UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 107—PART 6

MAY 1, 1961, TO MAY 17, 1961
(PAGES 6929 TO 8298)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1961

J
11
.R
v.107
pt.6

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, beset by the perplexities of these calamitous times with all their fury and terror, let not the heavenly vision fade nor our courage fail.

Strengthen in us the faith that Thy goodness faileth never, and renew our belief in the unrealized possibilities for greatness in Thy erring children—in spite of the stupid folly by which they have devastated the good earth Thou has given, and have marred the costly works of their own hands.

Give us the lift and exaltation of spirit that come to those whose powers are dedicated, not only to opposing the evils they are against, but to bringing to coronation the ideals they are for.

Amid the wrecks of ancient systems, in these tumultuous days, make us worthy in our motives and desires to help lead humanity toward the promised land of a loftier life and a cleaner and fairer world for all the disenfranchised and exploited peoples of the earth.

Gird us to meet with the might of righteousness and justice the massed forces of evil now loose in the world—

That we may tell our sons who see the light
High in the heavens, their heritage to take;
I saw the powers of darkness put to flight,
I saw the morning break.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 27, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the nomination of the Director of the Census.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar, beginning with that of the Director of the Census, will be stated.

DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard M. Scammon, of Minnesota, to be Director of the Census.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Louis J. Doyle, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state that the nominations of Richard M. Scammon, who has been nominated and confirmed to be Director of the Census, and Louis J. Doyle, who has been nominated and confirmed to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department, were reported by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Personally, I wish to say that both of these gentlemen are excellent nominees and are well qualified to fill these positions.

It was my privilege to work for many years with Mr. Doyle, while he served in the Department; and I believe we are fortunate to have a man of his experience and competence to serve in the position of General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

Likewise, I believe that Mr. Scammon will be an excellent Director of the Census.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. attorneys.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. marshals.

JAMES J. P. McSHANE

Mr. KEFAUVER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was very happy when I learned the President of the United States had recommended James J. P. McShane, of Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia, and that the nomination had received unanimous approval by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. McShane served with distinction on the staff of the Select Committee To Investigate Matters of Management and Labor Relations, commonly known as the McClellan committee. For some time he has been a member of the staff of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, in which he has done very good work. Considering his experience, his temperament, and his intelligence and courage, Mr. McShane has excellent qualifications to make an outstanding and capable marshal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these remarks may be printed in the RECORD immediately before confirmation of the nomination of Mr. McShane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator

from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of U.S. marshals be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc, and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of all the nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LAWRENCE M. HENRY

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, now that the Senate has confirmed the nomination of Lawrence M. Henry, of Colorado, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Colorado, I wish to make a brief statement. A peculiar situation exists in this case. The outgoing U.S. attorney in Colorado is today vacating his office. Under these circumstances, I wish to ask a question of the distinguished majority leader: Now that the nomination of Mr. Henry has been confirmed, and now that the Senate has ordered that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of his nomination, will the necessary papers be forwarded immediately to the President's office?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, the President will be immediately notified, in accordance with the order entered by the Senate. So the papers will be forwarded immediately to the President.

Mr. CARROLL. It is my understanding that the usual procedure is that shortly after confirmation of such a nomination, a commission is issued. Of course, it will take some time to have the commission engraved; and after it is engraved and after it is signed by the President, it will be sent to Colorado. Under these unusual circumstances, and in view of the fact that there will be a hiatus or vacancy in the office of district attorney for 3 or 4 days, I intend, as one of the Senators from Colorado, to telephone the senior judge of the Federal court there and ask him to fill the vacancy pending the receipt of the commission. I think such action will be entirely proper; when such a vacancy exists, I believe the Federal court has the duty and the responsibility of filling the office.

I realize that the able Senator from Montana, the majority leader, will see that, insofar as possible, action in connection with this matter will be expedited, so that the commission will be issued as soon as possible, under the circumstances.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Colorado can be assured that I shall do all I can. I understand that in instances of this sort the senior judge in the State has the right and the authority immediately to swear in the person who has been nominated and confirmed to the position.

Mr. CARROLL. Immediately after I leave the floor of the Senate, I intend to telephone the senior judge of the district court in Colorado, or one of the other Federal judges, and inform him of the confirmation of the nomination and the fact that the papers are being sent immediately to the White House for the issuance of the commission. I am confident there is no reason why the President will not immediately sign it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair state that the Secretary of the Senate will execute the necessary papers, and they will go immediately to the White House.

Mr. CARROLL. I understand. But of course it will take some time for the commission to be engraved and to be placed on the President's desk, for his signature. Consequently, a vacancy will exist during those 3 or 4 days.

I commend the President for submitting the nomination. I have known Lawrence Henry for 25 or 30 years. He is an able lawyer of approximately 20 years' experience. I support the appointment, and I believe Mr. Henry will make an excellent record in this office.

I merely wished to make this statement for the RECORD. Not only do I commend the President for making the nomination, but I also commend the majority leader for expediting the action on it.

The nomination could have been acted on by the Senate last Thursday; I believe the reason why that was not done is that one of the standing rules of the Senate requires that a nomination lie over for at least 1 legislative day before it is acted on by the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I notice on the Executive Calendar the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador to Iran. I wonder whether the majority leader can inform us when the Senate may consider that nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that it is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate adjourn from today until 11 a.m. on Wednesday. I hope to have before the Senate at that time the conference report on the minimum wage bill; and, following that, the Senate will take up the nomination of Mr. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran.

While I am discussing the program, let me state that later this week the Senate will consider all the measures on the Legislative Calendar, except those reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, which will be considered by the Senate today.

I hope that later in the week the Senate will also be able to consider Senate bill 1215, to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY, AT 11 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session today, it adjourn until Wednesday next at 11 o'clock a.m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAMS

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program, for the quarter ended March 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF CAREER COMPENSATION ACT OF 1949, TO INCREASE PER DIEM RATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 303(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 by increasing per diem rates and to provide reimbursement under certain circumstances for actual expenses incident to travel (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, TO BRING THE NUMBER OF CADETS AT THE U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY AND U.S. AIR FORCE ACADEMY UP TO FULL STRENGTH

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to bring the number of cadets at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy up to full strength and to authorize admittance of students from friendly foreign nations to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF SHIP TO PORT OF HOOD RIVER COMMISSION, HOOD RIVER, OREG., BY DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of the escort ship *Banning* to the Port of Hood River Commission, Hood River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RECREATIONAL BOATING IN THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on recreational boating in the United States, for the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, covering the 6-month period ended December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Alaska, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the development and utilization of Alaska's abundant mineral resources will be one of the principal future bulwarks of the State's economy, providing not only a source of employment and income but also a sound base for tax revenues; and

"Whereas the basic and essential mining industry has for several years been confronted with adverse economic conditions so severe that metal mining enterprises in the State, involving the production of antimony, tungsten, tin, chromite, and other strategic metals, have been forced out of business; and

"Whereas the cause of this serious predicament of our mining industry can be traced to governmental policy which stimulates the development and exploitation of foreign mineral resources and permits relatively free access of this low-cost foreign production to the U.S. markets; and

"Whereas this policy if continued will not only threaten the existence of Alaska's future metal mining industry, but will also impose a serious handicap on our Nation's capacity for providing from domestic sources the basic requirements for national defense; and

"Whereas the executive department of the Federal Government and both major political parties, as well as the Conference of Western Governors, have officially recognized the necessity for maintaining a domestic mining industry that is sufficiently progressive and vigorous to assure a minerals mobilization base adequate for national preparedness and security; and

"Whereas past efforts by the Federal Government to alleviate the depressed conditions which prevail in various segments of the domestic mining industry by means of short-range programs and temporary expedients such as stockpiling and quota limitations have proved ineffective and inadequate: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Second Legislature of the State of Alaska, now in session (the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States and the executive department of the Federal Government to develop and adopt as soon as possible a natural minerals policy that will guarantee a strong and healthy domestic mining industry by assuring domestic producers a fair and equitable share of domestic metal markets.

"We recommend that this policy be implemented by more effective enforcement of the antidumping laws, and by the imposition of adequate duties on metals and mineral imports to be applied only if and when the price of the metals fall below the period point level that is required to maintain a sound and healthy domestic mining industry; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Alaska be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress and to the Senators and Representative representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 31

"Be it resolved by the senate in second legislature, first session assembled:

"Whereas there has been introduced into the 87th Congress, H.R. 213, the purpose of which is to repeal the 6 percent construction bid differential for Pacific coast shipbuilders; and

"Whereas said differential is still essential and necessary to offset the freight differential which Pacific coast shipyards must pay in transporting steel from the east coast; and

"Whereas the Pacific coast shipyards have a wartime production record of which they are justifiably proud; and

"Whereas we cannot risk the loss of the highly skilled labor pool of shipbuilders on the west coast in case their services are again needed in time of war or national emergency: Be it

"Resolved by the senate in second legislature, first session assembled, That the President of the United States, the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives and the Alaskan delegation in Congress do all in their power to defeat H.R. 213 and any other bills or action that would deprive the Pacific coast of this justifiable and necessary 6 percent construction bid differential on shipbuilding; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted immediately to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Secretary of the U.S. Senate; the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives; the Alaskan delegation in Congress and to the Legislatures of the States of Washington, California, and Oregon."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 30

"Be it resolved by the house in second legislature, first session assembled:

"Whereas there has been introduced in the present session of the Congress a bill calling for a comprehensive program of oceanographic research and surveys; and

"Whereas the program would include the rehabilitation of the national commercial fishery, access, and utilization of the ocean fishery, fisheries exploration, and marine resources conservation and development; and

"Whereas the purpose and scope of the proposal made by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON in S. 901 are of vital concern to Alaska and the Nation in the conservation and development of their vast marine resources, known and potential: Be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives in second legislature, first session assembled, That the President and the Congress of the United States are respectfully urged to give favorable consideration to S. 901, the Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1961, and effect its passage and approval as soon as possible; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, Senators from Alaska; and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, Representative from Alaska."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 28

"Whereas John Muir was one of the Nation's foremost naturalists and an untiring proponent of the conservation of our great natural resources to preserve them for public use and enjoyment; and

"Whereas although born in Scotland, John Muir came to the United States in 1849 and settled in California in 1868, where he traveled extensively throughout the State and North America, exploring, often on foot, the many wilderness areas of our State and our country; and

"Whereas through accounts of his travels and his many other efforts and activities John Muir brought to the attention of his countrymen the beauties of nature and the scenic areas existing throughout California and North America and the need for national parks and reservations to preserve the great scenic and natural resources of our country; and

"Whereas there is in Martinez, Calif., the house John Muir called his home for nearly 20 years while making his many explorations and carrying on his worthwhile activities; and

"Whereas if this house is not preserved and saved for future generations as a monument to him and his many efforts on behalf of the citizens of our country it will eventually be lost to future generations: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States that funds be made available to acquire the John Muir home in Martinez, Calif., and establish it as a national monument; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 28

"Whereas the economies of many foreign countries which are already highly developed and industrialized are expanding at a rate greater than that at which the economy of the United States is expanding; and

"Whereas the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 contains provisions which are designed to indiscriminately encourage the investment of American capital in foreign countries; and

"Whereas among such provisions are those relating to the tax treatment of foreign subsidiaries, foreign tax credit, differential rates, and tax-free exchanges; and

"Whereas these provisions have the effect of sending abroad capital that today is vitally needed in this country for domestic business and industry; and

"Whereas indiscriminate American investment abroad is today contributing substantially to a critical reduction of our gold reserves, and thus may have an adverse effect on the value of the dollar; and

"Whereas it is essential to the national defense and to the health, welfare, and safety of the people that the economy of the United States be stable and expand at a rate to meet its needs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to revise the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to limit the application of the provisions in it which are designed to encourage the investment of American capital in foreign countries to those countries of Africa, Asia, and South America which are underdeveloped and underindustrialized; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 278

"Whereas the Florida Legislature has heretofore created the Florida Ship Canal Authority and the ship canal navigation districts by the respective sessions of 1953 and 1955; and

"Whereas Congress has heretofore authorized construction of this project conditioned upon establishment of economic feasibility; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army has recently filed its report with Congress establishing the economic feasibility of the project; and

"Whereas the construction is also justified as a defense measure and had it been so constructed when originally planned the many hundreds of lives and thousands of tons of cargo lost by ships and vessels necessarily going around the tip of Florida during the last war would have been saved; and

"Whereas the island of Cuba is within 90 miles of the tip of Florida and recent events in that country indicate the ever-increasing possibility of that country becoming a Communist satellite, which would greatly endanger the shipping of the United States and allied nations sailing around the tip of Florida; and

"Whereas it has been firmly established that the construction of this project would be like driving a 'golden spike,' creating a statewide waterway system directly connected with the entire national inland navigation network east of the Rocky Mountains; and

"Whereas this great project was first conceived in an effort to relieve the economic stagnation of the great depression and would today provide a boon to the economic progress of the whole State of Florida; and

"Whereas the present systems of the Withlacoochee and Ocklawaha Rivers are inadequate to carry floodwaters, the cross-State barge canal would provide new openings for these streams, thus greatly increasing the discharge capacity and materially reducing flood damage in these basins; and

"Whereas as a result of increased flood-carrying capacity better conservation practices may be undertaken at upstream points, thus conserving critically needed supplies of water for use during drought periods; and

"Whereas the barge canal now proposed, contrary to the old proposed ship canal, would provide for the impounding of many millions of gallons of water, thus increasing the dwindling water supply of Florida and assuring that ground-water levels will not be artificially lowered; and

"Whereas the project has been endorsed by and is being actively supported by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, the Mississippi Valley Association, and the Intra-Coastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas; and

"Whereas the early completion of the canal has been given top priority by the Florida Waterways Committee, which represents the entire State, and is familiar with all waterways projects proposed for the State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, requested to provide at the earliest possible time sufficient funds with which to commence construction of the cross-Florida barge canal during the next fiscal year, and that such funds be provided from time to time thereafter as may be needed to pursue such project expeditiously to completion; be it further

"*Resolved*, That it is the desire of the people of Florida that such project be completed in such a way as to contribute to the control and conservation of Florida's water resources; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; to each member of the ablest congressional delegation in the U.S. Congress, the Florida delegation; to the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.; and to the Governor of the great State of Florida."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 46

"Whereas there is a great need for additional fire protection facilities in the Waikiki area to safeguard adequately the rapidly increasing population in the Waikiki area of the city and county of Honolulu, State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the nearest fire station to provide fire protection for the Fort DeRussy area in Waikiki is located approximately 1.6 miles away; and

"Whereas the city and county of Honolulu is presently providing fire protection at Fort DeRussy and other military installations pursuant to the mutual-aid firefighting agreement entered into on June 8, 1959, by and among the city and county of Honolulu, the U.S. Army, the U.S. Navy (14th Naval District), and the Pacific Air Forces (base command); and

"Whereas the establishment of a fire station at Fort DeRussy will insure better fire protection for all of the people in Fort DeRussy and the surrounding areas: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1961 (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be and is hereby respectfully requested to transfer or set aside 30,000 square feet of land at Fort DeRussy to the city and county of Honolulu, State of Hawaii, for the exclusive use as a fire station site; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representative to Congress from Hawaii."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33

"Whereas Resolution 40 has been introduced in the Senate of the United States to develop a Lewis and Clark Tourway; and

"Whereas the resolution is based on the historic importance of the route, the tourist potential and assistance to conservation; and

"Whereas Nebraska is vitally interested in such a tourway because of the vital importance of Nebraska to the Lewis and Clark Tourway and other great highways across Nebraska: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1961 (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it endorse and support the above-described resolution and urge the adoption thereof; be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Senators and Representative to Congress from Hawaii and to the president of the Nebraska Legislature."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Whereas there is now before the Congress of the United States, Senate bill S. 473 and the House bill H.R. 12, providing for postal union recognition as a matter of right and not by sufferance; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government advocates and often insists that private industry officially recognize labor organizations and conduct sincere labor-management relations with unions designated by employees; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government should do no less for their own loyal workers than it encourages private industry to do; and

"Whereas the Post Office Department grants inadequate recognition of postal unions to represent their respective membership only on the basis of sufferance and not as a matter of right or law; and

"Whereas labor-management experience with Post Office Department officials at all levels has clearly demonstrated postal unions have an urgent need, not only of official recognition, but also the right by law to further appeal unfavorable and often unilateral and arbitrary decisions by the Post Office Department, in personnel matters, to an impartial board of review, exclusive of Post Office Department control or jurisdiction; and

"Whereas postal workers and their unions must necessarily have the assistance of the U.S. Government to implement decisions favorable to aggrieved personnel by such an appeal board of review, similar to the rights granted other citizens of our great country employed in private industry and members of labor unions of their choice: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States hereby respectfully is memorialized to enact S. 473 and H.R. 12 into law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each U.S. Senator and Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of Rhode Island."

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted at the annual General Conference of the Associated Churches of Christ in New Zealand, congratulating Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON on his election as Vice President of the United States; ordered to lie on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I present a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to ascertain and divulge the names of the American-owned foreign firms or those partly owned by citizens of the United States that are manufacturing on foreign soil and exporting into the United States textile products.

I ask that this concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to ascertain and divulge the names of the American-owned foreign firms or those partly owned by citizens of the United States that are manufacturing on foreign soil and exporting into the United States textile products

Whereas the general assembly, as representatives of the citizens of South Carolina, view with deep concern the financial plight in which the textile industry of the entire country finds itself; and

Whereas the general assembly is keenly aware that a large segment of the population of this State is directly dependent for its bread upon employment in our textile mills; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that this deplorable condition has been brought about by the encouragement which has been given by our Government to foreign textile manufacturing concerns and the assistance given these foreign establishments in the importation of large quantities of textile products, which are manufactured in foreign countries where labor is relatively cheap and the standard of living is far below that enjoyed by the American textile worker; and

Whereas the general assembly has learned that for the first time since the U.S. Government began the collection and retention of cotton statistics imports of cotton goods have exceeded the exports; and

Whereas this alarming increase of unfair importation has placed the owners of the textile manufacturing establishments in a difficult situation resulting in the rapid decline in employment of textile workers, which in turn has caused great apprehension among the cotton farmers of the State; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that the Congress of the United States should ascertain and divulge the names of the American-owned foreign firms or those partly owned by citizens of the United States that are manufacturing and exporting textile products into the United States and are being sold on the markets in this country in competition with textile manufacturing plants in America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to ascertain and divulge to the public the names of the American-owned firms or those that are partly owned by citizens of this country that are manufacturing and exporting into the United States textile products, which are being sold on the markets of this country in competition with textile products manufactured in the United States. Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of that body, and further copies should be forwarded to each U.S. Senator from South Carolina and each Member of the House of Representatives from this State in the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Administrator of General Services, dated April 19, 1961, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1751. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide, that for purposes of making deductions from an individual's social security benefits on account of excess earnings, there shall be counted as excess earnings for a taxable year only one-half of that portion of earnings which are in excess of $1,800 for such year; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 1752. A bill to establish a 3-year residence requirement for appointment as Governor of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa; and

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii):

S. 1753. A bill to provide that the Virgin Islands shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. GRUENING when he introduced the above-mentioned bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1754. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; and

S. 1755. A bill to provide certain exemptions from Federal excise taxes for nonprofit organizations for the blind which are now provided for nonprofit educational organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1756. A bill for the relief of the city of Pasco, Wash.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FONG, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1757. A bill to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1758. A bill for the relief of Kao Tseng Ying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

CREATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 132) creating a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MORSE, which appears under a separate heading.)

SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits, and to provide that one-half of an individual's earnings in excess of $1,800 be deducted from his social security benefits.

Last year, I supported similar amendments in the Senate Finance Committee. Although the committee and the Senate voted to increase the limitation to $1,800, the Eisenhower administration's disapproval made necessary, in the final version of the act, a smaller increase. The provision enacted in 1960 provides that a social security recipient who earns up to $1,500 will lose $1 of benefit for each $2 of earnings over $1,200. For earnings over $1,500, the recipient loses $1 in benefits for each $1 earned.

I believe this recently enacted adjustment in the limitation is overly modest and an inadequate compromise between no increase and the abolition of the limitation favored by some.

Many of our retired persons now eligible for or receiving social security payments are able and anxious to do a limited amount of work. The low earnings test now in effect serves to discourage them from seeking or continuing fruitful employment. This disincentive deprives some of our older citizens of the healthful activity and sense of accomplishment derived from productive, paying work, and deprives our Nation of their contribution to the economy, not to speak of the taxes payable on income exceeding $1,200.

Moreover, the earnings limitation as it now stands is grossly unfair to those persons who are most in need of unpenalized additional income. Persons who supplement their income from unearned sources such as dividends and rent do not suffer at all under the $1,200 limitation, but persons who can supplement their social security income only through wages may not earn more than $1,200 without being penalized. In justice to the retired worker who has little or no investment income, we should at least make the earnings test reasonable.

A reasonable test would be that which would allow unpenalized supplementary income sufficient to provide, when added to social security payments, an adequate

standard of living. According to recent Social Security Administration reports, the average monthly benefit payments to retired workers without dependents also receiving benefits were $79.20 for men and $59.30 for women. Under the proposed $1,800 limitation, an average of $150 a month earned income would not be penalized. This would permit an unpenalized average total monthly income of $229.20 for men and of $209.30 for women, or on a yearly basis, $2,751.40 and $2,511.60, respectively.

Placed beside the high cost of living, which has increased by 11 percent since the $1,200 limit was enacted in 1954, these figures lead me to believe that the increase I am proposing in the income limitation is necessary and not excessive.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1751) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to provide, that for purposes of making deductions from an individual's social security benefits on account of excess earnings, there shall be counted as excess earnings for a taxable year only one-half of that portion of earnings which are in excess of $1,800 for such year, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FOR A NEW FRONTIER POLICY IN OUR REMAINING OUTLYING AREAS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, colonialism has been in the public eye throughout the world as never before in history. With one exception, the Western Powers—Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Beligum, which have been great colonial nations—are liquidating their colonialism and either have relinquished their colonies or are in the process of preparing for independence those of their colonies whose people desire it. Particular credit is due to the United Kingdom, which has done so well in readying its former colonies for independence and self-government, and gratifyingly and deservedly has preserved the good will and friendship of its former dependencies, retaining nearly all of them, by their own consent, in the British Commonwealth.

Great credit is also due to France, which likewise has proceeded along similar lines. The heroic and enlightened efforts of President de Gaulle to settle the Algerian problem have been highlighted recently by the revolt of a few dissident military leaders. That rebellion has, happily, collapsed. With the one remaining exception among the Western nations, Russia alone remains the world's one great colonial power, having achieved by brute force and subversion the conquest of a variety of formerly free and independent nations which it has subjected to its iron yoke and all the repressions of imperial communism directed from Moscow. Gone into a colonial serfdom are formerly free and independent Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, the eastern portion of Germany, and northern Korea.

It is one of the ironies of our time that Cuba, freed from Spain's rule by and with the assistance of the United States, and for 30-odd years thereafter an American semi-protectorate, by virtue of the Platt Amendment, which then was annulled, giving Cuba complete freedom, has, for the time being, at least, become a Soviet satellite.

As for the United States, it has now very definitely established itself as a noncolonial power. Our Nation ventured into imperialism a little over 60 years ago, following the war with Spain, and somewhat previously also had acquired a few outlying areas—Alaska, away back in 1867, and eastern Samoa, beginning in 1889.

Consequent upon the Spanish-American War, just before the close of the century, there came under the jurisdiction of the United States the Philippines, Guam, Puerto Rico—acquired from Spain; and, with its consent, Hawaii was annexed. The Virgin Islands were acquired by purchase from Denmark in 1917, when the United States feared that Germany would seize them by means of compulsion exerted upon its neighbor.

The Philippines were granted their independence in 1946, after nearly half a century of American tutelage.

Some 9 years ago, after progressive increases in the local autonomy of Puerto Rico, in concert with representatives from that Caribbean island, the United States established for it a unique and unprecedented form of government which corresponded with the then expressed wishes of its people. By this mutually agreed-upon arrangement, Puerto Rico was given complete local autonomy, but at the same time retained the close association with, and protection of, the United States. Puerto Ricans have been American citizens since 1917, serve in our Armed Forces, and enjoy all the other rights and privileges of their fellow Americans, except the right to vote for President and Vice President. At the same time, they further enjoy the unique advantage of not being subject to any Federal taxes, but have been free to develop their own revenue system, being allowed to retain even the island's customs receipts. I believe this is a unique and unprecedented example of a praiseworthy and benevolent evolution in the relation of a great nation with a former possession.

In consequence of these changes, Puerto Rico has made tremendous progress and has demonstrated the practical value of enlightened American policy in the Caribbean. Its enjoyment of freedom and its participation in the benefits of the American idea, with special consideration for its economic needs, contrast sharply with the situation in the neighboring Greater Antilles—the Dominican Republic, where a dictatorship of the right prevails; and Cuba, where a dictatorship of the left has replaced a dictatorship of the right.

Alaska and Hawaii were admitted to statehood within the last 3 years, thus demonstrating anew the faith of our people in the basic American principle of government by consent of the governed.

There remain under the flag three outlying areas—the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Samoa—where it is clearly our duty to carry out, as far as it may be possible, the principles underlying and motivating the varied steps that have been taken in regard to the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii. The policy embodied in these diverse approaches is to secure for them, also, as rapidly as it may be appropriate, the maximum of self-government consistent with their desires as well as their capabilities and their special conditions, and to assist them to help themselves in securing a stable economy in a free and prospering society.

For many years, these areas, as well as Puerto Rico and the State of Alaska—when they were Territories—were governed by Governors appointed by the President and generally sent from the 48 States. Hawaii was protected by a 3-year residence clause enacted in 1921. That policy has varied from time to time, and it is desirable, I think, that the United States establish the principle that future appointees to the only three remaining outlying areas belonging to the United States—namely, Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands—be selected on the basis not merely of qualifications suitable for these important positions, but of previous knowledge of, and of interest in, the people, the problems, and the conditions of these areas. That principle has now been repeatedly well fulfilled in the Virgin Islands. Some years ago, President Truman appointed Morris De Castro, a native Virgin Islander, as Governor; President Eisenhower appointed John Merwin, a native of St. Croix; and again, a few weeks ago, President Kennedy appointed Ralphael Paiewonsky, a lifelong resident of St. Thomas, as Governor of the Virgin Islands.

I am introducing, along with other Senators, a bill to provide that gubernatorial appointments shall require of the appointee a 3-year residence in the area to which he is nominated. I think it is highly desirable that this policy be adopted and that not, as so often in the past, the governorship of one of these areas be made a political plum for someone from the mainland. In due time, it is my hope that the governorship may be made elective, as was done in the case of Puerto Rico—an interim step between the appointment of the first Puerto Rican as Governor and the present Commonwealth status.

A further step which I deem desirable is to establish the degree of representation in the Congress which has been enjoyed in the past by territories, namely, representation in the House by either a Resident Commissioner, Delegate, or Deputy. Bills to provide this office for Samoa and Guam have been introduced by my able colleague, Senator OREN LONG, of Hawaii, which I have been happy to cosponsor. I am introducing a similar bill for the Virgin Islands on be-

half of myself and Senator LONG of Hawaii.

It is my belief that these steps are essential to move toward what ought to be the goal, namely, that we should have no second-class citizens under the American flag.

A further step to validate this purpose which I foresee and favor, and was foreshadowed by the constitutional amendment giving the residents of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President, is to permit all citizens—all under the American flag—a similar right. There no doubt will be some complexity about working this out equitably, but we should certainly view this objective sympathetically and aim for its ultimate realization.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill providing a 3-year residence clause, and the bill providing a Deputy in the House of Representatives for the Virgin Islands, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Likewise, an article which is pertinent to this subject, from yesterday's New York Times, entitled "Palewonsky Stirs Round of Activity," be also included at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. GRUENING, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, and Mr. MOSS):

S. 1752. A bill to establish a 3-year residence requirement for appointment as Governor of Guam, the Virgin Islands, or American Samoa; and

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. LONG of Hawaii):

S. 1753. A bill to provide that the Virgin Islands shall be represented in Congress by a Territorial Deputy to the House of Representatives.

The article presented by Mr. GRUENING is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1961]

PALEWONSKY STIRS ROUND OF ACTIVITY; VIRGIN ISLANDERS IMPRESSED BY GOVERNOR'S VIGOR

ST. THOMAS, V.I., April 29.—In less than a month since his inauguration, Gov. Ralphael Palewonsky has stirred up more activity than the Virgin Islands have seen in 10 years.

Mr. Palewonsky ranks among the most important achievements to date this week's remodeling of the Virgin Islands incentive program, based on the analysis of Oscar Gass, an economic adviser, and a two-man task force from the Federal Government. Under the revised program, new enterprises will receive certificates of exemption from the Virgin Islands Government that will apply to the interest on any approved indebtedness. Thus, Virgin Islands developers can offer tax-exempt interest to the financial institutions making a loan on an approved project, regardless of where these institutions are located.

"While tourism is an important segment of our economy," Mr. Palewonsky said in an interview, "I don't think we should have all our eggs in one basket. With the help of Congress we could expand this new program of tax incentives on loans to include factories, new small industries and, for a limited time, a crash program of homebuilding. After the 10 years' tax exemption, the Virgin Islands would thus have on the tax rolls millions of dollars worth of taxable wealth created by the program.

"Equally important, we could improve the quality of employment, provide higher year-round wages, and keep our islanders at home. At the present time, 50 percent of our population is of school age, the rest overwhelmingly aged or indigent. We want to change that balance."

HOTELS TO BE FINANCED

Senator Earle B. Ottley, leader of the Unity Party, also rates the tax-exemption program among the top achievements.

A $10 million bond issue to finance three new hotels had been stalled for more than a year; with the new administration, enabling legislation is expected to pass during the current 60-day session of the legislature. Until now, the Virgin Islands have in many cases been unable to compete with rival islands of other flags in attracting American investment capital.

Mr. Palewonsky had overwhelming support from islanders in his battle for confirmation. And his actions since becoming Governor April 5 have won wide approval among native leaders.

One of the most crucial problems has been low- and middle-priced housing. An official estimate notes that 80 percent of the Virgin Islanders occupy substandard housing. For 2 years negotiations have been bogged down over one of the ugliest slums in Charlotte Amalie, with government and private ownership unable to reach an agreement to clear the way for public acquisition of the land. Within 48 hours last week, the Palewonsky administration reached an agreement with the principals, court condemnation proceedings were dropped and the government will acquire the necessary 15 acres to develop the new housing project.

MORE HOMES OUTLINED

In St. Croix, Mr. Palewonsky arranged for the rehabilitation of 50 plantation cottages on federally owned Estate Bethlehem, to provide homes for distressed families on that island.

In an effort to cut red tape, Mr. Palewonsky also cleared the way to put into effect surplus food distribution to needy persons as authorized by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The distribution will begin in June.

Mr. Palewonsky is also taking action on the St. Thomas airport problem. The first study of the St. Thomas Airport, in 1956, was followed by four subsequent studies, with no results. Mr. Palewonsky prefers to make the present Harry Truman Field suitable for medium jets rather than to scrap it as was previously recommended and build a new one at the other end of the island.

The airstrip can be lengthened and hazardous Sara Hill removed by natural (and costless) means by using the rock-crushing plant already installed on the far side of the hill. The islands need crushed rock badly and in providing it the rock crusher can at the same time remove the hill.

Progress in other areas covers a survey of land utilization, including the orderly westward expansion of the town of Charlotte Amalie; the establishment of a new Department of Commerce, to include the functions of the existing Department of Tourism with expanded sections on trade, harbors and airports; paving and beautification of the Veterans Drive Highway, an invitation for bids on the improvement of St. Thomas's largest new residential development, Estate St. Thomas, and the reorganization of the Public Works Department.

WITHDRAWAL PROCEDURES FOR PUBLIC LAND TRACTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators ANDERSON, BRIDGES, BIBLE, CANNON, CARROLL, CHAVEZ, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, FONG, GRUENING, HARTKE, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, KERR, LONG of Hawaii, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MOSS, RANDOLPH, and YOUNG of Ohio, a bill to amend the act of February 28, 1958, Public Law 85–337, which establishes in the Congress exclusive authority to grant to the agencies of the Defense Department public land tracts exceeding 5,000 acres in the aggregate. My amendment would extend these provisions to govern the withdrawal procedures of all agencies and departments of the Federal Government.

Public Law 85–337 was enacted to protect the public domain from indiscriminate and unwise withdrawals for the use of military branches of government. Extensive legislative investigations, directed in large measure by the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], then chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, revealed that withdrawal requests received by the Interior Department from military agencies had been consistently granted with little inquiry into the actual need for such reservations. It was discovered that large land areas had been selected and reserved by the various military branches without regard to the competing claims of the public for beneficial land utilization. Often, it was found, military withdrawals were of a size far greater than could be reasonably justified.

Although Public Law 85–337 placed a check on the authority of the military departments in this regard, there remains in all other executive agencies the power to request from the Interior Department withdrawals of any desired size and duration. During the 2 fiscal years 1959 and 1960, there were granted 16 such non-military-land withdrawals, each exceeding 5,000 acres. They are located within the boundaries of Alaska, Colorado, Montana, Oregon, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming.

It is the purpose of my bill to eliminate the inconsistency which is apparent in allowing withdrawals of this size to be undertaken by nondefense agencies in the executive branch without congressional sanction. I believe that the need for legislative review of large executive land dispositions is no less obvious in the case of these agencies than it is in respect to the military branches. Of all our national wealth, public land stands out as a singularly great resource. It is a resource which can be beneficially utilized only when the competing demands for its use in the public interest are weighed and analyzed.

It will be recalled by the Senate that the bill I introduce today is identical in purpose to legislation which was approved in this body during the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks there be printed in the RECORD an excerpt from

the favorable report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on my bill of last session, S. 2587.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the excerpt will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1757) to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The excerpt presented by Mr. BARTLETT is as follows:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2587) to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSES OF LEGISLATION

The broad purpose and objective of the bill is to return from the executive branch to the Congress the responsibility imposed by the Constitution on the Congress for the management of the Nation's public lands.

S. 2587 would amend the act of February 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 27), now applicable only to withdrawals of public lands for the use of the Department of Defense, to extend it to withdraways for the use of all departments and agencies of the Government. Under the 1958 act, as this bill would amend it, no withdrawal or restriction from operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (67 Stat. 462), which would result in the withdrawal, reservation or restriction of more than 5,000 acres for any one project or facility, could be made except by act of Congress. Under the 1958 act, applications for withdrawals, reservations, or restrictions must contain detailed information, including (1) description; (2) gross and net area of public land and water; (3) purpose and period of proposed use; (4) impact of conservation, utilization, and development of mineral, timber, grazing, fish and wildlife, and water resources and recreation, and other values; and (5) whether the use of water will be involved and whether rights thereto will be obtained under State law.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION

During the 1st session of the 85th Congress, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had before it two measures dealing with the subject of withdrawals of public domain lands; both were pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 557 (introduced by Mr. BIBLE of Nevada) dealt with the subject of the withdrawal of public lands for military purposes. S. 954 (introduced by Messrs. Watkins and BENNETT of Utah) sought to establish procedures for the withdrawal of public lands by all governmental agencies.

In reporting out a bill (H.R. 5538), limited to public land withdrawals for defense purposes, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs stated:

"In view of the urgent necessity of enacting legislation designed to control rapidly expanding military control of public lands, the committee limited its consideration of withdrawal legislation to public lands use by the military departments. The committee fully intends to consider the more comprehensive type of withdrawal legislation during the next session of the 85th Congress."

Prior thereto, during the 2d session of the 84th Congress, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held extensive hearings on "Withdrawal and Utilization of the Public Lands of the United States." These hearings, the printed record of which occupies some 781 pages, were conducted under the able leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], who was at that time chairman of that committee in the other body. While these hearings were primarily aimed at securing information concerning withdrawals for military uses, considerable testimony was adduced during the 18 days of testimony concerning the methods, purposes, procedures, and problems involved in the withdrawal of public lands for nonmilitary purposes.

The House record was so comprehensive that only limited hearings were held on H.R. 5538 by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. To a very great extent, the report herewith filed utilizes much of the material contained in the report filed by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with respect to H.R. 5538 (S. Rept. No. 857, 85th Cong., 1st sess.), which in turn, was an adaptation of the excellent report filed on that bill by the House committee. Deletions with respect to military withdrawals have been made; additions with respect to nonmilitary withdrawals have been inserted.

Stemming primarily from the facts brought out at those House hearings, the Congress enacted Public Law 85-337 approved February 28, 1958—the so-called Engle bill—reasserting congressional control over public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres for military purposes.

S. 2587 has as its purpose making public land withdrawals for nonmilitary purposes subject to the same legal restrictions as are applicable under Public Law 85-337 to public land withdrawals for military purposes.

As noted above, S. 2587 has as its fundamental purpose and objective returning to the Congress a greater degree of the direct exercise of the responsibility fixed by the Federal Constitution in the legislative branch for effecting policies and procedures governing the utilization of the public lands and other property of the United States.

Put another way, S. 2587 deals with the power to withdraw, reserve, or restrict the public lands and other property of the United States from settlement, entry, location, and sale. Subject only to the limits of its own provisions, and notwithstanding other provisions of law, it is a bill for the recapture by the Congress of those powers which the executive branch of the Government has acquired, over a long period of years, through acquiescence or silence on the part of Congress.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the 86th Congress I submitted Senate Resolution 19 with some 25 cosponsors. The resolution would have created a standing committee in the Senate on veterans' affairs.

Hearings were held on my resolution and on others like it submitted in the 86th Congress. A favorable report was made by the subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee which held the hearings. At that time the subcommittee recommended a new resolution to accomplish the same purpose. However, the full committee did not approve the subcommittee recommendation.

Since then I have promised my constituents and many people elsewhere in the country that I would resubmit my resolution for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I am doing so at this time, but I want to make it entirely clear that my resolution is in no way competitive with that to be offered soon by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

The Senator from Nevada will offer the text of the new resolution approved last year by the subcommittee of the Rules Committee, of which he is a member. I am delighted that he is doing so, and I surely hope that this time one or the other of these resolutions will reach the Senate floor, because I feel certain that the majority of Senators will approve the establishment of such a committee if given a chance to vote on it.

I am submitting the same measure as I offered 2 years ago in Senate Resolution 19 because I have pledged to do so. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is again a cosponsor. I send the resolution to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 132) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

SEC. 2. Section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed twenty-six Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed eleven Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Committee on Aeronautics and Space Sciences, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, may serve on three standing committees and no more."

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Sen-

ator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] be listed as additional cosponsors of S. 1615, the bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit reduced benefits thereunder—when based upon the attainment of retirement age—to be paid to men at age 62, and that at the next printing of the bill their names be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 27, I introduced S. 1718, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill the name of my colleague, the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] be included as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 7 AND 8 OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 27, 1961, the name of Mr. LONG of Missouri was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1734) to amend sections 7 and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, introduced by Mr. CARROLL (for himself and Mr. HART) on April 27, 1961.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Address entitled "Public Power in Texas and in the Nation," delivered by him at the 18th Annual Convention of the American Public Power Association, in San Antonio, Tex., on April 24, 1961.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address of Senator WILEY concerning issues now before Congress.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Article entitled "The Challenge of Change" by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, published in the Midwest Quarterly, issue of April 1961.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Editorial from Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette, April 28, 1961, entitled "Area Aid Bill a Tribute to Democratic Concern."

NEEDED SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM — FURTHER LIBERALIZATION OF THE EARNINGS TEST

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Senate Finance Committee is presently considering legislation to amend the Social Security Act in several important respects. There is much in this bill that is good and important, and I therefore hope that this measure will be expeditiously handled and will shortly be reported to the Senate for action.

I want to comment briefly this morning on a social security reform which is in the House-passed bill. The editor of the Syracuse Post Standard recently ran an excellent editorial reviewing the measures contained in the bill before the Senate Finance Committee, but called attention to the fact that it does not contain a needed further liberalization of the so-called social security earnings test.

Mr. President, legislation to amend the Social Security Act should include provisions dealing with the so-called earnings test. For many years, I have introduced legislation in the Congress calling for the complete elimination of the earnings test. As is well known, this test prevents workers from receiving their social security benefits if they have been employed and have earned over a certain limited amount in any one year.

Although the earnings test was amended last year, further changes are badly needed. A proposal was offered in the House to change this test. I regret that the other body did not see fit to act on this matter in the present bill, and I very much hope that the Senate or the Senate Finance Committee will include needed modification in the earnings test in the pending Social Security Amendments Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this point to include in the RECORD the text of the April 22 editorial from the Syracuse Post Standard which I referred to above.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENSION OVERHAUL

The social security bill passed by the House contains something for nearly everyone.

Under its terms a man may retire at 62 instead of 65 if he is willing to take a 20-percent permanent cut in his pension.

Widows covered by social security will get 82½ percent of the husband's benefit rather than 75 percent.

The minimum benefit will go from $33 to $40 a month.

An employee will be able to qualify for social security if he or she works the equivalent of one calendar quarter in four between 1950 and the time he or she reaches 65, instead of the present one calendar quarter in three.

To pay for these benefits the payroll tax goes from 3 to 3⅛ percent on the first $4,800 of income. The levy might have been 3¼ percent if the House had not pared President Kennedy's proposals.

The House has done well with the bill. It has wisely provided for the tax increase to become effective in January 1962 instead of 1963. There is no point in delaying the shock, and the tax automatically goes up another one-half percent in 1963.

In view of the 399-to-14 vote of approval in the House the legislation should have no difficulty in the Senate where one addition should be made.

Pensioners now may earn up to $1,200 a year without loss of benefits. On earnings between $1,200 and $1,500 they lose $1 in benefits for each $2 earned, and above that $1 in benefits for each $1 earned.

A Republican proposal in the House which apparently got nowhere, would increase this $1 for $2 earnings band from $1,500 to $2,400. That would give some help to pensioners trying to stretch dollars and at the same time retain in essence the earnings principle that has been followed.

If social security recipients want this they should make their views known.

AUTOMOBILE SEAT BELTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, on Friday, April 28, 1961, it was my privilege to be the first participant in the women's crusade for seat belts which is being nationally sponsored by the General Federation of Women's Clubs and the Auto Industries Highway Safety Committee.

The 5½ million women affiliated with the General Federation of Women's Clubs will work through the local clubs and through the local dealers to urge the installation of safety seat belts on all cars.

Studies reveal beyond any substantial doubt that safety seat belts, if properly installed and fastened, can reduce the hazards of automobile accidents. An automotive crash injury research project has been going on for many years, under the able direction of John O. Moore, and now Robert A. Wolf of Cornell University. Their reports indicate that traffic accident injuries—serious and fatal—are reduced more than one-third by the use of seat belts. Seat belts virtually eliminate the chance of being thrown from a car, and statistically speaking, the likelihood of being killed is five times smaller if a passenger or rider is not thrown from the car.

It is a source of considerable satisfaction to all who have studied these statistics that, beginning in 1962, the automotive manufacturers are going to install the basic hardware for seat belts on the assembly line. This will cut the costs from about $20 to about $3 per seat belt. This decision was made in Detroit, I understand, after the enterprising New York State Senator Edward J. Speno made a special pilgrimage to Detroit to argue the case for seat belts.

In New York State, Governor Rockefeller has already signed a bill requiring that all vehicles manufactured after June 1962 and sold in the State be equipped with anchorage units at the attachment points for attaching at least two sets of seat safety belts for the front seat of each such motor vehicle. Seat belts are already used in certain school buses in Long Island, and are going to be mandatory for vehicles purchased by several Federal agencies—HEW and Commerce.

The seatbelt crusade is being supported by a number of other groups who are aware of the increased safety factor. These include the American Medical Association, automobile manufacturers, Automotive Safety Foundation, National Automobile Dealers Association, National Safety Council, National Tire Dealers Retreaders Association, President's Committee for Traffic Safety, Public Health

Service, tire manufacturers, the American Automobile Association, and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters.

The slogan of the Women's Crusade is: "A Million and One in 1961." I should like to add to that the hope that by next year, when the hardware is installed in the factory, we can have an even bigger motto: "Two Million and Two for 1962."

SENIOR CITIZEN'S MONTH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the designation by Governor Rockefeller of the month of May as Senior Citizen's Month in New York State represents a most fitting tribute to the elderly people of our Nation. By their lives, by their careers, they have contributed richly to the greatness and the growth of our Nation, and it is well that America pauses both to pay homage to them and to reflect upon our debt and our responsibility toward them.

The senior citizens of our Nation have helped to build the America we know and love today. This Nation will always be an inheritance passed on to younger hands from the older hands that have molded it and now have earned both their repose and the rewards of their labor.

Our concern for those men and women who have reached retirement age must therefore be translated into active programs designed to enrich and to dignify their sunset years. In this respect one of the most heartening developments in the history of our Nation is the increased and urgent emphasis that is being given to the problems of the aged. It is not a matter of humaneness, but a matter of rightful responsibility that we should establish for our elderly citizens programs of assistance that are not only responsive to their physical needs but which keep in mind, as well, the social, intellectual, and leisure requirements of those entering upon their golden years.

In times past the age of retirement was conceived to be a sterile period when the individual's contribution to society summarily came to an end. Today, surrounded as we are by living examples of the dynamism of old age, we realize that our senior citizens can and do continue to contribute to the vigor and progress of our Nation. Their gifts, their talents, their abilities, contribute a fund of human resources that adds immeasurably to our national wealth. It is wholly appropriate, therefore, at the beginning of this month set aside to honor them that we salute the senior citizens of our Nation, that we pledge to them our unremitting concern and that we thank them for what they have done in their lifetimes to make the American dream come true.

PRINTING OF MEMORANDUMS RELATING TO CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES ON S. 1021, AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 170, Senate Resolution 126.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 126) to print memorandums relating to constitutional issues on S. 1021 as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 4, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "subcommittee." and insert "subcommittee; and a legal analysis of the Administration's brief on Federal aid to church-supported elementary schools, by Senator Kenneth B. Keating of New York.", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a Senate document the memorandums entitled "The Constitutional Authority of the Congress To Enact S. 1021", "The Impact of the First Amendment to the Constitution Upon Federal Aid to Education", and "Federal Programs Under Which Institutions With Religious Affiliation Receive Federal Funds Through Grants or Loans", submitted on March 28, 1961, by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, together with the opinions on the questions of the constitutionality of S. 1021 and the constitutionality of a measure which would provide loans for construction purposes to private and parochial schools at both the primary and secondary school levels submitted to the subcommittee by certain professors of law in response to requests by the chairman of the subcommittee; and a legal analysis of the Administration's brief on Federal aid to church-supported elementary schools, by Senator Kenneth B. Keating of New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

INCREASED DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD TO THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 171, S. 1748.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1748) to provide for the increased distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Federal judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 73 of the Act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U.S.C. 183), relating to the gratuitous distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is further amended (a) by inserting therein immediately after the paragraph reading:

"To the offices of the marshal and clerk of the Supreme Court of the United States, each, two copies of the daily and one semimonthly copy."

an additional paragraph reading as follows:

"To each United States circuit and district judge, and to the chief judge and each associate judge of the United States Court of Claims, the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the United States Customs Court, the Tax Court of the United States, and the United States Court of Military Appeals, upon request to a Member of Congress and notification thereof by such Member to the Public Printer, one copy of the daily. Copies so furnished shall be in addition to those authorized to be furnished to Members of Congress under the foregoing provisions of this section."

and (b) by inserting therein immediately after the paragraph reading:

"To the library of the Supreme Court of the United States, two copies of the daily, two semimonthly copies, and not to exceed five bound copies."

an additional paragraph reading as follows:

"To the library of each United States Court of Appeals, each United States District Court, the United States Court of Claims, the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the United States Customs Court, the Tax Court of the United States, and the United States Court of Military Appeals, upon request to the Public Printer, one bound copy."

PRESENTATION OF GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND OF FLORIDA

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on April 29 last, at a meeting of the American Good Government Society, an award was made to the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks on that occasion be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. On that occasion I had the honor of introducing the distinguished Senator from Florida. I ask unanimous consent that included in this presentation be a copy of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, OF KANSAS, UPON THE OCCASION OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD TO THE HONORABLE SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, U.S. SENATOR FROM FLORIDA, BY THE AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 29, 1961

It is with great pleasure that on behalf of the Good Government Society I present to the Honorable SPESSARD HOLLAND, U.S. Senator from Florida, this award for distinguished and outstanding service to the American people.

SPESSARD HOLLAND has been a friend and colleague of mine for the past 20 years, beginning when we were both Governors of our respective States.

A trained attorney, county prosecutor, judge, and teacher, the distinguished gentleman from Florida possesses courage, ability, and judgment, which have enabled him on innumerable occasions to make substantial contributions to our legislative process.

Modest by nature, he seldom reveals the honors which his intelligence, integrity, and courage have earned. Phi Beta Kappa, holder of the Distinguished Service Cross for his outstanding combat record in World War I, and a host of other awards mark his career.

Though we are of different political parties, my admiration for SPESSARD HOLLAND stems from my observation of his steadfast dedication and devotion to the best interests of this Nation.

Often in the heat of partisan debate, I have witnessed the gentleman from Florida in action. Calm, judicious, incisive, he logically devastates the flamboyant oratory of the demagogs, announces his position, and stands firm. A man unafraid—even though at times he might stand alone—because of principle and his convictions.

Good government can only be attained if good men are in public office. As a Republican I am delighted that the Democratic Party has within its ranks a man of such ability and conservative convictions as our honored guest.

Measured by any criteria, SPESSARD HOLLAND—former Governor, gentleman, scholar, soldier, legislator, and my friend, epitomizes the best in American government.

He typifies to me what was said of a great American—Joseph Eastman—by the late Carter Fort, when he spoke these words, "A spiritual leader cast in the mold of the finest American tradition, and he never sold the truth to serve the hour."

May I congratulate you on your choice for this award, and present to you the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, the Honorable SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND.

RESOLUTION OF TRIBUTE AND HONOR TO SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

Statesman and soldier, scholar and jurist, has worked effectively for the people of Florida and of the United States for more than 35 years as county prosecutor and judge, as State legislator and Governor, and since 1946 as a Member of the U.S. Senate.

An outstanding wartime Governor, his notable contributions to the American constitutional system include the Farm Credit Acts which are moving into private ownership all institutions of the farm credit system; and the vital restoration to the coastal States of rightful ownership of undersea lands within their historic boundaries. On this tidelands issue, he was the leader in the Senate and before the Supreme Court of the United States.

Senator HOLLAND'S ability and rectitude have earned for him the unqualified respect of his fellow Senators and all who know him. He is the only man born in Florida to serve the State as Governor and U.S. Senator.

FOR THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY.
APRIL 28, 1961.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am sincerely grateful to the American Good Government Society for conferring upon me this high and unexpected honor. And, of course, I appreciate deeply the gracious kindness of my longtime friend, Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, in presenting the award.

No one knows better than I that many good citizens worked long and hard in organizing the efforts which led to the adoption of the four Farm Credit Acts of 1953, 1955, 1956, and 1959, and the so-called Tidelands Act, which are mentioned in the award. No one realizes more keenly than I that dozens of Senators and Members of the House of Representatives labored together in bringing these measures before Congress and that a sizable majority of both Houses of Congress cast their votes in favor of the several acts before they were passed and reached the White House, where they received Presidential approval. And so, in accepting this award, I do so on behalf of the many whose cooperative efforts resulted in enacting these programs into law. I am glad that I could have an active part in the passage of the legislation and I am particularly happy for my coworkers and myself that this society, dedicated to the cause of good government, recognizes these laws as contributions to wholesome and sound American government.

The very nature of these laws is in line with the general objectives which I shall discuss briefly. The Farm Credit Acts were designed to encourage the retirement of Government capital from the farm credit program and to permit the ownership and control of farm credit establishments by the farmers, ranchers, and growers who use them. We are all happy that many farm credit units have already realized this important objective and are now operating as successful private enterprises without Government money. The Tidelands Act was enacted to restore and confirm to the coastal States, and to private purchasers from these States, the title to great areas in their coastal waters within their territorial boundaries. The Supreme Court has clearly upheld this restoration of traditional and historic State rights.

I think that our further pursuit of sound government requires that we do many more things that lie in these same general directions. We should encourage private enterprise and take the Government out of business in many fields. We should restore to the States, the local communities, and individuals their ability to function in those many areas where they can function best, so that they will be relieved from regimentation and control by the Federal Government. I believe profoundly that Thomas Jefferson was right when he insisted that "it is an axiom of freedom that that government is best which governs least" and that that government is soundest and most economical which is closest to the people.

It seems to me to be wholly clear that in following the trend of the past several decades toward greater centralization of government, we have already reached a stage where our National Government is too big to be either efficient or economical. There is no mortal mind, no matter how conscientious, which can grasp all the implications of our present huge centralized Government. The result is that the Congress, which is directly elected by and answerable to the people, is being deprived more and more of the opportunity to carry out in full its constitutional duty, while vital details of Government are being delegated more and more to the appointive heads of many executive agencies and bureaus. All this has produced a Central Government which is often arbitrary, wasteful, inefficient, undemocratic and, in short, inconsiderate of the rights and needs of States, communities, and individuals. I hope that the American people will never forget these wise words of Woodrow Wilson: "Liberty has never come from the government. Liberty has always come from the subjects of it. The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of limitations of governmental power, not the increase of it."

It is a regrettable fact that our Central Government, by its overexpansion, has grown too great to function well. It does, indeed, bestride the American world like a colossus. In our Central Government frequently the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing. And yet there are many among us who would go still further toward concentrating in our Central Government the legal supervision and control of further important activities in the daily lives of the American people, thus increasing the already intolerable load on Uncle Sam's weary shoulders. Several such acts have been proposed to the Congress which is now in session.

Without discussing in detail these proposals, which I shall strongly oppose, I merely comment that in my judgment this is no time to bring on the determined controversy or the vigorous and divisive debate which is bound to occur if such proposals are seriously urged. I strongly hope that the Nation will be spared such an experience and that national unity, instead of disunity and bitterness, may be made our immediate and continuing objective.

For at this very moment our form of government is more critically on trial throughout the earth than at any earlier time in our history. We badly need to spend our time and our united effort in concentrating on how best to meet our grave problems of international relations, national defense, fiscal solvency and scientific development which weigh so heavily upon us.

I need not remind this great gathering of the manifold troubles and the utter confusion which now confront us in Cuba, in Laos, in South Vietnam, in the Congo, in Algeria, and perhaps tomorrow somewhere else. We all know full well that godless communism seeks energetically to destroy all freedom on this earth, and that our country, the strongest bastion of freedom, is the supremely important target. When we realize that our very survival is at stake, how can we consider spending our time, effort, and strength in disruptive argument with fellow Americans?

I have no doubt whatever of the strength of our Nation and of the eternal soundness of its form of government. Our America has the manpower, the national resources, the developed assets, the resourcefulness, the strength of character, and the dogged courage, not only to survive, but to prevail over any force that may assail us from without. Our principal danger at this crucial time in our history is division amongst ourselves, distracting us from the present fundamental concern of good government, which is to assure, first, our survival so that we may bring to fruition our vast potentiality to serve our own people and the cause of freedom throughout the earth.

Surely there is no cause to which all patriotic Americans everywhere, whether we call ourselves conservatives or liberals, can more properly dedicate ourselves in these trying times than to insist that the divisions, the bickerings, the strenuous arguments as to what philosophy shall prevail on our domestic scene shall be laid aside until a less turbulent season. That course would permit the thinking and the dedicated effort of our best trained minds to be concentrated on the solution of those great external problems which confront us on every hand and which must be solved if our Nation is to fulfill its destiny. It is my earnest hope that we may follow that course.

Again may I say that I am deeply grateful for the high honor which the American Good Government Society has bestowed upon me.

DESIGNATION OF POLICE WEEK AND PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 156, Senate Joint Resolution 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 65) designating the week of May 14–20, 1961, as Police Week and designating May 15, 1961, as Peace Officers Memorial Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of May 14–20, 1961, is hereby designated as Police Week, in recognition of the contribution the police officers of America have made to our civilization through their dedicated and selfless efforts in enforcing the laws of our cities, counties, and States and of the United States regardless of the peril or hazard to themselves, and May 15th is hereby designated as Peace Officers Memorial Day in honor of the Federal, State, and municipal peace officers who have been killed or disabled in line of duty. Through their enforcement of our laws our country has internal freedom from fear of the violence and civil disorder that is presently affecting other nations.

To this end the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such period, with appropriate ceremonies and activities, as a tribute to the men and women who, night and day, stand guard in our midst to protect us through enforcement of our laws, and to honor those who have lost their lives in service to the community.

NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 157, Senate Joint Resolution 68.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) providing for the designation of the week commencing October 1, 1961, as "National Public Works Week."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the seven-day period commencing October 1, 1961, as "National Public Works Week", and calling upon the people of the United States to celebrate such week with activities and ceremonies paying tribute to the public works engineers and administrators of the Nation and the important work which they perform.

The preamble was agreed to.

INTERFAITH DAY

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 168, Senate Joint Resolution 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 24) designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth Sunday in September of each year is hereby designated as "Interfaith Day," and the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such day, and urging the participation of all Americans and all religious groups in the United States, regardless of sect or creed, to participate in the observance of such day by such means as they may deem appropriate.

The preamble was agreed to.

NATIONAL AMERICAN GUILD OF VARIETY ARTISTS WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 169, Senate Joint Resolution 34.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 34) designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of October 9–15, 1961, be designated as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week, in recognition of the outstanding services of performers and artists in the variety field to the American people.

The preamble was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Mr. Ralph McGill, the editor of the Atlanta Constitution and a distinguished journalist and columnist, has written a column, "From Everywhere, They Come To Pray," on the anniversary of the death of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This column is one of the most moving I have read in a long time and deserves to be seen and read by many more people.

Mr. McGill, while pointing out the weakness and human frailties of President Roosevelt, has nonetheless captured the sense and spirit of his greatness and the place he held in the hearts not only of our own countrymen, but of the world.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine article written by Mr. McGill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM EVERYWHERE, THEY COME TO PRAY

(By Ralph McGill)

In each April, the anniversary month of Franklin Roosevelt's death, there is a surge of visitors to the place where he died.

People go into the little chapel near the Warm Springs Foundation and kneel down to pray.

One may see them almost any time one goes there.

They come from everywhere. They say nothing. They drive up, park the car, go in, kneel, and pray.

Some seem to go about it so directly you know that for them it is something they have planned for a long time. They have rehearsed it in their minds so much that when they reach the chapel they know just what they must do.

Not far away, down the winding road, is the small clapboard cottage which was called "The Little White House." There is a fence before it.

It is interesting to watch there, too. There is hardly a day that at least 2 or 3 persons do not come there and stand for awhile looking at the house. Some are merely curious. Others stand there looking with eyes full of tears. Now and then one will kneel there and pray. Still others will bow their heads over the fence, close their eyes and remain there in meditation and prayer.

For all of them Franklin D. Roosevelt meant something very personal. It may be that it was a home or a farm saved. Or, it may be just a memory of those terrible, dark days which now seem like a dream and which many conveniently forget, when despair sat at the door of every heart, and the only voice with courage and faith in it was his.

But whatever it was, it brings them to Hyde Park in larger numbers than go to any other similar national monument or memorial. And, so it is at the Little White House in Georgia.

The critics come every day to the granite of Roosevelt's memory, calling him charlatan, Communist, and worse. They sharpen their beaks on the mountain of his deeds and his name, but somehow, they leave no impression.

His faults were many. Great men have great faults. And critics make a squalling noise about these faults.

But, somehow the people come to pray.

Not much damage can be done the name or memory of any man or any woman who has answered, even in part, some great yearning and some hunger in the human heart.

He was all they say.

He was ambitious. He pussyfooted at times. He was impatient. He played politics, and he was skilled at it. He used corrupt machines if they were going his way. His code of political morality did not include past party loyalty if it meant abandoning what he believed to be an important issue.

He would fret about small, personal things and be casual about big things. He had his share of vanity. He liked to lead

and be followed. He was not good at taking advice. He was all this, and more. (And so are much lesser men.)

Yet, if we take pencil and paper and add it up and put down the result, we will see that the same total will be found beneath the names of all those who have been projected by destiny and the fell clutch of circumstance to a place in the blazing sun of history.

And none in all our past history was ever so sharply projected as he. (Young Jack Kennedy now is in the white, hot glare of it.)

And, so, having added all the petty faults and the great faults, we are confronted with the immensity and the soundness of FDR's accomplishments.

A world, quite literally, was going to pieces about us. Revolution, and worse, swept the world. Kingdoms and governments fell or were scattered like tenpins in the bowling alleys of history.

And when the messenger came to take him to Charon's boat he left a country which had intact every single one of its institutions, unimpaired, strong and free. And he left a people bereft of not a single guarantee under a Constitution written generations before in hope and confidence. Nowhere else in the whole wide world could that be said.

And so, they come to pray, and in Georgia the place where he came to rest, and to die, is for millions a shrine.

THE CUBAN TYRANNY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a great deal of information has recently been published on Cuba, but if there are any who doubt how completely this formerly independent nation has been subverted to a police state tyranny, they will find the stark facts in two articles. One is called "Case Study of a Police State," written by that very knowledgeable and experienced reporter, Max Frankel, of the New York Times. Frankel knows the workings of communism, having served as the New York Times representative in Russia, where I had occasion to meet him when I was in Moscow a year and a half ago as a member of a Senate subcommittee.

The other is an excellent article from the current issue of Reader's Digest, entitled "Castro Betrayed Our Country," by Joseph P. Blank. It is important that the people of the United States be fully informed how the Western Hemisphere, dedicated variously to liberty for a century and a half and more, has now been invaded by a dictatorial, totalitarian, police state tyranny imbued with concepts alien to the traditions and purposes originated by Washington, Bolivar, Hidalgo, San Martin, Marti, and the other great patriots who kindled the torches of freedom in the New World. In Cuba that freedom which the United States helped the Cuban people secure has, for the time being, at least, been lost.

I ask unanimous consent that both be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine]

CASE STUDY OF A POLICE STATE

(Castro's Cuba is a prime example of how demagoguery and confusion can cloak the implacable maneuvers of a dictator bent on absolute power over his country.)

(By Max Frankel)

GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.—Cubans are a loquacious people, an animated gesticulating race, a hot-blooded, hot-tempered, anarchic clan with a formal Sunday religion and a weekday devotion to their private communities of kin, a people without any sense of time but an addiction to form, a people that loves to drive cars at perilous speeds and has long been accustomed to a violent tempo of life and yet loves to gush over sentimental Hollywood movies, a brusque yet gentle people, a democratic people that thinks nothing of addressing a stranger high or low with the familiar "Chico" and of pummeling his shoulder, grasping his upper arm and prodding him with a loosely cupped fist to make him listen to often shallow but deeply held convictions.

Long, long ago—last December—one of these convictions that you could hear up and down their island was that "it can never happen here." Cubans both for and against Fidel were witnessing the gradual interment of their right to dissent, the disappearance of their favorite detergents, the ugly emergence of neighborhood spies and roughneck policemen, and they would remark, "The Cuban people are not European peasants and automatons," or "Our undisciplined religious people will never stand for communism."

The conviction that to be Cuban was synonymous with being anti-Communist and that the Cuban people were only awaiting the right moment to rise up in fury was shared apparently by the Cuban exiles who mounted a pitifully small invasion against the heavily armed forces of Premier Fidel Castro 2 weeks ago. Apparently it was the conviction, too, of the U.S. officials who acquiesced in and advised on the invasion plans.

But none of these reckoned with the Castro totalitarian establishment in action. It was—and is even more so today—enormously effective in restraining the large but necessarily passive segment of the population that has turned against the Castro government, as well as in engineering and manipulating the convictions of the large segment that remains loyal to Fidel.

The two-jawed vise of inhibiting force and deceitful propaganda with which Castro set out to control his nation of 6 million individualists did not screw finally shut until the invaders began their charge up the beaches 2 weeks ago. Then suddenly movie houses and sports arenas had to be turned into jails and then suddenly the populace could sense the humiliation of knowing about its own fate only that which Fidel chose to tell.

But the vise had begun to tighten only a few weeks after it was suddenly and excitingly opened by Castro's triumph over the previous Cuban dictator, Fulgencio Batista. Each turn of the screw was firm and irrevocable.

Each new departure from law and from civil rights was accompanied by elaborate explanations of allegedly special circumstances and by deafening shouts of "democracy." Emotional crowds were whipped into revolutionary frenzy to scream "Si" to the sealing of their minds and opportunities.

At first the sports stadium executions and kangaroo trials were only for Batista's war criminals and it was held unsporting to object to the procedures. Only the newspapers and radio stations of corrupt millionaires now in exile were seized at the start, and who did not agree that they were reactionary and not very good papers and stations at that?

If there had been elections, Fidel would have won anyway, so why waste time? If there were a Parliament it would approve everything anyway, so why waste money?

With neither elections nor a legislature deemed important, it was hardly necessary even to proclaim the dissolution of all nongovernment political groupings—except miraculously the Popular Socialist, or Communist, Party, whose discipline organization, placed at the service of the Castro government, proved invaluable if not essential to the establishment of a totalitarian society. The party was given a newspaper plant by the government and all the opportunities necessary for organization and assembly. These opportunities were denied all unofficial groups and even Fidel Castro's 26th of July movement was allowed to die in everything but name.

Only the lands of the huge landowners were expropriated at the start; was not the peasant reaping the profit and was not every farmer to be left with all the land he needed to earn a handsome profit? Not all private enterprise, but only the scheming, profiteering U.S. monopolies were intervened at the start—why should honest businessmen be afraid?

Only student committees democratically and independently were purging the ranks of their professors—was this not the ultimate in academic freedom? Only those labor unions that extorted unduly high wages for their members while peasants went hungry were being forbidden to strike—was it not fair to let others climb the economic ladder for a while?

Only volunteers were wanted in the people's militia, but did not the Government have the right to expect all employees to demonstrate their patriotism as a condition of employment? Only disloyal teachers were thrown out of the schools, but did not the Government have the right to demand of all that they abandon their old ideas?

Turn after turn the vise tightened. The law was made, explained, and often invented during Fidel Castro's long television orations. Under the marvelous spell of his oratory in the infectious atmosphere of the mass meeting, with banners flapping and bands blaring, and eventually with armed patrolmen carting off the less than enthusiastic, decisions were heard and ratified by acclamation. This, said Fidel over and over again, was true democracy, not the lonely plodding stuffing of ballots into boxes—until even "this" became rarer and rarer and he deigned to appear only on special occasions before closed meetings of chosen claques.

Perhaps the most eloquent tribute to the skill with which the vise was closed (and a damning rebuke it is to those with faith in the inalienable democratic spirit of all men) came last fall from the fallen leaders of Cuba's Electrical Workers Union.

These men, who had helped Castro gain power by risking their lives to commit sabotage but who had now been denounced by him as profiteers who had never done anything for their country, confessed that they had stood by idly while the Cuban Federation of Workers was seized in rump meetings by Communists who then installed their own men in every local.

"We had never thought that anything like that would happen in our union," they said, in the safety of asylum in foreign embassies. "And we always were confident that if we could only get to Fidel, justice would be done."

For a time, many middle-class Cubans had cheered the demise of the wealthier classes; working classes had not objected to the seizure of middle-class properties, and the vacating of white-collar jobs. British and Canadian businessmen clung desperately

to their desks while only American firms were seized, and Cuban businessmen felt strangely unaffected when foreigners were sent packing.

Class hatred and an unwholesome elevation of things Cuban as opposed to things foreign were standard weapons in the government's campaign. The enmity of the United States—developed through unfortunate policies both in Havana and Washington—early became a justification for anything that could not be otherwise explained.

It was after 2 years of such totalitarian developments that Fidel Castro, speaking now in the relative security provided by Communist military and economic aid, quite mockingly revealed the inevitability of it all. He recalled riding in triumph into Havana in January 1959, he said, and seeing the cheering throngs not only of peasants and workers but middle-class property owners and even some rich people.

He laughed inwardly at these pseudo-revolutionaries, he said, for they did not know the fate that awaited them.

Neither did the propertyless Cubans who had taken heart at Fidel's promises from the hills of a constitutional government, fair trials and free elections.

By the time Fidel Castro disclosed this hypocrisy last December, Cuba was in the grip of his army's intelligence service which had absolute rights of indiscriminate search and seizure. It arrested at will and, often, without charges, held prisoners without trial, seized much of their property, and was accountable to no one.

The judges who tried to intervene with the Cuban leaders and soon those who refused to decide still pending cases according to government's wishes were summarily dismissed. Most of the cases traditionally heard in court were only disputes between monopolists, Fidel said, and he reorganized the judiciary with a stroke of the pen.

Law did not fare well either in a reorganization of the universities. When even student purge committees had run out of victims, the government itself devised a university reform, the essence of which decreed the dismissal of all teachers and students who entertained reservations about the Castro regime. Havana University's traditional autonomy that had allowed the young and rebellious Fidel Castro to operate with impunity was replaced by the doctrine of duty to state. Not so many lawyers, or whatever else students wanted to be, but graduates with skills required by the government were henceforth to be produced there.

Reform turned out to be a favorite word to justify the strong arm of the government. The agrarian reform had been advertised as a parceling out of large estates to the peasants, but it became really a method of organizing cooperative farms run by government-appointed managers, a program of controlling prices and produce, which before long required the exertion of government control over distributors and large manufacturers, their policies, and, finally, personnel.

The urban reform was simply the seizure of developed real estate. All tenants were declared to be mortgaged owners and for periods of 15 to 30 years they had henceforth to pay their rents to the government, plus additional funds to provide for the upkeep of the houses.

All city dwellers had to register. They were forbidden to move or to exchange residences without government permission. Anyone seen moving, so much as a chair or television set through the streets was normally arrested on suspicion of violating the reform law.

Soon there appeared concierges and janitors in the government service to report on the psychological as well as physical conditions of tenants. Recently the half-dozen surveillance agencies in every community were merged into defense committees—the groups that so effectively and massively fingered every suspect when the invasion danger struck.

By then an unusual purchase of, say, six cakes of soap, or the possession of a somewhat unusual amount of money, was enough to enroll a citizen on the lists of suspected counterrevolutionaries.

Not just war criminals, but counterrevolutionaries were being executed by the dozen and rotting in jails under conditions never subjected to inspection, but reliably described as properly in the tradition of Batista.

Only now there was an ideological lord over the totalitarian structure. Without even the dignity of law or a "reform" program the Cuban press and broadcasting stations were seized and enlisted in government service. They went under control of a central propaganda directorate, as did the new government news agency, Prensa Latina.

No subject was too insignificant to be written about without government direction. Sports writers were even prompted to begin to tout the healthy European sport of soccer over the un-Olympic baseball.

Without reservation or shame, these media now extolled the Soviet Union, Communist China and the Communist nations that Fidel Castro and his movement's paper revolution had once condemned as no better than Western imperialists. Nothing but progovernment expressions of universal support and popularity appeared in the press and on the radio, except for vicious assaults on real and supposed enemies. A Cuban with no alternate source of information—and very quickly there was none—could only believe that everything was going the regime's way and that his private reservations were only unhealthy aberrations.

In any case, he did not dare withhold his signature from the petitions and declarations thrust under his nose at work and in his home. Not to be with them was to be against them and the systematic prosecution and persecution of counterrevolutionaries was abundantly evident.

Generally though, even such acquiescence was not enough to keep a job or prevent denunciation by some jealous informer First there were the rallies to attend and at which to cheer. Then the organizations to join: the young rebels, or the women's organization, or the revolutionary student's council, or the labor union, now wholly a political organization. Finally it became necessary to bear arms in the militia under penalty of ostracism, sudden unemployment and suspicion of disloyalty.

All the while the reforms continued—the banking reform that centralized all control and forced everyone to explain his holdings and the education reform that, in the words of the education minister, meant that even in arithmetic class teachers had to preach loyalty to Fidel.

In this atmosphere no one even bothered to complain much that the mails and telephones were not instruments of private communication. Until the first of this year some Cubans were still being allowed to surrender their property and to flee the country; the government thus enriched itself and rid itself too of potentially strong opponents.

But in the last months of the emigration technicians and others needed in the economy were not allowed even this bitter choice of exile.

Through it all, the spirits of the Cuban people were remarkable. They know fear, of course, and danger, but they babbled on with those whom they could trust over Coca-Colas and cafecitos, utterly confident either that all this was necessary to get new schools and hospitals built or, more often, in the conviction that Cubans could "take" anything as long as it clearly was not communism, and in the confidence that when enough had decided it to be communism they would find deliverance as before.

The May Day celebrations that will be staged throughout Cuba tomorrow to celebrate the continuing triumph of what Fidel Castro now describes as his socialist revolution will compare with those that his sponsors in the socialist countries will arrange. Thousands of the Cubans who watched the construction of their new police state, confident of their ultimate ability to beat off a new totalitarianism of the left, will probably spend the fiesta time in jail. The many non-Cubans who misjudged the strength that Fidel Castro derives from his totalitarian structure cannot claim as democrats to know enough about the system that challenges them around the world.

CASTRO BETRAYED OUR COUNTRY

(From the lips of Cuban exiles now living in the United States comes this grim story of the way the Communists shattered the lives and hopes of people who once believed that the revolution would bring democracy to Cuba.)

(Condensed from Latin American Report by Joseph P. Blank)

In the 2 years before the U.S. Embassy in Cuba closed its doors last January, more than 40,000 Cubans had fled to the United States. Well over 30,000 others had registered with the Embassy their desire to come to the United States. Thousands more had tried to fulfill U.S. immigration requirements but could not.

To obtain visas, Cubans waited in lines of 400 to 1,000 which began forming at 8 a.m. each morning outside the Embassy. They made pleas to Embassy staff members in restaurants, movie houses, and buses. Applicants who failed to meet the requirements often wept. Sometimes they got down on their knees.

Who are these people so eager to leave their native land? They come from every level of the country's life: soldiers who fought with Castro, labor leaders, factory workers, students, teachers, lawyers, physicians, engineers. Almost all of them were solidly behind Castro when he took power. None of them were hounded out of Cuba. They left voluntarily, abandoning everything they owned and everything they had known. Most of those who made it to the United States took with them only their clothes and the $5 permitted them by their government. They left, knowing that their existence as refugees would be bleak and precarious.

Why did they leave? In Miami and other Florida communities, where practically all of them went, they have revealed their experiences.

Pedro Oliver Labra, a professor of physics, was asked in early 1960 to become rector of the Central University of Las Villas. "I understood that the post would be nonpolitical," he says, "but I was wrong. Everything was politics. The regime sent speakers to the university, politicians, to speak about ties with the Soviet Union and wrongs committed by the United States. I was on the reception committee for these men—nobody tells you, but you know what you have to do to keep out of trouble.

"Then came the case of Porfirio Ramirez, president of our student body. Ramirez criticized the government's policies, then fled to the hills to fight. The militia caught him and he was put on trial at 2 p.m. last

October 12. I telephoned Habana and pleaded for the young man. I was assured that he would not be shot. The court closed at 6 that evening. At 8 it announced its decision from behind locked doors. The following morning Ramirez was executed.

"Now I realized I was in politics. I was against the regime, against its executions, its controls, its ever-present militia. I could not breathe freely. I had to get out.

"If I had a choice again, I would still leave. It's almost impossible to explain this, because words cannot do justice to the feeling that would make a man deliberately leave his family, his friends, and his country."

For many Cubans the dream of a wonderful democratic government for their country ended as soon as Castro achieved power. In a rundown house near the Miami railroad tracks, Pepita Riera says, "Oh, how we were taken in." Miss Riera had been active in the anti-Batista underground. The author of 11 novels and a writer for Cuban radio and television, she was during the revolution one of five women with Maj. Hubert Matos' column in the Sierra Maestra.

"In the hills, Castro told us he was anti-Communist," she says. "He promised social justice for everyone, and everybody helped him. Then, after he came to power in January 1959, we saw that his promise was a lie. Castro began to confiscate factories, stores, residential properties. He took from those who owned property simply because they owned it, not because they had mistreated people or were crooked.

"For me, the end came when Castro sent two men to a phonograph-record factory owned by a relative of mine and ordered the production of two records within 24 hours. The records were Communist songs from Eastern Europe. I took the records to Castro. He said, yes, he had ordered them. He said the people were politically sterile, and he wanted to get started with their indoctrination. I knew then I had to fight this regime that I had given everything of myself to help."

"I was one of Castro's lieutenants in the mountains," says 29-year-old Manuel F. Artime. "I can still remember him talking about democracy, about his love for people. He told us that his heart was with freedom.

"After the victory Castro appointed me chief of agricultural reform for a large part of Oriente Province. Soon I found that it was not enough to work the land for the betterment of Cuba. We were expected to work the people toward an orientation with Russia and China. I opposed this. At meetings I called the Communists in government antirevolutionary. For this I was called a traitor.

"Then, in October 1959, I was called to Havana for a meeting of the Institute for Agrarian Reform. The main topic was the complete nationalization of all property. I felt like a man in another country. In a few weeks two military officers were assigned to help me—actually to watch me. Finally, an old friend of mine in the government warned me, 'You're headed for a lot of trouble. You cannot be against communism if you want to stay with the government.' I got out."

Dr. Rufo Lopez-Fresquet, a university professor, was one of Cuba's outstanding economists. Appointed by Castro, he was Minister of the Treasury from January 1959 until his resignation on March 17, 1960. During that time his feelings about the Castro regime swung from enthusiasm to despair.

"Castro turned away from the democracy he had promised," he says. "Newspapers were not permitted to publish freely. People were not allowed to meet or congregate. Men and women were taken to prison without due process of law. I became concerned over the growing power of Communists in government; but Castro told me, 'Don't worry. I want to see who they are; I want them to stick out their necks. Then I'll get rid of them.'

"I believed him. I believed that the suppression of liberties was a phase. Too late I saw the truth: that under Castro the Communists were in for good, that the totalitarian state was the ultimate goal. By the time we in the government realized this we were powerless to do anything about it. I resigned on the ground of ill health, slipped aboard a ship and hid in the lavatory with a .45 pointed at the door until we reached Florida."

Except for the hard core of extremists on the right and left, few Cubans expected the Castro regime to follow its current course. It is generally conceded that 95 out of 100 Cubans supported Castro when he marched in triumph into Havana. Today, the rollcall of bitterness and disillusionment attracts a reply from every sector of Cuban life.

A labor leader, Mario Fontela Alfonso, told me: "I was elected general secretary of the agricultural workers in February 1959. Within 6 months I saw that I was expected to knuckle under as the Communists took over. I fought back. Finally, a Communist delegation ousted me from the union by arranging a closed meeting of 24 delegates who sided with them. This was 24 out of a total of 380 union delegates. The government papers announced that I had been removed by a vote of all union delegates."

A 67-year-old retired worker: "I worked all my life, saved my money, and built two little houses so that I could have an income when I was too old to work. I rented one for $22 a month and the other for $18. My wife and I lived in a little apartment that cost us $12 a month. In the urban reform program my two houses were taken away from me."

A newspaper editor, Jorge Zayas, of El Avance: "I helped the revolution by forging documents and hiding arms in our plant. We were the only Havana newspaper to send a correspondent to the hills with Castro. After he came into power, I criticized the regime's mistakes and corrected misstatements in Castro's speeches. The government called me a traitor. The militia marched in and took over my paper."

An attorney, Santiago Fernandez-Pichs: "I was a member of the executive committee of the Cuban Bar Association. At the trial of the Batista pilots in early 1959 the revolutionary court acquitted them for lack of evidence. Castro ordered them retried, although the Cuban Constitution says that a person cannot be tried twice for the same offense. [The pilots were declared guilty and sentenced to 2 to 30 years of hard labor.] People were accused, tried, and convicted on the basis of emotions. The criminal code, which gives the accused the protection of the law, was ignored. Law became meaningless."

A professor of medicine at the University of Havana: "The underground at the university hospital provided Castro with money and guns. We propagandized his cause. But Castro's victory was no victory for us. The regime reopened the university as a kind of government educational agency. I did not agree with this concept and resigned.

"That labeled me a 'counterrevolutionary.' I found myself being followed. So I came to the United States. I've been a doctor for 31 years, and now I work as a scrub nurse in an operating room. But I am grateful to be still a part of medicine." (The hospital's director of personnel told me that this physician had an international reputation in his specialty.)

Yet this doctor is among the more fortunate of his refugee colleagues. About 350 Cuban physicians are now in the Miami area. State laws and the rigid requirements for obtaining a license prevent them from practicing medicine. Some 20 of them are employed by hospitals as operating-room or laboratory technicians. Others are working as store clerks, factory hands, parking attendants, waiters. The great majority are unable to find work of any kind. Through the University of Miami, authorities are preparing qualifying examinations for Cuban doctors to enable them to serve as residents in hospitals.

The shortage of jobs in south Florida is the most immediate and serious problem faced by the Cuban refugees. The moment they land in the United States they begin looking for work. They are proud: proud enough to be humiliated by charity, proud enough to take any kind of work. While job hunting they depend on friends, relatives and colleagues who preceded them to Florida. One man earning $50 a week can provide low-cost food for 15 people. Attorney Santiago Fernandez-Pichs is an usher in a movie theater. Other attorneys are cleaning fruits and vegetables in restaurant kitchens. Teachers, engineers and businessmen are working as roomservice waiters in Miami Beach hotels.

Church and welfare agencies, as well as some business corporations, have helped the refugees with money, food and clothing. Last December, President Eisenhower allocated $1 million to refugee assistance. Much of that money was spent in relocating men and women in areas where jobs are available. Soon after taking office, President Kennedy ordered a $4 million program of Federal assistance.

While the refugees are grateful for any kindness shown them, their basic need is one that cannot be fulfilled in the United States. What they want is to go back to Cuba. They want to regain what was taken from them: savings, careers, personal liberty—and their hopes and dreams for a new, democratic Cuba.

They're convinced that return is inevitable. Many are trying to hurry the day by supplying arms and explosives to the underground in Cuba, by encouraging internal opposition with radio broadcasts and air-dropped leaflets. Others are training themselves into military cadres.

"The dictatorship will be overthrown," Lopez-Fresquet asserts. "We will return home. No amount of guns or soldiers or prison cells can stifle the Cubans' love of liberty."

THE NATURAL RESOURCES OF MAINE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on Friday evening, April 28, 1961, the Maine State Society had the rare opportunity to hear one of our great jurists deliver a lyric tribute to the natural resources of Maine. At the annual Maine State Society lobster dinner at the Department of the Interior restaurant, Associate Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court of the United States expressed his deep and abiding interest in the sound utilization of our natural treasures. What he had to say should be of interest to conservationists and to all who are dedicated to the preservation of the primitive beauty of the wilderness.

In tribute to Justice Douglas and to former Gov. Percival P. Baxter of Maine, I ask unanimous consent that

Justice Douglas' remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

The people of Maine have contributed greatly to the American character. I start with Capt. Jeremiah O'Brien who sailed out of Machias against the British and dealt blows for American liberty in the same tradition as Lexington and Concord.

I include MARGARET CHASE SMITH, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, and the others of distinction who have represented Maine in the Nation's Capital. I also include the innumerable guides with whom I have spent days and weeks on end both in the Maine woods and on the rivers and lakes of that water wonderland. From them I received during the last 40 years a liberal education in the beauties and lore of the wilderness of the northland; and I learned from their lips many lessons in survival.

The lakes, the streams, the mountains of Maine are bright with memories—memories of the first blush of spring, fragments of the song of birds, glimpses of wild flowers in birch and spruce forests, the call of loons across deep blue waters, the song of whippoorwills at dawn, moose feeding in bogans.

Maine has a treasure in Baxter State Park. It is a true wilderness without roads and with a guarantee against the invasion of civilization. It is a small domain, hardly 20 miles long. But it has a charm of solitude that few places in America enjoy. Our people who live along the eastern seaboard often imagine the Far West as a wilderness.

But our western wilderness has been so heavily invaded that it is now difficult to get 10 miles from a road. To one accustomed to jeep-filled dirt roads of our western country, Baxter Park is a bit of heaven. It was once cruelly mutilated by loggers. But the Maine woods have a great regenerative force, thanks to rainfall and climate, that in a century will reproduce the majestic white pine our forefathers knew.

I wish there were more Percival Baxters who look ahead a century and plan today for the recreational needs of a people whose number will shortly double.

I wish there were Percival Baxters to make a sanctuary of the Allagash. We ran it in canoes last fall, starting at Telos Lake. It's a wilderness waterway that should be preserved in its natural beauty without roads, without hotels, without any other mark of civilization.

I am worried about the Allagash. One who stops paddling and listens can hear the bulldozers moving in at many places. Some of these bulldozers are leveling timber for lumber companies. Some are building roads. Each is making a permanent scar. In the old days the loggers came in, built their tote roads, snaked the logs out, and ran them down the lakes and the river. When they had finished and left, nature reclaimed the tote roads and the campsites. But roads built in this machine age are soon choked with cars. The invasion of the bulldozer is permanent.

Very few years are left to salvage the waterway that comprises the Allagash. It needs a corridor on each side that is broad enough to protect the watershed and to immunize it from civilization. Like the Baxter State Park it needs protection against civilization.

We are prone to think that the solution of every problem is to be found in Washington, D.C. Certain it is that some of our national parks are models for those who want to make sanctuaries of wilderness areas. Yet Baxter State Park, small though it may seem, has a charm that is unique. What the State of Maine has done there, it could do in the case of the Allagash. If it does not act quickly, the case for Federal acquisition will become complete. The host of Americans who love wilderness waterways will never, I believe, allow the wilderness waterway of the Allagash to be ruined by civilization. The Allagash is one of America's wonders—a choice creation that will be even more precious to our great-great-grandchildren than it has been to us.

FEDERAL FUNDS AND STATE SCHOOLS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the action by the Justice Department in attempting to force the State of Virginia and its political subdivisions to spend local and State tax money contrary to the will of their citizens is constitutionally incomprehensible and indefensible.

There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which requires States and their political subdivisions to operate public schools or which authorizes the executive branch of the Federal Government to exercise any degree of supervision or control over the manner in which public education is or is not provided on the State and local levels.

The effect of the suit which has been filed against the State of Virginia is to dictate to the general assembly of that sovereign State how it can and cannot spend public funds in the field of education. If successful, it would establish a precedent for Federal control over any facet of life in which the executive branch for any reason might choose to intervene. It would remove the last vestige of State and local control over the expenditure of State and local tax money and with it the last shreds of the constitutionally reserved right of the American people to govern themselves in all areas not specifically delegated to the Federal Government.

Mr. President, not only is this an action unprecedented in the history of our country but, worse, it is a deliberate slap in the face of Congress which on two separate occasions has refused to grant to the Justice Department the power of intervention in school cases.

Mr. President, surely the inconsistency of an executive branch, which on one hand is seeking enactment of a program of Federal aid to education on the assurance that it will be free of Federal controls while on the other hand is asking the Federal courts to issue orders controlling the expenditure of State and local funds for the same purpose, is not lost upon the American people.

The respected columnist, David Lawrence, dealt with this and other disturbing aspects of the Justice Department action in his column which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of April 28, 1961. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of it be printed herewith in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL FUNDS AND STATE SCHOOLS—U.S. DEMAND IN VIRGINIA CASE FEARED AS BLOW TO EDUCATION AID PLAN

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy may have dealt a fatal blow to the movement to obtain money from the Federal Government to subsidize public schools. He has just demanded that the legislature of a sovereign State—Virginia—be compelled to take punitive action against a single county for failing to open its schools or else abandon the whole public school system throughout the State. In view of this development, will Congress now take a chance and appropriate money that gives a bureau in Washington potential power over the operation of the public schools throughout the United States?

To tell a State how it must appropriate its funds, how it shall set up its own system of education, and what steps it must take to satisfy the Federal Government's demands is unprecedented in American history. Yet this, in effect, is the authority sought by the Department of Justice, with the approval of the President, in applying to a Federal court for an order against the State of Virginia.

The step is far reaching. It could mean that in the future the Federal Government could even tell a State it must have a uniform system of government applying to every county or city. It so happens that the State of Virginia permits its counties and independent cities to adopt, as they choose, various forms of executive management or control by boards of supervisors elected by the people. But, under the theory just applied by the United States Department of Justice, the counties and municipalities would not be permitted to have their own forms of local government, but would have to adopt a system uniform throughout the State. If any county or city deviated, it would be in danger of being compelled to accept an order of the Federal Government in Washington served upon the State through the courts.

This doctrine is, of course, based upon the concept of the 14th amendment which the Supreme Court of the United States proclaimed in its desegregation decisions in 1954. The point was made then that "equal protection of the laws" means equal application of State laws to children attending public schools. But there is nothing in the 14th amendment or anywhere else in the Constitution which says the Federal Government may tell a State it cannot provide funds to keep its public schools open in 97 counties and 32 independent cities because a single county happens to close such schools. This is an obvious form of punitive action that can readily be repeated by an Executive order directing any State which accepts Federal funds to operate all its schools according to standards laid down by a Federal bureau.

For months now, the lobbyists for Federal aid to education and the politicians who hope to get votes through promised increases in teachers' salaries have been denying that any form of Federal control of education would be involved in current proposals for financial aid to State schools. But now it turns out that, without any specific right granted through existing law, an Executive order could be issued—or a court decree sought by direct intervention of the Federal Government—telling a State how to run its educational system.

The Federal Government is demanding not only that a State reopen public schools in a particular county but that it shall stop State and county tuition grants for the use of parents who send their children to private schools and cease to pay from State funds for the maintenance and operation of public schools anywhere in Virginia as long as the public schools in one county are closed.

This can only mean that the Federal Government now feels it can interfere in any tuition grants, fellowships, scholarships, or other forms of aid if it doesn't like the way the States operate such educational programs. It is certainly something novel for

the Federal Government to tell State legislatures how to spend their money.

It will be contended that the Supreme Court has not as yet ruled on the new demand of the Department of Justice for dictatorial powers over education in the States. But it may be taken for granted that the lawyers at the Department have blazed a new trail and probably have found new devices satisfactory to them whereby the end will justify the means.

If the Federal Government can tell the State of Virginia that it cannot provide funds for its public schools unless it makes every county and city conform to a pattern approved by the Federal Government, then constitutional government, as it has been known since the founding of the Republic, will indeed have vanished. Government by Executive order or court decree will have supplanted acts of Congress and the laws of 50 State legislatures.

THE CRISIS IN LAOS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, all of us are aware that the United States is faced with a very difficult task in attempting to solve the critical condition in Laos. Our objective—to prevent a Communist takeover in that country while at the same time avoiding, if possible, military operations—will not be easily accomplished.

The gravity of the situation we face renders it inadvisable at this time to dwell upon postmortems relating to previous policy errors which have contributed to our present difficulties. At the same time, however, there are lessons for the future to be learned, and I think we should not miss the opportunity to develop guideposts which may serve to prevent unnecessary repetitions of previous mistakes.

For this reason, I think the RECORD should contain an article by Crosley S. Noyes, foreign correspondent of the Washington Evening Star, which states a strong case against the policies we have pursued in Laos in recent years. I offer it as a valuable contribution to the record of events leading up to the present crisis, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOGNITION OF U.S. ERROR IN LAOS

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

VIENTIANE, LAOS.—There is a certain irony in the thought that the United States—and its partners of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—are now all for an unalined and independent Laos.

If the same objective had been acceptable to the United States 3 years ago, Laos and the rest of the world might have been spared a great deal of anguish. What has happened in the meantime is proof, no doubt, of Communist skulduggery. But it is also proof of the bankruptcy of an American policy aimed at making Laos firmly alined with the West and completely dependent on the United States.

In 1958 there existed, in fact, a government in Laos dedicated to the principles of neutrality and independence. Led by Prince Souvanna Phouma, a distant relative of King Savang Vathana, the main objective of this government was to bring an end to the Communist-backed rebellion that had torn Laos in the last days of the French war in Indochina and to reintegrate the Pathet Lao rebels into the life of the country.

It was also something of a family affair. The leader of the Pathet Lao was Souvanna's half-brother, Prince Souphanouvong, longtime ardent disciple of the Vietminh's top military commander, Vo Nguyen Giap, and by far the most forceful personality on the Lao landscape. Since 1949, Prince Souphanouvong had led what was essentially the Lao chapter of the Vietminh rebellion, directing his guerrilla fighters in action against the occupying French. At war's end his forces had firm control of the two northern provinces of Phongsaly and Samneua, near the border of Vietnam.

LAO EXPERIMENT STARTS

After the French Army withdrew from Laos in 1954, Prince Souphanouvong announced his willingness to go along with the effort of national reconciliation under the terms of the Geneva Conference.

The experiment started off hopefully enough. With a great show of fraternal emotion, the two princes met and agreed to bury their past differences. The northern provinces were returned to the jurisdiction of the government in Vientiane. Some 1,500 Pathet Lao guerrillas were duly enrolled under the command of the royal army. A total of 4,500 men were demobilized.

At the same time, the Pathet Lao transformed itself into a political party known as the New Lao Haksat. Prince Souphanouvong entered the Government as Minister of Planning. Souvanna Phouma stayed on as Prime Minister.

It was at this stage that the United States stepped heavily onto the Laotian political scene and the experiment in integration came to an abrupt end.

The American presence in Laos dates from early 1955 when John Foster Dulles reached the conclusion that something drastic had to be done to fill the vacuum left by the departing French. Though the United States, under the terms of the Geneva agreement had no official role to play in Laos, there was no obstacle to the flood of money which started pouring into the country the same year.

Little legal objection either, to the arrival of American military equipment for the Laotian Army, or the presence of "civilian technicians" in large numbers as instructors in its use. By 1958, Souvanna Phouma's Western-leaning neutral government was in fact entirely dependent on American support.

UNITED STATES FEARS RED TAKEOVER

The Americans, furthermore, were not happy about the way things were going. There was a general feeling that Souvanna Phouma, though obviously no Communist himself, was naive and ineffectual in dealing with his dynamic half brother. Integrating the Pathet Lao into the country and the government ran the American argument, was the equivalent of inviting a Communist takeover in the long run.

In May 1958, a national by-election gave the Pathet Lao 13 out of 20 contested seats in Parliament. The worst fears of the American experts were confirmed and the ax fell swiftly. Soon after the fateful by-election, American aid to Laos was abruptly cut off on orders from Washington. Souvanna Phouma's coalition government promptly collapsed.

For some time, his successor had been waiting impatiently in the wings. Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, the dour, ambitious officer who dispensed American aid to the Lao Army, was hardly a popular political figure. His outstanding qualification was an unswerving loyalty to the Western cause, together with the loudly voiced conviction that the Pathet Lao to a man were Communist agents. With the fall of the government, General Phoumi emerged as the leader of a rightist group known as the Committee for the Defense of the Public Interest.

The fighting started almost immediately. Prince Souphanouvong was jailed on charges of treason and quickly escaped. The army, after trying ineffectually to round up Pathet Lao elements in its own ranks, found itself engaged again by tough, elusive guerrillas. There was no going back, however. In April 1960, after a highly questionable election, a government of committee candidates, with Gen. Phoumi Nosavan as its all-powerful minister of defense, was duly installed in Vientiane.

LAST CHANCE

The last chance to go back came just 5 months later when an unknown, but highly discontented, captain named Kong Le suddenly seized Vientiane at the head of his battalion of paratroopers. Taking advantage of the temporary absence of the government, the nocturnal coup met with virtually no resistance from the local garrison. Finding himself master of the situation—apparently somewhat to his own surprise—Kong Le declared the government overthrown and installed Prince Souphanna Jhouma. Once again, a neutralist government was installed and Prince Souphanouvong appeared in Vientiane to talk things over.

Once again, however, American policymakers moved decisively into the picture. Although the new government was apparently supported by the people, recognized by the United States, and warmly endorsed by the British and French, the whole American apparatus in Laos was soon geared to the task of bringing it down. The effort was successful. When the troops of General Phoumi reentered Vientiane on December 15 after an artillery bombardment that caused 200 civilian deaths, the American ambassador held a victory celebration at the Setha Palace Hotel.

The victory, however, was short lived. Though Kong Le had been routed and Souvanna Phouma had flown off to exile in neighboring Cambodia, two important new factors had entered the picture.

The first was that Kong Le, in leaving, had taken with him 400 of the best soldiers in the royal army. From Vientiane, the battalion cut directly northeast to the strategic Plaine des Jarres, routed some 1,300 troops which General Phoumi had stationed there, made contact with the Pathet Lao and dug in.

THE RUSSIANS MOVE IN

The second factor was that the Russians decided that the time was ripe to take a hand in the game. During his second brief interlude of authority, Souvanna Phouma, acting in accordance with his ideas of neutralism, had established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. A few weeks before his downfall, faced with a shortage of gasoline, he had appealed to the Russians for help.

It came quickly by airlift from Hanoi. After Souvanna Phouma was overthrown, the Russians, who refused to recognize the new government of Premier Boun Oum, kept right on coming. Only now the Illyushins carried mortars, 85-millimeter cannon and Russian experts from Hanoi to the Plaine des Jarres. The Pathet Lao with new strength and reinforced by Vietminh volunteers, moved to the offensive, cutting the vital road junction at Phou Khoun and advancing to within 15 miles of the royal capital of Luang Prabang.

Against this background, the choices that have faced the new administration have been grim. A decision to intervene militarily if

a negotiated settlement was not forthcoming would be a desperate alternative to total military defeat. The decision to seek a political solution based on a neutral and independent Laos amounts to belated recognition that the course of American policy in Laos over the last 5 years has been consistently and obstinately wrong.

It is idle, perhaps, to speculate what might have happened if the United States, instead of deliberately scuttling Souvanna Phouma in 1958 and again last year had offered him support in his effort to create a neutral state in Laos. What is quite clear is that what might have been possible then is no longer possible now. In Bangkok and even in Vientiane one still can hear plenty of optimistic talk of a political settlement that would exclude the Pathet Lao from any positions of real power. But in the light of the realities as they appear in Laos today the happy ending to the sad story is hardly believable.

NEGOTIATIONS FOR SUSPENSION OF NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, from the beginning, I have had an intense interest in the Geneva negotiations looking to an agreement among ourselves, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union for the suspension of nuclear tests. I am sure that many Members of the Senate are following closely the present effort to reach an accord with the Soviet Union on this subject.

It must be noted that the Soviet position does not appear at present to offer any special ground for hope that an agreement can be reached. Such an agreement will, of course, remain impossible so long as the Russians insist on the right to veto inspection procedures. There can be no question or wavering on this central issue: A test ban agreement must include provisions which afford reasonable certainty to all parties against clandestine violations. It would be foolhardy to retreat from this necessary condition of any meaningful agreement.

If, however, the Soviet Union should alter its position, thus opening the way for the establishment of a control commission upon which we can place reliance, then it would be equally foolhardy for us to refuse to come to terms on the ground that some residue of risk remained. This conclusion follows, I think, from the fact that there are overriding risks which cannot be ignored if no suspension agreement is reached.

These factors are weighed with unusual perception by Sir Charles P. Snow in an address recently delivered to the American Association for the Advancement of Science. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the text be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY SIR CHARLES P. SNOW

Only a very bold man, when he is a member of an organized society, can keep the power to say "No." I tell you that, not being a very bold man, or one who finds it congenial to stand alone, away from his colleagues. We can't expect many scientists to do it.

Is there any tougher ground for them to stand on? I suggest to you that there is. I believe that there is a spring of moral action in the scientific activity which is at least as strong as the search for truth. The name of this spring is knowledge.

Scientists know certain things in a fashion more immediate and more certain than those who don't comprehend what science is. Unless we are abnormally weak or abnormally wicked men, this knowledge is bound to shape our actions. Most of us are timid; but, to an extent, knowledge gives us guts. Perhaps it can give us guts strong enough for the jobs in hand.

I had better take the most obvious example. All physical scientists know that it is relatively easy to make plutonium. We know this not as a journalist fact at second-hand, but as a fact in our own experience.

We can work out the number of scientific and engineering personnel it needs for a nation-state to equip itself with fission and fusion bombs. We know that for a dozen or more states it will only take perhaps 6 years, perhaps fewer. Even the best informed of us always exaggerate these periods.

This we know with the certainty of—what shall I call it?—engineering truth. We also know most of us are familiar with statistics and the nature of odds. We know, with the certainty of statistical truth, that if enough of these weapons are made—by enough different states—some of them are going to blow up. Through accident, or folly, or madness—but the motives don't matter. What does matter is the nature of the statistical fact.

All this we know. We know it in a more direct sense than any politician because it comes from our direct experience. It is part of our minds. Are we going to let it happen?

All this we know. It throws upon scientists a direct and personal responsibility. It is not enough to say that scientists have a responsibility as citizens. They have a much greater one than that, and one different in kind.

For we genuinely know the risks. We are faced with an either-or, and we haven't much time. Either we accept a restriction of nuclear armaments. This is going to begin, just as a token, with an agreement on the stopping of nuclear tests.

The United States is not going to get the 99.9 percent security that it has been asking for. It is unobtainable, though there are other bargains that the United States could probably secure. I am not going to conceal from you that this course involves certain risks. They are quite obvious, and no honest man is going to blink them.

That is the either. The or is not a risk but a certainty. It is this: The nuclear arms race between the United States and the U.S.S.R. not only continues but accelerates. Other countries join in. Within, at the most, 6 years, China and several other states will have a stock of nuclear bombs. Within, at the most, 10 years, some of these bombs are going off.

I am saying this as responsibly as I can. That is the certainty. On the one side, therefore, we have a certainty of disaster. Between a risk and a certainty, a sane man does not hesitate.

NEEDED: GREATER UTILIZATION OF FREE ENTERPRISE TO SUPPORT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the United States and the free world are facing great challenges on many fronts around the globe.

To meet the challenges—as well as Communist threats to our survival—will require full mobilization and utilization of our human and natural resources.

Fortunately, a strong free world defense, spearheaded by the United States, continues to discourage massive military aggression by the Communists.

With a relative East-West standoff militarily, however, there is increasing emphasis on the nonmilitary aspects of the struggle.

The contest will take place on political, economic, social, and ideological battlegrounds. Consequently, we will need to adopt a stronger nonmilitary counteroffensive.

In attempting to cope with this great threat, we traditionally depend, to a large part, upon the President—as spearhead of U.S. foreign policy—and other governmental policies and programs.

However, we must not overlook the great reservoir of nongovernmental manpower, brainpower, materiel, and resources which can be mobilized in the battle against communism.

These, I believe, represent a great untapped reserve. The question, of course, is: How best can we develop and utilize such resources?

Briefly, now, I would like to discuss one such reserve: namely, the greater utilization of free enterprise to support and further the objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

Today, there are hundreds of businesses operating in many countries around the globe. If effectively utilized, these established firms could be "built-in" Voices of America, to spread U.S. ideas; distribute information on U.S. policies and programs for peace; serve as instruments of cooperation on projects of mutual interest and benefit between the United States and the host country; operate as channels for the spreading of free-enterprise know-how, to help local communities help themselves—thus more intimately acquainting more people on how free institutions can best serve a people in their search for progress, honor, dignity, and self-determination; and generally improving relations with the host country.

Recently, I contacted a great many business and industrial leaders, suggesting greater cooperation to support and strengthen U.S. foreign policy.

The great majority reflected a real interest of U.S. business—not just in engaging in profitable enterprising abroad—but also in serving—insofar as possible—our national interest and the cause of peace.

In the light of such enthusiasm, I believe it would be most worthwhile for the President to call a conference of businessmen to develop more effective ways in which private enterprise could support U.S. policies and programs abroad.

To demonstrate the gratifying patriotic interest of business leaders in cooperating to serve our national interests abroad—as well as a partial review of some of the ways in which they are now serving us—I request unanimous consent to have a cross section of the responses printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARKER PEN CO.,
Janesville, Wis., U.S.A., April 12, 1961.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for your letter of March 30 with attached news release from your office regarding your recent statement urging more effective business-Government cooperation in furthering U.S. foreign policy aims around the world.

I think you know that The Parker Pen Co. has long been active overseas and that we are doing business in approximately 100 countries. We are, therefore, naturally very much interested in this subject and appreciate your support.

We think your suggestion to schedule a conference of business leaders and industry engaged in operations overseas is an excellent one.

Yours very sincerely,

C. E. BOGGS,
Director, Foreign Sales Division.

KIMBERLY-CLARK CORP.,
Neenah, Wis., April 12, 1961.
Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Recently you wrote us in connection with your statement urging a large role for American business in fostering U.S. foreign policy. This, of course, we believe to be essential, not only to the welfare of our own people and Nation, but also to the effort of maintaining and enlarging the scope and influence of the free world.

For several years Kimberly-Clark has been active in the private organizations such as the U.S. chamber and the international chamber in fostering the excellent concepts you have enunciated. We feel strongly that it is the obligation of our people to enhance the U.S. position abroad. We feel just as strongly that it is incumbent upon our Government to do those few things which it is possible for them to do which will enable private enterprise in our country to grow and prosper here and abroad, in order to make the total effort meaningful.

As one who has had so many years of experience participating in foreign policy as you have had, I am sure you are well aware of what needs to be done. We too will continue to push those efforts which we think are for the best long-term good of our country.

Sincerely,

LEONARD E. PASEK,

KOEHRING CO.,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 11, 1961.
The Honorable Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This will acknowledge your letter of March 30 and the attached statement of your views on the possible role of businessmen in the field of international relations. Our own company has manufacturing arrangements of one kind or another in several foreign countries and sales activity in most areas of the free world. I am sure that our people who regularly travel to those areas of activity for the Koehring Co. could well be effective in carrying out some of the objectives which you suggest.

* * * * *

Yours very truly,

JULIEN STEELMAN,
President.

TIME,
New York, N.Y., April 4, 1961.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Time's editors were impressed with your sound, thoughtful proposals for implementing U.S. foreign policy through more effective business-Government cooperation in projecting the American image abroad.

* * * * *

Cordially yours,

ISABEL KOURI
(For the Editors.)

CUTLER-HAMMER INTERNATIONAL C.A.,
Milwaukee Wis., April 7, 1961.
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This is with reference to your letter of March 30, 1961, addressed to Cutler-Hammer Inc., dealing with the question of cooperation between business and Government in the improvement of our relationships with other countries of the world.

For a considerable period of time I have been of the opinion that U.S. foreign policy could be furthered by closer cooperation between Government and businessmen with international interest.

One primary reason for my opinion relative to the role of the international businessman in forming U.S. foreign policy is that a businessman conducting a business activity in a foreign country is stimulated by commercial motivation. With this in mind, then, the businessman is therefore encouraged to seek the best possible and most practical means of getting along with associates, customers, and government leaders in other countries.

Frequently the businessman with international interests has on his payroll foreign nationals or is in partnership with foreign nationals. Because of this, I believe the businessman is encouraged to know and understand the people and culture of the country in which he is conducting his business in a manner quite unique and different than is experienced by U.S. Government employees in foreign assignments.

To be a bit more specific on the above point, I cite the example of our subsidiary company in Mexico, Cutler-Hammer Mexicana S. A. We own 60 percent of this company and Mexican nationals own 40 percent of the company. We have approximately 100 people on the payroll of the company.

Each of the 100 employees of the Mexican company is included as a part of the Cutler-Hammer family and is encouraged to know as much as they possibly can about the nature of our company, its purpose, its policies, and its activities. Likewise, we in turn try to know our Mexican friends as intimately as possible so that we may create a true family relationship.

Additionally, our Mexican company is totally managed by Mexican nationals. This means that they are given a status and responsibility within their own organization and within the Cutler-Hammer organization which permits an exchange in ideas, thoughts, and opinions as to the conduct of our business on an equal footing with the management of Cutler-Hammer here in Milwaukee. Many times these ideas go well beyond the realm of day-to-day business activities and encompass political attitudes, cultural differences, and language, and social custom traditions.

What better way, in my opinion, could the United States get to know and understand the problems of our international friends than through the eyes of the businessman who seeks to find the most pleasant and profitable associations overseas possible.

In many instances, I feel businessmen are more responsive to problems abroad and are more alert to possible practical solutions to the problems which might very well enhance the position of the U.S. foreign policy. The suggestions which you have made in the memorandum attached to your letter of March 30 are not definitive enough to permit specific comment. However, I do feel such proposals are worthy of further exploration.

If we at Cutler-Hammer can be of assistance to you in any way or provide you with additional information regarding our international operations which might assist in furthering your proposals, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

P. C. FOOTE, *President.*

NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE,
New York, N.Y., April 11, 1961.
The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you for sending us your thoughtful and stimulating statement about the opportunity for business to play a more important role in support of our foreign policy. We heartily agree with your suggestion, and in a number of ways we have tried to act as responsible citizens abroad.

Last November, Keith Funston summarized some of our activities, explained our interest in developing a worldwide trend toward share ownership, and urged foreign representatives of our corporation to help in this trend. A copy of his talk is enclosed.

Recently we also sent to foreign exchanges, financial institutions, and financial editors the attached report on progress in developing share ownership abroad. The response has been most encouraging. Requests for more copies have come from all over—Brazilian Government Trade Bureau, Belgian Industrial Information Service, consulate general of Australia, German-American Chamber of Commerce, consulate general of Afghanistan, Austrian Consulate General, French and Swedish Embassies in Washington, German consulate general, German Economics Ministry, German Foreign Ministry, Toronto Globe & Mail, Stockholm School of Economics Library, and Banca d'Italia in Rome—among others.

As part of the educational program to strengthen the free enterprise system around the world, the USIA has translated into 16 languages prints of our latest motion picture, "Your Share in Tomorrow," which tells the story of democratic capitalism, and distributed them through their offices abroad.

As you probably know, our exhibit hall and visitors' gallery now have more visitors for the hours we are open than the U.N. and the Statue of Liberty—a total of about 500,000 a year. On a typical day, we found that some 48 States and 42 foreign countries were represented. In addition, we are host to a constant stream of foreign financial, business, and political figures as well as journalists, educators, and economists.

In these ways—along with the program outlined in Mr. Funston's talk—we hope to give further impetus to your call for business to assume a larger role in improving our public relations abroad.

If there is any way in which we can be of assistance, please call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

RUDDICK C. LAWRENCE.

GOODYEAR INTERNATIONAL CORP.,
Akron, Ohio, April 6, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have your letter of March 30 with respect to the role that American business and industrial firms operating overseas might play in furthering the U.S. foreign policy aims.

During many years overseas I can recall how often this subject came up in conversations among American businessmen who could never understand, since generally speaking they have good business and personal relations with nationals of other countries, that the American foreign service had brought them into the picture so little as compared with the close relations of British and European services with the members of their business colonies.

Well handled, without public fanfare, the business colony might prove very useful.

Most well established American business enterprises abroad do participate in community efforts to improve health, education, cultural and other types of programs, and recently I believe are improving considerably their public relations programs and efforts in this respect, and their personnel policies.

The American business community overseas as a whole I think are always willing and anxious to cooperate on any appropriately designed effort.

Sincerely yours,

F. T. MAGENNIS.

INSURANCE CO. OF NORTH AMERICA,
LIFE INSURANCE CO. OF NORTH AMERICA.
Philadelphia, Pa., April 10, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In reply to your letter of March 30 suggesting that American business could play a more vital role in furthering our foreign policy aims around the world.

In my opinion this is a very good suggestion. We are doing business in 34 countries outside of the United States, and we would be very happy to have our managers do everything possible to serve the best interests of the United States in these countries.

Yours very truly,

JOHN A. DIEMAND.

THE FIRESTONE TIRE & RUBBER CO.,
Akron Ohio, April 7, 1961.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On March 31, 1961, you favored our company with your statement recommending that businessmen of America be given the opportunity to assume a larger role in serving the interests of the United States by cooperating in furthering the foreign policy aims around the world. Our company has engaged substantially in such activities, and I welcome this opportunity to assure you our efforts will be pledged toward continuing to play a significant role in the economic life of the countries in which we invest our resources of capital, know-how, and production facilities.

You may be interested in the enclosed booklet, which was published a few years ago by the National Planning Association which evaluates the impact of our operations upon the advancement of one such underdeveloped nation, namely, Liberia. In all our operations throughout the world, we always are guided by the need for favorable public opinion and the advancement of the principles and philosophy of "free enterprise" which are so much a part of the good image of the United States of America.

We have continued our ceaseless efforts and have joined with other companies to raise the standards of living and stimulate the productive efficiency in many portions of this hemisphere and across the waters with that dedication which led the editors of Time magazine to say in 1956:

"The vision of increasing plenty that Firestone and other American companies were exporting to the world was a reflection of the American dream that was passionately held at home."

You can understand that we realize with all Americans the seriousness of creeping extensions of the Communist influence even into the Caribbean when I advise you that on August 30, 1960, our properties located in Cuba were taken over by the Cuban government by an order of intervention and on October 24, 1960, these properties were expropriated by a decree of nationalization. Such signs of stress in the world between ideologies in quest for peoples' dedications are most important to us as an organization of world-wide scope, operating 72 plants in 20 countries and plantations, warehouses, and branches in strategic locations throughout the free world.

If your suggestion to President Kennedy that a conference of business leaders could profitably be scheduled to map strategy and enlist support for more effective cooperation results in the call for such a meeting, our company would be pleased to respond to such an invitation.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH THOMAS,
Vice President and Secretary.

REMINGTON RAND,
New York, N.Y., April 12, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We certainly consider your objectives, as outlined in your letter of March 31, 1961, desirable from the standpoint of the U.S. Government and American companies operating abroad.

On the other hand, plans for a definite program which would not conflict with normal business effort have never to my knowledge been presented.

Certainly we will be glad to be represented at any meeting scheduled to discuss concrete plans for cooperation.

Sincerely,

T. A. KIRKLAND.

A. O. SMITH INTERNATIONAL S.A.,
Milwaukee, Wis., April 7, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We at A. O. Smith International S.A. wholeheartedly endorse your statement recommending that businessmen of America now operating around the globe be given a larger role in serving the interests of the United States in foreign countries where they operate.

Our goal is always to be a good corporate citizen wherever we find ourselves, and our experience indicates that this goal is shared by the large majority of the U.S. firms which engage in international trade.

Your very truly,

D. J. O'CONNELL,
President.

BUCYRUS-ERIE CO.,
South Milwaukee, Wis., April 17, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. WILEY: Your call for more effective business-Government cooperation in U.S. international relations has struck a responsive chord.

We believe that U.S. businessmen doing business abroad not only serve a great cause but are in the front lines of this country's economic and ideological battle against communism. That this effort on the part of U.S. business should not be effectively harnessed to parallel U.S. Government endeavors is a tragic waste of resources. This does not imply we have any wish to regiment ourselves under Government direction. But it does mean we believe there is a wide area of international activities which would be better served if, by mutual understanding, our common goals could be achieved.

Therefore, we would wholeheartedly welcome any opportunity to assist the President in strengthening the role of U.S. business in this country's foreign policy. Moreover, we would be happy to participate in and support any business-Government conferences which would be called for this purpose.

Sincerely yours,

JACK A. CHANTREY,
Treasurer.

AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
IN LONDON,
London, W. 1., April 18, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Mr. Kenneth Campbell, manager of the foreign commerce department of the United States Chamber of Commerce, has forwarded us a copy of your letter to that chamber dated March 29, 1961, along with your statement recommending that American businessmen operating abroad be given the opportunity to assume a larger role in serving the interests of the United States in the countries in which they have enterprises.

Your idea is very intriguing indeed, and is being passed on to our members for discussion and comment. In due course we shall forward you a consensus of their thoughts in the matter, but I feel sure they will endorse it in principle.

Meanwhile I would like to express my own personal views for whatever they may be worth inasmuch as until recently I have been for many years in our Foreign Service, and commercial attaché at our London Embassy from 1956 to the end of 1960. There can be little doubt about the worth of your idea, and the only question is how can it be implemented. I would venture that if our rival had the nucleus that we possess in our 23-odd chambers of commerce abroad there would be no hesitation whatever in supporting such organizations, though under state patronage, in efforts to create a certain image.

I know from our experience with American businessmen in England that individually they do some of the things you outline in your statement. You imply, however, that there be a coordinated program of activities which would more fully reflect the spirit and the letter of the American character in the countries where we have business enterprise. If such coordination of effort should be considered an appropriate function of our chambers abroad, certain contingencies have to be faced. For example, London harbors perhaps the largest of our American chambers abroad and therefore maintains a larger budget than the others. However, even we do not have the financial facilities necessary to engage in such public relations activities as radio, movie, and television programs, and to participate in local educational, health and cultural work.

Lacking Government subsidies to further the purposes you propose, and of course that would be incompatible with the free enter-

prise spirit characterizing the American chambers abroad, the way the public relations activity could be carried on even a modest scale, would be under some common fund organized by the American companies at home and distributed selectively by them to the chambers concerned, or through some other central medium which might call on the chambers for specific services in the directions you outline.

I do not think anything could be more popular among British business people, especially leaders, than the sharing of American industrial documentaries that are well done, e.g., the building of the Chesapeake Bay Bridge, of the aluminum skyscraper in Pittsburgh, prefab housing, and many other such achievements of which we are justly proud. There are untold areas of cooperation with the British in educational interchanges of junior business executives, speeches by prominent American and British industrialists, and so on. For one thing you may have heard of our chamber's famous luncheon forums where we have prominent men in business and politics speaking on international affairs. For want of money we probably suffer in not having enough Americans of proper stature come over to speak at these luncheons and offer a message to an interested British public.

The necessary finance to cover the activities envisaged, it appears to me, can come from one source only, namely public-spirited top executives of some of our sophisticated business organizations, large, medium, or small, who are sympathetic to your idea, especially if it should have the governmental blessing. The sums required need not be formidable; but rather, reasonable enough to support the results desired. All thinking Americans will agree that in the present free world, as you suggest, it is highly important that the member countries stand together. A convenient practical way is via the interchange which you describe in the type of relations you propose between the respective countries.

I attach hereto a little background information on chambers of commerce generally, and our London chamber in particular, which I hope you will find interesting.

Respectfully yours,

EMIL KEKICH,
Executive Director.

From: Emil Kekich, Executive director, American Chamber of Commerce in London, Inc.

The international exchange of products now approximates the staggering value of £36,000 million a year. Factors accounting for this unparalleled extension of world commerce include the occurrence of explosive increments in population; the expansion of investments in technologically improved industries enabling countries to increase the volume of goods produced, thereby enhancing their opportunity to trade with other lands; and the advances made in communication and transport facilities.

These factors are supplemented in western countries through the advisory aid given by governments and private service organizations to participants in foreign investment and trade. Markets abroad are so numerous, diversified, and complex in character, being subject as well to constantly changing conditions, that nations strive to use all available means, governmental and private, to influence the development of their foreign commercial relations as a matter of policy. In the Western World, particularly, comprehensive mechanisms of government and of private organizations—such as chambers of commerce, trade associations and similar groups—assist each other in according advice and practical service to firms engaged in trading or investing in oversea areas.

The highly organized machinery of modern governments and private groups promoting foreign business in behalf of their firms follows several hundred years of evolution. The roots of these instruments perhaps go back to the merchant guilds of the 12th century, the first group known as a chamber of commerce having been established by the civic council of Marseilles, France, in 1599. The early succeeding French chambers of commerce possessed wide governmental powers, and even today in continental European and several South American countries the chambers of commerce have at least some official connection with, or are supported by, their governments. In Great Britain, Canada, and the United States the chambers from the very beginning constituted themselves as voluntary associations of businessmen, independent of their Governments, interested in the improvement of business in their communities and of the communities themselves. Whether or not they happen to be directly or regularly concerned with international affairs, they work in concert with the Government in contributing as opportunities afford to foreign trade and investment devolpment as an integral part of the welfare of their countries.

The number of chambers of commerce in the United States increased rapidly, especially in the latter part of the 19th century, following the establishment of the oldest one, the Chamber of Commerce of New York (founded in 1768 by a nucleus of 20 merchants and granted a charter by George III). Today hardly a town of any size in the United States does not harbor a chamber of commerce designed to give expression to the views of its members in questions of labor and management relations, taxes, and of educational and cultural development.

With the increasing complexity of industrial and commercial affairs throughout the country the demand arose for a national federation of local chambers of commerce, trade, and professional associations. Members of these bodies were finding their constructive activities increasingly harassed by sudden strikes, higher taxes to cover mounting Government expenditures, unfair practices by predatory competitors and other conditions beyond their control. To give them a collective voice before Congress and the public on such issues and others relating to the commonweal the Chamber of Commerce of the United States came into being in Washington, D.C.

One of the purposes of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States is to assist in fostering and maintaining the Nation's commercial intercourse with foreign countries. It believes that the world of the future will be a world of diversity held together by a conception of common interests, and that the free competitive enterprise system can do much to promote peace and prosperity among peoples of the world. Whereas few members of the chamber originally were interested in venturing toward the distant and unfamiliar conditions associated with foreign commerce, it was in the national American interest to broaden its cultivation of foreign sources of supply and of sales outlets for its surplus production. Thus the chamber encouraged the formation of American chambers of commerce abroad primarily in order to render as much on-the-spot assistance as possible to the American and foreign firms interested in doing business with each other. As a result 23 American chambers were formed in commercial capitals of the world during the past half century or so. These bodies were set up as voluntary associations of free enterprise represented by American firms and individuals having business relations in the given foreign country, as well as by firms and individuals of that country interested in doing business with the United States. The chambers were designed to cooperate closely with the governmental authorities of the two countries concerned, but were unofficial, strictly private, nonprofit, and supported by annual dues of the membership. As members of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States they use its vast informational and other facilities, but are otherwise fully autonomous. In every case their constitutions require that a majority of the officers and directors must be American citizens. In other cases, as with the American Chamber of Commerce in London, there is a 100 percent requirement in respect to the American citizenship of the members sitting on the governing board.

Among the pioneers in the establishment of the American chambers abroad were a small group of American and British businessmen in England. In 1916 they organized the American Chamber of Commerce in London, Inc., at the suggestion of the board of trade which then sought every means to bring about the efficient flow of war materiel from the United States to Britain and her allies. The chamber's founders and successors, as in the case of its sister organizations abroad, believed that banding together would be a form of insurance against the multitudinous problems and patterns of foreign trade and investment that peculiarly lend themselves to periodic, often sudden, change incident to the social evolution reflected in the rising tide of consumer expectations for higher living standards via more and better products at attractive prices.

From modest beginnings the chamber grew to embrace in its membership many British and American leaders in industry, banking, shipping, and commerce. The number of its members increased from about 700 in the 1920's to 1,500 at the present time, and new members are being added daily. The rising trend in the membership derives from the great strides made in Anglo-American trade and industrial investment since World War II, for greater demands for information and advice on problems affecting the policy conduct of this traffic, and for a representative forum directed toward the objective of influencing the freer movement of goods between Britain and the United States. A number of the members have joined the chamber with little desire or necessity to obtain special or immediate benefit for themselves, but rather in the spirit that they are supporting a worthy community enterprise nurturing friendly Anglo-American relations generally, facilitating the making of business contacts, and promoting the exchange of useful information.

Others join the chamber in order to be in position whenever appropriate to take advantage of the specific services offered.

In the operational field the chamber's staff keeps the members au courant with international business trends based on authoritative sources, and with governmental projects and actions on tariffs and taxes, principally through the medium of its monthly magazine, Anglo-American News. On the request of members, information is supplied on the business capacity of firms interested in Anglo-American trade possibilities. The chamber arranges connections between buyers and sellers on an individual basis, or by way of facilitating meetings between British and American business groups visiting in the one country or the other. Specific inquiries of all sorts coming to the members of the staff of the chamber run at the rate of several hundred per month, and their stock in trade is in knowing where to find the answers. The chamber's varied membership affords extraordinary facilities in making market surveys either here or in the

United States. Indeed, these facilities assist the American Government to compile up-to-date reports on possible trade or investment openings in the United States or Britain, and are in increasing demand.

In this connection, the chamber has for half a century been publishing an annual reference work, Anglo-American Year Book, containing valuable data for any company or person engaged or interested in commercial relations between Britain and the United States of America. This is the only directory of its kind and finds considerable favor in the eyes of British and American concerns, and the governmental and private trade promotion organizations in Britain and the United States with whom the chamber maintains liaison. Not the least of the chamber's services offered to British-American business are its popular monthly luncheons where men of international prominence in government, industry, and commerce speak on significant topics of the day. These affairs have become famous not merely because of the attractions inherent in the caliber of the guest speakers but as convenient opportunities for members and their guests to meet and do business.

Over the years more American businessmen and their British counterparts have placed faith in the future of London's American chamber. The founders and their successors, leaders thinking in the large, recognizing that Britain and the United States faced mutual complexities that could be dealt with only by organization in a mutual and friendly spirit, have devoted endless months and years to the chamber's progress. The chamber has had its uphill moments, but somehow there always seemed to be a quorum of directors and members on hand to understand the basic importance of the organization and to assist selflessly in its progress. The Americans during the postwar years of slump appreciated, for example, the austerity situation of the British, and did not attempt to cajole them into trying to spend more than they could really afford on the American goods they wanted and needed. Meanwhile, the same Americans proved sympathetic and helpful in figuring ways and means through the chamber by which Britain could gradually build up sales of its goods to the United States of America. A long line of dedicated Britons and Americans certainly constitutes the main reason why the chamber has won respect in the United States and Britain, why it is growing, and why it promises to be more worthy than ever in the future.

J. I. CASE INTERNATIONAL, S.A.,
Caracas, Venezuela, April 21, 1961.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We have noted with a great deal of interest the memorandum attached to your letter of March 29 dealing with your views as to the role that can be played by U.S. business in U.S. foreign policy.

With respect to our international operation in oversea markets, I might state that in a commercial way and to a large extent we do offer the various forms of cooperation which you suggest.

It might well be that the gathering of businessmen called by the President and Secretary of Commerce which would provide a round-table discussion on this whole form of approach would be timely. In the event such a meeting is arranged, it would be our desire to attend.

Yours very truly,

H. H. BLOOM,
President.

IBM WORLD TRADE CORP.,
New York, N.Y., April 20, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I would like to thank you for your letter of March 30, which was awaiting me on my return from an extended business trip abroad.

Your proposal that a special effort be made to enlist the support of American industry operating abroad in reinforcing the foreign policy interests of our country is an excellent one. We in IBM World Trade Corp. have always attempted to conduct our business abroad in such a way as to yield maximum benefit to the foreign policy interests of the United States, and I believe the vast majority of other American firms operating abroad do likewise.

I am confident that if the President would call a conference of business leaders, as you propose, to consider this subject, new and fruitful lines of action would be developed. If such a conference does take place, you can be assured that we would be delighted to participate.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR K. WATSON.

STANDARD OIL CO.,
New York, N.Y., April 21, 1961.

The HONORABLE ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We appreciated receiving your letter of March 29 enclosing a statement recommending that American businessmen now operating abroad be given the opportunity to assume a larger role in serving the interest of the United States.

Frankly, we are in complete accord with your comments regarding the doing of business abroad. For your information, our company has emphasized the necessity for proper public relations in order to create the most favorable public image of the company and its affiliates in the countries in which they are doing buisness. Furthermore, for a number of years, we have been sponsoring documentary films and cultural activities, such as art exhibits and concerts, and have also maintained, principally in Latin America, a television and radio news program entitled "Your Esso Reporter" (known in Venezuela as "Creole Reporter"). It is our understanding that this program has been very favorably received in the various countries. In addition, every effort is made to support and improve health, educational, and other types of programs. As an example, the hospital of Jersey Standard's affiliate in northern Argentina was the forerunner of the Argentine public nursing program.

The policy of our company has always been to employ as many nationals of the country as possible and training programs are constantly carried on to insure that the best trained citizens are brought along promotionally. We do believe that such programs are essential to the doing of business abroad and are very pleased to see that your ideas and ours are along the same lines.

Again, we wish to express our appreciation for your courtesy in letting us have the opportunity of commenting on your views.

Sincerely,

CECIL MORGAN,
Executive Assistant to the Chairman for Public Affairs.

INVEST-IN-AMERICA WEEK—AMERICA'S SEVENTH ANNUAL CELEBRATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, perhaps more than ever before, our American ideals and our system of competitive free enterprise are faced with the gravest challenge in our entire history. The forces of international communism now control nearly a billion people—along with vast natural, industrial, scientific, and military resources—and have advanced to an island only 90 miles off the coast of our United States. Where the balance of power and of world opinion once was largely on the side of the Western nations, now they are teetering precariously. All of my colleagues here today recognize that this is a formidable and an urgent challenge. However, I am confident that we in this country—and in the free world—possess the necessary resources, the skill, and the strength which comes from the conviction that man has an inherent yearning to be free, in order to assure the survival and the success of our democratic system.

Our free enterprise system was founded—and has developed—upon the sacrifice, the hard work, and the savings of our people. Although it has produced the highest standard of living in world history, our system is now threatened not only by the forces of international communism, but by the domestic danger of a lack of basic understanding among our own citizenry. The national invest-in-America movement was founded in 1949 for the purpose of educating our American people as to the vital importance of capital investment in supplying new jobs as well as safeguarding existing jobs. Dedicated to the maintenance and promotion of a sound and strong economy for our country through public education and a crusade for investment in America, the program has grown and expanded until now—the 1961 Investment-in-America Week—April 30 through May 6, is being observed in all 50 States and in 244 individual cities.

Most of my colleagues will recall that the national invest-in-America program is one in which I have been considerably interested for a good many years, and it has been a pleasure for me to make numerous public statements in which I have endorsed the commendable objectives of invest-in-America. In addition, I have been glad to welcome fellow Senators and Representatives and to greet members of the National and Metropolitan Washington Area Invest-in-America Committees—as well as local leaders in business and in the executive branch of the Government—at kickoff luncheons here in the Capitol. These events have initiated annual celebrations of national invest-in-America activities and their purpose has been to dramatize the principles of this constructive program and to stimulate interest in year-round activities.

The 1961 National Invest-in-America Week, being celebrated from April 30 through May 6, is in sharp contrast to the annual May 1 holiday in the Soviet Union. International communism celebrates this occasion with long parades displaying military might; Red Square in Moscow is alive with teeming crowds carrying banners bearing the picture of

Lenin and slogans glorifying the workingman. This day ranks in national importance with the anniversary of the October revolution.

Tomorrow, May 2, it will be my pleasure to help to celebrate the seventh annual Invest-in-America Week by a luncheon in the old Supreme Court chamber here in the Capitol. Expected to be in attendance are many of my colleagues in the Senate and the House of Representatives; the national chairman of 1961 Invest-in-America Week, Mr. Ray R. Eppert, president of the Burroughs Corp.; Mr. Alexander Biddle, governor and treasurer of the National Invest-in-America Committee and executive vice president of the Philadelphia-Baltimore Stock Exchange; Mrs. Katheryn Duffy, executive secretary of the National Invest-in-America Committee; Mr. George M. Ferris, chairman of the Metropolitan Washington Area Invest-in-America Committee; and many other local leaders in the civic and business life of our community. Included also in the distinguished gathering will be leaders in the executive branch of the Government who will make significant comments as to the importance of investments in U.S. savings bonds, securities, and home ownership, and in the role played by small businesses, in the growth of our American economy. These gentlemen include the Honorable John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration; the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; the Honorable William H. Neal, National Director of the U.S. Savings Bonds Division of the U.S. Treasury; and Mr. Byron D. Woodside, Commissioner of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

At that time it will also be my particular pleasure to present to Mr. Roth S. Schleck, the State chairman of the Invest-in-America Committee for my own State of Wisconsin, the first officially authorized State charter by the officers of the National Invest-in-America Committee. Mr. Schleck, who is vice president of the First Wisconsin National Bank in Milwaukee, will accept this charter being presented in recognition of the active participation in my State by representatives in the fields of education, insurance, banking, investment brokerage, and public relations; and by savings and loan associations, the Savings Bonds Division of the U.S. Treasury Department, Wisconsin Manufacturers Association, and the chamber of commerce. It is also being presented in recognition of the active past years' observances of Invest-in-America Week by the cities of Milwaukee, Fond du Lac, Sheboygan, Stevens Point, Janesville, and Grantsburg.

In order to assure the continued success of our competitive free enterprise system, and in order to stimulate the production of wealth and prosperity for our Nation, it is essential that each American follow an adequate and intelligent program of personal savings and investment. In this way, he will not only be adding to his own personal welfare, but he will be helping to keep our country strong so that we may possess the means for maintaining an effective deterrent to military aggression by those who would enslave the peoples of a free world.

Mr. President, I send to the desk now a descriptive brochure which lists the activities of the invest-in-America program and emphasizes that every American is an investor in jobs, savings, homes, insurance, and securities. I ask unanimous consent that this brochure, which also includes a listing of the organization of the Invest-in-America National Headquarters, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the brochure was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVEST IN AMERICA FOR MORE AND BETTER JOBS

(A year-round program to create a better understanding among men, women, and children of the role of savings, investment, and finance in the American economy.)

EVERY AMERICAN A CAPITALIST—EVERY AMERICAN AN INVESTOR IN JOBS, SAVINGS, HOMES, INSURANCE, AND SECURITIES

A capitalist is a person who owns something. Capitalism starts when that person—you—puts money to work for himself.

Jobs

Your savings and the savings of corporations from retained earnings help provide the tools and jobs from which 56 million American families earn their living.

Homes

Two out of every three American families either own or are buying their homes. Every time you make a payment you increase your investment.

Work, save, invest

The American competitive enterprise system was founded on the work and savings of the people and has produced the highest standard of living in history. Our people of their own free will have made all forms of investment—in savings, homes, insurance, and in securities from Government bonds to venture capital for new enterprise. Competitive enterprise is dependent on the continued supply of these funds which benefit consumers, workers, and the national interest as well as investors.

Savings

Through your savings your own capital grows. Interest paid for the use of this money adds to your principal or income.

Insurance

Life, fire, and casualty insurance protects the average American family. Cash value grows with each payment and is increased by dividends.

Securities

When you buy a Government or corporate bond you receive interest on your money. When you buy a share of stock you become a partner in the business and share profits through dividends and also share losses.

Investing in America has helped to make our country great. This idea needs to be brought home to all the people, men, women, and schoolchildren, because a clear understanding of the function of finance in the American competitive enterprise system is essential to its preservation.

WHAT INVEST IN AMERICA MEANS

Savings and investments are essential to a strong America because they provide: Job security and higher standards of living for 56 million families; capital for the plants and tools necessary for an expanding economy; strength for a free government.

In the years ahead America will have to provide: $17 billion a year for a million new jobs a year—this is $17,000 in new capital investment for each job; $40 billion a year to maintain plants and machines to sustain the 70 million present jobs.

Where will this money come from?

From the collective savings and investments of millions of Americans. From the retained earnings of corporations.

Therefore, every American owes it to himself to become an investor in America through savings of his own choice in:

Government securities.
Savings accounts.
Insurance.
Homes.
Corporate stocks and bonds.

The strength of a growing America is in the personal freedom to work, save and invest. Money at work means men at work—invest in America for security and income.

ACTIVITIES

Invest in America Week drives home the invest in America message through concentrated effort by many groups. It also stimulates continuous year-round activities by our branches and by cooperating organizations that sponsor invest-in-America days.

For example, Freedom To Invest Day, sponsored by chambers of commerce, commercial banks, U.S. Savings Bond Division, Treasury Department, real estate boards, savings and loan associations, Investment Bankers Association, stock exchanges, bond clubs, railroads, utilities, corporations, Institute of Life Insurance. American Consumers Day—advertising clubs. Labor and Industry Day—Rotary, Kiwanis, foremen's clubs. Women Investors Day—women's clubs and organizations. Youth of America Day—school boards, college faculties, students, junior achievement.

On Sunday attention is directed in churches to invest in America principles that concern the well-being of every family.

Material is supplied to participants for use during the week and for year-round activities—TV scripts and slides, sample editorials and news releases, proclamations, pamphlets, posters for bulletin boards, material for speakers, envelope stuffers. Window displays furnished by Standard & Poor's were exhibited by participants in 48 States including Alaska and Hawaii.

An increasing amount of invest-in-America material is being distributed by cooperating organizations. For instance, the National Research Bureau, Inc., in Chicago, is giving mass distribution to the pamphlet "Your Share in America's Prosperity," through its information rack service in industrial plants. A postage meter slug has been developed by the Association of Stock Exchange Firms.

Included in year-round activities which have earned several Freedom Foundation Awards are the following:

Radio and TV programs—Speakers and material are available for public service broadcasts.

High school and college programs—Invest-in-America Award for best junior achievement team in field of commercial banking; college symposia, classroom presentations, essay and public speaking contests.

Adult education—Courses on savings and forms of investment.

Public relations contests—Alexander Hamilton Award in western region for year-round promotion of invest-in-America philosophy.

AAIE Award—A board of judges selected by American Association of Industrial Editors will confer awards annually for best articles on economic education of employees in company publications.

ORGANIZATION

Chairmen, Invest-in-America Week: 1955, Reese H. Taylor, president, Union Oil Co. of California; 1956, R. G. Rincliffe, president,

Philadelphia Electric Co.; 1957, T. S. Petersen, president, Standard Oil Co. of California; 1958–59, Walker L. Cisler, president, the Detroit Edison Co.; 1960, Gardiner Symonds, president, Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.; 1961, Ray R. Eppert, president, Burroughs Corp.

Officers: Frederic A. Potts, chairman of the board; Walker L. Cisler, vice chairman of the board; Rudolph F. Vogeler, secretary; Alexander Biddle, treasurer; Samuel R. Rosenbaum, counsel; Walter A. Schmidt, chairman executive committee; Franklyn Waltman, chairman public relations committee; J. Whitney Bunting, consultant board of governors, chairman eastern region; John Latshaw, chairman central region; George J. Otto, chairman western region.

Regional offices and program coordinators:

Western—Ivy Lee, Jr. & Associates, Russ Building, San Francisco, Calif.

Central—James P. Chapman, Public Relations Counselors, Inc., 777 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

Eastern—John Moynahan & Co., Inc., 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

I-in-A chapters in the following locations direct year-round activities in cooperation with regional offices and national headquarters: Washington, D.C.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Cleveland, Ohio; Los Angeles, Calif.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Portland, Oreg.; St. Paul-Minneapolis, Minn.; San Diego, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.

Invest-in-America Week committees throughout the country, Alaska, and Hawaii cooperate in the observance of Invest-in-America Week.

National Headquarters Invest-in-America: Mrs. Kathryn M. Duffy, executive secretary, 121 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Doremus & Co., Inc., 1616 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

NEEDED: STRONGER FOREST FIRE CONTROL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the forests of the Nation—an invaluable natural resource—suffer severe diminution annually because of forest fires.

This is a tragic waste.

The reasons are many, including: electrical storms, carelessness by persons visiting forests, and other causes.

If we are to provide the forest resources to meet the needs of an ever-growing population, then we need stronger, more effective efforts to prevent and control forest fires.

Today, I received a letter containing some constructive recommendations in this field from Norman S. Stone, general chairman of the Lake States Forest Fire Research Conference. Mr. Stone points out many of the significant factors which deserve, I believe, the attention of Congress. I request unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAKE STATES FOREST FIRE RESEARCH CONFERENCE,
Madison, Wis., April 21, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: About 3 years ago the Wisconsin Conservation Commission's forestry advisory committee began a study of the increasing problems of forest-fire control in Wisconsin. The Wisconsin committee explored the problem with public forest-fire control agencies of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin and found that all three States are faced with much the same problem—that of increasing fire hazard due to reforestation and regrowth of extensive natural forests. Over the years we have become accustomed to extremely high standards in forest-fire control, and, paradoxically, this success, along with intensified forest management, tree planting, and growing recreational use of forest lands, has increased tremendously the likelihood of catastrophic forest fires.

On March 7 and 8, 1961, a group of about 140 men, representing a broad cross section of public agencies, forest industries, associations, forestry colleges, the press, and general public, met in Green Bay, Wis., to discuss the matter. The problem was thoroughly covered by forest managers, public and private alike, and by fire-control experts and others. The recommendations of the people attending this conference are attached.

Summing up these recommendations briefly—

(1) There is a serious and fast-growing threat of catastrophic fires in the Lake States region.

(2) Present firefighting methods are not adequate to cope with the situation under catastrophic conditions.

(3) It is nearly hopeless to cope with this situation simply by strengthening our present fire-control organizations alone, though this will help, and some expansion should be made.

(4) The principal hope of controlling large, fast-running fires is through the development of new and improved methods of fire prevention and control through research.

(5) The conference recommends the development of a strong program of forest-fire research in the Lake States, headed up by the Lake States Forest Experiment Station of the U.S. Forest Service; and, further, that the program be cooperative in nature, bringing to bear the resources of State fire-control agencies and the forest industries.

It is our hope that you will find it possible to give your full support to this program and express your support to the U.S. Forest Service and the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN S. STONE,
General Chairman.

COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the State of Mississippi, officially recognizing the immediate need for legislation providing education and job training assistance to the Nation's post-Korean veterans, has adopted a resolution urging the Congress to take favorable action on the proposed cold war GI bill, S. 349.

I know my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Mississippi, shares my gratitude for the resolution adopted by his State. He was one of 37 Senators who sponsored the cold war GI bill when it was introduced in January.

The veteran of the cold war is performing a great service for the Nation; and the Legislature of the State of Mississippi wants it known that it favors a program of education and vocational training for this group when they return to civilian status.

I wish to read at this point one paragraph of the concurrent resolution of both houses of the Mississippi Legislature:

Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans resulting from higher education and improved skills will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970.

One point that should be considered is that the program is self-liquidating. It is not a giveaway, a grant, or a bonus. It is a program that will more than pay back to the Treasury in taxes alone the entire cost of the program, not counting the great economic benefits to the Nation as a whole of this trained reservoir of manpower.

I heard evidence submitted to the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare last week that in 1956, 7,300 young Americans applied for admission to dental schools, but last year only 6,100 applied for admission to dental schools. The standards are going down. Comparable figures are available for medical schools.

Why? Because of the playing out of the GI bills. As one official of the American Dental Association said, few families in America today are able to pay the $26,000 required to put a student through dental school.

In 1959 we licensed 8,000 medical doctors in America. Only 6,300 of those were educated in American medical schools. One thousand and seven hundred were emigrees from foreign countries trained in other medical schools, whom we licensed here because we did not have enough doctors trained at home.

We ought to be exporting instead of importing doctors. We ought to be furnishing them to the underdeveloped areas of the world. The cold war GI bill is the surest way of getting the trained reservoir of manpower that this country so badly needs.

The Veterans' Administration estimates that some 16,000 Mississippi veterans of the cold war will go to school or improve their job skills in the next 5 years under the proposed cold war GI bill.

One hundred and forty-seven thousand veterans from Mississippi received training under the World War II and Korean GI bills. In recognition of the service these bills rendered, the legislature's resolution underlines the importance and justice of providing the cold war veteran with the means to contribute with maximum efficiency to the Nation's economy.

Supporters of the cold war GI bill are convinced that the most constructive and feasible solution to the readjustment problems of the post-Korean veteran is a farsighted program of education and vocational training as in S. 349.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution from the State of Mississippi, supporting the cold war GI bill, with the official certificate, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the house concurrent resolution of Mississippi was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

Whereas millions of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have been educated under the provisions of the veterans education program established by the Federal Government; and

Whereas many veterans were able to obtain further education through the benefits of the veterans education program which would not have been possible otherwise; and

Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the level of education of this country and has produced a major national asset in better and more skilled manpower and has done much to improve the economy of our country; and

Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans resulting from higher education and improved skills will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

Whereas the President of the United States, by Executive order on January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational benefits that were granted to veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it has been established by reliable statistics that the investment in education for our own American youth will be more than repaid to the Public Treasury through increased taxes, resulting from higher incomes by such veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein), That the Legislature of the State of Mississippi does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend GI education benefits to all veterans who entered or who will enter military service from and after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended as long as the provision of the draft law shall exist; be it further

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution, a copy thereof be mailed by the clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Mississippi.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE WELCOME CORPS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, someone once said, "There is nothing new under the sun." This was in the days before hula hoops, frozen custard, canasta, the charleston, pony tails, Bermuda shorts, and many other things. Nevertheless, Mr. President, there is real truth in this old adage. When Marconi invented the wireless, another inventor is said to have built almost the same device at almost the same time. The automobile was invented simultaneously in several countries of the Western World. The same was true of television.

Let me give another illustration: Several weeks ago my distinguished colleague and good friend, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement about an idea of a constituent of his in Colorado, some 2,000 miles from the great metropolis of New York. Not having read this particular issue of the Appendix of the daily RECORD, about 2 weeks later I commented on the floor of the Senate about an idea which occurred to me because of the work of a gentleman from the great city of New York.

It was thereupon pointed out to me by my good colleague from Colorado that the lady from Colorado and the gentleman from New York are on the same wavelength. Both are interested in helping foreign visitors to the United States and both evinced a great interest in organizing groups to welcome and assist friends from overseas visiting the United States.

Senator CARROLL's constituent from Colorado has set up what she calls the host corps. We in New York, under the active leadership of Mr. David I. Stern, of Manhattan, are setting up what I call the welcome corps. The welcome corps and the host corps would accomplish the same fine purposes. Both are consistent with the increasing interest in our country in expanding the number of visitors to the United States.

Mr. President, we must now have a merger between East and West. We must drive a gold spike between the welcome corps and the host corps and set up what we might as well call the "corps corps" to publicize and promote travel to New York City, Denver, Colo., New Mexico, Arkansas, Minnesota, Maine, and all of our great States.

I want to make it clear to my colleague, and I say this in all honesty, that I was not aware of his comments in the RECORD or I certainly would have coordinated my statement with him. Nevertheless, just like Wilbur and Orville, I hope that Colorado and New York will get together and get this idea, like the first airplane, off the ground and soaring to great heights.

I have often expounded upon the many wonderful attractions of New York City and New York State. I know that my colleague from Colorado and his host corps just as vigorously publicize the thin air of the steep mountains of the great State of Colorado.

Mr. President, the latest information which I have indicates that the so-called tourist gap is widening. Americans are spending a great deal more money overseas than tourists from overseas spend in the United States. According to the Commerce Department, Americans spent $1.7 billion more abroad last year than was spent by visitors in the United States. This is an increase of approximately $200 million from the previous year.

The figures underscore the need to take every possible step to encourage visitors from abroad. The bill to establish an International Travel Office—S. 610—of which I am a cosponsor, is one of the most logical and direct ways in which we can accomplish this purpose. I am very enthusiastic about this program and hope that it will be enacted into law in the very near future.

The proposal for a welcome corps or a host corps to greet visitors from overseas is, in a sense, the other side of the coin. While the Travel Office will get them here, the welcome corps will make them feel better when they arrive.

On April 12, the New York Daily News editorialized on the welcome corps. The editors of the Daily News discussed and supported this idea in very thoughtful terms. The News pointed out that not only would a welcome corps help to redress our balance of payments, but it would also promote mutual good will and international friendship among peoples and nations. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Daily News editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR A WELCOME CORPS

David I. Stern, a former textile manufacturer, has come up with an idea which looks promising. He is concerned about the difficulties encountered by many foreign tourists here, particularly those who do not speak English. His suggestion: a welcome corps, set up by private civic groups and municipal visitors' bureaus. He recommends that registers be compiled of local citizens who speak various foreign languages, and who would be willing to help our visitors from overseas.

BOON FOR TOURISTS

Such groups, we feel, would pay off not only in mutual friendship but in tourist revenue—always a red-ink factor as far as our country is concerned. We wish Mr. Stern and Senator KENNETH KEATING, who is seconding his motion, the best of luck in their project.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at this point I wish to briefly mention a number of ways in which the activities of the welcome corps should be organized:

First. Having greeters registered and stationed at New York City terminals and hotels;

Second. Having students and retired people volunteer to serve as hosts to visitors;

Third. Encouraging the placement of foreign speaking personnel on sightseeing buses and in public places, such as museums and galleries;

Fourth. Promoting the employment of clerks who are able to speak foreign languages and who are specifically assigned to the greeting and assisting of foreign visitors;

Fifth. Informing foreign visitors about community attractions; and

Sixth. Setting up opportunities for visitors to meet with and get to know local citizens.

The initiative in this area must be taken by private and civic groups. However, once this program gets underway, it may be that the development of community registers and/or national registers of groups participating in such a program would have a great value. Such registers might perhaps be coordinated

by the Department of Commerce in Washington. If this actually is workable, I shall be happy to cooperate with the Senator from Colorado and other Senators to have proposed legislation introduced in Congress to establish such a center in the Commerce Department.

Mr. President, I am delighted that Mr. Stern, of New York City, has accepted this challenge and is working energetically to promote this idea in New York City. I am delighted also that other persons in communities such as Denver are working along the same lines.

Mr. President, I am also happy to state that the president of the National Travelers Aid Association, Mr. Donald S. Stralem, has been in touch with me, thus indicating the interest of this fine organization in the proposal to establish a welcome corps. Travelers Aid already has many services which overlap those which presumably would be undertaken by a "welcome corps"; therefore, it seems to me entirely appropriate that they should participate in the planning of this program, which would be unique in that it would focus upon visitors from abroad and would greet and assist all in this group.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stralem's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL TRAVELERS AID ASSOCIATION,
New York, N.Y., April 26, 1961.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: National Travelers Aid Association is very much interested in your bill on tourism and we are pleased with your recent proposal for a welcome corps. We believe this is a much needed program that could contribute greatly to improve international relations.

As you doubtless are aware, for many years the volunteers of Travelers Aid have been meeting travelers from abroad at the steamship docks, and more recently, at the airports. Travelers aid societies throughout the country maintain booths in all types of terminals—railroad, airport, bus, and steamship—with volunteers who give friendly welcome and information in whatever language is needed about places to stay and on all kinds of community resources. For example, the Chicago Travelers Aid Society has 500 trained volunteers working in the many different terminals in that city. Travelers aid societies also have professional workers who are available to assist families and individuals who have serious problems.

Our long experience in welcoming people coming to this country has demonstrated the great importance of this type of program and the desirability of extending resources to carry it on. An example of the kind of service needed is that of the New York USO Center operated by Travelers Aid for service personnel on 43d Street. This center welcomes servicemen and women and provides information about recreational, cultural, and educational programs and activities in New York City. This center has a wonderful group of volunteers who work under the direction of the employed staff who talk with the individual serviceman and see that he gets the kind of information and opportunity that he needs.

We believe this experience will be of interest to those working on any plans for the welcome corps. We will be very glad indeed to share what we have learned from our experience and to assist in any way that we can in the launching of this very important effort. Please feel free to call on me or the general director, Mrs. Savilla Simons, and her colleagues at the national office at any time.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD S. STRALEM,
President.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excellent and penetrating article written by Mr. Harrison E. Salisbury, and published in the New York Times of April 24, 1961. Mr. Salisbury states that the United States is not at present adequately prepared to greet and assist visitors from overseas.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 1961]

UNITED STATES FOUND ILL PREPARED TO SERVE FOREIGN TOURISTS

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

Unless prompt action is taken, the first wave of foreign tourists attracted by the new "Visit U.S.A." program may encounter a discouraging gantlet of language barriers, conflicts of national habits, and inadequate facilities.

A survey of present conditions in New York—chief entry point of the hoped-for tourist influx—reveals that little has been done to prepare for the new guests. Interest is widespread, but concrete action is lacking.

Thus far, the attention of the travel industry has been fixed upon pending legislation to set up a new Federal foreign travel bureau, efforts to remove complicated visa requirements, and other technicalities.

"But the fact is," Fleming Deryl of the American Society of Travel Agents said recently, "we're in poor shape to handle visitors. We have to educate ourselves first."

The flow of foreign tourists so far has been just a trickle of what is hoped for. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, there are expected to be about 460,000 foreign tourists, a sharp increase over the 350,000 who came here 2 years ago.

The big influx, in the opinion of travel specialists, is still a couple of years distant, giving the United States time to eliminate existing defects and deficiencies.

U.S. agencies such as Customs and Immigration are currently reexamining procedures with a view to making the visit of the foreign tourist more pleasant.

The city's department of commerce and public affairs is actively seeking to stimulate greater interest on the part of New York businesses and public agencies in various aspects of the problem.

The New York convention and visitors bureau thus far has concentrated its efforts on stimulating the flow of foreign tourists rather than on the problems of caring for them after their arrival.

The Port of New York Authority, which administers New York International Airport at Idlewild, Queens, is expanding customs and baggage facilities there, but a spokesman said it had no plans to handle requests for information from foreign tourists.

Most of the problems appear to stem from the fact that this Nation never has had any volume of ordinary tourists. Rules, regulations, and facilities are geared either to small numbers of luxury travelers and businessmen or to the once huge volume of immigration.

"There are two countries in the world which have never had ordinary tourists in any numbers," one longtime travel man said. "They are Russia and the United States. Now the Russians are in it up to their hips and they have had plenty of headaches. The United States has some painful years ahead before it learns the know-how."

"Look," said a customs inspector with a quarter-century's experience here, "for years we have been set up to keep people out. To keep out the smugglers and the dope operators. Now, we're supposed to go into reverse. They tell us we should welcome people with a red carpet. How are we going to do it? New techniques, the young fellows in Washington say. All I know is, it won't be easy."

PROBLEMS START EARLY

The problems of the foreign tourist—particularly one who does not know English—begin before actual arrival in New York. He may be handed immigration and customs forms printed in English that he can fill in only with the not-always-efficient assistance of airline stewardesses or shipboard personnel.

However, although they are not uniformly available, immigration forms are now printed in French, German, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian. Moreover, the U.S. Immigration Service has a staff of 23 girls on duty at New York International Airport to assist passengers in clearing Immigration swiftly and smoothly.

Originally, Immigration required that its reception girls have college degrees and proficiency in a least one foreign language—in addition to a pleasant appearance and personality. More recently, the language and college requirements have been dropped.

"In case of language trouble we call on the airlines," an Immigration official said. "They always have persons around who talk the languages."

TAX CLEARANCE DROPPED

One cause of irritation has quietly been dropped. No longer does the ordinary tourist have to get a clearance from the Bureau of Internal Revenue, showing that he owes no income taxes, before leaving the country. The regulation is maintained, however, for nontourist visitors.

Customs now has baggage-declaration forms available in French, Italian, German and Spanish. At Pacific ports forms in Chinese and Japanese have been prepared. Among the 111 inspectors stationed at Idlewild, 65 to 70 have a language in addition to English. In all, 12 languages are represented.

Nevertheless, a deficit in language skills is evident throughout the tourist picture. Not that New York, for example, does not possess enormous language resources. But persons with language skills do not, as a rule, man the ticket windows, information services, hotel desks, sightseeing buses and guide services with which the foreign tourist is likely to come into contact.

Information services are keyed, in general, to the American tourist rather than the foreign guest.

TOURISTS NOT GREETED

For example, there is no general information center at Idlewild. An information desk is maintained on the second floor of the international terminal, but this is basically to provide information on plane arrivals.

Neither the department of commerce and public events nor the convention and visitors bureau provides any special greeting service for ordinary foreigners. The city department greets distinguished visitors and special groups and the convention bureau largely concentrates on attracting conventions and meetings to the city.

The foreign tourist is largely left to his own devices, sometimes with untoward re-

sults. A travel representative by chance stumbled on a group of three Russians at Idlewild the other day. They had been waiting there for more than 4 hours, knowing no English and having no idea of what to do to get to Manhattan.

A party of Australian and New Zealand students spent almost the whole of 1 day wandering aimlessly in the Times Square area recently, not knowing where to go or what to see in New York and finding no one to give them advice.

The Port of New York Authority apparently has no current plans for assuming any responsibility for greeting foreign tourists at Idlewild or helping them with information.

In New York City, only two information centers are maintained—the city's own booth in Times Square and one operated by the convention bureau in a half-hidden site under the Park Avenue overpass across 42d Street from Grand Central Terminal.

There are no general information booths at such much-frequented tourist spots as Rockefeller Center, the Battery, or Central Park.

LANGUAGE SKILLS LACKING

Language skills are not a requisite at either information center. If a visitor shows up who speaks no English, a telephone call is made to a foreign language newspaper. The visitor puts his question to a newspaperman. The newspaperman repeats it to the information clerk in English. The clerk gives the answer in English, and the newspaperman then translates by telephone to the visitor.

The procedure works without much trouble at present. Of the 340,000 visitors to the Times Square booth last year, only a handful did not know English. But the system obviously would break down under any volume of inquiries from non-English-speaking tourists.

One proposed remedy is to set up a center here, and in other large cities, with a multilingual staff. Foreigners would be able to telephone the center for answers to their inquiries.

LITERATURE IS NEEDED

Only a handful of literature is now available to inform visitors in their native tongues about the sights of New York City and the United States.

The National Association of Travel Organizations publishes a simplified guide to the United States with a minimum of information about such things as tourist attractions and regulations. Two and a half million copies of this guide have been distributed in eight languages, including Russian, Japanese, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, and English.

The department of commerce and public events issues a visitor's guide to New York in German, French, Spanish, Italian and English. It also puts out an excellent quarterly calendar of New York City events. This, however, is available only in English.

In addition, several American airlines have published leaflets for distribution to potential European tourists.

The Hotel Association of New York is planning to issue a special booklet on the city's hotels, explaining their services and how they differ from European hotels. It is proposed to issue this booklet in six languages.

The booklet will aid in a major problem. Luxury New York hotels such as the Waldorf-Astoria, the Plaza, the Carlyle and the Sheraton East have handled foreign tourists for years. They have the needed language skills and they know how to cater to the foreign guest.

This is not true, however, of smaller, less luxurious New York hotels.

Desk clerks in medium and lower-priced hotels usually know only English. They are not familiar with the foreign tourist and his needs. They have never heard of the hall porter or concierge—the jack-of-all-trades around whom the life of the European hotel rotates.

American hotels have no counterpart for this functionary who without notice at any hour of day or night is prepared to change dollars for pounds or francs, provide theater tickets, hire a car, take a watch to be repaired or purchase a suitable souvenir.

If the European in an American hotel leaves his shoes outside his room to be shined overnight, he will be lucky to find them still there in the morning. And certainly they will be as unpolished as when they were put out.

The European custom of adding 15 percent to the bill to cover tips is unknown here. The foreigner, ignorant of this fact, is bewildered at the indignation of bellhops and waiters whom he fails to tip in the belief that the gratuity is included in his bill.

One New Yorker with great experience in handling foreign visitors considers tipping a prime source of friction. "Europeans, generally, do not tip as much as Americans," she said. "Unfamiliar with American money they often hand a cab driver a nickel or a dime tip. The result is explosive."

GUIDE TO IDOSYNCRACIES

Almost everyone connected with foreign tourists hopes that the proposed new Government program will include ample literature detailing in the language of the prospective tourist not only the attractions of the United States but also the idiosyncracies of its hotel, transportation and travel facilities.

They favor special warnings on such matters as tipping, the characteristics of New York taxi drivers, the nature of the American drugstore and other specialized sectors of the Nation's culture.

On the other hand, the American Hotel Association is distributing a pamphlet to member hotels, telling them the problems of handling the foreign guest.

However, this will not answer what one Government official calls the single most persistent complaint made by foreign guests in New York—"lack of politeness."

Foreigners report a lack of courtesy at every level in New York life—from high officials down to ordinary passers-by on the street.

Royal W. Ryan, of the convention bureau believes that the city police department must be made more aware of the problem of the foreign tourist. He proposes that some effort might be made to station officers with language facility in midtown and other Manhattan areas where foreign visitors are most likely to be found.

J. Stanton Robbins, a veteran travel specialist, wants to enlist the city's cab drivers. "They are the first ambassadors most foreigners meet," he says. "Sure, some of them are tough cookies. But if we could enlist their cooperation, it would make an enormous impression on the foreign visitor."

Another problem mentioned by Mr. Robbins is the European's lack of concept of American distances. "He wants to see New York, Niagara Falls, San Francisco, Hollywood, and New Orleans in a week," Mr. Robbins said.

"All Europeans have heard of the attractions of our country. What they don't understand is how big the country is."

The answer to many of these problems, in the opinion of Jerry Ryan, foreign travel specialist of the American Automobile Association, is the package tour, which can bring costs down sharply. It enables a travel organization to put a trained guide with the group. Hotel and transportation arrangements are made and language problems are simplified.

Mr. Ryan is already handling a considerable volume of such tourism, including many auto groups from Europe.

Mr. Ryan believes Europeans would find it pleasant and economical to tour the United States by car. Driver licenses from the 52 countries that have signed an international convention on such licenses are good in the United States.

VARIED STATE SYSTEMS

But there is a potential hazard here, too. European countries have an international system of highway signs and symbols. It utilizes simple pictographs, for the most part, and is equally intelligible in Kiev or Copenhagen.

In the United States, the international symbols are virtually unknown. While the Federal highway system has a unified and simple scheme of indicators, there is no uniformity in State systems. Each city has its own traffic rules. The unwary foreigner might quickly become confused. Worse, he could fall prey to accidents caused by hesitations or wrong turns.

John Hauser, a vice president of American Express, has probably had more experience than any other single individual in handling foreign tourists in the United States. He is convinced that the escorted group tour is the only effective immediate solution.

He believes there must be much more emphasis on languages in the Government staffs that handle incoming tourists and that forms must be simplified and put in the tourist's own language.

Mr. Hauser also believes that bus tours of America provide an excellent way of showing Europeans what they want to see. "The railroads don't seem to want the business," he commented.

BUS AND AIRLINES EAGER

Efforts to set up a 2- or 3-week pass on American railroads for a fixed fee—similar to those that Americans can purchase for interchangeable use on European railroads—have come to naught.

It is a different story with bus and airplane lines. They are eager to handled European tourists. Greyhound has been in the international business since 1935, James F. Cunningham, international sales director, reported. It provides package tours, meets the foreigners at the boat, escorts them by cab to the bus terminals and provides hotel accommodations and guides.

Trans World Airlines and Pan American World Airways have been pioneers in bringing European tourists to the United States. They are now busy passing tips on how to handle this traffic on to the domestic carriers.

How well are New York stores and restaurants prepared to cope with foreign tourists?

There is not much problem with the bigger department stores and many Fifth Avenue shops, which have multilingual sales personnel. As the volume of foreign shopping grows, these staffs can easily be expanded.

The problem of restaurants is different. In nationality restaurants—French, German, Spanish or Italian—language is no barrier. But the bilingual, trilingual or quadrilingual menu common in Europe is unknown in this country.

The foreigner who knows no English and drops into a typical American restaurant may encounter infinite difficulty in ordering even ham and eggs, unless he can point to the dish being served to his neighbor.

Price is another hazard.

"It is very easy for a foreigner to wander into an extremely high-priced restaurant without realizing it from the outside," notes Grace Belt, a State Department travel aid. "The place may not look like much. But

when the check comes, the visitor is stunned—and often angry."

Restaurant guides, specifying prices and languages, should be prepared for the foreign visitors, Miss Belt believes.

Eric Friedheim, editor of The Travel Agent, feels it is important to get the kinks out of the American facilities for handling foreign tourists before—rather than after—the influx begins.

Otherwise, dissatisfaction and complaints might undo any possible benefit from the drive to attract tourists.

However, a foreign airlines representative said:

"Europeans don't expect perfection here. They are so interested in seeing the United States that they will go a long way in compromising on comfort in order to see the country. When they do get a chance to see the real America—their opinion about Americans will change. Suddenly, they will find there are nice, quiet, pleasant, hospitable Americans instead of those loud-talking Americans in loud sports shirts who come as tourists to Europe."

MEETING OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY CONGRESSES IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, during the week of April 23 to 29, 1961, the executive committee of the Pan American Highway Congresses met in the city of Washington.

While they were here, I as chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate, called a meeting of the committee on April 25, 1961, which was addressed by the Honorable Romulo O'Farrill, Sr., president of the permanent executive committee. There were also present and introduced to the members of the Public Works Committee the following persons:

Hon. Misael Pastrana Borrero, Minister of Public Works of Colombia.

Hon. Pablo Bares, Minister of Public Works of Panama.

Hon. Juan Milla Bermudez, Minister of Public Works of Honduras.

Eduardo Dibos, former Minister of Public Works of Peru and founding president, Peruvian Highway Association.

Mr. Raul Paraud, highway director of Peru.

Mr. Alfredo Bateman, highway director of Colombia.

Mr. Ramiro Ramirez, engineer, Highway Department of Panama.

The engineers from the Highway Department of Brazil and the Highway Department of Honduras.

Mr. Aldo Fraticelli, representative of the Embassy of Argentina.

Mr. Jaime Holger, representative of the Embassy of Chile.

Mr. Jose J. March, director general, Mexican Highway Association.

Mr. Jorge O'Grande Fillos, director general of roads, Republic of Honduras.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. O'Farrill's address to the U.S. Senate Public Works Committee and the address which he delivered to the permanent executive committee of the Pan American Highway Congresses at the opening session be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS ADDRESSED TO THE U.S. SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE BY ROMULO O'FARRILL, PRESIDENT OF THE PERMANENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY CONGRESSES AND PRESIDENT OF THE MEXICAN HIGHWAY ASSOCIATION, APRIL 25, 1961

Honorable members and friends of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, it is an honor for the permanent executive committee of the Pan American Highway Congresses on this occasion of its fifth annual meeting to call upon this distinguished committee which has played such a large part in the development of the Pan American highway system from theory into reality.

All of us here today have spent many active years in support of this vital hemispheric link. No effort has been too great since road transport is an integral part of the complex pattern of economic and social life. Through it the problems of supply and demand can be met, through it the most effective allocation of resources of the manufacturer, the farmer, the merchant, and the craftsman are resolved. These basic economic premises transcend political frontiers. The greater the exchange the greater the benefit for all.

One thousand five hundred and seventy-three miles of road total the Inter-American Highway in the five Central American Republics and Panama. Almost 11 million people are in its area which covers over 200,000 square miles. All of these peoples are or will be served by this system, whose utility depends not only on its prompt completion but as well on the maintenance of its individual parts.

The committee which I represent is deeply appreciative of the important contribution of the United States in the building of the Inter-American Highway. The U.S. contribution covering two-thirds of the cost of the Inter-American Highway construction in Central America and Panama to the Canal Zone has been more than a giant step to insure realization of the highway. This action has provided a strategic defense for those zones of the continent and has also helped to increase and facilitate the movement of ideas, produce, and travelers. The far-reaching effects of increased travel over the Inter-American Highway are known to all of us.

But there are still many steps ahead to complete this giant task and we ask your earnest consideration of the fact that continued U.S. support be given to an extent which will help insure that the highway is completed in its entirety in accordance with accepted standards and that its post-construction care is assured.

In its recent study of the Pan American Highway in Central America and Panama, the International Road Federation reports on the amounts needed to improve specifications, widen certain sections, and complete stretches that still lack black top surface. U.S. participation on two-thirds and one-third basis is urged to insure completion of the project. I believe that remarks in support of the International Road Federation's findings have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in comments of your distinguished chairman, our good friend Senator CHAVEZ.

Once completed, it is imperative that the highway be uniformly maintained in a passable condition on a year-round basis. It is believed that the total cost of this post-construction care is outside of the economic capacities of certain of the republics through which the highway passes. We ask, then, that the committee seriously consider the feasibility of establishment of an Inter-American Highway Authority, in which U.S. Government would participate and which would be a multilateral cooperative effort by all countries through which the highway passes and the United States to insure appropriate maintenance over this great route. Such a highway authority has been recommended by the IRF.

Finally, it is equally important that we complete plans to bridge the gap of approximately 435 miles in the section of the Darien of Panama and the adjacent areas in Colombia. By developing a land route through this area we will in fact link up the segments of our hemisphere in a continuous surface route which will be unparalleled anywhere else in the world. The members of the Organization of American States have recognized the problem of this route through the Darien as one of an inter-American interest and one which requires inter-American action for its solution. Needed first is an engineering survey and preparation of construction plans. Contributions to defray the cost of this work have already been received from many Republics of Central and South America. We hope that this committee will give earnest consideration to U.S. participation in this project, in accordance with Resolution IV of the Eighth Pan American Highway Congress.

We in Latin America are proud to know the members of this committee and its staff as our personal friends. Your deep and abiding interest in the problems of your neighbors to the south has gone far to give new meaning to the phrase "inter-American friendship" and for all of this we are fully appreciative.

STATEMENT BY MR. ROMULO O'FARRILL, CHAIRMAN OF THE PERMANENT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY CONGRESSES, AT THE OPENING SESSION OF THE MEETING

Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, Hon. Secretaries and Under Secretaries of State, Hon. Ambassadors and Representatives, ladies and gentlemen, we have gathered together once more under the auspices of the Organization of American States with a threefold purpose in mind: to study the action of the permanent executive committee of the Pan American Highway Congresses; to evaluate the results of the work that has been accomplished and to sharpen the sights and lines by means of which we shall have to face the problems before us.

The Pan American Highway Congresses with the technical and specialized representatives of the 21-member states of the inter-American system, comprise a small OAS within the OAS itself. As Americans and as roadsmen, we cannot turn aside, in the pursuance of our interest in roads from giving consideration to the overwhelming problems facing the continent in this crucial moment in our history.

The problems of land communication are very closely linked with the general problems related to economic underdevelopment in Latin America. The most graphic examples of this underdevelopment, as attested to repeatedly by our statesmen, are illiteracy and ignorance; malnutrition, sickness, lack of adequate housing, and low industrial development. These conditions have been responsible for one of the lowest standards of living in the world today.

Our people and our governments are striving to resolve these problems or at least to lessen their depressive effects through various remedial measures, among which may be mentioned: A drive for public education, agrarian reform, better health, improvement in housing, the application of technical knowledge to agriculture, and encouragement

for investments and industrial productivity. In the realm of international exchange, it is necessary that we obtain adequate prices for our exportable products.

It is an unchallengeable truth that the solution of the problem of economic underdevelopment with its dire consequences—the subhuman conditions of life which are characteristic of the great masses of people of Spanish America—cannot be left to the desultory economic evolution to which our chronic poverty seems to doom us despite the vast natural and human resources with which nature has fortunately blessed us.

It has been repeatedly said that only through the acceleration of development programs and the obtaining of adequate prices for our products in the world market can the great social restlessness be quelled that pervades the countries of Latin America. This social unrest, heightened by poverty, becomes fertile ground for the rise of dictatorships. The growth of any kind of dictatorship implies not only the loss of freedom but also of the hope of mankind for increasingly friendly existence in peace.

The industrial countries, particularly the United States, happily adhere to the premise that this acceleration of economic development in America can no longer be delayed, not only in order that man may live as such but also to preserve the principles of human dignity, independence, sovereignty, and liberty, which are the very pillars upon which rest the action of the Organization of American States.

Furthermore, His Excellency Mr. John F. Kennedy, as Chief Executive of this great Nation, in his inaugural address and later in his state of the Union address, made special mention of Latin America in discussing the policy of his government during a lengthy analysis of the problems latent in the world. He assured that "To our sister Republics south of our border we make a special promise: To convert our good intentions into definite action in a new alliance for progress, dedicated to the purpose of helping freemen and free governments sever the bonds of poverty."

What role do roads play in the progress of our times? One so fundamental that the following statement is obvious: There is no progress, no progress of any kind, without roads.

As all of us know, roads open new areas for agriculture and create new markets for industry, commerce, and banking; in promoting the interchange of men and products, the road becomes the principal medium for disseminating material and spiritual benefits. Easy and efficient transportation results in lowering the expense of consumer goods and thus raising the standard of living. By overcoming isolation, the road facilitates the eradication of political bossism and police tactics. Lastly, the expansion and operation of highway networks directly or indirectly develop human activity in such industries as those of construction, automobile and tire manufacturing, petroleum and combustibles, transportation, tourist travel, and allied businesses.

The governments of Latin America are granting increasing importance to highway construction. According to the latest figures I have, which are for 1959, the governments of the 20 Latin American countries allotted the equivalent of $921.5 million out of their total national budgets of $8,549 million to the construction and maintenance of highways. This represents an average of 11 percent of the total funds available.

The percentage of the national budgets used for highways varies from 2.57 to 22.9 percent. Curiously enough, in my country, the increase in the total national product coincides with the increase in highway construction mileage—that is, approximately 8 percent a year. In Mexico, it has also been demonstrated that the modest country road increases the national product by more than 2 million pesos a year for each added kilometer. The amount of money invested in roads by the Latin American countries is not in itself indicative of the magnitude of the highway program, since some countries have to import everything or almost everything, for highway construction and maintenance, whereas others achieve the same results at lower cost, using local technicians and nationally produced cement, iron, asphalt, and other materials. To conclude this example, which, for obvious reasons, I am illustrating with Mexican figures, you may be interested to know that in my country, which has a network of roads passable the year round and totaling about 45,000 kilometers; construction of speedways, federal asphalt highways, and country roads is going on at a rate of approximately 5 kilometers a day.

As the implementing arm of the Pan American Highway Congresses, it is the duty of our committee to promote the full execution of the measures recommended by the congresses in their resolutions. With the help of our permanent technical committees, the one on planning, in Rio de Janeiro; on financing, in Caracas; on development of governmental highway agencies, in Lima; on terminology, in Buenos Aires; and the Darien subcommittee, in Panama, our permanent executive committee has accomplished a difficult task in the cause of highway construction, whose success I cannot elaborate upon in this message.

I feel, however, that I should point out two particularly encouraging efforts made in our behalf, without which our work would have been impossible. One of these is the unqualified support that our Pan American Highway Congresses have received for the past 8 years from the 21 American Governments, and the other is the almost unanimous observance of the recommendations made by the Congresses. These recommendations have been formulated within an essentially technical framework, and they have had the virtue of being completely possible of execution within the laws and economic status of the different governments. As a last point on this matter, I should like to mention that another advantage of these Congresses lies in their uninterrupted activity, which is carried on between one Congress and another by executive and technical bodies whose sole purpose is to implement plans and recommendations.

Without ignoring the execution of the many resolutions adopted by the Congresses, the integration of the pan-American highway system and particularly of the Pan American Highway, is what most preoccupies and interests us. In my address of May 18, 1959, as well as in this one, I stated that of the total 30,206 kilometers of the highway, 12,393 are paved with asphalt or concrete; 13,746 are in good passable condition the year round; 2,721 require improvement to be passable during the rainy seasons; and only 1,346 remain to be constructed; 218 in Costa Rica, 241 in Bolivia (where there is, however, a temporary alternate route, passable the year round), and 200 in Paraguay. The remaining 582 kilometers still to be built are to go through the jungles of the Darien region in Panama and adjacent areas in Colombia, with approximately half of this portion of the highway to be located in each of the two countries concerned. To sum up my report indicates that 97.74 percent of the highway is passable or in various stages of construction, whose financing is assured, and that only 2.26 percent of the total, that section in the Darien "bottleneck," remains to be completed.

During the period between that report and the present one, the pan-American highway system has been enriched by the addition of the Pacific Highway in Guatemala, an alternate route of the Inter-American Highway; the Central Highway in El Salvador, which is making significant changes in the economic picture of this small and progressive country; the completion of the movement of earth in the southern stretch of the Inter-American Highway in Costa Rica; the opening up of the route between Loja and Macará in Ecuador, and the impressive paved-highway explosions that have taken place all over South America, particularly in Brazil, Colombia, and Venezuela. Meanwhile, Mexico completed the asphalt paving of its southeast highway from Mexico City to Puerto Juarez, which is, 1,884 kilometers long and the important Durango-Mazatlan highway, and speeded up the completion of the Arriaga-Tapachula route, 250 kilometers, which will provide an alternate route to our Pan-American Highway and enable us to avoid the dangerous Selegua pass whenever conditions make it necessary. The year 1960, then, has been an unexcelled highway year for Latin America, and promises real achievements in this field for the future.

The Inter-American Highway extends 2,488 kilometers, of which 1,098 are paved; 120 need to have their paving repaired; 508 are in the process of asphalt paving; 505 are gravel and can be traveled at all times; and 245 remain to be built, of which 213 are already usable.

In accordance with an excellent study prepared by the International Road Federation at the request of the Central American Governments, $29.9 million will be required to complete the sections of the highway that are at present subject to cooperative agreements with the United States. An additional $22.7 million will be required to repair the existing stretches of highway that are not at present included in cooperative agreements with the United States, comprising the San Ramon-Cartago stretch in Costa Rica; 250 kilometers of highway in El Salvador that were built before the entering into force of the bilateral financing agreements and which are under substandard specifications; and the Arrijan-La Chorrera sector in Panama. The Sabanetas-Tegucigalpa-Las Manos highway, which Honduras requests with the support of the Pan American Highway Congresses, in order to include its capital city in the Pan American Highway, will require an additional $21 million.

The federation is in favor of the creation of an Inter-American Highway Authority in Central America, which will be in charge mainly of highway maintenance by means of another cooperative system, whereby expenses will be covered in the amount of 50 percent by the Government of the United States and the beneficiary countries.

We earnestly advocate these recommendations. And we do so in the conviction that the completion of the asphalt-coating stage of the Inter-American Highway, will benefit the economic development of this part of America even more impressively.

My good friend, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, chairman of the Public Works Committee of the U.S. Senate, who is a firm supporter of these causes, used the following significant words in an interesting and enthusiastic study which he submitted to the 1st session of the 87th Congress of the United States:

"One cannot travel on the highway at any point, without noticing the enormous economic, social, and cultural benefits that have been achieved through the completion of several stretches of the highway. The interest that has been awakened in the final completion, is very noticeable, and is evidenced in the frequent questions that were put to us in each city regarding the date

of completion of the continuous asphalt-paved highway from Panama to the other Republics and to the United States."

In the six small Republics of Central America, the economies are closely linked and the connecting point is the Inter-American Highway, along which over 70 percent of their production is transported. From 1949 to 1952 the number of automotive vehicles using this highway system doubled and in 1960 it was quadrupled. In no part of the world is there a more impressive proof of the economic and social evolution brought about by a highway than in Central America. Through official and private initiative and investments, large hydroelectric plants have been established; more cement factories; soft drink bottling plants; sawmills; textile factories, edible oil plants; and the manufacture of tires and other products. The highway has been an important factor in the diversification of production, in an area that was traditionally devoted to monoculture. Finally, in no other part of the world, have the benefits of the cooperative efforts of the United States in concurrence with national efforts, been felt as in this region. Interregional and foreign-tourist travel has increased noticeably in the last few years, and the currents of economic solidarity, and even political solidarity, between the nations of the isthmus have shown tangible and highly beneficial results.

As a result of another effort to achieve international cooperation, undertaken this time by nearly all the American nations, our technicians proved that the Pan American Highway was feasible in the Darien region, thereby denying the tales about the nature of this mythical region and the men who inhabited it. Meanwhile, the Governments of Panama and Colombia, in cooperation with the committee, finished the exhaustive studies that finally made it possible to adopt the layout of the route in both countries.

Last May in Bogotá our Eighth Congress unanimously adopted Resolution IV, which provides a cooperative financing formula for accumulating the special fund of $3 million necessary to complete the definitive study of the Darien, as far as construction plans. For this great highway endeavor, Dr. José A. Mora, secretary general of the organization, will receive from several of our countries the first payments of the Governments, to make up the Darien Cooperative Fund.

This fact alone would be enough to make this fifth meeting of the permanent executive committee of the Pan American Highway Congresses a memorable one. This is and will be an historic date in the annals of American highway endeavor.

Gentlemen, on the eve of my departure for this beautiful capital, the President of my country, Dr. Adolfo López Mateos, requested me to convey his cordial greetings and his best wishes for the success of the discussions we begin today and that, owing to their true professional approach, well deserve the great interest shown in national and inter-American spheres. It is my great pleasure to fulfill this request. I also bring the good wishes of the Minister of Public Works, Dr. Javier Barros Sierra, who wished to be here, but was prevented from attending by the pressure of business.

On behalf of the visiting delegations and on my own behalf, it is my pleasant duty to extend to the authorities of Washington and to our old friends who live here, our warmest thanks for the courtesies that have been shown us and for their traditional hospitality.

I will take advantage of your patience a little longer only to bring you this message, with one more remark, which might be summarized as follows:

The evolution of roads is undeniably favorable to the achievement of social justice, for which the peoples of the entire world are clamoring.

To bring Operation Pan America, which was conceived by the Brazilian statesman Juscelino Kubitschek, to fruition we must bring Operation Pan American Highway to fruition.

The cooperative plan between the United States, Central America, and Panama for the construction of the Inter-American Highway, and with other countries for attacking the Darien problem, is in itself a positive demonstration of what can be called "alliance for progress," as conceived by President Kennedy.

The Pan American Highway and highway system are simply necessary to the establishment and, above all, the operation of the Latin American Common Market, in its various stages of development.

Finally, the governments and the peoples of the Western Hemisphere should support by the power of their spirit, their imaginative spark, and the force of their will, the forging of the unifying link that is offered us by the Pan American Highway—this new frontier, this new horizon—in the dawning of the America of which we dream.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the following members of the Committee on Public Works attended the session and received the Latin American Delegates:

DENNIS CHAVEZ, ROBERT S. KERR, PAT MCNAMARA, STEPHEN YOUNG, ERNEST GRUENING, FRANK E. MOSS, OREN E. LONG, BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, LEE METCALF, FRANCES CASE, HIRAM L. FONG, and J. CALEB BOGGS.

Mr. President, irrespective of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and the Department of State, the cooperation which the United States is receiving from Latin America in the construction of highways and the contribution which we are making in that field will do more for the welfare of the United States than the efforts of the other two organizations combined.

DELINQUENT FEDERAL TAXES AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, upon my request, the Treasury Department in 1954 inaugurated a program of rendering an annual report showing the total amount of all delinquent Federal taxes as of December 31 of each year.

Today I shall incorporate in the RECORD the seventh annual report. This report is broken down by districts and types of taxes. It shows the dollar volume and the number of delinquent taxpayers in each category.

In addition, I have compiled a separate report showing the progress, or in some instances the lack of progress, toward reducing those accounts in the different districts over the past 7 years.

This supplementary report shows the total amount of all delinquent Federal taxes in each district along with the amount of such delinquencies as represented by withheld employment taxes.

The employment tax column represents withheld income taxes, social security taxes, unemployment taxes, and so forth, most of which are withheld from the employees and should be treated by the employers as trust funds. This money which is withheld from the pay envelopes of the employees should under no circumstances be considered by the employer as his own funds, nor should it be diverted to his own personal use.

Under the column representing total tax delinquencies are included all types of Federal taxes—individual income, excise, corporate, inheritance, employment, and so forth.

The seventh annual report is about the same as it was last year. It shows only a slight rise in the overall delinquencies—from $1,071,016,000 to $1,072,440,000. It is still a good report when compared with the fact that in 1954, when we first began to assemble these statistics, there were 1,754,474 delinquent taxpayers owing a total of $1,614,494,000.

Over the 7-year period the number of delinquent taxpayers has been reduced by nearly 700,000, and there has been approximately a $540 million reduction in the overall delinquent taxes. This is a 33-percent reduction in the 7 years, and I compliment the Treasury Department upon this progress.

However, similar progress has not been made toward reducing the delinquencies in the employment tax account.

I regret to report that the delinquencies in this category rose last year to $236,843,000, or an increase of 9.4 percent. While this is $17 million lower than it was 7 years ago, it is still too high.

These employment tax delinquencies represent the failure of an employer to turn over to the Federal Government taxes that have been withheld from the employees, such as income taxes, social security taxes, as well as unemployment taxes, and there can be no excuse for the diversion of these funds to the employer's personal use. Failure to turn these accounts over to the Federal Government not only represents a loss in revenue to the Treasury Department but also means that employees are not getting the proper credit for the payment of their income and social security taxes.

It should be emphasized that when we speak of delinquent employment accounts we are not referring to those situations wherein an employer unintentionally neglects to send in the withheld taxes on the specified date. Those situations can and do happen accidentally, but under those situations they would be promptly corrected when called to their attention by the Treasury Department.

No accounts are classified as delinquent until first the employer has been notified in writing and given a chance to mail in his check for the overdue account. Even then, before classifying the account as a bona fide delinquency, the employer is given a second notice in writing. This is to make sure that there has been no error. Then, if not taken care of, his account is classified as delinquent, and firmer steps are taken to obtain collection.

I emphasize this to show that in administering this program the Treasury

Department does exercise a degree of reasonableness, recognizing that employers acting in good faith can overlook sending in these accounts and should be entitled to an opportunity to make the payments without being classified as delinquents.

It is only when an employer deliberately ignores these written notices of his delinquencies that he is included in the tabulation which we have before us today.

The alarming manner in which employment tax delinquencies have increased in certain districts cannot be overlooked. There are four offices which show an increase of more than 100 percent in delinquent employment taxes during the past 12 months. I regret that one of these offices is in my own State.

Wilmington, Del., last year reported a 125-percent increase in employment tax delinquencies, bringing these accounts to a 7-year high. At the same time they reported a 32-percent increase in total tax delinquencies for that office, although it should be noted that total tax delinquencies have been reduced in that office by 87 percent over the 7-year period.

Cheyenne, Wyo., reported a 108-percent increase in delinquent employment taxes, thus establishing a 7-year high for that office. At the same time the overall total of delinquent accounts in Cheyenne increased 43 percent.

Austin, Tex., reported a 116-percent increase in its delinquent employment taxes, establishing an all-time high. The total delinquencies of all types of taxes in Austin increased 26 percent.

Under the classification of "International operations" there has been a 111-percent increase in the delinquent employment taxes while the total delinquencies have been increased 42 percent, bringing both items to an all-time high. "International operations" includes Puerto Rico and those employers or individuals who are known to be abroad and out of reach.

In addition to these 4 offices which have had an increase of over 100 percent in their delinquent employment tax accounts, there are 11 other offices which show between 50- and 100-percent increase in employment tax delinquencies.

Burlington, Vt., reported a 98-percent increase in delinquent employment taxes, establishing an alltime high. Total tax delinquencies increased 21 percent for the same office.

Cincinnati, Ohio, which was merged with the Columbus office in 1960, reported a 58-percent increase in employment tax delinquencies, thereby establishing an alltime high for the combined area. At the same time their combined report shows a 21-percent increase in total delinquencies for 1960.

Louisville, Ky., reports a 57-percent increase in its employment tax delinquencies—a 7-year high. Total tax delinquencies in 1960 increased 10 percent.

Springfield, Ill., reports a 66-percent increase in its total employment delinquencies, but this still leaves its account $400,000 lower than 7 years ago. In 1960 this office reduced its total tax delinquencies by 8 percent.

Aberdeen, S. Dak., reports a 76-percent increase in delinquent employment taxes and a 48-percent increase in total tax delinquency for 1960.

Denver, Colo., reports its employment tax delinquencies at an alltime high, or an increase of 74 percent over 1959, and the total tax delinquencies for this office jumped 68 percent over 1959.

In Des Moines, Iowa, delinquent employment taxes increased 66 percent, establishing an alltime high, while at the same time the delinquencies on all types of taxes increased 6 percent.

Fargo, N. Dak., reports a 53-percent increase in employment tax delinquencies, another alltime high, along with a 7-percent increase in total tax delinquencies.

Helena, Mont., reports an 86-percent increase in employment tax delinquencies and a 38-percent increase in total tax delinquencies.

Reno, Nev., reports a 72-percent increase in employment tax delinquencies and a 20-percent increase in total tax delinquencies for 1960.

In Puerto Rico delinquent employment taxes increased 64 percent to establish an alltime high, and total tax delinquencies increased 74 percent.

In addition to these offices singled out for special mention, there are 12 other offices showing an increase in employment tax delinquencies for the calendar year 1960 of between 25 and 50 percent. They are as follows:

Hartford, Conn., 45 percent; Portsmouth, N.H., 34 percent; Camden, N.J., 43 percent; Indianapolis, Ind., 29 percent; Jackson, Miss., 29 percent; Nashville, Tenn., 31 percent; Milwaukee, Wis., 45 percent; Omaha, Nebr., 37 percent; Boise, Idaho, 28 percent; Los Angeles, Calif., 26 percent; Phoenix, Ariz., 29 percent; and Salt Lake City, Utah, 30 percent.

These above, all represent increases in employment tax delinquencies; and the disturbing part about the entire report is that out of the 63 offices reporting, there are only 5 which show a decline in delinquent employment tax accounts for calendar year 1960, with the highest reduction being 22.5 percent for the Brooklyn, N.Y., office. Other reductions range down to 1 percent.

On the grand total of all types of tax delinquencies—that is, employment, individual income, corporate, excise, and so forth—the picture is somewhat better; however, here again there are 19 districts which reported increases in their total tax delinquencies in excess of 25 percent. Thay are as follows:

Portsmouth, N.H., 31 percent; Baltimore, Md., 34 percent; Camden, N.J., 25 percent; Pittsburgh, Pa., 36 percent; Wilmington, Del., 32 percent; Columbia, S.C., 25 percent; Nashville, Tenn., 44 percent; Aberdeen, S. Dak., 48 percent; Cheyenne, Wyo., 43 percent; Denver, Colo., 68 percent; Kansas City, Mo., 182 percent; Albuquerque, N. Mex., 34 percent; Austin, Tex., 26 percent; Helena, Mont., 38 percent; Los Angeles, Calif., 30 percent; Phoenix, Ariz., 44 percent; Portland, Oreg., 39 percent; Puerto Rico, 74 percent; and international operations, 42 percent.

It should be noted that the 182 percent increase in the overall delinquent accounts as shown for Kansas City, Mo., represents nearly a 160-percent increase in total tax delinquencies in that office over the 7-year period, and the Kansas City office also shows employment tax delinquencies as having nearly doubled during the 7-year period. This office needs attention.

There were, however, some offices which have made good progress in reducing their delinquent accounts. Eleven offices have shown a reduction in excess of 10 percent in their overall delinquent tax accounts for 1960, and thereby established an alltime low in delinquent accounts. Those showing such reductions are as follows:

Albany, N.Y., 17 percent; Brooklyn, N.Y., 19 percent; Buffalo, N.Y., 14 percent; Manhattan, N.Y., 22 percent; Scranton, Pa., 34 percent; Birmingham, Ala., 20 percent; Chicago, Ill., 24 percent; Wichita, Kans., 16 percent; Oklahoma City, Okla., 44 percent; Boise, Idaho, 34 percent; Salt Lake City, Utah, 12 percent.

In 1960, there were 10 other offices which, while reporting smaller reductions, likewise established alltime lows in their total delinquencies; and they, too, are to be complimented.

All these offices form the 1960 banner roll as being the offices establishing all-time lows in their total delinquent accounts.

I fully recognize that in some of the offices where there have been exceptionally large percentage increases in the reported delinquent tax accounts for 1960, they could be the result of one or two large delinquent accounts developing during this particular year. By the same token, exceptionally large percentage reductions could be accounted for in a similar manner; but all these increases and reductions cannot be accounted for on that basis. The purpose of this report is to show the progress of the respective offices over a period of years.

I compliment the offices and the Treasury Department upon those areas in which substantial progress has been made. At the same time, I am pointing out the trouble spots which need greater attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation showing a breakdown for the 64 districts, together with their 7-year reports on total taxes and total tax delinquencies; and also a letter, dated February 28, 1961, signed by the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, Treasury Department, together with its 1960 annual report, as furnished in compliance with the request.

There being no objection, the tabulation and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Delinquent taxes

District	Year	Employment tax		Percent change over previous year	Total taxes		Percent change over previous year
		Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
Augusta, Maine	1954	1,145	$665		3,478	$2,582	
	1955	1,119	489	−26.4	3,018	1,915	−25.8
	1956	1,138	543	+11.0	3,582	1,489	−22.2
	1957	1,185	543		4,027	2,032	+36.4
	1958	1,176	588	+8.2	3,986	1,569	−22.7
	1959	889	815	+38.6	2,992	3,842	+144.8
	1960	1,003	851	+4.4	3,242	3,565	−7.2
Boston, Mass	1954	15,058	11,226		57,082	41,306	
	1955	11,122	10,000	−10.9	39,723	37,835	−8.4
	1956	9,477	9,632	−3.6	36,337	36,896	−2.4
	1957	8,826	8,597	−10.7	36,239	30,255	−17.9
	1958	9,372	8,456	−1.6	34,992	34,107	+12.7
	1959	8,837	8,586	+1.5	30,952	31,601	−7.3
	1960	9,595	9,531	+11.0	31,389	33,512	+6.0
Burlington, Vt	1954	619	241		1,424	644	
	1955	441	145	−39.8	1,245	409	−36.4
	1956	421	201	+38.6	1,714	685	+67.4
	1957	510	236	+17.4	1,936	604	−11.8
	1958	762	322	+36.4	2,514	1,009	+67.0
	1959	373	200	−37.8	1,601	722	−28.4
	1960	658	396	+98.0	1,807	876	+21.3
Hartford, Conn	1954	4,232	2,831		22,554	15,271	
	1955	5,079	3,298	+16.4	21,219	15,348	+.5
	1956	4,079	3,202	−2.9	21,783	11,445	−25.4
	1957	5,156	4,317	+34.8	23,188	14,572	+27.3
	1958	4,836	4,370	+1.2	22,122	14,402	−1.1
	1959	3,885	3,413	−21.8	16,149	13,077	−9.2
	1960	5,610	4,973	+45.7	18,172	13,380	+2.3
Portsmouth, N.H	1954	1,017	460		2,854	3,252	
	1955	840	310	−32.6	2,347	2,179	−32.9
	1956	829	315	+1.6	3,144	1,948	−10.6
	1957	718	347	+10.1	2,556	1,018	−47.7
	1958	779	307	−11.5	2,785	911	−10.5
	1959	511	266	−13.3	2,006	744	−18.3
	1960	538	357	+34.2	2,628	979	+31.5
Providence, R.I	1954	1,847	1,204		8,060	7,389	
	1955	1,259	894	−25.7	5,985	7,173	−2.9
	1956	1,874	1,254	+40.2	7,329	6,041	−15.7
	1957	2,447	1,358	+8.2	7,169	3,331	−44.8
	1958	2,234	1,383	+1.8	6,828	3,421	+2.7
	1959	1,960	1,243	−10.1	5,551	2,864	−16.2
	1960	1,935	1,303	+4.8	5,381	2,760	−3.6
Albany (14th, New York).	1954	4,679	3,559		13,822	15,061	
	1955	4,770	3,454	−2.9	14,246	11,274	−25.1
	1956	3,818	3,368	−2.4	14,296	11,142	−1.1
	1957	3,960	3,366		15,598	12,223	+9.7
	1958	4,177	3,200	−4.9	13,413	8,988	−26.4
	1959	3,014	2,074	−35.1	9,233	8,397	−6.5
	1960	2,608	2,044	−1.4	9,384	6,912	−17.6
Brooklyn (1st, New York).	1954	28,903	18,534		88,274	106,522	
	1955	37,482	24,523	+32.3	100,932	133,339	+25.1
	1956	33,647	23,624	−3.6	105,604	129,428	−2.9
	1957	35,112	24,882	+5.3	108,819	125,382	−3.1
	1958	28,275	21,773	−12.4	83,173	90,776	−27.6
	1959	22,196	18,637	−14.4	62,176	75,461	−16.8
	1950	13,658	14,431	−22.5	41,091	60,670	−19.6
Buffalo (28th, New York).	1954	4,664	2,351		21,869	12,368	
	1955	4,756	2,916	+24.0	18,203	12,058	−2.5
	1956	4,141	2,778	−4.7	20,172	12,309	+2.0
	1957	4,836	3,436	+23.6	19,184	12,869	+4.5
	1958	4,031	2,969	−13.5	17,021	10,174	−20.9
	1959	3,128	2,508	−15.5	10,655	7,961	−21.7
	1960	3,395	2,666	+6.2	9,089	6,786	−14.7
Lower Manhattan (2d, New York).	1954	22,636	17,622		48,155	171,309	
	1955	25,952	20,573	+16.7	53,341	169,476	−1.0
	1956	19,669	21,087	+2.4	44,725	153,997	−9.3
	1957	17,600	18,495	−12.2	36,963	124,178	−19.2
	1958	13,497	13,689	−25.9	30,560	117,290	−5.5
	1959	10,081	13,867	+1.3	20,980	73,946	−36.9
	1960[1]						
Upper Manhattan (3d, New York).	1954	24,420	26,447		67,328	158,538	
	1955	31,922	32,691	+23.6	109,567	195,098	+23.0
	1956	33,586	31,514	−3.6	124,641	202,676	+3.8
	1957	32,259	32,466	+3.0	121,388	176,094	−13.1
	1958	30,135	32,199	−.8	116,608	182,180	+3.4
	1959	19,616	21,505	−33.2	78,620	120,370	−33.9
	1960[2]						
Manhattan	1960	24,325	32,750	−7.4	81,025	149,762	−22.9
Syracuse (21st, New York).	1954	3,046	1,552		12,486	5,650	
	1955	2,565	1,664	+7.2	9,308	5,395	−4.5
	1956	3,341	2,019	+21.3	13,955	6,443	+19.4
	1957	4,393	2,411	+19.4	16,618	5,921	−8.1
	1958	2,974	2,044	−15.2	11,859	5,415	−8.5
	1959	2,185	1,841	−9.9	7,287	5,550	+2.4
	1960	2,584	1,917	+4.1	8,555	5,226	−5.8
Baltimore (Maryland and District of Columbia).	1954	12,249	6,296		120,870	68,663	
	1955	9,577	5,733	−8.9	95,861	62,497	−8.9
	1956	6,963	4,402	−23.2	60,642	42,778	−31.5
	1957	7,246	5,100	+15.8	44,982	36,069	−15.6
	1958	5,965	4,010	−21.3	32,469	25,705	−28.7
	1959	3,560	2,739	−31.6	29,066	17,133	−33.3
	1960	4,662	3,014	+10.0	32,941	23,106	+34.8
Camden (1st, New Jersey).	1954	3,526	2,090		16,986	10,638	
	1955	3,684	2,657	+27.1	16,958	16,896	+58.8
	1956	4,709	2,950	+11.0	19,659	14,015	−17.0
	1957	4,876	3,590	+21.6	19,376	14,881	+6.1
	1958	4,379	4,194	+16.8	16,187	15,040	+1.0
	1959	2,700	1,984	−52.6	10,848	8,580	−42.9
	1960	3,445	2,852	+43.7	11,952	10,745	+25.2
Newark (5th, New Jersey).	1954	37,438	$24,083		122,953	$92,962	
	1955	23,673	22,244	−7.6	84,883	79,793	−14.1
	1956	17,240	18,193	−18.2	71,578	79,913	+.1
	1957	14,575	17,170	−5.6	55,722	55,667	−30.3
	1958	10,929	13,291	−22.5	36,048	44,825	−19.4
	1959	8,169	10,160	−23.5	30,459	38,527	−14.0
	1960	9,432	11,998	+18.0	39,146	37,731	−2.0
Philadelphia (1st, Pennsylvania).	1954	18,014	15,700		95,824	63,450	
	1955	17,918	17,060	+8.6	87,594	74,744	+17.7
	1956	11,923	12,342	−27.6	55,994	66,115	−11.5
	1957	7,564	10,317	−16.4	42,254	48,455	−26.7
	1958	5,816	8,944	−13.3	29,852	42,563	−12.1
	1959	4,387	6,274	−29.8	21,134	34,203	−19.6
	1960	5,222	7,515	+19.7	26,953	36,874	+7.8
Pittsburgh (23d, Pennsylvania).	1954	4,880	3,800		40,973	28,955	
	1955	6,651	5,079	+33.6	34,891	30,144	+4.1
	1956	5,251	4,858	−4.3	28,534	23,103	−23.3
	1957	4,592	3,583	−26.2	21,759	15,683	−32.1
	1958	5,976	4,569	+27.5	27,821	17,374	+10.7
	1959	3,998	3,206	−29.8	20,494	12,386	−28.7
	1960	4,301	3,823	+19.2	19,233	16,849	+36.0
Scranton (12th, Pennsylvania).	1954	2,134	2,345		9,414	7,948	
	1955	1,743	2,324	−.8	6,659	7,233	−8.9
	1956	1,397	2,220	−4.4	4,975	6,516	−9.8
	1957	1,547	2,127	−4.1	5,096	8,075	+23.9
	1958	1,598	1,655	−22.1	5,393	6,196	−23.2
	1959	1,563	1,421	−14.1	4,897	5,931	−4.2
	1960	1,585	1,679	+18.1	4,841	3,900	−34.2
Wilmington, Del	1954	571	303		5,460	22,009	
	1955	683	327	+7.5	4,586	3,639	−83.4
	1956	621	301	−7.9	5,522	3,722	+2.2
	1957	522	272	−9.6	4,817	3,811	+2.3
	1958	331	347	+27.5	3,706	3,296	−13.5
	1959	325	184	−46.9	3,435	2,043	−38.0
	1960	695	415	+125.5	3,743	2,701	+32.2
Columbus (11th, Ohio).	1954	1,207	594		13,054	6,652	
	1955	1,290	657	+10.6	11,010	6,624	−.4
	1956	1,517	845	+28.6	12,340	9,972	+50.5
	1957	1,625	878	+3.9	13,217	9,079	−8.9
	1958	1,714	1,087	+23.8	12,916	10,244	+12.6
	1959	904	681	−37.3	6,917	6,433	−37.2
	1960[3]						
Cincinnati (1st, Ohio)	1954	3,431	1,781		26,545	15,128	
	1955	3,630	1,947	+9.0	24,423	12,685	−16.1
	1956	3,060	1,801	−7.4	22,534	11,410	−10.0
	1957	3,349	1,980	+9.9	24,995	10,228	−10.3
	1958	2,764	1,529	−22.7	16,339	9,681	−5.3
	1959	1,886	1,273	−16.7	8,652	6,916	−28.5
	1960	5,015	3,102	+58.7	23,794	16,245	+21.6
Toledo (10th, Ohio)	1954	929	392		6,072	3,317	
	1955	785	393	+.2	4,855	2,896	−12.6
	1956	1,078	617	+56.9	6,277	2,471	−14.6
	1957	980	633	+2.5	6,328	3,180	+28.6
	1958	981	500	−21.0	6,449	2,373	−25.3
	1959	1,396	772	+54.4	5,426	4,495	+89.4
	1960[4]						
Cleveland (18th, Ohio).	1954	7,958	5,272		49,841	42,963	
	1955	8,720	5,523	+4.7	46,546	35,547	−17.2
	1956	8,219	5,924	+7.2	39,521	42,590	+19.8
	1957	7,431	5,788	−2.2	37,631	36,371	−14.6
	1958	5,951	3,794	−34.4	26,206	29,076	−20.0
	1959	4,777	3,021	−20.3	16,291	21,195	−27.1
	1960	6,444	4,351	+14.7	26,993	24,311	−5.3
Indianapolis, Ind	1954	3,420	2,477		23,475	19,133	
	1955	4,767	2,953	+19.2	22,273	20,760	+8.5
	1956	3,959	3,120	+5.6	20,007	20,574	−.8
	1957	4,667	3,386	+8.5	19,952	21,993	+6.8
	1958	3,594	2,907	−14.1	15,511	16,397	−25.4
	1959	2,889	2,376	−18.2	10,164	13,072	−20.2
	1960	4,278	3,070	+29.2	14,577	13,992	+7.0
Louisville, Ky	1954	2,019	1,035		12,161	11,834	
	1955	2,934	1,228	+18.6	12,963	13,172	+11.3
	1956	2,457	1,343	+9.3	12,331	12,930	−1.8
	1957	2,468	1,380	+2.7	11,367	10,876	−15.8
	1958	1,696	1,117	−19.0	8,725	8,378	−22.9
	1959	1,981	1,034	−7.4	7,463	8,682	+3.6
	1960	2,940	1,630	+57.6	11,289	9,609	+10.6
Parkersburg, W. Va	1954	3,221	1,952		15,917	12,931	
	1955	2,257	1,376	−29.5	11,094	10,627	−17.8
	1956	1,533	1,064	−22.6	8,357	9,032	−15.0
	1957	1,574	1,117	+4.9	6,877	6,860	−24.0
	1958	1,769	1,077	−3.5	7,794	5,372	−21.6
	1959	1,518	997	−7.4	5,243	4,299	−19.9
	1960	1,807	1,055	+5.8	6,446	4,492	+4.4
Richmond, Va	1954	4,692	2,239		32,611	20,986	
	1955	5,147	2,663	+18.9	29,332	21,881	+4.2
	1956	4,118	2,420	−9.1	26,199	23,932	+9.3
	1957	3,988	2,263	−6.4	19,830	15,687	−34.4
	1958	3,502	1,929	−14.7	15,574	12,333	−21.3
	1959	3,339	2,235	+15.8	14,553	11,927	−3.2
	1960	3,920	2,471	+10.5	18,203	12,781	+7.1
Atlanta, Ga	1954	4,963	2,947		26,021	20,972	
	1955	5,889	3,572	+21.2	24,979	18,809	−10.3
	1956	5,540	3,432	−3.9	24,713	17,080	−9.1
	1957	5,864	3,829	+11.5	25,328	18,972	+11.0
	1958	5,981	3,948	+3.1	23,875	15,388	−18.9
	1959	4,506	2,101	−46.7	16,554	10,763	−30.8
	1960	5,610	2,362	+12.4	22,928	10,996	+2.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Delinquent taxes—Continued

District	Year	Employment tax		Percent change over previous year	Total taxes		Percent change over previous year
		Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
Birmingham, Ala.	1954	4,874	$2,299		19,506	$19,488	
	1955	3,655	1,965	−14.5	16,003	17,636	−9.5
	1956	3,658	1,880	−4.3	16,780	21,969	+24.5
	1957	3,826	1,772	−5.7	15,986	18,889	−14.0
	1958	3,653	1,735	−2.0	14,130	17,066	−9.6
	1959	2,489	1,461	−15.7	12,188	14,954	−12.3
	1960	2,796	1,753	+19.9	12,516	11,930	−20.2
Columbia, S.C.	1954	3,727	1,078		14,246	7,201	
	1955	3,318	822	−23.7	12,972	6,511	−9.5
	1956	3,311	850	+3.4	13,202	5,413	−16.8
	1957	2,938	948	+11.5	13,339	4,462	−17.5
	1958	2,773	1,064	+12.2	11,573	4,471	+.2
	1959	1,697	1,011	−4.9	7,141	3,082	−31.0
	1960	2,595	1,159	+14.6	10,681	3,882	+25.9
Greensboro, N.C.	1954	5,332	2,016		22,459	26,395	
	1955	4,318	1,998	−.8	15,687	21,018	−20.3
	1956	4,336	1,957	−2.0	17,696	22,222	+5.7
	1957	4,922	2,023	+3.3	17,598	14,872	−33.0
	1958	4,186	1,359	−32.8	15,706	12,716	−14.4
	1959	4,078	1,441	+6.0	15,763	10,381	−18.3
	1960	3,682	1,597	+10.8	18,321	9,917	−4.4
Jackson, Miss.	1954	1,500	636		5,563	4,717	
	1955	1,526	596	−6.2	5,231	2,957	−37.3
	1956	1,321	656	+10.0	5,371	2,744	−7.2
	1957	1,634	684	+4.2	7,229	2,975	+8.4
	1958	1,774	852	+24.5	5,999	2,411	−18.9
	1959	1,505	614	−27.9	5,165	2,903	+20.4
	1960	1,891	797	+29.8	7,190	2,674	−7.8
Jacksonville, Fla.	1954	8,451	4,686		31,020	47,883	
	1955	8,239	4,996	+6.6	30,918	49,361	+3.0
	1956	10,203	6,562	+31.3	36,962	41,546	−15.8
	1957	11,447	8,519	+29.8	36,770	39,272	−5.4
	1958	10,375	8,029	−5.7	33,938	39,915	+1.6
	1959	9,947	8,608	+7.2	27,780	34,367	−13.8
	1960	10,813	9,407	+9.2	33,299	31,131	−9.4
Nashville, Tenn.	1954	3,721	1,775		15,763	12,463	
	1955	3,181	1,601	−9.8	12,971	13,229	+6.0
	1956	3,100	1,587	−.8	13,320	11,457	−13.3
	1957	3,214	1,679	+5.7	13,248	12,115	+5.7
	1958	2,522	1,287	−23.3	10,667	9,053	−25.2
	1959	1,910	870	−32.4	8,943	7,166	−20.8
	1960	2,411	1,142	+31.2	13,616	10,353	+44.4
Chicago (1st, Illinois)	1954	21,439	12,802		136,532	81,659	
	1955	22,891	15,915	+24.3	119,822	87,843	+7.5
	1956	24,597	20,829	+30.8	143,457	120,971	+37.7
	1957	35,678	32,698	+56.9	180,706	154,085	+27.3
	1958	25,352	22,996	−29.7	122,072	120,323	−21.9
	1959	20,410	17,580	−23.5	76,597	83,625	−30.4
	1960	16,550	15,445	−12.1	59,022	63,051	−24.6
Detroit, Mich.	1954	11,891	7,782		68,809	44,787	
	1955	16,325	10,808	+38.8	81,569	68,904	+53.8
	1956	16,871	13,328	+23.3	93,782	70,964	+2.9
	1957	20,538	15,168	+13.8	95,549	68,369	−3.6
	1958	18,337	14,121	−6.9	75,443	62,288	−8.8
	1959	14,465	13,259	−6.1	45,933	46,530	−25.2
	1960	14,326	12,437	−6.1	43,908	44,154	−5.1
Milwaukee, Wis.	1954	3,759	1,704		16,962	16,592	
	1955	3,781	2,087	+22.4	14,322	16,279	−1.8
	1956	4,534	2,314	+10.8	14,936	13,455	−17.3
	1957	4,529	2,551	+10.2	18,403	14,964	+11.2
	1958	4,608	3,033	+18.9	12,065	13,418	−10.3
	1959	3,090	2,180	−28.1	9,139	10,893	−18.8
	1960	4,015	3,176	+45.6	10,827	12,047	+10.5
Springfield (8th, Illinois).	1954	4,563	1,903		19,192	9,101	
	1955	3,381	1,627	−14.5	12,886	8,723	−4.1
	1956	3,374	2,171	+33.4	16,117	8,526	−2.2
	1957	3,255	2,007	−7.5	15,829	9,442	+10.7
	1958	2,027	1,378	−31.3	8,070	7,126	−24.5
	1959	1,432	885	−35.7	5,478	5,759	−19.1
	1960	1,995	1,474	+66.5	6,338	5,289	−8.1
Aberdeen, S. Dak.	1954	734	282		3,092	1,255	
	1955	604	248	−12.0	2,488	1,613	+28.5
	1956	823	248		2,948	1,441	−10.6
	1957	788	264	+6.4	2,844	1,391	−3.4
	1958	515	209	−20.8	1,865	971	−30.1
	1959	439	137	−34.4	1,476	676	−30.3
	1960	559	242	+76.6	1,763	1,003	+48.3
Cheyenne, Wyo.	1954	688	248		2,445	1,629	
	1955	727	256	+3.2	2,215	1,344	−17.4
	1956	639	264	+3.1	2,126	1,077	−19.8
	1957	490	205	−22.3	2,013	1,266	+17.5
	1958	616	264	+28.7	2,305	1,326	+4.7
	1959	354	182	−31.0	1,480	1,053	−20.5
	1960	667	380	+108.7	2,405	1,513	+43.6
Denver, Colo.	1954	2,754	1,319		9,888	7,552	
	1955	3,056	1,642	+24.4	9,748	7,960	+5.4
	1956	2,483	1,402	−14.6	10,236	8,142	+2.2
	1957	2,346	1,475	+5.2	10,336	7,163	−12.0
	1958	2,917	1,586	+7.5	10,946	7,938	+10.8
	1959	1,896	1,042	−34.3	7,339	4,795	−39.5
	1960	2,674	1,818	+74.4	10,078	8,056	+68.0
Des Moines, Iowa.	1954	1,781	770		8,810	9,737	
	1955	1,596	749	−2.7	8,207	8,200	−15.7
	1956	1,989	989	+32.0	6,729	9,118	+11.1
	1957	2,069	947	−4.2	6,351	7,480	−17.9
	1958	1,730	850	−10.2	5,101	4,564	−38.9
	1959	1,217	683	−19.6	3,995	4,965	+8.7
	1960	1,957	1,138	+66.6	6,236	5,289	+6.5
Fargo, N. Dak.	1954	843	$310		2,352	$1,353	
	1955	578	217	−30.0	1,607	1,011	−25.2
	1956	563	228	+5.0	2,199	1,336	+32.1
	1957	628	236	+3.5	2,135	1,414	+5.8
	1958	729	307	+30.0	2,320	1,342	−5.0
	1959	397	255	−16.9	1,430	1,001	−25.4
	1960	682	391	+53.3	2,038	1,073	+7.1
Kansas City (6th, Missouri).	1954	1,783	884		8,155	9,021	
	1955	2,030	1,146	+29.6	7,615	9,433	+4.5
	1956	2,522	1,466	+27.9	8,650	8,673	−8.0
	1957	2,591	1,497	+2.1	10,168	7,887	−9.0
	1958	2,882	1,454	−2.8	9,889	8,820	+11.8
	1959	1,754	1,414	−2.7	5,902	8,298	−5.9
	1960	2,324	1,539	+8.8	8,005	23,454	+182.6
Omaha, Nebr.	1954	810	548		3,932	4,180	
	1955	638	480	−12.4	2,697	3,364	−19.5
	1956	770	528	+10.0	3,441	3,544	+5.3
	1957	834	585	+10.7	2,884	2,729	−22.9
	1958	601	267	−54.3	2,234	2,770	+1.5
	1959	512	267		1,764	1,684	−39.2
	1960	585	366	+37.0	2,456	2,052	+21.8
St. Louis (1st, Missouri).	1954	1,958	974		11,539	12,267	
	1955	2,686	1,323	+35.8	9,999	10,085	−17.7
	1956	2,001	1,119	−15.4	8,997	9,606	−4.7
	1957	2,202	1,308	+16.8	10,578	10,031	+4.4
	1958	2,665	1,302	−.4	12,875	9,447	−5.8
	1959	1,824	846	−35.0	7,876	6,167	−34.7
	1960	1,699	956	+13.0	8,147	6,138	−.4
St. Paul, Minn.	1954	3,096	1,929		10,916	9,725	
	1955	3,110	2,093	+8.5	9,616	9,270	−4.6
	1956	3,590	2,546	+21.1	12,035	11,203	+20.8
	1957	3,830	2,711	+6.4	12,512	13,600	+21.3
	1958	3,969	2,494	−8.0	11,474	12,139	−10.7
	1959	2,376	1,951	−21.7	7,481	10,644	−12.3
	1960	2,735	2,176	+11.5	9,271	11,012	+3.4
Wichita, Kans.	1954	2,405	939		10,542	7,316	
	1955	2,912	1,018	+8.4	10,279	6,757	−7.6
	1956	2,300	1,269	+24.6	9,038	8,047	+19.0
	1957	2,294	1,299	+2.3	7,703	7,064	−11.9
	1958	2,298	1,104	−15.0	7,044	6,621	−6.5
	1959	1,815	1,094	−.9	5,612	6,232	−5.8
	1960	2,138	1,224	+11.8	7,121	5,203	−16.5
Albuquerque, N. Mex.	1954	1,911	741		5,491	2,824	
	1955	1,994	853	+15.1	5,078	2,960	+4.8
	1956	1,957	1,062	+24.3	5,888	3,926	+32.6
	1957	2,378	1,192	+12.2	6,777	3,935	+.2
	1958	2,077	1,075	−9.8	6,085	3,233	−17.8
	1959	1,717	1,095	+1.8	4,576	2,915	−9.7
	1960	1,947	1,345	+22.8	5,391	3,930	+34.8
Austin (1st, Texas)	1954	5,609	3,021		22,355	20,202	
	1955	6,580	2,702	−10.5	18,391	12,754	−36.8
	1956	5,283	3,080	+13.9	19,534	15,230	+19.4
	1957	5,664	3,336	+8.3	23,351	14,386	−5.5
	1958	4,445	2,797	−16.1	19,437	12,246	−14.8
	1959	3,700	2,439	−12.7	18,126	14,070	+14.8
	1960	3,306	5,271	+116.1	24,407	17,744	+26.1
Dallas (2d, Texas)	1954	9,311	5,077		31,244	23,748	
	1955	6,816	3,608	−28.9	22,420	16,337	−31.2
	1956	6,158	3,642	+.9	25,793	20,822	+27.4
	1957	8,225	4,750	+30.4	30,526	22,022	+5.7
	1958	5,530	3,225	−32.1	23,620	18,221	−17.2
	1959	5,515	3,658	+13.4	20,481	18,037	−1.0
	1960	5,187	3,976	+8.6	26,676	20,660	+14.5
Little Rock, Ark.	1954	1,801	462		5,421	2,315	
	1955	1,259	319	−30.9	4,182	2,108	−8.9
	1956	1,179	453	+41.5	4,781	2,355	+11.7
	1957	1,209	489	+7.9	5,338	2,465	+4.6
	1958	975	374	−23.5	4,115	6,930	+181.1
	1959	1,511	437	+16.8	4,481	8,849	+27.5
	1960	1,179	465	+6.4	4,256	8,844	
New Orleans, La.	1954	4,566	1,948		19,566	17,472	
	1955	4,261	2,260	+16.0	14,225	13,613	−22.0
	1956	4,097	2,214	−2.0	15,298	11,536	−15.2
	1957	4,300	2,489	+12.4	15,851	10,182	−11.7
	1958	4,342	2,420	−2.7	14,751	9,249	−9.1
	1959	3,638	1,920	−20.6	12,920	6,977	−24.5
	1960	3,569	2,093	+9.0	13,962	7,968	+14.2
Oklahoma City, Okla.	1954	3,311	1,790		9,994	9,043	
	1955	3,123	1,825	+1.9	9,455	9,421	+4.1
	1956	3,764	2,167	+18.6	12,896	8,737	−7.2
	1957	4,998	2,239	+3.3	15,637	7,629	−12.6
	1958	3,975	2,189	−2.2	11,580	8,452	+10.7
	1959	3,425	1,965	−10.2	9,482	11,017	+30.3
	1960	3,176	1,973	+.4	9,448	6,125	−44.4
Boise, Idaho	1954	1,050	470		3,115	2,083	
	1955	1,099	472	+.5	2,949	1,988	−4.5
	1956	860	411	−13.1	3,211	2,155	+8.4
	1957	842	513	+24.8	3,559	2,280	+5.8
	1958	760	395	−23.0	2,812	2,212	−2.9
	1959	791	509	+28.8	2,382	2,106	−4.8
	1960	1,068	656	+28.8	3,241	1,381	−34.4
Helena, Mont.	1954	1,064	436		3,214	2,863	
	1955	831	333	−23.6	2,912	2,575	−10.0
	1956	1,035	527	+58.2	3,299	1,799	−30.1
	1957	1,122	624	+18.4	4,136	2,047	+13.7
	1958	1,040	550	−11.8	3,572	2,024	−1.1
	1959	802	398	−27.6	2,857	1,510	−25.3
	1960	1,231	742	+86.4	3,912	2,068	+36.9

Delinquent taxes—Continued

District	Year	Employment tax		Percent change over previous year	Total taxes		Percent change over previous year
		Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
Honolulu, Hawaii	1954	1,338	$898		4,682	$4,620	
	1955	1,196	876	−2.4	3,835	4,345	−5.9
	1956	1,047	668	−23.7	3,800	3,929	−9.5
	1957	1,095	772	+15.5	4,101	3,297	−16.0
	1958	989	606	−21.5	3,448	2,887	−12.4
	1959	738	543	−10.3	2,092	1,606	−44.3
	1960	770	631	+16.2	2,064	1,828	+13.8
Los Angeles (6th, California).	1954	16,980	13,396		86,733	88,047	
	1955	22,429	19,706	+47.1	105,039	83,679	−4.9
	1956	17,151	16,600	−15.7	92,176	68,937	−17.6
	1957	19,853	20,762	+25.0	89,014	76,679	+11.2
	1958	19,895	18,723	−9.8	81,683	83,911	+9.4
	1959	15,736	16,199	−13.4	58,231	60,562	−27.8
	1960	20,005	20,468	+26.3	71,305	79,326	+30.9
Phoenix, Ariz.	1954	2,158	1,384		8,957	5,510	
	1955	2,059	1,327	−4.1	7,023	5,057	−8.2
	1956	1,533	1,169	−11.9	5,871	4,095	−19.0
	1957	2,039	1,396	+19.4	6,760	4,452	+8.7
	1958	1,961	1,288	−7.7	6,218	4,276	−3.9
	1959	1,881	1,560	+21.1	5,162	4,265	−.2
	1960	2,674	2,019	+29.4	7,463	6,169	+44.6
Portland, Oreg.	1954	4,059	2,053		14,799	15,351	
	1955	3,950	2,281	+11.1	11,636	12,429	−19.0
	1956	2,767	1,934	−15.2	10,300	13,215	+6.3
	1957	2,554	2,073	+7.1	10,295	13,139	−.5
	1958	2,410	1,766	−14.8	9,496	12,879	−1.9
	1959	2,659	1,857	+5.1	9,471	10,798	−16.1
	1960	3,140	2,248	+21.0	13,638	15,107	+39.9
Reno, Nev.	1954	1,455	1,480		4,567	6,043	
	1955	1,195	1,470	−.6	3,782	6,697	+10.8
	1956	1,038	1,574	+7.0	3,545	5,995	−10.4
	1957	928	1,393	−11.4	3,739	6,324	+5.4
	1958	717	1,174	−15.7	3,152	6,804	+7.5
	1959	715	1,143	−2.6	2,665	4,965	−27.0
	1960	1,088	1,977	+72.9	4,140	5,984	+20.5
Salt Lake City, Utah	1954	1,671	$925		5,554	$4,649	
	1955	1,491	809	−12.5	4,668	3,560	−23.4
	1956	1,374	778	−3.8	4,505	3,771	+5.9
	1957	1,527	861	+10.6	4,878	3,906	+3.5
	1958	1,344	807	−6.2	4,572	4,084	+4.5
	1959	1,137	741	−8.1	3,929	3,605	−11.7
	1960	1,517	968	+30.6	4,102	3,160	−12.3
San Francisco (1st, California).	1954	17,616	10,597		85,750	66,858	
	1955	17,509	11,951	+12.7	73,245	88,983	+33.0
	1956	11,473	9,214	−22.9	61,138	77,550	−12.8
	1957	12,797	10,119	+9.8	60,441	74,781	−3.5
	1958	12,169	9,562	−5.5	50,947	63,834	−14.6
	1959	8,360	7,103	−25.7	37,997	56,626	−11.2
	1960	8,972	7,909	+11.3	43,648	59,661	+5.3
Seattle, Wash.	1954	5,932	4,324		27,707	19,804	
	1955	6,417	5,409	+25.0	22,634	18,285	−7.6
	1956	5,937	5,687	+5.1	20,852	16,441	−10.0
	1957	5,715	4,786	−15.8	20,940	15,890	−3.3
	1958	5,238	3,935	−17.7	18,424	13,462	−15.2
	1959	4,315	3,246	−17.5	14,446	10,886	−19.1
	1960	4,997	4,011	+23.5	15,166	13,294	+22.1
Puerto Rico	1954	1,530	147		2,020	273	
	1955	1,853	252	+71.4	3,249	622	+127.8
	1956[5]	1,307	296	+17.4	2,509	624	+.3
	1957[5]	1,755	375	+26.6	2,674	721	+15.5
	1958[5]	1,612	290	−22.6	2,451	593	−17.7
	1959[5]	1,129	260	−10.3	1,682	393	−33.7
	1960[5]	1,616	428	+64.6	2,205	686	+74.5
International operations.	1956	1,504	442		14,321	17,328	
	1957	1,884	444	+.4	14,046	17,443	+.6
	1958[6]	1,867	410	−7.6	10,088	41,823	+139.7
	1959	1,557	435	+6.1	21,568	35,925	−14.1
	1960	2,091	918	+111.0	22,371	51,178	+42.4

[1] Merged with upper Manhattan as "Manhattan."
[2] Merged with lower Manhattan as "Manhattan."
[3] Merged with Cincinnati.
[4] Merged with Cleveland.
[5] Puerto Rico figures included in "International operations."
[6] Result of district offices' transferring to this division delinquent accounts of taxpayers known to be abroad and out of reach.

TOTALS

Year	Employment tax		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year	Total taxes		Percent increase or decrease over preceding year
	Number	Amount (in thousands)		Number	Amount (in thousands)	
1954	390,398	$254,062		1,725,474	$1,614,494	
1955	399,269	284,803	+12.0	1,596,615	1,646,383	+1.9
1956	356,748	279,183	−1.9	1,560,685	1,619,629	−1.6
1957	377,253	300,678	+7.6	1,554,876	1,504,709	−7.0
1958	329,457	$263,186	−12.4	1,280,642	$1,375,737	−8.5
1959	256,287	216,439	−17.7	949,146	1,071,016	−22.1
1960	268,396	286,843	+9.4	1,023,770	1,072,440	+.1

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 28, 1961.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This will give you the annual report on our taxpayer delinquent account inventories requested in your letter of January 31, 1961.

For the first time in 5 years our report does reflect a decline in the dollar amount outstanding as of December 31. The increase, less than one-half of 1 percent, is not, however, indicative of there being any letdown in our program in the collection enforcement area. On the contrary, with our concentrated effort on closing taxpayer delinquent accounts having resulted in our bringing the inventories to what we regard as manageable levels we were in a position to embark on a broader and better balanced enforcement program during 1960.

Before proceeding further it may be well to define "manageable inventories" as we see them. Simply stated, we consider manageable inventories to be the lowest levels at which we can get the most economical and efficient application of manpower commensurate with maximum productivity. To put it another way, we consider it to be the level at which it would be wasteful to continue to give exclusive attention to the closing of taxpayer delinquent accounts. Too small an inventory in the hands of revenue officers would, of course, result in their having to concentrate on accounts previously set aside for infrequent taxpayer contact by reason of their having no immediate revenue potential.

We felt that just such a position had been reached shortly after the close of last year with the result that we diverted a portion of our manpower to work in the returns compliance area. The program was in the form of a planned canvass aimed at contacting taxpayers for purposes of obtaining delinquent returns and collecting previously unreported tax as distinguished from collecting taxes that were already on our books. The success of the program speaks for itself. Some 975,584 delinquent returns having a dollar value of $138.2 million were procured from nonfilers not previously detected in our routine delinquency check operations. While we maintain no statistics as to class of tax, we are sure you would be interested to know that our districts have reported that a fairly high percentage of the returns were of the employment tax variety. Needless to say, we plan to expand this program to the extent possible, within our budgetary limitations, without permitting the taxpayer delinquent account inventories to get out of hand.

Notwithstanding the diversion of manpower to the canvassing operation, most of the districts reporting higher inventories have indicated that they could very well have held to their inventories of a year ago, or even accomplished reductions in them, both as to number and dollar value except for the fact that issuances of delinquent accounts were abnormally high, particularly during the latter part of the year when it was too late for them to pass through routine collection cycles and get into the hands of revenue officers for closing in sufficient time to be reflected in the yearend inventories. This is borne out by the facts since we find that issuances during the last half of the year were up 31.7 percent in number and 33.7 percent in dollars over what they were in the comparable period last year. While we had forecast a gain in issuances, owing to increased audit activity, population growth, increased delinquent returns activity and an intensified mathematical verification program, the size of the national increase was not fully anticipated, primarily due to the adverse economic conditions which developed sporadically during the year, and which could not be measured either in terms of scope or depth. Issuances were 370,000 accounts (15 percent) and $225 million (22 percent) more than in 1959.

The table, which follows, contains a summary as of December 31, 1959 and 1960 of the taxpayer delinquent accounts broken down as to those in an active and an inactive status. As we have previously advised you, inactive accounts are those on which collection action has been deferred pending

the outcome of court decisions, audit examinations or other contingent actions.

[Amounts in thousands]

	Active	Inactive	Total
Dec. 31, 1959	$675,590	$395,426	$1,071,016
Dec. 31, 1960	$649,243	$423,197	$1,072,440
Change from Dec. 31, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	−$26,347	$27,771	$1,424
Percent of change	−3.9	7.0	0.1
Number:			
Dec. 31, 1959	853,855	95,291	949,146
Dec. 31, 1960	934,994	88,776	1,023,770
Change from Dec. 31, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1960	81,139	−6,515	74,624
Percent of change	9.5	−6.8	7.9

The inactive accounts are also shown in the columns to the right in the attached tabulation. As in previous years, however, the figures reported in the columns under the various tax groups include those in the inactive category. Also we would like to assure you that all offices were current in their issuances as of December 31, with the result that the table includes all accounts that were in a delinquent status as of that date.

It will be noted that the lower Manhattan, upper Manhattan, Toledo, and Columbus offices are not in the current listing of inventories. The lower and upper Manhattan offices have been replaced by the Manhattan office. The Columbus district has been merged with Cincinnati, and Toledo has been merged with Cleveland.

In closing we would like to offer you every assurance that our activities in other areas of collection enforcement are not to be construed as evidencing any lessening in the importance which we attach to collecting delinquent tax accounts and keeping the inventories within reasonable bounds. Our basic responsibilities are broader, however, and we are sure you will appreciate that it is just as important that we pursue the taxpayer who neither reports nor pays his tax. Our aim, of course, is the deployment of our limited manpower in such manner as to obtain maximum compliance with the internal revenue laws.

Sincerely yours,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

Inventory of taxpayer delinquent accounts, December 1960 and 1959

Region and district	Tax groups																Inactive			
	Income				Employment				Other				Total							
	Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)	
	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959
National total	707,149	650,278	740,286	758,873	268,396	256,287	236,843	216,439	48,225	42,581	95,311	95,703	1,023,770	949,146	1,072,440	1,071,016	88,776	95,291	423,197	395,426
Atlanta	82,266	60,823	52,403	57,913	29,798	26,132	18,217	16,106	6,487	6,579	10,263	9,596	118,551	93,534	80,883	83,616	11,563	9,133	32,354	34,619
Boston	41,971	40,818	34,369	35,042	19,339	16,455	17,411	14,522	1,849	1,978	3,293	3,287	63,159	59,251	55,072	52,851	5,265	6,600	21,793	20,577
Chicago	77,007	91,943	79,025	100,546	36,886	39,397	32,532	33,903	6,202	5,807	12,984	12,357	120,095	137,147	124,542	146,807	10,028	27,781	38,201	51,768
Cincinnati	70,939	51,967	54,844	53,104	24,404	18,690	15,679	12,390	5,959	4,052	10,906	11,526	101,302	74,709	81,429	77,020	9,517	5,531	34,810	33,258
Dallas	58,825	46,731	43,553	43,613	18,364	19,506	15,123	11,514	6,951	3,829	6,595	6,737	84,140	70,066	65,271	61,864	6,147	5,459	26,852	27,227
New York City	97,816	122,202	156,574	207,565	46,660	60,220	53,807	60,432	4,668	6,529	18,976	23,686	149,144	188,951	229,357	291,684	13,074	12,514	80,194	72,348
Omaha	38,189	29,048	50,196	33,630	16,050	12,494	10,230	7,870	3,281	2,813	4,368	4,016	57,520	44,355	64,795	45,515	7,207	5,330	37,329	19,790
Philadelphia	104,370	91,025	85,355	78,254	29,342	24,702	31,297	25,967	5,097	4,606	15,254	14,583	138,809	120,333	131,906	118,805	10,559	7,420	58,660	48,682
San Francisco	115,662	95,867	135,424	114,144	45,462	37,134	41,629	33,299	7,555	6,231	10,955	9,487	168,679	139,232	188,008	156,929	14,641	15,040	79,122	74,136
Atlanta region:																				
Atlanta	15,794	11,036	7,391	6,898	5,610	4,506	2,362	2,101	1,524	1,012	1,243	1,764	22,928	16,554	10,996	10,763	1,875	1,471	3,704	4,591
Birmingham	9,056	8,958	9,003	12,619	2,796	2,489	1,753	1,461	664	741	1,174	874	12,516	12,188	11,930	14,954	1,698	1,497	7,398	8,430
Columbia	7,226	4,817	2,284	1,784	2,595	1,697	1,159	1,011	860	627	439	286	10,681	7,141	3,882	3,082	659	420	838	745
Greensboro	13,751	10,287	7,571	7,932	3,682	4,078	1,597	1,441	888	1,398	749	1,008	18,321	15,763	9,917	10,381	1,367	1,212	4,562	4,380
Jackson	4,847	3,115	1,496	2,024	1,891	1,505	797	614	452	545	381	266	7,190	5,165	2,674	2,903	786	449	868	665
Jacksonville	21,176	16,385	16,998	21,889	10,813	9,947	9,407	8,608	1,310	1,448	4,725	3,870	33,299	27,780	31,131	34,367	3,982	3,346	11,014	13,762
Nashville	10,416	6,225	7,659	4,768	2,411	1,910	1,142	870	789	808	1,552	1,528	13,616	8,943	10,353	7,166	1,196	738	3,970	2,045
Boston region:																				
Augusta	2,103	1,990	2,647	2,958	1,003	889	851	815	136	113	67	69	3,242	2,992	3,565	3,842	388	311	2,495	772
Boston	20,943	21,102	21,617	20,628	9,595	8,837	9,531	8,586	851	1,013	2,365	2,388	31,389	30,952	33,512	31,601	2,150	3,347	12,567	11,728
Burlington	1,093	1,144	436	477	658	373	396	200	56	84	44	45	1,807	1,601	876	722	159	134	262	224
Hartford	12,491	11,704	7,807	9,097	5,610	3,885	4,973	3,413	611	560	600	568	18,712	16,149	13,380	13,077	1,566	1,769	5,384	6,458
Portsmouth	2,012	1,445	496	364	538	511	357	266	78	50	126	114	2,628	2,006	979	744	285	292	400	380
Providence	3,329	3,433	1,366	1,518	1,935	1,960	1,303	1,243	117	158	91	103	5,381	5,551	2,760	2,864	717	747	685	1,015
Chicago region:																				
Chicago	40,315	53,613	41,023	58,210	16,550	20,410	15,445	17,580	2,157	2,574	6,583	7,836	59,082	76,597	63,051	83,625	2,909	18,843	13,124	30,004
Detroit	26,529	29,312	27,431	30,280	14,326	14,465	12,437	13,259	3,053	2,156	4,285	2,991	43,908	45,933	44,154	46,530	4,259	5,551	17,347	15,631
Milwaukee	6,277	5,533	7,613	8,179	4,015	3,090	3,176	2,180	535	516	1,258	534	10,827	9,139	12,047	10,893	2,068	2,238	5,148	4,046
Springfield	3,886	3,485	2,958	3,877	1,995	1,432	1,474	885	457	561	858	997	6,338	5,478	5,289	5,759	792	1,149	2,582	2,086
Cincinnati region:																				
Cincinnati	17,723	12,365	10,714	8,380	5,015	2,790	3,102	1,954	1,056	414	2,429	3,015	23,794	15,569	16,245	13,349	2,385	787	6,337	5,889
Cleveland	19,066	14,375	18,531	20,707	6,444	6,173	4,351	3,793	1,483	1,169	1,428	1,189	26,993	21,717	24,311	25,690	2,116	961	10,437	9,254
Indianapolis	9,335	6,425	8,192	7,567	4,278	2,889	3,070	2,376	964	850	2,731	3,128	14,577	10,164	13,992	13,072	1,721	1,628	6,622	7,599
Louisville	7,303	4,660	4,929	4,616	2,940	1,981	1,630	1,034	1,046	822	3,050	3,032	11,289	7,463	9,609	8,682	1,153	658	4,969	3,129
Parkersburg	4,142	3,369	3,061	2,881	1,807	1,518	1,055	997	497	356	375	422	6,446	5,243	4,492	4,299	674	448	1,344	1,595
Richmond	13,370	10,773	9,418	8,952	3,920	3,339	2,471	2,235	913	441	892	740	18,203	14,553	12,781	11,927	1,468	1,049	5,090	5,792
Dallas region:																				
Albuquerque	3,231	2,658	2,320	1,619	1,947	1,717	1,345	1,095	213	201	265	201	5,391	4,576	3,930	2,915	342	351	987	528
Austin	19,050	13,757	9,955	10,506	3,306	3,700	5,271	2,439	2,051	669	2,518	1,125	24,407	18,126	17,744	14,070	1,235	1,021	7,302	6,028
Dallas	18,452	13,750	14,377	10,796	5,187	5,515	3,976	3,658	3,037	1,216	2,307	3,582	26,676	20,481	20,660	18,037	1,566	1,369	5,002	3,853
Little Rock	2,812	2,619	8,257	8,204	1,179	1,511	465	437	265	351	121	208	4,256	4,481	8,844	8,849	578	628	7,682	7,608
New Orleans	9,559	8,468	4,869	4,091	3,569	3,638	2,093	1,920	834	814	1,006	966	13,962	12,920	7,968	6,977	1,167	1,048	3,301	2,768
Oklahoma City	5,721	5,479	3,774	8,397	3,176	3,425	1,973	1,965	551	576	378	655	9,448	9,482	6,125	11,017	1,259	1,042	2,578	6,443
New York City region:																				
Albany	6,106	5,882	3,871	5,588	2,698	3,014	2,044	2,074	580	337	997	734	9,384	9,233	6,912	8,397	1,026	871	2,801	3,164
Brooklyn	26,520	37,955	41,337	47,834	13,658	22,196	14,431	18,637	913	2,025	4,903	8,990	41,091	62,176	60,670	75,461	2,815	3,908	16,526	9,014
Buffalo	5,254	6,988	2,922	4,503	3,395	3,128	2,666	2,508	440	539	1,198	950	9,089	10,655	6,786	7,961	724	821	1,716	1,561
Manhattan	54,320	66,611	105,661	146,505	24,325	29,697	32,750	35,372	2,380	3,292	11,351	12,438	81,025	99,600	149,762	194,315	7,428	6,128	57,279	56,578
Syracuse	5,616	4,766	2,783	3,135	2,584	2,185	1,917	1,841	355	336	526	574	8,555	7,287	5,226	5,550	1,081	786	1,873	2,032
Omaha region:																				
Aberdeen	1,136	982	749	516	559	439	242	137	68	55	12	24	1,763	1,476	1,003	676	110	48	248	228
Cheyenne	1,554	1,067	1,027	823	667	354	380	182	184	59	107	49	2,405	1,480	1,513	1,053	118	112	227	155
Denver	6,866	5,155	5,872	3,287	2,674	1,806	1,818	1,042	538	378	367	467	10,078	7,339	8,056	4,795	1,385	991	4,060	1,866
Des Moines	3,610	2,398	3,765	3,754	1,987	1,217	1,138	683	639	380	386	529	6,236	3,995	5,289	4,965	603	420	1,474	1,279
Fargo	1,306	986	584	696	682	397	391	255	50	47	98	50	2,038	1,430	1,073	1,001	97	110	207	222
Kansas City	5,311	3,935	21,438	6,312	2,324	1,754	1,539	1,414	370	213	477	571	8,005	5,902	23,454	8,298	890	882	20,402	3,775
Omaha	1,721	1,154	1,525	1,329	585	512	366	267	150	98	161	88	2,456	1,764	2,052	1,684	314	140	853	1,031
St. Louis	5,945	5,630	4,363	4,546	1,699	1,824	956	846	503	422	819	775	8,147	7,876	6,138	6,167	883	423	2,998	2,582
St. Paul	6,060	4,285	7,197	7,647	2,735	2,376	2,176	1,951	476	820	1,639	1,046	9,271	7,481	11,012	10,644	1,850	1,278	4,574	5,169
Wichita	4,680	3,456	3,676	4,720	2,138	1,815	1,224	1,094	303	341	303	418	7,121	5,612	5,203	6,232	1,007	926	2,286	3,482
Philadelphia region:																				
Baltimore	27,385	24,578	17,862	12,626	4,662	3,560	3,014	2,739	894	928	2,229	1,768	32,941	29,066	23,106	17,133	1,517	1,093	10,077	6,542
Camden	7,619	7,553	6,365	5,712	3,445	2,700	2,852	1,984	888	595	1,528	884	11,952	10,848	10,745	8,580	1,177	426	3,631	714
Newark	28,353	21,077	21,915	24,193	9,432	8,169	11,998	10,160	1,361	1,213	3,818	4,174	39,146	30,459	37,731	38,527	2,727	2,378	12,244	13,678
Philadelphia	20,776	15,790	22,603	21,109	5,222	4,387	7,515	6,274	955	957	6,755	6,821	26,953	21,134	36,874	34,203	2,906	1,964	20,919	19,383
Pittsburgh	14,289	15,919	12,399	8,481	4,301	3,998	3,823	3,206	643	577	627	700	19,233	20,494	16,849	12,386	1,500	920	8,839	3,331
Scranton	3,014	3,103	2,008	4,388	1,585	1,563	1,679	1,421	242	231	213	123	4,841	4,897	3,900	5,931	473	404	1,563	3,205
Wilmington	2,934	3,005	2,209	1,746	695	325	415	184	114	105	84	113	3,743	3,435	2,701	2,043	259	145	1,387	1,329

Inventory of taxpayer delinquent accounts, December 1960 and 1959—Continued

Region and district	Tax groups																Inactive			
	Income				Employment				Other				Total							
	Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)	
	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959	1960	1959
San Francisco region:																				
Boise	1,909	1,470	658	1,523	1,068	791	656	809	264	121	67	74	3,241	2,382	1,381	2,106	319	359	263	1,280
Helena	2,448	1,907	1,231	907	1,231	802	742	398	233	148	125	205	3,912	2,857	2,098	1,510	177	170	205	312
Honolulu	1,216	1,255	1,037	896	770	738	631	543	78	99	159	167	2,064	2,092	1,828	1,606	136	222	418	422
Los Angeles	49,271	40,938	55,551	41,827	20,005	15,730	20,468	16,199	2,029	1,557	3,307	2,537	71,305	58,231	79,326	60,562	8,107	6,785	27,506	22,490
Phoenix	4,541	3,136	3,830	2,347	2,674	1,881	2,019	1,560	248	145	320	359	7,463	5,162	6,169	4,265	572	441	657	773
Portland	9,231	6,337	12,370	8,523	3,140	2,659	2,248	1,857	1,267	475	488	418	13,638	9,471	15,107	10,798	1,065	1,103	6,038	3,593
Reno	2,911	1,802	3,233	3,398	1,088	715	1,977	1,143	141	148	774	423	4,140	2,665	5,984	4,965	218	244	2,316	2,879
Salt Lake City	2,430	2,588	2,022	2,746	1,517	1,137	968	741	155	204	171	117	4,102	3,929	3,160	3,605	334	349	1,165	1,722
San Francisco	32,348	27,223	47,886	45,624	8,972	8,360	7,900	7,103	2,328	2,414	3,865	3,899	43,648	37,997	59,661	56,626	2,789	4,179	37,694	37,782
Seattle	9,357	9,211	7,605	6,352	4,997	4,315	4,011	3,246	812	920	1,678	1,288	15,166	14,446	13,294	10,886	944	1,178	2,858	2,883
International operations division	20,104	19,854	48,544	35,062	2,091	1,557	918	435	176	157	1,717	428	22,371	21,568	51,178	35,925	775	483	13,890	13,022
Puerto Rico	583	549	168	102	1,616	1,129	428	260	6	4	90	31	2,205	1,682	686	393	169	219	203	122
All other	19,521	19,305	48,375	34,960	475	428	490	175	170	153	1,627	397	20,166	19,886	50,492	35,532	606	264	13,687	12,901

NOTE.—Owing to rounding, components do not always add to totals.

U.S. POSITION REGARDING ADMISSION OF RED CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the Friday, April 28, issue of the Washington Post appeared an article captioned "Kennedy Backs New Approach to China Issue." This article states, among other things, that the President and his advisers are convinced that the United States can no longer keep Communist China out of the United Nations, and that the time has come for a new approach to the China problem. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY BACKS NEW APPROACH TO CHINA ISSUE

President Kennedy and his advisers are convinced that the United States can no longer keep Communist China out of the United Nations and that the time has come for a new approach to the China problem.

The United States "continues to be opposed under present conditions to the admission of Red China" to the U.N., the President told his April 12 news conference. According to informed sources, however, the new administration doubts both the wisdom and the practicability of clinging to the present policy.

No decision has been reached as to what new course to pursue. But some decision will be needed before the 16th session of the U.N. General Assembly convenes in September.

Last October, the Assembly voted for the 10th consecutive year not to debate the question of seating Red China. But the vote was 42 to 34, with 22 countries abstaining. Since then, moreover, three of America's allies—Britain, Canada, and Brazil—have indicated they will no longer support the U.S. sponsored moratorium.

This leaves the administration with three basic alternatives: to stage an all-out arm-twisting battle to swing the votes needed to extend the moratorium, to let the Assembly work its will and suffer the consequences of defeat, or to take the lead in proposing a new approach.

The first alternative, it is now believed, would be too costly in terms of keeping or winning support for other U.S. foreign policy objectives. The second would be undesirable for many reasons, even if preferable to the first. But the third course, while viewed as the most desirable, is also recognized as the most difficult to pursue.

TWO CHINAS AGAIN

What is involved, in the final analysis, is the two-China approach. In its purest form, this calls for switching China's representation in the United Nations from the Nationalist Government on Formosa to the Communist regime in Peiping, while admitting the Nationalists as representatives of a new country—the Republic of Formosa.

Variations of this approach have been supported in the past by three of President Kennedy's key advisers—former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, and Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai E. Stevenson. Administration sources now say that a two-China approach is generally regarded as the only sensible ultimate solution.

The first stumbling block to developing such a policy is the fact that it has been rejected repeatedly and emphatically by both the Chinese Nationalists and the Communists. The former say they will quit the U.N. if the Peiping regime is seated; the latter say they won't enter the U.N. so long as the Nationalists are there.

It is apparent that the administration cannot openly champion a two-China approach without some assurance that the Nationalists, at least, could be persuaded to go along. What the Nationalists do may depend, in turn, on the degree to which they believe they can rally the support of American public opinion in any showdown.

POWERFUL LOBBY

Such support has been manifested in impressive fashion over the past decade, since the China lobby of pro-Nationalists helped to shape the U.S. policy in full support for the Chiang Kai-shek regime as the true Government of China.

Congress has expressed its opposition to seating the Communists in the U.N. no less than 16 times since 1951. Only four Representatives opposed this stand when the House last voted on the matter in 1959; three of the four were defeated at the polls last November.

When President Kennedy reaffirmed this policy on April 12, the Republican leaders in Congress promptly called for another sense-of-Congress resolution to uphold the President. The Cuban crisis served to postpone any such action, but there is no question that many Democrats as well as Republicans are prepared to challenge any attempt by the Kennedy administration to bring about a two-China policy.

It is plain, therefore, that any decision to abandon the present U.S. position will lead to a major domestic political controversy. That is why some observers feel that, in meeting the forthcoming challenge in the U.N., the administration will choose the second of its three alternative courses, and accept a diplomatic defeat as making the best of a bad deal.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, articles of this type cause continuing concern on the part of the American people over rumors and reports that the new administration has, in fact, adopted a defeatist attitude over the admission of Red China to the United Nations. As I pointed out on April 13, in commenting on an article in the April 12 issue of the Washington Evening Star, which quoted informed diplomats in London as stating that President Kennedy's administration has decided not to oppose U.N. debate next fall on Red China's admission to the United Nations, the United States is in danger of losing its reputation among our allies and the uncommitted nations for firmness toward communism. That is why I then said that I thought the President should repudiate any such policy. All that I have seen is that the President labeled the report as "inaccurate"; but that is not enough; and, particularly, it is not enough in view of this latest article in the Washington Post.

A penetrating analysis of the situation involving the President's advisers was written by Constantine Brown, and was published in the April 27 issue of the Washington Evening Star. If, indeed, some of these advisers are responsible for a new policy toward Red China, or for seeking to obtain a new policy to-

ward Red China, which looks to weak submission to so-called inevitability of her admission to the United Nations, then the President either should change advisers or should see to it that in the future there is no repetition of such advice from them. The time to do this is now. If there is further delay there will appear more articles purporting to quote informed diplomats or administration advisers to the effect that our policy toward Red China has weakened.

If such articles are calculated to soften up public opinion, I suggest that they will not have that effect at all. Instead, they will merely provoke suspicion and disunity among our people at a time when confidence, trust, and, above all, firmness of purpose must be maintained.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article written by Mr. Brown printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S CLOSE ADVISERS: AIDS SAID TO HAVE MORE THAN EQUAL SHARE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR MISTAKES

(By Constantine Brown)

The first 3 months of the Kennedy administration have come to an end with America at its lowest ebb in many years so far as international prestige is concerned. Mistakes have followed mistakes.

While the Chief Executive has assumed sole responsibility for what has happened in at least three corners of the world, there is no doubt that his intimate advisers have more than an equal share of responsibility. These men, almost without exception, are learned and studious economists, historians, and scientists who have been able to deliver splendid lectures to their admiring students or who have written books and magazine articles winning plaudits from many intellectuals and book reviewers. But most of them have lived, relatively speaking, in the ivory tower of theory and have associated principally with other people who shared their theoretical thinking. Diplomacy and affairs of state, these days in particular, require a sense of sometimes ruthless reality. Perhaps the uneducated Nikita Khrushchev could serve as the best example of what modern diplomacy must cope with.

In the 3 months since Mr. Kennedy took office amid the loud approval, not only of the American people, but also of the rest of the world, we have lost more ground internationally than in the last 10 years. Mr. Kennedy, energetic, personable, articulate and full of the best intentions, makes an excellent impression on nearly everybody. His television appearances are described as nonpareil. But in these trying days, when Western civilization is on the brink, more than that is required—a maturity, if not of the Chief Executive himself, at least of those who surround him so closely.

It is in this that he has failed. The enormous blunders of the last 3 months are the result of the lack of realism and maturity of his entourage. The speeches and declarations made by the Chief Executive are inspiring, forthright and strong. But they are never followed by action.

For instance, powerful words were expressed when the Russians initiated the crisis in Laos. To back up his words, a carrier and two destroyers were ordered to Saigon from Hong Kong. But all knowing quarters in Washington expressed confidentially the belief that these were mere gestures and that we would never actually intervene. Further, the crisis in Laos actually was a Russian-American affair. Yet we accepted Britain as our middleman. The cease-fire agreement between Moscow and London came into effect only weeks after it was first proposed, when the Russian-backed Communist Lao troops already had taken the most important strategic points. It is an open secret that we accepted the terms demanded by the Soviets.

The fiasco in Cuba was one of the most monumental blunders ever committed by our frequently faltering diplomacy. Not only was the whole operation, directed from Washington in its initial phases, all wrong, but we announced before it occurred that we would not give it the backing without which it could never succeed.

It was folly to imagine that a group of 1,500 men could succeed against Fidel Castro's forces, 100 times as big and supported by Migs and Russian tanks, all manned by crews from Poland, Czechoslovakia and presumably China. Moreover, it was foolish planning to land the would-be rescuers of Cuba on only one strip 400 feet deep and half a mile long. Those conversant with such operations say that to make a successful movement it was necessary to choose several beaches on the more than 2,000-mile coastline of Cuba. It is highly doubtful that the operation was planned by our military, who have had such an excellent record for landings in World War II and in Korea.

Finally, the immaturity of Mr. Kennedy's advisers, whom he appears to follow closely, once more was demonstrated in the Algerian crisis, when the Chief Executive offered President de Gaulle of France all our support, including the use of our 6th Fleet and Armed Forces in Europe. It apparently was not realized that no French leader, any more than an American or British, would let foreign troops intervene in a purely national and domestic affair. There is no doubt that General de Gaulle would have preferred to go down to defeat rather than permit foreign soldiers to shoot at Frenchmen.

NECESSITY OF LESS TALK ABOUT PLANS, AND MORE CONSTRUCTIVE WORK

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last week, in speaking before the publishers' luncheon, President Kennedy called upon the members of the press to exercise a greater degree of restraint in writing articles which could affect our national security.

Certainly, all are in agreement that the press should exercise the proper restraint in dealing with such articles; and I think the record will show that they have done so.

In many cases, even when our country was not at war, the newspapers have exercised great restraint. The Wall Street Journal today cites one particular case: Last winter the New York Herald Tribune had the story of the imminent release of the RB–47 fliers. That was an important scoop for that paper; but upon the request of Washington, and in the interest of assuring that the fliers' release would go through, the newspaper killed the story.

While giving the press credit for their cooperation, and at the same time without in any way releasing them from any of their responsibility, I want to emphasize today that I think the real problem lies, not so much with the press, as it does with the irresponsible manner in which many of these stories are built up, oftimes to fantastic proportions, by the publicity agents of the Government itself. The Cuban fiasco was a perfect example of the disastrous results to our international prestige when those responsible give no consideration to the possibility that something may go wrong.

Now we are witnessing another tremendous buildup of a project which, if successful, will represent a great step forward in American space exploration; but if there is a failure, it will be looked upon as another American fiasco.

I refer, of course, to the proposed launching of an astronaut into space, which is being widely heralded as scheduled for tomorrow.

Administration officials responsible for this project are so confident of its success that they have spent the last 10 days in announcing to the world what a great achievement they expect to accomplish this week at Cape Canaveral. Approximately 500 reporters and photographers from all over the world have been invited there to witness the success of the first Yank-in-space project. I fail to find where any thought has been given as to what effect this tremendous buildup will have upon the American prestige should the attempt be a failure.

It is generally recognized that Russia had at least two failures before they were successful in putting a man into space. Yet the world was told only about their success.

It is long past time when administration officials should stop talking about their great plans, and should devote more of their efforts toward constructive work in getting the job done.

One cannot blame the members of the press for the Cuban fiasco. One cannot blame the members of the press if there is another fiasco at Cape Canaveral this week.

I have talked with representatives of the executive branch, and have suggested that it would be the better part of wisdom if the administration were to cancel immediately all publicized plans for putting an astronaut into space this week, and then reschedule the attempt for some future, undisclosed date. Then when this project is rescheduled, it should refrain from any publicity until after it has actually been attempted.

I am not saying we should start covering up our failures. Our country is big enough and strong enough to admit failures. But in the interest of good, commonsense, let us stop bragging about them.

Frankly, I think that if the administration would fire nine-tenths of its public relations officers in all of the departments, and would use that money for constructive workers, there would be fewer failures.

INTERNATIONAL POLICIES

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, it is timely to consider the strategy of this administration in trying to get bipartisan support of international policies which have brought us to the brink of both hot and cold wars. The President has courteously conferred with leaders of the Republican Party, like General

Eisenhower, Governor Rockefeller, and Richard Nixon. Apparently they have given assurances that whatever strategy is utilized by the President in these crucial days will receive unqualified approval of Republican leaders.

Mr. President, it is time to point out that the strength of our Government is not to be found in patriotic endorsement of whatever action is taken by the President in meeting the threat of Soviet aggression. If we are to utilize effectively the resources of our country, then certainly Members of the Congress should be given some consideration in reflecting public sentiment.

If it is desirable and beneficial that we should have only one viewpoint and one-party Government, then obviously every American who has some misgivings about what is being done at the international level should be ignored. If we become embroiled in war, then it will no longer be the prerogative of any American to offer advice or counsel to the Democratic leadership of this administration.

Mr. President, I believe the essential strength of our Government today depends upon the collective thinking of all Americans, and not just those who find themselves in control of the White House and the executive department of Government. I believe that it is generally recognized by all Americans that when our country is on the brink of involvement in a hot war, we must close ranks and support policies which will insure national survival. This does not mean a one-party government. It means that Congress has some responsibility to review White House policies and to insist that boobytraps and blunders be avoided before we become involved in an all-out nuclear war which may destroy our country.

Mr. President, no one will deny that when executive policies prove successful the Democrats assume full credit for directing the affairs of state. When mistakes and blunders are made, then there is little justification for asking the minority party and Republican leaders to assume responsibility for policies in the formulation of which they have had little, if any, responsibility. All Americans will inevitably face the same fate in military conflict with the Soviet nations. Therefore, it is most important that we give full recognition to utilizing the resources of a two-party system which has proved so effective in the history of our Republic.

Mr. President, the United States today faces many challenges throughout the world. We have only limited support among so-called allies, and it is apparent that if we become the victims of Communist conniving, we have no alternative but to support the Commander in Chief. Congress has joint responsibility, and this means not only a few leaders, but all the elected representatives of the people who must provide the manpower, the finances, and the patriotic support essential to national survival. Congress will forfeit its constitutional rights unless it meets this challenge with courage and patriotic devotion to the welfare of our country.

LAW DAY

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it is fitting that the Nation should observe a day proclaimed as Law Day as is May 1 of each year, because this Nation's very society and structure rest upon the philosophy of the rule of law.

May 1 was first proclaimed Law Day by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1958. It is significant that we should set aside as Law Day the very day used by troublemakers throughout the Western World for disorder and riots. To me, this observance seems typically American. Because our system of law is nonrigid and flexible, we have been able to adjust to the great stresses of the past 175 years without damage to our fundamental beliefs and culture. Surely this is the hallmark of a free and mature land.

"Equal justice under law" is engraved in marble above the entrance to the U.S. Supreme Court Building. It is a fitting motto, not only for the Court, but for the whole American Nation. For it is the law which bred us, led us, and fed us.

When our forefathers came together in a new world to proclaim a new nation conceived in liberty, they drew their propositions largely from Aristotle's natural law. "I pray God these principles may be eternal," wrote Thomas Jefferson.

On a broader scale only as the whole world comes to accept a rule of law, and agree on its common principles, will there be hope for a lasting peace.

Law Day is indeed an important and significant observance.

THE MINNESOTA UNION ADVOCATE CELEBRATES ITS 65TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to take this opportunity to invite the Senate's attention to the 65th birthday of one of America's finest labor newspapers, the Minnesota Union Advocate of St. Paul, Minn.

This paper, which is read by more than 50,000 families in the St. Paul area, not only reports what is happening in the labor movement, but it also serves as an articulate spokesman for humanitarian programs of interest and concern to people in the community from all walks of life. In so doing the Minnesota Union Advocate is true to the union movement's tradition and principle of working for the common good.

I salute the Minnesota Union Advocate for its fine record and I wish it many, many more happy birthdays. Let me also take this occasion to pay tribute to the devoted and talented editor of that paper, Mr. Earl M. Almquist, and to his predecessor, A. F. Lockhart, who served in that position for over 24 years.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the anniversary issue of the Minnesota Union Advocate along with an article telling the history of that fine paper, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minnesota Union Advocate, Apr. 20, 1961]

ADVOCATE REACHES 65TH BIRTHDAY AND STARTS FULL SPEED FORWARD

The Minnesota Union Advocate, which every one of you in the trade union movement in this area can accurately refer to as your newspaper, observes its 65th anniversary this week.

And needless to say, your Union Advocate upon reaching its 65th birthday is giving no thought whatsoever to retirement upon social security and/or other benefits, regardless of the fact that to millions of workers this is a highly pleasing prospect.

Brother, we're just getting our second wind.

Your Union Advocate, its staff and, we trust, the overwhelming majority of its union member subscribers and their families, are imbued with a deep conviction that a labor weekly newspaper is a fundamental and essential part of the community as a whole.

If a community the size of the Greater St. Paul area is to be a healthy, growing and truly good community, the voices of the 50,000 union subscribers to the Union Advocate must be heard and given equitable consideration.

And while a weekly labor newspaper is by no means the only medium for making articulate the aspirations, the hopes, the desires and the great contributions of the 50,000 union workers and their families, it is, probably, the one medium which can produce the greatest impact at any one time.

So, the assignment undertaken by your Union Advocate, or any other labor paper, is of importance not only to members of organized labor and their families, but to the total community of which they are so big and so essential a segment.

Now, while the responsibilities of a labor newspaper such as the Union Advocate may be said to be of a twofold nature—first the responsibility to the trade unionists it was founded primarily to serve, and second to the community as a whole—actually they are almost inseparable.

That is so obvious that the explanation is admittedly a cliche. What is really good for the community as a whole is good for all organized labor, and vice versa.

Growth of any community, accompanied by expansion of business and industrial facilities, is good for all who work for a wage or salary, union members or not, because that means more jobs and better paying jobs.

And when there is full employment at good pay that is an excellent thing for the community as a whole because well-paid workers who enjoy job security are eager buyers and consumers who make business hum, and they are taxpayers whose payments contribute mightily to the ability of the community, State, and Nation to provide essential services.

(Inasmuch as a parenthetical observation about taxes is inevitable in any discussion of fundamentals, it is pointed out here that those who justly argue for "broadening the tax base" must ever keep in mind that the tax base can be broadened only through broadening and deepening the income or taxable base.)

Because the organized labor movement is so widely not understood correctly, or even misunderstood completely, quite often as a result of attacks by those opposed to trade unionism, one of the first duties of a news-

paper such as the Union Advocate is to tell labor's side of the story.

This, we believe, is not only necessary but perfectly proper, because it is a basic American tradition as well as an integral part of our judicial system to give every individual or group the right to be heard, the right to plead his case, the right to reply to criticism or attack.

Another duty, equally or even more important, is a labor newspaper's responsibility to inform its readers truthfully and accurately.

Sometimes that is not a pleasant duty, but it cannot—must not—be shirked. We in the labor movement experience our setbacks and disappointments as well as our triumphs, great or small, and the rank-and-file membership of organized labor is entitled to the story, whether the news is good or bad.

In this area, as in the Nation as a whole, those who compose the labor movement have achieved the maturity to take the bitter with the sweet, the stature to regard obstacles or reverses as challenges rather than as defeats. And that makes publication of your Union Advocate a pleasure as well as important assignment.

So, on this 65th anniversary occasion, permit your Union Advocate to extend a "happy birthday" greeting to you. Why not? You, the union subscribers, own this newspaper, you know.

[From the Minnesota Union Advocate, Apr. 20, 1961]

THIS IS THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY ISSUE OF THE UNION ADVOCATE

Your Minnesota Union Advocate observes its 65th anniversary this week, humbly proud to be the official voice of the organized labor movement in this area.

Like any other labor newspaper worthy of the name, your Union Advocate is a publication of service and information, dedicated to the betterment of the community as a whole as well as the trade union movement.

This newspaper is the official voice of labor in this area because it is owned by the St. Paul AFL–CIO Trades and Labor Assembly, and serves to express the policies and views of that body and its affiliated locals as well as the tens of thousands of individual union members in this Greater St. Paul area.

Another birthday for the Union Advocate—even so venerable a one as the 65th—is noteworthy only because it serves primarily to mark another date in the history of organized labor's continuing progress.

And so once a year, to refresh the memory of the oldtimers and to acquaint new union members with the story of the labor newspaper they own, we print a brief history of the Minnesota Union Advocate.

This newspaper was established 65 years ago by P. J. Geraghty, longtime member of the Typographical Union and an AFL organizer in the Twin Cities.

The paper started with at least the semblance of its own mechanical plant in the back room of the assembly halls at Third and Wabasha, and was printed on an old Gordon foot treadle job press—one page at a time.

Cornelius Guiney bought the mailing list and records from Geraghty, moved the plant to the old union block, present athletic club site, and operated it as a private enterprise.

The labor movement did not subsidize the paper, but it generally supported the trade unions as long as there was no union opposition to Guiney's programs.

In 1920, Guiney sold the Advocate's title and goodwill to a corporation made up of the delegates to the St. Paul Trades and Labor Assembly, and ownership of the paper thus went to labor.

William Mahoney was selected as editor-manager, and the first issue under his direction was published September 10, 1920. A few years later Fred Miller joined the Advocate staff, and when Mahoney was elected mayor of St. Paul in 1932, Miller was named editor-manager.

A. F. Lockhart was named editor March 21, 1932, and held that title until April 1, 1938, when Miller resigned and Lockhart was given the title "managing editor."

"Lock" afterward gained the distinction of being the only labor editor in the United States listed in Who's Who.

The Advocate office was located at 158 East Third Street until it was moved into new quarters in the Labor Temple in March 1928, the same year that the paper bought a 16-page Goss press and began 100-percent production on its own power.

In the fall of 1947 the Advocate installed a unitubular Duplex rotary press, one of the most modern newspaper presses west of Chicago. Later, new typecasting machines and an automatic mailing machine were added, plus color units on the big press.

Lockhart, whose column, "Looking Things Over With Lock," continues to add sparkle to page 1 of each issue of the Advocate, retired as editor in September 1956.

Earl Almquist was named editor and Alan Larson was appointed business manager.

Note: "Lock" is enjoying his retirement in Florida, but he's really thrilled any time he receives a card or note from any of you fellows he knew and worked with so many years. So drop him a line at 2045 Highway 19 North, Clearwater, Fla.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF BOARD OF COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds listing policy recommendations of the council's national board of directors.

These recommendations deserve the careful attention of all people who are seriously concerned about the welfare of the American people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL OF JEWISH FEDERATIONS AND WELFARE FUNDS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 25, 1961.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: I am pleased to inform you of the following actions taken recently by our national board of directors:

Medical care for the aged: Reaffirmed its support for the principle of the use of the old-age and survivors insurance program for financing an expanded program of health services for persons covered by the Social Security Act.

Community health planning: Urged congressional appropriations to establish a Bureau of Community Health in the U.S. Public Health Service.

Nursing homes: Endorsed increased Federal matching grants to the States for construction of skilled nursing homes, with high quality of service.

General public assistance: Reaffirmed the position that Federal public assistance should be extended to provide financial aid and other service to all needy persons not covered by Federal law, with no restrictions on eligibility based upon residence or citizenship requirements.

Aid to dependent children: Endorsed the administration's recommendation to extend aid to dependent children to families of unemployed father without other resources.

The board also received with favor the action of the Federal Government in denying funds after July 1 to the few States which have withheld aid to dependent children because of illegitimate parenthood.

Residence laws: Voiced continued opposition to length of residence requirements for public or private assistance, and urged that Federal welfare legislation should bar such restrictions in use of Federal funds.

Research and demonstration: Endorsed the budget recommendation of $1,500,000 for research and demonstration programs in the causes of family dependency and disability.

Training grants: Reaffirmed support for Federal appropriations for training grants for social welfare professional personnel.

We hope that these measures, which in a number of instances have been recommended by the administration, will have your full support.

Sincerely yours,

IRVING KANE,
President.

DEATH OF FATHER ROBERT J. SLAVIN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on Thursday of last week I, along with over 2,000 persons, attended the funeral of Father Robert J. Slavin, O.P., S.T.D., president of Providence College. The overwhelming tributes accorded to Father Slavin on Thursday by these people from all walks of life emphasized most eloquently the great loss to Providence College, the State of Rhode Island, and the Nation, occasioned by the death of this man.

Father Slavin, born in Dorchester, Mass., in 1907, was educated at Boston College High School, Providence College, and Dominican Seminaries. He was ordained as a priest in the Order of Preachers in 1934. From that date until his untimely death 4 days ago, this sincere and scholarly man dedicated his efforts to the educational profession. Father Slavin served as president of Providence College since May 1947. During these few years this institution doubled the size of its faculty and student body and made outstanding progress in its building program and educational processes.

The loss of this vigorous and dedicated educator, philosopher, administrator, and author is particularly inopportune at this crucial time in our Nation's struggle for educational excellence. The educational philosophy to which Father Slavin was dedicated is best described by the one word which is the motto of Providence College, "Veritas." Truth was the very essence of this man's objective. Truth was the means and the end of his spiritual and intellectual life. The impact of Father Slavin's philosophy on Providence College, people of Rhode Island, and his many friends and associates throughout the country was great. All who knew, knew of, or worked with this man are indeed sorrowful at his passing.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Might of Excellence," from the Providence Visitor:

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Visitor, Apr. 28, 1961]

THE MIGHT OF EXCELLENCE

The death of the Very Reverend Robert J. Slavin, O.P., has brought forth a great many splendid tributes from leaders in education and public life. The messages that have literally poured into Providence College express not only the general sense of deep and sudden loss but also provide striking evidence of the extent of Father Slavin's good influence upon his fellow men, not only here in Rhode Island but throughout the entire Nation.

In his keynote address before the national convention of the NCEA last year, Father Slavin quoted one of his own favorite passages from the ancient Greek poet Hesiod: "Before the might of excellence the high gods have set exertion. Long is the road thereto and steep and rough at the first. But when the height is achieved, then there is ease, though grievously hard in the winning." Father Slavin set the goal of excellence for himself and for Providence College. The record of his attainment of that goal is the record of his life as a Dominican priest and a Catholic college president.

The facts and figures which describe the remarkable physical expansion of the college during the 14 years of Father Slavin's administration are impressive. They cannot, however, even begin to convey a true sense of the self-sacrificing dedication of the man who made that physical expansion possible. Father Slavin found Providence College emerging from the many problems of the years of World War II. His distinguished predecessors had built well and he saw at once the true potentialities with which the college was endowed. He never rested in his efforts to bring those potentialities to the fullness of actuality and the college of today is the evidence of how well he did so.

Father Slavin stood in the community of American colleges and universities as a true representative of the wisdom of Catholicism. He was not content with what he once described as the "abortive intellectual culture," which lacks true integration and ignores the cultivation of the moral virtues. He never made the common modern blunder of confusing the mere accumulation of information with true learning. Catholic philosophy and theology were the guideposts of Father Slavin's daily life. He lived what he knew and taught. Attaching great value to excellence in programs for both the arts and the sciences and promoting fine athletic teams, Father Slavin never lost sight of the true end of Catholic education—the man made perfect in Christ.

The people of Rhode Island and the many friends of Providence College all over the country share the grief of the present college community today. Father Slavin had new goals of excellence always before him. Now that he has gone to the reward of all his striving, we have every confidence that the college he served so well will continue to pursue the goals he set.

OREGON'S COASTAL DRIVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the "Travel" section of the New York Times for Sunday, April 30, 1961, carried a most graphic account of one of the Nation's loveliest scenic areas—the coastline of Oregon.

The Times story compared the trip along Oregon's Pacific shore to a world-wide tourist attraction in Italy, Amalfi Drive above the Tyrrhenian Sea. Oregon's coastal drive is 400 miles long, compared to the 26 miles of the Amalfi Drive; in addition, the Oregon coast drive includes a chain of campsites and recreation areas.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1961]

AMALFI DRIVE, U.S.A. STYLE—OREGON'S 400-MILE-LONG COASTAL ROAD IS AMERICA'S ANSWER TO ITALIAN HIGHWAY, BUT IT IS UNPAVED, UNMARKED

(By Henry N. Ferguson)

ASTORIA, OREG.—Many Americans who visit Italy feel their stay there is not complete unless they have experienced the thrill of traveling over the famous Amalfi Drive, the 26-mile highway carved into cliffs high above the Tyrrhenian Sea. A serpent of a road writhing against the flank of the mountains, it improvises its way around the peninsula of Sorrento, carrying on a constant, nerve-tingling flirtation with the sea below.

But Americans need not leave their own shores to enjoy the beauty of such a spectacular coastal highway. They have Amalfi's counterpart right in their own backyard here in Oregon. The difference is that no tranquilizer pills are necessary to soothe jangled nerves at the end of the trail.

TOP OF LIST

Each year more delighted motorists are discovering Oregon's 400-mile coastal road, certainly one of the most unusual public highways in the Nation. It is completely unpaved and devoid of confusing road markers. It even lacks a route number of its own. Nevertheless, this highway is near the top of the list of Oregon vacation attractions.

There is a story behind this distinctive road. In 1913, Gov. Oswald West became concerned with the fact that hundreds of acres along the Oregon coast had been sold to private individuals and real estate companies, often for as little as $1.50 an acre.

After a hard-fought battle, Governor West finally pushed through the State legislature a bill making the entire Oregon coastline, from the Columbia River to the California line, a public right-of-way. The land was declared forever open to the public, the only exception being acreage already sold, including about 23 miles of beach.

As a result, Oregon today is the only coastal State that has reserved its beaches for the public. This long stretch of shoreline is free to all visitors, and its scenic attractions compare favorably with the best the country has to offer.

Oregon's coastal road boasts no ancient monuments as does the Amalfi Drive. Instead, it is a wild and varied fringe of land, almost as unspoiled today as it was when Lewis and Clark reached it.

A narrow, broken strip, it is hemmed in by the coast range, which rises 25 miles to the east and sends lateral spurs down to the sea. From the Columbia River southward, the shore is a succession of sandy beaches, serried dunes, forested headlands, and cliffs that rise steeply out of the surf.

LUSH GREENERY

Huge black boulders jut from the water, and gnarled trees, bent by age and wind, grow along the shore. Seasonal temperatures ranges from 40° to 85°, and the area's average annual rainfall of 75 inches insures a lush growth of greenery.

Comparatively few people enjoy these beaches, which are some of the most scenic in the world, because most motorists choose the faster inland highway, U.S. 101. Service stations, motels, and small villages are scattered along the shore road, but such reminders of civilization rarely intrude upon the natural scenery.

The administration of the coastal area is completely in the hands of the State highway department. Through the years, the department has established a chain of campsites and recreation facilities along the shore. These parks, spaced about 10 miles apart, provide vacationists with facilities for swimming, sunbathing, golfing, horseback riding, deep-sea fishing, and surf casting.

Some local groups have formed racing associations, which conduct frequent hotrod events on the natural drag strips along the beach.

Beachcombing also is popular among visitors. Multicolored agates, oddly twisted driftwood, occasional "message" bottles, and even glass floats from Japanese fishing nets, washed ashore by the mild Japanese Current, are common rewards for the collector.

DUNES AND FLOWERS

The coast grows in magnificence as one travels south toward the California line. One sees mountains meet the surf, sand dunes embroidered with yellow verbena and forests that are wildflowers wonderlands. The road passes Seal Rock, the fishing village of Waldport and scenic Cape Perpetua. At Heceta Head, named for the Spaniard who sighted it in 1775, there stands a white lighthouse outlined against the sky.

At the lumber center of Coos Bay, south of Umpaqua Light, there is a huge lumber mill where tramp steamers load up for foreign ports. Myrtlewood novelties are made and sold in North Bend, and a side trip to Cape Arago, with its three State parks, is well worth while. Battle Rock State Park in Port Orford, is a wild, beautiful beach where the surf is strong and the sunsets are breathtaking.

Cape Sebastian affords a fine view of miles of coastline, where massive rock monoliths shatter the incoming waves into clouds of spray. Angora sheep roam the cliffsides near Pistol River, and, near Brookings, there are farms with acres of lilies.

SHIP GRAVEYARD

Near the California border is a jumble of jagged rocks where, from the days of the Spanish galleons in the 16th century, many ships have come to grief. The skeletons of these wrecks lie buried in the sand.

Last winter, as in years past, many coastal residents kept an eye peeled for storm warnings, watched the winter storms send long Pacific rollers crashing against the rocks. It is a sight not easily forgotten.

EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appeared in the April 18 issue of Oregon Education an editorial entitled "No Prizes for Second Place." I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO PRIZES FOR SECOND PLACE

"There are no prizes for second place," declared a dismayed Congressman shortly after Russia orbited the first man in space this month. The feat underscored the Soviet lead into a new era for mankind.

What the Congressman and too large a segment of the American public fail to understand is that for far too long education has been accorded a second place among the U.S. national concerns. No. 1 concern has

been maintenance of the world's most lavish living standard.

Since World War II's start educators have consistently urged more funds for school needs. But schools have been maintained on a constant marginal basis—high teacher turnover among districts, alarming losses of trained educators in classrooms, meager supplies. And the precarious profession has lured no substantial numbers of new recruits, despite widely known facts that the "work is steady," "there will always be jobs," and birthrate bulges "will increase demand" for some time to come.

For some, second-place education was good enough; dad and granddad had not fared so well.

The era of space development fast approached.

Sputnik I temporarily shattered our national complacency. More money and effort were poured into the missile race, and America relaxed slightly as Explorer went into orbit and then a small flood of tiny U.S. space bits.

Out of the flurry came the National Defense Education Act. Education in specific areas—science, math, foreign languages, and guidance—received a substantial national stimulation with defense needs in mind.

But when Major Gagarin looped the earth and landed safely amid worldwide acclaim, where did we find ourselves? "Orbit Feat Bothers Congress," said one news headline ultraconservatively.

Where did we find ourselves?

The 1961 Oregon Legislature was buffing its nails, leisurely speculating about a $10 or $20 increase in the basic school support fund, with a few members perhaps pondering no increase at all. And Morse-Thompson legislation in Congress (S. 1021 and H.R. 4970) was near paralysis from a spiderlike injection of religious issues.

The new Russian accomplishment—more substantial than sputnik—may jar complacency again. It should totally energize our national will toward dramatic educational change.

Loudly publicized U.S. preparations are well along to launch an astronaut within the next few weeks. A success—even though belated—will invite return to our frenetic pursuit of easy living.

No less than full national dedication is required in the race for space. Defense, with around $44 billion budgeted this year, is primarily a delaying proposition in the struggle for world leadership. And the Nation's investment of about $17 billion in education this year is principally for maintenance—maintaining the current level of education for increasing numbers of pupils. Development and imagination in education require substantially more than this 3½ percent of our gross national product.

In education—in the active minds of men—lies the offensive, the leadership, the tremendous developments of tomorrow.

We still have the time and resources to catch up. The question is, Will we?

As Utah's Representative KING said, "There are no prizes for second place."

LAO AID PROGRAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 6 of this year I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Drew Pearson entitled "United States Bungled Lao Aid Program."

The Comptroller General of the United States has written me about this article, and the paragraph of it, which read:

When Haynes Miller, an auditor for the General Accounting Office in Washington, came to Laos to check on expenditures, he reported the above improprieties and problems both to Washington and to local U.S. officials in Laos.

The General Accounting Office has informed me that Haynes Miller was not an employee of the U.S. General Accounting Office. In the seventh report by the Committee on Government Operations, U.S. House of Representatives, House Report No. 546, dated June 15, 1959, page 16, it is reported that Haynes Miller was an International Cooperation Administration auditor assigned to Laos.

GAO feels it is important that this point be corrected since the General Accounting Office is an independent agency within the legislative branch of the Government and is not under the control or direction of the State Department. It has so advised Mr. Pearson of this fact, and I wish the matter to be cleared up insofar as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is concerned, as well.

PENNSYLVANIA RACING SCANDALS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am sure that many Senators have read of the scandals in Pennsylvania that have developed over the jockeying for the four harness racetrack licenses available in that Commonwealth. But it would be helpful to have a more complete account in the RECORD since there is every evidence that these scandals will grow worse before they are cleaned up. The theme song seems to be "Horses, horses, horses; bosses, bosses, bosses."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD one news article and five editorials on this subject.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Apr. 17, 1961]

SHEPPARD WON'T QUIT RACE BOARD—CHAIRMAN SCORES LICENSE GRANTED TO CLARK IN PHILLY

(By Frank M. Matthews)

HARRISBURG, April 6.—Chairman L. B. Sheppard of the State racing commission said tonight that he will remain on the job to try to see that Pennsylvania is given harness racing and parimutuel betting.

The multimillionaire chairman, who yesterday blasted his fellow commission members for granting a license to James P. Clark, finance chairman of the Philadelphia Democratic organization, added that he believes three licenses should be awarded in the Philadelphia area.

He said yesterday that Clark, along with Arthur Rooney and Dan Parish, both of Pittsburgh and friends of Gov. David Lawrence, were attempting to set up a monopoly on all financially desirable harness racing in the Philadelphia area.

WOULD RESIGN

Earlier, Sheppard had said that he would resign if politics interfered with equitable operation of racing in Pennsylvania under the new parimutuel law.

But tonight Sheppard, nationally known breeder of standard bred horses and former champion driver, said that nobody is going to freeze him out.

"I'm not going to give up my objectives to see that the people of Pennsylvania get proper harness racing, no matter where the chips may fall," Sheppard said.

He said that the meeting in which the license was awarded yesterday to Clark's Liberty Bell organization was done so by prearrangement on the part of Racing Commissioners Martin Cusick, of Sharpsville, and Edward J. Kane of Philadelphia. Cusick and Kane are Democrats. Sheppard is a Republican.

"It was cut and dried long before Wednesday's meeting of the commission," Sheppard said. "They gave me a double barreled shot in the back."

The next meeting of the racing commission is scheduled tentatively for May 22. Sheppard does not know what he is going to do at that meeting.

"Wednesday's meeting definitely showed they had some prearranged cut-and-dried plan to give the Clark crowd a license and defer action on the other 12 applications," Chairman Sheppard said.

TO SIT ON FENCE

"I'll have to sit on the fence and see what happens between now and the next meeting."

Sheppard charged yesterday that the plan of the Clark crowd was for the Liberty Bell racing organization to operate for 50 days—the maximum allowed one group—and for Rooney and Parrish to lease the track for a second 50-day period of racing.

He said that Clark, who is a powerful political influence, had been adamant that only 100 days of racing should be permitted in the Philadelphia area. Sheppard wants at least 150 days at three different tracks.

As Sheppard spoke out at his home in Hanover, racing in Pennsylvania was attacked from another front.

Republican State Chairman George I. Bloom called upon the people of Pennsylvania to demand that racing be stopped in the State before it actually gets started.

"I don't think this should be made a political payoff to the money raisers of the Democratic Party in Philadelphia," Bloom said.

"We can expect the people of Pennsylvania to rise up and repeal the law authorizing harness racing and parimutuel betting in Pennsylvania if this is the type of operation the commission gives us," Bloom said.

[From the Philadelphia Bulletin, Apr. 6, 1961]

UNHARNESSED POLITICIANS

The shenanigans involved in the jockeying for the four harness racetrack licenses available in Pennsylvania have taken on a smell much like that which emanates from a stable.

The conflict for the four plums has boiled down to a struggle between the politicians and the racehorse owners, both of which groups are well represented among the leading applicants for the licenses. The chairman of the State harness racing commission, which grants the licenses, is Lawrence B. Sheppard, a leading owner of trotters and pacers. Mr. Sheppard has tended to be sympathetic to the applications of the owners.

The other two commission members, Democrats unlike Mr. Sheppard, have been inclined to favor the politician applicants.

The commission in a heated meeting yesterday, granted a license to a group controlled by James P. Clark, prominent Philadelphia Democrat, then adjourned without acting on other applications.

Mr. Clark is reported to be insisting that no more than two tracks be licensed in the most profitable Philadelphia area so that racing here may be limited to 100 days. The second group, according to Mr. Clark's plans, would be one controlled by a Pittsburgh syndicate which would lease Mr. Clark's track for its meet.

Chairman Sheppard insists this would give Mr. Clark a virtual monopoly over all racing in the Philadelphia area. He would like to see a third track in the area go to an owner's group.

Probably, with benefit of hindsight, the blame for the unsavory situation lies with the State's harness racing legislation. A large part of the current mess would have been avoided if the legislation had required public financing of tracks and had prohibited track ownership by politicians, as was done in New York. Perhaps horseowners should have been excluded, too, because of the possible conflict of interest involved.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Apr. 6, 1961]

HORSES AND POLITICIANS

The charges of political favoritism which accompanied yesterday's decision by the State harness racing commission should surprise no one. Before the racing referendum last April 26, the Pittsburgh Press and other opponents of legalized gambling repeatedly warned that such disputes would plague Pennsylvania.

"The Pennsylvania law," the Press pointed out, "gives the public no protection against the intrusion of politics and political influence in this dubious business of track operation, and if the tracks are authorized it can be considered certain that politics will find its way into the easy money—at the expense of political integrity and public confidence in government."

Unfortunately for Pennsylvania, that prediction came true yesterday when the State's first harness racing permit was awarded to a Philadelphia Democratic leader over the protests of Commission Chairman Lawrence B. Sheppard. The license was given to the Liberty Bell Racing Association, headed by James P. Clark, finance chairman of the Philadelphia Democratic organization and a close associate of that city's Democratic leader, U.S. Representative WILLIAM J. GREEN.

Mr. Sheppard said that the Liberty Bell Association intends to lease its Philadelphia track to Daniel Parish, Mount Lebanon contractor and active Democrat, and to Arthur J. Rooney, president of the Pittsburgh Steelers.

"To me," said Mr. Sheppard, "this is unthinkable because it is not to the best interest of the State, the patrons of racing and the sport itself where two political groups are awarded all the worthwhile racing in Pennsylvania and virtually controlled by one man."

Full exposure of this infectious situation has already brought a demand that harness racing be repealed in Pennsylvania. State Senator Robert D. Fleming of Aspinwall attacked this "shameful attempt at a political money grab" and announced that he will introduce a repealer next week.

Senator Fleming's proposal could redeem Pennsylvania from the monumental blunder of the 1959 legislature, which passed a horse-race gambling law so loosely drawn that it gave the public no protection from political domination of the horse tracks.

There is no need to spell out the dangers of mixing politics and gambling. Legalized gambling is, itself, an unhealthy activity which exists on the public's gullibility. When politics is added, it becomes intolerable.

Before Pennsylvania gets in too deep, let's call the whole thing off.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Apr. 7, 1961]

UNHOLY ALLIANCE—POLITICS AND RACING JUST WON'T MIX

Efforts to manipulate legalized racetrack betting into a profitable political monopoly, as charged by the chairman of the State harness racing commission, surprise us not in the least.

When six Pennsylvania counties—all east of the Alleghenies—voted last April to legalize track betting, we knew it was only a question of time until racing would be involved in a political scandal. Our only surprise now is in the timing; Commission Chairman L. B. Sheppard, a Republican, has blown the whistle on his two Democratic colleagues even before a track was built.

In urging Pennsylvanians to vote against legal track betting, the Post-Gazette a year ago said that the relatively small amount of revenue the State would get from racing could not possibly justify the evils:

Among these evils are the loss of business to normal channels of trade, the attraction to track communities of undesirable hangers-on, and the invitation to scandals involving people looking for a sure thing and a fast buck.

But worst of all is the unholy alliance of the gambling fraternity and public officials. Operators in some States have allowed employment at their tracks to be used as political patronage to curry favor with legislators. Despite a warning experience in New York, Pennsylvania legislators failed to insert in their racing bill provisions to prevent public and party officials from having financial interests in the operation of racetracks.

In view of that dark prediction, let us now trace events leading to the charges leveled at the racing commission's Democratic majority by Chairman Sheppard.

Philadelphia, with the largest population in Pennsylvania, was one of the counties that voted for legalized betting. The vote there was turned out by the Democratic organization headed by Congressman BILL GREEN and his financial coleader, a wealthy trucker named James P. Clark.

Then Governor Lawrence, who favored the racing legislation, named to the commission Mr. Sheppard, Martin J. Cusick, a Sharpsville attorney, and Edward J. Kane, a Philadelphia builder.

Now Mr. Sheppard charges that Messrs. Cusick and Kane have voted what amounts to a racetrack monopoly for the Liberty Bell Racing Association, of Philadelphia, in which Mr. Clark owns all of the voting stock.

What's more, says Mr. Sheppard, two Allegheny County buddies of the Governor, Arthur Rooney and Dan Parish, have formed the Bucks County Racing Association and propose to operate on Mr. Clark's racetrack for 50 days each season under a lease agreement. Consequently, the chairman has concluded that "this whole thing results in an absolute monopoly of all the best racing in Pennsylvania."

Incidentally, Liberty Bell proposes to build a mile track rather than a five-eighths-mile harness track. That means that the track-owners feel that once they are in business, they can get the legislature to permit the conversion of harness racing to thoroughbred racing.

Mr. Sheppard has said that he will resign if politics enters into Pennsylvania harness racing. Since he appears to be the only watchdog in a position to expose political manipulations, we urge him to remain on the job until the legislature repeals or modifies racetrack legislation.

GOP Senator Robert D. Fleming, of Allegheny County, has introduced legislation to rip out parimutuel betting. The legislature ought to approve it so that racetrack scandals in this State can die aborning.

Failing that, however, the legislature as a minimum should approve a bill introduced by Representative Maurice Goldstein, of Pittsburgh, to bar public and party officials from holding racing interests. Unless that is done, there will be no way to curb political corruption on the million-dollar gravy train known as parimutuel betting.

[From the Harrisburg Patriot, Apr. 14, 1961]

THE PUBLIC AND GAMBLING—A GOOD GOVERNMENT ISSUE

The New York State Investigation Commission has just issued a 136-page report on professional gambling and organized crime.

In central New York State, an area very similar to our midstate Pennsylvania, the bookmakers did a gross business of $500 million in 1959, the commission reported, and had a net profit of $50 million.

The report added: "Gambling revenues are used to pay for murders, to underwrite the labor racketeers, to corrupt the public official, to erect a still, to obtain firearms unlawfully, to purchase contraband drugs, to pave the way for introduction of prostitution, and to finance the Shylock."

The commission calls for drastic changes in society's attitude on professional gambling.

It cites chapter and verse on the consequences of graft and corruption and adds: "Organized crime's program of public relations is so successful that a majority of the population refuses to recognize the inherent danger."

Unlike New York, Pennsylvania does not have an investigation commission.

But our Commonwealth most certainly will get one when the first scandal blows up—as blow up it inevitably will. What happened in neighboring New York State was detailed on this page yesterday—the profiteering, ownership of harness race tracks, the alliances with racketeers by public officials, employees, and political party officers. All this was spread onto the public record in New York when a murder triggered a full-scale investigation.

The Lawrence administration and the Democratic majority in our legislature are adamant in the argument that public officials, public employees, and political powers won't be second-class citizens in Pennsylvania, barred from profiting off the multimillion-dollar parimutuel harness race gambling which will get underway late this year or next.

The one and only track license to be issued of the four allowed by law has been given by the Democratic-controlled harness racing commission to a syndicate headed up by a powerful Philadelphia Democratic Party officer.

Just this week the Democrats, with administration backing, beat down a Republican minority attempt to force the Goldstein bill out of committee. This is the bill that would bar public and political figures from participation in this government-regulated monopoly.

This bill deserves to be considered and passed on its merits. The experience of other States earlier in similar circumstances stands as clear-cut testimony to that.

But if the merits of the legislation are lost on the Lawrence administration and the Democratic majority, as obviously is the case, perhaps practical political considerations can prevail.

Surely, the practical politicians who are running Pennsylvania's Democratic Party must recognize that they are handing to a Republican opposition, which has lost just about every major statewide office in sight, a built-to-order situation for a comeback.

Here is a sure-fire good-government issue for next year's full-scale Governor and legislature campaigning, and the Republicans are already trying to do something with it.

For this reason if no other, the Lawrence administration and the Democratic majority may reconsider their stand on house bill 905. Whatever the motivation, enactment into law of a ban on participation in parimutuel gambling activities by public and political officials would be in the best interests of Pennsylvania.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Apr. 14, 1961]

IN THE SADDLE

House Democrats boldly served notice that they endorse politicians and public officials having a financial interest in harness racing

tracks. They made their position known by voting unanimously to keep the Goldstein bill bottled up.

The legislation, introduced by Representative Maurice H. Goldstein, Squirrel Hill Republican, would have barred politicians and public officials from track ownership. It was based upon a similar bill passed by New York State. That act was prompted after racing scandals. Gov. Nelson Rockefeller twice has vetoed bills easing restrictions on public officials and employees having financial interests in race tracks.

Republican efforts to get the Goldstein bill out of committee followed accusations by L. B. Sheppard, State racing commission chairman. Mr. Sheppard charged that the other two commission members were trying to create a political monopoly in granting the first racing license to James P. Clark, Philadelphia Democratic finance chairman. Mr. Sheppard named Steelers owner Arthur Rooney and Pittsburgh contractor Dan Parish as part of the planned racing monopoly in the Philadelphia area.

Thousands of Pennsylvania voters signified at the referendum last year that they wanted no part of legalized race track betting. Less than half of 14 counties holding referendums on the issue voted in its favor. There also are many thousands of citizens who voted yes on the issue who still must not like to see politicians gaining a monetary advantage from race tracks.

In an arrogant display of power, Democratic lawmakers are refusing to mollify either group by passing into law a safeguard against politicians and public officials getting involved in another racing scandal. Apparently the Democrats are convinced that voters permanently have placed them in control of a one-party State and they can do as they please.

As a word of advice to the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania, we suggest they don't push their luck—or the voters—too far.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, it is a generally accepted fact that although the Polish Government is communistic, the vast majority of the people in Poland are not.

This gives us all the more reason to join with the friends of Poland throughout the world in the observation on May 3 of the 170th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. By these public observances we tell the Polish people that we know their true sentiments lie with the May 3 constitution and not with the current government.

The Polish constitution was enacted by the Diet in 1791 and drew inspiration from the American Declaration of Independence. This sharing of ideals was mutual, since Poles helped the American Revolution through men like Casimer Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciusko.

Althougl. this constitution is not in effect today with a Red government in control, the ideals laid down in it survive in the hearts of all Poles. I am proud to join with the 7 million Americans of Polish origin in looking forward to the day when that once free land will again join the family of free and sovereign nations.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY AT 11 O'CLOCK A.M.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes a.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 3, 1961, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 1, 1961:

IN THE ARMY

Brig. Gen. Thomas Patrick Carroll, O1321152, Army National Guard of the United States, for promotion to major general, as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3392.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, in the Adjutant General's Corps, Army National Guard of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3392:

To be major generals

Col. Thomas Joseph Donnelly, O384942.
Col. Roderic Lee Hill, O416963.
Col. Leonard Holland, O1289581.
Col. Van Daley Nunally, Jr., O1167144.

To be brigadier generals

Lt. Col. John Samuel Anderson, O1283632.
Lt. Col. Chester James Moeglein, O384958.
Maj. Gen. Hal Williams, O1882263.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1961:

DIRECTOR OF THE CENSUS

Richard M. Scammon, of Minnesota, to be Director of the Census.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Louis J. Doyle, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Lawrence M. Henry, of Colorado, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Colorado for the term of 4 years.

George E. Hill, of Michigan, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Michigan for a term of 4 years.

Justin J. Mahoney, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of New York for a term of 4 years.

Carl W. Feickert, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years.

William T. Thurman, of Utah, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Utah for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHALS

Charles B. Bendlage, Jr., of Iowa, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years.

James E. Byrne, Jr., of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of New York for the term of 4 years.

James J. P. McShane, of Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the District of Columbia for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

MAY 1, 1961.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Rev. Hugh A. Jones, the Methodist Church, Linn Creek, Mo., offered the following prayer:

Mark 11: 25: *Whenever you stand praying, forgive, if you have anything against anyone.*

Eternal, creative, and sustaining spirit of the universe; we praise Thy holy name.

In the purity of Thy presence, we are stricken by our impurities and beseech the dispensation of Thy transforming power. Replace our arrogance with humility; our ignorance with wisdom; our cowardice with courage; our deceit with integrity; our selfishness with liberality, and our hatred with brotherly love.

Enter into this legislative body, through the chambers of their hearts, occupy them so completely that Thy divine transforming spirit shall emanate into all segments of our Government and influence all nations to do Thy holy will.

Unto Thee, O God, we give all glory and praise evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 27, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6100. An act to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize off-season cruises by American-flag passenger vessels.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 881. An act to revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 35) to permit documentation of vessels sold or transferred abroad.

The message also announced that the Chair had appointed the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH] a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy; also the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and having cleared the matter with the

ranking minority Member in the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], and Senator BUSH in the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the committee have until tomorrow at noon to file a report that was due yesterday, on a Sunday, along with individual supplemental views.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

JOHN J. O'NEILL

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Long Island has lost one of its finest newspapermen, John J. O'Neill, who has passed away at the age of 76.

John O'Neill was an editor, a publisher, and a man of the highest principles. For over 25 years, he published the Franklin Square Bulletin and the Floral Park Bulletin, in New York, and prior to this he was associated with the Floral Park Gateway, all local weekly newspapers which are invaluable to us for their grassroots opinions.

A pillar of his community, John O'Neill was a member of the Franklin Square School Board for 20 years and its president for 8. For many years he was a member of the Sewanhaka Central High School District Board. He helped to found the Franklin Square Community League, in his youth, and for many years was a member of the Franklin Square Fire Department. His activities in civic and fraternal organizations are legion.

This outstanding citizen leaves a son, Jim O'Neill, who is following in his father's footsteps and is now a reporter on Long Island's Newsday.

John O'Neill was a true reporter in the highest journalistic sense and his newspapers never "smeared" anybody. Nassau County is going to miss his wise counsel.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN STATUTORY AWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 861) to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman will tell the House his future intentions on this bill so that we can approach it in a different way.

Mr. FORD. My reason for asking that this bill be passed over is that the Veterans' Administration both in the previous administration and in the present administration has written letters to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs objecting to this proposal on the basis that it is an unwise precedent. Consequently, in deference to their views, I have asked that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman is aware that this bill has been passed by the House three times. I am sure he is aware that it has been reported out of our committee unanimously, and I am also sure the gentleman is aware that the gentleman's committee as well as the gentleman himself does not do just exactly what any administration tells him to do, but does what he thinks is the right thing to do based on his best judgment.

Mr. FORD. That is correct, but when you get a unanimity of opinion from both the previous and present administrations and not only the Veterans' Administration but the Bureau of the Budget, I have doubts as to whether this ought to be approved on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

STUDY OF REHABILITATION OF AGING VETERANS

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 73) providing for a study by the Veterans' Administration into the problems of veterans who are elderly, chronically ill, or otherwise handicapped.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Whereas the average age of veterans of the Spanish-American War is eighty-three years; the average age of veterans of the Indian Wars is ninety-one years; and the average age of veterans of World War I is sixty-six; and

Whereas the medical problems facing elderly veterans become of ever-increasing severity as advances in medicine and public health, through increasing lifespans, impose larger burdens on facilities for the care of the chronically ill; and

Whereas the increasing average age of war veterans entitled to hospital or domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration is likely to lead to increasing demands for such care; and

Whereas the number of aged veterans in need of care is expected to double by the year 1970 and to quadruple by the year 2000; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration is currently subject to numerical ceilings upon the number of beds which can be utilized annually for the care of veterans; and

Whereas means and methods which can reduce the need for beds by various categories of patients will make such beds available for treatment of other categories of veterans needing care; and

Whereas there is a need for studies focused upon specific methods of assisting in the cure and rehabilitation of the various categories of patients who may otherwise require longtime care from the Veterans' Administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall conduct a study, at a maximum cost of $300,000, of the advisability and practicability of various methods of rehabilitating, restoring to useful and productive lives, and preventing physical and mental deterioration of veterans receiving or entitled to receive hospitalization, or domiciliary care, by the Veterans' Administration. Such study shall include, but not be limited to—

(1) the use of sheltered workshops;

(2) provision of home care, including the use of home helps;

(3) visiting services;

(4) outpatient medical care;

(5) inpatient medical care;

(6) domiciliary visits;

(7) nursing care;

(8) intermediate care;

(9) foster-care homes;

(10) halfway houses;

(11) the use in industry of disabled veterans (including veterans suffering from neuropsychiatric disabilities);

(12) increased utilization of elderly veterans in new jobs in industry; and

(13) general research into the problems of aged veterans.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the study referred to in the first section of this joint resolution, the Administrator may make grants for studies to private or governmental agencies, or both, and may make contracts with private industry for the employment in such industry of elderly veterans and disabled veterans (including veterans suffering from neuropsychiatric disabilities).

(b) In carrying out such study, the Administrator may, with the consent of the veterans concerned, utilize the services of not more than five hundred veterans who are receiving long-term hospital or domiciliary care from the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 3. The study required by this joint resolution shall be completed before December 31, 1963. On or before March 31, 1964, the Administrator shall submit a report to the Congress on the results of such study, together with such recommendations as he deems advisable.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3 after line 17 insert the following:

In carrying out such study, the Administrator shall conduct a pilot project involving the provision of outpatient services for veterans suffering from service-connected or non-service-connected disabilities designed to ascertain the feasibility of a program of care for veterans requiring long-term care in which such veterans would be maintained outside of Veterans' Administration facilities through the utilization of such supplemental payments as might be required in addition to any other payments to which the veteran may be entitled, together with visiting services, home care, outpatient medical care, and other needed services and care being furnished.

On page 4, line 16, strike out "long-term" and insert in lieu thereof "or entitled to receive."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 310) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Chapter 163 is amended—

(A) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 2736. Property loss; personal injury or death: incident to use of property of the United States and not cognizable under other law

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of a military department with the approval of the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, he or his designee may settle and pay, in an amount not more than $1,000, a claim against the United States, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for—

"(1) damage to, or loss of, property; or

"(2) personal injury or death; caused by a civilian official or employee of that department or a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, as the case may be, incident to the use of a vehicle of the United States at any place, or any other property of the United States on a Government installation.

"(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, he or his designee has the same authority as the Secretary of a military department with respect to a claim, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for—

"(1) damage to, or loss of, property; or

"(2) personal injury or death; caused by a civilian official or employee of the Department of Defense not covered by subsection (a), incident to the use of a vehicle of the United States at any place, or any other property of the United States on a Government installation.

"(c) Under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, he or his designee may settle and pay, in an amount not more than $1,000, a claim against the United States, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for—

"(1) damage to, or loss of, property; or

"(2) personal injury or death; caused by a member of, or a civilian official or employee of the United States Coast Guard, incident to the use of a vehicle of the United States at any place, or any other property of the United States on a Government installation.

"(d) A claim may not be allowed under subsection (a), (b), or (c) if the damage to, or loss of, property, or the personal injury or death, was caused wholly or partly by a negligent or wrongful act of the claimant, his agent, or his employee.

"(e) A claim for personal injury or death under this section may not be allowed for more than the cost of reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses actually incurred, and not otherwise furnished or paid by the United States.

"(f) No claim may be allowed under this section unless it is presented in writing within two years after it accrues.

"(g) A claim may not be paid under subsection (a), (b), or (c) unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

"(h) No claim or any part thereof, the amount of which is legally recoverable by the claimant under an indemnifying law or indemnity contract, may be paid under this section. No subrogated claim may be paid under this section.

"(i) So far as practicable, regulations prescribed under this section shall be uniform for the military departments."

(B) By adding the following item at the end of the analysis:

"2736. Property loss; personal injury or death: incident to use of property of the United States and not cognizable under other law."

(2) Chapter 653 is amended—

(A) by repealing section 7625; and

(B) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

"7625. Claims against the United States: private property; loss or damage."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Chapter 163 is amended—

(A) by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"§ 2736. Property loss; personal injury or death: incident to use of property of the United States and not cognizable under other law

"(a) Under such regulations as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, he or his designee may settle and pay, in an amount not more than $1,000, a claim against the United States, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for—

"(1) damage to, or loss of, property; or

"(2) personal injury or death;

caused by a civilian official or employee of a military department or the Coast Guard, or a member of the armed forces, incident to the use of a vehicle of the United States at any place, or any other property of the United States on a Government installation.

"(b) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, he or his designee has the same authority as the Secretary of a military department with respect to a claim, not cognizable under any other provision of law, for—

"(1) damage to, or loss of, property; or

"(2) personal injury or death;

caused by a civilian official or employee of the Department of Defense not covered by subsection (a), incident to the use of a vehicle of the United States at any place, or any other property of the United States on a Government installation.

"(c) A claim may not be allowed under subsection (a) or (b) if the damage to, or loss of, property, or the personal injury or death, was caused wholly or partly by a negligent or wrongful act of the claimant, his agent, or his employee.

"(d) A claim for personal injury or death under this section may not be allowed for more than the cost of reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses actually incurred, and not otherwise furnished or paid by the United States.

"(e) No claim may be allowed under this section unless it is presented in writing within two years after it accrues.

"(f) A claim may not be paid under subsection (a) or (b) unless the amount tendered is accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction.

"(g) No claim or any part thereof, the amount of which is legally recoverable by the claimant under an indemnifying law or indemnity contract, may be paid under this section. No subrogated claim may be paid under this section.

"(h) So far as practicable, regulations prescribed under this section shall be uniform. Regulations prescribed under this section by the Secretaries of the military departments must be approved by the Secretary of Defense."; and

(B) by adding the following item at the end of the analysis:

"2736. Property loss; personal injury or death: incident to use of property of the United States and not cognizable under other law."

(2) Chapter 653 is amended—

(A) by repealing section 7625; and

(B) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

"7625. Claims against the United States: private property; loss or damage."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINCESS ANNE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD, VIRGINIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1627) for the relief of the Princess Anne County School Board, Virginia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Princess Anne County School Board, Princess Anne County, Virginia, the amount fixed by the Court of Claims in accordance with section 2 of this Act, upon the conveyance to the United States within the one-year period beginning on the date that court certifies its determination of value as directed in section 2 of this Act, of all right, title, and interest of such board in and to such school property. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said board against the United States on account of the loss of use of the school property known as Oceana Public School, and the cost of relocating such school, because of the noise and danger from jet powered aircraft using the nearby Oceana Naval Air Station: *Provided,* That no part of the amount paid as provided in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the Court of Claims to hear evidence concerning the value of the school property

known as the Oceana Public School, determine that value, and certify its determination to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment of the amount found due to the Princess Anne County School Board, Princess Anne County, Virginia, in accordance with the authority contained in section 1 of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike "all" and insert "any and all".

Page 2, lines 3, 4, 5, and 6, strike "on account of the loss of use of the school property known as Oceana Public School, and the cost of relocating such school, because of the noise and danger from jet-powered aircraft using the nearby Oceana Naval Air Station:" and insert "growing out of or connected with the operation of aircraft at the Oceana Naval Air Base:".

Page 2, line 22, after "Act." insert "For the purposes of this Act the value fixed by the Court of Claims shall be the market value of the land and buildings, as of January 1, 1958, of the property known as the Oceana Public School."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL RESERVED PHOSPHATE INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN LANDS LOCATED IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA TO THE RECORD OWNERS OF THE SURFACE THEREOF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2898) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, sell, and quitclaim all phosphate interests now owned by the United States in and to the hereinafter described lands to the present record owner or owners of the surface rights thereof: The southeast quarter of the northwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 11; the south half of the southwest quarter and the north half of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 12; the east half of the southwest quarter and the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 1; all in township 32 south, range 27 east; and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 36, township 31 south, range 27 east, all in Polk County, Florida.

SEC. 2. In the event that the Secretary of the Interior determines that the lands described in the first section are not prospectively valuable for phosphate, he shall convey the reserved phosphate interests to the present record owner or owners of the surface rights upon the payment of a sum of $200 to reimburse the United States for the administrative costs of the conveyance; otherwise, the phosphate interests shall be sold to the record owner or owners of the surface rights upon the payment of a sum equal to $200 plus the fair market value of the phosphate interests as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary.

SEC. 3. Proceeds from the sale made hereunder shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO SELL RESERVED PHOSPHATE INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN LANDS LOCATED IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA TO THE RECORD OWNERS OF THE SURFACE THEREOF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3526) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will someone explain this bill?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, both of these bills are bills which represent a return to the surface owners of certain mineral rights for which the owners will pay a consideration based on whatever the fair value is, and on a determination that has been made by the Department of the Interior that these mineral interests are not substantial enough to ever justify mining and development. At the present time, they operate as an impediment to the development of this land.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Are they at the present time owned by the Department of the Interior?

Mr. EDMONDSON. They are owned by the Government at this time. They were reserved by the Government at the time title to the land was acquired.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. In other words, it is not expected that it would be profitable to mine these minerals in the future?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The evidence with respect to both of these tracts involved in the two bills on the calendar today, Calendar No. 37 and No. 38, was that it was not considered to be worth development in the future by the Department of the Interior. However, there will be compensation paid for whatever the value of the minerals is.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Does the Department of the Interior own this land in fee simple or do they just own the mineral rights?

Mr. EDMONDSON. The Department of the Interior owns only the mineral rights. The surface is owned by the persons to whom it is proposed to sell the mineral rights.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey, sell, and quitclaim all phosphate interests now owned by the United States in and to the hereinafter described lands to the present record owner or owners of the surface rights thereof:

East half of the northwest quarter, of section 25, township 38 south, range 19 east, Sarasota County, Florida.

SEC. 2. In the event that the Secretary determines that the lands described in section 1 are not prospectively valuable for phosphate, he shall convey the reserved phosphate interests to the present record owner or owners of the surface rights upon the payment of a sum of $200 to reimburse the United States for the administrative costs of the conveyance; otherwise, the phosphate interests shall be sold to the record owner or owners of the surface rights upon the payment of a sum equal to $200 plus the fair market value of the phosphate interests as determined by the Secretary after taking into consideration such appraisals as he deems necessary.

SEC. 3. Proceeds for the sale made hereunder shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 470) to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (56 Stat. 248), is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph (6) to read as follows:

"(6) A domestic partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of individuals, supervised, directed, controlled, or financed, in whole or in substantial part, by any foreign government or foreign political party;".

SEC. 2. Section 3(d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only in private and nonpolitical financial or mercantile activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal or in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, if such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Act of November 4, 1939, as amended (54 Stat. 48), and any such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder;".

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the session I introduced several bills to carry forward the unfinished business of the Judiciary Committee from the 86th Congress. One of these was H.R. 470, a bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act so as to include within the definition of a "foreign principal," domestic organizations which are substantially "supervised, directed, controlled, or financed" by a foreign government or foreign political party.

In addition the bill seeks to clarify the so-called commercial exemptions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act by providing that a foreign principal, in order for its agents to be eligible for exemption from registering under the act, must be engaged in activities which are either private and nonpolitical and financial or private and nonpolitical and mercantile.

H.R. 470 is identical with H.R. 6817 which passed the House on August 31, 1959.

I again urge passage of this legislation which was strongly recommended by the Attorney General during the last session of Congress.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGN OF U.S. FLAG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1743) providing for the design of the flag of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask someone if this changes the dimensions of the flag in any way?

Mr. LIBONATI. No, it does not. It is purely a codification of the methods President Eisenhower used in determining the design of the present flag. There is no law covering this subject, and this codifies President Eisenhower's views.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 1 and 2 of title 4, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

"§ 1. Flag; design

"The flag of the United States shall have thirteen horizontal stripes of the same width, alternate red and white, with a union consisting of as many white stars on a field of blue as there are States in the Union.

"§ 2. Same; additional stars; dimensions

"(a) Whenever a new State is admitted to the Union, the President shall cause a plan to be made setting forth the positions of the stars in the union of the flag. He shall also cause to be fixed the proportionate dimensions of the constituent parts of the flag.

"(b) The addition of each new star to the union of the flag shall take effect on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State.

"(c) All flags of the United States on hand on the 4th day of July next succeeding the admission of a new State may be continued in use until unserviceable, but all flags manufactured for use after that date should conform to the design and specifications adopted pursuant to this section."

SEC. 2. Items 1 and 2 of the chapter analysis of chapter 1 of title 4 are amended to read as follows:

"Flag; design.

"Same; additional stars; dimensions."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFINING THE TERM "ORGANIZE" AS USED IN THE SMITH ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3247) to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term "organize" as used in that section.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask that the committee explain this bill a little.

Mr. LIBONATI. All the bill does is to clarify the meaning of the term "organize." It is to cover those organizations that are directed and controlled by Communist connections. The present law reads that these organizations must be directly subsidized in their support. The practice is now not to grant subsidies but to direct and control. So, in reality, it is a continuing interest.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not any hearings were held on this bill?

Mr. LIBONATI. In the committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. By the committee.

Mr. LIBONATI. This bill passed the House last year. No hearings were held this year because of that.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Were hearings held previously?

Mr. LIBONATI, Yes; they were.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. And is there an administration report by this administration on this bill?

Mr. LIBONATI. In view of the fact that the bill was passed last year the committee followed the usual practice to report out bills in accordance with a former declaration of the House unless there is objection.

Does the gentleman object to the passage of this bill?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I do not know whether I object or not at the present time, but I would ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. WALTER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TRANSPORTATION OF WATER-HYACINTHS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2041) to amend section 46, title 18, United States Code, with respect to transportation of water-hyacinths and seeds.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 46, title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the word "both", before the period, "*: Provided,* That none of the provisions of this section shall be applicable with respect to the transportation of water-hyacinth plants (Eichhornia crassipes) or the seeds thereof, or advertisements of such plants or seeds, in interstate commerce into or within such areas of the United States as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate as areas in which water-hyacinths are unable to survive winter weather."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, strike out "or within such areas of the United States as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate as areas in which water-hyacinths are unable to survive winter weather", and substitute "the States of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, or Oregon or any State north thereof, or with respect to advertisements in such States concerning such plants or seeds".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE WHEN APPLYING FOR INTERLOCUTORY RELIEF

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5656) to provide for reasonable notice of applications to the U.S. courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third sentence of subsection (b) of subsection 9 of the Act of December 29, 1950 (64 Stat. 1132; 5 U.S.C. 1039), is amended to read as follows: "In cases where irreparable damage would otherwise ensue to the petitioner, the court of appeals may, on hearing, after reasonable notice to the agency and to the Attorney General, order a temporary stay or suspension, in whole or in part, of the operation of the order of the agency for not more than sixty days from the date of such order pending the hearing on the application for such interlocutory injunction, in which case such order of the court of appeals shall contain a specific finding, based on evidence submitted to the court of appeals, and identified by reference thereto, that such irreparable damage would result to petitioner and specifying the nature of such damage."

SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of section 1006 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 795; 49 U.S.C. 1486(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Upon transmittal of the petition to the Board or Administrator, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, modify, or set aside the order complained of, in whole or in part, and if need be, to order further proceedings by the Board or Administrator. Upon good cause shown and after reasonable notice to the Board or Administrator, interlocutory relief may be granted by stay of the order or by such mandatory or other relief as may be appropriate."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAND PURCHASE ON BLUE RIDGE AND NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAYS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5765) to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to consolidate, on the Blue Ridge Parkway and the Natchez Trace Parkway, the land forming each such parkway, to adjust ownership lines, and to eliminate hazardous crossings of and accesses to these parkways, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, by purchase or exchange, land and interests in land contiguous to the parkways. In consummating exchanges under this Act, the Secretary may transfer parkway land, interests therein, and easements: *Provided,* That the property rights so exchanged shall be approximately equal in value.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LANDS IN THE GRANITE CREEK AREA, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2279) to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army, at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on the Consent Calendar today we have four or five somewhat similar bills involving the withdrawal of lands in Alaska. Inasmuch as this is rather new subject matter on the Consent Calendar I would like to ask the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs what the background is for this kind of legislation and for any other information that is pertinent so the House, as a whole, will know in this instance as well as in others, what we are doing.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield. This bill and five others have been brought to the House in conformity with what is known as the Engle Act passed by the Congress and approved by the President during the 85th Congress. At that time the military had several withdrawals of public land before the various agencies of Government. We had been advised that there were such pending withdrawal requests amounting in acreage to over 6½ million acres in continental United States. The Engle bill provides that if the military wishes to withdraw public land and the acreage in such request is over 5,000, they must come before the Congress and receive the approval of the Congress and the Chief Executive.

This bill, and the one which we passed on the last Consent Calendar, covering land in Arizona, have been in conformity with the program which is provided in the Engle Act.

There are five bills on the calendar today and inasmuch as all of these bills follow the same pattern of the Luke-Williams Air Force Range request, we had them put on the Consent Calendar rather than bring them before the House under suspension of the rules. As far as I am aware, as of this time, these bills and perhaps three more like pieces of legislation are the only ones that will be before the Congress during the present session. This means that through this procedure we have cut down the requests of the military from something like 6½ million acres of requested withdrawals of land from the Federal land area to somewhat under 1 million acres of land in continental United States plus the areas considered today in Alaska.

The military appeared before the committee which is chairmaned by the gentlewoman from Idaho and made a case in each instance for the particular area which they requested. The committee decided it would be necessary to have this land placed in condition so that after the military had finished with its use of the land it could be used for any other purpose that might be desirable. Accordingly, the committee has requested that the bills be amended so that each bill, except one, carries provisions calling for decontamination and dedudding programs.

Mr. FORD. Once these lands have been withdrawn based on the legislation, what happens when the military abandons use? Do we have to pass another law and return the land to the proper agency of the executive branch?

Mr. ASPINALL. In each instance, may I say, that has been brought before this Congress in the six bills, each provide for withdrawal for a 10-year period, plus a renewal period for 5 years. We have been advised by the military that they will come before our committee in case they desire renewals. At the end of 15 years the lands automatically go back to the public land area of the United States. The provisions to which I refer providing for decontamination or dedudding, means that the military must see to it that the land is sent back to the Federal Government in a usable condition.

The five bills considered today involving the withdrawal and reservation of public lands in Alaska for military purposes by the Department of the Army are required by the act of February 28, 1958, which precludes the withdrawal of lands in excess of 5,000 acres except by act of Congress.

This group of bills was considered together as a package by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I can assure my colleagues that representatives of the Department of the Army demonstrated to our full satisfaction the military requirement for these lands. We were impressed with the extent of military activity being carried on in this northernmost outpost of our country and its defenses. It is vital to our national security.

For the information of the Members I would like to list the areas and acreages involved with a brief recapitulation of the purpose of each:

	Acres
Fort Greely air drop and equipment testing area (H.R. 2279)	51,400
Surface-to-air (Nike) range H.R. 2280	607,800
Impact area of Fort Richardson (H.R. 2281)	4,706
Yukon Command training site (H.R 2282)	256,000
Fort Greely maneuver area (H.R. 2283)	572,000
Total	1,491,906

We realize that even in Alaska this represents a large acreage. We realize that even though there may be little if any demand for these lands at this time they may be valuable in the future. Nobody knows the values that may be present; there may even be an unheard of or an undiscovered mineral underlying these lands that in the long run may be as vital to our national well being as the military training now in progress.

We therefore amended four of the five bills to require that the Secretary of the Interior act on behalf of the Federal Government to designate areas in which dedudding and decontamination operations shall be carried out by the Department of the Army in order to make the lands safe for nonmilitary use when no longer required for defense purposes. In the case of the fifth bill—H.R. 2281, the artillery impact area for troops at Fort Richardson—no decontamination clause was deemed feasible at this time because the lands involved were contaminated during World War II use and are unsafe now. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of the Interior has prior to this time withdrawn the lands from all forms of appropriation in the interest of the public safety.

The committee has previously expressed its concern at the failure of the military departments to institute and prosecute vigorous cleanup procedures. As I indicated to the House on another occasion, we are looking into this matter in order to determine whether legislation is necessary with regard to public domain areas that have been made unsafe for reuse by the public. In the meantime, as these statutory withdrawals come along, it is our intention to provide some safeguard for the future generations who may have a greater need for this land.

As indicated in the committee reports on the bills, this legislation came to us as part of the administration's legislative program. Enactment of the bills as amended will provide for unrestricted use by the military departments of the lands involved during the time that they are needed by the military. In response to some demands that the lands be kept open for hunting, fishing and trapping, the committee has also amended the bills covering lands where this is feasible to permit these activities whenever they are determined by the Secretary of the Army to be consistent with military requirements and the public safety. This will provide the assurance of uninterrupted use when needed but emphasizes

the fact that Congress is concerned that these values are available to the public whenever it is feasible.

In closing, I would like to call attention to one bill which provides a different and unusual situation. This is H.R. 2280 covering the use of 607,800 acres of land as a surface-to-air Nike range.

The Army utilizes this range only from December 15 to March 15 annually—a period of the winter when civilian activity, on the one hand, is at a virtual standstill but which, on the other hand, serves to test the men and equipment involved under the most extreme conditions, including temperatures of 60 below zero. The bill as reported provides for homesteading, mining locations, mineral leases, and other appropriations or uses to be made within the large area subject only to the paramount and exclusive right of the Army to use the land during this annual firing season.

I commend the Army for this minimum military use and for permitting maximum public entry. It is an example of the multiple use than can be accomplished in land areas when all concerned sit down and work out their mutual problems.

All in all the bills represent minimum statutory withdrawals for needed military activities with the interest of the public protected to the greatest extent possible. Accordingly, I unhesitatingly support the measures and their adoption.

As a footnote to the consideration of these specific bills I would like to make a statement for the information of Members concerning other bills of a similar nature. The House has previously approved a bill for withdrawal of lands at the Luke-Williams Air Force Range, Arizona. In addition, there is on the calendar awaiting House action a bill for the withdrawal of lands at the Nellis Air Force Range, Nevada.

Action on the Nellis withdrawal will complete the statutory withdrawals of land now pending before the committee. We have been advised by the Defense Department that a couple of others that may require legislation are under review but they have not yet been finally approved.

In addition to withdrawals of land, we also had submitted two proposals for the restriction of large water areas of the Outer Continental Shelf from the operation of the mineral leasing provisions of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. The two ranges involved are in the Gulf of Mexico off of Texas and are known as the Corpus Christi and Matagorda water ranges. Together these ranges cover an area of 5.6 million acres.

I anticipate that the Public Lands Subcommittee of our committee will be able at an early meeting to consider these proposed restrictions, which were originally requested by the last administration and have been approved by the new one. I assure my colleagues that we will scrutinize these requests very carefully and assure ourselves of the military need for both the Navy and the Air Force and that the maximum provision will be made to protect the potential mineral resources of this vast area.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the five bills for withdrawal of approximately one and a half million acres of land for defense purposes in Alaska, let me first say that I concur in everything the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], has said with regard to both the military need and the maximum protection of the interest of the public.

I would like to add just a few things for the information of the House. First and foremost, with reference to the maximum 15-year withdrawal term. Provision has been made to insure an administrative review during this period, at the end of 10 years, by requiring the Secretary of the Army to notify the Secretary of the Interior if he desires to continue the usage for the full 15 years. In other words, the Department cannot forget it has the land and hold on to it for no purpose.

The committee has carefully considered the length of time for which these withdrawals should be made. Obviously, we do not want to burden Congress with unnecessarily frequent reviews of specific usages of land areas. On the other hand, we know from experience that withdrawals without time limitation have a way of becoming permanent. I submit that we have a good formula in these bills, one that will adequately protect the interests of the country and still not unduly burden either the Congress or the administrative agencies. In this connection I expect that the continued withdrawal by administrative action from the 10th to 15th years will be publicized by the departments involved, notification given to the Congress, and publication effected in the Federal Register.

Among the features mentioned in the Statement of Chairman ASPINALL were provisions concerning hunting, fishing and trapping and ultimate decontamination. In this connection, I just want to add and emphasize the fact that after long consideration of the problem we unanimously agreed that nothing should be done that would in any way hamper the usage of the lands during the period the Army has them under its control. In other words, having assured ourselves of the military need and having decided that the lands should be made available to the Department of the Army, we felt that it would be contradictory to attach any strings that might hamper the unrestricted training planned in these areas. The bills have protected this feature and represent a balance for public use when the military need permits.

Finally, I would like to say another word about the Nike range. As explained to the committee, a withdrawal of lands from all forms of appropriation is necessary in order to permit the Army to have exclusive use during its 3-month, December 15 to March 15, annual practice firing period. This will also preclude new claims being made for which the Army might have to make payment in order to use the lands when needed.

What I would like to emphasize is, that although we will make a general withdrawal, the bill still limits the use for a Nike range for 3 months annually. Furthermore, although the military department assured us that there was no danger of contamination of this particular area because of the necessity of retrieving any missiles that have malfunctioned, we have included a decontamination clause without broadening the bill. The committee report emphasizes the fact that this was done solely for the purpose of guarding against unilateral modification of training procedures but that if at any time the Army desires to expand its use of the area for any general purpose other than a Nike range, the Department must seek further legislative action.

In recommending favorable action on these five bills (H.R. 2279, H.R. 2280, H.R. 2281, H.R. 2282, and H.R. 2283) I join in assuring the Members of the House that, as I said, the military necessity has been demonstrated and the bills represent a recognition of this fact while providing public use not inconsistent therewith.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subject to valid existing rights the public lands aggregating approximately fifty-one thousand four hundred acres of land in the Granite Creek area, Fourth Judicial Division, Alaska, as more fully described in application (serial number Fairbanks 012203) from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Interior and set forth in the Federal Register of December 13, 1955, page 9318 (Federal Register document 55–10007; filed, December 12, 1955; 8:52 antemeridian), are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws including the mining and mineral leasing laws and disposals of materials under the Act of July 31, 1947, as amended (60 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601–604), and reserved for the use of the Department of the Army as a testing and maneuver area for a period of ten years or, if extended by the Secretary of the Interior for a period of fifteen years, or for any shorter period as may be determined by the Secretary of the Army upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Army, authorize use or disposition of any of the lands or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Upon the final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide for the appropriate disposition of the lands under the public land laws and other laws existing at the time of such termination. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Army at that

time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of the lands involved under laws and regulations then existing.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "Fourth Judicial Division,".

Page 2, line 5, strike out "60 Stat. 681;" and insert in lieu thereof "61 Stat. 681;".

Page 2, after line 15, add the following new subsection:

"(c) To the extent that the Secretary of the Army determines it to be consistent with military requirements and the public safety: (1) the lands withdrawn and reserved by this Act, or selected portions thereof, shall be open during legally established seasons for hunting, fishing, and trapping, and military operations affecting the same shall be suspended during such periods and (2) access across the lands, or selected portions thereof, shall be permitted to public hunting, fishing, and trapping areas."

Page 2, strike out all of lines 16 through 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior at the time of the final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Department of the Army shall make safe for nonmilitary uses the land withdrawn and reserved, or such portions thereof as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, by neutralizing unexploded ammunition, bombs, artillery projectiles, or other explosive objects and chemical agents. Thereafter the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law shall provide for the appropriate use or disposition of all or any part of the land withdrawn and reserved under provisions of this Act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Army at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of all or part of said lands under laws and regulations then existing."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS EAST OF FAIRBANKS, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2280) to provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as a Nike range.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to valid existing rights the public lands aggregating approximately six hundred and seven thousand eight hundred acres described in application for withdrawal, serial number Fairbanks 022929 published in the Federal Register of May 26, 1959, page 4218 (Federal Register Document 59-4405; filed, May 25, 1959; 8:49 antemeridian), are hereby withdrawn from all forms of use and appropriation under the public land laws including the mining and mineral leasing laws and disposals of materials under the Act of July 31, 1947, as amended (60 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601-604), except as provided in subsection (b) of this section and reserved for the use of the Department of the Army as a Nike range for a period of ten years or, if extended by the Secretary of the Interior, for a period of fifteen years, or for any shorter period as may be determined by the Secretary of the Army upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The lands and resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to use by the public in a manner that will not interfere with the use of the withdrawn area by the Department of the Army during the period December 15 to March 15 annually in accordance with schedules adopted by the Department of the Army.

(c) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Army, authorize use or disposition of any of the lands or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(d) Upon the final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide for the appropriate disposition of the lands under the public land laws and other laws existing at the time of such termination. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Army at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of the lands involved under laws and regulations then existing.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "60 Stat. 681"; and insert in lieu thereof "61 Stat. 681";

Page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out the words "use by the public" and insert in lieu thereof "use, appropriation, and disposition"

Page 2, line 15, strike out all of subsection (c) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) All occupancy and use under homestead entries, mining locations, mineral leases or other appropriation or use conformable with the public land laws of the United States as aforesaid which may be effectuated within the area withdrawn and reserved under subsection (b) of this Act shall be subject to the paramount and exclusive right of the Army to utilize the lands for Nike range and incidental military purposes during the period December 15 to March 15 annually until termination of the withdrawal and reservation effected by this Act, and all documents authorizing use or occupancy or effecting disposition of such lands shall expressly preserve to the United States the paramount and exclusive right above specified."

Page 2, line 19, strike out all of subsection (d) and insert in lieu thereof the following—

"(d) Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior at the time of final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Department of the Army shall make safe for nonmilitary uses the land withdrawn and reserves, or such portions thereof as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, by neutralizing unexploded ammunition, bombs, artillery projectiles, or other explosive objects and chemical agents. Thereafter the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law shall provide for the appropriate use or disposition of all or any part of the land withdrawn and reserved under provisions of this Act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Army at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of all or part of said lands under laws and regulations then existing."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESERVING FOR USE BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AT FORT RICHARDSON, ALASKA, CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN THE CAMPBELL CREEK AREA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2281) to reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek area, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to valid existing rights the public lands aggregating approximately four thousand seven hundred and six acres in the Campbell Creek Area, Alaska, withdrawn from the public domain by Public Land Order 2029 and described in detail in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959, page 10310 (Federal Register Document 59-10755; filed, December 18, 1959; 8:46 antemeridian), are hereby reserved for the use of the Department of the Army in conjunction with Fort Richardson for a period of ten years or, if extended by the Secretary of the Interior for a period of fifteen years, or for any shorter period as may be determined by the Secretary of the Army upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Army, authorize use or disposition of any of the land or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Upon the final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide for the appropriate disposition of the lands under the public land laws and other laws existing at the time of such termination. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Army at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of the lands involved under laws and regulations then existing.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the words "withdrawn and".

Page 2, line 18, strike out the words "the lands involved" and insert in lieu thereof the words "all or part of said lands".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM THE PUBLIC DOMAIN CERTAIN LANDS IN THE LADD-EIELSON AREA, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2282) to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command training site, Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to valid existing rights the public

lands aggregating approximately two hundred and fifty-six thousand acres in the Ladd-Eielson area, fourth judicial division, Alaska, as more fully described in application (serial number Fairbanks 020174) from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Interior and set forth in the Federal Register of July 31, 1958, page 5804 (Federal Register Document 58-5837; filed, July 31, 1958; 8:47 antemeridian), are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws including the mining and mineral leasing laws and disposals of materials under the Act of July 31, 1947, as amended (60 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601-604), and reserved for the use of the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command training site for a period of ten years or, if extended by the Secretary of the Interior for a period of fifteen years, or for any shorter period as may be determined by the Secretary of the Army upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Army, authorize use or disposition of any of the lands or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Upon the final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide for the appropriate disposition of the lands under the public land laws and other laws existing at the time of such termination. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Army at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of the lands involved under laws and regulations then existing.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "60 Stat. 681;" and insert in lieu thereof "61 Stat. 681;".

Page 2, after line 15, add the following new subsection:

"(c) To the extent that the Secretary of the Army determines it to be consistent with military requirements and the public safety: (1) the lands withdrawn and reserved by this Act, or selected portions thereof, shall be open during legally established seasons for hunting, fishing, and trapping, and military operations affecting the same shall be suspended during such periods and (2) access across the lands, or selected portions thereof, shall be permitted to public hunting, fishing, and trapping areas."

Page 2, line 16, strike out all of subsection (c) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior at the time of final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Department of the Army shall make safe for nonmilitary uses the land withdrawn and reserved, or such portions thereof as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, by neutralizing unexploded ammunition, bombs, artillery projectiles, or other explosive objects and chemical agents. Thereafter the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to law, shall provide for the appropriate use or disposition of all or any part of the land withdrawn and reserved under provisions of this Act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Army at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of all or part of said lands under laws and regulations then existing."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LANDS IN BIG DELTA AREA, ALASKA

The clerk called the bill (H.R. 2283) to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subject to valid existing rights public lands aggregating approximately five hundred and seventy-two thousand areas of land in the Big Delta area, Fairbanks recording precinct, fourth judicial division, Alaska, as more fully described in application (serial number Fairbanks 019269) from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Interior and set forth in the Federal Register May 8, 1958, page 3071 (Federal Register Document 58-3480; filed, May 7, 1958; 8:53 antemeridian), are hereby withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public lands laws including the mining and mineral leasing laws and disposals of materials under the Act of July 31, 1947, as amended (60 Stat. 681, 30 U.S.C. 601-604), and reserved for the use of the Department of the Army as the Fort Greely maneuver area for a period of ten years, or if extended by the Secretary of the Interior for a period of fifteen years, or for any shorter period as may be determined by the Secretary of the Army upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Army, authorize use or disposition of any of the lands or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Upon the final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide for the appropriate disposition of the lands under the public land laws and other laws existing at the time of such termination. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Army at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of the lands involved under laws and regulations then existing.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the words "fourth judicial division,".

Page 2, line 6, strike out the statutory citation "60 Stat. 681;" and insert in lieu thereof "61 Stat. 681;".

Page 2, after line 16, add the following new subsection:

"(c) To the extent that the Secretary of the Army determines it to be consistent with military requirements and the public safety: (1) the lands withdrawn and reserved by this Act, or selected portions thereof, shall be open during legally established seasons for hunting, fishing, and trapping, and military operations affecting the same shall be suspended during such periods and (2) access across the lands, or selected portions thereof, shall be permitted to public hunting, fishing, and trapping areas."

Page 2, line 17, strike out all of subsection (c) and insert in lieu therefore the following:

"(d) Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior at the time of final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Department of the Army shall make safe for nonmilitary uses the land withdrawn and reserved, or such portions thereof as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, by neutralizing unexploded ammunition, bombs, artillery projectiles, or other explosive objects and chemical agents. Thereafter the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law shall provide for the appropriate use or disposition of all or any part of the land withdrawn and reserved under provisions of this Act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Army at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of all or part of said lands under laws and regulations then existing."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT VANCOUVER NATIONAL MONUMENT, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3283) to revise the boundaries and to change the name of Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this changing Fort Vancouver from a monument to a national site?

Mrs. HANSEN. Yes, it is.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is true that it changes it from a national monument to a national historic site, due to the historic significance.

Mr. GROSS. Then, what is entailed in the change of the designation of this from a monument to a national site? What does that mean in terms of money to the taxpayer?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Nothing financially. There is no cost involved whatever.

Mr. GROSS. No additional cost whatsoever?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. No additional cost.

Mr. GROSS. Now or in the future?

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Well, as far as the future is concerned, I could not tell you that. There is nothing involved now.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of preserving certain historic properties associated with the Fort Vancouver National Monument, established pursuant to the Act of June 19, 1948, chapter 546 (62 Stat. 532; 16 U.S.C. 45Off-45Off-2), the Secretary of the Interior may revise the boundaries of the monument to include therein not more than one hundred and thirty additional acres of land adjacent to, contiguous to, or in the vicinity of, the existing monument.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may acquire in such manner as he may consider to be in the public interest the non-Federal lands and interests in lands within the revised boundaries.

SEC. 3. The heads of executive departments may transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without exchange of funds, administrative jurisdiction over such federally owned lands and other property under their administrative jurisdictions within the revised boundary as may become excess to the needs of their respective agencies, for inclusion in the Fort Vancouver National Monument.

SEC. 4. Fort Vancouver National Monument is redesignated Fort Vancouver National Historic Site.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE OF SUITS AGAINST FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2883) to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2679 of title 28, United States Code, is amended (1) by inserting the subsection symbol "(a)" at the beginning thereof and (2) by adding immediately following such subsection (a) as hereby so designated, four new subsections as follows:

"(b) The remedy by suit against the United States as provided by section 1346(b) of this title for damage to property or for personal injury, including death, resulting from the operation by any employee of the Government of any motor vehicle while acting within the scope of his office or employment, shall hereafter be exclusive of any other civil action or proceeding by reason of the same subject matter against the employer or his estate whose act or omission gave rise to the claim.

"(c) The Attorney General shall defend any civil action or proceeding brought in any court against any employee of the Government or his estate for any such damage or injury. The employee against whom such civil action or proceeding is brought shall deliver within such time after date of service or knowledge of service as determined by the Attorney General, all process served upon him or an attested true copy thereof to his immediate superior or to whomever was designated by the head of his department to receive such papers and such person shall promptly furnish copies of the pleadings and process therein to the United States attorney for the district embracing the place wherein the proceeding is brought, to the Attorney General, and to the head of his employing Federal agency.

"(d) Any such civil action or proceeding commenced in a State court shall be removed without bond at any time before trial by the Attorney General to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending and the proceedings deemed a tort action brought against the United States under the provisions of this title and all references thereto. Should a United States district court determine on a hearing on a motion to remand held before a trial on the merits that the case so removed is one in which a remedy by suit within the meaning of subsection (b) of this section is not available against the United States, the case shall be remanded to the State court.

"(e) The Attorney General may compromise or settle any claim asserted in such civil action or proceeding in the manner provided in section 2677, and with the same effect."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be deemed to be in effect six months after the enactment hereof but any rights or liabilities then existing shall not be affected.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "employer" and insert "employee".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSHUA TREE NATIONAL MONUMENT, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5416) to include within the boundaries of Joshua Tree National Monument, in the State of California, certain federally owned lands used in connection with said monument, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of September 25, 1950, chapter 1030 (64 Stat. 1033; 16 U.S.C. 450ii), is hereby amended by inserting after the period at the end of section 1 the following: "Also, all that portion of the south half of the northeast quarter and of the north half of the southeast quarter of section 33, township 1 north, range 9 east, San Bernardino base and meridian, in the county of San Bernardino, State of California, shown on map titled 'Record of Survey' by H. F. Cameron, Junior, licensed engineer 6826, dated December 29, 1948, and James B. Hommon, licensed engineer 6916, dated October 5, 1949, and made for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior, and recorded October 17, 1949, in volume 7, page 72, of the official records of the county of San Bernardino, said land being described as follows:

"Beginning at the United States Government Land Office monument marked as the east quarter corner of said section 33, thence proceeding on a true bearing south 89 degrees 02 minutes 10 seconds west a distance of 50.01 feet to the true point of beginning of the hereinafter described parcel of land;

"Thence north 0 degrees 02 minutes 55 seconds west a distance of 250.08 feet to a point of curve; thence along the arc of a curve to the left having a radius of 20.00 feet a distance of 31.73 feet to a point of tangency; thence south 89 degrees 02 minutes 40 seconds west a distance of 2,559.24 feet; thence south 0 degrees 19 minutes 50 seconds east a distance of 270.76 feet;

"Then south 0 degrees 21 minutes 02 seconds east a distance of 409.32 feet to the beginning of a curve; thence along the arc of a curve to the left having a radius of 280.98 feet a distance of 275.93 feet to a point of compound curvature; thence along the arc of a curve to the left having a radius of 800.00 feet a distance of 753.98 feet to a point of tangency; thence north 69 degrees 22 minutes 58 seconds east a distance of 125.31 feet to the beginning of a curve;

"Thence along the arc of a curve to the right having a radius of 1,400.00 feet a distance of 1,042.74 feet to a point of tangency; thence south 67 degrees 56 minutes 33 seconds east a distance of 94.55 feet to the beginning of a curve; thence along the arc of a curve to the left having a radius of 700.00 feet a distance of 366.52 feet to a point of compound curvature;

"Thence along the arc of a curve to the left having a radius of 167.60 feet a distance of 240.17 feet to a point of tangency; thence north 0 degrees 02 minutes 55 seconds west a distance of 648.91 feet to the point of beginning containing 57.839 acres, more or less."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER A SECTION OF BLUE RIDGE PARKWAY, VIRGINIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5475) to transfer a section of Blue Ridge Parkway to the Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subject to valid existing rights, the lands and interests in lands which comprise section 1–A of the Blue Ridge Parkway and lie between the southern boundary of the Shenandoah National Park at Jarman Gap and parkway centerline station 448+00 at Rockfish Gap are excluded from the parkway, made a part of the Shenandoah National Park, and shall be administered in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1–4), as amended and supplemented.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EFFIGY MOUNDS NATIONAL MONUMENT, IOWA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5571) to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of preserving certain important prehistoric Indian mounds and protecting existing wildlife and other natural values, the following described lands, consisting of approximately 272 acres, are hereby added to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa:

TRACT A

Township 94 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, Clayton County, Iowa: the portion of the southeast quarter southeast quarter of section 22 that lies between the easterly right-of-way line of the Chicago, Milwaukee, Saint Paul, and Pacific Railroad and the section line common to sections 22 and 23; those portions of lot 1 (except the northerly 900 feet thereof), lot 2, and lot 3 that lie easterly of the easterly right-of-way line of said railroad, the unnumbered lot adjacent to lot 3; and the former meandered river channel between said lot 3 and said

unnumbered lot, all in section 23; containing in all 138 acres more or less.

TRACT B

Township 96 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, Allamakee County, Iowa: Southwest quarter southeast quarter of section 33, containing 40 acres more or less.

TRACT C

Township 96 north, range 3 west, fifth principal meridian, Allamakee County, Iowa: South half northeast quarter and south half northeast quarter northeast quarter of section 33, expecting the right-of-way of Iowa State Highway Numbered 13; containing 93.7 acres more or less.

SEC. 2. The lands under the administrative control and jurisdiction of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service within tract A are included in the monument subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary and desirable in order to facilitate and control public access to the adjacent lands of the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge, and subject to the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to return them to the jurisdiction of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service when they are no longer required for purposes of the monument. The lands under the administrative control and jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, within tract A are included in the monument subject to the right of the Corps of Engineers to retain adequate flowage and navigation rights thereon to facilitate the operation and maintenance of lock and dam numbered 10, Upper Mississippi River, or the construction, operation, and maintenance of any dam affecting this location.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to acquire the lands designated tract C by purchase or through donations.

SEC. 4. All laws, rules, and regulations applicable to such national monument shall be applicable with respect to the lands described in the first section of this Act upon the addition of such land to such national monument.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized the sum of not to exceed $4,000 for the purpose of acquiring lands, interests in lands, and improvements thereon as may be necessary for carrying out this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 21, strike out "$4,000" and insert "$2,000".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6244) for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services erroneously in receipt of family separation allowances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, could somebody on the committee amplify the information we have available on this proposal? I know, according to the report, that it relates to repayment to the extent of $95,000. I raise this question. I think everybody in this Chamber and in the other body from time to time has been contacted by the members of the armed services after they have been discharged. Subsequently they find that the pay accounts are wrong, and the finance officer starts a procedure to collect because some paymaster made a mistake and paid them too much on discharge. I had one of these in my office this morning. It is pretty hard, I think, to condone the failure of the finance officer to not know what the proper pay is that a man receives on discharge. Apparently these mistakes are made from time to time, but for an individual there is no relief. This group, as I understand, are to be treated as a group. They are to have some $95,000 excused. How does the Committee on the Judiciary treat an individual differently from a group? In the one case he gets no relief. In this case a whole bunch are going to get some relief.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman has well stated, each and every one of us in the Congress from time to time has received these complaints from our constituents about these irregularities in payments. This bill is to take care of a certain number of servicemen. As a rule we try to take care of them through various agencies, if it is possible. This bill comes to us as an executive communication and its purpose is to relieve members of the uniformed services and former members who in good faith received family separation allowances which were subsequently held by the Comptroller General to be beyond the scope of the Career Compensation Act upon which it was based. These men served overseas, where there were no quarters available for them and they were paid family separation allowance at that time by the services. This took place over a period of only about 4 months, as I recall it, in 1956. The Comptroller General made a ruling that this was not proper and ordered these payments refunded. Some of this has been refunded by these men in the service.

In other words, there was no housing provided for the families and they had to maintain themselves, not only over there but they had to maintain their own homes back in the United States. Now, because of that ruling of the Comptroller General the Department of Defense now comes along and asks us to take care of the situation. In trying to collect these payments the Department found for the most part that these were all hardship cases. The Government has been trying to have this money refunded and, as I said, some of it has been refunded, to the tune of $95,000. They have been trying to collect the rest of it without success and for that reason this executive communication has come to your Committee on the Judiciary for action. After all, these men served outside continental United States and received this money in good faith. It was not due to any irregularities or any mistakes made by some office. This was a regulation decided upon by all of the defense agencies to pay these men this extra money because they were serving outside of continental United States without Government quarters available for themselves and their families. For this reason your committee has seen fit approve this bill unanimously.

In reference to the other bills we treat them as they come along; your committee goes into all the facts and takes up the question whether or not it is a hardship case, and so forth. In all cases we do give relief if we feel that the case merits such action.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman this question. Is this bill aimed at relieving some paymaster from responsibility, or is it a bona fide effort to relieve the individual who received this money through no fault of his own?

Mr. LANE. This bill is to relieve no individual. The uniformed serviceman and former members received this family separation allowance while serving overseas under Government regulations. It is to take care of that serviceman. It is not a question of some officer in the service who made any mistake. This is not to take care of anyone in that way. It is to take care of these men who we feel should have some relief here.

Mr. FORD. I agree with the gentleman that because of some erroneous opinion handed down by somebody in the executive branch of the Government a serviceman should not be penalized. But I must say that it is not entirely clear that we are not simply clearing a record for some paymaster or some lawyer or other person in the Department of Defense who just misinterpreted the law.

Mr. LANE. May I say to the gentleman that your Judiciary Committee and its staff went into that very thoroughly. We are satisfied that we are not covering up anybody so far as this bill is concerned. This bill will inure to the benefit of these servicemen in whom your committee is interested.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the members of the uniformed services are relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the amounts, which were otherwise correct, erroneously received by them after February 28, 1956, and before September 1, 1956, as family separation allowances under former paragraph 4304, Joint Travel Regulations of the uniformed services. Any member or former member of a uniformed service who has at any time made repayment to the United States of any amount paid to him as a family separation allowance within that period is entitled to have refunded to him the amount repaid provided application is made within one year.

SEC. 2. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 3. Appropriations available for the pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services are available for refunds under this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar today.

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on April 18 the President sent to the Congress a message urging the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. As a Representative of a district which is largely, though not entirely, urban, I feel that this proposal is a wise one. The manifold problems of our metropolitan centers, and the steady increase of that portion of the American people who live in cities, make Cabinet-level recognition of the peculiar problems of these areas highly desirable.

I have recently received, from the Portland Association of Building Owners and Mangers, an excellent letter commenting on this legislation, along with a copy of that association's letter of commendation to the President.

I include these letters at this point in my remarks:

PORTLAND ASSOCIATION OF
BUILDING OWNERS AND MANAGERS,
Portland, Oreg., April 13, 1961.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: A letter on behalf of this association was sent to the President recently commending his decision to create a Department of Urban Affairs; a copy of that letter is attached for your information.

The Portland area is one of the 25 or so great metropolitan complexes of the country; the problems faced here are the same, to one degree or another, as those in the other metropolitan areas. Proper zoning and planning, adequate financing, a realistic structure of local government, and the efficient functioning of the entire system, are problems common to all of our great cities. Many persons are aware of the nature of the problems, and the recognized methods of cure. For example, from improper planning derives great economic and esthetic loss, poor use of land facilities, traffic congestion, problems of health and sanitation (such as air pollution), and many others. This is well recognized. Yet, the units of local government are not sufficiently rich nor sufficiently strong to accomplish the necessary regional planning needed.

This association has been one of the leaders in urban renewal legislation through its various stages; has developed plans and statutes for municipal transit; a municipal parking authority; and has been in the forefront of numerous other moves for civic improvement. We recognize that a bigger view must be taken, and that funds must be very large if our cities are not to suffer further decay and disintegration.

It should not be overlooked that while much time and thought has been given to the great metropolises, many communities of every size in Oregon and elsewhere do not escape these problems. Efforts in recent years in Salem, Eugene, and Springfield show this. Even the smallest communities can suffer dislocation by reason of traffic pattern changes or highway developments, for example.

These cities, like Portland, should welcome an attack on these problems on a regional basis.

We urge that the House give the President's plan the earliest possible attention. Our cities are undeniably in a state of crisis; we offer our assistance to you personally, and to the other members of the Oregon delegation, in any way that it may be useful.

Yours very truly,
PAUL F. MURPHY,
President.
ARVIN A. BURNETT,
Chairman, Downtown Committee.
CRAIG KELLEY,
Executive Secretary.

PORTLAND ASSOCIATION OF
BUILDING OWNERS AND MANAGERS,
Portland, Oreg., March 21, 1961.

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: This association, composed of the principal office buildings in the downtown area of Portland, wishes to express its thorough endorsement of your recently announced plan for a Department of Urban Affairs headed by an administrator of Cabinet rank.

With more and more of our population gathering in the Nation's metropolitan areas, we think that the health and welfare of these regions need greater attention and study at the Federal level.

Within the metropolitan areas, the downtown, or core area, is the vital center of service to the populace, and is the principal location of professional, commercial, cultural, and governmental facilities. This concentration of services is essential to the proper functioning of the metropolis.

Yet these central areas are ringed by decay and often are themselves congested, drab, and inefficient. These difficulties cannot always be cured by local efforts alone.

We would envision that the Department of Urban Affairs would function along the lines of giving advisory service to the cities, relief in the form of self-liquidating loans, perhaps for rehabilitation, transit, parking, or similar basic needs, and give direction to metropolitan planning, which is one of the fundamental deficiencies.

We offer our support for your program and any aid or counsel which we can provide, and will enlist support for your program among business, labor, and local governmental circles.

Yours very truly,
PAUL F. MURPHY,
President.
ARVIN A. BURNETT,
Chairman, Downtown Committee.
CRAIG KELLEY,
Executive Secretary.

Our able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] has introduced the President's bill, and it is now before the House Committee on Government Operations. It is my hope that this legislation can receive careful and speedy consideration by the committee, and favorable action by this House.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works be permitted to meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 6713.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 271, Rept. No. 322), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2010) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AIR FORCE BALLISTIC MISSILE MANAGEMENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to a report being filed by the Committee on Government Operations today entitled "Air Force Ballistic Missile Management—Formation of Aerospace Corp."

This report was prepared by the Military Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. It gives the facts surrounding the Air Force's sponsorship of a new nonprofit corporation, Aerospace Corp., to provide technical management for its missile and space programs.

Aerospace will replace Space Technology Laboratories, Inc.—STL—as technical adviser to the Air Force. STL is a private corporation and wholly owned subsidiary of Thompson-Ramo-Wooldridge, Inc. For more than 5 years, STL has been the systems engineer and technical director of the Air Force ballistic missile programs—Thor, Atlas, Titan, and Minute Man. Also it has conducted experimental space flight projects and laboratory work for the Air Force and other Government agencies.

Presently Aerospace takes over direction of the Air Force space projects, while

STL continues to handle the three ICBM programs for the Air Force. As the ballistic missile programs approach their operational stages, STL gets phased out of its contract work on these programs.

Considering the fact that ballistic missiles provide boosters for satellites and other space flight experiments, Aerospace will have to be well versed in missile as well as space technologies. Also, it will have technical responsibilities for missile programs of the future. Consequently, to avoid possible duplication or overlap in the technical functions of Aerospace and STL, our report recommends that STL's contract work in the ballistic missile programs be phased out as rapidly as possible. We ask the Air Force to reexamine STL's contract functions with a view to reassigning more of them to Aerospace and the weapon contractors.

One of the problems highlighted in our report is that of maintaining technical objectivity. Aerospace, as a nonprofit corporation, will not be interested in hardware production contracts and thus will be able to direct groups of weapon system contractors impartially in the Government's interest. It was this problem which led the committee to recommend in an earlier report that STL be converted into a nonprofit corporation or sever its ties with the Air Force.

Since STL would not go the nonprofit route, Aerospace was created, and we are emphasizing again the severence of the STL tie. Of course, STL will be free to compete for new contracts as do other weapon system contractors, but it should not have the confidential relationship at the Ballistic Missile Division Headquarters which it enjoyed in the past.

The committee's 1959 report, entitled "Organization and Management of Missile Programs"—House Report No. 1121, 86th Congress, 1st session—set forth many of the problems that were created by the Air Force-STL tie-in. It was that report which led to an Air Force reevaluation of its management structure for ballistic missiles and space systems, and the formation of Aerospace as a new nonprofit corporation.

The present report deals mainly with Air Force management problems, but these have wide application throughout the Defense Establishment and other agencies of the Government. Many in Congress and elsewhere have expressed concern about the tendency to use private corporations as Government adjuncts in the field of research and development. I believe this report documents for all Members the problems that arise in this kind of contract relationship.

Our report takes the realistic position that the Air Force does not have the inhouse technical resources and manpower to perform the functions assigned to Aerospace. Neither is it likely that the Air Force will acquire such resources in the foreseeable future. As we see it, a nonprofit contract organization is more appropriate as the technical arm of the Air Force than a commercial concern such as STL.

The Ballistic Missile Division, located in Inglewood-El Segundo Calif., now has a work force of more than 9,000 including military and civilian Air Force personnel and employees of Aerospace and STL.

Pointing out that the new Aerospace Corp. is planning for a buildup to about 1,000 scientific and engineering personnel, with possible larger growth in the future, our report warns against empire building, which will dilute the elite quality of the technical staff.

To put Aerospace in business, the Air Force provided it with office and laboratory facilities, working capital in the form of advance payments, and a contract for technical work on designated Air Force space programs. The core of the new corporation's facilities is the Research and Development Center in El Segundo, which was purchased from STL at a cost of $23.5 million.

The total of Air Force contract outlays to both Aerospace and STL in fiscal year 1961 will be about $84 million, as against a cost for STL alone of $78 million in fiscal 1960. The Air Force attributes this excess to a peaking of work on the Minute Man program, and added administrative support requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that in reading this report, the Members of Congress will have a better understanding of the problems of mobilizing technical resources for national defense. The report is factual and fair. It is critical but it is not carping. We realize that we are dealing with issues of the highest national importance which affect the very survival of this Nation.

THREE HUNDRED AND NINETY-NINE YEARS AGO WAS OUR BEGINNING

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today, 399 years ago, Jean Ribault in discovering the mouth of the St. Johns River, Fla., began a series of events which led to the permanent settlement of America. The expedition was of French Huguenots seeking religious freedom in a new land; and the date was May 1, 1562.

Ribault said of the lands in northeast Florida as he viewed them in 1562:

> We entered and viewed the country thereabout, which is the fairest, fruitfullest and pleasantest of all the world.

Rene Laudonniere, his second in command, said of it:

> The place was so pleasant that unhappy people would be forced to change their nature as they viewed it.

Pushing up the coast to Parris Island, S.C., they left a detachment which shortly abandoned efforts of settlement there and returned to France. But in 1564 Rene Laudonniere returned with provisions for permanent settlement and did settle men, women and children at Fort Caroline, Fla., in that year. This began the permanent settlement by Europeans of what is now the United States. Though in 1565 the flag over Florida was changed to Spanish, and in 1763 to English and later to others, the seed of liberty in these lands was planted by these firstcomers in 1562 and 1564. Today in America we test whether America is wise and strong enough to preserve here the liberty sought so long ago by these courageous pioneers. Like in the days of old, this is a time for prayer, a time for personal dedication to principles and a time when men must seize history or history will seize men.

DEPARTMENT OF SMALL TOWNS AND RURAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced legislation which would establish a new Department of Small Towns and Rural Affairs. Since the administration has proposed a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, I believe the two proposals could well be considered by the appropriate committee together.

In this century, and especially in the years since World War II, we have witnessed in this country a constant trend toward bigness. It has occurred in business, in farming, in government, in virtually all fields of human activity.

We are all concerned about this trend as it affects various aspects of our society. For instance, we have tried to pass legislation which will preserve the family-size farm, yet we see each year the growth of corporate farms.

We read every day of mergers in the business world, and we fear for the future of the small businessman. As a manifestation of this concern, the Congress created the Small Business Administration some 8 years ago to work with the Nation's small businessmen.

I think we are all aware of the tremendous growth of the Federal Government. There are, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] recently pointed out, more than 2,250 Federal departments, agencies, bureaus, and so forth. All of us in the Congress find much of our time is spent trying to help our constituents who have a tremendous variety of problems with the various bureaus, boards, commissions, agencies, and departments.

So we are faced with the fact that things are big and probably going to get a lot bigger. Where do our huge urban areas fit into this picture? And also, where do our small towns and wide open spaces fit into the picture? The Federal Government has shown great concern over the problems of our urban areas, especially in the postwar years. We have provided generous programs of aid in many fields in an attempt to stabilize the economy of our cities. We have aided in the construction of city expressways, airports, and hospitals. We

have loaned and given money to remove urban blight. We have had grants for city planners and helped build community facilities. We provide aid for water pollution plants and grants to study air pollution. Housing is subsidized and we are asked to subsidize mass transportation of commuters.

Must we create a Department of Urban Affairs whose purpose would be to develop even further the concentration of power in the large cities? Should we have such a department which would be under the domination of and perhaps the dictation of big city mayors and other city officials? Should we do more to concentrate greater power in the big cities at the expense of the small and medium-sized communities which have no such powerful voice?

Let us first examine that other great segment of our population—the people who live outside of large concentrated urban areas who have no powerful voice to speak in their behalf. These people constitute almost half of our population.

Fifty-three percent of our people live in metropolitan areas of 250,000 or more, while 47 percent of the people live in smaller cities, towns, villages, and boroughs and in rural areas.

These millions of people deserve our attention. We certainly want to create a favorable climate for the growth of our small towns. We do not want them to become ghost towns or be swallowed up into huge urban strips.

We have inherited from our small towns a community spirit which is seldom found in urban areas. We find a wholesome family life which is apparently more difficult to maintain in urban areas with its many outside diversions and attractions.

I believe that we should encourage and assist the small towns in their efforts to develop and carry out local programs to meet their needs and the Nation's needs in this era of advancing technical and industrial development. We should give such aid as is necessary so that our small towns can benefit from the shifting patterns of economical activity and population.

There are already a few programs operating within the Federal Government which could well be gathered together as part of the duties of this new Department. The program of research to find increased industrial uses of farm products is one such program. The rural development program, which will probably be expanded by the rural redevelopment program—a part of the depressed area legislation—is another likely starting point. Another possibility would be the Office of Area Development in the Department of Commerce.

In these days when we are talking so much about preserving the small farm and the small business, should we not take a sensible step toward preserving the small town?

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTIONS ON HUNGARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation we are on the threshold of a new era in the conduct of our international affairs. Time, the harsh demands of reality, and the freely expressed will of the American people have brought us to the crossroads where change must take place. During the past several years our position in world affairs has deteriorated at a steady rate while the prestige, initiative, and relative strength of the Russian imperium has increased at an alarming rate. The year 1960 gave witness to a series of climactic events which awakened our people to this dangerous situation and put into clear perspective the need for change. The American electorate expect such change. We must not disappoint them.

As we enter this new era, much can be learned from the mistakes of the immediate past. There now can be little doubt that the greatest mistake of the past 6 years was the uncaging of the Russian bear, a process which began with the Berlin Conference of 1954, was advanced by the so-called summit meeting of 1955, the Nixon visit to Russia, and the Khrushchev visit to the United States during 1959, and was culminated in the Paris Conference and United Nations General Assembly fiascoes of 1960. The Russian bear had been caged through the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, by acceptance of the realities of the cold war, and the resolute actions taken on Berlin and in Korea. During 1952 American leadership of the free world cause was clear and our superiority was unquestioned by the Russians. We had moved to a position where positive political actions directed at the heartland of the Russian imperium was a logical next step. By then, we had come a great distance from the political and ideological confusion of the early fourties when public opinion held the Russians to be our allies and a people who cherished the ideals of democracy.

The great question today is whether we can once again cage the Russian bear or whether we must tame the bear now that he is loose and on the prowl. We must do one or the other if we are to survive as a free people.

During the last session of Congress, on August 22, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 716, the intent of which was to confront the Russian bear with a choice of these alternatives: either to behave as a civilized member of the family of nations or be returned to his cage. House Concurrent Resolution 716 called for the United States to take the initiative in the United Nations to cause the Russians to conform with the provisions of the General Assembly Resolution on Hungary or be expelled from membership in the United Nations. Congress adjourned before action could be taken on that resolution. Today I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 230, similar to House Concurrent Resolution 716.

The General Assembly Resolution on Hungary condemns the Russian aggression against Hungary in 1956, and calls for the withdrawal of all Russian military, political, and economic elements from Hungarian soil. For 4 long years the American delegation to the United Nations has done nothing but pay annual and weak lipservice to the high purposes of that resolution. In turn the Russians have demonstrated a persistent, adamant, provocative, and contemptuous disdain for this General Assembly decision on Hungary. It is little wonder that Khrushchev and company have used the forum of the United Nations to degrade, taunt, and vilify the United States in the eyes of the people of the world. Our shabby and weak defense of freedom's cause, in the case of Hungary, has invited the Russians to regard us as timid, compromising has-beens. It will not be easy to convince the Russians that they have judged us wrongly because a profile of American weakness is precisely what Russian propaganda seeks to portray on both sides of the Iron Curtain. They will not give up their present advantage easily. We must take it from them and this will require bold and determined action.

The case of Hungary is one known to all the peoples of the world, filled with human drama, the symbol of the struggle of freedom versus slavery. Just as the Russians have used this case to shower the United States with contempt and dishonor, so can we use it as the symbol of our commitment to stand by and resolutely support those who will fight for freedom's cause. This case is still pending before the General Assembly where it cries out for remedy. The meeting of the General Assembly, concluded less than 10 days ago, did not even consider the case of Hungary.

Last September Khrushchev launched a campaign to remake the United Nations into a complete Russian instrument or, failing to do so, to destroy that organization. What shall we do in the face of this challenge? Commonsense dictates that we take the initiative by confronting the Russians with a choice. Either they live up to the letter and spirit of the charter or be expelled from membership. This would represent a genuine and needed reorganization of the United Nations.

All the world awaits action by the Kennedy administration in the arena of international combat, where the Russian bear stands braced for the conflict and where first impressions are most times lasting and sometimes devastating. No single action could have a more favorable and convincing effect upon world public opinion than an unequivocal demand that justice be done the Hungarian people. This demand must set a time limit for the withdrawal of all Russian military, political, and economic elements from Hungary. The United Nations must supervise this withdrawal and conduct free and unfettered elections in Hungary within the time limit set. If the Russians fail to meet the timetable their expulsion from membership in the United Nations must be automatic. Nor should we hesitate to initiate such a demand because of lack of precedent or fear that we will not receive enough votes to authorize the action. It is far better that we fail to garner sufficient

votes in our stand for justice than to continue our present record of winning Pyrrhic victories in the United Nations. Only this course of action can return to our Nation the profile in courage which befits our station as free people.

Congress has grave responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs, a responsibility which rests upon every Member of this House. The greatest responsibility is to voice the demands of our people for a realistic policy toward the clear and present threat of imperial Russian communism. On all sides one hears the public clamor for action which will put aside high sounding speeches and get down to the business at hand. Our people have grown weary of the speechmakers, the high-sounding phrase turners, the patient statesmen whose faces have been slapped so many times they are immune to further injury. They are hungry for specific, purposeful action which will force the Russians to put up or shut up.

I do not suggest that greeting the Russians with a choice of either conformance with the United Nations Charter or expulsion from membership in that body is by any means the full or final answer to these growing public demands. It is, however, a start in the right direction. In a real sense it is a preliminary test of our willingness to engage the Russians in a political contest, a test which will require us to separate ourselves from many of the delusions which have been built up about our voting strength in the United Nations and who the friends of freedom really are. Sure a test will serve as a realistic assessment of our national prestige, and our ability to face the realities of the results. As such it will serve our national interests because it is time we knew exactly where we stood, prestigewise, in the world rather than depending on the Gallup-type poll as an index.

The case of Hungary pending before the United Nations General Assembly cries out for remedial justice. Until these cries are satisfied we must accept the fact that Cuba, Laos, Berlin, and the Formosa Straits news will continue to occupy the headlines of our daily press. What is going on in all these trouble spots results from Communist action and action is always news. It is time we flooded the press of the world with news about the rebirth of freedom's cause.

House Concurrent Resolution 230 reads as follows:

Whereas the freedom loving people of Hungary rose up in unison on October 23, 1956, to drive the alien occupier from their beloved homeland and to reestablish their freedom, dignity and national independence; thereby inspiring all people who love freedom and liberty; and

Whereas the Hungarian people by sheer courage, determination and united action did rid their homeland of the forces of Russian imperial communism after five days of sacrifice and heroism, winning for themselves five days of freedom and independence during which they began the rebuilding of their national culture, economy and free way of life; and

Whereas the aggressive military forces of imperial Russian communism did reinvade Hungary early in the morning of November 4, 1956, in violation of the spirit of international law and the letter of the United Nations Charter, killing many thousands of loyal Hungarians and robbing all the Hungarian people of their hard won liberty, freedom and national independence; and

Whereas the conscience of all civilized mankind was shocked by the ruthless, inhuman and criminal actions taken by the imperial Red army against the Hungarian people, causing a worldwide reaction by the common man demanding that justice be done for the Hungarian people; and

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly, moved by this demand, did on December 12, 1956, enact a resolution on Hungary, opposed only by imperial Russia and her supporting Communist regimes, which condemned the brutal Russian Communist aggression against the Hungarian people and called for the immediate removal by the Russians of their military, economic, and political apparatus from Hungarian soil; and

Whereas the imperial Russian Communists have treated this United Nations resolution with contempt, bluntly and publicly refusing to abide by its provisions thus demonstrating a dangerous disdain for the United Nations as an organization instituted among men to maintain law, prevent war, and secure justice for all nations and all peoples; and

Whereas the United Nations is limited with respect to sanctions authorized to enforce the decisions of the General Assembly, except for the privileges of membership in that body which can be withheld or withdrawn from any nation which violates persistently the letter and spirit of the carrier; and

Whereas the expulsion of the Soviet Union from membership in the United Nations for nonconformance with the provisions of the standing General Assembly resolution on Hungary would strengthen the cause of law and justice among nations while at the same time advancing the cause of peace; and

Whereas the prospects of war are increased when an aggressor, in this case imperial Russia, is permitted to continue its illegal occupation and exploitation of a foreign country contrary to the expressed will of the people concerned, in this case Hungary, in violation of the United Nations Charter and the standing resolution on Hungary: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the American Ambassador to the United Nations be instructed by the President of the United States to: (a) take immediate action to cause the Soviet Union to forthwith abide by the full provisions of the standing resolution on Hungary, including a set time limit for the withdrawal of all Russian military, economic, and political elements from Hungary under United Nations supervision, or be expelled from membership in the United Nations, and (b) to urge the United Nations to take responsibility for supervision of free elections in Hungary immediately following the withdrawal of all Russian military, economic, and political elements.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for what he is doing today. It is time that we brought again to the attention of the world what happened in Hungary. When that happened the world was shocked at the Russian brutality in overriding the will of the people of Hungary, killing people, many people. It is time now that the world should again be reminded so that all the world will know that it is the United States that stands for independence, for freedom, for the people, and it is Russia who grinds down, who kills, who destroys, and who murders.

I again commend the gentleman from Ohio for what he is doing. He is a great fighter for the people and for freedom.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the very able gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman think of the action of the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body in amending the Battle Act to provide for aid to these Communist satellite countries?

Mr. FEIGHAN. For many years I have been strongly in opposition to any relaxation of the Battle Act. The fact is that in some circumstances it should not be relaxed even to food, for food is used by the Russians as a weapon of war.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman. The Battle Act ought either to be enforced or be repealed, one or the other, and I think it ought to be enforced.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I do too. I agree with the gentleman heartily.

My position is to deny anything and everything to those who oppress the people of the captive nations, meaning the regimes imposed on those countries by Russia and at the same time to extend every possible assistance and comfort and encouragement to the people who are oppressed and held captive by those Russian regimes. And my opinion is that anything we do to help those countries today, whether it be loans or gifts of food, strengthens the regimes imposed upon the people of the captive nations and is a distinct disservice to the masses of people who are oppressed by them if we help to prolong the system which imposes tyranny and slavery upon them.

We should give no aid to any form of government which has as its aim destruction of our form of government. We have too long been deceived by such policies as, "we should endeavor to bring about changes in the Russian Communist Empire by evolutionary processes or we should aid Communist governments which show a tendency to be independent from Moscow.

I say draw the line and oppose and fight Communist tyranny wherever it be and whenever it rears to embrace another race or country. I do not speak of opposition by word, but by military force if necessary.

We have given away too many billions of dollars to support Communist governments. It is time we use our strength to destroy them, not aid them.

Mr. GROSS. Apparently what Congress is being called upon—and I must say without injecting politics into this thing that this pressure seems to be coming from the new President of the United States for this amendment of the Battle Act. What is proposed to be done here now apparently is to siphon more money away from the taxpayers of this country

to take care of the economic aid to several of the Communist satellite countries. I am opposed to it and I hope the gentleman is opposed to it. I hope the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House will be opposed to this legislation when it comes over here.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I have felt that the mutual security program has long varied from its initial purpose. It was never contemplated, in my mind, that the Mutual Security Act would be used to support Communist governments whether they be in Yugoslavia, Poland, or anywhere else.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The Mutual Security Act has varied from its original purposes which I think in the first instance were excellent.

Since its beginning in 1948 I have been a strong supporter of the foreign aid program. I did so because of my conviction that we serve our own best interests when we assist free and friendly governments to become strong enough to resist internal Communist subversion and become militarily prepared to stand up to armed Communist aggression. I have on several occasions in past years directed attention to what I considered to be phases of this law completely inconsistent with the original purposes of the original plan, namely, the strengthening of the security of the United States and other free people. I refer specifically to the tragic misuse of American public funds to support the Communist dictators, and to strengthen their hold over the good people of the respective countries.

Mr. GROSS. Now if the gentleman will yield further, they are apparently about to. I have no doubt but what the other body will pass this amendment that is presently pending.

It is out of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and before the other body. I have no doubt that it will be passed, and we will get it over here.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman agree that we have reached a point in our history where the United States cannot longer allow itself to be tied down by agreements or lesser commitments that prevent us from being ourselves? These restrictions on our freedom to support freedom were entered into with other countries in the faith and on the assumption we were to have a world of order and peace. But tragically the Communists have blocked such a world. There is the form but not the substance. The restrictions are outdated and, worse, they leave the United States of America like Gulliver's giant, held down by a multitude of little ties that paralyze us when men are fighting for freedom and must have our assistance.

Has not the time come when the United States—either through the Congress or the President—must develop and proclaim a new doctrine, comparable to the Monroe Doctrine or the Truman doctrine, to this effect, namely, that the United States was born in freedom and, wherever and whenever man's freedom is denied or jeopardized, the United States must be free to give effective support to people who are giving their lives to retain their liberty or to regain it. The United States must make that its first obligation, and all other obligations in conflict with it must be secondary.

The Communists are winning this war because they know they are in it; and we are not even fighting it in earnest, partly because it is called peace. We must find ways to break through the sophistries and legalities. Where there is a conflict between our agreements to do things in the normal, orderly, peacetime manner and not to intervene in outside situations, on one hand; and on the other hand, there are our eternal commitments to stand with human beings fighting for freedom, these larger commitments must be given precedence. The United States could well announce that in any such conflict it will take such action as it decides is wise and effective, disregarding any secondary commitments which keep us paralyzed and leave the enemy free to go ahead and win victory after victory by our default. Does not the gentleman think that the time has come for something like that?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I concur wholeheartedly with the gentleman. We have lived too long in a Disneyland world with the Russian aggressors and imperialists. For too long we have observed formality in international affairs and have disregarded the substance of world affairs which is the freedom of mankind. It is obvious that the initiative of the United States as the leader of freedom's cause, has been paralyzed by the tactics of the Russian Communists, their agents, and their collaborators, and outside of the United Nations and other international organs which are supposed to promote not only peace, but freedom and human rights for all nations and all people.

The primary issue before the United States concerning the United Nations is simply this—are we prepared to make the United Nations into an organization consistent with the Charter of the United Nations or are we going to stand paralyzed while the Russians either destroy the United Nations or remake it into a three-headed monster as proposed by Khrushchev?

Mr. JUDD. I was pleased when President Kennedy said last week in New York that, if anybody is wondering when the next war is to come, the war is already here; we are in it. Maybe the Congress of the United States should pass a resolution saying that, however much we regret it, we hereby recognize that a state of war exists. A powerful enemy has declared war on us in every field: economic, political, social, psychological, propaganda, educational, scientific, art, sports, and every other conceivable field, as well as in space and conventional arms. The United States, to survive, has got to free itself from any shackles that make it unable to defend itself and to help defend the rest of the free world, as is best in any situation. Without a free world we cannot long endure. I do not see any way for us now except to cut the Gordian knot and proclaim to all that where men are fighting for freedom, there the United States must be free to stand and help too.

Abraham Lincoln was legally wrong, the lawyers told him, when he signed the Emancipation Proclamation, but it was morally right and it was morally necessary. To stand for human freedom is always right and necessary. In the gradual retreat of the free world, the time has come when the United States, bound down by self-imposed restrictions, must break loose from those restrictions, or, at least, serve notice that we intend to whenever that is necessary in order to be free to act on behalf of human liberty.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The time has not only come; it certainly is long overdue.

I favor a clear declaration by the Government of the United States that would put all of the people of the world on notice that henceforth the United States intends to stand firmly as a defender and supporter of human freedom and individual liberty in any and all circumstances, notwithstanding any agreements, charters, or understandings to the contrary and even to the point of using military force.

It is time that the United States by positive action and inspired leadership create world opinion, rather than have U.S. policy tied down by so-called world public opinion, usually founded upon slanted polls, planted Russian Communist propaganda, or neutralist thinking.

I would like to go on record as saying that our former policy which takes into consideration the sensitivities of our allies at all costs be discarded when it is taken into consideration the extent that it paralyzes all our activities and destroys our leadership.

Our allies are important, providing they do not cause the United States to desert its leadership, based upon principles of freedom, humanity, and justice. Alliances are good, but they are not enough. United States, as leader of free-world alliances, has got to take action directly against the heartland of the Russian Communist Empire, and vulnerabilities of the Russian Communist Empire invite our political initiative. This is positive action because it relates to working with the common man in that area, not the tyrants who imposed the rule upon it. It should work in the direction to restore liberty and freedom to these people because it is these factors which make them our common allies. There are those who say it is purely negative to strike action against international communism, but it is certainly positive so far as the United States and freedom's cause is concerned if a blow is struck which will dismember the Russian power bloc. Any blow or any action which will lead to the peaceful dismemberment of the Russian power bloc is a necessity at this time. In other words, freeing the captive non-Russian nations now under Russian occupation and control.

Mr. JUDD. To pursue it further, in wars of the old conventional sort—of

course, we will never again have that kind of a war in which the enemy sends us a telegram of notice ahead of time—in traditional wars all nations regard themselves as released from commitments that reduce their chances of victory. There is no just reason why we should not do the same in this different and more deadly war. The United States must find ways to stand openly, unashamedly, everlastingly for human freedom. To fail to do this serves only our enemies and denies us the spark, the zeal, the release that our people need if we are to get fresh dedication to the ideals of freedom and faith in freedom among ourselves and other peoples of today's confused world.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind the gentleman from Minnesota that when the Berlin airlift incident occurred in 1948, I advocated the declaration of war against Russia at that time. We had 2½ million men under arms in Europe at that time. And we have been backing away and running away from these issues that have come up. I did not get any encouragement from my suggestion.

Mr. JUDD. I recall also the time, shortly after the Korean attack, when the then Congressman from Massachusetts, Mr. Herter, and the Congressman from Maine, Mr. Hale, and I joined in introducing a resolution which said in substance that whenever an act of aggression was committed by any of the following countries—and we listed the countries in Europe and Asia that are satellites or Communist controlled—the United States would regard it as an act of aggression by the Soviet Union itself and govern itself accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me further, may I say to my friend from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] that we were not able to get consideration of our resolution any more than he was of his. We were told we must not provoke the Communists—as if they go to war on the basis of being or not being provoked.

In a sense we are prisoners of our finest decencies. We did not and do not want to believe the hard facts about Communists. But surely the time has now come when the blindest man can see what they are up to and what we should have done at various points and times in the past. It is already late, but however late it is, it cannot be any earlier tomorrow. Events in Cuba and elsewhere have forced us to recognize we are in a showdown. Every time we yield, it encourages the aggressor to take the next step. Every time we wring our hands but do nothing effective, we increase the danger of war rather than reduce it, because we invite the enemy to think that when his next pressure is applied, we will again make some fine statements but we or some allies will find some excuse to back down.

There is risk in taking this sort of stand; but there is hope. There is greater risk every time we back down; and no hope.

Some people were critical of John Foster Dulles, because they said he practiced brinkmanship. Now President Kennedy is practicing it. He did not want to be at the brink any more than Mr. Dulles wanted to. The Communists are always pulling our leaders to the brink, testing them. We have only two choices. One is to go over the brink, and the other is to stand firm at the brink. It is not where we are, but how we behave where we are that counts.

Whenever we have stood firm at the brink, no Americans have gone over. And whenever we have vacillated or yielded in order to avoid a conflict, it has merely shifted the conflict farther toward ourselves. China to Korea to Vietnam to Laos. If we fail to try in Laos, the next tests will soon come, and be still more difficult.

I am convinced that the President could unite our country by declaring some such new doctrine that America is freeing herself from whatever keeps her from being herself. I believe our people would rally overwhelmingly to such leadership regardless of section or party or class or interest, and other peoples would be devoutly thankful.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman that we need a positive, firm foreign policy.

The NATO alliance could be tremendously strengthened by bold actions. I feel that the victims of communism and Russian imperialism should be given an opportunity to volunteer for service in the NATO community and an opportunity to form themselves into separate military units under NATO but carry their own flags. This would be action which would put the enemy on the defensive. This would be action which would serve notice on all the captive people behind the Iron Curtain that freedom and liberty and independence for them was inevitable and would also give them a rallying point and hope.

It is clear to me that once the United States takes a bold initiative in support of freedom's cause anywhere in the world, we will find people in other lands quickly rallying to our cause. It would not be long before tyrannical governments which refused to join in support of freedom's cause would find their people seeking to volunteer for action in support of the American principles of freedom and justice.

I agree that our policy has too long been governed by fear, that is, do not provoke the Russian Communists because it might cause general war. This policy has been instrumental in paralyzing all actions toward the Russian Communist bloc. As a result we saw a defeat in Korea, dismemberment of Indochina, the Hungarian debacle, and now Cuba and Laos.

We have found by experience that you cannot contain communism. Communism takes two steps forward and one step backward. This was expressed clearly by Stalin. The one step backward is taken whenever we stand up to them, but the net gain to communism in every case has been at least one step forward. Experience tells us that we must alter our ways, that we must begin to take two steps forward and no steps backward. This is the only formula that will defeat the international Russian conspiracy.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Do I understand that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is suggesting that we are now in a position where we should renounce the articles of the Organization of American States?

Mr. JUDD. I think we are in a world position where we have to say that when there is a conflict between existing commitments entered into in good faith and the necessity for acting in our self-preservation, which is the first law of survival, we must choose self-preservation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman's position, because under articles 14, 15, and 17 of the Organization of American States, we are tied.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. BOW. We just cannot move to protect ourselves in this situation that we have in the Caribbean.

Mr. JUDD. It is like the laws which had grown up around the Sabbath in ancient times. It was almost impossible to use the Sabbath for the benefit of man. At that point Jews had to violate the regulations in order to get the Sabbath back to its essential purpose—the service of man. First things must be put first. I think we are at that point and I hope that the present administration will take some action along these lines. It would not commit us to any particular course in any particular situation, but it would free our hands to do whatever is necessary for freemen to survive.

Mr. BOW. I think it would be amazing to Members of this body as well as to the American people if they read articles 14, 15, and 17 of the Organization of American States under which we are completely tied against any action that we might take to solve this situation.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield, in an orderly, law-abiding society we never interfere in anybody else's affairs. But if someone is lawlessly pouring typhoid organisms into the water supply of this city, we have to intervene to stop him and we do. When we have somebody pouring poison into our whole hemisphere, the United States has got to find ways to stop it. The greater obligations must take precedence over the smaller ones.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for

bringing this matter to the attention of the House today.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

The Declaration of Caracas of 1954 could be a rallying point of our South American policy. I know that our neighbors to the south wish to learn about the intrigues of communism. They have begged us to teach them and lead them in this battle, but we have turned a deaf ear. We should revive the Declaration of Caracas and in addition add teeth or a mailed fist to it. Instead of making the declaration a meaningless mass of words, let us make it militant. Our Latin American neighbors will assist us in the battle if we show initiative and courage.

It is clear that we must take action, positive action, against the aggressor. One place to start political action against and expose the aggressor is in the United Nations. I urge approval of House Concurrent Resolution 230. The hour has come when we should cause the Russian Communists either to abide by the General Assembly Resolution on Hungary or be expelled from membership in the United Nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] has again expired.

LET US KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, some persons have been telling lies to a number of ministers of the gospel and their parishioners in Iowa. I suspect the lie originated with opponents to Federal aid to education, with perhaps an assist from unscrupulous political workers of the same type who were responsible for spreading the literature of hate which we saw during last fall's election.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the general Subcommittee on Education, I have been the target of a barrage of mail urging defeat of H.R. 4970, on the grounds that it makes provision for Federal support for private elementary and secondary schools. The letters quite plainly equate H.R. 4970 with the latter proposition. Some refer to President Kennedy's campaign pledge to respect our laws regarding separation of church and state, and imply lack of faith by him.

Most of the letters are from Iowa. I have heard from ministers as well as others.

It is quite clear to me that a deliberate misrepresentation has been made to these good people. It is quite possible that a few people could confuse H.R. 4970 with other proposals providing financial help to private schools. But when I receive so many letters based upon a completely false assumption, I can only conclude that the instigation was deliberate.

Let me set the record straight. The bill H.R. 4970, is a public school bill only. It was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON]. It embodies the recommendations of President John F. Kennedy. When President Kennedy sent his education message to the Congress, he stressed that the program was aimed at supporting public elementary and secondary schools only.

The position of the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church is in sharp disagreement with that of the President. For this reason it has been facetiously remarked that "John Kennedy is the best Baptist President since Harry Truman."

Mr. Speaker, the Congress may or may not authorize a broad program of grants or loans to private schools. It may or may not do this by amending the President's program, or by a separate bill. That remains to be seen.

With or without a so-called parochial school amendment, some people are opposed to Federal aid to education. Many others, including the President, are in favor of aid to public schools only.

But let the record be clear. H.R. 4970 is a public school bill. I trust this will allay the fears of so many good people in Iowa to whom, I believe, a deliberate misrepresentation has been made.

COEXISTENCE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the sands still left in the hourglass near the vanishing point. Years of indecision have brought the United States to an inescapable choice. The choice lies between freedom as Americans understand it, which means freedom to go and come as one pleases, to engage in business or diversion, to spend or save, to speak or listen; and freedom as the "liberty-loving peoples" of Russia and China understand it, which means freedom to do as you are told. The latter freedom Americans label tyranny. The choice is a hard one. We shrink from making it. We have recoiled in horror from the choice for 15 dreadful years. In lieu of a choice, we have explored all the possibilities of coexistence. We have hoped for a settlement by negotiation.

Today all hope of any practical program of coexistence vanishes in Cuba.

We cannot claim that our opponents have left us in any doubt as to their choice. They have said over and over again that their purpose is to exterminate imperialistic capitalism from the face of the earth. That means freedom as Americans understand it. If we hesitate to give credence to their words, can we escape the meaning of their deeds? At two points, at Laos in the far corner of the earth, and at Cuba in our very whiskers, they are today insolently challenging long-standing commitments of our Nation. We must choose: yield or fight.

In the Western World, in the United States itself, there are arguments for both courses. The arguments of those who counsel submission are persuasive, most insidiously and dangerously persuasive. Many who urge this course start out with the contention that it is better to yield a little here and there than to risk the cataclysm of a nuclear world war. A few see clearly that to yield a little here and to yield a little there is eventually to yield the whole. Among these, the English nobleman and philosopher, Bertrand Russell, has faced the facts most frankly and, indeed, most courageously. Lord Russell argues that both the Western World and communism should make every effort to negotiate differences. But he foresees the possibility that negotiation will finally fail. At that point, one side or the other must yield, or there will be a world war. The only possible outcome of such a war would be total extermination, not only of civilization but even of the human race. All, both belligerents and the neutrals alike, would perish miserably. The only real choice, therefore, would be for one side or the other to yield, or accept responsibility for total extermination. Only a lunatic would prefer extinction to submission. However much the free world may hate communism, and however much communism may hate capitalism, either side could find it possible to exist under the other system, and would prefer such existence to extermination. Consequently, in the last and final choice, when negotiation fails, and only submission or war is left, any sensible man would choose to submit.

There are two serious flaws in Lord Russell's definitive analysis and an additional one in the arguments of those who do not carry their analysis to the end.

Taking the last one first, it is the hope of proponents that a little submission here and there will postpone the necessity for a final choice until a time when rational negotiation may be possible and a final settlement can be reached without resistance. Unfortunately, history does not justify such anticipation. In the past, submission has only delayed the fiery trial, not averted it. Do developments in the Caribbean today tend to confirm experience?

As to the flaws in Russell's reasoning, the first is that another world conflict necessarily means extinction. A preacher speaking over the radio this morning said: "We know too much about things that make us afraid." The horrors of nuclear war have been dinned in our ears incessantly in recent years. There is no attempt here to minimize those horrors. They are real, and they do exist. The horrors exist for the neutralists as well as for the Communists and the free world. Yet, curiously, only a few people seem to be dismayed by those horrors. All great wars have been wars to end all wars. Between the First and Second World Wars of this era, it was poisonous gas that was to exterminate mankind in another war, which was therefore unthinkable. Back of that time, it was the invention of the high explosives, and preceding that, of the firearm. But somehow mankind has managed to survive. Some of us will undoubtedly perish in another war, and vast numbers of us may perish. Casualties will be distributed impartially among combatants and civilians,

among belligerents and neutrals, in all probability. But even the savage and ruthless forces of ancient empires never succeeded in completely eliminating their foes, even though they tried. Some of us will survive any conceivable war.

In fact, if we were minded to be cynical, we might argue that wars tend to increase populations. After two Great Wars in a single half-century, in which millions were killed, overpopulation has become a world problem. Never previously did population increase so rapidly. Many thinkers believe that the problems arising from exploding populations are more difficult to solve than those arising from ideological differences between the East and West. In the United States itself, in the decade of the thirties, sociologists gloomily predicted a static or a declining population maximizing about 1975 at a figure far below the last census count.

The second of Lord Russell's fallacies is that only an insane man would prefer extermination to submission. The risk of personal extermination is one we face continously. It might be said that the price of progress, if not the price of existence itself, is risk. Countless decisions involve risk. Some decisions face risk to an individual, some to groups of individuals. A nation, also, must make decisions and accept the consequent risks. A nation unwilling to accept the risk of possible extermination in a worthy cause could scarcely deserve the name of the nation.

The Revolutionary period of American history was curiously like the current period, except perhaps in magnitude. It was a case of attempted negotiation, and failing that, submit or fight. Timid and hesitant counsel advised submission. The bold and resolute urged resistance. It is evident today that the timid were in the majority. But their appeals for pacific gestures are lost in musty pages of history seldom brought to light. In contrast, the fiery arguments of the patriot leaders among our Founding Fathers have been conned by every schoolboy since their time.

Was Patrick Henry insane, then, when he spoke in the Virginia Assembly in 1775:

> Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not, the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation? For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and prepare for it. If we wish to be free; if we mean to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have so long contended; we must fight. Why stand we here idle? What is it that the gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?

Or was Thomas Paine indulging in ferocious fanaticism when he wrote:

> The sun never shined on a cause of greater worth. 'Tis not the affair of a city, a county, a province or a kingdom; but of a continent. * * * 'Tis not the concern of a day, a year, or an age; posterity are virtually involved in the contest, and will be more or less affective even to the end of time by the proceedings now. This is not inflaming or exaggerating matters, but trying them by those feelings and affections which nature justifies, and without which we should be incapable of discharging the social duties of life, or enjoying the felicities of it. * * * O ye that love mankind. Ye that dare oppose not only the tyranny but the tyrant, stand forth. Every spot of the Old World is overrun with oppression. Freedom hath been hunted round the globe. Asia and Africa have long expelled her. Europe regards her like a stranger, and England has given her warnings to depart. O receive the fugitive, and prepare in time an asylum for mankind.

More than a century later President Wilson acknowledged his indebtedness to such inspiring words as these when he stood before the Congress on April 2, 1917:

> But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.

It is the cause, then, and not the risk of failure, that justifies action. "Success sways with the breath of Heaven," runs an old proverb. What is the breath of Heaven? The brilliant past of this Nation argues that it is compounded of equal parts of righteousness and resolution.

Our Government is a representative government. At frequent and stated intervals, free citizens select in free ballot from their fellows individuals to represent them in the operation of government. Those who are selected are charged with the solemn responsibility of promoting and protecting the interests of the Nation. The justice, the uprightness, of their stewardship is brought into question at the next election. These selected officials have at their disposal the time and the means of gathering information relevant to appropriate action, information more detailed and extensive than can be communicated to the public generally. We expect them to act vigorously and quickly in conformity with the implications of that information. They have, or should have, all the resources necessary to meet their responsibilities. And in many respects, they do have those resources. In one respect only is there lack, and that is in the unreserved understanding and support of the whole citizenry.

We have just inducted into office a new Chief Executive. He was chosen from a long list of eminent men, every single one of whom seemed highly fitted by character and proved ability for the highest office in the land. The successive stages by which a final choice was made involved a series of public and private discussions, conventions, primary elections, and a concluding general election. In every stage, free citizens not only possessed but exercised the right of free expression of opinion and free choice. The process required a full year to complete. During the whole of the period, both the extent and the quality of the courage, the fidelity, and the sagacity of the various candidates was subjected to the most minute scrutiny. The public judgment on those characteristics was a major factor in the final choice.

The theory and the longstanding practice of our system of government unite in demanding that in foreign policy we place the full weight and power of the Nation behind the decisions of those whom we have freely chosen for office. On domestic issues there is room for difference of opinion, but not in matters affecting the safety and preservation of the state against foreign aggression. The President has stated that his judgment requires him to resist, and not to yield. So long as the Nation wavers between one course and the other, he is powerless. It is therefore incumbent on all of us to place our full confidence and support on the decisions of the President. This support should be communicated in clear and unmistakable terms by citizens to the Congress, and transmitted by the Congress to the Chief Executive.

As the old Roman proverb runs: The Fates lead the willing; the unwilling they drag.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that for the future of this Nation a Federal aid to education program should be passed. I believe that it should be passed this year, and that the best possible bill should be enacted if we are to meet the new challenges of this changing world. We need to seriously examine realistically and in new terms the new demands that are being made on our country to realize its full potential through maximum efficiency.

This compels us to view realistically the present controversy as to the advisability of providing assistance to all schools that are academically qualified and still remain within the principle of the constitutional separation of the church and state.

It is far easier to avoid a sensitive issue, but I feel the more light that is shed upon the subject the greater will be the understanding of the need to not overlook any resources that provide for a stronger and better equipped nation to meet the great challenges that are being flung in our face by adversaries on a worldwide front.

There are two issues involved in the controversy over Federal aid to private schools:

First. Apart from the state-religion question, would it be in the national interest for the state to support such private schools?

Second. Is such aid clearly unconstitutional?

Many of those who are opposed to state aid to private schools may regard the first question as irrelevant to the issue. I do not, for the second question only becomes significant if the first question is answered in the affirmative.

A. THE NEED FOR AID TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Nearly one-seventh of the total U.S. enrollments in elementary and secondary education are in private schools, of which the overwhelming majority are under parochial auspices. It is evident that, should this burden be lifted from parochial shoulders and added to the burgeoning pressures upon public education, the impact would be heavy, perhaps calamitous for standards of education.

The American people already are straining their resources to meet present demands for public education. These strains cannot but increase and there are grounds for concern as to whether the challenge will be met adequately. But if the average embattled taxpayer finds himself almost overwhelmed by the pressures of ever-increasing demands for educational expenditures, those who support private schools are in far more desperate straits—they must contribute double to education: as church members and as taxpayers.

The issue here is not really whether it is fair and just for supporters of church-directed schools to have to carry a double burden. This misses the point. Clearly, from the viewpoint of such individuals, the extra burden is a self-imposed, purely voluntary one. If there were not a crisis in education, the matter could be easily dismissed. But there is a crisis. Teachers are in short supply, and the resources of those who support private schools are reaching their limit. It is very likely, however, that if state aid in the form of low-interest loans is not extended to the parochial schools, a far greater burden than the aid needed to keep them going will necessarily be shifted onto the public schools.

If the share of the burden of education presently being carried by the parochial schools declines, there will be reason for grave concern. Taxes will rise considerably more than would be the case if aid were granted the parochial schools. More serious, moreover, is the fact that a relative decline in private school enrollments will mean a net loss to education of competent teachers; the corps of nuns, priests, ministers, and brothers trained and equipped to teach will be gradually withdrawn from teaching since they can only—at least under present circumstances—teach in parochial schools.

A declining contribution by private schools—which seems inevitable unless effective Federal aid is forthcoming—to education in America thus would have a double-barreled effect: It would increase the taxpayers' burdens while reducing the supply of teachers. This means a still more rapid rise in school costs and school taxes while at the same time increasing teacher shortages and subverting the formulation of educational standards.

It seems fair to conclude, therefore, that the answer to question one is clearly in the affirmative. Aside from the state against religion issue, there are compelling reasons for state aid to the private schools. The choice is not between flourishing mixed systems of publicly supported schools and privately supported institutions and one in which public aid goes to both types of institutions. Over the long pull, it is between an overmanned deteriorating public system and declining private one, and a flourishing pluralistic system, relying only in part on public funds.

B. THE ISSUE OF STATE AND RELIGION

It is difficult to believe that the so-called constitutional issue being raised regarding Federal aid to private—mainly parochial—schools has real merit. This Nation has well-established precedents for such aid, which incidentally are receiving little attention in the present all too acrimonious debate.

It is vital to note that the Constitution does not distinguish between aid to education and other relationships between the state and religious institutions. And to support the principle that Congress should make no laws concerning religion does not imply that religious institutions are to be subject to specific state discriminations. Nor does precedence or practice suggest such an interpretation. There are these considerations:

First. State support of parochial school bus transportation.

Second. Allowance by Federal and State Governments of deductions from personal and corporate income taxes for contributions to religious and sectarian institutions.

Third. Subsidy by the state of religious institutions through exemption of this property from the tax rolls.

Fourth. Exempting from income taxes of religious institutions.

Fifth. Contracts between the Federal Government and religiously controlled colleges and universities. These contracts typically include substantial elements of aid eminently defensible—and defended—as in the national interest.

Sixth. A considerable number of precedents indicating governmental recognition of the claims of religion, such as religious elements in official oaths of office, in courtroom oaths; and state recognition of diplomas.

Seventh. Hospital grants for hospital construction regardless of religious denomination, if any.

Eighth. College housing: Presently the Government makes low-interest loans to both private and public colleges for construction of student housing.

Ninth. Federal loans under the National Defense Act are made to elementary and high schools for purchase of equipment, the teaching of science and mathematics without church application being a bar to the loan.

Tenth. The GI bills gave aid to students attending parochial schools.

There are scores of other Federal programs through which institutions with religious opportunities receive Federal funds through grants or loans.

The above list of established precedents indicates that American governments already contribute significantly and explicitly to the support of religious institutions and in ways that are of crucial relevance to the present debate. If these above factors are constitutional—which does not seem to be seriously in question—then it is difficult to see how in principle the inclusion of private schools in a program of long-term low-interest loans to nonpublic schools should be in question. Since the Constitution does not mention education in its provisions on the state-religion issue, it cannot be maintained that any constitutional distinction exists between aid to higher education and to the lower levels of schooling.

It is granted, of course, that the amount of direct support entailed, were private schools included in a Federal aid program, would mean a major step. Taxpayers might well complain at the extra costs involved. But such issues are matters of economics, of distributions of tax burdens, and so forth, not issues of constitutional principle.

I find it difficult to reconcile the strong hostility of those who oppose the low-loan program to private schools with their apparent acceptance of the above-established precedents—unless, of course, their opposition is based more on economics and/or on bias than principle. If it is wrong for the state to give aid to private schools, directly or indirectly, why is it all right for the state to give special tax status to religious institutions and to support them via income tax deductions for religious contributions?

C. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

It seems fair and reasonable, for the above reasons, to support a program of long-term low-interest loans to private schools to parallel the development of public schools in order to assure ability to meet using costs. Both systems are needed if our national goals of educational opportunity are to be realized. Each system of education contributes to the efficiency and excellence of the other. Each system contributes to the diversity and fruitful competition in excellence that is the particular glory of American education. I, therefore, intend to support and urge enactment of the long-term low-interest loan program to private schools—for a stronger educational system.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof may be permitted to sit this week during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SAYLOR for tomorrow, Tuesday, May 2, on account of death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. SHORT), for 30 minutes, on Tuesday, May 2.

Mr. STAGGERS, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. KING of New York.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. ALGER in two instances.

Mr. KEARNS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCDOWELL.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 881. An act to revise section 4166 of the Revised Statutes (46 U.S.C. 35) to permit documentation of vessels sold or transferred abroad; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 27, 1961, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4884. An act to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 2, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

848. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to supplement and revise the laws prescribing restrictions against conflicts of interest applicable to employees of the executive branch of the Government of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

849. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 303(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 by increasing per diem rates and to provide reimbursement under certain circumstances for actual expenses incident to travel"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

850. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to bring the number of cadets at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy up to full strength, and to authorize admittance of students from friendly foreign nations to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

851. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), relative to the Navy proposing to transfer the escort *Banning* (PCE-886) to the Port of Hood River Commission, Hood River, Oreg., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

852. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a revised draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

853. A letter from the executive secretary, American Chemical Society, transmitting the Annual Report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1960, pursuant to Public Law 358, 75th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

854. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, relative to providing war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, pursuant to the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of April 26, 1961, the following bill was reported on April 28, 1961:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report on health research and training (Rept. No. 321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted May 1, 1961*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 271. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 2010, a bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 322). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MACK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 4614. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Report on Air Force ballistic missile management; without amendment (Rept. No. 324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 6094. A bill to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946; with amendment (Rept. No. 325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 6713. A bill to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 6713. A bill to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 6714. A bill to establish a Department of Small Towns and Rural Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6715. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1959 to provide a 1-year moratorium on Federal Housing Administration insured and certain other guaranteed and insured mortgages, with the Federal Government assuming the mortgage payments (both principal and interest) and certain other mortgage costs, for mortgagors in areas of substantial unemployment who are unemployed and unable to make such payments through no fault of their own, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6716. A bill to amend section 17 of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for further delegation of duties to employee boards; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6717. A bill providing that the U.S. district courts shall have jurisdiction of certain cases involving pollution of interstate river systems, and providing for the venue thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDING:

H.R. 6718. A bill to prevent the service or consumption of hard liquor aboard commercial passenger aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6719. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON (by request):

H.R. 6720. A bill to provide a simple alternative to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to tax the national income, the rate adjusted currently to overbalance the budget, gradually retire the debt, and thus restore and maintain the buying power of the dollar; to apply the incentives and responsibilities of economic freedom to employees; to aid the needy and pay their medical bills; and to provide for the general use of farm-income insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 6721. A bill to permit unmarried annuitants under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to elect survivorship annuities upon subsequent marriage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 6722. A bill to amend section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 to provide that a nonprofit corporation otherwise qualified may in certain cases obtain a direct loan for elderly family housing even though it has obtained a commitment for mortgage insurance on such housing under the FHA elderly persons housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 6723. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to equalize certain benefits for veterans with service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6724. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and

1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6725. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6726. A bill to make it a crime to discriminate against Ambassadors and other public Ministers and their servants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 6727. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to strengthen independent competitive enterprise by providing for fair competitive acts, practices, and methods of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 6728. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to bring the number of cadets at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy up to full strength; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 6729. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain lands held for inclusion in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, N.C., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 6730. A bill to revise the effective dates of certain increases in compensation granted to employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 6731. A bill to extend the provisions of the so-called Davis-Bacon Act to certain contracts to provide services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 6732. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to encourage the construction and maintenance of American-flag vessels built in American shipyards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 6733. A bill to amend the act of August 11, 1939, relating to domestically produced fishery products to establish a fund for the advancement of commercial fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 6734. A bill to encourage the discovery of gold, the development of gold mines, and the production of domestic gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 6735. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President should instruct the American Ambassador to the United Nations to cause the Soviet Union to abide by the standing General Assembly resolutions on Hungary or, by their failure to do so, to be expelled from membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. Res. 272. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in opposition to the recognition of the Communist Chinese regime; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the development and adoption of as soon as possible a natural minerals policy that will guarantee a strong and healthy domestic mining industry by assuring domestic producers a fair and equitable share of domestic metal markets; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the proposed comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds for commencement of construction of the cross-Florida barge canal at the earliest possible time; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to transfer or set aside 30,000 square feet of land at Fort DeRussy to the city and county of Honolulu, State of Hawaii, for the exclusive use as a fire station site; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to endorsing and supporting Senate Concurrent Resolution 40 introduced in the Senate of the United States to develop a Lewis and Clark Tourway; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to S. 473 and H.R. 12 providing for postal union recognition as a matter of right and not by sufferance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to ascertain and divulge the names of the American-owned foreign firms or those partly owned by citizens of the United States that are manufacturing on foreign soil and exporting textile products into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 6736. A bill for the relief of Loreto and Giuseppina Puccia and their two minor children, Carmelo and Lucia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6737. A bill for the relief of Esther Stroli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 6738. A bill for the relief of Lt. Gen. Bryant L. Boatner, U.S. Air Force, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 6739. A bill for the relief of Jankiel Borsuk and wife, Sylvia Borsuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 6740. A bill for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 6741. A bill for the relief of Jorge Awapara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 6742. A bill for the relief of Arturo La Chuisha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6743. A bill for the relief of Sadako Suzuki Reeder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

134. Mr. DOLE presented a petition of the Kansas Retail Jewelers Association, Inc., by Charles Elliott, secretary, urging the Congress to take action toward transferring the 10 percent Federal excise tax on jewelry at the retail level to the manufacturer's level, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

National Radio Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, the month of May has been designated National Radio Month, and I feel it is appropriate on this occasion to consider the significant place radio has in our daily lives. As an indication of the industry's tremendous success, in 1960 radio ownership in the United States reached the record figure of 146 million sets, or 3 per family, with an additional 10 million sets in public places.

The radio has played an important role in the educational, business, philanthropic, and entertainment lives of our people. It serves as an integral part of our national defense system, as a crusader for civic betterment, and as an informational media to practically all of our citizens. The thousands of men and women employed as managers, announcers, newsmen, writers, salesmen, and technicians have made a major contribution toward the growth of the radio industry as well as the Nation's economy.

To symbolize National Radio Month, the National Association of Broadcasters has chosen as its theme "Radio: The Best Sound Around." In my opinion, this brief motto modestly conveys the high

fidelity in which the radio industry has fulfilled its responsibilities toward a better informed nation.

I wish to extend my heartiest congratulations and best wishes to all those skilled and devoted people in the radio industry on this splendid occasion.

Americans Are Basically Conservative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress could well give some serious thought to the advice of our distinguished colleague, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, in the article from Human Events, which I herewith include as part of my remarks:

AMERICANS ARE BASICALLY CONSERVATIVE

(By Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona)

On my way to work one morning recently the radio blared forth with a commercial for one of the Nation's largest banks. The announcer proclaimed that "this financial institution is proud of its long record of conservative management."

The same day I noticed a full-page ad of one of the Nation's largest insurance companies advising all readers that the "management of this institution is conservative and responsible."

It occurred to me to wonder how fast an insurance company would grow if it advertised its management as being "liberal." How many people would have confidence in a bank which announced that above all else it was liberal?

I would suggest that all Americans are basically conservative. We adopt a conservative philosophy in our attitude toward our children and their education. We follow conservative policies in the investment and administration of our earnings. And when we spend our money we reveal ourselves as clearly conservative by attempting to secure the greatest possible value for each dollar spent.

Most of the copybook maxims we remember are illustrations of conservative belief. We don't encourage our children to engage in wild experimentation, either in their education or their personal relationships with their fellow students. When our youngsters are old enough to drive the car, we rarely let them depart from our homes without a shouted admonition to "drive carefully." When they marry and begin building a life of their own, we encourage them to approach the purchase of such things as a home or a car cautiously, giving careful consideration to all elements involved.

It is only in the conduct of our Government that some of us espouse a liberal viewpoint. This, I suggest, is because Government money somehow or other is now regarded as free money.

In my home State of Arizona the State building and planning commission has just received something like $100,000 in Federal funds. This money is to be used for the planning of new public buildings and public facilities. It won't purchase the actual architectural drawings, it won't be used to buy a single brick or a single yard of concrete. It will be used instead to finance the deliberations of various committees and agencies who will explore the situation and then come up with a suggested solution.

I wonder how many people of Arizona would urge the expenditure of $100,000 for this purpose if they were compelled to make a direct contribution on some preestablished formula to that fund.

We want our insurance companies to operate on conservative principles in order protect the value of our own insurance policy. Yet we encourage the Government in such undertakings as social security to operate in a fashion which would bring bankruptcy to any private operator who did not have full access to the Federal Treasury.

Conservatives know the value of sound instruction in our public schools in courses devoted to what we old-fashioned folk call the solids. The liberals have just discovered that there is some value in teaching mathematics and science and history. Until the advent of the first Russian sputnik their attention was centered on the happy-life-adjustment courses, good manners, and easier methods of learning.

Isn't it time for a nation, which by instinct and by experience reaches out for conservative principles, to demand the application of this same conservative policy in the conduct of its Government? How do you stand, sir?

Two Hundred Eighty-Seventh Anniversary of the Founding of Germantown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1691

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, many old communities in the United States annually celebrate their founding dates with events which excite the interest not only of the residents of the area, but also of Americans everywhere. Some of these communities are so old that they deserve special comment because of a record of progress that has been both continuous and substantial. Such a place is Germantown, which is a part of the Sixth Congressional District which I have had the privilege to represent in the 87th as well as in the previous Congress. This settlement was founded more than a hundred years prior to the inception of the United States. It continues to flourish while maintaining the traditions which have made it one of the leading communities in the country. It will be recalled that George Washington was a familiar figure in Germantown in 1793 and 1794. He rented the Perot-Morris House for personal lodging; and it was here that his Cabinet met frequently during the summer of 1794.

The 278th anniversary of the founding of Germantown will be celebrated the week of May 14 with a series of events over an 8-day period. The celebration will be sponsored by the Germantown Community Council, comprised of some 150 organizations, and the Business Men's Association of Germantown. The activities will begin next Sunday with Prayer Day and a fellowship service at James Methodist Church. At 2 p.m. the annual Vernon Art Exhibit will open in Vernon Park, with awards presented at 3 p.m. Highlights of the week's exercises will include the traditional Vernon Fair to be held May 17 in Vernon Park. Value Days offered by the business community will be on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, May 18, 19, and 20. A tour of historic homes will be conducted on May 21.

President Kennedy Signs Area Redevelopment Act—Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette Terms the Measure a Tribute to Democratic Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, when President Kennedy signed into law the Area Redevelopment Act earlier today, a long-past-due measure of assistance for depressed chronic labor surplus areas and underdeveloped nonurban areas became a reality.

Many communities which have been forced into economic decline by excessive unemployment will be stimulated by this act to take steps to improve their outlook and their stake in the future.

The Area Redevelopment Act will not, in itself, solve the problems of any section. But it will afford a means whereby numerous towns, cities, and counties can act to help themselves. Nothing will flow to any community as a consequence of this measure unless its leaders and citizens demonstrate ability to plan and initiate positive programs calculated to revitalize its economy.

The incumbent President's predecessor had two opportunities—in 1958 and 1960—to sign area redevelopment legislation into law. On both occasions his actions were negative instead of positive.

For President Kennedy, the experience of affixing his signature to the 1961 act at a White House ceremony this morning doubtless was a most satisfying one. Along with the esteemed senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other able Members of the Congress, the President, as a Member of the Senate, was a devoted apostle and stalwart proponent of aid for depressed area legislation. As a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President, Mr. Kennedy stated forthrightly his positive position concerning the need for such an act, and as his party's nominee he vigorously supported the Democratic national platform pledge to continue the battle for enactment of area redevelopment legislation.

But as gratifying as was the honor which came to President Kennedy in being privileged to perform the final action which gave this legislation the status of law, he very properly paid special tribute to our diligent and effective colleague, Senator DOUGLAS, and other Senate and House Members whose perseverance and devotion were applied to area redevelopment bills during sessions of the 85th, 86th, and this 87th Congress.

Those of us who have been afforded opportunity to work for this legislation were gratified to have been participants in the White House ceremony.

Mr. President, the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., which has been a strong and consistent advocate of area redevelopment legislation, published an appropriate editorial in its April 28, 1961, editions. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREA AID BILL A TRIBUTE TO DEMOCRATIC CONCERN

To those who argue that party labels mean very little, enactment of a bill to aid depressed areas this week should shake them out of their comfortable indifference to party politics.

On two occasions, a Republican President vetoed essentially the same bill, thus delaying aid to West Virginia and other States faced with pockets of chronic unemployment which defy State and local solutions. The overwhelming majority of Republicans in Congress also have opposed the bill over the past decade.

It took the election of a Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, and a Democratic Congress cooperating with him to assure its long overdue enactment. The bill is a tribute to the Democratic Party's pragmatic concern for people in trouble.

The tragedy is that Republican fear of trying something new—in the face of obvious need—delayed the bill's passage for so many years. This chronic, GOP standpatism has prolonged the agony of thousands of jobless citizens in West Virginia and the Nation.

President Kennedy, U.S. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, the longtime champion and author of the depressed areas bill, and West Virginia's eight Congressmen deserve praise for their efforts in finally obtaining a national program for a national problem. By working for its passage, President Kennedy fulfilled one of his major campaign pledges to the people of West Virginia.

Now it's up to the governmental agencies and citizens of West Virginia to make immediate plans to take advantage of the bill's provisions. Valuable time already has been lost because of Republican shortsightedness. West Virginia can afford no more costly delays in building for a more prosperous future.

Questionnaire Results for 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, every year since coming to Congress I have conducted a poll of the people of the Sixth District of Florida to seek their views on major issues expected to come before the House of Representatives.

This year the response exceeded 48,387 returns. By mailing back such a big response the people of the district indicate their concern in the affairs of their Government, and these citizens deserve praise for taking the time to study the issues and make their opinions known. The fact that every questionnaire is signed indicates a firm conviction of opinion and it is most helpful to me to have the views of so many.

The newspapers of the district publish the questionnaire as a public service, and additional mailings are made from lists to the entire area.

So that all Members may have the benefit of this questionnaire, under unanimous consent I include the results in the RECORD:

Congressman Paul G. Rogers' 1961 questionnaire results

Total response 48,387

[In percent]

Question	Yes	No
1. Do you favor reduced foreign aid spending?	91	9
2. Do you favor the proposal to make a compulsory medical care plan for the aged part of the social security program?	55	45
3. Do you favor using Federal funds to aid depressed areas?	70	30
4. Do you favor Federal aid for—		
(a) School construction?	52	48
(b) Teachers' salaries?	33	67
5. Do you feel that the Federal Government should assist in solving problems affecting migrant laborers?	56	44
6. Do you favor legislation which would—		
(a) Raise the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25?	56	44
(b) Extend the coverage of the present wage and hour law?	61	39
7. Do you favor my proposal for systematic annual repayment of the national debt?	95	5
8. Would you favor an amendment to the Taft-Hartley labor law which would permit union picketing at construction sites?	21	79

The House Rules Committee Can Speed an Investigation of the Adequacy of Existing Laws To Protect the Public From the Consequences of Undue Speculation by Favorably Reporting the Kearns Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, stock-market prices influence the personal expenditures of consumers, as well as the market for other investments such as Government bonds.

The New York Stock Exchange, taking note of recent heavy trading in securities, has warned the public against unsound investment practices. Keith Funston, president of the stock exchange, said on April 4, 1961 that—

There is disquieting evidence that some people have not yet discovered that it is impossible to get something for nothing, and they are attempting to make improper use of the facilities of the investment community.

Mr. Funston said, according to the New York Times of April 5, that the exchange had received reports indicating that some would-be investors were trying to buy shares of companies whose names they could not identify, whose products were unknown to them and whose prospects were highly uncertain.

A resolution which I have sponsored, House Joint Resolution 21, as amended, requests an investigation of the monetary and financial structure of the United States, by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives.

The House Rules Committee can speed an investigation of the adequacy of existing laws to protect the public from the consequences of undue speculation by favorably reporting House Joint Resolution 21, as amended.

I include as part of my remarks a joint memorandum which my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and I have issued. I also include, as part of my remarks, articles from the New York Times and the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, which underscore the need for the type of study and investigation my resolution, as amended, would provide:

APRIL 26, 1961.

JOINT MEMORANDUM TO CHAIRMAN HOWARD SMITH AND THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

From: Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS.

Subject: Resolutions calling for study of monetary system, etc.

1. I have for many years been urging the Banking and Currency Committee to undertake a study of our monetary and fiscal policy in all its facets.

Since 1952, I have been introducing resolutions directing the Banking and Currency Committee to make such a study. The resolution, House Resolution 21, as amended, by Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS, also seeks such a study.

I join Mr. KEARNS in urging that a resolution be reported by the House Rules Committee, calling upon the Banking and Currency Committee to make such a study of our monetary system in all its aspects.

ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
Member of Congress.

2. Since testifying on April 25 on my House Resolution 21, as amended, my attention has been drawn to other resolutions calling for similar studies, and that the House Banking and Currency Committee has jurisdiction over the subject matter of my resolution.

I therefore suggest that my resolution be further amended to direct the House Banking and Currency Committee to undertake the complete study of our monetary system and report to the Congress its findings and recommendations.

From discussion with members of the House Banking and Currency Committee it is my view that they would welcome making such a study of our monetary system.

CARROLL D. KEARNS,
Member of Congress.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 5, 1961]

FUNSTON CAUTIONS PUBLIC ON RECKLESS INVESTMENTS—URGES CARE IN SELECTING STOCKS—SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION SEEKS STRICTER AD RULES

The New York Stock Exchange, taking note of recent heavy trading in securities, warned the public yesterday against unsound investment practices.

At the same time, the Securities and Exchange Commission proposed strict new regulations against deceptive or fraudulent advertising by investment advisers. The new rules would apply to 1,800 investment

advisers licensed by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Keith Funston, president of the stock exchange, said in regard to the activity in the stock market:

"There is disquieting evidence that some people have not yet discovered that it is impossible to get something for nothing, and they are attempting to make improper use of the facilities of the investment community."

Mr. Funston said the exchange had received reports indicating that some "would-be investors" were trying to buy shares of companies whose names they could not identify, whose products were unknown to them, and whose prospects were highly uncertain.

He urged investors to follow "time-tested guideposts" advocated by the exchange as a means to sound investment, including skepticism about tips.

The Securities and Exchange Commission's new rules were proposed under a law enacted last year. No date was announced as to when the new regulations would go into effect. Under them, advertisements would be prohibited from doing the following things:

Representing any "graph, chart, formula, method, system, or other device" as able to indicate when to buy or sell securities, "without disclosing, in close juxtaposition and with equal prominence, the limitations and difficulties" in using such techniques.

Containing testimonials about the investment adviser or his product.

Referring to an adviser's past recommendations, which may have been profitable.

Offering any service as free unless it is, in fact, entirely free and subject to no charges or obligations, direct or indirect.

The agency said other practices might have to be curbed, and it invited suggestions to be submitted by May 15.

The investment advisers licensed by the Securities and Exchange Commission sell advice on stocks and bonds in weekly letters to subscribers or in pamphlets, reports, analyses, and brochures. Their advertising is aimed at attracting buyers for this material.

A violation of Securities and Exchange Commission regulations can result in a $10,000 fine or 2 years in prison. Usually, however, the agency brings proceedings against violators, suspending, or revoking their licenses. It can also seek a court order enjoining illegal practices.

The president of the American Stock Exchange, Edward T. McCormick, endorsed the Securities and Exchange Commission program to stop indiscriminate investment recommendations. He added, however, that he did not think it unreasonable for persons assuming the risks inherent in the purchase of common stock to expect in the reasonably near future a dividend return of 5 percent on their investments.

Mr. Funston, in cautioning prospective investors, listed some of the guideposts for sound investing.

Investors, he said, should have well-defined objectives and should choose securities to meet these objectives. They should recognize that there are risks as well as rewards, and that stock prices go down as well as up.

He also advised investors to keep an emergency reserve for family needs, to get the facts from a member firm broker and not to invest on the basis of tips and rumors.

"There is no question that investors should exercise the same care in seeking securities as they would in purchasing a house, or a car or in making any other major investment," he said. He added that the recent market activity was a natural part of an expanding economy, and an overwhelming majority of investors are using the market place soundly.

Yesterday's warning against unsound investment practices was the exchange's second in 2 years.

In April 1959 an article by Mr. Funston, "A Word of Warning," was read on television in commercial time relinquished by the brokerage firm of Sutro Bros. & Co. The article was published in the exchange's monthly magazine and its message promoted by a $250,000 advertising campaign.

At that time, Mr. Funston said:

"It would be most unfortunate to have any part of our business reflect unsound or unreasoned transactions—whether it be based on tips or rumors, or concentrated in low-price issues merely because the price is low."

Wall Street observers have not been disturbed over the recent heavy volume of trading so much as they have been concerned by the soaring prices of many so-called glamour stocks. These are often cheap in price and represent the securities of new companies, especially in the electronics and missile fields. They are companies whose futures could be extremely disappointing, and investors—actually, speculators in these instances—could be financially hurt.

Trading on the New York Stock Exchange set a record in volume last month and in the first quarter of the year, exceeding even the trading of the crash year of 1929. Daily volume has climbed over the 5 million-share mark many times this year.

Yesterday, 7,080,000 shares changed hands. That was the largest volume since September 26, 1955, which was the first trading day after former President Dwight D. Eisenhower's heart attack, when 7,716,650 shares were traded.

Trading on the New York Stock Exchange has exceeded 7 million shares only 17 times—and 8 of those occasions were in 1929.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, May 1, 1961]

OVER THE COUNTER AND INTO THE BLUE—BROKERS WARN OF FLAMBOYANT STOCK-BUYING

(By Frank C. Porter)

Six months ago, a construction laborer with muddy shoes and khaki work clothes walked into a Washington brokerage house, plunked down $25, and asked to open an account.

The chary broker tried to steer him into a safe and sound mutual fund, but his new customer would have none of it. He took successive flyers in a number of highly speculative local stocks—buying Servonics at 10 and selling at 18; National Research Associates at 1½ and selling at 4; and Nuclear Research Associates at 2¾, which he still holds and which is now selling for about 6.

For a total investment of $100, the construction worker now has paper profits of more than $1,000. Recently he breezed into the broker's office in a natty new blue suit and pearl grey vest. "What looks good today?" he asked.

The construction worker reflects a new wave of flamboyant stock speculation sweeping the country. As the contagion spreads, it invites invidous comparison with 1929 and worries overworked brokers and exchange officials, who realize a blowup in the securities market could give them a black eye and bring more stringent Federal regulation. As one of them puts it:

"When the house of ill repute is raided, everyone gets arrested."

Others describe it more delicately, but no less vehemently:

"The fact is that now the whole country is rapidly trying to get into the blue sky."—Walter K. Gutman, Stearns & Co., New York.

Some "would-be investors" are buying shares of companies "whose names they can't identify, whose products are unknown to them, and whose prospects are, at best, highly uncertain."—G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange.

"A colossal wave of greed is building up among uninformed people."—A. Dana Hodgdon, Hodgdon & Co., Washington.

"The over-the-counter market has become a veritable gambling arena which causes grave concern to those who lived through and survived similar phases."—Jacques Coe, Jacques Coe & Co., New York.

"Unfortunately, some people are going wild, like an 18-year-old boy who suddenly discovers that girls are wonderful."—Sidney B. Lurie, Josephthal & Co., New York.

"Today we have people buying stocks merely because the company's name has the word electronic or space or computer or automation or infrared or vending or cryogenics in it * * * They haven't the slightest idea what they're buying."—A partner in Johnston, Lemon & Co., Washington.

"Earnings are not cutting too much ice one way or the other right now. So many people are out after a fast buck these days they don't know what they're buying and don't seem to care."—Theodore R. White, Hornblower & Weeks, New York.

Others insist that trading in common stocks today is sound and orderly, that there is no concern for alarm. All agree, however, that there has never been such a period of broad public participation in the market.

In the first 3 months of this year, trading on the New York Stock Exchange topped 300 million shares—a record for any quarter in history. Daily volume on April 4 soared above 7 million shares, highest since former President Eisenhower suffered his heart attack in September 1955.

A New York Stock Exchange seat was sold last month for $225,000, the highest price in 28 years.

"Our business has been terrific. It's doubled just in the past month," reports Edgar B. Rouse, partner in Rouse, Brewer, Becker & Bryant, a large Washington brokerage house.

Clerks at member firms of the New York Stock Exchange have been working far into the night to clear up backlogs of orders on the busiest days. Many have to work Saturdays, sometimes Sundays as well. Partners at some of these houses have been regularly eating lunch at their desks and complaining that they rarely see their families any more. Switchboards become jammed and phone service slows.

As the volume rises, mistakes and delays multiply disproportionately. A customer who has ordered 10 shares of General Time may wind up with 100 shares of General Tire. Transfer agents have lagged as much as a week in the delivery of share certificates.

NOT A COMPLETE MEASURE

But while volume on the New York Stock Exchange, commonly called the big board, has been setting records since the turn of the year, it is not a complete measure of today's speculative activity.

Actually there are two stock markets. One comprises listed shares, those that are traded on the big board, the American Stock Exchange, and the various regional exchanges such as the Midwest, the Philadelphia-Baltimore, and the Pacific coast stock exchanges.

The other is the over-the-counter market, where vast numbers of unlisted securities are sold directly by dealers without the offices of an intermediary exchange.

While the New York Stock Exchange lists some 1,500 issues, and its smaller sister, the American, about 900, the common shares of some 50,000 other firms are sold in the over-the-counter market. New York Stock Exchange member firms employ about 28,000 registered representatives, the "customers men" who actually serve the individual investor. By contrast, nearly 100,000 registered representatives are listed by the National Association of Securities Dealers, the

trade association which polices the over-the-counter market (many of the latter also work for stock exchange member firms).

How much business is done in the over-the-counter market? Nobody knows or is even willing to estimate it. But it is huge—probably several times the size of the volume on the exchange. The OTC market, about which little is known by the public, can be likened to the great bulk of an iceberg lying beneath the ocean's surface.

OTC MARKET BOOMS HERE

It is in this vast, less closely regulated market that today's wildest speculation is taking place. Shares listed by the exchanges are generally seasoned issues of well-known firms in mature industries. Although the OTC market has its own blue chips—American Express Co. or Weyerhauser Co., for example—it also includes thousands of untried fledgling firms, many with extremely romantic names, which permit the fledgling speculator's imagination to run riot.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than in Washington where a brisk over-the-counter market has developed in recent years to match the scores of exotic-sounding small research firms sprouting throughout the area and the growing appetite for stocks of Washington's relatively well-heeled population.

At the end of World War II there were possibly 2 dozen purely Washington companies with stock in the public's hands. Today the figure approaches 200, with more being added every month.

To meet the demand, new brokerage houses have sprung up at an amazing rate. Ten years ago, there were less than 30 in the metropolitan area, today there are just short of a hundred.

Although the bulk are firms of established integrity, the high-pressure tactics and questionable ethics of a few have caused alarm in the industry. Several have been closed down by the Securities and Exchange Commission in the past year.

Brokerage houses in the District of Columbia incidentally, are unregulated at the local level.

Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Law Day is not merely a reaction to the high festival of a rival culture, but is an expression of dedication to the rule of law. This day is significant as a recognition of the value of the system that we have inherited from past ages and which we build anew each day.

It is the daily need for rebuilding that I wish to note. The rule of law is paradoxical in its stability and the fact that it also has an ephemeral character. While generations of men have sustained the concept of the law through the ages, it could collapse overnight if its support is withdrawn.

And this support must come from many hands. If we ever depend upon one man to sustain the law for us, then the rule of law will end and a tyranny, however benevolent, will commence. I pledge myself, therefore, to join with the millions throughout the world, lawyers and laymen, Americans and allies, who are now renewing their determination that our grandchildren shall live under the rule of law and know the benefit of freedom.

The Greater Williamsport Community Arts Festival of 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was privileged to attend the ceremonies marking the opening of the weeklong Community Arts Festival in Williamsport, Pa. I consider this activity, under the outstanding leadership of Mr. Bernard C. Taylor, to be a highly significant adventure in community effort; and I am proud that the district which I represent has, within it, generated an idea which seems to me likely to grow up from the community and outward even into the area, and into the Nation. It is an idea of today, not possible in another era. Not possible, because the need was not apparent. But now, with leisure hours and a high standard of living as a challenge for the value of time, it is of significance to see people in a community getting together to dig out all the art organizations and activities contained in it and going further to bring authorities in each art field to it to help stimulate the growth of art in its area. It is a good thing to use leisure time in this way.

From an idea born of a need to bring industries into the city of Williamsport, the chamber of commerce searched the town for a person who could coordinate all art activity. There are an assortment of art groups involved, plus the public schools, churches, and organizations which as a policy have never done more than listen tolerantly to an artist speak. The art groups have set up the schedules for their day: Visual arts, music, dance, drama, crafts, literature, and architecture, photography, graphics, fashion designs. There are two leaders of each art, generally one from the local college, Lycoming, and one from the public schools or local art groups.

There is a workshop each morning. The service clubs have taken guest speakers at noon luncheons, and the women's associations have sponsored the speakers in the afternoons. These programs vary with dancing and demonstrations as a part of the whole. There are also dinners sponsored by clubs and the evenings are devoted to entertainment and the performing arts. To add excitement a beaux arts ball will be held.

The best part of the festival is watching artists work with sponsors. One hundred and thirty-five guides have been instructed by college professors in a capsule course of the arts. They will stand by at all the exhibits which are housed all over town: in the public library, the college, the hotel, and the banks. On the final Sunday, after a week of stimulation, there will be a garden arts show which has been held in the spring for a few years.

Already within the city, an orchestra has been organized that did not exist before though the musicians were there. The arts and crafts have had the stimulation of working up to standards. Artists have felt the stability of interest and enthusiasm from supporters who are businessmen, industrial men, ministers, clubwomen, workers, and school and college instructors. The industrial school has done the bulk of the building of easels and display panels. Very little money has been spent in display. The emphasis has been on the value of participating in art and absorbing its benefits.

This is the reason the movement for a concentrated showcase for the arts is a product of today, of the good which people find for their time, and for a forward look into a productive, peaceful community.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of April 29, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

APRIL 29, 1961.

The inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program involved $600 million in foreign aid and passed 330 to 82. Three hundred and ninety-four million dollars go to the recently established Inter-American Development Bank for the creation of a revolving loan fund; $6 million to the Economic and Social Council of the Organization of American States (OAS); $100 million to the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) for health and education grants; and $100 million to Chile for earthquake damage. Five hundred million dollars came under attack (all except Chile aid) for these reasons, as stated in the debate:

(1) The administration refused to justify the need for the money, although the Foreign Affairs Committee had stipulated the delineation of detailed projects must precede any appropriation; (2) it was even contended that the end justifies the means (help South American countries, though no description of how or why the money is given); (3) we have been too quick and too free in giving away the wealth of America, and the time has come for reevaluation and substantial reduction; (4) State Department bureaucrats in foreign aid are arrogant, uninformed about the program, and inclined to hold the American public and the Congress in contempt; (5) by backdoor spending in foreign aid in this bill (i.e. spending without specific control by Congress), control of foreign aid programs will be lost; (6) we are without facts as to what projects will be started and what the ultimate cost will be. If we should take too many excep-

tions of this type, we would destroy our very form of government; (7) we have already given South American nations $6 billion in the last 12 years; these, and others.

Every citizen should be appalled, it seems to me, that the administration is demanding that Congress give up its traditional scrutiny of appropriations of money. Further, these programs will subsidize nations not sympathetic to us, indeed, who, in a showdown, will be sympathetic to Castro.

The aid to depressed areas conference report brought to the House a clear-cut issue—Should House Members permit the Senate to stipulate that this new experimental program should be taken out from under House Appropriations Committee scrutiny, getting money without yearly appropriations? It came as a shock to many Members to learn that the Chief Executive had done an about-face demanding this new type financing in the Senate-House conference eliminating House Members from the traditional guarding of the purse strings. A spirited debate resulted in a close vote in which loose fiscal policy supported by the administration won.

Public Law 480, a bill to permit an additional $2 billion authorization for sale of agricultural commodities, brought some more shockers to view. India is to receive $2.2 billion of food in 1960 and 1961. Yugoslavia has received $597 million, Poland $518 million, United Arab Republic, $332 million. A program originally intended as a temporary surplus food disposal measure has become the reason for surplus foods in perpetuity, all the while subsidizing our enemies, failing to convert neutrals, and alienating our friends—sort of an international public assistance program. The fiction of payment is kept alive by payment in local currency, money which we can't have but which is then spent on projects within the specific country approved by their government.

Now, put all these together: (1) Cuba has fallen to the Communists; (2) we approve $500 million aid to South American nations, friendly or not, relinquishing congressional control at Mr. Kennedy's insistence; (3) we start a brand new nationwide Federal aid program to local communities, for business establishments, community facilities, and individuals with Mr. Kennedy insisting and succeeding in getting Congress to give up control of the spending; (4) we authorize $2 billion more food giveaway to other nations, friends and foe alike, making a temporary program permanent.

My beliefs, in summary, are these: (1) Blockade Cuba economically to prevent further Castro buildup; (2) stop aid to enemies and neutrals, extend aid only to pledged friends in a manner which permits them to retain their own self-respect and to understand the United States who gives in self-interest, protecting herself, her form of government and freedom and justice in the world; (3) keep the spending firmly in the hands of Congress as the Constitution stipulates; (4) quickly but carefully plan our freeing of Cuba from communism while the blockade prevents their buildup; (5) serve notice to the world that we will tolerate no foolishness, mainly Russian subversion.

The Increase Came in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, rising farm income has attracted much attention, but no one mentions that most of the increase came in 1960.

The seasonally adjusted annual rate of flow of farmers' realized net income went up from $10.2 billion from the first quarter of 1960 to $12.4 billion in the last quarter.

My reference is the Economic Research Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Broadcast Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the weekend, I was privileged to review some of the major challenges confronting Wisconsin and the Nation in a broadcast over a network of Wisconsin radio stations, reflecting upon a number of issues now before us in Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The problems confronting us, of course, are extremely difficult and complex. Consequently, the creation of solutions for such problems require the cooperation and dedication not only of our citizens, but also of our leaders in Government.

As of now, the major legislation approved by Congress includes:

Establishment of a 1-year experimental feed grains program, aimed at curbing surpluses of barley, corn, and other feed grains;

Extension of unemployment compensation benefits for jobless, whose benefits have expired;

Authorization to create a program for economic assistance to chronically depressed areas;

Legislation to create additional Federal judgeships for our overcrowded and overworked courts. (This measure has passed both Houses of Congress and is awaiting action by a Senate-House conference committee.)

And other measures.

However, there are a great many significant, and some controversial, issues yet to be considered at this midway mark in this Congress. These include:

Liberalization of the minimum wage laws;

Aid to education;

Expansion of the housing program;

How to finance the highway construction program;

Adoption of improved ways to meet the needs of our 16 million folks over 65;

Strengthening and, as possible, streamlining our defenses;

Stepping up our space program;

And other issues.

LEGISLATION OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO WISCONSIN

In addition, there are a number of pieces of legislation of special interest to Wisconsin.

These include:

Appropriations for port and harbor development, including projects at Milwaukee, Green Bay, Superior, Menomonie, and other ports along the Great Lakes;

Enactment of the Wiley bill, S. 1515, to provide supplemental funds to carry forward the school lunch program for the current fiscal year;

Extending the time for termination of Federal control over Wisconsin's Menominee Indians, to enable the tribe to get its economic house in order; and

Getting approval of funds for expansion of the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

These, then, are the highlights of the legislative workload ahead of us in Congress.

WORLD OUTLOOK

As Congress attempts to grapple with these and other problems of significance to progress in Wisconsin and the Nation, there exist ever-present and overhanging crises in world affairs.

Around the globe, the Communists are stirring up trouble, creating wars, sparking rebellions, attempting to overthrow existing governments, and engaging in a wide variety of espionage, sabotage, subversion, and other legal and illegal efforts to expand their influence and control. Today, there are an estimated 36 million Reds operating in about 86 countries, attempting to further the aims of world conquest by the Reds. Because the Red conspiracy is so widespread, it is difficult to predetermine when, or where, the next explosion—sparked by Red action—will occur in the world.

In spite of our difficult problems, however, we must not allow "curtains of gloom" to descend over the Nation; rather, freedom, in my judgment, will triumph if we are willing to make the necessary effort now to stop Red aggression and promote the cause of peace and freedom.

Overshadowing the activities of Congress then, and, yes, the world, is the Communist threat to world peace.

The creation of peace is still the great challenge. Questions remain:

Can we develop ways to accommodate, or at least negotiate, the great differences between the East and West? Can we stop the Reds without war?

Can we meet the great and growing demands of the billions of "have-not" people in the world for more of the good things of life?

These are grave and serious questions that need to be faced, and resolved, in our time. Ultimately, we must find realistic answers, if there is ever to be stability and peace.

REVIEW OF HOTSPOTS IN THE WORLD

Briefly, now, let's take a quick look at some of the "hotspots" around the world.

In Cuba, the Red-tinged Castro regime has become more firmly entrenched.

In Laos the Reds, though professing a desire for a cease-fire and negotiations for settlement of the difficulties, are continuing military operations to attempt to extend their control over more territory.

In the Congo, Mr. Khrushchev is still the No. 1 troublemaker.

In Berlin also there are recurring threats of Red action to create tension which would possibly result in war.

Overall, the Reds continue to build bonfires around the globe which threaten, if allowed to spread, to lead to a global conflagration.

Now, what can we do about it?

The free world, in my judgment, must soon develop more effective ways for combating Red expansionism, if we are to survive.

The balance of power, and of world opinion, for example, once was largely on the side of the Western nations. Now, this balance is teetering precariously.

If we are to defeat the Communists' aim of world conquest, then we need to adopt a stronger, nonmilitary offensive against the Communists. Among other things, this, in my judgment, should include—

First. Strengthening our information-spreading program to beat, not be beaten by, the Communist propaganda machine.

Second. Adopt more effective machinery against infiltrative penetrations, the fruits of which are being witnessed in Cuba and Laos.

Third. A sharper counteroffensive to penetrate the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, not leave this as untouchable territory for the Reds.

Fourth. Better tailored U.S. programs, such as the Latin American plan, to meet special needs in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere in the world; and

Fifth. Finally, undertake a more dynamic effort to present the efforts and objectives of U.S. policies to the people of the world.

In summary, the United States needs to adopt a stronger political, economic, social, and ideological counteroffensive against the Communists. By experience, we know that a so-called containment policy is obsolete and unworkable. For the most part, the result has been loss of more and more land and people until the Reds now control nearly a billion people and vast natural, manpower, industrial, scientific, and military resources.

Unless we are willing to dedicate the effort, manpower, and resources to stopping the Communists now, the survival of our way of life—indeed, of freedom itself—will be in serious jeopardy.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States have many close ties with Poland, which it is my pleasure to review each May on Polish Constitution Day. The provisions of the 1791 Constitution proved that the Polish people at the end of the 18th century sought a liberal government from the medieval feudal elements, just as we had sought and won our freedom in 1783. A historian has written of the Polish Constitution:

Posterity * * * joins with the best contemporary opinion in deeming the Constitution of the 3d of May one of the greatest achievements in Polish history.

For this reason the Polish people have remained true to their ideals, first expressed in this Constitution no matter where they have moved in the world. Polish immigrants to this country brought with them their love of independence; Polish people helped settle our country and built its cities and towns. They have contributed to our music and our literature. They have brought to us all the elements of their society which it has been so difficult for them to maintain under Soviet domination. Thus, I take great pleasure in honoring them on this most important day in their history.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish 3d of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

In Wilmington, Del., the Council of Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware will mark the adoption of Poland's first constitution on May 7.

Participating in the observance will be the Delaware division of the Polish-American Congress. The observance will be held at Modjeska Hall, in Wilmington.

Prominent Polish and American speakers will address the gathering. St. Hedwig's Choir and children of Polish Saturday morning classes will take part in the program, as will various officials of the city of Wilmington, and of New Castle County.

The Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware recently pointed out, in announcing the plans for May 7 that:

During the past two centuries, Poland, which was the most powerful nation once, became partitioned four times; [has been] ravaged, despoiled, persecuted, and enslaved by greedy neighbors. No nation could suffer so much without leaving a deep scar.

It is the hope and prayer of Polish people everywhere that a spirit of justice, understanding, and cooperation prevail among all the nations for a glorious and lasting peace on earth and good will among men.

The committee on arrangements for the May 7 observance of Poland's Constitution Day in Wilmington, Del., consists of Adam J. Rosiak, chairman; Joseph Falkowski, Ludwig Kopec, Frank J. Leski, Mrs. Frank J. Obara, and Mrs. Charles Kilczewski.

Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, widespread interest in utilizing television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges and in adult training programs prompts me to urge revision of pertinent legislation now pending before the Congress, such as H.R. 965—Senate counterpart S. 205—and H.R. 132. My purpose in speaking about these bills is to point out their inadequacy for the purpose of accomplishing the desired goal upon which, I am sure, almost all of us agree, and further to suggest changes for effectuating much greater results with the same amount of money than would otherwise be the case.

Although H.R. 132, approved by the administration, postulates grants to the States on a matching basis, while H.R. 965 would authorize straight grants without a matching requirement, the two bills have in common the basic restriction which, I believe, should be modified. I refer to the limitation that the Federal funds could be used by the State, university, or other appropriate agency or nonprofit educational organization only for acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus necessary for television broadcasting.

Let us now consider the practical results of this limitation. The legislation itself pinpoints the fact that none of the money can be used for acquisition of sites and buildings for installation of antennas and to house the television transmission apparatus, or for operation and maintenance of such facilities. By inference none of the Federal money would be available for producing either live programs, or films, or for reproducing such films for widespread use. Neither could any of the money be spent to meet such expense as would be incidental to cooperative arrangements with commercial television stations which might be willing to broadcast such educational films on a free time, public service basis.

This last-mentioned restriction is the one which would most seriously circumscribe the educational television program in Alaska, and in other sparsely settled

western States with widely scattered population centers. To back up this point, I will use Alaska as an example. Cities in Alaska which have television facilites are Anchorage, Seward, Kodiak, Nome, Fairbanks, Juneau, Ketchikan, and Sitka. Anchorage and Fairbanks each have two TV stations. Ketchikan and Nome are over 1,000 miles apart, and the others, with two exceptions, are several hundred miles away from each other. With the State struggling from a financial standpoint to meet its educational requirements and other responsibilities, it is doubtful that it could afford to establish and operate more than one of the public educational TV broadcasting facilities such as are contemplated in the pending legislation. If such facility were established at the University of Alaska near Fairbanks, for example, its educational broadcasts would reach only the people of Fairbanks, and environs. If the facility were located at the Alaska Methodist University at Anchorage, its programs would reach only the people of the Greater Anchorage area. All of the other towns I have mentioned with television services and the many smaller communities of Alaska would be left without benefit by the program.

Since this legislation has been introduced, I have heard from Dr. William R. Wood, president of the University of Alaska, that the university has applied to the Ford Foundation for assistance to develop a coordinated statewide adult education program and to establish an instructional materials production center to produce films, kinescopes, sound tapes, video tapes, slides, graphic materials, and related articles for an extended and intensified adult education program off-campus, and for general improvement of on-campus instruction. If this materializes, the university would be in a position to enlist the cooperation on a primarily public service basis of all the commercial television stations in Alaska. With this start the whole plan could be augmented as to the television phase, if only realistically flexible provisions were included in the pending legislation.

Such provisions, which I urge, would allow a portion of the money to be used for production equipment, for use at the University of Alaska, for example, in the course of producing live educational or informational or cultural programs, to obtain films for distribution to all of the cities which have television stations. With this type of arrangement, and with the University of Alaska, for example, as a focal point, plus cooperation by existing commercial television stations on a nonprofit basis, a highly practical solution to attaining the objectives of the pending legislation would be obtained. In order to further utilize these productions, another item of equipment which converts video-tape recordings to 16-millimeter sound on film would mean utilization in every secondary school or closed circuit television station where the 16-millimeter visual aid type of projector is available. Another portion of the money should be usable for the purchase of suitable ETV film or kinescope programs now available from educational centers such as Ann Arbor for use at the university, or elsewhere, and for distribution for telecasting on a cooperative and nonprofit basis by the commercial television stations, with credit given to the university or other agency or institution which acquired the programs. Another minor amount could be allowed for use in reimbursing the commercial television stations for their added expense incidental to telecasting these public service programs.

For the technical advice reflected in my remarks, I give credit to Mr. A. G. Hiebert of Anchorage, Alaska, an outstanding television authority and public-minded citizen. The above suggestions are fully endorsed by the University of Alaska. In my opinion, the adoption of the method I have set forth is necessary to any widespread fulfillment of the fine objectives of the legislation in question.

The Challenge of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has spoken frequently and effectively for the liberal position in politics.

He has recently summarized the liberal position in an article, "The Challenge of Change," which he wrote for the Midwest Quarterly, a journal of contemporary thought published by Kansas State College, of Pittsburg, Kans. I ask unanimous consent that this article, appearing in the April 1961 issue, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF CHANGE

(By Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

Liberalism is not a doctrine, a dogma or a distinct philosophy. It is rather an attitude—an open approach to life and society characterized by flexibility and adaptability.

The American liberal cannot offer a precise definition of his political attitude. Indeed, he shuns the oversimplifications and catch phrases which are used so often to describe liberalism. He seeks to express his views clearly and eloquently, but he is at a disadvantage. He knows that any rigid statement on liberalism could be rendered obsolete in a short time by the fast sweep of world events.

The key word which may be applied to the liberal viewpoint is "change." The liberal understands that life is not static, that anything—from a plant to a government—must change, or it will die. He knows that a mind, or a nation, cannot endure as an active, productive instrument if it is guided by the status quo and allowed to slip into stagnation.

The liberal welcomes change. He seeks change not for its own sake, but as an inevitable force of life which must be captured and channeled toward the right direction. He is thus willing to experiment, to try the untested, to develop the new, to dare the impossible.

The liberal's willingness—yes, eagerness—for change is not just a restless yearning for activity. His goals are clear; his ideals are strong. He is not afraid to pursue them with all his energy.

The liberal American seeks a world of peace, dignity, security, and freedom for every individual. He pursues the goal of a world in which each human being enjoys full freedom to live and work as his conscience and talent direct him.

This full freedom means far more than the absence of political restraints. It means a democratic society and a minimum of control by government, of course. But full freedom is not just freedom from political or social interference in the lives of individuals.

Full freedom for an individual to pursue and achieve his potential means freedom from the basic and ancient enemies of mankind—hunger, poverty, disease, illiteracy, ignorance.

The liberal fully understands that a man is not really free if he is hungry. That man is a slave; his chains are as strong and confining as if they were made of steel. He cannot work, he cannot produce, he cannot create. His progress is checked, and he becomes the target of the agents of totalitarianism.

The same chains bind the man who is impoverished, or sick, or illiterate, or ignorant. In this modern world, this scientific age, tens of millions of men are so bound. Two-thirds of the world's peoples are undernourished today. Three-fourths of all human beings are illiterate.

The liberal does not ignore these facts. He looks beyond the comfort, security, and relative luxury of his own surroundings and is deeply concerned with the plight of his brothers.

This is one key element, I believe in the character of the American liberal. He does not detach himself from the basic problems of mankind, even though he is not directly affected by those problems. He is guided, I believe, by an instinct of humanitarianism and a sense of compassion. Other men who reject the label "liberal" may be humanitarian and compassionate. But the liberal's concern for others is deep, enduring, and personal.

The liberal does not examine the plight of masses of men elsewhere, throw up his hands in defeat, and say: "It's too big a problem. I and my country cannot solve the problems of hunger, poverty, and illiteracy everywhere." The liberal knows the problems of mankind are massive, but he is determined to seek solutions, to work for the progress of all men, and to sacrifice some of his own comforts to save the lives and minds of others. The liberal feels responsible.

He also has faith that no problem is too big or overwhelming. He sees the hunger of millions not as a problem, but as a challenge. And he sees the surplus of food in America not as a problem, but as an opportunity—an opportunity to utilize this Nation's agricultural abundance to feed the hungry of the world and move mankind a big step closer to full freedom.

The liberal is also a realist. He has faced the facts of human need and is well aware of the difficulties of meeting those needs. But he is determined to work toward his goals. He understands that a world of full freedom may not be secured in his lifetime, but he knows that unless he works for such a world, it will never become reality. The world, he says, cannot and will not stand still. If mankind does not progress toward its noblest goals, it will slide back further away from them.

A food for peace program, or any program developed by the United States, can and must stem from the hearts and the will of the American people. And, by necessity,

it must be administered through their Government. Every American shares a belief in representative government by law, but the conservative tends to believe that government should do as little as possible, that it should have little authority and responsibility.

The liberal believes that for a successful democracy, government initiative is fully as necessary as private enterprise—for a food for peace program or any other national effort. He believes that primarily through the vigorous use of the mechanics of government can we muster our resources with sufficient strength, speed, and purpose to survive as a free nation threatened by totalitarianism.

To many conservatives, "planning" becomes an unpleasant word when it is applied to any effort outside the household or corporation. But the liberal knows that purpose and planning are absolute essentials of public policy, as well as of private enterprise. He is convinced that if we are not willing to shape history ourselves, others will shape it for us.

The liberal believes that government is not in competition with any group in the Nation, that it is not just another special force within our society. He believes that our Government is the noble extension and voice of the whole American society. Thus, planning in our democracy is a creative act which must draw on the intelligence and skills of the Nation as a whole, and not simply on the bureaucracy of the Federal Government.

The liberal today is often criticized for advocating what conservatives label a "welfare state." I think it is useful to examine two quotations which help define the welfare state concept:

"The scheme of society for which we stand is the establishment and maintenance of a basic standard of life and labor below which a man or woman, however old or weak, shall not be allowed to fall. The food they receive, the prices they have to pay for basic necessities, the homes they live in, their employment must be the first care of the state, and must have priority over all other peacetime needs."

"I believe that the American people feel that our production is so great that we can afford to put a floor under the necessities of life—food, education, medical care, housing—so that every family may have available a minimum decent living."

The first quotation is from Winston Churchill. This second was spoken by the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

Planning—for a minimum decent living—does not mean dictation in a free society. It means cooperation and coordination. The liberal does not want big brother dictating what people must do. But the liberal argues that the challenges facing America can never be met without the vigorous participation of the Federal Government.

Today's liberal believes that conservative government cannot cope with the restless, endlessly changing world of the 20th century. In the field of foreign policy, the liberal accepts the fact that Government action dominates the international scene.

The liberal identifies with the need for leadership in a world of turmoil, conflict, and danger. He is willing to act as a leader, and to see his nation stand as the leader of the free world. He sees challenge and opportunity throughout the world, and moves to seize the initiative. The liberal has worked for and won progress in international organizatons, more technical assistance, and more economic aid for the underdeveloped nations.

He does not rest on specific victory. He is forever seeking improvement and forever working for progress. He never takes his eye off the goal of a nation and world of prosperity, of peace, of brotherhood. Above all, the liberal recognizes that the means of achieving that goal must preserve the dignity, the freedom, and the self-respect of man, of the individual citizen.

Others who call themselves liberal may disagree with some of my comments, or place different emphasis on some elements of the liberal attitude. This is to be expected. President Franklin D. Roosevelt was asked once why liberals were so often divided, and conservatives generally united. He answered:

"There are many ways of going forward, but there is only one way of standing still."

Public Power in Texas and in the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 1, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have been requested to place in the RECORD the address I delivered before the 18th annual national convention of the American Public Power Association at San Antonio, Tex., on April 24, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion titled "Public Power in Texas and in the Nation" be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC POWER IN TEXAS AND IN THE NATION

(Speech by U.S. Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, of Texas, at the 18th Annual National Convention of the American Public Power Association at the Granada Hotel in San Antonio, Tex., April 24, 1961)

Mr. President, members of the American Public Power Association, guests, it is a great pleasure to welcome the American Public Power Association to Texas, here to the historic old San Antonio, where the American hero tradition reached its fullest flower. Here, 125 years ago, public duty even unto death was chosen voluntarily by every man of that heroic Alamo force. They set an example in time of peril that Americans today must be ready to emulate if we would keep our freedom secure. The spirit of Travis, Bowie, Bonham, and Crocket lives in the hearts of the people of Texas more securely than those stone walls of the Alamo which stand a stone's throw away from this hotel.

PUBLIC POWER IN TEXAS

In keeping with the spirit of her founders, Texas has a tradition of progresisve protection of the people in the field of public utility development. Under Texas' greatest Governor, James Stephen Hogg, the Texas Railroad Commission was created 70 years ago to regulate transportation abuses; along with Wisconsin, these were the first two States to create such public regulatory commissions. And U.S. Senator John H. Reagan from Texas, one of Texas' four greatest statesmen, was the author of the Interstate Commerce Act, creating the present Interstate Commission. Texas is proud of her old traditions and her great statesmen; they earned their place in history as you are earning yours, as open servants of the people, and not as covert agents of the people's opposition.

In keeping with its early tradition of public duty and welfare above private gain, our State has played an important part in public power since the early days. Texas also has had something to do with the founding and rapid growth of the American Public Power Association.

As you may know, Max Starcke, longtime general manager of the Lower Colorado River Authority, was one of the early leaders of your American Public Power Association board of directors along with the late E. F. Scattergood of Los Angeles, James D. Donovan of Kansas City and other American Public Power Association pioneers.

Although I can't claim having any part in the formation of American Public Power Association, I have had a keen working interest in public power since 1935, when I was appointed, in February of that year, by the late Gov. James V. Allred, to the original board of directors of the Lower Colorado River Authority of Texas, created to harness the Colorado River of Texas. One of the authority's principal purposes was to provide a low-cost power supply for municipal electric systems and rural electric co-ops. It was created even before the Rural Electrification Act of 1935 was passed.

As early as 1886, when there were only 30 municipal electric plants in the United States, there was a municipal plant in Texas. Unfortunately, the early records do not indicate just where all of those 30 plants were located.

But the first municipal plant in Texas that we know much about was set up in my home city of Austin in 1895. Greenville's plant was established in 1889, Brownsville's in 1907, Terrell's in 1908, and so on.

The city where you are holding your convention—San Antonio, Tex., mother city—has one of the newer municipal electric systems in Texas, but already it has established an outstanding record.

Texans formed their own electric systems for the same reason the people in hundreds of communities in other States decided to provide electric service to their residents: They were impatient to enjoy the full benefits of electricity, and no private companies were willing, at that time, to serve them adequately.

The result has been very similar to the situation which developed years later, when the rural electification program was established. The power companies couldn't see any profit in serving small, isolated communities and it was not until after the communities had taken the initiative and started their municipal plants that the potential growth of both the small cities, and their quantity of electric usage, began to impress the private companies. After the success of municipal electric plants was assured, the private companies were more than willing to buy them out and provide the necessary service.

In rural areas, private interests also wanted to go slowly in building lines, thus putting the responsibility on the rural people themselves to prove that they were good customers.

More than 30 of our State's municipal systems have been sold out over the years. A study by the Bureau of Municipal Research of the University of Texas reports that "at no time during the operating of municipal plants were they free from the attacks of private power companies." I suppose this statement would be true in any of the States of the Union. During the twenties, according to the study, many municipal systems were sold at several times their cost to power companies which put a high price on the nuisance value of these plants.

Fortunately, a contrary trend in Texas set in during the thirties, due at least in part to the creation of the Lower Colorado River Authority. Between 1939 and 1942, 17 municipalities started their own electric systems in order to distribute power from the Lower Colorado River Authority.

With the coming of the Lower Colorado River Authority, a source of low-cost wholesale power was opened up to residents of a 31,000-square-mile area centering around our capital city of Austin. More than 30 cities now buy all or part of their power supply from LCRA.

Low-cost power has been, in a sense, a bonus from the control of the Colorado River of Texas. This turbulent stream had a history of severe floods and alternating droughts, which would turn the stream into a mere trickle, insufficient to provide even enough drinking water for the communities along its banks.

The legislature of Texas in 1934, created the Lower Colorado River Authority as a State agency charged with controlling floods, conserving water for irrigation, creating power, and for other useful purposes, and protecting the watershed through prevention of erosion, and development of forests of the area.

This is a State public water and power development authority, based on the national TVA.

The authority has accomplished these purposes without levying any taxes and without direct appropriations for operation or construction by the State of Texas. Its water-control dams are financed through revenue bonds and its own revenues. Its multiple dams (six in all) on the Colorado River of Texas represent the finest power development in Texas.

I have recited this brief history of public power in Texas as a sort of prelude to your convention's theme—"A New Era for Public Power."

PUBLIC POWER IN THE NATION

Changes in the power industry during the past 10 years probably have been more rapid than during any comparable period in our history. But the next 10 years promise to bring even more dramatic changes in our methods of producing, transmitting, and distributing power, as well as a new surge in usage of electricity, some of it for appliances and electric servants which have not yet been invented.

On the policy side, great strides will be made during the coming years by an administration in Washington dedicated to moving ahead rapidly with the Federal power program and to stimulating what President Kennedy called in his message on natural resources "sustained heavy expansion by all power suppliers—public, cooperative, and private."

The President declared that if this Nation's power facilities are going to keep pace with the growth of our economy and national defense requirements "intensive effort" will be required by all segments of the power industry. Installed capacity should triple by 1980, he said, if we are to meet the needs of essential economic growth.

This is a great challenge to local public power systems. Tripling of capacity in less than 20 years is going to mean a big investment, larger and larger generating plants, and a greater degree of cooperation among the smaller utilities to make the most effective use of their generating plants.

The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources has called for a vast new program of water-resource development to meet expected needs for water, and I am sure that Senator Moss, who was a member of that committee, will give you more details on that when he speaks at your meeting later this week.

However, it is significant that the President endorsed the select committee's report as "very excellent and timely" and urged the Bureau of the Budget to schedule "a progressive, orderly program of starting new projects to meet accumulated demands" in his resources message.

Obviously, the Federal Government can be expected to give dynamic leadership during public power's new era through resource development, extension and interconnection of the Federal transmission systems, and through devotion to the preference principle in the marketing of Federal power.

With the Federal program providing a strong base of low-cost power in many areas, what will be the future for public power in these areas and in those parts of the country where Federal power does not now exist?

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

Let us review for a moment the situation in the States of Missouri, Arkansas, Kansas, Oklahoma, and northeastern Texas, where the Southwestern Power Administration serves as marketing agency for Federal power.

I use Southwestern Power Association as an example both because it is important to Texas and because the local publicly owned electric utilities in the area are eager to share in the benefits of this Federal power supply.

Today, relatively little of this Federal power has found its way to the municipal electric utilities in the area, for a variety of reasons. In some cases, the municipalities themselves are just beginning to realize the enormity of the benefits which they can gain from tapping this great power source. In other instances, restrictive contracts already signed, plus roadblocks put in the way of an aggressive policy of transmission line construction, have not permitted the full benefits of Federal power to be realized.

What might be called the "golden age" of Southwestern Power Association lies just ahead—in the new era.

Here's a rundown on the additional power capacity scheduled for installation during the next few years:

Bull Shoals Dam, 90,000 kilowatts in 1961 and 90,000 kilowatts in 1963; Greers Ferry, 96,000 kilowatts in 1963; Dardanelle, 31,000 kilowatts in 1964, 62,000 kilowatts in 1965, and 31,000 kilowatts in 1966; Eufaula Dam, 90,000 kilowatts in 1964; McGee Band Dam—52,000 kilowatts in 1965; and Beaver Dam, 112,000 kilowatts in 1965.

Although not all of this will be firm energy, the quantities involved are substantial, and could have a tremendous impact upon the public power situation in the five-State area.

I am confident that the new administration will see to it that this power is sold to the municipalities and rural electric cooperatives of the area under a strict compliance with the preference provisions in Federal law. The President made clear his own adherence to this principle when he said in his resources message that the Federal power marketing laws "recognize the prior rights of the general public, consumer and taxpayer who have financed the development of these great national assets originally vested in them." The President's message emphasized that power disposal "shall be such as to encourage widespread use and to prevent monopolization."

In Southwestern Power Administration it may require extension of the Federal transmission system to make such a power policy work. I believe that this administration will not hesitate to request funds for such an extension if it appears necessary.

So, for the municipalities in Kansas which are exploring the possibilities of joining together to obtain Southwestern Power Administration power, this kind of national leadership can have real dollar-and-cents meaning.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For communities in the southeast, the extension of the new Federal policy to the Southeastern Power Administration service area can mean lowcost power supply from the Hartwell, Walter George, and Barkley Dams, which will bring a combined total of more than 250,000 kilowatts on the line within the next 4 years. Aggressive planning for the marketing of the new power soon to become available, with Federal transmission lines where appropriate, can mean a larger flow of low-cost power to consumers who own their own electric systems.

The question of transmission comes up again and again in connection with the Federal power program, and I believe that in this field the previous administration has as poor a record as it has in the actual construction of multipurpose projects.

It is true that the "No new starts" policy shut off the flow of Federal power at the source. But it was the timid marketing policy, relying heavily on private utility lines, which has deprived the consumers served by many local public agencies of their share in the benefits of the Federal power program started under previous administrations.

There is ample evidence that the new administration is giving attention to the transmission line problem. Imaginative proposals for huge interregional interties such as the Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie, under study by the Interior Department, give evidence that there is an appreciation in the administration of the power facts of life.

AMISTAD DAM AND PUBLIC POWER

A new development of interest to all of us is the impending construction of the giant Amistad Dam on the Rio Grande, in Texas and Mexico, above Del Rio. The issue of public power is the most important unsolved issue about that dam. Some private companies want the United States to build this great dam, but sell them the "falling water" for a song while the taxpayers pay the fiddler, on the theory that the Federal Government can't develop the power.

I regard this as 19th and not 20th century thinking. Your association members, the TVA, the LCRA, and the REA prove that a public authority can ably generate and distribute public power.

It is my hope that the Federal Government will develop the power on this great project. It would be a tragedy of Texas and the Nation if it is given to private power companies under the falling-water concept, as some are now trying to do.

The claim that it isn't feasible to develop pulbic power at Amistad Dam because there isn't enough demand for it, fails to take into account America's anticipated population growth to 235 million people by 1975. People are hunting the sun; the great migration into California, Arizona, and Florida will hit southwest Texas from San Antonio to El Paso when there is water and power available which Amistad Dam will furnish them. I charge you to work with all your might and main to keep both water and power from Amistad Dam in public hands.

PUBLIC POWER IN THE FUTURE

For my part, I have always supported and will continue to support a program of full development of our water resources. In addition, in the light of new development, we need sufficient Federal transmission of sufficiently high voltage to tie together some of our great Federal power systems and to make the most efficient use of the installed capacity of these systems. Where Federal lines are needed to carry this public power to the load centers of the publicly owned plants of municipalities and rural electric cooperatives, authorization of such lines and the appropriations needed to build them should be granted.

This support will come from me, not because I am against private business, but because this is the only way to get adequate public power distributed to the public agencies who need it to build a stronger America.

Some of the experts in the power field contend that the United States has fallen behind Western Europe and the Soviet Union

in the construction of high-voltage transmission. While I am not such an expert, I am impressed by evidence that Western Europe is tied together in a huge power grid, greatly increasing the available supply of electricity. The special Senate subcommittee which visited electric power installations in Russia inspected a vast network of high-voltage transmission lines. Since private industry hasn't built such a network of transmission lines here, public power must again shoulder part of the job.

We need to get on with the job of bringing our transmission system up to date in preparation for the vast increase in power requirements which we can expect during the stirring sixties, or, to use your convention theme—the new era.

In this effort, of course, the individual utilities have a big part to play.

Already steps are being taken by some of you toward interconnection of your systems; proposals for joint power supply are underway. I am glad to see that you plan to devote an entire session to this subject tomorrow at your panel on "Joint Power Supply—Pattern for the New Era."

One of the best pictures of the new era that I know of was prepared by your own association for the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources.

The American Public Power Association pointed out in a detailed memorandum to the select committee that estimates of future power needs characteristically are too low. The official estimates of the Federal Power Commission have been worked over and revised periodically, as the actual use of electricity has far outstripped Federal Power Commission estimates.

In setting a high goal for itself, public power is bound to have a stimulating effect upon the economy as a whole. But its devotion to providing more power at lower cost to consumers, public power can help all American consumers both by doing a good job for its own consumer-owners and by needling the private power companies to do a better job.

While I haven't talked much of our friends of private power, not because I don't appreciate the vast importance of their 80 percent of the consumer market, but because I confidently expect the public power systems and rural electric cooperatives to lead the industry in experiments, venturesomeness, and new ideas, as we enter the new era of electrical abundance.

With 80 percent of the market they control, it seems to me private interests could find enough to do to prepare constantly for that expanding market, without wasting so much money on a propaganda campaign of distortion against our public power authorities.

Certainly, I don't question the need for both private and public power in this country, and I recognize that many of the private companies are doing a good job for their customers.

I do feel, however, that too many of the leading lights of private power have resisted change, have opposed a low-rate policy, have fought public power competition in an unfair manner, and generally have been about as enlightened as William McKinley.

In public power, the private companies have a challenge and they recognize it clearly, but their response is not to get out and sell electricity at competitive rates, which is right and proper. Their methods have been to destroy the opposition by political pressures, by propaganda, and by that highly regarded new science known as molding public opinion.

The time has come, I believe, when we should have a progressive effort by both private and public power to meet the great and growing electrical power needs of this Nation and the free world.

Today, with communism in Cuba just 90 miles from our shores, we have little time for fighting among ourselves for any reason. Today, with the crisis in Laos bringing us to the brink of a planetary war with the onrushing hordes of communism, we cannot afford to waste so much time in an effort to destroy one another here at home.

Demands of tomorrow in a vibrant, powerful expanding economy—our first line of defense against those who would wipe freedom from the earth—will dwarf the electric power requirements of the past.

We are heading into a 15-year period in history where it is predicted that our electrical power requirements will quadruple. It is estimated that by 1975, we will be using 2½ times as much power per worker in industry and about 2½ times as much electricity in the average home. The result is that by 1975 more than four times as much power will be consumed each year.

Mankind's progress in this age of science and technology does not depend alone on the success of our research scientists. It depends in greater degree on our ability as a people to accept change and to seize our opportunities for a better life for all men.

We stand near the threshold of a bright new world, where nuclear research may cure most dread diseases; where salt water may be made fresh so "the desert may bloom as the rose"; and where men may travel to the stars and bring back treasures more precious than Columbus and other explorers found in the New World.

There is a great challenge before us on President John F. Kennedy's New Frontier. It is a challenge not just for the few, but for the many; not just for the wise, but for the courageous; not just for those wealthy in bank accounts, but for those rich in compassion, hope and vision.

Some of the decisions before us will be more revolutionary and controversial than the public power program was in its beginning, and much more important to the destiny of man.

In the final analysis, we and our children will be called upon to decide whether America—as the torchbearer of world freedom—will practice the social justice freedom demands; whether as a people professing the Christian ethic, we will find it in our hearts to follow the gospel of "Brotherhood among men to feed the hungry and care for the ill"; whether as a people intelligently pursuing peace while zealously protecting the ideal of human liberty, we can find a way to endure in a world "half free and half slave."

These are some of the grave challenges before us on the New Frontier. But with Americans like you leaders in the public power field, leaders who have demonstrated vision linked with faith, I have no doubt we can meet these trials, and more, so long as we "do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with God."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

St. Paul's affirmation concerning God, Acts 17: 28: *For in Him we live, and move, and have our being.*

Our kind Heavenly Father, who art daily making us the beneficiaries of Thy bountiful providence, inspire us to believe that Thou art deeply concerned about us in these times of world tragedy.

May we be more fully aware of how dependent we are upon Thee and how able and willing Thou art to supply our many needs and gird us with insight and strength to meet life's duties and demands.

Grant that Thy continuing care and goodness may evoke within us the spirit of humility and gratitude and give us the assurance that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt also provide.

Help us to stand in the noble succession and sublime tradition of those who, in every generation, have put themselves on the side of faith and yielded to its appeals and pressures when besieged and harassed by moods of fear and anguish.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1748. An act to provide for the increased distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Federal judiciary.

S.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day."

S.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week.

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution designating the week of May 14–20, 1961, as Police Week and designating May 15, 1961, as Peace Officers Memorial Day.

S.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing October 1, 1961, as "National Public Works Week."

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT submitted conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

WORTHINGTON OIL REFINERS, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1414) for the relief of the Worthington Oil Refiners, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COL. JOHN T. MALLOY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1449) for the relief of Col. John T. Malloy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Colonel John T. Malloy, O–18576, United States Army, the sum of $1,347.59, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred by him in connection with the payment of ocean freight transportation on his private automobile from San Francisco, California, to Java and return. The Army orders issued incident to these shipments authorized the transport of one privately owned automobile by Army transport subject to availability of space, and, inasmuch as no Army transport service to Java existed and the Department of the Army had no discretion to ship the automobile by other means, and it was found after Colonel Malloy's arrival in Java on or about January 29, 1949, that the automobile was necessary to the establishment of a new military liaison office and the performance of his duty as assistant military attaché, Batavia, Netherlands East Indies, shipment of his automobile by commercial transport was arranged on or about May 13, 1949, at a cost of $634.47, and also at the time of his return on or about March 18, 1950, at a cost of $713.12, as Army transport service to Java had not been established: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMMETT P. DYER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1623) for the relief of Emmett P. Dyer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

LOUIS J. ROSENSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2686) for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MRS. MAURICIA REYES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3843) for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JAMES H. McMURRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4872) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

HELEN TILFORD LOWERY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1887) for the relief of Helen Tilford Lowery.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

BERNHARD F. ELMERS

The Clerk called House Resolution 112.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H.R. 2676) entitled "A bill for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to section 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and the court shall proceed expeditiously with the same and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, such findings of fact, including facts relating to delay or laches, facts bearing upon the question whether the bar of any statute of limitation should be removed, or facts claimed to excuse the claimant for not having resorted to any established legal remedy, and conclusions based on such facts as shall be sufficient to inform Congress whether the demand is a legal or equitable claim or a gratuity, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE A. McDERMOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3376) for the relief of George A. McDermott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That George A. McDermott of New York, New York, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States, either in money or in annual leave time, the forty-eight days of annual leave, which, through administrative error involving no fault on the part of George A. McDermott, he was erroneously credited with and was permitted to use during his employment, which began August 31, 1950, with the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, New York District.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That George A. McDermott of New York, New York, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the net amount of $658.19, which sum represents the monetary value of approximately forty-five days of annual leave, which, through administrative error involving no fault on the part of George A. McDermott, he was credited with and was permitted to use during his employment, which began August 31, 1950, with the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, New York District. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George A. McDermott, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. SGT. LOUIS BENEDETTI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3846) for the relief of M. Sgt. Louis Benedetti, retired.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Master Sergeant Louis Benedetti, retired (RA-6430103), is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $756.01, representing the total of amounts erroneously paid to him as military retired pay by the United States for the period beginning August 1, 1946, and ending July 31, 1955, both dates inclusive. The erroneous payments were made because of an incorrect certification by the Adjutant General of the United States Army of the total amount of military service of the said Louis Benedetti creditable for the purpose of computing his military retired pay. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be allowed for all amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KEITH K. HOOVER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4027) for the relief of Keith K. Hoover.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and

directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Keith K. Hoover, Lombard, Illinois, the sum of $500 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for refund of the amount of a departure bond deposited by him on behalf of one Franz Langhammer which bond was declared breached and the amount thereof forfeited on the basis that the said Franz Langhammer, while engaged in his studies at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, was employed as a part-time graduate assistant in the German language at that institution: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill, H.R. 4027, to refund the sum of $500 to Keith K. Hoover which was forfeited on a departure bond executed on behalf of an alien German student. The bond was forfeited as a result of the student, Franz Langhammer, accepting a part-time job as a student assistant in the German Language Department of Northwestern University. The student was admitted to the United States for the purpose of pursuing language studies and it is evident that accepting this part-time job did not alter the status of the student. In view of the innocence of the parties, I am of the opinion that it would be unjust to require payment of this sum of $500 and I therefore filed this bill to authorize a full and complete refund. This bill creates no precedent.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUNGE CORP., NEW YORK, N.Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5500) for the relief of Bunge Corp., New York, N.Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bunge Corporation, New York, New York, the sum of $1,082.58. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Bunge Corporation against the United States on account of the erroneous appraisement and liquidation of New York consumption entry numbered 842743 of March 8, 1951, resulting in excessive customs duties being charged against such merchandise: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID C. THOMAS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5647) for the relief of David C. Thomas, Robert W. Barber, Milton A. Chace, and Richard F. Turner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Reperesentatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David C. Thomas, 10412 Montrose Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland, the sum of $976; to Robert W. Barber, 10508 Montrose Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland, the sum of $2,613.61; to Milton A. Chace, 13229 Steel Avenue, Detroit, Michigan, the sum of $1,638.02; to Richard F. Turner, 3683 Jennifer Street, San Diego, California, the sum of $1,968; in full settlement of their claims against the United States for per diem during 1957 and 1958 which was promised them at the time they were recruited to take part in the Atomic Energy Commission junior professional development program in nuclear technology: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NARINDER SINGH SOMAL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1710) for the relief of Narinder Singh Somal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Narinder Singh Somal shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOVENAL GORNES VERANO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1860) for the relief of Jovenal Gornes Verano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jovenal Gornes Verano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE F. BALISH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2165) for the relief of Marie F. Balish.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marie F. Balish shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

"that, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Marie F. Balish. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Marie F. Balish shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANS HANGARTNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2351) for the relief of Hans Hangartner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hans Hangartner shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 10, 1953.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of 315(a) thereof shall be held not

to be applicable to the alien named in section 1 of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH MAZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2991) for the relief of Joseph Maz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joseph Maz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD JACQUES GERARD CARADEC

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3489) for the relief of Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of of May 23, 1946.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELO LI DESTRI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1717) for the relief of Angelo Li Destri.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act and section 4 of the Act of September 22, 1959 (73 Stat. 644), Angelo Li Destri shall be held and considered to have been, on August 12, 1953, the minor child of Raffaele Li Destri, a lawfully resident alien in the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the words "have been" strike out the comma and the remainder of the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "registered as an intending immigrant on August 12, 1953, and the petition approved in his behalf shall be held and considered to have been approved prior to January 1, 1959."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAIME E. CONCEPCION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1718) for the relief of Jaime E. Concepcion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jaime E. Concepcion shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DJURA ZELENBABA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1293) for the relief of Djura Zelenbaba.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Djura Zelenbaba, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Djura Zelenbaba, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA B. PROKOP

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1360) for the relief of Anna B. Prokop.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Anna B. Prokop shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Miron Prokop, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, at the end of line 4, insert a comma after the word "child".

On page 1, line 7, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIAN WALCZYK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1425) for the relief of Marian Walczyk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Marian Walczyk, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of John and Stanislawa Walczyk, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, at the end of the bill, add the following:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Marya Marek, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Marek, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 3. The natural parents of the beneficiaries of this act shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Marian Walczyk and Marya Marek."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADAM AND EDMUND WOJTOWICZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1441) for the relief of Adam and Edmund Wojtowicz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Adam and Edmund Wojtowicz, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Wojtowicz, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiaries shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after "natural-born" insert the word "alien".

On page 1, line 7, after the words "of the United States" strike out the colon and substitute a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

Add four new sections to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. For the purpose of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Krystyna Synowiecki shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Synowiecki.

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of section 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Eva Anna Marchewka, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Marchewka, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of section 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kazimierz Niezabitowski shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Niezabitowski, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 5. The natural parents of the beneficiaries of this Act shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PIETRO DIGREGORIO BRUNO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2107) for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Pietro DiGregorio Bruno, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Pietro Bruno, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WANDA FERRARA SPERA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2116) for the relief of Wanda Ferrara Spera.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Wanda Ferrara Spera, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Luciano Spera, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY WU CHUN AND ARLENE WU CHUN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2141) for the relief of Henry Wu Chun and Arlene Wu Chun.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Henry Wu Chun and Arlene Wu Chun, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. George Chun, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA CASCARINO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2346) for the relief of Maria Cascarino.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Cascarino shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Louis S. Vita, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, after the words "of the United States" strike out the colon and substitute a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

On page 1, at the end of the bill, add two new sections to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Carmelo Giuseppe Ferraro shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Carmelo Leo, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 3. The natural parents of the beneficiaries of this Act shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Cascarino and Carmelo Giuseppe Ferraro."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WIESLAWA ALICE KLIMOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2645) for the relief of Wieslawa Alice Klimowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Wieslawa Alice Klimowski shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Anatol Klimowski, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIOVANNA BONAVITA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2671) for the relief of Giovanna Bonavita.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Giovanna Bonavita, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Giuseppe and Giovannina Bonavita, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA NOWIK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2674) for the relief of Eva Nowik.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Eva Nowik, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Frank and Regina Nowik, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOZEF GROMADA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3146) for the relief of Jozef Gromada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jozef Gromada, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Thaddeus V. Gromada, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Joszef Gromada shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE SAUTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3371) for the relief of George Sauter (also known as Georgois Makkas).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, George Sauter (also known as Georgois Makkas) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Louis A. and Addie G. Sauter, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA CZYZ KRUPA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3722) for the relief of Maria Czyz Krupa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Czyz Krupa, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Krupa, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIECZYSLAW BAJOR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4023) for the relief of Mieczyslaw Bajor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mieczyslaw Bajor, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Edward and Irena Bajor, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVANGELIA KURTALES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4201) for the relief of Evangelia Kurtales.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Evangelia Kurtales, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Kurtales, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CASIMIR LAZARZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4282) for the relief of Casimir Lazarz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Casimir Lazarz, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Lazarz, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URSZULA SIKORA, RADOSLAV VULIN, AND DESANKA VULIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4482) for the relief of Urszula Sikora.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Urszula Sikora, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Benno Coster, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, at the end of the bill, add two new sections to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Radoslav Vulin and Desanka Vulin shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Dragutin Vulin, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 3. The natural parents of the beneficiaries of this Act shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Urszula Sikora, Radoslav Vulin, and Desanka Vulin."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AEC AUTHORIZATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1962

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today by request the proposed Atomic Energy Commission fiscal year 1962 authorization bill for capital facilities and the cooperative atomic power program which was submitted by the AEC yesterday, May 1, 1961.

Normally, at this point in the session, the Joint Committee would have already received and initiated hearings on the bill. Due to the problems incident to a change of administration and reexamination of programs, there was a delay in the submission by the Commission of the proposed bill. In order that there may be no further delay, the proposed bill—upon referral to the Joint Committee—will immediately be taken up by the Subcommittee on Legislation.

The subcommittee is prepared to begin hearings in open session this afternoon and to continue such hearings for as long as necessary on the following days in order to complete consideration of the bill as soon as possible. It would be the intention of the Joint Committee to review with AEC and other interested parties and agencies the subject matters involved in as thorough a manner as necessary and to report to the Congress the committee's recommendations as expeditiously as possible.

Since I only recently received the proposed bill, I have not had the opportunity to review it in detail. Before commenting upon the adequacy of the bill, I would of course wish to review it in detail and have the benefit of the testimony I expect to receive during the committee's hearings. I would like to say, however, that while I am pleased that a number of needed projects including project 62-a-6, electric energy generating facilities for the new production reactor, Hanford, Wash., and project 62-d-7, ultra-high-temperature reactor experiment

building at Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory, N. Mex., are contained in the proposed bill, I regret that some additional worthy projects apparently have not been included.

The proposed bill would authorize a total of $227,580,000 for the acquisition or construction of various new line item plant and facility projects under section 101. Added to this would be $7 million for the civilian power reactor demonstration program. In addition the proposed bill in section 107 would authorize an increase of $127 million in prior years' authorizations consisting of $111 million for the Stanford linear accelerator and $16 million for the advanced test reactor. A number of projects previously authorized would be rescinded including a $55 million ground test plant for the aircraft nuclear propulsion project.

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I intend to closely participate in the consideration of the bill by the Subcommittee on Legislation. As in the past, the Joint Committee—through its close review and continuous monitoring of AEC activities—reserves the right to recommend projects and levels of support which the committee believes necessary or important to national interests. As chairman of the Joint Committee, I wish to assure my colleagues that I will encourage the Joint Committee to continue to exercise its expert judgment which in the past has proven on so many occasions to have been correct.

PETITION FROM CITIZENS OF BURNET COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a petition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter and petition signed by a large number of responsible citizens of Burnet County, Tex., giving me the benefit of their views on four proposals. As will be seen from a reading of the petition, the signers of the petition have expressed the desire that the petition be read and be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter and petition is as follows:

WHITE'S STORE,
Burnet, Tex., April 24, 1961.

Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing a petition which is self-explanatory.

As you can see, it has been signed by a large number of responsible Burnet County citizens. Of all the persons that read this petition only two refused to sign it and they did not disagree with it, but for reasons of their own did not want to sign.

Over the years you have asked us as citizens to let you know our opinion. This is our way of stating to you the ideas we have on these particular subjects.

We send you this document because you are our elected Representative and we hope that it will enlighten you as to what these people really think and that you may act accordingly.

Sincerely,

JEROME K. FELPS.

To All Texas Representatives and Senators in the U.S. Congress:

The following U.S. citizens endorse the proposals listed below and submit them for action by the 87th Congress of the United States now in session. It is our desire that this petition be read before both Houses of the Congress and be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

1. That all subsidy payments by the Federal Government be abolished immediately, including those to agriculture, airlines, shipping, and any other form of business.

2. That the individual exemptions on the Federal income tax be raised from $600 for each exemption to $1,000 for each exemption. Further, that the maximum percentage rate on income tax be lowered to 50 percent, and that all money gained from the abolition of Federal subsidies be passed on as a reduction in individual income taxes.

3. That all foreign aid, with the exception of military assistance in the case of actual combat, be put on a strict loan basis and the recipients of these loans understand that the United States expects them to be repaid in equal value if not in dollars. Further, that the United States should politely, but firmly, ask all foreign nations to begin repaying the loans that they have received from us in the past.

4. That the Armed Forces of the United States be unified in fact, thereby eliminating the duplication now in existence. Proposals by the Hoover Commission and Senator SYMINGTON'S committee should be used.

(Signatures omitted.)

DEMAGOGUERY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, demagoguery or demagogism as defined by Webster's International Dictionary is as follows:

The principles or practices of demagogs.

Demagog is defined as follows:

One skilled in arousing the prejudices and passions of the populace by rhetoric, sensational charges, specious arguments, catchwords, cajolery, etc., esp., a political speaker or leader who seeks thus to make capital of social discontent and incite the populace, usually in the name of some popular cause in order to gain political influence or office.

The Kennedy administration's proposal to repeal the dividend credit and dividend exemption now allowed in figuring an individual's Federal income tax is demagoguery. The leaders of the Democratic Party who have been pressing this repeal for years have been using demagoguery.

That is not to say that there can be no honest difference of opinion about the economic theories behind the dividend credit and dividend exemption reform placed in the Federal Tax Code in 1954.

However, it is to say that there has been no honest attack on this reform. There has only been a demagogic attack. The attack is based upon the false statement that this reform was placed in the law to benefit the investing public.

This false statement is lent credence because the reform relates to a feature in our tax laws which results in dividends being taxed twice.

On May 1, 1961, U.S. News & World Report, page 50, repeats the demagoguery:

The outlook for changes in tax treatment of dividends is uncertain. In the past, Congress has been inclined to ease the tax on dividend income. The argument is that dividends are taxed twice—once when reported as earnings by the corporation and again when they are reported as income by individuals. Mr. Kennedy argues that "whatever may be the merits of the arguments respecting the existence of double taxation, the provisions of the 1954 act clearly do not offer an appropriate remedy."

Now the fact that dividend income is taxed twice is only a factor in the economic problem that confronted the Ways and Means Committee in 1954 when it put the reform in the tax laws. It is not the problem itself and it has never been set forth as the problem, by those who proposed the reform, even though there is some appeal to equity in it by itself.

The problem is this, as the Ways and Means Committee has officially stated and I have so often repeated in speeches on the floor of the House. Corporations have three ways of financing their growth: First, debt financing, that is borrowing from the banks or issuing bonds; second, retained earnings—by not paying all the corporate earnings to the stockholders in dividends; third, selling new stock to the public.

The first two ways of corporate financing receive considerable tax advantage over the third way of financing. The result has been twofold: First, corporations have resorted to debt financing and retained earnings financing to a degree that is fiscally unsound; second, the Federal Government is losing taxes from the investing public in the aggregate by the avoidance by corporations of financing through floating new stock issues.

Furthermore, ironically, the richer stockholders derive a special advantage over the less rich stockholders when a corporation in which they have holdings finances through debt or retained earnings instead of floating new issues of stock.

The tax reform of 1954 was to minimize the special tax treatment that the richer stockholder was getting through corporations financing their growth through increased debt or retained earnings. If a new stock issue as opposed to a new bond issue is used to meet the corporation's need for growth capital several things happen: First, the Federal Government gets more taxes from the investing public; second, the corporation is placed on a sounder fiscal base; third, the richer stockholder loses some of the advantage he has over the smaller stockholder; fourth, there is an encouragement for more people to be stockholders—because there s miore stock available in the market to buy; fifth, the price of common stocks is brought down to a more realistic level of their value because there would be more stock available for

those who wished to buy; sixth, the smaller stockholder has a better chance of getting stock in competition with the rich investor.

On page 79 of the same issue of the U.S. News & World Report is an advertisement for an offering of $300 million United States Steel Corp. 4½-percent sinking fund debentures dated April 15, 1961, due April 15, 1986.

I am placing this in the RECORD at this point:

(This announcement is neither an offer to sell nor a solicitation of an offer to buy any of these debentures. The offer is made only by the prospectus.)

Three hundred million dollars—United States Steel Corp.—4½-percent sinking fund debentures due 1986. Dated April 15, 1961, due April 15, 1986.

Interest payable April 15 and October 15 in New York City.

Price 99¼ percent and accrued interest.

Copies of the prospectus may be obtained in any State from only such of the undersigned as may legally offer these debentures in compliance with the securities laws of such State:

Morgan Stanley & Co.; Dillon, Read & Co., Inc.; the First Boston Corp.; Kuhn, Loeb & Co., Inc.; Blyth & Co., Inc.; Drexel & Co.; Eastman Dillon; Union Securities & Co.; Glore, Forgan & Co.; Goldman, Sachs & Co.; Harriman Ripley & Co., Inc.; Kidder, Peabody & Co.; Lazard Freres & Co.; Lehman Bros.; Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.; Salomon Bros. & Hutzler; Smith, Barney & Co., Inc.; Stone & Webster Securities Corp.; White, Weld & Co.; Dean Witter & Co.

April 19, 1961.

Now let us consider what would happen if the United States Steel Corp. was to offer $300 million of additional common stock to finance its growth instead of bonds. Let us see the tax effect on the U.S. Treasury, the tax effect on the higher income bracket stockholder and a few of the economic effects.

United States Steel will pay $13,500,000 a year in interest to these new bondholders. Let us assume that United States Steel makes 10 percent earnings before taxes on the new investment of $300 million, this would be $30 million a year.

United States Steel will pay 52 percent corporate tax on this $30 million but after the $13,500,000 in interest paid to the bondholders has been deducted as an allowable expense. In other words, United States Steel would pay 52-percent corporate tax on only $16,500,000 or $8,580,000 and not on $30 million or $15,600,000 in taxes.

Let us assume the investing public buying the bonds are in the 50-percent personal income tax bracket, as an average. It makes no difference to illustrate the point which bracket you select. The Federal Government will realize $6,750,000 in taxes from the bondholders in personal income taxes.

The total tax take of the Federal Government from United States Steel financing its new growth by a bond issue then amounts to $15,330,000—$8,580,000 in corporate taxes plus $6,750,000 in personal income taxes.

Now let us assume United States Steel financed this growth through a new issue of common stock. United States Steel would pay 52-percent tax on the full $30 million of earnings from the $300 million of new capital, or $15,600,000.

Assuming the investing public who bought the new common stock are still this "rich" group who average in the 50-percent personal income tax bracket and assuming United States Steel paid out all of its earnings after taxes—$30 million minus $15,600,000—$14,400,000 to these new stockholders. The Federal Government would collect in personal income taxes $7,200,000 minus $750,000 from the $50-per-person dividend exemption—assuming 300,000 separate investors buy the new stock at $1,000 per person, then $1,500,000 dividend income is exempt from the 50-percent personal income tax of the average stockholder minus $516,000 from the 4-percent dividend tax credit—$14,400,000 paid in dividends minus $1,500,000 exemption equals $12,900,000—4 percent of $12,900,000 equals $516,000—$7,200,000 minus $750,000 minus $516,000 equals $5,934,000 or the amount the Federal Government would receive in taxes from the personal income tax on the dividends declared to the stockholders.

The total tax take of the Federal Government from United States Steel financing its new growth by a stock issue amounts to $21,534,000. In other words, $6,204,000 or 40 percent more in taxes than from the bond or debt financing process.

Now, let us assume United States Steel instead of declaring dividends to its stockholders had retained $300 million of earnings to finance its growth. The Federal Government would have received $15,600,000 from the taxes on 52 percent of these earnings, but it would have received no income from personal income tax its stockholders would have been paying on the earnings if they had received them in dividends.

To contrast the tax effect on the three forms of financing capital growth, however, let us look at the picture on the basis of the tax effect if United States Steel decided not to pay the $14,400,000 earnings after taxes to its stockholders, but retains it for future financing. The Federal Government loses $5,934,000 in taxes. If it recoups anything on this loss, by a stockholder selling his shares for the capital gain resulting from the process of plowing back earnings into the corporation, it is limited to the 25-percent ceiling imposed upon the rate at which capital gains are taxed.

We were taking the stockholders as a group averaging in the income tax bracket of 50 percent. However, the higher the income tax bracket the stockholder is in, the more he stands to gain from the corporation plowing back earnings instead of declaring dividends. If he is in the 91-percent income tax bracket he saves 91 percent on his share of the $30 million annual corporate earnings before corporate taxes, at the most, and at the least the difference between 91 and 25 percent or 66 percent.

It is for this reason that the wealthier a stockholder is the more he prefers to have the corporation finance its growth either through bonds and borrowing or through retained earnings. Furthermore, the wealthier a stockholder is the less likelihood there is that he needs dividends on his stock to take care of his living cost budget. The less wealthy a stockholder is, the more that stockholder needs the earnings from his share in the company for his living costs. He cannot afford to let his money go back into reinvestment.

The pressure on corporate management by the wealthy stockholders to retain the earnings so they can get their shares of the profits with no tax or at most at 25-percent capital gain treatment as against the desire of the little stockholder to have the money declared in dividends is not academic. Our tax laws aid and abet the wealthy stockholder in his desire to have future financing done, if not through retained earnings through debt financing, because he can demonstrate that the corporation saves money through paying less taxes. These corporate tax savings amounting to $7,020,000 a year in the United States Steel example I have used provide a nice sum with which to pay the interest to the bondholders as well as to pay off the bonded indebtedness, leaving the equity interest of the stockholders increased in the process. This increase in value of the common stock of United States Steel again is taxed, at the least, nothing, and at the most at 25-percent capital gain.

It is no wonder that many shares of stock on the market are referred to as "growth" shares. Shares that the investor buys, not for the income received in dividends, but for the increase in value of the share itself resulting from growth derived from the specially tax-treated forms of financing growth, debt financing, or retained earnings financing.

Who can afford to buy and pay the most for growth shares of stock? The rich investor under our Federal tax laws. The higher the income tax bracket in which his wealth places him, the more it is worth to him in tax savings to have growth shares. He can outbid with tax-saved dollars the smaller investor every time.

Furthermore, common stock is one of the best hedges the public has against inflation. Common stock goes up in value as the dollar loses its purchasing power as the result of inflation. Growth stock is the best hedge of all against inflation. And growth stock comes from companies that finance their growth from retained earnings or debt financing.

I have suggested that one reason for the phenomena of the past decades of the high price of common stocks on the stock market is the result of the traditional economic law of inflation—too many dollars chasing too few goods. There is a greater demand for common stocks as a hedge against inflation and as a tax-saving device, than there is a supply. The reason is that the wealthier stockholders and the shortsighted company managers yielding to their pressure and the immediate dollar profit resulting from the tax laws which have been written to favor this kind of financing do not finance their growth by offering more stock to the public, by permitting more

people to become stockholders, by having more shares available. They discourage the small investor by emphasizing growth instead of regular dividends which the small investor needs to meet his daily bills.

United States Steel is a prime example of a corporation which has financed its great growth in the past few decades under these favorable Federal tax laws by not issuing new equity stock. American Telephone & Telegraph, on the other hand, is a fine example of a corporation which has encouraged the little investor to become a stockholder, by financing most of its growth through new stock issued. It is a healthier corporation than United States Steel fiscally because of it. Yet remove the tax reform in treating new equity financing and American Telephone & Telegraph will probably have to go along with United States Steel. From a corporate financing standpoint equity investment should be the base, not debts to banks or bondholders which have first call on the corporate assets and indeed have an inexorable call even if the corporation is in fiscal difficulties.

How can this be explained to the public over the shrill and loud voice of the demagogs? Who is promoting this demagoguery? The leader of it is now President Kennedy, the scion of a wealthy family which stands to continue to gain as this family has gained by giving the wealthier class a special tax treatment which works against the interests of the smaller investor, the retired people, if you please, the worker in the factory, or in the office who in America today can become a stockholder. If we give new stock issue financing a more even break than it now gets, instead of taking away the small reform that was made in 1954, even more Americans can become modest stockholders. This would mean a healthier America, a more dynamic economy, a more flexible economy, and an economy which spreads its blessings to more of our people. Will the newspaper, radio, television, and magazine writers, who by and large are little men, not people of inherited wealth, as I am, contemplate this message and if upon examination they find it is true, start giving the facts to the people?

INTRODUCTION TO THE "FIRST 100 DAYS" SERIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is inevitable that the communication media should take an analytical look at the first 100 days of the present administration and make comparisons with a similar period in the Roosevelt and Eisenhower years. While several television programs and national magazine articles have thus examined the period of time since January 20, 1961, we feel that our attention should be focused on the exact and precise accomplishments of the Kennedy administration as opposed to their campaign promises and the needs of 20th-century America rather than in comparison with administrations facing different problems in other periods of history.

We feel that greater service would be performed to the American citizens by a topical discussion of these 100 days than to yield to the temptation to take the easy way out; namely, comparing numbers of messages, bills passed, problems remaining, and children and pets in the White House to those of other eras. Along with several of my colleagues, I would today refer to positive, concrete action or lack of action by the current administration in several fields, along with constructive reaction from the Republican side of the aisle in this regard.

We hope to do this as dispassionately and objectively as possible. The American people elected President Kennedy by the narrowest of margins. They returned a wide majority in both Houses for the Democratic Party, despite Republican gains. Ever since that time, a rash of publicity for the New Frontier has assisted in a record wave of personal popularity for President Kennedy and his family. On the other hand, on specific issues public opinion and overall congressional sentiment has given rise to much more controversy. It is in an attempt to analyze these issues and convey Republican reaction to the first 100 days of the New Frontier that this speech series has been planned.

Several facts are clear. President Kennedy is the President of all the American people, and deserves the support of every American as the leader of our Nation. The Republican Members of Congress, by their support of such constructive proposals as the temporary program of unemployment benefits, aid to dependent children and revision of social security benefits, have demonstrated their determination to put the welfare of the Nation above petty political profit. They have particularly emphasized this in fields representing the current crises in Laos and Cuba. On the other hand, by opposing unsound provisions of the President's feed grain proposals, the minimum wage amendments, and the so-called depressed-areas bill, we have demonstrated actions of responsible opposition.

It is the function of the opposition party to scrutinize administration proposals, and to responsibly criticize and oppose those harmful to the national interest. Otherwise, no democracy could function, and we would be doing a grave injustice to the American people and to ourselves if we were to offer nothing but passive consent in all that the new administration proposes. Thus we must scrutinize all that the majority proposes and resist unwise or ill-conceived measures. On the other hand, we must be responsible and constructive in our opposition, supporting the administration when they are right, and when the national interest is at stake. In this event, both Republicans and Democrats must set aside partisan interests and work for the good of the Nation.

Since public discussion and analysis of vital issues of our times is the function of a free society, our congressional team would today put forth our views on the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration. For, Mr. Speaker, it has been truly said that "knowledge may give weight, but accomplishments give lustre, and many more people see than weigh."

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the field of education, President Kennedy has made several major proposals for legislative action. At the elementary and secondary level, he advocates spending $2.3 billion over the next 3 years to construct classrooms and to boost teachers' salaries. He describes this as "a limited beginning" and "a modest program with ambitious goals."

At the college level, Mr. Kennedy suggests spending $2.8 billion over a 5-year period to help build dormitories, classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and other academic facilities. He advocates also the establishment of 4-year Federal scholarships, averaging $2,800 each, for over 200,000 prospective college students, with additional grants of $350 annually to the institutions they attend. Only just made public are his recommendations for the expansion of the National Defense Education Act, including the present student loan program.

As might be expected, Mr. Speaker, these recommendations have resulted in considerable activity in the House Education and Labor Committee. Some bills will probably receive approval by that committee in the near future. Pending such action, perhaps it would not be amiss to comment on the situation generally as it seems to be shaping up.

The general Subcommittee on Education, of which I am a member, began hearings in mid-March on H.R. 4970, incorporating the administration's proposals for aiding elementary and secondary schools, as well as the teachers of the Nation. It would authorize expenditure of $666 million the first year, $766 million the second, and $866 million the third; 10 percent of these funds would be allocated for areas of special educational need—slums, depressed areas and the like.

However, perhaps we should look first at the bill's declaration of purpose. The Federal grants are intended to assist local educational agencies to construct urgently needed school facilities, and to employ needed additional public school teachers and pay them adequate salaries. It is the intent of Congress that with this assistance the quality of public elementary and secondary education will be substantially improved in all States, and inequalities of educational opportunities substantially reduced.

These are indeed ambitious goals. The question which needs to be answered is whether the proposed program reasonably could achieve such objectives. To aid us in our inquiry, a brief analysis of the problems might be helpful.

First of all, how urgent is the need for facilities? How many classrooms are needed, and how soon? The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare himself gave the committee some enlightenment

on this point. Mr. Ribicoff stated that there is now a shortage of about 140,000 classrooms.

He pointed out that during the past decade annual expenditures on education had increased from $6.5 billion to $16.5 billion. This represents an increase of 154 percent. Expenditures for construction had also increased substantially each year, he admitted. If this rate could be maintained over the next 5 years, he continued, there would be at the end of that period a shortage of some 60,000 classrooms. This prospective deficit of classrooms, in his opinion, justifies Federal intervention.

There are those, Mr. Speaker, who will almost surely argue that Mr. Ribicoff's estimates of future need illustrate that there is in fact no national problem requiring aid, at least of the kind proposed. The need in the years ahead is based in part on increasing enrollments and in part on replacing obsolescent facilities. These problems were faced also in the 1950's, some will point out, and led to an unprecedented expansion of school facilities, virtually all without Federal aid. The crisis is now about over, they might add, and there is no need for the Federal Government to initiate a general program at all.

Such critics of the President's program might also point out that the Office of Education figures, on which Secretary Ribicoff relies, indicate a sharp drop in school enrollment for 1966 and the following years. They might challenge the accuracy of the President's assertion, in his message to Congress, that during the next decade there will be an average net gain of nearly 1 million pupils a year. The figures estimate that there will be increased enrollments of just over a million for each of the next 5 years, with a sharp drop thereafter, resulting in a 10-year average annual increase of somewhat over 800,000.

A more careful definition of the need for school facilities, it might be argued, might, or might not, justify a Federal aid program, but if aid is to be given, it should be provided only for the years immediately ahead. Even for this period a continuation of the current rate of construction would indicate that this problem would be manageable without Federal aid.

As for myself, I have long favored a Federal program which would help accelerate, and facilitate, the construction of needed classroom facilities. We should limit, I feel, the length of such a program, and we should insure that the Federal responsibility is sharply defined. Over a period of years, though not as yet this year, I have introduced a number of bills along these lines. I have worked with others, on both sides of the aisle, to secure enactment of moderate and effective legislation.

It is for that reason, and because no one can ignore the storm signals now flying, that I have been disappointed at the character of the administration's recommendations. Much as I should like to strengthen this country's educational system by a judicious Federal program, I cannot persuade myself that President Kennedy's recommendations are particularly appropriate, or that they would be effective.

An effective Federal aid program, in my opinion, should concentrate on school construction. It should provide such assistance in areas having the greatest need, and where maximum effort has been made, yet where the need has not yet been met.

The administration's bill pays scant heed to these guidelines. It simply expresses the hope, in effect, that Federal aid will go where most needed. Admittedly it recognizes that some penalty should result if a State does not maintain a certain effort. But as I read the bill, a particular State need only match what it has been doing in previous years. In future years a State need only maintain this level of expenditures, with the Federal windfall alone providing the additional funds needed thereafter. Thus the Federal Government would bear the burden of raising educational standards in the future. And if a State should reduce its expenditures, or terminate them entirely, it would be penalized only by a reduction of one-third of the proposed Federal allotment.

In previous years, as we in Congress have considered school construction legislation, real efforts have been made to develop a formula whereby areas of genuine need, and these alone would receive Federal aid. The New Frontier concept of education, on the other hand, implies a general obligation on the part of the Federal Government to aid education, apart from any specific needs, and with little or no interest in strengthening local and State responsibilities. Apparently the Federal Government itself must assume responsibility, in President Kennedy's own words, for—

> A new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it.

Secretary Ribicoff puts the problem in a different way. Testifying before our committee, he asserted that the Federal Government has a special concern for programs which are in the national interest. At a later point he stated that we cannot afford to permit any of our childen to go even 1 year longer than necessary without adequate instructional staff and classroom facilities.

These are sweeping statements. The Government might open the door to an indefinite expansion of Federal responsibility, but is such a course wise?

I for one think the Federal role should be more narrowly construed. It is for this reason particularly that I view with genuine apprehension the prospect of a broad Federal subsidy program for the Nation's teachers.

Naturally we all want to see our teachers paid more, and the importance of their efforts more widely recognized. We can all rejoice that in the past 8 years alone the average teacher's salary has increased by 52 percent. This compares to a 30-percent increase in per capita personal income, and a 34-percent improvement in industrial wages. The quality of instruction, furthermore, has almost surely improved as a result of the decline in the number of children per teacher from 26.2 to 24.4 over the 8-year period.

The administration assumes that because we need still more teachers, who should receive still better pay than they do today, that there is no alternative to Federal intervention. This could prove to be a dangerous, as well as an unjustifiable, assumption.

In justifying his program President Kennedy has declared:

> We cannot obtain more and better teachers—and our children deserve the best—unless steps are taken to increase teachers' salaries. At present salary levels, the classroom cannot compete in financial rewards with other professional work that requires similar academic background.

Let us examine these statements. Does Mr. Kennedy mean simply that the Nation should continue present efforts to raise teachers salaries? Surely he cannot be saying that substantial steps have not already been taken? Or does he mean that these efforts are not enough? Does he feel, because present efforts are not enough, or future efforts may not be enough, that the Federal Government must help out? And if Federal help is forthcoming, is the President concerned about maintaining local and State efforts? Or is he suggesting that the Federal Government simply step in and pay whatever the balance of future bills may be? Does he feel the Federal Government must be responsible for making teachers salaries competitive with other professions?

And if our children deserve the best, what does this mean so far as the Federal responsibility is concerned? Is the best obtainable simply by the expenditure of more money? May this not necessitate better teachers? And perhaps different curriculums? And to what extent are these problems within the purview of the Federal Government?

Furthermore, if the Federal Government makes money available to help pay teachers, may it not be that Congress will actually be moving away from the goal of correcting inequalities of pay? A State which has no construction needs could provide more help for its teachers than a State with a serious need for classrooms, though the latter State might have an equal need to pay its teachers more. The Federal program, in other words, may increase rather than diminish existing discrepancies in salaries.

So, too, the Kennedy proposals to assist in the construction of classrooms may well not be effective. Here we do not find Federal aid dependent on genuine need despite local effort. The administration bill, it is true, would allocate somewhat more money to States with low per capita income, but there would be no attempt to pinpoint areas of need.

Equally important, there would be no requirement for matching of Federal funds in order to receive aid. This is a generally accepted method by which to insure State participation. Without such a requirement, the mild penalties provided for lack of effort could hardly be sufficient to insure continuing, or increased, effort by local and State governments. Since matching would be useful also in increasing the total funds to

be made available for school construction, it should not be ignored in a program of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say this: The Kennedy program, in my opinion, is overly ambitious in its goals. There has been too little consideration given to insuring that the States and localities continue to assume primary responsibility in the field of education, including the thorny, but central, question of raising the needed funds. There has been too little thought given to the consequences of broad and continuing programs, set up in such a way as virtually to insure demands for vastly greater Federal expenditures. Even more troublesome, the proposed Federal program will almost surely stifle, and not stimulate, what can be done by other levels of government.

I have not touched on other matters of concern, such as the possibility of increased Federal control over education as a consequence of the increased Federal financing of the kind proposed. I have not discussed the controversial situation of private schools and their place in this issue. Nor have I commented on the recent decision of the Civil Rights Commission that present practices of the Federal Government in supplying Federal aid to education to areas maintaining racially segregated schools put the Government in the position of supporting segregation. They felt that this in effect constituted underwriting the denial of equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment. These are just added complications which have in a sense clouded fundamental issues of the need and means to support education today.

Basically, during these first 100 days the questions of education in America have not been solved nor did anyone expect that they would. However, the program submitted to Congress by the President, while it contains some worthy ideas and goals, is based on fallacious reasoning. It would create more problems than it would solve. It would establish an enormous Federal responsibility for education without solving local needs which exist today. Educating America's youth, I would submit, is a goal of the highest priority. Nonetheless, debate over which course we should follow must continue long after the first 100 days. We must seek constructive proposals more compatible with the actual situation than those which have been advanced by President Kennedy.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the distinguished majority leader if he is in a position to make an announcement concerning the legislative program.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad my friend asked me. I like to keep the House advised as far ahead as possible as to the program for the following day. The water pollution bill will be brought up tomorrow, a rule having been reported out today. Also, if the Senate accepts the conference report on the minimum wage bill, it is expected that that will also be brought up. In what order, I am unable to state. If the Senate takes until sometime in the late afternoon, why, then, the water pollution bill will be brought up first. That will be brought up, anyway, and the probabilities are that the conference report will also be brought up, so that I am alerting the Members in this regard.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR STUDENTS OF AFRICA, ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, with the conviction that the educational resources of the United States can make a unique and timely contribution to the immense educational needs of the less developed and newly emerging nations, I am introducing a bill to provide a total of 12,000 undergraduate scholarships, of 4 years each, to be awarded to young men and women of Africa, Asia, and Latin America who will study in American colleges and universities. This bill amends the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to authorize the Commissioner of Education to award undergraduate scholarships in American institutions of higher education to certain students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America in order to help prepare those students to become national leaders in their home countries.

This simple and direct legislative proposal can do much to meet some of the greatest challenges and opportunities for American educational leadership that we have yet faced in our time. This scholarship program for African, Asian, and Latin American students can provide a new beginning—and its effect can become truly massive—in the development of wise leaders and educated citizens among all peoples.

I am mindful of our recent observance of African Freedom Day and of Pan American Day, both celebrations emphasizing again the common respect and common helpfulness that must be sought and the significant and tangible contribution that American education should be making.

And we have been painfully reminded by the recent dramatic successes of Soviet education and science that we have yet to turn the tide in the battle for men's minds, and that only an educated leader and citizen in Africa or in Asia or in Latin America will be equipped to make a wise choice or even to recognize the foundations of freedom, with responsibility, on which just and democratic governments must be built.

We have repeatedly demonstrated our willingness to provide modern weapons and other material resources to counter the ever-present threats to world peace—the smoldering areas of discord in which armed conflict on a large scale may break out at any moment—but, at the same time, most of us realize that we really have entered an era in which war is necessarily and categorically becoming obsolete—that we no longer can afford the luxury of a worldwide conflagration.

Recognizing that this is so, we seek the constructive alternatives; we look for the essential ingredient for social and economic growth, with freedom, among all peoples. And we see clearly that we must achieve a substantial and meaningful marshaling of the intellectual and educational resources of the United States to provide the instruction and training for the peoples of the emerging and newly independent nations to enable them to help themselves—and time is all too short.

We must provide now the educational sustenance that is demanded in the name of humanity and of our common cause. The "revolution of rising expectations" is going on all around us, and we can help make it a constructive transformation for good or we can ignore it—and someone else will help in their own way and for their own ends. What is needed now is education—that "critical mass" of education that will permit the peoples of the less-developed areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America to provide their own self-renewing leadership and education for the future.

As George Kimble argued so well in the New York Times recently:

> Without a corps of trained professionals no country can bridge the gulf between disease and health, poverty and prosperity, or between the world of superstition and the world of reason. * * * Without an enlightened citizenry there is no guarantee that any country can resist the seduction of materialism, communism, or any of the other sirens of our time—or even the blandishments of the first spellbinder to gain control of the radio and press.

The force of these conclusions has been abundantly demonstrated by the recent disastrous events in the Congo. There, in the wake of Belgian colonialism, is a vast country of 14 million people—but with only a few dozen university graduates native to that land. Only here and there, against an overwhelming need, does an occasional native physician or engineer work among a people craving both freedom and bread. The Congolese political leaders themselves are therefore ill equipped by education and training for the burdens of government leadership.

Yet, only a few hundred miles away, independence came also last year to Nigeria. And when self-government came to that country, there were already 16,000 Nigerian students and graduates of universities to provide a base for political and economic stability. The British and Nigerian educators have made the best of their resources in planning and building for the schools and colleges of today and tomorrow in Nigeria.

Mr. Speaker, for the 36 nations which have achieved their independence since World War II; for the 7 or more

which will enter the community of free nations this year or next; for dozens of older, underdeveloped nations in Africa, Asia and Latin America, the need for university-trained leadership is nothing short of an absolute need to prevent chaos.

Six years ago this month I reported to the Congress upon my return from the Bandung Conference. Then, as again today, I urged a scholarship program for students from the newer nations, but I received no support. The result of our delay in the face of this urgent need is plain for all to see—we have again allowed the Soviets to move ahead.

Last year the Soviet Union opened the doors of its new Friendship of Nations University in Moscow with several hundred students from Asia, Africa, and Latin America in attendance—and there will soon be 5,000 of these students enrolled in courses of study lasting from 4 to 6 years. Meanwhile, the United States drifts along, hoping that private donors and foundations will fill the void. Much credit should go to pioneering efforts like the Ford Foundation development program in Africa and the Kennedy Family Foundation's airlift of 300 students from Kenya, Tanganyika, and Uganda to the United States—but these only point the way—they don't begin to do the whole job. Instead of being 5 years ahead of the Soviet Union—as we could have been if we had shown sufficient foresight together in 1955—we are trailing 2 or more years behind them in meeting our educational responsibilities to the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, which are at least equally as important as the scientific challenges of outer space.

Nonetheless, this program is not offered in any spirit of simply keeping up with the pace and example of Soviet education. Friendship University, with its package plan of Soviet-style training, in a kind of Moscow ghetto for handpicked students from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, is not our model. We should, rather, learn from the Soviet mistakes in this field and, by all means, avoid engaging in a meaningless game of educational move and countermove.

The problem for us is, simply, how can this Nation help the new and less-developed nations, with both academic education and vocational training, so that they will achieve that critically important threshold of knowledge and competence on the part of their future leaders—which is the key to the full utilization of natural resources and the broad application of the fruits of science and technology for their citizens.

In meeting the challenge of education for the young people and adults of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, I am convinced that very helpful insights are to be had from the experiences of our own areas of Hawaii and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, as well as from the evolving West Indies Federation. These can enhance our scholarship program for the less-developed and newly emerging nations, on the one hand, as living demonstrations of bootstrap economic development and, on the other, of intercultural communication and understanding and of the development of responsible governmental leadership.

These simple appraisals have been confirmed on many occasions in personal and direct discussions with leaders in our own insular areas and in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Here, for example, are some very brief excerpts from among the many statements sent to me by foreign leaders in support of this proposed scholarship program. Mark you, many of those who want us to train their leaders will not cooperate with military pacts.

From the Prime Minister of the Republic of Togo:

> We cannot but be grateful for your generous initiative directed toward instituting a program of technical assistance in teaching and education.

From the Ministry of Programs of the Republic of Guinea:

> We are indeed happy to hear of this plan, which ties in perfectly with the aid which the highly developed countries are giving to the recently liberated young countries.

From the Emperor of Ethiopia:

> The Ethiopian Government and people are deeply appreciative of the educational and cultural ties which have been established with the United States of America, and assure you that the inauguration of the program of scholarship aid would indeed be greatly welcomed in this country.

From the Secretary of Public Instruction of Liberia:

> A scholarship aid program to Liberia will highly be appreciated as the need for more qualified educators is imperative. * * * We look forward in anticipation for the results of this program.

From the Minister of Education of Pakistan:

> We have already benefited considerably from the program of scholarships and fellowships of various agencies in the United States of America and we are grateful to you for initiating a program for further expansion. * * * We would welcome a program of massive aid, scholarships and fellowships for Pakistani scholars, as such a program would help us to develop much needed personnel.

From the Director General of the Colombian Institute for Advanced Training Abroad, formerly Minister of Education of Colombia:

> My congratulations for the important work you are doing to help the underdeveloped countries.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would close with the observation that this Nation which values its freedom so highly that it can give away well over $23 billion in foreign military aid grants in the last decade alone, can surely find it possible to support this modest educational program that, at a cost of about $100 million, may do even more for freedom and progress everywhere. And let us all remember that independence is not an end in itself, but only a beginning. The revolution of freedom is always unfinished business.

RADIO'S MANY VOICES

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, May has been proclaimed National Radio Month in recognition of the importance of radio to all of us. It has been less than 70 years since Marconi's successful transmission of radio signals, yet it is difficult to imagine life without the radio. Its advance during the succeeding years has been remarkable. By now there are more than 3,500 AM and 700 FM radio stations throughout this Nation.

Indeed, the sound of radio surrounds us wherever we go. It is present in 97 percent of our homes, broadcasting the morning and evening news, educating and entertaining our children, and bringing the world series and Rose Bowl to all of us. It accompanies us as we drive to work or motor across the country. We carry the new light portables with us to the beach and other vacation spots.

How many roles the radio has come to play in this country. To thousands of ham operators it is a fascinating hobby. To the airline pilot it is the signal that guides him to his destination. It is a sentinel in our defense system and through Conelrad warns us of impending enemy attack. It spans the distance between farm family and urban center, between the United Nations and our living rooms, between a space vehicle and our world. By mere change of channels it transforms a home into a theater, a symphony hall, or a lecture room. It is used by the policeman for rapid communication, by the mariner to call for help, and by the astronomer to explore the stars.

Whether the voice of radio is informative, entertaining, or urgent, it is participating in a vital way in the life of each of us. It is, therefore, fitting that we take time to honor this versatile medium. My congratulations to all who help make radio one of the strongest assets of this free society.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I introduce today for reference to the Committee on Public Works a bill to amend chapter 2 of the Federal Highway Act and to provide increased authorizations.

This bill is a combination but not inclusive of three Senate bills, S. 501 by MORSE and others, on forest development roads and trails; S. 1159 by CHAVEZ to amend chapter 2 of the Highway Act, road authorizations, including a new authorization for forest

recreation roads; S. 1151 by ELLENDER, a bill which is in part common with S. 501. The bill also contains sections which are not found in the three bills listed above. These deal with increased authorizations for forest highways, park roads, and parkways. The bill also creates a new class of road, "public land development road and trail." The bill provides for an executive coordinating commission for natural resource roads. Sections 1 and 2 are somewhat consistent with the Chavez bill, S. 1159, but provides for increased authorizations for all parts of chapter 2 of the Highway Act. A provision for forest recreation roads as a separate category has not been included since it should be possible to provide for these roads by administrative action. Roads serve many purposes and the need is to provide adequate funds in the class of road in question—forest development roads and trails.

A new category, public land development roads and trails, has been suggested for creation to enable adequate resource development roads on the 477,000,500 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management. The bill proposes amending all authorizations for 1963 and providing the authorizations for fiscal year 1964 and 1965—the regular biennial authorization. The authorization amounts are listed below with comparisons.

	1962 proposal	1963 present	1963 proposed	1964–65 proposed
Forest highways	$33,000,000	$33,000,000	$40,000,000	$50,000,000
Forest development roads and trails	35,000,000	40,000,000	60,000,000	70,000,000
Park roads	18,000,000	18,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Parkways	16,000,000	16,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
Indian roads	12,000,000	12,000,000	17,000,000	18,000,000
Public land highways	3,500,000	3,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
Public land development roads and trails	None	None	2,000,000	4,000,000
Total	117,500,000	122,000,000	176,000,000	199,000,000

The amounts suggested are those needed to place and schedule the various natural resources road progress in national forests, parks, Indian, and public lands.

Section 3a of the bill defines a public land development road and trail as one needed for the development of the national resources, including forest, minerals, outdoor recreation, range, water, wildlife, and fish on land administered by the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of Interior. The section excludes from the definition those roads which are on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, urban, or interstate system. The provision thus provides an authorization for public land development woods and trails synonymous with national forest development roads and trails.

Section 3b proposes a device to assure better coordination of the road programs covered by chapter 2 of the Highway Act. The Commission provided for by this section will be composed of the Secretaries of Commerce, Agriculture, and Interior. It will not take over operating responsibilities or diminish the functions of the existing agencies. It will provide means for coordinated analyses of resource road needs, and authorization requests. It will also issue a biennial report, designed to reach the Congress and the State, the year when the biennial authorizations are to be considered. Finally it will provide a mechanism for coordinating resource road developments in those situations where two or more Federal agencies are involved. Section 4, of the bill is taken from Senate bill 501 by MORSE and others, with some modifications. Some technical sections from S. 1151 are included as follows:

First. How maintenance charges will be applied is more fully spelled out.

Second. A fuller explanation of the type of elements the Forest Service may grant is provided.

Third. A description of how easement may be terminated is included.

Fourth. Provision is made for recordation of papers or agreements with legal significance.

This section contains five basic policy statements on forest development and trails.

First. The authority for the Forest Service to construct roads for maximum long-term economy is confirmed.

Second. The policy of multiple use is confirmed by also defining these roads as multiple-use management roads.

Third. The authority to issue easements for roads is transferred from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Fourth. Where mutual needs for access exist the granting of a right-of-way or road-use agreement may be conditioned upon receipt by the Forest Service of the rights it needs.

In introducing this bill I do so solely with the desire to have before a committee an omnibus measure which attempts to deal with all the matters in chapter 2 of the Highway Act in a coordinated and complete manner.

It is my hope that hearings will develop the type of legislation that is required if we are going to meet any road needs in the critical years ahead.

SEA LEVEL GHOST REVIVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of March 28, 1961, there was featured an article under the overall title of "Big Ditch II." Its author is William Beecher, a staff reporter of the Journal.

In view of all the circumstances involved, it seems clear that the article is intended as spearhead propaganda for the construction of a new canal at Panama of so-called sea-level design. In this light, it would seem equally clear that construction industry and engineering sea-level advocates are up to their old tricks of waging a campaign for such design, with customary zeal and deceptive methods. As always heretofore, these advocates, in their enthusiasm, ignore not only the diplomatic aspects of Panama Canal questions, but also the far more economic proposal for modernization of the waterway known as the Terminal Lake-third locks plan.

This plan, which was developed in the Panama Canal organization during World War II from war operating experience, makes maximum utilization of the existing waterway and the huge investment that it represents.

For the benefit of those who may not be familiar with it, I may explain that the Terminal Lake-third locks solution provides for the elimination of the serious traffic bottleneck locks at Pedro Miguel, the consolidation of all Pacific locks in three lifts near Aguadulce to correspond with the lock arrangement at Gatun, and raising the Miraflores Lake level to that of Gatun Lake so as to form a summit anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal to match that in Gatun Lake at the Atlantic end. This plan would also provide for a set of larger locks for larger vessels and for raising the summit lake level a few feet to supply greater depths for navigation and more water for lockages.

Not only is this solution the most economic, it is the most logically developed from all significant points of view of any plan ever proposed and has been officially recognized as affording the best operational canal practicable of achievement.

In my inquiries into the problems of the Panama Canal, I have read widely, consulted many recognized ship canal and other experts, and flown over its entire length by helicopter to view the terrain and observe canal operations.

The idea of a summit level anchorage at the Pacific end as offering the solution of most of the serious operating problems of the Panama Canal, is so simple, obvious, and logical that I am at a loss to understand why this modification was not included in the 1939 legislation for the third locks project.

As a further digression, it should be noted that work on the third lock project was carried on until May 1942, when it was suspended because of more urgent needs for war materials and shipping. About $75 million of the taxpayers' money was expended on the excavation of lock sites at Miraflores and Gatun, most of which will be a material contribution toward any third locks construction. No excavation, fortunately, was started at Pedro Miguel.

May I suggest that Members of the Congress, when visiting the Canal Zone, inquire into the third locks project and inspect the lock and channel locations as originally planned for that project.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to return to my discussions of the Wall Street Journal article, I would emphasize that advocates of a sea-level canal at Panama, as al-

ways in the past, fail to reveal that a new treaty with Panama would be required to arrive at the specific conditions for its construction.

In the event that negotiation of a new treaty with Panama is undertaken, there is every likelihood of demands for a tremendous indemnity, greatly increased annuity, and further weakening or surrender to that country of U.S. rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone and the canal itself.

The current propaganda effort utterly ignores the fact that if a new canal of sea-level design at Panama should be constructed, the clamor for its internationalization, aided and abetted by international communistic influences, would immediately ensue, with the possibility that internationalization might follow with resulting loss to the taxpayers of our country of the vast expenditures incurred.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat what I have said many times before that it is grossly unfair and unjust to attempt to saddle upon our taxpayers such an extravagant and unnecessary boondoggle at this time of international peril, both fiscal and belligerent in character. It would have for its inevitable consequence the further opening of the already cracked Pandora's box of Isthmian and Caribbean problems.

It is indeed remarkable, Mr. Speaker, that sea-level advocates, some of whom are in official authority, unfailingly endeavor to conceal all the facts and consequences involved and strive to commit our Government to an unnecessary venture that would overnight plunge us into a measureless sea of expenses and diplomatic turmoil. All of this could be, and would be, obviated by the major improvement of our existing canal by proceeding with the Terminal Lake-third locks proposal, which does not require a new treaty with Panama.

Almost two decades have passed since work was suspended on the third locks project in 1942. Meanwhile, transit traffic has continued to grow, making proper action more urgent. Most certainly the time for further procrastination in arriving at a wise decision is over.

As shown by recent history, diplomatic difficulties still plague our relations with Panama, which has a long-range program for nationalization. For this reason, it might be wise to go to Nicaragua or elsewhere for a second Isthmian Canal, if one is required.

In view of all the factors involved, together with the fact that the Nation has a new administration, it might be well to create, as hitherto proposed, a predominantly civilian Interoceanic Canals Commission to deal with all of these questions.

The time is rapidly approaching when there must be additional trans-isthmian capacity. In determining our country's attitude, all the pertinent facts must be considered and met. To decide upon questions of such magnitude in purely administrative manner, is absolutely shocking and contrary to the dictates of wise policy.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it an outrage that attempts should be made to settle these grave questions as casual routine matters, bypassing the Congress and the President, and withholding pertinent facts from the people of our Nation.

I believe that the canal situation is such that it requires the introduction of a new measure for the creation of a competent and objective Interoceanic Canals Commission, charged with broad authorities for making the necessary studies and reports touching the matter of increased interoceanic transit facilities.

Accordingly, I have reintroduced such a measure and quote its text:

H.R. 6296

A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Interocennic Canals Commission Act of 1961".

SEC. 2. (a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: One member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Army; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Navy; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Air Force; and eight members from civil life, four of whom shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering. The President shall designate one of the members from civil life as Chairman, and shall fill all vacancies on the Commission in the same manner as are made the original appointments. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of its work hereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of $18,000 per annum, each; but the members appointed from the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall receive only such compensation, in addition to their pay and allowances, as will make their total compensation from the United States $18,000 each.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for—

(a) an increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks Project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

(b) the construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

(c) the construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(d) the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal, and of any other canal or canals which may be recommended by the Commission;

(e) treaty and territorial rights which may be deemed essential hereunder; and

(f) estimates of the respective costs of the undertakings herein enumerated.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of conducting all inquiries and investigations deemed necessary by the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Commission is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other officer, of the Commission, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Commission may deem relevant or material for the purposes herein named. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later than two years after the date of the enactment hereof, a final report containing the results and conclusions of its investigations and studies hereunder, with recommendations; and may, in its discretion, submit interim reports to the President and the Congress concerning the progress of its work. Such final report shall contain—

(a) the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the Panama Canal, and to any new interoceanic canal or canals which the Commission may consider feasible or desirable for the United States to construct, own, maintain, and operate;

(b) the estimates of the Commission as regards the approximate cost of carrying out its recommendations; and like estimates of cost as to the respective proposals and plans considered by the Commission and embraced in its final report; and

(c) such information as the Commission may have been able to obtain with respect to the necessity for the acquisition, by the United States, of new, or additional, rights, privileges, and concessions, by means of treaties or agreements with foreign nations, before there may be made the execution of any plans or projects recommended by the Commission.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission.

SEC. 7. The Commission is hereby authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such engineers, surveyors, experts or advisers deemed by the Commission necessary hereunder, as limited by the provisions in title 5, United States Code, section 55a (1946 edition); and may make such expenditures—including those for actual travel and subsistence of members of the Commission and its employees—not exceeding $13 for subsistence expense for any one person for any calendar day; for rent of quarters at the seat of government, or elsewhere; for personal services at the seat of government, or elsewhere; and for printing and binding necessary for the efficient and adequate functions of the Commission hereunder. All expenses of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission, or such other official of the Commission as the Commission may designate.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

A FRESH LOOK AT TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, changing uses of our national wealth, how it is distributed, and the purposes for which it is used are ever the responsibility and obligation of a watchful Congress. Why did one section of the economy deteriorate? Why did another expand? What caused the decline or expansion?

One element of the economy that appears to have had a disproportionately rapid growth in recent years is the tax-exempt foundation. To say that it has grown rapidly is probably a colossal understatement. For instance, the Foundation Directory, prepared by the Foundation Library Center, reported on 899 foundations in 1948, 4,164 foundations in 1955, and 5,202 foundations in its 1960 issue. These foundations have assets totaling $11,518 million. They have annual expenditures of $686,400,000, including average annual grants of $625,600,000. Eight foundations have assets exceeding $100 million, the Ford Foundation topping them all with $3,316 million; 129 have assets exceeding $10 million, and 757 have assets of more than $1 million.

MORE THAN 12,000 FOUNDATIONS

In addition to the 5,000-plus foundations covered in the directory, there are 7,000 smaller foundations—average assets, $13,600 each—not covered in the report. The fact that most foundations are small does not mean they will remain in that category. Example: the Ford Foundation was created in 1936 with assets of $25,000. Assets of dozens of others have multiplied, but not as dynamically as Ford.

Let us digress here to say we have nothing but praise for the wonderful work that has been and is being done by foundations in many fields such as education, health, social welfare, scientific research, humanities, religion, international affairs, and government. So our thought today is not to criticize, but to urge Congress to take a fresh look. What has brought about this feverish growth? Do the goals in view truly justify this vast accumulation of wealth? Should we not again reexamine the tax-exempt status of foundation activities? Why do the numbers of foundations and their assets undergo explosive growth in some economic eras and lie virtually dormant in others?

Company-sponsored foundations may be cited as an example of growth periods. Before 1940 there were 30 company-sponsored foundations. At the close of 1957, there were 1,226. The upsurge started during World War II, but the biggest splurge was in 1952 and 1953. The heavy increase in the Federal corporation income tax during the war obviously stimulated the formation of company-sponsored tax-exempt foundations. This certainly was true in the case of the excess profits tax which most recently was in effect from July 1950 through 1953.

FOUNDED FOR TAX RELIEF

Many smaller foundations were established for tax relief or other personal advantage. This also applied to larger tax-exempt foundations. It permitted the family to remain in full voting control of the business enterprise whose funds were used to create the foundation. It enabled the family to benefit from any increase in the value of the equity. In event of inflation, the family would become entitled to receive the benefit of the increase in the monetary value of the company. No working capital is lost in establishing the foundation, which also may be used as a vehicle to provide employment for relatives and friends.

The Ford Foundation is a good example of the use of a foundation to solve the death-tax problem and at the same time to enable the family to retain control of a huge enterprise. Ninety percent of the ownership of the Ford Motor Co. was transferred to the Ford Foundation, created for that purpose. It is generally felt that the Ford family would have lost control of the company had the foundation not been established. The only other practical alternative probably would have been to sell a large part of the stock to the public or to bankers to meet the huge taxes payable by the Ford estates. The solution selected was to give away 90 percent of the company to "charity."

The company-sponsored foundations are tax-exempt, nonprofit, legal entities separate from the sponsoring company or companies, but with trustees consisting entirely or in large part of company officers and directors. Further, with the exception of large national corporations, their foundation activities are usually confined to communities where they have offices or plants, and to philanthropic channels that will benefit the corporation, its employees, stockholders or business interests. Would it not be wise for Congress to examine the extent of these activities? How much can be considered philanthropy, and to what extent should tax exemption be allowed?

SPECIAL PURPOSE FUNDS

It is high time that Congress take another look into special purpose foundations. The Foundation Directory reports that a special purpose foundation may be as narrow as the Dr. Coles Trust Fund to provide ice cream for the pupils of Scotch Plains and Fanwood, N.J., schools—a fund too small to be included in the directory—or it may be broad enough to cover all phases of education. The smaller special purpose foundations are usually set up by will or trust rather than by incorporation. Most of them serve worthwhile purposes—or at least purposes that do not impair the public welfare. Congress should, however, determine what so-called foundations or trusts are flying under false colors. Previous investigations have shown that some organizations have set themselves up as educational foundations while actually their function was subversive political propaganda.

Special attention should be given to abuses by foundations formed primarily as agencies to collect money from the general public. While many of them claim to be foundations and usually get the word "education" in their titles, they actually are collection agencies. Some of these organizations have been investigated extensively in the State of New York and elsewhere. Organizations like the National Better Business Bureau also can provide extensive information concerning them. A chief complaint against many of these organizations is that their costs of operation often far exceed the net amount available for distribution to charities. Perhaps it would be well for Congress to consider legislation to protect the public against such abuses.

CALLS FOR SCRUPULOUS POLICING

Even those most closely associated with the foundation movement agree that tax-exempt foundations must scrupulously police their activities or Government must do it for them.

With that in mind, let me say here that I shall be referring from time to time to the Foundation Library Center. It is located in New York and was established to collect, and make available to the public, information about foundations, and to promote sound standards for foundation reporting. The Foundation Library Center is supported through grants from the Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie, and W. K. Kellogg Foundations with the Russell Sage Foundation assisting by publishing some of the library's books and pamphlets. Director of the Foundation Library Center is F. Emerson Andrews.

I have mentioned this now because I want to read to you what Mr. Andrews has said on more than one occasion about the public responsibility of tax-exempt foundations. It is this:

> Foundations and charitable trusts receive from society certain privileges, of which tax exemption is the most tangible. In return for such solid advantages, and also in view of the fact that the ultimate beneficiary is society itself, however particularly the gift may be directed, it seems wholly proper that the foundation should account for its stewardship. The availability of the new social asset should be made known promptly and widely. Operations of the exempt organization should be fully disclosed, and, if it is of substantial size, regularly and publicly reported. Such disclosure may be all that is necessary in the public interest. But unless wide voluntary cooperation is secured for this degree of accountability, controls may be imposed by Government that will limit, and may destroy, the very freedom which has made foundations so significant a factor in pioneering research and social progress.

We shall discuss foundation financial reporting in more detail at another time. For the present, let us consider whether we are justified in overlooking lack of adequate controls simply because the words "charity," "education," or "the good of mankind" find their way into the names of some so-called foundations.

If Congress feels that tighter controls must be established, it obviously must be handled on a Federal basis. Currently, controls and regulations are left primarily to the States, but very few States have effective regulations and all are different.

NEW HAMPSHIRE OFFERS LESSON

New Hampshire was the first State to act on regulation of foundations and trusts. When its Trust Registry Act be-

came effective more than 20 years ago, it was reported that "a number of slumbering trusts" were discovered. In one case a trust had been accumulating for 18 years until its assets totaled $100,000. Another had accumulated for 47 years until its assets had grown from $30,000 to $90,000. In neither case had any grant been made to a beneficiary.

A third case, according to Prof. Eleanor K. Taylor in her book, "Public Accountability of Foundations and Charitable Trusts," was nipped in the bud just in time. A gift made 20 years earlier was subject to a reverter and was within 2 months of reversion when it was discovered. In this instance an educational bequest of more than $1 million was secured for the State. Yet, the very existence of the bequest had never been known, and would not have been known except for the Trust Registry Act.

The New Hampshire experience suggests the extent to which trustee obligations are left to chance in other States lacking comparable enforcement machinery.

The definition of a pure foundation has been stated like this:

> A foundation may be defined as a nongovernmental, nonprofit organization having a principal fund of its own, managed by its own trustees or directors, and established to maintain or aid social, educational, charitable, religious, or other activities serving the common welfare.

But the privileges which encourage charitable giving have become an invitation to abuse. Tax exemption is the most obvious example of inducements that create regulatory problems. Profits to the donor, particularly in the upper-income tax brackets, may be substantial. In one of his writings Dr. Andrews said:

> Whether the "recording angel" sets down to the giver the total amount the charity receives or the net cost of the gift is a matter on which there are no statistical data.

When the gift is in the form of appreciated assets, it is actually possible for the donor to be richer as a result of his gift. By giving, rather than selling, he reduces his income tax and escapes the capital gains tax.

TO PERPETUATE WEALTH

The foundation today is used to perpetuate wealth just as were the old laws of entail and primogeniture. When Thomas Jefferson began his successful fight in the Virginia House of Delegates to repeal these laws, Virginia's baronies were held in entail by a few families. By the law of primogeniture they were passed from heir to heir and could not be broken up or divided. As Jefferson described it:

> The transmission of this property from generation to generation in the same name raised up a distinct set of families who, being privileged by law in the perpetuation of their wealth, were thus formed into Patrician order, distinguished by the splendor and luxury of their establishments.

The special House Committee To Investigate Foundations—the Cox committee—found a striking similarity in its 1953 studies. It reported:

> Many have urged that a "rule against perpetuities" be applied to foundations in the form of an aggregate limit on life of, say, from 10 to 25 years. We strongly support this proposal. It should be applied primarily to foundations and other noninstitutional organizations whose sole or chief function is distributing grants. * * * This would minimize the use of the mechanism to enable a family to continue control of enterprises ad infinitum; avoid the calcification which sometimes sets in on foundations; and, among other desirable objectives, minimize the seriousness of the danger that a foundation might, in some future period, pass into the control of persons whose objectives differed materially from those which the creator of the foundation intended. (H. Rept. No. 2681, 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 214.)

The pressure of the present high rate of taxes induces the creation of foundations to perpetuate vast fortunes and accumulate extraordinary wealth. It is a loophole to effectuate tax savings but it is a perfectly legal loophole. Nothing is wrong legally, but is it wrong morally? Jefferson felt so strongly about the damaging effects of the laws of entail and primogeniture that he did not believe a free government could survive without their repeal. Although he was a member of what he called the "aristocracy of wealth," he felt that the power and privilege that accompanied concentrated wealth could only lead to tyranny.

Are we not facing that same concentrated and perpetuity of wealth today? The Ford Foundation was started in 1936 with assets of $25,000. As of 1959 the assets were $3,316 million. We cite Ford because it is by far the biggest. But almost all foundations grow every year. More funds are poured into them from profits or estates. Further, part of the foundation's income is added to the assets. The $415 million Duke Endowment withholds 20 percent of its annual income to be added to the assets.

Certainly the swelling growth of tax-exempt foundations should be of concern to all of us. Would it not be advisable for Congress to take a fresh look at this segment of our national life? Should we not find out where this untaxable pyramiding of wealth is leading us?

Mr. Speaker, in the near future I will discuss other phases of the foundation trend—the power and influence of big foundations, statutory provisions governing foundations, accountability requirements, corporation-sponsored foundations, and other tax-exempt groups.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RHODES of Arizona for 1 hour today.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) for 30 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ADDABBO) for 15 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. ADDABBO) for 30 minutes on tomorrow, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LINDSAY.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PATMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. DOOLEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ADDABBO) and to include extraneous matter and tables:)

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

Mr. McDOWELL.

Mr. STRATTON.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and joint resolutions of the Senate were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1748. An act to provide for the increased distribution of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

S.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution designating the week of May 14–20, 1961, as Police Week and designating May 15, 1961, as Peace Officers Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week commencing October 1, 1961, as National Public Works Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

855. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the General Sales Manager for February 1961 concerning the policies, activities, and developments, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support; to the Committee on Appropriations.

856. A letter from the Director, District Unemployment Compensation Board, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board for the year 1960; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

857. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting the "Report of the

International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, on the International Passamaquoddy Tidal Power Project," dated April 4, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 401, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

858. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

859. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda water range)"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

860. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

861. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 35 of title 18, United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

862. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain increases in rates of disability compensation and allowances for veterans"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee of conference. H.R. 3935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 327). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Economic Committee. 1961 Economic Report (Rept. No. 328). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 274. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6441, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; without amendment (Rept. No. 329). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (by request):

H.R. 6744. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 6745. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda Water Range); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6746. A bill to repeal 18 U.S.C. 791 so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 6747. A bill to amend the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6748. A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, section 18 (d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6749. A bill to provide that no member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall hold any other public office or position and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 6750. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that multiple sclerosis developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 5 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 6751. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6752. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to authorize cooperative housing projects to utilize (without specific FHA permission) funds in their operating reserves for necessary replacement, improvement, or repairs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6753. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to provide a system of supplementary financing for cooperative housing projects insured under that section; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6754. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study in such institutions and special national awards for academic excellence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6755. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 6756. A bill to amend sections 4561, 6082, and 9561 of title 10, United States Code, to require that to the extent practicable coffee provided as part of the military ration shall contain not less than 10 percent of Kona coffee grown in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6757. A bill to increase the college housing loan authorization and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 6758. A bill to provide increased authorizations for the fiscal year 1963 and authorizations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, Indian reservation roads, public land highways, and public land development roads and trails; to establish a National Resources Road Commission to provide for a system of forest development roads and trails for utilization and protection of lands administered by the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 6759. A bill for the relief of the Prince Georges County School Board, Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 6760. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 6761. A bill to amend sections 4504, 4511, 4520, and 4549 of the Revised Statutes, relating to shipping articles; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6762. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to authorize the Commissioner of Education to award undergraduate scholarships in American institutions of higher education to certain students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America in order to help prepare those students to become national leaders in their home countries; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6763. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 6764. A bill to amend section 8(e) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported shelled walnuts, dates with pits, dates with pits removed, and products made principally of dates; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 6765. A bill to authorize acceptance of an amendment to the articles of agreement of the International Finance Corporation permitting investment in capital stock; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 6766. A bill to amend the Expediting Act (56 Stat. 198; 15 U.S.C., sec. 28) so as to provide for appointment of a national panel of antitrust judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.J. Res. 399. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the present tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the present tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLE:

H. Res. 273. Resolution opposing the seating of Communist China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the

United States relative to the 6 percent construction bid differential for Pacific coast shipbuilders, which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 6767. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Stype; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 6768. A bill for the relief of Nicolita Boonos (also known as Nikolitsa Bounos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD (by request):

H.R. 6769. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice pharmacy in the District of Columbia to Paul L. Miller; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 6770. A bill for the relief of Manuel Pires; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6771. A bill for the relief of Laura Do Nascimento; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 6772. A bill for the relief of Hendrikus Zoetmulder (Harry Combres); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6773. A bill to repeal the act of August 14, 1957 (Private Law 85–160); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

135. By Mr. KOWALSKI: Resolution of the representative town meeting of the town of Groton, Conn., urging continuance of Public Law 874, to provide Federal school aid for impacted areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

136. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Peter Minwegan, King's House of Retreats, Belleville, Ill., relative to urging that any aid to education include all citizen-students, whether they attend public or independent schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Commuter Railroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for several years now the commuter railroads serving our large metropolitan areas have found it increasingly difficult to render the kind of service our expanding population wants and is entitled to have. The causes of the decline of the commuter railroads are many and complex—high taxes, losses of revenue to Government subsidized highway and air carriers, to name but two. And the solutions to the problems of the commuter lines have been equally varied, ranging all the way from Government ownership to complete discontinuance of this important service.

There have been a number of sound plans proposed. But none of these has been implemented. Instead we have stood idly by, watched our commuter railroad service decline, and have failed to offer a helping hand. Though the number of people flowing in and out of our metropolitan areas each day has increased tremendously since World War II, total annual rail commutation dropped 124 million from 1947 to 1957. Nowhere has this decline been more painfully evident than in the New York City area. Here the New York Central Railroad, one of the Nation's most important carriers, has alone lost 47.6 percent of its passengers since 1949.

At this time of crisis in our Nation's commuter railroads, a new threat to the continued operations of the New York Central has appeared in the form of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad's proposal for control of the Baltimore & Ohio railroads.

The New York Central has pointed out that this control, if approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, would give the combined C. & O.-B. & O. Railroad a total of 185 points served in common with the New York Central. Not only is this kind of duplication wasteful, but it gives the combined system the ability to take freight traffic away from the New York Central and other railroads serving the area.

The New York Central notes:

The freight traffic most susceptible to raiding by the C. & O.-B. & O. provides the backbone of Central's revenues. These revenues make it possible to provide essential freight and passenger service over the entire New York Central system as well as the New York area commuter and terminal freight services. If these services are to be maintained, the New York Central must have the revenues to make them possible.

The New York Central today handles 60 percent of all southbound commuter traffic coming into New York City. This is a $14 million operation involving 3,500 employees who work on commuter traffic exclusively. A blow to this phase of the Central's operations would have serious economic consequences not only to the railroad itself, but to the 40,000 people per day who are provided with efficient, reasonably priced transportation in and out of the city.

There is a workable alternative to this potentially dangerous and harmful C. & O.-B. & O. merger scheme—

The Central has pointed out.

The logic of creating a strong, balanced, competitive two-system railroad service in the East is so obvious that B. & O. was publicly committed to the approach outlined here.

Detailed studies of the plan were well underway. Though far from completion, these studies indicated beyond a doubt that savings would result which would be of unprecedented benefit to the railroads concerned, their investors, their customers, their users, and to the public at large.

Then, abandoning the studies in the face of their promising outlook for all concerned, B. & O. entered on-again-off-again negotiations with C. & O. which resulted in the present situation.

In the light of the facts at hand, however, New York Central intends to pursue the objective of helping to create a healthy two-system eastern railroad structure in the public interest.

The Interstate Commerce Commission will commence its deliberations on the proposed C. & O.-B. & O. merger on June 18. Obviously, the Interstate Commerce Commission will not force the New York Central to further curtail its commuter operations by giving undue competitive advantages to the lines that wish to merge.

However, there is a more profound consideration to this proposed merger than profit and loss. That is, will it serve the long-range public interest?

For the past 40 years Congress has advocated a carefully planned, balanced and competitive railway system. We must ask ourselves which of the two alternatives will help the commuter—the two-way B. & O.-C. & O. merger, or the three-way New York Central-B. & O.-C. & O. merger. Which will serve not only the best interest of the stockholders, but the interests of all the traveling public?

Tribute to Retiring Publisher Arthur Hays Sulzberger and Editorial Page Editor Charles Merz, of the New York Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great newspaper, the New York Times, on the occasion of a major change in its top executive command.

Arthur Hays Sulzberger has been a distinguished publisher of this distinguished newspaper and it is fitting that we take due notice of his major contribution to American journalism on the occasion of his retirement. I am pleased to note that Mr. Sulzberger will continue to serve as chairman of the board of the New York Times.

Mr. Sulzberger's successor as publisher is Mr. Orvil E. Dryfoos, who is president of the New York Times Co., and who has been with the Times since 1942. Mr. Dryfoos' outstanding career as a journalist guarantees that the high standards which have made the Times one of the world's great newspapers will be maintained.

I am also pleased to note that Mr. John B. Oakes, a member of the Times staff since 1946, has been appointed as editorial page editor. Mr. Oakes succeeds Charles Merz, editor since 1938, who now becomes editor emeritus.

I should like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to pay warm tribute to Arthur Hays Sulzberger and Charles Merz on the occasion of their retirement from distinguished careers in American journalism.

My heartiest congratulations go to their successors, Orvil E. Dryfoos and John B. Oakes, who can be counted upon to sustain the illustrious tradition of the New York Times.

The people of the 17th District of New York, and I as their Representative in Congress, take great pride in the New York Times as one of the great and authoritative newspapers of the world.

Naval Blockade of Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, in my latest newsletter to my constituents I urged the imposition of a naval blockade of Cuba as the only effective method of preventing continued Soviet armaments from coming into the Western Hemisphere in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Yesterday, I had the privilege of reading a thoughtful article in the U.S. News & World Report of May 8 which discussed this type of action in more detail, including both its advantages and its disadvantages.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the relevant portion of my newsletter, together with the text of the article from the U.S. News & World Report:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN, SAMUEL S. STRATTON, REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON, MAY 1, 1961

Cuban S.S.R.: Whatever may have been the setbacks resulting from the unsuccessful attempt of the Cuban rebels to establish a beachhead on the Castro-held mainland last week, there was at least one positive benefit, and that was the clear-cut revelation to the whole world of the complete conversion of Cuba into a Russian-dominated military base.

In fact, one of the major reasons for the failure of the ill-starred expedition appears to have been a lack of full information on the extent to which Cuba has been getting this Russian military equipment. Somehow, the pictures and stories of Soviet T-34 tanks on Cuban beaches and Russian Mig jet fighters strafing rebel troops has brought home to all of us the stark, blunt truth of what it means to have a Russian military base 90 miles away from home. Russian tanks and planes in Cuba jeopardize the security of the United States, violate the Monroe Doctrine, and threaten the security of every other Latin American republic.

Once the full extent of this Russian military penetration of Cuba was clear, President Kennedy announced we would take whatever action was appropriate to prevent this, even if we had to go it alone. But the Latin American republics who have been rather inclined to drag their feet on taking action against Castro also reacted swiftly last week by finally throwing Cuba off the Inter-American Defense Board. For years the United States had been trying to get these countries to exclude Castro's representative from secret military talks. But it took the pictures of the Migs and the T-34 tanks to do the job. There is a new atmosphere of urgency in Washington this week. You can see it, for example, in the extensive efforts President Kennedy has made to enlist solid bipartisan support for his actions toward both Cuba and Laos; efforts, as I see it, which are being directed, by the way, toward support for future actions, not for those already past.

What the next move will be only time, of course, will tell. Personally, I think we ought to set up an immediate naval blockade of Cuba. We simply can't tolerate further Russian weapons, including the possibility of long-range nuclear missiles, being located in Cuba. Obviously, we can't stop them from coming in, however, just by talk. A naval blockade would be thoroughly in line with the Monroe Doctrine, would be a relatively simple operation to carry out, and would bring an abrupt end to Soviet penetration of our hemisphere.

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 8, 1961]

NEXT FOR CUBA: AN ARMS BLOCKADE?

Look at Castro now—cockier than ever, with arms and agents to threaten the Americas.

How can the United States act?

Blockade is one answer offered by experts. In it they see a way to isolate Cuba, stop infiltration, maybe finish Castro, too.

This is the question now facing President Kennedy: How to put a stop to the Soviet buildup in Cuba and to Communist infiltration of this hemisphere?

On April 25, the White House reported that a total embargo of remaining U.S. trade with Cuba was being considered. Its aim: To undermine further Cuba's economy, weaken Castro.

Another strategy—bolder and tougher—was also attracting notice in Washington: A naval and air blockade to cut Cuba off from the world, destroy Castro.

Blockade, in the view of military and civilian experts, could restore teeth to the Monroe Doctrine. It could halt a flood of Communist arms and strategic supplies now reaching Castro. It could stop Cuban re-export of guns and propaganda materials to South America. It would be the most severe reprisal, short of declared war, that the United States could invoke against Castro.

It is the strategy of blockade, therefore, that is suddenly at the center of attention of administration officials, Members of Congress, officers in the Pentagon. As a possible course of action, it also is the center of debate and is raising many questions. Among these questions:

WHAT WOULD A CUBA BLOCKADE TAKE?

Military experts say a tight naval blockade off Cuban ports and at the approaches to Cuban waters would require two naval task forces, each built around an aircraft carrier with a complement of about 100 planes and several destroyers.

The Navy, on April 25, announced it is bringing back the carrier *Shangri-La* from the Mediterranean, increasing to four the number of attack carriers in the vicinity of Cuba. More than 36 other big Navy ships are no less than a day's sailing time away.

To round out the blockading force, submarines would be needed—to locate, identify and track approaching vessels. Land-based radar would help with this task. So would radar picket ships. A squadron of Navy jets and another of long-range patrol planes would add support to the carrier task forces.

Three requirements go with a blockade: It must be proclaimed; the blockading force must be powerful enough to enforce it; and it must be enforced without discrimination.

Once these conditions of international law are met, countries that try to run to blockade do so at their own risk. Blockade runners can be stopped—by gunfire, if necessary—searched and held, at least temporarily. They could be sent to U.S. ports for rulings whether cargo should be confiscated.

WHAT COULD A BLOCKADE ACCOMPLISH?

Plenty, say the experts. In a broad sense, it would reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine by opposing Communist interference in the Western Hemisphere. It could, by avoiding direct intervention, provide a short-of-war strategy to meet short-of-war infiltration.

Primary target would be shipments of tanks, guns, aviation gasoline and ammunition coming from Russia and Czechoslovakia. Shipments of arms from Western countries could similarly be seized as contraband. In a total blockade, action could also be taken against ships bringing in chemicals, oils, textiles, and even foodstuffs. At times, three ships a day from the Soviet bloc are unloading in Cuban ports. Castro's military machine and his economy could be squeezed as hard as the United States felt necessary to bring about his downfall.

To be totally effective, surface blockade must be acompanied by air blockade. Here, argument is heard. Some experts insist that all air traffic for Cuba would have to be diverted, forced to turn back or to land at designated friendly airfields. Those that pass U.S. ground checks could continue.

Other experts see this as risky business, creating danger of aerial duels and—if the Soviets wanted to press hard enough—the danger of war. These experts claim the risk is not worth it. They are convinced the Soviet bloc could not give substantial airlift support to Cuba, because of the long distances involved. They point out that, during the Berlin blockade, it cost the United States more than $200 million to airlift 1.2 million tons of supplies for short distances. A glance at a world map shows the limitations of a Soviet effort in the Caribbean.

WOULD THE UNITED STATES BE GOING IT ALONE?

Almost certainly, say the experts. They see no chance of either the United Nations or the Organization of American States lending approval to a peacetime blockade of a member state. Those who favor a blockade of Cuba are not deterred by this.

President Kennedy, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, has the power to order the Navy into any action short of declared war, even though shots may be fired. Use of a carrier task force by President Eisenhower last November off Guatemala and Nicaragua was, in essence, a pacific blockade with orders to prevent the landing of armed forces and supplies from Cuba. Panama received similar U.S. naval help in 1959. In 1954, the Navy was alerted to search for a ship carrying arms to Guatemala.

BUT A PEACETIME BLOCKADE—IS THAT LEGAL?

A debate is now developing over just how far the United States can go in a blockade of Cuba, and stay within bounds of international law.

Basically, there are two kinds of blockade. One is the belligerent blockade that accompanies declared and open warfare. The United States has taken part in three major belligerent blockades—in the Civil War and in World Wars I and II. Belligerent blockades have been common in history and are governed by well-established "regulations."

Second type is the pacific blockade, usually defined as a reprisal in time of peace, to block off trade. Pacific blockades are not recog-

nized in a strict sense, but are accepted as acts against international delinquency. The British and French, for example, joined in establishing a pacific blockade against the Dutch in 1831.

A pacific blockade can be invoked without declaration of war, but some U.S. experts believe that any naval blockade without sanction of an international organization is an act of war. They say that it would depend entirely on how Cuba and Castro regard and interpret the action.

Main point that troubles the legalists is this: There is considerable doubt whether a pacific blockade would give a clear right to stop any but Cuban and U.S. ships. The United States, for example, has argued in the past that a pacific blockade cannot legally be applied against a third power. Under this interpretation, Soviet vessels must be allowed free access to Cuba if the United States is to pay strict regard to international law. This is important to those who want to make a blockade conform as closely as possible to precedent.

Others say this is a time to be practical and not legal. They see the situation boiling down to this: If the United States is determined to act first and argue later about the legal aspects, a blockade can be made effective.

Protection for the American Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1961, I introduced a resolution calling for the creation of a House Select Committee on Consumer Problems. Its purpose would be to conduct studies and investigations regarding the administration of Federal laws relating to consumers, the extent to which Government agencies adequately serve the needs of consumers, and to assemble facts and information on consumer problems to aid Congress in enacting remedial legislation.

In a statement in the RECORD at the time I introduced my resolution, House Resolution 240, I stated as follows:

Think of all the instances that have come to light in recent years involving price rigging, fraudulent advertising, low standards of purity and wholesomeness of food and other articles, misleading labeling, deceptive packaging, misrepresentations in manufacturing, and other ways to deceive the American consumer. This requires not only continual study and investigation, but also careful overseeing by Congress. It is time to stop making an easy victim of the consumer and to see that he obtains his dollar's worth in the marketplaces of our Nation.

I would like to see Congress take the lead in protecting the consumer, but unfortunately no action has been taken as yet on my resolution. The public, however, is clamoring for action. As more and more deceptions are uncovered, consumers everywhere are becoming thoroughly disgusted with the methods of certain unscrupulous business people and are beginning to turn to State legislatures for protection. An example is the situation which has arisen in New York.

A group of public-spirited New York State legislators has launched a campaign which, I believe, merits widespread attention, as their efforts will affect millions of consumers.

In the forthcoming session of the State legislature, a bill will be introduced to create a joint legislative committee on consumer protection to study overall textile performance with a view toward adoption of consumer labeling safeguards.

The joint sponsors of the measure are Assemblymen Max M. Turshen and Irwin Brownstein, of Brooklyn, Aileen B. Ryan, of the Bronx, Alfred D. Lerner, of Queens, and State Senator Frank J. Pino, of Brooklyn.

These State legislators, responding to hundreds of consumer complaints, are particularly concerned with clothing which is subject to undue shrinkage. They have noted that no law currently exists to require that clothing subject to this defect be properly labeled.

As a result, consumers—many of whom operate on a tight budget—are uninformed with regard to the type of performance they can expect from a particular garment. All they are told is the content.

It has been estimated that millions of dollars of clothing are dumped on the market each year which is subject to shrinkage, and can be worn only a few times. A few cleanings, or exposure to rain, will often render the garment useless.

This situation registers its severest impact on middle- and low-income families, who must spend hard-earned dollars carefully at a time when the spiraling inflation does not allow for needless financial losses.

The proposed committee on consumer protection would conduct a year-long study of overall textile performance.

At the end of the study the group would present its findings to the State legislature, along with recommendations for the adoption of minimum performance standards and labeling safeguards, particularly in the area of shrinkage.

This worthy program has already elicited widespread community support. In fact, the million-member Central Trades and Labor Council of New York City and the Union Label Trades Council, with 200 member unions, have indicated their whole-hearted support of this effort.

In connection with this legislative drive, the National Institute of Dry Cleaning has joined with the Textile Refinishers Association and Better Fabrics Testing Bureau in a study with the following objectives: First, to determine the shrinkage characteristics of unsponged woolen fabrics in repeated drycleanings; and second, to devise a laboratory test method by which the shrinkage propensities of a woolen fabric can be accurately determined by laboratory inspection.

The problem of clothing shrinkage after cleaning has existed for many years. I believe the program I have discussed here will be of great significance in correcting an inequitable situation.

Mr. Speaker, I think, however, that this is a national problem and should be looked into on a national scale by the Congress. Early adoption of my resolution will be an effective step in this direction.

Address by Hon. Frank J. Becker at Dedication of Army National Guard Armory, Freeport, Long Island, April 30, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD the speech of my colleague and congressional neighbor, Hon. FRANK J. BECKER, delivered April 30, 1961, at Freeport, N.Y. It contains a message which should be read by all:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE FRANK J. BECKER, REPUBLICAN, THIRD DISTRICT, NEW YORK, DEDICATION OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD ARMORY, FREEPORT, LONG ISLAND, APRIL 30, 1961

We are here today to dedicate an Army National Guard Armory—a symbol of our country's willingness to prepare itself to guard its life, its principles and its heritage.

But today I want to ask you to do more than help dedicate this building—to do more, even, than dedicate yourselves. The fact that you are active participants in this guard unit is proof of your awareness of certain harsh but obvious facts of life. I want to ask you to listen carefully to what I have to say—and then join me in a very important mission—a drive to save our way of life.

It is no secret to any of us that world situations and tensions are grave. Every day the headlines scream of a new crisis—of a new outrage against humanity—of a new powder keg situation in the infant countries of Africa and Asia.

World situations have been grave before. In 1914, it was the Balkans, now Laos. In 1938, it was Czechoslovakia, now the Congo. But unlike 1914, unlike 1938, we cannot, even for a short while, withdraw behind the false security of an ocean barrier and say "It's the other fellow's problem—not ours."

Because it is our problem—unless we want to see our cherished ideals of democracy and freedom washed down the drain—unless we want to live as slaves in an atheistic, cruel tyranny of Communist control.

My friends, I am not asking you to prepare for war.

I am telling you we are at war now.

We are now—today—April 30, 1961—engaged in the greatest war civilization has ever known. It is a life and death struggle for survival. We fight more than men and machines. We fight a philosophy—insidious, evil, grasping, selfish, cruel, merciless—dedicated to the complete and total destruction of everything in which we believe.

Every day, a battle is fought somewhere. In the United Nations. In negotiations in Geneva. In Washington. In Moscow. This is war. We have an enemy more determined to destroy western civilization than all enemies since the beginning of time—put together.

We couldn't see the signs 20 years ago. We waited until American men had been slaughtered at Pearl Harbor before we mobilized the great American productivity

into a fighting machine that triumphed for our beliefs.

But just because we waited 20 years ago doesn't mean we have to wait now. In fact, we cannot—we dare not—wait.

But I say to you today: We must make a choice. We as a country must decide: We want to preserve our system. We must make this strong desire for survival known to our leaders.

We must decide now to build up our resources—our armed might, our physical might, our moral might. We must win the battle for survival, for men's minds, for the peace of the world.

But such a program takes time, dedication—and money.

Cuba has proven one thing to us. We are up against a formidable enemy.

Why should the people of this country think that the leaders of our Government can expend money, effort, and thinking for welfare state programs and, at the same time, devote effort, thinking, and money to win the fight for survival.

We must decide which is more important to us—an increase in social security—or an all-out effort so assure national security.

We must decide which is more vital to us and our children—Federal aid to education or assurances that our children will continue to be educated in a free world.

We must decide whether we would rather have vast depressed areas aid—or the continued right to live in freedom.

Because I am convinced that we cannot equitably engage in both efforts without weakening ourselves.

No government, no matter how great it may be, can divide its efforts in such a manner as to keep the "business as usual" sign out and, at the same time, spend the money necessary to assure that we will have business as usual 50 years from now.

Today we spend more than 50 percent of our national revenue on defense. If more is necessary, let us spend more.

The Bible said it best. "For what doth it profiteth a man if he gaineth the world but suffereth the loss of his soul?"

What will it profit our country to spend vast amounts of money on a welfare state—if we lose the battle for survival.

First things must come first, and the first thing is survival of our country. Once that has been accomplished, only then can we turn to a realistic appraisal of all these Federal projects. Only then will we be sure that our people will live to enjoy any benefits.

I say to you that we must make this decision. I fear it is not being made for us by our leaders. We must convince them that we are aware of the dangers facing us. We must tell them that we are willing to sacrifice for the survival of our system.

It is true that there are votes in all welfare state programs, but such political expediency cannot and must not be permitted to interfere with our all-out efforts in the life and death struggle in which we are presently engaged.

And what good are votes if we lose the battle for our very lives? We must preserve our system if we are to enjoy it.

We must take our Federal budget and reappraise it. We must remain solvent. To do this, we must reduce expenditures in nonnecessary domestic fields.

We are in the fight now. In World War II we gladly sacrificed to build our defense and war effort. Why cannot we do the same now? If we do not do this, it may be too late.

The situation is more serious now than it was then. We must wake up to this fact. We must let it be known that we will not sacrifice our country, our way of life, for political expediency.

No coddled country can or will survive. The Roman Empire offered its citizens bread and circuses—that resulted in total destruction at the hands of the barbarians.

We did not start our country by being given massive handouts by a paternalistic Federal Government.

We did not start our country by preferring comfort to work—and we won't be able to keep our country if we think that way.

We started our country and built it because we cared more for the future of our children and their children than we did for our own material comfort. And the only way to keep our country and its principles is to go back to that group effort for survival.

Why can't we have both the welfare state and an all-out mobilization for survival? For two reasons: First, commonsense. It takes money to win a war. We cannot bankrupt our economy by huge spending in both fields, or we will have no economy left. The second reason: It takes individual determination and responsibility to arm philosophically, physically, and morally to beat communism. Welfare state programs tend to kill individual responsibility by putting all decision making and implementing in the hands of an impersonal bureaucratic Federal Government.

I am sure it will take us only a few seconds to decide which is more important. So, again I ask you to join with me in this determination to put first things first. To be more concerned with the survival of our cherished ideals than with temporary Federal benefits. To help convince our country's leaders that we will not be taken in. That we recognize political expediency when we see it, and that we prefer survival. This must be a bipartisan effort, my friends, and we must begin today.

Americans Have Cause To Outrun the Communist Design To Enslave the World—Text of Communist Party Dedication Must Be Outnumbered by Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present to the attention of yourself and all the other Members of this great legislative body, and also to all others who read or learn of it, the following text which I received through the U.S. mail this day:

A TOTAL COMMITMENT DESIGNED TO ENSLAVE A TOTAL WORLD

JEFFERSON STANDARD BROADCASTING CO.,
Charlotte, N.C., March 10, 1961.

Mr. NORMAN R. GLENN,
Editor and Publisher, Sponsor,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR NORMAN: Enclosed is an exact copy of a letter which a young Communist sent to a friend of his back in the United States.

The letter appeared in Presbyterian Survey, a very fine publication of the Presbyterian Church. In reproducing it, the editor made one of the most profound and thought-provoking observations I've ever read. He said, "We think this letter shows more graphically than any editorial what total commitment means." He went on to say, "Are we as committed to the truth as this young Communist and millions like him are committed to an empty hope?"

To a great majority of people in the free world, particularly people in America, this kind of dedication is unheard of. They simply cannot believe that the architects of communism, Karl Marx, Lenin, et al., could possibly have such influence on any human being. I feel that to defend and protect freedom as we know it today, it is imperative that all people in the free world understand the inner feelings of those who are determined to destroy it. I am hopeful, therefore, that you—through your widely read publications—will give the enclosed letter as much publicity as you see fit.

We simply must convince Americans and as many of our friends in the free world as possible that communism is by no means just another political party. It is a form of religion, a complete dedication, a total commitment designed to enslave a total world.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLIE CRUTCHFIELD.

A YOUNG COMMUNIST WRITES

What seems of first importance to you is to me either not desirable or impossible of realization. But there is one thing about which I am in dead earnest—and that is the Socialist cause. It is my life, my business, my religion, my hobby, my sweetheart, wife, and mistress, my bread and meat. I work at it in the daytime and dream of it at night. Its hold on me grows, not lessens, as time goes on. I'll be in it the rest of my life. It is my alter ego. When you think of me, it is necessary to think of socialism as well, because I'm inseparably bound to it.

Therefore, I can't carry on a friendship, a love affair, or even a conversation without relating it to this force which both drives and guides my life. I evaluate people, books, ideas, and notions according to how the Socialist cause and by their attitude toward it.

I have already been in jail because of my ideas, and if necessary I am ready to go before a firing squad. A certain percentage of us get killed or imprisoned. Even for those who escape these harsher ends, life is no bed of roses. A genuine radical lives in virtual poverty. He turns back to the party every penny he makes above what is absolutely necessary to keep him alive. We constantly look for places where the class struggle is the sharpest, exploiting these situations to the limit of their possibilities. We lead strikes. We organize demonstrations. We speak on street corners. We fight cops. We go through trying experiences many times each year when the ordinary man has to face only once or twice in a lifetime.

And when we're not doing these more exciting things, all our spare time is taken up with dull routine chores, endless leg work, errands, etc., which are inescapably connected with running a live organization.

Radicals don't have the time or the money for many movies or concerts, or T-bone steaks or decent homes and new cars. We've been described as fanatics. We are. Our lives are dominated by one great, overshadowing factor—the struggle for socialism. Well, that's what my life is going to be. That's the black side of it. Then there is the other side of it. We Communists have a philosophy of life which no amount of money could buy. We have a cause to fight for, a definite purpose in life. We subordinate our petty personal selves into a great movement of humanity. We have a morale, an esprit de corps such as no capitalist army ever had; we have a code of conduct, a way of life, a devotion to our cause that no religious order can touch. And we are guided not by blind, fanatical faith but by logic and reason, by a never-ending education of study and practice.

And if our personal lives seem hard or our egos appear to suffer through subordination to the party, then we are adequately compensated by the thought that each of us is in his small way helping to contribute something new and true, something better to mankind. (Reprinted from the Presbyterian Survey.)

Mr. Speaker, in reading and rereading the text following the words: "A young Communist writes: 'What seems of first importance to you is to me either not desirable or impossible of realization,'" my memory is refreshed of an experience I have not infrequently had during these 14 years of my membership on the House Committee on Un-American Activities when I have been sitting as a member of an investigating committee of that vital and essential committee in some part or other of our beloved Nation. For, Mr. Speaker, the text of what I herewith present as a dedication of this "young Communist" is strangely familiar; yes, is substantially what I have heard many times stated under oath, by American citizens who have formerly been dedicated members of the Communist Party of the United States. Time and time again, under oath, as friendly witnesses in an endeavor to help the committee understand the danger resulting from the dedication of themselves and others as Communists to the Communist cause, I have sat in amazement and trepidation, as I heard them state their former dedication to the Communist conspiracy directed against the freedom-loving and freedom-dedicated philosophy of our beloved Nation, and to hear them say without hindrance or limitation or any thought of equivocation, that they had thus formerly dedicated their life, when they became Communists in the United States of America, to live for, and often, in fact, even to make unbelievable sacrifices for the Communist philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the former Communists in the United States who have had a revulsion of feeling against the philosophy and practices of the Communist Party; I speak of such of those who have volunteered to come to the support of the U.S. Congress through their cooperation with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and thus to help us better to understand, not only the threat of subversive Communist infiltration, but to understand the direct and positive danger and hazard thereof to American ideals and to American institutions of government, schools, churches, labor unions. I have heard them tell of divorcing a wife, or a husband, respectively, because of their Communist Party loyalty and dedication. I have heard them tell of habitually deceiving their loved ones; of neglecting their families, of going without food and going without adequate necessities of life. I have heard them tell of going underground and undercover like so many moles and gophers; living a daily life of deceit and false identity. I have heard them tell of abandoning loved ones and parents and brothers and sisters and sweethearts. Mr. Speaker, these former Communists who thus desert this Godless philosophy help very much indeed when they voluntarily come forward and help the people of the United States to protect themselves against the dedication of those who have not yet revolted against those false ideologies of communism sufficiently to take that step. Mr. Speaker, I would to God that we Americans who have no use for the Communist philosophy and would not think or dream of uniting with it in any way whatsoever, would have a devotion to our constitutional way of life; to our heritage, as God-loving American citizens; of freedom and dignity for the individual, might consciously and deliberately place these elements sufficiently into our daily experience so that all mankind would know from our daily life, in our actions and by our daily dedication to all that is high and lofty, patriotic and righteous that we do dedicate our substances and ourselves to a valiant and steadfast desire and readiness to make any sacrifice necessary to perpetuate the philosophy of the individual dignity of man and reverence for God, for our beloved Nation in a safe and sound world of enduring peace. Dedicate bespeaks loyalty and love. We have cause to outmatch and outrun the Communist dedication.

The First Accusations That the United States Had Encouraged the Revolt of the French Generals in Algeria Were Printed in Soviet Newspapers and Broadcast by the Moscow Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the first accusations that the United States had encouraged the revolt of the French generals in Algeria were printed in Soviet newspapers and broadcast by the Moscow radio.

The New York Times reports this morning that—

Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, checked with his subordinates and gave an unqualified guarantee that none of his agents had given any encouragement to the rebels in France, Spain, Algeria, or elsewhere.

After consulting Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State Dean Rusk assured the French Ambassador, Herve Alphand, last week that no U.S. representatives had been involved in any way with the rebels.

When the rumors persisted, he repeated this assurance yesterday to the Ambassador.

Today Mr. Dulles departed from his custom and issued a personal denial of reports that some of his officials had been involved.

We, and the world, were assured by Mr. Dulles that—

The reports in Pravda, Izvestia, and the French press are all without basis in fact.

In view of the continuing rumors it is my belief that the Congress must take steps to end them once and for all, and to give assurances to everyone concerned that the United States was not involved, nor were any of its agents involved, in the revolt of the French generals which fortunately collapsed.

I am convinced that the Congress can no longer shirk its responsibility to inform itself fully on intelligence matters.

On April 27 Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY introduced for himself and Senators ANDERSON, MORSE, CLARK, METCALF, BURDICK, BARTLETT, and MCNAMARA, and perhaps others, Senate Joint Resolution 77 to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence. In introducing the measure Senator MCCARTHY told his colleagues that—

The joint resolution is not, directly or indirectly, meant to express any criticism of this administration or of any past administration, but basically, to reflect what I consider to be a proper responsibility on the part of the Members of the U.S. Congress to accept responsibility in this field, to be informed, and to be involved when major policy decisions are called for.

And Senator MCCARTHY added the following incontrovertible point—

Under the Constitution, Congress is called upon to participate in a declaration of war. In modern times, war is not declared. Congress, therefore, has a continuing and very substantial responsibility for policy decisions with regard to the cold war or conducting foreign policy by any other means.

The measure introduced by Senator MCCARTHY is similar in purpose and substance to my own House Joint Resolution 250. I am in complete agreement with Senator MCCARTHY when he says that—

It is my hope the joint resolution will be considered and, in some form, adopted, so that the machinery and procedures which are the constitutional responsibility of Congress may be exercised.

I include here, as part of my remarks, two articles from the New York Times of May 2, 1961:

PARIS RUMORS ON CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY—DESPITE FIRM U.S. DENIALS, SPECULATION PERSISTS AGENCY AIDED ALGIERS REVOLT

(By Thomas F. Brady)

PARIS, May 1.—Now that the French mutiny of the generals may be a thing of the past, the question whether the United States helped save the day for President de Gaulle is perhaps less important than what is believed in France, in North Africa and elsewhere about the U.S. role in the events. Former Gen. Maurice Challe, leader of the mutiny, hoped for U.S. support and said so publicly, but President Kennedy quickly sent a message pledging full support to President de Gaulle.

Immediately after the collapse of the mutiny, President Kennedy publicly expressed his satisfaction and congratulated President de Gaulle. The position of the U.S. Government was never in doubt.

RUMORS WIDLY CIRCULATED

These facts have not, however, prevented the wide circulation, and at least partial acceptance here and in North Africa, of rumors that General Challe and his fellow mutineers had received specific encouragement from U.S. intelligence agents.

Emphatic official denials from U.S. authorities have not put a stop to the rumors.

No French official has denied them. French comment has been decidedly equivocal. At a news conference Saturday night in Algiers, Louis Joxe, French Minister for Algeria, said—

"I do not know whether foreign agents encouraged the insurrectional movement or

whether those responsible for the coup profited from foreign subsidies. This sad affair among Frenchmen is enough, for the moment, to keep me busy. I have no reason to try to find out whether the insurgents received foreign aid."

SOURCE IS UNCERTAIN

The source of the rumors is difficult to determine. Some observers attribute them to Communists, others to the highest French authorities.

A dispatch to the Observer in London said yesterday that one reaction after the collapse, "at least in President de Gaulle's own entourage and perhaps inspired by him, is to blame the Americans. Repeated American denials that any American military or civilian officials encouraged General Challe's rebellion have not succeeded in preventing French official spokesmen from telling journalists there must have been some unofficial American backing."

The rumors, which include at least one written report circulating here, repeated speculation in the French press, a dispatch from Washington to the Tunisian weekly Afrique-Action and widespread speculation in leftwing circles, boil down to this:

President Kennedy is said to have reacted as he did because he had learned of encouragement to the mutineers by the Central Intelligence Agency, which is said to have become a reactionary state-within-a-state in the United States.

U.S. agents are said to have encouraged the mutiny either because they feared communism in the ranks of the Algerian Rebel National Liberation Front, with which President de Gaulle is expected to negotiate Algerian independence, or because they hoped to precipitate the downfall of President de Gaulle and thus eliminate, his opposition to integration of the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

MEETINGS WITH AGENTS ALLEGED

U.S. sympathy for the movement is said to have begun as early as last December, when Jacques Soustelle, a former Governor General of Algeria and a foe of President de Gaulle's policies, was reported to have had lunch with Richard M. Bissell, Jr., a CIA official.

At a meeting in Madrid on April 12 or 13, a U.S. agent is said to have told Gen. Raoul Salan, one of the mutineers, that the United States would recognize a new government in France within 48 hours after its successful establishment if there were no attack on Tunisia or Morocco.

The speculation does not take cognizance of the fact that former General Challe spent nearly a year as a North Atlantic Treaty Organization commander at the Fontainebleau headquarters near here. He undoubtedly heard frequent and bitter criticism of President de Gaulle by allied officers who disagreed with his policies on NATO.

The possibility is cited that M. Challe was guilty of wishful thinking and believed the attitudes of the military leaders reflected the political thinking of the allied governments.

No matter what the source of the rumors may be, no matter how false they may be, their existence is a fact. The credence they have gained, despite U.S. denials, is considered a serious threat to French-United States relations and to the prestige of the United States among the Algerian nationalists and in north Africa, in general.

The equivocation with which French officials have treated the rumors has been regarded as a major factor in their propagation.

UNITED STATES IS CONCERNED BY PARIS RUMORS

(By Wallace Carroll)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—The U.S. Government is becoming concerned over the persistence of newspaper reports and rumors in France that someone from this country encouraged the April 24 meeting of French generals in Algeria.

The resulting suspicion and resentment among the French, it is feared here, may damage French-United States relations at a crucial period and create an unfavorable atmosphere for the visit that President Kennedy is scheduled to make to Paris on May 30.

Mixed with concern is some irritation among high officials. This is caused by a belief that some French officials, far from discouraging the rumors of U.S. involvement in the revolt, have been fanning French suspicions.

SUPPORT OF DE GAULLE STRESSED

Officials at the White House, the State Department, the Defense Department, and the Central Intelligence Agency were emphatic today in stating that no officer, official, or agent of the United States had anything to do with the revolt.

If there has been one consistent line of policy in the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations, it was noted, it has been support for President de Gaulle in his efforts to settle the Algerian problem.

The news of the revolt, these officials recalled, was received with consternation in all departments and agencies in Washington.

The first accusations that the United States had encouraged the rebels were printed in Soviet newspapers and broadcast by the Moscow radio immediately after the outbreak of the revolt.

Then French newspapers, including the highly respected Le Monde, gave currency to rumors that U.S. agents had been in touch with the rebels and had promised them support.

In view of this, the White House and the State Department made inquiries of all departments and agencies that had officers or employees in France and north Africa.

Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, checked with his subordinates and gave an unqualified guarantee that none of his agents had given any encouragement to the rebels in France, Spain, Algeria, or elsewhere.

After consulting Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State Dean Rusk assured the French Ambassador, Hervé Alphand, last week that no U.S. representatives had been involved in any way with the rebels.

When the rumors persisted, he repeated this assurance yesterday to the Ambassador.

DULLES ISSUES DENIAL

Today Mr. Dulles departed from his custom and issued a personal denial of reports that some of his officials had been involved.

"Any reports or allegations that the Central Intelligence Agency or any of its personnel had anything to do with the generals' revolt were completely false," he said.

"The reports in Pravda, Izvestia, and the French press are all without basis in fact."

Bits of fact have been used to buttress the reports in the French press. For example, it has been noted that officials of the Central Intelligence Agency had a luncheon meeting in Washington with Jacques Soustelle, a former member of the de Gaulle Government who is bitterly opposed to President de Gaulle's policy in Algeria.

U.S. officials said today that such a luncheon had been held, but on April 4, 1960, more than a year before the revolt. Moreover, they added, the lunch was arranged by an official of the French Embassy at the request of M. Soustelle. The Embassy official, they said, was present throughout the meeting. Thus, they declared there could have been no dark conspiracy.

Some officials believe that the rebel generals and their confederates started spreading the word well before the revolt that the United States favored their aims.

Reports to this effect reached the U.S. Government as long ago as last fall.

In November, French delegates at the meeting of the Sixth Pugwash Conference on Political and Scientific Affairs were reported to have asked American delegates about such a possibility.

According to these French delegates, certain anti-Gaullist generals were putting out the story that they were warmer supporters of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization than General de Gaulle. For this reason, these generals suggested, the United States was on their side.

Pierre Salinger, White House press secretary, left for Paris tonight to make preparations for news coverage of President Kennedy's visit.

He is aware of the efforts by the administration to assure the French that the accusations of U.S. meddling are without foundation. He may therefore talk with French officials about the persistence of the rumors.

Address by Senator Vance Hartke in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address by the very able and distinguished Democratic Senator of Indiana, the Honorable VANCE HARTKE, which he delivered before the New York County Democratic Committee at a dinner on April 27, 1961, at the Commodore Hotel in New York City.

Senator HARTKE, who is the chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee, delivered a very stirring address on the occasion. By his wise counsel, his political sagacity, and his ability to understand the specific problems of the Democratic Party in New York, he played a great part in helping to unite Democratic forces in our State. I was privileged to hear Senator HARTKE on this occasion and was very pleased to hear the many commendations expressed later.

The text of Senator HARTKE's address follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE, OF INDIANA

I consider myself greatly privileged to be in New York tonight in such distinguished company, having been invited by both your leader—my friend Carmine DeSapio—and by the national chairman—my friend John Bailey.

Political dinners are old favorites of mine since I come from a political organization background. In our committee, as in yours, we pride ourselves on uniting old-fashioned political organization with the reform-type service demanded by today's voters.

This is, I submit, uniquely possible within the framework of the Democratic Party. We are at once the oldest political party in continuous existence in the world today and yet we are the party of programs and progress. Our party and its leaders have always had a way of cutting through the fat and getting to the meat of the problem. They have always led when leadership was demanded. They have always had programs when pro-

grams were needed. They had all this because they were Democrats and the Democratic Party has always been grounded among the great masses of people.

Thomas Jefferson won the country's first contested election in 1796. His campaign theme was "The Rights of Man." As we look back to then from the problems of 1961, we must conclude that things have not changed much.

Jefferson said there were two kinds of people in political parties. "First, those who fear and distrust the people and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes. Secondly, those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe." Jefferson, of course, belonged to the latter.

In nearly every election since Jefferson's time the basic struggle has been between the people's party and the party of special interest. Last fall was no different. But this Nation saw a bitter campaign in which issues that have no place in American politics were blown far beyond their importance. After this campaign, you people delivered the Nation's largest package of electoral votes to John F. Kennedy. New York State provided 45 of President Kennedy's 303 electoral votes. The Kennedy majority in New York City was 792,000.

Immediately after that election, one of the closest in history, we listened while the Republicans cried "foul" and parroted the party line that they had been robbed. Yet, 2 months after taking office, President Kennedy pulled up with an astounding vote in the Gallup Poll. Dr. Gallup, just a month ago, reported 73 percent of the American people approve of the job the President is doing. That was 6 percent more than the figure recorded by Dr. Gallup for President Eisenhower at a comparable time in his first term. Last Saturday the Nation's newspaper editors voted 104 to 11 that the President is doing a good job.

President Kennedy and his new administration have awed the skeptics and fascinated the admirers. His grasp of presidential responsibilities and his forthright efforts to meet these responsibilities have been wonderful.

Every man and woman comes into this world without any understanding concerning his future, his life, his destiny. Yet, in spite of difference of wealth, position or birth, there is a difference in that individual who ultimately in life says that my soul and mind shall not be dedicated to serving only myself. This to me is President John F. Kennedy. This truly great individual possesses a soul and mind that is trying to comprehend the wonders of this world and trying in some measure to reproduce these wonders into something better for mankind. He is a mirror of the world—alive, not dead, active, not dull; courageous, not a coward. He is always thinking, learning, experimenting and practicing his knowledge. He is the kind of person who has learned that his own personal life is subordinate to achievement of the higher goals.

It is to him that others look for leadership. The world, his community, his party, his friends—and even his enemies—look up to him and expect to learn from him. Sometimes his ability is not immediately recognized or appreciated; in some cases, repelled by envy.

He cannot move in order to expect gratitude—but must move for posterity in the firm confidence that the future will benefit from his efforts. He must be like an acrobat who takes leaps which others cannot execute. He thereby derives a direct and lively pleasure in every accomplishment—in every problem solved, in every election won.

The boredom which haunts the ordinary man can never come close to him. Yet to him there can be a lonely existence in that he can expect little, if any sympathy for apparent failures. He cannot be surprised if society at times wants to repel him. The great and extraordinary work done by him can only be done if he disregards the talk, speeches, and opinions of critics. He must quietly continue on, in spite of their criticism.

The sloganeers have now come up with a new slick trick. They are trying to sell the people on the idea that the President may be popular, but his programs are not. I call this the soft-soap sell. It is not going to work because President Kennedy's programs are the Democratic Party's programs. The Democratic Party is the people's party and the majority party, and it always has been.

What these Republican sloganeers are trying to do is as transparent as glass. They know that President Kennedy is popular. They know he has nudged the ship of state out into the breeze and is piloting it with a firm hand on the rudder while heading it in the direction of progress.

So, the Republicans now know they have another popular Democrat. The Republicans want to turn what was a fact in the last administration into a salable myth for this one.

President Eisenhower was a popular war hero. He had no political affiliations before becoming a candidate and no experience in civil government before becoming President. Ike's idea of the Presidency was to allow the Government and the country to coast along with a minimum of guidance and a minimum of push. He liked to be known as one who was above party.

Yet, with such a popular hero in the White House, we Democrats gained control of Congress in 1954 and kept control throughout the remainder of the Eisenhower years. It was because the Democratic Party and its principles were still speaking for the majority of Americans.

The Republicans think they can suddenly hang a no-party label on President Kennedy, belittle his programs and seize control of Congress in 1962. I say it will not be done. I say we Democrats are going to increase our majority in Congress and get along with the job we have set out to do. And I think New York Democrats are going to do their part in 1962 as they did in 1960.

President Kennedy sought the office and brought to it a lifetime as a Democrat and many years of service in politics. In addition, he is blessed with intelligence, education, sincerity, experience, energy, and capable advisers. What is more, the girls say he is good looking.

With all this going for him, it is no wonder he is popular. The new spirit he has brought to the White House adds to his popularity. Yet, President Kennedy would never set himself apart from his party. He is, indeed, part of the Democratic Party and, happily, its best spokesman and salesman.

In capturing the spirit of the party, President Kennedy has captured the spirit of the Nation—tired of foundering, tired of drifting, worried about health and housing, work and waste, taxes and troubles.

We Democrats know that we cannot solve all the troubles of this Nation overnight. But we also know that these problems cannot be solved unless we dare to try.

In Congress we are working to hammer out the program designed by the President. We have made substantial progress on the antirecession bills, having passed extended jobless benefits, a bill to aid depressed areas, a new higher minimum wage, and measures to help out families suffering from unemployment. We are working on housing, tax reform, highways, incentives for business and industrial expansion.

It is we Democrats who are intent upon an expanded economy so that we can provide not only jobs for the jobless, but 1.2 million jobs for those youngsters who will enter the labor market this year and for the estimated 2.3 million jobs that we are told will be lost to automation and better efficiency.

It is a Democratic administration that is insisting on full protection of the rights of all Americans to work, to vote, to live in peace, and dignity. It is we who are insisting on full application of equal rights. It is we who are tackling problems of spreading communism around the globe, inadequate defense, second best in space, commuter transportation needs, better highways, polluted rivers, recreation needs, juvenile delinquency, not enough schools and teachers. It is we who are setting the pace as good neighbors at home and abroad.

Of course, some of these things may be unpopular with some of the special interests and with some Republican leaders. It is basic Republican belief that government should do as little as possible. It is basic Democratic belief that government should do what is necessary.

These programs are popular. They are being pushed by popular men, men who dare to act and who dare to tell the bald truth and not sweep unpleasant facts under the rug.

If any State in our Union understands leadership of this kind, it is New York. In our lifetime, New York has given us superlative leadership—from Franklin Delano Roosevelt to your present great leaders.

Republicans, too, have had great leaders in this State. The trouble is, when a New York Republican wins prominence in city hall or up in Albany or down in Washington, he ends up fighting a rear-guard action with his own party. This was true in the days of Teddy Roosevent and it still is true today.

In our party the program is clearly laid out. The leadership is firmly established and its goals are clear. The mood of the people is caught up in the program of the party and the determination of the leaders to get the job done.

The opportunity for service is as great as any time in our history. With dedication of purpose and belief in the undying principles of our party, confidence in the leadership, unity in the organization, we will accomplish the job we have set out to accomplish. We shall reach the goal we have set out to reach. We shall move from platform and promise to programs and performance.

The call has come clearly from the man in the White House. Ours, said President Kennedy, is the challenge to "get this Nation moving again. As the party of hope, it is our responsibility and opportunity to call forth the greatness of the American people. In this spirit, we must rededicate ourselves to the continuing service of the rights of man everywhere in America and everywhere on God's earth."

The President's Executive Order on Identical Bids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1961

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 25, 1961, President Kennedy issued Executive Order No. 10936 requiring that Federal agencies report to the Attorney General all instances of identical bidding. This is an extremely important action

and once again demonstrates this administration's determination to create an environment encouraging competitive behavior in American business.

In an effort to insure that this procedure will become permanent public policy, I introduced H.R. 4570. On April 25, 1961, I testified before the Government Operations Committee in behalf of this bill.

I would like to attempt briefly to clarify one point in connection with the likely impact of publicizing identical bids. There seems to be a question on the part of some persons genuinely interested in encouraging competition as to whether the mere act of publicizing identical bids will be of any help in eliminating conspiracy. Is it not likely, some ask, that would-be conspirators will simply use other techniques to avoid competition? True, the point could be made that to expose identical bidding would merely drive some conspirators to other devices such as submitting a range of bids and rotating the low bidder. However, this expectation misses an all-important point. If firms use other more sophisticated techniques, they have to engage in overt actions to develop and implement them. More sophisticated methods are also more complicated methods. The chief reason conspirators so frequently use the identical bid method of implementing conspiracy is its great simplicity. When it is used, authorities may suspect collusion but they have difficulty finding evidence of it. And under our judicial process proof of collusion is needed, not just suspicion. However, to carry on a conspiracy to rotate bids in a seemingly random fashion requires more or less continuous meetings, correspondence, or other direct communication. This is the stuff out of which proof is made. The electrical machinery case provides abundant evidence on this score. In other words, if more complicated methods of conspiracy are employed, detection will be easier for both the law enforcement agencies and the top corporate executives who really wish to keep their corporate houses free of conspiracy.

For the information of my colleagues, I have requested permission to extend my remarks to include Executive Order No. 10936, and my prepared testimony on H.R. 4570:

[From the Federal Register, Apr. 26, 1961]

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10936—REPORTS OF IDENTICAL BIDS

Whereas it is in the interest of the United States to obtain truly competitive bids in connection with its procurement and sale of property and services pursuant to public invitations for bids and the prevalence of identical bidding is harmful to the effective functioning of a system of competitive bids;

Whereas identical bidding may constitute evidence of the existence of conspiracies to monopolize or restrain trade or commerce; and

Whereas the collection and dissemination of information with regard to identical bids submitted to the Federal Government will discourage future submissions of such bids, aid in the enforcement of the antitrust laws and the maintenance of a competitive economy and serve to reduce the costs of the Government.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and statutes, and as President of the United States, I hereby order and direct:

1. Whenever, in connection with a procurement of property or services exceeding $10,000 in total amount and made pursuant to an advertisement or other public invitation for bids, a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government shall hereafter receive two or more bids (a) which are identical as to unit price or total amount, or (b) which, after giving effect to discounts and all other relevant factors, the department, agency, or instrumentality shall consider to be identical as to unit price or total amount, then such department, agency, or instrumentality shall make a report of the bid proceedings to the Attorney General not later than 20 days following the award. Whenever two or more bids of the nature described in clauses (a) and (b) hereof are received in bid proceedings which result for any reason in the rejection of all bids and the total value of the property or services bid upon is estimated by the department, agency, or instrumentality to be in excess of $10,000, it shall make a report of such proceedings to the Attorney General not later than 20 days following the rejection. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, a report shall not be made of bid proceedings in which only foreign sources have participated and in connection with which delivery and performance is to take place outside the United States.

2. The reports required by section 1 shall be in a form prescribed by the Attorney General and shall include the following information or such other information as he may prescribe:

(a) The name and location of the particular component of the department, agency, or instrumentality which advertised for the bids;

(b) the amount and a description of the property or services for which bids were solicited, and the proposed date of delivery or performance;

(c) the date of opening of the bids; and

(d) the names and addresses of all bidders and as to the bid of each:

(1) the unit price and terms of discount, if any, together with a notation of the point of origin specified by the bidder and a statement whether freight and any other costs of transportation to the point of delivery are included or excluded; and

(2) in the case of an accepted bid identical, or considered to be identical, as to unit price or total amount with another, the method by which selected.

3. Whenever, in connection with a sale of property for more than $10,000 in total amount pursuant to an advertisement or other public invitation for bids, a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government shall receive two or more bids, (a) which are identical as to unit price or total amount, or (b) which, after giving effect to all relevant factors, the department, agency, or instrumentality shall consider to be identical as to unit price or total amount, then such department, agency, or instrumentality shall make a report of the bid proceedings to the Attorney General not later than 20 days following the award to the purchaser. Whenever two or more bids of the nature described in clauses (a) and (b) hereof are received in bid proceedings which result for any reason in the rejection of all bids and the total sales value of the offered property is estimated by the department, agency, or instrumentality to be in excess of $10,000, it shall make a report of such proceedings to the Attorney General not later than 20 days following the rejection. The reports required by this section shall be in the form prescribed by the Attorney General and shall include information similar to that prescribed by section 2. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, a report shall not be made of bid proceedings in which only foreign sources have participated and in connection with which delivery and performance is to take place outside the United States.

4. The Attorney General is granted authority to establish reasonable exemptions and variations from the requirements of section 1 or of section 3 from time to time based upon his experience in connection with this order, including authority to take the following actions: (a) Exclude any category of property or services from the reporting requirements of section 1 or of section 3; and (b) increase or decrease the $10,000 limit prescribed in section 1 or in section 3.

5. The Attorney General shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services and the heads of such other departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government as he may deem advisable for the purpose of obtaining information in a feasible manner with regard to identical bidding in publicly advertised procurement and sale proceedings completed by these departments, agencies, and instrumentalities during periods prior to the date of execution of this order. The Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services, and the other heads of departments, agencies, or instrumentalities consulted by the Attorney General shall cause the submission of reports to him in respect to such categories of these proceedings and for such periods as may be agreed upon. The reports shall conform to the requirements of section 2.

6. The Attorney General shall formulate and put into effect procedures whereby State and local governments are invited to transmit reports to him of identical bids received by such governments similar to the reports required by sections 1, 3, and 5.

7. From time to time, as he shall find suitable, the Attorney General shall make a report to the President consolidating the information he has received pursuant to this order, and he shall transmit copies thereof to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. However, there shall be excluded from such report any information submitted by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the Government which it has requested to be withheld for reasons of national security.

8. The principal purpose of this order is to make more effective the enforcement of the antitrust laws by insuring that the Attorney General has at his disposal all information which may tend to establish the presence of a conspiracy in restraint of trade and which may warrant further investigation with a view to preferring civil or criminal charges. In exercising the discretionary authority granted under the provisions of this order, the Attorney General shall be mindful of this purpose and shall exercise such authority in a manner which insures that programs of reporting and analysis hereunder shall not by their magnitude interfere with his enforcement of those laws but instead shall contribute thereto. The heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government shall cooperate with and aid the Attorney General in analyzing the data reported to him and shall make available to him to the fullest extent possible any facilities they may have which would expedite that work. In particular, they should bring to his attention any further information which, in their judgment, may constitute additional evidence of collusion among Government contractors.

9. The heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Government are directed to give particular attention to compliance with the provisions of 41 U.S.C. section 252(d) and 10 U.S.C. section 2305(d) requiring referral to the At-

torney General of bids received in an advertised procurement proceeding which appear to them to evidence a violation of the antitrust laws. It is to be noted that the bids which must be referred to the Attorney General under those statutes as evidencing collusion include, although they are not limited to, identical bids. Nothing in this order shall be construed to mean that a report submitted hereunder to the Attorney General in connection with identical bids evidencing collusion in a procurement proceeding shall constitute a referral satisfying the requirements of those statutes or of the regulations issued pursuant thereto. Similarly, nothing in this order shall be construed to mean that a report submitted hereunder in connection with identical bids evidencing collusion in a sale proceeding shall satisfy the requirements of 40 U.S.C. section 488 in certain cases, or of the regulations issued pursuant to that statute, that specified information be supplied to the Attorney General for his use in considering the applicability of the antitrust laws to the sale.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 24, 1961.*

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE WRIGHT PATMAN, OF TEXAS, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN BEHALF OF H.R. 4570, APRIL 25, 1961

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this committee in behalf of H.R. 4570 which I introduced on February 20, 1961.

It is a fundamental premise of a competitive economy that business units make pricing decisions independently of one another. To tolerate collective action and collusion is to encourage the cartelization of American industry. I am sure that few Americans want such an economy. It not only extorts consumers but eliminates the competitive stick which encourages firms to operate efficiently and in the public interest.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES ARE BIG BUSINESS

I introduced H.R. 4570 in an effort to protect the public interest in governmental purchases. The various units of Federal, State, and local government purchase vast amounts of goods and services. Last year the Federal Government purchased goods and services amounting to about $53 billion; State and local governments purchased goods and services amounting to $14.8 billion and $32.5 billion, respectively. In many industries Government procurement represents a large share of total purchases. The economic indicators gotten out by the Joint Economic Committee with the help of the Council of Economic Advisers in the White House discloses every month the magnitude of Government purchases. I think you will see that from 20 to 22 percent of the gross national product is represented in the Federal, State, and local governments.

Many of these goods and services are purchased through the competitive bid procedure. This is as it should be because it offers all sellers an equal opportunity to compete for governmental purchases and it prevents discriminatory procedures by procurement agents.

Information made available under H.R. 4570 would prove helpful in the enforcement of existing consent decrees and orders, as well as provide valuable indications of additional areas of possible violation of the law.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS POWERLESS

Local governments are especially powerless to handle the problem of conspiracy leading to identical bidding. Mr. Ralph S. Locker, Cleveland's director of law, discussed this problem in the December 1960 issue of the Journal of the Cleveland Bar Association. As he put it, "Collusive bidding practices are a real and ever-present problem facing local, State, and Federal governments. On the Federal or State levels, the governmental units have at their disposal a large body of comparative figures that focus attention on instances when collusion among the bidders is likely to be present. Local governmental subdivisions usually lack the necessary investigative staff to make them aware of collusion among bidders."

I recommend the reading of this entire article and I submit a copy for the committee's interest.

IDENTICAL BIDS WOULD BE REPORTED

H.R. 4570 is designed to get at the sort of problems I have mentioned. The bill would amend section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for public information and publicity concerning instances where competitors submit identical bids to public agencies for the sale or purchase of supplies, equipment, or services. The bill in no way changes the present antitrust laws. Specific requirements of the bill are as follows:

First. It requires the Federal agencies to report to the Attorney General all instances of identical bidding—not just those instances where the head of the agency or his subordinate thinks the antitrust laws may have been violated.

Second. The bill would require the Attorney General to institute a procedure whereby it is made known to the State and local governments that they are invited to make similar reports to the Attorney General.

Third. The bill would require the Attorney General to make a consolidated report of all of these instances of identical bidding, and to submit such report quarterly to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The bill specifies the items of information to be reported.

It should be noted that when a public agency receives a batch of bids in which two or more of the bids are identical, it will then make a report giving the pertinent information for all the bids, not just those which are identical. It is well known that in some industries various firms submit bids to public agencies which are habitually and so inevitably identical in all details that the public agencies have set up lottery systems, such as putting the bidders' names in a rotary barrel, or into a hat, and drawing one at random. On the other hand, the competitors in the electric equipment manufacturers' case followed the not unusual practice of rotating the privilege of being low bidder on a particular bid, while the others all submitted identical bids.

Information which is to be reported includes, among other things, the names of the companies submitting the bids, the kind of equipment or supply for which the bid is submitted, the bid prices, and so on. The bill does not specify any date or any elapsed time within which the agencies must make their reports to the Attorney General. It is expected, of course, that these reports would be made promptly; and should some of the agencies become unreasonably laggard in submitting their reports, this fact will soon be revealed by the public report made by the Attorney General. Among the items to be reported are the date when the bids were opened and the name of the agency or bureau opening the bids.

The bill does not specify the form in which the Attorney General is to present his quarterly report. Rather, it leaves it up to the Attorney General to adopt a form which will present the information in a most orderly and useful way. I would imagine that the information would be arranged in such a way that all of the bids pertaining to a particular industry, or to a particular kind of commodity, would appear together in one section of the report. Further, I would hope that the report would be indexed to contain the names of all of the companies involved in the competitive bidding so that the reader can find from the index each and all of the instances in which a particular company has been involved in an identical bid situation.

Let me emphasize again that the bill does not amend any of the other antitrust laws. It does not provide any penalty for identical bids or make any presumption that such bids are illegal. It merely provides the public with information about the conduct of public business. In fact, the bill will require making public certain details about identical bidding which the public actually has a right to have in the case of all bids submitted to public agencies in pursuit of public business.

Since 1949 the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act has required the various Federal agencies to make a report to the Attorney General, giving the details of bids received under the advertised competitive bid procedure where in the opinion of the head of the agency there may have been a violation of the Federal antitrust laws. The Armed Forces Procurement Act of 1947 places a similar requirement on the heads of the defense agencies. But, of course, in practice purchases and contracts to purchase made by the defense agencies are made largely on the basis of negotiation, rather than on the basis of advertised competitive bidding.

Leaving the question of reporting or not reporting up to the various agencies, depending upon whether the department head thinks the antitrust laws may have been violated, naturally produces a law with some deficiencies. We may assume, I imagine, that only a fraction of the identical bids being received by the Federal agencies are ever reported to the Attorney General. In fact, I am told that in the first months after the law was passed, the various Federal departments flooded the Department of Justice with reports of identical bids. But as time went on and very little resulted, the departments largely quit making the reports.

IDENTICAL BIDDING WIDESPREAD

Even so, according to a study made by a university professor who is a noted expert in this field, the Department of Justice had received, by mid-1959, a total of no less than 10,000 reports on instances of identical bidding. This information comes from a paper by Prof. Vernon A. Mund, of the University of Washington, published in the Journal of Political Economy in April of 1960. I will insert Professor Mund's article at the end of my remarks, because it is most enlightening in several respects.

First, it contains a table, No. 1, which provides illustrations of identical bids received by the Federal departments. Second, and what is perhaps more useful, Professor Mund has also provided a table, No. 2, which gives similar information on competitive bids which are not identical.

So much has been said in recent times in defense of identical bidding that some of us may have overlooked the point that many business competitors still manage to submit different bids in pursuit of a given piece of business, and give the public agencies an opportunity to purchase needed supplies and equipment at a low cost to the taxpayers.

Finally, Professor Mund's article should prove useful to the public procurement and antitrust enforcement agencies, as well as to the Federal courts. It provides some enlightened guidance on how to tell the difference between prices in a competitive market and prices which are artificially fixed or rigged.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED

The executive branch of government recently has taken firm steps toward striking down conspiracy and price rigging. The electrical equipment case, of course, is only the most dramatic example.

Recently some leading American businessmen also have expressed similar concern over illegal and immoral business conduct. Mr. Henry Ford, II, chairman of the board, Ford Motor Co., last week articulated this viewpoint when he said: "It would indeed be a sad thing if the good will and confidence that business has laboriously built up over the years should now be washed away at this very critical juncture in our history." He said further: "No doubt there are those who will say that it is neither necessary nor wise for us to wash our business linen in public, that by talking about these things we will draw attention to them and, by so doing, foster the impression that things are much worse than they actually are. I don't agree."

The executive branch of government has acted to prevent undesirable business conduct. Responsible business leaders also are suggesting that steps be taken to put its house in order. I think the Congress should, whenever possible, also provide the tools with which to work on this problem. I offer H.R. 4570 as one tool which I think will be useful for this purpose. It will supplement the enforcement of our antitrust laws. It will help Federal, State, and local governments develop and follow more informed procurement policies. Finally, it will focus public attention on this critical matter. An alert, informed public may well be one of the strongest deterrents to this abuse.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1961

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable PRESCOTT BUSH, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, whose spirit searcheth all things, and who seeketh us, even when we grope in the midst of uncertainty, incline our hearts to draw near to Thee in sincerity and truth.

We do not ask that Thou shouldst give heed to the poverty and pettiness of petitions that may spring out of the perversion of our own warped desires. But we beseech Thee to hear and answer the deep cry of our inner need.

Illumine our darkened minds, that they may yield their devotion to Thy kingdom, and Thy light be thus shed, through us, upon the dark places of the earth, that the habitations of violence may be destroyed, and that to human misery and wrong there may come oil of joy for sadness, and beauty for ashes.

As we think of our Nation, conceived in liberty and consecrated to the common rights of man, may we fear nothing but to fail humanity and Thee. To the councils of our leaders, fraught with such awesome responsibility, give wisdom that is from above. In an hour which calls for greatness may our public service be a sacrament, and our politics purged of corroding littleness.

So may our personal devotion help to throw up a highway, across which the hopes and dreams of those who have seen the City of God across the hills of time may go on in triumph, from victory to victory.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BUSH thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 1, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1961, RELATING TO CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 152)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization in the Civil Aeronautics Board.

This Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961 follows upon my message of April 13, 1961 to the Congress of the United States. It is believed that the taking effect of the reorganizations included in this plan will provide for greater efficiency in the dispatch of the business of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The plan provides for greater flexibility in the handling of the business before the Board, permitting its disposition at different levels so as better to promote its efficient dispatch. Thus matters both of an adjudicatory and regulatory nature may, depending upon their importance and their complexity, be finally consummated by divisions of the Board, individual Board members, hearing examiners, and, subject to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 241), by other employees. This will relieve the Board members from the necessity of dealing with many matters of lesser importance and thus conserve their time for the consideration of major matters of policy and planning. There is, however, reserved to the Board as a whole the right to review any such decision, report or certification either upon its own initiative or upon the petition of a party or intervenor demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Board the desirability of having the matter reviewed at the top level.

Provision is also made, in order to maintain the fundamental bipartisan concept explicit in the basic statute creating the Board, for mandatory review of any such decision, report or certification upon the vote of a majority of the Board less one member.

Inasmuch as the assignment of delegated functions in particular cases and with reference to particular problems to divisions of the Board, to Board members, to hearing examiners, to employees and boards of employees must require continuous and flexible handling, depending both upon the amount and nature of the business, that function is placed in the Chairman by section 2 of the plan.

By providing sound organizational arrangements, the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the accompanying reorganization plan will make possible more economical and expeditious administration of the affected functions. It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1961.*

REPORT OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 153)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I

transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, covering its activities for the year ended December 31, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1961.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 310. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law;

H.R. 470. An act to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended;

H.R. 1627. An act for the relief of the Princess Anne County School Board, Virginia;

H.R. 1743. An act providing for the design of the flag of the United States;

H.R. 2041. An act to amend section 46, title 18, United States Code, with respect to transportation of water-hyacinths and seeds; and

H.R. 2279. An act to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 310. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury to settle certain claims for damage to, or loss of, property, or personal injury or death, not cognizable under any other law;

H.R. 470. An act to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended;

H.R. 1627. An act for the relief of the Princess Anne County School Board, Va.;

H.R. 1743. An act providing for the design of the flag of the United States; and

H.R. 2041. An act to amend section 46, title 18, United States Code, with respect to transportation of water-hyacinths and seeds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2279. An act to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Granite Creek area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations and the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, I am happy to report to the Senate that, so far as the minority leadership is concerned, there is no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the leadership wishes to announce that the Senate will stand in recess tomorrow at approximately 12:13 o'clock, and then will proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives, for the purpose of hearing the President of Tunisia, the Honorable Habib Bourguiba, Sr., address a joint meeting of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States. I make this announcement only to put Senators on notice that that will be the first order of business tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SELECTIVE INCREASES IN COMPENSATION RATES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain increases in rates of disability compensation and allowances for veterans (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

GENERAL SALES MANAGER, REPORT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the General Sales Manager concerning the policies, activities, and developments, including all sales and disposals, with regard to each commodity which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns or which it is directed to support, for the month of February 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ACCOUNTING FOR EARNINGS OF COVERED WORKERS, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of accounting for earnings of covered workers, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MANPOWER UTILIZATION IN SELECTED AREAS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FLEET ACTIVITIES, YOKOSUKA, JAPAN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of manpower utilization in selected areas of the Public Works Department Fleet Activities, Yokosuka, Japan, Department of the Navy, dated April 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RESTRICTION OF CERTAIN AREAS IN OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF

A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf for defense purposes, and for other purposes (Matagorda Water Range) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INCREASE OF APPROPRIATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF IRRIGATION AND POWER SYSTEMS OF FLATHEAD INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 35, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 35 of title 18, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SIMPLIFICATION OF PAYMENT OF CERTAIN JUDGMENTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a revised draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Veterans of World War I, First District of Texas, at Sulphur Springs, Tex., reaffirming their loyalty to the United States, and pledging their support to the President in the present world crises; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ALASKA SUPPORT FOR OCEANOGRAPHY LEGISLATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the State of Alaska is greatly interested in the enactment of Senator MAGNUSON's bill, S. 901, the proposed Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1961, to authorize a national, coordinated, long-range oceanographic research program.

There is good reason for this interest.

Alaska's general coastline of 6,640 miles is 1,800 miles longer than that of its 49 sister States combined. As a matter of interest Alaska's shoreline, including bays and inlets, totals 33,904 miles as contrasted with 54,769 miles for the other 49 States.

Alaska is the only State that has two oceans at its doorstep, the temperate Pacific and the icy Arctic. Three seas, the Bering, Chukchi, and Beaufort, wash her shores. Waters adjacent to Alaska are rich in resources and Alaska's fisheries are a major factor in her economy.

The University of Alaska already is contributing to our scientific knowledge of the oceans through its operation of the Arctic Research Laboratory for the Office of Naval Research, and with financial assistance programed by the Navy under its tenoc—Ten Years of Oceanography—will be in a position to expand greatly these contributions in the future. S. 901 strongly supports this program.

Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Alaska has followed the progress of this proposed legislation closely. So have Alaska's newspapers.

Secretary of State Hugh J. Wade has transmitted to me a certified copy of house resolution 30, which was passed by the Alaska House of Representatives March 27, urging enactment of S. 901.

I also have received from the Fairbanks, Alaska, Daily News-Miner an editorial titled "Alaska's Role in Research," published in its issue of April 4.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that house resolution 30 of the Alaska House of Representatives and the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 30

Resolution relative to the proposed comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys

Whereas there has been introduced in the present session of the Congress a bill calling for a comprehensive program of oceanographic research and surveys; and

Whereas the program would include the rehabilitation of the national commercial fishery, access and utilization of the ocean fishery, fisheries exploration and marine resources conservation and development; and

Whereas the purpose and scope of the proposal made by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON in S. 901 are of vital concern to Alaska and the Nation in the conservation and development of their vast marine resources, known and potential: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives in second legislature, first session assembled, That the President and the Congress of the United States are respectfully urged to give favorable consideration to S. 901, the Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1961, and effect its passage and approval as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States; the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the Senate; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, Senators from Alaska; and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, Representative from Alaska.

Passed by the house March 27, 1961.

WARREN A. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

ESTHER REED,
Chief Clerk of the House.

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, Apr. 4, 1961]

ALASKA'S ROLE IN RESEARCH

There appears to be a growing awareness in the Nation of the vital need for increasing knowledge of marine and ocean resources.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON has placed before Congress a bill, S. 901, to establish marine science and research facilities. This past week President Kennedy asked Congress for additional funds to make an intensive study of our ocean resources and their possible uses.

Here in Alaska, through the Institute of Marine Sciences, the University of Alaska has the framework for participating in such a program.

Actually, Alaska and the university stand in a unique position to make a particularly valuable contribution to any such program. Alaska could well be one of the great centers for any such study. The State has a coastline exceeding that of all the other States combined. It is the only State with two oceans washing its shores and the only State with marine waters in two climatic zones.

Senator MAGNUSON, in commenting on the bill before Congress, noted:

"From the best information I have we have lagged deplorably in Arctic research and the Russians certainly have conducted far more research in the Bering Sea. The Institute of Marine Sciences might well achieve a notable record in helping to close these gaps, and I hope that passage of S. 901 will be a step toward providing Government assistance in finances and facilities which will be needed to attain this goal."

We agree with Senator MAGNUSON's comments. We believe Alaska, and the University of Alaska, when given the opportunity, will make a valuable contribution to this important program.

ARAB BOYCOTT—RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we are all aware of the boycott which Arab nations have imposed, not only against the State of Israel, but also against American citizens whose contracts with Israel do not happen to meet Arab liking. The boycott is a shocking travesty of the principles of coexistence which the Arab States themselves preach.

I have denounced this boycott many times in the past and I am afraid, if the State Department does not act more vigorously, that I shall have to denounce it many more times. I should like to request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a letter and detailed comments upon a resolution of the New York State Legislature dealing with the boycott. The State Department indicates its hostility to the boycott, especially as it applies to American citizens. Yet at the same time the Department has taken virtually no action to defend the rights of American citizens or of international justice.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the New York State Legislature and the Department of State comments upon it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1961.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I have for reply your communication of April 14, 1961, which refers to Resolution No. 131 adopted by the New York State Senate and concurred in by the New York State Assembly memorializing the Department of State "to take steps to discourage and nullify the effects of trade restrictions, blockades and boycotts by the nations comprising the Arab League against American citizens of the Jewish faith and American companies controlled or managed by such citizens."

As you are aware, our Government does not recognize or condone the Arab boycott and has made clear on repeated occasions its strong disapproval of boycott regulations, particularly as these regulations affect American citizens or firms. Our missions in Arab countries have standing instructions to reemphasize this fundamental position.

The Arab boycott and blacklisting practices are outgrowths of the tension arising from the Arab-Israeli conflict. As sovereign states, the Arab nations assert that they are entitled to establish rules and regulations that proscribe dealings with any individuals or firms in accordance with what they deem to be in the interests of their national security. In the absence of a definitive settlement between Israel and the Arab States, including a settlement of the plight of the Arab refugees, the boycott and similar problems continue to manifest themselves.

Regarding the contents of Resolution No. 131, I note several statements which imply erroneously acquiescence in the Arab boycott by United States Government agencies and which tend to portray the boycott as more discriminatory than it actually is. For your information, I have enclosed a memorandum containing some brief comments on several points raised in Resolution No. 131. I hope these comments will be helpful to you in understanding various aspects of the Arab boycott as well as the Department's efforts to seek the elimination of discriminatory boycott practices.

In closing, let me again assure you that the Department will continue to do whatever is feasible and consistent with our national interest to help remove Arab trade restrictions and to help resolve the Arab-Israeli tensions from which these restrictions arise. The Department has communicated to the Legislature of New York United States attitudes toward the Arab boycott.

Please let us know if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

COMMENTS ON POINTS RAISED IN NEW YORK STATE RESOLUTION 131

1. The Arab League has blacklisted all American ships which have touched at Israel ports of call.

The Arab blacklist does not apply to world tourist vessels. It does apply to vessels carrying materials or instruments of war to Israel, Israel agricultural and industrial products, Jewish immigrants, or which are hired by Israel companies. There are about 25 American-flag vessels now on the Arab blacklist but, in fact, a much larger number of American vessels have stopped at Israel ports and have not been put on the blacklist.

2. American firms doing business with Israel are cut off from trade with Arab countries.

American firms which sell commodities to Israel are not subject to the provisions of the Arab boycott. The boycott is applied to firms which have factories, assembly plants, general agents or head offices in Israel or which hold shares in Israel companies, furnish technical assistance to Israel factories, encourage the sale of Israel products, or represent Israel firms abroad.

3. Most American companies controlled or managed, partially or wholly, by Americans of Jewish faith are not permitted to establish commercial relationships with countries that are members of the Arab League.

As far as is known, Arab boycott regulations are not applied against persons or companies because they are Jewish but rather because they do business with Israel as noted in paragraph (2). A creed declaration in connection with trademark applications was formerly required in one Arab country but has recently been eliminated. Arab boycott officials have indicated on several occasions that the boycott is directed against Israel, not against persons of the Jewish faith.

4. American citizens of the Jewish faith are generally not permitted to disembark on Arab soil by land, sea or air.

The Department has on repeated occasions brought to the attention of our posts abroad its continuing deep concern over restrictions on entry imposed by Arab States which have the effect of discriminating against American citizens of the Jewish faith. Our posts have in the past been able to make successful representations on behalf of individuals and they are under standing instructions to continue to do so.

5. Approximately 500 American business firms during 1960 received warnings through the U.S. mails from Arab boycott officers in Damascus and Kuwait that if Americans have commercial dealings with Israel, they must forgo doing business with Arab countries.

During 1960, the Department observed that several American business firms received letters from Arab boycott officers, particularly from Kuwait, which solicited information concerning their commercial relations with Israel and Israel firms. The Department took up the matter directly with the appropriate authorities concerned to effect a cessation of this disturbing practice.

6. Individual Hollywood motion picture stars have been blacklisted.

Arab boycott regulations provide for the blacklisting of any films containing anti-Arab propaganda or any distinguished actor or actresses whose financial support of Israel is proven.

7. The U.S. Navy reserves the option to cancel the charter of any vessel carrying Navy cargo, if any Arab country refuses to allow the vessel to load or unload cargo because the ship's charters or owners have previously done business with Israel.

At one time, the U.S. Navy in its contracting procedures for delivery of oil to U.S. naval installations abroad included the so-called Haifa clause, which stated that the Government was not responsible for any financial losses resulting from calls by tankers at Haifa which later called at Arab ports. At the time this clause was criticized, the Navy Department made clear that the Haifa clause was designed solely to protect the U.S. Government against loss and insure efficient operation of the fleet. However, the use of the clause was discontinued on February 19, 1960, lest it be misconstrued as U.S. acquiescence in the Arab boycott.

8. Contracts approved by the Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation and the U.S. Navy for the shipment of surplus wheat to the United Arab Republic provide that the vessel may not have traded at Israel ports.

No department or agency of the U.S. Government has sanctioned, through contractual language or otherwise, discriminatory ship charters barring American-flag vessels touching at Israel ports from carrying gifts of American surplus agricultural commodities to Arab countries under titles II and III of Public Law 480. In the case of title I, Public Law 480 shipments, countries making these purchases take delivery at dockside and negotiate the shipping arrangements themselves directly with the private carriers. Restrictive clauses in ship charters negotiated by the United Arab Republic have included a prohibition against sailing in Israel waters prior to discharge. Similarly, the Israel Government has included a clause in its title I, Public Law 480, cargo charter contracts which forbids the transporting vessel to sail in Arab waters or call at Arab ports prior to discharge.

RESOLUTION 131

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Department of State of the United States to take steps to discourage and nullify the effects of trade restrictions, blockades, and boycotts by the nations comprising the Arab League against American citizens of the Jewish faith and against American companies controlled or managed by such citizens

Whereas Arab nations, including the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Libya, Sudan, Tunisia, and Morocco, functioning as the Arab League, have been conducting a boycott of American citizens, business and industry; and

Whereas the Arab League has blacklisted all American ships which have touched at Israel ports of call; and

Whereas American firms doing business with Israel are cut off from trade with Arab countries; and

Whereas most American companies controlled or managed, partially or wholly, by Americans of the Jewish faith are not permitted to establish commercial relationships with countries that are members of the Arab League; and

Whereas American servicemen and Armed Forces employees of the Jewish faith are not permitted to serve at the Dhahran Airbase in Saudi Arabia; and

Whereas American citizens of the Jewish faith are generally not permitted to disembark on Arab soil, by land, sea, or air; and

Whereas approximately 500 American business firms during 1960 received warnings through the U.S. mails from Arab boycott officers in Damascus and Kuwait that if Americans have commercial dealings with Israel, they must forgo doing business with Arab countries; and

Whereas individual Hollywood motion picture stars have also been blacklisted; and

Whereas American citizens of the Jewish faith are generally excluded from private employment in any capacity in any Arab owned or controlled company; and

Whereas the U.S. Navy reserves the option to cancel the charter of any vessel carrying Navy cargo, if any Arab country refuses to allow the vessel to load or unload cargo, because the ship's charterers or owners have previously done business with Israel; and

Whereas with the approval of the Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation, and the U.S. Navy, contracts for the shipment of U.S. surplus wheat to the United Arab Republic provide that the vessel may not have traded at Israeli ports; and

Whereas the Democratic Party platform of 1960 pledged the protection of the rights of American citizens to travel, to pursue lawful trade, and to engage in other lawful activities abroad without distinction as to race or religion; and has further pledged to oppose any international agreement or treaty which by its terms or practices discriminate against American citizens on grounds of race, or religion; and

Whereas the Republican Party platform of 1960 pledged to seek an end to transit and trade restrictions, blockades and blacklists, and further pledged to secure freedom of navigation on international waterways and the cessation of discrimination against Americans on the basis of religion beliefs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the Department of State be and is hereby respectfully memorialized (a) to take a firm position against Arab interference in the conduct of the affairs of American citizens and businessmen;

(b) to abstain from any cooperation with Arab League boycott activities and policies;

(c) to resist any efforts by Arab nations to maintain or widen its boycott activities in the United States, and

(d) to exert all possible efforts and utilize its resources to the fulfillment of the spirit and purposes of this resolution, and it is further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purposes of this resolution.

By order of the senate,

WILLIAM S. KING,
Acting Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and myself, I have the honor to present for appropriate reference, a resolution (S. 239) of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations memorializing the Congress to enact S. 473 and H.R. 12 of the 1st session of the 87th Congress providing for postal union recognition as a matter of right and not of sufferance.

The general assembly resolution was approved by the Governor of Rhode Island on April 21, 1961, and duly attested by the secretary of state of Rhode Island on April 26, 1961.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 239

Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations memorializing Congress with relation to Senate bill S. 473 and House bill H.R. 12 providing for postal union recognition as a matter of right and not by sufferance

Whereas there is now before the Congress of the United States Senate bill S. 473 and

the House bill H.R. 12, providing for postal union recognition as a matter of right and not by sufferance; and

Whereas the U.S. Government advocates and often insists that private industry officially recognize labor organizations and conduct sincere labor-management relations with unions designated by employees; and

Whereas the U.S. Government should do no less for their own loyal workers than it encourages private industry to do; and

Whereas the Post Office Department grants inadequate recognition of postal unions to represent their respective membership only on the basis of sufferance and not as a matter of right or law; and

Whereas labor-management experience with Post Office Department officials at all levels has clearly demonstrated postal unions have an urgent need, not only of official recognition, but also the right by law to further appeal unfavorable and often unilateral and arbitrary decisions by the Post Office Department, in personnel matters, to an impartial board of review, exclusive of Post Office Department control or jurisdiction; and

Whereas postal workers and their unions must necessarily have the assistance of the U.S. Government to implement decisions favorable to aggrieved personnel by such an appeal board of review, similar to the rights granted other citizens of our great country employed in private industry and members of labor unions of their choice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States hereby respectfully is memorialized to enact S. 473 and H.R. 12 into law; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each U.S. Senator and Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of Rhode Island.

MARINE SCIENCES—RESOLUTION OF SEATTLE PORT COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the port commission of the port of Seattle has long supported expansion of marine science and research, particularly fisheries research. An understanding of the ocean and its resources is vital to the economy of not only Seattle but the entire Pacific Northwest, including Alaska.

On April 18, 1961, the commissioners of the port of Seattle formally adopted a resolution petitioning Congress to enact S. 901, the proposed Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1961. A copy of this resolution has been transmitted to me by the commission through its Washington representative, Joseph P. Adams. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 2085

Resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States of America to enact the legislation contained in S. 901

Whereas the Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1961 will provide funds for immediate long-term research bearing on fisheries conservation, underwater routes and ocean currents, marine food supplies and mineral capabilities; and

Whereas there is a serious need for oceanographic ships, oceanwide research operations and ocean-trained marine scientists and technicians; and

Whereas passage of this bill is necessary to enable the construction of new ships of a class capable of carrying on the required research operations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the port of Seattle does by this resolution petition the Congress of the United States to take the necessary legislative action to insure the passage of S. 901.

LAKE STATES FOREST FIRE RESEARCH—LETTER AND REPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last month a large group of leading forest experts, private citizens, and officials met in Green Bay, Wis., to consider the serious problems of forest fires in Wisconsin and the other Lake States. At their conference they expressed the conviction that the key to better control of forest fires lay in the development of improved methods of fire prevention and control, through research. They recommended that a vigorous program of forest fire research be established in the Lake States, under the leadership of the Lake States Forest Experiment Station of the U.S. Forest Service.

The general chairman of the conference, Mr. Norman S. Stone, has sent me a detailed report of their conclusions. Because of its importance, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stone's letter to me and the report be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the letter and report were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

LAKE STATES FOREST
FIRE RESEARCH CONFERENCE,
Madison, Wis., April 21, 1961.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: About 3 years ago the Wisconsin Conservation Commission's forestry advisory committee began a study of the increasing problems of forest fire control in Wisconsin. The Wisconsin committee explored the problem with public forest fire control agencies of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin and found that all three States are faced with much the same problem—that of increasing fire hazard due to reforestation and regrowth of extensive natural forests. Over the years we have become accustomed to extremely high standards in forest fire control and paradoxically this success, along with intensified forest management, tree planting, and growing recreational use of forest lands, has increased tremendously the likelihood of catastrophic forest fires.

On March 7 and 8, 1961, a group of about 140 men representing a broad cross section of public agencies, forest industries, associations, forestry colleges, the press and general public, met in Green Bay, Wis., to discuss the matter. The problem was thoroughly covered by forest managers, public and private alike, and by fire control experts and others. The recommendations of the people attending this conference are attached.

Summing up these recommendations briefly:

1. There is a serious and fast-growing threat of catastrophic fires in the Lake State region.

2. Present firefighting methods are not adequate to cope with the situation under catastrophic conditions.

3. It is nearly hopeless to cope with this situation simply by strengthening our present fire control organizations alone—though this will help and some expansion should be made.

4. The principal hope of controlling large, fast-running fires is through the development of new and improved methods of fire prevention and control through research.

5. The conference recommends the development of a strong program of forest fire research in the Lake States, headed up by the Lake States Forest Experiment Station of the U.S. Forest Service; and further that the program be cooperative in nature, bringing to bear the resources of State fire control agencies and the forest industries.

It is our hope that you will find it possible to give your full support to this program and express your support to the U.S. Forest Service and the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN S. STONE,
General Chairman.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF LAKE STATES FOREST FIRE RESEARCH CONFERENCE, GREEN BAY, WIS., MARCH 7–8, 1961

(By John A. Beale, chief state forester, Wisconsin Conservation Department)

(Conference sponsored by Lake States Council of Industrial Foresters; Wisconsin Forestry Advisory Committee; Northern Hardwood & Pine Manufacturers Association; Lake States Technical Committee of American Pulpwood Association; American Forest Products Industries; Forest Industries Information Committee; Timber Producers Associations of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; Trees for Tomorrow; U.S. Forest Service; and Conservation Departments of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.)

The time I have at my disposal is limited; this has been a long and productive session and you have heard some of the most capable men in the field of fire control point up our most important problems.

It is not my purpose to attempt to condense all that has been said in the past 2 days and I don't intend to try. I would, however, like to emphasize what to me are some of the most significant observations made here, both as they relate to existing problems and to proposals for future action.

1. Fire control people in the Lake States have done an outstanding job and I believe that this conference, representing a broad cross section of private industry and government, should make a special point of commending the dedicated fire control men of all three States.

2. Though fire losses have decreased over the past 30 years, the potential for catastrophic fires is greater than ever and fire control is still—as it always has been—our first priority forestry job.

3. Along with all other areas of government, forestry agencies are feeling the pinch of trying to do more with dollars which are worth less. Forest fire protection organizations necessarily have had to absorb some of this belt tightening.

4. In fire control activities, as in so many other fields of endeavor, we begin to reach a point of diminishing returns. In other words, it becomes increasingly more difficult to substantially better our situation by simply increasing our present efforts. In fact, it appears that we are fast approaching

the best we can do with present methods unless very substantial budget increases are made in all three States.

5. Not only is our job becoming more difficult as our forests grow toward maturity, as more and more trees are planted, as increasing intensity of management increases slash areas, and as increasing recreational use brings more thousands of people into the forests—but the values involved are mounting at a tremendous rate. I don't pretend to know what the true value of the Lake States forests is at the present time, but it's safe to say that in 20 years we will be protecting at least twice the value we are protecting now.

6. It appears to me from what has been said that our problems fall into four principal categories:

First, learning to be more effective with what we have.

Second, doing a better job of fire prevention.

Third, licking the crown fire problem.

Fourth, learning to apply recent advances in science to all phases of forest fire protection.

Learning to do more with what we have: Merle Lowden, speaking for Art Greeley, has reminded us that fires are prevented, discovered and put out, not by radio programs, fire towers, and tractors, but by decisions and actions of men. Only proper training can assure that men will know what should be done under a given set of circumstances and that they will be able to do it quickly. Do we always know if the right action was taken at the right time? Obviously, we do not. Taking a leaf from industry's book, "The Technique of O.M. Research"—or Operations Methods Research—can give us some of the answers we used to improve our own efforts. There is a definite need to completely document all major fires so that they can be reconstructed and critiqued to find out why things happened as they did—including all factors—human reaction, fuels, weather, and so forth.

Prevention: One of our speakers has pointed out that early efforts in prevention paid off rapidly but that fire occurrence has now tended to level off in spite of our best prevention efforts. This is, perhaps, indicative of the need for a new approach to fire prevention work. Industry, in selling its products, has probed deep into human behavior patterns which affect buying habits. Should we do likewise? Conclusions from such research may come as a rude awakening. I don't think we can afford to overlook this angle.

The crown fire problem: Jack Barrows, speaking for George Jemison, has stated that on a national basis, we are still taking 95 percent of our losses on a relatively few fires. In 1959 about half of the Wisconsin burn came in one fire; on the same day a single fire burned over 13,000 acres in Minnesota, and there is strong evidence that both of these fires resulted from the same upper-air meteorological conditions. Mr. Lowden has described the 1960 fire season in the West, which was characterized by many large fires, as one of the most disastrous in years. He stated further that this can happen in any part of the country in any year.

It's apparent that we are well able to handle normal fire conditions; but if we are to prevent catastrophic fires we must learn to cope with the unusual situation. This problem can be attacked in at least two ways. First, through advances in fire weather forecasting, making it possible to predict the time and location of weather conditions which will permit crown fires to develop; and, second, to develop new methods of dealing with crown fires after they have started.

Vincent Schaefer, a fire consultant with the U.S. Forest Service, in a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of American Foresters in Washington last November, stressed the need for finding out just what happens in blowup fires. He stated that such factors as time lapse and stereophotography; the dynamic relationships of moisture, pressure, wind, temperature, and radiation; the behavior of fuel types, their concentrations and exposures; obscure factors such as atmospheric electricity, the rate of change of pressure, the velocity profile of local winds, and the manner in which the local fire and weather behavior fits into the more extensive weather pattern, must be a part of such studies. He suggests that extremely mobile research teams be organized to get to prospective large fires as they are getting underway, or at least get to such fires during a major run. Postmortems alone simply won't bring out the information which is needed.

New developments in the equipment and chemical fields must be encouraged; the location of strategic cross-country-type firebreaks should be studied; aerial and ground application of retardants in advance of running fires should be investigated further. From these ideas and many more may eventually develop techniques or systems for stopping a running crown fire in its tracks—a big order to be sure, but we simply must think in terms of success.

I've already talked around my fourth category of problems—that of learning to adapt new scientific advances to our work. While we live in an electronic, atomic, scientific age, we are still fighting fire pretty much as we did 10 and 15 years ago. While radar devices watch for enemy bombers and missiles, we still depend on the naked eye. While fantastic advances are being made in the field of chemistry, we still use water and sand—and perhaps we always shall. While fantastic new developments in electronics are being integrated into military and commercial communications, we still maintain thousands of miles of costly telephone line. This is not to say that we should abandon our telephone systems tomorrow, replace towermen with TV scanners, and throw away our shovels and back cans—far from it. But it is time that a real effort is made to speed up the integration of new scientific developments into our fire control organizations.

I don't intend to try to make recommendations as to specific research projects to be undertaken; however, I have tried to point out where, in the opinion of the people who have expressed themselves here, the direction and emphasis should be placed in fire research. It is clear to me that a big research job lies ahead, a job which can be accomplished only by the combined efforts of public agencies, the forest industries, and our educational institutions working together as a team. Every team needs a quarterback and I am suggesting that the director of the Lake States Forest Experiment Station is in the best possible position to give this program the direction it needs.

In closing, I'd like to place the following recommendations before you as a motion.

"That this conference:

"1. Commends the fire control agencies of the Lake States, the U.S. Forest Service, and their dedicated men, for a superior job over a period of many years and further that the conference express confidence in their ability to maintain the high standards they have set for themselves.

"2. Recommends that the forest fire control organizations throughout the Lake States be strengthened, and that steps be taken to improve utilization of personnel and equipment resources on a local and regional level, to assure their continued effectiveness as forest use intensifies and as the values to be protected increase.

"3. Supports a strong national program of forest fire research and, in particular, recommends that the U.S. Forest Service substantially expand its program of forest fire research in the Lake States, that such program be closely integrated with the national program and with the work of the Lake States fire control agencies, forestry colleges, and forest industries.

"4. Recommends that the director of the Lake States Forest Experiment Station assume leadership in developing the coordinated program described. That he develop a long-range plan for forest fire research in the Lake States, taking into consideration the many recommendations made by the participants of this conference, listing specific research projects to be undertaken, their priorities, and recommendations for assignment of such projects to agencies and organizations best equipped to carry them out; and further that he appoint a forest fire research advisory group, consisting of representatives of the conservation departments of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, the several forestry schools in the region, the forest industries, and such others as he deems necessary to periodically review forest fire research in progress and to plan future research.

"5. Recommends that initial research efforts be directed toward those problems of immediate concern to fire control agencies but that long-range basic research and application of meteorological techniques to fire control be given high priority.

"6. Requests that the general chairman of the conference send copies of these recommendations with appropriate letters of transmittal to the public agencies and industry groups sponsoring the conference; the congressional delegations of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; the Governors of and conservation directors of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Chief Forester, U.S. Forest Service; and such others as the general chairman deems appropriate."

The above motion was seconded by Mr. William Kluender, forestry and agricultural agent, Chicago & North Western Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; and by Mr. Rowland Blair, chief forester, Packaging Corp. of America, Filer City, Mich. The motion was carried and the summary and recommendations approved unanimously.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

H.R. 5000. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 200).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

H.R. 6518. An act making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 201).

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART I OF HEARINGS ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original concurrent

resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) to print additional copies of part I of hearings on migratory labor, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare two thousand additional copies of part I of the hearing on migratory labor held before the subcommittee during the Eighty-sixth Congress, first session.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of March 1961. In accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MARCH 1961 AND FEBRUARY 1961, AND PAY, FEBRUARY 1961 AND JANUARY 1961

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for March 1961 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In March numbered—	In February numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In February was—	In January was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1]	2,365,232	2,358,141	+7,091	$1,043,874	$1,154,705	−$110,831
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,330,097	1,323,908	+6,189	579,575	651,042	−71,467
Department of Defense	1,035,135	1,034,233	+902	464,299	503,663	−39,364
Inside the United States	2,204,865	2,197,359	+7,506			
Outside the United States	160,367	160,782	−415			
Industrial employment	562,752	562,259	+493			
Foreign nationals	171,993	172,340	−347	22,214	[2] 23,265	−1,051

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1961, and comparison with February 1961, and pay for February 1961, and comparison with January 1961*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	March	February	Increase	Decrease	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	88,110	86,061	2,049		$36,928	$42,454		$5,526
Commerce [1]	29,441	30,271		830	15,564	16,794		1,230
Health, Education, and Welfare	66,987	65,946	1,041		31,425	[2] 32,903		1,478
Interior	51,915	51,282	633		25,449	27,078		1,629
Justice	30,464	30,565		101	17,335	19,042		1,707
Labor	7,252	7,234	18		3,647	4,016		369
Post Office	569,154	567,199	1,955		228,587	269,732		41,145
State [3 4]	37,678	37,788		110	16,802	17,537		735
Treasury	81,420	81,099	321		39,699	42,550		2,851
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	403	402	1		220	278		58
Bureau of the Budget	456	454	2		360	377		17
Council of Economic Advisers	37	34	3		24	34		10
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	70			36	40		4
National Aeronautics and Space Council [5]	1		1					
National Security Council	61	62		1	45	50		5
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,788	1,785	3		1,122	1,285		163
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	5		1	3	3		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	14	11	3		6	7		1
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	3	3			2	2		
American Battle Monuments Commission	433	425	8		72	80		8
Atomic Energy Commission	6,832	6,846		14	4,299	4,772		473
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	600	595	5		344	369		25
Civil Aeronautics Board	752	750	2		487	532		45
Civil Service Commission	3,677	3,637	40		1,965	2,126		161
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7			5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6			4	4		
Commission on Civil Rights	76	76			38	45		7
Development Loan Fund	151	149	2		98	106		8
Export-Import Bank of Washington	239	235	4		152	169		17
Farm Credit Administration	235	235			151	166		15
Federal Aviation Agency	40,937	40,393	544		22,537	25,145		2,608
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			4	5		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,361	1,365		4	795	875		80
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,246	1,243	3		704	768		64
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,067	1,066	21		622	668		46
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	343	341	2		258	283		25
Federal Power Commission	870	862	8		530	577		47
Federal Trade Commission	810	813		3	528	571		43
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	53	49	4		35	37		2
General Accounting Office	4,866	4,893		27	2,682	2,958		276
General Services Administration	29,577	29,293	284		12,314	13,495		1,181
Government Contract Committee	25	24	1		15	19		4
Government Printing Office	6,620	6,589	31		3,061	3,480		419
Housing and Home Finance Agency	11,133	11,165		32	6,061	6,684		623

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1961, and comparison with February 1961, and pay for February 1961, and comparison with January 1961*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	March	February	Increase	Decrease	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
Indian Claims Commission	15	14	1		$13	$16		$3
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,366	2,363	3		1,375	1,522		147
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16,499	16,391	108		10,977	11,172		195
National Capital Housing Authority	376	342	34		143	154		11
National Capital Planning Commission	45	46		1	29	31		2
National Capital Transportation Agency	13	12	1		8	6	$2	
National Gallery of Art	326	322	4		119	128		9
National Labor Relations Board	1,783	1,772	11		1,054	1,158		104
National Mediation Board	118	119		1	92	95		3
National Science Foundation	719	675	44		374	404		30
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	47	40	7		28	27	1	
Panama Canal	14,378	14,655		277	4,769	4,789		20
Railroad Retirement Board	2,185	2,190		5	1,032	1,140		108
Renegotiation Board	278	275	3		202	219		17
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	163	158	5		83	89		6
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,048	1,040	8		623	683		60
Selective Service System	6,545	6,509	36		1,835	2,005		170
Small Business Administration	2,385	2,350	35		1,308	1,446		138
Smithsonian Institution	1,094	1,104		10	482	536		54
Soldiers' Home	1,022	1,023		1	311	350		39
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	49	48	1		32	35		3
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	27			21	23		2
Tariff Commission	264	265		1	169	188		19
Tax Court of the United States	147	150		3	104	114		10
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,473	15,027	446		7,847	8,464		617
Texas Water Study Commission	49	49			30	31		1
U.S. Information Agency	10,804	10,804			3,905	4,275		370
Veterans' Administration	173,610	173,777		167	67,435	73,711		6,276
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,068	1,026	42		160	110	50	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,330,097	1,323,908	7,778	1,589	579,575	651,042	53	71,520
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			6,189				71,467	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,955	1,862	93		1,296	1,376		80
Department of the Army	382,674	381,905	769		166,551	179,886		13,335
Department of the Navy	344,256	343,672	584		160,827	174,806		13,979
Department of the Air Force	306,250	306,794		544	135,625	147,595		11,970
Total, Department of Defense	1,035,135	1,034,233	1,446	544	464,299	503,663		39,364
Net change, Department of Defense			902				39,364	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [6]	2,365,232	2,358,141	9,224	2,133	1,043,874	1,154,705	53	110,884
Net change, including Department of Defense			7,091				110,831	

[1] March figure includes 174 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[2] Revised on basis of later information.
[3] March figure includes 14,155 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 14,395 in February, and their pay. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The March figure includes 3,509 of these trust fund employees and the February figure includes 3,822.
[4] March figure includes 29 employees of the Peace Corps, a new agency established by Executive Order 10924 dated Mar. 1, 1961.
[5] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 85-568.
[6] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1961, and comparison with February 1961*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	87,109	85,049	2,060	
Commerce [1]	28,877	29,704		827
Health, Education, and Welfare	66,522	65,480	1,042	
Interior	51,442	50,812	630	
Justice	30,130	30,235		105
Labor	7,178	7,149	29	
Post Office	567,866	565,918	1,948	
State [2] [3]	9,458	9,325	133	
Treasury	80,842	80,534	308	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	403	402	1	
Bureau of the Budget	456	454	2	
Council of Economic Advisers	37	34	3	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	70	70		
National Aeronautics and Space Council [4]	1		1	
National Security Council	61	62		1
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,788	1,785	3	
President's Committee on Fund Raising Within the Federal Service	4	5		1
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	14	11	3	
Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission	3	3		
American Battle Monuments Commission	12	12		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,797	6,809		12
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	600	595	5	
Civil Aeronautics Board	751	750	1	
Civil Service Commission	3,674	3,635	39	
Civil War Centennial Commission	7	7		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	6		
Commission on Civil Rights	76	76		
Development Loan Fund	151	149	2	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	239	235	4	
Farm Credit Administration	235	235		
Federal Aviation Agency	39,974	39,456	518	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,359	1,363		4
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,244	1,241	3	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,087	1,066	21	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	343	341	2	
Federal Power Commission	870	862	8	
Federal Trade Commission	810	813		3
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	52	48	4	
General Accounting Office	4,795	4,821		26
General Services Administration	29,577	29,293	284	
Government Contract Committee	25	24	1	
Government Printing Office	6,620	6,589	31	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	10,988	11,019		31
Indian Claims Commission	15	14	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,366	2,363	3	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16,491	16,383	108	
National Capital Housing Authority	376	342	34	
National Capital Planning Commission	45	46		1
National Capital Transportation Agency	13	12	1	
National Gallery of Art	326	322	4	
National Labor Relations Board	1,755	1,744	11	
National Mediation Board	118	119		1
National Science Foundation	714	670	44	
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission	47	40	7	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1961, and comparison with February 1961*—Continued

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued				
Panama Canal	398	397	1	
Railroad Retirement Board	2,185	2,190		5
Renegotiation Board	278	275	3	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	163	158	5	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,048	1,040	8	
Selective Service System	6,392	6,355	37	
Small Business Administration	2,353	2,321	32	
Smithsonian Institution	1,085	1,094		9
Soldiers' Home	1,022	1,023		1
South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida Water Study Commission	49	48	1	
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	27		
Tariff Commission	264	265		1
Tax Court of the United States	147	150		3
Tennessee Valley Authority	15,470	15,025	445	
Texas Water Study Commission	49	49		
U.S. Information Agency	2,811	2,805	6	
Veterans' Administration	172,557	172,721		164
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,271,194	1,264,482	7,837	1,195
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			6,642	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	1,916	1,822	94	
Department of the Army	331,991	331,293	698	
Department of the Navy	322,035	321,523	512	
Department of the Air Force	277,799	278,239		440
Total, Department of Defense	933,741	932,877	1,304	440
Net increase, Department of Defense			864	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,204,865	2,197,359	9,141	1,635
Net increase, including Department of Defense			7,506	

[1] March figure includes 174 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[2] March figure includes 2,002 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 1,963 in February.
[3] March figure includes 29 employees of the Peace Corps, a new agency created by Executive Order 10924 dated Mar. 1, 1961.
[4] New agency created pursuant to Public Law 85-568.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1961, and comparison with February 1961*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,001	1,012		11
Commerce	564	567		3
Health, Education, and Welfare	465	466		1
Interior	473	470	3	
Justice	334	330	4	
Labor	74	85		11
Post Office	1,288	1,281	7	
State [1]	28,220	28,463		243
Treasury	578	565	13	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	421	413	8	
Atomic Energy Commission	35	37		2
Civil Aeronautics Board	1		1	
Civil Service Commission	3	2	1	
Federal Aviation Agency	963	937	26	
Federal Communications Commission	2	2		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	1	1		
General Accounting Office	71	72		1
Housing and Home Finance Agency	145	146		1
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	8	8		
National Labor Relations Board	28	28		
National Science Foundation	5	5		
Panama Canal	13,980	14,258		278
Selective Service System	153	154		1
Small Business Administration	32	29	3	
Smithsonian Institution	9	10		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	3	2	1	
U.S. Information Agency	7,993	7,999		6
Veterans' Administration	1,053	1,065		3
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,068	1,026	42	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	58,973	59,426	109	562
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			453	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	39	40		1
Department of the Army	50,683	50,612	41	
Department of the Navy	22,221	22,149	72	
Department of the Air Force	28,451	28,555		104
Total, Department of Defense	101,394	101,356	143	105
Net increase, Department of Defense			38	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	160,367	160,782	252	667
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			415	

[1] March figure includes 12,153 employees of the International Cooperation Administration, as compared with 12,432 in February. These ICA figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The March figure includes 3,509 of these trust fund employees and the February figure includes 3,822.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during March 1961, and comparison with February 1961*

Department or agency	March	February	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,541	3,965		424
Commerce	5,598	5,425	173	
Interior	7,977	7,896	81	
Post Office	234	238		4
Treasury	5,103	5,084	19	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	241	233	8	
Federal Aviation Agency	1,776	1,753	23	
General Services Administration	1,400	1,378	22	
Government Printing Office	6,620	6,589	31	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16,499	16,391	108	
Panama Canal	7,221	7,470		249
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	128	127	1	
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,638	12,207	431	
Virgin Islands Corporation	1,068	1,026	42	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	70,044	69,782	939	677
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			262	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 134,850	[2] 134,617	233	
Outside the United States	[2] 4,550	[2] 4,547	3	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	198,773	198,589	184	
Outside the United States	473	476		3
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	152,515	152,692		177
Outside the United States	1,547	1,556		9
Total, Department of Defense	492,708	492,477	420	189
Net increase, Department of Defense			231	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	562,752	562,259	1,359	866
Net increase, including Department of Defense			493	

[1] Revised on basis of later information.
[2] Subject to revision.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of March 1961 and comparison with February 1961*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force		National Aeronautics and Space Administration	
	March	February	March	February	March	February	March	February	March	February
Australia	1	1							1	1
Canada	32	32					32	32		
Crete	50	46					50	46		
England	3,321	3,312			18	15	3,303	3,297		
France	21,862	21,665	17,922	17,963	6	6	3,934	3,696		
Germany	80,487	80,696	67,621	67,733	58	57	12,808	12,906		
Greece	273	273					273	273		
Japan	56,120	56,444	19,881	[1] 19,384	15,206	[1] 15,208	21,033	21,352		
Korea	6,243	6,235	6,243	6,235						
Morocco	2,906	2,941			858	857	2,048	2,084		
Netherlands	43	41					43	41		
Norway	24	24					24	24		
Saudi Arabia	5	5					5	5		
Trinidad	626	625			626	625				
Total	171,993	172,340	111,667	111,815	16,772	16,768	43,553	43,756	1	1

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of March totaling 2,365,232. This was a net increase of 7,091 compared with employment reported in the preceding month of February.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1961, which began July 1, 1960, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1960—July	2,382,549		125
August	2,384,933	2,384	
September	2,364,636		20,297
October	2,360,534		4,102
November	2,360,667	133	
December	2,356,737		3,930
1961—January	2,352,837		3,900
February	2,358,141	5,304	
March	2,365,232	7,091	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of March was 1,330,097, an increased of 6,189 as compared with the February total of 1,323,908. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in March was 1,035,135, an increase of 902 as compared with 1,034,233 in February.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Agriculture Department with 2,049, Post Office Department with 1,955, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 1,041, Interior Department with 633, and Federal Aviation Agency with 544. The largest decrease was reported by Commerce Department with 830. Increases in the Department of Agriculture and Interior were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense, increases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Army with 769, and the Department of the Navy with 584. The Department of the Air Force reported a decrease of 544.

Inside the United States civilian employment increased 7,506, and outside the United States civilian employment decreased 415. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in March totaled 562,752, an increase of 493.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,365,232 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 171,993 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during March who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in February was 172,340. A breakdown of this employment for March follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	National Aeronautics and Space Administration	Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force	National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Australia	1				1	Korea	6,243	6,243			
Canada	32			32		Morocco	2,906		858	2,048	
Crete	50			50		Netherlands	43			43	
England	3,321		18	3,303		Norway	24			24	
France	21,862	17,922	6	3,934		Saudi Arabia	5			5	
Germany	80,487	67,621	58	12,808		Trinidad	626		626		
Greece	273			273							
Japan	56,120	19,881	15,206	21,033		Total	171,993	111,667	16,772	43,553	1

REPORT ENTITLED "1961 JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT"—MINORITY AND OTHER VIEWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Joint Economic Committee, I file today the joint economic report of that committee on the January 1961 Economic Report of the President, together with minority and other views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and will lie on the table.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1759. A bill for the relief of Floyd R. Lamb, Carlton Lamb, and Monte C. Lamb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 1760. A bill to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1761. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia;

S. 1762. A bill to regulate the practice of physical therapy in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1763. A bill to provide for the incorporation of certain nonprofit corporations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 1764. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to require justification of certain rate publications and suspension board actions; and

S. 1765. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to promote coordinated rail-barge transportation; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1766. A bill to extend the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1767. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to crimes in the Indian country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 1768. A bill to provide for the restoration to Indian tribes of unclaimed per capita and other individual payments of tribal trust funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1769. A bill to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1770. A bill for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1771. A bill to improve the usefulness of national bank branches in foreign countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1772. A bill for the relief of Dr. Edward Everard Low, his wife, Daisy, and their children, Helen Dawn and Michael Jonathan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 1773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an additional exemption of $600 to a taxpayer for each dependent son or daughter under the age of 23 who is a full-time student above the secondary level at an educational institution; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 1774. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See the remarks of Mr. PASTORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 1775. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend appropriated funds to acquire approximately 12 acres of land for the Richmond National Battlefield Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1776. A bill for the relief of Frances E. Sarcone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1777. A bill to amend section 326 of the Public Health Service Act to restore medical care for Coast and Geodetic Survey retired ships' officers and crew members, and their dependents; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1778. A bill to promote State planning with respect to public works necessary for the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1779. A bill amending the act authorizing appropriations for U.S. membership in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1780. A bill for the relief of Ralph E. Swift and his wife, Sally Swift;

S. 1781. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Lt. Col. James Murray Bate (deceased) and Maj. Billie Harold Lynch (deceased);

S. 1782. A bill for the relief of the estate of Walter Clark; and

S. 1783. A bill for the relief of H. M. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1784. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer certain facilities of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1785. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Giron Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1786. A bill for the relief of Heripsime Hovnanian; and

S. 1787. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Vitiello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1788. A bill to amend title V of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend the Interstate Commerce Commission's loan guaranty authority under such title to loans to State or local governments or other agencies for the purpose of acquiring certain property to be used by common carriers by railroad; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1789. A bill for the relief of Mr. Zang-Fah Zoen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1790. A bill for the relief of Emil Kafrouni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1791. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tzy-Cheng Peng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1792. A bill for the relief of Jessie Bamer;

S. 1793. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alfia Alessandro Milana; and

S. 1794. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Fuccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. THURMOND):

S. 1795. A bill to grant the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across the Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. HART):

S. 1796. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for the payment of benefits under such act to certain citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 1797. A bill to provide for the preservation of the Indiana Dunes and related areas in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BEALL, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MORTON):

S. 1798. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1799. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1800. A bill to amend section 4B of the Clayton Act;

S. 1801. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to declare private antitrust suits to be impressed with a substantial public interest; and

S. 1802. A bill to provide for the publication before entry of decrees, judgments, and orders entered by consent upon the merits of civil antitrust proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1803. A bill to provide for disaster loans to small business concerns which suffer economic injury due to federally aided highway construction programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1804. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, for the purpose of prohibiting loss leader sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S.J. Res. 78. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a Pan American Parliamentary Association should be established, and to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of such association; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to provide an immediate increase in the authorization for college housing loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

OPPOSITION TO RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINESE REGIME AND SUPPORT OF CHINESE NATIONALISTS

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) relative to relationship of the United States with the Republic of China and communis-

tic China, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART I OF HEARINGS ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.)

RESOLUTIONS

DR. THEODORE VON KARMAN

Mr. JACKSON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 133) expressing the gratitude of the Senate to Dr. Theodore von Karman for great things done and yet to be done, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JACKSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CANNON (for himself and Senators KEATING, BIBLE, BYRD of West Virginia, CARLSON, CARROLL, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, DOUGLAS, FONG, GRUENING, HICKEY, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JAVITS, KEFAUVER, KUCHEL, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MOSS, MUNDT, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, SPARKMAN, TALMADGE, WILEY, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YOUNG of North Dakota, and YOUNG of Ohio) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 134) to create a Standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CANNON (for himself and other Senators), which appears under a separate heading).

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC IMPACT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HART submitted a resolution (S. Res. 135) establishing the Senate Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HART, which appears under a separate heading.)

IMPARTIAL SETTLEMENT BY JUDICIAL MEANS OF LEGAL DISPUTES ARISING UNDER TREATIES

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. CLARK) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 136) favoring inclusion of international agreements of provisions for judicial settlement of legal disputes arising thereunder, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS.)

TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT TWO REPORTS ENTITLED "THE TIMBER RESOURCES OF WEST VIRGINIA" AND "A REPORT ON THE NATIONAL FORESTS OF WEST VIRGINIA"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 137), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed as Senate documents two reports entitled: (1) "The Timber Resources of West Virginia," and (2) "A Report on the National Forests of West Virginia."

GREAT BASIN NATIONAL PARK, NEV.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create the Great Basin National Park in White Pine County in eastern Nevada.

Two years ago, I introduced proposed legislation providing for a survey to determine the region's feasibility as a national park. The Advisory Board on National Parks recommended to the Secretary of the Interior that this area, known as the Wheeler Peak-Lehman Caves region, be included in the national parks system.

The Board considered the geological and ecological aspects of the 121,000 acre "sky island," in the heart of the Great Basin Desert, of national significance, making it suitable for preservation under the National Park Service.

Dr. Adolph Murie, an internationally known naturalist, who conducted the survey, listed these reasons for his conclusions:

The spectacular view of mountain ranges and valleys across the central Great Basin, combined with natural park areas of forests, streams, and lakes appropriate for camping, picnicking, hiking, and exploration of nature, are in themselves of national park caliber.

The area includes half a dozen splendid stands of bristlecone pines believed to be the oldest living things on earth.

The Wheeler area is the superb example of Great Basin country, illustrating well the geological process of basin and range formation, having good examples of various types of rock and geologic structure, and illustrating the representative Great Basin vegetation and wildlife.

In addition, the area includes a small but active desert-bound glacier in the deep cirque of Wheeler Peak, 13,063 feet above sea level, and a limestone arch big enough to cover a six-story building.

During the past 2 years, extensive hearings in the field have been held to attempt to reconcile the divergent views of the conservationists on the one hand, and local mining and grazing interests on the other.

Of particular concern was the discovery of a very valuable beryllium deposit on the borders of the proposed park area. Over half a million dollars is being currently expended by one of America's largest mining companies in exploration to discover the extent and location of this mineral so necessary in the furtherance of our space program. In order to protect the possibility of establishing a valuable industry that could employ many men in this presently depressed mining area, I have included in the present measure a section that would permit the continuation of prospecting, exploration, and mining within the park, limiting the activity to that necessary to the actual process of valid mining requirements.

Likewise, I have included a section that would permit present grazers to continue the use of the park area for 25 years plus the lifetime of the holders of grazing permits.

Both of these sections have precedent in other areas and cannot be considered an innovation in the establishment of national parks.

Mr. President, I would be very remiss if I did not at this time pay my respects to the Great Basin National Park Association, and particularly to its distinguished president, Mr. Darwin Lambert of Ely, Nev., an outstanding authority on the Great Basin, for the diligent, patient, and unceasing efforts on behalf of this proposal.

Mr. President, I have high hopes that both the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior will submit favorable reports on this bill, and that the Congress will look with favor on this region and give it the national park status it so richly deserves.

On behalf of my colleague the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] and myself, I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1760) to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Interstate Commerce Act: First, in order to promote coordinated rail-barge transportation; and second, in order to require justification of certain rate publications and suspension board actions. I ask unanimous consent to have these bills printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

These bills follow extensive study and hearings in the last session by the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries into the decline of this country's vital domestic offshore shipping. Several problem areas were identified and recommendations offered in order to strengthen our whole national transportation system. The measures introduced are consistent with those recommendations.

The first would improve coordinated rail-barge transportation. In the situation where an all-rail movement competes with a rail-water movement, a reduction of the all-railroad rate without a contemporaneous proportional adjustment of the feeder or delivery rail rate has a highly destructive effect on the water carrier. Under present law, the railroad has the duty to make such adjustment but this "duty," the committee was frankly told by a railroad witness, is not observed.

Neither has the ICC enforced it. Representatives from that agency told the subcommittee they had no power to enforce a contemporaneous adjustment. The record bears this out—four joint-rate cases took 14, 10, 8, and 6 years to resolve. Such a procedure makes commercial history but not good commerce.

In order to correct this deficiency, the first measure introduced would make it unlawful to reduce the all-rail rate without a contemporaneous adjustment in the rail portion of a rail-water rate, except in certain instances. The effect would be to give the Commission adequate authority and power to realize the original intention of Congress.

The second bill would require a justification by the carrier at the time of proposing a rate change as well as a written opinion by the Commission when it denies a requested suspension of a proposed rate. No area of the ICC's operation is more mystifying than the workings of the board of suspension. For most practical purposes, failure or success before the suspension board is the effective end of the case. Yet, this process, despite its importance to this country's transportation industries, is so shrouded in confusion that the pleaders do not know how to frame their pleadings, the judges apply no visible standards of law, and the winners or losers are denied that civilized adversary necessity of knowing why.

Quite simply, the second measure is disclosure legislation, introduced in the hope that the requirement of justification will make at least a better understood suspension system, if not a more rational one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. 1764. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to require justification of certain rate publications and suspension board actions; and

S. 1765. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to promote coordinated rail-barge transportation.

LEGISLATION TO EXTEND ORPHAN IMMIGRATION PROGRAM URGENTLY NEEDED; PRESENT LAW EXPIRES JUNE 30

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in less than 9 weeks the orphan immigration law will expire on June 30, 1961. Under the terms of this law, eligible orphans, who are under 14 years of age and who will be or have been adopted by a U.S. citizen and spouse, may be admitted to our country free of immigration quotas.

Legislation to provide for the quota-free admission of eligible orphans was first passed by Congress in 1948 in the Displaced Persons Act. Some 4,000 orphans were admitted under the terms of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 which expired on December 31, 1956, and in 1957 Congress provided Public Law 85–316, which remains the basic law, even though it was materially improved in 1959 by Congress, and was extended last year for 1 year.

Under these laws some 14,000 orphans have benefited. It is my earnest hope that legislation to allow the continued admission of orphaned children in the United States will be promptly enacted.

In the 1959 extension of the law, Congress wisely provided that the Department of Justice be given full operating authority, with the requirement that the Attorney General determine both for orphans adopted abroad and those admitted to the United States for adoption, that the adoptive parents will care for such eligible orphan properly, if the child is admitted to the United States. Operating authority has been assigned under this provision to the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Prior to the amendment of September 9, 1959, abuses took place in the orphan immigration program, and serious allegations were made of child selling, as well as unqualified parents obtaining orphan children.

Under the present law, adoptive or prospective adoptive parents are required to file a petition with the Immigration and Naturalization Service and that Service conducts a careful investigation before the child is admitted to our country. This investigation takes place both for children lawfully adopted abroad as well as those to be adopted in the United States under State law.

Commissioner J. M. Swing has written me, on April 19, of the nature of the investigation conducted by his Service. I quote from his letter:

To ascertain whether the petitioners have the ability to properly care for the orphan the investigation in each orphan case includes neighborhood, employment, and national agency checks. There is obtained from the interested voluntary agency, if any, and from the welfare department of the State, abstracts of their records if they conducted an investigation and, if possible, statements of their views concerning the proposed or completed adoption. The petitioners are interviewed in their own home and information is obtained from them regarding their plans for the rearing and education of the child. Also, to ascertain whether the beneficiary is an eligible orphan, and oversea investigation is conducted at the orphan's place of residence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Commissioner Swing's letter appear in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I believe the Immigration Service is to be commended for the way it has administered this program. Commissioner Swing has advised me that, since September 9, 1959, 4,018 petitions have been filed with his Service, and 3,093 petitions have been approved as of February 28, 1961. The average length of time required for the approval of a petition, is from 60 to 90 days, depending on the facts in the case.

The Department of Justice, and its Immigration Service, has district and field offices which are well qualified to administer this program with its own personnel. It is also worth noting that the Immigration Service submits to the House and Senate Judiciary Committees reports in connection with all private immigration bills.

Mr. President, I am indeed pleased to note that the distinguished chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, has introduced H.R. 6300, which makes a number of important and desirable changes in the Immigration and Naturalization Act that he coauthored, and also provides for a permanent orphan immigration program as a basic part of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

According to a table prepared by the Immigration and Naturalization Service as of December 31, 1960, 2,765 orphan immigration petitions have been approved since September 9, 1959. Of these approved petitions, 924 resulted from proxy adoptions abroad, 923 for children to be adopted following their admission to the United States, and 918 for children personally adopted abroad. It is not known, in this latter category, whether both the U.S. citizen and spouse were in the country where the adoption took place.

Mr. President, of the orphan immigration petitions approved, 1,434 have been for children from Asia. More than one-half of this number were proxy adoptions abroad, and of the 815 adopted from Korea, 650 were admitted as a result of proxy adoptions abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks, a table prepared by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, containing figures on the operation of the Orphan Immigration Act since September 9, 1959, through December 31, 1960.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,

Orphan petitions approved under the act of Sept. 11, 1957, as amended by act of Sept. 9, 1959, by type of adoption and country or region of birth: Sept. 9, 1959–Dec. 31, 1960

Country or region of birth	Total number	Personally adopted abroad	Proxy adoptions abroad	To be adopted
All countries	2,765	918	924	923
Europe	1,264	563	195	506
Austria	40	20	16	4
France	59	52	1	6
Germany	337	312	7	18
Greece	239	111	77	51
Italy	363	20	22	321
Poland	83	11	49	23
Portugal	28			28
Spain	44	11	7	26
Other Europe	71	26	16	29
Asia	1,434	339	726	369
China [1]	145	9	6	130
Hong Kong	133	7	5	121
Japan	233	168	52	13
Korea	815	96	650	69
Philippines	55	33	2	20
Other Asia	53	26	11	16
North America	48	8	1	39
Africa	13	6	2	5
Oceania	3	2		1
Other countries	3			3

[1] Includes Formosa.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is obvious from the table I have presented that if an orphan immigration program is continued, especially with respect to children from Asia, proxy adoptions should be allowed.

HARRY HOLT—GOOD SAMARITAN

Mr. President, at this time I should like to pay tribute to a devoted and humanitarian family who have done so much in behalf of Korean orphan children. I should like to mention Mr. and Mrs. Harry Holt, of Creswell, Oreg., and the members of the Holt family, who have been responsible for the placement of 2,300 Korean orphans in American homes. Many of the Korean orphan children were fathered by U.S. military personnel, and deserted by their mothers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks an article from the Portland Oregonian of February 2, 1961, which tells that Harry Holt was selected as Northwest regional winner of the Sertoma Club's 1961 Service to Mankind Award.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARRY HOLT WINS AWARD

Harry Holt, Creswell, Oreg., farmer who founded the nationally known "Korean baby lift," has been selected Northwest regional winner of the Sertoma Club's 1961 Service to Mankind Award, according to Lawrence Pierce, president of the Portland Sertoma Club.

Holt was selected from a list of Oregon, Washington, and British Columbia nominees. Since 1955, he has been responsible for the placement of more than 2,300 Korean orphans in American homes, many of them fathered by U.S. soldiers and deserted by their mothers. He also founded an adoptee hospital in Seoul, Korea.

In addition to receiving the regional Service to Mankind Award, Holt's name has been submitted to Sertoma's international committee, in nomination for the international Service to Mankind Award, which will be selected later this year. Sertoma is the Nation's second oldest service organization. It was chartered in Portland in 1957.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a planeload of Korean orphans landed in Portland on March 25, 1961. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this heartwarming story by James Lattie, which appeared in the Sunday Oregonian for March 26, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BABY LIFT BRINGS TOTS

(By James Lattie)

A Korean National Airlines plane landed in Portland a few minutes after 5 p.m. Saturday, adding 96 more Korean orphans to the many who have reached new American parents through Harry Holt's baby lift.

Some of the younger ones greeted their first cool, windy view of their new homeland with lusty yowls, but for the most part they were quiet and wide-eyed. With a little coaxing—very little—they would smile.

The youngsters were probably too tired to do anything else.

The planeload of more than 100 children, a doctor, nurses and others had made the 25 hour flight from Seoul, Korea, to Portland with only a stop in the Aleutian Islands. To make matters worse, heavy turbulence was encountered near the end of the flight.

Holt, a Creswell farmer before he started his baby lift nearly 6 years ago, remarked that Saturday's arrivals were the air-sickest bunch we've ever had. But the trip and the youngsters were fine otherwise.

THREE HUNDRED GREETERS WAIT

Half of the children are less than 1 year old, and all but 11 are less than 3 years old.

A welcoming party of nearly 300 adopting parents, brothers and sisters, friends and baby-lift workers waited for the landing of the plane. Some were a little tearful, most were eagerly cheerful.

Half of the parents were getting their second Korean orphan, a sign of success which pleases Holt.

The head of the baby lift is also pleased when a child goes to parents in an area which has no other Korean orphans. The youngsters are their own best advertisement, Holt says, and one in a new area usually means other families in the same area will soon be asking to adopt an orphan.

California, as in the past, took the largest single share of the Saturday shipment, with a total of 24 adoptions. Iowa was second with 10. Oregon and Washington were farther down the list with six each. All told, the children are headed for homes in 26 States.

FINANCES PROBLEM

Behind them is Holt's orphanage near Seoul. Over 400 orphans are still there, but many of them are unadoptable for physical or mental reasons. Maintaining the orphanage creates financial problems for Holt, but he noted that many American families provide funds by sponsoring one of the unadoptable children.

A much smaller problem for Holt is the North Korean Radio's Communist anti-Holt propaganda.

"It doesn't bother me a bit," commented Holt. "They don't like me, but I don't like them either," he chuckled, dismissing the subject to talk about typewriters.

When the plane which brought the orphans to Portland Saturday goes home, it will carry a number of old, battered, but still usable donated typewriters. Holt said about 40 orphan girls at his Seoul operation want to learn to type. The only problem: They will have to learn English first.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Mr. Holt is presently in Korea, assisting in this humanitarian work. He has constructed near Seoul one of the outstanding orphanages in that country. I have spoken at the Holt annual picnic to many families from all over our country who have adopted Korean orphan children under Holt's auspices. I can personally testify as to the joy and happiness of these children and the good care they are receiving. The Holts have expended freely of their time, efforts, money, and good health, and I know of no family which has better symbolized the Biblican Good Samaritan.

I regret to report that late last month Mr. Holt suffered a heart attack while in Korea. I have been in touch with his wife and family in Creswell, and have learned that Mr. Holt is beginning to feel better, but that he will be hospitalized for 3 more weeks. I want to wish him a speedy and complete recovery.

The problem of mixed-blood children fathered by American military personnel continues, but on a reduced scale. Sizable numbers of American military personnel are still stationed in Korea, Formosa, Okinawa, Japan, and other Far Eastern areas. While there has been some opposition to the admission of foreign orphan children, as well as other immigrants, I can think of no more worthy cause than to assist homeless and helpless children whom American families wish to adopt.

Among the other humanitarian organizations assisting the adoption of Asian children is that of Welcome House, an agency established by the famed author, Pearl S. Buck. An excellent article, with many fine illustrations, appeared recently in Look magazine, and tells of the adoption by a New Jersey family of a Korean orphan child of mixed ancestry under the Welcome House program. I wish it were possible for the excellent pictures, showing the

growth and development of this child, to be included in the RECORD, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at this point in my remarks, the Look magazine article "An 'Unadoptable' Finds a Home," which appeared in the April 11, 1961, issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN "UNADOPTABLE" FINDS A HOME

A frightened, undernourished little girl, Hong Soon Im was a tragic fruit of war. Her father was an unknown American soldier in Korea. Her mother was a Korean who could not bear the stigma of her baby's mixed ancestry. Like thousands of other babies fathered by U.S. servicemen in Korea, she was shunted from one orphanage to another. Then, at 2½, she was flown to America, where Mr. and Mrs. Edward Hughes and their two sons were waiting to welcome "Baby Susie" to their family. Today, Susie Hughes, of Newton, N.J., is as impish and noisy as any 5-year-old American girl The only differences are her beautiful almond-shaped eyes, and the tears that fill them whenever she sees a movie or listens to a story about a little girl who cannot find her way home.

Three years ago, Electrical Engineer Ed Hughes and his wife learned they couldn't have any more children of their own. They contacted dozens of adoption agencies, and then learned of Welcome House, an agency set up by Author Pearl S. Buck out of "indignation" over the cruel loneliness that befell half-American orphans in Asia.

Welcome House tries to find homes for orphans whose mixed racial ancestry makes them unadoptable in the society of their birth. The thought of such helpless children touched the Hugheses, and within months they had Susie, a girl who had been cast out to wander through a war-torn land until she was taken in by the first of several orphanages. She arrived at New York frightened and airsick, but cuddled into Mrs. Hughes' arms as they drove home. "We couldn't have wished for a more wonderful baby," her adoptive parents say. "She has given us far more than we'll ever be able to give her."

Susie's early timidity, coupled with her oriental features, made outside acceptance difficult at first. She clung to her mother's skirts, crying at the first sign of imagined danger and seeming to prefer the company of dolls to that of other children. Occasionally an unthinking person would ask the Hugheses how they could have accepted "that strange little girl" as their own. "She was ours," says Mrs. Hughes, simply. "How could we explain the joy of tiptoeing past her room and hearing her sing herself to sleep with Korean songs? Or that marvelous period when she was trying to learn English and still slipping back into Korean whenever she became excited?"

Susie was quick to learn English, and, just as rapidly, she lost all trace of her early fears and shyness. Then, last year, the Hugheses moved from their suburban home to Winding Lane Farm, near Newton, N.J. There, Susie has found security surrounded by animals, especially the helpless pups and kittens that make up her world until her brothers come home from school. She is exuberant and affectionate with her Sunday school classmates and warms up quickly to strangers. But until everyone learns that differences in people are often virtues, Susie may expect the familiar look of shock as she is introduced as the Hughes girl. "Still," says Millie Hughes, "we wouldn't change her oriental features for all the world. We want her to be proud of her heritage as we are."

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to continue the present orphan immigration program to June 30, 1964. It is my earnest hope that legislation extending the orphan immigration law will be promptly and favorably considered by the Congress, so as to prevent needless hardship and suffering, not only on the part of orphan children but by American families. It is my opinion that the present law requiring a careful investigation by the Attorney General provides sufficient safeguards to prevent abuses and, at the same time, the 88th Congress will have an opportunity to review the continuation of this program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my bill be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1766) to extend the date of termination of the provisions of law authorizing issuance of special nonquota immigrant visas to certain alien orphans, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes," approved September 11, 1957 (71 Stat. 639), providing temporary authority for issuance of nonquota visas to certain "eligible orphans" adopted or to be adopted by United States citizens (and their spouses), is amended by striking "June 30, 1961," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964."

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1961.

Hon. MAURINE NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Reference is made to your letter of April 10, 1961, concerning the existing orphan immigration program which expires June 30, 1961.

Since the amendment of September 9, 1959, requiring petitions to be filed with the Attorney General in behalf of orphans adopted abroad as well as those to be adopted in the United States, 4,018 petitions have been filed with this Service and 3,093 petitions have been approved. These figures are as of February 28, 1961. The average length of time required for approval of a petition is from 60 to 90 days depending upon the facts in the case. A table giving the number of orphan petitions approved for the year ended June 30, 1960, by type of adoption and country or origin of birth is attached.

To ascertain whether the petitioners have the ability to properly care for the orphan the investigation in each orphan case includes neighborhood, employment and national agency checks. There is obtained from the interested voluntary agency, if any, and from the welfare department of the State, abstracts of their records if they conducted an investigation and, if possible, statements of their views concerning the proposed or completed adoption. The petitioners are interviewed in their own home and information is obtained from them regarding their plans for the rearing and education of the child. Also, to ascertain whether the beneficiary is an eligible orphan an oversea investigation is conducted at the orphan's place of residence.

Your comments concerning the Service's administration of the program are appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING,
Commissioner.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE WITH RESPECT TO CRIMES IN THE INDIAN COUNTRY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce today for appropriate reference a bill (S. 1767) to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to crimes in the Indian country.

This matter arose from a letter dated March 8, 1961, addressed to me by Paul Jones, chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council. In the letter Mr. Jones pointed out that the U.S. court of appeals on September 16, 1960, in the case of United States against Rider, had ruled that carnal knowledge of a female under the age of 18 years committed on an Indian reservation was not a crime over which a Federal court could assume jurisdiction.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Jones to me may be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1767) to amend title 18 of the United States Code with respect to crimes in the Indian country, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

THE NAVAJO TRIBE,
Window Rock, Ariz., March 8, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: On September 16, 1960, in the case of *United States* v. *Rider* (282 Fed. 2d 476) the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ruled that carnal knowledge of a female under the age of 18 years committed on an Indian reservation was not a crime over which a Federal court could assume jurisdiction.

Prior to the decision in the Rider case, the Federal courts had always assumed exclusive jurisdiction over a crime of this nature pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1153 which provides as follows:

Any Indian who commits against the person or property of another Indian or other person any of the following offenses; namely, * * * rape * * * shall be subject to the same laws and penalties as all other persons committing any of the above offenses, within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.

As used in this section, the offenses of rape shall be defined in accordance with the laws of the State in which the offense was committed.

In effect, the disclaimer of jurisdiction by the court of appeals over the crime of carnal knowledge of a minor Indian female by an Indian created a jurisdictional void in this area of criminal prosecution since neither Federal nor State courts have jurisdiction

to prosecute offenders. There has thus been created an anomalous situation in the sense that a crime may be committed but the offender is subject only to moral sanctions because no legal means are provided for prosecution and punishment.

To protect the moral innocence of youthful Indian females, it is respectfully requested that appropriate legislation be presented to the Congress to restore exclusive jurisdiction in the Federal courts over the crime of carnal knowledge of a minor Indian female.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL JONES,
Chairman, Navajo Tribal Council.

Mr. ANDERSON. I transmitted the letter from Mr. Jones to the Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, and on March 31 I received back from Max N. Edwards, Assistant to the Secretary and Legislative Counsel, a letter dealing with a proposed amendment to title 18 of the United States Code with respect to crimes in the Indian country. I had written Mr. Edwards on March 14. I ask unanimous consent that my letter of that date, plus Mr. Edward's letter of March 31, together with a draft of a proposed bill, which is identical to the one I have today introduced, S. 1767, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 14, 1961.

Hon. MAX EDWARDS,
Assistant to the Secretary,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MAX: I have received the enclosed letter from Mr. Paul Jones, chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council requesting that appropriate legislation be presented to the Congress to restore exclusive jurisdiction in the Federal courts over the crime of carnal knowledge of a minor Indian female.

I would like to have the comments on the Department in this regard so that I in turn may take it up with the Senate legislative counsel.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: At the time your letter of March 14, 1961, was received, the Department was preparing a proposed amendment to title 18 of the United States Code with respect to crimes in the Indian country. We believe that the so-called 10 major crimes should be expanded to include the offenses of (1) carnal knowledge, and (2) assault with intent to commit rape. We also believe that the offense of assault with a dangerous weapon (which is now one of the 10 major crimes) should be defined in accordance with State law rather than Federal law. The Federal law makes intent to do bodily harm an element of the offense. Furthermore, although incest is named as one of the 10 major crimes, it is undefined and is therefore unenforceable.

In view of the recent controversy in New Mexico over alleged voting irregularities at State polling places on the Navajo Reservation, your suggestion that violation of the State voting laws should be made a Federal crime has considerable merit. We have therefore included it in the draft bill.

As a drafting service to you, I am enclosing a draft of a proposed bill to cover the proposed changes in the Federal criminal law relating to the Indian country. Inasmuch as it has not been cleared through the Bureau of the Budget or with the Department of Justice, I am sure you understand that the Department is not in a position to indicate the relationship of the draft bill to the program of the President.

If we can be of further help, please do not hesitate to ask.

Sincerely yours,

MAX N. EDWARDS,
Assistant to the Secretary and Legislative Counsel.

A BILL TO AMEND TITLE 18 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE WITH RESPECT TO CRIMES IN THE INDIAN COUNTRY

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1153 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended (a) by inserting in the first paragraph after the word "rape," the words "carnal knowledge, assault with intent to commit rape"; (b) by changing in the second paragraph the phrase "offense of rape" the first time it appears to "offenses of rape and assault with intent to commit rape"; (c) by inserting in the second paragraph after the phrase "offense of rape" the second time it appears the phrase "or assault with intent to commit rape"; (d) by changing in the third paragraph the phrase "offense of burglary" to "offenses of burglary, assault with a dangerous weapon, and incest"; and (e) by adding at the end of the first paragraph "Any Indian who, within the Indian country, commits an offense defined by the laws of a State with respect to elections of Federal, State, or local officers shall be punished in accordance with the laws of the State in which such offense was committed."

Mr. ANDERSON. It will be seen that a section (e) has been added by Mr. Edwards in response to my suggestion that there should be some Federal authority to punish irregularities for voting frauds committed on the Indian reservations. If the Indians are not subject to ordinary Federal laws, then it would be theoretically possible to pack ballot boxes on the reservations, to allow people not registered to vote contrary to State laws, and, in general, to interfere with Federal and State elections without committing a crime which might be punished in accordance with the laws of the State in which the crime was committed. Purely as a drafting service, Mr. Edwards added that section to the legislation originally proposed to deal with other crimes.

I trust this matter will receive early and appropriate attention.

DEFENSE FACILITIES PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, previously I introduced a bill which would give statutory sanction to an effective security system for the protection of our defense facilities. It has never been finally acted upon, however.

When I first introduced this bill we had a security program which was initiated administratively by President Roosevelt and carried forward by Presidents Truman and Eisenhower. The need for a program authorized by statute was great then. The need now, however, is absolute and has been since June 29, 1959, when the celebrated Greene case was decided against the Government by the Supreme Court. That decision effectively struck down the existing internal security programs which covered in excess of 3 million workers employed in private defense plants.

The decision struck down a program that was designed for one purpose and one purpose only—the protection of the defense and military secrets of this great country—and, therefore the protection of our freedom itself.

In the Greene decision, the Supreme Court held that the Government could not operate a security system which did not afford the safeguards of confrontation and cross-examination and suggested that a proper security system should involve confrontation and cross-examination.

The naivete of such reasoning is incomprehensible. It ignores the fact that much security information comes from confidential informants whose value would be completely destroyed if they were revealed. The decision would have the effect, also, of opening the files of the FBI wide to the Communist subversives and sympathizers in this country.

The rationale of the case is at the very least questionable. It subverts the rights of 180 million people to be protected by their Government to those of Communist agents or others who are subversive or not good security risks.

But enough reference to that Supreme Court decision. It is history, and the shocked citizenry of this still free country cannot and will not forget it.

The important thing is that legislation is still needed so that we can have the maximum of security in our defense plants. A good program, however, must afford certain protections to the workers so that they cannot be unjustifiably maligned by overzealous investigators. At the same time, there must be a degree of flexibility permitted to its administrators so as to provide maximum security for our defense secrets and, thus, the country itself.

The program must not treat the withdrawal of security clearance as a criminal matter and thereby apply the same guarantees and protections to which an accused criminal is entitled. In a criminal case a person is convicted if the evidence supports his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.

In an internal security problem this greatest of legal standards should not and cannot be applied. The more practical standard is—is there a reasonable doubt? If so, we should not entrust the security of our country to the questionable individual. This is a commonsense approach. To put it more simply—if we have a doubt as to someone's honesty, we are not going to trust him with our money. We do not have to be convinced beyond a reasonable doubt to foreclose him access to our cash register if we happen to be a shopkeeper. We simply will not hire him. And if he is already hired, we fire him. We do not invite thievery. And, likewise, Mr. President, we should not invite the scourge of international communism. We should not say we have secrets in the cash register of national defense and then let one of doubtful loyalty or trustworthiness operate it.

I think it is about time that all of us think a little more about the internal threat to this country and not let the bright light of external cold war blind us to it. It is present. It is increasing yearly. It will attempt to continue to grow. And if we do not stop it, or at least provide deterrents, we will be engulfed by the sea of communism which has for its only purpose the sinking of the free ship "America."

The House Un-American Activities Committee some time ago made public a report which revealed that over 2,000 known Reds are working in our defense and missile plants. There are undoubtedly many unknowns working there also. Mr. President, one Communist sympathizer working in an essential industry is one too many; but at the same time it is enough to end the freedom which we now have and which most of us so jealously protect.

The proposed legislation which I am introducing for the third time will be a giant step in the direction of eliminating all risks and will insure the people of this country the security they so richly deserve.

This bill has in the past had the full and complete approval of the Eisenhower administration, the Department of Defense and other Government agencies, including the Justice Department, yet Congress has failed to act.

Perhaps I should correct that statement. We of the Senate did pass it back in 1955, but the House failed to act. Since the Greene case in 1959, neither House has even given lipservice to increased protection for defense facilities.

I have stated the provisions of my bill many times in the past, but so that they will be perfectly clear to all I will repeat them again.

It authorizes the President, whenever he finds and proclaims the security of this Nation threatened, to prescribe rules and regulations to prevent access to defense facilities by those likely to commit sabotage, espionage, or other subversive acts. Admittedly, it does provide that the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act shall not apply, but to balance that it provides that a person who is denied access to a defense facility shall be notified in writing of the charges against him and given opportunity to defend himself against such charges. It also provides for remuneration of lost wages to a person who was previously summarily banned from a defense facility but who was subsequently cleared. Penalties are also provided as are other safeguards to individual rights such as that section which specifically prohibits a construction of the act which would deprive an individual of any rights or benefits conferred on him by the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Labor Management Act of 1947.

In its platform, the Democratic Party stated that, "We pledge our will, energies, and resources to oppose Communist aggression."

Mr. President, all the pious platitudes in the world will be worthless if we hand the Communists our secrets—as we have done so many times in the past—simply because we lack an effective security system and permit Communist agents and sympathizers to work in our defense establishments. I urge the Democratic leadership of this Congress, pursuant to its platform pledge, to initiate action on this bill immediately. The country needs it. Security demands it. I am sure you can rely on the help and active support of the Republican Party in getting the bill enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1769) to authorize the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

TAX EXEMPTION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION PURPOSES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, numerous recent events have caused all of us to be concerned with the demands to encourage higher education if this Nation is to continue to grow and prosper.

Numerous methods of further implementing the concern of the Federal Government for education have been proposed. However, the majority of these have been directed toward general aid to education on the primary and secondary level and have ignored students engaged in higher education.

It is, therefore, Mr. President, that I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in such a manner as to allow an additional exemption of $600 to a taxpayer with a dependent son or daughter under age 23 attending an educational institution above the secondary level on a full-time basis.

In offering this proposal, I believe we would be demonstrating in the most clear and tangible fashion the policy of the Federal Government in support of education as a national policy. In my judgment, the spur that such legislation would give to our school system would be enormous and of incalculable value to the strength of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1773) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an additional exemption of $600 to a taxpayer for each dependent son or daughter under the age of 23 who is a full-time student above the secondary level at an educational institution, introduced by Mr. CANNON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am introducing today by request the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission proposed fiscal year 1962 authorization bill for capital facilities and the cooperative atomic power program. This bill is identical with H.R. 6744 on which the Subcommittee on Legislation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy began hearings yesterday.

This bill would authorize a total of $227,580,000 for the acquisition or construction of a number of new line item plant and facility projects. An additional $7 million would be authorized for the civilian power reactor demonstration program. The bill also would authorize an additional increase of $127 million to previous years' authorizations.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Subcommittee on Legislation, of which I am chairman, is prepared to review in detail the various line items included in the bill. Two items particularly involve relatively heavy expenditures and have attracted a great deal of interest. One involves $114 million for the linear electron accelerator—the so-called Stanford accelerator. The other is $95 million for electric generating facilities for the new plutonium production reactor at Hanford, Wash. The Subcommittee on Legislation intends to review these two projects very thoroughly at the conclusion of the review of all other line items. It is expected that hearings on these two items will be held either the week of May 8, or the week of May 15. Sufficient advance notice will be given of the dates in order that all interested parties may have sufficient time for preparation of their views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1774) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PASTORE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State, dated April 21, 1961, to the Vice President in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1779) amending the act authorizing appropriations for U.S. membership in the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1945, as amended (22 U.S.C. 279a), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required for expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of State, for the payment by the United States of its proportionate share in the expenses of the Organization; *Provided,* That the percentage contribution of the United States to the total annual budget of the Organization shall not exceed 33.33 per centum."

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

APRIL 21, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I submit herewith a proposed draft amendment to Public Law 174, 79th Congress, as amended (22 U.S.C. 279a), to remove the statutory limitation of $3 million placed upon U.S. contributions to the Food and Agriculture Organization.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is one of the specialized agencies of the United Nations system. It now has a membership of 81 governments and 7 associate members. With the attainment of independence by 3 more African countries, membership is expected to rise to 84 before the end of 1961. This compares with a membership of 72 at the time the $3 million statutory limitation was enacted into law. The increase in membership comes mostly from the more underdeveloped countries which draw heavily on the experience and expertise of the Organization to aid them in developing their agricultural techniques as a means of increasing the quality and quantity of their food supply. The FAO is an entity whose contribution to the welfare of its participating members has been recognized throughout the world. The United States has played a major role in the affairs of the Organization since its inception in 1945.

The FAO's work is organized in two major departments: (1) the Technical Department concerned with land and water development, plant production and protection, animal production and health, rural institutions and services (including agricultural extension and education, land tenure, cooperatives and agricultural credit), fisheries biology, technology and economics, forestry and forest products, nutrition and home economics; and (2) the Economics Department concerned with economic analysis of food and agriculture, agricultural commodities, and agricultural statistics.

The work is carried out in five principal ways by:

1. The collection and publication of monthly, annual, or occasional statistical series, and of abstracts, bulletins, and technical studies;

2. Convening meetings, both worldwide or regional, on specific technical or economic subjects;

3. Providing direct technical assistance and advice to member governments, particularly in the establishment or strengthening of national institutions and service in food and agriculture in underdeveloped countries;

4. Organizing training centers and providing of fellowships in food and agricultural subjects; and

5. Acting as executing agency for projects financed by the U.N. expanded technical assistance program or the U.N. special fund. These activities serve to provide needed technical, statistical, and economic information on an international basis.

Some of the more significant current activities of the FAO include the continuation of its studies and consultations on agricultural price stabilization and support policies, the launching of a "Freedom From Hunger Campaign," from 1960 to 1965 and the designation of 1961 as "World Seed Year." In addition, a number of meetings of Government officials and/or agricultural experts were held on technical and economic subjects in all fields of FAO responsibility. Such meetings are one of the most effective means by which the FAO can provide technical information to governments, which they in turn can apply to their national educational and administrative services. Some of the more important and useful technical meetings held recently were: the second World Fishing Boat Congress; the second Meeting of the Committee of Government Experts on Designations, Definitions and Standards for Milk and Milk Products; the fourth Far East Meeting on Animal Health sponsored jointly by the FAO and the OIE (International Office of Epizootics) for consideration of sanitary regulations and methods of control or eradication of rinderpest, foot and mouth disease, poultry diseases, etc.; the Expert Meeting on Fishery Statistics in the North Atlantic Area; the World Scientific Meeting on the Biology of Sardines; and the International Training Course on Radioisotope Techniques in Agricultural Research, which was jointly sponsored by IAEA.

The FAO has also issued a number of significant technical publications. Some of these, as examples, are: "The Efficient Use of Fertilizer" (now completely revised); "Grasses in Agriculture"; "Agricultural Credit in Economically Underdeveloped Countries"; "Milk and Milk Products in Human Nutrition"; "Animal Health Yearbook" (jointly with International Office of Epizootics); "Study of University Agricultural Education in Latin America"; "Application of Science to Inland Fisheries"; and "Tropical Silviculture."

These are in addition to the basic monthly or annual series, among which are the "Yearbook of Food and Agricultural Production Statistics", "Yearbook of Food and Agricultural Trade Statistics", "Monthly Bulletin of Agricultural Economics and Statistics", "Yearbook of Fisheries Statistics", monthly "Plant Protection Bulletin", "Unasylva" (forestry), and "Food Consumption Balance Sheets."

The existing statutory limitation of $3 million on the annual U.S. contribution, when taken in conjunction with the U.S. percentage share of assessments of 32.51 percent, in effect limits the Organization's assessment budget to its current level of $9,225,000 annually. The increased cost of doing business alone will make it impossible for the Organization to maintain even its current level of activity, within the amount of funds available at a time when an increased membership is making new demands on the Organization for aid and assistance. In addition to the need for selective expansion of existing programs, the Organization is being called upon to undertake new urgent activities. Leading examples of such impending programs with budgetary implications for the FAO are: the U.S. sponsored U.N. resolution for the distribution of surplus foodstuffs; aid to education and training in Africa; and oceanographic efforts all being undertaken through the U.N. system. In light of these circumstances, it is anticipated that the Director General of the FAO will find it necessary to present a substantially increased budget for the calendar years 1962 and 1963. If the United States is to participate effectively in the development of the Organization's program and budget, it is essential that the $3 million statutory limitation be deleted. Otherwise, the United States will be forced to make a unilateral veto of the aspirations of other member governments of the Organization and at the same time will be effectively prevented from recommending programs which this country considers to be in the best interests of the Organization.

As between the raising of the current statutory limitation and eliminating it entirely, the Department recommends the latter. Other governments consider the existence of such a limitation as a unilateral veto by the United States on the size of the FAO budget and hence a veto on its whole program. No other country has enacted such legislation, but each prefers to relate its financial support of the Organization to the program and effectiveness of its operation. If other countries were to enact similar legislation it would complicate the budgetary processes of the Organization, since the size of the budget would be determined by a series of unilateral actions and not by multilateral negotiations. The result would limit the ability of U.S. delegations to participate effectively in the direction of the program and to hold the budget increases to reasonable increments, as we cannot respond to even the most urgent and justified projects if they breach the U.S. limitation by however slight an amount. It should be noted that the elimination of the statutory limitations would not result in excessive increases since the remainder of the membership have to pay their share of increased costs as well and the financial impact on their treasuries is, generally speaking, far greater than on ours. In the last analysis, the U.S. contribution is presented to, and must be adequately justified, before the congressional Appropriations Committees. It is hoped that Congress will be able to give favorable consideration to this request during the present session.

A similar communication is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

DEAN RUSK.

STRENGTHENING OF RAIL COMMUTER SERVICE

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make the loan guarantee authority of the Federal Government available for the financing, through public agencies, of new railroad equipment, terminals, passenger cars, and the like.

The Senate previously approved my proposal, in amendment form, on March 29 when the loan guarantee authority of the Interstate Commerce Act was extended. But the House accepted no amendments in extending the authority for 27 months, and it is necessary and, I believe, desirable, to introduce my proposal as a bill.

A recently submitted report to the Senate stresses the urgent need to preserve our mass transportation services. Several hundred thousand New Jerseyites who work in New York City and Philadelphia, and who have been threatened with drastically reduced rail passenger service, hardly need a reminder.

The New Jersey Highway Department knows what abandoned rail transportation service would mean to already crowded highways and parking areas. The Port of New York Authority could doubtless paint the same picture for its tunnels and bridges across the Hudson River between New York and New Jersey.

The report, which was jointly submitted by the Regional Plan Association and Anthony Arpaia, consultant to our Senate Commerce Committee, is specific about what needs to be done.

A major capital investment, says the RPA-Arpaia report, must be made to save and improve commuter rail service.

The report holds that, without immediate investment in equipment and facilities, operating deficits will continue to spiral while service declines. Eventually, if conditions continue to deteriorate, the safety of the public may be jeopardized.

The background study, which was prepared for the use of our committee's pilot commuter study of the New York metropolitan area, estimates that a capital investment of from $650 to $800 million is needed to stabilize operating costs and service and to take a step toward cutting costs and improving services.

The Federal Government can assist by helping provide a share of the capital funds. In the long run, as the Arpaia report points out, this is far less a burden on the taxpayer than providing alternative commuter facilities.

The bill I introduce would make it clear that the Federal Government could guarantee the bonds or other obligations issued by States, municipalities, and other public agencies for the purpose of buying or building modern equipment and facilities and leasing them to the railroads. In this way, I believe, railroads providing commuter service would get the maximum benefit from the loan guarantee authority which has been on the books since 1958.

Up to now, relatively little use has been made of this authority. In 1958, Congress attempted to deal with the deteriorating condition of American railroads by granting the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to guarantee improvement loans for them up to an aggregate of $500 million. Only about $85 million of such loans have been guaranteed to date. Few, indeed, have been made available to short-haul passenger railroads.

Loans for the improvement of commuter services from private sources, even with Government guarantees, have not proved attractive from the standpoint of the lenders or the railroads themselves.

This bill would use the guarantee authority not only for the obligations of the railroads themselves, but for the purpose of aiding any State, municipality, or other agency which may be organized for the purpose, in financing or refinancing the acquisition or construction of property to be used in transportation service of such common carrier by railroad.

Regardless of what Congress does with the $250 million direct loan program sponsored by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey and supported by me, we should not overlook the availability of the $415 million unused portion of the $500 million loan guarantee fund for use in strengthening our commuter services.

These objectives are highly desirable, and it is important that everyone know that they could be accomplished under the existing loan authority, as amended by my new bill. Fiscal experts have told me that credit provided under the loan guarantee program would be no more, and possibly less, expensive for the communities, the public transportation agencies, the railroads, and the taxpayers, than direct Federal loans.

There is an urgent need to improve as well as keep alive our essential mass transportation services. We must utilize all our available resources to that end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1788) to amend title V of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend the Interstate Commerce Commission's loan guarantee authority under such title to loans to State or local governments or other agencies for the purpose of acquiring certain property to be used by common carriers by railroad, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CONSTRUCTION OF DAM ACROSS SAVANNAH RIVER BETWEEN SOUTH CAROLINA AND GEORGIA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and myself, I introduce a bill to authorize the Duke Power Co., subject to the approval of the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers, to build a diversion dam across the Savannah River in conjunction with the construction of a steam-generating plant on the Anderson County, S.C., side of the Savannah River.

This proposed legislation also has the support of the distinguished Representative from South Carolina's Third District, WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, in whose district the steam-generating plant will be located.

Mr. President, throughout my political career I have worked for the development of the Savannah River to the full benefit of the people of my State and the people of our distinguished sister State of Georgia. I have always supported such development whether it was by private power companies or by public power, or from other sources, but always so long as any such development in no way hinders or prevents future development.

The Duke Power Co. has assured us that plans for its dam and steam generating plant have been worked out in collaboration with the Corps of Engineers and has further promised that this project will in no way prevent or hinder any future development in the public interest, of the Savannah River, including the Carter's Island Dam project. The construction of the dam will be subject to approval by the Corps of Engineers which will hold public hearings on the project to enable all individuals and interested groups to set forth their views.

I am pleased that the Duke Power Co. has agreed to spend $1,300,000 to bring the height of the dam up to specifications that will enable the construction of future dams on the Savannah River and avoid conflict between the Duke project and the Carter's Island project.

The Duke power proposal will initially generate 700,000 kilowatts, and will cost $91 million to build. The Duke Power Co. plans to expand this plant over the years as power demands justify, until it has a generating capability of 2 million kilowatts and represents a total investment of $280 million.

I know the county of Anderson and the State of South Carolina will welcome the $2,420,000 taxes the Duke Power Co. will pay annually on the initial plant as well as the $1,150,000 a year to be spent on operation, maintenance, and payrolls. This new plant will certainly fit into the industrial program of this area of our great State.

I hope that the ensuing hearings and studies enabled by this legislation will fully justify the construction of the dam and will show conclusively that it will not conflict in any way with future development of the Savannah River or the welfare of the rural electric cooperatives.

Mr. President, I ask the bill be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of pride that I join in introducing the bill to authorize the construction of this steam generating plant in Anderson County, S.C. The steam plant proposed to be constructed by Duke Power Co. is far more than just another step in the development of the resources of the Savannah River. It is my understanding that the steam plant which the Duke Power Co. proposes to build is larger than any such plant now existing in the world. It will represent an investment of $280 million, will employ 1,000 people during its construction, and ultimately will have a generating capacity of some 2 million kilowatts.

The willingness of private investors to undertake such a gigantic project is a measure of the existing confidence which exists in the South's continued economic industrial development and prospects for economic prosperity. It is also further proof of the fundamental ability of the private segment of our economy to meet with efficiency and competence the demands of a highly complex and industrial society.

The authorization bill we are introducing today actually constitutes the type of area redevelopment bill which is best designed to remedy defects in our economy and unemployment. The construction of this steam generating plant will by no means be limited in its economic impact to the areas of South Carolina and Georgia, to which its power will be distributed.

Some of the highest levels of unemployment and most serious economic illnesses exist in coal-producing States, such as West Virginia and Kentucky.

The steamplant which this bill authorizes will consume, upon its final completion, 3½ million tons of coal annually, which in itself will give a real boost to these coal-producing areas.

I urge that the Senate act speedily and favorably on this deserving measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1795) to grant the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON (for himself and Mr. THURMOND), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Duke Power Company, its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a dam across Savannah River, between Anderson County, South Carolina and Elbert County, Georgia, near Middleton Shoals, and about two hundred ninety-seven miles above the mouth of said river, for the purpose of providing a pool for condenser water for a steam-electric plant: *Provided,* That work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of the Army, and when such plans have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of the Army, it shall not be lawful to deviate from such plans either before or after completion of said dam unless the modification of such plans has previously been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further,* That in approving the plans for said dam such conditions and stipulations may be imposed as the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army may deem necessary to protect the present and future interest of the United States: *Provided further,* That this Act shall not be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop water power or generate hydroelectric energy: *And provided further,* That the grantee, or its successors, shall hold and save the United States free from all claims arising from damage which may be sustained by the dam herein authorized, or damage sustained by the appurtenances of the said dam, by reason of the future construction and operation by the United States of Hartwell Reservoir or any other Federal project upstream or downstream from the dam herein authorized.

SEC. 2. The authority granted by this Act shall cease and be deemed null and void unless the actual construction of the dam hereby authorized is commenced within four years and completed within seven years from the date of approval of this Act.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT TO PROVIDE BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide certain benefit rights, now granted to persons who were U.S. citizens at the time of the loss, to persons who at the time they suffered losses at the hands of the enemy during World War II, were not American citizens but who have subsequently become citizens.

Section 18 of my amendment would provide for payment of prisoner-of-war and civilian-imprisonment claims to persons, who are U.S. citizens on the date of enactment of this amendment, and who were imprisoned by enemy nations while citizens of the United States or of governments allied or associated with the United States during World War II.

Section 19 would provide similarly for internment, deportation, and forced labor claims.

This bill, in essence, will remove the limitation excluding many American-born and naturalized citizens which was placed by the original War Claims Act. The benefits would be paid from the war claims fund.

According to testimony offered before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on similar bills in 1959, the number of additional claims expected under the authorization of these amendments would be approximately 34,000. Of the new claims, about 23,500 would be from former Poles, 4,000 from former Yugoslavs, 3,200 from former Philippine soldiers and guerrillas, and 3,300 from others. The average claim is expected to be about $1,860, and the total cost to be borne by the war claims fund would be about $92.8 million. Of course, none of this money would be raised by taxation. These claims would, instead, merely be charges against assets held by the U.S. Government to compensate American citizens for losses which they suffered at enemy hands during World War II.

This bill would justly amend the law to allow compensation for claims of American citizens who were deprived during World War II because of their common cause with this Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1796) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 to provide for the payment of benefits under such act to certain citizens of the United States, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INDIANA DUNES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of Senators GRUENING, MCCARTHY, NEUBERGER, METCALF, HUMPHREY, and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the preservation of the Indiana Dunes and related areas in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to preserve for all of the citizens of our country a priceless piece of geologic and botanical history which is unique on the western continent.

I first introduced a bill on this subject during the 85th Congress, S. 3898, which was followed by a perfecting bill, S. 1001. This legislation was the subject of on-the-spot hearings by the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during July 1959, which concluded with a recommendation by the participating members of the subcommittee calling for approval of the bill S. 1001. At this point I want to call attention to the splendid work performed by Senators GRUENING and Moss, who were members of the subcommittee. The need for approval of this legislation was clearly demonstrated by the hearings.

The bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior may acquire to preserve in public ownership as a national scientific landmark representative portions of the Indiana Dunes and other areas of scientific interest and public recreational value on or near the shores of Lake Michigan, in the State of Indiana. The areas set forth in the bill have been included only after a recent on-the-spot survey of the dunes area which was conducted in order to determine the scientific and recreational values with significant national appeal still remaining in this region. The bill designates a block described as units 1 and 2 which is to be established because of its scientific and educational values. This is an area of not more than 3,000 acres. Units 3 and 4 set forth in the bill are to be established because of their scientific and public recreational values, and are areas of not more than 1,000 acres.

There is a third area described in the bill, amounting to about 4,000 acres to be used for the purpose of supporting units 1, 2, and 3, and in which there is found to exist scientific and public recreational values. The present bill differs from previous bills in that it now provides that the Secretary of the Interior may lease all or any part of the lands and interests in land acquired, to the State of Indiana, upon proper terms, set forth by the Secretary of Interior, which permit the State of Indiana to manage the property. Further, there is a provision for cooperative agreements with the State of Indiana, college scientific societies, and qualified individuals to permit scientific research within the areas acquired which will effectively interpret the scientific values.

Let me say a few words about this precious natural area and what we are working for. First, we have a remarkable example of dunes: a shifting, moving, living landscape and a natural phenomena which in itself holds much scientific interest as well as beauty. We have here a rare collection of southern flora, deposited by migratory birds, which can be found no farther north, and northern flora which can be found no farther south. The dunes are a mixed garden not duplicated anywhere in the world. We have one of the last remaining way stations for birds passing through the Midwest during migration; and more than 100 species of birds live and nest here.

In addition to all this, here is a site of rare historic significance. The dunes have been a highway of sorts throughout the history of this country. First, it was the site of Indian foot and horse trails which can still be traced. Then it

was a gateway for trappers and traders, and for missionaries and warriors. Marquette passed through in 1675 and died shortly after near Ludington; La Salle came in 1677, on his way to Montreal; Pontiac captured Little Fort, near Tremont, in 1754. In 1781 the Spanish took over and in 1803 U.S. soldiers trod through on their way to build Fort Dearborn.

Off to the west a matter of 5 miles or so, Octave Chanute carried on his experimental glider flight. Off to the southwest is the site of the trading post of Joseph Baillie, the first white settler in Indiana.

Down through history, this area has attracted scientists of all sorts. Let me quote from just a few of them.

In his report on the proposed Sand Dunes National Park of Indiana, Stephen T. Mather, whose foresighted service was in the best tradition of the U.S. Department of the Interior, said:

> The sand dunes are admittedly wonderful, and they are inherently distinctive because they best illustrate the action of the wind on the sand accumulated from a great body of water. No national park or other Federal reservation offers this phenomenon for the pleasure and edification of the people and no national park is as accessible.
>
> My judgment is clear * * * that their characteristics entitled the major portion of their area to consideration as a national park.

The noted geologist, Prof. T. C. Chamberlin, in a plea to save the dunes for the people, described their scientific value and natural beauty in these moving words:

> This earth of ours is a living, active organism constantly reshaping itself * * * selecting and assorting its material.
>
> The dunes are themselves a beautiful expression of the selective and accumulative action of nature. The material that is washed from the banks of the lake is exceedingly mixed material. But the waves at once begin a selective process. The dirty material * * * is washed out and deposited in the deeper and quieter waters. The coarser material is left * * * along the shore and then the waves wash that up and down * * * and at length * * * part is thrown up by the action of the waves and left to dry on the beach.
>
> The strata of earth are derived from mixed material in this way and have been so derived for millions of years. But the dunes illustrate a cooperative action on the part of the wind. This material is caught by the wind and drifted forward until it finds lodgment, and this lodgment illustrates the power of the wind, the turmoil to which the basal part of the atmosphere is subjected; and out of that come these beauties.

The eminent botanist, Prof. Henry C. Cowles, urging that the dunes be preserved for the people, related that he once had the pleasure of conducting a number of Europe's greatest scientists through our country. Time permitted them to see only three or four things. And these, Professor Cowles reported, were what they chose: the Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Yellowstone Park, and the Indiana Dunes.

> There are few places on our continent where so many species of plants are found in so small a compass. Within a stone's throw of almost any spot one may find plants of the desert and plants of rich woodlands, plants of the pine woods and plants of swamps, plants of oak woods and plants of the prairies. Species of the most diverse natural regions are piled here together in such abundance as to make the region a natural botanical preserve.
>
> Here one may find the prickly pear cactus of the southwestern desert hobnobbing with the barberry of the arctic and alpine regions.
>
> Nowhere perhaps in the entire world of plants does the struggle for life take on such dramatic and spectacular phases as in the dunes. A dune in the early days of its career is a moving landscape, a place that is never twice alike; it is a body of sand which under the influence of wind moves indifferently over swamp or town or forest. Perhaps nothing in all nature except a volcano with its lava flow is to be compared with such a moving dune.

What is the present status of this remarkable scientific area, this citadel of history, this mecca for recreation which sits squarely like a great oasis in the teeming industrial center of the United States? What has become of this 25 miles of uninterrupted shoreline with such a significant past, for which the original park builders of the country had such high hopes?

I will tell the Senate in a few words—too few—because it is a sad and simple story.

We have an Indiana State park, which rescued a scant 3 miles of shoreline. In addition, 5 years ago there remained about 5 miles of unused shoreline, an area of unusual scientific and historic significance which had not, as yet, been built up. Five miles of the original 25 was all that was left. During the prior years, since 1916, along the rest of the Lake Michigan shore from deep in Indiana to far beyond Chicago, factories and mills were piled one upon another. Only 5 miles of lakeshore were left unused, and hundreds of thousands of people surged about in an area where 40 years ago there were comparatively few. Only 5 miles were still there and in the meantime, the fishermen, the swimmers, the boaters, the millions around the Greater Calumet area, in Chicago, in Gary, had watched their recreation areas disappear one by one.

I am here to make a last-ditch effort to prevent the imminent closing out for all the future of this remnant.

Virtually all of this land is now owned as follows:

First. Inland Steel, a public-spirited company, owns the dunes west of Ogden Dunes, but seems to have no tangible plans for using it.

Second. National Steel, whose moving spirit is Mr. George M. Humphrey, owns, through its subsidiary, Midwest Steel, the land east of Ogden Dunes and Burns Ditch.

Third. Bethlehem Steel has acquired some acres from the Consumers Corp. under circumstances described in a series of articles which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times in the summer of 1958.

Fourth. Northern Indiana Public Service Corp. owns a portion.

Fifth. The Dune Acres real estate development owns a small portion.

Sixth. Scattered portions are held by individuals.

After I introduced a bill to save this area a few years ago, National Steel Co., in an effort to frustrate my attempts, built a steel mill just east of Burns Ditch, and the Northern Indiana Public Service Corp. wantonly leveled several hundred acres of beautiful duneland for a prospective power station. Bethlehem, however, shows no immediate intention of building.

National Steel and various private real estate interests are laying plans to get a $35 million subsidy from the Federal Government to construct a harbor which will permit ore boats to serve the National mill and such other mills as Bethlehem may at some future date construct.

I personally see no reason why such a large subsidy should be given to such prosperous companies as these, and I may also add that such subsidies seem to me inconsistent with the philosophy on such matters which is so eloquently stated by the heads of these specific companies, such as Mr. George M. Humphrey, a moving spirit in National Steel. Certainly I shall oppose such a project with all my strength, unless satisfactory arrangements can be made to save the remainder of the dunes for the people.

There still remain about 3 miles of unspoiled lakefront and a considerable amount of beautiful back country which can be saved. In all, we are proposing, as I have stated, to save a total of 8,000 acres, including 1,000 acres for two large bathing beaches, 3,000 acres of dune waterfront and backlands of unique scientific and educational value, and 4,000 acres of land with high recreational value south of Highway 12 and north of Highway 20.

Unless we act in the manner outlined in the bill, the whole dunes area will be turned into another industrial and asphalt jungle. The little Indiana park will be made useless by polluted air and water. This is our last chance to save this beautiful region, not merely for the more than 8 million people who live in the vast metropolitan area which stretches from Gary to Milwaukee, but also for all the people of the Midwest, including those of the States of Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois. We have no time to lose.

Interest in the problem of the dunes is widespread. The present Director of the National Park Service has recommended strongly that the remaining area be protected. The Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments of the Department of the Interior advised the Secretary of the Interior that steps should be taken to provide the protection which this area obviously merits. In addition to that, the matter has been taken in hand by the great conservation organizations: The National Parks Association, the Garden Clubs of Indiana, the Save the Dunes Council, the Indiana Federation of Women's Clubs, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Wilderness Society, the Council of Conservationists, Inc., the American Nature Association, the American Planning and Civic Association, the Conservation Council, Nature Conservancy, and many others.

The problem of the dunes is a symbol of the crisis which faces all America. It is as though we were standing on the last

acre, faced with a decision as to how it should be used. In actuality, it is the last acre, the last acre of its kind. In essence, the plight of the dunes foreshadows the time not too far removed when in all truth we will be standing on the last unused, unprotected acre, wondering which way to go. Have we the courage to stand up and place physical limits on the relentless march of industrialization?

With all humility I ask support of this bill. I ask it in the name of the people of the Middle West, to whom the dunes should belong forever, the people of Illinois, who depend upon it, and the people of the United States who are growing ever more alert to their disappearing natural resources. I ask for support in the name of the millions upon millions of people yet to be born who cannot live and grow and be happy in a tight little world of factories, smoke and noise, and unrelieved pressure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1797) to provide for the preservation of the Indiana Dunes and related areas in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

OPPOSITION TO RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINESE REGIME AND SUPPORT OF CHINESE NATIONALISTS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on January 26 I introduced Senate Resolution 67, expressing the sense of the Senate in opposition to recognition of the Communist Chinese regime. Since that date, various conferences have been held between the distinguished majority leader, the distinguished minority leader, myself, and many other Senators.

A resolution worded to cover the situation has been agreed upon by the distinguished leaders and other Senators, and has, I believe, been agreed upon by some of the leadership of the other body. I understand the resolution will be simultaneously introduced in both bodies.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my original resolution (S. Res. 67) be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in pursuance of the same subject, first I wish to do what I should do on another occasion, and that is to compliment the very distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] for his diligence in pursuing this all-important subject. There have been a good many conferences, including those with high-level representatives of the State Department; and as a result there was prepared a concurrent resolution which I now submit for appropriate reference, and which assigns a good many reasons why the Senate should take the proposed action. I shall read the resolving clause only because the remainder of the resolution speaks for itself:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that it supports the President in his affirmation that the United States shall continue to meet its commitments to the people and Government of the Republic of China and shall continue to support that Government as the representative of China in the United Nations.

Further, the United States shall continue to oppose the seating of the Chinese Communist regime in the United Nations so long as that regime persists in defying the principles of the United Nations Charter. Further, it is the sense of the Congress that the United States supports the President in not according diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime.

By a previous understanding with the majority leader and others, the concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further discussion. I am honored indeed to submit the concurrent resolution in behalf of myself and the very distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Do I correctly understand that the concurrent resolution has received the approval of Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is my definite understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Government of the United States enjoys close and friendly relations with the Government of the Republic of China, including treaty obligations which this Government honors; and

Whereas the Republic of China is an original and continuing member of the United Nations which has faithfully discharged its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations as a peace-loving member of the community of nations; and

Whereas the Government of the Republic of China has demonstrated that it is worthy of the great traditions and culture of the Chinese people; and

Whereas the Chinese Communist regime continues to proclaim its blatant defiance of the United Nations and its principles; and

Whereas the Chinese Communist regime committed open aggression against United Nations Forces in Korea for which it stands condemned by the United Nations, and boasts openly of its "victory" over United Nations Forces in Korea; and

Whereas the Chinese Communist regime continues to suppress in defiance of United Nations resolutions the human rights of the Tibetan people; and

Whereas the Chinese Communist regime continues to threaten world peace by its military pressures and incursions against the territory of peaceful neighboring countries in Asia, including India; and

Whereas the Chinese Communist regime since its beginning has maintained an attitude of unremitting hostility toward the people and Government of the United States; and

Whereas the Chinese Communist regime continues to hold Americans in prison despite commitments for their release; and

Whereas the Chinese Communists not only seek to impose upon the United Nations arrogant contentions with respect to their own admission but also to expel the representatives of the Government of the Republic of China from the United Nations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Congress that it supports the President in his affirmation that the United States shall continue to meet its commitments to the people and Government of the Republic of China and shall continue to support that Government as the representative of China in the United Nations; and be it further,

Resolved, That the United States shall continue to oppose the seating of the Chinese Communist regime in the United Nations so long as that regime persists in defying the principles of the United Nations Charter. Further, it is the sense of the Congress that the United States supports the President in not according diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Communist regime.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie on the desk until Monday next, to permit other Senators to join the majority leader and myself in sponsoring the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would like to say, with regard to what the distinguished minority leader has said, that while I do not sponsor multiple resolutions, as a rule, and do not intend to add my name in this case, I have read the resolution which has just been presented and I believe it overcomes any criticism which I may have had to an earlier resolution which, while the Members of the Senate and probably most of the people in the United States would understand, would not have been, in my opinion, perfectly clear to the people of other countries. I believe the present resolution overcomes what I consider to be a defect in the resolution which has been withdrawn by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The present resolution accomplishes the same purpose. I expect to support it both in committee and on the floor. The last time that I indulged in multiple sponsorship of a bill, when I was one of 71 Senators who sponsored a bill, it was defeated on the floor. Since that time I have been wary about multiple sponsorship. I hope the Senator from Illinois understands the reason why I am not going to do it in this case.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I certainly understand.

DR. THEODORE VON KARMAN

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 133, which I now submit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the contributions of Theodore von Karman to aeronautical and space science have been all-pervasive and unique; and

Whereas he has labored brilliantly and unceasingly to improve and speed the defenses of this Nation and of the Atlantic community; and

Whereas he has worked with equal zeal and skill to bend space to the ways of peace; and

Whereas he has been to countless many an inspired teacher, trusted counselor, and valued friend; and

Whereas on the occasion of his 80th birthday the world is paying him deserved tribute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate, that we express our gratitude to him for great things done and yet to be done; and that we wish him Godspeed in the years ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, every Member of this body is of course aware of the immense debt that our New World owes to the Old World in the field of science. The vigor of science in the United States today is due in large part to the contributions of brilliant and dedicated men who came to our shores from Europe and made our country their adopted homeland.

It is an interesting bit of history that five of the greatest of these men should have been born, and spent their childhood, in the same district of one city, Budapest, Hungary. I am, of course, thinking of Dr. Leo Szilard, Dr. John von Neumann, Dr. Edward Teller, Dr. Eugene Wigner, and finally, Dr. Theodore von Karman.

As Senators know, Mr. President, Dr. von Karman is called, and rightly so, the father of aerospace science. Pages would be needed merely to list the extraordinary contributions he has made to broadening man's understanding of aerodynamics and space flight.

Dr. von Karman has also labored mightily in the cause of strengthening the military defenses of our country and our free world partners. He has long been one of the most influential and respected advisers at the highest level of our Defense Establishment. He also took the lead in speeding and strengthening aeronautical and space research in the NATO community.

At the same time, Dr. von Karman has worked no less vigorously and fruitfully to promote international cooperation in the development of space for peaceful ends.

Finally, he has been an inspired teacher. Virtually every leading figure in aeronautical and space research today stands in his intellectual debt.

Next Thursday, May 11, will mark Theodore von Karman's 80th birthday. Here in Washington, distinguished men of science will gather from all over the world to pay him homage on this occasion.

Along with several of my distinguished colleagues in the Senate, from both sides of the aisle—I know we share the unanimous view of the Senate in this regard—I thought it would be fitting if this body now went on record as expressing its admiration and gratitude for the great contributions which Theodore von Karman has made to our country and indeed the entire world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a detailed biography with regard to Dr. Theodore von Karman.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF DR. VON KARMAN

Name: Theodore von Karman.

Present position: Chairman, Advisory Group for Aeronautical Research and Development of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Palais de Chaillot, Paris, 1952 to date.

Was Chairman, Scientific Advisory Board to the Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C., 1944 through 1954.

Presently, Chairman emeritus of the Scientific Advisory Board, U.S. Air Force, 1954 to date.

Birthplace and parentage: Born May 11, 1881, in Budapest, Hungary. Father, Prof. Maurice de Karman; mother, Helene (Konn) de Karman. Citizenship: Naturalized citizen of the United States, 1936.

Marital status: Single.

Education: M.E., Royal Technical University, Budapest, Hungary, 1902; Ph. D., University of Göttingen, Germany, 1908.

CAREER

Research engineer, Ganz Co., Germany, 1903–6.

Assistant professor, Royal Technical University, Budapest, 1903–6.

Privat Docent, University of Göttingen, Germany, 1909–12.

Director, Aeronautical Institute, University of Aachen, Germany, 1912–29.

Officer in Austro-Hungarian Air Corps, 1914–19.

Consultant, Junkers Airplane Works, Germany, 1924–28.

Consultant, Luftschiffbau Zepplin, Germany, 1924–28.

Adviser and consultant on design of Guggenheim Aeronautical Laboratories, California Institute of Technology, and of the 10-foot wind tunnel of the laboratories, 1926–27.

Research associate, California Institute of Technology, 1928–30.

Consultant, Kawanishi Airplane Co., Japan, 1927–29.

Designed Kobe wind tunnel, Japan, 1927.

Director, Guggenheim Aeronautical Laboratories of the California Institute of Technology, 1930–49.

Director, Guggenheim Airship Institute, Akron, Ohio, 1930–35.

Adviser in aeronautics to the National Tsing Hua University, Peiping, China, 1933–37.

Consultant, Army Air Corps and U.S. Air Force, 1939 to date.

Director, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, 1942–45.

Consultant, Department of Ordnance, U.S. Army, 1938–52.

Consultant, General Electric Co., 1940 to date.

Member of the board of investigation on the collapse of the Tacoma Bridge (State of Washington), 1942.

Consultant, Northrop Aircraft Co., 1941–49.

Founder and consultant, Aerojet Engineering Corp. (now Aerojet-General Corp.), Azusa, Calif., 1942 to date.

Consultant on high speed wind tunnel, Boeing Aircraft Co., Seattle, Wash.

Consultant in development of pumping equipment for the Los Angeles water system; the Grand Coulee Dam project; the Smith-Putnam wind turbine for development of electricity.

Member of the special committee appointed by the U.S. Navy to investigate the *Macon* and *Akron* dirigible disasters.

Consultant to the U.S. Army Air Force on design of the 20-foot wind tunnel at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

Chairman, advisory board, Allison Division, General Motors, 1957 to date.

Director, NAS-ARDC summer study groups, 1957–58.

HONORARY DEGREES

Doctor of engineering, Technische Hochschule, Berlin, Germany, 1928.

Doctor of engineering, University of Liège, Belgium, 1947.

Doctor of engineering, Princeton University, 1947.

Doctor of engineering, Columbia University, 1948.

Doctor of engineering, Yale University, 1951.

Doctor of engineering, Hebrew Institute of Technology, Haifa, 1952.

Doctor of engineering, Technische Hochschule, Aachen, Germany, 1953.

Doctor of engineering, Die Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zürich, Switzerland, 1955.

Doctor of science, University of Brussels, Belgium, 1937.

Doctor of science, University of Aix-Marseille, France, 1948.

Doctor of science, University of Lille, France, 1953.

Doctor of science, University of Istanbul, Turkey, 1953.

Doctor of applied sciences, Technische Universität, Berlin, Germany, 1953.

Doctor of law, University of California, 1943.

Honorary professor of Columbia University since 1948.

Professor emeritus, California Institute of Technology, 1949.

Doctor of science, Northwestern University, 1956.

Doctor, honoris causa, University of Paris, France, 1957.

Doctor of science, University of California, 1958.

LECTURER

Wright Brothers lecture, IAS, 1954.

Guggenheim Fund for the Promotion of Aeronautics, 1926.

Universities in Tokyo and Fukuoka (Japan), Nanking (China), and Calcutta (India), 1927–29.

Fifth Volta Congress, Italy, 1935.

Rouse Ball lecturer, Cambridge University, England, 1937.

American-Belgian Educational Foundation, 1937.

Wilbur Wright lecturer, Royal Aeronautical Society, England, 1937.

Josiah Willard Biggs lecturer, American Mathematical Society, 1940.

Tenth Wright Brothers lecture, Washington, D.C., 1946.

Robert Henry Thurston lecture, ASME, 1950.

Fulbright Act (USA), Sorbonne, Paris, France, 1951–52.

First Lanchester memorial lecture, 1957.

First Daniel and Florence Guggenheim memorial lecture, 1958.

MEMBERSHIPS

Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, honorary fellow.

Royal Aeronautical Society, honorary fellow.

American Rocket Society, fellow No. 1.

American Physical Society, fellow.

Society of Sigma XI, Cal. Tech. chapter, 1930.

Tau Beta Pi member, 1934.

Franklin Institute, honorary member.

American Geophysical Society, honorary member.

Associazione Italiana degli Ingegneri dell'-Automobile, honorary member.

Society of Civil Engineers, France, honorary member.

Société des Ingénieurs Civils de Belgique, honorary member.
National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., member.
Académie des Sciences, Paris, France, member.
Accademia dei Lincei, Roma, Italy, member.
Accademia delle Scienzie, Torino, Italy, member.
American Academy of Arts and Sciences, member.
American Philosophical Society, member.
American Society of Mechanical Engineers, member.
American Society of Civil Engineers, member.
American Ordnance Association, member.
Association Française des Ingénieurs et Techniciens de l'Aéronautique, member.
Royal Society of London, England, member.
Associazione Tecnica dell'Automobile, Torino, Italy, member.
Air Force Association, 1950.
Academy of Arts, Sevilla, Spain, 1955.
Pontifical Academy, 1955.
Membre de l'Institut, France, 1955.
Member, Scientific Advisory Board, Convair Division, General Dynamics, 1956.

DECORATIONS AND ORDERS

Army Air Force Commendation, for meritorious civilian service, 1945.
Medal of Merit, USA, 1946.
Officier de la Légion d'Honneur, France, 1947; Commandeur, Légion d'Honneur, France, 1955.
Grand Officer of the Order Al Merito della Republica awarded by the Italian Government, 1953.
Medal of Freedom, USA, 1956.
Gold Medal, U.S. Air Force, for exceptional civilian service, 1956.
The Great Cross with Stars of the Order of Merit of the Republic of Germany, 1955.
Great Officer in the Order of Orange-Nassau, Netherlands, 1956.
Spanish Grand Cross of Merit for Aeronautical Achievement, 1956.
Officer of the Order of Leopold (Belgium), 1958.

AWARDS

University of Liège Gold Medal, 1937.
Gold Medal (ASME), 1941.
Sylvanus Reed Award (IAS), 1942.
John Fritz Medal (ASCE, ASME, AIMME, AIEE), 1948.
Franklin Medal (Franklin Institute), 1948.
Lord Kelvin Gold Medal (England), 1950.
Air Power Award (U.S. Air Force Association), 1950.
Gold Medal (Royal Aeronautical Society, England), 1952.
Lord & Taylor Award, New York, 1953.
Trasenster Medal and Diploma, Association des Ingénieurs de Liège, Belgium, 1954.
Astronautics Award, American Rocket Society, 1954.
Wright Brothers Memorial Trophy, 1954.
Exceptional Service Award, U.S. Air Force, 1955.
Guggenheim Medal, 1955.
Louis Bréguet Award (Société Anonyme des Atliers d'Aviation Louis Bréguet), France, 1955.

PUBLICATIONS

"General Aerodynamic Theory" (with J. M. Burgers), two volumes, 1924.
"Mathematical Method in Engineering" (with M. A. Biot), English original, translated into French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, Turkish, and Japanese, 1940.
"Aerodynamics—Selected Topics in the Light of Their Historical Development," published by Cornell Press, English original, translated into French, Spanish, German, and Italian, 1954.
"Collected Works of Theodore von Karman (1902–52)," four volumes, published by Butterworths Scientific Publications.

Home address: 1501 South Marengo Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 133) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 32 other Senators I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate to create a standing Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. President, the creation of a standing committee in the Senate to handle excusively the voluminous and important legislation affecting veterans as a particular group has been the subject of numerous resolutions and parliamentary efforts since the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 became effective. While such a standing committee was deleted from the 1946 legislation as a measure of compromise made during the Senate debate, the original recommendation of the Reorganization Act provided for a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

In June 1959, the junior Senator from New York and the junior Senator from Nevada held hearings on this important subject and unanimously recommended the creation of such a standing committee. The recommendation was not passed by the full committee.

The veterans' organizations and many Senators favor this step. With this in mind, the other Senators have joined me in introducing this measure. I trust that a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs will be created during the 87th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 134), submitted by Mr. CANNON (for himself and Senators KEATING, BIBLE, BYRD of West Virginia, CARLSON, CARROLL, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, DOUGLAS, FONG, GRUENING, HICKEY, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, JAVITS, KEFAUVER, KUCHEL, LONG of Missouri, MCCARTHY, MCGEE, MOSS, MUNDT, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, SPARKMAN, TALMADGE, WILEY, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YOUNG of North Dakota, and YOUNG of Ohio) to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs, was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (1) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (p) the following new paragraph:

"(q) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all the wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out "and Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences; and Committee on Veterans' Affairs."

SEC. 3. Section 6(a) of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the designation of ex officio members of the Committee on Appropriations), is amended by adding at the end of the tabulation contained therein the following new item:

"Committee on Veterans' Affairs—For the Veterans' Administration."

SEC. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-seventh Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PROPOSED STUDY OF THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on July 24, 1959, I submitted a resolution calling for the establishment of a Senate Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense. Joining me as cosponsors were Senators Proxmire, Humphrey, Gruening, Byrd of West Virginia, Randolph, and the late Senator Neuberger of Oregon. This resolution, Senate Resolution 150, was referred to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

I now resubmit this resolution and ask consent that it lie on the desk until Monday next in order that Senators who wish may add their names as cosponsors. I also ask that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, some rather acrimonious words have been exchanged of late on the floor of the Senate on the subject of the location of defense contracts. Let me make it clear at the outset that Michigan has no quarrel with either New York or California. Let me make clear also that I do not advocate that defense procurement should become a tool for economic planning, nor do I believe it should be used for political reward or reprisal.

What I do contend is that defense procurement has an enormous impact on our economy. I am satisfied this can be proved; defense procurement undertakings of the Federal Government, by their very magnitude, cannot escape having such an impact. The Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems,

in its report of March 30, 1960, expressed it this way:

The impact of defense spending on the Nation's economy is greater than that of any other single item in the Federal budget. Any study of unemployment would be incomplete without consideration of this factor because the magnitude of the defense budget and the rate at which large sums are spent affect not only the armament industries, but nearly every other industry in the country * * *.

The magnitude of our commitments is unprecedented. For the past 8 years national security expenditures have amounted to more than $40 billion a year—almost 10 percent of our gross national product—and are likely to continue at this or a higher level. Expenditures of this dimension have an obvious impact on such diverse aspects of our economy as tax and monetary policy, development of natural resources, allocations for domestic needs within the Federal budget, and the development of new patterns of international trade. Nowhere, however, is the impact more apparent to the average citizen than in the area of employment and unemployment, as industrial producers shift to meet the rapidly changing needs of our military planners.

The Military Establishment itself recognizes the weight of this economic impact. Two years ago W. J. McNeil, then Assistant Secretary and Comptroller of the Defense Department, testifying before the Joint Economic Committee, said:

The trend of expenditures, of course, does not give the full picture of the impact of the defense program on the economy. Also important in terms of economic impact is the rate of defense obligations since, as stated earlier, obligations reflect the rate at which orders and contracts will be placed for goods and services.

The Department of Defense budget is normally summarized in terms of major categories. While the major procurement category has perhaps the most direct impact on the economy, there is a substantial flow of orders and contracts from obligations in other categories.

In tracing the impact of the defense program on the private economy, it is useful to examine the relationship between defense expenditures and obligations for military hard goods on the one hand, and sales, new orders, unfilled orders and inventories of the durable goods industries on the other hand. The relationship between the defense program and industry is most clear-cut in this area.

It is difficult to say whether the planned increase in defense order placements during this January–June 1958 period will be sufficient to reverse the trend in the durable-goods industries. But this much can be said; the increased rate of defense order placements certainly will be a positive factor in the economic picture, not only during the current 6-month period, but also beyond.

There is also a psychological impact. I am not perhaps the best one to estimate its effect. But the minute that orders are placed there is a different feeling than if there are no orders received or no hope of getting orders.

I think I detect, when I talk to a good many people from industry, quite a difference in their forward outlook when they see signs of business coming than when they do not see it coming. Particularly after they receive an order, the attitude changes noticeably.

The present Assistant Secretary and Comptroller, Charles J. Hitch, is co-author with Roland N. McKean of a book published last year entitled "Project Rand: The Economics of Defense in the Nuclear Age." In the summary of this excellent series of studies, on page 6, there appear the following key paragraphs:

Defense spending has a number of side effects over and above the direct costs and gains. A large defense budget, like any other large expenditure, affects the task of maintaining economic stability, increasing the likelihood of inflation and decreasing the probability of deflation. A large and fluctuating defense budget could aggravate considerably the difficulty of stabilizing the economy. To minimize the ill effects of prolonged cold war programs (even if expanded considerably), we need mainly improved monetary-fiscal policies that would damp price and income fluctuations.

Large defense expenditures, like any large Government program, may have other indirect costs, e.g., impairment of incentives, if the tax structure is poorly designed, and of the functioning of competition. But they may also produce significant indirect benefits, such as increases in the stock of capital and technological advances that become valuable in the private economy.

Most recently we have had the forthright speech of the able Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. Speaking in New York on April 24 he said:

Defense spending represents more than one-half of the Federal budget, and nearly 10 percent of the gross national product.

As one weapons system is phased out and another one developed, defense business moves not only from one contractor to another, but from industry to industry and from State to State * * *.

As our choices become more complex, their consequences extend further and further into the web of our economy * * *. In the typical weapons system today, there may be as many as six or eight layers of subcontractors * * *.

There are a number of steps we can take, some of them within the Department of Defense, and some of them involving the country as a whole * * *.

Our planning must extend further into the future in order to provide a leadtime sufficient to permit adjustment to the future consequences of present decisions * * *.

We can continue to expect, therefore, that there will be major shifts in our defense program from year to year, and perhaps more often.

Here we have responsible officials, each making clear the point. Surely we need not argue whether $40 billion should be spent with no regard for its impact on the economy. That point has been settled.

Indeed, in a haphazard way we recognize and attempt to deal with the effects of defense activity through such programs as aid for education in federally impacted areas, the Capehart housing program, Defense Manpower Order No. 4, the shipyard differentials, and on occasion the requirement for dispersal of subcontracts.

All agree that these defense sums are not spent in a vacuum. The next question is, "How many factors is it reasonable to require officials of the Defense Establishment to have in mind when their primary concern is with essential military requirements?" We know that they consider price; they consider speed; they consider quality; they consider transportation; sometimes they consider climate. Countless subjective evaluations are made on technical qualifications and corporate and financial capabilities before these contracts are let. I do not know to what extent they may consider the effects of procurement on business competition and monopoly. Where we bog down is on whether they should also consider idle human beings and idle plants.

This question is too basic to be dismissed as a battle between politicians for the spoils. No responsible person is asking that the defense procurement be divided into 50 equal parts, or into 50 parts based on taxation or on population or on any other such factor. The point those of us who have raised our voices are trying to get across is that the strength of our economy and therefore the welfare of the Nation requires a concerted effort to gear this enormous amount of Federal spending to the weak spots in our economy.

Essentially, our concern lies in three areas: insufficient use of competitive bidding; insufficient use of small business; and insufficient use of labor surplus areas.

What about competitive bidding? The Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. PROXMIRE, pointed to the testimony of Comptroller General Campbell before the House Armed Services Special Subcommittee on Procurement Practices in the Department of Defense, May 5, 1960. Among other things, Mr. Campbell said:

We believe that a careful examination of the use of the authority to negotiate and the development of effective criteria and guidelines for the use of contract negotiators would result in a substantial reduction of negotiated procurement in favor of procurements by formal advertising and would better serve the interests of both the Government and industry.

Steps should be taken to obtain proposals from qualified offerers, and to give all offerers, within a competitive range, an opportunity to discuss their proposals.

The Joint Economic Committee, in October 1960, pointed out that the exception has become the rule: the intent of the law notwithstanding, the great majority of military purchases are now made by negotiated contracts. The committee has this to say:

When the subjective, negotiated procedure is employed, the competition is between the companies with their technical staff, background, facilities, know-how and persuasion, and the Government contracting officers. This procedure permits the exercise of choice and so is subject to influence and pressure.

A great responsibility is thus placed upon the contracting officer of the Government since he is the dispenser of business, often out of all proportion to his salary. This is the lifeblood of industry, communities, States, and regions, and the source of individual employment and well-being. He thus controls great economic power and his actions cannot be considered merely as procurement matters.

Since negotiated contracting and particularly, cost reimbursement-type contracting is not a testing of free and full competitive forces, it follows that the system as practiced, is actually one of governmental control. Government officers, not competitive forces, dictate decisions of broad economic impact such as location, survival, and expansion of industry. (Economics Aspects of Military Procurement and Supply.)

What about small business? So many pious words have been spoken on the need for our small, independent businesses to share in the defense effort, I hesitate to add to the collection. Suffice it to say that despite all the mountains of protestations, we have so far produced not even a mouse. As the February 2, 1961, report of the Senate Small Business Committee indicates, the small business share of total military procurement has steadily declined from 25.3 percent in 1954 to 16.1 percent in 1960.

The platform of the Democratic Party, adopted in Los Angeles, pledges "a more equitable share of Government contracts to small and independent business." I want to see us get on with this commitment.

What about the matching of defense contracts with idle resources, both human and capital? This is the third aspect of this problem. We must find a means of better matching defense contracts with these idle resources. Last October, in Warren, Mich., then Senator and now President Kennedy said:

> I believe that Defense Manpower Policy No. 4, as it was known, should be reinstated, so those areas of the country which have high unemployment—we could use our defense contracts to put people to work as well as make weapons.

Then in his message of February 2, 1961, to the Congress on a program to restore momentum to the American economy, the President said:

> A principal purpose of the proposed Area Redevelopment Act is to create new jobs in chronic labor surplus areas by bringing in new private industries. It would be anomalous for the Government to urge these locations on private industry while ignoring these areas in the location of its own activities. Agencies of the Federal Government, in locating new facilities or deciding upon the use of existing facilities, are directed to give every reasonable preference to labor surplus areas.
>
> And I have today sent a directive to the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Labor, and the General Services Administration requesting prompt steps to improve the machinery by which Federal contracts can be channeled to firms located in labor surplus areas.

There were 101 major areas of substantial labor surplus as of February 1961. In these areas alone the work force totals 29 million persons. This fact was stressed by the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. But if you compare these 101 areas with the areas receiving defense contracts, it appears that the right hand does not know that the other hand exists. Let me use Michigan as an example, while making clear I do not propose a raid on any other State—north, east, south, or west. Michigan has a statewide unemployment rate of 14.2 percent. For the period October–December 1960, Michigan received 2.5 percent of the value of military prime contract awards.

All communities must be confident that they can seek defense procurement on an equal basis. Unless guidelines are established which insure that industry in whatever State has equal opportunity to share in the economic activity resulting from defense procurement, we will continue to have friction and wasteful haggling.

It goes beyond the point we have repeatedly raised in this continuing concern and debate. Communist propagandists long have charged that the United States is insincere in its efforts to control and to reduce armaments. Communist propaganda charges the American economy cannot survive unless it is fed with munitions dollars. I sometimes think there are Americans who, though not admitting it, themselves feel that the charge is true.

Go into a community which has just lost its principal payroll as a result of the termination of a defense contract. That community has experienced "disarmament" and it is altogether possible that there would be voices in that community who would agree that our economy could not survive the withdrawal of all defense procurement, the ultimate result of complete disarmament.

Inevitably, more and more areas of this Nation will feel the shock of removal of an important military payroll. Changes in military strategy and deployment of forces, the constant demands for new skills, the rapid technological and scientific advances all point to the fact that our defense procurement will be based upon change. The community which has never suffered the hardships which come from loss of a substantial defense activity cannot appreciate the impact upon the community which does suffer such loss; but more and more of our people are experiencing this type of upheaval.

The committee which I suggest in the resolution I am offering could provide a means whereby all impartial observers could see that we have prepared, by concerning ourselves with this subject long before disarmament becomes a probability, the means of orderly transition. If we can learn to handle the disarmament which results from shifting patterns in defense procurement, we will be in a better position to handle the broader changes which would result from any international agreement for arms limitation.

The development of successful machinery for adjusting to this continuing disarmament would strengthen our economy for the period immediately ahead; it would also provide an answer to Communist propaganda that our economy will collapse without the stimulus of arms manufacture.

I do not suggest that there are easy answers. What I do want to suggest is that this is a matter so fundamental to our strength as a Nation, so essential indeed to our long-term military position, that the Congress should no longer postpone a very thorough study of the impact of defense on our economy. We should recall the recommendation of the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems—"study by an appropriate committee of the impact of military procurement and deployment policies upon employment stability and unemployment, and consideration of measures to ease resulting dislocations."

An ever increasing number of my Senate colleagues have advocated such a study: the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], to name a few.

My resolution proposes a Senate select committee composed of three members each from the Armed Services Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Finance Committee, and three other Members of the Senate. This select committee would be instructed to make exhaustive studies of the extent to which defense procurement policies in the United States are related to the national economy. It would in no sense attempt to make a whippingboy out of any State or region. It would seek to determine the steps that could be taken to minimize the inflationary and deflationary effects of defense spending; it would consider what methods and processes of procurement will result in the least depletion of our national strength; and I would hope that it would look into the effects on competition and monopoly.

If a different committee structure would be more acceptable to the Senate, I would ask that the resolution be modified to meet that desire. But I do hope this resolution may be considered by the committee. The growing acrimony on this subject does us no good. The subject is of such urgency to our Nation's continued military and economic strength that I suggest it must be given this thorough and objective study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The resolution (S. Res. 135) was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

> Whereas a strong economy is essential to the continued welfare of the Nation, to its agricultural and industrial development, and to the national security; and
>
> Whereas Congress has recognized the need for controlling inflation and providing maximum production and employment; and
>
> Whereas the spending of the Department of Defense is the largest single item in the national budget at the present time; and
>
> Whereas the world situation indicates that this situation will continue into the foreseeable future; and
>
> Whereas the impact of this spending has a direct relationship to the Nation's economic well-being;
>
> Whereas the defense expenditure policy could have significant bearing on business competition and monopoly; and
>
> Whereas the termination, modification, or increase of the major defense undertakings frequently result in serious dislocation of the Nation's labor force; and
>
> Whereas an international disarmament agreement would involve readjustments in our Nation's defense policies; and
>
> Whereas maximum return for defense expenditures is essential to our continued prosperity; and
>
> Whereas the Senate, in connection with provision of funds adequate for national defense and maintenance of a sound economy, desires to have recommendations relative to

methods to achieve these essential goals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there shall be established a select committee of the Senate which shall make exhaustive studies of the extent to which defense procurement policies in the United States are related to the national economy, and the extent and character of defense procurement policies that can be expected to be required to provide for the national defense and maintain the Nation's economic strength to the end that such studies and the recommendations based thereon may be available to the Senate in considering defense procurement policies for the future. The committee shall be designated "The Senate Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense".

SEC. 2. (a) The committee shall be composed of three members of the Committee on Armed Services, three members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, three members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, three members of the Committee on Finance, and three members of the Select Committee on Small Business; all said members to be designated by the chairman of the respective committees, at least one member designated from each of the above committees being selected from the minority membership thereof. In addition, there shall be three Members of the Senate designated by the President of the Senate, at least one being from the minority membership thereof. The committee shall cease to exist at the close of business on January 31, 1963.

(b) Any vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect its powers, and any vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner as provided for determining the original membership.

(c) Nine members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

(d) The chairman shall be chosen by the members at the first meeting.

SEC. 3. The committee shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation with respect to the following matters:

(a) The impact of defense procurement spending on the national economy from 1946 to the present time;

(b) The extent to which this spending is currently affecting our economy;

(c) Estimate of future trends in defense spending and their effect on the economy;

(d) Steps which could be taken consistent with the defense effort, to minimize the inflationary and deflationary effects of defense spending;

(e) The character of legislation that may encourage the adoption of new methods and improved processes of defense procurement which will result in the least depletion of our national strength; and

(f) Such other factors it may consider necessary to attain a full and complete understanding of the impact of defense spending and defense procurement policies upon our national economy, our foreign policy, and the national defense.

SEC. 4. (a) For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to (1) make such expenditures; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjournment periods of the Senate; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony orally or by deposition; and (7) employ and fix the compensation of such technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants as it deems advisable, except that the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for comparable duties.

(b) Upon request made by the members of the committee selected from the minority party, the committee shall appoint one assistant or consultant designated by such members. No assistant or consultant appointed by the committee may receive compensation at an annual gross rate which exceeds by more than $1,200 the annual gross rate of compensation of any individual so designated by the minority members of the committee.

(c) With the prior consent of the executive department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, the committee may (1) utilize the services, information, and facilities of any such department or agency, and (2) employ on a reimbursable basis the services of such personnel of any such department or agency as it deems advisable. With the consent of any other committee of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, the committee may utilize the facilities and the services of the staff of such other committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the committee determines that such action is necessary and appropriate.

(d) Subpenas may be issued by the committee over the signature of the chairman or any other member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $175,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

IMPARTIAL SETTLEMENT BY JUDICIAL MEANS OF LEGAL DISPUTES ARISING UNDER TREATIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, for myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], a resolution which provides that treaties to which the United States is a party should include provisions calling for the impartial settlement by judicial means of legal disputes arising under the treaties; and for the utilization of the international court of justice, the World Court.

Now more than ever the United States must reaffirm its dedication to the principle that the rule of law should replace the rule of force in international affairs.

The resolution states:

Whereas the Senate has, under the Constitution, the duty and responsibility of giving its advice and consent to treaties entered into between the United States and foreign nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States shall, in negotiating any treaty or other international agreement, use his best efforts to secure the inclusion therein of provisions calling for the impartial settlement by judicial means of legal disputes arising under such treaty or agreement to which the United States is a party, taking due account in such negotiations of the availability of the International Court of Justice as the principal judicial arm of the United Nations.

Earlier in the session, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and I cosponsored a bill to strike out the 1946 Connally reservation to U.S. membership in the World Court, which gives the United States a veto power over the Court's jurisdiction. Favorable action on both these measures would erase the incongruity from our often-expressed determination to utilize the international judicial machinery to settle disagreements by force of reason and law, not by force of arms.

Should this judicial machinery get the support which this resolution proposes, it could then be expanded, along the lines studied by the American Bar Association, to include the establishment of regional courts of the International Court of Justice.

It is my intention to supplement in every way possible the efforts of a committee of the American Bar Association which is seeking to establish the rule of law through greater utilization of the International Court of Justice and through the establishment of regional judicial bodies for the purpose of the elimination of disputes between nations. I believe this is the true and final objective toward world peace, which we must assert in every way possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 136) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States declared in his inaugural address on January 20, 1961: "Let both sides join in a new endeavor—not a new balance of power, but a new world of law," and further declared in his state of the Union message of January 30, 1961: "Where nature makes natural allies of us all, we can demonstrate that beneficial relations are possible even with those with whom we disagree—and this must some day be the basis of world law"; and

Whereas President Dwight D. Eisenhower declared in his state of the Union message of January 9, 1959: "It is my purpose to intensify efforts during the coming 2 years * * * to the end that the rule of law may replace the obsolete rule of force in the affairs of nations"; and

Whereas President Harry S Truman stated on March 17, 1948: "The principles and purposes expressed in the Charter of the United Nations continue to represent our hope for the eventual establishment of the rule of law in international affairs"; and

Whereas the Honorable Christian A. Herter, as Secretary of State of the United States, declared on September 1, 1960: "We seek to move toward a world of law—not as a remote and abstract goal, but as something we are beginning to accomplish now through tangible and specific steps"; and

Whereas the Honorable George C. Marshall, as Secretary of State of the United States, said in a speech on September 17, 1947: "The Government of the United States believes that the surest foundation for permanent peace lies in the extension of the benefits and the restraints of the rule of law to all peoples and to all governments"; and

Whereas the Honorable Cordell Hull, as Secretary of State of the United States, stated on September 12, 1943: "Disputes of a legal character which present a threat to the peace of the world should be adjudicated by an International Court of Justice whose decisions would be based upon application of principles of law"; and

Whereas the United States Government is actively seeking to promote world peace with justice by encouraging the nations of the world to permit appropriate international tribunals to adjudicate legal disputes which might arise among them; and

Whereas, in 1946, the United States, pursuant to a declaration deposited with the

Secretary General of the United Nations, advised and consented to by the Senate (S. Res. 196 of the Seventy-ninth Congress), accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice over legal disputes to which it is a party subject to the Connolly reservation; and

Whereas provisions for the settlement of disputes arising under treaties and other international agreements by the International Court of Justice or other judicial means have been incorporated in treaties and agreements such as the Articles of Agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (article IX), the Arti- of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (article IX), the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund (article XVIII), the constitution of the International Labor Organization (article 37), the constitution of the World Health Organization (article 75), and the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency (article XVII); and

Whereas the Senate has, under the Constitution, the duty and responsibility of giving its advice and consent to treaties entered into between the United States and foreign nations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States shall, in negotiating any treaty or other international agreement, use its best efforts to secure the inclusion therein of provisions calling for the impartial settlement by judicial means of legal disputes arising under such treaty or agreement to which the United States is a party, taking due account in such negotiations of the availability of the International Court of Justice as the principal judicial arm of the United Nations.

REPEAL OF CHAPTER 43 OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 859) to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, and that the bill be appropriately rereferred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 859) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS BY ALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN DEDUCTIONS FOR FEDERAL INCOME TAX PURPOSES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on January 5, 1961, I introduced the bill (S. 2) to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable. I ask unanimous consent that if and when the bill is reprinted, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] may be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RAILWAY SAFETY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1669) to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of certain parts on railroad cars, and to require carriers by railroad to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes, introduced by me on April 18, 1961, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as cosponsor on S. 1669, a bill to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of certain parts on railroad cars, and to require carriers by railroad to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes. This bill was introduced on April 18 by the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

SURVEY OF RACCOON CREEK WATERSHED, INDIANA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARTKE's name be added as a sponsor of S. 753, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make an examination and survey of the Raccoon Creek watershed, Indiana, for soil conservation and recreation purposes, which was introduced by Senator CAPEHART on February 2, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION TO STUDY THE PROBLEM OF ALCOHOLISM IN THE UNITED STATES — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has long been active in the support of legislation designed to provide an effective program for the study and treatment of alcoholism. As a member of the Iowa State Senate, he sponsored legislation which, on the State level, was designed to provide centers for the treatment of alcoholism and for the dissemination of information calculated to prevent the spread of alcoholism. As a Member of the U.S. Senate, it is his earnest desire to work for this type of activity on the national level.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that he be listed as a cosponsor, with me, of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 72) to establish a Commission To Study the Problem of Alcoholism in the United States and to make recommendations for the more adequate provision of facilities for the treatment, rehabilitation, and cure of alcoholics, and for the prevention of alcoholism, and that the joint resolution carry his name at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wesley H. Petrie, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal, district of Hawaii, for a term of 4 years, vice Thomas R. Clark;

Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of Oklahoma, for a term of 4 years, vice Frank D. McSherry;

Cato Ellis, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal, for the western district of Tennessee, for a term of 4 years, vice George C. Harrison;

John H. Reddy, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney, for the eastern district of Tennessee, for a term of 4 years, vice John C. Crawford, Jr., resigned;

Joseph F. Radigan, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney, for the district of Vermont, for a term of 4 years, vice Louis G. Whitcomb, resigned; and

B. Andrew Potter, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney, for the western district of Oklahoma, for a term of 4 years, vice Paul W. Cress.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, May 10, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

Address entitled "Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Soldier-Statesman," delivered by Senator BUTLER upon the occasion of the 10th anniversary of General MacArthur's speech before a joint session of Congress.

By Mr. PELL:

Address delivered by Senator HART at a conference held by the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, at New York, N.Y., on March 24, 1961.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Address entitled "Policy for Growth," delivered by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges before the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., April 24, 1961.

Editorial entitled "C–21 Is Coming Strong," published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of April 21, 1961.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

Editorial entitled "Giving Protocol Meaning," published in the Washington Post of April 22, 1961, as a reprint from the Milwaukee Journal.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Letter of April 24, 1961, and telegram of May 1, 1961, sent by him to Mr. John A. Jones, Director of Public Relations, Weirton Steel Co., Weirton, W. Va., in connection with Steelmark Month in the upper Ohio Valley.

TENNESSEE VALLEY FLOOD CONTROL REGULATIONS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority announced today that 15 cities in the Tennessee Valley have adopted regulations involving construction in flood hazard areas, and that final action on similar regulations is pending in eight other cities.

These actions by the cities to solve their flood problems have been made possible primarily by their participation in a cooperative program involving TVA, the States of the Tennessee Valley area, and the local communities. Many communities have local flood problems which the overall TVA flood control system cannot solve, and this cooperative program affords much needed relief to participating cities.

An excellent example of how two Tennessee cities have faced up to their flood problems and, through participation in the cooperative program, have gone far in solving them, is presented in an article written by Glenn E. Waters, Jr., of the Tennessee State Planning Commission, and published in a recent issue of the Tennessee Planner. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO CITIES FACE THEIR FLOOD PROBLEMS

(Glenn E. Walters, Jr., senior area planner, middle Tennessee office)

In my role as city planner working with Columbia and Shelbyville, I have been involved directly and indirectly in assisting their planning commissions in adopting flood damage prevention measures. In a joint program sponsored by the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Tennessee State Planning Commission, these two Duck River cities have undertaken the task of solving their flood problems. This task will be accomplished by enforcing flood damage prevention amendments in their subdivision regulations and by adopting flood damage prevention regulations in their zoning ordinances.

The Local Flood Relations Branch of TVA has rendered an invaluable service to Columbia and Shelbyville in studying past flood histories and in preparing reports making flood damage prevention recommendations for future probable floods. Their recommendations are based on rainfall in the region and on past flood histories on the Duck River and nearby tributaries.

Columbia and Shelbyville have approached the problem of flood damage prevention through the process of regulating land use in urban areas. Both cities have municipal-regional planning commissions with regional jurisdiction extending approximately five miles beyond their present city limits. In the area outside the corporate limits, the most effective land use regulating measure that the cities presently have to work with are subdivision regulations. Within the city limits, the regulation of land development in the flood plain can be carried out by the enforcement of the zoning ordinance as well as of subdivision regulations.

The Shelbyville and Columbia Planning Commissions have approved floodway zoning provisions, and each has recommended that they be adopted by the city council and be made a part of the zoning ordinance. These zoning ordinance revisions will regulate construction and land use in the open floodway zone and flood fringe areas in the cities. Columbia now has in effect flood prevention sections in its subdivision regulation, and the Shelbyville Planning Commission has approved flood prevention measures to be included in its subdivision regulations.

FLOODING CONTRIBUTES TO URBAN BLIGHT

John W. Weathers, TVA hydrologic engineer, has stated that he has no problem in locating the slum areas in any city; he simply looks for the areas that are subject to flooding conditions and invariably he finds an area which is blighted and conducive to slum development. This writer feels that this is a basic fact which city planners and city officials should recognize. The only way to prevent further blight of this type is to prevent the area from being further developed and to remove the structures now existing in the area. The only tool that the city has at its disposal to prevent further development of areas subject to flooding is the adoption of flood prevention measures as part of its zoning ordinance and subdivision regulations.

As in the case of Shelbyville's Big Springs Urban Renewal Area, blighting conditions, which are both a direct and indirect result of frequent inundation of an area, are very costly to correct. The total cost of the Shelbyville urban renewal project, encompassing some 161 acres, will be in excess of $6 million. Sixty-nine acres in the project area are subject to periodic flooding from the Duck River backwaters, which exceeded the bankfull stage by 20 feet during the March 1902 flood of record. Flood control measures for the area will be considered as part of the total cost of the project. The city's share of the estimated cost will be $1,600,000, a sum for which the city of Shelbyville will gain tremendous benefits.

The TVA local flood relations branch will prepare a basic flood data report for any community in the TVA region. These reports contain information that the average city planner is not equipped to compile and which, in many instances, cannot be obtained without consulting with a hydrological engineer. Cities which are not located in the Tennessee Valley drainage area can get assistance from the U.S. Corps of Engineers or U.S. Geologic Survey concerning local flood data for their areas upon which to base flood damage prevention measures. The Corps of Engineers is now undertaking studies of this nature in various parts of Tennessee and in other States.

A great many city officials are not aware of the true flood damage potential within their urban and suburban areas. Without an engineering report concerning this potential, most city officials will continue to take no action to protect areas which otherwise may require very costly future urban renewal projects. It seems to me that one of the prerequisites for any city planning program would be to have a flood report concerning the flood potential of any and all streams passing through the urban area.

EXTENSIVE DAMAGE IN SHELBYVILLE

The February 1948 and March 1955 floods which occurred on the Duck River emphasized the great need for flood protection of developed areas in and around Shelbyville. Damage estimated at approximately $132,000 was caused by the 1948 flood which entered 141 homes, 63 business places, 5 churches, and 2 industries in the city. The city waterplant was out of operation for nearly 24 hours. The 1955 flood in Shelbyville caused damages estimated at approximately $36,700. Floodwaters entered 73 homes, 44 business places, and 2 churches, in depths ranging from a few inches to several feet.

Damages from these two floods were far more costly than that which resulted from a flood which occurred in Shelbyville in March 1902, the greatest flood known in Shelbyville. This extra flood damage was due to the urban development which had taken place within the level flood plain near the city. Continued development within this area in the future will create even greater potential flood damage. If the flood fringe area is also allowed to develop as it has in the past, the city can look forward to a $12 million urban renewal project by 1980. Can Shelbyville afford to let this happen? The answer to this question is obvious.

A TVA flood damage report stated that the March 1902 flood was the highest known flood to have occurred on the Duck River in 71 years. The report went on to state that the March 1902 flood should not be considered the maximum probable flood; in other words, a flood of greater magnitude could reasonably be expected some time in the future. The study pointed out that record floods of the past are not necessarily the maximum which might be expected in the future. From a thorough study of past storms and floods in the Duck River vicinity, TVA determined that floods of regional expectancy on the Duck River could have a discharge of 93,000 cubic feet per second at Shelbyville as compared to the peak discharge of 87,000 cubic feet per second in the March 1902 flood.

In order to prevent further or future flood damage in and around Shelbyville, the TVA study recommended that two districts be established. One district called the open floodway district, should be kept free and unobstructed by buildings. The other district would be called a flood fringe district and buildings to be erected therein would be regulated as to their floor height or foundation elevation. These two districts were delineated on a topographic map of the Shelbyville region by the TVA hydrologic engineers.

The Shelbyville Municipal-Regional Planning Commission went on record as approving flood plain provisions for both their subdivision regulations and zoning ordinance.

COLUMBIA'S EXPERIENCE

The flood which occurred on February 14, 1948, was the highest known flood recorded in Columbia. At that time, the flood waters exceeded the bankfull stage by 20 feet, and many residential and commercial buildings were flooded. The city's communications and utilities were also affected by the flood waters.

Records indicate that the second highest known flood was the flood which occurred on March 29, 1902. This flood was approximately 4 feet lower than the 1948 flood.

In the past 70 years approximately 46 floods have occurred which exceeded the bankfull stage of 32 feet in Columbia. In the past two decades, extensive development has taken place in and around the Duck River flood plain which has made the cause for alarm and need for action more evident. The February 1948 flood inundated approximately 35 commercial buildings, causing damages estimated at $213,000, which is probably a very conservative figure.

In the February 1948 flood the old U.S. Highway 31 bridge was flooded, and the city was temporarily divided until the flood waters receded. The new U.S. Highway 31 bridge, built after the 1948 flood, will clear the 1948 flood height by at least three feet. This points out the need for flood data in preparing road plans for cities. Columbia has taken this factor into consideration in reevaluating its major road plan.

The Columbia Municipal-Regional Planning Commission, thanks to the TVA flood

damage reports and recommendations, is now regulating development within the Duck River and Little Bigby Creek flood plains. The amount of money this program is saving the citizens and businessmen by regulating land use and advising them of the flood potential is impossible to calculate.

Flood protection for a city simply involves the delineation of the area which is subject to inundation and the determination of the open floodway area needed to carry expected or predicted flood waters through the urban and suburban areas. Flood profiles and floodways may be determined by the TVA Local Flood Relation Branch or by some other reliable engineering source. Once this information has been ascertained, the city planning commission and city councilmen should delineate these areas on all their future maps. They are then in a position to pass appropriate regulations to prevent the improper development of the areas which are subject to flooding and to guide the future development of the areas affected by floods.

No city should be without flood protection or ignorant of the flood dangers in its region. The adoption of flood protection provisions in a city's subdivision regulations and zoning ordinance is simply a matter of public discussion and planning. In most instances the present building inspector could see that these provisions are properly administered without taking a course in hydrological engineering or being excessively overburdened by the additional work.

Columbia and Shelbyville are two cities that have found that flood damage prevention can best be implemented by keeping the people away from the flood water instead of trying to keep the water away from the people.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there has been considerable criticism from time to time of the International Cooperation Administration. No doubt some of the criticism has been justified. However, it is a pleasure when one receives a report from a disinterested observer, which reveals how effective the work of the Administration can be. I refer particularly to the Community Development project of ICA, which provides technical and financial assistance to the Office of the Presidential Assistant on Community Development in the Government of the Philippines—an agency responsible for overall rural betterment. The Chief of this Community Development project is Mr. Richard Bernhart, a former Iowan, who has been doing an outstanding job.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the March 15 edition of the Oelwein Daily Register, of Iowa, which sets forth an excellent on-the-spot evaluation of the project by Mr. Lew Warren, editor and publisher of the Register.

Mr. President, lest there be any doubt over the objectivity of Mr. Warren's editorial, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD another editorial from the Oelwein Daily Register of April 26, which sharply criticizes some of the abuses and mismanagement which have occurred in our foreign aid programs, but at the same time evidences the thinking of the people of Iowa in support of bipartisanship in dealing firmly with the Communist threat—both in words and in deeds.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oelwein Daily Register, Mar. 15, 1961]

FILIPINOS PULLING THEMSELVES UP BY THEIR OWN BOOTSTRAPS

Because of the eagerness of the Filipinos to learn and become self-sufficient as well as the intelligently planned program of U.S. assistance through the community development program of the ICA, the Philippines are rapidly moving ahead. Their record represents one of the bright spots on our international map.

When 10 young government officials visited Oelwein early this year on a field trip from their four months study at the University of Wisconsin, this newspaper explained through considerable publicity the cooperative program between the United States and the Philippine Government. During our recent visit to the Philippines, we had an opportunity to observe firsthand how the program develops and the results to date.

The community development project of the International Cooperation Administration (ICA), formerly known as point four, provides technical and financial assistance to the Office of the Presidential Assistant on Community Development (PACD), the Philippine Government agency responsible to the President for overall rural betterment. The agency was set up wisely by the late President Ramon Magsaysay. The PACD works with the U.S. ICA (headed by Richard Bernhart, formerly of Oelwein, as Chief of the Community Development Division). We observed firsthand the 6-month training program where young men and women, properly qualified, are trained to go into the barrios (villages) and head up community improvement programs.

Each student entered in the course must have had 4 years of college training. There is a constant, unlimited waiting list among Filipinos for entry into the program because a job is guaranteed immediately after successful completion of the course. We met and visited with these people who exhibited the same enthusiasm that we evidenced in Oelwein among the 10 young men who visited there. With the present 13th course 2,200 young men will have been enrolled and actively carrying out the program in the villages, which represent some 80 percent of the Philippine population. The goal is 7,000. The United States started with $4 million, the Philippine Government zero, 4 years ago. Each year the United States gives less and the Philippine Government more. At the present the U.S. share has dropped to $2 million. This year's budget calls for 8 million pesos from the Philippine Government, 6.3 million pesos from the United States. Ultimately the Philippines will be operating their own program. This joint project between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, in our opinion, is the only foreign aid type of program that is really effective. We noticed that Filipinos would reduce their food and shelter requirements before they would reduce or cut back their personal education plans. Night school is common. The Filipinos yearn for knowledge and education. The rate of literacy is among the highest in the world.

It is gratifying to see this evidence of working togetherness with a country so close to Red China and to note that this doubtless is the most effective way possible, because it is a positive action program, to combat Communist influence in the archipelago.

The PACD training center is near the agricultural college. We visited with its business manager. Some 2,000 students are enrolled; 2,000 pesos per year per student (300 of which is tuition). Two thousand pesos represents about US$700. Through our ICA and the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations some 36 students are enrolled there from southeast Asia, including Pakistan, Laos, Indonesia, Nepal, Vietnam. The facilities are excellent, the curriculum complete.

This great agricultural college experiences the same staffing difficulties that characterize Iowa colleges and universities—need for more funds and necessity of raising faculty salaries to get the best instructors. Top now paid for full professors is 10,200 pesos (US$3,400); minimum is 7,800 pesos. The agricultural college's present budget is 2 million pesos for the year, which it receives from the Government via the University of the Philippines. In addition a half million is received for rice and corn research, and a new rice institute is being planned.

The Philippine people are doing a tremendous job in improving their standards and keeping the freedom light burning brightly. Much credit should go toward such programs as the community development of the ICA and its Filipino counterpart, the PACD. On the campuses, in business offices, and at social occasions we saw the warm friendliness and feeling of equality expressed by American and Filipino men and women toward each other. It is this sort of mutual expression of interests involving the men as well as their wives which should be burned indelibly into the U.S. training program for all diplomatic representatives from the embassies down. When there is mutual friendship, cooperation, and respect between people around the world and Americans placed in their cities, then success of the programs is much more likely. This is happening between ICA and PACD in Manila.

[From the Oelwein Daily Register, Apr. 28, 1961]

TALKING UP TO RUSSIA

It has been infuriating to read the critical blasts released from the Kremlin which accuse this country of endangering world peace by "aggression" in Cuba by a nation that has penetrated other countries and supplied antigovernment Communist rebels with impunity.

We feel President Kennedy's answer to one of these blasts was significant in which he said we do not propose to listen to preachings from a nation whose record was written in blood on the streets of Budapest.

But Adlai Stevenson, our U.N. Ambassador, has not been forceful in his replies. It is conspicuous that his best argument was never used. While the United Nations has been concerned with the Laos fighting, Stevenson as well as the administration have not reminded the world, as they should have, that it is Russian guns and tanks and other equipment that have been keeping the pro-Communist, antigovernment rebels in Laos on the offensive. Certainly the United States did not start an airlift of supplies and arms to Cuban attackers, but that is exactly what Russia has been doing flagrantly for weeks and months and the whole world knows it.

It is disheartening to read that Nehru, allegedly a neutral, attacked the United States for the Cuban fiasco while at the time of Russia's open aggression in Hungary he did not see fit to raise a finger or utter a word of criticism.

The United States is reaping the whirlwind because of the very foreign aid that has been designed to make us popular. Since we launched our policy of spending billions in foreign aid at the expense of American taxpayers, starting with the Marshall plan, we have reaped nothing but unpopularity and dislike. We are suffering from the mistakes that we have heaped upon ourselves and

this growing unpopularity which started to build up shortly after World War II becomes especially evident following the mismanaged, ill-fated Cuban attack which actually saw the United States supporting a man who is a known leftist in opposition to another anti-Castro leader who is well known for his pro-Western leanings.

We respect President Kennedy for his stature in silencing the partisan mouthings of Secretary of the Interior Udall, the public power socialist of the Southwest, who said the Cuban failure was Dwight Eisenhower's fault. It is regrettable that the President had inaccurate intelligence information. If we cannot be more accurate about a nation 90 miles away, we wonder about our intelligence around the world.

Of course hanging over President Kennedy is the Damocles sword of potential war and his awareness that the last three Democratic Presidents were identified with our last three wars. This is reminiscent of the report the day after election that a good many upper Iowa University coeds were in tears because they feared the Democratic victory would mean war.

It's been a grim 3 months for the new President. We admire and respect the position most Republican legislators are taking in the statement that their first concern and interest is for the country rather than partisan politics and to that extent and for the sake of unity they intended to back the Kennedy foreign policy. It's been a baptism of fire for the new President, a sobering and to some extent heartbreaking 90 days.

FIFTH ANNUAL U.S. WORLD FAIR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate that opening today in New York is the Fifth Annual U.S. World Fair, which last night had its ambassadors' dinner, and today, at 10:15 a.m., was opened by the Governor of the State of New York and the mayor of the city of New York. I, myself, would have been there, as I was on the program, had it not been for the imminent consideration of the conference report on the minimum wage bill here on the floor of the Senate.

The expansion of foreign trade and its maximation is probably one of the major problems facing our country. So, too, the issue incident to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act may well prove to be the most important economic issue before the public in the year 1962.

New York is very proud of the World Trade Fair, which brings to our city the goods of many nations throughout the world, enabling visitors from those countries to this country, as well as the people of this Nation, to see those goods displayed, they being an attraction to American buyers, as well as sellers.

At the same time it spurs our imagination and shows what it means to live in an open world, in which trade is not used as a technique for government penetration, as it is among the Communists.

So I hope that as many of our colleagues as possible will visit New York's Fifth U.S. World Trade Fair. They will be more than welcome there, I know. I hope very much the country may know the significant contribution to our economy and also our social order which is made by the fair.

SOVIETS USE BIAS ISSUE IN UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues a most important article entitled "Soviets Use Bias Issue in U.N.," written by Ralph McGill, and published in last night's Evening Star.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIETS USE BIAS ISSUE IN U.N.: RACIAL PREJUDICE INCIDENTS IN UNITED STATES RAKED OVER BY REDS IN ASSEMBLY

(By Ralph McGill)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—At a recent State Department briefing in Washington some 200 editors and publishers, assembled by invitation from all areas of the Nation, were told that the most difficult handicap our country has in its foreign relationships stems from our public prejudices toward colored peoples. The Secretary of State, himself, speaking not long ago in his native State of Georgia, told the city's first integrated meeting of lawyers that the American image of a free democratic country was being done serious damage by our racial prejudices.

Perhaps even more revealing is a check of Russian comments at the United Nations, made during the last several months. The Soviets know this Nation is vulnerable. They are aware of our official concern, and as they both watch and maneuver in the developing events in Africa and Asia, the Soviets are, of course, eager to do us all possible harm.

It is interesting, and dismaying, to learn that they now believe we are vulnerable at home. Se we see a new indictment of us creeping into Russian comments at the U.N. They are typically subtle about it. They note that this is a domestic affair. In fact, they emphasize this point. It is an American decision. So, having made this clear, they then go on to say that while they do not ordinarily comment on a nation's domestic matters, what goes on in America is so very bad that they think it cannot be allowed to continue without comment.

This is an easy way for them to establish themselves as a friend of all colored peoples and the United States as a prejudiced practitioneer of discrimination. There is great hypocrisy in this, but there also is truth.

It is no secret at all that the Eisenhower administration understood this. Because of new developments, President Kennedy and his Cabinet realize even more the grave threat to our national future which this dilemma of racial prejudice presents.

Mr. Eisenhower repeatedly appealed to the Christian ethic and moral conscience of Americans. This was largely ineffective. The present administration is seeking to make progress by private, direct appeals to Governors, Senators, Congressmen, mayors, and other persons of influence. It also will make full use of processes of law.

The point, which even many people of good will do not understand, is that something must be done. We do not have too much time left. It is not at all an exaggeration to say that our national security and our ability to continue as an effective world power is being seriously damaged by all that is wrapped up in a white citizens council and a Ku Klux Klan attitude.

Recently, for example, a distinguished U. N. official from an African state was refused service in a Maryland restaurant. One of our State Department officials, in discussing the case, quoted the cafe manager as saying that if the colored visitor had made it known he was a U.N. diplomat he would have been served. This was a damning confession, however naively made.

What the manager was saying, in effect, was that only American citizens are subjected to such discrimination. If foreigners will identify themselves they will be served. This story is a popular one at the U.N. and already has appeared in many newspapers around the world.

Prejudice, to be sure, is not to be confined to the South, but the essential difference is that in the rest of our country discrimination is not established and sustained by local laws. This is the key point. It leaves the South vulnerable to the indictment of willful and unreasonable prejudice and discrimination.

It is no longer possible to defend the common practices of prejudice, even though they continue. Most southerners are becoming aware of the fact that going to school is not, after all, a social act and never was. Going to school consists of proceeding to the building, sitting in a classroom, receiving instruction, and going home. It is simply not true that going to school is a matter of mixing the races in the true sense of that phrase.

Also, more and more persons are becoming uncomfortably aware of the fact that it is an insult to all southerners for the extremists to insist that only southerners, among all Americans, must have legal separation to prevent intermarriage. It is more and more being understood that social life is, and will always remain, a matter of personal choice.

There is no ready answer to this American problem. The administration knows this. But it also is aware that we simply cannot any longer allow some of our citizens to be less protected by the Constitution of our country than others, nor can we impose inferior educational and job opportunities on some Americans merely because of their color.

This country faces many dangers. It is a time for plain, honest talk and action, regardless of how unpopular it may be. Being an American imposes obligations and responsibilities. One of them is, no matter what our personal feelings may be, to do all we can to make it possible for all Americans to have fair and equal opportunity.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, many of us, like myself and the present occupant of the chair, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], among others, have called attention to the foreign policy significance of segregation and discrimination in the United States in all of their manifestations. Here is an article written by a distinguished southern editor—I repeat, a southern editor—which shows how the Russians are ringing this matter down upon the keyboard with tremendous aid to their own propaganda—of course, subordinating the fact that such action is contrary to our concept of morality and the Constitution of the United States, and the fact that we are doing many things to bring a final end to segregation and discrimination, and that in many parts of the country there are antidiscrimination laws. There are also laws on the Federal books on the subject. Our previous President did not hesitate to call out troops at Little Rock, Ark.—certainly a most drastic act—in order to maintain equality in eduction.

However, we cannot expect Communists to give the bright side of the story.

This article emphasizes how, in the world, and in the United Nations, this

whole matter is being used against us and is very damaging to freedom.

I hope those persons who feel segregation must be built into the social order in the interests of their own communities will read this article, and, in the interest of liberty—and the South has certainly been the foremost exemplar of liberty—they will help to bring to an end these most depressing and harmful practices to the cause of liberty.

LABOR FROM MEXICO

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times entitled "Labor from Mexico," which deals with the urgent need for proceeding wisely in respect to the extension of the law with regard to braceros, the importation of labor from Mexico.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR FROM MEXICO

The time has come for the Federal Government to stop fostering the use of cheap foreign labor to the detriment of American workers. We refer to the program by which Mexican laborors are allowed to come into this country every year on a temporary basis to harvest the crops, mostly in the Far West and Southwest. These Government-authorized invasions, over 300,000 strong last year, have an adverse effect on the wages, working conditions and employment opportunities of domestic farm workers.

Public Law 78, which permits these incursions, expires at the end of the year. The Gathings bill (H.R. 2010), now before the House of Representatives, would extend its life as it is for 2 years more. But Representative COAD of Iowa has introduced a measure (H.R. 6032), strongly supported by the Kennedy administration, which also provides a 2-year extension, but in contrast to the Gathings bill would give American workers much needed protection.

It requires that before growers can employ braceros they must offer U.S. workers wages that are at least equivalent to average farm wages in the State or Nation, whichever is the lower. Growers would also have had to make reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers by offering them conditions of employment comparable to those required by the existing law. Mexican workers would be limited to seasonal and temporary manual jobs and their numbers could be limited by the Department of Labor so as to assure active competition among growers for domestic farm workers.

The House Agriculture Committee has reported favorably on the Gathings bill and the Rules Committee has cleared it for action by the House. It should be killed—unless it is amended along the lines of the Coad bill. Its death would be unlamented except by the large-scale growers, less than 2 percent of American farm owners. They have used it to obtain an endless supply of seasonal farmhands who work without complaint under conditions far below decent American standards.

REQUEST FOR COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, by request, I object to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

NATIONAL SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK, MAY 7–14

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, next week is being observed throughout the United States as Soil Stewardship Week. It seems appropriate that we pause in our deliberations in the Senate to pay tribute to the soil conservation districts of America, their national association, and cooperating church groups which sponsor this annual observance.

In our land next week hundreds of thousands of church observances are being held to reflect on "the reward of the steward"—to recognize that the basic motivation behind good soil conservation is man's recognition of his responsibility under God to protect and use wisely His precious gift of soil.

I pay tribute to the 1,400 soil conservation district leaders throughout our Nation who for 7 years have inspired this annual observance. In my home State of Oregon these are the supervisors of the 58 soil conservation districts organized under Oregon State law. I also salute thousands of clergy in all faiths who use this observance to remind us that soil stewardship is everyone's responsibility—people who live in the towns and cities as well as those who work the land.

This point has been aptly made by Mr. Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service, in the statement he issued in connection with Soil Stewardship Week observances.

He said:

Soil Stewardship Week is a time for renewing awareness of man's responsibility to the land. It is not a reminder to the farmer or rancher alone, but a reminder to everyone who would put a spade to the soil. The contractor with his housing development, the engineer with his highway, the lumberman with his sawmill, and even the gardener with his plot of ground, share in the responsibility this week emphasizes. It is a week also of acquainting the city dweller with the role good land use plays in his life.

I commend Mr. Williams on this fine statement. I ask unanimous consent that his full statement appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL STEWARDSHIP: EVERYONE'S RESPONSIBILITY

(By Donald A. Williams, Administrator, U.S. Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture)

Soil Stewardship Week, May 7–14, is an important time for people throughout America, both rural and urban, for it is a time for emphasizing the importance of soil in the lives of people everywhere.

Soil Stewardship Week is a time for renewing awareness of man's responsibility to the land. It is not a reminder to the farmer or rancher alone, but a reminder to everyone who would put a spade to the soil. The contractor with his housing development, the engineer with his highway, the lumberman with his sawmill, and even the gardener with his plot of ground, share in the responsibility this week emphasizes. It is a week also of acquainting the city dweller with the role good land use plays in his life.

Without a doubt, both rural and urban dwellers have an interest in the use of our natural resources, particularly the soil. This interest goes beyond the present use of our land. It must take into consideration the demands that will be placed on the land by future generations, and the obligation that man has to those who will follow him.

After all, to whom does the land really belong? To you? To me? Isn't it a fact that it doesn't belong to any of us at all? Aren't we really just stewards of the land as well as everything we acquire in life?

We come into the world with nothing and leave it the same way. For we return to the land from whence we came, and what we leave behind us we leave to those who come after us.

Perhaps this is what makes us feel a close kinship to the earth. Or it may be that the earth is that part of nature that the poet and philosopher Samuel Taylor Coleridge spoke of as the "agent" between God and man. Whatever the reason, each of us has a feeling of closeness to the land and through the land to the Creator of it. And with that closeness we are struck with the impact of the permanence of the land. Then we realize that although we may live an hundred years, the land will be here long after we are gone.

This is why the care of the land becomes so important to us.

The farmer and rancher see their responsibility to the land through the day-to-day application of good land use practices on farm and ranch. Through his dedication to the cause of soil conservation, the professional conservationist recognizes his responsibility as a steward of the soil. The Congress of the United States recognized its responsibility by establishing a national program of soil conservation now being carried on in soil conservation districts and watershed projects throughout the land.

The nonagricultural land users also have an interest in Soil Stewardship Week. Perhaps they better than any other should grasp the meaning of "The earth is the Lord's." For they see His handiwork in the countryside on their Sunday afternoon drives—in the lush green meadows, in the symmetry of the stripcropped field, in the cool forests, and in the clear rippling brook. They reap the harvest of the land—in good but moderate-cost groceries, in the clothes they wear, and in the houses they live in. And they have the benefit of knowing how prized a thing is a little plot of ground in the city. Their very lack of contact with the land should make it more meaningful to them and their livelihood.

Yes, all of us have an interest in Soil Stewardship Week; but soil stewardship is not a matter for this week alone. Every week is Soil Stewardship Week for those who have caught its real meaning: That wasted land and land created poor "have no higher destiny unless they be aided by men."

PUBLICITY ON SPACE EXPLORATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a great deal has been said recently about the publicizing of our space exploration programs. Some very fundamental issues of public policy are involved in determining how much information on this subject is enough to satisfy our traditions of freedom, and how much information will violate national security objectives.

In my opinion, some light on these questions is revealed by the statement of James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, issued on May 1, 1961. He has emphasized that each step in the program is but one part of a larger effort, and the total effectiveness should not be judged by the success or failure of any one portion. His comments reflect a sound and sober judgment of the policy issues involved.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Webb's statement printed in the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JAMES E. WEBB, ADMINISTRATOR, NASA

For more than 2 years now the United States has moved forward with its Mercury manned-space flight program. This program from its inception has been operated in the belief that the public has a right to know what this country is doing in the space field. The press has had full access to the program. This has been so because we operate in a democratic society where our failures are known as well as our successes.

I think the press and the public should be aware that this frequently places a serious psychological burden on the United States all over the world. If any one flight is delayed or is not a success, every detail is completely reported and is contrasted to the Soviet space effort, the events of which do not become a matter of public record until a success is achieved. The recent Soviet flight was already successfully in progress before announced, and neither details nor the scientific data collected are yet available.

NASA has not attempted to encourage press coverage of the first Mercury-Redstone manned flight. It has responded to press and television requests with the result that over 400 representatives of the press, radio and TV are now at Cape Canaveral.

Our first manned space flight is an important milestone in the progress of our space effort, but we must keep the perspective that each flight is but one of the many milestones we must pass. Some will completely succeed in every respect, some partially, and some will fail.

From all of them will come mastery of the vast new space environment on which so much of our future depends.

THE EASTMAN PHILHARMONIA PARTICIPATES IN INTER-AMERICAN FESTIVAL

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the other day I had the pleasure of greeting the members of the Eastman Philharmonia in Washington. This excellent orchestra, composed of students at the Eastman School of Music, was in the Nation's Capital to play a concert at the Second Inter-American Festival at Howard University. It was the only orchestra composed entirely of university students that was invited to participate in this important cultural event. Dr. Howard Hanson, conductor of the Philharmonia, is one of America's most notable original composers at the present time.

The State of New York and, particularly, the city of Rochester, are proud of the Philharmonia's participation in the Inter-American Festival. I am sure that the Eastman Philharmonia not only brought pleasure to the persons who attended the conference, but also conveyed the spirit of cultural friendship to our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere that the festival is designed to foster.

PROXMIRE DISSENT FROM JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee [Mr. PATMAN] filed the committee's report on the President's economic message with the House. I emphatically disagreed with my esteemed majority colleagues on the committee and I offered my own individual views.

Unfortunately there is an illusion in our society that we have the answers to all of our problems including our toughest economic problems. The question is always put in terms of how the Democratic or Republican viewpoint can achieve powerful enough support to secure enactment; not whether either one provides the solutions to our biggest problems.

It is rare that public officials frankly admit that they do not know the answers to the really hard problems that perplex us. This may be the honest position. And it may be necessary if the real answers are to be developed.

I have differed from my colleagues on the committee for this very reason, under the present circumstances. The road of wisdom is to indicate what we do not know and then to pursue as vigorously as we possibly can an attempt to find out what the answers are to the frustrating and puzzling problems of slow economic growth in this country and of nationwide unemployment which has been increasing on a sectional basis.

I ask unanimous consent that my dissenting views, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR WILLIAM PROXMIRE

I dissent from the views of the committee majority with reluctance. I do so for these reasons:

1. The report underestimates the two big economic problems facing America. It fails to recognize the enormity of the unemployment dilemma in its full long-term significance. It does not face up to the full implications of America's feeble growth record as compared to other industrial countries.

2. The report assumes that tools are readily available to solve these problems, that the country only needs action—not answers. The real problem is that neither the administration nor this report has even come close to providing the answer to our massive unemployment or our perplexing growth problem. Before we act, we must know what to do. Neither this committee nor the administration knows.

Once we acknowledge this, then we can begin where we should begin—that is to search vigorously for answers.

FUTILITY OF BOOTSTRAP HOISTING

I emphatically disagree with the committee report's assertion that: "We have no doubt, either, that if both monetary and fiscal policies are properly used the economy can be brought to a rapid recovery."

This is a flat assertion wholly unsupported by American economic experience. The fondest illusion of modern economic policy in a free society is that this kind of bootstrap hoisting will do the job. The record indicates it would leave us where most bootstrap hoisting does—standing still.

AMERICAN ECONOMIC EXPERIENCE

There is not a single comparable instance when fiscal and monetary policy can be shown to have achieved rapid recovery. American experience in the great depression, when deficit spending and falling interest rates had a 10-year opportunity, was a dramatic example of its failure. Fiscal and monetary policy didn't do the job then, and no one is suggesting that the present administration contemplates running deficits in relation to our gross national product that would be comparable with that period.

Expressed as a percentage of gross national product, the Federal Government consistently ran heavy deficits for 10 consecutive years, from 1931 through 1940. These deficits averaged 4 percent of gross national product. But unemployment was not reduced below 14 percent—twice the present level—during the entire 10-year period.

Comparable Federal deficits today with our $500 billion economy would be a mammoth $20 billion per year, a gigantic $200 billion in 10 years.

Fiscal policy did not work then. How can we be so sure it will work now?

Also, the capacity of reduced interest rates in connection with heavy budget deficits to stimulate the economy was tested in that period. Indeed, interest rates steadily dropped from 3.7 percent on long-term bonds in 1932 (close to the present 3.8 percent) to 2.3 percent in 1940. But unemployment continued at depression levels until the outset of World War II.

What is there in this grim picture to warrant the blithe report assertion that—"if both monetary and fiscal policies are properly used the economy can be brought to a rapid recovery?"

Of course, it will be argued that with budget expenditures varying between 8 to 10 percent of the gross national product in the thirties, the governmental impact was far less than today when Federal expenditures are about 16 percent of gross national product. The answer to this platitude is that the critical relationship in fiscal policy is the ratio of the budget deficit or surplus to the gross national product. And, on this score, the Government would have to run deficits for 10 years averaging $20 billion a year to have an impact on the present economy comparable to the deficits of the thirties.

That impact was inadequate to solve unemployment in the last American economic experience unaffected by the immediate aftermath of war.

If the experience of the sixties with fiscal and monetary policy should follow that of the thirties, the national debt could be increased by a mammoth $200 billion in the next 10 years without solving the unemployment problem.

This is why the committee should warn the Congress that fiscal and monetary policy may not be enough, and that other policies to expand demand should be vigorously explored.

HARMFUL CONSEQUENCE OF POLICY

I assert this vigorous disagreement for two reasons:

1. Reliance on the assertion by the Joint Economic Committee that fiscal and monetary policy could solve our unemployment problem might persuade Congress to try them. Such a course might lead to an enormous increase in the national debt, and persuade the Government to dig itself into a deeper and deeper fiscal hole.

2. I think it is far more likely, however, that Congress will reject this assertion by

the Joint Economic Committee. This policy is simply not going to be sold to the Congress or the people of the United States in a time of relative prosperity in spite of our serious unemployment problem. When the country is at peace and incomes are at a near record high, prudent men will not adopt a policy that argues for additional deficits as good things in themselves.

The report asks Congress to adopt a sophisticated, novel, and undemonstrated theory—i.e., forget any attempt to balance the budget. Instead, calculate a point where inflationary and deflationary forces balance and adjust your spending and taxing so the budget will be in balance at that figure.

Monetary policy offers far more short-term promise. But it is much too weak a reed even when combined with fiscal policy to pull our economy to the rapid recovery promised by the report.

ALTERNATIVES TO FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICY

A healthy and realistic recognition of the limitations of fiscal and monetary policy is the first prerequisite to the kind of inquiry our Government should undertake on how we do solve this immensely serious problem of idle men and resources without interference with economic freedom.

The most promising alternative is the strengthening of the automatic stabilizers as contrasted with the conscious management of fiscal policy. The most significant statement in our hearings was the assertion of the Council of Economic Advisers that the built-in flexibility of the present tax structure and social security programs offsets between 25 and 30 percent of any change in gross national product.

MORE SPENDING VERSUS LOWER TAXES

But the majority report fails to present a balanced picture. It argues vigorously for higher spending or lower taxes or both so that the deficit will increase at a lower level of unemployment and will continue to stimulate the economy until unemployment drops to say 4 percent—i.e., gross national product increases by a fat $50 billion.

The report, however, fails to consider the Federal debt burden if unemployment simply doesn't drop to this level.

NO PREFERENCE FOR PRIVATE USE OF RESOURCES

The report reflects the attitude expressed to the committee during our hearings by Budget Director David Bell when he said: "The relevant criterion in determining the desirability of a proposed use of resources for a public purpose is its value to the country in comparison to the value of using the same resources for other purposes, public or private."

This statement and the whole tenor of the report imply that there should not be a presumption, and a strong presumption, on the side of using resources for private rather than public purposes.

In a free society faced with the inevitable tendency for government to grow and extend, the individual is sure to be dwarfed by the mammoth size of the Federal Government unless there is such a presumption.

The report concludes—"* * * private initiative and free, competitive enterprise are and must continue to be the primary and predominant sources of our Nation's vitality and strength."

This excellent assertion is meaningless, however, unless private rather than public enterprise is given consistent preference.

DISSENT FROM COMMUNITY FACILITIES RECOMMENDATIONS

What I have said immediately above is why I dissent from the committee's recommendation of a grant program for such local purposes as "police and fire stations, streets and parks."

The necessities of national defense, interest on the huge national debt, and such necessarily national programs as the farm dilemma and care of veterans have enormously swollen the size and cost of the Federal Government. But these are national problems, bearing a national responsibility that can be met only by the Federal Government.

It is true that CWA and WPA engaged in local projects at the depth of the great depression with great benefit to the idle men who were taken off a dole and provided with useful, constructive work.

Today, however, our unmet need for national defense, including civil defense, in an increasingly perilous world, is immense.

The responsible and expert Gaither and Rockefeller reports both call for a far greater national defense effort than we are now making. If the Federal Government is to step up its participation in our national economy, it should be in the field that is peculiarly its responsibility—providing a surer and safer national defense.

CLOUDED CRYSTAL BALL

What is happening to the economy in the current quarter is an excellent example of the harmful consequences of Government economic policy based on shortrun prediction.

The committee warmly praises the action of the administration in attempting to stimulate the economy as soon as it took office by speeding up Government spending. Hearings before the committee revealed, however, that almost none of this speedup was effective in the first quarter of calendar 1961 when unemployment and idle plant capacity reached their peak. Testimony also suggested that virtually the full impact of this speedup in Federal spending will be in the current quarter. Furthermore, it will coincide with the exact period during which the Government will already have by far the greatest expansionary impact on the economy in many years.

Accordingly, we can expect a sharp increase in demand during the current quarter but a serious letdown in the impact of the Government on the economy after July 1.

Here is a case study in economic policy gone wrong:

1. Virtually the full impact of the $600 million increase in Federal spending resulting from President Kennedy's order to agencies to speed up their spending to help put men back to work will be in their current quarter. This will be borrowed largely from periods later in the current calendar year.

2. The real sledge hammer impact of the Government on the economy is in defense procurement. Obligations for procurement, research and development, testing and evaluation, and construction are expected, according to testimony by Defense Department Comptroller Charles Hitch, to soar from $5 billion in the past quarter to $8½ billion in the current quarter. In the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1, they will drop by a billion dollars.

Mr. Hitch reported to the committee for the Defense Department that the current fiscal year just ending would provide the greatest obligation to spend by Defense since the end of World War II with the single exception of 1952, the peak year of the Korean war buildup. He further stated that it would be higher than in fiscal 1962.

3. A few weeks ago the Defense Department ended the requirement for a 20-percent set-aside by defense contractors and immediately began a process of contract settlement that will greatly increase private cash income primarily in the current quarter.

All of this adds up to the fact that the Government is heavily stimulating business in the current quarter, but that the sure drop in this spending beginning July 1 will act as a contrasting brake on the economy at a time when it is now certain there will still be heavy unemployment and idle plant capacity.

PRESIDENT'S TAX RECOMMENDATIONS

I would emphasize far more strongly than does the report the unfortunate fact that the President's proposal for a tax credit to provide incentives for business investment would tend to deepen cyclical swings.

The thrust of the committee's report is to promote for Government a more aggressive role in ironing out the business cycle. Spending, taxing, and interest rate policies have been primarily evaluated in the report in terms of their contribution to expanding the economy in times of recession and contracting it in times in inflation.

The President's tax credit proposal would have a precisely contrary impact. Business would be offered a superincentive to expand in prosperous times when its profits and taxes are rising. It would have a sharply reduced incentive for investment in recession periods when profits and taxes are low.

The President's tax credit proposal, therefore, would tend to aggravate inflation in boom times and subsequently exaggerate unemployment in bad times.

In spite of this significant weakness, the President's proposals do have the great merit of providing: (1) encouragement for long-range growth; (2) an effective reduction in the excessively high corporation income tax; (3) no loss of revenue because of balancing tax recovery proposals; (4) greater equity in the tax structure because special tax advantages to some forms of income would be reduced or eliminated.

I protest the absence in the President's recommendations for closing tax loopholes of any reference to that most notorious and unjustified of all tax loopholes, the 27½-percent depletion allowance for oil. The failure to recommend that this be reduced to the 15-percent level of most other minerals passes up some $400 million of additional Federal revenues and leaves the oil industry with its income taxed at only about one-third the taxes imposed on the rest of American industry.

AUTOMATION-UNEMPLOYMENT DILEMMA

Our unemployment problem is caused by the very productivity and efficiency that must be the basis of the victory for freedom in the world.

America's automated farms and factories have brought us the richest material blessings in the history of mankind. They will also predictably contribute to the waste of unemployment in our free society, unless we master the problems they pose.

The American farm economy is the supreme example. Our farmers have increased their efficiency three times as rapidly as the rest of America. Nowhere is this country's economic superiority to the Soviet Union more pronounced than in the great productivity of our electrified, power-driven, privately owned family farm.

And yet, this very automated efficiency is contributing vastly to unemployment by driving farmers off the farm where their work is not needed into the cities where automated factory unemployment is already large and growing. Here is the most dramatic illustration of our dilemma. Where our technological advance has been our greatest, our unemployment problem is the most acute.

The answer is not to stop or even slow down technological advance. We look over our shoulder at the onrushing surge of the Communist economic tyrannies of China and Russia with their forced economic growth. And we know that American economic superiority is what makes our Nation the arsenal of freedom.

Indeed, efficiency and productivity must be fostered and speeded.

This, then, is the tough economic dilemma which this report and the administration have not frankly faced:

1. A heavy and consistent increase in the American work force is certain.

2. Automated unemployment on the farm and in the factory is sure to increase.

3. Our national obligation for world freedom imposes on the Federal Government the policy of encouraging the very productivity and efficiency that is causing unemployment.

The administration and this committee must come up with far more precise and promising answers to this dilemma than the vague proposals for retraining, research, and education proposed to date.

CONCLUSION

My strong dissent from the majority of the committee should not be misinterpreted:

1. I have the deepest regard for the remarkable ability and judgment of the majority who have joined in this report.

2. Although I am highly critical in this dissent of the administration's policies, I recognize a unique excellence in the appointments the President has made to the highest positions of economic policy in his administration. I also admire the zest and determination with which the administration has tackled the No. 1 problem of our economy: getting the economy moving. Growth and a massive increase in employment have been the administration's proper objectives.

But the administration and this report make two serious errors:

1. They have grossly underestimated the dimensions of the problem.

2. They have overestimated the ability of the Government to solve it.

These errors if they persist will prevent those responsible for economic policy in our Federal Government from recognizing that the big fact is we have not come up with any real answers to our very large unemployment that grows with each swing of the business cycle. A frank acknowledgment that we don't have the answer is an essential first step toward solving the problem.

Also, we have not faced up to the enormously tough problem of how we can achieve an economic growth comparable to that of the other leading free industrial countries of the world, or our chief adversary, Russia. The terrible fact is that America is, and has been for several years now, at the very bottom of the pole in economic growth.

There is nothing either in the administration's program or in this report to indicate that this big fact has even been recognized.

Faith in our free economic system is essential. The administration, and I am sure every member of the committee, has it.

But that faith should not persuade us—as it has—to say that these massive problems can be solved simply by the kind of prescription the administration has offered and the committee has generally accepted.

We should have the courage to face up to the problems of growth and unemployment in all their immensity. We should admit that we haven't the answers—and not even much of a clue to the answers—and then seek as aggressively and vigorously as we can to develop some.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader about the program for the remainder of the week, and also for next week, insofar as he can inform the Senate at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the minority leader, it is the intention to take up in the Senate today, at the conclusion of morning business, the minimum wage conference report, and also the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be our Ambassador to Iran.

It is anticipated that tomorrow, Thursday, the conference report on the judgeship bill will be brought before the Senate for consideration; also the second agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, the so-called German treaty.

Provided all these measures are disposed of, it is anticipated that the Senate will then adjourn from Thursday until Monday, when it is anticipated we will bring up for consideration the so-called Battle Act, and the bill (H.R. 6518) providing aid to Latin America, which was ordered to be reported by the Appropriation Committee on yesterday. This bill has to do with the $600 million which was authorized by Congress last year, $500 million of it to be used on a cooperative basis with the nations of Latin America, and $100 million for the Chilean earthquake relief.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

PROPOSED MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY DURING THE SESSION OF THE SENATE TODAY

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this morning the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry met and held hearings on the omnibus farm bill. When the hour of 11 o'clock struck I suggested to the clerk of the committee that he obtain permission from the Senate for the committee to proceed with its hearings. A few minutes thereafter he presented me with a note saying that someone from the cloakroom had telephoned that there was objection to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry meeting during the session of the Senate today.

Under the rule, of course, I immediately recessed the committee, and I proceeded to the Senate floor, only to find that the objection to the committee's meeting had not yet been made. I believe that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under the circumstances, deserves an explanation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would have been proper for me, as the minority leader, to register that objection if I had been here. I came just a little late from a committee meeting. However, word came to me from a Senator, whose name has not been disclosed to me, to register an objection to the holding of a meeting. I doubt very much, under the circumstances, whether I would be at liberty to make that disclosure even if I knew the name of the Senator, because it was transmitted from one Senator to another.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is entitled at least to that much of an explanation as to the way in which the objection to his request was registered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it customary for a committee to be notified not to hold hearings when the Senate has not acted upon the request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know whether it is customary, but I think that common courtesy would dictate that the Senator should be notified with respect to such a matter. I try, within the limits of Senate procedure and the unpredictability of the calendar, from time to time to make sure that such notice is given. However, the information came to me at the last minute, and it came to the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] at the last minute. Therefore the Senator from Utah was actually acting in my behalf in registering the objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not finding fault. However, it was a little embarrassing for me, because the action in this case had not been taken until after I came back and after I had recessed the committee pursuant to the notice that had come to me from the cloakroom.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I can only hope that the Senator will feel no embarrassment for himself. I freely and frankly accept responsibility for the objection regardless of the fact that I do not know who was the initiating author of the objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not particularly anxious to know who objected. The only thing I am objecting to is that notice was given to the clerk of the committee, of which I am chairman, before the matter was submitted to the Senate for disposition.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If my vicarious apology can make amends for the Senator's embarrassment, I am more than willing to make such apology.

THE 170TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, May 3 marks the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. This anniversary is proudly commemorated by peoples of Polish origin in all free communities throughout the world, as this Constitution was the first liberal and democratic instrument in the history of Poland. This great document of freedom, adopted in 1791, takes on added significance as a symbol for all those who are working for the restoration of a democratic system of government in Poland, which for so many years has been under the heel of communism. I am indeed happy to join Americans of Polish descent in the celebration of Polish Constitution Day.

I have received from Mr. Charles Burke, Washington representative for the Polish American Congress, Inc., a letter which I should like to share with my colleagues in the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Burke's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1961.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUSH: May I draw your attention to the approaching anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, Polish national holiday, which for 170 years is being celebrated on May 3.

This act of wise statesmanship, enacted by the Polish Diet in 1791 in Warsaw, by unanimous solemn vote, brought about important political, social and educational reforms destined to strengthen the Polish state at a time of threatening dangers from imperialistic neighboring powers.

Men who undertook the task to guide the Polish nation on the path of social progress, belonged to the most enlightened brains of 18th century Poland. They were inspired by the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence and influenced by the French Proclamation of the Rights of Man and Citizen.

The principles laid down in the May 3 Constitution survived while Poland was struggling for independence and were referred to in the constitutional laws of the reborn Polish state after World War I.

Free Poland's Constitution Day was May 3, and it is still observed in the hearts of the people within the country, and throughout Polish communities in the world.

The imposing on Poland in 1953, under Soviet directives, of a constitution on Communist pattern—similar to that of all other people's republics—did but reaffirm the attachment of the Poles to their historic charter of 1791.

It became a tradition for Members of the U.S. Congress to commemorate on the floor of their respective Houses Poland's national day on May 3, to evoke links of friendship between both nations, and to stress U.S. interest in the fate of Poland.

Members of the U.S. Congress who visited Poland lately unanimously agree that although "the Polish Government is Communist, the Polish people are not." American visitors are impressed by the friendly feelings of the population toward the United States. As a matter of fact the Western trend in Poland has not been eradicated in spite of great efforts of Communist propaganda to discredit the Western democracies.

The commemoration of the May 3 Constitution by the U.S. Congress will undoubtedly find a favorable response among the people in Poland. Your support of the cause of Poland on that occasion will be greatly appreciated by the Polish American Congress.

I take the liberty to enclose for your attention a leaflet explaining in few words the meaning of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative.

MAY 3, THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises throughout the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May 3d Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish 3d of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words: "All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernible throughout the Third of May Polish Constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Meditation on the anniversary of May 3d deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty and her territory by one of our former allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today, on the 3d of May, we honor the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. This honor, as in too many years past, carries with it an element of sadness; an element of mourning for Poland's Constitution and Poland's liberty. It is a tribute to the courage of Poles in the face of their long and difficult history. It is also a tribute to the skill of Poles in fashioning a constitution which has stood the test of time as a document of extraordinary political wisdom. Neither the courage nor the wisdom of the Poles has failed them over the centuries.

Unlike the French, British, and our own Constitution, the Polish Constitution of 1791 was not born of revolution, either against a colonial power or social revolution within. It was the product of a brief period in history when the Poles were fortunate enough to be left to themselves to seek their own destiny as a nation free of pressures from Russia or from Prussia. They proceeded, nobles and people alike led by King Stanislas, to heal the wounds of internal strife and found a new basis for internal harmony and national strength. Their work reflected the thought of the French Revolution, though they recognized and avoided its excesses. The reforming tendencies of the French Revolution are blended well with a preservation of the values of tradition which mark the success of the British system. It was no easy task to propound such a constitution, and the skill with which it was steered into being as the governing organ of the nation, without fratricide, violence, or new wounds in the society, stands as a monument to what men can achieve in the quest for liberty.

Scarcely a year after the Constitution was proclaimed, Russia invaded Poland to put an end to the "dangerous novelty" of constitutional government and liberty. In another year Poland was partitioned. Fate and geography have not given the Poles an easy path. But their qualities of courage and political wisdom will long be noted by the rest of the world.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day is being celebrated today, May 3, by the friends of a free Poland throughout the world.

The triumph of democracy in the United States and in France were the great influences behind the Polish Constitution of 1791. It was one of the first to embody the ideals of the Declaration of Independence and the Proclamation of the Rights of Man; and it has served ever since as the inspiration for Poland's traditional love of liberty and willingness to fight for independence against crushing odds.

That indomitable spirit was demonstrated in the 1956 revolt against the Communist regime which restored a measure of Poland's national integrity. Although Communist control has been reasserted, the Polish people have given evidence that the fierce spirit of resistance still lives.

American ties with the people of Poland are much stronger than bonds of sympathy and understanding. Millions of our citizens trace their ancestry to this ancient land and for them these are ties of blood. For other Americans there are strong bonds of history and tradition in which the names of such great Revolutionary War heroes as Pulaski and Kosciusko loom large.

On this occasion I am happy to join in extending assurances that the American people support the fight of the courageous people of Poland for their liberty and independence, and I am confident that on liberation they will reinforce the principles of the Constitution of 1791 as a guide for a free Poland.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, May 3 is Polish Constitution Day. As long ago as 1791 Polish patriots established a liberal constitution, only to have it undermined. Since then, the Polish people have suffered under one alien tyranny after another, but the hope and memory of freedom has never died in their hearts.

Perhaps more than anything else, Poland has given free peoples everywhere an inspiring example to follow. The strength and perseverance of this glorious land offers us a guide to direct our efforts to secure freedom in every corner of our globe. Indeed, Polish history

epitomizes modern man's quest for personal liberty and the demand of people in all lands for national independence.

In commemoration of this occasion, I should like to present a speech prepared by an 18-year-old high school senior in Schenectady, N.Y., John M. Szostak, to celebrate this anniversary. John Szostak is not only, as the following text will show, a fine writer, he is also a promising scientist. He was a finalist in the 20th annual science talents search and has won many other awards and commendations for his scientific skill—which has included the construction of a color television set. I want to wish him all success in his future career.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed John Szostak's address at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This year's observance of Poland's May 3 Constitution coincides with the 101st anniversary of the birth of one of the greatest Poles of all time, Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Paderewski, great artist, humanitarian, and statesman, immortal interpreter of Chopin and composer in his own right, beloved in America and in Poland, does not belong exclusively to his native land. By virtue of his greatness as an artist, a humanitarian, and a statesman who fought for freedom and equality among nations, this genius represents humanity's best aims and endeavors.

Paderewski was born on November 6, 1860, in Poland. When still a child he started his musical studies. At the age of 12 he entered the Warsaw Conservatory and afterward continued his studies in Berlin and Vienna. He was acclaimed by the American public as the king of pianists.

At the beginning of World War I Paderewski gave up his artistic vocation and set himself the task of laboring for the liberation of his native Poland. He did much to enlist world support for the restoration of Poland as a member of the community of nations.

The simple words of Paderewski on the lecture platform endeared him to Americans everywhere. Through his dominating personality and the eloquence of his speeches, Paderewski coordinated the work of Polish-Americans who formed the central committee of assistance to aid the resurrecting Poland. As honorary member of the Polish National Committee and as the friend of President Woodrow Wilson, he exercised increasing influence in the political circles of Washington in behalf of Poland. It was largely through his efforts that the 13th of Wilson's 14 points was devoted to the restoration of a free and independent Poland.

Unofficial ambassador of a liberty-loving, oppressed people, Paderewski received official recognition from our Department of State on many occasions. Paderewski represented the Polish people at Washington during 1917 and 1918. He assisted in organizing the Polish Republic in 1918–19. Paderewski was president of the Polish delegation to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and signed the peace treaty by which Poland regained her independence. He was the first Polish delegate to the Council of Ambassadors at the League of Nations in 1920. In addition, Paderewski was at one time Minister of Foreign Affairs for Poland, President of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Poland, and Chairman at the time of his death.

In 1922 he went back to his artistic vocation and again as a virtuoso he astonished the world, especially as a performer of compositions of another great Pole, Chopin.

Despite his advanced years and poor state of health, Paderewski had returned to his second country, the United States, less than a year before his death to continue his lifelong battle for the freedom and independence of his beloved Poland, once again overrun in World War II.

Living in retirement in Switzerland at the time of the invasions and subsequent partitioning of Poland between the Nazis and Soviets in 1939 Paderewski instinctively knew that for his country as well as for any nation cherishing its freedom, there could be neither peace nor hope nor justice in object submission of the minds of freemen to the dictatorial philosophies of Poland's aggressors. Paderewski knew that one-half of the world could not live in freedom and independence, while the other half lived in ideological enslavement.

Now aged and weary, but spiritually valiant, Paderewski undertook the strenuous voyage to return to the United States arriving here on November 6, 1940. Despite the advice of his physician, Paderewski toured extensively to encourage and invoke needed aid for his distressed homeland. But this heroic Pole was brought down by an attack of pneumonia which took his life.

Paderewski died as nobly as he fought girded for battle against oppression. To the last, he prayed and fought for the freedom and independence of his native land. On his death bed, Paderewski's last words were the same battle cry uttered by other Polish sons throughout the long years of Poland's oppressive occupation: "Polska powstanice"—Poland will rise again.

The honors bestowed upon Paderewski as a statesman were innumerable. Honorary degrees, for his superior individual accomplishment, by the universities of the United States and Europe.

To Paderewski, however, the most significant of all honors would have been the homage of the humble who by the thousands filed past his bier as he lay in state in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City and the red and white flag of his homeland tenderly enfolding his last mortal remains while a guard of honor of Polish veterans proudly stood all night vigil.

Thousands of Paderewski's admirers from all walks of life—they knew no class distinctions—lined the route of the military funeral cortege as it slowly wound its way to the measured rhythm of Chopin's "Funeral March." All paused in silent tribute to the passing of the immortal Pole.

In the Nation's Capital, representatives of the diplomatic corps and our own Government, and thousands of those who loved him, paid their final respects as the body of Paderewski lay in state at the Polish Embassy. The highest tribute of the United States was bestowed upon Paderewski by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who authorized Paderewski's burial in Arlington National Cemetery.

Now resting in the quiet green hills overlooking the Capital of the Nation he loved so well this heroic Pole rests in hallowed peace until such time as his body can be returned to the free and independent Poland of Paderewski's dream.

In honor of this great Pole I ask Congress to adopt a resolution in erecting a statue of Paderewski in Statuary Hall among other heroes of freedom and humanity.

Paderewski's greatest happiness came in contributing his time, his talents and his resources to the needy of his own and other lands. To the American people whom Paderewski held in high esteem he stands as a symbol of liberty and long remembered in the hearts of freemen everywhere.

Let us recall the inspiring message of Paderewski in which he said, "The vision of a free and independent Poland has always been the lodestar of my existence."

Let us pray that the day will be soon when Poland will again join the community of free nations and her people can walk with heads high in a land that once again is an independent nation and an answer to Paderewski's dreams.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, today marks the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

It was on May 3, 1791, that King Stanislas Poniatowski of Poland accepted a constitution which gave hope of remedying the chief weaknesses which had paralyzed the Polish state. The liberum veto, under which a single Polish nobleman could veto a law, was finally abolished. The Crown was made hereditary and the nobility was made subject to taxation. Differences of religious belief were permitted, and it was recognized that all power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people.

Poland had finally overcome some of the weaknesses that had impeded it in its struggle for survival amid the vicious power politics of 18th century Europe. Partly perhaps because of this change, Catherine of Russia invaded Poland the following year, abolished the Constitution and invited Prussia and Austria to share in the spoils of the second partition of Poland. Three years later, in 1795, these three powers completed their dishonorable role in the extermination of Poland, which was not to reappear as a national entity again until after World War I.

No people has experienced more heartbreak and suffering in their aspirations for national independence than the brave people of Poland. Nowhere does the love of independence burn more fiercely than in the hearts of the Polish people. Neither Prussia nor Imperial Austria nor Czarist Russia nor Nazi Germany nor Communist Russia has been able to extinguish that love of country. Freemen everywhere yearn for the day when the aspirations of the Polish people can be given full expression in the lasting achievement of true national independence.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, today marks the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. It is a day that all Americans want to remember as it recalls the historic struggle by the Polish nation for their independence and sovereignty as a nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the following statement issued to the Polish American Congress, Inc.

There being no objection the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May 3 is the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. Inspired by the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence and influenced by the French Proclamation of the Rights of Man and Citizen, the Polish Diet, May 3, 1791, by unanimous vote, enacted their national constitution. It is significant that the Polish Constitution was adopted at a time of threatening dangers from imperialistic neighbors.

These principles of liberty and freedom survived while Poland struggled for independence and were reaffirmed in the reborn Polish state after World War I.

In 1953 the Polish captured government under the Soviet directives, imposed a Communist-patterned constitution and, in a move to mollify the Poles, again reaffirmed

the attachment of the Poles to their historic charter of 1791.

We are all aware of the tragedy which is Poland's today. Snared in the web of Soviet deceit and treachery, Poland remains a captive to the Kremlin.

However, there is a ray of hope pouring through the Red cloud of forced bondage. We know that although the Polish Government is Communist-oriented, its people still love freedom and share the idealism of the free nations. In spite of great efforts by the Soviets to discredit the Western democracies the people of Poland remain our friends and hidden allies.

As Poles behind the Iron Curtain and Polish-Americans here in our Nation recall their national holiday, we reaffirm our belief that Poland—land of Copernicus and Madam Curie, of Chopin and Paderewski, of Casimir the Great and John Sobieski, of Kosciusko and Pulaski, shall, when the Communist rule is finally overthrown, attain her unalterable dream of liberty. We reaffirm our friendship and hopes to the Polish people and extend our fraternal greetings on this, their national holiday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would like to join with the people of Poland and the people of Polish ancestry throughout the world in observing the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day on this May 3, 1961.

I have often paid tribute to the Poles as a brave people who have suffered much in their fight against tyranny. Their determination to preserve freedom and justice against overpowering odds should be an example to those who take this privilege for granted.

Americans know the Poles as a gifted, versatile people who have distinguished themselves as gallant fighters in war and industrious workers in peace. They are renowned for their outstanding achievements in the arts and sciences. The names of Chopin, Paderewski, Copernicus, Madam Curie, Pulaski, and Kosciusko symbolize the true spirit of this great country.

I would also like to pay homage to her sons and daughters who have settled in the United States, who have become outstanding citizens in their respective communities, and have contributed to America's greatness.

The history of Poland and the Polish people is the history of a nation dedicated to the principles of independence and individual liberty. It is tragic that this valiant country has enjoyed only brief periods of liberty as a nation since the adoption of its democratic constitution on May 3, 1791.

Since 1791, this peace-loving country has been overrun by Austrian, Prussian, and Russian forces and is now enslaved under the ruthless domination of the Soviet Union. We know, however, that the love of liberty and justice is still alive in the hearts of these gallant peoples as was demonstrated in the Poznan revolt in 1956.

On this day of rededication to the true Polish cause, my colleagues and I wish to assure these people that we will continue to supply economic and moral support until they can once again fulfill their national aspirations of political, religious, and economic liberty and take their rightful place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, today is the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, the day on which the liberal Polish Constitution of 1791 was enacted.

This document, which brought many badly needed political, social, and educational reforms to the Polish people, went into effect 2 years after the writing of the American Constitution. It was constructed by men who, like the drafters of our own Constitution, represented the most enlightened minds of their country and who drew many of their ideals from the same source, the American Declaration of Independence.

Tragedy befell Poland soon after this Constitution was written when she was partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria in 1795. It was neither the first nor the last time that this proud nation was dominated by foreign powers. Even now, Russian troops are quartered on Polish soil and a Communist government has been imposed on the Polish people by force.

As many conquerors have learned, however, Poles are not easily suppressed. There is a spirit of freedom alive within every Pole that makes him difficult to conquer.

Despite their adversities, the Poles have maintained a fierce spirit of independence and a steadfast loyalty to democratic institutions. They have kept many of their traditional cultural and economic ties with the West and have earned a measure of freedom that few of their neighbors behind the Iron Curtain enjoy.

The bonds between the United States and the Polish people are still strong and always will be, no matter what hostile government Poland is forced to endure. I would like my colleagues in the Senate to join me in sending greetings to these people and convey with me the hope that they will soon be free to choose a government which recognizes the democratic principles enunciated 170 years ago in the Constitution of May 3.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today, May 3, is the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. It is, indeed, appropriate to quote from the Polish 3d of May 1791 Constitution which reads:

All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Although Poland today is ruled by a Communist government, it is a well-known reality that the Polish people still hope for independence and sovereignty.

It is a pleasure to join in commemoration of Poland's Constitution Day. I know that this day is and will continue to be observed in the hearts of the people within the country and throughout Polish communities in the world.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, 2 years after the adoption of the Constitution by the United States of America in 1789, the Polish Diet, on May 3, 1791, 170 years ago, in Warsaw, adopted its Constitution without a bloody revolution, or even without a disorder, and succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline, and gave great rebirth of freedom to the people of Poland. Many of the basic principles in the Constitution of the United States were incorporated in the Constitution of Poland.

However, the newly founded nation was subjected to the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The true spirit of freedom remained with the Polish people, as it did with other countries in that era who were under the domination of tyranny and oppression. They maintained the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence and cherished them, while under the heel of their oppressor, until the Polish nation was reborn after World War I.

Mr. President, everyone remembers that fateful day in 1939 when the Nazis marched against Poland, and how those brave people, with ineffective weapons, attempted to resist the great and devastating Nazi tanks, weapons, and airpower. Hardly had the Polish people had time to catch their breath from the devastating effects of the Nazi invasion, when the Soviet Communists took the Polish nation and the people behind the Iron Curtain against their will.

Although there is a Communist government in Poland today, the real people of Poland are definitely not Communists, and they are still imbued with the hope that someday they may revert to freedom. This has been brought to the minds of Americans, public officials and individuals, who have visited Poland in recent years.

The Polish people, as are the people of other nations behind the Iron Curtain, are looking forward to the day when they can become free and live under a form of government of their own choosing.

Mr. President, I know that the Polish people living in the free world, and especially those who live in America, represent a people who are dedicated to the basic principles of our republic form of government. It is their hope and prayer that they can kindle the spark that will encourage the freedom-loving people of the world to demand, through the United Nations, that the Soviet Union permit these people to dwell under a form of government of their own choosing.

The record is clear that the Americans of Polish descent in the United States are among our great leaders in government, in the Congress, in industry and labor, and in the many other facets of our American way of life. Such organizations as the Polish American Congress are doing everything within their power to keep the world informed of the immense sacrifices and the great sufferings existing behind the Iron Curtain, and are stressing the importance of all freedom-loving people doing everything possible to restore freedom to the people behind the Iron Curtain. I hope that the day will soon arrive when the leaders of the world will realize that only when all men are free will the tensions that now face us in this era of cold war be eased and fade into the past.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, next Sunday more than 100,000 residents of

the Chicago area will gather in Humboldt Park at the statue of Tadeusz Kosciusko, colonel in the American Revolutionary Army, to commemorate the 170th anniversary, today, May 3, of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791. In other parts of the United States, and throughout the free world, others of Polish descent will gather in similar celebrations.

It is fitting, Mr. President, that Chicago Polish-Americans honor this holiday of Polish liberal government at the site of Colonel Kosciusko's statue, for probably no other figure in history so well represents the bridge of like aspirations for liberal government which joined the founders of our Nation and the authors of Poland's 1791 Constitution. Colonel Kosciusko was a distinguished Polish soldier and statesman who volunteered to fight for the cause of American freedom in the Revolutionary Army and who became General Washington's adjutant. When Kosciusko returned to Poland after the war, he led in securing adoption of the new, liberal Polish Constitution.

The common origin of our constitutions and our shared dedication to freedom have persisted as a bond between our peoples. But history has not treated kindly the cause of liberal and free government in Poland. This great pioneer of liberalism in Europe has been repeatedly partitioned, subjected to foreign control, and desecrated by war. The enemies of liberal government have constantly sought to crush the spirit of the 1791 Constitution. As we know, the latest totalitarian abuse of Poland's Constitution came with the imposition of a Soviet Communist constitution and regime.

Nevertheless, the aspirations and ideals of the 1791 Polish Constitution still live—in the hearts and minds of the subjugated people of Poland, of citizens of Polish descent in many countries, and of freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Mr. President, on this 170th anniversary of the Polish 3d of May Constitution, I am sure all Members of Congress join with me in recognizing our friendship with the Polish people and in commemorating Poland's progressive Constitution. Moreover, I am sure I can say that all Americans who understand the meaning of freedom join in the spirit of this celebration.

THE CRISIS IN THE FAR EAST CREATED BY COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, yesterday our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], addressed the Asian People's Anti-Communist League in Manila, Philippines.

Senator DODD's address, with characteristic vigor and forthrightness, dealt with the crisis in the Far East posed by Communist aggression. I believe that all of us can profit by reading this address, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD BEFORE THE ASIAN PEOPLE'S ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE, MANILA, PHILIPPINES, MAY 3, 1961

I consider it an honor to be present at this historic conference of the Asian People's Anti-Communist League.

You meet at a moment of peril and crisis.

We are all, I know, downhearted by recent developments in Cuba and in Laos. We are fearful and worried over the growing Communist guerrilla action in South Vietnam, over the growing threat to the free nations of southeast Asia. We are all concerned, too, over the propaganda implications of the Kremlin's one-sided triumph in space.

On the basis of our postwar record, I could not blame you for believing that the American giant has been asleep. This indeed, was the theme of a recent article in Reader's Digest by that great Asian and world statesman, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo. "Wake Up America," was the title of his article.

I believe there is symbolic significance in the fact that this article, calling upon America to raise itself from its slumber, was written by an Asian. It is in Asia that the Communists have scored their greatest victories since the close of World War II. It is in Asia, too, that the armed forces of communism and of freedom have clashed most frequently. In China, in Korea, in Vietnam, in Tibet, in Malaya, in the Philippines, and on the northern frontiers of India, hundreds of thousands of Asian patriots have given their lives in the battle for freedom.

And while the whole free world is threatened by the advancing Communist tide, it is Asia that is most immediately threatened. Your countries stand on the front line. Here in Asia there is no more room for retreat and there is precious little margin for error. The fate of freedom the world over, in my opinion, may very well be decided in the Far East in the bitter battles that now loom on the horizon.

The West would do well to heed the warnings of the Asian peoples, not only because of their present peril, but also because of their hard-won experience in the battle against communism. There have been defeats in the Far East, tragic defeats. But there have also been great victories.

I cannot help recalling that it was here in the Philippines under the leadership of the immortal Ramon Magsaysay, that freedom won one of its most significant victories over the subterranean forces of communism.

The most important item of news which I can convey to you today is that America is now awake. I believe that the moment of awakening can be dated from President Kennedy's historic speech on Cuba before the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

In this speech, the President of the United States warned the American people that "we face a relentless struggle in every corner of the globe that goes far beyond the clash of armies or even nuclear armaments." He warned them that conventional and nuclear arms are only a shield, behind which the Communists operate by means of subversion, infiltration and other underhanded tactics, that in this way they occupy vulnerable areas one by one in a manner which makes armed intervention difficult or impossible for the free world. He warned that our national security may be lost piece by piece, country by country, without the firing of missiles or the clash of arms.

In response to this challenge, the President has called upon the American people for an intensification of our efforts in every field, "and in many ways more difficult than war." He has accepted the struggle in which we are engaged as a struggle for the very survival of our way of life, and he has told the American people we must take up the challenge "regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril."

What President Kennedy's statement signifies is that the period of blunder and slumber, of retreats and defeats, is now at an end. We have recognized the nature of our adversary, we have accepted the fact of mortal combat, we realize that we stand with our backs to the wall—and we are prepared to fight.

Democracies by their very nature are slow-moving and easygoing. They are prone to believe the best of other people, prone to take the easy way out, prone to grasp at every blandishment that offers hope of peace and coexistence. But as Hitler and the Japanese war lords learned to their dismay, free nations and free men, once aroused, have the strength of giants.

For my own part, I am confident about the future because I believe that we have now emerged from the innocence and gullibility and half-sleep that have paved the way for so many defeats in the postwar period.

I venture this prophecy, I offer this encouragement, even though I am distressed, as I know you are, over the trend of events in Laos. In Laos again we have been the victims of Communist perfidy and deception.

It was no accident that the Laos crisis was precipitated after the American elections, when the old administration was on its way out and the new administration had yet to take over.

It was no accident that the Kremlin had made all the logistical preparations for a massive airlift of war materials to the Laotian and Vietnamese Communist forces.

It was no accident that the British and French Governments were encouraged to believe that a cease-fire was just around the corner if we agreed to accept a neutral coalition government and the reactivation of the so-called tripartite commission.

It was no accident that while the Kremlin continued to dangle the carrot of an imminent cease-fire in front of anxious Western noses, the Communist forces continued to attack and Soviet planes continued to supply them.

All of this was true to the pattern of Soviet conflict strategy. But once we had committed ourselves to the course of patience and negotiation and compromise, it was difficult to extricate ourselves.

The outcome should have been clearly predictable. The Communists have advanced under cover of negotiations, so that they now occupy the three northern provinces of Laos as well as the strategic Plain des Jarres.

If the question of Laos is now placed on the table of a 14-nation diplomatic conference, the Communists will be entering the negotiations in a position of formidable strength.

They will not evacuate the territory they have occupied in the course of the current hostilities: this, I believe, we can take for granted.

They will not disarm their forces.

If an agreement is made calling for the cessation of arms shipments to both sides, we are in for a repetition of the sorry experiences we have already had in Korea and Vietnam. We will observe the agreement. The Communists will violate it wholesale. And the tripartite "neutral" commission will, at the best be helpless, at the worst will prove itself "neutral" on the side of the Communists.

If a coalition government is established, it can be taken for granted that it will be headed by Prince Souvanna Phouma, fresh from his triumphant reception in Moscow,

and that the Communists will be given a number of key ministries in this government.

Someone, I cannot remember who, has expressed the hope that Laos will be able to survive such a coalition government, just as Finland survived the coalition government that was forced on her by the Kremlin at the end of World War II. I am afraid I cannot place much stock in this analogy.

From everything that I have heard about them, the Lao people are kindly, hospitable, and lovable. But they are not Finns nor do they have the very special qualities which enabled Finland to survive the ordeal of coalition government and to get rid of their Communist Minister of the Interior and Communist Minister of Defense, while countries like Czechoslovakia succumbed to similar coalitions.

The Finns are one of the toughest people in Europe, one of the toughest peoples I dare say in the entire world. They have a tremendous sense of unity, unlimited physical courage, and a political sophistication accumulated during decades of resistance to their Bolshevik neighbor. Had they not possessed all of these qualities in unique degree, the Finns would not be freemen today. And even with these qualities, for a period of years after World War II it seemed that the lights would go out in Finland.

By all means, let us hope for miracles and let us work for miracles. But let us not be foolish enough to derive comfort from the establishment of a coalition government in Laos by hoping for a repetition of the Finnish experience.

If the Kremlin pushes its luck in Laos too hard, almost anything could happen. I am convinced that the present American administration will not sit idly by while the Communist armies complete the conquest of the country.

If hostilities in Laos are terminated by an agreement on Soviet terms, the future there is dark—but it is not completely hopeless.

When the Lao people learn the meaning of communism, they will hate it, I am certain, as intensely as do the people of China and the people of Vietnam and every other people that has experienced its scourge on their backs.

If the free world will now firmly resolve that there will be no further concessions to communism in the Far East and no further retreats before it; that it will not tolerate the piece by piece guerrilla subversion of South Vietnam and Thailand; that it will as actively support the freedom fighters in the Communist-dominated territories as the Communists support their guerrilla detachments in free territories—if we make this resolve and adhere to it, then, even with a coalition government, the fate of Laos may not be sealed.

If it is not presumptuous of me to do so, I have a recommendation I would like to place before you.

What happens in Laos is of immediate concern to every Asian country, and not merely to the Laotians. If the Communists take complete power in Laos, then Thailand, South Vietnam, and Cambodia, and after them Malaya, Singapore, and Burma will be immediately imperiled.

The Asian people understand this and, because they understand it, the Philippines and Pakistan urged SEATO to take military action, if necessary, in Laos, and they offered contingents of military forces for such action. But the British and the French recommended delay and negotiations; and it was their counsel that prevailed.

As an American, I was unhappy to learn that we had decided to go along with the Anglo-French position. After all, the purpose of SEATO is to help the peoples of free Asia defend themselves against communism. If SEATO remains as inactive or as slow to react in future crises as it has in the Laos crisis, then it will, instead, be serving as a barrier to effective self-defense by the Asian peoples. That is why, however things now develop, there must be no repetition of Laos.

For my own part, I would not blame the Asian members of SEATO if they felt bitter and disillusioned over SEATO's laggard reaction in the Laos crisis. I would not even blame them if they felt that Western indifference in this instance was simply a manifestation of West's general indifference to the fate of the Asian peoples. I can assure you, however, that this is not so. It was, instead, a manifestation of the Munich psychosis, a recurrent sickness of Western society that does not discriminate between Caucasians and Orientals, and which is characterized, fortunately, by abrupt termination.

When Prime Minister Chamberlain returned from Munich, he justified the surrender of the Sudetenland to Hitler with the words "Czechoslovakia is a far away land about which we know little."

The Munich psychosis did not begin with Prime Minister Chamberlain and it did not end with him. Too often in our own times, there has been a tendency on the part of the democratic leaders to believe that they could purchase their own security or somehow make their nations more secure, by trafficking in the security and freedom of other nations.

I have described this as a psychosis because in my opinion it represents an effort at complete escape from both our moral tradition and political reality. How many historical catastrophies does it take to prove that softness and appeasement foster aggression, insecurity, and war?

I believe that SEATO is essential to the defense of Asia. I have absolutely no doubt that the Western members of SEATO will, in the final analysis, honor their commitment to defend Asian freedom. But perhaps the Asian peoples can help SEATO by their example.

The period of Allied retreat in Europe prior to World War II came to an end with the invasion of Poland. If the Communists push their luck too hard in Laos, Laos may well turn out to be the Poland of Asia. But even if it should turn out to be an Asian Munich, I would remind the Communist despots that Munich was the final Allied concession, that the very next act of Nazi aggression resulted in World War II.

I would urge the free nations of Asia, while cooperating with the West, not to rely slavishly on it. If it comes to a major war with the Sino-Soviet bloc, we shall have to fight together. But before it comes to such a war, I am afraid that there will be a series of situations, similar to Laos, where the security of the entire areas of Asia are decided in battles of limited scope.

I feel that in these situations a lead can be given by the anti-Communist nations of Asia, acting in concert.

I believe it would stir the imagination of free peoples everywhere if the Governments of the Philippines and Thailand and of non-SEATO countries like South Vietnam, Malaya, Nationalist China, and South Korea, announced to the world that they were prepared to permit the recruitment of volunteers in their countries to help defend Laos or South Vietnam or Thailand or any other area that may be threatened by Communist aggression.

I believe it would be a wonderful thing if, armed with this permission, the Asian People's Anti-Communist League would then appeal for volunteers for an Asian freedom legion and for funds to help equip these volunteers.

I am convinced that there are scores of thousands of dedicated anti-Communists in Asia who would be ready to volunteer for such service even if the legion could offer only token payment.

I am convinced that such a demonstration of free Asian unity, of the ability to work together and the will to fight together, would inspire even the peoples of the neutralist countries and would command the unstinted respect of the West.

I am convinced that such an initiative, even on a limited scale, might be of decisive importance in situations like Laos.

I am convinced that this new demonstration of united Asian resistance to communism would inspire not only the admiration but the active support of the entire free world.

From everything I have read, I believe that the Asian peoples are not only militantly anti-Communist but that they have an affirmative faith in the ultimate triumph of freedom. They do not accept the Communist tyrannies in China, in North Korea, and North Vietnam as permanent. They believe that regimes which so debase the human being and which inspire such passionate hatred, cannot endure too long.

In this respect I believe that the Asian peoples have shown more wisdom, more morality, and more political realism than many of us in the West. In the West, I regret to say, there is far too great a tendency to accept the Communist rule in Europe and Asia as something permanent, something to which we must reconcile ourselves, something with which we must strive to achieve coexistence.

This quest for coexistence, where coexistence is not possible, represents an abandonment of the first of all moral and religious precepts: "Thou shalt love thy brother as thyself." Whether they realize it or not, those who argue in favor of an entente with the Kremlin, are urging that, for the sake of preserving our own precious skins, we forget about the agony of the hundreds of millions of people enslaved by communism.

I say that we cannot forget about their agony.

I say that if we declare peace with the tyrants, morally we are declaring war on their victims.

I say that we cannot defend freedom if we limit it to mean only our freedom.

I believe that in the long run we will protect ourselves best and defend freedom best if, together with Thomas Jefferson, we "swear upon the altar of Almighty God, eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the minds of men."

To accept Communist rule in any country as permanent or unassailable is as wrong politically as it is morally. If the Communists always attack, and the free world always defends; if the Communists are able to extricate themselves from every defeat by means of a Korean armistice; if every free world victory is regarded as temporary while every Communist victory is regarded as irreversible—if these attitudes which have heretofore characterized Western policy persists for many more years, then I consider it inevitable that we, in our lifetime, will live under communism.

If we refuse to accept communism as inevitable and refuse to regard Communist victories as irreversible, then certain political conclusions automatically flow from this position.

If the Communists mount guerilla operations in South Vietnam and South Korea in an effort to undermine the elected governments of these countries, then I say that South Vietnam and South Korea should be encouraged and assisted in mounting guerrilla operations for freedom in those portions of their countries now occupied by quisling regimes.

Guerrilla warfare, skillfully used, can be a potent weapon. Even with the best trained antiguerrilla fighters, it requires 5 or 10 defending soldiers to cope with a single guerrilla. Why should the Communists be permitted to retain a monopoly on this

weapon? Why should we not encourage the spirit of resistance behind the Bamboo Curtain by creating diversions, and by sabotage and by ambushes and by undermining the Communist economy in every possible way?

Let there be no mistake: guerrilla war is war and, like every other war, it must be carried to the enemy.

The total commitment to freedom also points to certain definite conclusions in the case of Quemoy and Matsu. If you have this commitment, then it is morally wrong to surrender other people to slavery, just as it is morally wrong to kill or to enslave.

And if one truly believes in liberation from Communist tyranny, then it is politically and militarily the height of folly to surrender positions which inconvenience the Communist enemy, which help to keep alive the hope of freedom on the mainland, and which would, in Communist hands, be used as stepping stones for further aggression.

The total commitment to freedom also points unmistakably to the stand we must take on the perennial question of recognizing Red China and admitting Red China to the United Nations.

I say that we must take no measure that in any way enhances the prestige of the tyranny that now governs mainland China, we must do nothing to indicate that we accept or endorse it or regard it as permanent, we must strive to see that it enjoys the disrepute it deserves, we must do everything in our power to call its permanence into question and to challenge its authority to speak in the name of the Chinese people.

In short, I believe that many of the matters that we find so complex really have simple answers if we once recommit ourselves to first moral principles.

I cannot say that the views I have expressed here are, on every single issue, the views of the American administration. But I can assure you that in President John F. Kennedy the free world has found a leader of rare mettle: a leader who speaks quietly, but who will not be intimidated by Khrushchev's bluster; a leader whose whole being is dedicated to peace but who will not shrink from the test of war; a leader who meant every word when he said in his inauguration speech: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to assure the survival and success of liberty."

If Nikita Khrushchev or if Mao Tse-tung, think that they can play a cat-and-mouse game with President Kennedy, let them beware. For they will learn that, in this moment of peril, through the normal processes of democracy, the free world has found a champion who is more than a match for the absolute dictators spawned by the cannibalistic processes of Communist society.

Of one other thing I am certain. Man of the 21st century will not be a brainwashed Communist robot, in a glorified international commune, told what to read and what to think and what to do and what to eat, and how much time he may spend with his family. Let Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung prate about communism being the wave of the future. But I know, as certainly as I know anything, that the future of mankind lies with freedom.

The greatness of the Declaration of Independence is that it strikes a responsive chord in the hearts of all men, everywhere, and for all time. "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. * * *" What man of good will can hear these lines without believing them, and without feeling that they correspond to something he has always believed?

The eternal will to freedom is something that no dictator will ever succeed in suppressing. That is why, 44 years after the Russian Revolution, the rulers of the Soviet Union must still maintain themselves in power by means of a totalitarian dictatorship. That is why communism is doomed.

That is why we must never lose faith in the righteousness of our struggle or in it ultimate outcome.

EASTON, AND TALBOT COUNTY, MD.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, contrary to a belief prevalent in some quarters, it is possible for an area to develop its economy without Federal assistance. If a city or county has enough pride, determination, and public-spirited citizens, it can indeed perform minor economic miracles.

Such an area is the charming gracious city of Easton located in Talbot County on Maryland's Eastern Shore. In a recent editorial, the Baltimore Sun paid tribute to Easton in this way:

For all its aura of graceful retirement from the world's cares, historic Easton on the Eastern Shore has just announced the coming of three new businesses in its environs. This announcement follows one last week that papers had been signed for an 86-acre industrial park near Easton, which, in turn, followed an earlier announcement that a contract had been let for a large new warehouse.

The main reason for this activity? An economic development committee, "manned almost entirely by unpaid volunteers, which in the words of its chairman, Norman Harrington, is pledged to develop the area's economy without touching one dime of money from the public till."

This is traditional American initiative at its most enterprising and productive best. I hope that the efforts of Easton and Talbot County do not go unnoticed in every area of this Nation which seeks to improve its economic status. An editorial in the Easton Star-Democrat commented thusly upon the Baltimore Sun article:

We are moved to say "thanks." We hope we shall continue to merit more editorials in the same vein.

Mr. President, I am confident that they will receive many more plaudits in the years to come, for these citizens have demonstrated they have the will and the way to keep Easton and Talbot abreast and even a little ahead of the 20th century.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "Local Initiative," from the Baltimore Sun of April 6 and the editorial, "Thanks, Proper or Not," from the Easton Star-Democrat of April 14, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun]

LOCAL INITIATIVE

For all its aura of graceful retirement from the world's cares, historic Easton on the Eastern Shore has just announced the coming of three new businesses to its environs. This announcement follows one last week that papers had been signed for an 86-acre industrial park near Easton, which, in turn, followed an earlier announcement that a contract had been let for a large new warehouse.

Much of this activity stems from the creation in Talbot County of an Economic Development Committee, manned almost entirely by unpaid volunteers, which in the words of its chairman, Norman Harrington, is pledged to develop the area's economy "without touching one dime of money from the public till." In a year's time the committee has had conspicuous success in stimulating both local and outside interest in the economic potential of Easton and Talbot county generally.

Typical of the sort of thing that Talbot is going after is one of those that has just signed on: a management and consulting firm for small businesses which will operate throughout the Middle Atlantic States. As Talbot sees it, the Eastern Shore is close to Washington, Baltimore, Wilmington, Philadelphia and New York. For the type of businesses and industries that employ professional-type people, a place such as Talbot provides ready access to the large metropolitan centers and yet offers gracious living. It is a case of being able to fish, hunt and boat and also carry on a good business. That is Talbot's sales pitch, thought up all by itself, and it is drawing a tidy trade.

[From the Easton Star-Democrat, Apr. 14, 1961]

THANKS, PROPER OR NOT

Were it not for the implications of impropriety, it would be proper for all of Talbot County to give a rising vote of thanks to the Baltimore Sun for the editorial titled "Local Initiative" published last Thursday.

The impropriety stems from the fact that the Sun, historically one of the great American newspapers found on the desks of U.S. Presidents every morning for generations, has always called its editorial shots as it has seen them. Indeed, the Eastern Shore has borne the brunt of many an editorial barb. In candor, many have been deserved. Such demonstrated independence of editorial thought makes the Sun's accolade in this instance all the more welcome.

The important thing, which will not go unrecognized in social, business and industrial circles throughout the Nation, is that Talbot County's initiative in a unique, self-help program of economic development, financed without recourse to the public till, stirred the editorial imagination of this major, independent American newspaper. The Sun was moved to comment that Talbot's development efforts are "achieving conspicuous success in stimulating both outside interest in the economic potential of Easton and Talbot County generally."

One prominent businessman, after reading the Sun's editorial, said it was "worth a million dollars to Talbot County." Others had higher estimates.

So, whatever the propriety, we are moved to say "thanks." We hope we shall continue to merit more editorials in the same vein.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in 1954, the Federal Civil Defense Administration was transferred from the Washington area to Battle Creek, Mich. At that time, in a letter to President Eisenhower, I carefully analyzed the many reasons for keeping this agency in Washington. When my efforts to avert the transfer were to no avail, I stated that "civil defense is dying." Although I hoped that I might be wrong, I fear that my diagnosis was correct. Civil defense is now dead.

Recently, I wrote to President Kennedy urging that he give immediate consideration to the reestablishment of our Federal civil and defense mobilization headquarters in the Washington area so that this essential agency can begin to do the job its paramount responsibility to the people of the United States requires. It is my belief that such an action would resuscitate OCDM.

A recent editorial in the Cambridge Daily Banner called attention to the need for a public reawakening of the importance of civil defense. As the Banner commented:

> A nation armed only with hydrogen-headed missiles is still not the equal of one with a strong civil defense backing up its nuclear arsenal.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Good Bargaining Point," in the April 15 edition of the Cambridge Banner, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD BARGAINING POINT

Since the end of World War II civil defense in the United States has limped along with insufficient funds, little popular support and only an occasional good word from the Nation's leaders. This year we are spending $61 million on the entire civil defense program. The Soviet Union is said to spend from $500 million to $1,500 million a year on its civil defense. The new director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization wants $104,200,000 for the coming fiscal year, about a third of the sum which some experts think is needed to do an adequate job.

We are currently spending 34 cents per person a year to guarantee our continuing existence under nuclear attack compared to $250 per person for military defense. Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, in citing the figures, has called for the return of the Federal Civil Defense Administration from Battle Creek, Mich., to Washington. This is needed he believes, to pump new life into civil defense and to get it on a sound basis. The cost of communication and transporting people between the Capital and Battle Creek "would cover the cost of consolidating the agency in a single Washington operation."

Senator BUTLER notes that the Nation's military planners "emphasize that defense can no longer be accomplished by the military alone." The Russians know that and so do our allies who are spending part of their defense budgets "on the hardening of nonmilitary buildings for the protection of the civilian population." It has not been sufficiently recognized by Americans that an effective civilian defense program would make an impression at the international conference table. A nation armed only with hydrogen-headed missiles is still not the equal of one with a strong civil defense backing up its nuclear arsenal.

CRITICISM OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION'S NEW LOW INTEREST PROGRAM

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, since January 20, 1961, message after message has been sent to Congress by the President, and many suggestions have been made for legislative action in a variety of fields, such as housing, taxation, unemployment, depressed areas, highways, minimum wage, education, and so forth.

We have also seen much unilateral Executive action since that time in areas in which the President can act without prior congressional approval. The President—and perhaps wisely—has utilized this executive authority to reduce the FHA home loan interest rate from 5¾ percent to 5½ percent. The purpose of that action was to stimulate the homebuilding industry.

There were many other moves such as this by the President which were designed primarily to provide the stimulant necessary to bolster a faltering economy. The FHA action should achieve that result in the housing field.

Other programs designed with the same general purpose in mind cannot achieve the desired result, however. One of them is the new low interest rate program of the Small Business Administration, which was initiated in an effort to stimulate economic activity and reduce unemployment in depressed areas.

Approximately 2 weeks ago, as a result of prodding by, or more than likely at the direction of, the President, the Small Business Administration's Loan Policy Board, composed of the Chairman of the SBA and the Secretaries of the Treasury and Commerce, announced that in the case of loans made by the SBA to small businesses located in areas of substantial labor surplus, as classified by the U.S. Department of Labor, the interest rate would be reduced from 5½ percent to 4 percent.

This is indeed a significant reduction. Over the life of a loan a 1½-percent reduction would result in a considerable saving to the buyer. The prospective saving would, of necessity, have the desired effect of stimulating economic activity in labor surplus areas. It should give the necessary added incentive to businessmen who are undecided as to whether to go forward with a long-delayed expansion or building program.

The Small Business Administration upon taking the action said that it is being taken as a further step to give a lift to economic activity and employment in depressed areas.

Small Business Administration Administrator John E. Horne said further that:

> The lower interest rate should offer real incentive for small firms and development companies to move ahead with long-deferred construction, expansion or conversion of facilities and purchase of needed equipment, machinery, supplies or for working capital. It is our hope that * * * many will be able to expand their operations.

I am sure everything the Small Business Administration Administrator said was well intentioned. Unfortunately, however, everything he said in his statement regarding the reduction is not quite accurate, and the public is being misled.

Mr. Horne's announcement also stated that the new interest rate will apply to loans approved after this date—which was April 4, 1961. Unfortunately, that is not the fact.

I have been informed that on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, April 17, 18, and 19, the various regional directors of the Small Business Administration met in Washington with the Small Business Administration Administrator for the purpose of working out the mechanics of the new program.

During that conference it was decided that the 4-percent loans would be available only if the area in which the business was located was a substantial labor surplus area at the time of "disbursement" of the funds, rather than at the time of "approval" of the loan.

This action is contrary not only to the statements made to the press, but also to the official published regulations of the SBA entitled "Loan Policy Statement," which appeared in the Federal Register on Tuesday, April 11, 1961.

Those regulations state:

> Where the small business concern * * * agrees to use such assistance in the establishment or operation of the business located in an area of substantial labor surplus * * * the interest rate on Small Business Administration's share of such assistance shall not exceed 4 percent per annum. The provision of this subdivision shall apply to all loans disbursed subsequent to April 4, 1961.

No statement or regulation is found that the geographical area must still be designated as one of substantial labor surplus at the time of disbursement.

The significance of this fact, while it may not be readily apparent, is very important.

In most cases, disbursement of the proceeds of the loan is undoubtedly made within a short period of time after the loan is approved. But there are many cases in which such is not the fact; and these are really the more important cases—those which will actually give employment to many additional workers in the area.

To illustrate, in the case of a loan approved for the purpose of pursuing a construction program, the disbursement is not made by Small Business Administration until the project is complete and the building ready for occupancy. After the loan application is approved by the Small Business Administration, construction, funds are obtained from private sources on the strength of the Small Business Administration's approval. The project is then commenced and when ultimately completed, the Small Business Administration makes its disbursement to the private lender and takes up its portion of the loan. This disbursement by Small Business Administration may be as much as 10, 12, or 15 months after the loan's approval. By that time, the geographical area in which the applicant's business is located may no longer be a depressed area. One of the contributing factors would be the added employment provided by the construction project in question. The small businessman, however, who may have found sufficient motivation in the new 4-percent-interest rate, now finds he must pay a 5½-percent rate on the money. He has truly been put on the horns of a dilemma.

I think such a program is self-defeating. The lower rate was effectuated with the purpose of providing greater employment in labor surplus areas. If administered correctly, it would accomplish precisely that. But under the present Small Business Administration policy, of which, incidentally, the public has not

been informed, the businessman will not be spurred to greater activity. He will fear that at the time his project is completed and the funds are disbursed, he may no longer be in a labor surplus area and the interest rate will be back up to 5½ percent, rather than at the lower 4 percent.

I feel that if this new program by the Small Business Administration is to be a success, and it can be, it must be realistically approached. The lower interest rate must apply as of the date of approval of the loan, rather than the date of disbursement of proceeds of the loan. If it does not intend to do so, I do not think the Small Business Administration should delude the public into thinking it will. Otherwise, the program is self-defeating, a pitiful masquerade, and the perfect way not to aid substantial labor surplus areas.

PROPOSED CAPE COD NATIONAL PARK

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Cape Cod shoreline contains one of the last remaining unspoiled stretches of seashore in the United States. In an attempt to preserve it for the use of the public, I have introduced along with Senator SALTONSTALL a bill to create a Cape Cod National Park.

The May 1961 issue of National Parks magazine contains an interesting and informative article, "Last Call for a Cape Cod Seashore," by Lewis A. Carter, which tells of the beauties of the area and why its preservation has become such an urgent matter. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YEAR 1961 MAY SOUND THE LAST CALL FOR A CAPE COD SEASHORE

(By Lewis A. Carter)

I first viewed Cape Cod's great outer beach early in the summer of 1945, while I was in Chatham, Mass., on a short leave from the naval service. Here, the beach is a mere strip of sand separated from Cape Cod by Pleasant Bay, which I sailed across on the wings of a fresh breeze. It was a world of surf that thundered in my ears; of towering white curtains of spray; and of trembling sand. To the south was the end of the beach and the open ocean, while to the north the roaring breakers rolled endlessly on the shore.

After the war, I found another aspect of the beach from the summit of the high bank in the town of Eastham—a scene once described by Henry Beston as: "* * * the immense and empty plain of ocean which first seizes the imagination, the ocean seen as one of the splendors of earth."

Then, again, on a wintry December day in 1945, I stood on the bayberry barrens of Truro and looked to the great dunes marching northward at the other end of the cape. Within eyesight of these three viewpoints lies the entire 43 miles of the Atlantic shoreline now being considered as the site for a national seashore park.

For a number of years the National Park Service, in common with many conservation organizations, has been deeply concerned with the apparent lack of public seashore areas along the Atlantic and gulf coasts. A survey of the entire 3,700 miles of coast between Maine and Mexico was begun in 1953; and in June 1955, the Service published a report entitled "Our Vanishing Shoreline." The survey found that nearly 85 percent of the Atlantic and Gulf shorelines was not available to the public because of existing or projected private and commercial developments. Further, the Service named the outer beach area of Cape Cod as the outstanding shoreline of the North Atlantic, and one of four such areas considered worthy of national preservation.

A detailed 2-year study of Cape Cod followed the first report, and in 1959 the Park Service introduced a general land-use plan for the area, with suggested boundaries for a national seashore park. On September 3, 1959, legislation was introduced in the U.S. Senate by President Kennedy—then a Senator—who, with Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, wrote the proposed legislation calling for the establishment of a Cape Cod National Seashore Park. A parallel bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by HASTINGS KEITH of the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts.

SOLVING SOME PROBLEMS

The proposed bills followed earlier attempts at such legislation by Massachusetts Congressmen PHILBIN, O'NEILL, and BOLAND, but contained several features that were aimed as solving the serious problems bound to arise in the creation of a nationally preserved area in a long-settled region like Cape Cod. These bills died in committees at the end of the 86th Congress.

New bills which retain some of the features of the 1959 bills have now been introduced into the 87th Congress. Both versions of the present Cape Cod bills—the Saltonstall-Smith, S. 857, and the Keith, H.R. 989—through zoning arrangements, consider homeowners and the protection of their property within the park. The bills propose direct Federal payments to towns to make good the loss of taxes because of the withdrawal of their lands. Shellfishing is regulated by the towns, subject to the fishery laws of the Commonwealth. Hunting, provision for which has aroused some controversy among conservationists, may be permitted subject to regulation by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with State officials. In the case of the Keith bill, a provision for the eventual growth of towns returns 10 percent of privately owned land in the park to the towns upon their request. These, and a number of other features, have been designed to fit a national seashore park into the long-established life of the cape.

The proposed national seashore takes in the entire Atlantic shoreline from Race Point in Provincetown on the north, to the end of the beach in Chatham on the south, plus Morris and Monomoy Islands. (The latter is at present a national wildlife refuge, under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and some conservationists feel that it should remain so.) The upper, or northern part of the beach includes an inland strip along the 35-mile stretch from Provincetown to Nauset Inlet. This strip ranges from a half mile in depth to its greatest width of several miles in the Truro and Wellfleet sections that cross the neck of the cape from the ocean to Cape Cod Bay. On the bay side, Great Island and adjacent areas are included. The proposed preservation would amount to about 29,000 acres of land.

Among the 29,000 acres is included a 3,800-acre tract known as the Province Lands in the town of Provincetown. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which has held title to this tract from earliest colonial days, also holds title to a thousand acres of unspoiled land set aside in Truro as the Pilgrim Springs State Park, which would fall into the new park. Another occupant of the proposed park land is the Federal Government, which uses several small parcels along the beach for Coast Guard and Air Force installations, and one large tract of 1,600 acres at a coast artillery station, Camp Wellfleet.

THE AREA DEFINED

The proposed national seashore lies in the towns of Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, Eastham, Orleans, and Chatham. All these communities own landings and beaches along the outer side of the Cape, the largest of which is the 6-mile Orleans town beach, located on the thin barrier extending from Orleans to Chatham.

In Provincetown and Truro lie 8 square miles of sand dunes that are among the highest and best stabilized on the Atlantic coast. The dunes are flung in a pattern of miniature mountain ranges and valleys, and support a vegetative cover that includes bayberry bushes, hog cranberry (bearberry), beach plum, grasses, pitch pine and other shrubs and trees. At Highland Light in Truro a high bank rises sheer above the outer beach and continues south for nearly 20 miles, without any major break, to Nauset Inlet. Its highest point is 175 feet above the ocean.

This plateau is one of the most unusual features of the Cape Cod area. On it flourishes a growth of pine woods, and on it also lie—mostly in the towns of Truro and Wellfleet—some 20 fresh-water ponds, many of which are very close to the beach. The first real break in the beach from north to south, is in the vast salt marshes of Nauset Inlet. From this point to its termination in the town of Chatham, Nauset Beach stretches its narrow length for a distance of more than 5 miles.

FLORAL AND FAUNAL RICHES

Cape Cod possesses a remarkable wealth of plant, animal and marine life, aside from its splendid esthetic qualities; it is an area of the greatest scientific importance, geologically, botanically, and in a number of other respects. It is the habitat or resting grounds for many species of land and aquatic birds; on Monomoy Island, off the southern tip of Nauset Beach, more than 300 species of birds have been recorded. Inhabiting the tidal zones, marshes and coastal waters are another 300 or more species of marine organisms; the outer beach is considered to be one of the best salt water sports-fishing localities of the Nation, and the surf abounds with striped bass, bluefish, tuna, pollock and mackerel.

Thousands of acres of the great plateau of the Cape provide feeding and cover grounds for deer, smaller mammals, and birds, while the extensive marshes of Nauset Inlet and Pleasant Bay are the resting and feeding grounds for great flocks of ducks and other migratory waterfowl.

The Atlantic face of Cape Cod, exposed to the harsh and relentless pounding of the open sea, undergoes extraordinary erosion, especially from hurricane-whipped storm waves that often batter its fragile structure. There are no rocks to bolster its sand and clay, the surface of which is held together only by beach grass and strongly-holding shrub and tree roots. Highland Light in Truro has been moved inland four times because of the undercutting of its foundations by ocean action. (In 1958, a storm scooped large craters out of the asphalt parking areas at both Coast Guard and Nauset Lights as easily as a child cuts out a sand-pie. The dunes and banks next to these parking areas come through the storm unchanged, testimony to the remarkable holding quality of the vegetation of the Cape.) As the Atlantic eats into the midriff of the outer beach, sand and clay are carried in the direction of Provincetown to the north and Monomoy to the south, there to extend slowly the flying wings of beach that have been formed over a long period.

CAPE GEOLOGICALLY YOUNG

Geologically speaking, Cape Cod along with the Nantucket and Elizabeth Islands, is quite young. The Pleistocene ice, scouring and gouging the ancient rocks of Canada

and New England to the north, brought a vast supply of sand and clay to its southern terminus and dropped it along an approximate line drawn from Nantucket Shoals, across the length of Long Island and not far south of New York City. Cape Cod represents a great dumping ground for the rock debris of the glacial ice, sorted and shifted about by the waves of the Atlantic, and resting at considerable depth on a foundation of the ancient rocks of New England. The many fresh water ponds that dot the landscape of the Cape are glacial kettle holes, formed by the melting of ice masses within the cover of rock debris after the retreat of the main ice body.

Since the Department of the Interior proposal in 1955 to preserve national seashore areas, subdivision, construction and commercial development have been on the increase in Cape Cod. The introduction of bills in Congress in 1959 tended to accelerate the development process. Recently, a 100-acre tract in Truro was sold and subdivided for residential use. New houses have sprung up around the ponds in Wellfleet and Truro, and along many portions of land directly bordering upon the outer beach. New motels, filling stations, restaurants and other commercial ventures have mushroomed along U.S. Route 6, the mid-Cape highway. Unless the whole park area is to be overrun, congressional action must come very soon.

EARLY ACTION NEEDED

There has been strong opposition to the park on the part of special local interests. However, at recent public hearings in Eastham, conducted by a House Interior and Insular Affairs subcommittee, both opponents and proponents seemed in agreement that there should be some sort of national preservation to save the great natural and historic values of the outer beach area. They also agreed that any delay in decision would hurt the towns concerned, the real estate and construction businesses, and the general life of the Cape.

Also on the plus side is Secretary of the Interior Udall's recent recommendation for early legislation. "Unless action is taken in the near or immediate future to acquire and preserve lands at Cape Cod for public enjoyment," he said, "it seems quite evident that the Cape's traditional atmosphere and character will vanish under construction activity now under way there."

There appears to be room for compromise and eventual agreement between the National Park Service proposal for preservation, bills calling for creation of the park, and the reasonable demands of the towns of Lower Cape Cod. But the last call for a splendid national pleasuring ground may be sounding in 1961.

SENATOR KEATING CALLS FOR THE PRESIDENT TO TAKE THE INITIATIVE IN IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the continued unrest and political upheaval throughout the world and the resultant uprooting of many people from their homes is naturally of great concern to all of us.

My distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] recently delivered an eloquent address to a consultation on immigration policy conducted by the Church World Service in Washington. The Senator in his remarks called for a reappraisal of our laws relating to refugee problems and immigration, and proposed specific revisions in the present statute.

In view of the Senator's knowledge and concentration of effort in this area, his words are of particular significance. This address deserves wide circulation, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING

Mr. Chairman, honored delegates, and guests, it is a signal privilege for me to address this distinguished assembly. You exemplify, by your presence here, by the theme and purposes of the conference, that basic tenet of Christianity which makes all men blood brothers. It is that same tenet which recognizes that this spiritual kinship imposes the lofty obligations that give life and meaning to the concept of brotherhood under God. Lip-worship of the concept is not enough. It must be dynamized, vitalized, by the Christianity in action that each of you represents here this morning and throughout this conference.

An overwhelming majority of the American people are able to trace their physical presence in the United States to an immigrant forefather. Anthropologists may even support this statement with respect to the American Indian. Over 40 million immigrants have arrived in the United States since the winning of our independence from England. Yet, only 10 percent, or 4 million of these immigrant people, arrived in the United States in the last 30 years. The 265,398 immigrants admitted to the United States in 1960 represented approximately 0.0015 percent of our total population. Fifty years ago, the number of immigrants admitted to our shores accounted for a little more than 1 percent of the population. Based on these statistics it is apparent that America has substantially reduced immigration.

Fifty years ago, the quota system had not come into being in the United States, although restrictions on immigration from the Orient were already engraved in an indelible print on our Nation's foreign affairs.

Today, there are still, to an extent, discriminatory restrictions on the immigration of orientals to the United States. It is true, in addition, that a quota system of immigration based on statistics of the 1920's still holds sway after 40 years. We live in the present—but our immigration policies lie in the deep freeze of the past.

Many of today's immigrants are the victims of political upheavals, wars, and economic stresses. They are refugees and escapees from communism and other tyrannies. According to State Department statistics, well over 2 million people around the world are classified as refugees.

One million refugees live in the teeming city of Hong Kong alone, after fleeing the brutal Communist tyranny of Red China. Refugees are not voluntary immigrants. Being forced to leave one's home, possessions, and friends, to lead a life of untold misery in new strange surroundings, is demoralizing and devastating to the human spirit.

The National Council of Churches is no stranger to the problems faced by immigrants in strange lands. The refugee work and resettlement programs of the Church World Service are known and applauded by all people working in this field.

Distribution of self-help materials such as fertilizers, farm equipment, and other material goods has been of inestimable aid to the physical and spiritual lives of millions of depressed people around the world. From the Orient to the old world, the Church World Service has been at the disposal of mankind.

In Tibet and Hungary, the Church World Service has seen the need and extended the hand of Christian charity. The positive approach to refugee matters by responsible private groups in the United States has been one of the main factors in preserving the true and undistorted American image on foreign shores. I commend you for your outstanding contribution.

Sometimes we see ourselves more clearly, more objectively, through the eyes of others. To what extent the laws of our Nation relating to immigration policy have a bearing on our foreign policy is best stated by part of an editorial appearing in the London Times:

"An enlightened immigration policy is one of the chief instruments by which the United States can help ease the tensions of the old world. Other nations are especially sensitive to American treatment of foreign entrants; so, normally, is the American people itself."

It is my belief that not only would an enlightened immigration policy ease tensions in the Old World, but it would again light the beacon of opportunity for freedom-loving men in every nation. Ever since the passage of Public Law 414, more commonly known as the McCarran-Walter Act, there has been widespread and recurrent discussion of possible revisions in this law.

During the current session of the 87th Congress, I have sponsored, with several other Senators, three bills to help in some measure to make our immigration laws more equitable and humanitarian. A positive immigration policy would have a tremendous impact on the foreign relations of the United States.

The need for a dynamic and positive approach to foreign policy has been actively considered for years. However, in my opinion, the United States has failed to take the initiative in the battle for the minds of men. Economic assistance is not alone the answer to the dilemma of our foreign policy. Men do not live by bread alone. America can again capture the hearts and imaginations of people throughout the world only by setting that example which made our Nation a hopeful symbol of the oppressed ever since colonial days. The world is yearning for positive leadership. We must extend the ideology of freedom abroad.

Yet foreign nations can hardly be convinced of our desire to be truly helpful when discriminatory immigration laws in many instances bar entry into the United States on the basis of race and national origin.

The Judaic-Christian philosophy of our culture dictates that America extend the hand of friendship in compassion to the troubled of all lands. It is unfortunate, however, that the progress of our legislation in the area of immigration law and other aspects of our national life has been so out of touch with the teachings of the great religions in the world.

The proposals that I have sponsored with other Senate colleagues would, to an important extent, allow this country to share in its world responsibilities and aid in reforming many of the discriminatory features of the immigration statutes.

The worldwide refugee problem which I touched upon earlier has given me particular concern. Estimates of refugees, depending on one's definition of refugee, vary from 2 to 4½ million people. These individuals are earnestly holding out for a better life. Often they are the victims of disease, poverty, and the abuse that war and tyranny bring.

What responsibility do we, God-blessed in so many ways, have to the downtrodden of the world? I believe that the United States is morally bound to continue refugee programs currently in progress. In addition, I have suggested as one proposal, that persons who, because of persecution on racial, religious or political grounds are caused to flee from areas of the world where forces are at work against the best interests of the

United States, be granted admission to this country as parolees. After 2 years' residence in the United States, their status as parolees could be changed to that of permanent residents at the discretion of the Attorney General. This proposal is designed to provide for emergencies caused by future Hungarys or Cubas.

In addition, this proposal would also provide for the issuance of 40,000 nonquota immigrant visas to refugee-escapees in a 2-year period from July 1, 1961. Many deserving refugees from all parts of the world would be eligible to enter the United States under this provision. Of the total 40,000, 5,000 would be nonresettled, hard-core refugees. To assist in the settlement of these refugees, $5 million would be made available to Government agencies and private organizations for such resettlement purposes. It is morally indefensible for us to care less, or to do less.

Next, I would like to briefly outline some aspects of a bill I have sponsored during the 87th Congress to revise our present immigration and naturalization laws. Quota numbers today are based upon the outmoded census of 1920. Revising the quota system by basing it upon the 1960 census would be a recognition of the times in which we are living. Unused quota numbers, under this proposal, would be pooled and reallocated by Executive order of the President. This bill would also eliminate the discriminatory provisions of the so-called Pacific triangle. The elimination of this section would provide equal treatment to all, regardless of racial origins.

Another area of humanitarian concern for all Americans is the uniting of families who are separated by antiquated immigration laws. One aspect of this proposal is an acceleration of quota number waiting lists to aid in bringing together people of this Nation and their relatives from across the oceans.

The deportation provisions of the present law should also be modified. It should be possible to effect deportation in appropriate cases without an endless and frustrating series of appeals and motions for stay orders and other delaying tactics which can be devised by ingenious counsel.

I would favor a plain and simple form of judicial review which would guarantee each alien an opportunity for review before deportation, but which would preclude a judicial circus. In addition, we should establish a more reasonable statute of limitations on institution of proceedings for deportation. This whole problem of judicial review needs very careful study if future abuses are to be avoided.

I have also sponsored a bill to extend indefinitely the alien orphan adoption law. Although war, dislocation, and misery affect the lives of everyone, children for the largest part suffer the most irreparable and lasting damage.

It is for this reason that the provisions of the alien orphan law are particularly noteworthy. Alien orphans, given the opportunity for development in the homes of American families, can constitute an equally gratifying experience for both parent and child. It is my hope that this bill will be acted upon before the current session of Congress ends. Otherwise the benefits of this present law will cease on June 30 of this year.

International understanding and cooperation may be achieved by a full realization of the dignity of all men. The emerging nations of Africa look for moral leadership. I believe the United States, with its great and precious heritage of freedom and human dignity, can supply such a positive approach to world problems that sheer moral force will once again allow us to take the initiative in world affairs. Defensive foreign policy cannot move America forward. We cannot lead unless we show the attributes of leadership.

Immigration policies, as I have stated before, affect our foreign policy to a large extent. The President has indicated willingness to conduct the foreign affairs of the Nation with vigor and force.

I would hope that in his wisdom, a reappraisal of our present immigration policy will be made. As a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have a great interest in the area of immigration legislation. However, and regrettably, this concern is not very widespread in the Congress today. No hearings have been scheduled by the subcommittee to date and none is expected for the balance of this session of Congress. Leadership from the White House is imperatively needed, and unless it is forthcoming, immigration and naturalization legislation will never be enacted by the 87th Congress.

The President, in taking the lead on immigration legislation, would be carrying out the pledges in both party platforms. The Democratic Party's platform specifically stated: "We shall adjust our immigration, nationality and refugee policies to eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives already in our midst." The Republican platform contained essentially the same language.

The desire by both political parties is apparent. The need for this legislation is obvious. The missing ingredient up to now is action.

Campaign words and promises cannot carry into fruition proposed legislation. The groundswell must come from groups such as yours, to impel the executive and legislative branches to action.

I have full confidence that your dynamic and purposeful organization—representing as it does the Christian conscience and the spirit of man's humanity to man—will play the vital role that is required if we are to transform the hopes, the dreams, the yearnings of our fellow men into the joy and the peace of ultimate fulfillment.

DEDICATION OF FREMONT CANYON POWERPLANT NEAR CASPER, WYO.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on April 28, 1961, Mr. Floyd E. Dominy spoke at the Fremont Canyon powerplant dedication near Casper, Wyo. In his speech, Mr. Dominy pointed out some of the problems and difficulties in piloting reclamation and power projects from their inception until finally completed. He made particular reference to the Burns Creek project in Idaho and to the firm stand the Honorable GALE MCGEE, senior Senator from Wyoming, has taken in support of this project.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dominy's speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION FLOYD E. DOMINY AT FREMONT CANYON POWERPLANT DEDICATION NEAR CASPER, WYO., APRIL 28, 1961

We are met today in one of the most historic areas and on one of the most historic waterways in the Western Hemisphere.

When President Thomas Jefferson boldly pushed through the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, he set the course of empire west beyond the Mississippi and Missouri. From that day to this, the people of the United States have looked ever westward for living room, for opportunities to expand, to strengthen the economic muscle of the Nation.

When this expansion movement reached the forbidding peaks of the Rocky Mountains, the Valley of the Platte provided the easiest way—if any way could be called easy—over the mountains.

In 1842, even before Wyoming was a territory, the Congress of the United States appropriated funds for the purpose of making an investigation of the astronomy, geography, botany, geology, and meteorology of this most western part of the great Louisiana Purchase. The funds were recommended by the Senator from the new State of Missouri, Thomas H. Benton.

The Senator's son-in-law, a young, adventurous lieutenant in the U.S. Topographical Corps, was appointed to head the expedition. This young explorer was Lt. John C. Fremont. As part of his expedition, he entered the South Pass country, boated down the Sweetwater River to its juncture with the North Platte River, and then down the North Platte.

In this stretch of the North Platte River, there were many rapids. The force of the water on his boat over these rapids was so great that his boat capsized, and he and his party had to walk out of the canyon. The location of these rapids was in the general area of the bridge across the canyon over which we traveled today.

Because of this incident, this canyon was named Fremont Canyon after Lieutenant Fremont, and we have likewise used this name for our powerplant.

The westward-bound pioneers who followed, of course, did not attempt this precipitous canyon. The Oregon Trail, the Mormon Trail, the Overland Trail and the route of the Pony Express all left the North Platte near Casper, circled northwest of the Canyon and finally picking up the Sweetwater at Independence Rock.

But the pioneering did not stop then although many of the pioneers did. They found the valley of the Platte most inviting and carved out hard-won homesteads which today are one of the foundation stones of Wyoming's and Nebraska's irrigated economy.

The Reclamation Act of 1902 stands today as one of the historic measures in the winning of the West. The North Platte reclamation project was one of the pioneering ventures in that effort. The Pathfinder Dam upstream was appropriately named because it was one of the major structures in early reclamation history. Today, we reach the climax of that 60-year effort to develop the North Platte.

The Fremont Canyon plant and Gray Reef Dam represent the concluding step in utilization of the waters of the North Platte. And, like the earlier development, it is also somewhat of a pioneering and venturesome effort.

The Fremont Canyon powerplant, the largest hydroelectric plant on the North Platte River, has a rating of 48,000 kilowatts. The water for this powerplant is provided by a pressure tunnel which extends to the bottom of the Pathfinder Dam some 3 miles upstream. Thus after 52 years of valuable use as a storage reservoir Pathfinder Dam is now providing a further benefit to the people of the North Platte Valley by the production of hydroelectric power.

Fremont Canyon powerplant could not have been built with the tools and engineering know-how of early reclamation days. As you can well appreciate, from the drive up here this morning, the site was originally almost inaccessible.

The spot where we stand today was an area of rock debris which had loosened from the surrounding cliffs and formed a large, tall spire. In order to locate the powerplant, it was necessary to blast out and excavate

solid rock; to scale and remove loose rock from the surrounding high cliffs; and then to transport all this waste from the site.

The 3-mile tunnel which brings the water from Pathfinder Dam to the powerplant is 18 feet in diameter.

An interesting construction feature is the surge tank of which you are probably not aware. If there is a sudden load change on a hydroelectric powerplant, very high pressures develop in the penstocks. To overcome this, a surge tank, 40 feet in diameter and 246 feet high, approximately the height of a 24-story building, was constructed of concrete and steel. Approximately 160 feet of this tank is below the surface and is connected with the pressure tunnel. In constructing this underground portion, it was necessary for the contractor to build a railroad into the excavation to remove debris and waste and to provide necessary equipment and materials for construction of the tank itself.

In order to install the tunnel intake structure and gates, it was necessary to empty Pathfinder Reservoir. At the same time, it was essential to assure the availability of irrigation water as required during any irrigation season and to provide needed storage capacity for capturing water for the following season. Thus it was imperative that drawdown be accomplished during the off-irrigation season and that installation of the intake structure be done in a minimum of time.

Through the fine cooperation of the contractors in developing and maintaining construction schedules and in conjunction with Bureau and irrigation district officials in the scheduling of irrigation demands and utilization of other existing storage facilities, approximately 1 million acre-feet of water was moved out of Pathfinder through the North Platte system without loss of any water for future needs. Intake structure installation was accomplished from September through December 1957, and storing of water for irrigation the following year was immediately resumed.

During construction, it became evident that it would be impracticable, if not impossible, to scale all of the loose rock on the cliffs above this powerplant. Yet possible damage from future falling rocks must be prevented. Five cable barriers, which you can observe from the powerplant deck, were constructed to retain these loosening rocks. I expect that the material captured in these barriers will have to be removed from time to time in the future.

In the construction of this project, the sheer cliffs and underground tunnels presented many hazardous working conditions. The surveyors faced difficult measurements wherein the usual rod-and-chain methods could not be used. Nonconventional methods such as the double-transit method of "cutting-in" for measurements were employed.

The high scaling of these sheer walls to remove the loose rock took the "guts," strength, and bold efforts of many skilled workers. The placing of concrete necessitated methods other than the usual ready-mix concrete truck.

All of these operations taxed abilities and skill of our manpower. So I repeat—it is fitting today that we pay tribute to the modern-day pioneers who conceived the ideas and put them together into an economical plan; to the engineers whose technical training and experience equipped them to solve difficult problems and create structures that will last in the years to come; to the craftsmen and laborers who operated the machinery and the tools; and to the contractors who had the ability, the desire, and the fortitude to assume the risks involved in successfully building a project such as this.

Thus, we are here today to write the successful and concluding chapter to the development of the North Platte. But are we witnessing, too, the slowing down and possibly even the concluding efforts to expand and utilize the water resources of all of the West?

There are some who would have us think so from their efforts to obstruct and hinder present and proposed reclamation development. And I regret to say that some of this obstructionism exists right here in the Rocky Mountain country which is truly the last frontier of expansion and utilization of our natural resources.

The key to this continued growth is, as it has been in past decades, the maximum utilization of our precious water resources. Yet, what do we find?

To the west of us, across the State of Wyoming and barely within the Idaho border, lies the Palisades project on the Snake River. Downstream from Palisades Dam is the site of the Burns Creek Dam which will create a badly needed reregulating reservoir. Burns Creek would not be feasible or possible without the storage and river regulation realized by Palisades Dam. But together, the two make an ideal combination to fully utilize this stretch of the Snake River for power production and to supply needed supplemental water for irrigation.

Yet we have strong obstructionism today to the authorization of Burns Creek simply because it will contribute to the Federal power system. It is the same kind of obstructionism which hindered construction of Hoover Dam, Shasta, Grand Coulee, and even Yellowtail Dam which we are now undertaking on the Bighorn River north of here.

Some of this opposition, I regret to say, is coming from right here in your own State of Wyoming. I am afraid some of you may have been misled by a fraudulent bill of particulars put together by some segments of the private power industry—an industry which has long cried "gloom and doom" concerning Federal hydropower development.

And I remind these obstructionists that hydroelectric and thermal-generated energy are not competitive; hydropower development, as part of a multipurpose water resource development, is in the national interest and has been so considered and supported by Congress throughout reclamation history. They are for the most part complementary. Hydroelectric power, by itself, cannot begin to fill the future needs of industrial expansion. But it can be a very vital and necessary partner to the expansion of thermal capacity which will ultimately use the rich coal, oil, oil shale and natural gas deposits of the Rocky Mountain region, including those in Wyoming. Actually, the Burns Creek capacity, while important in the Palisades operation, is but a drop in the bucket to the thermal output which will be necessary from your Wyoming coalfields.

It is to the everlasting credit of your senior Senator, the Honorable GALE MCGEE, who is here with us today, that he has refused to bow to the pressure of those misguided obstructionists and has announced that he will support the Burns Creek authorization. His is the same kind of farsighted statesmanship and leadership that were the strength of the West in its pioneering days. Such qualities are equally necessary for our continued growth today.

You should also be aware that this same kind of obstructionism exists in the development of the Colorado River storage project which is so vital to the future of Wyoming and its sister States of the Upper Colorado River Basin.

The Bureau of Reclamation, over the past several years, has made a detailed study of transmission needs for the hydrofacilities of the Colorado River storage project. There is not only the movement of energy from the hydroplants to the load centers to consider, but there is also the necessity for maximum utilization of available generating capacity which can only be accomplished by integration and coordination. There is also the requirement of the authorizing act to keep the marketing rate as low as possible and at the same time, provide the necessary financial assistance from power revenues for the participating water use projects which are the ultimate objective of the entire authorization.

The Bureau of Reclamation consulted with the utilities in the evaluation of their offer to make sure it was clearly understood. Finally, the Bureau findings were reviewed and supported by an independent board. The previous administration found that a federally constructed system was the most feasible to meet the necessary objectives as recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation. Secretary Udall, after reviewing these findings, has also endorsed them. He is, indeed, going even further by proposing integration of this system with other adjoining systems for maximum beneficial returns from all facilities including your own North Platte and Missouri River basin projects.

In the face of this affirmation of our findings by an independent engineering board and support by the former Republican administration as well as the present Democratic administration, we find the purveyors of gloom and doom, the obstructionists, again raising red flags of fear of Government competition. Their cries that "we can do it better" are heard throughout the land.

But let me quote from a recent article in that most responsible member of the public press, the New York Times. On April 12, the Times carried an announcement of an industry plan for a high-voltage interconnecting grid in the Southwest. Of special significance is this notation in the same New York Times story that certain utility leaders have expressed demands that the industry get busy with actual interconnections lest the Government take over such grids and link them in the Federal network.

That, I think sums up the attitude of these obstructionists much better than I can—don't do anything until you have to but take such steps as are necessary to retain your monopoly.

Again, I repeat that the Colorado River project Federal transmission system is not competitive with but is complementary to the very necessary utility systems, both public and investor owned. It is designed simply to meet the specific needs of the project and to best utilize the resources therefrom as is the Burns Creek addition to the Palisades project. They are both desirable and necessary in the public interest and must go forward.

It has been a pleasure to be back here today in Wyoming where I spent so many wonderful years. It has been good to see so many friends. I thank you for inviting me to participate with you in this celebration of another milestone in our progress to conserve and utilize our natural resources.

I am confident that we will pull together just as did our forefathers in the pioneering days of the West. It is with that look to the future that I here and now dedicate the Fremont Canyon powerplant and Gray Reef Dam to the service of the present and future generations.

BACK-DOOR SPENDING

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, there is increasing pressure for more and more back-door spending, outside of appropriation control. It is a favorite device of big spenders who have no regard for fiscal responsibility.

I submit that any program worthy of sponsorship by the Government of the United States should be sound enough to stand the test of the appropriation process as required by the Constitution.

In this connection I invite the Senate's attention to an article on the subject written by John A. Grimes, and published in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, April 26, 1961. I ask unanimous consent to have the article published at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BACK-DOOR SPENDING—DEPRESSED AREA PROGRAM TO JOIN LONG LIST FINANCED DIRECT FROM U.S. TREASURY

(By John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—A familiar fiscal drama is scheduled for performance in the House of Representatives today, enhanced by the debut of a new star—the Kennedy administration.

The attraction is billed as a vote on a proposal to provide $451 million in Federal grants and loans to aid areas of chronically high unemployment. But the substance of the plot will deal, not so much with the advisability of initiating the new program, but how to finance it. As fashioned by a Senate-House conference committee, the proposed legislation calls for direct withdrawals from the Treasury rather than requiring the program to rely on annual spending grants from Appropriations Committees dominated by economic conservatives.

This direct withdrawal device, dubbed "backdoor spending" by its foes, is not new; far from it. The financing scheme has expanded from a special arrangement to propel the late, and largely unlamented, Reconstruction Finance Corporation into making business loans during the great depression until it now supports more than two dozen Federal programs ranging from home loans to ship mortgages to farm price support loans. More than $100 billion of taxpayers' money has been dispensed without resort to the appropriations process; authority to dole out another $25 billion already is on the books.

READY AND WILLING

Despite this long run, today's performance takes on some of the excitement of a first night. For the Kennedy administration is ready and willing to find out whether it will be able to make even more extensive use of the controversial spending approach. Already the President has asked Congress to permit him to bankroll a $7.3 billion 5-year program of foreign development loans by tapping the Treasury directly. And, though the administration didn't plan to make the depressed areas bill a key test of congressional attitude, the die has been cast. A defeat today would bode ill not only for the development loan program but also for future attempts to travel directly from the White House to the Treasury building next door. A victory, though it would not assure the success of the controversial development loan and other programs, would surely aid the effort. Says one observer: "The Kennedy administration would like to make as much use of backdoor spending as it thinks it can." The former Eisenhower administration, in contrast, at least tried to prevent the expansion of back-door-spending practices.

Esoteric as it may seem, the issue can have an important impact on taxpayers' pocketbooks. For example: Last session Congress trimmed some $221 million from the Eisenhower administration's regular appropriations request; at the same time, however, the lawmakers approved a combined increase of nearly $1 billion above the administration's requests for programs financed by direct withdrawals from the Treasury.

The back-door approach to the Treasury takes various forms. Sometimes it's called authority to spend from public debt receipts. Other times, it may be labeled "contract authority." Or, it may be a "revolving fund," or permission to spend foreign currencies owned by the United States. Whatever the name, the result is the same—direct withdrawals from the Treasury without annual appropriations from Congress.

In theory, a new agency or program has to get double approval from Congress. The first comes in the authorizing legislation; this sets up the framework and the limits of the program, and is handled by a regular legislative committee. Then, the administration must run the proposal through the Appropriations Committee for funds. Each year, also in theory, the agency or the program must return to Congress for reexamination and new money.

THE CALMER LOOK

Because authorizations for new programs may be shoved through Congress quickly under crisis conditions, a second and calmer look by a supposedly disinterested committee is essential, back-door spending foes contend. They also maintain that the legislative committees that handle the authorizing legislation over the years have become special pleaders for particular interest; the Agriculture Committee, the argument runs, is inclined to spend all it can for the farmers; the Banking Committee pushes measures to spread Federal funds throughout the housing industry; and the Veterans' Committee seeks to tap the Treasury for the benefit of the veterans. Authority over money bills was taken from the legislative committees in 1920 and given to the Appropriations Committees just to avoid this, House economy advocates assert.

Probably the most widely used of the back-door spending devices is the authority to spend from public debt receipts. Simply, this allows a Federal agency to write an I O U and give it to the Treasury in return for the needed money; the Treasury, in turn, is authorized to borrow the money publicly to replace that lent to the agency.

The technique is used mostly to finance Government lending programs: The Commodity Credit Corporation's price support program, Export-Import Bank lending, Veterans' Administration direct home loans, and others. Back when the RFC was set up, it was argued that Government loans eventually would be repaid so there was no need to complicate the budget process by requiring lending agencies to come to Congress each year for funds. But now that Uncle Sam is firmly in the lending business, it is apparent that some loans will never be paid off. No one, for example, really expects the CCC to recover the money it has sunk into surplus crops.

But perhaps the sharpest setback for the traditional appropriations process came in 1949 in a ruling on the House floor that direct Treasury borrowing was not an appropriation of Treasury money, and thus did not have to be routed through the Appropriations Committees. Since then, back-door spending opponents have been trying without success to close the door.

Early this year, a resolution to ban any back-door spending proposals was voted down by the newly enlarged and liberalized House Rules Committee.

Whatever the outcome of the impending drama, the performance can be expected to be reenacted again and again. For, as far as back-door spending is concerned, the Kennedy administration seems committed to the motto: "The show must go on."

GUGGENHEIM FELLOWS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I was very pleased to note that among the recent recipients of the Guggenheim Awards there were five Rhode Islanders.

Ben H. Bagdikian, the Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal Bulletin, who will study the development of the contemporary American press, is a remarkably capable and imaginative newspaperman. He is a credit to the profession of journalism. Undoubtedly his study will make a most worthwhile contribution to the field of communications.

Mr. President, four faculty members of Brown University, one of Rhode Island's most distinguished educational institutions, also received Guggenheim fellowships. They are: Dr. Robert Cole, chairman of the chemistry department; Dr. Sidney Goldstein, a professor of sociology; Dr. Ronald S. Rivlin, chairman of the division of applied mathematics; and Dr. Richard T. Shield, professor of applied mathematics.

Mr. President, as my colleagues know, the Guggenheim Awards have been made for 37 years to assist research and creative work in the fields of art, science, and scholarship. I congratulate these fellow Rhode Islanders on this high honor.

ASSISTANCE TO DOMESTIC TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I welcome President Kennedy's seven-point program for assistance to our domestic textile industry.

Undoubtedly, my senior colleague, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], as chairman of the Special Subcommittee To Study the Textile Industry, must have a great sense of accomplishment. The vast majority of recommendations made by Senator PASTORE's subcommittee in their reports, issued in February of 1959 and March of 1961, are reflected in President Kennedy's seven-point program. Other recommendations of the Pastore subcommittee have been previously implemented by Executive action. Mr. President, all of us with a deep interest in the textile industry are truly indebted to Senator PASTORE for his leadership.

I am encouraged to note that President Kennedy's program clearly recognizes the importance of the textile industry to our national defense. The President's directive that a study be made of the possibility of eliminating or offsetting the higher prices paid by domestic textile manufacturers for cotton is especially meritorious. It is grossly unfair that domestic manufacturers should have to pay 6 cents a pound more for cotton than their foreign competitors must pay.

The President's proposals dealing with modernization of equipment, expanded research, and a review of tax depreciation allowances are also highly desirable. In line with the President's statement, I hope that a conference of major textile importing and exporting countries will soon be called and I am encouraged to note that applications for relief by the domestic textile industry, under existing statutes, will be given the most careful consideration.

I eagerly look forward to seeing President Kennedy's proposals to Congress

for Federal assistance to industries which are seriously injured by imports. As has been pointed out many times in this Chamber, the difficulties of our domestic textile industry have caused grave concern in my State and nationally. Under the leadership of my distinguished senior colleague, I shall continue to concern myself very closely with the textile industry, the Nation's second largest employer, which employs over 2 million persons and affects, indirectly, 2 million additional workers.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BENNETT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BENNETT. I was asked to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that the majority leader might come to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah, who has the floor, yield to me, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, may I first get the floor? I ask for recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 154, S. 847. I may say that only bills and resolutions which are strictly noncontroversial will be brought up this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 847) to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may say, by way of explanation of the bill, that as the organization was originally incorporated, it included the Army and Navy, but did not include the Air Corps.

Obviously, the Air Corps should be included. That is the only purport of the bill, which comes from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is detained by other business. He was asked by the organization which is the subject of the bill to introduce the proposed legislation, so as to describe the organization more accurately. The Senator from North Carolina honored me by asking that I be associated with him, since I also am a member of the organization.

The purport of the bill is exactly as has been stated. It simply makes the title sufficiently all-embracing so as to include the various branches of the armed services which are not specifically mentioned in the earlier title.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with respect to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Florida, the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] likewise contacted me and asked that, if at all possible, this measure, in which he expressed personal interest, be brought to the floor for consideration at the earliest opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 847) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the corporation known as the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated, which was incorporated by the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America", approved August 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 486), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated, and any reference to such corporation under the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated, shall be held to refer to such corporation under and by the name of the Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated.

SIMPSON CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 158, Senate Resolution 129.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 129) relating to the bill (S. 101) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Simpson Construction Co."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to Senate Resolution 129, Calendar No. 158, but I ask that it go over so that we might communicate with the Department of Defense, the General Accounting Office, and the Department of Justice with a view to ascertaining the volume of cases which may be involved in this particular question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When I made my request, it was that the Senate proceed to the measures on the calendar to which there was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. I do not object to the resolution; I merely ask that it go over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If that be acceptable——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, certainly I have no objection to the calendar committee obtaining whatever information it may desire about this measure. I think the measure is highly equitable. It relates to a claim about which the Committee on the Judiciary is simply asking that the Court of Claims investigate and advise the committee upon the merits of the claim, which I think is quite desirable. However, if the Senator from Iowa wishes to look into the matter along the lines he has suggested, certainly I have no objection at this time. I shall, of course, press for the enactment of the bill, if that should become necessary later. However, I hope the Senator will be completely satisfied that the resolution is completely in accord with the doing of justice to have this course followed, because the Committee on the Judiciary, in the very nature of things, does not have either the time or the machinery to examine fully into the complexities of the merits of a claim of this kind, which is based on the wartime construction of an airport.

Mr. President, I am perfectly willing that the measure be passed over at this time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, as I said before, I do not object. I request that the resolution go over with a view to ascertaining the volume of cases of this kind which might develop. It is my understanding that the bill is the first of its kind, would establish a precedent, and would fall under the Lucas Act, concerning which the jurisdictional fact has not been established. It seems to me that as a matter of information the Senate ought to know the volume of cases which will be involved in this particular question. I do not believe it will delay the resolution too long. I would appreciate its being passed over.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw my request that Senate Resolution 129 be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request for the consideration of Calendar No. 158, Senate Resolution 129, is withdrawn.

FAUSTO LAVARI

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 159, S. 395.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 395) for the relief of Fausto Lavari.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill,

which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the periods of time Fausto Lavari has resided in the United States since March 13, 1921, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

MARTHA UCHACZ BARRAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 160, S. 921.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 921) for the relief of Martha Uchacz Barras.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Martha Uchacz Barras shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Anne Barras, a citizen of the United States.

JOSEPH ANTHONY VETTIGER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 162, S. 980.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 980) for the relief of Joseph Anthony Vettiger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 980) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joseph Anthony Vettiger may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act: *And provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

ALVARO RODRIGUEZ JIMENEZ

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 163 (S. 1045).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1045) for the relief of Alvaro Rodriguez Jimenez.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1045) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alvaro Rodriguez Jimenez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee.

HARALAMBOS AGOURAKIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 164 (S. 241).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 241) for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "section" and insert "sections", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Haralambos Agourakis shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of John William and Effie Parashos, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ANNA LEKOS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 304) for the relief of Anna Lekos, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee.", to strike out "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Lekos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. KEUM JA ASATO (MRS. THOMAS R. ASATO)

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 400) for the relief of Mrs. Keum Ja Asato (Mrs. Thomas R. Asato), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 4, after the name "Asato", to insert "the widow of a United States citizen who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Keum Ja Asato, the widow of a United States citizen who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States, shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 101(a)(27)(A) of that Act and the provisions of section 205 of that Act shall not be applicable in this case.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LILIANA GRAZYNA SWIATKOWSKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 973) for the relief of Liliana Grazyna Swiatkowska, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "section" and insert "sections", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Liliana Grazyna Swiatkowska, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Stephen Swiatkowska and Helen Swiatkowska, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Liliana Grazyna Swiatkowska shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1215) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. It is not properly a calendar bill. It will be brought up later this week or the first part of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 155, House bill 1723.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1723) to amend the joint resolution providing for observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, this bill merely amends a joint resolution which was passed last year by both Houses. The joint resolution created a Commission To Provide for the Observance of the 175th Anniversary of the Constitution of the United States, in Philadelphia, Pa. The original measure called for the Commission to report on January 3, 1961. Unfortunately, by that time neither the members of the Commission representing the Senate nor the public members to be appointed by the President had been appointed. Accordingly, the House passed, early this year, the bill now under consideration. It extends until June 28 of this year the time for the report.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the very brief, favorable report of the Judiciary Committee on the amended bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 191) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to change the reporting date for the U.S. Constitution 175th Anniversary Commission from January 3, 1961, to June 28, 1961.

STATEMENT

The act of July 14, 1960, created a Commission to be known as the U.S. Constitution One Hundred Seventy-fifth Anniversary Commission, which has for its purpose the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States.

Among the duties of the Commission are the following:

(1) Promulgate an address to the American people explaining its purpose;

(2) Prepare plans for the celebration of the 175th anniversary of the creation of the Constitution of the United States;

(3) Coordinate the plans of various State and civic groups.

The Commission is composed of 12 members—the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, 3 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 3 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 3 Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House.

The President of the Senate has designated the senior Senator from Pennsylvania (Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK), the senior Senator from North Carolina (Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR.), and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania (Senator HUGH SCOTT), to be members of the Commission.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives has appointed Congressman JAMES A. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Congressman JAMES J. DELANEY, of New York, and Congressman JOHN TABER, of New York.

The committee is in agreement that the reporting date for the Commission should be changed from January 3, 1961, to June 28, 1961, in view of the fact that the appointments of members to the Commission were completed only recently. Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of H.R. 1723, without amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope the bill will be passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 1723) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SALVATORE BRIGANTI

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, just to make certain, I now call up Calendar No. 161, Senate bill 971, and request its immediate consideration, because I am not at all sure that previously it was considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 971) for the relief of Salvatore Briganti.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Salvatore Briganti may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act. This Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the celender, so far as the measures to which there is no objection are concerned. I wish to express my deep appreciation of the courtesy and kindness extended by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am very happy to serve in association with the Senator from Montana, and I shall do all I can to expedite the transaction of the business of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time I may yield to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act of $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 3, 1961, pp. 7172–7178, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that additional members of the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be allowed the privilege of the floor during the consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCNAMARA. And I also ask unanimous consent that Joseph Goldberg, of the Department of Labor, whose advice and counsel were most valuable to us during the original debate on the bill, be allowed the privilege of the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in regard to the conference report.

First, I wish to thank my colleagues who served with me on the conference committee—the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. Certainly it was a pleasure to serve with them, and their cooperation is greatly appreciated.

There are a number of major differences between the two versions of the bill.

So far as the Senate is concerned, the major difference relates to the extent of coverage.

The Senate amendment called for a million-dollar test for newly covered retail enterprises which also purchase or

receive annually $250,000 of goods which have moved across State lines.

The basic House test for coverage was that an enterprise must operate five stores in two or more States.

The House conferees receded from the House position, and adopted the Senate test.

The next major area of disagreement related to minimum hourly rates for presently covered workers.

The Senate version called for $1.25 an hour after 28 months. The House version called for $1.15.

The Senate figure was accepted.

The next major area of difference related to minimum hourly rates and overtime protection for the newly covered workers.

The Senate version called for $1.25 an hour after the third year, and a 40-hour workweek after the third year.

The House version brought newly covered workers under the act at $1 an hour, and provided no overtime protection.

In this area, the conferees decided upon a compromise, as follows:

Newly covered workers would receive $1 an hour for the first three years of the new act; the fourth year, they would go to $1.15; and the fifth year, to $1.25.

There would be no overtime coverage for the first two years of the act; in the third year, 44 hours; the fourth year, 42 hours; and the fifth year, 40 hours.

It is the belief of the Senate conferees that this represents a position much closer to the Senate views than to the House proposal.

Other major differences related to coverage for the employees of automobile dealers and laundries.

In both these areas, the Senate conferees receded from the Senate's position, and adopted the House view. So neither of these groups of employees will be covered in this year's act.

I must say that the Senate conferees receded most reluctantly, particularly in the case of laundry workers. We did so only at the insistence of House spokesmen that the report would not be approved by the House unless laundries maintained their present exemption.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, a summary of the conference report be printed. A copy of this summary has been placed on every desk. Senators will be able to see how other minor areas of difference between the two versions were resolved.

The conference report represents a sound minimum wage measure. Its approval will result in the extension of minimum wage protection to approximately 3.6 million additional workers.

It will raise the minimum wage to a figure which will more closely mirror the harsh facts of the cost of living in the 1960's.

Mr. President, I urge immediate Senate approval of the conference report.

In conclusion, I should like to state that the Senate conferees very definitely believe that the conference report represents the farthest they can depart from the Senate version of the bill. The conference report is a moderate one. Despite whatever views may exist among Members of the other body, I cannot believe that the Senate conferees would be willing in any further sessions to diminish the scope and impact of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of minimum wage bill (H.R. 3935) as agreed to in conference

	Number of employees
A. For presently covered employees (23,900,000), the minimum wage is increased to $1.15 an hour for the 1st 2 years after the effective date and $1.25 an hour beginning 2 years after the effective date.	
B. For newly covered employees the minimum wage and overtime will be as follows:	
1st year after effective date: $1.00 minimum wage; No overtime requirements.	
2d year after effective date: $1.00 minimum wage; Do.	
3d year after effective date: $1.00 minimum wage; 44 hours a week.	
4th year after effective date: $1.15 minimum wage; 42 hours a week.	
5th year after effective date: $1.25 minimum wage; 40 hours a week.	
C. Retail trade:	
1. Retail and service enterprises: The bill covers retail enterprises which have a million dollars or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level) and which purchase or receive goods for resale that move or have moved across State lines which amount in total annual dollar volume to $250,000 or more	2,182,000
2. Gasoline service stations: Also covered for minimum wage, but not for overtime, are gasoline service stations which have $250,000 or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level)	85,000
3. Exemption from retail coverage: From this coverage in the retail trade the bill excludes the following:	
(a) Auto dealers and farm implement dealers.	
(b) Hotels.	
(c) Motels.	
(d) Restaurants, including retail store lunch counters, caterers, and similar retail food services.	
(e) Motion picture theaters.	
(f) Hospitals.	
(g) Nursing homes.	
(h) Schools for handicapped or gifted children.	
(i) Amusement or recreational establishments operating on a seasonal basis.	
C. Retail trade—Continued	
3. Exemption from retail coverage, etc.—Continued	
(j) Any small store which has less than $250,000 in annual sales even if it is in an enterprise that has more than $1,000,000 in annual sales.	
4. Special provisions for retail trade: In addition, the bill makes the following special provisions for particular problems in the retail and service trades:	
(a) Commission employees in retail stores will be exempt from overtime if more than half their pay is from commissions and if they earn at least time and one-half the minimum rate.	
(b) Assistant managers of retail stores will be exempt even if they perform up to 40 percent nonexecutive and nonadministrative work.	
(c) Student workers may be employed in retail trades at subminimum rates under certificates issued by the Secretary in occupations not ordinarily given to full-time employees.	
D. Laundries: The conference agreement has removed the proposed new coverage and the changes in exemptions for laundries that were contained in the Senate-passed bill. Laundries therefore remain in the same position as they were under the present law.	
E. Transit companies: Suburban and interurban transit companies which have $1,000,000 or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level) are covered for minimum wage but not for overtime.	93,000
F. Establishments which already have some covered employees under the Act are covered for all their employees if they are in an enterprise which has a million dollars or more in annual sales.	100,000
G. Construction: Construction enterprises which have at least $350,000 in annual business are also covered for minimum wage and overtime.	1,000,000
H. Seamen: Seamen on American flag vessels are covered for minimum wage but not for overtime.	100,000
I. Telephone operators: The exemption for telephone operators is limited to those employed by an independently owned public telephone company which has not more than 750 telephones.	30,000
J. Fish processing: Seafood processing employees are covered for minimum wage but not for overtime (seafood canners are treated in this way under the present law).	33,000
Total number of newly covered employees	3,624,000

K. Other provisions:

1. Puerto Rico: The minimum wage in Puerto Rico for presently covered employees is increased by the same percentage as the mainland minimum, subject to review by industry committees in hardship cases; for newly covered employees the rates will be set by industry committee procedures.

2. Broadcasters: Announcers, news editors and chief engineers of broadcasting companies located in nonmetropolitan cities of 100,000 or less population are exempt from overtime.

3. Bulk petroleum dealers: Independently owned and controlled local enterprises engaged in bulk petroleum distribution are exempt from overtime if their annual sales are less than $1 million (exclusive of excise taxes).

4. Trip rate: Trip rate drivers and drivers' helpers making local enterprises are exempt from overtime if the Secretary of Labor finds that the plan under which they are paid is consistent with the principle of the 40 hour workweek.

5. Farmer's livestock auction operations: Employees working in a livestock auction held by a farmer need be paid the minimum rate only for the hours they work at the auction if during that workweek they are employed primarily in agriculture by the farmer.

6. Country elevators: Employees in country elevator establishments in the area of production, which may also sell products and services used in the operation of a farm, are exempt from both minimum wage and overtime if no more than five employees are

employed by the establishment in such operations.

7. Cotton ginning: Employees engaged in ginning cotton for market in counties where cotton is grown in commercial quantities are exempt from minimum wage and overtime.

8. Holly wreaths: Homeworkers making natural holly wreaths are exempt from the act.

9. Shade-grown tobacco: An exemption from minimum wage and overtime is provided for agricultural employees engaged in bulking shade-grown tobacco if they were employed in the growing and harvesting of such tobacco.

10. Transporting fruits and vegetables to market: An exemption from minimum wage and overtime is provided for employees transporting fruits and vegetables from the farm to market or transporting harvesting hands, within the State.

11. Board and lodging may be included as wages on the basis of a fair-value calculation made by the Secretary: Also, such prerequisites may be excluded from wages to the extent that they are excluded under a collective bargaining agreement.

12. Study of employment effects of foreign trade: The Secretary is authorized to study employment effects of imports and exports in industries covered by the act and to report on such studies to the President and to the Congress.

13. Study of certain exemptions for canning and processing and of wage rates in hotels and restaurants: The Secretary will study the complicated system of exemptions in the act for the handling and processing of agricultural products as well as the rates of pay in hotels, motels, restaurants and other food-service enterprises and to report the results with recommendations in the next session of this Congress.

14. Effective date: 120 days after enactment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask whether, notwithstanding the failure to include such a provision, we retain complete freedom of action to seek from the Department of Labor a study in regard to what happens to laundry workers who are excluded from the coverage of this measure.

Mr. MCNAMARA. The part of the Senate version dealing with laundry workers was totally eliminated in the conference; and the conference report makes no reference to a further study. But, obviously, the Secretary of Labor has such authority and he has indicated privately to me that he will make such a study.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope the Senator individually and the committee as a group will bring this matter under scrutiny, because if we found the existence of a manifestly bad situation in which workers were really being exploited, I am sure our colleagues might take a very different view.

I understand the local views which finally prevailed. I heard them expressed in the committee, on which I have the honor to sit with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. I heard the expressions of those from my State who came to see me about this matter. I was not persuaded that we ought to eliminate the laundry workers, but, for reasons of practicality, they are eliminated. I think we owe a solemn responsibility to them, as we owed to the motel and hotel workers, the provision relating to whom I hoped would be adopted in the other body, too, to assure them that their interests are under constant scrutiny. I know I am stating what we all know to be the fact, but I think it is important, in view of the exclusion in the compromise between the two Houses, that some of us assume that responsibility in a very public way; and I know the Senator from Michigan feels precisely as I do about it.

Mr. MCNAMARA. For the RECORD I wish to state that I feel that way.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I must tell the Senator from New York that I have the floor. Unfortunately, I have promised one or two of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that I would yield to them, so they could meet some pressing engagements. I do not think I should yield for general debate or discussion of the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will yield, may I say that this practice of keeping the floor may be indulged in, but it may not be used to throttle discussion on an important matter as a conference report. I think the Senator from Utah would be the last one to make such a ground rule.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah was asked by the chairman of the subcommittee to yield for the purpose of introducing the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And also by the majority leader, who made that request, and the Senator from Utah was gracious enough to state he would acquiesce.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah does not want to be ungracious, but three Members on the other side of the aisle are facing a deadline, and want to make insertions in the RECORD. The Senator from Utah hopes the discussion on the conference report will resume after he makes his statement, for which purpose he sought and obtained the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say that is satisfactory if it is not intended to adopt the conference report until after the Senator from Utah makes the statement; but if it is intended to adopt it before that, I hope the Senator will not inhibit discussion on it.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah understood that he yielded for the purpose of the presentation of the conference report, and that action would be taken after he had made his statement.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I hope I may have the attention of the majority leader before he leaves the floor. This matter is a privileged matter. We have gone pretty far on it. Could we act on it now?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We could if there was not much of a debate on it. I point out that even though it is a privileged matter, the right of the Senator from Utah cannot be taken away from him. He has the floor, and he has graciously acquiesced to yield. I think he has gone a long way to comply with the request made by the Senator from Michigan and myself earlier in the day.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, there will be further discussion. The Senator from Vermont has a statement to make. I think I shall make some comments.

At this point I wish to point out that on the last page of the conference report, dealing with student workers, the language is:

> The Senate amendment is similar to the House bill, but provides that such students may be employed in retail or service establishments in positions ordinarily given full-time employees.

That language should read: "in positions not ordinarily given to full time employees."

Mr. MCNAMARA. I am advised the correction was made by the staff, as instructed by the conference committee. They had the authority to do it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If Senators will let the Senator from Utah yield to Senators who have pressing engagements, then we can resume discussion of the conference report later.

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to do so. Now I am happy to yield.

(Mr. BENNETT yielded to several Senators, whose statements appear elsewhere in the RECORD.)

DEATH OF VERY REV. ROBERT J. SLAVIN, O.P., PRESIDENT, PROVIDENCE COLLEGE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, scarcely a month ago, on March 28, I stood on this Senate floor to sound the praises of the basketball team of Providence College. Victors in the National Invitation Tournament, the campus of Providence College rang with all the youthful joy of their triumph. Their happiness was shared by the entire community—and most of all by their faculty—and the most ardent of their fans, the president of Providence College, the Very Reverend Robert J. Slavin, of the Order of Preachers.

Today the Providence College campus is silent in sorrow—steeped in the tragedy of the sudden and untimely passing of Father Slavin on Monday, April 24. Only a few days earlier, in the fullness of his powers and in the performance of his duties, Father Slavin was here in Washington.

Now in the quiet of the Dominican cemetery on this same campus, this great son of Thomas Aquinas finds his rest. All of the honors of his church have been paid him—and all the tender tributes of a stricken community.

For his passing has left a lonely place in the hearts of all who have known the labor and love Father Slavin gave to Providence College as the school, its faculty, and its scholarly sons achieved national respect, fame, and affection.

The world of education, the domain of religious understanding, the humblest home that has helped and been helped by the expanding greatness of the college—our whole community which has enjoyed its inspiration and intimate friendliness—all these have sustained a personal loss in the death of this good priest, this great teacher, this valued friend.

Sixth president of Providence College, to which honor he came in May 1957, and serving longer than any other, Father Slavin has presided over a third of that school's life of service—over the last 14 years of its astounding growth.

Three thousand students find opportunity in the classrooms of the buildings that dot its 73 acres as they find inspiration in its faculty of 159—more than half of them members of the Order of Friars Preachers, more popularly known as the Dominican Order. This is a far cry from its first class of 80 gathering 42 years ago.

Father Slavin came to the Providence College presidency from the Washington educational scene of which he had then been an important part for 13 years as professor of philosophy at the Catholic University of America. Here he obtained his master of arts degree—his licentiate in sacred theology and his doctorate in philosophy.

His national prominence has continued. He was a member of the executive committee of the American Council on Education, a member of the Advisory Committee on new educational media of the U.S. Office of Education and a former president of the National Catholic Education Association.

Father Slavin was an accepted authority on educational matters on the Hill, and many Members of the Congress were honored to call him a close personal friend.

Schools, colleges, and universities beyond number have bestowed their honorary degrees upon him, and for 10 years he has borne the highest and rarest honor of the Dominican Order—master of sacred theology.

Orator and author, builder and administrator, teacher and priest, these multiple careers Father Slavin has achieved in the half century of his life.

The dedicated life of this priest was foreshadowed in his Boston boyhood. Its arena was forecast as he became a student at Providence College. Its fulfillment is to be found in his influence that lives on in this school of the ideals that he sought and served.

No single campus confines such an influence.

It is coextensive with the character of America wherever the men of Providence College have gone with his instruction and inspiration.

While Rhode Island mourns her loss in the death of Father Slavin, we are conscious of and grateful for an existence made so much richer by the life of this beloved servant of his God and his fellow man.

FEDERAL AID TO CHURCH SCHOOLS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a report from Washington, prepared by Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, which report deals with the very important subject of the constitutionality of proposals for Federal aid to parochial schools.

I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a preliminary statement about Dr. Fuller's qualifications.

The report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, has had a long and active career in educational law and administration. He majored in administrative and constitutional law in earning a doctor of law degree from the University of Chicago Law School in 1932, and wrote his dissertation in school law in earning a doctor of education degree in educational administration at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. He has taught school law at the Harvard Graduate School of Education for 2 years, at the University of Southern California for three summers, and in other higher institutions. The constitutional phases have always been a major interest.

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON: KENNEDY MEMORANDUM PRESENTS ARGUMENTS FOR LEGISLATIVE PACKAGE ON EDUCATION—SAYS GRANTS TO CHURCH SCHOOLS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

A lengthy memorandum presenting the Kennedy administration's argument for the constitutionality of its legislative program in education has been filed with Congress and made public. Prepared at the request of Chairman WAYNE MORSE of the Senate Subcommittee on Education by attorneys of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, in consultation with the Department of Justice, it presents brilliant and sometimes subtle persuasion for the Kennedy bills on public school and higher education. Then it advises Congress on how to be certain that new legislation can be brought before the Supreme Court for tests of constitutionality under the first amendment.

On a few of the issues, opposition lawyers may have the advantage before the Supreme Court, but this possibility does not detract from the current importance of the memorandum. It presents an initial estimate of constitutionality appropriate for the executive branch.

Congress soon may make a second preliminary estimate by passing the legislation. Then the Supreme Court undoubtedly will give some weight to these executive and legislative estimates of constitutionality in its final judgments on any specific cases. The memorandum is an excellent contribution to the national discussion of public and private education.

The first conclusion of the memorandum is that general grants of public funds to church schools are unconstitutional. The memorandum cites the principle stated by Justice Black in *Everson* v. *Board of Education* as binding: "No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

The memorandum also says: "Since no effort is made to earmark the funds for specific purposes, such a broad grant would inevitably facilitate the performance of the religious function of the school." Thus begins the contention that general purpose funds facilitate religion in the school, but that special purpose funds do not.

One may agree that funds for general purposes always facilitate the performance of the religious function of a church school, without implying that funds for special purposes seldom or never do. Merely an "effort to earmark," even if accomplished, could scarcely save funds for even limited instructional purposes from unconstitutionality if they finance religion in such a school. The contention foreshadows later discussion on the loan provisions of title 3 of the National Defense Education Act.

Loans to church schools also unconstitutional, says memorandum. Cites McCollum case and draws analogy.

The second conclusion is that general loans to church schools are likewise unconstitutional. The memorandum states: "These benefits plainly have the purpose of providing financial advantage or convenience to the recipient. And like the broad grant, the across-the-board loan would inevitably facilitate religious instruction."

It adds that public property cannot constitutionally be lent for religious purposes, citing the McCollum case, and that the lending of public credit is in the same category. The Zorach case is then cited for the unequivocal position that "Government may not finance religious groups."

The third general conclusion is that tuition payments for all church school pupils are unconstitutional. The word "all" leaves much to the imagination, possibly implying that any number of pupils short of "all" might be selected and made eligible.

The memorandum says such tuition payments accomplish indirectly what grants to church schools would do directly, and that "* * * tuition payments, whether made to the school or to the parent or student, would constitute support of church schools. * * *" It points out that State courts have followed the Everson case in ruling such tuition unconstitutional because it "compels taxpayers to contribute money for the propagation of religious opinions which they may not believe."

Uncertain constitutionality in loan provision of NDEA loans "likely" to be upheld as constitutional.

In these areas the memorandum deals with the three interrelated constitutional limitations that apply: the twin requirements of the 1st amendment against establishment of religion and guaranteeing the free exercise of religion, and the due process clauses of the 5th and 14th amendments. It accepts the Everson decision upholding use of tax funds for public bus fares of parochial school pupils on their way to and from school as the outer limit under the Federal Constitution in the area of auxiliary services. This exceeds the outer limit of constitutionality under many State constitutions.

Another area of uncertain constitutionality is recognized in the loan provision of title 3 of the National Defense Education Act. This authorizes Federal funds for the purchase of materials and equipment to improve instruction in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools. The memorandum regards these loans as likely to be upheld as constitutional, saying they are for special purposes not closely related to religious instruction, are intended to advance specific national purposes, and are not likely to release other funds for religious purposes because the loans must be repaid.

The distinctions are unconvincing. Religion pervades the curriculum in church schools, and these subjects constitute some 40 percent of the curriculum. The national interest in education has been recognized by Congress as covering many more than these subjects; education itself was so recognized as far back as the Northwest Ordinance.

Governmental financing through loans constitutes an economic benefit to the school. These loans could be classed more logically with so-called across-the-board loans to elementary and secondary schools, and it is significant that the memorandum ends the section with the following statement:

"In what other directions this principle of special purpose loans may be extended is difficult to ascertain. Typically secular and

sectarian education is so interwoven in church schools as to thwart most possibilities."

The memorandum deals with higher education more briefly than with the elementary and secondary schools. On some points it is convincing. On others, however, it leaves an impression of desperate advocacy, occasionally making dogmatic statements that are no more than opinions while omitting demonstrable facts that objectivity requires.

"The constitutional principles involved are obviously the same whether the subject is elementary and secondary school education or higher education, but the factual circumstances surrounding the application of the principles are dramatically different," says the memorandum. Some of the conclusions reached in reversing settled constitutional principles on behalf of higher education are far more different than the circumstances.

Scholarships for students in both public and private colleges appear here to stay and will be expanded with no trouble.

The memorandum naturally emphasizes differences between elementary and secondary education on the one hand and higher education on the other as much as possible. There are some differences. For instance, elementary education is compulsory and secondary education is partly compulsory, although most States do not require attendance in either public or private classes when children otherwise are educated effectively. College attendance is voluntary. There are also differences in maturity of the students, so sectarian influence can be judged better by college students.

The memorandum emphasizes that 41 percent of college students attend private institutions, and that to limit the use of scholarships at these institutions would unbalance higher education and restrict individual opportunities. Holders of federally financed scholarships for college attendance may be privileged to attend sectarian colleges or universities under the guarantee of free exercise of religion in the first amendment.

In any event, enough real differences in circumstances between students and institutions at the higher and lower levels exist to support a strong case for upholding the constitutionality of federally financed scholarships used in any accredited public or private college or university.

The memorandum states: "Governmental assistance given directly to colleges for the construction and expansion of academic facilities perhaps raises, in the case of sectarian institutions, a closer constitutional question than scholarships." Here the attorneys hint that perhaps the nondenominational, nonprofit private colleges and universities might be considered more similar to the public than to the sectarian higher institutions. I believe they are, insofar as the first amendment is concerned, but to admit this openly in the memorandum is too much to expect. It would undermine the arguments for many of the positions taken, because sectarian colleges enroll about the same percentage of college students that sectarian schools enroll of elementary and secondary students.

For elementary and secondary sectarian schools, Federal financing of facilities is said to be unconstitutional, but circumstances bring the attorneys to an opposite conclusion for higher education. It is a close question.

Federal grants to sectarian institutions of higher education are constitutional, says memo, which rejects Everson case.

Half a page in the memorandum covers the most difficult of all the constitutional questions posed by the educational program of the Kennedy administration. It holds that Federal grants to sectarian institutions of higher education for operational expenses, in addition to tuition and other costs paid by holders of Federal scholarships, are constitutional.

Its argument is: "The payment to the institution is in reality merely a supplement to the scholarship, no less valid constitutionally than the scholarship itself. To regard such payments as unconstitutional would make the question of who receives the payment the one decisive criterion and sacrifice substance to form."

The memorandum rejects the authority of the Everson case for higher education:

"Everson put some emphasis on who received the assistance, student or institution. From this it has been argued that while assistance to the institution itself is prohibited, assistance to the student is more likely permissible, even though, functionally viewed, a similar purpose is served. This view overstates the significance of form alone. We believe that who receives the benefit is important only where form serves a substantive end."

Such direct Federal support of institutional expenses of church-controlled colleges and universities clearly violates the first amendment. Scholarships would be no more than a measuring device to determine the amount of the grants. As a practical matter, it would be impossible to use specific grants for specific scholars. The criteria for unconstitutionality in the memorandum would be violated beyond the power of differing circumstances to correct. This would be general and direct Federal financing of religion. The elementary and secondary schools would be next, approached through the junior colleges that typically combined both secondary and higher education in each institution.

Getting judicial review for education legislation is tricky process; memorandum prescribes method.

The memorandum makes an excellent contribution in discussing why Federal aids to religious institutions have not been tested for constitutionality. The reason is the decision in the case of *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, which held in 1923 that the Federal spending power cannot be challenged by an individual taxpayer.

The memorandum says: "There is, therefore, no significance to be attributed to the fact that the existing programs have not been litigated. We can regard them as precedents only for what the Congress and the President, not the Supreme Court, regard as within the first amendment."

Then the memorandum suggests to Congress a way to insure that new Federal legislation may be tested in the courts: "* * * Congress could direct the Commissioner of Education to make some benefit available to private schools with the requirement that such benefit shall not contribute to an establishment of religion or prohibit the free exercise thereof. The same legislation would also provide for a hearing on a written record of any application rejected and a statement of findings by the Commissioner. The Commissioner's decision rejecting any application for a benefit would be made subject to judicial review." Unless this is done, the Government attorneys believe, it will be difficult if not impossible to obtain court review to determine constitutionality of Federal legislation on education.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ERVIN ON LAW DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD remarks made by me on Law Day in the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR SAM J. ERVIN, JR., LAW DAY, MAY 1, 1961, THE PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am happy to be with you on the occasion of the fourth annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A., and I would like to pay tribute to the men and women of our military services who are joining with civilian communities throughout the country in reaffirming our faith and respect for the rule of law and the administration of justice in our society.

I think it fitting that in the space age, with its many breathtaking technological and scientific achievements, that we pause to give recognition to the laws which are so basic and fundamental to the peace and order of our national and international life.

Indeed, there is a greater need for such recognition today than there ever has been. For the time is not too far off when, in addition to our well-established bodies of national and international law, man may find it necessary to devise a system of interplanetary law. This great possibility is all the more reason that the officers and members of our military services should join with civilian lawyers and laymen in honoring our legal system. For in the conquest and exploration of space, they have played and will continue to play a significant and challenging role.

The rule of law is an essential ingredient of any civilized society. It is the difference between order and chaos, between harmony and anarchy; without law and order there can be no civilization. The mere existence of law, however, is not sufficient to attain fruition of the fullest potentialities of society. To command the respect of its peoples, and to inspire within them a desire to uphold the law, it must be fair and just. The law must be more than a set of rules and regulations by which men are governed; it must be a product of the express consent of the people who are to be governed by it, and it must never overlook nor forsake the inalienable right of the individual to what the Declaration of Independence calls life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is this concept of law which distinguishes a free society from a totalitarian society, and it is this concept which the forefathers of this great Nation wrote indelibly into the Constitution of the United States, the greatest charter ever conceived by man for a free republic.

The preamble to our Constitution which begins with "We, the people * * *" says in a clear and compelling manner that our Government is based only on the consent of the governed and the divine right of the people.

History is replete with stories of the failure of harsh and unjust laws. It abounds with stories of war and revolution as the result of a dictator's seeking to substitute his own rule of law for the law of the state. And, by the same token it isn't necessary to turn back the pages of history very far to discover the extent to which the people will go in their quest for freedom and human dignity. Indeed, this very quest of our forefathers has resulted in the democratic form of government under which we now live—a government which has become a blueprint for freedom-loving peoples the world over.

Man's struggle to be free and to be governed by just laws is not new. The concepts of due process and of equal protection of the laws as embodied in our Constitution are the same today as they were on June 15, 1215, when a group of English barons forced King John to put his seal to the Magna Carta on the windswept plains of Runnymede. They are the same today as they

were on July 4, 1776, when the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence. And, they are the same today as they were on September 17, 1787, when a small band of patriots gathered at Philadelphia to affix their signatures to the Constitution of the United States.

I have a deep and abiding respect for our Constitution with its Bill of Rights and I am constantly aware of its vitality. It is a great tribute to the vision of our forefathers that the hallowed words are as alive and meaningful today in the space age as they were when written.

Freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom against unreasonable searches and seizures, the right to trial by jury, the right to counsel, the right against self-incrimination, the right to freely elect those who are to govern us, and the other guarantees of our Constitution are so much a part of our daily lives that we have come to take them for granted. And therein is where the danger lies—in taking them for granted, in being lulled into such a feeling of security and complacency that we are rendered oblivious to the forces which would erode or destroy our rights and freedoms.

It has been said that "the price of liberty is eternal vigilance." That statement was never more true than it is today when an insidious international Communist conspiracy is storming the ramparts of freedom throughout the world.

As I speak to you on this the 1st of May 1961, the Soviet Union is celebrating its past victories and looking forward to its future conquests. Flushed with the success of their recent achievement in putting the first man into space, the Communists are parading their military might in the Red Square this very moment and Khrushchev continues his saber rattling and shoe pounding antics in trying to convince the uncommitted nations that communism offers them the solutions to their problems. So there is no more appropriate occasion than May Day—May 1, 1961—for us to recall the basic moral and philosophical principles upon which our society is based and to contrast these principles with the cynical, immoral, and atheistic philosophy that underlies international communism.

We must never take our liberty for granted and we must remain ever alert that the siren songs of foreign ideologies do not charm us into such a lethargic state that the freedom won through the sacrifices of our Founding Fathers, is lost through our own default.

Each of us should consider himself a watchdog of all the basic human rights which are part of our heritage. In the U.S. Senate, we have such a watchdog. It is the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of which I have the honor to be chairman. We have launched investigations and held public hearings on such subjects as freedom of information, wiretapping, eavesdropping and the Bill of Rights, the constitutional rights of the mentally ill, the Federal loyalty-security programs; civil rights; confessions and police detention; and the right to counsel. We will continue our work in these and other areas where erosions of our constitutional rights are likely to occur. I pledge to you that we will do all in our power to preserve fully the guarantees of our Constitution.

And, there are other protectors of the Bill of Rights. Foremost in their vanguard are the free and independent courts of our Nation and members of the bar. From my own practice of law and my service as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, I have come to appreciate the fairness and procedures of our courts and juries. I am aware that no system of law and justice can be absolutely infallible, but I am of the firm belief that our system is as near to perfection as any legal system yet devised.

Under our Federal laws, an individual cannot be arrested and held for trial without the protection of certain safeguards established by our Constitution. In the first place, he can't be arrested at all unless there exists probable cause that he has committed the crime for which he is charged. And, it is the committing magistrate, not the arresting officer, who determines the existence of probable cause. He is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. He has a right to counsel and the right to be tried by a jury of his peers. Throughout the trial, he is protected by procedural and substantive safeguards, including the right against self-incrimination. But, if by chance, he still feels that he has not been given a fair trial, the writ of habeas corpus is available to him and he has the right of appeal all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court. That is what we mean by due process of law—and I challenge any nation in the world, any dictatorship or totalitarian society to match the United States in its meticulous regard for the right of its individual citizens.

The U.S. Supreme Court has held that the liberty mentioned in the guaranty of due process of law means not only the right of the citizen to be free from the mere physical restraint of his person, as by incarceration, but the term is deemed to embrace the right of the citizen to be free in the enjoyment of all his faculties; to be free to use them in all lawful ways; to live and work where he will; to earn his livelihood by any lawful calling of his own choosing, and enter into all contracts which may be proper, necessary, and essential to his carrying out to a successful conclusion any lawful pursuit.

This is what we mean by freedom and individual liberty. Can international communism or any other foreign ideology meet these terms? The answer obviously is "No."

Charles S. Rhyne, former president of the American Bar Association, on the occasion of the first Law Day—U.S.A., 4 years ago, said:

"We tend to take too much for granted the great principles which underlie our Government. We have a legal system which, in spite of the size of our country and the necessary complexities of its organization, assures for the average citizen more vigorous protection for life and person, more widespread justice, more equality under law, more effective protection for individual rights, more evenly distributed economic opportunity, more security in person and property, and greater personal freedom, than any other system yet developed in all the history of mankind. What more meaningful proof is there that life under the rule of law assures the best existence yet devised by man?"

This, then, is the message which I would like to leave with you today: Let us rededicate ourselves to the preservation and protection of our liberty and freedom under our Constitution and laws; let us rekindle the flame of liberty that burned in the hearts of our Founding Fathers, for as Judge Learned Hand has said, "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women. When it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it"; let us repledge ourselves to the firm conviction that ours is the world's best system of law and government.

Finally, in the words of a small-town Illinois lawyer, Abraham Lincoln:

"Let reverence for the laws be breathed by every American mother to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap; let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs; let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation; and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay of all sexes and tongues and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars."

VISIT OF CHANCELLOR KONRAD ADENAUER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege on April 14 to be cohost, along with four of my distinguished colleagues, Senators BRIDGES, DODD, JAVITS, and HRUSKA, and a luncheon for His Excellency, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, and his Foreign Minister, Dr. Heinrich von Brentano.

The luncheon was a notable affair, attended by the distinguished President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, more than 100 Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, and a cross section of the executive and judicial branches of the Government, as well as representatives of American religious, civic, and business communities.

It was a stirring tribute to one of the world's greatest elder statesmen. In turn the Chancellor paid tribute to our people who as victors in World War II turned our energies to helping rebuild the Federal Republic of Germany from the ashes.

In these times of international strife, the harmony that prevailed between the leading citizens of our two Republics will help show other nations of the world that democracies will stand side by side and show a united front to all aggressors. This attitude was exemplified by the press reports concerning the Adenauer visit here, received from around the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a representative compilation of the American press reactions, including our State Department and White House communiques, to Chancellor Adenauer's visit to the United States.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AND CHANCELLOR KONRAD ADENAUER AFTER THE READING OF THE JOINT COMMUNIQUE OUTSIDE THE ENTRANCE TO THE WEST LOBBY OF THE WHITE HOUSE

The PRESIDENT. We have this communique which will come out in a few minutes. Perhaps I could read it quickly, and then I might say a word or two.

(After reading the communique:)

I want to say, speaking as President of the United States, that it has been a great pleasure to welcome to the shores of this country again the Chancellor of the Federal Republic. I don't think that there is any doubt that history will deal most generously with him in writing the history of the Atlantic Community in the years 1945 to the present. His accomplishments have been extraordinary in binding the nations of Western Europe together, in strengthening the ties which link the United States and the Federal Republic.

Therefore, speaking personally and also as President of this country, it is a great honor to welcome again to our shores a friend, a great European, and distinguished leader of his country, the Chancellor of the German Republic, Chancellor Adenauer.

Chancellor ADENAUER (as interpreted from the German). Mr. President, I was deeply moved and touched by the kind words which

you said after reading out the communique. I should like to assure you, Mr. President, that I feel exactly the same way as you do, that it was an extremely great pleasure for me to have come back again to your country in order to have had the opportunity of sensing the atmosphere which I was able to find over here. I especially felt this atmosphere in the discussions which I had with you, Mr. President, and I also felt it particularly this afternoon when I was welcomed in the Senate.

This is the ninth time that I have come here to the United States, and every time I feel deeper and closer linked with your country and with your Government. I am very happy indeed, Mr. President, to have had this chance of meeting you—and you, as the great leader of your country, and therefore the personality that carries such a huge responsibility for the fate of all the free world, and you are dealing with this big task with great energy, and great farsightedness.

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE BY THE PRESIDENT AND HIS EXCELLENCY CHANCELLOR KONRAD ADENAUER OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

During the past 2 days the President and the Chancellor have had a most cordial and useful exchange of views on a number of subjects of interest to their two Governments.

Their informal conversations have included among other things, discussions of the problem of a divided Germany including Berlin; the current nuclear test ban talks; political and military developments pertaining to NATO; aid to developing countries, European economic cooperation; East-West relations; and the situation in some critical areas of world politics.

Also participating in the talks were Secretary of State Dean Rusk and German Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano.

The President and the Chancellor reaffirmed the position of their Governments that only through the application of the principle of self-determination can a just and enduring solution be found for the problem of Germany including Berlin. They renewed their pledge to preserve the freedom of the people of West Berlin pending the reunification of Germany in peace and freedom and the restoration of Berlin as the capital of a reunified country.

The President and the Chancellor agreed that intensified political cooperation in NATO is indispensable in order to coordinate the efforts of the Allies for the preservation of peace and security in the world.

The President and the Chancellor reaffirmed their support of NATO as the keystone of the common defense of the North Atlantic area. They underlined the conviction of their Governments as to the necessity for the Alliance to maintain and develop further all military means required to enable them to deter effectively a potential aggressor from threatening the territorial integrity or independence of any ally.

Furthermore, the problems of general and controlled disarmament were discussed. The President and the Chancellor are convinced that reasonable, freely negotiated measures to reverse the growth of uncontrolled national armaments will serve to lessen the danger of war and that concurrently measures should be negotiated to secure a life in freedom to all nations. The goal is general and total peace.

The President and the Chancellor agreed on the importance of a concerted aid effort by the industrialized free world nations in an amount commensurate with their resources and on a basis corresponding to the magnitude of the task. They pledged the support of the United States and the Federal Republic to the fulfillment of the objectives adopted by the member nations of the development assistance group at their meeting in London two weeks ago.

The President and the Chancellor welcomed the prospective establishment of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development as constituting a step of vital importance in the development of an Atlantic community. The new possibilities which it opens for economic cooperation and economic policy coordination and the means of achieving closer interdependence were also discussed. In this connection, the President and the Chancellor agreed that continuing attention should be paid to the balance-of-payments problem.

The important role of the European Economic Community as a powerful and cohesive force in the core of the Atlantic community was stressed. The dynamic political and institutional potential of the EEC was agreed to be an important element of present strength for the Atlantic community.

The fruitful exchange of views which the President and the Chancellor have had, as well as the frank and cordial atmosphere in which the talks were conducted have contributed significantly to deepening the ties of friendship and understanding between the two countries and to the strengthening of the free world community.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK UPON ARRIVAL IN WASHINGTON OF HIS EXCELLENCY DR. KONRAD ADENAUER, CHANCELLOR OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. Chancellor, let me extend to you a warm welcome to Washington. It is a great pleasure for me both personally and officially, and a high privilege as well, to greet you on behalf of President Kennedy and the people of the United States.

We are happy to have you here with us not only because you are so well known as a close and understanding friend of our country, but also because you embody so clearly the dynamic and democratic Germany of today. It is most opportune that you could arrange to consult with us at precisely this time when a new American administration is shaping the major policy lines which we will expect to follow during the years ahead. In close cooperation with our allies and friends, we shall move together on the path toward freedom and peace for all the world. We will expect to benefit greatly from the wise and statesmanlike counsel that you will bring to this endeavor.

Permit me also to extend my welcome to your daughter, Mrs. Libeth Werhahn, and the distinguished members of your party, including particularly Foreign Minister von Brentano. I hope that, even though your stay with us will be a short one, the pressure of business will permit you some measure of relaxation and that your visit will prove most pleasant and enjoyable for yourself and your party.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1961]

ADENAUER GETS ACHESON BRIEFING; WILL DEMAND VOICE IN ATOMIC POLICY

(By Flora Lewis)

BONN, April 9.—Chancellor Konrad Adenauer is planning to tell President Kennedy that Europe must have a voice in any final decision whether to use atomic weapons under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Adenauer discussed this view today with Presidential Adviser Dean Acheson, who flew into Bonn for the afternoon and gave the Chancellor a complete briefing on Washington's new thinking about NATO.

Adenauer's argument is understood to be that a share in the crucial decision is necessary to overcome French President Charles de Gaulle's objections to NATO, and thus to rebind the alliance at its sagging seams.

The Germans are urging that concessions be made to the French, at least, as part of a streamlining reform of NATO command structure. Under the current system, the real power of decision on when defense of NATO territory requires the use of nuclear arms rests with the President of the United States alone.

Adenauer invited Acheson to Bonn today as a preparation for his own meeting with President Kennedy in Washington Tuesday. The future of the Atlantic alliance will be the focal point of the Washington talks.

Some recent American statements had caused the German Chancellor to worry that the United States might be planning to downgrade NATO as the keystone of Western policy.

He was eager to get details of Washington's new ideas from Acheson, who drew up a special NATO report for Mr. Kennedy, as advance guidance on how he can expect his meeting with the President to go.

Acheson said afterward that he gave Adenauer a complete account of my work in Washington and that "we think alike on almost all major questions."

Before leaving after 5 hours of talks, Acheson went out to the garden for a quick game of bocci (Italian lawn bowling) which is Adenauer's favorite sport.

The two fundamentals of Adenauer's foreign policy have always been the alliance with the United States and the drive toward unity with France. Quarrels within NATO have brought these parallel lines near clashing in the past year. Bonn therefore favors reform to strengthen and reunify NATO.

But despite assurances from the new administration, Adenauer has become uneasy lest American ideas for change tend to weaken the organization.

Adenauer returned yesterday from his spring vacation to complete preparations for his Washington trip which one leading German newspaper said could change the course of Western history.

The statement, though exaggerated, reflects the current intense uneasiness here over German-American relations and the general assumption that these relations are about to enter a new phase.

It is, many Germans feel, a phase that is beginning awkwardly but could work out for the best if the Chancellor can succeed in his mission to win the confidence of President Kennedy.

The Deutsche Zeitung, after taking Mr. Kennedy brusquely to task for neglecting NATO and failing to act yet toward bringing allied unity, said "the issue now is whether Germany can become the third great European partner belonging to this club—the club of true friends, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and Canada. The question is whether after enmity and dependence, a new era is to commence, an era of genuine friendship."

Highly influential German officials have been more blunt in private. They argue that the Americans must now decide once and for all what they think about Germans. There is a tightlipped impatience at criticisms they consider appropriate from a guardian to a ward. And they feel they have outgrown tutelage.

Adenauer, who is a strong believer in the power of political personalities, has been keenly eager for a firsthand impression of Mr. Kennedy ever since the American elections.

At 84, he is almost old enough to be the President's grandfather. German columnists have been publishing warnings to him to restrain any impulse of his occasionally sharp tongue to treat the Chief Executive

of the United States as a young whippersnapper, but Adenauer is far too concerned with the serious problems of alliance and anxious to make a sound impression for there to be any likelihood of temperamental gaffes.

NATO SEEN SUBJECT

The President's plans for strengthening the North Atlantic Alliance, as the basis of future relations, are of immediate and deep concern to Bonn. Doubtless, the concrete parts of the conversation will turn largely on that subject, although Adenauer will be prepared to talk about international finances, development aid, and West Germany's attitude to Eastern Europe if as is anticipated the President brings up these topics.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1961]

THE CHANCELLOR'S MISSION

Chancellor Adenauer becomes the second of the major NATO leaders to take the measure of the Kennedy administration. The German statesman is understandably eager to assess the attitude of the new administration toward European unity and negotiations with the Soviet Union. He also is reported to be concerned about potential American reaction to the Eichmann trial and about anti-German feeling prompted by recent differences on economic aid.

With respect to the Eichmann trial Dr. Adenauer may be unduly worried. The disclosures during the trial are bound to be horrible, and there may be some feeling that the Germans have not fully repented of the sins of the Nazis. But Americans do not ordinarily believe in mass guilt; and thinking people in this country are likely to be concerned more with the development of healthy roots for present-day German democracy than with punishment for bestiality of nearly two decades ago. There has undeniably been a feeling that Germany has not done enough to shoulder the common burden of economic help to underdeveloped countries. It became apparent last fall, however, that former Treasury Secretary Anderson presented the problem on entirely too narrow a basis of relief for the American balance-of-payments deficit (and some of the difficulty may have been that Mr. Anderson was not feeling well because of a severe diet). Substantially greater agreement now exists as a result of recent talks in Europe which stressed mutual obligations, but the pragmatic test will be in what Germany does to expand its help to other countries.

Dr. Adenauer will find President Kennedy acutely aware of the need to revitalize NATO, as indicated in his speech to the military chiefs. He also will find Mr. Kennedy attuned to the broader requirements of European unity. The address of Prime Minister Macmillan in Boston last week evangelizing political and economic as well as military unity was highly significant in this respect. Both Germany and the United States should be cheered by the signs that Britain is seriously considering membership in the Common Market.

This bears upon a concern here about the future in Western Europe. Dr. Adenauer and his counterpart in France, President de Gaulle, in the order of things will not be directing affairs much longer. The concern thus is both with policies that will bind the two nations firmly into the larger European community, and with the qualifications of potential successors to continue the association. Heirs are more apparent in Germany than in France; but German democracy still needs to demonstrate that it is prepared for an orderly transfer of power.

The new administration in the United States will be no less eager than the former administration for close relations with Germany, even though initiatives and approaches to particular matters may differ. It will be useful to have Dr. Adenauer's views and counsel, and he is assured a cordial welcome because, among other reasons, of the enormous respect for what he has accomplished.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 12, 1961]

DR. ADENAUER IN WASHINGTON: A REMINDER OF THE MOST SERIOUS DANGER

None of the points of conflict between East and West presents a trickier or potentially more explosive situation than Germany.

This is the harsh and enduring reality of which Dr. Adenauer reminds us as he follows Mr. Macmillan to Washington to initiate personal contact with the new administration.

At the present moment, for example, we happen to be engaged in an ill-defined and confusing conflict with the Soviet Union in Laos. There have been and will be other places like Laos—which is not to underrate the seriousness of that crisis—but Berlin still provides the best opportunity for the Soviets, the Germans, and everyone else to measure without the least unsureness the strength of our determination and the quality of our good faith. There we are and there, until Germany is reunited, we shall stay.

There is an immediate point to this reflection. The spring is coming on, and the spring is when Mr. Khrushchev is expected to rehearse his Berlin bombast. The recent meeting of the Warsaw Pact satellites, with its denunciation of the Federal Republic, could be a convenient starting point.

Whatever the shortcoming of its cold war policies elsewhere, the United States has never changed or diluted its promise that West Berlin is to remain free. Dr. Adenauer and the Berliners can be as confident of being reassured on that score by this administration as they were by the previous one.

There is another aspect of his visit which should be noted, and which concerns the Berlin question more directly than one might suppose.

Dr. Adenauer is campaigning for another term as Chancellor when Germany votes in September. Obviously his trip to Washington will have important repercussions from this point of view, especially since his opponent, Willy Brandt, is the mayor of Berlin. It also means that the Soviet Union has a special opportunity to interfere in West German politics.

The fact of the election is going to complicate the already unrewarding effort of calculating Mr. Khrushchev's intentions and foreseeing his moves. As to what we shall do, however, there is at least no doubt.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 12, 1961]

CONFIDENCE IN PRESIDENT: ADENAUER-KENNEDY TALKS TO START TODAY

(By Robert J. Donovan)

WASHINGTON, April 11.—The next round in President Kennedy's venture into diplomacy began tonight with the arrival of West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer.

The 43-year-old President and the 85-year-old Chancellor will confer in the White House tomorrow and Thursday.

In one sense the German leader's visit comes at a difficult time for him because of his great sensitivity to American reaction to the trial of Adolf Eichmann in Israel.

However, on his arrival at 6:01 p.m., Chancellor Adenauer spoke hopefully of a new sense of union and resolution among the peoples of the West. He said that already the German people have developed great confidence in President Kennedy.

The Chancellor was welcomed by Secretary of State Dean Rusk as he emerged from his jetliner at nearby Andrews Air Force Base in Maryland.

The United States has been putting pressure on Germany to assume a larger share of the West's burden in assisting underdeveloped nations. It was to this problem, presumably, that the Chancellor was addressing himself when he said in a statement read upon his arrival:

"The Federal (German) Government realizes that our share of responsibility for the fate of the world grows in proportion with our efficiency and capacity. We are prepared to make a contribution in keeping with our abilities, and we shall gladly do so in the realization that we are thereby helping to promote peace, to preserve freedom.

"Our times are filled with threats and dangers, but I feel sure that the free people of the world will overcome those dangers."

Shortly after Dr. Adenauer had taken off from Bonn this morning in the Lufthansa plane, German officials announced that their Government would prepay $587 million of its $787 million postwar debt to the United States. American officials have requested this as one way of easing the drain caused by this country's adverse balance of payments.

NINTH VISIT TO UNITED STATES

This is Dr. Adenauer's ninth visit to the United States since he became Chancellor 12 years ago.

"It is most opportune," Secretary Rusk told him, "that you could arrange to consult with us at precisely this time when a new American administration is shaping the major policy lines which we expect to follow in the years ahead."

Ambassador Wilhelm Grewe and almost the entire staff of the German Embassy here were on hand to welcome the Chancellor.

In addition to Germany's larger role in helping underdeveloped countries, Dr. Adenauer and the President will discuss such problems as Berlin, disarmament, and the strengthening of NATO. Last week the President conferred here with British Prime Minister Macmillan. On May 31 he will fly to Paris to see President Charles de Gaulle.

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 14, 1961]

J.F.K.'S BERLIN STAND PLEASES ADENAUER

(By R. H. Shackford)

West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer found President Kennedy's stand on the city of Berlin even stronger than that of the Eisenhower administration in its closing years.

Participants in the 2-day Kennedy-Adenauer talks reported the President made it crystal clear that so far as he is concerned:

The freedom of the people of West Berlin is not a subject for negotiation in any form.

Any change in the status of Berlin can come about only through reunification of all of Germany in peace and freedom.

A strengthened and improved North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is the best assurance for the security of the entire North Atlantic area, but especially for Germany and Berlin.

French President Charles de Gaulle's proposal to turn the clock back to national defense, rather than increase the system of common defense under NATO, would be tragic. Mr. Kennedy and Dr. Adenauer reaffirmed NATO as "the keystone of the common defense."

PLEASED

The 85-year-old Chancellor—who still reads without glasses—was reported to be more than pleased and satisfied with the President's unequivocal policies about the future of Germany and Berlin, and with the President's determination to revive the drive for far greater unity in Western Europe. The latter has long been a pet project of Dr. Adenauer.

Dr. Adenauer paid the President high compliments at his press conference after the White House talks were formally ended. He described Mr. Kennedy as: "Very precise, very exact, very quick, very frank."

U.S. POSITION

The U.S. position on Berlin has never been weak. The Kennedy administration has not changed any basic U.S. policies. But it has decided to put a far different emphasis on its position.

In the past the U.S. has placed major emphasis on the rights of the occupying powers (United States, Britain, and France) in Berlin. Now the major point is going to be—as the Kennedy-Adenauer communique stated: "to preserve the freedom of the people of West Berlin."

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 14, 1961]

ADENAUER BUOYANT OVER CAPITAL TALKS—SEES UNITED STATES SET TO USE ALL ARMS IN DEFENSE

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON, April 13.—West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, in a visibly buoyant mood, today ended "intensive, precise, and most satisfactory" talks with President Kennedy, convinced that America is ready to use all military means, including nuclear weapons, in defense of its allies.

The phrase in the joint German-American communique calling for the alliance to "maintain and develop further all military means" was the heart of the reassurance that the Chancellor had come here to get.

TO FILL NATO'S GAPS

It completely answered worries, aids said, that President Kennedy's emphasis on strengthening NATO's conventional military forces meant abandonment of plans to give NATO its own nuclear arsenal. At an evening press conference, the Chancellor said that studies are underway in the administration on how best to fill the gaps in NATO's nuclear strength.

The 85-year-old Chancellor had a triumphant day that started with his impromptu appearance on the Senate floor where he made a few informal remarks. He was roundly applauded.

This warm reception, which included cheers from the public gallery, has helped to allay the Chancellor's other chief preoccupation: that the Adolf Eichmann trial in Israel might start a wave of anti-German feeling in this country by reminding the world of Nazi atrocities. The Chancellor now is convinced, officials said, that such fears are largely groundless.

PRIZE OF FRIENDSHIP

In a series of public appearances during the day, Dr. Adenauer made it clear that the greatest prize he was taking back on this trip—his ninth—was "the great spirit of friendship" he felt had been established with the American President.

Referring to reports that the gap in years between the 43-year-old New Frontier President and himself might strain matters, Chancellor Adenauer told the press this evening, with one of his rare smiles: "Forty-three years is a very respectable age to be. Nobody is afraid of a man just because he is 43 years of age. When I was 43 I was mayor of Cologne. That is the best job I ever had."

Among the matters on which he and President Kennedy reached 100-percent agreement, according to the communique, was the continuing defense of West Berlin's freedom and independence; the need for intensified political cooperation in NATO; the belief that the problem of divided Germany must be solved by applying the principle of self-determination, giving the people there the right to decide their future.

PRESIDENT READS STATEMENT

On the Senate floor, where he was introduced by Vice President JOHNSON, the Chancellor responded to the warm applause by saying, "I know that this welcome is meant for the German people."

Then he added: "I can assure you that the German people will always stand on your side and be ready to help whenever we can."

This was Dr. Adenauer's way of saying that Germany was ready to respond to pressures that she do more in the field of assistance to underdeveloped countries and to assist this country in its balance-of-payments problem and the resulting outflow of gold, aids said.

The joint communique was read to newsmen outside the White House this afternoon by the President, who was hatless and coatless, while Mr. Adenauer, hatless but wearing an overcoat, stood at his side. Despite the raw, sullen day, the atmosphere was lightened by the ensuing warm exchange of compliments.

Said President Kennedy of Dr. Adenauer: "I have no doubt that history will be generous with him in writing the history of the Atlantic Community in the years 1945 to the present. His accomplishments have been extraordinary in binding the nations of Western Europe together and in strengthening the ties which link the United States and the Federal Republic."

Replied Chancellor Adenauer: "I am deeply moved and touched by these remarks. It is a great pleasure to come here and perceive the atmosphere in which this great leader with such tremendous responsibilities is pursuing his task with such energy and farsightedness."

At his evening press conference the Chancellor dealt with one of his major concerns that the German Army must have the best of weapons at its command and certain weapons equal to those of its Communist enemies.

"I am convinced that a positive solution to this will be found," said Dr. Adenauer. Germany itself, he indicated, would prefer to have the problem solved by making NATO the fourth nuclear power. But although the Kennedy administration may not be ready to adopt precisely the same formula on nuclear sharing as put forward by President Eisenhower, the West German Chancellor is convinced that some move in the same general direction is in the military cards. "It is vital not for reasons of prestige or of politics but for purely military reasons," he said.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1961]

STRONG U.S. LEADERSHIP NEEDED, ADENAUER SAYS

(By Elizabeth Wharton)

West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer yesterday said only strong and determined U.S. leadership could shepherd the free world safely through its current time of ordeal.

Adenauer pledged that Germany would stand steadfastly and faithfully with the United States against the threat of communism.

The 85-year-old Chancellor said he was impressed with 43-year-old President Kennedy during their talks this week. He said they advanced "the spirit of brotherhood and the unity of our ideals."

Adenauer and West German Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano spoke at a lunch given in their honor at the Capitol by Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut.

The affair was attended by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, Central Intelligence Agency Director Allen W. Dulles, Under Secretary of State George Ball, roving Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, the Armed Services Secretaries and about 150 other officials, Members of Congress, and business leaders.

DODD, a prosecutor at the Nuremberg war crimes trials, hailed Adenauer's role in rebuilding Germany after World War II. Senate GOP policy chairman STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, voiced similar praise.

Adenauer said America's true hallmark of greatness was its effort to help the vanquished nations get back on their feet after the war.

The Chancellor did not elaborate on his statement that "the time of ordeal of the present generation is not yet over."

But presumably he referred to the Russian threat to West Germany and Berlin as well as other Soviet pressures.

[From the Sunday Star, Apr. 16, 1961]

MEN MEET—AND AGREE

There is reason to believe that the talks between President Kennedy and West German Chancellor Adenauer, just concluded here, have served a more important purpose than was spelled out in their joint communique.

For, as in the case of the earlier meetings between Mr. Kennedy and Britain's Prime Minister Macmillan, this was a first opportunity for a face-to-face sizing up of each other by two of the most powerful leaders in the free world community. In this respect, it was a meeting perhaps more meaningful to Dr. Adenauer, whose own views and vigor already were well known to the President, but who had not in turn had previous opportunity for a personal evaluation of Mr. Kennedy in the role of Chief Executive. That Dr. Adenauer was pleased with his findings was indicated in his press conference description of the President as "very precise, very exact, very quick, and very frank." Along with Mr. Kennedy's own warm words about the German Chancellor, the exchange of compliments can be considered as something more than mere diplomatic politeness.

At the same time, the concluding communique itself reflects a wide range of agreement and of reaffirmation of purpose that undoubtedly is reassuring to the head of the Bonn government. It was made clear, for example, that the United States remains committed to the freedom of the people of West Berlin and that reunification of Germany (in freedom, not in subjection) still is a basic objective. Of the NATO alliance, there was emphasis not only on its primary function as a defensive military instrument and the necessity for it to develop all military means required to enable it to deter aggression, but there also was significant emphasis upon intensified political cooperation within the bloc—a principle which Dr. Adenauer has long favored.

Indeed, this theme of the desirability of a closer unity in nonmilitary affairs among the Atlantic nations was sounded also in parts of the communique dealing particularly with economic problems. Establishment of the new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, in which the United States and Canada will be joined with 18 other free-world nations, was described as a step of vital importance, opening the way to achieving a closer interdependence.

It was most noteworthy, against the background of reports that Britain is now seriously considering the possibility of joining the European Economic Community (the Common Market, often referred to as the inner six and numbering West Germany in its membership), that President Kennedy joined Dr. Adenauer in describing this group as a powerful and cohesive force with dynamic potential. It is known that Mr. Macmillan discussed this matter with the

President and that there is hope here that Britain will so decide. Currently, Britain is a member of the European free trade association, known as the outer seven, and there has been apprehension that continued division of free Europe into these two blocs would have dangerous economic and political consequences for the Atlantic community as a whole.

Having thus "covered the waterfront" with both Mr. Macmillan and Dr. Adenauer, the President has another summit meeting of major importance coming up next month—with President de Gaulle in Paris. Basically, these talks are part of a single pattern and it should be useful in preparation for Paris that the two others already have been held.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 17, 1961]

TEXANS ENTERTAIN ADENAUER

FREDERICKSBURG, TEX.—Residents in this central Texas area of ranches and wooded hills, where German pioneers settled a century ago, warmly welcomed West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer.

Signs reading "Willkommen Adenauer" and "Howdy Podnur" proclaimed the friendliness of these Texans, who retain many customs and the speech of their ancestors.

From the moment Dr. Adenauer stepped from an Air Force helicopter Sunday near a Roman Catholic church to attend services until he talked quietly during the evening with his host, Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the flavor of the fatherland surrounded him.

On Monday he brought a message from Berlin to the Texas Legislature meeting in joint session at Austin, 80 miles east. His noon address followed a scheduled parade up the State capital's main street and a helicopter tour of the Highland Lakes near Austin.

SUPPORT PROMISED

Before departing for Berlin, he and his official party were to dine with Texas Governor and Mrs. Price Daniel in the Governor's mansion.

About 7,000 turned out for a special German-English program honoring Dr. Adenauer Sunday afternoon. The crowd rose and applauded when Mr. JOHNSON said: "Where you stand up against the Communists, we of the United States will stand by your side."

A few hours earlier, in a white stucco church with a few petunias blooming outside, Mr. Adenauer heard the Reverend W. W. Schneider deliver his sermon in German at Stonewall, 15 miles east of Fredericksburg.

Presumably Mr. JOHNSON and his guest discussed problems of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Berlin once they had a moment of privacy.

After the church service, the visiting German officials and dozens of newsmen went to Mr. JOHNSON's LBJ ranch near Stonewall.

Mrs. Johnson escorted the Chancellor around part of the ranch.

Mr. JOHNSON presented Dr. Adenauer a Texas cowboy hat. The stoic Chancellor cocked it to one side and said he felt at home more than ever before.

APPRECIATION EXPRESSED

To the cheering crowd, Mr. JOHNSON described his guest as "a statesman who led his country from moral and materialistic defeat into a free and democratic nation."

Mr. Adenauer, replying in German, said he had held fruitful talks with President Kennedy. He expressed appreciation to U.S. citizens for their fight in winning freedom and liberty for his people.

Mr. JOHNSON promised support for Dr. Adenauer at a public reception in the German settlement of Fredericksburg near the Johnson ranch.

Dr. Adenauer and Mr. JOHNSON flew to Texas from Washington.

In a speech in German, Dr. Adenauer told a huge crowd jamming the Gillespie County fairgrounds that "we appreciate the great task this Nation has done in fighting for freedom and liberty. We will continue to resist those efforts by those who threaten this freedom and liberty."

Dr. Adenauer flew from Washington to Bergstrom Air Force base near Austin on Sunday in a gleaming blue, white, and yellow Boeing 707 jetliner. After 7 minutes in Austin he headed to Mr. JOHNSON's ranch 65 miles west of here by helicopter.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 17, 1961]

ADENAUER IN TUNE

With Chancellor Adenauer now absorbing the sun and charm of Texas, it is important to note that his official talks here, like those of Prime Minister Macmillan a week earlier, seemed to go very well indeed. If the German leader had any real doubts about President Kennedy's maturity or realism, they appear to have been thoroughly dispelled.

It is unlikely that Dr. Adenauer will enjoy in this administration as close an association as he had with the late Secretary Dulles. Circumstances and personalities are different; and Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Rusk have a new vision of American leadership. But Mr. Kennedy, while asserting this leadership tactfully, has managed to show that he has the basic interests of the Allies fully in mind. Indeed, the creation of new confidence abroad represents some of the best of the Kennedy performance so far.

It is particularly significant to have Germany and the United States agree on the need to increase conventional military strength in Europe. A move to reduce the dependence of NATO on tactical nuclear weapons would of course require a substantial increase in conventional strength. It might worry Defense Minister Strauss and a few others who are wedded to the concept of nuclear weapons for Germany; but it would do a great deal to improve NATO flexibility without affecting the availability of the American strategic deterrent. NATO ought to have the capability to respond to limited nonnuclear attack through conventional means, reserving nuclear weapons for situations in which their use would be imperative.

All of this complements the efforts to bring more economic unity in Europe. There now seems to be a real possibility that Britain will reconsider some sort of membership in the Common Market with due regard for her commitments to the Commonwealth and to the European Free Trade Association. Germany is in an especially good position to help bridge the fissures. And if Germany will now play a full part in the common foreign aid objective through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the bad feeling that started to erupt last fall can be readily overcome.

It is certainly true that the major problems with greater unity are now with France, which continues to follow a separate course in NATO and to insist on a separate national nuclear deterrent. But the more that the other obstacles can be worked out as the result of the talks with Mr. Macmillan and Dr. Adenauer, the better will be the chance of coping persuasively with French separatism when President Kennedy visits President de Gaulle next month.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently I received a very thoughtful and eloquent letter from one of my Minnesota constituents about the serious consequences of heavy medical costs resulting from his mother's illness.

The personal experience described in this letter could be multiplied by many thousands of similar experiences. This is the kind of situation we hope to alleviate, to change, to improve, by providing health care for elderly people through our social security mechanism.

And we hope to do this by enacting the administration's medical care program, S. 909, which I have joined the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] in sponsoring.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
April 10, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: In the past several months there has been much written and spoken for and against President Kennedy's plan for medical care for the aged, tied to social security.

On the one hand, spokesmen for the American Medical Association tell us that the plan is unnecessary, unwanted, and even dangerous.

On the other hand, those in favor tell us that the plan is essential to the welfare and well-being of our older people and would be indirectly beneficial to the younger people who otherwise have placed on them the burden of paying the medical bills of aging parents, while at the same time providing for their own families.

I know that you hold with the latter of these views and since I do, too, this letter is not intended to influence you. However, if you have a few minutes to spare, I would like to tell you a personal story that may help you influence others.

My parents are both in their upper seventies. My father worked until he was almost 70 years of age and has been retired and on social security for the past 8 years.

My parents came to this country as immigrants nearly 60 years ago, expecting as most immigrants did, I suppose, to find fame and fortune. That they found neither only makes theirs a more typical story. My father was a steelworker, a trade at which he worked for 45 years at the same place of employment. When he retired he was a shop foreman.

Looking back, I would say ours was a typical middle-class American family. Never rich, but never desperately poor either. My folks managed to raise five children and pay for a nice home in a good residential neighborhood. In the last few years of my father's working life, they even managed to save a few thousand dollars so that when he retired life for them seemed quite secure. That is, except for one particular problem: When my mother was about 55 years old she was stricken with a heart ailment that necessitated a serious operation. From then until now she has been under almost constant medical care.

Hospitalization insurance covered at least part of the medical costs while my father was still working. But when he retired, he found that his insurance was cut off by the company that had been carrying them. No company would cover them now, at a rate which was not prohibitive, and under no circumstances would any company cover them for the particular illness with which my mother had been plagued for so many years. So, at a time when they most needed some type of insurance coverage, they were on their own.

The fact that my mother is alive today and even now, fighting to sustain the spark of life, is a tribute to a good and faithful doctor, a cooperative patient and an understanding family who were always available in time of need. However, this is not enough. It also takes money; lots of it. It has, in fact, taken all they have. Other members of the family have from time to time contributed toward the medical costs, but when it comes to thousands of dollars, it just isn't there.

My mother has been hospitalized for the past 3 weeks. Part of the bill has been paid with the last of their savings. Now, since they have nothing left but the homestead, they are qualified for State aid. After considerable persuasion, we convinced my father that he should apply for this aid even though it meant that the State would take a lien on the homestead for the amount of aid given. So, eventually, the State would get their money back.

Now, I know that many people believe that this is as it should be. But it's extremely difficult to convince someone that their life savings and even their home should be, in effect, taken from them by forces beyond their control. When you are approaching 80 years of age, you can't work yourself out of situations like this. And even though the spirit is bent to the breaking point and faith is tried almost beyond endurance, the inevitable must be accepted. But it isn't easy.

For the life of me, I can't see why most doctors are so opposed to a medical care plan for the aging, tied to social security. I know from personal experience that they are forced sometimes to prescribe treatment in accordance with a patient's economic condition as well as their physical or mental condition. For example, on more than one occasion my mother was sent home from the hospital sooner than she should have been, which necessitated a quick return trip in each case. Once the return trip, by ambulance, came on the same day she was released. The doctor voluntarily commented that his judgment had been swayed by the fact that she was just lying there worrying about the bills and that this wasn't helping her condition.

There have been numerous other occasions when we cared for her at home under circumstances made almost unbearable by our inability to cope with situations that should have required professional knowledge and experience.

I realize that our family is not alone in this predicament. There are many thousands of families who are, or someday will be, in the same circumstances. Why should this be? Why should the good doctors in this great Nation of ours, feel compelled at times to make their treatment fit the patient's pocketbook?

The little country of Norway, from which my folks migrated so many years ago, takes better care of their older people, from a medical care standpoint, than we do. Many other countries have found it within their means to adopt medical care plans for the aged that are far better than anything we have, even though their material national wealth is only a fraction of ours. Could it be that their moral and spiritual values are greater than ours?

Time has run out for my parents. No plan, even if it were passed in this session of Congress, could help them now.

Each passing day finds more and more people facing the same bitter problems that my parents have faced. There must be some way to make the last few years of their lives less bitter. There must be some way we can help our older citizens to live—and, yes, to die—with dignity.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————.

CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference is recognized and honored for its policy statements concerning American agriculture and the family-farm system. At the recent executive committee meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., a policy statement was prepared, entitled "Cooperative Bargaining for American Agriculture."

It deserves the careful study and attention of every Member of Congress and of every agricultural leader and spokesman in the Nation. It represents an accurate report of the economic and social conditions that prevail in our agricultural economy. It lays down a program of action with constructive and specific suggestions designed to improve the living standards of American farm families and the economy of our farms.

The Reverend Father James L. Vizzard, S.J., director of the Washington office of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, presented to me the policy statement along with a letter in which he asked me to express my views on several points that were discussed in the policy statement. I replied to Father Vizzard's communication on the date of April 5.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the policy statement, the letter by the Reverend Father James L. Vizzard dated March 17, and my reply to Father Vizzard dated April 5.

I believe that a careful reading of these communications and documents will be helpful in gaining a better understanding of the objectives of farm organizations and, in particular, the role of cooperative bargaining and action in our rural economy.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVE BARGAINING FOR AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

We propose in this statement a bold approach to the economic ills of American agriculture. We urge extensive cooperative bargaining in the marketplace. We maintain that this approach is in keeping with Christian principles and is economically sound. In order that our proposal may be better understood and appreciated, we must review a few basic facts about American agriculture.

AGRICULTURE AND THE NATION

Agriculture is the most basic industry because it is the source of food, one of man's most essential material needs. An efficient agriculture assures adequate nutrition for the people of the Nation without which all other industries and all civic, social, and religious undertakings would be handicapped. Moreover, as agricultural efficiency increases, the number of people required to produce food is lessened and manpower is made available to develop other industries, arts, and professions. Therefore, the material, educational, cultural, and religious welfare of every nation depends largely on the efficiency and prosperity of its farmers.

In the United States agriculture has always been a family enterprise. Although there are some very large "factories in the fields," the great majority of our farms are operated by and for families. Family type agriculture is a most efficient way to produce food. The unprecedented productivity of U.S. agriculture is due in large part to the initiative, skill, and hard work which the family farm system engenders. But the family farm affords values even greater than productivity. It is a socioeconomic institution which exerts wholesome influences on the family life, religion, education, culture, and social life of rural people. In the United States farming is not only a way to earn a living; it is also a way of life.

Not only must our Nation safeguard the welfare of its farmers because agriculture is its most basic industry; it must protect their just interests for an additional reason, i.e., because the family farm system is one of the most precious and uniquely American heritages of our Nation.

ILL FARES THE LAND

But all is not well in the countryside. In spite of unparalleled productivity, major segments of American agriculture are experiencing a serious loss of income. During the past 10 years output per man-hour has increased 84 percent in agriculture; 28 percent in other industries. This efficiency, together with long hours of work, fertile soils and favorable weather, has resulted in an abundance of food, the like of which the world has never seen.

Since much of the increased productivity of farmers is due to new machines, some of the rewards for this productivity should go to the manufacturers of those machines. It is also proper for the consumer to reap some benefits from the increased efficiency of agriculture. But the farmer himself should not be penalized for it. Net farm income has declined from a high of $17.7 billion in 1948 to $16.3 billion in 1951, $13.2 billion in 1953, $11.6 billion in 1956. It rose to $14 billion in 1958 and then declined to $11.8 billion in 1959 and an estimated $11.4 billion in 1960. True wealth consists in the goods and services produced. By this measure, the American farmer should be prospering. We question the equity of a system which maintains no proportion between real wealth produced by farmers and the income they receive. Well might we repeat the lament of Oliver Goldsmith: "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey. Where wealth accumulates, and men decay."

THE GREAT EXODUS

Each year during the past decade an average of approximately 900,000 people migrated from our farms to cities and towns. We realize that mechanization makes it possible for farmers to cultivate more acres than their fathers could. Moreover, better crop varieties, fertilizers, etc., have increased crop yields, thus reducing the number of acres required. Eventually, this brings about a reduction in the number of persons needed to operate our farms. However, the present exodus from the land is not a normal transition from an agrarian to an industrialized economy. Inequitable income is forcing even efficient operators to give up farming and detering young people from entering agriculture. To make matters worse, Government programs have been most advantageous to operators of large farms and thus weakened the competitive position of family farms.

We protest against a system which thus undermines the foundations of the most basic of our industries and destroys the morale of our once proud and sturdy family farmers. Not only farmers but the whole Nation will pay dearly for this folly.

BITTER FRUITS OF EXTREME COMPETITION

The unhappy lot of many American farmers can rightly be ascribed to many contributing causes, but it seems to us that the chief reason for persistent distress is the extreme competition which exists in agriculture. In other industries competition has been extensively modified by various means of control. Most workers bargain collectively for wages, working conditions, and other

common interests. Manufacturers severely control the supply of their products, thus stabilizing prices and increasing their income. Physicians, lawyers, dentists, architects, and others form associations which limit entry into their professions and set fees at levels which they judge reasonable.

Farmers alone adhere to an extremely competitive system. Millions of farmers sell their produce on a freely fluctuating market. Prices are determined largely by supply and demand. In such a market, prices are severely depressed by even a moderate oversupply. Prices fall 5 percent for every 1 percent of oversupply. Consequently, the very productivity of the American farmer leads to a lowering of his income. Extreme competition in an antiquated market system has deprived farmers of their fair return for the production of abundant food and fiber.

Extreme competition is neither a rational nor a Christian approach to economic affairs. Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical "On the Reconstruction of the Social Order" declares: "Just as the unity of human society cannot be built upon class warfare, so the proper ordering of economic affairs cannot be left to free competition alone. From this source have proceeded in the past all the errors of the 'Individualistic' school. Free competition, however, though within certain limits just and productive of good results, cannot be the ruling principle of the economic world. This has been abundantly proved by the consequences that have followed from the free rein given to these dangerous individualistic ideals. It is, therefore, very necessary that economic affairs be once more subjected to and governed by a true and effective guiding principle. More loftly and noble principles must, therefore, be sought in order to control this supremacy sternly and uncompromisingly: to wit, social justice and social charity."

It is disconcerting to find that some Americans look upon extreme competition as if it were some sort of natural law or in some way implied in our democratic way of life. Democracy is the rule by and for the people. Extreme competition results, not in the rule by and for the people, but rather in domination by the few. Again we quote Pope Pius XI: "This accumulation of power is a natural result of limitless free competition which permits the survival of those only who are the strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience."

COOPERATION—THE BASIC REMEDY

If the origin of many farm problems is extreme competition, the basic remedy is cooperation. Each farm family is a tiny productive unit in an economy dominated by giant corporations and powerful nonfarm interests. Standing alone, family farmers have no bargaining power, no means to protect their just interests. United in a democratic cooperative organization which could bargain effectively for them in the marketplace, farmers could regain their voice in their economic affairs.

There are many reasons for attacking economic and social problems with group action. The human race has a common origin and a common goal. Almighty God made us dependent upon one another and He intends that we work together to solve our problems and to create a better way of life for all. Cooperatives are associations of producers or consumers bound together for mutual assistance. This is the Christian way of doing things.

OBLIGATION TO COOPERATE

Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical "Immortale Dei" states the obligation to cooperate in these words: "Man's natural instinct moves him to live in civil society. Isolated, he cannot provide himself with the necessary requirements of life, nor procure the means of developing his mental and moral faculties. It is, therefore, divinely ordained that he should lead his life—be it domestic, social, or civil—in contact with his fellow men, where alone his several wants can be adequately supplied." Pope Pius XI adds these observations: "Nature induces those who practice the same trade or profession, economic or otherwise, to combine into vocational groups."

The obligation to cooperate is spelled out more in detail in a pastoral letter of the hierarchy of Quebec, dated February 1950: "Every man has an obligation to seek to protect the security of his professional interests. He has the duty to contribute to the welfare of his fellows, especially those united to him in common interests. In the present state of things, accordingly, there exists a moral obligation to participate actively in one's economic organization."

Economic organizations such as labor unions and farm cooperatives must observe social justice. This, in turn, necessitates a sense of individual responsibility on the part of the members. Whenever the rank and file members fail to actively participate in the policymaking of such organizations, there is danger of control by unscrupulous leaders and consequent harm to the commonweal. This danger is emphasized in the 1960 statement of the American bishops, "Need for Personal Responsibility."

A NEW SYSTEM OF FARM MARKETS

Cooperatives are not newcomers in rural affairs. For several generations farmers have banded together to purchase supplies, to obtain better credit, and to market their produce. Nearly two-thirds of all farm cooperatives are marketing associations. These associations, however, operate within the old system of freely fluctuating markets. Most of these merely help the farmer avail himself of the best prices offered within that system and enable him to reduce the costs of marketing.

We urge most serious consideration of a far-reaching reorganization of the marketing system as is now being discussed in several quarters. We suggest that farmers unite in cooperative bargaining groups. The growers of livestock, cereal grains, fruit, vegetables, and each of the other commodities should bargain for sales contracts with processors, wholesalers, etc. Through such united action much of the price fluctuation would be eliminated. Today most farmers go alone to the market and accept the prices being offered. We urge farmers, banded together in cooperatives, to hold their produce until those who wish to buy are willing to bargain with them in good faith. Prices should be determined, not by the supply which happens to reach the market at a given time, but by a contract established by the farmers' cooperative organization with the processors, wholesalers, etc. Admittedly, it will be difficult to establish this marketing system in some commodities. We maintain, however, that the good resulting from it would be great, therefore worth the effort and the sacrifice.

At present cooperative bargaining is being carried on to some degree by milk producers and growers of fruits and vegetables. These limited efforts at cooperative bargaining are a good beginning and we can learn much from them. However, there has been little cooperative bargaining by the growers of wheat, feed grains, livestock, and other major crops. Most of these growers are concentrated in 10 States in the Midwest and Great Plains area. Yet, significant supplies of most of these commodities are produced in almost every State of the Union; hence, it is obvious that the organizational task is very challenging. We urge cooperative bargaining in all farm commodities. Thus, the bargaining power of the growers of a given commodity will not be destroyed by competition from similar commodities in which prices freely fluctuate.

SUITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

The principles which we enunciate in this statement will be brought to bear upon the practical problems of farmers only through cooperative farm organizations. As indicated above, already in existence are several groups which bargain cooperatively in the milk, fresh fruit, and fresh vegetable markets. Every housewife is familiar with the brand names of these organizations: Sunkist, Diamond, Ocean Spray, Sunmaid, Land O' Lakes, etc. The recently formed National Farmers Organization intends to bargain cooperatively in wheat, feed grains, livestock, and milk. We urge farmers to evaluate these organizations in the light of the principles enunciated in this statement. If there is no existing marketing association capable of cooperative bargaining in a particular commodity and place, such an association should be created.

Supply cooperatives and the three general farm organizations, Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, and National Grange, have served farmers for many decades and have large memberships. The agricultural situation in general and the marketing system in particular have changed dramatically since these organizations were founded. Their leaders are now considering the role that they should play in cooperative bargaining in the marketplace. This might necessitate some changes in their policies and bylaws. It might consist in their endorsement of those organizations created specifically for cooperative bargaining. In these critical times inter-organizational rivalries must be reduced to a minimum. All farmers and all organizations must work together for the good of agriculture and of the Nation. In principle this cooperative approach does not clash, but in most cases coincides, with the basic objectives of existent organizations.

It is not within the realm of NCRLC activities to organize cooperative bargaining groups. We are striving to contribute to this undertaking on a more basic level. By educational means we are trying to foster among our people a mentality more conducive to cooperative bargaining and more in keeping with Christian ideals. The cooperative bargaining movement in agriculture will have little hope for success unless we and other educational, religious, and agricultural groups school our people in the principles of social responsibility and mutual help.

BARGAINING POWER

Farmers will succeed in efforts to bargain cooperatively only if they have the power to bargain and the wisdom and courage to utilize that power effectively. Bargaining power among farmers is weakened by their individualism, their great numbers, the very diversity of enterprises and their separation over a very large area. On the other hand, since farmers produce one of the most essential of goods—namely, food—they could exercise very great bargaining power if they were properly organized.

If ever farmers were to make demands for extremely high prices, they would be checked by competition from farmers in fringe areas and foreign producers. This failing, the Federal Government might find it necessary to discipline farmers under provisions of appropriate antitrust legislation. Today, however, farmers have too little bargaining power. Hence, we urge the formation of cooperative bargaining groups. If such groups ever gained too much bargaining power, we should immediately urge measures to restrain them.

Holding produce on the farm is one means of demonstrating bargaining power. If processors, wholesalers, and consumers were convinced that farmers could and would hold produce until a fair price were offered, they

would probably consent to marketing contracts. The holding action is not an end in itself. It is a means to bring about the negotiation of a just contract.

Cooperative bargaining groups can provide services beneficial to both producers and consumers and in the long run need not be feared by either. For example, growers associations have improved the quality and uniformity of fruits, potatoes, and nuts; milk producers' associations have provided customers with a more uniform supply of milk and have modernized bottling and merchandising techniques. Such groups can also serve the best interests of processors. An association of livestock growers might be able to assure a meatpacker of a steady supply of animals of a specified weight and quality. This would enable the packer to utilize the facilities of his plant to 95 percent of capacity instead of the 66 percent of capacity now common in this industry.

COST OF FOOD

But what about prices to consumers? To the degree that cooperative bargaining were to be successful would not the prices of food and clothes, life's basic needs, be intolerably increased?

Consumers' legitimate interests, obviously, must be safeguarded. But we are convinced that no fairminded person wants to keep his own cost of living down by denying elements' justice to others. The fact is that in recent years plunging farm prices have kept the overall cost of living from soaring considerably higher than it has. Only 22 cents of each consumer dollar is spent on food. Out of their meager and dwindling resources farm families have been subsidizing the consumer.

Moreover, prices received by farmers account for less than 40 percent of the consumer's food dollar. For instance, the farmer receives 2.4 cents for the corn in a 26-cent box of cornflakes; 11 cents for the oranges in a 26-cent can of frozen orange juice concentrate; 2.3 cents for the wheat in a 20-cent loaf of white bread; about 11 cents for a 25-cent quart of milk; and about 29 cents for the cotton in a man's $4 shirt. Consequently, any price increase achieved by farmers would by no means bring a comparable increase to the consumer.

Still further, the benefits of greater efficiency in processing and distributing farm products, encouraged and made possible by cooperative bargaining, would be passed along, at least in part, to the consumer and would tend to balance off any increase in prices.

Finally, consumers are also taxpayers. In this capacity they would benefit greatly from a method which assures economic justice to the farmer without massive use of tax moneys. Certainly any increased cost of food and fiber would total only a fraction of the billions of tax dollars now being spent each year in futile attempts to bolster farm income.

ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT IN COOPERATIVE BARGAINING

During recent years the Federal Government has spent vast sums of money in an effort to stabilize farm income. These efforts have had limited results. One of the weaknesses of these programs lies in the fact that often the Government aimed at objectives which the individual farmer defeated. For example, the Government paid subsidies to farmers in an effort to reduce the production of corn. Many farmers, in turn, heavily fertilized their soil and used other techniques to actually increase their total production. This represents a costly and disorderly state of affairs.

When farmers bargain cooperatively in the marketplace, they will be able to stabilize their income. Then Government, in this new approach, will supplement and support the efforts of individual farmers and their organizations, not embark upon programs which the farmers will defeat. Pope Pius XI in his encyclical "On Reconstructing the Social Order" observes: "The state should leave to these smaller groups the settlement of business of minor importance. It will thus carry out with greater freedom, power, and success the tasks belonging to it." The total cost of the farm program in a system of cooperative bargaining will be only a fraction of the present expenditures.

It is not possible in this short statement to express in detail the Government's role in such a system. We might point out, however, the following possibilities:

The Government should continue its efforts to keep marginal lands out of production. Thus, the limited fertility of these lands would be restored and conserved until it is needed.

Cooperative bargaining groups would need credit especially during extended holding actions. Government loans at a reasonable rate of interest would help fill this need.

The Wagner Act helped preserve and strengthen cooperative bargaining by struggling labor unions in the 1930's. Cooperative bargaining by farmers in the 1960's to be effective certainly will require both legislative and administrative encouragement and assistance.

CONCLUSIONS

It is not our intention here to attempt to offer an answer to every farm problem or even every detail of this central attack on the farm-income problem.

Yet, we are convinced that within the general framework of cooperative bargaining (as the solution of the most fundamental problem, a just income for farm families) an answer can be found for other persistent problems which so long have been vexing both farmer and Nation. A much more effective means must be found, for instance, to fulfill the moral, economic, and political demand that we use both our enormous productivity and our actual on-hand food and feed stocks to the benefit of hungry and needy people everywhere.

Neither do we believe that an effective cooperative bargaining system would go very far in and of itself toward solving the critical problems of migratory farm labor, of the chronic low-income farm areas or of the ever-urgent demand for soil and water conservation. These and other special problems will continue to require specific programs under both Government and private auspices.

The proposals presented in this statement to some will seem bold. We are prompted to make them because we are convinced that the family farm system and the welfare of hundreds of thousands of farm families are in jeopardy. The dangers are great and pressing. We call upon all farm organizations as well as other interested agencies and individuals in and out of Government to recognize in these proposals a set of principles and a plan of action upon which all can unite to the benefit of the farm family and the Nation.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC RURAL LIFE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1961.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The National Catholic Rural Life Conference, like you, is vitally concerned with the drastic drop in farm income. We recognize the enormous difficulty in designing programs to deal with this complex problem.

The enclosed statement, "Cooperative Bargaining for American Agriculture," is the NCRLC's newest policy recommendation on this issue. We believe it is both sound and feasible, though we recognize that, as with any proposed solution, it would require time and effort to make it work.

If your busy schedule will allow, I would very much appreciate hearing your views on the following points:

1. Are the facts here presented correct?
2. Is the basic proposal sound?
3. Is it economically and politically feasible?
4. What, if any, legislation might be useful or necessary to make this approach work?
5. Could this approach act as a rallying point for both farm organizations' and administration effort?

The NCRLC's Washington office is now located at 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington 5, D.C. (Republic 7-3553, Ext. 314). Please do not hesitate to call if in any way we can be of help.

With every good wish.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES L. VIZZARD, S.J.,
Director, Washington Office.

APRIL 5, 1961.

Rev. JAMES L. VIZZARD, S.J.,
Director, Washington Office, National Catholic Rural Life Conference, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FATHER VIZZARD: I thank you very much for sending me the NCRLC's statement, "Cooperative Bargaining for American Agriculture." Indeed this is an accurate and eloquent statement of the socioeconomic values of the family farm and the disadvantages it suffers in our present society.

You ask if the basic proposal—cooperation among farm producers—is sound. Yes. As you know, I feel strongly about the value of cooperative action to attain worthwhile goals which the individual producer is completely unable to achieve by himself. The farm cooperative is the democratic structure that gives strength and encouragement to family farm agriculture.

Your statement suggests that farmers unite in cooperative bargaining groups to attain a fair contracted price for their commodities, using the device of withholding from the market to attain bargaining power.

Certainly the objective here is desirable, and the suggested means have been given consideration from time to time for many years. However, there are several factors and limitations which need to be taken into account in discussing the potential bargaining strength of farmer cooperative associations. Past experience has shown that the answer to the price level problem for a commodity such as wheat, feed grains, cotton or milk cannot be reached through voluntary cooperative action. By definition, the cooperative approach is voluntary and the 20 to 40 percent of producers who may stay out of the program and expand their production defeat the purpose of the group action.

Aaron Sapiro, the great cooperative leader of the 1920's, discovered this when he tried to form national cooperative associations to deal with agricultural overproduction in that decade. The California cooperatives learned this also, and turned to the device of the marketing order wherein the will of the majority with respect to supply management is extended to the minority.

In industrial collective bargaining, it has been found that the so-called open shop is frequently not effective in protecting the wage rates and income of workers. Efforts to unionize the plan under open shop conditions are often futile. This is equivalent to a proposal for collective bargaining power for cooperatives where no provision is made to extend its application to all producers. It is those who are left out under such voluntary arrangements that ultimately weaken the system and destroy its effectiveness.

In industrial labor-management relations, the effective trade union relies on what is called the union shop wherein a union may bargain for its members, but requires that within 30 days all employees, union and nonunion, shall be brought under the terms of

the contract. This is actually what happens under a marketing order, and this is why a marketing order, although supervised or regulated by the Federal Government, has proved to be a very effective means of obtaining a fair price for a producer's commodity.

Cooperatives can and do utilize marketing orders. It appears to me that the extension of this proposal to other agricultural commodities not previously covered is a sound approach. It was to this that President Kennedy and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman referred in the President's message on new agricultural policy. I feel that the solution to the price level problem, and thus to the income problem, for the great national commodities—wheat, feed grains, cotton, milk and others, must come through this kind of enabling legislation. The recommendations made by the President are in essence the same as the proposals made by the Family Farm Program Development Act which I introduced in the Senate in 1959.

Such legislation would permit farmers to participate in the development of programs best suited to a given commodity; such programs would be offered to all of the producers in a referendum; and, if approved, would become binding on all producers.

If such supply management programs resulted in a good, healthy, prosperous farm economic climate, the role of the cooperative associations would become increasingly important. In this role, there are numerous specific activities to be conducted by cooperatives:

1. The purchase of production supplies.
2. The supplying of production credit.
3. The concentration of supplies of marketable products of the desired quality specification.
4. The bargaining over price premiums and discounts, conditions of payment and sale and other commercial factors.
5. The representation of farmers in trade conferences, before regulatory bodies, in Government programing and policy development.

I know that you were pleased with the section of the President's farm message dealing with the encouragement of cooperatives. I hope that this is implemented by legislation that strengthens the Farmers Cooperative Service in the Department of Agriculture and that serious consideration will be given to the extension of REA-type loans to farmer cooperatives that will enable them to accomplish effectively the activities listed above.

I anticipate that enabling legislation such as I have discussed, as well as legislation dealing with other farm recommendations made by the President, will soon be before the Congress. The mismanagement of the basic price support programs during the past 8 years, and the 2-year corn program fiasco which is mentioned in your statement, have cost farmers and all taxpayers exorbitant sums of money, brought farm programs into public disrepute, and damaged the economic position of the family farmers.

I am hopeful that under the forthright leadership of President Kennedy and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman we shall have farm programs acceptable to the majority of the farm producers and farm organizations, which will set the house of agriculture in order at home and help to alleviate want and hunger in the world.

Frankly, we have a hard fight before us to get any new farm legislation. It will be all the more difficult if the great farm groups and organizations are divided. We need your help. I am sure you know of my great admiration and respect not only for you but for the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. May I respectfully urge that you carefully study President Kennedy's farm message? I am enclosing a copy along with the brief analysis presented by Secretary Freeman.

The main objectives of the NCRLA can be accomplished under the proposals and philosophy of the administration's farm program. We can develop our farmer cooperatives into new sources of economic and social strength. I believe we can do everything you are seeking to have done under the proposals for collective bargaining for farm cooperatives. But we will do it in an effective manner that protects the public interest as well as assuring economic quality and opportunity for our farm families.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, with the same understanding I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont for a brief statement.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

PROMISES AND PIECRUSTS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the compromise reached by the conference committee with respect to H.R. 3935 represents a considerably watered down version of the bill as amended by the Senate.

It was not too difficult to surmise what the ultimate recommendations of the committee would be even before its deliberations began, because prominent members of the majority party in the other body had made it clear that the House would not accept the Senate version of the bill in toto.

When this point of view was reiterated by House conferees, a majority of the Senate conferees agreed to the concessions in the hope that minimum wage legislation would be enacted this year.

Is there really substance to the shadowy cynicism that states:

Promises and piecrusts are made to be broken?

During the campaign last fall the American people were told that with a member of the majority party in the White House the power, influence, and prestige of the Presidency would almost guarantee the enactment of legislation which the party and the President really wanted and in a form acceptable to him.

How disillusioned many citizens must be to find that even a survey to determine the boundary of the New Frontier has scarcely begun and that most problems to which solutions were promised still exist—with new ones added.

Last September after the minimum wage conference collapsed the then Senator Kennedy made this statement:

I intend to take this fight to the American people. I am sure that they will support me in November in my goal of a minimum living standard of $1.25 an hour for millions of Americans who work in the large enterprises of our country.

Millions of people gained the impression that $1.25 an hour would be just around the corner in the event of a Democratic victory.

These workers will be bitterly disappointed to learn that $1.25 for retail and service workers is not coming in the first year of this administration—nor in the second—nor in the third—nor in the fourth—but rather a year after the President's term has expired.

Mr. President, some months ago I received a letter from a laundry worker that contained a sentence I shall never forget. It was a quotation from an unknown Englishman, who said:

What is the use of living in an empire on which the sun never sets, if one must live out one's life in an alley into which the sun never shines.

This saying has a sad and special kind of ironic relevance today when we find Congress extending minimum wage coverage to some workers who average $26 a day while denying help to women in laundries who make $26 a week.

How shocked the President must have been when he learned of this provision in the conference report. He cannot help but recall the stirring words he uttered in Buffalo on September 29, 1960:

As long as the average wage for laundry women in the five largest cities is 65 cents an hour for a 48-hour week there is a need for our party.

May I respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that this Congress will be known as the Congress which took the laundry workers to the cleaners?

I would not have Senators believe that all is dark along the Potomac, however. There is some good news for newly covered workers. They will receive $1 an hour in 1961, $1 an hour in 1962, a dollar an hour in 1963—then—2 months before the presidential election of 1965—they all get a raise of 15 cents an hour.

We must not forget that for 7 years President Eisenhower recommended that minimum wage protection be extended to millions of workers in the retail and service trades. He must be happy that the victory which was his, until the conference collapsed in 1960, has now been reestablished. President Eisenhower insisted that his proposal could be put into effect without disturbing accepted and longstanding principles as to the proper use of the commerce power. His view that retail firms should be regulated only if they import a substantial volume of goods across State lines is the view that has prevailed in this Congress. It is the basis for the commerce concept that I offered which will be found in the new law should the conference report be approved by the House.

Although I am disillusioned and dismayed about a few provisions in the compromise bill, I am, nevertheless, satisfied that we have made some improvement in the minimum wage field. It is the very least we can do to help the least advantaged among us.

The humanitarian interests which have been put aside will another day emerge again into the sunlight and they will not be denied.

President—then Senator—Kennedy said:

As long as the average wage for laundry women in the five largest cities is 65 cents an hour for a 48-hour week there is a need for our party.

I say, Mr. President, as long as these conditions exist, there is a need for the help of reasonable men from both parties.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield briefly to the Senator from Pennsylvania without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MODIFICATION OF HISS ACT PENALTIES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Utah.

Mr. President, modification of a harsh and cruel law in the broad field of Federal personnel administration has been advocated by the Kennedy administration. The act is the so-called Hiss Act, a modification of which passed the House last year and failed of passage in the Senate because of the objection of certain Senators.

I hope that this year the Senate will be able to carry out the request of the Kennedy administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Jerry Kluttz, which was published in the Washington Post and Times Herald April 30, 1961, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, in order that my colleagues may have their recollections refreshed as to the meaning of the act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION MOVES TO MODIFY HISS ACT PENALTIES

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Modification of a harsh and cruel law is the No. 1 legislative goal in the Kennedy administration in the broad field of Federal personnel.

The so-called Hiss Act, approved during the height of the era of McCarthyism, has caused hardships and injustices for hundreds of persons, many of them innocent victims, which Congress never intended and its sponsors couldn't foresee.

The law involved prohibits payment of Government pensions to civil servants, Congressmen or military servicemen who are convicted of a felony, or who plead protection of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination. Past or present membership in or support of the Communist Party also bars pension rights under this law.

Here are some Hiss Act injustices:

An Army sergeant pleaded guilty on August 18, 1947, long before the Hiss Act was approved (September 1, 1954), to a charge of unauthorized use of a Government vehicle. That minor offense cost him $38,922 in retirement pay.

In May 1951 another sergeant took the wrong turn in a Government auto he was driving. Unfortunately, a passenger was an impatient high-ranking officer who had the sergeant court-martialed and reduced to the next lower grade.

Now the former sergeant, ready to retire, has learned for the first time that his driving eight-tenths of a mile off his scheduled route will cost him his retirement annuity, valued at $32,946.

A chief warrant officer was charged with several offenses of which there must have been some doubt. He was prevailed on, at a pretrial conference, to plead guilty on condition he would merely be reprimanded and be required to forfeit $400. Neither the officer nor his attorney was aware that his convenient guilty plea would cost him retirement pay valued at $103,000.

A Treasury employee, with 33 years of service, stood on his constitutional rights and refused to answer questions put to him by a Federal grand jury on grounds of self-incrimination. He was denied a civil service pension valued at $35,000 under the act.

These are not isolated cases. The Defense Department warns that the law must be modified to prevent "a drastic effect on the morale of our Armed Forces."

Navy suspects that hundreds of its military and civilians are threatened with the loss of retirement pay under the act. Army estimates that 1 of every 1,000 persons it retires is affected. Air Force says about 575 of its members who will be eligible for retirement during the next 2 years could be affected. Marine Corps says 50 of its people could be denied pensions during the same period.

CSC, which must enforce the act, is using the strongest possible language to try to persuade Congress to limit it to cases involving the Nation's security. It points out that the law is "particularly obnoxious when applied to the innocent survivors of employees," and continues:

"Our position is entirely consistent with the American concept that crimes be defined and penalties for the commission of such crimes be established through criminal statutes. It has never been a part of the philosophy of our legal system to institute and demand criminal penalties in a civil benefits statute."

The offensive law was approved with the prime thought in mind of denying a civil service pension to Alger Hiss, the convicted perjurer, and he still couldn't be given the benefit under the proposed modification.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a minute?

Mr. BENNETT. I shall be happy to yield for an insertion in the RECORD. I have been on my feet for an hour trying to make a speech. I should like to make the speech. However, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas for a brief insertion in the RECORD.

HELIUM RESEARCH CENTER AT AMARILLO, TEX.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am reliably informed that the Bureau of Mines soon will establish a helium research center at Amarillo, Tex.

Purpose of this new research center at or near the biggest city in the Texas Panhandle is to permit intensive studies of character and possible new uses of this lightweight, nonflammable gas.

The research center will be under the supervision of Dr. L. Warren Brandt, of Amarillo, one of the Nation's foremost authorities in this field.

New emphasis on helium studies was ordered because of the increasing importance of this element to space age technology and its prominent position in electronics.

Details of the helium research center plans will be announced by U.S. Bureau of Mines officials within a few days. But because of the free-world importance of this new research center to be located in Texas—which with all its substantial natural gas reserves has only one or two fields which produce helium—I wanted to express the pride and pleasure of Texans in welcoming this important new facility to our State.

This development is a most important one in the High Plains region, which is that area over 3,500 feet above sea level. This is a great underground resource which will speed the entire economy of our Nation.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE "TRUTH IN LENDING" BILL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I look around the Senate Chamber and hear no further requests to yield. Therefore, I should like to hold the floor without yielding until I finish what I have to say.

Last Thursday the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] introduced what he called the "truth in lending" bill, and he, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] spoke in support of it.

Those who embark on a crusade in the name of truth take on themselves a great moral obligation. They must search for truth diligently with open minds—minds that are not so prejudiced that they reject, oppose, or ignore all facts that do not fit into their conceived goal or purpose. That is certainly required of us in Congress; and if we are to find truth in anything, including truth in lending, we must maintain truth in legislation.

Is this bill, S. 1740, conceived and supported in the clear spirit of truth? Do its requirements meet its stated objectives? Are the examples used and the arguments made to support it clearly relevant, internally consistent, and free from concealed purpose? Speaking as a member of the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, which heard a similar bill last year, my answer to all of these questions would be an unqualified "No."

It will take many hours of testimony and questioning in the committee to bring out all the evils buried in this bill; but from last year's hearings, this year's text and last Thursday's opening statements, we can easily discern what to look for.

Last year its author called it the Finance Charge Disclosure Act. This year, with a flourish, he rechristened it the "truth in lending bill." I could suggest a few other titles which seem to me to be more appropriate. For instance, if Perry Mason were naming it, he might very well call it "The case of the cross-eyed credit controls," because its stated objective looks toward one goal and its key provisions toward another. Another phrase that suggests itself is "nonsense and non sequitur" because the bill would not affect most of the evils described in the "horrible examples" used to arouse

emotional support for it, and its key provisions are, in my opinion, incapable of being understood, complied with, or enforced. Resorting to a bad pun, I have called this whole procedure the hidden bill trick. That this designation fits is evident all through the bill.

First, the language which describes the stated objective of the bill conceals the true purpose.

Second, it also may conceal an anti-business bias, including an apparent belief that businessmen must be immoral, ipso facto.

Third, the lurid examples, presented in the testimony, actually involve fraud and other crimes which are already punishable by local law.

Fourth, the language of the bill hides a hoax, because the bill as it is written cannot be enforced without also setting up and using vast new Federal powers to change the whole pattern of our present system of using credit in retail distribution, and to fix prices on every commodity and service in every town in the United States.

Fifth, our search for truth should lead us to try to discover whether there is any justification for legislation in this field at the Federal level. Have the States been asleep to the desirability of accurate, workable laws to provide truth in lending?

Sixth, and finally, we come to the question which should have basic and ultimate concern for all of us, who, as I said at the beginning, should be dedicated to truth in legislation. Is the bill constitutional?

UNSUPPORTED PREMISE

Let us start at the beginning with the objective. Does it state great truth—or, in fact—is it truth at all? Let me read again—it claims that Congress finds and declares:

> Economic stabilization is threatened when credit is used excessively for the acquisition of property and service. The excessive use of credit results frequently from a lack of awareness of the cost thereof to the user. It is the purpose of this act to assure a full disclosure of such cost with a view to preventing the uninformed use of credit to the detriment of the national economy.

This premise is at best highly debatable. Not a single line of testimony was presented to support this proposition at hearings on a similar bill last year. On the contrary there was opposite testimony by Prof. Theodore N. Beckman, professor of marketing at Ohio State University. He presented official statistics demonstrating that consumer debt had shown a very stable relationship to gross national product and personal disposable income during the preceding 4 years. His data also showed that rates of repayment had maintained a sensible relationship to new extensions of credit during the same period. His testimony was uncontradicted.

Furthermore, Federal Reserve Board officials concerned with consumer credit have flatly refused to commit themselves to any specification of a safe or unsafe ratio of consumer debt in relation to personal income or any other economic yardstick. So far as the record shows, consumers are better managers of their own credit problems than the sponsors of this bill would have the Congress believe.

Certainly I have seen nothing to warrant a congressional endorsement of the first bland assumption made in the declaration of purpose of this bill.

Now let us look at the bill's stated objective again in terms of its proposed solution. Are the two inherently related—or is this a great non sequitur?

HOW MUCH CREDIT IS TOO MUCH?

In the first line it says Congress finds and declares that economic stabilization is threatened when credit is used excessively for the acquisition of property and services. Have we found that? Is our gross national product, which is the total of goods and services, too high? Should we be working to cut it down? The bill suggests this, but does not say so specifically. If there is an excess of credit in this country, how great is it? And if this excess threatens economic stabilization, how shall we eliminate it? The bill does not attempt to set standards for proper credit volume, but says "this frequently results from a lack of awareness of the cost thereof to the user." Is this a valid reason? If so, is it the only reason? Or, the chief one? If the bill is passed, could we expect to have greater economic stability?

Or would we have economic chaos?

The plain inference of the bill is that there is now excessive credit in our distribution system which must be taken out. Where? Examples given point to durable goods such as automobiles. By how much is automobile credit excessive? If we take this excess out, by how much will we add to the unemployment in Michigan? The same question can be asked for any industry whose products are bought on credit.

Underlying the bill is an ancient myth which assumes there is a limit of virtue in interest rates, and that this is set at 6 percent. The corresponding inference that every finance charge above 6 percent is immoral. Could we apply this yardstick to all credit transactions and improve the stabilization of the economy? The truth is that if all consumer credit transactions above 6 percent were considered excessive, and therefore had to be eliminated, our whole present economic system of mass distribution, instead of being stabilized, would collapse. The truth is that most, if not all, of our retail transactions involving delayed time payments include other factors, the total cost of all of which far exceeds a 6 percent simple annual rate.

S. 2755, introduced in the last Congress, required that all charges for credit be totaled and stated as "simple annual interest". To have done this would have required a statement that is patently untrue; since interest, the cost of the use of money, is only one part of the cost of retail credit, which is usually unsecured. In order to provide credit to his customers, the retailer must himself borrow money at prevailing interest rates. In addition, he must incur other costs, including the expense of checking credit, keeping records, making collections, and the burden of bad debt losses, to name only a few—of a myriad of small transactions.

Actually the sum of other costs which are required to provide "on-the-spot" time-payment credit service for retail purchases is several times greater than the cost of the interest component.

ACTUAL COSTS OF CREDIT

A fundamental truth in lending, which the sponsors of this bill seem incapable of learning, is that the cost of providing retail merchandise credit, repayable in small installments at the customer's convenience, ranges from 12 to 18 percent per annum—the actual prevailing charges of reputable merchants.

The real cost of providing consumer credit is, of course, reflected by the numerous State small-loan laws. They authorize rates of 2 to 3 percent per month. In passing, it is significant to note that these laws require only disclosure of the applicable monthly rates, not the annual rates of 24 to 36 percent per year. I believe this, too, traces to the 6-percent myth, which would drive consumers to unlicensed loan sharks operating on a larcenous lump-sum basis, in the mistaken belief that it was cheaper than interest at 24 percent per year, permitted under State laws.

The reasonableness of an 18-percent annual finance rate for retail merchandise credit, in the light of related costs, was affirmed by a proponent of the bill, former Congressman Voorhis. He is executive director of the Cooperative League of the United States of America. This is what he testified:

> I know that retail stores have to charge monthly charges on credit accounts probably because it is a costly proposition. I also expect they do not maybe even cover that cost and that the people who pay cash are subsidizing the people who are getting the credit in many cases.
>
> And I want to try to make it clear that I am not blaming the retail stores for charging 1½ percent per month.

A banker witness, who testified for the bill, said the same thing. Speaking of retail credit charges, Mr. Herbert E. Cheever, vice president of the First National Bank of Brookings, S. Dak., said:

> There are transactions certainly where 1½ percent per month would not be exorbitant, depending upon the risk and the amount of the transaction.

Official statistics prove that he is right and undermine any contention that retail merchants are using credit charges as a device to exploit consumers. According to Internal Revenue Service figures included in the record of last year's hearings, the retail industry's after-tax earnings in 1957–58 were only 2 percent of sales and 6.2 percent of assets. Comparable figures for manufacturing industries during the same period were 7 and 10.1 percent, respectively.

The prevalence of the 6-percent notion was affirmed by credit union representative Donald J. MacKinnon of the Fort Dearborn Federal Credit Union, who testified:

> We have even been accused of usurious practices when we tell a member that we charge 12 percent per annum.

HORRIBLE EXAMPLES

Now let us see what the bill will do in the light of these facts. The irrelevant horrible examples contained in last year's hearings, and the uninformed editorials they inspired, some of which were put in the RECORD last Thursday, reveal an unwarranted attempt to besmirch the image of all retailers, big and little, who sell on credit. In his speech on Thursday, on page 6854 of the RECORD, Senator DOUGLAS says he is not trying to indict the American business community, but he also says the consumer does not get true and accurate information from them—businessmen—about credit. He then implies that they cannot be expected to have any morals because they "have fallen into a business jungle where survival seems to have depended on camouflaging, hiding, or understating the real price of credit." This bill is supposed to release them from that bondage. I claim that there is no such jungle now, but that this bill would create one. Where is the truth?

Let me put this problem in the framework of the bill before us, S. 1740. Let us assume that the Douglas bill is enacted and the reputable retail merchants advertise credit charges of 15 to 18 percent on the basis of simple annual rates as required by the bill. What will be the reaction of the credit exploiter who is the assumed target of the bill? I can envision the ads now:

> Why pay 15 percent or 18 percent for credit? Buy here and get 24 months to pay without any credit charge.

The very enactment of this bill and the attendant publicity on the importance of percentage rates would put a premium on such advertising. Nothing in the bill could stop such advertising because every merchant is free to absorb his credit costs in price, if he so chooses. And what will the legitimate merchant do in the face of such competition? The answer is plain. He will have to follow suit. For the average consumer will mistakenly assume that the merchant who advertises the true annual cost of retail consumer credit—15 percent to 18 percent—is the exploiter while his benefactor is the merchant who provides credit without charge. Precisely those consumers who are presently susceptible to exploitation by way of excessive credit charges will be the first to patronize the merchant who advertises no charge for credit.

DISADVANTAGE TO STATE THE TRUTH

The unfortunate fact is that because of public conditioning, the communication to consumers of an 18 percent annual rate would penalize the honest merchant who gave the message. Let me quote a witness who appeared at the behest of the Senator from Illinois.

I refer to Professor Morse of Kansas State University. These are his words:

> Yes, this seems to be the market truth. That is, one would be at a competitive disadvantage to state the truth, the true rate of interest under prevailing conditions.
>
> It would appear to be quite disastrous to be quoted at 12 percent or 18 percent, et cetera.

We cannot escape the plain answer that in a competitive economy such as ours no merchants can afford to state actual annual rates unless all merchants do so. I repeat there is nothing in this bill that can require all merchants to do so. On the contrary, adoption of this bill would encourage the very thing at which it is aimed. It would put a premium on deceptive pricing and advertising practices by a small group of unscrupulous credit merchants and in the long run force such practices on the great body of legitimate business.

BILL WOULD HIDE CREDIT COSTS

So passage of this bill will not affect the exploiters; less, not more, credit information will be furnished the public; and beyond this, cash customers will be saddled with hidden credit costs. Let there be no mistake about these inevitable consequences of this bill. They are borne out by the testimony of witnesses favoring the legislation at last year's hearings.

Let there be no mistake either about the decency of the credit practices of the overwhelming majority of American businessmen. The record of last year's hearings is equally clear on this. Again I refer to the testimony of witnesses who supported the bill. Mr. MacKinnon of the Fort Dearborn Credit Union said:

> I simply do not agree with those who believe that a large proportion of the people who charge rates of interest in excess of our own are guilty of usurious practices, or in any way deliberately attempting to defraud the public. It is my experience that the vast majority of those in the personal credit business are honest and upright citizens. Of course, there are the fringe operators who bring disrepute to any business but they operate largely outside or without benefit of legal control and are in no way representative of the great majority of ethical firms doing business in this country.

Mr. MacKinnon was not alone in commending the vast body of American merchants for their ethical credit practices. Other witnesses for the bill affirmed the same thing. President Buckmaster of the United Rubber Workers stated:

> The overwhelming majority of our business establishments are dedicated to the good economics of fair and honest dealings. This bill strikes only at the unscrupulous few who give business in general a bad name.

Mrs. Alice Thorpe, representing the American Home Economics Association, testified similarly and criticized only—

> The few who, in one disguise or another, cloak excessive charges and advertise in glowing terms so that the uninformed person is not able to distinguish between the legitimate costs and padding, so to speak.

CREDIT UNIONS NOT COMPARABLE

Even the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, a cosponsor of the bill, recognizes the unfairness of comparing the credit charges of retail merchants or commercial lenders with those of cost-free and tax-exempt credit unions. He said during last year's hearings:

> Of course, I am a great advocate and supporter of credit unions. They have their national headquarters in Wisconsin. But in all fairness, we have to recognize they do not operate on the same basis as the commercial loaning operation. They do not have the same charges at all, have all kinds of privileges that the commercial operation does not have. And the competition, therefore, is really not very fair.

DOLLAR COST MORE IMPORTANT THAN RATE

Apart from everything else I have said, the fact is the bill would not help consumers in the slightest, even if it were feasible and enforcible. The truth is that consumers are uninterested in annual percentage rates and could not use the information if it were provided. In this connection, I cite the following testimony of the president of the National Association of Better Business Bureaus, who appeared at the invitation of the subcommittee chairman:

> I have a great deal of doubt in my own mind from talking to thousands of customers over the years that they are particularly interested in what the so-called interest rate is in the installment contract. They are interested in what the dollar cost is and how much it is going to cost them per month to pay the balance which they have obligated themselves for.

Of course, he is right. Consumers are interested in how their dollar expenditures will fit within their budgets, not in abstract annual rate concepts which may be of importance to bankers and large investors.

On the uselessness of percentage rate information to customers, let me refer to the statement of Duncan Holthausen at last year's hearings. He is a former credit official of the Federal Reserve Board and is now the operator of a small family department store in Union City, N.J. Addressing himself to the claim that percentage information would enable consumers to compare credit costs, he demonstrated that this idea was illusory, even in the case of identical merchandise. Again I quote:

> Of course, basic to this whole discussion, is the assumption that consumers can tell which is the better buy if given price and interest rate. Is a 1960 brand X car for $3,200 [financed] at 18 percent simple annual interest with 24 months to pay a better buy than the same 1960 brand X car for $3,300 at 15 percent simple interest with 24 months to pay? I am sure few consumers could give this answer. Professor Morse, in a college level family finance course, finds it necessary to spend 2 weeks dealing with minute calculations of consumer credit arithmetic—in other words, the problems of relating credit costs to simple annual interest. How can we expect the average consumer to relate simple annual interest to dollars, if it takes 2 weeks of intensive study on the part of college students?

How many Members of this body could make the computations required to answer the question posed by Mr. Holthausen and how long would it take?

PROBLEMS OF ENFORCEMENT

Having shown my great doubt that there is any truth in the relationship between the stated objective of the bill and its requirements, and my feeling that the evil image of the American retailer which the bill projects is not accepted by the public, as evidenced by those witnesses who supported the bill in last year's hearings, let us turn now to consider the problem of compliance

and enforcement with their inevitable efforts on our whole retail distribution system.

Anyone with even meager experience in retailing can easily see why the bill is so misleading and deceptive. Its major provision is a requirement that no merchant can regularly sell goods on credit unless he informs each customer in advance, in writing, of the credit charge expressed in terms of a simple annual percentage rate. The claim is that this will insure the disclosure to the public of the real cost of consumer credit. This claim is deception itself. The bill will not and, as I have already said, cannot accomplish any such purpose. It would lead instead to suppression of the cost of credit.

The reason is that as the bill is written, the annual rate requirement can neither be enforced, nor observed, except upon two intolerable conditions.

The first is Federal regulation of the methods and procedures by which merchants may extend credit. Even the author of the bill denies this purpose.

The second is the establishment of a full-blown Federal price control agency to fix maximum cash ceiling prices for every merchant and on every item in every corner of the United States, and to compel the separate statement of the percentage credit rate. Otherwise the credit will be buried in the price.

PRICE CONTROLS INEVITABLE

The proponents of the bill have maintained a discreet silence on these points, and although price control may not be the ultimate objective of the bill, it is meaningless without such control. This silence is understandable because it hides the unpalatable truth.

I cannot conceive that any Member of Congress who is dedicated to a free enterprise economy would support nationwide credit and price controls in peacetime. Too many of us remember the huge price control agencies of World War II and the Korean war and the burdens they imposed on business and the consuming public alike.

The futility of the bill as it stands needs no intricate explanation. The point is simply that without such supporting credit and price control regulation, no merchant in the land would have to suffer the burden of stating credit charges in terms of annual rates. He would be free to fix his prices at levels which would take care of his credit costs and could remain free to advertise to consumers that he made no charge for credit, no matter how long the period of payment was extended.

This is no figment of my imagination. The point has never been denied, although it was raised during last year's hearings by the general counsel for the National Small Business Men's Association. This is what he told the subcommittee:

> If we embark on this course we can fully expect to pay the penalty of Federal price control.
>
> The whole concept of our economy, particularly the antitrust laws, is aimed at preserving the freedom of each businessman to fix his own prices. This is basic to our economic system. Consequently, any merchant would be free to fix whatever cash price he chose and to advertise whatever credit costs for time payment he saw fit. The only way this inherent weakness of the bill could be overcome is by adding to it provisions which either fixed maximum cash prices, and compelled a separate statement of the charges for time sales, or which compelled the disclosure, in addition to credit charges, of the merchant's wholesale costs and his selling expenses for the goods he retails. I do not think anyone here would want to see the kind of national agency which would be needed to administer a bill of that kind.

As a matter of fact, if the bill were passed, every merchant in the land would be under heavy pressure to set his prices so as to avoid any separate credit charges. And this could easily be done. As I have said, it would only be necessary to absorb credit costs in the base price in the same way as other overhead costs, such as advertising, rent and labor costs, are now so absorbed.

IMPOSSIBLE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENT

In fact, the bill will force this result for at least three reasons. First, it is actually impossible to comply with the simple annual interest rate requirement in the light of commercial realities. In the vast majority of merchandise credit transactions, it is impossible to know in advance what the simple annual credit rate will be. This is true of the most popular form of retail credit in use today, known as the revolving charge account. It is also true of the familiar kind of retail installment account known as the add-on account.

In these, as well as other types of retail credit procedures, a simple annual rate cannot be forecast because it is not known at the time of the original transaction how long the customer will use his credit and how much credit he will use over any defined period.

This failure of the bill to recognize the realities of commercial life was attested by an expert Federal agency during last year's hearings. With reference to similar problems encountered in the home loan field, the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board wrote the chairman of this committee as follows:

> It is not apparent how it would be possible to comply with the terms of the bill requiring a statement of the total amount of the finance charges, and the percentage that such amount bears to the balance, expressed in terms of simple annual interest.

S. 1740 asks Congress to ignore these elementary commercial facts. This is legislative irresponsibility. It departs from the experience and action of the numerous State legislatures which have already acted in this field. In fact, at least 31 States have passed laws dealing with various types of merchandise credit, including measures establishing maximum rates and compelling comprehensive disclosure of consumer credit charges, but in dollars or monthly rates of service charge. They have acted responsibly. They have known better than to saddle the merchants of America with the impossible liability inherent in the simple annual requirement of the bill.

"SIMPLE" INTEREST ISN'T SIMPLE

In the second place, if simple annual rates could be somehow calculated, the requirement would be intolerably onerous, burdensome, and expensive. There would be laborious paperwork every time a credit sale was made. "Simple" sounds simple, but it is not.

It would be, if all contracts were to run for an even year, with payments to be made in equal installments at equal time intervals. However, few contracts are written that way. They are generally written for periods shorter or longer than a year, with payments weekly, biweekly or monthly, often with no payment for the first month or two of the contract, or with smaller payments at first and larger payments at the end, or with a provision for skipped payments or with many other variations, all of which affect the interest rate, and make the computation of that rate extremely complex.

To illustrate, consider an example presented at the previous hearings by one witness. A man, caught in an emergency, wants to buy a $20 battery at a gas station, and wants to pay for it on time. The carrying charge is $2. He buys the battery on a Monday, and wants to begin payments on the following Friday, which is his payday. He is paid every other week, so he makes four biweekly payments of $5 each, with a final payment of $2, 2 weeks later. How much "simple annual interest" does the $2 represent?

I took this problem home with me that evening, and after a couple of hours came up with three different answers: 94 percent, 101 percent, and 104 percent, depending upon what assumptions are made about the proportion of each payment going to principal and interest. Next day, I asked a member of my staff, who has the degree of Ph. D. in economics, to compute it. He spent half an hour on it, but did not have the formula he needed, so he referred it to the Library of Congress.

After an hour's delay, the Library came up with an answer of 129.5 percent. One of the committee witnesses, a professor of marketing, worked on the problem for half an hour, and came up with an answer of 118.9 percent. The man who posed the problem in the first place could not figure it closer than between 110 and 130 percent.

A Newsweek article on the hearings and on the problem prompted a few letters to me. Three of these contained new and different answers to the problem. One, by a statistical expert for Beneficial Management Corp., brought an elaborate two-page computed solution of 125.33 percent. The other responses I received were 117.7 percent and 80 percent. In light of this variation among the experts as to the correct answer, how can an ordinary retail clerk possibly be expected to find the correct answer? I hope the sponsors of this bill love truth enough to learn it by trying to figure one of these so-called "simple" problems for themselves as I did last year.

RATE BOOKS NO SOLUTION

Let me point out also that rate books offer no solution. Because of the infinite variety of retail prices and credit terms, such books would have to as-

sume the proportions of the New York City telephone directory. Their accurate use would require the services of trained experts and hours of time, and there would still be more than two-thirds of the retail credit transactions which such books would not cover.

That was brought out by a study made under the sponsorship of Columbia University. The study will be available to the committee when the hearings begin.

The impact of this bill is not confined to professional financial institutions or even to large retail institutions. It would reach credit transactions in every town and crossroads of America. It would cover the credit transactions between the grocer and the housewife; between the corner filling-station operator and the local motorist. It is as broad in its sweep as the wartime price control acts. Imagine the difficulty faced by a rural hardware dealer who on a busy Saturday afternoon would have to take time to make the required calculations and to fill out voluminous forms every time he made a sale on credit to a farmer. Imagine the annoyance that would be encountered by a housewife who made five separate purchases in five sections of a department store, and had to wait for a credit rate calculation from each sales girl who waited on her. Yet that is exactly what the bill would require.

UNPRECEDENTED SCOPE

From what I have said, it is apparent that the bill is of unprecedented scope for Federal legislation. In this connection, I remind the Senate of the widespread concern about the intrusion into local affairs contemplated by the recently passed Senate amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act, the conference report on which is now pending before this body. This bill goes much further than that measure. If verification is needed, I cite the statement of the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, during last year's hearing on the bill. In his words:

> The bill goes far beyond the scope of Commission jurisdiction in that it contains no interstate or foreign commerce limitation.

The impossible enforcement and compliance problems were enough to cause the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to back away from the administrative responsibility. He advised the Chairman:

> Extension of the Board's duties into the field of fair trade practices as contemplated by this bill would be foreign to the Board's present responsibilities.

It is no wonder that the Federal agencies, suggested as the possible enforcement agency at least year's hearings, politely declined the honor. Even the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, whose name appears on the bill, is aware of the dismaying enforcement problems. During last year's hearings, he said:

> I would like to say I can see why the Federal Reserve does not want this administrative job. It is the job I do not think anybody would want.

FRAUD ALREADY ILLEGAL

Let us now consider whether the emotional supporting testimony presented at last year's hearing was either relevant to this bill, or indicative of any need for Federal legislation to control consumer credit. During those hearings, a parade of horror stories of consumer exploitation was presented to the subcommittee. Heartrending tales of episodes in which unscrupulous salesmen made exorbitant credit charges or palmed off shoddy merchandise on people of low income, some of them illiterate, were told on the record, presumably to give a surcharged, dramatic background to the proposal. However, most, if not all, of these were cases of plain fraud and deception which would not be covered or controlled by this proposal, and should better be left to the States and local communities.

This kind of consumer exploitation by a few unscrupulous merchants does not justify the extension of Federal dominion over the millions and millions of transactions which occur every day in the marketplace. State and local enforcement agencies already have the power to cope with this problem, and deal severely with this type of fraud. The Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Trade Commission, or any other Federal agency should not be required to exercise police power over the billions of local retail transactions in our economy.

RECORD OF THE STATES

Is there any justification for Federal legislation of any kind in this area? Have the States ignored their responsibility? The record is clearly the opposite. The truth is that many States have already dealt realistically and effectively with various phases of this problem, including maximum rates and disclosure, and others can be expected to follow. Let us take another look at the record of last year's hearings. This is what President Nyborg, of the Association for Better Business Bureaus, told the committee:

> There is no question about the fact that many of the States have moved and others are considering moving in various ways to afford protection at the State level.

He is absolutely right. All States have laws covering the lending activities of banks. In addition, 42 States have laws requiring the disclosure of credit charges on small loans; 31 States regulate automobile installment sales; and 18 States cover installment sales of other types of goods, as well as automobiles. And in the new area of revolving charge accounts, seven States have already passed laws, while such legislation is under active study in a number of other States. All indications demonstrate that the State governments are alert to the needs in this area and are going ahead with adequate legislation.

To me, this evidence is conclusive. Most State laws have been enacted in recent years. In other words, the current trend is for more and more States to meet the problem, thus making Federal regulation unnecessary. Before 1940, only three States—Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin—had special legislation covering installment credit. Three more joined this group between 1941 and 1945—California, Maine, and Maryland. In the 1946–50 period, Michigan basically changed its statutes; and four new States passed installment credit laws—Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

Between 1951 and 1955, Colorado, Nevada, and Utah were added in the installment statute group. Then, in the 4-year period of 1956–59, 17 States passed their first special installment credit laws. In 1959 alone, nine States either passed their first statutes in this area or amended old ones. In total, about 1,000 legislative proposals were made in State legislatures during that year. In fact, State laws protect consumers today in the Nation's heaviest population areas. In addition, the States of Iowa, Maryland, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania have established commissions to study installment selling.

There is an impressive record of performance on the State level. And it cannot be suggested that the State laws are dead letters. On the contrary, these laws are effective. The president of the National Association of Better Business Bureaus, Mr. Nyborg, affirmed this in answer to a pointed question from Senator BUSH. Let me read their exchange:

> Senator BUSH. You think then that the consumer and the average citizen is getting all the legal protection that he needs in connection with this matter of disclosure in the State of New York?
>
> Mr. NYBORG. It seems to me that this is the case, yes.

And his testimony was corroborated by Mr. William Kirk, representing the Union Settlement House of New York, who told the committee:

> I think it is very clear that where people in our community go down to established stores they are given complete information in every way that conforms with the law.

There is, in short, no reasonable basis for disregarding the advice of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to Chairman ROBERTSON that—

> This is a field of activity that should be appropriated by the State and local governments to govern and police.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

We come now to the last and ultimate question. I am not a lawyer and thus have not attempted any analysis of the legality or constitutionality of the bill. But I would point out that it contains criminal as well as civil sanctions. Speaking as a layman, I will only say that, from a purely commonsense standpoint, it seems to me that the Congress ought not inflict the business community of America with any legal liability on the basis of a measure so unrealistic, so unnecessary, and so uncertain in its application and requirements.

If this proposal is based on the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, it extends this clause far beyond its present limits, including the recent extension of the Fair Labor Standards Act to the retail trade.

For all of these reasons, I have considered it my duty to urge the Congress to be especially watchful of this legislation. Its alleged banner of truth is a tempting one to follow. But this truth label is a deceptive cover for a misleading package—a hidden bill trick. The bill will not lead to truth in lending. It will

produce exactly the opposite result. Congress is being asked to enact a bill which is absolutely unenforceable as it stands and which, however amended, could not be enforced except with the aid of a vast army of Federal price control bureaucrats. Its adoption could only lead to widespread evasion and disrespect of law like the late and unlamented NRA of the early 1930's.

If rigid enforcement of S. 1740 were attempted, it would burden the taxpayer with the heavy cost of a super-snooper agency, bring both weakness and chaos to our credit-based system of retail distribution, and lessen, rather than increase, the consumer's knowledge of truth in lending. On these issues I hope Senators DOUGLAS, PROXMIRE, and NEUBERGER will join me in the search for truth at the forthcoming hearings. If they do so sincerely, I have no doubt of the outcome.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to compliment the diligent and thorough Senator from Utah upon the very interesting statement which he has made concerning the bill. Before I question him, I simply should like to say for the RECORD that more than a year ago, when the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] introduced his first bill, I was one of the sponsors of the measure. I was the only Republican who did sponsor the bill. There was a large number of Democratic Senators who acted as sponsors. My purpose in joining was to explore the situation, because I felt that the general purpose of the bill—namely, the purpose of disclosing the finance charges in connection with the purchase of an item—was a desirable one. I believe even now this should be done, and that purchasers should know what they are paying in the way of finance charges, because I think it might have some effect on their buying habits.

However, as the hearings progressed last year—and the Senator from Utah and I attended most of them, and the Senator was very active in questioning witnesses and in bringing out some of the important points about the bill—it seemed to me three major points stood out as a result of the hearings, and the Senator has covered these matters in his address today.

First was the fact that the States already have programs underway, and those that have not are considering them. It seemed to me, from the witnesses who appeared, and from later talking with representatives of the States who know something about this field, it is indeed an area which should be left to the States, and that the intrusion of the Federal Government into this particular field is absolutely unnecessary and unwarranted.

Does the Senator from Utah agree that the witnesses rather brought out that point last summer?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct. If the Senator followed carefully my statement as I presented it, he will remember that I listed the number of States which had already prepared effective legislation.

Mr. BUSH. I followed it. There were 31 States listed. I am glad the Senator categorized them. I think that fact will be very helpful to anyone who is really interested in the truth of this issue.

Then a second point impressed me as a result of the hearings.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the Senator goes on to another matter, the Senator from Utah should like to make the observation that the State of Illinois, represented by the author of the bill, is not one of the 31 States, which may be a part of the reason for his concern; but I would hope, now that his party is in control of the State of Illinois, members of his party will be interested in handling the problem at the State level, as have the other States.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

The second matter which stood out, as a result of the hearings, was the problem of enforcement. By whom would the law be enforced? The bill provided at that time that the Federal Reserve Board should be the policeman. The Federal Reserve Board shrank from the possibility. The Board did not think they could do it, even if they tried to, and they felt such a field was not in their province. They shrank in horror from the prospect that the enforcement of the act might be put on them.

I believe Chairman Martin expressed the view that there was some merit in the purpose of the bill, namely, to acquaint a person with the amount of the charge in the overall price. He expressed some sympathy with that purpose. However, so far as enforcement was concerned, I am sure the Senator from Utah will bear me out that the Board shrank from it, and had no alternative suggestion that made any sense.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah remembers that when we met in executive session to write up the bill, the question of who would enforce the provisions was left in the air, and was decided very casually, without consultation with the Federal Reserve Board officials at the time, or without asking them finally whether they would accept the responsibility.

Mr. BUSH. No doubt the Senator from Utah has read the new bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. I have not had an opportunity to do it. Would the Senator care to say which agency would be the enforcement agency?

Mr. BENNETT. It is still the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. BUSH. So, in spite of what was brought out in the hearings respecting the impossibility of such enforcement by that agency, the provision is in the bill again. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. The third matter which I think stood out—and I think the Senator from Utah had most to do with bringing it out, although he very ably helped the witnesses bring it out—was the question of the impracticability of being able to reduce the carrying or finance charge to a matter of simple annual interest.

I think the impact of the revelations which came out as a result of the Senator's questioning last summer is revealed by the fact that in the present bill the rate of simple annual interest is not mentioned. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes. There has been substituted, instead, the phrase "simple annual rate," which means nothing.

Mr. BUSH. I ask the Senator what "simple annual rate" is. We speak of rate of growth. We speak of rate of progress. We speak of rate of speed. We speak of rate of this, that, and the other, but we do not talk about merely a rate. What does "simple annual rate" mean?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator from Utah can believe only one thing—that the criticism of the use of the word "interest" to be applied to charges extending credit which had nothing to do with interest—collection and other activities—forced the author of the bill to take the word "interest" out; and being eager to hang on to the basic concept—and, believe me, he hung on to it—he substituted the word "rate" for "interest," without really knowing exactly what it meant, himself. I do not think he can explain what "simple annual rate" is, unless it is a synonym for "simple annual interest."

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator. I am sure he and I will both look forward with interest to questioning our good friend from Illinois as to exactly what is the meaning.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator another question. The Senator touched on the fact that a dealer or retailer could conceal the finance charge by putting it in the price; is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. BUSH. Has the Senator in his broad experience ever seen that device used by dealers?

Mr. BENNETT. I think it is used every day, particularly by comparatively small dealers in out-of-the-way locations who have to attract customers by some unusual device. They advertise, "No downpayment, no carrying charges." That is a common practice.

Mr. BUSH. So the bill, as the Senator views it, would not come to grips with that practice?

Mr. BENNETT. Instead, I think it would——

Mr. BUSH. It would encourage the practice?

Mr. BENNETT. It would not only encourage it, but do more. The American retail industry has had a hard fight and has taken a long time to get the courage and the opportunity to separate finance charges from other charges, so that the two could be stated separately. There has been a fight against the people who have always, as they still do, lumped such charges together.

If the bill were passed, all that progress would be lost and we would be back in the situation that a man who paid cash would be paying, without knowing it, for a great variety of credit privileges introduced for the purpose of attracting business.

I think this is probably the most serious defect in the bill; that in an attempt to enforce the law we would actually force credit charges back into price and,

instead of giving truth in lending or increasing truth in lending, we would for a long time, at least, completely conceal the truth which is now available, when, under 31 States' laws, the customer has to be told, "The price of the article is so and so," in dollars, "and the price of the credit you are being extended is so and so," in dollars.

There has been a lot of discussion about the fact that we all know how to figure simple interest, that we learned it in high school, and therefore we should be concerned about expressing these things in interest or interest rates. I think the important thing, for the man who is deciding to make a major purchase on time and to fit it into his monthly budget, is not to know what percentage of interest he is paying, but how many dollars he has to put out every month to obtain the service.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the conference report on the minimum wage bill is now before the Senate. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Virginia without losing my right to the floor, and I state for the RECORD that I do not propose to yield further until we obtain action on this important proposal.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FEDERAL ACTION TO CONTROL PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Government of the United States has asked a Federal court to enjoin the State of Virginia from spending its own money in support of all public schools in the Commonwealth of Virginia for both white children and Negroes, unless one county submits to Federal demands.

The U.S. Attorney General on April 26 filed a petition in the Federal District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond, asking for an injunction to restrain the State of Virginia from approving, paying, or issuing warrants for the payment of any funds of the State for the maintenance or operation of public schools anywhere in Virginia for so long and during such period as the public schools of Prince Edward County are closed and a system of public free schools is not maintained within the county.

This action is so intemperate it defies belief by the parents of our children. But it is true, and it comes at a time when we are being urged to enact Federal subsidies for public school education in the name of "Federal aid to education."

If nonelected Federal officials will go to the extremes they are applying in Virginia now, who can imagine the ruthlessness of Federal bureaucrats with the power of the Federal purse to force their domination over the schools in our States and localities?

It is true that this move for Federal injunctive control over public schools in Virginia involves the Federal effort to force integration of schoolchildren, but I would remind citizens everywhere that their own school interests also are in jeopardy.

If the Central Government by Federal court order can cut off a State's financial support of its own public school system, it will not be difficult for it by bureaucratic decree to control such matters as textbooks, curriculums, teachers' salaries, and so forth.

If the precedent now sought in the Federal courts is set, and the administration's so-called Federal-aid-to-education bill (S. 1021) is enacted, the machinery for Federal domination of public education in this country will be virtually complete.

This bill, now under consideration by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, would authorize Federal appropriations in increasing amounts over a 3-year period for subsidization of public school administration, teachers' salaries, special public education projects, and school construction.

David Lawrence, an eminent writer, deals with the double-barreled effect of the proposed Federal-aid-to-education bill and the Federal petition for injunction against Virginia schools in an editorial entitled "Conformity by Coercion" appearing in the May 8 edition of the U.S. News & World Report. Mr. Lawrence says:

> We are being told that Congress should aid the States with huge expenditures to construct more school buildings, to pay higher salaries for teachers, and to make various grants for specific educational courses needed to assist our national defense program. Will this not enable the Federal Government to complete its usurpation of the whole educational process?

As should be expected with Federal subsidies, substantial Federal controls in vital areas of public education are actually written into the bill; but even more important, enactment of the bill would open the door for further controls which would be more distasteful.

Once enacted, these Federal school subsidies would never expire; State and local taxes to replace them could never be raised high enough to finance schools in the manner of Federal profligacy which would be established; the pressure would be for more and more Federal money. We would open up a Pandora's box of spending.

If we submit to the Federal subsidy and control of public education established in this bill alone, the surrender to domination by the Central Government at Washington is certain to be permanent. Coercion by Federal injunction would be in addition, with criminal penalties.

I am aware that the bill says there shall be no Federal control over the schools which are to be subsidized, and I know that it says the 3-year appropriations shall be provided in a manner consistent with the purposes of the bill.

This language in the bill is clear, but I completely disagree with those who think it would prevent Federal domination in vital areas of public education. Those relying on these provisions as safeguards against Federal school control will be boobytrapped.

In recent years, Congress has twice denied to the Justice Department the authority to intervene in school integration cases before Federal courts as an actual plaintiff, but this is precisely what was done in Virginia last week.

Recent history in public affairs has taught us how doors are opened for Federal usurpation of State and local authority and responsibilities. This bill is a perfect example in all respects. It could reach almost any situation effectively, with or without Federal injunctions.

Provisions of the bill enumerate the areas of subsidy; they authorize the appropriations for the purpose; they specify initial controls in considerable detail; and the bill opens the way for permanent extension and expanding domination.

These are big feet in a wide door leading directly to Federal control over public education in all of its vital aspects, including all new public school construction. This control is not limited to States and school districts with integration problems.

It should be noted at the beginning that the administration bill provides, in no uncertain terms, that Davis-Bacon labor wage rates must be paid for all public school construction wherever Federal subsidy funds are used in defraying the cost of the contracts.

Davis-Bacon wage rates, almost without exception, are metropolitan rates. To apply them elsewhere for school construction means spending more money for fewer classrooms; nonessential expenditures are made mandatory; and local wage schedules are disturbed.

Public resistance to Federal subsidization of public schools would be eroded by an initial authorization for appropriations totaling $2.3 billion—$666 million for fiscal year 1962, $766 million for fiscal year 1963, and $866 million for fiscal year 1964.

This action is only the beginning. We would be opening the door for huge expenditures to follow.

The subsidy payments would be based on a federally prescribed formula which

would emphasize so-called State effort. Before a State could receive its subsidy money it would be forced to submit a formal application to Washington for Federal approval.

A Federal bureaucrat could deny the application of any State, or if he found a State was not complying substantially with Federal demands he could reduce the subsidy payment, or require the State to repay funds already received.

The bill's formula for measuring so-called State effort is keyed to the level of State and local expenditures. No consideration of value received is required by the bill as it was drafted. Probably States and localities spending most would fare best.

Under such a formula States and localities using gold bricks at $35 an ounce in construction of their schoolhouses might rate more Federal subsidy payments than those preferring the use of cheaper and more practical materials.

This is an authorization bill, and it is practically useless without subsequent appropriations which must be made in other bills. Provisions in the pending bill could not control restrictive amendments to be added to the appropriation bills.

Appropriation bill provisions of a limiting nature are acceptable under parliamentary rules. Restrictive amendments to appropriation bills are common. Sooner or later restrictive amendments are certain to be offered to appropriation bills for public school subsidies.

By amendment to an appropriation bill the Federal subsidy money might be limited to those States with teacher merit systems, or vice versa, or to those States with a single pay scale for members of the teaching profession, or vice versa.

By the same process, amendments to appropriation bills might limit Federal subsidy money for use in States emphasizing science courses over those in humanities, or vice versa, or in States using certain textbooks, or vice versa.

The limitation might be on a combination of such requirements, and, with or without Federal court injunctions, it is certain that appropriation bill amendments will be offered to withhold funds from areas where segregated schools are maintained.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that the Senator's logic in this regard is inescapable. In years gone by a number of Senators have suggested that although they had great sympathy for amendments to limit Federal aid to education to States that had integrated school systems, they would nevertheless vote against such amendments when offered to an authorization bill on the theory that it might impair the chances of the bill to become law. But such argument would not be valid if it related to the program after it became law, and the amendments were offered on an appropriation bill. I doubt very much that Senators who indicated they would not vote for such an amendment on an authorization bill would vote the same way if an appropriation bill were subject to the same type of amendment. I fear the Senator's logic in that regard is completely inescapable.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senator from Louisiana is entirely correct. I shall state an example of what occurred in the Senate.

Efforts have been made to force integration through Federal aid to education bills for years, even in the midst of World War II. The Senate actually adopted an integration amendment to such a bill on October 20, 1943, by a vote of 40 to 37.

The amendment was offered by Senator William Langer of North Dakota. It resulted in a successful motion to kill the bill by sending it back to the committee. Because many Senators were not willing to vote for such amendments, they were able to kill the bill to prohibit Federal funds from being expended except on integrated schools.

The Langer amendment, as it was adopted, follows:

Provided, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this Act, or in the State funds supplemented thereby on account of race, creed, or color.

Then the patron of the bill moved that the bill be removed from the calendar. I cite that as a reminder.

This, of course, was an amendment to an authorization bill. I cite it as a reminder that there are many who have always regarded Federal-aid-to-education legislation as a vehicle for Federal intervention in State and local school affairs.

When grants of Federal funds are involved, Federal control is inherent. It is exercised in greater degree for some programs than it is in others; and where there is an authorization bill such as this, control can be exercised just as forcefully—as the Senator from Louisiana said—through riders on appropriation bills as through provision in the basic bill itself.

The administration's current aid-to-education bill would establish a new Federal grant program. Federal control would ultimately prevail. Let us not fool ourselves about that. It would be irresponsible for a Federal agency to pass out billions of dollars without exercising control over the programs for which they are provided.

If Federal domination should be restrained at the beginning, we should understand that application in full force would be easier after the subsidies are entrenched. The litigation now instituted in the Federal Court for the Eastern District of Virginia should be fair warning.

Once States and localities use Federal school subsidies, they should expect to submit to Federal domination or be prepared, if they give up these subsidies, to raise State and local taxes. Those who are lured into the trap of thinking Federal grants do not come from their own pocketbooks forget there is no other source of Federal revenue.

The State loses by reason of the fact that the original money and the additional cost is deducted from what they get back in return.

And for grant programs the Federal Government always collects more from taxpayers than it passes back to the States. It costs up to 20 cents for the Central Government to collect a dollar, bring it to Washington, and then allocate it back with strings attached.

You do not pay teachers' salaries or build schoolhouses throughout the country with dollars spent for Federal overhead, including the pay for bureaucrats in the ivory towers in the Capital at Washington. Both money and education control would be lost.

While the Central Government under title I of the administration bill would usurp State and local responsibility for public education, it seeks in titles II and III to renege on the only Federal responsibilities the Government at Washington has in this field.

Titles II and III deal with Federal contributions for schools in federally impacted areas. This bill, as introduced, would reduce these contributions and pave the way to absorb this justifiable program of Federal contributions under the overall control of title I.

This has been a sound and well established program. The Federal Government simply reimburses localities for the additional school costs imposed upon them by Federal activities, which frequently remove vast areas from the local property tax rolls.

Contributions by the Federal Government to localities whose schools it overloads cannot be compared with payments under a national system of school subsidies as proposed in title I. There are fundamental differences in scope, purpose, and character.

Federal contributions to impacted areas are in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes based on tangible Federal imposition on the localities. The title I program of this bill provides for subsidies through which control may be applied.

I have studied figures relating to public affairs a long time. I have never seen more conflicting statistics than have been produced on public education requirements. They lead you to a state of mind in which you discredit all of them.

The facts appear to be that tremendous school construction has been general around the country; most areas are overcoming bona fide shortages; few school districts have exhausted their bonding capacity; most of them can do what is necessary.

Nationalization of public schools through a system of Federal subsidies is not justified by any conditions existing today in the field of American education. Nothing could be more deadening to our public school system which, to most people, is a source of pride.

I have always opposed legislation leading to the establishment of Federal control over our public school systems. Likewise, in all areas of public endeavor, I have always opposed excessive and nonessential Federal expenditures.

I oppose this bill because it is offensive in both respects. I have faith in our system of public education under local control, as I do in our system of gov-

ernment, and I want both to be preserved. This bill would destroy fundamentals on which both depend.

It is even more offensive for a nonelected Federal officer, without the benefit of law, through a Federal court, to tell a State under what conditions it cannot spend its own money for the public education of its own children.

Such a decree would be unprecedented in American history. It would do violence to millions of schoolchildren; it would do violence to the rights of 50 States and the localities within them; and it would do violence to the foundations on which our system of government is built.

I am amazed that the Attorney General of the United States seeks to close every public school in Virginia to 847,000 white and Negro students unless little Prince Edward County surrenders its position on a principle it believes to be right.

The Federal proposal to withhold State funds legally appropriated by the General Assembly of Virginia for public school operation necessarily would close public schools all through the State. The attempt to punish an entire State because the action of one county displeases the U.S. Attorney General is fantastic and completely unrealistic, and, I believe, unconstitutional.

Such action will sow the seeds of intense bitterness throughout Virginia and the South when unity is needed as rarely before.

I urge the Attorney General of the United States to reconsider such intemperate and ruthless action.

I urge that he not attempt to destroy the few remaining States rights—one being the right to educate our own children with our own money in our own State.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to commend the able and distinguished Senator from Virginia for the magnificent address he has just delivered. The distinguished Senator from Virginia has the vision to foresee the danger of Federal aid to education. There is no doubt that the points he has brought out in his address are pertinent, and that the dangers he foresees will occur if such legislation is passed.

Furthermore, there is no question that Federal control follows Federal aid. That has been the case in the past. It will be the case in the future. Only a short time ago in my State, in Charleston, S.C., a Civil War centennial celebration was held. The President of the United States directed that the place of the celebration be transferred to the airbase at Charleston, merely because some Federal funds were involved in connection with the paying of a staff at national headquarters in Washington. If an incident of that kind can be seized upon as a pretense for forcing integration, there is no question that any kind of instance will be seized upon, in my judgment, to try to enforce integration in other places.

Only last week in my State a Democratic fundraising dinner was held. The distinguished Secretary of Commerce spoke at the dinner. Later, I understand, the President of the United States demanded that an investigation be made to determine if any nonwhite Democrats had been refused tickets. What authority did he have to inject himself into a State party matter? That has been done, however. I understand that the basis for his request was the fact that a Cabinet officer was speaking at the dinner, and that the administration will not countenance a Cabinet officer speaking to a group of white people who had invited him to speak.

In the case of Virginia, the recent action taken by the Attorney General of the United States is no less reprehensible. That action should be condemned by every right thinking American; not only by the people of Virginia, and not just by the people of the South, but by all the people of the Nation.

For the Attorney General to come into the State of Virginia and attempt to close all the schools merely because the people in one county say "We want to furnish our own private schools and not operate public schools," is one of the most unreasonable steps that any Cabinet officer has ever taken in the history of the country.

Again I commend the able and distinguished Senator from Virginia for his magnificent presentation on this occasion.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. May we proceed with the adoption of the conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon, if I do not lose the floor. I yield to him for the purpose of discussing the conference report which is now before the Senate. I understand that he wishes to discuss the conference report. I am happy to yield to him provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KUCHEL. Reserving the right to object, I am told that the minority leader would like to have a quorum call before any discussion ensues on the conference report.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KUCHEL. With the usual safeguards to the Senator, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

USE OF AMERICAN-FLAG CARRIERS BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am indeed gratified by the prompt action taken by President Kennedy and the Bureau of the Budget in response to my request to encourage the use of American-flag carriers by Government employees and their dependents.

I hope comparable action will be taken to assure the fullest use of our carriers by others traveling at Government expense similar to that taken by the ICA pertaining to personnel of Government contractors, consultants, students, and others.

The Bureau of the Budget rightfully recognizes that there may be instances where foreign-flag services will be required to meet the traveler's needs. However, with the worldwide service of American carriers, these instances should be rare indeed. I hope our carriers will be provided every opportunity to meet Government-financed travel needs and that tickets may be purchased through their offices as prescribed by the General Accounting Office. Further, it would be economically unrealistic if small savings in per diem or other expenses should deprive the U.S. marine carriers of large sums of revenue and impair the accomplishment of the objective to give full support to our own carriers.

With respect to U.S.-owned foreign currencies acquired as a result of our aid programs, every effort must be made to place our carriers on equal footing with foreign subsidized competitors to accept and use such currencies. Whenever our carriers can use and convert foreign currencies, the American dollar is strengthened.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter written by the International Cooperation Administration and a press release from the Committee on Commerce relating to this subject.

There being no objection, the letter and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

On November 16, 1960, a Presidential directive was issued concerning steps to be

taken with respect to the U.S. balance of payments. This directive explained the circumstances contributing to the decline in U.S. gold reserves and directed all U.S. Government departments and agencies to adopt a policy which will place primary emphasis on financing goods and services of U.S. origin in all activities.

This letter is addressed to you, therefore, as an organization involved in contractual relations with ICA, to solicit your cooperation in giving effect to the spirit and intent of the Presidential directive.

While it is possible that your contract currently in effect with this Agency or with a cooperating country may not bind you in this regard, it is requested that, wherever possible, you use your best efforts to procure goods and services in accordance with the policy outlined below which policy is currently effective as regards all other ICA expenditures:

(a) Procure equipment and supplies from U.S. dollar funds where authorized under ICA-financed contracts from free-world sources other than the following countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and Hong Kong. The term "free world" means any country in the world except the U.S.S.R., Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Germany (Soviet occupied), Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and China (mainland).

(b) Arrange for air and surface travel of your employees and their dependents and transportation of their personal property, by American-flag carriers or vessels, unless they are not available or their use is not feasible.

(c) Inform your personnel that if the contract authorizes shipment of a privately owned automobile, no foreign-made (non-U.S.) motor vehicle purchased by such personnel or their dependents subsequent to March 1, 1961, is to be transported at Government expense.

(d) Transport only on U.S.-flag vessels commodities, materials, and equipment procured under the contract from mutual security program funds.

(e) Restrict any ICA-dollar-financed travel of participants which may be authorized by the terms of your contract to free-world-flag carriers or vessels, other than those registered under the laws of the countries listed in (a) above, as excluded procurement sources.

Your cooperation in connection with the foregoing matter will be greatly appreciated. Should you desire further information regarding the Presidential directive and the methods whereby it may be applied effectively to your contract, the Office of Contract Relations will be pleased to discuss the matter with you.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD E. KUNZE,
Director, Office of Contract Relations.

RELEASE FROM THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Those traveling at Federal expense have been directed by the Bureau of the Budget to give preference to American-flag carriers. Chairman WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, of the Senate Commerce Committee, reported today.

MAGNUSON said, after talking with officials at the White House and Bureau of the Budget, that the new order, patterned after those in effect in Departments of State and Defense, would become effective May 15, 1961.

MAGNUSON had pressed for the order, maintaining in a letter to President Kennedy that nearly $100 million annually is involved, and that American-flag carriers now are at a distinct disadvantage as long as many traveling at Federal expense do so on foreign carriers, many of which are directly subsidized by their governments.

MAGNUSON was advised by White House and Budget officials that the new order would direct employees to use American airplanes where travel is performed by commercial air transportation between the United States and a foreign country or between foreign countries, with these notable exceptions:

1. Where a foreign plane might be necessary to insure arrival in time for conduct of official business.

2. Where a flight by an American plane is scheduled but does not have accommodations available when reservations are sought.

3. Where the departure time, routing, or other features of an American airplane flight would interfere with or prevent the satisfactory performance of official business.

4. Where a scheduled flight by an American plane is delayed because of weather, mechanical, or other conditions to such an extent that use of a foreign airplane is in the Government's interest.

5. Where the class of accommodations determined (under sec. 3.6c) is available on both an American and a foreign airplane, but the use of the American airplane will result in higher total cost to the Government due to an additional per diem or other expenses.

6. Where the class of accommodations determined (under sec. 3.6c) is available only on a foreign airplane and the cost of transportation and related per diem is less than the cost of available accommodations of another class on an American airplane and related per diem.

7. Where payment for transportation can be made in the currencies of the following countries: Burma, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, the United Arab Republic (Egypt), and Yugoslavia.

In his earlier letter to President Kennedy, MAGNUSON stressed "for several years the Senate Commerce Committee has been concerned with the amount of travel on foreign airlines by U.S. Government employees and their dependents—travel paid for by Government funds."

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am happy to yield, under the same conditions, to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my judgment the chairman of the committee of conference, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], deserves the thanks of the Senate for his leadership in connection with the conference report on the minimum wage bill, now before the Senate. At the time the bill was introduced in the Senate, I was pleased to join with the Senator from Michigan as a cosponsor of the bill. I have nothing but the highest respect for the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Michigan in first introducing the bill in the Senate, handling it in committee, bringing it to the floor, then having it passed through the Senate, and finally referred to the conference.

Mr. President, I did not sign the conference report. I think the RECORD should show my reasons for not signing the report. I shall vote for the report today because it is now perfectly clear that it is the best bill we can hope for at this session of Congress, but it is not a good enough bill.

I did not sign the conference report because I want to focus attention on the shameful way we are treating the laundry workers of the Nation. I refused to sign because the House conferees should have accepted the Senate's carefully drawn provision covering the country's larger laundries.

The fact that it is not a good enough bill does not reflect upon the Senator from Michigan, nor the other Senate conferees; in my judgment, it reflects upon the House leadership.

I did not sign the conference report because, very frankly, I could not agree with my Senate colleagues that we should yield to what I considered to be unfortunate tactics on the part of House conferees, tactics which could not, in my judgment, justify receding by the Senate conferees.

Apart from laundry workers, the bill did not cover all the many millions of workers in this country who ought to be covered. The bill, at best, as many of us said when it was before the Senate for approval in the first place, is a modest and moderate bill. However, it at least brings under coverage some persons who otherwise would not be covered.

Although most of those who are to be covered under the bill already receive the minimum wage, the coverage problem is the vital public policy question involved. It is for this reason that I will vote for the bill even though I did not sign the conference report.

The bill as passed by the Senate covered laundry workers who fall within the purview of the commerce clause of the Constitution. I think the record shows clearly that they are the most exploited group of workers in the Nation; they are at the bottom of the barrel. In my judgment they are the ones who should be covered first, and they are the ones to whom our Republic has a clear moral obligation. The situation of this group of workers makes them the largest group of workers in the United States who, to all intents and purposes, still are working under sweatshop conditions.

Mr. President, as I have previously informed the Senate, I have lived with this laundry workers' problem since 1942, when I wrote a unanimous opinion of the War Labor Board. At that time we increased the pay of the laundry workers to the maximum amount to which we could increase their pay under the then existing Fair Labor Standards Act. But it is to the everlasting shame of this country that in 1942 we increased their wages from 19 cents an hour to only 40

cents an hour. As I pointed out in my opinion in connection with that decision, the color of the skin of most of those workers was black; but that did not reduce by one iota the moral and spiritual responsibility of the people of the Nation to see to it that such economic degradation come to an end.

In that historic case in 1942, we were told that if we increased the wages of those workers to 40 cents an hour, the result would be that many laundries in the United States would have to close, and that the housewives of the Nation would go to their basements and do their own laundry. In that opinion I pointed out that if such would be the case if the laundry workers were relieved of subsidizing the housewives, then the sooner the housewives went into the basements and did their own laundry, the better.

Mr. President, the argument that if only moral justice is done to the laundry workers of the United States in the year 1961, many laundries will be closed, is the same old bromide with which we have been confronted whenever there has been a minimum wage bill.

The Senate voted on a rollcall vote, to do justice, to the laundry workers. The version of the bill the Senate passed covered at least some of the laundry workers. I thought it most important that we make a breakthrough—that at least we make a start in extending coverage to the laundry industry. The Senate version of the bill did not cover all the laundry workers; but it did recognize that these exploited fellow Americans are entitled to at least some beginning by way of legislation which will alleviate their sordid working conditions. So I was very proud when, this year, the Senate voted to include laundry workers among those covered by the minimum wage bill.

Then we went to the conference. There was no doubt where the Senate conferees stood. I wish to say to the clear credit of the chairman of the Senate conferees, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], that, in my judgment, he did everything he could to try to get the House conferees to recognize the justice of the Senate provision in regard to the laundry workers. But we were met with an argument which the House conferees make time and time again; and I have grown weary of it. So far as I am concerned, the House conferees will never be able to sell that argument to me, because it is a rationalization for their not making in the House the fight they should be willing to make in connection with these great social legislative problems.

The argument of the House conferees was this:

> Do you want any minimum wage bill at all? If you insist on including the laundry workers provision, the report will be rejected by the House. Then new conferees will be appointed and will be given instructions, and they will not agree to as many compromises as we have already agreed to.

Mr. President, I do not buy that argument. In my judgment, a conferee has an obligation to vote in conference for what he thinks is sound legislation. And when they find—as the House conferees found in this instance—that the Senate conferees were unanimous in favoring the coverage of laundry workers, I believe the House conferees should have taken that provision back to the House of Representatives.

Some may say that such a course would result in the loss of some bills. Mr. President, it may be necessary to lose some bills, for a time, in order to stop this device, which I believe is growing up in our conferences with the House, because in my experience this is not the first instance of such pressure by the House conferees.

Furthermore, I wish to say that the Democratic leadership of the House—and I speak as a Democrat—has some responsibility, too, in connection with this matter. All of us know where most of the exploiting of the laundry workers takes place. I speak most respectfully when I say that in this instance Mr. RAYBURN and Mr. VINSON had a duty to the party to take this issue to the House. To the contrary, these very leaders had made it clear to the conferees that there would be no bill in the House at all with laundry workers covered. Let us find out where the Democrats in the House stand. Let the Nation be told where the Democrats in the House stand on a rollcall vote, on a showdown, in connection with the proposal to bring to an end the exploitation of black laundry workers in America—because most of them are black.

We Democrats do a great deal of talking about how all of us are in favor of civil rights and first-class citizenship. But it is about time for the Democratic Party to stand up and be counted, when it is confronted with an issue such as this one. This issue should have gone back to the House of Representatives to see what the Democrats in the House of Representatives would do. We should have found out if it were true, as we were told in the conference, that the result of following such a course was that the minimum wage bill would be lost. Certainly the workers of the Nation have an obligation to do a little sacrificing for a time, if necessary, in order to prevent the exploitation of those within the ranks of labor who are suffering the most.

I take the position that anyone working within the purview and jurisdiction of interstate commerce in this country ought to be covered under a minimum wage law. We have made some progress toward that end and I hope we can correct the gross and inexcusable injustice to the laundry workers by bringing them under coverage next year.

I shall vote for the conference report, but with a heavy heart, because the House has had its way. The House has succeeded once more in taking the position that we can take it or leave it. However, I hope the American people will make clear to their political representatives in the Congress that they will hold them responsible at the polls if they continue to permit the exploitation of the laundry workers of America.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in 1938 the original Fair Labor Standards Act became law. Today, almost 23 years later, we are completing the democratic process—and I speak in the general term—through a significant contribution to the broad field of social justice in this area.

I would remind my colleagues that this contribution will not be a meager one. I recall that in 1949 and in 1955 there were few additional workers brought under the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. As a consequence of the 1949 act the minimum wage of 40 cents an hour became ultimately 75 cents an hour. In 1955, the 75 cents an hour was increased to the ultimate level of $1 an hour. There was opposition in 1949 and in 1955 to the increases which I have just mentioned.

Mr. President, this is not a time for dramatics, but it is a time to reflect upon what has happened since 1938 in this field of labor-management progress. It is my view that the conference bill is a notable advance, because when we add 3,600,000 workers under the act, we move forward for a strengthening of our economic base.

I remember 1938. Ofttimes we are accused of a certain amount of nostalgia—perhaps an evaluation—but I remember, as a member of the House Labor Committee in 1938, the vigorous efforts which we had to pursue to bring about a minimum wage of 25 cents an hour in this Republic. And I remind my colleagues again, although I have mentioned the increases of 1949 and 1955, that there were no substantial numbers of workers brought under the provisions of the act between 1938 and 1961. This is a day of achievement, hammered from compromise, but the major provisions of the Senate concept remain intact.

So this is not a slight accomplishment. This is a recognition, long overdue to American workers.

Mr. President, in the industries and businesses of America there were unconscionably long working hours in 1938. Many employees within interstate commerce received inadequate pay. Intolerable working conditions were prevalent. And so, with long hours, short pay, and, to a degree, sweatshop conditions prevailing, we were faced with the necessity of acting, and I think we acted constructively—in 1938. Someone may say here today that this is a return, in part, to the New Deal. Well, I do not apologize. I feel that those who believe in this program can take credit for once again bringing the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt, which existed in the 1930's, back into the Capitol Hill legislative process in 1961.

The Senator from Oregon has stated that we were unable to hold the provision as to laundry workers which was provided in the measure as it passed the Senate. Approximately 140,000 laundry employees were covered in the Senate version. That is approximately one-third of the number of such workers in the Nation who could be covered. We felt we should make an approach in this underpaid field. We made it in the Senate. Stiff opposition developed in the House. No coverage could be obtained in that body.

Let us speak now of the conference itself, where the Senate and House conferees, over a period of several days, considered a composite measure which might be brought to passage. Certainly Representatives POWELL, ROOSEVELT, and DENT, conferees from the House, were in agreement with the Senate conferees on the matter of the coverage for laundry workers.

I differ in degree with my esteemed colleague from Oregon, [Mr. MORSE] when he says that we should have held out on this merited proposal. We had to stop, temporarily, in pressing for our position. We are faced with the statement by House conferees that in the House the bill could not pass if the laundry worker provisions of the Senate bill remained intact. Senator MORSE and I were active in our attempt, as were others, to cover laundry workers. I desired action—even though it stopped short of equity to these workers. We are aware of the close vote in the House on passage of the original bill.

The chairman of our Senate conferees, the very diligent and devoted Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] realized, as did other Senate conferees, that it is important to secure the passage of legislation to bring 3.6 million workers under coverage and to raise the wage from $1 an hour ultimately to $1.25 an hour.

We could not justify a repetition of what happened in the 86th Congress, when the Senate and the House conferees failed to agree on a version which could be sent to the White House.

It is my hope that, since we have yielded on this point, that the House will find a sufficient number of votes to bring about approval of the work which has been done in the conference. I have every belief there will be a substantial support in this body for the conference report-measure as it has been adjudicated between the two bodies. I hope that not only in the Senate, but also in the House later today, the Congress will adopt the conference report, so that the bill may go to the President of the United States. We are assured the Chief Executive of our Republic will sign it into law.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I never criticize a colleague either for a bill which he has introduced or for a vote on the bill, or for a bill which a Senator brings to the Senate from conference, because I know some of the pains and aches of conference duty. I am not now criticizing any Senator because he supports the pending bill in its mutilated form.

I do not think, however, that the rule goes so far as to prevent the criticism of the outcome of the work of my colleagues, and I wish to briefly say I think this is a very bad bill, one which I could not support, one which I think so far abandons any principle that it is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to find any principle which runs throughout the warp and woof of the bill.

First, I wish to comment with reference to the remarks of my esteemed friend from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who stated that somebody had claimed the authors or sponsors of the bill were renewing the New Deal. I wish to make it very clear that I dissociate myself from that charge, because in the authorship and sponsorship of the bill its supporters have vastly outdealed the New Deal.

As has been stated repeatedly in the debate heretofore, every Senator knows that the then President of the United States, Franklin Roosevelt, in recommending passage of the original bill, confined his recommendations, in their effect, as they should have been confined, to clearing up sweatshops and cleaning up manufacturing enterprises from the intolerable conditions which prevailed. He said not once but several times that the retail and service employments in the Nation should not be covered by the law, for practical as well as legal reasons.

Everyone knows that the then sponsor of the bill, the able former Senator from Alabama, Mr. Black, who is now a Justice of the Supreme Court, who was the spokesman of the New Deal at that time in the Senate, not only reiterated that statement, but also in various remarks upon the floor of the Senate made it completely clear that under the principle of the bill, as he saw it, which was consistently maintained, retail enterprises within States serving local communities, and service establishments also serving local communities, could not be properly covered by such legislation. So the first departure from principle is this, in which the advocates of the bill have far outstripped and left behind and pushed off the left end of the bench the sponsors of the New Deal.

Secondly, I wish to invite attention to the fact that there is no principle which runs through the bill, because while it is asserted that the effort of the sponsors is to bring within the coverage of the bill the employees in retail establishments, in service establishments, and in other activities of that kind which heretofore always have been regarded as intrastate rather than interstate activity, one finds upon reading the bill that no such thing is to be accomplished by it. Surrendering the principles with which they started, the authors of the bill, last year and again this year, have omitted practically every one of the service establishments which were included. There were omitted from the original draft of the bill this year hotels, motels, restaurants, and motion picture theaters. I am glad they were omitted. I think all the added coverage which overstepped State lines should have been omitted. But the authors of the bill this year forgot much of the principle which animated them last year, and cut out hotels, motels, restaurants, and motion picture theaters.

The bill as it comes from the conference is even more different. I do not criticize the conferees for it. I am sure they had to do what they did or else fail in their effort, which I think was misguided in its totality. The conferees have omitted a large number of additional employees under the headings of automobile dealers, farm implement dealers, and laundries.

Certainly it cannot be said that those employees are in any different classification, in principle, from the employees who are still included under the coverage of the bill under the category of service establishments. There are very, very few indeed left within the coverage of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment. First I wish to say that the high principle which I assume motivated the introducers of the bill even at the beginning of this session has had to be abandoned in the details I have mentioned, in the omission of practically all service establishments.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If there is no principle running through the bill, and if certain intrastate activities have been covered and others exempted, to what cause does the Senator ascribe the covering of one and the exempting of another?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the question. I think the answer is rather self-evident.

I believe I am not being critical of individuals when I say they are trying to get a foot in the door. They are trying to put the camel's nose under the tent. They will try, if they once eliminate the principle of exemption of all intrastate business by passage of the bill, to come back a little later and to include the other service establishment employees, other retail employees, and other employees.

I think that is made rather clear by the fact that there are still sections in the bill, as I understand the conference report, requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study of pay rates in hotels, motels, restaurants, and other food service enterprises, with the intention of quickly informing the Congress at an early date, so that action may be taken.

I understand a similar provision is still in the bill which would give similar instructions with reference to those who are handling and processing agricultural products. I understood from the statement in the debate by my distinguished friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] that he understands that the Secretary of Labor will, on his own motion and initiative, make a study as to the needs of laundryworkers. Perhaps other workers were included in the statement of the Senator with reference to the study. But he made very clear that, as one Senator, he was not giving up on the question of the inclusion of laundryworkers.

I definitely recall that my distinguished friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has repeatedly stated in

this Chamber that he felt most agricultural workers should be included within the purview of the bill. A few minutes ago I believe he stated that he thought the coverage of the bill was woefully short and should have been greatly increased.

So the answer to the question asked by the Senator from Ohio is that the purpose of the authors of this pruned-back bill—which, as I say, is devoid of any thread of principle running throughout it—is simply to make a beginning in breaking down the barrier which has always been recognized, both constitutionally and practically, as existing between interstate business on the one hand and intrastate business on the other hand, with the hope and expectation of very soon enlarging the coverage of the bill so as to practically wipe out State jurisdiction over employees of all classes of business within State lines.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Therefore, if workers, let us say, in Ohio who are employed by hotels, motels, restaurants, farm implement dealers, automobile agencies, and laundries, believe that they will be covered by the bill, they have been deceived by the general discussion without having clearly pointed out to them the fact that they are exempted under the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Such workers will be disillusioned. If they have such an understanding as suggested by the Senator, that understanding is not in accord with the meaning of the bill, which clearly exempts them. As to whether they have been deceived or not I do not know, because it may be that those workers misunderstand the situation. But, as admitted by the chairman of the conferees, it is as clear as crystal that those classes have been excluded from the coverage of the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator from Florida is correct in his understanding that subsequently those who are now exempted will be covered, I ask why they have now been abandoned in the present bill. Why have they not been covered under the present bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator asks a question which I can answer only by trying to interpret the motives of Senators, all of whom are my friends. But as I have understood from their frank statements in the Chamber, they have said that they could not get even a shadow of the bill passed without the exclusion of these various groups, and therefore, as they have said, they reluctantly agreed to the exclusion of those groups. Certainly they did not want them excluded, because last year the bill covered all of those workers. This year the bill has gone back a little. Some additional workers were cut out in the Senate, though not many. Then, of course, in conference two large additional groups were eliminated. Having been a conferee myself, I suppose their elimination was a practical move on the part of the Senate conferees in order to try to get some legislation passed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To put the problem in a different way, is it not fair to declare that exemptions had to be given to employees of hotels, motels, automobile dealers, farm implement dealers, laundries, and others? In other words, those groups that were strong shook the harness off themselves and were willing to be free, but allowed the harness to be placed on others.

Mr. HOLLAND. My distinguished and colorful friend has well stated the situation, at least as I understand it. What he has stated is exactly what happened.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Florida recall that a year ago when the bill was before the Senate and the Monroney amendment was offered for consideration, an account was made on the prospect of the bill in view of the Monroney amendment? It was understood that the Monroney amendment would carry. Admittedly, on the floor of the Senate an agreement was made to exempt the interests covered by that amendment if they would in some manner release their pressure against the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I well remember that Senators gave assurance on the floor of the Senate, prior to the yea-and-nay vote on the Monroney amendment, that immediately after defeat of the amendment they would offer a softening amendment excluding various classes of business and workers, and they did so. They operated in complete good faith. They operated, however, in such a frank method that I believe the record clearly shows the situation was just as stated by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To refresh the memory of the Senator from Florida, I put the question squarely and asked the principal proponents of the bill whether an agreement had been reached that if the Monroney amendment were defeated, employees of automobile dealers, motels, hotels, farm-implement dealers, and restaurants would be exempted. The answer was, "Yes."

Mr. HOLLAND. I have some recollection of the subject mentioned by the Senator from Ohio. I think events occurred as he has stated them.

To restate the problem, any feeling on the part of anyone that there is a cohesive principle that now runs through the bill is mistaken because there is not. The bill is based upon expediency and power. The effort is to make a beginning at breaking down intrastate jurisdiction, and the supervision and control of States over businesses which serve their own people, and with which the members of the legislature are most familiar, so that they can take appropriate action, if any is required.

As the Senator well knows, no 2 of the 20-odd States which have enacted State wage-hour laws have adopted the same standards, because the standards of State laws have been based upon the habits, demands, methods of trade, character of employees, and standards of pay which are applicable in their communities. Several of such States, recognizing that the same standards do not apply in the large cities as apply in the country towns, have adopted variable standards, some of which are applicable in large cities, some in medium sized cities, and some in small towns and villages. I believe they have every right to do so, because they are answerable to their own people and they know their own people's customs.

I do not believe it is possible for the long arm of the Federal Government to reach out from Washington and properly to control, supervise, and regiment—that is the real word—the operation of every business in this Nation. What I have said is exactly the policy and philosophy of those who are behind this proposal, even though they have very greatly departed from this philosophy in many of the specific terms of the bill.

I close by saying that situations in this country are varied because it is a varied country. Employees in certain businesses in my State, for example, must compete with employees in the seasonal hotels, who are well paid; with the employees in the seasonal agriculture businesses, who are well paid; with the employees at Canaveral, Eglin Field, or the Jacksonville Naval Air Complex, Key West, or the various other places where Uncle Sam has many thousands of people employed. Obviously no employer can retain employees who are of sound mind and body, ambitious, and able to do something, without placing them under a wage structure that is somewhat comparable to that which they can receive in other businesses. The same situation does not obtain in every other State. That is the point. No two States ought to be regimented under identical provisions in their trades and businesses.

In closing, I remind the Senate that we have been asked to restore the competitive position of many of our products in world markets. We are now being asked in the bill to make that impossible by artificially raising wage rates. We have been asked to maintain a stable dollar, and we are being asked by the bill now to run in exactly the opposite direction. We have been asked to help the plight of the unemployed. My distinguished friend from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has made a valiant and wonderful battle for reemployment agencies, in which he was greatly interested. I remind him that one of the major causes of unemployment in the coal mines of his State has been the terrific increase in the wage rates which came about through collective bargaining, and not through any State law. The result is that coal can no longer compete with some of the other products with which it is in natural competition.

Mr. President, we are being asked by the bill to undo things that we have done in these three fields, and to go a long way toward destroying anything we can do to accomplish anything in these fields.

I know what will happen on the floor of the Senate. However, I want the RECORD to speak clearly of my feeling that the bill is based on an unsound philosophy, which will break down a great American principle. It should not be passed, because it will place vastly increased responsibilities upon Congress, already overloaded, and upon the National Government, which already cannot do a good job in many fields, because it is too big.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I find myself in the position of wanting to yield to both the Senator from New York and the Senator from North Carolina. However, the Senator from New York has been on the floor the longest, and I yield to him now.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall take only a few minutes. My reason for speaking is to answer precisely some of the conclusions stated by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I have had a great many businessmen, especially in the retail field, come to me to ask, "Why are we included?" Of course, only large businesses really in interstate commerce are included. There competitive conditions important to the economic life of our State become important.

Large States like New York, which are the home of businesses which engage in large-scale business, and especially States like New York which can lose business to low-wage States—are very much interested in having established some kind of concrete wage base which recognizes existing standards of living. Accordingly, this legislation is critically important to the economy of my State of New York and to the economy of other States which maintain high labor standards.

Secondly, a great argument has been made about the humanitarian qualities of the bill. Certainly that is an extremely important point. I should like to join those Senators who have protested the elimination of 140,000 laundry workers from the bill; it represents a disservice to the cause of the American working man in general. I certainly hope the omission will be corrected. I do not have in mind, Mr. President, any foray again to increase the minimum wage which will start the day after this bill becomes law. The bill itself, of course, takes 5 years to be fully implemented. That will give it every chance to develop. However, I do feel that we must take care of inequities which are manifest, as in the case of the laundry workers and the nontipped hotel, motel, restaurant, and food service workers.

With respect to the question of competition, I should merely like to say this: The fact that we in America have high wage scales is attributable to two things. One is high consumption. However, even more important—and particularly because a reasonable argument has been made which must be answered—is the fact that our high wages are attributable to the great efficiency and automation and the high productive power of American workers. If this bill becomes law—and I am certain it will become law—it should not become law without a word for American labor, because without speaking now on American labor we would not be doing our duty.

This bill was sought by American labor, and in asking for the bill American labor has implied a pledge that when it comes to a great many decisions, whether they deal with automation or imports, or the number of hours people work, or the intensity with which they work, and whether that be in connection with "featherbedding" decisions under laws or practices, or by way of bias and discrimination—which still persists, I regret to say, even though rarely, in some segments of American labor—I believe that labor, by seeking the enactment of the bill, impliedly undertakes that it will do its utmost to respond on its part with the needed productivity and the highest morale.

By this bill we have shown our confidence in the American labor movement. I believe very much that the American labor movement will hear my plea and other similar pleas made to it and show its confidence in us.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on the conference report.

When the bill was debated on the floor I supported every amendment that would omit filling stations, laundries, and similar businesses from the bill. I supported every amendment that would have taken those businesses out of the bill. We were unsuccessful in connection with every one of those amendments. I voted in favor of the bill with the understanding that the bill would be greatly improved in conference.

In conference it was improved to some extent, but not to the extent that makes it possible for me to vote for the conference report, and, therefore, I shall have to oppose it.

There are two or three good reasons for my opposition, which I wish to state. One of them is in answer to the Senator from New York, who has referred to cheap labor competing with operations in his State, and so forth. Every plant in New York State and in any other State operates under the same minimum wage which is applied in every State of the Union, because it is covered by the present law in interstate commerce. There is no cheaper scale in North Carolina than in New York. There is nothing to that argument.

I cannot conscientiously vote for any bill which would set up two wage scales for the same class of people doing the same kind of work. I do not care whether it is a small store or a large store, there should not be two scales for businesses selling the same kind of merchandise. Whether a company operates 1 store or 50 stores, if the stores are selling the same kind of merchandise, they ought to have the same kind of wage scale applied to them. The Interstate Commerce Commission has jurisdiction over stores which do business in interstate commerce. I believe that is right. I do not see anything wrong with it. I believe business has profited by it. I believe that has been of great help to people in connection with business being done in interstate commerce.

If we take the case of one store which does $250,000 worth of business and another which does a million dollars' worth of business and say that they will operate under two different wage scales, it is unlawful, in my opinion, and I do not believe that it would be constitutional to do so.

There are some who have said they thought the Supreme Court would invalidate title 3 of the bill. They have much more faith in the Supreme Court than I have, because recent decisions which that Court has made do not indicate that the Court will act on that basis whatsoever.

If it were necessary to pass a law of this kind, if we had to go into the question in this way, in my opinion, it should have been done on the basis that every single industry covered by the law operates on the same wage scale.

My State has a minimum wage scale of 75 cents an hour. I do not say that that is enough, by any means. I know it is hard to make a living on 75 cents an hour, but many people are doing it. I am certain that if the bill is passed, many persons will lose their jobs and will be on relief, instead of earning their own living. Many persons are beyond the age when they can easily find new jobs in industry, in stores, and other places. I am certain that if the bill is passed, many of those persons will lose their jobs. I cannot be a party to putting them out of work when I know that that is what will happen if the bill is passed. The same is true of schoolchildren who work on Saturdays and holidays.

Mr. President, I cannot support a bill which I am certain will hurt many persons. I think we should act here to help them instead of to hurt them.

I think it is unfortunate that the bill is before us now. The United States is being plagued, as it never has been before, with foreign competition in the form of products manufactured by workers whose wage scales range from 20 cents an hour downward. To raise the wage scales of American workers would put the U.S. manufacturers further out of competition with foreign companies. To me, that simply does not make good sense at this time. Perhaps at a later time the minimum wage scale should be raised, but I do not think this is the time to do it.

Mr. President, much as I dislike to oppose a bill which the President and the administration wish to have passed, I cannot conscientiously support a bill which I know will cause injustice to many persons. Therefore, I shall not support the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I voted against the passage of the bill in the Senate. For the reasons which the distinguished Senator from Florida has advanced, I shall vote against the conference report. However, for the purpose of having the legislative intent established on a couple of provisions in the bill, I wish to ask some questions.

The bill provides, for example, that if a business does $1 million in annual gross sales, then there will be coverage under certain conditions. The definition of the word "annual," I think, needs to be amplified.

If I am a businessman and am reporting, for income tax purposes, on a calendar year basis, does it mean a calendar year for income tax purposes?

Mr. McNAMARA. The definition of "annual" is spelled out in the report. It does not refer to the income tax year, because there is some variance in that

by special provision. So the income tax year is not tied into the bill.

The Senator will notice that on page 3, in the section numbered 8, the measure of annual dollar volume of sales is spelled out in great detail, but it makes no reference to the income tax year; simply to the 12-month calendar year.

Mr. MILLER. In other words, if I am a businessman and am reporting on a fiscal year basis, and the fiscal year ends on June 30 for income tax purposes, I cannot use my gross income volume for that income tax year in computing my coverage under the bill?

Mr. McNAMARA. In any given quarter in which one wishes to determine whether he is covered, he may take the preceding 12 months. He has control over the period to that degree.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps that answers my next question, but I should like to ask it anyway, in order to be certain.

If one operates on a calendar year basis, and on December 1 his accountant tells him that he has done business amounting to $950,000 in gross volume, must he reduce his payroll for the month of December, lest he come under the law for the whole calendar year; and if by the end of December he has exceeded the amount, must he go back for the whole year and pay overtime?

Mr. McNAMARA. Apparently one can get a ruling on the basis of the prior year before he goes into the period with which he is concerned.

Mr. MILLER. If for the prior year one had a gross volume of $950,000, may he go ahead, in the following year, and do $1,500,000 in gross volume and not be covered?

Mr. McNAMARA. That depends on the quarter in which one determines to get a ruling. This is a hypothetical question; it is hard to answer it definitely. If one does a volume of business of $950,000 a year, in the next quarter with which he is concerned he would not be covered.

Mr. MILLER. But he would be covered in the second succeeding quarter?

Mr. McNAMARA. If the previous 12 months, including the quarter about which the Senator is now talking, were included in the 12 months, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. MILLER. Then, is one covered from that point on, or is he covered for the quarter which brings him into the $1 million class?

Mr. McNAMARA. If that quarter brings him into the year, he is covered for the year.

Mr. MILLER. Starting with the following quarter?

Mr. McNAMARA. That is correct; for the year starting from that point.

Mr. MILLER. Suppose the fluctuation is downward in the following quarter, so that the previous 12 months would bring one under the $1 million volume. Is he not then in a position to be safe until he gets into another quarter which, added to the previous three quarters, brings him up into the $1 million bracket?

Mr. McNAMARA. Yes, in the total year at any point in the calculation.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator is entirely welcome.

Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader, who, I understand, wishes to make a statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first I pay a compliment to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, who was chairman of the Senate conferees and chairman of the subcommittee which handled and reported the bill to the full committee. He has been gracious; he has been indulgent; he has been demanding, I must say; but he has been very, very gracious, indeed, throughout the hearings, even though I did not have the opportunity to present all the witnesses I had hoped might be heard before the committee. With equal grace, of course, the Senator from Michigan conducted himself and the business of the Senate in the conference committee. So for his affability, his good nature, and his indulgence—up to a point—I congratulate him and pay to him a compliment which he richly deserves.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to thank him sincerely for his most gracious remarks. I have previously said that I appreciate the cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the other Senators on the minority throughout the proceeding.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not support the conference report. Whether there will be a demand for a yea and nay vote, I do not know. I shall not make such a demand; but I shall not support the conference report.

I think there is too much logic on the side of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who spoke about the lack of any clear-cut, uniform, or philosophical pattern in the bill. It simply is not there. All one has to do is to look at the list of exemptions. I am always glad to be indulgent and to go along with people who will be adversely affected and perhaps injured or damaged, but when we see the long list of exemptions which are being filed, and consider how they seem to increase year after year, it gives one a pretty fair idea that there is a great deal of expediency about the bill.

Nothing rises up to attest that fact better than what happened to the laundry workers. Without being invidious, without violating Senate rules or casting aspersions on any individual, because always they shall remain nameless, I think the whole wide world ought to know the expedient manner in which the conference report was approached. When we got to the laundry workers, it was obvious what happened in another body, which shall remain nameless, because I cannot use the name, under the rules of the Senate. However, the whole world knows that an amendment was offered on the floor of that nameless body with respect to the laundry workers, so they were removed from the bill.

The Senate did otherwise; and here I can speak more freely in identifying the body which took the action.

But when we got to conference, there was a very distinguished legislator, who shall remain nameless, so that his glory shall never be tarnished or his legislative record impugned, who said, "Now, gentlemen of the conference, we might just as well be practical." The word "practical" is a great one, Mr. President. What he should have said was, "We shall just be political."

He said, "You know you will not get a conference report adopted if you leave in the bill the laundry workers coverage provision." He said, "I go even farther than the distinguished Senator from Oregon with respect to the inclusion of laundry workers. But I am practical."

What he meant was that he was political. He amplified his statement, and said, "It is a case of getting votes for the conference report." So, Mr. President, you see there is some expediency in connection with this matter.

I know of no reason why the laundry workers should not be included when all other workers are included. I know of no reason why at the outset we should not have included the hotel workers and the motel workers. I know of no reason why we should not have included the implement dealers and the automobile dealers. They are dealers. I have heard something said about "dealing," and about how those groups finally got out from under the aegis of this bill. But they did.

So you see, Mr. President, when an attempt is made to spell out the thread of uniformity, it simply is not there. Restaurants are excluded. I think local retail business is involved when one goes into a restaurant and sits down at the counter, and a very gracious young lady brings a glass of water and the menu, and you say to her, "I will have eggs, sunny side up, with a great big slice of Kentucky ham." When those golden eggs and that delicious piece of ham begin to traverse your alimentary canal, I believe that can be considered interstate commerce. [Laughter.] But, you see, under this measure they are exempt from coverage, for it exempts from coverage restaurants, drugstore food counters, caterers, and similar retail services.

Motion picture theaters are also exempt. However, this measure contains a provision which states that coverage extends to something that is handled or touched or moved in interstate commerce. The word "moved" is a very selective one. It may be that the celebrated rocking chair we have been hearing about—and I saw it the other day—may have moved in commerce in 1812. But now it has come to rest in one place. However, if it comes within the $1 million provision and the $250,000 cutoff, that old rocker is in interstate commerce, according to this measure. To me, that is a rather astounding state of affairs.

So far as motion picture theaters are concerned, all motion picture films which have moved in interstate commerce are covered, unless they have come out of the rarefied atmosphere of Hollywood, or wherever such pictures are made. The coverage will extend even to films we make in room T–2, where we exhibit our statesmanship to our constituents back home. According to the bill, all those

films move in interstate commerce; and if they are shown in a motion picture theater in my hometown or elsewhere, they are regarded as being in commerce. But the motion picture theaters are exempted from the coverage of this bill.

Mr. President, one could go on, and could further examine the bill for the thread of uniformity, which a lawyer almost invariably learns about in law school. But I say to the distinguished lawyer from Florida that he is eternally and eminently correct: there is no uniformity, there is no philosophical uniformity, in this bill. That is the reason why the laundry workers are not covered by it.

So we were told that the conferees had to be "practical." Mr. President, that is a great business; I love the word "practical." We had no great difficulty in that instance, except for one thing: The noncovered workers will get what we refer to as "the old stretchout." You see, Mr. President, if they are not covered now, but if they will be covered by means of this measure, the first year their minimum wage will be $1, but they will not receive any overtime pay. The second year, their minimum wage will still be $1, and still they will not receive any overtime pay. The third year, their minimum wage will still be $1; and then the overtime pay will begin, after 44 hours. If that is uniformity, I have never seen it. I will bet there are in the Nation many people who will say, "Just wait until the House and the Senate vote for the conference report and the distinguished President signs the bill into law. Then we will be covered, and we will go to the boss, the next morning, and will say to him, 'We are now under the new minimum wage law.'" But the boss will say, "I've just looked at it; and in the first year you will not be covered, beyond $1. In fact, you will have to wait until the fourth year before you will even get up to $1.15."

Mr. President, let there be no disillusionment about this measure, let there be no embracing of an illusory hope, because they will be fooled under this "stretchout."

Perhaps some of these good folks will say, "Well, from now on, now that the Senate and the House, with their omniscience and wisdom, have given us a new law, we will get the benefits of overtime." So they will go to see the manager. He will say to them, "I am sorry; but I just took a look at the new law, and there is not going to be any overtime for the first year."

They will reply, "Well, that is funny." Perhaps they will wait; and if patience stays with them, the second year they will ask, "How about the overtime?" And the boss will again look at the new law, and will reply, "Well, if I can read the English language and if I can tell what those Senators and Members of the House of Representatives have done, there is not going to be any overtime for the second year, either."

Mr. President, someone is going to be fooled; but I am not going to fool them. I have been here too long and I have gotten to be too old in this business to go around fooling people. So I am not going to disillusion them and I am not going to fool them. But that is "the stretchout" in this measure, as regards those who are going to be covered for the first time.

Mr. President, the conference report does not cure the difficulty I find with this measure.

I must say for the House that it accepted with alacrity what we have done. That was good work, PAT.

I remember the story about the boss who said to the worker, "Did you do that work with alacrity?"

The worker replied, "No, I did it with a shovel." [Laughter.]

Well, Mr. President, that is what we did here; we did it "with a shovel," because out of 30 major items, the House—and I will not say who it was in the House—said, "We concur in the Senate view."

Of course, Mr. President, it builds up our ego, when another legislative body says, "We concur in the wisdom of the Senate." That makes us feel that, somehow, we know something about this business. But the basic difficulty still remains: It is the expansion of Federal power, about which I wish to express my alarm. How easily we embrace such business.

One of the things Oswald Spengler said—and he had one of the greatest brains in several centuries—when he wrote the monumental book "The Decline of the West" was that he could not quite understand the amazing fidelity of the American people to the Constitution of the United States and its effect in the swing of world affairs.

That, Mr. President, from Oswald Spengler, who took particular note of the Constitution and its effect—a man who was ready to look down the road beyond the year 2000, and longer, and to talk about the impairment and the disappearance of civilization; and then to come back and to single out one great thing, the Constitution of the United States, and to comment on it, and talk about its cohesive force and its effect upon the United States of America, and its greatness.

And today we see a further erosion. Senators can employ all the semantics, all the words in the law books, all the cliches, all the fancy phrases, all the quips they can find in court opinions, and they can examine what comes from on high in the opinions of the great tribunal—it still does not argue the fact that there is not before us today a further erosion of one of the most important clauses in the Constitution.

Embrace your expediency, Mr. President, if you will. Follow the political course if you will. Believe me, this speech is doing me no good today, coming from an industrial State; but it is important, because of the legacy that this generation is going to have to transit to those who come after. And I am not going to be one to tarnish and weaken and sully the Constitution any further, when I have such a redoubtable authority as Oswald Spengler on my side, who pointed out what the Constitution really meant.

Yes, Mr. President, that is high authority, because testimony has been given to the capaciousness and magnitude of his brain, and he called the turns of history before he died. He was one of the great students and scholars of all time.

Mr. President, that question is what is before us today. The Constitution is not going to die by frontal assault. The destroyers are too smart for that. No, it is the enfilading attacks that come first from one side and then from the other; it is the easy erosion. It will be said, "Oh, we are not doing anything about it. We are not changing the words in the Constitution."

Mr. President, that is not important. How they are applied is important. Oswald Spengler, when he wrote his great book on the Constitution, established that principle. Do not talk about its authority; talk about its application; then we will understand how we go down the easy road.

We have witnessed in recent days a dictator standing before 1 million people and asking the question, "Do you want elections?" Then we have witnessed the people saying, "No," in a great cascading chorus. Oh, how easy people extend their hands and say, "Put on the shackles." So, little by little comes this erosion.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry; I cannot go down that road with you. I cannot do it because I would be violating a fundamental and essential principle.

I would add one other thing. Put all these provisions together, and if you think, Mr. President, we have been a nation of bookkeepers, what will we be later when we have to separate and set out the items that move from Illinois to Indiana in commerce, and ascertain whether they amount to $250,000, and then ascertain what to do about the $1 million gross? What separations will have to be made and what books will have to be kept. It was said once that England was a nation of shopkeepers. We can say in truth and candor that we are going to become a nation of bookkeepers, whether we like it or not. I rather rebel at the thought. But there are penalties that go with the failure to carry out the responsibility under this act.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall take no further time, except to say to my congenial chairman: Perhaps I ought to congratulate you for getting the bill before us this year. I did my best to stop it before, as the Senator knows. I did not succeed. I always had one hope before, because, then having made the best fight of which I was capable, I could then say, "Well, if we can only get one-third plus one, maybe we are still safe." I cannot say it any more, I deplore it.

So I pay my compliment to the chairman, and express my regret that I cannot be a party to a bill that makes such a deep inroad into the organic, fundamental law of the country.

Mr. President, in connection with these remarks, I think it might be well to put in the RECORD a summary of the bill as agreed to in conference.

Mr. MCNAMARA. That has been done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand it has been done. If nobody will say that I am wasting the taxpayers' money, I think it might be well to put it in the RECORD a second time, in connection with my remarks.

Mr. McNAMARA. I have no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who knows, I may want to get it printed at public expense and get it sent out to the taxpayers.

So I ask unanimous consent, in order to round out my own remarks, to include this summary in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF MINIMUM WAGE BILL (H.R. 3935) AS AGREED TO IN CONFERENCE

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

A. For presently covered employees (23.9 million), the minimum wage is increased to $1.15 an hour for the first 2 years after the effective date and $1.25 an hour beginning 2 years after the effective date.

B. For newly covered employees the minimum wage and overtime will be as follows:

First year after effective date, $1, no overtime requirements.

Second year after effective date, $1, no overtime requirements.

Third year after effective date, $1, 44 hours a week.

Fourth year after effective date, $1.15, 42 hours a week.

Fifth year after effective date, $1.25, 40 hours a week.

C. Retail trade:

1. Retail and service enterprises: The bill covers retail enterprises which have a million dollars or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level) and which purchase or receive goods for resale that move or have moved across State lines which amount in total annual dollar volume to $250,000 or more—2,182,000 employees.

2. Gasoline service stations: Also covered for minimum wage, but not for overtime, are gasoline service stations which have $250,000 or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level)—86,000 employees.

3. Exemption from retail coverage: From this coverage in the retail trade the bill excludes the following:

(a) Auto dealers and farm implement dealers.

(b) Hotels.

(c) Motels.

(d) Restaurants, including retail store lunch counters, caterers and similar retail food services.

(e) Motion picture theaters.

(f) Hospitals.

(g) Nursing homes.

(h) Schools for handicapped or gifted children.

(i) Amusement or recreational establishments operating on a seasonal basis.

(j) Any small store which has less than $250,000 in annual sales even if it is in an enterprise that has more than $1 million in annual sales.

4. Special provisions for retail trade: In addition the bill makes the following special provisions for particular problems in the retail and service trades:

(a) Commission employees in retail stores will be exempt from overtime if more than half their pay is from commissions and if they earn at least time and one-half the minimum rate.

(b) Assistant managers of retail stores will be exempt even if they perform up to 40 percent nonexecutive and nonadministrative work.

(c) Student workers may be employed in retail trades at subminimum rates under certificates issued by the Secretary in occupations not ordinarily given to full-time employees.

D. Laundries: The conference agreement has removed the proposed new coverage and the changes in exemptions for laundries that were contained in the Senate-passed bill. Laundries therefore remain in the same position as they were under the present law.

E. Transit companies: Suburban and interurban transit companies which have $1 million or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level) are covered for minimum wage but not for overtime—93,000 employees.

F. Establishments which already have some covered employees under the act are covered for all their employees if they are in an enterprise which has a million dollars or more in annual sales—10,000 employees.

G. Construction: Construction enterprises which have at least $350,000 in annual business are also covered for minimum wage and overtime—1 million employees.

H. Seamen: Seamen on American-flag vessels are covered for minimum wage but not for overtime—100,000 employees.

I. Telephone operators: The exemption for telephone operators is limited to those employed by an independently owned public telephone company which has not more than 750 telephones—30,000 employees.

J. Fish processing: Seafood processing employees are covered for minimum wage but not overtime (seafood canners are treated in this way under the present law)—33,000 employees.

Total number of newly covered employees: 3,624,000.

K. Other provisions:

1. Puerto Rico: The minimum wage in Puerto Rico for presently covered employees is increased by the same percentage as the mainland minimum, subject to review by industry committees in hardship cases; for newly covered employees the rates will be set by industry committee procedures.

2. Broadcasters: Announcers, news editors and chief engineers of broadcasting companies located in nonmetropolitan cities of 100,000 or less population are exempt from overtime.

3. Bulk petroleum dealers: Independently owned and controlled local enterprises engaged in bulk petroleum distribution are exempt from overtime if their annual sales are less than $1 million (exclusive of excise taxes).

4. Trip rate: Trip rate drivers and drivers' helpers making local deliveries are exempt from overtime if the Secretary of Labor finds that the plan under which they are paid is consistent with the principle of the 40-hour workweek.

5. Farmer's livestock auction operations: Employees working in a livestock auction held by a farmer need be paid the minimum rate only for the hours they work at the auction if during that workweek they are employed primarily in agriculture by the farmer.

6. Country elevators: Employees in country elevator establishments in the area of production, which may also sell products and services used in the operation of a farm, are exempt from both minimum wage and overtime if no more than five employees are employed by the establishment in such operations.

7. Cotton ginning: Employees engaged in ginning cotton for market in counties where cotton is grown in commercial quantities are exempt from minimum wage and overtime.

8. Holly wreaths: Homeworkers making natural holly wreaths are exempt from the act.

9. Shade-grown tobacco: An exemption from minimum wage and overtime is provided for agricultural employees engaged in bulking shade-grown tobacco if they were employed in the growing and harvesting of such tobacco.

10. Transporting fruits and vegetables to market: An exemption from minimum wage and overtime is provided for employees transporting fruits and vegetables from the farm to market or transporting harvesting hands, within the State.

11. Board and lodging may be included as wages on the basis of a fair value calculation made by the Secretary: Also, such perquisites may be excluded from wages to the extent that they are excluded under a collective bargaining agreement.

12. Study of employment effects of foreign trade: The Secretary is authorized to study employment effects of imports and exports in industries covered by the act and to report on such studies to the President and to the Congress.

13. Study of certain exemptions for canning and processing and of wage rates in hotels and restaurants: The Secretary will study the complicated system of exemptions in the act for the handling and processing of agricultural products as well as the rates of pay in hotels, motels, restaurants and other food service enterprises and to report the results with recommendations to the next session of this Congress.

14. Effective date: 120 days after enactment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. With that summary added to my remarks, and with my day in court, I must be content to let the wheels grind, and have the conference report go to its destination.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the conference report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business, and is paired with the Senator for Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 36]

YEAS—64

Aiken	Hart	Morse
Anderson	Hartke	Morton
Bartlett	Hayden	Moss
Beall	Hickey	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Pastore
Boggs	Humphrey	Pell
Burdick	Jackson	Prouty
Byrd, W.Va.	Javits	Proxmire
Cannon	Johnston	Randolph
Capehart	Keating	Saltonstall
Carroll	Kefauver	Scott
Case, N.J.	Kuchel	Smathers
Chaves	Lausche	Smith, Mass.
Church	Long, Mo.	Smith, Maine
Clark	Long, La.	Sparkman
Cooper	Magnuson	Symington
Douglas	Mansfield	Wiley
Engle	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGee	Yarborough
Fong	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Gore	Metcalf	
Gruening	Monroney	

NAYS—28

Allott	Dworshak	Mundt
Bennett	Eastland	Robertson
Blakley	Ellender	Russell
Butler	Fulbright	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Talmadge
Carlson	Holland	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Jordan	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	McClellan	
Dirksen	Miller	

NOT VOTING—8

Bridges	Goldwater	Neuberger
Bush	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	

So the conference report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1293. An act for the relief of Djura Zelenbaba;

H.R. 1360. An act for the relief of Anna B. Prokop;

H.R. 1425. An act for the relief of Marian Walczyk and Marya Marek;

H.R. 1441. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 1449. An act for the relief of Col. John T. Malloy;

H.R. 1710. An act for the relief of Narinder Singh Somal;

H.R. 1717. An act for the relief of Angelo Li Destri;

H.R. 1718. An act for the relief of Jaime E. Concepcion;

H.R. 1860. An act for the relief of Jovenal Gornes Verano;

H.R. 2107. An act for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno;

H.R. 2116. An act for the relief of Wanda Ferrara Spera;

H.R. 2141. An act for the relief of Henry Wu Chun and Arlene Wu Chun;

H.R. 2165. An act for the relief of Marie F. Balish;

H.R. 2280. An act to provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as a Nike range;

H.R. 2281. An act to reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek area, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2282. An act to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command training site, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2283. An act to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2346. An act for the relief of Maria Cascarino and Carmelo Giuseppe Ferraro;

H.R. 2351. An act for the relief of Hans Hangartner;

H.R. 2645. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Alice Klimowski;

H.R. 2671. An act for the relief of Giovanna Bonavita;

H.R. 2674. An act for the relief of Eva Nowik;

H.R. 2883. An act to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure", of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2898. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof;

H.R. 2991. An act for the relief of Joseph Maz;

H.R. 3146. An act for the relief of Jozef Gromada;

H.R. 3283. An act to revise the boundaries and to change the name of Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3371. An act for the relief of George Sauter (also known as Georgois Makkas);

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of George A. McDermott;

H.R. 3489. An act for the relief of Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec;

H.R. 3526. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof;

H.R. 3722. An act for the relief of Maria Czyz Krupa;

H.R. 3846. An act for the relief of Master Sergeant Louis Benedetti, retired;

H.R. 4023. An act for the relief of Mieczyslaw Bajor;

H.R. 4027. An act for the relief of Keith K. Hoover;

H.R. 4201. An act for the relief of Evangelia Kurtales;

H.R. 4282. An act for the relief of Casimir Lazarz;

H.R. 4482. An act for the relief of Urszula Sikora, Radoslav Vulin, and Desanka Vulin;

H.R. 5416. An act to include within the boundaries of Joshua Tree National Monument, in the State of California, certain federally owned lands used in connection with said monument, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5475. An act to transfer a section of Blue Ridge Parkway to the Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5500. An act for the relief of Bunge Corporation, New York, N.Y.;

H.R. 5571. An act to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5647. An act for the relief of David C. Thomas, Robert W. Barber, Milton A. Chace, and Richard F. Turner;

H.R. 5656. An act to provide for reasonable notice of applications to the U.S. courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies;

H.R. 5765. An act to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways;

H.R. 6244. An act for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services erroneously in receipt of family separation allowances; and

H.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution providing for a study by the Veterans' Administration into the problems of veterans who are elderly, chronically ill, or otherwise handicapped.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1293. An act for the relief of Djura Zelenbaba;

H.R. 1360. An act for the relief of Anna B. Prokop;

H.R. 1425. An act for the relief of Marian Walczyk and Marya Marek;

H.R. 1441. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 1449. An act for the relief of Colonel John T. Malloy;

H.R. 1710. An act for the relief of Narinder Singh Somal;

H.R. 1717. An act for the relief of Angelo Li Destri;

H.R. 1718. An act for the relief of Jaime E. Concepcion;

H.R. 1860. An act for the relief of Jovenal Gornes Verano;

H.R. 2107. An act for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno;

H.R. 2116. An act for the relief of Wanda Ferrara Spera;

H.R. 2141. An act for the relief of Henry Wu Chun and Arlene Wu Chun;

H.R. 2165. An act for the relief of Marie F. Balish;

H.R. 2346. An act for the relief of Maria Cascarino and Carmelo Giuseppe Ferraro;

H.R. 2351. An act for the relief of Hans Hangartner;

H.R. 2645. An act for the relief of Wieslawa Alice Klimowski;

H.R. 2671. An act for the relief of Giovanna Bonavita;

H.R. 2674. An act for the relief of Eva Nowik;

H.R. 2883. An act to amend title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure", of the United States Code to provide for the defense of suits against Federal employees arising out of their operation of motor vehicles in the scope of their employment, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2991. An act for the relief of Joseph Maz;

H.R. 3146. An act for the relief of Jozef Gromada;

H.R. 3371. An act for the relief of George Sauter (also known as Georgois Makkas);

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of George A. McDermott;

H.R. 3489. An act for the relief of Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec;

H.R. 3722. An act for the relief of Maria Czyz Krupa;

H.R. 3846. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Louis Benedetti, retired;

H.R. 4023. An act for the relief of Mieczyslaw Bajor;

H.R. 4027. An act for the relief of Keith K. Hoover;

H.R. 4201. An act for the relief of Evangelia Kurtales;

H.R. 4282. An act for the relief of Casimir Lazarz;

H.R. 4482. An act for the relief of Urszula Sikora, Radoslav Vulin, and Desanka Vulin;

H.R. 5500. An act for the relief of Bunge Corporation, New York, N.Y.;

H.R. 5647. An act for the relief of David C. Thomas, Robert W. Barber, Milton A. Chace, and Richard F. Turner;

H.R. 5656. An act to provide for reasonable notice of applications to the United

States courts of appeals for interlocutory relief against the orders of certain administrative agencies; and

H.R. 6244. An act for the relief of certain members of the uniformed services erroneously in receipt of family separation allowances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2280. An act to provide for the withdrawal of certain public lands 40 miles east of Fairbanks, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as a Nike range;

H.R. 2281. An act to reserve for use by the Department of the Army at Fort Richardson, Alaska, certain public lands in the Campbell Creek area, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2282. An act to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Ladd-Eielson area, Alaska, for use by the Department of the Army as the Yukon Command training site, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2283. An act to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of certain lands in the Big Delta area, Alaska, for continued use by the Department of the Army at Fort Greely, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2898. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof;

H.R. 3283. An act to revise the boundaries and to change the name of Fort Vancouver National Monument, in the State of Washington and for other purposes;

H.R. 3526. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof;

H.R. 5416. An act to include within the boundaries of Joshua Tree National Monument, in the State of California, certain federally owned lands used in connection with said monument, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5475. An act to transfer a section of Blue Ridge Parkway to the Shenandoah National Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5571. An act to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 5765. An act to authorize the purchase and exchange of land and interests therein on the Blue Ridge and Natchez Trace Parkways; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.J. Res. 73. Joint resolution providing for a study by the Veterans' Administration into the problems of veterans who are elderly, chronically ill, or otherwise handicapped; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

C. Darwin Stolzenbach, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Ernest R. Feidler, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve; and

Frank M. McCabe, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the U.S. Coast Guard.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Fulton Freeman, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Colombia; and

John S. Everton, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Burma.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination of Hon. Julius C. Holmes, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The nomination will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

OREGON SCHOOL FUNDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from Mr. Cecil W. Posey, the executive secretary of the Oregon Education Association. In it he discusses the situation in my State with respect to funds for education. He states:

As you may be aware, public school cost in Oregon as in other States will continue to rise and, at the present time, nearly 70 percent of the cost of schools in Oregon comes from a property tax. This simply cannot continue. The 1959 Oregon State Legislature did not increase its proportionate share of the cost of schools, and it is very doubtful that the present session of the Oregon Legislature will do very much.

We have reached an extremely critical situation. Public schools are needed in this Nation and yet the funds to provide them are drying up at the State and local level. We hope that the entire Oregon delegation will recognize the necessity of maintaining a good public school system not only for the welfare of the boys and girls, but for the very survival of our Nation.

I think Mr. Posey has summarized the situation very well. I would point out to my colleagues that while Oregon ranks among the top States in the effort it makes to support its school system, many qualified observers such as Mr. Posey believe that State and local tax sources have about reached the breaking point insofar as school support is concerned.

DEVELOPMENT OF A SOUND EDUCATION SYSTEM IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished educators in the State of Oregon is Dr. Frederick M. Hunter, honorary chancellor of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

He has written recently to President Kennedy expressing his support for the President's program to promote the development of a sound education system in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Hunter's letter to President Kennedy appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE SYSTEM
OF HIGHER EDUCATION,
Eugene, Oreg., February 24, 1961.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: Your educational program, if enacted by the Congress, will prove the greatest bulwark and guarantee against the menace of communism ever proposed by the United States or any other nation. I earnestly hope for its speedy approval in toto.

I am a Republican, reared in a household where the unpardonable sin was not what Holy Writ says it is, but voting the Democratic ticket. But with millions of others, I am enthusiastically in favor of your constructive program for the defense of our free society and the complete realization of its aims to our own people. Every good citizen should support you vigorously in your great plan for the triumph of our way of life.

Very sincerely yours,
FREDERICK M. HUNTER,
Honorary Chancellor, Oregon State Board of Higher Education.

REPEAL OF CONNALLY RESERVATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received from the Honorable Alfred T. Sulmonetti, chairman of the Oregon State Bar Committee on World Peace Through Law. In it, Judge Sulmonetti advises me of the vote by the Oregon State bar at its 26th annual meeting in favor of repeal of the Connally reservation. His letter is an indication of the widespread interest in the legal profession in the establishment of world peace through law, and the wide support for positive and specific measures to achieve that objective.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON STATE BAR,
April 6, 1961.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Subject: Senate Resolution 39 (87th Cong., 1st sess.), relating to recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain legal disputes hereafter arising.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The subject resolution (S. Res. 39) submitted to the Senate January 13, 1961, by you and Senators HUMPHREY and JAVITS came to the attention of the Oregon State Bar Committee on World Peace Through Law, at its meeting at Eugene, Oreg., held March 24, 1961.

Adoption by the Senate of such resolution by concurrence of the requisite two-thirds majority would result in amendment of Senate Resolution 196 of the 79th Congress, 2d session (August 2, 1946), by eliminating the so-called self-judging or Connally reservation.

The purpose of this letter is to advise you that the Oregon State bar at its 26th annual meeting held at Gearhart, Oreg., on September 22, 1960, voted in favor of repeal of the Connally reservation.

Our committee feels this matter is very urgent and important. We want to encourage your efforts and, if you know of any way that our committee or its members can be of assistance in furthering the adoption of this resolution, please let me know.

Very truly yours,
ALFRED T. SULMONETTI,
Chairman, Oregon State Bar Committee on World Peace Through Law.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall take only 3 or 4 minutes to discuss three items that I shall insert in the RECORD, with very brief comment on them.

A week ago last Monday I spoke in the Senate of my disagreement with the policy of the administration with respect to the ill-fated attempted invasion of Cuba by Cuban exiles, financed and logistically supported by the United States. In my many years in the Senate I have never received such a public reaction to any speech I made in the Senate. My office has been literally flooded with comments from across this Nation, over 90 percent of which support the position which I expressed in my speech on the Cuban issue.

I cite this fact to the Senate because some of the columnists who are writing subject matter would leave the impression that the American people are ready to shoulder arms and proceed to subdue the island of Cuba. It has been said that the White House mail has been four to one in support of direct military action against Cuba, but my mail has been over nine to one against it.

Typical of the reaction in this country on the part of those who do not agree with the course of action the administration has followed in the Cuban crisis is an editorial written by one of the most distinguished editors of our State, a former Governor of our State, a former Delegate in the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, a man who is recognized as one of the most ardent citizens of our State in support of the development of a system of international law for the settlement of disputes. Charles Sprague has demonstrated time and time again in his writings that he recognizes that we do not win peace through war, and that a powerful nation may have the military might to force its will for a time upon other parts of the world, but that history is replete with examples of failure on the part of powerful military nations to settle for very long problems that threaten the peace of the world by resorting to the use of military force.

I believe that the writing of Governor Sprague on this subject is so important that I intend to take the time of the Senate to read it into the RECORD. It is a needed check upon the urgings that have been submitted to us that we ought to invade Cuba. I cannot think of a greater mistake we could make. As I said, after our conferences with Secretary Rusk the other day, it is a matter of great relief to hear the Secretary of State make clear that there are no plans for an American invasion of Cuba based upon status quo conditions in Cuba.

That does not mean, as I said, that it may not be necessary, in case Russia follows a military, aggressive course of action in Cuba, or in case Castro follows an aggressive military policy against American interests and rights, to protect our treaty obligations and our national rights by whatever means it becomes necessary to do so.

This great editor of the State of Oregon had this to say about the Cuban crisis:

President Kennedy's address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on Thursday was a declaration of policy, pointed plainly to the U.S. military intervention in Cuba.

I believe the Governor is wrong in that conclusion, but he is right in warning the American people in this editorial that that would be a most unfortunate policy, and I associate myself with his observations. He goes on to say:

President Kennedy's address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on Thursday was a declaration of policy, pointed plainly to U.S. military intervention in Cuba. He rattled our sabres, swinging one in the face of Khrushchev himself.

The address pleased the chauvinists and the activists who think we should come to grips with this Red infection in the Americas. But it will grieve those who oppose all war and disturb those who think that policy outlined is wrong. I find myself in strong disagreement with the Kennedy proposal.

In his announcement of possible unilateral action the President based it on the primary responsibility for the security of our own Nation. Since Cuba itself offers no threat to the United States, his fear may arise over its possible use as a Russian base. That certainly would give us cause for concern; but it would be a logical counterpart to our own policy of ringing the Soviet Union and its China ally with bases for our strategic air arm. What are Formosa and Okinawa but forward bases for the United States whose retention we claim is necessary for American security? If use of Cuba as a base for Communist penetration of the mainland of North and South America is the motivation for possible intervention, the chance is great that such intervention would alienate the peoples of all Latin America, whose affection for the United States is not strong anyway.

The President's reference to the "bloody streets of Budapest" was not a fortunate allusion. What about bloody streets in Havana or Santiago or Santa Clara, blood shed by American bombs and shells? Would we not invite the opprobrium of other nations in the same way that Russia did for suppressing the Hungarian revolution? Presumably, if the United States did intervene militarily, we would promptly set up free elections, which Russia has not allowed in Hungary or its other satellites. But that would not purge us of the guilt of use of force against a people who of themselves have committed no grave acts against Americans. And if the new government restored American corporations to their former possessions the charge of imperialism would surely stick.

What we suffer most is injured pride. And Kennedy, who ran for office on the claim that the former administration had cost the Nation heavily in prestige, seems to think that the way to regain it is to wave, and evidently to use, the big stick. So far his Cuban policy has come a cropper. The invasion which had the public blessing of the administration, and perhaps its undercover assistance, was quickly flattened out. It was poorly timed, poorly led, and lacked internal support.

I digress from the reading of the editorial to say that the testimony before my subcommittee by the Secretary of State, the head of CIA, and the Assistant Director of CIA, bear out Governor Sprague's statement completely. I repeat what he said:

It was poorly timed, poorly led, and lacked internal support.

He goes on to say:

Kennedy first announced that the affair was one of Cubans against Cubans. He should let it remain so, unless there is far greater provocation than we have yet experienced. But on Thursday he took the United States closer to the famous "brink" than his predecessor ever did.

Kennedy might look back to the invasion of the Suez by Israel, France and Britain in 1956, and note its outcome. Israel surely had more provocation for the invasion than we would have in Cuba, and Nasser was quite as great an annoyance to Britain and France as Castro is to the United States. But our Government led the pack at United Nations to compel the invaders to withdraw. We were the great moralists then.

The parallel was noted by the Manchester, England, Guardian which offered this comment, before the Cuban invasion was launched:

"American intervention against Cuba would be as wrong—morally and politically—as Britain's intervention against Egypt in 1956. In the United States, the two situations doubtless seem different. In the rest of the world, they look ominously alike. Traditionally, Egypt was a quasi-colony of Britain—as Cuba traditionally was of the United States. A hostile government in Egypt was a potential strategic threat to this country—as a hostile government in Cuba is to the United States. In 1956, Britain claimed that President Nasser was, among other failings, a tool of the Kremlin—which is exactly what the United States now says about Dr. Castro. The effect of Britain's intervention against Egypt was to strengthen President Nasser, and to convince a large part of the world that Britain could not be trusted. American intervention against Cuba would have the same effect."

What shall we do, if we do not intervene? Exercise patience, and more patience—more because this administration has botched the job in its eagerness to get rid of Castro. Revolutions in Latin American countries do not succeed when launched from foreign bases. They succeed from an internal base,

either in a military coup or in a popular uprising.

Castro's harsh rule would have led to one or the other. Now our policy has helped entrench him in power. Sure, we could send over some planes and ships and troops and run him out of the country. But Cuba and the Cubans would still be there, a majority hating us for liberating them; and the other Latins would cherish bitterness as they did for decades over our invasion of Mexico. The fruits of the good-neighbor policy would wither in our hands.

Mr. President, this editorial was written by one of the most noted journalists in the West; it comes from one of the leading internationalists in the United States; it comes from a former member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations; it comes, incidentally, from a man who is no political supporter of mine.

But when it comes to the realm of ideas, it does not make any difference to me from whose head the idea comes. If I think the idea is sound, I shall support the idea. In my judgment, the editor of the Salem Statesman, a former Governor of my State, made a contribution to commonsense in regard to the Cuban problem when he wrote this editorial of warning, as did Walter Lippmann in his column of yesterday. I shall not take the time to read it, but I wish to express this word of high praise to Mr. Lippmann because he has made a plea for calm judgment, he has made a plea for patience, he has made a plea for us to recognize, before it is too late, that the exercise of military might on the part of the United States against Cuba will not in any way resolve the great problems which confront freedom in Latin America but which, in my judgment, will only worsen the situation.

I have every confidence in the President and the Secretary of State. I feel certain that they will profit from the great mistake that was made; from the bad advice which obviously was given them; and from the miscalculation which, in my judgment, went into the fiasco which has come to be known as Cuban intervention.

I shall continue, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, to urge our Government to try to get together with our neighbors and our friends in Latin America. That involves trying to determine who are our neighbors and our friends in Latin America.

The time has come also, I believe, when we have the right to point out to our Latin American neighbors that they really have more to lose from Cuba's communism than does the United States.

We will be able to protect ourselves. We will be able to defend ourselves. If Russia wishes to follow an aggressive course of action in Cuba and attempt to take over Cuba as a Russian Communist beachhead, 90 miles from our shores, there is no doubt that we will meet that challenge directly, because then our own security will be involved.

DANGER IS TO REST OF HEMISPHERE

However, I point out to our Latin-American friends that their security can be endangered by Communistic infiltration from Cuba unless they are willing to stand now with those nations in the Western Hemisphere which are urging that we join together in a workable alliance this time, or in making the Organization of American States an effective, workable alliance, whereby we will cooperate, economically, politically, and militarily, if necessary, to prevent our friendly neighbors in Latin America from going down under the heel of Communist totalitarianism. This does not call for unilateral action on the part of the United States; it calls for joint action. It calls for a determination of policy. In my judgment, it calls for the appointment, in the immediate future, of an Assistant Secretary of State for Latin-American Affairs. It calls for the appointment, in the immediate future, of a U.S. Delegate to the Organization of American States.

Both of those offices are vacant at present. Such joint action calls, I say most respectfully, for some diplomatic consultation at the highest level between the United States and the Latin American countries, because I believe we owe it to ourselves and to the world—more important, we owe it to future generations—to exhaust every possibility of seeking to resolve the crisis which is developing throughout Latin America, by the maximum use of existing peaceful procedures. The sad fact is that we have not done that to date.

I close by expressing a great worry. In recent days I have listened, I have been briefed, and I think I have a reasonably accurate understanding of what happened. It does not augur well for the future of my country unless this administration will profit from the great mistake it has made in regard to the Cuban situation and will make perfectly clear to the country that we will not let the CIA and the Pentagon call the shots; we must not let preventive war groups in this country determine our policy.

I am greatly concerned about the increasing activity of what are undoubtedly powerful forces in this country which are urging a preventive war.

I am not interested in the incident they may use in order to cause that war, but I want to hear my President say, and to hear my Government make it clear, to the people of the country that we will not let those who have been guilty of giving the very bad advice which this administration has received in the recent past create an incident or lead us into a situation which will result in what I am satisfied will be a completely unnecessary war, in order to defeat communism in the Western Hemisphere.

I raise my voice once more—although it will not be the last time—in opposition to those who write in the press, speak on the radio, or appear before the television, seeking to wave the American flag into tatters in an attempt to whip up a hysteria in this country for direct military action. If we start a war on a small scale, we can have no assurance that within a short time it will not break out into that holocaust which mankind ought to seek to avoid, if at all possible, with honor—a nuclear war—because out of that nuclear war will come no victory.

I think we need to face the fact that millions of people in many parts of the world—we do not like this ugly thought, but it exists throughout the world—fear two nations, in respect to the maintenance of peace. Those two nations are the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

Millions of people must be brought over to the side of freedom, but they will not come with us or will not go with the Russians until those two powerful military nations, now marching down the road of an immoral nuclear armament race toward inevitable utter destruction, can have reason brought to bear before it is too late.

Therefore, I should like to see more attention given in my country these days to the maximum use of existing peaceful procedures, in an attempt, at least, to find some way to bring these two powerful nations to an enforcible disarmament program; because until Russia and the United States are disarmed, the danger of nuclear war, in my opinion, will increase month by month.

Lastly, I hope we will proceed to erase, by action demonstrating our determination to promote peace in the world, our violation of our treaty commitments. I have given further study to the problem since my speech a week ago Monday, and I have no doubt in my mind that we have written on the pages of history for all generations of the future to read, that, unquestionably, we violated the Caracas Convention; we violated the Charter of the Organization of American States; we violated our own domestic law; and, I think, we violated at least one other treaty, possibly two other treaties, when we proceeded to give logistic support, financial support, and training support to a group of exiles who we knew were seeking to instigate a revolution in Cuba.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Post Mortem on Cuba," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 2, 1961. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed following the Lippmann article, an article from the Christian Science Monitor on conditions in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1961]

POST MORTEM ON CUBA

(By Walter Lippmann)

President Kennedy is in grave trouble. If after the appalling mistake of judgment in the Cuban venture, he allows himself to be sucked into the quicksands of Laos, he will have compromised, perhaps irrevocably, his influence on events. For the more he engages himself directly while the Soviet Union and China keep a free hand, the more he will weaken his influence.

The disaster in Cuba has opened the way to Chinese diplomatic intervention in the Lao negotiations. An American military entanglement in Laos would not only open the way to Chinese military intervention but would greatly aggravate the pressure on Iran, on Quemoy, and Matsu, and on our other exposed and vulnerable outposts, including probably West Berlin.

The United States would have committed the cardinal strategic error of dispersing its

forces at places where there can be no decision while its adversary kept his forces concentrated and intact.

Though it is late, it is, let us hope, not too late to find our way back to the highway from which we have strayed.

To do this there will have to be a searching inquiry, which only the President can conduct, followed by a frank and convincing explanation of how so colossal a mistake was made.

The question is how the President decided to approve this venture which was, as the event has shown, so grossly misconceived. As I understand it, and contrary to the general impression, there was no serious expectation that the landing of the exiles would be followed immediately by a political uprising against Castro. The object of the landing was to establish a beachhead for a civil war against Castro, and no plans seem to have been made, no thought seems to have been given, to what we would do then, what the rest of Latin America would do then, what the Soviet Union would do while the civil war was being fought.

Bad as have been the consequences of the failure, they are probably less bad than would have been the indecisive partial success which was the best that could conceivably have been achieved. For in order to support the rebellion in Cuba we would have had to continue to violate not only our treaties with the other American states but also our own laws which prohibit the preparation of foreign military expeditions in the United States.

My own inquiries as to how the misjudgment was made lead me to believe that the President was not protected by the new hands—Bundy, Rostow, Schlesinger, and Rusk—against the bad advice of the old hands, Bissell and Dulles of the CIA, Lemnitzer and Burke of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Berle of the State Department. There is no doubt that the plans had been drawn up and the preparations made during the preceding administration. There is no doubt that the President insisted upon modifying these plans to avoid, as he thought and hoped, any appearance of direct involvement of the U.S. Armed Forces. Though much has been said that this proviso ruined the plan, there is no doubt also that the Chiefs of Staff and the CIA advised the President to proceed nevertheless.

I believe an inquiry will show that the Secretary of State, although he had his misgivings, approved the plan. Contrary to much that has been said, I believe it to be true that Stevenson and Bowles were excluded from the deliberations which preceded the fatal decision.

Furthermore, the record will show, I believe, that the one man who participated in the deliberations and pleaded with the President not to approve the plan was Senator FULBRIGHT. He foresaw what would happen, he warned the President that the right policy was not to attempt to oust Castro but to contain him while we worked constructively in Latin America. Senator FULBRIGHT was the only wise man in the lot.

When there is a disaster of this kind—as for example the British disaster at Suez—the mistake can be purged and confidence can be restored only by the resignation of the key figures who had the primary responsibility and by candid talk which offers the promise that the mistake will not be repeated.

In the immediate wake of the disaster the President took the position that he would accept all the blame and that nobody else was to be held responsible. This was generous. It was brave, and in the sense that the Chief Executive must stand by those under him, it was right. But it is not the whole story. Under our system of government, unlike the British system, the Chief Executive who makes a great mistake does not and cannot resign. Therefore, if there is to be accountability in our Government, the President must hold responsible those whose constitutional or statutory duty it is to advise him.

All this is a painful business, even for a hardened newspaper writer. But the stakes are very high and the national interest is that the truth be found and that justice be done. For there is at stake the confidence of our own people and of our friends throughout the world.

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

URGENT MOOD STALKS SAIGON

(By Takashi Oka)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—"We want President Ngo to succeed. But the way he is administering this country helps no one but the Communists."

Only the whirring electric fan punctuated my friend's discourse in his shuttered living room. A civil servant of more than 20 years' standing, he still occupied a responsible position within the South Vietnam administration.

"No one wants a Communist South Vietnam," he continued. "We all want to help the President. But I tell you frankly, civil service is approaching a state of utter demoralization."

Outside, in the Saigon night, a tropical city was coming to life after a hot, dusty afternoon.

ELECTION QUIET

Election Day, April 9, had passed without serious trouble despite preelection forecasts of Communist-inspired riots and demonstrations. President Ngo had scored a victory officially approaching 90 percent of the vote cast nationwide, though in Saigon itself his percentage was 63.

Yet my friend, speaking several days after the election, was deeply troubled. His measured, cultivated French was at all times quiet and polite. Its tone of urgency was unmistakable.

In brief, he said South Vietnam's governmental structure might well be facing collapse, not so much because of Communist guerrillas and subversion as because of the President's authoritarianism and exclusive reliance upon a tight little group of close relatives and subordinates.

AUTHORITARIANISM

Authoritarianism, he said, was already apparent from the early years of the Ngo regime (Mr. Ngo came to power in 1954). Excessive preoccupation with the loyalty of his subordinates even at the expense of professional competence has come within the past 2 years, especially since the unsuccessful rebellion last November led by paratrooper officers.

At the provincial level, my friend said civil governors of many years' experience had been replaced by young Army officers whose only qualification was loyalty to the President and membership in the elite Can Lao Nhan Vi, a clandestine political organization controled by the President's brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu.

(Reporters who have traveled in the provinces support this statement. One observer was told by the governor of Hue in central Vietnam that he was the only civilian left among the nation's 40 provincial governors. This reporter had an unilluminating conversation in Taynih recently with a 35-year-old major who had replaced the civilian governor there 11 months ago.)

In the central governments, not even cabinet ministers could appoint chiefs of bureaus without going through the Directorate of Social and Political Affairs—euphemistic title for the national security organ directly responsible to the President. Dr. Tran Kim Tuyen, the ascetic and intense director of this organization, is reputed to be one of South Vietnam's most powerful and mysterious figures. Like the President he is celibate and a devout Roman Catholic. "In short," my friend said, "civil servants feel they are all under surveillance. So do army officers for that matter. There seems to be no logical basis for many appointments, and senior officials must often serve under men who are many years their junior.

REFORMS PROMISED

"The President has promised reforms. He has promised decentralization of authority and reorganization of ministries. But so far, all we can see is reshuffling of forms. The basic question is whether or not the President trusts his own civil service. He has a pool of talented and experienced administrators. By misuse and nonuse of this pool he is needlessly creating silent, frustrated opposition."

"Many of us are refugees from the north," my friend concluded. "We fled from our homes 6 years ago precisely because we could not bear to live under Communist dictatorship. Here in the south we have a constitution, and we have the forms of democracy. I am a civil servant—I belong to no political party. All I ask for is that the President begin to give some substance to the forms that have been established."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask either the majority leader or the acting majority leader [Mr. SMATHERS] about the schedule for the remainder of the day. I ask this question because of the commitments which many Members have. I also wish to ask about the schedule for tomorrow and whether the Senate will convene early tomorrow.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, let me respond, on behalf of the majority leader, by saying that, because of the commitments, it is his intention to have the debate this afternoon continue until approximately 6 p.m.—presumably on the question of confirmation of the Holmes nomination; and then to have the Senate take a recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow, at which time the debate on the Holmes nomination will be continued, if the nomination has not previously been confirmed; and thereafter to have the Senate take up the conference report on the judgeship bill and the German treaty; and, if those items are disposed of tomorrow, then to have the Senate take a recess until Monday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it takes a recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

PLATFORM OF ILLINOIS YOUNG REPUBLICAN COLLEGE FEDERATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on February 18, 1961, the Illinois Young Republican College Federation adopted a platform dealing with a great many matters. I think it is a very impressive document, and, accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PLATFORM OF ILLINOIS YOUNG REPUBLICAN COLLEGE FEDERATION, ADOPTED IN CONVENTION, FEBRUARY 18, 1961

PREAMBLE

We, the members of the Illinois Young Republican College Federation believe that the proper function of Federal Government is to maximize the freedom of the individual and to extend freedom around a world threatened by the forces of international communism.

Inherent in the proper execution of these functions, we believe—

That with the centralization of power in government comes an inevitable abuse of power which threatens individual initiative and constitutional liberties;

That government action should provide only a floor over economic disaster and not a ceiling for personal endeavor;

That our determined objective in the cold war must be victory over, rather than coexistence with, the godless and enslaving forces of world communism.

AGRICULTURE

We feel that the farm crisis caused by overproduction and low farm commodity prices calls for a realistic settlement. Our goal is an agricultural economy governed by the natural market laws of supply and demand. Believing that excessive Government intervention in farming only destroys the American spirit of free enterprise and places an unfair burden on the American taxpayer, we propose:

A greatly intensified land retirement program as the only effective way to eliminate excess production. We emphasize the retirement not of submarginal lands but productive land previously used to produce crops that are Government supported and our disapproval of rigid production quotas.

A voluntary farm resettlement program for farmers and their families who wish to seek employment in other fields. This would include a temporary relocation and vocational training program for farmers moving to cities and towns, and the use of skilled farmers and farmworkers as advisers and trainers in our foreign agricultural assistance programs.

The gradual elimination of our present $9 billion commodity surplus. We advocate: (a) Reconversion of part of the surplus through research and technology aimed at the development of new industrial uses for farm commodities, (b) distribution of the surplus to private charitable institutions and to State and local welfare institutions who need, desire and request such aid, and (c) payment in kind out of the present surplus to farmers participating in land retirement programs. Furthermore, we commend Illinois' new 20th District Congressman, PAUL FINDLEY, for his plan, ratified by many of the Nation's leading free market economists, to utilize the principle of payment in kind to reduce our staggering farm surplus. We endorse the Republican Party's plan for creating a strategic food reserve for national emergencies and for the strengthening of its food-for-peace program.

Flexible price supports geared to specific commodities. We view this as a temporary measure, believing that through the land retirement and other programs the need for price supports will be eliminated in favor of the natural market laws of supply and demand.

ECONOMIC POLICY

We believe that the free market economy is a sound and growing economy, that a free economy is necessary for preserving individual liberty, and that only this freedom can be ultimately successful in waging the cold war against communism.

We favor the growth of private enterprise. To this end we encourage corporate expansion by an increase of depreciation allowances. Also, we favor holding the limit on capital gains taxes with an effort toward eventual reduction of this tax.

We favor constant effort toward devising a more incentive-encouraging tax structure.

We oppose any increase in the present national debt limit of $295 billion.

We favor taking positive steps to improve the dollar's value abroad by fighting inflation at home.

We favor the continued independence of the Federal Reserve Board.

We favor the removal of the ceiling on long-term Federal Treasury bonds to shift investment emphasis from the short-term to the long-term bonds.

We favor relating wages in production to productivity in order to maintain our competitive position at home and abroad.

We favor participation of the United States in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

We favor keeping expenditures less than revenues except in times of war or economic adversity.

We favor maintaining the current depletion allowance rates on national resources.

FOREIGN POLICY

We believe that the purpose of American foreign policy must be to maintain freedom for the American people, to hearten and fortify the love of freedom everywhere, and above all, to work for a just peace among nations of freemen.

We maintain that the United States is engaged in a war with the international forces of communism and that we must take the offensive toward winning that war. We assert that the sole criterion for judging foreign policy is whether or not proposed policy will further the just interests of the United States. To implement this policy, we state the following:

Realizing that no nation can purchase friendship and respect on the world market, we advocate limiting foreign aid to those anti-Communist nations which will use the funds and military assistance for the furthering of freedom and strengthening of the free world alliance, not to those countries which use it to build a Socialist superstate.

We oppose U.S. participation in any form of summit conference with Communist rulers unless there are preliminary negotiations which will lead to sound progress toward the goal of freedom and peace.

We support U.S. membership in the United Nations.

We favor the retention of the Connally reservation to U.S. membership in the World Court, maintaining that it is the sovereign right of any nation to determine the nature of its own domestic concerns.

We reaffirm our belief in the cause of those peoples of Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America who have been subjugated to the godless force of communism. We advocate the use of every peaceful and practical means toward regaining their independence from Communist domination. We favor the use of such instruments as U.N. observers whenever revolutions, such as that in Hungary during 1956, break out.

We advocate the strengthening of and continued participation in such collective security alliances as SEATO, NATO, and CENTO.

We reaffirm our belief in and the defense of the Monroe Doctrine, and will oppose, with force if necessary, the undesired intrusion of any non-Western Hemisphere nation into the internal affairs of any American nation. To implement this, we support participation in the Organization of American States.

We oppose any diplomatic relations with the Communist government of Fidel Castro in Cuba, and pledge our support to those displaced Cubans in this country who are dedicated to the return of democracy and freedom to their homeland.

We unalterably oppose the admission to the United Nations or the diplomatic recognition of Red China. We recognize the government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek as the only lawful government of the Chinese people. We emphatically deny that the American people accept or ever intend to accept the status quo in China.

We propose to meet any infringement of the sovereignty or freedom of West Berlin with military force, and reaffirm our support for the reunification of Germany under a free, democratic government. We emphatically deny that the American people accept or ever intend to accept the status quo in Germany.

In the war of words with the Communist empire, we advocate taking the offensive, using such Communist crimes as the downing of American fliers to their fullest American propaganda value, and exchanging verbal attack for verbal attack.

We call upon the Congress to submit a constitutional amendment to the States to protect the constitutional rights of the people and the sovereign States from abuses by treaties and other international agreements.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Reaffirming our strong belief in the ability of the individual human being to best solve his own problems without the intervention of paternalistic power, we believe that problems in health, education, and welfare should be private concerns, and should be handled on a level nearest the individual. When the assistance of government becomes necessary, this should be carried out on the local or State level.

Recognizing that Federal grants-in-aid lead to Federal control and, eventually, regimentation, and also that less than one-half of 1 percent of American school districts have reached their bonded debt limit, we oppose the unconstitutional intervention of the Federal Government in the field of education.

We favor the retention of the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit provisions of the National Defense Education Act, since this act was designed for the national defense. We reaffirm our belief, however, that such laws are interference with the field of education and should be repealed.

We believe that social welfare programs should be framed to maintain the principle of individual free choice.

We urge that the social security program be placed on a voluntary basis.

LABOR

Organized labor is a facet of American society which has contributed immeasurably to the well-being of the working people, and to the American economy as a whole. Recognizing that the function of the labor union is to represent employees in bargaining with their employers on terms of employment, it is therefore essential that the proper prospective of the labor movement's role be maintained. The Landrum-Griffin Act has made significant gains in the struggle to abolish corrupt labor practices, but we believe that additional legislative action is required to safeguard the interests of the American public.

As it is contrary to the principles of a free society, we oppose compulsory unionism, and support the passage of State right-to-work laws and the elimination of section 9(a) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The involuntary assessment of union funds, time, or manpower for use in a political campaign should be prohibited.

A "bill of rights" as proposed by Senator MCCLELLAN to the Kennedy-Ervin labor bill of 1959 would be a positive factor in safeguarding the rights and freedoms of the individual union member.

"Secondary boycotts" and "blackmail picketing" are two of the most dangerous and misused weapons in the hands of unscrupulous labor leaders, and should be prohibited.

As labor unions compromise the largest and potentially most powerful monopoly in the United States today, it is essential that legislation be adopted to prevent them from acting in restraint of trade.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

We realize that the future of freedom in the world rests upon the ability of the United States to remain militarily strong, maintain American liberties, and defend the cause of freedom all over the globe. This requires a powerful, well-trained military force equipped with the most up-to-date weapons of war.

But we maintain that the struggle between the free world and the Communist empire is more than a war of military preparedness—it is primarily a struggle of the will, the will to defend and die for freedom, the will to resist communism. We believe that when the American people are hypnotized into a relativist state of national complacency, the cause of freedom is doomed. To maintain American military might and promote freedom, we assert the following:

We firmly advocate the continued testing and development of nuclear weapons, and favor ending the present moratorium on testing. We will support a nuclear test ban only at such time as there are incontrovertible guarantees, such as adequate inspection systems and full mutual exchange of information, against the violation of such a ban.

Recognizing the Communist method of nibbling away at small countries of the free world, we favor the maintenance of a strong conventional armed force to successfully wage these "brush fire" wars.

We advocate a program whereby the United States can send a "cold war corps" of trained young men and women to, and at the invitation of, pro-Western nations, to assist in their efforts of resistance to the ideological onslaughts of international communism.

We support the American exploration of space and ask that no time or effort be spared in insuring the success of this operation to maintain our superiority over the alleged successes of the Communists.

We urge the rapid development of the Polaris missile, and further urge that it be made the basic weapon of our nuclear retaliatory force.

We urge the development of long range bombers carrying a nuclear payload, such as the B–70.

We advocate positive steps to reduce inefficiency and unnecessary duplication in the armed services, but favor the present system of separating basically autonomous military departments.

Recognizing the danger of the Communist tactic of subverting free countries from within, we favor continued efforts to expose the extent and the work of the Communist network in this country. In implementing this work, we strongly support the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in their valuable work in this direction.

We reaffirm our belief that a successful defense is less a matter of increased expenditures and greater weapons, and more a matter of the will to resist expediency and immorality and defend principles. We trust that the American people will persist in their dedication to the principles of world peace and freedom.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, departure from the President's recommended formula for keeping the Federal highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis very definitely leads to deficit financing. Changes already suggested mislead the citizenry as to the true facts. Instead of a pay-as-you-go formula, under these new proposals to take more money directly from the Treasury, it will be a program of "go now—and pay later, plus interest."

With the budget already out of balance, it is now proposed to tilt it further by diverting from the General Treasury fund into the highway trust fund, all of the 10 percent manufacturer's excise tax on trucks, buses, and trailers, equivalent to $150 million per year. This will result in tapping the Treasury for $150 million annually.

Mr. President, Congress must now face up to the facts about the Federal highway construction program. Keeping it on schedule, with no cutbacks, or stretchouts, is a helpful tool to alleviate unemployment in many areas. This program should have a high priority over any other nationwide public works programs. Plans have already been made and machinery put into motion.

I strongly urge that this program be permitted to continue without any interruption whatsoever.

I urge however, most strongly, that it be restored to, and continued on, a truly pay-as-you-go basis, as was originally planned. It is true that, since its inception, there have been incidents which have thrown out of balance the original basic financing formula; namely, an acceleration in 1958, mileage additions, temporary abandonment of the pay-as-you-go feature, and the adoption of deficit financing.

The President has strongly urged that Congress this year:

First. Neither stretch out nor cut back the program.

Second. Not obligate the general taxpayers to pay for, in the future, congressionally created deficits.

Third. Not to provide issuance of highway bonds to help finance the program.

Fourth. Not to change the Byrd amendment, which requires that apportionments to each State from the highway fund be reduced whenever revenues are estimated to be insufficient to cover authorized spending in any given year.

Mr. President, I heartily endorse these Presidential recommendations. For Congress to enact them would permit continuance without interruption and will place the cost on the shoulders of highway users in proportion to the degree of usage.

To finance this program by any other means would mean:

First. Saddling the added cost upon the shoulders of the general taxpayers and to the benefit of the heavy users of the highways.

Second. Any shift from a pay-as-you-go basis would provide the potential for double tax on the general public; first, through deficit financing which would be repaid from General Treasury income, plus interest, and, secondly, through the potential devaluation of the purchasing power of the dollar by reason of the inflationary effect of deficit financing.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the acting majority leader whether we can be assured that there will be no yea-and-nay votes tonight. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I feel certain, and I give assurance, that there will be no yea-and-nay votes tonight.

CUBA

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I was present in the Chamber a moment ago when the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which deals with Latin American affairs, spoke about his conclusions with respect to the error of the United States in the recent attempt by the freedom fighters of Cuba to recapture Cuba. I should like to make it unmistakably clear that the conclusions reached by the Senator from Oregon do not express in any fashion whatever the conclusions of the junior Senator from Florida, and I do not think that the conclusions expressed by the able Senator from Oregon in any way express the feelings of the people of Florida or, for that matter, the feelings of most of the people of the United States, as I can ascertain them with respect to what happened in Cuba.

I agree with the Senator's conclusion that the other nations of Latin America have to be interested, and had better get interested, because they are in graver danger than any other country.

I agree that, when possible, we must move through peaceful organizations to endeavor to settle the problem, but I could not help but agree with the President of the United States when he spoke at the American Society of Newspaper Editors, at which time he said, in effect, "While we shall endeavor to go through these organizations, and shall go through these organizations, we shall not allow them to be used as a shield for a policy of inaction." He also said:

We are not going to sit back and let the national security of the United States be endangered.

I, for one, do not believe that the simple solution to the problem of communism in Latin America is patience and a great deal more debate. It has been my observation that although we have used a great deal of patience and a lot of debate, we have observed the Communists increase in strength. At the end of World War II the Communists controlled 7 percent of the population, and today they control over 40 percent. The Communists then controlled 1 country, and today they control 14 countries.

I, for one, think the time has come when the United States of America and all others who believe in freedom should recognize there has to be a mark at which we say, "Beyond this you do not come."

We have the capacity and the determination and the willingness to make whatever sacrifice may be called for in circumstances which obviously show Communist aggression and subversion. Anybody who thinks for a moment that

the Communists did not take over Cuba by intervention—not necessarily military, but by subversion and with military aid—is mistaken. If it were not for the Russian-made tanks and the Russian-made MIG planes, the Cuban freedom fighters might be in Cuba today. It was the Soviet Union and the Communists which made it possible for these men who wanted to recapture their country to be defeated.

Along the line of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, I should like to read into the RECORD portions of an editorial with which I cannot help but agree, published in the Tampa Tribune of Saturday, April 22, 1961, written by Mr. Jim Clendinen.

I remind Senators that this particular editor has long lived among the Latin people in this area of our State. We have a city known as Ybor City, in which some 100,000 people have lived for many generations. These people have relatives in Latin American countries and travel back and forth. In their frequent travels they get an idea of what is going on in Latin America. I think the editorial rather well expresses their views.

Among other things the editor talks about the speech the President of the United States made. He says:

The dismal truth is that America's attempt to maintain a technically correct position of nonintervention in Cuba has brought us both failure and scorn. Our aid to the rebels has been too little to assure victory; yet it has been enough to permit the Communists to point a hyprocritical finger at us as the sponsors of an assault upon the independent Government of Cuba.

The United States simply cannot afford this kind of failure. It shakes the faith of freemen everywhere in the resolution and competence of American leadership; it lends new persuasion to Khrushchev's bellows of the inevitability of communism's triumph. If the United States is too weak or timid to topple a midget Communist dictator 90 miles from its door, why should friends respect it or enemies fear it?

What, then, can the United States do?

The editor outlines a course of action, which is his own. I do not necessarily subscribe to the specifics of his course of action. He also says:

So let them scream.

But won't a blockade bring risk of war? Of course there will be a risk. But if Americans shrink from every defensive action which contains the risk of war, we will bring ourselves by degrees to the precipice of disaster—no ground will be left on which to fight.

All one has to do is to look at the world to see what has been happening to us. It is rather evident that free countries have been shrinking and retreating and appeasing to the point there is some doubt as to where or when, if ever, we shall be able to practically and properly protect ourselves.

The editorial continues:

Will a blockade hurt our moral standing with the small nations of the world? The faint hearts may join the Communists in raising resolutions against us. But we need only remind them, as President Kennedy did, of the bloody streets of Budapest. Here was a savage, direct intervention to perpetuate tyranny. Ours would be an indirect intervention to help restore freedom. If there are governments which cannot perceive the difference, then they are poor allies in this battle for survival.

In his unsmiling, 14-minute appearance before the editors, President Kennedy concluded with these words:

"Let me make clear as your President that I am determined upon our system's survival and success, regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril."

The editorial concludes:

These are resolute, courageous words, and they needed to be spoken. But words throttle no tyrants. The President and Congress, with the full support of the people, must take resolute, courageous action, or the American system, fatally clothed in softness and complacency, will flounder in the sea and be swept away in the debris of history.

I agree with that editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with other editorials in a similar vein which appeared in the Orlando Sentinel on Wednesday, April 26, and in the Miami Herald on April 25.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tampa Tribune, Apr. 22, 1961]

"THE SOFT WILL BE SWEPT AWAY"

WASHINGTON.—A President wearing a dark blue suit and a mood to match has told American editors that the time has come for freemen to recognize that in Cuba, or in any other contested area of the world, "the complacent, the self-indulgent, the soft societies will be swept away with the debris of history."

It was President Kennedy's most solemn warning yet of the dangers with which predatory communism confronts the world. Delivered against the gloomy news from the Cuban beachheads, it bespoke a tougher American policy in dealing with Communist infiltration of this hemisphere.

"The evidence is clear and the hour is late," said the President. "We and our Latin friends will have to face the fact that we cannot postpone any longer the real issue of survival itself. On that issue there can be no middle ground. Together we must build a hemisphere where freedom can flourish; and where any free nation under outside attack can be assured that all our resources stand ready to respond to a request for assistance."

A sampling of opinion showed that most of the 1,000 members and guests of the American Society of Newspaper Editors gathered in the Statler convention hall applauded the firmness of these words. But as the President departed, for more conferences on the crises in Cuba and Laos, they began asking each other: "Yes, but what will our Government do? What can it do?"

In our opinion, it is precisely as President Kennedy said. The issue is survival. And in a contest for survival the United States must discard some of the traditional niceties of diplomacy as a man preparing to swim for his life in a stormy sea casts off his street clothes.

The dismal truth is that America's attempt to maintain a technically correct position of nonintervention in Cuba has brought us both failure and scorn. Our aid to the rebels has been too little to assure victory; yet it has been enough to permit the Communist to point a hypocritical finger at us as the sponsors of an assault upon the independent Government of Cuba.

The United States simply cannot afford this kind of a failure. It shakes the faith of free men everywhere in the resolution and competence of American leadership; it lends new persuasion to Khrushchev's bellows of the inevitability of communism's triumph. If the United States is too weak or timid to topple a midget Communist dictator 90 miles from its door, why should friends respect it or enemies fear it?

What, then, can the United States do?

There is one effective thing it can do. It can promptly establish an air and naval blockade of Cuba to prevent any more military weapons supplies or manpower from being sent to Castro by outside powers—specifically, Russia and China and their satellites.

The Communists will scream that this is intervention against an established government. Well, how was this government established? It came into being by force and has remained in power by the extinction of every human liberty. It holds no credentials whatever from the voters of Cuba. And Russia and China already have committed the first intervention, by supplying guns, planes, tanks, and technicians with which to beat back the forces of freedom.

So let them scream.

But won't a blockade bring risk of war? Of course there will be a risk. But if Americans shrink from every defensive action which contains the risk of war, we will bring ourselves by degrees to the precipice of disaster—no ground will be left on which to fight.

Will a blockade hurt our moral standing with the small nations of the world? The faint hearts may join the Communists in raising resolutions against us. But we need only remind them, as President Kennedy did, of the bloody streets of Budapest. Here was a savage, direct intervention to perpetuate tyranny. Ours would be an indirect intervention to help restore freedom. If there are governments which cannot perceive the difference, then they are poor allies in this battle for survival.

In his unsmiling, 14-minute appearance before the editors, President Kennedy concluded with these words:

"Let me make clear as your President that I am determined upon our system's survival and success, regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril."

These are resolute, courageous words and they needed to be spoken. But words throttle no tyrants. The President and Congress, with the full support of the people, must take resolute, courageous action—or the American system, fatally clothed in softness and complacency, will flounder in the sea and be swept away in the debris of history.

[From the Miami Herald, Apr. 25, 1961]

ROLL UP YOUR SLEEVES

We foresee that Cuba will go down in history as the first nation to be liberated from the clutch of Communist imperialism.

Short of inviting their own destruction, the Reds in Moscow and Peiping cannot defend this outpost of their empire in the Western Hemisphere. We think they know it. Otherwise, they and their stooges in Havana wouldn't be making so much noise about the alleged invulnerability of their position in Cuba.

Meantime, we see no reason for Americans in the United States or elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere to beat their breasts and blame themselves for helping Cuban patriots try to recapture their homeland. On the contrary, we should be proud of what we have done in that cause, and eager to do more.

Crawling into a scratchy hair shirt is an idle gesture. All the Americas should be rolling up their sleeves to liberate Cuba from the butchers of Budapest.

[From the Orlando Sentinel, Apr. 26, 1961]

WHY WE CAN'T LET CASTRO WIN

A good deal more is at stake in Cuba than a struggle for control of the government.

At best, if the anti-Castro revolt fails, Cuba will become a stronger outpost of communism, and Castro and his followers will make sure there never is another uprising.

At worst—and we think this is what would happen—Russia and Red China would proceed in their plan to make of Cuba a giant missile launching base. It would become the Western Hemisphere operations center in their plan to conquer us.

This will not sound too dramatic or improbable if you will tick off the countries already under Communist domination, or if you will believe Khrushchev when he says to us, "Your grandchildren will live under communism," or again, "We will bury you."

A stunning victory for Castro would increase his already great capacity for anti-American troublemaking in Latin America.

It would give Nikita Khrushchev and Communists generally a triumph at a critical time when the Reds are menacing Laos and South Vietnam, not to mention Berlin and the Near East.

The prestige loss for the United States would be profound. Some countries just now barely tipping the scale against communism would be inclined to go the other way, if not through fear, then through the necessity of being on the winning side.

These are some of the reasons for President Kennedy's fighting talk—and why we may actually have to fight.

These are some of the reasons why we must give arms and money as well as encouragement to the freedom fighters.

Those who think the invaders are fighting some kind of idealistic skirmish for the right to live in Cuba as free men are partially correct.

But in the main they're fighting for us whether they know it or whether we admit it.

We don't think they'll fail. We must not let them fail.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, an editorial that appeared in the Miami News on Sunday, April 30, entitled "Cuban Writer Doubts Cuba Has 'Sister Republics'" by Hal Hendrix, who, I submit, has as much information about the whole problem of Latin America as any other individual reporter whom I know. I commend it to the attention of all Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBAN WRITER DOUBTS CUBA HAS "SISTER REPUBLICS"

(By Hal Hendrix)

The prolonged debate and maneuvering among inter-American diplomats over whether the Organization of American States (OAS) should attempt to resolve the Cuban problem through collective action has prompted some historical research by Cuban newspaper columnist Carlos Todd.

Writing in this week's issue of the Times of Havana (in exile), Todd comments that someone with a rather refined sense of irony must have coined the phrase "sister republics" when referring to the Latin American nations.

This widely read Cuban writer points out that when his country was fighting a desperate struggle for its independence from Spain in 1895–98, Cuban exiles were traveling the length and breadth of Central and South America much the same as they do today in support of assistance.

Jose Marti, recognized as the apostle of Cuban liberty, in those freedom fighting days aroused peoples abroad with his inflammatory and patriotic writings about Cuba. For his pains, Todd recalls, Marti was jailed in several Latin American nations, his writings suppressed and the Cuban cause ignored by the so-called sister republics.

Todd notes that when the United States intervened and helped Cuba gain its independence from the Spanish crown, only Brazil voiced approval of the action.

"When the much discussed Platt amendment, that gave the United States the right to intervene in Cuba at any time, was inserted in the Cuban Constitution of 1902," Todd added, "not a single sister republic protested at this limitation of Cuban sovereignty.

"When Cuba was granted its independence by the United States in 1902, not one nation south of the border rejoiced or celebrated the entry of the island in the family of sister republics."

Today, Todd notes, the sister republics have remained "supremely indifferent to the Communist conquest of Cuba, to the total loss of freedom by its citizens, to the organized terror that rules the islands and executes and tortures its people, and to the enslavement of Cuban labor and of the peasants."

This reluctance by a majority of the Latin Republics to stand up and be counted has put the sister republics in danger for their future security.

The Latins now have a final opportunity to take up their share of responsibility and present a common front against Castroism-communism. If they fail, the OAS may be dying as a hemisphere instrument—a victim of the very nations which demanded just such a forum.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an editorial which also appeared in the Miami News on Sunday, April 30, 1961, written by the editor, Mr. Bill Baggs, entitled "How Does Freedom Fight a Closed Society?" I commend it to the attention of Senators.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW DOES FREEDOM FIGHT A CLOSED SOCIETY?

After his first 100 days in the White House, the new President traveled out to Chicago and there, on Friday evening, he said "every new piece of information, every fresh event, have deepened my conviction that the survival of our civilization is at stake."

Many Americans did not seem to share Mr. Kennedy's conviction, although the peril to democratic people has grown large and obvious in recent days. As the President talked in McCormick Place on Friday night, many Americans were more intent on the events of "77 Sunset Strip" than Laos.

Earlier in the same day, a mock bombing raid on metropolitan Miami revealed an enormous who-cares attitude. In truth, there was not much civil defense in Miami. The people did not appear to want any civil defense. On the special radio frequency, as part of the defense scheme, Gov. Farris Bryant urged the people to remain calm. They were calm all right.

VIGOROUS MASSAGE WITH WRONG TONIC

In Havana, the Castro proprietors warned the warlike Americans not to try invasion. They held several of our citizens in jails without any formal charges. They debated whether to send the prisoners to the wall, use them further for propaganda purposes and eventually free them. A relatively short airplane ride away, the people in Milwaukee were jubilant. Old Warren Spahn had just pitched a no-hitter on Friday night.

This was a strange world on Friday night.

Critics of the new President, people not engaged in watching television or ignoring the mock bomb attacks, thought Mr. Kennedy had made a poor compromise in Laos. They believed the Cuban affair had been horribly mismanaged. And there was much criticism that Mr. Kennedy was not following his splendid talks with much action. There was some truth in each criticism.

Yet the new President was trying to accomplish one thing which must be done if the United States is going to live in this world. He was trying to rally the American citizen to serious thought. For at least the past 4 years, the people of the United States have been vigorously massaged with the tonic that everything is just fine. Business is fine. Our national defense is just fine. Our alliances abroad are fine, Americans got very relaxed during those years.

Elect Kennedy, he'll fix it. The campaign last November between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon produced in sharp contrast the dilemma in Laos, the Cuban matter, our lag in space missilery. Americans voted for the candidate who argued that these and other things were not just fine, but Americans seemed to believe that Mr. Kennedy would move into the White House in January and patch things up and everything would become just fine promptly.

This, as we have witnessed, is not what happened. It could not have happened. You cannot, for instance, overhaul and redirect an entire missile program in 100 days.

So, all these problems rather converged in one of the worst April months in our history. Laos, a name almost unknown to so many Americans, was compromised to a cease-fire agreement and the Soviets did not keep their word. Mr. Kennedy had the choice either of agreeing to a cease-fire or committing American troops to a jungle 8,000 miles from our country and next door to Communist supply lines. Everyone, and first of all Mr. Kennedy, agrees the Cuban matter was poorly handled.

A boyish-looking young man named Yuri Gagarin rode a Soviet space vehicle around the world and, while this was a splendid technical achievement and it realized all men's ancient dreams to prospect the stars, it was a capital propaganda victory for the Soviet Union.

KEEPING SECRETS IN THE OPEN

In addition to these events, April was made worse by a French army which went over the hill in Algeria and, for 48 hours, threatened the Republic of France.

Laos and Cuba and the flight of Yuri Gagarin represented a tremendous psychological blitz by the Soviets on the new President of the United States. It also stoked the new President to think again of this already historic struggle between our country and the Soviet Union. He defined precisely for the first time, the nature of the struggle.

It was, he said, a competition between an open society and a closed society. These space flights are good examples.

No one in our country really knows how many times, in the calm atmosphere of secrecy, the Soviets tried to launch man into space. All we know is that the flight of Yuri Gagarin was announced one day. It could have happened a week before, a day before, and following many failures. But the success announced to the world nudged many unclaimed minds to the belief that the Soviet Union had become masters of space missilery, and this, in turn, argued for the superiority of Soviet ways.

This week, we shall send a man into near space and down range from Cape Canaveral. But the whole blooming world will know it. Several hundred reporters will be there to observe it. Television cameras will record it. It is our first try. We cannot keep a secret. We are an open society.

In other ways, our very freedom, which makes our society worthy, encumbers us in

this struggle with the Soviet Union. How can you contest an enemy whose tools are subversion, infiltration, and other tiptoe techniques, all performed in the shade of a closed society, when everything we do is rather out in the middle of the stage and in full view of everyone?

STRUGGLE CALLS FOR KNOWLEDGE

How, indeed, can you match this and remain a free country?

This is a huge task for John F. Kennedy. It is possibly the most difficult task ever handed to a President of our country. Especially is it difficult when Americans are not aroused to the nature and size of the dangers.

The beginning of equipping ourselves for this struggle is to know what kind of struggle we are in. Probably this is why Mr. Kennedy quoted old Patrick Henry in his talk in Chicago on Friday night. The quote, from Patrick Henry in 1775 when the Colonies prepared themselves for the worst, was:

"For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth, to know the worst and to provide for it."

Mr. SMATHERS. In closing, I wish to say that it does not appear to me that patience has freed the people of Czechoslovakia. Perhaps some day they will be freed. Patience does not appear to me to have yet freed the people of East Germany. It does not appear to me that patience by itself, with debate and argument, has yet freed the people of Poland.

Speaking only as one individual, my personal belief is that the time has arrived when we in the United States must realize that when Mr. Lenin, Mr. Marx, Mr. Stalin, Mr. Khrushchev, and all the rest of them say they are out to destroy the United States, they mean it, as Hitler meant what he said. We had better get that point clearly in our minds and begin to prepare ourselves for whatever sacrifices it might call upon us to make.

At this particular time it does not appear to me that we will get anywhere insofar as Cuba is concerned by talking a great deal of patience. I think we must practice prudence—yes. I think we must practice reason—yes. I for one was sorry when the Secretary of State, in whom I have the highest confidence, said the other day, "We have no plans with respect to intervention in Cuba."

Perhaps we do not have; maybe we do. But it would seem to me the wiser course of action to say nothing about it.

According to the newspapers of today and yesterday, the Government of Cuba is completely Communist. Therefore, if it is completely Communist, why do we not keep the Cubans sitting on the seat of uncertainty, rather than announce to them exactly what we propose to do?

Mr. Castro can put workers, who might have been ready to fight, into the sugar fields to harvest sugar, thus helping him to sustain his economy. It seems to me that we must recognize that we are in a battle. Mr. Castro has made clear that he would like to destroy this particular country. I certainly do not go along with the theory and philosophy that the way to answer that particular challenge is to enter into another debating contest either with him or with anybody else.

FLORIDA TOURISM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, there are many reasons why the United States would benefit from an increase of tourist travel to this Nation from other lands.

The outflow of gold is sufficient reason in itself. But there is also the fact that the distortions of our enemies would be difficult to foist upon citizens of other nations who have visited this country and observed our way of life.

An editorial in the Florida Times-Union of April 22 suggests that Government agencies seeking to increase tourism would be helped by a study of the promotional activities of the State of Florida in this regard.

The idea seems to me to be a sound one and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD this fine editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STUDY OF FLORIDA TOURISM MIGHT HELP U.S. PLAN

Congress is expected to act soon on measures to stimulate foreign travel to this country in order to narrow a tourist dollar gap that has been swelling the deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments.

Last year, for instance, American tourists took $2.2 billion out of the country while foreign tourists brought back only $1 billion. The gap of $1.2 billion was the largest single element in the overall deficit and one that caused an exceptionally large outflow of gold. This gap could be overcome by cutting down on American travel abroad, but rather than resort to such restrictions, the Government feels the best solution is to promote our own country as a vacationland and make it easier for oversea visitors to spend time and money here.

It seems unusual that this country is one of the few in the world which hasn't gone in for travel promotion in a big way. Almost since the time we gained our independence, we have been a promised land for the world's oppressed and homeless. We have opened our gates to tens of thousands of immigrants, and we may assume that if so many people wish to live here, there must be even more who would enjoy a short visit to this land of democracy. However, governmental redtape, the language barrier, and the high costs for many foreigners in a lower income level have become the chief obstacles preventing more visitors from other nations. But these can be overcome, and the United States should leave no stone unturned in promoting two-way tourism.

Our own State of Florida has been highly successful encouraging not only national tourists but in bringing many vacationers here from South and Central American countries. The Sunshine State relies heavily upon tourists to support its economy and has had many years of experience in the best methods of obtaining results through promotional campaigns. Perhaps if a U.S. Travel Service is created in the Department of Commerce, as a bill now urges, the new office—in cooperation with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—might wisely look into the techniques of tourism as developed by Floridians.

But certainly financial rewards would not be all America would seek through foreign tourists. While these would be beneficial, the more lasting gains would come from sharing our way of life temporarily with oversea friends who would return home as sincere good will ambassadors for the American people.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF RARITAN ARSENAL AT METUCHEN, N.J.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on March 30, 1961, the Secretary of Defense made a determination that 52 military installations or components thereof were clearly surplus to the present and future needs of the Military Establishment and initiated action to begin the disestablishment of inactivation of these installations.

One of the installations designated by the Secretary was Raritan Arsenal in Metuchen, N.J. At the time this action was announced I said:

The decision to inactivate the arsenal is in line with President Kennedy's policy to eliminate every needless dollar of defense spending. There can be no questions about support of this policy; every American owes it to himself and his Government to help in this campaign to reduce costs. I am asking for additional conferences on the Raritan Arsenal decision, however, to make absolutely certain that the Army has made a detailed analysis of the situation.

During the period that followed the announcement I held conferences with Defense Department officials in my office and at the site of Raritan Arsenal. I met many Raritan Arsenal employees and Government officials in order that I might be fully informed and understand clearly the issues involved. As a result of this prolonged study I have concluded that the Defense Department has not made its case. The decision to close the arsenal presumably rests upon the conclusions drawn from two studies. Yet persistent inquiries by myself and others has failed to elicit who conducted the study, and although we have been informed that various criteria were used in determining those arsenals having the best capability to perform the future ordnance missions, neither I nor any other public official has been told the weight assigned to each criteria—which were most significant in reaching the final determination. No copies of these studies have been forthcoming nor any excerpts from these studies. In short there is a growing conviction in my mind and the minds of many officials in my State that the decision to close Raritan Arsenal was reached precipitously. We may or may not be correct in this conviction, but I feel that the people of New Jersey and the employees of Raritan Arsenal are entitled to a full and candid review of this decision. It is in line with this conviction that I send to the desk for appropriate referral Assembly Concurrent Resolution 47, State of New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

Whereas the U.S. Department of Defense has announced a decision to close Raritan Arsenal, located in Edison Township, Middlesex County, N.J.; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Labor has classified the Perth Amboy-New Brunswick area, in which Raritan Arsenal is located, as a distressed labor market area; and

Whereas the number of employees of Raritan Arsenal is 2,600, involving an annual payroll of $15 million; and

Whereas the loss of the job opportunities afforded by the operation of Raritan Arsenal will increase unemployment in the area, already classified as distressed, and will adversely affect the economy of Middlesex and surrounding counties of New Jersey; and

Whereas it has been indicated that the decision to close Raritan Arsenal is irrevocable and is based on a study made by an unnamed group; and

Whereas the Department of Defense has failed to make known what consideration was taken and what weight was given to facts and factors involved in the survey; and

Whereas the Honorable Courtney Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Army, at a public meeting held in New Brunswick on April 17, 1961, failed to provide adequate or convincing reasons for the closing of Raritan Arsenal; and

Whereas this matter appears to be a fair and sound subject for congressional inquiry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the Senate concurring):

1. It is in the interest of Middlesex County, the State of New Jersey, and the national welfare that Raritan Arsenal be retained as an active establishment of the Department of the Army.

2. The Congress, through appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, is requested to investigate the wisdom of the decision to close Raritan Arsenal, and in particular to examine into the facts and factors contained in the survey upon which the decision to close the installation was based.

3. Pending completion of an appropriate congressional inquiry, the Department of Defense is requested to suspend existing orders looking toward the closing of the installation and to postpone further action in this regard.

4. Copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives elected from the State of New Jersey, and to the Secretaries of the Departments of Defense and of the Army.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the salient paragraph of this concurrent resolution requests the Congress through appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to investigate the wisdom of the decision to close Raritan Arsenal, and in particular to examine into the facts and factors contained in the policy upon which the decision to close the installation was based.

In urging this request for a review of the decision to close Raritan Arsenal it should be understood that this request is based primarily upon the conviction that information upon which this conclusion was reached, was incomplete if not inaccurate. I firmly believe that a full review will establish the fact that Raritan Arsenal is a vitally essential defense facility. Raritan Arsenal does not pretend to accommodate such implements of warfare as rockets and missiles; but this fact in itself does not negate its usefulness during noncritical periods and in possible instances of limited warfare. The Pentagon has informed us that we must maintain a balance between the long-range potential threat of nuclear warfare as well as the possibility of a conventional or limited conflict.

Mr. President, I am concerned that on March 28, 1961, Raritan Arsenal was not contained in a list of 51 stateside defense installations scheduled for closing but was included on March 30, 1961, in a press release of 52 installations, 36 of which—including Raritan Arsenal—were scheduled to be sold.

I am further concerned that as nearly as I can determine, only the arsenal's depot mission was considered in the review. Fourteen national missions, recognized for years as efficient and productive, were ignored. All missions, including the depot mission, were declared as needed. The plan proposes only to relocate these activities and assigned personnel at an alleged saving of $9.6 million annually to the Government. I am confused, frankly, by these figures. For one thing the transfer of personnel and ammunition would amount to approximately $8½ million. General supplies stored, to a high 78-percent occupancy against a maximum of 85 percent are not included since these materials would be shipped out during a 3-year period, anyway. Decontamination of the ammunition area with the arsenal to render it safe for industrial or residential use would likely cost between $3 to $5 million.

Your guess is as good as mine as to the cost of moving machinery and other capital equipment which is currently valued at $7 million.

I certainly have reason to question the validity of this alleged saving in view of a known plan to relocate one activity of more than 400 employees to another installation—but only after rehabilitation of an abandoned shop 100 years old is completed. I would be interested to know what facilities are available at specific installations which are intended to take on the Raritan Arsenal missions. The fact is that detailed phaseout plans were made available to the other four Ordnance Corps installations affected the day after the announcement, but not to Raritan Arsenal. Does this indicate that the decision to close Raritan was reached hastily?

Raritan Arsenal is strategically located to back up the port of New York. In fact, the reason for its establishment in 1917 was to relieve congestion at the port. Certainly, in this age, the metropolitan New York area along with coastal ports and cities, is no more vulnerable to enemy air attack than strategic inland targets. In addition to its own dock and access to the New York port, the arsenal is situated on the New Jersey Turnpike, only 2 miles from the Garden State Parkway with the Newark Airport only 19 miles to the north and the McGuire Air Force Base about 38 miles to the south. It has self-conducted utilities and facilities. But, most important of all, it has a work force of 2,600 highly trained civilians, 62 percent of which possess skills essential to the Military Establishment. Of the remaining 38 percent few employment opportunities exist, since there is currently a substantial labor surplus in the area. As of March 1, 19,100 or 8.8 percent of the labor force are unemployed in the New Brunswick-Perth Amboy labor market area. Several companies, one of which employs 2,700, have announced that they will move out of the labor market area during 1961. The Defense Department must have been aware of these critical developments in this area. Yet, this action takes place at the precise time when unemployment in the area has reached a 20-year high. The arsenal's payroll of more than $15½ million annually and $7 million expended for locally contracted materials and services has an economic impact of some $140 million in purchasing power resultant from the chain reaction through initial and successive investments and purchases.

Raritan Arsenal represents a conservatively estimated $44 million investment which can be translated into replacement costs well in excess of $100 million. What kind of savings are expected by the Defense Department? Are these structures and facilities to be destroyed? If not, what kind of industries could possibly afford to purchase this site with its central heating, water, and electrical systems?

The Defense Department has told us that the arsenal has no room for expansion, yet I am told that Raritan Arsenal has unlimited expansion capabilities for Army functions other than the installation of rockets and missiles.

Mr. President, so that the record may reflect some of the divergent views held in this matter I request unanimous consent that the following be included in the RECORD:

First. A letter from Col. R. E. Vollendorff, Office of Chief of Legislative Liaison dated May 3, 1961.

Second. A statement by the Raritan Arsenal Community Association.

Third. An April 21 editorial from the New Brunswick Home News.

Fourth. Six letters from individual citizens in the affected area which are representative of the hundreds I have received.

Because I have not had an opportunity to ask these correspondents for permission to use their letters I have deleted their names.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to your inquiry concerning the inactivation of Raritan Arsenal.

An exhaustive analysis of depot supply and maintenance workloads recently completed by the Army revealed that the Army Ordnance Corps has an excess of depot facilities in the North Central and Northeastern States. This is resulting in unnecessary costs estimated at $14.6 million per year. There is no current or future requirement for all of the depots located in this region. Therefore, missions and workloads must be consolidated into a lesser number of depots.

Extensive on-the-spot surveys were made by a team of experienced civilian employees especially selected by the Ordnance Corps for their background and judgment to determine which depots should be retained in the

logistic system. In comparing one depot against the other, it was determined that some of the depots are capable of meeting future requirements while others are rapidly becoming obsolete.

It became apparent to the Army in recent years that the changing nature of missiles presently under development required a reappraisal of the real estate to be used for missile depot maintenance shops and storage sites in the future. This involves work to be done on warheads, adaption kits, and missiles fueled by solid propellants. Guided missiles such as the Hawk and certain ballistic missiles such as the Pershing, require assembly and final testing of general supplies (class II and IV components) while containing solid propellants (class V or explosive items). Performing these operations in an area that satisfies quantity distance requirements is a function that cannot be compromised by any other considerations. Further, as missiles are suspect of containing explosives and toxic materials, they should be received in an ammunition area capable of controlling these hazards and with facilities for disposal of contaminated waste.

As presently constituted, Raritan Arsenal cannot perform these functions. To reconstitute Raritan and provide the requisite capability would require the acquisition of approximately 3,500 acres of land and the construction of facilities such as operating buildings, a destruction area for hazardous and suspect missiles, classification and inspection facilities, and similar type improvements. This would require a capital outlay of approximately $16.2 million.

The comprehensive studies of the Army depot system which resulted in the decision by President Kennedy to inactivate Raritan, and other large Army ordnance depots, gave primary consideration to the capabilities of the system when confronted by any type of general or limited war. The decision to close Raritan was based upon the complete capability of the entire system to carry out the Army mission of the future in support of small or large scale wars, regardless of location.

An Army ordnance depot of the future must be capable of developing weapon system supply, maintenance, and storage support for missile systems and special weapons, as well as conventional weapons. Many of these functions must be performed within the prescribed safety considerations of an explosive environment. The gradual encroachment of communities, industries, public highways, and communications systems, such as at Raritan, have seriously impaired the utility of some ordnance depots. There are other ordnance depots such as Letterkenny Ordnance Depot located at Chambersburg, Pa., which will be retained since they have the capabilities to perform the ordnance multipurpose missions for the present and foreseeable future.

The Raritan Arsenal inactivation plan provides for phasing out and transferring missions and personnel over a 3-year period. The required reduction in ceiling will be accomplished with a minimum effect on the individual, by placing an embargo against hiring on all ordnance depots. After an estimated attrition of about 750 to 800 personnel over the 3-year phase-down period through normal attrition such as retirements, deaths, and other employment, about 1,800 employees will remain. The remaining personnel, including those occupying positions to be phased out along with the missions, will be offered transfer rights at other ordnance depots in the region and employment opportunities to fill vacancies at any ordnance installation in the United States. The Ordnance Corps is particularly anxious to keep all of these employees and therefore will pay the cost of movement of families to the new locations, and retraining of the employees, if necessary. In addition other Army installations in the area and elsewhere in the United States will assist by considering these employees for their vacancies.

I trust that this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

R. E. VOLLENDORFF,
Lieutenant Colonel, GS, Office, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

STATEMENT BY THE EMPLOYEE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION OF RARITAN ARSENAL

1. Our national defense program must be designed to protect this Nation in the event of war—not to fulfill military peacetime requirements. Raritan Arsenal has been essential in every war since 1917.

2. In the event of limited war—the threat of which always seems to be imminent, and the likeliest in which we would be engaged, conventional weapons will be used. Raritan Arsenal is ideal, in location, facilities, and trained manpower, to execute its share of the ordnance portion of the Army's logistics requirements.

3. In the event of total war, the entire globe and the space above will be the battlegrounds. Modern military doctrine dictates dispersion of logistical facilities—for the uninterrupted execution of support plans upon which line offensives rely.

4. If Raritan Arsenal is demilitarized, the Army will be without a single integrated supply operations and management facility on the North Atlantic seaboard within 100 miles of the coast and outports.

Consider: The deactivation of Raritan Arsenal has been under consideration for some time. Among the high-ranking civilian-military braintrust, there have always been dissenting opinions, never unanimous agreement on this issue. How are we to know but that a group of different composition, today, tomorrow, or years from now, would not acclaim Raritan Arsenal as a vitally essential facility for expansion in the event of national emergency and optimum utilization in case of war? The essentiality of its present-day missions has been confirmed. The issue is then reduced to one of real estate; and the nominal post maintenance cost of $611,000 per year should be viewed as a worthwhile investment in the ultimate defense of our country.

I. PURPOSE

Reverse Department of Defense proposal to close Raritan Arsenal within 3 years.

The following points are submitted in support of this request for reconsideration:

1. Raritan Arsenal is not an obsolete defense installation because its missions are planned to be relocated, and not abolished.

2. Issue is not joined with its alleged obsolescence from the standpoint of its unsuitability for rocket and missile operations and storage.

3. There is good reason to believe that the closing of Raritan Arsenal was a snap decision—

(a) It was not contained in a press release prepared by the Armed Forces Press Service on March 28, 1961. It was announced on March 30, 1961, however, that Raritan Arsenal was included among the defense installations to be shut down in New Jersey. [Strong possibility exists that this action was not of military origin. (At least from the standpoint of its timing.)]

(b) Such a significant action would have been discussed with the Office of the Chief of Ordnance. We understand the announcement caught OCO by surprise.

(c) All other ordnance facilities except Raritan Arsenal were furnished phaseout plans immediately following the shutdown order. No plan had been prepared for Raritan.

4. Closing down Raritan Arsenal will create an economic depression in the central New Jersey area which no amount of Federal aid and grants could ever alleviate.

5. Raritan's 3,227 acres are not all suitable for industrial development as was first expressed from partisan quarters. The swamps and marshes of the ammunition area occupy 2,192 acres. The remaining 1,035 acres represent but a small fraction of barren, but high and dry land available within the (Middlesex) county for industrial development.

Sincerely, we ask not what our country can do for us; we know only too well what we can do for our country, and we can do it here at Raritan Arsenal.

II. PEOPLE (BOTH ARSENAL AND THE COMMUNITY)

1. The civilian work force at Raritan Arsenal is 2,608 (1,510 white collar and 1,098 blue collar).

2. Collectively, the Raritan work force possesses 262 occupational specialties:

(a) 62 percent possess skills peculiar to the Military Establishment, without counterparts in this and most labor market areas. (Many are high classifications in the white collar category.)

(b) 38 percent, mostly laborers, warehousemen, and employees in building maintenance and metalworking trades, possess capabilities with counterparts in private industry. However, there is little or no demand for such capabilities in this labor market area at the present time.

3. About 20 percent of blue collar employees currently designated in unskilled classifications possess skilled capabilities. Because of successive reductions-in-force over the past 3 to 5 years, they elected to "bump" down to lower classifications rather than be separated. There is then a "hidden capability" at this facility, not a potential, but an experienced talent in depth for growth and expansion.

4. Not to be construed as inflation of classifications, but rather as the progressive development of essential know-how over the past several years is this fact: Of 1,510 white collar workers, exactly 600 are grade GS–7 (the lowest administrative grade), and above. A large percentage (estimated 75 percent) of these are ordnance publications engineers, general supply, commodity and equipment specialists who have achieved a unique proficiency only after years of training and experience. This capability, especially in this volume, is not available in this or any other labor market area.

5. Since Raritan Arsenal's mission is admittedly not obsolete (but ostensibly only its location), much thought should be given to the replacement of employees with this know-how who will not elect to accompany the transfer of their respective activities. Experience has proved that only 40 to 50 percent of employees affected chose to accompany mission transfers.

6. The Raritan work force is composed of 1,976 male employees (better than 80 percent of which are veterans); 25 of the 632 female employees are five-point veterans. Fifty-two percent of arsenal employees have at least 15 years of Federal service. The great majority are under 47 years of age (veterans of World War II and the Korean campaign). On the other side of the coin, these employees are in a critical age bracket as far as seeking employment in the area is concerned.

7. Among the 1,574 veterans, 316 are disabled (min. 10 percent); in addition, there are 79 disabled nonveterans now employed at

Raritan. There are 11 widows of veterans who have retention preference.

8. Here is an account of the Raritan Arsenal payroll for fiscal year 1960:

Gross pay	$15,401,308
Retirement	946,375
Federal income tax	1,975,288
FICA	1,050
Group life insurance	97,966
U.S. Savings Bonds	804,871
Other [1]	7,938
Health benefits	247,900
Net pay	11,319,920

[1] Deductions for subsistence, quarters, etc.

9. Well over $11 million were earned and spent in the central New Jersey area. There should be added to this the earnings of wives whose husbands work at Raritan in terms of loss of revenue to local commerce.

10. There are some 50 trucking firms in this area. About $500,000 of the $749,320 expended for transportation and travel went to local truckers.

11. Rentals and local procurement of materials, services and utilities accounted for contracts in the amount of $4,995,141.

12. Total expenditures: $21,105,769.

13. Not included is lighterage contract which averages $52,000.

14. Between January 1, 1961, through March 31, 1961, purchases, in cash, through the impress fund amounted to approximately $90,000. All of this business went to local merchants.

15. Arsenal returns to three concessionaires average $8,000 per month.

16. An educated "guesstimate": Upward of $100 million (based upon the "economic factor of 5"), of the Greater Central New Jersey economy are generated by Raritan Arsenal. It would take one helluva lot of industrial development to match it.

17. The trend is not toward development of industry in this township, county, perhaps much of New Jersey (but certainly the New England States). The trend appears to be forming toward the movement of plants and, some of the time, a number of their employees to the Southern and Border States—the same States and rural areas slated for Federal aid and grants in the next several weeks. If the trend continues, there will have to be a transfer of aid and grants to the North Atlantic States.

18. Even though they are in the minority, exponents of "industrial development" appear to be whistling in the dark. The modern plant abandoned by Rabco on U.S. No. 1 (almost literally a stone's throw from the arsenal's main gate), was vacant for almost 2 years before its recent occupancy by Lockheed Electronics as the base of its digital computer systems operations.

19. There are well over 650 industrial plants in Middlesex County. Of these, only 3 employ more than 2,000 employees. Of the three, Raritan Arsenal is the largest. In no less than 28 of 43 of the largest plants, reductions in personnel between 1958 and the present time, reductions in personnel have occurred at a rate of 22 percent. This does not include the transfer of Mack Motors, located in Union County (Plainfield), to Hagerstown, Md., in October 1961.

20. The New Brunswick-Perth Amboy labor market area was still designated category D by the U.S. Department of Labor in March 1961 with 8-percent unemployment. Projected seasonal employment in the low-paying agricultural and apparel industries will offer some relief, but not as much in purchasing power as the numerical increase in employment might indicate. Anticipated layoffs in the fall, combined with unemployment created by the arsenal "phaseout," as well as plant relocation to the Southern and Border States, point to a tragic E rating for this area going into 1962. We respect local efforts to bring new industry into this area, but it should not be done at the cost of Raritan Arsenal. Federally sponsored low-interest loans for plant rehabilitation, other aid and grants for job retraining and to act as inducements to draw new industries into eligible depressed areas are economic crutches which should not be sought when men and women with the will and opportunity to work can stand on their own.

III. PROPERTY

1. General description and location: Raritan Arsenal is a class II installation under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Ordnance, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C. The general mission of the arsenal is that of a basic field service depot, plus a wide variety of national activities. The latter make up the great bulk of the arsenal's primary missions (please see map for data on location). [Not printed in RECORD.]

2. Physical facilities:

	Acres
Total area	3,227
Ammunition area	2,192
Industrial area	1,035
Buildings:	
Number (all types)	447
Area (square feet)	4,298,399

Storage capacity (expressed in terms of 2½-ton vehicles):

Outside	7,000
Shed	486
Transitory shelters	444

Covered storage space—Total, 3,079,000 square feet; 1,380,000 general supplies, 77-percent rate of occupancy; 1,216,000 ammunition storage, 72-percent rate of occupancy.

NOTE.—Maximum rate of occupancy is 85 percent; combined rate of occupancy at Raritan (ammo and general supplies) is 75 percent.

In addition, shed storage, 483,000 square feet.

Dollar value of stored inventory	$435,000,000
General supplies	231,000,000
Ammunition	204,000,000

Railroads:
Track (miles), 80.
Class yard capacity (cars), 232.
Unloading spurs (car capacity), 236.
Docks:
Length, 2,005 feet.
Width, 50 feet.

3. Building and space utilization: Raritan Arsenal contains 447 separate buildings. These are utilized for offices, shops, storage, and so forth. More than 80 percent of this total of 4,298,399 square feet of floor space is in permanent buildings. The replacement cost of these buildings, permanent equipment, and land is as follows:

Buildings and improvements, $83 million.
Land, $3,800,000.
Equipment, $1,995,000.

NOTE.—This is a conservative estimate. On basis of present day market, replacement cost would exceed $100 million; that is, cost $15 to $18 per square foot for construction of warehouses and shops, $20 per square foot for office space.

4. Paved roads: 58 miles.

5. Sanitary system (capacity): 500,000 gallons per day.

6. Water reserves: 1,350,000 gallons.

7. Electrical facilities (new substation): 26,000 volts.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

It is too soon to say whether the pressures arising from the first announced closings will slow down or prevent other and far more extensive closings. The 73 facilities have been viewed by the Department of Defense, however, as only the first quick go-round in the survey of the nearly 7,000 (6,700) military installations of all types that the Nation maintains.

Another factor that will probably be considered in future closings is the effect upon disarmament, something that was overlooked in the first go-round. The first list of 73 closings was announced by the President and the Pentagon without any coordination with John J. McCloy's group that is preparing U.S. disarmament position.

Pay: The average pay of the nonsupervisory work force at Raritan Arsenal is $2.52 per hour. This is precisely the same average rate for 84,100 workers in manufacturing (both durable and nondurable goods) in the New Brunswick-Perth Amboy labor market area as reported by the New Jersey Department of Labor and Industry for December 1960.

NOTE.—$2.52 is hourly average of all 2,244 nonsupervisory employees, both blue and white collar.

Breakdown: Blue collar, $2.56 (984 employees). White collar, $2.49 (1,260 employees).

Raritan Arsenal machine records activity: Raritan has the largest electrical accounting machine punchcard installation in the Ordnance Corps. This organization, with its 184 employees and 99 IBM machines, provides data processing services to the many varied and complex missions located at the arsenal (more appropriately, the Ordnance Field Service Center). Approximately 400 separate machine procedures are maintained to produce 1,600 essential reports at various intervals. Over 100 million cards are processed through these machines monthly on a three-shift basis. Two data processing machines (dual console) (Ramac-305 IBM) are also located at the arsenal.

Carteret storage activity: Under pressure to make land available for industrial development, the Army deactivated the Carteret (N.J.) storage activity in 1955. The 135 acres were sold in 1957. Carteret today is a motor vehicle storage area (foreign cars). To our knowledge, less than 30 people are working there.

Four reasons given for closing Raritan Arsenal:

1. Shrinking requirements for conventional weapons.

2. Maintenance missions curtailed.

3. Need money for research and development of missiles and rockets.

4. Need room for explosive environment.

In re 1 and 2: President proposes sharp increase in conventional weapons.

Gen. G. H. Decker, U.S. Army Chief of Staff:

"I believe that, while our capability for nuclear retaliation is adequate we need to improve our capability in the field of conventional or nonnuclear warfare. I feel our conventional capability might be sorely taxed in several possible situations."

In response to reason No. 3: Moving an arsenal and disposing of its land will not make money available for research and development. All employees have been promised jobs elsewhere. Transfer and closing costs will make less money available for rocketry and missiles for many years, if ever, at the sacrifice of an essential defense facility.

Some of the transfer costs:

Ammunition	$7,000,000
Moving of 2,000 families at a cost of $600 each	1,200,000
Plus equipment	----------
Plus decontamination of ammunition area	3,000,000

There are many hidden costs contained in the proposed action. We already know that the national inventory control and maintenance points are scheduled to occupy an abandoned shop in their proposed location—and that the transfer of this mission and its personnel will take place after con-

version is completed. We will not venture any guess as to the building renovation cost—but we are reasonably certain this project will be the first of many required to house our present missions.

Compare this with the following maintenance costs:

Fuel oil	$160,000
Electricity	140,000
Water	26,000
Custodial contract	85,000
Materials and supplies	200,000
Total	611,000

Many facilities, now located elsewhere could be accommodated at Raritan. In particular, several of those still located at the Rossford Ordnance Depot (which has been gradually deactivating for almost 2 years). Consideration should also be given to Raritan as the site for transfer of missions at installations to be closed in the second and third "go-rounds"—installations with far less in facilities and capacities now at Raritan.

[From the Daily Home News, Apr. 21, 1961]

GOVERNMENT HASN'T PROVED ITS CASE

Despite the Pentagon official's statement that the order closing Raritan Arsenal is irrevocable, we think it's too early to accept that verdict as final.

The outburst of public indignation at the announced closing continues to gain impetus. The campaign of the arsenal workers is eloquent.

But beyond the emotional demonstrations, the facts which are being brought out tend more and more to suggest that the arsenal is a mighty useful enterprise. Certainly the vast printing and publications phases of the arsenal's work can be carried on here, with experienced personnel and modern equipment, as economically as elsewhere. And the move would be costly.

Certainly the arsenal's outstanding warehousing and shipping record belies any suggestion that the operation here is uneconomical.

We can see the missile argument. Maybe the arsenal is not big enough to store missiles safely; and we are not at all sure that the people of the area would like that kind of operation. But we cannot see any new development which suddenly makes heretofore efficient operation here inefficient, or heretofore economical operations here suddenly wasteful.

No one disputes the Government's right to close the Raritan Arsenal for logical reasons. But the Government must make its case plain. So far, it seems to us, the case of those who would keep the arsenal open seems the more convincing. The Government hasn't made its case yet.

APRIL 13, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U. S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: It is requested that the reasons given for the closing of Raritan Arsenal, Metuchen, N.J., be carefully reviewed and investigated.

It has been stated that Raritan Arsenal is being closed down because its facilities were obsolete and that its continued operation was uneconomical, therefore, Raritan Arsenal could no longer play an effective role in our Nation's defense organization.

The above statement is not corroborated by a real property study conducted by the Chief, Real Estate Division, U.S. Army Engineer District, New York, Corps of Engineers. This study indicated that the facilities at Raritan Arsenal were unique and difficult to replace in event of mobilization. It was recommended that "Raritan Arsenal be retained in its present active status" since "strategically it provides the only ordnance field service support in the vast Metropolitan New York area. Both ammunition and general supplies are expeditiously processed because of the arsenal's excellent location with respect to primary rail and road networks, and also because of dock facilities which permit transshipment by water and (thus) effective support of the New York Port of Embarkation. It is important to note that Raritan is one of the very few military installations on the entire Atlantic coast which has such water facilities. Another factor is that Raritan Arsenal is situated in an excellent labor market, thus facilitating recruitment of not only basic mechanical and labor skills but also the engineering and administrative personnel for the many special activities located here. That the undeveloped area west of the installation be developed into hardstand and a fire protection system installed as funds permit.

The available area, when improved, would more than double the hardstand area of the arsenal, providing even greater potential to receive from and ship to domestic and oversea customers artillery, combat and tactical vehicles. In this connection, it is again desirable to refer to Raritan's water shipment facilities. The large dock, in addition to its rail and truck to lighter accommodations, is equipped with tank and vehicle loading wells. A recently installed stiff-leg derrick at the dock now handles the heaviest tanks and, of prime importance, considerable economies have been demonstrated through barge shipment direct from this installation. The above recommendations are considered valid not only in the light of present day operations but in a mobilization period as well, even considering the courses that a future emergency period might take."

The report further states "It is not believed that the value of the property to the Government and the cost of retaining it including necessary maintenance, is greater than the loss in value of the Government's investment, without considering the increased cost to the Government in the shipment of war materiels to the New York port, if any other station other than Raritan Arsenal was used to furnish these shipments." In light of the above findings, I am honestly and firmly convinced that the closing of Raritan Arsenal would have serious impact on our Nation's logistical defense effort for conventional support which is too often forgotten in this missile and atomic age. Wars still cannot be won without infantry. The infantry needs transportation and small arms. An article entitled "Army Makes a Comeback: What It Will Get and Why," published in the March 20, 1961, issue of U.S. News & World Report emphatically and specifically makes this policy clear.

Your cooperation and support is solicited to retain Raritan Arsenal as an active installation of the defense structure.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

APRIL 19, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Federal Building,
Newark, N.J.

DEAR SENATOR: I am a Raritan Arsenal employee and also a disabled veteran with a family of four living in the immediate vicinity of the arsenal. After 20 years of faithful service in the Federal Government, I now find that the closing of Raritan Arsenal is to be my reward.

If the reasons for closing Raritan were valid, I would refrain from troubling you with this letter. Raritan Arsenal is not primarily a supply or storage depot, in fact, nearly half its personnel are engaged in totally unrelated national activities. Since the Army has indicated that all employees connected with the national activity will transfer is admission enough that these services are required and not obsolete.

Therefore, after 20 years of employment for most at this installation, it is neither humane nor practicable to expect homes to be abandoned; children to be uprooted for no valid reason.

Your efforts to prevent Raritan from closing will be most appreciated by many.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

APRIL 10, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As an employee of Raritan Arsenal, several questions have arisen with regard to statements appearing in the press in connection with the announced closing of the installation. Your assistance in obtaining answers to these questions would be appreciated.

1. The Assistant Secretary of the Army stated the closing of Raritan Arsenal was based upon 22 points.

Did all of these points indicate Raritan should be closed or did actually many of them show Raritan is a very favorable location? The only specific point that has been released, where Raritan does not measure up, is that it does not have the area to handle certain missiles. What is the reasoning behind the requirement that an installation to be retained must have the facilities to handle every conceivable mission? Does not Raritan have a number of vital missions that can and should continue to be performed at Raritan?

2. The Assistant Secretary of the Army also indicated the impact on the employees would not be significant as many would retire and the others would be offered the opportunity to transfer.

How did he arrive at the statistics quoted? I know of no survey at Raritan to obtain these figures.

Did he include employees such as myself in the group that will retire? Certainly I will be eligible for retirement based on abolishment of my job and years of service; but can I raise a family including five school age children on 25 percent of my current pay?

Also, will employment offers be made at installations where all employees, regardless of color, receive the same consideration as they do in New Jersey and at Raritan Arsenal?

3. Local officials have made statements to the effect that if the arsenal property is released for industrial development there will soon be 10 jobs for every 1 at present.

Has any detailed study been made to support such fantastic claims? Do the individuals making the claims realize almost half the property is subject to flooding at extreme high tide? If their claims are correct, why, 3 years after release of Carteret subpost of Raritan for industrial development, are only 28 people employed where over 500 were employed previously? Why has the county been unable to attract industry to the area across the river from the arsenal which, with the trunk sewer and higher ground, is considerably more suitable for development?

While frankly, I am not expecting specific answers to the questions I have raised, it would be appreciated if you would review this matter, as after review, I am sure you will reach the conclusion that the ill-conceived, hastily arrived at decision to close Raritan Arsenal should be reversed.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Westfield, N.J.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: My purpose in contacting you is to voice my objection to the decision to close Raritan Arsenal here at Metuchen, N.J.

As a citizen, I am deeply concerned with the defense of our Nation, the national economy and the local economy.

I feel the Nation is losing an installation vital to national defense if this closing is permitted. I base this opinion on the fact that Raritan Arsenal is composed of brick permanent type buildings, permanent paved roads with all facilities, dock facilities for shipment by water, is serviced by two major railroads, is interwoven into the Nation's major highway system and has air facilities in close proximity.

In addition to the above, it is so strategically located as to afford adequate defense to our huge metropolitan area.

It is worthy to mention that Raritan Arsenal has enjoyed the best relations in the surrounding communities.

The Raritan Arsenal adds annually to the local economy $15.5 million in payroll, $4 to $6 million in contracts for services to local businessmen, and as 2,200 of the 2,650 employees live in the surrounding counties, contributes greatly to the tax income.

The employees of Raritan Arsenal have offered their faithful services to the Government during two emergencies and on the most part are in their middle ages. These employees are above the age in demand in industry, therefore are being given the opportunity to sever community ties and move to a distant area. I can see nothing but disaster in such a plan. I need not mention to you that the central New Jersey area was only recently considered a major unemployment area. The closing of this installation would only make this condition more critical.

I certainly wish you would expend every effort to retain Raritan Arsenal as a Government installation regardless of branch of service or mission.

———— ————.

APRIL 10, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am writing you from the standpoint of an employee of Raritan Arsenal and as a lieutenant colonel in the Army Reserve. I would like to enlist your support in keeping Raritan Arsenal open as a part of the national defense system. The following points are presented for your consideration:

1. A national defense program must be designed to protect the Nation in the event of war—not to fulfill military peacetime requirements. There can be no halfway measure. Raritan Arsenal has been essential in every war since 1917.

2. In the event of limited war—the most likely kind in which the Nation may be involved—conventional weapons will be used. Raritan Arsenal is ideal in all respects to handle Ordnance logistics for this requirement.

3. In the event of an all-out super world war, the entire globe and the space above will be the battlegrounds. Modern military doctrine calls for dispersion of facilities rather than concentration in this type of war. Raritan Arsenal should remain open to provide dispersed supply activities. If Raritan Arsenal closes, the Army will not have a single supply operation in New Jersey nor on the North Atlantic seaboard within 100 miles of the coast and outports.

4. In war, the Army always requires more supply facilities than it has. The Army has already lost the Belle Mead General Depot and the Carteret Storage Activity in New Jersey. How, in wartime, could the Army regain properly located large acreage required to fulfill its mission if Raritan Arsenal is turned over to civilian pursuits?

5. Every place in the United States is vulnerable to potential enemy attack. Alternate sites are required for all facilities. With Raritan Arsenal closed, there is one less alternate site.

6. Raritan Arsenal has proven to be an ideal location for national Army activities decentralized from Washington. These activities will not cease in the event Raritan Arsenal is closed. Why should they not continue at Raritan? It would be false economy to move them away from a location which has proven to be the best location outside of heavily congested Washington. Even now, a large segment of the Ordnance Corps is being moved out of the Pentagon.

The proposed closing of Raritan Arsenal does not fit into logical thinking for adequate national defense. The proposal to close Raritan Arsenal exhibits a parochial point of view and no vision or imagination of the requirements for any future war in which we may be engaged. Your thoughtful consideration will be appreciated. Aside from the impact on the local economy, Raritan Arsenal is essential to a continuing strong national defense in the light of current approved military doctrine.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————.

APRIL 10, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
Senator From New Jersey,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I strongly protest the decision to close Raritan Arsenal in Edison, N.J. As a resident of this nearby community for the past 39 years I was deeply shocked at the news and still cannot believe it.

As a nearby resident I have the opportunity to visit Raritan Arsenal during their Armed Forces Day open house and I am continually amazed at the modern facilities available to do the diversified work that is done at Raritan Arsenal. Very few industries in this area have such modern equipment or do these industries employ the number and caliber of people.

I ask you as New Jersey's representative of the Senate to acquaint yourself with this much-needed industry and assure yourself of the facts. Visit this arsenal located in New Jersey and do everything in your power to reverse the politically biased decision to close Raritan Arsenal. We need Raritan Arsenal for the good of New Jersey and for our national security.

Very truly yours,

———— ————.

TRANSPORT OF PASSENGERS AND CARGO BY AIR CARRIERS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate today on the subject of our American air carriers who are engaged in the transport of passengers and cargo to foreign countries. The problems of these carriers have been of concern to me for a long time and recent events have made it clear that their competitive position in the international air market cannot be maintained if the peculiar handicaps which have been forced upon them are allowed to remain unchanged or become worse. These handicaps are the outgrowth and consequence of a failure on the part of our State Department to maintain a firm, established policy in awarding air routes and a failure to see that the legitimate economic interest of the U.S. airlines are properly protected. The consequence of the State Department's failures is a steady weakening of our international air transport industry.

Briefly, the problem can be resolved into this—the U.S. international air carriers are losing more and more of the international air traffic to foreign air carriers. Let me cite some statistics. In 1948, shortly after World War II, approximately 73 percent of all international air traffic on the North Atlantic routes, the world's most competitive and most traveled air routes, was carried on U.S.-flag lines. In 1955, only 53 percent was transported over the North Atlantic in U.S. aircraft. Now, 6 years later, less than 40 percent of this traffic is being carried on U.S.-flag lines.

This in spite of the fact that the United States generates almost two-thirds of the transatlantic traffic. In other words, for every three people who make cross-Atlantic flights, two of these reside in the United States. Yet our U.S. carriers now share in less than 40 percent of the cross-Atlantic traffic.

The consequences of this decline are already seriously felt and will become alarming if the present trend continues. It means the loss of dollars, a loss which has become increasingly important to us in recent years. It means the failure of the United States to increase its industrial capacity and skills, a failure to put more men to work, for if our air carriers continue to carry less traffic they will make less flights, they will need less maintenance, and less replacement.

Our loss of traffic means, in addition, a failure to maintain our position as the world's foremost air carrier. Nowadays, we face more and more competition from foreign airlines—from Air France, Sabena, Lufthansa, British Overseas Airways, and others and will find increasing competition from the Soviet state-owned airlines, Aeroflot. These lines are moving more and more into traffic which was formerly moved by our own air carriers.

To a degree, this decline was bound to happen.

But it is obvious that we should not be carrying only 40 percent. Yet this is what the best available figures indicate—40 percent—when we have by far the largest fleet and the best equipment.

The major reason for our decline in international air carriage can be found in the bilateral air agreements the State Department has negotiated with foreign governments and the way in which these agreements have been carried out. Our negotiators have disregarded principles of equity and reciprocity and have, in effect, offered to foreign air carriers a silk purse in return for a sow's ear granted to American air carriers. This pernicious trend has developed over a period of years and several striking examples of inequitable air agreements are available.

Five years ago, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee appointed a special Subcommittee on International Air Agreements to investigate U.S. policy in regards to the awarding of air routes to foreign air carriers and to determine whether the routes which had recently been awarded to Lufthansa, the German airline, were putting our American air carriers in an unfavorable position. I was privileged to chair this subcommittee and Senators ALAN BIBLE and John Bricker were members.

The subcommittee conducted hearings over a period of about 6 weeks. We heard representatives of the Department of State, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the U.S.-flag carriers, the Air Transport Association.

We examined the principles upon which our bilateral air agreements are based and we studied in detail the circumstances surrounding the route awards to Lufthansa. We went into these and related problems thoroughly. I feel we covered the ground very well at that time and we issued a report in which we were quite critical of the method used by the State Department and the CAB in their negotiations. I would like to bring the Senate up to date on that report and let it know the situation that now prevails in the awarding of air routes to foreign air carriers.

In negotiating these air routes and surrounding problems, the United States has based its demands on the principles of the Bermuda agreement. The Bermuda agreement was entered into with the Government of the United Kingdom in 1946 and established the pattern which we have since followed in negotiations for reciprocal international air carriage.

When the Bermuda consultations started in 1947 the American and British negotiators were faced with the problem of defining the scope and establishing all the elements of such negotiations. Of the elements which were established two are important to consider today.

First, routes have to be exchanged. In drawing up this exchange, the carriage of the traffic, not only between the United States and foreign country, but also between that foreign country and third countries by the foreign country, must be negotiated.

This latter third country traffic is sometimes called fifth freedom traffic or secondary carriage, the fill-up traffic essential to economical operation of aircraft.

Second, general standards for governing the capacity to be operated on the awarded routes must be agreed upon.

With respect to these factors the American position was that there should be freedom to carry traffic to any oversea point as often as was desired—in effect, complete freedom of the skies. The British position, and the position taken by most of the European countries in similar negotiations at that time, advocated a strict control on all routes and capacity carried thereon. This was based on the fear that since only the Americans were then capable of manufacturing aircraft readily adaptable for commercial use, we might flood the market with air service to such an extent that it would retard the normal development of foreign airlines and the foreign aircraft industry.

To account properly for these divergent points of view and at the same time allow flexibility for future operations an article was inserted into the Bermuda agreement which said:

> The air service made available to the public by the airlines operating under this agreement shall bear a close relationship to the requirements of the public for such services. * * * Services provided * * * shall retain as their primary objective the provision of capacity adequate to the traffic demands between the country of which such airline is a national and the countries of ultimate destination of the traffic.

The rights to carry traffic from one foreign country to another, the fifth freedom or secondary carriage, was given special consideration in this same article:

> The right to embark or disembark on such services international traffic destined for and coming from third countries at a point or points on the routes specified shall be applied in accordance with the general principles of orderly development * * * and shall be subject to the general principle that capacity should be related—
>
> (a) to traffic requirements between the country of origin and the countries of ultimate destination of the traffic;
>
> (b) to the requirements of through airlines operation; and
>
> (c) to the traffic requirements of the area through which the airline passes after taking account of local and regional services.

Thus the article envisioned the carriage of traffic originating in one country and destined for another as the major source of the traffic which each nation's airlines would carry between the two nations. Passengers leaving England for the United States or vice versa would provide the primary source of the traffic which the United States and British carriers would transport between these countries. Fifth freedom traffic, traffic to a third foreign country, was recognized as necessary in the interests of economic operation but it was to have a lesser position, it was to be subordinate to the purpose of carrying traffic between a flight's place of origin and ultimate destination.

The principles stated in the Bermuda agreement were good. They were a logical, reasonable compromise of two opposing philosophies, and they provided a sound basis on which the airlines of two countries could operate in an orderly, effective manner and offer efficient service to the public. It is at our own risk that we violate any of these principles, or allow other countries to violate them.

But the principles of the Bermuda agreement have been violated again and again, both in the bilateral negotiations which we have conducted with various countries since 1946 and in the application of these principles to the day-to-day operations of foreign carriers to whom we have awarded routes. The consequence of this failure to uphold the principles has been the steady, alarming decline in the position of the American international air carriers.

An excellent example of our failure to uphold the Bermuda principles is provided by the bilateral air agreement made between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States in the summer of 1956. The Subcommittee on International Air Agreements went into the provisions of this agreement at great length and we found that the routes given the German airline, Lufthansa, and the accompanying difficulty of controlling capacity on these routes definitely worked to the detriment of the American air carriers. The first inequity of this agreement occurred wherein Lufthansa was given the right to fly into five major American cities—New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, and either San Francisco or Los Angeles—in return for the rights of American air carriers to operate into five major German cities—Frankfurt, Hamburg, Munich, Stuttgart, and the Dusseldorf-Cologne-Bonn, area which is served by a single airport. The combined population of the metropolitan areas into which Lufthansa achieved rights was approximately 29 million, about six times the population in the five German cities to which we received reciprocal rights. This disparity in population is compounded by the greater travel interest in the U.S. cities.

Lufthansa was also granted rights to fly beyond New York into Havana, in addition to starting with rights beyond Germany. This grant was the second inequity in the agreement. The grant of rights both from beyond Germany and from New York to Havana were for the carriage of fifth freedom traffic. The statistics presented to the subcommittee by the CAB showed that Germany would have received passenger revenues about two-thirds greater than the United States simply on the carriage of fifth freedom traffic alone. Moreover, Lufthansa might have achieved further rights beyond Havana which would have opened up the entire South American Continent to her. In gaining access into Latin America via New York, Lufthansa—carrying secondary traffic—would have come into direct competition with and taken revenue from the U.S. and Latin American lines which carry primary traffic between the two continents. I am happy to say that, perhaps because of the 1955 hearings, Lufthansa has never attempted to exercise the rights beyond New York which our negotiators granted. On the far end of the route, however, Lufthansa, in achieving beyond-Germany rights, came into competition with our carrier's primary rights to the Middle East and India.

In essence then the Germans were given, in addition to the appropriate and reciprocal equal opportunity to compete for the economically rich United States-Germany market, a right to operate in the market between the United States and countries intermediate to and beyond Germany and the right to operate in the market between the United States and the Caribbean and South America. The value of these third-country rights could not at any point be reciprocated by Germany.

Another example of our negotiator's failure to be guided by the principles of the Bermuda agreement is that made with the Australian Government in 1957 whereby Qantas, the Australian airline, was given rights to fly from Australia across the Pacific to San Francisco, on to New York, from there over to London, and even beyond. This award opened up, I would estimate, about half of the world's potential air traffic and is better than any route award ever given a U.S. carrier.

The route given to our U.S. carriers in return was hardly equitable. They were allowed passage from the United States through points in Australia to,

in some cases, southeast Asia and the Philippines, and, in other cases to Africa and Antarctica. On the very face of it, this agreement is inequitable and unjustified. It provides another example of the State Department's failure to protect our legitimate interests to the detriment of the U.S. airlines.

Last week the Department of State announced its willingness to reopen formal consultations on the 1957 bilateral air agreement between the United States and the Government of the Netherlands. The Dutch reply is awaited now. The announced intent of these consultations will be to consider a Dutch request for a transpolar route from Holland into Los Angeles. Under normal circumstances I would welcome such consultations and would hope that some drastic revisions would be made in the present air agreement with the Netherlands, for I feel that the American air carrier's interests and the interests of the United States were not properly protected when the present agreement was negotiated. I would welcome negotiations which would offer an opportunity to make changes in the provisions of that accord—changes which would undo and redress the inequities which were placed on U.S. carriers in 1957. But although these consultations, assuming they are held, will offer the opportunity to make changes, I fear that such modifications as may come out of these talks will not be ones which will benefit the U.S.-flag carriers.

In order that the Senate may understand exactly what is involved in these consultations, I think it would be well to go into the background of our present air agreement with the Dutch Government.

Initial air route negotiations with the Dutch Government commenced shortly after World War II, and a basic agreement was reached in 1946, whereby KLM Royal Dutch Airlines was granted travel over two routes—Amsterdam–New York and Miami–Curacao—Curacao being in the Netherlands Antilles. American-flag lines were also granted the same routes. This was a 1-year agreement which was successively renewed for varying lengths of time while further negotiations continued intermittently until 1957. In that year a formal agreement was reached wherein the earlier route awards were reaffirmed and KLM also received passage from Amsterdam to Houston via Montreal and New York-Curaçao. In return for these U.S. concessions, the U.S. carriers were granted some flexibility in their rights to fly into the Netherlands Antilles and we attained the Dutch willingness to abide by the principle of the Bermuda agreement.

Dutch adherence to the Bermuda principles would, in theory, enable KLM to share with U.S. lines all the services needed for transport of passengers or cargo having its origin or destination in Holland or the United States but would not permit KLM to operate these routes in substantial excess of the needs generated within the two countries. Of course, like limitations were to be applied to U.S. carriers.

It is doubtful, however, whether the Dutch concession to abide by the principles of the Bermuda agreement has been of much value to the American-flag carriers. Although no specific figures are available, because the United States does not check the volume of fifth freedom traffic, and because the Dutch Government has been unwilling to provide pertinent statistics, authoritative estimates put the amount of fifth freedom traffic on these KLM routes at substantially about 50 percent. If this is true, then KLM has been carrying on a flagrant and systematic violation of the Bermuda principles and the United States-Netherlands agreement of 1957.

In any case, the 1957 agreement provides KLM with access to more than 20 times the population that the U.S. carriers received by virtue of the agreement. The route from New York to Curaçao is particularly significant, for it provides a means for KLM to gain access to the entire New York-Latin American market, which should be reserved for Latin American and U.S. airlines. The 1957 air agreement with the Netherlands, was, like the agreements with Germany and Australia, distinctly disadvantageous to the American carriers, in that access to population and rights to carry fifth freedom traffic were inequitable.

In 1960, further consultations were held with the Dutch, at which time they requested that the United States grant KLM transpolar rights into Los Angeles. the same route they are requesting this year. After a month of talks, the State Department turned down the Dutch request. In a letter to an interested Member of the Senate, shortly thereafter, Assistant Secretary of State William MacComber said:

> It was considered that the aviation rights already given to the Netherlands in the Air Transport Agreement of 1957, represented quite generous concessions and that the grant of a further concession at this time would only create a further imbalance of benefits to the disadvantage of the U.S. airlines. The grant of the Netherlands request, therefore, was not considered to be in the best interest of the United States.

The State Department was indeed correct in its refusal and in its reasons for it. However, now, 15 months later, consultations on the very same route and the same problem are to recommence. I do not know of any significant economic or political changes in United States-Netherlands relations in the last year or so. Consequently, I see no reason for reopening the talks. The reasons for the refusal in January 1960 are even more valid today, since the share of the North Atlantic carriage by U.S.-flag lines has declined every year since 1957, and particularly during the past year.

The State Department's letter mentioned the creation of a further imbalance of benefits—a clear admission that the present United States-Netherlands air agreement is disadvantageous to U.S. airlines. If KLM is given access to the Los Angeles metropolitan area, with its population of about 7 million, no possible routing which U.S. airlines can get in return will offer true or equitable compensation. The only Dutch concession which might make such an award at all reasonable would be their willingness to accept a substantial cut in the capacity they now carry over their routes in and out of the United States. In order to insure effectiveness of an agreement to decrease capacity, the maximum number of flights would probably have to be specified as a total number or as a percentage of certain other capacities.

I said that normally I would welcome these consultations and the opportunity they afford to correct this imbalance of benefits. However, these talks are being taken up again at the initiative of the Dutch Government; and it would be unreasonable to expect that any country would ask for a cut in its flights or would request talks if it thought a decrease in capacity would result. Past experience shows that our negotiators have too often granted concessions of the type of those for which the Dutch will ask. Over recent years we have developed an unhealthy precedent for making route awards which disregard the principles of the Bermuda agreement and fail to contribute to the economic betterment of our own airlines. If the experience of the last decade gives any indication of what to expect in the future, I am sure that the route to Los Angeles—one which cannot be compensated by anything to which the Dutch can agree—will be awarded. Consequently, I do not welcome these consultations. I fear that will be the outcome of the consultation, and that it will be terribly injurious to international air carriers bearing the U.S. flag.

In addition to the questions of reciprocity of market access and general equity of routes, there are three other considerations which I hope our negotiators will bear in mind during the talks with the Dutch. These three considerations bear not only on these particular talks, but also will have a great effect on the conduct of all future negotiations for air agreements with foreign countries and on the actual day-to-day conduct of foreign carriers operating under their present bilateral agreements with the United States.

First, I mention that the 1957 United States-Netherlands agreement called for KLM's recognition and compliance with the Bermuda principles. Many impartial observers feel that KLM has consistently violated these principles, specifically on the capacity they carry on their routes. I hope that in preparation for these talks the Civil Aeronautics Board has gathered figures which will prove the truth or falsity of this accusation. If the accusation is false, the CAB should say so. If, however, the accusation is true, the United States should stand its ground and demand compliance with the 1957 agreement. Any other action would put us in danger of setting a precedent which would be extremely damaging to our national interests. If KLM, while committed to the Bermuda principles by the present agreement, is nevertheless violating the principles, it is most important that she not be granted the Los Angeles route in return for the guaranteed, effective compliance with the principles. While effective compliance might render the U.S. airlines some short-term benefits, it would indicate to other foreign carriers that the best means of gain-

ing from the United States an extraordinary and unjustified concession is to violate the agreement under which they now are operating, and then use their violations as a negotiating tool with which to gain further concessions.

Consequently, Mr. President, it is most important that before any talks begin, the CAB attempt to determine the extent of KLM's compliance with the 1957 agreement. If there is a consistent failure to live up to the principles of the original agreement, we must—more than ever—refuse to accede to the Dutch request for a route into Los Angeles.

Second, KLM's drive to obtain this route has received the strong backing of the Dutch Government. The Dutch Ambassador has called on officials of the State Department and has urged the reopening of talks. The Dutch Foreign Minister has apparently discussed this matter with the President of the United States. Their 1960 bid for this route was carried on in conjunction with a strong public-relations program in the United States; and approaches were made to various civic groups, in seeking their support. In the face of this, granting of the route into Los Angeles can only lead to the conclusion that the United States will yield to any determined, high-pressure campaign for the awarding of extraordinary routes, no matter how unjustified or how prejudicial to U.S. interests. This will furnish to other foreign carriers an invitation to employ exactly the same tactics; and a second, third, and fourth dangerous and damaging effect will have occurred.

Third, the awarding of this route—an award which the Civil Aeronautics Board has opposed in the past, and, I understand, will again oppose—will be an indication that the State Department has no guiding principles or policies to be followed in the negotiation of international air routes, and that the principles which were talked about at Bermuda are only a mockery, a sham, to which only lipservice is given. In this case, I suggest that it is within the province of Congress to establish a policy which will serve as a guide in future negotiations, and to institute procedures which will insure that the policy is carried out.

Mr. President, I would think the Congress eventually will have to consider this problem, and to devise some rules—itself—which can be followed by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and at least make to the State Department some suggestions as to what positions should be taken with respect to the granting of these routes.

It is indisputable that at least some of the situations about which I have talked today—and I speak specifically of the unjustified route awards and our policy to limit the capacity on these routes—were allowed to come into existence by, and owe their continued existence to, diplomatic and political considerations.

I can imagine no other reason for letting Qantas carry our American citizens from San Francisco to New York and on to London. Nor can I see any economic virtue in allowing Lufthansa the right to fly into Latin America via New York. I do not say that politics or diplomacy provide good, or logical, reasons for these routings. I simply say that they provide the only conceivable grounds on which these routes could have been awarded since equity and the economic facts of life rule out all others.

In this connection, I think it is important that the United States indicate, through its dealings and negotiations with both friend and foe, that it is honest, forthright, and eager to protect its own legitimate interests. Only in this way can we insure that our Government's voice will have the respect it deserves. But we gain no respect when we grant to foreign countries air rights which, on their very face, are damaging to our own flag carriers and in opposition to the declared principles of action which we made explicit in the Bermuda agreements. I do not think that the ignoring of our American-flag carriers' legitimate interests can aid in the achievement of our long-range foreign policy goals, nor do I think such disregard is in the interest of the United States or anyone else, except some of these foreign countries.

We have too long toyed with the future of our U.S. international flag carriers. The outcome of the forthcoming negotiations may be the final blow to their hopes for equitable routes or may provide a turning point—a new departure—toward the principles that will serve not only these foreign countries, but our own country. I hope the State Department will recognize the legitimate interests of the U.S. airlines and will refuse to grant KLM the route to Los Angeles.

PRESIDENT'S TEXTILE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we face today the opening of an effort of pertinacious significance in the struggle which will go on until next year with respect to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the determination of what will be the trade policy of the United States.

The administration yesterday announced a seven-point program of assistance to the U.S. textile industry. I believe that most of the points proposed by President Kennedy represent a commendable first step toward the assumption of governmental responsibility to help those injured by trade policies pursued in the national interest. However, this is only a first step.

The administration proposals overlook or leave in doubt the five following points:

First. Provision needs to be considered for aid to other industries which feel themselves injured by concentrated imports, such as fabricated metal products, industrial chemicals, cord and twine, electronic and office machine equipment, sporting goods, buttons and toys, and other American manufactures. During 1960, less than 15 percent of all the briefs filed with the Tariff Commission in opposition to duty reductions at the trade negotiations, beginning this year, under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—came from the textile industry.

Second. Even for the textile industry alone these proposals as yet make no provision for: (a) Extended unemployment compensation to help workers through their period of transition; (b) retraining of workers; (c) relocation aid for workers; (d) early retirement provisions for workers; (e) loans to larger businesses not eligible for financing from the Small Business Administration; and (f) financing and stimulation of community development corporations.

Third. Consideration should be given to the important principle of phasing out additional tariff and quota protection for American industry on a graduated basis with a definite time limit. This is basic to the concept of trade adjustment assistance. It assures that such a program does not develop into a permanent Government subsidy and it serves notice on our trading partners—who last year took $20 billion of our commercial exports—that the United States is not signaling retreat into a policy of economic isolation.

Fourth. Criteria should be established to distinguish between enterprises actually injured by imports and those well able to meet foreign competition. In other words, the President's program proposes aid on an industrywide basis. Therefore, aid would be given also to the profitable producers and may leave those who really need it at the same comparative disadvantage which they now suffer. It should be realized that one-half of the yardage increase in textile imports between 1958 and 1960 occurred in only one item: soft cotton-filled sheeting.

Fifth. Provision should be made for action within the framework of our present trade legislation and our present trade agreements. Such provision would require amendments of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to distinguish between injury to whole industries or parts of them and injury to individual businesses. This is a most important distinction if we are to help those who need help while preserving our policy to expand trade necessary for the maintenance and expansion of our export markets.

These five points take into consideration the principal provisions of S. 851, the National Import Policy Act of 1961, which I introduced for myself and Senator CASE of New Jersey on February 9, 1961.

The administration approach, if confined to textiles alone, fails to show an awareness of the growing problems faced by a wide variety of businesses and their workers and communities from concentrated import competition; problems which have to be met in the national interest and also be reconciled in connection with it.

Also, there should be awareness of the need for bipartisan action on the part of those interested in the preservation of an effective U.S. foreign trade policy; partisanship would be inviting danger for the foreign economic policy of the United States, of which trade is the most

vital element. In the face of the impending great debate on renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act next year and the bipartisan tradition in foreign policy, the administration should seek such support.

Foreign trade is an issue of overriding importance to the domestic economic expansion and the foreign economic leadership of the United States. The appraisal of our foreign trade policy should begin now.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article from the New Republic, May 1, 1961 issue, written by Mr. Asher Brynes, and an article from Brandon's Shipper and Forwarder, March 20, 1961 issue, written by me. I believe that these two articles present a picture of the scope of the problems and opportunities in foreign trade before the United States. I hope that they will help to fill the urgent need for a balanced approach and for widespread public discussion on the foreign trade issue.

I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the text of the May 2 White House release announcing the President's program.

There being no objection, the articles and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Republic, May 1, 1961]

THE TROUBLE OF PROGRESS

(By Asher Brynes)

The big battle over trade policy is a year off but the campaign began, as this journal noted last October ("Needed—A New Bipartisanship?" by Selig S. Harrison), when 16 southern Governors repudiated the Democratic free trade tradition and embraced economic nationalism. Within a few working days after he was sworn in the President took up his position. "A return to protectionism is not a solution," he told the Congress early last February, in his message on the balance-of-payments problem. On the same day he followed through with an action that reversed a stand he had taken as a Member of Congress. When he was a Senator representing the interests of his State Mr. Kennedy supported the claim of a Massachusetts twine and cordage concern for higher tariff protection. Now as a President representing the national interest he rejected the same proposal when it was bucked up to him in the form, technically, of a split decision by the Tariff Commission on that very claim. (The Commission operates with extremely deliberate speed.) The six Commissioners were divided two for, two against, two not voting in favor of higher duties on cordage and twine. He cast his ballot; it was final with the first pair.

Over on Capitol Hill, also on the same day, Senator JOHN PASTORE, of Rhode Island, convened a subcommittee on textile imports to hear testimony about the need for import quotas to turn the rising tide (as most witnesses suggested) of textile products from low-wage countries that threatened to inundate our markets, and extinguish our industries. Out of old habit the witnesses slugged hardest at Japan, although that country has imposed voluntary controls on most of its textile exports to the United States. Textile imports from Hong Kong, which have accelerated sharply in recent months, were also mentioned together with shipments from the newly industrializing countries whom we ourselves, as a result of our foreign-aid programs, have endowed with credits for the purchase of raw materials and equipped with the machinery and know-how to process those materials into cloth and finished goods. In the production of textiles the most important of these are India, Pakistan, and Taiwan or free China.

Here is a dilemma that has grown steadily more acute since the passage of the first Trade Agreements Act in 1934, which was pushed through as a recovery measure in the darkest days of the great depression. Under this act tariff levels have been peeled down slowly, as a cook might dismantle an onion, with a constant outpouring of tears. The hurt that is caused by cutting a tariff is hard to believe unless one is familiar with the dry literature in which these sufferings are recorded. Last June, for instance, a subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee heard more than 300 pages of testimony on the impact of imports. Aside from the Government witnesses and a lawyer who appeared for a liberal trade policy group, all of the witnesses but one argued for more protection against imports. Many were dissatisfied with mere tariff increases and called for absolute controls, quotas and the like. The single industry witness who spoke in favor of a liberal approach to foreign trade policy was refreshingly obstreperous.

"To sum it up very briefly, Mr. Chairman," he said, "I believe that the natural desire of any businessman, large or small, to eliminate his competition, should not blind us to the great and obvious advantages that competition brings to the industry, to our economy, and to the security of our country as a whole. If a man cannot compete with his neighbor, no matter what language that neighbor speaks, he must change his method or change his business. This is economic progress and economic strength. Perhaps the U.S. Government wants to help him to adjust to a condition where he is competitive. But no government based on our principles can want to eliminate the competition. The suggestions made [here] that we subject our industries to the allocation straitjacket of quotas would merely subject our industrial strength to the same mess that now exists in agriculture, where artificial allocations of production require artificial allocations of markets, which require artificial determinations of price. There is no end to the straitjacket which these believers in free enterprise would put our industrial system into."

One does not have to endorse these brave words to see that the heart of the matter, as Mr. Charles P. Taft of the Committee for a National Trade Policy said on the same occasion, is that it would be a crass inconsistency if the United States were to shrink its markets for the products of the countries on which we are spending billions in foreign aid and investment capital. We assert we are making such expenditures in order to help them lift their living standards to a point sufficiently high to protect their people from the possibility of Communist subversion. Restriction of our markets would amount to more than a neglect of this purpose. It would be tantamount to placing these newly industrialized countries in a situation in which they must call on the Communists to complete what we were too fainthearted to finish.

Over the past 25 years organized labor has supported liberal foreign trade policies because of its similar interest in raising living standards for American workers. Imports from low-wage countries normally impinge on what economists call our labor-intensive industries. Generally speaking, wherever much labor and relatively little capital are required to turn out the goods, as in the ceramic and textile industries, wages in this country, as elsewhere, tend to be depressed and trade-union organization either weak or nonexistent. As a consequence the impact of imports on such industries may have all the appearance of doing forcibly what organized labor in these cases cannot do, that is, help its membership to get out of such primitive industries and find better-paying jobs elsewhere. This shift has already occurred in much of the American ceramics industry, with scarcely enough complaint to be visible on the front pages of the big city newspapers.

Textiles are another matter, not because the Textile Workers' Union is strong but rather because of its connection with the two large apparel workers' unions. One of them, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, has been branching out into the more highly labor-intensive sections of the apparel and associated industries. Today it has jurisdiction not only over men's suits and overcoats, but also "pants, shirts, pajamas, underwear, outerwear, rainwear, gloves, sportswear, and athletic equipment." Imports of these articles have multiplied fivefold, by dollar value, in as many years.

Last March 21, 1960, the Textile Workers' Union reacted sharply by inserting a long advertisement in the Daily News Record (the leading textile trade publication) of that date. "It is good, indeed, to see management bestirring itself before congressional committees. * * * But is this enough? We say no, for the basic flaw in management's case for relief from imports lies in the fact that textile management does not speak for the million workers in its employ; nor does it speak for the many hundreds of communities which depend on it for its economic well-being. The sad fact is that management speaks only for itself."

At the biennial convention of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers the following June President Jacob S. Potofsky announced that, "We have enlisted the cooperation of the International Ladies Garment Workers, the Textile Workers, the United Hatters, and the International Leather Goods Workers * * * to defend ourselves against the threat of extinction." He closed his address with a stirring peroration: "Do our cutters have to continue to cut fabrics imported from Japan? Do our operators have to work on fabrics made in Japan? Do our bushelmen have to alter Japanese manufactured suits? * * * We cannot be compelled to commit economic suicide."

This year Mr. Potofsky's union followed through with the declaration that its members would refuse, after May 1, to work on fabrics imported from Japan. It was joined in this boycott by a union in a completely different industry, the Chicago local of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which said that its membership would not work with Japanese electronic components after the same date. The double announcement made major news. At the President's press conference on March 7 he was asked for his views on the use of economic boycotts by labor unions concerned about import competition. Apparently there had been much previous discussion on the upper levels of the administration, for Mr. Kennedy's answer was crisp. He hoped the boycotts would not spread to other unions because there are statutory procedures under which the industries that are affected adversely by imports can bring their complaints to the Tariff Commission. Workers in some of these industries have been, indeed, hard hit but "they're not always able to make a judgment of what the total national need is, and also the international need." He concluded with the remark that "two can play this game" of boycotts—we might find our export industries injured by discriminatory controls abroad, if we discriminate against foreign products here.

LABOR'S DUTY

There has been more show than substance in these boycott actions. One of them, on Japanese electronic components, has been suspended and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers have just called off their threat of a boycott against Japanese textiles. Mr. Potofsky announced that he was taking this action at the request of President Kennedy and, as he put it, "in the national interest."

At the same time he said he was prepared to negotiate an agreement for the limitation of imports of men's suits from Japan with the Japanese themselves. Their chief importance so far as the entire foreign trade picture is concerned, may be merely as attention-getting devices.

To understand what is going on we must grapple with basic trade union policy in these matters. According to Solomon Barkin, director of research of the Textile Workers' Union, organized labor has a duty to protect union members from injury in the course of technological and economic change. In its view, the personal and social costs of production should be carried by the enterprise itself, meaning the owners of the businesses in which the workers are employed. The price of goods and services should therefore include the costs of unemployment, sickness, retirement, conservation of natural resources, and the economic and social development of people and regions. What that adds up to is a claim for full protection from any fluctuation of demand for the services of labor traceable to any cause but catastrophe; that is, forces that actually disrupt the social order.

How does the businessman feel about this? Unfortunately, one has to put together the case for business out of scraps and bits, for it employs few spokesmen as perceptive and articulate as Mr. Barkin. The average businessman appears to work in a climate of self-imposed discipline as a consequence of the voluntary elections of risks, or rather risk taking, which characterizes his operations. If (he feels) he is to be saddled with the burden of carrying his employees through all economic adversities, too great a proportion of his working capital will have to be earmarked for that purpose rather than for the maintenance of the enterprise itself—which is another way of saying for the maintenance of himself in the role of businessman, whether he be an active proprietor or a professional manager. This difference of views is not a matter of degree but of kind; it is qualitative or absolute. But we live in a social order that is intolerant of the violent collision of interests which such differing views would generate if each side insisted on its own way. In our present circumstances both can unite to throw this problem on the general public, or its agent, the administration. This appears to be one of the underlying reasons for the success of the welfare state in recent years. Its operations help to buffer the shock of these absolutes.

THE LIMITS OF "TRADE ADJUSTMENT"

Until quite recently the industries that are strongly unionized have been less affected by import competition and, to put it bluntly, the liberalistic attitudes of labor leaders have led most of them to favor liberal foreign trade policies in the absence of real sacrifice. Now the liberal trader in the trade union ranks, as Mr. Barkin puts it, who may have "merely adopted the logic and argument of the free trade movement will have to part company [with it] as the domestic impact of foreign trade becomes more and more evident."

Last February the AFL–CIO executive council issued a new statement on international trade policy. As in previous years it endorsed the broad national, political, and economic objectives which require a continued expansion of international trade. It went on to say, however, that a modification of this policy was required for the sixties—a new policy "that is proper both for America's economic and political objectives at home and abroad, as well as being fair both to American firms and workers and the nations that trade with us." Trade adjustment legislation of the type sponsored by Mr. Kennedy when he was a Member of the Senate and which is now being pushed in a more comprehensive form by Senator JAVITS, of New York, was mentioned as the most effective program for workers, industries, and communities adversely affected by imports. However, and this is the key point: "U.S. trade policy should also aim at safeguarding absolute historic levels of production in significant domestic industries, so that competitive imports will not depress U.S. production and jobs below their historic norm. The policy should be flexible enough so that as soon as modifications are possible, they could be reconsidered."

A large-scale study of these matters which is shortly to be published by the AFL–CIO defines this safeguarded absolute historic level of production as a standard "based on the recent experience of the particular industry prior to any unusual influx of imports." Once the specific standard had been set, American producers in that industry would be on notice that they had, as it were, an exclusive license to supply domestic consumption up to that level. For any sales above it they would have to compete with imports.

The apparent rigidity of this decision is softened by a conditional statement, which is quoted for emphasis: "It is possible that inevitable attrition in declining industries plus an effective trade adjustment program might make it feasible to gradually reduce the safeguarded level and thereby permit a greater volume of imports without adversely affecting firms and workers in the domestic industry." The process of natural attrition toward which the framers of labor's new policy on foreign trade look hopefully resembles what is often heard in Washington when an impulse to economize passes over the Government and an order to reduce overhead expenses goes out to the various bureau heads. They also hope that the rate at which civil service personnel leave spontaneously to take other jobs, or retire, will result in a payroll shrinkage that hurts nobody. What this emphasized sentence implies, as keen-sighted readers have doubtless noted, is that no realistically conceivable trade adjustment program can completely eliminate the trouble of progress, and this is precisely what labor objects to.

[From Brandon's Shipper & Forwarder, Mar. 20, 1961]

EXPANSION OF U.S. FOREIGN TRADE—THE CHALLENGE TO BUSINESS AND THE RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

During the past 10 years, U.S. commercial export and import trade has grown by 75 percent—from somewhat less than $20 billion in 1950 to $34.3 billion in 1960. Both then and now it comprises between 16 percent and 17 percent of all foreign trade in the free world. This is the largest share of world trade held by any single nation. It represents also the largest commitment, except for defense expenditures, of U.S. economic resources to world affairs. Nine times greater than annual U.S. foreign economic and military aid combined, nine times greater than annual U.S. private oversea investment, representing four-fifths of all U.S. international transactions, foreign trade is the most accurate measure of U.S. economic power in the world.

And every dollar of it passes into or out of the country as the result of a private business transaction—and this includes the sale of agricultural products which is supported by the Government. Furthermore, the $3.3 billion increase in our exports during 1960, as compared to 1959, prevented our serious balance of payments deficit from virtually doubling and reaching a figure in excess of $7 billion.

It is a challenge to private enterprise to maintain and expand trade as a great instrument of U.S. world leadership, and it is the responsibility of Government to provide the services needed by private enterprise for the fulfillment of this task. I should like to discuss the challenge to business and the responsibility of Government in two separate parts.

THE CHALLENGE TO BUSINESS

1. Business has to have the will to engage in export. The American manufacturer cannot content himself with producing products tailored to the needs of our domestic markets and then try to get rid of what he cannot sell here by sending it overseas. The businessman must realize that, to an increasing extent, a steady and expanding export market can mean the difference between profit and loss for him, and between work and layoffs for his employees. This is true for a large number of enterprises, including manufacturers of automobiles, chemicals, electronic equipment, jet aircraft, machine tools, other metal products, and even many textiles. A study in the December 1960 issue of the Survey of Current Business of the Department of Commerce concludes: "With the slowing down of our economic pace during the course of 1960, the brisk rate of the export business has become a welcome stimulus to domestic output of a broad range of commodities."

This means that the American businessman must familiarize himself with export opportunities and must service his foreign customers, once he has sold his products to them, just as he does with domestic markets and customers. He must actively learn about the export services provided by the U.S. Government and, through personal contacts and through his representatives in Congress, seek to improve those services wherever they do not now fit his legitimate needs.

In our free enterprise system all of this depends upon the initiative of the private businessman himself. It is his personal responsibility.

2. Business has to have the will to meet the competition of imports. An American manufacturer cannot hope to hide inefficiency permanently behind high protectionist walls. The American business community cannot afford to let him do so, if it hopes to compete in oversea markets. Trade is a two-way street, and whatever profits one businessman may gain by operating uneconomically behind tariff and quota barriers will be lost by his fellow businessmen who cannot enter foreign markets because of countervailing protectionist measures taken by other countries.

I believe that it is highly significant that, while the voices of those seeking high protection grow more numerous and stronger, hardly anything is heard from those businessmen who, whether they know it or not, are increasingly dependent upon liberal U.S. trade policies. Tariff Commission statistics, comparing the years 1955 and 1960, both of them preceding years of U.S. trade negotiations with other contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), show a threefold increase in the number of firms opposing further U.S. tariff concessions and a fivefold increase in the number of briefs asking for duty increases. As a Senator, I have received many hundreds of letters, cards, and telegrams over the past year asking for high tariffs. I have received few, indeed, asking for trade liberalization. I believe that my fellow Members of the Congress have had the same experience.

I must warn especially you, whose livelihood depends largely on foreign trade, that this kind of public silence on exports cannot continue without seriously affecting the actions of your Representatives in Washington.

Next year the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act will expire. Its further extension, unhampered by crippling amendments, will be one of the most critical and hotly debated issues before Congress during the next 18 months.

It is the responsibility of the businessman to make his views known.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

1. Government must provide the kind of service which will fit the export needs of business. The export services of the Departments of Commerce, Agriculture, and State, of the Export-Import Bank, and of the Small Business Administration must be coordinated and augmented so that they will effectively fill the requirements of the U.S. exporter.

The National Export Policy Act of 1961, which I have introduced in the Senate with the cosponsorship of several of my colleagues, is designed to meet this responsibility. It would create a Council for Export Promotion to coordinate the various services provided by the Government and to bring them closer to the Amercan businessman. It would set up a broad-scale export credit guarantee program in the Export-Import Bank with the participation of private banking and financial institutions, and it would greatly expand the foreign trade activities of the Departments of Commerce and State as well as of the Small Business Administration.

2. Government must provide assistance to those businesses, workers, and communities adversely affected by the concentrated increase of certain imports, resulting from the reciprocal trade policies pursued in the national interest. Businesses and workers must be helped to meet foreign competition, and communities must be helped to overcome the possibly depressing effects resulting from this temporary economic adjustment.

The National Import Policy Act of 1961, which I have introduced in the Senate with the cosponsorship of Senator CASE of New Jersey, is designed to meet the Government's responsibility in this respect. It would provide loans and technical assistance to businesses and communities suffering serious injury as the result of increased imports, and it would set minimum levels and periods of unemployment compensation for their workers. It would also provide for retraining and relocation assistance to those workers, as well as the opportunity for early retirement under the social security system.

In addition, it would authorize the President to set a time limit of up to 7 years, when he wishes to bring about the gradual reduction of additional tariffs or quota restrictions which he imposes as the result of Tariff Commission recommendations. This would give assurance to our trading partners throughout the world that, even if the United States increases some important barriers for the welfare of its citizens, these increases may be eliminated once they are no longer necessary. Such an assurance would make much easier the successful carrying out of another governmental responsibility: the constant negotiation for the reduction of high foreign tariff walls and the elimination of remaining discriminatory barriers against U.S. products.

CONCLUSION

The challenge to business and the responsibility of Government in the field of U.S. trade expansion can be met only through the closest possible cooperation between business and Government. But it must be emphasized that Government can only meet its responsibilities with the active support of the people—in this instance the people who, like you, have the most direct interest in foreign trade. Congressional renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and passage of other legislation on exports, as well as the implementation of policies for export expansion, are of continuous interest and concern to you.

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1961]

KENNEDY OFFERS TEXTILE AID PLAN; HINTS AT QUOTAS—DECLARES SEVEN-POINT PROPOSAL VITAL TO NATIONAL ECONOMY—INDUSTRY ENCOURAGED

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—President Kennedy announced today a program of assistance to the textile industry. There were indications that import quotas might be imposed on competing nations.

J. M. Cheatham, head of the American Cotton Manufacturers Association, said he was "highly encouraged." He said he did not know if quotas would result.

"We are encouraged that this is going to lead to some corrective action," he declared.

His organization has long urged quotas as a relief from the heavy import competition felt by domestic manufacturers, particularly in the last 2 years.

While the seven-point program did not mention quotas or tariffs, it was regarded by some in the administration as a "green light" for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to impose quotas on such sources of competition as Hong Kong, Pakistan, and other low-wage countries.

RELIEF FOR OIL IN 1959

This view was based on the seventh of the actions, proposed by the President.

"An application by the textile industry for action under existing statutes, such as the escape clause or the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, will be carefully considered on its merits" he said.

This was interpreted as possible encouragement for the Tariff Commission or the OCDM to favor applications for relief.

The Commission has rejected such applications made under the escape clause of the Trade Act. The clause is designed to assist an industry when it is suffering from foreign competition.

MEETING AT WHITE HOUSE

The OCDM considers requests for relief under the national security clause, designed to prevent damage to the national security through damage to essential industries. In 1959 it restricted crude oil imports, the only time it had granted such relief.

The OCDM, unlike the Commission, is part of the Executive Office.

Mr. Cheatham and other textile men met at the White House today with Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges, Gov. Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina, a textile State; members of the White House staff, and Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce, who heads a Cabinet study committee that developed the program.

Mr. Chatham, head of the Dundee Mills in Griffin, Ga., said the program showed "the President's recognition of the vital importance of the textile products industries to the national economy."

Mr. Kennedy's statement called the industry's problems "serious and deep rooted." He had firsthand knowledge of the subject when he was junior Senator from Massachusetts, another textile State.

After noting that the OCDM had already cited the industry as "essential to our national security," he added that "textiles had a direct effect upon our total economy."

The industry is "our second largest employer" with 2 million workers directly affected by its conditions and 2 million indirectly concerned, the President said.

He also proposed:

A conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries to "seek an international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries."

A study of the possibility of eliminating or offsetting higher prices paid by domestic manufacturers for domestic cotton. Because of an export subsidy paid to cottongrowers, manufacturers in this country now pay 6 cents a pound, or $30 a bale, more than foreign buyers. On August 1, the differential will be 8 cents and $42.50.

Expanded research on new products, processes, and markets, with the Commerce Department cooperating with union and management groups.

A review of depreciation allowances on textiles machinery, assistance in financing the modernization of this machinery by the Small Business Administration, and a proposal to be sent to Congress "shortly" to permit industries hurt or threatened by imports to receive Federal assistance.

No details on any of these points were given.

Mr. Kennedy said he hoped the measures "will strengthen the industry and expand consumption of its products without disrupting international trade and without disruption of the markets of any country."

A political factor underlying the move reportedly was the rise of protectionist sentiment in Congress, where the Trade Agreements Act must be renewed next year.

Congressmen from textile areas have been outspoken in demands for relief from import competition. Many, like Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, are influential.

The views of these men endangered the Trade Agreements Act. Thus, the program announced today could have the effect of satisfying them without threatening the principle of reciprocal trade.

Mr. Vinson said the program "has started us on the right road." He expressed hope that the proposed international conference would do much to relieve the industry of "serious danger."

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island and chairman of a Subcommittee on Textiles, said the administration's attitude, as expressed today, should be helpful in getting responsible action on the Trade Act next year.

Some informed sources thought that an international conference could not be effective in working out voluntary quotas for competing countries because there were too many such countries.

A possible consequence, however, was that some of the biggest exporters to the United States might move to establish quotas for themselves rather than have them imposed by the OCDM.

When Japan was the chief competitor, she imposed quotas on herself and abided by them in shipments to the U.S. market. That was in 1957. Imports dropped that year to 122,400,000 square yards of cotton cloth, from 188,200,000 in 1956.

The effect of this was short lived, as other low-wage nations developed textile industries and discovered that Japan had opened the way for them to enter the U.S. market.

As a result cotton cloth imports increased to 140,500,000 square yards in 1958; 240,400,000 in 1959, and 454,600,000 last year.

This drastic increase was accomplished by more than a dozen competitor nations, as diverse as West Germany, Switzerland, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Spain. Now the 5-year Japanese agreement is expiring and she will no doubt seek to increase her quota for next year.

Textile imports totaled 7.2 percent of all domestic production last year.

LAW DAY OBSERVANCE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on May 1 a ceremony was held in the Capitol which deserves widespread recognition. The occasion was Law Day, U.S.A., and

its observance in the Old Supreme Court Chamber took the form of official judicial proceedings. U.S. District Judge Luther H. Youngdahl, in naturalization proceedings, administered the oath to 25 new citizens. It is fitting indeed that a naturalization proceeding should keynote the observance of Law Day, U.S.A., in our Nation's Capitol, and it is interesting to observe that this marks the first time since the Supreme Court discontinued using the Chamber in 1935 that an official Court proceeding has taken place there. The commemoration of Law Day, U.S.A., here in Washington was only one of many observances throughout the Nation, all of which had as their objective the reaffirmation of the principle of world peace through law.

James E. Palmer, Jr., chairman of the Capitol Hill section of the Federal Bar Association, welcomed the other bar associations joining at the invitation of the attorneys on Capitol Hill in sponsoring this impressive and notable event. These included the bar association of the District of Columbia, the national organization of the Federal Bar Association, the Women's Bar Association, and the Washington Bar Association.

My colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], was the principal speaker. His message was not only inspiring for the new citizens, but merits the consideration of all of us. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This grand occasion has historical significance. We meet here on Law Day 1961 in the same room in which the U.S. Supreme Court regularly met for 75 years. This is also the room in which the Senate met until 1860. It was in this very chamber that Senator Daniel Webster declared in immortal words for "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable."

The idea of a Law Day is new, but the heritage we commemorate on this day is of ancient origin. Our law has its roots in antiquity—in the Torah of the Jews, the first five books of the Old Testament—in the Republic of Plato, the Greek philosopher of the ages—in the Code of Justinian, the Roman Emperor—in the Sermon on the Mount, Christianity's contribution to all mankind. In more modern periods, we have built the foundation of our legal system on the teachings of a German, Leibnitz; a Frenchman, Montesquieu; an Italian, Beccaria; an Englishman, Locke; and many other citizens of the world.

America is a land of immigrants. Our forefathers came to this land from different cultural backgrounds and from nations all over the world. They bequeathed to us a Constitution which has nurtured our Republic and made it strong. America's progress and growth can be attributed in large measure to the vast reservoir of wisdom in the fundamental law.

Our people must never be complacent or self-satisfied. They must never forget their debt to the Old World. Americans are the beneficiaries of a proud inheritance; we are morally bound to pass this inheritance on to future generations ennobled and enriched. Our immigration laws must not unreasonably bar from our shores those who seek to live and work in freedom. We will not thrive in isolation. I welcome you as brothers. I am proud as an American that you have chosen our land in which to spend your sojourn on earth. I am grateful to you for joining our fellow Americans in a constant quest for a better life.

Your admission to citizenship on Law Day is altogether fitting. This is the day on which all Americans commemorate our love of liberty, justice, and freedom. Law is the safeguard of liberty, the arbiter of justice, and the protector of our freedom.

It assures the solution of disputes on the basis of principle, not whim or person. It protects every citizen from oppression. It gives sanctity to our agreements, and security to our lives. It is mightier than any mortal no matter how high his rank or position. Yet it is the servant, not the master, of the people. It is the tool which the people use to promote their welfare and the common good.

We have at times witnessed the deliberate violation of the law by powerful officers in our Nation. These men shame our country and subvert its most sacred heritage—respect for the law. They are weak men who have done us incalculable harm by succumbing to narrow pressures and prejudices. The people must be firm in confronting such detractors. Obedience to the law is an American commandment.

Law is a process, not a thing. It is constantly growing in depth and scope in the manner of a living organism, not an inanimate object.

It must be stable but it cannot stand still if it is to serve its eternal purpose. For the law must adapt to its environment and adjust to the needs it fulfills, just as a person must, to survive and thrive.

Justice Cardoza put it well when he said: "Law is not a cadaver, but a spirit, not a finality, but a process of becoming, not a clog upon the fullness of life, but an outlet and a means thereto, not a game, but a sacrament."

My friends, you know better than I the blessings of liberty and freedom. Some of you have been the personal victims of oppression and discrimination. You can appreciate without any prodding from me the importance of the heritage and challenge you have today embraced.

I welcome you all as citizens of America. As of today, you are equal citizens entitled to the same rights and privileges and subject to the same obligations as Americans whose fathers and grandfathers and great-grandfathers were born in this land. I thank you for choosing our country in which to work and live and serve humanity. May God bless you and guide you and let his countenance shine upon you for ever and ever.

LOSS OF CONTROL OVER FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, my colleagues know I am becoming increasingly concerned over the loss of control over Federal expenditures by the Congress. We too often pass bills which require a later appropriation without considering them in the light of their impact upon our budget deficits. We too often open the door to the so-called back-door spending. We seem to authorize more and more raids upon the Treasury.

It has been my pleasure to be a cosponsor with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] of the proposed Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. This resolution has received a great deal of favorable attention, although I am compelled to state that this attention has been more outside the Halls of Congress than inside. As an example of the type of support which it has engendered let me report that the city of Arvada, Colo., through its city council, has endorsed the principle of Senate Concurrent Resolution 13.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD a letter from the mayor of Arvada, Dr. Gail H. Gilbert, be printed so that my colleagues may see the type of thinking which is becoming more and more prominent throughout our Nation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF ARVADA,
Arvada, Colo., April 25, 1961.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: I received your letter of February 27 in which you describe procedures under Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 which would give the people of this country an accounting of Federal expenditures. I must apologize for this late answer, but the content was so important that I thought it necessary to take it before the Arvada City Council for formal action.

On April 24, the Arvada Council in regular session formally adopted a resolution supporting in principle Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 which has been introduced by Senator BYRD of Virginia, Senator BENNETT of UTAH, and yourself. We realize that this may not have been the usual business before a municipal governing body, but we also feel that as the accepted political leaders of our community, we should give voice to what we are convinced is the general feeling of the 25,000 citizens of the city of Arvada. While we, of course, have no idea of the details involved in this resolution, the council felt unanimously that the very motives as described by your letter were sufficient for us to ask that you exert every effort to see that movements of this or any other similar type be encouraged by you in the U.S. Senate to provide not only a long overdue brake on Federal spending, but also for accounting of expenditures from the vast amount of money taken from the people in Federal taxes.

The growing magnitude of our Federal Government is awesome to say the least. Perhaps much of it is necessary, but in no event does immensity of this Government alone relieve it from a strict accounting for each and every expenditure. Where it was once millions we now speak in terms of billions of dollars. Where once we might have looked with some alarm on a budget not quite balanced, we now amuse ourselves with conjecture on the billions of dollars of deficit spending necessary each year. The council joins with me in sincerely asking that you and your colleagues in the Senate maintain your vigilance in these matters on behalf of the American people. Your efforts will be rewarded because I am convinced that there is a terrific swing toward sane, intelligent Government spending practices.

Sincerely yours,

GAIL H. GILBERT, *Mayor.*

FREEDOM'S LIGHT SHINES THROUGH DEFEAT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, all of us have been deeply shaken by the turn of events beginning with the abortive attempt by Cuban expatriots to return to their native land. I have already made clear my sentiments on the subject. Others have joined me in expressing theirs. One of the most sensitive stories was written by Jack Foster, editor of the

Rocky Mountain News, while in Washington a few days ago. So that my colleagues can share the profound impression I received when reading this article, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM'S LIGHT SHINES THROUGH FOG OF DEFEAT

(By Jack Foster)

WASHINGTON, APRIL 22.—I am writing this at a hotel window looking across Lafayette Square toward the White House.

It is early morning. A thick gray fog drapes the distant finger of Washington Monument and hangs leadenly from the roof of the home of Presidents, veiling its classic pillars. A light shines dimly from the front porch.

This is the mood of Washington today.

The whole city is plunged into a pit of gloom and sadness because of the tragic events that have taken place on what was to be freedom's beachhead in Cuba. Not since the days of Pearl Harbor has the city known such bitter disappointment, as one by one the errors in our leaders' judgment became more apparent.

WE ALWAYS LOSE FIRST BATTLE

Yet now, as then, all minds are turned with understanding through the fog to the light on the front porch, knowing full well that whatever decisions are made within will shape their lives for years to come.

It is the old story of American democracy being retold. This Nation, it seems, always must lose the first battle at the sacrifice of heroes' lives before the real issue is fully realized.

Now that issue is crystal clear. When arms and massive tanks from Communist Czechoslovakia with military precision crushed a brave band of refugees in a stinking swamp at the Bay of Pigs, the cold awakening came.

No longer can we say, and dismiss the matter: We will never let Cuba go Communist.

Cuba is Communist—fully entrenched, amply armed, a partner of Moscow and Peiping, with a secret police force able to control its people—all this 90 miles from the United States.

This fact, in itself, has changed the whole course of American history.

No longer from our hemisphere of security can we wage our crusade for freedom only in distant places. The battle has advanced to our own borders and those nations near us, whom we have considered friends, will be sorely tried as explosions occur within their own countries.

Last Thursday at a luncheon of the American Society of Newspaper Editors (ASNE), I heard President Kennedy meet this issue head on. He said:

"We do not intend to be lectured by those whose character was stamped for all time on the bloody streets of Budapest."

U.S. STAND: RIGHT ON THE LINE

"Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are to the security of our own Nation."

There it was—right on the line. Common causes we want with our Latin American neighbors. But if through fear of the Communist Parties within their own countries, or through weakness and lack of faith, they choose not to join us, then the United States will—and must—go it alone.

The brave men who died at the Bay of Pigs brought the issue to this point—before, we hope, it was too late.

For their sacrifice the American people must ever bow their heads in gratitude. For in defeat they chose to give their lives in the first battle that the last battle might be won.

And someday when the smoke of the last battle blows away and the world begins to pick up the pieces again, I hope that the name of Bahia de Cochinos—the Bay of Pigs—will be changed to Bahia de Heroes—the Bay of Heroes. And a monument, molded by Yankee hands, I pray will be lifted there to their glorious memory. All this, God willing.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will vote on the nomination of Mr. Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran.

This nomination was before the Committee on Foreign Relations. In that committee I voted against a favorable recommendation. I did so on the basis of Mr. Holmes' participation in a transaction which took place in 1948, which I shall attempt to describe.

At that time there was created a National Tanker Corp., with shares outstanding in the number of 1,000. There were three stockholders who were Mr. Holmes, Mr. Klein, and Mr. Casey. The price per share of the stock was $1. The company thus had a capitalization of $1,000, held by three stockholders, including the nominee, Mr. Holmes. Based on the records of the company Mr. Casey owned 400 shares, Mr. Holmes owned 300 shares, and Mr. Klein owned 300 shares.

The corporation, National Tanker, was negotiating for the purchase of three ships from the merchant marine. Before the purchase was consummated, National Tanker, guided by Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein, made arrangements to sell those three tankers before they were ever bought and to obtain a profit of $450,000.

United Tanker, to which the three tankers were to be sold, was capitalized at $2,506,000. The Chinese Nationalist interests put up $2.5 million and three U.S. citizens put up $2 each.

One might ask, "Why was United Tanker organized under these circumstances?" The U.S. Government, under law, declared that the tankers had to be sold to American citizens and that when the ships were operating they were to operate under the United States flag. The Chinese interests, known to Mr. Holmes, Mr. Klein, and Mr. Casey, were prepared to buy the ships and were prepared to pay liberally for them. An arrangement was made that National Tanker would buy the ships, with the knowledge that before the ships were bought the arrangement was made for United Tanker to buy the ships from National Tanker. That was done.

Thus the situation was—and the testimony will so prove—that these three men, knowing there was a law in existence prohibiting the sale of the ships to foreign interests, devised a scheme under which the law was circumvented, and the ships finally passed into foreign holdings. For each of the dollars put up in the capital investment of National Tanker there was drawn down a profit of $450. $1,000 was put up and a profit of $450,000 was made, before the ships were purchased from the Merchant Marine.

On January 24, 1948, as shown by the testimony—I invite the attention of Senators specifically to the letters carried on pages 66, 67, 68, and 69 of the transcript of the testimony taken—before the ships were bought, as I have stated, these men knew there was a profit of $450,000 to be made.

The Merchant Marine learned that there was a purpose to sell the ships to United Tanker, and it sent a letter to National Tanker asking whether it was a fact that National Tanker had arranged to sell the ships.

Mr. Casey answered that letter and stated:

> There have been no arrangements made. There is no contemplation of selling them. The present purpose is to operate under a bottom charter plan the ships in the name of the United Tanker.

I believe a careful study of the record will disclose the facts to be as I have stated them. A scheme was devised to circumvent the laws so that these ships would be ostensibly purchased by a U.S. citizen, whereas, through plot and scheme, they were in truth purchased by Chinese nationalists. That plot and scheme was devised with the knowledge that before the document buying the ships from the U.S. Government was signed, a profit of $450,000 would be enjoyed.

Mr. Holmes stated that in his mind there was nothing wrong with what was done. On page 25 of the record I asked Mr. Holmes certain questions:

> Senator LAUSCHE. How did you contemplate financing the purchase?
>
> Mr. HOLMES. The purchase, we financed the purchasing of five ships previously to this by——
>
> Senator LAUSCHE. No. How did you——
>
> Senator WILLIAMS. Senator LAUSCHE is talking about these three ships.
>
> Senator LAUSCHE. How did you contemplate financing the purchase of these three ships when your capitalization was only $1,000?
>
> Mr. HOLMES. This was an initial, nominal, capitalization, and the hope was to be able to charter these ships and pledge the charter hire.
>
> Senator LAUSCHE. So that is how you hoped to get the money to finance the payment—out of the chartering of the ships?
>
> Mr. HOLMES. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator LAUSCHE. Now then, the question is: Did you have that financing arranged before you formalized the purchase?
>
> Mr. HOLMES. Yes; Senator Williams, I think, has just described it.
>
> Senator LAUSCHE. So that you knew in advance that you would be putting up $1,000 for 1,000 shares. Were there four men or three?
>
> Senator WILLIAMS. Three men.
>
> Mr. HOLMES. Three.
>
> Senator WILLIAMS. And they knew in advance they would be getting back $450,000

for this same stock at the end of the time; is that not true?

Mr. HOLMES. That is substantially true, yes.

Then I put this question to Mr. Holmes:

Did you think there was anything wrong with that?

His answer was:

No, I did not.

I cannot justify our passing a bill a month ago authorizing the spending of $100 million, or whatever the amount was, in order to fight juvenile delinquency, and then approving this transaction as being morally sound. To me it makes no difference whether or not the participants were within the technical and legal provisions of the law.

The scheming makes the moral improprieties worse. The participants set up the plan to circumvent the law by creating a corporation, and giving it the frontpiece of American ownership. when in truth it was owned by Nationalist Chinese. To make things worse, the corporation to which the ships were sold, in which Nationalist Chinese put up $2,500,000 and three Americans put up $6, paid $10,000 for the $2 that each of the three put up. I ask the Senator from Delaware whether I am correct in that statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. In addition, it was proved that the Chinese nationals had an option to buy the $2 worth of stock at any time for $10,000 apiece from these three men. Obviously they received $10,000 for the use of their names as their participation in the scheme to put these ships into foreign ownership.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To summarize, I have never looked with sympathy upon scheming to get around the law. I think it is morally base. In this transaction, those who participated may have circumvented the law. But morally what was done was wrong. The three men were indicted. Subsequently there was a dismissal of the indictment against Holmes and Klein. But the dismissal was on the basis of the finding that one of the participants testified before the grand jury, and by reason of being called to testify before the grand jury, he became immunized against prosecution. The U.S. Department of Justice declared that if one defendant were immunized, it would not proceed against the other two. In sum, that statement is a description of the prosecution. I cannot see my way clear to give approval to that type of conduct. To me it requires denunciation rather than approval.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to join the Senator from Ohio in protesting the nomination of Mr. Holmes. I think it is most regrettable that we would even be thinking of sending as our Ambassador to Iran a man in whom there is an element of doubt as to his integrity.

As the Senator from Ohio has pointed out with respect to this particular transaction, on the 19th of January 1948, 3 days before Mr. Holmes and his two associates were awarded the three tankers by the Maritime Commission, they had entered into an agreement wherein they would collect $150,000 on each tanker that they could get from the U.S. Government and turn over to this foreign group. On the 24th of January, 2 days later, they signed an agreement under which the United Tanker Corp. received from Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein, an irrevocable option giving United the right to buy the 1,000 shares of stock at any time before October 15 at $450 per share.

The National Tanker Corp. had been formed by Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein the day before and capitalized for 1,000 shares at $1 per share.

Mr. Holmes was assigned 300 shares of this stock.

Then to make sure that Mr. Holmes and his two associates would be protected, the United Tanker Corp., which was buying these ships, included in the same agreement a provision that they were to place in escrow $450,000 to guarantee that they would exercise the option.

So there was no speculation whatsoever. The Holmes group had the ships sold to this group of foreigners prior to the time that they actually bought the ships from the Maritime Commission. The law specifically prohibited the sale of these tankers by Mr. Holmes and his associates to this foreign-owned or foreign-controlled company. To justify this sale Mr. Holmes used the flimsy excuse that the company, the United Tanker Corp., was 75 percent American because they had only four stockholders and three of them were Americans.

What they did not tell was that the one foreign stockholder, a Chinese citizen, had $2½ million invested and the three Americans had only $2 apiece invested. In addition, the Chinese citizen also had an option to buy the $2 worth of stock from the three Americans for $10,000 each. This was a $10,000 payoff for the use of their names.

The reason the Government was so anxious to keep these ships under American flag and under the control of the American-owned companies was so that the ships would always be used in the furtherance of American commerce and trade. The Government wanted to be sure that we had control of the ships. For that reason Congress passed the law providing that these tankers, under the Merchant Ship Sales Act, would be sold only to American-owned companies. Congress did not want these American ships which were being sold as surplus to fall into foreign hands.

As evidence that this was not a bad policy, I point out what happened when Mr. Holmes and his group violated this law. The United Tanker Corp. was in effect wholly owned by foreign interests, with $2½ million out of the $2,500,006 capitalization being foreign owned. After they took title to these three tankers from the Casey-Holmes-Klein group, one of these same tankers, the *Kettleman Hills*, was leased to the Soviet Union and was used for the transportation of high octane gasoline from Rumania to Communist ports in China and in North Korea.

The Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, in a letter dated October 4, 1949, vigorously protested this action. I quote from that letter:

The Department of Defense is concerned that two U.S.-flag vessels, the SS *Kettleman Hills* and the SS *Christopher*, have been chartered to transport gasoline and other petroleum products from Constanzia, Rumania, to Dairen, China.

Permitting U.S.-flag vessels to transport high war potential goods to and from Communist-controlled ports presents a definite threat to the national security of the United States.

The rest of the letter I will put into the RECORD later.

Again, on January 19, 1950, the Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, wrote another and even stronger letter, to the then Secretary of State, urging that they stop this trade. Secretary Johnson pointed out the inconsistency of letting this foreign-owned company, which had taken control of these ships, to transport oil and potential war goods for the Soviet Union into Communist Chinese ports and North Korean ports. He also pointed out that what was even worse was that at the same time the State Department was giving the United Tanker Corp. some cargo to haul for ECA. They were hauling for both sides at this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Both sides of what?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under the ECA program the United Tanker Corp. collected $6,600,000 from the U.S. Government to haul ECA products, and they collected close to a half million dollars for the use of two of its tankers for hauling oil for Russia. One of these tankers was the same tanker which had been turned over to the group by Mr. Holmes and his associates.

I cannot conceive that the President of the United States knew about these transactions when he sent Mr. Holmes' name to the Senate. Whoever in the State Department prepared the memorandum for the President of the United States, recommending this nomination, should be called upon to explain why he did not tell the President ail the facts. I cannot conceive of this name being before us if the President had known of these transactions. I do not understand how the Senate could be asked to confirm Mr. Holmes' nomination, particularly in view of the excellent message the President of the United States sent to us earlier this week with reference to the need for establishing a higher code of ethics for Government officials.

There are many more aspects to this transaction which will clearly demonstrate why this man's nomination should not be confirmed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So there will be no misunderstanding, I point out that some refuge will be sought in the proposition that of the 1,000 shares some distribution was made to other citizens. That distribution is shown at page 38. To me, that fact makes no difference so far as the basic question is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. A letter signed by Mr. Julius Holmes as an official of the National Tanker Corp., under date

of January 24, 1948, and signed also by Mr. Klein and Mr. Casey, states that the three of them owned 100 percent of all the 1,000 shares of stock at the time of the transaction.

Mr. Holmes owned 30 percent of this company at the time of the sale to this foreign group.

Tomorrow we shall discuss this particular transaction more fully and also point out another deal involving five other tankers. In this second deal Mr. Holmes and his group made a profit of $2,800,000 on an investment of $100,000.

Again they made their large profit by violating the clear intent of the law when they sold these tankers also to a foreign owner.

PROPOSED REVIEW OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the New York Times of April 26, an article entitled "Reappraising the CIA" discusses the appointment of Gen. Maxwell Taylor by the President to review our intelligence service and paramilitary activities. The editorial comments on the leadership which the distinguished majority leader Senator MANSFIELD has given to the effort of bringing the CIA under some degree of congressional oversight.

As Senators know, my colleague the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], has introduced similar proposed legislation in this session of Congress, and is following the lead of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. So the proposal before the Senate today, instead of being the Mansfield bill, is the McCarthy bill. The objectives of the bills are the same.

I take this opportunity to state once again my solid concurrence with the senior Senator from Montana in his views on the relationship between Congress and the CIA, and in support of the bill introduced by my colleague from Minnesota.

I have also long felt that the proper role of any intelligence body is the gathering of information and the recommendation of alternative policies. I think it is important to emphasize that alternatives, supported by intelligence data in depth, should be available to the President for his final decision.

Certainly the most serious consideration should also be given to the better coordination of the various intelligence services, such as the intelligence services of the respective branches of the armed services. The reports are frequent enough over the years to indicate that there is an insufficient apparatus for the final evaluation of intelligence data from all sources.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article from the New York Times entitled "Reappraising the CIA," and the article which appeared in the Minneapolis Star of April 24, 1961, entitled "Get CIA Out of Public Life." This article was written by C. L. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, and is datelined Paris.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1961]

REAPPRAISING THE CIA

The appointment of a man with the qualifications of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor to review U.S. intelligence services and paramilitary activities suggests the seriousness of President Kennedy's determination to find out what went wrong in the intelligence operations that led up to the Cuban fiasco of last week. The implication is that changes in the functioning of the Central Intelligence Agency, its status and its personnel are contemplated.

We have long supported Senator MIKE MANSFIELD of Montana, now the majority leader, in his contention that Congress should have greater control over the CIA, which, though it spends vast sums of money, is virtually a law unto itself, subject only to Presidential direction. By its very nature it must operate in secret; but a watchdog committee such as Mr. MANSFIELD proposes could serve a useful function without violating security, in much the same way as the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy has done in an equally secret field for years.

An institution like the CIA should be solely a body to gather intelligence, to weigh it, interpret it if required, but not to make policy decisions. It was never intended to make policy, which in the field of foreign affairs is the prerogative of the President working through the State Department. Yet in the case of Cuba, for instance, the CIA's insistence on backing one group and excluding another was a policy decision, and a mistaken one at that.

[From the Minneapolis Star, Apr. 24, 1961]

GET CIA OUT OF PUBLIC LIFE

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

We are an emotional, impatient people with a taste for quick results, a tendency toward extreme disappointment when these are not obtained and a habit of wishful thinking. All these characteristics played their role in the dismal Cuban affair. Consequently, distinguished American leaders privately mutter: "This is our worst defeat since the War of 1812."

That is excessive, although foreign reaction to this operation, from which we feebly pretended to disassociate ourselves, could indeed hardly be worse. That indefinable substance known as American prestige has shriveled. We look like fools to our friends, rascals to our enemies, and incompetents to the rest. The high moral tone we had been proclaiming has risen to an undetectable dog whistle.

Furthermore, we are as addicted to practical maxims as the Turks. We venerate slogans like "Honesty is the best policy" and "Nothing succeeds like success." We now find that fake honesty is the worst policy and nothing fails like failure.

Yet, when breaks appear in the unmitigated overcast, it will be shown that realities haven't changed. Our moral and political leadership have been tarnished. But we remain the strongest Western Power and our policy need not alter because it has been handicapped by folly. Indeed, to judge from the tenor of President Kennedy's speech, Fidel Castro himself must feel forebodings.

The administration seems determined, as a matter of overwhelming pride, that someday he shall fall.

Nikita Khrushchev enunciates the strange doctrine that, while war as an expression of policy is obsolete, wars of liberation are not. For us the Cuban affair approaches a war of liberation under the Monroe Doctrine. And, as the Russians showed us unsuccessfully in Yugoslavia, almost successfully in Greece, and successfully in Hungary, there are various means of fighting such wars under the pretended guise of helping the oppressed.

This is not to be recommended as an American style of action. But it is not to be forgotten that there are precedents in our own as well as others' history.

Moscow might now try to revive some of its old-fashioned barter formulas. It may hint willingness to sacrifice Cuban friends if we yield gracefully in Laos. Certainly Khrushchev would be attracted by any hint that we would guarantee hands off in eastern Europe for similar promises in Latin America. Yet we would be fools and scallawags to contemplate such a deal.

We went wrong three ways in Cuba.

First, those responsible showed inadequate familiarity with history. They might have reread the story of those French Royalists landed by Britain in Quiberon Bay in 1795 to join rebels against revolutionary France. Or they might have reread the story of Bonny Prince Charlie. They would have seen that foreign-aided emigrés cannot succeed without a groundswell of popular support.

Second, we allowed ourselves to be deceived by the jejune optimism of Cubans with whom we dealt and the miscalculations of our agents. In the absence of certain information, cautious pessimism is a sounder basis than hope.

And third, it is clear that our famous Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) has not only failed us but is far too publicized. The CIA performed brilliantly in Iran, during the Mossadegh crisis. It cased the 1958 French situation better than the State Department. It was crudely effective in Guatemala, unsure in Laos and fell flat on Hungary, Suez, and Iraq.

The CIA is infinitely too prominent a feature of our public scene, nor does it seem to take sufficient camouflage precautions. Compare the "Made in U.S.A." labels on the Powers case with the anonymity of Britain's Cmdr. Lionel Crabbe or Russia's Col. Rudolf Abel, who still denies he worked for Moscow.

We don't have to change policy and we can hold leadership because the realities of force and purpose remain with us. The President may decide, if Congress clamors for sacrificial heads, to accelerate his eventual intention of replacing the excellent Allen Dulles with Gen. Maxwell Taylor.

But the important thing is to learn from this grievous mistake. We must postulate our acts on sounder information and weigh more surely the consequences of failure. We must obscure our methods of cold warfare and get the CIA right out of public life. Democracies can sometimes be too curious. And we must learn to obscure our official reactions in a cooler, more studied way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Sulzberger article comments in particular about some of the more obvious public activities of the CIA and its officials, such as speechmaking, articlewriting, and the like. It seems to me that an agency which is as sensitive as the CIA would do better to remain out of public activity and confine its activities to supplying information to the President and other duly constituted officers of the executive branch of the Government and Members of Congress, who would be eligible to receive such information under the McCarthy-Mansfield proposals.

I am pleased to note from an article published in the New York Times this morning and also in an Associated Press

news dispatch from Washington the appointment of Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., as the head of a Presidential Board to watch over foreign intelligence activities. The Associated Press dispatch reads:

The White House announced today that Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., will head a Presidential Board to watch over foreign intelligence activities.

Killian, chairman of the corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, headed the Board when it was set up in 1959 by former President Dwight D. Eisenhower to watch over the Central Intelligence Agency and all other agencies engaged in foreign intelligence.

The remainder of the press dispatch merely notes that the New York Times published an article today giving an interpretation of this move.

Mr. President, it seems to me that not only is it imperative that there be a reexamination of the Central Intelligence Agency and its activities—and this must be done most discreetly and carefully, and must be done in executive session—but it is also equally important that there be some coordination of the intelligence functions of other areas of the Government, so as to provide better relationship and better coordination between the Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence services, particularly those of the Department of Defense and related agencies.

The New York Times article comments in some detail in reference to the press dispatch I have just read.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the article entitled "President Names Killian To Coordinate Intelligence," written by Wallace Carroll and published in the New York Times of Wednesday, May 3, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note that the Board which Dr. Killian will head will have many changes from the Board which was established in 1956. The Board has as its function something entirely different from the study which is underway by Gen. Maxwell Taylor. General Taylor is examining into the Central Intelligence Agency's activities in the recent Cuban affair and will make a report to the President on that matter. Also, he will make some recommendations for the revision or reform of the CIA.

There can be no more important task now than to provide for the Government intelligence services which are informational and reliable, and which confine their activities to supplying information to the policymaking officers of the Government. It is also important that an agency which is, by its very nature, somewhat exclusive and secret at least have some form of supervision, so that it will not begin to think it is a government unto itself. The danger in American foreign policy is that there may be an ascendancy or there may be an overemphasis of the counterintelligence forces and the military, which by the very nature of their actions formulate policy, thereby denying to the State Department, the National Security Council, and the President of the United States the proper opportunity to formulate policy on the basis of the information which is available through the intelligence services.

I want my position to be crystal clear. The Pentagon, the military services, and the intelligence services of the Nation are to be the servants of the policymakers. They are not to be policymakers in themselves. They must not be permitted to be policymakers. They are the experts who must be kept on tap, not on top.

If we have learned anything in recent months in southeast Asia and in Laos; if we have learned anything from the Cuban affair; it is that the preponderance of the emphasis or the preponderance of the activity on the part of the military, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the other intelligence services was overwhelmingly involved in the policymaking functions of the Government, to the point where the actions of the military and the CIA made policy through their preemption of the field.

Regrettably, the policy which is made under such circumstances is all too often not sound. I am one who has a high regard for the Central Intelligence Agency in most of its functions. I want that to be quite clear. I do not think we ought to look for scapegoats in order to solve our problems. These problems have been coming upon us for a long time. They are somewhat a part of the national character. We have not really taken the struggle against communism very seriously, as I have often said on the floor. I shall repeat, every time I have the opportunity to do so, that until this country buckles down to the task of assuming the job of world leadership, which it is capable of doing, it will never be able properly to combat the Communist conspiracy and to overcome some of the problems which beset us. We have not even tried. The world struggle will not be won by solving the problem of parking automobiles. We cannot win the struggle when we do not know what to do with all the food we are producing. No one can tell me that a Nation which nourishes itself on a diet of pills and diet regulations is one which is stripped down for action in the cold war. I am of the opinion that we have grown a bit soft and a bit fat. It is my opinion that until we realize the urgency of the situation and the tremendous challenge which is ours, and that we are fighting the battle of our lives, we will not be able to succeed.

I say most respectfully that it is not the desire of the senior Senator from Minnesota to have an investigation made to ascertain if someone has committed a terrible mistake and then to make a scapegoat of him. I heard one Senator say there is a great difference between an investigation and inquiry. An investigation seeks a scapegoat. An inquiry seeks information. I think we ought to try to get information, so that we can repair any weaknesses in our national security structure. I think we ought to get information, so that we can make proper decisions for the future.

EXHIBIT 1

PRESIDENT NAMES KILLIAN TO COORDINATE INTELLIGENCE

(By Wallace Carroll)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—President Kennedy has selected Dr. James R. Killian, Jr., to lead the permanent Presidential board that monitors the Government's foreign intelligence activities. Dr. Killian is chairman of the corporation of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The selection is the latest of a number of steps taken by President Kennedy to restore confidence in the intelligence services after last month's unsuccessful attempt to set off a counterrevolution in Cuba.

There were developments relating to intelligence problems today on Capitol Hill:

1. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee in closed session questioned Allen W. Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, on the agency's role in the Cuban rebel landings. The committee also questioned Richard M. Bissell, Jr., a deputy director, who was in general charge of the Cuban operation.

2. Support increased in the Senate for a resolution introduced by Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY, Democrat, of Minnesota, to set up a joint congressional committee as a "watchdog" over the Government's intelligence and information programs.

ON BOARD OF ADVISERS

The post for which President Kennedy has picked Dr. Killian is the chairmanship of the President's Board of Consultants on Foreign Intelligence Activities.

This is a board set up in 1956 by President Eisenhower to keep permanent watch over the Central Intelligence Agency and all other agencies engaged in foreign intelligence.

Dr. Killian was the board's first chairman and served from 1955 to 1958. He was succeeded by Maj. Gen. John E. Hull, former commander of the U.S. forces in the Far East and president of the Manufacturing Chemists Association. Now he will succeed General Hull.

Other members of the board are Dr. William O. Baker, vice president for research, Bell Telephone Laboratories, Murray Hill, N.J.; Adm. Richard L. Conolly, president of Long Island University, Greenvale, L.I.; Colgate W. Darden, former Governor of Virginia, Norfolk, Va.

Also Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, chairman of the board, Space Technology Laboratories, Inc., Los Angeles; Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, New York, and Edward L. Ryerson, former chairman of the Inland Steel Co., Chicago.

SOME TO LOSE POSTS

Some of these members will be replaced by President Kennedy. The new Board will be announced in a few days.

The Board is a continuing body and is supposed to report to the President every 6 months. It is thus distinct from the temporary group under Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, whom the President appointed to conduct an investigation of the intelligence activities with special reference to the Cuban landing.

President Eisenhower set up the Board for two purposes.

The first was to meet criticisms of a Hoover Commission task force that found a number of administrative weaknesses in the Central Intelligence Agency.

The second was to head off just such a move in Congress as that now underway to set up a congressional watchdog committee over the intelligence services.

The Board's principal concern was the Central Intelligence Agency, but it was also

asked to keep watch on at least 30 other intelligence activities, including those conducted by the armed services, the State Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and some units of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

EISENHOWER OPPOSED UNIT

General Eisenhower was unalterably opposed to a congressional watchdog committee. So was the Central Intelligence Agency Director, Mr. Dulles.

This Presidential opposition and the personal popularity of Mr. Dulles in Congress helped to defeat a Senate resolution in 1956 to set up such a committee.

The resolution was introduced by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, who is now the majority leader. Mr. Kennedy, then a Senator, voted for it.

The Senators who are promoting the new resolution therefore believe that President Kennedy would not object to a joint congressional committee to keep watch on all intelligence activities * * *. It is also one of the agencies that by the nature of its mysterious operations can involve the United States in the most serious embarrassments and risks.

The Central Intelligence Agency was established in 1947 to gather and correlate intelligence and to conduct the kind of subversive operations that all great powers engage in but seldom acknowledge.

It produces, among other things, a daily intelligence digest that goes to the President every morning.

SIZE OF STAFF SECRET

Its budget and the size of its staff are secret. Only a few Members of Congress have an idea of how much money it receives and spends. Its headquarters staff is scattered throughout Washington in 30 or more buildings but it will eventually move into a new building almost as large as the Pentagon on the Virginia side of the Potomac.

One of its projects that became known was the development of the U–2 plane, equipped to take remarkably clear pictures of ground installations from great altitudes. These planes were used over the Soviet Union to take pictures of rocket launching sites and other military and industrial installations. U.S. relations and a summit conference in Paris at which President Eisenhower met Premier Khrushchev collapsed on the very first day.

The handling of this incident involved the agency in much criticism at the time. The attempt to overthrow Premier Fidel Castro's regime in Cuba revived and increased Congressional uneasiness over the agency's activities.

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY PRESIDENT HABIB BOURGUIBA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, today a very distinguished world leader came to Washington, D.C., the Nation's Capital. As a citizen and as a U.S. Senator, I salute his arrival.

Senators who were Members of this body in 1956 may recall that during the period of the Suez crisis, it was my privilege to serve as one of the U.S. delegates to the United Nations. I returned from those sessions convinced that the United States needed to look for new friends—solid friends, reliable friends—in the Middle East. We needed to look for those reliable friends in some of the Moslem countries, as well as to our reliable friends in the State of Israel.

I pointed out that there was a reliable friend, a friend of freedom, a friend of the West, a man of understanding and vision. He was the President of Tunisia. I said this repeatedly on the floor of the Senate, because I had the privilege of knowing something about the President of Tunisia. It has been my privilege to know his distinguished and worthy son not only as a public figure, but as a friend and as an individual.

I have read and studied much about the political life of the President of Tunisia. I refer to President Habib Bourguiba, who is, in my mind, one of the really great leaders of the second half of the 20th century and a champion of responsible freedom and liberal democracy.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Speaking from this side of the aisle, I am delighted to congratulate the able acting majority leader. What he says is very true. The American people are honored to have as their guest in the Capital City of Washington today, and for several days, a distinguished leader of a proud people, one who has overcome many hardships, and whose activities as the Chief Executive of his nation have been marked by a high quality of statesmanship.

I remember very well when my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, commented considerably on this subject prior to today. I simply congratulate him for the comments he has made in regard to our distinguished guest, and I am delighted to associate myself with those comments by him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the acting minority leader, the Senator from California. I knew his mind and his heart were just as his words have indicated.

I felt that not only should our President extend the official welcome of our country to the President of Tunisia, as he did today, but that also as a man who believes in parliamentary government, free elections, and the cultural institutions of Western civilization, President Bourguiba, of Tunisia, would appreciate, or at least would look with favor upon, some reaction by the Congress of the United States; and I believe I speak for, if not every Member of this body, at least the overwhelming majority of the Members on both sides of the aisle, when I say that one of the great signs of hope in the troubled world of today is the tremendous progress being made in Tunisia in parliamentary government, in economic reforms, and in responsible world leadership.

As an instance of that, I point out that despite the emotions involved in the Algerian crisis, President Bourguiba, of Tunisia, has been willing to act as a mediator between the Republic of France and Algeria, which is in the jurisdiction of France.

So I wish to salute President Bourguiba for that act of statesmanship and courage; and, Mr. President, as one Senator, I wish to welcome him to our Capital and our Nation.

I hope we shall take seriously what President Bourguiba had to say in one of his earlier comments, prior to his coming to the United States. In that connection, I refer to a New York Times dispatch from Amsterdam, which reads in part as follows:

President Bourguiba said he would urge on President Kennedy the necessity of helping Tunisia to strengthen herself to maintain her special character as an African nation.

* * * * *

Mr. Bourguiba said he would give President Kennedy the details of his view that conditions are very good for a negotiated Algerian solution and an ultimate cease-fire in the 6½-year-old war for independence.

* * * * *

It is a favorite Tunisian thesis that the United States should choose pilot countries for massive aid—to set an example of what can be done, as Mr. Bourguiba put it. Tunisia is a favorite candidate of Tunisians and, according to some reports, of the State Department for a pilot role in Africa.

Mr. President, I am not in a position to know whether that is the best area to select. But I say—and I think that, again, I speak for the majority of the Members of this body—that when we pour out our foreign aid, which we are willing to do, we should be most generous with the countries and the leaders who really want social reforms and economic, political, and social progress. I believe we should put a premium upon giving our economic aid to governments which have eliminated corruption and have enacted laws to help the people, and are embracing social and economic reforms. I, for one, am sick and tired of having the Congress appropriate moneys to help areas where the people do not want to help themselves, or areas in which a ruling clique is insisting upon its special privileges or its aristocratic privileges, regardless of the needs of the masses of the people.

I say that a country in which the institutions of government and of economics are designed for the betterment of the people is the kind of country we should help; and we should let others know that we do help such people, and that we are unwilling to help those who are unwilling to help themselves.

Mr. President, we shall talk about this matter further on Monday, in connection with the Latin American aid program. I feel that in my discussions with some of my colleagues, the general tenor of my remarks is fairly consistent with the reactions of the majority of the Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article entitled "Bourguiba Drafts 10-Year Plan Calling for More Aid From the United States."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1961]

BOURGUIBA DRAFTS 10-YEAR PLAN CALLING FOR MORE AID FROM UNITED STATES—TUNISIAN PRESIDENT ON WAY TO WASHINGTON—PROPOSAL TO COST $800 MILLION

(By Thomas F. Brady)

AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS, April 30.—President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia is taking with him to the United States plans and planners to establish a 10-year budget of $800 million for the economic and social development of his country, he disclosed today.

Mr. Bourguiba arrived here at midday on the first leg of a 2-week trip to Canada and the United States. He flew to Montreal and is scheduled to arrive in Washington Wednesday.

Aboard the special plane of Tunis Air, which brought him and his suite to Amsterdam, President Bourguiba said he would urge on President Kennedy the necessity of helping Tunisia to strengthen herself to maintain her special character as an African nation.

FRIENDSHIP LINKS CITED

It was apparent he meant Tunisia's character as the most occidental of the new nations of Africa and possibly the stanchest friend of the United States in the underdeveloped world.

In the political sphere, Mr. Bourguiba said he would give President Kennedy the details of his view that conditions are very good for a negotiated Algerian solution and an ultimate cease-fire in the 6½-year-old war for independence.

President de Gaulle's triumph over the recent mutiny by a group of army officers and parachutists annihilated men who had constituted obstacles to peace, Mr. Bourguiba said.

"I do not doubt General de Gaulle's will to find a solution," he said. "Now the Algerians should overcome their distrust."

It is a favorite Tunisian thesis that the United States should choose pilot countries for massive aid—to set an example of what can be done, as Mr. Bourguiba put it. Tunisia is a favorite candidate of Tunisians and, according to some reports, of the State Department for a pilot role in Africa.

Mr. Bourguiba said Tunisia could be used as an example of what help to a people who work can achieve in increasing economic potential.

The example, he said, would have an important effect on neighboring Algeria, which is moving toward independence, and on the rest of Africa. "Decolonization is not yet finished in Tunisia, and we need reinforcement," he said.

Accompanying the Tunisian President on the trip are five members of his Cabinet, Sadok Mokaddem, Mohammed Masmoudi, Ahmed Ben Salah, Mahmound Messadi and Ahmed Noureddine, Secretaries of State respectively for Foreign Affairs, Information, Finance and Planning, Education and Public Works.

Hedi Nouira, director of the Central Tunisian Bank of Issue, is also in the party. Mrs. Moufida Bourguiba, the Tunisian first lady, is accompanying the President. Their son, Habib Bourguiba Jr., Tunisian Ambassador to the United States and Canada was scheduled to meet the party in Montreal.

United States aid to Tunisia has varied between $20 million and $25 million annually in recent years. The new plan would require an average expenditure of $80 million a year.

Tunisia, Mr. Bourguiba said, expects to find a part of this money herself and hopes also that other countries, such as West Germany, may contribute to the plan.

EDUCATION KEY FACTOR

The plan includes agricultural, industrial and social development, Mr. Bourguiba said. It is his thesis that the essential factor in the permanent improvement of an underdeveloped country is general, basic education combined with technical training. This is why he has brought Mr. Messadi with him to discuss plans for the building of schools and of a Tunisian university.

Mr. Messadi's projects look toward the United States for the financing of school plants. For linguistic reasons, Tunisia looks toward France for teachers. This conception has met with some resistance from the United States because the American aid administrators feel that France should finance some building and the United States should supply some teachers, at least at technical levels.

Mr. Bourguiba said his plan envisaged spending at a slower rate than the $80 million average at the beginning and at an accelerated rate later, when the first investments began to produce results that would permit the more efficient use of funds. The annual average rate would amount to about 20 percent of Tunisia's yearly national revenue.

PROPOSALS TO AID SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during my service in the Senate, one of the subjects in which I have had an especial interest has been American small business. I have now served for 12 years on the Senate Small Business Committee.

This interest is not an academic one for me. In fact, as a boy I was literally raised in an independent business; and, as a young man, I practiced pharmacy in our store in South Dakota. So when I speak about small business and the problems of small business, I believe I have firsthand knowledge of the subject. That knowledge is added to in every month, let me add, as I read the accounting and the reports of a small business institution.

One of the real joys of my service in the Senate has been the opportunity to serve on the Senate Small Business Committee ever since its creation in 1950. I may add that the committee has never shown partisanship. Instead, it has shown a desire to serve the independent businesses of the country. Through the work of our committee, under the able and devoted chairmanship of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], attention here in the Senate has been focused on the problems of small business.

In the past several years, significant progress has been made by the Congress on behalf of small business. We can point to the establishment of the Small Business Administration and to the passage of the Small Business Investment Act—two very important programs to provide small business with the help it needs and deserves if our free enterprise system is to remain strong and vital. And there has been legislation to provide more equitable taxation of small business and to assure it a fairer share of Government procurement and research and development contract awards.

But, Mr. President, much more needs to be done. The facts speak for themselves. For example, a recent study by the Federal Trade Commission reveals that between 1948 and 1958, chain food stores increased their share of total food sales from 26 to 44 percent. During the same period, independent store owners' share of total sales declined from 58 to 25 percent.

These facts prompted the Director of the Commission's Bureau of Economics to state before the Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practice Subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business that:

> We disclose a trend toward mergers which, if continued at this rate, may lead to a few colossal chainstore companies and other competitive groups * * * controlling the great bulk of the retail grocery business in this country.

The same study revealed that 20 percent of the advances scored by chain organizations resulted from acquisitions from smaller operators.

And this is just in the retail grocery line. The pattern is repeated in many other areas.

The overall statistics on the rise in the rate of small business failures are well known to the Members of the Congress.

In 1960, small business failures climbed to a 27-year high; 15,445 firms closed their doors in 1960. This constitutes an alarming rate of 57 failures per 10,000 concerns, the most severe toll in the postwar period. Involved in these casualties were liabilities of $38.6 million—a volume of losses 35 percent higher than in 1959.

According to Dun and Bradstreet, in January 1961, the rate of business failures climbed to 61 per 10,000. And in February, the rate jumped again—to 64 failures per 10,000 concerns.

Clearly there is need for positive action by the Government to aid the small entrepreneur, if we are to avoid becoming totally dependent on economic giants.

Mr. President, yesterday I visited the White House, and had an opportunity, in company with Mr. John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and Mr. C. J. Silver, of St. Paul, the chairman of the National Small Business Advisory Committee, to visit with President Kennedy concerning the problems which affect American small-business enterprises.

The President, being a former Member of this body, was keenly aware not only of the statistical information I have presented here, but also of the need for extra emphasis upon the economic well-being and protection of independent small-business enterprises.

Mr. President, I can say here that President Kennedy called upon Mr. Horne, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and some of the White House staff to check with the Department of Defense and to see to it that a larger percentage of the orders under defense contracts go to independent small-business manufacturers and business institutions, in connection with the provision of goods and services for our Defense Establishment.

The President made it crystal clear that he would not be contented with a record which this year is just as good as that of last year. He wanted a better record. The President was fully aware of the problems that affect business enterprises in areas of economic distress, so-called distress areas, or areas of chronic unemployment. The President raised this point in our discussions, and asked that greater effort be made for the placement of Government contracts with business firms in distressed areas.

This subject has not received much press attention. It is very difficult to

raise the interest of the Fourth Estate in matters relating to the economic salvation of some poor soul in the hinterlands. We are so involved with Laos, Cuba, CIA, and other such matters, that we have forgotten some of our own people and their economic well-being.

I say that when we witness the rising number of independent business failures in our economy, it should be the business and concern of everyone. Thank goodness, the President of the United States, who is so much concerned with our foreign policy and the security and defense of our own country, was not only interested in what we had to say, but led the conversation, and was fully informed. He not only displayed his knowledge of the subject matter, but, also, as the President and as the leader of this country, asked that the agencies of the Government pay special attention to the needs of small business enterprises.

I know Mr. Horne, who by the way, is doing a splendid job as Administrator of the Small Business Administration, was very pleased, and I know the advisory committee, headed by Mr. C. J. Silver, was also pleased to see this interest on the part of the President.

So I am today introducing six bills aimed at the concept of making it possible for business success to depend to a greater degree on an individual's judgment and ability, and not so heavily on his size or power in a particular field.

First, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to impose a graduated tax on the taxable income of corporations. It would substitute graduated rates for the present normal and surtax rates applicable to corporate income. It is drawn in such a fashion as to bring the maximum benefit to those who need it most, the smallest corporations.

The present law imposes a normal tax rate of 30 percent on the first $25,000 of corporate net income and a surtax of 22 percent for a total statutory rate of 52 percent on all net income over that amount. The bill which I have introduced today would substitute the following rates.

If the taxable income is not over $10,000, the tax is 20 percent of the taxable income.

Over $10,000 but not over $25,000, $2,000, plus 25 percent of excess over $10,000.

Over $25,000 but not over $50,000, $5,750, plus 35 percent of excess over $25,000.

Over $50,000 but not over $100,000, $14,500, plus 45 percent of excess over $50,000.

Over $100,000, $37,000, plus 52 percent of excess over $100,000.

I am sure my colleagues will be interested in a comparison of this bill and the present law, and I am, therefore, requesting unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the tax yields at various taxable income levels ranging from $10,000 to $10 million, together with data showing the amount and percent of change in corporate income tax payments that would result from this bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1

Taxable income	Present rate	Proposed rate	Present tax liability	Proposed tax liability	Change	
					Amount	Percent
$10,000	30	20	$3,000	$2,000	−$1,000	33⅓
$15,000	30	21.66	4,500	3,250	−1,250	27.77
$20,000	30	22.5	6,000	4,500	−1,500	25.0
$25,000	30	23.0	7,500	5,750	−1,750	23.33
$50,000	41	29.0	20,500	14,500	−6,000	29.26
$100,000	46.5	37.0	46,500	37,000	−9,500	20.43
$250,000	49.8	46.0	124,500	115,000	−9,500	7.63
$500,000	50.9	49.0	254,000	245,000	−9,500	3.73
$1,000,000	51.4	50.5	514,500	505,000	−9,500	1.84
$5,000,000	51.9	51.7	2,594,500	2,585,000	−9,500	.36
$10,000,000	51.95	51.84	5,194,000	5,184,500	−9,500	.18

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I said at the outset of my remarks that this bill is designed to bring the maximum benefit to those who need it most, the smallest corporations. The table which I have introduced establishes this point. Corporations with taxable net incomes up to $10,000 would make the greatest rate of savings in the taxes they pay under the present law; that is, 33⅓ percent. I should like to point out additionally that these same corporations constitute 63.4 percent of the total number of corporations.

At this time, therefore, I request that a second table, which includes data supplied by the Internal Revenue Service with respect to statistics of corporate income for 1959, the latest year available, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Corporate income tax returns, fiscal 1959*

Net income	Number of returns	Percent of total
Under $10,000	387,490	63.4
$10,000 to $15,000	49,930	8.2
$15,000 to $20,000	35,959	5.91
$20,000 to $25,000	33,648	5.52
$25,000 to $50,000	51,879	8.51
$50,000 to $100,000	23,411	3.81
$100,000 to $250,000	15,814	2.6
$250,000 to $500,000	5,946	.9
$500,000 to $1,000,000	3,197	.52
$1,000,000 to $5,000,000	2,904	.47
$5,000,000 to $10,000,000	420	.07
$10,000,000 and over	533	.09
Total	611,131	100

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, these tables demonstrate that the smaller corporations get the greatest benefit from this graduated income tax bill. Current financing practice and the broad welfare of our economic system make this imminently necessary.

Current financing practice has forced the small concern to rely on its retained earnings as the principal source for its capital, thus restricting its growth potential. This is the story told me by businessman after businessman. It is substantiated by sound economic research.

A few years ago, Profs. John Lintner and J. Keith Butters of Harvard University found that in the period 1925–29 retained earnings financed about 75 percent of the net physical expansion—including inventories—of U.S. nonfinancial corporations; for the period 1947–50 the proportion increased to 80 percent; and in the 3 years 1953–55 it rose further to 87 percent.

High corporate taxes restrict in particular the growth of small companies which are at a disadvantage as compared to the larger corporations in obtaining outside capital on satisfactory terms. The small corporations must rely heavily on retained earnings for growth and development.

Clouding the entire small business problem is the strong merger movement that has invaded our economy in recent years. It has even become advantageous for large corporations to absorb their smaller competitors who have suffered losses, in order to take advantage of their tax savings through loss carryovers.

I wish to add that the tax message sent to the Congress by the President of the United States, including the so-called tax credit for investment purposes, will be of great help. It is something which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the senior Senator from Minnesota have been interested in for many years. What a joy it is to have an administration take the suggestions which the Congress has worked out, as a result of many months of hearings and testimony, and put those suggestions into executive recommendations, with the support of the President and the Executive Offices, before the Congress.

One final observation. The American wage earner has a special stake in this bill inasmuch as the job security and an improving standard of living for thousands and thousands of wage earners depend on the prosperity, growth, and expansion of small business. Over 98 percent of all manufacturing firms in this country employ less than 500 employees. This is a common definition of small business applied by the Small Business Administration. Bureau of the Census figures reveal that 54.8 percent of all persons employed in manufacturing are employed in such small concerns.

Mr. President, in my opinion, and this is based on many years of close study of the problems of American small business, this bill for a graduated corporate income tax gives promise of bringing

meaningful relief to an important segment of the American small business community and at the same time of serving to strengthen the economic and social fiber of our entire free enterprise system.

My second and third bills are closely related. The second bill prohibits the waiver of private enforcement rights under the antitrust laws; the third bill declares private antitrust suits to be impressed with a substantial public interest. Both of these bills have developed as a result of the public hearings held jointly by the Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices, which it is my privilege to chair, and the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. President, our subcommittee discovered that it is common practice in certain industries for major suppliers to require their lessee and contract dealers to waive their legal rights to sue for damages resulting from their suppliers' antitrust violations. Despite the universal recognition of the rule that statutory rights may not be waived where to do so would be against public policy, it was discovered during the hearings that there may be some question as to the applicability of this rule to the waiver of private enforcement rights under the antitrust laws. My second bill is introduced in order to remove all doubt as to congressional intent in this matter.

The third bill introduced here is focussed on a slightly broader scope. It is directed toward the whole role of private antitrust enforcement in protecting small business.

Briefly, let me state that the right of private parties to sue for treble damage redress of business injuries resulting from trade restraints and other monopolistic practices first found statutory expression in section 7 of the Sherman Act. By allowing injured parties to recover costs of suit, plus three times the amount of the damage done, Congress hoped to give businessmen a strong incentive to become copartners, in effect, with the Government in antitrust enforcement. The procedures established reflected a logical uniting of self-interest with public policy.

After a quarter century of experience, however, it became clear that private enforcement of the Sherman Act was falling far short of expectations held for it. Therefore, in 1914, the Congress passed the Clayton Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. Congress reaffirmed the right of private suit and, to make it an effective instrument, proclaimed that a final judgment or decree rendered in a criminal antitrust prosecution against a defendant shall be prima facie evidence against that defendant in a private suit. But, and this is important, the Congress declared this was not to apply to consent judgments or decrees.

Little did the framers of this section—section 5—of the Clayton Act realize that in certain periods to come the Department of Justice would be settling the heavy majority of its antitrust cases by means of consent judgments, thus vitiating the purposes of section 5 of the act. Justice Department records for 1957, for instance, reveal that the Antitrust Division terminated by consent judgment 83 percent of all antitrust cases instituted. By contrast, between 1935 and 1955, only 70 percent of the Government's civil cases ended by negotiated settlements. The necessary result is that private litigants are being increasingly deprived of section 5's benefits and antitrust violators are getting away with minor punishment.

My third bill, therefore, is aimed at restoring private antitrust enforcement to its intended role as a copartner with the Federal Government by declaring once and for all that private antitrust suits are impressed with a substantial public interest.

My fourth bill would require publication of the terms of antitrust consent judgments and orders in the Federal Register, 30 days before such judgment or order is to become final. The purpose here is to give the general public an opportunity to lodge objections to the proposed consent judgment or order with the Justice Department or the Federal Trade Commission. This bill will also enable the general public to put a brake on the light punishments so often meted out to antitrust violators.

Mr. President, I am only one member of the committee. I am chairman of one of the subcommittees. These bills are the results of basic recommendations that have been made by the Senate Small Business Committee and its subcommittees.

Fifth, a bill prohibiting loss leader sales. This bill would amend both the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act by making it unlawful for a retailer to sell any commodity at less than his delivered cost. As defined in the bill, the term "delivered cost" means invoice cost, less discounts, and includes all transportation costs and applicable taxes. Enforcement of the bill's provisions would lie with private parties and would be undertaken by any person damaged by a loss leader practice which affects interstate commerce.

Sixth, a bill to provide for disaster loans to small business concerns which suffer economic injury due to condemnation proceedings under federally aided highway construction programs.

Many small businesses which are forced to move as the result of highway programs have no loan program which would assist them in making the change-over to a new place of business.

In other words, under the highway program, a business is plowed out of existence, and it is said that it is done in the name of transportation. In the meantime, we have transported someone to the relief rolls. I say it is unfair and unjust and something should be done about it.

It has been estimated that as many as 50,000 American businesses may be forced out of their current site in the next few years because of the tremendous amount of redevelopment and highway construction scheduled.

My proposal addresses itself solely to condemnation proceedings of small businesses as a result of federally aided highway construction programs. Clearly this is a Federal undertaking and a Federal responsibility.

The Small Business Act now provides a program of disaster loans at very low interest to business firms which suffer economic hardship as a result of floods, droughts, and other natural catastrophes. These loans are made either by the Small Business Administration directly, or in cooperation with private lending institutions, at 3 percent interest payable within 20 years. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the disastrous effect on many small businessmen who are forced to move is no less complete than a disaster suffered as a result of natural causes.

What difference does it make if a business is moved out as a result of a natural disaster, a flood, or a highway program? If the business is moved out, it is moved out. It seems to me a reasonable suggestion that the same disaster provisions which apply in the event of natural disaster should apply relating to the highway construction program where there has been a forced removal of a business establishment.

It is in my opinion only equitable that there be set up a program to provide such small businessmen with disaster loans to enable them to make the transition over to a new place of business.

It will be argued that in condemnation proceedings there is a constitutional guarantee of just compensation. I am informed, however, that very often business property in particular is undervalued. The courts seldom permit appraisers to take into consideration such items as loss of goodwill, costs of moving the business to a new location, or loss of profits occasioned by the move. It is for this reason that I think my proposal should be enacted.

In view of the scope of the Federal Interstate Highway program which is now underway, this is a problem which is going to be of increasing importance. I believe that now is the time to enact legislation to ease the difficulties of countless businessmen in making the move to new locations.

Mr. President, I introduce these small business bills in the firm belief that the independent businessman is a prime cause and not merely a product of America's economic greatness and strength. It is the energy, ingenuity, competitive challenge of our Nation's 4 million small businessmen which stimulates the timely arrival of a variety of new and better products at prices which everyone can afford. Moreover, it is our small entrepreneurs who, by their number and diversity and independence of action, constitute the most effective safeguard against the creation of corporate giantism and monopoly. So long as small businessmen remain numerous, healthy, and prosperous, our economy will continue free and competitive, and thus a fount of opportunity for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1803. A bill to provide for disaster loans to small business concerns which suffer economic injury due to federally aided highway construction programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. CLARK, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1804. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, for the purpose of prohibiting loss leader sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I suggest to my colleagues, Mr. President, that some of the recent disclosures with respect to identical bids, which reveal there is little or no competitive instinct or even competitive tactics, should be a matter of alarm and concern not only to the Justice Department but also to the Congress. I hope some day the Congress will become as concerned about some of the institutionalized practices of corporate business as it is with regard to the great trade unions.

We pass laws to make substantial reforms and corrections in labor-management relations. Laws are passed by overwhelming votes. There was such a body of public opinion in this country, created by certain disclosures and by a certain amount of propaganda, that the Congress of the United States by an overwhelming vote established new rules of conduct in the field of labor-management relations. Many of the trade unions complained bitterly because of the interference by the Government in, as they call it, their private activities. Nevertheless, the Congress acted.

What bothers me is that when a trade union official is caught utilizing some of the funds of union members in a manner which the Congress finds undesirable, there is an outcry in the Congress which can be heard round the world, but when we learn of instances in which consumers have been overcharged millions of dollars or the Government of the United States has been overcharged millions of dollars because of fixed prices, because of collusion on bidding, because of identical bids by substantial numbers of companies on items which ought to have some competitive difference, the Congress simply goes rolling along as if, somehow or other, this was a little egg-rolling contest on the White House lawn instead of something about which we should be concerned.

I suggest that all the moral outburst which took place a year ago, which resulted in passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill, has lost some of its fervor, apparently, when the other side is exposed.

I am not one who thinks business is corrupt. I do not think labor is corrupt, either. I think some labor leaders have gotten completely out of hand, and there were some corruptionists in the labor movement. I think it was fitting and proper that laws be directed to correct the weaknesses, and that the persons guilty be punished.

Mr. President, I wish to say with equal candor and fervor that when we find the antitrust laws of this country are being ignored or openly flouted, when we find the Government of the United States is the victim of administered prices, monopolistic practices, oligopoly, and all forms of violation of what we call free enterprise, the Congress of the United States ought to be as concerned as the Justice Department.

Thank goodness that the present Attorney General and, I add respectfully, his predecessor have demonstrated a keen concern over what is a very obvious abuse of the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and other laws designed for the preservation of free enterprise.

I hope that we may at least act positively now by giving small business an opportunity to protect itself from the inroads, the aggression, and the imperialism of monopoly and what we call giant corporatism, which grinds out the very life of independent enterprise.

RECESS TO 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, in executive session.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1961, at 11 o'clock a.m., in executive session.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 3, 1961:

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Joseph F. Radigan, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years, vice Louis G. Whitcomb, resigned.

John H. Reddy, of Tenessee, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years, vice John C. Crawford, Jr., resigned.

B. Andrew Potter, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Oklahoma for a term of 4 years, vice Paul W. Cress.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Edward A. McDermott, of Iowa, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

A. S. J. Carnahan, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sierra Leone.

UNITED NATIONS

Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the ninth session of the Economic Commission for Latin America of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A. Everette MacIntyre, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1961, vice Robert Thompson Secrest, term expiring.

CENTURY 21 EXPOSITION

Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, of Minnesota, to be U.S. Commissioner for the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition, now known as Century 21 Exposition, vice Philip M. Evans, resigned.

U.S. MINT, DENVER, COLO.

Fern V. Miller, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be senior surgeons

Marvin S. Cashion
Louis S. Gerber
Dominick J. Lacovara
Louis J. Oropallo
Bernard F. Rosenblum

To be surgeons

Baruch S. Blomberg
Carleton R. Dean
Walter H. Freygang, Jr.
James P. Shortal
Chen Tung Sun
Hugh F. Williamson
Harold C. Woodworth

To be senior assistant surgeons

Ray A. Brinker
Vincent A. DiScala

To be senior dental surgeons

Charles J. Donnelly
Isadore J. Jarin
Harry J. Kunstadter
Louis L. Murzin

To be dental surgeon

Stanley Raynor

To be senior sanitary engineers

Clarence J. Feldhake
Jens A. Jensen
Daniel J. Weiner

To be sanitary engineer

Paul F. Woolrich

To be pharmacists

Cornelius B. Kelly, Jr.
Dwight D. Wendel

To be senior scientists

Elwin E. Bennington
William F. Buren
Leo O. Emik
Robert H. McCauley, Jr.
Herbert F. Schoof

To be scientist

Albert S. Perry

To be sanitarians

George J. Burton
James A. King
Wilbert R. McLean
Stephen Megregian

To be senior veterinary officer

Earl J. Catcott

To be nurse officers

Hilda H. Falls
Elsie K. Y. Ho
Ovelia Winstead

To be dietitians

Rebecca T. Crockett
Margaret L. Smith

To be therapists

Martha D. Collins
Edith W. Palmer

To be health services officers

Louisa E. Haas
Stanley I. Hirsch
Max T. McKee
Elsa J. Nelson
Albert E. Rhudy

To be senior assistant surgeons

William J. Atkinson
John R. Baugh
George T. Harding, Jr.
Otto L. Loehden
Robert J. Warren
Frederick V. C. Featherstone

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

James W. Knowles

To be senior sanitary engineer

Joseph L. Minkin

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The words of Jesus in John 9: 4: *I must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day for the night cometh, when no man can work.*

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that our lives, which are so brief at their longest and so broken at their best, may in these dark days be aglow with the light and leading of Thy divine spirit.

May this be for us a time of faith and good works and, in a world shaken with strife, may we join hands and hearts in a new convenant of love and loyalty, pledging our allegiance to those age-long values and lofty principles which are eternal and forever true.

We earnestly beseech Thee that the difficult problems which demand to be solved and the things which are happening may never cause us to be downhearted and dismayed.

Inspire us to be numbered among those valiant and heroic souls who believe that a better day is coming and are continually praying and working for it and are seeking to prove ready for it and worthy to receive it.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

POLAND LOOKS FORWARD TO FREEDOM

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, throughout their whole history, the Polish people have never surrendered. From time to time, their country has been invaded by powerful neighbors. It has been occupied by foreign troops. But every effort to subjugate Poland has failed because the deep and enduring faith of the Polish people in freedom can never be conquered.

On May 3 of every year, people of Polish origin throughout the world celebrate their Constitution Day, as they have done for 170 years, and will continue to celebrate, forevermore. In this they are joined by hundreds of millions of freemen who are one with them in spirit as they affirm the irrevocable right to "government of, by, and for the people."

We in the United States, where so many of our friends and neighbors are of Polish ancestry, admire the accomplishments and the qualities which they contribute to the mainstream of American life. Because of the close spiritual kinship between Poland and the United States, we shall give every aid and encouragement to the Polish people in regaining their independence.

In honoring the great national holiday of Poland, we are serving notice on the Kremlin that we shall never be diverted from our friendship for and loyalty to the Polish people and their right to a representative government chosen through free and democratic elections.

To the Polish people we send this message: "We are celebrating your Constitution Day to let you know that we shall never forget what we owe to you. The time of your liberation is coming nearer."

YEAR-ROUND COMMERCE ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago a number of House Members representing the Great Lakes area joined with me in introducing a bill to provide for an investigation and study by the Corps of Engineers of ways of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation on a year-round basis.

Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary for me at this time to cite the astonishing increase in tonnage which has taken place in Great Lakes shipping since World War II. This, of course, is the result of a natural increase in our domestic economy, of increased imports of minerals from Canada and elsewhere, and—perhaps most dramatically—as a result of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I hardly need point out, too, that this increased activity has taken place in an inland waterway which, because of ice conditions, operates only 8 months a year.

Mr. Speaker, with the increased technology which is now available to us, and with the ever-increasing commercial challenges which our Nation must meet in the years ahead, the time has come to explore the feasibility of maintaining Great Lakes shipping on a year-round basis. Considerable scientific thought has already been directed to this matter and it is for this reason that legislation is now being introduced for a comprehensive review and correlation of such factors as water thermal conditions, geography, prevailing weather conditions, and other factors which, if not immediately, must be explored in order to eventually extend the shipping season for year-round commerce on the Great Lakes.

POLITICAL FUNDRAISING TACTICS OF SECRETARY UDALL DEMONSTRATE NEED OF KENNEDY ETHICS BILL

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post this morning carried a story which indicated that Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall admitted he has organized class C and other top-drawer Interior officials into a Democratic Party ticket sales agency, for the specific purpose of selling $100 tickets for the forthcoming celebration of President Kennedy's birthday.

The article states further that the Secretary has directed these public servants to sell tickets to other persons who have contact with the Department of the Interior.

I regard this as highly improper and I suggest that the President clean house at the Department of Interior. It is apparent that the Secretary has outlived his usefulness as an administrator and has lost the trust of the American people.

If the President wants to use Udall as chief ticket salesman, he should get someone else as Secretary of Interior. The high-sounding phrases of the Kennedy presidential campaign would seem to demand that a man who attempts to use his high Government position for political fundraising be removed from the Cabinet.

President Kennedy has had much to say in the past about conflict of interest. Secretary Udall's scandalous betrayal of trust is obviously in conflict with the interest of the American people in good government.

Referring to the President's recent message to the Congress on ethics, I commended his statement at that time, and in particular his conclusion that these recommended standards can be best maintained by personal example of those in leadership. This statement appealed to me then. It appeals to me now. Mr. Udall's actions in my judgment are in direct contradiction to this Presidential declaration. He is a prime example of the need for a code of ethics.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 5963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 153)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President

of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 10 of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, covering its activities for the year ended December 31, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1961.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 152)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization in the Civil Aeronautics Board.

This Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961 follows upon my message of April 13, 1961, to the Congress of the United States. It is believed that the taking effect of the reorganizations included in this plan will provide for greater efficiency in the dispatch of the business of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The plan provides for greater flexibility in the handling of the business before the Board, permitting its disposition at different levels so as better to promote its efficient dispatch. Thus matters both of an adjudicatory and regulatory nature may, depending upon their importance and their complexity, be finally consummated by divisions of the Board, individual Board members, hearing examiners, and, subject to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 241), by other employees. This will relieve the Board members from the necessity of dealing with many matters of lesser importance and thus conserve their time for the consideration of major matters of policy and planning. There is, however, reserved to the Board as a whole the right to review any such decision, report or certification either upon its own initiative or upon the petition of a party or intervenor demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Board the desirability of having the matter reviewed at the top level.

Provision is also made, in order to maintain the fundamental bipartisan concept explicit in the basic statute creating the Board, for mandatory review of any such decision, report, or certification upon the vote of a majority of the Board less one member.

Inasmuch as the assignment of delegated functions in particular cases and with reference to particular problems to divisions of the Board, to Board members, to hearing examiners, to employees, and boards of employees must require continuous and flexible handling, depending both upon the amount and nature of the business, that function is placed in the Chairman by section 2 of the plan.

By providing sound organizational arrangements, the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the accompanying reorganization plan will make possible more economical and expeditious administration of the affected functions. It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1961.*

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 274) providing for the consideration of H.R. 6441, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6441) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Pubic Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 274 provides for the consideration of H.R. 6441, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control. The resolution provides for a straight open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 6441 is to extend and strengthen the Federal water pollution control program and to assist the States and local communities in providing for more effective programs of water pollution control at all levels of government.

The bill as reported by the Committee on Public Works would vest in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare full responsibility for the conduct of the Federal water pollution control program authorized by the act.

Water has become the No. 1 resource problem confronting the United States today.

The water problem is directly related to our country's rapid population and economic growth. This growth is creating a major impact on water resources from a rapidly growing demand for water to produce the things we need to eat, wear, and use, and for an ample supply of clean, safe water for drinking and for recreation.

By 1980 our population is expected to reach the 232–274 million range. Probably the most significant population growth trend is that toward urbanized living. Also, by that time more than 90 percent of our people will live in cities and towns, half of these in cities over 50,000 population or their suburbs.

In addition to population growth and concentration, the phenomenal growth of industry will also continue. Production of goods increased sevenfold from 1900 to 1950 and is expected to double the 1950 figures by 1975.

The result of population and economic-industrial growth will be a tremendous increase in fresh water use. By 1980, our estimated fresh water needs will nearly double present water use.

The Committee on Public Works conducted hearings for 4 days on the legislation, at which time testimony was presented from witnesses representing municipal and county government associations; State health, engineering, and pollution control administrators; conservation and civic groups; industry and labor representatives; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 274.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, this, of course, is not a new proposition to come before the House. It has been before the House in some form or other for every session of Congress since I have been a Member.

I would like to point out, however, that in the committee there has been no account taken of this extra $50 million in the bill by the supplementary budget that has been sent to the Congress by President Kennedy. Stated in another way, it means that if this bill passes with the additional $50 million a year, as recommended by the committee, it will mean that the budget for 1962 will be imbalanced by $50 million more than was estimated when the Kennedy supplement came to the Congress a few weeks ago. I am advised that it was not included, and I think justifiably so, in that budget because the additional $50 million

a year was not authorized and, therefore, it would not have been proper to include it in a budget estimate.

The administration has a rather nebulous position on this legislation, as I would construe it. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare supported the main objectives of the bill, but he did not make a clear-cut statement, as I read his letter of transmittal, in favor of it.

I think it is important to point out at this time the minority position. The minority has taken the position that there is some justification for a Federal incentive payment, for the abatement of pollution in our streams. The minority, however, has taken the position that this subsidy should be reduced or confined to an incentive, not converted into another Federal financial obligation that goes on, and on, and on, and gets larger and larger each year. That has been the position of the minority.

President Eisenhower vetoed a bill similar to this 1 year ago. The minority views are set forth in the report. The minority views this year are consistent with the position taken by the previous administration.

There are a few principal differences. One, of course, is the increase in cost per annum, which is doubled. There is no use to discuss it further, because it will be well covered, I am sure, when we get into general debate.

Then there is the matter of jurisdiction. This, I think, is very important. The jurisdiction of the Federal Government is extended to virtually every stream or waterway in the United States, and that is a rather far reaching departure, should I say, from the original bill passed in 1956. Despite the fact that the question of jurisdiction has been pretty well spelled out in the bill, I would like to ask a question about the effect of the jurisdictional extensions to the Federal Government in the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 45]

Blitch	Hagan, Ga.	Passman
Boykin	Jensen	Riley
Celler	Kearns	Rousselot
Coad	Kirwan	Selden
Davis, Tenn.	McSween	Siler
Flynt	Murray	Thomas
Gray	O'Brien, N.Y.	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 412 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1961

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] is recognized.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just before the point of no quorum was made I had announced, as I analyzed the bill, three important differences, and I was about to state the Republican position that might be offered in the way of amendments after general debate has been completed.

One of the principal differences in this bill over present law, of course, is the extension of Federal jurisdiction to all navigable streams; and the language is so broad that almost any stream or body of water within the continental United States might be included. Since we are extending the jurisdiction of the Federal Government so far as pollution of water resources is concerned, I think it should be made abundantly clear that we are not in any way interfering with or abrogating any existing States rights in the way of regulation or control over uses of water within the States. I have, therefore, prepared a question, a copy of which I have already given to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works who is in charge of this bill, and also to the ranking minority member. I think the record should be clear at this point at to what the intent of the committee as jurisdiction of the Federal Government was extended, so to speak, in respect to the control of water. The question is this: By extending the control of the Federal Government to abate pollution to all navigable streams, has the committee made the record abundantly clear that they have not intended in any way to abrogate or interfere with any other existing State rights, authority, or control over water flowing through its domain or along its border?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the question is very pertinent in asking if the committee had made the record abundantly clear that they have not intended in any way to abrogate or interfere with any other existing State rights, authority, or control over water flowing through its domain or along its borders.

The answer is, very definitely and most emphatically, Yes, the committee has made it clear. And I cite for the RECORD the language of the bill under consideration, H.R. 6441, page 1, line 10:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters of such States, including, but not limited to, the power, authority, and jurisdiction of such States to enforce State water-pollution control laws and regulations.

Again, on page 8, line 17, the bill states:

> State action * * * shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a final order or a court order.

Finally, the committee report states, page 5:

> The committee has exercised extreme care to assure that the language of the bill will allow continued comprehensive action by the States in the field of water-pollution control. There certainly can be no assumption that the Federal interest in the field of water-pollution abatement authorized by this bill is so dominant as to preclude State action. The proposition is well established that the protection of the health and welfare of the citizens of a State is a proper subject for the exercise of the State police power. The bill provides specifically for cooperation with the States and its aim is to encourage and assist States and local communities in their efforts to control water pollution, not to usurp or preempt their rights, powers, or responsibilities in this field.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman for his response. Would the response made, as I was able to understand it, in respect to the abatement of pollution apply similarly with regard to any other existing State right over waters within the domain of the State?

Mr. BLATNIK. No, it would not affect, impair, or detract any existing rights whatsoever.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

I would like to ask the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Florida, if he concurs in that response.

Mr. CRAMER. I agree with the gentleman from Minnesota with regard to abrogating rights of States in other fields. It does not do that. It deals solely with the subject of water pollution control. In the field of water pollution control it obviously abrogates existing States rights under existing water pollution control laws. In these respects—this is to some extent where the minority differs with the majority—under present law today the Federal Government has no jurisdiction in the field of water pollution control; under Public Law 660, it has no jurisdiction over intrastate water, waters flowing in and arising within a State and not crossing State boundaries. In that sense, in that this bill does include intrastate water, it provides Federal jurisdiction over all navigable water and the State's responsibilities and the State's right in that respect are substantially abrogated.

The second basic area in which States rights in the field are being abrogated, again where the minority differs with the majority, the States do not have a right to join in any court action to enforce orders relating to either interstate or intrastate, or both interstate and intrastate waters under the now elastic controls. The partnership program in existence under Public Law 660 is largely abrogated under the new bill.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman. This rule should be adopted, and I also urge the adoption of amendments later to be offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Works has reported that "Water has become the No. 1 resource problem confronting the United States today." Even now, along heavily populated river banks, the available water has to be used over and over again. Five and six time reuse of water in our major river basins is a certain prospect.

The discharge of raw sewage into these rivers makes pollution control an absolute necessity to protect and conserve

the water quality for each downstream community, industry, farm, and recreation area. Obviously, this requires the complete cooperation of all concerned, through the construction of waste treatment works at various points along the course of each river.

We must purify and reuse available water, because the growth of population and industry will create a demand that will exceed the developed dependable fresh water supply by 85 billion gallons daily, within 19 years. Research into methods of desalting sea water at a low cost, in order to serve the needs of our population and economic growth points to the urgency of our present water problem.

The fragmentation of the news has hidden from the American people the seriousness of this national problem, and the extent to which various communities are trying to clean up the polluted streams for the supply of usable water that is essential to life and progress.

Over the past 4 years, contract awards for sewage treatment plant construction have averaged almost $360 million annually—an increase of 62 percent over the 5-year average before Federal assistance became available.

As of March 31, 1961, a total of 2,671 grant offers have been made aggregating $219.3 million. These in turn supported construction of projects having eligible costs totaling $1.27 billion. Every Federal dollar expended has been matched by over $4.80 in local funds.

Federal financial assistance has been of substantial help in the progress made so far, but the backlog of need is greater. According to the Public Health Service, 4,136 new plants are required for 23 million people in communities now discharging raw untreated sewage, and communities where existing treatment works are obsolete and require replacement. Another 991 communities need major additions and enlargements of existing inadequate plants to provide satisfactory treatment for 19 million persons.

In addition to many other rivers, the greater part of the Hudson River is excluded under the present law from Federal enforcement jurisdiction as are important reaches of the Tennessee, Columbia, Colorado, and Merrimack Rivers.

The bill before us will extend to them the authority for Federal abatement enforcement action to the pollution of waters which endanger the health and welfare of any persons.

The older industrial States of the Northeast have shown initiative in facing up to this problem. Since the enactment of Public Law 660, five States in the Nation have originated financial assistance programs predicated on the Federal program, and three of these are in New England: Maine, Vermont, and New Hampshire. They are to be commended for their foresight and willingness to participate in a true Federal-State-local partnership. It is hoped that other States will follow their example, and their sense of public responsibility.

The seriousness of the Nation's water pollution problem makes it imperative for the Federal Government to assist local communities in the construction of waste treatment plants, even in those States that do not provide similar financial assistance. However, I believe that the grant formula should be changed to provide a larger percentage of Federal aid to those communities where their State governments have assumed a share of the financial responsibility.

Summing up, the additional grants provided by H.R. 6441, will help to solve the water supply problems of the Nation that are approaching the critical stage.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, our distinguished majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the committee has done a very excellent job in the consideration of this bill. The bill reported out is one that is for the best interests of our country, and I hope that the bill as reported will be adopted without any amendments.

The committee has given excellent consideration to the bill and all aspects thereof. The bill now before us represents not only necessary legislation but legislation that brings about progress in the interest of our country and our people.

One of the most important problems confronting us, not only the people of America but people everywhere, is the matter of water pollution, the control of our polluted streams, the cleansing of them. In connection with that, an important matter confronting our people is clean, clear water for their use. This is particularly so in view of the increased population that is taking place, and it constitutes a great challenge to our country and to our people.

Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation is not one that originated in one particular political party of the Congress. As far back as 1948 Senator Taft and the then Senator Barkley were leaders in not only introducing legislation but in fighting for the passage of water pollution legislation. As a matter of fact, the program in 1948 that they submitted as I remember, in the other body called for an $880 million authorization. As I also remember, it was for a 10-year period. The program before us now calls for a $100 million authorization each year for a period of 10 years, so that the program before us now constitutes in its entirety $1 billion. Already, under the law upon the statute books, more than 2,600 localities have received $220 million of Federal funds and the total construction cost of those projects is $1.27 billion. In other words, for every dollar appropriated by the Federal Government in connection with this program the local communities, either State or local subdivisions, have contributed close to 5 additional dollars.

This legislation has the support of the American Municipal Association, the Conference of Mayors, and every major conservation organization. The legislation, as I have said, is bipartisan in nature, initially brought about by two great men who made their contributions toward the original legislation, the late Vice President Alben Barkley, when he was a Member of the U.S. Senate, and the late Senator Taft. We are now continuing the legislation. This bill proposes a continuation of this program for an additional 10 years. As a matter of fact, if I had my way, $100 million a year would not be sufficient. In any event, that $100 million a year means a total expenditure of about $500 million a year, with the local participation.

Mr. Speaker, this is a step in the right direction, and I urge not only the adoption of the rule but the passage of the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6441) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6441, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, water has become the No. 1 resource problem confronting the United States today.

The water problem is directly related to our country's rapid population and economic growth. This growth is creating a major impact on water resources from a rapidly growing demand for water to produce the things we need to eat, wear, and use, and for an ample supply of clean, safe water for drinking and for recreation.

By 1980 our population is expected to reach the 232 to 274 million range. Probably the most significant population growth trend is that toward urbanized living. By 1980 more than 90 percent of our people will live in cities and towns, half of these in cities over 50,000 population or their suburbs.

In addition to population growth and concentration, the phenomenal growth of industry will also continue. Production of goods increased sevenfold from 1900 to 1950 and is expected to double the 1950 figures by 1975.

The result of population and economic-industrial growth will be a tremendous increase in fresh water use. By 1980, our estimated fresh water needs will total 600 billion gallons a day—nearly double present water use.

In the past, we met rising demands for water largely through construction of storage facilities to increase the amount of water available for use. Now, however, the limit of the amount of dependable water supply is in sight. The maximum dependable fresh water supply we can ever hope to develop by engineering works is estimated to be 600 to 650 billion gallons a day by the year 2000. This is our fixed water supply—foreseeably all

the Nation will ever have to support continued population and economic growth.

By 1980 the developed dependable fresh water supply is expected to total about 515 billion gallons a day. Therefore, by 1980 demand will exceed supply by 85 billion gallons. It is obvious that the Nation's water needs from now on must be met by using the same water over and over. Thus, the highest priority in water resources developments must be given to the all-important need of providing for the cleanliness of the limited water supply so that it can be used and reused in meeting the Nation's increasing requirements for water for all purposes.

Water reuse on a large scale is already a necessity. Some of the water in every stream is used one or more times with much greater reuse of streams in developed areas. During low flows it is estimated that the flow of the Ohio River is used 3.7 times. Five- and six-time reuse of water in our major river basins is a certain prospect.

Water must be of suitable quality to be reusable, however. Used water is invariably polluted water and pollution degrades its physical, chemical, biological, and esthetic qualities. Multiple water reuse, therefore, will require highly effective pollution control to protect and conserve water quality if streams are to serve each downstream community, industry, farm, and recreation area.

We have entered the era in water resource conservation and development in the United States where water quality management must have the highest priority in supplying present and future water supply needs. An important segment of water quality management has been and will be accomplished by providing storage of good quality waters for water supply purposes and for dilution of downstream pollution. For the Nation as a whole, however, water quality management can best be effected by the prevention and control of pollution. More "new" water can be provided to meet needs by controlling pollution than by any other means. Pollution control has the advantage of permitting the use of an already available distribution system, the waterways of the country, to deliver water of satisfactory quality to the points where it is needed.

H.R. 6441 will establish the more effective Federal water pollution control program needed to assist the States and local communities in obtaining the highly effective pollution control necessary to protect and conserve the water quality of the Nation's waterways.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF THE BILL
ADMINISTRATION OF THE PROGRAM

The Committee on Public Works has watched carefully the progress and development of the national water pollution control program and particularly the supporting role of the Federal Government. The committee has always believed that the objectives of the program should be given high priority in an appropriate administrative framework in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Existing law provides that the pollution control program be administered by the Surgeon General through the Public Health Service under the supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The administrative status of the program has not changed since 1948 when it was originally established despite a great increase in program activities, responsibilities, personnel, and appropriations. During public hearings the committee heard testimony favoring the establishment of a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The President has urged the establishment of a special unit in the Public Health Service to administer both air and water pollution control programs.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, recognizing the need to upgrade pollution control activities in his Department, asked the committee for "time to take a complete fresh look at the situation and the various proposals for dealing with it."

In order to give the Secretary complete flexibility in effectuating his decision relating to the proper administrative status of this program the bill transfers responsibility for the administration of the Federal water pollution control program from the Surgeon General to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This action is in conformity with recommendation No. 14 of the first report of the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (H. Doc. 55, 81st Cong.) which states:

> Under the President, the heads of departments must hold full responsibility for the conduct of their departments. There must be a clear line of authority reaching down through every step of the organization and no subordinate should have authority independent from that of his superior.

I am sure that in reaching any decision on this matter the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare takes into consideration the fact that the water pollution control program established in 1956 and strengthened by this bill goes far beyond the usual public health legislation in that it assigns to his Department the responsibility for controlling water pollution to conserve water for all uses—propagation of fish and aquatic life and wildlife, recreational purposes, industrial and agricultural—including irrigation—supplies, and other legitimate purposes, as well as public water supplies and protection of the public health.

Nothing in this bill is intended to impair or in any manner affect any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters of the States, including but not limited to the power, authority, and jurisdiction of the States to enforce State water pollution control laws and regulations.

The committee has exercised extreme care to assure that the language of the bill will allow continued comprehensive action by the States in the field of water pollution control. There certainly can be no assumption that the Federal interest in the field of water pollution abatement authorized by this bill is so dominant as to preclude State action. The proposition is well established that the protection of the health and welfare of the citizens of a State is a proper subject for the exercise of the State police power. The bill provides specifically for cooperation with the States and its aim is to encourage and assist States and local communities in their efforts to control water pollution, not to usurp or preempt their rights, powers, or responsibilities in this field.

Every time during the past several years when this vital legislation is discussed on the floor of the House, some Members express concern because the entire matter is not left to the States and local communities for disposition. However, the inescapable fact is that the record shows that effective enforcement measures against pollution of this Nation's waters have been accomplished quicker, more effectively, and with better cooperation on the part of State and interstate agencies when guidance and assistance are rendered by the Federal Government.

The problem is simply this: The matter of water pollution control is so vital and so nationwide in its importance that it can best be coped with by the joint efforts of the States and Federal Government. I do not believe that anyone will seriously contend that the participation of the Federal Government is not desirable in this effort to prevent pollution of our waterways. Essentially, under the provisions of the bill, the role of the Federal Government is that of a stimulator, a supplier of spark, to keep the vital pollution abatement program moving. Federal enforcement measures against pollution of navigable waters are undertaken independently only when State or interstate action to abate pollution of navigable streams are shown to be inadequate. It is clearly provided in section 8(b) of the bill that it is the intent of Congress that State and interstate action to abate pollution of navigable waters shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except when such State or interstate actions are shown to be ineffectual. This is the clear intent of the act. However, effective water pollution control and enforcement measures against pollution require a joint effort by all governments concerned, including Federal, interstate agencies, State, and municipal. In view of the broad spectrum of the problem, I do not believe that it will be seriously contested that, for the program to be successful, it must be guided by a paramount authority, which authority can only be, by the very nature of the problem, the Federal Government.

This bill contains no subtle plot to encroach on State preserves. The declaration of policy, not only in the section of the bill pertaining to enforcement measures, but also in the first section of the bill provides that it is the intent of the bill to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution. It is further stated in section 1(b) that nothing in the act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any

right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to waters of such States including but not limited to the power, authority, and jurisdiction of the States with respect to waters of such States to enforce water pollution control laws and regulations.

How now—I ask—can it be conceivable that there is any implication in the act to infringe on any right or jurisdiction of any State with respect to enforcement measures against pollution of waters in that State? If this bill is enacted, and I am confident it will be, the declaration of policy spelled out in section 1 clearly shows that nothing in it—that is, nothing in the act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner restricting the right or jurisdiction of a State in regard to enforcement measures against pollution of waters in that State. In the face of such unequivocal language, I must say that it seems to me that any objection to this bill on the ground that it in any way restricts the State's powers to enforce measures against pollution of waters within that State appears specious.

RESEARCH AND STUDIES

Research has always been recognized as a basic Federal water pollution control responsibility. The need for a much greater Federal research effort was consistently recognized during the hearings on the bill.

At least six permanent regional water pollution control laboratories, fully equipped and staffed with skilled laboratory and field project personnel, are badly needed to support expanding programs in comprehensive program development, special field study projects on specific problems, basic data, and enforcement; also, much needed increases in technical assistance to State and local agencies and in connection with projects and other Federal water resources agencies. At present the Public Health Service must establish temporary facilities, make such use of the Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati as distance permits, rely on the facilities of others, or contract for needed laboratory services.

The bill authorizes the establishment of regional water pollution control laboratories in various sections of the country.

The bill also authorizes a continuing study of the quality of the waters of the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes constitute the largest single source of fresh water in this hemisphere. They must be protected from pollution caused by population and industrial growth and increased shipping.

STATE AND INTERSTATE PROGRAM GRANTS

A significant provision in existing law is that providing for matching grants to State and interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate water pollution control programs.

The bill increases the appropriation authority for program grants to State and interstate agencies from $3 million to $5 million annually and extends the authorization to June 30, 1971.

GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT PLANT CONSTRUCTION

Under existing laws there is authorized $50 million annually in Federal grants to communities to assist them in the construction of needed waste treatment facilities. This program has been in operation since 1956. Over the past 5 years contract awards for sewage treatment plant construction have averaged almost $360 million annually—an increase of 62 percent over the 5-year average before Federal financial assistance became available.

Every Federal dollar expended has been matched by over $4.80 in local funds.

Despite the great progress made as a result of Federal financial assistance, much more remains to be done. Construction since 1957 has been largely offset by new needs and the number of needed projects remains at 5,100 sewage treatment plants.

In addition to the backlog of treatment plant needs, population growth will continue to create new needs. If municipalities are to catch up by 1970, they will have to spend an average of $600 million a year to eliminate the backlog, provide for new population, and to replace the plants that will become obsolete.

In order to stimulate construction up to $600 million a year, the bill authorizes an increase in Federal financial assistance from the present $50 million annually to $100 million annually and an increase in the total grant authorization from $500 million to $1 billion.

MAXIMUM GRANTS

The need for construction of treatment plants by municipalities exceeding 50,000 population amounts to about 30 percent of total needs, yet these cities have received less than 15 percent of the Federal grant funds under existing legislation. Further stimulation of projects in these areas is desirable. To provide Federal financial assistance to achieve more effectively the required stimulus of necessary construction within this group of communities, the bill would limit the Federal grant to 30 percent of the first $1 million of the estimated reasonable cost of a project, plus 15 percent of the next $2 million, plus 10 percent of the remainder of such cost, but subject to an $800,000 ceiling; however, no grant of more than $250,000 shall be approved for a project in any State until all applications filed prior to the effective date of enactment of this bill have first been approved.

JOINT PROJECTS

In order to encourage the construction of projects serving more than one municipality, the bill would apply this ceiling to each municipality's share of the cost of the project. The grant for joint projects would be the total amount each participating municipality would have been awarded had it constructed a separate facility with a ceiling of $2.4 million for such projects.

REALLOCATION

The bill would also provide for reallocation of construction grant funds of a State that are not obligated for the construction of approved projects within 18 months after allocation.

DAVIS-BACON

The bill also requires that with respect to work performed on sewage-treatment projects, the taking of such action as may be necessary to insure payment of wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. These provisions now apply to all direct Federal construction, as well as to contracts for school, hospital, housing and airport projects constructed with Federal-aid funds.

ENFORCEMENT JURISDICTION EXTENDED TO NAVIGABLE WATERS

Under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, Federal enforcement authority applies to pollution of any interstate waters, which the act defines to include "all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across, or form a part of, boundaries between two or more States." Under this definition almost all coastal waters are excluded; so are waters which, though they may be navigable, do not cross or form part of State boundaries.

In addition, Federal enforcement authority covers only pollution of interstate waters, defined as above, which "endangers the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates." Thus only pollution having an interstate effect is subject to abatement under the existing law.

The bill amends existing law by extending the authority for Federal abatement enforcement action to the pollution of any navigable waters—including coastal waters—which endanger the health and welfare of any persons.

ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

The bill makes a number of changes in existing law relating to procedures in initiating and carrying out Federal enforcement actions. First, in addition to requests from a State water pollution control agency or the Governor of any State to initiate action, as provided in existing law, the Federal Government would be required to enter a case if a municipality, with the concurrence of the State, requests such action.

It is particularly heartening and encouraging to note that at long last the municipality is being brought into the cooperative Federal-State partnership in enforcing abatement of water pollution.

Municipal water supply ranks high on the list of beneficial uses of water. The Water Supply Act of 1958 gave Federal acknowledgment to the importance of providing for present and potential municipal water supply needs in the planning and construction of Federal water resources projects. Our burgeoning population growth, most notable in our urban areas, and the shortages of water already being commonly experienced in various sections of the Nation make imperative the protection and maintenance of the quality of our available water supplies.

The major impact of pollution is felt most immediately by the municipality faced with the problems of having its municipal water supplies degraded. Where such supplies are made unusable by the injurious effects of pollution, the municipality is put to unusual expense in adopting more costly water purification methods in order to provide its citizens with this basic essential. Out-of-basin diversions, some of them traversing great distances, are already the only manner in which the water supply needs of some municipalities may be met.

All of these factors amply justify bringing the municipality into the enforcement partnership. Under the bill's provisions, a municipality adversely affected by pollution and unable to secure relief under its State's laws is presented with the opportunity of being instrumental in bringing Federal enforcement authority into force. This is a truly progressive measure for strengthening the effectiveness of total enforcement authorities by combining Federal, State, and local efforts to abate pollution.

Second, the bill makes Federal enforcement procedures available not only in cases where the pollution discharge crosses State lines, but also whenever there is pollution affecting legitimate uses of the water of any navigable stream whether or not there is interstate pollution. Federal jurisdiction in intrastate pollution situations, however, would be exercised only upon request from the State or from a municipality with the concurrence of the State. No direct Federal action can be initiated in such a case without such a request being made by the affected State.

Third, the bill clarifies and strengthens the role of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the enforcement process by providing that the findings and recommendations of the hearing boards shall be the Secretary's findings and recommendations, except to the extent modified by him and authorizing him to issue an order—instead of a notice—based on his findings and recommendations for abatement of any pollution found to exist. To afford adequate protection for the parties in interest, provision is made in the bill for an appeal from the Secretary's order to be taken within 60 days to the U.S. court of appeals. If such appeal is not taken the order shall be final.

Fourth, if action reasonably calculated to carry out the Secretary's order is not taken, he could request the Attorney General to bring a civil action in the U.S. district court to enforce any order issued by him or, after appeal, by a U.S. court of appeals.

This bill should be passed, as the present limited enforcement jurisdiction does not permit sufficient latitude to accomplish fully the interests and purposes of the act, that is the conservation of water resources for the use and benefit of the Nation. Many important segments of some of the Nation's waters are outside the present Federal abatement enforcement jurisdiction. For example, the Missouri River from the Kansas State line to just above St. Louis is untouchable. The greater part of the Hudson River is also excluded, as are important sections of the Tennessee, Columbia, Colorado, and Merrimack Rivers.

Present law also excludes from the Federal abatement jurisdiction the greater part of the Great Lakes and their tributaries, the coastal waters and coastal streams of the Nation, important international boundary streams such as the St. Lawrence, Niagara, Lower Colorado, and Rio Grande. The same situation pertains in regard to international streams flowing across our northern and southern borders. For example the Red River of the North in Minnesota, Lake Champlain in New York, Souris River and Riviere des Lacs in North Dakota, and the Flathead and Kootenai Rivers in Montana.

The degree of exclusion under the present act is indicated by the fact that there are 1,080 municipalities each discharging wastes equal to a population of 4,000 or more into 845 navigable intrastate water bodies. And also that of the estimated 26,000 water bodies in the country, only about 4,000 are interstate within the meaning of the present act.

An extension of Federal authority to abate pollution in navigable intrastate streams is consistent with scope of the authority of the Corps of Engineers to protect and improve navigation for the promotion of interstate commerce. In fact it would complement that authority.

Extension of pollution abatement enforcement jurisdiction would have other beneficial effects. It would serve to accelerate and facilitate our goal of clean water to promote the general welfare of the Nation; reduce the incidence of disease and the spread of disease; improve health and increase the abundance of fish and wildlife including shellfish in coastal areas; and bolster the economy by providing industrial sites where unsuitable water now precludes them.

The proposals of the bill would be beneficial in balancing equities between big and little cities; neutralizing State authority against recalcitrant polluters. The extension of authority would also accelerate abatement processes by permitting cities to request Federal abatement action, with, of course, the consent of the State, when State agencies might have to delay such action for reasons of budget and personnel limitations and the like.

Unless this extension of jurisdiction is given now, I feel future generations of America will be justified in considering us derelict in our duty.

Some ask whether the States can handle the matter alone.

In 1948 the Congress passed the first water pollution control bill. It expressly stated a policy of support of State action. In 1956 the law was made permanent and expressed the same policy—support the States. The Federal Government has paid out millions of dollars in Federal money for construction of sewage treatment facilities, for technical assistance to the States, for research in water problems, and for other administrative cost of the acts. But have the States been able to do a job with all this help? The facts show they have not scratched the surface. As of 1960 according to the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers this country still needs 4,136 new plants to serve 22,997,547 persons and this does not include extensions and replacements. That number totals 991 and would serve 19,243,178 people. The conference also estimates it will cost $2,014,435,400 to clean up the backlog of municipal waste treatment needs.

Now let us take a look at State effort to enforce their laws. The Public Works Committee conducted a survey of the States the purpose of which was to assess tangibly the utilization of enforcement action by the States. The study covering replies from 42 States showed that of the 37 States having authority to issue administrative orders 8 have never done so, only 12 have issued more than 50 each.

The record for court actions is not much better. Seventeen of the 42 States have never instituted court action and only 3 States have instituted more than 15 cases.

It is interesting to note that those States whose laws are less than 10 years old have been proportionately more active in enforcement than those whose acts have been on the books more than 10 years. In fact 5 of the States which have had laws in effect for more than 20 years have averaged 27 orders and 4 court cases since the law was passed while those whose laws have been in effect less than 10 years averaged 34 orders and 11 court cases each.

This is not an impressive record nor in view of the backlog figures can it be said that there is no need for enforcement in the States. The only reasonable conclusion which can be drawn is that active, effective, and extensive Federal enforcement is needed to achieve the objectives of the act.

DISCHARGES FROM FEDERAL INSTALLATIONS

The bill amends existing law to provide that summaries of conferences prepared as a result of an enforcement action shall include references to discharges from Federal installations and that notices of hearings pursuant to the enforcement section shall be sent to Federal agencies having jurisdiction over any Federal property involved and that findings and recommendations of the hearing board shall also include references to discharges from Federal property which are contributing to pollution found by the hearing boards.

That concludes my discussion of the major provisions of the bill, Mr. Chairman.

In conclusion I would like to add that although it has long been axiomatic in American politics that the promises so encouragingly held out in party platforms are promptly and speedily forgotten, we would not have expected so complete a disregard of their announced party stand on the part of our minority friends.

The 1960 Republican Party platform, in the section auspiciously devoted to human needs, includes this pledge in the subsection on health:

> Strengthened Federal enforcement powers in combatting pollution and additional resources for research and demonstration projects.

Fully as pertinent was the statement on natural resources enunciated by their standard bearer in October of last year. In its comment on the Federal role in pollution abatement, this statement is unequivocal. Allow me to quote:

> It is clear now, however, that amendments to the existing Water Pollution Control Act should be sought so that its provisions can be extended to apply to all navigable waters.

The minority portion of the committee's report has its own answer to this worthy and noble sentiment. It states:

> Therefore, we believe that the provisions of existing law which limits application of Federal abatement enforcement measures to interstate waters should be continued in force.

This view is no less difficult to understand when the draft legislation proposed by the previous administration as recently as January 18 of this year is taken into account. In his communication accompanying the submission of the draft legislation, the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare made it pointedly clear that Federal enforcement authority to abate pollution was being requested for application to significant intrastate as well as interstate pollution situations. His recommendations were made in accord with and in fulfillment of the President's directive contained in his 1961 budget message.

We must unhappily conclude, therefore, that the minority members of the committee are engaged in throwing into the discard all of the well-intentioned and meaningful provisions for strengthening Federal enforcement which have been put forth by the more enlightened among them. Once more, as so often before, they offer us too little, too late.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in behalf of the minority, we had very pleasant sessions in discussing this bill. We had the cooperation of the majority, and I think the minority party contributed considerably to the discussion. I am very proud to state that in the consideration of this bill, the minority party on the committee had 100 percent attendance at those meetings. This shows their interest and it shows their sense of their responsibility in relation to this very important subject—and it is a very important subject. We think we have a good bill, but it can be made better.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, may I say of our very dear friend and deeply respected colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, that the gentleman is being quite modest as far as his own personal contribution and his support of this program is concerned. I, as chairman of the subcommittee, would like to state that the original bill in 1956 very likely would not have come out at that time had it not been for the understanding of the problem and the cooperation and assistance of the leader of the majority on our committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. My colleague's kind statement has sort of taken the thoughts out of my mind.

But, Mr. Chairman, we feel we can make this bill even a better bill. I urge and beg every Member of the House to read the minority report, which we worked on with a great deal of care. I hope you will read it because I know you will get some benefit from it. And I will read a few sentences from it in the first paragraph. It reads as follows:

> We feel that this bill does not give proper recognition to the responsibilities of the States to participate, along with the Federal Government and municipalities, in the costs of construction of necessary sewage and waste treatment works; that it imposes unwarranted obligation upon the Federal Government to finance the construction of facilities which are the primary responsibility of State and local governments; and that the responsibilities and interests of the States are abrogated beyond reason or necessity by the new Federal enforcement measures to secure abatement of pollution.

Mr. Chairman, on our side of the aisle, the gentleman from Florida, has made a great study of this question of stream pollution. I am going to yield to him such time as he may require. I want to express the views of many of us on the committee, on both sides of the aisle, our appreciation to him for his study and his interest in this very important matter. We may not agree with his conclusions, but still he commands our respect; and I am pleased to yield such time as he wishes to consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, in keeping with the attitude of sweetness and light prevailing, I will cut my remarks short.

Mr. Chairman, I have some deep-seated feelings with regard to this legislation. I will attempt to express them as briefly and pointedly as possible. I, too, want to say that the committee did take a considerable amount of time in the consideration of this legislation. Amendments were offered to try to improve the legislation.

It is our position that we would like to clear up this water pollution control bill, to make a good bill out of it, to make an effective bill out of it. The purpose of the minority, Mr. Chairman, is not to make a limited partnership out of what is presently a full partnership program between the States and the Federal Government. In my opinion, that is precisely what the majority-recommended bill to the committee does. It would make a very limited partnership, if a partnership at all, out of what is presently an effective full partnership between the States and the Federal Government. Let me make certain that my position is clear concerning the matter. We recognize that there are serious water pollution control problems like there are serious other problems throughout the Nation, but the fundamental question remains: What is the proper Federal function in this field? And the converse of it is: What is the proper State function in this field?

I happen to be one who believes in the fundamental principle that there are certain State responsibilities that are coordinate with States rights; that there is such a thing as a vertical separation of powers as conceived under our Constitution; that there are certain reserve powers of the States; that there are proper Federal, State, and local government functions as conceived by the Constitution. I agree that the States should exercise their reserve rights fully, but at the same time must have their rights protected.

So, fundamentally, the issue is: What is the proper State function? What is the proper Federal function? And how can this bill be amended in order to observe this basic concept of Federal-State partnership?

To get to the crux of the matter, let me explain briefly what the present law does, Public Law 660, in this field of State-Federal relationship and what the new proposal does. It is our position that the new proposal practically divests the States of their intrastate pollution enforcement authority and weakens their interstate abatement say-so as compared to the present Public Law 660, and this is precisely what I mean.

Under existing law, Public Law 660, full enforcement measures for the abatement of pollution apply only to the pollution of interstate waters, waters flowing between States, and solely with respect to pollution which endangers the health and welfare of persons in any State other than that in which the discharge originates. That is the present law. Thus, under existing law, Federal abatement proceedings apply only to interstate waters. The minority has no argument with the proposal as recommended by the previous administration of broadening the enforcement of the Federal Government relating jurisdictionally only to interstate streams to include a noninterstate pollution itself, but limiting it to interstate streams as a jurisdictional matter, because of the difficulty in proving that pollution crosses State lines.

When such pollution is believed to exist the Surgeon General may on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, initiate the Federal administrative abatement proceedings by calling a conference of affected State water pollution control agencies or such proceedings may be commenced by the Surgeon General when requested by a State water pollution control agency or the Governor of any State.

This, of course, is in an interstate situation.

The end product of these administrative procedures consists of findings and recommendations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relative to the existence of such pollution and action to be taken for its abatement.

If action is not taken to secure abatement of the pollution, the Secretary may request the Attorney General to bring a suit on behalf of the United States to secure such abatement, but only with the written consent of the State water pollution control agency or any officer or employee authorized to make such request of the State or States within which the pollution is discharged or at the written request of the State water pol-

lution control agency or any officer or employee authorized to make such request of any other State where the health or welfare of persons is endangered by such pollution.

So in order to initiate a proceeding under the present law, which applies only to interstate water, the States may concur in the initiation and must concur in the request for court order setting forth what the action shall be to abate the pollution.

What does the new bill do? I think a brief discussion of it will indicate why the minority is concerned, in that the authority of the Federal Government is greatly broadened to the exclusion of the States in the water area; therefore, that is why particularly under those circumstances we feel jurisdiction should be limited to interstate waters, in addition to the basic question that intrastate water jurisdiction righfully belongs to the States in the first place and should be retained by them. If it is not retained by the States, if intrastate jurisdiction is not retained over some of these streams, the State water pollution control agency program is going to dry up and wither, and then you will not have a Federal-State program.

Every committee that has studied the problem, including the Kerr committee, and I have the report before me of the other body, also the recommendations of the recent national conference on water pollution, the President's recommendation to the Congress last session; all of these, as set out in the minority views, have all stressed the basic concept of the necessity of keeping the States in the program and of beefing up the State program. Even the present bill has a provision for additional funds to help States establish administrative procedures and agencies to beef up their own water pollution control agencies on a State level.

On the other hand, we are saying, "All right, we want the States to go ahead with their program, but we are going to limit the jurisdiction; as a matter of fact, we are going to take away jurisdiction; the Federal Government is going to have jurisdiction over all waters." You can hardly conceive of a stream of water that is not going to be taken over by the Federal Government as far as water pollution control is concerned under the legislation proposed.

Let me indicate how that comes about by a discussion of the proposed bill.

Under the bill the Federal enforcement measures for abatement of pollution apply to all navigable waters, and if you will look at the bill, H.R. 6441, on page 8, dealing with enforcement measures, section 8(a), reads, the pollution of "navigable waters." That is the terminology that sets forth the basic jurisdiction for control under the new bill.

How about the present law? Section 8(a) of the present law provides "pollution of interstate waters."

So, the proposal is to change the jurisdiction from "interstate" to "navigable" waters. The previous administration under President Eisenhower recommended that the interstate concept be maintained; that the intrastate jurisdiction should be retained by the States and was very explicit in spelling that out in those recommendations. But, he did recommend, and we agree, that if the pollution itself is not of an interstate nature, but if it occurs on an interstate stream, then the Federal Government should have jurisdiction. But, as to what the basic jurisdiction test should be, that it must be an interstate stream, should be maintained. That is the position of the minority, and that is the amendment that will be offered by me at the proper time to offer an amendment, to add the word "interstate" in order to retain State jurisdiction and provide the Federal Government with its proper jurisdiction without injecting itself into proper State functions.

Under the new bill Federal enforcement measures apply to all navigable waters, whether interstate or intrastate, and with respect to any pollution, whether the pollution is intrastate or interstate in character.

Federal administrative enforcement procedures: Now, let me explain these procedures. They have been substantially tightened. I personally favor tightening these procedures in some respects. I do not favor using an intrastate test for jurisdiction on one hand and tightening the procedures and thus eliminating the States from having a part in those procedures on the court order level which they presently have, doing both things—eliminating State jurisdiction on intrastate waters and eliminating State rights and responsibilities in concurring in the request for a court order, which is the present law. I object to that approach.

As it relates to interstate waters, the minority is agreeable that the procedure should be tightened up when relating to interstate waters, in order for the Federal Government to do its job in this field in interstate waters where it properly has its jurisdiction.

Now, let us discuss how these administrative procedures are changed. I have discussed the administrative procedures under present law requiring State concurrence. Under the old procedure the Secretary or the Surgeon General could not issue an order that was enforceable. He only issues and recommends concurrence of the State, and then the court is asked to issue a court order setting forth what shall be done to abate the pollution. Now the procedure is that the Secretary shall issue an order as the result of, first, a conference being called; second, a public hearing being called; third, an order being issued by the Secretary which is enforceable by the court, enforceable without concurrence of the State in requesting such enforcement. The State is not consulted on the order itself as is the case under present law. The State is not consulted on going into court to enforce that order, which is the present law. And, this applies not only to interstate streams but to State streams as well, that is, intrastate streams. The States do not have any say so.

As to whether the stream is within their own State boundaries, whether the Federal Government shall enforce the Secretary's order by going into court, these are the changes being made:

In instances where pollution of navigable waters is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates, whenever requested by the Governor, the State water pollution control agency, or the governing body of a municipality, the Secretary may commence such proceedings or he may initiate such proceedings without any request from a State on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies. So, in an interstate case, the Federal Government can initiate the program without request of the States, and can ask for a court order without request of the States. In the case of intrastate pollution, of course, the States are consulted on the initiating procedure. They have a right to a membership on the hearing board, but beyond that they having nothing to say about what the order shall be that the Secretary issues or whether that order shall be enforced through court action.

There is where there is a difference of opinion between the minority and the majority. We do not believe, under those circumstances, of such stringent and broadened enforcement provisions, that the Federal Government should have jurisdiction over intrastate waters; particularly under those circumstances. Basically we do not believe they should have such jurisdiction in the first instance.

Mr. Chairman, there are numerous other aspects, but there is generally serious concern even among some of the State pollution control agencies with regard to the Federal Government taking over what is presently State jurisdiction; because the obvious result is going to be that their jurisdiction will be shrunken and the Federal jurisdiction expanded. How we are going to bring the States into this program, working with them to abate pollution, which we all want to do, by increasing Federal jurisdiction into even intrastate waters, asking for a court order without State approval, is beyond me. I do not think that is the approach. I think as related to interstate, yes—intrastate, no.

Mr. Chairman, briefly with regard to financing, in the last session of the Congress the President vetoed a similar matching-fund bill, providing for an additional $40 million annually. The House sustained the veto. The House at that time passed a bill similar to this, providing $100 million in Federal grants-in-aid money, which actually is a community facility program. The Senate passed a bill for a lesser amount, $80 million. A compromise was reached at $90 million. That bill was passed by the House and Senate but the President vetoed it and the House sustained that veto.

The amendment to be offered by the minority with regard to that, so far as I am concerned, will be one to reduce the amount from $50 million increase to $25 million increase and to require State matching as of 1965, giving the States adequate opportunity to enact legislation to provide for State matching funds.

Again, if this is to be a partnership program, if the States are to be brought

into it, even the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said in testimony that he would like to see more States in the program; the question is, how do you encourage them to come in? He had no answer to that. He, himself, wanted them to come into such a program. The question is, how do you encourage them, how do you offer an incentive? I think the logical way to do it is to provide for a requirement of State matching for moneys in excess of the present program, effective in 1965, giving them ample opportunity to act, so that we can have a true partnership program on the State-Federal level. Those are the amendments which will be offered by the minority at the proper time.

Mr. Chairman, I promised to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, as the answer to the question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY], a member of the Committee on Rules, made it abundantly clear, we do not enter into the matter of States rights. We extend the potential Federal enforcement into intrastate waters, waters within a State, only when that is initiated by the State itself, which is shown by the specific language on page 8 of the bill, line 24, which reads as follows:

> Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State water pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State water pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated).

Then the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can come in with proceedings, the conference, the hearings, and the final order. This will strengthen the States.

Mr. CRAMER. Will the gentleman then explain the meaning of the language on page 10, lines 8 to 13, which very clearly states that in an interstate situation where the public health and welfare is involved the Secretary himself without request by the States can bring such an action?

Mr. BLATNIK. This has been discussed all through the hearings. The gentleman has been talking about the Federal Government's injecting its enforcement powers in connection with intrastate waters. Now the gentleman comes around and dodges on the other side of the question. Read the language. It refers to interstate situations. I will discuss either one. Let the gentleman pick it out, but stick to the one he picks out.

Mr. CRAMER. There is no difference in opinion. As I stated at the outset, State concurrence is required in connection with interstate waters but is not required in connection with intrastate waters. Is that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. It never was.

Mr. CRAMER. The point is that you are going to extend it to intrastate waters. Does the gentleman say the Federal Government has jurisdiction over intrastate waters under the present law?

Mr. BLATNIK. None. The Federal Government can come in only when the Governor of the State or the health agency feel they need to be bolstered in their attempts to enforce pollution abatement. They themselves must initiate it by asking the Federal Government.

Mr. CRAMER. We have no disagreement on that.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman did not make it clear.

Mr. CRAMER. That is the procedure required, but I ask the gentleman if it is not true that the States do now have a right to participate in making the order or having the order enforced, which is the present law.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Of course there is a different order provided for in the new bill than the order that is provided for in the law.

Mr. CRAMER. That is precisely what I asked in my question. As to the Secretary's order, which he now has authority to issue, as it relates to intrastate streams the States are not consulted on that order, nor are they consulted or required to request court enforcement of that order, which is the case today even on interstate streams. Is that not correct, under present law?

Mr. BLATNIK. No. We would like to proceed and clarify this immediate question of jurisdiction.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman agrees that on an intrastate stream the Secretary has the right to issue an order, the States are not parties to the draftsmanship of that order, and that order can be enforced in court even on intrastate streams without the State's making the request. Is not that correct?

Mr. BLATNIK. The State initiates the whole operation.

Mr. CRAMER. The answer of the gentleman is "Yes."

Mr. EDMONDSON. The answer is not "Yes."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], who is chairman of the Watershed Committee and one of those who had a most intimate and direct role in the drafting of this legislation and conducting the hearings and writing the final report.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of the fact that this bill today, the Blatnik antipollution bill, is the first major bill to come from our committee in the present Congress. It is also one of the major items of legislation that is part of the program of the present administration to help provide a better utilization of our national resources in the United States. The chairman of our subcommittee has made very clear the urgency involved in getting this program fully underway. The matter of money, of course, is of great concern to all of us. We wish it could be done at less cost, but we know also that if the minimum which is proposed in this bill is not utilized now, it will cost far more in just a few years.

ENFORCEMENT

We have had a lot of smoke thrown up in the air about this bill in regard to the enforcement procedure, which is really the heart of the matter in regard to these antipollution programs. The whole purpose of this bill so far as the enforcement section is concerned is to give the States a strong arm and a stronger weapon in enforcement. Every type of enforcement involved here is concurrent enforcement. It had to originate with the States. If the States did not start it, it would never be underway. It gives the States a weapon to use in carrying forward this enforcement that they might not be able to have through their own machinery.

We had a lot of talk earlier about the difference between the present law and the change with reference to navigable waters. But, obviously, that means very little. Actually, this talk about the States rights here is nothing more than a smokescreen to cover the efforts of those who would not like to get this thing passed. The best demonstration of that is the fact that every bit of opposition against this is being activated and pushed by the paper companies, the biggest offenders involved in this problem. I hope Members of the House will not be so lax in their duty as to actually fall for this type of propaganda that is being presented by the people who are the worst offenders in this country, and that they will not be misled by some noble words about the type of enforcement. This effort to prevent a strong enforcement provision from being put in this bill is being pushed by the people who do not want pollution to stop. If you want to join with them in preventing an antipollution program and letting pollution continue, then go ahead and vote against the enforcement procedure.

STATES RIGHTS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman from Mississippi is well known for his leadership and statemanship in the matter of protecting the rights of the States in Federal programs. Is it not accurate to say that not only do the States participate with requests for the initiation of action in any type of an intrastate antipollution program, but that the States also participate in the naming of participants in the hearing boards which make the recommendations to the Secretary?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The States participate in this all the way down to the final orders involved, and the additional power here is only to enable the States to have the additional weapon to enforce the orders involved. Actually, this provision to give the States the strong arm of the Federal Government in regard to enforcement is put in the bill only at the request of the State agencies involved. They are the ones who came to us and asked us to put this in. We are giving them a weapon which they can use in meeting their responsibilities just as we are giving them in the grants to municipalities for the sewage plant programs the incentive and assistance so that they can carry out their local responsibilities in that regard. In this enforcement pro-

cedure, we are giving them the same weapon that they use today with reference to some of our Federal laws such as the Dyer Act and the Mann Act and the Antikidnapping Act. All this does is to help the States meet their proper responsibilities.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, whenever a legislator opposes any of the provisions of a Federal pollution bill, he is immediately charged by the pressure groups with being insensible to the health and welfare of millions of Americans. Of course, this type of pressure tactics is not only applied to pollution legislation.

As an example, those of us who oppose Federal aid to education are charged with being insensible to the needs of our children, inconsiderate of the welfare of our teachers, and the scientific educational needs of the country. As a result, many harmful, unwise, and costly provisions are engineered into basically needed and worthwhile legislation by special interest groups and welfare-staters.

Let me say at the outset that there is no question but that for years local communities and industries have wantonly dumped their untreated refuse into the streams of this country because it always appeared that it was the fellow downstream who had to worry and contend with it. However, when the worm turned and the pollutor became the man downstream, the country generally began to realize that it had a serious problem of such magnitude that drastic legislation, both at the State and Federal level, was needed to stop this pollution.

The Senate in 1956 passed a water pollution control bill which put teeth into enforcement and control provisions. The power of the Federal Government was utilized to compel pollutors in one State to desist upon complaint of another State's being harmed. Research programs by the Federal Government were broadened. The techniques for the treatment of wastes developed by these research programs were made available to the States, local communities, and industries. Legislation such as this was vitally needed, and no sensible person opposed it.

However, when this bill reached the House, those who believe that the Federal Government should inject itself into almost every activity of American life, those who believe that the Federal Treasury is inexhaustible, inserted in the House bill a brandnew grant-in-aid program direct to local communities. The States were bypassed in this new Federal pork-barrel handout.

It is usually the bureaucrats and Federal agencies that conceive these new spending programs. The then President vigorously opposed this new grant-in-aid program. However, some of the professional bureaucrats in HEW secretly wanted it. This is the nature of a meddlesome bureaucracy.

The proponents of this amendment to the Senate bill argued that these grants-in-aid to the local communities would stimulate construction, that local communities could not afford these costly sewage treatment plants—as if the Federal Government could. No State, no local community, in fact, no nation of the world, was and is as broke as the United States. Remember, our debt today is $50 billion more than the combined debt of all of the States and all of the nations of the world.

Those of us who opposed this new and novel aid program direct to local communities pointed out that the $50 million a year Federal grant-in-aid money provided in the 1956 House bill was another "foot in the door" spending program; that, in view of the tremendous cost of sewage disposal treatment plants, $50 million a year was only a drop in the bucket. It was pointed out that the city of Cincinnati which had built its own sewage disposal treatment plants and arranged to pay for them without Federal help by a tax on the water bills of users, had spent $62 million; that the $50 million Federal funds authorized in that bill was a snare and a delusion; that once the Federal Government injected itself into this program the funds required from the Federal Treasury would eventually reach astronomical heights.

Last year the Congress increased the amount to $90 million a year and the President vetoed the bill. The House sustained that veto. The President said in his veto message that he was vetoing it because—

> water pollution is a uniquely local blight; that primary responsibility for solving the problem lies not with the Federal Government but rather must be assumed and exercised as it has been by State and local government.

Of course, the President was right.

Local and State governments which set their minds to doing this job have done it and have done it effectively. The eight States in the Ohio River Valley under a compact created the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission. Under it the cities, villages, and towns in that great industrial valley had been doing a remarkable job in eliminating pollution without cost to the Federal Government.

The proponents of Federal aid argue that it has been the grant-in-aid program that has stimulated the spending of money on sewage treatment plants. Certainly more money has been spent in the last number of years on sewage disposal facilities, but it has not been Federal aid money that has caused the increase in expenditures. Rather it has been the teeth that were put into the law that caused communities to act. The great bulk of the money spent on sewage treatment facilities has been spent by communities that have had no Federal subsidies. In fact, the average Federal subsidy to a local community has been only about $75,000. The limit under the present law is $250,000 to any community. Considering the high cost of sewage treatment plants, only the extremely small communities can receive in Federal moneys a substantial part of the costs.

The bill before the House, of course, increases the authorization to $100 million a year and also increases the amount any one community may receive. Next year I predict that there will again be legislation offered to further raise the annual authorizations, and that year after year there will be requests for additional increase in authorizations.

It should be obvious that this is what is going to happen. Instead of these Federal subsidies stimulating the building of these plants by local communities, it will delay them because as we increase the maximum authorization for cities, more and more of them will get in line with hat in hand for Federal handouts. They will drag their feet, knowing that Congress the following year will make more Federal moneys available so that they can get their share.

The President last year in vetoing an increase in authorizations supported this position. He said:

> By holding forth the promise of a large-scale program of long-term Federal support, it will tempt municipalities to delay essential water pollution abatement efforts while they wait for Federal funds.

The Scripps-Howard newspapers, in commenting on last year's antipollution bill which was eventually vetoed, effectively stated the case when they said:

> If the Federal Government permitted the States and cities to mind their own affairs, and if the Federal Government didn't tax these same States and cities so heavily to pay for Federal "benefits," then the States and cities could levy their own taxes to pay for their own benefits, and, under local supervision and responsibility to the local taxpayers, the cities and States could do their chores a great deal better and a lot cheaper.
>
> The Federal program to build local sewage treatment plants is just one instance.
>
> Now a bill is ready for action on the House floor, proposing to spend $100 million a year—running up the cost of this program $400 million in the next 8 years.
>
> It is free-spending ideas like this which run up taxes.
>
> This new $400 million giveaway should be defeated and if Congress, despite this year's $13 billion deficit, passes it, it should be vetoed.

It was vetoed. The veto was sustained by the House. This year, however, bureaucrats in HEW have had their way. An amendment to keep the authorizations at the present level of $50 million a year will no doubt fail. The increased Federal handouts will be approved by the Congress. The President will sign the bill and the sky in the next few years will be the limit.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Would the gentleman from Ohio be so kind as to tell us how the States become the recipients of these grants?

Mr. SCHERER. Under this bill?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under any bill, the method by which the States become the recipients of these grants; in other words, what legislative authority the States have at the present time to participate in receiving grants.

Mr. SCHERER. The States have no authority to receive any grants because, as I have said, we bypassed the States

for the first time and gave aid directly to the cities.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What occasioned that so-called bypassing?

Mr. SCHERER. I do not understand the question.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. What occasioned the fact we bypassed the States?

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman can answer that question on his own time. I am saying that I am opposed to grants-in-aid to States, because we started, as I said, a new grant-in-aid program at that time direct to cities. It was a foot-in-the-door program. We provided $50 million and, as the majority leader in his discussion on the rule a few minutes ago pointed out, that is only a drop in the bucket. This amount of money is going to increase from year to year. When you consider that in one city the cost of its disposal plant is $62 million, you can readily see that a $50 million Federal funds for the entire United States is going to do practically nothing toward furnishing adequate funds to the communities for the building of sewage disposal plants. What you are going to have is first a $50 million a year grant-in-aid program then a $100 million, then the next year a $200 million request, will be made, and so on—up and up. Last year, as the gentleman from Florida pointed out, when the House and Senate attempted to increase this amount from $50 million a year to $100 million a year, a compromise was reached and a figure of $90 million appeared in the conference report. That bill was vetoed, and the President said in his veto message:

> Because water pollution is uniquely a local blight, primary responsibility for solving the problem lies not with the Federal Government but, rather, must be assumed and exercised, as it has been, by the States and by local governments.

Here is the question the House must decide: Whether this year we are going to expand these grant-in-aid provisions or we are going to cut them off now. This is a program that should be handled as it has been by local communities that are now compelled to do so because of the strong enforcement provisions put into force by the 1956 act.

There are many new enforcement provisions in this bill that are good and should be enacted into law to enable the States and Federal Government to move in against those industries and against those municipalities that will not treat their own waste.

So when the bill is being read under the 5-minute rule I shall offer an amendment to strike out the provision which would increase the amount for Federal grants-in-aid from $50 million to $100 million a year and from $500 million to $1 billion over a 10-year period.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, water, in more than a symbolic way, is the lifeblood of civilization. If we turn to the pages of history, and examine the decline of empires, we find many causes. But no loss more surely, more irrevocably dooms a great civilization than the loss of its water supply. All the great cultures have arisen where water is plentiful and pure. And when that abundance, or that purity, has been damaged, desolation has followed, as surely as the night the day. Today, for the first time in our history, this Nation faces a future in which the foreseeable water supply may be less than the demand. We must, as the committee report on this bill so clearly points out, prepare ourselves for the careful use and reuse of our water supply.

Earlier this year, I was proud to be among those Members of this House who joined with the able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] in introducing bills similar to his H.R. 4036. Today, I am delighted to be able to cast my vote for H.R. 6441, the bill produced by the Public Works Committee, under Mr. BLATNIK's leadership.

I have read the committee hearings. They tell a compelling story. I have read the report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I am deeply proud that this administration has seen fit to greet this legislation with constructive suggestions, rather than with the stone wall of opposition which has cost us irreplaceable time in the last few years.

Never has the Nation's need been greater for expanded research in water pollution. And never have our guidelines been clearer for the establishment of the field laboratory and research facilities as proposed in H.R. 6441.

President Kennedy, in his natural resources message, stated:

> I propose an intensive and broadened research effort to determine the specific sources of water pollution and their adverse effects upon all water uses; the effects upon the health of people exposed to water pollution; and more effective means of preventing, controlling or removing the contaminants—including radioactive matter—that now pollute our rivers and streams so that the water may be safely used.

A Senate select committee, under the able chairmanship of Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, has just completed the most comprehensive study ever undertaken on national water resources. The committee has told us:

> The only way to forestall disaster tomorrow is to begin today on the prolonged procedures of research, planning, and constructing. * * * We must greatly expand our scientific research programs to develop ways to make better use of available water.

Last December there occurred the first National Conference on Water Pollution—called at the direction of the President. Of the conference's 30 major recommendations, no less than a half dozen stressed research. No. 24 said:

> The flow of research findings on the water environment must be increased and intensified in depth as well as breadth.

Another urged that the Public Health Service assume leadership in establishing safe allowable concentrations of toxic contaminants in water for human consumption.

For the past 45 years no fundamentally new sewage treatment processes have been developed. The Public Health Service has just begun limited research seeking more effective means of treating municipal wastes. Countless new chemicals are finding their way into our Nation's waterways as a result of the great technological advance since World War II. They defy treatment by presently known processes, and they are progressively building up in our surface waters. Radioactive wastes pose still additional threats.

The President's Water Pollution Control Advisory Board has repeatedly called attention to the need for greater research. The Board held one of its meetings a year ago at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati. The members went there specifically to study the work and intelligently recommend needed expansion in water pollution research. In its report to the Surgeon General, the Board pointed out that "the Center with its present space and staff is highly inadequate to cope with new problems of the chemical and virus age" and that "the present staff and budget is about one-third of the actual present need in the national water research program." These were actual quotes from scientists in charge at the center who are dealing—day by day—with the Nation's water pollution research problems.

Many of the States are not financially able to set up and maintain their own water pollution research laboratories. They must depend upon Federal facilities. Most requests for such services at Cincinnati now come from States within less than a 500-mile radius.

The regional laboratories proposed in H.R. 6441 would bridge a dangerous gap—growing constantly wider—in needed resources to safeguard the Nation's water supplies. Support for water pollution research has always been disproportionately low with respect to its need and importance. Last year it totaled less than $5 million for Federal, State, industry, and university programs. This is sufficient barely to "touch base" with the many serious water pollution problems that need solution.

Strengthened pollution control programs, including research, are of particular importance to the Pacific Northwest. In addition to its needs for clean water for municipalities, industry and agriculture, this region has special reasons for requiring maintenance of water of the highest quality. The scenic resources of the Pacific Northwest are outstanding. The region serves as a recreation-vacation area for people from all over the United States. The Pacific Northwest, together with Alaska, contains what is left of the Nation's important salmon resource—a resource, I would remind you, which has long since disappeared from the Atlantic coast due to pollution.

Within the past several years there has been strengthened planning for water resource development in the Columbia

River Basin. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers developed its major water plan in 1958 providing for flood control, power, navigation and related water uses. The treaty with Canada, which the Congress now has under consideration, provides for vast additional river basin development. During the past year the Public Health Service's Columbia River Basin office, located in Portland, has been preparing for the development of a strong water pollution control plan for the Columbia Basin and adjacent northwest coastal areas. This plan is being developed in cooperation with the States of the area and would provide a broad framework guiding the future pollution control activities within the Northwest. There is dire need for adequate research facilities to complement this comprehensive development.

Pollution problems in the Columbia River Basin differ from those in other areas. There is need for research dealing specifically with pollution problems of the Pacific Northwest. The important anadromous fisheries, the pulp and paper industry, special climatic and hydrologic conditions, and many other facets, all combine to create conditions requiring specific research—conducted within the region itself.

There is strong support from many sources in the Pacific Northwest for this legislation. The Pacific Northwest Pollution Control Council, for example, made this statement last year to the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources:

> There are increasing signs that unless major technical breakthroughs are achieved during the next half dozen years, an increased portion of our water resources will become unfit for use even with the full application of present-day knowledge for feasibly treating sewage and industrial wastes. Although such signs are more commonplace in many areas of the East and Midwest, similar situations are beginning to arise in the Willamette River in Oregon, in the Yakima River in Washington, and in other places in the Pacific Northwest. Answers to this problem need to be obtained now if we are to prevent the wasting of our waters in the future. The speed and accuracy with which we solve these problems depends solely on the accumulation of new knowledge. This knowledge must come from research.
>
> The immediate need is for the provision of funds to expand the research program. In addition, the proper place to seek many of the answers to the problems of the Pacific Northwest would be through the establishment of a Pacific Northwest regional laboratory of the Public Health Service in order to give more intensive study to the problems of this region.

Less than a month ago the Oregon State Legislature sent to President Kennedy, to the Senate, and to the House of Representatives, its enrolled Senate Joint Memorial No. 9, urging passage of legislation to establish a Pacific Northwest Pollution Control Laboratory by the U.S. Public Health Service—

> dedicated to advancing the frontiers of knowledge by conducting research for the treatment of water, waste waters * * * and the control of pollution for the protection of the health and well-being of the people of the Pacific Northwest and, at the same time, making possible the safe and orderly development of industries on which the economic advancement of the region depends.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we can no longer afford an inadequate program of research dealing with so vital a resource as water. More than 182 million U.S. citizens now are using 325 billion gallons of water daily. While the national population increased 19 percent in the past decade, water use gained 64 percent. We are entering a critical water supply situation—seriously complicated by pollution—which must have immediate attention. We of this 87th Congress have a serious obligation to provide the needed intelligence to deal with it through adequate research facilities.

There is broad public support for this bill. Public health officials have testified in its favor. I ask that there be printed at this point in my remarks the excellent letter sent to me by Dr. Richard Wilcox, Health Office of the State of Oregon.

OREGON STATE BOARD OF HEALTH,
Portland, March 13, 1961.

Hon. EDITH S. GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Reference is made to H.R. 4036 and related bills which are now being heard before the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, House Public Works Committee.

We have reviewed the bill carefully and strongly support all of its provisions except the amendment to section 2 which transfers the responsibility for water pollution control from the Public Health Service to a separate water pollution control administration.

The public health implications of water pollution control have become increasingly more important during the past several years, particularly in view of increased populations and industrial production with their attendant demands for more water of higher quality.

The control of water-borne virus diseases, as well as the probable necessity for more careful control over the disposal of some of the complex chemical wastes which may affect human health, can best be handled by those skilled in public health procedures. I also believe that the Public Health Service has the competency and the technical staff necessary to carry on such a program in a manner which will gain the acceptance of both the Congress and the people, provided sufficient support in the way of adequate appropriations are made for water pollution control activities.

The Federal grants which have been available to Oregon under the present Federal Water Pollution Control Act have been most helpful in accelerating the construction of public sewerage works needed to abate pollution. They have also been of assistance to smaller communities faced with difficult financing problems.

While a great deal of progress has been made in Oregon, sewer systems and new or improved sewerage treatment works are needed by many communities if we are to gain any headway in the control effort. It is appropriate, therefore, that grants for construction of treatment works be increased so that cities and other political subdivisions in his State can meet both their current and future needs for waste treatment facilities.

Your attention is particularly directed to section 3 of the proposed legislation which authorizes the establishment of regional field laboratory and research facilities. The need for greatly expanded research in the field of water supply and water pollution control cannot be too strongly emphasized. The highly complex and diversified demands for water resources in the United States present a need that is a research problem in water quality control that cannot be satisfied by a centrally located laboratory which already has heavy demands placed on its staff and is a half a continent from many other problems on which study should be undertaken.

We urge you to strongly support the establishment of enactment of legislation which would establish the regional laboratory since there is an urgent need for such a facility in the Pacific Northwest.

With regard to the enforcement provisions of the proposed legislation, it appears that substantial safeguards have been included which would permit a State like ours that has an active and progressive water pollution control program to carry on its activities without Federal intervention. It is hoped that you will make certain that these safeguards are included in any act which is finally adopted.

It is requested that you take such measures as you may consider appropriate to insure the enactment of this legislation with the exceptions which have been outlined in this letter, and to assure that appropriations are made to the full extent authorized by law so that the excellent work which has already been done can be continued.

Very truly yours,
RICHARD H. WILCOX, M.D.,
State Health Officer.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Chambers of commerce and labor unions find common ground in this legislation. As evidence of this, I ask that there be printed at this point in my remarks, letters from Mr. Todd Forrest of the Oregon State Jaycees, and from Mr. William Westerholm, executive secretary of the Columbia River Fishermen's Protective Union:

SALEM JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE JAYCEES,
Salem, Oreg.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The waterways of the United States should rightfully be declared our greatest resource. Not only is clean water essential to life and industry, but recreational activities associated with water have become the greatest "participation sport" ever known to the world, in spite of pollution. Very few of us could quell the urge to exercise that was generated within us at the lakes and rivers and beaches when we were younger; now it is not at all difficult to restrict our exercise to rock throwing, walking, and bathing suit ogling.

The restraint has not been imposed by age alone, either. Negligence, greed, ignorance, laziness, selfishness, commercialism, and that universal curse of mankind, nonapplication of the Golden Rule, have all contributed to the present unattractive appearance of our Nation's waterways.

What a waste of resource. Beauty, recreation, exercise, industry, and economy lost because of pollution.

Our Nation, cleaned by a litterbug broom, compressed by a girdle of highways, has lost many, and is losing the rest, of the beauty spots that the first two improvements have made even more necessary.

Oregon is especially hampered by pollution's waste. With our magnificent rivers and lakes, public beaches, and manmade waterways we should be the Nation's favorite outdoor recreational area. As we are, if one cares to drive far enough. But imagine the selling point to industry if Oregon could invite industries' highly educated, specially trained and, consequently, more selective employees to swim or boat or fish an easy 5 minutes from their homes.

But as matters now stand neither they nor anyone else can enjoy clean water without a 50-mile drive. (We complain about a 50-mile drive; other States would consider that convenient.)

Cities and industries have been proven to be the worst offenders, but private citizens are not blameless: indeed, the fault lies with each private citizen for not insisting that their waterways' cleanliness be maintained. Waterway pollution, to the private citizen, seems related to Mark Twain's weather: "Everyone talks about it, but no one does anything about it."

H.R. 4042 is an excellent beginning to do "something about it."

It is unfortunate that it has become necessary for the Federal Government to initiate the means of reform contained in H.R. 4042, but apparently the States cannot conceive of benefits accruing from clean waters within State boundaries. It therefore becomes mandatory for the Federal Government to make information concerning pollution available to the States.

Field laboratories in the various sections of the Nation, if they work with local industries, municipalities and individuals, and if they utilize local graduate students, sanitation engineers, and production managers to prove to the various regions that the laboratories are concerned with a given area's particular problem, can be of inestimable value to State and local sanitation authorities. But if one or two laboratories are meant to serve the Nation, removed States will not be too concerned about achievements. The Federal laboratory in Ohio has undoubtedly been of value to sanitation experts, but Oregonians cannot be convinced that it has solved the sulphur disposal problem connected with paper manufacture.

But if a Federal laboratory located in Salem, Portland, or St. Helens were to initiate studies of economically feasible sulphur disposal methods the entire populace would be available for advice, criticism, complaints and acknowledgments. Be available? They would demand to be heard.

So it would go throughout the Nation. Small, unorganized groups in every walk of life are in complete accord with the Public Works Committee's problem, as is every citizen, if the citizen were only aware of it. (How could anyone be unalterably opposed to waterway cleanliness?) But without initial impetus, as is provided by H.R. 4042, the situation will gradually worsen until correction will cost many times the money and manpower expenditure proposed in the bill.

The Oregon Legislature on Tuesday, March 14 defeated a bill designed to assist the sanitation authority in enforcing their recommendations, on the grounds that the bill would give the sanitation board too much authority. Can such an appointed board have too much authority? Can their findings, limited though the board is by money and manpower shortages, be forever questioned and refuted without any corrective measures being adopted? The answer should be "No."

Speaking now of the Willamette Valley only, what can be done? The paper plants and canneries using the Willamette for a sewer know they are polluting the river, but the wages they pour into our economy help offset inconveniences caused by their effluence. But they are willing to cooperate. In fact most, if not all, spend large sums of money each year in private investigations of waste disposal. How much more economical it would be if these sums of money and energy and findings were going into a locally situated Federal laboratory for evaluation.

Cities on the Willamette have also been made aware of their sanitation shortcomings. The largest has been hampered by the public's unwillingness to vote necessary funds; smaller communities have banded together to insist that until the large city provides proper corrective measures the smaller communities will remain uncorrected. A suggestive body, such as a field laboratory, annually equipped with local facts and figures, could greatly assist in eliminating these petty bickerings and make the people upstream aware of their obligations to people who live downstream.

Thank you for the opportunity of making this incomplete statement. If it has been, or can be, of assistance I shall be happy. Use it as you deem necessary and please let me know if I or the organization I represent can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

TODD FORREST,
Chairman, Oregon State Jaycee Waterway Cleanup Campaign.

COLUMBIA RIVER FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE UNION,
Astoria, Oreg., March 13, 1961.

STATEMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE UNION IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 4036 AND H.R. 4042

I am William Westerholm, executive secretary of the Columbia River Fishermen's Protective Union, whose address is 322 10th Street, Astoria, Oreg. Our organization is made up of commercial fishermen producers who operate in Columbia River between Oregon and Washington. Our objectives are stated on our letterhead, "Maximum Harvest Consistent With Sustained Yield."

We supply salmon to those who like to have fish available for use and are unable to catch them personally—especially the aged, the ill, and the infirm, and to return an income for many families and businesses and employees.

Our organization has worked since the early 1930's on the problems of cleaning up our rivers. We have had excellent cooperation with sportsmen's organizations in letting the public know of the real need for having clean, unpolluted public water available for all uses.

The problem is larger than any one organization or industry can handle and we believe that the U.S. Government is the only agency that can coordinate the efforts of all to solve the problem. We are definitely in favor of section 3 of the resolution, which would provide funds for a field laboratory in the Northwest. The research can be done more efficiently in the Northwestern States than elsewhere as costs are lower than elsewhere and skilled staffs in the State universities and State agencies and industry are willing to cooperate in the research.

Much of the problem is due to the industrial wastes put into our rivers. Accompanying this statement are five photographs and exhibits showing samples of industrial pollution, to wit:

Exhibit A: Clean gill net.

Exhibit B: Same net, showing slime pollution after a drift in the Columbia River.

Exhibit C: Same net showing slime pollution from industrial wastes.

Exhibit D: Type of Salmon we are trying to save.

Exhibit E: Economics of fisheries.

Research will solve these and similar pollution problems and show the way to make useful byproducts from wastes.

The increasing use of insecticides in agriculture which get into our streams is creating a new problem and contributes to the killing of fish and acquatic life, and if uncontrolled will adversely affect public health.

The cities and individuals are placing increasing amounts of human wastes into our waters. With the ever increasing popularity of water skiing and water sports, there is a real hazard in exposing our people to loathsome diseases and epidemics transmitted and carried by human and industrial wastes in public waters.

We feel that scientific research is the only way to solve the problems and our Government is the only agency that can coordinate efforts to clean up our waters. We ask that adequate funds should be appropriated at once to establish a field laboratory in the Columbia River area at once to solve the problems of water pollution. The results of such studies will be available to other areas.

We sincerely thank this committee for their real interest and their efforts to solve these problems at once.

Sincerely yours,

COLUMBIA RIVER FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE UNION,
By WILLIAM WESTERHOLM,
Executive Secretary.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The bill, Mr. Chairman, has even, according to the hearings, earned the support of the DAR—or at least its Maryland State chapter. I submit that with this truly universal support, the bill should pass without difficulty.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Public Works which has considered this water pollution legislation over the years, I am extremely happy and pleased to see H.R. 6441 being considered by the House today.

I am certain that all of you are well aware of the fundamental problem that now faces us as regards our Nation's water supply. The water table remains constant but our population is exploding at a tremendous rate. Thus day by day the amount of users of water increases steadily, while the available water supply continues to remain at a fixed figure. From this, it is obvious that there is every need to conserve and have available as much pure, fresh water as possible. For this reason, the need to clean up our Nation's streams, rivers, and lakes has become a must. H.R. 6441 is a gigantic step in this direction and I strongly urge its approval.

In connection with my own home State of Illinois and city of Chicago, I am particularly pleased with the fact that this bill authorizes a continuing study of the quality of the waters of the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes constitute the largest single source of fresh water in this hemisphere. They must be protected from pollution caused by population and industrial growth and increased shipping.

Particularly in connection with the Great Lakes, I am pleased that this would allow for a full and proper study of the pollution problem concerning my own city of Chicago. For many years I have joined with my colleagues from the metropolitan area of Chicago in urging legislation that would provide for a proper study of the sanitary problems in the city of Chicago and with waters of the Great Lakes immediately adjacent thereto. It is my understanding that under this legislation the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will carry out such a study and make the necessary recommendations that will in the long run provide the final solution to Chicago's sanitary problems.

Chicago being the progressive city that it is will take full advantage of these studies and the recommendations that they bring forth and thus this legislation, among other things, will, I hope, bring about a full and final solution of our local pressing sanitary problem in Chicago.

H.R. 6441 is needed legislation. Its passage is a must for the full development of the economic development of our country and I hope today the House will put its stamp of approval on this legislation and that it will pass in a resounding fashion.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee for bringing out a most important piece of legislation which is so badly needed by this country

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6441 and desire to once again congratulate our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, JOHN BLATNIK, for his outstanding leadership in our common fight to protect our Nation's greatest single resource—water.

I am privileged again in this Congress to cosponsor the bill before the House today. Although I am heartily in support of all provisions of H.R. 6441, I would particularly like to emphasize the provision of the bill which makes discharges from Federal installations subject to administrative findings by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This section of the bill will mean a great deal to those States such as Maryland, that have a large concentration of Federal activities. I believe that the enforcement procedures in the bill will bring to this program vigor and vitality that will inspire all of our political subdivisions to join the Federal Government in this all-out war against filth.

I am particularly proud that the State of Maryland is one of the five States that has created a companion State-grant program whereby any municipal corporation in Maryland that is eligible for a Federal grant is automatically entitled to an additional State grant.

Gov. J. Millard Tawes in a recent letter to me has stated:

> It is, I think, no exaggeration to say that the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1956 has put Maryland in a position where it can now see a solution to its pollution problems. The Federal grant program plus the State-grant program makes it possible for our small cities and towns to undertake the heretofore financially prohibitive construction of needed sewage treatment facilities.

The passage of H.R. 6441 will give us a national pollution control program that will serve notice on one and all that we intend to mount a continuing war against the ever-increasing filth of our Nation's streams.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, today we have the opportunity to assure our present and future citizens of an adequate supply of clear, clean, and drinkable water. Water means life to all living things, and that includes the human race. With water, we live. Without it, we die. Therefore, it is proper that we consider water to be our oldest friend as well as our most valuable servant. We have no right to contaminate it, and, as a society, we must prevent others from doing so.

Unfortunately, America's lakes, streams and rivers are being used as a vast floating garbage can. More wastes have been poured into them in the last half century than have been removed. The first noticeable effects of such pollution are odors and unsightliness, followed by a dropoff in the numbers of swimmers, boaters, and picknickers. Less noticeable, but very much present, is the rise in the incidence of communicable waterborne disease.

Clean water is a challenge to the Nation. Unless brought to a halt, the continuing pollution of a large part of our indispensable present and future water supply will create increasingly serious problems for every citizen. These problems involve our public health, our economic growth, and our general enjoyment of life.

Mr. Chairman, America has already begun to feel the pinch of a water shortage. In 1957, a U.S. Geological Survey study revealed that a thousand communities in 47 States were suffering from restricted water use. This affected 15 out of every 100 of our citizens. In order to maintain today's ratio of water use to water availability, we must increase our supply of available water by one-third by 1975.

In other words, we are fast approaching the point where we will not have a drop of water to waste. I strongly feel that such a critical situation calls for a broad and comprehensive water pollution control program such as the one outlined in Congressman JOHN BLATNIK's bill, which I was glad to join him in sponsoring in the House. This measure will double the existing Federal grant program under which local communities can receive funds to aid in the construction of waste treatment facilities. It also substantially strengthens Federal enforcement authority to abate the pollution of navigable waters, making possible for the first time uniform pollution control regulations throughout the country. Last but not least, the bill authorizes expanded research into the problem of water pollution.

Seventeen municipalities in my home district can testify to the effectiveness of this Federal grants-in-aid program, for it has enabled them to build or modernize their sewage treatment plants. They are the towns of Abbotsford, Baldwin, Blair, Durand, Eau Claire, Fairchild, Granton, Greenwood, Hudson, Independence, Menomonie, Merrillan, Osseo, Prescott, Strum, Whitehall, and Withee. Mr. Speaker, if you were to talk to any of the officials and residents of those towns, I know they would have nothing but high praise for the program which has enabled them to clean up their water supply. By stepping up this aid to local communities, we will be helping many more municipalities to provide safe, pure water for their citizens.

I also want to comment briefly on the provision dealing with the all-important matter of research in the field of water pollution control. I feel that it is vital to the success of the entire water pollution control program to conduct research on the varying pollution problems of the different areas of this vast country of ours. For this reason, the bill provides for the establishment of field laboratories and research facilities in various sections of the United States in order to give special attention to the specific problems of each region.

Coming in for an intensive study will be the Great Lakes pollution problems, which has been intensified by the increased use of the lakes since the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Since I hail from Wisconsin, I am thoroughly familiar with this growing problem that faces the people who live along the Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out in closing that President Kennedy's Natural Resources Advisory Committee, of which I am a member, has urged the adoption of legislation to establish a national water pollution control policy that will protect and enhance the capacity of water resources to serve the widest possible range of human needs. Congressman BLATNIK's bill was drafted to carry out the recommendations of the Advisory Committee. I might add that President Kennedy urged the adoption of legislation along the lines of this measure in his special message on natural resources, which was sent to Congress on February 23.

As Representatives of the citizens of the United States, we are charged with the tremendous responsibility of putting into effect a water pollution control program which will not only aid this generation but succeeding generations as well. Despite the great progress that has been made as a result of our present Federal water pollution control law, much more remains to be done in order to assure a safe and adequate water supply today and in the years to come. Therefore, I hope that the water pollution control bill now before the House will be speedily enacted into law.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 6441 which would extend and strengthen the Federal water pollution control program and assist the States and local communities in providing more effective programs of water pollution control.

Mr. Chairman, there is no resource problem confronting us today which is more important than developing new supplies of water and protecting those supplies which we already possess.

President Kennedy succinctly stated the problem in his message to Congress on February 23 when he said:

> Our Nation has been blessed with a bountiful supply of water; but it is not a blessing we can regard with complacency.

At the present time, we in the United States are using over 300 billion gallons of water daily. By 1980 our daily demand is expected to exceed 600 billion gallons, or twice our present requirements.

Until now we have been able to meet our ever increasing needs by constructing water storage facilities. By 1980, however, it is estimated that our demand for water will exceed our supply by 85 billion gallons per day.

Efforts to find an effective and economical means of converting salt water into fresh, usable water are of unquestioned importance. As Justice Fugate, representing the American Municipal Association, pointed out to the Committee on Public Works, though, the most effective assistance we can give ourselves in the immediate water crisis is to clean up the water we have. As increasing demands are placed against our limited supplies, more usable water can be provided by the prevention and control of pollution than by any other means.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6441 is crucial to our Nation's interests and welfare and I urge that it be passed today.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I was very pleased a few minutes ago to hear the gracious tribute by the chairman of the subcommittee to the ranking minority member of our committee, our beloved colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS]. I think the sentiment expressed is shared by all of us on the majority side of the committee. And, just as emphatically I would like to state what I believe is the view of the committee also, that the entire Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Minnesota, our able and distinguished colleague, JOHN BLATNIK, for his leadership in this field.

There are all over this country today millions of Americans who are drinking cleaner and purer water because of the fight which JOHN BLATNIK has led for legislation of this kind in the Congress of the United States. And, I doubt very seriously, when all of us end our terms and our careers in the House of Representatives if we will have done any single thing that contributes more to the development of our country, to the provision of a better and a finer life for our children and their children than the parts which we have played, however small it may have been, in advancing legislation to clean up our rivers and streams and the waters which the people of America drink.

It seems to me that most of the preoccupation and most of the concern on the minority side that has been expressed on the floor deals with the fact that we are proposing to extend jurisdiction under this bill; that we are proposing to take in more waters in this land of ours that are not today covered. There has been no complaint at all that I have heard that there has been any arbitrary use of this power in the waters that are already under the bill; there has been no complaint that anyone has been mistreated or that in any way the Federal Government has been abusive of its powers and responsibilities. But there is a strong argument that we should not extend the Government's responsibility in any form or in any fashion by this bill. The chairman has told you that today we are able to take care of only about 4,000 bodies of water in the United States under this legislation; that 22,000 bodies of water remain outside coverage. Our good friend from Florida would like to keep those bodies of water outside the coverage in this legislation. I have been unable to discover any reason why. He has not indicated any reason to us that represents anything wrong with the program. He has not criticized the mechanics; he has not criticized the exercise of discretion which thus far has been present in the program. He simply says, "Let us not expand it and let us not deal in any more water." My friends, if this is a good program for 4,000 bodies of water in the United States, why not be fair to those people who live on the other streams and the other rivers? Why not give to those people in other communities which do not have the protection of this law all the power and authority that has thus far been exercised discreetly? Why should we deprive any group in this land of ours who today are the victims of polluted water the benefits of this program and the opportunity to correct that pollution?

I do not think the gentleman from Mississippi intended a few minutes ago to imply that our friend from Florida was a friend of the polluter, but I will say to you that if I were polluting the streams of America today with a big factory or with some other type of operation, I could not handpick a better position to defend against any Government action to stop that pollution than the position which has been taken by the gentleman from Florida. Let us extend this program to all the people. Let us make it possible to clean up all our streams and all our waters.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER].

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK]. I want to identify myself in support of this legislation. To northern California, this legislation, Public Law 660, has meant the difference between pure and polluted streams. It has done more for northern California, for the wildlife and the economic prosperity of the area, than almost any other piece of legislation. Conservation groups such as the California Wildlife Federation regard it as the most important Federal legislation in many years. It is a tribute to the efforts of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. Chairman, this is what I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota. We have a very serious problem in southern Oregon and northern California in Klamath Lake and River Basin. Due to certain conditions algae infests the area, Klamath Lake, Copco Lake, and the river. The dying algae gives off a poison fatal to fish and thus affects the economy of the area which is dependent on it. I should like to ask: Will this bill permit research to cure this problem? Would it be within its purview?

Mr. BLATNIK. In my opinion, it certainly would include study of such a problem. The reason we are recommending regional research laboratories is because of the great difference in the character of pollution in different areas. In the gentleman's area there is the problem of algae, with which I am familiar, and which is a very important, difficult, and up to this time, unmanageable problem. We have problems in the Northeast, in the Great Lakes, on the east coast, where we have high concentrations of industrial activities, where chemicals are used, and so forth. There are these variations. In the gentleman's case the problem of algae definitely would be included.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I thank the gentleman very much. I am sure the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], in whose district Copco Lake is located, and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN], where Klamath Lake is located, will join me in appreciation of the answer the gentleman has made on this subject. It is of such tremendous importance economically to the welfare of the people of our area.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER] for bringing this important problem to the attention of the House. In our concern regarding the many and serious water pollution problems of urban areas we sometimes tend to forget that the rural areas of our Nation also have water pollution problems. Noxious algae have become a real pollution problem in my area of the West. A specific example is the problem of noxious algal bloom on Upper Klamath Lake in Klamath County, Oreg. It is a serious one which should be given thorough study by the research facilities which enactment of this bill will provide. As documentation on the nature and extent of this situation I want to include as a part of my remarks a report by Kenneth McLeod, Jr., research consultant at Southern Oregon College in Ashland, Oreg., entitled "A Proposed Study for the Control of Noxious Algal Bloom."

The measure under consideration calls for establishment of research facilities in various parts of the Nation, including one in the Pacific Northwest. Such a laboratory could continue the type of

work which Mr. McLeod has outlined as a part of its task of conducting investigations and field studies. The point, Mr. Chairman, is that our rural areas as well as our urban areas have a vital interest in the passage of this important measure and the implementation of the needed research to build on this type of work in developing a solution to the problem of algae pollution along with other water pollution problems.

As a cosponsor of legislation to expand the water pollution control program I am in full support of the bill which the Public Works Committee has reported. I oppose the weakening amendments offered and urge my colleagues to pass the measure recommended by this able committee. We need this research program along with the other provisions of this excellent legislation so that the serious situation on Klamath Lake can be studied and corrected. We need this bill to go forward in meeting our crucial water pollution problems across the Nation.

A PROPOSED STUDY FOR THE CONTROL OF NOXIOUS ALGAL BLOOM

(By Kenneth McLeod, Jr.)

SUMMARY

To determine the ecological factors responsible for the observable Daphnia-algae cycle which now controls algal bloom at several sewage lagoons in northern California and southern Oregon, and to see if it is possible to extend this apparent biological control to the natural waters of the Klamath Basin noted for their noxious bloom. Among questions to be answered are:

1. In the observable process is Daphnia the prime predator or an essential secondary element of a much more complex food chain in which the prime predator may be bacterial?

2. If Daphnia are primary predators, then what species or strains are most effective?

3. Has the presence of detergents in the oxidation pond played any part in the establishment of the observable cycle, i.e., as a factor of natural selection developing special strains of Daphnia essential to the cycle? In fact, what influence do detergents have on the zooplankton population?

4. To study the order of succession in the phytoplankton population created by the gradual enrichment of the waters by nitrogen and phosphorous; as well as factors of sunlight, temperature and drought.

RESEARCH PLAN

The specific aim of this proposed study is to determine the environmental factors that stimulate a tremendous multiplication of the Daphnia population in certain sewage lagoons of northern California and southern Oregon with the resultant observable control of algal bloom in these oxidation ponds. And, to see if it may be possible to induce similar Daphnia population explosions in natural waters of ponds and lakes noted for their production of noxious blooms.

If such a program is possible we would possess a biological tool to control noxious bloom by natural means rather than resort to the use of industrial poisons, such as treating with Shell "Aquilin," as in that company's present proposed program to rid the waters of Upper Klamath Lake of noxious bloom, a program that has received strong local support even though it is opposed by wildlife interests.

The natural algae-Daphnia cycle controlling algal bloom in our local oxidation ponds appears to be a unique development in that the Daphnia produce tremendous rhythmic population explosions, which, apparently by mere mass of number, consume the algae of the oxidation pond much as a plague of locusts sweeps bare the vegetation of an African landscape. This rhythm of population growth may occur in intervals as short as 8 days in the oxidation pond, however, climatic factors do influence the development speed of the cycle. This cycle of algae-Daphnia growth is somewhat faster than that recorded by Slobekin, 1954, which emphasizes the fact that we are dealing with different ecological conditions.

In our oxidation ponds there appear to be no natural agent present to hold the Daphnia growth under control other than the available algal food supply, thus the rhythm of first the growth of algae, followed by the swarming Daphnia which consumes it and die, then the algae again increases—thus the cycle is established.

At the South Suburban sewage lagoons of Klamath Falls the algae-Daphnia cycle is well established in control of algal bloom, yet a quarter of a mile away is the water of the Klamath River loaded down with algae. At this point the question becomes obvious, why does the process function in the lagoon but not in the adjacent natural water? Basically there is not much difference between the nutrient solution of the oxidation pond and the extra rich natural water of the Klamath Basin which is noted for its production of noxious bloom, nevertheless the Daphnia population of the natural water apparently has not been noted for population explosions as in the case of the oxidation pond.

This poses for us two lines of investigation: First, the problem of succession in the phytoplankton population. The natural waters of the Klamath Basin, though rich in nutrients, are not as rich as the oxidation pond and while the natural waters support a tremendous growth of blue-green algae the higher ratios of nitrogen and phosphorous in the oxidation pond present problems largely concerned with green algae species. This problem of succession due to enrichment offers us the field of study to determine if it is the nutrient ratio that controls the algal-Daphnia cycle. The second problem imposed is the speculation regarding the presence of detergents in the oxidation pond which makes that solution essentially different from the natural water. This raises the question: has the presence of detergents in the oxidation pond served as an agent that has assisted in some fashion the establishment of this cycle, by either placing pressures upon the processes of natural selection and developing a special strain of swarming Daphnia, or, assisting in some other fashion? As a consequence of this question this program would aim to study the influence of detergent concentrations upon the native zooplankton population.

While we have the unusual continuous predation by Daphnia on the algae of the oxidation ponds this has not been true of the natural waters. Studies of pollution and algae made on the Klamath River and Upper Klamath Lake in a continuous series from July 1952 to July 1959 found no evidence of any kind of biological control of the noxious bloom. This also has been our experience in a more general association with the problems of the use of natural Klamath River water for steam production during the past 30 years. It therefore was most startling for us to observe natural biological control over the algal bloom on Upper Klamath Lake to take place in 1959 and again in 1960.

Our interest in the potential possibility of establishing biological control over the noxious bloom in the Klamath Basin waters was directed to the algae-Daphnia cycle by Mr. Wendell H. Candland, regional engineer for the North Coast Regional Walter Pollution Control Board of California, in June of 1959, and we established a station on Upper Klamath Lake, in an area of good growth of the blue-green Aphanizomenon with the intention of introducing Daphnia in the swarming state from the local oxidation pond. On July 1, the density of Aphanizomenon was about 10 million per liter; on the 14th of July we were startled to note that there was not a single visible trace of strands of Aphanizomenon; furthermore, there was no further return of the blue-green algae for the remaining part of 1959. This phenomenon was not merely confined to the observing station but equally influenced thousands of acres of the best growing Aphanizomenon waters. While we did not observe a Daphnia explosion in population our observation of the oxidation pond would lead us to believe that Daphnia would be the most likely agent to produce this effect, though we cannot discount the possibility of other factors. The example, however, clearly demonstrated that biological control was possible. In 1960 the process repeated itself just as in 1959.

There appears to be some degree of controversy inherent in these observations based largely on the question of whether or not the Aphanizomenon was actually consumed by Daphnia. Authorities such as Lefevre, 1950, and Edmondson, 1957, have developed the thesis that it is impossible for Daphnia to consume this algae. However, Watanabe, Ito, and Sasa, 1955, were faced with destruction of their blue-green algal cultures by Daphnia. The Japanese experience appears to be a direct parallel to what we observe taking place in our oxidation ponds. To settle this controversy it has been suggested that we study the gut content of the Daphnia and correlate the various species in the gut to their abundance in the pond; however, we are more concerned with what happens, the result of the abnormal population surge of Daphnia population. The Japanese do state that they do not believe the Daphnia normally graze upon the blue-green algae when population numbers are low; it is only when the population explosion occurs do they loose their culture; they believe that the green algae in their culture gives the Daphnia the opportunity for this spring into the explosive stage where their numbers become so great that the waters they occupy resemble a heavy concentration of orange juice in color.

We realize that there are times it is difficult to believe our eyes; in fact, we may not be faced with a simple relationship of Daphnia directly consuming the blue-green algae as the primary predator our eyes would lead us to believe. The cycle might be much more complex in a food-chain relationship and it might be that bacteria actually is the prime predator. This then becomes another point for study which must be answered if we are to gain the complete story of ecological relationships.

If 7 years of close study by competent scientific personnel and 30 years of general observation did not note any change in the algal problem on Upper Klamath Lake, then why should a change take place in 1959? Perhaps it might be the result of the introduction of an active swarming group of Daphnia from the Santa Rosa, Calif., oxidation pond which was made into Upper Klamath Lake early in 1958. We have no means of knowing, as this was merely a "trial to see what would happen" without any adequate scientific control to check the end result.

If the planting of a new species or strain of Daphnia did result in the effective destruction of the noxious bloom, it appears then, to have paid off in some remarkable results in 1960 in improved recreational water and of fishing success. The angler reports of 1960 begin to read like reports near the turn of the century, when, by all historical accounts, Klamath Lake was not burdened by severe noxious bloom. This observation raises the question as to the toxic

influences of the blue-green algae on the production of aquatic life which may be outside the scope of this proposed study. Nevertheless this question becomes an important consideration in relation to the Daphnia problem since the antibiotics given off when the Aphanizomenon have reached a high level might reach such a concentration as to achieve severe autoinhibition, as pointed out by Lefevre, Jakob and Nisbet in 1952, and Ryther in 1954. This antibiotic factor could possibly have played an important role in suppressing the native Daphnia yet not inhibiting a cultured strain or species of Daphnia that has been developed in the sewage lagoon under the detergent influence if detergents had a part in natural selection of a resistant strain. This factor calls for some study in the ecologic problem.

METHODS OF PROCEDURE

1. The south-suburban sewage lagoons of Klamath Falls will serve as the basic cultural unit for the study of the mechanics of Daphnia population growth; here, the Daphnia swarm at regular intervals throughout the year. By systematic sampling, algae-Daphnia populations will be checked; a running analysis on the nutrient solution will be kept with interest centering on pH, oxygen, phosphorous, nitrogen, and detergent concentration; climatic factors of sunlight and temperature will be metered. The study will seek to correlate these known factors with the algae-Daphnia cycle. Because of the short cycle involved in the study of the oxidation pond, samples will be checked each 24 hours. In most cases the Clarke-Bumpus plankton sampler will be utilized.

A great deal of interest has been expressed concerning the enrichment of the Klamath Basin natural waters by nitrogen and phosphorous. Work by Phinney, 1955–59, upon this subject was not conclusive, possibly because of the difficulty in correlating the level of dissolved N and P with algal populations; however, we hope that the measurement of total P (including that contained in the algae) correlated with measurements of dissolved P will yield more conclusive data.

By necessity we are involved in two parallel studies, dealing with the chemical and biological cycles of the oxidation pond and their counterpart in the adjacent natural waters; one can hardly logically proceed without the other because of the climatic factor which at any one collecting period is essentially the same for both.

Taxonomic studies dealing with species of zooplankton and phytoplankton and their population density become an essential part of the study; perhaps in this we solve the question of whether the Daphnia are the prime predator or an essential factor in a more complex food-chain system.

2. The study will seek to correlate the data of the Klamath lagoons with that of the California lagoons which possess the same algae-Daphnia cycle.

Special attention will be devoted to the grazing problem of Daphnia upon the algal forms present. The proposed method is to use two 1-gallon jugs in the water under study, suspended in situ. One jug to contain raw water as sampled, the other will be the same but from which the Daphnia have been filtered. Initial algal density counts will be checked against the end of the 24-hour experiment. The Daphnia population will likewise be checked.

Plans also call for the measurement of rates of production of the algae through the use of the oxygen light and dark bottle method.

3. Checks will be made on natural-water plankton populations to determine their resistance to the presence of detergent concentrations; this should answer the question of whether our lagoons are developing special resistant strains.

These checks will be done in the laboratory upon native species from pond waters that have had no contamination from detergents, or, are bothered by heavy blue-green algal growth. It may be that these same native species introduced into water samples taken from heavy growths of Aphanizomenon will give us some information in regards the antibiotic effect; as we know of no way of analyzing for these antibiotics except possibly by bioassays—in a field into which we are not equipped to follow.

4. Ten test plots of one-thousandth-acre areas will be set up in natural waters known for their high production of bloom. These plots, 8 feet in diameter, will be located in water of varying depths; they will consist of a polyethylene tube of 20 gage sheeting standing upright in the water, secured to the bottom by a sheet metal ring pressed into the bottom mud. The top will be supported by a floating ring. Life goes on within the plot isolated from the main body of water and not influenced by drift. Check samples will be taken within the plot and outside the protected area for comparison. Such plots make possible the ability to check normal growth; and through fertilization the problem of succession, influence of detergents, and other essential study data under normal climatic conditions. Other such plots will be added as needed as we prefer to pursue as much of the study under natural conditions rather than the artificial life of the laboratory.

5. On the hypothesis that the native Daphnia population is held in balance in the natural waters by antibiotic effects or other natural controls, tests will be run to seek ways of upsetting this natural balance by introducing Daphnia in a swarming state into lagoons where algal bloom is heavy. We have talked with the Fish and Wildlife Service in regard to the lagoons on the Klamath-Tule National Wildlife Refuges. Daphnia swarms to come from the local oxidation ponds.

6. If simple introductions of swarming Daphnia are not sufficient to upset the natural balance, checks will be made to see if some pretreatment of spot areas by detergent may make the introduction effective.

Significance of the work is the fact that we believe noxious algal bloom can be brought under control by biological methods rather than by expensive treatment with commercial algicides. These chemical methods are far too expensive to cope with the Klamath problem which affects more than 200,000 acres of water. The heavy load of algae in the waters of the Klamath reach from the mountains to the sea and have created serious hazards to aquatic life, resulting in dramatic fish kills. There is some concern that livestock drinking the water may develop physical and physiological manifestations that might be misinterpreted as nutritional deficiencies or some similar ailment. Botulism which annually attacks ducks in this area is largely attributed to effects created by algal bloom. The biology and chemistry of the Klamath River is very definitely affected by the load of algae it must carry and the total length of the river from the Klamath Basin to the ocean carries quite a uniform population. Fear is being expressed that the building of additional impoundments will greatly increase the organic load and put an end to fish life in this stream. The most immediate complaint is largely esthetic from appearance and odor.

FACILITIES AVAILABLE

1. The surface oxidation ponds at Klamath Falls, Oreg.; and, ponds at Blue Lake, Arcata, Santa Rosa, and Sebastopol in California.

2. Upper Klamath Lake, Klamath River, and Klamath-Tule National Wildlife Refuge ponds.

3. The laboratory of the Klamath Highlands Research Center in Klamath Falls.

4. Facilities of Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oreg.

Previous work done on this project has been largely at the instigation of Mr. William G. Shackleton, executive officer, and Mr. Wendell H. Candland, engineer, of the water pollution control board, north coastal region, of California, who will act as consultants on this project. John N. Wilson, biologist, Water Supply and Water Pollution Control, Pacific Northwest, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will also act as a consultant. Much of the early work of these investigators concerns the pollution problems created by algae in the waters of the Klamath River. Practically no research has been devoted to the study as outlined, other than personal observations and transplants of Daphnia by Mr. Candland. The principal investigator of this proposed study came into the picture in 1959 and started preliminary observations which led to the discovery of the algal kill on Klamath Lake in 1959 and 1960. His previous experience with the waters of the lake was confined to its chemical composition and the use of its waters for the production of steam. The high organic content coupled with lime and silica content made for a very difficult treatment problem before it served industrial use.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Public Works in 1956 when the first major bill in this field was passed, which became Public Law 660. It was my privilege to support and to vote for that bill at that time. It was also my privilege to vote for the bill which was passed by this body last year which eventually ran into a Presidential veto. I have also voted for this bill as it came out of committee this year.

The problem of pollution in the streams today is a most serious one and a number of factors are causing it to become particularly critical. In the first place, the growth of the population of our country without any material increase in the total water supply has increased the ratio of pollution to the same amount of water that is available in this country.

In the second place, the further development of our skills in the field of industry has caused additional types of chemicals and materials of that kind, to be produced in plants, with related discharges going into our streams, some of which we do not know how to control.

Thirdly, as we get into the atomic energy field, we are also beginning to create atomic wastes and we are not sure how to control those wastes when some of them get into our water supply.

All of these problems are going to present a serious challenge to us in the years ahead. For this reason the section in the bill providing for the establishment of research facilities in different parts of the country I think is going to be particularly important to us. Also the increase in grants from $3 million to $5 million a year to the States to help them set up control programs I think is going to be particularly important.

The fact that I voted for this bill in committee does not necessarily indicate that I think this bill is ideal. I think there could be improvements in it. One

of the fields in which I think we could make improvements is to bring the States into this program. We have brought the States into a number of other programs where it has worked extremely well; for instance, the ABC highway program, for primary and secondary roads, where we have a 50-percent Federal and a 50-percent State contribution, and that program has worked extremely well.

It seems to me we should ask the States to join us in conducting this crusade to clean up the Nation's streams. We are putting up 30 percent in grants for plants to meet pollution in the communities, but we are not asking the States to do anything. I think we could do better by telling the States they should recognize that they have an interest in this problem and should be sufficiently interested in the program to join with us in providing matching funds for carrying out the program.

I supported in committee and intend to support on the floor today an amendment that the States should come into this picture from a matching standpoint and that the States should match any Federal grants above the present $50 million per year program of Federal grants. I think that is fair, I think that is reasonable. We should ask the States to give recognition to their interest in this problem by joining with us in making a contribution to cleaning up our Nation's streams.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor for the purpose of expressing my deep appreciation of the efforts of the gentleman from Minnesota in his program and campaign to clear up our streams and the bodies of inland waters from the pollution from which they presently suffer.

I had occasion to address the Petroleum Association of West Virginia some years ago. In inviting me they failed to tell me what topic they wanted me to discuss. I wired them, and they wired back, "Use your own judgment." I spoke on the subject of "Water, Black Gold of the Future." They often refer to oil as black gold. It was quite an eyeopener to those folks because they had been interested only in petroleum and natural gas. I told them about this subject, of pollution control that is more necessary today than ever.

Let me tell you something about West Virginia and why I am particularly interested. We have completed four huge reservoirs and are constructing a fifth. The waters of those reservoirs are contaminated by millions of gallons of sulfuric acid pouring out of the open mines in the State and polluting not only the rivers but killing all the aquatic life in those rivers. They have polluted four huge reservoirs. This pollution prevents the State of West Virginia from making use of its potentialities, because you cannot clear up those streams and reservoirs and, particularly, stock them with fish without removing the pollution. We are looking forward in West Virginia to making use of those potentialities by attracting tourists. It will help the situation considerably in the State of West Virginia. The only way we can do it is to seal between 5,000 and 6,000 open coal mines that are pouring sulfuric acid into our streams, because we let oxygen get into the mines and change iron pyrites into sulfuric acid.

So I can pledge the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and others supporting this legislation that I will be greatly disappointed if there is not a unanimous vote from the West Virginia delegation for this bill, regardless of their politics.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY].

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee's bill, H.R. 6441, because it represents a forward step in solving one of the most critical problems of our times.

Our wonderful country today, with all its amazing techniques and technologies for modern living, with all its attention to high-speed engines, to data-sorting machines, to beautiful buildings, to jet planes, has not yet found a way to properly maintain or approximate the natural conditions of its rivers and streams. The result is that people in many parts of our country are drinking water which has been befouled by organic and plant wastes many times over. Only by intensified treatment is this water made potable.

To reduce the amount of Federal participation in water pollution control might be likened to constructing a beautiful patio around an old-fashioned outhouse. Some who oppose this bill base their opinion in part on the need for matching funds from the States. There is of course much to be said for this viewpoint, but the fact remains that polluted water constitutes a national problem—a grave national problem which I believe the Federal Government must face up to. It does face up to it in the provisions of H.R. 6441.

The waters of the Mississippi River at New Orleans contain the polluting ingredients of some 30 rivers that flow directly or indirectly into the Father of Waters. Every town and city on those rivers that lacks an adequate pollution treatment plant is an offender and a jeopardizer of the public health. The same is true of rivers in certain other areas.

Teeth are needed in the law, and the bill, H.R. 6441, has such teeth in it to require cities and towns to carry out their responsibilities to other communities.

Criticism has been leveled at this bill by those opposed to it, because it would increase the amount of Federal aid for disposal plant construction. The aid, to my way of thinking, would be a boon, rather than a detriment. The grant of 30 percent or a maximum of $250,000, whichever constitutes the lesser figure, is provided for under the present law. This is inadequate to the necessities of the times. The legislation under discussion would raise this figure to a maximum of $800,000.

The proposed formula provides that a Federal grant would amount to 30 percent of the first million dollars of the cost of a project, plus 15 percent of the next $2 million, plus 10 percent of the remainder, with $800,000 being the limit. This is a realistic approach.

Not long ago a plant near my constituency was constructed at a cost of $9 million. The maximum Federal commitment of $250,000 under the present law could hardly be called a strong incentive, but under the new bill which permits a higher maximum Federal contribution the incentive would be substantial.

Admittedly most of the water pollution control plants are in the smaller category insofar as costs are concerned, but I think it can be conceded that the old formula did not do justice to the larger cities and communities, where the cost of a plant ran into millions of dollars. As a matter of fact, it was developed during the hearings this year that the need for construction of treatment plants by municipalities, exceeding 50,000 population, amounts to about 30 percent of total U.S. needs, yet these cities have received less than 15 percent of the Federal grant funds under existing legislation.

It is comparatively easy to dream up formulas for State-matching funds. For example, there is suggested an arrangement which provides that if the States are required to match that portion of annual appropriation in excess of $50 million per year, the authorization in H.R. 6441 can be reduced from $100 million to $75 million per year while still making $100 million available annually by a combination of Federal and State aid for the construction of local pollution control plants.

The problem is that the States would be slow or even reluctant to participate in such a plan. To date only a few States offer any incentive of a financial nature to communities constructing pollution control plants—some four in all.

Obviously the ideal situation would be one in which States participate with matching funds, but there is little evidence of a willingness or inclination on the part of the States to cooperate along these lines. If they agreed to such a plan, it would take action by the State legislatures to validate it—a time-consuming process—and the whole enterprise would not be implemented until 1965.

The gentleman from New York feels that Federal money earmarked for water pollution control plants is money well spent. It assures cleaner streams and rivers and healthier drinking water.

Under the proposed bill, enforcement would be strengthened by extending Federal enforcement jurisdiction to all waters and to any pollution which endangers the health or welfare of any person. The bill would make an order of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relative to abatement of pollution a final order, unless an appeal were taken to the U.S. circuit court of Appeals, in which event the court review is limited to the record of the proceedings below, and the findings of the Secretary if supported by substantial evidence are conclusive.

Lastly, it would provide for the enforcement of the Secretary's order by the U.S. district courts in a civil action brought by the Attorney General of the United States at the request of the Secretary, without any requirement as in existing law for the consent or request of an interested State.

Under existing law, Federal enforcement to secure an abatement of pollution is applicable only to pollution of interstate waters which endanger the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates. Hence, both the waters involved and the pollution itself must be interstate in character as a prerequisite to Federal enforcement jurisdiction. It is interesting to note that of the estimated 26,000 water bodies in the United States only about 4,000 are of an interstate nature.

H.R. 6441 eliminates both of the above-mentioned requirements for Federal enforcement jurisdiction. No longer would Federal jurisdiction be limited to interstate pollution. By substituting the word "navigable" for "interstate" waters, Federal enforcement jurisdiction encompasses a wider area than formerly.

Under H.R. 6441 the Federal Government may enforce the abatement of pollution in either interstate or intrastate waters which are or can be made navigable, whether such waters flow across or form a part of State boundaries, or are confined within the boundaries of a single State.

In other words, for all practical purposes the new enforcement provisions would apply to all waters in every State. This I think is entirely equitable.

It is claimed that the Federal Government is taking over the States' responsibilities in abatement of pollution by substituting Federal enforcement for State enforcement in intrastate waters. This is a measure born of necessity because the States have been lax in their enforcement of water pollution abatement.

While the Federal Government has broadened its enforcement area, the States nevertheless have concurrent enforcement jurisdiction in intrastate pollution. I do not believe the States are going to shift their enforcement responsibilities to the Federal Government as has been claimed by some. Pollution abatement enforcement is a job requiring both State and Federal cooperation.

This measure merits wide support.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire tc the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on H.R. 6441 testimony was received by the Public Works Committee from the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers reporting a recent survey of municipal waste treatment needs.

This is the most complete report on needs that has come to my attention. The information I will give you today was provided by the State Sanitary Engineers themselves and not by the Federal Government.

These figures represent State estimates of their own needs existing at the beginning of the present year. They do not take into account new needs continuously arising from obsolescence and increasing population.

Forty-eight States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands responded to the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers in this survey.

They reported 5,127 communities requiring new sewage treatment plants, plant enlargements, or major additions, to serve a present population of 42 million people. Of this number, 4,136 cities and towns require new plants to prevent the discharge of raw sewage from a population of some 23 million.

A substantial majority of needed new plants are for smaller communities of less than 10,000 population. However, the cost of providing new facilities for larger cities is approximately the same. Most States reported a large backlog of treatment needs for communities still discharging untreated or inadequately treated sewage. New plant construction needs account for nearly 70 percent of the total backlog cost.

The estimated cost of all municipal waste treatment needs is $2 billion. Calculations by the Public Health Service indicate that the removal of this backlog of needs in 10 years, together with providing for population growth and obsolescence of existing works, will require an average annual expenditure of $600 million.

We have experienced a great deal of progress under the existing Water Pollution Control Act with the present $50 million a year for construction grants-in-aid. There is every reason to believe that we can reach the required $600 million per year expenditure required for effective control of pollution from municipal wastes with an increase in Federal grants to $100 million annually. Even at this rate, it would take a full decade to get the job done. Without the proposed increase in grants the task is insurmountable. With it, we can master the municipal water pollution problem and rid the Nation of this monstrous blight.

I hope the bill will pass by a large majority.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the distinguished Public Works Committee for bringing forth a bill which when enacted will prove to be a great milestone in law for the protection of the American people. This bill has two features which are going to do a great deal to preserve the health of the people. The first of these is an increase in the grant program to $100 million, double what it was under Public Law 660 for the construction of sewage abatement works; and, second, the section which increases the ability of the Federal Government in cooperation with the States to abate pollution of the waters of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are some things that need clarifying today. My very distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], is either confused or has been seeking to confuse the House. I choose to take the more charitable interpretation of what my very good friend has been saying today, to believe that he is confused. I speak today, Mr. Chairman, as one of the authors of this bill, and as one of the authors of a series of predecessor bills which were presented to this House during the previous session.

The language of both the legislation before us today dealing with pollution of navigable waters and the language of the report make it amply clear and abundantly plain that we do not seek to usurp the functions of the States, or to take away their prerogatives to abate pollution within their borders or to in any way impair State water pollution control activities. Indeed, the language of the bill on page 8, line 17, is as clear as crystal to anyone who would read the declaration of policy:

> Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, State and interstate action to abate pollution of navigable waters shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement except as otherwise provided—

And so on. The language goes further on page 8, line 24, and states:

> Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State water pollution control agency or with the concurrence of the State water pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated, the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to pollution of navigable waters which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State—

And so on.

This language is clear as to intent. It shows very clearly that we do not wish nor intend to usurp the function of water pollution control nor to exclude the States from their legitimate and proper activities in this field. We intend, rather, and I say to my good friend who has displayed a very considerable degree of erudition on this subject, we seek only to offer to the States, to the municipalities, and to the Governors of these States, an additional weapon in dealing with the hard core polluters, both municipal and industrial, that have been soiling and defiling the waters of this country to a point where it has become intolerable. We do not weaken the States or their pollution programs; we give incentive and a tremendous weapon. We make available trained staffs of the finest sort to help the States, and Federal financing to assist them in their war on polluters and conduct of pollution abatement procedures. Pollution is not, as somebody stated here today, an isolated thing, nor is it a uniquely local plight. The pollution of the waters from which the people of St. Louis or New Orleans may drink originate as far north as Chicago, it may originate in Pittsburgh, or it may originate as far up as the headwaters of the Missouri River. These substances are of equal toxicity when they are put in 1,000 yards up stream and when they are put in 1,000 rules upriver. These substances which are inserted into the waters of our land today are not the substances which we know or understand or, indeed, of which we have any understanding of proper and adequate treatment for removal of these substances. Rather, these substances are not only

often in their own right toxic but they may even permit the waters to harbor other toxic matters to the point where they cannot be purified so that they may serve as useful, decent water for our people to drink.

I pay tribute to the committee for the compromise amendment eliminating controversy by placing the water pollution control activities under the Secretary of HEW. This is recognition of failure by the leadership of the Public Health Service to sufficiently, vigorously prosecute the program. I am hopeful that the vigorous and active people who have been so liberated from the dead hand of bureaucracy will not later be again buried within the Public Health Service or a bureau of environmental health.

The original bill made the water pollution control agency an independent and autonomous agency directly under the Secretary. The original provision I would favor over that in the committee amendment. But regard the compromise as a vast step forward in giving the devoted public servants who have so long worked to make this program vigorous and aggressive in spite of the desire of the Public Health Service high command to not walk on toes and to conduct a polite and genteel program of research, lecture, and study. This liberation, if respected, offers vast promise for the future. I hope that the Secretary and the administration will respect it.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Michigan that he failed to read the balance of the last sentence on page 8, in the exceptions.

except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a final order issued in accordance with subsection (e) of this section or a court order under subsection (g) of this section.

The action or policy against infringing on the State or interstate water pollution agency is not involved in this area in the exceptions.

Those are the exceptions, and they are broad.

I will also point out the gentleman was not specific in regard to the areas he felt were not clarified in my remarks.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, there should be little question over the fact that the need to prevent and control water pollution should stand high on our list of national priorities. As our society grows and becomes ever more complex, the threads of water quality and water quantity will become inextricably interwoven. Already, as our water needs spiral upward, the repeated reuse of water is becoming the rule rather than the exception—more and more people and machines demanding more and more water and, in a vicious cycle, at the same time producing more and more pollution to degrade those same waters.

Thus America faces another problem of urgent national concern, calling for clear concepts and principles and for action that cannot be postponed. This is not a problem for the next generation to worry about. Our need is not tomorrow—it is today.

Congressional awareness of that need, however, demands more than hasty expedient action. Implicit in that awareness on our part is also a challenge to attempt to strike and to maintain certain balances—balances in the apportionment of responsibility, the distribution of costs and the application of enforcement regulations. Obviously, the most difficult balance for us to strike, in the multilayered, interwoven economic and administrative world of today, will be in the area of responsibilities.

Both for reasons of tradition and practicality, the fundamental responsibility for pollution abatement and control should, in my judgment, remain at the source—with the local municipalities and industries concerned—and, in my further judgment, in the long run our success in solving this problem will be directly proportional to the acceptance of responsibility for the application of abatement measures by those whose very existence creates not only the demand for clean water but the pollution problem itself.

I think it is equally clear that the several States ought to be the keystones in our national pollution-abatement effort. Historically, legislatively, and logically, our ability to stimulate a stronger interest and participation in this problem at the State level has been and, in my judgment, will continue to be a major determinant of our long-range success.

Finally then, rounding out what one might call a trinity of responsibility, comes the unmistakable Federal concern, derived from the interstate nature and national scope of this complex problem. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is here a virtually unbounded opportunity for Federal leadership in the Nation's interest—for leadership in research and investigation, for leadership in contributing to a more enlightened awareness concerning this problem on the part of both public and professional interests, and for leadership in stimulating and strengthening action at both the State and local levels.

There are many facets involved in our consideration of H.R. 6441 to which I might address myself, but I would like to focus your attention on what I consider to be the need to develop a better balance of that three-way responsibility I have been talking about. Now I know that there are those here who will argue that if we get into this subject we will be running the risk of becoming bogged down in a provincial squabble that might threaten the passage of this bill or the future of this program—that if we decide to endeavor to encourage greater State participation, no matter how desirable that might be, we might end up in only delaying the "steady progress" (as the majority refers to it), that is being made by virtue of the grant-in-aid feature of the 1956 act. I must admit that there may be such a danger, but I submit that it is necessary to run the risk thereof because, while the task we face may prove to be too big for any one or any combination of two of the three necessary partners, it is not too big for all three if we can get them working together in tandem with the support of an enlightened industrial community.

Perhaps a brief historical review might help at this point. Strong national impetus to tackle this one of our many problems was provided by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1948—an act that delineated the principle of Federal-State cooperation and, for the first time, provided for a Federal role in the fields of research and technical assistance, for limited Federal authority over interstate waters and a small amount of Federal financial assistance as well. This authority was further extended and expanded upon in 1956 when Congress added the principle of Federal grants-in-aid to provide our smaller local municipalities with both the incentive and some of the dollars needed in order that they might break out of the straitjacket of inaction that had been imposed upon them by a lack of adequate financial resources and the notion, held to by most of their hard-pressed taxpaying residents, that the economic and social benefits of pollution abatement were far more real for their downstream neighbors than for themselves.

There are still those who will question the initial wisdom and propriety of that Federal grants-in-aid program. Some of them even argue that this program has hindered rather than helped us toward our goal of cleaner waters. Be that as it may, it seems to me that we have long since turned the corner of "no return," and that we could only abandon the existing Federal participation in this program with the certain knowledge that we would be impeding further progress. If you should happen to agree with me, then the only remaining question is, Where do we go from here?

In searching for the proper answer, we must first pause to see what we have accomplished. On paper, the "carrot on a stick" approach represented by the grants-in-aid program would seem to have generated close to $5 in local expenditures for abatement purposes for every $1 of Federal money similarly invested. Over 2,500 local sewage-treatment projects have been approved for Federal participation since 1956. Of these, as of the time of the recent National Conference on Water Pollution, 1,246 are completed, 717 were under construction and the rest were awaiting construction. Those most friendly to the grants-in-aid program claim that it has stimulated a 62-percent increase in treatment-plant construction since the passage of the 1956 act. Be that as it may, it is also estimated that the Nation's construction backlog, excluding such new needs as will accompany population growth, amounts to some $600 million a year for the next 10 years, a total of $6 billion. I think that estimate fairly accurately shows the magnitude of our problem, and the point I would like to now make as clearly as I can is that the burden of that problem, even if H.R. 6441 is passed in its present form, will continue to fall the heaviest on the one partner—the local municipality—in that

trinity of responsibility which is probably the least able to afford it.

This is so—and will surely continue to be so if H.R. 6441 is passed in its present form, because the Federal Government's entry into this field with Federal tax dollars has, almost without exception, been chiefly cause for sighs of relief from our respective State legislatures. Only three States—Maine, Vermont, and Maryland—since 1956 have been stimulated sufficiently by the Federal program to shoulder any major part of the disproportionate burden assigned to the local municipality. New Hampshire, to its credit, has recently become an added starter along with those original three States in recognition of the principle that this is a three-way partnership problem, and I also understand that Georgia may soon join their ranks. I wish I might also say to you that my own State of New York was preparing to assume its share of responsibility here, but unfortunately I cannot.

In any event, I would choose to consider that the five progressive-minded States I have mentioned represent solid evidence of the point stressed in the minority report that it is not so much a question of whether or not the various States can afford to join hands with Uncle Sam in tackling this problem, as it is that most of them have not so far assigned to this problem the high priority that it deserves.

I recognize that it is considerably easier for those municipal associations and civic organizations who are most seriously concerned with water pollution to obtain additional Federal moneys in order to speed up our attack on that backlog of needs than it is for them to be required to approach 45 reluctant State legislatures. Thus, it is not surprising that H.R. 6441 was so vigorously supported before our committee by State water pollution control administrators, sanitary engineers and civic organizations ranging all the way from the League of Women Voters to the Izaak Walton League. I also recognize that we here sometimes get States rights mixed up with States' responsibilities. However, I for one, happen to think that the continuing emphasis on the bankruptcy of local government is not quite consistent with the continuing expenditure by our people of billions of dollars annually on the auto, the cosmetic and the other excitements of daily living so characteristic of our way of life.

So what do we do here today? Do we pay no attention to the fact that there is an absence of realistic data establishing the inability of the various States to accept their rightful responsibilities? Do we ignore the testimony of almost every witness that came before our committee, including Secretary Ribicoff, himself, admitting that it would be a most beneficial thing if we could somehow get the remaining 45 States into the picture? Do we once again take the escapist view that local responsibility is bankrupt and local resources are exhausted, forgetting that it is those same resources and only those that nourish the coffers of the National Government? Do we want our States to become mere conduits for the receipt and allocation of Federal moneys, or do we want them to be strong and active partners in all the various areas of shared responsibility?

Many members on the minority side of our committee would like to support this program. We worked hard to come up with suggestions that would not weaken or negate the purposes of this program nor impede the progress that is being made. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] will offer an amendment or amendments, which I urge you to support, that will go along with a substantial increase in Federal participation in the construction program as it now exists—from an authorization of $50 million a year to $75 million a year, thus bringing H.R. 6441 in line with its companion measure in the other body. For 3 years those additional Federal dollars, if appropriated, could be used to attack the construction backlog now existing. During that 3-year period it is hoped that those States which need to do so will enact enabling legislation that will eventually authorize their participation in this partnership endeavor in the same way that five of their sister States are already doing or preparing to do. Then, beginning with the appropriations for fiscal year 1965, the Cramer amendments will require State matching funds, dollar for dollar, for any Federal funds appropriated in excess of the existing annual $50 million authorization.

These amendments will preserve the existing program as a base upon which to build. I think we could well consider that that base program represents a fulfillment of the basic Federal share of responsibility in this field. Then, after that 3-year waiting period, Federal funds offered over and above that base program will serve as a "carrot on a stick" to stimulate State participation in the same way that the base or existing program now serves as a "carrot on a stick" to stimulate local action.

This, in my judgment, represents a responsible and a progressive approach to the needs of our Nation. It will equalize the burden shared by the three responsible partners. It will stimulate construction. It will tear away the last vestiges of local public apathy. It will strengthen the program. It will help us get the job done. I hope those Cramer amendments will carry.

Before closing, I would like to commend the committee for adopting the new provisions contained in H.R. 6441 which will encourage joint construction projects for several communities banded together. The minority sponsored a ceiling on this feature of the bill so that a metropolitan complex could not absorb the lion's share of any State's allocated portion of Federal funds thus continuing the program's emphasis on aid to the smaller community. This feature is a decided improvement, and will be of immediate benefit in my congressional district where a number of such joint projects are presently under consideration.

Finally, I would like to urge that, in view of industry's important role in the attack on water pollution, other committees of Congress should give their early consideration to various measures that have been and may be proposed to give industry a better incentive—perhaps through faster tax writeoffs for treatment-plant construction—than it now has to accept its responsibility, in full. In the long run, our ability to provide such an incentive may be as important to our eventual success as what we seek to do here today.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STUBBLEFIELD].

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to record my strong and enthusiastic support of H.R. 6441. This bill, expanding the highly successful Federal water pollution control program and providing for additional research in the field of water pollution control, is of great value to the Nation. The need to maintain the purity of one of this Nation's greatest resources—water—can hardly be overestimated.

The district I have the honor to represent is bordered by the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers, and bisected by the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the Clarks, the Little, and the Pond Rivers. The purity of the waters of these rivers and more particularly Kentucky Lake and of the Barkley Lake which will be impounded in 1964 is our minimum duty as citizens. Desecration of these waters with untreated or inadequately treated sewage and industrial wastes would reflect great discredit on our democratic concept that freemen can govern themselves and can work together for their mutual best interests.

I salute the great Public Works Committee for bringing forth this bill, and more particularly the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, ably chaired by our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, JOHN BLATNIK.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. HARDING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure to speak today in support of H.R. 6441. I concur with the views of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK], and our other colleagues who want to improve our Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

I am from the Snake River Valley of Idaho. This is one of the most beautiful rivers in the world. It provides our residents of Idaho and our visitors from other States and throughout the world with a body of water where we can swim, water ski, fish, and hunt waterfowl. It provides vital irrigation water for about 650,000 acres of Idaho cropland. After rendering this service to Idaho, this river flows on through Oregon and Washington, into the Columbia River and then to the Pacific Ocean.

We in Idaho want to give this water to our downstream neighbors in just as pure a state as we have received it—fresh from the beautiful springs and snow runoffs of our mountains.

Today we have in Idaho a fast-growing industrial economy. We have increased urban populations and vegetable processing plants, many of which are still dumping untreated waste into the Snake River. It is a disgrace if we allow it to become a river of disease and a public sewer for every community and processing plant that wishes to dump their waste into the Snake River.

I feel that H.R. 6441 will provide the controls and the incentives to help the people of the Snake River Valley and Idaho, as well as the people throughout America, to maintain pure and beautiful rivers.

While the Water Pollution Control Act as it was earlier enacted has greatly benefited Idaho, contributing $2,695,340.70 to which the State has matched $4 for every Federal dollar received, there is still much to be done.

Idaho State Health Department officials estimate that there are 104 communities serving 190,000 people which need sewage plants estimated to cost $5,906,000. Additional work to put these plants in good operating condition would require $4,724,000 or a total expenditure for water pollution of $10,630,000.

Nationally the picture is similar. According to a recent Public Health Service report, 21.5 percent of the 102 million people living in communities served by sewers still discharge their raw sewage into public water. Nearly 2,900 new plants are required for the treatment of this raw sewage. Some 3,000 other communities need replacement or enlargement of facilities to meet the obligations of their downstream neighbors. The Public Health Service further estimates that an additional 6,000 industrial waste treatment projects should be in operation right now.

With greater Federal stimulus, I believe we can solve this problem. I am proud to rise in support of this much-needed legislation.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, many years ago a very wise man named Solomon wrote: "Where there is no vision people perish." In 1956 when we began this landmark legislation to control the pollution of the Nation's streams, I believe that the Congress was acting with great vision.

One of the really overpowering truths of our time is the rapid rate at which our population has been expanding. Every evening when we sit down to dinner there are some 7,200 more of us needing to be served here in the United States than there were the evening before. At the same time that our population is growing by such strides, our per capita consumption of water is growing even more swiftly. So that one of the truly great challenges of our time, of this civilization, is to look ahead and make provisions to the end that there shall be sufficient quantities of usable water for the next generation and the generations which will follow it upon this land.

When we first began the water pollution control program of grants to municipalities, the fear was expressed on the part of some minority members that it would not achieve the goal of stimulating local activity. Rather than increasing the work done to clear up the streams by sewage treatment plants, they said these Federal matching grants would slow down the work by discouraging the cities from undertaking activity on their own and encouraging them instead to wait until the Federal Government made grants available to them.

By any yardstick you can apply this has been a monumentally successful program. Let us look at the record. In the 5 years which immediately preceded the beginning of this program the average total annual amount of money spent on sewage treatment plant construction was some $222 million. In the 5 years of the program's activity the average annual amount has been 62 percent greater, two-thirds again almost. During this time when the Federal Government has appropriated and made grant offers for a total of $219,300,000, we have stimulated on the part of local communities the spending of more than $1 billion in order to qualify for this amount of money.

A total of some 2,671 communities have thus been encouraged, have thus been aided, have thus been given an incentive to tackle this problem. For every Federal dollar expended on this program there has been more than $4.80 spent to match it at the State and local levels. So, you see, the fear that was expressed in the first place has had no validity whatever.

Those in the minority are saying now that they accept the basic philosophy of the program which first they resisted. They now publicly accept the idea that we should make grants, but they simply do not want us to make grants any higher. They accept the idea that we have done a great thing in stimulating and encouraging on the part of the States and local communities some activity on their own to abate this growing pollution problem, but they do not want to spend any more money than we have been spending.

A few years ago in an effort to oppose the program of grants to cities, they said, "All you need to do is beef up enforcement. We can cure this pollution problem without giving any money to anybody if you just strengthen the enforcement procedures." Now we come to you with a program which not only makes money available to those communities which could not effectively tackle the problem without these grants, but we have strengthened the enforcement procedures. Yet today they have reversed their position entirely. Instead of saying that grants are bad and enforcement is good, they appear today saying that grants are good but enforcement is bad.

Just what do we do in this bill? First, we increase the total authorization to $100 million a year. Second, we increase the maximum amount that is available to an individual municipality to the end that larger municipalities also may be helped under this bill, they being some of the most extremely important targets we must reach if we are to control the pollution of our streams.

Third, we make it possible for groups of municipalities to join together in concerted action to build area treatment plants aimed at serving all those municipalities without being limited to the maximum grant figure that would apply to one municipality alone.

In the fourth place, we strengthen the enforcement procedures and it strengthens also the powers that are available to the States and the State pollution control agencies where they exist by giving them another weapon they may use against willful polluters by allowing these States at their option to call upon the Federal authority.

I call your attention to the fact that in no instance does this bill authorize the Federal authority to enter the field of enforcement except upon the invitation of the States. Where shall we have lost States rights in this?

I direct and invite your attention to the language beginning at the bottom of page 8 of the bill, where it states:

> Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State water pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State water pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall * * *.

The Secretary shall give formal notification, enter into a hearing in which the States themselves are parties, and ascertain the extent to which the pollution has occurred and the extent to which it is subject to being abated by Federal order. In no instance can the Federal Government enter into the enforcement procedures except upon the invitation of the State.

The gentlemen seem to be saying that after the Federal Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued an order to desist from the pollution of a stream, the States ought to have the right to veto the enforcement of that order. This would amount to nullification. I do not think any reasonable or prudent person would say that a State could possess inherent in its jurisdiction or sovereignty the right to veto the enforcement of a valid Federal order. This is not consistent with our long-standing policy of separate powers and divided responsibilities in the large area of concurrent jurisdiction between State and Federal authorities. So, Mr. Chairman, we have done nothing to invade or violate States rights, but rather have given to those States an additional weapon with which they can, if they wish, stop the pollution of the streams that flow through their borders.

Finally, the bill contains a new section providing that prevailing wages shall be paid in contracts under this bill. There is nothing new or revolutionary in this requirement. It is the only thing we can consistently do consonant with long-standing public policy.

There is ample precedent in Federal grant programs for the guarantee of prevailing wages. This same protection is afforded in the Housing Act, the Hospital Act, the Federal Airport Act, the School Construction Act, the Community

Facilities Act, the Civil Defense Act, and the Federal Aid Highway Act.

Exactly what does the wage provision say? Does it say that Federal moneys shall be used as a lever to pry up the existing wage levels in an area? Not at all. It simply says that Federal moneys shall not be used to depress the existing wages of an area by setting up an unfair competition for jobs.

Does it oppress a contractor or place him at an unfair disadvantage with his competitors? Not at all. It simply assures him that he can pay the average wages which prevail in the immediate area without himself being placed at a competitive disadvantage by an unscrupulous competitor who might otherwise walk away with the contract by undercutting the wages that others in the industry are paying.

It simply sets up an understandable ground rule for all concerned and removes the matter of wages as a haggling device by which to get the jump on a competitor. What possible objection can there be to such a policy? If we were to oppose the payment of prevailing standard wages, then would this not mean that we favored the payment of substandard wages? Surely the Congress does not wish to take that position.

Those who propose the removal of this guarantee have thrown up the false argument that some communities, if required to pay the standard, average wages of the locality, might lose more than they would gain in the Federal grant. The fallacy of this argument should be evident on its face. The Federal participation in most cases amounts to about 15 or 20 percent of the total project. If any firm should be paying such pitifully low wages that he could thus underbid the cost of an entire job by 20 percent, then, obviously, he is depressing wages, and his gain is ill gotten.

It is and has been the policy of our Government for many years to promote decent wages for the working force of this Nation. It has been the conscious policy of our Government to eradicate substandard wages and thus to elevate the standard of living of our people.

This policy is inherent in the minimum-wage laws. It stems from the realization that labor is not just another inanimate commodity in the marketplace to be bargained for at the lowest possible price in the cold and unfeeling manner in which we might bargain for a secondhand car or a piece of used machinery. Labor is flesh and blood. It is the currency of life, the ultimate product of the human creature, and the measure of the worth we assess as a nation to the individual person.

It is precisely this realization which distinguishes a humane and civilized society from the law of the jungle. It is just this official concern for the welfare of the humblest American which has made this Nation an inspiration to mankind.

So, I think the House will agree with the committee that this is a sound bill providing an overdue expansion of a program which has proven to be one of the most successful avenues of approach we have developed in the Congress toward the solution of one of the growing and truly crucial social and economic problems of our time. I ask you then to join with us in giving it your support to the end that we may move forward and keep pace with the growth of this problem and, perhaps, gain a bit on it so that the next generation and the generations to follow will not find a ravished land with polluted streams and inadequate supplies of usable water even for their drinking needs, and to the end, Mr. Chairman, that those words of Solomon, "Where there is no vision, the people perish," may not become the epitaph of our civilization.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, today we have before the House the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961. We all want to keep our rivers and streams clean and useful. We all wish to lessen water pollution. It is my belief that we can do more to help in cleaning up water pollution and I intend to vote for this bill. There is vital need to increase our supply of clean usable water. We have today harnessed most of our sources. In the future there will be no new sources to tap, especially around great urban centers such as New York. We must clean up the water we now have and reuse it. This requires more emphasis on preventing pollution.

I support the proposal in this bill to put full responsibility for the conduct of the Federal water pollution control program directly with the Secretary of the Department concerned, Health, Education, and Welfare, instead of with the Surgeon General in the Public Health Service, a subdivision of the Department. This is in conformity with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission and is a sound proposal.

I support the establishment of regional water pollution control laboratories, especially since the locations mentioned in the bill are not intended to exclude any other area where such facilities are needed.

I also strongly support the statement in the bill which reaffirms the primary responsibility and right of the States for preventing and controlling water pollution. However, the bill in fact does not carry out this policy. It extends the area of Federal enforcement from its proper area, interstate waters, to all navigable waters. This in fact gives control of all waterways to the Federal Government in the field of pollution. Thereby Federal power will preempt State in yet another area. Extension of such Federal power raises a serious policy question. I fully support strong Federal enforcement measures. In fact, I believe that strong enforcement through the combined efforts of Federal, State, and local authorities is a greater stimulation to cleaning up our water than any other part of the act. However, I do not believe that the Federal Government is acting properly when it takes over State responsibilities and substitutes Federal enforcement in matters entirely intrastate. The Federal Government should encourage and promote State and local enforcement rather than undermine it by preempting the field.

The other section of the bill with which I am not entirely satisfied is that which increases by 100 percent Federal grants for waste treatment plant construction. The bill authorizes doubling the present Federal financial assistance from $50 to $100 million annually with a total authorization of $1 billion. No provision is made for the States to share in financing the construction program. An increase in Federal grants without any requirement for State matching will merely discourage State action since the local authorities will wait for Federal action rather than initiate their own. If the urgent need for treatment plants is to be met, it is essential that the States have incentive to participate in providing the facilities. Equally important is the need to curtail Federal expenditures wherever it is possible for the State or local governments to do the job.

Thus, while I am voting for this bill because I feel strongly the need for water pollution control, it is not a satisfactory bill. The interests of the States are bypassed beyond reason or necessity with new Federal encroachments and ill-conceived expenditures. However, it is the only bill that will come before the Congress for several years and so for lack of a better bill I shall support it. We would hope that before too long wiser proposals will be presented to the House.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the last sentence of section 1(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 (a)) is amended to read as follows: "To this end, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act called the 'Secretary') shall administer this Act."

(b) Section 1(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters of such States, including but not limited to the power, authority, and jurisdiction of such States to enforce State water pollution control laws and regulations."

(c) Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and the first sentence of section 10(a) of such Act are each amended by striking out "Surgeon General" and "Surgeon General's" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary" and "Secretary's", respectively.

(d) Sections 4(a) and 7(c) of such Act are each amended by striking out "Public Health Service" and inserting in lieu thereof "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare".

(e) Sections 7(a)(2)(B) and 10(b) are each amended by striking out "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

(f) Section 10(a) of such Act is amended by striking out the second and third sentences thereof.

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (a) of section 4 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out in paragraph (4) thereof the following: ": *Provided,* That the total sum authorized to be appropriated for

any fiscal year for fellowships pursuant to this subparagraph shall not exceed $100,000; and".

(b) Paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of section 4 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "; and".

(c) Section 4 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) The Secretary shall establish, equip, and maintain field laboratory and research facilities, including, but not limited to, one to be located in the northeastern area of the United States, one in the southeastern area, one in the midwestern area, one in the southwestern area, one in the Pacific Northwest, and one in the State of Alaska, for the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, field demonstrations and studies, and training relating to the prevention and control of water pollution. Insofar as practicable, each such facility shall be located near institutions of higher learning in which graduate training in such research might be carried out.

"(e) The Secretary shall conduct research and technical development work, and make studies, with respect to the quality of the waters of the Great Lakes, including an analysis of the present and projected future water quality of the Great Lakes under varying conditions of waste treatment and disposal, an evaluation of the water quality needs of those to be served by such waters, an evaluation of municipal, industrial, and vessel waste treatment and disposal practices with respect to such waters, and a study of alternate means of solving water pollution problems (including additional waste treatment measures) with respect to such waters."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by inserting immediately following "June 30, 1961, $3,000,000" the following: ", and for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $5,000,000".

(b) Subsection (f) of section 5 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph 4 thereof, by striking out the period at the end of paragraph 5 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and " and by adding after such paragraph 5 the following new paragraph:

"(6) sets forth the criteria used by the State in determining priority of projects as provided in section 6(b)(4)."

SEC. 4. (a) Subsection (b)(2) of section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) No grant shall be made for any project in an amount exceeding whichever of the following is the smaller: (A) $800,000, or (B) the total of 30 per centum of the first $1,000,000 of the reasonable cost of the project as determined by the Secretary, plus 15 per centum of the next $2,000,000 of such cost, plus 10 per centum of the remainder of such cost: *Provided*, That the grantee agrees to pay the remaining cost: *Provided further*, That in the case of a project which will serve more than one municipality (A) the Secretary shall, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable, allocate to each municipality to be served by such project its share of the estimated reasonable cost of such project, and shall then apply the foregoing limitations in this clause to each such share as if it were a separate project to determine the maximum amount of any grant which may be made under this section with respect to each such share, and the total of all the amounts so determined or $2,400,000, whichever is the smaller, shall be the maximum amount of the grant which may be made under this section on account of such project, and (B) for purposes of the limitation in the last sentence of subsection (d), the share of each municipality so determined shall be regarded as a grant for the construction of treatment works".

(b) Subsection (b) of such section is further amended by striking out "and" after clause (3) and by inserting before the period at the end of clause (4): "; and (5) no grant shall be made for any project under this section in any State in an amount exceeding $250,000 until a grant has been made thereunder for each project (A) for which an application was filed with the appropriate State water pollution control agency prior to the date of enactment of this clause and (B) which the Secretary determines met the requirements of this section and regulations thereunder as in effect prior to such date of enactment".

(c) The third sentence of subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out the final period and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", except that any such allotment which is not obligated within six months following the end of the fiscal year for which it was made because of a lack of projects which have been approved under subsection (b)(1) of this section, or certified as entitled to priority under subsection (b)(4) of this section, shall be reallotted by the Secretary, on such basis as he determines to be reasonable and equitable and in accordance with regulations promulgated by him. Any amount made available to a State by reallotments under the preceding sentence shall be in addition to amounts otherwise allotted to such State under this section, and shall be available for payments with respect to projects in such State which have been approved under this section prior to the close of the fiscal year following the year for which the original allotment was made."

(d) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by striking out "$50,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$100,000,000", and by striking out "$500,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000,000,000".

(e) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects for which grants are made under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on the same type of work on similar construction in the immediate locality, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the Act of March 3, 1931, as amended, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (46 Stat. 1494; 40 U.S.C. 276a through 276a–5)."

SEC. 5. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a)(1) of section 7 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows: "There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board, composed of the Secretary or his designee, who shall be chairman, and nine members appointed by the President, none of whom shall be Federal officers or employees."

(b) The first sentence of subsection (a)(2)(A) of such section 7 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof: ", and (iii) the term of any member under the preceding provisions shall be extended until the date on which his successor's appointment is effective".

SEC. 6. Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended to read as follows:

"ENFORCEMENT MEASURES AGAINST POLLUTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS

"SEC. 8. (a) The pollution of navigable waters in or adjacent to any State or States (whether the matter causing or contributing to such pollution is discharged directly into such waters or reaches such waters after discharge into a tributary of such waters), which endangers the health or welfare of any persons, shall be subject to abatement as provided in this Act.

"(b) Consistent with the policy declaration of this Act, State and interstate action to abate pollution of navigable waters shall be encouraged and shall not be displaced by Federal enforcement action except as otherwise provided by or pursuant to a final order issued in accordance with subsection (e) of this section or a court order under subsection (g) of this section.

"(c)(1) Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State water pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State water pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to pollution of navigable waters which is endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originates, give formal notification thereof to the water pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States where such discharge or discharges orginate and shall call promptly a conference of such agency or agencies and of the State water pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the State or States, if any, which may be adversely affected by such pollution. Whenever requested by the Governor of any State, a State water pollution control agency, or (with the concurrence of the State water pollution control agency for the State in which the municipality is situated) the governing body of any municipality, the Secretary shall, if such request refers to pollution of navigable waters which is endangering the health or welfare of persons only in the requesting State in which the discharge or discharges (causing or contributing to such pollution) originates, give formal notification thereof to the water pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the requesting State where such discharge or discharges originate and shall promptly call a conference of such agency or agencies and of the State water pollution control agency and interstate agency, if any, of the requesting State. The Secretary shall also call such a conference whenever, on the basis of reports, surveys, or studies, he has reason to believe that any pollution referred to in subsection (a) and endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge or discharges originate is occurring.

"(2) The agencies called to attend such conference may bring such persons as they desire to the conference. Not less than three weeks' prior notice of the conference date shall be given to such agencies.

"(3) Following this conference, the Secretary shall prepare and forward to all the water pollution control agencies attending the conference a summary of conference discussions including (A) occurrence of pollution of navigable waters subject to abatement under this Act; (B) adequacy of measures taken toward abatement of the pollution; and (C) nature of delays, if any, being encountered in abating the pollution.

"(d) If the Secretary believes, upon the conclusion of the conference or thereafter, that effective progress toward abatement of such pollution is not being made and that the health or welfare of any persons is being endangered, he shall recommend to the appropriate State water pollution control agency that it take necessary remedial action. The Secretary shall allow at least six months from the date he makes such recommendations for the taking of such recommended action.

"(e) If, at the conclusion of the period so allowed, such remedial action is not taken or action which in the judgment of the Secretary is reasonably calculated to secure

abatement of such pollution is not taken, the Secretary shall call a public hearing, to be held in or near one or more of the places where the discharge or discharges causing or contributing to such pollution originated, before a Hearing Board of five or more persons appointed by the Secretary. Each State in which any discharge causing or contributing to such pollution originates and each State claiming to be adversely affected by such pollution shall be given an opportunity to select one member of the Hearing Board and at least one member shall be a representative of the Department of Commerce, and not less than a majority of the Hearing Board shall be persons other than officers or employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At least three weeks' prior notice of such hearing shall be given to the State water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, called to attend the aforesaid hearing and the alleged polluter or polluters. On the basis of the evidence presented at such hearing, the Hearing Board shall make findings as to whether pollution referred to in subsection (a) is occurring and whether effective progress toward abatement thereof is being made. If the Hearing Board finds such pollution is occurring and effective progress toward abatement is not being made it shall make recommendations to the Secretary concerning the measures, if any, which it finds to be reasonable and equitable to secure abatement of such pollution. Such findings and recommendations shall be the findings and recommendations of the Secretary except to the extent, on the basis of the evidence at such hearing, he believes additional or different findings or recommendations are warranted. The Secretary shall send his findings and recommendations to the person or persons discharging any matter causing or contributing to such pollution, together with an order specifying a reasonable time, but not less than six months from the date of issuance of such order, to secure abatement of such pollution in accordance with such findings and recommendations. Such order shall become final on the sixtieth day after the date of its issuance unless an appeal is taken as provided in subsection (b). The Secretary shall also send a copy of such findings and recommendations and such order to the water pollution control agencies and interstate agencies, if any, attending the hearings as a party of record.

"(f) An appeal may be taken from any such order of the Secretary by any person who has been made subject to such order to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which any discharge or discharges causing or contributing to the pollution subject to abatement by such order originates by filing with such court a notice of appeal within sixty days from the date of issuance of the order. The jurisdiction of the court shall attach upon the filing of such notice. A copy of such notice shall forthwith be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary or any officer designated by him for that purpose and to any other person who received a copy of the Secretary's order. The Secretary shall thereupon file in the court the record of the proceedings before the Hearing Board as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code, together with his findings of fact and recommendations. Such findings of the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence when considered on the record as a whole, shall be conclusive, but the court for good cause shown may remand the case to the Secretary for the taking of additional evidence in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the court may deem proper. The Secretary may thereupon make or cause to be made new or modified findings of fact and recommendations, and he shall file with the court the record of such further proceedings, the new or modified findings and recommendations, and his recommendations, if any, for the setting aside or modification of his original order. Such new or modified findings shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence when considered on the record as a whole.

"(g) Upon the basis of the record of the proceedings filed with it, the court shall have jurisdiction to enter an order affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Secretary. The judgment of the court shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"(h) The United States district courts shall have jurisdiction of any civil action brought by the Attorney General at the request of the Secretary to enforce any order issued under this section by the Secretary, or by a United States court of appeals.

"(i) Members of any Hearing Board appointed pursuant to subsection (e) who are not regular full-time officers or employees of the United States shall, while participating in the hearing conducted by such Board or otherwise engaged on the work of such Board, receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(j) As used in this section, the term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State.

"(k) As used in this section, the term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law."

SEC. 7. Section 9 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "In his summary of any conference pursuant to section 8(c)(3) of this Act, the Secretary shall include references to any discharges allegedly contributing to pollution from any Federal property. Notice of any hearing pursuant to section 8(e) involving any pollution alleged to be effected by any such discharges shall also be given to the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property involved and the findings and recommendations of the Hearing Board conducting such hearing shall also include references to any such discharges which are contributing to the pollution found by such Hearing Board."

SEC. 8. Section 11 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended by striking out subsections (d) and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(d) The term 'State' means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"(e) The term 'interstate waters' means all rivers, lakes, and other waters that flow across or form a part of State boundaries, including coastal waters."

SEC. 9. In the case of any discharge or discharges causing or contributing to water pollution with respect to which the actions of the Surgeon General or the Secretary prescribed under section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act, have already been completed prior to such enactment, the provisions of such section as so in effect shall continue to be applicable until the pollution caused by such discharge or discharges has been abated.

SEC. 10. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1961".

Mr. BLATNIK (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "7, and 8" and insert in lieu thereof "and 7".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 25, strike out "; and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 1, 2 and 3 on page 3.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 4, strike out "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(b)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 12, strike out "4" and insert "(4)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 13, strike out "5" and insert "(5)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 14, strike out the comma and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 15, strike out "5" and insert "(5)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, strike out lines 21 and 22 and insert in lieu thereof: "follows: '(2) no grant shall be made for any project in an amount".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 4, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "unless, in the judgment of the Secretary, the effect of such pollution on the legitimate uses of the waters is not of such significance to warrant exercise of Federal jurisdiction under this section."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, strike out "(B)" and insert in lieu thereof "(f)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANKFORD: Page 3, line 6, after the words "United States" add "one in the Middle Atlantic area,".

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned that section 2(d) of H.R. 6441, in providing for the establishment of field laboratory and research facilities throughout the United States, has omitted specific reference to the Middle Atlantic area.

This region, comprised, as a minimum, of the States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, Delaware, and Maryland, with its population today of approximately 21 million, is in desperate need of the establishment of its own regional laboratory and research facility. The committee in its report emphasized the problem of acid-mine drainage from abandoned coal mines in Pennsylvania and West Virginia. These drainage problems quite obviously affect the States of Maryland and Virginia. The Chesapeake Bay region needs immediately research assistance to find ways to combat the effects of water pollution on the region's great seafood industry.

The State of Maryland has for a considerable period of time conducted its own research program and in recent years has undertaken cooperative research efforts with the State of Virginia. I believe the public is now becoming fully aware of the effects of certain kinds of pollution, both industrial and municipal, on fish and other marine resources. I am deeply conscious of the fact that an alarming number of public beaches have been closed by health agencies and that the use of oysters, clams, and other foods has been forbidden, if taken from polluted areas, the number of which is on the increase. This is a problem of the greatest magnitude to our Nation's economy, and is of paramount importance to the Middle Atlantic area. It is recognized that the seafood industry is in real need of assistance, and the location of a research facility in the area as called for by my amendment will not only be of inestimable value to this region, but will supply sources of information that will assist other States dependent, as we are in Maryland to a large degree, upon a vigorous and healthy seafood industry.

The advantages of locating a regional laboratory in the Middle Atlantic area, I believe, are self-evident. Not only would such a facility be in close proximity to Washington, but it would also be close to many colleges and private research organizations that would enable the establishment of graduate training in various fields connected with this most complex problem.

Gov. J. Millard Tawes of Maryland, in his letter to me of March 15 supporting my amendment, expressed his deep concern that all too many of the areas of the Chesapeake Bay have shown evidence of increasing pollution. He is certainly correct when he refers to the Chesapeake Bay as the greatest natural resource of the State of Maryland. I submit that it is an area that will not only provide increased recreational opportunities for all the people of the Middle Atlantic region, but one which is even now a principal source of income for many residents of the States of Maryland, Virginia, and Delaware.

Earlier this week, I advised my colleagues from the five States directly affected of my intention to offer this amendment. I am very encouraged by their overwhelmingly favorable response. I strongly urge acceptance of the amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota is well aware of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland, well aware of the problem of the Middle Atlantic area. We included in our report specific reference to other areas including, but not limited to, one to be located in the northeastern area of the United States, one in the southeastern area, one in the midwestern area, one in the southwestern area, one in the Pacific Northwest, and one in the State of Alaska.

Speaking for the majority of the committee, we accept the amendment.

Mr. LANKFORD. I thank the chairman and express the hope that the minority will be equally willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I had some difficulty in determining whether the Middle Atlantic should be specifically noted as a separate area. It seems as though the Secretary would have authority to locate one there, or that this area would come within the Northeast and Southeast, why to say they could not locate a laboratory in the Middle Atlantic area as part of one of these two. Do I interpret it correctly?

Mr. LANKFORD. As I understand the bill it calls for six locations.

Mr. CRAMER. That is correct.

Mr. LANKFORD. Northeast, Southeast, Midwest, Pacific Northwest, southwestern area, and one in the State of Alaska.

I feel that the problems of the mid-Atlantic area States are peculiar to that area and as such merit a laboratory to deal with these problems.

Mr. CRAMER. I will say to the gentleman that under those circumstances I do not believe the minority would object to the area being considered a separate area for a laboratory.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANKFORD. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I wish to compliment the gentleman for calling the attention of the House to the need of the Mid-Atlantic area for such a laboratory.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERER: On page 7, line 1 through 4, strike out all of subsection (d); and on line 5 strike out "(e)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)."

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would keep at the present level the Federal aid money to cities, as in the present law, namely $50 million a year, with a maximum amount over a 10-year period of $500 million.

The bill provides that we increase the amount from $50 million a year to $100 million a year, with an overall increase of $1 billion over a 10-year period.

As I said in general debate, there is no question that the pollution of our waters today, as in the past, is as outlined so ably by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. BLATNIK. There is no question about that. The question we have to determine is whether or not we want to continue to have the Federal Government take an ever-expanding role in granting moneys to cities in the United States to help them clean up their own pollution. That is the real issue insofar as this bill is concerned.

In 1956 the Senate did approve a bill which broadened the base of Federal enforcement jurisdiction. It put teeth into the enforcement provisions of the law at that time. There was no grant-in-aid program to cities in that bill.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare at that time opposed any grant-in-aid provisions for that bill. The then President of the United States opposed it and vetoed the bill because it did eventually contain such a provision.

The proponents of increasing the amounts of Federal money argue that this money stimulates the construction of disposal plants in cities that cannot afford to build their own plants. That is not so, in my opinion, because you must remember that these strong enforcement provisions and the broadening of the base of Federal enforcement came in the 1956 act. It is and was those stronge enforcement provisions, both at State and Federal level, that caused and compelled many of these cities to get busy and build their own treatment plants. That is what caused the expenditure of the money for disposal facilities by cities. Anyone who feels that the $50 million a year we have been expending to give to the cities to help them build a pollution plant is an incentive is living in a fool's paradise, because disposal plants cost money. In my own city the disposal plant cost $62 million. What in the world can we do with $50

million a year for the entire United States? As I said in 1956, this is a foot in the door for another big continuing ever-expanding Federal-aid program.

We are now being asked to increase the Federal money available from $500 million to $1 billion. If you are going to do any kind of a job, if the Federal Government is going to continue to participate in this program, the total cost may eventually reach $5 billion. We ought to know where we are headed. That is the reason for my amendment.

The President in his veto message last year stated the issue better than I can:

> Because water pollution is uniquely a local plight, primary responsibility for solving the problem lies not with the Federal Government but, rather, must be assumed and exercised, as it has been, by the States.

The President continued in his veto message as follows:

> By holding forth the promise in a large-scale program of long-term Federal support, it would tempt municipalities to delay water pollution abatement efforts while they waited for Federal funds.

That is what is going to happen.

Cities will delay going forward. They will wait hat in hand for Federal moneys which they know will be increased from year to year. Let us adopt this amendment and let local governments take care of their own waste as many cities have already done with their own money—without Federal aid. Let us not make these cities who paid to take care of their own waste now pay to get rid of the laggard's dirt.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, all of us wish that it were possible to accomplish this program with a less expenditure of money than is contemplated in the bill. Unfortunately, it is obvious from the experience that we have had in the 5 years in which the program has operated that a larger amount of Federal grants is necessary in order to accomplish the minimum needs that are involved. What we need to realize now is that unless we establish a program that is in keeping with the minimum established needs, that the cost to us in the not very distant future is going to be far more than the $100 million a year that is authorized here. The $100 million authorized here will meet the problem as it has been surveyed both by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and by the Association of State Commissioners who operate in this field. However, if there is further delay, if the needs pile up, if a more accelerated crash type of program becomes necessary, the present authorization is going to be insufficient, and we are going to have to meet far greater costs than are envisioned in the bill here.

INCENTIVE

I do not think I have to explain to any of you who have watched this program in your individual States about the incentive that is involved in it. I have seen in my own State communities which had no thought of participating in the program; who were not under any threat of State or local government as a requirement to participate in the program, who joined in the program because of the incentive offered by the 30 percent grant. The increase from $50 million to $100 million is designed for no other purpose than that each need throughout the country can be met in an orderly fashion.

According to the estimates that have been made by the authorities in this field, within the program envisioned here in the next 8 years, the current needs can be met. If we adopt this program now, we will be doing it at far less cost to the taxpayer than if we put it off and have to move into a crash program later.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. In the final analysis, looking at this from a sensible standpoint, would it not be very unrealistic for this body to extend considerable coverage in this program to more than 22,000 bodies of water not now covered by the program and yet hold down the sum of money to the present figure that the gentleman from Ohio advocates?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. We, of course, have to increase the allocation to meet the additional coverage. We have to do it primarily, however, because it is a cheaper way for us to assure a supply of cleaner water for the future than if we have to get it through some other means. This is the biggest individual weapon that the communities can have in an overall water pollution control program. We have to have the program expanded insofar as the grants are concerned to enable us to meet the clearly defined needs for our water supply in the future. Our water is going to cost us a whole lot more in the future in terms of both the Federal and local costs if we do not attempt to meet this problem right now through the authorization of these additional grants that are absolutely essential.

Mr. Chairman, it is in the interest of a long-range program to vote down the amendment and vote for the figure outlined in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman or the acting chairman of the committee a question. Under the provisions of the bill, H.R. 6441, the State of Mississippi would do pretty well by way of obtaining funds, would it not?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes, on a proportionate basis on which the distribution is made. On the $50 million formula, the State of Iowa would fare equally well. The table is set out on page 14 of the report showing the amounts that each State would be eligible to receive under the terms of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps the gentleman from Alabama cannot answer the question, but perhaps the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH], who just addressed the House, can answer it. Did the State of Mississippi a couple of years ago reduce its State income taxes?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I would have to defer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] for an answer to that question.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps the gentleman from Mississippi can answer the question.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman ask the question again?

Mr. GROSS. Did the State of Mississippi within the last 2 or 3 years reduce its State income tax?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The State of Mississippi reduced its State income tax, but I was not a member of the legislature that did that.

Mr. GROSS. I am not saying anything about the gentleman's being a member of the State legislature. So, Mr. Chairman, we have a situation here where the State of Mississippi has, as I understand it, substantially reduced its taxes on corporations and individuals, and now comes crying to the U.S. Government for help. We have had no reduction in State income taxes in the State of Iowa and we do not benefit as much as does the State of Mississippi under the terms of this bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield, if the gentleman can shed any light on why we should be spending money to increase the allocation to the State of Mississippi when it is reducing the taxes on their people.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I should like to point out to the gentleman from Iowa that there are other States that have increased their tax loads who are asking for this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I do not doubt that at all, but I do not see any reason why the Federal Government, with a debt of $290 billion, should be increasing allocations to States that find it possible to decrease the taxes upon their own people.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman realizes, I hope, that these allocations in the final analysis go to the municipalities, within the States, and not to the governments of the States themselves, to the State sovereignties.

Mr. GROSS. They are integral parts of the State governments, are they not?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Practically every municipality in the country has been increasing its taxes in recent years and I am quite sure that that holds true in Mississippi as well as in the gentleman's own State of Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I just got through saying to the gentleman that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] admitted that that State has reduced its State income tax. You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. EDMONDSON. This money is going to the municipalities. I do not believe the gentleman from Iowa can point to any municipality in Mississippi that has not been increasing its tax load, as well as other cities in other States.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure that the people who live in the municipalities pay State income taxes in the State of Mississippi, too. The gentleman will agree with that, will he not?

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. The point that the gentleman is making, of course, is well taken, particularly as it relates to State responsibility. The amendment which I intend to offer, and which I shall offer shortly, would require that by 1964 the States would accept some responsibility by matching the additional moneys above $50 million with State funds. That is the problem in the whole program. The States have not shown enough interest, because the States have not had to put up the money. This is a program by the Federal Government, to be offered to the local governments. The States should bear their fair share. As I said, the gentleman's point is well taken. The States have not gone ahead with programs, except in five States. I think we should encourage them to do so and by 1964 we should require them to do so.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] has a comment with regard to Cincinnati as it relates to the matching funds, if the gentleman will yield to him.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Florida and yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. There are many, many cities in the United States that have gone forward and built sewage treatment plants without aid from the Federal Government and have not only imposed income taxes as in my own city, but also have imposed water taxes to pay for these sewage disposal treatment plants. If we continue to expand the amount the Federal Government is going to contribute to the cities, these cities to which I have just referred, are going to have to pay twice.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1961, to provide, among other things, additional funds for grants to communities to assist in the construction of sewage-treatment facilities.

I believe this legislation is urgently needed and long overdue. There is no question about water pollution having become a very serious national problem, and if we are to insure that in the future our country will have water sufficient to meet its ever increasing needs, we must take action now to control and abate pollution of our waterways.

I have been interested in this overall problem, but there is another urgent need for this legislation, particularly as it will help the area which I represent. There exists at the present time in my district a serious situation, which may exist in other parts of the country also, in that almost all residential, commercial, and industrial construction is at a standstill, not because of economic conditions but because of a ban on new building construction imposed by the Michigan State Department of Health. The department has imposed this ban because of inadequate sewage facilities which will prevent pollution in the area.

As I have pointed out many times, my area suffers from one of the highest rates of unemployment in the country and the halt in construction has only aggravated the situation. Therefore the legislation under consideration will help alleviate not only the water problem but also the unemployment problem in an economically depressed area.

I urge approval of the legislation now under consideration.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, for individual as well as national well being, I feel it is imperative that the water pollution bill be passed.

A grave shortage of pure water exists in most parts of the United States today. This problem is not confined to the businessman and the industrialist, but to the homemaker and the farmer. Each of us share a basic need for pure, uncontaminated water. Each of us share a primary concern in the deterioration in health. And my fellow colleagues, this concern will be intensified unless something is done and done now.

At the present time, water is being reused, but this method will have to be stepped up and increased if we are to meet present and future needs. Research must go forward for in less than 20 years it is anticipated that we will be using double the amount of water that is being used today. States and cities should be encouraged to participate more fully with water pollution control activities.

Physical fitness is of paramount importance to the individual and to our country's welfare and because of the fast pace which is kept by all Americans, it is imperative that we maintain places where we can get away from it all. But as I have seen, and I am sure each of you have seen, in many, many of our parks today we find posters—warning us of contaminated water.

In my home area, Metropolitan Kansas City, Mo., the shortage of pure, safe water may become acute. I am sure that most of you find the same potential shortage in your metropolitan areas.

Yes, this program will cost money—but I do not believe we can say it is an expense—rather it is an investment in the future of America—an investment we cannot neglect to make in the face of our expanding population.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of H.R. 6441, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control. This legislation will authorize the establishment and maintenance of field laboratory and research facilities in various parts of the country and the conduct of water quality studies of the Great Lakes; increase grants to State and interstate agencies for the operation of their water pollution control programs from $3 to $5 million annually and extend the authorization for such grants to June 30, 1971; increase the authorization of appropriations for waste treatment works construction grants from $50 million to $100 million annually and the total authorization from $500 to $1 billion, and, among other things, increase maximum allowable grants from $250,000 to $800,000 and substitute sliding scale formula for present 30 percent grant limitation.

Mr. Chairman, as the Committee on Public Works has so well stated in its report to the House, water has become the No. 1 resource problem confronting the United States today. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Public Works, I have been keenly aware and most concerned about this problem. The water problem is directly related to our country's rapid population and economic growth. This growth is creating a major impact on water resources from a rapidly growing demand for water to produce the things we need to eat, wear, and use, and for an ample supply of clean, safe water for drinking and for recreation.

FRESH WATER DEFICIENCY WILL REACH 85 BILLION GALLONS DAILY IN 1980

The committee report points out that by 1980 our population is expected to reach the 232 to 247 million range and that our estimated fresh water needs will total 600 billion gallons a day—nearly double present water use. However, by 1980 the developed dependable fresh water supply is expected to total about 515 billion gallons a day. Therefore, demand will exceed supply by 85 billion gallons a day in just 20 years. It is obvious that the Nation's water needs from now on must be met by using the same water over and over. Thus, through this legislation and vital program, the highest prority in water resources developments must be given to the all-important need of providing for the cleanliness of the limited water supply so that it can be used and reused in meeting the Nation's increasing requirements for water for all purposes.

Mr. Chairman, more "new" water can be provided to meet needs by controlling pollution than by any other means. Pollution control has the advantage of permitting the use of an already available distribution system, the waterways of the country, to deliver water of satisfactory quality to the points where it is needed. I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as one who advocated and supported the pasage, in 1948, of the first water pollution control bill, I rise to urge my colleagues to promptly approve the measure presently before us, H.R. 6441, designed to amend the existing Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for a more effective program in this area which so vitally affects the Nation's health and welfare.

From the expert testimony that has been presented so ably here by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, the author of this bill, it is unquestionably clear that water has become the No. 1 resource problem confronting the United States today.

Although Federal financial assistance has been of great help to the States in dealing with this urgent problem of water pollution control, the evidence before us demonstrates the urgent need for an expansion and extension of the current program.

Over the past 4 years, contract awards for sewage treatment plant construction have averaged almost $360 million annually, an increase of 62 percent over the 5-year average before Federal aid became available.

However, according to the U.S. Public Health Service 4,136 new plants are

required for 23 million people in communities now afflicted with health dangerous sewage, and to replace sewage treatment plants that have long been obsolete and operationally deficient. Another 991 communities require major additions and enlargements of existing plants to provide the minimum measure of health safety for 19 million persons.

Mr. Chairman, it is eminently worthy of note that nothing in the measure before us is intended to impair or in any way affect any right or jurisdiction of the States with respect to the waters of the States, including but not limited to the power, authority, and jurisdiction of the States to enforce their own water pollution control laws and regulations.

I submit that the problem of water pollution control is so essential to national welfare and progress that it can be most realistically overcome only by the joint efforts of the States and the Federal Government. Let us bear in mind, however, that under the provisions of this bill the role of the Federal Government is that of a stimulator and helper to keep the important pollution abatement program moving ahead.

Mr. Chairman, the basic duty we all have in the enactment of legislation is the fullest exercise of our reason and intelligence in attempting to provide today, as best we can, a solution for the problems of the future. In my considered judgment, we now have the opportunity, in this measure, to discharge that basic responsibility in great measure.

In order to sensibly forestall the disaster of a growing water pollution and shortage problem, let us approve this bill without extended delay so that the expanded procedures of research, planning, and construction, so necessary to preserve the health, safety, and welfare of American citizens, may begin.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, the subject of H.R. 6441, the water pollution bill, is one which is of very great interest, not only to the people of my district but to all Americans who share their concern with the preservation of our great national heritage of rivers, lakes, streams, and beaches, for health, for beauty, and for recreation.

I am privileged to have sponsored similar legislation on this subject and warmly associate myself with the proposals embodied in the measure introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

The bill would, among other things, first, increase the annual authorization for grants for waste treatment works construction from $50 million to $100 million and the total authorization from $500 million to $1 billion; second, increase the maximum allowable grant from $250,000 to $800,000 and substitute a sliding scale formula for the existing 30 percent grant limitation; third, require priority for previously filed applications under $250,000; fourth, increase from $3 million to $5 million annual grants to State and interstate water pollution control programs, and extend the time limit from June 30, 1961, to June 30, 1971; and fifth, transfer the administration of the Federal water pollution control program from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is essential that we should act immediately, through the Federal Government, to protect our coastal waters and navigable streams and many other waters which are now faced with the threat of sewage, industrial wastes, garbage, and other sources of pollution.

The plain fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the tremendous growth of population, especially in the suburbs of our metropolitan areas such as my own district in New York, requires action of a kind which was not needed in an earlier, simpler age. Practices which were tolerable even a generation ago, today threaten the homes, health, and happiness of millions of decent, self-respecting American families. I know nothing that is of greater ultimate national importance than to preserve our heritage of water for ourselves and our children. I freely acknowledge that State and local governments also share this responsibility. We of New York State have long recognized our obligation, through our long fight for conservation which began over a generation before the Federal Government concerned itself with this great national problem. It is clear now, not only for reasons of jurisdiction over coastal and navigable waters, but for the pooling of experience and the administration of broad conservation policies to deal with problems which are interstate in their nature, that the Federal Government should play a stronger and more decisive part in the struggle to preserve our heritage.

I hope that in the enactment of this bill in its entirety that the Congress and the Government of the United States will lend full authority, wisdom, and experience to the solution of the many problems of pollution and deterioration which have been created by generations of human carelessness and indifference.

Mr. Chairman, again I say I am pleased to be identified with this vital legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHERER) there were—ayes 59, noes 132.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 6, line 6, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and such subsection (b) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'If the total of all appropriations, made under authority of this section, for any fiscal year which begins after June 30, 1964, exceed $50,000,000, no grant shall be made for any project from that portion of the appropriation in excess of $50,000,000 which is allocated to any State unless such State shall pay toward the cost of such project an amount equal to the Federal contribution made to such project from such amount in excess of $50,000,000.'"

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have a second amendment, on page 7, lines 2 and 3, dealing with the same subject matter. I ask unanimous consent that these amendments may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: Page 7, lines 2 and 3, strike out "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000", and on line 4, strike out "$1,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$750,000,000".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, these amendments are very simple. What they do is reduce the authorization as proposed in the bill from $100 million to $75 million annually and require after June of 1964 that the States match all funds in excess of the present program of $50 million. In other words, until June of 1964 the program of the $50 million plus an additional $25 million, or a total of $75 million, will continue to go forward, for a period of 3 years.

My amendment acknowledges that we have serious problems in connection with the abatement of water pollution. I initially supported Public Law 660; that is, I was one of those who introduced one of the bills which became Public Law 660. I was opposed to the bill, which was vetoed by the President, on the basis that I believed it should be on the basis of the States matching the money, because I feel we will never have an effective water pollution program until we have the States contributing to this program, and giving them adequate time to do so legislatively so that they can provide the money to match the additional $25 million or such amount as may be approved above the present $50 million program.

That is all the amendment does. I think it is sound. I am an advocate of a strong antipollution control program. I do not believe we should go so far in enforcement as to include intrastate streams, which is dealt with in another amendment that I will offer.

So far as the grant-in-aid program is concerned, this amendment provides for a $25 million increase. We just got through voting on the floor of the House and recently passed in this body a bill which would provide for such funds in surplus labor areas, the so-called depressed area bill. We had a program of $100 million in loans and $75 million in grants in that bill, any portion of which can be made available for exactly the same purpose as this program. Likewise, with reference to the Housing and Home Finance Administration which has a program to put money into a sewage disposal plant. As a matter of fact, that is where most of the $100 million authorized money has gone. As a matter of fact, that is where practically all of that loan money has gone so that we find the Federal Government giving a grant of 30 percent and giving their Housing and Home Finance Administration a loan program for the balance of the money.

This puts the grant program in proper focus. I say to you the additional $25

million proposed in the amendment I have offered requiring State-matching funds in 1964 is a sound approach, and for this reason if we do not get the States into this program on a State-matching fund money basis, then I do not think this program on a longrun basis can ever really do the job when it comes to sewage disposal treatment plant construction.

The matching of an additional $25 million annually and authorization for Federal grants will have the same result that the majority wants in the bill to provide $100 million for the program, after June of 1964, with the States accepting their responsibility for an increased amount. The requirement of the States matching of additional authorizations would result in more effective screening of the project applications since the State would have a financial interest. The State under such a matching arrangement would want to confine its grants to projects of outstanding merit most urgently needed to handle the real water pollution problem if they had to match the money. Cooperation by the State with the Federal Government would greatly strengthen the water pollution control program. Likewise, it would mean—and please listen to this—it would actually mean more money would go to the local communities. It would mean additional matching funds, State and local, on a percentage basis would go to local communities. It would mean the States would be able to put up additional matching funds and the local communities themselves would be able to put up less than the present maximum requirement of approximately 70 percent.

So what you would be doing through State participation is encouraging the State to go forward with even greater Federal-State matching funds. So this would have the effect of providing up to 40 percent of State-Federal money as compared to 30 percent Federal money today to the local communities.

To those who wish to see this program go forward, this will give the State more effective participation in the water pollution control program. That is what the fight is between the minority and the majority today on this bill. We all want and, so far as I am concerned, of course, I want water pollution control. We want adequate control of water pollution. We want adequate funds in the bill. We want the States to be proper partners in the program and not have the Federal Government exclusively accept the responsibility. My amendment will accomplish it.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida is a repetition of the previous amendment which was considered and which was offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, in the last 50 years this Congress has considered over 100 bills dealing with the pollution problem, but it was not until 1948 that we passed a bill that specifically dealt with the water pollution problem, the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948. That bill did not contain a grant section. It was passed with the expectation that there would be great gain from its operation over the ensuing 10 years, that disclosures would be made as to whether or not cooperative action with the States would be satisfying in dealing with the problem realistically. Eight years passed and there were no accomplishments and there were no gains made under the Antipollution Act of 1948. But in 1956 an act was passed providing for grants, and it has been one of the most successful water acts ever passed by the Congress. It has been received and accorded applause in every State of the Union as demonstrated by the fact that almost every State has participated to the maximum extent of allotments available.

So if we are to achieve greater success and attain the ends we seek in this bill we must increase the minimum requirements.

I hope the committee will not accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I would like to congratulate the committee, both the majority and minority members, on the hard work which has been put in on a most important and difficult subject. I have been very active in my own State on water affairs, having been a member of the water committee of the State legislature for 4 years, having sponsored research studies on methods of replenishing underground waters without contamination, and having sponsored and helped to push through a metropolitan sewage-disposal district which will provide service for a great number of municipalities in the Denver metropolitan area. I am, therefore, aware of the importance of the measure and aware of the local efforts which have been made by many areas to solve the problem of waste disposal.

I suggested to the water conference held in Washington, D.C., in December 1960 that consideration be given to the enactment of a uniform law containing provisions which would standardize pollution criteria and enforcement of antipollution measures. I feel that Federal aid should be conditioned on a State adopting such law. Unfortunately, however, no such law has yet been completed, and, hence, this type of approach is not now feasible.

It is my own feeling that Federal participation in local sewage-disposal districts must at least be conducted on a partnership basis with the States involved so that there will be a true Federal, State, and local partnership, with the costs shared in proportion to their respective responsibilities. Without this, it seems to me that, instead of providing an incentive for action by local communities to accept obligation for local responsibilities, we will be inserting the Federal jurisdiction into local affars. I earnestly request, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that for these reasons you consider favorably the proposal advanced by the gentleman from Florida, under which State participation in these projects would be required. This proposal is not extreme, as it gives ample time for the States to take action to provide such assistance.

If we are to retain our system of sharing responsibilities between governmental levels, we should not at the same time take away responsibility from the basic element of our Government—the States—and transfer it to the Federal Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 69, noes 138.

So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAMER: On page 8, line 10, after "of" insert "interstate".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I will take only so much time as I think is absolutely essential to explain the purposes and the reasons for the amendment I have offered.

Mr. Chairman, during this discussion we have heard quotations of Solomon and quotations of proposals by Senator Taft. But I would venture to say if Solomon were considering this question his position would be that the Federal Government has limited powers and States have responsibilities and authorities that should be protected, and that an all-powerful Federal Government is not a proper approach in a representative form of government in a republic, as we have in this country.

That is the fundamental issue involved in this particular amendment. I venture to say further if Senator Taft were present, and I venture to say any proposition made by him would not be one that would include the Federal Government taking over jurisdiction from the States so far as water pollution is concerned over intrastate waters, waters flowing within the boundaries of States, waters flowing within the States to coastal waters, which are of course the vast majority of the shorter streams throughout the country. The larger interstate streams are largely covered by present legislation and would be covered by the bill before us; adding the Great Lakes and streams forming State boundaries.

I say to you it is a crucial question of Federal responsibility, a crucial question of policy which this Congress must decide, and I think by implication involves the basic constitutional concept of separation of powers as between Federal, State, and local governments.

Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested that because I take the position the States should retain jurisdiction, and

by retaining jurisdiction I mean over intrastate waters, I am for some unknown reason supporting some polluters. This is absolutely false. No one has been a stronger supporter of Public Law 660, having sponsored the bill myself, or of needed amendments to this bill than myself. So far as I am concerned, if my amendment is adopted, I will support the bill. The result of it as so amended would be that you would have stronger water pollution control throughout this country because you would have the States retaining intrastate jurisdiction, and in so retaining jurisdiction accepting responsibility and going in and doing the job themselves on their own intrastate streams and working conjunctively with the Federal Government where it properly has jurisdiction on interstate streams. My objective is to strengthen water pollution control by strengthening the hands of the States, by retaining in them residual jurisdiction, which means this will help them in beefing up their water pollution programs. They can only be encouraged to do so if the Federal Government does not sap up all of the jurisdiction. That is what this fight is about, that is what the difference of opinion is. It is a very deepseated feeling, so far as I am concerned.

I believe that the States have certain rights and likewise they have certain responsibilities. Nothing has been shown to indicate that the States have not been accepting that responsibility. As a matter of fact, it has been shown that States have been coming in with stronger antipollution laws because they have jurisdiction over these intrastate streams. Now we are going to discourage them from doing that job by taking away from them exclusive intrastate jurisdiction which they now have.

As a matter of fact, it is important that the significance of this proposal be understood, in view of what the present law is and what this bill proposes in the way of enforcement provisions.

Let me say I am wholeheartedly in favor of strengthening the enforcement provisions that relate to proper Federal interstate stream jurisdiction. I am wholeheartedly in support of strengthening the water pollution control arm of the Federal Government in cooperation with the States as it relates to interstate waters, which is a proper Federal function. I am not in favor of going beyond that to include intrastate waters, a proper State function.

Where did this idea come from? Again, it is not necessarily only mine. It came from the previous administration in its recommendations to Congress in the last session. What did the administration say at that time with regard to this very same question, realizing, of course, that today the only jurisdiction the Federal Government has under present law is over interstate waters?

So, the question is, Do we want to broaden that jurisdiction to include practically every shallow stream in America? That is the question in my mind. Do we want to include every stream that can float a log? That is what it amounts to, even though it has nothing to do with interstate commerce whatsoever, let alone intrastate commerce, in fact, when it comes to actually using the stream for navigation.

So, here is what the previous administration recommended:

> The first recommendation for the amendment of section 8 would make these procedures available also whenever there is pollution affecting the legitimate uses of the waters of any navigable interstate stream, whether or not there is interstate pollution.

And, we go along with that. We accept that proposal.

> Federal jurisdiction in this kind of pollution situation, however, would be exercised only upon request by the State, and then only when the interference with legitimate uses is judged to be of sufficient significance to require the initiation of enforcement procedures. Such an extension of Federal authority could serve to improve serious pollution situations which are also of great national importance although not endangering the health or welfare of persons in a State other than that in which the discharge originates. Inclusion of navigable interstate waters within the scope of the water pollution enforcement procedures is consistent with constitutional authority over these waterways.

So, this is consistent with the previous administration's program of jurisdiction only over interstate waters but including intrastate pollution on those waters if such exists. So, we go along with that extension, but we do not go along with the extension of including intrastate waters within Federal jurisdiction, and I think for many, many sound reasons. As a matter of fact, this proposal is consistent with the broad recommendations suggested by Senator KERR's special committee in the other body. It is consistent with the position of the distinguished Senator, who is an authority on this subject in regard to enforcement, in that the bill he introduced carried in the first place a $75 million figure, which was just defeated by the House, but also did not include additional law enforcement provisions, because he apparently felt they were adequate today.

You have to realize that if this is included, you are discouraging not only the individual States, but look at all these compact States, these river basin States. Many of them in these areas joined together to lick this problem themselves. I say that the Federal Government taking over the enforcement authority is going to destroy and not build up that concept which is so essential for the control of a proper water supply in the future as pointed out in the Kerr committee report. Unless we adopt this amendment, the result is that we are going backward instead of forward in carrying on a very essential program between the States and the Federal Government, and believe you me, as far as I am concerned, that is the only way we can ever have a strong program. You cannot do it by weakening the States. Not only do you take in intrastate jurisdiction, but the States have nothing to say, as they do under present law, about the form of the order issued by the Secretary. The Secretary does not have to consult them when he makes the order. Also, when he goes to court to get an order enforced, he does not have to consult with the States, as he does under present law. That is why we are concerned about extending this Federal jurisdiction, because the enforcement sections are being so broadened and the States left out of the picture, in the final stages, and therefore the intrastate feature should be excluded from the bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask just which bodies of water the gentleman would bring in and just which bodies of water he would leave out by the inclusion of this word which he suggests for insertion. I recall yesterday in the Committee on Rules when a group of us from the committee appeared the illustration was given of the Rappahannock and if I recall properly the gentleman's definition, he said the Rappahannock would still be in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has expired.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I believe he said at that time that under his proposed definition the Rappahannock would still be in; is that correct or incorrect?

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman has made a good point and I am glad he has given me the opportunity to emphasize this. If he will look at page 16, line 7, he will find the definition of interstate waters. It is agreed by the minority and the majority that the proper definition of that term is, as it affects coastal streams—that is, streams flowing from within a State to the coast—the proper definition would mean that those would be excluded by my amendment. It is intended for them to be intrastate streams in the future as they have been in the past, and therefore the determination of interstate waters does not include streams that flow from within a State, not across State boundaries to the coast. Those would be excluded by my amendment and properly so, because in the past they were.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has again expired.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can agree with just about one statement which has been made by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], and that is his statement that this is a significant amendment. There is no question about it. If you want to take the innards out of this bill, if you want to emasculate its operation, if you want to take out of its scope about 85 percent of the waters of the United States, then adopt the amendment of the gentleman from

Florida. If you agree with him that pollution is a uniquely local problem, you should vote with him. If, instead, you believe that the laws of gravity operate in our streams and on our waters and that pollution, once deposited in a stream, moves downstream, just as everything else does, and pollutes the people downstream, then you will say that it is not a uniquely local problem and we want to see all navigable waters in the United States covered by this program.

What are some of the shallow waters that the gentleman says he wants to keep out of this program? He says he wants to see that we do not affect these shallow streams. Let me name a few of them that would be excluded under his amendment if it is adopted. You will find them on page 8 of the report. They are, the greater part of the Great Lakes and their tributaries, the coastal waters of the Nation in their entirety, the Detroit River, most of the rivers and streams of Florida, all rivers, streams, lakes, and coastal waters of Alaska, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico; interntional boundary streams such as the St. Lawrence, Niagara, lower Colorado, and Rio Grande Rivers. These are some of the shallow streams that the gentleman from Florida says represent uniquely local problems, purely intrastate problems, that the Federal Government should not be concerned about.

Mr. Chairman, if you want to see an effective program that covers the 26,000 bodies of water in the United States, that deals with the problem upon a national basis, that treats fairly the people of the 50 States, you will vote against his amendment. The gentleman would give to the people of Alaska no opportunity to participate in this program. He would give to the people of Hawaii no opportunity to take part in it and be protected by it. He would limit it only to completely interstate situations involving navigable streams. Only there could this program be invoked.

We say let us take the standard of navigable streams or navigable waters. Ever since 1865 when the Supreme Court spoke clearly on this subject it has been established that the Federal Government has undisputed responsibility for navigable waters, not limited to navigation matters. We propose to take this longstanding principle and say we are going to take care of the problem of pollution on these navigable waters wherever we find them in the United States There is nothing radical or revolutionary about this. It is facing up to the problem and facing up to it on a national basis. I say let us defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida and do a national job on a national problem.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. We both want to cure the problem of water pollution. With regard to the problem as to whether the Great Lakes are included in my amendment, the Great Lakes will not be taken out nor will any river forming any boundary between any two States, or coastal waters, which are excluded under present law, so the only thing excluded under my proposal would be streams flowing within the State that do not form part of the boundary between two States, which is true under present law covering streams which flow into certain waters. Alaska would be included because of its border with Canada. I am afraid the gentleman does not understand the amendment or its effect.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I decline to yield further to the gentleman. The gentleman has completely misstated and misrepresented the amendment, I am sure unintentionally. It is quite clear to us from a reading of the amendment offered by the gentleman that it would severely restrict the scope of this program.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like the record to be made clear that there are those of us who have been engaged in this whole matter for quite some time and there is no question in our minds what this amendment will do. What the gentleman is doing is trying to get this program down to the level of the weakest link, trying to have it operate on the lowest level. His amendment would only do this, that the enforcement section of this bill would apply to only about 4,000 bodies of water out of the 26,000 where this program is of importance.

I should like to refresh the gentleman's recollection, that at the 1960 Republican Convention when they adopted the platform, in the section devoted to human needs and the subsection under the heading of health, they announced this pledge, that they are for strengthening Federal enforcement powers in abating pollution. I say the gentleman's proposal would weaken this. I hope the amendment is defeated. All it does is either constrict or restrict or obstruct or destruct. That is about all I can think the gentleman's amendment would do.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. With regard to the streams that would be included under this amendment, are not my remarks correct that the Great Lakes would continue to be included and that streams on boundaries would be added? There is no question about that.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman's amendment would restrict it so that 80 percent of the waters would not be touched by enforcement. The gentleman gives the wrong impression. He says interstate streams would be subject to enforcement. You take the Missouri River, the shallows of the Missouri.

Mr. CRAMER. It crosses the State boundary; does it not?

Mr. BLATNIK. The Missouri is definitely an interstate stream and can be polluted from here to Kingdom Come on an intrastate basis, and there is nothing here in the enforcement section of existing law that can cause it to cease and desist unless you go downstream and prove that it came from a certain affluent.

Mr. CRAMER. There is nothing under my amendment which would prevent it from being done or to delete it; is there?

Mr. BLATNIK. Your amendment actually would prevent it.

Mr. CRAMER. It would not prevent it. It would permit enforcement on interstate streams and does not change the present situation when it comes to intrastate pollution. The gentleman knows that. It is specifically stated in my amendment, and I so state it on the floor, and if the gentleman will examine this language in the present bill, he will see that that is true.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but actually I rise to clear up one point which I have already discussed to a limited extent. Of course, the committee knows I have always favored doing away with stream pollution, but on page 25 of the report, I read this language:

> Thus, for all practical purposes, the new Federal enforcement provisions apply to all waters in every State.

I have an inquiry, Mr. Chairman, from a large plant which employs several thousand people. These people do use some chemicals and over the years they have developed at their own expense a lake or body of water which has been used largely for their own purposes and to discharge some of the chemical wastes from that plant. It so happens that a portion of that water is located in Louisiana and part of it is in the State of Arkansas. I want to ask the gentleman this question: These people are disturbed about this bill. Is there anything in this bill that would make their situation worse than it is under the present law, and do they have any means of protecting themselves in a case of this sort where the work has been done at their own expense and with the tacit consent of the local people in the development of a waterway for one particular purpose, which is for the discharge of chemical wastes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The answer to the gentleman's inquiry is "No"—there is nothing in this bill that affects the situation you have just described.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The fact that you have this statement in the report here that this covers all waters in every State would not necessarily cover their body of water; would it?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. They are covered in the 1956 act which, of course, has been in operation since its enactment.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. There is nothing then in this bill that would make conditions any more rigorous against that company?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. No, there is not.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in answer to his question?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think the gentleman from Alabama and I have a little different opinion as to what the effect would be. It is quite obvious that the State's authority in joining with the Federal Government in cleaning up this particular stream would find that they would be substantially limited and restricted as compared to the situation under the present law. Assuming that it is an intrastate stream, the State would have nothing to say—and I will repeat it over and over again—the State would have nothing to say as to what kind of order the Secretary would issue ordering the local community to clean it up. The State has nothing to say if the local community refuses to obey the order as to whether the Federal Government shall go to the court and force it to carry out that order as they do under the present law, and I challenge the gentleman from Alabama to dispute that statement.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. My understanding has been that under the present law the State is in the same position as it would be under this bill.

Mr. CRAMER. And I have explained why that would not be the case.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The statement of the gentleman from Florida that the States have nothing to do with the procedures under this revised bill is absolutely incorrect. The States participate in initiating the case; the States participate in the hearing boards; they name a member of the hearing board which makes the recommendation on which the Secretary acts. So it is an absolutely inaccurate statement to make in this House.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Would I be correct in saying that this particular plant would be just as well protected under this bill as it is under the present law?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAMER) there were—ayes 70, nays 151.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6441) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control, pursuant to House Resolution 274, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3935) entitled "An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes."

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1961

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 327)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3935), to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961'.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (m) of section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, defining the term 'wage', is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: *'Provided*, That the cost of board, lodging, or other facilities shall not be included as a part of the wage paid to any employee to the extent it is excluded therefrom under the terms of a bona fide collective-bargaining agreement applicable to the particular employee: *Provided further*, That the Secretary is authorized to determine the fair value of such board, lodging, or other facilities for defined classes of employees and in defined areas, based on average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, or average value to groups of employees, or other appropriate measures of fair value. Such evaluations, where applicable and pertinent, shall be used in lieu of actual measure of cost in determining the wage paid to any employee'.

"(b) Paragraph (n) of section 3 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before 'shall not' the following ', except as used in subsection (s)(1),'.

"(c) Section 3 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(p) "American vessel" includes any vessel which is documented or numbered under the laws of the United States.

"'(q) "Secretary" means the Secretary of of Labor.

"'(r) "Enterprise" means the related activities performed (either through unified operation or common control) by any person or persons for a common business purpose, and includes all such activities whether performed in one or more establishments or by one or more corporate or other organizational units including departments of an establishment operated through leasing arrangements, but shall not include the related activities performed for such enterprise by an independent contractor: *Provided*, That, within the meaning of this subsection, a retail or service establishment which is under independent ownership shall not be deemed to be so operated or controlled as to be other than a separate and distinct enterprise by reason of any arrangement, which includes, but is not necessarily limited to, an agreement, (1) that it will sell, or sell only, certain goods specified by a particular manufacturer, distributor, or advertiser, or (2) that it will join with other such establishments in the same industry for the purpose of collective purchasing, or (3) that it will have the exclusive right to sell the goods or use the brand name of a manufacturer, distributor, or advertiser within a specified area, or by reason of the fact that it occupies premises leased to it by a person who also leases premises to other retail or service establishments.

"'(s) "Enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce" means any of the following in the activities of which employees are so engaged, including employees handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods that have been moved in or produced for commerce by any person:

"'(1) any such enterprise which has one or more retail or service establishments if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than $1,000,000, exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated and if such enterprise purchases or receives goods for resale that move or have moved across State lines (not in deliveries from the reselling establishment) which amount in total annual volume to $250,000 or more;

"'(2) any such enterprise which is engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than $1,000,000, exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated;

"'(3) any establishment of any such enterprise, except establishments and enterprises referred to in other paragraphs of this subsection, which has employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce if the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not less than $1,000,000;

"'(4) any such enterprise which is engaged in the business of construction or reconstruction, or both, if the annual gross volume from the business of such enterprise is not less than $350,000;

"'(5) any gasoline service establishment if the annual gross volume of sales of such establishment is not less than $250,000, ex-

clusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated:

Provided, That an establishment shall not be considered to be an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, or a part of an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and the sales of such establishment shall not be included for the purpose of determining the annual gross volume of sales of any enterprise for the purpose of this subsection, if the only employees of such establishment are the owner thereof or persons standing in the relationship of parent, spouse, or child of such owner.'

"INVESTIGATIONS OF EFFECTS ON EMPLOYMENT OF FOREIGN COMPETITION

"SEC. 3. Section 4 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that in any industry under this Act the competition of foreign producers in United States markets or in markets abroad, or both, has resulted, or is likely to result, in increased unemployment in the United States, he shall undertake an investigation to gain full information with respect to the matter. If he determines such increased unemployment has in fact resulted, or is in fact likely to result, from such competition, he shall make a full and complete report of his findings and determinations to the President and to the Congress: *Provided,* That he may also include in such report information on the increased employment resulting from additional exports in any industry under this Act as he may determine to be pertinent to such report.'

"SPECIAL INDUSTRY COMMITTEES FOR PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

"SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act is amended by inserting after the words 'production of goods for commerce' wherever they appear, the following: 'or employed in any enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce'.

"MINIMUM WAGES

"SEC. 5. (a)(1) Section 6(a) of such Act is amended by inserting after the word 'who' in the portion thereof preceding paragraph (1), the words 'in any workweek'.

"(2) Paragraph (1) of section 6(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) not less than $1.15 an hour during the first two years from the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, and not less than $1.25 an hour thereafter, except as otherwise provided in this section.'

"(3) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of section 6(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) if such employee is employed in American Samoa, in lieu of the rate or rates provided by this subsection or subsection (b), not less than the applicable rate established by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with recommendations of a special industry committee or committees which he shall appoint in the same manner and pursuant to the same provisions as are applicable to the special industry committees provided for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by this Act as amended from time to time.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) Every employer shall pay to each of his employees who in any workweek (1) is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, as defined in section (3)(s)(1), (2), or (4) or by an establishment described in section (3)(s)(3) or (5), and who, except for the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, would not be within the purview of this section, or (ii) is brought within the purview of this section by the amendments made to section 13(a) of this Act by the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, wages at rates—

"'(1) not less than $1 an hour during the first three years from the effective date of such amendments; not less than $1.15 an hour during the fourth year from such date; and not less than the rate effective under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) thereafter;

"'(2) if such employee is employed as a seaman on an American vessel, not less than the rate which will provide to the employee, for the period covered by the wage payment, wages equal to compensation at the hourly rate prescribed by paragraph (1) of this subsection for all hours during such period when he was actually on duty (including periods aboard ship when the employee was on watch or was, at the direction of a superior officer, performing work or standing by, but not including off-duty periods which are provided pursuant to the employment agreement).'

"(c) Subsection (c) of section 6 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The rate or rates provided by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be superseded in the case of any employee in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands only for so long as and insofar as such employee is covered by a wage order heretofore or hereafter issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a special industry committee appointed pursuant to section 5: *Provided,* That (1) the following rates shall apply to any such employee to whom the rate or rates prescribed by subsection (a) would otherwise apply:

"'(A) The rate or rates applicable under the most recent wage order issued by the Secretary prior to the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, increased by 15 per centum, unless such rate or rates are superseded by the rate or rates prescribed in a wage order issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a review committee appointed under paragraph (C). Such rate or rates shall become effective sixty days after the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 or one year from the effective date of the most recent wage order applicable to such employee theretofore issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a special industry committee appointed under section 5, whichever is later.

"'(B) Beginning two years after the applicable effective date under paragraph (A), not less than the rate or rates prescribed by paragraph (A), increased by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the rate or rates applicable under the most recent wage order issued by the Secretary prior to the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, unless such rate or rates are superseded by the rate or rates prescribed in a wage order issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendations of a review committee appointed under paragraph (C).

"'(C) Any employer, or group of employers, employing a majority of the employees in an industry in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands, may apply to the Secretary in writing for the appointment of a review committee to recommend the minimum rate or rates to be paid such employees in lieu of the rate or rates provided by paragraph (A) or (B). Any such application with respect to any rate or rates provided for under paragraph (A) shall be filed within sixty days following the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 and any such application with respect to any rate or rates provided for under paragraph (B) shall be filed not more than one hundred and twenty days and not less than sixty days prior to the effective date of the applicable rate or rates under paragraph (B). The Secretary shall promptly consider such application and may appoint a review committee if he has reasonable cause to believe, on the basis of financial and other information contained in the application, that compliance with any applicable rate or rates prescribed by paragraph (A) or (B) will substantially curtail employment in such industry. The Secretary's decision upon any such application shall be final. Any wage order issued pursuant to the recommendations of a review committee appointed under this paragraph shall take effect on the applicable effective date provided in paragraph (A) or (B).

"'(D) In the event a wage order has not been issued pursuant to the recommendation of a review committee prior to the applicable effective date under paragraph (A) or (B), the applicable percentage increase provided by any such paragraph shall take effect on the effective date prescribed therein, except with respect to the employees of an employer who filed an application under paragraph (C) and who files with the Secretary an undertaking with a surety or sureties satisfactory to the Secretary for payment to his employees of an amount sufficient to compensate such employees for the difference between the wages they actually receive and the wages to which they are entitled under this subsection. The Secretary shall be empowered to enforce such undertaking and any sums recovered by him shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee or employees affected. Any such sum not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of three years shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"'(2) In the case of any such employee to whom subsection (b) would otherwise apply, the Secretary shall within sixty days after the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961 appoint a special industry committee in accordance with section 5 to recommend the highest minimum wage rate or rates in accordance with the standards prescribed by section 8, not in excess of the applicable rate provided by subsection (b), to be applicable to such employee in lieu of the rate or rates prescribed by subsection (b). The rate or rates recommended by the special industry committee shall be effective with respect to such employee upon the effective date of the wage order issued pursuant to such recommendation but not before sixty days after the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961.

"'(3) The provisions of section 5 and section 8, relating to special industry committees, shall be applicable to review committees appointed under this subsection. The appointment of a review committee shall be in addition to and not in lieu of any special industry committee required to be appointed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of section 8, except that no special industry committee shall hold any hearing within one year after a minimum wage rate or rates for such industry shall have been recommended to the Secretary by a review committee to be paid in lieu of the rate or rates provided for under paragraph (A) or (B). The minimum wage rate or rates prescribed by this subsection shall be in effect only for so long as and insofar as such minimum wage rate or rates have not been superseded by a wage order fixing a higher minimum wage rate or rates (but not in excess of the applicable rate prescribed in subsection (a) or subsection (b)) hereafter issued by the Secretary pursuant to the recommendation of a special industry committee.'

"MAXIMUM HOURS

"SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (a) of section 7 of such Act is amended by designating such subsection as subsection (a)(1), by inserting after the word 'who' the words 'in any workweek', and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a semicolon

and the word 'and' in lieu thereof and adding the following new paragraph (2):

"'(2) No employer shall employ any of his employees who in any workweek (i) is employed in an enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, as defined in section 3(s)(1) or (4), or by an establishment described in section 3(s)(3), and who, except for the enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961, would not be within the purview of this subsection, or (ii) is brought within the purview of this subsection by the amendments made to section 13 of this Act by the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961—

"'(A) for a workweek longer than forty-four hours during the third year from the effective date of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961,

"'(B) for a workweek longer than forty-two hours during the fourth year from such date,

"'(C) for a workweek longer than forty hours after the expiration of the fourth year from such date, unless such employee receives compensation for his employment in excess of the hours above specified at a rate not less than one and one-half times the regular rate at which he is employed.'

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out 'in excess of forty hours in the workweek' in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'in excess of the maximum workweek applicable to such employee under subsection (a)'.

"(c) Paragraph (5) of subsection (d) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out 'forty in a workweek' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'in excess of the maximum workweek applicable to such employee under subsection (a)'.

"(d) Paragraph (7) of subsection (d) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out 'forty hours' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'the maximum workweek applicable to such employee under subsection (a)'.

"(e) Subsection (e) of section 7 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'forty hours' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the maximum workweek applicable to such employee under subsection (a)', (2) by striking out 'section 6(a)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subsection (a) or (b) of section 6 (whichever may be applicable)', and (3) by striking out 'forty in any' and inserting in lieu thereof 'such maximum'.

"(f) Subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out 'forty hours' both times it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'the maximum workweek applicable to such employee under such subsection'.

"(g) Section 7 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(h) No employer shall be deemed to have violated subsection (a) by employing any employee of a retail or service establishment for a workweek in excess of the applicable workweek specified therein, if (1) the regular rate of pay of such employee is in excess of one and one-half times the minimum hourly rate applicable to him under section 6, and (2) more than half his compensation for a representative period (not less than one month) represents commissions on goods or services.'

"WAGE ORDERS IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

"SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act is amended by inserting after the word 'industries' where it appears in the first sentence the words 'or enterprise'; and by inserting after the words 'production of goods for commerce' where they appear in the second sentence the following: 'or in any enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce'.

"CHILD LABOR PROVISIONS

"SEC. 8. Subsection (c) of section 12 of such Act is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'or any enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.'

"EXEMPTIONS

"SEC. 9. Subsections (a) and (b) of section 13 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) The provisions of sections 6 and 7 shall not apply with respect to—

"'(1) any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity, or in the capacity of outside salesman (as such terms are defined and delimited from time to time by regulations of the Secretary, subject to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, except that an employee of a retail or service establishment shall not be excluded from the definition of employee employed in a bona fide executive or administrative capacity because of the number of hours in his workweek which he devotes to activities not directly or closely related to the performance of executive or administrative activities, if less than 40 per centum of his hours worked in the workweek are devoted to such activities); or

"'(2) any employee employed by any retail or service establishment, more than 50 per centum of which establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services is made within the State in which the establishment is located, if such establishment—

"'(i) is not in an enterprise described in section 3(s), or

"'(ii) is in such an enterprise and is a hotel, motel, restaurant, or motion picture theater; or is an amusement or recreational establishment that operates on a seasonal basis, or

"'(iii) is in such an enterprise and is a hospital, or an institution which is primarily engaged in the care of the sick, the aged, the mentally ill or defective, residing on the premises of such institution, or a school for physically or mentally handicapped or gifted children, or

"'(iv) is in such an enterprise and has an annual dollar volume of sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level which are separately stated) which is less than $250,000.

A "retail or service establishment" shall mean an establishment 75 per centum of whose annual dollar volume of sales of goods or services (or of both) is not for resale and is recognized as retail sales or services in the particular industry; or

"'(3) any employee employed by any establishment engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing or fabrics, more than 50 per centum of which establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of such services is made within the State in which the establishment is located: *Provided*, That 75 per centum of such establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of such services is made to customers who are not engaged in a mining, manufacturing, transportation, or communications business; or

"'(4) any employee employed by an establishment which qualifies as an exempt retail establishment under clause (2) of this subsection and is recognized as a retail establishment in the particular industry notwithstanding that such establishment makes or processes at the retail establishment the goods that it sells: *Provided*, That more than 85 per centum of such establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of goods so made or processed is made within the State in which the establishment is located; or

"'(5) any employee employed in the catching, taking, propagating, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life, or in the first processing, canning or packing such marine products at sea as an incident to, or in conjunction with such fishing operations, including the going to and returning from work and loading and unloading when performed by any such employee; or

"'(6) any employee employed in agriculture or in connection with the operation or maintenance of ditches, canals, reservoirs, or waterways, not owned or operated for profit, or operated on a share-crop basis, and which are used exclusively for supply and storing of water for agricultural purposes; or

"'(7) any employee to the extent that such employee is exempted by regulations or orders of the Secretary issued under section 14; or

"'(8) any employee employed in connection with the publication of any weekly, semiweekly, or daily newspaper with a circulation of less than four thousand the major part of which circulation is within the county where printed and published or counties contiguous thereto; or

"'(9) any employee of a street, suburban or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier, not in an enterprise described in section 3(s)(2); or

"'(10) any individual employed within the area of production (as defined by the Secretary), engaged in handling, packing, storing, compressing, pasteurizing, drying, preparing in their raw or natural state, or canning of agricultural or horticultural commodities for market, or in making cheese or butter or other dairy products; or

"'(11) any switchboard operator employed by an independently owned public telephone company which has not more than seven hundred and fifty stations; or

"'(12) any employee of an employer engaged in the business of operating taxicabs; or

"'(13) any employee or proprietor in a retail or service establishment which qualifies as an exempt retail or service establishment under clause (2) of this subsection with respect to whom the provisions of sections 6 and 7 would not otherwise apply, engaged in handling telegraphic messages for the public under an agency or contract arrangement with a telegraph company where the telegraph message revenue of such agency does not exceed $500 a month; or

"'(14) any employee employed as a seaman on a vessel other than an American vessel; or

"'(15) any employee employed in planting or tending trees, cruising, surveying, or felling timber, or in preparing or transporting logs or other forestry products to the mill, processing plant, railroad, or other transportation terminal, if the number of employees employed by his employer in such forestry or lumbering operations does not exceed twelve; or

"'(16) any employee with respect to his employment in agriculture by a farmer, notwithstanding other employment of such employee in connection with livestock auction operations in which such farmer is engaged as an adjunct to the raising of livestock, either on his own account or in conjunction with other farmers, if such employee (A) is primarily employed during his workweek in agriculture by such farmer, and (B) is paid for his employment in connection with such livestock auction operations at a wage rate not less than that prescribed by section 6(a)(1); or

"'(17) any employee employed within the area of production (as defined by the Secretary) by an establishment commonly recognized as a country elevator, including such an establishment which sells products and services used in the operation of a farm: *Provided*, That no more than five employees

are employed in the establishment in such operations; or

"'(18) any employee engaged in ginning of cotton for market, in any place of employment located in a county where cotton is grown in commercial quantities; or

"'(19) any employee of a retail or service establishment which is primarily engaged in the business of selling automobiles, trucks, or farm implements; or

"'(20) any employee of a retail or service establishment who is employed primarily in connection with the preparation or offering of food or beverages for human consumption, either on the premises, or by such services as catering, banquet, box lunch, or curb or counter service, to the public, to employees, or to members or guests of members of clubs; or

"'(21) any agricultural employee employed in the growing and harvesting of shade-grown tobacco who is engaged in the processing (including, but not limited to, drying, curing, fermenting, bulking, rebulking, sorting, grading, aging, and baling) of such tobacco, prior to the stemming process, for use as cigar wrapper tobacco; or

"'(22) any employee engaged (A) in the transportation and preparation for transportation of fruits or vegetables, whether or not performed by the farmer, from the farm to a place of first processing or first marketing within the same State, or (B) in transportation, whether or not performed by the farmer, between the farm and any point within the same State of persons employed or to be employed in the harvesting of fruits or vegetables.

"'(b) The provisions of section 7 shall not apply with respect to—

"'(1) any employee with respect to whom the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to establish qualifications and maximum hours of service pursuant to the provisions of section 204 of the Motor Carrier Act, 1935; or

"'(2) any employee of an employer subject to the provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act; or

"'(3) any employee of a carrier by air subject to the provisions of title II of the Railway Labor Act; or

"'(4) any employee employed in the canning, processing, marketing, freezing, curing, storing, packing for shipment, or distributing of any kind of fish, shellfish, or other aquatic forms of animal or vegetable life, or any byproduct thereof; or

"'(5) any individual employed as an outside buyer of poultry, eggs, cream, or milk, in their raw or natural state; or

"'(6) any employee employed as a seaman; or

"'(7) any employee of a street, suburban or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier; or

"'(8) any employee of a gasoline service station; or

"'(9) any employee employed as an announcer, news editor, or chief engineer by a radio or television station the major studio of which is located (A) in a city or town of one hundred thousand population or less, according to the latest available decennial census figures as compiled by the Bureau of the Census, except where such city or town is part of a standard metropolitan statistical area, as defined and designated by the Bureau of the Budget, which has a total population in excess of one hundred thousand, or (B) in a city or town of twenty-five thousand population or less, which is part of such an area but is at least 40 airline miles from the principal city in such area; or

"'(10) any employee of an independently owned and controlled local enterprise (including an enterprise with more than one bulk storage establishment) engaged in the wholesale or bulk distribution of petroleum products if (A) the annual gross volume of sales of such enterprise is not more than $1,000,000 exclusive of excise taxes, and (B) more than 75 per centum of such enterprise's annual dollar volume of sales is made within the State in which such enterprise is located, and (C) not more than 25 per centum of the annual dollar volume of sales of such enterprise is to customers who are engaged in the bulk distribution of such products for resale; or

"'(11) any employee employed as a driver or driver's helper making local deliveries, who is compensated for such employment on the basis of trip rates, or other delivery payment plan, if the Secretary shall find that such plan has the general purpose and effect of reducing hours worked by such employees to, or below, the maximum workweek applicable to them under section 7(a).'

"SEC. 10. That section 13(d) of such Act, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: 'or to any homeworker engaged in the making of wreaths composed principally of natural holly, pine, cedar, or other evergreens (including the harvesting of the evergreens or other forest products used in making such wreaths)'.

"EMPLOYMENT OF STUDENTS

"SEC. 11. Clause (1) of section 14 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and' after 'apprentices,' and by inserting after 'messages,' the following: 'and of full-time students outside of their school hours in any retail or service establishment: *Provided*, That such employment is not of the type ordinarily given to a full-time employee,'.

"PENALTIES AND INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

"SEC. 12. (a) Section 16(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: 'The right provided by this subsection to bring an action by or on behalf of any employee, and the right of any employee to become a party plaintiff of any such action, shall terminate upon the filing of a complaint by the Secretary of Labor in an action under section 17 in which restraint is sought of any further delay in the payment of unpaid minimum wages, or the amount of unpaid overtime compensation, as the case may be, owing to such employee under section 6 or section 7 of this Act by an employer liable therefor under the provisions of this subsection.'

"(b) Section 17 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

"'SEC. 17. The district courts, together with the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the District Court of Guam shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of section 15, including in the case of violations of section 15(a)(2) the restraint of any withholding of payment of minimum wages or overtime compensation found by the court to be due to employees under this Act (except sums which employees are barred from recovering, at the time of the commencement of the action to restrain the violations, by virtue of the provisions of section 6 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947).'

"STUDY OF AGRICULTURAL HANDLING AND PROCESSING EXEMPTIONS AND RATES OF PAY IN HOTELS, MOTELS, RESTAURANTS, AND OTHER FOOD SERVICE ENTERPRISES

"SEC. 13. The Secretary of Labor shall study the complicated system of exemptions now available for the handling and processing of agricultural products under such Act and particularly sections 7(b)(3), 7(c), and 13(a)(10), and the complex problems involving rates of pay of employees in hotels, motels, restaurants, and other food service enterprises who are exempted from the provisions of this Act, and shall submit to the second session of the Eighty-seventh Congress at the time of his report under section 4(d) of such Act a special report containing the results of such study and information, data and recommendations for further legislation designed to simplify and remove the inequities in the application of such exemptions.

"EFFECTIVE DATE

"SEC. 14. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of one hundred and twenty days after the date of its enactment, except as otherwise provided in such amendments and except that the authority to promulgate necessary rules, regulations, or orders with regard to amendments made by this Act, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and amendments thereto, including amendments made by this Act, may be exercised by the Secretary on and after the date of enactment of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

ADAM C. POWELL,
JAMES ROOSEVELT,
JOHN H. DENT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCNAMARA,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
BEN A. SMITH,
CLAIBORNE PELL,
QUENTIN BURDICK,
WINSTON L. PROUTY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment strikes out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserts a substitute. The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill and the substitute agreed to in conference are described in the following statement, except for incidental and minor clarifying and technical changes. The instances in which the House bill and the Senate amendment are substantially the same are not discussed in this statement.

MINIMUM WAGES

Presently covered: The House bill provides that the minimum wage for employees now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (hereafter referred to as the "act") will become $1.15 an hour on the effective date.

The Senate amendment provides that the minimum wage for presently covered employees will become $1.15 an hour on the effective date and will become $1.25 an hour 2 years thereafter.

The conference substitute (sec. 6(a)(1) of the act [1]) includes this provision.

Newly covered: The House bill provides that the minimum hourly wage for newly covered employees will be $1. The Senate amendment provides that the minimum hourly wage for newly covered employees will be $1 an hour during the first year after the

[1] References here and through this statement are to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as it would be amended by the conference substitute.

effective date, $1.05 an hour during the second year, $1.15 an hour during the third year, and $1.25 an hour thereafter.

The conference substitute (sec. 6(b)(1)) provides that the minimum hourly wage for such employees will be $1 for the first 3 years after the effective date, $1.15 during the fourth year, and $1.25 thereafter.

OVERTIME FOR NEWLY COVERED

The House bill does not provide overtime coverage for any newly covered employees. The Senate amendment provides no overtime compensation for newly covered employees during the first year after the effective date. During the second year, such employees will receive overtime after 44 hours in the workweek, during the third year they will receive overtime compensation after 42 hours, and thereafter they will receive such compensation after 40 hours.

The conference substitute provides no overtime compensation for newly covered employees for 2 years after the effective date. Such employees will receive overtime compensation after 44 hours during the third year after the effective date, after 42 hours during the fourth year after such date, and after 40 hours thereafter.

RETAIL AND SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS

Coverage: The House bill extends minimum wage coverage to employees of retail establishments in enterprises which have five or more retail establishments and which operate such establishments in two or more States. The House bill defines "retail establishment" to exclude establishments which are primarily service establishments, and gives as examples of such establishments which are service establishments, and therefore not covered, the following: hotels, motels, restaurants (including lunch counters, cafeterias, and drive-ins), caterers, hospitals, laundry or drycleaning establishments, motion picture theaters, amusement or recreational establishments, parking lots, beauty or barber shops, and repair shops. This general extension of coverage in the House bill is qualified by certain specific exemptions which are discussed below.

The Senate amendment extends coverage to employees of retail or service enterprises meeting the following conditions: First, they must have employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, including handling, selling, or otherwise working on goods that have been moved in or produced for commerce. (This requirement also applies to the enterprises or establishments covered by the other categories hereafter mentioned.) Second, the enterprise must have an annual gross volume of sales of $1 million or more (exclusive of certain excise taxes). Third, the enterprise must purchase or receive goods for resale that move or have moved across State lines (not in deliveries from the reselling establishment) which amount in total annual volume to $250,000 or more. As in the case of the House bill, the general extension of coverage is qualified by certain specific exemptions which are discussed below.

The conference substitute (sec. 3(s)(1)) includes this provision and also a provision making it clear that the definition of "resale" in the Act does not apply to this provision.

Exemptions: The House bill exempts employees of retail establishments having an annual dollar volume of sales of less than $250,000. The conference substitute (sec. 13(a)(2)(iv)) adopts a provision to the same effect, except that service establishments would also be given the advantage of the exemption.

The Senate amendment provides both a minimum wage and an overtime exemption for employees of the following: hotels, motels, restaurants, motion picture theaters, recreational establishments operating on a seasonal basis, hospitals, institutions primarily engaged in the care of the sick, the aged, or the mentally ill or defective, residing on the premises of such institution, and schools for physically or mentally handicapped or gifted children. The House bill reaches the same result as the Senate amendment since under the bill's definitions these are service establishments and therefore not covered by the House bill. The conference substitute (sec. 13(a)(2)(ii) and (iii)) adopts the provisions of the amendment.

In addition, the House bill exempts employees employed in connection with a lunch counter, restaurant, or cafeteria in department, drug, and similar stores which qualify as retail establishments. The Senate amendment and the conference substitute (sec. 13(a)(20)) also exempts employees of retail or service establishments employed primarily in connection with the preparation or offering of food or beverages for human consumption, either on the premises, or by such services as catering, banquet, box lunch, or curb or counter service, to the public, to employees, or to members or guests of members of clubs. Clauses (2) and (20) of section 13(a) also are intended to continue the exemption for independently owned and operated restaurants in industrial plants, office buildings, Government installations, hospitals, or colleges, such as were involved in *McComb* v. *Factory Stores* (81 F. Supp. 403 (1948)). This exemption would extend to all employees primarily engaged in the preparation or offering of food or beverages such as dishwashers, cashiers, busboys, etc.

LAUNDRY AND DRY CLEANING ESTABLISHMENTS

The House bill provides no additional coverage for employees of laundries. The Senate amendments extends coverage to enterprises engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce which have one or more establishments engaged in laundering, cleaning, or repairing clothing or fabrics if the annual gross sales of the enterprise is $1 million or more (exclusive of certain excise taxes). This coverage provision is broadened by certain provisions of section 13(a)(3) which also have the effect of extending the coverage of the act. The conference substitute follows the House bill.

COVERAGE OF URBAN AND INTERURBAN TRANSIT ENTERPRISES

The House bill does not extend coverage to urban and interurban transit companies. The Senate amendment extends the coverage of the act to enterprises engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce which are engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban or interurban electric railway, or local trolley or motorbus carrier. However, the Senate amendment also provides an overtime exemption for these employees. The conference substitute (sec. 3(s)(2)) changes this provision of the Senate amendment so that the new coverage will extend only to employees of such enterprises having an annual gross volume of sales of not less than $1 million (exclusive of certain excise taxes).

COVERAGE OF CONSTRUCTION ENTERPRISES

The Senate amendment and the conference substitute (sec. 3(s)(4)) extend the act's coverage to any enterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce if it is engaged in the business of construction or reconstruction, or both, and the annual gross volume of business of the enterprise is not less than $350,000. The House bill does not contain such provisions.

COVERAGE OF GASOLINE SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS

The House bill provides an exemption for employees of retail gasoline establishments which might otherwise be brought under the coverage of the act as retail establishments.

The Senate amendment extends the coverage of the act to gasoline service establishments which have an annual gross volume of sales of not less than $250,0000 (exclusive of certain excise taxes). However, the Senate amendment exempts all employees of gasoline service establishments from the overtime requirements of the act. The conference substitute (sec. 3(c)(5)) adopts these provisions.

ESTABLISHMENT COVERAGE

The Senate amendment, unlike the House bill, extends the coverage of the act to any establishment which has two or more employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce if it is part of an enterprise which is not covered by one of the foregoing, and has an annual gross volume of sales of not less than $1 million. The conference substitute (sec. 3(s)(3)) includes this provision.

EXEMPTIONS

Fish processing: The Senate amendment, unlike the House bill, changes the exemption in the act for processing, marketing, freezing, curing, storing, packing for shipment, or distributing fish and certain other marine products from a minimum wage and overtime exemption to an overtime-only exemption. The present complete exemption is retained for employees employed in catching, propagating, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming, fish and certain other marine products, or in the first processing, canning, or packing such marine products at sea as an incident to, or in conjunction with, such fishing operations, including the going to and returning from work and loading and unloading when performed by such an employee. The conference substitute (secs. 13(a)(5) and 13(b)(4)) retains this provision.

Switchboard operators: The Senate amendment limits the exemption in the act for switchboard operators employed in public telephone exchanges having fewer than 750 stations. Under this provision switchboard operators are exempt only if employed by an independently owned telephone company which has no more than 750 stations. The House bill did not deal with this subject. This provision of the Senate amendment is included in the proposed conference substitute (sec. 13(a)(11)).

Seamen: The Senate amendment and the conference substitute (secs. 13(a)(14) and (13)(b)(6)) change the complete exemption contained in the present law for all seamen to provide minimum wage coverage for seamen on American vessels. The overtime exemption for seamen is not affected and is continued. The Senate amendment and conference substitute also permit the computation of wages of seamen on the basis of periods longer than a workweek and provide that hours are included as hours worked only if the employee was on duty. The employee is considered to be on duty only while he is on watch or is, at the direction of a superior officer, performing work or standing by, but he will not be considered to be on duty during off-duty periods provided pursuant to his employment agreement. There are no comparable provisions in the House bill.

Livestock auctions: The Senate bill provides a minimum-wage and overtime exemption for any employee with respect to his employment in agriculture by a farmer, notwithstanding other employment of such employee in connection with livestock auction operations in which such farmer is engaged as an adjunct to the raising of livestock, either on his own account or in conjunction with other farmers, if the employee is primarily employed during his workweek in agriculture by such farmer, and is paid for his employment in connection with such livestock auction operations at not less than

the minimum wage applicable to him. The House bill has no comparable provision. This exemption is included in the conference substitute (sec. 13(a)(16)).

Country elevators: The Senate amendment and the conference substitute (sec. 13(a)(17)) provide a minimum-wage and overtime exemption for any employee employed within the area of production (as defined by the Secretary) by an establishment commonly recognized as a country elevator, including such an establishment which sells products and services used in the operation of a farm, if not more than five employees are employed in the establishment in such operations. The House bill contains no comparable provision.

Cotton ginning: The Senate amendment provides a minimum-wage and overtime exemption for any employee engaged in ginning of cotton for market, in any place of employment located in a county where cotton is grown in commercial quantities. The House bill has no comparable provision. The conference substitute (sec. 13(a)(18)) contains this exemption.

Auto and farm implement dealers: The House bill provides an exemption for employees of establishments primarily engaged in selling automobiles, trucks, or farm implements which might otherwise be brought under the coverage of the act as retail establishments. The Senate amendment covers such dealers on the same basis as other retail or service establishments, but exempts them from the overtime requirements of the act. The substitute agreed upon in conference (sec. 13(a)(19)) follows the provisions of the House bill.

Shade-grown tobacco: The House bill provides that the term "agriculture" includes the processing of shade-grown tobacco, for use as cigar wrapper tobacco by agricultural employees employed in the growing and harvesting of such tobacco, which processing shall include but not be limited to, drying, curing, fermenting, bulking, rebulking, sorting, grading, aging, and baling, prior to the stemming process. The Senate amendment contains no comparable provision. The conference substitute keeps the substance of this provision of the House bill, but places it in the exemptions section of the act (sec. 13(a)(21)) providing an exemption from both minimum wage and overtime.

Fruit and vegetable transportation: The House bill contains a provision to the effect that the term "agriculture" includes, in the case of fruits and vegetables, the transportation and preparation for transportation, whether or not performed by the farmer, of the commodity from the farm to a place of first processing or first marketing within the same State, and the transportation, whether or not performed by the farmer, between the farm and any point within the same State of persons employed or to be employed in the harvesting of the commodity. The Senate amendment contains no comparable provision. The substitute agreed upon in conference (sec. 13(a)(22)) includes the substance of this provision but places it in the exemptions section of the act (sec. 13(a)(22) thus providing an exemption from minimum wage and overtime.

It is not intended by the committee of conference to change by this exemption or by the exemption for employees engaged in the named operations on shade-grown tobacco the application of the act to any other employees. Nor is it intended that there be any implication of disagreement by the conference committee with the principles and tests governing the application of the present agricultural exemption as enunciated by the courts.

Certain broadcasters: The House bill provides an overtime exemption for announcers, news editors, and chief engineers employed by a radio or television station the major studio of which is located in a city or town having a population of at least 100,000, unless the city or town is part of a standard metropolitan statistical area which has a total population in excess of 100,000. The Senate amendment contains a provision which is substantially the same except that the population figure of 50,000 is substituted, and an additional exemption is provided for stations located in such areas, if the station's major studio is located in a city which has a population of not more than 25,000 and is more than 40 miles from the principal city in the area. The conference substitute (sec. 13(b)(9)) adopts the House bill, with the additional exemption referred to above.

Bulk distribution of petroleum: The Senate amendment and the conference substitute (sec. 13(b)(10)) provide an overtime exemption for any employee of an independently owned and controlled local enterprise (including an enterprise with more than one bulk storage establishment) engaged in the wholesale or bulk distribution of petroleum products if the annual gross volume of sales of the enterprise is not more than $1 million, exclusive of excise taxes, and more than 75 percent of the enterprise's sales are made within its State, and if not more than 25 percent of its sales are to customers who are engaged in the bulk distribution of such products for resale. The House bill contains no comparable provision.

Drivers and drivers' helpers: The present act contains an overtime exemption, in section 13(b)(1), for drivers, drivers' helpers, loaders, and mechanics with respect to whom the Interstate Commerce Commission has power to regulate maximum hours of service. While this exemption applies to many drivers and drivers' helpers employed on a trip rate or similar basis, there are some employees engaged in such activities whose employment is not within the ICC's jurisdiction.

The Senate amendment does not change this exemption. However, it provides, in a new section 13(b)(11), an overtime exemption applicable to an employee employed as a driver or driver's helper on a trip rate or similar basis making local deliveries. An employee so employed will be exempt from the act's overtime provisions if the Secretary of Labor finds that the agreement establishing such basis of employment has the general purpose and effect of reducing the hours worked by the employees to, or below, the maximum workweek applicable to them under the act. The House bill contains no comparable provision. The conference substitute (sec. 13(b)(11)) contains this provision.

Holly wreaths: The Senate amendment and the conference substitute (sec. 13(d)) provide an exemption from the minimum wage, overtime, and child labor provisions of the act for any homeworker engaged in the making of wreaths composed principally of natural holly, pine, cedar, and other evergreens (including harvesting of products used in making such wreaths). The House bill has no comparable provision.

Commission employees: The Senate amendment provides an exemption from the overtime provisions of the act for any employee in a retail or service establishment if the employee's regular rate of pay exceeds 1½ times the minimum hourly rate applicable to him and more than half his compensation for a representative period represents commissions on goods or services. The House bill does not deal with this subject. The conference substitute (sec. 7(h)) adopts this provision.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Foreign competition: The House bill provides that whenever the Secretary of Labor has reason to believe that in an industry under this act the competition of foreign producers in the United States markets or in markets abroad, or both, has resulted, or is likely to result, in increased unemployment in the United States, he shall undertake an investigation to gain full information with respect to the matter. He is required to make a full report of his findings and determinations to the President and Congress. The Senate amendment requires the same investigations as the House bill, but requires a report only where the Secretary determines that increased unemployment has in fact resulted, or is in fact likely to result from the foreign competition with respect to which the investigation is made. The Senate amendment also requires inclusion in the report of pertinent information on the increased employment resulting from additional exports in any industry under the act. The substitute agreed upon in conference (sec. 7(e)) is the same as the Senate amendment.

Board and lodging: The Senate amendment modifies the definition of "wage" in section 3(m) of the act to give the Secretary authority to determine the fair value of facilities furnished by the employer on the basis of average cost to the employer or to groups of employers similarly situated, or average value to groups of employees, or other appropriate measures of fair value. The House bill has no comparable provision. The conference substitute (sec. 3(m)) includes this provision.

The House bill provides that the cost of board, lodging, and other facilities will not be included as part of the wage paid an employee to the extent it is excluded therefrom under the terms of an individual contract or collective bargaining agreement. The Senate amendment was the same, except that it did not permit the exclusion of these costs by reason of the terms of individual contracts. The conference substitute (sec. 3(m)) is the same as the Senate amendment.

Enforcement: The committee of conference adopted provisions (secs. 16(b) and (17)) contained in the Senate amendment but not in the House bill, dealing with enforcement of the minimum wage and overtime pay requirements of the act. Under these provisions, the Federal district courts would be authorized, in injunction actions brought by the Secretary of Labor, to issue court orders requiring employers to cease unlawful withholding of minimun wages and overtime compensation found by the court to be due to employees under the act. In such actions only the minimum wages and overtime pay found due under the act may be awarded and no award shall be made of any additional amount as liquidated damages. The bringing of an action by the Secretary seeking such relief with respect to such compensation owing to any employee would, after filing of the complaint in the Secretary's action, preclude such employee from becoming a party plaintiff in a private action to recover the amounts due and an additional equal amount as liquidated damages. The filing of the Secretary's complaint against an employer would not, however, operate to terminate any employee's right to maintain such a private suit to which he had become a party plaintiff before the Secretary's action. Nor would the amendment change the present authority of the courts to order reimbursement for losses incurred by an employee as a result of a discriminatory discharge in violation of section 15(a)(3) of the act.

Study of certain exemptions: The House bill requires the Secretary to study the complicated system of exemptions now available under the act for handling and processing of agricultural products and to submit to the 2d session of the 87th Congress a special report containing the results of the study and information, data, and recommendations for further legislation designed to simplify and remove inequities in the

application of such exemptions. The Senate amendment contains a provision which is like the House bill, except that it adds to the subjects to be studied, the complex problems involving rates of pay of employees in hotels, motels, restaurants, and other food service enterprises which are exempt from the provisions of the act. The substitute agreed upon in conference adopts the House bill and the additional study called for under the Senate amendment.

Minimum wages in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands: The Senate amendment contains provisions under which each of the rates applicable to currently covered employees in any industry in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands will be increased by 15 percent, the same increase as will be applicable to mainland industries, unless an appeal is made. Two years after the first increase in the wage rate for any industry has become effective, the rate will be further increased by an amount equal to 10 percent of the rate in effect at the time of enactment of the amendments, but not in excess of $1.15 during the first 2 years after the effective date of the act, or $1.25 thereafter. However, no rate applicable in these islands which has been in effect for less than 1 year will be increased until a full year has elapsed.

Either of the percentage increases referred to above may be superseded upon the basis of the recommendations of a review committee appointed by the Secretary of Labor under procedures prescribed in the Senate amendment upon application by employers employing a majority of employees in an industry. The application must be accompanied by financial and other data as required by the Secretary. The Senate amendment makes provision for appointment of a review committee if, on the basis of such financial and other data, the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe that such percentage increase would substantially curtail employment in the industry. A review committee may recommend a rate or rates in lieu of the applicable percentage increase, not in excess of $1.15 during the first 2 years after the effective date of the act, or $1.25 thereafter. In the event a wage order is not issued pursuant to the recommendations of such review committee prior to the dates the percentage increases are scheduled to become effective, the percentage increases will take effect, except with respect to employees of an employer who (1) filed an application for the review committee and (2) provided an undertaking with sureties satisfactory to the Secretary to cover the difference between the wages his employees actually received and the wages to which they become entitled. It is further provided that no special industry committee shall hold any hearing within 1 year after a minimum rate or rates for such industry shall have been recommended to the Secretary by a review committee.

Provision is also made for setting the initial minimum rate for employees on the islands to whom protection will be newly extended. Provision is made for appointment, within 60 days after the date of enactment, of a special industry committee to determine the rate or rates appropriate for the newly protected workers. Such rate or rates will become effective on the effective date of the wage order issued pursuant to the industry committee's recommendation, but not before 60 days after the effective date of the amendments. Subsequently, each rate will be subject to review at least once during each biennial period.

The substitute agreed upon in conference (sec. 6(c)) includes these provisions.

Student workers: The House bill authorizes the Secretary to permit employment of full-time students outside their school hours at subminimum wages, subject to the same standards and restrictions applicable in the case of learners, apprentices, and messengers. The Senate amendment is similar to the House bill, but provides that such students may be employed in retail or service establishments in positions ordinarily given full-time employees. The conference substitute (sec. 14) adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment.

ADAM C. POWELL,
JAMES ROOSEVELT,
JOHN H. DENT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, on April 25, Mr. ROOSEVELT, Mr. DENT, Mr. KEARNS, Mr. AYRES and I, as the conferees designated by the Speaker on H.R. 3935, met with the nine Members of the other body who were similarly designated. Before us was the task of reconciling the differences which appeared in the measures adopted in the House and in the Senate.

During the course of the conference, the House managers were always sensitive to the views expressed by Members of this body during our full debate on H.R. 3935. In fact, the conference almost foundered because of the adamancy of our views on several matters. The Senate conferees were determined to preserve coverage of the laundry industry, as they had proposed in their bill. The special provisions with regard to shade-grown tobacco, cotton ginning, and transporting fruits and vegetables to market could have been lost if the sentiments of many of the conferees were followed. No one who fully participated in all of our deliberations can factually refute this statement.

We were particularly sensitive to the views expressed by Members of this body with regard to the treatment of newly covered employees. We knew that the imposition of a new wage standard and overtime requirements within a short period of time, as provided in the Senate bill, would be contrary to the views expressed in this Chamber by many Members. For that reason a realistically long period of adjustment for both the wage and hour requirements were demanded of the Senate conferees and they acceded in the conference report before you. You will note that a $1 minimum wage is required for the first 3 years and no overtime requirement until the third year.

Mindful of the constitutional question raised by certain House Members, we believe that a minimum of $250,000 goods from out of the State per store and a $1 million sales test per chain represents a policy determination by the conferees which draws an equitable line between large enterprises and small ones, without discrimination against smaller operations due to the chance location of their branches in two or more States.

Those who will speak in opposition to this report, will attempt to discredit the labors of your conferees by implying that there was an overwhelming eagerness on the part of the House Managers to recede in favor of the bill adopted by the Senate. I will just note at this point that on a vast majority of the substantive provisions of the bills before the conferees, all of the House and Senate conferees, Democrat and Republican alike, voted unanimously 21 times to adopt the language. On items in dispute, both the House and the Senate had to recede an equal number of times or only six each. This subject will be discussed in greater detail by Congressman ROOSEVELT. Never during the conference did the sponsor of the substitute measure that passed the House attempt to persuade the conferees that the provisions of the measure which he cosponsored deserved consideration and support.

The conference report now before you simply seeks to match the protections afforded by the Congress in 1938 in the original act with the demands and needs of the 1960's. The report on which you are going to vote contains many of the concepts and features recommended to this Congress by the President, and I believe that it has his wholehearted endorsement and support. It is a moderate bill. It is a modest bill. It is a step forward in providing minimum living standards and decent working hours for less fortunate breadwinners who cannot achieve these standards through their own efforts.

President Kennedy, as a Senator in the 86th Congress, said, "Conscience and good business sense join in demanding the enactment of this measure." He was speaking of the need for new wage-hour legislation last year. A majority of your conferees endorse this statement and stress its import and timeliness this year. We urge you to support this conference report which we have presented.

I shall have further remarks at the conclusion of this 1 hour of debate.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], the distinguished minority member of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. KEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished minority leader of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I think it ought to be understood first of all that the matter we are here discussing has been before the House of Representatives from time to time in past years. At the outset I want to say, so that we shall not subsequently hear something different, that I have supported these increases in minimum wages and extensions of coverage through the years, as have, I would say, most of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

Last year, on the recommendation of President Eisenhower and the Secretary of Labor, we adopted here after considerable controversy, a bill providing for an increase in the minimum wage of 15 cents and holding fast to the interstate commerce concept in respect to coverage. We voted for that bill. The other body passed a different bill and the bill died in conference.

This year the committee reported another bill. It provided for a 15-cent increase immediately and going to 25 cents

2 years and 4 months later, known as the escalator clause, which, as I understand it, is the administration proposal. Then it substituted for the interstate-commerce concept, in which we believe, the dollar-volume concept. When that finally came on for a vote, the House here, first in the committee, adopted the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], and then when the vote came on that in the House it was adopted by a vote of 216 to 203. Then vote came on that in the House it was and the vote went then 340 to 78 for an increase in the minimum wage and for an extension of coverage. I voted for that bill.

That bill went to conference. In my opinion, there was a clear obligation on the conferees to insist on the House position. To me, it is to beg the question for the chairman of the committee, the leader of our conferees, to say that the interstate commerce concept was not urged by our conferees. My understanding is that they did urge it, but whether that is true or not, I say this with all respect, because it is known to all of us, that the House conferees, Mr. POWELL, Mr. ROOSEVELT, and Mr. DENT, were not in sympathy with the provisions of the House bill when they went to conference. The conference did not last very long, and maybe that is as it should be; I do not know.

But in any event, I think the question here on this conference report today is this: Shall the House of Representatives without firing a shot surrender its position? I say "No." I say that this conference report is no fair compromise between the position adopted by the House of Representatives and that adopted by the people on the other side of the Capitol. On the contrary it is really an abandonment of the fundamental House provision. So I say this conference report should be voted down and this bill sent back to conference to support the House position.

It is urged by the three House conferees who signed the conference report that that will mean no minimum wage bill. They predicate that upon an alleged continuing refusal by the people in the other body to accept House provisions. I just do not believe that is a fair assumption. It is an assumption I am not going to indulge because if I indulge it on this measure then I would have to say on all measures coming along that the House of Representatives might as well fold up and quit and go home and let the other body write the laws.

Of course we all know that if this conference report is voted down the chairman of the committee has no alternative but to move to appoint new conferees and to send this bill back, and it should be sent back for a fair compromise.

To state my position, and there have been lots of discussions by a lot of us about it, as far as I am concerned I am prepared to take the administration's recommendations in respect to the minimum wage and having to do with the escalator clause. Let the 15 cents go in presently as the administration recommends for those employees now covered. And then 2 years and 4 months from now, as the administration recommends and as the committee reported, let the 25-cent provision apply.

You know, as a matter of fact, if that provision prevails there are going to be millions of disillusioned people in this country who are presently covered under the Minimum Wage Act because there has been so much said about this being a 25-cent bill right now and so much printed, that they are expecting to get the 25-cent increase the minute the bill is signed by the President. As I say, they are going to be disappointed.

Certainly, I want to say to those who may have voted against the substitute before, because they wanted to go for the escalator clause and the ultimate 25 cents, there is no reason why this position that we now take, and I take it as the minority leader, should not convince them that they can vote down this conference report and still hold fast to the interstate commerce concept, which is vitally important, with the knowledge that the escalator clause will be retained in the bill. The ultimate effect, therefore, as I see it, would be to turn down the dollar volume provision and to stick to the provision that was contained in the substitute which clearly deals with interstate commerce.

Let me just warn you, my friends, that if you adopt this substitute and create this pattern for coverage, you will, if you live a little while, see the day when the Federal Government will be reaching right down into every corner store to control it.

Let me emphasize this one thing further. If we vote down this conference report, and I hope we do because I think it is the sensible and sane thing to do to make some advance in this area that is reasonable and sound, and if it goes back to conference and the conferees bring back something that represents at least some substantial part of the interstate commerce position taken by the House as a whole by a vote and not just the position of a few people talking on the floor, then that sort of a conference report, in my opinion, would be overwhelmingly adopted in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, may I simply say that in my opinion this is a matter involving the prestige and standing of the legislative processes and decisions of the House of Representatives. I do not say that our views must always prevail against the views of the other body, and likewise I do not think it is right or proper or fair for any Member of the House to insist that we must completely surrender to the other body and give up our right to have something to say as to what is going to be done.

Mr. Speaker, there were some provisions added in the other body at the last minute to take employees of cotton gins out of the coverage that is now presently accorded them in the act. And somebody told me they are taking out the people that make holly wreaths. Insofar as those added exemptions are concerned, I would say to the conferees on my side that those added exemptions would probably be acceptable, too. If there are people who are tremendously interested in these propositions, I do not see any reason why we ought to be obstinate about it.

Let me just sum up by saying that a vote against this conference report is not a vote against the minimum wage and the extension of coverage—not at all. Practically all of us voted for the committee bill or for the Ayres substitute, and on final passage the bill that finally passed the House of Representatives was passed by an overwhelming vote. What we do here is to simply sustain the position of the House of Representatives and proceed to get good sound legislation.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the issue before the House today is a clear-cut one. Those who favor a minimum wage should vote for the conference report; those who do not should vote against it. The arguments we have heard from some on the Republican side of the House are but typical of their attitude throughout the years, offering amendments in an effort to weaken and defeat legislation, just as we saw practiced earlier this afternoon on another bill, offering amendments to weaken or destroy an effective bill.

My friend from Indiana is too alert a legislator and too good a parliamentarian to advance the argument that the vote on the passage of the bill was tantamount to instructions to the House conferees when they went into conference. That is not so. I voted for the passage of the bill upon the theory of getting the bill into conference, and my vote certainly was not to bind the conferees. The substitute was adopted by 1 vote in the Committee of the Whole, 186 to 185; and on the adoption of the substitute, as the gentleman said, the vote was 216 to 203, as I remember it. If the substitute had been defeated the committee bill would have been passed in the House. The gentleman from Indiana understands that as well as I do.

The conferees have done a magnificent job under the circumstances; they have brought back a bill that represents a victory for the House. So far as I am concerned, I want to see further coverage than contained in the conference report. The Senate bill extended coverage to 4,086,000 new employees. The conference bill extends coverage to 3,624,000 new employees. The Ayres-Kitchin substitute extended coverage to 1,365,000 additional employees. The House conferees have done a remarkable job.

If this bill goes back to conference, in my opinion we will never get a better conference report; if anything, the House conferees would probably have to get nearer to the bill as it passed the Senate; and, personally, I favor the Senate bill. But I compliment the House

conferees for sticking up for the position of the House and seeing that the position of the House was maintained. They have done a remarkable job. I think the conference should be adopted.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the fine statement made by the minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. In the 7 years I have been a conferee of this body this is the first sham, if I can use the word, that I have ever felt was forced on the House of Representatives. We are humiliated.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one who has greater respect for the Speaker than I have, but when we went over to conference there were nine Senators. Every member of their subcommittee was a conferee. We went over with five, and the three majority members, the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] were committed to the administration bill against the will of the House when we passed it here. We had no representation over there for the will of this body. We went over there with the whole thing sliced—on the Senate side and on our side.

I want to tell you this, Mr. Speaker, if that is the way we are going to run our Government we are going to be in a precarious position from here on in. It should have been debated longer. The conference should have run longer. Then, too, the fact that this House voted 340 to 78 was never considered in conference. There was one little amendment I remember Senator RANDOLPH gave in on.

So I want to tell you Members today that we face a serious situation in Government if the House of Representatives is going to acquiesce all the time with the Senate.

I would like to make one other statement here too. I feel that from here on in, Mr. Speaker, when we go to conference I would like to see the House represented as well as the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to state my reasons for opposing the conference report on the minimum wage bill.

At the outset I would like to note that as ranking minority member of the Education and Labor Committee, I was one of the five conferees named to represent the House during the meetings of the conference. The fact that the House was permitted to name only five conferees while the Senate named nine placed the House position in jeopardy from the very beginning. It was almost as if the House was determined to subordinate itself to the Senate—and this is exactly what finally happened. Thus, it was my dubious honor to sit through three sessions of the conferees which were in every respect a sham and a studied flaunting of the will of this august body. A majority of the House conferees—ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JAMES ROOSEVELT, and JOHN DENT—were on record prior to the conference as being absolutely opposed to the bill which this House passed by the overwhelming majority of 340 to 78. It was no surprise, therefore, that the dollar volume test which was rejected by the House was rammed through by the chairman of the conference, ADAM POWELL, without any discussions whatsoever. Under this concept there is no question but what the corner grocer and the local drugstore can be brought under the provisions of the minimum wage bill at some not too distant date.

I am convinced that it is the will of the House today, just as it was a month ago, that extension of coverage should only be effected on a basis which will extend coverage to truly interstate commerce and preserve for local and State governments all intrastate commerce and business.

It has been stated that if this conference report is rejected, there will be no minimum wage bill this year. This statement cannot be supported.

Mr. Kennedy could have had a minimum wage bill last year which would have increased the minimum wage to $1.15 and extended coverage to an additional million employees. I am absolutely convinced that when this conference report is rejected, a new conference committee will forthwith report out a minimum wage bill which will increase the minimum rate to $1.25 and which will extend coverage to employees of those enterprises which are engaged in interstate commerce.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues in the House to join with me in rejecting this conference report. By doing so, we can once and for all establish the principle that Federal regulation shall not be extended to those aspects of our life which should properly be reserved to our States and local governments.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], a conferee.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the remarks of the minority leader and I noted that he took the position that in conference the members of a conference committee are supposed to stand solidly behind the position taken by the House that named them as conferees. If that were true, what would be the need of having conferees? What would be the need of the Senate naming its conferees and the House naming its conferees if both were adamant in the position they would accept only that which they believed was a dictate from their body? We all know a conference is set up to try to iron out the differences between the two bodies. Very frankly, the personal attitude of any member of the conference committee has nothing to do with what is to be done within the conference.

Mr. Speaker, we were there to decide the issue between the House version and the Senate version. We were not there to decide the issue between two or more versions of the House. That has nothing to do with a conference aimed at trying to pass a compromise piece of legislation. Any person who believes this type of legislation can ever be passed without a compromise has no knowledge whatsoever of legislative procedure. For a minute I thought that the minority leader was against all compromise and adamant in the position for the particular bill he thought the House ought to stand for, but I noticed in the end, before he left the floor, he did agree that the committee should accept the last-minute amendments offered by the Senate, which was a compromise and which would leave out the slaughterhouse employees, the holly wreaths, the cotton gin amendments, and the grain elevators. In fact, he would compromise to that point where the votes would be worth a compromise.

We did not work on that basis, and in order to give the truth to the matter in relation to what we did to protect the House bill, let me say that we started out with a House version. This House version in two items of exceptional importance were these: The House set a minimum wage at $1.15, without any escalation. The Senate set the minimum wage at $1.15 for 2 years after the effective date, and $1.25 thereafter.

The conferees on the part of the House facing this same adamant position of the Senate that was expected from us fought until we worked out a program which now sets the minimum wage for the newly covered employees at $1.25 after 2 years and 4 months. However, when we went into the new coverage, which is the important bone of contention at this time, we found that the House set the minimum at $1 without any escalation, the Senate set the minimum at $1 the first year, $1.05 the second, $1.15 the third, and $1.25 thereafter.

Your House conferees were able, because of their diligent approach to the proposition and staying on the job in conference every minute that the conference was called, to work out a compromise.

Now, you can have a 1-day conference and work for 8 hours a day, or you can have a conference for 8 days working 1 hour a day. It does not make any difference how long the conference lasts. It all depends upon what you are doing on the job.

Now, when we came out of conference we started the first years after the effective date with $1. We did not increase the minimum for 3 years afterward. After 3 years we entered the figure of $1.15 and we reached $1.25 at the end of 5 years. That is neither the House version nor the Senate version. It is a compromise version, and compromise is the purpose for which the conferees are gathered together.

Now, let us go into the overtime. The House of Representatives sent a bill over there with no overtime for newly covered employees. Of course, that is no bill, because you do not need a bill not to give overtime coverage to new employees, because there is no overtime now. You can just sit tight and not do anything. What did the Senate do? The Senate passed a bill in which they set up overtime for the first year at 44 hours, the second year 42 hours, and the third year 40 hours.

I just want to cover that feature. Our compromise which is in the report before you establishes no overtime for the first year, no overtime for the sec-

ond year, 44 hours the third year, 42 hours the fourth year, and 40 hours the fifth year. If ever a compromise was reached, this is it.

The two bills before the conference were in substantial agreement as regards the level of the minimum wage rate.

For the 23.9 million workers currently covered, both bills provided an increase to $1.15 an hour 4 months after the date of enactment and a further increase to $1.25, 2 years later. These provisions were adopted by the conferees.

Adoption of these provisions will greatly improve the effectiveness of the act. Substandard wages lead to substandard living conditions, hardship and distress. Since 1956, when the minimum wage was increased to $1, both living costs and productivity have increased to such an extent that a rate of $1.25 merely reflects an adjustment to keep pace with these factors.

When the minimum wage is increased to $1.15, 1.9 million low-paid workers will receive wage increases. These increases will total $336 million on an annual basis. Not only will the level of living of the families of low-paid workers be greatly improved, but their increased purchasing power will stimulate the economy and be of benefit to business and the country generally.

Employers will be allowed 1 year and 4 months from the date of enactment to complete their adjustment to the moderate rate of $1.15. Only after 2 years and 4 months have elapsed will the minimum rate be advanced to $1.25—an objective which can be readily justified at this time. Only caution prompts delay.

For newly covered workers both bills provided a rate of $1 an hour beginning 4 months after the effective date. However, the two bills differed in that only one provided for subsequent increases in the rate—after 1 year, the rate would have come to $1.05, after 2 years to $1.15, and after 3 years to $1.25.

The bill approved by the Labor Committee contained escalator provisions for newly covered workers. Although these provisions were not incorporated in the bill which finally passed this body, I do not recall that anyone objected to them on grounds of social undesirability.

I believe that we are all in agreement with the words of the President when he stated that our Nation can ill afford to tolerate the growth of an underprivileged and underpaid class. We can no more afford it in retail trade than we can in manufacturing.

Workers in large retail enterprises and others who would be newly covered have to pay the same prices for goods as workers who are now covered by the act. Both groups of workers have families to support. Both are desirous of raising the standards for their families. The bill would provide equal treatment for the two groups of workers.

Objections to escalator provisions for newly covered workers were made on grounds of economic feasibility. What we have done is to stretch out the step-up provisions over a longer period of time. This will eliminate any possibility that the impact of the new provisions would be so great as to hurt the very people we are trying to help.

In revising the escalator provisions, we have considered not only the problem of adjusting to an initial minimum wage and to increases in the minimum wage but also the problem of adjusting to overtime standards.

The bill which the conferees agreed to sets a minimum wage of $1 to become effective 4 months after the date of enactment. This rate is maintained for a period of 3 years. During the first 2 of those years no premium payments for overtime are required. Only at the beginning of the third year after the effective date does an overtime standard become the law, and the requirement is only that time and one-half the regular rate of pay be paid for hours over 44 in a week.

While the overtime standard is being adapted to, the minimum rate of $1 remains in effect. Only after the large enterprises in the country have operated for 3 years under a $1 minimum rate and for 1 year under a 44-hour workweek standard does the rate increase to $1.15 per hour and the overtime standard drop by 2 hours to 42. In other words, only during the fourth year after the effective date do we reach $1.15 an hour and the 42-hour workweek.

At the end of the fourth year the newly covered workers are finally raised so that these workers and the workers now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act are on a par. The minimum wage applicable to both groups becomes $1.25 and their standard workweek becomes 40 hours.

I have spelled out the escalator provisions for newly covered workers in considerable detail to indicate to you how modest they really are. I want to emphasize that in arriving at a conference report we were extremely cautious about achieving our aims.

For example, although the newly covered workers will number 3.6 million, the establishment of a $1 minimum rate will mean pay raises only for 663,000 of them.

By the beginning of the fourth year, when the minimum is advanced to $1.15, many of the 1 million workers who are now paid less than that amount will have been raised to $1.15 or more as a result of labor market forces. Similarly, by the beginning of the fifth year, many of the 1.3 million workers who are now paid less than that amount will have been raised to $1.25 or more.

By allowing over 4 years for employers to adjust to the $1.25 rate, we insure that the newly covered workers will receive the same benefits as currently covered workers, without loss of jobs or undue burden on business.

The House bill set a rate for presently covered employees of $1.15; while the Senate bill set a rate of $1.15 for 2 years, and then escalated the rate up to $1.25.

The conferees, in increasing the rate up to the latter figure after 28 months, were only taking into account the increased productivity of American workers, and the increased costs of living.

Between March 1956 and December 1960, the Consumer Price Index rose by 11 percent; while real output per man-hour increased by 13 percent.

Based upon Labor Department figures, a modest level of living requires an annual budget of in excess of $5,000. It varies from $5,370 in Houston to $6,567 in Chicago. Even a rate of $1.25 would cover less than half of such budgets.

In 1955, to adjust to the $1 rate, the wages of those paid less than such rate would have increased manufacturing costs 8 percent. In 1961, to raise the rate of those covered to $1.15 would be only half that amount, or 4 percent.

President Roosevelt, 23 years ago, said in asking the Congress to pass a labor standards act, that the frontiers of social justice should be extended.

President Kennedy, in 1961, stated in requesting additional protection and increased rates:

> When we permit the growth of a depressed class, whose members cannot afford the bare necessities of life, we pay a heavy price. We undermine the general prosperity of the Nation which rests upon consumer purchasing power. We promote the spread of slums, of crime, of disease, of all the ills that grow from hopeless poverty.

The moderate nature of the conference bill is seen from the fact that of the 3.6 million newly covered employees, only 663,000 are paid less than $1 per hour, compared with 753,000 under the Albert bill; and 728,000 under the Senate-passed bill. Of the 1.8 million retail establishments, only 65,000 would be covered—a relatively small number.

With respect to overtime, only 460,000 are presently employed over 44 hours. This, I emphasize, is the figure in 1961, not in 1963 when the first overtime requirement would be effective.

I would also point out, that the bill requires various studies by the Secretary of Labor, with reports on imports being made to the Congress, which will enable us to keep fully abreast of economic developments. Additionally, there is the 4(d) annual report, dealing with the impact and operation of the statute.

Finally, the conference bill has sought, in fairness and equity, to take into consideration some specific problems in the newly covered fields. In retail service, the tolerance for managerial employees has been increased to 40 percent for nonexempt work. Commission employees, where more than half of their income is from commissions on goods or services and amounts to 1½ times the minimum rate, are also not subject to any overtime requirements. The continued hiring of student workers also would be permitted, at rates less than the minimum.

Exemptions also have been provided for: employees engaged in cotton ginning, country elevators, making holly wreaths, in processing shade-growing tobacco, in transporting fruits and vegetables to market. From 16,000 to 25,000 employees would be affected by these exemption provisions.

Following is a complete and final report on the conference committee's version of a compromise bill.

Summary of minimum wage bill (H.R. 3935) as agreed to in conference

A. For presently covered employees (23,900,000), the minimum wage is increased to $1.15 an hour for the 1st 2 years after the effective date and $1.25 an hour beginning 2 years after the effective date.

B. For newly covered employees the minimum wage and overtime will be as follows:

	Minimum wage	Overtime after—
1st year after effective date	$1.00	No overtime requirements.
2d year after effective date	1.00	Do.
3d year after effective date	1.00	44 hours a week.
4th year after effective date	1.15	42 hours a week.
5th year after effective date	1.25	40 hours a week.

	Number of employees
C. Retail trade:	
1. Retail and service enterprises: The bill covers retail enterprises which have a million dollars or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level) and which purchase or receive goods for resale that move or have moved across State lines which amount in total annual dollar volume to $250,000 or more	2,182,000
2. Gasoline service stations: Also covered for minimum wage, but not for overtime, are gasoline service stations which have $250,000 or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level)	86,000
3. Exemption from retail coverage: From this coverage in the retail trade the bill excludes the following:	
(a) Auto dealers and farm implement dealers.	
(b) Hotels.	
(c) Motels.	
(d) Restaurants, including retail store lunch counters, caterers, and similar retail food services.	
(e) Motion picture theaters.	
(f) Hospitals.	
(g) Nursing homes.	
(h) Schools for handicapped or gifted children.	
(i) Amusement or recreational establishments operating on a seasonal basis.	
(j) Any small store which has less than $250,000 in annual sales even if it is in an enterprise that has more than $1,000,000 in annual sales.	
4. Special provisions for retail trade: In addition, the bill makes the following special provisions for particular problems in the retail and service trades:	
(a) Commission employees in retail stores will be exempt from overtime if more than half their pay is from commissions and if they earn at least time and one-half the minimum rate.	
(b) Assistant managers of retail stores will be exempt even if they perform up to 40 percent nonexecutive and nonadministrative work.	
(c) Student workers may be employed in retail trades at subminimum rates under certificates issued by the Secretary in occupations not ordinarily given to full-time employees.	
D. Laundries: The conference agreement has removed the proposed new coverage and the changes in exemptions for laundries that were contained in the Senate-passed bill. Laundries therefore remain in the same position as they were under the present law.	
E. Transit companies: Suburban and interurban transit companies which have $1,000,000 or more in annual sales (exclusive of excise taxes at the retail level) are covered for minimum wage but not for overtime	93,000
F. Establishments which already have some covered employees under the act are covered for all their employees if they are in an enterprise which has a million dollars or more in annual sales	100,000
G. Construction: Construction enterprises which have at least $350,000 in annual business are also covered for minimum wage and overtime	1,000,000
H. Seamen: Seamen on American-flag vessels are covered for minimum wage but not for overtime	100,000
I. Telephone operators: The exemption for telephone operators is limited to those employed by an independently owned public telephone company which has not more than 750 telephones	30,000
J. Fish processing: Seafood processing employees are covered for minimum wage but not for overtime (seafood canners are treated in this way under the present law)	33,000
Total number of newly covered employees	3,624,000

K. Other provisions:

1. Puerto Rico: The minimum wage in Puerto Rico for presently covered employees is increased by the same percentage as the mainland minimum, subject to review by industry committees in hardship cases; for newly covered employees the rates will be set by industry committee procedures.

2. Broadcasters: Announcers, news editors, and chief engineers of broadcasting companies located in nonmetropolitan cities of 100,000 or less population are exempt from overtime.

3. Bulk petroleum dealers: Independently owned and controlled local enterprises engaged in bulk petroleum distribution are exempt from overtime if their annual sales are less than $1 million (exclusive of excise taxes).

4. Trip rate: Trip rate drivers and drivers' helpers making local deliveries are exempt from overtime if the Secretary of Labor finds that the plan under which they are paid is consistent with the principle of the 40-hour workweek.

5. Farmer's livestock auction operations: Employees working in a livestock auction held by a farmer need be paid the minimum rate only for the hours they work at the auction if during that workweek they are employed primarily in agriculture by the farmer.

6. Country elevators: Employees in country elevator establishments in the area of production, which may also sell products and services used in the operation of a farm, are exempt from both minimum wage and overtime if no more than five employees are employed by the establishment in such operations.

7. Cotton ginning: Employees engaged in ginning cotton for market in counties where cotton is grown in commercial quantities are exempt from minimum wage and overtime.

8. Holly wreaths: Homeworkers making natural holly wreaths are exempt from the act.

9. Shade-grown tobacco: An exemption from minimum wage and overtime is provided for agricultural employees engaged in bulking shade-grown tobacco if they were employed in the growing and harvesting of such tobacco.

10. Transporting fruits and vegetables to market: An exemption from minimum wage and overtime is provided for employees transporting fruits and vegetables from the farm to market or transporting harvesting hands, within the State.

11. Board and lodging may be included as wages on the basis of a fair value calculation made by the Secretary. Also, such perquisites may be excluded for wages to the extent that they are excluded under a collective bargaining agreement.

12. Study of employment effects of foreign trade: The Secretary is authorized to study employment effects of imports and exports in industries covered by the act and to report on such studies to the President and to the Congress.

13. Study of certain exemptions for canning and processing and of wage rates in hotels and restaurants: The Secretary will study the complicated system of exemptions in the act for the handling and processing of agricultural products as well as the rates of pay in hotels, motels, restaurants and other food service enterprises and to report the results with recommendations to the next session of this Congress.

14. Effective date: 120 days after enactment.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the prior speakers, and I talked to all of the people that came out of conference. I was a little bit unhappy to hear the reference to attendance at the conference, and I want to pay particular tribute at the outset to our subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES], who is here today filled with penicillin and should not be out of bed. He has been sick for the last 2 days. He would have offered the substitute in conference had he been able to be there.

Now, there has been reference to standing by the House and how much time was spent in conference on these issues that are so critical with reference to the differences between the House and the Senate. We all know, and I think that the prior speaker admitted, that the chief issue between the House and the Senate is extension of coverage, and more particularly, dollar volume of sales as a basis for extending Federal jurisdiction. It has been reported to me that there was absolutely no discussion at all on this point in the conference; that it was voted upon immediately without any discussion. Now, there is the critical issue between the two Houses. And, I might say that I think this is one of the most cynical types of approaches that I have seen as a young Congressman since I came here. We are granting concessions here that almost have the names of individual Congressmen on them and we get down to holly wreaths as presently covered and to exempt them under this bill in order to pick up one or two votes here and there.

We have all talked about this to our constituents and here in the House on a partisan basis and a sincere basis. Let me talk for a moment on a completely nonpartisan basis, because I think the issues that are at stake here rise far above partisanship, and the political con-

sequences of your vote and mine back home will long be forgotten when the real consequences of this act come home to our people.

We were all worried about extension of coverage under the dollar volume sales formula. Obviously, the Senate was also worried about it because before they could pass the bill in the Senate they added a clause providing essentially that $250,000 of merchandise in a retail store had to come across State lines before that retail store would be covered. Let me read you the key clause on this because this clause, which was added in the Senate presumably to meet the interstate test, is actually the worst thing in this respect that we have had in any of these bills; and I say that advisedly, after staying up several nights with the most expert lawyers who have worked for years in this fair labor standards field. They added a provision that if $250,000 worth of goods for resale move or have moved across State lines, that store is covered.

We can discount the $1 million, we can discount the $250,000; they are not basic criteria for determining involvement in interstate commerce. We know those figures are going to be reduced. So what is the meaning of this clause? Let me tell you. Once a piece of merchandise moves across State lines it is forever tainted; you might as well paint in phosphorescent paint that "This is radioactive, it is dangerous; if you touch it you are subject to Federal control." That is what it means. And there is no time limit on it. If a piece of merchandise once crosses State lines, as long as that merchandise is in existence, anybody who touches it is subjecting himself to Federal control. There is the key to it. I wrote all of you a letter this morning which pointed out that if a rocking chair was carried across a State line during the War of 1812 and never crossed a State line since that time, this provision will make anybody who touches that rocking chair and works on it subject to Federal jurisdiction. Not only that the employees working with him in that enterprise are covered even though they never touch the rocking chair. That is the way this is written, and I quote: "moves or has moved across State lines."

This is not just my opinion. This is the opinion of experts on this subject who have told me that this is a radical, an incredibly great expansion of the present Federal law in this area as to the meaning of the clause "engaged in commerce."

We are completely discounting the present test that for anybody to be engaged in commerce he must work on goods that have had some direct relationship to the flow across State lines. This does not say that. It does not say that if you unload goods immediately after they come across State lines you are covered. It says "move or have moved across State lines." Anybody who believes in limiting the Federal jurisdiction had better watch out for that clause. That is a dangerous precedent.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman's interpretation of this particular clause in order to gain some jurisdiction under the interstate commerce feature. I understood the gentleman to say there is absolutely no time limit whatsoever once goods have been transported across State lines. Is that correct?

Mr. GOODELL. That is correct.

Mr. KITCHIN. Have not the courts universally held with reference to when the interstate feature of goods and merchandise ceases is that in civil matters it is when they come to rest in the retail store; and in criminal matters under the criminal provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, I will ask the gentleman if the courts have not held that the Federal Government loses jurisdiction once those goods that have been transported in interstate commerce come into the hands of the ultimate consumer or the ones who purchase those goods. We have the Federal jurisdiction delineated from State jurisdiction under those decisions that come into play to stop the taint of which the gentleman is speaking as far as the interstate commerce feature is concerned.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina, who is certainly thoroughly cognizant of the provisions of this bill and of this conference report. The Supreme Court has said with reference to the clause engaged in commerce that it reaches the farthest reaches of the channels of interstate commerce. It presently requires that those channels have some sort of relationship to the flow of merchandise across State lines. This bill for the first time is saying that it does not make any difference if it is part of this channel moving across State lines, or related to that flow at the time. Once it moves across State lines and comes to rest, even if it never moves again, anybody that works on it subjects himself to Federal jurisdiction. What are the restraints on such a power? I know this may be a little technical under the circumstances because it was thrown in in the Senate and we have not debated this point—I am sorry there is not more time—but I ask you gentlemen who think on these questions and who are worried about the Federal jurisdiction if that is the kind of provision you want to vote for.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then apparently the conferees were interested in maintaining an interstate commerce feature here under such guise as is included in this particular substitute. I will ask the gentleman to refer to subsection (2) under paragraph (s) of section 2 where it states:

> Any such enterprise which is engaged in the business of operating a street, suburban or interurban electric railway.

May I ask him if there is any semblance of interstate commerce involved in that particular phrase.

Mr. GOODELL. Only in the paragraph above, which is very little, where it states that they must handle, sell, or otherwise work on goods that have been moved in interstate commerce, and I emphasize "have been moved" at any time.

Mr. KITCHIN. So if the bus or street railway or whatever they are operating moved at one time in interstate commerce, the car or one feature of the car or the gasoline or the electricity which runs it, under those circumstances they receive jurisdiction under this legislation.

Mr. GOODELL. Or the coinbox was made in another State. Once you wipe out this million-dollar feature and the new $250,000 requirement, which everybody agrees can be reduced rapidly right down to nothing.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. The gentleman last year in the debate on the Landrum-Griffin Act I do not notice showed a similar concern for interstate commerce. The standards of interstate commerce in the Landrum-Griffin bill are substantially the same.

Mr. GOODELL. I am sorry, the gentleman will have to get time on his own side to make his argument. That is not correct. Landrum-Griffin is completely different. This is a new clause as to the definition of the technical clause "engaged in commerce." If you will have one of your speakers come down here after I am finished and point out the clause in the Landrum-Griffin Act that is the same as this, then I will say you are right.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come, when instead of debating whether the House had good conferees or bad conferees, to talk a little about what actually and really was done in the conference. I think one of the most important things for Members of the House to realize in considering the report, is that the House conferees insisted on the inclusion of an amendment which was adopted by the House, which was proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] for the exclusion of laundries from the bill for the very simple reasons that he recited in that debate. I can assure you that this was only accomplished after a great deal of stubborn debate within the conference, because the other body had already, by vote, approved the inclusion of laundry and drycleaning enterprises, and if anything held up the conclusion of the conference, it was this issue, and the inflexible stand taken by your House conferees. But, we went much further than that. We insisted also that automobile and farm dealers be excluded. We furthermore changed the language as to urban and interurban transit, insisting on an interstate commerce requisite, including the million-dollar exclusion. We also went into the matter of broadcasters and we insisted and prevailed on the original idea of what the House of Representatives had in mind in that respect.

Then, of course, we came down to the measure adopted in the House which was

known as the Herlong amendment. You will remember that amendment was made to the Kitchin-Ayres bill. Again the House Members insisted against bitter Senate opposition that the Herlong amendment be retained, and it was retained and is in the conference report today.

There were certain other things we added. We have been criticized for accepting some of the Senate amendments. One of them, however, was similar to the amendment proposed last year by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH]. As you may remember, there was some difficulty with it, but basically we agreed upon the principle and went along with the other body in accepting that amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also important to recognize that this whole business of interstate commerce which has been raised so strongly today, is a matter which came before this House and was decided by only one vote. After the deliberations were over—the Albert bill was defeated by one vote only. Then on final passage of the Kitchin-Ayres bill, there was adopted a concept of interstate commerce which I call the "5 and 2" test; namely, the retail enterprise has to do business in two States and have at least five or more retail establishments. My friends, may I ask you to consider, that in no other Federal statute is such an interpretation or concept of interstate commerce set forth. You can find it nowhere. There are no interpretations by any court of such a novel concept or untried interpretation of interstate commerce. So, on the Senate side, the Members of the other body, decided that the Albert bill, where we said 25 percent of the goods of any establishment must cross State lines, was not accepted, because it was not specific enough. So they made it specific in order to insure an interstate commerce foundation, and therefore puts in the requirement of $250,000 of goods that must cross State lines. That has been ridiculed, somewhat, because we have included the requirement that these goods must have crossed State lines—not particularly in the last transaction, but at some point must have crossed State lines.

Let me tell you why, and it is a very simple thing, I think, for all of us to understand. Suppose we had written that only the goods on sale on the counter had to come directly across State lines. You know what would have happened; do you not? Everybody would have taken the goods and put them out in a warehouse and then after the warehouse was loaded, they would have sold them to the individual retailer and he would have been exempt under the law. My friends, it is very obvious, therefore, that the Congress had to write into the law something to take care of that situation, and close that loophole. That is exactly what the other body did, and which we felt, established a sound constitutional foundation, as it has been established in many labor relations statutes.

If they were going out of State they should not be counted twice. In other words they were being sold and then transported to the consumer within the State so they should not be counted twice in the $250,000 figure. So we accepted that amendment to tighten it up, and to make sure that this concept of interstate commerce was sound and valid, and would be interpreted as such things have been interpreted in previous instances. In no case, has a "5 in 2" test been tested, because it has never been heretofore suggested.

Just so you understand that we are not talking in a vacuum, I would like to explain that what we have done is based upon very definite judicial decisions. NLRB jurisdiction in the case of *Meatcutters* v. *Fairlawn Meats* (353 U.S. 20), involving three retail meat markets, all of whose sales were intrastate, was upheld, although its annual out-of-State purchases, totaled slightly more than $100,000 out of gross purchases of $900,000.

I note that we require that $250,000 in goods for resale, have come from out of state.

Again, in the case of *United States* v. *Sullivan* (332 U.S. 689), a druggist was convicted of failure to comply with labeling requirements for a particular product, which was sold to customers, after having moved in commerce. Again, it was held that it was not necessary to have a history of the goods having crossed State lines at any particular time or during any time period, but that they have crossed State lines previously. That was held to be constitutional. So there is no question, I think, of anybody saying with any legal basis, that we have not followed strictly every possible legal protection and precedents, to set forth a good, sound interstate commerce foundation.

I have been asked what the thinking of a majority of the House committee of conference on wage-hour legislation—H.R. 3935—was with respect to language appearing in the Senate committee report dealing with seafood processing.

The House conferees accepted the provisions of the Senate bill covering for minimum wage purposes only such employees, and the inquiry is whether it was not our desire also to approve the explanation dealing with this matter which appeared in the Senate Labor Committee report on its bill. That language is as follows and appears on page 33 of the report:

"An estimated 33,000 persons who are employed in the activities removed from the section 13(a)(5) exemption will have minimum wage protection but will continue to be exempt from the act's overtime requirements under an amended section 13(b)(4). The bill will thus have the effect of placing fish processing and fish canning on the same basis under the act. There is no logical reason for treating them differently and their inclusion within the act's protection is desirable and consistent with its objectives.

"The present exemptions in sections 13(a)(5) and 13(b)(4) have been judicially interpreted to apply to all employees employed in the seafood industry including any employee who participates in activities which are necessary to the conduct of the operations specifically described in the exemptions (*McComb* v. *Consolidated Fisheries Company*, 174 F. 2d 74, C.A. 3, 1949). These interpretations are consistent with the congressional purpose of treating all employees of one establishment in the same manner under the act and of avoiding segmentation as between different employees of the same employer engaged in the named operations."

There are also additional statements in the report explaining other provisions of the bill which we did not feel it necessary to amplify. Since a question had arisen, however, specifically on this point, I feel the record should be made clear. I believe such language reflects correct legislative intent.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one other thing. It is sometimes said that if this conference report were not to be adopted we could then ask for another conference and instruct the conferees to stick by the House bill. I am sure that the Members, particularly the older Members of this House, know how difficult it is to go to any conference that prohibits a free conference. The minute you do that it is resented on the other side as we, I am sure, would resent it on this side. It is a practical impossibility, but it became, even a certainty, this very afternoon when this conference report was accepted in the other body by a vote of 64 to 28, better than 2 to 1, two-thirds having voted in favor of it. What can we expect to get if we instruct our conferees to go back after that vote? It would mean there would probably be no legislation in this session or the next, maybe not in the life of this Congress. I am sure you know this, in spite of what the minority leader has said.

So I appeal to all of you. This, Mr. Speaker, is a moderate bill. This has less coverage than the Albert amendment, and this applies all the way down the line in every item. For instance, for the newly covered employees, the conference bill provides that they will not be moved from the dollar figure for 3 full years, until another Congress can come into being, have the benefit of section 4(d) reports from the Secretary, and take such action as may be appropriate.

The same is true in the overtime provisions. There is no overtime requirement, Mr. Speaker, no overtime required for 2 full years. In other words, all that we are doing here is binding this Congress. The next Congress can take action if those horrible things, which my friend on the other side tries to picture, occur. I say he has very little respect for the men and women who are going to be elected to the next Congress. I have a great deal of respect for them and in their judgment and good sense. Therefore, I appeal to each Member for the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a cosponsor of the Ayres-Kitchin bill that we passed by 340 votes, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Cali-

fornia the question I wanted to ask him while he was on the floor.

It appears to me, and this is a very key issue in this entire debate, the gentleman's remarks conceded that it makes no difference how long ago a piece of merchandise crossed a State line, that merchandise once it crosses the State line subjects the person handling it to Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In answer to the gentleman, may I say that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], very clearly stated that the Federal courts upheld that once something is sold in retail then it is finished and done with. All we have protected here is to make sure it must come into its first retail store, and that is the proper thing for us to do. By the words of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], after it is sold in retail it is no longer subject to being in interstate commerce.

Mr. GOODELL. I think that is a very adroit misstatement of what the gentleman from North Carolina said. But I would say that the gentleman has conceded if it goes across a State line it thereafter subjects the person working on it to Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I do not concede that at all.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second minimum wage conference I have been a member of. Last year we met under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], who had worked very closely with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], in the drafting of the bill that the House passed last year.

This year, under the leadership of the gentleman from California, the House passed almost the identical bill that it passed the year before, this year by a larger majority, 216 to 203.

In this conference it is true there were 21 times we had a unanimous vote. We did not argue about Eli Whitney's invention being given special consideration, we were not arguing about whether or not holly wreaths should be considered. In fact, there was only one amendment that there would have been real controversy on had I been there to offer my substitute, and that was the amendment that determined how the newly employed would be covered.

First, I would like to tell the membership that all of this talk about how many millions are going to be covered is not the real crux of the issue. We talk about 3 million going to be covered, or 4 million, under one bill, and a million and a half under another bill. But what we should be considering is how many people are going to get a raise. Under the conference report and the provisions in that bill, only 700,000 people are going to get an increase in wages up to the $1 for newly covered, and the average increase is going to be only 6 cents per hour.

Under the bill that the House passed, there would be 400,000 people getting an increase of 6 cents an hour.

So do not be concerned about which bill covers so many millions. We are only arguing about 300,000 people who are going to get an average 6 cents an hour increase.

The issue is far more important than that. What is the formula by which we are going to determine how these people are to be brought under a Federal minimum wage law? The formula is that if you had a million-dollar gross before, even though it is within the confines of one State, the Federal Government is going to set the minimum wage. Why do we not go further under that concept in the bill—and I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from California for their work in the field of civil rights. Both of them have been diligently engaged in the work of the NAACP.

A member of the committee, a member of the other body, raised the point that by their actions they were denying the lowest paid workers of this country, the Negroes in the laundry industry, the right to an increase.

This hurts me as much as deviating from the interstate commerce principle to hear these two gentlemen sacrifice principle for political expediency. And, when I heard them say that we must deny these people coverage at this time or we will not get the votes in the House, what a change that was from the speeches I heard these gentlemen make in the well of this House before. I remember well having favored the Powell amendment on principle, when apparently it was going to be defeated, and I recall just a few weeks ago when the gentleman from California stood in the well of this House fighting to cut the appropriations for the Committee on Un-American Activities, knowing very well in advance he was going to be defeated. But, he did not deviate from principle. We deviated from principle in this concept, and believe you me, Mr. Speaker, if I thought the Federal Government had a right to reach out into intrastate operations, I would not be exempting people by seeing how many votes I could get. That is what we heard in the conference, when we heard it said, "We cannot help these people now, because if we do, we will not have the votes in the House to adopt the conference report."

The issue is, Vote down the conference report, and we will go back to conference and get a sensible minimum wage bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to my good colleagues from Illinois. I hope they realize that a vote for this bill will help our State. We can say, with pride, that wages are high in our State. But we have to admit that substandard wages are still being paid in Illinois. These substandard wages are not only a blot on our State, they constitute unfair competition to the great majority of our employers who want to pay good wages, and this competition hurts, because it comes from larger stores and chains which compete directly with firms which pay the good wages. This bill will eliminate this unfair competition.

This bill will provide additional income for presently covered workers in Illinois, some 65,000 of whom are earning less than $1.15, and between 30,000 and 40,000 newly covered workers who are earning less than $1 an hour. Every one of these workers is in that economic class where every single additional penny he gets he is going to plow back into the economy of the State. Every additional penny these people get as a result of this new coverage and the increase in the minimum wage will be spent for groceries, shoes, dresses, shirts, household equipment, and for payments on a car, or on a modest home. This increased consumer purchasing power in the hands of these low-wage workers will bring them more effectively into the consumer stream of commerce, increase the demand for goods and services, stimulate our industry and reduce our unemployment.

The bill will be good for our State in another way. As I have pointed out before, we are getting in the State of Illinois, and have been for some time, some 2,000 people a week. These people are streaming into our State from States where wages are extremely low and unemployment is very high because these people have not been earning enough wages with which to purchase the goods produced in those States. These people, I say, are coming into our State looking for work and for a higher standard of living. This is creating grave problems for us in Illinois. It is adding to our unemployment and relief problems. How long can the businessmen and taxpayers in Illinois continue to provide schools, housing, medicine, general relief, and all the other things that we have to provide for these human beings simply because they are being exploited where they come from. In Illinois somewhat less than 5 percent of the 1.7 million presently covered workers are earning less than $1.15; in the South some 20 percent are earning less than $1.15. In Illinois, as of March, the unemployment rate was 6.3 percent. It was 9.4 percent in Tennessee, 9.6 percent in Mississippi, 10.5 percent in Arkansas, 11.6 percent in Kentucky. If we pass this bill, wages will be raised in these States, and the increased purchasing power will reduce their unemployment.

I hope, when we come to vote, that my colleagues from Illinois will remember that a vote for this bill is a vote for the employers of Illinois, for the taxpayers of Illinois, for the low-wage earners of Illinois. These people are watching us as we vote. Let us go on record in favor of this minimum wage bill.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to understand why anyone would oppose legislation providing for a minimum wage of only $1.25 an hour and why one would deny the protection offered by this bill to the millions of underpaid American citizens who are not presently covered by existing minimum wage and hour laws.

Any industry or retail merchandising business which does a gross business of $1 million a year certainly is affluent enough to afford a wage which, after all, will be only sufficient to provide the bare necessities of life.

These business organizations will have 2 years to adjust themselves to the wage scale proposed by this legislation, and to say that it will inflict an undue hardship upon them is ridiculous. On the other hand, to aver that American workers are to be denied a fair wage and to say that their exploitation must be permitted to continue in this day and age is contrary to all American concepts of fair play and, to put it mildly, is downright puritanic callousness and a complete disregard for the welfare of millions of families who cannot begin to exist decently on the small wages they are now receiving.

With regard to industrial establishments, there are many low wage areas in this country which are a drag upon the economy of the entire Nation. Through their substandard wage rates, they have lowered local standards of living and created conditions which permit unfair competition with those sections of the country that pay decent wages. They are a detriment to the economy and the well-being of the United States as a whole, and it is the obligation of Congress to correct this condition. It is particularly important to do it at this time in order to increase consumption power and thus provide a stimulus to the faltering economy we have inherited from the previous Republican administration. The depression is an additional reason for immediate action rather than for delay. The argument that the passage of this legislation will result in more unemployment because it will induce these employers to lay off employees is a fallacious one. The people in business who pay these low wages are not the type who hire an excess of employees—rather, the opposite is true. Experience has shown that they always operate with a minimum of employees. They have long since reduced their employee requirements to an irreducible minimum. I do not believe we have anything to fear on that score. These employers should be compelled to get into step with the American standard of living and American standards with regard to conditions of employment. They are out of line with the times, and are profiting unduly at the expense not only of their own employees but at the expense of the entire Nation. I sincerely trust that this Congress will finally approve the legislation as sponsored by President Kennedy and the Democratic leadership.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, Department of Labor statistics reveal that 665,000 of the workers to whom coverage will be extended by the new law now earn less than $1 an hour, and about 4½ million of the presently and newly covered workers earn less than $1.25 an hour. I believe that these figures argue eloquently for the passage of the amended Fair Labor Standards Act.

We simply cannot regard as excessive a take-home pay of $50 before deductions to an American man or woman for a 40-hour week in the 1960's.

The law as presently proposed is as close to President John F. Kennedy's recommendations as can be obtained, and I urge its enactment.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the conference result on the minimum wage bill which is now before the House. The compromise proposal is certainly a tremendous improvement over the original legislation.

The extension of coverage will provide benefits to about 3,600,000 newly covered workers, almost 1,500,000 more than were included in the original proposal approved by this body. This will mean pay raises to $1 an hour for 663,000 newly covered workers and $1.15 an hour for almost 2 million of the almost 24 million workers already covered.

Affected retail workers will particularly rejoice in the passage of this legislation.

The entire Nation will benefit by the passage of this important legislation which seeks to establish a firm foundation for the Nation's wage structure.

More importantly, this legislation seeks to eliminate competition between the several States on the basis of low wage standards. As minimum wages are increased throughout our economy, incentives are reduced for plant migration to low-wage States. The several States should not be permitted to compete for industry on the basis of the available supply of cheap labor. That kind of competition is unfair and serves to lead the Nation to social and economic disorder.

This legislation will prove to be a giant step toward economic recovery and employment stability.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is dangerous, un-American legislation. It is contrary to the concepts of our great opportunity system; the system that made this Nation the wonder and envy of the world. This bill will place the iron hand of the Federal Government eventually over every little business in the United States. It is a blueprint for Fascist socialism, and Hitlerian domination of individual initiative.

At this moment, we are having more small business failures than in the history of this Nation. It will further harass and intimidate little businessmen already overburdened with rules, regulations, and redtape. It will promote unemployment, further inflation, and discord.

This bill is a Federal economic control bill with bureaucrats and minority pressure groups calling the tune. It will promote automation and do-it-yourself campaigns which will result in more unemployment, welfare expenditures, and a demand for more unemployment compensation. This conference report should be rejected entirely. It is a reflection on the individual, local and State government. It is an expression of no confidence in these time-honored institutions. It is a naked, stark, blatant Federal bid for power and complete totalitarianism. It will make the workingman a slave of the state and pawn in the hands of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering the conference report on the minimum wage bill. The raising and expanding of the minimum wage is vital to the expanding economy of the United States. The working people over the entire Nation are extremely interested in what we do here today.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another vast area where we find the laborers of our Nation in need of relief. This, too, is basically a wage situation. It is the simple fact that the importation of Mexican farm laborers is taking from our farmworkers work which should rightly be theirs.

H.R. 2010, the bill to extend Public Law 78—the Mexican farm labor importation program—without change for an additional 2 years, has been reported out favorably by the House Agriculture Committee and will be brought before the full House shortly. I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6032, which would extend Public Law 78 for an additional 2 years, provided that amendments are adopted which would protect the interest of the U.S. farmworker. This bill is supported by the administration.

The views of the majority of the members of the House Agriculture Committee are contained in the report which accompanies H.R. 2010. In order that the Congress may be able to consider both sides of the question, I would like to present, today, my views concerning the extension of Public Law 78. I would also like to insert into the RECORD an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times. This editorial states, in part, the following:

> The House Agriculture Committee has reported favorably on the Gathings bill and the Rules Committee has cleared it for action by the House. It should be killed—unless it is amended along the lines of the Coad bill. Its death would be unlamented except by the large-scale growers. They have used it to obtain an endless supply of seasonal farmhands who work without complaint under conditions far below decent American standards.

The Mexican farm labor importation program, a wartime emergency measure which has been extended and expanded during peacetime, raises serious moral, economic, and social questions, as well as principles of public policy.

This is a program which depends for its existence on poverty and unemployment in the Republic of Mexico and has a tendency to increase poverty and unemployment at home. As it is presently operating, it has been denounced by religious leaders of all faiths, and has been criticized by responsible citizens from all walks of life. It has been declared detrimental to the interests of U.S. farmworkers by both the former Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell, a Republican, and the present Secretary of Labor, Arthur J. Goldberg, a Democrat. Its effect on the economic position of farmers who do not use foreign labor has been questioned by the leaders of national farm organizations. The present administration has announced its opposition to any extension of Public Law 78 unless the law is amended to protect U.S. farmworkers from unfair competition with Mexican labor.

Essentially, the Mexican farm labor program raises the following important question concerning public policy: Should the power and authority of Government be used in such a manner as to perpetuate a farm labor system rooted in underemployment, unemployment, and poverty both at home and abroad?

H.R. 2010, by providing for a carte blanche 2-year extension of Public Law 78, answers this question in the affirmative. This bill is based on the proposition that the Nation's largest industry—agriculture—is dependent on cheap labor for its survival, and that U.S. growers are incapable of solving their labor problems without help from the Federal Government. Growers who have benefited from this program through the years have come to believe that the Government owes them a labor force.

I deny the validity of this proposition. In good conscience, therefore, I must sharply dissent from the views of the House Agriculture Committee. I must also dissent for a very practical reason. In view of the growing opposition to any extension of Public Law 78, coupled with the firm position taken by the administration that the law should be extended only if substantially amended, the views of the committee will result in failure to extend the program at all. Some bracero-using growers already realize this. For example, the following is a quote from the annual report of the Imperial Valley Farmers Association, one of the largest contractors of Mexican nationals in the country:

From the best information we can get, the extension of Public Law 78 will be difficult and, if extended, will have amendments that will make it more difficult and expensive to use. It is obvious that, the less we farmers depend upon braceros, the better our situation will be.

It is my contention that it should be public policy to accomplish in agriculture what we have already accomplished in other sectors of our economy; namely, the restoration of respect and dignity, based upon good wages, good working conditions, and steady employment to the men and women who labor for hire on American farms.

H.R. 2010, in my opinion, would work against the accomplishment of this goal. In considering the effect of this bill, my views are arranged as follows:

First. The effect of Public Law 78 in fostering a class system in American agriculture.

Second. The effect of Public Law 78 on U.S. farmworkers.

Third. The effect of Public Law 78 on the vast majority of farmers who do not use foreign labor, and the majority of farmers who do not use any hired labor at all.

Fourth. Answers to arguments advanced by the proponents of H.R. 2010.

Fifth. Alternative legislation to H.R. 2010—H.R. 6032.

Sixth. Conclusions.

EFFECT OF PUBLIC LAW 78 IN FOSTERING A CLASS SYSTEM IN AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Witnesses representing bracero-using associations, sugar companies, processors, and canneries testified before the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower that American workers will not perform stoop labor on American farms. A steady parade of these witnesses variously described this kind of work as arduous, disagreeable, unpleasant, nasty, and distasteful.

At the same time, they described the American workers who do accept this work as unreliable, physically incapable, alcoholics, and skid row derelicts. When these witnesses were asked whether higher wages and better working conditions might attract more reliable and qualified workers, the answer was generally "No," the contention being, apparently, that Americans are above performing these so-called distasteful agricultural jobs.

The implication of such testimony is that there are some jobs in American agriculture that are below the dignity of qualified American farmworkers. The further implication is that such work is not below the dignity of citizens of Mexico. Thus, according to this point of view, Mexican labor is needed to perform jobs that only the derelicts of American society will perform. Once the initial premise is accepted, it is easy to arrive at the ultimate conclusion: Since American growers should not have to depend on unreliable and physically incapable American derelicts to satisfy their labor needs, they must be provided with foreign labor.

It seems clear that these growers are arguing for a class system in American agriculture. Years ago the English economist, Ricardo, defined what he called the natural rate of wages, as being "that price which is necessary to enable the laborer, one with another, to subsist and perpetuate their race without increase or diminution" and thereby be able to serve the owners or producers. This is the basis of the class system theory of the 19th century liberal economists, a theory which has been rejected by American economists and industrialists, as well as the molders of public policy. We have rejected the theory that labor exists solely to serve employers; that labor is a commodity to be bought at the lowest possible price; and that laborers compose a special race somewhat akin to the "workers" of the bee and ant families. What is more, we have succeeded more than any other nation in the history of the world in proving these theories false.

Yet, in American agriculture, we still have proponents of the Ricardo school of economics. These growers tell us that if American workers are not available at the prevailing wage—the modern substitute for Ricardo's natural rate of wages—we must recruit workers from the poor of foreign countries. The so-called prevailing wage is very often predetermined by employers who combine for the purpose of stabilizing wages with the knowledge that, if U.S. workers will not accept the wage offer, foreign labor will be made available. Presumably, these growers believe that there will always be a sufficient amount of poverty in the world to provide workers who are willing to perform jobs that higher class people will not accept. This theory is based, of course, on placing a very low economic and social value on those jobs associated with the harvest.

Is it true that these jobs are so disagreeable that qualified American workers will not accept them, regardless of the wages and working conditions offered? Frederick S. Van Dyke, a grower from Stockton, Calif., testifying on behalf of the National Advisory Council on Farm Labor, said the following:

There is dignity, gentlemen, in agriculture. For the moment it has shrunk under the onslaught of misguided legislation such as Public Law 78. But, given the chance, it can survive and it can flower. The dignity inherent in agriculture deserves to survive, no less than our free society itself deserves to survive.

The dignity Mr. Van Dyke speaks about will not survive if agriculture becomes permanently dependent on a special class of poverty-stricken and underprivileged people, regardless of whether they originate in the United States or Mexico. Each year, hundreds of thousands of migratory workers, underemployed, poorly paid, poorly educated, and trained only in agriculture, roam throughout the United States helping to reap the rich American harvest. To this we add approximately 400,000 underprivileged foreign workers because, according to the bracero-using growers, there are not enough migrants to perform agriculture's disagreeable jobs.

The fact is that foreign labor performs less than 20 percent of the seasonal work in agriculture. U.S. workers predominate in cotton and many other activities. Mexicans dominate only in situations where wages have been frozen or where growers have organized their recruitment around the use of Mexicans. For example, tomatoes in California's San Joaquin and Sacramento Counties are harvested almost exclusively by Mexicans. Yet, tomatoes in Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, and most other States are picked by domestic labor.

The proponents of Public Law 78 dismiss the migratory labor problem as a social question, not the concern of American growers. They are quick to admit, however, that many American growers are dependent on migratory labor; that they could not get their crops harvested without the migrants. In effect, what these spokesmen are saying is that many American growers are dependent on a supply of socially and economically displaced people.

By the same token, these same grower spokesmen claim that thousands of growers would go out of business if the supply of Mexican braceros were cut off. The implication is that these growers are dependent on poverty and unemployment in Mexico, an economic situation which spawns hundreds of thousands of unemployed and/or low-paid workers who are willing to migrate to the United States to accept work on farms at substandard U.S. wages.

Such a system cannot continue unchecked indefinitely, and farsighted growers already realize this. Fred Bailey, testifying on behalf of the National Grange, described Public Law 78 as a crutch and advocated termination of the program as soon as possible.

The Grange does not believe—

Mr. Bailey said—

that continued extensions of Public Law 78 are in the best interests of a majority of American farmers. We doubt that it is in the long run best interests of even a minority. Too many of us in agriculture have leaned far too long on Public Law 78 as a crutch—as an excuse for failure to take

positive steps which would make the program unnecessary.

Reuben Johnson, testifying on behalf of the Farmers Union, got to the heart of the class system problem when he said:

It is our deep conviction that farm labor problems should not be singled out for separate and different treatment from other labor relations issues. These are principles equally correct and just as the goal of parity farm income for farm operator families. We do not think that a large majority of farmers favor a future for our Nation's agriculture that is built on a mud sill of poverty.

Mr. Bailey and Mr. Johnson, representing two of the most respected farm organizations in the country, do not believe that American agriculture must be dependent on a class system to survive. These men, as well as Mr. Van Dyke, believe that American agriculture is capable of finding essential solutions to its labor problems. The reliance of agriculture on the underprivileged of the United States and foreign countries is to a certain extent an excuse for avoiding labor problems rather than a solution to them. Only one national farm organization identified itself with the philosophy of those farm organizations which represent bracero users, and that was the American Farm Bureau Federation. This is an organization which makes eloquent pleas to Congress to get the Government out of agriculture in order that the law of supply and demand may be restored to the marketplace, but insists in the continuance of Public Law 78—a Government program which interferes with the normal workings of the labor market.

I can understand the support given this program by those farm associations which represent bracero users, but it is difficult to understand why the American Farm Bureau Federation, which purports to represent more than 1½ million farmers, testifies so strenuously in favor of a program which is of benefit to less than 2 percent of the growers in the United States.

The Farm Bureau often complains that agriculture is the victim of poor public relations. It seems to me that as long as growers advocate a class system in agriculture, as long as they advance the proposition that the State and Federal Governments owe them a supply of premium labor at cutrate wages, they will continue to have a public relations problem.

American workers perform strenuous tasks in coal mines, steel mills, foundries, and in oil fields. They work on garbage trucks, in cesspools, under rivers as sand hogs, and in the boiler rooms of ships and factories. They perform heavy labor in industry and construction.

They would be available to perform the so-called arduous work in American agriculture—if the wages offered and other conditions of employment were right. American workingmen are far less soft and far more capable than bracero-using growers, association managers, and the processing corporation representatives give them credit for—and they have a greater respect for the work of the harvest than those who describe such work as nasty, distasteful, unpleasant, fit only for the dregs of the American labor force and the unemployed citizens of foreign countries.

EFFECT OF PUBLIC LAW 78 ON AMERICAN FARMWORKERS

American farmworkers are the most underprivileged group in the Nation's labor force. According to the Department of Agriculture, underemployment of rural people is estimated as the equivalent of 1,400,000 fully unemployed workers. The average earnings of agricultural workers are barely over $1,000 a year from all sources, farm and nonfarm. Farmworkers are excluded from minimum wage, unemployment insurance, and most workmen's compensation legislation. In addition, they are excluded from legislation which protects the right of workers to organize into unions and bargain with their employers.

Each year, approximately 400,000 American farmworkers are forced to migrate in order to avoid either low wages or unemployment at home. While on the road, their lives are very often characterized by underemployment, low wages, poor housing, lack of education, lack of health and welfare services, and in some cases unsafe vehicles for transportation.

The effect of Public Law 78 on these already downtrodden American workers is similar to the effect of a boot applied to the head of a person who, through no fault of his own, is already groveling in the dust.

The Reverend William E. Scholes, western field representative, division of home missions of the National Council of Churches, gave the following testimony before the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower:

Some time ago, our staff made an informal study of the needs of migrant workers. We always ask one question, which is important to us, and it is: "What can we best do to help?" We thought that the answer might come that: "You could encourage the school system to help our children with their studies," or something of this nature.

Instead, almost invariably high on the list of what we could do was to help them get some of the jobs back that the braceros had taken from them.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Holleman has stated:

It is not in the public interest for Government to interpose itself in the farm labor market to guarantee a labor supply to employers whose refusal to adjust wages, working conditions or personnel practices creates artificial labor shortages.

For 9 months in 1959, four consultants studied the effects of Public Law 78 on domestic farmworkers at the request of former Secretary of Labor, James P. Mitchell. These men conducted their investigations not only in Washington, D.C., but in all the areas where Mexican nationals are employed. They conferred with farm employers, domestic migrants, braceros, Government officials, and others close to or directly concerned with the Mexican farm labor program.

The four men who reported to the Secretary of Labor on this matter were: Ex-Senator Edward J. Thye of Minnesota, one of the men who helped write Public Law 78; Rufus B. Von Kleinsmid, chancellor of the University of Southern California and ex-president of the University of Arizona; Glenn E. Garrett, executive director of the Good Neighbor Commission and chairman of the Texas Council on Migratory Labor; and Msgr. George G. Higgins, social action director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

These distinguished Americans, from varied backgrounds and varied points of view, arrived at the unanimous conclusion that the Mexican farm labor program was undermining the already deplorable economic condition of American farmworkers.

Evidence accumulated by the Department of Labor supports the conclusion reached by the four consultants.

A. Supply and demand: The mass importation of Mexican nationals in some parts of the country has made the law of supply and demand inoperative. The fact that Mexican workers can be obtained at a prevailing wage below the level which American workers will accept, makes it unnecessary for bracero-using growers to raise prevailing wages or offer other recruitment incentives which might attract American labor.

Fred S. Van Dyke said the following in his testimony before the Gathings subcommittee:

The phrase "prevailing wage" for domestic workers is obviously meaningless when virtually 100 percent of the canning tomatoes in San Joaquin County are picked by Mexican nationals. The phrase "reasonable efforts to recruit" is obviously meaningless when I can pick up my telephone and order a hundred braceros any day I feel like it. The phrase "adverse effect" is obviously meaningless when the wages for tomato picking have declined by a full 50 percent during the 10 years of the bracero program.

Max Miller, vice president of the Arkansas Farm Bureau Federation, testifying in favor of H.R. 2010, answered a question as to what wages he paid his braceros in the following manner:

We pay the Mexican—the wage on the Mexicans is 50 cents an hour. And we have to pay the other labor (Americans) the same wages.

Mr. Miller admits that growers in his State do not make any attempt to recruit American labor by raising wage rates. On the other hand, he complains that he has to pay the same rate of pay to American workers that he pays to Mexicans. Later in his testimony, he describes the Americans that are available at this rate of pay as old people, and a few children after school hours. Mr. Miller might be asked what kind of labor he expects to get for 50 cents an hour. What able-bodied man who has to support a family can afford to work for this rate of pay?

The significance of Mr. Miller's testimony, however, is that Arkansas growers do not have to make any adjustments in their labor recruitment practices in order to attract American labor. The importation of foreign labor in this case makes a mockery of the law of supply and demand.

B. Wages: A vast amount of evidence accumulated by the Department of Labor proves conclusively that the importation of Mexican labor has had a definite adverse effect on the wages offered to American labor. The following facts,

which, at my request, were supplied to me by Assistant Secretary of Labor Holleman, are to the point:

1. Hourly wage rates, without room and board, reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture rose about 16 percent from 1953 to 1959, but Labor Department surveys show that wages in most areas and activities employing Mexicans remained relatively stable. Fifty percent of the studies show no significant change in rate from earlier to later years within this period; 32 percent show an increase, and 18 percent show a decline. Declines would not be expected to occur in labor-shortage situations.

2. In 43 percent of the cotton-harvest wage surveys in Mexican-using areas compared within the 1953–59 period, wage rates remained stable, and in 32 percent declines were reported.

3. A study of 1960 trends shows that in 52 percent of the cotton-harvest wage surveys in important Mexican-using areas wage rates remained the same as in 1959, while 28 percent declined. Most Mexican nationals are employed in the cotton harvest.

4. In some sections of Arizona wage rates in the cotton harvest have remained virtually unchanged from 1953 to 1960, and in other areas of the State cotton wage rates have dropped 50 cents per hundredweight.

5. In Mississippi County, Ark., wage rates for cotton picking were virtually unchanged from 1953 to 1960, despite the fact that the USDA hourly rate for the State as a whole rose 28 percent. (This area uses 11,000 Mexican braceros.)

6. Phillips County, Ark., had an hourly cotton chopping rate for domestic workers of 30 cents in June 1954. Although the average rate in June 1960 was 37 cents, rates as low as 30 cents were still being paid. Mexicans are paid contract rates of 50 cents. The USDA average hourly rate for Arkansas was 69 cents in July 1960.

7. In Texas and Arkansas widespread declines occurred between 1959 and 1960 in cotton harvest rates (pulling in Texas and picking in Arkansas). Typically, the decline was from $1.75 to $1.50 per hundredweight in pulling (Mexicans are paid the contract rate of $1.55), and from $3 to $2.50 per hundredweight in picking. A notable exception resulting from Department of Labor action under earning policies, occurred in the lower Rio Grande Valley, where the picking rate rose from $2.30 to $2.50. But this followed a period of several years in which there had been no change in rate until 1959, when, also by virtue of Labor Department action, the rate rose from $2.05 to $2.30.

8. In the Imperial Valley of California, wage rates remained unchanged at 70 cents an hour between 1951 and 1959. Recently the average hourly rate has increased to 90 cents an hour. Nevertheless, this rate is about 35 cents below the average for the State as a whole. (The Imperial Valley is a bracero-dominated area.)

This is just some of the evidence accumulated by the Department of Labor. There is much more. For example, Department of Labor studies have shown that in many areas growers who hire foreign labor tend to pay lower wage rates to the Americans they hire than growers who hire American labor exclusively. Even more important, the Labor Department has found that Mexican braceros are employed at approximately 20,000 skilled, semiskilled, and year-round occupations.

At a time when American farmworkers are the victims of a high degree of underemployment and unemployment, the employment of foreign workers in these jobs is a disgrace. It is difficult to imagine, in an employment situation such as this, by what set of mental gymnastics bracero-using growers can justify the employment of foreign workers in skilled occupations.

It is true that Public Law 78, as it is presently written, does not specifically limit the employment of Mexican labor to unskilled occupations, but it is our contention that it was the intent of Congress to so limit their employment. The use of Mexicans for skilled work reduces the opportunities of domestic farm workers to advance from unskilled to higher paid skilled jobs and tends to lower the wage levels of domestic farmworkers employed in skilled occupations.

C. Employer recruitment efforts: In areas of severe labor shortage, as growers compete for the short labor supply, there would normally be a tendency for wages to rise, improvements to be made in other conditions of employment, and for labor practices to be adopted to make maximum use of the available workers. However, the availability of a vast potential labor supply south of the border has reduced competition for domestic workers in labor shortage areas and has caused many growers to make only token recruitment efforts.

Msgr. George G. Higgins, social action director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and one of the four consultants who advised Secretary of Labor Mitchell on the administration of Public Law 78, testified before the Gathings subcommittee on this question:

> I can cite testimony of a number of growers and representatives of growers associations in various parts of the country who are quite willing to admit that their organizations, growers associations, were not really trying in an organized manner to recruit domestics.
>
> They said that, "We have become in effect, recruiting agencies for braceros. So long as the braceros are available in large numbers, there is no compulsion of us to get out and do the kind of recruiting that we would have to do in private industry or that we would have to do in agriculture in the absence of the bracero program."

I have already discussed the decline in wages in many bracero-using areas. But, what about other recruitment incentives? For example, do bracero-using growers offer American workers the same conditions of employment they offer Mexicans? Do bracero-using growers attempt to attract American workers to their areas by providing the kind of housing they need to meet requirements of their families? Do bracero-using growers plan their crop production in accordance with the labor available to do the work?

Unfortunately, the answer to each of these questions is for the most part, "No."

Growers are required to furnish transportation for Mexican nationals to and from reception centers. Mexican nationals are guaranteed the opportunity to work at least three-fourths of the work days in the contract period, which usually has a minimum of 6 weeks. If Mexican workers are offered employment for less than 64 hours in any 2-week period, they are entitled to subsistence during idle days at the employer's expense. Mexicans must be provided with free housing. They must be paid no less than the prevailing wage for similar work in the area and are guaranteed at least $2 a day during a 48-hour learning period if paid by the piece rate method. Employers of Mexicans are required to pay insurance against occupational injuries and to pay for the workers' subsistence during days of illness or injury. The employers must also carry occupational health insurance for Mexican workers, but the cost of this item is paid by deduction from wages.

Very few employers provide all of these benefits to their domestic workers; some provide none. There could be no clearer indication that the availability of Mexican workers tends to curtail active competition for the domestic labor supply and to prevent the normal adjustments in wages and conditions of employment that would be expected to occur in free labor markets.

An even more shocking practice by bracero-using growers is the adoption of production methods predicated on the displacement of their domestic employees by foreign workers. For example, there has been an increasing tendency to shift the packing and sorting of vegetables from packing sheds to the fields, where the activity is performed either on mobile packing platforms or as an adjunct of hand harvesting. In such cases, the packing shed workers, who are usually domestics, often refuse to shift to the fields because fieldwork receives a lower wage and is frequently performed under unfavorable conditions. They are then replaced by Mexican nationals. Typical cases of this type occurred in California's Salinas area carrot harvest in 1959, and in the lettuce and celery harvests of Southern California during earlier years.

While I am not opposed to improvements in technology, I feel that changes in production methods which are predicated on the replacement of American workers by Mexican nationals cannot be justified under any circumstances. Such a change in production procedures could never have occurred under conditions of a competitive labor market unaffected by the use of foreign workers.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said recently:

> The root of the trouble in agriculture is the same as in other parts of our economy: There are not enough jobs to go around. Unemployment is the basic cause of underemployment, the basic reason we have pockets of poverty in rural areas.

In summary, there can be no doubt that Public Law 78, as it is presently written, has a depressing effect on the wages, working conditions and employment opportunities of U.S. farmworkers. The poor of Mexico are being exploited in a manner which increases poverty at home.

EFFECT OF PUBLIC LAW 78 ON FARMERS WHO DO NOT USE FOREIGN LABOR

Representatives of organizations and associations whose members use Mexican labor testified before the Gathings subcommittee that the majority of their

members are small farmers. From this testimony—testimony presented by witnesses who have a special interest in perpetuating the bracero program—the committee has concluded that Public Law 78 is of inestimable help to the small farmer; indeed, that many small farmers would be forced out of business if the program were terminated.

The bracero program may be of short-run help to those small growers who use Mexican labor. It is questionable, however, whether the program is beneficial in the long run to these growers. Considerable evidence has been accumulated which shows that the availability of Mexican labor causes overproduction and a resulting decline in the prices these small growers receive for their products. The large grower who is able to increase his acreage—usually at the expense of the small grower who has been forced out of business—is not affected by this decline in prices.

Furthermore, the bracero program is of no benefit whatsoever to the majority of family farmers who hire no labor at all—54 percent of all the farmers in the United States—or to those growers who hire domestic labor exclusively—over 40 percent of all the farmers in the United States. Less than 2 percent of all American farmers hire Mexican labor. No doubt there are small growers among this 2 percent, but compared to the vast majority of growers who do not use foreign labor, they constitute a minuscule minority.

Furthermore, there is some doubt as to whether those small growers who do use Mexican labor are farmers in the real sense of the word. Mr. Van Dyke explained it this way:

> Professional spokesmen for bracero-using associations * * * have come before you (the Gathings subcommittee) and stated that the majority of their members are small growers who could not possibly survive without bracero labor.
>
> Let us take, for example, associations of citrus growers, managers of which have testified before you in favor of the bracero system. The small citrus growers of southern California may be small, but they are not growers in any meaningful sense. They do not grow anything. They are a form of landlords. Instead of renting out apartments and office space for profit, they rent out orange and lemon trees. The tenant is the Sunkist Association.
>
> And who does the labor for the Sunkist Association? On February 25, 1961, 1,890 of the 2,160 employees in the Ventura County lemon harvest were foreign contract workers; i.e., 87 percent. Since about 10 percent of the workers in any such harvest are foremen, checkers, truckdrivers—positions which cannot be legally filled in California by braceros—we may conclude that Mexican nationals do virtually all the actual picking of lemons on the small farms of southern California.
>
> These are the small farmers who claim they need Public Law 78 * * * I say that it is time to call a halt to the phony farming that has emerged as an adjunct of the foreign contract labor system.

In many cases, the legal employers of Mexican nationals are labor contracting associations. It is the task of these associations to supply labor to their members whether they be growers or distributing and processing cooperatives or corporations. Often the grower does not even pay for the Mexican labor he is supplied with. For example, the following colloquy took place between Chairman GATHINGS and Fred G. Holmes, labor commissioner of the Great Western Sugar Co. and the Northern Ohio Sugar Co.

> Mr. GATHINGS. That money (cost to import a bracero to Montana and back to Mexico) comes out of the pocket of the farmer, is that not right?
>
> Mr. HOLMES. The sugar companies advance the money and make what we call a mechanization charge to the grower. If the grower fully utilizes the labor, uses mechanical means to reduce the amount of labor, he makes no payment to the company, the company bears the entire cost of labor.
>
> Mr. GATHINGS. It does not come out of the pocket of the grower at all?
>
> Mr. HOLMES. No, it does not in this particular case.

Another colloquy between Chairman GATHINGS and Robert H. Ford, of the National Pickle Growers Association, brought out the same fact:

> Mr. GATHINGS. Are the expenses of these Mexicans that come up to Michigan reimbursed—do you have to pay that to each grower, does the grower have to pay that?
>
> Mr. FORD. The actual farmer does not, no sir. The association does, the processors, and the association ultimately winds up bearing that expense.

The question arises as to whether the sugar companies and the processors of pickles must depend on the availability of Mexican labor. For all practical purposes, they are the real employers of braceros. Because of the business relationships involved, they are also, in effect, the employers of the farmers who grow the crops.

Spokesmen for several farm organizations have taken a dim view of this system. Reuben Johnson, of the Farmers Union—an organization of family farmers—asked the Gathings subcommittee to consider the effect of the Mexican national program on family operated farms:

> We are concerned by the lack of information on the economic effect of large numbers of imported farmworkers on family-operated farms. We, therefore, urge you to provide for further study of the Public Law 78 program on our traditional pattern of family-operated farms.

The fact is that if a large grower or processing corporation is able to obtain an unlimited quantity of labor for low wages, the labor performed by a farm operator and the members of his family on a small family farm becomes of equally low value. Even more important, the availability of braceros very often causes overproduction and a resulting decline in the prices all farmers receive for their products. This fact has been brought to the attention of the House Agriculture Committee many times before, but, as yet, it has not struck home. For this reason, we believe that it is necessary to present in this speech specific illustrations of how the importation of unlimited quantities of Mexican labor adversely effects small family-operated farms.

A. Lettuce: The spring lettuce crop is grown in Arizona and California, largely with foreign labor, and in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia exclusively with domestic labor. Over the last 6 years, production in the Western States has risen while production in eastern areas dropped. There has been a clear downward drift in average price for both the eastern and western crop. The average price per hundredweight for eastern lettuce declined 35 percent to $3.88 for 1959 and 1960; the corresponding price for western lettuce went down 15 percent to $3.50. It appears that the availability of foreign labor has contributed to lower returns for eastern farmers by overexpanding production and by enabling western growers to take over some of the markets formerly available to small farmers in the East.

B. Strawberries: California growers have doubled their production of mid-spring strawberries for processing over the last decade, largely with the help of Mexican labor. U.S. production rose by about 20 percent and prices fell 18 percent. The five other States producing this crop in competition with California—Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Oklahoma—all of which use domestic labor for strawberries, have curtailed production sharply as prices fell.

C. Tomatoes: More than four-fifths of the California workers who harvest tomatoes for processing are Mexican workers. U.S. production of this crop averaged 3.8 million tons in 1959 and 1960, about 3 percent higher than in 1950 and 1951. California's annual production rose 0.5 million tons over this period while annual output in other producing States, which rely mainly on domestic labor, went down by about 0.4 million tons. The U.S. average price to farmers dropped by about 12 percent.

The use of Mexican labor probably has a bearing on the disappearance of the family-scale farm and the concentration of production on the large farm. The census of agriculture of 1959 revealed that the number of large scale farms with value of products sold at $10,000 or more increased more than one-third in the last 5 years from 583,000 to 794,000. Meanwhile, the number of medium and small-scale commercial farms declined by more than 40 percent.

It may be inevitable that the family farm type of operation must gradually disappear from the American scene. Perhaps, this is the price we must pay for progress. However, it does not seem fair that this should happen partly because the Government of the United States makes available to large-scale growers and processing corporations an unlimited supply of foreign labor at wage scales which undermine the value of the labor performed by family farm operators and the members of their families.

I believe that the family farm operator should be given a fighting chance to survive.

ANSWERS TO PRO PUBLIC LAW 78 ARGUMENTS

Witnesses testifying before the Gathings subcommittee have advanced a series of arguments for Public Law 78 which appear to range from the irrelevant to the ridiculous when analyzed. I shall examine them one at a time.

A. No labor available: Some witnesses claimed that without braceros their crops would rot in the fields. They claim that domestic labor is not available for seasonal agricultural work. This argument was partly answered in section I of this report. A few additional remarks, however, seem warranted.

Most of the witnesses who advanced this argument were the representatives of labor contracting associations, user organizations and processing cooperatives and corporations which have a special interest in perpetuating the bracero system. These witnesses claimed that they made all-out attempts to recruit domestic labor but failed. Harvey R. Adams, executive vice president of the Agricultural Council of Arkansas, put it this way:

> I don't believe anybody can make any more effort to obtain the workers (domestic) than we have; we think we have done a tremendous job in soliciting them from out of State and any place we can find them.

Can Mr. Adams really be serious about his recruitment efforts when farmworkers in Arkansas are paid, according to Department of Labor surveys, between 35 and 50 cents an hour? The truth is that American farmworkers are understandably not available for such preposterous wage rates, and neither should they be. From any viewpoint these wage rates are morally wrong and economically absurd. They belong to the unhappy depression days of 25 years ago, from which we have long and thankfully emerged—at least in most parts of these United States.

Where decent wages and working conditions are offered, American labor is available. It is available, for example, in the State of Washington, where wages are as high as $1.25 an hour, where growers participate in an annual worker plan, and sometimes advance transportation costs to American migrants.

It is available in the State of Oregon where the State legislature has enacted legislation, improving conditions for American farmworkers. It is available in northern California, where American workers can earn as much as $1.50 an hour on many tree crops. It is available in the State of Ohio, where an enlightened State and grower policy has resulted in an elimination of the foreign labor which once came into the State.

In other words, in those places where growers have made a sincere effort to recruit domestic workers, they have been successful. Where an unlimited supply of foreign labor is available, however, there is no economic pressure put on the grower to improve his recruitment activities.

B. Inability to pay: Some witnesses testified that because of decreasing farm income, growers cannot afford to raise wages. This argument is generally coupled with the plaint that growers have no control over the price they receive for their products.

The question arises as to what growers cannot afford to pay higher wages. There is no doubt that the family farmer who uses little or no labor is in serious economic trouble. No evidence has been presented, however, that indicates that those large growers and processing corporations and cooperatives, who are the chief beneficiaries of the bracero program, are fighting for survival. On the contrary, these enterprises seem to be doing quite well. It is highly possible that an increase in labor costs could be absorbed by most growers who use Mexican labor through mechanization, crop diversification, or some other means.

Even if labor costs could not be absorbed, it is highly doubtful that an increase in labor costs would result in a substantial increase in overall production costs in agriculture. In 1958 the total farm wage bill amounted to $2.9 billion, while total farm production expenditures, including interest and rent, amounted to $25.2 billion. Labor costs, therefore, represent only 11.5 percent of total farm production costs, or less than one-eighth, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. This means that farm labor wages could rise more than 8 percent before production costs are raised as much as 1 percent.

J. Blaine Quinn, master of the California Grange, in a speech before the 88th annual convention of the California Grange, said the following regarding the price growers receive for their products:

> The threat to orderly production and harvesting of California's $3 billion agricultural output must not be ignored. We take the position that the present labor strife is an indirect result of greed on the part of large landholders who brazen their way with unlimited expansion of all farm products, with little heed to supply and demand. Naturally, they depress the market for all similar products and force the independent producer to seek the cheapest labor supply available in order to get enough out of their year's effort to keep aboveboard. This forces wages for farm labor down below those of any other scale in the American Nation.

Without the braceros, it is highly doubtful that the large landholders Mr. Quinn describes could brazen their way with unlimited expansion of all farm products. Mr. Quinn suggests that when the independent producers organize they will be able to calmly and rightly demand a fair return. When this happens, Mr. Quinn says, labor unrest will be reduced to a minimum.

Yet, even if all these factors did not exist, it would still be impossible to argue that American agriculture must, in the attempt to meet its economic problems, exploit farmworkers. Fred Bailey of the National Grange, testified as follows before the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower:

> We shouldn't rely on the pleas of economic poverty in agriculture to justify a low rate. We have got to put the emphasis, in our opinion, on raising agricultural income to the point where it is attractive to American workers.

I heartily concur with Mr. Bailey and the Grange.

C. Consumer prices: Some Public Law 78 supporters contend that consumer prices will increase if the bracero program is terminated or reduced. The argument goes like this: A reduction in the amount of Mexican labor available to American growers will cause an increase in labor costs, thereby raising food costs.

In my opinion, this question has no bearing whatsoever on whether or not Public Law 78 should be reformed, extended, or terminated. As former Secretary of Labor Mitchell said:

> In this country we do not choose to keep down our bills, including our food bills, at the cost of overworking and underpaying human beings. We choose to pay the price necessary to support an adequate wage.

I am in complete agreement with this statement, and I believe that the vast majority of farmers in the United States would also support Mr. Mitchell's views on this question. Spokesmen for consumer groups, testifying before the Gathings subcommittee, stated unanimously that consumers would be willing to pay the extra cost, if any, necessary to eliminate substandard labor conditions in American agriculture.

It is doubtful, however, that reform of Public Law 78 would have a significant effect on consumer prices. In 1959 farmers received 38 cents of every consumer dollar spent for food. Of the receipts, farmers paid 8.8 percent in wages. That is, 3.3 percent of consumers' food expenses went for farm labor. If the farm wage level should rise, even if farmers were able to pass the increase straight along, the consumer would scarcely feel its effect upon his budget. If wage costs rose 25 percent, for example, retail prices would be pushed up less than 1 percent.

D. Effect on Mexico: The Mexican farm labor importation program is, in effect, a point 4 program to Mexico, the supporters of Public Law 78 have testified. The fact is that Public Law 78 is not a foreign aid program, but a program to supply American farmers with supplemental labor. It must be examined on this basis, and not on the basis of a point 4 program. While it is true that the money brought home by Mexican braceros is of help to the Mexican economy, it cannot be argued that this is a legitimate justification for a program which is undermining the economic position of American farmworkers.

As was stated in the minority report of the House Agriculture Committee last year:

> One can hardly expect the American farmworker to shoulder the burden of providing foreign aid to Mexico. If Mexico is to be helped, let us do it through programs established for that purpose—and not by injuring a large segment of our population.

There are indications, however, that Public Law 78 could become a thorny economic issue in Mexico, itself. Mexican cotton producers have complained of U.S. cotton dumping on the world market. The following is a quote from an article, "Balance of Trade Problems," contained in the March 1960 issue of Commercio Exterior de Mexico, a monthly publication of Mexico's Banco Nacional de Comercio Exterior:

> The situation (disequilibrium of the Mexican foreign trade) is further aggravated by certain cases of open disregard for the vital interests of the Mexican economy, exemplified by the U.S. cotton dumping on the international markets. In spite of

being such an important outlet for U.S. producers, Mexico does not receive fair treatment from her northern neighbor.

We are certain that Mexican cotton producers are not unaware that much of the U.S. surplus cotton which is dumped on the international market is produced with the help of Mexican braceros.

E. Antiwetback measure: Proponents of Public Law 78 have claimed that the bracero program is an antiwetback measure. If the program were terminated or reduced, these growers claim, the invasion of illegal entrants from Mexico—the so-called wetback invasion—would begin all over again.

It must be stated that this is more of a threat than an argument. The growers are telling the U.S. Government that if it reduces the amount of braceros available for work on U.S. farms, they will hire Mexicans who enter the country illegally. Turning logic upside down, they say that the best way to cure the wetback problem is to legalize the wetbacks.

I believe that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is adequate to the task of policing the Mexican border. I believe, further, that if growers, or any other employers, presume to break our Nation's immigration laws by harboring and trafficking in wetbacks, they should be punished for their actions. The Wetback Control Act of 1952 provides adequate penalties for this purpose.

F. Religious testimony: Proponents of Public Law 78 rejected the testimony of many national religious leaders who testified on the evils of the bracero program, but accepted with a great deal of relish, the testimony of one priest and one minister who testified on behalf of Public Law 78.

Msgr. Daniel Keenan, of Coalinga, Calif., testified that—

> We just don't have the type and the quality and the stamina people who will go out and do that work.

Monsignor Keenan said that good money could be made in agriculture and that the working conditions were not bad. He put it this way:

> If they [the domestic workers] will adjust themselves to the situation, if they will work 12 and 14 hours a day and forget time and one-half and holidays and so forth, and make hay while the sun shines, they can make a good living, if they want it.

The monsignor added:

> If we could get a curtailment of some of these fringe benefits (unemployment insurance, etc.) that keep people from working we might have a group in here who would and could work and could make a fairly good living, if they wanted to.

While every other religious leader, including the minister who testified on behalf of Public Law 78, advocates the extension of labor standards legislation, income insurance legislation, and other decent standards to agricultural workers, Monsignor Keenan seems to be advocating the abolishment of these benefits, in order to force workers to accept seasonal agricultural employment—to make hay while the sun shines. By so doing, he emphasizes one of the main reasons why it is difficult to recruit American workers for seasonal work in agriculture. These benefits represent hard-won victories for the working men and women of the United States, and they will not give them up without an equally hard fight.

The Reverend Loyal H. Vickers, executive director of the Riverside-San Bernardino Counties, Calif., Council of Churches, testified that the program is working well in his area. He stated that there were not enough domestic workers available who were willing to accept the hard, unpleasant, less desirable work of the harvest. The Reverend Vickers, with the cooperation of the churches and church organizations in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, attempted to recruit workers for the citrus harvest in that area. For the most part this effort was a failure. Most of the workers were either incapable of doing the work, or just plain unreliable. From this evidence, the Reverend Vickers concluded that Mexican braceros are necessary to Riverside and San Bernardino county growers.

In answer to a question concerning the Reverend Vicker's testimony, Rev. William E. Scholes had this to say:

> I think most of us realize that agricultural labor is semiskilled labor. If one is to make a good living at picking, he has to know how to do it. Also he has to become accustomed to it. You cannot pick people off the street and that quickly make agricultural workers out of them.

The Reverend Vickers, himself recognized this. In his testimony before the Gathings subcommittee, he made the following recommendation:

> That the growers with the help of the Federal Government instigate a program of training and upgrading of farm labor, and that a way should be found * * * to make sure our farmworkers would be able to live respectable lives on an adequate income, adequate to support and educate their families.

I agree with the Reverend Vickers. It may be that until this is done there will be a need for braceros in the San Bernardino-Riverside area. However, I believe that one way to enact the recommendation made by the Reverend Vickers would be to reform Public Law 78 in a way that would protect American farmworkers from unfair competition with Mexican labor.

ALTERNATIVE LEGISLATION

There is an alternative to H.R. 2010. It is a moderate proposal which corrects the weaknesses of Public Law 78, while providing an opportunity for the users of braceros to make adjustments so that the Mexican farm labor importation program may be eventually eliminated. This measure is H.R. 6032.

H.R. 6032 has the backing of the administration, as well as the support of the following organizations: The National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the Board of National Missions of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, the Bishops' Committee on Migratory Labor, the Young Christian Workers, the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish Speaking, the American Friends Service Committee, the National Consumers League, the AFL–CIO, the American GI Forum, the Joint United States-Mexico Trade Union Committee, Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcher Workers, AFL–CIO, the United Packinghouse Workers, the Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee, AFL–CIO, the National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor, the National Sharecroppers Fund, the National Education Association, the National Council on Agricultural Life and Labor, and the National Child Labor Committee.

Basically, H.R. 6032 would provide the following:

First. Eligibility to employ Mexican workers should be conditioned upon the employers attempting to recruit U.S. workers by offering them wages at least equivalent to average farm wages in the State. Employers would in no case be required to raise their wage offers by more than 10 cents per hour in any one year or to raise their wage offers to more than the average farm wage for the Nation as a whole—97.6 per hour in 1960. Where the wage offer thus determined is less than the wage already prevailing, the prevailing wage must, of course, be offered and paid.

Second. Eligibility to employ Mexican workers should be restricted to employers who make reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers by offering—and actually providing—terms and conditions of employment reasonably comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

Third. Mexican workers should be confined to employment in seasonal and temporary jobs—less than year-round—and to employment not involving the operation of or work on machinery, except in specific cases where found necessary by the Secretary of Labor to avoid hardship.

Fourth. The Secretary of Labor should be authorized to limit the number of foreign workers who may be employed by any employer to the extent necessary to assure active competition among farmers for the services of U.S. farmworkers.

Fifth. If amended in the respect proposed above, the law should be extended for 2 years, terminating December 31, 1963.

Needless to say, these changes would greatly improve the protection of the American farmworker against the cheap labor competition of unlimited importation of Mexican braceros. By clarifying the law, it would enable the Labor Department to administer Public Law 78 in a manner which is fair to all the parties involved. Finally, it would constitute a significant step toward the elimination of the class system, based on poverty at home and in Mexico, which now exist in American agriculture.

CONCLUSIONS

> The time for study is past. In the view of the Department of Labor and in view of the administration the extension of Public Law 78 is acceptable and desirable, but only if it can be properly revised.

These were the words used by Assistant Secretary of Labor Jerry Holleman in presenting the administration's posi-

tion on Public Law 78 to the Gathings subcommittee.

The leaders of some of the Nation's leading church groups have given similar testimony. Rev. Victor C. Obenhaus, testifying on behalf of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., testified, in part, as follows:

The program (Public Law 78), we believe, is having serious and lasting effects on the American agricultural labor market. It thus contributes to one of the bleakest and most persistent pockets of poverty in our generally affluent society.

Rev. James L. Vizzard, S.J., director of the Washington office of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference:

Such legislation (Public Law 78) takes dishonorable advantage of the desperate poverty of workingmen of other nations and creates labor pools of foreign fieldworkers who are denied the opportunity of normal immigration as permanent residents.

Mrs. Paul Blanshard, executive director, Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice:

The growers in the United States are doing precisely now what was done in the early part of this century by the sweatshop operators and owners in the great cities of our country.

Finally, the Reverend Shirley E. Greene, town and country church secretary, Board of National Missions, Evangelical and Reformed Church:

Believing that we must safeguard the welfare of the American agricultural worker, we favor the early termination of the Mexican farm labor program.

Clearly, the moral implications of Public Law 78 are extremely important. Can we sacrifice our convictions in order to satisfy the wants of a small minority of farm employers? I believe that Congress must answer this question with a resounding, "No."

I do not suggest that Public Law 78 should be terminated immediately. I recognize that those farm employers who have become dependent on labor from Mexico need time to adjust to a free farm labor economy.

I do suggest, however, that Public Law 78 should not be extended unless the law is amended to provide the minimum safeguards contained in H.R. 6032. I suggest, also, that in view of the position taken by the administration, Public Law 78 will not be extended unless reform measures are adopted.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, every one of us today is being asked to vote on a bill which will have a major impact on all the people of this country. I say this advisedly because you know and I know that although the present act only takes in those companies which have a rather high gross volume of sales, nevertheless, the proponents of this measure have already indicated that they intend in future sessions to have the dollar volume test cut at least in half and perhaps lower than this. This admission means then that it is the purpose of the supporters of this bill to inject the Federal Government into every business in the country regardless of our constitutional and historical concept of government and regardless of local conditions.

I, for one, do not believe that the powers of the Federal Government should be so expanded. Certainly the framers of the Constitution must be having nightmares if they are listening to the proposition that the Constitution authorizes the Federal Government to determine the major operating expenses of every business in the country.

I strongly suspect that this act is unconstitutional but even if it is not, it is a return to the philosophy of the Administration that businessmen of this country are so insensitive and so stupid that they are unable to properly handle their personnel problems and to manage their own businesses.

This bill is also being proposed on a humanitarian basis, but the obvious cynicism with which this is promoted can easily be seen when the proponents of the bill, in order to gain votes, have exempted from its provisions the lowest wage group of any in the country; namely, the laundry workers. This was further emphasized by the action of the conference committee in agreeing to take out of the coverage of the existing act employees of cotton gins, obviously for the purpose of picking up some additional southern votes.

I have said before, and I will repeat, that I have no objection to raising the minimum wage in legitimate areas of coverage, whether it be to $1.15 or to $1.25, but it is fundamentally wrong, in my opinion, to go beyond the constitutional authority granted to the Federal Government to control interstate commerce and to inject it into what has been always considered and known as local enterprise and local business.

There is a further point which should be brought up and that is the question of unemployment. We have been told by the Administration, and the facts would bear it out, that there is substantial unemployment in many areas. There are a number of people who are now employed who are young or working part time or who are mentally or physically handicapped. Most of these are in serious need of employment at any level not only for living expenses but also in order to be able to show that they are capable of contributing some effort to the overall enterprises of the country. It seems apparent to me that the proposed minimum wage will immediately and sharply hurt these categories; namely, the ones who are least able to help themselves. Instead of improving the unemployment situation this bill will undoubtedly increase the problem. I would also suggest to you that where labor costs are a high item of expense in any business, the effect of the bill will be to accelerate automation. This will, in turn, increase unemployment problems.

As you can see from the foregoing analysis, it is my firm opinion that enactment of this bill will constitute a massive invasion of local rights by the Federal Government in order to give power to a few theoretical bureaucrats in Washington; will accelerate automation to the detriment of union members and nonunion members of the laboring force, and will create sharp distress for the marginal workers who are least able to help themselves. It is for these reasons that I most emphatically and sincerely urge you to vote against this conference report so that a reasonable bill can be produced by a new conference committee.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the action of the House in approving the conference report on the minimum wage bill was a great victory, not only for the administration, but for underpaid workers throughout the Nation. It would have been unconscionable, in my view, to have permitted another session to go by without giving some relief to this group.

For the first time since 1938 we have succeeded in substantially extending the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Under the bill which we approved on Wednesday, retail and service establishments, with certain exceptions, which gross at least $1 million annually and which purchase or receive goods for resale that move or have moved across State lines in the sum of $250,000 or more per year, will pay their employees a federally designated minimum wage. It is difficult for me to understand why this provision evoked so much controversy. Small retailers are not affected, and surely it is not unreasonable to expect firms which do a business of $1 million a year to pay $1 or $1.25 an hour. Nor is the dollar volume yardstick a unique concept in determining what constitutes interstate commerce. As has been frequently pointed out, the National Labor Relations Board has used it for years, and the Congress gave its consent to this approach by incorporating it into the Landrum Griffin Act in 1959. As a Representative from the State of New Jersey I am deeply gratified by the new minimum wage law. Although most industry in my State already pays wages considerably in excess of the new minimum, the bill will help those workers at the very bottom of the wage scale. It will represent an increase in purchasing power as well, and this cannot but stimulate the expansion of our general economy. And, to some extent, it will tend to discourage industry from moving out of the State to areas where present wage rates are far below the national average.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope this House will promptly accept and approve this conference report on the minimum wage bill as the most reasonable compromise that can be effected at this time.

Department of Labor statistics show that 665,000 of the workers to whom coverage will be extended under this compromise now earn less than $1 per hour and about 4½ million of the presently and newly covered workers earn less than $1.25 per hour.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is difficult, indeed, to understand how anyone living in the United States can regard as in any way excessive a take-home pay of $50, before deductions, to an American working man or woman for a 40-hour week in this economic day and age.

In my opinion, the whole Nation will benefit by the acceptance of this compromise agreement which seeks to provide a firm foundation for the country's

wage structure and which embraces a great assistance toward further economic recovery and employment stability.

Of significant import is the objective, contained in this agreement, of eliminating competition among the several States on the basis of low wage standards. As minimum wages are reasonably increased throughout our economy, incentives for plant migration to low-wage States are reduced. It is certainly not in the American tradition to encourage competition for industry among the States solely on the basis of attraction through an available supply of cheap labor. All authorities agree that sort of competition is unfair and serves to encourage only social and economic dispute and disorder in the Nation.

This compromise agreement is as close to the President's recommendations as can now be accomplished and it is as reasonable to everybody involved as can be expected. I earnestly hope it will be adopted by this House without undue delay.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring the facts before my colleagues. In the first place, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], has told us that we should not compromise, and yet here on the floor in front of all of us just a few minutes ago he said he was in favor of a $1.25 minimum wage. When he voted for the so-called Kitchin-Ayres bill he voted for $1.15. I am very happy that he is now in favor of $1.25, and I am happy to welcome him to our ranks.

Next, I would like to bring the truth before this body. I say again that the proponents of the bill that passed this body in the conference did not make a single fight for their bill. I deeply regret that the gentleman from Ohio took sick, but he was at two of the meetings, and I hold in my hand the original notes. I was elected chairman of the conference, and in the very beginning there was an opportunity to offer the formula of five or more stores in two or more States. That formula was never offered, and the majority of us therefore voted in favor of the dollar volume formula.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. The vote was 3 to 2. And, the reason the point was not made, the gentleman from New York knows that I planned to offer the substitute. And it has been my experience that whenever you are looking at a stacked deck there is no use putting your money on the table.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the gentleman for agreeing with me that he did not offer a fight. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us proceed. In the next place—and I hold the original notes in my hand—all of the conferees from the House, including the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] who talks about principle now, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] who called the conference a sham, voted 21 times unanimously to recede. These are the penciled notes that I have here. Is or is not that true? I thank you for agreeing with me. Now I would like to proceed a little further.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I am sorry, no. Let us talk about holly wreaths. The amendment on holly wreaths was introduced in the other body as a Republican amendment.

I must raise my voice at this juncture to make another point and that is as to the constitutional provisions. The NLRB right now says that you are engaged in interstate commerce if you are in excess of $500,000 per year. In this bill we say you are engaged in interstate commerce only when all three of the following take effect: First, an annual gross of $1 million, not $500,000; second, $250,000 of the goods are shipped across State lines; and, third, when the employees are engaged in handling goods in interstate commerce. All of these three conditions must be met in order to qualify for interstate commerce. The present rule of the NLRB is that only one of those must be met. This is in truth, therefore, a very stringent definition.

Mr. Speaker, finally I would like to say that we must vote today either for or against this conference report with the full knowledge that if we do not accept it now, today, there may not be another chance in this session of Congress to vote on minimum wage. The other body has just passed this conference report by a vote of 64 to 28. The other body has discharged its conferees. We, the conferees, know the sentiments of the other body. We know they will not accept any further whittling down of their position. This is the plain stark truth and fact that we must face. The moment of truth has arrived. We vote now and if we do not vote correctly now then we may not have another chance for the balance of this session.

Finally, I defy anyone to contradict this last point. There is not a single piece of Federal legislation upon the statute books of this Nation that imposes the concept of interstate commerce as proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] and by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN].

Therefore I say the time has come to go on record for or against minimum wage and I urge you with all my heart, soul, and mind, to accept this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 196, answered "present" 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—230

Addabbo	Anfuso	Baldwin
Addonizio	Ashley	Baring
Albert	Aspinall	Barrett
Alexander	Bailey	Bass, Tenn.
Bates	Hansen	O'Brien, Ill.
Beckworth	Harding	O'Brien, N.Y.
Bennett, Fla.	Harrison, Wyo.	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Hays	O'Hara, Mich.
Blatnik	Healey	O'Konski
Boggs	Hechler	Olsen
Boland	Hemphill	O'Neill
Bolling	Holifield	Osmers
Brademas	Holland	Patman
Breeding	Holtzman	Perkins
Brewster	Huddleston	Peterson
Brooks, La.	Hull	Pfost
Brooks, Tex.	Ichord, Mo.	Philbin
Buckley	Inouye	Pike
Burke, Ky.	Jennings	Pirnie
Burke, Mass.	Joelsen	Powell
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Calif.	Price
Cahill	Johnson, Md.	Pucinski
Cannon	Johnson, Wis.	Rabaut
Carey	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Celler	Jones, Mo.	Randall
Chelf	Karsten	Reuss
Clark	Karth	Rhodes, Pa.
Coad	Kastenmeier	Rivers, Alaska
Cohelan	Kee	Roberts
Conte	Keith	Rodino
Cook	Kelly	Rogers, Colo.
Cooley	Keogh	Rooney
Corbett	King, Calif.	Roosevelt
Corman	King, Utah	Rostenkowski
Cunningham	Kirwan	Ryan
Daddario	Kluczynski	St. Germain
Daniels	Kornegay	Santangelo
Davis, John W.	Kowalski	Saund
Davis, Tenn.	Landrum	Saylor
Dawson	Lane	Schweiker
Delaney	Lankford	Scranton
Dent	Lesinski	Seely-Brown
Denton	Libonati	Shelley
Diggs	Lindsay	Sheppard
Dingell	Loser	Shipley
Donohue	McCormack	Sibal
Doyle	McDowell	Sisk
Dulski	McFall	Slack
Dwyer	Macdonald	Smith, Iowa
Edmondson	Machrowicz	Spence
Elliott	Mack	Stafford
Evins	Madden	Staggers
Fallon	Magnuson	Stratton
Farbstein	Mailliard	Stubblefield
Fascell	Marshall	Sullivan
Feighan	Martin, Mass.	Taylor
Finnegan	Merrow	Thomas
Fino	Miller, Clem	Thompson, La.
Flood	Miller, George P.	Thompson, N.J.
Flynt	Milliken	Thornberry
Fogarty	Mills	Toll
Fountain	Moeller	Tollefson
Frazier	Monagan	Trimble
Friedel	Montoya	Ullman
Fulton	Moore	Vanik
Gallagher	Moorhead, Pa.	Vinson
Garmatz	Morgan	Wallhauser
Giaimo	Morris	Walter
Gilbert	Morrison	Watts
Glenn	Morse	Whitener
Granahan	Moss	Wickersham
Gray	Moulder	Widnall
Green, Oreg.	Multer	Willis
Green, Pa.	Murphy	Wright
Griffiths	Natcher	Yates
Hagen, Calif.	Nix	Zablocki
Halpern		Zelenko

NAYS—196

Abbitt	Broomfield	Durno
Abernethy	Brown	Ellsworth
Adair	Broyhill	Everett
Alford	Bruce	Fenton
Alger	Burleson	Findley
Andersen, Minn.	Byrnes, Wis.	Fisher
Anderson, Ill.	Casey	Ford
Andrews	Cederberg	Forrester
Arends	Chamberlain	Frelinghuysen
Ashbrook	Chenoweth	Garland
Ashmore	Chiperfield	Gary
Auchincloss	Church	Gathings
Avery	Clancy	Gavin
Ayres	Collier	Goodell
Baker	Colmer	Goodling
Barry	Cramer	Grant
Bass, N.H.	Curtin	Griffin
Battin	Curtis, Mass.	Gross
Becker	Curtis, Mo.	Gubser
Beermann	Dague	Haley
Belcher	Davis, James C.	Hall
Bell	Derounian	Halleck
Berry	Derwinski	Hardy
Betts	Devine	Harris
Blitch	Dole	Harrison, Va.
Bolton	Dominick	Harsha
Bow	Dooley	Harvey, Ind.
Boykin	Dorn	Harvey, Mich.
Bray	Dowdy	Hébert
Bromwell	Downing	Henderson
		Herlong

Hiestand	May	Schwengel
Hoeven	Meader	Scott
Hoffman, Ill.	Michel	Selden
Hoffman, Mich.	Miller, N.Y.	Short
Horan	Minshall	Shriver
Hosmer	Moorehead, Ohio	Sikes
Ikard, Tex.	Mosher	Smith, Calif.
Jarman	Murray	Smith, Miss.
Jensen	Nelsen	Smith, Va.
Johansen	Norblad	Springer
Jonas	Norrell	Steed
Judd	Nygaard	Stephens
Kearns	Ostertag	Taber
Kilburn	Pelly	Teague, Calif.
Kilday	Pilcher	Teague, Tex.
Kilgore	Pillion	Thompson, Tex.
King, N.Y.	Poage	Thomson, Wis.
Kitchin	Poff	Tuck
Knox	Quie	Tupper
Kyl	Ray	Utt
Laird	Reifel	Van Pelt
Langen	Rhodes, Ariz.	Van Zandt
Latta	Riehlman	Weaver
Lennon	Rivers, S.C.	Weis
Lipscomb	Robison	Westland
McCulloch	Rogers, Fla.	Whalley
McDonough	Rogers, Tex.	Wharton
McIntire	Roudebush	Whitten
McMillan	Rousselot	Williams
McVey	Rutherford	Wilson, Calif.
MacGregor	St. George	Wilson, Ind.
Mahon	Schadeberg	Winstead
Martin, Nebr.	Schenck	Young
Mason	Scherer	Younger
Mathias	Schneebeli	
Matthews		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Bonner

NOT VOTING—5

Hagan, Ga.	Passman	Siler
McSween	Riley	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Passman for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Riley with Mr. Siler.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. If he were present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the conference report may revise and extend their remarks and that all other Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. CELLER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 275, Rept. No. 343) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed six hours, three hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, and three hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to title I of the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Public Works, and no amendments shall be in order to title II of the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, which shall be in order notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, but any such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1961

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the bill H.R. 6441, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CRAMER. I am, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAMER moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 6441, to the Committee on Public Works, with instructions to report the same back to the House with the following amendments: One page 6, line 6, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and such subsection (b) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"'If the total of all appropriations, made under authority of this section, for any fiscal year which begins after June 30, 1964, exceed $50,000,000, no grant shall be made for any project from that portion of the appropriation in excess of $50,000,000 which is allocated to any State unless such State shall pay toward the cost of such project an amount equal to the Federal contribution made to such project from such amount in excess of $50,000,000.'"; and on page 7, lines 2 and 3, strike out "$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000", and on line 4, strike out "$1,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$750,000,000"; and on page 8, line 10, after "of" insert "interstate".

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 256, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—165

Abbitt	Downing	Minshall
Adair	Dulski	Moore
Alexander	Durno	Moorehead, Ohio
Alger	Dwyer	Morse
Andersen, Minn.	Ellsworth	Mosher
Anderson, Ill.	Fisher	Nelsen
Arends	Ford	Norblad
Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Nygaard
Ashmore	Garland	Osmers
Auchincloss	Glenn	Ostertag
Avery	Goodell	Pelly
Ayres	Griffin	Pillion
Barry	Gross	Pirnie
Bass, N.H.	Gubser	Poff
Bates	Haley	Quie
Battin	Hall	Ray
Becker	Halleck	Rhodes, Ariz.
Beermann	Harrison, Va.	Riehlman
Belcher	Harrison, Wyo.	Robison
Bell	Harsha	Rogers, Tex.
Berry	Harvey, Ind.	Roudebush
Betts	Harvey, Mich.	Rousselot
Bolton	Hiestand	St. George
Bow	Hoeven	Schadeberg
Bray	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Bromwell	Hoffman, Mich.	Scherer
Brooks, La.	Horan	Schneebeli
Brown	Hosmer	Schweiker
Broyhill	Jensen	Schwengel
Bruce	Johansen	Scranton
Burleson	Jonas	Short
Byrnes, Wis.	Judd	Shriver
Cahill	Keith	Sibal
Cederberg	Kilburn	Smith, Calif.
Chamberlain	King, N.Y.	Smith, Va.
Chenoweth	Kitchin	Springer
Chiperfield	Knox	Taber
Church	Laird	Teague, Calif.
Clancy	Langen	Teague, Tex.
Collier	Latta	Thomson, Wis.
Colmer	Lindsay	Tollefson
Cramer	Lipscomb	Tuck
Cunningham	McCulloch	Utt
Curtis, Mass.	McDonough	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mo.	McIntire	Wallhauser
Dague	McVey	Weaver
Davis, James C.	MacGregor	Weis
Derounian	Mailliard	Westland
Derwinski	Martin, Mass.	Whalley
Devine	Martin, Nebr.	Whitener
Dole	Mason	Widnall
Dominick	Mathias	Williams
Dorn	May	Wilson, Calif.
Dowdy	Meader	Wilson, Ind.
	Michel	Younger
	Miller, N.Y.	

NAYS—256

Abernethy	Boland	Cooley
Addabbo	Bolling	Corbett
Addonizio	Bonner	Corman
Albert	Boykin	Curtin
Alford	Brademas	Daddario
Andrews	Breeding	Daniels
Anfuso	Brewster	Davis, John W.
Ashley	Brooks, Tex.	Davis, Tenn.
Aspinall	Buckley	Dawson
Bailey	Burke, Ky.	Delaney
Baker	Burke, Mass.	Dent
Baldwin	Byrne, Pa.	Denton
Baring	Cannon	Diggs
Barrett	Carey	Dingell
Bass, Tenn.	Casey	Donohue
Beckworth	Chelf	Dooley
Bennett, Fla.	Clark	Doyle
Bennett, Mich.	Coad	Edmondson
Blatnik	Cohelan	Elliott
Blitch	Conte	Everett
Boggs	Cook	Evins

Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gilbert
Goodling
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hansen
Harding
Hardy
Harris
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Holtzman
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Ikard, Tex.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kyl
Landrum
Lane
Lankford
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Loser
McCormack
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald
Mack
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Matthews
Merrow
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Milliken
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill
Patman
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Rabaut
Rains
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Rutherford
Ryan
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Scott
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Toll
Trimble
Tupper
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Walter
Watts
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Willis
Winstead
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—11

Broomfield
Celler
Findley
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Kearns
McSween
Machrowicz
Passman
Riley
Siler

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs.

Mr. McSween with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Findley.

Mr. McDONOUGH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 308, nays 110, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—308

Abernethy
Addabbo
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alford
Andersen, Minn.
Andrews
Anfuso
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Baring
Barrett
Barry
Bass, N.H.
Bass, Tenn.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bonner
Boykin
Brademas
Bray
Breeding
Brewster
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Cannon
Carey
Chamberlain
Chelf
Chenoweth
Clark
Coad
Cohelan
Conte
Cook
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, John W.
Davis, Tenn.
Dawson
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Downing
Doyle
Durno
Dwyer
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Everett
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Finnegan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton
Gallagher
Garland
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Giaimo
Gilbert
Glenn
Goodling
Granahan
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Griffiths
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halpern
Hansen
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Wyo.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Healey
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Holland
Holtzman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Ichord, Mo.
Ikard, Tex.
Inouye
Jarman
Jennings
Joelsen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Md.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
Kilday
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Knox
Kornegay
Kowalski
Kyl
Landrum
Lane
Langen
Lankford
Latta
Lennon
Lesinski
Libonati
Lindsay
Loser
McCormack
McDowell
McFall
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mack
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matthews
May
Merrow
Miller, Clem
Miller, George P.
Milliken
Mills
Minshall
Moeller
Monagan
Montoya
Moore
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Mosher
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murphy
Natcher
Nelsen
Nix
Norblad
Norrell
Nygaard
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N.Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill
Ostertag
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Peterson
Pfost
Philbin
Pike
Pilcher
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Rabaut
Rains
Randall
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Rutherford
Ryan
St. Germain
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Schweiker
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Shriver
Sibal
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taylor
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Thornberry
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Tupper
Ullman
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Walter
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Willis
Wright
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—110

Abbitt
Adair
Alger
Anderson, Ill.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Avery
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Becker
Beermann
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bromwell
Brown
Broyhill
Bruce
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Cederberg
Chiperfield
Church
Clancy
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davis, James C.
Derounian
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Dulski
Fisher
Ford
Goodell
Gross
Gubser
Halleck
Harrison, Va.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Bow
Hemphill
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Judd
Keith
Kilburn
Kilgore
King, N.Y.
Kitchin
Laird
Lipscomb
McCulloch
McDonough
McIntire
Martin, Nebr.
Meader
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Moorehead, Ohio
Murray
Osmers
Pillion
Poff
Ray
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rousselot
St. George
Schadeberg
Schenck
Scherer
Schneebeli
Schwengel
Short
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Taber
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tuck
Utt
Van Pelt
Weaver
Westland
Whitener
Williams
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Younger

NOT VOTING—14

Broomfield
Celler
Findley
Grant
Green, Pa.
Hagan, Ga.
Harding
Kearns
McSween
Machrowicz
Mason
Passman
Riley
Siler

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. McSween with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Siler.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Findley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 6441.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE FIRST HUNDRED DAYS OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, there has been much comment this week on the history of the Kennedy administration, and its critics are far more glib in reviewing its hundred days than in discussing the 8 weeks which preceded them.

A variety of interesting comparisons could be made, but I shall draw just one contrast between the hundred days and

the 8 years—and do it in the field of agriculture.

After 8 years of talk about problems and no action on solutions—after 8 years of administrative veto response to the promise of progress through the Congress—we have in less than a hundred days witnessed dynamic, positive movement toward supply adjustment and income improvement in agriculture.

We have seen farmer-administration of farm programs, dormant for many years, reactivated.

We have seen floors raised under farm prices.

We have seen farmer apathy replaced by farmer interest as meetings on the feed-grains program drew audiences numbering high in the hundreds and producers stood in long lines to sign up for program participation. In that connection I would point out that farmers do not turn out for meetings or stand in line to be regimented—not American farmers.

We have seen the President and his Secretary of Agriculture submit to the Congress a comprehensive program that will make possible an all-out attack on the total farm problem and at the same time guard the interests of consumers at home and abroad.

We have an administration that spotlights agriculture as a national asset rather than a burdensome taxpayer responsibility.

The first hundred days have been good days for American agriculture—days of appreciation, days of action and days of constructive results. Measuring them against the preceding years, it is highly doubtful that any farmer would want to turn backward and retrace the path.

POLAND AND ITS CONSTITUTION

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, to the people of Poland and Polish communities throughout the world, this day, May 3, holds sacred significance. It was on this day, 170 years ago, that the Polish Diet adopted one of the first European constitutions providing a democratic form of government.

Inspired by the historic ideals of a people that have fought for their freedom throughout the centuries, this Constitution brought economic, social, and political reforms that were destined to make Poland one of the bastions of democracy in the east of Europe. Into this Constitution, adopted only 4 years after the ratification of our own Constitution of the United States, were woven strong threads of humanitarianism, tolerance, religious freedom, individual liberty, and justice, forming a fabric bound to endure the ravages of tyranny and oppression.

Time, alas, was not given to the Polish people to bring to fruition the seeds of freedom implanted by their Constitution. As early as 1795, the nation suffered its third partition and its people again fell under the yoke of bondage. Not again until 1918 did the Polish state rejoin the family of free nations. And the following 20 years brought advances in economic, cultural, educational, and social endeavors that won the admiration of the world. The cause of freedom everywhere was enhanced by the contributions of the Polish nation.

Once again these valiant people fell victim to invasion and partition. The world will not quickly forget that September day—September 17 in 1939—when alien forces once more marched into Poland and sparked the flame that plunged the world into war. The resultant dissolution of the Polish state and the partition of its territories brought about the Moscow-dominated government and dictatorship which today has stifled the political freedom, but not the hope of the Polish people.

So today, we pay tribute to their strength and courage—the strength and courage of a people whose passion for freedom continues to burn brightly in their hearts. It is difficult indeed to recall any nation that has fought more consistently and more valiantly for the freedom of man. We look forward eagerly to the day when the Polish people shall again be free and walk among us as citizens of a free world. We express the hope that the ideals and principles set forth in the Constitution of 1791 will soon again be the law of that great land.

In paying merited tribute, we hail also that vast segment of our own population, Polish in origin, dedicated at all times to the highest standards and concepts of our own great Republic. Significant and major has been the part that our Polish-Americans have played in the building of this Nation and in the strengthening and protection of our freedoms. We appropriately, on this May 3, join with our Polish brethren in rededication of ourselves to the great cause of freedom and in reaffirmation of our unbreakable ties with those all over the world who refuse to abandon that cause.

RECESSION PROBLEMS AND THE FIRST HUNDRED DAYS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, when the 87th Congress convened, Republican Members of this body came to Washington greatly concerned with recession problems, with chronic depressed areas and their needs, and with the problems of slums and blighted areas in our cities, along with the slump in housing construction. We agreed with the September 2 text from Manchester, N.H., in which candidate Kennedy stated that "The Federal Government cannot do for us what we must do for ourselves, but it can set the atmosphere in which our economy can be revitalized." We agreed with his observations in Scranton, Pa., on October 28 that all agencies should give priority to the needs of depressed areas. And we were especially pleased at his views as expressed in Roanoke, Va., on November 4, that "we must work to increase our productivity, our national wealth and our national strength through sound economic policies" and that, insofar as the dollar is concerned, "we will defend its value and its soundness."

I frankly expected that recession, or cyclical unemployment would be handled in a sound manner and that temporary additional unemployment benefits and legislation to make children of unemployed parents eligible for assistance under the aid to dependent children program would be enacted speedily and effectively. After some hesitation when the administration bill contained a controversial provision raising the unemployment tax wage base from $3,000 to $4,800, the Republican policy committee became the first official body in Congress to support the special temporary extension program on February 21, 1961. We urged that the program be financed by temporary increases in the tax rate, and this was done when the House Ways and Means Committee reported the bill. Eighty-five percent of the Republicans in this body supported this bill on final passage, March 1. Twenty-nine of thirty-one Republican Members of the other body voted for final passage 2 weeks later. Meanwhile, by voice vote the House passed H.R. 4884 to temporarily permit States to use matching Federal grants to aid children of the needy unemployed. A big step had been taken toward the provision of needed benefits to help get the economy back on its feet again. I note with pleasure the fact that all economists seem fairly well agreed at this time that the Nation has reached and perhaps emerged from the bottom of the cyclical pattern.

Our cooperation on antirecession matters could well have continued into depressed area legislation if the administration had made a reasonable effort to support sound legislation similar to that proposed by President Eisenhower in the past. As a matter of fact, the chronically depressed areas of this Nation could have received aid some time ago, if the Democrat-controlled Congress had supported the Eisenhower program so that the wage earners of this country could have received a $1.15 per hour minimum wage in 1960 instead of 1961. This could have taken place if then Senator Kennedy had agreed to accept last year's House-passed bill.

Be that as it may, the House Banking and Currency Committee finally reported a bill which had many improvements over past reported legislation in this area. I commend the committee for supporting this year such Republican programs as antipirating provisions, retraining and financing by regular appropriations rather than by back-door financing—all Republican-sponsored policies in the past. However, other Republican members of the committee and I were greatly concerned over several features of the bill.

The Members of this body are by now more than familiar with my objections to "shotgun" rural area loans, public

facility grants, and the discretion given to the Secretary of Commerce in designating redevelopment areas. My substitute would have authorized $150 million in industrial area plant loans instead of $100 million, and would have more than doubled the inadequate grants for vocational retraining. However, this substitute was not adopted, nor was any consideration given to utilizing the device of accelerated tax amortization to promote plant construction in depressed areas. A bad bill passed this body, and a worse one passed the other body. I do not believe the resultant law will solve the problem of depressed areas or even make much of a helpful impact.

Many have asked why rural areas were eliminated from my bill rather than leave the full provision in to angle for rural southern votes. The answer is simple—we prepared a bill which would have worked and which would have eliminated most of the deficiencies of the committee bill. It would have set up a sensible study on how to best develop a workable program for rural areas rather than setting up a rural loan fund used as a $100 million bribe and boondoggle in that no one knows where it is going to be used. We were right, and, therefore, we followed through in an attempt to convince other Members of this body.

Perhaps as Reverend Smith used to say, "Minorities are almost always in the right," but, on the other hand, we are hopeful that the statement "Heaven still guards the right" might prove equally true before too many more measures such as this are enacted.

Meanwhile, as a portent of things to come, President Kennedy sent to Congress his message on housing and community development on March 9. Unnoticed by some in the deluge of papers, task force reports, special messages, and just plain messages from the White House, several danger spots reared their ugly heads and will bear close watching during the hearings and debate on the administration housing program.

The recommendation for a no down-payment, 40-year mortgage loan program to be insured by the FHA seems to lead to an era where depreciation will outrun the amount of equity of the home buyer. Some have criticized the possible debasement of the FHA if they must supervise and process direct Government lending programs which the President proposes. A recommendation for more public housing units is sure to be questioned strongly by many Members of this body, while I would hope that the burden of proof would be put on administration witnesses as to the need for a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Affairs. Proposals to increase the direct-loan authorization for elderly housing from $50 million to $100 million, while admirable in purpose, should be judged in relation to the fact that of the current authorization, only about $20 million has actually been borrowed by nonprofit organizations to finance housing units for the aged.

This is not to say that there is no merit in the President's housing recommendations. But I only hope that any resulting legislation to reach the floor of this body does not weaken existing sound programs, impose administrative rigidity, increase authorizations needlessly, nor inaugurate new programs without adequate consideration.

There has been a misty haze over the first 100 days, primarily because of the differences between the task force reports, the recommendations of the President, the so-called administration programs, and the final determination by the administration as to direction. The blurred picture presented is illustrated by the depressed areas bill. Everyone understood and it was proclaimed to the United States that the new administration was for sound financing by the regular appropriation process. The picture was painted, the appeal of soundness and fiscal responsibility acclaimed by the citizens of the United States, and then what happened? In conference that fiscal responsibility was torpedoed by a switch in position by the administration.

One wants to believe that a recommendation by the administration is a conviction on the part of that administration and fully supported by it. What happened in this instance seems to have been a well calculated plan to obtain public acclaim for a soundly financed program but with an ultimate objective of obtaining power to circumvent the Congress in such a way that the public would not realize the change of position.

The past week I read a statement on the depressed areas bill in the Washington Post under date of April 27, 1961, that stated "the Senate version was backed by the administration to keep the program out of the hands of the conservative House Appropriations Committee and this was the way the bill finally passed." It was then inferred that all who voted otherwise were against aid to depressed areas.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The only way that Congress could express itself as to fiscal responsibility was to vote up or down the conference report. The American public should know and is entitled to know that the original administration bill, H.R. 4569, was changed by direct command from the White House. This example of sleight-of-hand change, it is hoped, will not emerge as a pattern for the future. There must be mutual confidence between the legislative bodies and the Executive Office. If we are to legislate intelligently with the welfare of all the American people at heart, we, as Members of the Congress, are entitled to know the true position of the administration.

On April 27, 1961, the President issued a special message to the Congress of the United States on conflicts of interest. In this statement he said:

> Of course, public officials are not a group apart. They inevitably reflect the moral tone of the society in which they live. And if that moral tone is injured—by fixed athletic contests or television quiz shows—by widespread business conspiracies to fix prices—by the collusion of businessmen and unions with organized crime—by cheating on expense accounts by the ignoring of traffic laws or by petty tax evasion—then the conduct of our Government must be affected. Inevitably the moral standards of a society influence the conduct of all who live within it—the governed and those who govern.

This certainly applies, I would hope and believe, to relations with the Congress and also to political elections.

This all-too-rapid review of the first 100 days has been limited to the specific area of housing depressed areas, and emergency antirecession measures. However, it indicates Republican cooperation where such cooperation has been warranted. It also, unfortunately, indicates that some of the programs of the New Frontier have violated the very traditions of the American frontier—that of individual initiative and enterprise pressing onward with freedom and opportunity. Restrictions and unsound provisions in several of the administrative programs as applied to the "Old Frontier" would have meant that Daniel Boone, Davy Crockett and all the rest would have been so hamstrung by the restrictions of Government that they might never have been allowed to cross the Appalachians or even "kill them a b'ar" without authorization from a Government agency.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to discuss the Kennedy administration's fiscal policy based on its record during the first 100 days.

I attach to our economic situation the same importance as I do to defense and national security. The fiscal health of America is vital to the survival of our free way of life against communism. As such, it transcends partisanship and my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, will be entirely objective.

Like other Americans, during the last presidential campaign I listened to the candidates and read the platforms. When Mr. Nixon said, for example, that the Democratic promises in the Los Angeles convention platform would cost $13 to $16 billion, it worried me. I firmly believe the Nation must live within its income and that leaving payment of all these spending programs to future generations is wrong.

Frankly, however, I was somewhat reassured by statements of candidate Kennedy on fiscal policy, such as he made in my own home city of Seattle in September. I was worried about certain massive spending proposals, but it was reassuring when Mr. Kennedy told a meeting of my fellow citizens that it is important that the United States maintain "to the extent possible, a sound fiscal policy."

Again, a short while later in Roanoke, Va., candidate Kennedy spoke in the same vein; and I was impressed also with the statement wherein he promised that "we will seek a balanced budget over the

years of our administration—seeking a budget surplus as a brake on inflation in times of prosperity." He referred to his party as committed to a sound fiscal policy.

Along with all Americans, even though I am of the opposite political party, I believed we had a right to expect under Jack Kennedy an administration dedicated to maintaining the value of the dollar and promoting fiscal responsibility for us and our grandchildren.

On November 8 the American people saw fit to accept candidate Kennedy's solemn assurances, especially so with a Congress heavily weighted with Democrats, to carry out his policies and programs.

On January 30 the new President, it seemed to me, reaffirmed his adherence to sound fiscal policy in his state of the Union message. This was the more encouraging after the ringing inaugural words of admonishment:

> My fellow citizens, ask not what your Govment can do for you. Ask what you can do for your Government.

I thought this was a meaningful appeal to the people to forgo more services and benefits in light of the overall picture—the flight of gold, the drop in financial revenue, and defense needs. I looked for an end to budget busting and a firm and responsible fiscal policy which had been promised the American people.

On the heels of Kennedy's ringing inaugural challenge to his fellow citizens came a further indication of restraint. This was the release of a report, prepared for President Kennedy, which evaluated current economic and financial matters. Three distinguished citizens—Allan Sproul, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Dr. Roy Blough, of Columbia University; and Dr. Paul W. McCracken, of the University of Michigan—made recommendations for domestic economic policy which strongly opposed Government spending to create prosperity. This is the way it read:

> Even in a recession the Government should continue to make its decisions about expenditure programs on the basis of the ongoing needs of the Nation for public services and facilities. It should not try to step up Federal spending, which does not meet this test, in order to counter the recession. Countering a mild and short recession by emergency public spending does not work well in practice.

Would the leader of the New Frontier follow such advice?

Like all Americans concerned with fiscal policy, I watched and wondered and waited. I was eager to discover if the new administration was going to try to fulfill the sweeping promises of the Democratic platform Kennedy espoused before November 8, or if people would indeed be called on to make sacrifices and forgo some benefits as was voiced on January 20.

President Eisenhower had told us the Nation was in an economic transition and would readjust itself. And, as attested by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, Economic Adviser Walter Heller, Director of the Budget David Bell, and even Leon Keyserling—all on separate occasions—the economic picture had begun to show improvement. I was encouraged. The pressures for an all-out massive spending recession attack were lessening. The President could exert leadership and offer the Nation a fiscally solvent program in line with his campaign assurances.

Then, in separate messages to Congress, March 24 and March 28, the President spelled out—vaguely at times—the broad outlines of his fiscal program.

In presenting his non-defense-budget revisions March 24, President Kennedy pointed to overestimated revenues for fiscal 1961 and widespread unemployment. He said that the previous administration unrealistically assumed that Congress would raise postal rates. These were factors which prompted an estimated budget deficit of $2.2 billion for fiscal 1961, instead of the Eisenhower projected surplus. However, without shame, President Kennedy went on to fiscal year 1962, making the same unrealistic assumption himself about postal rate increases. He added $5.1 billion in new obligational authority to President Eisenhower's estimates, and came up with an even larger budget deficit of $2.8 billion for that fiscal year.

All the while, any drop in tax receipts would not be Kennedy's own responsibility, but he wanted credit for at least $900 million in new revenue which he hopes may be raised by his new programs. It was a self-serving, purely politically inspired attitude.

Painful as it is for me to say so, I feel the President could not have made a worse start. It augers poorly for the future. This was the time and the place for forthright fiscal responsibility—a balance between outgo and income. Instead, he sought refuge in a previous miscalculation. He sought refuge also in removing increased defense spending from his budget calculation. He shifted the blame. Therein was the tipoff of what was to follow, an attempt to cover up deliberate deficit spending, abandonment of fiscal integrity by the New Frontier.

Another device used by President Kennedy, of which I am highly critical, has been his plan to postpone the step-up of special taxes. For example, the $1 billion in benefits over the next 15 months in unemployment compensation will start at once. But, the increase in payroll taxes—borne by the employers to finance these benefits, as recommended by Kennedy—would not begin until 1963.

The increase in social security benefits, at a cost of $1 billion a year, was similarly treated. The increase in payroll taxes to meet the cost would not start until January 1, 1963, under his plan.

The same was true of the President's medicare bill proposal—a delay in imposing its cost on the taxpayers until 1963.

It may be good politics to delay the increased tax burden until after the congressional elections next year. But, to me, it is irresponsible from a fiscal point of view.

The evasive approach has continued in message after message. Proposal after proposal has outlined needs and problems, but has been without price tag or without explanation of the overall relationship of cost to available revenue.

And, speaking of cost, what is the cost?

Taking the Kennedy administration forecasts, this will be the situation for fiscal 1961 and 1962—for the present fiscal year, spending will total $80,690 million, while the income will be $78,520 million, leaving a deficit of $2,170 million.

For the next fiscal year, spending is projected at $84,260 million, with income at $81,430 million, resulting in a deficit of $2,830 million.

So, $5 billion will be added to the burden of debt to be visited on future generations.

But no one—neither President Kennedy nor Director of the Bureau of the Budget David Bell, nor anyone—could possibly tell the total cost of the built-in mandatory increases of the Kennedy proposals. The new farm recommendation is a sort of multi-billion-dollar blank check to certain farm groups. It is impossible to attach any accurate price tag to it. Actual budget revisions which were spelled out reveal the immensity of proposed increased spending.

President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message of January 30, 1961, stated:

> Barring the development of urgent national defense needs or a worsening economy, it is my current intention to advocate a program of expenditures which, including revenues from a stimulation of the economy, will not of and by themselves unbalance the earlier (Eisenhower) budget.

On March 24, the President sent his non-defense-budget message to the Congress; and 4 days later he sent his budget message for defense.

When the Kennedy spending proposals are compared with those in the Eisenhower budget, a marked increase in proposed spending is apparent. The following contrasts the Eisenhower budget with the Kennedy budget in terms of new obligational authority or authority for the Government to commit itself to future payments:

New obligational authority

[In billions]

	1961	1962
Kennedy proposals	$87.1	$86.0
Eisenhower budget	82.1	80.9
Increase	5.0	5.1

The added expenditures for the 2 years—$5.3 billion—represent slightly more than half of the added obligational authority—$10.1 billion—requested for the same 2 years. Thus, the additional authority that Kennedy now seeks would enable him to spend—aside from the $5.3 billion in 1961 and 1962—an extra $4.8 billion in 1963 or thereafter.

In his March 24 budget message, President Kennedy set forth one of his basic fiscal policies:

> The Federal budget should, apart from any threat to national security, be in balance over the years of the business cycle, running a deficit in years of recession when revenues decline and the economy needs the stimulus of additional expenditures, and running a

surplus in years of prosperity, thus curbing inflation, reducing the public debt, and freeing funds for private investment.

This is an often heard—and often criticized—approach to fiscal policy.

For example, Columnist Henry Hazlitt, in the February 20 issue of Newsweek, pointed out:

> The political advantage of this system is that no one can ever hold you to account, because no one knows when an economic cycle has begun or ended, or just where we are in it, or when employment is ever high enough to take the terrible risk of balancing or overbalancing the budget. We have already had 24 budget deficits in the last 30 years. The record will become even worse if we adopt the indeterminate cyclical-balance theory as official doctrine.

If one penetrates a masterful Madison Avenue image of false-front fiscal respectability, the total becomes a huge proposed spending adventure built in over the ensuing years. This is hardly consistent with preelection statements, or his inaugural call to the citizenry for sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, how can the United States ever balance its budget, be it good times or bad, when President Kennedy has already added $10.1 billion in new obligational authority to President Eisenhower's estimates in just 2 fiscal years, one of which is almost over? How can the United States ever balance its budget, in good times or in bad, when, in the first 100 days of an administration, we find that housing spending for fiscal year 1962 is increased by $214 million; welfare spending is increased by $215 million; education spending is increased by $500 million; labor spending is increased by $431 million—all in one fiscal year, 1962?

While some of the increases in nondefense spending may be necessary, I ask this body to scrutinize most carefully spending measures which lead directly to a national debt figure of $290 billion at the end of fiscal 1962. President Eisenhower's estimate was $283.4 at the same time.

An extra $6.6 billion is thereby passed on to future generations. There is an automatic built-in addition of an additional $200 million annually in interest on this growing national debt. No end is in sight as projected education, housing, and welfare programs will automatically increase in years to come. My colleagues will examine specific administration programs in these fields. I am merely calling the attention of this body to the true picture of so-called fiscal responsibility.

In foreign aid, my fingers have been crossed, lest through an economy weakened by excess spending we lose the very freedom we have sought to protect. I have had added misgivings about the stability of our dollar and the gold scare. But I have counted on the existence of one overall House committee to weigh the urgency and need of foreign aid against the available revenue and the overall fiscal welfare of the country.

Imagine, then, my feelings when President Kennedy requested in addition to a regular $4 billion in foreign aid an extra $7.3 billion outside of the appropriation process. In other words, he sought the money through back-door spending. This would authorize borrowing from the Treasury so the money could be spent without the control or scrutiny of the Committee on Appropriations.

There are many meritorious proposals for economy and ways of holding down the national debt. But until the back door of the Treasury is locked there is no hope of fiscal responsibility. A committee must oversee and be responsible for balanced budgets and holding the line on spending.

Back-door spending is the way special pressure groups get what they want. It is like the head of the family setting up one bank account and letting every member of the family, including Johnny who wants a new car, and Jane who has a taste for fancy clothes and a new fur coat, draw checks against the account.

All father can do is borrow and cover the regular deficits. With Uncle Sam, it has been like that.

In the last 30 years, the United States has only paid its way six times. We have increased the debt 24 times, mostly on account of back-door spending.

Commonsense should tell us that deficits in bad years should be made up by surpluses in good years. But do some economists who teach at Harvard have that kind of commonsense? The President is not programing that way.

The administration opposes the annual review and overall scrutiny of channeling all spending bills through one committee. In two recommendations alone, and in foreign aid and in the administration housing proposal, approximately $15 billion in back-door spending is included. These programs would be blank checks for future years' expenditures, without regard to conditions in the world, or any test of the desirability of continuing programs after their usefulness had ceased. We hear another $7 billion giveaway of surplus crops is planned outside the appropriation procedure.

The administration has supposedly advocated fuller discussion of controversial issues. But it has packed the Rules Committee with three additional members, to assure absolute administration control over House legislation. This same Rules Committee, despite platform promises to restore fiscal responsibility, and with knowledge of our problems of inflation and the flight of gold abroad due to a lack of confidence in the financial affairs of our country, recently rejected by an 8-to-6 vote House Resolution 115. This resolution was designed to curb budget busting, to hold down the level of the national debt, and to provide for constitutional congressional control over Federal expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, more than 120 Members of this body signed a letter in opposition to so-called back-door spending. Yet my resolution to curb it was not brought before the House for debate. Some 16 insertions and remarks in the RECORD already this year have brought out the facts on this issue. Startling figures show that Congress increased the President's budget requests for public debt transactions and contract authorities by $149 million in 1958, $221 million in 1959, and $997 million in 1960. I would hesitate to predict the final figure for 1961.

Rule XXI(4) of the Rules of the House states that no bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations can be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor can an amendment proposing an appropriation be held in order during consideration of a bill or joint resolution which has been reported by a committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations.

However, the House has passed legislation authorizing various Government agencies to borrow funds from the Treasury and to spend these borrowed funds without the called-for Appropriations Committee approval. This is back-door spending at its insidious worst. Without discussion and possibility of remedial legislation, blame for unbalanced budgets can hardly be assessed unless control is vested in any governmental branch or body.

On February 13 of this year I inserted in the Appendix of the daily RECORD a table listing the back-door bills enacted in the past 3 years. The total money involved—over $1⅓ billion—is striking, as is the diversity of programs encompassed. Many of the bills originated in the other body, despite constitutional prerogatives and responsibilities of the House to originate bills withdrawing money from the Treasury.

There is no doubt that a legislative enactment permitting money to be drawn from the Treasury is an appropriation. Unless this problem is recognized, and rectified, there is no sense working for other items of legislation promoting fiscal responsibility, be they authorization of the use of the item veto, gradual reduction of the public debt, or any other. Fiscal integrity begins at home, and no homeowner padlocks his front gate only to leave his back door open to all comers with his life savings in plain view on the kitchen table. We in Congress do this, however. It must be stopped.

In summary, the first 100 days has seen an expansion of Government expenditures not only in the recession fiscal year from which we are now emerging, but in years to come. The first 100 days has seen a continuation of back-door spending and even a refusal to bring remedial legislation to the floor for debate.

I, for one, am tired of unbalanced budgets. I am sick of Congress abdicating its responsibility to exercise independent judgment apart from the executive branch of Government. Back-door spending eats away at the value of the dollar. It has increased the national debt $107 billion. I want no more temporary extensions of the debt limit. The time has come to take a firm stand for fiscal integrity in the wake of the backwash of the first 100 days.

From the first 100 days one thing is clear: The New Frontier has supported fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget in name only and all the while has asked for programs to cost billions.

Our fellow citizens can do something for their Government. They can call on their President not to seek to do so much for so many, but rather to give us all a fiscal policy against inflation and one that we, not our grandchildren, will pay for.

In the face of preelection assurances of sound fiscal policies the first 100 days indicate that we face the greatest Government spending orgy in history, with less congressional control. It is a sorry prospect for the disillusioned taxpayers and future generations of America.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a tabulation of the first 100 days of the Kennedy spending proposals which reveals not what the citizens can do for their country, but rather what the Government is asking to do for President Kennedy's fellow citizens and the direction and manner in which our President is keeping his preelection pledge to seek a balanced budget over the years of his administration:

COST OF THE PRESIDENT'S NEW SPENDING PROPOSALS

(As obtained from "Federal Spending Facts" issued by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce)

President Kennedy has sent to Congress a number of messages calling for enactment of legislation to authorize new spending programs and to extend and expand existing programs. In several instances the message spelled out the dollar spending authorizations requested, but in some others the message was vague or noncommittal. In most of the latter cases, cost figures became available upon introduction of the proposed legislation or in congressional hearings. Up to the present time, however, a compilation of the overall cost of these new spending programs has not been made available to the public or to the Congress, and may not even have been prepared by official sources. To fill this informational need, the following analysis has been prepared from currently available cost data.

With a few exceptions, the President's proposals call for authorization of specific or approximate dollar amounts to conduct the programs over stated or implied periods of time. The time periods range from 15 months for the temporary unemployment compensation program to 40 years over which subsidies would be paid on new public housing construction. In view of the different periods for which the various program authorizations are being sought, it would not be very meaningful merely to add up the total costs of each program. Moreover, in a few instances the proposals do not set a time limit to the programs and, consequently, there can be no estimate of total cost.

SUMMARY

The table below shows in summary form the cost estimates discussed hereinbefore.

[In millions]

	Estimated cost, fiscal year 1961	Estimated cost, fiscal year 1962	Average annual cost next few years	Probable annual cost by 5th year
Temporary programs:				
Unemployment compensation [1]	$550	$440		
Aid to dependent children	28	215		
Feed grains program		[2] 125	$125	
Subtotal	578	780	125	
New perennial programs:				
Aid to depressed areas		40	125	0–$500
Aid to public schools		500	750	1,000–2,000
College scholarships		21	125	190
Medical facilities and scholarships		9	80	100
College facilities loans			250	350
Youth Conservation Corps		60	300	400
General farm program			(?)	(?)
Subtotal		630	1,630	2,040–3,540
Extension and expansion of existing programs:				
College housing loans		45	250	250
Urban renewal grants		54	400	600
FNMA and other housing		50	400	500
Public housing (100,000 units)			40	80
Veterans compensation		65	65	60
Veterans housing		30	225	180
Water pollution control		12	50	50
Subtotal		256	1,430	1,690
Total, budget expenditures	578	1,666	3,185	3,730–5,230
Payroll-tax-financed programs:				
Social security liberalizations		1,100	1,200	1,300
Medical care for aged			1,400	1,500
Total, all expenditures	578	2,766	5,785	6,530–8,030

[1] Budget Bureau estimates. According to Labor Department estimates these amounts overstate 1961 expenditures by $160,000,000 and understate 1962 by same amount.

[2] It is assumed that the budget impact of the $500,000,000 feed grains program cost will be spread over the next 4 years.

The above table indicates that if all of the spending measures discussed in this analysis are approved by Congress, budget expenditures will be increased by $578 million in fiscal 1961 and by about $1.7 billion in 1962. More importantly, the budget cost of these programs will rise substantially after 1962. It will average about $3.2 billion annually for the next few years and probably total between $3.7 billion and $5.2 billion by fiscal 1966. And these estimates assume no future liberalization of any of the programs for which authorizations of 5 years or more have been proposed. The only probable liberalizations taken into account in the 1966 expenditure projections are in connection with extension of the proposed 3-year public school aid program and aid to depressed areas.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the research director of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce says adoption of all the spending measures proposed by President Kennedy would make a $90 billion budget a certainty by fiscal 1965 and a possibility by 1964.

Obviously, such a budget trend of the first 100 days offers no prospect of relief from repressive taxes.

Finally, let me finish by saying, Mr. Speaker, that my remarks today regarding the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration can be summed up very simply. Last fall when I ran for reelection, I told my constituents that the Republicans believed the least government was the best government. I told my constituents that the election of Senator Kennedy and the Democratic Party meant bigger government, more government, more regimentation, more spending, and the continuation of the philosophy of centralization of power in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, the record of the first 100 days makes me an honest man. It is a clear indication that what I said is coming to pass. Major new programs and proposals and subsidies are additions to centralization of power for the New Frontier for proposed expenditures which over 11 fiscal years, from 1962 to 1972, will build in some $36 billion of new expenditures. This figure does not include the proposed new farm bill, which certainly will add substantially to this figure, nor any future extensions or additions to existing programs.

And in addition to this vast increase in Federal bureaucracy and big government, there is one other threat to our free way of life which I had not foreseen; namely, as we have seen during the past 100 days, the increase in backdoor spending by which the legislative branch is abdicating its responsibility to control and scrutinize spending programs and has handed it over to the President and the executive agencies.

These two trends constitute a threat to our economic stability and our entire constitutional system.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the American people will see what is going on and in their wisdom and on the basis of facts, return the control of this House in 1962 to a political party that stands for the exercise of judgment and responsibility by the representatives of the taxpayers of this great Nation.

Estimated costs of Kennedy proposals over entire life of programs

	Millions of dollars
Education	4,626
Housing	7,173
Highway	11,550
Distressed area	389
Extended unemployment	950
Aid to the children of unemployed	305
Medical care to aged	5,250
Social security changes	5,050
Emergency feed grains	500
Defense	1,900
Total	37,693
New farm bill	(?)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the question of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]

who used the figure of $36 billion as the amount of new expenditures over the next 11 fiscal years proposed thus far by the administration. I wonder if the gentleman could summarize these proposals for the record.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the estimated cost of the various Kennedy proposals over the entire life of those programs has been worked out on this basis. The education program would cost $4,626 million. The housing program over its entire life would amount to $7,173 million. The highway program would amount to $11,550 million. The distressed areas bill, which we passed, was originally proposed to cost $389 million. The extended unemployment bill, which we passed, would cost $950 million. The aid to children of unemployed, which we passed, would cost $305 million.

The medical care for the aged, which was proposed by the administration, would cost an extra $5,250 million. Social security changes as proposed would cost $5,050 million and then the legislation of the emergency feed-grains bill was estimated to cost $500 million. The request for additional defense was, I believe, $1,900 million. I think, if my arithmetic is correct, that would add up to something like $37 billion-plus and it does not include, of course, the cost of the new farm bill which is almost impossible to estimate.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I read an article by Roscoe Drummond in which he discussed the apparent attempt on the part of the administration to blame the projected deficits in 1961 and 1962 on Eisenhower miscalculations. Has the gentleman read that article?

Mr. PELLY. I did read that article. Of course, I believe that anyone who reads my remarks, as I hope many will tomorrow in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will find that the President himself greatly increased the cost of those budgets and that certainly the blame for the deficits for those 2 years should not be put on the back of the Eisenhower administration as so-called miscalculations of income.

We, of course, always have to estimate the amount of income, but there are other built-in costs which will also greatly increase the budget deficits for those 2 years.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Washington for what I consider to be a very worthwhile effort and for giving information to the House and the country which the country and the House both need. I hope there will be more talks by Members on both sides of the aisle on this very important subject of what we are doing and where we are going. I compliment the gentleman very highly.

Mr. WIDNALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIDNALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman on taking this time and putting this material together. I think it is information in which everyone is interested and which everyone should have.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF WEEK

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the acting majority leader as to the program for tomorrow?

Mr. BOLLING. The program for tomorrow is the joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency, the President of the Republic of Tunisia, to be followed by the consideration of the conference report on S. 912, the additional judgeships bill, and then the bill H.R. 6713, the proposed Federal-aid highway program of 1961.

Mr. SHORT. May I inquire further about the program for the balance of the week?

Mr. BOLLING. It is my understanding that when this program is completed that will be all the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, after the motion to recommit on the water pollution control bill I was called off the floor and missed the final vote. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S MAY 3 CONSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD following my remarks today on the 170th anniversary of Poland's May 3 Constitution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this special order today so that my colleagues in Congress and I may pay tribute to the magnificent Constitution of Poland which was adopted by that nation on May 3, 1791.

It might quite possibly be asked why Members of Congress in the United States would be paying tribute to this great document which was adopted by a nation removed from our own shores by thousands of miles. The answer is at once a source of justice and inspiration.

We Americans pay tribute to Poland's Constitution not only here in Congress but throughout the United States because we are mindful of the fact that Poland's Constitution of 1791 brought to the European Continent those fundamental principles of human dignity which our own Nation adopted only 2 years earlier after the heroic American Revolution. This Polish Constitution was the first effort made by any European nation to bring to the people of Europe in 1791 the principles of justice and self-rule which were incorporated in the U.S. Constitution adopted in 1789.

Equally compelling in our efforts to recognize the great contribution of the people of Poland in adopting their Constitution is the fact that the Poles made this heroic move at a time in European history when despotism was on the rise in Europe, and to suggest the principles of democracy or self-government was a move which provoked only bitter resentment and antagonism by the rulers of all European nations of that day.

In paying tribute to Poland's Constitution, we here in Congress are sending an assurance to the Polish people of our continuing belief that just as they had carved for themselves a concept of dignity under freedom in 1791, that same spirit of freedom will again emerge when Poland's present Communist rulers fall from the weight of their own oppression and despotism.

Throughout her 1,000 years of history, Poland has provided in Europe a stanch bulwark against those who would defile the dignity of man by placing him in bondage of oppressive rulers. Just as our own American Constitution adopted in 1789, Poland's Constitution was indeed a revolutionary document. It introduced to the European Continent for the first time in formal language the principle of sovereignty of a people in the state.

This Polish Constitution gave live meaning to the words of Thomas Jefferson, when he stated:

> The disease of liberty is catching. I think it is catching in our time, and I want it to spread the world over. Our function is to maintain its vitality here, maintain our example here, so that as it starts to spread throughout the world, we will be the nucleus of a great army of people the globe around who desire to follow the same road we follow.

This challenging principle laid down by Thomas Jefferson not only to Americans but people throughout the world might very well explain why Poland's Constitution of 1791 was so short lived. Her despotic neighbors in Russia and Prussia were indeed mindful of Thomas Jefferson's admonition that the disease of liberty is catching, and they saw the early results of that admonition by Poland's adoption of her Constitution. It is an indisputable fact of history that the tyrannical rulers of Poland's neighbors could not afford to have this disease of liberty brought to the European Continent, and so in 1795, 4 years after Poland adopted the principles of the

American Constitution, Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent into Poland to partition that gallant nation.

But even though the Poles were no longer to enjoy the fruits of their great Constitution of 1791, the spirit of freedom prevailed, as it does even today.

Poland rose again after World War I and rekindled on the European Continent the democratic principles of her people's stubborn belief, only to see them decimated again by the infamous Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement of 1939, which sparked the beginning of World War II and the ultimate treachery of the Communists in taking over Poland in 1945.

Mr. Speaker, the tragic history of Poland in her desperate struggle for liberty should be an inspiration and a lesson to all Americans. Freedom is a precious commodity which can be easily lost in the great struggle of world powers today.

In paying tribute to Poland's Constitution here in Congress today, we Americans should soberly reappraise our own position as defenders of freedom. We can learn from the tragic history of Poland that those same despotic elements exist in the world today which crushed the spirit of freedom in Poland 170 years ago. We must recognize the fact that while freedom brings great blessings, it also requires tremendous sacrifices. I pray to God that we in America will never become so self-assured of our freedom that we will let it slip away from our shores through apathy and inaction.

Poland's Constitution of 1791 should rightfully inspire those who respect freedom just as does our own Constitution of the United States, but, Mr. Speaker, I believe to understand this fully, we should heed the words of President Kennedy made on September 17 of last year in Greensboro, N.C. The then Senator said:

> I think the United States has lost its image as a revolutionary, forward-looking country. We celebrate today the anniversary of Constitution Day. I hold the view that the Constitution is the most revolutionary document, with the Declaration of Independence, ever written; and it should, to the new countries, serve as a source of stimulation and enterprise. We hold the view that the people will come first, not the Government. We hold the view that every American, regardless of his religion or his race, is entitled to his constitutional rights.

The words of President Kennedy are as true today as they were half a year ago, or as they would have been 170 years ago, when the heroic Poles adopted the concept of constitutional rule.

They will lose their meaning only if our Nation becomes so entrenched in its own comfort that it fails to recognize the plight of millions of people throughout the world who are today living in privation under the rule of Communist dictators.

I truly hope the tribute we are paying today to the Constitution of Poland will rekindle in all Americans that revolutionary spirit which our own forefathers manifested so heroically in the struggle which won for us our own freedom. I hope this revolutionary spirit will again spread through the whole world and bring about a dedication to freedom and constitutional rule under the principles of sovereignty for all people.

It is most significant that the revolution which brought to Poland these principles of constitutional government in 1791 was accomplished without a single drop of blood being spilled. It was an act of wise statesmanship enacted by the Polish Diet in 1791 in Warsaw that by unanimous solemn vote brought about this historic political, social, and educational reform destined to strengthen the Polish state at a time of threatening dangers from imperialistic neighboring powers.

I have never been convinced by those who proclaim that armed intervention must be the necessary corollary for bringing freedom to all the people of the world. I stand before you firmly convinced the decisive leadership of President Kennedy, being today magnificently supported by the leaders of America from both parties, can indeed bring to the world those basic freedoms we hold for ourselves without resorting to armed intervention. But this can only happen when enlightened people throughout the world will recognize our President's determination and reflect this determination to their own people.

Just as the Polish people carved for themselves a doctrine of dignity under freedom, so can the entire world follow this magnificent example if the leaders of the free world will stand firm and resolute against Soviet threats. History has shown us that despotism triumphs only in the wake of weakness, indecision, and appeasement.

In paying tribute to the people of Poland today, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we here in Congress should serve notice on the present Communist rulers of Poland that our patience is not inexhaustible. Let Poland's Premier Wladyslaw Gomulka take heed of the fact that we in this Congress, mindful of the great contributions the people of Poland made on the altar of freedom, recognize that they need all of our assistance to relieve their present privation. But this assistance cannot long continue by humanitarian Americans while Mr. Gomulka continues his blind allegiance to Moscow rule. I was shocked to read about Premier Gomulka's unprovoked attack against the United States the other day when, like a puppet he followed Soviet propaganda in trying to place the tag of aggressor on the United States for the abortive attempt at restoration of freedom by the Cuban people themselves.

I hope ways will be found to tell the gallant people of Poland, who are today suffering privation under Communist rule, that it is Premier Gomulka himself who is emerging as the chief architect of obstruction to further help by the United States to millions of men, women, and children in Poland.

I have supported efforts in this Congress to help these gallant Polish people, even though they are under the rule of Communist leaders, because it is an indisputable, undeniable, unequivocal fact that the millions of people in Poland are not Communists, never have been Communists, and never will subscribe voluntarily to Communist dogma. But even my patience is not inexhaustible. It becomes increasingly more difficult to provide help to these wonderful people who have made such great effort in the cause of freedom and who, if given the opportunity today, would indeed aline their loyalties with the democracies of the West, when Poland's present albeit temporary Communist leaders continue in their brutal attacks on the honor and dignity of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, my one consoling fact is the sincere belief the people of Poland are not going to be beguiled by Mr. Gomulka's intemperate assaults on the dignity of our Nation. They will not be deceived because burning in their hearts today, just as in 1791, is the spirit and longing for freedom.

Poland's Communist rulers will fail in their efforts to deny the Polish people their sovereignty just as Hitler and all other previous despots failed.

Today, as we pay tribute to Poland's great Constitution of 1791, we look with confidence to the day that freedom will again emerge in Poland and the rest of the captive world, and these great nations will again join the world family of nations as free people.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to join with others in the celebration of Poland's Constitution Day.

The people of Poland can be justly proud of their wonderful heritage, for they have given to the world and this country great men, achievements, and ideals.

Though Poland for these past many years has been tied under the yoke of oppression, I know the people in their hearts carry the joy of this celebration and the undieing prayer for independence from the claws of communism.

In joining in the celebration of this great day, we must also continue to join with them always in their prayers and works so that the people of Poland and Polish heritage throughout the world can be again truly free to enjoy the independence they so deeply love and enjoy.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is a date of special significance for the millions of Americans who are of Polish descent. For it was on that date, in 1791, that Poland reformed her government and adopted constitutional principles that placed her among the most enlightened nations of the world.

Those principles, unfortunately, were submerged by the partition of Poland a few years later, but they lived on in the hearts of the Polish people and were carried to this country by the millions of Polish citizens who started life anew here.

The healthy root that principles of liberty and equality took in our land was in no small part due to the ardent belief with which these principles were held by the sons and daughters of Poland.

While May 3 is therefore a date that is of particular pride to Americans of Polish descent, it is also a date that should be proudly noted by all Americans. For Americans of every race and creed and national origin rejoice in liberty and hope that the day will not be

distant when the people of Poland live again in freedom.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the unhappy history of the Poles in modern times is full of ups and downs; it is marked with glorious deeds and tragic disasters. Their late 18th century history was especially so, for in the middle of an inescapable national disaster their patriotic and statesmanlike leaders did their best in presenting their country with the most liberal and democratic constitution.

After the first partition of Poland in 1772 among her three greedy and grasping neighbors, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, Polish leaders knew that Poland could not escape eventual dismemberment in the hands of these powers. They thought that, in the absence of effective foreign aid, their best chance of forestalling such a sad eventuality rested in the overhauling and strengthening of Poland's Government. They thereby hoped to unite all Poles more firmly behind the Government, and thus face their foes in unison. With that lofty objective in mind a committee of the Diet—or the Assembly—was appointed to draw up a constitution. The work was begun in 1788, and by early 1791 the drafted document was ready. It was promulgated on May 3, and thenceforth became known as the Constitution of May 3.

That memorable and historic document embodied many liberal and progressive ideas, and represented a decisive advance over anything of the kind yet attempted in any country in central and eastern Europe. By its provisions Poland emerged from an antiquated medieval system of government and entered into one with many modernistic features.

Autocratic Poland became a constitutional monarchy. Ministerial responsibility was introduced and cabinet type of government was established. The intricate and obstructive features of the old system were abolished, and many class distinctions were eliminated. The barrier separating the nobility from the rest of the people was drastically lowered. Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the gentry alone were now made available to all townsmen, and the peasantry were placed under the protection of the law. The powers of the upper house were reduced and those of the lower—or popularly elected—assembly were increased. Freedom of conscience and of speech were guaranteed. These democratic features made the constitution of May 3 a model constitution, and as such it was widely hailed both in Poland and by Poland's friends in other lands. The date of its proclamation became a Polish national holiday. But the above is the story of the valiant attempt on the part of Polish leaders to salvage their country from eventual dismemberment, a noble and intelligent attempt, and its failure is no discredit to their memory.

Soon after the constitution was proclaimed in Poland, her implacable foes declared war upon her, and finally brought her independent existence to an end. For that reason the Polish people never had the good fortune to live under their constitution, and perhaps that is one more reason why they have looked upon it as a memorable document embodying their unrealized dreams and long-cherished hopes. That is why, as the years and decades go by, the Poles regard that document, their constitution of May 3, as the true expression of their ideals and celebrate its anniversary as their national holiday. I am pleased to echo their genuine patriotic sentiments on the 170th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the 3d of May is one of the most significant days in man's turbulent history of fight for freedom. Since 1791, the ideals of freedom, when the people of Poland promulgated its constitution, have been held steadfast by the people of Poland, both within and without the country.

When we consider the words that are part of the 3d of May constitution, reaching back to the 18th century, we know that the good people of Poland were in the vanguard of democracy:

> All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Just so long as the people of Poland, as well as all freedom-loving people, hold on to the ideals and the vision of these early Polish patriots, just so much closer will come their realization.

We have learned that the overthrow of tyranny is no easy matter but in history's long pull, it is as inevitable as the rise of the sun.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of Poland's Constitution Day is an occasion for honoring a nation which refuses to be conquered. An indomitable people, the Poles throughout all history have suffered probably more and more often than any other ethnic group in the whole world. They have suffered at the hands of their ruthless neighbors on all sides, again and again and again. Since 1939 they have endured terror and misery beyond even that of the suffering millions throughout all the world and greater than their own repeated anguish down the centuries. Yet, as always in their centuries-old history, they have endured and persisted in their heroic and independent spirit. They have remained an entity.

The divisions of Poland between the warring powers of Europe before 1800 are landmarks in the annals of exploitation of nation by nation. In the last century and a half Poland has twice lost her freedom. Yet Poland has never ceased to be. The country which led Europe as it emerged from the Dark Ages—led Europe in Christianity, in culture, in political development—has never lost its basic stamina, its capacity for recuperation, or its enduring qualities of courage, cultivation, and Christian fortitude.

Poland as the eastern outpost of Western civilization for centuries withstood the onslaught of the barbaric hordes from the east. In modern history Poland emerged again and again from the assaults of Germany on the left and Russia on the right of her beleaguered frontiers. Throughout all the vicissitudes of history the Polish people have not only endured, they have emerged with a faith in their own permanence, a knowledge of their inexhaustible spirit, and an unquenchable hope for the triumph of justice.

Never did a people deserve more support and encouragement from the free world. For the Poles have carried the banner of freedom throughout the holocaust of centuries. Their respect for the individual, for the rights of man, for liberty of person, of mind, and of soul has pervaded despite all efforts to annihilate it. Since the beginning of World War II they have suffered not only the awful horrors of war known to all nations, they have been subjected to catastrophic defeat, ruthless terror of occupying forces, torture and murder both inside and outside of concentration camps, forced emigration.

Yet the spirit of Poland remains unconquered. As it has endured, so will it endure. We salute the Polish people with admiration, with hope, and with confidence in their ability to triumph.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, 170 years have passed since the people of Poland drafted their real democratic charter, which was to become the guideline for all those who were opposed to tyranny and dictatorial powers. Last year there were over 30 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing speeches made by distinguished Members of both the House and Senate. In nearly all of the addresses the Members expressed the hope that the following year would bring a better future for the oppressed Polish people, along with all their enslaved neighbors. Unfortunately, this was not the case, and looking back today over the past year, one can only wonder why we have not found ourselves yet engaged in a third world war.

Reading the daily press, it seems that there is not a single spot on this earth which has not become inflamed. Barely did we try to clear up the situation in the Congo, when fire broke out in Laos, and while fighting continued there, we woke up one morning only to learn that rebel forces had landed on Cuban soil in an attempt to liberate their homeland from Castro's Communist-infested dictatorship. While fierce fighting was going on in Cuba, we learned that French forces in Algeria had staged a mutiny against President de Gaulle, and up to this day there is no end in sight.

I do not believe I have to tell anyone here what the reason is for all this. Certainly it is not American incapability, or ill will, to handle the situation. We have tried hard enough to convince people who do not share our views that we are sincere in our words and that we want to see all people free from ruthless police systems, be it on the far right or the left. We have shown time and again that we support fighters for freedom in Communist-enslaved countries, in Trujillo's Dominican Republic or Hitler's Germany.

Yet, unfortunately, we have not succeeded, and many among us ask why?

Why do we have enemies in Europe whom we have helped to liberate? Why are we disliked in African countries that became independent due to our vote in the United Nations? The answer to this and to the many questions that have puzzled today most policymakers is plain—Moscow is against it. Just as we adhere to our great American Constitution, and just like the Nazis followed closely to Hitler's guideline "Mein Kampf," the answer to today's events can only be found in Marx's manifesto "Das Kapital." The Soviet tyrants from Lenin through Trotsky, Stalin to Khrushchev, have followed the preaching of Marx completely, and exactly. They may differ on how to run their own nation, and they may oppose each other in their lust for absolute power, but nevertheless, all of them agree in the principle, that to achieve their aim a world revolution is necessary. No matter what the means, said Marx, as long as we achieve our final aim. Cheating, lying, and blackmail has been most commonly used by the Soviet leaders, to line up ignorant and discontented masses, throughout the world.

Having closed themselves up behind an iron wall for nearly half a century, the masters of the science of propaganda have told all sorts of lies, easily picked up by ignorance. Only a very few people know that were it not for American support in World War II, the Soviet Union would have perished under the steamroller of the advancing Nazi machine. Few only realize how many American engineers and technicians, who went as advisers to the Soviet Union prior to the last war, have perished there in slave labor camps and have never again been heard from. Few people remember that were it not for Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, their mutual friendship since the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact would have existed to this day.

How many people do remember the Atlantic Charter, drafted during World War II, and later in the course of the Yalta Conference abused and disregarded when Stalin insisted on having the entire Polish border changed. Should not Khrushchev and his gang that worked under Stalin occupy the same glass dock along with Eichmann, on trial for having massacred 6 million people? What about the countless millions who were deported to slave labor camps from all the Baltic States and who were never heard of again? What about the Polish insurgents who fought off Hitler's occupants in Warsaw, expecting promised aid from the Soviet army occupying the other side of the city? How about the 12,000 Polish officers shot in the Katyn Forest and dumped into mass graves? And what about the suppressing of the Hungarian revolt? Are not these few charges alone sufficient to bring the ruthless masters of the Kremlin before a world court of justice, just like Eichmann is facing today?

About 10 days ago the world went wild over the Soviet's achievement of sending a man into space. Once again very few of us analyzed Soviet reports on this world event to really grasp the true picture of this brilliantly staged propaganda masterpiece. At this point, I must bow my head to my young distinguished colleague, Hon. ROMAN PUCINSKI from the 11th Congressional District of Illinois. He was perhaps the first to doubt the story about the mysterious flight. Time magazine and other publications followed his belief. Knowing a little bit about the true workings of the Moscow propaganda mill, someone may find many analogies in this trumped-up and unfounded achievement.

Credit went to an unknown flier who overnight became a hero of the Soviet Union. If true, he was just used like a guinea pig in a remote controlled missile, with no less power than was exercised by Laika, the Soviet dog. Poor Laika, except for an additional meal on that day, did not get a medal.

But what was not surprising was the ballyhoo that followed the landing of Gagarin. Most of his well-prepared speech made after his landing was a brief rundown, a cliche style, hailing the Communist leadership, the party, and the Soviet Union. Whatever he said about the flight itself has been already known from photographs taken by our own cameras placed in our guided missiles. Not one word said by Gagarin was new. Once he spoke about a porthole in his spaceship, which was again denied later. He did not forget to mention kolkhozes—cooperative farms—he saw while flying over the Soviet Union. His own wife was amazed to learn that her husband was a major in the Soviet Air Force. Even the launching point of the spaceship was held in deep mystery. Yet the world jumped to the conclusion that a space flight with a man in the missile had taken place, but no one has heard any signals, allegedly sent by Gagarin from his flight. Did we not learn also that it was not Marconi who invented the radio, but an obscure Russian a long time before? How absurd can we become in trusting Soviet words? But should we really be inclined to believe in the great Soviet achievements, and should we really take it for granted that they have launched a spaceship, then why should we not ask them to produce the true builders of the Soviet spaceship, release their names, just as we have done for years, telling the world that Von Braun is our top man in the field of rockets and missiles. Where are the thousands of German scientists deported by the Russians in 1945?

I believe that there is still time to change the picture and to prevent a third world war clash. We have to show the world that most of it is being duped by masters in that art. We should produce pictures and distribute them widely, of larger Soviet towns that are empty of traffic, with people rushing through their main streets in shabby and rugged clothes. We should cite and emphasize the facts of how the Soviets exploit their satellite countries, by buying a ton of coal for pennies and reselling it for dollars.

Only then the Soviet lies can be defeated, just as Hitler when the truth came out in the end. If this is done, we will once again be able to celebrate a true 3d of May in a democratic and free community of Poland.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1918, right in this very Chamber, President Wilson enunciated his famous "14 points of peace." Freemen here, as well as throughout the world, thrilled at his inclusion of Poland's independence as a sine qua non for charting world peace.

No more ardent and able champion of Poland's longing for recognition as a free Nation can be found than our illustrious World War I President.

Is it any wonder then that his name and memory are revered in Polish homes throughout the world? His picture, tattered by time, can still be found in Polish living rooms.

Today, as true Poles everywhere observe the 170th anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland, we should pause to reflect on that historic document patterned after the fundamentals of freedom which the Founding Fathers had written into our own Constitution just 4 years earlier.

Europe was startled by the scope and liberalness of the Polish Constitution. European despots feared the results of this daring document and strove quickly to submerge it lest it inspire their own subjects to similar expressions of their desire for freedom. The Constitution of Poland is the more amazing when we consider that it was conceived during Poland's most critical hour, at least up to that time. And it was a major step forward in internal liberty as well as a gesture of defiance to her greedy neighbors.

Beset on both eastern and western frontiers by hostile nations, Poland was overrun and partitioned several times. Her fields were drenched with blood as her sons fell in her defense.

Even today, fettered as she is by her godless oppressor, Polish hearts and minds still retain the deathless yearning for freedom. On this anniversary of the Constitution of Poland, her sons and daughters still chant their national anthem, loud and clear in the free world, but muted and whispered wherever the hammer and sickle are flown.

That very anthem, Mr. Speaker, is a prayer for deliverance—a prayer that finds its echo in the hearts of freemen everywhere.

We in the United States owe a special debt of gratitude to Poland which gave us valiant men to aid us gain our own independence. And she gave us and the world of her scientists, artists, and craftsmen. In all these fields, Poland's rollcall of honor ranks second to none—Copernicus, the world's eminent mathematician; Madam Curie, the wizard of roentgenology; Paderewski and Chopin, music's immortals; and Modjeski, the brilliant bridge builder. Of course, no roster of Poland's heroes would be complete without mention of those two warrior immortals, Kosciusko and Pulaski, who played a brilliant part in helping us win our own independence.

No, Mr. Speaker, I submit that as long as there are freemen in the world, Polish Constitution Day will be observed with appropriate honors.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a duty of grave

importance to recognize the anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. On May 3, in 1791, the Polish people established a constitutional government founded on the principles of equality of man and the right of men everywhere to personal liberty. They did this despite the fact that they were surrounded by aggressive neighbors who overwhelmed them in a few short years. Undaunted, Poland fought for her freedom again and again, finally regained it after World War I, only to be invaded in 1939. Today, even under communism, the indomitable spirit of the Poles is still unbroken.

Reading the daily news, it appears that we are living in a period of political turmoil with only the United States and a few stable democratic nations still holding firm while sinister ideologies threaten to overpower the whole world. This is a time of swift and radical change. President Kennedy has said:

> Only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger.

Actually we are living through a political explosion when millions of people are achieving freedom for the first time in their history. Such people, ignorant of the pitfalls of self-government, can easily be misled. Millions more, struggling toward the same goal, have already fallen into a quicksand of political oppression.

At such a time it is of maximum importance that we establish communication with them. Somehow we must teach the real meaning of freedom: freedom of enterprise, of speech, of religion; freedom from want, from oppression, from fear. We ourselves, so long used to our privileges that we no longer fully appreciate them, have handicaps in speaking to newly freed peoples.

But the Poles, more than any other people, understand the meaning of freedom. They have fought boldly and persistently for a freedom which they have lost again and again, but which they value more than life itself. The celebration of Polish Constitution Day demonstrates to all the world the importance of freedom and the terrible sadness of freedom lost.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Polish people on this 170th anniversary of their Constitution Day.

On this day in 1791, the Polish Diet in Warsaw, inspired by the American Bill of Rights and the French Declaration on the Rights of Man, adopted by a unanimous solemn vote important political, social, and educational reforms destined to strengthen the Polish state at a time of threatening dangers from Russian and Prussian imperialism.

Polish immigrants came to America bringing with them a rich heritage of dedication to human rights and freedom to make a substantial contribution to American culture and progress.

In my own community of Reading and Berks County, as in towns and cities throughout the Nation, these immigrants and their descendants have proved themselves to be fine and decent citizens. They are industrious, energetic and progressive, and have contributed much to our own free way of life.

Five years ago, the heroic struggle of the people of Poznan against the Soviet puppet regime gave renewed hope to millions of freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain. This spirit of devotion to the principle of democratic government will eventually triumph.

Polish descendants in this country can well be proud of their culture and traditional love of freedom. I join in saluting them on this anniversary of their first constitution.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, to the freedom-loving and liberty-minded Poles, the anniversary of their Constitution Day is almost as important as that of their independence day. The constitution was promulgated and adopted when Poland was in imminent danger of losing its very existence as an independent entity. Through its adoption Polish leaders meant to strengthen the Polish Government and to resist its enemies more effectively. At the same time they hoped to overhaul their governmental machinery and bring it up to date. With these objectives in mind, and inspired by the ideals of our own Declaration of Independence, they framed a progressive, liberal constitution.

That constitution contained much of what we today regard as basic human rights. Its keystone was the clause on power:

> All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

The king's authority was controlled and curbed, and Poland became a constitutional, limited monarchy. The powers of the elected legislative chamber were enhanced and those of the upper chamber reduced. The nobility lost some of its privileges, and the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law. Religious toleration and freedom of speech were guaranteed. Restraining the powerful, guaranteeing the rights of the weak, the constitution was a true instrument for social progress.

Unfortunately, the Poles never had the chance to put the constitution to work. Soon after its promulgation, Poland was again overrun by its neighbors, then partitioned for the third time and lost its independence. Thus the constitution could not be the law of the land. But far from remaining a scrap of paper, its ideals have become the political creed of the Polish people, emblazoned in their minds and hearts, no matter what foreign rule has been imposed on their nation. The promulgation date of the constitution is, therefore, one of the most important national holidays. Today is the 170th anniversary of that historic event, and as such it is being celebrated in Polish communities throughout the free world. We join all Poles and Americans of Polish ancestry in commemorating this historic occasion, and we pray that this constitution will again rule Polish land as well as Polish spirits.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in times of trials and troubles people's thoughts draw hope and encouragement from happier days in their past history. This is especially so with the Polish people who find themselves enslaved in their homeland under an alien tyranny. Today, 170 years after their first democratic constitution, they can look back to that instrument with justified pride and sincere faith that someday they will live in freedom once again.

The adoption of that liberal constitution in 1791 moved Poland from the Middle Ages into modern times. To this day that single event constitutes one of the brightest and most significant landmarks in Poland's modern political history. The document made Poland a constitutional monarchy, with a responsible cabinet form of government. Old class distinctions and privileges were wiped out, and the government was strengthened by bringing the peasantry under the protection of the law. Freedom of speech and conscience was guaranteed, and the powers of the nobility were curtailed. In short, it was a most progressive constitution, the first democratic constitution in central and eastern Europe. On the 170th anniversary of the enactment of that constitution we honor the memory of patriotic Poles who drafted and enacted that great document and voice our hope that Poland will once again be able to throw off all bonds of tyranny and oppression imposed by the Soviet Union.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, the month of May signifies the birth of new life as can be evidenced by nature's cycle in bringing forth the freshness of spring with new buds bursting from flowers and trees. So it is synonymous that the people of Poland chose this 3d day of May to announce their new life of freedom, when they adopted a constitution in 1791 that closely follows our own form of representative government as initiated by our Founding Fathers.

Well over a century and a half have passed since that era of freedom seemed to blow like a fresh wind through old Europe and what was then the New World. In those days, men pledged their fortunes, their honor, and their lives to the sacred cause of liberty—and more often than not were called upon to fulfill their pledges. Polish patriots fought for liberty in the United States and American patriots applauded when ancient tyrannies seemed to be on the wane in Poland.

But tyranny is a cancer and, once removed, does not assure a complete cure for its many ills. For, as cancer, in time it can regrow to death-dealing proportions. Tyrants are again on the move in the world and this present-day tyranny is more subtle, all-pervasive, and much stronger than past generations have experienced.

Poland has been engulfed in this animalistic movement which constantly assails the minds and souls of its people with a pagan Communist philosophy. Self-determination and equality before the law are receiving their most severe test and the people of Poland can well

be the criterion to determine the eventual victor in the struggle to eradicate the tenacious grip of communism. For in their minds and souls there still exists the memory that all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people. If this image is destroyed the tide of battle could turn in favor of communism, as our most important ally—located in the heart of communism's operation—would be lost. This destruction would add fuel to the fire of communistic propaganda and would be an example to be placed before arising new nations, to show democracy as the villain of mankind, inasmuch as Poland experimented with this form of government and rejected it in favor of communism.

So it is vitally important that today, we renew our efforts to recharge the spirit of the Polish people to reestablish their freedoms under their own chosen government. As a nation dedicated ourselves to the democratic principles of personal liberty, and individual freedom, the U.S. Government has an obligation to unceasingly maintain the right of Poland to her independence, and to persevere, both as an individual nation and as a member of the United Nations, in demanding that Communist leaders grant freedom and independence to Poland. As long as the people of Poland continue to hold in their hearts this great desire for freedom, the forces of communism will never be completely triumphant. People with a strength such as this are a source of inspiration and a beacon of hope for those in other oppressed areas who will someday regain their God-given birthright—freedom. And new nations will observe the time-tested program that Poland has experienced—as a democracy and under the forces of tyranny—which will be a definite stamp of approval that democracy is the only way of life for survival of all mankind.

Hilaire Belloc, the well-known contemporary Catholic author, has written:

> Poland is the test of Europe. The restoration and preserving of a powerful and independent Polish state is, and must be, among the first of our political objectives—if we cannot restore Poland, it will mean that the forces destructive of all by which we have lived have triumphed. Our descendants will no longer be able to call themselves civilized men, inheritors of the Roman Empire and of Greece through the strength of the Catholic church and through its power to preserve. The very magnitude of the issue makes it difficult to grasp. The statement of it sounds so exaggerated as to be fantastic. We stand or fall by Poland—and "we" means all our art, literature, philosophy, all the mighty heritage now at stake.

So it is fitting and proper that we take time today, Polish Constitution Day, to encourage the Poles to continue their struggle to regain the freedom they have lost to the thieving butchers of Moscow. I am confident that our messages of faith and hope will add new strength to Poland's will in their struggle against the Russian aggressors.

I join with the Polish people throughout the world as we lift our hearts to pray that the end of tyranny and the rebirth of national freedom will soon be a reality for Poland. May the next Polish Constitution Day be a celebration of its true meaning.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, when we commemorate Polish Constitution Day on May 3, we are paying tribute to the democratic ideals of the Polish people, which have lasted for almost 200 years. I honor all the Polish people who have held true to these principles in spite of partition and foreign domination. They are truly a heroic and dedicated people. There are a few such examples in history when against all existing odds a people have remained so fired with democratic principles.

There are many illustrations of this dedication to the 1791 constitution. The great Polish patriot, Kosciusko, attempted to prevent Russia from partitioning his country in 1793. A military revolt by young Polish soldiers occurred in 1830 against the Russian regime. Polish youths again revolted in 1863 when a plan to recruit them en masse into the Russian Army became known. In 1956 Poles once again stood up against their foreign masters. It is obvious that in each generation since the promulgation of the constitution of 1791 the Polish people have felt an instinctive desire for freedom and independent government.

Today the Soviet hold over Poland is stronger than at any other period of foreign domination. And yet it is not as strong as it is in other Iron Curtain countries. The valiant Polish people have showed the Soviets by both active and passive resistance that they will not be treated as captive peoples, that they will have some control over their government, their economy, their educational system, and their church. We in the United States have supported this attitude by the Polish people. I salute the courageous Polish people, and I know I speak for all Americans when I say that we fervently pray that they will soon know the independence for which they have struggled so long.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the people of Poland have suffered many trials and tribulations throughout their modern history, and the crisis which they faced late in the 18th century was one that threatened their existence as an independent national entity. The country had already suffered its first partition, and had lost a third of its area and population. Late in the 1780's another partition, planned by her avaricious neighbors, seemed in the offing. The Poles themselves seemed helpless to forestall it, but a group of their leaders thought that by overhauling, modernizing and strengthening Poland's Government, they could dissipate the threat to their unity. In 1788 a group of these leaders began the drafting of a constitution. Their task was completed early in 1791, and the constitution was promulgated on May 3 of that year. It is the 170th anniversary of that constitution that is being celebrated today.

That constitution was a memorable and historic document in Poland's history. By its provisions Poland's Government became a limited, constitutional monarchy. The upper chamber lost a good deal of its powers, while the lower and popularly elected chamber gained much. Religious toleration was guaranteed, and the peasants were taken under the protection of the law. Townsmen recovered their judicial autonomy, and received a number of political rights. For all these and other liberal, democratic and progressive provisions the constitution was hailed as a great step forward.

Unfortunately the Polish people were not given the chance to see this constitution work. Soon after its promulgation Poland was attacked by her three implacable foes—Austria, Prussia, and Russia. With Poland's loss of independent existence the constitution also perished. But the spirit of freedom and democracy embodied in that constitution did not die. Today the Polish people still cling to the eternal ideas embodied in that memorable document, the constitution of May 3 of the year 1791.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, is the 170th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution, one of the outstanding contributions to the evolution of democracy in Europe.

In observing this day, Americans join the Polish people and people of Polish origin in many countries in renewing spiritual contact. In commemorating this important moment of history annually in this body, we are helping to keep alive also our own traditions. It was just 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution that Poland, without bloody revolution and disorder, succeeded in reforming her public life and granting equality of rights. It was a great assertion of democracy as we know it.

We Americans have much in common with the people of Poland. Poles arrived in the United States at Jamestown as early as 1608. A young Polish engineer, Thaddeus Kosciusko, was among the first to offer his services to General Washington. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, another famous Pole, dedicated his life to the cause of American freedom. There are over 7 million Americans of Polish descent in the United States today, many of whom play an important part in our Government.

Although Poland today is still behind the Iron Curtain, we know that the Polish people retain their independent spirit and love of freedom. This has been amply demonstrated on many occasions in the past. The human spirit and the human mind know no iron curtain and this anniversary deepens our faith and belief in the ultimate restoration of true freedom to an ancient nation. I should like to convey warmest greetings and assurances of continued friendship to the Polish people on this memorable occasion.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, today we once again commemorate the anniversary of the enactment of the Polish Constitution.

One hundred and seventy years ago, on May 3, it was decreed in the state of Poland that all power in civic society shall be derived from the will of the people. This historic doctrine, influenced by the American Declaration of Independence, and by the French Revolution,

marked the culmination of efforts by Polish political thinkers and philosophers.

Surrounded by totalitarian regimes to the east and to the south, this center of liberalism was to face many struggles in the years to come. Only a short time after the proclamation of the constitution, Russian and Prussian troops moved in to partition the Polish nation. In 1939, we saw once again this unholy alliance in action. And today, Russian imperialism, now thinly masked as communism, continues to oppress the Polish people.

It is most fitting that we in Congress commemorate this historic occasion, for in Poland itself there will be no overt celebration. The document of May 3 has been supplanted by an imposed constitution, where power is derived, not from the will of the people, but from oppressors from above. Communism has replaced freedom, and tyranny has been substituted for liberty. Though the May 3 constitution is no longer on the statute books, it lives on, stubbornly, in the hearts of Polish citizens. We can be sure that, despite brutal suppression, despite all attempts at Russification and communization, the spirit of 1791 still survives. The Polish people will not soon forget the liberal ideas which forged that historic document, nor can they forget the air of freedom which they once breathed.

It is our fervent hope today that their prayers soon will be answered, and that the promise of the constitution of 1791 will once again be proclaimed on Polish soil.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 3 all of us in America wish to join our voices with the rest of the world in honoring the spirit of Poland's Constitution Day. It is indeed a crime—literally a crime—that we cannot pay tribute to the reality of a free Poland and not merely the ghost of a memory.

However, Poland in her past demonstrated her determination to be free and in this lies their hope and that of all those who are grieved at her plight. We remember her sufferings during the 18th and 19th centuries when she was a pawn in the quest for a balance of power. Russia, Prussia, and Austria took advantage of her weakness and at will partitioned her valuable land. In the 20th century Hitler took first Poland and thus secured the crucial Polish corridor to the Baltic. Her plight has always been to fall victim before an overpowering enemy.

We recall these tragedies but we also remember that after each fall Poland sprang back to establish freedom in her land. Once the power of her enemies was destroyed, the Polish people themselves always joined to establish freedom and self-government.

This has been the pattern of her history and we can have every hope that Poland will rise to freedom from under the oppression she now suffers. Already she has demonstrated her courage and her hope by defying the Communist armies that occupy her land. Poland has shown the world that the spirit of May 3 is still in her heart. This is the spirit that we honor today.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 I would like to make some comments in commemorating that event.

Although Poland in 1791 had already been the victim of power politics in Europe and great sections of her territory had been swallowed through the conspiracy of Prussia, Austria, and Russia against her, the Poles gathered enough courage to bring forth reforms which would have transformed their country into a modern and progressive nation. Educational and economic reforms preceded the drive for the constitutional changes of 1791. This constitution was a progressive one for the time that it was written, particularly if one considers the shadows of reactionary Prussia and Russia which practically covered the whole of Poland. Under the constitution of 1791 a hereditary monarchy was established and a representative assembly was to make decisions on the principle of majority rule.

This constitution had the approval of the Polish people who on May 3, 1791, the date of its ratification, celebrated on the streets of the cities and in the villages.

Under this constitution, Poland had become a constitutional monarchy.

However, this happy state of affairs was short lived. Catherine of Russia disapproved of the constitution and making common cause with her former conspirators stepped in again with the purpose of partitioning the whole country this time.

The last heroic act of Poland was performed in 1793–94, when led by Tadeusz Kosciuszko, a young patriot who had fought on the side of George Washington during our War of Independence, his people wrote some of the most brilliant pages in the history of their country. The result was that Poland fell fighting for its independence.

A prominent historian, Bernard Peres, characterized the action of three conspirators against the independence of Poland as follows:

> In October, 1795, the three robbers finally affected a third partition, by which Poland disappeared from the map of Europe.

History has termed this act of Russia, Prussia, and Austria as "the rape of Poland." However, Poland was destined to reappear as an independent nation after World War I, only to fall victim to Hitler some two decades later. After resisting twice during World War II, Poland again fell under Russian domination, but this time it was the domination of the Soviet Union.

It is our hope that the Polish people will someday fulfill their national aspirations and once again see their country as a free entity and themselves masters in their own home.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, May 3 of this year marks the 170th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, and on this anniversary the minds of the free people throughout the world turn to the enslaved Polish people suffering under Communist domination.

As we in the Congress express our feelings and our hopes for Poland's early liberation, we again underscore our warm friendship for the Polish people.

The relationship of our two peoples is traditional and historical and no matter how hard the Communists may try they cannot erase it. The people of Poland have always manifested a strong attachment to the Western World, particularly to America, because our free way of life is also their way. The American people have always supported the struggle for a free and independent Polish nation and we will continue to do so in the future.

It is to the great credit and glory of the Polish people that they never surrendered their rights, they have never forfeited their freedom, they have never ceased their resistance to tyranny. It is my firm conviction that the spirit of freedom, liberty, and love of Polish independence is so deeply rooted in the hearts of her patriots that they will emerge the victors.

The consoling forces for the Polish people has been their strong reliance on their religion. Amid persecution and propaganda, they have remained steadfast in the faith of their fathers, and this sort of faith can never be destroyed.

Free Americans of all nationalities join today with the people of Poland in ardent support of that tenacious will for freedom.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, during their modern history Poles have often found themselves in impossible situations. Such was their unenviable lot in the 1780's. Surrounded by three powerful and aggressive foes on the west, east, and south, they were powerless to cope with all three of them. A decade earlier these three powers—Austria, Prussia, and Russia—had helped themselves to a good share of Polish territory, but not content with what they had obtained, they seemed determined to put an end to Polish independence. Well aware of such a disastrous threat, Polish leaders thought that by reforming their national government and thus enlisting the support of all Poles in their fight for their very existence, they would have a better chance for survival. With that purpose in mind they drafted a constitution which was promulgated on May 3, 1791. Today is the 170th anniversary of the promulgation of that historic document.

By that constitution, Poland became a constitutional, limited monarchy. A cabinet-type of government, with ministerial responsibility, was established. The old unanimity rule in the Diet—the one great obstacle to effective legislation—and other intricate measures of the previous system were thrown overboard. Class distinctions were practically eliminated. The towns received full administrative and judicial autonomy, as well as a certain measure of parliamentary representation. The power of landlords over peasantry was restrained, and the latter brought under the protection of the law. Religious toleration was also established.

In brief, by this constitution, Poland moved from one age to another, from

the Middle Ages to modern times. This daring and desirable move was hailed both in Poland and elsewhere. Both Poles and their friends abroad were overjoyed.

Unfortunately, however, before the constitution was put into force Poland's enemies made war upon her. Poland lost the war, and with it she lost both her independence and the constitution.

Happily the spirit of that constitution survived, and today the 170th anniversary of its promulgation is celebrated in all Polish communities as a national holiday.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join in commemoration of the Polish Constitution of 1791. It was adopted at nearly the same time as our Constitution, and granted similar rights and freedoms. But due to the might of oppressors, these freedoms are no longer enjoyed by the people of Poland.

Many sons of Poland have come to our country, proved themselves fine citizens, and made notable contributions to our communities. We share their concern over the plight of Poland, and their hope that it will once more know the blessings of peace under freedom.

But words of friendship, words in condemnation of the tyranny which now oppresses Poland, are not enough. Our country and its citizens must do what is possible to make effective the policy of our Government as expressed by both the President and the Congress.

Just prior to Premier Khrushchev's visit to this country in the fall of 1959, which was later so ill reciprocated, President Eisenhower said, referring to the captive nations of Eastern Europe:

America will never concede that there has been a sound, durable, or working peace that could be called global until these nations have had the right to express their own convictions and desires about their own fates. The United States would never cease to use every peaceable means to give them such an opportunity.

In his first state of the Union message of January 20, 1961, President Kennedy said:

We must never forget our hopes for the welfare of Eastern European people.

During last fall's campaign, President Kennedy, then a candidate, said:

We must never—at any summit, in any treaty declaration, in our words, or even in our minds—recognize Soviet domination of Eastern Europe.

Mr. Richard Nixon, the opposing candidate at that time, said:

In my acceptance address I unequivocally declared that our Government activities must be reorganized to take the initiative from the Communists and to develop and carry out a worldwide strategy and offensive for peace and freedom.

The captive nations resolution, passed by the House on May 2, 1960, provided:

Whereas the establishment of just and lasting peace is inconceivable without the restoration of freedom, independence, and national sovereignty to the captive people of eastern and central Europe * * *

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That * * * the Congress of the United States reaffirms its belief in the inalienable right of the people of the captive nations to live under governments of their own choice.

The Soviet bloc countries constantly accuse countries of the free world of unjust colonial policies, and their leaders give tirades against colonialism, but they never mention the more cruel type of colonialism inflicted upon millions of unwilling people by the Soviets. Poland's Constitution Day is a forceful reminder of the hypocrisy of the Soviet claims and protestations.

Whenever Mr. Khrushchev or any of his spokesmen reproach free world nations for colonialism, let us in answer refer to the 100 million people in eastern Europe who are not and never were Russians, but are held in bondage today by Communist tyranny. Let us not only answer back, let us take the initiative and give these people in bondage reason to keep up their hopes and spirits and to know that they are not forgotten and will not be forgotten by the United States and other free peoples.

We join friends of Poland throughout the free world in looking forward to the day when alien domination of that land will be forever cast away.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, wherever people of Polish descent are gathered together today, whether in Union County, N.J., or some other corner of the free world, they will observe Polish Constitution Day. And throughout the remainder of May this holiday will be celebrated with appropriate exercises in order to remind their fellow citizens that Poland was a pioneer in the establishment of free, constitutional government at the dawn of our modern age.

To me, Mr. Speaker, it is especially significant that the Polish people should single out May 3, 1791, as their great national holiday. This day does not mark a great military victory for Poland, nor does it represent the successful culmination of a bloody revolution. It stands, instead, for a peaceful event—the adoption by the people of Poland, freely and without coercion, of a national constitution which secured for them their individual liberties and established principles of free and democratic government which still endure in the hearts of Polish people everywhere.

This heritage, Mr. Speaker, similar to the heritage which Americans of Polish descent received again when they became citizens of the United States, has endured and grown stronger despite the passage of time and the burden of invasion, of oppression, of the loss of their liberty and national independence. No matter how strong the invaders or how brutal the oppressors, Poland and her people have resisted; they have never surrendered. They have nourished their love of freedom and honored their constitution even during the worst days of the Nazi-Soviet invasion of Poland in 1939 and the Soviet Communist tyranny which has been imposed on Poland since World War II.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that we in the Congress of the United States should commemorate Polish Constitution Day and thereby pay tribute to the traditions of freedom and independence for which Poland and her people have always stood. Not only were the American and Polish Constitutions adopted during the same brief period of history, but both were inspired by common principles of justice, of concern for human rights, of dedication to the idea that men are capable of governing themselves.

It is important, too, that we help to keep alive this devotion to freedom wherever it may be threatened, and to reaffirm our interest and our sense of common cause with all who have been deprived of freedom.

Freedom is an often overworked word, subject to many abuses of interpretation. But freedom is the noblest work of God on earth. As such, it is a lasting bond which unites all Americans with the suffering people of Poland.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, Poland has been under Soviet rule the last 16 years. The enforcement of its mandates are not as rigidly kept as others under the communistic yoke. The Polish people are jealous of the encroachment of communistic religious views upon their Catholic tenets. Their masters are very careful not to disturb the populace in this sensitive area.

It is true that tyrants and despots throughout the years of the existence of the Catholic Church have thirsted for the blood of priests and nuns. The freedoms and liberties of men are protected in countries where God and country respect the rights of worshipers in their religious beliefs and the strong loyalties of the family to their country and its institutions.

The power of religion is manifested in every activity of Polish life. At this time there is a growing unrest among the people of Poland due to exacted pressures against church policies on governmental restrictions in political matters. In the recent election, practically a one party ticket, the church did not oppose the administration candidates, who received 98 percent of the electorate vote. But immediately after the election the puppets of the administration were critical of the attitude of the clerics of the Catholic Church in the election. They attacked Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski for his public utterances on civic and governmental affairs relative to the method of the selection of the candidates. But the vast majority of the Polish people stand behind their religious leaders. They loathe Soviet rule.

The Polish by nature are a very happy people. It is this quality that has contributed much to their guarded patience since 1939; to withstand the rigidity of foreign domination. Their carefree, romantic, and cultural elegance has not changed.

Perhaps Poland is not a happy country today but since 1956 she has enjoyed, because of the indifference of her population to the pressure of the Communist grip—but the widespread activities of the population in discussing and dreaming of lost causes—had the opposite effect and they have enjoyed more liberties through the relaxation of government controls. To be sure there is still the censorship of newspapers and the difficulty of passports, as well as spy practices—yet the government that rules them is not that of a police state. At least—it is not practiced.

The Polish people love their liberties and hate the form of government that

rules over their land but her citizenry has schooled their minds to accept the Communist powers of control.

She is intellectually active—her people bubbling over in debate and discussions of ideas and clashes of the differences of opinion on all subjects of the day.

Poland is a Christian nation of Western ideology. Western culture of every variety finds fertile minds ready to accept all panaceas.

Western literature is there for the asking. Western plays by the score in every tongue are given strong patronage.

Artists of all talents known to culture of art are at work, inking, painting, drawing, and charting on boards or canvas their impressions of their subject. Architects evaluate with sour distaste the new designs born of infiltrated ideas.

Yet with all these disordered arrangements, unorganized programs and distorted ideas, the Polish people are an intensely religious country of the Catholic faith. True the intellectuals as nearly everywhere are for the most part free thinkers and agnostics but Poland is more solidly Catholic than any other nation. We must reiterate that the church is a sole bulwark of continued opposition to the Soviet regime.

It is the strongest protagonist with such tremendous power that even the Soviets realize that it reflects the honest, patient, inflexible attitude of the millions of the faith.

Several years ago the Russian military forces were in complete control at a place where a million of the faithful were at prayers, the troops looked passively on in frustration; the throng of those unyielding dissenters, in disregard of their masters, without a moment's hesitancy continued saying aloud their prayers.

The soft chants were as a measured cadence for the troops to retire from the scene—defeated.

So the people in a listless acceptance of these conditions go through the motions of living in a deft silent manner. In their eyes can be seen the sad stare of indecision. Yet much has been gained by this go along policy. The years of suffering at the hands of conquerors through the ages have taught the people how best to accept the alien rules for the governed.

Poland, although a poor and somewhat backward country, has accomplished much in the rebuilding of war-torn cities and its recaptured independence in spite of an enslaved economy.

Their political tolerance has paid off with the vaulting into Communist leadership of Wladyslaw Gomulka, a plain workingman who lives a plain, simple life and has ruled his nation as a realist should rule—even though he serves a Soviet purpose.

In 1956 with the end of Stalinism policies, Gomulka and Khrushchev realized the Polish people could be better appeased if their political bonds were relaxed and a system sans secret police interference would change the grim attitude of the Polish people.

It is said that the Polish worker has no heart in his tasks and does them badly—partly due to communism and also due to the cruel treatment suffered over the centuries by their conquerors in the past.

Communist discipline has achieved some regularity of order in the economy but the lack of incentive brings disgruntled apathy on the part of the worker.

There is fear now that the regime will become harsher in its rule in order to bring about uniformity of productive action. There is a growing fear recently of their complete absorption by Russia.

The Poles are suffering in pathetic silence. It seems the soul of the brave patriot is dying. The sadness of the nation is like a malady of hopelessness.

It is to the credit of the United States that we have not forgotten the plight of Poland. Our good Government responding to the pleas of millions of Americans to give aid to Poland has resulted in extending assistance to Poland in the sum of $460 million in the last 4 years.

In 1960 our food credits alone amounted to a $40 million deal of surplus wheat. Also some $61 million for machinery. Certainly we have contributed much to the bolstering of the Polish economy.

Good relations with Poland have had a very salutary effect in accordance with reports from our ever increasing number of tourists to Poland. Our good enjoyment of business factors with Poland are ready to pay off—she is paying now $40 million in settlement for U.S. properties in Poland confiscated in World War II.

The bursts of liberalism streaking out of Poland's aura of social, spiritual, and cultural activity, wherever and whenever possible, is the soul of Poland's masses speaking out—she may be captured but not a captive in chains. She lives to fight again to regain her freedom and independence.

We agree with other millions of Americans of Polish antecedents that under the great leadership of President Kennedy the day is nearly here when this seething strength building up noticed only within conservative limits of outward manifestation, will bring about the nationalization of a free Poland again under its great freedoms enunciated in the sacred constitution of May 3, 1791—only 3 years after the adoption of our own and so modeled after it with God-given rights inherent in man. We must create a climate in Poland for revolution. This can be done by using the same methods that are used by our common enemy, the Soviet Union, by undermining ruling puppet governments—we must overthrow tyranny. Our vibrant President Kennedy will not hesitate to act at the right time. Russia's zero hour is nearly here. The spreading of world domination through puppets begets only temporary power—and awaiting the public will to be overthrown. It is only delayed by the happening of the one incident that will give the lone spark for worldwide revolution against tyranny. We must carry on with these freedom loving patriots of these nations ready to die. War supplies and military advisers are necessary to implement its success. Their aims with God's blessing and our help cannot fail.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of Poland's Constitution which for 170 years has been a model document, setting out proclamations for human liberty which has been admired by the people of all nations for almost two centuries. Since that day in 1791 in Warsaw, Poland, the nation's governmental leaders have always fought for political, social and economic reforms and maintained a standard for human liberty which has been interrupted from time to time by powerful and tyrannical neighbor nations.

I need not review today the history of the valiant wars which the people of Poland have fought over the centuries to preserve liberty and free government as these facts are known to all people who have studied world history. Poland's geographic location, unfortunately, has been the main reason that its independence has been jeopardized and challenged and made a victim of war, invasion and partition during its history.

After World War I, people now living are familiar with the great progress free Poland made as an independent nation up to the outbreak of World War II when the nation was again devastated by the Nazi and communistic tyrants. The Polish people demonstrated during these years of freedom that their leaders possessed a natural talent to organize free government, expand education, industry and agriculture and provide happiness and contentment for its people during these times of free Poland.

I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, ROMAN PUCINSKI, for setting aside this time on the floor of the House today to pay tribute and also give an opportunity to other Members of Congress to remind the people of our country that Poland and other smaller nations are now enslaved under the iron heel of Soviet tyranny.

In the 82d Congress, as chairman of the special congressional committee which was organized to investigate the Katyn Forest massacre, the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman PUCINSKI, and myself had an opportunity to listen to the testimony of several hundred witnesses who exposed the real facts regarding that international crime and also the testimony revealed the methods used by the Communists to infiltrate and force Poland and other neighbor nations into the Communist sphere. Many witnesses during those hearings which were held in this country and in Europe, were leaders of government and the military of former free Poland and without exception, in their testimony, they warned that the free nations must be on guard to expose the highly organized communistic tactics which enslaved their native land 20 years ago.

We are today witnessing almost an exact blueprint of the same methods of infiltration and aggression by the Soviet tyrants within 90 miles of our shore where they have succeeded in capturing Cuba as a Soviet satellite. Unless something is done to halt these familiar communistic aggressive methods, the time will come when most or all of our neighbor nations in South America will be victims of the same communistic infiltration and enslavement as Poland, Cuba

and other satellite nations are experiencing today.

The history of the people of Poland reveals that they will continue to fight whether they live under the Soviet tyranny or in free America until freedom is reestablished to their motherland. I know the vast majority of the people of our country realize that when any small nation is enslaved, unless that nation receives the aid of free nations throughout the world, liberty is jeopardized everywhere on the globe.

I know that on this 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, the talks that are made on the floor this afternoon will be a reminder to the people of our country to sacrifice and make every effort to see that the fight for freedom everywhere on the globe continues against the international Communist conspiracy.

Communist leaders through their worldwide organization can easily promise people in Africa, Asia, and South America jobs, land, and economic utopia in return for surrender to Communist enslavement. Once the Soviet tyrants are in control the people are helpless, as they are then under complete military control and their liberties and freedom are no more.

The people in Poland and other captive nations realize this fact but millions in so-called neutral and backward nations must be educated on the true facts on the Communist conspiracy.

This fight must be carried on by the United States and all free nations.

Some day, and I hope it is not too far distant, world public opinion will unite and destroy communism and all it represents. Then Poland and all enslaved nations can enjoy liberty, freedom, and self-government.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I commend my distinguished colleague and friend from Illinois for arranging this special order and for his eloquent remarks. It is a distinct pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in commemorating the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

As we pay tribute to this historic document, we are mindful of the fact that it represents a significant milestone in the history of man's advancement in freedom.

It is therefore fitting that we pause in our deliberations in the Congress of the United States, to recall the constitution of 1791 and to honor the Polish nation which gave it birth.

The constitution of May 3, modeled after the French Proclamation of the Rights of Man and Citizen and the American Declaration of Independence, guaranteed the people of Poland the rights and freedoms to which men everywhere have aspired.

It embodied a fundamental principle handed down to us as a birthright by the founders of our own country—the principle that sovereignty belongs to the people—and it corrected the basic weakness of Poland's parliamentary system by eliminating the requirement of unanimous consent in arriving at legislative decision.

It is tragic to reflect that the freedom-loving peoples of Poland who conceived this brilliant and enlightened document, should now be under the yoke of communism, a philosophy completely alien to their every tradition.

The Polish people are today denied those principles of liberty and free, meaningful participation in their political life which were the keystones of the constitution of 1791.

On this anniversary of the constitution of May 3, my thoughts turn to the present plight of the Polish people. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I visited Poland during the congressional Easter recess. I was deeply moved by the intense dedication of the Poles as they work to advance their progress, their restlessness under the shackles of the police state, and their undiminished love for freedom and independence.

Poland is a country beset by grave economic problems, whose people, unfortunately, are bound in the Communist system and have little opportunity to exercise their imagination, inventiveness and enterprise in trying to fashion a better tomorrow for themselves. They do not enjoy any real participation in shaping the economic policies of their nation. Their advancement is handicapped by the inefficiency which appears inherent in a centrally administered economic system, with its production bottlenecks, shortages resulting as much from a scarcity of resources as from the practice of centrally allocating such resources, and its other shortcomings. I have seen this repeatedly during my inspection of their housing projects, industrial organizations, schools, roads, hospitals and other facilities.

It is particularly in such fields as medicine and surgery in which the dedicated and imaginative individual can still strive to advance his techniques and the level of knowledge, that the Poles have been able to overcome the stultifying effects of a Communist-type economy and the lack of adequate facilities, to achieve some amazing advances. The Poles are proud of those accomplishments, of their progress in rebuilding their war-devastated cities, and of those modern facilities which they have been able to fashion with their own hands or to obtain from their friends abroad.

Generally speaking, however, the level of living in Poland, although higher than in any other Eastern European country, is low by Western standards and the depressing influence of the Communist state can be felt wherever one travels in that country. The government-controlled press, radio, and television disseminate only the news approved by the government, and present a distorted picture of life in the United States and in the West generally. Freedom of religious practice is being suppressed through continuing pressure upon the church, confiscatory taxation policies, refusal to permit the construction of churches, and interference in the affairs of religious orders and lay clergy. There is little doubt but that the current Government of Poland is consciously and with determination pursuing policies designed to transform Poland, and the Polish nation, into a 100-percent Communist, materialistic state.

One pleasant impression stands out from my visit to Poland—that there is a tremendous reservoir of good will and friendship for the United States among the Polish people. This sentiment was confirmed in my talks with people in all walks of life. They expressed deep interest in everything that goes on in our country, and they look to us for help in their efforts to attain a better tomorrow.

On this anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, I would like to restate our determination to assist the cause of freedom and self-determination for the people of Poland. I hope that the policies of the U.S. Government will serve to counteract the process of communization of that country whose intense desire to be free left an indelible impression on my mind. We must exert every effort to help the Poles in achieving the measure of economic independence and advancement which they seek.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to state that it is my hope, shared by millions of Americans of Polish ancestry, that the spirit of the constitution of May 3, 1791, shall continue to live in the hearts of the Polish nation, and hasten the day when the principles embodied in that document shall once again be proclaimed openly and freely throughout the Polish land.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it has become a custom in this House for Members to rise to speak in behalf of the people of Poland at this season of the year, when on May 3 with the coming of spring they celebrate their national holiday, their Constitution Day.

Poland's Constitution Day came in 1791, just 4 years after the Constitution of our own Republic was devised. The men who wrote Poland's Constitution 170 years ago are generally credited with being among the wise statesmen of the age of enlightenment. Poland's sons had fought in our Revolution. Poland's leaders were influenced by our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, by the French Revolution's Declaration of the Rights of Man.

Free Poland's Constitution of 1791 was saluted by reference when the nation was reconstituted after World War I. It is celebrated in the hearts of the people of Poland today. It is remembered—as all men and women remember the emotions of their childhood and the traditions passed on by their ancestors—in many families of Polish descent throughout this country and all over the world.

The Polish people's fate for the last century and a half has not been a happy one.

Three times the nation was partitioned—and at last temporarily obliterated—in the wars between Russia, Prussia, and Austria. German and Russian troops met in a campaign that led to the "final" partition of 1795. But Poland rose again. German and Russian troops met again in partition of 1939—and in 1953 the Soviet Union obliterated the existing state to the extent of imposing a Communist-style constitution for a so-called peoples' democracy.

It can safely be assumed in this House that the people of Poland have no liking for the imperialistic intervention of the Soviet Union in their national affairs.

They have been able to maintain a national existence on a somewhat different plane from that endured by other eastern European countries. Yet they cannot live except in the consciousness of the danger of even more pervasive evils of total intrusion.

The sense of nationality is a characteristic that the Polish people have developed to a high degree. They preserved it through a century and a quarter—throughout the five generations that encompassed the rise and fall of Napoleon, the rise and fall of the triple alliance, the age of Victoria, the emergence of the United States as a world power, and through more wars and battles than we care to speak of. A free nation of Poland was born again after all this time and all these events—and no doubt a free Poland will rise once more after the testing time of the present.

It is the privilege of all in this House to speak with frankness and respect of the Polish people's Constitution Day, and to pay our tribute to the spirit it represents.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes overlooked that the American Revolution and the French Revolution had their counterparts in Poland. The date was May 3, 1791, when Poland achieved a constitution. Of his own volition the king limited his power and vested legislative powers in a diet of two chambers. Modest as these changes were compared to those of the United States and France, they were regarded by the central and eastern European monarchs of the 18th century as revolutionary. It was no idle figure of speech when Poles in the last decade of the 18th century were called the Frenchmen of the north.

A strong, stable, and liberally minded Poland was abhorrent to Russian absolute rulers. In less than 5 years the Russian czar, assisted by the monarchs of Austria and Prussia, dissolved the Polish kingdom.

Perhaps the heaviest sorrow lay with Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, who had fought gallantly in both the American Revolution and the Polish defense. When the constitution had been announced, he had immediately declared himself for it. Kosciusko had fought hard in America, fighting not for foreigners but for the democratic principles for which the American Revolution was being waged. He and his fellow countryman Pulaski had dreamed of a strong and democratic Polish nation. Pulaski had died defending democracy. Kosciusko had seen his dream come true and disappear—a brief interlude of hope amid chaos.

Poland today is not free; it is not democratic; and it is not independent. Once again Russia has brought about the downfall of this proud nation. The Communist regime has suppressed the celebration of Polish Constitution Day. Nevertheless, we in the United States share the sentiments which the Poles still retain for this historic document. It is a symbol of independence and of progress toward democracy. Let us hope that the principles which that constitution embraces may soon be restored to the Polish people.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, today May 3, marks the 170th anniversary of the Constitution of free Poland. Just 170 years ago today, the Polish Diet unanimously voted to create a country founded upon the democratic principle of popular sovereignty. This act becomes all the more significant when viewed in the light of the European situation at the end of the 18th century. To the west of Poland was a France that was on the verge of the Napoleonic years. To the east, a Russia firmly held under czarist dictatorship. Yet the courageous Poles of 1791, following the example which our own Nation had set not too many years earlier, struck out on a new road: the road of liberty and democracy.

These principles, long held dear by the Polish people, are commemorated every year on the anniversary of the Polish Constitution. For the past decade and a half, however, this traditional day of celebration has been dimmed by the shadow of the Communist tyranny which hangs so heavily over that country. The people of Poland have, nevertheless, even under this harsh and oppressive dictatorship, continually demonstrated love of freedom and constitutional government which led their forefathers to write the historic Constitution of 1791. They have demonstrated to the world on many occasions that they will not remain pawns of the Soviet Union.

It may truly be said that the shots fired in Poznan in 1956 were, indeed, "heard 'round the world." Freedom-loving Poles, throughout Poland and the world, hope, pray, and fight for the liberation of their homeland from the alien dictatorship. As long as Poland remains a captive nation, we in the United States shall join them in their prayers, in the hope that someday, in the not too distant future, Polish Constitution Day may once again be a cause for jubilant celebration rather than mournful prayer.

On this the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, it is only fitting and proper that we pause to express both our sympathy and our congratulations to the Polish people. Our feelings are indeed ambivalent at this moment. To the Polish people currently held captive by an international Communist tyranny we extend our heartfelt sympathy, and pray that we may one day welcome their land back to the community of free nations. At the same time, we congratulate the Polish people on their continued faith in God and in democracy, in the face of an atheistic and tyrannical government. On this historical, though sad day, we wish to join with Americans of Polish descent in praying for the reemergence of the Poland reflected in the 1791 Constitution.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 170th anniversary of the proclamation of the Polish Constitution. On May 3, 1791, the Polish people promulgated a democratic constitution, the first of its kind in Central Europe. The document was never enforced, though, since the partitioning of Poland by the surrounding powers began immediately after its declaration. However, the day will always be remembered, for the spirit of the democratic-loving people of Poland lives on, through tyranny and war, chaos, and destruction. We salute this indestructible spirit and express our hopes that once more the Polish people will be free to celebrate their cherished Constitution, that once more they may enjoy sovereignty and independence so rightfully theirs.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was a liberal, democratic, and progressive document. That Constitution aimed to overhaul the old and unwieldy governmental machinery of the country, and at the same time its framers hoped to strengthen Poland against her foreign foes. By its provisions Poland's autocratic king became a constitutional monarch with limited powers. A cabinet type of government was established. The upper chamber lost much of its power, and the authority of the lower chamber was enhanced. The nobility lost a good deal of its privileges, and the townsmen regained their right to hold many public offices. The power of landlords over the peasantry was curbed, and the latter was brought under the protection of the law. Religious toleration was guaranteed. These and certain other liberal features of this Constitution marked it as a pioneering document, embodying the liberal spirit of the age. It was joyously welcomed by all Poles, and the day of its promulgation was made a national holiday.

Unfortunate events to the promulgation and adoption of this Constitution prevented its implementation. Thus unhappy Poles never had the chance to have it work, but during the past 170 years they have clung to the ideals embodied in it, and celebrate its anniversary as a memorable national holiday.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks an important date in the long calendar of the history of the Polish nation and the Polish people. On May 3, 1791—170 years ago—the free people of Poland established for themselves a truly liberal guidemark in the form of a constitution. This document embodied the true spirit of the liberal ideals which still guide freemen throughout the world today. It is set forth in clear and unmistakable form that the powers of government are derived from the people and belong to the people.

This May 3d is observed by Poles throughout the world as the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day. I rise to pay homage to this document and to the Polish people.

I believe it is fitting that this document came into being but 2 short years after the establishment of our own great Constitution. Since that date the people of Poland and the people of this Nation have been bound together in a true spirit of freedom.

Four years after the establishment of this constitution the Polish nation was partitioned for a third time by the Russians, Prussians, and Austrians. Throughout the years following that partition Poland has suffered cruelly under the hands of tyranny and absolutism. As we all know, as recently as 1939

the twin evils of nazism and communism met on Polish soil to eradicate the soul of the Polish nation.

That soul and the spirit of the Polish people will never die. In 1953 there was imposed upon the Polish nation under Soviet rule a so-called people's court. We all know all too well that this document does not in the least embody the true feelings of the Polish people.

Those who have visited Poland discover quickly that while the government of that nation is communistic, the Polish people themselves are not. These people know that someday Poland will carry out its true destiny in mankind and that eventually that nation will once again occupy its true place among the free nations of the world.

I salute the spirit of the Polish people that is embodied so well in this historic document of May 3, 1781, and I can close in no better fashion than quoting these words from that document:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and objective being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, 170 years ago today, the Polish people struck a pioneer blow for liberalism in Europe. On this the anniversary of the 3d of May Constitution, persons of Polish origin throughout our Nation and throughout the world, as well as lovers of liberty everywhere, will be paying tribute to the memory and dedication of those statesmen who during a time of turmoil proudly proclaimed to the world those principles for which their nation stood. While the imperial powers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria menaced her frontiers, Poland declared her adherence to the then shaky principle of the sovereignty of the people within the state.

Unhappily, the Polish efforts of 1791 were not sufficient to preserve that nation in the face of the cruel might and ambitions of Russia and Prussia. Until 1919, Poland remained chained by despotism. The Polish nation then emerged to enjoy 20 years of illustrious independence. As we know, Poland is now again bound unmercifully to Russia, but if Poland can be manacled, Poland can never be broken. Polish liberty can be repressed, but Polish liberty cannot be exterminated. Russian steel has never shown itself to be adequate to the task of piercing the spirit of a Poland steeped in a proud and upright history. No barbaric and oppressive wind from the East can turn Poland's face from the heritage of the West to which the Polish people have contributed so much.

Generosity and idealism have long been associated with the spirit of Polish patriotism. Many sons of Poland have left their homeland to fight for freedom and justice wherever these truths have attempted to make themselves known. What schoolchild does not know of Kosciusko and Pulaski who, in the days of America's fight for independence, saw the torch of liberty burning and came to carry it aloft?

Today, Poland cries out for aid against the brute forces of ruthlessness. Let America respond not only out of appreciation to the many Poles who have borne our banners but out of concern with the repression of a great nation. Poland stands today as an example that the mind cannot be forced into submission nor the soul into treachery. Let us hope, however, that before long Poland can wave her courage on high instead of preserving it in her heart. Let us hope for that day, but even more, let us actively seek it.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, 170 years ago the people of Poland, inspired by the ideals of the American Revolution and the French Revolution, undertook the writing of a constitution under which representative government and human dignity were emphasized. Although Poland in 1791 was surrounded by greedy nations which had already partitioned great sections of its territory, its people courageously defied the Prusso-Russian threats and on May 3, 1791, adopted, through their representatives, a liberal constitution.

But her great reactionary neighbors, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, intolerant of liberal ideas, invaded Poland with their military might in order "to teach 'Jacobins of the east' a lesson." The courageous people of Poland made a last stand in defense of their freedom under their leader Thaddeus Kosciusko who had received his military training under Washington fighting for America's independence.

The struggle was an unequal one with the result that Poland ceased to exist as an independent state until 1919. Even after her rebirth, Poland was not destined to enjoy freedom. Nazi and afterwards Soviet occupations have left that country still today not the master of its destinies but a puppet of the Soviet Union under a puppet Communist regime.

The people of Poland will not be allowed by the Communist regime to celebrate their real independence day on May 3. However, we, free men in America, know that on May 3 the minds of all freedom-loving Poles will be thinking of their real independence day. The Communists have not succeeded in their efforts to erase May 3 from the minds of the Polish people.

We hope that some day the Polish people will again celebrate May 3 as freemen under free democratic institutions.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, on this day, 170 years ago, there was heard in Europe a resounding call to freedom and democracy. On May 3, 1791, the Polish Diet overwhelmingly approved a new constitution which followed the example set by the French Rights of Man and our own Declaration of Independence. As one observer explained:

> The nation was given liberty and independence; the respect for the law, for person, and property was assured; and all this without violence, without murder, solely through the virtue of the courage of the nation.

In these times of crisis when one-third of the world lies under the yoke of communism and the remainder are threatened with the same fate, it is necessary that we periodically reaffirm our belief in the ideals of liberty and democracy. Few days could be as appropriate to such a reaffirmation as the national holiday of the Polish people, the selfsame Poles who contributed so much to the cause of freedom through the centuries. From Kosciusko and Pulaski to the workers at Poznan the Polish people have been in the vanguard of the fight against tyranny. Unfortunately they have also been among those least given to enjoy the freedom they so long desired.

On this anniversary of their Constitution Day we express our hopes that Poland will soon see the realization of the dream of independence and democratic government so eloquently expressed in the Constitution of May 3.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the Polish people have suffered many hardships and have sacrificed more for their freedom than many nations in Europe, but unfortunately they have not been adequately rewarded for their efforts. Today they find themselves enslaved in their homeland by Communist totalitarianism. Even in misery and misfortune, however, they look back to their happier and glorious days, and seek inspiration in their past. One such source of inspiration is the great Constitution of May 3, 1791.

That Constitution made Poland a constitutional, limited monarchy with a government based upon Cabinet responsibility. The upper chamber lost much of its power, and the lower—or the popularly elected—chamber gained authority and responsibility. Townsmen regained some of their former rights, and many public offices were opened to them. The powers of landlords were curtailed, and the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law. Freedom of conscience and of speech were guaranteed. In this and in many other respects the Polish Constitution of May remains as one of the brightest landmarks in Poland's political and constitutional history.

Today on the observance of its 170th anniversary all Poles everywhere pay tribute to the memory of its framers, and affirm their devotion to the ideals embodied in it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, marks the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, an anniversary that is observed by Americans of Polish descent throughout the United States, and in every corner of the world where people of Polish ancestry now live.

It is tragic that the people of Poland cannot join in the open celebration of this day which commemorates the adoption of Poland's Constitution on May 3, 1791, just 2 years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

The Polish people cherish freedom, and the history of this gallant nation has been the history of a people's determined struggle to gain and maintain political freedom from tyranny.

Poland, in spite of the dedication of its people to freedom, and their continued and determined struggle to regain national independence, has experienced only brief periods of liberty as a nation since the adoption of its Constitution.

Polish-Americans, since the days of the Revolution, have made great contributions to the growth and development of the United States. The great Polish patriots, Gen. Casimir Pulaski and Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, joined the American patriots in the fight for American liberty and independence.

It is appropriate on this Polish Constitution Day that we Americans join with the people of Poland and those of Polish ancestry in a devout prayer for Polish independence and the restoration of individual freedom for the citizens of Poland.

Here in the Congress we pause on this date to express the tremendous admiration we of the United States have for the courage, the patience, and the fortitude of the Polish people which they have displayed in their determination to regain their national freedom.

May the struggle of the Polish people against oppression triumph, and may their confidence and faith in the might of justice and the destiny of Poland culminate in the reestablishment of Poland as a free nation.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, each year we in the free world look forward to joining with liberty-loving Poles everywhere in ceremonies marking their rededication to the principles of their May 3 constitution.

It is inspiring to Americans who themselves have over a period of 172 years lived, prospered, and grown great under the U.S. Constitution—undominated by foreign tyrannies—that the Polish people treasure the precious heritage of liberalism which they enjoyed during a fleeting moment of freedom in their tragic and glorious history. For 170 years Polish patriots have called to world attention their proud and unquenchable yearning for liberty on each anniversary of the 1791 Polish Constitution.

That Poles commemorate May 3—an occasion of peace and of liberalism and democratic parliamentarianism—signifies the greatness of this people.

The American and the 1791 Polish Constitutions were jointly inspired by ideals of the enlightenment and thus shared a potential for democratic development. For the Polish nation this glorious destiny was not to be, for rapacious imperialist powers shortly sundered her and subjected her people. The yoke has not yet been lifted and today Poles suffer a different and even crueler tyranny.

It is incumbent on us in the free world to keep alive the flame of hope for the freedom-loving Poles who yearn and work for liberation of their state by joining with them on this May 3 to celebrate Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the conflict which grips every quarter of the world today, and which grows hotter with each passing month, can be summed up in one, simple, analytical sentence. It is a life and death struggle between those who believe in representative self-government which guarantees the basic freedoms together with the blessings of individual liberty, and those who believe in a totalitarian dictatorship which flaunts every concept of freedom while denying every exercise of individual liberty. Volumes have been written and spoken about the nature of the conflict in which we are now engaged but in the final analysis it boils down to these basic essentials. And this is why the leaders of Russian communism have made the United States of America the primary target in their global plan to establish a world empire controlled by a handful of Russian autocrats sitting in Moscow. The Russian leaders are keenly aware that the National Independence Movement, the natural enemy of all forms of colonialism and imperialism, was born in our Thirteen Original Colonies and that the end product of the American Revolutionary War was a Constitution out of which generations of free Americans have developed the most advanced form of popular, representative self-government the world has ever known. That is why the United States is today the primary target of the Russian imperialists. Recognizing these facts of life will lead us to an understanding of where our real strength lies and who our proven allies are in the winner take all struggle with the Russians.

Today, May 3, marks the 170th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. It is no accident of history that the people of Poland adopted their first Constitution but 2 years after the adoption of the American Constitution. The freedom loving sons of Poland came to our shores in legions to support the inspiring purposes of our Declaration of Independence. Led by great men such as Pulaski and Kosciusko whose place in American and world history is assured, these sons of Poland fought for those ideals proclaimed by our Founding Fathers. Our victory in the Revolutionary War brought encouragement and hope to the oppressed in many distant lands and the people of Poland lost no time in following the example of our success. The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, was predicated on the belief that the authority of the State was granted by and subject to the popular will of the people. Poland was then surrounded by empires predicated on belief in the sovereign rights of czars, kings, and assorted despots. The trumpet call for popular forms of government, coming from Poland, deeply disturbed the then reigning monarchs. They reasoned that should the Polish venture in constitutional government be allowed to succeed, it would not be long before the infection of human freedom would topple their empires. The national independence movement in Poland was built upon the concept of national sovereignty as distinguished from that of the sovereign state comprising several or many nations. Thus, two ideological threats to the then existing empires were raised by the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. These ideals and their popular support among the Polish people led to the invasion and partition of Poland in 1795 by the combined action of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The Constitution of May 3 was declared to be nonexistent by the occupying powers.

But history tells us that ideals which grip the spirit of man cannot be wiped out by invasions, occupation by a foreign power, or the tyrants' whip. The people of Poland endured foreign occupation and partition for over a century, a century in which the rule of empire controlled most of Europe. World War I brought the total collapse of imperial rule over long submerged nations in the heartland of Europe, and introduced the golden age of national independence. Poland arose again, her culture flourished, her national life revived and for more than 2 decades the people of Poland were masters of their destiny. But these 20-some years gave witness to the restoration of the Russian Empire under the banner of communism, crushing the national independence of many newly independent nations, and the rise of a tyrant in Germany who had dreams of a vast empire. It was the secret agreement between the leaders of the Red Russian Empire and the Nazis, aimed at destroying the national independence of Poland, which launched World War II. Thus, history repeated a dark chapter, a chapter of struggle between imperialism and the national independence movement. Poland was the victim and remains the victim of Red Russian imperialism to this very day.

But the people of Poland have not accepted the rule of the Russian proconsuls who have been imposed upon them by their ancient enemy. The present Warsaw regime could not stay in power for 48 hours without the support of the Russian armed forces in Poland and those stationed in the puppet state of East Germany. Gomulka knows this as does every Pole worthy of the name. The Russian leaders are using Gomulka as a convenient safety valve, to keep the Polish nation from exploding with contempt for communism and the Russian empire which hides behind its slogans and propaganda. Now the question arises: Should the United States help Gomulka and his henchmen stay in power by extending assistance to his regime or should the United States refuse to bail him and his Russian masters out of the economic predicament in which they have placed the Polish nation? The answer is obvious. Anything we do to strengthen or preserve the Gomulka regime is a premeditated blow against the hopes and aspirations of the Polish people.

The true character of the Gomulka regime is clearly evidenced by events in Poland during the past 2 weeks. That regime has organized public demonstrations to support the Castro regime in Cuba, to denounce the United States as an imperial power and to paint the United States as a powerless nation, unable to assist its friends who live but 90 short miles from our shores. The purposes of those rigged demonstrations in Poland are obvious. Gomulka and his henchmen are attempting to convince the people of Poland that their confidence in the United States is ill advised, that the United States is powerless to support its friends, that communism is unbeatable and that they should make their peace with him. It is time the Government of the United States began to treat Gomulka and his crowd with the

same contempt with which he treats our country. This would raise the hopes of the people of Poland and hasten the day when that Russian puppet regime would be toppled by the popular will of the Polish people.

The people of Poland are our proven allies. They are bound to us historically, they cherish the same ideals we hold to be as dear as life itself, they belong to the culture of the Western World, they long for a return of their national independence, they will not long be denied their human and political rights as a nation. It is time we recognized these facts of life. It is time we began to treat the people of Poland as our allies and the alien regime imposed upon them as our sworn enemy.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I am most honored today to join in this solemn commemoration of the anniversary of the famed Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

It is a day of memory deeply enshrined in the minds of those living within Poland, despite their present oppression by Soviet Russia, and those of Polish birth and descent now residing in many other areas of the world, including our United States.

May 3, 1791, was a day of honor of accomplishment as the Polish Diet, meeting in Warsaw, adopted the new Constitution by unanimous vote. It was a milestone in the centuries-old struggle of mankind for liberty and freedom just as was our own Declaration of Independence. Significantly, the Constitution of May 3 was adopted just 2 short years after the adoption of our own Constitution.

This should be a day of joyous celebration. Instead, because of the masters of the Kremlin, people of Polish birth and descent and believers in freedom and liberty everywhere must observe this sacred anniversary in contemplation and in prayer for a future when Poland will regain its position as a free nation and its people once again will live under the Constitution of May 3.

Here in these hallowed Halls of Congress it is most fitting that we, on this day, join in these prayers and hopes for early deliverance of the Polish nation from the bonds of Soviet Russia. Through our observance, and all others being held during this month of May, may the faith and courage of Poles everywhere be deepened and maintained until the ultimate triumph of justice.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Poland, throughout her history, has struggled unceasingly for freedom. In spite of sufferings, of invasions, partitions and occupations the desire for liberty has never left the Polish people. It was this search for freedom—so often unattainable—that brought many of the Polish people to our shores. Poland's loss was to be our gain, for these brave Poles did much to assist us in our own struggle to obtain and maintain freedom.

Ever since the American Revolution, Polish blood has been shed for American liberty. Thaddeus Kosciusko and Casimir Pulaski were instrumental in our initial struggle for independence. In the Mexican, Civil, and Spanish-American Wars, also, Americans of Polish descent fought for the preservation of our liberty. More recently in World War I, 300,000 and World War II over 900,000 served with honor in the defense of freedom.

Polish-Americans aided in the development of America as well as in its defense. The vast energy of the Polish immigrant contributed to the growth of America. They assisted in the cultivation of our soil, in the construction of our railways and in the development of our mines. They have been peaceful, honest, hard-working and loyal American citizens.

It is appropriate, on this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, that all Americans express their appreciation to Polish-Americans for their contributions to the defense and development of America. At the same time it offers the American people an opportunity to reiterate their concern for the Polish people in Poland who still are not free; to assure these oppressed people that the American conscience will never know peace until the Polish people are once again masters of their own fate; and to promise them that we will work for conditions in the world that will eventually enable the Polish people to choose the form of government under which they will live.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is regretfully ironic that May 3, Polish Constitution Day, is celebrated with greater ceremony by this body, and throughout the United States, by Polish-Americans than it is in Poland itself. This is not to say that the people of Poland are unaware of the significance of this day, nor is it to say that they are tending to forget the freedom they might have with a different form of government. To remove this day from the minds and hearts of Poles would require total eradication of their history—a program that communistic governments of captive nations openly promote, but seldom accomplish.

It is entirely fitting and proper, though, that we take note of Polish Constitution Day, for America in 1789 and Poland in 1791 adopted similar courses of action governmentally. Their Constitution arose out of the same feelings and desires for liberty and justice as did ours. They were the first nation to join with the United States in a venture into democracy.

Destiny has given us vastly different positions today, but our mutual love of freedom binds us irrevocably. This Nation might take further note that its favorable geographic location was one of the biggest factors, in our early years, in explaining the differences between our two nations today. Poland, surrounded by contiguous enemies, was subject to their powerful wrath at the formation of a liberal constitutional government. Our Nation, at that time, was relatively sheltered and protected from the same wrath of its enemies. But shelter and protection today is nonexistent. Any new nation is subject—militarily, economically, and psychologically—to the form of invasion that has produced the Poland of today. Let these new nations beware. For when a country steeped in the vitality, the history of legal protection of human rights, the yearning for freedom—when a nation of this background falls into the hands of tyranny, what protects the many young, impressionable nations from the same tragedy? Certainly Poland was not without leadership. She had Kosciusko and Pulaski in her youth; Paderewski and Beck in her maturity. These men, so devoted to the fight for sovereignty for their country, all carried the torch abroad after the borders of their homeland had been closed to them.

No, it is not likely that Poles at home or abroad are about to surrender their heritage although the degradation of giving up their freedom has been forced upon them these many years. This is why we still know Poland through its many partitions and dominations by foreign powers. The name of a less persevering people would long ago have disappeared—totally absorbed by her conquerors.

Although we here today can give voice to Poland's plight and summarize her hope for the future, we cannot give this day the reverence that it will be given by her people at home. They will be forced to quietly remember, quietly meditate, hopefully plan for their day to shout aloud that they are free.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the bonds of friendship which link the people of the United States to the people of Poland have been strengthened rather than weakened by the imposition of a Communist dictatorship in the halls of government at Warsaw.

We know that the people of Poland today cherish the same spirit of freedom and the same devotion to democracy that has characterized the history of their country for centuries. The atheistic Communist conspiracy may succeed in dominating a government, and by brute force may master a nation—but it cannot destroy the conscience nor the aspirations of a people who, like the Poles, have known oppression and tyranny for years but have never for a moment lost courage or hope in the ultimate triumph of right.

In the worldwide struggle of men of good will against the masters of deceit and darkness, we in the United States must constantly reaffirm our dedication to the preservation of freedom and to the release from bondage of all peoples. On this day, which has been celebrated as Poland's Constitution Day for 170 years, we salute the people of Poland and pledge to them and to all oppressed peoples of the world our friendship and our understanding.

As we see the atheistic Communist conspiracy marching onward coldly and relentlessly, we in the free world must not only speak loudly and firmly but must take vigorous and effective action to preserve our way of life. If it is worth saving—and it very definitely is—then it is worth saving now. If it is good for us—and it is—then it is good for others. And most importantly, if we permit others to lose their freedom, how long can we preserve our own?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, today, citizens of Polish origin in many

countries, including thousands in our own United States and in my own Connecticut, celebrate a Polish national holiday—the 3d of May Constitution Day.

For 170 years, this day has been a day of great significance to all Poles. It is today a landmark on freedom's trail.

In the district which I have the honor to represent, and likewise in many other congressional districts, Americans of Polish ancestry have made plans for appropriate observance, not only today but extending throughout this month of May.

It is becoming that we in the Congress should take note of this anniversary, so that all Americans may be reminded that Poland was one of the pioneers of freedom in Europe.

It was on May 3 in 1791, 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, that Poland, without a bloody revolution, succeeded in reforming her government. But this great thrust for freedom, the adoption of the Constitution of Poland, came too late, and did not prevent the carving up of Poland, for the third time, by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, in 1795.

The greatness of the May 3 Constitution of Poland was marked because the constitution eliminated with one stroke the greatest weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The people of Poland were united in a great moment in history, when they proclaimed in their Constitution that—

> All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

On this anniversary, let all Americans be reminded of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind.

Let us encourage as we may our friends in Poland that justice must triumph, and one day again will end Soviet Russia's deprivation of the Poles of their independence, sovereignty and territory.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, much of the color, tumult and heroism of our Nation's immortal struggle for independence originated in the confines of what is now the Fifth District of Massachusetts. To those of us who call this area home the Revolutionary War is not a faded page of history. We have grown up with the famous bridge at Concord, the gallant minutemen at Lexington, the storied midnight ride.

We who love the tales of redcoats and patriots are ever mindful of the vast debt the United States owes the Polish soldier-statesman, Thaddeus Kosciusko. For 8 years, he gave of his courage and genius, risking his life at Saratoga and in the Carolina campaigns out of sheer devotion to the freedom of man.

When Kosciusko returned to Poland, we stood on the threshhold of our great Republic. We watched, with brotherly pride, as he laid the groundwork for liberty in his own homeland. The Polish Constitution, adopted 170 years ago today, reflects his deep friendship and empathy with Thomas Jefferson. It is patterned closely after our own principles of freedom and dignity of the individual.

Sharing with our Polish friends this inborn love of liberty and the legacy left us by their national hero, we rise today in the House to voice the prayer that in the goodness of time Poland will see her Constitution of May 3, 1791, restored; that, in the words of this Constitution:

> All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, modern history of the Polish people is marked with misfortunes and calamities. This was especially so in the late 18th century when their freedom and independence were in jeopardy. In 1772, they had already lost a third of their territory to Austria, Prussia and Russia. In order to forestall the repetition of such a disaster, Polish leaders aimed at strengthening the Government of Poland by reforming and overhauling its ineffective governing machinery. In 1788, a committee of the Diet—the Assembly—began to draw up a constitution. In the course of 3 years this work was finished, and the resulting document, the Constitution of May 3, 1791, was promulgated on that day. For the Poles the date became memorable and the Constitution a historic document.

That Constitution introduced many radical changes in the government of the country. Poland became a constitutional monarchy, with a responsible cabinet type of government. The powers of the lower chamber were enhanced and those of the upper chamber drastically reduced. The barriers separating the nobility from other classes were practically eliminated. The authority of landlords over the peasantry was reduced, and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. Religious toleration was guaranteed. All such liberal provisions made the Constitution a truly democratic document. Its promulgation was hailed both by Poles and by their friends in many lands. The date of its promulgation became and remains to this day a national holiday.

Unfortunately for the Poles and for their friends, the Constitution was not put to work, because soon after its adoption Poland's foes made war upon her, eventually defeating her, thus putting an end to her independent existence and to the Constitution of May 3. But the Polish people have steadfastly clung to the spirit of that historic document; they still cherish the ideals embodied in it, and reaffirm their devotion to these ideals by celebrating its promulgation anniversary as a national holiday.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, people of Polish extraction throughout the world will observe Poland's Constitution Day, which is that nation's most celebrated national holiday even though the country continues to suffer under the heel of Soviet domination.

The Polish Constitution was adopted just 170 years ago in Warsaw and was both inspired by and patterned after our own Federal Constitution and Declaration of Independence.

Five years from now, Poland will be 1,000 years old. Throughout its long history, its people have maintained a constant and vigorous battle for personal freedom and independence, despite aggression by its neighbors. From the 14th to 17th centuries, it was one of the world's great powers. Later it was apportioned four times and, finally, completely engulfed.

The heroic stand of the Polish people in 1939 in the face of Nazi and Soviet coercion will go down in history as one of the most courageous defenses of principle and human dignity ever recorded. It will be recalled that this resistance cost Poland thousands of lives, its independence, and helped set off World War II.

The imposition by Soviet Russia of a communistic constitution on the Polish people in 1952 darkened hopes that this freedom-loving nation, which had led the world's resistance to tyranny in 1939, would be given back its independence by the Western Powers with whom she sacrificed so much.

But the fires of independence which had burned for nearly 1,000 years could be extinguished in less than a decade, and the entire free world today is aware that the land of Chopin, Paderewski, and Pulaski is as firmly dedicated as ever to the overthrow of oppression. The first nation to lead the resistance against nazism well may be the first inside the Iron Curtain to successfully rise up against communism—if she is given the moral and physical support of those countries which are free.

The desire all Americans have for the eventual emancipation of the people now enslaved by communism perhaps is best expressed in the document the Poles will celebrate May 3. The Polish Constitution of 1791 sets forth this principle:

> All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

I believe I can say that all who hold our own Constitution sacred join the people of Polish extraction, in Poland and elsewhere throughout the world, in their determination to restore that historic principle to their own government by throwing off the yoke of Russian oppression.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to speak on behalf of the Polish people throughout the world, who celebrate Poland's Constitution Day each year on the 3d of May. I speak not only for the loyal, patriotic Poles now enduring hardship and privation in a Poland devoid of its cherished freedoms and liberties, but also for the millions of people of Polish descent now living in the United States and in other parts of the free world.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 was an important event in the history of Poland. It marked the beginning of modern Poland, with a limited monarchy, ministerial responsibility, and biennial parlia-

ments. Much of the obstructive machinery of the old system was abolished and invidious class distinctions were done away with. Absolute religious toleration was established. No sooner was the Constitution adopted, however, than it was overthrown by the force of invading Russian armies. Since then Poland has known little freedom except for the brief period between the two World Wars.

Poland still is not free today, more than 15 years after Hitler's nazism was crushed to the ground. During the war, Stalin promised to see that free elections were held in Poland. But this pledge was cynically brushed under the rug and a Communist government forced onto the Polish nation by its Soviet masters. Poland still has a Communist government that lacks genuine public support; Poland still lives in the shadow of Soviet domination.

Poland's latest so-called free election was held only last month. Ninety-five and one-half percent of the eligible voters went dutifully to the polls, or slightly less than the traditional Communist total of 99.5 percent. But what could the voters choose between? There was no real choice. They could elect 460 parliamentary deputies from a list of 616. But this was almost meaningless when you look behind the facade of the people's democracy. The only parties authorized to nominate candidates were the Communists and their allies in the National Unity Front. And even the objectionable or independent minded candidates among these parties had been weeded out by the bosses before the lists were submitted to the voters. The results of this "election" were predictable even before the people trudged to the ballot boxes.

The Soviet Union has consistently exploited the satellite economies since the end of World War II. At the same time the satellites, until recently, have not been permitted to accept the benefit from the economic aid offered by the free world. Look at the record.

In the final stages of the war and for some time after that, more than a hundred Soviet Army units lived in Poland and stripped it of its food reserves and other stocks. Poland was never paid for this. The Polish people were desperately short of food after the war and received massive aid from UNRRA—the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. All together the UNRRA provided $201 million in food to meet this crisis. But at the same time this was happening, the Soviets seized and shipped to the Soviet Union more than $200 million worth of Polish food.

In 1948, the Soviet masters refused to permit Poland and the other satellites to join in the U.S.-sponsored Marshall plan for economic rehabilitation. Instead the Soviets set up their own counterpart of the Marshall plan for Eastern Europe, which instead of providing aid, however, continued the merciless exploitation of the satellite economies. During this period, Poland was annually forced to send 3 million tons of coal to the U.S.S.R. for nothing, as payment for the German plants in East Silesia which the Russians had turned over to Poland at the end of the war. These forced exports of Poland's most important commodity have cost the country many millions of dollars and have, in fact, created a domestic fuel shortage. Only the Poznan riots of 1956 brought a halt to these free shipments and elicited a Russian promise to pay world-market prices for other Polish imports.

The Soviet Union stripped Poland of much of its industrial, railroad and farm equipment in 1944–46 as war booty because it had theoretically been owned by German investors. In fact, however, this was true of only a small portion of what the Soviets extracted. Then the Russian masters refused to give Poland 15 percent of the reparations they collected from Germany, as had been agreed at the Potsdam conference. At first, Poland was to get industrial equipment, then it was changed to consumer goods. But what actually was received? The highest free world estimate sets the value at $60 million. If this is correct, it represented less than 1 percent of the reparations collected in Eastern Germany alone by the Soviet Union. Thus the Soviets gave Poland only one-fifteenth of what they solemnly promised to give her at the great power meeting in Potsdam.

Even Polish territory has not been safe. As late as 1951, the Soviet Union simply annexed a strip of Polish land southeast of Lublin, and in return gave Poland a strip in the Carpathian hills. The fertile black earth area ceded by the Poles had been previously known as possessing rich deposits of bituminous coal, a part of the only coal field in existence between Silesia and the Donets basin, while the hilly area Poland received was relatively worthless.

Soviet Russian exploitation of Poland became so intense and all pervading that even the local Communist boss, Wladyslaw Gomulka, felt he had to make a public statement of some Polish grievances after the 1956 revolt. Gomulka coldly enumerated the errors of Soviet policy. There were the huge ruble debts growing out of false ruble-zloty exchange rate, with the Poles being paid ruinously low prices for their products and the Russians selling their own products at prices equally ruinous to the Poles. There was the failure of the Russians to account for, let alone repatriate, some 500,000 Poles believed to be held by them since World War II. There was the contempt for Polish sovereignty shown by the Soviets in moving Soviet troops about the country without Polish consent. These errors, Gomulka maintained, must be corrected. Despite what Gomulka and other Soviet puppets say, however, the Soviet Union still controls Poland both economically and politically.

Many accounts say that Soviet economic exploitation of Eastern Europe ceased after Stalin's death. This is not true. The character of the exploitation changed and it became more subtle. But it still is exploitation. After the Poznan riots and the Hungarian revolution, the Communist economic planners promptly began to pay more attention to agriculture and consumer needs and provided long-term loans to the satellites. Soviet outright extortions of Polish raw materials and industrial products stopped. But look at what has replaced this earlier Stalinist pattern of operations.

Through the Council for Mutual Economic Aid, the Soviet Union has organized the European satellites into one massive economic structure that functions almost exclusively for the benefit of the Soviets. The satellites all coordinate their economic development plans with those of the Soviet Union. Their trade relations have become increasingly limited to the other bloc countries, and especially to the Soviet Union. Each country specializes in some particular type of industrial production and becomes dependent upon its Communist neighbors for most of its other manufactured needs. Thus, Poland has been forced to reorient its economy to specialize in shipbuilding and railroad rolling stock, together with some light industries and trucks. The necessary raw materials usually must be purchased from the Soviet Union. The result is that the industries of Eastern Europe import Soviet raw materials and process them for reexport to the U.S.S.R., thus acting as a workshop for the Soviets. Under this arrangement, Russia emerges as the chief customer for machinery and strengthens her hold over the satellites.

The hidden and most virulent form of exploitation, however, lies in the Soviet's multiple-price system. The satellites are captive customers of the Soviet Union and are forced to pay higher prices for Soviet products than the free world countries pay when they purchase the same items from the Soviet Union. And, similarly, the Soviets refuse to pay Poland and the other satellites as much for their exports as Poland could earn by exporting them to the free world. For instance, Poland has had to supply the Soviet Union with millions of tons of coal at $1.25 a ton, when the world market price was between $12 and $15 a ton. Thus, the satellites have been forced to overpay the Soviets for their imports and have been underpaid for their exports to the Soviets.

It is clear that the Poland of today is still under the complete domination of the Soviet Union. While Khrushchev poses as the friend of nationalism and the foe of imperialism, he steadfastly denies the Polish people their long-sought-after right of freedom.

On this occasion of the celebration of the 3d of May Constitution, I wish to commend the Polish people for the courage and inspiration they have shown in their struggle for the reestablishment of freedom for the enslaved nations of the world.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in commemorating this 170th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution.

The people of the United States have a long record of friendship for the Polish people, solidified by the blood ties of many Americans of Polish origin. My own city of Cleveland is proud to include among its citizens a great number

of persons of Polish descent. They have contributed significantly to every aspect of community and civic life, discharging with the utmost conscientiousness the responsibilities of citizenship.

Ravaged by the Nazis and repressed by the Soviets, the people of Poland have never broken faith with the great principles of Western civilization. The Constitution of May 3, 1791, represents a major achievement in the history of Polish statesmanship, paralleling in many respects the U.S. Constitution adopted just a few years earlier. This historic document was inspired by the common ideals enunciated in our own Declaration of Independence, and embodied the principles of freedom and liberty so cherished by Western peoples.

Increasingly, the Communist regime is striving to blot out all remaining concepts of independence and freedom from central Europe. The church, long the stronghold of individual expression, has now been singled out as the primary target in the Communist campaign of harassment.

Despite the harsh repressions they have suffered at the hands of the Communist masters, the people of Poland still carry the spirit of freedom within their hearts. On occasion they have demonstrated their opposition to Soviet domination, and reaffirmed their adherence to the values set out in the 1791 Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, let us solemnly dedicate this day to the Polish people and the reemergence of a free and independent Poland. Our hearts unite in the prayer that these people who have contributed so richly to our common cultural and political heritage may again be enabled to share publicly in the joys of freedom and Western civilization.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the last 200 years peoples in many nations have discovered, often through trial, error, and hardship, that a democratic form of government is the most successful and rewarding. In the United States we chose to base our form of government in 1789 on republican constitutional principles. Out of Britain evolved the modern parliamentary government, which that country introduced in many farflung locations in the world. France and Italy fought long and hard for their democratic government with false starts and preliminary failures. Many countries, Poland among them, selected to base their governments on concepts of limited monarchy. No matter what form the democracy took or how long it took to establish, the countries all started from common beliefs and ideals.

Poland established its Constitution in 1791. Like all those countries that achieved some form of democracy in the 18th and 19th centuries, Poland thus demonstrated its belief in liberty, the rights of the individual, freedom of action and thought, minority rights, and limited government—all the tenets on which the governn.ents of the Western World are based.

In spite of Poland's avowed desire to practice these beliefs, she has been beset by foreign domination during most of the years since 1791. She has never had a substantial period of time in which to illustrate those principles which she set down in her Constitution. Nevertheless, throughout this period of Soviet subjugation, the Polish people have kept alive those ideals, always in the hope that they will be able to establish a democratic government once again. We take this day to commemorate and encourage the Polish people in this hope.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, today, the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, marks one of the high points in the history of free government. It marks the victory of democracy in a great nation. The Polish Constitution followed our Revolution by only a few years and after great contributions had been made to our Revolution by Polish patriots.

Often since that day, Poland has been beleaguered by oppressors, none worse than the Communist tyranny that for the present has crushed the rule of freemen in Poland.

This is a sober day under the present circumstances. Half the world is darkened by the Communist conspiracy, which cruelly twists the aspirations of common men to its own ends of world dominion. In Poland, as in many other lands, the faintest stir of desperate men seeking to be free is swiftly stamped out. But still the search goes on and cannot be stamped out completely. Poland knows what it is to be free and one day she must be free again. Until that day comes, however, we are none of us truly free.

Mr. Speaker, we should take this moment to pledge ourselves anew to the cause of freedom; to look to our own defenses; and to keep alive the brave legacy of Poland until she can redeem it for herself.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a scant 2 years following the ratification of our own Constitution a group of stalwart patriots making up the Polish Diet of 1791 in Warsaw adopted by unanimous vote a Constitution which, because of its similarity with our National Charter, remains a living testimony to the identical aims and purposes of our two great peoples.

With communism on the march throughout the world there are those who take each new saber-rattling as a threat to our own free institutions and seem inclined to accept the boast of each new pipsqueak dictator as something that subjects our liberty and free institutions to imminent danger. At a time like this it is imperative that we draw upon the example set us by the liberty-loving Poles who, despite a repetition of events resulting in their virtual enslavement, have fiercely maintained their determination to be free and are in as violent opposition to dictatorship today as they were 170 years ago when they drew up their bill of rights.

In each of the wars in which our Nation has become embroiled we have found stalwarts of Polish extraction fighting for the cause of their adopted land and there has never been a catalog of deeds of valor performed by American soldiers that has not included a long list of Polish names among those who have paid the hero's price for the preservation of human dignity and freedom. This Nation, which we all love, is the bulwark of liberty today largely because she has always been the haven for the oppressed and the sanctuary for those who have been forced to flee their native land in the face of some marauding tyrant. Coming to this land of the free they have brought with them their own unquenchable devotion to the cause of freemen and have quickly found their places in a society and economy in which each citizen shall be free to work out his destiny without let or hindrance from some strutting gauleiter or commissar.

In these times when people in high places seem inclined to equivocate or shirk their clear responsibility in a world in which power politics is basic to international interchange, it behooves us to take direction from our Polish friends who have never hesitated to bare their breasts to the shafts of the aggressor. No one wants war and no one wants to again see American youth sacrificed on the altar of global intrigue. The fact remains, however, that if oppressed peoples such as the Poles are ever to be freed and if we ourselves are not to taste the bitter dregs of enslavement by a godless ideology we must bestir ourselves—and quickly. And like these Polish patriots we must have a primary concern for our own security and a complete disregard for the opinions of the pacificist and the appeaser who call for peace even at the price of our national survival.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I count it an honor and a privilege to be able to join my many colleagues who extend the hand of friendship and support to the people of Poland. The American people—through their representatives in this Congress—speak to the people of Poland with messages of hope for the future.

This 170th anniversary of the enactment of Poland's modern and democratic Constitution is a solemn occasion. It is a reminder to all free people that a nation which led the way in modern history toward democracy now lies dominated by Soviet communism.

There is no justice when such a situation exists. Let us send our greetings to the courageous people of Poland who have had their independence so often trampled under by the military boot of invaders. Let us send our prayers and hopes to these brave people that the destiny of Poland is one of a free independent nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the record of Polish history is full of glorious deeds and gallant acts. The May Constitution of 1791, as the work of a group of Polish patriots, in their effort to overhaul the governmental machinery of the country and thereby save it from destruction by its enemies, constitutes a most glorious act.

Late in the 18th century Poland became prey to her aggressive neighbors. In 1772 she had already lost one-third of her territory to Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Poland herself was not strong

enough to prevent that disaster. Her weakness was rightly attributed to her autocratic government, and many enlightened Poles had been trying to devise means whereby the governmental machinery would be overhauled and strengthened by the solid support of the people. In 1788 a committee was formed for the specific purpose of drafting a Constitution. This task completed early in 1791, was regarded as the crowning achievement of a band of liberal, wise, and patriotic statesmen. The Constitution was promulgated in the midst of joy and celebration on May 3, and since then the date of its promulgation has become a Polish national holiday.

By the May Constitution of 1791 Poland's Government was modernized and brought up to date by the inclusion of many liberal and progressive provisions. The King's authority was limited, though he still retained many of the prerogatives of his position. His executive power was to be shared with a council of six, "Guardians of the Laws," made up of the primate and the heads of five departments. This council may be regarded as the forerunner of a cabinet type of government in Poland. The nobles lost many of their privileges and townsmen became eligible for some public offices. Agreements signed between the peasantry and their landlords came within the purview of the law. The popularity elected legislative chamber became more powerful, while the upper house lost a good deal of its powers. In short, by the May Constitution, Poland moved from the medieval days to modern times; it was transformed from an unlimited autocracy to one of limited monarchy.

We all know too well what followed the adoption of this liberal Constitution. Poland's implacable enemies, fearing that the birth of liberalism in Poland might spread to other lands, and also anxious to rob the Poles of what territory remained to them, made war on Poland. In the end the Poles lost the war, their country was partitioned, and the May Constitution never had the chance to be put into force. Thus one might say that this Constitution, with many of its idealistic provisions, was a dream and so it remains to patriotic and freedom-loving Poles to this day. They cherish its ideals and the spirit embodied therein, and have made the date of its promulgation a national holiday. Yes, Polish Constitution Day is indeed a Polish national holiday, and on this 170th anniversary celebration of that liberal and democratic Constitution I join in saluting all American friends of Polish ancestry.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, once again the gallant Poles, as well as peoples of Polish blood and other true lovers of liberty, celebrate Poland's May Constitution Day, an event that will and should be celebrated throughout the entire world by peoples of Polish blood, their friends, admirers and allies, and all those who are concerned with the great cause of freedom.

It is most fitting that this House should again join in celebrating Polish Constitution Day because our country is bound to Poland and the Polish people by the common heritage of free institutions and we are indebted to the Polish nation since Revolutionary days for most valuable, effective support by distinguished Polish leaders and soldiers who rallied and fought and died in the great battle we waged to become a free and independent nation.

There are still other compelling reasons why we are in the debt of the Polish nation, to be found in the increasingly large numbers of people of Polish birth and of Polish blood who have been, and are, such outstanding citizens of our own great country, who, in war and in peacetime, have served, sacrificed and died, whenever necessary, to uphold the security and freedom of the United States and who have labored and struggled throughout the years in our industrial, commercial, farm, and professional activities with a loyalty, a devotion and attachment to the best interests of the Nation that cannot be denied. The American Poles have grown steadily, not only in numbers, but in stature, and they are numbered among our most respected citizens, our most distinguished leaders and our most zealous patriots.

There is yet another strong reason why we should celebrate this day and that is to recall the great evil that has been worked upon Poland and its struggling people by Communist tyranny which alas, was fastened upon these defenseless people by unconscionable diplomatic agreements consented to by some of our own leaders but strongly disapproved by the American people.

The national conscience of America has been stirred by the deep wounds of a gallant nation betrayed, of a great people shamefully consigned to bondage in the name of vagrant, nefarious political expediency that was neither necessary nor just and that could never be morally justified.

The free world can never make adequate amends to the Polish people for this betrayal or for the terrible carnage and bloodshed, indignity, suppression, and debasement it has caused them in the intervening years, but if it be true to its own heritage, the free world must recognize the obligation to repair the damage and redress the hideous wrong that has been perpetrated upon a valiant people with a glorious history of over a thousand years of sacrifice and bloodshed to secure the rights and blessings of independence and freedom.

The ghastly injustice of a helpless Poland delivered to Soviet coercion can really be redressed in but one way, and that is by the liberation of the God-fearing souls that now suffer under the iniquitous tyranny to which they were abandoned.

On this occasion, inspired as we are by the indomitable fight of the Polish people for liberty throughout the centuries, we must recognize that, in truth, the real free world is split and divided by those who are truly free and those who are still behind the Iron Curtain yearning and struggling to be free.

Until the cruel shackles of enslaved nations and peoples are broken and the blessings of freedom and independence are restored to them, and their territories and their properties are again repossessed under their own control, can we say that there is a rule of law or fundamental concept of justice in this world, for it is as clear as the handwriting on the wall or the light of day, that until these great wrongs are redressed and the Poles and other free peoples are released from their bondage wherein they are compelled to suffer under a tyranny worse than death, there can never be any peace, let alone justice, in this world, there will never be any cessation of the struggle of many helpless nations and peoples to be liberated from darkness and oppression and permitted once again to breathe the hallowed air of freedom.

On this great day we celebrate, therefore, it is not only fitting but proper, and in keeping with our most glorious traditions, that we should once again reaffirm our faith in the principles by which the Polish Nation has lived and by which the Polish people still continue to be inspired.

Despite their oppression the fearless Poles are still fighting bravely with dogged determination for their liberation and liberty. We must let them know, we must let their oppressors know, and we must let the world know, that we will never forsake them to their plight, but that we will continue to encourage, support and assist them in every way that we possibly can in their aspirations to regain their freedom and once again to secure for themselves and their posterity the blessings of free, self-ordered government and the right to an independent, democratic existence as a nation, as individuals whose faith in God and in principles of freedom has never wavered through suffering and persecution.

Today let us with solemn resolution express our high and our strong, unalterable purpose that Poland and the other oppressed nations must and will be supported in such ways as to expedite the time when they may be liberated and freed from cruel domination and restored to their rights as free citizens in a peaceful world. May the good Lord bless the heroic Polish people. May this country and the free world encourage, sustain, and help them.

Polish history is replete with great intellectual stature, lofty moral purpose, and noble spiritual loyalty.

Notwithstanding their almost continual, historic struggles against tyranny, the Poles at an early time implemented many basic principles, procedures, and policies, which now have been written into the laws of many civilized countries and many democracies.

The Statute of Wislica, adopted in 1347, was not only the first codification of Polish laws, the charter of human rights of its time, but also the first complete code adopted by Christian Europe.

In the year 1430, 249 years before the enactment of the English Habeas Corpus Act, Poland adopted the various laws embodying the habeas corpus principle—no person should be detained unless legally convicted—and insuring to every individual accused of wrongdoing his right to a hearing in court. A similar law was not enacted by the French until

359 years after the Polish version of habeas corpus.

As early as 1573, Poland, a self-governing country, became a legal republic with kings elected for life as presidents by electors strikingly similar to those which elect American Presidents today.

The Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, preceded by 57 years the Constitutions of Germany and of Austria, and by 114 years the Constitution of Russia.

The truly impressive thing about these various enlightened measures passed centuries ago was that they were achieved in an era when absolute monarchies were the prevailing mode of government and were accomplished without revolution, bloodshed, or the loss of a single human life. Unlike the experience in other nations that subsequently enacted such laws, these notable reforms were accomplished by orderly, peaceful legislative processes and became precedents for other nations that later adopted them.

In a recent letter to the Boston Globe, Juliana Huszonek of Portland, Maine, made reference to these reforms and attributed them to certain elements of the indomitable Polish character—enormous, creative vitality based on mental, moral, and spiritual vigor, an innate sense of integrity and a highly developed sense of loyalty and patriotism for their country—be it America or Poland.

Americans of these troubled times should ask themselves this question: Is it fair, is it just, is it morally right that this great people should be abandoned to Marxist tyranny and persecution?

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, the revolutionary spirit of the 18th century had profound impact on many countries. New ideas, both progressive and liberal, were taking root in the Western World, and were spreading in all directions. In the United States, our Revolution produced the Declaration of Independence and the constitutional form of government. In France, the cry for liberty, equality and fraternity led to the French Revolution, and in isolated Poland the spirit of equality and tolerance, and also the urge to overhaul her governmental machinery, led to the adoption of the May Constitution in 1791.

That Constitution introduced a responsible cabinet type of government in Poland. Monarchical authority was considerably curtailed, and that of the people's representatives was enhanced. The Polish peasantry was relieved from the arbitrary authority of local feudal landlords and placed under the protection of the law. Economic and social class barriers were practically eliminated, and the townspeople were given political rights. The powers of the upper house were drastically reduced and those of the lower, elected house considerably increased. Even more significant than these important changes was the guaranteeing of religious freedom to all citizens of the country.

In short, this was a liberal, democratic and popular Constitution, drafted by the Polish patriots and promulgated on May 3, 1791. But unhappy Poles were never to live under its provisions, for soon after its promulgation Poland was partitioned by her foes. This anniversary celebration has become a Polish national holiday, and it is observed in all Polish communities where people enjoy freedom.

The anniversary of this important day deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It should remind all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind and prophesy the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty, and her territory by the Soviet Union.

Now, under the yoke of Communists, with their desire to stamp out the natural human desire for freedom wherever or whenever it is demonstrated, the Polish people must be constantly reminded of our passionate interest in freedom and liberty, not only for ourselves but for all the people of the world, including those who have demonstrated fervor for it so often, the Polish people themselves.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, today, May 3, 1961, marks the 170th anniversary of the adoption of a democratic Constitution by the people of Poland. On this occasion it is only fitting and proper that we pay tribute to the people of Poland and to those citizens of the United States of Polish origin.

The history of Poland is a history of a great people who have always fought for political and religious freedoms; a people who by their very nature are deeply religious and home loving. History records that generations ago the people of Poland saved Christianity from the pagan hordes that had overrun Europe. It also records that this freedom-loving nation has become the victim of the most vicious anti-Christian force the world has ever known.

The story of Poland's great has been told and retold. The valiant deeds of Polish men and women of the past have been repeated over and over again. No nation on God's earth has been subject to the brutality which has been the unhappy lot of Poland. Freedom has been completely suppressed. The school system, the youth organizations, the trade unions, universities, and colleges have all been subjected to corrupt totalitarianism.

On this day, which should be such a happy one for this courageous nation, we, in America, cannot help but feel the great sadness bearing on our brothers of Polish descent. In the days ahead it is our duty to rectify, whenever and in whatever way we can, the grievous wrong and injustice that has been done to Poland. It is our duty to sustain the spirit of Poland and her people; and to encourage them to live on in the hope and with the faith that liberty, freedom, and justice will again prevail. The soul of Poland is not dead. It lives and will continue to live until Poland is again a free land.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pleasure that I join my other colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying a just tribute to the genius and spirit of the brave Polish people. Today, May 3, is celebrated as Poland's Constitution Day. We, as Americans, who have given thought to the Constitution of Poland, are struck by certain great similarities between the organic law of that nation and the Constitution of the United States. In clear language, the Polish Constitution states:

> All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

From this, one can gather that liberalism is not the sole possession of Anglo-Saxons but is also shared by other peoples.

America has long acknowledged the greatness and invaluable contributions of Poland and of its people in all fields of human endeavor. In fact, Polish names are given to a great number of our streets and highways. Who hasn't heard of Madame Curie, the discoverer of radium? Who has not thrilled to the immortal music of Paderewski and of Artur Rubinstein? In my own State of Maryland, U.S. Route 40 is known as the "Pulaski Highway" and that great name is also borne by the Skyway bridges of U.S. Route 1 through New Jersey into the city of New York.

Today, Poland is but a state held captive by the atheistic, cruel, and inhuman Russian Communists. We Americans, who value liberty and freedom more than life itself, have not forgotten the plight of the Polish people behind the Iron Curtain. It is, therefore, right and proper that we, in the Congress of the United States, should call to the attention of the world that the people of Poland, who have been imbued with the highest standards of religious conduct, are now held in bondage. I wish to say to them that they should not despair, because right and justice will triumph in the end. I most strongly urge that everything possible be done to hasten their day of liberation, and I fervently hope that in the not too distant future Poland will take its rightful place among the community of free and independent nations.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, we live in a time of great challenge and grave crisis, as indeed was the case of the Polish people at the time when their Constitution of 1791 was instituted.

The President of the United States has appealed to the American people for help in devising new ways of fighting the kind of warfare against the Communists into which perforce we have been drawn—warfare in which the enemy, even when stopping short of the use of mass armies, stops short of nothing else: Guerrilla fighting—as in Laos and South Vietnam; subversive takeover—as in Cuba; vicious propaganda, bearing no relation to the truth; staged mass demonstrations; the manipulation of many innocent people in "front" groups all over the world; and other devices of similar nature.

His appeal should be heeded by the American public for it is indeed obvious that unless we, and free men and nations everywhere, develop methods of countering these tactics, the area of freedom will gradually be constricted and our own could eventually be lost.

The recent history of Poland provides valuable object lessons on the tactics of a Communist takeover. As World War II drew to a close the United States strove, through negotiations, to insure that a free Poland should emerge from the ruins of a devastated Europe. In the Yalta and Potsdam agreements the Soviet Union pledged, along with the United States and other signatories, that "free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot" would be held by a Polish provisional government. But these agreements, like so many others the Communists have signed, proved worthless in practice.

A brief chronology of events following the war reveals how the brave Polish people were subjected to the yoke of Communist tyranny:

July 3, 1945: New Polish provisional government promises Great Britain and the United States that it will hold free and unfettered elections.

January 9, 1947: United States charges Polish Government with violations of pledge.

January 19, 1947: Falsified results of election announced. Communist power established.

January 28, 1947: The United States declares rigged elections violate Yalta and Potsdam agreements.

November 6, 1949: Marshal Rokossowski, of the Soviet Union, is appointed Commander in Chief of the Polish armed forces.

January 27, 1952: Polish draft constitution, based on Stalin constitution of 1936, is published.

July 22, 1952: New Polish constitution is enacted, transforming Poland officially into a Communist so-called people's republic.

Thus the sorry tale unfolded. In 7 short years, by one relentless measure after the other imposed under the watchful eye of the Soviet Army, the Polish people were dragged behind the Iron Curtain.

The Hungarian revolution of 1956 lit a beacon of hope for all of Eastern Europe and, indeed, for all of the West. It showed that in spite of every known measure of a military, political, economic, and psychological nature to mold a people into the Communist form, the courage and the determination to be free could survive in an entire nation. In Poland, also, in 1956 the people sought to loosen the bonds of their Communist straightjacket, but, heeding the lessons of the tragic climax in Hungary, they did not go so far as to invite slaughter from Soviet tanks.

The Hungarian revolution, the overt resistance in Poland, and other actions reveal that there are millions of people throughout Eastern Europe who yearn for freedom, with the right to think and say what they please and to determine their own destiny. I am sure that the Kremlin leaders are aware of this and that it presents important obstacles to their designs.

The events of 1956 also made clear, however, that the West, including the United States has not yet learned how to help a captive people who wish to leave the Communist fold to redeem themselves from their captivity. As the President has pointed out, we are engaged in a new kind of struggle. In order to fight successfully we must reexamine our objectives, our available resources, our procedures, and discover in what ways they can be improved for the task at hand. This endeavor requires the best efforts of the American people.

On this day of tribute to the Polish people let us, therefore, see in their experiences and their example the model of courage, dignity, and national resolve so that we may accept the challenges that this time of crisis imposes upon us.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is highly significant that in celebrating Poland's Constitution Day we hark back to the Constitution of Poland of May 3, 1791. That document expresses the spirit of liberalism which has marked the Polish people in their long history. It pays tribute to their noble past. It places emphasis on respect for the individual, a characteristic which endures in Poland. It foreshadowed the future. It might well have been drafted in the 20th century by the most truly democratic and farseeing statesmen.

The theme of that Constitution is the love of liberty, the respect for individual freedom, the granting of equality to all men. The courage and determination to achieve these goals for country and for the individuals who constitute it have ever been qualities which the Polish people typify. Today as in the centuries of their past history they cherish the hope and the faith that the spirit of the Constitution of 1791 will prevail.

A constitution which speaks of the common fate of all people of whatever persuasion, and endeavors to provide for them mutual security and justice for every citizen is not a document of an era. It is a pattern for all time.

So, too, is the spirit of the Polish people. Throughout centuries of vicissitudes such as few peoples could have braved, the Polish spirit has never been quelled. It is based on a faith and a culture which antedates that of most of Europe.

In the annals of Western civilization Poland has played a leading part. In the 16th century Poland was the largest state in Europe. Succeeding centuries were to profit from Poland's civilizing influence, its political development, its cultural progress.

As Prussia grew in strength, on Poland's west, as Austria gained in stature to the south, as Russia emerged from its barbaric state on the east, Poland's territory was violated. Again and again the Polish people seemed in danger of being swallowed up by her avaricious neighbors. Despite the utmost in physical and political suffering, the spirit of the Polish people has persisted.

The great Constitution of 1791, the epitome of freedom and democracy, is the voice of a people which has been and will ever remain indomitable.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the many Members of this body who are paying just tribute to the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. Certainly, the principles embodied in that document are as valuable and inspiring today as they were at that time.

The tragedies we recognize whenever we speak of Poland and the other satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain weigh heavily upon us. So on this occasion I believe it is essential that we rededicate ourselves to the goal that is shared by all; namely, that Poland and the other countries that have lost their freedom to Soviet aggression will regain their freedom and have the right and power to establish governments of their own choosing.

I strongly urge all Members who participate on this occasion to direct their attention to the various resolutions calling for the creation of a special House Committee on Captive Nations. Through this committee, we can effectively develop a program that will lead to eventual restoration of freedom in the lands behind the Iron Curtain.

As an American of Polish extraction, I am pleased to note the sound bipartisan response of Members of both bodies to the commemoration of Polish Independence Day. The Poles have been a brave, vigorous, and justly proud people for centuries, and their contribution to the development of the United States of America is too well known to be repeated here. I am pleased to note the tremendous knowledge that Members of the House have concerning Polish history and current conditions in Poland.

My only hope is that the Polish people will practice the necessary patience in looking forward to the day when, in cooperation with the desire of all peoples of the world for true freedom, we will create an atmosphere whereby the principles of the Polish Constitution of 1791 will once again be restored to that great land.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the emancipation of feudal central Europe began in the year 1791 when the Poles declared a constitution. By this document, the common man could own land; the peasant was permitted the protection of national law; the individual was recognized by the establishment of a regular parliament. To the surrounding powers, though, these provisos were heresy, and would not be tolerated. Dismemberment and annihilation were the outcome of this concerted action.

Poland did not emerge again until it was proclaimed sovereign and independent at the end of the First World War. The hopes and aspirations of the free world and of the Poles had once more been fulfilled. An ethnic Polish state could now attain its destiny begun over a century before. Democracy for and by the people prevailed at last.

But the war lords of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia could not and would not refrain from dismembering once more Polish lands. This time, the slaughter of the patriots was horrendous. The Poles fought for their country but were completely overwhelmed. What chance had a cavalry brigade against an armored corps?

The spirit of the Constitution lives on in these unconquerable people. Subjected to slavery in their homeland by

the Communist forces, they still dare to express themselves, sometimes acting with violence as in the case of Poznan in 1956. The same spirit also lives in the Poles scattered throughout the world, and especially those in the United States. Immigrating to a new land to escape subjugation and terror, they have played an integral part in the development of America. Throughout the Nation one can see by the names of the cities and towns the influence played by the Poles in settling our vast lands. There are Warsaws in Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, and Virginia; a Breslau in Nebraska; and a Krakow in Wisconsin. We have even named cities, parks, and landmarks after their gallant patriots Kosciusko and Pulaski, who helped us to gain our freedom.

It is only right that we honor this indefatigable spirit, undiminished throughout the intervening 170 years since the proclaiming of the constitution. Let us hope that a peaceful climate will prevail in the near future, one which will make possible the restoration of those principles so nobly stated in the Constitution to the Polish Nation—freedom, independence, and democracy.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of my fellow Members the Polish 3d of May Constitution Day. On this day, men, women, and children of Polish descent all over the world pay tribute to the Polish nation, which now is no longer free, and to the ideas of Polish independence, which will never die. One hundred and seventy years ago today, Poland succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. And while Poland has not always had the freedom to enforce this underlying postulate—that the people are sovereign to the state—the idea has burned fiercely in Polish hearts and minds from that day 170 years ago to today. It has many times been said since Russian control of Poland's Government was imposed, in 1953, that "the Polish Government is Communist—the Polish people are not." Our mutual ideals bind Americans with the Polish people on this day.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today as we observe the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, two facts are uppermost in my thoughts. One is that the cause of freedom everywhere is the cause of free men everywhere. Because of that, and because of the indomitable spirit of the Polish people, we have the other fact—"Poland will rise again."

Until that day, we in America should by every means possible let our Polish friends know that we have not forgotten them, and, more importantly, that we have not forsaken them.

"Poland will rise again." These are the last recorded words of the great Polish patriot and statesman, Ignace Jan Paderewski. They are the banner under which the cause of Polish freedom silently is on the march in the hearts and minds of a brave people.

This march cannot be stopped by any "ism." And I know that all Americans are joined in fervent hope that it will not be long before it becomes a victory march; that the days of Soviet tyranny will end, and that Poland will take its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today we are celebrating the birth of a dream. Unfortunately, the crushing, bruising, physical force of a series of tyrants and despots prevented this dream from reaching full fruition.

Instead, the dream was turned into a nightmare, and this nightmare exists to this day.

This is the 170th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, one of the most enlightened documents to come out of Europe in centuries. Born out of our own Declaration of Independence and the French Proclamation of the Rights of Man and Citizen, it was an expression of the basic belief that free men, living their own lives, were best suited to handle their own affairs of government and state.

This document promised political, social and economic reforms for the people of Poland. It was a document which we in America could embrace with open arms. It was an affirmation of our own belief in our own worth, of respect, consideration and concern for our neighbors.

Poland was not permitted to realize its destiny, however. There were other forces at work in Europe, forces of raw, brute strength which denied the worth of man and which treated him as a slave of the state.

Time after time, these forces overran Poland, crushed its people, burned its cities, turned its citizens into slaves, and left thousands to die and to suffer unspeakable tortures.

These forces are still in power in Poland today. The Polish people dwell under the nightmarish boredom and enforced privations of communism. But their dream is still alive and bright. Their hopes are still warm and vital.

The dream of a free Poland will come true and the nightmare will be erased from the face of the earth.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in commemorating the Polish Constitution of 1791 and to salute the indomitable spirit of the Polish people which inspired its creation. The Polish people of today are under the heels of Communist oppressors, but that same spirit of their ancestors burns fiercely in their hearts and minds. Their Communist rulers realize that given the opportunity to vote in free elections, the people of Poland would cast them aside and return to the democratic form of government symbolized by the Constitution.

As an American of Polish descent familiar with the character of the Polish people, I am sure that with the Constitution of 1791 as their symbol of freedom, they will continue to strive unceasingly for restoration of their right to live as freemen under a government of their choice.

In observing this anniversary, I believe it would be appropriate that we in America take the occasion to vow to be ever more resolute in our determination to resist to the utmost those alien forces which seek to subjugate all the free people of the world and to remind the enslaved people that we shall not cease our efforts to find the proper means to help them in their never ceasing desire for freedom.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Polish Constitution Day is a significant reminder that many of the peoples of the world are still enslaved. As we hear the cry for independence and freedom arise from Africa, the Far East, and Latin America, it is sobering to realize that some peoples have been seeking that same liberty for hundreds of years with little permanent success.

The Poles established a democratic constitutional government in 1791, in the vanguard of liberal European movements. The democratic intentions of the Poles were soon shattered, however, when Russia and Prussia partitioned Poland in 1793. Except for a brief period of independence after World War I, Poland has remained under Russian domination.

That period of independence between the world wars was an important time for Poland. For it gave the Polish people a taste of the independence they had never known. It taught them to resent an infringement on their liberty and freedom of action. It taught them to harbor always a determination to regain that independence they once knew. I am confident that with such strength and such singleness of purpose, the Polish people will once again know the freedom first set down in the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Not long ago, I visited Poland. I found no greater friends of America than the Polish people, this despite the fact that they are entirely surrounded by Russians and have a Communist government dedicated to wiping out the great spirit of freedom that has always existed in the hearts of the Polish people.

I recently introduced a bill to enable the President to encourage and assist the Polish people in the great contest that goes on between the Communist government and the Polish people in their desire for freedom, liberty, and the right to worship as they please.

Poland is the outstanding example of a spirit that cannot be conquered, of a people who refuse to yield their beliefs, of a nation that has outlasted Hitler's nazism, and who will outlive Khrushchev's communism. It is the outstanding example of Communist's failure to convince a people who have nothing to defend themselves with except their steadfastness to their beliefs.

It is this spirit that is Poland's greatest gift to America. It became part of the culture of America by the Polish people who came to America in search of freedom.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, this is the 170th anniversary of free Poland's Constitution Day. On May 3, 1791, there was established in Poland a democratic Constitution. Though it lasted but a short time before being crushed by neighboring tyrannies, its spirit has survived. It inspires the hearts of her oppressed people today, 170 years later.

Therefore it certainly is fitting that we in the Congress of the United States should pay tribute on this day to the centuries-old struggle of Poland for freedom, democracy, and independence. By doing so we wish to remind the Polish people, both in this country and in their homeland, that Americans have not forgotten the pledge to return Poland to the western family of free nations. We must keep up the hopes of these millions behind the Iron Curtain who now live under the repressive regime imposed by a foreign power. However, as she successfully threw off the yoke of the czars, so someday I know Poland will be freed from the yoke of communism.

The history of the Polish people is both magnificent and tragic. Geography has made them guardians of the ramparts of Western Europe. So from ancient times it has been Poland's role to struggle against conquerors from the East who have poured across her borders from the wild steppes of Russia.

Always the heart of the Polish nation has beaten for independence and freedom, not only in Poland but wherever men struggled for these priceless possessions. What significance the names Kosciusko and Pulaski have in our own struggle for independence here in America.

The Constitution of 1791, the anniversary of which we commemorate, is a monument to past hopes which live on today. So I wish to join especially with those New Yorkers of Polish descent, in paying tribute to Poland and to echo the cry of Poland's sons throughout her periods of occupation and oppression, "Polska powstanie," Poland will rise again.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, when we celebrate Polish Constitution Day, we celebrate the spirit of freedom. The proclamation of a democratic Constitution by the Polish people, on May 3, 1791, marked Poland's break with its aristocratic, feudal tradition. It was the Polish people's assertion that all men shall be their own masters.

That assertion lived in the hearts of the Polish people even before 1791. Freedom still cherishes the memory of the great Polish patriot, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who fought heroically for freedom in his own country and died for American freedom.

America's struggle for independence was won. Poland's independence was snuffed out in 1792, only a year after its democratic Constitution had been proclaimed. Geography has been as unkind to Poland as it has been kind to America. From 1792 until the First World War, Poland was the pawn of the powers by which she was surrounded.

But the Polish spirit could not be crushed. In 1830, and again in 1863, the Poles revolted against their Russian masters. Poland finally regained its independence at the end of World War I.

In attempting to reconquer Poland in 1920, the Soviets provided the world with its first evidence that they had inherited the imperialist ambitions of czarist Russia. Poland thrust out the Soviet Army in 1920, but in 1939 Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia plotted the division of Poland in the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. That plot was carried out a year later, when both Germany and Russia invaded Poland.

In the aftermath of World War II, a war fought to free the world from Nazi tyranny, Poland once again fell under the shadow of imperialist Russia. But the Polish spirit of independence lives on. The example of Poland offers hope, indeed, proof, to the whole world that the deep-rooted desire of all peoples to be masters of their own destiny will some day be realized.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the Polish people, now unhappily subjected to an alien totalitarianism, and to all Polish-Americans on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day.

Poland was one of the pioneers of European democracy and constitutionalism. On May 3, 1791, 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, Poland enacted a liberal democratic Constitution that heralded a great rebirth for the Polish state.

The democratic evolution of Poland was tragically arrested by the infamous partition of 1795, in which Russia, Prussia, and Austria carved up the Polish nation and annexed its territory to their own. Throughout the 19th century, despite heroic revolutions in 1830 and 1863, Poland was kept under the yoke of alien autocracies.

Poland emerged once again as a proud and free nation at the end of World War I. The reborn Polish nation was thereafter submerged by the evil deal between Hitler and Stalin in 1939 by which Poland was once again partitioned. At the end of World War II, the Polish people hoped for a new birth of freedom but Communist imperialism and the Soviet Army shattered this hope again, imposing on the Polish people, against their will, a Communist dictatorship.

Poland succeeded in the brave defiance of Khrushchev of 1956 in winning a very limited measure of autonomy, but the dream of true freedom is far from realized.

In paying tribute to a brave nation on the occasion of Polish Constitution Day, Mr. Speaker, I know that I share the sentiments of all Americans in expressing the hope that the day will not be long delayed when Poland will resume her proud and rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in the long, historic struggle of mankind to achieve a society of liberty under law there are certain important landmarks which Americans will never forget. One of these landmarks occurred on May 3, 1791, when the Polish Constitution was adopted. At a time when our own Founding Fathers were just starting to establish a new government under our own Constitution, the Polish people adopted a Constitution which declared that "all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people," and which granted the people full protection of the laws, religious freedom, the right to acquire land, and to be appointed to the civil service. This Constitution granted basic human rights.

No celebrations will be allowed in Poland on May 3. In their long history, the Polish people have had very little opportunity to celebrate this day, and very little opportunity to enjoy the freedom that it symbolizes. They have been the victims of conquest, partition, invasion, and subjugation across the centuries. Yet—through the centuries—as today the Polish people have constantly and courageously struggled to attain liberty.

Because this Constitution got its start at approximately the same time as our own, it is all the more tragic that the people of Poland have enjoyed the freedoms it outlined for only very brief periods.

They cannot celebrate the day. But we can. And we do. In commemoration of our Polish brothers let us reaffirm our own dedication to the fundamental precepts of the Polish Constitution of 1791 and restate our determination that the Polish people shall once again be free.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today on the 170th anniversary of Polish independence, I join my colleagues in paying special tribute to the framers of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

The people of Poland and those Americans of Polish descent can be proud of this rich heritage of freedom which stemmed from the adoption of their constitution. This document was inspired by the American Declaration of Independence and it included within its framework the fundamentals of freedom written into the U.S. Constitution several years earlier. It is fitting and proper that we remember each year this sister document of freedom which symbolizes with our own the will of man to achieve liberty for himself, his family, and his community.

While the people of Poland have been less fortunate than we in preserving their freedom in their homeland, they have persevered in their efforts to regain liberty each time it was taken from them by war and political partitions. In addition to their brave resistance to tyranny at home, they have sent to our own shores their sons and daughters who have made a major contribution in our own struggle to maintain the institutions of democracy.

Americans of Polish descent who live in Cleveland as well as in every other American community have been stable, prudent, and reliable citizens. They have contributed in every line of endeavor. They have been a part of the greatness of our country.

It is our hope that a relaxation of artificial barriers which exist in Europe will permit greater communication between citizens of the free world and Iron Curtain countries. Communism cannot long survive in its present tyrannical form if it is thus exposed to the free exchange of ideas which would result from increased personal contacts between citizens of our countries.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would feel remiss if I did not take this opportunity to express my good wishes to all American citizens of Polish descent on

the observance of the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution Day.

Misfortune and misery have been the unenviable lot of the Poles since mid-18th century. With the rise of Russia in the East and Prussia in the West, the political position of the Poles became precarious. Her neighbors were eager to rob Poland of its territory. In 1772 Austria, Prussia, and Russia partitioned a third of Poland among themselves. In order to forestall the repetition of such a disaster, Polish leaders were determined to strengthen Poland, and this they hoped to do by overhauling and modernizing the government of their country. Late in 1788 a committee of the national Diet—the Assembly—began to draft a constitution. This work was completed early in 1791 and on May 3 of that year this document was promulgated as the Constitution of May 3. Today marks the 170th anniversary of its promulgation.

The Polish Constitution of May 3 was a liberal, democratic and progressive document. It was heartily received by the Poles and was hailed by liberals in many lands. By its provisions the old and antiquated governmental system of the country was replaced by a modernized and effective government. The autocratic powers of the king were reduced and brought under legislative control, thus making him a constitutional monarch. A cabinet type of government was introduced, responsible to the popularly elected lower chamber. The barriers separating the nobility from the rest of the people were practically eliminated. The power of landlords was drastically reduced, and the peasantry placed under the protection of the law. The upper chamber lost much of its power in legislation. Freedom of conscience and of speech was guaranteed. For these and other liberal provisions this Constitution was regarded as a model at the time, marking a great advance in the attempts to reform Poland. Unfortunately for the Poles and also for their friends, the Constitution was never given a fair trial. Before it could be put into force, Poland's enemies made war upon her; she was defeated in that war; independent Poland ceased to exist, but the Constitution continued to live as a noble idea in the hearts and minds of the Poles. To this day they cherish the ideals embodied in it, and solemnly observe the anniversary of its promulgation.

Both before and since the partition of Poland millions of Poles sought refuge in other lands, and a multitude of them were welcomed in this country. Here they have worked hard in strengthening the democratic institutions of this country and have been among the gallant defenders of our way of life. Thus both in peace and in war they have contributed immensely to our civilization. They are gifted, industrious, loyal, law-abiding and public-spirited citizens of this Republic. For these fine traits they have earned our admiration, and on this occasion, on the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, I am glad to echo their noble and patriotic sentiments.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues and all Americans of Polish descent in the commemoration today of the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

In 1791, the Polish people composed and put into effect one of the first democratic constitutions in Europe. At that time they sought to break many of the harsh and despotic ties with the past. In this document the Poles revealed themselves to be one of the most politically advanced peoples in continental Europe. Today, under Communist bondage, the Poles do not enjoy any of the benefits found in the Constitution of 1791, but they still cling to the spirit which represents that historic document.

We rise today to remind the Polish people that Americans have not forgotten their pledge to help Poland restore her freedom and independence and to facilitate her return to the Western family of nations. It is our hope that our remarks here in the Halls of Congress today will have a beneficial impact on the hopes and aspirations of the Polish people who have been forced to endure Soviet oppression.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the recognition of the Polish national holiday in the House today is in keeping with the spirit of my resolution urging that the American people observe as days of historic significance the national holidays of all of the captive nations.

There is so little that we have been able to do to help the freedom-loving people of Poland throw off the bonds of Soviet imperialism.

The very least that we can do is let them know we are with them in spirit, that we recognize the justice of their cause, and that we yearn with them for the day when they will again enjoy the right of self-determination and self-government.

There is little reason to be complacent and less reason to be optimistic as we meet today. Liberty has never been in danger more grave than at this hour. The borders of freedom are being pushed back in strategic areas around the globe. The Communist imperialists who have brought under their control most of Eastern Europe, China, North Korea, Tibet, and now Cuba are busily absorbing half of independent Laos. They are making headway in their campaign to turn the new independence of the African nations into subservience and captivity. It is difficult to understand how anyone behind the Iron Curtain can be optimistic about liberation, but we know that the spark still burns in their hearts and we can try to give them reassurance by this observance today.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in the House and Senate in paying tribute to the 7 million Americans of Polish descent who are today celebrating the 170th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. I wish to extend my congratulations to that courageous nation on this very important day.

Freedom-loving people everywhere have come to admire Poland, whose democratic ideals and respect for the dignity of man is so much like our own. Nowhere in the world is the love of freedom and independence stronger than in Poland. Although the people today are ruled by the tyrant of communism and the imperialistic powers of the Soviet Union, the Poles have never lost their sense of nationalism nor their dedication to the principles of liberty.

It is my prayerful hope that the day will not be too far off when Poland will again join the community of free nations and live in lasting peace.

We in America extend our sympathy to these brave people and our firm assurance that we shall work constantly toward the goal of total freedom for all the people of this great land.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791 and the brief period in which it was in effect was a bright chapter in Polish history which has influenced the life of the nation ever since.

The Constitution was designed to launch Poland upon the path of democracy. For its time, it was a liberal and enlightened document. It was an attempt to do away with a medieval and outmoded system of government and to replace it with a modern executive and a representative parliament. The legislature was liberalized and broadened. The power of the head of state was hedged about by his ministers. The cities were given a voice in the government and the peasants were taken under the protection of the law.

Throughout Poland's turbulent history the Polish people have been notable for their courage and their desire to determine their own destiny. These characteristics seem to grow and harden in adversity even as they bloom in freedom.

The Polish people may indeed vaunt of their past. They have as much reason to be proud of their present.

The Polish patriots who launched the revolutionary movement of 1956 evidenced as much cool courage, as much imagination and enterprise as their forbears of 1791. The fact that the movement could not succeed under the threat of Soviet guns does not detract from its essential glory.

A more recent example of Polish courage under a despised puppet government was the brief rebellion at Nowa Huta. Nowa Huta is a new town and one of the state's favorite showpieces. Naturally, when it was laid out no provisions were made for a church. The citizens of the town, supposedly favored by Communist officials but still Poles and still religious, collected money among themselves to build a church. One morning after the foundations were laid and the cross had been raised men appeared who began to dismantle it, under orders from the Government. Immediately a crowd of rioting men and women gathered at the scene. They fought the police, and when the police were reinforced with army units, they fought the army. There were many injured and truckloads of the rioters were carted off to jail. But after 4 days the cross was back in its place.

The freedom-loving spirit of the Polish people will never die and will one day triumph again. The words of the Pol-

ish national anthem, "Poland has not perished yet" echoes not only in the hearts of the Polish people but in those of all of their friends in the outside world.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on this 170th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day all Americans of every racial descent join with the people of Poland in a prayer for Polish independence and a renewed pledge to continue to work for the restoration of liberty and freedom to Poland and the rest of the enslaved Christian world.

No one who understands the great contribution to our own independence of the immortal Polish heroes of the Revolution or who has read of the glorious history of Poland in defense of Christian principles can help having tremendous admiration for the courage, patience, and fortitude of the Polish people in their persistent struggle to regain independence.

Heroic Poland gave us the best and most inspiring modern example of sacrifice for Christian principle in that terrible engagement with the Communists in 1920. The Polish people proved then to the world that they were among the very, very few who early recognized the planned and determined Kremlin objective of reducing the free world to pagan slavery. Would that we had wisely learned from their example, and the recent years of too much appeasement and too often retreat, of developing world confusion and of increasing turmoil, might well have been avoided.

The price the Polish people paid for their early courageous resistance to Communist attack was catastrophic and the blow was even more severe when it appeared that their supposed allies turned their backs upon and heads away from their cruel plight under Soviet subjugation and tyranny. The debt the free world owes to heroic Poland for her courageous struggle against the Communist horde 41 years ago still remains unpaid and will remain a blot upon the moral integrity of this country and the United Nations until it is paid.

That is why we as Americans must never relax our efforts to help the Polish people to reestablish their freedoms under their own chosen government. As a nation dedicated ourselves to the democratic principles of personal liberty and individual freedom, the U.S. Government has an obligation to unceasingly maintain the right of Poland to her independence and persevere, both as an individual nation and as a member of the United Nations, in demanding that the Communist leaders grant freedom and independence to Poland. We can do no less and still call ourselves a Christian democratic country while we join in prayer that the day will soon come when Poland, and all the other enslaved nations, will once again happily enjoy their personal and national freedom.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, drawn up shortly after our own Declaration of Independence and Constitution, stands as a great document of human rights, social justice, religious toleration, a contribution of the Polish people to the heritage of freedom.

By its adoption, Polish leaders hoped to lead their countrymen from the feudal path of the Middle Ages to the broad democratic highways of modern times. Through the abolition of the crying political evils of the old regime and by granting protection of the law to the peasantry, increased freedom of action to the middle and lower classes, the Constitution of May 3 sounded the keynote of that love of freedom and willingness to fight for it so characteristic of the people of Poland.

You do not teach one of Polish blood love of freedom and justice; it is in his blood.

The Constitution was welcomed by all the people of Poland, and it was hailed by all friends of Poland. The whole liberal world regarded it as the greatest advance made in governmental system in modern Poland. But it seems that Poland's enemies, not her friends, were the first to profit by this encouraging step. The autocracies of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, fearing that through this Constitution Poland might regain her former strength, and thus make it difficult for them to carry out their hostile designs against Poland, hastened to make war upon her. In the ensuing war, Poland was defeated, partitioned, and of course both Poland's independence and her democratic Constitution became victims of her foes.

But the spirit of democracy, of independence and freedom, embodied in that document did not die; they lived in the hearts and minds of millions of patriotic and gallant men and women of Poland.

The spirit of freedom and justice embodied in the Constitution of May 3, 1791, has been woven into the fabric of American freedom, which is our proudest heritage. Beginning with Jamestown, where the Polish settlers proved such an asset to the first English colony, saving it from starvation by their competent, industrious, and patient work, the contribution of Poland is part of the history of America.

In the war of the American Revolution, Kosciusko and Pulaski fought for our independence. Kosciusko liberated many Negroes with the net proceeds from the sale of his governmental grant.

During the Civil War, Polish names are found in the list of freedom fighters. Gen. Vladimir Krzyzanowski is the most famous, but there were many others. Gen. Joseph Karga, Capt. Alexander Bielwaski, Capt. Joseph Gloskowski, Capt. Louis Zychlinski, Capt. Peter Krolbasa—later city treasurer of Chicago. In our list of freedom fighters we must pay tribute to Sister Veronica. She and her sister, also a Mercy nun, nursed the sick and the dying on the battlefields and in the military hospitals. Perhaps they may be regarded as the precursors of the Grey Samaritans, Polish-American women, many of whom went from Chicago to nurse the pestilence-stricken, homeless and crippled families of Poland during World War I.

Love of freedom, service of God and country are Polish characteristics from which my own city of Chicago has profited. Chicago is the largest Polish-American city in the country. In its growth, civic, social, and economic development it owes much to the honest courageous and industrious labors of its noble Polish population. The Polish-American has blended his culture, his religion, and social qualities into the life of the city. The center of his community is the parish church, the school, the home, the press.

The first Polish conservatory of music was established in Chicago in 1870. The Polish Roman Catholic Union has headquarters in Chicago. In its office building are housed the Polish archives and museum; its library and reading room have the largest collection of books on Poland in the English language.

The Polish Women's Alliance, with its home office in Chicago, has its own library and museum. The alliance grants scholarships, conducts recreation centers. During two World Wars they sent vast material and financial aid to countless orphans, homeless men and women in Poland and other parts of Europe. The Polish Civilian War Relief formed the largest production unit of the American Red Cross.

The Polish Alma Mater was founded in 1897 by the Reverend Francis Gordon, brother of the late beloved chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable Thomas S. Gordon, to promote Christian ideals, standards and Polish culture among the youth of America. The Polish Welfare Association was organized to combat juvenile delinquency and antisocial attitudes. Through systematic casework by trained workers they have done invaluable work particularly in the juvenile, women's, domestic relations, and boys' courts.

On this Polish Constitution Day we pay tribute to the 170th anniversary of the promulgation of that document of human freedom. We remind ourselves, however sketchily, that the spirit of that Constitution has been woven into our own American history, is part of our heritage. It would be ironical to recall that the country, which could produce that Constitution, whose people have been a dynamic force in our American life, is now a captive of Russian imperialism, unless we can believe that the spirit never dies. The Polish people will never desert their goal, freedom, liberty, and national independence. Someday Poland will shake off the shackles of Soviet domination and take her place among the free nations of the world.

And here today in the historic Chamber of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States we renew our pledge of stout and unfailing friendship to the brave and noble people of Poland in their struggle, which can end only in triumph, their struggle to break from Soviet chains and give to the world of freedom the strength and the inspiration of an independent and sovereign Poland.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, there was promulgated in the kingdom of Poland, a constitution, setting forth principles which would initiate a democratization of the kingdom. This document came about, not through bloodshed as had happened in France, but through peaceful means. And in this

bloodless revolution lies the irony of Polish history. For today, we commemorate a document which ceased to exist before it was universally proclaimed, a document which has been fought for in horrendous uprisings, a document which today is only a symbol.

Poland ceased to exist in 1795 by the final partitioning of the surrounding powers. Its nationalistic spirit, though, grew as the years passed. Great artists continued to represent a Polish nation. Every note of Frederic Chopin's marches and polonaises sounded Polish liberty. His concert tours in behalf of his people overtaxed his strength and he became another in a long list of Polish martyrs.

It was left, though, to another eminent pianist to see the rebirth of a new Polish nation. Ignace Paderewski worked tirelessly for his fellow countrymen and became their chosen head at the peace conferences concluding the First World War. For his unceasing labors, he was rewarded with the premiership of the newly created Polish nation.

With the rise of nazism, Germany, aided by Communist Russia, once more proceeded to conquer and divide Poland. Throughout the Second World War, though, the Free Polish soldiers fought well against the tyrannical powers, fighting for their country, marching to their national anthem: "On! On! From Italy's fair plain. Lead us on to greet our homeland; lead us back again."

Though a Poland still exists today, it exists in name only. Russian mastery controls its every move; Russian military might prompts the Polish Government to adhere to the Communist doctrine. But even today the courage of the Poles come forward. Some of their leaders, particularly Cardinal Wyszynski, have dared to speak and act against the present regime. Polish resistance erupts occasionally to cause international sympathy.

The people in Poland cannot celebrate their Constitution Day. We in the United States must honor it for them. We salute their Constitution so that it may always be remembered as a lamp of freedom for the oppressed peoples of the world.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am happy, again this year, to join with my colleagues in this traditional observance of Polish Constitution Day, celebrating the occasion when Poland became a free, independent, and democratic Republic 170 years ago.

It is indeed sad and unfortunate that this day cannot be commemorated publicly by the people who are most concerned with its significance—the people of Poland themselves. They are under the rule of a ruthless foreign dictatorship, whose control is enforced by military might and the oppressive methods of a police state.

So it remains for the people of Polish blood in America and the other areas of freedom throughout the world to publicly observe this occasion and in this they are heartily joined by all lovers of liberty, of all races, who respect the dignity of mankind and who believe that it is the inherent right of all men to live under governments of their own choice.

Who can doubt that if the people of Poland had the power to choose between the foreign dictatorship which now rules the nation and a democratic government under a free election what the outcome would be? Every reasonable person knows the answer to that question. The people of Poland would choose liberty.

It has been well said that the "Polish Government is Communist—but the Polish people are not." The people of Poland are a religious, God-fearing nation. Atheistic communism is abhorrent to them. They have demonstrated this fact at every opportunity.

Even though they cannot observe this significant day publicly, we can be sure the people of Poland commemorate it in their hearts and minds. Let it be known to them that the people of freedom-loving America are thinking of them today and commiserating with them over their servitude.

Even in these dark hours of their sad plight, we can derive encouragement from Poland's history. Numerous times in the past, she has fallen prey to a larger and more powerful neighboring nation but through the indomitable spirit of her people, she has broken the chains of bondage.

May God speed the day when she can do so again.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1791, just a short 2 years after the United States adopted its Constitution in 1789, the Polish Diet by unanimous and solemn vote enacted Free Poland's Constitution, kindling a flame of freedom that still burns brightly in the minds and hearts of a freedom-loving people.

Today is the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, and we rise in tribute to this anniversary and also to honor our Polish-American citizens who sense so deeply the blessings of a free land. For while the anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day finds that nation dominated by Communists, its people are still loyal to the ideals that initially whetted their appetite for independence and sovereignty.

Connecticut, my home State, and the Fifth District, which I represent, are privileged to have many fine citizens of Polish ancestry. I take pride in joining with friends and descendants of Poland, wherever they may be, in commemorating this day, because I can attest to the vital role they have played in the enrichment of my district, the State of Connecticut, and the Nation.

The best efforts of their Communist rulers have failed to destroy the spirit of the Polish people; nor have they been able to stamp out the characteristics of nationalism, religion, and love of personal liberty which have symbolized the Polish people since 1781.

These were attributes long recognized in men and women of Poland who won world renown and this Nation's admiration or gratitude for accomplishments in the military, scientific, medical, and musical fields they championed. I refer to Copernicus, Madam Curie, Chopin, Paderewski, John Sobieski, Casimir the Great, Kosciusko, and Pulaski. Poland has contributed enormously to the civilization and cultural heritage of the West. Our debt is great to Kosciusko and Pulaski, who contributed immeasurably to the achievement of our own independence.

Men who undertook the task to guide the Polish nation on the path of social progress belonged to the most enlightened brains of 18th-century Poland. They were inspired by the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence and influenced by the French proclamation of the rights of man and citizen. The principles laid down in the May 3 Constitution survived while Poland was struggling for independence and were referred to in the constitutional laws of the reborn Polish state after World War I. The present plight of Communist domination does but reaffirm the attachment of the Poles to their historic charter of 1791.

I hope that by these observances and commentaries we may bring inspiration and assurance to men and women who love liberty, that the yoke of oppression need not be eternal, and that, in the words contained in the Polish national anthem, "Poland is not lost forever, while our lives remain."

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. The same spirit of democracy which the Polish people expressed in their Constitution 170 years ago is the central theme of our American heritage and way of life, and this common dedication to the rights of man under God has been strengthened here in our country by the presence among us of the many thousands of American citizens of Polish origins.

The Polish people of the Second District in Minnesota are fine people, and I am happy that I can speak for them to bring their greetings to their fellow men throughout the United States in observance of the Polish Constitution Day. They are proud of their heritage and their common bonds with freedom-loving people all over the world, and their only regret is that they cannot look to their motherland as an independent nation enjoying its rightful place among the family of free and independent nations. Poland has been subjected to one invasion after another since the adoption of her republican constitution on May 3, 1791, and has not known the blessings of liberty except for a brief period of time between World Wars I and II.

It is amazing to me to realize that the spirit of the Polish Constitution still lives in the hearts and minds of the Polish people after these many long years of invasion and subjugation, and in a world torn today by the Communist-inspired cold war we can all take increased dedication to the cause of liberty from the inspirational example of the Polish people.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, freedom is the great heritage of mankind. It is the foundation upon which this Republic of ours rests. We cherish the Declaration of Independence because it is one of the classic expositions of man's longing to be free. The Magna Carta and the Proclamation of the Rights of Man are similarly revered. A lesser known but

equally important document which follows this tradition is the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. The Polish Constitution, adopted on the eve of Poland's partition by its powerful neighbors, has been characterized as "one of the greatest achievements in Polish history." Another historian, speaking of the Constitution, concluded:

> This heroic breach with the past, this abjuration of the ancient sins, this renunciation of the idolized "golden liberty" throws an immortal gleam over the last dark years of the Republic.

Today Poland is once again under foreign rule. The Communist dictatorship which controls the country denies the people their right to govern themselves. We in America who have that right have a duty to those less fortunate than we. It is incumbent upon us that we use all our strength and resources to win the struggle against communism. We cannot afford to slacken our effort even momentarily lest we find ourselves in the position of all too many nations which have fallen under Communist rule. It is fitting that on this, the 170th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution, we proclaim to the people of Poland and the world our dedication to the cause of liberty and democracy and our unflagging determination to fight for that cause.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is celebrated as Polish Constitution Day.

The Polish people, like our own Founding Fathers, fought against overwhelming odds to secure the establishment of a parliamentary democracy. The Polish Constitution of 1791 is an achievement of this heroic struggle. Freemen everywhere have a special responsibility to commemorate this historic event, for in Poland, no such celebration is permitted.

Poland's Communist rulers know that promotion of democratic principles will be a prelude to their downfall. The Polish Constitution of 1791 proclaims that the state exists to serve its citizens and to do otherwise is to foster despotism. This is the lesson which freemen have learned to appreciate.

Thus, it is fitting that we recall the stirring words that were penned but 2 years after the ratification of our own Constitution:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty, and the good order of society, on an equal scale, and a lasting foundation.

All freemen will do well to remind themselves of these truths.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the 3d of May, 170 years ago, in 1791, the Polish Constitution was proclaimed. George Washington, a man acquainted with constitutions and the meaning of liberty, write to a friend:

> Poland * * appears to have made large and unexpected strides toward liberty * * *.

Large indeed were the strides, for the Polish Constitution was not just another ill-conceived and ill-drafted legal document, the like of which the world has seen too often. It was a monument to man's capability to rise above petty strife and self-seeking and establish a basis upon which liberty and human dignity might endure. Almost 2 centuries after this Constitution was drafted, it continues to be recognized as one of the major accomplishments of Western society, ranking with the British and American Constitutions.

The Polish Constitution was born not of abstract thinking but of the national virtue of courage, the ability to realize the misfortune of her geographic location and to heal the wounds of previous strife. The misfortune of her location between the aggressive neighbors of Russia and Prussia was soon to press again on the Poles. Barely a year after the Constitution was established, Russian troops invaded Poland to put an end to the "dangerous novelty" of a Constitution which provided liberty. Poland resisted as best she might, but did not prevail. Such has been the tragedy and the heroism of Polish history.

To some Americans, and some of our younger Americans, Poland has seemed a long way off and 1791 a long time ago. But Poland was not a long way off when our own Nation fought for its liberty in the 18th century. Poles with their attachment to liberty were among us then and their courage stood us well. Casimir Pulaski was the most notable of these. A Polish noble who had fought for liberty at home and had been thrust penniless into exile, Pulaski offered his services to General Washington. In the new America, Pulaski brought a skill most needed—the knowledge and ability to organize and direct calvary. He is properly remembered as the "Father of American Cavalry." But he brought more than skill. He brought a dedication to liberty and a knowledge that liberty for men is indivisible. He died in battle for American liberties in the knowledge that no man is fully free until man everywhere is free. He brought to Americans the knowledge that we did not struggle alone but together with men throughout the world.

In our times, Poland again, as throughout too much of her history, does not know liberty but knows the struggle for it. It is vital that the United States retain Pulaski's knowledge that liberty is indivisible and that we do what we can to aid Poles in their present hour of need. The task is neither simple nor easy, but we do have a definite opportunity in our foreign aid to Poland.

Our modern aid to Poland began in 1957 after the Gomulka government had indicated some ability to move out from under the closest and most complete Soviet control. President Eisenhower clearly recognized the difficulties in providing assistance to a nation under a Communist government in these words:

> We do not demand of these governments their adoption of any particular form of society as a condition of our economic assistance. Our one concern is that they be free—for their sake and for freedom's sake.

In this framework, our Government proceeded to provide Poland with our surplus farm commodities, notably cotton, wheat, and edible oils. These were paid for in Polish currency deposited to the credit of the United States in Poland. A small loan for the purchase of machinery, farm equipment, and fertilizers was negotiated. In return for this initial assistance, the Polish Government agreed to reopen the question of claims of U.S. citizens for property seized by the Communist regime after World War II. In 1960, the Warsaw government agreed to set aside some $40 million to meet these claims.

Our assistance in surplus agricultural commodities has continued and as of the present the United States holds some $400 million in Polish money resulting from the sale of these commodities. This money is frozen within Poland and cannot be converted into dollars and a proposal is under consideration at present to use much or part of it within Poland on projects approved by the United States. They would be projects designed to improve the economic situation of the Polish people. It is a fashion in which our country can make a contribution to the eventual liberty of Poles and Poland.

Poland still knows and knows well the misfortune of her geographic location next to a rapacious neighbor. But the Polish virtue of courage quite clearly has not been lost and the United States must never lose sight of it.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, toward the end of the 18th century Poland's greatness and glory had become past history, and she was fast becoming victim to the evil designs of her aggressive neighbors. By the early 1790's Austria, Prussia, and Russia had already robbed the Poles of a good part of historic Polish territory, and Poland's independent existence was under threats. In the midst of such anxiety, a band of patriotic and courageous Polish leaders tried to strengthen and overhaul Poland's Government. Their concerted action resulted in the Polish Constitution of May 3 in 1791.

This historic and memorable document at once became, and remains to this day, a real landmark in Poland's modern history. Through it Polish leaders meant to lead Poland from Middle Ages to modern times. This liberal, progressive, and democratic Constitution sharply curtailed the unlimited powers of the king, making Poland's Government one of limited, constitutional monarchy. A responsible form of cabinet government was provided for, and the legislative assembly became the supreme governmental authority of the country. The basis of the electorate was broadened and religious freedom was guaranteed. The nobility lost much of its privileges, and the peasantry were brought under the protection of the law. In short, this was a model Constitution, and as such was a great pioneering effort on the part of gifted Polish leaders.

Unfortunately for the Poles, before the Constitution was put into effective force, Poland's foes treacherously attacked her, partitioned her, and put an end to her independence. But the liberal and democratic spirit of the Constitution of May 3 still lives in Poland, and on the 170th anniversary of its proclamation all patriotic Poles and all lovers of freedom

observe that historic anniversary, the Polish Constitution Day.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. It was on May 3, 1791, that the Polish patriots, without bloodshed or disorder, won approval of a Constitution which assured important social, political, and educational reforms for the Polish people. The Polish Constitution was adopted only 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, and was imbued with the same spirit of freedom and democracy; in fact many Polish patriots had aided us in our own earlier struggle for freedom.

Unfortunately, Poland's 3d of May Constitution is no longer the foundation stone of the Polish Government; instead it has been replaced by a Communist "constitution" forcibly imposed on the Poles in 1953 by the Soviet Union. But the Polish people have not abandoned the ideals and aspirations embodied in their 1791 Constitution. Despite the ruthless Communist oppression, the Poles have not accepted this Russian domination and have not surrendered their love of freedom.

Millions of Poles have emigrated to this country and contributed their strength and vigor to the building of America. Today, I would like to join with them and freedom-loving Poles everywhere to mark this important anniversary of freedom, and to pledge our support for returning to Poland the liberty and sovereignty she has known in more fortunate periods of her history.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the debacle in Cuba has created a furor which is going to continue for some time. On the part of the United States, there were a number of tactical errors, not the least of which are already accepted by the President.

We do not want to display a disunited front in this situation but, surely, an observation seems altogether proper—and necessary.

Can you imagine the consternation of a Cuban, only hours before the revolt, hearing our President and Secretary of State state emphatically that the United States would not come to his aid? It undoubtedly put the damper on a general uprising. And then, a short time later, President Kennedy quite strongly said the United States would not sit idly by as communism advanced into this hemisphere. What is the Cuban's reaction now? Where was help when it was needed?

Next in this strange and danger-torn drama came the President speaking about the "lessons we have learned" from the popped balloon in Cuba. Let us hope we have secured a quick education.

I would specifically like to speak to you today about the Central Intelligence Agency. There has been an apparent movement to shift the entire blame for the Cuba mess on the shoulders of the CIA. This is wrong, for high administration officials must share some of the blame.

However, the CIA's role in the invasion failure is under attack as well as CIA activity in general. The charges are somewhat unclear because of the very nature of the CIA's work—secrecy, of course, being an important factor.

Nonetheless, we can maintain a proper check and balance on the CIA without destroying the necessity for secrecy. The CIA now operates unchecked, and, ofttimes, off balance. And it does it with a blank check.

Nobody, not even Members of Congress, knows what the CIA spends. A recent newspaper report pegged it at $7 billion. I cannot agree with that but some estimates run higher than that. Nobody knows and, in the light of many charges, whether the Agency is even effective.

Even now, the President has called on the Attorney General and Gen. Maxwell Taylor to review our paramilitary and intelligence activities.

I hope this is not merely a smokescreen to cover up errors made at the White House but a sincere attempt to pinpoint CIA mistakes—if there are any.

Just what is the CIA doing? Is it being effective? Is the cost worth it?

Is it worth $2 million to purchase a hotel in a major middle eastern city in order to bug several rooms in the hope an enemy agent might stop there? That, I understand, was a CIA proposal some years ago.

Is it worthwhile to buy a drive-in movie theater, bugging all the car speakers, in the hope an enemy's conversation might be picked up among 200? That, too, was reportedly a CIA suggestion which fortunately got the ax before it went too far. These stories are significant if they reflect general CIA policy.

Historically, the Congress keeps an eye on the purse string. This, uniquely, is not the case with the CIA. And are we getting results worth the cost?

Look within the CIA itself: a special department was reportedly established, consisting of three persons. Within 3 years, this department had grown from those 3 persons to 400 and was costing millions to operate. Is this to go unchecked?

For these reasons, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution, establishing a joint House-Senate committee to study and investigate the foreign intelligence activities of the Central Intelligency Agency.

Some bills in the past have put the FBI in the picture. I do not feel the FBI, which is doing a magnificent job, is of concern here. This resolution is concerned only with the CIA and its foreign intelligence operations. Although the committee would report to this Congress and dissolve, the resolution specifically directs the committee to look into the advisability of establishing a permanent joint committee to oversee the activities of the CIA and its expenditures.

We are concerned with three points. First, what is the goal of the CIA? Second, how will it achieve that goal? And, third, how much will it cost? Such a committee need not violate the necessary secrecy. But it would look into the need for a proper measure of balance and restraint on such an important tool of our Government.

PRICE STABILITY MUST BE MAINTAINED

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, it appears that there is a belated but increasing interest in achieving price stability in our country and I am reintroducing the bill which I first introduced in the 86th Congress to make price stability one of the goals of the Employment Act of 1946.

This legislation was specifically recommended by President Kennedy's special task force to analyze the current economic position of the United States with special attention to the balance of payments. The recommendation was submitted to Mr. Kennedy on January 18, 1961. On April 11, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the Honorable William McChesney Martin, Jr., spoke out strongly and clearly on the need to stabilize the prices of our commodities if all segments of our population are to reap the benefits of our productive system and we are also to remain competitive with the rest of the world.

My bill would make the maintenance of relative price stability an explicit aim of Federal economic policy, as it is already implied in the language of the Employment Act that "it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power." Maximum purchasing power is not being promoted when price levels are increasing.

The bill would give an important mandate to the President's Council of Economic Advisers—to work for both maximum employment and a stable cost of living, not one at the expense of the other.

Somewhere along the line many in our country seem to have forgotten that often times the most beneficial use of increased productivity is not to increase wages and/or profits, but rather to reduce the price of the product.

In recent years the increased earnings resulting from improved machinery, techniques, and skills have been devoted almost solely to increasing wages to the workers and profits to the owners. In fact, in some years wages and/or profits have gone up more than the increase in productivity. The inevitable result is that the price of the product goes up also and those consumers with fixed income—this is particularly cruel for retired people who cannot go back to work

to increase their income—suffer a reduction in their purchasing power. Those who receive the larger profits and wages from increased productivity have more purchasing power temporarily; but as prices go up, before very long they have no greater purchasing power than before and everybody else has less.

But to the extent that increased productivity is used to reduce the price of the product, everybody gets an increase in purchasing power. The worker gets the same number of dollars in wages, but they will buy more because things are cheaper. The stockholder gets the same number of dollars in dividends, but they will buy more. And the people with fixed incomes, pensions, social security benefits, savings, get the same number of dollars, but they will buy more. Thus everybody gets an increase in purchasing power.

And when everybody gets an increase in purchasing power, there is a vast increase in buying, which calls for expanded production, and, therefore, more employment. This is the real way to prosperity.

Every Member of Congress is interested in the welfare of our retired persons and those on fixed incomes. All of us, as well as management and labor, should support this proposal and help enact it promptly.

THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR SEAPOWER, NOW OR IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE—AN ADDRESS BY REAR ADM. R. K. JAMES, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF BUREAU OF SHIPS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to hear recently an extremely fine and most timely address by Rear Adm. R. K. James, U.S. Navy, Chief, Bureau of Ships, at the annual convention of the National Association of Master Mechanics and Foremen held in the Nation's Capital. What he said, in my opinion, needed to be said during these turbulent and often confusing times in which we live. In addition to the specific comments contained in his address, it included a clarion call to all Americans to meet the challenges of our day. I hope Members of the House will read the speech which follows herewith:

Members of the Master Mechanics and Foremen Association and distinguished guests, the major purpose of any convention is to recognize and analyze the problems confronting the organization, to iron out the areas of difference, and arrive at a general agreement as to the course to be pursued for the future.

I am particularly appreciative of the invitation to participate in your convention because the conclusions you reach here will have a significant bearing upon the mission of the Navy Shore Establishment and the Bureau of Ships during the ensuing year.

Consequently, I welcome this opportunity to place before you a few of my thoughts in the hope that they will help to solidify our thinking and further cement the military-civilian partnership which is so essential to the operation of the Navy, the service to which all of us are devoting our careers.

For almost a century and a half those naval officers responsible for the construction and maintenance of the fleet have relied upon the production skill and management know-how of the predecessors of this association for the accomplishment of their mission.

This working partnership has been a significant factor in the creation of the world's mightiest sea power.

History has already recorded the accomplishments of the past, and while we take a natural pride in and draw encouragement and confidence from this brilliant history, the shoals of the future are our responsibility.

And what is the future of the Navy?

There is no substitute for seapower, now or in the foreseeable future. Nuclear energy, guided missiles and even the spectacular man in space have not reduced the importance of sea power for the maintenance of our world position.

If anything, the importance of the Navy has increased with each of these scientific achievements.

Oceans can no longer be regarded as barriers behind which a nation can feel secure from an aggressor.

On the contrary, the seas are the highways which bind the world together and those nations which are in a position to protect themselves against aggressors who would deny them the free use of these seaways can maintain their world leadership.

The pages of medieval and modern history are strewn with examples of vigorous nations whose decline followed the disintegration or stagnation of their seapower.

The question then is not the continuing need for the Navy but rather our ability to satisfy the growing demands being made upon our forces afloat and, consequently, upon the Shore Establishment which supports them.

I need not review with this audience the grave crisis facing us in the unsettled world situation and the major role which the Navy Shore Establishment plays in this crisis.

A crisis is a time of grave danger and of great opportunity. Let us be aware of the danger but welcome the opportunity with courage and conviction.

We won two world wars because we had the time to marshal the sheer weight of our tremendous wealth in national resources, technical know-how and manpower and bring them to bear against an enemy which was not our equivalent in these assets.

Today, we no longer bask in the sunlight of these advantages. Time is no longer a protective factor. Many key natural resources are under the control of the opposition and our previously unchallenged leadership in the technological fields is not only being equaled but has been surpassed in at least one spectacular field.

Quite apart from the international situation, there is another potent and vocal force opposing us which is of grave concern to all of us who are dedicated to the support of the Naval Shore Establishment.

I am sure that you have noted the increasing frequency of articles in the daily press clamoring for a reduction in the work assigned to our naval shipyards and for a corresponding increase in work in the private shipyards. We are referred to as tax-free, high-cost naval shipyards in competition with taxpaying low-cost private shipyards. Legislation, with powerful backing, has already been introduced in the Congress, which, if enacted, would drastically curtail the work now being performed in our naval activities.

As an agency of the Government, we are not immune from public appraisal and criticism—nor would I desire that we were. We can turn this criticism into a strong asset if we accept and handle it with intelligence and vigor.

These are not defeatist comments but only a realistic appraisal of the task which confronts us. We have rested on our past laurels in a spirit of complacency too long. We cannot build and maintain a missile fleet with the approaches and attitudes which produced the 16-inch gun.

Let us first make a soul-searching appraisal of ourselves as managers in a key segment of our Defense Establishment. We need to recognize and appreciate the problem fully before we can take the necessary action.

If our position is not now a satisfactory one, then some changes must be made. The evolution of our Navy from sails to nuclear power was not made without decided changes in the areas of organization and management as well as in the technological fields.

Past changes were a matter of gradual and easy evolution which made their assimilation relatively painless. However, if the management function is to keep pace with the rapid changes in hardware today, we cannot rely upon the gradual process of evolution to bring about the necessary changes.

Resistance to change is a natural human attitude. We are more comfortable amid customary surroundings and procedures. The new is sometimes strange and unknown and we have a natural apprehension for what might lurk behind the untried change.

But, progress is not made without change; not change for the sake of change but modifications to present procedures when we recognize a better way of operation.

In the 2 years that I have been the Chief of the Bureau of Ships, I have been accused, because of the changes I have initiated, of being a disturbing factor. This is the polite language I use in public although I understand there have been many more colorful sobriquets pinned on me.

I know that some of my changes have disturbed some people and I do not evade the responsibilities which are mine alone for the consequences of these changes. But, we are not moving fast enough.

Frankly, I am not satisfied with the limited progress I have made in my own job of improving overall Bureau of Ships management. I, too, am not excluded from the human limitations and shortcomings which plague us all.

But, there is no question in my mind as to what we have to do if we are to meet the international challenge successfully and also satisfy our critics at home.

I have said this many times before and you will hear it from me many times again.

We have got to improve the management of the Bureau of Ships from top to bottom with the ultimate objective of improving the job performance of every member of the Bureau family, both military and civilian, from top to bottom.

The end purpose, of course, is to do our work faster, better and at less cost. You may say that this is not only a preposterous task but one that we have been working on for years. But, have we really worked at it or have we just given it lipservice?

The big difference now is that it must be done. We have no other choice.

I agree that the challenge is great but the stakes are even greater.

We cannot accomplish this massive renovation by talking about it or by wishful thinking. We must make positive moves, step by step, as we recognize the problems and arrive at solutions.

Since it must be done, it can be done and we have already made a start. I speak, of

course, of our ships cost analysis panel in which this association played a significant part.

Although in operation only a little over a year, these changes have saved the Bureau of Ships over $138 million. These millions are being used to finance needed work which was not budgeted for. In other words, this is additional work which we are able to do within our current budget limitations.

A significant portion of these recovered funds came from improved operations in our shipyards. While this is already a substantial figure, the SCAP item with the greatest potential savings is just now getting underway, and that is the grouping of our shops. The reports I am receiving from the yards indicate that the benefits which will accrue from this change will exceed our most optimistic hopes.

The grouping of shops is one SCAP item which generated some vigorous but honest difference of opinion between your association and myself. However, I hasten to add that once the decision to move ahead was made, those masters selected as the group heads are proceeding with the difficult task of setting up the new organization, and in many cases ably assisted by those masters heading up the individual shops. I am grateful to you for the splendid job you are doing in this regard.

As pleased as we are with our SCAP accomplishments, we must recognize that this is only one step in the direction of our ultimate goal. However, it is an important step and should encourage us in our conviction that we can move forward if we work together toward our objectives.

I have reserved the most vital and important area demanding our attention until now, and that is the people who make up the Shore Establishment family, both civilian and military.

We accomplish our mission through people, and no matter how dedicated and zealous those of us in this room may be, we will accomplish little unless we provide the leadership and the example to encourage our fellow workers, at all levels, to join us in our resolve for improvement.

All of our employees are dedicated Americans who have proven that they can rise to any occasion when the necessity becomes known to them. The necessity is here.

The cold war and the results thereof are just as real and effective as those of a shooting war. However, a cold war is the more insidious because it lacks the dramatic awakening and national alertness which is generated by a shooting war.

In other words, a cold war permits and even encourages individual and group complacency.

In a way a further handicap is our national history of world superiority. We have led the field for so many years that we find it difficult to realize that our world position is being seriously challenged.

The purpose of General Order No. 21 is to improve the quality of leadership of the military and civilian supervisors of the Department of Defense so as to bring about a massive revitalization of the basic moral principles which are the foundations of this democracy.

General Order No. 21 recognizes a gradual but steady drift away from strong personal convictions and firm commitments to definite courses of action which are traditional in America.

Patrick Henry's "give me liberty or give me death," and Jefferson's "we pledge our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor," are examples of the type of moral courage which made our heritage possible.

The modern tendency seems to avoid taking a stand or course of action for fear of ridicule, or of offending someone, or being accused of being a flagwaver and oftentimes our immobility is controlled by purely selfish reasons.

We need to generate a grassroots movement to rededicate ourselves to the type of patriotism which made this country the light of the free world in order to meet the challenge at hand—for each of us to make a critical self-appraisal of our own performance to see how we can improve as individuals and as a group.

All of us have benefited handsomely from the wealth of this country. This is our heritage and certainly no one wants to reduce our benefits and blessings. But, as we continue to reap our privileges, benefits and protective rights which our forefathers never dreamed of, but for which we avidly continue to strive, do we give sufficient reflection to the obligation on our part to make an adequate return for these benefits?

Do we give equal concern for the adequacy of our own job performance as we do for the protection of our personal rights and privileges? Do we react to these increased benefits by greater dedication to the job or do we just accept them as a matter of our just due and keep pressing for more?

President Kennedy clearly set forth the principle when he said, "Ask not what your country can do for you but rather what can you do for your country."

Whether we realize it or not, we are now in a contest to prove that a free people, wealthy beyond the fondest dreams of most nations, still has the stamina and courage to resist and overcome the concerted opposition of a way of life completely inimical to our own.

As the leaders of our entire navy industrial complex, we have the responsibility and the opportunity by our own attitudes, job performances and personal example to set in motion an employee revitalization all down the line.

You have a tradition of performance behind you which is shared by few organizations. I am confident that you can add further luster to this tradition by the leadership and example you will provide to all your employees during this time of need.

In closing, let me quote from a recent speech by Secretary Connally to Navy and Marine Corps officers, and I quote:

"Our tasks are great—our responsibilities no less exacting. Whether we are worthy to stand in the reflected light of those who preceded us we cannot now know. That judgment truly can be made only by those who follow us.

"Let it at least be said of us: 'They understood their task. They accepted their responsibilities, large and small. They were men and women of courage and understanding. And above all, they place country above service and service above self.'"

ONE-WAY STREET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as we keep going down the one-way street we sometimes run into a friendly traveler who, like ourselves, is curious and is doing a little window shopping.

Last week I visited one of the taboo buildings known as surplus. There are many more of those same surplus warehouses. In fact, there are so many that even the one-way street cannot give them all frontage so they are now being stacked up on the back lots and alleys.

There are so many buildings filled with surplus that you can get directories giving locations and other pertinent information. Bargains are advertised in many of our large newspapers and magazines.

I often wonder why the Congress does not name a special buying committee. It could buy much of the surplus, sell it back to the Armed Forces and other Government agencies and deduct the savings from the billions appropriated each year to buy the same goods we have in surplus.

You may think this is farfetched. I thought so too until I went window shopping on the one-way street. I found one item that most of us never even give a second thought to: I found a wood screw, in fact I found a whole mass of screws, cap screws, hexagons, flat heads, round heads, slotted, squared, long and short, thick and thin, all shapes and sizes.

Talk about screws, brother, we have got them. And according to procurement plans, we are going to keep getting them. In one pile alone I found 7,242,500 hex headed screws marked "Surplus—Bargain. Government cost: $217,000. Can be bought for fraction of cost."

I talked to an American interested in this "screwy" business and he made these observations which shows again how much you can learn if you will take a walk with me some day down the one-way street. This American said:

The placing of this substantial quantity of capscrews on the American market as surplus is bound to cause further injury to the domestic capscrew manufacturing industry which, due to heavy inflow of low-wage-cost foreign screws, is already in a badly weakened condition. Information regarding the injury already sustained by the domestic capscrew manufacturing industry and its employees, is contained in the attached copy of appeal just mailed to the Honorable Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics).

This is a matter of vital importance to our national security. Capscrews are essential to the production of tanks, guns, and other important war items. Further weakening of the domestic capscrew industry might make it impossible for that industry to supply adequate quantities of capscrews in another national emergency when imports would be completely cut off.

Having gone this far, I figured maybe there might be some more information on down the one-way street so I walked into a complainant's office and ran into the U.S. Capscrew Service Bureau lodging a complaint against the Congress, President Eisenhower, and GATT. This interested me so I listened. This is what I heard:

Surplus is bound to cause further injury to the domestic capscrew manufacturing industry, which, due to heavy inflow of low-wage-cost imports of screws into the United States, is already in a badly weakened condition. Capscrew plants and other domestic screw plants now are operating on a reduced shift basis. Furthermore, statistics show that on a national basis unemployment in the screw manufacturing industry rose 15 percent, between the first and last quarters of 1960. Although complete figures are not as yet available for the first quarter of 1961, reports received to date indicate an additional increase in unemployment in that quarter.

As further indication of the weakened condition of the screw manufacturing industry, resulting from imports, we enclose herewith a copy of the woodscrew "black cloud chart" which shows that in 1960, more than half of the American woodscrew production was lost

to imports. Also, enclosed are copies of recently issued lists of screw imports extracted from incoming ships' manifests showing substantial quantities of low-wage-cost imported capscrews, machine screws, woodscrews, etc., now being virtually dumped on the American market.

Under the circumstances outlined above, we respectfully request and urge that immediate steps be taken by your office to stop the sale of capscrews by the Marine Corps Supply Center at Barstow, Calif., in offering B-27-61.

I studied the "black chart" referred to above and this is what I learned—Department of Commerce figures:

In 1939 we imported 15,000 gross woodscrews.

In 1950 we imported 150,000 gross woodscrews.

In 1959 we averaged 1 million gross per month.

In 1960 we reached the staggering figure of 1,895,000 gross per month for the summer building months.

During the first 10-month period of 1960, imports rose an additional 18 percent while domestic production was reduced a further downward cut of 22 percent.

This exorbitant waste of the American economy was caused directly by a 40-percent tariff reduction by the U.S. Tariff Commission plus an added cut in our tariff rates by GATT of 17½ percent more, plus a Presidential veto by Eisenhower of a recommended quota of 253,000 gross per month—October 1954.

Now, my good colleagues, since "protectionism," "high tariffs," "quotas," and "national interest" are bad names and taboo words, what can you suggest to take their place since we can make the screws we use here at home?

Incidentally, we have not made any friends doing this "screwy" bit of reciprocal trading. It seems that some newcomers in the screw business—Hong Kong and Japan—are chasing our former foreign screw suppliers out of our market and they are madder than wet hens because our free trade policies are screwing up their economies and their screwmakers are losing money and jobs. For those who want more details, I have pages of screw facts.

I did not intend to walk so long today, but the one-way street holds an unbelievable fascination and you meet the nicest people—I almost said "the screwiest."

As I was about to leave, I ran into a fellow most of us in Congress would call a reactionary or even worse—someone living in the past. This fellow actually believes that foreign aid and trade are tied together and that the same smart operators manipulate both programs. He believes the American Congress is living in the past and does not know that the lofty aims of our Marshall plan and Cordell Hull Trade Agreements Act have been perverted and are now the greatest threat to our domestic economy and our national security.

Too many oldtimers—6 or more years served—in Congress have not caught up with the fact that the greatest damage was done when Congress fell into the 4-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act in 1958 after a fictitious trade balance created in 1947 by the closing of the Suez Canal.

This fellow thinks the smart operators on both sides of the oceans are setting Congress up for another killing in 1962 when the Trades Act comes up again for action. This time it is being done by the trade-aid manipulators who are cutting down their exports to the United States and increasing imports from the United States to set up a nice, fat trade balance. With this, they are telling their boys overseas not to buy up or claim our gold reserve, to go along with our aid to underdeveloped countries on a 1-year commitment while our President is demanding a 5-year approval from Congress; and, last but not least, to pay back some of the money owed us during this period to help fatten Congress for the kill next year.

In line with this fellow's thinking, I started looking over the past few months' calling cards at the White House and, by golly, we have been visited by trade missions, ministers, potentates and economic advisers from some of the best sources of supply for imports as well as some of our neediest friends.

I must have anticipated this kind of a deal being cooked up because, along with others, I have introduced bills to amend the Buy American Act, to remove tax exemption for American corporations operating in foreign countries, wiping out tax havens abroad, resolutions on reciprocal trades agreements and foreign aid.

Recently I appeared before the Rules Committee on my House Resolution 152 which states simply:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of nine Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study with a view to ascertaining the direct and indirect costs to the United States of all foreign aid supplied by the United States after December 31, 1946, and the estimated direct and indirect costs of foreign aid currently being supplied by the United States.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Territory, Commonwealth, or possession thereof, or elsewhere, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary; except that neither the committee nor any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is meeting unless special leave to sit shall have been obtained from the House. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

In appearing before the committee I made this brief statement:

This resolution would create a committee of nine Members of the House named by the Speaker with full and complete powers as an investigatory committee to ascertain the direct and indirect costs to the United States of all foreign aid supplied by the United States after December 31, 1946, and the direct and indirect costs of foreign aid currently being supplied by the United States.

This resolution is even more important now than upon its original introduction in February of this year, as well as during other sessions of Congress. It has been made more important at this time by President Kennedy's plan for a 5-year extension of foreign aid as against the present and past custom of passing foreign aid appropriations on a yearly basis.

Too few of the American people, and I might say Members of Congress, including myself, have a very complete knowledge of expenditures under the foreign-aid acts and if we pass the 5-year plan, the limited knowledge we now have will become even more limited. There are various estimates and figures issued by almost every group in and out of Government on the actual amounts spent under foreign aid, where it was spent, what it was spent for, and the results direct, or indirect, of such spending.

I sincerely believe that the only method by which this Congress can act with any degree of universal knowledge in this very serious area of Government expenditure is by having a congressional committee study and evaluate both past and present programs. This Congress today will be voting on $600 million at what may be termed a new phase of foreign aid spending in a new area of world interest.

It is not difficult to justify these expenditures to ourselves, but it becomes increasingly more difficult to justify expenditures to the peoples of our districts and of the country at large. There are many questions that can be answered by this committee; the determination of whether lump sum appropriations or selective, directed spending, both in grants and loans to specific countries would be the better program.

The answers cannot be ascertained unless a comprehensive, painstaking and meticulous study is made by a committee responsible to the Congress itself. I beg of you to give serious consideration to this resolution or to any other suggestion for congressional action that could or would perform the same functions as those directed under House Resolution 152.

Now the question to be answered is this: How can any Member of Congress refuse this resolution—or one like it—unless he knows the answers propounded by the resolution?

I have tried, believe me, I have tried hard and I not only do not know the answers but I cannot find anyone in or out of Government who does.

Seriously, can you tell me how much of the $209 billion—or was it $72 billion—we have spent in Pakistan—or was it in Nyasaland?

If you are around next week, how about taking a little walk down the one-way street with me?

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, our good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] has just discussed the love of freedom which exists in the hearts and minds of the people of Poland. I certainly concur in his desire that freedom-loving people everywhere be given an opportunity for self-expression and that we in this country should stand steadfastly behind them. The problem which I will discuss today, however, is one which concerns the people of our own country.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest problems confronting the people of the congressional district which I am privileged to represent, and the Nation generally, is the threat posed to the textile jobs of our Nation through importation of textile products. Since my congressional service commenced I have joined with many of my colleagues in an effort to impress upon others the seriousness of the impact of foreign textile imports. I am hopeful that some progress is being made in this effort.

I was delighted to be named as one of the members of the informal Textile Import Committee organized by more than 100 Members of Congress several weeks ago. As the representative of the greatest textile-producing district in America I have felt that the work of this voluntary committee is one of the most important assignments that could come to me as I undertake to serve the people whom I am privileged to represent.

On February 16, 1961, President Kennedy appointed a five-man Cabinet Committee on Textile Exports, representing Commerce, State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Labor, to make recommendations to him without delay as to the course of action that the administration should take on this important problem. We at least have the comfort of knowing that the President is concerned about the plight of those who earn their livelihood in the domestic textile field.

Another evidence of the President's great interest in this problem was the very warm reception that he gave to the 15 members of the special informal committee that I have heretofore mentioned when we called upon him at the White House several days ago to present the cause of our people. For this great interest on the part of the leader of our Nation we are all deeply grateful.

Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess I was asked to serve as a member of a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee to go to the Far East to study the problem arising by reason of the Chinese refugee situation in Hong Kong. Collateral to our assignment was the admonition that we should investigate with our immigration officials in Japan and Hong Kong questions which arise in connection with the consideration of an omnibus immigration bill by the Judiciary Committee. Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and I constituted the special subcommittee. Our counsel, Mr. William Crabtree, was assigned to accompany us to make this important study.

At the time of the receipt of the request that I serve on this subcommittee I pointed out to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that I would do so provided it was agreeable with him that I might spend some time looking into the textile import problem from the point of view of imports from Hong Kong and Japan. He very readily acceded to my request. I am delighted that I can bring to the membership of the House today some of the observations that I made during the very short visit to those two important textile-producing areas. It is my hope that at sometime in the not-too-distant future I shall be privileged to make further study in some of the other new textile-producing countries of the world since I am firmly convinced that one must actually witness firsthand these operations in order to be able to form sound conclusions.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it crystal clear that I do not contend that the short visit that I was able to make to Hong Kong and Japan would qualify me as an expert on their problems and activities. I do feel that my background of work as a textile employee and the great interest that I have had throughout my lifetime in textiles would assist me in making conclusions much more rapidly than I otherwise would have been able to do.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITENER. I am happy to yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I agree 100 percent with what the gentleman says and commend him wholeheartedly for the fine statement he is making in connection with this very important problem. I am confident the Members will appreciate the valuable information he brought back from his trip to the Orient and appreciate his presentation this afternoon. Again I commend my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER], for the leadership which he is furnishing and the responsibility he is assuming in this fight for the preservation of American industry and jobs.

Mr. WHITENER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and want to say that as one of the new Members of the North Carolina delegation we have watched him as he has gone about his duties here in Washington. We have watched his zeal for the preservation of our own economy. Many of the great textile operations of the country are to be found in his district in the counties of Guilford, Durham, and Alamance. I know the many people who earn their livelihood in those industries will appreciate what he is doing for them here in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, our first opportunity to look into the textile picture arose when we arrived in Hong Kong. There the Foreign Service officers of our State Department provided us with an unclassified publication on the economy of Hong Kong. In that bulletin I noted the following paragraph:

> Hong Kong's trade with the United States was reduced in 1951 as a result of the United States and United Nations controls on trade with Communist China. Since that time, however, there has been a steady increase in this trade. In 1960 total trade with the United States was over US$159 million, compared with US$14.4 million in 1949, prior to the beginning of the Korean war. This makes the United States the colony's most important trading partner followed by Communist China, United Kingdom, and Japan. The export to the United States of mainland Chinese products is embargoed, but through the establishment of a comprehensive certificate of origin system there has been considerable export to the United States of traditional Chinese-type goods—including goods made of cotton—which are produced in Hong Kong. In 1960, exports to the United States came to US$133 million, a 33-percent increase over 1959 and more than a tenfold increase over 1954.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this increase of 33 percent in 1960 over 1959 is a tremendous jump in shipments of textile imports from Hong Kong to our country. The increase by 10 times of such imports between 1954 and 1960 is even more alarming when we couple this information with our knowledge of increased imports of textile products of other new producing areas.

Even more disturbing to me was the fact that there is now in progress in Hong Kong an unprecedented activity in the erection of additional textile producing plants. On one industrial site in the new territory of Kowloon in Hong Kong I was startled to see a builder's sign announcing that on that site was being built seven new textile plants. This building announcement contained the names of the contractors who were then engaged in erecting those plants. I have reliable information that in addition to those seven plants there are 8 others now being constructed in the Hong Kong Colony.

To date there has been no voluntary or involuntary quota imposed limiting the shipment of textiles from Hong Kong to the United States. How long can we idly sit by and see this expansion of foreign competition without imposing restraints upon the shipment of their low-wage goods into our Nation?

How long can we idly sit by and watch jobs in the textile industry now available to our people in this country being wiped out by our failure to restrict foreign imports?

Just a few days ago when we discussed this problem on the floor of the House we used the figure 900,000 in referring to the numbers of people now earning their livelihood in the textile industry of America. It now appears that that figure has been diminished according to the latest reports that we have from a reliable source. We are now told that in March 1961, employment in the textile mill products industry fell to 804,900 from 806,100 in February and that the average weekly hours of persons employed in textile in America amounted to only 38.8 hours per week in March 1961. This should graphically point out to all of us the real seriousness of the problem of our textile people.

While in Hong Kong I was privileged to meet with local textile manufacturers and to visit textile plants. I must say that I was received very cordially and felt that the industry people there were cooperative in giving me information which I requested. These visits and conferences gave me an entirely different picture of the quality of the textile industry in Hong Kong from that which I had had prior to this opportunity to see firsthand what is going on there.

The largest plant that we visited was very modern in every respect. The company was established in 1948 and is now employing 1,800 people—1,300 of whom are male and 500 are female. It has a factory area of 754,992 square feet and installed capacities of 34,900 ring spindles, 2,744 ring doublers, and 624 automatic looms. This plant produces carded gray weaving and knitting cotton yarns, 10s to 42s, single and double, super combed up to 60s; gray loomstate cloths, sheetings, drills, jeans, poplin, haircords, and so forth, up to 54 inches in width. The monthly output of the plant is 1,350,000 pounds of yarn, 20/1, and 2 million square yards of sheetings per month. It uses about 1,500,000 pounds of raw cotton per month.

This plant operates three 8-hour shifts each day and pays an average wage of 8 Hong Kong dollars—$1.36 U.S. money—per 8-hour shift. The hourly wage, however, is not the only consideration that must be given when determining the production cost of the plant since it furnishes free dormitory and subsidized meals for all workers, infirmary, cooperative stores, library, recreation fields, swimming pool, and vocational training for apprentice and junior operatives. In addition, I found that under the law of the British Crown Colony a workmen's compensation program similar to that found in our country is required to cover the employees in the event of industrial accidents.

The average age of the employees of this company was 23 or 24 years, which is a very young average age when you consider that under the law existing there an employee must have attained his 18th birthday before being eligible for such employment.

In going through the plant I was most interested in looking at the machinery to ascertain whether any of it was produced in the United States. While I saw a sizer manufactured by West Point of Georgia and was told that a Barber Coleman automatic spooler was on order by this company from one of our U.S. machinery manufacturers, I did not see any other American machinery in place in the sections of the plant which was shown to me by the manager. The machinery that I saw was manufactured by Toyoda of Japan, Reiter of Switzerland, Zinsor of Germany, Universal Karmiton of Japan, J. Hibbert & Co., Ltd., of England, Scharer of Switzerland, Schweiter of Germany, and Northrop of England.

So, it will be seen that some of the contention that we have heard that these plants are great customers of American textile machinery manufacturers does not prove to be true in this particular case.

In connection with my discussion of this company I should say that the laboratory facilities were much more extensive than I have generally observed in our American textile plants, and we cannot, therefore, underestimate the technical and research efforts being made by these Hong Kong competitors of our American textiles.

The paternalism practiced by textile employers in Hong Kong, as well as in Japan, is something now unknown to the textile industry in our country. On the grounds of the mills in both places we found their modern dormitory facilities provided for the employees. These dormitories are the equal of dormitories provided for most university students in our country, and we were told that there were also housing facilities for employees who were married while in the employ of the company. When this occurs the employees obviously must move from the separate dormitories provided for the male and female workers to family-style homes. The cafeterias furnish low-cost meals to the employees in the most sanitary and pleasant facility. In addition, a company store is operated by the employer at which purchases may be made at reduced prices, a full recreation program is carried on, and three nurses are in constant attendance at the plant. In addition to the nurses, medical services are provided by two physicians who are on call at all times by the company.

My purpose in bringing out this rather detailed information is to give to those who hear and those who read these remarks an opportunity to more accurately evaluate the quality and fiercesomeness of the competition which we are experiencing in the textile-producing areas of the United States. It is only through this knowledge of the situation that we can evaluate the competition that we have.

I think further, Mr. Speaker, that it is wise that I call to the attention of all Americans that the people of Hong Kong are very aware of some of the potential problems that they face in their program of virtually unrestricted exports from Hong Kong to the United States. Seldom did we see a newspaper while in Hong Kong which did not in some way address itself to the trade problem. Obviously these publications were weighted to the side of their own areas as will be noted in the editorial of Tuesday, April 4, 1961, in the Hong Kong Standard entitled "America's No. 1 Trade Problem in Asia." In order that my colleagues may have the benefit of this editorial expression, under unanimous consent I include it as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

AMERICA'S NO. 1 TRADE PROBLEM IN ASIA

All of Hong Kong will want to join in extending a warm welcome to the U.S. Department of Commerce officials and U.S. trade and commercial attachés in Asia who are gathered in Hong Kong at this moment for a conference to discuss the problems connected with America's trade with the countries in this area.

No other place in Asia offers the American officials a better venue for a meeting on international trade. Hong Kong's own record of growth and prosperity during the past decade will serve as a constant reminder to the participants that an area's economic well-being can be best served by a system of free enterprise and self-help, and by the conscientious removal of all the impediments of international trade such as tariff walls and quotas.

Coming from countries where trade and industries have been stifled by currency controls and by the imposition of too many obstructing regulations, not a few of the U.S. officials would probably privately wish that some of Hong Kong's exceedingly liberal economic policies could be transplanted to the areas where they are stationed.

Several factors in Hong Kong's industrial growth undoubtedly deserve the particular attention of the American trade officials who are gathered here for their meeting.

First, unlike the majority of the countries in Asia, this Colony has managed to rebuild after the war, to tackle its enormous refugee problems and to establish a prosperous light industrial complex without any subsidy to its economy through American aid funds.

Second, despite Hong Kong's proximity to Communist China and the presence within the city of a number of Communist labor unions, newspapers and other Peking-controlled organizations, its friendly relationship with the United States has never been marred by a single serious anti-American incident since the end of the war.

Instead, as a British colony, Hong Kong is remarkably America-oriented, as witnessed by the wide acceptance and the exceptional popularity of all kinds of American products among the local consumers.

Third, until 2 years ago, American exports to Hong Kong had always had a favorable balance. In a period of 15 years since the end of the war, the United States took at least $300 million in favorable trade balances with Hong Kong. Although lately Hong Kong's exports to America have increased, thus giving this Colony a slight edge since 1959, this small balance has been offset by a stepped-up outflow of invisible payments such as heavy local investments in U.S. shares and mutual funds.

Under these circumstances, it would seem that the most sensible thing for the United States to do is to leave a place like Hong Kong alone.

This Colony does not expect any special U.S. benevolence, because it strongly believes that handouts, given even with the best of intentions, tend ultimately to demoralize its spirit of self-help. On the other hand, Hong Kong also would not welcome any U.S. action which tends to strangle its exports to America.

Recently, there have been reports that the United States may send a group of Peace Corps members to Hong Kong to help us with our problems with the drug addicts. While such a demonstration of goodwill would be greatly appreciated, Hong Kong, however, feels that if it is allowed to make its own way in its trade with the United States, it would be able to have both the money and the personnel to care for its own drug addicts and its other welfare problems.

In fact, it would be highly ironic if the United States, on the one hand, should send its Peace Corps to minister to the Colony's drug addicts, and, on the other hand, should take away the livelihood of thousands of Hong Kong workers by placing artificial limitations on this city's exports to America.

Such drastic and unilateral trade controls would instantly create economic havoc in Hong Kong and lead to widespread distress. They would certainly provide the Communist press and the Communist organizers here with a welcome pretext for instigating a virulent campaign accusing America of breaking the rice bowls of Hong Kong workers.

These problems are by no means restricted to Hong Kong. The same problems and the same latent political dangers face every one of the American trade officials in their respective areas if their government should

put into effect controls and quotas on products manufactured by the newly established industries in Asia.

In the case of Hong Kong, Japan, India, and Pakistan, cotton textile products are the major items of export. And if the United States should enforce unilateral quotas, American trade officials abroad would certainly be called upon to explain how America's national security could be seriously threatened by a total volume of textile imports amounting to only 5 to 6 percent of the aggregate U.S. consumption.

They would also have to offer a convincing explanation that America's unilateral limitation of textile imports, if and when imposed, is not in direct contradiction with its constant pleas for other nations to remove trade barriers.

During their week's conference in Hong Kong, the U.S. trade officials will discuss many diverse problems and it is hardly likely that they will single out the textiles control question for priority consideration.

But the principle underlying quotas and controls is of paramount urgency to them because the removal of trade barriers and the stimulation of a freer flow of trade are the chief objectives of their work. If they cannot persuade their own Government to practice what it constantly preaches, they can hardly hope to succeed in winning new friends and customers for the United States in this part of the world.

It was a startling thing for me to see the writer of the foregoing editorial come to the conclusion which he stated as follows:

Under the circumstances, it would seem that the most sensible thing for the United States to do is to leave a place like Hong Kong alone.

How, Mr. Speaker, can anyone here or abroad feel that we should permit a basic domestic industry to be crippled or destroyed? If we leave a place like Hong Kong alone to expand and expand its textile industry which produces goods with cotton purchased at a cheaper price than our domestic manufacturers can buy such cotton, at wages only a fraction of those paid to our textile employees, and in an atmosphere such as exists in Hong Kong and other new textile-producing areas we will be disregarding the interests of our own people and our Nation. It is abundantly clear that we have already left these types of producers alone to the great injury of our American people.

But, apparently, Mr. Speaker, there are those in America who would take the position advocated by the editorial to which I have referred. It was shocking to me while in Hong Kong to read in the Hong Kong Standard of April 5, 1961, a news story purporting to set forth a synopsis of a statement made by Hon. Rowland Burnstan, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, at a meeting being held at Hong Kong by the United States commercial attachés in the Far East. Rather than undertake to paraphrase the remarks imputed to Mr. Burnstan I prefer to have the news story set forth at this point in the RECORD and under unanimous consent I include as a part of my remarks:

RESTRICTIONS TERMED LAST RESORT: UNITED STATES ADOPTING POSITIVE APPROACH TO TEXTILE QUESTION

Restrictions and other protective measures with regard to textile imports to the United States, would only be adopted as a last resort, Mr. Rowland Burnstan, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, said at a press conference yesterday.

He said that the American Government is adopting a positive approach to the question of textile imports into the United States, rather than a negative one of restriction.

He, however, pointed out that if a genuine hardship could be shown by a section of the American industry because of specific imports, the tariff commission had a right to recommend some protective action.

The positive approach which he had in mind was sales promotion, efficient production and other steps which any industry would take to try to better their sales to any market.

Mr. Burnstan, however, added that the question of textile was not something just between the United States and Hong Kong. Any solution to it would have to be international.

With regard to the plastic flower issue, in which a comparatively new local firm had taken out copyrights on a number of plastic flower designs, Mr. Burnstan said he had not heard of it until he came to Hong Kong and he understood that it had been handled by the Hong Kong government very satisfactorily.

Mr. Burnstan is in Hong Kong for a conference of all the U.S. commercial attachés in this part of the world. The conference started on Monday and will carry through till Friday.

Mr. Burnstan explained that Hong Kong was chosen for the site of this conference because of its geographic location. The conference was more managerial than economical. They would discuss problems of management and other common problems with which they were all faced.

He also added that they want to promote an increase in two-way trade with this part of the world.

A total of 26 commercial attachés in this part of the world and six members of the U.S. Department of Commerce and State Department are here attending the conference.

I had the pleasure of meeting Assistant Secretary of Commerce Burnstan while in the Far East. He impressed me as a very personable gentleman, but I must say that from my conversation with him I gather that he has had little, if any, textile experience. It seemed to me to be most unfortunate that this gentleman was sent to the Far East to give forth his views on this important textile import problem when at the very time that he was making his statement a special Cabinet textile committee and the President of the United States have under consideration the type of action that should be taken to preserve the textile industry in our country. If Mr. Burnstan was expressing the view of the administration that no restrictions on imports of textiles will be imposed by our Government, then he has information which was not given to us in our conferences with the President and with the special Cabinet textile committee.

I felt that Mr. Burnstan had rendered our country a great disservice by building up what I believe to be false and unfounded hopes that there can be a continuing expansion of textile production in Hong Kong and other new textile-producing areas without restrictions in the immediate future. In order that the other side of this question could be presented through the press to the interested people in Hong Kong I issued a statement to the press when they interviewed me on the following day which was carried in the South China Morning Post which, under unanimous request, I include as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

HONG KONG TEXTILES: EXPORTS TO AMERICA MUST BE RESTRICTED

Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER, of North Carolina, which is one of the largest cotton and textile producing centers in the United States of America, said that unless something was done in this respect on a voluntary basis, he was confident that the Trade Agreement Act would be revised when it arose for discussion on expiry in 1962.

VIEW SUPPORTED

Congressman A. MOORE, of West Virginia, said, "I wish to affirm what my fellow Congressman has said."

Mr. WHITENER said he was one of the 14 members of a special committee on textile import problems. This committee represented 43 textile producing centers in the United States. It was a nongovernmental, unofficial organization, he added.

GRAVE SITUATION

Members of this committee met President Kennedy and discussed with him the grave textile situation in America.

"This problem should not be considered lightly," Mr. WHITENER said.

He added: "When any subordinate official of the U.S. Government makes ill-advised statements such as I have read since coming to Hong Kong, he is not being fair, of course, to either our country or to Hong Kong."

When asked whether he was referring to the statements made in Hong Kong at a conference of U.S. officials, Congressman WHITENER declined to elaborate.

He stressed the seriousness of the textile import problem now confronting the United States of America. He said Japan agreed to a voluntary restriction in 1957 and she was abiding by her agreement.

"Other countries, including Hong Kong, have increased their export of textiles to us," he said. "This cannot continue. We will have to take action to protect the jobs of the American people. I am confident action will be taken."

Mr. Speaker, such statements as Mr. Burnstan made in Hong Kong should be made only after approval by the leaders of our Government. Certainly men not acquainted with the textile industry should not be permitted to go about giving their personal views without having cleared them with the top echelons of our Government. We saw this type of conduct carried on in the previous administration when my good friend, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kerns, constantly downgraded the American textile industry and indicated a lack of consideration for the preservation of the jobs of our own people. I know that our distinguished and able Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, who is so familiar with the textile industry and who has been so concerned about the problems that confront it, must have been greatly concerned by the reported statements of his assistant, Mr. Burnstan.

While I realize that the legislative branch of the Government has the responsibility, separate and apart from that of the executive branch, it is my hope that at some point during the hearings next year on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 that the Ways and Means Committee will find it possible to explore the philosophy of Mr.

Burnstan and inquire into the factors which caused him to make the unfortunate statement which he is reported to have made in Hong Kong.

Mr. Speaker, statements by high Government officials or low Government officials which would give encouragement to new textile producers in Hong Kong or elsewhere are, in my judgment, a great disservice, not only to the United States but to the countries which accept these statements in good faith and proceed to erect textile plants which may be idled at some time in the future by reason of a firm policy which I hope we will have against the unrestricted imports of textile products from other lands. Instead of making the type of statement attributed to Mr. Burnstan I think it would be much more desirable if persons purporting to speak for our country would recommend a go-slow policy to those who erect competitive industries in textiles or other fields with the expectation of dumping their products in our country.

After leaving Hong Kong we proceeded to Japan in furtherance of the assignment of our subcommittee. While in Japan I was privileged to meet with the commercial officers of our embassies and consulates, as well as with many officials of the Japanese Government and of various textile industrial organizations of that country. Among the Government officials with whom we met was the Minister of Commerce of Japan and the head of the textile division of their Commerce Bureau or agency in Japan. In addition to these gentlemen, it was my privilege to meet and talk with former Prime Minister Kishi and some of the legislative leaders of Japan as we met at the home of the Chargé d'Affaires of the U.S. Embassy, Mr. Leonhardt.

I found in Japan a very great concern about the textile import situation, particularly as it is affected by the rapid growth of new textile-producing countries. The Japanese Government officials and industry people pointed out to me that while they had made a voluntary agreement with our country limiting their exports to the United States they were concerned greatly by the fact that such quotas had not been agreed upon or imposed upon other countries. They feel that this condition should not be permitted to continue to the injury of Japan and her textile industry.

In each conference I pointed out to the Japanese officials that we were aware of the fact that the percentage of the American market which they now enjoy is less than the percentage that they enjoyed at the time that they agreed to the voluntary quotas. I also expressed to them the feeling that our government and industry people had with reference to their fidelity to the observance of the voluntary quotas to which they had agreed during the Eisenhower administration. Candor compelled me, however, to state to them that many of us felt that the amounts of imports coming in under their voluntary quota arrangement were excessive and damaging to our domestic economy but that notwithstanding our feeling with reference to the excessiveness of the Japanese imports into the United States we did have a feeling of appreciation for their honesty in living up to their agreement. I further pointed out to these various gentlemen in Japan that I felt that their problem now was a common problem with ours in that they stood to lose just as heavily as we if immediate restrictions were not imposed upon those countries presently engaged in building up industrial textile frankensteins in Hong Kong, Spain, Portugal, and other countries.

Mr. Speaker, when we realize that Japan is one of our best United States cotton customers and when we take into account the strategic nature of her location in our fight against international communism, we are led to the inescapable conclusion that our relations with that country are greatly endangered by the increase in textile imports from other parts of the world. When we take into account this fact, together with the facts of our own economic well-being, it seems to me that in fairness to ourselves and to the Japanese people immediate steps should be taken to prevent a worsening of our relations with that country. I think no one can deny that our own domestic situation requires immediate action even if we are willing to disregard the interests of our friends, the Japanese.

During my visit to Japan I went to the industrial center which we find in the Osaka region. While there I visited textile plants and talked to our commercial attachés and with officials of one of the largest textile machinery manufacturing concerns in Japan. I found the same sort of concern with those individuals as I found in talking to government officials in Tokyo.

While in the Osaka area I visited a large plant at Kaizuka. The management of this plant was very hospitable and very willing to give me such information as I requested.

I found that this mill had two plants, one of which was built in 1935 and the other in 1936. It was situated on an industrial site of 14 acres. The mill had 549,044 square feet and warehouse space of 75,543 square feet. There were other buildings such as offices, dormitories, staff residences, dispensary, mess rooms, class rooms, and so forth, which, when added to the warehouse and mill space, totaled 1,069,764 square feet. The warehouse area had a maximum storage capacity of 15,000 bales of cotton, a good portion of which cotton was American cotton, although I did observe great quantities of Egyptian and African cotton fiber in bales in the warehouses.

This company employs a total of 1,563 persons of whom 269 are males and 1,294 are females. The plant runs 15½ hours per day on two shifts with the employees working a 6-day week. This company has dormitories with a housing capacity of 2,964 persons, a messroom which will seat 700 persons, and a lecture hall which will seat 1,500 persons. The company operates a company store selling the daily necessities, a barber shop, a beauty parlor, bathhouses, a laundry, and dining facilities. It operates a school in a building having six classrooms, including a sewing room, and teaches subjects which will give their employees the equivalent of a high school education.

The company operates a dispensary, giving medical and surgical treatment free of charge, in a facility having a capacity of 34 beds. Recreational facilities, including a baseball diamond, tennis court, volley ball courts, gymnasium, ping pong room, summer beach houses, and other facilities are provided by the company. A recreational tour is given to the employees twice a year, and the local holidays are observed with some ceremonial by arrangement of the company. Movies are shown once a month and from time to time the company provides concerts, plays, and other entertainment on their grounds for the employees.

I was impressed by the fact that this industry takes young ladies who have finished what is called middle school and then gives them a course of training in their work. While training for work they go to school for regular subjects and learn their work through an on-the-job training program lasting approximately 3 months. In the mornings these apprentice workers practice on the machinery, and during the afternoons they are given lectures on textiles. At other times, primarily in the evenings, they are given the regular 3-year high school educational training, all at the expense of the company. These young people must be 16 years of age before they commence work, and at that time their educational program under the sponsorship of the employer is carried forward.

The young men who desire to attain positions of responsibility attend a technical school sponsored by the company for at least 2 years before being given any position of responsibility. The wage scale is slightly higher than found in Hong Kong, but less than one-sixth of the wage scale found in our country in the textile industry.

I asked the management of this plant about their outlet for their products and was told that 12 to 13 percent of their output was sold in the Japanese market, whereas the balance found its way into the export trade, a good portion of which was sold to the United States.

This textile operation in Kaizuka was most modern in every respect. It was in many ways more advanced than I find to be true in many of our American textile plants as far as machinery was concerned. I did observe, however, that in both Hong Kong and in Japan that employees operated fewer machines than is generally true in America, but the quality of the work produced was, in my judgment, the equivalent of that produced in our domestic plants.

Another interesting conference was had with the president and sales manager of one of Japan's leading textile machinery manufacturing companies at their principal offices in Osaka. During the full afternoon of conference, I felt that we were able to develop an understanding of some of the problems which exist between our domestic industry and the Japanese textile industry which

otherwise neither they nor I would have understood. These individuals seemed to have a feeling that there was great discrimination against sales of their products to the textile industry in the United States. They could not quite grasp the reason for it.

I pointed out to them that in the several plants I had visited in the Far East that I had noticed a great dearth of American-made textile machinery so I felt that we might take the same attitude toward them that they are taking toward our industry. When they stated that their machinery was the equal or superior of ours and that, therefore, there was no need for Japanese and Far Eastern textile industrial companies to purchase any great amount of our American machinery, I pointed out to them that we felt our machinery was the equal or superior of theirs and that for that reason our American industry people saw no reason for purchasing their machinery in great supply.

Another concern which they had was that there seemed to be a stigma on their machinery in the minds of American textile people. I pointed out to them that this was not difficult to understand when we considered that there had been a great feeling in this country that our domestic textile industry had been greatly damaged by excessive imports from Japan and other places and that it would be inconsistent for our textile industry to purchase Japanese machinery while at the same time asking for protection from excessive imports of finished textile products into our country.

It was my feeling that after our mutually frank and open discussion an area of understanding had been reached which theretofore had not prevailed. Certainly there was nothing in the attitude of these gentlemen toward me and their willingness to talk freely that would indicate there was anything other than the greatest spirit of friendship between us. This was further amplified when they furnished me with copies of many of their technical manuals relating to the various types of machinery and their assurances that they had no desire to upset the American textile economy but rather were trying to proceed in an orderly way to promote a textile economy and textile machinery industry which would be of benefit to their own country.

The concern that we found in Japan as to the future of their trade with our Nation is understandable when one realizes that the country has practically no raw materials available to them except those which are bought in foreign commerce. They do have a problem which is not facing us in that they have no cotton-producing ability or other natural resources.

I can appreciate the causes which bring about some of their thinking on the question of international trade, but I must, Mr. Speaker, express concern about the conflict in their position when they assert that they are our best cotton customer but at the same time tell us that they are developing their own man-made fibers and that they contemplate that in the future they will not be required to purchase as much cotton as in the past and that they will not be dependent upon the United States and the United Kingdom for synthetic or man-made fibers in the future. It seems to me that they should realize that their ability to export to the United States will be affected very greatly by any lessening of imports to Japan of raw materials and other commodities from the United States. This, I think, our Government should immediately call to their attention. We should point out that while they proclaim that world trade is necessary for them that we, too, must have an outlet for our products and raw materials if we are to continue to permit any appreciable amount of imports into our country from theirs.

The daily press in Japan reflects the great interest which they have in foreign trade in the daily stories in the newspapers dealing with this subject. One of those stories appeared in the Japan Times of April 8, 1961, under the heading "Nineteen Hundred and Sixty Trade Figures Set Record Highs." Under unanimous consent I include that newspaper story as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY TRADE FIGURES SET RECORD HIGHS

Japan's exports and imports totaled all-time highs of $4,117 million and $4,661 million, respectively, on a customs clearance basis in fiscal 1960 ended last month, the Finance Ministry announced yesterday.

The foreign trade account for fiscal 1960, as a result, left an unfavorable balance of $544 million. The import excess was $216 million over that for the preceding year.

The tempo of export expansion slowed down gradually during the year. The rate of increase, which in the April–June and July–September period was 18.2 and 18.7 percent, respectively, higher than that of the comparable periods of fiscal 1959, sagged to 12.6 percent in October–December and 7 percent in January–March.

Exports showed an increase of $505 million or 14 percent over fiscal 1959. The 1959 figure of $3,612 million was the highest previous record.

Imports rose by $722 million or 18.3 percent over the preceding year. The previous import record was $4,023 million in fiscal 1957.

Imports which amounted to above $380 million every month from April to December swelled to over the $400 million mark in the January–March period.

Itemwise, almost all exports increased, with metal and textile products showing increases of 38 and 12.5 percent, respectively, over the previous year.

Imports also rose generally. Oil increased by 22 percent, iron ore 40.6 percent, and coal 53 percent.

The Finance Ministry also reported yesterday that March exports totaled $371,280,000 according to customs clearance, or a 17.9 percent increase over February.

The figure was the second largest monthly export amount following the highest figure of $442 million registered in December last year.

March imports totaled $463,130,000, or up by 6.9 percent over the preceding month, setting a new postwar high monthly record.

The previous highest monthly import figure was $452,710,000, in May 1957.

The excess of imports over exports was, as a result, slightly eased in comparison with that of February against January, which was about $100 million.

Export gains were in machinery with 33.9 percent over the previous month; metal products, 19 percent, and drugs and chemicals, 61.9 percent.

Metal ores and scrap metals increased by 22.4 percent over the previous month in the import section.

In the same newspaper I found another article entitled "No U.S. Cotton Tariff Raise Seen." This article is perhaps very much related to statements such as I have heretofore mentioned as having been made by Assistant Secretary of Commerce Burnstan during his appearance in Hong Kong a few days earlier. We would hope that the content of those news stories is not correct since it would indicate that the Japanese at least feel that we in our Government are not going to protect the rights of our own people to earn a livelihood in the textile industry.

Under unanimous consent I include this news story as a part of my remarks at this point:

NO U.S. COTTON TARIFF RAISE SEEN

A high MITI official said in the Diet yesterday that he did not think the United States would raise tariff rates against Japanese cotton textile imports this year.

Testifying before the House of Representatives Commerce and Industry Committee, Keiichi Matsumura, head of the Textile Bureau, International Trade and Industry Ministry, said Japan has asked for a 30-percent expansion of cotton textile exports to the United States this year.

Particularly, Japan has requested the United States to allow gingham imports during 1961 to increase to 50 million square yards from 40 million square yards in 1960, he said.

Zenei Imai, head of the Trade Bureau MITI, told the committee that trade between Japan and Communist China would amount to some $30 million one way during 1961 as both exports and imports are likely to show marked increases during the summer-autumn harvest season.

Major imports will be iron ore, coal, soybeans, and salt, he said.

During my stay in Japan there was a trade mission from that country meeting in our own country. The mission had as one of its members, Mr. Kojiro Abe, chairman of the Toyo Spinning Co., who joined with his other fellow members of the mission to urge an increase in the allowable quota of exports from Japan to the United States. The Japan Times of April 9, 1961, carried under a New York dateline a report upon the work of this trade mission in the United States.

Under unanimous consent I include it as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

ECONOMIC MISSION SEES: TREMENDOUS BOOST IN UNITED STATES-JAPAN TRADE

NEW YORK.—A Japanese economic mission Friday forecast a tremendous increase in trade between the United States and Japan and called for the removal of restraints which tend to obstruct the flow of goods.

Speaking on behalf of the eight-man mission which has been touring the United States, Kiichiro Sato said that if the United States maintains its 30 percent share of the Japanese market, American exports will rise to well over $3,000 million by 1970. American exports to Japan during 1960 are estimated at $1,400 million.

Another member of the mission, Kojiro Abe, chairman of the Toyo Spinning Co., said

the Japanese textile industry has been losing its share of the American market to competitors and called for a 30 percent hike in the self-imposed Japanese quota for 1961.

Sato, vice chairman of the Federation of Economic Organizations and chairman of the Mitsui Bank, Ltd., said "The future offers rewarding opportunities for trade" between Japan and the United States.

Japan, he said, is now America's second largest export market. These exports increased by 43 percent last year.

"If the United States maintains its 30 percent share of the Japanese market," he said, "American exports will rise to well over $3,000 million by 1970, on the basis of the overall trade target set by the Ikeda government in its 10-year economic plan to double the national income and raise the standard of living."

Major increases in American exports are anticipated in finished products such as machinery and consumer goods as well as in raw materials, he added.

"This," he told newsmen at a press conference, "will provide American jobs even though the United States is considered less dependent on exports than we are."

Japan, on the other hand, must increase its exports to pay for imports from the United States, but to realize the mutual benefits of the two-way trade, "both countries need to overcome movements, if any, to obstruct the flow of goods," he said.

Japan, he said, is doing its share in liberalizing restrictions on imports and investments. He called on American businessmen to help bring about greater awareness of the overall advantages of increasing, and not restraining trade with Japan. He said the mission was delighted to know that President John F. Kennedy has spoken out in favor of a free trade policy.

Abe, who headed the Japanese team which negotiated the 5-year Japanese quota in textile exports to the United States, said the Japanese textile industry "now has considerable doubt" about its self-imposed quota which expires in December 1961.

The quota system was instituted "in the interest of friendly relations" between the United States and Japan in 1957, he said.

Since then, however, Hong Kong, Spain, and Portugal have expanded their exports to the United States so that the Japanese share of the American market has declined.

He cited as an example exports of cotton cloth. In 1957 Japan had 70 percent of total U.S. imports of cotton cloth, whereas the Japanese share has now declined to 19 percent. "This," he said, "is a case where an honest man has lost."

"We feel there should be no further unilateral reservations on textile imports. We can no longer go on with this type of arrangement."

He said that negotiations are now going on between officials of Japan and the United States on the quota for 1961. The Japanese, he said, are asking for a 30-percent increase in this year's allowable export to the United States, which he described as "a modest request."

He declined to speculate as to whether the Japanese textile industry would prefer to forgo the quota system in favor of a tariff arrangement.

"We are not thinking beyond 1961," he said. "If the U.S. Government can come up with a reasonable solution for 1961, for 1962 and thereafter, I would think things would work out rather well."

He stressed the importance of two-way trade and cited as an instance of Japan's trend toward liberalization of its trade restrictions the big increase in American exports of raw cotton. Japan now buys 3,200,000 bales of raw cotton, of which half comes from the United States.

Japanese exports in the form of finished goods are equivalent to about 10 percent of American cotton exports to Japan.

Among the other points made by the mission members:

Expanding trade will enable Japan to increase its economic assistance and investments abroad.

Improved living standards is the best guarantee of strengthening democracy in Japan and our spirit of cooperation with the free world.

Charges that Japanese low-cost labor has displaced American workers export in order to survive and an important consideration in this context is the friendly relations which exist between the two nations.

The transfer of Government from the Republican Party to the Kennedy administration will not affect the circumstances of trade.

There will be an increase in United States buying of Japanese securities once Japanese currency restrictions are further liberalized.

Mr. Abe was in Washington after my return from the Far East and as a result of a telephone call which I made we arranged a conference in my office to discuss our views on the textile import situation. Mr. Abe is a very successful textile manufacturer and is head of a textile empire employing over 22,000. He is a very personable gentleman and is one of the leaders in the textile industry in his country. In our conference he very candidly advanced the theories which he had about foreign trade, and I undertook to present the viewpoint of the people in the textile industry in the area which I am privileged to represent.

I told Mr. Abe that I concurred with the view that the great reduction in the percentage of the American market which his country had sustained by reason of the rapid building of new textile-producing facilities in new countries was unfortunate and that he was probably correct in his view that the adherence of Japan to their voluntary import quotas had brought about some injury to them in the development of their industry.

I further suggested that he should not overlook the fact that when quotas are involuntarily imposed at some time in the future, as we advocate, his country will probably receive a much more cordial consideration by reason of their having seen the problem in advance and living up to their voluntary quota agreement. I further pointed out to Mr. Abe that I felt that the voluntary agreement between Japan and this country had not been realistic in that it permitted excessive amounts of textile imports of Japanese textiles into our country. While he and I could not agree upon that subject I feel that since he is the outstanding textile industrial spokesman of Japan that our conference was well worth while.

Mr. Speaker, if Japan should abandon the present voluntary arrangement or undertake to increase the quantity of textiles which they import into our country, it is my firm conviction that our Government will then be faced with the absolute necessity of taking action which will restrict the Japanese imports into the United States to a point far below the amount of textiles now coming in under the voluntary arrangement.

As I stated to Mr. Abe, I believe that anyone can see the disastrous effects that have been brought about in our own country in the loss of employment and injury of our domestic textile industry and that whatever position they may take in the future they must take into account that we in this country have a solemn obligation to keep ourselves strong in our textile economy as well as in all other phases of our American economic life.

Mr. Speaker, I have undertaken to give some of the facts and observations that I made during the rather brief visit that I made to the Far East textile areas of Hong Kong and Japan. It would not be appropriate for me to take the time of the membership of the House to go into greater detail than I have already done. I hope that in some way, though, that what I have reported here will be of benefit to our people in America in understanding something of the foreign textile industry with which we are competing.

I think, too, Mr. Speaker, that I can render a public service to the agricultural economy of our country when I point out that in the textile plants of Japan as I passed through the warehouses I observed that cotton from other countries was received by the mills in very firm and sound packages.

Unfortunately, I observed that American cotton was poorly packaged and the bales were in very bad condition as they were seen in the various warehouses over there. It seems to me that with the vast experience that our cotton trade has had in the foreign shipment of cotton that we could at least expect our product to arrive at these foreign plants in as good condition as we find cotton from other cotton-producing areas.

In talking to the representative of one of the leading American cotton sales firms in Osaka he told me that my observation had been correct and that one of their big problems was the matter of delivery of bales of cotton to their Japanese customers in good condition. He further told me that the number of claims filed for damaged cotton was appalling and that this was the subject of great concern to the industry of which he was a part. This was also confirmed to me by our commercial attachés who have been faced with the complaints of the Japanese manufacturers from time to time.

A few days ago I mentioned this poor packaging of cotton being shipped from the United States into our foreign markets to a young textile man in my district. He called to my attention that this subject has recently been discussed and illustrated in a publication prepared by the North Carolina State College School of Textiles. This publication was entitled "Textile Research in Japan." It was written by William A. Newell, director, Textile Research Center of North Carolina State College.

On pages 39 and 40 of this publication there are photographs which accurately and correctly illustrate and portray the shocking contrast between our American cotton bales and those of Soviet Russia,

Syria, and Mexico. As I hold these photographs and exhibit them to you I believe that you will fully appreciate the alarm which I experienced when I encountered this condition upon visiting the warehouse of the plant in Kaizuku. I know that many of you will want to make a closer inspection of these photographs; therefore, I am leaving them in the Speaker's lobby for your scrutiny during the remainder of the day.

I would urge that the National Cotton Council, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and other agencies who are so vitally concerned in further developing our world trade in cotton might well give attention to this problem of proper packaging and thereby make their cotton attractive to those who would buy it for use in other lands.

I merely point this out, Mr. Speaker, for the reason that we must not only be interested in the jobs of our people in the textile plants but must be equally concerned with the availability of markets for our cotton farmers in America. It seems to me that this is a very basic problem which could be settled and solved with a minimum of difficulty if proper thought and action were given to it at once.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude my remarks I would like to make it abundantly clear that the observations that I made while in the Far East convinced me that the problem confronting our domestic textile industry and the people who find employment therein is more acute and pressing than I had believed before. We must have immediate relief from the existing foreign textile competition and from the additional competition which we see on the economic horizon. Our domestic textile industry cannot long survive if there is an unhindered development of low-wage foreign competition in addition to that presently existing which has wrought such havoc upon the economy of our country.

Textiles are a vital part of our national security. We are now told that our security situation is endangered by reason of the inability of our present American textile industry to meet the demands which would confront us in the event of military conflict. For the sake of our own national security, therefore, it seems to me that it is dictated that positive and immediate steps be taken to curb the present excessive flow of foreign low-wage textile imports.

Our economic security is equally important to our defense situation. We have made many commitments to foreign nations and to our own people which must be paid for from the Treasury of the United States. These payments and obligations cannot be met if we permit the textile and other basic industries of our country to suffer greater destruction in the future. Already too much damage has been done to many industries by reason of these unfair foreign competitive situations which we have tolerated. And so, Mr. Speaker, if we are to remain strong internally and if we are to have the type of economy which will provide the standard of living to which our people are accustomed, and which we believe they are entitled to have, immediate action must be taken to bolster our own economy by limiting excessive foreign imports.

Our relations with other nations, if they are to continue to be friendly, must not have the handicap of a later drastic imposition of restrictions upon foreign commerce if we are to have peace and harmony in the world. Already we have permitted the inflow of foreign-made goods to such an extent that it seems to be elementary that some positive steps must be taken to reduce that flow in the interest of our own domestic welfare. It cannot be productive of good relations with other now-friendly nations if we sit back and permit them to expand their industries with the view of dumping their products into our country and then to come along 1 year or 10 years later and put them out of business by reason of sealing off their markets.

So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it is only good judgment and good sense that we take immediate action so that there will not be an occasion for us to require that industrial houses be torn down in the future which we permitted to be built in the present under the false hope extended to those people that they will have a permanent open market for their goods in our country.

No one can deny that this is a most difficult problem. No one would claim that we can be a seperate island doing no trading with foreign nations. But, Mr. Speaker, such trading as we do must be done in the light of the prinicples of the late Cordell Hull, who believed that there must be reciprocity; that there must not be imposed upon the American economy an abundance of foreign-made goods which will compete with goods which are already in adequate supply in our own country. We must revert to the fundamental principle that the United States must be strong economically if she is to meet her commitments to other nations of the world and to her own people.

Mr. Speaker, the trip that I made, during which I made these collateral textile import observations, was an experience that I shall long remember. It was an opportunity for me to see first-hand the real frightening picture that confronts the great industry which provides jobs for approximately 200,000 people in the State of North Carolina and over 800,000 people in the United States of America. I believe that these jobs must be preserved for our own people. I believe that when we have done that we will have best served the interests of our own country and by reason of the resulting preservation of our own internal strength will have served the cause of the people in the free world everywhere.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

WISCONSIN'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF NATION'S FIRST WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, it is significant to note that 50 years ago today, Gov. Francis E. McGovern signed chapter 50, Wisconsin Laws of 1911, putting into effect the first constitutionally valid State workmen's compensation law enacted in this great Nation.

Passage of this historic act climaxed 6 years of deliberation and research by many illustrious citizens of the State serving as legislators, including two who still are alive today, the Honorable Theodore W. Brazeau, of Wisconsin Rapids, and former Chief Justice Edward T. Fairchild, of Madison.

I take personal pride in the fact that my own grandfather, the Honorable William D. Connor, Lieutenant Governor of Wisconsin and president of the senate from January 7, 1907, to January 4, 1909, had an active part in the deliberations during a critical stage when the thoughts of all citizen groups were being sought and heard.

Wisconsin citizens are pleased to acknowledge that nine other States adopted similar workmen's compensation laws the same year. It is most gratifying to further note that today every State has some form of workmen's compensation law in effect.

The Wisconsin law made provisions for funding workmen's compensation benefits through private insurance programs. This was the beginning of the "Wausau story." The first policy written under this historic act was issued by Employers Mutuals, of Wausau, a Wisconsin firm organized specifically to underwrite this coverage. This first policy, issued to the Wausau Sulfate & Fibre Co., a firm now known as Mosinee Paper Mills, is still in effect, daily providing important benefits to the many employees of this prominent company.

The Wisconsin workmen's compensation law of 1911 should be recognized as one of the great laws of modern history. It has made major contributions to the economic welfare and physical well-being of all who labor. It has been a vital force in providing a safe environment for all workers and has greatly increased productivity of our industrial community.

Workmen's compensation laws from the beginning have been models of democratic social legislation in both concept and administration. These laws epitomize the true spirit of the American free enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Congress of the United States information

about Wisconsin workmen's compensation legislation as one way of commemorating 50 years of industrial progress that has had unusual and lasting significance for labor and management alike.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO ABOLISH THE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from Illinois who a few moments ago drew attention to the Constitution of Poland that was drawn up in 1791 and to the terror that has been imposed on the Polish people since that time; and I join him in the wish that the future may see the liberation of the people of Poland from the Red tyranny that is rampant in their land.

Mr. Speaker, throughout every section of our country there is a tremendous, and still increasing, wave of support for the energetic efforts of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to expose internal subversion. Nevertheless, some voices have been raised in condemnation of the Committee and the film entitled "Operation Abolition." Indeed, voices have been raised here on the floor of the House by two of our colleagues, echoing this condemnation.

Perhaps many do not realize that this film is part of an official report to the Congress by the Committee on Un-American Activities, of which I am a member. On pages 6 and 7 of House Report No. 2228, 86th Congress, 2d session, appears the following:

> This film titled "Operation Abolition" graphically illustrates the problem (obstructive processes of witnesses and deliberately staged riots or other disorderly tactics employed and designed to frustrate proper inquiries) involved. Bearing in mind the apt saying that "one picture is worth a thousand words," and that only the film can portray fully the actual occurrence, we have deemed it necessary to submit a print of the film herewith, which is made a part of this report.

Unfortunately, there are people born into this world with physical color blindness. This affliction hampers them throughout their lives to some extent, and it prevents their being used in certain areas of life for which all their other talents make them qualified. But rarely is their color blindness a cause of injury to others.

In our day, however, there are a number of Americans far more unfortunate because they appear to be psychologically colorblind. I speak of people who will not or cannot distinguish red from white. They will not or cannot see through the deliberate deceit of our enemies. I speak of those who consistently fall for the Communist Party line, who consciously or unconsciously do the work of our enemies by parroting the Communist propaganda which deceives and confuses our citizens.

Today we hear attacks from all sides on the committee officially entrusted by this body of Congress to investigate subversion in America. I want to call the careful attention of my colleagues and the people of America to a document which I hereby place in the RECORD. This is entitled "National Abolition Campaign Program." It was drafted by Frank Wilkinson, field representative of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee. This document was received in the mail directly from this Communist front. It outlines activities to be undertaken over the period March 1961 to February 1962, by the Communist Party and its fronts in their efforts to destroy the Committee on Un-American Activities. The Supreme Court, as many of you know, upheld Wilkinson's contempt of Congress conviction on February 27 of this year and he entered Federal prison camp on May 1.

This document shows that the attacks we hear from all sides are the result of a carefully laid out plan, developed and put in operation by the Communist Party through the frontal agency it has set up for this purpose. I am not saying that every attack on the Committee on Un-American Activities is Communist inspired. Many well-intentioned Americans sincerely believe there are things wrong with the committee and/or the film "Operation Abolition." What I am pointing out here is that the national Putsch to destroy an official committee of the elected Representatives of the American people is a highly organized, top priority program of our enemies. It is calculated to develop a mass propaganda to be echoed in our various communications media by misled commentators and editors, that people are being unfairly accused, that witch hunts abound, and so forth.

I strongly defend the individual's right to criticize me or any committee I am on, or this entire Congress, if he so chooses. My purpose here is solely to focus the attention of our citizens on the existence of this massive subversive effort by the Communist Party so that our good people will not be deceived by deliberately distorted material. I hope their knowledge of this Communist plot will warn them to be careful about the charges they will read and hear, charges coming from the groups identified in this program of the National Abolition campaign.

In connection with this program I wish to point out that 7 of the 13 original officials of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee have been identified as Communists, according to the records of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and other Government agencies. I place the records of these seven men in the RECORD here for the benefit of my colleagues and the American people:

NATIONAL ABOLITION CAMPAIGN PROGRAM, MARCH 1961–FEBRUARY 1962—PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS (DRAFT)

(Prepared by Frank Wilkinson, field representative, National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee)

PETITIONS TO CONGRESS

Previous petitions: It is proposed that the petition which appeared in the Washington Post, January 2, 1961, and New York Times, February 9, 1961, under the sponsorship of the Princeton Ad Hoc Committee, and which is now being printed by this committee as an 8½- by 11-inch booklet in newsprint, be distributed nationally in the greatest possible quantity. The ad hoc committee estimates that this can be purchased for $2 or less per 1,000, plus freight.

Circulation of new petitions: It is proposed that as many new petitions as possible be circularized throughout the country.

Content: In addition to petitions which call upon Congress to abolish the HUAC, it is proposed that the following petitionable proposals be considered: (a) Opposition to such new hearings as the HUAC may schedule; (b) opposition to all forms of governmental sponsorship of the HUAC-aided film "Operation Abolition"; (c) curbs on HUAC's appropriation; (d) other.

To whom: Depending upon subject matter of petition and geographical areas covered, it is proposed that petitions be directed to: (a) An individual Congressman from the constituents of his congressional district; (b) all Congressmen within a section, metropolitan area or State; (c) a general petition to the House of Representatives, addressed to the Speaker.

From whom: All possible groups of citizens should be urged to petition Congress, including: (a) Ministers and rabbis; (b) faculties; (c) student bodies; (d) union memberships; (e) political councils and clubs; (f) a cross section of prominent citizens in the community; (g) general public petitions.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Educational meeting offense: It is proposed that abolition committees in all communities organize "town hall" types of public meetings where discussion and debate will stimulate interest in specific action projects to abolish the HUAC. Meetings of all kinds should be encouraged, including: (a) Neighborhood-home meetings; (b) congressional district meetings; (c) area-wide meetings; (d) church, synagogue, union, fraternal clubs; (e) other.

First amendment cases: There are approximately 45 persons in the country today who have various legal challenges of the authority of the HUAC and other inquisitorial committees of Government pending before the courts. As these cases are processed through the courts, they become valuable focus points in the abolition campaign, providing an excellent opportunity for educational-protest meetings. Examples: (a) Dr. Willard Uphaus who has already served a year in prison rather than cooperate with a witch-hunting New Hampshire committee, has volunteered to speak across the country in behalf of campaigns to abolish all such committees; (b) Peter Seeger, nationally recognized and beloved folk artist, is scheduled to go on trial for his contempt of the HUAC sometime in March; he has agreed to accept invitations for public meetings in support of the abolition campaign during April and May—after his trial, and depending on his schedule openings (for further information, telephone Mrs. Toshi Seeger: Beacon, N.Y.—Beacon 2652). (c) For further information on other cases,

write William Price, Coordinator, Committee of First Amendment Defendants, P.O. Box 564, Radio City Station, New York 19, N.Y.

EDUCATIONAL MEETINGS—DEFENSE

HUAC hearings—protest meetings: It is proposed that all future hearings called by the HUAC be countered by every possible, effective public demonstration, including public meetings. The newly formed Greater Washington (D.C.) Committee To Abolish the HUAC has offered to provide both housing accommodations and, where desirable, to organize public protest meetings and stimulate public attendance at hearings which the HUAC may schedule in Washington. Persons subpoenaed to the Capital from distant cities should be honored by send-off and welcome-home rallies at airports. Those subpenaed from areas closer to Washington should be accompanied (by chartered bus, etc.) by those supporting the abolition of the HUAC.

Pro-HUAC meetings: Meetings called in support of the HUAC should be opposed by every effective means. The HUAC should be countered by public protest against each activity it initiates to perpetuate itself.

Due to the fact that the committee has issued such false, inflammatory literature, speeches and films to discredit its critics and has repeatedly warned and forecast "violence" from its critics, it is extremely important that all aspects of the abolition campaign be planned with special care to achieve models of peaceful assembly; such planning should include written instructions on the best techniques and discipline for such demonstrations, advance notification of plans and fullest cooperation with police authorities, etc.

LITERATURE

Previously prepared literature available:

(a) Washington Post-New York Times petitions to Congress by Princeton Ad Hoc Committee: $2 per 1,000 or less, plus freight.

(b) "In Search of Truth," a student analysis of San Francisco demonstrations of May 1960: $2 per 1,000, plus freight.

(c) "Collection of Editorials and Resolutions in Opposition to the Un-American Activities Committee," now expanded by 25 additional pages, and to be increased and indexed as new materials become available: 25 cents each, plus postage. It is urged that a maximum number of copies be secured by every abolition committee for personal delivery to key community leadership.

(d) "Sounds of Protest"—12-inch, long-playing records of the San Francisco student demonstrations—prepared by and available through SLATE at the University of California at Berkeley: $2 each, plus postage.

(e) Summary of San Francisco student demonstrations, Congressman ROOSEVELT'S historic April 25, 1960, speech, and supporting editorials, prepared by the United Electrical Workers (11 East 51st Street, New York City): $3 for tape recording; $3.50 for 12-inch, long playing.

NEW LITERATURE PROPOSED FOR PREPARATION AND/OR NOW AVAILABLE

(a) Summary of analyses and criticisms of HUAC-sponsored film "Operation Abolition," including Herblock cartoons; San Francisco News-Call Bulletin article, "The Truth About the San Francisco Riots"; the resolution of February 23, 1961, by the National Council of Churches of Christ of the United States, cautioning against film showing without presentation of factual data regarding the film's admitted and alleged distortions; and a montage of editorial criticisms from the following: The Christian Century; the Methodist's Concern, Marquis Childs; Paul Jacobs, the Washington Post, the Northern California Council of Churches, and other bay area critics, etc. Price not determined; estimated at 3 cents to 5 cents each, plus postage (offset; 8½- by 11-inch three-fold booklet).

(b) National Council of Churches of Christ's February 23, 1961, resolution and "Some Facts and Some Comments" regarding "Operation Abolition" (37 pp.), available through NCCUSA, 475 Riverside Drive, New York City.

(c) "Curb the HUAC's Appropriations," the carefully documented, hard-hitting attack upon the HUAC's lack of legislative purpose or product, presented by Congressmen JAMES ROOSEVELT and WILLIAM FITTS RYAN before the House Administration Committee on February 21, 1961. Price not determined; estimated at $3 to $4 per 1,000, plus freight.

(d) "The Truth About the San Francisco Riots," a series of eight articles in the San Francisco News Call-Bulletin, available without charge by writing to the paper, San Francisco, Calif.

(e) "Collection of Cartoons in Opposition to the HUAC," proposed offset collection, similar to those presented in the "Collection of Editorials and Resolutions in Opposition to the HUAC" (see above). Price not determined; estimated 10 cents to 20 cents each, plus postage.

(f) "Facts Regarding the HUAC," proposed short history of the HUAC; a summary of the legal arguments supporting the unconstitutionality of the HUAC (Supreme Court decisions and dissents); and other critical facts regarding the mandate and practices of the HUAC. This type of literature has been requested by many student groups and others; a draft is being prepared for possible publication by the students and lawyers committees of the New York Council To Abolish the HUAC. Price undetermined.

(g) A new 12-inch LP recording of a summary of all materials now available in opposition to HUAC, presented in recorded form. This material has been tentatively suggested by a committee within the New York Council To Abolish HUAC.

(h) "A Collection of Editorials and Resolutions From Religious Leaders and Organizations in Opposition to the HUAC," proposed literature being considered by the Religious Freedom Committee, Inc., for distribution to churches and synagogue leaders. Price not determined.

Other program recommendations:

Student abolition committees: There are now abolition committees on a score or more college and university campuses. The NCAUAC will continue to provide literature, speakers and every other possible assistance requested by the various student groups. While the spontaneous nature of this student concern in the abolition of the HUAC is undoubtedly its most significant and valuable characteristic, it is important that the various student abolition groups find the means to coordinate their activities, exchange information of their experience, etc.

In this regard, student groups in Washington, D.C., have considered a national student conference on abolition of the HUAC; the New York Youth To Abolish the HUAC Committee is preparing a summary of known information regarding student activity in this field—for national distribution to student groups and editors; the National Student Association has conducted a 6-region, 100 college-university conference-discussion, which included a study of the HUAC; etc. The NCAUAC will continue to include editorials and resolutions from student groups in the "Collection of Editorials and Resolutions in Opposition to the HUAC."

Conventions: At all forthcoming conventions, conferences, seminars, etc., of church, labor and other organizations, special attention should be given by the abolition committees located in the areas where such meetings are scheduled to see that—(a) literature is made available; (b) speakers are made available if requested; and (c) resolutions in opposition to the HUAC are solicited.

The 1962 campaign to curb HUAC appropriations: Long-range plans should be borne in mind by all abolition committees to seek the maximum congressional vote in opposition to the HUAC appropriations for 1962. It is proposed that the NCAUAC should again establish a temporary Washington, D.C., office for this purpose in late December 1961 to February 1962.

National coordination, NCAUAC relations to abolition committees:

Local abolition committees: It is proposed that as many local abolition committees as possible be established throughout the country—undertaking as much as possible of the above program recommendations. These committees may identify and coordinate their efforts as closely as they desire with the NCAUAC, still maintaining their autonomy for as flexible and independent a program as possible.

Regional coordination: To insure maximum efficiency and economy, it is proposed that the national abolition campaign undertake self-coordination by regions, as follows:

Atlantic coast: coordinating organization—New York Council To Abolish the HUAC, No. 442, 150 West 34th Street, New York City 1, PE 6-3228.

Midwest: coordinating organization—Chicago Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights, No. 811, 189 West Madison Street, Chicago 2, Ill., DE 2-7142.

Pacific coast: coordinating organization—Los Angeles Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms, 617 North Larchmont Boulevard, Los Angeles 4, Calif., HO 2-1329.

NCAUAC activities:

The NCAUAC shall assist the national abolition campaign by providing the following:

(a) General coordination, in liaison with regional coordinating organizations, through correspondence, telephone (where essential) and travel. If manpower is available, two to four national coordinating trips should be undertaken. In addition, coordinating assistance should be encouraged from others in connection with their business and vacation travel throughout the year.

(b) Literature preparation: As indicated above, the NCAUAC should be responsible for the preparation or procurement of all literature needs of the national campaign. Local literature preparation to service local campaigns with local information is to be encouraged at all times; the Chicago and San Francisco committees have made outstanding contributions of this kind.

(c) National mailings: It is proposed that the NCAUAC maintain a national mailing list of 5,000 to 10,000, covering key national leaders and organizations—as well as key personnel in the various abolition committees. As circumstances require and material is available, it is proposed that NCAUAC undertake national mailings five or more times during the year to this list.

NCAUAC budget

PROPOSED EXPENSES

Item	Minimum	Maximum
Salaries	None	None
National trips, at $500 each	$1,000	$1,500
5 national mailings of 5,000 each:		
Postage	1,000	1,000
Printing	2,000	2,000
Special mailings (collections of editorials, resolutions, etc.)		2,000
Long-distance phone calls, at $50 per month	600	600
Washington, D.C., office 1962 appropriations:		
Rent, etc. (1 month, plus)	300	300
Travel and food (1 month, plus)	500	500
Stenographic services (part time)		2,000
Stationery, postage, etc., at $50 per month	600	600
Total	6,000	10,500

NCAUAC budget—Continued

PROPOSED SOURCE OF INCOME

Area	Minimum budget		Maximum budget	
	Year	Month	Year	Month
New York	$2,500	$205	$4,000	$330
Chicago	600	50	1,500	125
Washington, D.C.	600	50	1,500	125
Philadelphia	600	50	1,200	100
San Francisco	600	50	1,200	100
Miscellaneous [1]	1,100	90	1,100	90
Los Angeles	(2)		(2)	
Total	6,000		10,500	

[1] Massachusetts, New Jersey, Maryland, Ohio, Indiana, Wisconsin, Missouri, Michigan, etc.

[2] Los Angeles pays salary of field representative.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add this one item. Before a duly constituted committee of the Congress, one of these men, whose name I will place in the RECORD, was appearing as a legitimate witness. At that hearing I attempted to bring to the committee the facts and the background of this man. The chairman of that subcommittee overruled me, saying it was irrelevant in studying the problems of unemployment.

I daresay that the problem of unemployment when presented before a committee of this Congress by a man who has used the fifth amendment a number of times is most relevant to that investigation.

OFFICIALS OF NATIONAL ABOLITION CAMPAIGN

According to the August 15, 1960, announcement of its formation, the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee will be administered by a national committee consisting of the following persons:

Chairman: Aubrey Williams, Alabama, president, Southern Conference Educational Fund; editor, Southern Farmer; National Committee, ACLU.

Treasurer: Robert W. Kenny, Esq., California, former attorney general; past president, National Lawyers Guild.

Secretary: Dorothy Marshall, California, chairman, Los Angeles Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms; past president, Catholic Women's Club.

James Imbrie, New Jersey, retired Wall Street banker.

Harvey O'Connor, Rhode Island, chairman, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee; Committee of First Amendment Defendants; author, "For Abolition of the Inquisitorial Committees of Congress," "Behind the Bars for the First Amendment."

Florence Luscomb, Massachusetts, member, Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts.

Dr. Otto Nathan, New York, chairman, Friends of the Committee of First Amendment Defendants; executor and biographer, Albert Einstein Estate.

Rev. William Baird, Illinois, minister, Essex Community Church; chairman pro tempore, Chicago Committee To Defend the Bill of Rights.

Bernard Weller, New York, businessman.

Rev. William Howard Melish, New York, member, Religious Freedom Committee, Inc.

Russ Nixon, Washington, D.C., Washington representative, United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers Union.

Frank Wilkinson, secretary, Los Angeles Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms, is named in the document as the field representative of the NCAUAC. Mr. Wilkinson has made a nationwide tour, undertaken for the express purpose of instigating rallies, petitions, and other agitational and propaganda devices designed to arouse support for the NCAUAC's objective of bringing about the abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Richard Criley of Chicago is the Midwest contact for the NCAUAC.

The following are background data taken from public records, on seven of the key leaders of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee.

The Communist Party, at its 17th national convention held in New York City in December 1959, adopted a resolution to "abolish the witch-hunting House Un-American Activities Committee."

RICHARD L. (DICK) CRILEY

Richard Criley has been identified as a member of the Communist Party by four former Communists in testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities. Lee Lundgren so identified him in sworn testimony before the committee on September 2, 1952; Lou Rosser on December 1, 1953; Anzelm Czarnowski on December 4, 1956; and Carl Nelson on May 5, 1959. In addition, two non-Communists have referred to Criley as a Communist in testimony before the committee. On October 25, 1938, Harper Knowles referred to him as a known Communist. On March 27, 1947, Louis E. Starr, then commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, referred to Criley as at one time head of the Young Communist League of California.

Criley, in testimony before the committee on May 5, 1959, invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he was a member of the Communist Party at this instant.

Criley also invoked the fifth amendment when asked various questions concerning his Communist Party membership in testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on July 6, 1954.

In 1946, Criley was expelled from Local 28 of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, CIO, because of his Communist record.

He was a speaker and member of the presiding committee at the 1938 California Communist Party convention. He also served in the 1930's as executive secretary of the Young Communist League in California. According to confidential information in the files of the committee, Criley was a delegate to the 16th national convention of the U.S. Communist Party held in New York City in February 1957.

Early last year Criley visited Cuba, addressed several unions there and brought greetings from them to the May Day celebration of the Communist Party held in Chicago.

After graduating from the University of California in 1934, Criley was for a time a supervisor of a WPA project. During World War II he was commissioned a second lieutenant, after attending officers' candidate school.

He subsequently served as the civilian affairs officer of several towns in Italy; was attached to the American Military Government in Naples and was a staff officer with the Welfare and Displaced Persons Division of SHAEF.

He was separated from active duty in December 1945 with the rank of captain.

RUSSELL ARTHUR (RUSS) NIXON

Russ Nixon has been identified as a member of the Communist Party by five former Communists who have testified before congressional committees. Three witnesses identified him as such in public testimony before this committee—Victor Decavitch on July 14, 1950; Samuel DiMaria on October 15, 1952, and Dorothy Funn Swan on May 4, 1953. A fourth witness identified Mr. Nixon before this committee in executive session. He was also identified in testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on July 23, 1957, by William A. Wallace, who was a member of the Communist Party from 1949 to 1955.

Mr. Nixon is a member of the executive committee of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. He is also the Washington legislative representative of the Communist-controlled United Electrical Workers Union and Washington editor of the pro-Communist weekly the National Guardian.

On four different occasions Nixon has invoked the fifth amendment when questioned concerning his Communist Party membership by congressional committees—in 1948 before the House Education and Labor Committee; in 1953 and 1956 before the Committee on Un-American Activities, and in 1954 before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. In 1951, he appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee to propound the position of the United Electrical Workers Union on pending legislation. He did not testify under oath on this occasion and, when asked, denied that he was a member of the Communist Party.

Articles by Mr. Nixon have appeared in the official Communist Party newspaper, the Worker, and also in its west coast counterpart, the daily People's World.

Mr. Nixon was employed for several months in 1941 in the Economic Research Division of the WPA. While in the U.S. Army during World War II, he was assigned to the Financial Division, Allied Control Council of the Office of Military Government, and held the positions of Deputy Director and Director, Division of Investigation of Cartels and External Assets, Allied Control Council, Berlin. Subsequently, as a civilian employee of the U.S. Treasury Department, he worked for the same agency and was a member of the Berlin Joint Intelligence Committee and acting U.S. member of the Quadripartite German External Properties Commission established by the Potsdam agreement.

In January 1946, immediately prior to resigning from these positions, Nixon

issued a statement charging that the U.S. State Department was creating a Western bloc against the Soviet Union and that he was going to resign because of the dirty deals that are brewing to help save German investments in foreign countries.

The State Department flatly denied Mr. Nixon's charges. In replying to them, it said in part:

The misleading and unsupportable statement issued by Mr. Nixon, apparently prior to his resignation from an official post, threatens both the relations of the United States with its allies and the effort to obtain control and power of disposition of German external assets. The Department therefore believes it necessary to contravert directly Mr. Nixon's assertions.

The statement issued by Mr. Nixon is full of mischievous inaccuracies and misleading innuendoes.

Mr. Nixon's statement represents a clear disservice to the cause of the Allied nations.

REV. WILLIAM HOWARD MELISH

Rev. William Howard Melish has been identified as a member of the Communist Party by Louis Budenz, former member of the Communist Party's national committee and managing editor of the party's official newspaper, the Daily Worker.

Budenz first identified Melish as a Communist in an interview with the New York World Telegram, published in that newspaper on April 29, 1948. He subsequently identified Melish as a party member while testifying under oath in a libel suit in New York State in 1950 and in sworn testimony before the Subversive Activities Control Board—SACB—during its hearings on the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

Although the courts have held that calling a person a Communist is libelous per se and Melish denied Budenz' accusation in a statement given to the press at the time, he did not sue either Budenz or the New York World Telegram when they made their charges against him in 1948. Melish later denied Budenz' charge under oath while testifying before the SACB in behalf of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, of which he had been chairman during the years 1946–49 and a director since its inception.

SACB Member David J. Coddaire, who heard the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship case, stated in his recommended decision:

The testimony of Budenz showing Melish to be a member of the Communist Party in 1944 is credited. It is concluded that Melish, during this period of his tenure with respondent (the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship), was a member of the Communist Party. The testimony of Melish, due to the above findings and his manner of testifying, is not credited in the area pertaining to his connection with Communist Party activities.

The full SACB, in its report and order of February 7, 1956, which found the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship to be a Communist front and ordered it to register as such with the Department of Justice, stated that after reading all of Melish's lengthy testimony:

The conclusion we reach on Melish is inescapable. In this connection we concur with the examiner's (David J. Coddaire) assessment of Melish's manner of testifying in relation to his reliability and we find that the declination of the examiner to credit Melish's testimony in explaining or denial of connection with party activities was justified.

Articles written by Reverend Melish have appeared in official Communist publications such as the Daily Worker and the Worker, and in the magazines New Masses and Soviet Russia Today.

In addition to affiliation with many Communist fronts, Reverend Melish has served as a trustee of a Communist Party school, marched in the Communist Party May Day parades in 1946 and 1947, and sent greetings to the Communist Party on the occasion of its 40th anniversary celebration in September 1959.

In 1956, Melish was awarded and accepted the $14,000 International Peace Prize—formerly called the Stalin Peace Prize—of the Moscow-controlled World Peace Council.

OTTO NATHAN

The Department of State charged in 1955, when it denied Nathan a passport, that he had been a member of the Communist Party in Germany before coming to the United States in 1933. It also charged him with consistent and prolonged adherence to the Communist Party line on a variety of issues and through shifts and changes of that line during a period of many years and said that he had been closely associated with known Communists and had been in contact with officials of Iron Curtain embassies in the United States.

Testifying before this committee on June 12, 1956, in answer to a subpena, Nathan refused to say if he was then or had ever been a member of the Communist Party. He said that in April 1953 he had given the State Department an affidavit saying that he was not then and never had been a Communist Party member. He refused, however, to say if the affidavit he had filed with the State Department was true or false. He invoked the first, fourth, and ninth amendments, rather than the fifth, in refusing to answer these and other questions. He was convicted of contempt of Congress in 1956 for refusing to answer questions while testifying before the committee. On appeal, his conviction was reversed in 1957, on the basis of the Supreme Court's Watkins decision.

In 1947, Nathan was a member of the board of directors of the then planned Brandeis University. On June 21 of that year, Nathan and another member of the board announced their resignations. On the following day, George Alpert, president of the board of directors, charged that the two had tried to give the university a radical, political orientation and that both had surreptitiously made overtures to a thoroughly unacceptable choice to assume the presidency of the university. Mr. Alpert said:

To establish a Jewish-sponsored university, to place at its head a man utterly alien to American principles of democracy, tarred with the Communist brush, would have condemned the university to impotence from the start.

In 1948, after visiting Poland, Nathan granted an interview to the magazine Poland of Today, which was the official propaganda publication of the Polish Communist Government. This interview, in which Nathan had high praise for the accomplishments of the Communist Polish regime, was published in the December 1948 issue of that magazine.

In the intervening years, Nathan has been associated with numerous Communist-front organizations, and has lectured on various phases of Marxist economics as applied to the United States, in appearances at Communist Party-endorsed institutions, sharing the platform with open Communist Party officials.

Mr. Nathan, the executor and a cotrustee of the estate of the late Albert Einstein, became a naturalized citizen in 1939. In the past, he has been employed by the OPA, the Treasury Department, Library of Congress, and the U.S. Army.

FLORENCE LUSCOMB

Florence Luscomb was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Armando Penha, undercover operative in the party for the FBI from 1950 to 1959, in public testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities on March 21, 1958.

The June 1955 interim report of the Massachusetts Commission on Communism and Subversive Activities made the following statement concerning Florence Luscomb:

This commission has received creditable evidence that Florence Luscomb has been a secret member of the Communist Party, and that her prominence and standing was such that she has attended meetings in New York of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States, the top echelon in that party. Her activities over a great many years have been consistent with the aims and purposes of the Communist Party (p. 133).

In January 1943, Florence Luscomb signed a message to the House of Representatives, opposing renewal of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. This message was sponsored by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, cited as subversive and Communist by the U.S. Attorney General. In 1954, she testified before the Massachusetts Committee on Constitutional Law against senate bill 222, which provided for the continuation of the Massachusetts Commission on Communism and Subversive Activities.

The following excerpt from the testimony of Armando Penha before this committee on March 21, 1958, casts light on the reason why Florence Luscomb was selected to be a member of the ruling body of the National Committee To Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee:

Mr. PENHA. Sir, this committee (Massachusetts Committee for the Bill of Rights) was established for only one purpose, and that was to put all the pressure within its command, of the Communist conspiracy, to do away with the State sedition law, which I believe was passed in 1919 in Massachusetts, the 1951 law which outlawed the party in Massachusetts, the Smith Act, the McCarran Act, and Immigration Acts—numerous acts, everything, in other words, that

was anti-Communist, in order to preserve the legal status of the party.

Mr. ARENS. Would you kindly tell us the names of those persons who controlled the organization, who to your certain knowledge are members of the conspiracy?

Mr. PENHA. Nathaniel Mills, Florence Luscomb, Mary Carlson, Herbert Zimmerman—these are just a few of them (p. 2394).

Florence Luscomb was a member of the national committee and also the Massachusetts chairman of the Communist-controlled Progressive Party. Like Harvey O'Connor, Frank Wilkinson, Russ Nixon, and other key officers of the NCAUAC whose records are contained in this release, she has an extensive record of activity in Communist fronts and causes.

FRANK WILKINSON

Frank Wilkinson was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Anita Schneider, a former undercover agent for the FBI, who testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities on December 7, 1956.

Mr. Wilkinson is the executive secretary of the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms, a cited Communist front with offices at 617 North Larchmont Boulevard, Los Angeles, the address from which the announcement of the formation of the NCAUAC was released. He has also served on the executive committee and national council of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

In 1959, he resumed full-time work with the CCPAF after having taken a year's absence to work with the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee as a roving agitator in its campaign to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Wilkinson was formerly information director of the city housing authority in Los Angeles. He was fired in 1952 after invoking the fifth amendment in a superior court hearing in that city.

He has refused on constitutional principles and on grounds of conscience to answer questions concerning Communist Party membership when testifying before the Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities of the California Legislature in 1952 and before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1956 and 1958. He was convicted of contempt of Congress following his last appearance before this committee and was sentenced to 12 months in prison. His appeal from this conviction has been denied by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Wilkinson played a prominent role in organizing the mob riot which took place during the committee hearings in San Francisco in May of last year. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, in a special report on that riot prepared for and recently released by this committee, made the following statement:

Not to be overlooked in the organized attack that was carried out against the HCUA are organized activities that paralleled those of the (Communist) Party. Much of the literature that was distributed during the campaign, for example, emanated in the name of the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms (CCPAF) and the East Bay Community Forum (EBCF). According to a party official, both of these organizations are under control of the Communist Party.

The San Francisco branch of the CCPAF was organized, in fact, on April 4, 1960, for the specific purpose of opposing the HCUA hearings. This group held an emergency action meeting the first week in May 1960 at which time it solicited funds, urged the preparation of letters to newspaper editors, and advocated abolition of the HCUA.

The Communist Party furnished funds to the CCPAF to defray the expense of mailing literature during the campaign, and, when the whole affair had ended, Mickey Lima (chairman of the Northern California District of the Communist Party) praised the executive secretary of the CCPAF, Frank Wilkinson, for the role he had played in organizing the demonstrations. It is to be noted that Wilkinson, described as the brains and energy behind the CCPAF, was cited for contempt of Congress on August 13, 1958, for his refusal to answer questions before the HCUA on July 30, 1958, concerning Communist Party membership.

HARVEY O'CONNOR

Harvey O'Connor was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Benjamin Gitlow, former general secretary of the Party, in sworn public testimony before the committee on September 11 and October 17, 1939.

Mr. O'Connor is chairman of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, a cited Communist front which, for the past few years, has devoted the major part of its funds, agitation and propaganda to a campaign to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities—see committee report "Operation Abolition."

From the late 1920's to the present time, Mr. O'Connor has been associated as sponsor, speaker, and official with numerous Communist fronts and causes. He has also served as an instructor in a Communist Party school, and articles written by him have appeared in the Communist Party newspaper, the Worker, and the Communist magazine, New Masses. His pamphlet "How Mellon Got Rich," was published by International Publishers, the Communist Party's major publishing firm in the United States.

Mr. O'Connor was indicted for contempt of Congress after refusing to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities during hearing held in Newark, N.J., in 1958. He is now awaiting trial on the charge in Federal court.

In an appearance before the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in 1953, Mr. O'Connor refused, on the grounds of the first amendment, to affirm or deny membership in the Communist conspiracy. He was subsequently tried and convicted of contempt and sentenced to 1 year in jail and a $500 fine. On appeal, his conviction was reversed on the technicality that the phrase "Communist conspiracy" was too vague a term to sustain a contempt conviction.

Mr. O'Connor is the author of "Mellon's Millions," 1933; "Steel Dictator," 1935; "The Guggenheims," 1937; "The Astors," 1941; "History of the Oil Workers International Union, CIO," 1950, and "The Empire of Oil," 1955.

THE FIRST 100 DAYS IN THE ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, a number of articles have appeared in such publications as the New York Times, the Washington, D.C., Post, and the Washington, D.C., Star about the Salute to the Arts luncheon held by the Woman's National Democratic Club on April 27, 1961, at the Mayflower Hotel in downtown Washington, D.C.

The theme was "What I Would Do for the Arts if I Were President for a Day."

Speakers at the luncheon included Philip C. Johnson, architect; Cornelia Otis Skinner, actress; Mischa Elman, violinist; and George Balanchine, director of the New York City Ballet.

Perhaps it is time to review the Democratic accomplishments in the arts during the first 100 days, relating them to the entire picture of the arts as it developed during the preceding 8 Republican years.

There have been no Presidential messages on the arts, such as President Eisenhower sent to the Congress in asking for the passage of legislation to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

There were several statements during the political campaign last fall on the arts by Senator Kennedy about what he would do about the arts, if he were elected.

However, we are still awaiting any definite steps by President Kennedy—and by other top administration officials and their families—aside from those steps, that is, which are widely reported only in the society pages of the newspapers, which would define the proper role of the Federal Government in the encouragement and growth of the fine arts in our country.

Recently, moved by a spirit of good neighborliness, I offered a few suggestions to the members of the Woman's National Democratic Club. This was in connection with the Salute to the Arts luncheon with its theme of what the President could do for the arts in a day if he wanted to.

Miss Betty Beale, a brilliant and discerning commentator, wrote as follows in the Washington, D.C., Star of May 1, 1961:

[From the Evening Star, Monday, May 1, 1961]

CULTURE TALK EVOKES BLAST

(By Betty Beale)

A Republican Congressman and the only member of that august body to hold a degree of doctor of music, has let go a broadside at the Democrats for all this talk about culture.

The Salute to the Arts luncheon given by the Woman's National Democratic Club last Thursday is what finally got Representative CARROLL KEARNS' dander up.

The Pennsylvania legislator has sent a letter to Mrs. Richard Bolling and other members of the luncheon committee to set the record straight. The ladies may still be reeling from the blow.

Noting that many people are beginning to think that the art interest of the Federal Government began with the invitation to Robert Frost and 150 other cultural leaders to

attend the 1961 inaugural, Mr. KEARNS fires his first shot. There came into being, he observes, under Eisenhower the National Cultural Center Act, and the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Act under which our great orchestras, artists, drama, and dance groups are sent overseas to demonstrate U.S. accomplishments in the fine arts.

Then he blasts his second shot. President Eisenhower, he said, called for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts and although the Democrats have been in control of the Congress since 1955, nothing has happened.

"Six years is an awfully long time to wait for the establishment of such a new Federal advisory agency. The contemplated budget is only $50,000. When our gross national product is over $500 billion, it can be seen that such a step would scarcely unbalance the national budget. So one may well ask what is the reason for the present timidity on the Democratic side in holding up the early creation of such an arts council?"

He next takes aim at the Kennedy administration, pointing out that President Kennedy himself (about a year ago when he was a Senator) introduced legislation to save the Dolly Madison House, the Benjamin Tayloe House, and the Belasco Theater on Lafayette Square, and recalling that the General Federation of Women's Clubs and other organizations support their preservation, he lets go at two Kennedy men.

"Two men, William Walton, a painter, and John Moore, Administrator of the General Services, like pharaohs or reigning monarchs of an earlier and unenlightened period—have decided to proceed with the destruction of the Lafayette Square buildings. At this very moment, however, the President has called for spending some $10 million in saving the ancient treasures of the Nile. Recently the President rescued Harvard University from an office building.

"If the Nile treasures and Harvard Yard can be saved, why can't the Lafayette Square buildings be saved—" asks the Congressman.

Neither Pharaoh Walton nor Pharaoh Moore could be reached for an answer to this question.

Numerous other points were brought up by Mr. KEARNS in his letter to Mrs. Bolling. In fact, so many it will be days before he gets an answer. The Republican's epistle was 7 pages of single-spaced typewriting. A good rupture over culture may be just what we need to put hearts into the arts.

I include the New York Times account of the saving of Harvard Yard at this point in my remarks.

HARVARD, AGAIN

Another item the White House has said nothing about is how, in the midst of questions of national and international import, the President took up a cause with Harvard.

It was proposed that Cambridge, Mass., sell a piece of the Common as the site for a 15-story office building. The land is near Harvard Yard.

The President thought he had better stay out of the fight. But when the legislature's Democratic majorities pushed through a bill authorizing the sale, he quietly let his views be known in the right places.

P. Kenneth O'Donnell, class of 1949, and special assistant to the President, phoned leading State Democrats urging them not to make the project a party issue.

McGeorge Bundy, Yale 1940, and a Republican, former dean of the Harvard faculty, and now special Presidential assistant for national security affairs, passed the word to some Republicans.

Also active was Mr. Kennedy's one-time Senate colleague from the Bay State, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, a Republican.

Last week, Republican Gov. John A. Volpe vetoed the bill. The State senate, with some Democratic support, upheld the veto.

Nationwide support is growing for legislation to preserve the historic buildings on Lafayette Square in the Nation's Capital. This legislation was introduced only last year as S. 3280 when he was a Senator by President Kennedy. Other good Democrats cosponsoring the legislation at that time were: Senators Humphrey, Morse, Douglas, Murray, Hennings, Mansfield, and Gruening. Very little has been heard from these distinguished legislators this year, however.

However, this year the President's good friend, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Senator WAYNE MORSE, and I have introduced legislation which would carry out the purposes of S. 3280.

Three great organizations of American women are carrying on national campaigns to save the historic buildings on Lafayette Square. They are: the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the National Federation of Music Clubs.

The Daughters of the American Revolution adopted unanimously with applause a resolution presented by Miss Gertrude S. Carraway, honorary president general, on April 20, 1961, deploring the fact that "one-fourth of the historically significant buildings in this country have been destroyed during the last 20 years" and calling for the preservation of the Lafayette Square buildings.

It is a brash generation, indeed, which will destroy all physical evidences of its great heritage.

Two men, William Walton, a painter, and John L. Moore, Administrator of the General Services Administration—neither one of them an elected official and, indeed, only one of them a public official accountable to the people of the United States—like pharaohs or reigning monarchs of an earlier and unenlightened period, having walked around Lafayette Square, decided to proceed with the destruction of the Lafayette Square buildings.

I was always taught that this was a representative government, and that Federal officials were elected or appointed to carry out the will of the people. Otherwise, why have elections? Perhaps this is just an antique Republican notion, but it is one which I have held for many, many years. Elections could be won on this matter, since 80 million people visit our historic sites and buildings each year.

The situation regarding the historic buildings on Lafayette Square is unique, I think.

No public hearings were held by either the Public Works Committees of the Senate or the House on the question of whether the historic buildings on Lafayette Square should be saved.

So, here is the sequence.

First, no public hearings by the Senate or House. Second, the decision is taken, without such public hearings, to destroy the historic Lafayette Square buildings. Third, neither the Senate nor the House is permitted to vote on the issue of the destruction of the Lafayette Square buildings. Fourth, the Administrator of General Services, John L. Moore, and the painter, William Walton, walk around the square and, communing together, decide finally to ignore the people of the United States and to destroy the historic Lafayette Square buildings: the Dolly Madison house, the Benjamin Tayloe house, and the Belasco Theater.

A German language publication, the Washington (D.C.) Journal, reported, on May 5, this year, that steps were under consideration to restore the Belasco Theater as the Beethoven Operahouse, as a bond of friendship between the American and German people. The cost would be borne by the German Government, it is said.

Some months ago a bipartisan drive saved New York City's Carnegie Hall—certainly no greater a cultural facility than the Belasco Theater—from destruction. The Carnegie Hall drive was headed by Mayor Robert Wagner, Governor Nelson Rockefeller, Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Isaac Stern.

The New York Times reported on April 8, 1961, that President Kennedy proposed on April 7 that a $10 million U.S. contribution be made to preserve ancient Nubian temples and other monuments on the upper Nile.

The New York Times declared:

He asked Congress to authorize U.S. participation in an international effort to save antiquities marked for inundation by the Soviet-financed Aswan Dam, which is being built in the United Arab Republic.

The President suggested that the United States finance alone the estimated $6 million cost of preserving the "Pearl of Egypt," a group of temples on the Island of Philae, between the old and new Aswan Dams. They now are submerged part of the year.

Mr. Kennedy also proposed that the United States take part in preserving lesser temples both in the United Arab Republic and in the Sudan, at a cost of $2,500,000, and that it contribute $1,500,000 to speed extensive archeological and prehistory research in areas now unexplored but threatened with flooding.

If the Nile treasures and Harvard Yard can be saved by the intervention of President Kennedy then, surely, the historic buildings on Lafayette Square—which are so intimately associated with our own national history—can be saved.

I include at this point, the New York Times article on the Nile treasures to which I have referred:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 8]

KENNEDY ASKS FUND TO SAVE NILE RELICS

(By W. H. Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, April 7.—President Kennedy proposed today a $10 million U.S. contribution to preserve ancient Nubian temples and other monuments on the upper Nile.

Mr. Kennedy disclosed that the United Arab Republic and the Sudan, in whose territories the antiquities lie, had offered to cede to assisting countries part of the finds made as a result of new excavations to be included in the program.

He asked Congress to authorize U.S. participation in an international effort to save antiquities marked for inundation by the Soviet-financed Aswan Dam, which is being built in the United Arab Republic.

The President suggested that the United States finance alone the estimated $6 million cost of preserving the "Pearl of Egypt," a group of temples on the Island of Philae, between the old and new Aswan Dams. They now are submerged part of the year.

Mr. Kennedy also proposed that the United States take part in preserving lesser temples both in the United Arab Republic and in the Sudan, at a cost of $2,500,000, and that it contribute $1,500,000 to speed extensive archeological and prehistory research in areas now unexplored but threatened with flooding.

However, Mr. Kennedy deferred any U.S. participation in a major project, estimated to cost $60 million to $80 million, to save Abu Simbel, the most majestic of the threatened Egyptian antiquities. He said the engineering problems concerning preservation of the temples, which are hewn out of solid rock, entailed "serious difficulties," and required further studies.

All the expenditures proposed by Mr. Kennedy already are available in Egyptian pounds accumulated as a result of U.S. mutual aid expenditures. He said all the needs could be met from funds already determined to be in excess of prospective U.S. requirements.

In parallel letters to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, Mr. Kennedy said the United States should join with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to prevent "what would otherwise be an irreparable loss to science and the cultural history of mankind."

He noted that the Governments of the United Arab Republic and the Sudan had offered to "cede, with certain exceptions, at least half of the finds of the parties carrying out excavations in Nubia." He said he would name a commission of leading Egyptologists and Government officials "to make plans for the acquisition and distribution of the antiquities ceded to the United States as a result of our contribution."

"In making these funds available," the President continued, "the United States will be participating in an international effort which has captured the imagination and sympathy of people throughout the world. By thus contributing to the preservation of past civilizations, we will strengthen and enrich our own."

He suggested that the first U.S. contribution should match the cost of preserving the Greco-Roman temples of Philae, sacred island of Isis, Egyptian goddess of motherhood and fertility. They are considered the second most important group of monuments on the upper Nile.

The project on which Mr. Kennedy held up a recommendation involves tremendous engineering problems. The great temples of Abu Simbel is flanked by four 67-foot-high figures of Rameses II carved during the 13th century B.C., as well as other statuary.

The President told Congress that two major plans had been advanced for saving these monuments. One, he said, recommends building a cofferdam around them and the other proposes to sever the temples from the cliff of which they are a part and lift them 200 feet to the future level of the Nile.

"Each of these plans entails serious difficulties," he observed, "and further studies are being made. Therefore, I feel it would be premature to recommend, at the present time, that any U.S. funds be provided for this purpose."

The following statement was read Thursday morning, April 20, 1961, by Miss Gertrude S. Carraway, of New Bern, N.C., honorary president general, during the 70th Annual Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in Constitution Hall, Washington, D.C. Miss Carraway offered the motion, seconded by Mrs. F. Clagett Hoke, of Jeffersontown, Ky., and it was passed unanimously, with applause, by the large assemblage of members, NSDAR:

Too late for consideration by the resolutions committee, a matter of historical importance to all patriotic Americans has been called to our attention by Congressmen belonging to both political parties.

One-fourth of the historically significant buildings in this country have been destroyed during the last 20 years.

By decision of two officials, without public hearings, I am informed, the houses of history fronting on Lafayette Square here, a veritable forecourt for the White House, are slated, unnecessarily and unwisely, for immediate removal to make way for a Federal building.

Both Democratic and Republican Congressmen are gravely concerned and have earnestly requested the aid and interest of Daughters of the American Revolution, not only to help save the Dolly Madison House, the Benjamin Tayloe House, and other historical and cultural structures in the Nation's Capital but also to assist with the passage of congressional legislation to provide for the publication of a compilation of historic sites throughout the country and for the preservation of antiquities of national significance in all parts of the United States.

From its beginning one of the main objectives of our National Society, as set forth in our bylaws, has been the protection of historical spots. Our members have long realized that from living history we are much more apt to want to prove worthy of our rich heritage by working for better citizenship in the present and a greater Nation in the future.

Due largely to our DAR examples and teachings, citizens in general are at long last becoming increasingly interested in American history and the value of holding relics of past importance in trust for the generations to come.

Bills along these lines have been recently introduced and sponsored by Congressmen of both parties. In my judgment, they merit and deserve the careful study and active support of our members in their endeavors to stop the wanton destruction of historical, cultural and architectural gems.

Accordingly, I move that Daughters of the American Revolution be urged to write to the President of the United States and to Congressmen registering support and interest in efforts to preserve historic sites and other symbols of our American heritage.

In February 1961 I introduced a bill to establish a Commission on the Cultural Resources in the Nation's Capital, and to provide a comprehensive plan for the effective utilization of such resources in carrying out a long-range program to make the Nation's Capital equal in cultural matters to the capital cities of other great nations.

Similar measures were introduced by Senators JOHN SHERMAN COOPER and WAYNE MORSE, and by our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. So here is a bipartisan measure which deserves Presidential support. Perhaps this is forthcoming, because, in a speech to fund-drive workers of the National Symphony Orchestra, the new Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Philip H. Coombs, called for a great overall plan to give the significant overarching cultural climate needed to make it possible for the Nation's Capital to take its rightful place beside other capital cities of the world with regard to the fine arts.

A study by the Library of Congress which the distinguished gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL], and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last year showed that the municipal government of Washington, D.C., spends annually only the piddling sum of $16,000 on the fine arts. This can be compared to the $800,000 which San Francisco, a smaller city, spends on the arts. It was facts such as these, doubtless, which led the New York Times, Time magazine, the Reporter magazine, the Christian Science Monitor, and other publications to deplore the lack of cultural progress of the Nation's Capital.

The Nation's Capital has been described in such unflattering terms as "hick town" and "cultural backwater" by these national publications. W. H. Kiplinger, publisher of the Kiplinger newsletters, a native Washingtonian, has declared that Washington, D.C., has no homegrown culture, such as London, Vienna, and other European capital cities have, and that such culture as it does have is brought in and pasted on.

The Congress controls the purse strings of the Nation's Capital, and allocates local taxes raised locally—a function of city governments alone elsewhere in the United States.

So, a word from the President to the Democratically controlled Congress could quickly raise the $16,000 to a respectable sum.

Let us hope that he will soon move on this matter.

In 1942 the Congress established the District of Columbia Recreation Department and gave it extensive authority in the fine arts. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed this act into law.

Some discerning students of government have compared this law, in its possible significance, to the British Arts Council.

The Congress allocates the $16,000 for local art programs to the District of Columbia Recreation Department. Now, I admit that $16,000 is better than nothing, but when we have spent more than $85 billion abroad in recent years—and this has helped other nations restore opera houses, and carry on cultural programs of important and significant extent—then it does seem to many cultural leaders that Congress ought to do something which would permit the residents of our Nation's Capital to spend 1 mill out of each tax dollar of their own local revenue for cultural activities. This would provide a tidy sum of $180,000 a year for art and make it possible for the Nation's Capital to shed the "hick town" status immediately.

Bills have been introduced by a number of Democrats, including Senators HUMPHREY, and MORSE, and the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL] which would allocate to art 1 mill out of each tax dollar raised locally. So far they have failed to get the nod of the President.

I forgot to mention that in his bill, H.R. 4348, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] called for the effective development of the human and other cultural resources in the District

of Columbia without regard to race or color, a necessary step in view of the undemocratic hiring and employment policies persisted in by such cultural organizations as the National Symphony Orchestra despite the contribution of the American Negro to our Nation's culture.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] declared on March 20, 1961:

A thorough search would surely find Negro musicians capable of playing in the National Symphony Orchestra.

He went on to say, in a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date that:

If it is simply a matter of not being able to find a competent Negro musician, and not a matter of bias reinforced by hiring only through a Jim Crow local of the American Federation of Musicians, then there is a simple solution. That solution is to make a more thorough search.

Because I am confident that competent Negro musicians can be found who will add luster to the National Symphony Orchestra I hereby offer my own services in an effort to find a Negro instrumentalist for the orchestra.

The National Symphony Orchestra should represent to all the world our high standards and aspirations as a nation and as a people, and our part in and contribution to Western civilization.

The National Symphony Orchestra has represented this Nation on its tours abroad under the sponsorship of the Department of State and as part of the President's program for cultural exchange which is financed by taxes which are paid on a nonsegregated basis.

That the National Symphony Orchestra does not have a single Negro instrumentalist in its ranks despite the vast contribution of the American Negro to our Nation's musical culture, a contribution which is universally acknowledged by people of all nations, is a matter to be deplored.

Top Government officials have shown deep concern in the case of the nonreferral of Negroes to employers and contractors working on Federal buildings or holding Federal contracts.

Surely, the fact that there has never, in the entire time that the National Symphony Orchestra has been in existence, been even one Negro employed by this musical organization should also be a matter of public concern.

The National Symphony Orchestra has been included in the budget for the first time, and Members of Congress will soon be asked to appropriate funds to it. These funds are small in amount, and far from what a city the size of Washington should be contributing to its orchestra if we are to judge by what other American cities contribute.

But, in any event, the National Symphony Orchestra and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia should come to the Congress with clean hands and, especially, in view of the worldwide interest in what we as a people do about solving our own problems of bias and prejudice, they should make an honest attempt to end the longstanding bias of the National Symphony Orchestra against Negro musicians.

Now I read in the New York Times:

RACIAL CURBS BANNED—KENNEDY CAUTIONS AGENCIES ON RECREATIONAL GROUPS

WASHINGTON, April 20.—President Kennedy ordered Federal agencies Thursday to take immediate and specific action to bar the use of their names or facilities to any employee recreational groups that practice racial discrimination.

"Current practices in each department are to be brought into immediate compliance with this policy, and a report by the head of each executive agency filed to that effect before May 1, 1961," the President said in a memorandum to the heads of all departments and agencies.

Pierre Salinger, White House Press Secretary, said he did not consider the memorandum to be based on anything specific when asked if the President was hitting at any particular group or agency.

Mr. Kennedy said his order was in line with his March 6 Executive order affirming that "discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin is contrary to the constitutional principles and policies of the United States."

The newspapers report that the National Symphony Orchestra, about which the Democrats are hurling these segregation charges, is using the new State Department auditorium for its concerts.

Will the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, actually bar the National Symphony Orchestra from use of the fine new auditorium in the State Department, which the President uses for press conferences?

Or does the President's order with regard to segregation apply only to Federal employee organizations?

Of course, it may be argued that the Democratic charges that the National Symphony Orchestra is biased in its hiring practices have nothing to do with art.

This is true, for the charges are only more politics.

One is inclined to suspect that politics are involved because, or so it is said, all other major American symphony orchestras have exactly the same hiring policies that the National Symphony Orchestra does.

In any event, to sum up, it is clear that the Democrats have done little for the arts during the first 100 days of the new administration to carry out their campaign promises of last fall.

The destruction of the Lafayette Square buildings will give our country a definite and major setback in world opinion.

The lack of response to the people by the Democrats in this regard is monumental, and is more typical of a monarchial form of government than of a democracy or a Republican form of government such as ours is.

The Democrats are going to have to do much better than they have done so far to match the splendid record of President Dwight Eisenhower in the arts.

Among the cultural steps taken during the Eisenhower administration were: enactment of the Humphrey-Thompson Act—Public Law 860, 84th Congress—under which our great orchestras, artists, and talented groups from our colleges and universities are sent overseas to demonstrate the cultural accomplishments of the people of our country and to counteract Russian propaganda that we are a nation of materialists.

Other steps taken under President Eisenhower included the adoption of the Thompson-Fulbright National Cultural Center Act; and the Thompson-Humphrey-Anderson Act transferring the historic Patent Office Building to the Smithsonian Institution as a permanent home for the National Collection of Fine Arts which the Congress established in 1840.

The Patent Office Building, designed by the great architect, Robert Mills, who designed the Washington Monument and the Treasury Department Building, will also house a National Portrait Gallery.

These are far-reaching and important steps of which the Republican Members of the Congress and President Eisenhower can be proud.

LIVESTOCK, MEATPACKING, AND MONOPOLY

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the 84th, 85th, 86th, and the present 87th Congress, I have been honored to serve as chairman of Subcommittee No. 5, a subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee. During the 86th Congress, our Subcommittee No. 5 investigated, studied and reported on small business problems in food distribution. On December 27, 1960, we submitted and the Select Committee on Small Business approved and forwarded to the House, Report No. 2234, entitled, "Small Business Problems in Food Distribution." In that report, the committee concluded that the tendencies to the concentration of economic power, to collusive price action, and to unfair competitive methods which have been uncovered through this and other investigations of the food industry are shown to have arisen in part from first, acquisitions and mergers by large corporate chain food retail firms of competing retailers and of facilities engaged in food manufacturing and processing; second, vertical integration by corporate chain food retail firms of the functions of food retailing with wholesaling, transportation, manufacturing, processing, and in some instances, with the production of food products, such as, for example, the feeding of livestock; and third, utilization of concentrated economic power by large chain food retailers in the buying and marketing of private label food items to the exclusion of competing brands from the marketplace, such as, for example, the exclusion from appropriate shelf space in the stores of the chain retailers.

Therefore, we recommend that Congress enact new legislation to strengthen our public policy against monopolies and monopolistic practices. In that connection, we recommend legislation to strengthen the Packers and Stockyards Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act to prohibit integration of food retailing with meatpacking and other functions of food manufacturing and processing where the effect of such integration of functions would be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create monopoly.

In following through on that recommendation, February 2, 1961, I introduced H.R. 3798 to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 to strengthen independent competition by providing for competitive enterprise in the retail sales of meat, meat food products, livestock products, and other food items. Briefly stated, that bill would make it unlawful for any meatpacker or food retailer whose gross sales were more than $30 million during the preceding calendar year to engage in both the business of meatpacking and food retailing.

It should be recalled that the Department of Justice brought an antitrust case against the big packers charging them with monopoly power and the abuse of that power. At that time, they were engaged in meatpacking and in the wholesale and retail distribution of meat and meat food products. That case against the five largest packers was concluded in 1920 with a consent decree which required those large packers to discontinue their operations involving retail distribution.

In 1956, Swift & Co., Armour & Co., and the Cudahy Packing Co. filed a petition in the U.S. district court that the 1920 consent decree be modified so as to permit them to reengage in the retail distribution of meat and meat food products. They argued that any economic power that they retain in meatpacking can no longer be carried over into other branches of the food industry in view of the enormous changes which have occurred in retail food distribution. In that connection, they pointed out that large corporate chain food retailers have engaged in the business of meatpacking. Earlier in 1939, the U.S. district court denied a similar request that these large meatpackers reenter the business of retailing meats and groceries. The denial of the petition on that occasion was on the ground that reentry into the field of retail food distribution would imperil the independent retailers and that the very existence of the economic power that they would hold and exercise, held inherent dangers of abuse.

On December 12, 1960, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois—eastern division—denied the petition of the big packers for a modification of the 1920 consent decree. In doing so, the court stated:

> If the defendants were to engage in the business of operating general retail food stores, they would enjoy a substantial advantage over their rivals as a result of their control of nearly half of the Nation's meats and meat products. Vertical integration through acquisition of existing retail stores or chains would tend to restrain competition by providing the defendants with captive outlets for both their meats and groceries, to the exclusion of competitive products.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Retail outlets are increasingly integrated with wholesalers, and centralized buying of meats has increased, with corporate chains purchasing practically all of their meats under group buying arrangements. Approximately 106 of the 704 voluntary and cooperative chains have group meat buying programs. If the defendants were permitted to sell groceries and fresh milk and cream at wholesale along with their meats, the competitive advantages of offering a full line of products and the economies resulting from large volume and combined managerial and sales staffs would afford the defendants a competitive advantage similar to that which has largely eliminated the butcher shop, the greengrocer, and the bakery shop from the retail trade.

For the same reasons, I have publicly stated that the 1920 consent decree should not be upset, revised, modified or made ineffective. Also, I have said that since the basic and fundamental principles upon which the 1920 consent decree were based appear to be sound, then we should not permit corporate chain food retailers to engage in meatpacking and retail food distribution and then put the meatpackers to a competitive disadvantage.

The objective of H.R. 3798 is to help promote fairness and simple justice by keeping others from doing today what the 1920 consent decree prohibits the large meatpackers from doing.

Large segments of the business community have expressed strong support for this proposed legislation. This support has come from the Western States Meat Packers' Association, a trade association of small and independent meatpackers who are located in the 11 Western States, and the National Independent Meat Packers' Association, a trade association of thousands of small and independent meatpackers located throughout the United States. In addition, food distributors at both the wholesale and retail levels have expressed their thought that legislation along these lines must be enacted if we are to save our free and competitive enterprise system in food distribution.

Not only is the competitive enterprise system in food distribution threatened by monopolistic practices and conditions through the integration of meatpacking and retail distribution of meat and meat food products, but, also, these integration practices and conditions are giving rise to unmistakable tendencies toward monopoly conditions in the marketing of livestock. For that reason, representatives of important livestock marketing agencies have expressed alarm over these tendencies to monopoly conditions. Also, they are expressing widespread and vigorous support for enactment of H.R. 3798.

On April 21, 1961, Mr. David L. Chambers, Jr., president of the Independent Stockyards Co., Indianapolis, Ind., wrote to the chairman of the House Small Business Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], in the following language:

> May I compliment you, your committee, and its Subcommittee No. 5, for helping to bring into sharp focus the chaotic and discriminatory conditions now prevailing in the livestock marketing industry?

On the same date, Mr. Chambers wrote me and enclosed excerpts from the 1960 annual reports of the Indianapolis Stockyards Co., Inc. In that annual report of the Indianapolis Stockyards Co., it was pointed out that the purpose for which Congress passed the Packers and Stockyards Act in 1921 has not been realized, and urged that consideration be given to a strengthening of the Packers and Stockyards Act and its administration. These expressions are similar to those made by representatives of the Denver Stockyards Co. and representatives of the River Markets Group, who represent stockyards and livestock marketing facilities in practically all of the principal meatpacking centers.

In view of the fact that some of the largest corporate chain food retail organizations have integrated their operations to include not only meatpacking, but, also, extensive feed lot operations, members of the House Small Business Committee are viewing growing tendencies as a matter which deserves the most serious consideration of the Congress.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks I wish to include here excerpts from the annual report of the Indianapolis Stockyards Co. entitled "Government Regulations and Competition in the Livestock Marketing Industry," and the letter from the president of the Indianapolis Stockyards Co. under date of April 21, 1961. The documents are as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS STOCKYARDS CO., INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., April 21, 1961.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: As chairman of Subcommittee No. 5 of the Select Committee on Small Business, I thought you might be interested in the attached excerpts from the 1960 annual report of this company which quotes extensively from the report of Subcommittee No. 5 (H. Rept. No. 2234, "Small Business Problems in Food Distribution").

Congress intended that the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1920 (broadened in scope by the 1958 amendments) should protect the public, particularly the grower and feeder of livestock. The act was also intended to curb unfair competitive practices among those who engage in livestock marketing. If these two purposes of the act are to be achieved, the Department of Agriculture through its Packers and Stockyards Division would have to set about far more aggressively and conscientiously than in the past to administer and enforce the act fairly, uniformly, and without discrimination as between those engaged in the production and marketing of livestock.

May I compliment you as chairman of Subcommittee No. 5 and your fellow committee members for helping to bring into sharp focus the chaotic and discriminatory conditions now prevailing in the livestock marketing industry?

Sincerely yours,

DAVID L. CHAMBERS, JR.

[Excerpt from the 1960 annual report of Indianapolis Stockyards Co., Inc.]

GOVERNMENT REGULATION AND COMPETITION IN THE LIVESTOCK MARKETING INDUSTRY

The last two annual reports have discussed at considerable length the subject of Government regulation and its significance to the Indianapolis market. They explained how the monopoly power of the big packers in controlling the livestock and meat trade from the producer to the consumer had prompted Congress back in 1921 to pass the Packers and Stockyards Act; how an intended purpose of the act was to protect livestock shippers from certain unfair trade practices at the public stockyards; how a loophole in the act itself and the failure of the various Secretaries of Agriculture down through the years to give the act impartial, uniform, and vigorous enforcement have served as fertile soil for the widespread growth of unregulated small stockyards, auction markets, sale

barns, concentration points, and buying stations; how this condition of competitive disadvantage and discrimination has been aggravated by close regulation of the major stockyards as national public utilities without benefit of protective franchise such as enjoyed by other utilities.

These reports further explained how, in 1921, 90 percent of all livestock was sold at the public stockyards; how by 1958 nearly half of the livestock sales in the United States were being made through unsupervised marketing channels; how in that year Congress amended the Packers and Stockyards Act to bring under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture all livestock markets, market agencies, and dealers in interstate commerce; how during 1959 the Department of Agriculture had made considerable progress in the initial step toward effective regulation—that of posting hundreds of markets and registering thousands of market agencies and dealers newly covered by the amended act; how amending the act is one thing, aggressive enforcement is another; how the long era of discrimination against the big central markets will come to an end only at such time as the Secretary and the Department of Agriculture set about to fulfill Congress' intent of equal and uniform regulation of all livestock markets in interstate commerce.

Our 1957 and 1959 annual reports elaborated on this matter of the severe competition faced by the major public markets in the United States. They disclosed, for example, that within a radius of 75 miles of Indianapolis there are some 60 livestock markets of one type or another, 12 packers buying direct at their plants, and scores of traders, packer buyers, and commission men from other central markets all scouring the countryside for livestock. These reports explained how packers have two basic ways of buying livestock, in competition and out of competition; how it was traditional for the packers over the years to buy most of their livestock in competition at the major public stockyards; how packer buying gradually became decentralized as packers set up country buying stations; how in the last few years the packers have taken more and more to bypassing the central markets and buying through noncompetitive channels.

In the Far West, for instance, the rapid growth of commercial feedlots with cattle going direct to packers has reached such proportions that in recent months the public markets at San Francisco and Los Angeles were closed. This direct movement has cut sharply into the cattle receipts at Denver, Omaha, Sioux City, and other western markets. Here in the Middle West where there are relatively few commercial feedlot operations, direct buying of cattle and swine by the packers is, nevertheless, extensive. They accomplish this by having buyers ride the countryside purchasing livestock right on the farm, by operating numerous buying stations in rural areas, and by encouraging producers to bring their livestock right to the packing plant. Farmers are urged to sell direct on the idea that they can thereby eliminate marketing charges, shrink, and the cost of hauling, insurance, and feed. The convenience of selling direct has great appeal to farmers. This is particularly true as long as prices made at a large public market in their area can guide them as to the value of their livestock. The question is, what will happen to the farmers' bargaining power and how will they know what their livestock is worth if the competitive public markets are severely weakened or should cease to exist?

If selling direct appeals to farmers, buying direct is even more attractive to the packers: the element of competition is largely, if not entirely, eliminated. The more they buy in the country, the less they support the forces of competition at work on the price-setting public markets. This, of course, tends to depress prices.

Within the last 2 years the House of Representatives Committee on Small Business[1] appointed a subcommittee[2] to study the influence of the Nation's huge retail chains in food distribution and its effect on small business throughout the food industry. This study included an inquiry into the direct buying practices of packers. The subcommittee has just released an extensive report on its findings, conclusions, and recommendations.[3] It considers the whole background of the Packers and Stockyards Act and explains that regulation of packers is provided for in title II of the act.[4] The report then discusses the failure of the Secretary of Agriculture and his Department to enforce title II and states in part:

"The act provides that meatpackers subject to its provisions shall not engage in practices that restrain commerce or create a monopoly. They are prohibited from buying or selling any article for the purpose of or with the effect of manipulating or controlling prices in commerce. They are also prohibited from engaging in any unfair, deceptive, or unjustly discriminatory practice or device in the conduct of their business, or conspiring, combining, agreeing, or arranging with other persons to do any of these acts.

"The lists of cases in which the Secretary of Agriculture has proceeded under the Packers and Stockyards Act since January 1957 * * * shows that in very few cases has the Department of Agriculture proceeded in formal cases under title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act against monopoly, price discrimination, or restriction of competition in the sale of meat to conclusion and with effective results."[5]

"The USDA has proceeded in many cases against false and misleading advertising and similar merchandising practices under title II of the act. Some of those cases have been concluded since 1957, but they are relatively unimportant in their impact on the economy of the meatpacking industry. More important are the unfair livestock buying practices' cases involving restrictions of competition in the buying of livestock. Two important cases have been filed within the past 3 years but those cases have not been concluded.[6]

"Complaints have reached [the] subcommittee to the effect that much of the failure of the Secretary of Agriculture to expeditiously and effectively handle important cases involving monopoly, price discrimination, and the restriction of competition practices in the sale of meat, and unfair practices and restriction of competition in the buying of livestock, stems in large part from a lack of sympathetic understanding and determination to enforce title II provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act against these practices and to keep in the top positions of the packers and stockyards administration officials in sympathy with vigorous and effective enforcement of these provisions under the law.

"As a result of some of these complaints, inquiries were made about organizations and reorganizations which have taken place in the administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act in the USDA. It was learned that the latest of these reorganizations was made effective July 1, 1960. In this and each of a series of changes which has taken place in a shifting of personnel since 1953, personnel with experience, sympathy, and understanding of the Packers and Stockyards Act have been removed from top operating positions and either moved out of supervisory positions or separated from the Department of Agriculture."[7]

After stating in detail the findings of the subcommittee as a result of hearings held in many different parts of the country, the report recites the subcommittee's conclusions, one of which reads as follows:

"10. The national antimonopoly public policy has not been fully realized because under existing laws the enforcement agencies are hindered by—

"(e) Failure of the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to utilize to the fullest extent possible experienced career administrators and advisors who are in sympathy with and have enthusiasm for vigorous and effective enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended;"[8]

In the subcommittee's recommendations which follow its conclusions, the Secretary is urged to correct this condition and Congress is advised to strengthen the Packers and Stockyards Act.[9]

Whether direct buying as now conducted by some packers has the purpose or effect of manipulating or controlling prices is not clear. No one can object to packers wanting to buy their livestock requirements as cheaply as possible, the same as other processors when they buy their raw material. There is increasing concern, however, that some packers may be playing their country buying against their buying at the big public markets, and vice versa, in order to hold down livestock prices, or at the very least, to keep price levels unsettled. There is also apprehension that the establishment of numerous buying stations may give rise to a division of territories by the packers or may otherwise foster monopoly control at the expense of the livestock producers and feeders. What is clear is that thus far the Department of Agriculture has given remarkably little attention to these matters.

The change of administrations in Washington has brought new faces in all the top posts in the Department of Agriculture. It is too soon, of course, to know whether the new Secretary of Agriculture and his Department will set about more diligently and enthusiastically than their predecessors to enforce title II of the Packers and Stockyards Act as vigorously as Congress intended in order, among other things, to uncover and stop any price manipulation, control or monopolistic practices in the buying of livestock. It is also too soon to know whether they will undertake to enforce the act with equal vigor to insure fair, equal, and nondiscriminatory regulation of all markets under their supervision.

Meanwhile, some of the larger packers continue to step up livestock purchasing through noncompetitive channels. Whether this bypassing of the big markets like Indianapolis comes to a halt will have to depend—in the absence of Government action—on how many farmers come to recognize that the buyer stands to gain the upper hand through direct buying and country marketing; that the only effective weapon farmers have for meeting the challenge is by pitting their supply of livestock in large numbers against the packers in open competition at the major markets. During 1960 we redoubled our efforts to get this message across to every farmer within reach. The results of these efforts may not have been

[1] Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Texas, chairman.

[2] Subcommittee No. 5 of the Select Committee on Small Business, Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, California, chairman.

[3] 86th Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 2234, "Small Business Problems in Food Distribution," published Dec. 27, 1960.

[4] Report, p. 113. Regulations of stockyards is provided for in title III of the act.

[5] Report, p. 114.

[6] Report, p. 114.

[7] Report, p. 115.

[8] Report, p. 120.

[9] Report, p. 121.

encouraging in terms of hog receipts at our market, but we continue to feel confident that farmers will see the light and not continue to dissipate their bargaining power.

PRESIDENT CROWDUS BAKER AND HIS COLLEAGUES—ENLIGHTENED BUSINESS LEADERS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest speeches of the year was delivered before the New England Council at Boston last November by that distinguished and illustrious business leader and patriot, President Crowdus Baker of Sears, Roebuck & Co.

When the speech first came to my attention I was deeply impressed with it because it struck me as being a splendid example of business statesmanship at its best. Not only did it contain a comprehensive summary and review of the business activities of his company in New England, but what is rare, in a speech of this type, in his remarks Mr. Baker analyzed and spoke out with the boldness and imagination of enlightened leadership on contemporary economic questions.

The story he recited of the magnificent accomplishments of his great company in New England completely dispelled pessimism because the great progress demonstrated by Mr. Baker in the expansion and increased business volume of his company in this area would dispel and put to rout even the most confirmed pessimist.

In 1959, for example, he states that his company's total sales in the area came to approximately $200 million and that in this picture for every dollar that the company sold it bought a dollar and a half in New England. Apparently the best is not yet in sight, because the selling value of Sears' New England purchases were approximately $300 million and represented the largest volume of goods the company has bought in New England, 13 percent more than the previous high of the year before. Spread among 688 sources located in 229 New England cities and towns, over 10,000 employees conduct the company's business in our area, not to speak of the company's investment holdings of some 6 million of New England municipal bonds of various kinds, and bank balances throughout the New England States amounting at that time to well over $11 million.

Mr. Baker brought out the astonishing fact that total taxes paid by Sears in and for New England over the past 10 years, 1950 to 1959, amounted to $91½ million with $10 million in 1959 alone. This huge sum was broken down into local taxes for real and personal property, State taxes, franchise, unemployment compensation, and gas taxes, and the proportion of Federal taxes assignable to its New England business amounted to nearly $73 million in the above 10 years.

In addition to the foregoing taxes paid by Sears itself, there were other taxes which Sears collected and remitted in New England amounting to $13 million for State taxes of various kinds and $33 million for Federal taxes. In total, in the past 10 years Sears has handled about $138 million of tax money in connection with its New England business and these amounts of tax payments and remittances are most impressive and show on their face the tremendous contributions which this great company is making to our section of the country.

With characteristic and becoming modesty, Mr. Baker pointed out that it was not his purpose to single out Sears as doing more than its share but merely to point out that its share represented some very sizable sums, as he very modestly put it.

I was also pleasantly surprised to learn of the number of scholarship students financed by Sears attending educational institutions in the New England area and of the substantial grants the company has made annually for remedial teaching in both the public and parochial school systems in Boston. The company has not allowed any specious interpretations to restrain it from making grants for these beneficient educational purposes both to public and parochial schools.

One of the choicest excerpts from Mr. Baker's fine speech was his statement that his company has long believed that a corporation must be a good citizen as well as a profitmaker. There is food for thought and a spur to action in that simple statement. Quoting General Wood, who was not only a great military leader, but is one of America's greatest business statesman who brilliantly served as president and chairman of the board of Sears, a great American highly evaluated and applauded throughout the Nation:

> Business must account for its stewardship not only on the balance sheet, but also in matters of social responsibility, the improvement in living standards resulting from business accomplishments in the fields of production and distribution is an important contribution to the well-being of the American people. As business assumes a greater share of responsibility for community needs, the public will respond and do its share toward providing the legislative and economic climate that will permit business to function with maximum efficiency.

Declaring that Sears considers that a vital reason for its success over the years has been the interest of its employees, its enterprise and aims, Baker declared that loyalty and efficiency have been fostered by the fact that the majority of the employees are shareowners and are able to live out the years of their retirement with an unusual degree of financial security.

Thus it would appear that the wise, courageous leadership of this great company has democratized its operations and has successfully promoted an enlightened and beneficent system of profit sharing among its employees as well as notably contributing to building the strength and vitality of our great free enterprise system while rendering conspicuous services to the American people.

The country that can produce great business leaders like Wood, Baker, Kellstadt, Houser, and McConnell, so deeply imbued with social consciousness and so admirably concerned with the welfare of employees and the rank and file of the people, is fortunate, indeed, and the Sears Co. may well be proud of its great, enlightened business leadership and the enduring contributions they are making to the building and advancement of the Nation.

Crowdus Baker has recorded many sterling achievements and received many honors, the most recent from his own famed Austin College, Sherman, Tex., which is conferring upon him its coveted, most distinguished alumnus award, thus honoring one of its most illustrious sons, who reflects greatest credit upon his alma mater, his proud State, his company, and his country.

America needs more men like Crowdus Baker.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY APPOINTS WHITE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified to learn that President Kennedy yesterday named a White House Committee on Small Business. This again demonstrates the President's keen interest in the critical problems facing small business, and his awareness of the important contribution which small business can make toward fostering economic growth. President Kennedy pointed out that small businesses comprise 95 percent of all American business and directed the new committee to generate new ideas, new approaches, to overcome obstacles that may impede small business goals; to devise means for assuring small business a larger share of Government contracts and subcontracts and to enlist the support and ingenuity of small firms in essential research and development work. The President further cited as a goal at least a 5 percent annual growth rate for our economy.

President Kennedy correctly recognizes that to achieve maximum growth we must not overlook small business and small business people.

I know how deeply aware he is of the problems facing small business and the importance of the job the White House Committee is undertaking, because I had the pleasure of discussing the possibility of such a committee with him, on a visit to the White House back in early March.

Small business represents a tremendous reservoir of talents, ideas, and productive capacity. Too many people have become so enamored by big business growth that they have ignored the fact that our greatest potential for accelerating our growth rate is to be found in America's millions of small businesses. They still are the heart and soul of many

of our economic and social institutions. Truly, this is a part of America which must start growing again.

America's small businessmen are fortunate indeed to have someone in the White House who fully appreciates their problems and their potential.

Named to the new White House Committee on Small Business are the following:

John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, chairman; Bernard Boutin, Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration; Jack T. Conway, Deputy Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency; Paul Rand Dixon, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission; Frederick G. Dutton, Special Assistant to the President; Kermit Gordon, Council of Economic Advisers; Lee Loevinger, Assistant Attorney General—Antitrust—Department of Justice; Thomas Morris, Assistant Secretary—Installations and Logistics—Department of Defense; James Reynolds, Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor; Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs, Treasury Department; Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Department of Commerce.

The House Small Business Committee is very pleased with the appointment of this new committee and hopes to hold hearings in the near future to learn more about its specific plans and to see in what ways our committee can be helpful in furthering its work. The White House Committee on Small Business can serve as a powerful force to help small businessmen get equitable treatment in our economy.

POWER AND INFLUENCE OF LARGE FOUNDATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the number of tax-exempt foundations has increased so rapidly since 1939 that it defies comprehension. And as the number has increased, so has the amount of assets and the power and influence of the foundation in our economic life. The growth came mostly with World War II and higher corporate and individual income taxes. For instance, American Foundations Information Service reported on 188 foundations in 1938, but on 5,202 in 1959. In 1937 only two foundations had assets in excess of $100 million—Carnegie and Rockefeller—and now there are 10, and only 4 of the top 10 were in existence in 1937.

We have already cited how the Ford Foundation started in 1936 with $25,000 and now has assets of $3,316 million, including 90 percent ownership of the Ford Motor Co. derived from the estates of Henry and Edsel Ford.

FORD SETS PATTERN

The Ford Foundation set the pattern for foundation founding.

The owner of a business may set aside a limited amount for a foundation so that it is in being at the time of his death. Nonvoting stock is left to the foundation and the family retains the voting stock and control of the business along with a substantial cut in estate taxes. Thus, as was pointed out by the 1953 House Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, the compelling motivations behind the rapid increase in numbers and accumulation of wealth is tax planning rather than "charity."

The possibility exists that a large part of American industry will eventually be in the hands of foundations. This may perpetuate control of individual enterprises not contemplated by existing legislation, in the hands of closed groups, perhaps in turn by families. Another purpose is to build up the wealth of the foundation in perpetuity. This was stated flatly in the trust instrument establishing the Duke Endowment in 1924 with these words:

> The trust established by this indenture is hereby denominated the Duke Endowment, and shall have perpetual existence.

To make certain that the endowment of $40 million would continue to accumulate wealth, Duke provided that the first 20 percent of the endowment's annual income must be added to the fund's assets which now total $414,754,000. The Duke endowment grants go primarily to Duke University, and three other educational institutions, various hospitals and orphanages.

WIDE FREEDOM WITH FUNDS

Because of the tax exemption given them, and because they must be dedicated to public purposes, the foundations are public trusts, administering funds of which the public is the equitable owner. However, under present law there is little implementation of this responsibility to the general welfare. The foundations administer their capital and income with the widest freedom, bordering at times on irresponsibility. Wide freedom is clearly desirable as long as public purpose is faithfully followed, but present laws do not compel performance.

The first large foundations, Carnegie and Rockefeller, were created from personal fortunes. While these fortunes came from industry, the industry did not in itself contribute to the foundations, and the foundations had no connection with industry except as a stockholder. Now, it is the reverse, and industry contributes directly to the foundations, and maintains the powerful control of the purse strings.

Even when the Rockefeller Foundation was proposed for Federal incorporation in 1912, protests were made on the prospective power of such a foundation and as a medium to accumulate and perpetuate wealth.

In "The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation," Raymond B. Fosdick writes:

> In letters which have since been published, it appears that George W. Wickersham, the Attorney General, wrote to President Taft denouncing the proposal. "Never," he declared, "has there been submitted to Congress or to any legislative body, such an indefinite scheme for perpetuating vast wealth as this; and personally I believe it to be entirely inconsistent with the public interest that any such bill should be passed." To this Mr. Taft replied: "I agree with your characterization of the proposed act to incorporate John D. Rockefeller."

Wickersham's fears were partially borne out by the influence wielded over higher education by the Rockefeller and Carnegie Foundations. The Rockefeller General Education Board was chartered in 1903 and terminated in 1953. The Carnegie Fund for the Advancement of Teaching was started in 1905. While it is true that the purpose was to raise standards of education, and was effective to a degree, it gave the foundations a tight grip on administrative and educational policies and procedures of the institutions. Plans for the pensioning of professors and offers of college endowment were conditioned upon conformity to the plans and standards of the granting foundations. With hundreds of millions of dollars being poured into educational coffers, the plans and offers were irresistible. Grants and pensions were not available unless the arbitrary standards set by the foundations were accepted. Thus the foundations grew to be the comptrollers of higher education in the United States, its directors and molders.

It is not enough to say that the influential donors were men of good will. Power that could be used for benign purposes could just as well be used against the public interest and general welfare. It is this unbridled power which is dangerous. It is power uncontrolled by public responsibility. The foundations adopted coercive tactics to reform entrance requirements, financial practices and scholastic standards. As an example of coercion, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education held that no college could participate in its pension fund if it remained under the control of a religious group. Moreover, those colleges which were considered "weak" or "superfluous" by foundation executives were permitted to die a hoped-for natural death.

Several executives of large foundations told the House Special Committee in 1953 that some regulation of smaller foundations might be desirable because they were so frequently set up for tax or other personal advantages. The same executives expressed the opinion that further regulation of the large foundations was undesirable. This conclusion appears to be based on an erroneous premise. The great foundations are also set up for tax or other personal advantages. Moreover, there is a distinct danger in mere size. In the so-called Walsh investigation in 1917, both Samuel Untermeyer and Louis D. Brandeis concluded that the foundation as a perpetuity was inconsistent with democratic conceptions. Granting that foundations have been in the hands of responsible men, they expressed the fear that foundations might become great powers for evil in the hands of persons whom we cannot foresee. They might even, it was feared, grow stronger than the Government.

SECOND ONLY TO GOVERNMENT

The fact is that the foundations have become a force in our society second only to that of Government itself. Foundations now administer $11.5 billion—$5 billion more than they controlled at the time of the 1953 investigation, and they are continuing to grow with relentless rapidity. A very small number of the foundations administer almost 60 percent of the total.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

It may be of interest to Congress to look into the political activities of certain foundations. Most of the foundations impinging on the political area get their tax exemption as "educational" institutions. Courts have so construed the definition of the word "education" that much of what actually is propaganda comes under that term. The tax law itself in referring to "propaganda" tends to mean "to influence legislation." The 1953 investigation by a House special committee held it as "axiomatic that whatever the defects in the tax law as it stands, foundation funds, constituting public money, should not be used for political purposes or with political bias or slant."

One of the more obvious cases of political activities reported by that committee in 1954 involved the League for Industrial Democracy. An attorney for a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee held that the league was an adjunct of Socialist Party and therefore was not entitled to tax exemption. As a matter of fact, when the league was founded back in 1905, it was called the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. Another specific instance of political use was found at that time in the American Labor Education Service. The background of its officers and staff members suggests an interlock with individuals and groups associated with militant socialism and in some instances with Communist fronts.

Then there are other organizations such as the 20th Century Fund, and the Fund for the Republic, both of extremely dubious character.

There also was the old Institute of Pacific Relations, which a Senate subcommittee found to have served pro-Communist and pro-Soviet interests, and was supported by both the Carnegie Corp. and the Rockefeller Foundation.

FOUNDATION BUREAUCRATS

Let us consider the power and influence not only of the foundations, but of their professional staff, directors and managers. They, more than the trustees themselves, influence and direct the flow of funds into the channels they desire. Most foundation trustees are much too occupied with other affairs to be able to devote much time to foundation activities. This means that the professional staff members are in a position to influence in a measure the academic course of an educational institution by providing funds for specified purposes rather than making a grant without strings attached. They also are in a position to wield an influence in international affairs again by specifying what grants will go to what countries and the purposes for which the funds are to be used. These professional staff people have been described as "the foundation bureaucrats."

The Internal Revenue Code states that tax-exempt religious, educational, charitable, and scientific foundations need not file reports with the Internal Revenue Service. They need not account for their assets, their expenditures, or the grants they make. Would it not be advisable for Congress to give this further extensive consideration? I have learned that the Statistics Branch of the Internal Revenue Service is seriously considering an investigation of the status and activities of tax-exempt foundations and the desirability of requiring at least annual financial statements. This probably would require the hiring of additional personnel by the Service. It is my thought that the House of Representatives could assist the Internal Revenue Service in making this investigation and help them and cooperate with them in reaching a conclusion on what controls or restrictions may be desirable in the handling of foundation funds, and help the foundations themselves toward more efficiency in the fruitful use of their funds.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAGAN of Georgia today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WHITENER, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. KEARNS (at the request of Mr. SHORT) for 40 minutes, today.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mr. SHORT) for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRUCE (at the request of Mr. SHORT) for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JARMAN, for 1 hour, on Tuesday, May 9.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLMER and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. BATES.

Mr. BERRY.

Mr. COLLIER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROOKS of Texas.

Mr. LIBONATI.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. WATTS.

Mr. McDOWELL.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) to revise and extend his remarks made on the conference report on H.R. 3935 and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. KORNEGAY) to revise and extend her remarks made on the water pollution bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3935. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

863. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the review of manpower utilization in selected areas of the Public Works Department, Fleet Activities, Yokosuka, Japan, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

864. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving a net increase in the amount of $3,478,540 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 150); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

865. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving an increase in the amount of $1,500,000 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 151); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

866. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, pursuant to Public Law 163, 83d Congress (22 F.R. 4633); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

867. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of accounting for earnings of covered workers, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

868. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the restoration to Indian tribes of unclaimed per capita and other individual payments of tribal trust funds"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

869. A letter from the executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, transmitting the audit report of March 31, 1960, for the Reserve Officers Association, pursuant to Public Law 595, 81st Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

870. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

871. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

872. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

873. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Bak-Min Lum, A12586379, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 3279. A bill to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. S. 912. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 342). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 275. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6713, a bill to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 343). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi: Committee on Public Works. H.R. 5963. A bill to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946 with respect to the vertical clearance of bridges to be constructed across the Mississippi River; without amendment (Rept. No. 345). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6413. A bill to extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax; with amendment (Rept. No. 346). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1353. A bill for the relief of Max Bleier; without amendment (Rept. No. 330). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1399. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Pidlaoan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaoan; with amendment (Rept. No. 331). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Mansureh Rinehart; without amendment (Rept. No. 332). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Ido Enrico Cassandro; without amendment (Rept. No. 333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1642. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lilyan Robinson; with amendment (Rept. No. 334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Elie Hara; without amendment (Rept. No. 335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Tomislav Lazarevich; with amendment (Rept. No. 336). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2152. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Francisca Hartman; with amendment (Rept. No. 337). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2155. A bill for the relief of Reoko Kawaguchi Moore; with amendment (Rept. No. 338). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2156. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo; with amendment (Rept. No. 339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2835. A bill for the relief of Jose Lauchengco, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1877. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; with amendment (Rept. No. 344). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 6774. A bill to extend and improve the National Defense Education Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 6775. A bill to amend the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, to provide for the operation of steamship conferences; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 6776. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H.R. 6777. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 6778. A bill to amend the act of June 10, 1955, as amended, so as to establish the hours of work for rural carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6779. A bill to amend title II of the National Housing Act to authorize existing management-type cooperatives to obtain additional commercial and community facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6780. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the FHA cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis, and to authorize loans to cooperatives under such program for replacements, improvements, and repairs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 6781. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $2,400 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 6782. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make relative stability of prices an explicit aim of Federal economic policy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H.R. 6783. A bill to assist the U.S. cotton textile industry in regaining its equitable share of the world market; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 6784. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to authorize the review of the administrative regulations by committees of Congress prior to their promulgation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 6785. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 6786. A bill to provide coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, as self-employed individuals, for employees in the folding room of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 6787. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 6788. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 6789. A bill to grant the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6790. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6791. A bill to amend the National Housing Act relating to mortgage insurance of section 213 cooperative housing, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 6792. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percent the retirement multiplication factor used in the determination of annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 6793. A bill to provide for the establishment of the King Range National Conservation Area in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 6794. A bill to permit the admission to registry and the use in the coastwise trade of not more than two foreign built hydrofoil vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6795. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a 5-percent increase in rates of disability compensation, to provide additional disability compensation for seriously disabled veterans as partial compensation for the reduction in their life expectancy because of their disabilities, to liberalize effective dates of certain awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 6796. A bill to safeguard the employment benefits of custodial employees in the postal field service by providing for the retention of such employees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6797. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 6798. A bill to amend the act incorporating the Washington Home for Foundlings and to define the powers of said corporation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 6799. A bill to provide for the holding of a term of court for the western district of Kentucky at Hopkinsville; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 6800. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain increases in rates of disability compensation and allowances for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON (by request):

H.R. 6801. A bill to provide for disposition of certain tribal assets of the Colville Confederated Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6802. A bill to provide for disposition of certain tribal assets of the Yakima Tribes in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 6803. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide that financial assistance under title II and III of such act shall be available for education in ancient foreign languages as well as in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 6804. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.R. 6805. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 6806. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain State and local employees who have elected (under the divided retirement system procedure) not to be covered under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program may have an additional opportunity to elect such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 6807. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents to discriminate among its members on the basis of race, color, creed, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6808. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to permit the National Labor Relations Board to refuse to certify a labor organization for the purposes of collective bargaining which engages in certain discriminatory practices; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 6809. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 6810. A bill to amend the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, to provide that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall be subject to annual budget review by the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 6811. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 6812. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 6813. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 6814. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 6815. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committe on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6816. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 6817. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 6818. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. Con. Res. 233. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Con. Res. 234. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. Con. Res. 235. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 242. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. Con. Res. 243. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:

H. Con. Res. 247. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:
H. Con. Res. 248. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JONAS:
H. Con. Res. 249. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:
H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:
H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANGEN:
H. Con. Res. 252. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:
H. Con. Res. 253. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:
H. Con. Res. 254. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McINTIRE:
H. Con. Res. 255. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:
H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foregin Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:
H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:
H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NELSEN:
H. Con. Res. 259. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:
H. Con. Res. 260. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:
H. Con. Res. 261. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PELLY:
H. Con. Res. 262. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PIRNIE:
H. Con. Res. 263. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:
H. Con. Res. 264. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:
H. Con. Res. 265. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:
H. Con. Res. 266. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:
H. Con. Res. 267. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:
H. Con. Res. 268. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:
H. Con. Res. 269. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:
H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:
H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WEIS:
H. Con. Res. 272. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNGER:
H. Con. Res. 273. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:
H. Con. Res. 274. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:
H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DELANEY:
H. Con. Res. 276. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD:
H. Con. Res. 277. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:
H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. Con. Res. 279. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:
H. Con. Res. 280. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:
H. Con. Res. 281. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:
H. Con. Res. 282. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. PFOST:
H. Con. Res. 283. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL:
H. Con. Res. 284. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:
H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CAREY:
H. Con. Res. 286. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:
H. Con. Res. 287. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WHALLEY:
H. Con. Res. 288. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HIESTAND:
H. Con. Res. 289. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct an investigation and study of the foreign intelligence activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. STEED:
H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:
H.R. 6819. A bill for the relief of Tong Il Han; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:
H.R. 6820. A bill for the relief of Helene Gavrilou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:
H.R. 6821. A bill for the relief of Chong Chul Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:
H.R. 6822. A bill for the relief of Alfred C. Altum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHELAN:
H.R. 6823. A bill for the relief of Orhan Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:
H.R. 6824. A bill for the relief of Josefine Lepschi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:
H.R. 6825. A bill for the relief of Janusz Gozdz Wolanin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6826. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Olga Patramanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:
H.R. 6827. A bill for the relief of Miss Grace Doreen Sarjeant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYL:
H.R. 6828. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Ernest G. Rider; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY (by request):
H.R. 6829. A bill for the relief of Compagnie Generale Transatlantique; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:
H.R. 6830. A bill for the relief of Mary Minniti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6831. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 6832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marija Justinich and her minor daughter, Bozica Justinich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 6833. A bill for the relief of Frantisek Tisler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

137. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Theodore Krohn, National Women's League of the United Synagogue of America, New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

138. Also, petition of Jodie Aldridge, Nashville, Tenn., relative to requesting legislative action to repeal the 16th amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Century 21 Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Seattle Post Intelligencer, editorially, gave a progress report on plans for our Century 21 Exposition last Friday, April 21.

Making this summation more important regarding steps taken to make this world fair a true report of the latest scientific and technological achievements to be shown to the entire world was the fact that just 1 year from last Friday, the exposition will open its gates.

So that Senators may know how the city of Seattle, the State of Washington, and the entire Pacific Northwest are moving ahead with the task of preparing this "jewel case exhibit of science," I ask unanimous consent that the Post Intelligencer editorial be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C–21 Is COMING STRONG

One year from today the world fair called Century 21 opens to the public.

Even oldtimers, accustomed to watching the west coast achieve big things against the odds, are astonished with the progress of the Century 21 exposition to date.

First of all, the $80 million project (exclusive of foreign exhibits) is on a solid footing financially. Several of the buildings, including some of the largest structures, are well along. Construction of the Nation's first monorail, from midtown to the exposition grounds, is underway. This has had the effect of alerting local citizens to the reality of Century 21.

That is a reality long since understood by people elsewhere. This 1962 world fair has the support of the United States, and Uncle Sam himself will be the largest exhibitor. Moreover, Century 21 is approved by the Bureau of International Expositions. It is the only world fair now projected in the United States to receive such endorsement by this board of 30 nations.

Thus foreign exposition experts, the Nation, and the State of Washington, are solidly behind Century 21. But, almost as important, all our neighbors this side of the Rocky Mountains have begun to recognize that Century 21 will reflect the energetic enterprise of the entire 11 Western States.

They see that this is not a Seattle fair or a Pacific Northwest fair, but a world fair whose roots and influence extend throughout the Far West and around the Pacific rim.

Such are some of the factors which led the region's hydroelectric utilities, both public and private, to combine on a complex exhibit in its own building. These are the reasons why wood cellulose companies, with worldwide markets, have pooled their imaginative resources toward a major exhibit. And why Pacific Telephone Northwest and General Electric were among the first major U.S. companies to sign up for sizable space. Nor will the presence of the Boeing Aircraft exhibit be a mere matter of propinquity.

Such companies want to identify themselves, properly enough, with the five worlds of the exposition: the world of Century 21, the world of commerce and industry, the world of science, the world of entertainment with its gay way, and the world of the arts.

While the response of business and industry is not discouraging at this stage of development, the absence thus far of certain major companies from the growing list of exhibitors is difficult to understand.

Among major companies at this moment conspicuous by their absence from the roster are, surprisingly, some which have found the Far West a lucrative market and whose future plans include expansion to serve this fastest growing population in the Nation.

It is the belief of the Post-Intelligencer that these companies simply have not yet grasped the scope and role of Century 21. Or perhaps have not considered that the exposition will draw the bulk of its attendance from the Far West and Midwestern States, just as 2 years later the world fair at New York will draw most of its spectators from the Atlantic seaboard.

We do know that at least a score of topmost companies are taking a second look at Century 21 and we are confident that their judgment will lead them westward and toward the warm welcome in which the Far West takes traditional pride.

Meanwhile it is up to us in Washington State to continue our support of Century 21 and of its officials who are doing such a splendid job.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Washington made reference to the Century 21 Exposition, but did not state what he was submitting for the RECORD.

Mr. MAGNUSON. An editorial published in the Seattle Post Intelligencer, relating to the exposition.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the exposition now in progress?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, no; it will start 1 year from now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But it is in process of being developed?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes. The Senator from Ohio, who took a great interest in the subject, may like to know that good progress is being made. The State contribution, made by the last legislature, was exactly what the State government had said it would be. The Senator is aware, of course, of the Federal contribution.

The exhibitors are rapidly falling into line. Approximately 30 nations will take part.

The science exhibit is progressing well. Ground has been broken for the Federal building. The other parts of the fair are rapidly underway. The State building is approximately 60 percent completed.

Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus will be the Federal Commissioner. The President submitted the nomination of Dr. Spilhaus to the Senate today. The exposition is making good progress and will be completed on schedule, 1 year from this week.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the transportation line being constructed, or has that been abandoned?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; the construction of the monorail was begun 60 days ago. I happened to be at home and attended the ceremony which marked the construction of the monorail.

Now under construction is a tower which will be about 500 feet high, and in which there will be a restaurant. It will be a sort of Eiffel Tower.

The exposition is privately financed. The total investment to date is between $55 and $59 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much has been contributed by the Federal Government?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Nine million dollars.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Rule of Law Requires Judicial Discipline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is fortunate that the right of freedom of speech, on any question, is protected by a constitutional provision that remains inviolate.

Our distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has raised a very provocative question in his observations concerning the importance of requiring strict judicial discipline in the applications of the rule of law and its maintenance, essential to the protection of individual liberties and our republican form of

government. He describes, pointedly, that reasonable adherence to the principles of law and judgments established in prior decisions of the courts is an absolute requirement of the rule of law.

He is to be admired for his frankness in his recognition of the rule of law, with its certainty of pronouncement, as opposed to the rule of men, which is subject to the influence of caprices, prejudices, and lack of mental discipline. He points out the steady erosion of the rule of law through the legalistic matrix of minority judicial opinions. Our colleague is positive in his criticism of these opinions. Certainly, he sets forth an indictment of the courts which, if true or not, merits study. His position in these matters is both interesting and challenging. Whether one agrees with his position or not, certainly, we must agree that the courts are not infallible. No one can disagree with his position as to the statement that judicial appointments are of such public interest that, under our democratic process, the appointment of qualified men to occupy high positions in the judiciary must be influenced by public opinion, if we are to make effective the rule of law and its guarantees to the protection of our individual rights; the administration of our institutions and the guarantees of our republican form of government. No legislation should be so rigid as to affect the reasonable discretion of the court.

The following article, from the Friday, April 28, 1961, issue of the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin, presents his views:

[From the Chicago Daily Law Bulletin, Apr. 28, 1961]

STARE DECISIS—RULE OF LAW REQUIRES JUDICIAL DISCIPLINE

(By Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, House Committee on Un-American Activities)

Essential to the maintenance of individual liberties and our republican form of government is the rule of law. Indeed this is a basic feature of our society which distinguishes it from the totalitarian—the latter being the rule of men. The rule of law is an egalitarian principle of historic origin and necessity. A principle which declares the equality of men demands a rule of law, that is to say, standards of conduct of general and equal application. The rule of law is likewise a libertarian principle. Tyranny exists in a government of men who are bound by no standards except those of personal whim and prejudice. Accordingly, Alexander Hamilton noted: "It has been frequently remarked, with great propriety, that a voluminous code of laws is one of the inconveniences connected with the advantages of a free government." (Federalist, No. 78.)

I wish particularly to make an observation with reference to the application of the rule of law to the activities of the judiciary—notably the Supreme Court of the United States. Alexander Hamilton followed the above-quoted statement with this: "To avoid an arbitrary discretion in the courts, it is indispensable that they should be bound down by strict rules and precedents, which serve to define and point out their duty in every particular case that comes before them."

There is growing concern among a large number of lawyers, as we observe what appears to be a steady erosion of the rule of law within that body of justices, evident particularly in the opinions of the minority justices, namely, Warren, Black, Douglas, and Brennan. Hamilton was undoubtedly making references to the discipline of the common law, which in its wisdom teaches reasonable adherence to consistency and stare decisis. It is the apparent rejection of this discipline by that minority on the Court which is very properly a matter of comment.

Contempt of Congress cases involving the committee of which I am the chairman, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, have been particularly revealing, in the court's treatment of the first amendment privilege. For example, the dissenting opinions of Justices Black and Douglas in the *Viereck* case (318 U.S. 236) dealing with Nazi talk, endorsed a qualified privilege, whereas in the cases of Wilkinson and Braden, decided February 27, 1961, which dealt with Communist talk, the same justices joined by Warren and Brennan now pronounce an absolute privilege.

Reasonable adherence to principles of law and judgments established in prior decisions is a requirement of the rule of law, and plainly a demand of liberty and fairness. There must be some predictability in the law for those who must live by it and equal treatment to those who must come before the same tribunal—and indeed the same judges—for judgment. The doctrine of stare decisis is a recognition of the rule of law, with its certainty, as opposed to the rule of men, with their caprices and prejudices.

This points up another and related issue of equal importance in maintaining the rule of law. What kind of men are we selecting to administer the rule of law? If the rule of law is to be a reality, it is evident that our justices be men who accept its discipline—and men of mental balance and intellectual stability. It is therefore incumbent upon the bar to engage in determined political activity in the area of judicial appointments, to utilize the democratic process in the creation of public opinion, to assure the appointment of qualified men to occupy high stations—if we are to make effective the rule of law.

Immigration Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIBORNE PELL
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as a firm proponent of liberalized immigration policies and as a member of the Board of Directors of the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference, I congratulate my esteemed colleague and friend, Senator PHILIP HART, on the speech he delivered before the annual conference of that organization on March 24.

Senator HART's remarks were succinct and frank. He rightly emphasized the desirability of making clear to the American public the relationship between our immigration legislation and our prestige abroad.

Mr. President, it is indeed important to our foreign policy that the ideals of the dignity and brotherhood of mankind be incorporated in our immigration laws. We must share those blessings which our heritage has bestowed upon us.

In his speech Senator HART has allied himself with that very type of imaginative, forward thinking leadership which must lead our country in these times of crisis. It has clearly never been so important for the United States to stand as a symbol of truly democratic thought and action throughout the world.

It is a genuine pleasure for me to ask unanimous consent that Senator HART's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR PHILIP A. HART, OF MICHIGAN, AT A CONFERENCE HELD BY THE AMERICAN IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP CONFERENCE: HOTEL PLAZA, NEW YORK, N.Y., MARCH 24, 1961

The President, in his message to your conference, again has expressed his abiding belief that we must constantly strive toward the day when our immigration and refugee programs will reflect our highest principles of fairplay, humanitarianism, and equality.

All of you who work so faithfully in organizations and through such groups as the Immigration and Citizenship Conference are aware of the President's earlier writings and legislative achievements. It is my hope that we are entering a period when significant steps can be taken, both in and out of Congress, to achieve some of the priority goals you have sought.

The signs are encouraging. The obnoxious questionnaire has been rescinded, and we no longer thus insult the visitor to our shore. The recognition of continuing departmental responsibility for the welfare of those who arrive homeless on our shores is equally significant. This I would add, does not detract from nor lessen the need for, the excellent work being done by the many voluntary agencies so skilled in postarrival adjustments and assistance. The new study of alien fingerprinting requirements also reflects a changing tenor of the times and is, I believe, another good omen.

Your meetings today have recognized the importance of a renewed effort in developing immigration and refugee policies responsive to this new decade and now tiny world. This has been called by some the decade of decision. The President said a few days ago in his foreign aid message, a "decade for development." Perhaps it is not out of order to suggest that for all concerned with the challenges of our immigration policy, this could well be the decade of dedication.

It would be my hope that ingenuity, flexibility, and imagination could be the hallmarks with which you as an organization, along with the executive and legislative leaders, would approach the job ahead. Defeat is inevitable only if we become rigid and step beyond the realm of the possible. There are important executive policy and reorganization steps that can be taken. There are governmental and nongovernmental ways through which the public can be educated on policy objectives. And one by one it should be possible to make the legislative changes necessary to bring our goals closer.

It would be helpful if the primary energies of all could be directed not to debates on procedures and strategy, but to educating and informing the public and the public's representatives on the basic policy questions. The questions and debates over short legislative steps versus long steps, omnibus bills versus multibill approaches are not the keys to success.

In my book the real key is to make clear the full impact on U.S. foreign policy of our immigration policies—our national origins approach to screening individuals. President Kennedy made this point very clear in his message to this Congress. A major recognition of the importance of immigration and refugee policy to foreign policy was made in the 1960 Democratic Party platform under a section entitled: "The Instruments of Foreign Policy." This sec-

tion included the pledge to "eliminate discrimination and to enable members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives." Here, in very personal terms, is described the full impact of immigration policy on our foreign relations. Let us increase enormously the number of Americans who think immediately in just this way whenever the phrase "immigration policy" is heard or seen.

Everyone recognizes that the challenges of emerging nations are tremendous. Let us not be further hampered in our efforts to join with them in free world endeavors by the embarrassment of taking no action to move forcibly against the kind of national policy discrimination we know today under our immigration quota system.

What are the congressional prospects? Well, I am sure that in 1956 no one would have made a serious bet that Congress would have passed two significant civil rights laws before 1960. We must not look too closely at the roadblocks of the past in assessing the possibilities of the future.

Finally, and this is the reason I was invited to make these few remarks I am sure, the tentative plans of the Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees are probably of interest to you.

The chairman of the subcommittee is new to the intricacies of this field. The subcommittee has a modest budget with which to initiate our work. Yet I hope that within the next year or two the subcommittee can evolve a program which will give members of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate background studies and hearings on such subjects as:

What we have learned from our current experiences with the Cuban refugees, and our Nation having been the first stop of those seeking asylum from tyranny;

World refugee and escapee facts and policies within the jurisdictional scope of the subcommittee's resolution and charter.

U.S. experience gained from participation in the World Refugee Year.

And if staff time and funds permit, I would hope to collect some experiences of those most familiar with the success or lack of success we have had in assimilating, training, and resettling the homeless of the world under the program of the last 15 years.

Your hospitality and warmth in inviting a neophyte to address you is deeply appreciated. If objectives sought in immigration reform are achieved in the months and years ahead, you will be largely responsible. If the Refugee and Escapee Subcommittee makes a small contribution to fairly and equitably assess the many ramifications of this subject, it will be as a result of the support and cooperation of all of you. The pledge I make you is simply a desire to be helpful, cooperative, and available to all as I attempt to perform my duties in the Senate.

Steelmark Month in the Upper Ohio Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on May 1, the cities of Weirton and Steubenville held official ceremonies inaugurating the month of May as Steelmark Month in the upper Ohio Valley. Due to the pressure of Senate business, I was unable to participate in this significant event. However, it is a project which, in my judgment, deserves wide notice as a community experiment in implementing the spirit of the New Frontiers.

In a letter from the Weirton Steel Co. which sets forth the program and purposes of Steelmark Month, Mr. Martin F. Fahey, legal administrator of the industrial relations department of Weirton Steel Co., stated:

Forty cities will participate in Steelmark Month and 19 mayors recently attended a meeting here and issued proclamations declaring the month of May to be Steelmark Month. Every chamber of commerce in the six counties comprising the upper Ohio Valley is actively and vigorously participating, and every retail merchants bureau in every city in the six counties is also enthusiastically supporting this program.

In addition * * * at least 25 mayors representing the key cities in the upper Ohio Valley will participate in the activities on May 1, all feeling that Steelmark Month is vitally necessary to the well-being of the people of their respective cities.

Mr. President, in the interest of bringing to wider attention Steelmark Month as an outstanding example of community enterprise and initiative, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my letter on the event dated April 24 and my followup telegram of May 1.

There being no objection, the letter and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 24, 1961.

Mr. JOHN A. JONES,
Director of Public Relations,
Weirton Steel Co.,
Weirton, W. Va.

DEAR JOHN: With reference to my conversations with you and Mr. Martin Fahey last Thursday, I would very much like to participate in your official inaugural ceremonies for Steelmark Month on May 1. However, in view of the mounting pressure of Senate business, I would consider it most unlikely that I will be able to absent myself from the Senate that day.

In the event that I will not be able to join you in the ceremonies, I hope that you will not think it presumptuous of me to take this occasion to extend a message in keeping with the general purpose of the event.

It is gratifying to learn of this effort by Weirton Steel and the communities of the upper Ohio Valley to implement at a grassroots level the spirit of President Kennedy's inaugural message.

The management personnel of Weirton Steel are particularly to be commended for their role in assuming the leadership of Steelmark Month. This is the kind of effective industrial and community relations work which is responsible for the vital place that Weirton Steel occupies in the life of the upper Ohio Valley.

Steelmark Month represents also the kind of initiative and enterprise which have brought the Ohio Valley itself into a position of prominence in the industrial and economic life of America. It is worth noting, in this respect, that no matter how dynamic and forward looking our leadership at the national level, no program of national goals will be achieved if these goals are not embraced and carried forth by the actions of individual men and women at the community level.

No industry has more clearly exemplified the dynamism and vigor of America than has the steel industry. In developing new uses for steel and new techniques for its production, the men and women who make the steel for America have also made their industry the bedrock and foundation of American industrial, economic and military strength.

The efforts of the men and women in the American steel industry have brought America to the highest per capita annual production of steel in the world—1,300 pounds of steel per year for every person in the United States, as compared to 9 pounds per year in India. And in the wake of this outstanding achievement, we have virtually eliminated from our society the conditions of poverty and dire need.

Yet the remarkable increase in productivity in the steel industry, as well as many other industries, has not been unaccompanied by new problems. We are faced with a continued growth in our labor force at the same time that automation and mechanization displace manpower. These processes are already well advanced in the coal and steel industries, with the end not yet in sight.

Therefore, in addition to the very worthy immediate goals of Steelmark Month, I would hope that the joint efforts and the relationships between industrial business, labor, and civic leaders established in this enterprise will be carried forth into further planning for the future. For in order to meet the displacement that is destined to occur in many industries, we must begin now to plan for an orderly process of readjustment, in discovering new regional resources and sources of employment, in planning for vocational retraining, and in extending the range and variety of industry-community relationships over the entire field where their interests and purposes are joined.

In this respect, Steelmark Month may come to have a wider and a continuing beneficient effect upon the economic life of the upper Ohio Valley region.

With my firmest hopes for the success of your project and with warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

MAY 1, 1961.

Mr. JOHN A. JONES,
Director of Public Relations,
Weirton Steel Co.,
Weirton, W. Va.:

Senate business here prevents my participation in your important ceremonies today. President Kennedy has asked me to be present for signing of area redevelopment bill at White House at 11 a.m. A conference committee of Senate and House of which I am a member will meet at 2 p.m. in an effort to finalize amendments to Fair Labor Standards Act. Please know of my sincere congratulations and I trust my letter of April 24 commending your effective industrial and community effort will be a further indication of my appreciation of the value of your Steelmark Month. If convenient please extend my best wishes to all those who are in attendance.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
U.S. Senator.

Questionnaire Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently completed the tabulation of the returns on my questionnaire, which was distributed throughout my district in

mid-March. I was very gratified by the response I received. Almost 13 percent of the questionnaires were returned, and many people took the time to add personal comments on items of special interest.

Because these views are representative of the thinking of the people of western South Dakota, I would like to insert in the RECORD the results of the tabulation together with some of the comments included in the questionnaire:

Questionnaire returns

	Percentage		
	Yes	No	Not certain
Do you favor—			
1. Increasing the minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 per hour and extending coverage to 4,300,000 additional workers?	31	59	10
2. Liberalization of our social security program including optional retirement for men at age 62, $10 increase in minimum monthly pensions, increase in widow's allowance, liberalized disability provisions, and less coverage to establish eligibility? An increase in payroll taxes of both employer and employee would be required to cover the over $1,000,000,000 annual cost	34	54	12
3. Medical care for the aged under the social security program not based on need, pushing the payroll tax to 10 percent by 1969, applicable only to those covered by social security? This program has been proposed rather than the State-administered program covering any needy person enacted by Congress last year	19	70	11
4. Establishing protective tariffs and quotas to enable our domestic production to successfully compete with low-cost foreign imports in order to protect industry, agriculture, and mineral interests and our gold reserves which are being seriously depleted as imports exceed exports?	75	13	12
5. The proposal to assist areas where chronic labor surpluses exist, resulting from industries forced out of business primarily because of foreign competition? The proposal would enable these areas to lure industries away from prosperous communities	33	57	10
6. A massive program for Government-owned public housing	7	69	24
7. Continuation of foreign economic aid at its present level of approximately $4,000,000,000 annually	20	56	24
Do you favor—Continued			
8. Expanding the aid to dependent children program to include children of unemployed parents	36	44	20
9. An increase in postal rates	37	51	12
10. Retaining gasoline tax at its present 4-cent level, shifting greater responsibility upon trucks for the Federal highway construction program	77	13	10
11. Abolition of the House Un-American Activities Committee	9	73	19
12. The general principle in agricultural legislation of—			
(a) Permitting the CCC to dispose of commodities on the open market at less than support price (cost to the Government)	27	43	30
(b) Payment by Government, either in cash or in kind, for further retirement of production acres on either a temporary or permanent basis	17	56	27

	Percentage
13. In the field of Federal aid to education, which do you prefer:	
(a) A $5,700,000,000 Federal aid to education program including school construction, teachers' salaries, college scholarships, etc., paid directly from the Federal Treasury, even though it will bring certain Federal control of the schools?	13
(b) As an alternative to direct Federal aid to education, legislation enabling the taxpayer to substract from his Federal income tax the amount he pays in local property taxes for school purposes up to $100, and to deduct from taxable income up to $2,000 per year for each child in college? This would enable school districts to finance their own operating costs by making additional tax levies without additional cost to the taxpayer	77

QUOTABLE QUOTES FROM THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Social security. "How do they expect to get the additional unemployment benefits out of employers who no longer employ the unemployed?" "When this law went into effect, people had the idea that they would live a grand life in their old age and made no other provision for themselves. Now, with their pensions, they simply eke out the bare necessities."

Tax suggestions. "A double exemption allowance should be provided on the income tax return for a handicapped child or adult. It should include any person unable to hold a job due to a mental or physical handicap."

Tariffs. "We have been using nails manufactured in Holland since the steel strike. Labor got their pay raise but lost their market."

Gasoline tax. "The President's request on increased taxes for the highway system must have been prepared by the railroad lobby as its net effect is to torpedo the $5 billion trucking industry. It recommends that the trucking industry pay an amount equal to the net profit of the industry for 1960. Maybe Dr. Galbraith and Dr. Schlesinger were taught in Harvard that profits were not the incentive that made the free enterprise system successful in America" * * *. "An average truck running 100,000 miles would presently pay $800 in Federal fuel tax. An automobile running the same number of miles would pay about $266 in gasoline tax."

Agriculture. "If the CCC is permitted to sell at less than support price, it will put all small independent buyers and grain dealers out of business."

Un-American Activities Committee. "Do everything you can to strengthen the committee." "Increase the funds for the Un-American Activities Committee instead of reducing them." "We need greater protection against the Communist threat."

Spending. "This 'Giverment' ". "In 83 years the Homestake Mine has produced three-fourths billion dollars in gold and the Government gives away that much every week." "You don't see many businesses still going that spend more than their income year after year." "Put a stop to back-door spending—there is already too much going out the front door unnecessarily."

Education. "Why do you try to make people believe that if we have Federal aid to education we must have Federal control of education?" "How can Congress take money from one group and give it to another without retaining control of how it shall be spent?" "I know firsthand that Federal aid means Federal control. Here the Government is telling them how to run the sewing course next year. We have always had an exceptional course here and now they are offering a little sewing and a little homemaking to comply with Government regulations." "Smith-Hughes now dictates the qualifications of teachers."

General. "Any government that can make you rich can also make you poor." "We people do not want handouts—we just want a fair chance. Let's make government good government and keep it businesslike. Let's not mortgage our freedom." "When you hurt a small man a little, you hurt him a lot." "The Communist and Socialist countries have centralized governments. America was built upon the foundation of the freedom of the individual. Mount Rushmore has space for the man who can keep it that way. Only four have qualified so far." "What is it when the government of a country taxes the products of the people's labor and dispenses those products back according to their needs? This is socialism and every Government program seems headed in that direction." "After objecting to so many things being done, I feel that I should shed a little light on the other side. I am very grateful to be living in a country where the individual can state his convictions toward his government. I also believe that any good American citizen does not mind paying his fair share, and would pay taxes that were necessary for the operation of his country, but I also believe that a good citizen doesn't look to the government for a living and a handout for every little pinch in his business. I am a young man of 24 and certainly hope that I do not have to live the rest of my life in a welfare state."

Extent of Back-Door Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, an idea of congressional lack of control over the Federal purse strings can be gained by examining the status of back-door spending authorizations to agencies of the Federal Government, permitting these agencies to borrow from the Treasury and expend the funds without requiring an annual justification or review by the congressional committees having jurisdiction over appropriations.

Just to show the enormity of these public debt transactions and their ever-continuing growth over the years, I include a tabulation covering the period from the time this device of bypassing the scrutiny of Congress was first used and on through the years until 1960.

However, the most shocking figures of all cannot yet be calculated; namely, the amount Congress will add to the total

this year. Altogether on the heels of the recommendation of President Eisenhower that back-door spending be discontinued, the Kennedy administration requests already exceed $18 billion and thereby and therein is the threat of greater use than ever of this fiscally unsound method of financing Federal programs.

If the Congress enacts a $8 billion housing bill, a $7 billion foreign aid bill and $7 billion more for grain disposal under Public Law 480, plus many more, plus those that have passed to date—all outside the normal appropriations process—history may well set the 87th Congress as having yielded its constitutional responsibility to the executive branch in greater degree than any Congress before. If so, the representatives of the people this year will have contributed more to "one man rule" than Members during any time since the Constitution was adopted.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is the year by year record of weakening of the legislative branch through increasing loss of control of money drawn from the Treasury without the regular process of appropriation as contemplated by the Founding Fathers:

Record of public debt transactions from June 30, 1932, to June 30, 1960

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Borrowings and other advances from Treasury	Unused balance of authority at end of year	Balance of borrowing from Treasury at yearend
1932	$350.0	$1,150.0	$350.0
1933	1,235.0	2,537.4	1,585.0
1934	1,670.0	7,570.7	3,255.0
1935	825.0	5,590.4	3,655.0
1936	865.0	4,586.9	4,030.0
1937	227.0	4,997.8	3,630.0
1938	345.0	5,783.8	882.7
1939	426.3	6,235.2	273.3
1940	641.8	6,874.3	104.3
1941	798.2	9,374.4	301.7
1942	4,178.3	18,868.4	4,078.7
1943	6,969.0	15,774.7	7,519.1
1944	7,615.0	15,156.8	10,717.3
1945	4,149.0	16,810.0	12,168.7
1946	3,553.1	24,527.1	12,504.9
1947	7,346.6	21,206.2	16,579.8
1948	5,505.0	15,166.8	9,122.7
1949	5,851.0	13,473.8	13,184.3
1950	4,031.7	16,991.4	14,756.8
1951	3,780.6	17,604.9	15,360.7
1952	2,739.2	21,326.7	15,854.1
1953	4,420.4	20,006.2	18,369.3
1954	5,398.4	20,738.4	19,067.4
1955	6,224.0	19,245.2	22,347.6
1956	5,273.1	17,979.9	26,172.8
1957	6,077.7	19,834.4	28,887.9
1958	7,301.7	25,197.4	28,019.2
1959	9,958.7	25,185.7	32,827.7
1960	6,733.6	25,734.0	33,068.4
Total	114,489.6		

Killer Substances in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the American people have been greatly disturbed over a period of time now about persistent reports of increasing peril from cancer-causing agents in foods, drugs, and cosmetics. From time to time the Congress has given considerable attention to this most serious question and some legislation seeking to control this menace to human welfare has been enacted.

Recently Dr. Freddy Homburger, president of the Bio-Research Institute of Cambridge, Mass., testified before our House Subcommittee on Health Appropriations that a Federal appropriation of $10 million is urgently needed to help protect the American people against cancer-causing agents in the above products. At the same time he suggested that this sum would enable the Food and Drug Administration to speed up research on improved methods to detect cancer-inducing substances in consumer goods.

"We have a law designed to exclude from human consumption all cancer-producing substances," said the doctor, "but we lack the methods to determine exactly what constitutes a cancer hazard, even for test animals."

Pointing to the fact that in existence today there are innumerable consumer items which never have been adequately tested because of the lack of quick, economical, and reliable methods, the doctor outlined a $10 million program, one-half of which would go for intramural studies, grants-in-aid, and contract research programs. Another $5 million would go for the construction of needed laboratory space for the Food and Drug Administration.

Dr. Homburger's recent demonstration that an agent used widely in soft drinks and contained in many other flavoring components produces cancer in rats was most alarming. Strongly urging the Congress to take action, this well known scientist declared that as an example of what the public must be guarded against, was the substance used as a weight-reducing agent for years until it became evident that it caused cataracts of the eyes. Dr. Homburger also urged Congress to support and bolster independent research institutions which exist outside of universities and hospitals, and requested an appropriation of $50 million to create new institutes of this kind throughout the country. He said this sum would make it possible to organize, construct, and equip 100 independent institutes at the rate of two in each State, to be operated by Government and private grant-in-aid funds.

He summarized his case by stating:

The universities, with their team efforts, educate a type of scientists who work together admirably in committees, research teams, and departments of large laboratories. But nowhere are we training—systematically—the leaders of tomorrow who will guide new scientific developments. Such leaders can emerge from independent institutes.

I trust that the Congress will take Dr. Homburger's urgent warning to heart, and I urge the Appropriations Committee to make sure this year that sufficient funds are appropriated to take every effective measure that is necessary to eliminate cancer-causing agents or other deleterious substances in food, water, drugs, and cosmetics and other products, materials, or substances with which the public comes in contact and are capable of producing incurable or serious disease or affliction.

This question is one of greatest urgency and topmost priority because America's food preparation and eating habits are changing greatly. Additional effective controls must be found to protect the public health and to prevent millions of innocent people from being poisoned or rendered sick or afflicted by what they eat, what they use, what they wear, or what they may be exposed to in modern society.

There is need for boldness and immediate action in fashioning the broadest type of program to combat these evils. Congress must provide the answer at an early date and I strongly urge that it be done.

The article follows:

FUNDS ASKED FOR RESEARCH—FOOD TESTS VITAL IN WAR ON CANCER

WASHINGTON.—A Boston scientist told Congressmen Thursday that a Federal appropriation of $10 million is urgently needed to help protect the American people against cancer-causing agents in their foods, drugs, and cosmetics.

Dr. Freddy Homburger, president of the Bio-Research Institute of Cambridge, Mass., told a House Subcommittee on Health Appropriations the sum would enable the Food and Drug Administration to speed up research on improved methods to detect cancer-inducing substances in consumer goods.

"We have a law designed to exclude from human consumption all cancer-producing substances," Dr. Homburger said, "but we lack the methods to determine exactly what constitutes a cancer hazard, even for the test animals."

WORKED AT TUFTS

"There exists today innumerable consumer items which never have been adequately tested because of the lack of quick, economical, and reliable methods," he said.

Under the Homburger plan, one-half of the $10 million appropriation would go for intramural studies and for a grant-in-aid and contract research program. Another $5 million would make possible construction of needed laboratory space for the Food and Drug Administration. "The agency," Dr. Homburger said, "now has practically no funds for such research."

Dr. Homburger, former research professor of medicine and director of cancer research at Tufts University, recently demonstrated that an agent used widely in soft drinks and contained in many other flavoring components produces cancer in rats.

As an example of what the public must be guarded against, the Boston scientist cited the case of a substance used as a weight-reducing agent for years until it became evident that it caused cataracts of the eyes.

NEW TEST DESCRIBED

"Dr. Bernard Armbrecht of the FDA has now developed a method, using chickens, that can demonstrate toxic properties of drugs in a matter of days," Dr. Homburger said.

Dr. Homburger also urged Congress to encourage independence in health research by bolstering independent research institutes which exist outside of universities and hospitals. He requested an appropriation of $50 million to create new institutes of this kind throughout the country.

He said this sum would make it possible to organize, construct, and equip 100 independent institutes at the rate of 2 in each State, to be operated by Government and private grant-in-aid.

"The universities, with their team efforts, educate a type of scientists who work together admirably in committees, research

teams, and departments of large laboratories," he said. "But nowhere are we training—systemically—the leaders of tomorrow who will guide new scientific developments. Such leaders can emerge from independent institutes."

Mr. Robert Riggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the House the distinguished career of one of the Nation's outstanding representatives of the fourth estate.

I speak of the Washington correspondent for the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, the president of Washington's famed and exclusive Gridiron Club, and the well known political analyst, Mr. Robert Riggs.

A native of Joplin, Mo., Mr. Riggs is a graduate of the journalism school of the State university there. He began his newspaper career in Madison, Wis., with the Associated Press in 1927, and after some experience on the Milwaukee Journal he joined the staff of the Courier-Journal in 1929 as assistant State editor. Through hard work, diligence, and a natural talent which soon manifested itself, he eventually became assistant managing editor, a position he held until 1942 when he came to the Courier-Journal's Washington bureau as correspondent.

Recently elected to his first term as president of the Gridiron Club, Bob Riggs is known through Washington; throughout Kentucky, where he has long been known as a brilliant journalist; and throughout the Nation, where the Courier-Journal has for many years been regarded as one of the finest examples of a working newspaper.

The respect and admiration of his colleagues in the press, a notably competitive industry in which praise is hard come by, is indicative of the acute perception and keen insight into every aspect of the newspaper business which characterizes Bob Riggs. That same insight and perception, when applied to legislative affairs with a talent for separating the wheat from the chaff and simplifying the most complicated legislation into readable and understandable prose, has made Bob Riggs an invaluable asset to every member of the Kentucky delegation. From his first job with the AP in Wisconsin, Bob's talent for seeing into the working mind of an official personality—as evidenced in the chapter he contributed on LYNDON JOHNSON to Eric Sevareid's "Candidates of 1960"—has been praised by his colleagues and his readers.

It is my pleasure to point out Bob Riggs' achievements to this distinguished body, and my privilege to know him. It is my earnest hope that he will continue in a career which has brought pride and glory to his lovely family and his many admiring friends and has been an invaluable asset to the press of America in general and that of Kentucky in particular.

Giving Protocol Meaning—New Strength in the Office of Protocol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the State Department, directly under the Under Secretary of State, there exists a little understood, yet important, adjunct to our foreign policy. I refer to the Office of the Chief of Protocol, currently held by Angier Biddle Duke.

Too often, the Chief of Protocol is envisioned as the President's representative at white-tie parties and fancy diplomatic receptions. His responsibility is thought of as merely requiring that Ambassador A is recognized as being senior in rank to Ambassador B, and treated accordingly. Fortunately, Mr. Duke is bringing a broader concept of this job to the office he holds.

Mr. Duke has taken into his jurisdiction many of the personal problems that the representatives of other nations, particularly the new nations of Africa, face on being accredited to the United States. Problems such as decent housing, schooling, vacations, and trips around the country are only some that have crossed Mr. Duke's desk.

His quick response to the insult to the Chargé d'Affaires of Sierra Leone at a restaurant in Pennsylvania and the understanding with which he came to the assistance of several young African students when they had been picked up for demonstrating on the death of Patrice Lumumba augur well for the sensible and sensitive handling of these minute yet important problems.

About 2 weeks ago, Mrs. Eleanor Israel, of New York, was sworn in as a special assistant to Mr. Duke to work on housing problems. Mrs. Israel has had an outstanding career as a leader in the resolution of social problems. In a quiet yet effective manner, she has attained many significant goals. In the ceremony swearing in Mrs. Israel, Mr. Duke said, "She will not receive all the recognition she will deserve because the nature of her job requires that she be efficient while being unobtrusive."

On April 22, the Washington Post reprinted an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal discussing the job of the Chief of Protocol of the State Department. I ask unanimous consent that it appear with my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVING PROTOCOL MEANING

The traditional job of the Chief of Protocol of the State Department has been one of assuring that foreign diplomats and dignitaries are dealt with on the basis of rank and seniority. He sees that they are properly greeted upon arrival—whether at airports or receptions—and given proper send-offs. He is in charge of the social and diplomatic amenities. Protocol, as the French expert said, "is the code of international politeness."

Angier Biddle Duke, new Chief of Protocol, wants to expand the duties of his office. He suggests that his staff help diplomats get their children placed in schools, help plan their vacations, and trips about the country and help them meet their neighbors.

But he wants to take over a much more important problem, too. It is that of seeing to it that African diplomats are properly treated. In the past many have run into racial discrimination in Washington and around the country. They have had difficulty finding housing, entering places of recreation, getting served in hotels and restaurants, finding office space. This, of course, is harmful to American foreign policy—and shameful in view of our democratic professions.

If Duke succeeds in getting the assignment he wants, and solves its problems, he will not only raise the level of his office but will serve the best interests of our foreign policy.

The Opinion of the 18th Congressional District, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the 18th Congressional District of New York. My area is populated probably by the most heterogeneous group in the United States. Their ethnic backgrounds are Irish, Italian, Puerto Rican, Cuban, German, Hungarian, Czech, Greek, Belgian. It is an integrated community with all races and religions. This area is known as East Harlem and Yorkville. It is strictly urban with few private residences or one-family homes. My district is populated by residents who are paying extremely high rents and extremely low rents. The rentals range from $100 per room per month to $5 per room per month. Included among them are the residents of a great number of low-income public housing projects. Within the past few years because of the great land values and desirability of location, more than 15,000 families have been dislocated in the Yorkville section. In a bulldozer operation, luxury housing has been built and is being built. As a consequence, great hardships have been suffered by residents who have lived within the area for more than a generation.

Many new residents have moved into the section whose viewpoints I have not had the opportunity of ascertaining. Because of the rapidly changing conditions, the viewpoints of my constituents whom I represented in the 85th and 86th Congresses may have changed, and consequently, I may not be aware of their present attitudes.

From 1947 through 1956, with the exception of 2 years, I represented the

greater portion of this section as a State senator. I feel that I am close to my people and that their viewpoints are well known to me. However, one of the great political mistakes any public official can make is to assume that he knows at all times the thinking of his constituents. It is necessary, therefore, from time to time to be advised as to the opinions of the constituency as to specific issues. We public officials, after all, are the servants of the people representing them in a republican system where we are accountable for our decisions every 2 years.

In the early part of this year, before legislation was voted upon, I forwarded to all the registered voters in my congressional area a questionnaire. Approximately 10 percent of the voters or 5,000 responded to my request for their opinions, and I am pleased to present the tabulation of the answers to my inquiries. This tabulation was compiled by two collegians from the University of Maryland and American University, Henry Hyde and Robert Hardgrove. While many of the results were expected by me, others were a complete surprise and a revelation. The two most surprising results related to the viewpoint of the constituency with respect to Federal funds to private or parochial schools for private school construction and Federal loans for private or parochial school construction. My district is populated by many persons of the Roman Catholic faith, including the Irish, the Italians, and the Puerto Ricans. The great number of my constituency consists of wage earners working in factories, in government, and in industry. Their answers with respect to their viewpoint regarding labor unions was a great surprise.

In view of the fact that most of the new construction with high rentals and luxury apartments are located south of 96th Street, I have had a separate tabulation of the answers with respect to the northern part of my district above 96th Street. The results of the answers to the questions in the entire district and the so-called low rental area and East Harlem section follow:

QUESTIONNAIRE

	Percentage results in entire district		Percentage results above 96th St. at East Harlem section	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Education:				
(a) Do you favor the administration program of providing Federal funds for school construction and teachers' salaries in the discretion of the States' government?	75	25	79	21
(b) Do you favor Federal funds to private or parochial schools for private school construction?	23	77	40	60
(c) Do you favor Federal loans for private or parochial school construction?	43	57	62	38
(d) Do you favor allocation of funds to States on the basis of school population in private and parochial schools as well as on population in public schools?	39	61	55	45
(e) Do you believe that Federal loans to private or parochial schools for school construction and teachers' salaries violate the principle of separation of church and state?	58	42	44	56
(f) Do you favor Federal scholarships of $1,000 based on merit without regard to needs test?	36	64	39	61
(g) Do you favor tax deduction of $1,200 for taxpayer for higher education of himself or dependents?	75	25	79	21
2. Foreign affairs:				
(a) Should economic aid to Europe and Asia and South America be— *Percent*				
Increased 26				
Decreased 20				
Discontinued 15				
Maintained at present level 39				
(b) Do you believe that recognition of Communist China in the United Nations is inevitable?	54	46	46	54
(c) Do you believe that our support for NATO should be— *Percent*				
Strengthened 44				
Maintained at present level 47				
Withdrawn 9				
(d) Do you believe that the United States should take— *Percent*				
Economic sanctions against Cuba 44				
Diplomatic sanctions 16				
Maintain normal trade relations 19				
Economic and diplomatic sanctions 21				
(e) Do you believe our support of the U.N. in the Congo and Africa should be—				
Strengthened with additional financial aid 44				
Strengthened with military forces 26				
Discontinued 14				
Strengthened with additional financial aid and with military forces 16				
3. Foreign trade:				
(a) Do you believe that reciprocal trade agreements with foreign nations should be—				
Continued as is 55				
Revised with higher tariffs and lower quotas for foreign goods 40				
Discontinued 5				
4. Labor:				
(a) Should restrictions on labor's right to picket and boycott under Landrum-Griffin law and Taft-Hartley law be repealed?	36	64	48	52
(b) Do you believe that labor unions should be subject to antitrust laws?	80	20	76	24
(c) Do you believe that secondary boycotts and picketing on construction sites should be declared not illegal?	40	60	38	62
(d) Do you favor increase of minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 under present coverage?	78	22	87	13
(e) Do you favor extending coverage of $1 hourly minimum wage to employees in retail or service establishments grossing $1,000,000 or more annually?	85	15	84	16
(f) Do you favor legislation granting $1 hourly minimum wage for service employees in hotel, motel, and restaurant establishments grossing $1,000,000 or more?	83	17	86	14
(g) Do you favor Federal funds for depressed areas to stimulate and revive business?	82	18	87	13
5. Social security:				
(a) Do you favor boosting minimum old-age pension from $33 per month to $43 per month?	93	7	98	2
(b) Do you favor permitting men to retire at age 62 instead of 65, the same as women, on reduced pensions?	74	26	81	19
(c) Do you favor raising pensions for widows to 85 percent of husband's pension?	87	13	92	8
(d) Do you favor increase of payroll tax of ¼ percent on employees/employers to finance liberalization of social security benefits?	79	21	82	18
(e) Do you favor legislation granting annually 60 days of hospitalization, nursing care, and surgical expenses for retired pensioners under social security system in lieu of present law which provides that Federal Government will match State expenditures for programs for retired pensioners earning less than $2,500 annually or who are welfare recipients?	74	26	87	13
6. Housing:				
(a) Do you favor Federal program for more public housing for more low-income families?	76	24	82	18
(b) Do you favor Federal program for public housing for middle-income families?	80	20	85	15
7. Rent control:				
(a) Do you favor— *Percent*				
Continued and effective rent control 55				
15 percent increase for those who have not been given 1 increase since 1950 18				
Decontrol of rents 6				
Decontrol of vacant apartments 4				
Continued and effective rent control + 15% increase 17				
8. Your standard of living:				
(a) Is your income as much today as it was this time last year?	74	26	63	37
(b) Are you now— *Percent*				
Employed full time 64				
Employed part time 8				
Unemployed 8				
Retired 20				

With respect to the answers 2(a), 2(c), 2(d), and 2(e), the following are the results of the entire district as compared with the results above 96th Street:

	Entire district	Above 96th St.
2. Foreign affairs:	*Percent*	*Percent*
(a) Increase	26	27
Decrease	20	17
Discontinue	15	18
Maintain	39	38
(c) Strengthen	44	46
Maintain	47	43
Withdraw	9	11
(d) Economic	44	45
Diplomatic	16	15
Maintain	19	25
Economic and/or diplomatic	21	15
(e) Strengthen financial	44	35
Strengthen military	26	35
Discontinue	14	19
Strengthen financial and military	16	11

With respect to the answers of 3(a), the following are the results of the entire district as compared with the results above 96th Street:

	Entire district	Above 96th St.
3. Foreign trade:	*Percent*	*Percent*
(a) Continue as is	55	43
Revise	40	50
Discontinue	5	7

With respect to the answers of 7(a), the following are the results of the entire district as compared with the results above 96th Street:

	Entire district	Above 96th St.
7. Rent control:	*Percent*	*Percent*
(a) Continue	55	63
15-percent increase	18	18
Decontrol	6	4
Decontrol of vacant apartments	4	3
Continue and 15-percent increase	17	12

With respect to the answers of 8(b), the following are the results of the entire district as compared with the results above 96th Street:

	Entire district	Above 96th St.
8. Your standard of living:	*Percent*	*Percent*
(b) Full-time employment	64	51
Part-time employment	8	7
Unemployed	8	19
Retired	20	23

It will be seen, therefore, that the answers to most of the questions are comparable and that the viewpoints held are held without regard to the economic status of the constituency.

President Kennedy has recommended legislation which would promote the economy of our country and increase the purchasing power of the workingman. My questionnaire discloses that two-thirds of my constituency are employed full time whereas one-third are employed part time or retired or unemployed. This result justifies the viewpoint of our President in moving ahead to solve one of the major problems of the new administration, that is, the purchasing power of the working people in the United States. I am certain that my constituency will draw their own conclusions when they review the results as set forth above.

I thank them for favoring me with their opinions which I requested, and I intend to advise my constituency with the results. Many of my constituents included personal comments, suggestions, and notes, which because of their number, I am unable to answer individually. However, I am at my congressional office at 1484 First Avenue every Saturday afternoon between 1 and 5 p.m., and will be available and more than happy to have them pay me a visit, and to discuss any matter which they would like to personally bring to my attention.

National Radio Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, radio has come to have such a significant and pervasive role in our lives today that we tend to take it for granted.

We are likely to forget that it has grown to its present proportions in a few short decades.

A few remember the old crystal sets they made with copper wire, peanut butter cartons, and a crystal.

Today the radio is a necessity to the farmer and the rural resident. More than 99 percent of all farm homes have a radio and 79 percent have two or more in use.

There is an amusing story told about radio that might give point to the importance of this medium.

It concerns an old Indian brave who achieved wide local fame in his community with his excellent weather predictions. He was consulted by everyone. But one day he was cross and irritable and upset because he could not answer when asked what the weather would be. When he was asked why, he replied, truthfully enough, that a tube in his radio set had gone out.

Radio has, indeed, become the workhorse of agricultural communications bringing news and information as soon as it is available.

Millions of us share, too, the great religious music broadcast throughout the years, and at Easter and at Christmas time, as well as the inspiring messages which are delivered by our leading clergymen of many faiths.

Radio and its sister medium, television, bring music and other programs of the highest cultural level to the family fireside.

We must welcome with deep appreciation the educational radio and television fare and work to have more of such programs broadcast on what is undoubtedly one of the greatest educational mediums in the world today.

No longer is the farmer, his wife, and his children the forgotten people of our era, removed by the barriers of time and distance, from the cultural riches of our civilization.

They share with city folk at the same time and with the same means the rewarding things of life.

Radio thus united us as a people, and constantly knits up the seamless garment of our common aims and aspirations.

And now as we face up to the realities of the space age it will be radio and telecommunications that we will depend on to keep us well informed hour by hour.

Needed Now: A Joint Committee on the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith for the consideration of my colleagues as well as the tax-burdened citizens of this country a very timely article, which appeared in the April edition of Tax Review, by the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, our highly esteemed colleague and senior Senator from the State of Arkansas.

Senator MCCLELLAN points out in a very logical and forceful manner the need for a Joint Committee on the Budget to be set up within the Congress and responsible to the Congress. He very appropriately calls attention to the fact that the existing Bureau of the Budget is the agent of and responsible to the President. Further, that the Congress, which has the responsibility under the Constitution to appropriate funds, is more or less at the mercy of the executive department. This for the reason that the hearings before the Appropriations Committees of the Congress are virtually ex parte. The witnesses from the various departments of Government are largely, if not exclusively, from the executive branch, who present and attempt to justify the Presidential budget.

What the Congress—I repeat, responsible for spending the tax money—needs is a staff responsible to the Congress. The bill sponsored by Senator MCCLELLAN in the Senate and a similar bill sponsored by me in the House would provide the Appropriations Committees particularly and the Congress generally with an adequate staff of its own.

Senator MCCLELLAN has succeeded in having his bill passed by the Senate in two previous Congresses. The House Committee on Rules cleared my bill for floor consideration in 1953. But the House itself turned down its consideration by some 16 votes. Both Senator MCCLELLAN and I have reintroduced our bills, and I am very much in hopes that this much needed legislation can be passed at this session of the Congress. Certainly, with a national debt in excess of $290 billion and prospects of an additional deficit this year of $5 billion or more and possibly more next year,

something should be done to get our fiscal house in order.

Senator McCLELLAN'S article follows:

One of the most serious problems confronting the Nation today is the maintenance of national solvency in the face of ever-growing demands on the Federal Government for programs and services, coupled with the necessity of meeting the national defense requirements of the cold war and the atomic age. Our national expenditures budget has grown from $66 billion in fiscal year 1956 to $80.7 billion in 1961, and the probability of an $84.2 billion expenditures budget for fiscal year 1962.

Nor is the end in sight. The Congress is being bombarded constantly by demands for new or expanded programs in social welfare, education, agriculture, housing and other fields.

Breaking the fiscal year 1962 expenditures requests down by functions, we find that $48 billion is requested for major national security; $2.8 billion for international affairs and finance; commerce, housing and space technology, $3.8 billion; agriculture and agricultural resources, $5.7 billion; natural resources, $2.1 billion; labor and welfare, $6 billion; veterans services and benefits, $5.3 billion; interest, $8.6 billion; and general government, $2 billion.

While the President is clearly authorized to propose, it is equally clear that the responsibility to dispose rests with the Congress. Of this there can be no doubt. In fact, one of the most important responsibilities which the Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, vested in the Congress of the United States was the control over appropriations.

Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States provides, in part, that "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law * * *."

From the formation of our Government down to the present time, it has been clearly understood and accepted that this clause vested exclusively in the Congress the right to grant supplies of money to the various branches of the Federal Government, and to designate the purpose for which the money shall be used.

Perhaps an examination of the magnitude of this responsibility, in terms of the work it entails, will serve further to demonstrate its tremendous importance. Early in January of each year, the President submits the Federal budget to the Congress. It is usually a large document, running in excess of 1,000 pages, representing a full year of work on the part of the agencies and departments of the Government, as well as the Bureau of the Budget. The material contained in the Federal budget has been developed and assembled by a vast number of persons in the departments and agencies, reviewed and reorganized by each department and agency, and finally reviewed, revised and finalized by the Bureau of the Budget where some 450 persons are involved in the preparation and submission of the final document. In addition, in the Washington headquarters area alone, a total of some 2,000 persons in executive branch departments and agencies are involved in the preparation of the budget each year.

In addition to the Federal budget itself, a tremendous amount of detailed information is supplied in written form to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and presented orally at hearings which last for several months and cover thousands of typed and printed pages. Finally, when the requests are reduced to the form of legislative proposals, there are usually between 12 and 15 appropriations bills running many pages and containing thousands of separate items.

Over a period of 12 years, together with other Members of Congress, I have been seriously concerned over the manner in which the Congress handles its appropriations responsibilities. As I have studied congressional procedures for handling appropriations, I have become convinced that there are serious deficiencies in these procedures; and it is absolutely vital that we take steps immediately not only to remedy them but also to improve the surveillance exercised by the Congress over the expenditure of public funds.

Both the Senate and House Appropriations Committees perform their functions through subcommittees which deal with the appropriations requests of one or more departments and agencies. Hearings on budget requests are held by these subcommittees beginning sometime in January or early February and continue until their work is completed. Subcommittee recommendations are submitted to the full Appropriations Committee in each House and final action is then taken by the respective committees. All along the line the procedure is duplicated in both Houses, in that following hearings by House subcommittees, identical hearings are held by Senate subcommittees, although in the Senate emphasis is often placed by departmental representatives on restoring items which were deleted by the House.

TAXPAYER NOT REPRESENTED

The usual procedure followed by the Appropriations Committees is for witnesses representing executive branch departments and agencies to appear before a subcommittee, usually accompanied by a corps of technical experts from that agency, as well as from the Bureau of the Budget. The entire proceeding is virtually ex parte in nature, and these witnesses represent exclusively the point of view of the executive branch of the Government. Since it is their duty, as executive branch officials, to support all of the budget items contained in the President's budget, it becomes their function and responsibility to demonstrate, both by oral and written justifications, that the amounts requested are absolutely necessary. For the most part, these requests are supported by elaborate justifications and exhibits, based upon extensive agency research and by the testimony of technical experts who have devoted many years to the fields in which they have been working.

Unlike hearings on substantive legislation, where witnesses appear in support of or in opposition to pending bills, at appropriations hearings, testimony from the public, except on certain public works projects, is rarely, if ever, received. In a great majority of the proceedings before the subcommittees, no witnesses are present to represent the taxpayer, and the only manner in which the public interest can receive the consideration and protection it deserves with respect to either the purpose for which the funds are sought or their need or adequacy, is through careful scrutiny of the requests and justification by the few staff members who are assigned to handle each of the appropriation bills, and by members of the Appropriations Committees. Other Members of Congress who do not serve on the Appropriations Committees must, and generally do, rely largely on the recommendations of these committees when final action on appropriations measures is taken on the floor of each House.

Unfortunately, members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees are so heavily burdened by other legislative duties and responsibilities that they are unable personally to give adequate attention to each budget item. Equally important, however, is the fact that they do not have adequate facilities to obtain the information necessary to enable them to pass judgment on the necessity for the funds requested. Because the Congress is not adequately equipped to carry out its vital fiscal responsibilities, many millions of dollars have been appropriated in excess of actual requirements of the Federal Government. These excesses have, in turn, added to the large recurring deficits which must be passed on to already overburdened taxpayers.

Examining the results of a survey made by the Committee on Government Operations on the activities of the Senate in the 84th Congress, we found that, exclusive of sessions called for the purpose of marking up appropriation bills, the Senate Committee on Appropriations held some 300 open hearings consuming approximately 825 hours. In addition, at least 30 executive sessions were held to consider other matters pertaining to the functions of the committee, involving some 67 hours. In summary, the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in the 84th Congress, held a total of 330 meetings and consumed an estimated 900 hours on appropriations measures alone.

As a further illustration of the tremendous workload, the Senate Appropriations Committee, during the 84th Congress, had a regular standing subcommittee for each of the 12 major appropriations bills. Each member of the committee had a minimum of four subcommittee assignments, with some members serving on as many as six subcommittees. On many occasions there were two or three hearings in progress simultaneously and members sometimes found it necessary to attend one hearing for a limited time and then to participate, insofar as time permitted, in other hearings of subcommittees on which they served.

Aside from an overburdened staff, members of the Appropriations Committees are forced to rely upon two major sources of information: (1) the testimony of representatives of the executive branch who formulate the programs and present them in a light most favorable to their requests; and who tell us only as little or as much as they desire to disclose; and (2) information media, such as newspapers, periodicals, books, and radio and television programs. Of course, some Members of Congress have additional sources of information, such as members of their own office staffs, interested groups, confidential informers, or reliable friends who work in executive branch agencies.

This picture raises dramatically, in my judgment, the question of whether this is the way for the Congress of the United States to obtain information necessary to enable it to formulate the considered judgment which is its constitutional responsibility and which is so vital if it is to carry out its obligation to the American people.

MUST DEVELOP MACHINERY

The answer to the question is clearly and emphatically "No." It is not the way. If the Congress is to discharge its responsibilities with respect to the expenditure of public funds, it must develop the necessary machinery as well as adequate procedures. Only then will the Congress have the facts and background information necessary to enable it to act judiciously on requests for funds from executive branch agencies and departments. This machinery must be designed so as to enable the Congress to analyze more thoroughly and screen more effectively spending requests.

I propose to accomplish this vital objective by the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of an equal number of members from the Senate and House Appropriations Committee, staffed on a nonpolitical basis by outstanding experts and technicians. Such a joint committee would provide the Appropriations Committees with the same kind of expert staff facilities and technical information as the Bureau of the Budget provides for the executive branch.

Ample precedent for this proposal is found in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, established by the Congress more than 30 years ago, which is composed of members of the Ways and Means Committee

of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. These committees work together through this joint committee, using a trained, technical staff to enable it to obtain the facts and information needed for tax legislation. It seems obvious that it is just as important that the Appropriations Committees, which must pass on the expenditures of public funds, work together cooperatively through a joint committee with a trained professional staff to safeguard the revenues raised by taxation.

The proposed Joint Committee on the Budget would be required to inform itself with respect to all aspects of the annual budget of the departments and agencies of the Government, to examine all expenditure reports, and to investigate the details of Federal operations. Assisted by a nonpolitical staff of technical experts, the Joint Committee's functions would include, on a year-round basis, analyses of and reports on the details of program operations, a review of the administration of authorized programs and functions, and the compilation of data on agency activities and their conformity to or deviation from legislative authority. Although this information would be primarily for the use of the Appropriations Committees, it would be available to all other committees and to all Members of Congress.

WOULD BE "WATCHDOG"

The joint committee would also be required to utilize fully information emanating from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, and from all other sources as to estimated revenues and changing economic conditions, in order that a well-considered fiscal program may be devised to hold expenditures to a minimum in relation to anticipated Federal revenues. In addition, it would have investigative powers, and would be authorized to report on and recommend appropriate legislative changes to standing committees in order to eliminate wasteful practices, correct deviations from programs authorized by Congress, and effect cutbacks in such programs when consistent with essential requirements of Government and the national security.

In other words, this joint committee and its staff would work continuously, analyzing and screening the budget, checking on department and agency expenditures and determining where waste and extravagance exist, so that appropriations for succeeding years may be reduced or denied entirely where such action is warranted. It would serve as a congressional watchdog to do the work, obtain the facts and furnish the Congress with the information it needs to enable it to make cuts in appropriations where they can and should be made in the interest of governmental efficiency and economy.

The proposal to create a Joint Committee on the Budget has been studied carefully for more than 10 years by the Senate Committee on Government Operations, on which it is my privilege to serve as chairman. During the 82d, 83d, 84th, and 85th Congresses, the measure was approved by the Senate, the last three times without dissent. Unfortunately, the House of Representatives has not seen fit to take favorable action. I have reintroduced the bill in the 87th Congress (S. 529), together with 66 other Senators, and we are hopeful that a majority of Members of the House of Representatives will support it. Because of the continuing interest in the financial procedures of the Federal Government, in general, and in this proposal in particular, at my direction, the staff of the Committee on Government Operations has prepared a comprehensive study and analysis of existing and proposed legislation relative to fiscal management, published in the 87th Congress as Senate Document No. 11, "Financial Management in the Federal Government." Readers who are interested in further particulars concerning the joint committee proposal will find in that document a complete legislative history of the proposal, as well as an analysis of its background and major provisions.

Based upon my many years of study and consideration, it is my firm and sincere conviction that the establishment of a Joint Committee on the Budget, clothed with the authority and duties I have proposed, and staffed with nonpolitical experts and technicians, will equip the Congress with adequate machinery to enable it to carry out its constitutional responsibilities. It will enable the legislative branch to examine carefully every item of proposed expenditure so that appropriations may be limited to no more than is actually required to provide the funds which are essential to the successful operation of the Government.

I am firmly convinced that the adoption of this measure will do much to remedy existing deficiencies in procedures relative to the appropriation and expenditure of public funds, and that it constitutes a positive approach to the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations. Finally, I believe that in the face of ever-mounting spending pressures and ever-increasing budgets, it is essential to the welfare of the Nation that this proposal be enacted into law without delay.

Dan Ryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I call to the attention of my colleagues the death on April 8, 1961, of one of the great leaders in the civic as well as the political life of the city of Chicago, Daniel Ryan, president of the Board of Commissioners of Cook County.

Mr. Ryan was first elected to the county board in 1923 when he succeeded his father, Daniel Ryan, Sr., who had been president of the board. He served for 34 years as a member, the last 7 years of which he served as president. He also served as chairman of the roads and bridges committee, and for 10 years as chairman of the finance committee.

In these capacities he was instrumental in the establishment of a system of superhighways that now serves the Chicago area; the modernization of the Cook County Hospital and Nurses Home and its research arm, the Hektoen Institute; and also the expansion and protection of the forest preserve district of Cook County.

Mr. Ryan was one of the most powerful Democratic leaders in Illinois and was a close friend of the Honorable Richard J. Daley, mayor of the city of Chicago, and one of his most trusted advisers.

He had a multitude of friends in all walks of life and his many kind and charitable deeds, though he did not seek to publicize them, were well known throughout Chicago.

The sermon given by Archbishop William E. Cousins, of Milwaukee, a close personal friend of many years, at the Holy Name Cathedral, epitomizes Mr. Ryan's philosophy of life. I should like to quote a part of this sermon:

Mr. Ryan practiced to the fullest Christ's admonition to "render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God the things that are God's."

He rendered to Caesar the things that were Caesar's; he rendered to the Government he served a complete, humble, and full allegiance. And he rendered to God the things that were God's in his personal, family, and public life.

Mrs. Murphy and I join his many friends in extending our deepest sympathy and our prayers to his gracious wife, Ruby, his son Daniel III, and the other members of his family.

Tanks and Propaganda Only Dim Poland's Flame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. BATES

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, rumbling tanks and Soviet propaganda will never extinguish the flame of freedom in Poland, and it is fitting on this day, the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day, that we should renew our pledge to her people—a pledge to assist in the restoration of her independence and return to the Western family of nations.

I know that it is the constant prayer of thousands of my constituents in the Sixth Massachusetts District of Polish extraction, that their native country will soon be free from its present oppressive yoke.

A champion of human rights, Poland has never been totally crushed because of her indomitable character and creative vitality based on mental, moral, and spiritual vigor. The Pole abhors the despot, the tyrant, and the dictator. Men who undertook the task of guiding the Polish nation on the path of social progress, belonged to the most enlightened brains of the 18th-century Poland, and they fought and died for freedom.

Great names and lasting achievements in Polish history speak for themselves and the contributions of great leaders in government, music, arts, and sciences bring visions of a great heritage left to mankind.

We are, for vital reasons, seriously concerned with the present fate of our Polish friends, even though changing world events may dim our view as we watch communistic developments in Laos, Cuba, and other parts of the globe. Sealed off behind the Iron Curtain, millions of Polish people are virtually imprisoned in their homeland, and there they enjoy precious few of the freedoms for which they and their forebears fought so gallantly and courageously.

As we cherish our own glorious birthright, let us join with these valiant people in commemorating the inception of their liberty and pledge our help in the realization of their proper place among free nations.

The Polish Government is Communist—but its people are not.

Rumbling tanks and the steady drone of Soviet propaganda notwithstanding, Poland's flame of freedom shines brightly and her march toward independence is certain to succeed.

Law Day Address of Representative Burr P. Harrison of Virginia, Before Richmond, Va., Bar Association, May 1, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a speech of my esteemed friend and colleague, the Honorable BURR P. HARRISON, of Winchester, Va., Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia. Mr. HARRISON delivered his brilliant and learned address before the bar association of my native city of Richmond, Va., on May 1, in observance of Law Day. His timely remarks should be read and heeded by every citizen of our Republic:

LAW DAY ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE BURR P. HARRISON, OF VIRGINIA, BEFORE RICHMOND, VA., BAR ASSOCIATION, MAY 1, 1961

Throughout America today many gatherings commemorate the sublimity of our system of constitutional law. Most of these assemblies will hear a worthier speaker than you, but no orator anywhere will address this subject in a happier atmosphere than I. We meet here in Richmond where Patrick Henry defied the tyranny of British lawlessness and asserted his demand for liberty or death; here in Richmond where was enacted Thomas Jefferson's Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom; here in Richmond which witnessed the Virginia Convention of 1788, probably the outstanding group of intellectual giants ever to meet in one assembly, who subjected the provisions of our Constitution to its most penetrating and exhaustive debate; here in Richmond from whence as a member of this bar went John Marshall to expound that Constitution and to assure it the vibrancy of life and the virtue of justice, and, finally, here in Richmond, where sits the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, one court left in this land which restricts its doings to the problems of the forum and scorns to engage in the political controversies which belong on the Hustings, one court left in this land that holds that plain words have plain meanings and rejects the philosophy of Humpty-Dumpty that a "word means what I choose it to mean—no more and no less," one court left in this land whose members do not, and have no occasion to, engage in degrading wrangles as to which of them has degraded the court. Thank God there is one such court left in this land.

Our purpose today is to compare our system of law with the tyranny that bears the name of law wherever the Red Fascists of communism hold sway. It is time that, with absolute candor and no reservation, we should contrast all our strengths and weaknesses, our opportunities and our vulnerabilities, with those of our deadly enemies. Events of the last 10 days have brought us understanding, as never before, of the dire peril in which we stand. The daily march of momentous episodes carry us to the full realization that the sword which can plunge our own individual children into slavery or destruction hangs over their head by a single thread.

In a balance between our system of constitutional law and theirs of terror and oppression, the scales weigh heavily in our favor. Under honest administration, our law is the servant of the people; under theirs, the people are the servants of the law. Ours derives its just powers from the consent of the governed; theirs is maintained by subjugation and suppression. Theirs is tyranny under the law of terror; ours is liberty under the law of self-government.

We cannot lose this struggle if we are faithful to the principles of our law. Our strength will be as the strength of 10 and we will be the strong man to run the race. Communism's brutality and despotism is the soft underbelly which makes it vulnerable. If our country adheres to its constitutional government, we may walk through the valley of the shadow of death and fear no evil.

It is in the cancerous erosion of representative government that our peril lies. The paring away of our system of law, a little at a time, in imitation of totalitarian methods, is folly that leads to destruction. If our people have become so complacent and so effete that they permit our system of constitutional law to be whittled away by those who have sworn to defend it, we will lose this struggle with communism—and what's more, we will deserve to lose it.

Under the methodical arrangement of the parts of our law, the sole power to make law is in legislatures, which are quite as responsible for the public welfare as executives and judges. Yet, for years, the American people have permitted the lawmaking power vested in the legislatures of the several States to be siphoned off to Washington. During this same time, the power of the elected representatives in Washington has been subverted to bureaucracy and the judiciary. The balance of power is in imbalance, and the liberties of the people suffer as a consequence.

In no area is legislative responsibility more cynosural than in the power over the public purse. More and more over the years, State legislatures are required to appropriate in accordance with formulas developed by Washington bureaucracy. This goes on while elected representatives in the Congress delegate increasing control of public funds to a civil service over which neither the people, nor the Congress, nor, actually, the President, has effective control.

On Wednesday of last week, the Government of the United States moved dramatically to invade further the power of the people's representatives over the public purse and to subjugate the expenditure of public money to the notions of nonelected strangers in Washington, D.C. Tiny is the county of Prince Edward, but great is the principle that its people have the right to be taxed only by their representatives, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

The 14th amendment was designed as a shield to protect the individual from the State. In the tiny county of Prince Edward, we shall learn whether it will become a sword to strike down local self-government.

With reference to that part of their effort devoted to the closing of all Virginia schools until Prince Edward does their will, the actions of these nonelected Washington officials in bypassing the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals is, in some respects, the most insulting of all. It is basic that the laws of no State shall be found to be administered contrary to the Federal Constitution until passed upon by the legitimate interpreter of State laws, the State supreme court. There must be somebody in the Department of Justice with sufficient legal training to find the case of *Harrison* v. *Day* in volume 200 of the Virginia Reports, where the obligation of the State with respect to public education is clearly set forth.

The action in Prince Edward, though ruthless, is not an isolated incident. It forms a pattern. It finds its counterpart in the decision of Federal judiciary to substitute its judgment for that of the discount committees of banks and to compel banks to release their money after judges have looked into the minds of money lenders and have found that credit was denied on account of political activity and not because of credit risk. It has its counterpart in the action of Federal judiciary in compelling a renewal of an ended contract when one of the parties did not want to renew the contract. It has its counterpart in the action of Federal judiciary in forbidding the lawful assembly of parents to discuss the educational problems of their children. It has its counterpart in the action of Federal judiciary in decreeing that when Congress said a closed shop shall be illegal, Congress meant a closed shop shall be legal; that when Congress said shop foremen may not be organized, Congress meant shop foremen may be organized. It has its counterpart in countless bureaucratic and judicial performances done without sanction of law and maintained by fiat which on one occasion was backed by military force.

All this is the beginning of despotism and, unchecked, leads to absolute depotism. It is an interesting coincidence that the menace of communism has grown as the virility of our self-government has declined. As we weaken our system of checks and balances; as we eclipse the powers of elected representatives of the people; as we move away from the spirit of constitutional law, we dissipate a powerful weapon in the arsenal of democracy and move toward the day of annihilation and destruction.

No Federal Aid to Education and Balancing the Budget by Curtailing New Government Programs Favored in Poll of 10th District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in pointing out that the constituents of my district—10th, Illinois—have answered the public opinion poll I sent them and left no doubt that they overwhelmingly favor a balanced budget, preferring this to any expansion of new Federal programs. Seventy-three percent of those who answered the poll favor balancing the budget by cutting down on new Federal activities. I submit that this is a sizable percentage.

Those polled also definitely oppose measures aimed at granting Federal-aid-to-education activities. Forty-eight percent favor loans only for school districts that are unable to provide adequate standards of education.

I am convinced that complete results of the poll, which follow, provide interesting reading:

[Figures are percentages of questionnaires returned]

	Yes	No	No opinion
I. Federal aid to education: Do you favor—			
Federal funds for teachers' salaries	20	69	11
Federal funds for school construction	31	61	8
Federal loans for private and parochial schools	17	77	6
Leaving the full responsibility to State and local communities	67	23	10
Federal loans to only those school districts unable to meet the required standards	48	42	10
II. Foreign trade policies and tariffs. Do you favor—			
Setting restrictive limits or quotas on the volume of imported competitive goods?	55	33	12
Increasing tariffs and duties on competitive foreign-manufactured goods and products?	53	36	11
Maintaining present tariff rates and policies but removing Executive authority to provide any further reductions until 1962?	44	31	25
III. How would you solve Post Office deficit of $900,000,000 annually?			
Increase 1st-class postage from 4 to 5 cents, airmail from 7 to 8 cents?	22	53	25
Increase 2d- and 3d-class mail rates?	67	16	17
Increase rates of all types of mail service across the board?	41	44	15
IV. Budget and debt policies: Do you favor—			
Balancing the current budget by curtailing new Federal programs?	73	18	9
Increasing the national debt ceiling to meet cost of new programs over and above anticipated revenues?	22	75	3
Cutting all wartime excise taxes and cutting Federal spending accordingly?	70	19	11
Increasing taxes to meet the cost of any new programs?	17	70	13
V. Federal medical care legislation: Do you favor—			
Assistance limited to social security recipients by increasing social security tax rates?	30	59	11
Assistance to all citizens over 65 based upon criteria of need with Federal Government and States sharing the cost?	55	35	10
VI. To halt shrinking of U.S. gold reserves, do you favor—			
Putting limits on U.S. industry investments abroad through more restricted taxation?	63	24	13
Adopting more restrictive trade policies in basic commodities?	50	29	21
Reducing number of military and Government personnel abroad?	63	25	12
Lowering limit on duty-free goods brought back into the United States by American tourists?	60	29	11
VII. Foreign aid appropriation legislation: Do you favor—			
Providing 3 separate bills for the military, economic, and technical assistance phases of the mutual security fund?	48	19	33
Providing more assistance in the Western Hemisphere nations and cutting elsewhere?	49	28	23
Reducing direct grants of assistance and increasing foreign loan programs accordingly?	65	14	21
Cutting all phases of foreign aid?	45	40	15
Insisting that other free nations capable of helping distressed countries share the burden?	92	2	6
VIII. Presidential election system: Do you favor—			
Continuing with the present electoral college system?	14	69	17
Direct election of President by candidate receiving greatest number of popular votes?	63	23	14
Adopting proportional plan wherein each elector would cast presidential vote in keeping with the popular vote total in his district rather than the present winner-take-all plan?	45	31	24

Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD my "Report From Washington," because of its bearing on the current crisis.

Something took place in Washington this past week which shows the gravity of the international situation in which the United States now finds itself. As the Nation's Capital, Washington, was of course involved in the civil defense air raid warning test, conducted throughout the Nation to test our communications, and the Conelrad warning network.

As one might expect, Washington probably has the most comprehensive air raid warning system in the Nation, and when the sirens started howling here the noise was loud enough to drown out an Ozark family reunion complete with hoedown back in our beloved Missouri hills. But what stands out in my mind, is that many persons who complacently missed all the newspaper, radio, and TV publicity on the test actually thought a real attack was underway and that the missiles were on the way.

Their fears, real or fancied, are perhaps the clearest indication of the seriousness of the international crisis now facing our country.

Indeed, events are happening so swiftly that one crisis comes along while a previous one is still on the front pages. And so, in rapid succession, we have had the Russian manned space flight, or at least the claims thereof, the Cuban fiasco, the Algerian revolt, and the Communist military success and deceit in Laos.

The President has met over three times within the last week with the National Security Council; and reports indicate that consideration is being given, not to how to save Laos, but to how to lose it gracefully.

It is impossible to disguise the magnitude of the defeat which the United States and our allies have suffered in Laos, Cuba, and world prestige.

While we have issued "strong words," the Communists have been countering with "strong deeds." On one hand, the Communist rebels have been dangling a cease-fire agreement in front of our officials like a Yo-yo, and each time we have grasped, the string has been pulled, tantalizingly, just beyond our reach. With the other hand, the Communist rebels have been taking over territory so swiftly that we virtualy have nothing left to bargain for.

The Communists now control the northern half of Laos. A month ago they controlled only one-third. The price of a cease-fire is likely to be Communist domination of any so-called neutralist government which is set up. If this occurs, Laos seems certain to be converted into a major base for Communist operations against neighboring South Vietnam. If this comes to pass, the fall of southeast Asia to the Communists is at best only a matter of time, as Laos, Vietnam, Malaya, and Thailand complete the pincers movement, and lays bare an unprotected Burma and India.

Just as in a game of chess, one move in the field of international power politics can have a drastic effect on the next move. And so it is, that what has happened in Cuba has affected not only Cuba, but every other place where we are at grips with Russia, in the so-called cold war. Having inflicted a setback of major proportions in our own backyard, the Communists are now using that opportunity to apply pressure in every other part of the world. As soon as, and if, the Lao crisis is over, we may expect new pressures to be applied on Berlin, in South Vietnam, and any other place where we are vulnerable, even Korea, again.

Having reached this incredible situation in the short space of only a few months, there are strong rumors in Washington that some drastic changes are about to take place in the executive branch of our Government.

There is much to indicate that Government by "professors and theorists" is about to be abandoned. U.S. News & World Report magazine points out that the new administration brought in a wide range of top-level "professors," noted for their theories about how the United States and the world should be run. The theories ranged from how to deal with Russian Dictator Khrushchev to how White House operations could be made to work more efficiently. Today, little more than 3 months later, doubts have begun to rise, even among the President's aids. Experience, in a brief

time, has clashed sharply with theory. Nothing has happened, as the professors theorized, it should happen. And so, the magazine concludes, the "professors" will now lose some of their influence because their neatly reasoned ideas about Khrushchev and the world have not worked out, in practice. Words, which have been superabundant in this administration—over 150 white papers and messages, so far—are likely to be reduced somewhat in number. Actions, when taken, will be based less on snap judgment, and more on conference.

The question facing Washington, and the Nation, is whether there is still time to act, and how to draw the line.

Freedom, Si, Communism, Never

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most impressive editorial from a recent edition of the celebrated Worcester (Mass.) Gazette entitled "The Meaning of Communism." It is refreshing that the able editorial of this paper which makes many valuable contributions to contemporary thought on public issues should have drawn attention in this admirable editorial to the morals and concepts of family life against the Communist backdrop.

When fundamental Marxist beliefs are considered, it will be seen and recognized by fair, impartial commentators that, as the editorial points out, the Marxist virus is imbedding itself deeper into Soviet society, and this trend appears most ominously in the field of family relations which are, in contemplation of Western civilization, the very foundation stone of free, democratic society.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that we have some thinkers and commentators among us who are willing to gloss over or make light of the various antidemocratic, antireligious, and antisocial ideas which are essential parts and working techniques of the Communist ideology. There are also those who do not believe that the Communist conspiracy constitutes a great threat to our democratic system, or our free enterprise system.

Even a cursory study of Marxism demonstrates certain fundamentals that are not only alien to but incompatible with free, democratic principles. The specious idea of class struggle, the materialistic conception of history, the fanatical hatred of and opposition to all forms of religious belief, the incessant warfare against the institutions of the family and other traditional patterns of freedom, the fostering of racial and religious antagonism, offenses against international order and continual aggression, and threats of aggression, accompanied by nefarious infiltration of other weak governments and nations—all clearly reveal the Marxist system as one committed to hatred, animosity, violence, and enmity toward most of the most precious ideas upon which Western civilization rests, toward the human race itself.

The Soviet Marxist system is based on the theory that a man as such has no being or existence independent of the state, but is merely a puppet of the great, bureaucratic, absolute superstate which neither recognizes his existence as an individual soul, nor his basic rights as a human being.

Under this system marriage and divorce are reduced to post card status. Human relations between husband and wife, father and mother, sister and brother, and relatives and members of the family circle are either blatantly ridiculed and discouraged, or systematically prohibited with the thought that in time over the course of a few generations, filial love, and the instinct for family life can be suppressed and its great powers transferred to a superstate ogre.

People who are capable of holding to such beliefs simply do not know human nature. They fail to observe the conduct of the jungle beast, let alone the sacrifice that parents and members of families have historically made throughout the centuries in ways so graphic as to defy description. The idea of this seeming, gross oversight could not be better expressed than it is in this editorial. If we destroy the family institution there will be little, if anything, left of civilization.

The eloquent editors of the Gazette could do no better service to the country at this time than to continue their writings on the ghastly ideological deficiencies of the Marxist system and the debasement of human feelings and human values which it entails, not to speak of its dangerous penetration into the internal fabric of this Nation and much of the free world.

Let us awaken, Americans. Tomorrow may be too late.

Time and time again in my public utterances and statements I have decried the subtle and not so subtle attacks of organized communism on the family unit, upon our Western religious spirit and morality, upon our basic economic and social patterns and our entire way of life. I have repeatedly deplored the insidious growth and spread of Communist ideas in American educational, scientific, and secular life. But my warnings and urgent pleas seem too often to have fallen on deaf ears. Why will not the American people and their leaders be aroused to these great perils?

The article follows:

THE MEANING OF COMMUNISM

For the past few years, certain quarters have been hopefully promoting the theory that the Soviet Union is mellowing. Those who hold this view predict that time is softening the harsh Communist ideology and that greater wealth and freedom will eventually turn Russia into a sort of middle class, social welfare state with which we can coexist peacefully.

But recent indications suggest that this is at best a half-truth, if even that. Far from relaxing its hold, the Marxist virus is embedding itself deeper in Soviet society. In some respects, at least, the Soviet Union is becoming more like George Orwell's vision of 1984 than like the United States of America.

This trend is seen most ominously in the field of family relationships, which are the foundation and the key to the free, democratic way of life. The Soviet planners have correctly concluded that reactionary family ties are the biggest obstacle to "pure communism." And they have also apparently concluded that the answer is the virtually total separation of children and parents from infancy, with the children brought up in state-run collectives.

A recent article by Stanislav Strumilin, deputy chairman of the Soviet State Planning Commission, spells it out:

"Parents will be permitted to visit the children's premises and their living quarters as often as the rules allow. But a children's collective, when directed by an experienced pedagogue, is incomparably better equipped to give the greatest indoctrination to the child with the best social habits than the most loving and attentive mothers. Egotistic inclinations of the child will be snuffed out in the cradle. In place of this, all inborn social instincts and sympathies will be developed as the result of new conditioned reflexes formed in the process of daily comradely interrelationships."

To the westerner, there is something obscene in this. The idea of tiny children being deliberately cut off from the loving care of their mothers, brought up through their formative years to think of the state as the source of all intelligence and goodness, without religion, without the warmth of family ties, without knowing the meaning of home, is abhorrent. The generation thus produced will surely be a new race of massmen, cut off from the human traditions that have shaped all civilization for thousands of years.

The Soviet state apparently is preparing to go through with this program, to separate children from their parents as early and as completely as possible. But in their rush to produce a breed of willing, instinctive automatons, will the masters of the Soviet people overreach themselves? Is there anything in Marx or Engels that can ease the ache in the lonely human heart?

Charles F. Crowley Nomination for the Football Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it was most gratifying to have word recently of the nomination of my good friend, the late Charles F. Crowley, of Cambridge, Mass., for the Football Hall of Fame.

Charles F.—Charlie—Crowley, distinguished alumnus of the great Cambridge Latin School was one of the outstanding football leaders of his generation.

He was educated at Cambridge Latin, Harvard College, and Notre Dame University and his career on the gridiron

of his day stood out like a beacon light in the history of American sport.

He was recognized by his contemporaries as a rugged, star football player of invincible spirit and dogged determination. The great Percy Haughton named him as the greatest end he had ever coached, and the famous Jim Thorpe hailed him as the only end who ever stopped him without a single gain during the course of any football game.

At Notre Dame, he was the teammate and close friend of the noted Knute Rockne, Gus Dorais, and others who were developing the modern game at Notre Dame and bringing the forward pass into the important role that it plays today.

After a brilliant career as a player, Charlie Crowley later entered the field of coaching at Harvard where I first met him, and where he aided materially in promoting the success of great Harvard teams of that time.

He was head coach at Dallas University in Texas where his teams made a deep impression on the entire southern conference, and later at Columbia University, first under Percy Haughton, and later as head coach, where his teams made the best record in modern Columbia history.

Charlie Crowley was undoubtedly an outstanding sports figure of his day, and a real credit to any and every institution with which he was associated and a great credit to the game of football and American sport.

But Charlie Crowley was something more than that: he was an outstanding coach, a great American, and a noble Christian gentleman.

While he was a rugged, courageous competitor greatly respected by his opponents, he was esteemed and respected for his sense of fair play, his inspiring leadership of young men, and his superb brand of sportsmanship.

While he believed that any game worth playing was worth winning, he was an ardent disciple of hard, clean play, and always stood for the highest standards of sportsmanship and conduct on and off the football field.

He was a man of amiable and generous personal qualities, a great human being interested in promoting sound values in his boys, helping them with their problems and encouraging them to seize their opportunities and take up the burdens of leadership in whatever field of life they aspired.

Though he was endowed with strong, rugged personal traits and a remarkable courage, and quick-witted reactions that enabled him to rise above almost any situation, he was a man of supreme kindness, gentility, and love of his fellow man. He was beloved by all who knew him, and he was a friend whose loyalty knew no bounds.

Such a man was Charles F. Crowley, who is so fittingly honored by a recent coaches' nomination for the Football Hall of Fame.

We can all be proud that this noble American lived in his time to make such noteworthy contributions to the game which he loved, to the youth which he so intelligently and devotedly trained, to our schools and colleges, and to the Nation which he served in war and in peace with all his heart.

The life and work of Charlie Crowley will long be remembered. His burning faith, his high ideals, and his unselfish contributions are a source of genuine pride to all of us who were close to him and to all of those in this great country of ours who admire rugged character, inspiring example, stalwart Americanism, and unswerving loyalty to the principles of our national life.

It was a great honor and privilege for me, Mr. Speaker, to join in impressive exercises for my very dear and beloved friend, one of the great figures of the American gridiron, Charlie Crowley, on December 20, 1960, at Cambridge Latin School, Cambridge, Mass., when I made the presentation of the Charles Crowley Memorial Cup to a very fine young man of whom Charlie Crowley would be very proud, Louis E. Cellineri, Cambridge Latin football star and honor student who was selected for this honor by his coaches and Headmaster Jack Sheehan.

This award was made for the first time at an assembly at Cambridge Latin which had many of Charlie Crowley's old friends in attendance, including a large delegation of Gridiron Club members, and the proud parents of the outstanding young man, Louis E. Cellineri.

Crowley's career was one which truly serves as an inspiration for the young men of the Nation. Starting at famous Cambridge Latin School where he was an all-round athlete and captain of the football team, he was probably the only man in the history of American football who could claim the honor of having been a star player at both Harvard and Notre Dame. His outstanding skill as a player and repute as a gentleman, sportsman, and student, still continue to be legendary at both these great American universities.

At Harvard he played on some of the great Percy Haughton famous teams and at Notre Dame where, with his warm friends, the immortal Rockne, illustrious Gus Dorais, and other greats, he became one of the leading originators and exponents of the type of forward pass football and the open game that now dominates the American scene.

The great and famed Boston sportswriter, George C. Carens, took occasion recently in his celebrated column to comment on the Crowley Award and at the same time briefly outline Charlie's brilliant career alluding to his close association with Percy Haughton and Rockne, two of the truly outstanding men in American football and Gus Dorais, another coach-player of first magnitude.

The fine young man, Louis E. Cellineri, is following in several respects in Crowley's footsteps, and as the first recipient of the Charles Crowley Memorial Cup at Cambridge Latin School he unquestionably has a brilliant athletic, academic, and personal career ahead of him.

He was selected for the Crowley Award by experts who evaluated and appraised his magnificent work as a player and these included the very eminent headmaster of Cambridge Latin School, Hon. John Sheehan, his teachers, coaches, and others familiar with his all-round performance, not only as an athlete but as a brilliant student and an inspiring young leader.

The selection of Cellineri as a student-athlete carries out the gleaming heritage and tradition of this old and highly esteemed secondary school, one of the greatest in the Nation, which throughout its long faithful service as an outstanding educational institution has emphasized the building of character, the cultivation of the arts and sciences, the encouragement and inspiration of lofty aims and achievement and the virtue of the old Roman expression "Mens sana in corpore sano" and the effective balancing of the intellectual and the physical, and, of course, proper emphasis on the role of those spiritual values which must predominate in any adequate, successful program.

The headmaster of this great school is an inspiration in himself and the same is true of the excellent teaching staff. Jack Sheehan has distinguished himself as one of the great educators of our State. A brilliant athlete in his day, an accomplished scholar and student, an inspirational and highly qualified leader, Jack Sheehan has admirably carried on the great traditions of Cambridge Latin and the same may be said of his associates on the teaching staff of this renowned school.

On the day I had the honor of presenting the first Charles F. Crowley Award, I was profoundly impressed with the atmosphere that prevailed in the school, the complete order and attentiveness of the more than 3,000 boys and girls crowded into the huge auditorium.

An air of solemnity pervaded the great room and you could almost hear a pin drop during the exercises presided over by Headmaster Sheehan. The dignified, able, and distinguished head of the Veterans' Administration at Boston, a great personal friend of Charlie Crowley for many years, the beloved and respected Gen. William J. Blake, spoke of Crowley's great intrinsic worth, high character, and his superb contribution as a captain of the infantry in World War I and his highly gifted, effective, and outstanding service to the work of the Veterans' Administration as a learned lawyer, counselor, and valued aid in this vital work.

Lifelong friends, schoolmates, teammates, and admirers of Crowley's were gathered to join in the tribute of honor and affection being paid him. They included his Veterans' Administration associate, Neil Cronin, John Irwin, Patrick Roche, his close friend, Dr. Simon Kelleher, Tom Hickey, the incomparable N. V. (Swede) Nelson of Harvard football fame, one of the greatest after-dinner speakers and finest American sportsman, John Carver, John Glacken, and his old and very dear friend, Charles Linehan, another inspiring football great and longtime outstanding beloved and revered coach of Rindge Technical School, a teacher, educator, and gentleman of unsurpassed character, integrity, ability, and good works, Joseph Kozlowski, famous Boston College foot-

ball star, Henry C. Lynch, another warm friend and great teacher and Dr. Edmund J. Twohig, and very close friend, Dr. William Sharry. The distinguished colleagues and comrades were crowded into a special section reserved for Charlie Crowley's gracious and beloved wife and helpmate, Mrs. Myrtle Crowley, his two lovely daughters, Mrs. Mary Rogers together with her two sons, and Miss Jean Crowley.

There was an unusual quality of solemn appreciation of a great event about this award that made a vivid and lasting impression upon the participants and everyone in attendance and the stirring occasion will long be remembered as one of the moving events of its kind in the long, bright history of Cambridge Latin School and Massachusetts.

I feel that a special word of commendation should be said of the interest and efforts of the great sports figure and teacher, Mr. Charles Linehan, in assisting Headmaster Sheehan with the arrangements for the award which contributed so greatly to the success of the occasion. His loyalty to his ideals and his friends, not to speak of his other noble qualities, make him stand out in Cambridge and in the Nation.

Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in this study of the administration's first hundred days, there is not, I believe, a more significant or important trend indicated by acts and omissions than that which lies in the area of foreign policy.

We are living in an age in which the very structure of our civilization, the lives of our people and their offspring yet unborn, the whole future course of history particularly as it has reference to the continuation of the principles of this Republic, are being determined by the conduct of our foreign policy.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there has never been a period in the lifetime of our Nation in which our lives and liberties, our goals and hopes, were more dependent upon the delicate strands woven into the fabric of our relationship with other nations, with other ideologies rooted deep in the foundations of foreign states.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the activities of the President and his subordinates in this most sensitive area must be based upon sound, indeed, upon faultless judgment. The lessons of recent history must be ever present in the minds of those who guide the ship of state. This is not, Mr. Speaker, a time for innovation for the sake of innovation, a time to ignore the realities of the situation solely to provide an outlet for the ever-busy minds of those within the administration whose penchant for social experimentation has blinded them to the cold winds that swirl about the fringes of civilization.

With these facts in mind, Mr. Speaker, an examination of the first 100 days of this administration reveals not a parallel with the first 100 days of the New Deal, but rather a trend that brings to mind discomforting thoughts of the 100 days to Waterloo.

Let us examine the drift of American foreign policy since January 20. Has it followed the course charted by the dictates of past experience? Experience which has taught all reasonable men that any embraces shared with the ravenous Soviet bear will ultimately result in benefit to the bear and the bear alone.

The acts of the Kennedy administration in these first 100 days indicate that it has not.

Much has happened since January 20. The Republican Members of this body have not sought to exploit recent disasters for the very obvious political benefits that might be gained. I do not intend to depart from this policy.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there is a very legitimate question that can be raised over the trend toward appeasement that has manifested itself since the administration took office.

Many of the old Acheson appeasers have reappeared on the scene still befogged by the notion that softness is the best reply to Soviet aggression.

Their hands have been visible in such instances as the release arranged by the State Department and the Attorney General of a Soviet spy caught red-handed in the process of committing espionage against the United States.

Communist propaganda, much of it not bearing the label of the Soviet Union from whence it comes, has been freed from restrictions and permitted to flow into the mainstream of American thought and opinion.

One of the more disquieting aspects of this trend toward appeasement has been the tendency of President Kennedy to make ringing declarations concerning our determination to resist Communist aggression while so many of those formally dedicated to appeasement are still in the background of this administration.

This, I submit, is disquieting since it causes the American people to believe that we are adopting the hard attitudes they favor when, as a matter of fact, precisely the opposite is true.

It is unfortunate, but obviously true, that the hard words are a facade whose only supports are the bean-pole and cornstalk braces of indecision, wishful thinking, and the almost Freudian desire to have all the world love the United States regardless of the cost to our national security.

Consistent rumors and vague statements that dart in and out through the dense undergrowth of the English language by administration figures such as Adlai Stevenson, Chester Bowles, and J. K. Galbraith have characterized the administration's attitudes on the question of Red China.

This single question, Mr. Speaker, contains more omens of trouble to come than any other problem now in existence. It illustrates the trend toward softness better than any other subject recently discussed in the Nation's press.

For some years, the U.S. Government has, through the strongest diplomatic pressures, prevented the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Such pressure was necessary since many of our fellow U.N. members were being subjected to relentless campaigns at home demanding admission at all costs.

Because Ambassador Stevenson, Chester Bowles, and J. K. Galbraith, each high in the Kennedy administration have been less than concise in their expressions on the subject, doubt has been sowed around the world as to our real sentiments on the question. Already, the Brazilian and Commonwealth nations have let it be known that they will not support our position any longer.

Mr. Speaker, any signs of a weakening of our position on this matter, and I submit that the failure of many administration officials to take a forthright and unmistakable stand on the subject is, in fact, a sign of weakness, and will inevitably lead to admission of Red China into the U.N. and the ultimate crippling of that body as an instrument of world peace.

We find scant comfort in Mr. Kennedy's description of the Associated Press story out of London on April 12, which said, among other things, that the President had told Prime Minister Macmillan that he would need "12 months to prepare the American people" for the admission of Red China, as inaccurate "in that it stated that we had changed our position on the moratorium."

Mr. Speaker, it may be that my command of the English language is inadequate and leads me to mistaken conclusions, but this statement does not appear to disavow the body of the story—the brainwashing of the American people into accepting a betrayal of the people of China—and it leaves open the real question, the administration's true attitude on the matter.

Admission of Red China to the United Nations, Mr. Speaker, would lead to the eventual loss of all Asia. It would be a betrayal so cynical in its nature that the entire free world would be put on notice that the United States does not stand by its friends—that it only appeases its enemies.

Nor can we find solace in the continual reference by the administration to the legitimate Government of China—the Republic of China—as the Taiwan or Formosa Government. This, I submit, is a harbinger of a two-China policy and I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that such a policy also represents betrayal.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives took a firm stand in opposing admission of Red China to the United Nations only 3 weeks ago. This stand, contained in a statement of policy unanimously adopted, was carefully documented.

Another area that causes great concern is that in which lies the question of a nuclear test ban.

This shameful masquerade has been going on for years, and it has failed to

bear any fruit whatsoever. In the meantime, we have crippled our nuclear capabilities by continuing a unilateral ban on safe underground testing so vital to the development of new fallout-free small weapons. If we are to survive, Mr. Speaker, we must resume such tests immediately should the Soviet Union fail to reach an agreement with us within the next several weeks. Any other course is madness and I cannot avoid calling to mind the injunction that "whom the gods would destroy they first drive mad."

Mr. Speaker, I have tried, in these brief remarks, to point out a disturbing trend toward appeasement which is a product of these first hundred days. There are other instances where this trend has been manifested. The return to secret diplomacy is one such instance. Another is the tendency of our Ambassador to the United Nations to ally himself against our friends and allies in NATO and to join with the Soviet bloc in the vague and unrealistic hope of impressing certain underdeveloped nations whose populace, by virtue of an appalling mass illiteracy and ignorance, is far beyond being impressed by such sophistry as votes in the United Nations. Further, Mr. Speaker, I submit that our votes on the Angola question have now laid us open to a similar situation regarding the Panama Canal Zone.

Mr. Speaker, in closing permit me to sound a warning—if the trend toward unrealistic, wishful thinking and appeasement so manifest in these first hundred days is not corrected at once there may well be a very limited number of 100-day periods left to us during which we can enjoy our liberty and its concomitant blessings.

Remarks of Hon. Paul A. Fino, of New York, at Dedication of Bluttal Building at the Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center in the Bronx

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, my dear friend and colleague, Congressman PAUL A. FINO, was recently a guest speaker at the Kingsbridge Heights Jewish Center in the Bronx. Congressman FINO's remarks were delivered on the occasion of the dedication of the Bluttal Building of the center which ceremonies were held on Sunday, March 19, 1961.

I am privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of Congressman FINO's speech:

Mr. Chairman, Rabbi Miller, Mrs. Bluttal, members of the center, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, today is a proud and special day for Kingsbridge Heights, and I am honored to be here among you. When Mr. Moskowitz kindly invited me to attend this event, he described the 3 years of effort which this community building represents, as a labor of love. I can well believe that it has been a labor of love. The idea for facilities like these, in this location, is a splendid one. And the only thing better than that good idea is the structure itself. This community building, in my judgment, is a magnificent and impressive one.

Beauty and utility seem to be found in close company more and more often these days. This is true of many of the implements and gadgets we use around our homes, and it is becoming more and more the case with many of the buildings we live and work in. Sometimes I think many of the Government buildings in Washington were built on the theory that utility and beauty are enemies, and that if you try to achieve one of these two aims, you might as well forget the other. I can report that utility generally came out on top.

On the other hand, here in New York, it seems to me, we have had several delightful examples in the last few years of structures, many of them office buildings, in which usefulness and attractive design are combined. This community building, which your efforts have put here, is a happy illustration of trend.

I haven't been inside this center yet, but from without it seems to have a welcome aspect. In my imagination, I can already picture the meetings which will be taking place here, the banquets that will be held, the plans made, and the work that will be done, the festive occasions that will be celebrated, and the possibilities that exist there for quiet conversation, reading, reflection and relaxation.

The American Jewish Year Book informs me that this fine community center is one of approximately 350 Jewish community centers in the United States. In 1947 these organizations had a combined membership of 458,000 and today it is well over 600,000. These figures seem dry in print, but in the light of what I have seen here today, they take on vitality and significance. Beyond those community centers which are already up and in operation, there are several more in the building stage and in the planning stage. These facts are testimony that our developing communities need these centers, and that these needs are being met in a lively and energetic way. This community building in Kingsbridge Heights is going to be good for this neighborhood and city. It is also a blessing, I feel confident, to the Nation at large. By putting your structure here you have brought many benefits to this neighborhood. You have, first of all, put a new luster on the very word "neighborhood." Your building is going to be a place where neighbors and friends can pursue common interests and solve mutual problems together.

Sometimes I think the reason we hear so much about togetherness these days is that there is so little of it left anymore. Why is this? Partly because we have solved some of our more immediate problems of food and shelter. Maybe there is less in the way of family activities together because of rapid transportation and commuting. Father no longer lives and works in the same locality. He spends a third of his life at work, a third at home, and a third on the train or bus or in the taxicab or car. Maybe television is the villain—maybe that is why we see each other less often. In any event, with this building you have created, there is a good chance that Kingsbridge Heights is somewhat closer to our idea of a neighborhood with all the pleasant connotations which that word suggests.

The Bronx needs space for recreation and relaxation, that is certain, and you have provided it. This new and spotless structure should be taking on a lived-in look very quickly. That is all to the good. That is the way it is supposed to look. Activities in this building will be an indication of how much this building is needed and evidence that we need more community buildings like it. Not only does your fine community building help this neighborhood and community, it is also a feather in the cap of the whole United States. I have one thing in mind when I make this assertion.

The way in which you have helped the United States at large is simply this. You have demonstrated the idea that there is a necessary partnership between Government, on the one hand, and private efforts on the other. Government can accomplish much when broad-scale action is required. But often in the area of human needs, what is required is a local, neighborhood, tailor-made response to a specific problem. This is the type of response your new community building represents. You have put your minds and energies into it, and, of course, your hearts. By doing so, as I said before, you have made a gift to the whole country.

In closing, may I say in your own language, "Mozeltov."

Policy for Growth—Address by the Secretary of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Monday, April 24, 1961, I was among those who had the privilege of listening to a heartening and forceful address delivered by Hon. Luther H. Hodges before the National Press Club.

There has been no doubt in my mind at any time since the nomination of Governor Hodges to be Secretary of Commerce was confirmed that under his able leadership the Department is entering a new era and has a new concept of its responsibilities.

As Secretary Hodges expressed it in his address to the Washington press corps:

There is no place for a passive service department.

The new Secretary is a man of action, and he intends to get things done. Already he has taken effective steps to beef up our export trade, to recognize and strengthen the role of science and technology in our economy, to promote traffic safety, and to close the annual $1.1 billion travel gap.

As chairman of the Committee on Commerce, which has legislative jurisdiction over most of the activities of the Department of Commerce, I think I can assure Secretary Hodges of the committee's cooperation in his efforts to revitalize the Department and its role of strengthening our trade, both foreign and domestic, our transportation, and our technology in the national interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address entitled "Policy for Growth," delivered by Secretary of Commerce Hodges before the National Press Club on April 24, 1961, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY FOR GROWTH

(Address by Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges to the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., Monday, April 24, 1961)

I appreciate, President Cosgrove, your invitation to speak here today. I am just back from a 4-day trip to the Pacific Northwest where I met with trade groups and saw firsthand how a community and a region can help in promoting exports. Next week, I am off to Europe for 10 days to help sell American exports and do what I can to push forward our urgent program of export expansion and two-way international travel.

With all this moving around, it's a pleasure, as the visitor says, to be in Washington. And it's a particular honor and treat to be able to talk to you today.

Jefferson used to say that when a man assumes public office, he should consider himself as public property. I don't know how many of you are avid to claim me as a public possession, but I do know I feel a very real obligation to make myself as available as I can to the public, and mainly through you, the press.

Since February, as you're probably aware, I have been holding news conferences regularly every other Tuesday, and we have had other sessions as important stories came along. I intend to continue this practice and to see to it that in every way you have the broadest access possible to Commerce information. You and the public are entitled to know exactly what we are doing in the Department and, equally important, what we are not doing that we should do.

Incidentally, in case you haven't guessed it, I enjoy meeting the press. And I don't mind your questions, even the barbed ones. And I like your overall fairness and thank you for it.

Here today I would like to take these few minutes to talk about some things we seldom seem to get around to in press conferences. Specifically, I want to tell you a little of my thinking about the Commerce Department—what I see as its role in the economy, and what we are doing now, and hope to do, to make it a more vigorous and effective instrument for national growth.

To be frank, until last December I really had not thought much at all about Commerce, let alone the job of being its Secretary. Naturally, I took a part in the Kennedy campaign. My role, mainly, was to combat as best I could the religious issue and to say to my many conservative friends that the President, while progressive and imaginative, was very much a fiscal conservative and a sound-money man.

These things I did out of belief and loyalty. A Cabinet job, or any other post in Washington, was never discussed during the campaign. In fact, until the President called me in early December, the only future I was sure of was that I was going to be the ex-Governor of North Carolina.

Today, almost exactly 3 months after the inauguration, I am happily a part of the New Frontier, and I have seen enough of the Commerce Department to develop some fairly fixed views about the Department and its possible service. Today, I am going to talk mainly about two of these views.

First, although Commerce is the Government Department primarily concerned with business and industry, it is not a tool of industry, not its automatic spokesman. Its role is to serve business only as this serves the country. The interests of the Nation come first. You will never hear from me that this country should do this or that simply because business wants it. What is good for General Motors may, or may not, be good for the country.

In his own way, the President, I think, expressed this same attitude when he spoke to the National Industrial Conference Board early in February. As you may remember, he said that the hope and aim of this administration was an alliance with business in which both the public and private sectors of the economy would, by playing their proper roles, promote national growth.

Now, in my mind, an alliance prescribes a quite definite relationship—a joining together of independent parties to pursue common goals. From the standpoint of this administration, alliance means we will seek to understand the problems of business, and to assist in their solution. We will not harass or regulate it needlessly, but will work to promote its growth and prosperity.

By the same token, we, as allies of business, are not obliged to act in any way which runs counter to our own interests, which are those of the Nation. In short, this administration and we at Commerce are at once joined with business yet separate from it. We are its friend, but not its unquestioning servant; its sympathetic counselor, but not its conspirator. All of this, I am sure, business as a whole understands and commends.

A few weeks ago, you probably know, I made some suggestions to the Business Advisory Council, which led to certain changes in its organization and the opening up to the press of any meetings where Government officials speak. Now the reason I did this traces from what I have just described—my conviction that Commerce must act primarily for the country as a whole, not just one segment of it.

I have no reason to think that members of the advisory council ever gained advantage from, or misused, the information they got from Government officials at private meetings. But that's not the point. Whatever was told them officially by Government people should have been available to everyone—the rest of business and all the public.

The second conviction I have about the Commerce Department is this: whatever its role has been in the past, Commerce today must be an active stimulator of business, a goad to economic growth.

Within this Kennedy administration, pledged to a new vigor in American affairs, there is no place for a passive service department, one which acts only when asked. This is doubly true in the area of economic affairs where today there is not only need for immediate action, but for long-range stimulation of the economy so that it can fulfill its growth potential.

As Walter Heller, the President's economic counsel, has said, "economic recovery in 1961 is far more than a cyclical problem. It is also a problem of chronic slack in the economy—the growing gap between what we can produce and what we do produce."

Had we fulfilled even our available growth potential last year, we would have added about $500 per American household to our gross national product. This would have been almost twice the amount spent on public education by all the governments in the United States and about one and one-half times the total that went into new homes last year. With the extra output, upwards of 1.5 million of our unemployed workers would have jobs. Personal income would have been $20 billion higher than it was, and corporate profits $5 billion above their actual level.

All this could have been realized with available manpower, materials, and machines. The only missing element was the momentum to carry us forward.

This problem of momentum, of catching up with the potential of our domestic economy, exists over and beyond the temporary necessity for ridding ourselves of the recession. We are going to get out of this recession, of course. There are ample grounds now for confidence. But there is little likelihood we can restore momentum to the economy by the relatively simple measures needed to correct cyclical slides. To revive lagging growth requires something far more ambitious—a truly national effort by industry and government to improve technology, lower production and marketing costs, and devise new and superior products, all under conditions of price stability.

In my mind, the Department of Commerce must undertake a leading role in this effort. I feel it has both the ability and the obligation to make important contributions to the drive to achieve our economic potential. Indeed, except that it already has an official name, we might well call Commerce today the Department of Economic Progress. For its function, as I see it, is to help move this economy forward as rapidly as possible.

Now I am well aware of the reputation that Commerce has had over the years. The gentler phrases have referred to it as a departmental counterpart of the Smithsonian—a sort of Nation's attic of agencies—a subsidized publishing house, or, as one of my predecessors implied, a woods littered with poison oak. I have even heard it suggested that since our main building is built over the Tiber Creek, this has inevitably produced a sogginess of atmosphere and a definite wetness to our statistics.

Even in North Carolina, some of my friends, after I was appointed, dredged up old cliches. One of them, who knew of my habit of jingling coins in my pocket when I get impatient, suggested that, at most, my pocket linings would last about 3 months.

Well, I haven't worn out the pockets yet. And the reason I haven't is that in these last few months I have seen a real mood of vitality take hold in Commerce, an eagerness to do more and to pick up responsibilities for economic growth. In fact, right now I sort of feel like "Cousin Ed" Murrow when he remarked about the young people in his agency. Ed said: "These young folks want to work until 2 a.m., and I find I must quit at 1 a.m."

All right, you say, what are you making out of this added drive. What exactly are you doing in substance to get this economy moving forward?

I think you already know a good bit about our program to increase American exports and create new markets for our goods. Today, out of 300,000 or so manufacturing enterprises, only about 12,000 are actively exporting. We are trying to raise this small representation, to get more companies to take advantage of the potential for oversea sales. We have developed a complete export program, showing firms and especially smaller ones, just how they can enter the market abroad. And we are getting news of export opportunities to businessmen more quickly than was ever true in the past.

At the same time, we have stepped up efforts to broaden the oversea market for American goods and encourage new demand for our products. We have increased the number of our trade missions overseas; this year we plan to send 17 abroad, compared with 11 in 1960. We have also raised our participation in trade fairs, and have strengthened our commercial offices throughout the world. Further, we have plans for more permanent trade centers abroad. The first, as you know, opens in London in June.

Just in the past few weeks, Commerce and the State Departments started a series of meetings to determine what further assistance the Government should give to the companies that want to start factories overseas or invest in existing operations. We have in mind, particularly, the developing countries where some type of monetary guarantee against expropriation and startup

costs may be required. While foreign investment does not return dollars immediately, as exports do, in the long run, such investments pay off.

In the field of travel, where there was a $1.1 billion gap last year, we are also moving ahead to stimulate business. We expect soon to have congressional sanction of the first program in history designed to promote travel to the United States.

Once the bill becomes law, we will establish travel information centers overseas and mount an energetic advertising and promotion campaign. In the meantime, we have started shipping abroad in a modest way travel information, materials, and posters for distribution to travel agencies, airlines, and others.

As you know, the assignment to administer the distressed areas program will shortly be lodged in Commerce. This will be a most important lever for growth in the American economy. The program is one of the keys to rebuilding and revitalizing this industrial soil of ours. It will have, I am sure, a marked impact on one of our most urgent problems, structural unemployment.

The President has asked for this new program. We intend to use it with incisiveness. We will try not to allow its administration to shift the burdens of economic difficulty from one community to another. We will help labor surplus areas, but we will act to the good of the total economy, rather than just its regional components.

I could go on about other efforts, but what I really want to single out today is our plans for science and technology. Research is perhaps the most important tool of all in spurring the economy toward full employment and prosperity. It alone holds the answer to new and superior products which will enable industry to command new markets here and abroad.

Whether you realize it or not, the Department of Commerce today represents the Nation's largest nonmilitary scientific capability. Within its walls are the research resources of the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, the Bureau of the Census, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Maritime Administration, and the Bureau of Public Roads. The scientific work of these agencies touch much of the economy and they vitally and directly affect the national security.

We have asked Congress to strengthen the research role of Commerce by authorizing an Assistant Secretary of Science and Technology. Specifically, this new Secretary would be in charge of all the research functions carried out by the Department. But he would also work closely with industry, and particularly those which are lagging in their own research and development. Together with business, he would seek ways to increase and quicken their scientific efforts.

Let me cite just a few things we have in mind.

The Federal Government is now spending some $3 billion a year on public roads. Yet there has been relatively little spent for research in two crucial areas: safety and lower cost roads.

We pay a terrible price in traffic deaths, and we know roads can be made safer. How do we do it? How can we design and construct highways so that surface, route, access, and lighting all add up to a maximum safety factor? The answer, if it is to be found, lies in research.

Can a better, lower cost road be developed? A 5-percent reduction in construction cost would save some $150 million a year. And think of the savings in maintenance expense from a road that was really winterproof.

Another case, the Federal Government subsidizes our maritime fleet at a cost of some $350 million. It has been suggested that we may be subsidizing mediocrity. We ought to find out. The maritime industry and the Government together should undertake research to see if there aren't ways to reduce shipbuilding costs and operating costs which are now so badly out of line with those of foreign countries.

In the National Bureau of Standards all the standards and measurements used in the Nation are established. Today we have what is called a "measurement pinch." Our technology has progressed to such refined point that we have to find new methods of measuring things—temperature, pressure, space (both big space and infinitely small space). Without these methods we are deadended.

If we are to produce energy of millions of pounds of thrust, we must find efficient ways of measuring millions of pounds of thrust. If we are to produce interchangeable parts of tolerances of hundreds of thousandths of an inch, we must find easy ways of measuring hundreds of thousandths of inches. The National Bureau of Standards is the Nation's yardstick, and you can't produce goods without a yardstick.

The Patent Office, soon to celebrate its 125th anniversary, is the direct reflection of the state of the country's capacity to invent. And invention is our life blood. Right now we have a 3-year backlog in the Patent Office. A patent for a new complex data processing invention can take as long as 17 months to research. If our inventive genius is to flourish, it should not be subject to this kind of delay and frustration.

But entirely new techniques of automated search are needed to break this backlog. Literally a new language must be invented that can be used in electronic data processing machines. When we do invent it, I'll tell you one thing: We won't patent it, and add another 17 months to time lag.

In our Weather Bureau we are working with the new satellites for global weather observations. We are researching problems in weather alteration. A new project on tornado prediction and forecasting has just begun. Industrial traffic flow and inventory control will before long depend on extended forecasts from Commerce's Weather Bureau. It is so easy to visualize the losses in human life, crop damage, and retail close-outs that could be eliminated.

These functions need national support and national status, if we are to achieve the scientific progress that the pace of technology demands of us. Industry must have these scientific icebreakers to open the way to further growth and progress. And it must also have new programs designed specifically to advance productivity by grasping the gains offered by automation and atomic energy.

Now just one final word about Commerce and its role as a stimulator.

I have been much concerned lately by the black marks that business has been getting in the news. I mean, of course, the price-fixing scandals. The conspiracy in the electrical industry has shocked the Nation. And I am very much afraid that it is in for more shocks in the months ahead.

This collusion, this price-fixing is an unjustifiable thing. It should be exposed, punished, stamped out. We are right to treat for what it is, a bad blot on the record. But, and this is my point, we should not treat it for more than it is.

The real spirit of American business is not represented by these price fixers. The real spirit belongs to the thousands of businessmen who recognize their public responsibilities and who run their affairs honestly and ethically.

What I am most afraid of is that a handful of businessmen, who deserve public censure, may impair the good standing of all of business. If this should happen, the damage would be great—loss of public support, and worse yet, public faith.

I do not accept a passive role in this problem. I think the Commerce Department can and must help call attention to the principles of business conduct, which most businessmen observe and which all should.

After consultation with the President, I have asked a group of distinguished individuals to prepare for me what I hope may come to be a code of ethical practices for American business. My distinguished colleague, Secretary Goldberg, some years ago made a significant contribution to the American labor movement and all of the country when he developed labor's ethical codes. I hope, with the help of the people I have asked to suggest a set of standards, that I can make some similar contribution for business conduct.

I am confident that this administration, working with enlightened management and enlightened labor, can achieve in the 1960's an era of record growth and prosperity. We can move far toward the elimination of poverty and unemployment and toward a fuller life for all our people.

The President is determined that the record of the sixties shall be one consistent with our potential. His economic program is both farsighted and sound. We at Commerce will use our full resources to implement this program and to assist, entice, and prod business to achieve under it the kind of economic growth we must have to meet our national and international obligations.

Thank you for letting me come and talk with you.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur—Soldier-Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the recent conference between President Kenney and Gen. Douglas MacArthur regarding the Cuban situation was in the best tradition of bipartisanship. Indeed, I could think of no better man than General MacArthur for the President to consult in this time of crisis. I recently made some remarks relative to the 10th anniversary of the general's historic speech before a joint session of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have these remarks entitled "Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Soldier-Statesman," printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, SOLDIER-STATESMAN

(Remarks by Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland)

Mr. President, it is with a great sense of pride for me to commemorate one of the greatest moments in the history of the United States, for it was 10 years ago today that a joint session of Congress had the honor of being addressed by Gen. Douglas MacArthur after his return from Korea.

As I reread this historic speech, it came to my mind that many truths which he expressed in his speech of April 19, 1951, could still apply to the world today. He said:

"The issues are global and so interlocked that to consider the problems of one sector, oblivious to those of another, is but to court disaster for the whole.

"While Asia is commonly referred to as the gateway to Europe, it is no less true that Europe is the gateway to Asia, and the broad influence of the one cannot fail to have its impact upon the other.

"There are those who claim our strength is inadequate to protect on both fronts—that we cannot divide our effort. I can think of no greater expression of defeatism. If a potential enemy can divide his strength on two fronts, it is for us to counter his effort.

"The Communist threat is a global one. Its successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction of every other sector. You cannot appease or otherwise surrender to communism in Asia without simultaneously undermining our efforts to halt its advance in Europe."[1]

We all know too well of the threat of war in Laos as well as the fact that two of the basic tenets of communism as stated by Stalin are "to take all necessary measures to strengthen the national liberation movement in the East," and "to spare no pains or means to assist the proletarian revolutions of the West."[2]

Gen. Douglas MacArthur's rendezvous with history was predetermined, as even his father served the United States in the Far East from the middle of the 19th century until his death; whereas General MacArthur began his service to his country in 1899 when he entered West Point and graduated as one of its most brilliant students—ranking with such great Americans as Robert E. Lee, John J. Pershing, and Jonathan Wainwright.[3]

His life has been one of self-discipline and duty to country. However, I believe, he can best be characterized by his own words when he says: "The man who will not defend his freedom does not deserve to be free."[4] General MacArthur has long been known to be a stanch advocate for a democratic form of government. He proved this is his dealings with the Japanese, for he was without a doubt one of the greatest ambassadors of the American way that we have ever had. No defeated nation had ever been in such a depressed state as Japan after the ordeal of having two atom bombs dropped on two of its major cities, yet Mr. Toshikazu Kase, a Japanese diplomat who accompanied Foreign Minister Shigemitsu as a member of the surrender party on the battleship *Missouri* said the following of the supreme commander:

"He is a man of peace. Never has the truth of the line 'peace has her victories no less renowned than war' been more eloquently demonstrated. He is a man of light. Radiantly, the gathered rays of his magnanimous soul embrace the earth, his footsteps paving the world with light. Is it not a piece of rare good fortune, I asked myself, that a man of such caliber and character should have been designated as the supreme commander who will shape the destiny of Japan? In the dark hour of our despair and distress, a bright light is ushered in, in the very person of General MacArthur.

"I raised a question whether it would have been possible for us, had we been victorious, to embrace the vanquished with a similar magnanimity. Clearly, it would have been different. Returning from the audience, Shigemitsu told me that the Emperor nodded with a sigh in agreement. Indeed, a distance 'inexpressible by numbers that have name' separates us—America from Japan. After all, we were not beaten on the battlefield by dint of superior arms. We were defeated in the spiritual contest by virtue of a nobler ideal. The real issue was moral—beyond all the powers of algebra to compute.

"The day will come when recorded time, age on age, will seem but a point in retrospect. However, happen what may in the future, this big day on the *Missouri* will stand out as one of the brightest dates in history, with General MacArthur as a shining obelisk in the desert of human endeavor that marks a timeless march onward toward an enduring peace."[5]

We all know of the extreme effort General MacArthur placed on the rebuilding of Japan, and today well appreciate the success of his labors. However, he again led our forces as well as those of the United Nations in the war in Korea, and when victory was in sight was recalled from duty. On his return home, the Nation welcomed a man whom they loved dearly—a man whom all knew understood the Chinese better than anyone else, and he has proven this as only time can verify when he said:

"To understand the changes which now appear upon the Chinese mainland, one must understand the changes in Chinese character and culture over the past 50 years. China up to 50 years ago was completely nonhomogeneous, being compartmented into groups divided against each other. The war-making tendency was almost nonexistent, as they still followed the tenets of the Confucian ideal of pacifist culture. At the turn of the century, under the regime of Chan So Lin, efforts toward greater homogeneity produced the start of a nationalist urge. This was further and more successfully developed under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, but has been brought to its greatest fruition under the present regime, to the point that it has now taken on the character of a united nationalism of increasingly dominant aggressive tendencies. Through these past 50 years, the Chinese people have thus become militarized in their concepts and in their ideals. They now constitute excellent soldiers with competent staffs and commanders. This has produced a new and dominant power in Asia which for its own purposes is allied with Soviet Russia, but which in its own concepts and methods has become aggressively imperialistic with a lust for expansion and increased power normal to this type of imperialism. There is little of the ideological concept either one way or another in the Chinese makeup. The standard of living is so low and the capital accumulation has been so thoroughly dissipated by war that the masses are desperate and avid to follow any leadership which seems to promise the alleviation of local stringencies. I have from the beginning believed that the Chinese Communists' support of the North Koreans was the dominant one. Their interests are at present parallel to those of the Soviet, but I believe that the aggressiveness recently displayed not only in Korea, but also in Indochina and Tibet and pointing potentially toward the south, reflects predominantly the same lust for the expansion of power which has animated every would-be conqueror since the beginning of time."[6]

There is no question, I am sure, in the minds of any of my colleagues but that Red China is now as much a threat to the free world as Russia itself.

Therefore, with the Laotian crisis presently challenging us, I would like to draw again on this famous speech of April 19, 1951, when General MacArthur said:

"War's very object is victory—not prolonged indecision. In war, indeed, there can be no substitute for victory.

"There are some who for varying reasons would appease Red China. They are blind to history's clear lesson. For history teaches with unmistakable emphasis that appeasement but begets new and bloodier war. It points to no single instance where the end has justified that means—where appeasement has led to more than a sham peace. Like blackmail, it lays the basis for new and successively greater demands, until, as in blackmail, violence becomes the only other alternative. Why, my soldiers asked of me, surrender military advantages to an enemy in the field? I could not answer. Some may say to avoid spread of the conflict into an all-out war with China; others, to avoid Soviet intervention. Neither explanation seems valid. For China is already engaging with the maximum power it can commit and the Soviet will not necessarily mesh its actions with our moves. Like a cobra, any new enemy will more likely strike whenever it feels that the relativity in military or other potential is in its favor on a world-wide basis."[7]

Let us remember that in the spring of 1951, the United States had the power to make peace, as we alone among the nations of the world had advanced to such a great degree in the development of nuclear energy.

General MacArthur's experience has, as we all know, led him into varied fields of endeavor. His philosophy regarding our own domestic policy was quite clearly stated in a speech before the National Association of Manufacturers in 1954 in which he said:

"It is an unassailable truth, that the science of industry has become a major element in the science of war. The successful conduct of a military campaign now depends upon industrial supremacy. As a consequence, the armed forces of a Nation and its industrial power have become one and inseparable. The integration of the leadership of one into the leadership of the other is not only logical but inescapable. It has become indisputably clear that it is no longer the standing armies now in being, nor the naval and air forces which range freedom's vast frontiers, which stay the bloody specter of willful aggression, but rather a realistic appreciation of our massive potential of industrial power which is so capable of rapidly mounting the means to retaliate and to destroy. Industry has thus become the leavening influence in a world where war and the threat and fear of war would otherwise distort the minds of men and violently react upon the peaceful progress of the human race.

"In the mighty and almost limitless potential of American industry, the brilliance and rugged determination of its leaders; the skill, energy and patriotism of its workers—there has been welded an almost impregnable defense against the evil designs of any who would threaten the security of the American continent. It is indeed the most forceful and convincing argument yet evolved to restrain the irresponsibility of those who would recklessly bring down upon the good and peace-loving peoples of all the nations of the earth the disaster of total war.

"Belabored by the Communists, their fellow travelers and the socialists, the capitalistic system has even been tacitly repudiated by some capitalists themselves. Succumbing to propaganda, they have wavered in their loyalty to a theory and a practice which has both served them well and built this Nation far beyond the wildest dreams of its architects. It has never failed to maximize the fruits of human energy and creative enterprise. It has never failed to provide the sinews for victory in war and has become now the one great hope in the struggle for peace. Was there ever greater hypocrisy than that which flows from those who castigate private capitalism as an evil to be

---

[1] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 3, p. 4123.

[2] Bouscaren, Anthony T., "Imperial Communism," Public Affairs Press, 1953, p. 13.

[3] Hunt, Frazier, "The Untold Story of Douglas MacArthur," Devin Adair Co., 1954, p. 32.

[4] Miller, Francis Trevelyan, "General Douglas MacArthur—Fighter for Freedom," John C. Winston Co., Chicago, 1942, p. 1.

[5] Whitney, Maj. Gen. Courtney, "MacArthur—His Rendezvous With History," Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1956, pp. 224–225.

[6] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, op. cit., p. 4124.

[7] Ibid., p. 4125.

renounced by human society, while avidly seeking to ensnare its benefits—those who regard American dollars as the panacea for all economic ills, while denouncing and condemning the source of such wealth—those who seek American goods, while scoffing at and deriding the very institutions by which these goods are produced?

"The past 20 years have witnessed an incessant encroachment upon the capitalistic system through the direction of our own public policy. This has left our free economy badly bruised and severely tried. The assault has taken various forms. For political expediency and even baser purposes, efforts have constantly been made by those in power or those seeking to be in power to provoke distrust and strife between industrial owners and industrial workers, between management and labor—to breach the community of purpose and effort which so logically must exist between these two great segments of our industrial economy. The effect of this has been to produce a sense of unrest and antagonism where a firm and confident alliance, built upon a mutuality of faith and understanding and a community of purpose, will not only serve the interests of both, but further the well-being of that third great economic segment, the consuming public.

"Another and yet more serious form of assault upon the capitalistic system has been the increasingly oppressive Government levies upon both capital and profit. The principle underlying such levies has not been to equalize the burden of meeting the legitimate costs of Government by a just and uniform assessment, but has followed instead a conspiratorial design, originally evolved by Karl Marx, to first weaken and then destroy the capitalistic system. Thus, many of our tax laws amount in practical effect to a series of graduated penalties upon the efficiency and the thrift which produces profit and accumulates capital—penalties which strike at the very roots of the incentive to labor, to create and to cheerfully accept the risks and hazards of enterprise in the traditional American pioneering spirit. If the capitalistic system—free enterprise—is to be preserved to the future generations of our people, the course of Government must now be sharply reoriented and America's industrial leadership must assume an invincible and uncompromising defense of that system. Only thereby may there be fostered and preserved adequate inventive to encourage the thrift, the industry, and the adventure which brought our Nation to its present preeminence among all of the other nations of the earth and which alone can carry it forward in peace and security and progress." [8]

At this point it is well to note that General MacArthur has received the esteemed praise from many great Americans. John Gunther, the well-known author, in his book entitled "The Riddle of MacArthur" said: "He is that rare thing in the modern world, a genuinely high person. This is not put on. It is part of his marrow and essence * * *." [9]

My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL, at the conclusion of 3 days of hearings thanked General MacArthur as follows:

"General MacArthur, I wish to state to you that the 3 days that you have been here with us are without parallel in my legislative experience.

"I have never seen a man subjected to such a barrage of questions in so many fields and so on many varied subjects.

"I marvel at your physical endurance. More than that, I have been profoundly impressed by the vastness of your patience and the thoroughness and the frankness with which you have answered all of the questions that have been propounded.

"We have certainly drawn freely on your vast reservoir of knowledge and experience, not only as a great military captain, but as a civilian administrator of 80 million people.

"We will continue to delve into this matter with the objective of discovering the facts and the truth in order that we may contribute to the workings of democracy, and to enable America to emerge from the very critical situation in which we find ourselves today, safe and secure, and supplying the world the leadership that is necessary to enable us to have the best place on earth to live." [10]

The love and honor the people of Japan felt for Gen. Douglas MacArthur was clearly shown during the summer of 1960 when they bestowed upon him Japan's highest decoration for a foreigner—the Grand Cordon of the Order of the Rising Sun with Paulownia Flowers. In the citation accompanying this award the Japanese expressed their gratitude by saying that General MacArthur gave "great contributions to the postwar reconstruction of Japan and to the development of the immense reservoir of good will that exists between our two nations today." [11] Upon receipt of this award from the Emperor, General MacArthur commented that he could recall "no parallel in history where a great nation has so distinguished its former enemy commander." [12] I am quite sure no such parallel exists and that the significance of the presentation of this award exemplifies the friendship the Japanese people have for the United States.

And even more recently, General MacArthur was rated as "in a class above other Allied commanders in any theater," [13] by Great Britain's top military analyst, Capt. B. H. Liddell Hart.

However, with all these accomplishments behind him and with the great praise bestowed upon him by his fellow man, it might be well for us here in the Congress of the United States to review the remarks of this great soldier-statesman at the Founders Day ceremony at the University of Dallas when he said:

"I cite for example such phrases as 'the rate of our national growth,' 'the direction of our national purpose', or 'the promise of our new horizons'. Such slogans are but political jargon little understood by even the most informed of our people, and with issues so obscure as to have little in common with reality. They are 'catchalls' designed to impress the votes of a bewildered and trusting populace. Their authors know or should know that the 'rate of our national growth' is dependent more than all else on the degree of freedom left for the uninhibited play of our individual initiative and creative energies; they know or should know that 'our national purpose' is simple and supportable by every American—the steady increase in our standard of life and adequate defense of that standard against all pressures at home or abroad; they know or they should know that the only 'new horizons' to which we should as a nation now aspire are not to our left or right but up—not horizontal but vertical—those which measure the well-being and happiness of all the people.

"And how, it might rightly be asked, would a statesman approach the problem, a solution of which directly concerns our 'rate of national growth', the direction of our 'national purpose' and the 'new horizons' of our life?

"He would seek the answer in the basic and immutable principles of the science of government, not in the temporary expediences of popularity and adulation under the guise of the art of government. He would see a violation of the fundamental laws of freedom in our insatiably expanding Federal bureaucracy with its growing controls over our daily lives. He would see that if we reduced the monetary cost of the Federal Government, thus curtailing its bureaucratic power, we would, first, advance our economic growth and consequent standard of living, by lowering the extreme burden of taxation which threatens to reduce us all to a form of involuntary servitude, thereby releasing for constructive purposes our presently suppressed initiative and creative energies; second, insure a sharp curtailment of the growing paternalism inherent in massive Central Government, thereby permitting us once again the freedom to determine the direction of our own lives and to remarshal our resources fully to exploit our opportunities; and third: provide us the chance to pass down to our progeny a solvent rather than a bankrupt nation."

Mr. President, it is imperative for us as the chosen representatives of this great Nation to dwell over the words of wisdom given so freely to us by this truly great American.

[8] Whitney, Maj. Gen. Courtney, "MacArthur—His Rendezvous With History," op. cit., pp. 533–535.

[9] Gunther, John, "The Riddle of MacArthur," Harper & Bros., New York, 1950, p. 79. 1961, p. 28.

[10] Military situation in the Far East, hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 82d Cong., 1st sess., pt. 1, pp. 318–319.

[11] Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 25, 1960, p. A5518.

[12] Ibid.

[13] U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 20, 1961, p. 28.

Medical Care Under Social Security: A Program That Would Undermine America's Quality Health Care System for Her People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity of addressing the annual meeting of the Connecticut State Medical Society at Hamden, Conn. At that time I spoke on the proposal which had been made that we put a program for medical care for the aged in our social security system. This would result in a significant, and most unfortunate, fall in the quality of medical care which Americans now enjoy. An answer in perpetuity for a need that is temporary and being met better every day could well cost Americans, aged and not, the quality medical care which we have become accustomed to.

I would like to place this speech in the RECORD at this point:

THE MEDICAL COLD WAR—WHAT IS YOUR IQ ON THE MEDICAL CARE CONTROVERSY?

(Speech of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri; senior Republican House Member, Joint Economic Committee, member of Ways and Means Committee, South St. Louis, St. Louis County, Mo., before the annual meeting of the Connecticut State Medical Society, April 27, 1961, Hamden, Conn.)

There is much misinformation, misunderstanding, propaganda, and outright false-

hoods abroad concerning the real facts regarding medical care legislation pending before this Congress. News stories, radio and TV programs, and, even many officials are guilty of speaking from the hip without having examined into the facts. The proponents of government compulsory health insurance pretend to be experts, which they are not, in all fields in which they urge a government takeover of both industry and the professions. They are hard at work disguising the true facts by parading before the public's eye drawings, pictures, and cartoons of people in distress while claiming that the solution to all of these ills, aches, and pains can be supplied through "free" government-supplied food, housing, unemployment checks, and medical services. Doesn't it seem strange that the only two committees of this Congress charged with the responsibility of considering health care legislation, after examining the facts, hearing testimony, and meeting in extended executive sessions have voted down by a ratio of at least 2 to 1 the compulsory government programs presented them. Let me provide you with some of the pertinent information upon which these decisions have been made. A majority of the members of both the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee are agreed that with all of the voluntary, local, State, and Federal medical programs available to our population, including the recently enacted legislation now popularly known as the Mills-Kerr bill, every person in the United States is possessed of either the ways or the means for securing proper medical care. Admittedly, for a small percentage of our population there is now and has been in the past difficulty in meeting the cost of prolonged and expensive illnesses. The appropriate reference committees of Congress which have considered this problem over the past several years have, in their reports, indicated that more than 70 percent of the total population and over 50 percent of the aged possess health insurance. Moreover the quality of insurance protection is and has been improving rapidly. One example of the improvement in this field is the recent action by your State's legislature, the Connecticut General Assembly. It has given approval to a plan by which Connecticut insurance companies can join together in providing health insurance for the aged. This is a truly significant step forward. We know that cancellation of health insurance because of age has been nearly eliminated. Some of this improvement possibly has come in the bright light generated by congressional hearings.

We know that the quality of medical care in the United States under our system is the best in the world, whether the individual purchases health care voluntarily or receives it from one of the levels of government without having any agency impose a compulsory health tax upon him. We know that this kind of a system guarantees a higher quality of medical care than is being delivered to the population in all other parts of the world under compulsory systems—compulsory in the tax sense, and compulsory in the sense that the tax is paid whether the individual uses the system or not, and compulsory in the sense that the providers of care report to government authority and deliver the kind of care which is prescribed by government rather than by the doctor. We know that in no nation other than our own does any similar population group live longer and have less incidence of disease than do Americans. We know that in every civilized nation in the world except in the United States there exists a system of government or socialized medicine. It is no accident that by comparison we excel all these systems in the quality of medical care which is available to our population. We know that 30 years ago our medical students—in fact, medical students from all sections of the world—flocked to the medical centers of Europe for their education. This was before the day that governmental medicine systems came to these former great medical centers. Today medical students the world over, including Western Europe, travel, not to Europe, but, rather to the United States. In every nation in the world except our own, the ratio of doctors to population is on the decline, with all of the adverse implications that such a decline has upon all the population. The ratio of physicians per patient in the United States is remaining steady at about 1 physician to 750 of population despite our population explosion. Reports from abroad indicate that fewer sons of physicians in foreign countries are following their father's footsteps in the medical profession. Because few young men are attracted to the medical profession in Great Britain and because many are coming to the United States, the ratio of physicians to population which was 1 to 877 in 1947 decreased to 1 to 1,149 by 1957, indicates loss in quality.

Even in Canada, which has a compulsory tax-supported system which involves only hospitalization, there is a loss of physicians to the United States in excess of 200 per year.

If we need further proof of the great number of foreign-trained physicians who have recently come to America, make a trip to a hospital and there talk to some of the 12,000 and more foreign-graduated physicians who are interning and serving residencies in our hospitals; it makes a trip to the hospital have the enchantment of a visit to 100 foreign countries. And a goodly majority of these foreign-trained doctors, you will learn, have applied for U.S. citizenship.

On the technique side of medicine, difficult and advanced treatment and surgery has become so highly developed in the United States that daily one reads in the newspaper of collections being made to rush some person to the United States for open heart surgery or for treatment of some difficult condition or disease.

Would the United States continue to have the quality lead in medicine if we were to move from our present programs of free enterprise medicine, sprinkled with our compassionate Government-supplied programs which we have for our indigent sick? Isn't it time that each of us take the trouble to really inspect our own communities to learn who it is in our area are not receiving the best quality medical care in the world?

A few of my colleagues in Congress tell me about heart-rending letters which they receive from their constituents under great hardship because of medical expenses and yet, if they will take the trouble to follow through on any one of these few letters received, if they will call upon a local official or a close personal physician friend to look into the complaint, in 999 cases out of 1,000 it will be found that the constituent is eligible to apply for voluntary health insurance, or that one of the programs established by some level of government will, if that person should present himself, supply the needed medical services either without cost or at a cost which can be afforded by either the constituent or his family. Is this true in New Haven? Is this true in Connecticut? It is true in St. Louis. It is true in Missouri.

Thus far I have indicated the highlights of what I have found to be the case as pertains to quality of medical care and availability of service for all of our population. Next I wish to allude to a few statistics which apply to costs under the system of medical care which we follow in America as compared to the costs of programs under other countries' compulsory-type health care systems. Too few people are aware that under our system we are expending $25.2 billion annually to bring health services to our population. Private care costs in the most recent year available, 1959, according to reliable Federal statistics, reach a total of $18.965 billion, while all levels of Government expended an additional $6.23 billion. Private care expenditures break down as follows: $4.998 billion for physicians' charges, $5.514 billion for hospital charges, $3.604 billion for drugs, $1.963 million for dentists, $1.185 billion for appliances, $842 million for nurses, therapists, osteopaths, chiropractors, etc., $220 million for nursing homes.

The proponents of national compulsory health insurance would have us add to our present $80 billion Federal budget a large part of the cost of medical care which is now being borne independently of Government. If they would but check a few of the other countries, they would find this additional tax load would be but a beginning of the ultimate tax increase Congress would have to vote if we imitated the foreign systems. I made this statement because it is the history of government health programs that the medical care expenditures spiral upward when government takes over. This is because once the tax is imposed and the benefits are free, the benefits will be excessively used. Let me give you several examples.

The Province of Saskatchewan, which is immediately to the north of North Dakota, is a Province of people who look and act like our own. Should you cross the boundary from North Dakota into Saskatchewan, there would be few indications that you are not still in the United States. Prior to 1947, when Saskatchewan began their free hospitalization for the aged experiment, people over 65, on the average, utilized hospitals 2½ days per year. This was the same utilization rate for the United States for that same age group at that time and still is. However, after 13 years, the average person over 65 in Saskatchewan was found to be using a hospital bed 8 days per year. Just imagine what would happen to the $25.2 billion total expenditure for medical care here in the United States should we adopt such a system.

I am in possession of a letter from Great Britain which indicates that the average hospital stay for the total population because of hospitalization for medical illnesses averages 27.6 days and that the average stay in the surgical departments averages 13.4 days, whereas in the United States our average stay for medical cases is 10.3 days and our average stay for surgical cases is 7.5 days. The information on the U.S. experience comes from the U.S. National Health Survey Reports. Imagine, if you will, the increase in taxes we would have to vote, not to provide needed health services, but, rather, to satisfy the demands of a population which can get this extra care free. And if any person has in mind attempting to answer this argument with the statement that what I have pointed out only indicates that people don't get enough hospitalization, let me erase such a thought by repeating what I have said earlier. Our population lives longer, we have less incidence of disease than any of these other countries, because of our top quality preventive and curative medical care and the high standards of living which our people enjoy. The Blue Cross program directors would do well to inaugurate $25 to $50 deductible policies to offer to their policyholders. They would find that the premium they would have to charge would be so much lower because of the elimination of abuse resulting from this simple discipline that the deductible policies would outsell the "first dollar of cost" policies.

Under our system of free enterprise medical care, we know that on the average, every 2 years, since 1930, we have added a new 4-year medical school so that now we

have a total of 83. We know that our medical school graduates in 1940 totaled 3,745, and that last June our medical schools graduated 7,081, and that next year the rate will be correspondingly up. We know that our rate of hospital and other medical facility construction under free enterprise and our form of government exceeds that of the rest of the world. In Great Britain, bludgeoned by the high cost of their medical program, only one new hospital was built in the first 10 years of their socialized medicine program, thus indicating that government did sacrifice quality by permitting obsolescence and deterioration of their hospitals and health facilities.

The majority of the Congressmen who serve on the committees which have studied this legislation sincerely believe that if Congress should enact legislation to cover any segment of our society, whether that segment be the aged or the young, we will have established a principle which will yield to coverage of the total population. We know this by the experience of every foreign country, because none of them have stopped with coverage of a single age group without going the full route of coverage for the entire population. Indeed there is no logic to limiting health care by the age of a person. If the U.S. Congress should imitate these foreign medical systems, we will be inviting the skyrocketing cost phenomena which have happened in all of the foreign countries. The $25.2 billion which is being expended today by our people for medical care will double or even triple if the experience of other countries proves the rule. And the increased money instead of being carefully spent under the discipline the individual person exercises over his or her own personal budget will be scattered and wasted. It will damage the effectiveness we derive from the expenditure of less funds.

Many people say, but let's do something. My answer is look what we have done in our society and are continuing to do. Government can help some, but the essential program must remain in the private sector. Last year in Congress we passed a supplementary program for the aged with low incomes, not so much out of necessity as out of a desire to be doubly sure that cost should not bar any person in our society from receiving adequate health care. It is the Mills-Kerr bill, which many States are implementing. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare early this week said that more than half of the State legislatures had either enacted or were poised to enact legislation providing funds to match the Federal contributions so that all those persons in need, not as falsely stated "on relief" who are in a position to pay all of their living expenses, but not all their medical care, will be assisted in that area. The viciousness with which some of the promoters of the social security approach to health care for the aged have attacked this act by calling it degrading and an insult to the older people, is astounding. Their reaction suggests anger at having a social problem upon which they were relying to provide the beginning of their program for socialized medicine.

I call attention to a report which I shall put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD next week along with this speech. It lists over $3.75 billion annually being spent under the auspices of the Federal Government in programs in which it is actively engaged and it reveals also that an additional $5.731 billion is being paid out under Federal programs on account of health and disability to more than 7 million beneficiaries. Realize, however, when you go through this list, that none of these programs is of a compulsory nature, such as would be a program financed under the social security system. Study, too, the provisions of the Mills-Kerr legislation which was enacted last Congress, and realize, if you will, that 25 States will have implemented this program before adjournment time in the State legislatures in this calendar year. I shall also put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from a British medical official which reveals several facets showing weaknesses in the British medical program. This letter shows me just enough to want Congress to inquire further into that program and the programs of several other of the foreign countries which have experimented with compulsory health systems. Because I have such a curiosity and because I believe the American people can benefit from the experience of these countries, I am urging my chairman, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, suggesting that we consider at the next committee meeting the feasibility and advisability of sending a delegation to make an objective study and to report on the advantages and disadvantages of government medicine before this Congress again considers the enactment of such a program for our population.

Finally, I want to call attention to a letter I received from Joseph P. Clark, president, St. Louis Labor Council, AFL–CIO, in which he asked me if I would help vote out of committee a compulsory Federal health care bill tied to the social security system, even though I opposed this approach.

I replied by pointing out that many times I have voted measures out of committee to which I was opposed if I felt the committee had done a study job which was sufficient to enable the House to come to intelligent decisions on the policy matters involved. This has not been done. In this letter I asked for some reciprocity on the part of the national labor leaders who, in camera, decided several years ago to try to enact into law a compulsory Federal health care program tied to the social security program. I asked them through my letter to Mr. Clark to listen in an unprejudiced way to the facts and arguments that I and others have advanced in support of what we believe is the most effective way to meet the problem of health care for the aged and why we feel the compulsory Federal approach will badly damage and in no sense help to solve this important social problem.

Regrettably there has never been an appeal to reason on the part of the promoters of compulsory, Federal health care legislation from the beginning of their campaign to the presesnt. The promotion has been an appeal to emotion, not to reason. It carries with it a viciousness of attacking the motives of those who will not bow to their will that is foreign to honest public debate and not conducive to reaching an intelligent solution to the social problem. This matter became so serious last year that on May 2 I took the floor of the House to deliver an address entitled "Lobbying and Reporting: The Future of Representative Government in the United States." I was happy, Vital Speech of the Day selected this speech as one they republished. This speech needs to be read by all Americans, not just in relation to this issue and the rotten propaganda and political pressure techniques it embraces, but in relation to all legislative promotions going on in the United States today. As I speak there are paid teams going around my congressional district ignorant of the issues involved in the problem of health care for the aged but intent on one thing alone, to appeal to the emotionalism of my people and break my will to judge legislation on the basis of reason and true humanity.

In the speech, Mr. Speaker, I made reference to letters from a union official and my reply to him. I should like to place these in the RECORD. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I should like to place in the RECORD the letter from the British medical official to which I referred:

ST. LOUIS LABOR COUNCIL,
St. Louis, Mo., March 29, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Congressman, Clayton, Mo.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Under date of March 20, I addressed a communication to you relating to the King-Anderson bill H.R. 4222 and S. 909 which are health bills for the aged as an extension of the social security system.

I asked for your position on this legislation and further urged that even if you don't agree with the purposes of the program that you should vote to report the bill out for consideration by the House of Representatives. You made your position clear in your recent vote to enlarge the Rules Committee by stating that you didn't believe that any committee should hold up legislation and not permit the entire Congress to have an opportunity to pass judgment. I am hoping that you will follow the same principle on this important legislation.

An early reply will be appreciated.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH P. CLARK, *President.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1961.

Mr. JOSEPH P. CLARK,
President, St. Louis Labor Council, AFL–CIO, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. CLARK: Thank you for your letter of March 30, 1961. I certainly shall give serious consideration to the King-Anderson bill relating to health care for the aged if the Ways and Means Committee ever calls it up for consideration. This I have no control over. The agenda are by practice and I believe by rights under the control of the chairman and his 15 to 10 majority.

I say this although I am strongly opposed to tying health care for the aged to the social security system. In my judgment, for the reasons I have advanced in many speeches on the floor of the House and to the general public in person, on radio and TV, this would seriously damage the health care program in our society for all of us, including the older people, and we have the greatest health care program existing in any society, past or present.

Indeed, it has been the very success of our health care program that has brought about the very serious problems that our older people are faced with in this area. It has been the success of the health care program, not its failure, which has kept our older people with us 10 years longer than they or anyone had anticipated.

This should be a blessing to us and to them and I am satisfied it can be if we will approach the problem with care, and on the basis of appealing to knowledge and good reason rathar than appealing to prejudice and unwarranted charges that those who do not agree with our approach are either (a) unconcerned about the aged or (b) socialists.

Perhaps someone can come forward with facts or arguments that have not yet been presented to me to demonstrate that my judgment is in error. That is why I say I will give serious consideration to the King-Anderson bill.

Cannot there be some reciprocity in this? Cannot you and the top labor leaders who for several years now have taken a fixed position on this serious problem give serious consideration to what I have been trying to point out? Indeed, if I am right and you are wrong, you will both damage the old people and all of us and solve nothing. If I am right and you are wrong, the programs I have advocated—some of which are now law—will enable us to solve this problem.

Congressman Forand has refused to debate me publicly on this issue. Walter Reuther refused to appear on a TV program to debate the matter with me. Senator McNamara has declined to debate me, so has Congressman Machrowicz, Senator McCarthy, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff (although in this instance I feel there is good reason why a Cabinet Secretary should not appear on the same forum to debate a Congressman). In fact, no one seems interested in examining the facts and arguments I have adduced in respect to this important issue.

Yes, I would vote a bill out of committee for floor debate even though I opposed the bill. I have done this many times. I am perfectly willing to have my facts and arguments tested in any fair forum. I wish a few others—particularly those in opposition to my views—had the same attitude toward the need for fair debate.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
London, February 10, 1961.

DEAR SIR: Dr. Lord wrote to me on the 23d of January seeking some information in connection with a study being undertaken into the cost of medical care for the aged, in conjunction with the American Medical Association. I am afraid that in a number of instances the information which Dr. Lord was seeking is just not available, but I set out below such data as I can:

1. Average length of stay in hospital, in days: nonteaching hospitals, 1959; medical departments, 27.6; surgical departments, 13.4.

2. The same figure for persons over 65 years is, nonteaching hospitals, 144.8; London teaching hospitals, 138.8; Provincial teaching hospitals, 153.8 (chronic sick and geriatric departments).

3. Weekly cost of beds in acute hospitals is, nonteaching hospitals, £25 16s, 7d; teaching hospitals, London, £36 9s. 7d.; teaching hospitals, provinces, £30 4s. 11d.

4. The hospital cost per day of persons over 65 is not available.

5. The cost of the National Health Service per head of population is £13 0s. 0d.

6. The medical care cost per person over 65 is not available.

7. The ratio of doctors per population in 1957 (the latest figure available) is 1:1,149.

8. The ratio of doctors per population 10 years ago—1947—was 1:877.

I hope that the above information will be of some assistance to you.

Yours faithfully,

WALTER HEDGECOCK,
Deputy Secretary.

Senator Ralph Yarborough, Addressing Joint Session of Texas Legislature, Urges Closer Cooperation Between State and National Legislative Bodies

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 3, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Texas recently passed a concurrent resolution honoring our distinguished senior U.S. Senator from Texas, the Honorable RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, and inviting him to address a joint session of the Texas house and senate.

Senator YARBOROUGH responded with a noteworthy speech eloquently urging closer coordination and cooperation between State and National legislative bodies in the interest of more efficient and responsible government by consent of the governed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the text of the aforementioned Texas Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, inviting Senator YARBOROUGH to speak, as well as the text of his stirring address upon that occasion:

There being no objection, the text of the concurrent resolution and the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the senior U.S. Senator from Texas will visit in Texas during the Easter holidays; and

Whereas this outstanding Texan has made many contributions to our great State as a citizen, judge, war veteran, and statesman; and

Whereas it is the desire of the Senate of Texas, the House of Representatives concurring, that the senior U.S. Senator from Texas be invited to address a joint session of the 57th legislature at 11 a.m. on April 6, 1961: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, senior U.S. Senator from Texas, be and he is hereby invited to address a joint session of the 57th legislature in the house of representatives at 11 a.m. on April 6, 1961; and

That an official copy of this resolution of invitation be forwarded to Senator YARBOROUGH by the secretary of the senate.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.
JAMES A. TURMAN,
Speaker of the House.
CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

FEDERAL-STATE PARTNERSHIP

(Speech by U.S. Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat of Texas, before a joint session of the Texas Legislature at Austin, Thursday, April, 6, 1961, at 11 a.m.)

Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant Governor Ramsey, fellow legislators, friends, Texans, I am grateful to each and every one of you for this privilege of coming again as an invited guest before a joint session of the greatest legislature of the greatest State. I owe a real debt to the Texas Legislature because it was your action 4 years ago this month that turned thumbs down on a change of rules in the middle of the game, while I was engaged in a tough race against highly competent, experienced opposition.

While my service in the U.S. Senate is my first service as a member of a legislative body, I have served with the Texas Legislature in the past as an assistant attorney general under the late beloved James V. Allred, when I had a job during some sessions of drafting bills for some members of the legislature. Those were the depression years of the thirties and Chief Justice Bob Calvert, Judge Sarah Hughes, the late Judge Harry Graves, and Governor Coke Stevenson were among the many influential members here then.

And later your committees were uniformly courteous to me as I appeared before them on unpaid committees of the University of Texas exes, of the State bar, and on behalf of mental hygiene societies, and of the State permanent school fund. I appreciate all of those courtesies, and hope that I may practice some reciprocity when you come before committees of our Senate.

Three times in my life, gubernatorial appointments for State office were confirmed on my behalf by your Senate, even before my good friend Doyle Willis was there to plead my cause, as he has done so many times these past 8 years.

This is a body of influence; your house has produced two distinguished Speakers of the U.S. House of Representatives, Vice President John Nance Garner, and the present record-breaking Speaker, "Mr. SAM," "Mr. Democrat" himself, Speaker SAM RAYBURN. And this house was for years the training ground of its member Sam Johnson, father of the distinguished Vice President of the United States, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

You trained the present Governor of Texas, his immediate predecessor in office, a number of U.S. Congressmen and the next Governor of Guam.

It is an honor to serve in a body so rich in accomplishments and traditions, but richer yet in its potential for the future, now on the verge of new hope for more meaningful service, engendered by the modest salary increases the people of Texas voted last fall.

While we speak nationally of New Frontiers, here at home we have our own Texas frontiers, but so entwined are our destinies as a people with our dual Federal-State relationships, that some of the best government that we have evolved in America is partnership government, involving partnership action by the State and Federal legislative bodies.

Outstanding examples of cooperation are in highway building programs, old age pensions, medical care for the aged, vocational and rehabilitation programs, National Guard programs, care for the blind, public health, public education, game, wildlife, soil and water conservation, and many other programs jointly financed for many years now.

Even in a field of such seemingly unilateral action, joint and cooperative efforts are needed if any worthwhile advancement is to be made. This is illustrated by the Big Bend National Park, the only national park in Texas, which was first authorized by the Texas Legislature, and presented to the Federal Government by Texas, before the Congress would act. In that case the Texas Legislature boldly took the initiative, and Texas has a national park.

There is now pending a proposal for a greater national park in Texas, the Padre Island National Seashore Recreation Area. Those best versed nationally on these matters look at it as the No. 1 seashore in America.

PADRE ISLAND SEASHORE

Padre Island is 117 miles long and varies from about one-fourth mile to 3 miles in width. Our first project in Congress called for a full-length national seashore recreation area, less about 5 miles at each end for private development. Later we agreed to shorten the park area to 100 miles of the total length of 117 miles. Then, in order to win the unanimous support of the National Parks Advisory Board, without whose approval no national park project can be created under Federal law, we compromised again, and shortened the area to an 88-mile-long park, but only 85 miles long on the gulf side, leaving 32 miles of gulf beaches on Padre Island for private development, if we have the 88-mile-long park.

I have been working hard for a Texas-size national seashore recreation area on Padre Island for two main reasons. First, I'm convinced that the project will bring a many-million-dollar tourist bonanza to our State, and even more important, it will preserve as a recreation area for this and future generations of Americans, a part of our country's rapidly vanishing natural grandeur.

A Texas-size national seashore park, which would attract many hundreds of thousands of additional tourists to Texas within a few short years, is especially needed right now. Over the last 4 years, the number of tourists and the number of tourist dollars, coming to Texas, have declined steadily. Last year, only 8,600,000 tourists visited Texas, a decline of 1,700,000 out-of-State visitors since 1957. Based on the average amount of $45 each out-of-State visitor spends in Texas, the decline in tourist trade (just last year alone) amounted to a $144 million loss of business. This loss of tourist trade is something we can correct, and it seems clear that the best answer is a national seashore recreation area on Padre Island.

Up to the present, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area in North Carolina is the only facility of its kind in our entire Nation. It was opened in 1955 and attracted 264,000 visitors that year. In the past 6 years, while we have had a costly decline in visitors to Texas, attendance at Cape Hatteras has doubled. Visitors to Cape Hatteras Seashore totaled 467,000 last year. If this trend continues annual attendance will reach 1 million visitors by 1965. This tremendous increase in tourist trade has boosted the economy of Dare County, N.C., where Cape Hatteras is located, to the point that residents last year enjoyed a 20-percent tax cut, a rare thing in any State or county.

Building a Padre Island National Seashore Area is a sound step toward attracting new tourist trade to Texas. The National Park Service wants to build a Texas-size, 88-mile seashore area on Padre Island. Department of Interior officials have proposed to spend upwards of $8 million to buy land and build roads, visitors centers and other improvements over the next 5 years. President Kennedy has urged Congress to pass enabling legislation. But there is strong competition for the limited dollars budgeted for conservation projects. Hearings already have been held on proposed seashore recreation projects for Point Reyes, Calif., and at Cape Cod in President Kennedy's home State in Massachusetts.

Discord among us Texans and with the National Park Service over size of the seashore area or where roads should be built might well result in our Padre Island project being delayed while other seashore projects are built on the east and west coasts. Such a project in California would help give that State an advantage in the competition for beachbound tourist business.

I believe it is time for all of us Texans to begin working together to build a Texas-size national seashore recreation area on Padre Island. The Texas Legislature led the way in the 1959 session with a bill authorizing a 50-mile park on the island and, paving the way now for an 88-mile-long authorization.

Some argue against this national seashore area, saying a Miami Beach type of development is needed instead. But, they are not alternatives. There is ample room for both.

In this regard, a reasonable review of the facts reflects that the 88-mile seashore plan leaves adequate land for private development. Based on the 7.1-square-mile resort area of Miami Beach, private developers on Padre Island would have the space to build three resort centers the approximate size of the Florida vacationland outside that part of the 117-mile-long island after an 88-mile seashore recreation area is established. The area for private development on Padre Island in Cameron County alone is about the same size as Miami Beach, where there are 397 hotels, 2,350 resort apartments and other improvements valued at a total of $404 million.

EDUCATION

Fellow legislators, while this park project is urgent, we face even greater urgencies in this dangerous world in which we live, half slave and half free. For generations we have enjoyed advantages over other nations because of our educational lead. By our system of public free schools, we have pulled ahead of other nations.

Now that lead is threatened. All the peoples and nations of this world now realize that education is the golden key that unlocks the door for social and economic as well as intellectual advancement. They have crash programs to catch up, to educate their people.

We have led the world in the past; our ability to lead it in the future depends upon our willingness to pay the price of education and leadership.

Today, we spend about 4 percent of our gross national product on education, while the Russian Communists spend about 12 percent of their annual gross national product for education.

Soviet Russia now has more than twice as many engineering and science students in college as we; they have almost twice as many science and engineering students in college as the entire free world.

In 1959, we licensed 8,000 medical doctors; Soviet Russia graduated 16,000. Of these Russian Communist medical graduates, 14,000 were for service in Russia, while 2,000 were trained in the languages, religions, customs, and mores of the underdeveloped peoples in the world, and were pledged to go and live with the people directly, in their native huts and habitations, in the underdeveloped nations. We are running on borrowed time.

In those countries we are living on the good will earned by American missionaries and other representatives in the past, but we must educate to meet the new threat, rising like a cloud on our horizon.

Admiral Rickover, developer of the atomic submarine, has said that, despite the fact that the Russians are ahead of us in missiles, he regards the greatest Soviet Russian threat to us as coming, not from missiles, but from the driving Russian educational system.

Here in Texas we have a woeful failure to give our young people a fair chance at a college education. Of all the young people in Texas between the ages of 18 and 21, only 31½ percent attend college, while in California 60 percent of all young people between 18 and 21 attend college; in Utah 64 percent, and in Massachusetts 53.3 percent.

Here in Texas we have the greatest quantum of natural resources and mineral wealth found in any 265,000 square miles of the earth's surface. Despite that wealth, the average annual per capita income of Texans (at a little over $1,900 per year) places Texas 32d among the States of the Nation (32d down from the top) in the average income of our people.

Furthermore, recent surveys have revealed that of all management jobs in Texas business and industry, 65 percent are held by persons educated in other States, and only 35 percent are educated in Texas. Veritably we are becoming the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for those educated elsewhere who come in to manage our patrimony and enjoy our birthright.

But the problem isn't limited to Texas. A very fine article in the Austin American yesterday (Apr. 5, 1961), by Lynn Poole of Johns Hopkins University, under the title "Rising Costs Will Bar College Doors to Youth," warns of the tragedy of America's greatest underdeveloped resource and asset, the brainpower of her youth. The article gives these results of a survey:

"Assume that you live on a street which contains 10 houses. Further assume that you and your nine neighbors all earn between $5,000 and $7,500 per year, and that you will have children in elementary school.

"Today, in 8 of the 10 houses on that street, parents are making plans for their children to attend college when the time comes in the years ahead. If you are making similar plans, your house is one of these eight.

"The sorry truth is, however, that children from only three of the houses on your street will ever see the inside of a building on a college campus. Parents in the other five houses who had been hoping to see their youngsters march off to college are doomed to disappointment.

"There is one overriding reason for these discouraging facts: money.

"A recent survey has uncovered some revealing facts with regard to the financing of higher education.

"Of parents earning $3,000 or less per year, 39 percent expect their children can go to college. Only 12 percent get there.

"Of parents who earn $10,000 or more 95 percent expect their offspring to attend college. In this group 65 percent do attend.

"In both cases, fewer children go than are expected to. However, the greatest disappointment comes in the middle income range—on your street of 10 houses.

"In the $5,000 to $7,500 group, 80 percent expect their children to go to college—28 percent actually go.

"The figures are slightly better for the group whose income ranges from $7,500 to $10,000. Ninety percent anticipate college for their children and more than 50 percent make it.

"Thus, it becomes quite clear, according to the report, that there is a correlation between parent's income and college for the children."

With the financial burden of a college education barring the door for half of all those whom we should be educating, we must find means to unlock this resource of talent and brainpower. One such means is the G.I. bill for the education of cold war veterans, which I am sponsoring in the Senate of the United States. It would furnish educational opportunities, either college, high school, or on-the-job training, for 4¼ million veterans of the cold war, over 200,000 of them right here in Texas.

We have other educational programs pending in the U.S. Congress—cooperative programs, calling for partnership action by State and national legislative bodies, to give American youth, and ourselves, the thrust for the future that only education can give.

Dr. Arthur H. Moehiman, a leading authority on education, now serving on the faculty of the University of Texas, in discussing the need for meeting and expanding our educational system, in keeping with the educational awakening now going on, warned us:

"The cost will be very high because of the tremendous increase in population, because of the complex nature of our culture, because of the mandatory need for cooperation between school and community, and because of the speeded-up metabolism of human history, which can outrun man. We are creating a new world, but we find it difficult to visualize what is a better world. There is a vast warfare between our ethics and our knowledge, between human wisdom and cosmos-shaking mechanisms. However, if we can pay the price of searching for the good and noble life through democracy and universal education, history will not outrun us and we will play a wise and courageous role

in our new world. If we can carry out our second educational awakening, universal education will continue to be the United States' greatest contribution to world culture."

Fellow legislators, the tasks, responsibilities and duties of meeting this challenge are yours, and mine. Some other branches of Government receive more favorable treatment from the press and other news media than we legislators. But we are the ones who meet the hard unpleasant duty of levying the taxes to pay for this educational advance. The legislator lives in no sheltered world, such as the judiciary enjoy. How well we legislators face and discharge that duty, will be the measure of the freedom and security of us all.

The free world looks to us for leadership and guidance. Fellow legislators, I trust we will not fail our country and freedom. It is a part of the legislator's creed that he takes the gaff, does his duty, and advances freedom, learning, justice, and civilization. Thanks for this visit, and God bless you in this discharge of your duties.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1961

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 3, 1961)

The Senate met in executive session at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable EDWARD V. LONG, a Senator from the State of Missouri.

Rev. G. E. Rittenhouse, minister, Second Baptist Church, Bowling Green, Mo., and chaplain of the Missouri State Senate, offered the following prayer:

Our dear Heavenly Father, as this body convenes today, may each one search his heart for the attitude that will best serve the people of this Nation, and may those attitudes be pleasing to You.

We realize the troubles that are present around the world. Help the leaders of our Nation find the key to the solutions through the leadership and guidance of Your spirit.

We thank You for Your many blessings; and may we always be ready to acknowledge You in all things.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EDWARD V. LONG, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LONG of Missouri thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the legislative Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 3, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 1, 1961, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 3935) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

As in legislative session, by unanimous consent, the following proceedings occurred:

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF LIQUIDATION ACTIVITIES OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the progress of the liquidation activities of the national defense, war and reconversion activities of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the quarter ended March 31, 1961; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK INSURANCE AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, as of March 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, covering the period January 1-June 30, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESTORATION TO INDIAN TRIBES OF CERTAIN FUNDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the restoration to Indian tribes of unclaimed per capita and other individual payments of tribal trust funds (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LIFE TENURE AND RETIREMENT RIGHTS FOR CERTAIN JUDGES

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. district court for the district of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered on behalf of certain aliens, relating to adjustment of their immigration status (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"S. 113

"Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the establishment of a prompt and affirmative policy encouraging and assisting the citizens of the United States in constructing fallout protection shelters in the event of a nuclear attack

"Whereas the Governors' conference meeting in San Juan, P.R., in 1959, urged responsible officials at all levels of government to take immediate steps to encourage and assist people to prepare themselves for survival from nuclear attacks, by the construction of fallout shelters; and

"Whereas a special committee on civil defense of the Governors' conference in January 1960, reported that fallout protection for all citizens is a prompt reality; and

"Whereas in June of 1960 the Governors' conference, meeting in Montana, urged that protective steps be taken by and for the people of every State and asked that the Federal Government take further supporting action; and

"Whereas the health, the safety, and the survival of the individual citizen is a matter of paramount State and national concern: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the members of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations now respectfully request the President and the Congress of the United States to make prompt and effective fallout protection for all of the citizens of the United States a declared national policy and to support State, local, and individual efforts by measures, among other things, providing income tax deductions for the cost of shelters up to $100 per planned shelter occupant, appropriate funds for fallout protection in all existing and future Federal buildings, making fallout protection mandatory in all construction built with Federal funds, or financed by Federal loans or guarantees, and direct the promulgation of a comprehensive nationwide program of nuclear protection, warning and training; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby requested to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States in the earnest hope that each will use every endeavor to have favorable and prompt action taken hereon."

A letter in the nature of a petition signed by H. Joseph Mahoney, of Bronxville, N.Y., praying that the Senate will not consent to compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD a copy of Senate Joint Memorial 10, adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislative Assembly of Oregon late in April 1961.

This memorial was brought to my attention by one of Oregon's outstanding legislators, the Honorable Dwight H. Hopkins, a member of the Oregon State Senate.

I urge serious consideration of the memorial by the Corps of Engineers and by the appropriate committees of the U.S. Senate.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 10

To His Excellency the Honorable President of the United States; to the Honorable Stuart Udall, Secretary of the Department of the Interior; and to the Oregon Congressional Delegation:

We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that—

Whereas there has been designated by the Corps of Army Engineers a damsite on the upper Grande Ronde River in Union County, Oreg., known as Spring Creek damsite; and

Whereas there has been designated by the Corps of Army Engineers on upper Catherine Creek in eastern Union County, Oreg., a damsite known as Catherine Creek damsite; and

Whereas these damsites were designated as such as a part of the flood-control program of the Columbia River Basin; and

Whereas if Spring Creek damsite and Catherine Creek damsite are developed to their full potential by the construction thereon of dams, substantial benefits in the form of flood control, farmland irrigation, and recreational development would be realized in Baker, Union, Wallowa, Grant, and Umatilla Counties in northeastern Oregon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives (jointly) concurring):

1. The Honorable Stuart Udall, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, is memorialized to take all steps possible to insure that projected flood-control dams be constructed as soon as possible on Spring Creek damsite on the upper Grande Ronde River in Union County, Oreg., and on Catherine Creek damsite in Union County, Oreg.

2. Copies of this memorial shall be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1289. A bill to amend section 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifests (Rept. No. 202).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1185. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the expenditure from certain capital reserve funds of certain amounts for research, development, and design expenses (Rept. No. 203).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1805. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chong Shee Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1806. A bill relating to lands comprising a part of the Arrowwood National Wildlife Refuge managed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CHURCH (by request):

S. 1807. A bill to authorize the disposition of land no longer needed for the Chilocco Indian Industrial School at Chilocco, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT):

S. 1808. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1938, as amended, to encourage the construction and maintenance of American-flag vessels built in American shipyards; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1809. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1810. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi Offshore Warning Area, for defense purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1811. A bill to amend section 13(h)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, relating to conveyances of property for park or recreational purposes, and for historic-monument purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr RANDOLPH, and Mr. MUSKIE):

S. 1812. A bill to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 138); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to standing committees) is amended by—

(1) striking out subparagraphs 10 through 13 in paragraph (h) of section (1);

(2) striking out subparagraphs 16 through 19 in paragraph (l) of section (1); and

(3) inserting in section (1) after paragraph (o) the following new paragraph:

"(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to consist of nine Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the following subjects:

"1. Veterans' measures, generally.

"2. Pensions of all wars of the United States, general and special.

"3. Life insurance issued by the Government on account of service in the Armed Forces.

"4. Compensation of veterans.

"5. Vocational rehabilitation and education of veterans.

"6. Veterans' hospitals, medical care, and treatment of veterans.

"7. Soldiers' and sailors' civil relief.

"8. Readjustment of servicemen to civil life."

SEC. 2. Effective for the remainder of the Eighty-sixth Congress, section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) (a) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed twenty-one Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed nine Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on three standing committees and no more.

"(b) In the event that during the Eighty-seventh Congress members of one party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the thirty third-committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

"Senate seats		3d committee assignments	
Majority	Minority	Majority	Minority
50	50	23	7
51	49	21	9
52	48	19	11
53	47	17	13"

SEC. 3. Effective at the beginning of the Eighty-seventh Congress, section (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed nineteen Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed seven Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may serve on three standing committees and no more."

SEC. 4. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed as promptly as feasible after its appointment and organization to confer with the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the purpose of determining what disposition should be made of proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters theretofore referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the Eighty-seventh Congress which are within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

STUDY OF CONDITIONS IN AMERICAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSTON submitted a resolution (S. Res. 139) to study conditions in American textile industry resulting from investments abroad in that industry by Americans, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JOHNSTON, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF AMERICAN-FLAG VESSELS BUILT IN AMERICAN SHIPYARDS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1938, as amended, to encourage the construction and maintenance of American-flag vessels built in American shipyards. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1808) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1938, as amended, to encourage the construction and maintenance of American-flag vessels built in American shipyards, introduced by Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"For purposes of this section, the term 'Privately owned United States-flag commercial vessels' shall not be deemed to include any vessel which, subsequent to the date of enactment of this amendment, shall have been either (a) built outside the United States, (b) rebuilt outside the United States, or (c) documented under any foreign registry, until such vessel shall have been documented under the laws of the United States for a period of three years."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, generally referred to as the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952. This law, which was enacted over a Presidential veto in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, was virtually a complete recodification and modification of our immigration, nationality, deportation, and naturalization statutes.

A measure of the magnitude of the Immigration and Nationality Act is bound to require some qualifications from time to time to keep abreast of developments, both at home and abroad. The changes in existing law as proposed by this bill are as follows:

1. DEFINITIONS

The section listing definitions is amended by the addition of a new subparagraph at the end, which adds eligible orphan—adopted abroad or coming into the United States for adoption—to the list of definitions under the term "child." "Eligible orphan" is then defined as an alien child under age of 10 who is an orphan due to the loss of both parents or due to the complete legal release of the child by the remaining parent. It is also provided that no natural parent of such a child shall gain any rights under the Immigration and Nationality Act. The result of this change is that the term "child" will include eligible orphans for all purposes of the subchapter dealing with immigration.

The definition of "veterans" is amended by the addition of veterans of the Korean hostilities. The result of this change is that the term "veteran" includes veterans of the Korean hostilities—June 25, 1950, to July 1, 1955—for the purposes of part 3 of subchapter 3 dealing with the loss of nationality.

2. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS OF DEPORTATION

The bill incorporates the provisions of chapter 19A, 5 U.S.C. 1031, which is entitled "Review of Orders of Federal Agencies." The bill, however, lists several limitations and changes to be considered with chapter 19A. The result of combining chapter 19A and these changes is as follows:

First. The venue of any petition for review will be in the judicial circuit in which the deportation proceedings were held or wherein petitioner resides.

Second. Exclusive jurisdiction is given to the court of appeals of the particular circuit except that if a genuine issue of material fact as to the petitioner's nationality is presented, the proceedings will be transferred to a U.S. district court where petitioner resides.

Third. A petition for review must be filed within 6 months of the issuance of the final deportation order.

Fourth. Service of the petition shall be made upon the Attorney General and upon the immigration official in charge of the district wherein the court is located. The Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be made respondent.

Fifth. The filing of the petition to review shall stay or suspend the operation of the deportation order but the Attorney General in his discretion may proceed with the deportation or hold the alien in custody.

Sixth. Makes habeas corpus proceedings the method for obtaining review when an alien is in custody. Review by habeas corpus is made the sole means of obtaining judicial review for persons excluded because of affliction with contagious disease.

Seventh. Allows a separate motion for judicial review before trial in a criminal proceeding where the alien is accused of attempting to evade deportation or for refusing to appear when ordered, if the validity of the deportation order has not been judicially determined.

3. QUOTA RESERVE SYSTEM

Provides for a quota reserve system, a method for using the total quota numbers not used by the various quota areas. Preference for issuance under this reserve system is given in order to:

First. First 40 percent of the reserve—parents of citizens.

Second. Next 30 percent of the reserve—spouses or children of citizens.

Third. Next 30 percent of the reserve—brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters of citizens.

4. SKILLED SPECIALIST SELECTION BOARD

Sets up a five-member Skilled Specialists Selection Board with one member chosen from each of the following Departments: Justice; Defense; Agriculture; Commerce; and Health, Education, and Welfare. These members will be appointed by the respective heads of the Departments. The chief duty of the Board will be to determine the eligibility of skilled applicants and to evaluate

their prospective contributions to the national defense, scientific or cultural progress, technical development, economic interest, or welfare of the United States.

5. NONQUOTA STATUS

Amends the section dealing with nonquota status by preventing "eligible orphans" from being eligible from such status. Such a child may be admitted, however, if the petitioner submits proof that he will properly care for such child and in the case of a child adopted abroad that he and his spouse were physically present in the country. A limit of two petitions is set in cases of adopted children and "eligible orphans."

6. EXCLUDABLE CLASSES OF ALIENS

Allows admission of aliens afflicted with tuberculosis subject to regulations prescribed by the Public Health Service and Attorney General except where it is necessary to prevent the separation of brothers and sisters. This makes permanent the procedure which is temporarily in effect until June 30, 1961. Also permits admission of aliens convicted of a single misdemeanor. Authorizes the admission of an alien who would normally be excluded because of a criminal conviction or connection with prostitution if it shall be established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that (a) the alien's exclusion would result in extreme hardship to the U.S. citizen, (b) the admission to the United States if such alien is not contrary to best interests of United States. Also, permits Attorney General in his discretion to admit aliens who are excludable because of previous fraudulent attempts to enter.

7. DEPORTATION FOR FRAUD

Grants an alien who has sought or procured a visa as entry through fraud the right to show that the misrepresentation was based on fear of persecution if repatriated to his former home.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and that it lie on the desk through Monday, May 8, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 1809) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101) is hereby amended by adding the following new subparagraph (6):

"(6) The term 'eligible orphan' means an alien child under the age of ten who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents, or because of abandonment, or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or who has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of, abandonment, or desertion by, or separation or loss from the other parent, and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for such orphan and has in writing irrevocably released him for emigration and adoption."

SEC. 2. Section 101(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101) is hereby amended by adding the following:

"(F) a child who is an eligible orphan, adopted abroad by a United States citizen and spouse or coming to the United States for adoption by a United States citizen and spouse: *Provided,* That no natural parent of any such child shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under this Act."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 101(d)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101) is amended by inserting immediately after "December 31, 1946," the following: "or from June 25, 1950, to July 1, 1955,".

(b) Section 101(d)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101) is amended (1) by striking out "and (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(C)", and (2) by inserting immediately after "December 31, 1946" the following: "; and (D) the term 'Korean hostilities' relates to the period from June 25, 1950, to July 1, 1955".

SEC. 4. Title I of the Immigration and Nationality Act is hereby amended by adding the following:

"JUDICIAL REVIEW OF ORDERS OF DEPORTATION

"SEC. 106. (a) The procedure prescribed by, and all the provisions of the Act of December 29, 1950, as amended (64 Stat. 1129; 68 Stat. 961; 5 U.S.C. 1031 and the following) shall apply to, and shall be the sole and exclusive procedure for, the judicial review of all final orders of deportation heretofore or hereafter made against aliens within the United States pursuant to administrative proceedings under section 242 (b) of this Act or comparable provisions of any prior Act, except that—

"(1) a petition for review may be filed not later than six months from the date of the final deportation order or from the effective date of this Act, whichever is the later.

"(2) the venue of any petition for review under this Act shall be in the judicial circuit in which the administrative proceedings before a special inquiry officer were conducted in whole or in part, or in the judicial circuit wherein is the residence, as defined in this Act, of the petitioner, but not in more than one circuit;

"(3) the action shall be brought against the Immigration and Naturalization Service, as respondent. Service of the petition to review shall be made upon the Attorney General of the United States and upon the official of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in charge of the Service district in which the office of the clerk of the court is located. The service of the petition for review upon such official of the Service shall stay the deportation of the alien pending determination of the petition by the court, unless the court otherwise directs;

"(4) except as provided in clause (B) of paragraph (5) of this subsection, the petition shall be determined solely upon the administrative record upon which the deportation order is based and the Attorney General's findings of fact, if supported by reasonable, substantial, and probative evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive;

"(5) Whenever any petitioner, who seeks review of an order under this section, claims to be a national of the United States and makes a showing that his claim is not frivolous, the court shall (A) pass upon the issues presented when it appears from the pleadings and affidavits filed by the parties that no genuine issue of material fact is presented; or (B) where a genuine issue of material fact as to the petitioner's nationality is presented, transfer the proceedings to a United States district court for the district where the petitioner has his residence for hearing de novo of the nationality claim and determination as if such proceedings were originally initiated in the district court under the provisions of section 2201 of title 28, United States Code. Any such petitioner shall not be entitled to have such issue determined under section 360(a) of this Act or otherwise;

"(6) if the validity of a deportation order has not been judicially determined, its validity may be challeneged in a criminal proceeding against the alien for violation of subsection (d) or (e) of section 242 of this Act only by separate motion for judicial review before trial. Such motion shall be determined by the court without a jury and before the trial of the general issue. Whenever a claim to United States nationality is made in such motion, and in the opinion of the court, a genuine issue of material fact as to the alien's nationality is presented, the court shall accord him a hearing de novo on the nationality claim and determine that issue as if proceedings had been initiated under the provisions of section 2201 of title 28, United States Code. Any such alien shall not be entitled to have such issue determined under section 360(a) of this Act or otherwise. If no such hearing de novo as to nationality is conducted, the determination shall be made solely upon the administrative record upon which the deportation order is based and the Attorney General's findings of fact, if supported by reasonable, substantial and probative evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. If the deportation order is held invalid, the court shall dismiss the indictment and the United States shall have the right to appeal to the court of appeals within thirty days. The procedure on such appeals shall be as provided in the Federal rules of criminal procedure. No petition for review under this section may be filed by any alien during the pendency of a criminal proceeding against such alien for violation of subsection (d) or (e) of section 242 of this Act; and

"(7) nothing in this section shall be construed to require the Attorney General to defer deportation of an alien after the issuance of a deportation order because of the right of judicial review of the order granted by this section, or to relieve any alien from compliance with subsections (d) and (e) of section 242 of this Act. Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to preclude the Attorney General from detaining or continuing to detain an alien or from taking him into custody pursuant to subsection (c) of section 242 of this Act at any time after the issuance of a deportation order.

"(8) it shall not be necessary to print the record or any part thereof, or the briefs, and the court shall review the proceedings on a typewritten record and on typewritten briefs.

"(9) any alien held in custody pursuant to an order of deportation may obtain judicial review thereof by habeas corpus proceedings.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, any alien against whom a final order of exclusion has been made heretofore or hereafter under the provisions of section 236 of this Act or comparable provisions of any prior Act may obtain judicial review of such order by habeas corpus proceedings and not otherwise.

"(c) An order of deportation or of exclusion shall not be reviewed by any court if the alien has not exhausted the administrative remedies available to him as of right under the immigration laws and regulations or if he has departed from the United States after the issuance of the order. Every petition for review or for habeas corpus shall state whether the validity of the order has been upheld in any prior judicial proceeding, and, if so, the nature and date thereof, and

the court in which such proceeding took place. No petition for review or for habeas corpus shall be entertained if the validity of the order has been previously determined in any civil or criminal proceeding, unless the petition presents grounds which the court finds could not have been presented in such prior proceeding, or the court finds that the remedy provided by such prior proceeding was inadequate or ineffective to test the validity of the order."

"(d) This section shall take effect on the thirtieth day after its enactment and, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, including section 405 of this Act, shall then be applicable to all administrative proceedings involving deportation or exclusion of aliens notwithstanding (1) that the person involved entered the United States prior to the effective date of this section, or (2) that the administrative proceeding was commenced or conducted prior to the effective date of this section.

"Any judicial proceeding to review an order of deportation which is pending unheard in any district court of the United States on the effective date of this section (other than a habeas corpus or criminal proceeding in which the validity of the deportation order has been challenged) shall be transferred for determination in accordance with this section to the court of appeals having jurisdiction to entertain a petition for review under this section. Any judicial proceeding to review an order of exclusion which is pending unheard on the effective date of this section shall be expedited in the same manner as is required in a habeas corpus proceeding. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this section are, to the extent of such inconsistency, repealed. If any particular provision of this section, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this section and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

SEC. 5. Section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151) is amended by adding the following:

"(f)(1) As used in this subsection—

"(A) the term 'quota reserve' means the total amount of annual quota numbers allocated to all quota areas pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) which have not been used during any fiscal year.

"(B) the term 'subquota' means the respective amount of quota numbers allocated annually for the use of immigrants specified in section 202(c).

"(2) The Secretary of State shall, not later than on the sixtieth day immediately following the end of any fiscal year, determine and proclaim the quantum in the quota reserve for each such fiscal year. The quota numbers in the quota reserve shall be available during each respective ensuing twelve-month period, beginning October 1 and ending September 30 of the following year, for immigrant visa issuance to qualified quota immigrants specified in paragraph (3) of this subsection who pursuant to the provisions of this Act are chargeable to a quota or subquota which does not exceed seven thousand numbers annually. Each quota of such quota area or subquota area shall be allotted a percentage of the quantum in the quota reserve equal to the percentage which the respective quota or subquota bears to the aggregate of all annual quotas which do not exceed seven thousand numbers.

"(3)(A) Any alien who is eligible for a preference quota immigrant status under the provisions of paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of section 203(a) if otherwise admissible under the provisions of this Act, may be issued a quota immigrant visa under this subsection: *Provided*, That upon his application for an immigrant visa, and for his admission into the United States, the alien is found to have retained his status, as established by the Attorney General pursuant to section 205.

"(B) The first 40 per centum of the quota reserve for each respective twelve-month period specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection plus any portion of such quota reserve not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of this subsection, shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to applicants classified for preference status under the provisions of section 203(a)(2).

"(C) The next 30 per centum of the quota reserve for each respective twelve-month period specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection plus any portion of such quota reserve not required for the issuance of immigrant visas to the classes specified in paragraphs (B) and (D) of this subsection, shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to applicants classified for preference status under the provisions of section 203(a)(3).

"(D) The next 30 per centum of the quota reserve for each respective twelve-month period specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection plus any portion of such quota reserve not required for the issuance of immigrant visa to the classes specified in paragraphs (B) and (C) of this subsection, shall be made available for the issuance of immigrant visas to applicants classified for preference status under the provisions of section 203(a)(4).

"(4)(A) The provisions of section 203(c) shall be applicable in the issuance of immigrant visas under this subsection.

"(B) A quota immigrant shall be entitled to receive a visa under this subsection only if there is not immediately available to him an immigrant visa under the quota established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

"(C) Quota numbers from the quota reserve not used for immigrant visa issuance during the respective twelve-month period specified in paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not be available for issuance or other use at any other time."

SEC. 6. Section 202(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1152) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) After the determination of quotas has been made as provided in section 201, revision of the quotas shall be made by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Attorney General, jointly, whenever necessary, to provide for any change of boundaries resulting in transfer of territory from one sovereignty to another, a change of administrative arrangements of a colony or other dependent area, or any other political change, requiring a change in the list of quota areas or of the territorial limits thereof. In the case of any change in the territorial limits of quota areas, not requiring a change in the quotas for such areas, the Secretary of State shall, upon recognition of such change, issue appropriate instructions to all consular offices concerning the change in the territorial limits of the quota areas involved. Whenever one or more colonies or other component or dependent areas overseas from the governing country, or one or more quota areas have been subject to a change of administrative arrangements, a change of boundaries, or any other political change, the annual quota of the newly established quota area or the number of visas authorized to be issued under section 202(c)(1), notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, shall not be less than the sum total of quotas in effect or number of visas authorized for the area immediately preceding the change of administrative arrangements, change of boundaries, or other political change."

SEC. 7. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) After an investigation of the facts in each case, the Attorney General shall, if he determines that such facts stated in the petition are true and that the alien in respect of whom the petition is made is eligible for an immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(F)(i) or section 203(a)(1)(A), approve the petition: *Provided*, That the Attorney General shall not approve any petition for the classification of an alien under section 203(a)(1)(A) unless the Skilled Specialists Selection Board, established pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection shall have recommended the approval of such petition.

"(2) The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to establish in the Immigration and Naturalization Service, under such regulations as he may prescribe after consultation with the Secretaries of Defense; Agriculture; Commerce; and Health, Education, and Welfare a Skilled Specialists Selection Board, composed of five members who shall be employees of the Departments of Justice; Defense; Agriculture; Commerce; and Health, Education, and Welfare, respectively; appointed by the respective heads of the Departments herein listed, with due regard to their fitness for the performance of the duties imposed upon them by this subsection and regulations issued hereunder.

"(3) The Skilled Specialists Selection Board shall have jurisdiction to review the petitions filed under the proviso to subsection (c) of this section and make recommendations to the Attorney General pursuant to determination of the eligibility of the alien therein named and the evaluation of his contribution, prospectively, to the national defense, scientific or cultural progress, technical development, economic interests, or welfare of the United States. The Attorney General shall forward one copy of the petition approved under this subsection to the Secretary of State who shall then authorize the consular officer concerned to grant the immigrant status specified in the approved petition."

SEC. 8. (a) Section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1155) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his spouse or child and that such immigrant is entitled to a nonquota immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(A), or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his parent or unmarried son or unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(2), or any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence claiming that any immigrant is his spouse or his unmarried son or his unmarried daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a quota immigrant status under section 203(a)(3), or any citizen of the United States claiming that any immigrant is his brother or sister or his married son or his married daughter and that such immigrant is entitled to a preference under section 203(a)(4) may file a petition with the Attorney General. No petition for quota immigrant status or a preference in behalf of a son or daughter under paragraph (2), (3), or (4) of section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be approved by the Attorney General unless the petitioner establishes that he is a parent as defined in section 101(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of the alien in respect to whom the petition is made, except that no such petition shall be approved if the beneficiary thereof is an alien defined in section 101(b)(1)(F). No petition for nonquota immigrant status in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b)(1)(F) shall be approved by the Attorney General unless the petitioner establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the petitioner and spouse will care for such child properly if he is admitted to the United States, and (i) in the case of a child adopted abroad, that the petitioner and

spouse were physically present in the country of such child's residence when adoption proceedings were instituted, pending, or terminated, and (ii) in the case of a child coming to the United States for adoption, that the petitioner and spouse have complied with the preadoption requirements, if any, of the State of such child's proposed residence. The petition shall be in such form and shall contain such information and be supported by such documentary evidence as the Attorney General may by regulations prescribe. The petition shall be made under oath administered by any individual having authority to administer oaths, if executed in the United States, but, if executed outside the United States, administered by a consular officer."

(b) The last sentence of section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1155) is amended to read: "Not more than two such petitions may be approved for one petitioner in behalf of a child as defined in section 101(b)(1) (E) or (F), unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers and sisters."

(c) Section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1155) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, no petition shall be approved if the alien previously has been accorded—

"(1) a nonquota status under section 101 (a)(27)(A) as the spouse of a citizen of the United States, or

"(2) a preference quota status under section 203(a)(3) as the spouse of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, by reason of a marriage determined by the Attorney General to have been entered into for the purpose of evading the immigration laws."

SEC. 9. Section 212(a)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) Aliens who are afflicted with any dangerous contagious disease;"

SEC. 10. Section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended by changing the semicolon at the end to a period, and adding thereafter the following: "Any alien who would be excludable because of the conviction of a misdemeanor classifiable as a petty offense under the provisions of section 1(3) of title 18, United States Code, by reason of the punishment actually imposed, or who would be excludable as one who admits the commission of an offense that is classifiable as a misdemeanor under the provisions of section 1(2) of title 18, United States Code, by reason of the punishment which might have been imposed upon him, may hereafter be granted a visa and admitted to the United States if otherwise admissible: *Provided*, That the alien has committed only one such offense;".

SEC. 11. Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended by adding the following additional subsections:

"(f) Any alien afflicted with tuberculosis in any form who (A) is the spouse or the unmarried son or daughter, or the minor unmarried lawfully adopted child, of a United States citizen, or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or of an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, or (B) has a son or daughter who is a United States citizen, or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, shall, if otherwise admissible, be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence in accordance with such terms, conditions, and controls, if any, including the giving of a bond, as the Attorney General, in his discretion, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, may by regulations prescribe.

"(g) Any alien, who is excludable from the United States under paragraph (9), (10), or (12) of this section, who (A) is the spouse or child, including a minor unmarried adopted child, of a United States citizen, or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or (B) has a son or daughter who is a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, shall, if otherwise admissible, be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence (1) if it shall be established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that (A) the alien's exclusion would result in extreme hardship to the United States citizen or lawfully resident spouse, parent, or son or daughter of such alien, and (B) the admission to the United States of such alien would not be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security of the United States; and (2) if the Attorney General, in his discretion, and pursuant to such terms, conditions, and procedures as he may by regulations prescribe, has consented to the alien's applying or reapplying for a visa and for admission to the United States.

"(h) Any alien who is the spouse, parent, or child of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence and who is excludable because (1) he seeks, has sought to procure, or has procured, a visa or other documentation, or entry into the United States, by fraud or misrepresentation, or (2) he admits the commission of perjury in connection therewith, may be granted a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if otherwise admissible, if the Attorney General in his discretion has consented to the alien's applying or reapplying for a visa and for admission to the United States."

SEC. 12. The first sentence of section 221 (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201) is amended to read: "An immigrant visa shall be valid for such period, not exceeding four months, as shall be by regulations prescribed, except that any visa issued to a child lawfully adopted by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business, shall be valid until such time, for a period not to exceed three years, as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his service, employment, or business."

SEC. 13. Section 222 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1202) is amended by deleting from subsection (a) the language "race and ethnic classification;", and by deleting from subsection (c) the language "his race and ethnic classification:".

SEC. 14. Section 241 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1251) is hereby amended by adding the following:

"(f) The provisions of this section relating to the deportation of aliens within the United States on the ground that they were excludable at the time of entry as (1) aliens who have sought to procure, or have procured visas or other documentation, or entry into the United States by fraud or misrepresentation, or (2) aliens who were not of the nationality specified in their visas, shall not apply to an alien otherwise admissible at the time of entry who (A) is the spouse, parent, or a child of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; or (B) was admitted to the United States between December 22, 1945, and November 1, 1954, both dates inclusive, and misrepresented his nationality, place of birth, identity, or residence in applying for a visa: *Provided*, That such alien described in clause (B) shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the misrepresentation was predicated upon the alien's fear of persecution because of race, religion, or political opinion if repatriated to his former home or residence, and was not committed for the purpose of evading the quota restrictions of the immigration laws or an investigation of the alien at the place of his former home, or residence, or elsewhere."

SEC. 15. Section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1421) be amended by adding the following additional subsection:

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 405(a) any petition for naturalization filed on or after the enactment of this subsection shall be heard and determined in accordance with the requirements of this title."

SEC. 16. (a) Section 329(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1440) is amended by inserting after "December 31, 1946," the following: "or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955,".

(b) Section 329(b)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1440) is amended by inserting after "December 31, 1946," the following: "or during a period beginning June 25, 1950, and ending July 1, 1955,".

SEC. 17. (a) Section 340(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 260; 8 U.S.C. 1451(a)) is amended by inserting, following the language "that such order and certificate of naturalization" the language "were illegally procured or".

(b) Section 340(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 260; 8 U.S.C. 1451(b)) is amended by inserting, immediately preceding the word "procured", the language "illegally procured or".

(c) Section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 260; 8 U.S.C. 1451) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(k) In any proceeding under this section, for the purpose of revoking and setting aside the order admitting a person to citizenship and canceling the certificate of naturalization, the burden shall be upon the Government to prove its case by a preponderance of the evidence and such proof shall be sufficient for the making and entry of a judgment or decree revoking and setting aside the order admitting any person to citizenship and canceling the certificate of naturalization."

SEC. 18. Section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1481) is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(c) Whenever the loss of United States nationality is put in issue in any action or proceeding under, or by virtue of, the provisions of this or any other Act, the burden shall be upon the person or party claiming that such loss occurred, to establish such claim by a preponderance of the evidence. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), any person who commits or performs, or who has committed or performed, any act of expatriation under the provisions of this or any other Act shall be presumed to have done so voluntarily, but such presumption may be rebutted upon a showing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the act or acts committed or performed were not done voluntarily."

SEC. 19. Section 354(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1486) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(4) who has attained the age of sixty years, and has had a residence outside of the United States and its outlying possessions for not less than ten years, during all of which period he has been engaged in an occupation of the type designated in paragraph (1), (2), or (4) of section 353, or paragraph (2) of this section, and who is in bona fide retirement from such occupation; or who is the spouse or child of the national described in

this paragraph and who has his residence abroad for the purpose of being with such American citizen spouse or parent; or"

SEC. 20. The Table of Contents (Title I—General) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following:

"Sec. 106. Judicial review of orders of deportation."

SEC. 21. The language "CHAPTER 3—ISSUANCE ON ENTRY DOCUMENTS" of the Table of Contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"CHAPTER 3—ISSUANCE OF ENTRY DOCUMENTS"

SEC. 22. (a) The title preceding section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS; ANNUAL QUOTA BASED UPON NATIONAL ORIGIN; MINIMUM QUOTAS; QUOTA RESERVE"

(b) The title preceding section 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"PROCEDURE FOR GRANTING IMMIGRANT STATUS UNDER SECTION 101(a)(27)(F)(i) OR 203(a)(1)(A); SKILLED SPECIALISTS SELECTION BOARD"

(c) The title preceding section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"GENERAL CLASSES OF ALIENS INELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE VISAS AND EXCLUDED FROM ADMISSION; WAIVERS OF INADMISSIBILITY"

(d) The title preceding section 329 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"NATURALIZATION THROUGH ACTIVE-DUTY SERVICE IN ARMED FORCES DURING WORLD WAR I OR WORLD WAR II OR THE KOREAN HOSTILITIES"

SEC. 23. (a) Section 201 of the Table of Contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 201. Numerical limitations; annual quota based upon national origin; minimum quotas; quota reserve."

(b) Section 204 of the Table of Contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. Procedure for granting immigrant status under section 101(a)(27)(F)(i) or 203(a)(1)(A); Skilled Specialists Selection Board."

(c) Section 212 of the Table of Contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 212. General classes of aliens ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission; waivers of inadmissibility."

(d) Section 329 of the Table of Contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 329. Naturalization through active-duty services in Armed Forces during World War I or World War II or the Korean hostilities."

SEC. 24. (a) The following Acts and all amendments thereto and parts of Acts and all amendments thereto are repealed:

(1) Section 4 of the Act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145; 8 U.S.C. 1182a);

(2) Section 4 of the Act of September 11, 1957 (71 Stat. 639–640; 8 U.S.C. 1205);

(3) Sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Act of September 11, 1957 (71 Stat. 640–641; 8 U.S.C. 1182b; 8 U.S.C. 1182c; 8 U.S.C. 1251);

(4) Section 15 of the Act of September 11, 1957 (71 Stat. 643–644; 50 U.S.C. app. 1971a, note);

(5) Sections 9 and 12 of the Act of September 11, 1957 (71 Stat. 641–642; 8 U.S.C. 1101, note; 8 U.S.C. 1153);

(6) The Act of August 21, 1958 (72 Stat. 699; 8 U.S.C. 1255; 8 U.S.C. 1153, note);

(7) Sections 4 and 6 of the Act of September 22, 1959 (73 Stat. 644–645; 8 U.S.C. 1153, note).

(b) Paragraphs (5), (6) and (7) of subsection (a) of this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the one hundred eightieth day immediately following the date of enactment of this Act.

ADJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to bridge the substantial gap between anticipated revenue and expenses in the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1962 by increasing postal rates for first-, second-, third-, and fourth-class mail.

This is a companion measure to a bill that has been introduced in the House, for which preliminary hearings have already been started. My purpose in introducing the bill here is to permit the Members of the Senate to study all the issues involved, and to expedite Senate hearings at an early date. Many of the witnesses now appearing before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee will be asked to testify before our Senate committee, of which my distinguished colleague, OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, is chairman. Early action by the Senate on this most vital legislation will save an inestimable amount of time and money for all concerned.

Under the terms of this bill the proposed adjustments for postal rates would raise the sum of $741 million. This will help to narrow the gap of $831 million between postal income and outgo. Postmaster General J. Edward Day assures us the difference of $90 million will be met by administrative action.

In his budget message the President urged the Congress to take action to close this gap. And in his appearance before the House Committee Postmaster General Day has given logical and compelling reasons for congressional approval of his recommendations.

I heartily endorse General Day's public statement that rate adjustments must not be regarded as the only solution to chronic and burdensome postal difficulties, and I applaud his pledge to work unceasingly to reduce the cost of handling the mail.

It is clear, however, that no cost reduction plan alone can close the gap to which I refer without fatally impairing the postal service.

Congress, therefore, has the responsibility, under the Postal Policy Act of 1958, to adjust postal rates in order to produce revenue that would match operating costs—minus, of course, the amount Congress appropriates for public services.

Although the Post Office Department is a public service, we have a duty to place it, as nearly as we can, on a pay-as-you-go basis if we are to maintain an efficient and effective postal service.

I would not introduce this proposed legislation were I not convinced that the Post Office Department has tried to reach an equitable balance in calling on all users of the mail to pay a more reasonable share of the cost of our postal operations.

I recommend the bill for your most earnest consideration and study.

Cosponsoring the bill with me are Senators HAYDEN, NEUBERGER, RANDOLPH, and MUSKIE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1812) to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

INVESTIGATION OF DOMESTIC INVESTMENTS IN FOREIGN TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, today the American textile industry and the millions of people who work in the textile mills are threatened by the terrific import of foreign textile products manufactured by cheap foreign labor. Everyone is concerned for our textile industry, and even the President just the other day announced a seven-point program to help ease the pains now being felt in our textile industry. Although I think even more should be done in the way of mandatory quotas, I wholeheartedly endorse what the President has suggested.

For some time I have heard and received reports that American citizens and American textile manufacturers have heavily invested in foreign textile enterprises which are engaged in the manufacture of products now underselling American-made goods and putting American workers out of jobs and American industries out of business.

To say the least, I was shocked to learn of this because the American textile industry appeared to be unified in attempting to get relief through the imposition of mandatory import quotas on foreign products imported to this country. However, the reports I have been receiving indicate stronger and stronger that the true picture is that some American individuals and corporations have heavily invested in foreign textile plants and are reaping heavy profits as a result of imports coming into this country.

The American people, and particularly those engaged in the life-and-death struggle in the textile industry, both employers and employees, are entitled to know who is playing this international "shell game."

Mr. President, I therefore call on the Senate of the United States to probe investments by American citizens and domestic textile manufacturers in foreign textile mills competing with America.

To implement the investigation I submit a resolution to authorize the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to examine, investigate, and to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the effect upon the unemployment situation in the U.S. textile

industry, and conditions in the industry generally, of investments by American citizens and domestic manufacturers in the textile field in foreign textile plants exporting products to the United States in competition with products purchased by American labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 139) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized under sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, and in accordance with its jurisdiction specified by rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the effect upon the unemployment situation in the United States textile industry and conditions in the industry generally, of investments by American citizens and domestic manufacturers in the textile field in foreign textile plants exporting products to the United States in competition with products produced by American labor.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, from the date on which this resolution is agreed to, to January 31, 1962, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants: *Provided*, That the minority is authorized at its discretion to select one person for appointment, and the person so selected shall be appointed and his compensation shall be so fixed that his gross rate shall not be less by more than $1,200 than the highest gross rate paid to any other employee; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. The Committee shall report its findings upon the study and investigation authorized by this resolution, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed $ _____, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, S. 1706, a bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was introduced on April 24, 1961, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is quite sensitive with respect to its responsibilities for fixing the pay and adjudicating all other matters generally considered to be in the field of personnel management, but it does not believe that this responsibility extends to the establishment of top-level positions in agencies under the legislative jurisdiction of other committees.

In keeping with this policy, it would appear that the subject bill should be considered by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee that has the legislative responsibility for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I have discussed this with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], chairman of the committee, and he is in complete agreement with this action.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of S. 1706 and that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STABILIZATION OF MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be added as an additional cosponsor to the bill (S. 1747) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States and for other purposes, and that his name be listed at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF EQUITABLE RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 27, 1961, the name of Mr. DOUGLAS was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1723) to establish equitable railroad freight rates, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT) on April 27, 1961.

FOREIGN COMMERCE ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 27, 1961, the names of Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. GRUENING were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1729) to promote the foreign commerce of the United States, and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. ENGLE (for himself and other Senators) on April 27, 1961.

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 27, 1961, the names of Senators HUMPHREY, CARROLL, LONG of Missouri, MOSS, MCGEE, TALMADGE, HICKEY, CASE of South Dakota, PELL, PROUTY, YOUNG of Ohio, HART, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 77) to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence, introduced by Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and other Senators) on April 27, 1961.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Joseph Peter Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of Ohio, for a term of 4 years, vice Hugh K. Martin.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, May 11, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

Letter from Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller and excerpts from his remarks at dedication of IBM Research Center, Yorktown, N.Y., April 25, 1961, in respect to amendment of the tax law in relation to employees' stock options.

By Mr. HART:

Article entitled "Northern Virginia's Duchess Has Many Viewpoints," dealing with Esther Van Wagoner Tufty, national president of American Women in Radio and Television.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

Remarks of Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., at the National Housing Conference on March 13, 1961.

AWARD FOR JOURNALISM IN THE COMMONWEALTH TO BRUCE HUTCHISON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Christian Science Monitor for Monday, May 1, 1961, appears a short article relative to Bruce Hutchison, editor of the Victoria, British Columbia, Daily Mail. He has been honored by his colleagues in the Commonwealth by being given the award for journalism in the Commonwealth, instituted by the Council of the Royal Society of Arts, in London.

Mr. Hutchison is one of Canada's outstanding editors. He has made great contributions to the bettering of knowledge of his own country and also to the bettering of understanding between the United States and Canada. He has been interested, of course, in the Northwest, because of the fact that British Columbia impinges upon the States of Washington, Idaho, and Montana.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which gives the background of the award to this outstanding journalist, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADIAN EDITOR HONORED IN LONDON

LONDON.

Bruce Hutchison, editor of the Victoria (British Columbia) Daily Times, and who for many years has been the Christian Science Monitor's special correspondent in Canada, has been chosen to receive the Award for Journalism in the Commonwealth, instituted by the Council of the Royal Society of Arts here, it is announced in the May issue of the society Journal.

The award is made to an individual journalist who has "during the last 3 years made the most distinguished contribution to the highest standards of his profession, both by the quality, accuracy, and objectivity of his work and by his example, and has best promoted among his own people a closer understanding and appreciation of the problems and achievements of his country and of the Commonwealth as a whole."

Nominations were received from eight British Commonwealth countries, the Journal says.

ADDRESS BY EUGENE R. BLACK, PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD BANK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a speech by Mr. Eugene R. Black, President of the World Bank, given before the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, in New York.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS TO THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK

(By Eugene R. Black, President of the World Bank)

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, this year I am making my annual report to you in a period when world tensions are particularly acute. Like millions of other people, I have been following events in this United Nations Building with deep and anxious concern over the past 12 months. I am aware, of course—as all of us are—that the political difficulties with which the United Nations is struggling are reflections in many cases of economic problems; no lasting political solutions can be expected until much more is done to remedy the economic ills which afflict so many countries.

In these circumstances it is all the more important that the Economic and Social Council should continue to seek cooperation among nations to deal with the financial problems of our time. It is now acknowledged everywhere that much more assistance must be rendered to the less developed countries by those more fortunately placed. But the needs for financial assistance are of such great magnitude that it is vitally important to insure that aid is used in such a way as to contribute the maximum to the economic growth of the recipient countries.

The World Bank is itself, of course, a great cooperative of nations. What has been going on in our affairs over the past year can be taken as a good sample of the whole picture—and the past year has been a very busy one for us. Our rate of lending in the last fiscal year was maintained close to $700 million for the third successive year. In the first 9 months of this fiscal year new loans have totaled $380 million. That our volume of loans remains high despite the several new sources of finance which have become available indicates how large is the demand for development investment.

Geographically, the bulk of our lending continues to be in Asia, but Africa accounted for almost one-third of the Bank's lending in the last fiscal year. There has also been increased lending in Latin America, a development which reflects the degree to which some Latin American countries, despite reduced prices for their products, particularly coffee, have taken hold of their internal economic affairs and brought them to a state of order which provides a suitable basis for further economic growth. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Council should take note of the increasing number of Latin American countries which have recently attained relative stability after several years of acute inflationary difficulties. Readjustment in such circumstances is not easy and calls for sacrifice and discipline on the part of the peoples concerned. It is my hope that this new outlook on the part of those responsible for financial affairs in the Latin American countries will be sustained. For our part we look forward to increasing activity in that region.

In reporting these increases of Bank lending in the less developed regions I must also report a balancing factor, a considerable decrease in our lending in Europe. In calendar 1960 we made only one loan in Europe, of $25 million. It is cause for great satisfaction that Western Europe is in a position to satisfy its own needs for capital.

But Western Europe has not only made a negative contribution to the Bank, in the sense of abstaining from drawing on our loan funds. It has also made positive contributions of great importance by providing increasing amounts of money for lending elsewhere, both through the Bank and in other ways. The annual report before you records that, in our last fiscal year, two-thirds of the Bank's borrowing was outside the United States and included issues of bonds or notes in Germany, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. This situation has continued to prevail and all our borrowing so far in this fiscal year has been outside the United States. In September last we sold a $100 million issue of bonds by private placement with 47 institutional investors in 29 countries outside the United States. And we have made two public issues of bonds on the Swiss market, borrowing a total of 160 million Swiss francs, equivalent to about $37 million. In January of this year we made very satisfactory arrangements with the Deutsche Bundesbank, the Central Bank of West Germany, regarding the equivalent of $360 million of our notes held by the Bundesbank which were due to mature at intervals during 1961 and the ensuing 2 years. The effect of these new arrangements was to lengthen these maturities so that we shall not be called upon to redeem the earliest of them until 1964. Agreement by the Bundesbank to these transactions was very helpful to us and was one more example of the cordial cooperation which we continue to receive from the Bundesbank and from the West German Government in financing our operations. In fact, Germany has been the largest provider of funds for World Bank operations for the past 3 years—total outstanding Bank borrowing from Germany, public and private, is now equivalent to over $750 million.

So much for the financial aspects of the past year. But I often feel that the Bank's lending and borrowing are only the most noticeable part of the iceberg—the fraction which shows above the surface. A great deal of the Bank's time is spent on a variety of other, less publicized, activities directed at trying to assist the economic growth of our member countries. Our engineers and financial experts are engaged in regular visits to our member countries, investigating on the spot not only the progress of existing projects but the proposals for new projects which are constantly coming in. In the course of their duties these men are often able to render important technical assistance, especially when, as so often happens, the type of project being embarked upon is novel and requires new kinds of expertise on the part of the member country. Others of our staff often accompanied by consultants employed especially for the purpose, are engaged directly in technical assistance work, advising our less developed member countries on ways of coping with particular problems. Of particular interest in this connection are national transportation surveys which we have helped to organize in Argentina, Colombia, Peru, and Spain. We have also continued to respond to requests from many countries for assistance in the establishment, reorganization and operation of industrial development banks.

And during the past year we have had three general economic survey missions out in the field—in Venezuela, Tanganyika, and Uganda. Reports of two survey missions, which recommend the basis for long-term development programs, have recently appeared in book form, concerning Libya and Tanganyika. A third report, on Venezuela, will be published in May and the report on Uganda is now being written. I am glad to say that in all cases the governments have begun to act along the lines of the mission reports even before they were published to a wider audience. Demand for this kind of help continues. We have one mission in Spain now, another in Kuwait, and we are considering a mission to Kenya. In addition, within the next month or two, missions of slightly narrower scope will go to Chile and the Philippines to review their development programs.

Another important field of technical assistance is our work for the United Nations Special Fund. Mr. Hoffman has asked us to be executing agent for several of the projects undertaken by the Special Fund and we have handled a wide variety of surveys, including power and transportation in Argentina, a river valley development study in Nigeria, and a mineral survey in Surinam. In all, the Bank has been asked to act as executing agent for eight Special Fund projects in seven countries.

Then there is another type of effort in which we are engaged. We now call together at regular intervals a consortium of countries interested in the financing of the Indian 5-year plans. A meeting of that consortium will take place in Washington later this month. We have also organized a similar consortium to coordinate ways of assisting the Pakistani economic plan, and this group will meet in May.

Our work in connection with the Indus Basin has now, I am happy to say, moved from negotiation to action. When I addressed you last year I was able to be optimistic about the chances of an Indus Basin agreement and my optimism turned out to be well founded. The Indus Waters Treaty was signed last fall and also the Indus Basin Development Fund Agreement, whereby several countries generously joined to contribute almost the entire cost—about $1 billion—of the massive works which are needed in Pakistan to carry out the settlement. The Bank is administrator of the Development Fund and no time has been lost in calling for international tenders for the large projects which are involved.

Turning to another subject, I have to report to you, as Chairman of the International Finance Corporation, that the investments made by the Corporation during the past year have continued at the level reached in the previous year; 14 new investments have been made, aggregating about $16 million. The Corporation has now made 37 investments totaling $42.2 million in 17 member countries. Of the projects in which IFC has invested during the year, eight are

owned and managed by residents of the country where the project is located; five are joint enterprises of local and foreign ownership and management; and one is a subsidiary of a foreign firm.

Of considerable importance is the move to amend the Corporations' Charter to permit it to make investments in capital stock. Under its charter at present, IFC is prohibited from investing in capital stock or shares, and the experience of 4½ years has now convinced the Directors and management of IFC that this restriction is in practice a serious handicap both to the growth of IFC's operations and the mobilization of private capital for foreign investment. The proposed change is being submitted to IFC's Board of Governors for action.

In addition to these varied activities, the Bank has been very busy bringing into being the International Development Association. IDA already has over 45 signatories, with subscriptions totaling $900 million, and we have a lengthening list of likely IDA projects under investigation.

The range of these projects is wide, both in geography and type. They are located in Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa, and they include water supply, irrigation works, road development, port facilities, rural electrification, telecommunications, and industrial estates. Under its charter, IDA is to support projects which can contribute most to the development of the country concerned, whether or not they are directly productive. IDA will finance all the kinds of projects which the Bank finances and a broader range as well, including, I hope, a number in which other specialized agencies of the United Nations will have a direct interest. This wide variety of projects, many in countries at very early stages of development, may well make the task of processing IDA credits more difficult than processing Bank loans. Nevertheless, IDA will apply the same high standards in project preparation and execution as does the Bank. The fact that IDA's management and staff are the same as the Bank's will facilitate this.

IDA's charter does not prescribe terms of financing, other than to specify that they shall be flexible and shall bear less heavily on the balance of payments of borrowers than the terms of conventional loans. Although this does not necessarily establish a general pattern, we have decided for the first projects to provide IDA financing in the form of 50-year development credits, free of interest or commitment charge. These development credits will be repayable in foreign exchange, thus avoiding the accumulation of large quantities of local currencies. Amortization will begin after a 10-year period of grace, and the credits will carry a small service charge, designed to provide IDA with income to meet its administrative expenses. I was pleased to note that the U.S. administration wishes to adopt similar terms for its bilateral development loans.

We believe that IDA's objectives can best be served by limiting the availability of IDA funds to countries which, for reasons beyond their control, are not able to finance a satisfactory rate of development with their own resources plus conventional financing. Thus IDA borrowers can be expected to include not only countries whose foreign exchange situation is such that they cannot borrow abroad at all on conventional terms, but also those whose foreign debt service burden over the short and medium term is already so high that they cannot prudently borrow, on conventional terms, all of the external capital which they require to carry out their priority programs. It is already clear that the needs of these potential borrowers for development credits of the type which IDA can provide are far greater than can be satisfied with IDA's present resources. I am hopeful that in due course the obvious need, and IDA's record of performance, will together justify a substantial increase in IDA's financing capacities. I would hope, too, that countries contemplating an expansion of their aid programs may see fit to channel a part of the additional funds through IDA. Such a pooling of resources, I am convinced, is by far the most effective and satisfactory means of coordinating development aid.

But we should be less than wise if we were to place all reliance on new institutions providing development finance on easier and easier terms. There is a limit to the funds that capital-exporting countries are willing to provide. There are also movements in the less developed countries themselves which vitiate all efforts to raise world living standards. One of the most massive of these obstacles is the tremendous rise in the populations of already crowded countries.

For every four persons on earth in 1950, there are today five. For every 5 today, in 40 years there will probably be 10. In the past half-minute alone, about 90 babies will have been born into the world; only 60 persons will have died, leaving a net increase of 30 or 1 every second. This rate of growth last year added the equivalent of the population of Italy to the world's millions, and the rate seems to be accelerating. In 1961 it will probably push the population of the world past the 3 billion mark, and it will double that figure before the end of the century.

Three hundred years ago there were probably no more than 500 million people alive in the world, and the total was increasing only slowly. This stability was maintained by an uneasy balance between high birth rates and death rates. Many babies were born, but many also died. Living conditions were such that many of the remaining children failed to survive beyond the age of 30.

In Europe, the picture began to change in the late 18th century. Populations began to grow, sometimes very fast. Elsewhere the balance of new lives against deaths has been upset largely in our own lifetime. The pattern has been a steep fall in death rates, with birth rates little changed. But the circumstances have been somewhat different from the earlier European experience. The population revolution has often been achieved very cheaply. In Ceylon, to take the best-known example, the expenditure of $2 a head on a public health campaign with the prime purpose of eradicating malaria reduced the death rate by three-quarters over a single decade. Similar stories can already be told of public health programs undertaken in other countries, and there will undoubtedly be more in the future.

Of course we welcome this trend, whatever the problems it may set for us. We all want to reduce the suffering and waste involved in premature death or disabling disease, and we can expect death rates to go on falling in the developing countries. Medical science continues to discover increasingly effective ways of promoting public health, and since governments can usually act on behalf of the community in putting these new techniques to work, we may expect them to be applied as soon as the money can be found to pay the accompanying bill. People will live longer in the future.

But if only 20 people—or even fewer—in every thousand are henceforth to die each year, then a birth rate of 40 per thousand, which formerly just kept the population steady, will bring an explosive growth in numbers. And there is little reason to suppose that birth rates will soon decline to match the fall in death rates. It is much simpler to attack disease than it is to alter the reproductive pattern of a society. Medicine has yet to make available a cheap and easy method of regulating births. And not everyone wants fewer children.

What view are we to take of all this?

I am not convinced that population growth will eventually outrun the development of the world's resources. It is true that at present rates of consumption we will use up the known reserves of several important fuels and minerals within a few decades. Heavy demands will certainly be made on our agricultural resources, and there may be acute difficulty in organizing the movement of food and other necessities about the world on the scale required to meet the needs of a population twice its present size. But I am inclined to think that those prophets who forecast the exhaustion of the earth's resources, underestimate the ingenuity of man and the potentialities of science. And I am not too disturbed about the longrun problems of feeding the extra persons we expect, although I find myself a little out of sympathy with some of our professional agricultural optimists—it seems to me utopian to expect that every country will be cultivated as efficiently as Denmark, and that thereby the world could easily feed twice its present population.

But all this does not mean that we ought to welcome population growth on the scale that we see it today.

Some people argue that a big population implies a good market for the businessman's product: he can use mass production techniques and charge low prices. They insist, too, that with a growing population, the businessman constantly finds demand exceeding his estimates. Optimism and production run high; new products win ready acceptance, while obsolete industries die painlessly; the incentive to invest is strong; and social mobility and change are encouraged. The burden of social costs is spread widely. By contrast, they suggest, a declining or even stationary population brings pessimism and economic stagnation; there is insufficient reward for private enterprise, and the state is thereby forced to intervene increasingly in fields better left to the private citizen.

This body of theory may conceivably be true in the circumstances of a rich country with resources to spare. But it is wildly irrelevant to the problems of most developing countries today.

It is, of course, a fact that some of the poorer countries do not have domestic markets big enough to support mass production industries. But it is clearly ridiculous to suggest that inadequate population is holding back the development of, say, India, which packs more than twice the population of the United States into less than half the space. Where most people go barefoot for lack of shoes, industry is not failing to grow because its products are not wanted. Where the agricultural laborer can find work to occupy him for only half the year, no further pressure is needed to make him wish for a different occupation. Where two-thirds of every dollar of income must be spent on food, where manufacturing industry is almost nonexistent, one need not worry that excessive saving will lead to underemployment of resources. The lash of further poverty is not required to drive these people to action. The developing countries need many things—not only capital, but the skills and health to make good use of it. By no means do all of them need population growth.

But need it or not, they have it. They should ask themselves if they can afford it. In Asia, in the Middle East, in Latin America, in Africa, the population of most countries is growing at the rate of 2 percent annually—and sometimes 3½ percent or more. In most of Latin American and Africa there is fortunately room for the extra people. In the long run, although not now, there

should also be adequate resources available to feed, clothe, and house them. But in many parts of Asia and the Middle East, resources are few, and there is not nearly enough room. Agricultural land which once sufficed to support a stationary and much smaller population has already been divided and subdivided beyond the limits of effective cultivation. Cities are crowded to bursting, and are still getting bigger.

Population growth on this scale would be a serious challenge to a country with adequate living standards. Where incomes are very low, and economic development is a desperate need, such growth can be a crippling handicap.

The speed at which a country develops depends largely upon its ability to direct its growing resources to investment rather than to consumption, to uses which will raise tomorrow's output rather than satisfy today's demands. A poor society finds it difficult to save at all, and will be doing well if it can set aside 10 percent of its income. At this rate, if its population is growing, it will barely be investing enough to stay where it is. Yet the likelihood must be that it will invest not more than 10 percent, but less; a growing population with a high proportion of dependent children will find it increasingly difficult to spare any of its income from consumption.

Unless foreign aid can be increased, a country in this position is faced with a stark alternative. It must reduce its savings, or lower its living standards—although both are already inadequate.

The industrialized countries have shown their willingness to help. Common humanity and self-interest alike impel them to do so. All the evidence points to a greater flow of aid in the coming years. But I find myself increasingly doubtful whether domestic savings and foreign aid together will be sufficient to allow real progress, if present rates of population growth continue for long.

Figures are hard to come by in this field. But it may be possible to indicate some orders of magnitude.

Some calculations have been made about the cost of providing houses in India during the next generation, if the population continues to grow at its present rate of about 2 percent a year. If you disregard the cost of rural housing, on the somewhat optimistic assumption that it can be carried out entirely with local materials and labor, then you still have to pay for the homes of nearly 200 million extra people who, it is expected, will be living in India's cities 25 years hence. Making full allowance for the fact that many of the extra persons will be children needing not new houses, but simply more space in existing households, a sober estimate of the cost suggests that in the 30 years between 1956 and 1986 a total investment in housing of the order of 118 billion rupees, or roughly $25 billion, will be needed. If you find a figure like that difficult to grasp, I may say that it is well over four times the total lent by the World Bank in all countries since it started business 15 years ago. Put another way, it is more than 30 times the initial resources of the International Development Association—and those resources are supposed to cover IDA's first 5 years of operations.

My cost estimate takes no account of the need to improve existing housing in such cities as Calcutta. It leaves out the cost of roads, sewage systems, water supplies, and other services. Yet the problems of urban growth form only a small part of the challenge presented when economic development is attempted in the context of a vast expansion in population.

In the social field, many more new hospitals and clinics will be needed, simply to maintain present standards—standards which by common consent are sadly inadequate. Far more must be spent on education. Here look again at India, not because its problems are unusual, but because they are well documented. In 1956, about 31 million Indian children were getting an education—less than 40 percent of those of school age. It is mathematically certain that if the population grows as expected, a threefold or fourfold increase in educational investment will be needed if all children are to be receiving an education by 1976. When you come to productive investment, the story is similar. Enormous investments will be needed. But population growth does not only tend to reduce the flow of investment funds. It also means that the capital invested in industry must be spread increasingly thinly over the labor force; each pair of hands is backed by fewer dollars of capital. Productivity suffers, and the gap in living standards between the developing and the industrialized countries widens, instead of narrowing.

I must be blunt. Population growth threatens to nullify all our efforts to raise living standards in many of the poorer countries. We are coming to a situation in which the optimist will be the man who thinks that present living standards can be maintained. The pessimist will not look even for that. Unless population growth can be restrained, we may have to abandon for this generation our hopes of economic progress in the crowded lands of Asia and the Middle East. This is not a field in which international agencies can do much. But there is scope for governments to act: it is time that they gave earnest attention to this threat to their aspirations.

Population growth does not alter the rules for successful economic development. On the contrary, it reinforces their strength by increasing the penalties for breaking them. In relation to the need, capital is short, and must be stretched as far as it can possibly go. In the developing countries, therefore, the first question to be asked of any economic policy must be, "Is this the road to maximum economic growth?" and if the answer is "No," we must look very closely at any doctrines which are put forward to excuse this sacrifice of economic advancement.

For the providers of economic aid, this situation implies a duty not only to see that the money is properly and efficiently applied, but also to guard against the temptation to use development assistance to achieve their own commercial or short-term political objectives, rather than to serve the priority needs of the recipient countries. For the developing countries themselves, it implies that they must realize that they least of all can afford to accept low returns on their investments. They cannot afford to waste scarce resources by putting prestige ahead of real need, by ignoring hard economic calculations, by refusing to accept productive capital while they debate for years the respective roles of public and private enterprise.

At best, and even if real sacrifices are made by the industrialized nations to increase the flow of aid, there is grave danger that, in the face of existing rates of population growth, the resources available for economic development will fall short of the needs of the developing countries. We bear a heavy responsibility toward succeeding generations to make the best use of all our resources.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUILDING A BIGGER AND BETTER FUTURE FOR AMERICA—THE SEVENTH ANNUAL INVEST-IN-AMERICA WEEK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week it was my pleasure to welcome many of my colleagues in the Senate and the House of Representatives, as well as officials in the executive branch of the Government and local and national business leaders, at a luncheon in the Old Supreme Court Chamber here in the Capitol. The purpose of the luncheon was to initiate national and local observance of the seventh annual Invest-in-America Week; which began on Sunday, April 30, and which will extend through Saturday, May 6. Dedicated to the maintenance and promotion of a sound economy for our country through public education and a crusade for investment in America, the invest-in-America program was begun in 1949, and has since grown and expanded until now it is being observed in all 50 States and in 244 individual cities all over our Nation.

During the course of the program following the luncheon, it was my privilege to make an official presentation—on behalf of the National Invest-in-America Committee—of the first authorized State charter to the Wisconsin State Invest-in-America Committee. The charter was accepted by the State committee's able and energetic chairman, Mr. Roth S. Schleck, vice president of the First Wisconsin National Bank in Milwaukee, who came East especially for the presentation.

At this time, also, I was pleased to hear several significant statements with regard to the vital importance to a sound national economy of an adequate and intelligent program of personal savings and investment. One such statement was made by a local business leader who has personally devoted considerable time and effort toward helping Americans understand how their earnings and savings can be put to work for their own best advantage. I refer to Mr. George M. Ferris, Sr., of the respected brokerage firm of Ferris & Co., here in the Nation's Capital. Also included in the program were outstanding statements by the Honorable Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; the Honorable John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration; and Mr. Byron D. Woodside, Commissioner of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that these fine remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD, including the statement of acceptance of the first State charter by Mr. Roth Schleck; and also a listing of the Metropolitan Washington Area Invest-in-America Committee.

There being no objection, the statements and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEORGE M. FERRIS, CHAIRMAN, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON INVEST-IN-AMERICA WEEK COMMITTEE

Senator WILEY, distinguished guests, it is a happy occasion to meet in the Old Supreme

Court chambers at the Capitol for luncheon with so many of your colleagues, civic leaders of national and local Invest-in-America committeemen.

An increasing volume of funds will be required to meet our unfilled needs for more housing, plant expansion and modernization as well as schools, roads, hospitals, and other public improvements. The American people must be encouraged to save to invest in industries, saving accounts, insurance, municipal bonds, Treasury bonds, and so on, in order to maintain a strong vigorous economy in the years to come.

This may not be the time or place, but I believe you would like the candid opinion of an investment banker who is in daily contact with the investing public to point out that double taxation on dividends is a deterrent to the flow of capital to establish industries. Taxation on capital gains is a deterrent to the flow of capital to financing of new industries. I am sure the legislative body is aware of this. Our Congress has done most constructive work in strengthening our economy through the formation of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Small Business Administration, and the Securities and Exchange Commission which has given confidence to the investing public.

Invest-in-America Week is dedicated to the proposition of freedom, for without the free flow of capital to industrial growth the capitalistic way of life and democratic form of government will vanish from this earth.

Senator WILEY, please accept my thanks on behalf of the Metropolitan Washington Invest-in-America Committee; as chairman of that committee I wish to extend our appreciation to all of you present and thank you for your interest in Invest-in-America Week.

STATEMENT OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE FIRST STATE INVEST-IN-AMERICA CHARTER BY MR. ROTH S. SCHLECK, CHAIRMAN, WISCONSIN INVEST-IN-AMERICA COMMITTEE

Senator WILEY, Mr. Eppert, and honored guests, I would like to thank you, Senator WILEY, on behalf of the Wisconsin Committee for Invest in America, for your presentation of the first State charter so issued, and I would also like to thank the board of governors for awarding the first State charter to Wisconsin. This demonstration of confidence in us will not be misplaced, and we will in the future months increase our efforts to more fully inform all citizens of our State as to the importance of savings, investment, and finance in the everyday life of the community.

While this week will see an observance of Invest in America in eight Wisconsin communities, we are sure that next year will result in the extension of this program to many new areas. Like any new project it takes time to inform key people as to our purpose, and our real limitation has been in the time available, for wherever we made an explanation, we were enthusiastically received and help was generously given.

The awarding of this charter in the Nations Capital provides real inspiration for us in our work, and serves to emphasize the importance of the invest-in-America principles. We strongly feel an extension of this program will provide the American people with fundamental facts upon which to base important decisions during a period characterized by daily problems of great import. You can be assured that in the State of Wisconsin we will be working hard to provide our neighbors with the basic economic facts.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT C. WEAVER, ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE

Senator WILEY, honored guests, I am delighted to be here in two capacities: First, as an individual because I am a native Washingtonian, born in a house in Washington where I still have the ownership papers on it. I lived in that house all of my young life and, as a matter of fact, the mortgage on that house helped me go through college. So I know the advantages of homeownership.

I am very happy to be here as an official, because the Agency which I have the honor to administer is perhaps one of the greatest aids to homeownership of any government anywhere in the world. It has accelerated homeownership in this Nation in a way which I think is unique in the modern world.

Because of the millions in the Nation using materials which go into homebuilding and construction, it is extremely important element in the economy.

I would like to call attention to the fact that the stockpile of residential structures in this Nation is valued at about $500 billion. This is a very important part of our economy.

FHA has a bill, an administration bill before Congress which would provide new assets for homeownership, part of which would be to extend homeownership to groups which have not heretofore been able to participate as they would like to. The new program would provide FHA insurance for loans up to $10,000 to last for a period of 25 years.

Finally, this is most important because this is a dynamic economy, a dynamic country. It emphasizes ways of making homeownership possible for each and every citizen in this country.

When we talk about this Invest-in-America Week, we are talking about something we believe in, and we shall do everything in our power to facilitate the accomplishment of its purpose.

Thank you very much.

REMARKS BY JOHN E. HORNE, ADMINISTRATOR, THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AT A LUNCHEON OBSERVING THE SEVENTH ANNUAL NATIONAL INVEST-IN-AMERICA WEEK, OLD SUPREME COURT CHAMBER IN THE SENATE WING OF THE CAPITOL, MAY 2, 1961

Senator WILEY, distinguished guests, "Invest in America" is the central purpose of much of the work the Small Business Administration is attempting to carry forward in behalf of the more than 4½ million small firms in this Nation.

We are striving to do this in several ways.

First of all, and to the greatest degree possible, we want to stimulate bank lending to small firms. Through our regular business lending program we are providing an effective means whereby banks can, in participation with SBA, make a larger volume of their resources available for loans to finance small businesses. About two-thirds of all our loans are made in participation with local banks.

We are attempting also to open up new and largely unexplored avenues of equity financing for small business.

One such avenue—and, I believe, truly symbolizing "Invest in America"—is SBA's licensing, regulating, and financing of privately owned investment companies. These companies, in turn, provide equity and long-term financing to small firms. The importance of this program lies in the fact that many sound and well-established firms have great difficulty obtaining equity funds to expand their operations. Yet they must expand, if they are to meet competition.

I am confident that by the end of this year more than 300 small business investment companies will be in operation throughout the land, ready to provide millions of dollars of additional capital for small firms.

Another way in which SBA is attempting to open up a new avenue of small business financing is through loans to State and local development companies. This program is designed to help local communities to help themselves.

Under this program a local community, working through a publicly owned and controlled development company, can provide the initiative and initial investment to help established small businesses expand and modernize and assist new small businesses to get started. The SBA, in turn, can lend the development company the major part of the funds it needs to help small enterprises.

The great potential of this program has scarcely been tapped. I believe that as many as 8,000 local development companies could be established if community groups would take the initiative.

This Nation is at the threshold of a great new beginning, a new resurgence in its economic expansion. The old frontiers are gone, but there are new economic frontiers which we must explore, develop, and bring to flower.

This we are trying to do all over America, confident that we will succeed because we are determined to do what must be done to bring to this country a new measure of hope, of faith, and firmness of character.

We are assembled here not to make "Invest in America" a mere slogan, but a meaningful adventure. We seek to give America a new resurgence of world leadership as we explore and develop new economic frontiers.

STATEMENT BY BYRON D. WOODSIDE, COMMISSIONER, U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Senator WILEY, ladies and gentlemen, the Senator mentioned we are concerned intimately with the flow of securities to the investing public. I don't know whether the investment bankers arranged it that way but last week, the week preceding Invest-in-America Week, there were 64 proposals for corporate financing in the amount of $1 billion.

That is the highest peak of proposed financing ever submitted to the Commission, with one exception, for any single week. In April 1958, A.T. & T. disposed of $1 billion debentures all by itself. But the record of the last few years has been somewhere between $15 to $17 billion to corporate securities, which have been marketed through the machinery of the investment-buying business in this country.

Nowhere else on earth is an operation on that scale by which the people of the country participate in ownership of the business enterprises of that country. There seems to be no sign of any abatement in interest in the appetite of investors. We have in recent months had about $4 billion worth of corporate securities of all types in the process of going through our Commission. It is proof that it has been purely a seller's market in the last few years.

I am sure everybody hopes that type of market can continue.

This is Invest-in-America Week—we in the Commission might suggest that the emphasis be in the word "invest."

Thank you.

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AREA INVEST-IN-AMERICA COMMITTEE

Chairman: George M. Ferris, Sr., senior partner, Ferris & Co.

Vice Chairmen:

Robert M. Hanson, general partner, Jones, Kreeger & Co.

John V. Hinkel, chairman, American Ideals Committee.

Regional Vice Chairmen:

Ernest S. Corso, Virginia coordinator, associate, Ferris & Co.

Charles J. Harnett, vice president, Mt. Vernon Bank & Trust Co.

Robert T. Mitchell, executive vice president, A.B. & W. Transit Co.

Robert A. Peck, president, Peck Chevrolet.

George A. Sacks, chairman of the board, Bank of Bethesda.

Robert Sherwood, Maryland coordinator, president, Suburban Trust Co.

Carroll V. Shreve, president, Falls Church Bank.

T. Hammond Welsh, Sr., president, Hyattsville Building Association.

Treasurer: W. S. Martindill, vice president and secretary, Perpetual Building Association.

Secretary: Henry P. Loss, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

Committee:

E. C. Baltz, president, Perpetual Building Association.

Daniel W. Bell, chairman of the board, American Security & Trust Co.

James P. Benfer, Jr., president, D.C. Bankers Associations.

Donald Bittinger, president, Washington Gas Light Co.

Morris Cafritz, president, Cafritz Construction Co.

Barnum L. Colton, president, National Bank of Washington.

Martin A. Cook, president, D.C. Savings & Loan League.

Oscar I. Dodek, president, Merchants & Manufacturers Association.

R. Roy Dunn, president, Potomac Electric Power Co.

Harold D. Fangboner, vice president of public relations, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.

Norman V. Farquhar, chairman, Washington branch, Philadelphia-Baltimore Stock Exchange.

Howard W. Kacy, president, Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Frank J. Luchs, president, Washington Real Estate Board, Inc.

Ray F. Mack, business manager, Washington Daily News.

Louis Moses, president, Junior Chamber of Commerce of Washington, D.C.

Benjamin M. McKelway, editor, the Evening Star.

Richard A. Norris, president, the Riggs National Bank.

John C. Pyles, president, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

Dr. Herbert Robinson, president, Greater Washington Industrial Council.

Robert W. Swope, chairman of the board, Southern Oxygen Co.

C. Carney Smith, CLU, general agent, Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company of Newark, N.J.

Philip M. Talbott, special assistant to the president, National Savings & Trust Co.

Millard F. West, Jr., partner, Auchincloss, Parker & Redpath.

J. Russell Wiggins, vice president and executive editor, Washington Post and Times Herald.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am compelled to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am still reluctant to, but I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommitteee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it deeply wounds me to have to do this, but I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY TO AMERICAN INDIANS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in New York City on April 17, Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., addressed the annual meeting of the Association on American Indian Affairs on the subject of the Federal Government's responsibility to the American Indian population.

Because it contains a lucid analysis of an area of Federal responsibility which has in the past been hampered by a failure to come to grips with basic concepts, I am confident that this speech will be of great interest to all those who are concerned with Indian problems.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR JOHN A. CARVER, JR., APRIL 17, 1961, BEFORE THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION ON AMERICAN INDIAN AFFAIRS AT THE INTERCHURCH CENTER, NEW YORK CITY

Before I joined the Department of the Interior, I spent 4 years on Capitol Hill where I was administrative assistant to Senator CHURCH of Idaho. He was chairman of the Senate Indian Affairs Subcommittee, and I fancied I knew quite a bit about American Indian affairs.

As Assistant Secretary of the Interior with direct supervision over and responsibility for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, I have had a great awakening. I have come to realize that I don't know really as much as I thought I did when I was on Capitol Hill.

And it is disturbing to contemplate that I don't know as much now as I did 3 months ago. If this is true, then I ought to be glad I wasn't invited here 6 months hence. By then, at the present rate, I will know nothing at all about Indian matters.

Tonight I want to review with you some of the analytical processes I have applied to my job of supervising the Bureau of Indian Affairs. To put it another way, I want you to come with me while I retrace my pilgrim's progress toward an intelligent understanding of roles and responsibilities in the field of Indian affairs.

As a lawyer, I hope I can be forgiven for inquiring first into the basic constitutional, legal, and judicial authorities for the program which occupies the talents and time of 11,000 Bureau employees. For I feel, as I talk tonight with this highly knowledgeable and experienced group of citizens drawn together by a common interest in Indian affairs, that we will not really communicate unless you know what kind of tests I am likely to apply to program suggestions made to me, whether by you, the Bureau, or the Congress.

In a larger sense, until the Interior Department, the Congress, the States, the Indians, and the Indian interest groups like your own all have the same understanding of what the Federal Government can properly do, and what it cannot legally do, we simply won't be able to make progress at all in achieving the goals of a better life for a particular underprivileged segment of our population that happens to be of Indian blood.

Let me give you an example of what I mean:

Recently the national press, including the New York Times, carried reports of a charge made in my own State of Idaho that up to 70 percent of all the Indians on the reservation at Fort Hall were near starvation. Well-intentioned citizens in nearby communities organized caravans to take food to the starving Indians.

Now of course the Indians weren't all eating as well as they might like, but they weren't starving. From the standpoint of normal welfare standards, the Indians on the reservation were receiving assistance of various kinds exactly as non-Indians off the reservation. No application or referral for welfare had gone unattended, and in general the situation was probably at least the equivalent of, and possibly superior to, that which prevailed among the welfare and assistance recipients in the surrounding non-Indian communities.

But I sensed immediately that the citizens generally were applying different sets of standards. In Pocatello which adjoins the reservation, the community expects the needy to at least walk down to the courthouse to apply for relief: recipients of money aid get little aid or comfort if they spend one check before the next one is due. The same good people, however, seem to expect of the Federal Government something entirely different, something comparable to the old rations system as to Indians—in other words, it is taken for granted that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has a special responsibility toward the Indians because they are Indians, and whether they live on or off the reservation.

Well, do we?

No one can deny that the Federal Government has broad affirmative responsibilities toward Indians. But does it have these because they are Indians, or are our programs rooted in some more substantial soil than ethnic origin or the accident of Indian ancestry.

I pondered this question as I flew toward Idaho to look into the Fort Hall situation, and I jotted down these notes as the basis for a talk to the Indians, community leaders, and interested citizens at Eagle Lodge at Fort Hall:

"THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

"(a) We act within the laws, and carry out programs prescribed and appropriated for by the Congress.

"(b) The laws do not: (1) Confine the Indians to the reservation; (2) give us an affirmative welfare responsibility toward Indians as Indians, any more than toward any other ethnic group; (3) relieve the States, counties, or municipalities of any responsibility they owe to their citizens generally as to any Indian living off the reservation, either as to welfare, law enforcement, education, or anything else.

"(c) The laws do: (1) Give to the BIA the responsibility of managing trust property; (2) give the Indian tribes certain self-governing power on the reservations; (3) authorize and appropriate for welfare, education, and law and order programs within

reservations, in recognition of the IRA separateness of the tribe, and in recompense for the tax exempt status of the trust property."

I have no idea that you will all agree with everything in the hasty outline I scrawled while 6 miles up in the clouds.

However, if we turn our attention to another situation I've grappled with—the Miccosukees, or Trail Seminoles—you can suffer with me the difficulties of applying formulary tests to the demands for Indian programs. The Miccosukees, numbering several hundred, are Indians of the Everglades who have never made formal peace with the white man. They have no reservation. As the white man's roads and canals reach into the hitherto trackless swamps they've called home, the colossus of government in the persons of highway engineers and right-of-way men for roads and drainage projects threatens to overrun them. Without acknowledged legal title to their lands, they claim a status and assert rights which are not taken seriously. The compassionate among us see their desperate plight, and demand action.

Should this action be provided by the Indian Bureau? If so, and we undertake to give services to the Miccosukees just as we do the Shoshone-Bannocks at Fort Hall, how do we rationalize our actions? Here there is no trust property; here there is no treaty; here there is not even a reservation.

Maybe it is at this point that I can repeat an observation I heard from a Briton on a radio program once—the trouble with you Americans is that you think every problem must have a solution. But if we work out some pragmatic way to help the Miccosukees, and I'm determined that we shall, and if we find no other way to rationalize than to admit that we've helped Indians with no justification better than the frank admission that it is because they are Indians, we will be the better off, as I hope to demonstrate in a moment, if we are honest with ourselves and invoke the right to abandon consistency on occasion.

In other words, I think the Indian business demands some ground rules. We won't always stay within them, but I think it is high time we tried to formulate them, at least.

Why is it high time?

It is high time, I submit, because in my opinion we are not only not making progress toward a better life for the Indians, more self-sufficiency, less emphasis on Indianness, but on the contrary we are losing ground.

Let me catalog a few problems that have come to my desk within the last weeks to demonstrate the accuracy of this pessimistic view:

Item: Geometrically increasing numbers of Bureau people struggle with the enormous task of determining the ownership of allotted lands through and after successive probates, while thousands of acres of land go out of cultivation each year because with hundreds or thousands of fractional owners, the land has no owner at all. This can only get worse, unless new ground rules are set.

Item: A tribe of Indians whose members are wealthy by any standard—into the hundreds of thousands of dollars each—look to the Bureau to seek an appropriation to build them a few miles of road.

Item: Untold hours and dollars of departmental effort go into the abstruse inquiry of Indianness and tribal membership, as Indian claims are prosecuted to judgment and the possibility of per capita distribution looms.

Item: The Indian population is exploding, and I'm not referring to the land of which New Delhi is the capital. A clipping with the news that the Indian population had increased 45 percent in the 10 years from 1950 to 1960 came to my attention, but diligent inquiry into the question of whether the census takers had any statistically sound way of telling brought a negative reply.

So I'm going to set forth some of my nominations for ground rules—I invite you to join in the game, for as I've said I've been here only 87 days and each day I know less.

No. 1, I suggest, is that Indian programs should be tied wherever possible to the fact that the Federal Government retains a trust responsibility over Indian real property. So long as the title is in trust, and tax exemption status applies to the land and its fruits, the Federal Government can justify performing special services for Indians. Many a Federal program is based on this concept; for one example, take aid for federally impacted schools.

The minute we abandon this anchor, the lid is off Pandora's box. The Veterans' Administration can give us some lessons about the importance of clinging to standards. Service connection, of course, is not the only test of eligibility for certain disability benefits, but it is a useful starting point.

Special Federal services to Indians as Indians may be necessary, and I don't rule them out. But we must live with the inexorable corollary that we will isolate the Indians more and more from the mainstream of American life which, after all, is centered still around the local communities, counties and States. All I ask is that we be honest with ourselves about our programs and their implications.

My second ground rule or guideline for policy and program formulation is that we ought, wherever we have a clear choice, to move in the direction of tribal management programs. I think it highly unfortunate that in so many cases there have been per capita distributions dissipating capital assets of tribal governments which were ready, willing and able to manage wisely for the continuing benefit of the tribal members. The allotment acts were a cruel and misguided hoax, based on a premise of an agrarian Indian society unrealistic at the outset, and archaic today. Some of the trust responsibilities reserved to us with respect to individual Indians are impossible to justify on any rational basis in their across-the-board application. I've been told we have trust responsibilities over the property of a U.S. Congressman.

Thirdly, we must recognize and agree that "termination" as a descriptive term is semantic nonsense. As a ground rule, then, let us say that we will cease talking about termination, defensively or offensively. The word is a dishonest word, which confuses ends with means, and conveys no real meaning.

Termination, in the limited sense of chopping off of special Indian services, and abrupt abandonment of the trust responsibility for Indian property, is not, and cannot be, a justifiable end of itself.

Naturally, we want the Indian people to have full legal, economic and social opportunity, but we do not espouse the notion that this can be accomplished by the surgery of simply chopping off our programs on a date certain. I wish I had time here to outline what I think "termination" as that kind of goal has cost us in the Menominee situation in Wisconsin.

The President himself has promised that the Indian land base will be protected, credit assistance will be given, and we will encourage tribal planning for economic development.

Another ground rule, and these aren't in any order of importance, is that our programs must be better tailored to the needs of the individual reservation or tribal situation. We must show more imagination in matching our programs to the potential of tribal assets, whatever they may be. If, as is the case on some reservations, the only real resource is the human resource, then we must face up to the fact, and concentrate on training, education, location of new job opportunities. If the resources are material, land, water or mineral, our development assistance must be realistic, and flexible, and responsive to the particular situation.

Fifth, we must get far away from paternalism. We have the duty of promoting self-government under tribal constitutions. To my way of thinking, freedom of self-government includes freedom to make mistakes. We must get out of tribal politics, and stay out of tribal politics.

But ground rules aren't enough. We still must examine deeper. We must exorcise some ghosts; we must fact a harsh and unpleasant reality which casts a bitter shadow over this whole subject.

The United States is conscience-stricken about its treatment of Indians in the past. Is it possible that we are beating our breasts and wearing the hair shirt for the way the pioneers drove the Indians from their lands and herded them to the reservations so that we won't have to face the more stark shame of the way we are treating Indians today? How many Americans in cities like Pocatello or Butte or Rapid City call upon the Federal Government to get more food to the Indians while tolerating discrimination ranging from the patronizing, to the hateful restaurant window card "No Dogs or Indians."

Across the length and breadth of this land officials who ought to know better—judges, lawyers, welfare workers, health officers, and private citizens—(I'll resist the temptation to include Congressmen) automatically, unreasonably, unthinkingly assume that if a person appears to be an Indian or says he is an Indian or is said to be an Indian, a different set of rules and regulations immediately comes into effect. Call the Indian hospital if he's ill; send the bill to the Government if he must be institutionalized; blame the tribe or the Bureau or both if he breaks a law like shooting a deer out of season.

Why are Americans who have fought the hardest to erase this pattern from the fabric of American life for Negroes, Jews, and other minority groups quite often found in the vanguard of those demanding special treatment for Indians?

There is a real split in our national thinking about the problem. Alaskans, for example, are proud of the fact that with only a minor exception or two they have no Indian reservations. We have full integration, they boast, of all the native groups, Indian, Eskimo, Aleut; an Eskimo is president of the Alaska Senate. Yet the most extensive educational system the Bureau of Indian Affairs operates is in Alaska, just for Indians. Alaskans continually demand that we do a better job, build more facilities, get more teachers.

Are we educating Indians in Alaska because they are Indians? Or is it another form of transitional governmental assistance given a new State? If the latter, should the schools be restricted, as they generally are, to the natives and Indians?

These are hard questions—and on the surface, at least, it seems that the facts support a statement I recently made at a sub-Cabinet level meeting in the White House. We were discussing discriminatory practices in public programs and I said that in one sense, at least, the Government was carrying on basically discriminatory programs itself.

The foregoing, I confess, is the way my own thinking has developed about the Government's role and responsibility toward American Indians. It may be that it is a strange one. I supervise, in a general way, the operations of a Bureau in the Interior Department whose mission it has been, and still is, to serve the needs of Indians, period. Not much attention has been given to whether we have carried out our programs,

because we thought Indians should have special treatment because they were Indians. The Department, I think, hasn't often asked whether its programs should be rationalized on standards applicable to other Government programs dealing with the welfare of individual citizens. We have shut our eyes to the fact that some aspects of the system itself amount to discrimination.

But I hope I bring to my administration something more than an analytical approach, for at root and heart it remains a human problem.

I think the Department is making real progress toward making its program more human, more responsive, more efficient. I am convinced that, from the President down to the Secretary, to me, and to the Acting Commissioner, we now have leadership which is knowledgeable, understanding, and compassionate toward human beings, including Indian human beings.

You are familiar with the techniques being applied to the task of improvement, such as the appointment of the five-man task force by the Secretary, headed by Mr. W. W. Keeler. Let me say that the energy and interest of the Secretary himself has infused a new enthusiasm in the Bureau which has made it a new and exciting place to work. We haven't had bad policies in the past nearly so much as we've had an absence of policy. Previous Secretaries and previous Congresses have in effect told the Bureau to run the Indian business in such a way that no problems would be referred up to them.

The task force has been meeting not only in Washington, but throughout the country. Your officers have met with them, and so have tribal representatives. I know that the result will be a strengthening of our programs at the reservation level. Indeed this is one of the principal objectives of my Secretary. He frequently reiterates that we must have more brainpower at the reservation level. I know that your association has often called for us to take the wraps off the agency superintendent. You are on the right track. I hope that we will have a far better rapport with your association and others similarly motivated. I think we can be helpful to the Congress.

Your own role and responsibility you will work out for yourselves. Perhaps you will not accept my premises or analyses. I hope, however, that where we do see eye to eye, we can pool our efforts. If you agree, for example, that we ought to have a greatly expanded program to eliminate discrimination near reservations, to emphasize the commercial exploitation of authentic arts and crafts, to assist Indians in learning the techniques of self-government, then you can be of mighty assistance to us in a joint effort.

I hope you will.

ACTIVITIES OF AMBASSADOR STEVENSON AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organization Affairs, I have followed with special interest and admiration the activities of Adlai Stevenson as our Ambassador to the United Nations. A few days ago I inserted in the RECORD an article by Roscoe Drummond which commented upon the fine work he has done in this crucially important assignment.

William R. Frye has contributed to the Sunday Star another fine and perceptive article about Ambassador Stevenson's role at the United Nations, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEVENSON'S ROLE AT U.N. IMPRESSIVE

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The first 100 days of Adlai E. Stevenson at the United Nations have been tumultuous, frustrating and inconclusive in all respects but one. That one: that Mr. Stevenson, personally, is a master of the diplomatic trade.

The new U.S. delegate to the U.N. scarcely had time to dust off his desk last January before a major Congo crisis blew up in his face as a result of the murder of Patrice Lumumba. Much of the next 3 months found him in the midst of one such challenge after another.

He survived—and survived very well.

Looking back on the last 100 days, three major threads can be detected:

Mr. Stevenson sought to identify the United States with anticolonial Africa and Asia, at the same time minimizing, where he could, the damage to traditional American alliances with Europe and Latin America.

He sought to establish a line of communication, if not yet of meaningful negotiation, with the Soviet delegation.

He opened up for reconsideration traditional U.S. policies, tactics and viewpoints, giving other delegates a welcome impression of flexibility and openmindedness. At the same time, he introduced a new dimension of subtlety and literary style into American public utterances here.

EXTRAORDINARY REPUTATION

Mr. Stevenson had the advantage of an extraordinary reputation preceding him. In a sense, this reputation was also a handicap, in that his every utterance was expected to be in iambic pentameter, and no man could live up to such a standard. But in general, it was an asset to have U.N. delegates viewing him through rose-tinted spectacles.

Soon after he arrived, the usually blase Secretariat News, house organ of Dag Hammarskjold's international civil service, passed along to its readers a highly complimentary bit of Stevensoniana. The new U.S. delegate, it said, had been asked how he managed to avoid the deleterious effects of so much popular adulation.

"Oh," he was quoted as replying, "it's all right so long as you don't inhale." The attitude behind publication of this story was as significant as the story itself.

Mr. Stevenson began his tenure with important personal and policy approaches to the Africans. He paid them elaborate courtesies, sought them out socially, and asked their advice. More important, he followed that advice, at least in certain respects.

A CHANGING POLICY

The U.S. Congo policy underwent subtle but significant changes in directions desired by the moderate Africans. A U.S. aid plan for Africa, first presented by the Eisenhower administration, was followed up.

Mr. Stevenson sided with the Africans and Asians against Portugual on freedom for Angola. He and his aids denounced South African apartheid (racial segregation) more forthrightly than Americans had ever denounced it before.

Meanwhile, the United States and India began cooperating more closely than they had in years, to mutual advantage.

It was not all gravy, however. Latin Americans, envious of the attention given to Africa and fearful that help to that continent would cut into their slice of the aid pie, began to sulk.

They staged a full-scale revolt against paying their share of the Congo peace operation, and had to be bought off with 80 percent rebates, largely financed by the United States.

Whether out of deference to Latin fears or for other reasons, Mr. Stevenson pulled back slightly on the Africa aid plan—and a disappointed Africa began to complain. Jaja Wachuku, of Nigeria, delivered two bitter anti-American tirades, rubbing much of the gloss off the earlier honeymoon.

Meanwhile, Mr. Stevenson took a new look at issues involving the Russians. He tried to reach a broad understanding with them early in March for a moratorium on the cold war in the U.N.

DROPPING EMBARRASSMENTS

The negotiations were by no means entirely successful, but he and Foreign Minister Gromyko did succeed in eliminating certain embarrassments for the United States and in producing circumstances which led to a dropping of Hungary and Tibet, at least until September.

Critics called this "softness" to the Communists, but others felt it was flexibility in conditions where the United States had much to gain from a temporary cease-fire on some propaganda fronts.

The Cuban crisis presented Mr. Stevenson with by far his most serious problem. He had a mountainous task, defending the U.S. position in an action of which virtually everyone else in the U.N. disapproved—some, including Latin Americans, very strongly, indeed.

Nevertheless, by eloquence and patient lobbying, he succeeded in shunting the General Assembly into an empty exhortation for peace. Stronger criticism was shelved, though not until after the United States has taken a bad tongue lashing and a 44–7 rebuke in committee for giving bases to the anti-Castro rebels.

This, plus an Arab explosion against American support of Israel, represented Stevenson's principal setbacks. He scored on the Congo, on relations with India, and—despite Wachuku—on friendship with the new Africans.

The consensus here is that the United States is represented in the U.N. by a man of exceptional stature.

SUPPORT FOR DEICING PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, man's progress, to a large degree, has been accomplished by conquering and harnessing the forces of nature.

This has been done in a multitude of ways.

The conquest of space; the harnessing of the atom; the mastering of aerodynamics: all of these, and other human efforts, demonstrate man's attempts and successes at conquering and utilizing such forces in the universe.

Even in these modern times, however, man still reaches out for a greater understanding of these forces, as well as for ways and means to harness them, to serve the needs of humanity.

In the polar hemispheres of the world, for example, icing during the winter months still proves a major obstacle of nature to navigation, trade, and commerce—and other human activities.

If the icing problem could be solved, it would be of tremendous benefit to the country.

In recent times, efforts have been made to develop deicing systems.

Although only in the rudimentary stage, these developments have shown sufficient progress, in my judgment, to warrant further investigation.

Consequently, I have recently introduced a bill, S. 1704, to authorize the

Corps of Engineers to undertake an extensive study to determine the feasibility of developing deicing systems. The purpose would be to extend the shipping season in the northerly regions of the United States.

The idea has sparked a great deal of interest throughout the country.

Recently, for example, I received a message from the Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, expressing approval of the proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the endorsement by this fine association, as well as an editorial from the News Tribune, of Duluth, Minn., also supporting the idea, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPPER MISSISSIPPI WATERWAY ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., May 1, 1961.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We have noted with interest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24 the introduction by you of S. 1704 in which other Senators have joined to provide for an investigation and study of waterway deicing systems for the ultimate purpose of providing year-round navigation on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway. We hope this bill will be enacted and that the study will be fruitful.

Our interest in this study stems from the fact that the same problem of seasonal navigation quite seriously affects navigation on the upper Mississippi River. There is no navigation to and from the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul from approximately December 1 to April 1, and in fact this is true for almost all of the upper Mississippi River above St. Louis. At its annual meeting on October 21, 1960, this association adopted, among other resolutions, the following which deals with this subject:

ICEBREAKING

"River transportation on the upper Mississippi River ceases in various areas every year for as long as 4 months due to ice conditions. A longer operating season where physically possible would better utilize the public investment in inland waterways and allow users of river transportation to operate more economically.

"We therefore urge the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to permit the U.S. Coast Guard and the U.S. Corps of Engineers to study ice conditions on the upper Mississippi to determine whether, and to what extent, installations of winter-use facilities and application of known icebreaking techniques is justified by the economic ratio of benefits to expense."

It is hoped therefore that solutions sought by your bill will be found, since such answers should almost certainly also solve the problem of river navigation in areas where severe icing occurs.

Sincerely yours,

A. C. MILLS,
Secretary.

[From the Duluth (Minn.) News-Tribune, Apr. 26, 1961]

WINTER NAVIGATION STUDY WORTH WHILE

Senator WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, probably expected some kidding when he started his campaign for an Army Engineers' study of problems and possibilities of year-round shipping on the Great Lakes. He had heard years of speeches by opponents of his efforts on behalf of the seaway. One of their favorite points was an assertion that the waterway would be frozen up a large part of the year, anyway.

It seems fair to note that Senator WILEY isn't asking for all-year shipping to start in the fall of 1961. No; but he proposes a study of the obstacles and advantages, to be completed by the end of 1962.

Quite possibly most of today's adults won't live to see a time when benefits of channel ice prevention will be worth what they cost. But techniques will improve and needs will grow. We might be a happier, more secure Nation today if we had bothered a bit, 25 years ago for example, about travel into space.

RECOGNITION OF POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, May 3, 1961, marked the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day.

The historic charter adopted in 1791 still lives in spirit, in the hearts of Polish people in their homeland, and throughout the world—even though totalitarian communism now rules in Poland.

The spirit of the 1791 Constitution—bringing about significant political, social, and educational reforms—also elicits the respect of other nationals around the globe.

As evidence of friendship between the people of the United States and the Polish people—Members of Congress traditionally join in observance of this Polish national holiday.

I now welcome the opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the form and spirit of the 1791 Constitution. As well, I would pay homage to the Polish people, who—despite the existence of a communistic system in their homeland—keep alive the spirit of freedom and independence.

The philosophy reflected in the Polish Constitution is similar, in word and spirit, to our own Constitution, such as:

All power in civic society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the State, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Observances alone, however, are useless, without rededication to the high values, ideals, and principles inherent in such anniversaries.

The observance of Polish Constitution Day, then, offers an opportunity for free world rededication to the ultimate freeing of the Polish, as well as other orbit-country peoples, from enslavement to totalitarian communism.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE ECONOMY OF SPAIN

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the International Monetary Fund has issued a significant press release which sets forth in some detail the accomplishments of the economy in Spain.

The Fund reports that the Spanish Government has repaid $50 million obtained from the Fund in 1959, far ahead of schedule. The Spanish Government has also been able to cancel arrangements which it had set up for certain credits which now are not needed because, as the International Monetary Fund release states:

The stage has thus been set for renewed efforts to accelerate the development of the Spanish economy under conditions of balanced growth.

In this day and age, Mr. President, I think that the progress made by Spain as reported by the International Monetary Fund, is a bright light which many other nations may want to reflect upon. I ask unanimous consent that the press release issued by the International Monetary Fund, No. 351, and dated May 1, 1961, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND
PRESS RELEASE NO. 351

The Spanish Government has repaid to the International Monetary Fund $15.4 million and £2 million, thus completing ahead of schedule the repayment of the equivalent of $50 million obtained from the Fund in August 1959 in connection with the comprehensive program of internal and external stabilization measures introduced at that time.

The Government has also canceled as of March 20, 1961, the 1-year standby arrangement concluded in August 1959, which had been prolonged for another year in August 1960. Under this arrangement Spain had been authorized to draw an additional $25 million from the Fund in case of need, but this facility was never used.

The Spanish Government earlier this year repaid $24 million drawn from the OEEC, and also canceled the undrawn part of the credit extended by the OEEC at the time of the introduction of the stabilization program. The Government has also canceled $71 million of credit lines extended to it by U.S. banks in support of the stabilization program. These credit lines had not been used.

These advance repayments and cancellations reflect the success of the stabilization program. Spain's gross gold and foreign exchange reserves increased from a level of $63 million just before the introduction of the program to $600 million at the end of March 1961. The rise in prices prevailing before the stabilization program was introduced has been arrested, exports have substantially increased, and income from tourism collected into the central reserves has greatly expanded. Gradually the restrictions on imports and invisibles have been considerably reduced and with a new foreign investment law the chances of attracting foreign capital have been enhanced. The stage has thus been set for renewed efforts to accelerate the development of the Spanish economy under conditions of balanced growth.

REPRESENTATIONAL FUNDS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was very interested in an editorial which appeared in the April 21 edition of the Concord Monitor. This editorial was written by James M. Langley, formerly the U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan. It is entitled "An Old Misconception" and deals with the matter of representation funds. I think it is an interesting commentary to clear up the confusion which exists with respect to this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OLD MISCONCEPTION

Representational funds allowed in the Foreign Service of the United States have been under attack mistakenly for years as representing primarily expenditures for liquor. Mostly, Ambassadors and others of lesser rank who have had to do desirable and necessary diplomatic entertaining have spent their own funds over and above the meager entertainment allowances and kept quiet publicly. Privately they have done a lot of justified grumbling.

We know something of all this from 2 years of service in Karāchi. Pakistan is a Moslem country and most Moslems do not drink liquor. At receptions and dinners soft drinks were provided for them. At affairs attended also by the other diplomats liquor was also provided. Soft drinks or liquor, however, were incidental to other expenses, particularly food, the hiring of extra servants, the retaining of police to handle car traffic, the erection of shamianas (colorful tents without side walls) and the hiring of rugs to spread upon the ground, the renting of chairs, the renting of glassware and dishes, the provision of temporary lighting, and often the hiring of musicians.

On our national day, July 4, a brief hour for diplomats of other countries to pay their respects, at noon, was followed late in the afternoon by a reception for all Americans. Some 2,500 to 3,000 American men, women, and children had to be taken care of and hot dogs, hamburgers, cokes, and beer were provided. There was no liquor. This day alone cost the larger share of the year's representation allowance of the Ambassador.

Dinners or receptions were frequently necessary to present visiting American VIP's to persons they wished to or should meet, including key American officials as well as important Pakistanis and diplomats of other countries.

Then there were the dinners essential to repay invitations which the Ambassador had accepted to other embassies, to the President's and to the Prime Minister's and other Ministers' houses, in addition to those of important private citizens.

Incidentally, American military personnel in the attaché posts and the military assistance program had representation allowances which exceeded those parceled out through the Department of State.

Entertaining can be overdone, but most of it is inescapable in the Foreign Service. Liquor is a minor fraction of its cost, but is required at times.

President Kennedy is right in expecting the Congress to provide reasonable representational allowances. Career personnel is not so well paid that it can privately afford such expenses requisite to carrying out diplomatic responsibilities in the best interests of the United States. Receptions and dinners are not held for pleasure. Actually, they are a burden, and sometimes even a boor, but nevertheless necessary.

THE PUBLIC DEBT AS A THREAT TO NATIONAL FINANCIAL STRUCTURE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I believe it is continuously important for all of us—Members of Congress, the executive branch of Government, and the American taxpayer—to keep in mind the constant threat to the financial structure of our country through mounting annual expenditures with little regard to the now staggering public debt of the United States. This problem has bothered me for years, as it has many other Members of Congress, and with this in mind, I and others have repeatedly attempted to bring about legislation which would force upon the Nation a balanced budget.

In this connection, I wish to call attention to two brief articles which appeared in the March 22, 1961, edition of the publication Life Lines. In one article "Draining Our Financial Strength," Life Lines points up forcefully the great expenditures of our Government over the years for foreign aid to restore the economies of our allies. This was done at the expense of not only our own national economy but especially at the expense of the average wage earner's pocketbook.

The second article "Creating Perpetual Debt," calls attention to Thomas Jefferson's words of wisdom on economy and the public debt. I commend both articles to the reading of all Members of Congress and request, Mr. President, unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life Lines, Mar. 22, 1961]

DRAINING OUR FINANCIAL STRENGTH

In the last 20 years, the United States has spent $133 billion on foreign aid. The program had a twofold purpose: First, it was to assist both our allies and former enemies in World War II in restoring their economies. The second purpose was to win the peace and to stop the growth of communism.

The first part of the program has been successful. So successful in fact that today the American economy is in grave danger because of the low-wage competition from these countries that we have rebuilt with the taxes of American wage earners. With 80 percent of all taxes coming from people with incomes of less than $10,000 per year, the American laboring man has borne the brunt of paying for the factories in foreign countries that now are driving him from his job here at home. The total debt of the United States is now more than the combined debt of the rest of the world. Many of the countries whose economies have been rebuilt with the tax dollars of the American laboring men and women are now in a position to help other underdeveloped nations and there has been some talk about this happening. Unfortunately for the American taxpayer, it has been mostly talk with very little action.

Instead of cutting off the aid program to these countries who are frankly in a much better financial position than we are, our Government continues it year after year.

As to the second purpose of the foreign aid program, that of winning the peace and stopping communism, this has been a miserable failure. We have given India, which is supposed to be neutral, more than two and a quarter billion dollars. Yet India votes against the United States in the U.N. Tito, of Yugoslavia, who has stated frankly, "In any future war, we shall march shoulder to shoulder with Soviet Russia," has received almost the same amount, more than two billion dollars. Poland and Indonesia, both openly communistic, have received another billion and still are receiving yearly hundreds of millions of American tax dollars. Communism, which was supposed to be stopped by this fantastic outpouring of American money, has extended its borders to within 90 miles of the coast of Florida.

To those critics who say that anyone who is opposed to foreign aid is hardhearted and unconcerned about the rest of the world, may we pose just one question? If America permits herself to be spent into national bankruptcy—if we do not maintain our fiscal integrity here at home—how long will any nation on earth be able to remain free from communism?

Peaceful coexistence to the Communist means a gradual triumph of the worldwide conspiracy to end freedom. Spending America's financial strength to nothingness is the surest way of achieving that goal—all by peaceful means.

[From Life Lines, Mar. 22, 1961]

CREATING PERPETUAL DEBT

Thomas Jefferson said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities, and in our comforts, in our labor and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labor of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

Those words should be emblazoned on every one of the thousands of buildings occupied by the Federal Government.

What is our Government doing today if it is not wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them? What is it doing if it is not creating perpetual debt?

If we as individuals were to operate under the same financial philosophy as our Government, we would never give a thought to our incomes and would think only of what we would like to spend. We could plan that trip to Bermuda, buy that extra car, get that luxurious yacht, build that desirable addition to the house, purchase a country estate for our leisure hours—and tell ourselves that we must have all these things simply because we want them. Of course we would end up in the bankruptcy courts and perhaps in jail.

On the other hand, if the Federal Government ran its financial affairs the way the average American family does, it would begin by estimating what its revenues should be and then would adjust its spending to stay within the limits of the income. And we would pay something every year on the national debt.

Such a revolution in Government financing is long overdue.

Not the least effect of an exorbitant rate of taxation is the loss of freedom. For as Thomas Jefferson also said, "We must make our choice between economy and liberty, between profusion and servitude."

EXCHANGE OF JOURNALISTS WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of the largest Catholic newspapers in this country with a weekly circulation is Our Sunday Visitor. Seldom does an issue go by which does not carry one or more sound anti-Communist articles. The March 26 issue has just been brought to my attention. The warning of the Reverend Joseph F. Thorning, carried in Father Ginder's column, "Right or Wrong" is both timely and important. Four preliminary steps to educate the American public to the acceptance of the inevitability of recognizing Red China are set forth in this article.

These were:

1. There will be an early decision by the new administration permitting a number of sovietized Chinese journalists to enter this

country, with the simultaneous authorization of U.S. newsmen in limited numbers to visit Red China.

2. A cultural exchange program.

3. Relaxation of the embargo on shipments to Red China.

4. Finally, complete acceptance of the Red capture of China as a fait accompli with an exchange of ambassadors.

I commend the Sunday Visitor for publishing this article and, in order to call it to the attention of all Members of Congress, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT OR WRONG—CHANGE IN CLIMATE

(Father Ginder's views on current events)

On January 22 under the title "Stop Thief" this column predicted that "traitorous Reds here in the United States and all over the world will concert their efforts with special vigor during 1961 to procure diplomatic recognition by our Government and admission to the U.N. (with a place as one of the great powers on the Security Council) for Communist China."

We then quoted a memorandum from Father Joseph F. Thorning, of World Affairs, outlining four steps by which this goal would be reached:

"1. There will be an early decision by the new administration permitting a number of Sovietized Chinese journalists to enter this country, with the simultaneous authorization of U.S. newsmen in limited numbers to visit Red China.

"2. A cultural exchange program.

"3. Relaxation of the embargo on shipments to Red China.

"4. Finally, complete acceptance of the Red capture of China as a fait accompli with an exchange of Ambassadors."

On March 1, less than 6 weeks after that column appeared, United Press International reported that our Government would submit the names of 34 U.S. reporters cleared for travel to Communist China. Speaking for the State Department, Lincoln White said that this would enable the Chinese Reds to submit an equally long list or a longer one. Mr. White assumed that if more than 34 bona fide Chinese newsmen were submitted for U.S. visas, they would be cleared by our Government.

We hardly thought it would come so soon. Watch, now, for the next item on the timetable—the cultural exchange.

Now, you know and I know that the United States has quite a bit to lose and nothing at all to gain by such a gambit, whereas with Red China it is just the reverse. Why then is it being pushed, and by whom?

There are other questions equally urgent that come to mind in numbers too great for recording here. For instance:

Why did the State Department give tacit encouragement to the overthrow of anti-Communist dictators such as Syngman Rhee of South Korea, Batista of Cuba, and Trujillo of the Dominican Republic? What does Tito have that Trujillo lacks? How is Gomulka of Poland better than Syngman Rhee?

Why was the State Department so anxious to help Castro when all their advice indicated that he was a veteran Communist? And granted that it was nothing worse than abysmal stupidity on the part of Roy Rubottom and William Wieland, why were they promoted instead of being sacked?

Whose advice was it that we lose the war in Korea?

Who promoted the Khrushchev and Mikoyan visits to this country?

Who is behind the agitation for ditching our defenses and standing naked and unarmed before the atomic might of the Russians?

Who is it that each year urges millions of dollars from us as a free gift to Communist Poland and Czechoslovakia?

Who persuaded Mr. Eisenhower to order a foreign flag flown beside our own in the Canal Zone, against the all but unanimous advice of Congress?

Whose work created the climate of opinion in this country in which the Supreme Court felt able to strike down practically all of our defenses against the citizen-traitor here in the United States? And why did they do it?

Who is behind the movement to abolish the one committee in Congress specifically authorized to ask questions—not about kidnaping or rape, not about industrial monopolies or labor racketeers, but about the critical subject of communism?

Why is it considered boorish to question the wild and dangerous notion that all of our homegrown spies dropped dead when Senator McCarthy was censured?

These disturbing phenomena have resulted, at worst, from the criminal conspiracy of world communism—at best, from a "stupidity" so carefully worked out, so logically enmeshed at every step as to be, frankly, unbelieveable.

In 1947, the House Committee on Un-American Activities conducted hearings in Hollywood. Their questioning uncovered a hard core of 10 witnesses who, instead of cooperating, defied and vilified the Committee, denouncing the United States while at the same time invoking the protection of the U.S. Constitution.

The American public was shocked. In self-defense, the heads of the movie industry entered into a gentlemen's agreement, known as the Waldorf Declaration, not to hire anyone unless he first renounced the Communist Party.

Among some 250 people who refused to repudiate their disloyalty was Dalton Trumbo. He went to jail for 10 months in 1950 for contempt of Congress.

Since then, he has staged a comeback that can only be called a triumph, with the production of two of his scripts, "Exodus" and "Spartacus," both of them big, costly things, both propaganda vehicles for the current party line. He was glorified in an extensive eulogy by Time (Jan. 2), implying that the punishment of disloyalty is "McCarthyism." Many of the critics have come forward to congratulate Trumbo on his rehabilitation and to praise the producers for their "courage."

Now, Trumbo has not changed. He has never purged himself of his contempt nor renounced the views that led to his questioning. In 1950 he was odious to the American people. By 1961 he has become something of a hero. Obviously it is public opinion that has changed from a state of alarmed patriotism to one of apathy toward treason.

One recalls the statement made by President Kennedy 9 days after his inauguration: "Today," he said, "we need a nation of minutemen; citizens who are not only prepared to take up arms, but citizens who regard the preservation of freedom as a basic purpose of their daily life and who are willing to consciously work and sacrifice for that freedom. The cause of liberty, the cause of America, cannot succeed with any lesser effort."

Studied in the context of current events, the President's words are almost ominous.

SPACE-CIVILIAN CONTROL IN JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Veterans of Foreign Wars have long maintained a close and objective interest in national security. An organization born of the Nation's armed conflicts, the VFW, in common with our other great veterans' organizations, is keenly aware of the complex and pressing requirements of defense.

No aspect of defense has received closer scrutiny by the VFW than the problem of civilian control over the vast and powerful Defense Establishment. The VFW has shared with the Congress absolute faith in the fundamental constitutional principle of civilian control over the military forces of our Nation.

I find, therefore, of more than passing interest a brief but penetrating comment in the current issue of the VFW American Security Reporter entitled "Space-Civilian Control in the JCS." It is an analysis, distinguished by its clarity, of the delicate balance of civilian-military leadership and effort which must obtain at the highest level of our defense organization if we are to receive in full measure the best contributions of both. Just as the Congress must be ever alert to any erosion of firm civilian control of the military, so also must we insist that the JCS system be used to the fullest. The country needs the best of both its civilian and military leaders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comment to which I refer be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. It warrants the careful reading of all thoughtful Americans.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPACE-CIVILIAN CONTROL IN THE JCS

The Pentagon is still reverberating over the recent decision giving the Air Force primacy in space development. The purpose here is not to go into the pros and cons of that order—although it must be recognized on the basis of congressional and Army and Navy reaction—that grave questions are raised by this edict.

The fundamental issue involved in the recent space directive by the Secretary of Defense is one of governmental procedure. In this case the emphasis focuses upon the role of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with respect to the development of defense policies and the relationship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as a corporate body, to the Secretary of Defense. By law the Joint Chiefs of Staff system is the central feature of defense planning at the seat of government. Vested with no plenary decisionmaking authority, the JCS is the principal planning and advisory agency in defense matters.

It would be the logical expectation that the JCS would function in its advisory role in the formulation of any policy as broad and far reaching as the recent directive on space activity. Such an expectation, however, apparently is not justified in this instance. As the background of the events leading up to the space directive becomes more apparent, it appears that the JCS was excluded from participation in this vital policy determination. Whether or not the JCS was bypassed has resulted in one of the most delicate exercises in semantic hairsplitting in recent years.

As a result of queries from the press the Pentagon stated, "The report that General Lemnitzer has protested to Secretary McNamara that the Chiefs are being bypassed or edged out of crucial military decisions by the Kennedy administration is simply without foundation." Yet a Chicago Sun-Times article by its military affairs

specialist, Thomas B. Ross, stated that the JCS was given 1 week to submit its views on the proposed space directive. Considering the magnitude of the proposal and its manifold ramifications, such a deadline could not help but raise questions as to the motive behind it. After all, there was no combat operational requirement for speed. Furthermore, precipitant action in an issue so vital to the long-range security of the United States could be extremely dangerous. The result of the time squeeze on the JCS was that General Lemnitzer, as Chairman of the JCS, reportedly expressed the opinion that the deadline made it impossible for the JCS to develop its view, and that as a result he submitted his "personal opinion."

To assert that General Lemnitzer's memorandum to the Secretary of Defense is not a protest is questionable. But there is no question but what his carefully chosen words do express serious concern.

An administrative device which goes through the motions of referring a basic defense policy matter to the JCS, and yet sets a deadline which makes it impossible for the JCS to perform its role, could set a most serious precedent. Also, there is a question of just what is the status of the personal opinion of the JCS Chairman. The duties of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are set out specifically and with great deliberation in the National Security Act. The Chairman's duties, under law, do not involve the submission of personal opinions.

One byproduct of the time squeeze placed on the JCS in this instance is widespread resentment that the very able JCS Chairman, General Lemnitzer, who has gained the admiration and respect of uniformed and civilian officials for the circumspect manner in which he has exercised his duties and authority, should be maneuvered into having no practicable alternative to submitting a personal opinion on a major issue.

The submission by the Chairman of personal opinion could set a precedent for the Chairman being a de facto spokesman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If such a procedure is repeated, it could constitute an important step toward the development of the JCS Chairman as a single Chief of Staff. Such an alteration of the status and functions of the JCS Chairman has long been recognized as the means by which supporters of the single Chief of Staff could eventually achieve their goal. General Lemnitzer's admirers, who are legion in the Pentagon and in Congress, are highly critical of the procedure by which he has been forced into this unenviable position.

There is no question, however, but what the Secretary of Defense is legally the top authority in the Pentagon. Recognition of this basic fact is essential to the continuation of the constitutional principle of civilian control. His powers are limited only by a few basic stipulations in law, and, of course, by a sense of administrative discretion. The exercise of civilian authority over the military is the most profound, yet delicate, problem confronting the high civilian defense officials. No detailed blueprint for the relationship which a Secretary of Defense establishes with his principal military subordinates can be devised. In the final analysis the efficacy of top civilian direction depends upon a sound—perhaps even an intuitive—understanding of the philosophy of civilian control of the military and a genuine desire to make the legally established organization work successfully.

As the old saying goes, there is more than one way to skin a cat; and there is more than one way to change a governmental organization. Any organization will fail if those to whose stewardship it is entrusted misuse it or don't use it. And the JCS is no exception.

Consequently, if the bypassing of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in connection with the space directive was intended to be an exceptional and isolated administrative procedure, then it can be viewed as a specific and extraordinary procedure—although a dubious one—within the authority of the Secretary of Defense. If, however, it is to be considered as a precedent, then continued use of such method would quickly assume the character of an extralegal procedure that could have the practical end result of destroying the Joint Chiefs of Staff system and creating, out of necessity, to fill the resulting organizational vacuum, a single Chief of Staff.

This, of course, would be contrary to the intent, legislative history, and specific provision of existing law. All of which once again illustrates how great is the obligation of those in authority to conduct government in accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the law.

SANCTIONS AGAINST CUBA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I had intended today to speak at some length about the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, which was introduced by the senior Senator from New Hampshire on March 13 of this year.

In recent weeks I have made a number of contacts with key members of the administration stressing the need for action by the executive branch in order to implement the intent of my resolution immediately. At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 be printed.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18

Whereas the Government of Cuba has established close diplomatic, economic, and military ties with the several Communist-dominated governments dedicated to the overthrow by violence of all nations governed by the republican or democratic processes; and

Whereas such diplomatic, economic, and military ties do in fact constitute a threat to the free nations of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the Inter-American Defense Board is a military planning body composed of army, navy, and air officers of the American Republics, who study and recommend measures for the defense of the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas it is patently absurd to allow an enemy to sit in on our councils of defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is requested to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the initiation of action for the exclusion of representatives of the present Government of Cuba from membership on the Inter-American Defense Board, or to support any such action heretofore or hereafter initiated by any other nation or its representatives.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it was the intention of the senior Senator from New Hampshire to supplement his earlier warnings and appeals with a plea to the administration on the floor of the Senate today. I am delighted, Mr. President, that this is not necessary. Apparently my previous entreaties, and those of others concerned about the presence of representatives from Cuba on the Inter-American Defense Board, have not gone unheeded.

The action of the IADB recently in excluding Cuban representatives from its secret Board meetings must be hailed by all peace-loving peoples of this hemisphere as a significant contribution to the future security of the Americas.

I am heartened by this decisive move because I feel that the Inter-American Defense Board can once again be an effective instrument in planning and promoting the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

TRAINING OF FREEDOM FIGHTERS

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, with each day that passes, events in Cuba, Laos, and elsewhere in the world underscore the compelling need for America to devise new tools to counter the Communist cold war offensive.

The need is unquestioned. The hour is late.

America needs a total strategy for the total warfare the Communists are waging against us. For years, Communists have received indoctrination in the strategy and tactics of revolution in the Lenin Institute of Political Warfare—in the Academy of Red Professors—in the Sun Yat-sen University—in other training schools in Moscow, Leningrad, Prague, and other Communist cities. These institutions graduate Russian and foreign students as professional fighters in all forms of conflict—political, ideological, psychological, economic, cultural, and technological.

We have nothing comparable in America.

On February 9 this year a bipartisan group of 12 Senators, including myself, joined in sponsoring a bill, Senate bill 822, to establish a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy to outthink, outsmart, and outmaneuver the Communists on cold war battlefronts all over the world.

The Freedom Commission would have the task of developing a systematic, integrated applied science of nonmilitary action appropriate to the cold war struggle. The Freedom Academy would offer courses in this applied science of nonmilitary warfare to persons from many walks of life: Government personnel, teachers, trade unionists, businessmen, clergymen, and others. Foreign students also could receive instruction at the Academy.

Last August a similar bill passed the Senate without objection. President Kennedy was serving in the Senate at the time. Now I am hopeful that, as President, Mr. Kennedy will urge enactment this year by both Houses of Congress.

The Freedom Academy bill is pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which I hope will schedule early hearings.

There is growing support for a Freedom Academy, as evidenced by comments of independent writers and observers. There has just come to my attention an article entitled "West Point for Freedom Fighters," which makes a plea for the Freedom Academy. I ask unanimous consent that this article from the publication, Life Lines, dated May 5, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST POINT FOR FREEDOM FIGHTERS

A sort of West Point to train freedom fighters is the goal of those who back the proposal that the Federal Government establish a Freedom Commission and a Freedom Academy.

It is known that the Soviet Union operates an extensive system of political warfare training schools and development centers at Moscow, Leningrad, Tashkent, Prague, and elsewhere on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Some of these schools like the Lenin Institute of Political Warfare began operating in the mid-twenties. The center at Prague specializes in training Latin Americans and Africans, while the school at Tashkent trains Communists from the Islamic countries. The top schools in Russia, China, and Czechoslovakia are not narrow trade schools, but comprehensive training centers giving detailed instruction in the vast field of political warfare and supporting subjects with courses often running 2 or 3 years in length. Significantly, the training of Latin Americans was stepped up in 1956 and in that year Red China began operating a parallel system of schools for Latin American Communists.

Working in close cooperation with the political warfare schools are a number of centers where political scientists, linguists, anthropologists, psychologists, economists, sociologists, and others have been enlisted in the service of political warfare. They are engaged in practical research projects aimed at increasing Communist operational capacities. In recent years these centers have greatly increased their special studies preparing for Soviet penetration of Africa and Latin America.

The increased activities at these political warfare schools and associated centers spell out future Soviet intentions in clear terms.

Two Communists' expanding industrial base and scientific and technological advances give them not only a powerful new propaganda theme but also greatly increased means for economic subversions and missile blackmail. A weak Soviet Russia, capturing a third of mankind through superior power-seeking techniques, was a formidable enemy. Its increasing strength adds immeasurably to the threat to America. Our methods of meeting this threat have not worked. New methods will have to be developed and leaders systematically trained in their use.

There are grave deficiencies in America's preparation to defend itself in this total war to the finish. At the top of the list, and underlying our other failures, is our failure to institute an adequate cold war development and training program.

As hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee brought out, no concentrated, systematic effort is being made to develop an operational science for our side which will meet the mistaken attack and work toward our national objectives in a coordinated manner. We have not been through all the methods and means which freemen can use when faced with this kind of antifreedom challenge. We have not brought these methods and means together in a broad strategic plan. This is particularly true in the field of political and economic warfare. Bits and pieces of the problems are being worked on within the Government and at some educational institutions, but the total effort falls far short of what we need.

Nowhere today can Government personnel or private citizens receive broad training in cold war, especially in the large and highly complex field of political and economic warfare. Not only do we lack top level schools, we do not even have intermediate or lower level schools. There is no place where the bits and pieces are pulled together and taught in concentrated form.

The Freedom Commission proposal has two broad objectives:

1. To carry on research with a view to developing the necessary science to meet the political and economic attack against us;

2. To train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science.

The Freedom Commission would be authorized to establish and administer an advanced cold war development and training center, the Freedom Academy. The Academy is seen as the principal instrument for achieving the two objectives listed. Properly staffed and financed, the Freedom Academy would stand as a symbol of our determination to win the cold war. It would instruct its students not only in the threat to freedom but also in positive, practical ways to meet that threat successfully.

Patriots will want to learn all they can about this proposal for a Freedom Academy. It may be the answer to a need that is great and immediate.

RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today is the 185th anniversary of the General Assembly of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations formally renouncing their allegiance to Great Britain and King George III.

Since the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations passed this Act of Independence on May 4, 1776, 2 months before the signing of the Declaration of Independence of the 13 United States of America, Rhode Island was the first sovereign State of the United States. This Act of Independence was the culmination of many historical events that took place in my State.

In September of 1765, resolutions were adopted by the general assembly denying the right of any power but that body to levy taxes upon the colony. On February 14, 1766, a liberty tree was dedicated at Newport and on July 5, 1768, another liberty tree was dedicated at Providence. The first overt act of violence against the British Crown in America was committed on July 19, 1769, by the destruction of the British revenue sloop, the *Liberty*, at Newport, R.I. This act of violence was soon followed by another, the famous burning of the British revenue schooner, the *Gaspee*, which the torch of liberty ignited in Narragansett Bay.

In June of 1774, a most important decision was made in the colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations—the importation of slaves was prohibited. In March of 1775, Providence had its own tea party—the town crier urged that every citizen bring and cast into the fire the "needless herb" in Market Square.

The men of my State were not found wanting in this crucial era of history for in April of 1775, a thousand militia started for the seat of war on the reception of the news of the Battle of Lexington to go to the aid of that gallant band of farmers in their sister State of Massachusetts. On the same day, an army of observation of 1,500 men was voted by the General Assembly over the Governor's protest. Eleven days later, this same Governor was suspended by an act of the general assembly by reason of his Tory proclivities.

Another first that my State has the honor of having was on June 15 of that year 1775, when Capt. Abraham Whipple who commanded a colonial sloop, chased ashore and captured a tender of the British frigate *Rose*. This was the first naval engagement of the Revolution.

On June 22, 1775, Nathaniel Greene, of whom my great predecessor Senator Theodore Francis Green is a collateral descendant, was chosen brigadier general and later in August 1776 a major general by the Continental Congress.

Mr. President, I cannot fail to remark at this time, that on April 5, 1776, less than 1 month before the general assembly of my State declared its independence 185 years ago today, General Washington appeared in Providence, the hub of the State until this day, and fanned the sparks of freedom into flame, which resulted in Rhode Island becoming the first sovereign State of these United States.

COMMEMORATION OF POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, yesterday marked the 170th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day. On the 3d of May 1791, the Polish Diet proclaimed the undying devotion of the Polish people to the immutable principles of civil liberty, justice, and the inalienable rights of the people to determine their form of government.

Mr. President, the history of Poland clearly demonstrates the will of the Polish people to be free. Few peoples have shown such determined resiliency against domination and repression as the freedom-loving Poles who have suffered so often under foreign conquerors. The Poznan riots and the warm reception which the Poles gave Vice President Nixon are evidence of their deep-seated adherence to liberal ideals although presently a foreign power, the Soviet Union, has imposed a Communist constitution upon them.

My esteemed colleague, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, among others, has recognized the importance of demonstrating continuing American interest in the Polish people. His efforts to establish a children's hospital in Poland, assisted by American funds, deserve warm support. Mr. President, the United States can, I firmly believe, strengthen the bonds between it and the Polish people through steps such as these. The Polish people are not forgotten by their American friends, and it is an honor for me to have this opportunity to salute them.

SEA TRANSPORTATION RESOURCES MOVE A YEAR FURTHER INTO OBSOLESCENCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for some years, the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations—Logistics—has very kindly

provided me with an annual appraisal of the posture of "Ocean Shipping to Support the Defense of the United States."

The following summary of our maritime capabilities and deficiencies which Vice Adm. John Sylvester, U.S. Navy, furnished on March 10 of this year, presents an alarming, yet not insoluble situation:

Under the most optimistic assumptions, and on a quantitative basis only, the United States still possesses a marginal capability to carry out the sea transportation tasks of a general war.

There are serious qualitative deficiencies in our overall sealift capability, particularly in the dry-cargo ship and the transport-passenger ship categories. The further aging of outmoded ships will aggravate this situation.

The present rate of new shipbuilding will not offset the rapidly approaching block obsolescence of the vast proportion of U.S.-controlled merchant-type tonnage—both active and reserve. There is an urgent need for increased emphasis on orderly ship construction.

The continued depreciation of ships in the national defense reserve fleet without cyclic purification will soon generate serious quantitative deficiencies in our total sealift capability.

Crash building programs in wartime can only be avoided by maintaining a modern and adequate maritime posture in peacetime.

In limited or general warfare, as well as in times of cold war, the merchant marine has an important function, and if the administration and the Congress take resolute action, the conditions which the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations describes can be promptly and economically corrected. Mr. President, so that my colleagues can be fully informed as to this matter, I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Sylvester's letter of March 10, 1961, together with his supporting document, entitled "Ocean Shipping to Support the Defense of the United States," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and document were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF
OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1961.

Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
U. S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In your letter of January 30, 1961, you expressed interest in again receiving a current detailed appraisal of our maritime needs along the lines of the documents sent to you in the 2 previous years entitled "Ocean Shipping To Support the Defense of the United States." This paper has been revised and updated. A copy is enclosed for your information.

There have been only minor changes in the substance of this appraisal since its last revision in March 1960. The largest part of our sea transportation resources have moved a year further into obsolescence. No adequate steps have been taken toward their modernization or renewal.

The segment of the U.S.-flag merchant marine operating under subsidy still numbers a few over 300 ships; 2,400 subsidized voyages were authorized in the past year, the same number as in the previous year. There are a number of applications for subsidy pending. Although most of the subsidized shipping companies have entered into long-range ship replacement contracts, funding shortages within the Government have prevented actual replacement construction from being adequate. The rate of progress in the replacement of subsidized shipping depends on the future of construction differential subsidies. Our domestic shipbuilding industry is also largely dependent on this subsidy. Additionally, the construction of the superliner passenger vessels authorized by the 85th Congress has not started. Construction of these ships will depend on the willingness of Congress to appropriate the necessary funds.

Unsubsidized operators currently have about 600 ships under U.S. flag. Most of this tonnage is of World War II design and is therefore 15 to 19 years old. There is no orderly or comprehensive plan for the replacement of these ships, and the present state of the shipping market provides little incentive to the nonsubsidized owners to initiate replacement programs.

Our coastwise fleet which prior to World War II comprised the largest segment of the merchant marine, remains in a depressed state. There are some signs of hope in this field however. Management and labor are cooperating in the search for means to improve the industry, and considerable progress is being made in the use of modern cargo handling techniques. Further, some applications for new service are being considered by the Federal Maritime Board.

This domestic deep water fleet is more significant to our defense shipping capability than the number of ships and the tonnage would indicate. In their operations, these ships are never far from major U.S. ports and, as a group, are the most readily available for emergency usage of all ships under U.S. control.

The national defense reserve fleet has undergone a decrease in numbers due to the sale for scrapping of about 320 Liberty-type vessels; 780 such ships have been approved for scrapping. Although some ships have been traded into the reserve fleet as partial payment on new construction to be financed through the Maritime Administration, it may be said that in general the reserve fleet is gradually deteriorating, both in size and in qualitative usefulness.

Over the past few years, the American-owned merchant fleet registered under the so-called flags of convenience has become significant in national defense planning. Modern war concepts put a high premium on the active and operating ship over the ship in reserve. The American-owned foreign-flag merchant vessels that may be presumed to be under effective U.S. control constitute an active operating fleet of roughly 450 ships, mostly large tankers and bulk carriers. About half the tonnage of this fleet was built in the last 5 years. Roughly half of the tanker capacity available to the United States is under flags of convenience.

The operation of these ships by American owners under flags of convenience has for some time been the target of strong opposition by maritime labor groups. This has increased to the point that operation under the usual flags of convenience (Liberia, Panama and Honduras) is becoming less and less tenable for ship operators.

The American owners of flag of convenience ships contend that they cannot pay American wage scales and operate in competition with European shipping without governmental subsidy. On the other hand, American maritime labor contends that the United States should support a strong merchant marine as being necessary to our position as a maritime power.

Again I should reiterate that it would not be appropriate for either the Navy or the Department of Defense to become involved in a dispute between maritime labor and management. Our interest in the matter relates to the impact of this problem on our defense posture. It is imperative that U.S. effective control of this shipping be retained.

Your position and your interest in our maritime industry make it particularly important that you be fully informed on these matters. I am, of course, at your service for any additional information that you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN SYLVESTER,
Vice Admiral U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics).

OCEAN SHIPPING TO SUPPORT THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

INTRODUCTION

The United States must be prepared today—and throughout the foreseeable future—to deal immediately and effectively with any emergency that may be forced upon us. We must be ready at all times to fight limited wars, or general war, or to support our foreign policies under tense conditions short of actual conflict.

The prosecution of war might employ the full range of our Nation's resources. Our entire industrial capability is available to be integrated into our overall national defense effort. To support sustained combat operations and to project our military power overseas, our Armed Forces would rely heavily upon American industry. Our maritime industry would play a central role, supplying the raw materials to feed domestic industries and carrying the bulk of our troops and their equipment and supplies to oversea areas.

The strategic importance of ocean transportation in wartime dictates that the United States must have under its control sufficient active merchant type shipping to promptly meet our initial emergency sealift requirements.

Our present capability to handle this task is marginal at best. The slow rate of progress made in the replacement of aging vessels has left us facing the 1960's with a largely obsolescent merchant marine. Orderly shipbuilding programs and replacement programs should be instituted without further delay.

It is often proposed that we rely on our friends among the European maritime nations to provide our emergency shipping needs. We should keep in mind that the interests of the United States are global, and emergencies may well arise wherein our interests would not be identical with those of our European allies. Even within the NATO framework it appears probably that the combined requirements of the NATO nations will exceed the total capabilities of the NATO shipping pool.

BACKGROUND

At the outbreak of World War I, shipping available for charter to American interests suddenly became extremely scarce. Charter rates skyrocketed. We were forced to hastily improvise a shipbuilding program which was both costly and inefficient, and peak production was not reached until after the war ended. We learned in World War I that the law of supply and demand is real. We were subjected to the same lesson again in World War II.

The primary mission of the American merchant marine is the task of transporting our domestic water-borne commerce and a substantial portion of our foriegn export and import ocean trade. Our industrial economy is now dependent on sea transportation for the importation of vast

amounts of petroleum, metal ores, and other raw materials, and for the exportation of finished products. No other type of transportation can meet these tremendous requirements. It is imperative that the world's foremost trader control sufficient merchant shipping to transport what we need, when and where we need it. This is true from the standpoint of our emergency requirements, and it is also valid when we consider the outflow of dollars in payment for foreign controlled shipping services.

A collateral and extremely important mission of the American Merchant Marine is the maintenance of a posture of strength and readiness that will contribute to our national security. In the event of either limited or general war we would require the services of a large number of merchant-type ships to meet our military, industrial, and civilian demands.

It is important that the ability to meet our anticipated wartime needs be insured to the maximum practicable degree in peacetime by the ready availability of active, privately owned merchant ships employed in gainful ocean commerce. Only actively employed merchant ships can provide the rapid response required. Further, it is only the active merchant marine that will provide in peacetime the employment for skilled American seafarers in sufficient numbers to allow effective wartime personnel expansion of our maritime effort. The magnitude and quality of active U.S. commercial tonnage in peacetime will determine, in the event of a future war, whether or not we will be required to initiate crash programs for shipbuilding and personnel procurement. Even so, we cannot presume that time will be available.

REQUIREMENTS AND AVAILABILITIES

Periodic evaluations of merchant shipping requirements and availabilities are made jointly by the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. Similar joint appraisals are made by the Maritime Administration and the Navy Department.

These evaluations of shipping availabilities have consistently shown that the United States does not have sufficient active merchant shipping to meet our initial needs for general war, even when we combine the total of U.S.-flag and U.S.-controlled foreign-flag shipping. Consequently, our estimated total capabilities must include planned early activations from the national defense reserve fleet—under optimum assumed conditions which make no allowances for possible damage to shore facilities. Some allowance is made for cumulative losses of shipping from enemy action.

It is expected that a new joint Navy-MARAD review of merchant shipping requirements and availabilities will be completed this summer. The last such joint review was conducted in May 1959 and updated in mid-1960.

Our sea transportation resources for limited war are currently under review and reappraisal by the Department of Defense for determination of the present capability of sealift to support military requirements under varying limited war conditions. Pending this reappraisal, these resources are considered as quantitatively adequate in the tanker category. Qualitatively, particularly in terms of cargo ship speed and characteristics, much improvement is highly desirable.

The degree of promptness with which sealift responds in an emergency will have an important impact on the eventual outcome. A limited war crisis could well become a race against time to evacuate nationals, to redeploy troops and equipment, or to augment and resupply existing forces overseas. To be prepared for such situations, we must rely on the ready availability of active modern merchant ships of all types.

PRESENT CAPABILITIES

Existing inventories of sealift resources under U.S. flag, as of January 1, 1961, are summarized below:

	Number	Capacity
		Deadweight tonnage
(a) Dry cargo ships:		
Operational	703	7,586,900
Reserve fleet	[1] 1,387	14,146,300
Total	2,090	21,733,200
(b) Tankers:		
Operational	373	7,121,500
Reserve fleet	86	1,083,700
Total	459	8,205,200
		Passengers (emergency capacity)
(c) Passenger ships/transports:		
Operational	47	71,301
Reserve fleet	107	259,233
Total	154	330,534

[1] Includes about a thousand Liberty ships of little or no wartime value, recommended for scrapping.

Additional sealift resources consisting of certain active vessels under the so-called flags of convenience as of January 1, 1961, are as follows:

	Number	Capacity
		Deadweight tonnage
(a) Cargo ships:		
General cargo and reefer	97	941,500
Bulk cargo	71	1,728,600
Total	168	2,670,100
(b) Tankers	282	8,360,600
		Passengers (emergency capacity)
(c) Passenger/transports	5	7,900

The active U.S.-flag sealift capability is comprised of active merchant ships under U.S.-flag and merchant-type ships operated by the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS).

The additional sealift resources listed consist of certain foreign-registered merchant ships considered as under effective U.S. control for emergency use. The term "effective U.S. control" applies to selected American-owned ships which have been registered by their owners under the so-called flags of convenience (Panama, Liberia, and Honduras), in order to reduce operating costs. In such cases, the Maritime Administration has negotiated agreements with the parent shipping companies in the United States to make these ships (which in the main are large tankers and bulk ore carriers) available to the U.S. Government in the event of a national emergency. The Department of Defense and the Maritime Administration consider that such ships can be reasonably expected to be available and are therefore under effective U.S. control.

The vast proportion of our U.S.-flag merchant tonnage was constructed under the World War II building programs: 79 percent of our dry cargo and 54 percent of our tanker tonnage are in the 15- to 19-year-old age bracket. Nearly all of these ships were mass produced for specific wartime purposes. Many of their design features were matters of expediency rather than choice. They have long been outmoded from the standpoint of modern design.

The capabilities shown as comprising the national defense reserve fleet may be misleading. It should be pointed out that about 1,000 of the dry cargo ships are slow-speed Liberty types of extremely limited usefulness. Over 300 Liberties have already been sold for scrapping under approvals to select and scrap 780 of the poorest quality ships. Their marginal value did not warrant the cost of further preservation efforts. Of the 107 transport/passenger ships, 51 are 17-knot C–4 austerity transports and 23 are 15.5-knot Victory troopships.

We can look forward to further depreciation of the overall potential of the reserve fleet—from the standpoints of both quantity and quality. Consequently, there is an obvious need that the reserve fleet be upgraded by the trade-in of aging ships under orderly replacement programs. This requirement goes hand in hand with the need to modernize our active merchant fleet.

DRY-CARGO SHIPS

Only 1.7 percent of the U.S.-flag tonnage of dry cargo ships are under 5 years of age. Only 5.9 percent are from 5 to 9 years old. This latter age group includes the Mariner class ships, that were built by the U.S. Government, plus a few modern container ship conversions. The 20-knot C–4 Mariners, which can do 23 knots if required, represent an impressive step forward in cargo ship design. Their performance has been highly praised by several private operators, to whom 29 of the ships were sold. Three of these ships have been converted into passenger ships. The defense sealift value of the Mariner class ships is very high.

With regard to future construction of dry cargo ships, the Department of Defense recommends that the design characteristics listed below be incorporated to the maximum degree that is commercially practicable.

(a) Speed: When built under construction-differential subsidy contracts and certified as being suitable for economical and speedy conversion into naval auxiliaries, dry cargo ships should have a sustained sea speed of 20 knots or better. Dry cargo ships certified as otherwise suitable for the use of the U.S. Government in time of war or national emergency, should have the maximum sustained sea speed possible consistent with the commercial utilization of the ship. Where construction subsidies and/or national defense allowances are not involved, the owners are encouraged to build into the ships, the highest commercially economical speeds.

(b) Other characteristics: The most practical and useful types of general-cargo vessels, from a military point of view, appear to be those having the capacity and characteristics of the C–3's and C–4's (particularly Mariners), of Maritime Administration design. However, much is to be desired in the matter of modernization with respect to cargo-handling equipment and methods. Cargo vessels should be designed and equipped to load and discharge, using their own gear, in one-half the time now required by the existing C–3's and C–4's. At least one hatch of each vessel should be served by a jumbo boom of 60 tons capacity and all hatches should be equipped with 10-ton booms. There is a definite need for a limited number of heavy lift ships equipped with oversized hatches and cargo booms capable of lifting up to 150 tons.

(c) Special type cargo ships: Roll-on/roll-off ships on the order of the USNS *Comet* as well as ships with partial roll-on/roll-off capability offer advantages in meeting requirements for the overseas movement of mobile military equipment such as wheeled and tracked vehicles. Additionally, we encourage the continued development of container cargo ships, which are designed to carry containerized and prepalletized cargoes. Further construction of such ships in peacetime would increase active capability and afford operating experience. U.S. shipyards would also gain construction experience which would enable them to commence early production under an emergency situation.

TANKERS

American shipowners have built a good number of modern tankers in the past few years—some constructed in the United

States for registry under U.S. flag but most built abroad for registry under foreign flag.

Of the U.S.-flag tanker tonnage, 26.5 percent is under 5 years old. These new ships range in speed from 16 to 18 knots. Consequently, the overall quality of our total tanker capability is much better than the dry-cargo category.

The tanker building program should continue in order to provide orderly replacement of aging ships. It is recommended that future tanker construction incorporate design features as indicated below:

(a) Speed: Where national defense allowances are made, and the ships are certified as suitable for speedy and economical conversion into naval auxiliaries, tankers should be capable of a sustained speed of 20 knots or more.

(b) Other characteristics: Although tankers of large deadweight tons capacity can be utilized to a limited extent, the recommended general characteristics of commercial tankers most suitable for military purposes are 25,000 to 32,000 deadweight tons, capable of carrying several types of petroleum products. At the same time, there is still a requirement for smaller tankers of about 17,000 deadweight tons to handle products to and from limited terminal facilities. All new commercial tankers should have the ability for transfer of their cargo at sea to provide a limited fueling-at-sea capability. Further, this capability should be added to existing tankers when it is feasible to do so. The expense of the necessary modifications and equipment are relatively small, in the magnitude of $17,000 per ship. Tankers so equipped will be capable of replenishing fleet oilers at sea or in unimproved harbors. Under emergency conditions, such tankers could provide fuel directly to combatant fleet units.

PASSENGER SHIPS/TRANSPORTS

Seven new passenger ships have been build since World War II and three have been converted from Mariner class cargo ships. The seven new ships are the 25-knot *Constitution* and *Independence*, the 33-knot *United States*, the 20-knot *Santa Paula* and *Santa Rosa*, and the 21-knot *Brasil* and *Argentina*. The Mariner conversions are the 20-knot *Mariposa*, *Monterey*, and *Atlantic*. These ships have contributed significantly to our maritime prestige and to our defense readiness.

Additionally, the 19-knot *President Cleveland* and *President Wilson* were converted from troopships. These ships, however, are basically World War II types. They form a part of the older, and major segment of our total trooplift capability, which is not fully suitable for possible future emergencies. The majority of our ships are old, deficient in speed, and lacking in other features that are important in minimizing the hazards of moving troops by sea.

There is an urgent need to improve the quality of our trooplift potential, and in this regard the construction of the two authorized but unfunded superliners should be expedited. For ships that will be employed in wartime to transport personnel through areas in which hostile modern submarines may be operating, it is necessary to set much higher standards of performance and safety than would be required for ships carrying dry cargo and fuel.

(a) Speed: Speed is the best defense that merchant ships can employ against an enemy. The faster the target, the more difficult it is to hit with submarine torpedoes—or to pinpoint with aircraft-launched missiles. Fast ships can be operated independently over more devious routes than is possible in convoy operations. This complicates the search and attack problems of enemy aircraft and submarines. Studies and analysis confirm that vulnerability to submarine attack is significantly and progressively reduced as speeds of 20 to 25 knots and greater are attained.

Troopships constructed in the future, and passenger ships suitable for conversion into troopships, should be capable of a sustained speed of 25 knots or greater. In no case should their maximum sustained speed be less than 20 knots.

The Department of Defense has consistently and repeatedly urged that all new merchant-type shipbuilding incorporate the maximum speed that is economically practicable. In this regard, it is important that our merchant ships be commercially successful. To be of immediate use to the Department of Defense in an emergency, they must be operating commercially at the time they are first needed.

(b) Other features: Emphasis on added speed should not obscure the significance of other national defense features which can be built into a merchant ship. High standards of compartmentation reduce vulnerability to enemy hazards by localizing damage. Various preventive measures increase a ship's resistance to the spread of fire. Special mountings minimize breakdowns of essential machinery under shock.

Endurance adequate for round-trip voyages at maximum sustained speed is a vital factor in wartime. Additional fuel capacity, the size of distilling plants, the storage space for provisions, and many other design aspects have an important bearing on endurance. Many of the foregoing factors, aside from improving the wartime utility of a ship, also assure safer, more versatile and reliable performance in peacetime commercial operations.

FUTURE OUTLOOK

The subsidized segment of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet amounts to 313 berth line ships. They operate over essential trade routes under mandatory voyage scheduling procedures dictated by the Maritime Administration. Several unsubsidized shipping companies have applications pending for governmental subsidy.

The rate of replacement of subsidized ships is much slower than that considered necessary to avoid future obsolescence in block. The replacement program for fiscal 1962 has been set at 14 ships; proper replacement even on a 25-year-life basis, will require 25 to 30 ships per year.

The 85th Congress authorized, but did not appropriate funds, for the construction of two large high-speed passenger ships—one of 33-knot and one of 30-knot speed. Construction of these two ships would significantly improve our trooplift potential. They would almost double our active capability in the important speed range of 25 knots and above.

The rate of progress of the building programs will depend on actions taken in the future with respect to construction-differential subsidies. It is hoped that it will be practicable for future governmental subsidy funding to keep pace with the contractual schedules for replacement.

Our unsubsidized shipping companies operate approximately 600 ships under U.S. flag. Few unsubsidized operators, if any, have either a comprehensive or a long-range plan for the replacement of aging ships on an orderly time schedule.

Over the past year, increasing pressure has been exerted against flags of convenience by maritime labor organizations through the courts and the Labor Relations Boards. This pressure is making it less and less practicable for American owners to operate their ships under flags of convenience. This raises the question as to what steps should be taken to insure the continued availability of these ships for purposes of national defense. It is important to note that well over half of the tanker tonnage available to U.S. control is registered under the flags of Liberia and Panama.

Prior to the outbreak of World War II, the part of our shipping that was engaged in the coastal and intercoastal trade was the largest segment of the U.S. merchant marine. At that time nearly 700 ships took part in the carriage of our deepwater domestic trade. Shortly after our entry into the war, practically the entire coastal and intercoastal merchant fleet, which at that time represented about 60 percent of our total ocean-carrying capability, was put into service, usually transocean, directly supporting the war.

With the domestic deepwater fleet engaged, worldwide, in supplying the Allied Armed Forces, the domestic trade which they formerly carried was absorbed by other modes of transportation. The domestic deepwater common carriers have never regained their former status. Only 3 companies with a total of 15 ships are currently furnishing common carrier service. One of these, the Luckenbach Steamship Co., has announced its intention to terminate its intercoastal service, which will leave only 10 ships in this trade.

Ships engaged in coastal and intercoastal trade occupy a particularly significant position relative to the emergency use of transportation. Ships in the coastwise trades are the most readily available for emergency usage of any ships in the U.S. merchant fleet. In their normal operations they are always close to U.S. ports, ready immediately to handle such high-priority movements as may be necessary. Of course, to be available for immediate use, these ships must be active and operating commercially at the time they are first needed.

At the onset of a major, nuclear war, the domestic deepwater fleet would be uniquely fitted to act as a link between our coastal cities during the period of likely disruption of systems of land transportation. A large percentage of the ships in domestic trade would be at sea at any given time and would therefore be most likely to escape damage. Their ability to provide communications and transportation betwen coastal cities during the period just after an attack could be highly important. Systems of land transportation in the United States are especially vulnerable at many focal points. The ability of the domestic deepwater fleet to provide essential coastal and intercoastal movements of priority material might well be crucial. A number of the ships of this fleet are especially adapted for rapid cargo handling, giving them an increased value at such a critical time.

EMERGENCY EXPANSION

One basic factor to be considered in the development of specific construction programs is the necessity for the maintenance of a sufficient number of private shipyards in operation to form the base for expansion in time of war to meet large ship construction and ship repair programs. The Department of Defense has emphasized that the existence of these active privately owned shipyards, together with the skills of the shipyard workers and the capabilities of the tools, equipment, and facilities, is essential to the national defense.

SUMMARY

Under the most optimistic assumptions, and on a quantitative basis only, the United States still possesses a marginal capability to carry out the sea transportation tasks of a general war.

There are serious qualitative deficiencies in our overall sealift capability, particularly

in the dry cargo ship and the transport passenger ship categories. The further aging of outmoded ships will aggravate this situation.

The present rate of new shipbuilding will not offset the rapidly approaching block obsolescence of the vast proportion of U.S.-controlled merchant-type tonnage—both active and reserve. There is an urgent need for increased emphasis on orderly ship construction.

The continued depreciation of ships in the national defense reserve fleet without cyclic purification will soon generate serious quantitative deficiencies in our total sealift capability.

Crash-building programs in wartime can only be avoided by maintaining a modern and adequate maritime posture in peacetime.

CONCLUSION

In order for the United States to maintain adequate merchant shipping to meet our initial wartime needs, it is important that the ships of both subsidized and nonsubsidized operators be periodically replaced under orderly and progressive programs. In so doing, every advantage should be taken of recent and future technological developments. Cargo-handling equipment and propulsion plants should be further improved with a view to reducing the transit and turnaround times of commercial shipping.

Our shipbuilding programs should be farsighted in order that ships contracted for in coming years will be actually competitive throughout their economic lifespan. Ships built with foresight will be more readily adaptable to speedy and economical conversion into naval auxiliaries, or otherwise suitable for naval use in the event of war.

RABINDRANATH TAGORE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, civilized men everywhere will begin this month to celebrate the centenary of Rabindranath Tagore, modern India's greatest poet and one of her most illustrious thinkers and spiritual leaders. Tagore was born on May 6, 1861, 5 years after the outbreak of the Sepoy rebellion, which Indians have characterized as the War of Indian Independence.

Long before the end of the 19th century, Tagore's genius was acclaimed throughout India and much of the rest of Asia. In 1913 he was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature, and the acclaim became international. His works were translated into English, and Tagore visited the United States five times, giving lectures and recitations.

The Review of Reviews of August 1913 commented:

The East and West meet in deep appreciation of the supreme literature of Rabindranath Tagore, India's greatest lyric poet and singer and spiritual and patriotic leader. His influence upon India for the last 30 years has been enormous; he has practically reconstructed the rational ideals of the masses through a wide dissemination of his poetry. Even our Western men of letters have felt the force of his genius.

Tagore was both productive and versatile. He wrote over 50 volumes of poetry, 20 or more dramas, 20 or more novels, and several short stories and essays. He composed over 3,000 songs, painted at least 200 pictures, and composed and choreographed quite a number of ballets. Yet it has been said that his real life's work was the International University of Visva-Bharati. His life, I think, was a vindication of some lines that are contained in one of his poems:

Leave me not in the soft lap of comfort and vain dreams,
But make me fit and free in the field of action.

Tagore wrote much on the subject of nationalism.

In one of his essays, he admonished his countrymen with these words:

We never dream of blaming our own social inadequacy as the source of our present helplessness. Those of us in India who are under the delusion that mere political freedom, however important and urgent that may be, will make us free have lost faith in humanity. We must remember that whatever weakness we cherish in our society will become the source of danger in politics. The same inertia which leads us to our idolatry of dead forms in social institutions, will create in our politics prison houses with immovable walls.

Tagore did not live to see the dream of Indian independence fulfilled. He died in 1941. Now, 20 years later, the world continues to honor him, not only for his artistry, and his gift to India, but because he was a compassionate and productive thinker, whose concern was all mankind. Three months before his death, and nearly 80 years old, he said:

I had at one time believed that the springs of civilization would issue out of the heart of Europe. But today when I am about to quit this world, that faith is going bankrupt. As I look around I see the crumbling ruins of a proud civilization strewn like a vast heap of futility. And yet I shall not commit the grievous sin of losing faith in man. I would rather look forward to the opening of a new chapter in his history. A day will come when the unvanquished man will retrace his path of conquest to win back his lost human heritage.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall not object to the termination of morning business. I have some morning business to present, but I have been assured by the majority leader I shall have an opportunity to speak during the consideration of the German Treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate in executive session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in executive session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since the Senate is in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the nomination of Mr. C. Darwin Stolzenbach.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable report was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive C, 86th Congress, 2d session. An International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, signed at London on May 12, 1954 (Ex. Rept. No. 4).

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Clayburne A. McLelland, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the district of the Canal Zone.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin;

Harold C. Doyle, of South Dakota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of South Dakota;

Anton T. Skoro, of Idaho, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Idaho;

John E. Maguire, Sr., of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Florida;

William J. Andrews, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Georgia;

Fred F. Hoh, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Ohio; and

Peyton Norville, Jr., of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of C. Darwin Stolzenbach, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADORS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fulton Freeman, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John S. Everton, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Pleni-

potentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Burma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ernest R. Feidler for promotion to the permanent rank of Rear Admiral in the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Coast Guard be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

THE SECOND AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 3, Executive D, the second agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the treaty (Ex. D, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), the second agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, which was read the second time, as follows:

SECOND AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY REGARDING CERTAIN MATTERS ARISING FROM THE VALIDATION OF GERMAN DOLLAR BONDS

The United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany,

Considering,

That the United States of America (hereinafter referred to as "the United States") and the Federal Republic of Germany (hereinafter referred to as "the Federal Republic") concluded on April 1, 1953 an Agreement Regarding Certain Matters Arising from the Validation of German Dollar Bonds, which entered into force on September 16, 1953;

That Article 1 of that Agreement provides that, except as may be agreed between the Federal Republic and the United States, the Federal Republic will not amend or modify its Law for the Validation of German Foreign Currency Bonds of August 25, 1952 (Bundesgesetzblatt 1952, Part I, page 553) (hereinafter referred to as "the Validation Law") or the Schedule thereto as they relate to bonds, debentures or other obligations listed in the said Schedule or in the First Implementing Ordinance under the said Law of February 21, 1953 (Bundesgesetzblatt 1953, Part I, page 31) and in respect of which the Schedule or the said Ordinance describes the United States as the Country of Offering, or extend the provisions of the said Law to bonds offered in the United States and not listed in the said Schedule or the said Ordinance;

That the Validation Law and thus the said Agreement relate only to Dollar Bonds whose issuers have their seat in the area of applicability of the Validation Law;

That it appears now in the mutual interest to extend the provisions of the Validation Law and the Agreement to the Dollar Bonds described in Article I, paragraph 1, below, whose issuers have no seat in the area of applicability of the Validation Law, since the Dollar Bonds are guaranteed by corporations located in that area or since the issuers own realizable assets in that area;

That it further appears necessary to enable the Federal Republic to amend the Validation Law with a view to allowing the subsequent granting of declaratory decrees, so as to eliminate hardships borne by former holders of Dollar Bonds;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

(1) Dollar Bonds of the types listed in the attached Schedule shall be deemed to be foreign currency bonds as defined in Article 1 of the Validation Law. In respect of such Dollar Bonds, the United States shall be deemed to be the Country of Offering.

(2) The provisions of the Validation Law, the provisions of the Second Implementing Ordinance (Bundesanzeiger No. 50 of March 13, 1953) and of the Twelfth Implementing Ordinance (Bundesgesetzblatt 1956, Part I, page 742) thereto dated respectively March 7, 1953 and August 11, 1956, and the arrangements made in the Agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Federal Republic of February 27, 1953 and in the Agreement between the United States and the Federal Republic of April 1, 1953 shall apply to the Dollar Bonds listed in the attached Schedule including coupons issued in connection with the said Bonds, except as otherwise hereinafter provided.

(3) The Federal Republic may, with the consent of the Government of the United States, provide for the validation of other Dollar Bonds.

ARTICLE II

The provisions referred to in Article I, paragraph 2, above, shall apply to the Dollar Bonds listed in the attached Schedule under serial number 1 with the following provisos:

1. The guarantors referred to under serial number 1 of the attached Schedule shall be deemed to be the issuers.

2. Articles 2 and 50 of the Validation Law and Article II of the Agreement between the United States and the Federal Republic of April 1, 1953, shall apply only in respect of the guarantors' obligations.

3. The Examining Agency (Article 11 of the Validation Law) shall be designated within two months from the date of entry into force of this Agreement.

4. The Opening Date (Article 19 of the Validation Law) shall be the first day of the third month following the date of the entry into force of this Agreement.

5. The registration period prescribed in Article 21, paragraph 1, first sentence, of the Validation Law shall be three years. The provisions of Article 21, paragraph 1, second sentence, and paragraph 2 of that Law shall not apply.

6. The provisions of Article 36 of the Validation Law shall apply with the proviso that the denial of validation shall not be noted on the registered bond and that such bond shall not be invalidated.

7. The references in Article 50, paragraph 2, of the Validation Law to invalidation of bonds shall be deemed to be references to the return of the bonds.

ARTICLE III

The provisions referred to in Article I, paragraph 2, above, shall apply to the Dollar Bonds listed in the attached Schedule under serial numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 with the following provisos:

1. Article 2 of the Validation Law and Article II of the Agreement between the United States and the Federal Republic of April 1, 1953, shall not apply. No rights arising out of the Dollar Bonds may be asserted within the Federal Republic unless the bonds have been validated. The prohibition of payment in Article 14 of the Validation Law shall apply only with regard to payment from an issuer's assets located within the Federal Republic.

2. The Examining Agency (Article 11 of the Validation Law) shall be designated within two months from the date of entry into force of this Agreement.

3. Whenever, under the provisions of the Validation Law, venue depends on the seat of the issuer, the seat of the Examining Agency shall be controlling.

4. The Opening Date (Article 19 of the Validation Law) shall be the first day of the third month following the date of entry into force of this Agreement.

5. The registration period prescribed in Article 21, paragraph 1, first sentence, of the Validation Law shall be three years. The provisions of Article 21, paragraph 1, second sentence, and paragraph 2 of that Law shall not apply.

6. The provisions of Article 36 of the Validation Law shall apply with the proviso that the denial of validation shall not be noted on the registered bond and that such bond shall not be invalidated.

7. The provisions of the Validation Law governing declaratory decrees (Article 4), invalidation of foreign currency bonds which have not been validated (Article 50), subsequent validation of foreign currency bonds (Article 51), compensation for foreign currency bonds which have become invalid (Article 52), claims for compensation under declaratory decrees (Article 53), compensation claims for amortization bonds (Article 54), and the release of collateral (Articles 59, 60 and 61) shall not be applicable.

8. The administrative fee prescribed in Article 64 of the Validation Law shall not exceed four percent of the measuring amount prescribed in paragraph 1, third sentence, of that Article.

ARTICLE IV

The Federal Republic undertakes to enact legislation permitting bankruptcy proceedings to take place in respect of the assets in the Federal Republic of the issuers of Dollar Bonds listed in the Schedule under serial numbers 2 to 7. In this connection, provision may be made to the effect that the validation costs to be borne by issuers pursuant to Articles 63 and 64 of the Validation Law shall, in the event of bankruptcy proceedings in respect of the issuers' assets, be deemed to be first priority charges within the meaning of Article 58 No. 2 of the German Bankruptcy Code.

ARTICLE V

The Federal Republic may amend the Validation Law by enacting provisions permitting a subsequent granting of declaratory decrees in respect of Dollar Bonds in cases where the claimants' failure to comply with the registration periods prescribed in the Validation Law was not due to gross negligence on their part. In this connection, the Federal Republic will provide that claims for compensation under declaratory decrees issued subsequently may not be asserted where

such assertion would impair the claims for compensation under Articles 52, 53 and 54 of the Validation Law, and that claims for compensation of the first-mentioned type shall be inadmissible to the extent that their admission would entitle the issuer to make the reductions provided for in Article 53, paragraph 2, or Article 54, paragraph 2, of the Validation Law.

ARTICLE VI

(1) This Agreement shall also apply to Land Berlin provided that the Government of the Federal Republic has not delivered a contrary declaration to the Government of the United States within three months from the date of entry into force of this Agreement.

(2) In the application of this Agreement to Land Berlin, references to the Federal Republic of Germany shall be deemed also to be references to Land Berlin.

ARTICLE VII

(1) This Agreement shall require ratification; the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged in Washington as soon as possible.

(2) This Agreement shall enter into force upon the exchange of the instruments of ratification.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized thereto, have signed this Agreement.

Done at Bonn in duplicate, in the English and German languages, both texts being equally authentic, this sixteenth day of August 1960.

For the United States of America:
WALTER DOWLING
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
v BRENTANO

Schedule to art. 1, par. 1

Serial No.	Issuer		Original rate of interest (percent)	Designation	Year of issue
	In German designation	In American designation			
1	Ostpreussenwerk Aktiengesellschaft Garanten: Vereinigte Industrie-Unternehmungen Aktiengesellschaft; Preussische Elektrizitaets-Aktiengesellschaft.	East Prussian Power Co. Guarantors: United Industrial Corp.; Prussian Electric Co.	6	1st mortgage sinking fund gold bonds due June 1, 1953.	1928
2	Aktiengesellschaft Saechsische Werke	Saxon Public Works, Inc	7	1st mortgage 20-year sinking fund guaranteed external loan gold bonds.	1925
3	Do	do	6½	General and refunding mortgage guaranteed gold bonds due May 1, 1951.	1926
4	Do	do	6	Guaranteed gold notes due July 15, 1937	1932
5	Do	do	5	Guaranteed serial gold notes due Mar. 1, 1943	1933
6	Maerkisches Elektrizitaetswerk Aktiengesellschaft (jetzt: Brandenburgisch-Mecklenburgische Elektrizitaetswerke Aktiengesellschaft).	Brandenburg Electric Power Co	6	25-year 1st mortgage sinking fund gold bonds external loan due May 1, 1953.	1928
7	Ueberlandzentrale Pommern Aktiengesellschaft	Pomerania Electric Co	6	Sinking fund mortgage gold bonds due May 1, 1953.	1928

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations explains the treaty, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations, with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of debate, if any, on the treaty, the Senate agree to vote immediately upon the reconvening of the Senate after the meeting in the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the President of Tunisia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this means that immediately on the reconvening of the Senate after the meeting in the Hall of the House of Representatives there will automatically be a yea and nay vote on the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is the second agreement between the United States and Germany relating to the validation of German dollar bonds. The first agreement, which was approved by the Senate in 1953, outlines the procedure for the validation of dollar bonds held outside Germany on January 1, 1945.

For the information of the Senate, I shall review briefly some of the factors leading up to the agreement under consideration.

It will be recalled that in the 1920's a large volume of German dollar bonds in bearer form was marketed in the United States and sold to private investors in all parts of the country. During the 1930's, payments on most of these bonds were defaulted and they dropped in value. Subsequently, the German Government established a conversion office for foreign debts, and during the period up to the outbreak of World War II repurchased a large number of these bonds at the depreciated prices.

Most of these bonds were physically returned to Germany, but many disappeared after the capture of Berlin by the Soviet forces.

The total amount of bonds which may have fallen into Russian hands cannot be determined with exactitude, but it may run as high as $350 million.

In December of 1941, the security exchanges in the United States suspended dealings in listed securities of German origin. However, as a means of preventing the Soviets from introducing unlawfully held bonds into our country, a validation procedure for German dollar bonds was established and incorporated into the 1953 agreement between the United States and Germany.

The validation procedure provided that in order to recover bondholders had to demonstrate that the bonds were physically outside Germany on January 1, 1945—that is, prior to the fall of Berlin—or that the bonds were lawfully owned by that date or were acquired by an uninterrupted chain of legal transfers. The purpose of this procedure was to make sure that payment would be made only on those bonds which were legitimately held, as opposed to those which disappeared after the Soviet occupation of Berlin.

I wish to point out, however, that the validation procedure in the 1953 agreement was restricted to bonds of issuers located in the German Federal Republic and the western sectors of Berlin. Since that time information has been developed that certain East German dollar bonds are guaranteed by solvent companies located in West Germany. In addition, some East German issuers of dollar bonds have assets in excess of $4 million located in West Germany which can be used to pay off these outstanding obligations.

In order to extend existing validation procedures to East German dollar bonds and satisfy bondholders' claims out of the assets and guarantees to which I just referred, another agreement between the United States and Germany is required. Executive D, the second agreement on German dollar bonds which is now under consideration, will accomplish this purpose. It is estimated that the outstanding bonds covered by this agreement have a face value of $7 million and that approximately $5 million is recoverable and will be distributed to American beneficiaries.

I might add, the Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on this agreement on April 5, 1961. It was also discussed at some length in executive session on April 25, at which time the committee voted to report it favorably and recommend that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the agreement.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the minority leader, who is in the Chamber, and now in consultation with the majority leader, has informed me that as a result of the calendar call yesterday there is practically no undisposed of legislative business pending before the Senate. The minority leader has also advised me and my colleagues on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that yesterday objection was raised, by a Senator who desired to remain anonymous, to a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

This morning the minority leader, acting entirely within his rights, objected to a continuation of a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

called to mark up the Federal aid to education bill.

We are now getting into the fifth month of this session. Large amounts of important proposed legislation are pending in committee. Many committees are trying to dispose of the measures referred to them as expeditiously as possible. Here are two instances within the last 24 hours of how a single Senator can block a meeting of a committee when the Senate is in session.

It will be recalled that last August I submitted a resolution to repeal the rule which allows a single Senator to prevent all Senate standing committees and subcommittees from meeting during the Senate session. In my judgment, no Senator should have the power to block all meetings of 16 standing committees of the Senate, and 112 subcommittees of those standing committees. This power has been used frequently for purposes of delay. The objective of the rule, to increase Senate attendance, has not been achieved. Senators do not attend Chamber debates on matters they are not interested in just because the committees are not sitting, and conversely they do not miss Senate debates they are concerned with, whether or not committees are meeting. This practice is particularly true since practically every committee in the Senate allows committee members to vote by proxy.

The question of whether a committee should meet during a Senate session should in my judgment be decided by a majority of the members of the committees concerned, and not by the decision of a single Senator.

It may well be also that a majority of the Senate might conclude that committees should not be permitted to meet, but certainly one single Senator should not have this obstructive power.

The proposed change in the rules was reintroduced by me on January 4, 1961, together with a number of other suggested changes in Senate procedure.

My proposed rules have been referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have been assured by the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], that he would shortly call a hearing on the proposed rule changes. My purpose in rasing the question is to point out how in actual practice this obsolescent bit of procedural folly is preventing the Senate from carrying out its constitutional obligations to act promptly on proposed legislation. I hope that we can soon bring to the Senate an amendment to our rules which will take away the power of a single Senator to prevent Senate business from being conducted in committees in an orderly manner.

PREMIER MANLEY, OF JAMAICA, ADDRESSES NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, all of us are anxiously watching the development of a new era in our relations with Latin America, one which we all hope will square the historic interests of the United States in the peaceful progress of the Western Hemisphere with the best hopes and aspirations of all the Americas.

Recently, I had the privilege of meeting a man who will undoubtedly play an important part in welding a new unity among nations of this hemisphere, and in creating a bridge to better understanding between ourselves and the Latin countries.

Many Senators know the Honorable Norman W. Manley, Premier of Jamaica. Mr. Manley visited Washington to discuss with Members of Congress and Government officials some of the economic and political problems faced by his country in this difficult time of emerging nations, and to tell us informally what we can expect from the independent Federation of the West Indies, of which Jamaica will be a part. The Federation hopes to become an independent nation next year.

It is important that we understand that this new nation of 10 islands, strung strategically across the Caribbean—the scene of some of our most difficult problems today—will become an anchor of stability in a very troubled sea.

It is this area, I believe, in which we can help create through well-conceived economic assistance a showcase of peaceful cooperation which the Communist world—including Castro's Cuba—can only envy. The Federation represents a tremendous new opportunity for us to demonstrate that we can successfully work on a basis of complete equality with all of our hemisphere neighbors.

Mr. Manley touched very ably on many of these points in his address to the National Press Club. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE NORMAN MANLEY, Q.C., PREMIER OF JAMAICA, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB LUNCHEON, APRIL 18, 1961

Mr. President and gentlemen, it is a very great honor to be able to address your club which has a worldwide reputation, well deserved, and, your President assures me, intended to be preserved forever. And it is a new experience for me after 25 years of association in America, on many fronts, first as a lawyer when I came here to do business. And I assured the President that I am no longer a lawyer; I have elevated myself to a far more dignified profession, that of a politician. More precarious, but more dignified.

Then as leader of the opposition having been soundly defeated, I came, as many politicians have come from other countries, to visit my West Indian friends in America, and to draw aid and comfort and financial strength from their interest in my activities; which is why I was so glad to reward their help with my victory in 1955.

The West Indies, the Federated West Indians, the 10 islands that joined the Federation 3 years ago, expect to become independent next year, and I think the emergence of a new nation in the Western Hemisphere, the first, I believe, in this century, and one with a long tradition of association with the United States both in trade, in commerce and in the field of mining, and emigration, where tens of thousands of West Indians settled in America in your more liberal days [laughter]—and in education, where half of our middle class were educated in America. The emergence of such a nation in the Caribbean area, a troubled area, at this time is an event of great significance, not only to us but, I think, to the United States of America.

One of the most important historical facts of today is the emergence of new nations all over the world. And what happens to them, how they grow and develop in the acute conflicts of this world is a matter that may very well be decisive for history in the future, just as your relationships with Latin America will be decisive for Western Hemisphere history in the future.

Therefore, I think, apart from the special interest that you should have in the West Indies, it is of importance to you to have a look at the West Indies and ask the question: What sort of new nation is this that will shortly join the community of nations in the world?

What I really would like to make the text of my little talk this afternoon is this: The West Indies seen as an oasis of stability in a very troubled political area.

Our importance derives from the fact that geographically we stretch from the tip of the South American Continent in a chain right across the Caribbean Sea to Jamaica, which is only 90 miles from Cuba which, itself, is very little more than 90 miles from the other side of the island to Florida. That means that we are the sort of first line of defense, strategically, for the union between the two continents. We cover the whole area from Venezuela right up to Florida by our geographical position.

Politically, we satisfy all the tests of stability. The sort of tests that you would understand. We understand democracy and what it means. We understand the two-party system. I have a far more highly organized party system than you have ever conceived of in this country, or I suppose you would tolerate for a minute.

We have a deep tradition for the observances of the rule of law which permeates all the aspects of our life.

I would like to give you one or two examples of what I call political stability.

Long years ago at the crisis of the war, two great men, Sir Winston Churchill and your President, Mr. Roosevelt, negotiated a deal to provide West Indian bases right through the islands to guard America in time of war. We were then a colony and we weren't consulted. It was a tough bargain. The Prime Minister of England was in desperate straits and the President of the United States had to face a political problem in giving aid and comfort to one of the contestants at that time. To put it in his own language, he had to do some hard horse trading that the American public could admire as tough dealing.

So we gave up thousands of acres of land and bases for 99 years in exchange for 50 old destroyers of 1890 vintage.

Then the time came when in good faith, but perhaps mistakenly, we decided to put the Federal capital in the most important of those bases, and asked you to give them up. You said, "No," and a controversy arose which could have led to the development of protracted bickering and the creation of very hard feelings on both sides. And then the West Indies displayed its own maturity by offering to your Government to consider the need for bases and to enter into a new agreement on the footing that as a new nation we would promise when we achieved independence that we would not join the bloc of neutrals, but would declare against neutrality as having no meaning for us in our circumstances, and would declare ourselves willing to cooperate in hemispheric defense.

That was great evidence of stability, because I think we are the only new nation that has emerged in the last couple of years

that has opted against neutrality, and, in exchange for that, the United States agreed to negotiate with us on a basis of equality and to recognize that we had a right when we became independent to say that we were not bound by treaties which we had not been a party to the making of. And the consequence of that is that your good will for us has been greatly enlarged and we have satisfied our ambitions, and we have taken our part firmly in standing in this hemisphere for the ideals and principles and methods and types of life that you believe in and that we enjoy. [Applause.]

Then I will give you another example on a much smaller level. This one derives from our own country, and I think has been much misrepresented abroad, not always to the credit of my country.

One of the consequences of the emergence of freedom in Africa has been greatly to excite interest throughout the world in all countries like mine, like the West Indies, where the people are predominantly of Negro origin, to excite great interest in African affairs. And one way that interest manifests itself is in the development of "back to Africa" movements. You have them here. You have at least two organizations now, and you still have traces of the old Garvey movement. You have a movement known as the Muslims; you have an organization known as the "First Africa Corps." And we have a number of these "Back to Africa" movements and, inspired by Castro's success in the Escambray Mountains, some of them misguidedly conceived the idea, inspired by some of your American organizations, of starting a Castro-type revolution in Jamaica.

And so they came and they set up a little camp in the mountains, tried some of their own people for treachery and executed them in the proper style of such movements; and when we sent out our police and our soldiers to clean them up, two soldiers were killed and about half a dozen of these people escaped into the mountains.

Well, what happened to them? They found themselves with people who were totally opposed to anything of that sort. They found no hope of rest or shelter anywhere. They wandered for 2 weeks in the mountains and eventually, when worn out with fatigue and lack of food, they invaded a little, small bushman's cottage, he put them to bed and went as fast as he could to the nearest police post.

And so they were taken in, duly tried by lawful means, and 4 weeks ago all of them paid the penalty by being hanged for murder.

And the demonstration there of the deep-seated respect for law and order and a total rejection of that sort of thing was as fine an example of stability as you could find anywhere.

And now I have, myself, organized a mission to Africa and included in it are a large number of these people who peacefully and happily are touring Africa and finding out for themselves whether there are or are not opportunities for returning to Africa as migrants to that country, which is the way such things should be handled.

And I would like you to know that those of you who may have read stories about these lunatic fringes in Jamaica, I would like you to know that they do not represent one-hundredth of 1 percent of the solid basic feelings of the country, which is an example as, indeed, is the conduct of the whole area, of what stability, political stability, means.

One other thing I would mention about the West Indies, and that is that it is an area made up of people drawn from all over the world. The population is predominantly Negro, or of mixed blood. We have Chinese, Indians, Europeans, and we have large numbers of people who have been there for over a century, two centuries, three centuries, from England. And nowhere in the world has more progress been made in developing a nonracial society, in developing a society in which color is not psychologically significant, in which men and women work together and play together and study together and worship together without being conscious of their color in any shape or form. [Applause.]

And let me remind you that that is one of the great unsolved problems of the world, as it is also one of the problems that your country has not solved and must solve if it is to accept the role of world leadership fully in the universe today.

I do not talk about tolerance. Tolerance is not a nice word to use in an issue of this sort because tolerance presupposes something superior that tolerates something inferior. What is important is that you should not be conscious of it, that it should not matter psychologically.

Well, obviously a new nation of that sort taking its place as an independent voice in the council of nations has a significant contribution to make in the world today. One practical example of how a difficult and an acute problem like that can be solved is worth a thousand speeches about its solution; one voice that speaks from knowledge is worth all the speeches of the idealists who have never lived what they talked.

So I think for those reasons the emergence of the West Indies as a federated entity in the council of the nations is an important historical fact and one of particular significance to our nearest great neighbor, the United States of America.

Just a word about the Federation itself.

I suppose all federations are born with difficulty. They are conceived in enthusiastic affection and brought forth with extremely hard labors. Our Federation is no different and we have not yet solved all its problems, but we are meeting next month in Trinidad to have a final conference between the units to frame the constitution for independence. Then we are going to London to fix Independence Day, which should be early next year. Then I will unfortunately have to go through a referendum in Jamaica to decide whether we remain in the Federation because there are strong antifederal forces which I am determined to defeat.

Then we will become independent and we will bring with us our political stability, perhaps easily the most stable independent country in the whole Caribbean area. Take all the countries that border on the ocean and all the islands, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, and there are many difficult political situations both in the islands and in the Central American countries. We will bring that stability to the new community of nations, and all we ask—if I may say a word about why I am here—all we ask is help to maintain our economic progress to the point where we can have a self-sustaining economy, so that stability is maintained by economic strength. It is a law of development that the faster you progress economically the more acute becomes the demands of the masses to share in the economic process, and we are precisely at that crucial point in development now in the West Indies.

We welcome the historic message to Congress which President Kennedy sent out on March 14 laying down the principles of self-help that countries in Latin America—we include ourselves there—must observe if they are to receive economic aid. We are willing to and do now accept all the challenges of that statement.

We make the maximum effort to develop ourselves out of our own resources. We do not come asking for gifts. We are prepared to depend for progress on loans of money. We do not ask for money to be spent to defend ourselves by trying to build some dams against communism, and as far as there are Communist forces in the West Indies, we can take care of them. All we ask is to be allowed to develop fast enough, and we know exactly what to do with them and how to do it. [Applause.]

We do not ask for money to build up forces to stem revolutions. All we want is sound business deals, and we will guarantee payment a hundred percent.

We look forward to the sort of help we can get from your international lending agencies, which I am glad to see your Government proposes to reorganize and streamline, because I confess for myself that I have been bewildered to know how to find my way through the maze of those agencies. [Laughter.]

We in Jamaica are the first colony of our type to go to the money market in New York and borrow money on Jamaica bonds which we are selling with a premium paying over 7 percent. Good money, gentlemen, good money. You come and help us set up industry; you invest in our gorgeous climate or our tourist trade.

I hope some day some sort of new agency will be created in the Americas whereby with some assurance or guarantee from the Government small funds that people would like to invest to help underdeveloped countries so long as they were sure the development was secure, because there must be thousands of people who under the crisis of the Caribbean and who under the crisis of Latin America, and who would be willing to do something to contribute to development properly conceived in those fields.

As far as we are concerned, we welcome those who come in to help us. We have no fear at all of economic domination. Money is money, and investment is investment. We can take care of our own political situation, no matter how much money you put in. We welcome it. And we have no discrimination against your landowners, homeowners, or industrial proprietors. All we ask is a chance to prove to the world what a country like ours, made up of all sorts of people, beset by every sort of problem of economic difficulty, all we ask is to be given a chance to prove that we can do the job and to become a living example to the world that there is not only one road for underdeveloped countries, but another road, the road of freedom, democracy, and observance of the rule of law and the rights of humanity.

THE SECOND AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the Second Agreement Between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, naturally there is always a question that arises in respect to subject matter such as that covered by the pending proposal; namely, the Second Agreement Between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany, as to whether or not there might be a speculative interest in the proposal. To that end I simply wished to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], whether the committee has probed the subject and whether they are satisfied that there is no speculative interest to be subserved here.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The subject was discussed in the committee. The securities are not being traded in on any of

the security markets now. The SEC has gone as far as it can under the law to supervise this question, as they did before in relation to the previous agreements. Really, the only difference between the present agreement and the 1953 agreement is that the present agreement applies to issues in East Germany. We are trying to follow the same procedure, which I believe has proved very satisfactory, established with regard to the previous validation program, which applied to issues of companies in West Germany and West Berlin. The same procedures are being followed. The present agreement does not involve nearly as much as the other agreement, and the committee believes, and I believe, that if there is any speculation, it is a very minute amount and is purely between private individuals, over whom we could have no control anyway.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Therefore, the Congress can assume from such investigations as have been made by the SEC, the State Department, and the committee that there is no speculative interest involved, that is, not a legitimate interest.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the action taken is as near as we can make it. We did ask those concerned about the question. The Senator from Illinois will notice in the report that we asked about who had held the bonds in the previous validation procedure, and it appeared from the pattern that was established that they were very widely held. A large majority was held by reputable banks. It would be a very natural procedure for people seeking this kind of recovery to turn the bonds over to banks for collection, and so on. There was nothing unusual, that we could see, in the procedure followed before, which would be applicable here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe it can be said that it has been traditional with Congress to make sure, wherever and whenever it can do so, that no one shall be unjustly enriched through any action of this kind. I gather from what the distinguished chairman has said, he is satisfied and the committee is satisfied on that point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are. We believe the State Department, in cooperation with SEC, has done everything it can reasonably be expected to do to prevent any such thing from happening.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no further questions. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Commerce Committee be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as acting minority leader, since objection has been made to this request from this side of the aisle, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION DECLARES WAR ON MEDICAL CARE BILL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the American Medical Association has declared all-out war on President Kennedy's proposal to place medical care for the elderly under the framework of the social security program.

Speaking in Chattanooga, Tenn., recently, Dr. Vincent Askey, president of the AMA, warned his organization would, I quote, "exert tremendous pressure to prevent passage of the Kennedy bill."

A flood of AMA-sponsored newspaper advertisements, television commercials, and special films attacking the President's program will be unleashed on the American people, he predicted.

Mr. President, the AMA once again will try to sell Americans a pig in a poke. It will try to sell them the idea that the proposed bill will lead to socialized medicine. This is the label it has applied to all legislation dealing with the health care of our citizens. Indeed, in his Chattanooga speech, Dr. Askey called the proposal the advent of socialized medicine in this country.

Mr. President, he knows as well as we know that the administration proposal will in no way affect the traditional doctor-patient relationship in this country. Patients will still be able to select their own doctor without interference from the Federal Government. Doctors remain free to treat whom they wish to treat, or to refuse to treat them.

Reactionary AMA leaders—a small band of willful men still living in the 19th century—never grow weary of swimming against the mainstream of American life.

Mr. President, I take exception to fraudulent AMA propaganda, so obviously motivated by self-intest. This association is one of the "spendingest" lobbies in Washington. I well recall that it spent almost $5 million to defeat President Truman's health insurance program in 1949. Apparently, it is prepared to spend as much, or more, to defeat President Kennedy's proposal this year.

It is clear the American Medical Association does not throw this much money into a battle to protect the interests of the American people.

Mr. President, the list of AMA distortions and exaggerations is long. It claims President Kennedy's bill will lead to socialized medicine, but it knows this is false. It claims the inadequate bill enacted last year is superior to the social security approach. But it knows that as of 2 weeks ago only six States and two territories had put the program into effect, and that the legislation does not give enough protection to enough people.

Not one individual in my State of Ohio has been helped by the Eisenhower program of care for elderly persons, which was passed by Congress last August. I am glad to say that I voted against that bill. No elderly person in Ohio, unless he is on relief, or unless he or a relative on his behalf takes a humiliating position, can qualify for help under the Eisenhower program of aid for the elderly unless enabling legislation is enacted by State legislatures. From all indications, the States are not rushing for inclusion in the Eisenhower program.

The AMA claims private insurance will meet the staggering health needs of our elderly. But it knows a minority of the aged carry private insurance, that prices for them are exorbitant, and that coverage is inadequate.

Mr. President, there are other false claims, but they all add up to one plain fact: The reactionary leaders of this organization will go to any lengths to discredit and defeat President Kennedy's program.

In the past, the AMA opposed the social security program. It opposed private insurance programs. Indeed, it has opposed virtually all progressive legislation for the welfare of the American people.

Once again, its high-paid propagandists and its spokesmen are attempting to prevent Federal Government assistance in a crisis situation for which the AMA offers no reasonable, practical alternative. The AMA will again ignore the needs of millions of citizens who want results, not propaganda.

I point out, Mr. President, that Dr. Askey made a great point of criticizing what he calls, politicians who try to practice medicine.

What are we to think of AMA leaders who have abandoned the practice of medicine to spend full time promoting selfish political aims contrary to the general welfare of the American people? It is our job, as U.S. Senators, to legislate in the interests of our people. If it is established—as it has been to my satisfaction—that medical aid to the aged is essential, it is pitiful that our efforts to legislate for this need are blocked by the small group of reactionaries who dictate AMA policy.

They are no more than political doctors who have left the practice of medicine—for which they trained—and suddenly pretend to be actuarial experts. In truth, they have only become propagandists, experts on the unsubstantiated charge, the reckless assertion, and the misleading distortion. They are willing to say anything—no matter how farfetched—to promote their ends.

Despite their efforts, let us respond to the overwhelming need of our elderly and enact this year legislation to provide medical care within the social security framework.

Over the years, this small group of dictators of the American Medical Association has opposed social security and practically all other legislative proposals which were for the public welfare. This group is comprised of a board of 192 members of a house of delegates, so called, of whom only 40 are practicing

family doctors; the other 152 are specialists or political medical men.

It is noteworthy that many other professional groups, such as dentists and lawyers, do not maintain any lobby whatever which seeks to persuade or coerce Members of Congress to vote on various and diverse legislative proposals.

American Medical Association officials write learnedly about the ethics of a medical practitioner. Is it ethical for a physician to solicit letters from his patients—some of whom are receiving social security benefits—addressed to Senators and Representatives, opposing the inclusion of medical and hospital care for the aged within the old-age, survivors, and disability system, known as social security?

In my judgment, that is unethical action. I think I know something about ethics as it should be practiced by professional men, because I practiced law for many years in Ohio and have been the president of two bar associations in my home county of Cuyahoga.

Certainly thousands of patients, to accommodate their attending physicians and surgeons, respond by writing the form letters suggested, demanding that "medicare" for the elderly should not be included within social security. The facts are that most of these doctors and their patients have never read the pending bills but are quick to denounce an important and highly technical proposal which should be publicly considered and which definitely is in furtherance of the general public welfare.

REELECTION OF JOHN C. MACKIE AS MICHIGAN STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSIONER FOR A SECOND 4-YEAR TERM

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, in a recent spring election, the voters of Michigan reelected John C. Mackie as their State highway commissioner for a second 4-year term. The wide majority by which Mr. Mackie won is a tribute to the excellent work he has done in Michigan.

In commenting on his reelection, an editorial in the April 27 issue of Engineering News-Record interpreted it as not only a personal victory for him but also as a giant public opinion poll endorsing the national highway program.

The editorial concluded:

> Members of Congress who are responsible for solving the current financing crisis should take note of Michigan's clear-cut directive for a continuation of highway development at utmost speed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial published in Engineering News-Record be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANDATE FOR HIGHWAYS

Michigan's reelection of John C. Mackie as State highway commissioner (ENR, Apr. 13, p. 21) represents an overwhelming vote of confidence in its accelerated highway program. Such an interpretation of his victory seems justified because his election was, in effect, a giant public opinion poll in which a million voters expressed approbation or disapproval of modern highway building. And since Michigan is the only State to elect the operating head of its highway department, the election provided a unique test.

The sole issue in the campaign was the highway program. Mr. Mackie campaigned on the theme that good roads mean more profits for business, more safety for the motorist and a better State for everyone. He offered the highway construction program of the last 4 years as the reason he should be elected.

His opponent attacked the method of financing, and the design of the new highways, as well as the validity of announcing highway plans 5 years in advance.

Commissioner Mackie won by a majority of a quarter-million votes, a near landslide, Michigan voters endorsed the program and, in effect, called for building more and better highways now.

Members of Congress who are responsible for solving the current financing crisis should take note of Michigan's clear-cut directive for a continuation of highway development at utmost speed.

GERMANY'S DEBT TO FORMER PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly a matter which does not necessarily come within the scope of the treaty which the Senate is discussing, but I shall mention it because I think it relates to Germany's debt to approximately 10,000 ex-prisoners of war, stateless persons, formerly of Yugoslav nationality. They are veterans and were America's valiant allies in World War I and World War II.

These men were captured in Yugoslavia in April 1941, by Germany's armed forces and were liberated by the American Armed Forces in Germany in May of 1945. On the date of their liberation, Germany owed each of these men approximately $1,000 as unpaid wages for work performed for the German economy, as called for by the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, of July 27, 1929; and for unpaid military pay to officers, as provided for in the said Geneva Convention.

I shall not discuss this subject in great detail at this time; I simply call it to the attention of the Senate because it is my intention to press the matter—in particular, to do one thing:

We are going to appeal for help from the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, in order that the representatives of the United States in the Third Committee of the United Nations may be prepared to ask the High Commissioner for Refugees, at the conclusion of his forthcoming annual report to the Third Committee of the United Nations, to inform the Third Committee about the matter of Germany's debt to these stateless ex-prisoners of war, with which matter the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has occupied itself continuously for more than 8 years.

All this material is a matter of record, and has been before these bodies. I think it is recognized that these persons are entitled to this pay.

I sincerely hope that at an appropriate time consideration will be given to this matter. I call it to the attention of the Senate; and, later on, I shall discuss it further.

I believe it only fair that these persons be paid for their labor, inasmuch as they performed it in behalf of our interests, as well as in behalf of the interests of other freedom-loving peoples.

THE IMPORTANCE OF LONG-TERM PLANNING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there has been a rising interest concerning the economic policies and development of the Soviet Union. Many questions have been asked relating to the structure of economic organization, the extent of economic planning, and the developments in the field of automation, along with the role of science in government.

A series of articles entitled "The Second Red Revolution," relating to the economic and scientific progress of the Soviet Union, has been written by Mr. David Binder, staff correspondent of the Minneapolis Tribune, Minneapolis, Minn. He is now in New York, with the New York Times. Mr. Binder is a keen student of the international scene, particularly the Soviet Union.

His first article, entitled "We Ought To Be Scared," reveals in a dramatic way the bold and serious competition the Soviet Union offers the United States and other Western countries. In the articles we find a revealing analysis of the new power of the Soviet Union—its technology, the emphasis upon automation in heavy industry, the revitalized economic organization of its industrial complex, the political and economic impact of long-term planning, and finally the relationship of science to political power at home and abroad.

Mr. President, these are the very areas in which there is a lack of understanding in the United States. We always enjoy the luxury of discussing science as if it had little relationship to political power. There are casual and academic discussions of the impact of automation, rather than getting down to the hard, serious problems which automation raises in our industrial economy. We have had all too little consideration of long-term planning; it has been only within recent months, during the new administration, that one has hardly dared use the word "planning," insofar as governmental activities are concerned.

Is it any wonder that today the Soviet Union seems to be towering like a giant above the rest of the world, because of the emphasis the Soviet Union places upon technological development and planning?

I suggest that if our Nation wishes to assume the role of leadership about which it talks, it should take on some of the characteristics of such leadership. Surely one of those characteristics is looking ahead and developing some long-range planning, rather than only looking to the present day.

Every thoughtful American should read these articles. We know far too little about the Soviet Union. We either overestimate its strength or underestimate its capabilities. We have lacked a sense of balance and proportion in our

analysis of Soviet politics and economics. These articles can give us a better insight into the Soviet system.

I wish to commend Mr. Binder on this remarkable series. He is a scholar and a brilliant writer. He follows in the traditions of his late and illustrious father, one of America's foremost foreign correspondents, Mr. Carroll Binder.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE OUGHT TO BE SCARED

(By David Binder)

Soviet Russia is in the throes of a new and tumultuous revolution, one that is as fundamental and far reaching as the 1917 uprising that brought the Bolsheviks to power.

The new revolution is the one that sent up the sputniks and gave nuclear weapons to the Soviet Union. But these are only a small part of the total radical change.

It is a revolution whose insurgent leaders are relatively unknown in the West: men named Kantorovich, Sobolev, Pontryagin, Trapeznikov, and Markov.

It is a revolution with a vocabulary containing esoteric words like econometrics, cybernetics, and parameters—words employed by Western scientists for some years, but words that are assuming new significance behind the Iron Curtain.

It is the revolution being wrought by automation, new scientific planning methods, science in government, and a drastic revamping of the Soviet economic administration.

For this second Red revolution is technological rather than political, although it has the overtones of politics common to all Communist undertakings.

There are even wars and casualties in this revolution. The battles are fought over Marxist dialectic and ideology. The casualties are those Soviet scientists and engineers who fail to hew to the party line.

Yet, in the view of some Western scientists, this revolution represents a far greater threat to the West than that first insurrection 44 year ago.

"We ought to be scared," said British automation experts after a tour of Soviet institutes and factories last summer.

"Up to now," an American automation authority told Business Week, "the West has had a clear lead in the industrial field, and we still do. But steming up behind us at a rapid rate are the Soviets."

Hugo Schuk, head of research at the aero division of Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., who attended the first international automation conference in Moscow last summer, came back with this impression:

"If I were startled by anything, it was that they are as far along as they are."

Half strangled by the destruction of World War II and by the suffocating ideological restrictions imposed on research, Soviet science and industry got a late start on automation—perhaps a 10-year lag behind the West.

An even greater lag was present in the application of the new scientific methods to economic planning.

Yet all at once, many American industry and Government leaders are concerned about the recently swiftening Soviet production growth rate.

For a time last fall it was even an issue in the presidential campaign.

How does it happen that the Russians suddenly appear to be breathing down American necks in industrial output? And what does the challenge of automated Soviet economic power mean to the peoples of the West and the underdeveloped nations?

The answer as to how the Russians accomplished so much in so little time requires a study of their automation program, their economic reforms, and their reorganization of government in the past 15 years.

The answer to the question of significance is more difficult.

On a globe divided three ways—between the West, the Communists, and the neutral nations—the Soviet technological revolution and the new economic power resulting from it could prove to be the decisive factors in tipping the balance the Red way.

It is the peaceful coexistence period in which the Soviet bloc intends to outstrip the West in production of all goods, to undercut Western trade on the world market and thus hasten the downfall of capitalism and finally to lure the uncommitted neutral nations into the Communist orbit.

Does this sound like idle speculation, foolish prophecy?

Prof. Paul C. Rosenbloom, of the University of Minnesota, one of the Nation's leading mathematicians and a longtime student of the Soviet development, has this to say:

"Within 5 to 10 years we are going to have to compete with a Soviet system that can make economic decisions faster than we can, that can produce as much as or more than we can.

"For a country whose steel industry is working at less than half capacity and whose farm surplus is stacked in silos, this means we will have to find new ways to organize and plan our economy."

Rosenbloom and others feel the time is at hand when the United States—its Government and its people—must sit down and rethink the problems of industrial organization, decisionmaking organs, and the wider implications of automation for modern society.

This is what the Russians have done to begin their broad technological revolution.

We Americans, in contrast, appear to have entered the same revolution on a piecemeal basis. We still have an industrial lead over the Soviets. But their efforts are narrowing the gap rapidly.

At the heart of the Soviet technological revolution is automation; that is, electronic computers and automatic control devices.

These new machines, developed only in the last decade by Russian scientists and engineers, forced the adoption of revolutionary scientific methods in economic planning and the reorganization of the clumsy Soviet economic apparatus.

Yet, it is the very essence of Soviet communism—a blinding ideology—that prevented Russia from getting automation sooner.

In fact, the first computers and automatic control devices were conceived and put into use in the United States.

Based on theories advanced in the 1920's and 1930's, these machines were designed in the early 1940's by men like John von Neumann, Vanneva: Bush, Claude Shannon, and Norbert Wiener—the last three at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

At first huge and unwieldy, the computers were greatly refined through the use of small electronic parts.

Only a few years after World War II there was a strong and growing computer industry in this country.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Union had no computers and no automatic control devices.

One reason for this was that the Soviet scientists who might have developed them were cut off from the work of their Western colleagues by the harsh isolationist policies of Stalin.

Another supremely ironic reason was that Communist ideology forbade the exploration of several scientific fields essential to the development of computers and control devices.

Among these scientific disciplines was formal logic, which is intimately related to mathematical logic.

(Formal logic is a general discipline derived from the teaching of Aristotle on true-false relationships and the like. Mathematical logic is essentially the same subject, except that it uses the language of mathematics—equations—rather than words.

It is, as Rosenbloom explains, the natural mathematical tool for analyzing or devising automatic computer designs.

Another scientific tool lying useless in the Soviet workshops was the mathematical concept known as probability theory.

Probability factors—estimating as accurately as possible how often something is going to happen, for example—are essential not only to certain automatic control principles, but also to mathematical economics.

Again paradoxically, Russia had a core of outstanding probability theorists, including brilliant mathematicians like A. A. Markov and A. N. Kolmogrov, who enunciated one of the principles of computation probability back in 1933.

But Communist Party dogmas like "chance is the enemy of science" prevented the scientists from using their theories in practice.

As Rosenbloom described it, the Soviet probability theorists were "forbidden to apply their finding. That wasn't 'kosher.'"

The case of logic is a more flagrant example of the Communist Party's abuse of pure science, and it may be one of the main causes for what some call the Soviet "automation gap."

The role of logic has been disputed by Communists all the way back to Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Formal logic was ridiculed by Engels and given short shrift by Lenin.

They boasted their own "dialectical logic" as one of the key components of dialectical materialism.

But Soviet philosophers still argued the merits of formal logic over dialectical logic in the 1920's. Then, in the 1930's, under Stalin, the controversy was ended. The party dismissed formal logic as "metaphysical" and "bourgeois."

"The few Soviet scholars who still worked in the field of mathematical logic had to do so almost surreptitiously," says Rosenbloom.

The lag in logic thus became part of the lag in automation.

Logic research continued to trudge along under a dark Marxist cloud of anathema during the forties. Ingenious Russian scientists occasionally managed to publish outstanding works, sometimes disguising them in innocuous terms inoffensive to the party ideologists.

Then came a dramatic reversal. In November 1946 the Communist Party central committee suddenly decreed that textbooks in formal logic should be printed and that the subject should be taught in schools.

A Stalin Prize was even offered for the best textbook on logic, but it was never awarded.

Instead, bitter fighting broke out between the proponents of formal logic and those of dialectical logic.

Formal logic defenders like W. F. Asmus, A. D. Alexandrov, Strogovich, and Vinogradov were subjected to violent attacks in the press. At least one book was banned.

Then, in November 1950, the important journal Voprosy Filosofii (Philosophical Questions) opened a discussion on formal and dialectical logic.

A year and 60 contributions later, Voprosy Filosofii closed the discussion with a compromise editorial statement that the two logics were related, but not identical—distinct, but not exclusive of each other.

But even this declaration of coexistence between the logics didn't end the struggle. According to Gustav Wetter, the distinguished Jesuit student of Marxism in Rome, the controversy is still going on full blast.

The relationship of the logic dispute to the development of automation is explained this way by Rosenbloom:

"This change in the party line (permitting nondialectical logicians to come out into the open) occurred at the same time as the first big effort in the development of Soviet computers, apparently to encourage scientists to work in fields that apply to computers.

"A man like A. A. Markov, who had done outstanding work in the field, but had had no students and could not apply his theories, all of a sudden became a big shot."

It it interesting to note, incidentally, that two prominent formal logic defenders, Asmus and Alexandrov, recently gained enough party approval to be assigned major roles in writing the 1959 edition of "Foundations of Marxism-Leninism," the most important statement of party doctrine since the death of Stalin.

Despite the continuing fog of controversy, the Soviets nevertheless have accelerated the teaching of nondialectical logic.

Reporting this month on a 1959 conference at Moscow State University, David D. Comey noted that a variety of logical fields related to automation are being explored: semantics, modal logic, information theory, and linguistics.

Comey, professor at St. Lawrence University, Canton, N.Y., remarked, however, that the Russians were self-critical on the lack of logic-trained scholars who actually were working in the field.

"The conference stressed the severe lack of adequate 'specialists of a broad profile.'" Comey added.

Finally, Comey reported that the conference urged the establishment of a department of logic at Moscow University that would prepare specialists in theoretical as well as practical work, with "application of logical methods to concrete scientific and technical problems"—in other words, automation.

Meanwhile, at the height of the logic controversy of the early fifties, it had become the task of Soviet mathematicians to design computers and control devices.

They started, apparently about 1950, on a crash-program basis. They did so using the tools of mathematical logic, regardless of whether they were "kosher" or not.

RUSS AUTOMATION HAS GROWN RAPIDLY

(By David Binder)

A remarkable conference was held last July, the world's first International Congress of Automation. Reportedly, 1,111 delegates attended the 5-day sessions, among them 126 Americans.

The striking thing about this conference was its location: Moscow. Not Cambridge, Mass., where computers and control theory got their start.

The host role was played by a country that got a late start in automation—later by far than the United States or Britain. Indeed, the Soviet computer industry was less than 10 years old.

These delegates unfamiliar with the Russian automation advances got the surprise of their life in Moscow.

They were shown computers that matched their Western counterparts in speed and capability. They were shown so-called "self-optimizing" control systems (control devices that automatically select the best solution to a problem containing various unknown factors). They toured huge laboratories and institutes where Russia's new generation of scientists are training and doing research.

"We've been a bit shattered," one Western delegate commented. "We never dreamed this level had been reached."

Another said: "We are all lost in admiration."

A third, from Britain, added: "They will really get way ahead unless we buckle down to work."

V. A. Trapeznikov, chairman of the conference and director of the Soviet Union's National Commission for Automatic Control, struck a more modest note, perhaps envisioning the not too distant day when Russia is completely automated.

"Automation," he said in his keynote address, "is still an infant."

In any case, the Soviet push toward computers and control devices began sometime between 1948 and 1950. The theoretical groundwork and basic research had been accomplished already, among other things the translation of an extensive body of Western computer literature.

Furthermore, enough air had been let into the Soviet halls of science to permit adequate study of such hitherto taboo subjects as mathematical logic.

In Kiev, capital of the Ukraine, a team working under the leadership of Sergei A. Lebedev, conceived and built the first Russian computer, the MESM, about 1950.

Lebedev was well rewarded. He was called to Moscow to head the new Institute of Precise Mechanics and Computer Technology. He also was made a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences in 1953, one of the highest honors that can be accorded a Russian scientist.

Meanwhile, control theory engineers had set up what was probably the first automated assembly line in the Soviet Union—the Ulyanov small engine factory's piston production line, finished in 1951.

It was followed by the automated ball bearing line at the Moscow State ball bearing works and the Chelyabinsk wire rope pulley line, and more recently, a host of others.

At the same time, new institutes and training centers devoted to automation were shooting up all over Russia.

The department of computer mathematics at Moscow State University, established in 1949, now graduates about 60 specialists a year.

The Moscow Computing Center of the Academy of Sciences, headed by A. A. Dorodnitsyn, which does research with the recently developed Ural-1, Strela-III, and BESM-II computers.

The Institute for Automation and Telemechanics in Moscow, headed by Boris S. Sotskov, which specializes in electronic, pneumatic, and hydraulic control devices, built in 1957.

The Institute of Electro-Mechanics in Leningrad, established in 1956: This, in turn, gave birth to the Leningrad Computing Center, headed by Prof. S. V. Vallander.

The computing center of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in Kiev, which grew out of the old Lebedev group; established in 1958: At last report some 1,000 persons were working at the Kiev institute, and 20,000 are expected to work there later.

Newer institutes in the capitals of Soviet Armenia and Georgia, and in the "science city" of Novosibirsk.

The digital computers built by Lebedev and his assistants were followed soon by analog computers like the Ural-I and the MPT-9, designed by other teams.

(Digital computers are machines that work by counting, using ordinary arithmetical processes—a simple example being the adding machine; analog computers work mainly by measuring physical quantities—all the conditions and variables of a given process are reproduced in analogy in the machine, making it useful for control operations.)

As soon as it became feasible, the computers were put into mass production, first at the Moscow Computing Machine factory, and later at a factory in Penza, 350 miles southeast of Moscow.

But establishment of a computer industry and the institutes to train computer specialists were only part of the vast Soviet crash program in automation.

For example, the Soviets had to peel the Marxist scales from their eyes to see what Western scientists had been accomplishing in the field of control theory.

It seems absurd, but control theory, the very essence of automation, was a despised concept in the Soviet Union until the middle 1950's.

This is the science developed by Norbert Wiener and his associates at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

It is the theory of control involving the principle of feedback, or, an instrumentation that can adapt and correct itself in accordance with changing conditions—such as a thermostat, which must regulate room temperature in terms of the outside temperature as well as the heating plant. Such a control device "feeds back" temperature changes caused, say, by a cold wave and causes the heating plant to put out more.

Wiener named this science "cybernetics" in 1948, coining a word derived from the Greek for steering or controlling.

Today, David D. Comey, of St. Lawrence University, Canton, N.Y., writes:

"A few years ago there was a dramatic and sudden shift in the official Soviet attitude toward cybernetics. Until that shift, the term 'cybernetics' and the name of Norbert Wiener had virtually been swearwords. After the shift they became very much in."

This shift in party line on cybernetics was marked by the May 1957 conference on the development of information machines by the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

Attended by some 500 specialists in logic, semantics, engineering, and linguistics, the conference sought to draw up broad outlines for Soviet work in cybernetics—mechanical translation from foreign languages, electronic information storage, and so on.

A couple of years later the first edition of the new Soviet magazine Kybernetik rolled off the presses.

Yet long before it had become socially acceptable to the Communists, Russian scientists were working in cybernetics and applying its principles to control devices.

For instance, M. A. Lavrentyev, vice president of the Academy of Sciences, had initiated work on mathematical problem solution by digital computers back in 1950.

Theoretical investigations of programing for computers were carried out by men of the so-called cybernetics group at the V. A. Steklov Mathematics Institute as early as 1952, among them men like A. A. Liapunov, L. V. Kantorovich, and A. P. Ershov.

Prof. Liapunov also was one of the first Russians to work on the possibilities of machine translation.

One asks how the Soviets could curse Western sciences like mathematical logic and cybernetics with one breath and work on them in the next.

Comey, a specialist in mathematical logic, comments:

"To have computers, they (the Russians) needed to train computer theorists; and if computer theory (cybernetics) conflicted with other in dogmas, such as Pavlovian psychology (conditioned reflex theory) and Marxist logic, then that conflict was simply another contradiction to be neatly accounted for by Soviet dialectical logic.

"In this respect the cybernetics dispute had an earlier parallel: both relativity theory and Albert Einstein were being severely attacked ideologically at the same time that the Soviets were using the theory to construct atomic bombs.

"Perhaps such official nonrecognition hampers some theoretical work, but it does not seem to deter the Soviets from making practical applications of the theories. It is simply another example of the Soviets' abil-

ity to be coldly pragmatic and resort to doublethink when necessary."

The result has been that even though cybernetics was officially anathematized for a time, the Soviets had been able to achieve great advances in this very field.

According to latest reports they are on the threshold of refined translation at high speed by computing devices.

Reviewing the latest advances in information technology in a recent article, Alexander Nesmeyanov, president of the Academy of Sciences, foresees enormous development of electronic memory devices that can store huge amounts of data, aiding all technical and scientific areas.

Concrete examples of control theory application would include such machines as a learning device built into a multistage rocket that could control the timing and firing of each stage by utilizing data picked up during its flight.

Another example would be data-processing machines that could provide producers with quick answers on supply of materials and demand for products. This would enable producers to make rapid and rational production adjustments.

A third basic use of control theory already tried in some American industries is the smoothing out of oscillations—or hills and valleys—in seasonal employment by scientific regulation of production schedules.

NEW TOOLS OF MATH BRING UPHEAVAL TO RUSS ECONOMICS

(By David Binder)

Automation, in addition to causing an enormous upheaval in Soviet industry, has touched off a cataclysmic change in the whole concept of Communist economics.

This change was highlighted by a climatic 13-day struggle in 1954 between the so-called "antimathematicians" and the mathematicians in Russian economics.

The upheaval in economics, like that in automation, was set in motion by the new tools of mathematics. Among these tools are econometrics (mathematical economics) and statistical analysis.

In the opinion of Leon Smolinski, of Boston College, this economic revolution would not have occurred if it hadn't been for the introduction of electronic computers in the Soviet Union.

But automation suddenly alerted the Soviet leaders to the clumsiness of traditional Communist economic theory and its inadequacy for a modern industrial nation.

In 1956, the Russians began to use the new tools, at first cautiously and then with growing confidence.

The history of what went before the economic revolution illuminates still another case of the conflict between science and Maxist ideology in Soviet Russia:

The core of Communist economic thinking is centralized state planning. This was and is carried out by Gosplan, the state planning commission.

The method employed by Gosplan until very recently was simple. One Western economist calls it primitive.

The planners drew up a series of balance sheets for all the available major resources and for all the major products desired by the Communist leaders.

These balance sheets—at one time numbering 1,600—were added up laboriously and combined in a balanced national plan.

It required setting priorities for scarce materials and a tremendous flow of information from the top (Gosplan) to the bottom (the individual plants and industries) and back again.

In a 1960 study of Gosplan, Richard Judy and Herbert Levine called the material balances method a many-sided bureaucratic administrative process—unsystematic and time consuming.

In fact, Gosplan was operated by men who had little or no understanding of economics. Judy and Levine called it "a theoretical vacuum."

Meanwhile, economists in the Soviet Union and the West had been developing new theories of efficient industrial planning—theories that applied equally well to a capitalist and a Communist economy.

These theories, collected under the term "econometrics," utilized mathematics.

But in 1930 the new theories suddenly were condemned as heresies, Kuibyshev, the Gosplan chairman, denounced them as the "statistical-mathematical deviation in planning."

The planners further accused the new mathematical economists like Groman, Feldman, Kondratiev, and Bazarov of "wrecking" (a Communist swearword) and hiding "counterrevolutionary concepts behind the logarithmic veil."

Groman was charged with working on the principle that there is no God but the desk calculator, and Groman is his prophet.

Apparently, Smolinski says, the planners felt the mathematical economists were encroaching on their jobs. Those who worked for Gosplan were purged as reactionary bourgeois political economists.

The 1930 ban on economic "heresies" lasted until 1956. It was a duplicate of the later bans on cybernetics and logic teaching, but it had a deeper effect.

For nearly three decades, the vaunted "planned economy" of the Soviet Union lumbered along on the wooden wheels of Marxist doctrine—the collective economic wisdom of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. It was the application of vague 19th century ideas to precise 20th century problems.

Meanwhile, the mathematical economists were perfecting the new tools of econometrics during the 1930's.

By the beginning of World War II some of them were already in use in the West.

Among these tools barred from use by Soviet economists and planners were input-output theory and the concept known as linear programing.

The first was developed by a native Russian, Wassily Leontief, who came to the United States in the 1920's. Extending economic model-building theories propounded in earlier decades, Leontief conceived input-output analysis in 1936 as a mathematical method for seeking the most efficient means to make a product.

Leontief drew up intraindustry models using mathematical coefficients to represent the various amounts of materials, service costs, and labor needed to make a product. In this way, Leontief's scheme made it possible to estimate scientifically the mixture of inputs required to attain a desired output product.

Linear programing is a refinement of input-output analysis. Its discoverer, paradoxically, was the brilliant Soviet mathematician, Leonid Kantorovich, who enunciated the concept in 1939.

Linear programing is a mathematical means of determining the best way to allocate a limited number of resources. A simple example is the so-called transport problem in which a firm has eight plants in different parts of the country and 200 stores to which it must deliver certain products.

This problem can be translated mathematically into a system of 1,800 equations and inequalities with 1,600 unknowns. But, using a computer, it is entirely feasible for the firm to work out the most efficient means of distributing the product.

The term linear is used because the equations that occur, when expressed, as graphs, have straight lines or planes.

Linear programing has many other applications. It has been used in the United States for machine scheduling in the chemical industry to meet seasonal sales variation. It has been employed to select the best possible diets and to select crop-rotating plans.

Independent of Kantorovich, whose ideas were not publicized, let alone exploited, several Americans worked out linear programing theories in the 1940's: F. L. Hitchcock, T. C. Koopmans, and George Dantzig.

It was applied with great success to the "transport problem" in routing of cargo ships during World War II by the British-American combined shipping adjustment board.

Later American refinements of linear programing included the first use of an electronic computer on a linear problem in 1952.

But input-output analysis and linear programing, which constitute the essence of econometrics, remained taboo in the Soviet Union, even though Kantorovich and others knew their potential.

Then came what Leon Smolinski calls "the mathematical revolution in Soviet economics."

An open debate on the merits of econometrics began in the Soviet Union in the winter of 1956. Encouraged by powerful men in the party, prominent mathematicians like Kantorovich, Kolmogrov, Liapunow, and Markov went on the offensive against the old ban.

They were severely attacked by the planners, including economists like Aaron Boyarskii, who branded econometrics as "bourgeois" in mid-1957.

But in less than a year, the mathematicians had carried the day.

Smolinski writes that the Communist leadership agreed to make use of input-output tables and even limited use of linear programing.

"It was," he added, "tantamount to an embarrassing admission that during three decades of economic planning, Soviet economists proved unable to produce the analytical and operational tools needed, whereas the allegedly sterile bourgeois economists unexplainably worked them out."

However, the party line change on econometrics was not accomplished with a single flat. The debate continued, acrimoniously, and is going on even today.

Meanwhile, the Soviets had their hands full making up for lost time. First they had to give what Leonid Hurwicz, of the University of Minnesota, calls a Marxist birth certificate to econometrics. There was at least a partial legitimate claim in the person of Kantorovich, the inventor of linear programing.

But the Russians also had to institute new courses in mathematics and statistics to train economists in the new disciplines.

(In the United States, too, economists have had to brush up on their mathematics. An example is the University of Minnesota summer institute in mathematics for faculties and graduate students in economics.)

The victory of econometrics in the Soviet Union is now being widely hailed by young Russians. One economics student recently compared the impact of mathematical methods on economics to the invention of the printing press on publishing.

But the effectiveness of econometrics depends on vast amounts of industrial statistics, and from the earliest days of the Stalin era (1926) statistics were regarded as state secrets in the Soviet Union.

Running almost parallel to the radical change in the party line on econometrics was a similar change regarding statistics.

The debate on statistics broke out in 1954. This was the year when the respected Soviet economist S. G. Strumilin published a book on planning using statistics dating from 1925. Later figures were forbidden him.

The debate, as described by E. M. Feis, of Pittsburgh University, was a 13-day battle between the mathematicians and the

antimatematicians. The latter group was led by V. A. Sobolj, of the central statistics administration.

Feis says the mathematicians won the debate but the statistics bureaucrats stayed in office. So a leading mathematician, V. S. Nemchinov, started a journal called "Scholars Writings" in 1955. It was devoted to the cause of utilizing statistics.

In 1956, Nemchinov and the others gained support from the Communist Central Committee, by then under the control of Nikita Khrushchev.

In a report signed by Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan, the party said: "Our economists in recent years haven't done any serious scientific work * * *. Our economic science institutes have gravely lost contact with the practice of Communist construction.

"Unfortunately, statistical data are still under the seven seals of the central statistical administration, with Comrade Starovskii. The economists are (thus) sentenced to the role of uncritical, petty Bible readers and parrots of ancient formulas and ancient data. That is one of the reasons why one sees nothing of creative work by our economists."

Shortly after this blast, the "seven seals" were lifted from Soviet statistics and the mathematicians were allowed to revel in them.

Nevertheless, while the new concepts of econometrics and statistical analysis were accepted in principle, debate on specific aspects continues, mostly on ideological grounds.

Thus Leonid Kantorovich was still under attack in 1960 for trying to introduce Western theories into his linear programing schemes.

Last summer, the important journal Problemy Ekonomiki accused the Leningrad mathematician of abandoning Marx's labor theory of value, which says that the ultimate worth of a good is determined from the amount of labor put into it.

In another publication Aron Boyarskii accused Kantorovich of trying to introduce the heretical Western concept of marginal analysis (a theory with which a businessman reckons the cost of expanding output by calculating the cost of producing one extra unit).

Even Nemchinov, the man who promoted statistical analysis, warned against Kantorovich's Western ideas.

But the fact remains that the Soviets are using the greater part of Kantorovich's ideas in economic planning today.

A group of American automation experts who toured Soviet installations in 1959 found a team of Russians solving a linear programing problem on the Strela computer—the efficient distribution of sand from 8 sources to 100 building sites with a truck fleet. They reported the computer solved the problem in 30 minutes.

ORGANIZATION PROBLEM PLAGUES RUSS

(By David Binder)

One of the worst problems facing the Soviet Union (and the United States) in the midst of the present technological revolution is that of organization.

How does one adapt an industrial organization conceived in the 19th century to the complex, interdependent nature of 20th-century manufacturing?

Apparently, the Russians are having just as much trouble answering this question as Americans.

In late February, Premier Nikita Khrushchev pushed through a radical reform of his whole agriculture apparatus, from top to bottom. It was the latest in a series of similar reforms in the organization of industry and commerce.

In fact, since Stalin's death in 1953, the Soviet leaders have instituted three vast reforms of the Communist economic apparatus in an effort to master the organization problem.

In the United States, organization reforms have been carried out by some industries and some Government agencies, but in no case on the scale of the Russian reforms.

George Steele, a leading American computer designer, defined the organization problem this way in his controversial 1960 book "The Crisis We Face."

"For almost 200 years (Adam) Smith's classic description of the benefits of division of labor, old style, leads to increased efficiency only in particular cases.

"The difference today is that all departments (of a business operation) affect and are affected by the policy decision of the whole or the parts."

Steele concludes that since automation uses machines "in combination" it is clear that "overall organization must be integrated" in order to utilize automation effectively.

But similarities between organizational difficulties in the Soviet Union and the United States end with the statement of the problem.

In America, executives who don't move with the times get shifted or dismissed. In the Soviet Union they are fair game for the executioner.

Of five Gosplan (State Planning Commission) chairmen since the end of World War II, three have been denounced as traitors and one was shot in the head (Nikolai Voznesensky in 1949).

The first great organizational reform was undertaken by Georgi Malenkov during the 1953–55 interregnum after Stalin's death. Malenkov inherited the ponderous Gosplan apparatus built by Stalin, "the lunatic centralizer," as one Western observer called him. Gosplan comprised some 30 branch ministries, all located in Moscow.

By the time these ministries combed through the economic plans, each jealous of its rights, months and even years had passed.

Malenkov, and Khrushchev after him, sought to decentralize the competencies of of the Gosplan behemoth. The question was, How?

Malenkov's answer was to reduce the powers of the Moscow ministries and to strengthen the economic decisionmaking powers of the governments of the various Soviet republics. According to P. J. D. Wiles, of Oxford University, Malenkov's scheme "was defeated" by the territorial party apparatus.

The second reform was instituted with much fanfare by Premier Khrushchev in 1957.

First he fired M. G. Pervukhin as Gosplan chief. Then, over a 5-month period, he dissolved the old Gosplan branch ministries and divided the whole Soviet Union into 104 economic districts. Each of these was presided over by a Sovnarkhoz (economic council).

Gosplan, in turn, was ordered to absorb the old ministries and to act as watchdog on the Sovnarkhozy as well.

Wiles summed up the advantages of the reform this way: Fewer long hauls from a factory in one sector of the economy to another, less ministerial autarchy, less concentration of industry around Moscow, economies in local transport, and better "vertical integration."

The disadvantages he listed as more local autarchy, less horizontal integration, transport interrupted by Sovnarkhoz boundaries, and the tendency of the Sovnarkhozy to develop crackpot industrialization schemes that didn't fit into the large picture.

But the great organization reform of 1957 created even greater difficulties for the Soviet leadership.

It spawned a new plague that the Russians called mestnichestvo, or localism. This was the tendency of many Sovnarkhoz leaders to strive toward self-sufficiency, to place local aspirations above national goals. They were a Communist kind of states righters.

Thus Comrade Onika, chairman of a Sovnarkhoz in Karaganda, spent 74 million rubles designated for industry construction on a circus, a theater, a resort, two swimming pools, and a seven-story administration building for himself.

Onika, according to the Soviet press, had imitators in the Sovnarkhozy of Gorki, Kuibyshev, Dnyepropetrovsk, Altai, Krasnoyarsk, Kazakhstan, and Sverdlovsk.

Khrushchev cracked down on these mestnichestvo villains in August 1958. Onika was fired and eight other district leaders were disciplined.

Meanwhile, the central Gosplan apparatus itself appeared to be faltering. Under the reform, it had absorbed most of the old branch ministry employees left over from the Stalin era. Evidently they went back to their old ways.

The Gosplan chairman, Josef Kuzmin, was no economist, but rather a simple apparatchik—a bureaucrat. Following heavy attacks on the Gosplan bureaucracy by the Communist Central Committee in 1959 Kuzmin was dumped. He was replaced by the able economist Alexei Kosygin.

Then, last summer, Khrushchev and Kosygin quietly began the reform of the reform, so quietly that it was never reported in the American press.

They shuffled the Sovnarkhozy about and placed them under the control of 15 new economic councils which corresponded with the Soviet Union republican governments.

They also reduced the functions of Gosplan merely to drawing up plans. Hitherto, Gosplan had supervised them as well. That job was taken over by the new republic economic councils.

Wolfgang Leonhard, the German expert on Communist affairs, calls this latest reform a "redecentralizing" of the economic organization.

Leonhard adds, however, that the reform only proves that the Soviet Union is "still experimenting" to find a proper system that will spur local initiative, but still guarantee that central directives will be obeyed.

Recent dispatches from Moscow indicate that even the new reform has failed to eradicate the tendency toward localism.

Meanwhile, there have been two other developments in the Soviet Union that have a strong bearing on the organization problem.

The first is the announcement, late last year, that 110 regional data-processing centers are to be set up as soon as possible. These are to contain computers for processing economic information, thereby aiding the planning organs.

Paul C. Rosenbloom, of the University of Minnesota, regards this development as extremely significant for the Soviet economy. "It will enable them to speed up the whole decisionmaking process," he says.

The second Soviet development is the growth of the "science city" founded 3 years ago at Novosibirsk on the edge of Siberia.

Under the leadership of M. A. Lavrentyev, vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and an outstanding mathematician, the "science city" is to be the nerve center for the industrialization of the vast Siberian wastes.

At present, 40 scientific institutes are operating in the science city. They were built before the place even had sidewalks. At the heart of them is a data-processing center outfitted with the latest computers.

Every branch of automation is represented in Novosibirsk—weapons, business systems, and factory equipment.

Yet, one thing that still hinders the Russians from attaining full economic efficiency is the lingering fear that linear programing and input-output techniques might somehow break down if applied on a gigantic national scale.

The other hinderance is the continuing lack of a proper price system in the Soviet Union. This is because the Soviet leadership still hangs on to the old Marxist dogma that says prices derive solely from the labor invested in a good.

It is one of the fundamental theses of Western economics that prices, based on consumer demand and on supply, are absolutely necessary to sound economic thinking. But even today, the Russians regard these theories with utmost suspicion.

Again, it was the brilliant Leonid Kantorovich, who led the scientists' struggle for a more adequate pricing system in the Soviet Union.

The search for such a system is one of the elements of his book "Economic Estimates for Optimum Utilization of Resources," published in 1959. And because Kantorovich dared to adapt some of the Western ideas of value he was violently attacked.

Nevertheless, it appears that the pricing problem will be resolved soon. Leon Smolinski notes that a reform of wholesale prices in the Soviet Union has been scheduled for 1961–62.

Meanwhile, Soviet economists already have begun to study such hitherto forbidden subjects as consumer demand.

Thus, on the horizon is the prospect that the Soviet Union will develop what Smolinski calls an "econometric sputnik"—a huge input-output table for the whole nation, using an operational pricing system.

Richard Judy and Herbert Levine, of Harvard's Russian research center, foresee the eventual adoption of linear programing techniques on a national scale.

This, they say, would enable Soviet planners to construct a "production possibilities frontier" that would present the Soviet leadership with a whole range of choices—every one of them efficient—for allocating Russia's resources.

That, in turn, would permit the Soviet economy to do on an enormous scale what American industry now does on a miniature scale: distribute resources and products in a totally efficient manner.

As Smolinski states it, econometrics thus would have "an important effect on the growth rate of the Soviet economy."

In other words, scientific planning, combined with the rapid expansion of Soviet industry through automation, would present an unprecedented challenge to the West.

In a recent article, Alexander Nesmeyanov, president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, confirmed this prospect:

"It is clear what enormous economic usefulness can be achieved when the national economy can be planned according to the most favorable variants calculated by a computer."

Such a vista may seem naive to Westerners who have seen the material paradoxes of Russia—sputniks on the one hand and primitive farms on the other, dazzling new machines here and ancient equipment there.

But a British automation expert offers another view following his tour of Russia last summer: he expressed his conviction that suddenly, all will click into place and obsolete office and factory practices will be replaced almost overnight with new highly advanced devices.

Professor Rosenbloom, of the University of Minnesota, says the implication for the United States is clear: a pressing need for more coordinated economic planning on a national scale to meet the Soviet challenge.

Experts Wonder How United States, Russ Compare on Automation

(By David Binder)

Comparisons between the level of automation in the Soviet Union and the United States are exceedingly difficult, not the least because the Russians still have a penchant for keeping overall production figures to themselves.

Some Americans say we are 10 years ahead—an estimate that seems optimistic in the light of recent revelations.

Observers who combed through the 7-year plan targets released at the 21st Communist Party Congress in January 1959 concluded that even if the automation goals are fulfilled by 1965, "the Soviet Union will be lagging some 7 years behind the United States."

But there are other indicators that show the Communists to be keeping step with American automation.

Among them is Soviet rocket technology. It takes highly refined computing equipment to guide and track such gigantic and far-reaching space shots as the Russian moon rocket and the more recent Venus rocket. In fact, there is every evidence that the Soviets applied their computers first to military problems and only lately to industrialization problems.

However, there is a much more significant aspect of Soviet automation that distinguishes it from automation in the West, and that is its totality of approach.

This is reflected in a report some time ago by the academic council of the Institute of Automation and Telemechanics in Moscow that states:

"The opinion is sometimes advanced that the new technological revolution in the Soviet Union will be the practical use of atomic energy. This is not the case. In fact it is automation, moving productive processes under their own power, which today plays the same decisive role as was played by power machines in the industrial revolution of the 19th century."

With this in mind, the Soviets worked out a comprehensive automation program that was apparently adopted at the famous 20th party congress of 1956, in which Nikita Khrushchev emerged as the leader of post-Stalin Russia.

The first phase involved the education of control specialists and the development of control theory. To this end many outstanding Soviet mathematicians switched fields to work on automation application problems.

Among them were men like the blind Lev S. Pontryagin, a leading mathematics topologist, and Sergei L. Sobolev, a partial differential equation specialist who now heads the Moscow computing center.

Meanwhile, stipends for students in computer fields were raised to provide incentive.

The second phase, still in progress, involved bridging the gap between theory and application.

The third phase, according to the current 7-year plan, will be the period of general industrial automatic control which is to be attained between 1965 and 1975.

To that end, Premier Khrushchev announced in 1959 a goal of 1,300 automated assembly lines throughout the Soviet Union, plus introduction of control devices in the electric power, communications, transportation, steel and petroleum industries.

Considerable progress already has been achieved automating the steel and petroleum industries.

The Soviet emphasis, as always, is on application. Thus five institutes were assigned the task of automating blast furnace and steel rolling mill processes.

The Kiev computer center was ordered to design an analog computer that would link 13 Soviet power stations into a single grid (something already accomplished in the United States).

In Kiev alone some 40 automation laboratories are studying areas of application for computers and control devices.

All of this reflects something new in Soviet history: the decisive role of science in the halls of government. As never before, scientists—mathematicians, engineers, physicists, linguists, and others—work in close conjunction with the political decisionmakers.

The Soviet Academy of Sciences is intimately involved at every level of Russian economic activity, from the factory to the central planning commission.

The Soviet budget for science, already much higher than the American one, was raised 15 percent this year.

The scientists themselves are provided with incentives unmatched in Western countries. Members of the academy, for example, receive 5,000 rubles a month above their regular salaries, plus their own summer villas.

The Soviet education system has been studied exhaustively by Americans since the first sputnik went up. Suffice it to say here that Soviet education in science and engineering surpasses American schooling in length and intensity.

Moreover, the Soviet leadership has striven in recent years to create what they call "an atmosphere of learning" throughout the country.

Factory workers are encouraged to take night courses in natural science. So are farmers and white-collar workers. Science books written in a popular vein are published—and sold—in huge, cheap editions.

Premier Khrushchev and his colleagues are well aware that automation already is making multitudes of workers redundant in certain industries. The aim of the new education program is to aid in the retraining of these labor forces to supply the manpower vacancies in the new, more specialized industries.

The primary field of endeavor in the science-education program is mathematics.

The Soviets have grasped the fact that a mathematical revolution is in progress around the world and that it is the basis for the technological revolution.

Alexander Nesmeyanov, president of the academy of sciences, described this phenomenon a few months ago:

"At the moment an unusually interesting, and for the sciences extremely significant process is developing—the mathematization of the sciences."

Nesmeyanov continued with a description of the new roles of computers, automated production and information theory in Soviet society.

Early this year a group of American mathematicians organized by the research institute of advance studies of the Glenn L. Martin Co. completed a lengthy report on Soviet mathematics.

These are some of the conclusions of the group, headed by Joseph D. LaSalle:

The United States and the Soviet Union lead the world in mathematics and are at about the same level, but the Soviets will move ahead at a swifter rate in practical applications of mathematical theories.

Leading Soviet mathematicians work in both pure and applied mathematics, whereas Americans in pure mathematics rarely have interest in applications.

Soviet engineers and scientists in other fields maintain an interest in mathematics and utilize mathematical theories. They have no counterparts in America.

More and more Soviet mathematicians are working in applied fields related to automation. In quantity and output they lead the world.

The Soviet mathematical research programs are better balanced than American programs.

The Soviets have more space in their mathematics journals than do American journals.

The foregoing, incidentally, is not limited to the Soviet Union alone. The advances in mathematics, in automation and in economic efficiency, are spreading to other Communist bloc countries: East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Rumania and China.

The implication here is clear: the West has highly developed industries, highly developed economies, brilliant scientists and exceptional engineers. But it now faces the prospect of an equally powerful economic machine in the East that is dedicated to surpassing and ultimately destroying our society.

The tools are the same.

But Prof. Paul C. Rosenbloom of the University of Minnesota remarks:

"The question of whether, as Khrushchev says, the Russians 'will bury us,' depends on whether we can organize adequately the use of these tools in a democratic society—and in time."

PRESIDENT BOURGUIBA, OF TUNISIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last evening I commented, here in the Senate, on the visit to our country by the President of Tunisia, the Honorable Habib Bourguiba.

Yesterday, an excellent editorial and article concerning this illustrious visitor were published in the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star.

The editorial published in the Washington Post is entitled "Tunisia's President." The editorial proclaims:

Among all the heads of government visiting the United States this spring, none is more deserving of acclaim than President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia.

Mr. President, I join in that evaluation of this remarkable man.

The article published in the Washington Evening Star is entitled "Headline Personality—Bourguiba Has Hope To Head North Africa."

Let me add that nothing could be better for the cause of freedom and justice than his leadership throughout north Africa.

The opening paragraph of the article reads as follows:

President Habib Bourguiba, the man President Kennedy has called the champion of international cooperation arrived in Washington today to see Mr. Kennedy and to help tighten American links with Tunisia.

Mr. President, I think that paragraph of the article tells the story.

I hope the visit of this outstanding world citizen will be a pleasant, fruitful, and happy one. We wish President Bourguiba and his family the very best.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and the article to which I have referred be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 3, 1961]

TUNISIA'S PRESIDENT

Among all the heads of government visiting the United States this spring, none is more deserving of acclaim than President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia. The small north African country which he heads is not numbered among the world's great powers. But Mr. Bourguiba has shown, particularly since Tunisia's independence from France 5 years ago, a magnanimity of spirit that classifies him among the world's great statesmen.

The leader who arrives in Washington today is one of those rare individuals, a man without bitterness toward those who persecuted him. Despite various periods in jail and exile at the instance of France because of his nationalist activities, he maintains his affection for France.

More than this, he is a peacemaker. He has afforded a principal contact with the Algerian national liberation front and has worked to encourage the moderates. Simultaneously he has made clear his respect and admiration for French President de Gaulle. If now the negotiations between France and the FLN lead to an Algerian settlement, it will be in no small measure because of Tunisia's interest and help as an honest broker.

Mr. Bourguiba is said to hope that Tunisia will be chosen as a pilot project for massive American assistance toward an economic breakthrough. Whether this would be feasible depends upon many factors of preparation. But few countries or governments are more worthy of thoughtful help. Mr. Bourguiba comes as a genuine friend of the United States and of the West and at the same time an authentic nationalist who has done much to modernize his country and infuse it with new hope. We join with many others in bidding him a warm welcome.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 3, 1961]

BOURGUIBA HAS HOPE TO HEAD NORTH AFRICA

Full name: Habib Bourguiba.

Claim to fame: President of Tunisia; in Washington today to start a 10-day state visit.

Home: Tunis.

Birth year: 1903.

Education: French schools in Tunis; graduate of the Faculty of Law and School of Political Science in Paris.

Jobs: Began law practice about 1927 in Tunis; entered politics in 1930 as a nationalist; organized the New-Destour Party; became first Premier of Tunisia in 1955; elected President when Tunisia became a Republic in 1957.

Family: Married Mathilde Lorrain, a Frenchwoman; one son, Habib, Jr.

Hobbies: Horseback riding and the theater.

TUNIS, May 3.—President Habib Bourguiba, the man President Kennedy has called the champion of international cooperation, arrived in Washington today to see Mr. Kennedy and to help tighten American links with Tunisia.

The 57-year-old Moslem ruler is quick-minded and ebullient, and he does not hide his ambition of becoming President of a United States of North Africa some day.

Tunisia, a north African Republic the size of Louisiana, has become a stanch Western ally under his leadership. Mr. Bourguiba has often pointed out that, by sheer geography, his nation has no choice but to be with the West.

AID FROM UNITED STATES

Since Tunisia gained its independence from France in 1956, the United States has sent a fortune in economic aid. This year alone the total in direct aid and long-term loans is $84 million.

Lately Tunisia has been doing some economic flirting with the Communist bloc. The results have been marginal, however, and the United States has made no effort to discourage such trade.

"The best answer is to create such conditions that the Tunisians will prefer to do business with us," said one American diplomat.

The 60-man U.S. mission here, along with the diplomats, has made its motto: "We will have friends if we merit them." The hope is that Tunisia will be a sparkling example of success for Mr. Kennedy's policy of peaceful competition with Russia.

OF TWO CULTURES

Mr. Bourguiba himself is the product of two cultures. He is equally at home among the shrill mobs of the Tunis markets or within the refined intricacies of French politics.

A short man with thinning gray hair, piercing blue eyes, a square jaw and a puffed-out chest, Mr. Bourguiba is a master at balcony oratory.

CAMPAIGNS TRIUMPH

He is eloquently persuasive in either French or Arabic and has tremendous magnetism over a crowd. Matched with his genius for grassroots political organizing, this helps explain his rise from a rebel jailed by France to the leader of his own free country.

As a student of 15 he was expelled from a Tunis school for strikes and bad behavior. Later he studied political science in Paris. The French first arrested him in 1934 for his nationalist political activity in Tunisia. He was in and out of French prisons regularly during the next two decades.

Mr. Bourguiba waged a fierce guerrilla campaign that resulted in limited home rule after 5 years. When France saw the futility of suppressing Tunisian nationalism any further, Mr. Bourguiba returned to Tunis in personal triumph.

Mr. Bourguiba is making his third visit to the United States. He was in the United States in 1947 as a rebel leader and again in 1951, the second time as a guest of the American Federation of Labor in connection with its labor union program for Africa.

Mr. Bourguiba's Paris-born son, Habib, Jr., is currently the Tunisian Ambassador in Washington.

If France eventually settles the long and costly rebellion in Algeria, next door neighbor of Tunisia, much credit can go to Mr. Bourguiba for his role as a mediator trusted by both French officials and the Algerian rebel leaders.

Far from modest, Mr. Bourguiba once was asked if there was a "Bourguiba" in Algeria who could negotiate peace with France.

"A Bourguiba," he replied confidently, "would have been noticed by now."

IMPORTANCE OF AUTONOMY FOR THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note in the New York Times an article entitled "Peace Corps Wins Fight for Autonomy." In the article it is stated:

It is understood that the President ruled Monday night that the Peace Corps would have semiautonomous status under the State Department.

The President's decision followed a 2-month tug-of-war within the administration. For Peace Corps officials, it was an important victory.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE CORPS WINS FIGHT FOR AUTONOMY

(By Peter Braestrup)

WASHINGTON, May 3.—President Kennedy has decided that the Peace Corps will not

be merged with the Nation's other foreign-aid programs.

It is understood that the President ruled Monday night that the Peace Corps would have semiautonomous status under the State Department.

The President's decision followed a 2-month tug-of-war within the administration. For Peace Corps officials, it was an important victory. These officials had contended that without a special identity of its own, the new agency would attract few recruits, get snarled in red tape and lose its effectiveness abroad.

Mr. Kennedy made his decision after consulting with Vice President Johnson, who had pressed the Peace Corps' cause. Before going on an overseas trip last month, R. Sargent Shriver, the President's brother-in-law and Peace Corps Director, argued his case at the White House staff level but deliberately refrained from going to the President in person.

FIVE HOURS OF TESTS SET

It was announced today that entrance tests for Peace Corps volunteers would be given May 27 and June 5. Some 7,500 persons are expected to take the 5½-hour examination at centers across the Nation.

The President's decision putting the Corps under the State Department also called for Mr. Shriver to seek separate legislative authority and appropriations from Congress. Mr. Shriver would have Assistant Secretary of State status, reporting directly to Dean Rusk, Secretary of State. President Kennedy created the Corps by Executive order on March 1, but also asked Congress to pass laws making it a permanent agency.

Opposition to the agency's semiautonomous status came from Henry Labouisse, head of the International Cooperation Administration, some career State Department officials, and several White House aids. These men urged that the Peace Corps be made a unit of the foreign-aid organization being planned by the administration.

SIX THOUSAND QUESTIONNAIRES SENT

The Peace Corps is seeking engineers, surveyors, geologists, teachers of English, agricultural specialists, and community development workers. Some 6,600 filled-out questionnaires have been received here from would-be volunteers and several thousand more are expected to come in by May 27.

The first project, a road job for engineers and surveyors in Tanganyika, has been announced. Agricultural projects are reportedly under consideration in Colombia, Ghana, and Nigeria. Teaching projects are being considered for the Philippines.

All candidates will take a general test on May 27. This test, prepared by the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, N.J., will seek to measure vocabulary, learning, ability, language aptitude, knowledge of American history, and skills in particular technical fields.

Dr. Nicholas Hobbs, the Corps' Director of Selection, said:

"A Peace Corps volunteer must, first of all, be competent. He must be able to do a job well. These tests will measure job competence. Later tests and interviews will assess personality qualifications. The Peace Corps wants practical people with basic skills."

MEASURING ABILITIES

Dr. Hobbs emphasized that the tests were intended to measure candidates' abilities regardless of formal educational background.

Candidates with questionnaires on file at Peace Corps headquarters will be told where to report for testing by mid-May.

On June 5 a test will be given to those college graduates with liberal arts and teaching degrees who want to teach English, biology, chemistry, physics, or mathematics in secondary schools overseas. By year's end, it is planned, several hundred teachers will be working in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. More will follow in 1962.

There will be no "passing" grade. Those whose test scores indicate they have both intelligence and skills will be notified in late June that they are eligible for Peace Corps training the next month.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hope that will be the decision. Of course the article to which I have referred is only a news story, and as yet it has not been substantiated by any official action. But I hope the Peace Corps will enjoy an autonomous position, so it will have some independence of action.

My hope that the Peace Corps will be a success rests in no small measure upon its independence and its autonomous status in the governmental structure. The Peace Corps is a new venture. I do not want it to be limited or adjusted or thwarted by the heavy hand of an established, old-line agency. The Peace Corps needs the freedom of action which comes from an autonomous status in the Government. This Corps should work in close cooperation with the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration. It is most important that it also have the freedom of action which will give it drive and vitality.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has been unanimously agreed that the vote on Executive D, which has been under consideration up to this time, will be taken immediately upon the return of the Senate from the joint meeting in the Hall of the House of Representatives. Mr. President, on the vote I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess and proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is agreed to, and the Senate will stand in recess and will then proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address to be delivered by the President of Tunisia.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE HABIB BOURGUIBA, PRESIDENT OF TUNISIA

The Senate, preceded by the Secretary [Felton M. Johnston], the Sergeant at Arms [Joseph C. Duke], and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint meeting of the two Houses to hear the address to be delivered by the Honorable Habib Bourguiba, President of Tunisia.

For the address delivered by the President of Tunisia, see the House proceedings of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RESUMPTION OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. METCALF in the chair).

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SECOND AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The Senate resumed the consideration of Ex. D (87th Cong., 1st sess.), the Second Agreement Between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the treaty will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to the point of the consideration of the resolution of ratification.

The resolution of ratification of the Second Agreement Between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn on August 16, 1960, will now be read.

The resolution of ratification was read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Second Agreement Between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany Regarding Certain Matters Arising From the Validation of German Dollar Bonds, signed at Bonn on August 16, 1960 (Executive D, Eighty-seventh Cong., first sess.).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification of the agreement? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 5, as follows:

[Ex. 1]

YEAS—86

Aiken	Fulbright	Monroney
Allott	Goldwater	Morse
Anderson	Gore	Morton
Bartlett	Hart	Moss
Beall	Hartke	Muskie
Bennett	Hayden	Pastore
Bible	Hickenlooper	Pell
Boggs	Hickey	Prouty
Bridges	Hill	Proxmire
Bush	Holland	Randolph
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Cannon	Jackson	Saltonstall
Capehart	Javits	Scott
Carlson	Johnston	Smathers
Carroll	Jordan	Smith, Mass.
Case, N.J.	Keating	Smith, Maine
Church	Kefauver	Sparkman
Clark	Kerr	Stennis
Cooper	Kuchel	Symington
Cotton	Lausche	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, Mo.	Thurmond
Dirksen	Magnuson	Wiley
Dworshak	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McCarthy	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McClellan	Yarborough
Engle	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Fong	Miller	

NAYS—5

Case, S. Dak.	Gruening	Mundt
Douglas	Long, La.	

NOT VOTING—9

Blakley	Chavez	McGee
Burdick	Dodd	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Long, Hawaii	Schoeppel

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of executive business, to consider the nomination of Mr. Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Mr. SYMINGTON and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KUCHEL. I object.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator who interposed objection to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights meeting this afternoon to withdraw his objection, because the subcommittee has important business before it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is in doubt. Did the Chair correctly understand the Senator from California to object to the request that the subcommittee be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, objection was lodged with the minority leader, and I interposed that objection. I do object.

U.S. TREATMENT OF CUBA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, an article published in El Mundo, a leading newspaper of Caracas, Venezuela, on Thursday, April 27, 1961, is indicative of the attitude and opinion being expressed to me relative to the treatment the United States has been and is according Cuba.

The people of our country are aware of the concern of our President about Cuba, and are united in their determination to help him. However, decisions are needed, and it is to be hoped that they will be forthcoming shortly.

Mr. President, I have translated the article published in El Mundo, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have read the recent discourse in the Venezuelan National Congress of my first cousin, Ignacio Luis Arcaya in which he supports Fidel Castro and his policies and censures those of the United States. Again our family name appears in support of the assassin of the Caribe.

We do not share the opinions of Ignacio Luis respecting Cuba and could not hold his views without going against the fundamental principles upon which our country was established and under which we live.

We maintain that Venezuela was founded upon the general principle of respect for human lives as well as for that of private property, freedom of expression, and freedom of worship. Castro, with his firing squads assassinates his countrymen; with his bands of spies he has eliminated freedom of speech; he persecutes the church and mocks humble priests and nuns dedicated to aiding the poor. Castro has confiscated private property and has in fact stolen the lifetime savings of many aged persons who cannot longer work.

Castro's system has not only hurt the middle class, but has in fact ruined the working class. In the Cuba of today the worker is a virtual slave of the state, forced to toil longer hours with a lesser real pay than before, without the right to strike, in fact practically without human rights at all.

Castro and his criminal accomplices, Russia and Red China, seek not only to enslave Cuba—but also Venezuela as well. To support Castro is in fact to support an enemy of Venezuela. To back Castro is to accept the dissolution of our armed forces as has been done in Cuba and the establishment of an armed ruthless militia. To lend even moral support to Castro is to invite mercenary communistic intervention into Venezuela emulating that of the Argentina Communist Che Guevara and that of Chinese-Czecho-Russian pilots with their MIG's that strafed the patriotic Cuban invaders.

In our opinion the United States has been too benevolent in the treatment accorded the assassin Castro. Even today the United States is purchasing Cuban tobacco and other products and is sending food and medicine when in reality the United States should send a well-trained and equipped group of marines to end once and for all that nest of foreign communists which is the Cuba of today.

CUBA: A SOVIET SATELLITE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, with the continuing successes of Fidel Castro and the open declaration by him that Cuba is a Soviet satellite—just as much as East Germany, Poland, Hungary, or any other Iron Curtain country—the efforts of Communists in Latin America have been redoubled.

They are making a particular effort to work their ends in Latin America behind the camouflage of Soviet-front groups.

The noted scholar on Latin American affairs, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, in a letter written to the New York Times, and published on April 17, pointed out the role of ex-President Lázaro Cárdenas of Mexico as a "sponsor of numerous Soviet-front activities throughout the globe."

Dr. Thorning's letter says in part:

Despite a few superficial differences, the Marxist-Leninist planners are determined to get the maximum advantages available in the present partnership and collaboration between ex-President Cárdenas and Premier Castro.

The exposure of Soviet blueprints for Latin America can help defend the security of the Western Hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Thorning's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROLE OF GENERAL CÁRDENAS—ASSOCIATION WITH SOVIET-FRONT GROUPS IS CHARGED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

It would be comforting to be able to characterize ex-President Lázaro Cárdenas of Mexico, sponsor of numerous Soviet-front activities throughout the globe, as a person belonging "in the line of the humanistic, liberal traditions of Latin America." (The Times, March 11.)

The truth is that for the past 12 years General Cárdenas, although not a card-carrying Communist, has allowed his name, popularity and prestige to be exploited by forces that have been undermining or destroying free, God-loving peoples in Latin America, Asia and Africa.

In September 1949, Cárdenas was named one of several honorary presidents of the

Continental Congress for Peace and Democracy, Mexico City. The next year he was elected a member of the Presidium of the World Peace Council, Warsaw, Soviet Poland. For the first 6 months of 1954 General Cárdenas was active in support of Col. Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán of Guatemala, the latter now in Cuba and an open advocate of the Marxist-Leninist dictatorship of the Castro brothers, Fidel and Rául.

TOUR OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Once more the World Peace Council listed Cárdenas as a vice president at its meeting in Helsinki, August 1955. After accepting the Stalin Peace Prize in 1956, the general was again elected as vice president of the World Peace Council, Stockholm, in 1958. His tour of many captive nations and praise of Soviet China followed in the winter of 1959–60.

In April 1960, the ex-president, with considerable fanfare in Mexico, received a World Peace Council delegation composed of Viktor Chkhikvadze (U.S.S.R.), Abelardo Adán (Spain), and Ive Farge (France).

The recent Latin American Conference for National Sovereignty, Economic Emancipation, and Peace, Mexico City (March 5–8), demonstrably was the culmination of the aforementioned activities, although, as the conference title indicated, it was principally a propaganda show in favor of Fidel Castro and aimed at inciting hatred of the United States.

One of the proposals denounced by General Cárdenas and his adherents at this conference was the food-for-peace effort as an item in the broad program of cooperative, socioeconomic reconstruction described by President Kennedy as a fruitful alliance for progress.

Joining in the bitter attacks against the U.S. brotherly approach to a systematic, scientific solution of inter-American social problems was Vicente Lombardo Toledano. The latter, according to UPI dispatches, emphasizes that his new-style, Popular Socialist Party is Marxist-Leninist. This follows the pattern established by the Castro brothers in Cuba, where the one legal political organization is called Popular Socialist.

CHANGE IN TACTICS

Possibly it was a mere coincidence that the change in tactics was noted after a tour of several South American countries by Vladimir Baikin, Soviet Ambassador in Mexico, and a sudden visit to Mexico by Sergei Kudriavtzev, Soviet Ambassador to Cuba, on the first day of a 4-day convention of Lombardo Toledano's Popular Socialist Party.

Despite a few superficial differences, the Marxist-Leninist planners are determined to get the maximum advantages available in the present partnership and collaboration between ex-President Cárdenas and Premier Castro.

Fair consideration of these facts can safeguard the security of all the American Republics and promote genuine social reform.

REV. DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING,
U.S. Honorary Fellow of the Historical and Geographic Institute of Brazil; Professor of Latin American History, Marymount College, Arlington.

BRAZIL ALARMED BY CASTRO

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, today's New York Times carries a front-page story by Mr. Juan de Onis, one of the most respected American reporters of Latin American affairs.

The story is headlined "Brazil Alarmed by Castro Stand."

The first paragraph reads:

RIO DE JANEIRO.—Premier Fidel Castro's dedication of Cuba as a Socialist republic and one without elections has swung Brazilian opinion strongly in favor of holding an American Foreign Ministers' conference to consider the Cuban problem.

The story goes on to report that Brazil's leading newspapers, reflecting the opinion of the Brazilian people, have declared that "the continent must react."

According to the article, there is now general agreement in official Brazilian circles that a conference of American Republics must be held immediately to deal with the Castro-Communist menace.

To me it is heartening that Latin America's biggest nation has recognized that Castro is a hemispheric problem and a far greater threat to the Latin American nations than to the United States.

For 18 months I have unsuccessfully urged that the Department of State, through our representatives in the Organization of American States, call for a meeting of consultation of the Foreign Ministers of the OAS, to expose Castro as a Soviet stooge and to take steps to expel the Communist invaders from Cuba.

The Castro menace has long existed, the authority to convoke an OAS meeting to deal with that danger has been available in the Rio Treaty and the Caracas agreement, but nothing has been done.

I again urge that the Secretary of State take advantage of the opportunity offered by Brazil's strong stand against Castro and that he seek an immediate meeting of the OAS Foreign Ministers to resolve the Cuban crisis.

I think that our Voice of America must meet the challenge by pressing home to every person in Latin America the fact that Cuba is a Communist satellite and that Cuba's 6 million Latin Americans are slaves of an eastern European dictator.

Castro has made his arrogant May Day proclamation. His paraders flourished Soviet weapons. His picture was flanked by those of the Soviet's patrons—Marx and Lenin. Castro is a Communist. He says so himself. But the world, and our own American Republics have a way of forgetting these facts, as they too often in the past ignored the gradual communization of Cuba.

We must not let this advantage slip by, as we have let so many others slip by. Now is the time to rally the hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Brazil Alarmed by Castro's Stand," published in the New York Times of May 4, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAZIL ALARMED BY CASTRO STAND: PROCLAMATION OF SOCIALIST CUBA LEADS TO CLAMOR FOR ACTION BY OAS

(By Juan de Onis)

RIO DE JANEIRO, May 3.—Premier Fidel Castro's dedication of Cuba as a Socialist republic and one without elections has swung Brazilian opinion strongly in favor of holding an American Foreign Ministers' conference to consider the Cuban problem.

The Cuban Premier's May Day speech was greeted today by a chorus of alarmed editorials, all striking the same chord. The substance of the editorials was summed up in one sentence by the editorial column of the influential Correio da Manha: "The continent must react."

President Janio Quadros called a cabinet meeting for Saturday and summoned Foreign Minister Afonso Arinos de Melo Franco to Brasilia Friday to analyze the Cuban situation. The Presidential Palace issued last night the latest in a series of telegrams exchanged between President Quadros and Cuban authorities, who have been appealing for Brazilian support.

In a message to President Osvaldo Dorticós Torrado of Cuba, President Quadros said:

"I take this opportunity * * * to reiterate the determination stated by Brazil on various occasions that the principle of self-determination of peoples and effective sovereignty of nations be respected in this continent. To this end my government will always be ready to promote any initiative that will be judged useful to maintain a climate of harmony between countries of our hemisphere for the sake of peace and prosperity in the Americas and in the world."

This noncommittal statement which added nothing to Brazil's position, since the Cuban crisis began, did not reflect the hardening view of all influential sectors of the Brazilian press and the mounting conviction in official circles that the time had come for collective action on Cuba.

The preponderant opinion in the Foreign Ministry now is not whether there should be a conference, but what kind of conference it should be and what should be its objectives. The dominant view is that the American Republics should agree on defensive measures to block any propagation of the now manifest Communist situation in Cuba.

Newspapers that were the most critical of the April 17 invasion of Cuba by anti-Castro rebels took the lead in condemning the Cuban policy outlined by Dr. Castro.

Jornal do Brazil, a Roman Catholic independent newspaper, declared editorially:

"Fidel Castro burned his bridges on the 1st of May. He took a stand against the inter-American system and not just the United States * * * of course this does not justify armed intervention in Cuba. But democratic governments of the continent must take necessary precautions that the Cuban revolution does not spread and that the Andes * * * should not become the Sierra Maestra of the Americas."

Diario de Noticias, a nationalist newspaper that has strongly backed President Quadros' hands-off policy on Cuba, said that the May Day statements by Premier Castro "will require reformulation of the inter-American system based on doctrinary solidarity."

Correio de Manha declared that Dr. Castro, by refusing to invoke the 1947 Rio de Janeiro Inter-American Defense Treaty to air his invasion charges against the United States, had "virtually abandoned the Organization of American States." The newspaper added:

"He can no longer solicit mediation by American foreign offices or the help of American governments. The continent must react. But reaction against threats does not necessarily mean military intervention. The awaited and now inevitable Foreign Ministers' conference has other means at hand, the most effective of which will be that imposed by Fidel Castro himself: isolation."

Dr. Castro's assertion that Cuba did not need elections under her new system as a Socialist republic has had a sharply adverse effect on official and public opinion. Moreover, considerable enthusiasm has been expressed over Costa Rica's threat to break relations with Cuba if prisoners taken after the invasion are executed.

President Dorticós has promised Brazil that the prisoners will receive "serene justice, free of a spirit of vengeance." The promise was contained in a telegram to President Quadros in reply to an appeal by Senhor Quadros on behalf of the prisoners.

At the same time, Dr. Dorticós asked Senor Quadros to "take such actions and measures as you consider pertinent" to prevent the repetition of "similar or worse criminal aggressions" against Cuba by the United States, which Dr. Dorticós said had "assumed responsibility for the unsuccessful invasion."

UNITED STATES STUDIES POLICY ON CUBA

WASHINGTON, May 3.—Immediate and long-range U.S. policies toward Cuba and Latin America were reported tonight to be under review by the National Security Council.

Some indications of the trend of the U.S. thinking on hemisphere problems in the wake of the unsuccessful April 17 landing in Cuba by rebel forces and of the formal proclamation Monday by Premier Fidel Castro of a Socialist state may come Friday when the National Security Council meets with President Kennedy. It was believed that Cuba might be one of the main topics of the session.

Following statements on Cuba this afternoon by Secretary of State Dean Rusk to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the course of a general briefing on world affairs, Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, the committee's chairman, declared that the Cuban situation was being closely examined.

"What to do next," he said, "is under very serious study. We are trying to develop long-range plans."

The immediate problem facing the administration was to decide what action to take in the face of the establishment by Premier Castro of what was described by the Department of State yesterday as a full-fledged Communist state in the Western Hemisphere.

Having ruled out armed intervention but being unwilling to allow the impression in Latin America that the United States was tacitly prepared to coexist with a Communist regime 90 miles from its shores, the administration still appeared to be groping for a solution.

TELEVISION STATION WCKT, MIAMI, RECIPIENT OF PEABODY AWARD

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am pleased to learn that a Florida television station—station WCKT in Miami—has been named the recipient of the Peabody Award, a singularly high honor in the field of television news coverage and public affairs.

The awards are made to recognize distinguished achievements and the most meritorious service rendered each year by radio and television.

The judging is done by the Henry Grady School of Journalism of the University of Georgia.

Station WCKT received its award for responsible leadership in the prompt analysis and exposure of problems incident to the Cuban crisis through such programs as: "Compass Points South," "Cuba on the Move," and "Gitmo: Leave or Stay."

In addition to its coverage of many phases of the Cuban crisis, station WCKT also devoted much time and effort to programs pinpointing Communist subversion and penetration in the United States and the nations of Latin America.

I commend the staff of station WCKT, including News Director Gene Strul, for their enterprise and public service, and I congratulate them for winning the coveted Peabody Award.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, when the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and I left the floor of the Senate shortly after 5 o'clock last evening, we were under the impression that the debate on the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran would not begin until today. However, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] each made a statement in opposition to the nomination of Mr. Holmes. I wish to comment on those statements before I give the Senate my own views as to the nomination of Mr. Holmes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield? I rise to a point of personal privilege.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the Senator from Missouri imply that the Senator from Ohio was a participant in the understanding that there would be no discussion of the nomination of Mr. Holmes on the floor of the Senate last night?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Missouri does not so imply.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I had no such understanding. If there had been such an understanding, I would not have spoken.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Was there any such understanding? If there was, I was here all day yesterday and knew nothing about it. The Senate was supposed to remain in session until about 6 o'clock, after which the discussion would be finished. If the Senator from Missouri was not here, as I understood him to say, that was his own fault. However, I wish he would cite any understanding, anywhere, that any Senator was not privileged to speak on the nomination of Mr. Holmes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It was my understanding from the leadership of this side of the aisle that the Holmes nomination would not be taken up. Therefore, the Senator from Kansas and I left the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator from Missouri will further yield, the Holmes nomination was taken up at 2 o'clock yesterday afternoon and has been the pending business ever since.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to draw the Senate's attention to the following points which, among others, require correction before we proceed with the debate.

First, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] named Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein as the three stockholders of National Tankers, a company which later realized a profit of $450,000 on the stock sale to United Tankers Corp. He implied that Holmes, Casey, and Klein split this sum among them.

The fact is, as Mr. Holmes testified, and as is supported in the findings by the U.S. Tax Court, that Holmes, Casey, and Klein were acting for a larger group, which included the late Admiral Halsey; the late Edward R. Stettinius, a former president of the United States Steel Corp. and chairman of its board, and a former Secretary of State; and about 20 other persons who provided the capital for the group.

Mr. President, on page 38 of the hearings will be found the list of citizens who were stockholders, many of them distinguished Americans.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I believe it probably would be better—inasmuch as this morning I notified the Senator from Ohio that I would comment on some of his observations—for me to finish my statement; and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. At this point I merely wish to ask a question: Is it not a fact that last night I stated that page 38 of the committee hearings record shows a distribution of shares?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator from Ohio says it is so, I am sure it is so.

But the reaction I got—and so did several other persons who read the RECORD—was that the distinguished Senator from Ohio said three people made $450,000.

The truth of the matter is that Mr. Holmes made $45,000, on which he paid a straight income tax; and, therefore, his net income on it was about $25,000. Mr. Holmes' share was 10 percent. Accordingly, his profit before taxes was $45,000, not the figure used by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask the regular order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I insist——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator fron Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I shall yield when I complete my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri declines to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I can understand that he would decline to yield in the face of that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has made an implication which is totally unfounded. Therefore, I now yield to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suggest that the Senator from Missouri read the RECORD; and he will find that last night I stated that on page 38 of the committee hearings record is set forth an alleged distribution of shares to supposed stockholders, which was made after the $450,000 profit was enjoyed by the corporation; and the RECORD will clearly show that I identified page 38; and any

implication that that was not done is unfair to the entire Senate, and especially unfair to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I shall discuss injustice later in my remarks.

Mr. President, as to the same transaction, the Senator from Ohio stated:

> An arrangement was made that National Tanker would buy the ships, with the knowledge that before the ships were bought the arrangement was made for United Tanker to buy the ships from National Tanker. That was done.

The fact is that the ships were the subject of an option, not an agreement of sale. An option is considerably different from an agreement of sale, as every businessman knows. The option was not exercised until months later. National had no assurance that its stock would be purchased.

Point 3 is as follows: The Senator from Ohio commented critically on the capitalization of United Tanker, substantially all of which was supplied from foreign sources. The Senator termed that "a scheme to circumvent the law." He said they did not tell the facts as to that situation.

Mr. President, the truth is that they did tell. The record is clear that this Chinese capitalization was fully disclosed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call for the regular order, and I ask that the Senator from Ohio be required to take his seat.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor, and he has declined to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the record is clear that that Chinese capitalization was fully disclosed to the Maritime Commission, in the application for the tankers. What the Senator from Ohio did not tell us was that this whole transaction was covered by the legal opinion of the Assistant General Counsel of the Maritime Commission, who, after pointing out that substantially all of the capital was from a Nationalist Chinese source, gave his opinion that this company was a citizen for the purposes of the Ship Sales Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, so that there may be no misunderstanding, I repeat that what I said last night is the absolute truth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I must demand that the Senate be in order. Every Senator knows the rules of this body, and the Chair is required to enforce the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished assistant majority leader, and I appreciate the Senate's giving me an opportunity to state my position on this matter.

Finally, Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio, in discussing the transaction, stated that the three men were indicted as a result of it.

Mr. President, there was no indictment, and no proceedings were ever brought by the Department of Justice or anyone else on the three-tanker transaction. The indictments against a much larger group were brought as a result of other transactions, on which I shall comment later.

Mr. President, as to the remarks made by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I have nothing further to say, except that in response to his question as to why someone has not told the President of these transactions, I say the State Department has fully investigated these transactions, and the administration is aware of Mr. Holmes' participation in the tanker deals, as was President Eisenhower when he sent Mr. Holmes' name to the Senate in 1955, for a similar nomination.

Now I should like to state briefly to the Senate my views as to the reasons why the Senate should confirm the nomination of Mr. Holmes.

Today, I am glad to support the action recently taken by the Foreign Relations Committee; and, therefore, I urge confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Julius Holmes to be U.S. Ambassador to Iran.

No question has been raised in this debate, or before the Foreign Relations Committee in the hearings, as to Mr. Holmes' professional qualifications as one of the senior officers of our career diplomatic service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to state that I have known Mr. Holmes for a number of years; that I have visited with him at posts where he was stationed—as minister, at London; as consular agent—I believe that was the title—with the rank of Minister, at Tangiers; and as consul general, again with the continuing rank of Minister, at Hong Kong. In all those instances I found him a worthy, a dedicated, and a patriotic Foreign Service career officer.

It is my understanding that he has served approximately 30 years in the career Foreign Service; that his record is one of the best in that service; that he has taken part in extracurricular activities, perhaps special assignments is a better term, such as a survey of Africa, long before the majority of those countries became independent.

It is my belief that on the basis of his service in the Department of State, he is one of the outstanding Foreign Service officials.

Let me recall to the attention of the Senate the fact that the nomination of Mr. Holmes was before the Foreign Relations Committee some 5 or 6 years ago; that it was reported favorably from the committee at that time; but that the nomination was withdrawn by the administration then in power, because of Mr. Holmes' illness. Let me say that it was an actual case of illness; he was undergoing a serious situation at that time.

I am sorry the nomination was not then pushed; but I am happy that the nomination is now before the Senate, once again; and, as I understand, it has been reported overwhelmingly by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority leader, who is one of the senior members of the Foreign Relations Committee. He is a fair, wise, and just man.

I was glad to hear from the junior Senator from Kentucky, that the withdrawal was not made at the suggestion of President Eisenhower. I am glad to know that, because around the Senate there has been a rumor the nomination was withdrawn at the suggestion of President Eisenhower. However, not only was it not withdrawn at the suggestion of President Eisenhower, but last year President Eisenhower stated that if the name of Mr. Holmes was sent to the White House for a suitable position, he would send it to the Senate.

Again let me express my appreciation to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri to permit me to ask a question of the distinguished majority leader. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so, if the Senator from Missouri is willing.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to accommodate my friend, the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate very much what the majority leader has said in connection with Mr. Holmes' qualifications. I should like to ask the majority leader this question: As he reviews Mr. Holmes' participation in these two tanker deals, does he think these financial transactions were all open and aboveboard, without being subject to criticism, or does he disapprove of some of these transactions?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that I do not know much about the material which the Senator has asked me about, but I will call to the Senate's attention the statements contained in the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination of Julius C. Holmes. If I may take 2 or 3 minutes, I should like to answer the Senator. The material is on page 98, under the title "Grand Jury Action and Indictment":

> Senator SYMINGTON. In your statement you say there were two grand juries that investigated these tanker deals, and the grand jury you went before was not the one that indicted you. What was the reason for the two grand juries?
>
> Mr. HOLMES. When I returned from London, Senator, and discovered what the situation was, that I was involved in this, I voluntarily waived immunity and asked to appear before a grand jury because I had not been called by the Hoey committee. They had not considered my part in this sufficiently important to send for me.

Senator SYMINGTON. The Hoey committee did not call you?

Mr. HOLMES. They did not call me. The counsel of the committee asked me on one occasion for an affidavit which I furnished by mail from London.

I asked to appear before a grand jury so that I could put in my part of the story, and——

Senator SYMINGTON. Did you request that voluntarily?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes, sir; and I did appear before this grand jury, but they did not do anything; but it was before another grand jury that——

Senator SYMINGTON. Wait a minute now. You said you appeared before a grand jury.

Mr. HOLMES. A grand jury.

Senator SYMINGTON. What did that grand jury do?

Mr. HOLMES. Nothing.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why didn't it do anything?

Mr. HOLMES. I am not certain, Senator, why the grand jury did not act, but it did not act.

Senator SYMINGTON. Now, later there was another grand jury?

Mr. HOLMES. Earlier. No; the grand jury which handed down the indictment had met earlier.

Senator SYMINGTON. Yes. Did they ask to see you?

Mr. HOLMES. They did not.

Senator SYMINGTON. Did you know that you were going to be indicted in any way?

Mr. HOLMES. Oh, no; not until I came back, and it was a sealed indictment.

Senator SYMINGTON. It was a sealed indictment?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes.

Senator SYMINGTON. So you immediately asked for a chance to appear; is that correct?

Mr. HOLMES. That is correct.

Senator SYMINGTON. And this case was then dismissed by the Government; was it not?

Mr. HOLMES. Eventually it was dismissed by the Government.

Senator SYMINGTON. Why was it dismissed by the Government after all this committee said? Why did the Government dismiss it?

Mr. HOLMES. As I recited in my testimony, I never moved for a dismissal. My attorneys never asked for any legal or technical defense whatever.

Senator SYMINGTON. Actually you did the reverse; you asked for a chance to have a hearing, and you were denied that chance.

Mr. HOLMES. I then asked for a trial, asked for a severance so we could get an earlier trial.

Senator SYMINGTON. Then the State Department took you back and gave you these tricky jobs, everything, for some reason, except your name before the Senate. Now you are up here for confirmation. They put you in Tangiers when we had that crisis, and Hong Kong, and Morocco. And during the war you worked on General Eisenhower's staff. These grand juries you talk about, Did the State Department know about them?

STATE DEPARTMENT LEGAL ADVISER'S REVIEW OF ACTION

Mr. Holmes. Oh, yes. The State Department knew about it. And after the indictment was dismissed on motion of the Government, and I went back to active duty in the State Department, the Legal Adviser went into the whole thing.

Senator SYMINGTON. The Legal Adviser of the State Department?

Mr. HOLMES. Of the State Department.

Senator SYMINGTON. Did he look at the record of the grand jury?

Mr. HOLMES. He got the record of the grand jury.

Senator SYMINGTON. What was his name?

Mr. HOLMES. Herman Phleger.

Senator SYMINGTON. From where?

Mr. HOLMES. California.

Senator SYMINGTON. And he went over the record?

Mr. HOLMES. Oh, indeed. He reviewed the entire record, and he got the transcript of my testimony before this grand jury.

Senator SYMINGTON. Now, he was general counsel in the Eisenhower administration, is that correct?

Mr. HOLMES. No. He was called Legal Adviser to the Secretary of State.

Senator SYMINGTON. Legal Adviser to the Secretary of State?

Mr. HOLMES. That is right, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Did he take any position in this matter?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes, he did. He certified to the Secretary of State that he had reviewed the record and that there was nothing in it that would impair me for a Presidential appointment.

Senator SYMINGTON. He reviewed the record—will you repeat that, please?

Mr. HOLMES. He reviewed the record and gave his opinion to the Secretary of State that there was nothing in my part of these proceedings which in any way impaired me for Presidential appointment.

Senator SYMINGTON. No further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yielded for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The question has not been answered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, this is no laughing matter to me. If this man's life is to be destroyed, let it be destroyed on the basis of the facts. Let us consider those facts today. The Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Delaware can talk on their own time; I will yield only for a question in the future.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Missouri protests too much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield so the Senator from Delaware can ask further questions of me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Delaware ask another question of the Senator from Montana. I would point out to the Senator from Delaware, however, that this is a very complicated matter, as he knows. I want it all clear a leg of lamb is better than nothing. Nothing is better than heaven. But that does not mean a leg of lamb is better than heaven.

I have devoted many days to getting the truth about what this public servant has done for the defenses of the United States and the diplomatic service of the United States. I shall be glad to try to answer any questions the Senator from Delaware asks. However, I would say respectfully to the Senator I had hoped to be able to complete my statement, this time I yield so the Senator from Delaware may ask a question of the majority leader.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The only reason I wanted to ask the Senator from Montana a question was that I did not think the Senator from Montana had answered my question as yet. However, out of respect for the Senator from Missouri, I shall not ask it now. I asked a very simple question, and I do not know why the Senator from Missouri got so excited. I certainly did not ask an exciting question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would prefer it if the Senator from Missouri yielded so the Senator from Delaware could ask any question of me.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the majority leader's feeling that way, but I think it is better to let the Senator from Missouri proceed since he feels as he does. I know the majority leader would be willing to cooperate. I asked the majority leader a very simple question. All that I asked for was his opinion as to the propriety of Mr. Holmes' participation in these two tanker deals. Nevertheless, if the Senator from Missouri feels that——

Mr. SYMINGTON. The reason my voice is a bit high is that it is very difficult to talk over the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. [Laughter.] If the Senator from Delaware would like to ask a further question of the Senator from Montana, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. Again, I ask the Senator from Montana the same question. The question is, After reviewing the record, what is the majority leader's opinion as to the propriety of Mr. Holmes' part in these two tanker transactions?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I say to the Senator from Delaware, for whom I have great respect and admiration, that I read the colloquy in an attempt to give an answer to the question raised, because, as I understand the situation, Mr. Holmes, of all the people involved, was the only one who voluntarily requested to be heard. This indicated, in my opinion, that he felt he was acting aboveboard and within legal limitations and was willing to appear before a grand jury even though the Government had, as I recall, quashed the indictment entirely.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further on that point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to clear up that point. I will say to the Senator from Montana that this same thing bothered me. But I checked into it with the Justice Department and found that the circumstances were quite different than outlined by Mr. Holmes. I have a memorandum which was prepared by Mr. Phleger of the State Department in connection with Mr. Holmes' appeal for an opportunity to go before the grand jury. I should like to read the statement as contained in Mr. Phleger's memorandum:

> He [Mr. Warren Olney] also stated that, following the indictment, Mr. Holmes testified before another grand jury in order that the Attorney General could consider his sworn statement and on the basis of it determine whether to seek a dismissal of the indictment; after Mr. Holmes' testimony, the Justice Department did not so determine.

According to the memorandum Mr. Holmes came back to this country and

found out about his indictment, and he then asked for an opportunity to appear before a grand jury to present his case under sworn testimony in an attempt to convince the Department of Justice that his indictment should be dismissed.

Based upon this memorandum, which was submitted to the State Department by its own council in conjunction with this matter, after hearing his sworn testimony "the Justice Department did not so determine."

Thus we find that the Department of Justice after hearing Mr. Holmes' sworn testimony before this second grand jury decided not to drop the indictment which was then pending.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, with respect to these indictments I should like to present for the consideration of my colleagues in the Senate the fact that there were 90 indictments of individuals and corporations packaged together in 13 cases. All but two were dismissed at the suggestion of the Government. One was dismissed by the judge. The other, which was brought to trial against a Philadelphia corporation, resulted in the defendant being found not guilty.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the principal offender was dismissed from prosecution on the legal grounds that he was called to testify before a grand jury and the fact that he testified automatically made him immune from prosecution?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the question which is asked by the Senator from Ohio has nothing to do with the Honorable Julius Holmes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator permit me——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator answer this question——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, before I answer the question of the Senator from Ohio I should like to read into the RECORD the statement of the counsel for Mr. Holmes, at a time the counsel of the gentleman to whom perhaps the Senator from Ohio is referring said, "I am happy to accept this position of the Government."

Counsel for Mr. Holmes stated:

> I would just like to add this word. Mr. Holmes, who is on leave of absence from the State Department, is a Government official, lifetime career man in the State Department. Regarding himself innocent of the charges in this indictment, he has always been ready to try this case. In fact, when the other defendants moved to dismiss the indictments he did not join in those motions. The only motion he has ever made was for a prompt trial of the case.

Mr. President, under those circumstances I trust the Senate will realize how hard this great public servant has attempted to have an opportunity to clear his name.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator has not answered my question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that Mr. Casey, the principal person involved, was dismissed from prosecution because he claimed that under the law he was automatically exempted when he was called to testify before the grand jury?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio speaks of a Mr. Casey. I will be honest with the Senator from Ohio. I do not know if the statement he makes is correct or incorrect.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do know, however, that the question before the Senate of the United States this afternoon has nothing whatever to do with Mr. Casey and has everything to do with Mr. Julius Holmes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I will tie the two facts together.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to continue, but if the Senator wishes to ask another question I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the Federal Government took the position that if Mr. Casey was to be dismissed from prosecution then the Federal Government ought not to prosecute Mr. Klein and Mr. Holmes? Was it not on that basis that the indictments against Mr. Holmes and Mr. Klein were dismissed?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not all of the indictments were dismissed. Two were brought to trial. One was dismissed by the judge. In the other instance the case was lost.

I say to the Senator that what I have read shows Mr. Julius Holmes attempted to clear his name to the best of his ability. Not only did he attempt to do it, but also it is important for the Senate to realize that he failed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I respectfully submit——

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to continue with my statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has not answered my question.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Mr. Holmes has held a series of highly responsible and sensitive posts under the last five Secretaries of State, and in various parts of the world.

During the war he added extraordinarily distinguished military service to his record.

Throughout his entire career, Mr. Holmes had demonstrated to all of us who have noted his work, his skill and capacity in representing the United States in its dealings with other countries.

The questions which have been raised are based upon certain business transactions during the short period Mr. Holmes was in private life, from 1946 to 1948, and the part he had in the purchase of Government surplus tankers.

These transactions are not claimed to involve any breach of law or ethics as a Government official or any conflict of interest as an officeholder.

Mr. Holmes at the time was out of office and a private citizen.

I bring this up because remarks on the floor of the Senate on Thursday, April 27, may have conveyed the erroneous impression that these transactions had some relationship to Mr. Holmes' official duties.

There has been reference to "shady deals involving government officials," and "putting a fast buck above the national interest."

These statements are unfair.

There can be no justifiable claim of conflict of interest here.

The target of this attack, the nature of which is now clear, is the character and integrity of Mr. Holmes.

Mr. President, I have full confidence in Mr. Holmes' character and integrity.

I base this upon my knowledge of the man, upon the candor with which he fully disclosed his part in these transactions, and the manner in which he responded in testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee during a searching examination of over 7 hours.

As the Senate knows, the committee favorably reported the nomination by a vote of 12 to 4.

Mr. President, I base my position also upon the confidence which has been placed in him over a long period of years by Presidents and Secretaries of State of both parties, under whom he served, and to whom his record was intimately known.

And I also base my confidence upon careful study of the transactions in 1947 and 1948, which are the sole grounds for the attack which has been renewed here today.

The facts concerning these transactions are set forth in great detail in the record of the Foreign Relations Committee.

These facts are taken largely from a Senate committee report of 1952. Nothing new has been added in the recent hearing before the Foreign Relations Committee, or in this debate.

It would serve no purpose to elaborate again the details of these transactions. But in an effort to restore perspective to the matter, I present for the attention of my colleagues the following conclusions I have come to after study of the record and analysis of Mr. Holmes' testimony.

First, Mr. Holmes and his associates made a substantial profit in these transactions. This group, which included other men of unquestioned integrity and standing—among them the former Secretary of State Stettinius and the late Admiral Halsey—acquired Government surplus tankers at a statutory price, and in accordance with the procedures of the Maritime Commission.

It was the earnest desire of the Government to move these surplus tankers, and that of course required substantial financing.

This group provided for the most part through loans by the Metropolitan Life backed by charter arrangements with the Standard of New Jersey.

Second, the acquisition of the tankers and the financial arrangements made by this group were legal and in line with

Maritime Commission policies and procedures at the time, and recognized as such, not only by counsel for the individuals concerned, but also by Government counsel.

Third, it was the subsequent transfers of these vessels which was the basis of the criticism of the Hoey committee report. The Department of Justice tested the legality of these later transfers by criminal proceedings.

Indictments were brought against 90 individual and corporate defendants. In all cases, the indictments against the individuals were dismissed without trial. In only two cases did the Government bring corporate defendants to trial. Of these, it dismissed one and lost the other.

Fourth, the record does not show any attempt to withhold any facts or any secret dealing; on the other hand, there appears to have been an effort by Mr. Holmes in his part in the transaction to make full disclosure to the Maritime Commission, and to the other parties involved.

The fact that the Senate committee later criticized the Maritime Commission for several of its policies during this period should not obscure the situation as it existed at the time.

In remarks on the floor of the Senate on April 27, reference was made to the chartering of one of the tankers to Soviet Russia for oil transport from Rumania to ports in Communist China and North Korea.

I am at a loss to understand why this statement was injected into the debate on Mr. Holmes' qualifications. The fact which should be clear to every Senator is that these charters were made by the transferee of the tankers, over which Mr. Holmes and his associates had absolutely no control. This charter might have been made by any company, American or foreign, which had acquired surplus tankers. For charters for this purpose were not at that time—late 1949 and early 1950—opposed by the State Department as the correspondence of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson shows.

I may add that I was involved to some extent in that "rhubarb" between the Department of State and the Department of Defense at that time. It is my opinion—and I believe it is the opinion of 99 percent of all Americans—that the Department of State, not the Department of Defense, should dominate anything that has to do with our foreign policy or our relations with foreign governments.

Whether this policy was right or wrong, Mr. Holmes had absolutely no connection with these charters.

I submit that they have not the slightest bearing on the question before the Senate.

I now comment on several other statements made recently on the floor.

A "fast buck" was mentioned and also the amount of syndicate profits.

The profits made by the group were substantial, but this was not because of any illegalities or irregularities.

So far as I know it is still legal in America to make a profit. I add that the $10,000 Mr. Holmes put into this transaction may not seem to some Senators to be much, but it was a very large percentage of Mr. Holmes' assets.

The reason for these profits is clear. It was that the tanker market took a sharp upward turn, and therefore, instead of having to wait for the end of a 5-, 10,- or 15-year charter for profit on this investment, these investors were able to take a good profit in less than 3 years.

It has also been stated as a fact that the tankers were all sold to companies which were foreign owned or foreign-controlled.

This was a legal question. As to one of the two transactions of this group, the Department of Justice brought proceedings based on the claim of foreign control. These resulted in the wholesale dismissal I have referred to.

As to the other, the question of ownership was specifically covered at the time by the opinion of the Assistant General Counsel of the Maritime Commission, with which the Department of Justice never took issue.

Finally this Senate committee report has been quoted generally, particularly portions containing critical or derogatory language with the implication that these comments were directed at Mr. Holmes and his activities. The fact is that Mr. Holmes was never before the Hoey committee, nor was he ever called to testify. I believe this was because his connection with the transactions was not considered sufficiently close or important to justify his appearance in the course of the examination of these transactions.

So in summary we now have before us a most important nomination. In this time of tension and crisis the President of the United States and the Secretary of State deserve the support of the most able officers they can find. It is probably true that Mr. Julius Holmes is the most experienced member of our Foreign Service.

In passing, I observe that I was in the Senate years ago when a bitter, extended and, in my opinion, unfair attack was made on the Foreign Service of the United States. Perhaps there was some justification in one or two cases, but the damage that was done to the position of the United States as a result of those attacks has never been fully repaired. I say that as one who has consistently traveled abroad.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I have listened with great interest to this debate, and have attempted to review the record in an effort to make up my mind how to vote on the nomination. My friend from Missouri is far more familiar with the case than I. I would therefore like to ask him a few questions.

First, I ask the Senator from Missouri whether it is not true that starting in the year 1925, the nominee became a member of the Foreign Service, and served in that position until 1937, in various posts, including Marseilles, Smyrna, Tirana, Sofia, and in the Department itself; then became Assistant Chief of International Conferences; whereupon he resigned from the State Department in good standing after all those years, with no question that his services had been honorable and able.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am sure the Senator is correct. I believe the distinguished majority leader said that Mr. Holmes had served for 30 years. My impression is that he served for some 35 years. I might add, for the edification of Senators, that one of the great sagas of military courage and ability, with favorable results, was the premature landing in North Africa of Gen. Mark Clark. Julius Holmes, then a major who had volunteered, was on that assignment. He later became a brigadier general in the service of his country. He later was a member of the staff of General Eisenhower, and was a part of that epochal experience in connection with the submarine landing.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for further enlightening me. There was a period between 1937 and 1944 when he was not in Government service. My earlier question referred to his first experience with the Department. After he left the Government, I understand the nominee held some very important positions. I note that for 3 years he was vice president of the New York World's Fair. He was also president of General Mills of Brazil. He was president of Transcontinental Western Air, Inc. In 1946 he was president of TACA Airways, which made the effort—though it ended in failure—to establish a successful service in Central America. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. It is also true, is it not, that Mr. Holmes went back into the Foreign Service after the events for which he is now being criticized took place?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding, with reference to the controversy which is taking place in the Senate, that the nominee did make a substantial amount of money in a relatively short period of time, entirely within the law. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not only entirely within the law so far as he was concerned; but, as a former businessman who has been in business transactions, I am convinced that what he did was not only legal—which, after all, the record proves—but also entirely ethical and proper.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true also that although he was indicted for participation in the transaction to which reference has been made, he was never brought to trial, despite his every effort to clear his name?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not also true that although many other persons were indicted in connection with this transaction, no one was convicted?

Mr. SYMINGTON. To the best of my knowledge, none of the 90 individuals who had sold tankers in the years that have been discussed were ever convicted.

Mr. CLARK. Is it true also that counsel for the State Department, hav-

ing reviewed the record, as he said, carefully, found nothing in the record which would impair the nomination of the nominee or the confirmation after Presidential appointment?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is true. As we all know, Herman Phleger is one of the finest Americans and one of the ablest men, who have been in Government service in many years.,

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield. First I thank the very able Senator from Pennsylvania, who also would see justice done, for his thoughtful questions and observations.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to associate myself with the questions asked by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. In that regard, am I correct in assuming that not only has Mr. Holmes, whose nomination is before the Senate for confirmation, been investigated on entering the Foreign Service, but, also, his life has been studied at least twice since then in connection with his appointment to sensitive posts, as Ambassador. In the last administration during the tenure of Secretary of State Dulles, he was nominated after all the detailed checking and work connected with it that was always done. His nomination was then approved by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and his name was sent to the floor, although later it was withdrawn because of illness. Again, now in the Kennedy administration, he has gone through this process under the magnifying glass of careful scrutiny, with all the facts brought again before the Committee on Foreign Relations. All the facts having been laid on the table with reference to these business deals which had been highly publicized—they were certainly not secret—and after a full investigation, with everyone asking any question he wanted to ask, the committee voted by an overwhelming majority to bring his name to the floor with a recommendation for confirmation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is entirely correct. Many Presidents and many Secretaries of State before and after the transaction we are discussing, and in which he was involved when he was a private citizen, have utilized the talents of this great public servant. He has been given posts in the Foreign Service which are among the most important posts in that service from the standpoint of the security and future of the United States. Now the question is, Are these services to be recognized, or is Mr. Holmes to be allowed to continue these able services only as, say, a chief consul, but not as an Ambassador?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I heard no word of condemnation of the assignment of Mr. Holmes to the very sensitive and critical spot in Hong Kong when he went there as consul general. Now, when it is proposed to send him as an Ambassador to the Middle East, it seems strange that voices should be raised against his services, after he served in the highly sensitive post at Hong Kong, where we have the only open window through which to look behind the Bamboo Curtain. In my personal experience, I have been briefed by dozens of ambassadors of high standing and many consuls. I have seen the way in which his office in Hong Kong was conducted by him, it being the best administrative job I have ever seen in my lifetime. The high quality personnel he had with him were extremely competent in language and background, and deep basic historical knowledge of communism and what was transpiring within China. They had developed a massive system of knowledge and information vital to Americans who are interested in what is going on. Such information was flowing freely to the United States because of this man's great competence and the wonderful organizational job that was done there. So I find it difficult indeed, with all the explanations, all the evidence, all the testimony, and clearance by all the authorities of the State Department, to understand why its competent man should be denied confirmation by the Senate because of his involvement in the ship matter which later was cleared by the courts, as the distinguished Senator has said. I hope the nomination will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Oklahoma. We all respect him for his fine concept of fairness and justice. Once again he has put his hand on the basic problem. Here is a man who had an extraordinary record of heroism for his country in the military and who has served loyally as a member of General Eisenhower's staff in the war. He served equally loyally in important posts with President Eisenhower after the war, a man only yesterday a distinguished senior Senator, a great southern Senator, said that when he was in Hong Kong last year Julius Holmes stood out like a giant.

I do not wish unduly to take the time of the Senate on this subject. The record of this public servant is clear to most of us. I yield to no man in my conviction that officers whose names are before the Senate for appointment to posts of trust, must be judged not only by their professional qualifications, but also by their personal attributes and, above all, their character and integrity.

This man is adjudged by his colleagues and superiors to have had these attributes throughout a long period of distinguished service. I am convinced that his part in the tanker transactions during his brief business career did not depart from the standards he has maintained in the public service.

In addition, no one would deny that since the investigation of these transactions and the attack upon Mr. Holmes, he has behaved with the propriety expected of a gentleman of the highest caliber and integrity, and he has continued his service to the country.

I cannot bring myself to believe that the minutiae of these tanker transactions, which have again been dredged up, as they were before the Senate and its committees 10 years ago, should cause the Senate to deny confirmation of the nomination, which the Committee on Foreign Relations now recommends.

I wish to vote my confidence in the judgment of the President of the United States, his Secretary of State, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that a large majority of Senators will do the same.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A short while ago, we had a discussion of the circumstances under which the indictment against Mr. Holmes was dismissed in the court. I have before me a copy of the statement made in the criminal proceeding. The statement reads as follows:

On May 18, 1954, the four corporate defendants entered pleas of guilty before Judge Laws. Following imposition of sentence the court dismissed the indictment as to eight individuals upon the Government's motion. Three individuals remained to be tried, namely, Joseph E. Casey, E. Stanley Klein, and Julius C. Holmes.

The trial of the case was set for October 11, 1954. Subsequent to this action and on September 9, 1954, Judge Youngdahl granted a motion to dismiss this indictment against the defendant Joseph E. Casey, on the ground that his testimony before the grand jury in another case gave him statutory immunity from prosecution.

Since we had recommended a direct appeal to the Supreme Court, we moved for a postponement of the trial pending the decision of that Court.

The motion for postponement was made before Judge Letts, and we indicated we did not deem it advisable to try the case without the presence of the defendant Casey.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Who is "we"? Who signed the statement?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is a statement by the representative of the Department of Justice.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Who was the individual who made the statement?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. Krouse. I continue to read his statement made to the court:

It was stated to Judge Letts and with the agreement of counsel for the defendants that if the decision of Judge Youngdahl was reversed, all the defendants would be tried at one time, thus avoiding the necessity of two trials. Judge Letts was also advised that in the event of an affirmative answer of Judge Youngdahl's ruling, the case against the defendants Klein and Holmes would be dismissed.

Judge Letts granted the Government's motion to postpone the trial to June 4, 1954. However, after a full appraisal of Judge Youngdahl's decision by the Solicitor General, it has been determined not to prosecute an appeal.

So the Government now considers itself bound to honor the commitment made before Judge Letts to the defendants Holmes and Klein to dismiss as to them in the event Judge Youngdahl's decision as to Casey was affirmed.

My question is: Is it not a fact that the prosecution against Holmes was dismissed because Casey was immunized from prosecution on the theory that he had testified before the grand jury against his will?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have previously taken the position that we are not discussing the qualifications of Mr. Casey. The statement which the

Senator from Ohio has read is a statement I have seen and read many times. The point I wish to make, and tried to make a few minutes ago, however, is that the position of Mr. Casey's counsel was obvious. I shall read the position of counsel for Mr. Klein. Counsel for Mr. Klein said:

I am happy to accept this position of the Government on behalf of the defendant Klein, Your Honor.

But this is what counsel for Mr. Holmes, the man who spent a year or two in private life, and then went back to the service of his country—and came back in effort to clear his name—said in reply to the position of Mr. Krouse and the Department of Justice:

Mr. GILLESPIE. On behalf of the defendant Holmes I would just like to add this word. Mr. Holmes, who is on leave of absence from the State Department, is a Government official, lifetime career man in the State Department. Regarding himself innocent of the charges in this indictment, he has always been ready to try this case. In fact, when the other defendants moved to dismiss the indictments he did not join in those motions. The only motion he has ever made was for a prompt trial of the case.

Mr. President, I am confident that the Members of this body do not wish to convict a man on the basis of guilt by association.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6441) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 1723) to amend the joint resolution providing for observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6441) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi provided I do not lose the floor. I understand he wishes to have action taken on a conference report and that its consideration will take but a few minutes.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

As in legislative session, by unanimous consent the following proceedings occurred:

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of executive business.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in reply to the point raised by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Casey was given immunity. Mr. Holmes moved to sever. The Department of Justice said it would not try all three defendants because to do so would be unfair. Mr. Holmes sought a trial for himself.

In a document which appears on page 100 of the hearings, the Government states its position. I might add, quite aside from the commitment, that the Government considered it both impractical and unfair to proceed against Holmes and Klein when Casey was the principal actor in those transactions and had obtained immunity.

Note again that Mr. Holmes did everything he could to clear his name.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now getting down to the transaction about which I have complained, is it not a fact that it was a transaction which involved the sale of tankers having a value of more than $6 million?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Which transaction is the Senator from Ohio talking about—the five tankers or the three tankers?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Let us understand which one the Senator is referring to, for there were two different deals. Which one does the Senator from Ohio wish to talk about?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am talking about the sale by the United Tanker Corp.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The sale of how many tankers?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Three.

Mr. SYMINGTON. All right; then let us talk about the three-tanker deal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the amount of money involved in the sale of those three tankers?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Ohio has asked that question; and I know he wants me to give him the truth and the answer in detail, so he will understand the transaction in detail.

These men——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish the Senator from Missouri would answer my question.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am going to answer it, but I am going to answer it in my own time and in my own way. The Senator from Ohio can obtain the floor and can say anything he wishes to say. But I am privileged to give answers to his question as I see it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Well, I shall be a little more considerate of the Senator from Missouri than he has been of me.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am not going to be caught in a question if I think that in answering the question out of context, I present a thought and give the Senate a wrong impression.

These men established a corporation. They put money into the corporation. Mr. Holmes put in a large percentage of his total assets. After that was done, in accordance with the law, and under the formula of the Maritime Commission, and also recognizing that they had to pay the base price that was specified per tanker, of the some 4,700 surplus ships which were to be sold, including 390 tankers, they applied for 20 of those 390 tankers. They were allowed only five, at first; and, later, three. When they were allowed the five tankers, they chartered them to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey; and based on that charter, they went to a reputable concern, the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., and said, "We have followed the instructions of the Government, and we now have this charter from the Standard Oil Co.; and therefore we ask to borrow money from you." I believe they asked to borrow over $9 million.

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. said:

We will do this.

One of the provisos of that deal was that they could enter into no new transaction until they had paid out that loan.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Not at this time, Mr. President; I wish to answer the question asked by the Senator from Ohio.

Later on, the Maritime Commission gave them 3 more ships—which made a total of 8, of the 20 for which they had applied. But in that case they could not continue with the same corporation, because the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. said:

> No; until you pay out this transaction, you can have no further transaction in this corporation.

Therefore, they had no money and they had no place to go.

So they went to some people who knew a lot about the shipping business. Let us remember that at that time, and also today, the Nationalist Chinese were not only our allies but also our friends; and they went to other people, Americans who knew a lot about ships—much more than they did—and organized a corporation: The control of it was in the hands of Americans, in accordance with the law.

But not satisfied with their opinion, they then asked the Maritime Commission; and the Maritime Commission lawyer gave them an opinion that it was in accordance with the law. As a result they borrowed the money—several million dollars. It was known by the Government and by everyone else that it was money from the Nationalist Chinese; and that is the way they obtained the additional three tankers, which were allotted to them by the Maritime Commission. The 390 tankers were sold—all of them—in effect, in the same general way this transaction was handled by these men. There may be a deviation here or a deviation there, but the general idea was the same.

This subject of surplus is one about which I know something, because I came into the Government as Chairman of the Surplus Property Board, and later was Administrator of the Surplus Property Corporation. If anyone thinks it is not difficult to sell surplus goods properly after a war, he should try it.

Nevertheless, in this case, by law, the Government said, "You shall pay a minimum amount"—I believe the price was about $1,500,000-plus—"and, in addition, you can sell only under this formula."

In every one of these matters the law was observed. There has never been a conviction against anyone. The question in connection with Mr. Holmes we are talking about is whether he did anything unethical or improper. He did nothing as a Government servant; there is no question of conflict of interest.

The question is: When Mr. Holmes was a private citizen for a couple of years, did he do anything unethical or improper?

Mr. President, I have been a Member of the Senate for a long time, and I have known many of the gentlemen who serve with me now in the Senate many years before I began to serve here. I think I know something about the concept of integrity, honor, and justice that should be expected by the American people from their public servants. I do not like to see a man destroyed unless the facts so justify it.

I have studied this case hour after hour. My colleagues know me well enough to know that I would not stand here and say anything if I did not believe it. I say to you today that I believe the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, world conditions being what they are, are entirely justified in making this recommendation to the Senate, not only because of this man's ability but also because he has done nothing unethical or improper.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me to ask a specific question, it is this: In the statement of sale by the company of which Mr. Holmes and Mr. Klein and Mr. Casey were the original principal stockholders, it is set forth that National has outstanding 1,000 shares of capital stock "registered in the names of the stockholders listed on schedule A hereto." Schedule A shows Mr. Casey, 300 shares; Julius C. Holmes, 300 shares; E. Stanley Klein, 400 shares; and it further states that National has no assets except the sum of $1,000 paid on its capital stock, and that National has no liabilities.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. My question is, Where did Mr. Holmes put in a large sum of money, to make the big profit which has been described? Where is the evidence of it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Very well, Mr. President; the Senator from Ohio has asked that question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There were a thousand shares, at $1 a share; and in one deal they made $450,000.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call for the regular order. The Senator from Ohio is not asking a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in my opinion, the Senator from Ohio is giving further evidence—and I say this with great respect—of his lack of knowledge of the matter we are discussing, which involves the future of a man's life.

The first transaction was as follows: A group of men put in more than $100,000; and Mr. Holmes himself put in more than $10,000, which to the average public servant is a great deal of money.

From that transaction, as a result of the charter with Standard Oil and the loan from the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., they made a good profit—which to the best of my knowledge is still legal in this country. They might have lost their money if the price of tankers fell below the floor price which the law specified had to be obtained.

Later, when three additional tankers were offered, they could not participate in the transaction, because of the stipulation of the lender to them of the money for the previous five tankers, namely, Metropolitan Life. Therefore, it was necessary for them to obtain new capital.

The stockholders who received this money were almost identical. One exception was the University of Chicago. The reason why the University of Chicago was in the first negotiations as a stockholder was that at one time it was felt that the University of Chicago might finance the transaction. Later, when that proved to be not the case, the University of Chicago voluntarily suggested that it not be considered in the distribution of the stock for the 3 remaining tankers of the 8 that were allowed against the application for 20.

A great point has been made of this. As a former businessman I fail to understand this complaint. I have been the principal negotiator and have signed a paper with the understanding my partners would receive their share of the stock on the basis of a "prenuptial" agreement. Other times I have been a party when other persons have signed, and I relied on their integrity.

Read the list. Many times people rely on the fact certain stockholders are taking the stock in escrow for them.

The truth is that as soon as they got this stock—it is all a part of the Tax Court record; not just my opinion—they distributed said stock in accordance with the agreement.

Many times in discussion there has been an implication that something was wrong when Mr. Casey, Mr. Klein, and Mr. Holmes were the stockholders. It was clearly understood that when they received the stock they would do what any other honorable men would do—distribute it. This is a matter of record in the Tax Court. The list of the stockholders to whom they distributed it was made a part of the record by the Foreign Relations Committee, before the committee, by a large majority, approved the nomination. The list appears on page 38 of the hearings. They are the people who owned this stock. I fail to see anything wrong or improper about something which is actually often standard American business practice.

Mr. MORTON rose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I had hoped the temperature would chill a bit, so I could proceed, but I see there is little possibility of achieving that at present, and since this is a weekend when it is necessary for me to be in Louisville, Ky., and I must leave the Chamber, I wish to make this statement. I have been asked by some of my colleagues about certain facts relating to the nomination of Julius C. Holmes.

I hope I will be present to vote on the nomination. If I am, I shall vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Holmes. Questions have been asked of me by my colleagues, and I desire to set forth the facts as I recall them, because it happens that I have participated in the matter.

The nomination of Julius Holmes was sent to the Senate for confirmation to the same post that is now before the Senate, namely, to be Ambassador to Iran. We got into the same problem of the tankers, and other problems. As

Assistant Secretary of State on Congressional Relations, I had my hands full with the Trade Agreements Act, and the effort to keep the then 96 Members of this body, whom I considered to be temperamental individuals, happy. I went to the Secretary of State and said:

It is my judgment, based on the legislative program, and the complexities of having Congress controlled by one party and the Presidency controlled by the other party, that the President should withdraw the nomination. I think this is not the time and place to present the nomination, in view of the conditions.

The Secretary said:

I do not like to do it.

He talked with the President. The President said he would not withdraw the nomination. Subsequently he said:

I will withdraw it only at the request of Julius Holmes.

I had a meeting with Julius Holmes, along with Loy Henderson and Bob Murphy, who were the two senior diplomats at that time, both serving as Deputy Under Secretaries of State. We called in Mr. Holmes and talked with him. He said:

I will think it over.

At that time the chief medical officer of the State Department said that Holmes could not go to Iran. He had some kind of ulcer condition. He could not leave the country, or, at least, go to a non-European country for a year. It was at Mr. Holmes' request that the President withdrew his nomination.

Subsequently, the nominee held various positions in the State Department. In March 1956, I resigned from the State Department, so I am personally not aware of what went on after that.

In the event action on the nomination goes over until tomorrow, I shall not be able to be present. Questions have been asked me regarding the nominee. I have tried to give a statement of the facts as I recall them. I am sure it is accurate. I have checked it with others involved in the matter. I thought the facts should be stated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. He and I have had our differences, especially, in more recent months, in the political field. But we all know the Senator from Kentucky is a man of high character and integrity.

Mr. President, there has been a rumor the previous Holmes nomination was withdrawn by President Eisenhower. It is typical of the Senator from Kentucky to have the kindness and understanding to stand up and state the truth with respect to this particular point. So long as he has made the statement, in character, that President Eisenhower last year said that if the name of Mr. Julius Holmes were sent to the White House for a suitable appointment, "I shall send it to the Senate," I may add that that was told to Mr. Holmes by the Department of State.

Now I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I desire the floor, when the Senator shall have concluded.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio for a question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A moment ago I asked how much money was involved in the operation. I wish to read from paragraph 2 of the offer made by National Tanker:

United—

Which was the buyer—

agrees to lend to National the entire cost of purchase by National of each of the three tankers, estimated to be approximately $2 million per tanker. The cost of purchase is understood to include all expenses which necessarily will be incurred in the acquisition of each tanker and also in the conditioning, outfitting, and furnishing of each tanker, but shall not include any commissions or attorneys' fees payable by National.

The point I wish to make is that there was a transaction involving $6 million, which National Tanker financed by an investment of $1,000. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator may well be correct. Anybody who understands the operations of a holding company in American knows that the holding company is one of the bases of corporate activity, and knows also that one man can control a corporation, into which he puts $1. He can sell preferred stock worth a half billion dollars, but retain control of the corporation. He has all the voting rights. If that is illegal, we could check countless arrangements which would be illegal.

These men received their profits from the sale of the tankers. Mr. Holmes received, from the profit of $450,000 before taxes, some $45,000 because of his 10 percent interest. On this he paid full income, therefore received a profit of some $25,000.

I do not see anything wrong with that, Mr. President. I have never known that a man is allowed to make a percentage of profit based only on the amount he puts into the arrangement. If a man buys a farm for $100 and strikes oil, as many of my more fortunate colleagues have, I know of no reason why the $100 cannot grow to $10 million under the American system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I point out that the company had no assets other than the $1,000. The company had no ships. Before the ships were bought, they were sold. By the sale of the ships a huge profit was made, when the three men ostensibly put in $1,000.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, that statement is not correct. The men did not sell the ships; they had an option to sell the ships.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to discuss this nomination, but first I point out to my very good friend the Senator from Missouri, that I am not trying to damage the character of any man. I never shall. If, however, when we discuss some of the financial transactions of Mr. Holmes those transactions reflect upon his character, that is because he himself engaged in those transactions and not because of something I have said. No one pushed Mr. Holmes into these tanker deals.

The Senator from Missouri made his position very clear in the committee. He conscientiously stated that he saw nothing wrong with what Mr. Holmes did. In fact, I believe I paraphrase the Senator correctly when I say he said that if he were given a similar opportunity he would take advantage of it and do the same thing himself. I respect his frankness in that regard. I happen to differ with him. I happen to differ with him because I do not feel that these tanker transactions were either ethical or legal. That is not only my personal opinion. It was also the unanimous opinion of the Senate committee which a few years ago investigated the tanker deals.

It should be noted that the Senate committee investigating these tanker deals was a Democratic controlled committee—controlled by members of the same political party as is the Senator from Missouri.

I should like to quote the conclusions made by the Hoey committee, but first I shall list the very distinguished membership of this committee. The late Senator Clyde R. Hoey was chairman. Other members were Senator John L. McClellan, chairman of the full committee; Senators Hubert H. Humphrey, now the assistant majority leader of the Senate; Thomas R. Underwood; Joseph R. McCarthy; Karl E. Mundt; and Richard M. Nixon.

The subcommittee report in turn was approved by the full committee, including such a distinguished Member of the Senate as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who spoke a few minutes ago.

I emphasize that this report was a unanimous report of a committee of the U.S. Senate. I now read briefly what was said about the tanker transaction by this committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator read the names again of the Senators who put out the report condemning the transaction?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The transaction was condemned by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations under the chairmanship of the late Clyde R. Hoey. The report was signed by John L. McClellan, as well as by Hubert H. Humphrey, Thomas R. Underwood, Joseph R. McCarthy, Karl E. Mundt, and Richard M. Nixon.

The subcommittee report was later approved by the full committee. The full committee included the members of the subcommittee and, in addition, these other Members of the Senate: Herbert R. O'Conor, Mike Monroney, Blair Moody, Margaret Chase Smith, Andrew F. Schoeppel, and Henry C. Dworshak.

Every one of these Senators approved the committee report. I should like to read what they said about the tanker transaction:

This entire investigation has demonstrated to the subcommittee how various

groups of shrewd and calculating businessmen and attorneys, through an intricate series of corporate and financial transactions, were able to realize substantial profits by taking advantage of the confusion and mismanagement which marked the administration of the surplus ship disposal program by the old Maritime Commission.

In concluding the report the subcommittee made this recommendation:

The subcommittee is of the opinion that there appears to be sufficient evidence of violations of the civil provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act in these tanker transactions to warrant prompt action by the Department of Justice.

I wish to repeat that quote. Remember, this is what the subcommittee said about Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein. This is not what I am saying, but it is what a Democratic-controlled subcommittee said:

In addition the concealment and misrepresentation of pertinent facts—

I repeat:

the concealment and misrepresentation of pertinent facts by various officers and representatives of the firms involved in this inquiry in their dealings with the Maritime Commission lead the subcommittee to believe that various criminal statutes may have been violated by these individuals. In view of the long delay which has already occurred in making final determinations in these cases, it is the recommendation of the subcommittee that the Department of Justice take prompt and vigorous action to bring these cases to a logical conclusion.

I emphasize this was a unanimous report of the subcommittee. Every member of the subcommittee agreed to the report and agreed that these men had violated the laws.

I now comment upon the claim by the Senator from Missouri that these tanker transactions with the Maritime Commission were proper and legal. I wish to quote from page 14 of the committee report. Mr. Holmes, supported by the Senator from Missouri, has claimed that the resale of these tankers by the Casey-Holmes group to foreign owned and controlled companies was made with the approval of the Maritime Commission. That is not true. Again I read from the report signed by such a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate as our assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]:

There is no credible evidence that Mr. Morris or any other representative of the United Tanker Corp. group made a complete disclosure to the Commission concerning the arrangements between the Casey group and the United Tanker group which were entered into as early as January 1948.

This refers to the three-tanker deal.

Continuing on page 7 of the committee report they said:

It was determined that no such approval was either requested or given.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Missouri vigorously declared that full disclosure was made about a contract under which the sale was to go to persons he calls Americans, but whom I call Chinese nationals. What did the committee say on that subject in the report from which the Senator read a moment ago?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have just read the statement of the committee. It emphatically denies that Mr. Holmes or his associates either applied for or were granted approval.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Will the Senator tell us from what page he is going to read?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall read from page 13 of the Hoey committee report.

Mr. CLARK. Is that in the record of the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Part, but not all of it.

Mr. Holmes tried to claim that he had gone before the Maritime Commission and obtained approval of the sale of these tankers.

Before refuting that argument, I wish to read the section of the law which makes it mandatory that there be prior approval. That is in section 9 of the law.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is, before the sale could be made to a foreign company or to any foreign person it was necessary to get prior approval of the Maritime Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Great effort has been made in an attempt to prove there was not anything irregular about Mr. Holmes' tanker deals. The Government had many surplus tankers which it was trying to get rid of, and the tankers were sold at statutory sales prices fixed by the Congress. That point is correct. There never has been any argument about the fact that the tankers were purchased at the regular statutory price.

However, there was also a law—I repeat, a law which specifically prevented the sale by the Maritime Commission to foreign-owned or foreign-controlled corporations.

In the period immediately following World War II that provision of the Merchant Ship Sales Act was temporarily waived. Later, as the number of surplus ships was reduced, the Maritime Commission reinstated the old provision under which the tankers could be sold only to American-controlled and American-owned companies.

This reinstated regulation restricting the sale of these tankers by the Maritime Commission to American citizens only, was in effect prior to the purchase of a single tanker by Mr. Holmes and his two associates.

No one in any of the committees disputes the statement that prior to the date the Casey-Holmes-Klein group bought the eight tankers, the law was that the Maritime Commission would not sell such tankers to foreign-owned or foreign-controlled companies. Therefore, after this new regulation went into effect the only manner in which a foreign-owned company, such as the United Tankers Corp., could get tankers was by maneuvering around the law and using the names of Americans operating under a dummy corporation.

Section 9 of the act, which is applicable after an American company has bought such tankers, provides as follows:

It shall be unlawful, without the approval of the Maritime Commission, to sell, mortgage, lease, charter, deliver, or in any manner transfer * * * to any person not a citizen of the United States * * * any vessel or any interest therein owned in whole or in part by a citizen of the United States and documented under the laws of the United States.

That provision was to prohibit specifically the possibility that such persons could get ships and sell them to foreign owners without the knowledge or approval of the Government.

I should like to read briefly the legislative background in connection with this legal requirement. At the time the amendment was adopted by Congress, Representative Saunders made the following statement in explanation.

First I quote the amendatory provisions of section 2 as adopted by the Congress and then I shall quote Congressman Saunder's explanation.

The amendment reads as follows:

The controlling interest in a corporation shall not be deemed to be owned by citizens of the United States (a) if the title to a majority of the stock thereof is not vested in such citizens free from any trust or fiduciary obligation in favor of any person not a citizen of the United States; or (b) if the majority of the voting power in such corporation is not vested in citizens of the United States; or (c) if through any contract or understanding it is so arranged that the majority of the voting power may be exercised, directly or indirectly, in behalf of any person who is not a citizen of the United States; or (d) if by any other means whatsoever, control of the corporation is conferred upon or permitted to be exercised by any person who is not a citizen of the United States.

Congressman Saunders then explained this amendment as follows:

By the wording of the amendment, such a situation is intended to be brought to pass that by no possible legal legerdemain can any arrangement be made by which the controlling interest may be in the hands of some other person or persons than citizens of the United States, and at the same time the corporation continue to be a citizen of the United States.

As the colloquy continued, Representative Saunders was asked another question about how the plan would work if a majority of a company's directors were American citizens but the financial control rested with foreign nationals and what the result would be.

This is the answer of Representative Saunders to that question:

If such a scheme * * * was sought to be worked out, it would not only be in fraud of the law but would be inoperative, since it would be an arrangement by a contract or understanding for the majority of the voting power to be exercised in behalf of someone not a citizen of the United States. Under the terms of the amendment, should such a scheme be perfected, the controlling interest of the corporation would be held not to be owned by citizens of the United States.

Congress very clearly intended that when those ships were sold to Americans they were not to be transferred—and the very words used were "without the approval of the Maritime Commission."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to finish this point first.

Mr. Holmes made much of the argument before our committee that he had sought and obtained the approval of the Maritime Commission for the sale of these tankers. I read the statement found on page 13 of the Hoey committee report wherein Admiral Smith, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, emphatically denied that claim:

> Vice Adm. William M. Smith, who was then Chairman of the Maritime Commission, testified that he recalls a conversation with Julius C. Holmes, who discussed with him the question of a bareboat charter of the three tankers to another American company. He denied, however, that Holmes made any mention of an irrevocable option which had been given to the United Tanker Corp. to purchase the stock of National, and testified that if Holmes mentioned the possibility of a stock sale, it was only in passing. Commissioners Mellen, Carson, and McKeough also testified, and all categorically denied that any representative of American Overseas Tanker Corp. or the National Tanker Corp. had discussed the agreement with them or that they had either formally or informally approved such an agreement.

Those statements by each of the Maritime administrators categorically denying that there had ever been any permission sought or approved was taken before the Hoey committee under oath.

No record has ever been produced to show that Mr. Holmes had ever obtained such permission.

I quote again from page 14 of the Hoey committee report, wherein they, too, repudiated Mr. Holmes' claim:

> There is no credible evidence that Mr. Morris—

Mr. Morris was the attorney for this group—

> or any other representative of the United Tanker Corp. group made a complete disclosure to the Commission concerning the arrangements between the Casey group and the United Tanker group which were entered into as early as January 1948.

There is the answer to the question. This refutes the claim of the Senator from Missouri that Mr. Holmes had obtained approval of any of these sales of tankers to these foreign owners by his group.

It also establishes that there was a legal requirement that they should have obtained such approval prior to the sale.

They did not get prior approval.

Under the law it was the clear intent of Congress that they did have to get such approval before they sold the ships to foreign owners.

Later, Mr. Holmes, in a further attempt to justify this sale, said that after all, they did sell them to an American-owned and American-controlled company. He supported this claim by saying that there were only four stockholders—three of whom were American citizens and only one was a foreign citizen. Therefore, Mr. Holmes reasoned that the company was 75 percent American-owned.

But what about the invested capital of each stockholder? The purchasing company, the United Tanker Corp., was capitalized for $2,500,006. The fact is that the one foreign citizen—a Chinese citizen—owned $2½ million worth of the stock of the company. Each of the three American citizens had exactly $2 apiece invested in the company. In addition, the three American citizens had given an irrevocable option to the foreign stockholder to buy even these small, limited stockholdings for $10,000 for each.

In other words, the members of the foreign group were merely using the American citizens as fronts. This was the company to which Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein sold the three tankers, and it should be noted that they arranged the sale of these tankers to this foreign group for a net profit of $150,000 per tanker before they had even been bought from the Government.

This was not a profit from a speculation adventure as pictured by the Senator from Missouri. This was a sure profit or payment for the use of their names in helping this group of foreigners to maneuver around the law to get American tankers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is my understanding correct that the company which bought the three tankers from the Casey-Holmes-Klein group had in its capital structure $2,506,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; it was $2,500,006.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Delaware for the correction. The claim was made that the corporation was an American corporation because it consisted of three American stockholders and only one foreign stockholder.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct, and such is the basis of their claim.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There were three American stockholders and one foreign stockholder—and I wish the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would listen to this statement—but the capital structure was built up with $6 in American money and $2,500,000 in Chinese money. Is that statement correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. In addition, the foreign group financed all of this transaction. The Senator from Missouri suggested that there was nothing unusual about such a transaction. The Senator from Missouri attempts to justify this by saying that the preferred stock does not vote and suggests that perhaps the Chinese held preferred stock.

That argument does not apply here. There was equal voting power of this stock. I quote again from the Hoey report:

> The certificate of incorporation and the by-laws of the company permitted one vote for each share of stock held, either of A or B type.

In other words, it did not make any difference, because the $2½ million in stock had full voting rights. The argument that these three Americans with $6 invested capital controlled the voting power is—well, the word assinine is hardly adequate. How can anyone with a straight face say that three men with only $6 invested in a $2,500,006 company can control the voting power.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does it not amount to this, namely, that the proponents of the transaction want reasonably minded people to believe that a corporation made up of $6 of American money and $2,500,000 of Chinese money is an American corporation, because three of its stockholders are Americans and one of them is Chinese?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The interesting part of it is that they never even came in with this flimsy excuse until after they were caught not getting prior approval of the Maritime Commission. They chartered the company, the National Tanker Corp., with 1,000 shares at $1 a share. That was done on the 23d day of January. On the day before, on 22d of January, the Maritime Commission had approved an amendment submitted by Mr. Casey, Mr. Holmes, and Mr. Klein, requesting permission to take title for these latter three tankers in the name of this newly created company.

Going back to the beginning, we find that they had originally incorporated the American Overseas Tanker Corp. in August 1947. They then filed an application for up to 20 tankers. First, they were assigned five tankers; later three additional tankers were allocated to them, which would bring the number to eight tankers.

On the 22d of January they filed an amendment with the Maritime Commission asking for permission to take title to the three latter tankers, which had been assigned to the American Overseas Tanker Corp., under the newly created company, the National Tanker Corp.

At that time Mr. Casey, Mr. Holmes, and Mr. Klein gave a statement to the Maritime Commission to the effect that the National Tanker Corp. had the identical stockholders as had the American Overseas Tanker Corp. They then listed themselves—Holmes, Casey, and Klein—as owning all of the stock. These three men gave a signed statement certifying that all of the stock of the American Overseas Tanker Corp. and that all of the stock of the National Tanker Corp. was owned by these three men. If they now claim that there were other stockholders then they signed a false statement.

They signed that statement certifying that they owned 100 percent of the stock. They used the words "100 percent." They said they owned all the stock of the National Tanker Corp. and listed that stock as being owned 300 shares by Mr. Casey, 300 shares by Mr. Holmes, and 400 shares by Mr. Klein. On that basis they asked for the assignment of these three tankers on January 22, 1948. It was approved on that day. Yet now the Senator from Missouri brings

in a lot of other names as being part owners when these transactions took place. His claim cannot be supported.

The record shows that even prior to January 22, the date on which they bought these tankers from the Government, they had entered into an agreement with foreign citizens under which they would turn over these tankers that they were getting from the Maritime Commission at a clear profit of $150,000 each, with the further understanding that the foreign group would furnish all the capital necessary for the transaction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that before they entered into a binding contract with the Federal Government they had an understanding with the United Tanker Corp., made up of three American stockholders and one Chinese stockholder, with its capital contributed, $6 of American money and $2,500,000 of Chinese money? In other words, before they ever bought the American ships, they had already sold them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; that is correct. On the 15th of January, which was 7 days prior to the time they applied for the ships in the name of the National Tanker Corp., they had a meeting with representatives of this foreign group. They were then told of the offer of a clear profit of $150,000 for each tanker they could get from the Government and turn over to this foreign group.

On the 19th of January, which was 3 days before they bought the ships, this offer was condensed into a formal memorandum outlining the understandings of the contemplated sale. This agreement was formalized in a written memorandum. This was 3 days before they bought the ships.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Was the memorandum signed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On the 19th? What difference does that make? Does the Senator from Missouri deny there was such a memorandum? The Hoey committee said there was a memorandum dated the 19th of January; was prepared and agreed upon. The Senator from Missouri is not going to contradict that, is he? Mr. Holmes confirmed it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Did not Mr. Holmes say he did not know about the memorandum?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; he did not say that. How could he not know about it? He said he was not present when it was drafted, but he signed the final agreement on the 24th of January. Is the Senator trying to tell us that Mr. Holmes did not know about this?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. At page 39 of the hearings I read:

> In this application United Tanker stated (par. A.5): "Substantially all of the capital of the applicant will be contributed by China Trading & Industrial Development Corp., a Chinese corporation engaged in the export-import business as set forth in answer to item 6. It is the intention of the applicant, if this application is granted, to charter the tankers obtained to the National Resources Commission of the Chinese Government"—this, of course, is the Nationalist Government—"or one of its controlled corporations to carry oil from Persian Gulf ports to Shanghai and other Chinese ports, and arrangements have been made with the National Resources Commission to this effect."

Then on page 40—I am merely covering some of the points made by the Senator from Delaware—there is a letter addressed to Messrs. Post, Morris, and Lovejoy, of New York, which reads:

> DEAR SIRS: In reply to your telegram of February 2, 1948, advising that a question has been raised as to the citizenship of your client, United Tanker Corp., and requesting our opinion in the matter, I wish to advise that, in my opinion, the United Tanker Corp. is a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended.
>
> I have examined the application to purchase as filed by the United Tanker Corp., the certificate of incorporation and the by-laws thereof, and find from the evidence submitted therein that the United Tanker Corp. is a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. SYMINGTON. May I finish reading this part?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The quotations being read by the Senator from Missouri are not even in reference to these memorandums. I am familiar with the statement he is referring to. It deals with an entirely different matter. Besides, Mr. Goertner's statement from which he is quoting is dated February 2, 2 weeks after the tankers had been sold.

The agreement about which I am talking had been entered into on the 19th of January, before they were bought. On the 24th of January Mr. Holmes himself joined in signing the final agreement; the agreement was also signed by Mr. Klein and Mr. Casey, as well as by a Mr. Mackey, as their attorney. This was on the 24th day of January 1948.

In that same agreement Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein also certified that they were holders of all of the stock in the newly formed National Tanker Corp.

As a part of this June 24 agreement they gave to United Tanker Corp., this Chinese group, an irrevocable option to buy at $450 per share all of the 1,000 shares of stock which they had purchased the day before at $1 a share.

In turn, as a part of this same signed agreement, the United Tanker Corp.—the Chinese-owned company—agreed to place in escrow $450,000 to guarantee that they would exercise this option. The purpose of the option was to let it run long enough to allow the stockholders to claim the payment as capital gains.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall not read the whole statement, if the Senator does not wish me to do so. He has given the wrong date. It was February 3. The Senator and I have a difference of opinion as to whether the transaction was a sale or an option, from the standpoint of the ethics of the transaction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to place in the RECORD the document from which I was reading when the Senator pursued his statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection to the Senator from Missouri putting this or any other document in the RECORD, but he should include it in his own speech. I do not want him to filibuster the continuity of my speech with quotations dealing with an entirely different subject than that which we are discussing.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Delaware means that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Missouri can put it in the RECORD under his own name. I have no objection to his placing in the RECORD what he pleases, but I do not want him to insert extraneous material in the middle of my remarks.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to have one point made clear about the option to purchase. It is my understanding that the first corporation, before it ever bought the tankers, had entered into what was called an agreement of purchase with the second corporation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. After the tankers were purchased, they were not immediately transferred, because there was a period of 9 months of waiting, as I understand, before the second corporation exercised the option to purchase. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. As I understand, the main reason for the delay of about 9 months in the transaction was so that the profit to be derived from the transaction, in the hands of the first corporation, would be treated as a long term capital gain for tax purposes. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was the plan.

Mr. MILLER. Was there a controversy with the Federal Government, which was taken to the Tax Court, and which was referred to a few moments ago, involving the question as to whether that was a capital gain or ordinary income?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There was. The Treasury Department took the same position as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and I are taking today; namely, that the memorandum of January 24, 1948, was a bona fide sale.

This meant that the date that United Tanker Corp. agreed to put up $450,000 in escrow represented the date of the sale. This date being January 24 or less than 24 hours after the company had incorporated meant that the profit was not subject to capital gains but was taxable at regular income tax rates. The Tax Court sustained this position.

I recognize the fact that normally if a person has stock at $1 a share, or whatever the cost may be, and he gives a man an option to buy it at $450 a share, that does not of itself mean anything. The proposed buyer may not exercise the option. But this transaction has a peculiar twist to it. Not only was there an option on the part of Mr. Holmes and his two associates to sell their stock at $450 a share, but on the same day, as a part of the same agreement, the buyer, the United Tanker Corp.—a Chinese group—also agreed to put up $450,000 to be held in escrow as a guarantee that they would exercise this option. In other words, there was no risk at all. The sale was made and the money advanced for full payment.

After the option was exercised and the payment made, about 9 or 10 months later, Mr. Holmes and his associates reported it as a capital gain on their tax returns. The Treasury Department took the position that it was not a capital gain. It held that there was never any element of risk and that it was a bona fide sale on the day the ships were bought and the money placed in escrow. They ruled that to all intents and purposes it was a straight payment for services and therefore the profit was taxable at the regular income rates. The Tax Court upheld this position.

Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] made much of the fact that the regular income tax was paid on the profits of this transaction. It paid only after the Treasury Department overruled them, carried the case to the Tax Court, and won the decision in the Tax Court.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the full agreement of January 24, 1948, which is signed by Julius Holmes and his two associates. This is in the form of two letters, both dated January 24, 1948. Not only does the agreement carry with it an irrevocable option to sell all the stock at $450 a share, but it also contains the fact that the purchasers will put up $450,000 in escrow as a guarantee that they will exercise the option.

In addition, the agreement contains the clause that the purchasing group will put up 100 percent of the money which was necessary to pay the original purchase price of the ships, plus all attorney fees and incidental expenses. It clearly states that all that Casey, Holmes, and their partners will have to put up is the original $1,000 with no other risk attached.

The second letter certifies that as of that date Mr. Holmes owned 300 shares of National Tanker stock; Mr. Joseph Casey, 300 shares; and Mr. E. Stanley Klein held 400 shares.

I also ask to have printed at this point the article appearing in the July 7, 1959, issue of the Washington Evening Star entitled "U.S. Wins Tanker Sale Tax Suit for $105,446."

There being no objection, the agreements and the newspaper article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL TANKER CORP.,
New York, N.Y., January 24, 1948.

UNITED TANKER CORP.,
Dover, Del.

DEAR SIRS: We wish to confirm the agreement between us as follows:

1. National Tanker Corp. (hereinafter called "National") represents as follows:

(a) National was organized on January 22, 1948, under the laws of the State of Delaware, and proposes to take title from the U.S. Maritime Commission to three T–2 tankers, namely, the SS *Meacham*, the SS *Kettleman Hills*, and the SS *Antelope Hills* (hereinafter called the "tankers"). National has outstanding 1,000 shares of capital stock registered in the names of the stockholders listed on schedule A hereto. National has no assets except the sum of $1,000 paid in on its capital stock, and National has no liabilities. National proposes to execute or cause to be executed contracts with the Maritime Commission for the purchase of the tankers on or about January 26, 1948.

(b) Representatives of National have discussed informally with three members of the Maritime Commission the subject matter of this agreement and have been advised informally that the Maritime Commission has no objections to the carrying out of this agreement.

2. United agrees to lend to National the entire cost of purchase by National of each of the three tankers, estimated to be approximately $2 million per tanker. The cost of purchase is understood to include all expenses which necessarily will be incurred in the acquisition of each tanker, and also in the conditioning, outfitting and furnishing of each tanker, but shall not include any commissions or attorneys' fees payable by National or any expenses of any kind incurred by National prior to the date hereof. Of the amount to be advanced to National by United, $202,650 will be advanced with respect to each tanker simultaneously with the execution of the contract of sale of such tanker and the remainder of the cost of purchase of each tanker will be advanced as required by the Maritime Commission.

3. All advances made by United to National shall be evidenced by notes or bonds of National payable to United or its assigns and to be secured by a preferred ship mortgage or mortgages on the tanker with respect to which the advance or advances are made, and by an assignment of all moneys to become due under the bareboat charter referred to below, except for such moneys as must be retained by National to pay necessary corporate taxes and expenses. At the option of United the preferred ship mortgage or mortgages shall be either directly to United or to a U.S. bank or trust company or other U.S. citizen. The notes or bonds will bear such interest rate or rates and have such maturities (not exceeding 10 years) and such other terms and conditions as United may approve. The preferred ship mortgage or mortgages shall be delivered to United by National promptly upon the registration of each tanker in the name of National and shall be in form and substance satisfactory to United.

4. National agrees to charter each tanker for a term of 10 years under a bareboat charter to United in usual form at the rate of $1.20 per deadweight ton per month, plus such additional amount as may be necessary to enable National to complete the payment of corporate taxes and interest and expenses. To secure the performance of the obligations and commitments by United under this bareboat charter contract, such contract shall contain the provision that United agrees to deposit, simultaneously with the delivery of tankers to National, an amount equivalent to $150,000 multiplied by the number of tankers acquired by National pursuant to the provisions of this agreement. Such deposit as provided for herein shall be made with and to an escrow agent satisfactory to United, or at United's election, shall be in the form of an irrevocable letter of credit, or a bank guarantee, in favor of the escrow agent in such aforesaid amount. Such security is to be maintained by United for a period of 1 year from the date of delivery of the tankers, or until such earlier time as National shall give its consent in writing to the termination of such security.

5. At the request of United, National agrees to arrange to have each tanker moved to a shipyard or elsewhere for drydocking and/or inspection, and representatives of United shall be entitled to inspect such tanker and either to accept or reject each such tanker at the time of such inspection. If any tanker is rejected by United, National shall return to United any advances theretofore made by United with respect to such tanker, less all amounts, if any, owing by National to the Commission for such drydocking and inspection and the movement of such vessel to drydock or for inspection and returning it to its previous location, and all other necessary expenses in connection therewith.

6. National agrees that, without the written consent of United, which shall not be unreasonably withheld, it will not during the period from the date of this agreement until the expiration of the period of the bareboat charter or charters and until all moneys due United under this agreement have been paid:

(a) Engage in any business whatsoever other than that of chartering the tankers to United.

(b) Voluntarily create, incur, assume, or suffer to exist any mortgage, pledge, or other encumbrances upon any of its properties or assets whether now owned or hereafter acquired, except mortgages, pledges, or encumbrances to United.

(c) Voluntarily create, incur, or assume any liability for borrowed money except to United.

(d) Assume, guarantee, endorse, or otherwise become liable in connection with the obligation of any person, firm, or corporation.

(e) Enter into any merger or consolidation, or sell, assign, transfer, mortgage, pledge, or hypothecate its interest in this contract.

(f) Use any of the funds of National for purpose of paying compensation, or enter into contracts of any kind.

(g) Issue or sell additional shares of stock, declare any dividends, or make any payments of any kind.

7. National agrees that during the period from the date of this agreement until the expiration of the period of the bareboat charter or charters and until all moneys due United under this agreement have been paid, the assistant treasurer of National shall be a person satisfactory to United, and all checks drawn by National shall bear the countersignature of such assistant treasurer.

8. Simultaneously with the delivery to National by the Maritime Commission of the bill of sale for each tanker, and the bareboat charter of such tanker to United by National, United agrees to pay to a payee to be designated by National the sum of $8,333.33 as reimbursement for expenses incurred with respect to each such tanker.

9. United represents that it is a corporation duly organized under the laws of the

State of Delaware, that its president and directors are U.S. citizens, that the holders of the majority of its stock are U.S. citizens, and that this representation will continue to be true and correct during the life of this contract. United further represents that the statements made as to its citizenship and as to its officers, directors, and stockholders in the application dated December 10, 1947, filed by United with the Maritime Commission, a copy of which has been furnished to National, are true and correct as of the date hereof.

10. This contract may be terminated by United at its option by written notice delivered to National at its office at 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, if within 20 days from the date hereof a contract of purchase for the tankers duly executed by the Maritime Commission has not been received. Upon such termination National will, at the request of United, promptly notify the Maritime Commission of its rejection of the tankers and thereafter diligently take all necessary steps to obtain the refund of all sums theretofore advanced by United, and repay such sums, upon receipt thereof, to United, less expenses, if any, incurred with the consent of United.

11. Neither United nor National shall be under any liability to the other for failure to carry out the provisions of this agreement, if performance of this agreement is rendered impossible by action of the Maritime Commission or the U.S. Government or by events beyond the control of either party; provided, however, that if performance of this contract is rendered impossible National will, at the request of United, promptly take all necessary steps to enforce any rights which it may have for damages or compensation or recovery of amounts paid to the Maritime Commission or expenses incurred, and, upon receipt thereof, repay United for any advances theretofore made to National by United, less expenses, if any, incurred with the consent of United.

12. It is understood that under the present requirements of the U.S. Maritime Commission any tankers chartered to United under the provisions of this agreement must be operated in the coastwise or nearby foreign trade until May 1, 1948, as per the attached letter marked "Exhibit B."

Will you kindly confirm that the foregoing correctly sets forth the agreement between us by signing and returning the enclosed copy of this letter.

Very truly yours,

E. STANLEY KLEIN,
Vice President.

Confirmed January 24, 1948.

HAROLD C. LENFEST,
President.

SCHEDULE A

Stockholders of National Tanker Corp.:	*Number of shares*
Joseph E. Casey	300
Julius C. Holmes	300
E. Stanley Klein	400

NATIONAL TANKER CORP.,
New York, N.Y., January 24, 1948.

UNITED TANKER CORP.,
Dover, Del.

DEAR SIRS: We wish to confirm the agreement between us as follows:

1. The undersigned represent that they are the holders of all of the outstanding shares of stock of National Tanker Corp. (hereinafter called "National"), and that said stockholders ratify and approve the attached agreement between National and United Tanker Corp. (hereinafter called "United"), which is attached hereto as exhibit A. The undersigned stockholders further represent that their representatives have discussed informally with members of the Maritime Commission the subject matter of this agreement and have been advised informally that the Maritime Commission has no objections to the carrying out of the agreement.

2. In consideration of your execution of the attached agreement between United and National, simultaneously with the execution of this agreement, the undersigned hereby grant to United an irrevocable option to purchase all of the stock of National at any time after September 15, 1948, but not later than October 15, 1948, for a price equal to $150,000 multiplied by the number of tankers acquired by National pursuant to the provisions of the attached agreement.

3. To facilitate the exercise of such option by you, the undersigned agree to deposit all of the shares of stock of National in escrow in transferable form with an escrow agent satisfactory to you, such deposit to be made immediately upon the execution of this agreement. The escrow agent is hereby irrevocably instructed to deliver said stock to you upon your payment to the escrow agent at any time after September 15, 1948, but not later than October 15, 1948, of the option price by certified check.

Will you kindly confirm that the foregoing correctly sets forth the agreement between us by signing and returning the enclosed copy of this letter?

Very truly yours,

E. STANLEY KLEIN.
JOSEPH E. CASEY.
JULIUS E. HOLMES.
JAMES S. MECKY,
As Attorney in Fact.

Confirmed January 24, 1948.

HAROLD C. LENFEST,
President.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 7, 1959]

UNITED STATES WINS TANKER SALE TAX SUIT FOR $105,446

The U.S. Tax Court has ruled that prominent stockholders in a corporation involved in the sale of three surplus oil tankers to the Chinese Nationalists owe the Government $105,446.47 additional income taxes on the deal.

The individuals had reported and paid a capital gains tax in the $450,000 profit realized from the sale. But the court ruled that the shareholders in a subsidiary company of American Overseas Tanker Corp. would have to pay ordinary income taxes instead.

STETTINIUS' WIDOW

Mrs. Virginia Stettinius Dudley, widow of the former Secretary of State, Edward Stettinius, was assessed more than $22,000 additional taxes.

Fleet Adm. William F. Halsey and his wife will have to pay $5,548 additional taxes, according to the court's decision.

Another shareholder involved is Julius C. Holmes, who was vice president of the New York World's Fair and a former Assistant Secretary of State. He and his wife owe more than $10,000 additional taxes, the court held.

A total of 20 individuals and two estates are involved.

SUBSIDIARY FORMED

The corporation was set up back in 1946 to purchase surplus tankers from the Maritime Commission, which held more than 500 such vessels at the time. The corporation borrowed the money to buy five tankers. But because of the stipulation of a loan it obtained, it could not buy any others. So a subsidiary corporation was set up and it bought three additional tankers for resale to Chiang Kai-shek's government.

It was there that the $450,000 profit was realized, which the Internal Revenue Service claimed was ordinary income and not a capital gains, on which the tax is lower.

The stockholders paid $450 for their stock and reported the difference as long-term capital gains. The IRS, however, contended it was ordinary income and the court has upheld the determination.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Hoey committee condemned this transaction of Mr. Holmes and his associates. They said the transaction was a clear violation of the law.

Mr. President, there are many other very disturbing angles to the transaction. The reason why the Government insisted that these tankers not fall into foreign ownership was that they wanted to be certain that the tankers which it was selling at a reduced price, as compared to the world price, would remain in the possession of the American owners and under the control of the U.S. Government. They wanted to be certain that if any trouble arose the tankers would be at the command of the U.S. Government. That was a wise policy, as the Government was later to learn in connection with one of the three tankers which was being sold by Mr. Holmes and his associates.

Shortly after the United Tanker Corp., which was owned by the Chinese interests with the exception of $6 of the investment, obtained these three tankers from Mr. Holmes and his associates. The Chinese group promptly chartered one of them, the *Kettleman Hills*, to Soviet Russia. This tanker was then used to transport high octane gasoline for the Soviet Government from Rumania to Communist ports in China and North Korea.

Remember, this was one of the tankers which Mr. Holmes and his two associates had turned over to this foreign group under circumstances which the Senate committee described as a "clear violation of the intent of the law."

The use of this tanker to transport Russian oil was strongly protested by the Secretary of Defense. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] dismisses this feature of the deal on the basis that there was at that time a bitter debate between the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State concerning whether this transporting of Russian oil should be stopped. I do not know about what they were debating. The U.S. Government has spent $70 billion to fight communism. We were on the verge of the Korean war. Just why anyone in the Department of State had to sit down and debate whether an American ship should be chartered to Soviet Russia to transport oil to Communist China is something I do not understand.

Secretary of Defense Johnson and Secretary of Defense George Marshall, both bitterly denounced to the Secretary of State this trafficking with the Communists.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am still a little unclear about how much profit was involved. As I understood the distinguished Senator from Missouri to say, about $25,000 profit was made by the

nominee. But I have also been told that on an investment of $10,000, there was a profit of about $270,000 or $280,000. Would the Senator please clear the record on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There were two transactions involved. On one, a five-tanker deal, Mr. Holmes put up $10,000 and got $280,000 back. These five tankers were sold by the Holmes group in June 1950, on the eve of the Korean war, again to foreign citizens in violation of the clear intent of the law. At that time the tanker price in the world market was higher than in the domestic market. On this transaction Mr. Holmes and his group received $2,800,000 for stock in a company in which they had invested $100,000. Mr. Holmes owned 10 percent of this stock and thereby received $280,000 for his $10,000 investment.

Mr. Holmes referred to himself as a very poor businessman, that he should really not be held responsible for what was taking place. After all he said he really paid very little attention to the company operations. I told him I thought he was too modest. I thought he underestimated his ability. If a man can make a $270,000 profit on a $10,000 investment and then pyramid a $300 investment in another company into $135,000 without paying attention to business, I shudder to think what would happen to the free enterprise system if he were turned loose and gave the business all his attention.

Let us stop kidding; Mr. Holmes was just as responsible for what happened in these transactions as were his two associates, Mr. Casey and Mr. Klein.

I agree with the Hoey committee report—they were all three guilty of violating the clear intent of the law and did so for the sole purpose of making a fast buck.

Just because Mr. Holmes has a few more friends in Washington, does that make him any less responsible for his part in these get-rich-quick tanker deals?

On the second transaction the company, the National Tanker Corp., was capitalized for $1,000 on 1,000 shares and was sold for $450 per share, or $450,000. Mr. Holmes' testimony was that when the United Tanker Corp. exercised the option, he owned only 100 shares and got only $45,000 of the $450,000. If so he got rid of the other 200 shares after January 24, 1948, the date of the sale to the United Tanker Corp. Mr. Holmes said he had got rid of this other 200 shares by transferring it to other people. Whether he received $1 per share or whether he gave it away, I do not know. By his own statement he originally owned 300 shares. At least to accept his own statement he received $45,000 in return for his $100 investment he had left in the company.

Mr. MILLER. In other words, he made a profit of $35,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was about a $45,000 profit on the second transaction, because it was $450 a share, and he said he had 100 shares, for which he had paid $1 a share, and he received $450 a share.

Mr. MILLER. On the $10,000 investment, the profit was $270,000?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. As to whether he made anything on the extra 200 shares, which he either sold or gave away, I do not know.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the three letters written by Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, in which he bitterly protested the leasing of these tankers to Soviet Russia, along with the one letter written by George C. Marshall as Secretary of Defense. These letters are dated October 4, 1949; January 17, 1950; April 24, 1950; and October 5, 1950. I call particular attention to the fact that this last letter was dated 4 months after the outbreak of the Korean war.

Yet, here today we are being asked to confirm as an Ambassador a man who was responsible for some of this Communist traffic.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 4, 1949.

Maj. Gen. PHILIP B. FLEMING,
Chairman, Maritime Commission.

DEAR GENERAL FLEMING: The Department of Defense is concerned that two U.S.-flag vessels, the SS *Kettleman Hills* and the SS *Christopher*, have been chartered to transport gasoline and other petroleum products from Constanzia, Rumania, to Darien, China.

Permitting U.S.-flag vessels to transport high war potential goods to and from Communist-controlled ports presents a definite threat to the national security of the United States. Under existing export control regulations it is doubtful that shipments of petroleum products would be permitted to Communist China from this country. This Department would certainly oppose any such transactions. We have consistently opposed the export of highly strategic items to Communist China as well as to other areas of Soviet control or influence.

Tankers are subject to rigid export control. Therefore it might be inconsistent if the United States while strictly controlling the sale of tankers should permit the uncontrolled chartering of such vessels to Soviet-controlled organizations to transport highly strategic materials.

In view of the above it appears imperative that action be taken immediately to prohibit the chartering of U.S.-flag vessels to haul strategic items which we understood would not export to areas of Soviet control or influence. It is understood that the Maritime Commission is considering the revision of its General Order No. 49 to require the specific approval of the Commission in all cases involving the chartering of American-flag vessels to aliens. If such an amendment will facilitate control of this trade, I strongly endorse such action by the Maritime Commission.

Should you desire the assistance of the Department of Defense in reviewing requests for chartering of American-flag vessels to aliens, I would be pleased to designate representatives of the staff of the Munitions Board to cooperate with the Maritime Commission staff in this regard.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

JANUARY 17, 1950.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: There is enclosed a copy of a letter which I sent to Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Chairman, Maritime Commission, on October 4 relative to trading by U.S.-flag tankers to and from Communist controlled ports. A copy of General Fleming's reply dated November 1 is also enclosed.

The purpose of my letter to General Fleming, as you will note, was to recommend that the Maritime Commission take steps to control the chartering of U.S.-flag tankers for the purpose of transporting highly strategic goods to and from Communist-controlled ports. In his reply, General Fleming stated that he looked to the Department of State for guidance in these matters and thus far the Department has not indicated that trading by U.S.-flag vessels to and from Communist-controlled ports is contrary to the best interests of the United States. General Fleming stated also that he thought that one of the vessels, the SS *Kettleman Hills*, would probably seek other fields of employment in the near future if that had not already been done. The *Kettleman Hills* was at Antwerp on December 15, 1949, and from there it was to proceed to Constanzia, Rumania, to pick up oil, presumably for transmittal to Communist China. It was chartered for this trip by the Soviet Export Co. of Moscow, and the operating agent is Sieling & Jarvis, an American firm with headquarters in New York, N.Y.

This matter has received careful consideration by interested officers within the Department of Defense. It is the conclusion of this Department that the chartering of U.S. vessels to aliens to transport high war potential goods to and from Communist-controlled ports represents a threat to the national security of the United States. Under present controls on exports, the sale of tankers either to the Soviet Union or to Communist China would probably not be allowed. It would therefore seem logical for the Department of State to inform the Maritime Commission that the charter of U.S.-flag tankers to either of these countries is inappropriate.

General Fleming mentions that should control be exercised over U.S.-flag vessels, it would not eliminate the chartering of foreign flag vessels in this trade. This may be true but it does not appear to be a valid reason for lack of action. The United States denies license for the export of strategic items even when other sources are available. Moreover, according to the records of this Department, Norwegian, Italian, and Danish-flag vessels are engaged in this trade in addition to the U.S. vessels. Each of these nations is a Marshall plan recipient and each is a signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty. It is thought that action by the United States would provide a basis for negotiations with those governments whose vessels are involved in this trade to seek comparable action.

In view of the foregoing, it is strongly recommended that the Department of State recommend to the Chairman of the Maritime Commission that he take action to control the chartering of U.S.-flag vessels to transport highly strategic goods to and from Communist-controlled ports.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

APRIL 24, 1950.

The Honorable SECRETARY OF STATE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to my letter of January 17, 1950, relative to the operation of U.S.-flag tankers between Communist-controlled ports, a copy of which is attached.

As mentioned in my letter of January 17, it is the conclusion of this Department that the chartering of U.S.-flag vessels to aliens to transport high war potential goods to and from Communist-controlled ports represents a threat to the national security of the United States. In view of the security danger of permitting U.S.-flag vessels to en-

gage in such trade, I should appreciate information relative to the action that the Department of State contemplates with respect to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

OCTOBER 5, 1950.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On January 17, 1950, my predecessor wrote to you relative to reports that U.S.-flag vessels were hauling highly strategic cargoes to and from Communist-controlled ports, and suggested that you recommend to the Chairman of the Maritime Commission that he take action to control such trading in the interests of the national security of the United States. Further, the letter mentioned that action by the United States would provide a basis for negotiating with those governments whose vessels were involved in this trade.

In a letter dated 18 May 1950, Mr. James E. Webb informed this department that a letter had been sent to the Chairman of the Maritime Commission requesting that no U.S.-flag vessels be chartered without specific approval of the U.S. Government for the carriage of cargoes of any kind to or from most Communist-controlled ports. It is understood that the Maritime Commission encountered legal difficulties in issuing the necessary order to comply with this request, but it now expects to issue it shortly.

Tankers and merchant vessels are under rigid export control. It seems inconsistent, therefore, that the United States and the Western nations permit the chartering to the Soviet Union of tankers and merchant vessels when the strategic value of these vessels is recognized in existing export control administration.

In view of the foregoing, it is recommended that as soon as the Maritime Commission issues its order, representations be made to other governments with a view to obtaining action parallel to that of the United States.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I should like to quote from the letter of October 4, 1949, signed by Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense:

Permitting U.S. flag vessels to transport high war potential goods to and from Communist-controlled ports presents a definite threat to the national security of the United States.

Two vessels are mentioned. One of them, the *Kettleman Hills*, was sold by Mr. Holmes to the United Tanker Corp. for a $150,000 profit.

The fourth letter dated October 5, 1950, and signed by George C. Marshall, the Secretary of Defense, is addressed to the Secretary of State, refers to all the previous correspondence about U.S. flag vessels hauling war potential goods to and from Communist ports, and suggests that that traffic should be stopped.

That was 4 months after the Korean war had broken out. It was not until December 1950 that this traffic was stopped.

In the meantime, this same company, still claiming to be an American company—with its $250,000,006 of capital stock and with a citizen of China owning all of the stock except the $6 which was owned by three Americans—collected about $6,500,000 from the U.S. Government for hauling ECA materials to South Korea and other areas, and collected about $500,000 from Russia for hauling oil to Communist ports. And all that time Mr. Holmes was working for the State Department. He disclaims all responsibility. He said he had no control over what the United Tanker Corp. did with any of the three tankers. Yet the fact remains that the United Tanker Corp. obtained one of the tankers leased to Russia from Mr. Holmes and his two associates under conditions which the Hoey committee said were in clear violation of the intent of the law. I agree that at that late date he could not have stopped it because for $150,000 per tanker they had signed a document turning over all their rights of control of these three tankers. As one of the three men who, by circumventing the law, allowed this tanker to fall into possession of this foreign group, he cannot dodge his responsibility for what happened.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the debate on the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran be conducted for 2 hours at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday next; that the time be equally divided between the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the majority leader; and that at the conclusion of the 2 hours, the yeas and nays be ordered on the nomination.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, because of a previous commitment, it will not be possible for me to be present next Monday. As one who is very much interested in the confirmation of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, I shall not object; but I certainly desire some time this afternoon, and wish to have a definite understanding that I will have time, to make a statement in behalf of Mr. Holmes. Otherwise, I shall have to object to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Kansas that he can have all the time he wants this afternoon to say everything he wishes to say in behalf of Mr. Julius Holmes.

Mr. CARLSON. I have been on the floor all afternoon and have observed that sometimes it is not so easy to get the floor. I simply want to be certain that my rights are protected, because I have observed the way the time for speeches in the debate has been parceled out. With the understanding that I shall have at least 10 or 15 minutes before the time limitation becomes effective, I shall not object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The time will not be limited today. I cross my heart. The Senator from Kansas will get all the time he wants this evening.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, what is the request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That debate on the nomination be limited to 2 hours following the morning hour on Monday, the time to be divided equally between the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on Monday, May 8, 1961, at the conclusion of routine morning business, debate on the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran be proceeded with for two hours; that the time be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing confirmation, and controlled, respectively, by the majority leader and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware; and that at the conclusion of the two hours, the yeas and nays be considered as ordered on the said nomination and the Senate then proceed to vote thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand that all the interruptions, beginning with my yielding to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], will be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, to continue with the particular transaction I was discussing——

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. I wish to commend my distinguished and able colleague for the vigorous, able, and fair manner in which he is presenting his views on the nomination of Mr. Holmes to be United States Ambassador to Iran.

I wish to ask a few questions, in order to help clear up some confusion which exists in my own mind in regard to this matter.

In the first place, I understand that my distinguished colleague is not criticizing in any way the making of a profit in a business transaction, if it is legal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, and I have emphasized that point throughout. The fact that a large profit was made on a small investment is no crime in our country; it is part of our economic system, and when done in a proper manner the men are to be complimented.

The criticism which I am directing against Mr. Holmes and his two associates is that they made the large profit by circumventing the law, or at least the clear intent of the law, in that they sold the tankers to foreign-controlled and foreign-owned companies. This was definitely in violation of the intent of the law.

To show that I am not alone in that opinion, I have cited the unanimous report of the Hoey committee, which investigated this transaction. In that report, that committee strongly condemned both tanker transactions as violations of the clear intent of the law.

That committee in its unanimous report to the Senate referred to Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein as "shrewd and calculating businessmen" who reaped these large profits by the "concealment and misrepresentation of

pertinent facts" in their dealings with the Government.

Mr. BOGGS. I wish to understand clearly the specific offense with which Mr. Holmes and his associates are charged. I understand the offense is the transfer of these tankers to a corporation which was not an American-citizen corporation, without the permission of the Federal Government, through the Maritime Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The law specifically states that purchase of the tankers by an American-citizen corporation—and that is what Mr. Holmes and his group did—is perfectly legal. So there was nothing wrong with their purchasing the tankers, and they paid the statutory sales price.

But after they bought the tankers the law specifically prohibited their transferring or selling them to a foreign-owned or foreign-controlled company without the prior approval of the Government. In addition, that prohibition was included in the agreement under which they purchased the tankers from the Government. Mr. Holmes personally signed both the application and the purchase agreement. He, as an officer and stockholder of the company buying these tankers from the Government, agreed not to sell or transfer the ships without such prior approval. Mr. Holmes' signature is on those documents, so he cannot claim that he did not have knowledge or responsibility for these transactions.

In the case of the one transaction—the three tankers—at the time when Mr. Holmes, along with his two associates, signed the agreement they certified that they owned all the stock. They agreed that they would not sell to foreign-owned or foreign-controlled companies without the prior approval of the Maritime Commission. They willfully violated that agreement. In fact, they had already sold the tankers before they ever received title to them from the Government.

For this flagrant violation of the clear intent of the law the Hoey committee condemned them very strongly.

Mr. BOGGS. That was in regard to the three tankers, was it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. BOGGS. Was there a similar transaction in regard to other tankers?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They had another transaction with regard to five tankers, which were purchased in the name of the American Overseas Tanker Corp. Subsequently, they leased these five tankers to another wholly-owned Panamanian subsidiary, and then this subsidiary re-leased them to a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. According to the Hoey committee this Panamanian subsidiary was set up to enable Mr. Holmes and his partners to escape paying U.S. income taxes. Then, early in 1950 the company was approached by a Greek ship operator, Mr. Niarchos, with a request to buy these five tankers, and the Holmes-Casey group and their associates again without obtaining the prior approval of the Maritime Commission—as required by law sold these 5 tankers to this Greek operator. On this transaction they made a $2,700,000 profit.

Mr. BOGGS. I see.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In that instance the company to whom they sold the tankers—the World Tanker Corp. was its name I believe—was owned by Mr. Niarchos. Mr. Niarchos' company was first certified as being 49 percent owned by the Greek, Mr. Niarchos, and 51 percent by the American citizens. That, if true, would have made the transaction all right.

But the Hoey committee established that there again, misleading information was given. It was established that the Greek, Mr. Niarchos, had an irrevocable option to buy all of the 51 percent of the stock held in the name of the American citizens. In addition, the committee brought out the fact that none of the American citizens had advanced a single dollar to pay for their stock. It was held in their names only, for the purpose of using them as fronts. Obviously this was another plan to circumvent the law.

Mr. BOGGS. That would have disqualified the corporation as an American-citizen corporation, would it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Maritime Commission's representatives testified before the Hoey committee that if Mr. Holmes and his associates had made application, as they were supposed to do, to sell these vessels to the Greek corporation or to Mr. Niarchos, on the basis of the facts established they would have rejected the application to make the sale.

They said they would not have permitted the sale.

Mr. BOGGS. That was in the case of the five tankers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS. Also, in the case of the three tankers, the sale to the United States Tanker Corp. was again in violation of the law?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. In the case of the three tankers it represented an even more flagrant violation of the law.

Mr. BOGGS. Because it was not an American citizen corporation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was not an American citizen corporation, to which they sold the tankers, and again they were sold even before they were bought from the Government. Mr. Holmes argues that it was an American citizen corporation in that there were only four stockholders, three of whom were Americans. A Chinese citizen was the other. But what Mr. Holmes did not say was that the Chinese citizen held $2½ million worth of the stock, while these three Americans each had $2 invested. The implication that by putting up $2 each the three American citizens had control of a company capitalized at $2½ million is perfectly ridiculous.

Mr. BOGGS. If the Senator will yield further, after the Hoey committee report, what, if any, action did the Justice Department take in this regard?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Justice Department had indictments brought against Casey, Holmes and Klein. Their case was approaching trial when the attorneys of Mr. Casey asked for a dismissal of the indictment against him on the ground that he had gained immunity from prosecution as a result of having testified before the grand jury.

I do not understand the legal reasons for such an argument. But Judge Youngdahl sustained the motion and dismissed the indictment against Casey, whereupon the Department of Justice advised the judge that it would appeal that decision. The Department said it would like to try the three men together, because the cases were related and that they considered Mr. Casey a principal in the deal. The Department asked for a postponement of the trial against Mr. Holmes and Mr. Klein until it could obtain a ruling from the Supreme Court as to whether it would uphold the dismissal of the indictment against Mr. Casey.

The Department of Justice entered into an agreement with the court and with defense counsel that, in return for getting an agreement to postpone the trial of Mr. Holmes and Mr. Klein pending the ruling on the dismissal of the indictment against Casey, if it lost the appeal and the dismissal of the Casey indictment were sustained, it would then go into court and ask for a dismissal of the remaining indictments. The Department lost the appeal. As a result, the Justice Department told the Court that they were honoring their previous agreement and asking for a dismissal of the indictments against Mr. Holmes and Mr. Klein.

It was after the agreement had been made to dismiss the indictments that Mr. Holmes began talking about how he would like to be tried.

Why the Department of Justice could not pick up the case at that point and try him then, I do not know; but it said it could not try one defendant without the other two. The Justice Department had entered into an agreement with the court to dismiss all three indictments if it lost the appeal to override the dismissal of the indictment against Mr. Casey, and the Department of Justice said they were honorbound to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point the statement the Department of Justice presented to the court at the time it asked for the dismissal of the two indictments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CRIMINAL NO. 685–53

(*The United States* v. *Stravros Niarchos, et al.*, defendants, Washington, D.C., Thursday, Nov. 18, 1954—Proceedings: Motion to dismiss.)

Mr. KROUSE. If Your Honor please, I have a prepared statement, which is very short, which I should like to read.

May it please the court, I am here concerning Criminal No. 685–53. The indictment in this case originally charged 11 individuals and 4 corporations with conspiracy to violate the provisions of the Shipping Act and substantive violations of that act.

On May 18, 1954, the four corporate defendants entered pleas of guilty before Judge Laws. Following imposition of sentence the court dismissed the indictment as to eight

individuals upon the Government's motion. Three individuals remained to be tried; namely, Joseph E. Casey, E. Stanley Klein, and Julius C. Holmes.

The trial of the case was set for October 11, 1954. Subsequent to this action and on September 9, 1954, Judge Youngdahl granted a motion to dismiss this indictment against the defendant Joseph E. Casey, on the ground that his testimony before the grand jury in another case gave him statutory immunity from prosecution.

Since we had recommended a direct appeal to the Supreme Court, we moved for a postponement of the trial pending the decision of that Court.

The motion for postponement was made before Judge Letts, and we indicated we did not deem it advisable to try the case without the presence of the defendant Casey.

It was stated to Judge Letts and with the agreement of counsel for the defendants that if the decision of Judge Youngdahl was reversed, all the defendants would be tried at one time, thus avoiding the necessity of two trials. Judge Letts was also advised that in the event of an affirmative answer of Judge Youngdahl's ruling, the case against the defendants Klein and Holmes would be dismissed.

Judge Letts granted the Government's motion to postpone the trial to June 4, 1954. However, after a full appraisal of Judge Youngdahl's decision by the Solicitor General, it has been determined not to prosecute an appeal.

So the Government now considers itself bound to honor the commitment made before Judge Letts to the defendants Holmes and Klein to dismiss as to them in the event Judge Youngdahl's decision as to Casey was affirmed.

I might add, quite aside from the commitment the Government considers it both impractical and unfair to proceed against Holmes and Klein when Casey was the principal actor in these transactions and has secured immunity.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, in the instant case, the nomination before the Senate, has the Justice Department taken a position before the committee, or has it made a statement or recommendation in this regard?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; it has not.

Mr. BOGGS. One way or the other?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] called attention to the fact that Mr. Holmes asked for an opportunity to go before a grand jury and explain his part in these transactions and emphasized that the grand jury did not indict him. That does not mean anything. The situation was that Mr. Holmes had already been indicted with his two associates, Mr. Casey and Mr. Klein. That indictment was pending. It was while the indictment was pending, Mr. Holmes asked the Department of Justice for an opportunity to go before a grand jury and under oath to testify as to his participation in these transactions in the hope that he could convince the Department of Justice or the grand jury that his indictment should be dropped. The Department of Justice, after hearing the testimony under oath, did not drop the indictment.

I should like to read from a memorandum prepared by the State Department in this connection. It was prepared by Mr. Phleger of the State Department on February 1, 1955, and was in connection with the consideration of an appointment for Mr. Julius C. Holmes:

Following the indictment, Mr. Holmes testified before another grand jury in order that the Attorney General could consider his sworn statement and on the basis of it determine whether to seek a dismissal of the indictment; after Mr. Holmes' testimony, the Justice Department did not so determine.

So we find that this testimony before the second grand jury was in an effort by Mr. Holmes to convince the Justice Department that the indictment against him should be dropped. He did not convince the Department.

There is another interesting quotation found in a State Department memorandum. This quote deals directly with the question of my colleague as to whether or not the Justice Department's opinion had been requested.

I quote from a memorandum dated February 13, 1961—signed by Mr. Abram Chayes of the State Department, again in reference to Mr. Holmes' eligibility. This quotation——

Mr. BOGGS. Let me interrupt the Senator, in order to get it straight in my mind. Was this statement requested by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, it was not. This was an interdepartment memorandum. It was prepared in the Department to be used in connection with the consideration of the recommendation of Mr. Holmes. I am reading from the memorandum:

Mr. Macomber has informed me that in his estimation, if the Department of Justice had been asked for its views in the last administration, it would have been rather lukewarm toward the appointment, if not worse. Whether this attitude has changed with the advent of the new administration, I do not know.

This memorandum was dated February 16, 1961.

Apparently they were afraid to ask the Department of Justice as to its opinion of Mr. Holmes. I suggested to the committee that we should have had a representative of the Department of Justice before us to get their recommendation. The Attorney General has said much in recent weeks about the need for establishing higher moral standards and the need for geater integrity among the leaders of industry. The President recently sent a message to Congress urging the enactment of laws establishing a higher code of ethics and higher moral standards for Government officials. The President said the private and official conduct of public officials should be above reproach.

This statement of the President cannot be reconciled with the administration's support of Mr. Holmes' confirmation as an Ambassador. The Hoey committee very strongly recommended prosecution of Mr. Holmes and his two associates. It was very critical in describing the tanker transaction as being a clear violation of the law.

I shall place in the RECORD here the statement made by the Senate committee wherein they condemned the sale to the United Tanker Corp. of these three tankers by Mr. Casey, Mr. Holmes, and Mr. Klein.

I quote from the Hoey committee report:

In considering all of the facts in these transactions involving the transfer of three tankers from the Casey group to the United Tanker Corp., the subcommittee finds that a group of Chinese aliens with the cooperation of the Casey group and others, and with the guidance and assistance of the law firm of Lovejoy, Morris, Wasson & Huppuch, were able to obtain improperly the use and control of these three vessels with which these Chinese aliens made substantial profits through various subchartering arrangements. Title to these vessels was transferred to the control of the United Tanker Corp. largely because the various groups involved failed to deal openly, directly, and frankly with the Maritime Commission.

This report refers to the tanker deal of Mr. Holmes and his two associates. I quote further from the report:

In the opinion of the subcommittee, it was never the intent of the law to allow this type of profit-grabbing in the allocation or sale of Government-owned surplus tankers.

Furthermore, representatives of both the National Tanker Corp. and the United Tanker Corp., in their negotiations with the Martime Commission which resulted in United obtaining control of the three tankers, did not disclose the complete facts concerning the transactions to the Commission. * * * They informed the Commission that the officers of United who held title to the majority of the voting stock were U.S. citizens, while in fact the subcommittee found that the American officers of United, though they did hold the majority stock, were nothing more than front for the Chinese aliens, who financed and controlled the policies and operations of United.

In addition, the subcommittee noted that within a week after National agreed to sell its stock to United, Mr. Casey denied any intention of selling the vessels in response to a direct inquiry by the Maritime Commission. This was an outright misstatement of fact, and the subcommittee can conclude only that Casey's action was an intentional effort to deceive the Commission.

What concerned me is that, in response to a direct question which I put to Mr. Holmes, "Did you see anything wrong with this transaction at the time the tankers were bought and sold?" his answer was emphatically "No."

My next question was:

Looking back on this transaction, seeing what happened and viewing it in light of all the circumstances, some of which may have been obscure at the time, do you see anything wrong with it now?

His answer again was "No."

He indicated that if he were given an opportunity, he would do it all over again. To me that disqualifies him so far as confirmation for this position as an Ambassador is concerned.

Mr. Holmes and his two assistants violated the clear intent of the law for the sole purpose of making some easy money. The Senate committee referred to these men as a "group of shrewd and calculating businessmen," who were trying to circumvent the law whereby they could make a fast dollar.

Certainly this is not the moral standard one should expect under the New Frontier. If the Kennedy administration is going to set this as a standard of the qualifications of a public official, it had better stop talking about ethics in either Government or private industry.

I said last night that I could not conceive of the President of the United States, after having access to all these facts, sending the nomination to the Senate. I have since been advised that the President has reviewed the record of these tanker deals and has decided that Mr. Holmes and his associates did nothing wrong. I am amazed and disappointed in that decision, especially in view of the strong committee report otherwise.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. I certainly think he would wish to have the recommendations of the Justice Department under these circumstances.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thought so, too.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have been told here today that the President is aware of all the facts and apparently sees nothing wrong with this group's having violated the clear intent of the law to make a fast buck. I was told that the President had all of these facts brought to his attention and apparently sees nothing wrong with what this man did.

To me it is not a question of whether or not laws were violated. What they did was morally wrong and should not be condoned. Here today we have the President sending to the Senate for confirmation the name of a man whom the Department of Justice only a few years ago tried to put in jail and who was released from prosecution on a technicality. Certainly it cannot be said that this man is above reproach.

The Senator from Missouri objected to a phrase which was used, referring to these tanker deals as "slick" or shady deals. That phrase did not originate with the Senator from Delaware. That phrase originated in an editorial which was published in the Washington Post in Washington, D.C., at the time of the Hoey committee investigation. I should like to read from this editorial. It shows that there were others besides the Senate committee who viewed the transaction in a questionable light.

The editorial was published on Friday, February 22, 1952. I quote from the editorial:

> The involved surplus ship negotiations of Joseph E. Casey and his associates seem to fall somewhere in between what is legal and what is proper. The inquiry by the Senate investigating committee may not show that the Casey group actually violated the law. On the other hand, the procedure whereby great profits were realized on transactions which resulted in American surplus tankers ending up under the control of foreign-financed corporations will strike at least some persons as a slick deal.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I support the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, who was recently appointed by President Kennedy to be Ambassador to Iran.

Mr. Holmes was born and reared in Kansas and has always maintained his residence in our State. He comes from one of the old established families and it has been my privilege to personally know Mr. Holmes and his family for many years.

He has had many years of experience in the foreign service field, beginning in 1925, and is a career service officer.

Mr. Holmes entered Government service as a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, serving as vice consul at Marseilles, and continued in this field with many outstanding appointments until the conclusion of his recent service as consul general and Minister at Hong Kong, with the exception of a few years spent in non-Government service and military service.

From 1937 to 1940 he served as vice president of the New York World's Fair and handled the foreign participation in the World's Fair. In addition to serving as vice president of the New York World's Fair during his non-Government service, he was president of General Mills, Brazil; vice president Transcontinental Western Air, Inc., and president of Taca Airways, S.A.

At the beginning of World War II, Mr. Holmes was a major in the Reserve Corps and was in Brazil at the time of Pearl Harbor. He immediately reported by telegram to the War Department and volunteered for immediate service. On arriving in Washington, he reported for active duty and was assigned as an executive officer in the Combined Chiefs of Staff, which was just then being formed, and this was made up of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff and representatives of the British Chiefs of Staff. Gen. Bedell Smith was the U.S. Secretary and Brigadier General Dykes was the British Secretary and Mr. Holmes was the executive officer and had charge of their operations.

In August 1942 he joined General Eisenhower's headquarters in London.

At this time the decision had been made for the invasion of north Africa and Mr. Holmes became the American member of what was called the liaison section and was charged with the preparation of how to deal with the French authorities after landing in north Africa.

Mr. Holmes joined with Gen. Mark Clark and arrived in north Africa in a submarine and there colloborated with citizens and others in securing intelligence that was badly needed for our invasion forces.

His duties from the beginning in that area were a close liaison with the French authorities, both civil and military. He became Chief of what was then known as the Liaison Section in the Allied Forces Headquarters. It was during this service that General Clark, Mr. Holmes, and others finally induced the Governor General of French West Africa to enter into an agreement which was signed by General Eisenhower, that brought French West Africa and Dakar into the war. This was one of the important developments that hastened the end of the African conflict, as it gave the Allied Forces airfields and coastal landing facilities.

Following the African campaign and early in 1944, Mr. Holmes was transferred to SHAEF in London, where preparations were being made for the Normandy landings. At that time Mr. Holmes was made Assistant Chief of Staff G–5. Incidentally, he was the first Assistant Chief of Staff G–5 ever in the Army. In this position he was responsible for planning the combat phase of the military government of Germany and also for relations with the governments in exile in the planning for them to assume civil control of the various territories as the Germans were driven out. In this position he helped reestablish governments in France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Denmark, and Norway.

For this outstanding military service, he received many decorations and awards.

I regard this military service as a part of his foreign service work and on this basis, with the exception of a few years in non-Government service, he has been in foreign service work from 1925 until the present time.

There will be much discussion in regard to some private transactions and shipping deals which took place during the time Mr. Holmes was not in Government service. I want to stress the word "not," because I think it has an important bearing in this case. Testimony before our committee was to the effect that these transactions did take place during the time he was not in Government service and also based on hearings by congressional committees, these transactions were not illegal.

Mr. Holmes is recognized as one of our outstanding Foreign Service officers and I have yet to hear of anyone who has not or will not state that he has rendered meritorious service in this field.

I sincerely trust that no action will be taken that will prevent our Nation from further use of his training and background in this field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief biographical sketch relating to Mr. Holmes.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULIUS C. HOLMES

Present position: Consul general, at Hong Kong and at Macau, also Minister.

Considered for: Ambassador to Iran.

Born: Pleasanton, Kans., April 24, 1899.

Education: Student, University of Kansas, 1917–22.

Marital status: Married.

Experience:

Nongovernment 1923–25, insurance business; 1937–40, vice president, New York World's Fair; 1941–42, president, General Mills, Brazil; director since 1942; 1945, vice president, Transcontinental Western Airlines, Inc.; 1946, president, Taca Airways, S.A.

Government 1925, FSO, unclassified; vice consul of career; vice consul Marseilles; 1926, vice consul of career, Smyrna; 1929, vice consul and third secretary, Tirana; 1930, FSO–8; consul; consul, Tirana; third secretary, Bucharest; 1933, third secretary, Sofia; 1934, assigned to Department; Assistant Chief, Division of Protocol and Conferences; 1935, FSO–7; 1937, Assistant Chief, Division International Conferences; resigned; 1944, appointed Assistant Secretary of State; 1945, resigned; 1948, appointed FSO–1, consul general and secretary in Diplomatic Service; counselor of Embassy at London; rank of Minister; 1950, Class of Career Minister; Minister at London; 1954, assigned to De-

partment; senior European political adviser; U.S. delegation, ninth session, UNGA; special assistant to Assistant Secretary for European Affairs; 1955, diplomatic agent and consul general with rank of Minister, Tangier; 1956, special assistant to Secretary for NATO; 1959, consul general, Hong Kong, also consul general, Macau, also Minister, Hong Kong.

Military: National Guard and Reserve, 8 years; 1942–45: major in U.S. Army 1942; advanced to brigadier general, 1943; decorations: Distinguished Service Medal; officer, Legion of Merit.

Awards: Commander, Crown of Yugoslavia; commander, Order of the Foenix, Greece; Lebanese Order of Merit; officer, Southern Cross of Brazil; officer, French Legion of Honor; Croix de Guerre with palm; commander, Oussam Alaouite, Morocco; grand officer, Nishan Iftticar, Tunisia; commander, Crown of Rumania; commander, Order British Empire; World War II, North African, European Campaign Medals.

Office: American consulate general, Hong Kong.

Home: Care of the American consulate general, Hong Kong.

Legal residence: Kansas.

THE RECORD OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION TO DATE IN THE FIELD OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield, so that I may ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to discuss for a few minutes a less controversial subject, if it is understood that in yielding for that purpose the Senator from Delaware will retain the floor?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the less controversial subject which I desire to discuss for a few minutes is the record of the Kennedy administration, during its first 100 days, in the field of agriculture; and I also wish to make some brief remarks on the omnibus farm bill which is now before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for hearings.

Mr. President, although I know it cannot be expected that a new administration can be fully or conclusively judged on a basis of 100 days' record, nevertheless we can expect that trends which appear during this period will enable us to judge the capabilities, the accomplishments, and the purposes of such administration.

The Kennedy administration has now been in office over 100 days, the period which the President himself on assuming office indicated would be a time of considerable accomplishment.

It is my purpose to review the record of the administration to date in the field of agriculture.

In doing so, I intend to give credit where credit is due, to offer criticism where criticism is deserved, and to make such suggestions as I feel will be helpful to the administration should it see fit to accept them in the spirit in which they are given.

Before examining the results of the first 100 days, however, we should review the condition of our agricultural plant at the time when the present administration assumed power on January 20, 1961.

As of this date we find 8.7 percent of the American people actually living on farms, with about three times this number engaged in producing farm supplies or processing and handling farm production.

Thus, about one-third of our people are dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood.

We find that the average capital investment per farm is $36,000, with the total investment reaching the staggering sum of over $199 billion. This amount, if added to the investment in allied industries, would well exceed all other corporate investment of the Nation.

From this investment, we are realizing dividends in the form of the greatest agricultural production that any nation has ever known—a production which is the envy of the world today.

From this production, the people of our Nation have become the best fed and best clothed people of the world.

Not only are they the best fed people, but they are fed the highest quality food at the lowest proportionate cost.

The American consumer spent 20 percent of his disposable income for food, last year.

The Russian consumer spent 56 percent of his disposable income for food.

The American had 80 percent of his income left, to spend for other purposes.

The Russian had only 44 percent left, for all other expenses.

Not only was the American farmer able to feed and clothe our own people; but in 1960 we were able to export over $4.5 billion worth of farm commodities to other nations, and still have some of our production left, to add to our reserve.

About one-third of our exports were sold to other nations on easy terms or were contributed to famine-threatened people, under Public Law 480.

In spite of the miraculous record of American agriculture, however, all was not well with the American farmer when John Kennedy became the 35th President of the United States.

In spite of the heavy financial investment per farm, the average income per person living on farms was only $986.

This compares with an average income of $2,288 for the nonfarm population.

This discrepancy does not represent a new condition. The farmers' income has always lagged behind that of others.

Since this condition has been a perennial challenge to the Government, it was properly expected that the new administration would attempt to meet it.

On the day following his inauguration, President Kennedy issued his first Executive order. It directed Secretary of Agriculture Freeman to make more and better quality foods available to the needy and helpless people of our own country.

Existing law does not permit complete and effective action in this field; but the Secretary of Agriculture, using such authority as is permitted and such funds as are available, is now carrying out the President's directive to the best of his ability.

I congratulated President Kennedy on issuing the order.

I now compliment Secretary Freeman on his efforts to implement this order.

After this auspicious beginning, however, it became apparent that either a lack of coordination or a sharp cleavage of purpose existed within the administration itself.

On February 16 of this year, the President sent a message to Congress requesting emergency legislation for the control of feed grain production.

In this message he stated:

> The existing program has failed. It has resulted in the accumulation of a burdensome and dangerous surplus, mainly of commodities for which there is no adequate outlet even under our expanded programs of providing food for those in need.

In plain language this meant that there was no further outlet for so-called grain surpluses and that production must be sharply reduced.

Yet on the very same day, February 16, Secretary Freeman sent another message to Congress asking for authority to sell $2 billion worth of the same commodities to foreign countries.

Surely the Secretary would not have been able to sell goods for which there was no market.

In this first indication of internal discrepancies, I can unhesitatingly say that the Secretary of Agriculture was right in his belief that our grain surpluses could be disposed of to good advantage.

What was the actual situation in regard to feed grains?

The fact is that we do have a possible supply of six to eight hundred million bushels more than is necessary to maintain a safe normal peacetime reserve.

But, Mr. President, we are disposing of feed grains for all purposes at the rate of 450 million bushels per month.

We are increasing our consumption of feed grains at the rate of over 200 million bushels a year.

Therefore, the President's professed alarm over an undisposable surplus was generated by the fact that we have on hand today possibly 2 months' supply more than the amount necessary to insure us against shortages and high prices.

A single poor growing year would wipe out this presently comfortable insurance for ranchers, dairymen, poultrymen, and, of course, the American consumer.

The emergency feed grain bill has been passed by the Congress and signed by the President. It raises the minimum price of corn from $1.06 per bushel to $1.20 for the 1961 crop. It provides reimbursement for farmers who reduce their production of feed grains this year. Unless we have an unfavorable growing season, I doubt that it will be as successful as its sponsors hope for. If it does accomplish the pronounced purpose, it will raise the cost of production of meats, poultry, and dairy products.

By itself, the feed grain act is not likely to raise general farm income. It simply takes income from certain groups of producers and gives it to other groups.

The Secretary has undertaken to soften the impact of higher production costs to the dairyman by raising the support price for manufacturing milk.

There has been no corresponding action taken in the case of cattle feeders,

poultrymen, or other users of grain. But for the effort he has made for the dairy industry, the Secretary is to be commended.

The emergency feed grain program will inevitably raise consumer costs unless direct or indirect subsidies are resorted to which, in turn, would either increase our taxes or the national debt.

We know from experience that when a Federal agency sponsors a program that fails, the reason given by the agency is that it was not granted authority enough to make it work.

In the case of the emergency feed grain program, however, the administration has not waited to see whether it would work or not, but has already requested of the Congress powers over agriculture so unusual as to constitute a revolutionary proposal.

There has been sent to the Congress a bill known as the omnibus farm bill. This bill, which I will not undertake to discuss in detail today, embodies several proposals to which there can be no logical objection on the part of anyone.

A good example in this category would be the extension of the school milk program, to which I am sure there is no opposition in either House of Congress.

The bill contains other proposals which, in principle, would strengthen the hand of the American farmer by making it possible for him to deal with other factors of our economy on more even terms than he is presently permitted to do.

These proposals will encounter rather strong opposition from what in agricultural parlance is called the trade.

I unhesitatingly support the idea of strengthening farm cooperatives and broadening marketing agreements.

I would, however, suggest that some of the Secretary's proposals in this direction go too far.

The bill should also be modified so that greater powers would be vested in the farmer himself, rather than the Secretary of Agriculture. There are other provisions in the Department's proposed legislation with which I can agree either with or without reservation, but this is not the time or the place to discuss these matters in detail.

In the proposals which I have referred to, and which relate to such matters as school lunch and school milk programs, extension of research and development programs, strengthening of farm cooperatives, and so forth, one can see the hand of the career employee of the Department of Agriculture as well as that of many conscientious farm leaders throughout the country and also I believe that of the Secretary himself.

These principles of the farm program, as well as the principle of price supports, farm credit, inspection service, and so forth, were basically established long ago.

The administration request, however, contains other proposals which are about as far-reaching as they can be without formally changing our framework of government.

I appreciate the exasperation which a Secretary of Agriculture, and even a President, may feel when Congress delays desirable legislation, but in the President's recommendation we find for the first time proposals which could virtually eliminate the Congress from the formulating of farm programs.

It is suggested in this proposed legislation that the Secretary be permitted to set up committees representing various commodities to formulate programs applicable to such commodities.

As a matter of fact, under the law as it is today, the President can establish advisory committees for any commodity grown in the United States. He does not need law for that purpose. He can select them today from names submitted by farm organizations, or in any way he wants to. But they are advisory committees only. However, he now proposes that he be permitted to name committees for each commodity for which he desires to name a committee, and that such committees may formulate programs, and these programs would be submitted to the Secretary, who in turn would approve, or alter, or even rewrite them, if he so chooses, and submit them to the Congress.

These programs, after being submitted by the Secretary to the Congress, would become effective without legislation unless vetoed by the Congress within 60 days, and if approved by two-thirds of the producers of the commodity concerned.

With the power vested in the Secretary by the bill, there would be no difficulty in getting a two-thirds vote.

The omnibus farm bill would go far toward eliminating the constitutional responsibilities of Congress in the field of farm legislation.

What about the veto power of the Congress?

That would amount to absolutely nothing.

No legislative body, having once surrendered its constitutional powers to executive direction, would defy the executive head of the government in the exercise of those powers.

A small minority of either House of Congress, in sympathy with the executive branch, could easily prevent the vetoing of any executive proposal.

In western European countries or in Canada, where government does propose programs, the legislative body holds the whip hand through its power to vote the executive branch out of office.

In the United States, the legislative branch does not have any such powers, and once we surrender such power as is granted to the Congress under the Constitution, we may be sure that it will not easily be recovered.

This proposal to transfer powers from the legislative branch to the executive branch of government is doubtless prompted by the feeling that our slow and rather cumbersome machinery of government, with its constitutional division of powers, has become obsolete and is inadequate to meet the requirements of the present day as some people see its requirements to be.

Before taking any such irrevocable steps, as proposed in the omnibus farm bill, however, we should look sharply lest we leap out of the frying pan into the fire.

The time is not here, Mr. President, when it would be advisable to give the administration, any administration, if we please, such broad and autocratic controls over the American farmer as are embodied in the legislation which the President proposes.

We are proud of our farmers. We are proud of the agricultural productivity of our country.

This productivity is due, in large measure, to the fact that our farmers operate with a minimum of controls and regulations. Current history is replete with production deficiencies in countries where governments have undertaken to regiment their agriculture. Food is our most potent weapon in the war being fought for the freedom of mankind. A people who are hungry or ill nourished are most likely to fall victim to the dictates of a few.

Since World War II, and particularly since the enactment of Public Law 480 in 1954, the excess food production of America has been available to needy people all over the world.

Countries which used to fear famine no longer hold that fear.

They know that food from the United States, Canada, and Australia and other surplus-producing democracies will be available to them in case of need. This assurance has enabled them to plan their future developments and to resist the pressures of totalitarian and imperialistic governments.

Our greatest victories of recent years have been won not on the field of battle but on the bloodless fields of economic and social cooperation.

The power of our Nation to save life probably exceeds our ability to destroy it in the event of war.

Now they say we have to reduce our food production—that it costs too much—that the Government must be given tools to enforce the reduction of food production in America. Some say it costs too much to maintain a reservoir of food. Such talk is nonsense, Mr. President. The actual cost of all our farm programs, including the loss on surplus grain sales, is only 10 percent of our defense budget. It is only 40 percent of the interest costs of the national debt—a debt incurred primarily by the cost of past wars.

In times of international crisis and with the possibility of armed conflict on the horizon, a food supply that is merely in balance is not adequate to the security of our Nation.

To say now, when the world is in crisis, that we must curb our productive power either by compulsion or incentive borders on imbecility. Let the farmer produce with a minimum of controls and let the world see what a free agriculture can do, as the world can see today. Let the world know, too, that in our food and fiber supplies we have a weapon more potent than moonshots and Migs—a weapon that gives life and strength and heart to people who would be free.

Mr. President, we cannot, we must not permit this vital strength of our Nation to be weakened in this hour of need.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont for making a very thoughtful and effective speech this afternoon. It is one I shall read and reread as we deal with the farm bill in the days and weeks ahead.

I should like to ask the Senator one question. Is the Senator satisfied, on the basis of the bill as it was presented and explained by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, that the bill is constitutional, having in mind section 1, article I, of the Constitution, which reads:

> All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont is not a constitutional lawyer. I think the article of the Constitution well answers the question of the Senator from South Dakota. There is no question that the bill would give to the executive branch of the Government almost unlimited powers to control the American farmer, and it would also divest the Congress of most of its responsibility for formulating farm legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I, too, wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his very timely statement on the agricultural situation in this Nation. I know of no one who is better qualified to speak on this subject than the Senator from Vermont.

I was greatly interested in the Senator's comments with regard to surplus food. It seems, in any discussion in connection with surpluses, there is a feeling among many people that this is sort of a disastrous situation for our Nation to be in, when, as a matter of fact, food is one of the most important weapons in a world in which we are struggling for the minds, the sympathies, and the ideas of citizens in underdeveloped countries.

Yesterday I had printed in the Appendix of the daily RECORD a letter from Mr. Terrence McDonald, vice president of American Flours, Inc., of Newton, Kans., who is in New Delhi, India, representing Wheat Associates of the United States, in regard to what the benefits have been.

I was interested to note that in 1952 from 1½ million to 3 million people in India died because of the lack of an estimated 300,000 tons of food. This year 300,000 tons is only one-tenth of the amount we are sending to India.

It seems to me this program benefits our foreign policy. It gives us an opportunity to prevent millions of people from starving. It gives us a Christian, humanitarian satisfaction of having shared our great surplus and abundance at a time it is badly needed in the world.

I sincerely appreciate the comments of and the statement made by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

I, too, received a copy of the letter to which the Senator refers, and I would have had it printed in the RECORD had he not done so. I commend the letter to all who care to read it.

We all recall the recurrent famines to which the countries of southern Asia have been subject. We know now that with available food from North America and Australia, whenever famine threatens those countries we shall not only be able to do away with the fear of famine but also shall be able to do away with the inflation which frequently comes immediately before a famine and aggravates the famine.

This is one of the best examples we have had in regard to the use of our so-called surplus farm commodities, which have won for us battles we probably could not have won in any other way. This has enabled many countries of the world not only to stand up against famine and inflation, but also to stand up against oppressors who would put them under their dictation and make captive nations of them.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I commend the Senator from Vermont for the speech he has made, which is a consistent speech for him. The Senator said essentially this same thing about the problem of Government surpluses, which he did not consider surpluses, when we had a previous Democratic President and Democratic administration.

The Senator made the same statement while we had a Republican President and a Republican administration, and he is making the same statement now that we have a Democratic President and a Democratic administration again.

I cannot make the same statement with respect to his Republican colleagues since the end of the last Democratic administration. There was a rather continuous, loud, and widespread attack upon the surpluses and the programs which had been followed up to that point. The attack from the Republicans tended to decline somewhat during the Republican administration, and I regret that some Democrats attempted to take up the line previously followed by Republicans. That procedure is not true, I repeat, of the Senator from Vermont. I hope his address now is one which will be called to the attention of the Republican Members of Congress—Senators particularly—and I hope it will be noted by Democrats also, so they will not be quite so ready to give up the whole of the program and to be somewhat hesitant to say that the farm problem is a mess. I say it is not, and I hope the Senator from Vermont will agree.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks, particularly for reminding the Senate that my speeches have the same trend, regardless of what party may be in power. I hope that I may get sympathetic response from the present administration for the suggestions which I have been making today. In fact, I have some reason to believe that there is much sympathy in the present administration for the proposals which I have made today and the view that, having all we need, and a little more, of food and fiber supplies is not something to worry about but something for which to be extremely thankful.

In regard to the omnibus farm bill which has been proposed, I believe that the present Secretary of Agriculture has his whole heart in improving the lot of the American farmer. But I call attention to the point that when we enact legislation, we do not enact such legislation for the present incumbent in office. We legislate for the Office itself, in this case the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture. I have told the Secretary, whom I like very much, that I am sure he would not undertake to abuse this great power should it be granted to him. But I cannot agree to granting such powers to the Office of Secretary of Agriculture, because we do not know who may be occupying that office at some future time. The present Secretary will not always be there. No one knows how long he will be in office. When I vote on a measure like the one of which I speak, I always cast my vote as if someone in whom I do not have too much confidence might occupy that office some day. I believe the Secretary and I have a good understanding as to my position.

Mr. McCARTHY. The request was made during the last administration that there be vested in the Secretary authority to adjust prices between 0 and 90 percent parity, and that request was rejected. I assume that if the request were made again in the present administration, the Senator from Vermont might still be opposed to it.

Mr. AIKEN. No; the Secretary has that authority, except for the six basic commodities stated.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Congress has set the minimum and maximum amounts between which the Secretary has had authority to fix prices from 0 to 90 percent parity for, I believe, the last 20 years.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not wish to permit that suggestion to pass without making one or two points in defense of the administration. I believe the Senator from Vermont has oversimplified the point in stating that there was a clear contradiction between the statement made by the President and the statement subsequently made by the Secretary of Agriculture. I believe the President said that there is no adequate outlet, even under an expanded program, to provide food for those in need. The proposal made by the Secretary of Agriculture was that there was still some outlet for it. So the statements are not in direct and full contradiction.

Mr. AIKEN. A $2 billion outlet, to be exact.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Congress has since granted such authority. I did not believe at the time the request was made that the Secretary of Agriculture could dispose of $2 billion of commodities before next January 1, but I understand that it is now hoped that that mark

will almost be reached. If the Department does so, it will go a long way toward relieving the fears we have had that wheat was in deep trouble, and that feed grains were in some trouble, if not quite so deep.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the disposal program is a success.

I wish to make one further point. The Senator from Vermont expresses concern over raising prices to consumers. I think he must acknowledge that the part of the program which he supports does have that effect. In the milk marketing agreements, for example, one of the consequences is that consumers pay not an unreasonable price, but a fair price. It is not altogether bad to have a farm program which may have the effect of requiring the consumers to pay a fair price.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator may have noted, as I pointed out, that the American consumer now gets his food for 20 percent of his disposable income, while the Russian consumer is required to pay 56 percent of his disposable income. The American consumer is very well off today so far as purchase, availability, and quality of foods are concerned. I believe that for the past 10 or 15 years the American consumer has been better off proportionately than the American farmer has been.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to express my commendation to the distinguished Senator from Vermont for his review of the first 100 days of the present administration in the field of agriculture. I find myself in complete agreement with the criticism which he has made of the bill which has been sent to us in the field of agriculture. I agree that there are some good points in it, but I believe the distinguished record of the Senator from Vermont gives us confidence in his great experience in this field. His experience gives us confidence that he has analyzed this program with his usual care.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to yield a couple of minutes to me to say that later I shall review at length the legislative record of the first 100 days of the present administration in the field of civil rights. It will not take very long, because the record is almost a complete blank. The only administration representative who has come here to give testimony on civil rights has asked that the Civil Rights Commission be given enough funds to phase out of existence. Not a single administration-supported measure to strengthen civil rights has been proposed in Congress.

There have been promises of far-reaching executive action and some widely ballyhooed reorganizations of existing civil rights agencies. But no real effort has been made to use the vast powers of the Chief Executive to implement constitutional protections. The President has refused to pledge that Federal funds will not be used to build segregated school facilities. The billions expended in grant-in-aid programs continue to be disbursed without any protection against their use to promote discrimination and deny equal protection to our citizens.

There is one exception to this general lethargy. The full power of the executive department has been invoked in an all-out effort to desegregate the Washington Redskins football team. Of course, it is shameful for any team representing the Nation's Capital to discriminate against Negro players—and if the Redskins engage in such practices, they ought to be persuaded to change their ways. But we must have some perspective on this issue. I cannot help but feel that Governor Faubus and his cohorts need a little more attention than George Preston Marshall and company. The Redskins may be tough on a football field, but the administration apparently has decided that they are easy targets in the political arena. In the jargon of the gridiron, although the Kennedy eleven has swarmed in on George Preston Marshall, they have not yet challenged Orville Faubus, the fancy stepping quarterback of "Southern University."

We heard a great many bold promises during the campaign. But rhetoric will not protect the right of citizens to vote, prevent the use of Federal funds to promote discrimination, or further compliance with the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision. I am filled with wonder as to how so many who criticized President Eisenhower for not going far enough in this field can sit by silently accepting every excuse for this administration's glaring failure to move forward 1 inch toward the goal of fair treatment for all Americans.

Brevity is not only a virtue in discussing the administration's first 100 days in the field of civil rights—it is a necessity. The plain truth is that there is nothing to report.

In that respect the situation differs from the agriculture situation, in which, as the Senator has so clearly pointed out, a proposal has been made to us which in some respects is good and in some bad.

I assure the Senator from Vermont that I will support the President where I feel the President's program is sound in this field or in any other field. And certainly in no field can we afford to play politics. I commend the Senator for his view in this regard. The field of civil rights is another field of the kind to which the Senator from Vermont has referred.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New York. I look forward avidly to his full-scale discussion of the civil rights program at a later date.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from Vermont is an expert in many fields, including the field of farming. I am not. It is very edifying to have the Senator give expression to his views with regard to the farm problem. He is very helpful in showing the failure of the administration in this area to come up with a proposal which is either fair to the farmers or to the consumers. The nonperformance in this field is in sad contrast to the brilliant promises of last year. I commend and congratulate the Senator on his presentation.

I would like to make the comment, as the junior Senator from New York has stated, that in the field of civil rights nothing has been done. This indicates what may be commendable modesty on the part of the administration. If the administration does not plan to proceed in the civil rights field, it is indeed modest for them not to offer any plan. However, we did not hear this modesty in the golden period of promises. It is only in the drab era of nonperformance where one now finds the administration unprepared to offer anything in the civil rights field except the integration of the Washington Redskins. One feels that this is one of those battles which the Indians have won. To that extent maybe the cowboys have lost. This is not a good month for cowboys, I suppose. It favors the Indians and the guardian of the Indians.

I should like to say that at an early date I also expect to have some comments to make on the first 100 days, and on the administration's promises with regard to the right of Americans to know what their Government is doing and their right to be kept informed; and on the sad downfall of numerous promises in this field where we were told with high indignation only a few short months ago that it was improper to conceal from the American people anything which their Government was doing, other than matters which were related to our security or which were of a classified nature, and therefore could not be revealed.

I will comment further on the nonperformance. While we were told that the administration would have a great deal more information to give the public than heretofore, we have not only been deprived of that information, but the clear, pure stream of truth we have seen substituted the brackish, murky waters of propaganda. At a later date I will address myself further to that subject. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his remarks. I will look forward to hearing his lengthier speech on the subject.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope to follow the Senator as close as the calendar will permit with my own analysis of the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration, and as to where people on my side of the aisle who think as I do should go from there.

I congratulate the Senator from Vermont on his speech on agriculture. We in the big cities have a great problem in protecting our consumers. I like the Senator's emphasis on the fact that the initiative shall remain with Congress, because this, in essence, is the people's body.

I take great heart from the fact that the Senator has initiated a process of development of ideas on this side of the aisle by representative Members who have a modern outlook, which my colleague from New York will pursue in civil rights, which my colleague from Pennsylvania will pursue on information, and which I will pursue in my speech a little later, and perhaps which later we may pursue in the foreign economic field and perhaps in the field of medical care for the aged.

I hope very much that other Senators on this side of the aisle will be similarly encouraged by the fine initiative which has been shown by the Senator from Vermont today.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New York. I am sure there is no idea of harassment in the minds of anyone who has announced his intention to make a speech at a later time on the various subjects which have been mentioned.

There is value in constructive criticism, particularly when offered by members of the minority party.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that my apprehension with regard to the agricultural omnibus bill, about which I spoke today, is due to the fact that there is a question, which was raised by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], as to constitutionality of Congress turning over such powers to the Secretary as are contained in the bill. There is danger in the interpretation which will be put on the provisions of the bill by the legal staff of the Department of Agriculture, either this year or 10 years from now, if the bill is passed. This matter concerns me, no matter how much confidence we may have in the present occupant of the Office of Secretary of Agriculture. We must remember that we are legislating for the Office, not for the present occupant of the Office.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. With the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, and that the remarks of other Senators, as was the case with the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, will be printed in another part of the RECORD, I yield first to the Senator from Maine for some brief remarks on another subject, following which I will yield to the Senator from South Carolina. Then I have also promised to yield to the Senator from New York, if that is agreeable.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield later to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield to the Senator from Kansas also.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Reserving the right to object, I did not understand the request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Maine has a brief statement to make on another subject. The Senator from South Carolina, likewise, has a brief statement to make on another subject. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to both of them without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SELF-DISCIPLINE OF REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I have read with interest and gratification the May 3, 1961, article written by the noted national columnist, William S. White, who is greatly respected not only for his intellect and integrity, but for his sense of fairness, as well.

For me—or any other Republican—to have said or written what Mr. White wrote in his May 3, 1961, column would have been politically suspected. The expression by him on the subject on which he wrote is far more readily accepted free of political suspicions.

But I agree so much with what he said. I could not, myself, have expressed my own thoughts on the matter better than he has. I call the attention of every Member of the Senate to his column, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICANS PRACTICE RESTRAINT—PARTY'S SELF-DISCIPLINE AND REFUSAL TO JUMP ON KENNEDY HELD ADMIRABLE

(By William S. White)

The Republicans have come through magnificently in the first grave test of their capacity to act with responsibility as a minority party.

Every leader of every wing of the GOP has seen his duty and done it—from Nelson Rockefeller on the leftwing through Dwight Eisenhower and Richard Nixon at the party center and on to Senators STYLES BRIDGES and BARRY GOLDWATER on the rightwing.

Every one of them has refused the cheap temptation to leap upon President Kennedy and his luckless staff—which is to say upon the United States itself—for the failure of the anti-Castro invasion of Cuba. Every one of them has recognized that it is not simply Mr. Kennedy who has suffered a setback; that it is really the United States.

Every one of them—Mr. Eisenhower most poignantly from his own still-fresh memories of the burden of the White House—has recognized that whatever party's President is in power in a time of crisis should be free from sterile second guessing, not merely in ordinary fairness but also under the highest demands of national interest. For no President can do his best work if, as the already sufficiently harried representative of all of us, he must be continually protecting himself against those of us who bear none of his responsibilities but are ready at the instant of any failure to bite at him.

Every one of these Republican leaders, to go on, has recognized that to spend national energy now on a shrill search for devils about Cuba would be worse than simply schoolgirlish. It would be a lament for the past producing nothing for the future beyond backbiting and national divisions which might serve the Russians but hardly us.

Mr. Eisenhower has put the thing in perspective. He has contemptuously rejected this sort of thing as the mere witch hunt it would be. Wherever we have been, we have been there already. What counts is where we go now. An inquiry to find facts might be one thing; a scapegoat hunt would be quite another thing.

So, if it is not easy to find large ground for much satisfaction, it is possible to find solid ground for some satisfaction in the behavior of the principal Republicans.

For, after all, their right restraint is, happily, infinitely more important than the unrestrained righteousness, after the event, of the handful of Democratic second-guessers and their friends now so busily proving how right they were and how wrong the President.

And, parenthetically, they were "right" anyhow only in the sense that they nearly always prefer to settle for no action at all rather than face the hard dangers of any kind of action.

Given a hotly partisan Republican reaction to Cuba, on top of this earnest self-vindication by such Democrats as Senators WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and WAYNE MORSE, the President—and the country—might well have been paralyzed on policy for months to come.

All this is not said to "defend" a man named Kennedy. Nor was much the same said by this same columnist to "defend" a man named Eisenhower when much the same clack was raised from much the same sources over his effrontery in sending "spy planes" over the Soviet Union. It is said in behalf of an institution called the Presidency of the United States.

It is the President who is elected by the people to run their foreign affairs. If he does not "listen" to certain Senators and others, so what? Their opinions often are easier to come by than his. And their strategic plans can be comfortably forgotten if they don't happen to work, and none the worse for it.

And (horror of all horrors) if the present President went so far as not to "listen" even to Adlai Stevenson and Chester Bowles, again so what? These two disappointed aspirants for Secretary of State are admirable men. But neither is President. And neither bears an ounce of responsibility or power that is not assigned to him by the President.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, it was just a year ago on May 23, 1960, when partisan attacks were made on the then Republican President of the United States for the U–2 affair, which admittedly was badly handled. The attacks that day reached such extreme partisanship that statements were placed in the RECORD that constituted nothing less than slurs on the President of the United States.

Those statements charged the then President with disgracing the United States and implied senility to the President of the United States, for one statement placed in the RECORD stated:

Mr. Eisenhower had no right to so disgrace the United States.

Another statement placed in the RECORD read:

We had better start electing Presidents who are young enough to keep their wits until they finish their terms.

I am very proud that no Republican leader and no Republican Senator, a year later, in the aftermath of the failure of the anti-Castro invasion of Cuba, has resorted to such attacks and characterization of our young Democratic President.

I am very proud that no Republican Senator has offered similar statements a year later as "documentation" for such

characterization as was done on the Senate floor on May 23, 1960, with a prefatory statement of admission of not being able to resist suggesting such claimed "documentation."

I cite the words of Columnist William S. White, as he wrote in his May 3, 1961, column:

> The Republicans have come through magnificently in the first grave test of their capacity to act with responsibility as a minority party. * * * Every one of them has refused the cheap temptation to leap upon President Kennedy and his luckless staff—which is to say upon the United States itself—for the failure of the anti-Castro invasion of Cuba.

I am very proud that Republican Senators a year later have not placed in the RECORD statements charging President Kennedy with having disgraced the United States.

I am very proud that Republican Senators a year later have not placed in the RECORD statements impugning the mental status of President Kennedy.

I am very proud that Republican Senators have resisted the temptation to place such alleged documentation in the RECORD. I am very proud that Republican Senators have refused the cheap temptation to leap upon President Kennedy.

GREATEST LIVING AMERICAN AWARDS BY UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on May 1, 1961, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, at its leadership recognition dinner during the chamber's 49th convention in Washington, presented its Greatest Living American Awards to three outstanding and distinguished Americans: James F. Byrnes, Maurice Stans, and Herbert P. Buetow.

We in South Carolina are very pleased that one of our State's most illustrious sons was selected for this high honor. I was present for this great occasion and was deeply impressed with the great standing applause which was given to Mr. Byrnes as an additional recognition of the magnificent and distinguished services he has rendered to his State and his Nation.

No person has rendered such varied service to this Nation as has Mr. Byrnes—and I might add that few Americans have served so capably and with such distinction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the description of the award and the citation for Mr. Byrnes be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the description of the award was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AWARD TO JAMES F. BYRNES

The Great Living American Award is presented for personal achievement. It is presented to individuals who have made "a unique or creative contribution of wide significance to human progress, and to our American way of life"—individuals who, by their "initiative, self-reliance and effort, have stimulated or encouraged others to work for the solution or resolution of community or State or nationwide problems by voluntary effort." And, to qualify for such an award, each must also be "a person of character, a person others look up to, admire and respect."

Each of the distinguished citizens who will receive Great Living American Awards tonight meets all the qualifications I have described, and others as well.

The award itself is in the form of a silver laurel wreath, mounted on an ebony base.

This design was chosen because, for thousands of years, the laurel wreath has been the emblem of personal achievement. The ancient Greeks dedicated the laurel tree to the god, Apollo. They wove the beautiful leaves of the laurel tree into wreaths with which to crown men of distinction in all walks of life.

The custom spread to ancient Rome—and eventually the word "laurel" came into the English language, and down to us. It is one of our most sublime and poetic words. In its meaning, it carries the majesty of honor and merit—which, after all, is the only true majesty of life.

I will ask Arch Booth to read the first citation.

We are honoring this evening a true statesman.

We honor him—

For the unmatched excellence of his performance of duty in an unprecedented career of service in high public office, as a Member of both Houses of Congress, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Governor of the State of South Carolina, and as Secretary of State;

For his long and vigorous fight against Socialist trends in this country;

For his earnest and practical efforts to safeguard our form of representative government;

For his effective work in stressing the part which the individual citizen must play in the affairs of government, local, State and National;

For the constructive contribution he has made, through his articles and books, toward strengthening the American way of life;

And because of the example which he has always set as a person of character, self-reliance and outgiving spirit; and

We salute and honor as a great living American—James F. Byrnes.

ADDRESS BY R. ALEX McCULLOUGH, GREENVILLE, S.C., BEFORE SOUTH CAROLINA CONGRESSIONAL DINNER

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Tuesday evening, May 2, 1961, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Washington, some wise advice was offered to Members of Congress and their constituents by a gentleman who has had the unusual experience of working as a schoolteacher, a newspaperman, a gubernatorial assistant, a U.S. senatorial assistant, and also as the officer of a bank. Mr. R. Alex McCullough, of Greenville, S.C., vice president of the South Carolina National Bank, presented this advice in an outstanding address which was delivered before the South Carolina congressional dinner sponsored by the chambers of commerce in South Carolina.

Mr. McCullough served very capably and loyally as my administrative assistant during the period 1955–57, and during the period 1951–54, he was research and press assistant to Gov. James F. Byrnes. Since leaving Government service, Mr. McCullough has continued his keen interest in governmental affairs and civic responsibilities. In view of his keen intellect, unusual experience, and his interest in good government, I commend his address to the Members of the Congress and to the public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS BY R. ALEX MCCULLOUGH, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA NATIONAL BANK, AT THE SOUTH CAROLINA CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, SPONSORED BY THE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE IN SOUTH CAROLINA, IN WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1961, AT THE STATLER-HILTON HOTEL

Mr. President, distinguished Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, ladies and gentlemen:

It has been my pleasure to enjoy a rather close relationship to government from three different viewpoints: as a newspaperman, as an employee of both State and Federal Governments, and now as the officer of a bank. I hope this triple exposure has given me a basis to take an objective approach to matters of government.

Citizens who have not served in government often are impatient with the general slowness of its processes. On other occasions—when the results obtained are not satisfactory to individual desires—government is condemned for failing to be more deliberate in its consideration of problems. Although these critics of governmental processes are sometimes right on both charges, they cannot accurately indict government on either count without implicating themselves.

Government is the creation and instrument of the citizens of this country. Its strengths and its weaknesses are qualities and characteristics of the citizens themselves, reflected in their laws, their representatives, and their machinery of government.

Government was not created for the individual, but for the general good.

When invdividuals or special groups want something or want something done, they complain if government moves slowly. When they don't want somebody else to get something or don't want something more favorable to others to be done, they object to the speed which the machinery of government seems to acquire.

Citizens outside of government find it extremely difficult to be fair and objective when they want something or when they oppose something strongly. Citizens in government—elected, appointed, and employed—experience the same difficulty of being objective. Requests, demands, and pressures from individuals and groups of divergent views and interests make it impossible for people in government to please everyone on any issue.

Good citizens and nongovernment organizations have the responsibility and obligation of knowing the facts and then asking government only for those things in the general good and within the limits of constitutional authority.

Unfortunately, all requests to government are not reasonable. Many are solely for the selfish gains of special groups and individuals. Regrettably, many such proposals originate in government.

Therefore, it becomes the duty of fair and objective legislators and other officeholders to decide their positions on any issue according to the facts and the law, as best they understand them, without fear or favor.

This prescription for citizens and their representatives is simple. However, its use, both inside and outside of government, has never been widely accepted.

If every issue coming before the Congress could be classified as "right" or "wrong," there would be only one remaining problem. That would be who would decide the right or wrong of an issue. We won't pursue that point because we all recognize the fact that most issues involve more complicated elements than "right" or "wrong."

Quite often the objectives of opposing sides are nearly the same, but the real debate arises over the proper method of obtaining the desired results. Right now the widely different proposals for sustaining and expanding the national economy illustrate this point. All the proposals do not meet the test of being fair and objective; but, certainly, no one fails to agree that growth is desirable. The disagreement arises over the exercise of governmental powers and the speed with which they are exercised.

An additional problem which citizens and their representatives face in most issues is the matter of personalities. Our Government was designed to be a government of law and not of men; but, men designed the Government, men are running it, and men are supporting it. The element of conflicting personalities cannot be eliminated.

This makes it essential for all of us to place principles above persons—to seek what is right and reasonable regardless of appealing or conflicting personal relationships. Perhaps it is in the area of personalities that the greatest trouble arises. None of us forgets past experience and all of us react to experience with other persons long after a particular issue has been decided. At all levels of government, and in international relations, history shows that personalities have frequently overshadowed principles with disastrous results.

For the general good, it is important that we avoid letting personalities become issues. Therefore, it is essential for those being represented and those who represent to avoid predeterminations until all the evidence has been examined on every question. The practical application of such objectivity is more difficult than simply saying it, but objectivity should be a constant goal.

The day-to-day details of government which beset the Members of the House and Senate cannot be visualized by those unfamiliar with congressional operations. Duties and responsibilities imposed by the Constitution and by statutes comprise more obligations than any Member can perform without expert assistance. The growth of our Government to its present state of bureaucracy forces our Senators and Representatives, not only to deliberate and legislate, but, also, to serve as auditors on the activities of the 10 executive departments and the multitude of independent agencies.

The Constitution, in article I, section 8, specifies 18 powers of Congress. A few other powers are stated at other points in the Constitution with reference to special subjects. Limitations on the powers of Congress are listed in section 9, in the Bill of Rights, and in several other references.

But in all their wisdom, and in their wildest imagination, the authors of the Constitution could not have dreamed of the bureaucracy of today. The growth of the Federal Government has created an almost overpowering burden on the Congress, collectively, and upon the Members, individually, with their assistants. I know it is an impossible task to keep up with all the details at all times. Therefore, general principles and policies are usually more important than details.

Citizens who feel that consistency is not a virtue practiced by their representatives, and that inconsistency is a characteristic, should apply the same measure to their own conduct in relations with their Congressmen.

The citizen who believes certain principles apply to government generally—economy for example—should be consistent enough to have the rule applied in his own State as well as in the other 49. A Member of Congress cannot vote "no" on all general expenditures and "yes" on those beneficial to his own State.

Members of the Congress represent all the people of all the States—political friend and political foe. They cannot avoid that responsibility.

Someone has said that "the test of a man's true character is what he would do if he knew it would never be found out." I believe an even sterner test of character is faced by the Members of Congress who know that everyone who wants to do so will find out how they voted. No matter how many times a Congressman pleases his constituents, it is the time he displeases them that they seem to remember longest.

I am sure that every member of South Carolina's congressional delegation is well aware of the close examination given to his voting record on legislation. Just as we expect our Senators and Representatives to vote their convictions on each issue, so must they expect to have those votes, pairs, and absences scrutinized by their constituents. They should also expect and welcome constructive comments, either of praise or criticism. Eventually, they should expect their records to determine whether they receive the continued support of citizens who seek constructive legislating.

I use the word "legislating" instead of "legislation" because, so often, the most constructive legislating is a vote "against" instead of "for" proposed legislation.

Organizations, such as chambers of commerce, and the people generally, should spend more time in studying issues. We should have sound reasons for our positions if we expect to be effective and convincing. Then we should express our views and reasons to our representatives at the appropriate time. In many instances, Members of Congress, having been convinced themselves, can win support from other Members by using the facts and arguments supplied by constituents.

Such a working relationship between businessmen and the Members of Congress is certain to result in greater understanding of and greater mutual respect for each other.

Even more time consuming and often more difficult than legislation are the innumerable "personal services" which have become a part of the Congressman's daily routine.

The average citizen, and even those who deal with such matters regularly, expect their Congressman's assistance in solving the puzzle of bureaucratic regulations which they must deal with at times. Government has become so big that a citizen without an introduction by his Congressman feels insignificant before a bureaucrat. This should not be true, and often there is no basis for such a feeling. Nevertheless, proper attention has to be given to the constituent who appeals to his Senator or Representative. At this point, the Congressman has to consider whether he can legally or properly go beyond a mere introduction, if he feels his constituent has a valid request. Sometimes there is disagreement on this point between Congressman and constituent.

Probably most of you here tonight are familiar with these problems, but what can we do about them? I am not so naive as to think I have the answers. On the other hand, I am not so cynical as to believe that we cannot help each other by considering the problem openly.

No one can presume to advise the Members of Congress on their obligations and responsibilities. That is the "long way which they must tread alone," after they have assumed public office.

No individual or group can set the standards for all others in governmental relations. None has a monopoly on facts or wisdom.

However, there are practices which might be better employed by citizens and their representatives alike to attain greater mutual understanding in dealing with the complicated problems of Government.

In all interrelations, citizens and Members of Congress should first evaluate every matter on this basis:

1. Is it necessary?
2. Is it for the general good?
3. Is it fair to all?
4. Can it be done without the action of Government?
5. Can Government action be stopped at the minimum essential?

Those questions cannot be answered without communication, and communication is not simply the expression of one person's ideas to another. Real communication goes beyond a one-way message.

We appreciate the efforts of our Senators and Congressmen to keep those of us back home informed of their views—through the press, radio, television, and newsletters. They do an excellent job. But we must do a better job from back home.

We must express ourselves intelligently on the vital issues of current legislation. Right now the vital issues include the minimum wage, aid to education, social security amendments, aid for so-called depressed areas, tax reforms, secondary boycotts, and reciprocal trade agreements. Any citizen who fails to make clear his views to those who represent him should expect to obtain from legislation about what he has earned.

Government needs more two-way exchanges of facts and ideas to obtain real communication between people and their representatives. Communication means sharing and the interchange of thoughts and opinions.

Better communication means the people and their representatives will both be better informed. Thus, better communication means better legislation.

We must seek constantly to strengthen our lines of communications in the interest of better government for better citizens.

We cannot escape our mutual responsibility for the economic well-being and progress of our State and Nation. At home we must be imaginative and resourceful in developing and administering the leadership of free enterprise. In Washington, you should be ever mindful that the best government is the least government and that no legislation is better than bad legislation.

As representatives who desire to represent and as businessmen who desire to be represented, let us strive for better communication and greater understanding of each other's problems. Such mutual efforts are certain to result in public well-being which is otherwise unobtainable.

"RACE AND REASON: A YANKEE VIEW"—BOOK BY CARLETON PUTNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Senate the publication of a new book which I hope will be read by every Member of this body and by everyone who is concerned about the problem of race relations in this country, regardless of any preconceived ideas. The book is entitled, "Race and Reason: A Yankee View," and was written by Carleton Putnam, the author of the famous Putnam letters concerning the Supreme Court's 1954 desegregation decision.

In this book Mr. Putnam provides a deep, candid, and responsible analysis of the circumstances which underlie the

problems between the races. It is a challenge to objectivity which no American, regardless of color or status, can safely afford to ignore.

This book has received strong endorsement from Senators HARRY BYRD and RICHARD RUSSELL.

Senator BYRD makes the following comments in his endorsement of the book:

This book should be read by people in the South, North, East, and West. It should be read by judges and educators, the clergy, those in government, and all who may be held responsible for disseminating information and molding public opinion.

"Race and Reason" refutes fallacies which have been perpetuated in all sections at home and in many areas abroad.

It answers questions which have disturbed and confused well-meaning men and women everywhere.

Great damage has already been done by subtle propaganda, emotional thinking, and misguided action in this field. Much more irreparable harm will result unless ignorance on the matters discussed in this book can be dispelled.

Senator RUSSELL has this to say:

Mr. Putnam answers frankly, fearlessly, and forcefully the fundamental questions that are involved in the relationship between the white and colored races in America. Surely this book should be required reading for all Americans of all sections and of all races who desire a full understanding of racial attitudes and problems.

The book contains a foreword by Mr. Thomas R. Waring, the nationally respected editor of the Charleston News and Courier, the South's oldest newspaper. The following is an excerpt from the foreword:

This book is a signal contribution to an understanding of the race controversy. No other writer, in my opinion, has yet combined so forceful an analysis of the viewpoints of both North and South with so clear a grasp of the reasons behind each.

Carleton Putnam strikes at the root of the matter. He thoroughly explores the ideology which led to the Supreme Court's decision in the desegregation cases and traces it to its source. In the process he puts race against the background of fundamental American ideals with arresting results. He presents documented facts, and discloses a situation, which I believe should be brought to the immediate attention of the American people. "Race and Reason" may well become a text for the unorganized majority in their battle against the social concepts of our minority groups.

If there be an argument in favor of integration which is not plainly set out in this volume, and as plainly examined, I have not heard it. The writing is incisive and can be read by the layman at one sitting with pleasure as well as profit. The author has thought through many issues, and has combined his thinking with careful research. He gives his results in telling sentences, crisp and spare. In these pages, any legislator, judge, lawyer, minister, or college debater can have at his fingertips, conveniently indexed, a succinct reply to every sophistry advanced by the propagandist. To those who recognize that the salvation of the South lies in the education of public opinion rather than in rearguard court actions, and that our national leaders must be told the scientific as well as the political facts of race, this book will be indispensable.

My personal enthusiasm has been increased by knowing Putnam himself. He is a dyed-in-the-wool northerner, a New Englander collaterally descended from both Israel Putnam, George Washington's first major general, and Rufus Putnam, founder of the Ohio Colony. Putnam is a Yankee in the true sense of the word. He speaks with detachment and from what I may term the native American outlook. Few men are better qualified by inheritance and training to recall us to the principles on which our Republic rests.

In his own career Putnam has been singularly successful both as a practical man of affairs and as a scholar. Graduating with a science degree and with honors in history and politics from Princeton, and with a law degree from Columbia, he was for 15 years president of Chicago & Southern Air Lines and later chairman of the board of Delta Air Lines. He finally retired, in his early 50's, to write biography, and has already distinguished himself in this field. My fellow journalist, Virginius Dabney, aptly described the situation when he said editorially that the first volume of Putnam's Theodore Roosevelt had the critics turning handsprings.

Putnam writes from a knowledge of history, science, and law. He writes from nationwide experience in business, and from long residence in North and South. He knows America, its past and its present. I consider his message imperative reading for its own sake, and doubly valuable because of the man who speaks.

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Waring makes mention of the panel of scientists—Drs. R. Ruggles Gates, Henry E. Garrett, R. Gayre, and Wesley C. George—who likewise endorse Mr. Putnam's book in the introduction. This is what the scientists have to say about the book in the last paragraph of the introduction:

Whatever may be said for or against minor or detailed points made by the author of this book, we feel that it deserves the serious attention of both scientists and public men wherever racial problems exist. The facts in it cannot much longer be ignored. It probes to the core of an abscess, yet does so with a healing touch. There is logic and commonsense in these pages; there is also inescapable scientific validity.

Mr. President, for those interested in more information on this outstanding book, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a review of the book written by Mr. Anthony Harrigan in the April 30, 1961, issue of the News and Courier.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOKS IN THE NEWS—RACE AND REASON

("Race and Reason: A Yankee View," by Carleton Putnam. With a foreword by Thomas R. Waring. Public Affairs Press, Washington, D.C., 125 pages, $3.25).

(By Anthony Harrigan)

Understanding ideas is the most important responsibility of a historian. Anyone can recognize an event. But comprehending the ebb and flow of ideological currents which influence action requires deep insights and calm judgment.

Carleton Putnam, who came to historical writing in middle life, possesses understanding of ideas and their interplay on the American scene. His study of the equalitarian ideology in 20th century America is a real contribution to the history of our times.

"Race and Reason" is no narrow-gage analysis of the segregation dispute. Neither is it conceived as mere literary ammunition in a duel between regions or political groupings. Rather is it a scholarly effort to put the issue of race inside the framework of American traditions and world history.

Mr. Putnam properly looks behind May 17, 1954, when the U.S. Supreme Court handed down decrees in several school cases. He digs at the historical roots of the modern vogue of equalitarian thinking on race. With sure instinct, he finds that these roots extend back into the 1880's. The character of the United States began to undergo major change then as immigrants and their intellectual spokesmen poured in from Southern and Eastern Europe.

"The new arrivals," Mr. Putnam notes, "were not readily assimilated. Starting under what they considered unjustified discrimination, they set purposefully to the task of showing they were just as good as the native stocks (as, indeed, in many ways they were), and they tried to do this by proving all races were equal in their adaptability to our white civilization. Important chairs in several of our leading universities were taken over by these men, and two generations of American youth came under their influence, aided by others whose hearts were softer than their heads were clear."

One of the most interesting parts of this book is that section where Mr. Putnam recounts his correspondence with members of the academic world. Polite inquiries were greeted with sneers and ridicule. Again and again he heard the gambit: "No educated man believes any longer * * *." Having received an educated man's challenge on racial questions, Mr. Putnam declared: "I observed a scurrying for the intellectual exits."

Without anger or emotionalism, Mr. Putnam reports a tragic deterioration in American academic freedom.

Professors of genetics and other relevant sciences, he reports, "were hesitant, withdrawn, and fearful" when approached for comment. The reason, he adds "was not far to seek. Their employers on whom their livelihood depended—the universities, the museums, the foundations—were either controlled by equalitarians or were intimidated by the race taboo."

One scientist told him: "I cannot commit academic suicide. I still have work to do. But when I retire."

Mr. Putnam writes the truth. As anyone familiar with the history of ideas in contemporary U.S.A. is aware, a "brain curtain" prevents serious discussion of certain intellectual issues. No issue is more taboo, except when discussed in orthodox equalitarian language, than the issue of race. Mr. Putnam's book should be a challenge to scientists to reassert their integrity and to permit free discussion and inquiry.

What "Race and Reason" does is to help Americans understand that the tremendous, unthinking drive to force equality strikes at the foundations of the Nation.

If true equality is not to be earned, as has been the custom in ages past; if equality is to be a gift from a political hierarchy; if real merit must give way to ideology, then the rational basis of national action is undermined.

The driving emphasis on racial equality, irrespective of worthiness by objective standards, brings to mind the institution of "political science" in the Soviet Union. In the field of life sciences, for instance, eminent Soviet scholars have been repudiated because their findings were not in accord with official state policy. The same situation applies in the United States, with respect to scientific investigation of race.

While "Race and Reason" is a scholarly analysis, it also provides the reader with answers to many questions raised by those

to whom total racial equality is a religion. As Thomas R. Waring says in his foreword, the book offers "a succinct reply to every sophistry advanced by the propagandist."

No review of this book should close without pointing out that Mr. Putnam's views on racial matters are endorsed by four eminent scientists whose credentials are printed in the volume. These are men with international reputations. They carry proud records of scientific publication and have been honored by many universities and scientific societies. They are men not only of proved ability but of proved intellectual courage. Their warranty should lead persons interested in scientific investigation of race to give a careful reading to Mr. Putnam's work.

CAN THE COMMUTER SURVIVE?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, an article in the May 6 issue of the Saturday Evening Post describes the American commuter as the No. 1 problem child of our metropolitan areas. The article, by Joe Alex Morris, also asks a question: "Can the commuter survive?"

Unfortunately the author can give only a limited prognosis about chances for survival. A more precise estimate will not be possible until we as a nation make basic decisions about this national problem.

And yet, as the article makes dramatically clear, decisions are overdue. Mr. Morris gives a useful and concise summary of the many forces now pushing us to a showdown on the mass-transit problem. He tells of a Chicago test which proved that a bicycle ridden by a boy was the fastest vehicle in rush-hour street traffic. He reminds us that one transit line recently built in the median strip of a superhighway carries more than four times as many persons, per dollar-mile invested, than are being moved over the expressway. He describes one study which indicated that train commutation cost a little more than half of what auto commutation cost for an entire year of travel.

Mr. Morris adds new evidence that helps us arrive at an irresistible conclusion. We must act at all levels of government to create a national program to deal with a national problem. My mass transit bill, for instance, is just one device to help us arrive at that program. We will also need farsighted planning and hard work at other levels of government, too.

The final service performed by Mr. Morris is his description of proposals for regional agencies or for regional pacts that will lead to areawide action on transit and related problems.

The Saturday Evening Post article is a very welcome addition to the growing number of timely reports we must have to understand one of the crises we face in our urban areas. I ask for unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN THE COMMUTER SURVIVE?

The American commuter is much abused. Cartoonists malign him as an unshaven, sleepy-eyed character running for the 7:42 train in the morning, or stumbling from a bar just in time to miss the 5:15 home at night. An editorialist may describe him as an unhappy passenger on rattletrap coaches, while a rail executive complains that he is a parasite, costing the Nation's railroads millions of dollars in annual deficits. And an urban planner may warn that commuters who use automobiles threaten to strangle, in one horrendous traffic jam, the great cities in which they work but do not live.

Victim or villain, the commuter has now become the No. 1 problem child of our metropolitan areas, and his future is so important, in human and economic terms, that it is engaging the attention of alarmed officials at all levels of government.

Nobody can say exactly who is responsible for the gigantic mess in mass transportation that, by some kind of twice-a-day miracle, keeps in circulation the economic lifeblood of our cities. But the results of the mess are visible in paralyzed midtown traffic, long delays at highway bridges and tunnels, and the shocking deterioration of suburban rail service. It has been estimated that traffic jams in New York City alone cost a billion dollars a year in lost time, lost sales, and extra expenses. The great technological advances that put America on rubber wheels have slowed urban traffic to the pace of 19th-century horsecars.

In Chicago, for instance, a test showed that a bicycle ridden by a boy was the fastest vehicle in rush-hour street traffic.

Morning and evening rush-hour commuters are an old headache of central business districts. The railroads would like to forget that back in grandfather's day they started commutation service as a kind of byproduct, encouraging city workers to move to the country by offering low monthly fares on already existing rail lines, even giving newcomers free transportation for several years. When the suburbs grew rapidly, special commuter service had to be established. By 1929, commuter lines carried 457 million passengers a year; if the railroads lost money on low fares, they made it up on a flourishing freight traffic.

But change was coming—a vast increase in automobile travel, encouraged by publicly financed roads and expressways. Instead of clinging to railroad lines, new suburbs sprawled across countryside open to automobiles and buses. Rail commutation decreased to 227 million rides in 1940, despite the rapid growth of our suburban population, and is has remained close to that figure ever since. At the beginning of the 1960's, with our suburban population up to 50 million—and with 23 million automobiles in our main metropolitan areas—the American Municipal Association reported the threatened collapse of rail commutation service; annual deficits totaled almost $60 million. The railroads had long since appealed to government agencies for relief, complaining that competition from trucks, automobiles, and airplanes had cut their revenues until they could no longer absorb commuter losses.

Totting up these losses involves the allocation of costs to long- and short-haul traffic—an area of controversy. Last year, Laurence V. Farnham, a consulting engineer for the New York Public Service Commission, testified that losses claimed by the New Haven Railroad for its suburban passenger service were "greatly exaggerated." Herbert Askwith, a member of the Governor's committee to frame legislation for relief of suburban railroads in New York, accepts the roads' figures on overall passenger deficits, but had long asserted that their allocation of costs is wrong. Rail commutation in Westchester County, he figures, actually produces "substantial profits." On the other hand, when the Illinois Central had its commuter deficit checked by outside auditors a few years ago, the outsiders increased the railroad's red-ink figures by $90,000. Most impartial experts consulted by this reporter don't challenge the available deficit figures in general.

But everyone agrees that commuter lines have deteriorated. Changing national habits—the 5-day week, the movement of industry to outlying districts, the growth of suburban shopping centers—have affected passenger traffic. Since 1933 average costs of railroad supplies and average straight-time hourly wages have increased 250 percent, while average commutation fares have increased only 116 percent. Taxes have gone up 42 percent in the last 15 years, consuming a substantial portion of commuter revenues—11.8 percent in New York; 14.9 percent in Boston. Since the service loses money, credit needed to buy new equipment has been virtually unavailable. In the East, commuters riding cars built 25 or 40 years ago are likely to parboil in summer and freeze in winter.

Worst of all, the rush-hour traffic has held steady or even increased in recent years, while offpeak traffic has dwindled. The commuter roads support rolling stock and train crews which handle maximum business only 4 hours a day—20 hours a week. The New York Central, for example, uses about 300 cars at peak hours to move 40,000 commuters each morning and evening. But for offpeak traffic, 20 hours each weekday and all day Saturday and Sunday, 60 cars are enough. This, as any expert will testify, is a hell of a way to try to run a railroad at a profit.

Another source of pain to railroad executives is comparison of their deficits with Government expenditures—about $9 billion, for instance, in the year 1957—on highways, expressways, airports, bridges, and tunnels that accommodate competitors. Philadelphia, according to an estimate by John A. Bailey, deputy managing director of the city, spends on its street system, including traffic police, about $27 million a year. That's about $50 per car per year. He estimates that Chicago spends $85 and Milwaukee $90 per car per year. Referring to Government subsidizing of competitive transport systems and to regulation and taxation of the railroads, Vice President W. W. Patchell, of the Pennsylvania Railroad, has concluded that "the railroads today are actually subsidizing the public and the community. This we cannot afford."

Then why not abandon rail commutation, letting automobiles do the job? The answer is obvious. At peak hours in five cities—New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, and Cleveland—about 330,000 commuters travel by suburban train, 355,000 by automobile. The automobiles used number 223,500—100,000 in New York, for example, 52,000 in Chicago—all trying to get into central business districts at the same time, with unhappy results. If all train commuters switched to autos and buses, it is estimated that they would need additional highways costing more than $17 billion. In New York City alone, commuters would require an additional 20 square miles of parking space.

In sprawling Los Angeles, where a good rail commutation system has long since been abandoned in favor of an $800 million network of freeways, two-thirds of the downtown area is now devoted to the storage and movement of automobiles. As a result, the city is spread all over the map, the economy of the central business district has suffered, property-tax sources have dwindled, and the transportation problem has become perhaps the most baffling in the world.

A fact not generally understood is that rail commutation normally is not only faster

than travel by automobile, but cheaper too. In a speed demonstration, Nancy Kanzer and her twin sister, Patricia, left the Chestnut Hill station of the Reading Railroad in Philadelphia at 8:16 a.m. Nancy took the train. Patricia climbed into a chauffeur-driven automobile. Twenty-seven minutes later Nancy arrived at the terminal in midtown; she had to wait 16 minutes for her sister, whose automobile had been slowed to 11 miles an hour on a 5-mile stretch of expressway.

Average costs per mile to commuters, as recently reported in a study made for the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, were 2.79 cents by suburban railroad and 3.2 cents by motorbus, assuming a 5-mile average trip. The out-of-pocket cost by private automobile was estimated at 3.5 cents for one person per vehicle or 1.75 cents per person for two, plus a substantial charge for parking. But, the study added, the full automobile costs should be considered; depreciation, insurance, and upkeep boost the per mile expense of automobile commutation to 10 cents for one person per vehicle and more than 5 cents for two.

Finally, with the total number of commuters expected to increase by 50 percent in the next 20 years, the cost of providing additional facilities must be counted. In building freeways, costs vary from a few million dollars per mile in some cities to as high as $50 million. But, as rail executives are fond of saying, more persons can be moved at peak hours by two railroad lines than by 20 four-lane highways. In Chicago, for example, an eight-lane expressway was built at a cost of $10 million per mile; a two-track transit line was built in the median strip at a cost of $4 million per mile. Although the railway operates at only 30 percent of capacity, the Chicago Transit Authority estimates that it carries more than four times as many persons, per dollar-mile invested, than are being moved over the expressway.

Such urban planning experts as Wilfred Owen, of the Brookings Institution, Robert B. Mitchell, of the University of Pennsylvania, Stanley Berge, of Northwestern University, and McKim Norton, of the Regional Plan Association, Inc., have concluded that we cannot abandon rail commutation if we expect to preserve our great cities in anything like their present form. Instead, suburban rail service will have to be improved and extended, reversing the trend toward abandonment of many lines or reduction of service. The problem then is: How do you lure motorists back to commuting trains? And, if you succeed, how do you pay for rail commutation?

Taking the first question first, engineers believe that it is technologically possible to provide vastly expanded rail service on trains that are pleasant, comfortable, much faster than present trains, and running on time. Considering passenger numbers only, there is the example of the Long Island Railroad, which carried two or three times as many commuters as usual when last winter's snowstorms blocked highways. High capacity alone will not lure riders to the rails, but convenience, speed, and comfort almost certainly will, as increasing traffic congestion slows automobile travel in the future.

Engineers already have designed automatic metropolitan transit systems, governed entirely by electronic computers and running at speeds up to 80 miles an hour, which could revolutionize urban and suburban travel at reasonable cost. A Princeton expert has designed a self-propelled, electronically controlled type of car that could run on suburban streets as a bus, attach itself to a bus-train on an expressway, and become part of a railroad train, if necessary, to reach the core of a big city. The monorail system, permitting speeds of 100 miles an hour or more, has long been advocated by experts; and in recent years much publicity has been given to a wheelless 300-mile-an-hour vehicle designed to travel on a thin cushion of compressed air.

Another possibility is a suggested system of continuously moving cars on belts, elevated, and air-conditioned, proposed to the city of Atlanta for movement of passengers in the central business district. In New York a respected engineering expert, Col. S. H. Bingham, former chairman of the New York Board of Transportation, has proposed a plan for commuter services to suburbs in three States, with automatic central traffic control. Trains would move in and out of stations without human supervision, and would have air-conditioned cars with doors spaced for quick loading and unloading. Speeds would range up to 80 miles an hour, and linking of lines would let a passenger travel anywhere in the area.

All these advances are technologically possible, and one or another would prevent auto traffic strangling our big-city business districts. In this effort San Francisco, with about 215,000 daily commuters, may become a pioneer. During peak hours in the bay area, San Francisco has almost 50 percent more automobile traffic now than it had 5 years ago; meanwhile, rail commutation on the Southern Pacific has declined. Seeking a cure, the five-county Bay Area Rapid Transit District proposed a regional system of rail transportation. Lightweight modern electric trains governed by a centrally located electronic computer were envisioned, to run over 100 miles of track at an average speed of 45 miles an hour. Each of the five lines would carry 60,000 seated passengers an hour, five times as many as a six-lane freeway. Fares would be tabulated by computer using a charge-account plate system, and billing customers on a monthly basis.

Officials say that the service will be profitable once the capital cost of $926 million is provided. Under present law, the transit district must seek the capital through issuance of general obligation bonds, secured by the property tax base up to a limit of 15 percent of assessed values in the five counties; but first they must get two-thirds of the voters to approve. Other means of financing part of the cost are being studied, and the legislature has approved diversion to the project of surplus automobile toll revenues from the Bay Bridge.

San Francisco may one day show us how to develop a regional commuter system with balanced rail and rubber traffic. But what about other cities, where private enterprise has developed suburban transportation over many years, often at a financial loss?

Perhaps the best example of what private ownership can do is seen in Chicago, which at peak hours has about 100,000 rail and 76,000 automobile commuters. In the early 1950's the Illinois Central, the Burlington, the North Western and the Rock Island roads were losing commuters and facing mounting deficits. Then they got busy, with Chairman Ben W. Heineman, of the North Western, taking an aggressive role. To begin, Heineman persuaded the Illinois Commerce Commission to let his road eliminate most of 21 commuter stops inside the city, where he competed with rapid transit lines. Then North Western installed a computer accounting and ticket system that saved money. Tickets were issued in a form that could be slipped into holders by each seat; and they were made good for unlimited rides, so that conductors didn't have to punch them, thus eliminating losses on crowded trains.

The North Western began buying new cars at $155,000 apiece. In a 5-year period 200 cars were added, well-lighted coaches, air conditioned, handsomely decorated, easy to keep clean, and double-decked to carry 161 seated passengers. The new cars were made up into trains that could run in either direction by using remote-control equipment for operation of the diesel engines, thus eliminating the costly and time-consuming problem of switching at terminals. In all, the road spent about $43 million on modernization. Having added 75 trains a week on one line, it now plans to increase service elsewhere.

But that wasn't all. North Western began spending $100,000 a year on a publicity campaign to tell its riders about the improvements, and to attract new riders. Newspaper advertisements extolled the benefits of railroad speed, of time to relax and read the newspapers, of air-conditioned comfort instead of snow and cold on the highways. Claiming that "you can save hundreds of dollars a year," they presented figures to show that auto commutation for a 40-mile round trip cost $667.50 annually, whereas the cost by train was only $367.84.

As a result, North Western had a 26-percent increase in passengers between 1954 and 1959. Reporting a deficit of around $3 million a year when the campaign began, it showed in 1959 a profit of $30,000. Other Chicago roads also have made improvements and won new business. The Burlington, although still in the red ink, increased commuter traffic by 52 percent in the 1950's. The Milwaukee had a 13-percent increase from 1954–59, and is now almost breaking even. The Illinois Central turned a 1958 deficit of $579,000 into a slight profit in 1960. All the roads have had fare boosts, but in the words of Heineman there is in Chicago "a growing belief that commuter operations can be maintained without the aid of public subsidies."

A different approach to the problem has been taken in Philadelphia, where the Pennsylvania and Reading railroads report total commuter deficits at $8 million a year. The problem was a common one: declining rail commutation and increasing automobile traffic. Mayor Richardson Dilworth recognized the need for unifying the city's transportation system, but the immediate task was to prevent collapse of rail commutation. Acting through the nonprofit Passenger Service Improvement Corp., the city began in 1958 to make contracts with the two railroads to (1) improve service within the city limits by using more and better trains, (2) charge lower fares, and (3) provide cheap transfer rides on bonus buses serving key rail stations. In addition, the city financed a $7 million improvement program on the lines, and expects eventually to spend $25 million on modern equipment.

The PSIC plan was put into effect by stages; the first stage increased rail commutation by 24 percent in a year. By the autumn of 1960 City Solicitor David Berger estimated that the plan was keeping about 8,600 automobiles a week out of the downtown sector. With the plan extended to all lines in the city, the contracts will cost Philadelphia about $1,500,000 in 1961, but that amount actually is saved the riders in lower fares, city officials believe. Dilworth's administration regards the plan as a successful step forward, but it cannot fully succeed unless it is extended to adjoining counties, where most of the commuters live.

Inevitably plans for such an extension run into political obstacles. The problem is to get coordinated action and tax money not just from a city, but also from adjacent towns and counties where political rivalries, divergent interests, and even resentment toward the city obstruct broad planning. "The biggest load the rail-commutation system carries," one railroad executive said wryly, "is politics."

The problem becomes even more complicated in New York City, where railroads carrying about half of the city's 400,000 commuters have been reducing service, abandoning lines, threatening to go out of business, and actually going broke. Is this crisis just a problem for the city, where commuters earn some $2,225 million a year? Or is it also the problem of adjacent counties, or of the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut, where the commuters live? Obviously it is a regional or interstate problem.

The Long Island Rail Road, operating wholly within New York State and carrying more passengers than any other road in the country, went bankrupt in 1949. The road had been trying for 29 years to get a fare raise. Equipment was run down and service was erratic. But abandonment of a line carrying 100,000 commuters a day meant chaos, so the State government stepped in. It created the Long Island Transit Authority, and set up a 12-year rehabilitation program. About half of all local and State taxes, amounting to $2,225,000 a year, was forgiven. The Pennsylvania Railroad, which owns the Long Island, agreed to forgo for 12 years any return on its $100 million investment, including $2 million a year interest on bonds. The Long Island was given the right to raise fares enough to break even, and it has since boosted fares about 20 percent.

This gave L.I.R.R. President Thomas M. Goodfellow breathing time and about $65 million with which to work. He bought 222 new air-conditioned cars, rebuilt 456 others, modernized the system to speed up traffic, added 10,000 new parking spaces at suburban stations, and maintained a record of 98 percent "on time" trains. While other roads were declining, the L.I.R.R. became one of the best commuter systems in the country, registering a gain of almost 7 percent in passengers by the late 1950's.

Unfortunately these reforms didn't put the L.I.R.R. on Easy Street. It reported business falling off in 1960, due to competition with new expressways, and said it would need more public assistance in 1961, or permission to reduce service, or to increase fares. Furthermore, it has been paying nothing on its debts, and no return on its bonds, and its tax relief is scheduled to expire in 1963.

The troubles of the New Haven Railroad, which carries 30,000 commuters daily to New York, have been worse. Despite fare boosts and schedule cuts, the road was on the point of bankruptcy in 1960 when the Interstate Commerce Commission approved a Federal guarantee of $8 million in loans to keep it going. Then the Governors of New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts set up an interstate staff committee that recommended a 4-year, $55 million program of tax relief, fare increases, and operating economies—a stopgap formula, with a long-range program to be spelled out later. The interim plan requires approval of all four State legislatures and of other governmental units if it is to be effective.

Although in this instance the four States started working harmoniously on the relief program, that "if" is important in seeking to solve any commuter problem that cuts across political boundaries such as city or State lines. Philadelphia's plan, for example, can be fully successful only if it can overcome obstacles to cooperation by surrounding counties.

Speaking generally, provision for rail commutation is being seen as a "public responsibility." The San Francisco plan is designed to use taxing power to provide coordinated urban mass transportation. In 1959 New York State in cooperation with municipalities granted some $15 million in tax relief to railroads, and established a railway-equipment fund of $20 million for purchase of new commuter cars, to be leased to the roads. The State of New Jersey in 1960 provided for a $6 million annual program of aid to rail commutation, by means of contracts for service with railroads. In 1958 Massachusetts paid the New Haven $900,000 to continue service on the Old Colony commuter branch for a year, and collected the money by assessment from Boston and suburban towns.

For the most part, these schemes are patchwork efforts to keep the commuter trains running, instead of long-range approaches to the problem, requiring cooperation at the city, State, and Federal level. The political difficulties of such cooperation are illustrated by a letter to the New York Herald Tribune from a citizen living outside the commutation area: "As a taxpayer, I wish to protest being compelled to contribute to the support of railroads which do not serve the area in which I live. We have had no passenger service for years. Why should (we) help pay for transportation of New York commuters? The commuters have been riding at the expense of the railroads until they are broke."

Political and sectional differences are vividly illustrated in Boston, where suburban railroad commutation has dwindled to around 24,000 riders per day and midtown traffic congestion has reached critical proportions. The New Haven, still gripped by financial convulsions, ended service on the Old Colony line after 1 year of subsidy, and the Boston & Albany wants to drop its service to western suburbs. The rapid transit service of the Metropolitan Transit Authority, which carries city residents to work, opened a branch in 1959 that extended one line about 12 miles from the downtown area; 3,000 passengers a day promptly increased to 27,000, including many suburbanites who drove to the outer terminus from outlying districts.

Some experts believe that Boston's problem could be solved by extending all MTA lines into the suburbs. But the MTA is losing around $20 million a year, which is paid by Boston and 13 districts in which it operates. Other outlying districts, especially those whose commuters can drive to existing MTA stations, don't want to pay a share of the deficit, and have refused to vote for extension of the service.

In view of these crises, what can be done to solve the rail-commutation problem and save our central business districts? There are those who agree with George Alpert, president of the New Haven, in saying that commutation by rail is essential to the public interest, and there ought to be a subsidy in some form to take up the deficits.

Alpert recently suggested that commutation service could be completely modernized and put on its financial feet by a combination of three things: Tax relief, gradual fare increases in line with rising costs in other fields, and indirect subsidization such as State maintenance of grade crossings. Some rail executives, including the Long Island's Goodfellow, have indicated support for establishment of regional agencies to plan coordinated rail, bus, and automobile transport and to make contracts with the railroads to supply the necessary service at set standards, as in Philadelphia. Deficits would be met by some kind of subsidization.

Subsidization is an abhorrent word to many rail executives, however, and they would be more likely to agree with a prominent railroad official who recently said that a solution can be found by giving railroads "complete tax relief and complete freedom to provide services and schedules at rates which the railroads would determine to produce a fair return." This proposal seems unlikely to be any more popular than the argument, put forward by some planning experts, that the eventual solution must be public ownership of the railroads, with the Government making up deficits.

Most students of urban planning see the problem as twofold: a need for immediate relief to prevent further declines in rail service and some long-term formula for expanding the service. Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey has a bill before Congress providing $325 million in low-cost, long-term loans to benefit mass transportation. A study by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has recommended direct loan of Federal funds for capital improvements on suburban railroads, as well as tax relief.

Speculating on a long-range solution, most experts on planning have little doubt that commutation must be regarded as a public responsibility entitled to support from various levels of government, with some kind of capital financing or subsidy. "We can't continue the fiction that rail commutation is profitable," one authority said recently, "even if it may be self-supporting in unusual circumstances."

Equally important are proposals to create regional agencies with power to plan transportation in relation to land use, to issue bonds and impose taxes with approval of the voters, and to settle disputes arising when city, county, or State boundaries are crossed. Unlike such arms of government as the Port of New York Authority, the regional agency should be able to draw off excess revenue from profitable operations, like a toll bridge, in order to support a losing public service like rail commutation. To an extent, this is what is being attempted now in the San Francisco Bay area.

As an unlikely ideal, however, the regional agency should have the power to pool all forms of commutation and all finances. Some experts believe the pool should include revenues from parking services and taxicabs, along with bridge and tunnel tolls, and that there should be toll charges for expressways leading into the heart of the city. Such details may seem fantastic, but the basic idea of regional control is generally accepted. As early as 1955 the Urban Traffic and Transportation Board of Philadelphia expressed the widely held belief that the only logical means of relieving the crisis was to get transportation out of the hands of numerous uncoordinated agencies—there are actually 46,000 governmental units in the country that have some degree of control—and into the hands of a regional organization. "This regional agency," it added, "should be responsible for development and control. It should be vested with the powers necessary to effectuate the regional transportation program."

Unfortunately no clear pattern of responsibility for metropolitan planning can be seen at present, according to the University of Pennsylvania's Robert B. Mitchell. "Apparently," he says, "most metropolitan areas are not ready to take the initiative and to overcome local jealousies. The States are the only governmental bodies with overall jurisdiction in most metropolitan areas. They should give officials of these areas the opportunity to take the lead, but if they do not, the States have the clear responsibility to proceed without them."

The time for action may be shorter than we think. "Of one thing I am certain," David I. Mackie, chairman of the Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference, said recently, "if it is left up to the railroads to continue commuter service without adequate tax relief and without the Government giving them equal treatment with competing forms of

transportation, there will be no commuter service operated by railroads in 1970 except under compulsion. And compulsion will inevitably bring financial ruin."

NEED FOR ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES SECURITY FORCE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, 2½ years ago when Fidel Castro seized power in Cuba, Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS was one of the first to raise his voice warning that Castro was not the Cuban Robin Hood he claimed to be.

Senator SMATHERS cautioned that known Communists were being put into key positions of power when Castro took over. He called upon Castro to announce that free elections would be held in the country if he really wanted to demonstrate that his government was a democratic one. Senator SMATHERS urged our State Department not to recognize the Castro government until at least an announcement for free elections was made in Cuba.

Senator SMATHERS also proposed the establishment of a hemispheric security force to maintain peace and order in the Western Hemisphere. The police force which he envisioned would be a small, highly mobilized force, armed with the most modern weapons. Its personnel would be recruited from the member nations of the Organization of American States. Its operation would be completely directed by the OAS.

For several years, Senator SMATHERS has time and again urged that such a force be established and that the United States take the lead in the OAS to get the police force started. But again his pleas were ignored. Now unfortunately, at the most crucial time in the history of the OAS, that group lacks the police force which might well be needed to carry out some of its mandates against the Castro-Communist government.

Mr. Gould Lincoln, of the Washington Star, has written an enlightening column about Senator SMATHERS' proposal for a police force and I ask that his column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED FOR AN OAS SECURITY FORCE

(By Gould Lincoln)

President Kennedy is wisely seeking quick action by this country—and also by the countries of Latin America—to promote social and economic progress as an important step to halt and prevent the spread of communism in the Western Hemisphere. Already his message to Congress urging prompt appropriation of $500 million, authorized by the 86th Congress, and also another $100 million to aid in the restoration of earthquake-torn southern Chile, plus his address to the representatives of 18 of the American nations at the White House, is described as "the Kennedy doctrine" by Latin Americans as well as by North Americans. Mr. Kennedy has vividly described the need (a) of aiding Latin America toward social progress, including the elimination of illiteracy, the improvement of health conditions, of housing and the use and distribution of land and (b) of aiding the economy of these countries from outside resources. The first step, the President stressed, should be social progress, so that economic aid could later be properly administered.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, a student of Latin American affairs, has wholeheartedly endorsed the President's Latin America program. He was a strong supporter of the Eisenhower recommendations which led the last Congress to authorize the funds now requested by President Kennedy. The fact that the authorization law already has been enacted has expedited action by the new Congress, if it will give heed to Mr. Kennedy's message—as it is expected to do.

OAS SECURITY FORCE

Another step in the fight against a spread of communism, in the opinion of Senator SMATHERS, should be promptly taken—the formation of an OAS (Organization of American States) security force, a military force sufficiently strong to prevent any aggression, such as that which Cuba's Castro tried in Panama, Guatemala, Costa Rica and other Latin American countries, and any aggression by any Latin American country against another. The need for such a security force, provided by all these American states and capable of being airborne to any spot in the hemisphere in record time, has been urged upon the OAS, but has not been authorized or established. The organization at present can only pass resolutions for the setup of armed forces to preserve peace, a time-consuming way of doing business at best. If necessary the United States, Mr. SMATHERS believes, should take the lead in moving for a security force of this kind.

One benefit which could arise from this OAS security or peace force is a disarmament agreement—or limitation of armaments—among the Latin American nations, some of which now spend large amounts of money every year to maintain armed forces. Indeed, it is reported that in some of these countries one-third of the entire budget is allocated to the military forces. The money so expended might well be used by these countries for social and economic developments within their borders.

As Senator SMATHERS has said, if it is proper for the establishment of NATO, with its armed forces, to repeal aggression and keep the peace in the North Atlantic, it should be eminently proper for OAS to have a similar security force to safeguard peace in the Americas. Also, if there is danger of a nuclear armed attack on this hemisphere, the defense will necessarily come from the United States, which is equipped to resist any such attack by Russia and its Communist allies.

PROGRAM OVERDUE

Quite naturally, Castro and his Communist followers in Cuba have already begun to scream because of the Kennedy doctrine, and they will scream even louder if the OAS does provide a strong well-armed security force. His charges of U.S. imperialism will fall on deaf ears in the Americas if they all take their full part in a security force.

The program now advocated by President Kennedy has been overdue. Too long this country has not given enough attention to aid for its southern neighbors in the matters of social and economic advancement. The money now requested by the President is for the Inter-American Fund for Social Progress set up by the Bogotá Conference. Mr. Kennedy in his message to Congress commented: "Social progress is not a substitute for economic development. It is an effort to create a social framework within which all the people of a nation can share in the benefits of prosperity and participate in the process of growth. Economic growth without social progress lets the great majority of the people remain in poverty while a privileged few reap the benefits of rising abundance." The President said emphatically, however, that the move for social progress was only a first step—that much must be done to advance the economy of the Latin American countries. To this extent, the Kennedy program may be likened to the Marshall plan which worked so effectively after the Second World War to aid in reviving the economies of the Western European nations.

THE FIRST HUNDRED DAYS OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, April 30 marked the 100th day of the Kennedy administration. It is a time for a first evaluation of the new President, his leadership, and his program.

The hundred-days' period as a yardstick for measuring the accomplishments of a new administration is, of course, arbitrary. But it is a span with some historical precedent, and the President himself, in his campaign, has tagged this period as "crucial" in establishing his legislative leadership. Thus the hundred-days' concept has been persistently rooted in the public consciousness during all these early moves of the Kennedy administration.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] led off very admirably today with an analysis of agricultural policy. We already know that other Senators will speak on similar subjects. My colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] will speak on civil rights. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] will speak on information. Perhaps other Senators will be moved to speak in the same vein.

I believe this is an excellent time to state the character of the opposition that is contemplated by Republicans like myself in the days ahead. Other Senators have their own identification. I speak in those terms today only for myself.

I think we should evaluate the 100 days. More importantly, the country should be clear as to what Senators like myself should support where support is dictated, and what Senators like myself must oppose where opposition is dictated, and, what is perhaps even more important, to offer constructive alternatives where these are required by the desirability of the objectives to be attained. An exposition of our ideas in the way which is here proposed is the most congenial for this purpose to our congressional tradition and practice.

The hundred-days period is basically a test as to whether the incoming President has used the momentum of his election to achieve his major goals as developed in the campaign. I feel by this standard President Kennedy has given up the impetus of his election. In the first 100 days, we have not had accomplishments measuring up to his campaign promises, because he has not asked for them.

Certainly—and we want to be very fair about this—on the whole the Ken-

nedy administration has shown a commendable vitality and energy in presenting its programs. But these programs in realization have lacked the boldness of the words which were uttered both during and after the campaign; and the creative initiative of which so much was made during the campaign has not yet been forthcoming—other than in implementing the campaign promise of the Peace Corps.

The fundamental objective of our people, I believe, is the establishment of stable prosperity at a rate of high productivity, with the enjoyment of its fruits developed on the basis of social justice and with the private economic system operating essentially in the public interest.

In view of the historic competition we face from the Communists it is essential to the attainment of this objective to have a bipartisan foreign policy to secure peace with freedom and justice—through the United Nations, through regional organizations to which we adhere, and by collective action under a rule of law. Such a policy requires the United States firmly to accept its responsibility for the peace leadership of the free world—a leadership to be constantly earned and not imposed—a leadership unsought but ours by virtue of history, geography and concentration of productive resources unmatched in the free world.

I lay that down as a fundamental precept, because I believe that Republicans who feel as I do wish to subscribe to the principles of a bipartisan foreign policy as developed by Senator Vandenberg, which continues to be the dominant factor which should determine the actions in the foreign policy field of Republicans during the administration of a President from the Democrat Party. The attitude of President Eisenhower on Cuba and Laos has been an eloquent testimonial to that kind of bipartisan foreign policy.

It has been a trying time in foreign policy and ranks have properly been closed in the country without regard to party to back the administration in Cuba, Laos, and the Congo. But the way forward must yet be charted and the great bipartisan tradition should be opened so that those from whom support is to be sought should join in charting the course.

Also necessary to the attainment of the basic objective that I have stated is a vigorous and enterprising domestic policy profiting fully from the partisan debate and the ideas which can be developed in such a debate.

In this frame of reference, what are the weaknesses disclosed by the administration so far? I mention these weaknesses only in the hope that doing so will prove constructive and helpful in overcoming them. These weaknesses are:

First. Failure to meet adequately the relentless issues of productivity and costs.

Second. An apparent inability to make the American people fully aware of our critical responsibilities in the world; and of the sacrifices required to meet them.

Third. A "must" legislative program devoid of that boldness which was made the keynote of the campaign.

Fourth. A reluctance to face major controversies now, as for example in civil rights and medical care for the aged.

Fifth. An absence of vitality in our foreign economic policy.

I believe that Republicans should be: hardheaded about money; strong for legislation to assure equal opportunity—civil rights; committed to the private economic system, including, as used in these remarks, labor, management, agriculture and voluntary associations, and the need for seeing it operated in the public interest; and committed to the Government's role to carry on those functions which the private economy cannot undertake or cannot undertake as well. The Republican national platform of 1960, following the lines of the task force report by the Republican Committee on Program and Progress headed by Charles H. Percy of Chicago, carries out this position. These references are an interesting commentary on the fact that when Republicans get together in national conclave they come up with modern, not outdated policies. The Republican Party platform of 1960 states these principles very well, as follows:

> Government's primary role is to help provide the environment within which the individual can seek his own goals. In some areas this requires Federal action to supplement individual, local and State initiative. The Republican Party has acted and will act decisively, compassionately, and with deep human understanding in approaching such problems as those of the aged, the infirm, the mentally ill, and the needy.

The Percy report picks this up in the following words:

> The Government has a positive responsibility to its people to maintain the conditions for a sound, productive economy. Without this there can be no opportunity, no assurance of meaningful life for anyone.
>
> A government has a responsibility to move effectively against either depression or inflation. This responsibility to help keep the economy operating well has been wisely fixed in the Employment Act of 1946.

These ideas are implemented as for example in such fields as the domestic economy, research, and education in both documents.

The Republican Party platform states:

> Our continuing and great national need is for basic research—a wellspring of knowledge and progress. Government must continue to take a responsible role in science to assure that worthwhile endeavors of national significance are not retarded by practical limitations of private and local support.

The Percy report states:

> That every American must have access to the best education his individual endowments enable him to use. To achieve this requires the strongest combined efforts of government at all levels to stimulate the pursuit of excellence in our schools.
>
> That every American of whatever race or creed must have the chance to make his best contribution to society, to himself, and his family, and to earn a status of respect.

Those of us who believe in this kind of Republicanism have always had to fight against the efforts of liberal Democrats who would smother us by identification with them. But we have a distinctive position which we must implement and carry forward in the interest of our party and country.

It is our recognition of the private economic system as a prime guarantor of freedom and the determination that it should operate in the public interest. With all the loyalty to the private economic system expressed by many Democrats—and I feel it is sincere—there is nonetheless inherent in their political philosophy an unwillingness to sacrifice much for this principle in the way of legislation they consider to serve a socially desirable objective and which may vest more power over the private economy in the Federal Government. I believe Republicans must find a way to accomplish socially desirable objectives with prime reliance on the private economic system as I have defined it and scrupulous attention to preserving it.

The President on February 22, 1961, handed the congressional majority leadership a "must" list of 16 priority measures with a target date of July 31 for their enactment.

Here is a box score:

Temporary unemployment benefits: Signed into law March 24.

Feed grains: Signed into law March 22.

OECD membership: Ratified by the Senate March 16 and signed by the President March 23.

Reorganization Act: Signed into law May 1.

Dependent children's aid: Before the President.

Minimum wage: Before the President.

Federal judgeships: In conference.

Office of International Travel: Passed Senate; reported in House.

Increased social security benefits: Passed House, in Senate committee.

Aid to primary and secondary education: House hearings; reported by Senate subcommittee.

Aid to higher education: House hearings.

Medical care for the aged: No action.

Medical training: No action.

Health facilities: Senate hearings.

Restrictions on trade with Soviet bloc—Battle Act: Reported in Senate.

An analysis of these measures shows little to indicate inventive leadership so far.

The extension of temporary unemployment benefits, coming in the midst of a recession, followed action taken previously by the Eisenhower administration under similar circumstances. Dependent children's aid, also a reaction to the recession, is a stopgap measure. Membership in the OECD represented ratification of a truly bold initiative in foreign economic policy undertaken by the

Eisenhower administration. The judgeship bill was an Eisenhower-originated measure—denied to it, on political grounds, by virtue of Democratic control of Congress, notwithstanding demonstrated need. The bill for an office of international travel was originally introduced by me and was since vigorously pushed by Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee. And the Reorganization Act is a technical measure following an established pattern. The feed grains bill, although strongly opposed, was a stopgap measure of doubtful value.

The depressed areas and minimum wage bills would not have passed in the form they did, had not support been given them by House Republicans. On these measures, the President skated on the edge of defeat because he failed to arouse public awareness—and therefore, congressional support—of the critical need for this legislation.

The social security improvements, the aid to education bills, medical training and health facilities bills—these are measures, too, that can hardly be considered new or inventive although their form and amount is different—and the administration program involves much higher costs.

The one really distinctive measure associated with the President is medical care for the aged and yet there seemed to be every disposition to defer action on this measure until 1962, notwithstanding the fact that such legislation is urgently needed. Currently, it would appear that the administration has shifted its position—perhaps to some extent in response to the urging of Republicans like those holding views like my own—and is now said to be willing to deal with the issue at this session—this is all to the good.

However, the administration's program shows certain important deficiencies which I believe it is our duty to endeavor to correct, as follows: Extension of coverage to all over 65 who need it; nature of benefits to include preventive care; preservation of existing voluntary health protection programs; and utilization of the varying medical resources of each State based upon capability. The alternative to the administration measure which I have sponsored with eight other Republican Senators corrects these deficiencies and there is every reason to expect mutual agreement on a medical care for the aged bill at this session if the administration will join us in the drive to get one passed.

In addition to medical care for the aged and civil rights, there have been other inadequacies.

In the economic field, the most striking has been lack of adequate attention to the need to increase our productivity—the growth factor in the economy—so widely discussed during the campaign.

Despite all the talk about combatting the recession, the administration has failed fully to come to grips with its underlying economic problems—productivity and hard-core unemployment.

The organization of a Labor-Management Advisory Committee at the White House level has been the major effort in this direction. Little or no attention has been given so far to the problems of featherbedding—in management as well as in labor; increased automation; national or community emergency strikes; private job discrimination; and concentrated imports. The President's tax credit proposals, spelled out in his message to Congress on April 20, may act—according to the administration's own estimate—as an incentive for $2 billion to $3 billion in additional business outlay for plant and equipment; but this is a "less-than-half-measure" and invites comparison with an annual capital investment rate in the Soviet Union which by 1959 was already $9 billion higher than in the United States.

It has been authoritatively stated that our industrial plant is rapidly getting out of date, averaging between two and three decades in terms of its use so far. Other tax adjustment problems are related to a stimulus for constructive foreign private investment and to a proposal to end limited income tax credit on dividends.

Retraining and even relocation for workers subjected to disadvantage because of technological changes, ability to transfer pension rights when changing jobs, and labor-management productivity councils at the plant or community level as proposed in my bill, S. 1181, all require attention.

The problem raised by imports in certain lines, and the growing concern over their effect on American industry are becoming one of the critical issues of the day. When he was Senator, President Kennedy showed a commendable diligence in meeting this issue and he was one of the sponsors of a measure carrying out the trade adjustment concept. This is the subject of the National Import Policy Act, S. 851, I have introduced with Senator CASE of New Jersey to deal with this subject. But today, except for some tentative steps with respect to the textile industry, the administration is coming to meet this issue very slowly, indeed.

Also failing to get the urgent attention it deserves is the basis for imbalance in our international payments which notwithstanding first quarter improvement is still a potential danger, and the major question of a more rational international credit system with better facilities for balancing international payments and more intimate financial cooperation with the other principal industrial countries. To be sure, the administration has taken some steps in this area—recommended cuts in tourist import allowances, flexibility in interest rates for foreign central bank deposits in the United States and curbing certain kinds of U.S. overseas investment. But these measures are inadequate to the enormous problem before us.

Of the initiatives undertaken by the administration, the Peace Corps has been an exciting and productive concept for our country. But to succeed, the program must take the shape of a major well-organized, well-financed foreign policy program. Personnel requirements need to be gaged to the size of the need and should not be just a sporting effort. There should, for example, be no inhibition about seeking appropriations for adequate compensation for services rendered; the draft deferment problem should be faced frankly; and new emphasis should be placed on expanding and improving our present educational facilities for training Peace Corps recruits, and others in existing organizations engaged in international service activities.

Despite the support for encouraging foreign travel in the United States, there is a reluctance to deal with the vexing visa question which is in itself far more important than almost any other single factor in discouraging tourism to the United States.

And there has been a strange silence in the administration, so far, on our immigration laws generally which are archaic, obsolescent, operating against the national interest and are racially discriminatory and unjust—as well as on the admission of refugees and escapees into the United States.

Finally, a most fruitful undertaking would be to enlist the powerful and vital U.S. private economy in all its branches—business, labor, agriculture, and voluntary organizations—as the most effective instrument in the foreign policy of our country. In the field of foreign aid, the President's recommendations for long-term authority are certainly deserving of praise and support. However, nothing can be done in this field unless private resources are marshaled together with Government resources. They are realistic and necessary if we would utilize most effectively our economy and social organization to meet the grim competition of the Communists in the neutralist and developing areas of the free world. But much more than that is needed. We need, in a two-stage process, to effectively enlist our allies in these efforts; and to effectively enlist the private economic systems of the United States and of its allies. For the massive effort required to win for freedom over communism with our best weapons—credit and production—will take a marshaling of these resources greater than anything of which we have yet conceived.

The effort to renew the reciprocal trade agreements program in 1962, when it will expire, will be one of the major legislative struggles of our time—and the issue will be vital in the 1962 national political campaign. The facts show that the stimulation of trade can prove even more important and constructive to the development of newly emerging areas than aid itself. This is equally true of private investment and private technical assistance. These can be encouraged by tax incentives that are urgently needed, by leadership for an optimum interna-

tional investment code, and by working out techniques for enlisting individuals with technical skills in foreign technical assistance activities.

In summary, while the administration has shown commendable activity in certain areas, it has not demonstrated an equally decisive leadership or a boldness in taking the initiative on the most controversial and basic issues. By documenting the parts of the administration's program that we support, the parts we oppose, and the parts on which we offer constructive alternatives, I believe we can be of the most use to our people as a worthy opposition in a time of such peril and national responsibility.

For all practical purposes, the output of the American people, through their willingness to sacrifice, must be tantamount to what it is in time of war. So far, this is a peaceful war, and we hope very much that we can win it by economic and social means. But it will require an output which is full enough, massive enough, and courageous enough in terms of the sacrifice of the American people to equal the kind of sacrifice we are accustomed to making in time of war in order to win the struggle for freedom against communism.

It is in that vein that I have made these comments and certain analyses and criticisms with respect to the first 100 days.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION INTEREST RATES IN AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] made some comments regarding a recent regulation by the Small Business Administration. His comments appear on pages 7069 and 7070 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have no quarrel with the comments made by the Senator from Maryland, but I believe there ought to be an understanding of the regulation which was issued by the Small Business Administration.

The regulation or policy announcement was made for the purpose of giving relief in surplus labor areas; or, in other words, industrialized areas. The plan was to lower the rate of interest. The ordinary rate of interest on Small Business Administration business loans is 5½ percent. The announcement was to the effect that in distressed areas, for all moneys disbursed subsequent to the date of issuance of the announcement, the rate of interest would be at the rate of 4 percent rather than 5½ percent.

The Senator from Maryland raises the question of what would happen if a labor surplus area became reclassified during that time. Then the interest rate would, I believe, return to the normal rate, because the area would have recovered from the labor surplus condition.

At any rate, I believe it would be well to have printed at this point in the RECORD—and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done—the press release which was issued by the Small Business Administration on Wednesday, April 5, 1961, concerning this question, and also the regulation as it was published in the Federal Register on pages 3063 and 3064.

There being no objection, the press release and regulation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE BY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, APRIL 5, 1961

Effective immediately, interest rates on Small Business Administration loans to small firms and to local and State development companies in areas of substantial labor surplus will be lowered to 4 percent, SBA Administrator John E. Horne announced today.

The new 4-percent interest rate will apply only in substantial labor surplus areas, as classified by the U.S. Department of Labor, Mr. Horne emphasized. The lower interest rate applies only to loans approved (should have been "disbursed") after this date. The established interest rate—5½ percent on direct loans to small firms and local development companies, 5 and 5½ percent to State development companies—continues in all other areas, Mr. Horne stressed.

Mr. Horne said today's action is being taken as a further step to give a lift to economic activity and employment in depressed areas.

"The lower interest rate should offer real incentive for small firms and development companies to move ahead with long-deferred construction, expansion or conversion of facilities and purchase of needed equipment, machinery, supplies or for working capital," Mr. Horne said. "It is our hope that by making these lower interest, long-term funds available to qualified small businesses and development companies serving small firms in these hard-hit areas, many will be able to expand their operations, modernize their facilities or purchase new equipment, thus stimulating business, jobs and income."

The lower interest rate action was approved by the Loan Policy Board which is responsible for determining SBA general loan policies. The Board is composed of the SBA Administrator, as Chairman, and the Secretaries of the Treasury and Commerce.

Loan applications should be made to the nearest SBA field office, as in the past.

Following is the revised SBA loan policy:

With respect to SBA's regular business loan program under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, as amended, the interest rate on direct loans and on SBA's share of participation loans is reduced from 5½ percent to 4 percent per annum subject to the qualification that the borrowing small business concern is located in an area of substantial labor surplus.

On loans made to State development companies under section 501 of the Small Business Act of 1958, as amended, the interest rate is changed from 5 percent to 4 percent per annum, provided that the State development companies will use the loan proceeds for small business concerns located in an area of substantial labor surplus and will pass on the benefit of the reduced rate.

On loans made to State and local development companies under section 502 of the Small Business Investment Act, the interest rate on direct loans made by SBA and on SBA's share of participation loans is changed from 5½ to 4 percent per annum, subject to the qualification that the small business concerns to be assisted by the development companies are located in an area of substantial labor surplus.

For all the foregoing, "area of substantial labor surplus" means a geographical area within the United States which is classified by the Department of Labor as an "area of substantial labor surplus" or "area of substantial and persistent labor surplus" and is listed as such by that Department in its publication "Area Labor Market Trends" or is individually certified by the Department of Labor as an "area of substantial labor surplus."

TITLE 13—BUSINESS CREDIT AND ASSISTANCE

CHAPTER I—SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

[Amdt. 1 (Rev. 1)]

Part 108—Loans to State and Local Development Companies

Miscellaneous Amendments

The loans to State and Local Development Companies Regulation (Revision 1) (26 F.R. 1822) is hereby amended by:

1. Adding a new paragraph (h) to § 108.501–1 as follows:

§ 108.501–1 Section 501 loans.

* * * * *

(h) Assistance in Areas of Substantial Labor Surplus: On and after April 5, 1961, section 501 loans may be made to a State development company for the purpose of making long-term loans to small business concerns which will use such assistance in the establishment or operation of their businesses located in an area which at the time of disbursement to such small business concerns shall be an Area of Substantial Labor Surplus, as such area is defined in part 121 of this chapter; subject to the other applicable provisions in § 108.501–1 except as such provisions are modified by the following:

(1) The State development company shall agree that, within 30 days after disbursement of the section 501 loan made for the purpose stated in this paragraph, it will make and maintain portfolio loans, to such small business concerns, having a stated outstanding principal value equal to no less than 100 percent of the unpaid principal of such section 501 loan, which portfolio loans shall have been made at a rate of interest at least one percent per annum less than the established or customary rate of interest charged by the State development company for long-term loans, unless another rate is approved in writing by SBA.

(2) Interest on section 501 loans made for the purpose stated in this paragraph shall be at the rate of four percent per annum.

2. Adding a new sentence at the end of paragraph (h) of § 108.502–1, which new sentence reads as follows:

§ 108.502–1 Section 502 loans.

* * * * *

(h) Interest rate. * * * Where the section 502 loan is made subsequent to April 4, 1961, to a State or local development company for the benefit of a small business concern which will use the Plant in the establishment or operation of its business located in an Area of Substantial Labor Surplus, as such area is defined in part 121 of this section, the interest rate on such a direct section 502 loan to a development company and on SBA's share of such a section 502 loan made in participation with another lending institution shall be four percent per annum.

Dated: April 5, 1961.

JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 61–3242; Filed, Apr. 10, 1961; 8:52 a.m.]

[Amdt. 3]

Part 120—Loan policy statement

Business Loans

The Small Business Administration Loan Policy Statement (23 F.R. 10513) is hereby

further amended by: Renumbering § 120.4–3(b)(2)(iii) to be § 120.4–3(b)(2)(iv) and adding a new § 120.4–3(b)(2)(iii):

§ 120.4–3 Terms and conditions of loans.

* * * * * *

(b) * * *

(2) * * *

(iii) Area of Substantial Labor Surplus: Where the small-business concern to be benefited by assistance authorized pursuant to section 7(a) of the Act agrees to use such assistance in the establishment or operation of its business located in an Area of Substantial Labor Surplus, as such area is defined in Part 121 of this section, the interest rate on SBA's share of such assistance shall not exceed 4 percent per annum. The provisions of this subdivision shall apply to all loans disbursed subsequent to April 4, 1961. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the provisions of this subdivision shall not apply to assistance authorized pursuant to section 7(a)(5) of the Act (group corporation loans).

(iv) Interest on SBA's share of loans, whether direct or participation loans, which may be made to group corporations shall be at the rate of 5 percent per annum. Subject to the approval of SBA, banks or other lending institutions may establish such rate of interest on their share of participation loans as shall be legal and reasonable.

Effective date: This amendment shall become effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Dated: April 4, 1961.

JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 61–3243; Filed, Apr. 10, 1961; 8:52 a.m.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I believe the regulation is clear in its statement, and there should be no misunderstanding as to its meaning. I believe the release made that clear. Certainly the Small Business Administration is seeking to do something which will be helpful in carrying out the policy announced by the President to give relief to the surplus labor areas.

SECOND REPORT ON SIGNUP UNDER 1961 FEED GRAIN PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, when Congress passed the so-called feed grains bill, it was hoped that the results would have the effect of reducing acreage, thereby reducing production. I am happy to report that under date of May 3, 1961, the Department of Agriculture, in its report on feed grain signup, shows that about 7,500,000 acres will be diverted. The Department's release reads, in part:

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today announced that the second report on signup under the 1961 feed grain program—through April 28—shows 366,000 farms will divert 7,487,488 acres from corn and grain sorghum production this year. Corn and grain sorghum plantings on these farms averaged nearly 18.3 million acres for 1959 and 1960.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the entire statement of the Department of Agriculture, together with a State-by-State report of signups and the amounts involved in terms of acreage and the advance payments which can be paid this spring to farmers who are cooperating.

There being no objection, the statement and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND FEED GRAIN SIGNUP REPORT SHOWS ABOUT 7.5 MILLION ACRES DIVERTED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1961.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today announced that the second report on signup under the 1961 feed grain program—through April 28—shows 366,000 farms will divert 7,487,488 acres from corn and grain sorghum production this year. Corn and grain sorghum plantings on these farms averaged nearly 18.3 million acres for 1959 and 1960.

"The addition of 5.3 million acres to the 2.2 million acres reported a week ago continues the encouraging trend of program participation," Secretary Freeman said. "Farmers are responding to this opportunity to make needed production adjustments while still protecting their current income."

The second report shows that about 7,161,036 acres of corn will be diverted from the 17,466,902 acres of corn base established for farms signed up. For grain sorghum, 326,542 acres will be diverted from the 804,038 base acres on farms signed up.

The corn base acreage on farms signed through April 25 is about 21 percent of the average 1959-60 U.S. corn plantings of about 83,648,000 acres. The 7.2 million acres to be diverted from production this year is about 41 percent of the base acreage on signed farms.

For all farms signed, possible advance payments under provisions permitting about half of the payments to be made this spring come to about $96,500,000. While the potential total payments for acreage diverted to date under the program are not being determined for these initial reports, Department officials estimate that total payments will probably be more than double the value of the advance payments.

The 1961 feed grain program provides payments to farmers in the form of certificates for diverting corn and grain sorghum acreage to conserving uses. Producers may receive grain or the cash equivalent of grain for their certificates. Diversion of corn and grain sorghum acreage from production this year is expected to help achieve a better balance between production and utilization of these grains. The payments to producers will maintain their income this year.

The report shows that certificates covering about $22 million worth of grain had been issued to farmers under the advance payment provisions. Of the $22 million worth of certificates issued through April 28, farmers had received about $18,800,000 in cashable sight drafts from county agricultural stabilization and conservation (ASC) offices. In these instances, as provided under the program, the Commodity Credit Corporation pays farmers in cash and then later acts as their agent in marketing the quantity of grain covered under the certificates.

The following tables show signup figures by States. The first table shows combined figures for corn and grain sorghum. It shows the number of farms with base acreage, number of farms signed up, the total acreage to be diverted, the advance payments that can be paid this spring, the value of certificates issued, and the value of certificates cashed.

The second table shows separately for corn and grain sorghum the average 1959–60 planted acreages, the base acreage on farms signed up, and the acreage diverted on signed farms:

State	Number of farms with base acreage	Number of farms signed up	Total acreage to be diverted	Advance payments that can be paid this spring	Value of certificates issued	Value of certificates cashed
Alabama	109,551	11,897	199,554	$1,280,675		
Arizona	1,979	148	7,374	134,035	$37,527	$23,412
Arkansas	15,538	1,126	18,308	176,967	120,066	106,158
California	5,166	472	16,701	251,853	63,668	42,168
Colorado	15,022	128	3,084	29,894	7,884	6,336
Connecticut	160					
Delaware	5,103	678	15,017	107,657	71,188	59,690
Florida	15,087	3,325	94,014	849,749	714,041	666,142
Georgia	51,211	3,821	101,775	844,341	144,752	108,398
Idaho	1,507	58	1,042	23,777	12,721	12,072
Illinois	209,049	49,021	1,060,905	16,020,024	216,580	97,839
Indiana	154,538	6,813	156,087	2,425,636	357,948	280,974
Iowa	199,688	73,325	1,923,045	23,774,724	795	391
Kansas	160,000	447	12,106	164,098	42,743	14,968
Kentucky	87,548	1,404	282,499	2,818,315	229,334	213,854
Louisiana	18,599	1,544	26,800	312,414	261,598	248,554
Maine	1,764					
Maryland	18,092	1,938	40,289	604,947	109,979	66,511
Massachusetts	1	1	25			
Michigan	92,120	6,955	126,601	1,748,691	379,749	294,238
Minnesota	126,801	17,361	424,157	5,129,434	2,545,572	2,276,548
Mississippi	79,563	5,491	78,428	790,363	621,168	577,098
Missouri	135,901	35,726	958,272	14,550,662	4,842,173	3,755,620
Montana	2,673					
Nebraska	109,921	4,204	127,845	1,396,375	363,846	257,944
Nevada	21					
New Hampshire	2					
New Jersey	4,119	481	10,709	$222,931		
New Mexico	3,176	28	1,274	13,345	$5,981	$3,600
New York	34,781	5,255	80,200	1,273,929	895,787	1,261,568
North Carolina	140,324	23,926	278,203	4,110,274	3,417,289	2,772,374
North Dakota	27,412	2,181	44,833	223,045	167,616	132,141
Ohio	145,469	17,783	311,865	5,478,539	208,283	118,324
Oklahoma	42,142	1,024	23,384	153,157	65,195	50,359
Oregon	2,660	187	3,320	73,980	1,116	1,116
Pennsylvania	78,486	4,456	60,493	994,371	965,706	929,610
Rhode Island	9					
South Carolina	56,900	5,373	76,331	766,828	554,814	467,211
South Dakota	62,665	3,649	117,304	790,482	598,986	481,134
Tennessee	91,565	15,118	241,888	2,327,188	2,044,990	1,685,600
Texas	148,685	4,694	120,978	970,905	668,266	623,826
Utah	2,055	57	812	6,591		
Vermont	49					
Virginia	40,983	5,689	62,496	929,478	877,208	870,105
Washington	2,890	327	6,433	172,194	126,783	126,041
West Virginia	954	25	404	6,645		
Wisconsin	120,740	20,106	37,0830	4,527,278	250,886	152,297
Wyoming	1,586	70	1,803	23,804	23,804	22,976
U.S. total	2,624,255	366,312	7,487,488	96,499,595	22,016,132	18,807,197

State	Corn			Grain sorghum		
	1959–60 average planted acreage [1]	Base acreage on signed farms	Acres to be diverted	1959–60 average planted acreage [1]	Base acreage on signed farms	Acres to be diverted
Alabama	2,212,000	335,025	197,502	64,000	3,720	2,052
Arizona	35,000	540	165	133,000	17,083	7,209
Arkansas	390,500	28,284	16,859	98,500	2,921	1,449
California	230,000	15,212	6,318	290,000	26,144	10,383
Colorado	493,000	21,376	2,468	710,000	1,825	616
Connecticut	41,000					
Delaware	161,500	28,375	15,017			
Florida	600,500	210,732	93,016		1,362	1,004
Georgia	2,788,500	230,085	100,649	66,500	2,889	1,126
Idaho	81,000	2,216	1,030		21	12
Illinois	10,191,500	3,012,259	1,058,368	18,000	6,049	2,537
Indiana	5,292,500	383,117	155,684	29,500	974	403
Iowa	12,481,000	5,664,256	1,915,563	78,500	29,792	7,482
Kansas	2,032,000	16,176	8,012	5,257,500	10,694	4,094
Kentucky	1,779,000	495,861	279,375	44,000	6,557	3,124
Louisiana	527,500	45,244	25,624	16,500	2,340	1,176
Maine	11,000					
Maryland	506,000	80,850	40,245		59	44
Massachusetts	31,500	25	25			
Michigan	2,224,000	238,329	126,600			
Minnesota	6,822,500	1,344,369	424,012		484	144
Mississippi	1,344,000	127,840	76,731	64,500	3,795	1,697
Missouri	4,270,000	1,636,680	845,000	612,500	233,400	113,272
Montana	142,000					
Nebraska	6,851,500	289,431	98,340	1,788,500	69,875	29,505
Nevada	4,500					
New Hampshire	11,500					
New Jersey	191,000	18,766	10,709			
New Mexico	47,000	906	410	325,000	2,283	864
New York	656,500	132,209	80,200			
North Carolina	1,978,000	472,343	266,967	120,000	16,354	11,237
North Dakota	1,348,500	103,617	44,812	13,500	82	21
Ohio	3,889,000	633,546	311,783		124	82
Oklahoma	270,500	6,931	3,928	1,321,000	34,202	19,456
Oregon	67,500	6,066	3,280		92	40
Pennsylvania	1,286,000	91,883	60,390		207	103
Rhode Island	6,000					
South Carolina	895,500	139,714	75,055	54,000	2,296	1,276
South Dakota	4,283,500	304,069	109,028	316,000	17,806	8,276
Tennessee	1,620,000	369,238	231,012	87,500	18,178	10,876
Texas	1,469,500	121,577	35,699	8,310,000	289,227	85,279
Utah	51,500	951	680		194	132
Vermont	59,500					
Virginia	806,000	108,303	61,603	23,500	1,914	893
Washington	87,000	10,325	5,864		1,061	569
West Virginia	148,000	606	404			
Wisconsin	2,870,500	746,023	370,826		19	4
Wyoming	62,000	3,547	1,788	7,500	15	15
U.S. total	83,648,000	17,466,902	7,161,036	19,849,500	804,038	326,452

[1] Planted for all purposes as published in the AMS 1960 Annual Summary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it should be gratifying to Congress to know that a program adopted only recently is now in full effect and is working well. There is widespread cooperation on the part of county committees and township committeemen of the so-called ASC committee system in getting farmer compliance with this important feed grain program.

I compliment and commend the Secretary of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture on the good work they have done, and I commend farmers for their excellent cooperation.

EFFICIENCY IN FEDERAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], has just released a 278-page publication entitled "Coordination of Information on Current Scientific Research and Development Supported by the U.S. Government."

The print is the latest in a series of publications which have been prepared by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of which it is my privilege to be chairman.

Members of the subcommittee, in addition to the Senator from Arkansas, include the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

AIDING SCIENTIFIC PROGRESS AND EFFICIENCY

This publication, in the judgment of expert observers who had reviewed it in manuscript form, may make one of the most significant contributions of recent years to the cause of scientific progress and scientific efficiency.

The print points out that:

First. The Nation is investing $12 billion in current scientific research, development, testing, and evaluation. Two-thirds of that sum is a Federal investment of $8 billion. This amounts to one out of every 10 U.S. budget dollars.

Second. The work involves an estimated 160,000 projects and tasks, being performed in over 9,000 separate and dispersed laboratories.

Third. Regrettably, there is no master, indexed inventory of this current work. So, it is next to impossible for any one agency, any one division, any one administrator or scientist to know who is now doing what and where in the same or related fields.

UNINTENDED DUPLICATION OF EFFORT

Fourth. As a result, hundreds of millions of dollars of unintended duplication of effort inevitably occur. This means a tragic waste in men, money, and material.

The print follows up for the physical sciences a line of questioning which our subcommittee pursued in the medical sciences in our hearing of August 1960. At that time, we found 22,000 current federally supported projects, with no adequate interagency coordination of information on the current effort.

POSTPUBLICATION AND PREPUBLICATION DATA

The print also follows up on the subcommittee's past work on published scientific literature—technical articles, monographs, books.

It turns, however, from such postpublication information to the mountains of information in the prepublication stage. This latter category includes work still in progress, which may not be written up for a year, 2 years, or ever. Much of this information may become lost forever. No one but the investigator may know that certain work has already been done.

Many of the current scientific experiments will fail. But in the future, other scientists, unaware of the fact that earlier research proved futile, may go on endlessly repeating the unsuccessful experiments in vain. Or they may rediscover knowledge which was based on successful experiments performed long ago but never reported.

The Nation cannot afford such pointless duplication. It cannot afford to waste a single dollar or a single manhour, particularly in the highest priority areas of scientific research in military-space science.

COMMITTEE APPROVED MAIN STAFF CONCLUSIONS

The report consists essentially of a consultative analysis, together with staff findings.

A summary statement of its principal policy conclusions was approved without dissent by the full membership of the Committee on Government Operations at a meeting on January 26.

DEEP INTEREST BY ADMINISTRATION

At that time, I presented advance copies of the report to the Federal agencies. I am glad to say that the report has already had a salutary effect. A number of improvements have already been commenced by Federal agencies. Deep interest has been manifested in it by the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology, Dr. Jerome Wiesner, and by Secretary of Defense McNamara, as I state in the concluding portion.

COMMITTEE'S RESPONSIBILITY TO U.S. TAXPAYER

The Committee on Government Operations was formerly known as the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

Our responsibility is to secure the best possible expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar. Under the Rules of the Senate, we are responsible for issues of budgeting

and accounting and economy and efficiency.

The reports which we have issued have, in my judgment, resulted in substantial financial savings to the American people.

The present publication can, if its recommendations are followed, also result in the saving of literally millions of dollars of effort. What is most important, it can help us in research to deter war, research for survival, research for civilian progress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a statement which I released to the press on the subject of this publication be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAGIC WASTE DUE TO "MODEL T" MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION ON CURRENT FEDERAL RESEARCH

The Federal Government's "model T" methods of managing scientific information contribute to unknowing duplication and "tragic and intolerable waste of men, money, and material," Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, declared today.

The Minnesota legislator urged Federal agencies to master the scientific revolution in information control. He made the recommendation in personal conclusions to a 278-page report, issued by a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, of which he is chairman.

EFFICIENCY IN $8.1 BILLION IN SPENDING INVOLVED

The report states that there is no indexed interagency inventory of an estimated 160,000 projects, involved in $8.1 billion of current federally financed research and development projects.

Various agency information systems are designed to cover at least part of this effort. But the systems are a hodgepodge—"overlapping, underplanned, undernourished, and underused," HUMPHREY states.

For the Federal Government to rely on present methods, he said, "is no way to run a railroad or a race for survival."

INFORMATION CONTROL KEY TO MAN IN SPACE

No administrator or scientist, however competent, can attempt to know personally about all current work in progress which is related to his field, the report states. Yet, Senator HUMPHREY observes, "knowledge of work in progress is a key to effectiveness in many fields—to man in space, to control of the weather, probing the ocean depths, drilling into the earth's crust, bombarding the nucleus of the atom, deciphering the code of life, or unlocking the secrets of why plants are green."

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration has no central index of all its inhouse and extramural research and development projects, now in process, the report observes.

SCIENCE INFORMATION EXCHANGE

It adds that partly because of the Senate committee's urging, several Federal agencies, including NASA and the Defense Department, have organized a Science Information Exchange for the registration of all current research projects. However, the exchange has hardly begun operations in the physical, social, engineering and mathematical sciences. Previously, the exchange has registered 30,000 current projects in the biological and medical sciences. But, the report states, agencies have not used even the medical coverage to its fullest potentiality.

The report criticizes lost effort and unknowing duplication in Federal research and development:

"Sufficient attention has not yet been given to the problem of salvaging results from the vast investment in contracts and subcontracts which are canceled prior to producing finished hardware. More than $2 billion of such contracts and subcontracts were canceled in the last 3 fiscal years * * *. Another of the important phases of the information problem concerns duplication of effort—either on an intentional or unintentional basis. The Department of Defense does not have a reliable study on the extent of unintentional duplication, but some estimates run as high as 10 percent."

New procedures to salvage information from canceled contracts and to prevent unknowing duplication were urged by HUMPHREY in letters to the new administration, shortly after the January 1961 changeover. At that time, the Committee on Government Operations approved the key points in the subcommittee's report.

ENCOURAGING TREND IN LAST 3 MONTHS

HUMPHREY said that, in the last 3 months, there has fortunately developed "a new information-mindedness * * * among Federal policymakers." He indicated interest "at the top level—the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology, Dr. Jerome Wiesner and continuing through the executive branch. When, for instance, I communicated the staff's findings to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, shortly after he had taken office, his reply and actions were prompt and encouraging.

"Now, the issue of followthrough arises—not only by the principal agency supporting research and development, the Department of Defense—but by the Federal Council for Science and Technology and the various other Federal agencies."

The bulk of the report was prepared by Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., senior science specialist, Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service.

Additional information was compiled by the subcommittee's staff.

TWO HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS IN ELECTRONIC DUPLICATION INDICATED

A separate committee publication, to be issued next month, analyzes in depth the problem of controlling information on current federally supported electronic research and development projects. These are estimated to total one-third of all current Defense-sponsored projects. Unknowing duplication in the electronic area, alone, may cost $200 million a year, the report notes.

COMMITTEE'S BACKGROUND

The Committee on Government Operations has been reviewing problems of scientific information for several years. Earlier, it had concentrated on the problems of finding and managing information which has already been published in thousands of scientific journals, books, and monographs.

Today's report deals, however, with information in the prepublication stage, i.e., from the date a research or development project is approved to the day—a year, 2 years, 3 years later, if ever, that its results are reported. The report notes that a great many research projects are never reported in talks to professional societies or written up in technical journals. This may be because experiments fail. Yet, the report says, it is essential that science learn about tests which had negative results, so that, in part, scientists will not go on endlessly repeating futile experiments.

A REVIEW OF GOVERNMENT POLICY IN RESPECT TO THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I notice that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], is on the floor; and I am much pleased, because, as I indicated to him earlier today, it is my intention to make some remarks in regard to the Post Office Department and to make a direct reference to the postal rate structure and the financial problems our Government faces because of certain deficits in the Post Office Department.

On April 14, the Postmaster General transmitted to the Congress a message dealing with postal rate policy, and suggesting legislation to be enacted at this session of the Congress. In transmitting his requests, the Postmaster General frankly stated that, in substance, the proposals he is making were inherited by him from his predecessor. General Day further stated that in order to accomplish the goals he seeks, such legislation should be effective on July 1 of this year.

I am certain that most Members of the Senate have had an opportunity to read the request of the Postmaster General. However, I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, in order that the record may be before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is transmitted herewith proposed legislation, the Postage Revision Act of 1961, for consideration by the Congress.

The President's message on budget and fiscal policy, March 24, 1961, stated: "The January budget submitted by my predecessor called for an additional $843 million in postal revenues to eliminate the deficit in that Department's operations. Such an increase must be effective July 1 to close the gap between postal expenditures and postal revenues; and, building on the previous budget, this administration's budget requires an equal amount. I urge the Congress to close this gap."

This Department reduced the budget expenditures by $12 million, leaving $831 million of new postal revenues to be raised in 1962. Of this amount about $90 million can be raised through administrative rate actions, primarily on fourth-class parcel post and catalogs.

This leaves about $741 million to be met through legislative rate increases effective on July 1, 1961. The attached proposal, if enacted, will provide this amount of additional revenue.

The table following summarizes—for the major legislative rate classes—the financial effects of the postal rate program developed pursuant to the January 1961 budget:

Major legislative rate increases

Mail class	Postal revenues				Cost coverage [1]	
	Estimated 1962 revenues (current rates)	Projected new revenues	Projected revenues (proposed rates)	Increase	Current [2]	Projected
	Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1st class	$1,621	$409	$2,030	25	99.7	124.6
Airmail	181	14	195	8	106.3	114.8
2d class	98	78	176	79	23.0	41.2
3d class	532	212	744	40	67.4	94.4
Other changes		28				

[1] Including public service revenues.
[2] 1960 experience adjusted for all known rate and cost increases.

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

A 1-cent increase is scheduled for first-class mail: the rate for letters would rise from 4 cents per ounce to 5 cents and for post cards from 3 cents to 4 cents. This would yield about $409 million, apart from additional revenues from corresponding rate increases on penalty (Government) mail. Airmail postage would be raised correspondingly: from 7 cents per ounce to 8 cents for letters, and from 5 cents to 6 cents for cards.

The statutory basis for first-class rates: In the Postal Policy Act of 1958, the Congress stated that first-class mail is a premium service for which rates should be sufficient to cover costs plus an additional amount to reflect the value of its preferred handling. This pricing policy is rooted in the knowledge that costs alone do not reflect the true value of services. Many intangible factors, such as expedited handling at post offices, cannot be reflected in costs. The privilege of secrecy is another intangible value enjoyed only by first-class mail patrons.

Most of the postal administrations of other countries follow the same differential pricing approach in fixing rates. In response to a recent inquiry to a number of foreign nations, nearly all reported a break-even goal for their overall postal operations with letter mail producing revenues substantially in excess of costs. (See exhibit A.)

Even prior to the enactment of the Postal Policy Act in 1958, the Congress over many years tacitly endorsed the value-of-service principle as a guideline for first-class mail. From the start of the post office cost ascertainment system in 1926 through World War II, rates for first-class mail were set at levels which produced revenues substantially in excess of allocated costs. From 1926 through 1941, the value-of-service premium on first-class mail averaged 40 percent above costs.

At the present time, cost coverage on first-class mail is running just under 100 percent. A 1-cent increase would bring it to about 125 percent.

The lag in first-class rates: Rates for first-class letters have increased only once, and moderately, in the past 29 years. In contrast, however, the general price level has changed frequently and substantially in that period. If letter postage was worth 3 cents in 1932, it should be worth nearly 7 cents today. While the consumer price index has gone up 118 percent since 1932, and the cost of mail handling has gone up even more, first-class letter rates have increased only 33 percent. A 5-cent rate would still bring the total increase since 1932 to only 67 percent.

SECOND-CLASS RATES

Second class is the mail service for magazines and newspapers. From the very beginning of the U.S. postal system, low postage rates for these media have reflected the belief of Congress that wide distribution should be encouraged for the public good.

According to the cost ascertainment system, which has been used in previous years, the gap between costs and revenues for second class is currently about $340 million, on an annual basis. That amount cannot, of course, be taken as a rate goal in view of the established congressional policy of below-cost rates for second class.

Postal revenues from second-class mail now cover about 23 percent of fully allocated costs. Under the rate program outlined, postage revenues from second class would be increased $78 million in fiscal 1962. This would amount to an increase of 79 percent.

Enactment of the proposed increases would raise cost coverage for second class from 23 percent to 41 percent.

On a relative basis, the proposed increases would be greatest for publications of lighter weight and for those preferential publications which have not shared in any general rate increases for many years. Included among these are small hometown newspapers which go through the mails free, or at the rate of 1 cent per pound, when delivered within their counties of publication. Under the proposal submitted, these publications would pay the same rates as those proposed for publications of authorized nonprofit organizations: one-fourth cent per piece plus a bulk rate of 1½ cents per pound.

THIRD-CLASS RATES

Third-class mail consists largely of advertising circulars mailed at bulk rates. It also includes fairly sizable quantities of catalogs and small parcels.

Third-class bulk rates, as distinguished from rates for single pieces, were first enacted by the Congress in 1928. For advertising circulars, the initial minimum rate was 1 cent per piece. That rate remained in effect for 23 years and then, in 1951, it was raised to 1½ cents. Subsequently, in 1958, the Congress approved two successive one-half cent increases which brought the third-class bulk rate to its present 2½-cent level.

Since 1928, when low bulk postage rates were first approved, mail volume in third class has increased more than fourfold—a substantially greater increase than in any other mail service, except airmail. With this very rapid growth, direct mail has become the second largest advertising medium in the United States.

According to the cost ascertainment system, which has been used in previous years, revenues in the third-class mail service currently cover 67 percent of allocated costs. That adds up to an annual revenue deficiency of $250 million.

A 1-cent increase to 3½ cents is scheduled for the minimum rate for bulk mail. This increase would affect most of the pieces moving as third-class mail. If enacted, together with other adjustments proposed for third class, cost coverage would rise from 67 percent to 94 percent.

Delivery of third-class mails can be deferred somewhat in the interest of expediting higher priority mails. In consideration of that deferment, a moderate rate concession below cost is justifiable.

OTHER CHANGES

Educational and library materials: Fourth-class matter mailed as educational materials consists largely of books and phonograph records. Postage rates currently are 9 cents for the first pound of each parcel and 5 cents for each additional pound. At these rates, postage covered 60 percent of costs in 1960, resulting in a revenue deficiency of 21 cents per parcel, and $20 million in the aggregate. For fiscal 1962, both costs and the postage revenue gap are expected to increase.

Under the terms of the Postal Policy Act, revenue deficiencies for educational materials are to be covered by public service appropriations from Treasury funds. Adoption of the rate provisions submitted would raise postage revenues by about $6 million and reduce public service appropriations correspondingly. The increases in postage would be 1 cent per pound, to a level of 10 cents for the first pound and 6 cents for each additional pound.

For parcels of library materials, the current rate is 4 cents for the first pound and 1 cent for each additional pound. Under the attached proposal, this rate would be increased to 50 percent of the general educational materials rate: 5 cents for the first pound and 3 cents for each additional pound. Postage revenue would rise by about $2 million.

Government mail: For fiscal 1962, it is estimated the Post Office Department will handle over 2 billion pieces of Government mail consisting mostly of first class and third class. For this, post office revenues are credited on the basis of postage rates paid by the public at large. Adoption of the rate changes outlined would increase postal revenues about $22 million as a direct result of Government mail deliveries.

Other minor changes, including an adjustment for changing mail mix, bringing the total revenues from these other changes to $28 million.

This completes the schedule of legislative rate changes which, if enacted, would produce $741 million of added annual postal revenue.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised the Department that enactment of this legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General.

THE POSTAL POLICY OF OTHER NATIONS

(Replies to a communication from the International Service Division, Office of the Postmaster General, March 24, 1960)

AUSTRALIA

However, despite the results of our cost studies, judgment must be exercised in determining the practical limits of charges for particular services.

We try to make a profit on the letter category to meet the deficiencies which are incurred in handling the other items of mail and providing special postal facilities.

It was estimated that postage revenue from the letter mail category would exceed the estimated cost of the service by a little over 20 percent in a full year.

AUSTRIA

Revenues exceeded the expense incurred for the classes of mail concerned by 25.9 percent. Even though the percentage indicated covers several classes of domestic mail, the postage revenues from letters and post cards are certainly the decisive factor.

BELGIUM

Private letters leave a surplus of 339,319,371 Belgian francs, which represents some 34 percent of their operating cost.

Although the letter category is already largely profitable * * * the minimum postage for an ordinary letter in the domestic service has been raised from 2.50 to 3 Belgian francs. It may therefore be deduced that the profits realized on letters are intended to cover, to a certain extent, the losses on other classes of correspondence.

CANADA

The latest financial report of the Canadian Postal Service indicates a 154 percent cost coverage for first-class mail in fiscal 1959.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

By law the Deutsche Bundespost is bound to cover its expenditures with the revenue of postage rates. Therefore, this administration is starting from the costs in establishing postage rates. However, this principle applies only to the whole of all postage rates. For cultural, social, and economic reasons the rates of some branches of service are under the costs. The deficit resulting from these rates must be covered by excesses of other branches of service.

For letters and post cards together which correspond to your first-class mail, revenues exceed the expenditures with approximately 10 percent.

FRANCE

Generally speaking, postage rates are established in France so as to cover the operating charges on the whole * * * making it necessary to recuperate on first-class articles the losses entailed by these other articles * * * than between various classes (first-class articles, on the one hand, second-class articles, on the other hand), where the high rates collected for the first permit maintaining reduced rates, lower than the actual cost of handling, for the others.

GREAT BRITAIN

The domestic letter rate is the sheet anchor of our inland postal finances and for many years we have used the profit from it to carry losses on some of our other services. * * * The profit of £13.5 million on the letter service represented 24 percent over cost and without it we should have run well into the red.

The post office has many social obligations. But the existence of these obligations does not mean that the post office should be run primarily as a vast social service without regard to the economic facts of life.

NETHERLANDS

So apart from these rather small differences, it may be said that the object of being self-supporting is approximately attained for the postal service as a whole.

I can tell you, however, that the rate for letters considerably exceeds the cost price.

NORWAY

Our policy must therefore be to fix postage rates which as a whole warrant revenues that cover expenditure. Consequently, this deficit must be covered by means of higher rates concerning other services; in first place the domestic first-class mail service. This excess cannot be computed with accuracy, but on the approximate estimate revenue exceeds expenditure by 60 percent.

SWEDEN

The goal of our postage rate policy is that the organization should pay its own way.

It is a natural thing that items protected by monopoly—in the main, letters and post cards—have to bear a greater part of the expenditures than items not protected by monopoly.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Rates in force for letters and post cards fully cover actual costs (cost price); moreover, they provide necessary net income which is defined to cover losing operations in other branches of services.

At present, postage revenue for transmission of letters and post cards within the country exceeds actual postal costs of the U.S.S.R. by approximately 20 percent.

POSTAGE REVISION ACT OF 1961—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1 provides a short title.

Section 2 increases the postage rates on first-class mail by 1 cent.

Section 3 increases the postage rates on airmail other than air parcel post by 1 cent. It does, however, make a conforming and clarifying change to assure that first-class mail may not be sent as air parcel post at a lesser rate than by surface means.

Section 4 imposes a piece rate of one-fourth cent on all within-county mailings except those on which postage is presently fixed by the piece. It also increases the existing per-pound rates on within-county mailings by one-half cent, and applies these rates to publications now mailed free of postage.

Section 5: This section imposes a piece rate postage charge to all mailings beyond the county of mailing except transient mailings. The piece rate is 1½ cents except that in the case of classroom publications and for all nonprofit groups, it is one-fourth cent.

Section 6: This section repeals the existing minimum charge on second-class mailings. The piece rates of postage provided in sections 4 and 5 of the bill make the minimum rate unnecessary.

Section 7: This section increases the rate of postage on controlled circulation publications to 14 cents a pound and the minimum to 3 cents a piece.

Section 8: Increases the single piece rates on third-class mail to 4 cents for the first 2 ounces, and 2 cents for each additional ounce. It increases the bulk rate on books, catalogs, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants to 18 cents a pound, and on other third-class matter to 21 cents. The rate for bulk mailings of third-class matter is increased by 1 cent, except that the minimum for qualified nonprofit organizations is raised one-half cent. The minimum charge for odd-size pieces was fixed at 3½ cents by Public Law 86-56. This section increases that rate to 4½ cents.

Section 9: This section increases the rates on educational materials to 10 cents for the first pound and 6 cents for each additional pound, and on library materials to 5 cents for the first pound and 3 cents for each additional pound. It also incorporates into section 4554 of Title 39 the changes made by Public Law 86-644 in the materials covered by these rates and the conditions under which they apply.

Section 10: This section continues the provision of law, originally section 211 of the Postal Rate Increase Act, 1958 (Title II of Public Law 85-426), which eliminated the rate increases provided by that law in determining the gross receipts of a post office, except to the extent necessary to retain it in the same status as it had prior to that act. In addition, this section extends that provision to any subsequent increases in postage rates, including those in this bill.

Section 11: This section postpones the effective date to July 1, 1961.

S.——

A bill to adjust postal rates, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the Postage Revision Act of 1961.

SEC. 2. FIRST-CLASS MAIL.—Section 4253 of Title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "four" and "three" wherever they appear, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "five" and "four", respectively.

SEC. 3. AIR MAIL.—Section 4303 of Title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out:

(a) the word "seven" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eight".

(b) the word "five" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the word "six".

(c) the phrase "three cents an ounce or fraction thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "the rate of postage for other first-class mail matter".

SEC. 4. SECOND-CLASS MAIL WITHIN COUNTY OF PUBLICATION.—(a) Section 4358 of Title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (a), by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (a), and by striking out the phrase "Except as provided in subsection (a) of this section and subject to the minimum rates provided by subsection 4360 of this title, the" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "The", and by striking out the phrase "one cent a pound" wherever it appears in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "one and one half cents a pound".

(b) Section 4358 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) Each individually addressed copy of a publication in that portion of any mailing on which postage is fixed by the pound under subsection (a) of this section is subject to additional postage of one-fourth cent."

SEC. 5. SECOND-CLASS MAIL BEYOND COUNTY OF PUBLICATION.—Section 4359 of title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) By striking out so much of subsection (b) as precedes the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(b)(1) The rates of postage on publications mailed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section are fixed both by the piece as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection and by the pound as provided in the following table:

[In cents]"

(b) By adding a new paragraph (2) to subsection (b) as follows:

"(2) The piece rates of postage are charged on each individually addressed copy of a publication mailed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section in addition to the pound rates. The piece rates are as follows:

	In cents
Qualified nonprofit organizations	¼
Classroom publications	¼
Other publications	1½"

SEC. 6. MINIMUM POSTAGE RATES ON SECOND-CLASS MAIL.—(a) Section 4360 of title 39, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The chapter analysis of chapter 63 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by deleting "4360 Minimum Postage."

SEC. 7. CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS.—Section 4422 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "12 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "14 cents", and by striking out "1 cent" and inserting in lieu thereof "3 cents".

SEC. 8. THIRD-CLASS MAIL.—Section 4452 of title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) By amending the table in subsection (a) to read as follows:

"Type of mailing	Rate	Unit
	Cents	
(1) Individual piece	4	1st 2 ounces or fraction thereof.
	2	Each additional ounce or fraction thereof.
(2) Bulk mailings under subsec. (e) of this section of—		
(A) Books and catalogs of 24 pages or more, seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants.	18	Each pound or fraction thereof.
(B) Other matter	21	Do."

(b) By amending the table in subsection (b) to read as follows:

"Mailed by—	*In cents*
Other than qualified nonprofit organizations	3½
Qualified nonprofit organizations	1¾"

(c) By striking out the phrase "six cents" in subsection (c), and inserting in lieu thereof "four and one-half cents".

SEC. 9. EDUCATIONAL AND LIBRARY MATERIALS.—Section 4554 of title 39, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(a) By amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the postage rate is ten cents a pound for the first pound or fraction thereof and six cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed in this subsection on—

(1) books permanently bound for preservation, consisting wholly of reading matter or scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcement of books;

(2) sixteen-millimeter films and sixteen-millimeter film catalogs except when sent to commercial theaters;

(3) printed music, whether in bound form or in sheet form;

(4) printed objective test materials and accessories thereto used by or in behalf of educational institutions in the testing of ability, aptitude, achievement, interests, and other mental and personal qualities with or without answer, test scores, or identifying information recorded thereon in writing, or by mark;

(5) sound recordings;

(6) manuscripts for books, periodicals and music; and

(7) printed educational reference charts, permanently processed for preservation."

(b) by striking out "4 cents" in paragraph (1) of subsection (b), and inserting in lieu thereof "5 cents", by striking out "1 cent" in paragraph (1) of subsection (b), and inserting in lieu thereof "3 cents", by inserting "(including cooperative processing by libraries)" immediately following "loaned or exchanged" in paragraph (1) of subsection (b), and by striking out the word "students" immediately preceding "notations" in paragraph (2) of subsection (b).

(c) By striking out:

"(D) bound volumes of periodicals;

(E) phonograph recordings; and" in paragraph (2) of subsection (b), and inserting in lieu thereof:

"(D) periodicals, whether bound or unbound;

(E) sound recordings; and".

(d) by deleting "and catalogs of those items" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "scientific or mathematical kits, instruments or other devices and catalogs of those items, and guides or scripts prepared solely for use with such materials."

SEC. 10. METHOD OF DETERMINING GROSS RECEIPTS.—Subsection (c) of section 711 of Title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Public Law 85–426" and inserting in lieu thereof "any Act of Congress enacted on or after May 27, 1958".

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall become effective on July 1, 1961.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me add that I believe the Postmaster General is doing an excellent job, and I wish to compliment him on the manner in which he is tackling the difficult problems which face the postal service. The remarks I shall make today are not in any way to be interpreted as a criticism of the Postmaster General or of the effort he is making. As will be disclosed, the purpose of my remarks is to aid the postal service and, I hope, to be of some help to my friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He was chairman of the committee for several years before I began to serve on it.

I am frank to say to my colleagues that the request of the Postmaster General leaves me in somewhat of a quandary. I am as anxious as anyone else to have the budget balanced and to have the financial integrity of the Post Office Department assured. However, I want the pledges of the Democratic Party to be carried out, and I wish to make certain that the citizens of my State and all other citizens of the Nation are provided the finest postal service that we can devise.

As the Members of this body know, I was a somewhat interested participant in the Democratic Convention at Los Angeles, Calif., in the summer of 1960. I learned many lessons at that convention—some of which, I may add, were somewhat painful. But along with the bad, there is always a little good. At the convention we adopted a platform which was subscribed to wholeheartedly by all the Democratic candidates, and it faithfully reflects the true character of the standards of public service of the Democratic Party.

In our convention platform we adopted a plank dealing with the postal service. At this point, I should like to read that section of our program:

The Republican policy has been to treat the U.S. postal service as a liability instead of a great investment in national enlightenment, social efficiency, and economic betterment.

Constant curtailment of service has inconvenienced every citizen.

A program must be undertaken to establish the Post Office Department as a model of efficiency and service. We pledge ourselves to:

1. Restore the principle that the postal service is a public service.

2. Separate the public service costs from those to be borne by the users of the mails.

3. Continue steady improvement in working conditions and wage scales, reflecting increasing productivity.

4. Establish a long-range program for research and capital improvements compatible with the highest standards of business efficiency.

I should like to discuss briefly the four parts of our postal service plank. The first part is:

1. Restore the principle that the postal service is a public service.

Democrats should take great pride in the postal plank adopted at our Los Angeles convention. No major political party for a generation had considered the vast ramifications of the postal establishment. Because of the constant bickering over postal rate readjustments from the year 1949 to the present, the public has lost sight of the major economic contributions made to the American economy by the postal establishment.

As I have said earlier, I am as interested in having the budget balanced as is anyone else. But when it comes to postal service, I want everyone to know that I am much more concerned with the delivery of mail and parcels to every citizen of the State of Minnesota and to all other citizens in the entire Nation. I want to be sure that the farmers, the small businessmen, and all other patrons of the Post Office receive the kind of service to which they are entitled from a public-service institution. The Post Office Department is not like a private business. The citizens of our country have to get their mail from the Post Office Department, whether they like it or not; and I consider it to be my job to see to it that they get the best possible service that we can provide. The Post Office Department is not a competitive enterprise, it is a public institution.

The second part of the Democratic Party postal plank is that we shall "separate the public service costs from those to be borne by the users of the mail." This is nothing new, but, rather, is an affirmation of the 1958 Postal Policy Act, which requires certain enumerated free and reduced-rate services to be set aside on a "total loss" basis, to be paid for from the general funds of the Treasury.

At the time when that law was enacted, the estimates ranged from $250 to $300 million. As a matter of fact, a minimum factor of 10 percent of total costs was fully discussed on the floor of the Senate during the 1958 debate.

Today, this would price our public services somewhere in the neighborhood of $400 million. Nevertheless, the past administration never fully complied with

the requirements of the 1958 Postal Policy Act.

The 1958 act, for example, sets aside $90 million on all the nonprofit church, charitable, and fraternal mail. Six thousand five hundred religious and charitable publications are involved in this figure. I consider it a good thing to provide special, below-cost rates on this category of mail. It also includes certain essential, prime services performed in the public interest, such as star routes and third-class and fourth-class post offices. The act further supports free mail for the blind, our soldiers overseas, widows of Presidents, and certain diplomatic mail.

The 1958 act specifically repealed the much abused "loss of revenue" concept, and substituted in its place the "total loss" theory. Equity demands that we make a proper cost allocation in connection with the postal public services.

The third part of the Democratic Party's postal plank provides that we shall "continue steady improvement in working conditions and wage scales, reflecting increasing productivity." One has only to refer to the several studies conducted by our Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee from 1953 to date, to appreciate and understand the wholesome regard of the entire Congress for improvements in working conditions and wage scales.

It was a Democratic Congress that provided long-overdue pay increases in 1955, in 1958, and again in 1960.

I wish to say that the leader in that very worthy effort was the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

I need not remind this body of the great opposition by a Republican administration to these proposals during the past 8 years. As a matter of fact, the several Presidential vetoes are matters of painful reminders to our loyal Government employees. I firmly believe that the volume of mail will continue to grow by leaps and bounds; and, in that respect, I heartily endorse the earlier recommendations of the Senate committee for the rapid adoption of machinery and modern methods in postal operations. This is surely one method by which we can assure increased productivity on the part of our great postal force and provide pay adjustments more comparable to the pay in private industry.

I believe that in the near future it will be possible for the existing force in the Post Office Department to handle, with modern machinery and methods, an ever greater volume of mail. I know that on many occasions the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has pledged his support to modernization of our postal system. This is essential if we are to achieve the kind of service to which every American is entitled.

The last point in platform postal plank is that we shall "establish a long-range program for research and capital improvements compatible with the highest standards of business efficiency." The problem of research and capital improvement is obviously complex. Technological advances in the field of transportation and materials handling will have a far-reaching effect on the operation and location of post offices and the entire concept of postal organization.

Decisions as to the location of post offices are being made in terms of current costs and the availability of transportation. Technological advancement in transportation can make these sites obsolete and inefficient before their time.

Facilities must be planned to meet regional growth objectives; there must be research into the cause-and-effect relationship between the postal service and population growth.

A fresh approach to post office automation is required. Future work must be based on comprehensive and definitive studies of the postal system; and capital requirements, labor policy, and technological and social changes must be considered as important aspects of the problem.

So far we have not seen a complete and comprehensive description of the elements and resources available to the postal system.

We cannot afford to mount our horse and rush off in all directions. We cannot afford to begin dazzling experiments in automation for the purposes of getting good publicity for the post office.

The post office is essentially a service to be judged by the extent to which it permits the Nation to enhance its economic and social values. It can succeed only if we provide the funds and establish policies and safeguards that can promote an environment responsible to changing conditions and able to employ without delay every benefit of emerging technology.

Having considered these platform planks in detail, I am concerned because of the apparent conflict in philosophy between the approach to these matters taken by two great committees of this body.

On January 24, 1961, my good friend, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, wrote the Postmaster General regarding postal policy. In his letter Senator JOHNSTON succinctly outlines what I consider to be the position of the Democratic Party and the Post Office and Civil Service Committee with respect to the public service functions of the Post Office Department.

Senator JOHNSTON makes a most convincing argument that the financial computations of the Post Office Department under Arthur Summerfield, which have now been resubmitted, are erroneous in their treatment of the public service aspects of the postal service. In addition, the distinguished Post Office Committee chairman outlines in detail many suggestions which seem to be valid for revising the postal service and making it more efficient. At this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to insert Senator JOHNSTON's letter to Postmaster General Day, together with a press release.

There being no objection, the letter and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1961.

Hon. J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. POSTMASTER GENERAL: As the new administration develops its budget for 1962, I want to raise a few points concerning the financing and operation of the U.S. Post Office Department. Of course, it is unnecessary for me to point out to you the postal plank contained in the recent Democratic platform, but I do believe that I should detail for you the long struggle that has taken place between the outgoing administration and the Congress on the matter of public service costs.

After 5 years of study and lengthy hearings in both Houses, the Congress adopted the Postal Policy Act of 1958 (Public Law 85-426). Section 104 of this act details the public services to be costed out on a total loss basis and to be paid from the general funds of the Treasury, instead of charging mail users with such costs. It was the opinion of my committee when this act was adopted that the total loss on certain public services at that time would amount to $300 million. The items have been costed out at various figures somewhat less than this amount, but I am convinced, after full allowance is made for the last two postal pay hikes and the rate increases, the minimum cost of these services will be more than $300 million. The last administration made some initial effort to comply with the law, then with the help of the Budget Bureau proceeded to breach the law before the Appropriations Committees. For fiscal year 1959, the administration submitted $171 million and for 1960 it submitted $172 million, omitting from the calculations, in both instances, the total losses involved in the operation of third- and fourth-class post offices and the star route system as required by law. I shall not go into a detailed justification of these matters, since they are now the law of the land, but their omission accounts in a large part for the difference between the administration's early requests and the total figure contemplated by the Congress.

Throughout the prior discussions before both committees of the Congress, the Post Office Department used as a basis for determining public services the loss of revenue concept. This was the old Kelly law adopted in 1930 (39 U.S.C. 793) which the Postal Policy Act of 1958 specifically repealed in section 214. Despite this repeal, the administration insisted on following the loss of revenue concept and, I am sorry to report, succeeded in this approach before the Appropriations Committees. As a consequence the public service estimates ranged from $26 million in 1956, to $49 million for fiscal 1961. A few examples will serve to illustrate the absurdity of this contention.

Recently, I noted that the new administration was careful to exclude nonprofit fraternal and religious mail from any plans for future rate hikes. This is quite proper and contemplated under the Postal Policy Act of 1958, provided the total loss of $60 million on these items is set aside and charged to the general funds of the U.S. Treasury. The last administration insisted on loss of revenue and would only charge off approximately $3 million as the public service cost. As I have asked so many times: "Who pays the balance?" To insist that business mail users pick up the loss is in effect asking businesses, who must make a profit and pay taxes, to pick up the loss on their nonprofit competitors. This is manifestly unfair.

As a matter of fact, a fine publication like the National Geographic will pay 1½ cents

per pound on its advertising content irrespective of distance, while a magazine in business for a profit is required to pay 2½ cents per pound on its editorial content on the same basis. Has education sunk so low that we place nonprofit advertising on a more preferred basis than the vital editorial content of our press? Of course, a publication in business for a profit is required to pay up to 14 cents a pound on its advertising content in the eighth zone. I have always maintained that if real equity is to be obtained in this matter we must charge off the total loss of the so-called nonprofit, fraternal, religious, etc., newspapers and magazines as the public service involved.

A further example is the total loss on free-in-county newspapers which amounts to more than $15 million. This would be the public service measure as contemplated by the law, but the past administration has insisted on placing less than $1 million on this item. Again, I ask the question: "Are we going to ask other newspapers to pick up the losses on their competitors who ride for nothing?" This question would seem to answer itself.

The past administration omitted three items contained in the law; namely, the total losses on star route and third- and fourth-class post offices, saying that such computations were impossible. The losses on these items can be readily determined from their annual cost ascertainment reports, but better yet the past administration has not hesitated to inform the Congress that every time it discontinued an uneconomic fourth-class post office, it saved the Federal Government $1,400 per year on a single office. It seems computations can be made when convenient.

I have seen varying estimates concerning the postal deficit for 1961. Assuming a deficit of approximately $900 million, I would urge that at least $300 million of this amount be set aside as a public service pursuant to law and so presented to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. Without a clear resolution of this controversy involving public services, the setting of future postal rates is impossible because we wind up with nothing but confusion confounded insofar as basic costs and the rate formula in the 1958 law are concerned.

You will note from the record that the ranking minority member of my committee and I, as chairman, have both appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of the committee's intent and, for that matter, the intent of Congress on the subject of public services. Several members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee have appeared either before the House Appropriations Committee or risen on the floor of the House to support this legislative intent of the Congress.

Once the matter of full adherence to the 1958 law is accomplished, I would urge you to give some careful consideration to other well-known subsidies existing in the postal service, as well as economies that might be achieved in the near future. There are at least $200 million in subsidies which should be spelled out and recognized for what they are, and should not constitute a charge against the various mail users.

I have in mind, first of all, the subsidy arising from the refusal of the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916 (sec. 557, U.S.C. 39). The law is unequivocal in its requirement that the Postmaster General need not pay the railroads a higher rate for carrying second-, third-, and fourth-class mail than the railroads receive for carrying railway express matter. The record is quite clear that overpayments to the railroads, resulting from the nonenforcement of this law, amount to about $100 million a year. In all fairness, it should be pointed out that former Postmasters General have attempted to comply with this law, but their efforts have been consistently nullified by the ICC. I feel that a repeal of the law at this time (as ICC proposes) would only admit the subsidy. I doubt very much if the railroads, in their present economic plight, could withstand this kind of downward adjustment. I certainly would not support it. Nevertheless, this annual subsidy to the railroads should be set aside, so identified, and not be imposed as an additional charge on mail users.

The second subsidy involved is that to Railway Express Agency (wholly owned by the railroads), involving the unwieldy limitations on parcel post weight and size. Public Law 82–199, enacted in 1951, substantially curtailed permissible weight and size of parcel post. This was done in an endeavor to bolster the sagging volume of Railway Express shipments. Early in 1954 the Post Office Department testified that its net loss in revenue directly resulting from this new act amounted to $73 million annually. I am confident that, with the postal pay increases enacted since that time, this subsidy has risen to at least $100 million annually.

One has only to consult the recent record before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on H.R. 7055 to know that the weight and size limitation (Public Law 82–199) has been a failure. Fourth-class mail prices have been more than doubled since 1951. Parcel post volume has declined. Similarly, the volume and revenue to the Railway Express Co. has continued to diminish. The volume of Railway Express shipments reached a peak of 235 million in 1946 and declined to 82 million in 1951. After the enactment of Public Law 82–199, in 1951, the volume increased slightly to around 92 million shipments, but today it is less than 64 million shipments. If unwieldy limitations on weight and size of parcel post are continued, as is a probability, then this annual $100 million subsidy to Railway Express should be clearly identified as a subsidy, and not included as part of the total deficit to be recovered from mail users.

I fully realize that fourth-class mail is required to pay its way within certain limitations, and this confuses the issue as far as the Railway Express subsidy is concerned. It might be well to bear in mind that despite this requirement of law, the deficit in fourth-class mail in the last 2 years has averaged $100 million per year. There again this amount has been used by the past administration to swell the alleged postal deficit.

Another item erroneously included in the alleged postal deficit of $900 million is an amount of over $80 million for capital improvement. The Department admitted this last summer, under questioning before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

You will find these matters fully set forth in congressional records, yet I feel compelled to draw them to your attention in a general way because, in my opinion, they do have a direct bearing both on the postal deficit and the amounts of money which should be charged to the Nation's mail users. I have thus far detailed $580 million worth of public services, subsidies, and capital costs erroneously charged to the deficit. The Carlson committee report of 1954 disclosed that public services in our postal operations amounted to 12 percent of total costs (1952). My committee report of 1957 disclosed that public services amounted to 14 percent of total postal costs (1955). Applying the lesser percentage to current costs ($4 billion plus) the total of public services would amount to $480 million exclusive of capital investment.

Immediate economies may well be achieved in the postal service, amounting to at least 5 percent of the annual $4 billion operation. To that end, I suggest for your consideration:

First, for years I have questioned the necessity for continuing postmark and cancellation operations in processing mail. I recognize, of course, that postmarking is frequently a mark of identity for many small communities throughout the Nation and certain political implications could be involved. Nevertheless, any visitor would be impressed, as I have been on recent visits to our larger post offices, by the large number of employees, presumably temporary, engaged in hand-canceling many thousands of packages and odd-size envelopes. In my view, this is wholly unwarranted. I am convinced the American people would be willing to forgo the postmarking process if it meant that they would at long last get the kind of service our Government should be providing.

Business, of course, has its postage meter machines for contractual purposes. These might continue to be used. It would seem, however, that we could eliminate the postmarks, and perfect stamps which would automatically cancel themselves upon use, and thereby dispense with this large mass of unnecessary temporary help. I am told that there is considerable support for this idea among the career employees of the Post Office Department itself.

If an individual requires a postmark for legal purposes, it might be well to charge an extra fee for this. However, the vast majority of mail users might well content themselves with writing the date of mailing on their personal mail. This appears to be one reasonable approach toward operations economy in a national institution still using a large amount of hand labor. One inevitable result is increased unit costs as volume increases. This is a weird concept completely at variance with modern American business practice.

Next, consistently and frequently, I have urged a speedup in the use of machines and more modern facilities in our large post offices. Necessary financing for this purpose would have my strong support. While the retiring Postmaster General has made progress in that direction, I hope we may move out of the prototype stage and achieve wide adoption of many of the new labor-saving devices.

No reasonably precise estimate has ever been given on the potential economies inherent in this kind of adjustment, but I am sure they must be very large. I look forward to the day when certain standard envelopes might be used by the American public at a differential price on the assumption that such standard sizes are readily adaptable to automatic processing.

Furthermore, I believe the postal service should give careful consideration to the economies accruing to the Department as a result of postal operating services performed by second- and third-class mailers. These services by mailers include zoning, sorting, and, in many cases, transporting the mail with the costs being borne directly by the mailer himself. In this day of rising prices, I think careful attention should be given this situation. Perhaps a system of credits for differential pricing could be developed.

Finally, it has long been a matter of concern to me that the Post Office Department has apparently been unable to utilize the Nation's several transport facilities to reasonably adequate advantage.

American business has fully realized that each means of transportation has its own peculiar value and advantage. Business has dovetailed the various transport media into a competitive and correlated distribution pattern of high efficiency and economy. I do not believe the Post Office Department has given its problem of mail distribution similarly businesslike analysis.

Better utilization of transport facilities by the Department would undoubtedly reduce the alleged postal deficit and such subsidies as may be currently involved.

These comments would be incomplete if I did not mention that, despite the high price tag on public services, there still remain ways through which these can be reduced. It may be possible to institute, or increase, prices on free or nonprofit mail. Apparently the past administration found such a move impossible, because no such requests were made during the first of its 7 years. After a single bold advance in this area in 1960, the past administration quickly withdrew its request. Also, the so-called special services operate at a loss although the Department has full authority to fix rates on this category.

In retrospect, the past 8 years constitute one of the most amazing periods in the Nation's postal history. Two well-merited pay raises and certain fringe benefits for postal employees brought increased costs of approximately $500 million a year. But the entire cost of these pay increases was offset by the mail rate increases of 1958.

We should recall that, at the end of fiscal 1952, the postal deficit amounted to $727 million. Almost immediately after taking over in 1952, your predecessor administration transferred out of the Department, at no savings to the taxpayer, $107 million in airmail subsidies and official Government mail. The cost of these was taken over by other Government agencies. Also, at that time there was still an amount of $272 million in additional revenues to be realized on an annual basis as the result of 1951 rate increases. After allowance for these factors, the deficit should have been reduced to approximately $350 million without any allowance for public services. A little old-fashioned economy would have gone a long way to wiping out this deficit. The Carlson committee report of 1954 and my committee's report of 1957 are also ample proof of that contention.

However, the obligations of the Department increased by over 48 percent. In 1952 obligations amounted to $2.7 billion and the estimate for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, is in excess of $4 billion. So, with all these adjustments, we are told to anticipate a deficit of $900 million for 1961.

I have always felt that the cost ascertainment report, as used by the past administration, has not accurately reflected a proper allocation of the costs of handling the various classes of mail, particularly first class mail. It is imperative that a proper allocation of such costs and a reduction of departmental expenses be undertaken. Only then will mail users and the Congress know what the real loss on first-class mail is. Thereafter, consideration can be given on a sounder basis to the necessity, if any, for adjustments on postal rates generally.

It seems to me that if more energy had been devoted to improving the Department operations and less on demonstrably unneeded rate increases, you might have inherited a Department in a far sounder financial condition.

These brief observations may be helpful to you. You will agree, I am sure, that America deserves the best postal service in the world, not the most expensive. The past administration has not produced the former, but was in a fair way of producing the latter. I stand ready to assist you at any time on these matters of mutual concern.

My best wishes for every success.

Sincerely,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

PRESS RELEASE BY SENATOR JOHNSTON

Until a clear definition of the public service costs of the postal system is achieved, it is impossible intelligently to set future postal rates, U.S. Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, informed the new Postmaster General today.

Writing to Postmaster General J. Edward Day, Senator JOHNSTON reviewed the history of the postal rate structure and emphasized the failure of the previous administration and the Congress to recognize the Postal Policy Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–426).

A proper application of the law's provisions, according to Senator JOHNSTON, would show a Post Office Department anticipated deficit of somewhere around $300 million, rather than the approximately $900 million envisaged by the former administration.

"It was the opinion of my committee when this act was adopted," he wrote, "that the total loss on certain public services at the time would amount to $300 million. The items have been costed out at various figures somewhat less than this amount, but I am convinced, after full allowance is made for the last two postal pay hikes and the rate increases, the minimum cost of these services will be more than $300 million.

"The last administration made some initial effort to comply with the law, then with the help of the Budget Bureau proceeded to breach the law before the Appropriations Committee. For fiscal year 1959, the administration submitted $71 million, and for 1960 it submitted $172 million, omitting from the calculations in both instances the total losses involved in the operation of third- and fourth-class post offices and the star route system as required by law * * *"

Senator JOHNSTON said he has seen "varying estimates" of the postal deficit for 1961 but "assuming a deficit of approximately $900 million, I would urge that at least $300 million of this amount be set aside as a public service pursuant to law and so presented to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress."

He told Mr. Day: "Without a clear resolution of this controversy involving public services, the setting of future postal rates is impossible because we wind up with nothing but confusion confounded insofar as basic costs and the rate formula in the 1958 law are concerned."

Pointing out the long struggle of his committee to bring about adherence to the 1958 Postal Act's requirements, he said: "Once the matter of full adherence to the 1958 law is accomplished, I would urge you to give some careful consideration to other well-known subsidies existing in the postal service, as well as economies that might be achieved in the near future. There are at least $200 million in subsidies which should be spelled out and recognized for what they are, and should not constitute a charge against the various mail users."

One example: "Another item erroneously included in the alleged postal deficit of $900 million is an amount of over $80 million for capital improvement. The department admitted this last summer."

Taking the true measure of public services (which Senator JOHNSTON listed for Mr. Day) and excluding capital investment would provide a more accurate picture of a post office deficit of around $30 million—and not $900 million.

Critically reviewing the policies of the previous Post Office Department administration, Senator JOHNSTON declared: "I have always felt that the cost ascertainment report, as used by the past administration, has not accurately reflected a proper allocation of the costs of handling the various classes of mail, particularly first-class mail.

"It is imperative that a proper allocation of such costs and a reduction of departmental expenses be undertaken. Only then will mail users and the Congress know what the real loss on first-class mail is. Thereafter, consideration must be given on a sounder basis to the necessity, if any, for adjustments on postal rates generally.

"It seems to me that if more energy had been devoted to improving the Department operations and less on demonstrably unneeded rate increases, you might have inherited a department in a far sounder financial condition."

To the new Postmaster General, Senator JOHNSTON said: "These brief observations may be helpful to you. You will agree, I am sure, that America deserves the best postal service in the world, not the most expensive. The past administration has not produced the former, but was in a fair way of producing the latter. I stand ready to assist you at any time on these matters of mutual concern."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think it is safe to say, in summarizing the letter of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], that his position and that of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is that a clear definition of the cost of public service is necessary before postal rates can be intelligently arrived at.

On the other hand, my good friend, the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], in a most challenging speech to the Senate on March 29, urged that action be taken immediately to wipe out what he describes as the deficit in the Post Office Department. The distinguished Senator from Virginia has been a longtime student of the postal system, and, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Departments of the Treasury and the Post Office, is vitally concerned with the financing of the postal service and the efficiency of its operations.

It is because of this difference between my two good friends and the committees that they represent that I believe we should not proceed hastily in the enactment of postal rate legislation. I believe that we owe it to ourselves and to the country to make a definitive study of these problems and resolve the differences that seem to exist.

We need to take a long look at the Post Office Department and the service it renders. We need to determine why the parcel post service is becoming more inadequate day by day. We need to study postal service and the movement of the mails in relation to the changes in our transportation system brought about by the jet age. We need to reduce this patchwork structure of service and rates in the Post Office Department to a more streamlined entity.

The whole matter of the abandonment of railroad routes is of grave concern to the postal service.

There has never been a comprehensive frontal attack on the whole postal rate structure in terms of better service, better equipment, and more efficient cost ascertainment.

We have tackled the postal rate problem at the committee level to the best of our ability. I think the time has arrived, in light of the deficit and in light of technological improvements which are available, for a very careful, methodical, and intensive study of the postal rate situation.

In the past few days, because I am interested in this problem, I have been reading a private study made by an outstanding management engineering firm dealing with the postal service. This re-

port, among other things, contains this statement:

> The true value accruing to society through many uses of the mails cannot be measured in monetary terms.

I believe this should be our guideline in approaching the problems of the postal service, and I think it high time that we make final determinations with the cooperation of all interested Senate committees and nail down, once and for all, the policy of our Government with respect to the postal service, which reaches the doorstep of every one of our citizens in all 50 States.

I believe the present administration in the Post Office Department should take a fresh look at the Postal Policy Act of 1958. I urge it not to rely on the estimates handed down to us by the previous administration. It should then submit findings to the Appropriations Committees of Congress which are realistic and which give meaning to the public service provisions of the act. When that has been done, the Appropriations Committees can then identify, with some degree of assurance, the true amount of our postal deficit. At that time our Post Office Committees can proceed to the task of rate changing with firmness and intelligence.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the statement and suggestion offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I agree completely that we cannot and should not undertake another round of postal rate fixing until we have fully and finally resolved the matter of public service costs.

I was hoping that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would be present, because he takes the same position I do upon this matter.

I thought we settled the controversy with the enactment of the Postal Policy Act of 1958, but as time goes on, we seem to get further and further from the intent of that legislation. There are some who disregard its provisions on the basis that it was a hastily conceived, repent-in-leisure proposition. That is not so. The first modern postal policy legislation was originated in the House of Representatives as early as 1956. Again in 1957, that body incorporated in its rate bill a section dealing with postal policy as a basis for rate making. Finally, in 1958, after months of deliberation and many hours of debate, the Congress adopted the Postal Policy Act of 1958.

The law provides a list of free and preferred-rate services performed by the Post Office Department that should be set aside on a "total loss" basis, to be paid for from the general funds of the Treasury and not charged to any user, or class of users, of the mails.

The 1958 act also repealed the Kelly law, which had originally provided a measure of public services on a loss-of-revenue basis, because with the tremendous growth of our postal system, it was not fair or equitable to ask business mail users to foot the bill for those items that were strictly in the national interest. The cost of such services should be paid for out of the general funds.

Many of us who supported the 1958 law were of the opinion that public service costs at that time amounted to approximately $300 million, or somewhat less than 10 percent of total postal costs. There was considerable support here on the floor of the Senate for a minimum allowance of 10 percent for public service costs.

In 1954 the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, under the leadership of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], found that such services amounted to 12 percent of total costs. Again, in 1957, the committee reported that the total loss on public services amounted to 14 percent of costs. The Post Office Department fought us every step of the way on this matter, but the Congress overruled the Department.

Why is it that $300 million, out of a $4 billion budget, causes so much controversy? This is a little more than 7 percent, and, in my judgment, very reasonable. In the 1940's, when we had the Kelly law on the books, nobody objected to an 8-percent factor on public services. Recently, I reviewed the annual report of the Postmaster General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946. On page 129 of that report, I found the following tabulation of services:

Penalty matter for branches of Government other than Post Office	$98,261,000
Franked matter	846,000
Publications going free in county	647,000
Free mail for the blind	86,000
Differentials in postage for nonprofit mail	406,000
Total	100,246,000

With total expenditures of $1,354 million for that year, the $100 million amounts to a little under 8 percent for the year. Do Senators know what that would produce in public services today? It would amount to over $320 million.

Again, in 1951 the annual report carried an adjustment of $105 million, about $18 million of which involved airmail subsidies. In all, it amounted to approximately 5 percent of total expenditures.

Of course, I know that we have transferred the cost of penalty and franked mail and airmail subsidies out of the Post Office at no savings to the taxpayer. That is why we had to repeal the Kelly law. Today, I would tell my colleagues that the losses on nonprofit mail alone will equal the former totals of public service credits under the Kelly law.

When the House of Representatives places a zero factor on public services, as was the case when it acted on the 1962 Post Office budget, I say we are going backward instead of forward. A public service factor is not a new development in postal finances; we have had provision for it as far back as 1930. However, the total loss on just the nonprofit items in our postal service today exceeds the grand total of the items under the Kelly law. That is why we had to enact a new law, and why we provided total losses this time so that future postal rate bills would not, in effect, be a tax on postal users. It is a tax when we ask such users to pick up the losses on all the free and reduced-rate operations. As long as the Congress has provided for these free services, then I say they should be paid for out of the general funds of the Treasury. I want to make sure the postal patrons only pay for the service they receive, and do not contribute to the cost of free and many other subsidized services.

I agree completely with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that until the matter of postal policy is resolved it will be impossible to enact a proper rate bill. I wish to thank my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota, for his very fine explanation of the problem and his suggestion for its solution.

TEACHERS, TEXTBOOKS, AND TRAVELS: COMMUNIST ACTION IN THE WORLD'S SCHOOLS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on April 12, 1961, the Honorable Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Jr., Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency, addressed the Seventh Annual National Military-Industrial and Educational Conference at its meeting in Chicago, on the subject "Teachers, Textbooks, and Travels: Communist Action in the World's Schools."

Meetings with this conference were under the sponsorship of the Institute for American Strategy, which is a nonprofit educational corporation whose objective is to further public understanding of the nature of the contemporary totalitarian challenge to American freedom.

This institute conducts programs designed to increase public awareness of the nature, objectives, and methods of communism, and also of the ideals and assets inherent in our free society for meeting its challenge. The institute is tax exempt, nonpartisan, and privately managed. It is financed through the contribution of some 100 corporations of the United States and a number of foundations.

It is a splendid organization for its declared purposes. Those who support it and are active in its affairs are to be highly commended.

Mr. Kirkpatrick has had long and varied experience in the field about which he spoke. The information and the thoughts which he expressed are deserving of more widespread circulation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHERS, TEXTBOOKS, AND TRAVELS: COMMUNIST ACTION IN THE WORLD'S SCHOOLS

(Address by Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Jr., Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency, to the Seventh Annual National Military-Industrial and Educational Conference, Chicago, Ill., April 12, 1961)

The world's educational institutions will be one of the decisive battlefields in the fight for existence between communism and the free world.

The election by the Communists to pursue their struggle for world domination by competitive coexistence has signaled an intensification of their efforts in education.

Let there be no illusion that the Communist efforts in the schools, colleges, and universities will be confined to the area of the Red bloc. Throughout the world there is ample evidence that the Communists are determined to win the youth as the first step in winning the world.

In a report entitled "Communist Target—Youth," J. Edgar Hoover, the eminent Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a foremost authority on both communism and the problem of youth, wrote: "The successful Communist exploitation and manipulation of youth and student groups throughout the world today are a major challenge which free world forces must meet and defeat."

You will recall that Lenin wrote: "Give us the child for 8 years, and it will be a Bolshevik forever." He also noted: "He who has youth, has the future."

On the first day you heard from Mr. Sullivan, the Chief of Research of the FBI, on the subject of "Communism and Education in the United States." I am sure his excellent report left no doubt in your minds that the United States is a major target of this Communist offensive in education. The statement of Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, to the national committee on January 20, 1961, certainly made their intentions completely clear. He said: "There is a mushrooming of Marxist- and Socialist-oriented groups on the campuses in all parts of the country, and we have witnessed the emergence of a new and very successful youth paper." He went on to say: "the party must give much higher priority for the work among youth in all fields of endeavor."

This is a worldwide effort on the part of the Communists. The statement of policy adopted by the Moscow conference of 81 Communist Parties in December 1960 has been called the sharpest declaration of war ever adopted by any international Communist gathering. This statement emphasized Communist youth work in saying "there are new opportunities now to draw the younger generation into the struggle for peace and democracy, and for the great ideals of communism."

It is our purpose today to present a factual analysis of how the Communists plan to pursue their objectives in the field of education. These objectives are clearly recognizable in the underdeveloped, education-starved, and intensely nationalistic countries of the free world. Here the aim is to capture the future leadership and to utilize the pull of educational centers in the free world, particularly the United States, the United Kingdom, and others. Propaganda which identifies communism and the bloc with the national aspirations and anticolonial attitudes of the young generations creates a favorable climate for the operation.

We should recognize at the start that what we are talking about today is the struggle between those forces who want to create the Communist man and those who want men to be free. The international Communist movement is dedicated to and organized for the destruction of all non-Communist institutions.

Teachers are the principal targets of Communist activity. East Germany provides a picture window on what happens in an area that falls under Communist domination. Every year from 2,000 to 2,500 teachers have fled from East Germany. These men and women could not live with themselves under Communist conditions. They recognized that they were no longer educators, but propagandists and political puppets.

The Special Committee on Refugee Teachers from East Germany of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession reported the reasons for the teachers' flight as follows:

"He is not only forced in all classes and to pupils of all ages to represent the political conditions and measures in the Soviet Zone as right and good, but in addition has political tasks to fulfill outside school, such as taking part in political organizations, leadership work at political rallies and propaganda meetings, participating in courses of political instruction."

This same report goes on to say that the teacher is obliged to determine the political views of the parents. He cannot have any religious convictions and he must influence children to abandon the church.

The same report noted that the economic circumstances of the teachers in the East Zone are quite good compared with other professions. This is a significant aspect of the problem of which we should take note.

One of the principal Communist appeals to teachers is that in many areas of the world they are underpaid and socially insecure. Quite a few turned to Communist doctrines in search of a political philosophy which would assist them in explaining the complexities of modern life to themselves and their students. Sad to say, the training afforded teachers has often neglected modern history and the political sciences and left them all too vulnerable to the impressive pretensions of Communist pseudoscience.

Communist peace propaganda attracted teachers because their daily contact with young students kept questions of pacificism and militarism continuously before their eyes. This propaganda skillfully combines the teachers' economic and professional demands with its disarmament bid: "If the defense budget is reduced the Government can build new schools, raise teachers' salaries, and provide for new research facilities."

Some teachers accepted Communist leadership of their professional organizations and unions for the same reason as many industrial workers did: the Communists promised them everything they wanted in a material sense—higher salaries, increased job security, old-age insurance, etc. The fact that these promises mean nothing is often not recognized until it is too late. Mr. Hoover says in his book "Masters of Deceit": "The party keeps stressing Marxist-Leninist education: Party schools, reading the Communist press, self-study. It builds up a discipline that automatically attacks doubts, rationalizes contradictions inside the party structure, and guides every decision in the party's favor."

To prevent deviations there is constant pressure from the party or from the union which is affiliated with the World Federation of Teachers Unions, an affiliate of the Communist-run World Federation of Trade Unions.

The history of the World Federation of Teachers Unions indicates its true nature. It was organized in 1946; was expelled from Paris in 1952 for "fifth column activities." The WFTU moved to Vienna; was again expelled from that city in 1956. It finally settled its headquarters in Prague.

The World Federation of Teachers Unions claims a membership of some 6 million from 30 countries. However, the bulk of its membership comes from the Communist bloc. Among its objectives it lists the establishment of universal free education, meaning under Communist control; and the outlawing of all textbooks propagating militarism, imperialism, or racial domination, meaning all those not written from a Marxist-Leninist point of view.

Under the sponsorship of the World Federation of Teachers a third World Conference of Teachers was held in Conakry, Guinea, in July 1960. This conference was attended principally by delegates from Communist countries and Communists from Western countries. There were actually more minor officials from the various ministries of education present than there were teachers. There was little serious discussion of the problems in education facing Africa, but considerable political propaganda was directed at the United States. The tactics were in keeping with the pattern established by the World Federation of Teachers Unions, wherein educational problems are never studied as such, but always from the viewpoint of the so-called class war.

To propagate its philosophy the World Federation of Teachers Unions publishes an illustrated monthly magazine, Teachers of the World, in English, French, German, Spanish, and Japanese. This is but one of the many Communist publications designed to have an impact in the field of education.

The Communists have long recognized the tremendous impact of the printed word. But in their use of the printed word they are extremely careful to see that the student and intellectual see only the right words. It should be noted here that without exception education in the Soviet orbit is praised, while that in the United States and the British Commonwealth is ceaselessly criticized.

In the United States and other free countries the students in courses of political philosophy and economy are given a careful objective analysis of the various types of political and economic systems. Original documents and publications from the various countries of the world are used.

In Communist countries a course in political economy presents the capitalist system within the framework of a Marxist interpretation of history. Students are not allowed access to current Western texts. In the political economy course required of all students in Communist universities there are books by only four authors: Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx, V. I. Lenin, and Josef Stalin.

Such is education in the Communist bloc. These efforts are not so obvious in areas of the free world, but equally dangerous. In one important area of southeast Asia, where as you know there are large Chinese communities, it is estimated that as high as 90 percent of the students in the Chinese secondary school systems are under Communist influence. With few exceptions the textbooks used are identical with those used in Communist China. They are carefully written in order to create a sense of identification with China, so that the schooling, rather than providing an objective and balanced education, is in effect creating a fifth column for Peiping.

In a major Latin American city a new school is being organized under the direction of two prominent Communist activists whose role, if they are successful in their covert activity, will be unknown to the public, to most of the teachers, and to the students. In other words they are using respectable citizens and educators as a front. The courses which will be presented have most respectable names: Political economics, philosophy, and history. What these courses will actually present are the political economics of Marxism, dialectical materialism, and the history of socialism.

Perhaps we should note here in passing that the Cuban public schools have recently received an order from the Government to give instruction in Communist doctrine.

Under the Communist scheme of things the student is not just a passive recipient of indoctrination. The objective is to bring him under firm control and to make him an activist.

Terror is not an unknown weapon in this effort. Force is used against teachers and nonconformist students—something that never fails to affect the impressionable

young. Social ostracism is used by listing the names of opponents on the blackboard and labelling them as traitors.

Enticing scholarship offers attract many, particularly those students who are bright but poor. In order to get and keep their scholarships students are required to read prescribed books and to follow the orders of all leaders.

Tool of the Communists in their activities among students is the International Union of Students which was founded in Prague in 1946 and which claims a membership of more than 3 million students in some 36 affiliated organizations. Most of the non-Communist affiliates of this organization left it by 1950.

The International Union of Students holds periodic World Student Congresses, and works closely with the World Federation of Democratic Youth, another Communist front, in running the biennial World Youth Festivals. It uses every opportunity to criticize conditions in the free world eulogizing life in the Communist countries. Indicative of the wide extent of its activities are the departments in the secretariat in Prague. (1) Education, culture, and travel; (2) student needs and welfare; (3) press information; (4) administration and finance; and (5) faculty bureau.

This organization is among those responsible for the mass of Communist literature available to the students from secondary schools and universities. Attractive books and periodicals are sold for very little. These print distorted reports and half-truths about the United States and the free world and extol the conditions of life in Communist countries. It is small wonder that many students are tempted to travel to Communist countries for university education.

Chukwuemeka Okonkwo, of Nigeria, wrote of his experiences in this regard in the Nigerian Sunday Times. He reported that he was consciously trying to test the suitability of communism as a state system in order to prepare himself to play a part in the development of Nigeria. He obtained U.N. sponsorship to study in the Soviet Union. Before going he read everything he could lay his hands on about the U.S.S.R. and about Marxism-Leninism. He was impressed by the promises of aid to Africa and by the objectives stated.

Here is his report in his own words: "On the basis of what I had read * * * I formed a mental picture of a perfect society, devoid of social, economic, and political injustice, a highly organized state, potentially greater than any other."

He goes on to say that upon first arriving in Moscow the students were pampered and feted. They were allowed to mix with the Russians. "It was hoped no doubt that they would influence us." But he reports that the reverse was true. The Russian students had never experienced such free and open discussions and questions in class—"they could not understand this at first; but they, too, began to imitate us because we * * * got away with it." The inevitable followed: "The authorities called a halt to fraternization. They put us in separate hostels and gave us passes. * * * From your hostel through the Russian sectors to the classroom you had to use three passes."

Okonkwo said many of the African students had a grudge against the West for what they considered the injustices of colonialism, and were urged to make statements favorable to the U.S.S.R. and anti-Western. He said: "We did not know it then, but later it dawned on us that not only were the Russians striving to convince the world of their own system, they were hard put to it, trying to convince their own people about communism." He wrote: "Today I know that communism in theory reads better than any ideology on earth; but I know, also, that communism in practice is the most oppressive, the most abominable, and the most inhuman government machine that has yet been evolved."

Okonkwo isn't the only African who had illusions shattered by the realities of the Communist system of education. Another commented: "In Africa they all want to come here. We come to be taught but we find, when we get here, that you cannot be neutral in this country. They won't let you." And a third student said: "The best way to become an anti-Communist is to live here."

We would be foolish to presume that education in the Communist countries affects many in this manner. But even if a few students see through the sham, we cannot conclude that Communist manipulation of education is so obvious that it is self-defeating. Young people are often intelligent but rarely wise.

Most students are selected with care by the Communist embassies, or the Communist Party, or front organizations. Several countries have expressed concern over the direct recruitment of students in this manner. The Indian Government has indicated that it will not permit it, and further that the 30 to 40 students selected to attend the new Friendship University in Moscow will not be permitted to take political or ideological courses.

The Friendship University will be the lodestone by which the Communists will try to attract more and more foreign students to Moscow. It opened October 1, 1960, with 500 students—only about 10 percent from the Soviet Union and all the rest from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It has been stated that the foreign students will not have to take courses in Marxism-Leninism which are compulsory for all Russians. Foreign students will get free tuition, a free room, medical care, a clothing allowance and $70 a month. Transportation will be provided to Moscow—and home again after 5 years. In 3 years this university will have 3,000 to 4,000 undergraduates in everything from engineering to Marxist economics.

The Soviet Union is not alone in offering expanded opportunities for foreign students. African youth leaders are trained free at the Wilhelm Pieck Youth College in Bernau. Czechoslovakia has offered 40 technical scholarships to Mali, each for a 2- to 3-year period with all expenses paid. Leipzig University has a department of African studies and many other opportunities are offered in schools and universities from Prague to Peiping.

The challenge that this Communist offensive poses for the free world is impressive. It is a challenge which must be met or we will truly be buried.

First, as Allen Dulles said in a speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Detroit last August: "We need far and wide in this country more education on the whole history of the Communist movement.

"We should not be afraid to teach the subject. A history of communism and all of its works would bear its own indictment of the system. Let the facts speak for themselves."

There is no shortage of literature on the subject. Your own Dr. Kenneth Colegrove produced the book "Democracy Versus Communism" under the auspices of the institute of fiscal and political education. J. Edgar Hoover's book "Masters of Deceit" should be required reading. And there are other studies produced by many research organizations throughout the country.

Second, every effort should be made to permit others the opportunity to study not only communism but the free world. Already many fine research institutions in the free world are studying the problems of the Communist world particularly in such countries as West Germany, England, and Japan. There should be more such institutions and they should particularly be open to scholars from the new and underdeveloped nations.

Third, worldwide efforts are required to improve the status of the teacher. I have described what attracts teachers to communism, and perhaps the most important is the poor economic state in many parts of the world. Salaries of teachers are all too often insufficient to meet the necessities of life. The Hong Kong Government reported that a growing interest on the part of teachers in communism vanished when a more adequate salary scale was adopted.

Fourth, students in the world should not be permitted to have empty stomachs and intolerable living conditions. These conditions breed communism regardless of the education they receive.

Finally, there should be a full and free interchange of unclassified information. When a chemistry student spends 6 months in the Soviet Union without being permitted to see the list of chemistry courses offered by the university in which he is enrolled, it is obvious that Communist practices do not match their promises of freedom.

The Communists are terrified of the searchlight of truth—they will not allow it to shine on their own people; they will strive to keep the light from all others.

TRIBUTES TO DR. KONRAD ADENAUER, CHANCELLOR OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, AND HIS FOREIGN MINISTER, DR. HEINRICH VON BRENTANO

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on April 14, a large and distinguished cross section of the legislative, executive, and judiciary branches of our Government and a number of leading private citizens paid a well-deserved tribute to one of the great statesmen of our time, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany and his Foreign Minister, Dr. Heinrich von Brentano.

The Vice President of the United States, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, headed a representation of the executive branch, which included the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, and the President's three military aides as well as many other distinguished members of government, political, civic leaders, and laymen.

Former President of the United States, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, through his personal assistant, Col. Robert L. Schulz, telephoned a message of greetings to his old friend and comrade-in-arms in the struggle against Communist imperialism. Colonel Schulz also expressed regrets on behalf of General Eisenhower, that, due to being on the west coast, it would be impossible for him to attend the reception and luncheon in honor of Chancellor Adenauer and Minister von Brentano, both of whom he reveres so highly. He requested that his respects and highest regards be conveyed to both gentlemen.

It was my privilege to serve as a cohost with my distinguished colleagues, Senators THOMAS J. DODD, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, STYLES BRIDGES, and JACOB K. JAVITS, at a luncheon in honor of the Chancellor and his very able Foreign Minister, Dr. Heinrich von Brentano, in the New Senate Office Building.

Following as it did the discussions between the Chancellor and President Kennedy on the major problems confronting our two countries in meeting the insistent threats of the Communist challenger, it was our objective to convey to the Chancellor and to his colleagues a sense of the nonpartisan solidarity which unites America in its resolve to stand by him in his determination to defend the freedom of Berlin and to achieve the unification of his country through free elections.

It must be said that the great courage and integrity was never more in evidence than in the timing of Chancellor Adenauer's visit to Washington. For many years, he and his government have been the primary targets of ceaseless drumfire of invective by Soviet propaganda mills.

The Communists have sought continually to blot out the clear and by now thoroughly established distinction between the Germany of Adenauer and the Germany of Hitler. These efforts reached a peak of intensity during the few weeks immediately preceding his arrival in Washington. They were aimed especially at turning the Eichmann trial in Israel into renewed assaults on the integrity of the Chancellor and members of his Government. This, despite a clear expression by Prime Minister Ben-Gurion of Israel that his Government draws a sharp distinction between the Germany of the 1930's and the Federal Republic of today.

To underscore this reasoned judgment, it is worth pointing out that among those who accepted our invitation to the luncheon honoring the Chancellor was Mr. Mordechai Gazit, Minister Plenipotentiary of Israel, who came as the representative of his Government's Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Avraham Harman, who was not in Washington at the time and wanted to be sure that he was represented on this occasion.

If any further testimony were needed to the Federal Republic's stature as a nation dedicated to the freedom and dignity of the individual, it was provided by an inspiring invocation given at the luncheon by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld of the Washington Hebrew Congregation. We were additionally honored by the presence of the Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, and Rev. Martin J. Casey, of Holy Trinity Catholic Church, where our President frequently worships.

I invite the Senate's attention to the international background against which the tribute to the Chancellor took place.

The continuing turbulence in the Congo, the Soviet obstruction of a cease-fire in Laos, the failure of Soviet negotiators in Geneva to show the first sign of good faith in the negotiations on nuclear arms control, the unremitting efforts to vitiate the effectiveness of the United Nations and its Secretary General—all of this has given fresh urgency to the need for giving new strength, unity, and purpose to the Western alliance.

By all odds, one of the most forthright voices for this end has been that of Chancellor Adenauer. Through his Foreign Minister, Dr. von Brentano, he has called for Western economic and political cohesion to match the solidarity of our common military defenses.

Recognition of all this indomitable champion of human freedom represents, not only for the rebirth of his own country from the ashes of a totalitarian regime, but for the future of a world based on the rule of law and respect for human rights, was reflected in the remarks of my colleagues, which I should like to include in the RECORD.

The response by Chancellor Adenauer to these well-merited tributes was a moving and eloquent experience for all who had the privilege to hear him.

The high-minded context in which the Federal Republic of Germany views its relations with the United States was admirably stated by Foreign Minister von Brentano.

Mr. President, the opportunity afforded so large and representative a gathering of Washington's official life, as well as leading figures in American civic and business affairs, to meet the Chancellor and his party and talk with them at first hand, should cement still further the bonds of friendship and understanding between two countries whose peoples share the same aspirations and face the same challenges.

It was our hope and certainly our intention to give the Chancellor to understand in personal terms the great respect and affection in which he is held in our country, and through him to convey to the German people our unyielding determination to stand by their side in the great endeavors for peace, freedom, and justice that animate our two countries.

We trust that the significance of our expression of esteem and confidence in the Chancellor will not be lost on those to the east of his country who find the prospect of German-American partnership discomforting.

Let them read the words that were exchanged at this historic gathering, to enable them as well as a larger audience to do so. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks a verbatum transcript of the tributes paid to Chancellor Adenauer, and the tribute which the Chancellor and his Foreign Minister Dr. Heinrich von Brentano paid to the American people by their presence and by their remarks at this heartwarming display of solidarity between nations; also that a list of the distinguished persons present at this notable event be printed after that transcript.

There being no objection, the transcript and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCEEDINGS OF LUNCHEON PROGRAM HONORING DR. KONRAD ADENAUER, CHANCELLOR OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY, AND HIS FOREIGN MINISTER, DR. HEINRICH VON BRENTANO

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, official luncheon host introduced Rabbi Norman J. Gerstenfeld, minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, who delivered the following invocation:

Rabbi Gerstenfeld's invocation:

"We bow our heads and turn our hearts unto Thee.

"O Thou who art the peace of the world: Save our generation from the terror that cometh by night and the arrow that flieth by day; from the pestilence that walketh in darkness and its destruction that wasteth at noonday.

"O Thou who hast led us across the Red Seas and the wilderness of the yesteryears in a vision of a divine covenant: quicken that vision in our minds so that with renewed faith we shall be its living witness and inspire freemen toward a rebirth of freedom to face the promise and the dangers of a new age.

"O Thou who hast been our refuge and our fortress through the ages, our altar of devotion, light our lives with Thy sacred fire and our hearts with Thy flame so that with strength of spirit and courage of purpose we will strive toward a world bringing Thy light and Thy peace unto the children of men.

"Bless Thou the men who raise Thy standards in our own time; the men who guard the rights of their fellow men; the men who are not neutral in time of evil; the men who turn not away their face when the wicked would barter the birthright of freedom for the mess of pottage of petty gain or glory; the men who have the self-discipline of disciples of Thy sacred law, as children of a just God. Guide us and guard us and lead us forward so that through our labors in this moment of history we shall in truth be the living witness of Thy covenant and the time will soon come when the world shall be filled with the knowledge of a righteous God even as the waters cover the seas.

"Thus we pray as we ask Thy special blessing unto the leaders of the new Germany in their righteous purpose. Amen."

SENATOR DODD'S TRIBUTE

Senator DODD. We have come together today to pay tribute to one of the great statesmen of our time. Indeed, I venture the prediction that historians, looking back upon our troubled era, will rank our guest of honor as one of the great statesmen of all times.

In a sense, every statesman is a symbol of mankind's ability to respond to historic challenges. No political leader can achieve the rank of statesman unless he has confronted such challenges and triumphed over them.

If this is the true mark of statesmanship then I can think of no political leader in our times, who more richly merits recognition as a statesman.

Other statesmen have confronted the problems of history with the united support of their people, with the tradition of stable constitutional government behind them, with the supporting advantage of strong and healthy economies.

But when Konrad Adenauer became Chancellor of Germany, he took over the helm in a country which 12 years of Nazi rule and 6 years of war had converted into a physical, economic, and moral wasteland.

Germany's cities were in ruins. Her economy was in shambles. To add to her difficulty, almost 10 million German expellees were pushed across the frontiers by the Communist regimes in Poland and Czechoslovakia.

All of these difficulties, however, were of minor importance compared to the difficulty of reconstituting a democratic and civilized society on the basis of the ashes left by the Nazis.

To those of us who were close to the problem in the immediate post-war period, the problem of denazification seemed almost insurmountable. How could tens of thousands of administrators be dismissed—and an administration still be maintained? How could minds be purged of the Nazi virus and a sense of morality and civic responsibility restored? How could teachers be found so that the new generation of Germans could be schooled in dedication to the ideals of democracy? There were many of us who

felt at the time that the restoration of Germany would be a work of generations.

I have seen the bottom of the abyss from which the German people had to come—and, for my own part, I cannot help marveling that they have traveled so far in so short a period of time.

If there is any one man who deserves supreme credit for the miracle that has been accomplished in Germany, that man is Konrad Adenauer.

We join in honoring you, Mr. Chancellor, because you have brought the German people back to their rightful place in civilized society. We honor you for the wisdom and vision and courage you have brought to the councils of free nations and to the council of NATO. We honor you for your efforts on behalf of European unity. We honor you because we feel you belong to the free world and to free men everywhere.

Now, I would like to call upon Ambassador Dowling and ask him to propose a toast.

TOASTS TO THE PRESIDENTS

Ambassador DOWLING. Mr. Chancellor and Senator, ladies and gentlemen, will you join me in a toast to the President of the Federal Republic of Germany? [Toast and applause.]

Senator DODD. Now, I am honored to ask Ambassador Grewe to propose a toast.

Ambassador GREWE. I am very honored to propose a toast to the President of the United States.

Senator DODD. I would now like to call upon Senator BRIDGES to introduce His Excellency, Chancellor Adenauer.

"ADENAUER A GREAT STATESMAN," SAYS BRIDGES

Senator BRIDGES. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chancellor, Mr. Vice President, and Mr. Foreign Minister, Mr. Secretary, Mr. Ambassador and my colleagues in the Senate and the House, distinguished guests and friends, it is a pleasure today to participate with you in this luncheon in honor of a great friend of the United States. You know, in his own country, he is called "Der Alter," which means the old one. But in spirit his stamina at 85 years of age indicates that he should be called—in his own language—"Der Junge," which means the young one. And that is how we greet him here today. [Applause.]

Under his leadership, he has taken his country from a war-torn land and built it into one of the strongest nations in the world today. He did that in spite of the fact that, back in 1930, when he was talking to a conference of mayors when he was mayor of the city of Cologne, Germany, he asked them to resist the Nazi movement and the rising of Hitler. As a result, the Nazis captured him and the Gestapo placed him in a concentration camp and there he stayed for most of the war.

He is over here today conferring with President Kennedy, with Vice President JOHNSON, and with other responsible executives in our Government. We are very happy that those conferences have resulted in a stepped-up spirit, a lasting agreement, and a friendship which will show that the United States of America and the Republic of Germany are working hand in hand for the common objective. [Applause.]

Now, it is my pleasure to present to you today one of the great men of the world, one of the great statesmen of this 19th and 20th century period which we have been passing through and who is a deep friend of the United States and a man who has had the courage to meet all the problems which are so complex in this present day. We are glad to welcome him to the United States and to present him to our friends here and to the U.S. Senate today, Chancellor Adenauer. [Applause.]

GERMANY STEADFAST ALLY, PLEDGES CHANCELLOR

Chancellar ADENAUER. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, ladies and gentlemen, I was extremely and most deeply touched by what I have seen, heard, and experienced in these 3 days since my arrival in Washington. I regard myself here primarily as the representative of the German people, and in this spirit—in this sense—I was aware of the great cordiality and warmth of the reception which I have been given on the occasion of this visit. The talks with the President were conducted in a spirit of brotherhood and of a community of ideals and a community of interests, and I was most extraordinarily impressed by these conferences and by the spirit in which they were conducted.

The United States of America, as a result of the First World War, entered the scene of world politics and became one of the most powerful nations, and in this capacity, the United States entered also into the Second World War and then after the end of the Second World War the United States of America stood that great historical test; namely, to fulfill the task of the victor after the victory. The task of victor after victory is not to destroy the vanquished, but to help the vanquished to recover and to help him do peaceful work together with the other members of the community of nations.

I feel that it is one of the noblest deeds of the American people for all times to come that they dedicated their strength and their power in order to help rebuild a destroyed world and this, ladies and gentlemen, is the true hallmark of greatness. This is the test of true humaneness and of true vision. I think the American Nation has stood this test and this is a record which will greatly contribute to the honor of the people of the United States of America and of this generation.

Now, the previous speakers were kind enough to refer to the contribution which I had the honor to make in rebuilding Germany. But I should like to say this was, not only my own merit, but it was the merit of all those Germans who were determined to start to work again—to do peaceful work; to rebuild their country and to enter the community of peace-loving and honor-loving nations. Therefore, I think I am entitled to convey the expression of gratitude which you were so kind to say to the entire German population—to all those Germans who participated in this great task. As for myself, I would like to say that reference was made to the difference in age.

Reference was made to the fact that there are young people; there are old people. But I think young and old go very well together. It only depends on how one behaves himself. I believe that even if I am old in years, I hope to stay young in spirit and mentality, and I hope, further, to cooperate and go on together with you in this spirit. [Applause.]

The ordeal of the present generation isn't over yet. We are all aware of this and we are also all aware that we can stand this ordeal only under the strong and determined leadership of the United States of America, and I want also to assure you distinguished leaders of this Nation that Germany, in this ordeal, will stand by you on your side, steadfastly and faithfully. [Applause.]

In conclusion, and in expressing the gratitude which we feel toward the people of the United States of America, I should like to propose a toast to the future prosperity and happiness of the people of the United States of America. [Applause.]

Senator DODD. Thank you, Chancellor Adenauer. It is my pleasure now to call on one of our great colleagues in the Senate, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY.

DISTINGUISHED GUESTS

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you very much, Senator DODD. Your Excellency Chancellor Adenauer, Mr. Vice President, honored guests—all of you here. It is my privilege to introduce a few of the distinguished guests whom, I am sure many of you would like to know and meet. Like in most instances, one will undoubtedly forget one or overlook one, so please forgive me.

First of all, I want to present to this very fine luncheon gathering in honor of Chancellor Adenauer, one who has honored his life and who in her own being, her charm, her beauty, and her presence, honors all of us and I would like to ask her to stand so that we might pay her our respect and tribute—the daughter of the Chancellor, Mrs. Werhahn.

Now, I might add that she is in the company of two of our most gifted and talented ladies—two of the secret weapons of the American democracy, the senior Senator from Maine, Mrs. SMITH, and the junior Senator from Oregon, Mrs. NEUBERGER.

Just a few more introductions at the head table. Without any reference to protocol, but with reference to the geography of the table, to my left at the end of the table—Senator Jacob Javits of New York; Senator Olin Johnston of South Carolina; His Excellency, the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador Grewe. I shall pass by the next honored guest because we shall introduce him a little later. To my extreme right, Senator ROMAN HRUSKA of Nebraska; the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. You have already heard from our esteemed colleague, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, and I know that we will hear from one who is on my immediate right, the Vice President. So we will wait for that. We will hear from the Foreign Minister later, also.

May I introduce a few guests from the audience? First of all, I would like to apologize for not having acknowledged the distinguished clergy, Rabbi Gerstenfeld, who gave us a beautiful invocation. He is the leader of the Jewish community of our Capital City; Father Casey and our own Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Dr. Harris. We are very honored to have these distinguished churchmen with us.

Your Excellency, Chancellor Adenauer, we have so many fine and distinguished admirers of yours here today, it is difficult to know where to start and stop, but I should like to present Ambassador Harriman—our President's Ambassador; Ambassador Dowling, our Ambassador to the Federal Republic. We have the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, Secretary Ball; we also have with us the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Stahr; the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Connally; Secretary of Air, Mr. Zuckert; and Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Dulles.

Now, may I just inject this little nonpartisan spirit to this. We have here the representatives—the spokesmen, both able and vocal, of the two major political parties. In light of recent developments, may I first introduce the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Mr. John Bailey. He apparently had to leave—things must not be well in the New Frontier right now.

We also have with us the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. THRUSTON MORTON. It disturbs me that he is so calm and collected. We also want to acknowledge the past national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, Gen. Julius Klein.

Your excellency, I hope that you now have a little more all-encompassing view of the guests that have gathered with us today to pay you their sincere respects and profound admiration for service in the cause of human freedom and human dignity. We are forever grateful to you. [Applause.]

Senator DODD. I mentioned to Senator HUMPHREY that I saw here two distinguished guests he wanted to introduce, but overlooked unintentionally—General Gruenther

is here and I see nearby General Medaris. And, now Senator HUMPHREY, you may come back on stage.

Senator HUMPHREY. Chancellor Adenauer, you will see what they reserved Senator HUMPHREY for—primarily to introduce speakers and I gather there may be some reason for this, which my American colleagues would be more than happy to explain to you—they had me under wraps.

STRONG RIGHT ARM

It is now my privilege to present to this distinguished assembly one of the great statesmen of the free world, a gentleman who has been the strong right arm of the Chancellor of the Federal Republic, one who has worked in close association with our Government—the Government of the United States under the former President, Dwight Eisenhower, and the Government of the United States under the present President, John Kennedy. And, we in this country, feel that it is fortunate for the free world and for those who love freedom to have in a Federal Republic of Germany, as a foreign minister, a man as gifted in the art of diplomacy and as knowledgeable in the affairs of this troubled world as the Foreign Minister whom I have the privilege to present today, Foreign Minister von Brentano. [Applause.]

"GRATEFUL HEARTS," SAYS BRENTANO

Foreign Minister VON BRENTANO. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, after such a great deal of brilliant eloquence, I find myself in a somewhat embarrassing situation. I do not know whether I can find any appropriate words. But let me tell you that we came over here with open minds and open hearts in order to continue those relations that existed between our two countries which have been created in the course of the last few years. You have heard about these talks between an old, wise statesman and your young President and, if I may take the liberty, ladies and gentlemen, to say here, with all due restraint, to the guests and foreigners present, that we admire and respect your young President as much as we admire and respect our Chancellor, and we are proud that they have had this exceptional meeting. We believe it will be a good contribution to the strengthening of peace all over the world. Because, what is the task with which we are confronted today? The task is to do everything in our power to strengthen peace and we know that of this task the future of the world depends.

Therefore, we will do everything in our power to make these relations among the nations of the free world as close as possible and to establish an unqualified solidarity in order that those who try to attack or intend to attack this free world know right from the beginning that this will not be possible and that they will refrain from taking such action.

Military defense preparations, however important they may be, there is something that is even more important and that is to develop and strengthen our unity and our solidarity because in this world of ours, moral strength is still stronger than military threats.

I believe I may say, on behalf of the Federal Chancellor, that we are leaving Washington with grateful hearts about the possibility we were offered here of these talks—about the possibility to contribute to this solidarity, and to strengthen it. We want to say this in behalf of all those, included in our community of free nations who accept and adhere to the principle of justice, who accept the rule of law and who stand for it, and all those who do everything in order to fight that evil spirit of totalitarianism from which we unfortunately had to suffer in Germany.

There is no doubt that if we tackle our task in this spirit we will succeed if we go on to shape our relations and to work together as we have done in the last few years. And we will continue in this spirit which was so characteristic of the meetings and of the talks between the President and the Federal Chancellor. Ladies and gentlemen, let me, in conclusion, express my gratitude for the warmth and cordiality of the reception you have extended to me. Thank you. [Applause.]

Senator DODD. Before calling on Senator JAVITS, I noticed that we overlooked a few other guests. Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, and Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Burnstan, are here. We also have with us a distinguished friend representing the Ambassador of Israel, Minister Plenipotentiary Mordechai Gazit. I see we have present the aides to the President who have come to honor Chancellor Adenauer. They are Brigadier General Clifton, Commander Shepard, and Colonel McHugh. The Chaplain of our Senate, Rev. Dr. Harris, who is so gracious and wonderful to us at all times is here. He has been introduced by Senator HUMPHREY.

I hope we haven't overlooked anyone else. If so, please don't be offended. So many of you have come here today to greet and honor Chancellor Adenauer. I am now going to ask Senator JAVITS to speak on behalf of those of us from the Senate who are represented here.

JAVITS' TRIBUTE TO ADENAUER AND BRENTANO

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chancellor, Minister von Brentano, Secretaries, Ambassadors, all our friends, and colleagues in the House and Senate and our guests. I really speak on behalf of all my colleagues who invited us here today to express our gratitude to the Chancellor for being with us and for speaking so eloquently in a way which has become traditional with him in our country.

We had hoped to present to you for brief remarks both the German Ambassador, Ambassador Grewe, and our own Ambassador, Ambassador Dowling, but they are graciously yielding to the demands of time. I will say for both of them that they have served both nations in a tremendously historic hour and that we in the United States, especially those of us in political life, appreciate the foresight of Chancellor Adenauer, who is here today, in view of the fact that he comes to us when so many thorny problems assail the world in terms of his nation. And we know that he has been discussing with our President the balance of payments, the military responsibility, the aid and trade possibilities which are incident to the new Organization for Economic Cooperation, a new kind of initiative by the Atlantic Community, historically so promising. We know, too, that he comes quite in the way that we expected him to—with tremendous and flaming courage to show the face of the new Germany at a time when the world will be holding in the balance the contrast between the new Germany and the old Germany, in view of the celebrated trial which is now going on. And it is for this flaming courage, Mr. Chancellor, we pay you such tribute.

We, in public life and in political life, know how hard it is to face the tough decisions and to face the people of the world when the decisions are difficult. You have faced it before in the reunification of Germany and the freedom of the city of Berlin. You have maintained the finest traditions of the whole world. You are determined that they should be—but you are also determined that they shall be, if humanly possible—in peace. And, so for my cohosts in the Senate and all of us here, Mr. Chancellor, we toast the prosperity, the health, the success of freedom as it is premised upon the very best in relations between the German Federal Republic and the United States.

Senator DODD. We are grateful to all of you for your presence. Chancellor Adenauer, everyone who is here—and some of the finest people in this country, as well as this city—have come to honor you and to demonstrate for you some of the feeling that the people of our country have for you. Thank you all for having helped us to express our feeling of appreciation to Chancellor Adenauer.

BENEDICTION

At this time, I shall call on Father Casey, the pastor of President Kennedy's church, and ask him to close our luncheon meeting with a prayer.

Father CASEY. We thank Thee, O Lord, for these, Thy gifts which we have received in the bounty through Christ, Our Lord. Amen.

List of those in attendance at luncheon honoring Dr. Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of Federal Republic of Germany and his Foreign Minister, Dr. Heinrich von Brentano; the Vice President of the United States Lyndon B. Johnson; Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn; and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Earl Warren.

Representing the Diplomatic Corps were: Ambassador Wilhelm Grewe, Embassy of Germany; Hon. J. Walter Dowling, U.S. Ambassador to Germany; Minister Plenipotentiary Mordechai Gazit (representing Ambassador Avraham Harman); Hon. W. Averell Harriman, U.S. Ambassador-at-Large; Minister Franz Krapf, German Embassy; Dr. Joseph Thomas, German Information Office, New York; Michael Arnon and Nathan Bar-Yaacov of the Israeli Embassy.

Government representatives in attendance were: Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara; Secretary of Navy John B. Connally; Secretary of Army Elvis J. Stahr; Secretary of Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert; Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs George W. Ball; Under Secretary of Treasury Henry H. Fowler; Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Foreign Affairs Rowland Burnstan; Director of the Central Intelligence Agency Allen Dulles; Administrator of the Veterans' Administration John S. Gleason; Deputy Administrator of Small Business Administration Phil David Fine; State Department Director of German Affairs Martin J. Hillenbrand; State Department Director of News for Public Affairs Lincoln White; Judge Homer Ferguson; former U.S. Ambassador to Ireland Scott McLeod; the three military aides to President Kennedy, Brig. Gen. C. V. Clifton, Comdr. Tazewell T. Shepard, Jr., Col. Godfrey T. McHugh; Administrative Aid to the Vice President Walter Jenkins; Administrative Aid to Senator Bridges, C. M. Wiggin; Executive Director of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee Jack Fleischer; Commissioner John W. Bush of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

U.S. Senators in attendance were: GEORGE D. AIKEN, CLINTON P. ANDERSON, E. L. BARTLETT, J. GLENN BEALL, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, CLAIR ENGLE, SAM J. ERVIN, ALBERT GORE, ERNEST GRUENING, VANCE HARTKE, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, LISTER HILL, HENRY JACKSON, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, KENNETH B. KEATING, ESTES KEFAUVER, ROBERT S. KERR, THOMAS H. KUCHEL, EDWARD V. LONG, RUSSELL B. LONG, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, GALE W. MCGEE, MIKE MANSFIELD, A. S. MONRONEY, THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman, Republican National Committee; KARL E. MUNDT, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, JOHN O. PASTORE, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, HUGH SCOTT, GEORGE SMATHERS, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, STUART SYMINGTON, STROM THURMOND, ALEXANDER WILEY, RALPH YARBOROUGH, and MILTON R. YOUNG.

U.S. Congressmen in attendance were: E. ROSS ADAIR, JOHN B. BENNETT, FRANCES P. BOLTON, WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, OMAR BUR-

LESON, CLARENCE CANNON, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, LAURENCE CURTIS, DANTE B. FASCELL, DANIEL J. FLOOD, PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, OREN HARRIS, WAYNE L. HAYS, THOMAS F. JOHNSON, WALTER H. JUDD, MELVIN R. LAIRD, ROLAND V. LIBONATI, JOHN V. LINDSAY, HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., PETER MACK, WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, GEORGE MEADER, CHESTER E. MERROW, ROBERT H. MICHEL, WILLIAM E. MILLER, WILLIAM T. MURPHY, THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, BARRATT O'HARA, MELVIN PRICE, ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., WILLIAM SPRINGER, JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, CARL VINSON, FRANCIS E. WALTER, J. IRVING WHALLEY, and CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI.

Civic and business leaders in attendance were: Mr. John M. Bailey, chairman, Democratic National Committee; president of International Finance Corp., Robert L. Garner; president of the American Red Cross, Gen. Alfred E. Gruenther; executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Otto Donner; former Attorney General William P. Rogers; former Secretary of Defense, Louis A. Johnson; former Assistant Secretary of Defense, H. Struve Hensel; Judge Thurman Arnold; Mr. Milton Freeman; Mr. Arnold F. Shaw; Maj. Gen. Herman Feldman; Mr. Milton Kronheim; Mr. David Ginsburg; Gen. John B. Medaris; Mr. Hunter C. Harrison; Mr. L. W. Horning; Mr. Carroll Cone; Mr. Heinz C. Hoppe; Dr. R. F. Kallir; Mr. Max Oppenheimer; Mr. Peter Cusick; Dr. Ernest C. Steefel; Mr. Lewis S. Rosenstiel; Mr. Richard Harris; Dr. Helmuth Wohlthat; Mr. Henri Abt; Mr. Leslie Biffle; Hon. Sidney Solomon, Jr.; Mr. James Meredith; Mr. John Scott; Mr. Richard Wagner; Mr. Ernest W. Farley, Jr.; Mr. O. A. Kaletsch; Mr. Oscar Reschke; Mr. Hans Meyer; Mr. Roger Doulens; Maj. Gen. Julius Klein; Maj. Gen. Kenneth Buchanan; and Mr. Robert Pfeifle.

Members of the clergy who were present: Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister of the Hebrew Congregation of Washington; Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate; and Rev. Martin J. Casey, pastor, Holy Trinity Catholic Church.

Members of the Chancellor's official party present were: Mrs. Libeth Werhahn, daughter of Chancellor Adenauer; State Secretary for the Federal Press Office, Felix von Eckardt; State Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Karl Carstens; Assistant Secretary, Foreign Office, Dr. Gunther Harkort; Assistant Secretary, Foreign Office, Dr. Hasso von Etzdorf; Deputy Assistant Secretary and personal aid to the Chancellor, Dr. Heinrich Barth; executive assistant to the Foreign Minister, Peter Limbourg; Officer in Charge, Press Relations, Foreign Office, Karl-Gunther von Hase; Officer in Charge for NATO Affairs, Foreign Office, Ulrich Sahm; Officer in Charge for North American Affairs, Foreign Office, Franz-Josef Hoffmann; and Officer in Charge for Disarmament Affairs, Foreign Office, Richard Balken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy that the Senator has made the statement he has made today. It was my privilege to make a few comments with reference to that luncheon. It was a joy and privilege to work with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and other Senators. I really believe that Chancellor Adenauer found his recent visit to the United States to be one of the most heartening and encouraging of his several visits. I only hope that the hour that Members of Congress and other citizens had with him here in the Senate was as enjoyable for the Chancellor as it was for those of us who were privileged to be with him.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. As the transcript of the proceedings shows, the Senator from Minnesota contributed a great deal to the success of the event. It was his graciousness, informality and, I believe, the fine and easy fashion in which he introduced the guests and did other chores around the place that added a great deal to its success. I take this occasion to compliment him on that and to thank him for his remarks.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the unanimous-consent agreement entered into earlier this afternoon provides that a yea-and-nay vote will be taken next Monday on President Kennedy's nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be United States Ambassador to Iran. Before that time arrives I desire to record publicly an intention to vote to confirm the nomination.

In ordinary circumstances in all probability I would have nothing to say on the subject on the floor of the Senate. I am not a member of the committee. Mr. Holmes is not a resident of my State. As has been pointed out previously, he is a resident of Kansas and is warmly supported by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who spoke on his behalf earlier. I am only slightly acquainted with Mr. Holmes. But it is on the basis of that acquaintanceship that I intend to vote affirmatively.

In the autumn of 1959 I was in Hong Kong over a weekend. At that time Mr. Holmes was consul general there. It was a time when the term "Ugly Americans" was much in use. One might almost infer that all Americans abroad were ugly and all Americans at home were beautiful.

I found serving under Mr. Holmes in Hong Kong some fine Americans. The group associated with Mr. Holmes in Hong Kong, as well as Mr. Holmes himself, spent many hours with me on a Saturday, extending far into the afternoon, giving me the benefit of their knowledge of the situation in that area, and, indeed, throughout southeast Asia.

In addition, they spent several hours with me the following day, which was Sunday. I could not help but be impressed—no one could—with the extent of the knowledge and the dedication of the leaders in the consul general's office. Of course, their patriotism, devotion, dedication, and intelligence were theirs individually. But I suggest that this wonderfully well-working team performed so greatly in the interests of the United States because the consul general, Mr. Holmes, was a wonderfully well-equipped leader.

I never forgot that weekend there. I never forgot the rare opportunity given to me to learn more about how our people in the diplomatic service operate and how they are willing to forgo on occasion the ordinary pleasures of life to help a visitor who might have a voice in these affairs back home learn more about the situation.

The only test I have sought to apply in respect to the nomination is this: Will the best interests of the United States be served if Mr. Holmes becomes Ambassador to Iran? I am convinced, as a consequence of those 2 days in Hong Kong, that we have in high diplomatic service, in the person of Mr. Holmes, an able and informed man of whom we ought to be proud. I believe the best interests of the United States will be served by his going to Iran. So I am happy to record my intention to vote in favor of his nomination.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the majority leader indicated the program for the early part of next week. I wish again to make an announcement as to that program and some adjustment in it.

At the conclusion of the session tonight the Senate will adjourn to reconvene on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon. Following the vote on the nomination of Mr. Julius C. Holmes, the Senate will proceed to legislative business.

The first item of legislative business following the vote on the nomination of Mr. Holmes will be the military construction bill, which is noted in general orders as Order No. 173, H.R. 5000.

Following action on the military construction bill, if time permits, the Senate will take up what is known as the Battle Act. That is listed on the calendar as Order No. 172, S. 1215.

If those items are completed on Monday, the Senate will proceed to the consideration on Tuesday of Order No. 174, H.R. 6518, the inter-American aid bill.

That is the present plan of the leadership.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, as in legislative session, until Monday, May 8, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4, 1961:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Joseph Peter Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years, vice Hugh K. Martin.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

John Joseph Gunther, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the unexpired term of 5 years from March 4, 1957, vice Andrew Parker, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4, 1961:

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

C. Darwin Stolzenbach, of Maryland, to be Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS

Fulton Freeman, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

John S. Everton, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Burma.

U.S. COAST GUARD RESERVE

To be rear admiral

Ernest R. Feidler for promotion to the permanent rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to the rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be captains

Frank M. McCabe.
James McIntosh.

To be commanders

Walter C. Bolton.
George A. Philbrick.

To be lieutenant commanders

Paul A. Hansen
Sydney M. Shuman
Richard Q. Lowry
John C. Soltesz

To be lieutenants

Patrick M. Jacobsen
Thomas C. Volkle
Edwin L. Rahn
Hugh M. McCreery
Delmar F. Smith
James Napier, Jr.
John B. Mahon
Ronald D. Stenzel
Bobby C. Wilks
Calvin P. Langford
Charles S. Wetherell
Hugh L. Murphy, Jr.
Richard A. DeCorps, Jr.
Mitchell J. Whiting

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Ara E. Midgett, Jr.
Richard B. Eldridge
Robert C. Nichols
James D. Webb
Richard Fremont-Smith
John C. Armacost
Everett J. Lecourt, Jr.
Thomas R. Schiller
Cecil S. Berry
Robert E. Warakomsky
David A. Naus
Kenneth M. Roughgarden
Louis J. Albert
Larry E. Telfer
Carl P. Denney, Jr.
Robert C. Williams
Douglas G. Currier
Henry C. Rayburn
Terry R. Grant
David A. White
Alan G. Dahms
Richard A. Sutherland
Frederick F. Burgess, Jr.
John M. Commerton
Stuart A. Yoffe
John C. Spence
Wayne G. Douglass
John R. Wells, Jr.
Thomas R. Cummings
Emlyn L. Jones, Jr.
Frank R. Grundman
Bert T. Potter
John C. Ikens
Richard G. Matheson
John E. Footit
Alexander R. Larzelere
Robert S. Tuneski
Walter E. Peterson, Jr.
James O. Sullivan
James H. Costich
Philip J. Dolan, Jr.
Ronald D. Rosie
Ira B. Jacobson
Robert S. Palmer, Jr.
Robert T. Nelson
Robert F. Bennett
Gerald K. Mohlenbrok
Jon C. Uithol
George P. Mitchell
Carl A. Gruel
Stevens H. Smith
George W. Conrad
Ernest B. Acklin, Jr.
William A. Parker
Francis F. Silvia
Marshall E. Gilbert
Charles J. Helpingstine
Christopher M. Holland
Ralph H. Burr III
Ronald G. Bitner
Edward V. Grace
Howard E. Snow
Alfred F. Parker
Thomas R. Klein
James D. Martin
Thomas S. Monnone
Melvin L. Sites
Robert W. Gauthier
Robert B. Jamieson
Neil F. Kendall
Robert J. Watterson
Charles E. Clarke, Jr.
Robert M. Schissler
Wallace F. Kelley
Michael J. O'Brien
Robert F. Dugan
James Watt
Ransom K. Boyce
Rex E. Henderson
Peter J. Cronk

To be ensigns

Joseph Carlos Amaral
Joseph Sweeney Anderson, Jr.
William Alden Anderson
Richard Alan Applebaum
Robert Lloyd Ashworth
Matthew John Barbour, Jr.
William Francis Barry
Michael John Begley
Joseph Carl Beima
Dale Lance Bennett
James Stephen Billingham
Francis Myers Blackburn
Thomas Eugene Blank
Peter Avron Bornstein
Thomas Edward Braithwaite
John Patrick Brennan
Thomas Richard Brougham
Joseph Francis Carilli
Robert Roland Caron
Kenneth Harrison Cary, Jr.
Robert Henry Cassis, Jr.
Ronald Jack Caudle
Samuel Joseph Cavallaro
Guy Peter Clark
Robert Gordon Coale
Peter Liberty Collom
John Scott Davis
William Arnold Day
Edward James Dimmock
Vincent Gardner DiPasqua
Leonard Vincent Dorrian
Charles Gavan Duffy
Ronald Steven Dugan
David Joseph Duquette
Robert Carroll Eddy
Keith Carter Edgecomb
Robert Erwin Ettle
Donald Alexander Feldman
Robert Alexander Ferguson
Harold Grove Fletcher, Jr.
Richard John Flynn
David Lindley Folsom
Anthony Brian Ford
Thomas Francis Frischmann
George Edward Gaul
Fred Stanley Golove
Cecil Warren Gray, Jr.
James Alexis Hallock, Jr.
Donald Dwight Hanson
Norman Henry Harrold, Jr.
David Wendell Hiller
Dennis Cowan Hilliard
Richard Jon Hinkle
David Alan Hough
Jonathan Colby Ide
William Allen Jansen
Macon Theodore Jordan
Peter Anthony Joseph
Leon Zareh Katcharian
Earle Wayne Keith III
Jon David King
Robert Edward Kramek
James LaVerne Krish
Donald George Langrock
Stephen Patrick Leane
James Moffett Lightner
Nils Linsfors, Jr.
Richard Alan McBride
Robert Conrad McFarland
James Francis Meade
Lawrence Frank Merlino
John Cantwell Midgett, Jr.
Brent Cramer Mills
Joseph John Misiaszek, Jr.
Robert Frederick Muchow
Francis Angelo Nicolai
Douglas Charles O'Donovan
John Lou Patterson
Gordon Philip Patnude
Robert Laing Pearson
Edward Behnke Peel
Joseph Thomas Ponti
Joseph Dominic Porricelli
Stanley Frederick Powers
William Protzman, Jr.
James Douglas Prout
John Anthony Randell
Brian Patrick Richards
Frank Douglass Ritchie
John Frederick Roeber, Jr.
Charles Ray Robinson
Byron Harl Romine
David Anderson Sandell
Gregory John Sanok
Jerome Jay Savel
Craig Raymond Schroll
James Mark Seabrooke
Jon Arnell Setter
James Lowell Shanower
Adam John Shirvinski
John Robert Statz, Jr.
William Blaine Steinbach II
Carl Albert Strand, Jr.
Robert James Swain
Bruce Wayne Thompson
Peter Nance Thurman
John Charles Trainor
Aylmer Raynolds Trivers
Bruce Gordon Twambly
Paul Edward Versaw
John Douglas Vitkauskas
Kenneth Edward Wagner
John Robert Wallace
Warner Robert Wallace
John Thomas Ward
Russell Clayton Warren
Robert Harris Wehr
Robert Arthur White
George Alvin Wildes
James Edward Williams
Robert Thomas Willoughby
David Arnold Worth
George Paul Wisneskey
William George Zinti

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The prayer of the psalmist, Psalm 19: 14: *Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my Redeemer.*

Eternal God, whose divine guidance and strength we so desperately need, grant that we may possess these spiritual resources in an abundant measure in these times when a holocaust of hatred is desolating the earth and brutal forces are defying the principles of justice and freedom.

We earnestly beseech Thee that we may have statesmen and political leaders who, amid the strain and stress of tragic events, are men and women of wise decisions and resolute determination.

Incline our hearts to pursue the heroic way of faith when we encounter experiences which terrify us and tempt us to wonder whether Thou art not good enough to care and not great enough to prevent cruelty from running riot and catastrophe and calamity from overtaking us.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1723. An act to amend the joint resolution providing for observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis;

S. 304. An act for the relief of Anna Lekos;

S. 395. An act for the relief of Fausto Lavari;

S. 400. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Ja Asato (Mrs. Thomas R. Asato);

S. 847. An act to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc.;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Martha Uchacz Barras;

S. 971. An act for the relief of Salvatore Briganti;

S. 973. An act for the relief of Liliana Grazyna Swiatkowska;

S. 980. An act for the relief of Joseph Anthony Vettiger; and

S. 1045. An act for the relief of Alvaro Rodriguez Jimenez.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY HABIB BOURGUIBA, PRESIDENT OF THE TUNISIAN REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER of the House of Representatives presided.

At 12 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort His Excellency the President of the Tunisian Republic into the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort, the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. FULBRIGHT; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; and the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced His Excellency the President of the Tunisian Republic.

His Excellency the President of the Tunisian Republic, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the deep pleasure of introducing to you a great world figure, a man who loves humanity, who loves freedom, and who is the friend of the United States of America, the President of the Republic of Tunisia. [Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY HABIB BOURGUIBA, PRESIDENT OF THE TUNISIAN REPUBLIC

(President Bourguiba addressed the joint meeting in French, and immediately thereafter an English translation of the speech was read as follows:)

President BOURGUIBA. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, honorable Members of Congress, it is both an honor and a great joy for me to address the representatives of a friendly people who share with us the same devotion to the deepest human values, the same faith in the continuing struggle against oppression in all its forms, the same belief in the ultimate triumph of freedom and human dignity.

Independent Tunisia will never forget the loyalty of the United States of America to the principle of liberty and self-determination which was evidenced to her at a particularly critical moment in her history when, after the forces of the Axis had been shattered in north Africa, the representative of the United States in Tunis demonstrated that he understood the sense of our national struggle. In 1943, at the most heady and enthralling moment of a victorious campaign, Mr. Hooker Doolittle—allow me to name him at the risk of embarrassing him—did not hesitate to give his support to the Tunisian national movement which he recognized as the authentic mouthpiece of our people's aspirations. At almost the same moment, at the other end of north Africa, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was lending his support to the idea that the end of war should also be the end of empire.

Nor will we ever forget that President Eisenhower was the first head of state to recognize the independence of Tunisia and to give it his blessing upon its entry into the international community; nor that he helped us to safeguard our independence on several occasions when it was threatened; and that by a decisive material aid he enabled us to give flesh and blood to our newly won sovereignty.

In this evidence we have witnessed of your country's loyalty to the principles which are the basis of all human society, I wish to hail our common attachment to liberty. For both our peoples this is our pride, our glory, and the true source of the eternal flame of youth.

Honorable Members of Congress, it is indeed in the name of a people who fought for their liberty for half a century that I have the honor to address you. I must tell you that my people never for one moment wavered from its faith in the necessity of cooperation among men, throughout all the vicissitudes of its struggle, and beyond all the resentments that that struggle might have generated.

For the primary quest of nationalism, as is so well recognized by President Kennedy is essentially liberation from the degrading subjection of man to man and of people to people. And its basic premise is the assertion that all men are born equal, and thus all should share alike in the great work of building human civilization, whatever differences in circumstances the accidents of history may have produced.

Nationalism is an attempt to render human society truly human by giving to each people and to each man both dignity and a free choice of the institutions under which they live. That is why Tunisia, throughout its national struggle, has remained steadfast to this abiding truth: That the future of mankind lies in our ability to cooperate with each other, and to be moved by the tremendous force of human solidarity generated at this historic moment when man is about to pierce the limits of space and venture into the infinity of the cosmos.

We believe in the future of man, in his possibilities for progress. We believe that it is not only of intellectual and technical progress that we must think, but also of moral progress. This possibility of man's moral progress is the only hope for the establishment of a genuine international peace.

In the existing climate of international relations, peace is nothing but the absence of war, and thus infinitely unstable, precarious, dangerous. Rivalry, jealousy, fear, and suspicion, the desire to dominate others motivate the policies not only of the great powers, but also many of the small nations. And these motives of passion are stronger than an enlightened view of self-interest, which, if genuinely followed, would lead the governments of the world to cooperation rather than to competition. The problems which agitate the world today—Algeria, the Congo, Palestine, Cuba, Laos, Angola—are a reflection of these motives rather than their cause. When men, and the leaders of men, realize that their need for each other, for solidarity, for cooperation, is stronger than their need for temporary victories, more real than their fears, more fruitful than their hatreds and their passions, the foundations of a solid peace can be laid.

These are the principles and premises which have guided Tunisia since her entry into the international community of sovereign states in 1956. We have at all times sought to avoid demagoguery and to

resist the temptation to take up extreme positions, however facile. We have always preferred attachment to principles to an easily won popularity. We have taken up stands which have not always been approved by our friends, and which have seemed suspicious to our adversaries but which have always in the long run been approved. We have never chosen policies out of a so-called solidarity, which is often a pretext for self-interest or a cloak for real divergences.

All this has given us a genuine freedom of action in international affairs, and earned us, I believe, a respect beyond the measure of our modest size. A real friend is not he who flatters your pride by always agreeing with you, whatever he may secretly believe, but rather he who tells you what he believes to be true, at the risk of a temporary irritation.

Thus, for example, we have never hesitated to point out to the Western World the harm it has done itself by compromising with its own principles in order to avoid giving offense to some of its members, or by allying itself without real conviction with causes which are unjust, or simply lost.

It is therefore a real source of satisfaction to us to see the United States of America return to its traditional policy of anticolonialism and support for the principle of self-determination and independence for all peoples. What your country gains in affection and prestige from the recently emancipated and the still colonized peoples is greater than the anger or irritation of guilty governments, however powerful these governments may be. The forces of history are stronger than those of individual men and governments, and if you march with progress, not against it, you can never lose.

It is our common attachment to these principles which constitutes the surest foundation for cooperation between Tunisia and the United States of America. A relationship between a great power and a small one which is based only on immediate interests or on constraint, is not a happy or a healthy one. What your country needs are not satellites who vote with you automatically on all issues because they want your money, but friends who support you from conviction. I can assure you that Tunisia will always tell you when we disagree with you, just as we will always applaud you when we believe you to be right. And we expect from you a reciprocal frankness.

One of the greatest problems in the world today is the transformation of the relationship between the colonial and imperial powers and the colonized peoples. The transition from the status of subjection to that of sovereignty is not an easy one. It has been the constant preoccupation of Tunisia to demonstrate that it need not be disastrous. In the period of our national struggle to regain our independence from France we were very careful to restrain from any actions or words that might have rendered our future cooperation with France difficult or impossible. We believed firmly that a national movement based on hatred or revenge would be unfitted to shoulder the responsibilities of power.

It is for this reason that we accepted the idea of a graduated progression toward full sovereignty. We never claimed all or nothing. What we claimed was the recognition by France of our right to freedom and to sovereignty, and the acceptance of the consequences of that recognition. Even today we are still unable to exercise our full sovereignty over a portion of our national territory—and I am thinking of Bizerta, still occupied by French forces against our will. I must state here that it is our firm intention to liberate our country from the last vestiges of a foreign occupation.

The same desire for a transformed relationship with our former governors has guided us in our attitude to the war in Algeria. We have never ceased to proclaim our full and unqualified support for the struggle of our Algerian brethren for independence, or to translate that support from the moral to the material plane. We have been proud to extend to our Algerian brothers all the facilities of our territory to carry on their legitimate struggle. But we have done all this not to anger or to combat France, but rather to help France to liberate herself from the intolerable burden of empire. At the same time we have tried to help the Algerian people to recover their rights. Once the war in Algeria is over, and the Algerian people enter into sovereignty and independence as we have done, we may look forward to a new era not only in north Africa, but throughout Africa and all around the Mediterranean. The age-old rivalries and hatreds between the peoples of the Mediterranean, the ancient exploitation of Africa by Europe, will give way to a common effort to exploit our resources, to construct a better world all together.

For this is the great challenge of our times. History will judge us by the efforts we have made to assure the welfare and the plenty of our peoples; not by the alliances or the pacts we have made. Our external relations with the rest of the world are to be judged not from the point of view of power or prestige, but by the extent to which they enable us to help our peoples acquire a better life.

In this sphere the relations between Tunisia and the United States of America have been happy. In a critical period of our newly won independence your Government came to our aid. And for 4 years now a program of economic cooperation and technical assistance has been in existence in Tunisia to the mutual satisfaction of both our countries. If we try to discover the reasons for which our cooperation has been so successful, our relations so happy, I believe it is because we have shared a common approach to our problems. The basic philosophy which underlies our struggle against underdevelopment is the principle that the major effort must be our own. We have not waited for others to help us before we began to help ourselves, nor have our programs depended for their inauguration upon an assistance from outside. We have started from the premise that there are certain objectives in the social and economic sphere, certain minimum standards which our citizens have a right to expect, which we have to aim at. We fully realize that the greatest burden, the largest sacrifices, lie upon ourselves. We realize also that no amount of economic aid will help a people who have no clear idea of where they are going, or no willingness to create the means of getting there. Insofar as we look to outside sources for help, it is only to the extent that that help will enable us eventually—and in not too long a time—to dispense with it.

However, in the struggle for economic growth and development it is not only the end that counts, but also the means. And it is here that we share one more belief with you. While we recognize that the effort to raise the living standards of our people depends on a planned and orderly use of our resources, we also hold that this is not incompatible with the maintenance of individual liberty and the development of free institutions. It is not our intention to sacrifice the basic rights of the living for the hypothetical happiness of the still unborn, nor do we believe that the necessity of any such choice exists. If freemen do not have the will and the ability to submit to common sacrifices and to share in a common effort, then there is no future for liberty in the world. This we cannot believe to be the case. We know that there is no greater force in the world than that of freemen working together for a common effort.

I believe that this Congress realizes fully to what extent the fate of the more privileged peoples is linked with that of the less privileged. The world today is one, and no people can live alone. The relationship between rich societies and poor is not an easy one, and calls for infinite tact, patience, and above all, intelligence. Aid inappropriately given may do more harm than good. Formulas and theories which are too rigid must be avoided. The techniques of cooperation must be constantly revised in the light of experience. There must also be an exact appraisal of the relation of the moral to the practical: for if on the one hand to help the less fortunate is a duty, it is also a matter of self-interest. The continued health of the more developed societies depends on the possibility of economic growth in the less developed. There should be no condescension of the rich to the poor, just as there should be no resentment by the poor of the rich.

In all our thinking, cooperation rather than aid or assistance should be our watchword. In the Arabic language there is a saying that "It takes two hands to clap." Cooperation implies a mutual effort, and mutual benefit. It demands an understanding not only of the needs of one side, but also of the possibilities of the other. Above all, it demands a common vision of the goal ahead and a common philosophy of life.

I believe firmly that the conditions of an ever-growing cooperation between my country and yours exists. History has forged many links between us in the past. May the Tunisian and American peoples look forward to a future in

which these links will be ever stronger, based as they are on cooperation, respect, and affection.

I thank you. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m. His Excellency the President of the Tunisian Republic, accompanied by the committee of escort retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.) the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 2 o'clock p.m. the House was called to order by the Speaker.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING THE RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 342)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 912), to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That (a) the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, three additional circuit judges for the second circuit, one additional circuit judge for the third circuit, two additional circuit judges for the fourth circuit, two additional circuit judges for the fifth circuit, one additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit, and one additional circuit judge for the tenth circuit.

"(b) In order that the table contained in section 44(a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of permanent circuit judges for said circuits, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuits:

"'Circuits:	*Number of Judges*
* * * * *	
Second	Nine
Third	Eight
Fourth	Five
Fifth	Nine
* * * * *	
Seventh	Seven
* * * * *	
Tenth	Six'.

"SEC. 2. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the northern district of Alabama, one additional district judge for the district of Alaska, one additional district judge for the district of Arizona, one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas, two additional district judges for the northern district of California, two additional district judges for the southern district of California, one additional district judge for the district of Colorado, two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut, two additional district judges for the southern district of Florida, one additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia, two additional district judges for the northern district of Illinois, one additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana, one additional district judge for the southern district of Indiana, one additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of Iowa, one additional district judge for the district of Kansas, two additional district judges for the eastern district of Louisiana, one additional district judge for the western district of Louisiana, two additional district judges for the district of Maryland, one additional district judge for the district of Massachusetts, two additional district judges for the eastern district of Michigan, one additional district judge for the southern district of Mississippi, one additional district judge for the western district of Missouri, one additional district judge for the district of Nevada, one additional district judge for the district of New Jersey, two additional district judges for the eastern district of New York, six additional district judges for the southern district of New York, one additional district judge for the eastern district of North Carolina, one additional district judge for the middle district of North Carolina, one additional district judge for the western district of North Carolina, one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio, one additional district judge for the northern, eastern and western districts of Oklahoma, three additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, one additional district judge for the middle district of Pennsylvania, two additional district judges for the western district of Pennsylvania, one additional district judge for the district of Puerto Rico, one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina, one additional district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee, one additional district judge for the middle district of Tennessee, one additional district judge for the western district of Tennessee, two additional district judges for the northern district of Texas, one additional district judge for the southern district of Texas, one additional district judge for the western district of Texas, and one additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Washington.

"(b) The existing district judgeship for the middle district of Georgia, created by the Act of March 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 16), entitled 'An Act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the middle district of Georgia', and the existing district judgeships for the district of New Mexico, the western district of Pennsylvania, and the district of Utah created by paragraphs (1), (5), and (6), respectively, of section 2(b) of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes', approved February 10, 1954 (68 Stat. 10, 11), shall be permanent judgeships and the present incumbents of such judgeships shall henceforth hold their offices under section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code as amended by this Act. The Act of March 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 16), and paragraphs (1), (5), and (6) of section 2(b) of the Act of February 10, 1954 (68 Stat. 10, 11), are hereby repealed.

"(c) The existing district judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Washington, heretofore provided for by section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code, shall hereafter be a district judgeship for the western district of Washington only, and the present incumbent of such judgeship shall henceforth hold his office under section 133, as amended by this Act.

"(d) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of permanent district judgeships for said districts and combination of districts, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said districts:

"'Districts:	*Judges*
Alabama:	
Northern	3
* * * * *	
Alaska	2
Arizona	3
Arkansas:	
* * * * *	
Eastern and Western	2
California:	
Northern	9
Southern	13
Colorado	3
Connecticut	4
* * * * *	
Florida:	
* * * * *	
Southern	6
* * * * *	
Georgia:	
Northern	3
Middle	2
* * * * *	

"'Districts—Continued	
Illinois:	
Northern	10
• • • • •	
Indiana:	
Northern	3
Southern	3
Iowa:	
• • • • •	
Northern and Southern	1
Kansas	3
• • • • •	
Louisiana:	
Eastern	4
Western	3
• • • • •	
Maryland	4
Massachusetts	6
Michigan:	
Eastern	8
• • • • •	
Mississippi:	
• • • • •	
Southern	2
Missouri:	
• • • • •	
Western	3
• • • • •	
Nevada	2
• • • • •	
New Jersey	8
New Mexico	2
New York:	
• • • • •	
Southern	24
Eastern	8
• • • • •	
North Carolina:	
Eastern	2
Western	2
Middle	2
• • • • •	
Ohio:	
Northern	6
• • • • •	
Oklahoma:	
• • • • •	
Northern, Eastern, and Western	2
• • • • •	
Pennsylvania:	
Eastern	11
Middle	3
Western	8
Puerto Rico	2
• • • • •	
South Carolina:	
• • • • •	
Eastern and Western	2
• • • • •	
Tennessee:	
Eastern	3
Middle	2
Western	2
Texas:	
Northern	5
Southern	5
• • • • •	
Western	3
Utah	2
• • • • •	
Washington:	
• • • • •	
Western	3'

"(e)(1) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the southern district of Ohio. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

"(2) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio. The first vacancy occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

"(3) Sec. 134(c) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the beginning the following new sentence: 'One of the district judges for the Eastern District of Louisiana shall reside in East Baton Rouge Parish, Louisiana.'

"SEC. 3. (a) The second sentence of section 81(a)(2) of title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Court for the Northeastern Division shall be held at Huntsville and Decatur.'

"(b) The second sentence of section 86 of title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Court shall be held at Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, and Waterbury.'

"(c) The second sentence of section 93(b)(2), title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Court for the Southern Division shall be held at Alton, Quincy, and Springfield.'

"(d) The second sentence of section 102(b)(1) is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Court for the Southern Division shall be held at Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, and Lansing.'

"(e) The second sentence of Sec. 123(c)(2), title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: 'Court for the Western Division shall be held at Memphis and Dyersburg.'

"(f) The second sentence of section 89(a) of title 28, United States Code, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'Court for the Northern District shall be held at Gainesville, Marianna, Panama City, Pensacola, Tallahassee and Live Oak.'

"(g) The limitations and restrictions contained in section 142 of title 28, United States Code, shall be waived with respect to the holding of court at Kalamazoo, Michigan, by the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan, at Fayetteville, North Carolina, by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, and at Dyersburg, Tennessee, by the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee.

"SEC. 4. Sec. 98 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 98. Louisiana

"'Louisiana is divided into two judicial districts to be known as the Eastern and Western Districts of Louisiana.

"'EASTERN DISTRICT

"'(a) The Eastern District comprises two divisions.

"'(1) The New Orleans Division comprises the parishes of Assumption, Jefferson, Lafourche, Orleans, Plaquemines, Saint Bernard, Saint Charles, Saint James, Saint John the Baptist, Saint Tammany, Tangipahoa, Terrebonne and Washington.

"'Court for the New Orleans Division shall be held at New Orleans.

"'(2) The Baton Rouge Division comprises the parishes of Ascension, East Baton Rouge, East Feliciana, Iberville, Livingston, Pointe Coupee, Saint Helena, West Baton Rouge, and West Feliciana.

"'Court for the Baton Rouge Division shall be held at Baton Rouge.

"'WESTERN DISTRICT

"'(b) The Western District comprises six divisions.

"'(1) The Opelousas Division comprises the parishes of Evangeline and Saint Landry.

"'Court for the Opelousas Division shall be held at Opelousas.

"'(2) The Alexandria Division comprises the parishes of Avoyelles, Catahoula, Grant, La Salle, Rapides, and Winn.

"'Court for the Alexandria Division shall be held at Alexandria.

"'(3) The Shreveport Division comprises the parishes of Bienville, Bossier, Caddo, Claiborne, De Soto, Natchitoches, Red River, Sabine, and Webster.

"'Court for the Shreveport Division shall be held at Shreveport.

"'(4) The Monroe Division comprises the parishes of Caldwell, Concordia, East Carroll, Franklin, Jackson, Lincoln, Madison, Morehouse, Ouachita, Richland, Tensas, Union, and West Carroll.

"'Court for the Monroe Division shall be held at Monroe.

"'(5) The Lake Charles Division comprises the parishes of Allen, Beauregard, Calcasieu, Cameron, Jefferson Davis, and Vernon.

"'Court for the Lake Charles Division shall be held at Lake Charles.

"'(6) The Lafayette Division comprises the parishes of Acadia, Iberia, Lafayette, Saint Martin, Saint Mary, and Vermilion.

"'Court for the Lafayette Division shall be held at Lafayette.'

"SEC. 5. Sec. 83 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out so much thereof as related to the Eastern District of Arkansas and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'EASTERN DISTRICT

"'(a) The Eastern District comprises five divisions.

"'(1) The Eastern Division comprises the counties of Cross, Lee, Monroe, Phillips, Saint Francis, and Woodruff.

"'Court for the Eastern Division shall be held at Helena.

"'(2) The Western Division comprises the counties of Conway, Faulkner, Lonoke, Perry, Pope, Prairie, Pulaski, Saline, Van Buren, White, and Yell.

"'Court for the Western Division shall be held at Little Rock.

"'(3) The Pine Bluff Division comprises the counties of Arkansas, Chicot, Cleveland, Dallas, Desha, Drew, Grant, Jefferson, and Lincoln.

"'Court for the Pine Bluff Division shall be held at Pine Bluff.

"'(4) The Northern Division comprises the counties of Cleburne, Fulton, Independence, Izard, Jackson, Sharp, and Stone.

"'Court for the Northern Division shall be held at Batesville.

"'(5) The Jonesboro Division comprises the counties of Clay, Craighead, Crittenden, Greene, Lawrence, Mississippi, Poinsett, and Randolph.

"'Court for the Jonesboro Division shall be held at Jonesboro.'"

EMANUEL CELLER,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
LESTER HOLTZMAN,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
HERMAN TOLL,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
ESTES KEFAUVER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
SAMUEL J. ERVIN, Jr.,
EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The House passed the Senate bill after amending it by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting its own provisions. The Senate insisted upon its version and requested a conference; the House then agreed to the conference.

The conference report recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House amendment and agree to the same with an amendment, the amendment being, to insert in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment the matter agreed to by the conferees, and the House agree thereto.

In substance the conference report contains the language of the House amendment with a few exceptions which are subsequently explained in detail.

ARKANSAS

Both the House and Senate versions of the proposal provided for one additional roving judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas. However, the Senate provided for the creation of a new fifth division in the eastern district of Arkansas, which was to be known as the Pine Bluff Division and was to be composed of counties transferred from the existing western and eastern divisions of that district with the court sitting at Pine Bluff. The House eliminated the provision for the new division from its version of the bill. In the conference report, the House receded and adopted the language of the Senate bill.

CALIFORNIA

The Senate provided for two additional district judges for the northern district of California, whereas the House version provided for only one additional judge. In this instance, the House receded and adopted the language of the Senate bill.

In that same district the Senate provided for the creation of a new eastern division in the northern district of California comprised of the counties of Alameda and Contra Costa, with court sitting at the county seat of Alameda County. The House eliminated that provision from its version of the bill and the Senate receded from its position and the provision for the new division was eliminated from the conference report.

The House provided for one additional district judge in the southern district of California. The Senate provided for the creation of a new southern district of California consisting of San Diego and Imperial Counties, and the rest of the present southern district was to be redesignated as the central district of California, with the further provision that two additional district judges be appointed to the central district of California. The Senate further provided that the incumbent judges of the southern district now assigned to San Diego would become judges of the proposed new southern district. In conference, both the House and the Senate receded from their respective provisions and agreed to eliminate the provision for the new district in the southern area of California but to authorize two additional district judges for the existing southern district of California.

FLORIDA

The House version provided for two additional district judges for the southern district of Florida only. The Senate version, however, provided for one additional district judge in the southern district of Florida and also created a new judicial district in the State of Florida to be designated the middle district, and further provided for the appointment of one additional district judge for the middle district of Florida. The House eliminated the provision of the Senate bill for the creation of a new district in Florida. In conference, both the House and the Senate receded from the language of their respective provisions regarding Florida and agreed to the language creating two additional district judges for the existing southern district of Florida and authorized court for the northern district of Florida to sit at Live Oak. Thus, the Senate provision for the new district in Florida was eliminated.

CONNECTICUT

Both the House and Senate versions provided for two additional district judges for the district of Connecticut. The Senate version authorized the holding of a term of court at Bridgeport, while the House version authorized the term to be held at Bridgeport and Waterbury. The Senate receded and adopted the House version.

LOUISIANA

Both the House and the Senate provided for two additional district judges in the eastern district of Louisiana. The Senate made no provision for an additional judge in the western district, as did the House provision. In addition, the House provided for a new division in the western district consisting of parishes now located in both the eastern and western districts of Louisiana. The new division was to be designated to Lafayette Division, with court sitting at Lafayette. With regard to the western district, the Senate receded and adopted the language of the House provision, both as to the additional judge and the new division.

The Senate provided that one of the judges for the eastern district of Louisiana should reside in East Baton Rouge Parish. The House version made no such provision.

The House receded and accepted the Senate language.

MICHIGAN

The Senate provided for two additional permanent judgeships in the eastern division of Michigan, while the House provided for one permanent and one temporary judge. The House receded and accepted the Senate language for two permanent judges in the eastern district.

The House provision, in addition, provided that the city of Mason be eliminated as a place of holding court and Lansing be substituted in the southern division of the western district. In addition, the House provided a waiver of section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Kalamazoo. The Senate version had no such provision with regard to Lansing or Kalamazoo but the Senate receded and adopted the House language.

NEVADA

The Senate provided for one permanent judge in Nevada and the House provided for one temporary. The House receded and adopted the Senate language.

NEW YORK

Both versions provided for six additional district judges in the southern district of New York. The Senate, however, provided for two temporary judges in the eastern district, while the House provided for two permanent. The Senate receded and accepted the House language for the eastern district.

NORTH CAROLINA

The Senate provided for one roving judge for the eastern and middle districts of North Carolina, and one for the middle and western districts. The House provided one additional district judge for the eastern district, one for the western and one for the middle. The Senate receded and adopted the House language.

In addition, the House provided for a waiver of section 142, title 28, United States Code, for the holding of a term of court at Fayetteville in the eastern district of North Carolina. The Senate had no such provision and in conference accepted the House language.

OKLAHOMA

The Senate provided for a roving judge for the northern, eastern, and central districts of Oklahoma, while the House made no such provision. The House receded and accepted the Senate language.

PENNSYLVANIA

Both the House and the Senate had identical provisions for the eastern and western districts, namely, three additional judges in the eastern district, two in the western district, and an existing temporary made permanent there. However, for the middle district, the Senate provided for one temporary judge and the House had one permanent judge. The Senate receded and accepted the House language.

RHODE ISLAND

The Senate provided for one judge for Rhode Island, the House provided for none. The Senate receded and the provision for an additional judge there was eliminated from the conference report.

TENNESSEE

Both the House and the Senate versions provided one additional district judge in each of the three districts—eastern, middle, and western. In addition, the Senate authorized the holding of a term of court at Dyersburg, Tenn., and waived section 142 of title 28, United States Code, as to that place of holding court. The House had no such provision in its version but receded and accepted the Senate language for the term of court at Dyersburg.

In addition, the House provided to eliminate language now contained in section 123 of title 28, United States Code, relating to Tennessee and the division of judicial business in the eastern district of Tennessee. The Senate had no such provision. The House receded and the provision for the division of judicial business in the eastern district of Tennessee was eliminated from the conference report.

UTAH

The Senate provided that the existing temporary judge in Utah be made permanent. The House had no such provision but receded and accepted the language of the Senate.

VERMONT

The Senate provided for one additional district judge for Vermont, while the House made no such provision. The Senate receded and the provision for an additional judge for Vermont was eliminated from the conference report.

WASHINGTON

Both House and Senate versions provided that the existing roving judge for the eastern and western districts of Washington would become a permanent judge in the western district. The Senate and House also provided for a new roving judge for the eastern and western districts but in the Senate version this judgeship was permanent and in the House version temporary. The House receded and accepted the language for the new roving judge on a permanent basis.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE U.S. COURTS

The Senate provided that the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts shall receive the salary of a district judge and the Deputy Director shall receive the salary of $20,000 per year. The House made no such provision. The Senate receded and the provision was eliminated from the conference report.

ALABAMA

The House provided for the holding of a term of court at Decatur, Ala., but the Senate made no such provision. The Senate receded and accepted the House language.

Both the House and the Senate provided for an additional judge for the northern district of Alabama.

ILLINOIS

Both the House and the Senate provided for two additional district judges in the northern district of Illinois.

The House also provided for the holding of a term of court at Alton, Ill., in the southern district. The Senate had no such provision. It receded and accepted the House language.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The Senate provided for 10 additional circuit judges as did the House version. However, the Senate provided for 58 additional permanent district judges, while the House provided for 55 such judges. Both versions created 5 additional temporary district judges, thus creating in the Senate version 73 new judgeships, both district and circuit, while the House created a total of 70 new

judgeships. The Senate version made four existing temporary judges permanent, while the House only made three such judgeships permanent.

In the conference report 10 new additional circuit judges are created; 61 additional permanent district judgeships are created, and 2 additional temporary district judgeships. Thus, 73 new judgeships are created by the conference report. In addition, the report provides for the making permanent of four existing temporary district judgeships.

EMANUEL CELLER,
PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
BYRON G. ROGERS,
LESTER HOLTZMAN,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
HERMAN TOLL,
WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to express my personal gratitude and extend my commendation to my colleagues, Messrs. RODINO, ROGERS, HOLTZMAN, DONOHUE, TOLL, MCCULLOCH, MILLER of New York, and MEADER, for their excellent efforts in concluding what I believe to have been a very successful conference on this measure. These men were most diligent ever since the House Committee on the Judiciary first considered this legislation back in the early part of February.

The statement on the part of the managers is a clear and detailed explanation of what is in the bill as it is now before us and as it passed both the House and the Senate earlier.

The Senate provided for 10 additional circuit judges as did the House version. However, the Senate provided for 58 additional permanent district judges, while the House provided for 55 such judges. Both versions created 5 additional temporary district judges, thus creating in the Senate version 73 new judgeships, both district and circuit, while the House created a total of 70 new judgeships. The Senate version made four existing temporary judges permanent, while the House made only three such judgeships permanent.

In the conference report 10 new additional circuit judges are created, 61 additional permanent district judgeships are created, and 2 additional temporary district judgeships. Thus, 73 new judgeships are created by the conference report. In addition, the report provides for the making permanent of four existing temporary district judgeships.

The bill, as reported from the conference, represents on the whole, the views of the majority of the Members of this House. While it is true that the total number of new judgeships was increased by three; nevertheless, it should be remembered that all but four of the new judgeships bear the stamp of approval of the Judicial Conference. Of those four judgeships, two were passed by both the House and the Senate. The House conferees yielded to the Senate in the case of California by adding two judges, which judgeships were recommended by the Judicial Conference.

The House provided for one judgeship in the northern district of California and another judgeship for the southern district of California. The Judicial Conference, in its March report of this year, recommended that there be four additional judges, two in the northern district and two in the southern district. After due deliberation by the Conference we, the House managers, felt that the two judgeships should be increased to four judgeships.

I was asked by one of the Members, "How can you change your opinion in making four out of two judgeships to be created?" I remember some years ago William Blake saying, "A man who refuses to change his opinion is like stagnant waters; he breeds reptiles of the mind." If the reasons are sound and compelling to provide for a change, I am willing to change my mind.

I was told it was very essential for the State of California, growing as it has grown and is continuing to grow with the coming into California of a great many manufacturing operations, that California was entitled to its place in the sun, as it were, and was entitled to four judgeships, and the members of the conference yielded in that regard.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I thank the gentleman for the very kind words he has said about the State of California. The gentleman shows an awareness of the situation that exists in California and the great changes and development taking place in our part of the country, which I might say, Mr. Speaker, is characteristic of the gentleman's understanding of the deep problems that come before his committee.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I was disappointed to hear that the conference rejected the judgeship for Rhode Island, which the Senate had adopted. Could the gentleman give us an explanation for that action?

Mr. CELLER. I know no man who has been more diligent and assiduous in protecting the interests of his State of Rhode Island and, in this instance, the additional judgeship, than the gentleman who has just addressed that question to me. I assure you that I yielded only at the very last and am very sorry to cause the gentleman this disappointment in view of his efforts to secure an approval of the judgeship both before our committee and just recently before the conference. However, the members of the Committee on the Judiciary and the members of the conference searched as far as we could and, frankly, it was difficult to justify the inclusion of any new judgeship for the State of Rhode Island and, therefore, in good conscience it was necessary for us to reject the proposition of the other body and we did not include the judgeship for the State of Rhode Island. I should be very glad to place in the RECORD at this juncture additional memorandums and data which support the view of the conferees:

MEMORANDUM RE ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR RHODE ISLAND

The Senate seeks to add a second judge to the one existing in Rhode Island which constitutes a single judicial district sitting at Providence.

Although the executive committee of the Rhode Island Bar Association has supported the creation of this second judgeship, the Providence Evening Bulletin of March 1, 1961, opposed its creation. See attached editorial.

According to records of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, there appears to be no justification for the additional judgeship which has not been recommended by the Judicial Conference.

The statistics for the filing of new civil cases has declined steadily since 1957. They have dropped from 222 commenced in 1957 down to 148 commenced in 1960. The backlog of civil cases pending on June 30, 1960, was 189. In private civil cases in 1960, 84 were commenced; 118 terminated, leaving 140 pending.

The number of criminal cases filed annually number less than 40 percent of the national criminal caseload per judgeship. On June 30, 1960, it had only 16 cases pending, having had 41 filed and 35 terminated.

In civil cases commenced per judgeship, the caseload in total civil cases was 148 compared to a national average of 221. In private civil cases it was 84 per judge in Rhode Island compared to the national average of 133, and in criminal cases it was 39 compared to a national average of 107.

In the disposition of cases, however, the disposal rate in Rhode Island is higher than the national average. For the 30 civil cases tried in 1960, the rate of disposal from filing to disposition was 23.9 months compared to the national average of 17.8 months and from issue to trial the rate was 21.6 months compared to the national average of 11.5. In total trials in 1960 the Rhode Island judge commenced 37, of which 33 were civil—8 being nonjury, 25 jury—they had a total of 4 criminal trials, all of which were jury. The national average for trials per judgeship was 40 in 1960 for both civil and criminal work, whereas in Rhode Island the judge had 37 trials. Thirty-seven trials were had in Rhode Island in civil cases compared to a national average of 27 and in criminal cases it was 4 compared to a national average of 13.

A breakdown of the nature of the litigation in Rhode Island shows very few involved cases.

If a second judge had existed during fiscal 1960 in Rhode Island, the average total civil caseload per judge would have been 74 cases compared to 221 nationally. Of these, 42 would have been private civil cases compared to the national average of 133, and in criminal cases it would have been 19 compared to the national average of 107.

It appears that one of the prime reasons for the additional judge is to relieve Judge Day so that he will no longer have to forgo part of his vacation and days off. The records of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts indicate that during fiscal 1960 two judges in the first judicial circuit, namely, in the districts of Maine and New Hampshire, took assignments outside of the circuit on 3 occasions and spent 67 days doing judicial work. If it was necessary to grant some relief to Judge Day of Rhode Island, these judges could easily have been available to assignment to the district of Rhode Island. At no time during 1960 was any judge assigned to Rhode Island from outside of the circuit or within the circuit.

The only other evidence submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary was that given by Congressman JOHN FOGARTY as it appears

in the hearings on the judgeship bills. The committee received no evidence that Judge Day himself or the judicial council of the first circuit ever requested an additional judge for the district of Rhode Island. Besides, it should be stated that Circuit Judge John P. Hartigan maintains offices in the Federal Building at Providence, R.I., which is also the headquarters for the U.S. district court. Obviously, in emergency cases Judge Hartigan would be available in the absence of Judge Day.

[From the Providence Evening Bulletin, Mar. 1, 1961]

CONGRESS CONSIDERS THE LACK OF FEDERAL JUDGES

It is a foregone conclusion that Congress, which denied a Republican President the opportunity to appoint 40 new judges last year, will create many more than that number of Federal judgeships this year. This is because Congress sat on the lid so long that the pressure of backlog cases in the Federal court system is about to blow the lid off. Unfortunately for taxpayers, the process may result in the creation of more new judgeships than are needed.

Two weeks ago, President Kennedy asked Congress to create 59 judgeships. The request was in line with recommendations by the Judicial Conference of the United States for 9 new posts on the courts of appeals, and 50 on district courts.

There is no guesswork about the number 59. The Judicial Conference reached that figure after examining the backlogs in all districts. The Conference consists of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the chief judge of each of the 10 judicial circuits, chief judge of the Court of Claims, and a district judge from each judicial circuit. So the conference knew what it was talking about in recommending 59 new posts.

The Senate Judiciary Committeee has voted to increase the number to 69. The number represents about 20 percent of present places on the Federal bench. Among the 10 additional district court judgeships approved by the committee is one for Rhode Island, where the Judicial Conference determined that justice is administered without undue delay.

The additional Rhode Island judgeship was sought by its two Senators, although Senator PASTORE in 1951 opposed an additional judge for Rhode Island. The extra judgeship also has the backing of officers of the Rhode Island Bar Association, who, in a letter to Senator PASTORE, said that timely justice is administered here only because Judge Edward W. Day forgoes part of his vacations and some of his days off.

The question then arises: Is an additional full-time judge required in Rhode Island to perform work which Judge Day accomplishes during part of his vacation and on some of his days off? It seems there would be hardly enough work to keep another full-time judge busy the year around.

Judge Day, of course, is entitled to full vacation and holidays, but it does not seem necessary to create another judgeship to let Judge Day have them. Could he not get part-time assistance from judges in other districts once Congress has adequately staffed them in the manner recommended by President Kennedy?

No one questions the need for new judgeships. A backlog of 75,000 civil and criminal cases had accumulated by the end of last year, most of them in 12 of the 86 district courts. Delay in trying cases often means a denial of justice. It contributes to disrespect for law. It causes deterioration of evidence after a period of 2 or more years. Enough judges should be appointed to eliminate delay in administering justice.

How many are enough? If the 10 additional judgeships approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee are all as necessary as the Rhode Island judgeship, then enough would be nearer 59 than 69.

Too many judges are to be preferred over too few judges. But it will be a pity if politics prevents the Nation from getting just enough judges.

Frankly, I would say to the gentleman, we see no reason for any additional judgeship especially in view of the need in other districts. The Judicial Conference did not recommend it. Significantly, I might point out, there has been decline in the number of cases brought in the Federal District Court for the State of Rhode Island and not an increasing number of cases.

Further, there are other reasons why we felt that the additional judgeships should not be created.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I was very much interested in the comment the gentleman made about his ability to change his mind. I agree fully, and I am sure all Members of the House agree with me, that the gentleman from New York has a very, very fertile, very able and very facile mind, and that he uses it to great effect in the Congress of the United States, as well as elsewhere. But, if I recall correctly, some 10 months ago he reported to the floor of the House—that is first to the Committee on Rules and then to the floor of the House—a bill to create 35 additional Federal judgeships. If I understand the gentleman's statement today, this conference report to which he agreed, and which he is sponsoring now, would create 73 new judgeships or 38 more than was sponsored by him and his committee last year. So, evidently, the gentleman has had quite a change of mind—he has changed his opinion and his views, at least mentally, if not otherwise, from 35 judges, as I remember the number, that were needed to serve the people of the United States, to 73 judges. Is that just a slight change or is that a complete change?

Mr. CELLER. I want to say in answer to the gentleman, I personally was in favor of a far greater number than was recommended last year by the Committee on the Judiciary, and I labored very hard for additional judges. But, I am only one man on that committee. Even prior to last year, I advocated more than 50 new judgeships because when one considers the clogged calendars, the conclusion is inescapable that we need more judgeships.

Mr. BROWN. May I compliment the gentleman on the ability he has gained in the last 10 months to influence his committee. He was unable to get that committee of his to give him the judges he wanted 10 months ago, yet this year he has a plentiful supply of judges. I want to congratulate him. He has certainly grown in stature, ability, and influence within his own committee.

Mr. CELLER. There has been a change going on in the committee, in a French phrase it is a political milieu.

Mr. BROWN. Speaking of politics, less than a year ago the gentleman said he was going to gamble on the judgeship matter. He gambled and won.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for his statement, and I want him to know that as far as his own State is concerned we gave his State everything the people of Ohio wanted.

Mr. BROWN. That was without solicitation by the gentleman from Ohio. I did not appear as a witness before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. DOOLEY. Will the gentleman tell me whether there is an additional judgeship for Hawaii and Alaska?

Mr. CELLER. An additional judge is provided for Alaska.

Mr. DOOLEY. Presently there is one judge in Hawaii. He has to fly frequently to Alaska, quite remote, and it is a long trip over the Pacific.

Mr. CELLER. Two judges were authorized under the statehood bill and there is one vacancy there now for some time. The court calendar does not seem to require any additional manpower.

Several States sought to create new judicial districts and divisions. If we had gone into all the ramifications, repercussions, and differences of opinion among State delegations, we would have bogged down this bill and probably not been able to get any additional judgeships at all. So we deemed it advisable to postpone consideration of the creation of new judicial districts for separate consideration.

I wish also to state that in conference the proposals to create new judicial districts were eliminated. The Committee on the Judiciary, during its consideration of similar proposals, advised the authors of both bills, that such proposals would be considered by the committee. In furtherance of that statement reports have been requested from various governmental agencies on all such proposals, and hearings will be held in each case.

In adopting this conference report, this House will take a major step to alleviate the denial of a speedy trial throughout the entire Federal judicial system. It is my sincere hope that the executive department will act promptly and swiftly to fill these posts. The delays of the past in nominating and confirming judges have in no small way contributed to the problem of court congestion and delay. For many years, now, the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, has provided the judicial branch with improved techniques for the administration of the business in the Federal courts. However, in spite of these efforts the problem of congested dockets remained. I have been firmly convinced that the need for added judicial manpower was probably the most causative factor for this delay and congestion. I am confident that the Federal judiciary will take advantage of this new judicial manpower and extend its utmost efforts to achieve the objective which we here in this House seek today; namely, current dockets and expeditious

disposition of the litigation in our Federal courts.

Much has been stated as to what the President will do concerning nomination of these new judges. Statements have been attributed to me in the public press. A great many of those statements have been taken out of context and my whole statement has been misinterpreted. In effect I said some Republicans would be undoubtedly appointed. I am in no position to state how many. In effect I said these judgeships are not to be prizes to be withheld from worthy Democrats nor to be rewards to be withheld from deserving Republicans.

These assignments should go to intellectually honest, intelligent, diligent, morally alert, legally objective, judicially minded lawyers, regardless of politics. But being a realist, candor compels me to say that being a Democrat will not hurt. It may help.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say also I hope the President in his wisdom will see fit to put a woman on the Federal bench. We have had only two women on the Federal bench in its history. One, Judge Florence Allen, former chief judge of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals has retired, the other, Judge Burnita Shelton Matthews, sits in the district court here in the District of Columbia.

We find that there are 6.500 women lawyers in this country. Certainly we ought to be able to get from that array or roster of women lawyers at least one suitable woman to wear the ermine of judicial office.

One hundred and forty-three of these ladies hold positions in various State judicial systems, and I think the time has now come when we must draw on the distaff side for the appointment of at least one, maybe more, of these judges who are women.

I should also like to give you a quotation concerning these appointments attributed to President Kennedy when he was a Senator. This is the reference:

> Replying to a letter dated August 25, 1960, from President John D. Randall, of the American Bar Association, which stressed the importance of a qualified and independent judiciary, Senator John F. Kennedy wrote in part: "The appointments [of judges] during the past 8 years were overwhelmingly Republican and in the past, during Democratic administrations, they were overwhelmingly Democratic. I would hope that the paramount consideration in the appointment of a judge would not be his political party but his qualifications for the office.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the conference report on the omnibus judgeship bill, S. 912, as amended. Although I have serious reservations about the necessity for creating additional judgeships in many judicial districts, which have less than the national average caseload, the compelling need for additional judges in some districts causes me to support legislation, which, in part, is objectionable.

When we started the hearings on this important legislation on March 1 of this year, I determined to work for two principles; first, the creation of only those judgeships which are reasonably needed; and second, the removal, insofar as possible, of judicial appointments from the arena of partisan politics.

I regret that I have been only partially successful.

The two principles are related in their practical application. Since it has been indicated, by statements in the record, that appointments to the proposed positions may be politically inspired and dispensed—and I remind this body that I gave the Attorney General every opportunity to spread upon the record the manner in which the proposed appointments would be made—the urge to the party in power to create more judgeships than are reasonably necessary was indeed irresistible. Of grave consequence, too, is the great harm done to the office and prestige of Federal judges.

The conference report now provides for 73 circuit and district judges. With the 19 existing vacancies, President Kennedy will be empowered to appoint a total of 92 Federal judges, just as soon as the bill becomes law. In addition, at least 74 judges are now eligible for retirement, at full pay.

President Roosevelt had been in office more than 4 years before he made 92 appointments to the circuit and district courts; President Truman more than 5 years; and President Eisenhower 4 years.

I realize that the pressures to reward the politically faithful with the passage of this bill will be more than any President in our history has been called upon to withstand. I take this occasion, however, to again urge the establishment of the precedent advocated by President Dwight D. Eisenhower when he clearly indicated that he would make all future judicial appointments on an approximate 50-percent Republican, 50-percent Democratic basis.

The judicial system of our Federal Government is now, for the first time in our history, approximately in balance between the two major political parties. We now have a chance to establish a long-overdue precedent which is advocated by the bench and bar and responsible laymen everywhere. That principle is to take the selection of judges out of partisan politics. President Eisenhower is reported to have said that it would not be right for the public to get the impression that all members of the Federal judiciary come from the same party.

My able and industrious colleague from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], who did not sign the report, will have time to set forth some interesting, yes, even startling, information concerning the caseload in some of the districts where additional judgeships are being created.

Finally, I again respectfully urge the President to courageously resist the partisan political pressure which will be applied, and become the first President to unquestionably lift the Federal judiciary to a high level above that of rich patronage for party faithful.

This legislation will give the President an opportunity to establish a precedent which for so long has been so sorely needed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I see in the conference report that the proposal presented by the Senate providing for an additional middle district for the State of Florida which I favor, as evidenced by my bill (H.R. 5525), was deleted. Of course, this matter has been discussed by me with the chairman in the House Committee on the Judiciary. I should like to ask the gentleman if it is not his position as chairman of that great committee, that this matter as well as perhaps other district matters will be heard in the near future before our committee in order that they may be resolved on their merits.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, there will be hearings on the subject and the matters will be considered on their merits.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have in the report of the conferees a list of the judges who will be available for appointment to vacancies existing at the present time that have not yet been filled?

Mr. CELLER. I think there are 19 vacancies, but we do not list them in this report.

Mr. CRAMER. They were included, were they not, in the committee report on the bill?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; in the report on the bill and also in the transcript of the hearings before the committee the gentleman will find ample reference to those vacancies.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill provided 73 new judgeships, the House bill 70. So we compromised at 73.

The Senate bill contained five judgeships which were not in the House bill; two in California, one in Oklahoma, one in Rhode Island, and one in Vermont. The House bill contained three judgeships which were not in the Senate bill; one in Florida, one in Louisiana, and one in North Carolina.

So the compromise we made was to give the Senate three judgeships that were not in the House bill and to give the House all of the judgeships that were not in the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I opposed this legislation when it was before us on the 12th of April on the ground that it creates far more judgeships than are necessary.

Let me give a few statistics on what we are doing here. Present law authorizes 68 circuit judgeships. Five of those judgeships are now vacant. We are adding 10 circuit judgeships, making a total of 78 circuit judgeships authorized after this bill becomes law.

We presently have 245 district judgeships of which 14 are vacant. We are adding 63 new judgeships, or a total of 308 judgeships for the district courts.

Three hundred and eighty-six judgeships will be authorized after this bill becomes law.

As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] pointed out, with the 19 vacancies and the 73 new judgeships, President Kennedy can appoint 92 judges, almost 30 percent of the Federal judiciary.

Can we justify that huge increase in judgeships on the basis of the facts? I submit that we cannot. I base that assertion on statistics compiled by the Administrative Office of the Courts. In 1960 the total civil filings were 57,665 and the number of cases terminated 57,449, only 216 less than the number filed. In other words, with 19 vacancies in currently authorized judgeships the judges of the courts were keeping pace with the workload. They were not falling behind.

In one of the districts in which a new judgeship is created by this conference report the weighted caseload per judge is 144 cases per judge, while the national average is 226 weighted cases per judge. In other words, with the existing judge power in one of these districts working only a little over half time we are going to create a new judgeship.

In my judgment, this bill is an unconscionable increase in the size and cost of the Federal judiciary, with each new district judgeship costing approximately $90,000 in the first year.

However, the great damage it does, in my judgment, is to water down, weaken, and cheapen the office of district judge, tainting the office with a political cast.

The Attorney General, it is true, under questioning by my colleague from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], refused to make the forthright bipartisan statement made by the Eisenhower administration in connection with the judgeship bill last year. However, he did say this, and I will read from page 402 of our hearings:

> Mr. McCULLOCH. Do you have any opinion concerning the advisability of the Federal Judiciary being reasonably in balance with respect to the politics of the judges prior to their appointment?
>
> Mr. KENNEDY. I think that the best qualified individuals should be selected as judges, Congressman.

I want to refer to the situation in the eastern district of Michigan. Michigan fared very well in this conference report, I must say, far better than the facts justified on the basis of statistics but no better than many other districts where additional unjustifiable judgeships were created.

We have a sitting judge who has been appointed but not confirmed and has served on the bench since last October. The presiding judge of the eastern district of Michigan and the Bar Association of Michigan and individual attorneys have testified to the excellence of his performance on the bench of the eastern district of Michigan.

If, after the passage of this bill, the name of that judge, who happens to be a Republican, is withdrawn after this demonstration of competence, then the political cast of this legislation will become clear.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, visiting over on the other side, as I sometimes do when I forget myself, I was asked by the majority leader what Republicans mean by partisan politics, but no answer. I have assumed that always when a Republican Congress, a Republican President was in power, those selected for judicial positions would be individuals who agreed in the political philosophy with that party's views. The same would hold true when the Democratic Party was in control. But always heretofore there was an apparent effort to find individual lawyers or judges for these judicial positions who were members of the opposition political party—that is if the Republicans were in power, individuals in about the same number who were conservative in their views, supporters of constitutional provisions—strictly construed—would be named but lack of action last year and the present bill seems to indicate there are in the opinion of majority party leaders no suitable Republicans.

In years gone by I read the Supreme Court decisions, that is, when Cardozo and Hughes were on the Bench, just as I would read the prayer book or the Bible. It was my book of authority on ordinary matters. But now as you read the decisions, many of them 4 to 5, as in that case that came in from New York, when in that censorship case there were six opinions in the one case—Kingsley against Regents, decided June 29, 1960—and they all agreed that New York could not prevent the showing of a film even though New York's regents decided "the whole theme of the motion picture is immoral under said law, for that theme is the presentation of adultery as a desirable, acceptable, and proper pattern of behavior." The reason giving being that "motion pictures are within the 1st and 14th amendments' basic protection."

Last week, when I heard Justice Frankfurter saying that the Court was hunting for technical errors, then heard Justice Warren tell Justice Frankfurter not to degrade the Court, and Justice Frankfurter reply that he would let the record stand, and I heard somebody saying the Court was degrading itself, it left me in doubt as to the principles of the Court—rather perhaps its political or judicial philosophy. Is the right of the individual absolute or is the welfare of all paramount?

I do realize our Democratic President appoints the Judges with the advice of Bobby, these learned scholars—I assume he will appoint individuals who agree with his political philosophy. The net result is that for years to come we will have judicial decisions which write, rather than interpret, legislation. Decisions which ignore precedent—lessen the rights of all who do not belong to minorities or pressure groups—who are just Americans who pay taxes, believe in the form of government outlined in the Constitution.

One result of this legislation will be to lessen the power of the Congress. The people's only representatives increase the power of the courts and the administration.

To digress for a moment, whether we think alike or agree with Reuther and Jimmy Hoffa, I do not know, but certainly I would say to my Republican colleagues, What can you expect? Officially if not actually—and now no matter by what means, the opposition won—at least according to the present official count. Our work should have been before the election—we should have done a little bit more work then. Just as when some of the members of the chamber of commerce came up with this invitation to their dinner and wanted to point out the danger of a vote for or against legislation and I ask, Where were you when we were selecting representatives? Why did you not give more help to those who think as do you? Where was your propaganda machine and its output? Hoffa, Reuther, and other union officials had their partisan publications in the mail for years. It is just too late and we as Republicans are too late on this judge business. We are going to get a group of judges who will put this New Deal policy into effect. The people are stuck, not only with the Supreme Court but with district attorneys, district and circuit judges who will shape our political policy for 50 or 100 years. All because the people trusted their representatives, were not vigilant. Sad but true.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize we are going through an exercise in futility here. In the course of 3 years work on an omnibus judgeship bill, I certainly discovered that it seems to be too much to expect that we will act reasonably on a subject of this kind. When the bill was here before, I offered an amendment to cut the bill back to 59 judges, which seemed to be the most reasonable number that the Congress should act upon at this time. That amendment was beaten by a smoothly operating coalition on the majority side—in fact, there was not a single vote for that amendment on the majority side. That is why I say this is an exercise in futility. I find it ironic, Mr. Speaker, that in the 86th Congress, when we were debating the civil rights bill, there was a violent attack launched upon the Federal judiciary by the southern wing of the majority coalition, and the other day when the judgeship bill was before us, there was a violent and unnecessary attack launched upon a distinguished and independent and courageous member of the Federal judiciary in the State of Massachusetts. Again, that is why I say this is an exercise in futility. We will get our 73 judges, and I suggest to my colleagues the best thing we can do is to vote for this conference report because each day that we fiddle around with it, the number goes up a little higher. So, let us put a ceiling on it and act on it today before it gets any higher. You know it may be that we are approaching John Locke's state of nature, where every man is both prosecutor and judge of every other man's

transgressions. But, leaving that as it may be, I think I will vote for this conference report, knowing something of the needs of the country, but I can assure my colleagues that I do so with a heavy heart.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, having been fairly active as a member of the California bar for about 30 years before I first came to this great legislative body over 14 years ago now, and still being a member of the California State and the Long Beach Bar Associations, I am not unaware of the rapidly increasing need of additional Federal judges in my native State of California. So, I feel I can meritoriously commend the House conferees on being in concord with the language of the Senate bill whereby two additional judges for the northern district of California were added to the conference report. I concur with the statement of the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER, to the effect that the population situation and the industrial growth and progress situation in California made necessary the addition of these two additional district judges.

The conference report on pages 7 and 8 thereof clearly states the very worthy functioning of the conferees on this very important and very worthy matter wherein these two additional district judges were added. Again, I take sincere pleasure in congratulating all the conferees on this matter and having before them the easily available statistics showing the status of the litigation before these courts and the economic situation in California as well, which I am familiar with and which I believe clearly demonstrates and proves that this addition of two additional judges for California, thus giving California four new judges, is thoroughly justified and merited and is clear as crystal justified and made fully essential.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter on the conference report, just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1961 AND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AND HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AMENDMENTS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 275) providing for the consideration of H.R. 6713, a bill to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed six hours, three hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, and three hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendments shall be in order to title I of the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Public Works, and no amendments shall be in order to title II of the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, which shall be in order notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, but any such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader if he can inform us as to the legislative program for the balance of this week and, if possible, what he can tell us about the program for next week.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The only legislation for the balance of this week is the bill about to come up, the interstate highway bill.

If we finish it today I will ask unanimous consent to go over to Monday; if not, we will continue the bill tomorrow. I am hopeful the bill may be finished today, because there will be no business on Monday. I cannot project my mind ahead at this moment to announce the full program for next week, but I can say there will be no business on Monday.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and yield myself such time as I may desire.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 275 provides for the consideration of H.R. 6713, a bill to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for a closed rule, waiving points of order, with 6 hours of general debate.

H.R. 6713 contains in title I certain necessary provisions for the continuation of the Federal-aid highway program. Title II of the bill contains the recommendations of the Committee on Ways and Means to the Committee on Public Works to provide necessary tax revenues to finance the highway program.

The provisions of the two titles have been incorporated in the bill, after having been approved by the respective committees having jurisdiction over the subject matter in order to permit the simultaneous and orderly consideration of the highway program by Congress.

The purpose of H.R. 6713 is to provide for the completion of the Interstate System on schedule, as originally planned by the Congress, by establishing a firm program of authorizations based on the new cost estimate submitted to the Congress earlier this year.

More than 10,440 miles of the Interstate System are now open to traffic. This total includes 5,135 miles adequate for 1975 traffic, 3,041 miles adequate for today's traffic, but requiring further improvement before 1975, and 2,264 miles of toll roads incorporated in the system as authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956.

Interstate projects underway or authorized on December 31, 1960, total $5.2 billion, of which $4.5 billion were Federal funds. The work underway includes construction contracts totaling $3.2 billion, of which $2.9 billion were Federal funds, and engineering and right-of-way acquisition totaling $2 billion, of which $1.6 billion were Federal funds.

This is a sizable program but it does not permit the rate of advancement necessary to complete the Interstate System by 1972. For this reason, recommendations have been made for increased interstate authorizations in this bill totaling $11.56 billion which are needed to complete the Interstate System on schedule.

Under this proposed program, the interstate apportionments will total $37 billion. An interstate apportionment of $2.4 billion for the fiscal year 1963 would be made this summer, and the apportionments for the succeeding fiscal years would gradually increase to a maximum of $3 billion for each of the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970, with a balancing apportionment of $2,885 billion for the fiscal year 1971. Amounts in the highway trust fund will be available to meet obligations resulting from these apportionments until the latter part of the calendar year 1972.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 275.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of the legislative business of the day the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] and I may extend our remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at the end of the legislative business of the day and to include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides a rather peculiar and unusual rule, as the gentleman from Arkansas has explained. It is a rule making in order the consideration of two titles to one bill, H.R. 6713. Title I deals with the Federal highway program which was considered by the House Committee on Public Works. Title II deals only with the taxes to be levied to pay the costs of the Federal highway aid program until 1972, as has been authorized in the past.

This is a "closed" or "gag" rule under which the bill will come to the floor with divided control of time. It provides for 6 hours of general debate on this measure, 3 hours to be assigned to the Committee on Public Works and equally divided between its majority and minority members, and 3 hours to the Committee on Ways and Means which, of course, has jurisdiction over title II of the bill, to be equally divided between the majority and minority members of that committee. It makes in order and permits consideration of only those amendments that may be offered by instruction of either of the two committees.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The gentleman has stated that the resolution calls for a closed or gag rule. In a way I regret that, because I have a telegram from the Governor of the State of New York which I would like to read. I am afraid we cannot agree with all the Governor says in that telegram, even though it has some merit.

I am afraid we cannot accede to what the Governor suggests, although I think it has a great deal of merit.

He states:

APRIL 21, 1961.

Hon. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge your support of action to reestablish the planned completion schedule of the Interstate Highway System by 1972. In addition in order to help with the grave problems of unemployment I urge development of means to allow States, like New York, that are prepared to speed up the programs to draw down upon their future Federal highway allotments and complete their share of the system ahead of schedule. There is critical need for these roads to promote economic growth, provide immediate employment opportunities and a general stimulus to business. They are necessary for highway safety. Their accelerated construction will save money.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

I take it, however, that under this rule it would be impossible to offer such an amendment.

Mr. BROWN. The gentlewoman is entirely correct. Under the provisions of this rule there is a prohibition against the offering or consideration of any amendments except those submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Public Roads, as the case may be. I think I should make it clear I voted against the gag rule in the Committee on Rules simply because I am getting tired, and am growing more tired day by day, month by month, and year by year, of seeing the House bound by gag or closed rules so we cannot work our will. In spite of the great reform we have recently had in the Rules Committee, we are not permitted to work our will. However, in the other body, any Member can offer an amendment, and have it considered, to this bill, or to any section of it, as he or she may desire, whether it be germane or not. They at least have that privilege in the other body, which body I sometimes criticize severely, but they are at least able to work their will on legislative matters.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to go on to another subject.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What substantial reason was given for the imposition of the gag rule on this bill?

Mr. BROWN. First the argument was made, as usual, and it has been a rather substantial argument in the past, that you cannot enact good tax legislation on the floor of the House. Of course it is so enacted quite often in the other body.

The other reason for a gag rule on title I was that if you changed the provisions dealing with the highway program that change would necessarily alter entirely the tax provisions contained in title II. The Rules Committee voted that way. I did not. I cannot explain the workings of the minds of my colleagues on the Rules Committee or even of my colleagues in the House.

Mr. GROSS. Now we are called upon to vote a bill up or down involving $9 billion, or something of that kind?

Mr. BROWN. Quite a little more than that, I think the gentleman will find. I will leave that up to members of the legislative committees.

Mr. GROSS. When the Rules Committee was packed, we were told that the House was going to have an apportunity to work its will, there was to be self-determination.

Mr. BROWN. I do not want to discuss an issue like that. I never do.

I have noted with a great deal of appreciation, and perhaps a bit of amusement, that some of those who voted to pack the Rules Committee are now attempting to explain to their people that they were misled.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to give an answer. The gentleman from Iowa, my very good friend, and the other member of my party, has talked about a gag rule. One reason for that is that perhaps if they let the House offer amendments some of the things that the folks back home wanted they might get. Do you not see?

Mr. BROWN. If I may continue, having yielded for that very astute observation—a little while ago we had a colloquy or dialogue, on another matter, between myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, about changing minds. I think perhaps that this is a good place and time to continue our dissertations on that particular subject.

In this bill, the title II portion of it, at least, pertaining to raising taxes, we are doing something here in the House contrary to what we promised the people of America a year ago, faithfully, to do. You have received letters, many of you, throughout the months that have come and gone since that time—and we again promised that the extra 1-cent tax on gasoline, the 4-cent per gallon gasoline tax, would be reduced, automatically eliminated, and terminated on next June 30, at midnight, and revert back to 3 cents per gallon. That was the pledge and the promise which was made here on this floor in the last Congress. Then, to my amazement, when this bill was brought in by the great Committee on Ways and Means such was not the case. I realize fully that the committee has often been placed in the position where it had to furnish the money, one way or another, by taxation to meet the cost of some of these programs which the Congress votes, and I do want to congratulate the Committee on Ways and Means for at least being fair enough and honest enough to say, "Well, if you want this highway program, you will have to pay for it." Most of the costly programs which we initiate and put into effect here in the Congress, that is, the big spending programs, are all too often on the basis we will go out and borrow the money, for our children and grandchildren to pay back some day after we are dead and gone, and after our failures have been written off the books. Now we are placed in a rather peculiar position, in this matter, where we will have to decide whether we will vote for the bill—we cannot amend it—whether we will vote for the bill that contains a continuation of the 4-cent gasoline tax which would annually raise about $500 million, instead of reverting back to the 3-cent gas tax as we pledged and promised very solemnly, on our honor, all of the people of America a year ago that we would do, and would permit to come about, on June 30 next.

Then there is another strange situation which has developed in connection with the hearings on this bill. It has been stated and argued that we could not take the money to support this program out of the general revenue funds of the Treasury. We could not go direct to the Treasury, but we had to have a special tax levied to take care of this program, for we needed about $800 million or more per year to balance this Federal highway fund. This bill provides, in substance, that there shall be $500 million a year derived from a 10 to

12 year permanent increase in the gasoline tax, from 3 to 4 cents, on each automobile user. There would be about $150 million more of the needed funds derived from levying new taxes, or increasing taxes, on heavy trucks, which have a capacity of more than 26,000 pounds, and with a bit more to come from some increase in the taxes on tires, and on rubber used in tire repair and retreading purposes. Then, finally, in order to make up the complete $800 million cost of this program, we take $150 million a year out of the general revenue fund of the Treasury.

This all reminds me that we have been quite conservative and thoughtful and greatly interested, in the welfare of the Federal Treasury. This highway construction here in this House, where it has been passed upon by the Congress, as well as passed upon by the people, where it has been a matter of public debate and discussion for 4 or 5 years, and where we have pledged to do certain things, justifiably, but still, we could not take money out of the Federal Treasury, the general fund, except this $150 million. It would be wrong to take the other $650 million. But here a week or so ago, without any justification whatsoever, without keeping any of the pledges or commitments that were made to the effect that the Congress would be advised, and given direct and concrete plans and programs for the spending of the money—that no appropriation would be requested or made until those plans had been submitted to the Congress and approved by the appropriate committees and by the Congress itself—we took out of the general fund of the Treasury, by a four to one vote, $600 million to give away to the people of some South American countries where most of the recipients will probably be the fat cats of those particular nations, and not the poor people whom we would really like to help.

We were able to take $600 million out of the Treasury for that, without any justification whatsoever. But it now seems to be immoral and improper to take similar funds out of the Federal Treasury to put into effect a program to construct highways for the benefit of the American people themselves.

I asked a question the other day in the Committee on Rules to which I have not yet received an answer, or at least a direct one, as to the difference between the two propositions. I know the difference. The real difference is $50 million. That is the monetary difference. The other and more important difference is that under this program we are going to levy taxes on the American people, for their own benefit, while in the other program we are taking money directly out of the Federal Treasury, and thus add to our present deficit, and to the great national debt which our children and grandchildren will inherit, all for the benefit of people who are not citizens of this country, and too often are not even friends of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you that we face a most peculiar situation. I assume this legislation will pass. While I am opposed to the rule, I am sure it will be adopted. I am realistic enough to know that. Along with my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], I am a realist in politics. I am sure this rule is going to be adopted, and perhaps this bill will be passed. But I think it is time to call attention of the House to this very peculiar situation, this rather remarkable condition, which has developed here in less than 2 weeks' time, and which prompts me to remark, "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file sundry reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINES PAYS ITS DEBT

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER].

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the pessimism that seems to be alarming many of us regarding the present and future of countries allied to us and which we have helped, there is a note of optimism and a gleam of bright light that comes from one of them to which I wish to call the attention of the House. I refer to the Philippines.

There is something in the accomplishments of that young Republic which should make every American proud. Its progress since its independence in 1946 has been steady. It has not deviated one whit from democratic processes. In a recent article written by Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, former Member of this body and now Philippine Ambassador to the United States, he showed with facts and figures how, under the administration of President Carlos P. Garcia, the Filipino people have advanced economically and politically. The article was published in the March issue of the authoritative national magazine Current History and this article was inserted in the RECORD by the distinguished Majority Floor Leader MCCORMACK on March 27, 1961.

I wish to call the attention of this body to an editorial that appeared the other day in the Journal of Commerce of May 2 which confirms the statements made by General Romulo. But there is something noteworthy in the editorial that I wish to stress: the fact that in order to maintain its credit unimpaired, the Philippine Government had to reduce its international reserves to pay an obligation of $20 million that it owes our Government.

Mr. Speaker, is this not something out of the ordinary, something our people should know, that a nation like the Philippines pays its debt even if it has to do so at great sacrifice? This deserves special notice and it is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I have taken the floor this morning to ask unanimous consent that the Journal of Commerce editorial be made part of the RECORD.

NEARING THE TAKEOFF

In common with a number of countries at or near the economic takeoff stage, the Philippines has to watch its foreign exchange expenditures most closely. But it's noteworthy that for the third year in a row the young nation gives promise of being able to maintain a fair balance in its international accounts, thus consolidating the base for further diversification and strengthening of the economy.

This relatively favorable payments outlook, of course, to some degree results from unexpectedly large demand from the profitable American sugar market because of shutting off of Cuban supplies. But, it also reflects striking progress by the Republic since Independence Day on July 4, 1946.

Immediately after independence the Philippines had to concentrate on reconstruction of its severely devastated islands. Later, however, Manila authorities concentrated their energies increasingly on diversification of the economy, notably by a drive for new industries and by redirection of farming activities so dependence upon foodstuffs imports could be lessened and ultimately virtually eliminated.

Philippine efforts have been facilitated by the preferred status of its products in the U.S. market, by war damage payments and by financial assistance from this country. The outbreak of the Korean war in 1950 also provided a special assist since it led to booming commodity markets from which the islands profited materially for a while.

Even so, the Philippines path toward the takeoff stage has by no means been smooth. The ups and downs in world markets in the past several years and the natural desire to do too much too fast at times have checked progress severely.

Internal governmental expenditures have often outrun receipts and in 1957–58 a deficit of nearly 340 million pesos was racked up. At the same time, the Philippines reserves were run down, falling to $150 million in 1957 and to a low of $128 million in 1958.

These developments necessitated belt-tightening measures both internally and externally. Imports were cut back by quotas, foreign exchange regulations and the imposition of a margin fee of 25 percent which had to be paid in purchasing exchange for for all but the most essential imports. Meanwhile, exports were pushed.

The chronic postwar deficit in merchandise trade, that had reached a peak of $180 million or so in 1957, was greatly decreased in 1958, and in 1959 converted into a small export surplus. Reserves also were rebuilt, rising to $171 million at the end of 1959.

Last year, further progress was made. Exports rose to a new high of $551 million. Imports, on the other hand, expanded more rapidly and the Republic, accordingly, incurred a moderate deficit in its merchandise trade. Reserves, however, were built up to the $200 million level and held around that figure throughout the year. This higher level of reserves reflected in part a $24 million payment by the United States in settlement of a claim arising from the hike in the gold price in 1934 to $35 per ounce. But, the showing nevertheless was relatively satisfactory.

Meanwhile, the Philippine Government is proceeding with simplification of its foreign exchange control mechanism, involving the establishment of a more realistic rate for the peso.

A first step was taken in April 1960, another last September, and a third in March of this year. Exporters now may convert 75 percent of their dollar earnings at the free market rate of 3 pesos to the dollar, although the remainder must be sold at the official rate of 2 pesos to the dollar. In addition, the margin fee importers of most products must pay when they obtain foreign exchange, has been reduced to 15 percent.

Since the last step was taken reserves have declined considerably, falling to $166 million in mid-April. However, the drop to this level is due materially to a $20 million repayment to the United States, and Philippine authorities hope they can carry through their program to eliminate the margin fee and have one rate for the peso applying to all exports and imports by 1962.

Given the breaks, it is probable this goal will be realized. But, even if it is, the Philippines will continue to face a balance of payments problem for years to come, in part because of service on its external debt and in part because of the extremely heavy imports that the new and expensive stage of further industrialization will require. Moreover, higher U.S. tariffs—20 percent in 1962—are slated under the so-called Bell Act that calls for elimination of mutual preferences by 1974.

As the Philippines look ahead, however, to this testing period, it can take reassurance from the record of the past decade or so. Its agriculture has been rejuvenated and expanded with self-sufficiency in corn and rice attained; traditional mining operations have been restored, exploitation of iron ore gotten underway and a vigorous oil search launched; manufacturing has been tremendously expanded with more than 14,000 new firms set up since independence, and exports have been diversified both as to product and geographical distribution.

Thus, the Philippines, with its rich resources and relatively limited population density by Asiatic standards, have a good foundation on which to take off in pursuit of a still more diversified and industrialized economy.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1961 AND INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AND HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AMENDMENTS

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER].

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, this is a much better bill than we could have been led to expect several weeks ago. I shall certainly support it. The committees have done a most excellent job. But I most heartily regret that we were not given an opportunity to sever the 1-cent gas tax. Local governments are in trouble. Gas taxes are one of the few sources of revenue local governments have. I regret that the Federal Government, with its vastly superior taxing ability does not give local government the opportunity to avail itself this source of income for itself.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include news stories and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, listening to my adviser and superior on the Committee on Rules—not that I am on the Committee on Rules; I was not one of those who helped stack the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELANEY). The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Republican policy committee, I withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert certain tables immediately following my remarks in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6713, with Mr. SMITH of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House, H.R. 6713, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961, provides for the orderly continuation of the construction of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to permit the completion of the system by the end of calendar year 1972.

The bill consists of two titles. Title I deals with the authorizations for Federal aid to highways and other matters germane to title 23, United States Code. Title II consists of amendments to the Highway Revenue Act, and will, therefore, be presented to the House by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

No authorizations are provided in this bill for the regular program of improvements on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, with their urban extensions, the so-called A–B–C program. Authorizations for the A–B–C program are already firm through fiscal 1963. Next year, the Committee on Public Works will consider legislation making authorizations for fiscal 1964 and 1965 for the A–B–C program.

The master plan for the completion of the Interstate System was provided by Congress 5 years ago in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. The plan, in essence, was to complete a 41,000-mile system of high-standard, high-capacity freeways connecting the principal centers of industry and population in the United States, and serving as the backbone system for our total highway network. Such a system will carry, safely and efficiently, at least 20 percent of the highway traffic of 1975.

The Interstate System is the foundation or core system, with the other Federal-aid highways serving as feeders, connectors, and distributors to make up a comprehensive and coordinated system of highways.

Research and studies in the field of transportation over the last 5 years have fortified and reaffirmed the justification for the program envisioned in the 1956 act. The highways are urgently needed. They are being provided through the cooperative efforts of the State and Federal Governments on the pay-as-you-build principle, through taxes levied on the highway users who are the direct beneficiaries of the program.

It is recognized that Congress may, from time to time, find it in the public interest to make modifications in the Federal-aid highway program. However, it is essential that we keep our long-range goals always in sight.

H.R. 6713 provides for the orderly continuation of the interstate program as adopted by Congress in 1956, and covers three major points, which are closely interrelated.

First. The bill accepts the 1961 revised estimate of cost as the basis for apportioning funds to the States for work on the Interstate System for fiscal years 1963–66. As provided in the 1956 act, interstate funds are apportioned to each State on the basis of the estimated cost of the proportionate amount of work remaining to be done in that State, so that the work can go forward uniformly and can be completed simultaneously in all States.

Second. On the basis of the 1961 revised estimate of cost, the bill will revise the schedule of annual authorizations for the interstate program, increasing these authorizations to permit the completion of the Interstate System by the end of calendar year 1972.

Third. The bill levies increased taxes on highway users in amounts sufficient to provide the funds needed for future A–B–C authorizations as well as those

which will be required by the increase in interstate authorizations.

These matters are, as I have said, closely interrelated. All three provisions are essential to the basic goal of completing the Interstate System by the end of calendar year 1972. The Committee on Public Works has endeavored to limit the scope of the bill to the essential matters, and has refrained from bringing to the floor at this time other proposals which, while they may have a great deal of merit, stand apart from the central issue.

In the belief that it is completely noncontroversial, we have included a section authorizing States or their political subdivisions to permit the use of the airspace above and below interstate highways for such purposes as will not impair the full use and safety of the highways. Certain States have expressed an urgent need for such a provision, and the committee has heard no objection.

The 1961 cost estimate was prepared by the States, following standard procedures established by the Bureau of Public Roads, and with the Bureau of Public Roads acting as the coordinating agency. The State highway departments used 1.65 million man-hours of work in preparing this extremely thorough estimate, which we believe to be as accurate an estimate as can be made at this time.

The schedule of authorizations in the 1956 Highway Act was based on a cost estimate submitted to Congress in 1955. The 1955 estimate was a reasonably accurate appraisal of the cost of completing to modern freeway standards a proposed system of interstate highways, over routes which had not been exactly located. Since the date of this first estimate, we have added new mileage to the system, we have written certain requirements into the law which were not contemplated by the estimators, and the highway cost index has fluctuated, rising during the period 1954–57 and falling somewhat since then.

The 1961 cost estimate agrees closely with the 1958 cost estimate, confirming the belief that the States now have sufficient experience in the construction of interstate-type highways to provide estimates which are quite close to actual costs.

Accordingly, H.R. 6713 provides for additional apportionments of $11.56 billion, beginning with fiscal year 1963 and extending through fiscal year 1971. The annual rate of apportionment would be increased gradually from the present level of $2.2 billion to reach the maximum level of $3 billion with the apportionment for fiscal year 1968, and continuing at that level through fiscal year 1970, with a balancing apportionment of $2.885 billion to be made for fiscal year 1971.

The revenue program provided in title II of the bill will permit these apportionments to be made in accord with the "pay-as-you-build" provision of the 1956 act.

The President, in his special message to Congress of February 28, called attention to the tremendous benefits which will accrue to the highway users on completion of the Interstate System. The system will save at least 4,000 lives a year through the reduction of traffic accidents. Users of the Interstate System will save 42,000 man-years of travel time every year. The elimination of stop-and-go driving will save users 9 billion costly stops and starts every year.

The benefits to highway users alone fully justify our best efforts in working toward the timely completion of the Interstate System.

It is of special significance that these direct benefits have an effect which expands to touch every segment of the economy. The modernization of the highway transportation system is a necessary step toward the expansion of our national economy to offer opportunities for better living for our increasing population.

Quite properly, the Congress has taken cognizance of the Interstate System as an element of our Defense Establishment. Highways—especially a system of highways connecting production centers—play a vital role in our defense planning in an era when mobility is a preeminent consideration.

The Committee on Public Works is unanimous in the belief that the completion of the Interstate System not later than 1972 is essential to the national economy, essential for the safe and expeditious flow of highway traffic, and essential to the national defense.

I include the following tables:

Relationship of 1955, 1958, and 1961 Interstate System cost estimates

[In billions of dollars]

Item	Estimated costs		
	Total	Federal share	State share
1955 estimate	27.6	25.0	2.6
5 percent increase due traffic	1.3	1.2	.1
15 percent increase due local needs	3.8	3.4	.4
3 percent increase due utilities and miscellaneous	.8	.7	.1
12 percent increase due price increase	4.1	3.6	.5
Subtotal, 1958 estimate	37.6	33.9	3.7
Increase due 1,452 miles added routes	1.6	1.5	.1
Carryover and contingency	.7	.6	.1
Total to complete a 40,000-mile system, based on 1958 estimate	39.9	36.0	3.9
Additional 1,000 miles	1.1	1.0	.1
Total to complete a 41,000-mile system, based on 1958 estimate	41.0	37.0	4.0
Reduction in 1961 construction cost estimate	−1.0	−.9	−.1
State highway planning and research	.6	.5	.1
Public Roads Administration and research	.4	.4	0
Total, 1961 estimate	41.0	37.0	4.0

TABLES OF APPORTIONMENT

Comparison of approximate apportionments of interstate funds under present law and under H.R. 6713 for fiscal years 1963 and 1964

[In millions]

State	Fiscal year 1963			Fiscal year 1964			State	Fiscal year 1963			Fiscal year 1964		
	Existing law ($2,000.0)	H.R. 6713 ($2,400.0)	Difference ($400.0)	Existing law ($1,500.0)	H.R. 6713 ($2,600.0)	Difference ($1,100.0)		Existing law ($2,000.0)	H.R. 6713 ($2,400.0)	Difference ($400.0)	Existing law ($1,500.0)	H.R. 6713 ($2,600.0)	Difference ($1,100.0)
Alabama	$41.4	$49.6	$8.2	$31.0	$53.8	$22.8	Nebraska	$11.7	$14.0	$2.3	$8.8	$15.2	$6.4
Arizona	28.1	33.7	5.6	21.1	36.5	15.4	Nevada	10.1	12.1	2.0	7.6	13.1	5.5
Arkansas	20.9	25.1	4.2	15.7	27.2	11.5	New Hampshire	9.0	10.8	1.8	6.7	11.7	5.0
California	191.2	229.4	38.2	143.4	248.5	105.1	New Jersey	52.1	62.6	10.5	39.1	67.8	28.7
Colorado	26.5	31.8	5.3	19.9	34.5	14.6	New Mexico	20.0	23.9	3.9	15.0	25.9	10.9
Connecticut	28.2	33.9	5.7	21.2	36.7	15.5	New York	94.7	113.7	19.0	71.1	123.2	52.1
Delaware	7.4	8.9	1.5	5.6	9.7	4.1	North Carolina	16.4	19.6	3.2	12.3	21.3	9.0
Florida	41.5	49.8	8.3	31.1	53.9	22.8	North Dakota	8.8	10.6	1.8	6.6	11.5	4.9
Georgia	36.8	44.2	7.4	27.6	47.9	20.3	Ohio	136.5	163.8	27.3	102.3	177.4	75.1
Hawaii	15.7	18.8	3.1	11.8	20.4	8.6	Oklahoma	24.1	28.9	4.8	18.0	31.3	13.3
Idaho	9.4	11.3	1.9	7.0	12.2	5.2	Oregon	34.7	41.7	7.0	26.0	45.1	19.1
Illinois	104.3	125.2	20.9	78.2	135.6	57.4	Pennsylvania	89.4	107.3	17.9	67.1	116.3	49.2
Indiana	49.5	59.4	9.9	37.1	64.4	27.3	Rhode Island	7.4	8.8	1.4	5.5	9.6	4.1
Iowa	25.3	30.4	5.1	19.0	32.9	13.9	South Carolina	17.3	20.7	3.4	12.9	22.4	9.5
Kansas	15.5	18.6	3.1	11.6	20.1	8.5	South Dakota	13.1	15.8	2.7	9.8	17.1	7.3
Kentucky	40.8	48.9	8.1	30.6	53.0	22.4	Tennessee	50.4	60.5	10.1	37.8	65.5	27.7
Louisiana	57.8	69.3	11.5	43.3	75.1	31.8	Texas	90.5	108.6	18.1	67.8	117.6	49.8
Maine	9.4	11.3	1.9	7.1	12.3	5.2	Utah	28.9	34.7	5.8	21.7	37.6	15.9
Maryland	36.6	44.0	7.4	27.5	47.6	20.1	Vermont	13.8	16.6	2.8	10.4	17.9	7.5
Massachusetts	42.8	51.4	8.6	32.1	55.7	23.6	Virginia	60.8	72.9	12.1	45.6	79.0	33.4
Michigan	77.9	93.5	15.6	58.4	101.3	42.9	Washington	41.7	50.0	8.3	31.3	54.2	22.9
Minnesota	51.7	62.1	10.4	38.8	67.2	28.4	West Virginia	30.1	36.1	6.0	22.6	39.1	16.5
Mississippi	24.3	29.1	4.8	18.2	31.6	13.4	Wisconsin	17.7	21.2	3.5	13.3	23.0	9.7
Missouri	51.1	61.4	10.3	38.4	66.5	28.1	Wyoming	19.2	23.0	3.8	14.4	24.9	10.7
Montana	18.7	22.5	3.8	14.0	24.3	10.3	District of Columbia	28.8	34.5	5.7	21.6	37.4	15.8

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes that I have today, I shall not repeat the many compelling reasons why the highway program should be completed on schedule. I believe all of us are aware of the tremendous savings that will result to the motorist, the economy of the Nation, and in loss of life, by the completion of the highway program on schedule.

Both President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower, in their messages to this Congress, have strongly urged that we act accordingly. There are some landmark provisions of the 1956 act which both administrations have asked that we preserve: First and basically, that we keep this program on a "pay as we build" basis and not pass on the cost to future generations. To do otherwise would unbalance the budget and further increase the national debt and add fuel to the inflationary spiral.

The bill before us today carries out about 90 percent of this basic pay-as-we-build provision of the 1956 act. It preserves the balance between the Interstate and A–B–C Systems. It will continue to allow highways to be built where the traffic is—where the need exists. It provides for the completion of the system on target date, thus bringing to the country the tremendous savings that result from adequate modern highways at the earliest possible date.

I am not unmindful of the fact that Members of this House are greatly concerned that they are being called upon, in this bill, to provide approximately $10 billion more in Federal moneys to complete the Interstate and A–B–C Systems, than was contemplated and provided for at the time we passed the 1956 act.

Mr. Chairman, I find that there is much misinformation not only among the public generally, but here in the Congress, as to why the cost of this program has increased by $13.4 billion over the 1955 estimate. I think the Members of this House should be armed with the facts so that they will be in a position to answer the questions their constituents will raise about this increase in cost.

Some people in and out of the Congress believe and argue that the cost increase has been due to waste, inefficiency, and fraud; others contend that the cost has increased because the program is too colossal; that the rights-of-way and median strips are too wide; that the interchanges are too complex and costly and adorned with frills. In answering these charges, we first must have some conception as to the magnitude of this program which is the largest public works program in the history of the world. We can get some idea of the size and undertaking of this highway program if we can conceive, in our mindseye, a public works program which would combine the Panama Canal, the Grand Coulee Dam, and the St. Lawrence Seaway into one mammoth project, and then multiply it 35 times. We would then have the equivalent of this highway construction effort, which, for the past 5 years has been daily opening new frontiers in every nook and corner of the United States. When you have a program of this magnitude involving an expenditure of billions of dollars and involving millions of people, both in and out of government, you are bound to attract the chiselers, the grafters, and those who want to make a fast buck. You are bound to make some mistakes. There will be some inefficiencies, waste, and bad practices. The Highway Investigating Committee has put its finger on some of these shortcomings. I am certain that more will be uncovered by the committee. However, I am just as certain that these weaknesses, these shortcomings, these failures, are infinitesimally small compared to the tremendous number of fine and outstanding accomplishments of this construction program. I am positive that those connected with this program, in and out of government, who are guilty of wrongdoing are infinitesimally small compared to the overwhelming number of dedicated, conscientious highway people—contractors, engineers, lawyers, realtors, and supply companies—who are giving their best efforts and talents to making this colossal undertaking a lasting benefit to the American people.

You and I all know that the enemies—and there are enemies of a program such as this—will seize upon its shortcomings and failures. They will exaggerate and distort them out of all proportion. We know that news media like to write and talk about waste, inefficiency, and fraud rather than success and accomplishment. As a result, the public can easily be given the impression that this whole highway program is riddled with waste and corruption.

Now, I do not want what I have just said to be taken out of context and interpreted to mean that I feel we can ignore any weaknesses or failures of this program. I do not want anyone to gather, from what I have said, that we can condone in any way, the shortcomings of this program. All I am urging is that we keep those things that are wrong, in proper perspective with that which is right.

Now I hear someone say, "Well, SCHERER, you still have not told us why the estimated total cost of the 41,000 mile Interstate System has increased $13.4 billion over the $27.6 billion estimate made in 1955 by the State highway departments." Well, here are the reasons:

First. In 1955 the States were given 6 weeks to estimate the cost of building and rebuilding 36,300 miles of interstate highways of the then authorized 40,000 miles. At that time the States came up with a hurried estimated cost of $23.7 billion for this mileage. Of the undesignated mileage, 2,300 miles reserved for urban areas, was quickly estimated to cost about $4 billion. This figure, rightly or wrongly, was literally taken out of the air. This brought the original cost estimate to $27.6 billion for the Interstate System. The Ways and Means Committee, in the 1958 act, provided moneys for the trust fund to cover this estimate. Now it developed, however, that when these 2,300 additional miles were finally designated, we find that the cost, instead of being $4 billion, is going to be actually $8 billion—so we now have already accounted for $4 billion of the increase over the estimated cost.

Second. The cost of the balance of the undesignated mileage—roughly about 1,400 miles—was not even estimated in 1955.

Third. When the House bill reached the Senate in 1956, the Senate added 1,000 miles to the 40,000-mile Interstate System. No provision, however, was made to increase the revenues for the trust fund to pay for this mileage. Naturally, the cost of this additional mileage was never included in the original cost estimate. You can readily see, therefore, that one of the basic reasons for the difference in the 1955 estimate and the current estimate, is the fact that the 1955 estimate was based on 36,300 miles of highway while the current estimate has been figured on 41,000 miles.

Fourth. After the trust fund was established, it assumed $1.6 billion highway obligations incurred prior to the passage of the 1956 act. It was never contemplated by the Congress that the trust fund would absorb this substantial sum.

Fifth. In arriving at the original 1955 estimate, the States used a base period of mid-1954 as the level of unit prices. It just so happened that bid prices at that time were at a particularly low point. Between 1954 and 1957, there was a 12-percent increase in the unit bid price of construction work of this type, although the general level of prices did not increase in the same ratio in that same interval of time.

Sixth. The 1955 estimate did not include administration costs of the Bureau of Public Roads and the 1½ percent for State highway planning and research. In arriving at the current estimate, as a result of the decision by the General Accounting Office, these items were included.

Seventh. Furthermore, when the 1956 act was passed—and remember all the additional requirements of that act took place after the 1955 estimates were submitted—the Bureau of Public Roads was directed, in planning the Interstate System, to give equal consideration to local needs along with those of interstate commerce. This meant, of course, that an additional volume of traffic had to be accommodated on the Interstate System. This directive increased the need for additional interchanges, access highways, and connections with other systems.

Eighth. Another significant factor is the fact that the 1955 estimate was made on the basis of traffic needs between the years 1954 and 1964. In the 1956 act, however, the Congress provided that the Interstate System should be built to standards and capacity adequate to take care of traffic in 1975. This meant that the highways had to be built to accommodate a far greater volume of traffic. The requirement to build for 1975 traffic needs rather than 1965 needs, increased the cost by $1.3 billion.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, there are those who still claim that the highways we are building, particularly the Interstate System, are too

grandiose; that the rights-of-way and median strips are too wide; that the interchanges are too costly and complex. We must remember that we are building these roads so that when they are completed, they will be able to handle the 1975 traffic. Traffic, like our population, is now increasing at a rate far exceeding that predicted by the experts just a few years ago. We need to build permanence into the new highways to protect this multi-billion-dollar investment from being obsolete at the very moment it is completed.

In the years past the most crucial failure in highway construction has been to underestimate traffic, the potential of the automobile, and the urgent need for sufficient highway capacity. We must realize that, if we cannot buy rights-of-way adequate for future widening, we do not have the correct location. Some of these plans may look too big for our britches in 1961, but they will fit just right in 1971. It does not make sense to build something new and then have to rebuild it in 10 years. That is real waste.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Will the gentleman tell me what we would do with this 42,000 years of time we would save by expediting and finishing this today?

Mr. SCHERER. If the gentleman from New York drives each night from the Capital to Virginia, like many thousands of Washingtonians do, and as many individuals do all over the United States in driving from their office to their home, and getting in those long lines of traffic, he could well use the hours of time that he is delayed in these traffic snarls.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I think I would be remiss if I did not at this time in the RECORD say that I agree with the gentleman so far as the activities of the special investigating committee of the Federal-aid highway program are concerned and also if I did not express to the gentleman my appreciation as a member of that committee and to him as the ranking minority member of that subcommittee for the aggressiveness that he has shown throughout in this program concerning possible fraud and corruption and graft connected with the system and the exposure thereof which, as he has said, although it exists, is infinitesimal in comparison to the total program. He and I were two of the first to call for the formation of such a watchdog committee after the passage of the 1956 Highway Act. He has shown aggressiveness as the former ranking member on the minority side with regard to rooting out corruption and wrongdoing in the program. And of even greater importance—and I think this is the significance of the job being done by that subcommittee—they have pointed a way to avoiding these errors and this wrongdoing in the future. The gentleman has certainly done monumental work in that respect and I think he, together with the other members of the subcommittee, should be congratulated on that work.

Mr. SCHERER. I thank the gentleman. The difficulty is, whenever you deal with shortcomings in a program like this, the enemies of the program, and there are some, seize upon these shortcomings, exaggerate them, blow them up beyond all proportion. The press likes to write about fraud and corruption and mistakes rather than accomplishments. The trouble is, as I have said, you are liable to give to the public in this country a bad image of this program and many people will believe that is is completely riddled with inefficiency and waste. And that is the thing we must guard against.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the investigating committee is going to be kept on as a watchdog committee until the completion of the program?

Mr. SCHERER. The investigating committee, in my opinion, will be continued during the life of this program. I think it is necessary that it does continue. The mere fact of its existence as a watchdog, in my opinion, will prevent many individuals who might want to cut corners from doing so.

Mrs. CHURCH. May I further ask the gentleman whether it would take a legislative action to provide for the continuation of that committee until the end of the program?

Mr. SCHERER. The special investigating committee was set up by the Committee on Public Works, but the House of Representatives appropriated the funds necessary to operate that committee, and I think in the future the Congress, after it gets the reports from this committee, will see fit to vote further funds for its operation.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to express to the gentleman and to the committee itself the hope that that watchdog committee will be kept in being. I think that I speak for many Members in the Congress today whose constituents are strongly protesting the continuation of the extra 1-cent excise tax on gasoline, and other proposed increases in taxes; and I think that if there were any preventable waste or error to develop in this program, the protests would become more than vocal—and understandably so.

Mr. SCHERER. That is exactly the reason I said we have to keep the shortcomings, which we admit exist in this program, in proper perspective with the many tremendous accomplishments in this program.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. I have no questions to put to my colleague, but I merely want to commend him for his remarks and say to him and to the Members of this body what a distinct privilege it has been to serve under his distinguished leadership.

Mr. SCHERER. That is very kind and I thank the gentleman and appreciate it.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6713 because in my opinion it places an undue burden upon the highway users of my district and because I do not approve its provisions for financing our highway program.

Gasoline in North Carolina is currently taxed at the rate of 11¼ cents per gallon. This is made up of the 4-cent Federal tax, a 7-cent State tax, and an additional ¼-cent State inspection tax. This is equivalent to a 57-percent sales tax on each gallon sold. The estimated auto tax burden per vehicle, which includes State and Federal gasoline taxes, motor license fees, and other taxes on automobiles and fuel, is in excess of $153 annually. This overall tax burden is very high when one considers that per capita income in the State is only $1,581.

Currently under consideration in North Carolina is a request of the State Highway Commission for an additional $505 million during the period 1960–75 for proposed road construction and maintenance. This is equivalent to an additional $33.6 million annually. The State Highway Commission has recommended to the Advisory Budget Commission that this amount be raised through an increase in the gasoline tax and motor vehicle registration fees, coupled with the reduction of a portion of the highway funds currently being diverted.

North Carolina's advisory budget commission has recommended the appropriation of an amount which is $103 million in excess of that appropriated during the last biennium. In addition, the Governor has recommended the appropriation of another $83 million to carry out new programs. The latter two requests represent total additional appropriations of $186 million. North Carolina's citizens are already heavily taxed and there is little doubt that they will be more heavily taxed in the future.

It appears that insofar as gasoline tax revenue in North Carolina is concerned we may have already reached the point of diminishing returns, due to the 57-percent tax and the advent of the compact car. The State advisory budget commission has reported that compact cars have already affected gasoline tax revenue by 1 percent and that expected additional purchases of compact cars may reduce gasoline tax revenue by as much as 3 percent during the 1961–63 period.

I feel that North Carolinians are already overburdened with heavy and excessive gasoline taxes. There is no doubt in my mind that they expect the temporary one-fourth cent of Federal tax, amounting to $14.6 million annually, to be removed next June 30. This was rather forcefully brought to my attention during the month of November when a group of businessmen from my district approached me with signatures of some 20,000 motorists from my district and asked that I do my part in keeping the one-fourth cent temporary. It is my understanding that some 310,000

motorists across the State signed such petitions. This, to me, is a mandate.

In addition to this, I personally can see no justification whatever for penalizing the motorists with the continuation of this temporary tax as long as $1.7 billion of automotive user tax revenues are diverted annually to the general fund of the U.S. Treasury.

In view of the plight of the North Carolina motorist and the excessive amount of diversion taking place on the national level, I strongly feel that the temporary fourth penny of Federal tax on gasoline should be dropped as promised on June 30, 1961.

Automobiles and trucks are not luxuries; they are necessities, playing an increasingly important part in the economic life of America. All taxes assessed against the users of our highways and on automotive equipment should be set aside and specifically earmarked for highway construction and maintenance purposes.

I am informed that representatives of the Interstate Commerce Commission are of the opinion that the imposition of higher taxes on the trucking industry will result in a loss of business that may be expected to substantially offset any gain in the total tax return. The practice of diverting highway user taxes to the U.S. Treasury should be reversed, if necessary to expedite our highway program, and the Treasury should contribute from the general fund because of the recognized benefits accruing from the program to nonhighway users.

I strongly favor a national highway program and would even support an expanded program properly financed on a pay as we go basis from highway user taxes, provided such taxes are used for highway purposes and not urban renewal.

In conclusion, it is appropriate to observe that the pending bill is presented to us under a closed rule that precludes amendments.

My vote against this bill should not be construed as opposition to a national highway program if soundly financed and administered. I would gladly support such a program.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6713 amendments to the Highway Act providing for the continuation of this gigantic and most important program. Upon the enactment of this legislation the highway program will be kept on schedule with a completion date set for 1972.

Mr. Chairman, we could talk for days concerning the need for keeping this program on schedule but I think the most compelling reason is to provide, as quickly as possible, four-lane interstate turnpikes in order to cut down on our high fatality rate. Last year we killed 38,000 of our friends and neighbors in accidents on American highways and the direct property damage in accidents is estimated to have cost upward of $7 billion. Mr. Chairman, if highway casualties were placed in funeral hearses lined up, the procession would reach from my district in Illinois to Washington, D.C. This is tragic because adequate highways will reduce these tragedies to an estimated one-third of the present number when the system is completed. There are those who say the program should go slower—that we should wait. These arguments should be ignored because they are certainly not true. By passing this legislation we can meet the challenge of our changing times.

No one wants to levy unnecessary taxes; however, this bill will not overburden the motor vehicle users. We do not increase taxes for passenger cars under the present levy. It is true that a 1-cent gasoline tax reduction is scheduled to go into effect on July 1. However, it is my firm belief that if this tax were allowed to expire the motor vehicle users would not receive any reduction—it would probably be absorbed by the oil companies or the filling station operators. The slight increase to the interstate trucker will be more than compensated for when the Interstate System is completed because this segment of motor vehicle users will benefit the most from these four-lane interstate turnpikes. A trucker will save great amounts of money in wear and tear on his truck, less fuel from starts and stops, and shorter distances between hauling points—all which will give him speed in transporting his goods coupled with safe and economical service. Mr. Chairman, now that we have this program rolling we must not only continue at our present rate but we should accelerate the program wherever possible. To do this takes vast sums of money. This year the Federal share to States was $2,200 million. This includes the $724 million advance release by the President for the last quarter of this fiscal year ending June 30.

My district in southern Illinois is receiving their fair share of these funds and I can assure my colleagues that not only do my people appreciate this program and are willing to pay for it, but it is a lifesaver for hundreds of people who are unemployed and will be able to receive jobs in the construction of Interstate 57, the Chicago to New Orleans segment of the Interstate System.

In closing I want to congratulate our subcommittee chairman on roads, Mr. FALLON, and my colleagues on the House Committee on Public Works for the time and effort that has been spent to give America the greatest public works program ever written. I also want to thank my friend Mr. MILLS, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the members of his great committee for their leadership and help in providing the financing section of this act. I am sure when this program has been completed the American people will say—thanks, a job well done.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, all of us who come from districts where trucking is a major enterprise, must feel a sense of gratitude toward the reasonable approach taken by the Ways and Means Committee in drafting the Highway Act of 1961. It is a much fairer proposal than we had any reason to expect 2 months ago.

Frankly, I was stunned by the proposals of the Commerce Department, and I said so in no uncertain terms. They were discriminatory against the trucking industry which has become a popular whipping boy for many reasons having little to do with trucking, and additionally, on the natural but unscientific grounds that trucks take up a lot of room on the highway.

Popular as this pastime may be with politicians seeking the motorist vote, these big rigs, the diesels, services, and combinations are the economic lifeline of many congressional districts, including mine in northern California.

I am convinced that these large rigs are paying their share of highway costs. It has been an easy but unsupported assumption that the trucking industry is not paying its way. An important national study is now in the final stages of preparation to tell us who does what to who on the highways. There is strong evidence already that it will dispel the popular political myth that trucks are tearing up our highways and doing it without paying their share.

There is evidence to show that it is the commuter traffic in our big cities which gets the free ride. Highway construction around our metropolitan areas has become fantastically expensive, and this is where the big money is being spent. Statistics show that trucks are a low percentage of travel on these superhighways.

Yet, we do not oppose such construction. We are for it. Just as we favor the Interstate Highway System though not a mile of it lies in my congressional district. All we are saying is that the easy pastime of kicking the trucking industry should cease until there has been an opportunity to look at the facts.

Frankly, I put into question the entire justification for our present highway financing methods. What private corporation would put up a multi-million-dollar plant with cash from current earnings? A corporation executive would be fired tomorrow if he proposed such an unwise, imprudent scheme. Yet, this is what we have in our highway trust fund, which is ironically being sold to us as wonderfully sound, even though the reverse is the case. And in the name of this so-called soundness, the Bureau of Public Roads would saddle the trucking industry with confiscatory taxes, an industry already precariously balanced between red ink and razor-thin profit margins. What is more, the Bureau of the Budget opposed transferring important truck taxes amounting to $800 million from the general fund to the highway trust fund on the grounds it would unbalance the budget. This is all very well, but they cannot at the same time boast about their pay-as-you-go scheme only to withhold the pay to keep us going by changing it into a soak-as-you-go for the trucking industry.

Senator Randolph Collier, chairman of the California Senate Committee on Transportation, has certainly put his

finger on the basic defect in this so-called sound highway fund when he said:

> In the final analysis, we must recognize that the more centralized our highway financing become, the more approximate and crude will be our highway user tax programs. The chasm between tax payments and highway expenditures becomes almost too wide to bridge at the Federal level.

Well and truly said, senator. One cannot read the hearings on this bill without wondering how the balancing act can ever be equitably accomplished. What looks so good in theory, on paper, and sounds so good saying pay-as-you-go from the speaker's rostrum, bogs down right now when you start putting it into effect. In the midst of all the confusion the truckers are in a fair way to get gored unmercifully.

And this particularly applies to the West. Again referring to Senator Collier, California pays 9.7 percent of the taxes to finance Federal highway programs, and get back 8.7 percent of the funds. This is going to get worse with an ever-broadening spread before it gets better. Right now, this amounts to $100 million a year, not an unconsiderable sum.

When we narrow the focus to trucks, the real discrimination becomes crystal clear. The Pacific coast has 45 percent of all the heavy trucks of our United States. Thus, we clearly pay a disproportionate share of the user taxes, over what we receive in return. Further, the provision to tax trucks on the basis of gross weight, and to increase this tax from $1.50 to $3 is discriminatory for several reasons: First, rarely do trucks travel fully loaded, but they will be taxed as though they were; second, no evidence has been submitted to support the $3 figure. It has been taken blind out of the barrel.

Again, I would say that there is little complaint on our part about these matters in spite of popular discrimination. We understand the need for finances. We understand the difficulty to exactly balance all of the competing interests.

What we do stoutly complain of is the continual attacks and misunderstanding in the face of these facts; and the continual efforts to worsen our situation.

So, as I said at the outset of my remarks, it is with considerable pleasure that we record the actions of the Ways and Means Committee in looking at the facts, in shunning the course of action which might have been more politically popular, to present us with a bill which we can honestly and decently support.

THE INEQUITABLE CONTINUATION OF 1-CENT TEMPORARY GAS TAX

There is one portion of the bill which, it does not seem to me, meets any test we can support. It is most regrettable that the closed rule under which this bill is coming to us for consideration, gives us no opportunity to delete it from the bill. This is the continuation of the temporary 1-cent Federal gas tax. This strikes me as grossly inequitable and unfair. We were told on its original imposition that it was strictly temporary, that it was designed merely to get over the hump of our pay-as-you-go financing. The hump appears to be growing in size instead of diminishing. It will continue to grow, let us be assured of that. It is proof positive of the unsoundness of a pay-as-you-go program which is no such thing; but rather, a soak-as-you-go and a fall-further-behind-as-you-go.

And who pays the piper for this unconscionable system? Local government does, county government, city government. The counties of my district, for example. This is doubly burdensome. At the very moment when the counties of my district are straining with inadequate revenues, when unemployment and economic distress threaten their future, one of the comparatively few sources of financing—the gas tax—is denied them by this continued Federal imposition. This is not right.

I am talking specifically about the three northern counties of the First Congressional District in California, Del Norte, Humboldt, and Mendocino Counties. These counties have unemployment rates of 15 percent to 22 percent. They are counties in which lumber is the principal industry. With steep ravines, small upland valleys, heavy rainfall, and serious flood damage almost every year, road construction is expensive, road maintenance an onerous burden.

These counties are expending every ounce of effort locally to keep abreast of their road problem. With heavy Federal ownership of land, their tax base is precariously low. In spite of these factors, the county supervisors are ceaselessly at work on the problem. Humboldt County with 44 cents on $100 has the highest road tax in the State of California. This county has never recovered from the 1955 floods, and paying for damage incurred at that time has haunted all county activity in all fields ever since.

In light of this the continued imposition of the extra 1-cent Federal tax has been a real blow to local government. The Federal gas tax was supposed to drop from 4 cents to 3. This bill continues it at 4 cents.

Now, I have heard it said that my complaint is really not justifiable at all. It is said that if we should lower the Federal gas tax 1 cent that local government would divert such savings to other purposes than roadbuilding. Well, I can only speak for my own counties, but I say this would not happen. On the basis of present conduct, it would not be true. We are road conscious in these counties, because the road network is the string which ties our entire local economy together. But even if it should be true in some other area, is it not about time that the Federal Government with its vastly superior sources of tax revenue, eased off in those very few tax areas which county government has available to it if it is to perform its functions? I say that we should. We should lay off county government. I say the continued imposition of this 1-cent tax is iniquitous, and I regret there is no opportunity to vote on the matter because of the closed rule.

Now, there is another thing said by exponents of the continuation of the additional 1-cent gas tax. They say that the Federal Government is already paying most of the local road construction bill. Again, I can only speak for my own counties. In Humboldt County, local and State governments spent last year $2,531,800 on county roads. The Federal Government spent $273,020, but this was for flood damage repair. In Mendocino County, last year local and State government spent $1,310,780 against the Federal expenditure, again for flood control, $198,911. In Del Norte County, State and local government spent $365,955 with the Federal Government spending $250,576.

We do not derogate these very substantial Federal contributions. We are most appreciative of the assistance rendered. On the other hand, I do not feel we come as a suppliant to the United States for these moneys. They are appropriately ours, as our share of the national tax dollar. These Federal grants are made possible by the superior taxing powers of the Federal Government. In equity, a portion of that amount belongs to Humboldt, Mendocino, and Del Norte Counties just as a portion belongs to Los Angeles or New York City. We seek to penalize no one, realizing we are all in this together, and will sink or swim together.

On the other hand, there is no justification for saying, at least as far as my counties are concerned, that the amplitude of the Federal contribution is overwhelming, and hence the extra Federal gas tax of 1 cent should be continued. The figures do not indicate this to me. The figures offer to me additional evidence that this gas tax should be returned to the States and localities.

It is iniquitous. It is bad faith with the pledges we made here a few brief months ago. I regret that we will have no chance to sever it from what is otherwise a fair and equitable resolution of a most perplexing problem.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, no person today can deny the critical need for substantial improvement in both our primary and secondary road systems. The transportation requirements of the country today demand we do everything possible and within reason to meet these present day requirements. However, despite this demand and the essential need for giving attention to it, one like myself is concerned about the heavy burden we are placing upon the users of the highways for the cost of this program and its possible effects on some of our commerce and some parts of our general economy. I hope it will not be too boresome and will not be an oversimplification if I allude briefly to my own congressional district made up of substantial industrial developments and substantial agricultural developments in an area composed of 18 counties. More than one-third of the counties in the district I represent must depend upon truck transportation for commerce and travel to and from employment. Liter-

ally thousands, more than 10,000, of the wage-earning people in that area must pay heavily on the cost of this program through taxes they pay on the gasoline they purchase. In this connection I want to read briefly from a letter which was sent to me recently by a very distinguished attorney, in which he says that a small trucking operation in the district composed of nine trucks driving over the same 70-mile stretch, none of which is in this Interstate System and the operator of these nine trucks has to pay an annual tax of $4,422.98, but that under the additional financing program his taxes would be increased to $5,471, or an increase of about 22.87 percent in taxes.

Surely we want and must have roads, but is it not the best judgment to stretch out the development of these roads over a period that will not burden the small businessman, the small trucking establishment that is serving a vital part of our economy? And is it not well to take notice of the fact that many of the wage earners of this country are going to find heavy increases in the cost of transportation if this goes into effect?

When we get back into the House, Mr. Chairman, I shall ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter, together with certain charts and tables to support my own remarks.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Statement taken from the actual records of a trucking operation headquartered in Georgia which operates 9 tractor-trailer units using diesel fuel

Types of taxes	Actual taxes paid in 1960	Under proposed increases, taxes would have been	Amount of increase	Percentage increase
Fuel and oil taxes	$32,959.18	$40,314.79	$7,355.61	22.32
Vehicle licenses, fees, and use taxes	2,315.48	4,065.48	1,750.00	75.58
Property taxes	562.50	562.50	None	None
Social security taxes	3,969.64	3,969.64	None	None
Total	39,806.80	48,912.41	9,105.61	22.87
Taxes paid by 1 truck	4,422.98	5,434.71	1,011.73	

NOTE.—These trucks operate over the same 70-mile stretch of highway, none of which is on the Interstate System. Thus, for the use of each mile of highway, each truck now pays yearly $631.84 per mile per truck. Under the proposed increase, each truck would pay yearly $776.36 per mile per truck. Under the proposed increase, these 9 trucks would pay additional taxes over 10-year period of $91,056.10. Under the proposed increase, these 9 trucks would pay total taxes over 10-year period of $489,124.10. Under the accounting system employed by the above company, certain taxes are not segregated; therefore, the above figures do not include any amounts for (1) State sales taxes; (2) Federal excise taxes on purchase of equipment; (3) existing or proposed taxes on tires and rubber. Obviously, the above figures would be increased considerably by the inclusion of these additional taxes.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARSHA].

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, the interstate highway program is providing an unprecedented economic growth, not for any special group but for all Americans who in our complex society must daily depend for their existence on the rapid and safe moving of people and goods from place to place.

This dynamic highway program had to be created to break the traffic snarls and bottlenecks that were slowly but surely strangling a large segment of the American economy.

I am in full accord with the program and with the results that we all hope will be achieved by such a system; however, I cannot agree with the financing proposals in this bill.

Motorists across the Nation are paying much more in special automotive taxes to the Federal Government than they are getting back from that Government in the form of so-called highway aid. This situation is nothing new. It has existed ever since this mammoth interstate highway effort got underway in 1956.

During the first 4 years of this program, your constituents and mine paid some $14.5 billion in special Federal taxes on the ownership and use of their motor vehicles. However, only 57 percent of that huge sum—or about $8.5 billion—was actually used for the highway program. Fully 43 percent of all these special Federal levies were used for purposes completely unrelated to highways.

To compound the inequity of this situation, more than 80 percent of the revenue that was channeled into the financing of this largest public works program in human history came from the Federal tax on a single product—motor fuel.

I submit that this lopsided method of financing can put this whole program in jeopardy in the future. We cannot keep turning to the gasoline tax, time after time, year after year, to bail the highway trust fund out of its recurring financial difficulties when we are not even tapping all the other revenue that should be used for roads. Let us not forget for 1 minute that motorists are also paying a stiff bill in gasoline and other special automobile taxes at the State level. In the same year that the so-called temporary fourth cent of the Federal gasoline tax was enacted, the motorists in my home State were hit with a 2-cent increase in the State gasoline tax rate. In Ohio, the combined Federal and State gasoline tax of 11 cents per gallon is equivalent to a 50-percent sales tax on the produce. But at least in Ohio we can say that all the special highway user taxes are used for highways. Unfortunately, those of us here today cannot say the same thing with regard to the Federal highway user taxes.

The first Federal gasoline tax, in 1932 was temporary. It stayed so until 1941, when it became permanent. In 1951, to help finance the Korean war, it was raised to 2 cents, temporarily. The 1956 increase to 3 cents, for the duration of the highway program was temporary. So is the current 4-cent rate.

Now the temporary 4-cent tax is to be extended by this bill until September 1972. What then, another temporary extension?

It seems to me that this should be the year when we face up to the issue squarely and keep faith with the millions of motorists in this great Nation. The responsible course for us to follow would be to apply to the road program the portions of the automobile and parts taxes as called for by the 1959 legislation. The faithful course would be to allow the fourth cent of the Federal gasoline tax to terminate as scheduled on June 30 and to use the methods provided for in the existing legislation to finance this program.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, may I call the attention of the Members to the fact that during the past week both the President and the Secretary of Commerce have made public reference to the importance of keeping our great Federal-State highway program on schedule.

In proclaiming May 21–27 as National Highway Week, President Kennedy said that an adequate highway network "is indispensable to traffic safety, to the growth of our economy, and to the national defense."

In a statement following the President's proclamation, Secretary of Commerce Hodges said:

> The annual cost of our present highway inadequacies is staggering in terms of dollars and tragic in terms of human life and suffering. We must not take our highways for granted, like the air we breathe.

As a member of the House Committee on Public Works, of the Subcommittee on Roads, and of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, I would like to add a few words to those of the President and the Secretary.

The urgent need to complete our National System of Interstate and Defense Highways on schedule in 1972 can hardly be overstated. To take one example, a new study by the Automobile Manufacturers Association indicates that a 3-year stretchout of the program would cost as many as 10,000 lives. Of course, human life and suffering cannot be measured in dollars and cents. But it is possible to place a monetary value on other effects of a stretchout. The same study shows that highway users would pay needless penalties in accidents, vehicle operating costs, and other items totaling $10 billion if the program were extended to 1975.

It is obvious from this and other studies conducted by the Bureau of Public Roads, the States, and other public and private agencies that savings to the American people in lives, dollars, and time will far exceed the cost of the Interstate System.

A word as to the cost. The Bureau of Public Roads submitted to the Congress in January a new estimate of the cost of completing the Interstate System. The

figure of $41 billion, including $37 billion of Federal funds, confirms the previous estimate developed in 1958–59. The new Federal Highway Administrator, Mr. Rex M. Whitton, has called it "a good sound estimate" and he is thoroughly familiar with the detail that went into its preparation. I am convinced that, barring some unforeseen circumstance, it is a sound basis for the development of long-range financing.

I should point out in passing that we already have more than one-fourth of the Interstate System in use—about 10,600 miles—and another 4,400 miles are in various stages of construction. It is important, I think, to point out that we do not have to wait for completion of the entire 41,000-mile network to realize substantial benefits. The open segments are paying enormous dividends every day. A 10-mile section near Des Moines, Iowa, is saving motorists $1.4 million a year; a 6-mile section near St. Louis is chalking up direct savings to users of $1,100,000 a year; a 21-mile section in Michigan is saving $3 million a year. As the President said in his vigorous special message on highways of February 28:

> A study, for example, of a 16-mile section of the Schuylkill Expressway in the Philadelphia area showed direct savings to motorists of over $18 million per year, enough to pay the entire cost in 3 years. Even less tangible, but equally important, are the widened horizons a modern highway network affords the individual and the family—greater recreational opportunities, greater freedom of choice in places to live, work, and play—and less time and effort spent in getting there.

I have gone into some detail on the value and the potential of the Interstate System because this is our basic highway transportation network that will carry more than 20 percent of the traffic. However, it depends for its efficiency on the connecting and feeder routes, the urban arterials and the farm-to-market roads that make up what we call the A–B–C program. The Interstate System alone would be somewhat like a network of transcontinental pipelines, without the necessary local outlets.

We must, therefore, have a balanced highway program, keeping the improvement of the primary and secondary roads and their urban extensions in pace with work on the Interstate System. I come from a State which is largely rural and heavily dependent on the modernization of the A–B–C roads. I am proud to say that since July 1, 1956, we in Alabama have completed construction on 3,700 miles of these roads. I am also proud that Alabama ranks third among all the States in the Nation in the use of Federal funds available for A–B–C work.

We in the Congress are now taking a careful look at the Federal-aid highway program to determine its future speed and direction. If we solve the financing problem, I am confident that the Interstate System will be completed by 1972, the target year. And I am equally confident that the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments, working together as they have done since 1916, can meet the challenge of creating the network of roads we need to meet the needs of national defense, commerce, and the ever-increasing ranks of the traveling public.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled to object to the financing provisions of H.R. 6713. I say this because it is now apparent that the expenditures for this highway program have gone far beyond those originally represented to us when the 1956 act was enacted.

Originally, we made a commitment to finance a $25 billion Federal program. Now we are being asked to provide revenues that approximate $37 billion.

One of the things I notice is that the big increase in this program has been due to the unanticipated cost of going through the larger cities—such as my own city of Omaha.

In analyzing this, I must say that it looks like we are now being asked to raise taxes to meet the requirements of local urban needs. It appears that the benefits of these tax increases are primarily for the city residents. This program now envisions taking care of commuting traffic instead of true interstate traffic—therefore relieving the municipalities of their primary responsibilities.

This was not the concept of the Interstate System originally presented to us in 1956. We were then acting on a program to serve interstate traffic by connecting the principal cities of the Nation.

The Federal Government, of course, has an interest in developing urban highways in our country and does so in our regular Federal highway-aid program on a 50–50 matching basis. However, I suspect it is not fair to saddle the extreme Federal costs involved in a 90–10 city interstate program throughout our rural areas and the small towns in the country through the use of the Federal tax collecting powers.

Because much of the increased statements of cost lie in the area of building interstate highways through and around metropolitan areas—resulting in demands for higher levies to be imposed on our taxpaying motorists—I cannot support the measure under consideration.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday when we were considering H.R. 6441, the antipollution bill, the minority wished to offer for your consideration certain key amendments which we felt were worthy of your support and would, if adopted, strengthen this Nation's attack on the problem of polluted waters. Those amendments were complex and difficult to explain, let alone to encourage your support thereof, but our time in which to try to do that was severely limited.

Now, lo and behold, some 24 hours later, we are provided with 6 whole hours, courtesy of the new Rules Committee, within which to debate the merits of H.R. 6713, an act which, according to its title, will make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program.

But what is there to debate? Although we were promised, some weeks ago, the opportunity of working our will on every piece of legislation that would thenceforth come before us, H.R. 6713 is presented under a gag rule that prohibits amendments of any kind. All we can do, in the end, is to vote "Yes" or to vote "No," and, before that, to utilize our time to explain, if we can, why we are so voting.

Well, if you are interested, I am going to vote "No" on H.R. 6713, and here are my reasons why.

If you will turn to page 12 of the committee report, you will find four short paragraphs devoted to the question of reimbursement for State-constructed free and toll roads incorporated into the Interstate System. I am grateful to the committee for making mention of that subject, having done my best to again focus its attention on this perennial issue. However, despite my complete confidence in the good faith and the support of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], my experience in late 1959, when the House struck out of H.R. 8678—86th Congress—a section dealing with this question of reimbursement, convinced me that, unless and until those of us who believe in the principle of reimbursement take a firmer stand in favor of that principle, the Congress will continue on, like so many Scarlett O'Haras, content to worry about this problem tomorrow.

At the risk of boring some of you, let me go over the same old ground again for the benefit of the newcomers.

As the committee report before you mentions, some 10,440 miles of the Interstate System are now open to traffic, and work is going forth, on schedule, toward the completion of the balance of the system. This is a record of success in which we can all take pride, but the pride felt by some of us is diminished by the fact that a substantial portion of that completed mileage to which we point with pride was actually built by certain of our more progressive States, either as free or as toll highways, before passage of the 1956 act. Included in the above-mentioned completed mileage of 10,440 miles, as the report further says, are some 2,264 miles of such previously constructed toll roads, including, of course, New York's Thruway.

The following is a rough sequence of events showing how this came about:

First. In 1947, Congress approved the so-called interstate network, allotting a total of 40,000 miles to the various States, New York being allotted 1,227 miles.

Second. For 9 years, there was no further congressional action and certain of the more-populous States, deciding that they could not afford to wait for congressional favors, set about on the construction of their urgently needed turnpikelike highways, most of which were so costly that the States could only build them on a toll-road, revenue-bond basis. New York started its $1 billion Thruway

in 1948 and completed it in 1958, and other States followed suit in varying degrees.

Third. The so-called Clay Commission, which was set up by the previous administration to study the Nation's highway needs, recognized this factor and, stating that the national objective being to get roads built in whatever fashion, suggested in effect that these progressive States should not be discouraged from so going ahead on their own, building toll or free roads that might fit into the interstate network, and that they should eventually be reimbursed for any such mileage that might later on be taken into the Interstate System.

Fourth. Finally, in 1956, Congress passed the Federal-Aid Highway Act and created the trust fund we seek to replenish today, in order to finance the construction of the original 40,000 interstate miles plus another 1,000 then added by the other body.

Fifth. Since it was obviously unwise to then build parallel interstate mileage alongside any existing toll or free road that met interstate standards and could fit into the interstate network, the various States that had so gone ahead on their own were encouraged to take such action as might be necessary to have their so-qualified highways "incorporated" into the Interstate System. In New York's case such incorporated mileage amounted to 588.8 miles, most of it in our throughway, and our originally allotted interstate mileage was accordingly reduced from the original 1,227 miles to only 658.2 miles.

At this point, a brief legislative review might be helpful. In 1955 in the 84th Congress, H.R. 4260—the prototype of the eventual 1956 act—provided, section 207, for credits for then-existing toll or free State highways that might measure up to interstate standards and thus could become incorporated into the proposed Interstate System. Although extensive hearings were held on this and companion measures, no final House action was obtained. In 1956, however, the House Committee on Public Works, after further hearings, favorably reported out H.R. 8836, which, when the tax provisions emanating from the Ways and Means Committee were added, was superseded by H.R. 10660 that eventually became law and is now known as the Federal-Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956.

In both H.R. 8836, and H.R. 10660 as passed by the House, appeared section 109 which provided as follows:

SEC. 109. Declaration of Policy With Respect to Reimbursement for Certain Highways.

It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to equitably reimburse those States for any portion of a highway which is on the Interstate System, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957, and such highway meets the standards required by this title for the Interstate System. The time, method, and amounts of such reimbursement shall be determined by the Congress following a study which the Secretary of Commerce is herey authorized and directed to conduct, in cooperation with the State highway departments, and other agencies as may be required, to determine which highways in the Interstate System measure up to the standards required by this title, including all related factors of cost, depreciation, participation of Federal funds, and any other items relevant thereto. A complete report of the results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958. It is also declared to be the policy and intent of the Congress to provide funds necessary to make such reimbursements to the States as may be determined.

H.R. 10660, in this form, passed the House on April 27, 1956. In summary, then, both the House committee and the House went on record as favoring the principle of reimbursement, although, as stated then in the committee report—page 11—it was recognized that there was not then sufficient information available to Congress to permit it to determine the time, method, and amount of such reimbursement.

When H.R. 10660 reached the other body, however, its Committee on Public Works was opposed to reimbursement and deleted section 109. After the other body adopted H.R. 10660, with that deletion and other amendments, the bill went to conference, and there a new section was added in place of the original House version of section 109, as follows:

SEC. 114. Determination of Policy With Respect to Reimbursement for Certain Highways

It is hereby declared to be the intent and policy of the Congress to determine whether or not the Federal Government should equitably reimburse any State for a portion of a highway which is on the Interstate System, whether toll or free, the construction of which has been completed subsequent to August 2, 1947, or which is either in actual use or under construction by contract for completion, awarded not later than June 30, 1957: *Provided*, That such highway meets the standards required by this title for the Interstate System. The time, method, and amounts of such reimbursement, if any, shall be determined by the Congress following a study which the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to conduct, in cooperation with the State highway departments, and other agencies as may be required, to determine which highways in the Interstate System measure up to the standards required by this title, including all related factors of cost, depreciation, participation of Federal funds, and any other items relevant thereto. A complete report of the results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within 10 days subsequent to January 2, 1958.

That conference report was accepted, and, as above mentioned, H.R. 10660 eventually became law.

If you have followed the foregoing, you will thus see that the House has already once gone on record as favoring the principle of reimbursement, but then bowed to the will of the other body by agreeing, in essence, to take another look at that question when the Congress could be provided with more detailed information.

And there the matter has rested, although Congress now has the full benefit of the above-mentioned 1958 report—House Document No. 301, 85th Congress, 2d session—furnishing comprehensive data concerning the mileage of those toll and free highways, bridges, and tunnels, or portions thereof, eligible for consideration for such reimbursement, their cost and depreciation, and the Federal-aid payments already made thereon, from which the net reimbursable dollar amounts due the various States can be determined. In addition, we have the somewhat dubious benefit of a subsequent report submitted by the Secretary of Commerce on February 1, 1959, pursuant to Public Law 85–845, which suggests two alternative proposals for a reimbursement formula which, in my judgment, are not generally acceptable to most of the representatives from the reimbursable States.

In case any of you are still interested, that report by the Secretary of Commerce is known as Committee Print No. 1, of the Committee on Public Works, 86th Congress, 1st session, under the title of "Proposed Formulas for the Reimbursement of the States by the Federal Government for the Cost of Certain Highways on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways." The then Secretary of Commerce balked at recommending either of those two formulas, the chief reason being, of course, the cost of reimbursement, namely, $4,295 million, coming at a time when, as we all know, the estimated cost of completing the rest of the interstate network is far in excess of the anticipated revenues that will be available to the trust fund unless legislation such as that contained in H.R. 6713 now before us is adopted.

Nevertheless, I would like to once again point out that the magnitude of the financial problems we face would be approximately $4,295 million greater than it is today but for the vision displayed by those several States who have furnished, gratis so far, interstate mileage for the use by the rest of the Nation.

Now, of course, New York is the principal victim of this unjust and inequitable situation. Our reimbursable mileage, both toll and free, based on a 1959 study by the Bureau of Public Roads as adjusted for depreciation and any Federal moneys advanced thereon, amounts to $799.1 million. Illinois comes next with $410.7 million, then New Jersey with $298.8 million, Pennsylvania with $287 million, and so on, with every State except Alaska and Hawaii being a "loser" in some degree. This inequity is compounded for New York by the fact that, since interstate funds are allocated each year on the basis of State-by-State cost for completing the network, our annual allocation is reduced and stretched out by virtue of the fact that our mileage, when the throughway is thrown in, is more than half complete.

This dilemma will apparently continue on after today's action, since our overriding national financial problem will probably continue to get worse instead of better. Now, I am realistic enough not to suppose that the other body, where the votes of the representatives of the States having the greatest interest in reimbursement are canceled out by the votes from the less interested

States, is about to vote to give New York $799.1 million or additional interstate mileage equivalent in cost to such an amount. Not, at least, before all the remaining interstate mileage is completed sometime around the 1972 target date.

However, in simple justice, the Congress can and should, without further delay, pass legislation such as that proposed in my bill, H.R. 1076, which merely proposes to establish the intent of Congress—reestablish that intent insofar as the House is concerned—to reimburse each State for whatever mileage it may have contributed to the Interstate System without the benefit of 90–10 Federal moneys, freezes the State-by-State reimbursable figures as they were determined by that 1959 Bureau of Roads study, and postpones for later congressional action, perhaps not even until just before 1972, the determinations that will have to be made regarding the time, manner, and method of providing such reimbursement.

It is especially important, if the principle of eventual reimbursement is an equitable one, to so freeze those reimbursable figures as, otherwise, 10 or 12 years from now when the ravages of further depreciation may have eroded those study figures, actual reimbursement could become a very empty gesture, indeed.

Now, it does not seem to me that this is a great deal to ask. We came close to getting this much in 1959, as I mentioned, when such a section, paralleling the language of a comparable bill I had introduced in the 86th Congress, was included in H.R. 8678 only to be deleted on the House floor. This approach costs us nothing, at least for the time being. It would not add one iota to our present trust fund burdens. But it would go a long way toward justifying the faith that the people of the State of New York, for instance, have had in the wisdom and sense of fair play that I know exists abundantly in the Congress of the United States.

Even though it is my hope and expectation that my committee will give its earnest consideration to this collateral problem later on in this Congress, I cannot bring myself to vote for any additional taxes on highway users from the State of New York unless and until positive action to erase this inequity has been taken. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I have reluctantly concluded that, despite my earnest desire to see the Federal highway program go forward, I must vote "no" on H.R. 6713.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING], a member of the committee.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished colleague, Mr. ROBISON, in calling the committee's attention to the fact that the State of New York, at some time, should be reimbursed for the thruway inasmuch as we in New York had enough foresight to construct and complete an adequate throughway before the Federal-aid highway program went into effect.

There are several States, my own being the principal victim, which have been inadvertently penalized for its progress and leadership in constructing its own thruway system. While we are proud of this achievement and have appreciated the many excellent benefits and advantages this system has brought to our State, we are, nevertheless, being denied reimbursement by the Federal Government because our program has already been completed.

In addition, we are receiving reduced allocations of Federal interstate funds each year since such funds are granted on the basis of cost to complete the system, and our share, including the throughway, is nearer completion than most others.

Federal Highway No. 87, which in the State of New York is referred to as the Northway, will extend for approximately 300 miles entirely within the confines of my congressional district. I wish to go on record in support of the Federal-aid highway program because I have assured the residents of my district that I would exert every effort to see that the Northway was completed on time. There may be many objections to the specific tax formula used in order to complete this highway program on time but in my opinion, if the people really want good highways, they should be willing to pay for them.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Roads [Mr. FALLON] for the fine job done on this bill, also the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss one or two aspects of the committee report and also reply to the question asked by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

I trust that the subcommittee established as a watchdog subcommittee on Federal highway construction will be continued throughout the life of the highway program to assure continuation of sound practices, getting rid of corruption where it is found to exist, and retaining the integrity of the program, which is essential.

This year, of course, the Congress did appropriate adequate funds for its work, and, likewise, by resolution approved its continuance throughout this session. I hope that will be the case in the future. It has had a salutary effect, and I hope it will fully observe its duty in the future to bring to light any and all instances of wrongdoing that might be brought to the attention of the subcommittee in order to retain the overall integrity of the program. Much has been done by the subcommittee to retain this integrity. For instance, through the cooperation of the Bureau of Public Roads, it has been brought to the attention of all State administrators and employees that it is a Federal crime to attempt to or to actually incorrectly make inspections, to falsify reports and tests, or to purposely commit wrongdoing with regard to those inspections. It is a Federal as well as a State crime.

Likewise, improvements in right-of-way procedures have taken place. States have been put on notice—it has actually been put into effect in one instance—that the Federal Government, through the Bureau of Public Roads, will attempt to recoup any funds from contractors where wrongdoing has been shown to exist, where the result is the taxpayers will lose money.

The Bureau of Public Roads has the authority to withhold funds in those instances until they are recouped or proper action taken.

Likewise, inspections themselves have been improved, the inspection as a whole. Salutary and sound effects have thus resulted from the activities of the subcommittee thus far.

There is another subject I want to briefly comment on. If you will look at page 12 of the report, you will see a reference to reimbursement for State-constructed free and toll roads incorporated in the Interstate System. This or a similar provision has been contained in all recent highway legislation. The reason I want to comment on that is, and I trust that the situation is not prevalent, as exists for instance in the State of Florida, where apparently the State administration as the result possibly of this clause being contained in the legislation year after year has gathered what I believe is a false impression that the Congress sometime in the near future will make available $4.4 billion and will add that to the cost of this program, which would be the result if reimbursement of tolls and freeways were accomplished. As a result of taking that for granted, some States, I feel, are going forward with plans for injecting toll sections into the Interstate System in contemplation of the Congress at a future date handing out this extra money or handing them an equivalent number of miles equal to that amount of money. I say that so far as I am personally concerned as a member of the subcommittee, I have in the past and will in the future, even though there is some toll mileage involved in my own State, oppose any effort to provide reimbursement for toll facilities unless that money is used for paying off the indebtedness, for paying off the bonds and for making those toll roads free or unless assurances are given that such toll sections will be free and provision is satisfactorily made therefor.

Otherwise it is my belief that the basic concept of the free flow of traffic, particularly as it relates to defense, cannot be accomplished properly as envisioned under the bill itself as initially passed and as evidenced in the present law under section 301, which states, "except as provided in section 129 of this title with respect to certain toll bridges and toll tunnels," that is, the limitation of highways constructed under the provisions of this title, "shall be free from tolls of all kinds." That is the basic concept as contained in the basic act. I believe in it. I intend to support it.

Now, in the State of Florida, as an example, there is a proposal to inject a

70-mile stretch toll trap into what is now Interstate 75, incidentally serving my district, on the west coast of Florida, which I think is being considered under the assumption, which I believe to be false, that if that is done, some day in the future they will get equal money or equal mileage back. And, I take this time for the purpose of saying that so far as I am concerned I do not believe that will happen. I personally would oppose it, and the States, if they are planning on that basis, they are planning erroneously. Likewise, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 6324, for the purpose of retaining the basic concept of the act. It being a free road—that is what the taxpayers are paying for in the first place—they should not be asked to pay twice, once for the toll road when it is in operation and for the original highway construction under this act. I have introduced this bill for the purpose of requiring some congressional supervision over this general problem that would require Congressional approval through the House and the Senate committees anytime in the future a toll facility is being considered for integration into the free system, so that we can take a look at what is happening to the highway system so far as it relates to the injection of toll facilities or toll traps in the highway system in the future.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman I do not have much disagreement with him on the question of reimbursement. As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I introduced an amendment providing for reimbursement. I would say that I agree with him that if you want to give New York a billion dollars to take care of our New York State Thruway, I am for reducing the bonds and paying them off, and I think that should be done.

Mr. CRAMER. That matter will be taken up before our committee, but I do not want the States to be operating under and planning for integration of toll roads into the free system under what I believe to be a false assumption.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join others of this body in commending the chairman of the Committee on Roads, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], for the splendid leadership which he has given to this program, and also to commend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the chairman of the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means, for the long and laborious work which they have devoted to this problem of a financial fix in which we find ourselves and making it possible to get this construction program back on schedule.

I do not want the Members of the House to think that this is my week to disagree with the gentleman from Florida, but I do have some reservations of my own evaluation of his remarks on the subject of reimbursement to the States which have contributed in a very substantial way to the success which we have at this stage in our interstate program. When you evaluate the figures on the more than 10,000 miles that we now claim as completed portions of the Interstate System, you would find that about one-fourth of that mileage consists of turnpikes which have been incorporated into the system.

Now, as of this date the Federal Government has borne no part of the cost for those turnpikes. I think personally that in fairness and in equity the States which have permitted a fixed section of their road systems to be incorporated into the Interstate System did this in their rightful apportionment of Federal funds.

There is no other way to evaluate what has happened in those States. In the case of the State of New York, they have given up literally hundreds of millions of dollars in what would have been allocated to them in Federal funds by permitting the incorporation of the freeways and of the turnpikes in New York into the Interstate System. The same is true of other States across the Nation that have done this—Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Ohio, I think, has a big section that has been incorporated in the Interstate System.

To my way of thinking, it is only fair that these States be reimbursed in some way for this contribution that they have made to a finished Interstate System. Whether that contribution takes the form—and the committee commented to this effect I think appropriately—whether it takes the form of giving to those States additional mileage for construction in the future and permitting them to receive their fair share of Federal funds for that construction, or whether it takes the direction of a reimbursement of funds, is a matter which we still have to decide in the future.

I do not think there is anyone in this Hall today who would dispute the equity of some reimbursement formula for those States. On the question whether or not bonds could be paid off and the turnpikes made free, I think there will be some States where that can be done at bargain rates by the Federal Government and where it should be done. I think there will probably be other States where that will not be the best way to get a dollar's worth of road from the Federal Government out of this money. This is going to be a question which may have to be approached individually in many of the States and individually as to some of the turnpikes. But I am here today to say that I think the committee did a wise thing in recognizing that this is an unfinished problem and in recognizing that we should give attention to it. And while we are operating within financial limitations today that make it impossible to cross that bridge today, I think they are right in saying to the Congress that we are going to have to cross that bridge one of these days if we are to deal fairly with all the States.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman. He and I have been in agreement on this from the time the law was passed. Very few people realize that the interstate road system maps were made up by the Bureau of Public Roads in 1944, and because the gentleman's great State of Oklahoma and the great State of New York and other States could not wait until we could proceed with an Interstate Highway System, we had to go ahead on our own and build our own interstate system. For that we are being penalized today and have been penalized.

The only point on which I am in disagreement is in this respect. This matter has been dragged out for 5 years. It seems to me with all the studies made by the Department of Commerce and others, by this time we should have been able to arrive at some conclusion as to what nature of reimbursement should be made. But I think a determination should be made now, or next year, as to just what we are going to do. We have been waiting 5 years to do it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I agree with the gentleman that at the earliest possible time there should be a decision made.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. I agree almost 100 percent with what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] have said with reference to the matter of reimbursement. But at this time I think we all know that to try to reimburse the States that have built their own roads and freeways would add an additional $4 billion to the cost of the program. We are not in any position, because of the precarious financial condition of the program, to do that at this time. I favor moving forward in this field as soon as we can see daylight.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman that if we are able to secure an upturn in the economy and an increase in revenues to our Federal Government for the trust fund, which we hope to see under the New Frontier administration, we might be able to cross that bridge next year.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, it has been a privilege to serve on the Roads Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works during the past 7 years. It has been a privilege to serve on that committee under the very able chairmanship of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. I have found him to be a very fair and very honorable chairman. I think this has been one of the reasons why all of us who have served on that particular subcommittee have found it such a pleasant and rewarding experience, and also found it a constructive one, to be a part of a subcommittee that has had as its objective

the launching and carrying through of the greatest public works program ever carried through by any nation in the entire world.

This bill provides for the completion of that program by 1972. There are those throughout the country who would like to find some way of carrying through this program without causing anybody to pay for it, but that as a practical matter is impossible. If we are going to build these roads to the proper standard, a four-lane standard, with divided center line and with controlled access, they have to be paid for. This bill is probably as reasonable a means of doing it as any that could be worked out.

This bill provides for additional authorizations of about $11.5 billion to complete this program on schedule. There are many benefits that will result from bringing this program into reality as soon as we can. The cities of this country today are being stifled because of the inability of those cities to take care of the traffic that comes into and out of those cities. Every place that we build a four-lane highway with divided centerline and controlled access, we are aiding those cities to keep alive and we are aiding the people who commute into and out of those cities on the highways to get to their destinations as fast as possible.

We are saving countless lives. The best statistics we have show that on a four-lane divided highway with controlled access the number of deaths per vehicle-mile traveled is cut by two-thirds as compared to the traffic on a two-lane road with no divided centerline and no controlled access. Therefore, this means that when this system is completed we will be saving on the average 4,000 lives per year just because of these improvements being brought into reality, and in addition to the 4,000 lives saved probably 150,000 injuries will be eliminated per year. These could be someone in your family or someone in my family. I want to do everything possible to eliminate these unnecessary casualties that dull the enthusiasm of everyone for driving on our highways today.

This bill likewise will make it possible for our country to grow as it should grow. We are growing in population at a much more rapid rate than was anticipated some years ago. Our people have to move farther to find places to live in relationship to the places they may find to work. These interstate highways are going to be the means whereby they can do this as they can travel a greater number of miles in the same period of time.

Therefore, if you believe in keeping this country alive and allowing our highway system to function, there is no alternative except to vote for this bill to make this program possible and to complete it by the 1972 target date.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make my position with regard to this bill completely clear. I am 100 percent in favor of constructing this Interstate System, and constructing it on schedule. I think we should all realize that these new highways are going to be an important factor in improving highway safety.

Having had the honor and privilege of serving as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I believe I am as keenly conscious as any man can be of the need for maintaining our Nation's defenses at peak capacity. This tremendous system will certainly play a distinctive and vital role in the safeguarding of our Nation.

I do want to say, however, that I will be forced to vote against this bill because of its financing provisions. I cannot condone or support a form of financing for this national defense network which could potentially cause a breakdown in the entire program. At present over 80 percent of this program's gigantic cost is being borne by taxation of one product, and one product alone—gasoline. This tax distortion is made even more severe by the fact that the State governments also tax gasoline, almost all of them at even higher rates than the Federal 4-cent level.

A program as essential to the defense of our country, to the movement of military supplies and troops in an emergency or any time of sudden need, cannot be endangered by overreliance on any single tax source.

I might also mention that during my service as commander of the VFW, I had occasion to travel to many parts of the country and to talk with many representative Americans of all income groups. These people, veterans of our Nation's past wars, are intensely concerned about high taxes. They do not shirk paying their fair share of the cost of their government, any more than they shirked fighting in defense of our country in its hour of need, but they would certainly welcome and could use some tax relief.

A reversion of the Federal gasoline tax to 3 cents per gallon would be welcome to these people and would certainly be an answer to those critics who claim that labeling a tax increase "temporary" is only a device for softening up the taxpayers for a permanent increase in their burden.

I believe we would be strengthening our Nation's defense and the public's faith in this Congress if we allowed the fourth cent of the gasoline tax to expire on schedule.

It is because this bill calls for an extension of that tax that I cannot support it. I could, however, support a bill incorporating the provisions of the 1959 Highway Act which calls for the expiration of the temporary gasoline tax and its replacement in the trust fund with the revenues from certain other automotive excises.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOOLEY], a member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from California, in commending the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], for his patient and persevering efforts in behalf of this bill. I also want to say publicly that it has been a pleasure to work with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], in this endeavor.

After extensive hearings over a period of 2 years, followed by careful deliberation, Congress enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. This legislation was responsive to the overwhelming public demand for a realistic solution to the mounting costs of inadequate highways—costs which are measured in appalling loss of lives, money, and time. We have seen highway deaths reach a high of 40,000 per year, with injuries going into the hundreds of thousands. Costs of accidents have soared upward of $5 billion annually, and insurance costs have increased to the equivalent of 18 cents per gallon of gasoline for the average motorist. Traffic jams have threatened to literally choke off highway transportation in the more populous areas of the country, and the detrimental effects of inadequate highways have been felt by every segment of our economy.

It was in recognition of these pressing problems, and the requirements of our national defense, that Congress launched a construction program in 1956 to catch up with our most critical highway needs and to provide for completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways by 1972, to standards adequate for 1975 traffic.

Great progress has been made during the past 4½ years. The Federal Highway Administrator reports that 10,440 miles of the 41,000-mile Interstate System is already open to traffic. This total includes 5,135 miles adequate for 1975 traffic, 3,041 miles adequate for today's traffic but requiring further improvement before 1975, and 2,264 miles of toll roads incorporated into the system. As of December 31, 1960, construction, right-of-way acquisition, or engineering was underway on an additional 14,458 miles. Thus, some form of work is completed or underway on 24,598 miles, or about 60 percent of the Interstate System.

The A–B–C program has kept pace with work on the Interstate System. Since July 1, 1956, approximately 113,000 miles of construction contracts have been completed on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions, and work is underway on more than 21,000 additional miles of construction contracts.

Each full working day last summer, on our Federal-aid highway systems across the Nation, nearly 20 million cubic yards of earth and rock were excavated and most of it compacted into embankments. At this rate, the Panama Canal could have been built in a little over 2 weeks, and the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project in about 1 week. There have been over 50,000 construction contracts awarded, and over 1½ million people have been directly involved in the operations.

It is a big program, and it is on schedule in relation to the revenues available in the highway trust fund, but its orderly continuation is seriously jeopardized by lack of sufficient funds. Congress provided temporary financing in 1959, pending submission this year of two reports to assist Congress in establishing adequate financing for completion of the program. These reports—the 1961 Interstate System Cost Estimate, and the Highway Cost Allocation Study—were submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Commerce in January of this year. It is now incumbent upon the Congress to provide the necessary financing if the Interstate System is to be completed in 1972, as originally planned.

Title I of H.R. 6713, in addition to permitting use of the airspace above and below the paved surface of the Interstate System, would accomplish two things. It would approve the latest estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System, which is a prerequisite for the apportionment of interstate funds to the States for fiscal years 1963 through 1966, and it would increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Interstate System, so as to permit its completion by 1972.

Interstate funds totaling $25.44 billion have been authorized through fiscal year 1969. The 1961 estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System is $41 billion, of which $37 billion is the Federal share. This is the same total amount as was estimated in 1959, based upon an estimate submitted to the Congress in 1958 plus certain supplemental costs. It is clearly apparent that the Federal share of the cost of completing the Interstate System will be $11.56 billion more than now authorized. Title I of H.R. 6713 would authorize the appropriation of this additional sum and would reschedule the amounts of annual authorizations through fiscal year 1971, to permit completion of the Interstate System by 1972. Necessary additional revenues are provided by title II. Enactment of this bill will give continuity to the program and will establish a firm basis on which the States and the highway industry may plan their work in orderly fashion and perform their jobs at a minimum of cost. History has proved that a stop-and-go or crisis-to-crisis construction program inevitably costs the owner, in this case the public, substantially more than a continuing, orderly program.

Highway deaths, injuries, property damage, and increasing transportation costs will not take a holiday while we postpone essential highway improvements. If we do not face up to our responsibilities and act now, the highway program will immediately face a serious setback. Even though $2.2 billion are presently authorized for the Interstate System for each of fiscal years 1963 and 1964, the estimated receipts of the highway trust fund are so deficient as to permit apportioning only $2 billion for 1963 and $1.5 billion for 1964. Not only are the present authorizations grossly inadequate for completion of the Interstate System, but the revenues to be provided under existing law will not even currently finance these authorizations. On page 11 of the committee report is a table comparing apportionments which can be made to each State for fiscal years 1963 and 1964 under existing law and under H.R. 6713. If this bill is not enacted, New York will lose $71.1 million for these 2 years and will fall that much behind schedule in completing the program. Every State will suffer a proportionate loss in Federal-aid funds and a proportionate setback in their highway program.

I firmly believe that the public interest and the urgencies of our economy require completion of the Interstate System on schedule, together with the planned continuation of the A–B–C program.

We can no longer afford the luxury of shortsightedness in highway construction. If our way of life is to continue, we must take aggressive action to assure the early completion of these transportation arteries, which literally carry the lifeblood of our national survival.

It has often been said, "We pay for good roads whether we have them or not." This was never more true than today. In the year just ended we traveled on our highways over 720 billion vehicle miles, and we spent directly in doing that traveling about $75 billion. One out of every seven persons today works in a highway transport industry, for a total of over 10 million automotive jobs. Our motor vehicle transportation system has made all of America one gigantic assembly line for production, and highways are vital links in the current pattern of plant location and dispersal. With one-seventh of our gross national product coming from highways and relative industries, motor vehicle transportation has become so interwoven with our economy and way of life that adequate and safe highways are essential to our existence.

Experience has shown that on highways of the interstate type, accident frequency is reduced by two-thirds and accident fatalities by one-half. The Interstate System alone, when completed, will annually save at least 4,000 lives, reduce personal injuries by 150,000, and result in savings in accident costs of well over $1 billion annually.

It is estimated that users of the Interstate System, when it is completed, will save an aggregate of 42,000 years of travel time and 9 billion vehicle starts and stops annually. The savings in operating costs are estimated to be at least $1.25 billion per year.

One typical example of such savings is shown by a study of operating economics for trucks of the General Electric Co. using the New York Thruway between company plants in Buffalo and Schenectady. It was found their trucks on the thruway traveled over 10 miles per hour faster than on parallel routes, saved 14 gallons of fuel, had to make 298 fewer gear shifts, and 69 fewer full stops. These trucks saved 38 miles on round trips and 4 hours 29 minutes in transit time. Use of the thruway also resulted in a rebate on insurance because of the lower accident rate. In another study, recently completed, of vehicle operations on a 16-mile section of the Schuylkill Expressway in the Philadelphia area, direct savings to motorists from new highway construction amounts to over $18 million per year, enough to pay the entire cost of the highway in 3 years.

There are other measures of the highway program's value. The most obvious stimulus to the economy comes from expenditures made for highway construction itself. However, this sparks other related construction, such as new housing developments, shopping areas, industrial construction, and all related service facilities. Beyond this influence, and perhaps of more importance, are the permanent benefits to business and the providing of new opportunities. New attractive manufacturing and commercial sites are developed, and marginal land is converted into residential areas in the wake of highway construction, which favorably affects land values all across the country.

Highway improvement offers new opportunities for capital investment and growth. It has been estimated that more than $650-million worth of industrial, commercial, and residential development has been attracted to sites along the 538-mile route of the New York Thruway. Similarly, within 3 years after improvement of Massachusetts Route 128, the number of industrial firms along that highway had increased from 39 companies in operation, with 14 others under construction, to 209 in operation and 17 more under construction. This same growth and development is following construction of the Interstate System in many other parts of the country.

There are, in addition, many intangible benefits from the highway program, and perhaps the most important of these is the wider horizons to be provided for the family, in greater freedom of choice in places to live, work, and play, by making all of America one big neighborhood.

Considering all of these benefits, it is the poorest kind of economy to postpone completion of the Interstate System beyond 1972. The need is urgent, and the decision is upon us now. I strongly support the provisions of this bill to continue the highway program on schedule, as an investment in the future of America.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the legislation in the 86th Congress which increased the Federal gasoline tax on a temporary basis to 4 cents a gallon.

I had strong convictions that the year 1959 was the year to draw the line against further Federal invasion of the gasoline tax field, a field of taxation which is of such extreme importance to the States in financing their own highway programs. I have felt great and growing concern about the steady and systematic expansion of the Federal Government into areas previously reserved for the States.

To the farm folks in my district, this national highway program is a perfect example of the steady encroachment of the Federal power once the seed for such intervention is allowed to take root.

That is why I believe more strongly than ever that I acted wisely in voting to check further expansion of the Federal gasoline tax in 1959. Now, having gained possession of that extra tax, there appears to be great reluctance to relinquish this additional revenue—even though the people were led to believe that the tax was a temporary measure to expire as of June 30 of this year.

Instead of reducing taxes on motor vehicle owners this year, in accordance with the understanding made in connection with the temporary gasoline tax increase, the call has gone out for still more tax money from our people. And in a year, or 2 years or 3 years, history tells us to expect another demand for still more. We are witnessing here, and if we yield again this time we will continue to witness, the development of another sector of persistent, unrelenting erosion of States rights.

Mr. Chairman, this highway program is not being carried on as a charitable enterprise of a benevolent Federal Government. Every dime of that program's cost comes from motor vehicle owners of Alabama and the other 49 States. The States are not getting any highway handouts. The people of those States are paying for those highway authorizations—and more. The Nation's motor vehicle owners are paying nearly $2 billion each year in special automotive taxes that do not go for the road program. These automotive taxes are withheld from the highway program and used for other purposes.

The saving grace of the legislation enacted in 1959 was supposed to be that it would correct this injustice, starting with the 1962 fiscal year. From then on, one-half of the proceeds of the tax on new automobiles and 62½ percent of the tax on automotive parts and accessories were supposed to be dedicated to the Federal highway trust fund and used for the road program. This revenue was meant to take the place of the temporary fourth cent of the Federal gasoline tax, which was slated to expire as of June 30.

Now those Members of Congress who voted for this proposal in all sincerity, believing that it was the best hope of getting fairer play for their car- and truck-owning constituents in the financing of the Federal highway program, find that they are being asked to participate in legislation to continue the so-called temporary tax.

I say that this is no way to run a government and no way to run a highway program. I say a Federal Government that conducts its affairs in this manner had better put its own house in order before it presumes further dictation to the States about the administration and handling of their programs.

With all its shortcomings, the compromise proposal enacted by Congress in 1959 was a far more equitable and fairminded proposition than the one we are considering today. I urge you, in fairness to the motor vehicle owners of this Nation, to keep the faith by letting the terms of the legislation adopted in September of 1959 go into effect. The measure before us today should be recommitted to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to rewrite the financing section.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL].

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Public Works Committee I should like to say that it has been a great honor and privilege to serve under the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the Roads Subcommittee and under the Honorable GORDON H. SCHERER ranking member of the subcommittee. Both of these men are not only able and dedicated Members of the Congress but great leaders of our committee. Both have done yeoman's service in steering the original Interstate Highway bill through the Congress. Without leaders like these important programs like this which mean so much to the growth and progress of our country would not be possible.

JUSTIFICATION

With one-seventh of our gross national product coming from highways and related industries and with our economy and way of life so closely oriented around the motor vehicle, adequate and safe highways are essential.

The Interstate System, alone, when completed will annually save at least 4,000 lives, reduce personal injuries by 150,000, and cut economic losses by $2.1 billion. Many believe these figures to be extremely conservative.

Changing patterns of living and working and the dynamic urbanization that are in evidence are predicated to a very large extent on the comprehensiveness, flexibility, and convenience of highway transportation. An expanding economy is tied to highway development commensurate with needs.

Highways are vital links of our production lines in the current pattern of plant location and dispersal.

Actually only a small part of the cost of owning and operating an automobile goes for building and maintaining highways. The amount averages 12 percent for the Nation.

The cost of insurance and repairs take up a much greater part, because as the late Chief Thomas H. MacDonald, formerly of Iowa Bureau of Public Roads, aptly said many years ago, "We pay for good roads whether we have them or not." Sometimes, in fact most of the time it costs more not to have good roads.

We are designing and constructing the Interstate System for a time when there will be at least 50 percent more motor vehicles in operation than now and the program is designed so that the construction will be completed and the system be connected up simultaneously in all the States when this added traffic load will be making its effects felt.

The continuing increase in traffic is much more noticeable now than it was in 1956. To delay the completion of the interstate past the design period would be losing the race against mounting traffic needs.

All of the justifications that existed for the Congress to take the action it did in 1956 still exist and are even more evident, plus the fact the on-site construction and off-site industrial employment that would be furnished by putting the interstate back on its original schedule is very desirable.

PROGRESS AND ABILITY OF THE STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS

The State highway departments are on schedule for the program on the basis of the money made available through the trust fund.

In developing our policy statements, the State highway officials have unanimously reiterated their individual and collective abilities and capacities to complete the Interstate System program by 1972, and carry on an equally important A–B–C Federal-aid program that would be increased $25 million annually until the annual authorization reaches $1 billion per year.

Both of these goals were expressed as the intent of the Congress in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956 and in the legislative history of the hearings.

The State highway departments, by policy action, have called on the Congress to give substance to these statements of intent in the form of adequate financing so as to give the assurances needed by the States and highway building industry to properly plan the program and keep the costs at a minimum.

Forty of the State highway departments report they can finance their respective portions of the interstate program at a level to complete it in 1972, based on the present pro rata financing.

The other nine indicate they can handle the program at the level required for the next biennium, and anticipate no insurmountable problems thereafter.

Eight indicate they probably will seek additional highway revenues at the State level this year and eight more could within the next year or so.

In addition to matching Federal-aid funds, the States have responsibilities of furnishing highway improvements in addition to the facilities furnished by the Federal-aid programs, as well as the maintenance of all the State highway systems, including completed interstate projects which require some relatively heavy maintenance expenditures.

We must, of course, keep a balanced program of improvement for all systems. For this reason, we believe the ABC authorizations should be increased $25 million annually, instead of biennially, until a total of $1 billion annually is reached, and the matter should then be reviewed by the Congress as to progress and needs every 2 years, instead of setting those authorizations for several years in advance.

Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the importance of this program, about its shortcomings and while I have some convictions about these I shall not comment further except to say that I am not completely satisfied with the financing feature which I believe should be made more equitable in relation to the cost benefit ratios.

I am supporting this legislation now in the hope that we can keep the building of the Interstate System on schedule and with the hope that the financing phase

of this program will be given further study by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE].

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I favor a Federal interstate highway program consisting of a fully integrated, long-range plan and construction schedule, as was originally conceived. I am against this unreasonably expanded and accelerated implementation which is resulting in the imposition of higher and higher taxes on my constituents and on highway users nationwide.

I am frequently told of new highways now being completed that have no justification on today's traffic flows—of bridges built and sitting with no approaches or supporting roads. The whole program seems to be run on the basis of spending us into a deficit and then using this deficit as the justification for raising taxes.

My people are being taxed to death, higher local taxes to pay for needed schools and community services, higher State taxes and higher Federal taxes often unjustified. Our Federal gasoline tax should be cut back to 3 cents and then the road program should be scheduled to fit the revenue. If this means a 3 or 4 year stretchout, no great harm will be done since we will not be closing up shop in 1972 anyway. Surely no one believes that claim.

As a matter of fact, since many miles of roads now being built will not be needed for 10 or 15 years, we are not on pay as you go but rather pay before you go, and in the case of the trucking industry it is pay now and go broke, you will never last to see the day.

My constituents are getting fed up. Automobile dealers in my district tell me that more and more customers are switching to compacts in an effort to save on the gasoline tax, and we may well find that with gasoline taxes remaining at today's high level, revenues will fall short of estimates.

I, therefore, urge that we vote to recommit this bill to the House Ways and Means Committee and direct that they reduce this tax overload to the 3-cent level which we promised back in 1959.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Alford	Celler	Gallagher
Auchincloss	Coad	Garland
Breeding	Cohelan	Harsha
Broomfield	Dawson	Ikard, Tex.
Buckley	Flynt	Kearns
Kee	Norblad	Staggers
Keogh	Passman	Steed
Kyl	Powell	Thomas
McSween	Riley	Thompson, La.
Machrowicz	Siler	Tollefson
Matthews	Smith, Miss.	Willis
Miller, N.Y.	Spence	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6713) and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 397 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in urging adoption of the bill before us, permit me to lay before the members of the Committee as frankly as I know how the problem presented to the Ways and Means Committee, and outline the considerations that influenced us in reaching the agreement which is title II of the bill before the Committee at this time.

Mr. Chairman, in this matter involved in title II, the Ways and Means Committee was not able to write on a clean slate. The financing situation which confronted us was that the total expenditures from the highway trust fund, taking into account the amendments in title I of the present bill, were estimated to be $52.5 billion. Of that amount $37 billion is devoted to the Interstate System, the remainder to the so-called A–B–C system. Under the financing provisions contained in the existing law, on the other hand, revenue going into the trust fund would amount to $42.8 billion during the lifetime of the trust fund. This revenue falls short, as you can see, of the pay-as-you-go financing goal that the Congress established in 1956 by approximately $9.7 billion.

The problem actually was made more difficult by the fact that the $9.7 billion deficit I just cited was held down because present law proposes to divert from revenues of the general fund of the Treasury in the fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964 a total of $2.5 billion of expected revenue coming from the manufacturers' excise tax on automobiles and automobile parts and accessories.

This diversion was proposed as a temporary measure in the act of 1959. At that time many Members of the House thought that some part of the automobile and parts and accessories tax should be permanently dedicated to the highway trust fund.

As we stated in our committee report on the act of 1959, we did not foresee that any budgetary situation in the general fund for the fiscal year 1960 or 1961 would permit this diversion of nearly $1 billion a year. We did hope things might be better by fiscal 1962, and we clearly said that the situation would be reexamined at that time. I stated on the floor in September of 1959:

> It is clear that the transfer of moneys from the general fund to the highway trust fund either during fiscal year 1960 or 1961 would only further increase the budgetary problems which we already face. Under these circumstances, our committee considered it unsound to provide for any transfer of funds prior to fiscal year 1962. We did conclude it feasible to make the prospective transfer of part of the auto excises and parts and accessories excises beginning in fiscal year 1962, since that is sufficiently far ahead that plans can be made to take it into account and plans can be made, if necessary, to adjust the situation as the future may require.

Unfortunately—and I say "unfortunately" advisedly, because I have as much regret over the necessity of making this report to the members of this Committee as I could possibly have, and certainly as much regret as any of you have in hearing the report—unfortunately, the long-sought goal of a large budgetary surplus seems to be as remote this year as it was in 1959 when we passed the temporary highway financing proposal. The Committee on Ways and Means believed that the only responsible financing measure at the present time was to remove the projected diversion of this amount of the automobile and parts and accessories tax scheduled to go into effect on July 1 next for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964. This removal meant that the prospective deficit in the highway trust fund was not $9.7 billion but was increased from that figure to $12.2 billion. This was the problem presented to the committee.

Now, how was the problem resolved? The major legislative addition provided in the bill is a continuation of the tax on gasoline and other motor fuels at the rate of 4 cents a gallon. This rate, which has been in effect since November 1959, under present law will revert to 3 cents a gallon beginning July 1 of this year. A continuation of this 4-cent tax rate on motor fuel through the balance of the program will bring to the highway trust fund an additional $8.3 billion. Second, the bill increases the rate of the use tax which has to be paid by trucks over 26,000 pounds from $1.50 to $3 per thousand pounds. This rate increase, along with expected improvements in the collection or administration of the tax, is expected to add $1.1 billion to the highway trust revenues. Third, the bill provides for an increase in the taxes on tires, tubes, and tread rubber. It increases the tax on tires of the type used on highway vehicles from 8 to 10 cents a pound; on inner tubes from 9 to 10 cents a pound; and on tread rubber, commonly referred to as camelback, from 3 cents to 5 cents per pound. It is estimated these rate changes involving rubber will add approximately $1.1 billion to the highway trust fund during the lifetime of that fund. Thus, $10.5 billion of the $12.2 billion to which I referred above which is needed on the estimates submitted to our committee is provided by these items of tax changes.

In addition to these rate changes, the bill provides that the remaining 5 percentage points of the manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, buses, and trailers will be dedicated to the highway trust fund, and this dedication will provide an additional $1.8 billion for the lifetime of the trust fund.

Thus, the provisions which I have outlined will take care of the $12.3 billion requirement and, when considered in addition to the moneys already expected to come into the trust fund under existing law, will overcome the deficit that we were told existed of $12.2 billion.

In part, the additional revenues will be provided by the extension beyond June 30 of 1972, for 3 months, or until September 30, 1972, of these rates of tax involved in the revenues going to the highway trust fund.

All this means that on the basis of the information given to the committee, we have provided not only every dollar that is anticipated in the cost of the Interstate System, plus the construction under the A–B–C program, out of this trust fund—we have not only provided every dollar that we are told today that that program will cost—but we have allowed on the plus side a margin of error of some $100 or $200 million.

Some people have said in the course of this debate that it is to be regretted that other expenditures can be made from the general fund of the Treasury without regard to the condition of the general fund of the Treasury—and I assume they do not agree that that is right, maybe it is wrong—but they imply that because of this we ought to finance highways the same way, dip into the general fund of the Treasury.

I would think that there would be general commendation of the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means for facing up to this difficult part of highway construction and providing a way for this program to be continued in accordance with the desires of this administration, of the past administration, and of the Committee on Public Works, and to be completed on a pay-as-you-go basis within the year 1972. We are doing it on a pay-as-you-go basis by providing the $10.5 billion of additional funds, and only dedicating at the annual rate of $150 million of money from the general fund. I should think that there would be general acceptance that we had done the proper thing regardless of what may have been done in the past with regard to some other expenditures of the Government.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHERER. The minority members of the Committee on Public Works, particularly those of the Subcommittee on Roads, do commend the members of the Committee on Ways and Means for what they have done.

Mr. MILLS. I know that, since I remember the gentleman said it in the committee, and I appreciate my friend's statement.

Mr. Chairman, here is what I thought we might be able to do in 1959, in all frankness, and I know there are others who hoped the same thing could happen. I thought maybe what we could do was to extend this diversion for these 3 fiscal years through the balance of the program. Do you know how much would be involved in transfers from the general fund of the Treasury if we did it? Around $11 billion.

Mr. Chairman, in the light of the facts that we have with respect to the fiscal situation at the moment and the demands on the general fund of the Treasury that we know are imminent, now and in future fiscal years, I am not in a position to tell the members of this Committee, that we can be secure in the diversion of about $1 billion a year from the general fund of the Treasury into the highway trust fund for this purpose. I think, frankly, if we do that, if we permit existing law to continue for these fiscal years I have referred to—1962, 1963, and 1964—and certainly we know with respect to 1962 and perhaps with respect to the other fiscal years—that all we will have done is to transfer a deficit from one fund of the Treasury to another fund of the Treasury.

The Committee on Ways and Means did not believe that there was any strong equity case for providing this type of relief to highway users, namely, by paying for their highways to the extent of $1 billion a year out of tax revenues currently in the general fund instead of continuing the 4-cent gasoline rate. When the highway trust fund was established, a number of net revenue sources then in the general fund were allocated to the highway trust fund. These amount to almost $750 million a year at current levels of business. In addition, there are nearly $40 million worth of highways constructed each year in connection with national forests and public lands which become a part of the Federal-aid system but which are paid for out of the general fund. There are also some $60 million of revenue paid into the highway trust fund each year with respect to vehicles that do not use the highways.

This program, Mr. Chairman, was started on the basis of a pay-as-you-go program. We have kept faith with the original decision of the Congress to keep it on that basis. The so-called Byrd amendment which was in the 1956 act is still in the law, so that these moneys will not be apportioned in future years except that there be money in prospect in this highway trust fund to pay for those costs in those future years. The revenue, therefore, that is provided in the bill keeps it on the pay-as-you-go basis, the original objective of Congress and the very heart of the original 1956 act as finally passed by the Congress.

Maybe we have not done the proper thing. Maybe others would have had a different idea about how we should have worked this thing out, but the Committee on Ways and Means believes this to be the sound solution. I have discussed in some detail one of the alternatives offered to our committee by many of the witnesses who appeared before us, namely, no additional costs to the highway users, instead dipping into the general funds of the Treasury to let us complete the program that way. I have already tried to explain why the committee did not go that route. There were others who thought that perhaps we should have done more, and I have read some statements to the effect that we should have placed more of the burden upon those involved in the trucking industry. Very frankly, Mr. Chairman, we went most carefully into the recommendations that had been made to us that we were advised would have increased the operating cost of the trucking industry, had we enacted it, by 1.5 percent. We even went to the extent of having personnel from the Interstate Commerce Commission come to our committee to give data on the financial condition of this industry with respect to its ability to carry such an increase as was involved in that recommendation.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Will there be any of these funds in the future diverted to other purposes?

Mr. MILLS. There will not be one penny of this money diverted to any purpose. These moneys can be spent only under the terms of the existing law in connection with the Federal Government's part of the cost of the Interstate Highway System plus the Federal Government's part in the construction of the so-called Federal-aid system, your primary secondary system, known as the A–B–C system.

Mr. BONNER. Under the existing law, how much has been diverted from this program to other purposes? That is the reason the fund is in default.

Mr. MILLS. No. That reason was discussed by the members of the Committee on Public Works during the time of the general debate allotted to them. If the gentleman wants me to discuss the deficit I will be glad to do it, briefly.

What happened was this: In 1956 we wanted to move expeditiously with the establishment of this Interstate System Had I known before what I know about it now, I would have recommended to the Congress that Congress delay the commencement of that system until we had the better estimates of cost that we have today but did not have then. I might have had a different idea, frankly, about the desirability of some of this had I known what I know today, about the costs. I do not say I would, but there are Members who have expressed concern to me over the fact that today it seems to cost so much more than we were told it would cost in 1956. But there is a reason for that, and no one is to be blamed because we did not have correct information. We moved so hurriedly that we told our State highway departments to get together estimates of what it would cost to do his job and have them for us within a period of a few weeks. They did it that quickly.

Thereafter, in 1958, when further studies of the costs were made, they recognized that those orignal estmates were too low. That is one of the primary reasons for the difference in what we thought the cost would be in 1956, and what we know the cost will be today. But I will say this to my friend from North Carolina, there is not great difference in the estimates of cost today, they are no greater, for constructing this road system than they were as the result of those studies made in 1958 of actual

costs. As a matter of fact, I believe we were advised there was some small reduction.

In this connection, my friend from North Carolina may furthermore be interested to know in the letting of the contracts for the construction of this system, we are averaging now contracts at about 5 percent less in cost than the highway departments estimated in 1958 these particular jobs would cost. So we are proceeding now without additional increases. We are having some margin of savings in the letting of the contracts.

But, what I had started to say was this, in connection with some of the studies that were directed by the Congress to be made as to the allocation of these costs between various users of the highway system, the Public Roads Bureau developed estimates under what they call the differential benefit method and the incremental-cost method, along with some others. I think these two that I have mentioned are particularly worthy of our consideration. I think they serve to give us some factual idea of how to divide these costs among the different users of this program. This program in title II comes almost between those two methods. It does not go to the incremental-cost method because we felt in the committee, or at least a majority of the members did, that would impose too sharp an increase on one segment of highway users, too rapidly increasing their operating costs when they were not, in the years we were looking at, operating on a very profitable basis anyway.

We have also done something here—and it was not suggested to us and it was not recommended—we have provided for the transfer of the remaining 5 percentage points of the tax on trucks, buses, and trailers from the general fund to the highway trust fund.

Now why are we justified in doing that? That is a tax which we think is somewhat different from a tax on consumption, such as a tax on goods, such as cosmetics, or services, such as telephones, having more relationship to the highway program, that is. Moreover, in the original 1956 act 5 percentage points of this tax had already been dedicated to the highway trust fund—and we were here simply dedicating the remainder. But, remember this, in this whole proposition before us there is to be diverted from the general funds of the Treasury, over the lifetime of this program, only $1.8 billion whereas under the provisions of the existing law, if the contemplated diversions were continued throughout the lifetime of this program, there would be diversions from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent of $11 billion.

We will be in a position in the future, if the situation changes, if we get to that fine day when we can reduce tax rates or put surpluses to debt retirement, then we can make a decision as between tax reduction in the general fund or in the highway trust fund. If, however, we divert too much from the general fund of the Treasury, knowing that in the future, even in the year just immediately ahead of us, we will have a deficit, we may be foreclosed from making reductions in other taxes in the general fund of the Treasury to that extent, or from applying any surplus to the debt retirement. We may, by such a course, be increasing the Federal debt.

We have kept faith, we think, with the original purpose the Congress had in mind. It is a compromise, as most things of this magnitude are. The President himself is not altogether pleased—we know that. He would like for us not to have diverted anything from the general funds of the Treasury. In that respect, he is no different from his predecessor in office. He, too, suggested and recommended that we not divert any funds from the general fund of the Treasury. They know, as you and I know, the risk involved in placing such a charge, as I have outlined, of a billion dollars a year, approximately, on the general fund of the Treasury and what might be forthcoming as a result of doing that. The bill does not do that.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman has stated that unless this bill is passed and made law that a certain amount of money would of necessity have to be taken out of the general funds and put into this road fund.

Mr. MILLS. Under the provisions of existing law that would be true, for 3 fiscal years.

Mr. JENSEN. If this bill should become law, is it not a fact that the time should be extended 2 years to, say, 1974, for the completion of this highway program and without any additional tax?

Mr. MILLS. No, sir; it would not; you could not complete it in that time. We were advised in the committee, when that question was raised, that if we did nothing but left the existing law as it is and merely extended the date of this trust fund to encompass the time of highway construction, that it would be 1977 or 1978 before this program which has been authorized would be completed.

In our committee we did not feel that the time of completion for this construction was exclusively our jurisdiction. This highway construction program belongs to the Public Works Committee; it is in their jurisdiction. Our job is to do the part that we have tried to do here in title II, of providing funds to carry out the wishes that are expressed with respect to construction and the provisions that the Congress adopts with respect to construction. We know what those provisions are. We have tried to carry out our responsibilities in this bill.

There is another factor. Very frankly, I am pleased that so far it has been the decision not to extend this program for 5, 6, or whatever number of years would be required to complete it, and I am pleased that it is possible for us to get this behind us by 1972. I have never heard anybody dispute what my colleague from Iowa and what my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] said on the floor here today, what was said to our committee, that this program itself means the saving of at least 4,000 lives per year. It means the saving of a tremendous number of millions of dollars in loss of property, and in loss of time. I could not bring myself, I must say frankly to my friend from Iowa, to the conclusion that with our exercising only part of the jurisdictional responsibility in the Ways and Means Committee, that we should assume the entire responsibility of telling the members of this Committee, of the Public Works Committee, and of the administration, that we were not willing to complete it in 1972.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MILLS. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. JENSEN. There is, of course, the matter of saving lives, on which all are agreed. But I have never seen figures which would prove to me that loss of life was greater on the secondary roads than it is on the superhighways.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman's colleagues on his side of the aisle can give him those figures if he asks them. The highway trust fund also supports the A–B–C system.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me ask this question: How much money will be raised this year by the additional tax on tires and other things that are included in this bill? What will be the annual increase in revenue?

Mr. MILLS. The 2-cent tax increase on tires will raise about $64 million in 1962; the tax increase on inner tubes about $2 million in 1962; and the tax increase on tread rubber will produce about $9 million in 1962. The tax on gasoline will amount to around $600 million or more, on an average annual basis. The use tax, which was raised from $1.50 to $3, runs, per year, all the way from $79 million to about $108 million, taking into account the growth through the years. I gave the total of all these a while ago. For the year-by-year estimates on each item, I refer the gentleman to page 18 of the committee report.

Mr. JENSEN. That burden will fall most heavily on the trucking industry?

Mr. MILLS. It is true the trucking industry will have to pay some of this burden. But let me remind the gentleman of the fact that the trucking industry appears very much elated over the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means did not accept every recommendation given it by the administration with reference to the allocation of these costs.

Mr. JENSEN. I recognize that.

Mr. MILLS. The administration proposal would have increased the operating cost of the trucking industry. I have heard nothing in opposition from the trucking industry on this bill. I heard plenty of opposition from them on the original request. A majority of our committee did this only because of the fact it was thought to be a fair and equitable approach to the distribution of the cost of constructing this highway program, and we have done it in a way that will not impose an undue burden on anybody within our economy.

Mr. JENSEN. One more observation, and I appreciate the gentleman's position. He is a great legislator. Did the gentleman and his committee take any

cognizance of the amount of money that is being spent on running these highways through cities and parts of cities where millions and millions of dollars are wasted?

Mr. MILLS. It is a question always of whether or not a person is for that expenditure or whether or not, perhaps, he benefits from it in some way. I know the gentleman thinks there is a great deal of waste, but let me tell him how it operates, as we were told. These roads through the cities are very expensive; yes, they are extremely expensive; but of the total cost of this system the percentage devoted to roads through and around the cities represents a smaller percentage than the percentage of the total take in revenue from those people. It seems to me the cost is around 42 percent, the revenue take from them as a percentage of the total is 44 percent. They are also paying these taxes, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the members of the Committee to accept this compromise worked out by the Committee on Ways and Means, not on the basis that what we present to you is the ultimate in legislative advisability and perfection but as the very best job that can be done in our committee with a very knotty problem, intending as we did in the committee to see that with respect to this program at least the commitments that were made to the American people in 1956 to complete it in 1972 on a pay-as-you-go basis will be carried out by the Congress in 1961. I urge approval of the bill by the Committee.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the minority leader, Mr. HALLECK.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week; and I might add, too, as to the present situation in respect to the final consideration of the measure now before us.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we are hoping to complete this bill today. I assume by implication that the members of the Committee on Ways and Means have that profound appreciation in mind if it is not completed today it will go over until Monday.

The program for next week follows:

Monday is District Day, but there is no business. There will be no legislative business on Monday. So that we will go over in fact until Tuesday if we complete the consideration of the present bill today.

On Tuesday we will take up H.R. 5490, deferment of reserves, a bill out of the Committee on Armed Services, and H.R. 4130, termination impact of Menominee Indian Tribe.

On Wednesday there is a very pleasant bill coming up that I hope the Committee will accept a couple of amendments to, and that is H.R. 2010, a continuation of the Mexican farm labor program.

Thursday, H.R. 6090, Council of Economic Advisers Employment Act.

The rest of the week is undetermined. Then there is the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program will be announced later. Without committing myself, I do not know of any further program, but I want that slight reservation.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, we now come to the period in today's deliberations when we give consideration to the way in which we will pay through present taxes and increased taxes for the spending that we have previously discussed in connection with the consideration of title I of the pending bill.

Under title II of H.R. 6713, it is proposed to provide $9.8 billion in additional revenue for the highway trust fund in the period from July 1, 1961, through September 30, 1972. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has explained to the membership, this additional revenue is raised through the continuation of present tax rates on gasoline and diesel fuel, the increase in tax rates applicable to highway tires, inner tubes, and tread rubber as well as an increase in the truck use tax. In addition, the life of the trust fund and the taxes paid into that fund has been extended 3 months so that the termination will occur effective October 1, 1972. The 5 percentage points of the 10-percent manufacturers excise on trucks, buses, and trailers that are now allocated to the general fund would be earmarked for the highway trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, it is now estimated that the cost of completing the Interstate Highway System in the period from 1957 to 1972 will be approximately $37 billion. The cost of A–B–C roads for the same period is estimated at $15.5 billion. So that when we discuss our Federal-aid highway program we are talking in terms of a $52 billion undertaking. The revenues as proposed in the bill now before us, plus the revenues that have been collected under previous applicable revenue acts, would amount to $52.6 billion in taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the bill before the Committee represents a significant improvement over the proposal for highway financing submitted to the Congress by the President. For the information of the membership, I will insert a table that is explanatory of present law, the President's message, and the tax proposals contained in title II of H.R. 6713. I will also include explanatory material relative to expenditures and revenues under the program.

Highway financing—Title II of H.R. 6713

I. TAXES

Article taxed	Unit of tax	Present law	President's message	Bill
1. Gasoline	Cents per gallon	[1] $0.04	$0.04	$0.04
2. Diesel fuel	do	[1] .04	.07	.04
3. Trucks over 26,000 pounds	Per 1,000 pounds	1.50	5.00	3.00
4. Highway tires	Per pound	.08	.10	.10
5. Inner tubes	do	.09	.10	.10
6. Tread rubber	do	.03	.10	.05

[1] Scheduled to be 3 cents per gallon effective July 1, 1961.

In addition to the above tax schedule the following tax adjustments are of significance:

1. Trucks, buses, and trailers—present rate is 10 percent of manufacturer's sales price of which one-half goes to general fund and one-half to the highway trust fund. Under bill entire 10 percent goes to the highway trust fund.

2. Highway trust fund—under present law scheduled to terminate June 30, 1972, and the bill would extend it to September 30, 1972.

3. Automobiles and parts—present rates are 10 percent and 8 percent respectively. Present law provides that 5 percentage points of each would go to the highway trust fund effective July 1, 1961, and the bill would continue these taxes in the general fund.

4. The President proposed to divert aviation fuel taxes from the highway trust fund and to charge certain highway costs to the trust fund. No action.

II. EXPENDITURES AND REVENUES

1. The net total revenues added to the highway trust fund by the bill amounts to $9.8 billion in the period July 1, 1961, to September 30, 1972.

2. Cost of completing the Interstate Highway System from 1957 to 1972 is estimated at $37 billion. The cost for A–B–C roads is $15.5 billion. These figures are Federal costs.

3. Revenues under present law for the period 1957–72 are estimated at $42.8 billion. Under proposed legislation the revenues would be $52.6 billion.

4. Spending in the period July 1, 1956, to June 30, 1961, on the Interstate System amounted to $6.1 billion and in the future is scheduled to be $30.9 billion. Similar figures for the A–B–C system are $4.8 billion and $10.7 billion.

5. Allocations of cost according to tax source and highway user on a percentage basis for the period under the bill of July 1, 1961, through September 30, 1972, are as follows:

Tax source basis

Source:	Percent
Gasoline	71.5
Diesel	3.7
Trucks, etc	8.6
Tires	10.6
Tubes	.5
Tread rubber	.9
Truck use tax	4.2
Total	100

Highway user basis

Type user:	Percent
Autos	61
Buses	2
Trucks:	
Light	8
Medium	7
Heavy	22
Total	100

Mr. Chairman, I joined with some of my committee colleagues in filing mi-

nority views. I am opposed to title II of H.R. 6713 because I am unwilling to impose additional tax burdens on our already overtaxed citizens. I believe that if the American people want a $52 billion highway program, then we should spend less on other things so that we can accomplish our objectives without increased taxation and within the framework of a balanced budget. It is my view that the highway user taxes not presently earmarked for the Highway Trust Fund should be used for highway purposes and this would provide adequate revenue to complete our highway system on schedule. It is true that this would result in a reduction of the general funds of the Treasury, but on this point I would make it clear that it will be my purpose during the present Congress to vote for sufficient economy in public spending that I will be consistent with my conviction that a balanced budget is the first order of business.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take further time of the membership to elaborate on my opposition to the pending proposal. The minority views begin on page 26 of the committee report and I commend their reading to my colleagues. I am convinced that if we are to maintain the economic strength of our great Nation, it is imperative that we begin to think in terms of how we can tax less rather than how we can tax more. I am opposed to the favorable House consideration of this legislation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS].

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to discuss a program which I would like to have had the opportunity to offer as a substitute with the following provisions:

Tax:	*Revenue*
3 cents fuel	$1,800,000,000
3 cents per pound tread rubber	15,000,000
9 cents per pound tires	315,000,000
9 cents per pound inner tubes	16,000,000
$3 per thousand pounds use tax	120,000,000
Allocation of one-half of excise tax to highway trust fund	840,000,000
Total	3,106,000,000

It will be noted that this proposal would not fall too far short of the revenue necessary to complete the highway program on schedule the stretch-out would be slight but not dangerous.

My main objection to the committee bill is that it tends to highlight the admitted plight of the trucking industry without giving adequate concern to the millions of passenger car owners.

I agree that the proposed tax increases recommended in the President's highway message would have been a serious threat to the operation of trucks. However, there can be little doubt that the financing recommendations approved by the Committee on Ways and Means gives insufficient consideration to the owner of the "family car." I believe that an equal distribution of highway user taxes under the proposals in the bill should have included a return to the 3-cent Federal gasoline tax.

Although I signed the minority report, there is logic in the conclusion that trucks should contribute something more than at present over and above the tax on passenger cars. For that reason I approve the action of the committee in raising the truck use tax from $1.50 to $3 per thousand pounds over 26,000 pounds but it should be part of a formula which includes a 3-cent gasoline tax. The increase on tires and tubes can also be justified for the same reason.

There is a great segment of small business involved in the retreading of tires. The original proposal to raise the tax on retread rubber to 8 cents per pound could easily have been ruinous to these small concerns and destroyed the present competitive advantage over new cheaper tires. For that reason it seems that the present tax of 3 cents per pound ought to be continued without a raise.

The same reasoning applies to the need of keeping the diesel fuel tax at the same rate as the gasoline tax. Many millions of dollars have been spent in developing the economical advantages of diesel engines. To have raised the diesel fuel tax higher than the gasoline tax would be using the tax power to destroy this competitive feature. I am happy that the committee bill has eliminated any differential between these two taxes.

The committee bill recognizes the appropriateness of allocating further portions of the excise taxes to the highway trust fund. But this recognition falls short of allocating a sufficient amount. I agree that no part of financing the Federal highway should be met by deficit spending. However, it is difficult to reconcile the recent appropriation of $600 million for an admittedly unknown, unplanned, and untried program in Latin America with the refusal to transfer sufficient user tax revenue from the general fund for a planned program in our own country. After all, the President said that our highway program "is in peril." Furthermore, all witnesses before the committee conceded that at least 8 percent of highway benefits are nonuser benefits, including defense, which supports the use of general funds to a limited extent.

I am sure everyone wants good highways, including myself. However, strangely enough, I find no enthusiasm for the program. I believe I am safe in saying that I have received few if any letters from my constituents urging support of the program. I offer this observation only as something to be considered in deciding whether we should go "all out" to meet any given deadline.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the attention of the membership to the minority views that are in the report on page 26 that express a little different version from what we have heard already, though I must say I share many of the views that have been expressed today by members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the views of our distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Public Works. I do think there is another side, or several sides, to this that at least you might want to consider regardless of what you ultimately do, and what you will find on page 26 pretty well presents those views.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is anyone, certainly not the gentleman speaking, who is against highways or against this program or lacks the dedication that our distinguished chairman expressed, when he says he would like to see this program built and built on time, if possible. I am among those, however, that really believes the burden of taxation now is so heavy that it is stifling the enterprise of our country. Indeed, if I could paraphrase it, we will come through, and we have come through before, and we will have more taxation recessions, a phrase I coined to describe what I believe is the sickness in our economy today. There is too much Government spending, then reflected in too heavy a tax burden on our people, including small business. And, because I feel it so keenly, I believe the time has come to think a little bit further, like a family does when it needs an additional car or something else. We should trim our expenditures to fit the pocketbook. When Members take the floor and tell you that this will save 4,000 lives, I categorically challenge that fact. I could not disprove it any more than they can prove it. If lives will be saved—and God knows we are all for that—then I say, let us put the money in the program, but do not think that we can then spend increased amounts of money on every other kind of social and welfare program at the same time, if you want to balance the budget and keep our economy strong. We had testimony before our committee which many of you may not know about but intimately touches each of your communities. As an example, the lumber industry came before us. They use big trucks. They said that the lumber industry is operating in areas already designated depressed areas. They said, "We are not making money, and now you are going to raise our taxes." And, those of you who are interested in appropriating for depressed areas, look what you are doing. You are increasing the taxes of the people in the depressed areas. The taxes are already too high, but you are increasing them still more today. Isn't it contradictory and harmful to increase taxes which depresses industry and then extend subsidies to aid them.

The people in the retread business say that they are in trouble. Some of the best operators in the country so testify. There is one in St. Louis, for instance. They are having trouble making both ends meet. So today you are proposing to raise the cost of their doing business. I do not know how my colleagues can do this with so little concern, as though

the taxes paid by our businessmen were not a part of the final cost of doing business. Indeed, I challenge you to tell me that that is not actually the case, causing some of them perhaps to have difficulty to break even, and causing some of them to lose money and possibly go out of business.

Now, let us look at the truckers. My chairman, I think, might contradict this, or at least challenge me in this part of my presentation, but I want to tell you how I see the situation relative to the truckers. I have no financial interest in the truckers. I am just stating what I have heard during the hearings. This is what the hearings will show and, if I am wrong, I hope some member of the committee will challenge me on this point.

It was shown to us by financial statements, many of which are in the hearings, that the truckers are having financial trouble. Many of them are not making both ends meet. Some of them are just breaking even. Are they all poor businessmen? Maybe so, but I doubt it. The figures show that in their recent best year they made 3.5 percent. I do not think that is the kind of margin that you would call good, sound business. In any event, they convinced me that they could not absorb the additional tax.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I want to inject something here on this side of the argument.

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. On Monday night, before the Empire State Chamber of Commerce, Professor Landis, who was charged by this administration with overhauling the regulatory agencies, said, in his own words, that the trucking industry is in trouble, in financial trouble. But he did not say that this additional tax would put them in further trouble or out of business.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield??

Mr. ALGER. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. True it is, the trucking industry vigorously opposed the taxes recommended by the administration. As I understand it, the trucking industry today is satisfied with the taxes recommended in this bill.

Mr. ALGER. I will say to the gentleman that I appreciate this additional information, which was unknown to me. If it is true. I think it would have a material bearing on this bill. But again I must restate what I have learned in committee. I am merely telling you what was developed in the hearings and each man can take his own position on it. Certainly I respect the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER] in whatever position he takes.

Mr. Chairman, let me tie down the point that I have just made. The truckers told us, because of the present cost of operation and because of the present taxes which are very heavy, they are having trouble making both ends meet, at least in some instances. In any event, they convinced me that they cannot absorb further taxes.

Now, someone might say, all right, like any other business, let them pass them on. Can they do this? We had before us members of the ICC who said, in good conscience, and in answer to direct questions, that the truckers cannot pass on this increased cost of doing business caused by these taxes, without losing that same amount of business to other modes of transportation. They would know better than I what they had in mind in making that statement. I am only reporting to you that I am convinced that they think that the truckers will be hurt by an increase of the taxes.

Certainly this tax increase is not as heavy as the administration requested. I realize that, and I should like to say another thing in this general connection. I do not think the motorists ought to be saddled with additional taxes. I think the 1-cent extra tax should be allowed to expire. That is my opinion. I believe in helping the motoring public. I believe even in cutting down some of those taxes. Certainly that would help the people of modest income who need this kind of help, and I am all for them.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a constructive suggestion. I have pointed out some of the fallacies as I see them. While we all believe in pay-as-you-go as a general principle, and I am one of those who supported that theory all along—even when my administration wanted a bond program, I was on the other side—but I must confess to you, as I said at the outset of this, that this is not pay-as-you-go. So far as the truckers and others are concerned, it is pay-before-you-go. We are going to levy taxes to build highways, the use of which highway users do not have while they are paying the tax, until they are completed. As the chairman has pointed out, since there are many general benefits to the public it would be entirely appropriate that some of this money come from the General Treasury.

In telling you this, may I say I have consistently made this point. Because I have voted against many of the programs to spend more money, I think I have the right to make this suggestion in all consistency. We must keep our budget balanced. So we should cut down on less necessary programs.

Now I want to talk briefly about the excise taxes. I call the attention of the House to the fact that additional money could be diverted annually from the general fund that is now being paid by the highway users in excise taxes up to $1.6 billion and put into the program. Some may say this money being paid by highway users should not go into the spending on highways. I certainly would respect this view, but I believe that there is a great deal of money being paid in by highway users that is not going into the construction of highways. I do not, myself, believe that all this money should go into paying for highways, but I do want to make the point that more can be diverted and should, because as I understood the chairman earlier, he took issue over the diversion of funds. I believe there is some merit to the position that some funds can be diverted that are now being paid in without the need for increasing taxes.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. What I am taking issue with is the thought expressed in our committee by several witnesses, as the gentleman will remember, that we can have all this merely by transferring funds from the general fund of the Treasury. I take issue with that type of diversion at a time when it merely transposes deficits from one fund to another fund. I know the gentleman from Texas also dislikes that.

Mr. ALGER. I certainly share the gentleman's concern over deficit financing. I certainly do share that view. But I must call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that since 1955 we have increased nondefense expenditures 2 to 1 over defense expenditures, at a time when we say we are girding ourselves for this struggle with the Communists.

My own position, and I respectfully differ with the chairman on this account, is that we are spending too much money in other programs. If we would save these lives on the highways, as some allege, then I believe this bill has priority and should get money from the Federal Treasury, whereas some of our other welfare programs could take less amounts at this time in order to finish the highway program. So again I think a balance can be struck by taking out of the General Treasury excise taxes and funds of money paid by the highway users into this program without increasing the burden laid on our taxpayers.

Further, if we cannot increase the amount of money without increasing the taxes, I say stretch the time out. Here we have a divergence of opinion. I do not share the concern of some of my colleagues that a stretch-out would be too bad. As our economy grows and tax receipts grow, in a few years there may be additional funds for this program before the 10-year period is out or before it is finished in 1972. We may even exercise self-discipline in this body on the spending on other bills, so we would have the money for the highway program.

I also feel that the 90–10 percent relationship between Federal and State contributions deserves further study. I commend the gentlemen of the Committee on Public Works who appeared before our committee and told us that in their opinion there was no need for such a change, but I believe additional money is being spent that could be saved if the States had a little larger stake in it. There is an elemental incentive in the States paying a larger proportion of the cost.

Further, I believe that before we raise the taxes on the people to pay for the highways we ought to have the findings of the Subcommittee of Public Works on the expenditures irregularities, whatever they may be. We might be spending less on the present program depending on what those findings are, yet we go right ahead here raising the taxes to pay for these expenditures. We are in

effect condoning, if not covering up, mistakes, waste, and irregularities, if such there are.

There are other matters I have some concern about, the reimbursement for utility relocation, the cost of the Davis-Bacon law, where the Secretary of Labor sets the wages, the prevailing wages, together with the State. These need more study. I realize that is in the area of the Committee on Public Works, but I think the Committee on Ways and Means must responsibly be interested since we are to raise the money to pay the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. I am not going to increase the taxes in this program. The tax burden already is too heavy.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, in the report on page 12 there are a few paragraphs dealing with the question of reimbursement to the States for highways built on the Interstate System prior to 1956, at the time of the enactment of this program. Now, at that time and prior to that time, I was a member of the Committee on Public Works and I have thought from the time this program came before the committee in 1954, 1955, and 1956 to provide for recognition of reimbursement to those States, and we finally put in a section in the bill to provide for reimbursement, establishing the policy of the Congress that the States would be reimbursed and that the Secretary of Commerce be empowered to make a study as to mileage and cost reimbursement. In the present report, and I ask you to just listen to the words expressed here, the language in part is as follows:

> The committee agreed at the present time any definite resolution of the question of State reimbursement by Congress should be deferred until a later date.

Five years have gone by, and I do not know what the later date means. I am not asking at this time that we include the money in this bill or that we include the mileage in this bill, but I think the time is now ripe that we include in this or any legislation that the States shall be reimbursed for the highways that they have built on the Interstate System. Take my own State of New York as a case in point. Under the act of 1944, when the Interstate System map was established, New York State was entitled to 1,200 miles. Under that program, however, because the Congress did not act to provide any means to build the Interstate System, we and many other States could not wait and we proceeded to build highways. And one highway in New York State, known as the New York State Thruway, a highway which is one of the finest in the Nation, extending for about 500 miles from the western part of the State at Buffalo all the way to New York City, on that particular one highway, New York State was entitled to reimbursement of approximately $1 billion. If we do not get the reimbursement because it is now a toll highway, we certainly are entitled to the mileage that was deleted from the bill in 1956. We are now only getting 750 miles instead of 1,200 miles. I say the time is here now when we should have recognized this long before the 5 years have elapsed, and this recognition should be put in legislation. That even after this system is completed, a system of reimbursement to the States should be recognized by legislation and all the States that are entitled to this should be reimbursed for these sums of money, or extra mileage.

One other thing, I do not believe this highway system date of 1972 is sacred. I do not believe that it has to be completed in 1972 nor do I believe it is necessary to have this additional tax encompassed in this legislation. I want to say this, in the area where I live, outside of New York City, we have tens of thousands of people who daily have to travel to and from their places of work, working people, upon whom you are going to continue this tax and increase the tax and thus increase the cost of their transportation to go to work in order to make their livelihood. This I cannot support at this time.

Another part of this program that I do not understand is the sacrosanct method of looking at this, or that this is a so-called pay-as-you-go proposition. In this legislation you have pay-as-you-go. You have deficit spending and you have diversification of funds all encompassed in one piece of legislation.

I have consistently voted through the years against deficit spending bills. I have voted against back-door spending, and there will be billions of dollars more of back-door spending programs for which no tax will be provided. So why is this so sacred that we must continue to finish this on a certain date and provide all the funds at this time when, as was just said by the gentleman from Texas a moment ago, at a time when we are going to be asked in this particular session, and I know we will be, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, to spend several billions of dollars more for national defense in this fight for survival in the life and death struggle against communism.

Why should we then impose additional taxes for this type of program when we should be reserving every dollar we can scrape together to meet the necessities of future national defense, not only of our own country but also of the free world which is so vital today?

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. SCHERER. Why should we not stretch out this program?

Mr. BECKER. I cannot understand any reason why we should not.

Mr. SCHERER. I want to tell you why we should. The experts who know their business say that this program if voted will save in 1 year 42,000 years of traveltime of the public, 4,000 lives, and cut expenses by $151,000 and cut back economic losses by $2.1 billion.

Mr. BECKER. I would like to say that the public cannot eat these statistics. Professor Landis, employed by this administration to study regulating agencies in this field, said before the chamber of commerce Monday evening that not only the trucking industry, but also the airplane industry, and the railroad industry are in serious trouble today and are almost unable to exist under the present form of operation. How are they going to exist under the burden of greater taxes and higher costs that are going to surely be placed upon the backs of everybody?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

FIRST AND NECESSARY THINGS FIRST—HIGHWAYS SECOND TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, some things we learn by experience, which is the hard way. One thing I seem to have learned, and that is that our leaders on both sides have some very difficult tasks to perform, burdens to bear that the rest of us do not even get a chance to look at; and, naturally, being busy outside, coming along after a bill has been under consideration, I would not say they are impatient, but they do sometimes seem to wish us to proceed a little faster, get through for the day. That is a commendable desire, but, inasmuch as they cannot be here much of the time during debate and that they just cannot do because of their other duties, sometimes some of us—well, I will strike out the "some of us"—sometimes your humble servant grows a little impatient because of the apparent impatience exhibited by some of the leaders when it, in their opinion, is time to close debate. Sometimes some of us—there are one or two of us—well, I think my colleague from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] will join me—there are two of us who would like to have an opportunity to advance——

Mr. GROSS. Talk.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, talk, whether we say anything or not. And our present Supreme Court has in some cases gone a long, long way in support of the first amendment, the right to free speech.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and other members of the committee who have done a very, very excellent job of explaining this bill and the reasons it was reported out. From the statement of the chairman as to how this bill was to be financed and the purpose, he almost persuaded me, and if it had not been for the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] who made clear that there were other more pressing needs, as for example, national defense, I could at this time go along and vote for it. But again the danger confronting us—the billions needed—not only for defense but for many of the administration's proposals; this program, while desirable, can wait, while more pressing, more needed—yes, necessary appropriations are made.

The cost does seem to be excessive. Wholly unnecessary—especially in view of the passage of legislation giving additional unemployment compensation—the passage of the distressed area legislation and some other measures.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the able, distinguished and always on the job gentleman from Iowa—my colleague who day after day by diligence finds the waste in the bills which come before us and never fails to advise to be careful in spending the tax dollar.

Mr. GROSS. Why does the gentleman say it is excessive?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not being an expert, not having attended the committee hearings or being in on all the details of what is going on all over the country, not knowing too much about all the construction, and I will say perhaps I do not know too much about it, I do know of some highway contractors who a few years ago did not have anything, but today are very prosperous. I know one group that had to even split up into three or more corporations in order to divide the business. On occasion there seems to be a suspicious identity of bids—a practice somewhat similar to that followed by industry. Some of that prosperity comes from improved methods of roadbuilding. For example, when the old contracts were let in Michigan, much of the work was done by small machines—some hauling dirt by team. Today contractors come along with bigger and more costly machines. We do not have mountains in Michigan except some small ones in the northern peninsula where we are not building too many roads, but we have some hills and hollows. I have watched some of the big machines just push a hill into a ravine. Contractors bring along a great big machine and push that hill right over into a hole, then they sell the top of what was a hill and the top of what was a hole for building lots. Some of those gentlemen have been able to become immensely wealthy. That is all to the good but it does indicate that highway construction contracts should be let on present-day conditions—not on costs based on the use of equipment or methods which long have been discarded. Nor are contractors' profits the only cause of increased cost, the reason why the tax dollars buy less highway. There is also the labor cost.

We have all been receiving letters, many from truckers and the truckers' wives about the hardships that have and will come to them if we do not aid them—owners and employees—to continue to successfully meet competition from railroads, to give them more and better highways, and that without unduly adding to their tax burden.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Very briefly. Is it some more about lives being saved? My answer is if users of the highways did not drive so fast, and I am one of them, we would not kill so many people nor would the danger of meeting death on a highway be so great.

Mr. SCHERER. Some contractors have made money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, perhaps too much money.

Mr. SCHERER. Wait a minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was just citing the item of cost. I am glad contractors are making it. Some of them may patronize my son's law firm in connection with some of these damage suits. Though that I doubt and no one is so heartless as to wish for an accident.

As I sit here I could not help but think about this big beautiful marble building over here with that real expensive marble bath—its luxurious offices, its commodious dining room—while Congressmen eat in a crowded restaurant, served from a below-the-ground, cockroach infested kitchen by a devoted and efficient cook—not a French chef—and his hardworking assistants—a group of ever attentive and courteous waiters.

Mr. SCHERER. Will the gentleman yield now? He said some contractors made money. How many went broke on this interstate highway business?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman may know of some, it may be many—I do not know of any. I certainly do not want any to operate unless there is a fair prospect of a profit. The tax they pay helps build more roads. Some I have met were in Canada fishing, came up there in private planes. I do not know of any contractors who went broke on highway contracts—it would be strange if some did. Every business has its hazards—its risks. I know many hearts bleed for the gentlemen over there in this marble building that has cost—how many millions? Over in that beautiful building where they can look out to the Senate Building just a block or two away and call up Senators, call up Representatives and give orders. They send them over to your office, they send them to my office—remind us of their support, of their financial contributions to our campaigns. Thirteen of the twenty Democratic Members of the House Labor Committee received financial aid according to the reports filed with the House Clerk. Maybe I should suggest that the railroads are not making money and the employees of the railroads are also in need. Do the truckers' representatives say, "Forget that. We are not interested in that." But that is only human nature. But has it not something to do with the cost of building highways, with competition?

In my country when the farmers and the businessmen in a small town vote money to build schoolhouses—a somewhat similar incident actually occurred in a district in the northern part of the State. In my district a hospital—what happened? "Oh, boy," the steelworkers say, "Nothing doing unless we have the job—all the jobs—none for the local people."

What did Goldberg say over here a week ago on a Monday? That the jobs belong to the union men. But are there not some people who are not union men who pay taxes, a few of them here and there, scattered around? How are they to dig up the dollars for highways if they cannot work? Must we all pay tribute to a union before earning money—some of which goes automatically through the checkoff to the union treasury? That is one of the things that gets us down, and I cannot understand it, that increased cost of everything that goes into a highway just as soon as a program is started, and it keeps going up and up. Pardon me, what was it the gentleman wanted?

Mr. SCHERER. May I ask a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman does not make an argument.

Mr. SCHERER. The gentleman complains about the leaders not being on the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not complaining about anything, except that with just a few Members on the floor we kill time all day—no opportunity to speak because committee members are entitled to the time and then in come the leaders and we are told we must finish in 5 or 10 minutes. I admire and respect the leaders on both sides. All I object to is that because they are engaged in their necessary worthwhile activities, they cannot be on the floor, then they come in along the last end of the day and especially as the end of the session draws near and want us to quit and get out of here.

Well, that is human nature. And, I am a little bit resentful. Just cannot forget: When I had a couple of amendments which merited considerable support to the labor bill, they allowed me 54 seconds on each amendment. Was that not generous? No; I am not complaining about the leaders, I am talking about the necessity of reducing costs so we can get more mileage for less money—have funds for—at the moment more vital projects. Permit me to call attention to another situation where there is excessive cost—where our future security is at stake—which if not treason comes close to it.

TREASON? SABOTAGING OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Constitution states that treason "against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

While our constitutional provision was derived from the English Statute of Treasons enacted in 1351, it is more restrictive than the definition of treason in the English statute and takes from the Congress the power to define treason and prescribe limitations on the power to punish.

For present purposes, we may forget the constitutional definition which refers to war, limit present consideration to the phrase "adhering to their—our—enemies, giving them aid and comfort."

AID AND COMFORT

In Haupt against United States,[1] where a father harbored and sheltered in his home a son who was an enemy spy and saboteur, assisting him in purchasing an automobile and in obtaining employment in a defense plant, the Court upheld a conviction for treason. Justice Jackson speaking for the Court said:

> No matter whether young Haupt's mission was benign or traitorous, known or unknown to the defendant, these acts were aid and comfort to him. * * * They were aid in steps essential to his design for treason.

[1] 330 U.S. 631 (1947).

Supreme Court decisions,[2] in the opinion of some, leave the definition of treason in a somewhat uncertain state.

On April 16, 1917, as we entered World War I, President Wilson enumerated acts which the Courts held to be within the constitutional definition of treason. One definition was—

> the performance of any act * * * which will give or supply in any way aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States.

Unquestionably, any act which lessens our ability to maintain or add to our national defense gives "aid and comfort" to our enemies.

However, because we are a member of various international organizations,[3] whose majority decisions we have obligated ourselves to accept and support, it is obvious that we can no longer independently determine when or where we will wage war. Hence, we dare not limit our defense efforts to a war which we may declare.

It follows that any concerted, sustained effort which lessens, hinders, or destroys our national effort to either defend ourselves or, at the demand of our associates, wage an aggressive war, is, within the meaning of the Constitution, giving aid and comfort to our enemies.

It is common knowledge that Congress has appropriated billions of dollars to enable the United States to prepare for national defense. We have given other billions, as well as implements of war, to make good our promise to, at the demand of our allies, join them in war to maintain their national independence.

While some unions are voluntarily accepting a reduction in compensation,[4] others appear to deliberately follow policies which ultimately result in increasing the price of the product to a point where consumers refuse to buy, followed by the loss of the jobs upon which employees are dependent for a livelihood.

It is also common knowledge that our efforts to produce and have on hand well-known instrumentalities of defense have been and are impaired by strikes in plants producing missiles, munitions of war of all kinds.

Recently, April 26, Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of a Senate subcommittee, and others in a position to know, called attention to the fact that not only have strikes delayed national defense efforts, but have added to the cost of our missile program,[5] hence, given us less adequate defense.

An editorial from the Chicago Tribune of May 1, 1961,[6] carried the implication that it might well be that Communists are, to at least some extent, behind this effort to delay and lessen our military ability to defend ourselves, thus, if successful, given them—our enemies—aid and comfort.

Earlier, then Attorney General Jackson charged that the strike at the plant of the Vultee Aircraft Co. in California, which had an $84 million contract for equipment for the national defense program, was "caused and prolonged" by Communists.

From recent publicity, one might think this effort to delay preparedness was something new, something heretofore unheard of; that otherwise the Congress would have written and demanded the enforcement of remedial legislation.

But the issue is an old one. Individuals and organizations, whose laudable ambition has grown into greed, for more than 20 years have made more costly, less prompt, less adequate, our efforts to strengthen our national defense in time of threatened war. Did that not give aid and comfort to an enemy?

As long ago as October of 1939, the then Acting Secretary of the Navy filed an official statement, disclosing that the production of castings for airplane engines needed by the Navy to add to our defensive ability was, in one instance held up for 41 days, in another for 24 days, at the demand of the United Automobile Workers–CIO.[7]

As early as January of 1941,[8] attention was called to a similar situation and to a bill introduced to make it possible for greater defense production at less cost.

In March of 1942, both the AFL and the CIO were successfully demanding that workers engaged in the construction of military barracks buy a work permit before they could aid in constructing shelter for those who had enlisted or been drafted and who were in training for war.[9]

January 10, 1941, a bill, H.R. 1814, was introduced to render effective the right to work, "to provide for the common defense." It was never given consideration.

The bill enumerated just a few of the incidents demonstrating that at that time our preparations for national defense were being hindered and delayed by selfish demands.[10]

NOT A NEW BUT EFFECTIVE REMEDY

From the press, it is learned that Senator McCLELLAN suggests that depriving misbehaving union organizations or officers and members of some of their special privileges may be helpful and necessary.

That suggestion is not a new one, nor is it unreasonable.

Like the willful driver who refuses to operate his automobile in a manner which will protect the rights and safety of others and is therefore deprived of his license to drive, it may be necessary and, in my judgment, it long has been necessary, to deprive unions and union members, as well as their officials, of special privileges, benefits, and exemptions granted them, when they arbitrarily disregard national needs, the rights of others, by misuse of the special legislative benefits and exemptions they enjoy.

As long ago as February 1946, when labor disputes were burdening and obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, a bill was introduced,[11] which provided that one who violated the act should cease to be entitled to the status of an employee for the purposes of sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act.

That bill was reintroduced in 1947.[12]

Another bill, introduced in 1951,[13] provided that, when an employee violated certain sections of the act, his status as an employee should end.

In 1952, a bill[14] "to promote the national defense and protect the public welfare" was introduced. That bill prescribed a penalty which deprived an employee and a labor organization which violated the act of certain rights under legislation which granted special benefits and privileges to labor organizations and their members.

In 1955, a bill[15] to protect the public health, safety, or welfare when injuriously affected by strikes in public utilities provided that, whenever a labor organization or its officers or members violated the act, special privileges granted by so-called labor legislation should be suspended during the work stoppage or strike.

None of these bills has been given consideration.

While the remedy suggested by Senator McCLELLAN is not new; while none of us would suggest strikes or work stoppages should be prohibited, if we are to prosper, remain free to enjoy our natural and constitutional rights and privileges, insure our security as a Nation, it is apparent that we cannot permit individuals or organizations to even lessen—much less destroy—our efforts to continue a free nation, maintain our ability to provide for our future security.

Work stoppages, strikes, in national defense industries are indefensible, certainly give aid and comfort to the enemy.

On May 25, 1946, following World War II, President Truman appeared before a joint session of the Congress and, among other things, he said:

> (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, part 5, p. 5752): I desire to thank you for this privilege of appearing before you in order to urge legislation which I deem essential to the welfare of our country. For the past 2 days the Nation has been in the grip of a railroad strike which threatens to paralyze all our industrial, agricultural, commercial, and social life.
>
> * * * * * *

---

[2] *Ex parte Bollman*, 4 Cr. 75 (1807); *Cramer* v. *United States*, 325 U.S. 1 (1945); *United States* v. *Burr*, 4 Cr. 470 (1807); *Haupt* v. *United States*, 330 U.S. 631 (1947); *Kawakita* v. *United States*, 343 U.S. 717.

[3] United Nations; North Atlantic Treaty Organization; Southeast Asia Treaty Organization; Organization of American States; Australia, New Zealand, and U.S. Mutual Defense Pact, and others.

[4] Washington Star news item Apr. 26, 1961. See app. A.

[5] Articles from Washington Evening Star and editorial from Chicago Tribune, app. B.

[6] Chicago Tribune editorial, app. C.

[7] Answer of then Acting Secretary of the Navy Charles Edison dated Oct. 20, 1939, to HOFFMAN. H. Res. 314, app. D.

[8] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 1, p. 349.

[9] See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 3, p. 3085.

[10] See app. E.

[11] H.R. 5570, Feb. 25, 1946, 79th Cong., 2d sess.

[12] H.R. 86, Jan. 3, 1947, 80th Cong., 1st sess.

[13] H.R. 2428, Feb. 6, 1951, 82d Cong., 1st sess.

[14] H.R. 7716, May 5, 1952, 82d Cong., 2d sess.

[15] H.R. 7212, July 7, 1955, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

As I stated last night, unless the railroads are manned by returning strikers, I shall immediately undertake to run them by the Army of the United States.

Following that statement and on the same day, the House, under suspension and by a vote of 306 to 13, passed a bill, H.R. 6578—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 92, part 5, pages 5762–5763—which among other things, provided that—page 5754:

Whenever the United States has taken possession, under the provisions of section 9 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or the provisions of any other applicable law, of any plants, mines, or facilities constituting a vital or substantial part of an essential industry, and in the event further that a strike, lockout, slowdown, or other interruption occurs or continues therein after such seizure, then if the President determines that the continued operation of any such plant, mine, or facility is vitally necessary to the maintenance of the national economy, the President may by proclamation declare the existence of a national emergency relative to the interruption of operations.

The bill further provided that—

Any affected employee who fails to return to work on or before the finally effective date of the proclamation (unless excused by the president), or who after such date engages in any lockout, strike, slowdown, or other concerted interruption of operations while such plants, mines, or facilities are in the possession of the United States, shall be deemed to have voluntarily terminated his employment in the operation thereof, shall not be regarded as an employee of the owners or operators thereof for the purposes of the National Labor Relations Act or the Railway Labor Act, as amended, unless he is subsequently reemployed by such owners or operators, and if he is so reemployed shall be deemed a new employee for purposes of seniority rights.

A subsequent section of the bill further provided that, where an employee refused to return to work within 24 hours after the final date of the President's proclamation, he should be—

Inducted into the Army of the United States at such time, in such manner (with or without an oath), and on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the President, as being necessary in his judgment to provide for the emergency.

Today we are confronted by a national emergency. In my humble judgment, those who refuse to work on a defense program, seek to prevent others from so doing, are giving aid and comfort to the enemy, and we should not for one moment tolerate what might justly be termed their disloyalty.

At the moment, if a defense worker wants to walk off a defense job, I would not deprive him of that right. But I would tell him that he was through on that job and that none of the remedial legislation passed for the benefit of unions or employees should longer be of benefit to him.

Permit a repetition. The present situation, which not only deprives citizens of their civil rights, but threatens our effort to prepare for national defense and our ability to keep our pledges to our allies, is not a new one.

Nor is the remedy now suggested new or unreasonable. Special privileges, abused, misused, should be suspended or withdrawn.

Lacking either the inclination or the courage, perhaps seeking political support of powerful labor leaders—and they did control enough votes to decide the last counted presidential vote—we have, for all of 20 years, permitted action by certain organizations, more especially by their representatives, which have and which now do, give "aid and comfort" to the enemy.

Long, long ago, we gave notice to the world that we would not tolerate any act in the Western Hemisphere which might endanger our national safety. Yet today, when we are fighting communism, when it is said that a Communist base is being established in Cuba, less than 100 miles from our shore, when we are on the verge of war in several places throughout the world, when we are straining every effort to aid our allies and prepare for our own national defense, we sit idly by and permit the production of munitions of war to be delayed by individuals and organizations whose primary desire is more money.

APPENDIX A

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 26, 1961]

UNIONISTS ACCEPT CUTS TO KEEP PLANTS GOING

(By A. F. Mahan)

DETROIT, April 26.—To keep their plants competitive or from moving elsewhere—in other words, to preserve their jobs—approximately 10,000 Michigan unionists have agreed this year to take cutbacks in wage contracts.

In one Detroit instance, workers had the National Labor Relations Board kick out their union, which had demanded more. Then they accepted less.

Among those agreeing to cutbacks are locals of the United Auto Workers, the Allied Industrial Workers, the Railway Brotherhoods, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, and the International Association of Machinists.

VOTE TO CONTINUE CUT

In one case early this year, some 500 UAW members voted 2 to 1 at Menominee, Mich., to continue in effect a 10-percent wage cut they had accepted a year earlier. Involved were employees of the Lloyd Manufacturing Co., a maker of seating for schools and public buildings. The firm is a subsidiary of Heywood-Wakefield Co. of Gardner, Mass., where employes previously had agreed to continue a 10-percent cut they accepted for 1960.

In both instances Heywood-Wakefield expressed doubt it could meet competition without the cutback. It said both the Michigan and Massachusetts plants might have to be closed.

The Menominee union first rejected continuation, on grounds the UAW cutback had saved the company $175,000 in 1960, while individual living costs were rising. The company countered it had lost $613,000 last year and estimated its current Menominee wage at $1.99 an hour. It said losses had been higher in 1958 and 1959.

In a subsequent second vote, the union decided 235–102 to continue the cutback.

WORKERS UPSET UNION

One of the most dramatic developments in this field in Michigan was in heavily unionized Detroit. The 76-year-old Best Broom Manufacturing Co., Inc., laid off 15 of its 25-man work force in November 1959, contending it could no longer remain competitive. It said it would increase its broom imports from Mexico to 16,800 a month.

Then in November 1960, a representative of Local 42 of the General Industrial Employees presented President Shimon L. Berris with demands for improved vacations, 3 additional paid holidays and a welfare plan which Mr. Berris said would have cost $9.35 a month per employee.

At this point, employees led by Russell Sargent asked the National Labor Relations Board to decertify the union as bargaining agent and voted 8 to 2 against the union.

Meantime, a large food chain notified Berris it was meeting customer resistance to brooms made outside the United States. Mr. Berris said he determined he could manufacture brooms here and sell at the Mexican price if he could reduce wage costs by 7 percent. Employees voted unanimously March 24 to accept the wage cut. Mr. Berris promised to return to full production in his Detroit plant and to halt all imports. He estimated 1961 wage savings would approximate $10,000.

"The important thing," Mr. Sargent said, "is that all of us will be working, and maybe some of those who were laid off—and most of them are on welfare today—will be recalled."

At Lansing an abrupt end was put to rumors on March 7 that Motor Wheel Corp. was planning on moving some of its operations elsewhere. Local 182 of Allied Industrial Workers, which represents the firm's 2,300 hourly workers, and Motor Wheel announced a contract revision effective to September 1, 1963.

R. J. Wilcox, Motor Wheel executive vice president, said the revision provided for an adjustment in production rates and incentive pay, elimination of paid lunch periods for two-shift operations, elimination of an extra coffee break, and changes in relief and overtime clauses.

Employees of C. M. Hall Lamp Co. of Detroit, accepted a 17-cent hourly pay cut in a "keep-the-plant-here" agreement, which the UAW's international executive board has refused to sanction but which local 304 has put in operation anyway.

The agreement carries a pledge from the company that no operation or equipment will be moved from the Detroit plant—where employment has dropped from 500 to 150 in 3 years—to another Hall plant in Clinton, N.C., for at least 2 years.

"Our company," said Hall President Harry D. Hirsch, "would have been forced to end all operations in Detroit by the end of the year without wage relief. * * * We anticipate employment at our Detroit plant.

APPENDIX B

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 1961]

MISSILE BASE STRIKES DEPLORED BY MCCLELLAN

Senator MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas said today costly strikes and work slowdowns at missile bases invite a tough new law to outlaw unions responsible for such things.

Senator MCCLELLAN said his Senate Investigations Subcommittee in hearings this week produced "evidence beyond any reasonable doubt" that organized labor at the Cape Canaveral missile base abused the strike weapon to enrich its members at taxpayers' expense.

The subcommittee has heard a parade of witnesses denounce the 109 strikes and uncounted work slowdowns reported at Canaveral in the last 4½ years, charging these have inflated costs by millions of dollars and slowed the program.

Senator MCCLELLAN said it was clear that most of the strikes were called on flimsy grounds with "the premeditated purpose" of throwing missile projects behind schedule so workers could draw overtime pay in a rush to catch up.

SOME GOT $764 A WEEK

The subcommittee has produced evidence that many plumbers and electricians drew

wages up to $764 a week, including overtime computed at four times the regular wage rate.

Robert Palmer, top labor leader at the base, has acknowledged that they "must have" slowed the missile program. He denied any strike was designed to force overtime wage payments, and swore he never authorized a walkout.

Mr. Palmer is business manager of Local 756 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Witnesses have said other unions follow his lead on strike and work slowdown matters.

Joseph W. Morgan, Teamsters Union general organizer in Florida, invoked the fifth amendment constitutional provision against possible self-incrimination when asked yesterday about his own role in a strike which virtually paralyzed the base for 4 weeks in 1957 near the peak of the rush to gear up missile programs.

LEGISLATION CONSIDERED

Senator McCLELLAN told reporters he may draft legislation to protect missile bases and other defense installations from crippling strikes.

He said the situation seemed to invite a law to strip a union of its legal rights to bargain and enforce labor contracts or retain tax exemption if convicted of violations.

He said he was still undecided how far the law should go in curbing strikes against the Government and the people.

Such a bill would collide with an administration proposal to legalize picketing at common site construction projects. These are jobs where two or more employers have separate work crews. In these cases a picket line established against one employer poses a question as to whether the employees of the others should cross the line.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 27, 1961]

MISSILE BASE STRIKES HIT AT SENATE PROBE

A Cape Canaveral contractor says labor unions have done more damage to the Nation's missile program than the Communists ever could.

Electrical contractor Henry Gable said there have been deliberate work slowdowns, inflation of labor costs, and other practices he called "rotten."

In testimony to the Senate Investigations Subcommittee yesterday, he said:

"There is no way the Communists could do this Nation's missile effort the damage done by labor at Cape Canaveral."

The subcommittee is investigating labor difficulties at the Nation's far-flung network of missile bases, including 327 strikes in 4½ years at 22 bases.

"It borders on subversion, doesn't it?" subcommittee Chairman McClellan, Democrat of Arkansas, suggested.

"I have a worse word for it than that, sir," Mr. Gable replied, "but there are ladies present."

But Mr. Gable insisted he does not believe there is a single Communist involved in what he criticized.

There was no immediate comment from the unions involved. C. J. Haggerty, president of the AFL—CIO building and construction trades department, said he was on call as a witness, perhaps today, and is ready to answer all questions.

Mr. Gable's testimony capped a day in which a string of witnesses charged that strikes were used as a form of blackmail to force payment of exorbitant, needless overtime to workers at Cape Canaveral in Florida and at the Vandenberg Air Force missile base in California.

"Patriotic blackmail," was the term employed by William L. Rose, general manager of the Milgo Electronic Corp. of Miami, in a denunciation of strike threats he said were used at Cape Canaveral to enforce featherbedding practices.

Another witness, Euell H. Hodge, testified he resigned last week as the civilian contract officer at the Vandenberg base because he was frustrated by loafing and featherbedding. He contended these had inflated costs and slowed work on Titan and Atlas missile projects there.

Witness after witness pictured conditions at the two bases which seemed, they said, to have but one goal—to inflate wages through the payment of double, triple, and even four times the official pay rates.

Robert E. Dunne, a subcommittee staff investigator, and J. J. Bevis, a Government accountant, teamed up to tell about ditchdiggers and other workers at Vandenberg and Cape Canaveral.

They explained how an electrician's $3.50-an-hour wage rate can produce a weekly pay check of $674.50, as the overtime mounts into quadruple time.

They cited the wages of Electrician R. J. Corteaux of Ormond Beach, Fla., as an example. They said he worked an 84-hour week last October, with regular wage rates for the first 12 hours, time and a half for 18 hours, double time for 22 hours, triple time for 26 hours, and quadruple time for 6 hours.

"The above is not unique," they added.

They said plumbers and pipefitters drew wages of $420 to $733 a week, including overtime computed at up to 4 times the regular rate; electricians $413 to $670 a week, while Maj. Gen. David Wade, the commander of Vandenberg got pay and allowances totaling $365 a week.

"Common laborers (including ditchdiggers) earned up to $287 during the weeks we checked, considerably more than the total pay and all allowances for our astronauts," they wrote.

"The foreman of the common laborers group made $434—more than the Secretary of the Air Force. The 14 ironworkers on the payroll earned salaries ranging from $444 to $611 and had average earnings of $520 each—considerably more than the $480 we pay the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara.

"Elevator operators made $360 a week, warehouse clerks $262—more than a full colonel," the two investigators added.

Contending these are not isolated cases, Mr. Dunne and Mr. Bevis said Joseph H. Baker, a Daytona Beach, Fla., electrician, drew wages at Cape Canaveral totaling $17,679 in 1958, $14,907 in 1959.

They reported Baster B. Cash, an electrician whose home address was not given, received $15,518 in 1958 and $13,096 in 1959, while a man named Ray King averaged $518 a week for 10 weeks in 1958.

They said Scientist Wernher von Braun and Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover drew Government pay of only $13,894 in 1958.

Irwin Longenbacher, the subcommittee's assistant counsel, said he has made a survey which showed that the time lost in 109 strikes at Cape Canaveral in the last 4½ years is equal to 5.6 percent of the total mandays worked there in the same period.

He said many strikes were from trivial jurisdiction rows between unions.

Mr. Rose testified that the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers forced the Government to pay twice for the installation of electronic devices known as squeezers used in launching missiles. He said the extra cost was many thousands of dollars.

[From the Washington Star, Apr. 28, 1961]

ELECTRICAL UNION HIT ON MISSILE JOB COSTS

Senate investigators charged today that arbitrary rules of an electricians union threaten to add $3 million to the cost of the Titan missile program.

Defense plans call for 12 squadrons of the intercontinental missiles.

Jerome S. Adlerman, counsel to the Senate Investigations Subcommittee, claimed evidence that unionized electricians' refusal to permit the use of prefabricated electrical cable connections in the missile would add a quarter of a million dollars per squadron to the cost, or a total of around $3 million.

Subcommittee Chairman McCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, demanding new Federal laws to curb the strikes and other labor trouble plaguing missile bases, called more witnesses for questioning on this and other matters.

"Where is America's patriotism?" he exploded yesterday after hearing testimony of strikes allegedly called to throw projects behind schedule and force payment of overtime wages to laborers at Cape Canaveral, Fla., in a drive to meet project dates.

Robert Palmer, pictured as the top labor official at the base, denied heatedly that any strikes have been called there to force the payment of overtime.

DEFENDS PATRIOTISM

He is business manager of Local 756 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. Witnesses have said other unions follow his lead on strike and work slowdown matters.

Mr. Palmer conceded that strikes and slowdowns at the base must have had some adverse effect on the missile program.

But he insisted that the strikers were patriotic Americans just as interested as anyone else in seeing the United States beat Russia in the race for mastery in the missile and space flight fields.

"I have never called a strike," Mr. Palmer said, declared all of the many electricians' walkouts at the base were the workers' own ideas. He conceded he rarely tries to induce the men to go back to work before they have won the strike.

OPPOSES LONG SHIFTS

Far from trying to promote overtime, Mr. Palmer said he has sought to induce the Government and the Air Force to reduce it. He denied the 12-hour work shifts and 6-day weeks that ran electricians' wages up to $764 a week were their desire.

Under Senator McCLELLAN'S prodding, Mr. Palmer said he was willing to negotiate a new contract calling for 8-hour shifts around the clock to take care of rush programs, provided the men are reimbursed for their travel between home and work. He said there was little housing near the base.

Mr. Palmer sidestepped questions on whether his union's refusal to allow installation of complex prefabricated electrical connections in Titan or other missiles was a waste of taxpayers' money. But he said he was opposed to waste in the program.

Witnesses have testified the connections could be produced in factories several times as fast and at far less expense than on the job at Canaveral, as is now being done at IBEW insistence.

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 2, 1961]

UNION GOUGING IN ORBIT

The testimony on union practices at the Cape Canaveral and Vandenberg Air Base missile-launching sites can't be called incredible because nobody disputes it. It is incontrovertible that the unions have, in these years of national peril, hampered missile development by means of strikes, slowdowns, and working at 20 to 30 percent of the efficiency expected of them.

These tactics have been pursued in total disregard of patriotism or the national safety solely in order to enforce an extortionate wage scale in a field that is vital to America's survival. These scandalous practices have gone unhindered for years, with never a word of remonstrance from either the National Government or the central union administration.

Only now that the story is coming out through the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee have the taxpayers become acquainted with the full details of what they are paying union racketeers to sabotage the Nation's defenses. Among the facts are these:

1. There have been 327 strikes or work stoppages since missile-site construction began in 1957, at a cost of 163,000 man-days.

2. Workers have forced an abnormal 12-hour shift on contractors, rigging the starting time so that they collect the regular rate of pay the first 4 hours, time and a half the second 4 hours, and double overtime the last 4 hours.

3. While Secretary of Defense McNamara is paid $480 a week, all 14 ironworkers at Cape Canaveral average between $520 and $611 a week.

4. An apprentice electrician, brother-in-law of a union boss at Canaveral, collects $673 a week, equal to the salary of the Vice President of the United States.

5. Another electrician at the cape has earned as high as $748 a week, more than the combined pay of Vice Admiral Rickover, developer of the nuclear submarine, and Dr. Werner von Braun, space and rocket expert.

6. Pay of plumbers and pipefitters ranges from $402 to $733 a week. Electricians averaged between $413 and $670 a week.

7. Plumbers and pipefitters at Vandenberg Base refused to handle manifolds that came assembled for installation in missiles. At first the so-called workmen were allowed to estimate the time it would require to assemble the mechanisms and were permitted to sit idle an equivalent time, starting at the manifolds, while drawing full pay. Now they have enforced delivery of the manifolds unassembled.

The chief of the racket at Canaveral is the local boss of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. He exercises control over 30 unions engaged at the missile base. It seems unlikely that the extortion against the taxpayers is permitted to operate merely to enrich the rank and file workers. The committee should pursue the possibility of kickbacks.

This disgusting business is to be read against the background of the platform pronouncement of President Kennedy's New Frontier:

"The right to a job requires * * * repeal of the antilabor excesses which have been written into our labor laws."

The evidence from the missile sites points to the exact opposite. Far from compelling reasonable union practices, existing labor laws are so feeble and ineffective that union bosses have been freed of all restraint and are engaging in highway robbery against the Government itself.

May we expect Mr. Kennedy to correct these abuses? Considering how deeply he is committed to the unions, we wonder how far he will go.

APPENDIX C

[From the Chicago Tribune, May 1, 1961]

THE FIFTH AMENDMENT AT THE CAPE

The latest installment of Senator MCCLELLAN'S Permanent Investigations Subcommittee inquiry into union operations at missile bases strongly suggests that Communist sabotage as well as union greed has played a part in the agonizing delays that have frustrated progress in missile development.

The investigation had already disclosed that since construction began in 1957 on the missile sites at Cape Canaveral, Patrick Air Force Base, and Vandenberg Air Base, 347 strikes and work stoppages at a cost of 163,000 man-days were called by unions to enforce an extortionate wage scale. Union malingerers in the plumbing, pipefitting, electrical and ironworking trades were regularly collecting pay of between $400 and $750 a week—in excess of the salaries of the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the chief American expert on rocketry, and Vice Admiral Rickover, who developed nuclear submarines.

The subcommittee's attention turned to one strike which halted work at Cape Canaveral for 4 weeks in 1957. It developed that the strike was called by Joseph Morgan, an organizer for James Hoffa's racket-ridden International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Although both Federal and Florida State law ban union membership as a condition of getting a job, Morgan demanded that contractors force their drivers into the Teamsters Union. When the demand was refused, the strike followed.

Senator MCCLELLAN demanded of Morgan whether he was serving the Communist conspiracy or the United States. Morgan invoked the fifth amendment and refused to respond on the ground that a truthful answer would tend to incriminate him. He sought the same refuge when subjected to other questions about the strike. One referred to a statement attributed to Morgan that "the pickets will stay on till hell freezes over."

"Let's stay on till old Khrushchev comes over to bury us," remarked MCCLELLAN. He called Morgan's "a new brand of patriotism" when a strike was calculated to serve the Soviet promise to "bury" us.

This was not Morgan's first resort to a plea of fearing self-incrimination. He had dodged behind the fifth amendment before the Senate rackets committee in 1957, when he was questioned about violence in a Florida trucking strike in 1954. In his latest appearance, he even refused to tell Senator MCCLELLAN whether he is a citizen.

Ever since—especially since—the late Senator McCarthy's investigations of Communists, we have had extended oppositions of the theory that those who resort to the fifth amendment are not only exercising a constitutional right but somehow adorning themselves with a badge of honor. Thus Professor Harry Slochower of Brooklyn College, having been dismissed under New York City law after taking refuge in the amendment before a Senate committee which sought to learn if he was a Communist, was ordered reinstated by the Supreme Court with $40,000 back pay.

"We must," said the Court in that decision, "condemn the practice of imputing a sinister meaning to the exercise of a person's constitutional right under the fifth amendment."

But when the question thus evaded is specifically that of Communist affiliation, most citizens, we think, will feel that while the exercise of the right may not be denied, the refusal to answer contains an unmistakable implication. If so, adverse opinion or penalties which may be incident to the exercise of the right are justified.

Let us suppose that Morgan were a Soviet citizen who stopped work on a Soviet missile installation in pressing a union jurisdictional claim. He would be shot in short order. But, in all likelihood, he will leave the Senate hearing and be free to continue his sabotage. Mr. Hoffa will smile upon him, and the professoriate of the liberal law schools will be delighted that a constitutional right has demonstrated its continuing usefulness to the Communists.

We should think that if there were an ounce of gumption in the administration, in Congress, or in the military services which have shown a disposition to put up with every excess by unions which strikes at national survival, something would be done fast to chase the union racketeers and Communist agents out of every military installation. Mr. Kennedy in his latest speech again said that "the hour is late" in the struggle against communism. That it is as late as it is may be attributed in no small measure to the pernicious activities now disclosed at the missile bases upon which our safety depends.

APPENDIX D

REQUESTING CERTAIN INFORMATION FROM THE SECRETARY OF NAVY ON CERTAIN MATTERS IN CONNECTION WITH A STRIKE OF EMPLOYEES IN THE PLANTS OF THE BOHN ALUMINUM CO. AT DETROIT, MICH. (H. RES. 314). MR. HOFFMAN

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, October 20, 1939.

The CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution (H. Res. 314) requesting information from the Secretary of the Navy on certain matters in connection with a strike of employees in the plants of the Bohn Aluminum Co. at Detroit, Mich., was referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for report.

The questions in the resolution are set forth below, the answer to each appearing immediately thereafter:

(a) Whether the Navy Department did have a contract with said corporation.

At the time the said strike was called, the Navy Department did have a contract with the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp., of Detroit, Mich., for the manufacture of special bearings for aircraft engines. In addition, the corporation was also engaged in the manufacture of special bearings and castings for manufacturers with whom the Navy Department had contracts.

(b) Whether a strike which interfered, or would interfere, with the activities of the Navy Department occurred.

A strike actually occurred in the plants of the said corporation which did interfere with the activities of the Navy Department.

(c) How long such strike continued.

A strike was called at the corporation's plant No. 1, Detroit, Mich., on August 29, 1939. At the time the strike was called, plant No. 1 was engaged in the manufacture of special bearings for aircraft engines for manufacturers with whom the Navy has contracts. On September 15, 1939, a second strike was called at all of the seven plants of the corporation in the Detroit district in sympathy with the strike at plant No. 1 (bearings). At the time of calling the second strike, plant No. 2 was engaged in the manufacturer of castings for airplane engines in process of manufacture at the Naval Aircraft Factory, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, Pa.; also castings for a manufacturer with whom the Navy has a contract for a special type of marine engine.

The duration of the strike in plant No. 1 (bearings) was from the 29th of August to October 8, inclusive, 41 calendar days. The duration of the strike in plant No. 2 (castings) was from September 15 to October 8, 1939, inclusive, 24 calendar days.

(d) Whether the delivery of bearings or parts which had been manufactured for the Navy, or of plans, specifications, or equipment, or any of them was delayed.

The delivery of completed castings, bearings, and parts, also those in the process of manufacture, was delayed for the duration of the strike.

The Navy Department was unable to obtain the return of the Government-owned patterns, plans, and equipment for the duration of the strike.

(e) What, if any, representations were made by the Navy Department to the corporation looking toward the ending of said strike.

No representations were made by the Navy Department to the corporation looking toward the ending of the strike.

(f) What, if any, representations were made by the Navy Department to the union or its representatives looking toward the settlement of the strike?

On September 28, 1939, the U.S. Navy resident inspector of naval material at Detroit, Mich., informed the regional director of the United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Detroit, Mich., of the seriousness of the delay in the delivery of the material due on contracts, also the urgent need of the shipment of patterns and requested that he instruct his representative in charge of the picket line at the corporation's plant No. 2 to allow a representative of the inspector of naval material and a truck to pass through the picket line to pick up Government-owned patterns and ship them on a Government bill of lading.

The regional director of the United Automobile Workers, Congress of Industrial Organizations sent three representatives of union local No. 208 to discuss the removal of the patterns with the inspector of naval material. The representatives of union local No. 208 were given full access to the files on the Navy contracts and they were informed that the delay in releasing patterns for delivery were seriously jeopardizing the manufacture of airplane engines at the Naval Aircraft Factory. At the end of the discussion, the union representatives stated that as the strike situation stood at the present time, their answer was emphatically "No" and that they would not let patterns or inspected castings be removed. No further action was taken by the Navy Department to remove the patterns and castings. The Navy Department kept in touch with the strike situation at the Bohn plants through its field representatives, and through the U.S. Department of Labor, but took no steps looking toward the settlement of the strike.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES EDISON,
The Acting Secretary of the Navy.

APPENDIX E

H.R. 1814, JANUARY 10, 1941, 77TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION, PAGES 2–6

(b) Experience has demonstrated that preparations for national defense were delayed and hindered by a strike at the plant of the Vultee Aircraft Co., in Downey, Calif., which was under contract to furnish more than $84 million worth of equipment in connection with the national defense program, and that one of the causes of that strike was the demand, on the part of the company, and the refusal of the workers, to incorporate in the strike settlement agreement a no-strike clause, without a previous submission to arbitration.

(c) Attorney General Jackson charged that this strike at the plant of the Vultee Aircraft Co. was caused and prolonged by Communists.

(d) We know that 7,500 employees of the Aluminum Co. of America, of New Kensington, Pa., which had contracted to deliver supplies for military equipment, including a $1,200,000 order for new type U.S. Army field kitchens, and which are necessary for national defense, ceased work because the company refused to discharge an employee who refused to comply with a demand of the union for the payment of back dues.

(e) We know that, on December 31, 1940, a strike by the Congress of Industrial Organizations caused the closing of the International Harvester Co.'s truck works at Fort Wayne, Ind., halting production on national defense orders, and that a picket line 2,000 strong, consisting of both men and women, prevented the operation of the plant, throwing 3,300 employees out of work, and that this strike interfered with the national defense program.

(f) We know that, at Milwaukee, Wis., the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., which received orders from the Government for the construction of $18 million worth of turbine and shafting for the U.S. Navy, in connection with the national defense program, was advised by the Allis-Chalmers Workers' Union, Local No. 248, United Automobile Workers of America (Congress of Industrial Organizations) that the entire plant will be shut down if any attempt is made to reemploy two men who were members of the American Federation of Labor.

(g) We know that, at Flint, Mich., approximately 12,000 workers at Chevrolet plant No. 9, which is engaged in the production of motors for Army trucks, will soon vote on whether a strike will be called.

(h) We learn that officials of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, United Construction Workers' Union, contended that the American Federation of Labor unions would collect $350,000 if they succeeded in limiting employment at Camp Grant, Ill., to American Federation of Labor members. That the Congress of Industrial Organizations union filed with John Griffin & Sons, general contractors, a protest, because they specified membership in the American Federation of Labor as a job requirement.

(i) We know from experience that many other strikes which hinder and delay our preparations for national defense have been called and carried on because of jurisdictional disputes between labor organizations, and other strikes called and carried on because of the failure of members belonging to labor organizations to pay dues.

(j) We learn from the public press that the Congress of Industrial Organizations, through its newly elected president, Philip Murray, after a conference with the executive board of his union, announced that the most intensive labor organizing campaign in the history of the United States would be started against Bethlehem Steel Corp., Ford Motor Co., and others, and that, according to Mr. Murray, the union has all the essentials necessary to make possible the perfection of the campaign. And we know from what happened in Michigan in the sitdown strikes of 1937 that it will be impossible for this Nation to effectively prepare to defend itself if the activities which then prevailed in Michigan are repeated at the Ford plant and at the plants of the Bethlehem Steel Corp.

(k) We know that Sidney Hillman, a member of the national defense commission and a vice president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and other officials of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, acting in unison, have protested the awarding by the Government of Government contracts to the Ford Motor Co. and that, at the same time, the Congress of Industrial Organizations is engaged in an organizing drive to force Ford employees to join the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

(l) We know that Walter Reuther, who received training in subversive activities in Russia; who advocated fighting for a "Soviet America," who, with well-known Communists took part in the unlawful destruction of property in the sitdown strikes in Michigan; who openly joined Homer Martin Anderson, Communist candidate for Governor in Michigan, and Frankensteen, and others in unlawful strike activities and who is an official of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, which defied the U.S. Navy, and, by threat of force, withheld from the Navy, during the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corp. strike, property belonging to the Navy, now advocates a taking over of a portion of the motor plants at Detroit.

We know, too, that Reuther and his organization insist that no one shall work on the defense program who does not belong and pay dues to the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

(m) We know that, throughout the country, American citizens seeking employment with contractors who have agreed to perform work for the Government in connection with the national defense program, have been and are being forced to pay tribute to nongovernmental organizations, and to individuals, who have no right to make such demands, as a condition precedent to obtaining work. That the representatives of organizations without legal authority so to do are demanding and exacting at Camp Grant, Ill.; at Fort George G. Meade, Md.; Fort Custer, Mich.; Camp Peay, Tenn.; Fort Dix, N.J.; Camp Edwards, at Falmouth, Mass.; Fort Devens, Mass.; Fort Sheridan, Ill.; Great Lakes Naval Training Station, Ill.; Camp Blanding, Starke, Fla.; and at Fort Belvoir, Va., tribute, unlawfully exacted, from American citizens desiring to work and qualified to work on the national defense program, as a condition precedent to the exercise of the right to work.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there have been a good many remarks laudatory of the two committees that brought this bill to the floor of the House. But, I want to sympathize with the taxpayers of this country rather than commend the committees. And, I have no apologies to make for requesting a quorum call a little while ago. This is a $9.8 billion bill; that is, the taxpayers are being asked to cough up an additional $9.8 billion under the terms of this bill, and at the time of the quorum call there were only some 80 of the 437 Members on the floor of the House.

I am just old fashioned enough to believe there ought to be some more people around here interested in what is going to happen to the taxpayers under the terms of this bill.

I am opposed to it and I am opposed because among other things, I do not think any committee of Congress has yet stopped the enormous waste in the highway program. That is one reason. It is my understanding, for instance, that an interstate highway is being run through the city of Reno, Nev., when that highway could be located around the city of Reno at a saving to the taxpayers of $32 million. That proposition still hangs in the balance. I should think there would be no question about taking a highway around any city where there would be a saving to the taxpayers of this country of $32 million.

It will be impossible to build these highways without increasing the taxes still more if money is going to be sent down the drain in that fashion.

Mr. Chairman, I am also opposed to breaking the agreement with the taxpayers of this country that the federally levied 1-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline would expire on June 30 of this year. I am further opposed to the diversion of hundreds of millions of dollars, obtained from excise taxes on users of the highways, to the general funds of the Treasury.

We have heard a great deal today about pay-as-you-go. I do not recall, when the bill was before the House last week that spewed out a half billion dollars or more to the South American countries, with no justification, no agreements, and no contracts—I do not recall a single Member in favor of that

proposal who stood on the floor of the House and said, "Let us levy a tax to take care of this expenditure." I am for pay-as-you-go. I think it is laudable. But why not apply it to other expenditures?

A few of us around have been discussing this afternoon a bill to provide that the foreign-aid program be put on a pay-as-you-go basis; in other words, a special tax to finance the foreign giveaway program. I wonder if I might ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means which writes the tax legislation, if there would be the slightest chance we could get a bill out of his committee to provide that the foreign giveaway program be put on a pay-as-you-go special tax basis.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I would think that such a procedure would create problems.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think it would be a nice thing for Congress to put the foreign giveaway on a pay-as-you-go basis, levy a special tax to pay for it?

Mr. MILLS. I thought of all my colleagues that my friend from Iowa would rejoice the most over the fact that we were doing that with respect to this program. I do not understand how you can say that you are opposed to doing it here because we have not done it anywhere else. Let this be the starting point and then maybe we can do it with respect to some of the others.

Mr. GROSS. The trouble is, this is where pay as you go starts and this is where it finishes. As far as the foreign aid program is concerned it will be gone "Where the woodbine twineth and the whine doodle whangeth," and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to take additional time. It has been announced that the "T and T" Club, the out-on-Thursday, back-on-Tuesday Club, is all set up. I am sure that the members of the club are anxious to get away.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am very happy to yield to the leader of my party.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The rest of your party. The gentleman knows of those social engagements, does he not, that have to be met?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And we cannot interfere with that. I hope the gentleman will not.

Mr. GROSS. I would not want to be antisocial.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. My supplemental minority views follow the minority views. I am for highways, of course. This is a tax increase here, and I do not believe this is the time to increase taxes in any area whether they are earmarked taxes or otherwise. This is the second tax-increase bill that has been before us. The other was social security, another earmarked tax.

It is obviously a waste of words to call attention to the fact that earmarked taxes at the Federal level are unconstitutional, but the fact remains that they are unconstitutional. There is one other way, of course, possibly, of financing this program, that is, deficit financing, but I want to suggest that that is no out, either. The Committee on Ways and Means is going to come before the House within a month or so asking that the debt ceiling be increased. We are going to ask permission to try to market more Federal bonds.

There is a way, if anyone would care to go into it, how this program could be financed properly, constitutionally, and, I might say, with some fiscal responsibility. Now is not the time to go into it. I have tried to go into it year after year in the Committee on Ways and Means. I simply state that I have tried to point out a way in which this program can be financed from a fiscally sound standpoint. Actually if we wanted to complete it in 1972 we could do so. This is not before the House. There is one issue before the House, regrettably, whether you are going to increase taxes. In my judgment, now is not the time to increase taxes. If this bill is defeated it simply means that this program will take 3 or 4 more years to complete. In the priorities that face this country, I suggest that completing this program in 1972 is not among the highest. I urge my colleagues to vote it down.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inform the Committee, especially those on the Republican side, that 5 of the 10 members of the Committee on Ways and Means who are Republicans voted for this bill. I do not know whether or not you knew that, from the nature of the debate.

I am for the bill. I want to finish this program on schedule, in 1972. The only way you can do it is to finance it. This is a thorough bill, an equitable bill, a much more equitable bill than the one sent down to us by the present administration. Seven cents a gallon was recommended by the President. We put it at four. Talk about the trucking industry shedding tears. They are crying to high heaven. Five dollars was recommended by the administration. We put it at $3. The other levies are more or less minor.

This raises the money. It will save thousands of lives. We need it as a defense measure. I urge you to vote for this bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND].

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to ask a question of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Throughout all this debate we have heard about a tax on highway users. You have nevertheless taxed vehicles, not particularly or necessarily used on highways. Some reference has been made during the debate to the logging industry operations, which in many cases in the district I represent, and in the State of Washington and the State of Oregon, have vehicles which do not use these Federal highways to any extent. I have seen testimony given before your committee to that effect. Yet, nowhere in this bill can I find any consideration given whatsoever to that particular matter. Can the chairman tell me if any consideration was given and why these logging trucks which do not use our Federal highways are not exempt from this additional tax burden?

Mr. MILLS. It is my recollection, under the original act which this bill amends, that trucks are not subjected to this use tax applying to the pounds of weight unless they actually use the highways. We did give consideration to the question of whether or not we would provide in this bill any further exemptions from effective rates of taxes for special situations. It was the decision in the committee that we would not make any further exemptions to these taxes at this time on the ground that such matters could later be considered by the committee, by our committee which has jurisdiction over these taxes as well as those going to the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. WESTLAND. Is the gentleman saying, if they do not use these interstate highways, they are not going to be paying, let us say, this weight tax which is really the most onerous? And believe me, I am happy to see this committee reduce that from $5 to $3.

Mr. MILLS. The use tax is imposed only on vehicles that use the highways.

Mr. WESTLAND. These are highway motor vehicles. They are great big logging trucks and 72,000 pounds is about the average size.

Mr. MILLS. It is my recollection with reference to this use tax, the term "use" means use in the United States on public highways. That is part of the existing law. So that, for example, if I have a truck that weighs 50,000 pounds, which I use exclusively on a farm, let us say, and it never gets off my own land, which truck is used in hauling something from one point to another point, I do not have to include that truck in my statement which I file with the Internal Revenue Service for the assessment of this tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their own remarks on the pending bill at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people I have the privilege to represent, the financing legislation offered in H.R. 6713 is a real disappointment and should be rejected.

We are being asked to ignore the promise made in 1959 that the temporary fourth cent of Federal gasoline tax would expire on June 30.

We are also asked to renege on another promise—that of replacing the receipts from the fourth cent of Federal gasoline tax with revenue from portions of those special highway taxes that are now going into the general fund.

Briefly these are my reasons for opposing H.R. 6713. The motor vehicle owners of my district already bear a heavy tax load. On gasoline alone—not to mention other special highway levies—they pay a combined Federal-State tax of 11 cents a gallon. Such a stiff tax burden by itself contributes greatly to the cost-price squeeze that is being felt more and more in our rural communities.

I am opposed to tinkering with the philosophy of the 1959 Federal highway legislation. Certainly, those special road taxes now being paid to the Federal Government and not used for highways cannot be ignored if the taxpayer is to receive fair treatment.

In my opinion, the action by Congress in 1959 to use a portion of the auto and parts taxes for the road program was sound. And these provisions should be allowed to go into effect as scheduled. In all fairness to the motoring taxpayer, let us first use what he is now paying before we extract still more from him. Ample funds are already available from Federal highway taxes now being collected but not used for roads.

It is in the American tradition to face issues squarely. Our taxpaying motorists deserve to be dealt with fairly. Anything short of this would be an injustice.

Adoption of this measure would result in double taxation on a class of citizens solely because they use the highways. I submit, therefore, under any test of logic or equity that the tax proposals contained in H.R. 6713 are both unreasonable and unnecessary and should not be enacted by this Congress.

The following is my testimony of March 15 before the Committee on Ways and Means:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE RALPH F. BEERMANN, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Mr. BEERMANN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am the Representative from the Third District of Nebraska. The district I represent is primarily agricultural. I am one of six brothers who farm and feed cattle on a farm in Dakota County, Nebr. My share of this operation is 280 acres, on which I have the privilege of paying interest and taxes on an area of land about equal to what is more commonly known as the family-sized farm.

On behalf of the people I have the privilege to represent, I would like to state that the recent special message submitted by the President to the Congress concerning the Federal highway program was a real disappointment.

In his message, the President ignored the promise made by Congress in 1959 that the temporary fourth cent of the Federal gasoline tax would die in June of this year. What he did call for was an indefinite continuation of this temporary tax combined with steep increases in other road levies. This despite the fact that as a Senator 2 years ago John F. Kennedy had favored the 1959 Highway Act.

In Nebraska when one makes a promise, not only do people expect that promise to be kept, but the man making it is honorbound to keep his word.

In this same message, the President also asked Congress to renege on another promise—the feature which calls for replacing the receipts from the fourth cent of the Federal gasoline tax with revenue from portions of those special taxes on motorists that is now going into the general fund. This is the money from one-half of the 10-percent Federal tax on new autos and from five-eights of the 8-percent tax on parts and accessories.

The people of my district already bear a heavy tax load just to own and operate their motor vehicles. On gasoline alone—not to mention other special highway levies—they pay a combined Federal-State tax of 11 cents a gallon. Such a stiff tax load by itself contributes greatly to the cost-price squeeze that is being felt more and more by our people in our rural communities today.

I am appearing here today to urge that the promise made by Congress in 1959 at the recommendation of this committee be kept and the reduction in the Federal gasoline tax rate be made.

I am opposed to tinkering with the Federal highway legislation which is now on the books. Certainly those special road taxes now being paid to the Federal Government and not being used for highways cannot be overlooked if the taxpayer is to receive fair treatment.

By the same token, there is absolutely no justification whatsoever for increasing our taxes as proposed by the President.

At this point, if I may digress for a moment, let us review some of the history of the Federal road program which leads me to these conclusions.

As I understand it, the Federal Government met its obligations for highways over the years by appropriating money out of the general fund. This had been a traditional practice dating back to the time when the Federal highway program was first started. It is also my understanding that the proceeds from Federal taxes on motorists were not tied to the road program but went into the general fund.

However, in 1956, when the interstate highway program was put in motion, it was the decision of Congress to change this traditional method. As a result, certain Federal highway taxes were singled out and their proceeds deposited in a new and separate highway fund. The new approach also called for increasing the Federal gasoline tax rate to provide most of the money to pay for the program. But the revenue from all of the various special highway taxes—such as the auto excise tax—was not set aside because it was not needed at the time.

Furthermore, it is my understanding that in 1959, when Congress was told that more money was needed to keep the road program rolling, it was reluctant to increase the gasoline tax rate again.

However, it did so with great reservation and with the understanding that the increased rate would only be temporary. The expiration of the fourth cent was to be followed by using a portion of the auto and parts taxes previously withheld from the highway fund.

In my opinion, the action by Congress in 1959 to use a portion of the auto and parts taxes for the road program was sound. And the provisions of this legislation should be allowed to go into effect as scheduled.

Moreover, looking toward the future, it seems to me that this road program can be kept moving simply by continuing the dedication called for by the 1959 act for the remaining life of the program.

In all fairness to the motoring taxpayer, let us first use what he is now paying before we extract still more taxes from him. Ample funds are already available from Federal highway taxes now being collected but not used for roads.

It is in the American tradition to face issues squarely. Our taxpaying motorists deserve to be dealt with fairly. Anything short of this would be an injustice to them.

Adoption of the President's recommendations would result in double taxation on a class of citizens solely because they use the highways. I submit, therefore, under any test of logic or equity that the tax increases recommended by the President are both unreasonable and unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, we have heard a great deal in recent months about the march to new frontiers. To my way of thinking, this should mean working toward something better. But the new frontiers we are now promised apparently represent nothing more than a staggering burden of taxes which are apt to sink the taxpayers before they can even get started on the march.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. BOGGS?

Mr. BOGGS. Congressman, I am interested in some of your remarks in your statement. Did you by any chance read President Eisenhower's message of January of this year relative to the continuation of the highway trust fund?

Mr. BEERMANN. Yes, I did.

Mr. BOGGS. What did he recommend?

Mr. BEERMANN. He recommended something on the same line.

Mr. BOGGS. Do you know that it was President Eisenhower who signed the 1959 act?

Mr. BEERMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOGGS. Who is reneging on what?

Mr. BEERMANN. This is a congressional program, as I see it, and it was instituted for 18 months with the promise that that would be the end of the line, and I think it is time that we live up to our promises.

Mr. BOGGS. I know, but you have the statement in your statement that President Kennedy, who was not President in 1959, was reneging on a promise. President Eisenhower recommended the continuation of this program. Would you say that President Eisenhower was reneging on his promise?

Mr. BEERMANN. I would say that President Kennedy was a Member of this Congress at that time and helped make this promise.

Mr. BOGGS. My question is about President Eisenhower.

Mr. BEERMANN. You are from Louisiana; is that right?

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct, sir, and I am proud of it.

Mr. BEERMANN. Thank you. I would like to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I was not here. I did not help make this promise.

Mr. BOGGS. I know, but the gentleman seems to know all about the highway program. I was here. I happened to be chairman of the subcommittee that wrote that program. The gentleman gave us the benefit of a review of the program. I am glad the gentleman admitted he was not here. It is obvious that the gentleman was not here.

Is the gentleman for the interstate program? Are you for the highway program?

Mr. BEERMANN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOGGS. How does the gentleman propose to pay for it?

Mr. BEERMANN. Does not this 1-cent gas tax bring in about $800 million?

Mr. BOGGS. I asked the gentleman how he proposed to pay for it.

Mr. BEERMANN. I am getting ready to answer the question, sir.

Mr. BOGGS. Go right ahead.

Mr. BEERMANN. Does not the excise tax rate raise about $1 billion and if we take the part that is supposed to be put into the program and now going in the general fund, we would have $200 million a year more now?

Mr. BOGGS. Does the gentleman know why those excises were not put in the trust fund?

Mr. BEERMANN. I would like to be enlightened.

Mr. BOGGS. There happened to be a Secretary of the Treasury named Humphrey, who was a very able man, incidentally, and a man whom I respected greatly who made the same statement that was made here on yesterday, incidentally, by the new Director of the Bureau of the Budget, namely, that the general fund could not stand it.

I happened to be one that felt at that time that all these excises should have gone into the trust fund. I felt that way then and I still feel that way, but the gentleman's knowledge of the partisan considerations here, I must say, is quite partisan, to say the least.

This program originated in the Eisenhower administration. The original estimates on the cost were $25 billion. The estimates that we get now are $11 billion more than that and these estimates originated not since January 20, 1961, but prior to January 20, 1961.

If I may be so bold as to make a suggestion to the gentleman, it would be that this program has not been a partisan program and I am surprised at him coming here making a partisan approach to it.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BEERMANN. May I have a remark there, please?

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. BEERMANN. I said that I farm with five brothers.

Mr. BOGGS. I have heard that several times. I know that you are a farmer. I heard your speech on the floor.

Mr. BEERMANN. We have to meet a payroll.

Mr. BOGGS. A lot of people have to do that.

Mr. BEERMANN. There are a lot of things we would like to have on our farm. We would like to have some new tractors and new equipment and we would like to build some buildings, if you please, but we have to operate within our budget, and if the cost of this program has gone up, and I do not know why it has, and I am not going to point an accusing finger at anyone, or any administration on that basis, I think we should live within our budget.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MASON.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: That this witness is a witness after my own heart and that he does talk business sense, and regardless of whose fault it is that this highway program is costing 50 percent more than it was originally estimated and why it is costing that much more, that has nothing to do with the problem before us with the exception that it has created that problem and now we are trying to meet it. I am in full accord with what the witness has told this committee, and I approve his reasons for it.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. In your statement you said:

"It is also my understanding that the proceeds from Federal taxes on motorists were not tied to the road program, but went into the general fund."

I presume you are referring to the gasoline tax. What taxes are you talking about?

Mr. BEERMANN. Prior to 1956?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I do not know. This is part of your statement on page 3. What did you have in mind?

Mr. BEERMANN. The part that I have in mind is that I would like to see the promise kept on the excise taxes.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. What excise taxes are you referring to?

Mr. BOGGS. What excise taxes?

Mr. BEERMANN. On cars and tires, batteries, parts.

Mr. BOGGS. Give us the ones that do not go into the trust fund. Spell them out for us so we know which ones they are.

Mr. BEERMANN. I understand now that all of the excise taxes are going into the general fund. I would like to see the promise kept that the 50 percent that should go into the highway fund be put there.

Mr. BOGGS. Oh, no. Some of the excises go into the general fund, some of them do not. Which ones are you referring to in your statement that should go into the trust fund?

Mr. BEERMANN. Then I will have to ask you. Which ones do not?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Which ones did you have in mind?

Mr. BEERMANN. I understand that all of the excise taxes are going into the general fund.

Mr. BOGGS. Your understanding is quite wrong.

Mr. BEERMANN. Then enlighten me, please.

Mr. BOGGS. It was my understanding you had come here to enlighten us.

Mr. BEERMANN. No, I came in to ask you to keep a promise. That is my sole purpose in being here, to keep faith with the people on the basis that this law was originally passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. In answer to Mr. BOGGS' question, you said that if the excise taxes that were supposed to be put into the program were put in there, there would be no need for these additional taxes. What excise taxes do you understand were supposed to be put into the program?

Mr. BEERMANN. I understand that 50 percent of the excise taxes, which would amount to approximately $800 million, were supposed to be put in the special fund at the expiration of this cent gas tax.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Do you mean that when the excise taxes on automobiles were enacted by Congress they were intended to be used in the road fund? Is that what your feeling is?

Mr. BEERMANN. I understand that in 1956 this program was changed and the excise taxes were supposed to go into the special fund. Then, at the end of this temporary 18-month 1-cent tax half of these were to go into the special fund on highways instead of into the general fund.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Did you know before you made the statement that when the excise tax on automobiles was enacted, it was never intended to be used for the road fund, but was to go into the general fund?

Mr. BEERMANN. Gentlemen, I think we are running around the bush here pretty far.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I am asking you, did you know that?

Mr. BEERMANN. I am asking you to keep your promise that you made when this legislation was enacted. That is my sole purpose.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Is that the only answer you have to my question?

Mr. BEERMANN. That is why I came here, to ask to keep faith with the people.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. CURTIS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the witness for coming here and giving us the point of view of one of the citizens of the community, and I take it, and I am sure it is unfortunate, that some of the members of the committee have misinterpreted this statement. I have read it. I see no partisanship in the statement. The only comment I would make is, I do myself direct some of the criticism to the previous administration just as I do here. I think that should be the objective of the committee, to take the benefit of your views as a citizen, and I hope other citizens will come before us as you have done and give us their point of view. I did not expect you to come and give us, this committee, details on excises.

Mr. BOGGS is an authority on that and so is Mr. MACHROWICZ. I think the point that you make is very well taken. It is a point that I have made. You could have, had you done some additional research, substantiated your point of view even more thoroughly. This Congress, without the request of the previous President, and indeed against his advice, extended this program, and its cost, and accelerated it without providing the method of financing those changes. We had this problem up the last time we had the question of financing.

I think our people have a right to be disturbed about the way this program is going, and I myself am very disturbed. I appreciate your statement. I hope that this will not discourage you other Congressmen and other citizens from coming before this committee and giving us the benefit of your point of view on these things. I hope my colleagues will refrain from going into matters which I can tell you do not claim to be an expert on and did not come here to testify on. You limited yourself to a very proper comment, and I just wanted to say that I appreciate it and I hope you will again appear and other citizens, and will not be discouraged by the treatment that you have been given at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

Mr. ALGER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. ALGER.

Mr. ALGER. I must say to you, my colleagues, that I do not share the sentiments expressed here today because I am quick to admit I do not know all the tax law, and I suspect if some of us up here had to recite the excise taxes and just where they go we might have trouble, any one of us, if not all of us.

Furthermore, as one who departed from the previous administration most vociferously when this bill was written to put it on a pay-as-you-go basis, which I was a true champion of then and I am now, I took exception to some of the things the administration said. I do not consider your statement partisan. I think you are only reminding us that some in Congress seem to be awfully fast and loose with the taxpayer's money, and you are asking us to be more responsible in looking into where the money is going. We have increased the cost of this program hand over fist. We are not even sure why and I am asking questions and I intend to find out, and I think others on this committee are equally interested as you are in finding out, the why of the increase of cost before we ask people to jack up the taxes once again. I want to add my word to that of my colleagues in thanking you for appearing, and I hope your experience today does not discourage you in the future in appearing before this committee.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. I think the gentleman from Nebraska's statement has been most refreshing for no other reason than that it gives us a basic philosophy that has made this country great, that you stay within your budget, pay your bills, and do not borrow unnecessarily, because it is the "little fellow" who gets hurt in the end. Being a small farmer he does not come here as a representative of some of these Mississippi corporations that get 3, 4, 5 million dollar subsidies. He comes here as a Representative in Congress and one who has built up his farm operation by the sweat of his brow.

I would certainly say this to the gentleman: That if you disagree with anything this administration does, it is your duty, if that is the way you feel, to speak out. I do not think you need clear with Pierre Salinger before you come before any committee of Congress to tell us what you think.

Mr. BEERMANN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. KING?

Mr. KING. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I came in a little late. I have the gentleman's statement. As long as they leave the administration of Mr. Truman out of the argument, I suggest that we go on to the next witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps Mr. KING has made a very good suggestion. Thank you, Mr. BEERMANN, for coming to the committee.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, had there been a rollcall vote on H.R. 6713, I would have voted "no" for the following reasons:

My State of Pennsylvania has just added an additional 2-cent gasoline tax which is a large percentage of increase.

The people were promised the 1-cent temporary gasoline tax would expire June 30, 1961, and that promise should have been honored.

Proponents say our highway program must be kept on schedule. Sound business principles dictate that when improvements are contemplated and the money is not available, the improvements should be delayed.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, there are means of obtaining the funds for financing the highway program other than by continuing a fourth cent to the Federal gasoline tax. The tax rate on gasoline can revert to 3 cents a gallon come June 30, and the program still be completed on schedule if we eliminate the extravagance and unnecessary expenditures.

In my mind, the question of controlling highway costs is important not only for the highway-using taxpayers, but for the people as a whole. If costs in the highway field are allowed to get out of control, it cannot help but increase the overall inflationary spiral which is the greatest single long-range threat to our entire economic structure. Runaway inflation of roadbuilding costs, if not checked, will mean that the Nation will get fewer miles of highway for much greater expenditures in depreciated dollars.

Unless we make an honest and sincere effort to get a full dollar's worth of roads for each dollar of highway taxes, it will always be a case of the dog chasing his tail. And it will be the taxpaying motorist who will suffer. The inevitable result would be to heap more and more taxes on our motorists—and they are already bearing a staggering tax load.

I believe this bill will place an undue burden on the backs of the motorists, and the question we must ask ourselves is, What can we do to avoid this. One approach is to eliminate unnecessary and costly expenditures in the national highway program by using more heavy-duty asphalt paving in place of expensive portland cement concrete paving.

This approach would not be a novel idea. In 1959 I sought the same type of equitable remedy. A remedy which merely would assure our taxpayers that they are paying for the least expensive paving whenever and wherever possible.

I would seek an amendment, Mr. Chairman, if I were allowed, which would simply require the States to solicit competitive bidding for both types of road surfacing—asphalt and portland cement. I deeply regret that the rule for this bill does not permit me to offer such an amendment.

Perhaps it is a needless reminder, but we must not forget that the entire motoring public is paying the bill for this highway program. I believe they would desire and demand that their tax funds are spent as economically as possible. Any highway act which permits any State unilaterally to select only one type of road surfacing is an open invitation to waste and inefficiency. It is an elimination of free competition and a prejudiced use of the taxpayers' moneys.

Where comparative bid prices are available for interstate projects, the record shows conclusively that asphalt is vastly more economical than portland cement. In my own State of Massachusetts, the saving with asphalt per 4-lane mile is more than $86,000.

The Secretary of Commerce, in a speech before the National Press Club just a couple of weeks ago, had this to say:

> The Federal Government is now spending some $3 billion a year on public roads. Yet there has been relatively little spent for research in two crucial areas: Safety and lower cost roads.

The Secretary went on to say:

> A 5-percent reduction in construction cost would save some $150 million a year.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that substantial savings can be realized by using lower cost paving materials. I say to you that a saving of $86,000 per 4-lane mile when translated into the entire 41,000 mile Interstate System is a tremendously important savings.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the highway bill in view of the fact that the United States presently has in operation a highway program passed in 1956 calling for the expenditure of $52½ billion. Of this amount, almost $11 billion has already been spent, leaving more than $41½ billion still remaining to be spent.

The only question arising from the bill is whether an additional sum in excess of $9½ billion in taxes should be authorized until 1972 in order that the program can be completed on schedule. This will require that American motorists will be deprived of the 1-cent-per-gallon reduction in gasoline taxes scheduled to go into effect in July of this year, that the tax on trucking will be greatly increased, and that additional revenue of $150 million per year will be needed from the general income tax.

The highway program would be completed 4 years later without these increased taxes. If the current highway bill does not pass, the program merely will be stretched out.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in first things first. I oppose additional taxes to build shining highways from slum to sordid slum. Our national wealth is not limitless, and I prefer to use our tax dollars on emergency needs such as defense, urban renewal, education, and health.

The highway program is, of course, important. However, we already have a long-range program for highway construction without tapping general tax revenues, and with minimum impact on the users.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I also want to say that the financing provisions of this bill disturb me greatly. I do not see how we can justify a continuance of this fourth cent of the Federal gasoline tax to our constituents while the Federal Government withholds from support of the highway program huge portions of the special taxes it collects from this country's motor vehicle owners. At this time nearly $2 billion of automotive taxes are being so withheld annually.

The point has been made that it is no more reasonable to say that all automotive taxes should be dedicated to the road program than to say that certain other taxes should be dedicated to functions of particular value to the people who pay those taxes—cigarette taxes for the benefit of cigarette smokers, liquor taxes for the benefit of drinkers, and so on.

But this claim ignores the practical fact that the Nation's motor vehicle owners have been saddled with the sole and exclusive responsibility of paying the entire cost of the most gigantic public works program in the history of mankind. The national highway program, inaugurated in 1956, is described as being of the most widespread economic and defense benefit, but the cost of that program is placed entirely upon the shoulders of the people who own and operate cars, trucks, and buses.

Surely in the face of that fact, it is not unreasonable to expect that these people should at least be given full credit for all the special taxes they pay. Even at that, they are getting no great bargain from their Government. They are still paying for benefits that many others will enjoy.

But to single them out to pay the entire cost of this program, and then to deny them credit for nearly half of the special taxes they pay, is illogical and unreasonable by any standard of measurement.

It seems to me that this country's motor vehicle owners are long overdue for a more reasonable tax treatment by the Federal Government. I am disappointed that this bill does not even take a step in that direction.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to those of my colleagues who are concerned about the financing provisions of this bill before us. What particularly bothers me about this bill is that it would, in effect, make permanent the fourth cent of the Federal gasoline tax.

Let me review this situation very briefly. When the new interstate highway program was enacted in 1956 the Federal tax on gasoline was increased from 2 to 3 cents a gallon to supply most of the revenue for this tremendous program.

Then, after the estimated cost for completing the system shot up from $27 billion to $41 billion in the short space of 2 years, we were told again in 1959 that it was necessary to increase the gasoline tax another cent as a stopgap measure to keep the program moving along. As we all know, however, that 1959 legislation stipulated that the tax increase was to be temporary, and that when it went back to 3 cents a gallon in June of this year we were going to tap some of the other revenue that motorists are paying in special Federal

automotive taxes for the highway program.

I can say with some pride that the last time the State gasoline tax in Florida was increased was back in 1931. In other words, our tax rate has held steady in Florida for 30 years. The first Federal gasoline tax was enacted on a temporary basis in 1932. But I find it a little ironic that the Federal tax has grown to 4 cents in the same period and that now we are talking about making the fourth cent permanent. I am sure that I am not the only man in this room who is concerned about this trend and where it is leading us.

I think that one very real danger we face in keeping the tax rate on gasoline as high as it is, is the possibility that we are going to encourage more and more people to buy compact cars. A study prepared for the Florida Legislative Interim Tax Committee, by Rollins College, in my State, indicates that there may be more than half a million compact cars registered in Florida by 1964. That would be just about one-quarter of total passenger-car registrations.

If this comes to pass, gentlemen, I do not know what precise effect it will have on gasoline tax revenues for the Federal highway program and for Florida's own road program. Many people are saying that compact cars will mean lower gasoline consumption and reduced tax revenues. This makes sense to me. If this happens—and it could happen in your States as well as in mine—the high tax burden on gasoline will be one principal reason for it. I hope you are all aware of this fact.

Let me remind you all of one other thing. Back in 1956 Congress called for the Bureau of Public Roads to conduct a study of how the costs of this highway program might be allocated in the fairest and most equitable manner. The results of that study, which were published early this year, indicate that there are benefits of these new highways to the general economy that justify a contribution to the cost of the program from the general fund of the Treasury. This contribution would not even include the standby value of this System of Interstate and Defense Highways—let me repeat that word "Defense"—to the military.

We asked the Bureau of Public Roads to make this study. Now we are being asked in this bill to ignore one of the most important findings of that study. I, for one, do not think we should ignore it. I think that we are asking the motorists of this Nation to pay too much for a program that benefits everyone in this country, whether he drives an automobile or not.

And to be even more specific, I think we are asking the motorists to pay an exorbitant tax on one product that comes close to being an absolute necessity for rich and poor alike. I am, of course, referring to gasoline. These, gentlemen, are my reservations about this bill.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Chairman, there are but a "baker's dozen" serving in this House today who were Members when the first temporary Federal gasoline tax was passed in 1932. Many other Members have participated in further increases, with each one being described as "temporary," the latest being in 1959.

As the Members of this House may suspect, my interests in 1932 were in matters other than taxes. The people of my district, however, have long memories and are impatiently waiting for this latest tax increase to drop back according to schedule. I have received many letters and calls urging that this tax expire June 30, 1961, according to law.

These communications have not been of the type recognized as resulting from an organized campaign—each was a personal appeal for relief and a call for return to principle. The average motorist, in my State at least, is fed up with paying a disproportionate cost of maintaining our highways.

Today I find myself faced with a problem. The bill before us comes to us under a closed rule and while it contains many provisions which I favor, the inclusion of a section extending the 4-cent Federal gasoline tax rate for an indefinite, and possibly permanent, period leaves me no choice but to reluctantly vote against the bill.

As a former member of the Maine State Legislature, I know the problem which our State has in meeting its highway commitments; I know of its reliance on the gasoline tax as a source of that income. I think it is unfair both to our citizens and to our States to permit this inequitable Federal tax to continue.

Our Interstate and Defense Highway System should not be the responsibility of a tax on a single product but distributed over as broad a base as possible so that all citizens who share in its benefits may assume a share of the cost.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to commend Mr. FALLON, chairman of the Highway Subcommittee, and Mr. MILLS, chairman of Ways and Means, who had such a vital role in compromising the financing part of this program. I am vitally interested in the highway program particularly because of the fact that I have the honor to be a member of the Public Works Committee and a member of the Subcommittee on Roads which has considered this legislation over the years. I believe this is the year of decision. This is the year when the Congress must determine once and for all just what we will do with the highway program, particularly with reference to the 41,000 miles of Interstate System which we authorized in 1956. You have had before you and we all have, as Members of the Congress, the results of several important highway studies that have been forwarded to us since the beginning of this session. This includes the 210 study which deals with the beneficiaries of the program.

I have examined the various proposals which have been advanced as possible methods of financing the program. This includes all those which run the gamut from an increase of the gasoline tax to a stretchout of the program. I favor none of these proposals.

The position I take today is the same one that I took 2 years ago when we were considering the question of temporary financing of the highway program until the reports we now have before us reach the Congress. In August of 1959 I introduced H.R. 8512 which authorized the transfer of certain excise taxes on automobiles and parts and accessories from the general fund to the highway trust fund to help finance the program until we had reached the position we are now in today. These were simply intended as a stopgap for the purpose of continuing the program until we could decide what the final form of financing the balance of the program would be.

This measure was compromised in that the Federal gasoline tax was increased 1 cent for a 21-month period ending June 30 of this year and then the excise taxes are to go into effect. I might remind the Committee that at that time we made a commitment to the American motorist and to the American people that this 1-cent tax was to be of a temporary nature. I believe we should honor this commitment. I do not take the somewhat cynical approach that eventually in all cases temporary taxes become permanent taxes. I believe the ordinary user of the highway, the passenger car owner, is paying more than his share at the present time for the construction of these roads. He is doing it willingly because he realizes the advantage that will accrue to all of us when we have modern, safe, efficient highways crisscrossing our American continent. But, gentlemen, we made a commitment at that time and we should honor it.

Now I would further like to remind you that when we enacted the Federal-Aid Highway Act in 1956 that created the Interstate System we authorized the creation of a trust fund to which highway-user taxes—and I emphasize "highway-user taxes"—were to be diverted to finance the program. At that time we were advised that the estimated costs for completing the system would be some $25 billion. We now discover there has been a considerable increase in the cost of the program and that it will run to $41 billion or more. However, since the creation of the trust fund only a certain percentage of highway-user taxes have been diverted to the trust fund, while the balance of these taxes have gone into the general fund. Parenthetically, I might add that at the very beginning of the life of the trust fund, even before it went into full operation, almost $2 billion worth of prior authorizations which were earmarked for the general fund were transferred to the trust fund. Thus, at the very outset this fund found itself saddled with some $2 billion that no one assumed it would have to handle. I remind you of this factor as a partial answer to those who would argue that these additional highway-user taxes cannot be diverted from the general fund to the trust fund because of the problem of balancing the budget. Yet 4 short years ago a reverse situation went into effect, and that is partially the reason we find ourselves in this financial fix today.

I am advised that roughly $1.7 billion of highway user taxes, those on automobiles, parts and accessories, buses, and

trucks still remain outside of the trust fund. I believe that if the balance of these funds were diverted to the trust fund this would more than adequately finance the remainder of this program so that it could be completed on schedule by 1972.

For the information of the Committee, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the highway taxes which are not available for highway use at the present time and which are being diverted to the general fund. These include three main taxes—those on parts and accessories; automobiles; and the balance of the tax on trucks, buses, and trailers. I have prepared a chart which runs from fiscal year 1962 through fiscal year 1972, which shows the estimated revenue these taxes should bring into the Treasury. A careful examination of this chart will show that several particular combinations of these taxes will provide more than sufficient funds to finance the balance of the program and complete the system on schedule. I ask permission to insert it at this point in the RECORD:

Not available for highways

[Millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Parts and accessories	Trucks, buses, and trailers	Automobiles	Total
1962	210	143	1,358	1,711
1963	219	146	1,384	1,749
1964	230	149	1,418	1,797
1965	237	153	1,433	1,823
1966	246	158	1,463	1,867
1967	254	162	1,503	1,919
1968	262	168	1,543	1,973
1969	271	172	1,588	2,031
1970	280	178	1,633	2,091
1971	289	182	1,678	2,149
1972	298	188	1,723	2,209

I trust that this Committee will give serious consideration to my proposal. I believe that many besides highway users will benefit by this program. This includes the property owner near the highway; the various agencies of government in city, town, or village who use these roads for safety and health purposes; our great postal service; the industries whose materials are carried safely and efficiently over these roads; the industries that supply the materials for road construction and many other nonuser beneficiaries.

Probably one of the single most important units of our entire national life that will be benefited by this program is our defense system. In fact, in 1956 the Congress renamed this program, calling it the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. Certainly in years to come in times of crises our military should and will take full advantage of these roads. In fact, today at the present throughout the Nation on day-to-day maneuvers the military is using these roads for the swift, safe, and sure transport of men, arms, missiles, and other strategic materials.

I think it is quite apparent that these roads will indeed prove a benefit to many so-called nonhighway users who really will find these roads an invaluable adjunct to the various forms of business whether private or governmental. If this is the case, then certainly it seems logical that these people should be taxed along with the highway users for the construction of these roads for indeed they are just as strongly beneficiaries and users of the program as is the driver of the car, bus, or truck that moved on these roads. In fact, the 210 study recently submitted by the Secretary of Commerce points out in the report, and I believe this figure is low, that a charge of at least 8 percent to the general fund should be made to take care of the cost of those who benefit from this program.

There is indeed every logical reason why the additional highway user taxes in the general fund should be diverted to the trust fund for the benefit of the highway program.

Let me conclude by saying that I am a firm believer in good highways and I believe they are essential to our national self-interest. I believe this program should be completed on schedule and I believe that highway user taxes should be used to finance this program. Gentlemen, let us solve this highway financing problem once and for all but let us not solve it by the imposition of additional taxes upon those who I believe cannot afford any more. Let us instead use the taxes we have available and give this highway program the green light it needs to produce the greatest benefits to all of us as citizens of this Nation.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to those of my distinguished colleagues expressing grave concern about the financing provisions of this bill. The temporary 1 cent of the Federal gasoline tax is due to terminate on June 30 of this year. By extending that tax for at least the next decade, what this bill would do is saddle the motorists of this Nation with a combined Federal and State gasoline tax averaging a little over 10 cents a gallon.

If the tax would stop there it would be bad enough. But you all know as well as I do that Congress and the State legislatures will be knocking on the door year in and year out to push the tax rate higher and higher. That is what makes the situation even worse.

Frankly, I am opposed to any new taxes at this time. And the continuation of what had been promised as a temporary, stopgap tax increase is hardly different from a brand new tax measure.

Rather than look for ways to extend temporary taxes and levy new ones, I think we should be devoting the considerable talents of this body to looking for ways to keep expenditures in line with revenues. After all, the American public is already carrying a tremendous burden of taxation at the Federal, State, and local levels.

I have heard very little said here today about exactly why it is so imperative that this vast system of interstate highways be completed by 1972. It would not do for us to complete 38,000 miles by that date. It would not do to complete 40,500. It definitely has to be 41,000 miles. And if we do not complete all 41,000 miles, what is going to happen? Not very much, I suspect.

I am not proposing that we intentionally drag our heels on this program. But I do think that it is more important that we spend the taxpayers money soundly and prudently than that we spend it fast.

We all know that it is being spent fast, but not always soundly. There have been mistakes of planning and administration. There have been grave errors of judgment. And there have been too many examples of waste and scandal for me to want to write a blank check for a continuation of the same sort of operation.

I believe we should be thinking in terms of giving priority to those portions of this vast system for which the need is greatest. By the same token, there are obviously other portions which could easily be postponed for many years to come.

I also believe that if we proceed on a level-headed basis, in line with the revenues available under the provisions of the 1959 act, that construction materials will be available at lower prices and that there will be less likelihood of inflation increasing the costs of this program again in the next few years.

Gentlemen, these are the reasons why I firmly believe we can have a reasonable level of taxation and good highways too. We should be able to honor our promise to the American motorists that the fourth cent of the Federal gasoline tax will expire on June 30 and still have an interstate highway program that this Nation can be proud of.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, the people of Kansas recognize the importance of the Interstate Highway System. Kansas citizens will use these highways along with their farm-to-market roads which constitute the bread and butter of our agricultural transportation. We are more than willing to pay our share on their behalf, as we have been doing for years.

We also have a rather pleasant habit in the Midwest of putting faith in another's word—and of keeping faith with our own.

It seems that the Federal Government has instituted several temporary tax programs which never are allowed to expire. Temporary taxes on new trucks, gasoline, and other highway-related items is one of those programs.

Once again as we approach the expiration date of the 4-cent-per-gallon temporary tax on gasoline on July 31, 1961, we tell the family motorists of the Nation: "Sorry, you will have to continue paying 4 cents a gallon tax on your gasoline until July 31, 1972."

While we continue to tax the motorist, we also add to the tax burden of truck operators. Each of us already has been forewarned by many of these small business men and women in our districts that higher taxes would result in their losing business and lead to more unemployment.

I concur with my colleagues who believe that the 1-cent-per-gallon decrease in the excises applicable to gasoline and diesel fuel should be allowed to occur as scheduled on July 1, 1961.

We should build our highways on a pay-as-you-go basis; and we should earmark for highway purposes those tax receipts now going into the general fund

of the Treasury which are realized from taxes imposed on highway users.

The general fund of the Treasury should contribute to the highway program because of the benefits which accrue to nonhighway users.

It is possible that we may have to accept the possibility of stretching out the completion of this program beyond 1972. In view of the burden which the taxpayers already must bear, and in consideration of the commitments which we may have to make in this Congress to stimulate the economy and strengthen our defenses, it would be appropriate to apply the brakes here.

Finally, I regret that the Rules Committee has permitted this important measure to reach the floor with a rule that does not allow amendments. The House cannot work its will in this instance.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill before us today for several reasons.

First. I am opposed to the continuation of the additional 1-cent-a-gallon levy on motor fuels because it represents another in the seemingly endless succession of so-called temporary taxes that are somehow never permitted to expire. I have not bothered the Legislative Reference Service for a list of the onetime temporary taxes that have followed this time-honored course, but I can assure you that such a list would be lengthy. Partly responsible for the state of our present jerry-built tax structure, this procedure does not foster confidence in the manner in which we seek needed revenues.

Second. I am opposed to the bill because it is inequitable insofar as the taxpayers of New York State are concerned. We in New York have built almost 570 miles of interstate highways without Federal assistance and are entitled to nearly $800 million in reimbursements for our efforts. The people of New York exercised initiative and foresight when they proceeded to construct at their own expense free and toll roads for inclusion in the Interstate System at a time when those roads were badly needed and when there was no money forthcoming from the Federal Government to build them. The Congress will not even say that it will consider the matter of reimbursement at some future date. The fear grows in my mind that the people of New York will forever stand penalized because of the progress they made when progress was badly needed. I ask why they should be forced to pay higher taxes to help construct interstate highways all across the country and continue to bear the expense for a considerable portion of their own interstate mileage allocation.

Third. I am opposed to this bill because I feel that the nonhighway user does not pay a fair share of the cost of the program in proportion to the countless benefits that accrue to him as a result of highway construction. The Department of Commerce, in assessing the allocation of costs for the program, stated that 8 percent of the program's benefits accrue to others than those whose taxes now finance the trust fund. Although that estimate is open to some question, I think it is widely agreed that the interstate highway program is beneficial to our national defense and has an important impact on the health of our economy. The benefits to nonhighway users cannot be easily measured but they can certainly be said to justify assigning the general revenues a portion of the responsibility for financing the cost of the Interstate System.

Fourth. I am opposed to this bill because I feel it is time we readjusted the target date for completion of the interstate program, instead of continually boosting the taxload on our citizens. The feeling seems to be that the system must be completed on target date no matter what it costs the American people in taxes. We always force the taxpayer to do the adjusting, never the program itself. I think it is time we achieved some balance here. I do not recognize any pressing need to maintain this steadfast adherence to the 1972 target date.

Fifth. I am opposed to this bill because I think the interstate highway program is loaded with excessive and unnecessary expense and, although some effort has been made to investigate this matter, I feel that a much longer and much harder look needs to be taken before saddling the taxpayer with this additional load.

I think the interstate highway program is clearly a worthwhile program and I continue to support it and endorse its objectives. I only wish that we could have a bill here today which was equitable to the people I represent so that I could support it with a clear conscience.

I do not want to see the program undercut here today. It is merely this bill that I oppose. I realize that it is necessary to produce more revenues if we are to complete the program as scheduled. I merely contend that there are constructive and feasible alternatives to the measure which the Ways and Means Committee has given us, and I would like to see this body have an opportunity to consider one or more of those alternatives.

I introduced an alternative measure earlier in the session which called for an extension of the completion date till 1975, a lowering of the tax on gasoline and diesel fuel, an appropriation each year from the general fund of the Treasury to meet the clear obligation of the nonhighway users, a waiving of the operation of the Byrd amendment so that the elements of stability and certainty could be injected into the program, and an authorization of $2.1 billion a year for interstate construction which could be depended upon by the States for the fiscal years 1963 through 1974.

I introduced measures earlier in the session providing for reimbursement of New York State for free and toll roads constructed by the State and included in the Interstate System.

There are other constructive alternatives—mine is not the only one.

It is not the program that I oppose here today. It is the proposed provisions for financing that program that are unacceptable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I realize it is rather unpopular to oppose legislation which has as its stated purpose good highways, modern schools, pure water, and so on. Nevertheless, all these measures are going to meet a severe test in the not too distant future; and that test is—can the taxpayers afford it?

The bill under consideration, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1961 would impose more taxes on the motorist. He is now paying more than enough in special taxes to complete the interstate highway program on schedule.

We are told that additional levies are needed because all highway users' taxes do not go in the highway trust fund; a large percentage goes into the general fund so we can build roads in foreign countries. It was called to my attention recently that the General Accounting Office reported that a foreign-aid road program in one country originally having an $18 million estimate, cost over $70 million before it was finished.

In fairness to the taxpayers of this Nation, I sincerely believe we should pay for our highway program from general funds and set up a foreign aid trust fund. If this were done the American people would have a clearer picture of the extravagance of our foreign-aid program and I dare say that a great deal of money would be saved.

Because of the method of financing proposed in this bill, I must oppose it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, too long have we imposed taxes upon our people for a given period of time to accommodate emergency situations and then find ourselves in a position of being forced to extend such taxes. It is my belief that until the day arrives when a more thorough evaluation of requirements is made at the time such assessments are written into the law, we will find ourselves imposing upon our constituencies.

I have long felt that the Federal Government is imposing upon tax areas that belong to the several States. If the individual States were able to utilize tax moneys as local funds, we could certainly have developed a coordinated program of highways which would have been built cheaper than the Federal system now indicates the cost will be. At the outset of this program, I advocated strongly that it would be better to go a little more slowly on the highways and pay for them as we built. True, this attempt at extending the gasoline tax is made ostensibly to accomplish the pay-as-you-go philosophy. However, I believe the time has come when we must keep the faith with people who are bearing the brunt of the Government program. I fear greatly that in my areas, this extension of the gasoline tax will reduce purchases of gasoline to the extent that our small service station owners will suffer a loss of business.

I realize that the System of Interstate and Defense Highways is a grave prob-

lem and most necessary in the movement of troops in the event of emergency, the evacuation of people at the greatest possible speed, or the normal flow of traffic in commerce in our ever-building economy. This program as it is now written and being developed was a great victory for the Democratic Party and the American people, but I must indicate to this body that it was at my insistence and through an understanding committee that the word "Defense," was added to the name of the program, making it the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways." It is my sincere belief now and it was then that if these highways are to be built to accommodate vehicles of our defense forces with reference to clearances, widths, and other dimensions to accommodate the movement of troops, missiles, and so forth, that certain payments should be made from our defense appropriations to take care of these additional costs. As a matter of fact, they are not costs that should be borne by the normal users of highways.

I, therefore, request of the Members of this body who believe as I do, that our traveling public, our farmers, truckers, and service stations themselves be given this relief which was promised them at the time of the passage of the existing statute.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, as a State legislator before coming to the Congress, I attempted to persuade my own State of Indiana in the period immediately following World War II to embark upon a program of new highway construction and highway improvement. We were collecting at that time just enough to maintain the highways we had. It was very difficult, and I was not successful in persuading the people of the State of Indiana to do so. During the ensuing years, the need became greater and the lag in highway construction became more evident. Highways are extremely important, not only to the life and economy of our country, but they are one of our most important links in our whole defense setup. They provide for the American people a way to enjoy visiting and traveling in all parts of our great Nation.

I supported in 1954 the first highway bill under the Eisenhower administration and subsequently the 1956 bill, for they were set up on the basis that would give us ultimately a fine system of highways without, at the same time, creating any additional indebtedness. However, as it became evident that the cost of the system of implementing this highway program was going to be much greater than we had previously anticipated, it has become necessary that we either stretch out our program or levy a heavier tax to expedite it.

In voting "no" on H.R. 6713 I have had the feeling that the enormous increase in tax as proposed in this bill is so much greater than most people realize that in voting "no" I hope to be able to bring to their attention the amount of this additional tax, which is $9.8 billion. The American people are already overburdened with taxes. Of course, you can say this is for highway purposes, but, regardless of what you pay taxes for, nonetheless, it does represent your money that you have to put up for your Government. We are also confronted locally and statewide with a substantial increase in taxes.

As a candidate last year, I pledged to work for and support programs to reduce taxes rather than to increase them. This would very definitely add a substantial tax burden to all the people of my district, and I should also say to our whole country. As fine and as worthwhile as this highway program is, it seems to me it is more important to maintain fiscal stability and to prevent another inflationary spiral than it is to try to speed up the construction of our highways. I realize that in many instances this highway program is needed; but again I do not feel that a highway program is in such dire need that we have to resort to the kind of programs such as we have been witnessing at Cape Canaveral, where money has literally been wasted in millions due to an unfortunate necessity demanding great speed. In the example of Cape Canaveral it is possibly a justifiable waste of money, if any waste can ever be said to be justifiable, for the defense of our country. But in this instance I do not think a speedup in the program will actually see our highway system constructed efficiently or economically; this is certainly a very important consideration.

So again I say that I am reluctant to vote against this bill, but I feel under the circumstances I must. I would just like to add, in conclusion, that in my district the vote on the question of increasing the taxes or having a stretchout in the program resulted in almost a dead heat. Out of more than 13,000 ballots cast, we had less than a 300 difference in the final tabulation of the poll on this particular question.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, according to testimony by the Honorable C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, before hearings of the House Committee on Ways and Means, a total of $9.7 billion will be needed to meet the anticipated costs of completing the Federal highway program by 1972. This means $900 million a year must be raised to meet the 1972 target date for completion. Further, $2.5 billion has been diverted into the general fund making a real cost total of $12.2 billion.

It is interesting to note that the bill proposes a tax increase from 8 to 10 cents per pound on tire rubber; 3 to 5 cents per pound on tread rubber; and 9 to 10 cents per pound for tube rubber—for an estimated total of $1.1 billion, raising about $150 million a year. The bill also calls for a continuation of the 1 cent temporary tax on gasoline for the duration of the Federal highway program keeping the Federal gasoline tax at 4 cents a gallon—for an estimated total of $8.3 billion or about $600 million a year.

It is my conviction that the Members of this House have an obligation to the people in three respects regarding the Federal highway program and its financing:

First. To allow the 1 cent tax on gasoline offered as a temporary tax to expire June 30, 1961. The people cannot long be patient in view of the fact that temporary measures seldom are temporary but with seeming apparent ease are extended and made permanent. The people have a right to expect their Representatives in Congress to mean it when they say that a measure is temporary.

Second. To expect that money raised in support of the Federal highway program is used for the program and not diverted to the general fund. I was happy to hear the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee assure the House that this bill will not permit such diversion of funds in the future. However, the public has a right to know that some of the excise taxes collected on vehicles and equipment are being placed in the general fund and are not being used to pay for the Federal highway program.

If the $2.5 billion diverted from the Federal highway program to the general fund were replaced, the additional tax levy against rubber would not be necessary. The fact is that the 1 cent temporary tax on gasoline could be allowed to expire and a new tax of 0.9 cent could be levied to pick up the tab for the balance needed to complete the program by 1972.

Third. To expect to be informed that this is a pay-before-you-go bill and not a pay-as-you-go bill.

I am not opposed to the highway program. However, I do feel that the cost for completion of the 41,000-mile program should be shared by all who benefit from it and not just those who happen to operate motor vehicles. The fact that the highway system contributes substantially to our national defense indicates that part of the burden of the cost should be levied against the defense budget.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the interstate road program and the results that we hope to achieve by the final passage of H.R. 6713.

No person today can fail to see the critical need for improvement in both our primary and secondary road systems. As our economy becomes more complex so does transportation and commerce. It therefore stands to reason that as we progress economically our highway program must move forward on schedule.

The transportation needs of our country demand that our highways be made modern and safe. I am reliably advised that completion of the $41 billion Interstate System by the target date in 1972 will reduce highway deaths by as many as 4,000 persons a year. On a four-lane divided highway with controlled access the number of deaths by vehicle mile traveled is reduced by two-thirds as compared to traffic on the ordinary two-lane road.

Aside from this foremost safety aspect highway users, truckers, businessmen, vacationers, will be saved an estimated $2 billion a year in vehicle operating costs and upkeep.

The interstate highway program in many sections of our Nation will bring about unprecedented economic growth.

The congressional district which I am privileged to represent, situated in western North Carolina amidst the most lofty and picturesque mountains in the Appalachian Range, is among those sections of our Nation which has suffered economic retardation because of geographic isolation and inadequate highway facilities. The people in this district are now receiving their full share of interstate roads. They appreciate this program and are willing to help pay for it. The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961 has given the people of my district, and I am sure the people in the districts of most of my colleagues, new hope for modern highway facilities in their areas commensurate with the needs.

It is incumbent upon Congress to provide the necessary financing if the Interstate System is to be completed in 1972 as originally planned. Now that we have this program moving we must not only continue at the present rate but should accelerate construction.

By our action we determine the future speed and direction of this important program. We hasten the day when interstate roads will stretch in all directions across the face of this great Nation for all citizens to use and enjoy.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment.

(The bill is as follows:)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961".

SEC. 102. APPROVAL OF ESTIMATE OF COST OF COMPLETING THE INTERSTATE SYSTEM.

The estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System in each State, transmitted to the Congress on January 11, 1961, by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the provisions of section 104(b)(5) of title 23, United States Code, and published as House Document Numbered 49, Eighty-seventh Congress, first session, is hereby approved as the basis for making the apportionment of the funds authorized for the Interstate System for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966.

SEC. 103. REVISION OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTERSTATE SYSTEM.

Subsection (b) of section 108 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, or improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the Interstate System, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d) of section 103 of title 23, United States Code, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be in addition to the authorization heretofore made for that year, the additional sum of $1,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, the additional sum of $1,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, the additional sum of $2,200,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, the additional sum of $2,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, the additional sum of $2,600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, the additional sum of $2,700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the additional sum of $2,800,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the additional sum of $2,900,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, the additional sum of $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the additional sum of $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the additional sum of $3,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1970, and the additional sum of $2,885,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971."

SEC. 104. AGREEMENTS RELATING TO USE OF AIRSPACE ON INTERSTATE SYSTEM.

(a) The last sentence of section 111 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "Such agreements may, however, authorize a State or political subdivision thereof to use or permit the use of the airspace above and below the established grade line of the highway pavement for such purposes as will not impair the full use and safety of the highway, as will not require or permit vehicular access to such space directly from such established grade line of the highway, or otherwise interfere in any way with the free flow of traffic on the Interstate System."

(b) Upon application, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to revise any agreement made prior to the date of enactment of this Act to the extent that such agreement relates to the utilization of space on rights-of-way on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways to conform to section 111 of title 23 of the United States Code as amended by subsection (a).

TITLE II—INTERNAL REVENUE CODE AND HIGHWAY TRUST FUND AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. CONTINUATION OF MOTOR FUEL TAX RATES.

(a) DIESEL FUEL AND SPECIAL MOTOR FUELS.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to taxes on diesel fuel and special motor fuels) are each amended—

(1) by striking out "3 cents a gallon" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 cents a gallon"; and

(2) by striking out "1 cent a gallon" and inserting in lieu thereof "2 cents a gallon".

(b) GASOLINE.—Section 4081(a) of such Code (relating to tax on gasoline) is amended by striking out "3 cents a gallon" and inserting in lieu thereof "4 cents a gallon".

(c) RATE REDUCTION IN 1972.—Sections 4041(c) and 4081(b) of such Code (providing a reduction to a 1½-cent a gallon rate on July 1, 1972) are each amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1972".

(d) REPEAL OF TEMPORARY PROVISIONS.—Sections 4041(f) and 4081(c) of such Code (relating to rates of tax for the period beginning October 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1961) are hereby repealed.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6421(h) of such Code (relating to nonhighway or local transit use of gasoline) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1972".

SEC. 202. INCREASE IN TAXES ON CERTAIN TIRES, TUBES, AND TREAD RUBBER.

(a) TIRES.—Paragraph (1) of section 4071(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on tires used on highway vehicles) is amended by striking out "8 cents a pound" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 cents a pound".

(b) INNER TUBES.—Paragraph (3) of section 4071(a) of such Code (relating to tax on inner tubes for tires) is amended by striking out "9 cents a pound" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 cents a pound".

(c) TREAD RUBBER.—Paragraph (4) of section 4071(a) of such Code (relating to tax on tread rubber) is amended by striking out "3 cents a pound" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 cents a pound".

(d) RATE REDUCTION IN 1972.—Subsection (c) of section 4071 of such Code (relating to rate reduction on July 1, 1972) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) RATE REDUCTION.—On and after October 1972—

"(1) the tax imposed by paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be 5 cents a pound;

"(2) the tax imposed by paragraph (3) of subsection (a) shall be 9 cents a pound; and

"(3) paragraph (4) of subsection (a) shall not apply."

SEC. 203. TAX ON USE OF CERTAIN VEHICLES.

(a) INCREASE IN TAX.—Subsection (a) of section 4481 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on use of certain vehicles) is amended by striking out "$1.50 a year" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3.00 a year".

(b) PERIOD TAX IN EFFECT.—

(1) EXTENSION FOR 3 MONTHS.—Section 4481(e) of such Code (relating to period tax in effect) is amended by striking out "after June 30, 1956, and before July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "before October 1, 1972".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 4481(a) of such Code (relating to imposition of tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In the case of the taxable period beginning on July 1, 1972, and ending on September 30, 1972, the tax shall be at the rate of 75 cents for such period for each 1,000 pounds of taxable gross weight or fraction thereof."

(B) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 4481 of such Code are amended to read as follows:

"(c) PRORATION OF TAX.—If in any taxable period the first use of the highway motor vehicle is after the first month in such period, the tax shall be reckoned proportionately from the first day of the month in which such use occurs to and including the last day in such taxable period.

"(d) ONE TAX LIABILITY PER PERIOD.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that the tax imposed by this section is paid with respect to any highway motor vehicle for any taxable period, no further tax shall be imposed by this section for such taxable period with respect to such vehicle.

"(2) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For privilege of paying tax imposed by this section in installments, see section 6156."

(C) Subsection (c) of section 4482 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) TAXABLE PERIOD.—The term 'taxable period' means any year beginning before July 1, 1972, and the period which begins on July 1, 1972, and ends at the close of September 30, 1972."

(c) INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS OF TAX.—

(1) Subchapter A of chapter 62 of such Code (relating to time and place for paying tax) is amended by renumbering section 6156 as 6157, and by inserting after section 6155 the following new section:

"SEC. 6156. INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS OF TAX ON USE OF HIGHWAY MOTOR VEHICLES.

"(a) PRIVILEGE TO PAY TAX IN INSTALLMENTS.—If the taxpayer files a return of the tax imposed by section 4481 on or before the date prescribed for the filing of such return,

he may elect to pay the tax shown on such return in equal installments in accordance with the following table:

	The number of installments shall be—
"If liability is incurred in—	
July, August, or September	4
October, November, or December	3
January, February, or March	2

"(b) DATES FOR PAYING INSTALLMENTS.—In the case of any tax payable in installments by reason of an election under subsection (a)—

"(1) the first installment shall be paid on the date prescribed for payment of the tax,

"(2) the second installment shall be paid on or before the last day of the third month following the calendar quarter in which the liability was incurred,

"(3) the third installment (if any) shall be paid on or before the last day of the sixth month following the calendar quarter in which the liability was incurred, and

"(4) the fourth installment (if any) shall be paid on or before the last day of the ninth month following the calendar quarter in which the liability was incurred.

"(c) PRORATION OF ADDITIONAL TAX TO INSTALLMENTS.—If an election has been made under subsection (a) in respect of tax reported on a return filed by the taxpayer and tax required to be shown but not shown on such return is assessed before the date prescribed for payment of the last installment, the additional tax shall be prorated equally to the installments for which the election was made. That part of the additional tax so prorated to any installment the date for payment of which has not arrived shall be collected at the same time as and as part of such installment. That part of the additional tax so prorated to any installment the date for payment of which has arrived shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Secretary or his delegate.

"(d) ACCELERATION OF PAYMENTS.—If the taxpayer does not pay any installment under this section on or before the date prescribed for its payment, the whole of the unpaid tax shall be paid upon notice and demand from the Secretary or his delegate.

"(e) SECTION INAPPLICABLE TO CERTAIN LIABILITIES.—This section shall not apply to any liability for tax incurred in—

"(1) April, May, or June of any year, or

"(2) July, August, or September of 1972."

(2) Section 6601(c)(2) of such Code (relating to determination of last date prescribed for payment of tax) is amended by striking out "6152(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "6152(a) or 6156(a)", and by striking out "6152(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "6152(b) or 6156(b), as the case may be".

(3) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 62 of such Code is amended by striking out

"SEC. 6156. Payment of taxes under provisions of the Tariff Act."

and inserting in lieu thereof

"SEC. 6156. Installment payments of tax on use of highway motor vehicles.

"SEC. 6157. Payment of taxes under provisions of the Tariff Act."

SEC. 204. EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF 10 PERCENT TAX ON TRUCKS AND BUSES.

Section 4061(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to tax on trucks and buses) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1972".

SEC. 205. CERTAIN GASOLINE SOLD FOR FURTHER MANUFACTURE.

(a) EXEMPTION FROM TAX.—Section 4221(d)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to use in further manufacture) is amended—

(1) by striking "or" at the end of subparagraph (A),

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(C) in the case of gasoline taxable under section 4081, such gasoline is sold for use by the purchaser, for nonfuel purposes, as a material in the manufacture or production of another article to be manufactured or produced by him."

(b) USE BY MANUFACTURER OR IMPORTER CONSIDERED SALE.—Section 4218(a) of such Code (relating to use considered as sale) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "This subsection shall not apply in the case of gasoline used by any person, for nonfuel purposes, as a material in the manufacture or production of another article to be manufactured or produced by him."

(c) CREDIT OR REFUND.—Section 6416(b)(3) of such Code (relating to tax paid articles used for further manufacture) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (D),

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or", and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

"(F) in the case of gasoline taxable under section 4081, such gasoline is used by the second manufacturer or producer, for nonfuel purposes, as a material in the manufacture or production of any other article manufactured or produced by him."

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT. — Section 6416(b)(2)(E) of such Code is amended by striking out "or (E)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(E), or (F)".

SEC. 206. FLOOR STOCKS TAXES AND REFUNDS.

(a) IMPOSITION ON CERTAIN TIRES, TUBES, AND TREAD RUBBER.—Subsection (a) of section 4226 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to floor stocks taxes) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(6) 1961 TAXES ON CERTAIN TIRES AND INNER TUBES.—On tires subject to tax under section 4071(a)(1), and on inner tubes subject to tax under section 4071(a)(3), which, on July 1, 1961, are held—

"(A) by a dealer for sale,

"(B) for sale on, or in connection with, other articles held by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of such other articles, or

"(C) for use in the manufacture or production of other articles,

there is hereby imposed a floor stocks tax at the rate of 2 cents a pound in the case of such tires, and a floor stocks tax at the rate of 1 cent a pound in the case of such inner tubes. The taxes imposed by this paragraph shall not apply to any tire or inner tube which is held for sale by the manufacturer, producer, or importer of such tire or tube, or which will be subject under section 4218(b) or 4219 to the manufacturers excise tax on tires or inner tubes.

"(7) 1961 TAXES ON TREAD RUBBER.—On tread rubber subject to tax under section 4071(a)(4) which, on July 1, 1961, is held by a dealer, there is hereby imposed a floor stocks tax at the rate of 2 cents a pound. The tax imposed by this paragraph shall not apply in the case of any person if such person establishes, to the satisfaction of the Secretary or his delegate, that all tread rubber held by him on July 1, 1961, will be used otherwise than in the recapping or retreading of tires of the type used on highway vehicles (as defined in section 4072(c))."

(b) DUE DATE OF TAXES.—Subsection (d) of section 4226 of such Code is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and "and except that the taxes imposed by paragraphs (6) and (7) shall be paid at such time after September 30, 1961, as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(c) FLOOR STOCKS REFUNDS IN 1972.—Paragraph (2) of section 6412(a) of such Code (relating to floor stocks refunds on trucks and buses, tires, tread rubber, and gasoline) is amended—

(1) by inserting "TUBES," after "TIRES," in the heading;

(2) by striking out "4071(a)(1) or (4)," and inserting in lieu thereof "4071(a)(1), (3), or (4),";

(3) by striking out "July 1, 1972" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1972";

(4) by striking out "November 10, 1972" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "February 10, 1973"; and

(5) by striking out "October 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1973".

(d) REPEAL OF 1961 FLOOR STOCKS REFUND ON GASOLINE.—Paragraph (3) of section 6412(a) (relating to 1961 floor stocks refund on gasoline) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 207. HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

(a) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS EQUIVALENT TO TAX ON TRUCKS, BUSES, ETC.—Subparagraph (C) of section 209(c)(1) of the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 (relating to transfer to Highway Trust Fund of amounts equivalent to certain taxes) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) 50 percent of the tax received after June 30, 1957, and before July 1, 1961, under section 4061(a)(1) (tax on trucks, buses, etc.), and 100 percent of the tax received after June 30, 1961, under section 4061(a)(1);".

(b) REPEAL OF TRANSFER TO TRUST FUND OF EXCISE TAXES ON AUTOMOBILES, PARTS AND ACCESSORIES, ETC.—Paragraph (2) of section 209(c) of such Act (providing for the transfer to the Highway Trust Fund of amounts equivalent to a portion of the excise taxes on automobiles and parts and accessories received after June 30, 1961, and before July 1, 1964) is hereby repealed.

(c) RECEIPTS IN FISCAL YEAR 1973.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 209(c) of such Act (relating to transfer to Trust Fund of amounts equivalent to certain taxes) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1972".

(2) Paragraph (3) of such section 209(c) is amended—

(A) by striking out "JULY 1, 1972" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "OCTOBER 1, 1972";

(B) by striking out "after June 30, 1972, and before July 1, 1973, and which are attributable to liability for tax incurred before July 1, 1972," and inserting in lieu thereof "after September 30, 1972, and before July 1, 1973, and which are attributable to liability for tax incurred before October 1, 1972,";

(C) by striking out subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(C) 50 percent of the tax under section 4071(a)(1) (tax on tires of the type used on highway vehicles) and 10 percent of the tax under section 4071(a)(3) (tax on inner tubes for tires); and".

(d) EXPENDITURES IN FISCAL YEAR 1973.—

(1) Paragraph (1) of section 209(f) of such Act (relating to expenditures from Trust Fund for Federal-aid highway program) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1972".

(2) Paragraph (3) of such section 209(f) (relating to transfers from Trust Fund for gasoline used on farms and for certain other purposes) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1972" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1972".

(3) Subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 209(f)(4) of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(B) 100 percent of the refunds in respect of articles subject to tax under section 4071 (a) (1), (3), or (4) of such Code (certain tires, tubes, and tread rubber); and

"(C) 80 percent of the refunds in respect of gasoline subject to tax under section 4081 of such Code."

(4) Paragraph (5) of such section 209(f) (relating to 1961 floor stocks refunds on gasoline) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 208. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) (1) The amendments made by sections 201, 202, and 203 shall take effect on July 1, 1961.

(2) The amendments made by section 205 (a), (c), and (d) shall apply only in the case of gasoline sold on or after October 1, 1961.

(3) The amendment made by section 205 (b) shall apply only in the case of gasoline used on or after October 1, 1961.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule no amendments are in order to title I of the bill except amendments offered by the Committee on Public Works; and no amendments are in order to title II of the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means has no amendments to offer.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Works has no amendments to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H.R. 6713, pursuant to House Resolution 275, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MASON. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MASON moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 6713, to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 912) entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 8

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE GOLDEN JUBILEE OF FATHER LORENZO F. ANDOLFI, O.S.A., PASTOR OF HOLY ROSARY CHURCH, LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this is the golden year—the time of spiritual harvest—for Father Lorenzo F. Andolfi, pastor of Holy Rosary Church in Lawrence, Mass.

On Sunday, April 30, 1961, at Central Catholic Auditorium, he was the special guest at a dinner honoring the 50th anniversary of his ordination as a Roman Catholic priest.

The speakers walked with him in retrospect, up the years from 1911 to 1961, and expressed the sentiments of all present with the tribute, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant of the Lord."

As Father Andolfi looked out upon the large assembly, he saw in their happy faces the fruits of his labors in sowing and cultivating the seeds of faith for many, many years.

Years that he had been the guide, the counselor, the friend by their side; bringing divine grace to bless them through all the stages of their lives on this earth.

From the album of personal memories, each person who was there silently recalled the relief he had experienced in talking out his troubles with Father Andolfi. The pastor had listened patiently, and then, with the kindness and the wisdom of one who has learned the secrets of the human heart, he had said:

Do not be afraid. Beyond the darkness of failure and anxiety, God welcomes you with the light of His redeeming love.

The memories of Father Andolfi embraced all who were present and some who had passed on.

The ones that gave him the greatest satisfaction were the sweet innocence of a child receiving first communion; the glowing happiness of a man and woman united by the sacrament of holy matrimony; and the quiet devotion of a grandmother, bent by the toil of years, following in the footsteps of Christ as she makes the stations of the cross.

When Father Andolfi arrived in Lawrence, Holy Rosary was not a prosperous parish. And there was the further handicap of the depression. Collections for the support of the church could not be substantial when many of the parishioners were unemployed.

The good father did not ask them for the impossible.

By prudent management of the church income, and by his own hard work, he succeeded in strengthening the position of Holy Rosary during those lean years.

Under his guidance, the parish societies became more active, and as Father Andolfi spoke from the pulpit on Sundays, his heart was warmed by the sight of whole families that had come to worship in Catholic unity.

"My, how the children are growing up," he thought before he began his sermon.

In addition to his priestly duties, he found time to drop in at the homes of parishioners for what seemed like a casual social chat. Somewhere in the conversation he would ask the youngsters what they wanted to become in life. After they had left, he would urge the parents to make plans for the education and the future of their children.

This extra missionary work reaped material as well as spiritual benefits.

The bright and friendly children have grown up to become fine citizens who enrich the life of the community and the Nation with their character and their ability.

Lawrencians of Italian ancestry found happiness and fulfillment during the years that the pastor of their home church worked with them and for them, inspiring them by his saintly example.

With gratitude, respect and affection, they gathered by the hundreds to honor him on his golden jubilee.

It was my privilege to be there, and to join with so many others in expressing our esteem for the priest who is a joy to God—Father Lorenzo Andolfi.

AID PROGRAM FOR LATIN AMERICA

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is gratifying to note that we are making progress in shaping a suitable assistance program for our neighbors in Latin America. There is no objective presently confronting us in this field that has greater claim upon our affections, our interests, and our careful attention.

The Latin American nations are part of our hemisphere, but they are something more than that. They are our warm friends and neighbors and the American people cherish them with exceptional devotion.

There have been misunderstandings and problems in our Latin American relationships to be sure. Some of them have been extremely unfortunate, because they have been needlessly generated by unsound policies and the actions and attitudes of some of our American business people as well as some high-ranking diplomatic and Government officials.

However, it must be noted, and the American people must keep in mind, that the areas of disagreement as well as episodes of unpleasantness, though they exist, are minimum as compared with the vast amount of good will, wholehearted neighborliness, true friendly feelings, and deep affection that usually exists between the peoples of Latin America and our own people.

There is a vast, immeasurable reservoir of true loyal friendship existing between our countries that must be recognized by all our leaders just as it is sincerely felt by the American people. Of course, since these feelings are shared by our Latin American neighbors, their inspired presence must be recognized in Latin American countries too.

Our Latin American friends have not come to us making heavy demands. Indeed, they are frequently embarrassed by our overtures of help and the shape and features it sometimes takes. It is only natural they should be offended, as they are painfully affected, by various forms of dollar diplomacy and shoddy, unrepresentative cultural and other programs that have sometimes been pressed upon them.

As friendly nations, they rightfully desire that their sovereignties and self-respect, their dignity and interests be observed, not only by our Nation but by all other nations.

The Organization of American States has given us all a great opportunity to work in harmony and in cooperation for furthering our legitimate, mutual interests and the security, well-being, order, prosperity, and peace of the Western Hemisphere. In my opinion, this great Organization, if it is wisely guided and implemented, could be an incredibly valuable and effective force in dissipating many existing misunderstandings, in keeping communism and subversion out of our hemisphere, and strengthening the political, economic, and social free institutions which are common to the participating nations.

From our standpoint, no greater disservice could be rendered the most important work of hemispheric cooperation than for us to send leaders, officials, and workers, who do not basically understand Latin America, to represent our Nation in any way among our beloved neighbors to the south.

Both the American and Latin American peoples have a right to expect that our representatives there, as well as their representatives here, share a deep interest and unswervable loyalty in the cause of harmonious, hemispheric relations, and that they are well equipped by virtue of background, training, character, experience, point of view, and understanding of common problems to carry out their vital work of keeping our peoples close together promoting their mutual interests and protecting our respective territories, sovereignties, and liberties.

It would be a great mistake to think that Latin American problems can be solved by financial grants alone. What is needed is the kind of assistance that comes from the heart, as one friend and neighbor to another. This heart service should be predicated on a real desire to foster even closer relations, mutual trust, and the fostering of standards and conditions under the sound guidance of those who understand the problems of the respective countries—the psychology and the spiritual perspectives of the people.

While I would not here present a complete plan for the extension of Latin American aid, I desire to mention a few of the subject matters which I think should be included.

First. Housing: I think it is of utmost importance to assist our Latin American neighbors in providing very many additional units of suitable, modern housing for their peoples in remote as well as urban areas.

Second. Schools: Few things could be more important than helping our friends to very materially extend their present educational facilities across a very broad front.

Third. Water: Assistance in developing in areas and localities adequate supplies of clean, fresh water, and this is of extreme importance.

Fourth. Health and medical facilities: This is obviously a must in any program of aid to Latin America and anything we do along these lines should be pressed into local and remote areas where there are large numbers of people who seldom, if ever, have the services of a doctor or a nurse or a hygienic adviser, and who do not know the meaning of modern miracle drugs or other medicines of common usage that would be of valuable aid and relief to them.

These are not all the things that should be done to try to assist our Latin American friends, but to me they embody a few measures that must be a basic part of any really worthwhile program of assistance.

Most of all, proper, informed and enlightened administration must accompany any program we operate because unless we have people handling this work who know their job, who are trained for their job, who adequately understand the mind, the nature and the problems of our good friends of Latin America, the ground cannot be properly covered. In fact, additional misunderstandings might arise that could conceivably nullify many of the good effects that would come from a well conceived and efficiently managed aid program.

I urge the President, his advisers and the departments concerned with this matter to give the most careful consideration to the selection of leaders and personnel for this most important program, and to inaugurate without delay the measures I have mentioned, which would seem to me to be an irreducible minimum in the first approach to the solution of these problems, and other measures that may be pertinent and related to the program.

Above all, it must be remembered that pride, arrogance, superiority complexes, do-gooder and busybody fixations, and the presence of visionary administrators and personnel must be scrupulously avoided.

Our Latin American friends for the most part have great heritage in freedom, culture and spiritual devotion and any assistance we render them must be predicated on a true understanding of their natures, their problems, their pride in their own origins, institutions and loyalties and their willingness to champion and defend the cause of freedom.

In a word, heart service must be the inspiration and dedicated method of our Latin American aid program, and we must make sure that no pernicious or vapid, ideological pressures are allowed to distort our great objectives.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the ill-fated landing of anti-Castro forces in Cuba has had widespread and serious consequences. It is obvious that this operation must have been badly planned, and that there was a disastrous miscalculation of the forces available to Castro.

Under such circumstances, it may seem unusual that there has been no pressure for a public investigation of this matter. That this has not developed is fortunate, in my opinion. Apparently it is tacitly recognized that further publicity of this kind would not be helpful. We are demonstrating, quite properly and wisely, that the Nation stands behind President Kennedy at this moment. Disunity now would only compound our difficulties.

Nevertheless, we must try to learn some lessons from this setback. The executive branch, where the primary responsibility rests, is already undertaking several evaluations. From these may well develop major changes in the ways in which this Nation fights the cold war.

The question then arises, What, if anything, should Congress do? It seems to me that Congress also bears responsibility in this field. Now might well be an appropriate time for us to develop a more direct interest in this country's intelligence activities.

I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 400 to set up a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence. Back in 1955 I first advocated such a committee and I have no doubt that others introduced legislation before that time. In May of 1958 I reintroduced my measure. This joint committee composed of House and Senate Members, would be charged with direct responsibility over intelligence activities and would provide a focal point for matters which now, in part at least, are of interest to several committees.

In times like these, ineffective intelligence may prove our undoing. Now is the time for Congress to establish a watchdog committee over our intelligence operations.

CIVIL DEFENSE SHOULD BE RESPONSIBILITY OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may exend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time I have felt compelled to urge this body to come to grips with the pressing problem presented by the inadequacy of our present civil defense system to cope with the problems that would immediately arise in the event of an all-out nuclear attack on this country. I do hope this will be the last time that I shall have reason to feel such a compulsion.

We need, as never before, to make a reappraisal of the legislative foundations on which our civil defense program rests. It should be apparent to anyone who takes a careful look that our present civil defense program is not sufficiently geared to the requirements of the nuclear age.

It is not a question of whether our civil defense officials have succeeded or failed in their assigned tasks. The problem is not one of performance. In this regard I pay tribute to the persons who administer and participate in our civil defense program, from the highest to the lowest levels. They are, for the most part, doing the very best they can with the tools at hand.

It is, rather, a matter of lifting our conception of civil defense out of the framework of pre-atomic-hydrogen days. It is a matter of carefully examining the realities of defense requirements in a completely new and modern setting. It is a matter of considering, in the light of present realities, the problem of constructing a rational national program for civil defense.

We can no longer depend upon the dual system of charging the Department of Defense with the responsibility for a military defense of our people from enemy action and charging the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, through a loose confederation of State civil defense agencies, with the responsibility for passive civil defense of our citizens in the event of military attack upon our homeland.

The time has come to face the fact that military defense and civil defense cannot be separated. They are highly interdependent. A weakness in one is a weakness in the other, a failure in one may lead to a failure in the other. Just as we could not afford to base today's offensive strength on the weapons of a decade ago, we cannot afford to base our vital civil defense program on the requirements of a decade ago. We must develop an entirely new concept of civil defense, based on its inclusion as an integral part of our total military-defense planning. Our survival could well be at stake, and it is imperative that we think and act accordingly.

I have been convinced for several years now that the civil-defense functions formerly administered by the Federal Civil Defense Administration and now by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization can only be effectively carried out within the framework of our Defense Establishment. I have been convinced that many of the tasks presently to be performed by individuals on an essentially voluntary basis can only be carried out effectively by trained military personnel with a predetermined and primary civil-defense mission.

Voluntary participation in civil defense is, like voluntary armies, largely a phenomenon of the past. We are being faced with the possibility of total war. Civil defense now requires an effective corps of trained personnel. In terms of importance, it is no longer possible to distinguish this type of service from purely military service.

In 1954 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 233, expressing the sense of the Congress that, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, the President should prepare and submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to establish within the Department of Defense the responsibility for administering all the functions of the then-existing Federal Civil Defense Administration.

In 1955 I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 108 which was in substantially the same form as its predecessor.

In 1956 the Military Operations Subcommittee, chaired by my colleague from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], again became alarmed at the advent of megaton-range weapons and the possibility of lethal radioactive fallout, together with the imminent development of ICBM's, and recommended new civil defense legislation. Our subcommittee recognized then, as it does now, that the entire concept embodied in the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 was, and is, outmoded.

In 1957 members of the subcommittee introduced identical bills to implement the recommendations made in the subcommittee's 1956 report. These bills were not acted upon, although several minor provisions were incorporated in the legislative proposal enacted in 1958 establishing the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The action of the Congress and the Executive in 1958 recognized that the close relationship between military preparedness and nonmilitary defense readiness, and the vital importance of both, demanded that the nonmilitary defense functions be vested in no one short of the President. For almost 8 years civil defense had been primarily the responsibility of the States and their political subdivisions. The Federal role was informational and advisory. Then, in 1958, civil defense was expressly declared to be the joint responsibility of Federal, State, and local government. The act of 1958 enabled the Federal Government to assist the States and cities with their civil defense administrative and personnel costs, it permitted Federal financial assistance for training State and local personnel, and it authorized distribution of federally purchased radiological instruments throughout the Nation.

But, in spite of that apparent shift in emphasis in 1958, the basic framework of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 remains today relatively unaltered. The present civil defense program was established before the development of large megaton-yield thermonuclear weapons and intercontinental ballistic missiles. Emphasis remains on Federal assistance to the States and localities for the purpose of aiding in the development of individual State civil defense programs. And Congress has not been overly generous in providing the wherewithal for the small amount of Federal assistance that could be given.

So here we are today faced with a potential nuclear threat in terms of the loss of scores of millions of lives and in terms of the very ability of our Nation to recover from a sneak attack, and only a small proportion of what must be done is being done. There is no question that satisfactory results have not been obtained. And, in spite of the best efforts of the thoroughly capable and conscientious people who administer our civil defense program, there is no reason to expect satisfactory results in the future.

Civil defense is no longer a program which we can afford to relegate to a subordinate position in our governmental structure. It cannot be separated from the main element of our national defense program.

President Eisenhower said in 1956 that "an effective civil defense is an important deterrent against attack on our country and thus helps preserve peace. In the event of an attack upon us, civil defense at once becomes one of our immediate reactions imperatively required for our Nation's survival." There is no room for argument here. And if civil defense is an important deterrent and a key to national survival, then the question can rightly be asked why we have not made provision for an effective civil defense.

Our strategy is primarily one of deterrence, one of making it clear that aggres-

sion against us cannot be profitable. Deterrence is provided by our military power, our ability and will to prevail, and the adequacy of our civil defense measures. It is unthinkable that we can continue to neglect the civil defense mission the way we have in the past, because without it our national security, as well as our national strategy, becomes incomplete.

The point was well stated in a communication from the Department of Defense to the Military Operations Subcommittee during 1960 hearings on civil defense:

> A strong civil defense program is an increasingly important part of our deterrent posture. Such a program will strengthen the conviction and credibility of our firm resolve to meet aggression with force. If our policy of deterrence should ever fail, then military power and civil defense are our assurance of survival and of prevailing.

When Gen. Curtis LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, appeared before our subcommittee last year he indicated two basic tasks of the military: First to maintain offensive strength sufficient to deter any rational enemy from initiating war, and second, should deterrence fail, to retaliate and fight a war with the objectives of minimizing damage to our country and concluding hostilities on terms which are as advantageous as possible to this country and which would insure the preservation of our freedom and way of life. In General LeMay's estimation these tasks required maintaining a military force capable of counterforce operations, maintaining the capability to engage enemy forces en route to targets in the United States as a further means of minimizing damage to our country, and most important for purposes of this discussion, providing protection to our population by practicable passive defense measures.

General LeMay stated that civil defense has the same identical objective as counterforce operations and active defense operations, namely, minimizing damage to our country and its people. Thus, civil defense is a vital element of our national deterrent posture and is another factor which must be carefully assessed by any potential enemy in calculating his chances of success.

Mr. Speaker, because of my firm belief that a strong civil defense program is absolutely essential to our deterrent posture and to an ultimate defense of our homeland, and because of my equally firm conviction that the framework of our present civil defense program is wholly inadequate to do the necessary job, I am introducing a concurrent resolution which would express the sense of Congress that the President, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, should prepare and submit to the Congress a positive program for placing full civil defense responsibility in the Department of Defense.

The program outlined in this resolution would place the civil defense functions now vested in the President, and delegated to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, in the Department of Defense. These functions should be administered by the Secretary of the Army under the direct authority of the Secretary of Defense.

It also specifies that the civil defense programs now conducted by civilian volunteers should be made the responsibility of Army Reserve forces whose training will be to prepare them for full-time active duty in the civil defense area.

I full well realize that there are a number of considerations involved in realining our civil defense sights. It would not be feasible to completely supplant all present civilian participants in the civil defense program with military personnel. It would appear to be both necessary and wise to utilize certain of the personnel presently participating voluntarily in the program. It goes without saying that all of the accumulated experience of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and many of its experienced personnel would be utilized. The areas of Federal, State, and local responsibility, and the precise limits of Federal authority under the new program are incapable of being defined at this time. The resolution does not attempt to go into detail because the effective transfer of these functions would have to be based on an extensive and detailed study. There will be many problems, but I feel it is imperative that we face them and resolve them regardless of their difficulty.

Military Reserve personnel, as a result of their training and discipline, would be eminently qualified to carry out the tasks that would face this Nation in an immediate postattack period. They could perform vital services. There are large numbers of people in our Reserve units who have had training in command, communications, supply, logistics, and other vital areas, and who could make a very real contribution to the success of our civil defense program.

The military is the best equipped organization in the country to cope with the emergency that would arise in the event of a nuclear attack. It has greater resources, better communications systems, the necessary discipline, and a better overall capability for doing the job than has our present civil defense organization.

A number of persons have recognized the valuable contribution the Reserve forces could make to civil defense, but only until such time as direct military support requirements force their withdrawal from recovery operations. In other words, they would have the military play a vital role in civil defense until it was called off to do battle with the enemy. This feeling was reflected in the subcommittee report last year.

I say that we must plan now for the use of military Reserve units for specific civil defense functions, and that they must be given a sole and primary mission in this area, with no ifs, buts, untils, or unlesses. This will certainly mean beefing up our Reserve forces, if we assume that existing Reserve elements have a primary mission to support our military defense efforts. If we proceed on the basis that civil defense is an integral and inseparable element of our total national defense capability, it is inescapable that we must provide the money and the men necessary to carry out the added civil defense responsibilities. I would not pretend for a minute that the Department of Defense could effectively handle civil defense responsibilities without additional appropriations and without additional manpower and equipment.

It was brought to light during hearings before the subcommittee last year that, of 27 National Guard divisions in the country, only 6 had mobilization missions in the event of a national emergency. The National Guard, in my estimation, offers another excellent possibility for training military personnel in a primary civil defense mission. It is probable that most National Guard units in the country will be supporting civil defense efforts anyway in the event of an emergency, and I think serious consideration should be given to incorporating the guard's great potential in the civil defense segment of our national defense planning.

Although I have opposed in the past, and shall continue to oppose in the future, the shifting of many legitimate State functions to the Federal Government, it would seem obvious today that civil defense, as well as military defense, is a proper responsibility of the National Government.

It is not only necessary that there be a greater concentration of authority at the Federal level, but it is also necessary for the Federal Government to shoulder the principal financial burden. Every American citizen is entitled to an equal minimum share of protection afforded by civil defense measures should a war be brought into our backyards.

Mr. Speaker, there would be scant hope for the survival of the free world if we were able to destroy the enemy but incapable of preventing the annihilation of our own cities and people.

Our homes, our cities, our families, our skilled industrial workers are just as much a part of the total national defense potential as our uniformed military forces. It would be disastrous to continue to ignore this simple truth.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION, 1961

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish it were unnecessary for me to speak as I must today. I have been among those who uged that the new administration be given ample opportunity to develop its programs before members of the minority take the floor of this House to criticize. In a Lincoln Day speech I defined it as the duty of the minority to offer unstinting support when support is warranted, but to confront the administration with coherent and constructive criticism when criticism is warranted. Support I have given when it has been in the best interest of the United States. But now I find it incumbent upon myself to be sharply critical of a serious omission on the part of the Democratic administration. The omission to which I

refer is the administration's deliberate failure, contrary to campaign and platform pledges, to submit to the Congress a civil rights program.

I commend to the Democratic administration the pledges which they themselves solemnly made in their 1960 platform regarding civil rights:

> It is the duty of the Congress to enact the laws necessary and proper to protect and promote these constitutional rights.

The Democratic Party platform went on to define a specific program of needed civil rights measures:

> Above all, this program will require the strong, active, persuasive, and inventive leadership of the President of the United States.

The American people are entitled to ask when and through what specific proposals the administration will undertake to redeem these solemn pledges.

Civil rights are the foundation stones of democracy. If we do not maintain the foundation and seek unceasingly to reinforce it, the whole structure will tumble. Democracy and the maintenance of individual liberties are a difficult and complex business. Democracy does not work by itself; it must be made to work by its dedicated adherents. The maintenance and enhancement of individual liberties require a strong foundation in law and the superstructure of these liberties must be built brick by brick, painstakingly and with resolution. What the Government does or does not do in this regard profoundly conditions the social, economic, and moral fiber of our national life, and is increasingly taken as the acid test of our sincerity and leadership capacity abroad.

During the last presidential campaign, the platforms of both parties set forth many meritorious legislative proposals. So did the candidates. In Chicago on September 9 President Kennedy called for the establishment of a Federal Bureau on Intergroup Relations. In Los Angeles he declared:

> So let us make it very clear that when the Democratic Party wrote its platform in July, it meant it in September and in November and in January. In 1961 I intend to see that those commitments are carried out.

In the same speech he stressed the need to broaden the scope and strengthen the Commission on Civil Rights, to grant the Attorney General power to enforce all constitutional rights, to wipe out discriminatory poll taxes and literacy tests, to pass effective antibombing and antilynching legislation, and to strengthen the legal framework which will allow us to advance toward economic, educational and political equality.

President Kennedy further averred in September that legislation designed to serve these ends was already being prepared. These were his words:

> I have asked Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and Congressman CELLER, of New York, to prepare a bill embodying all the pledges of the Democratic platform, and that bill will be among the first orders of business when a new Congress meets in January.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the new Congress met in January and it is now May. The 1st session of the 87th Congress is well past the halfway mark but still we have received no legislative proposals on civil rights from the administration. And where are those civil libertarians of the House who took the floor only a year ago to decry and lament the inadequacies of the Civil Rights Act of 1960? "Just wait until we have a new President," they cried, "a Democratic President, and we will correct all this." Mr. Speaker, not a single omnibus civil rights bill embodying the pledges of the Democratic platform has been introduced on the other side of the aisle. Can the opposition, under these circumstances, be anything but puzzled and dismayed?

A former mayor of my city once asked the people of New York, "Will you love me in November as you did in May?" Those who believe in the cause of civil rights and who supported the Democratic Party in the election can hardly be blamed if they now plaintively inquire, "Do you love me this May as you so ardently professed to love me last November?"

Political platforms and campaign promises sometimes have a way of fading after the votes have been delivered, the election won, and the jobs parceled out. I have vainly looked for a Presidential message on the subject of civil rights and I am surprised, troubled, and profoundly disappointed that it has not come. Can it be that for some obscure political reason the administration has lost its ardor for civil rights legislation?

All the Executive orders in the world and the most vigorous possible application of existing legislative tools cannot rationalize compromises with justice and morality, both of which call resoundingly for prompt and resolute action by Congress. The legislative process is slow and painstaking, and it is never too early to begin. Let us, therefore, begin. Ask anyone who has lived and worked with the subject of civil rights and he will assure you that legislation is what we need. We cannot do the job merely by occasional Executive orders, still fewer Presidential pronouncements that have no teeth—that do not have the force of law behind them.

The time is ripe, indeed long overdue, for Congress to enact a Federal law on fair employment practices with respect to concerns operating in interstate commerce. In the campaign and in its platform, the new administration promised a Federal fair employment practices bill. But since the election neither the administration nor its leadership in Congress has breathed a word about this worthy subject. Well, if the majority is not so disposed let us of the minority mount a major effort to bring about this necessary result.

It is time also for Federal legislation to prevent discrimination in the employment policies of Government agencies and private industries holding Government contracts. The President's Executive order of March 6 traveled in the right direction, but only a very short distance, in that its effect was solely to reestablish an existing committee and to give it limited powers and limited sanctions. The President's action amounted to a reshuffling of President Eisenhower's Committee on Government Contracts, a body which both President Eisenhower and Labor Secretary Mitchell considered inadequate, as evidenced by their request for a far stronger committee, legislatively established and endowed with powers to issue subpenas and impose sanctions.

It is time also for Federal legislation to prevent denials by State and local authorities of any constitutionally guaranteed rights. A number of us in the last Congress tried to write into law title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, which would have granted authority to the Attorney General to seek civil injunctive action to protect the constitutionally secured rights of all our citizens from discriminatory encroachments, and which passed the House but was stricken out in the final enactment. This is perhaps the most important legislative need of all. If it is important to safeguard the right to vote by giving the Attorney General civil enforcement powers, is it not then equally important to safeguard every other right? This, it seems to me, goes right to the heart of the school problem. Why should private groups carry the burden of implementing legislation by having to undertake costly and protracted civil suits? Only 25 percent of the voting-age Negroes of the South are registered to vote. Segregation continues to be practiced in schools, in housing, and in public facilities. Equal employment opportunity is far from being a reality—in businesses, in the professions, in labor unions, even in government. The report of the Civil Rights Commission clearly illustrates the breadth and depth of the civil rights gap that remains in these areas. The enactment of title III would bring about far-reaching reforms in each of these areas.

It is time for the Federal Government to take the lead, on the basis of invitation, in offering technical assistance to those States which have attempted to comply with court orders by instituting programs of transition from segregated to integrated schools. Legislation for this purpose was placed before the 86th Congress by the Eisenhower administration, and the Congress refused to act.

Mr. Speaker, let us now consider a problem that has long been avoided. I refer to the existence of widespread discrimination in labor unions, aided and abetted by management. I urge my colleagues to read a document issued by the NAACP entitled "The Colored Wage Earner and Apprentice Training Programs." This document is a deeply disturbing treatise on the subject of employment barriers permitted, indeed fostered, by some leaders of some labor unions. Obviously these practices could not flourish except for the cooperation of management. Discriminatory practices within labor unions do serious damage to the economy, deprive American citizens of their civil rights, and reflect discredit on the unions involved. To its own great discredit, the Government refuses to examine the

anti-civil-rights practices being carried out within labor unions, in many if not most cases with the tacit acquiesence of management. I have submitted legislation, Mr. Speaker, to make it an unfair labor practice, defined as such, for labor or management to discriminate on account of race, creed, or color. This is a subject that has been carefully avoided in the past and I fear that it is being even more carefully avoided by the new administration.

I recommend also that the NLRB be empowered to refuse certification, for purposes of collective bargaining, to any labor union with locals which are operated on a segregated basis.

In addition to the legislative proposals which I have outlined thus far, there are other pressing needs. Antilynching legislation is necesary. We must strengthen voting rights by acting to prevent the use of literacy tests or poll taxes in such a manner as to deny the franchise arbitrarily and discriminately. Where, one must ask, are the administration's proposals on these subjects?

We must consider the implications for civil rights of existing Federal grants-in-aid programs. So far we have had no comment from the White House on the necessity for according equal treatment to all beneficiaries of these programs, especially where tax-supported institutions are involved.

There has been much discussion in recent months of the so-called antisegregation amendment to prospective legislation for Federal aid to education. I and many others adhere strongly to the view that Federal funds should not be used to perpetuate segregated school systems. On the other hand, those of us who believe in the urgent need for Federal aid to education have been much concerned over the possible consequences of a Powell amendment to a school bill. In the 86th Congress a school bill which had my support passed the House of Representatives with an antisegregation amenament attached to it, also with my support. This was a historic breakthrough. But this year we face additional complications arising from widespread pressures for the inclusion of private schools in a Federal program of aid to education. Controversies arising from both a Powell amendment and the private school issue could easily result in killing any Federal aid to education bill. It is in this context, therefore, that we must examine the desirability of an antisegregation amendment to a school bill.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress should not become ensnared in a tangled web of different objectvies that could result in failure on all counts. The President has it within his power here and now to resolve the dilemma arising from the unfortunate interlocking of different issues. He can prevent the use of Federal funds to perpetuate segregated institutions and at the same time possibly save a very important piece of legislation. I submit that the President has the power under the Constitution and under existing law to withhold Federal funds appropriated for any project that is or will be operated on a racially discriminatory basis. He has not only the authority to do so, but the constitutional duty, and this definitely includes the withholding of funds from segregated schools. Rather than risk defeat of the school bill by allowing it needlessly to become entangled with a separate issue, let the President clarify the subject by an unequivocal statement on the use of Federal funds, be it for schools, housing, terminal facilities, defense establishments, or any other Government assisted enterprise.

If there is doubt in his mind as to the law and constitutional question involved, the President has the right and the duty to submit the question to the Attorney General for a legal opinion. He did not hesitate to do this in the case of the constitutional question of the separation of church and state. Why can he not do it in regard to the question of withholding Federal funds from segregated facilities? The President lays great stress on the vigorous use of the powers of his office. I am here suggesting a specific area where Executive action is needed, where, properly employed, it can render academic the question of an antisegregation amendment to the school bill.

I have looked in vain for vigorous action on the part of the Department of Justice in the area of civil rights. With the exception of the commendable steps now taken in Prince Edward County, Va., such action has not been forthcoming, despite the fact that in at least four Southern States not a single school has been desegregated, and in the rest only token integration has begun, involving a mere handful of Negro children. In one southern city it is a crime for a colored child to attempt to read a book in the public library. In that same city Negro preachers have been subjected to arbitrary and vicious harassments. The whole world has seen the disgraceful pictures which recently appeared in the newspapers of a leading Negro minister being attacked by a snarling dog at the end of a leash held by a policeman. But even occurrences such as this have not yet moved the Department of Justice to take action.

Our preoccupation with missile gaps and unemployment gaps should not be allowed to blind us to the existence of a gaping legislative gap in the field of civil rights. Congress has a job to do and it is not doing it, nor is the administration suggesting that it should. Many of us have introduced responsible civil rights legislation, including my own bills, H.R. 5875, 5876, 5877, 5878, and 6005. This legislation concerns each of the areas I have discussed on the floor of the House today. I should very much like to receive some support for it, especially from those whose eloquent pronouncements in the past have evidenced a most sincere dedication to the cause of civil rights. With the backing of the administration, so conspicuously lacking when set against the pledges of its electoral platform and campaign, the battle for individual freedom can be continued and ultimately won. With the President's enthusiastic support, we can close the broad gap between the promise of the Constitution and the firm application to its principles.

Admirable advances in civil rights have been made. Today more than 1.2 million Negroes are registered to vote in Southern States where 20 years ago there were fewer than 100,000. The Supreme Court, in its epochal decision of 1954, struck down the legal basis for school segregation, and, in the years since, slow but measurable progress has been made toward integration. Progress has also been made in the Armed Forces, in Federal employment, in interstate transportation, and in the provision of access to public facilities. Inadequate though it was in proportion to existing needs and injustices, significant civil rights legislation was enacted in 1957 and again in 1960—the first such legislation in over 80 years. Historic advances have resulted which a few short years ago no one thought possible.

Our satisfaction with these advances must be greatly tempered by shame that they were so long overdue. The history of injustice and neglect that preceded these gains must be duly recognized lest we judge progress only in relative terms. In terms of the broad gap that remains between the promise of our Constitution and the realization of its principles, the task is barely begun.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps this administration is relying on Secretary of the Interior Udall to carry on his apparent request to run the civil rights of the Washington professional football team. That may be the answer, I will say to the gentleman. I do not know. Has the gentleman given that any thought?

Mr. LINDSAY. That is a possibility, I will say to the gentleman. The thought had not occurred to me. I am grateful to him for suggesting the possibility. The thought has merit; no question about it.

I was interested to note, I might say to my friend from Iowa, that the distinguished Secretary, a fine former Congressman, had suggested to friends in the oil and gas industry that contributions to the May dinner would be desirable. I was interested to note at the same time that the tax revision program suggested to the Congress by the administration makes no mention of the problem of depletion, oil and gas depletion and mineral depletion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have had a bill in here dealing with this depletion allowance for a long, long time, for several years, and I do not seem to be able to get action on it. I do not know why. I cannot get any action on that bill to reduce the depletion allowance from 27½ percent to 15 percent.

Mr. LINDSAY. I wonder if this comes under the heading of "Special Interest."

Mr. GROSS. I would not know.

Mr. LINDSAY. I would not know, either, and I am grateful to my friend for his contribution.

Mr. GROSS. I perhaps should have mentioned it this afternoon in the debate on this road financing bill. Perhaps Mr. Udall's ability to raise funds

for the Democratic war chest could lend assistance to some of these other pay-as-you-go propositions and take a little heat off the taxpayers of this country; he in conjunction with Mr. Evans.

Mr. LINDSAY. I think the gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I will be happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not to ask a question but to say that I enjoy the colloquy between the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] bebecause they so seldom vote together.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there might be merit in that, too, I will say to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. LINDSAY. If the gentleman will permit me to say, I find that there is common ground for agreement on many occasions between both my friends on either side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to review the approach to the farm problem in the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration. During the campaign, President Kennedy constantly referred to this problem as a vital one. At La Crosse, Wis., he promised, on October 23, 1960, to give the "farm problem top priority in the opening weeks of my administration."

Again, in a telegram to Claude Wickard on September 8, 1960, he stated:

> I regard the agricultural problem as the No. 1 domestic issue facing the Nation today, and I intend to attack it on a national basis.

At various times in the campaign, he talked of raising farm income to full parity; he talked of ending the senseless burden of waste and costs on taxpayers and of making the farmer a full partner in American prosperity. At other times, he defined the goal for farmers as "parity of income."

With these goals and objectives, candidate Kennedy still insisted in the third television debate with Mr. Nixon, that, "Our agricultural program will cost $1½ billion and possibly $2 billion less than the present Eisenhower program."

President Kennedy's farm message on March 16 contained the specific recommendations for his program to stabilize the prices and productivity of farm commodities, eliminate stockpiles of surplus goods and stimulate farmer's earning power.

While the farm vote in 1960 seemed to indicate that the farmers generally favored the Nixon approach, President Kennedy sought to shift gears with an elaborate program subject to the approval of farm producers and Congress. He wants to do this using tools such as flexible marketing quotas, price supports, incentive payments, surplus commodities purchases, and payments for diversion of commodities and byproduct uses. The Secretary of Agriculture would work out programs with farmer committees subject to the veto, rather than the enactment, of Congress.

Thus, the administration will try to lick the surplus program before putting the farmer on his own by subsidizing him against the pressures of increased costs.

Will this program cost $1½ billion, perhaps $2 billion, less than the present program?

I would point out the projected changes in the budget for the fiscal year 1961–62 in which spending on national security will be up 1.7 percent over the Eisenhower estimate; spending for interest will be up one-tenth of 1 percent; spending for labor and welfare will be up 12 percent, and spending for agriculture will be up 26 percent over estimates carefully prepared by President Eisenhower on the basis of projected farm programs.

Besides increased spending of $642 million for the next fiscal year, additions of $2.5 million in that next spending authority were made to the current fiscal-year budget—all as a result of new proposals.

This does not sound like a program that will save taxpayers, or consumers, or even the farmers, any money. Rather, it sounds like a continuation of the high and higher subsidizations with few tangible results.

Let us examine the only tangible agricultural bill which has reached the floor of the House today; namely, the feed grains bill.

In mentioning this bill, I of course don't want to detract in any way from the credit which should go to the administration and the Congress for two other agricultural bills which have gone through the House. The first one was the farm credit bill to increase the funds for operating loans which, as I recall, was originated by Congressman CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of Maine. I am happy to see the administration and the Congress accept these changes. The other bill was the extension of the Sugar Act for 15 months in order that sugar producers in this country might better program for the next year and a half until permanent sugar legislation is enacted by the Congress.

And getting back to the feed grains bill, which is now law, I would like to compliment the Kennedy administration on their espousal of Republican proposals which have been advocating for years with, I might add, not much success in this body. These changes were advocated by many Republican candidates for public office during the past campaign.

The changes call for payment-in-kind, voluntary land retirement, and price supports contingent on compliance. This recently passed 1-year emergency plan for feed grains to restrict planting using payments-in-kind and price supports for those who participate in the program to gain compliance, appears to be on the road to a successful operation, bearing out the validity of the statements made by myself and others in support of this type of legislation in previous months.

However, there was one section—now known as section 3—which gives a good indication of the direction this administration would like to go in that it provided, when first introduced, that the Secretary of Agriculture could sell all of the surplus stocks of grain at market prices. About 600 million bushels of corn will be marketed by the trade in this marketing year. Such a proposal would have thrown an additional triple that amount on the market.

This would have had a devastating effect on the market; it would have reduced the income of farmers; it would have channeled most of the compliance grains through the Commodity Credit Corporation, thereby increasing the cost of the program. Congress, in its wisdom, would not accept the original section 3. However, we did pass a bill with a section 3 which could be detrimental to agriculture and the consumer alike.

This section provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may sell at the market price the grain representing the payment-in-kind in the event the farmer chooses to allow the Department of Agriculture to merchandise his certificate for him.

We have seen the effect of the threat of this power on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture. To give you an idea on what this has done to the price of grain, I can quote the following table which has been reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before:

	Apr. 18, 1960	Jan. 20, 1961	Apr. 18, 1961
Wheat, No. 2 Hard, Kansas City	$2.06⅞	$2.02⅝	$1.97½
Corn, No. 2 Yellow, Chicago	1.23¼	1.12	1.10¾
Oats, No. 1 White, heavy, Chicago	.73½	.68½	.66¾
Rye, No. 2, Minneapolis	1.19	1.07¼	1.08¼
Barley, malting, New York	1.52	1.50	1.47

Subsequent statements by the Secretary of Agriculture evidently has reassured the trade, and it appears now that the market price on these grains might be strengthening. However, it should be pointed out that, using authority under section 407 of the present act, the Department of Agriculture is releasing substantially more grain than was released by the previous administration during a similar period in 1960 and it might be further noted that the previous administration was criticized at that time for the detrimental effect it was having on the market by releasing grain which was going out of condition, or it was suspected that it was going out of condition.

In fact, many farm organizations last fall wrote resolutions requesting that when the CCC sold grains suspected of going out of condition, they immediately replace them with good grains from the open market to prevent the USDA from pushing the market price down.

The following table gives you—in bushels of corn—the amount the U.S. Department of Agriculture released between March 4 and the second week of April in 1960, and March 3 and the second week of April in 1961:

Week of—	1961	1960
Mar. 3	5,373,000	2,279,000
Mar. 10	4,883,000	1,890,000
Mar. 17	5,080,000	2,158,000
Mar. 24	6,078,000	2,599,000
Mar. 31	8,120,000	2,046,000
Apr. 7	9,397,000	1,870,000
Apr. 14	8,948,000	2,809,000

I have no criticism of the Federal Government protecting itself by releasing out-of-condition corn or corn going out of condition. But in order to protect the market, I believe—as many farm organizations have stated repeatedly in the past—that when the Government releases corn for this reason, it should replace an equal amount from the market in order that the price might be protected.

It is interesting to note that, with the witnessed phychological effect of the Government's authority to release payment-in-kind grains at the market price, what a devastating effect it would have had on the market if the nearly 3 billion bushels of feed grain surplus was no longer insulated from the market as it is at the present time.

We shall watch how the Secretary of Agriculture administers his more limited power under the present section 3 for the remainder of his administration, with the hope that he will recognize the danger involved, and not utilize his authority after the signup for the new program has been completed this spring. Despite the merits of this feed grain program, it would be a fatal defect if farmers were allowed to sell their grain or their corn to the Government at $1.20 a bushel and buy it back for something like $1.05, with the taxpayers footing the "middleman" costs. If livestock production pattern was disrupted by this unwarranted authority on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, it could then greatly reduce the income of the farmers engaged in our great livestock industry.

Recently, the administration's omnibus farm bill has been introduced, and subsequently hearings have been held. Immediately, many of us were quite concerned lest the principle involved of the original section 3 of the feed grains bill, which we believe would destroy our competitive marketing system, and replace it with a system whereby the Government sets the farmer's price, controls his production and markets his produce, would be inherent in the provisions of the new omnibus approach.

What have we found in this new omnibus bill? In its 79 pages, we find among other things that we are to abdicate much of our congressional responsibility to formulate farm laws, and that the long-heralded statements that these programs—the new farm laws—would be written by the farmers themselves is just not true. The way the new law would function, the Secretary of Agriculture would write a new program for each commodity. The Congress would only have the right to veto; not the right to amend, nor the right to enact, but only to veto. Whenever the Secretary determines it necessary or desirable, he can write a law for any farm commodity or group of commodities. This would provide for national marketing orders, marketing quotas—expressed in volume bushels, pounds, barrels, hens, hogs, and cows, and so on—including price supports with production payments.

After the Secretary appointed and consulted with the Farm Advisory Committee—and they can only advise—he would, under this bill, send not the new law, which he had written, to the Congress for our approval or disapproval, but he would by way of the President send just the basic features of that law. If the Congress wanted to amend in any way the basic features or the details which would not be sent to us, we could not do so. They could only accept or reject, and if the Congress delayed taking action for 60 days, the new law written by the Secretary of Agriculture would automatically take effect subject to referendum by farmers who the Secretary decides can vote.

This is the kind of authority we will be asked to give the new Secretary of Agriculture. Let me point out to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, however, this authority will carry on past this Secretary of Agriculture to future Secretaries.

In looking over this and the long-range goals of the Kennedy administration, as seen in its recent farm message, once more we must ask, will it ultimately save the taxpayer's money? Will it eventually reduce Government surpluses? Will it get at the basic causes of the surplus problem? Will it improve farmers' income? Will it protect the farmer's right to manage his own operation? Will it protect the market price, rather than jeopardize it? And lastly, we can ask, will it be fair to the consumers?

The long-term answer to all these questions, so vital to the American agricultural economy and to all Americans alike at this time, appears to be negative.

Perhaps, in the next 100 days, and in the period following, this administration will yet develop a sound, stable agricultural program composed of factors unleashing the powers of the farmer, rather than restraining him.

In any event, we will continue to cooperate in applauding and supporting those factors when and if they are proposed by the administration.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have attempted to give our best judgment of what would constitute a Republican evaluation of the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration. It was Walter Bagehot who said in his epochal work, "The English Constitution":

> England invented the phrase, "Her Majesty's opposition"; that it was the first government which made a criticism of administration as much a part of the policy as administration itself. This critical opposition is the consequence of cabinet government.

I firmly believe that critical opposition, responsibly given, is as much in order in our American system of government today. We wish to help in providing it.

We have today examined a number of key issues currently before Congress or, in the case of civil rights, not before Congress. We have perhaps pointed with understandable pride to the accomplishments of the past administration, and we have certainly pointed with responsible retrospect to the pledges of the current administration in the past presidential campaign. We have then traced progress in these areas through the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration, frankly giving credit where credit is due, and yet criticizing where we feel that the administration has erred or fallen short of what we feel the goals for America and the means for attaining these goals should be.

I might mention at this point that, while an overwhelming majority of the views expressed by those participating in this speech series represent the views of most Republican Members of Congress, there may be inevitably some statements to which many minority Members would not subscribe. However, we feel that by encouraging diverse views by Republican Members who have become keenly interested in a subject or who have served on a committee studying such an area we have illustrated the great breadth of a Republican Party which is not oblivious to the views of any within its midst. By encouraging such freedom, we only serve to emphasize the statement that "by different methods different men excel."

It may well be that people ask you for criticism but that they only want praise. In that case, the administration might well be disappointed with this speech series, in that it is not a 100 percent favorite critique. On the other hand as Lowell put it:

> A wise skepticism is the first attribute of a good critic.

By that token, the wise skepticism of my colleagues here today has revealed shortcomings among many areas of the administration's performance to date. This is to be expected, and the public airing of these shortcomings should do much to dramatize to the American people a better all-around analysis of the Kennedy administration than they might see through televised press conferences, commercial spectaculars in the White House, and sweeping travel sequences from Glenora to Palm Beach. We have endeavored to keep in touch with actual performance in the reality of governmental policy.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that we have in no way tried to rank the Kennedy administration or to give it a batting average in any of these fields.

It is fairly early in the spring for that, and, as some members may recall, the new Washington Senators finished high up in the spring training exhibition standings this year while the New York Yankees were near the bottom. The season has started, but October is some time off. So, too, the date of January 20, 1965, is in the distant future. We must also note that a batting average of .750 in education might be impressive, but the slightest shortcoming in foreign policy might indeed be fatal to our Nation and to our world as we now know it. Thus even a .999 batting average there would do us no good. Rather, the function of this series was to lay the facts as we know them before the American public for their study and their evaluation. If we have caused doubts about the wisdom of some measures, and if we have aroused a greater interest among the citizenry, we will have performed our function well.

The original 100 days were not the first 100 days of the New Deal, but they consisted of the period of time between Napoleon's entry into Paris on March 20, 1815, and his eventual abdication in the same city shortly after the debacle at Waterloo. Napoleon went from glory to disaster in 100 days, from which the phrase has been derived. In examining the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration as we have done, we wish to make sure that the United States does not turn from the strongest nation in the world to defeat at Waterloo, or exile at St. Helena, or delay at Elba. Victory in the cold war, and a prosperous nation at home—these must be our goals, and we pledge our support to policies geared to these ends or, in their absence, to the formulation of our own policies in this regard. This we have done in the first 100 days, and this we will do in days to come. We say in some few areas to President Kennedy, "Congratulations on a job well done. Keep it up. We will help you with every resource at our disposal." In other areas, and, I fear, a majority, we must resolutely and firmly chide the administration for its shortcomings and say, "You are wrong, and this is what should be done. We will stand up for what we believe is right with firmness and vigor, and we will carry our story to the American people." By this type of responsible opposition, the American people will move forward as they will ever do when national interest is placed above thoughts of political gain. And, inspired by our analyses of these issues, I trust the American people will continue to turn toward those who work for a sound government, dedicated to the dignity of the individual and the freedom of the private enterprise system which has brought America to eminence and leadership in the world in which we live.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY]. The gentleman referred to civil rights and referred to the first civil rights legislation in over 80 years, passed by the Congress since the Civil War. But, the interesting thing, Mr. Speaker—and I think the record should show this—is that that legislation was passed by a Democratically controlled Congress—first, by the 85th Congress and then the 86th Congress. I think the record should also show that the 83d Congress was controlled by my Republican friends in both the House and the Senate, and the occupant of the White House was former President Eisenhower. But, during that 83d Congress, with the complete control of our Government at the executive and legislative level in the hands of our Republican friends, the Republican Party did not even report a civil rights bill out of committee. I think that is a very significant and important thing in the history of our country. So I agree with the gentleman's observation, but I simply want the record to show that it was under the leadership of the Democratic Party that that civil rights legislation is now on our statute books.

MAY 4—RHODE ISLAND INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST. GERMAIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, today, May 4, is Rhode Island Independence Day.

The State which I have the honor to represent came into being between the years 1636–47, during the reign of Charles I. In June of the earlier year Roger Williams, driven from Massachusetts by Puritan wrath, finally settled on the site of the present city he aptly named Providence.

It is common knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that my State is the smallest in the Union. What is not so generally known is that, as if to make up for physical limitations, my State has by far and away the longest name of any of her sisters, our full and proper appellation being "The State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations." There, now I defy any other Commonwealth to come up with, or even remotely approach, this handsome cognomen. The geographical designation alone reaches the impressive total of 35 letters to which, when we add the words, "The State," as provided by the act of July 18, 1776, of the general assembly, brings its style and title to the grand total of 45 letters. Our nearest rivals are Massachusetts and North Carolina and South Carolina, with 13 letters apiece, while the imperial State of California is confined to a mere 10 letters, and the greatest of them all in size, the new State of Alaska, to a half a dozen. So what "Little Rhody," to employ the sobriquet by which she is known, lacks in square miles and inches, she more than compensates for the lack by the grandeur of her title—and bids her bigger sisters not to forget it.

We have, Mr. Speaker, yet another unique distinction. The War for Independence, which began in the spring of 1775 with the engagements at Lexington and Concord, found Rhode Island more than ready to adhere to the patriot cause. Just 10 years previously she had shown where her sympathies lay by burning a British vessel which had been impressing Americans in Newport. News of the engagement at Lexington on April 19, 1775, reached Rhode Island on the same evening; by the very next day no less than 1,000 men were ready to march to the assistance of Massachusetts. Two days later a special session of the legislature met at Providence and authorized the enlistment of 1,500 troops. The Governor, being dubious about the practicality of making war, was promptly suspended and later deposed.

On May 4, 1776, the General Assembly of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, after first repealing the existing statute for securing the allegiance of Rhode Island to the British Crown, and providing for the dropping of the King's name in all forms of commissions, of all writs and processes in the courts, and of oaths prescribed by law, declared its entire political independence of the King of Great Britain.

Thus, the smallest of the British colonies antedated by 2 months the Declaration at Philadelphia, as it had also antedated Virginia's Bill of Rights, and Rhode Island may forever claim to be the oldest independent State in the Union.

For this reason, we of Rhode Island take peculiar pride in observing on every fourth of May the anniversary of our independence, which led the way to the independence of all the States. It is peculiarly symbolic that the device upon the State flag is a golden anchor, and the State motto is "Hope"—a hope that both in State and Nation has been thus far so gloriously fulfilled.

THE 170TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the 170th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, celebrated throughout the world by free Poles just as we celebrate July 4.

For more than a score of years this body has been marking this date. This is entirely fitting. Much of what we call our American heritage we owe to Poland.

The parliamentary system, the father of our own system, reached its first high state of development in Poland during the period between the 12th and 15th centuries.

One hundred years before our own Declaration of Independence, the great Polish political and legal thinker, Andrzej Grzymcka Goslicki, published a treatise, "De Optimo Senatore." This treatise has had a tremendous influence on liberal thinking.

Goslicki proclaimed:

Sometimes a people, provoked and irritated by the tyranny and usurpation of their King, justly take upon themselves the undoubted right of vindicating their own liberties; and by a well-formed conspiracy, or by open arms, shake off the yoke, drive out their lords and masters, and take the government entirely into their own hands.

That certainly has a familiar sound to those of us who revere the Declaration of Independence.

In Polish jurisprudence, a provision similar to our cherished habeas corpus was promulgated in 1430.

Then as every school boy and girl know, Kosciusko and Pulaski contributed their valuable services to our own fight for independence.

Thus, we in America have much in common with Poland. Our sympathies go out to those freedom-loving people who today are enslaved by the Kremlin. We are pleased to join with the millions of our fellow citizens of Polish ancestry in marking this day.

The torch of freedom burns a little brighter because the day is remembered.

A TRIBUTE TO RABINDRANATH TAGORE ON THE CENTENNIAL OF HIS BIRTH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker—

"Prisoner, tell me, who was it that bound you?"
"It was my master," said the prisoner.
"I thought I could outdo everybody in the world in wealth and power,
And I amassed in my own treasure-house
The money due to my king.
When sleep overcame me
I lay upon the bed that was for my lord,
And on waking up,
I found I was a prisoner
In my own treasure-house."

"Prisoner, tell me who was it that wrought this unbreakable chain?"
"It was I," said the prisoner,
"Who forged this chain very carefully.
I thought my invincible power
Would hold the world captive
Leaving me in a freedom undisturbed.
Thus night and day I worked at the chain
With huge fires and cruel hard strokes.
When at last the work was done and the links were complete and unbreakable,
I found that it held me in its grip."

GITANJALI
—*Rabindranath Tagore.*

There are men of words and men of action but rare is the felicitous and electrifying combination of both attributes in one man. It is my happy privilege today to pay respectful tribute to Rabindranath Tagore—a many faceted genius, a man of towering personality and integrity, whose life encompassed so many ramifications it is difficult to do any one aspect justice in this commentary. Poet, dramatist, story teller, composer of music and songs, essayist, humanist, educator, philosopher, psychologist, to him, truth and beauty complemented each other. On May 6, in Calcutta, a century ago, he was born into an atmosphere of religion, education, and culture. India seethed with discontent at the time, as the government of the country had just changed from the control of the British East India Co. to the British Crown. Religious bigotry and related evils plagued most of the people while the progressives among them sought the regeneration of their country. Among the latter so dedicated was the father of the poet, Devendranath Tagore, a remarkable man, called Maharshi or great saint, because of his deep piety, dedication to moral principles and his worship of an invisible God. He was the foremost source of inspiration to his son, although Rabindranath had said he did not see much of his father.

As a young child, Rabindranath found the routine of classwork and its environment depressing and, fortunately, his parents provided him with tutors. He soon became proficient in Bengali and Sanskrit, English, history, mathematics, and science. He had no difficulty in forming his thoughts in poetic imagery.

When his brother decided to study in England, Rabindranath, then 16, accompanied him, thinking he might enter a law school. Enthralled by nature, the scenic delights of the countryside were too persuasive and he found himself fascinated by the English poets as well. To broaden his knowledge of poets in other languages, he studied French and German. When his brother completed his course, both returned to India and Rabindranath encountered another sorceress—the Indian literature of all periods. His poetry continued in a never-ending flow.

Rabindranath was a man of silence, who sought space and who found meditation a vital force in his joyful soul. Although he played his part in the management of his father's estate, Rabindranath spent many quiet days in houseboats on the rivers of Bengal or in his father's ashrama in Santiniketan. His life pattern had the smooth flow of a tranquil river, a majestic rhythm of peace and harmony. He wrote ceaselessly—beautiful songs and poems—and the passing years revived memories of his reactions to his early school days. A man of ideas, ideals, and artistic creativity, with a unique perspective on life, he decided that children should learn in an atmosphere of love and affection; that they must have freedom of movement and expression; to build mind, body and personality, they must be close to nature. So strong were his convictions as to the barrenness of conventional schools, Tagore sold most of his property and in 1901 opened a school in his father's ashrama in Santiniketan, a village some 100 miles from Calcutta. Significantly, the name means "the Abode of Peace." There were the necessary studies, of course, but essential in his educational system were music and the dance, painting and drama. In his search to nurture harmony and the natural creative instinct in his charges, Tagore's esthetic sense proved an infallible guide. Noguchi, a well-known poet in Japan, felt that Tagore trained his pupils to hear music in the air. But the basic ingredient was love. Classes were held outdoors, in groves, and self-help and self-discipline, as well as self-government, were strongly encouraged. Teachers and students enjoyed a pleasant relationship but life at Santiniketan revolved around the tremendous personality of Tagore.

A relentless foe of ignorance, poverty, and squalor, Tagore recommended practical work for the villages and set about providing the means to establish this desirable end. A second school was started in 1914 at Sreeniketan for the study of village reconstruction and cooperatives. The curriculum included agriculture, carpentry, tanning, weaving, clay-modeling, foundry work, a machine shop, health sanitation, and so forth, and so continues to this day, drawing students from hundreds of surrounding villages.

Ever the visionary, Tagore was the personification of the international outlook. In an India intent on national integrity, he founded his International University at Visva-Bharati in 1921. Scholars have come to it, not only from India but from many parts of the world as they find there an atmosphere where young men and women may reach out beyond narrow nationalism to the broad horizon of international understanding and cooperation.

Long before the turn of this century, Tagore was well known in his native land and in other parts of Asia and in limited circles in the Western World. Although a few of his works had been translated into English in 1910, it was not until 1913—when he received the Nobel Prize in Literature—that he gained world renown.

His subsequent visit to the United States was a great success in one sense and a failure in another, as he was victimized by propaganda and a whispering campaign. Americans loved his physical beauty, the sensitive face, his expressive movements, the lyricism of his thoughts. He viewed us with surprising objectivity and delighted us with his witty and keen observations.

Rabindranath had tried to induce his own countrymen to face the facts of their lives. He was an eloquent critic of the Indian caste system, considering it established artificial and humiliating barriers between men. He was burdened with an acute awareness of the daily problems of the less fortunate and an astute appraiser of the social changes unavoidable then and in the future as he saw it.

On his 80th birthday, Mahatma Ghandi wrote him:

Fourscore is not enough—may you finish five. Love.

Tagore replied:

Thank you for your message; but fourscore is impertinence. Fivescore will be intolerable.

Fortunately for mankind, Tagore enjoyed a long and fruitful life, distinguished by insight, imagination, and vision. Writing prodigiously, he published more than 50 volumes of poetry, poems of nature, of love, and of India's heritage, filled with the harmony of emotion and idea, over 20 dramas, many novels and short stories and a large number of essays and at least 3,000 songs. He composed and choreographed about 8 dance dramas and turned to painting when over 60, finishing at least 200 pictures. His works, panoramic in scope, have been translated into 25 different languages.

Tagore is worshiped in India and his plays are not only performed there but in many countries in the world. Now, in New York, there is an off-Broadway production of his challenging play, "The King of the Dark Chamber." It has been the subject of many interpretations, as it is mystic and symbolic and requires much thought and attention from a Western audience. Needless to say, it opened to critical acclaim.

Like all great men, he has had his detractors and he succumbed at times to frustration and despair. But for him the birds would never cease to sing, every breeze bore a message of hope, every storm would end. And there was always the forest. Life had its lonely moments but he knew there was truth and beauty and love.

India and the world are deep in the debt of Rabindranath Tagore for the riches his intellect has bequeathed to us. He has to be studied to grasp the dynamism and profundity of his work. My gentle advice to my fellow Americans is: Become familiar with the glorious heritage this man has left the world; life will hold greater meaning for you when you do.

ANNIVERSARY OF TAGORE, GREAT POET OF INDIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, just 100 years ago this coming Saturday, Rabindranath Tagore, one of the world's great poets, was born in Calcutta. He died in his beloved India on August 7, 1941. On the occasion of the centenary of this distinguished writer, educator, and philosopher, a few reflections on his significance seem appropriate.

Tagore, recipient of the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1913, is far too little known to Western readers. His poetry, much of it written in the halcyon days before World War I when many in the West believed technology was about to wipe out forever all of man's baser instincts, calls insistently for men to find mutual understanding and love. As the years have gone by, as man's inhumanity to man has not vanished but grown, Tagore's message has become steadily more relevant.

Listen for a moment to an excerpt from Tagore's essay entitled "Nationalism in the West," written more than 40 years ago:

> The truth is that the spirit of conflict and conquest is at the root of this nationalism. Its basis is not social cooperation. It has evolved a perfect organization of power but not spiritual idealism. When this organization of politics and commerce, whose other name is "Nation," becomes all powerful at the cost of the harmony of the higher social life, then it is an evil day for humanity. The slavery that it gives rise to unconsciously drains its own love of freedom dry. Not merely the subject races, but you who live under the delusion that you are free, are every day sacrificing your freedom and humanity to this fetish of nationalism, living in the dense poisonous atmosphere of world-wide suspicion, greed, and panic.

There is a constant tendency in the United States to isolate our poets, artists and thinkers—what might be called our humanists—from the rest of society and to assume their function is primarily decorative. They entertain and edify us, we feel, while the rest of us get on with the job of making the world go round. The presumption, thus, is that this group is somehow basicaly irrelevant to the really important things.

Mr. Speaker, this opinion, so far as we hold it, we hold to our peril. Techniques—know-how—the kind of learning which has built the modern world and in which the United States has so long excelled—is essentially a discipline without moral quality, a discipline which can be used for good or for evil. We conceive of our society as a machine and apply to it our expertise. It is a fine machine and every day we learn more about how to make it run well. But so preoccupied are we with keeping our machine well oiled and smoothly operating that we seem to pay little attention to what product it is manufacturing.

It is Tagore and thinkers like him who cry for us to consider the kind of world we are building; it is they who urge us to build a world where the individual spirt is whole and free. Such principles and ideals, I submit, focus upon what is truly important and central to the life of men, and to these all technology, all expertise, must be subservient and secondary.

Is not our true native land the same as that described by Tagore?

> Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
> Where knowledge is free;
> Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
> Where words come out from the depths of truth;
> Where tireless striving stretches its arms toward perfection;
> Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sands of dead habit;
> Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever-widening thought and action—
> Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake.

PROPOSED MERGER OF GREAT NORTHERN & NORTHERN PACIFIC AND THE CHICAGO, BURLINGTON & QUINCY RAILROADS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is proposed a railroad merger of the Great Northern & Northern Pacific and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy, and including the Spokane, Portland & Seattle railways.

As proposed, this consolidation would create the biggest single railroad in the United States measured by the miles of track. The combined railroads propose to use what is now Great Northern's transcontinental mainline. Most of the Northern Pacific's present mainline, which parallels Great Northern, however, some 100 to 300 to the south would be used for intermediate local and freight services only.

I rise in opposition to the proposed merger for many reasons. The two most important being, first, a merger would eliminate competition between the roads and the public services will be neglected and suffer, and second, serious hardship upon the railroad workers and their families and the businesses which depend upon them. I fear curtailment of employment which would seriously affect communities all across Montana.

The railroad executives have said that there would be no immediate unemployment but that the reduced employment on roads would be accomplished over the years as employees die or otherwise leave their employment. Nevertheless, however, the reduced employment is provided, the economy of Montana will suffer from both causes, first, reduced services, and second, reduced employment.

One community in my district is a frightening example of the ill effects of such a merger.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include at this point in the RECORD the many quotations which I have gathered from publications and from a few of the great many letters written me from that great city of western Montana—Missoula:

MISSOULA IS A BUSY TERMINAL TODAY—BUT WHAT OF TOMORROW

Missoula, Mont., is a railroad center. This city used to be as isolated and remote a frontier post as could be found in the Northwest; but the railroad has converted it into a stirring place. Communities do not grow by chance, but by the operation of physical laws. Position, climate, natural resources, and transportation are predestinating forces.

The year 1960 saw the centennial celebration of this community. The charter of the Northern Pacific was granted in 1864 and approved by President Lincoln on July 2 of that year. On September 23, 1883, the last rail was laid with impressive ceremonies in the valley of the Hellgate River near the mouth of Gold Creek.

The main line of the Northern Pacific cuts through our city. From here main-line trains and crews are dispatched both east and west. An average of 10 through trains enter and leave this terminal each day. Local and branch line freights work in conjunction with present main-line facilities to service this and surrounding areas daily.

Wood products and agriculture are basic industries in our area. Established lumber concerns demand and receive first-class service from the Northern Pacific. Welcome new arrivals such as paper products and plywood plants have located in our area, and are serviced by the Northern Pacific Railroad.

A fine beet sugar factory and large and excellent stockyards are essential to agriculture. The majority of beets and other raw materials used in the making of sugar are brought in via Northern Pacific, and the finished products are shipped to major consuming points through this terminal. Livestock men are assured of swift market delivery on present main-line operations with the through fast freight service offered.

Missoula hasn't yet been hit by the railroad "modernization program." Being a mainline town with a roundhouse and shops, Missoula did feel the effect of the railroads' changeover from steam to diesel several years ago, and is still adjusting to the change.

Past city fathers have spoken of the "important role the Northern Pacific has played in the development in Missoula and Western Montana." The President of the Northern Pacific reported in a Missoula address that "* * * the fortunes of Missoula are still closely related to your pioneer transcontinental railroad." The reality of all this is that the healthy economic growth of this community is very much dependent upon the maintenance of present Northern Pacific mainline facilities.

Further than services, Northern Pacific payroll and taxes mean much to this community. In his Missoula appearance the president of the Northern Pacific referred to this subject by saying, "* * * Northern Pacific makes a substantial contribution to the economy of the area."

Mr. Speaker, the following message is posted on telephone poles and walls and buildings around the town:

How much can you afford to lose? If only 100 railroad employees lost their jobs or move away from a city, this could happen, based upon statistics reported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in a booklet entitled, "What New Industrial Jobs Mean to a Community"; $70,000 in annual grocery sales would be lost; 112 fewer households would exist; 107 less passengar cars would be registered; $30,000 in food-drink business would be lost; 51 less school children would be enrolled; and 4 retail establishments would close.

More than 33 retail employees would change jobs if only 100 rail workers left. (An estimated 174 workers in all industries, other than railroads, would be affected.)

Now Mr. Speaker, I continue with the quotations from leading citizens of Missoula:

After reading several articles and listening to speakers for and against this merger, I wish to state that I oppose it on the grounds that I do not believe it to be in the best interest of the city of Missoula or the State of Montana.

JOHN W. STEELE.

Most railroad people own their own homes. They are a stable class of people. During the layoffs at the railroad shops, they kept their home payments up as much as they could. Any serious layoff of railroad workers or movement of them to another city would be disastrous to this community. This has been proven by the transfer of the Bureau of Public Roads personnel from Missoula to Helena and Portland. Missoula has not, to date, completely recovered from this transfer.

ROBERT L. DESCHAMPS, Sr.
ROBERT L. DESCHAMPS, Jr.

The railroad personnel are a most important economic segment of Missoula's population.

In our particular business which deals with thrift and homeownership, we have many fine savings customers among railroad personnel, and we have many home loans with railroaders who are presently paying their way to homeownership for their families in our community.

We know, from long years of good business experience with these people that they are a very real credit to Missoula. The loss of a major part of these railroad families would do very grave damage to the economy of Missoula.

R. J. FREMOU,
Manager.

ECHOES FROM THE PAST

"All that has heretofore been written about the superior land-grant of the Northern Pacific in Montana, scarcely gives an adequate conception of the extent and true value of the grant. The company will receive 25,600 acres of our best agricultural and grazing land for every mile of road that is built. I have no doubt that these lands will not only cancel the entire cost of building the railroad, but will leave a surplus to the company."

An address made by B. F. Potts, Governor of Montana Territory, July 12, 1871.

As a citizen and taxpayer, I am opposed and would resist any action taken that would curtail or reduce our labor force in Missoula County.

HI STOUTENBURG.

I feel the pioneers who founded this part of the country and the U.S. Government that gave land grants so we could have a railroad should not at this time be jeopardized by a consolidation, for our nation was built on competition, the lack of which defeats progress. I want to see Missoula progress and grow with employment for our sons and grandsons. It is said the railroad is the best barometer of business—let's not lose our barometer.

WILLIAM LUCIER,
County Commissioner, Missoula County.

When I retired recently after 37 years on the faculty of Montana State University, I decided that I wanted to continue to live in the Treasure State. I should regret any occurrence that would tend to reduce the prosperity of the citizens of this region.

G. D. SHALLENBERGER,
Professor Emiritus, Montana State University.

It is the opinion of our organization that the loss of a number of families connected with the railroad business in the Missoula area would be felt by all Missoula businessmen.

MISSOULA RETAIL GASOLINE DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
JOHN E. ROEMER, *Secretary.*

In the past 8 years we have done business in Missoula, we have served a good number of people connected with railroad work in this area. We feel that loss of these people would be greatly felt by all businessmen in Missoula.

JOHN E. ROEMER.

The railroads operating on lines through Missoula have long been an important factor in the economy of Western Montana. In loss of either, or both, of these railroads or even a reduction in the service would be crippling to the welfare of the five great valleys, with Missoula as the focal point.

There are many "big" businesses vitally dependent on transportation services on the level of railroads. Every retailer engaged in buying and selling is serviced by the railroads and in need of adequate service to fill the needs of the community.

By these activities the employees of the railroads help local business to function and grow, and in turn, it is beneficial to them and the railroad corporations. Yandt's Men's Wear has been fully aware for over 50 years that the railways and businesses are dependent on each other. It is the ardent desire of this firm that the railroad retain its employees to the highest number possible and maintain their operating schedules as at present.

MAXFORD K. YANDT,
President, Yandts' Men's Wear, Missoula.

If 100 families were to lose their jobs and be forced to move to other locales, and if fifteen of these families would be our customers, there would be a resulting loss to our business of approximately $1,500 per month, or $18,000 a year. We, in turn, would have to reduce our working staff accordingly, and this chain reaction could follow all the way down the line to our many wholesalers.

Let us hope this does not happen in our Treasure State of Montana. We have so little industry in our State now, we should strive to hold what we have while encouraging more.

DON'S MARKET, INC.,
DONALD D. DAVIS, *President.*

It is our firm conviction that Missoula, Mont., the hub of five great valleys, needs the services of the Northern Pacific Railroad.

A factor involved is the future desirability of development sites for industrial and commercial plants. If we do not have the proper transportation for raw materials and finished goods, our growing community will be stagnated. Another factor to be considered is the loss of several hundred skilled persons who serve this community very diligently both to their employer and the social and welfare aspects of this community.

In short, we are for a growing, thriving community. We need the railroad as the railroad needs us.

COAST TO COAST STORE,
LLOYD MAHLUM,
DALE MAHLUM.

RAILROAD WORKERS ARE A PART OF THIS TOWN'S LIFEBLOOD

Railroad employees affect the city and its economy in many ways. A recent employee canvass shows the vital part these people play in the community in which they and their families represent 10 percent of the population.

More than $85,000 annually are paid in personal property taxes, a part of which supports our schools. Employee tax dollars contribute to the bridge program which is so vital to our city, and they will certainly add substantially to the proposed sewage disposal plant.

Three hundred and ninety thousand dollars Federal income tax plus $30,000 in State taxes yearly, shows another way in which they "carry the load." But equally important, they spend their earnings in this area. The $4 million annual payroll passes through your hands. If the railroaders leave this community, they take away schoolteachers, church workers, nurses, civic officials, and much more.

IF OPERATING EMPLOYEES GO

The loss of operating employees and railroad terminal status would be a tragedy to

Missoula. This city spends endless hours trying to win new business and new people, not to lose a basic industry.

Several organizations are working together to improve the community. Missoula is ideally located for industrial expansion, and a community development program is underway attempting to exploit this situation.

Missoula is a town interested in growth and aggressive enough to search for new business and new life for the community. The 20.5 percent populating increase over the past 10 years reflects this attitude. Nothing must jeopardize this situation.

If operating employees go, all other employees will be affected. In terms of community progress this means a loss of paychecks contributing to the city's prosperity and a loss of service for the development program.

To a city dependent on railroad wages and transportation it would be the last chapter in history. To a city partially dependent it would be a depression.

Mr. Speaker, these quotations were prepared and circulated by the Missoula Civic Group, Franklyn A. Caron, chairman, and Roger S. Murray, public information director.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to cite other quotations from a portion of my personal mail from communities in my district.

From C. L. Birdsill, general chairman, general grievance committee, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Northern Pacific Railway:

A merger such as they propose would give a rail transportation monopoly to the new company in the entire Northwestern United States from Chicago to Seattle and Portland. After the merger became effective, the shipper would be at the mercy of their management policies, whatever they might be, within the law. There would be no competitive opposition save trucks. The Milwaukee Road is already only nominal competition west of Mobridge, S. Dak. Against a monopolistic giant as proposed in this merger that road would be driven out of business on the Pacific coast.

On behalf of the citizens of Montana represented by this organization and by the 20 other standard railroad labor organizations who are unified by one common purpose, the preservation of their jobs and of the economy of their hometown and home State, for the reasons I have hereinabove set forth, I urge you to assist us in every manner at your disposal as Congressman for Montana, in opposing the merging of the N.P.–G.N.–C.B. & Q.–S.P. & S. railroads into one railroad system when such proposal is filed. The economies of operation for which the carriers contend the merger is necessary can be effected by efficient joint use of facilities in most cases. If a true free enterprise, competitive system is to prevail in the railroad industry in the Northwest a monopolistic company such as proposed by this merger must not be created.

From Carl Rabe, division chairman, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Kalispell division protective committee:

The effect this merger will have on the State of Montana, its counties and cities, I do not know. It will in my personal opinion have a great deal to do with the present tax structure to these types of government. It is true the real effect will be felt in southern Montana as the Northern Pacific will greatly cut its installations in this area. Also there will be a great deal of relocation and loss of employment in this area.

From Howard L. Beatty, secretary, Switchmen's Union of North America, Local No. 283, Whitefish, Mont.:

We feel that if these four lines are merged the livelihood of approximately 30 switchmen and their families will be jeopardized who live and work in this small town. The railroads propose building an $11 million electronic hump yard in the vicinity of Spokane which we feel will practically eliminate all the switching operations here. We do not hold seniority rights at any other yard and if our jobs should be eliminated many men would undoubtedly lose the homes which they are now buying.

The railroads in a public release anticipate the loss of about 8,000 jobs. We have learned from past experiences this would probably be a very conservative figure. Whitefish is a very small part of the overall picture as many Montana communities will be affected if this merger is allowed. This merger also looks as if a Government-sanctioned squeeze play will be directed toward the Milwaukee Railroad.

From Mr. Edwin F. Ogle, district director of the Northern Pacific Hospital Association, Missoula:

We feel that the economic impact would be very detrimental to the State as well as the future growth of the Northwest. We also feel that the monopoly created by such a merger would throttle freight rates and create a single monopoly that would eventually prevent competition and therefore fair freight rates. This merger will affect 17 States and control shipping to Alaska and Canada. The State of Montana will suffer far more from the adverse effects than any other single State. The side effects will be tremendous: i.e., the sure loss of the Northern Pacific Hospital in Missoula now employing 78 to 80 persons; the loss of a great number of employees now working in Missoula at the various crafts; other small business almost entirely dependent either on railroad people or the railroad itself.

From Mr. Webb Sullivan, public relations chairman, Livingston Antimerger Group:

The New York Stock Exchange listed Northern Pacific Railway stock at $17 per share on January 4, 1950. One hundred shares of stock purchased on that date and held as an investment for 10 years through the two-for-one stock split of April 18, 1956, and the 20 percent stock dividend of December 24, 1952, would give a holding of 240 shares. $3,255 in dividends would have been received on a $1,700 investment. The $480 dividend check received for 1959 would be a 28-percent return on the original investment. This is considerably better than the 2.75 percent return on Series E savings bonds purchased on January 4, 1950, and held to maturity.

The livelihood of the 17,884 Northern Pacific employees is dependent on their salary. The dividends received by the 31,067 stockholders is merely supplementary income.

From Mr. Charles H. Linn, chairman, Local 482, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Whitefish:

This merger will have a far-reaching effect on both employment and business.

With the heavy unemployment already experienced in the railroad business and other cutbacks, the loss of over 8,000 to 10,000 job opportunities will not help the economy of this country. Also there will be a loss of employment in business along both the Northern Pacific and the Great Northern railroads.

We feel that railroad companies that have been operating at a profit and paying substantial dividends on stock, should not be allowed to merge at such a critical time.

From Mr. Vesta Shaw, president, Bartenders Local 609, Great Falls:

We believe this merger to be contrary to public interest and detrimental to the economy, health of our community and workers alike.

From N. E. Lechner, local chairman, Lodge 194, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Missoula:

The members of Lodge 194 of the B.L.F. & E. are strongly opposed to the proposed merger, because of the hardships that will be inflicted on our members due to loss of jobs, plus the adverse effect on the economy of our community and the State of Montana as a whole.

The merger of the railroads mentioned above, plus two other roads, would for all practical purposes eliminate competition among the railroads in this State. The effect of such a rail monopoly on the quality of service that can be expected by the shippers of Montana is very easy to see.

Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD, statements opposing railroad consolidations and mergers made by leaders from other parts of the country:

From Mr. L. A. Combs, secretary-treasurer, Association of General Chairmen, Standard Railroad Labor Organization, St. Paul, Minn.:

The financial unnecessity of such a merger, the tremendous loss of thousands of railroad jobs that would result, the serious setback to the economy of the entire northwest that could result, the curtailment and abandonment of railroad service and lines which invariably result from mergers and which could seriously cripple our national defense in case of a national emergency, are of deep concern to the employees and the citizens in the hundreds of towns and cities affected.

From Mr. G. R. Bichsel, general chairman, General Committee of Adjustment, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, St. Paul, Minn.:

The loss of jobs and job opportunities to thousands of breadwinners plus the thousands of employees that would be required to move their residences if they wished to continue to work on the merged lines, would cause undue harm to the tax structure and school systems of the cities and States so adversely affected.

From Mr. J. C. Hanson, president, Switchmen's Union of North America, Fargo, N. Dak.:

The railroads involved are financially sound and are among the most prosperous in the Nation. It is a known fact that if this merger is consummated, it would represent the largest railroad merger in the history of this Nation. Consequently, adverse effects would be felt by people in towns and States served by these railroads. This merger would eliminate competition, and thereby put the public at the mercy of the railroad.

From Mr. R. L. Bushaw, chairman, General Committee, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, St. Paul, Minn.:

Not only would there be a tremendous loss in job opportunities, but there would also be a very serious dislocation of those employees able to retain employment. Many thousands of employees would be required to move their residences if they wished to continue to work. Whole communities would be adversely affected. Businesses de-

pendent upon the railroad payroll would have difficulty, schools in one area would increase enrollment to overcrowding while those in the areas vacated would become underenrolled.

The tax structure of the cities and States involved would be affected, not only from the loss in revenue from taxes imposed on railroad properties which would be abandoned, but also from loss of tax revenue from the employees who would be forced to move to new localities and those who find themselves jobless.

The impact of such a merged operation would, as I have attempted to point out, have a very serious effect on the employees, the businessmen, and the municipal and city governments.

From Mr. W. R. McGee, chairman, antimerger committee, Livingston:

Operating personnel and all other supporting personnel will be reduced by 66 percent—in direct proportion to the business handled. These employees affected will include carmen, clerks, roundhouse employees, sectionmen, etc.

From the Sun, Jamestown, N. Dak., letter to the editor from E. J. Larson, M.D., Jamestown, N. Dak.:

I do not believe the creation of a monopoly in rail transportation is to the best interest of the Northwest.

The elimination of the Northern Pacific as a strong transcontinental line will seriously handicap our Government in case of war as the main line would be much more vulnerable to attack.

The Government is spending many millions of dollars in building a superhighway system for defense purposes. If we supplant three first-class railroad systems with one, it seems to me that our transportation system becomes more vulnerable to attack, and less capable to haul vital materials in case of war.

From the "New Threat of Railroad Consolidation" by Mr. A. J. Bernhardt, general president of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America (in the Railway Carmen's Journal, February 1961):

The adverse effects of mergers: (a) weakening of the base for economic expansion; (b) decline of competition: growth of monopoly; (c) reduction of service; (d) loss of economies of railroad transport; (e) the loss to railroad labor.

Unemployment from consolidation results from the termination of service to vast areas and the scrapping of railroad facilities and equipment. There is small possibility of restoration of railroad jobs when alternative means of transport, even if they are more costly and less efficient, are readily available. With the prospect of a growing consolidation movement, railroad workers are confronted with the destruction of job opportunities that no improvements in efficiency or increase in the volume of traffic can recreate.

From the Merger Mania, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen magazine, April 1961:

Railroad service to a community is of paramount importance if economic growth and stability are to be maintained. That service * * * contributes enormously to the development of towns, cities and States all over the Nation. The effect of good railroad service is almost incalculable and is felt in every field of activity; industry, small businesses, municipal income, school operations and, of course, the labor force.

From the letter of Mr. G. E. Leighty, chairman of the Railway Labor Executives' Association to President Kennedy, February 23, 1961:

Railroad mergers and consolidations, by their nature, proceed in the opposite direction. They stem from a philosophy which accepts economic decline and sells short the future by curtailing existing facilities and services in order to increase immediate profits.

SAN FRANCISCO RIOTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said and written about the so-called San Francisco riots including a report by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, as well as the reports of the House Un-American Activities Committee, flatly stating that the riots were directly due to action of students of the University of California at Berkeley. Charges against all students except one were dismissed in court. This one, Robert J. Meisenbach, was duly charged and tried on a charge that he clubbed a police officer during the demonstration against the House Un-American Activities Committee in the San Francisco City Hall May 13, 1961. After a trial before a jury the student was acquitted on May 3, 1961. The details are described in the below account by the Associated Press, published in the Washington Post of May 4, 1961. I particularly draw attention to the last two paragraphs of the AP story. These are the words not of the defense counsel, but of the AP reporter and deserve the fullest consideration.

JURY ACQUITS STUDENT OF RIOT CHARGE

SAN FRANCISCO, May 3.—Robert J. Meisenbach was acquitted today of a charge that he clubbed a police officer during student demonstrations against the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco City Hall last May 13.

The 10 women and 2 men deliberated 2 hours and 50 minutes.

Meisenbach, 23, University of California senior, was arrested with 63 other demonstrators, but charges against all the others were dropped.

Specifically he was accused of assault with a deadly weapon—hitting Patrolman Ralph E. Schaumleffel on the head with the officer's own night stick.

The jury heard 223,000 words of widely diverging testimony in 10 trial days.

Meisenbach and defense witnesses denied he struck the officer. Meisenbach said it was the other way around—the officer hit him. Police rebuttal witnesses who assisted in the Meisenbach arrest said they didn't see anybody hit anyone.

Defense Attorney Jack Berman declared the acquittal would "knock 'Operation Abolition' into the creek."

The Committee on Un-American Activities sponsored the privately distributed film "Operation Abolition" as a report of the disorders.

Committee members said in the film that the student demonstrations were Communist inspired and directed. Student leaders contended their protest was based on reasoned conviction.

Berman said the jurors had weighed all the evidence surrounding the city hall disorders and that their finding is proof that "Operation Abolition" is filled with falsehoods.

The film's narration said rioting was touched off in city hall by a student who leaped a barricade, grabbed an officer's night stick, and started beating him over the head.

There was no such testimony at the trial.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was absent because of official business for which the RECORD shows I had official leave. Had I been present, on rollcall No. 46 I would have voted against the minimum wage bill. Also, Mr. Speaker, had I been present on rollcall No. 47, I would have voted against the motion to recommit the water pollution bill and I would have voted "yea" on the final passage of the bill on rollcall No. 48. I had requested to be paired on these votes before leaving on official business, but no pairs were available.

PUBLIC REACTION TO THE ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT CASE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the initial public reaction to the recent antitrust case involving price rigging and market sharing in the sale of electrical equipment was one of shock and concern. I think most Americans agreed with the statement made by Judge Ganey at the time he imposed sentence that "what is really at stake here is the survival of the kind of economy under which America has grown to greatness, the free enterprise system."

The irrefutable evidence, the violating parties' admission of guilt, and the magnitude of the conspiracy involved seemed to silence temporarily many of the harshest critics of effective antitrust enforcement. The complete clarity of the laws against price fixing deprived antitrust critics of their customary charge that these laws are vague and that their enforcement is capricious. Quite surprisingly, even some of the captive press criticized severely the offending parties. Life magazine made one of the strongest indictments of the violators when it said:

The crooks in the electrical industry have set back the progress of the modern corporation toward public acceptance of its claims to wider social responsibility and a quasi-political role.

THE VALUE LINE RATIONALE OF CONSPIRACY

Despite the widespread initial expressions of shock at the magnitude of these violations, the inevitable and predictable reaction has been set in motion. More and more editorial policies are changing back to their customary chant against effective antitrust enforcement.

The line of attack is still very poorly drawn. It is still more defensive than offensive. However, recently many of the traditional critics of antitrust seem to have found a new rationale on which to base their attack. This new rationale is based largely on a commentary of the Value Line Investment Survey, published March 13, 1961, by Arnold Bernhard & Co. The article is entitled "United States Against Itself. The Antitrust Convictions in the Electrical Equipment Case."

The Bernhard commentary is a seemingly sophisticated effort to set the record straight; at least it may appear so to the unsophisticated reader. It speaks with the authoritative voice of the insider, of one who has the intimate counsel of America's corporate elite. This would seem to give this analysis special merit. And at least one of the parties found guilty in the electrical case thinks so too. Westinghouse reportedly has reprinted this piece and has distributed it to key persons, such as newspaper columnists who play a prominent role in molding public opinion. Because of the attention this commentary is receiving and the role it may play in building up an antagonistic attitude toward vigorous antitrust enforcement, I urge my fellow Congressmen to study it carefully.

A thorough analysis of this seemingly sophisticated piece reveals that it is really a sham. It is a compounding of errors resulting from the use of faulty premises, improper inferences and specious evidence, the destruction of strawmen of its own creation, and the improper interpretation of the nature and philosophy of our antitrust laws. I came to this harsh conclusion only after thoughtful study of Bernhard's commentary. I wish to share some of my findings on this matter with you.

At the onset of his analysis Bernhard states that an unprejudiced examination of this case will, we think, reveal the following. He then states seven points and goes on to explain the evidence underlying each. Let us consider each of these in turn, and evaluate the alleged bases for each.

THEY DID INDEED CONSPIRE

1. The condemned did indeed conspire to violate the law against price fixing.

After conceding this point, Bernhard says:

Their conspiratorial practices were carried on with the sophistication of teenagers and the Government investigators had little trouble getting the evidence on them, cold. No need to discuss this further.

This statement is palpably false. The record in this case demonstrates clearly that the conspirators went to great lengths to cover their crimes. They used secret codes. They corresponded in private rather than through company channels. They held secret meetings in secluded retreats. In the light of this evidence, Bernhard's statement that their actions had the sophistication of teenagers seems strange unless first, he feels that by dismissing the heart of the case in this light fashion he can play down the magnitude of the crime or, second, he is replacing the traditional dictum of "go and sin no more" with "go and sin, but sin in secret, and you shall avoid punishment."

CONSPIRACY AS A WAY OF LIFE

2. General Electric did, indeed, make every effort that a big company could make at the top to prevent violation of the antitrust laws in its decentralized subdivisions. Westinghouse also had directives designed to achieve compliance with the antitrust laws.

First, Bernhard says nothing of the other 27 companies' efforts on this score. Moreover, I am not surprised that the Government could not find anything in GE's file proving that top management was involved. Apparently GE long has had a policy against letting the sort of thing show up in its files. Mr. T. K. Quinn, a former vice president of GE writes that Mr. Gerard Swope, president of GE from 1922 to 1940, once said:

Never write anything which you wouldn't want to see printed on the front page of the New York Times tomorrow morning.

To conclude that top GE management did everything it could to stop the conspiracy simply because it issued a directive conveniently found in the files is not adequate proof of Bernhard's statement. It is true that the Government could not prove that top management was involved in the conspiracy, but this is not proof that GE's top management did everything it could do to stop such a conspiracy.

Paul Hartig, a former GE employee, testified recently:

It was just another policy and we had many of them. * * * If they weren't practical we wouldn't follow them.

Hartig's definition of "practical":

If it suits the best interests of the company.

The logical inference is that GE's famous policy 20.5 on compliance with the antitrust laws was mere window dressing. Other former GE officials testified that conspiracy had become a way of life at GE.

THE SUPERIOR EFFICIENCY MYTH

3. The method by which businessmen attempt to carry out the purpose of the antitrust law, which is to prevent monopoly, and to do so without creating monopoly, draws such a fine line between legal and illegal price stabilization, or price fixing, as to be impracticable in the workaday world.

Bernhard reaches this conclusion by an ingenuous analysis based on faulty premises. He begins with the assertion that the antitrust laws compel conspiracy. As he puts it:

Business leaders in their effort to abide by the law and also by the intent of the law, which is to prevent monopoly, find themselves compelled to stabilize prices in certain of their markets.

He further says:

The big companies could have cut prices below the costs of their small competitors and thus forced them to the wall. * * * They then would have been guilty of violating section II (of the Sherman Act) which makes it a crime to monopolize or attempt to monopolize.

Of course, Bernhard is correct that their vast size and diversification give GE and Westinghouse the potential market power to engage in predatory price cutting which could destroy their smaller rivals. But he is incorrect when he implies that there is no question but that the firms with such power are also the lowest cost producers. He confuses naked market power with efficiency. He uses GM to drive home his point:

As the largest volume, lowest cost producer, General Motors could quite readily force the marginal companies (themselves giants of industry) to the wall and thereby considerably enlarge its already superior profits.

The evidence is not at all conclusive that large firms are also always the most efficient. This not only is a questionable generalization but it is even more questionable in the particular case of General Electric. Mr. T. K. Quinn, a former vice president, and for 24 years an employee of GE, struck a serious blow at its superior efficiency myth when he said:

The company was never an efficient manufacturer of anything to my best knowledge, except lamps or articles produced by outside companies which we purchased. Our position always depended upon capital advantage.

Mr. Quinn added further:

The answer to the obvious question of how an inefficient manufacturer could continue in business is that we had capital and prestige.

A former high-ranking GE official, Paul Hartig, testified recently:

I'm ashamed to admit that smaller firms are more efficient than GE.

Hence the impression Bernhard wishes to leave rests on a false, or at least an unsubstantiated premise. He would have us believe that the facts of industrial life make price conspiracy and market sharing necessary in order to protect smaller firms from the superior efficiency and market power of the giants. He expects us to take on faith his assertion that GE and Westinghouse are more efficient. Of course, he is on firm ground when he asserts that they have superior market power. But is the only alternative to predatory practices a policy permitting collusion? I hardly think so. Since 1890 much of the thrust of our antitrust laws has been toward preventing the exercise of such power. Of course, Bernhard's argument does raise the significant problem that arises when the balance of power in an industry is held by one or two firms. This raises the question as to whether it might not be more appropriate to strike at the real problem and divest such vast, diversified firms of some of their tangential operations, rather than to suspend enforcement of the antitrust laws in favor of a cartelized economy.

THE BENEVOLENT CONSPIRACY

4. The Government and the consumers of this country were not, in any meaningful economic sense, defrauded by being sold goods higher in price than would have been paid had the guilty practices to which the defendants pleaded guilty not been committed.

Bernhard argues that the electrical price conspirators did not abuse the public interest; that while they conspired to avoid competition in the interest of stabilizing prices, the prices they established were at competitive levels after all.

To prove his point he resorts to statistical evidence which indicates that the prices of electrical equipment have risen no more—indeed less—than the prices of other equipment in industries where no violations have been charged. This scanty statistical evidence leaves much to be desired.

First, he gives no evidence on the way prices are set in the other two industries which he selected for comparison, except that they have not been charged with violating the antitrust laws.

Second, he compares prices for only the period 1954 to 1959, whereas the evidence indicates that the conspiracy was in effect well before 1954. A GE official recently testified that the conspiracy went back many years. Hence, if there were a longstanding conspiracy, there is no reason to believe that electrical equipment prices would suddenly go up more rapidly after 1954 than before. Of course, Bernhard does not point out the fact that, whereas all manufacturing prices went up an average of 28 percent between 1947–49 and 1959, electrical equipment prices went up by over twice this amount. Finally, and most damaging to his benevolent-conspirators theory is the fact that since the conspiracy ended, prices have dropped dramatically in many cases. For example, earlier this month prices on the first electrical equipment bids submitted to the District of Columbia were about 15 percent below those of last June. Also, earlier this month GE announced a 15-percent reduction in its gas turbine powerplants and an 8-percent cut in power generation turbines. GE announced these cuts were a move to meet current competitive market conditions. This and other evidence indicates that the conspirators were not acting like benevolent monopolists. They had market power and they used it. And they used it to their advantage, not the public's.

THE PRICE STABILITY DEFENSE

5. The free enterprise system in which prices are free to fluctuate without restraint, which is the system that Judge Ganey says America professes to its people and the model which it holds up as a free world alternative to State control and tyranny, has not existed for a couple of hundred years.

Bernhard's reasoning on this point deals a deathly blow to a strawman of his own conception. He uses agriculture to prove his point that conspiracy to stabilize prices is justified in the electrical industry. Certainly the extreme fluctuations in agriculture have led at times to chaotic conditions. But there are many other industries in America beside agriculture. And in most of these industries chaos does not follow simply because they do not have a GE or Westinghouse to set a pattern of conspiracy aimed at stabilizing prices. Moreover, if price stability was their only objective, GE and Westinghouse failed to achieve it. Bernhard's own figures show that electrical machinery and equipment prices have been far from stable—they have continued to rise until by 1959 they were 55 percent higher than in 1947–49.

THE CARTELIZATION PROPOSAL

6. There is a large body of law and a long political and economic tradition that not only permits, but even requires, control over price fluctuations.

Bernhard points out several important areas in which public policy has been directed toward stabilizing and fixing prices: Agriculture, tariffs, labor legislation, and the NRA. His examples are valid. But in each instance it has been explicitly recognized that these are exceptions to the rule in our economy. And interestingly, business interests have been almost unanimous in their condemnation of these policies—with the exception of tariffs. Moreover, when the American people granted exemption to competitive market forces, they made provisions for the protection of the public welfare.

But by and large we still have an economy in which the only protection of the public welfare is the forces of competition. Bernhard apparently is arguing that because competition is limited by public action in some areas, private individuals should be permitted to quiet the winds of competition everywhere. He would further leave it to business statesmen to decide which prices are in the public interest. This suggestion makes a mockery of a market economy and is a fundamental contradiction to the philosophy of such a system. To seriously propose it is to invite complete regimentation of the American economy. The American people will not stand by meekly and see our free enterprise system replaced by the kind Bernhard envisions. Such a system of private control would make behavior in the public interest the gift of benevolent holders of vast economic power, rather than the inevitable product of a competitive economy.

A PLEA FOR REPEAL OF ANTITRUST LAWS

(7) Finally, and here is the heart of the problem, the law against price fixing through which the Government attempts to control or prevent monopoly, would if enforced to the letter, actually bring about monopoly.

I have already discussed this assertion under point 3, above. This argument rests in large part on the untested theory that the biggest firms are also the most efficient firms.

I will make only two more points. First, Bernhard is wrong when he declares that the law against price fixing is the most important means by which the Government attempts to prevent monopoly. Section 7 of the Clayton Act is aimed at stopping in its inception the creation of monopoly power—such as Bernhard would have us believe is possessed by GE. If Bernhard is correct, perhaps this law should have been enforced long ago in the case of GE. Its vast size today is largely the result of its approximately 90 mergers. Its growth history—like other concerns which achieve positions of dominance—is not one of having its power thrust upon it. As former GE vice president Quinn put it:

The record of the giants is one of moving in, buying out and absorbing the smaller creators.

The other chief method of preventing monopoly and monopolizing is to prohibit predatory and discriminatory practices. Both the Sherman and Robinson-Patman Acts are vitally concerned with these matters.

Second, Bernhard's thesis does raise an interesting question of public policy. If GE does, in fact, possess the vast economic power Bernhard implies it possesses, perhaps the public interest would be served best if GE were divided into a number of smaller economic units. If this is necessary for the preservation of an effectively competitive economy, then I am for it although I am not at this time advocating it. Certainly it is preferable to Bernhard's proposal which amounts to a recommendation that we repeal the antitrust laws and abandon our free enterprise economy in favor of a cartelized economy.

FOUNDATIONS FAIL TO GIVE ADEQUATE FINANCIAL REPORTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in two previous reports to the House on tax-exempt foundations, I have discussed their astounding growth and the power and influence wielded by the giants of the foundation world. Today I want to discuss financial reporting of the tax-exempt foundations—or perhaps I should say—the lack of financial reporting and the loose and irresponsible methods of reporting.

All of the very large foundations make annual or biennial public reports, but let us bear in mind that there are more than 12,000 foundations, and the 5,202 that have listed financial statements with the Foundation Library Center in New York have assets of $11,518 million.

The Library Center issued this table for foundation financial reporting for 1959 for the 5,202 cooperating foundations:

Asset class	Number reporting	Number in class	Percent reporting
Over $10,000,000	49	129	38.0
$1,000,000 to $10,000,000	43	655	6.6
Under $1,000,000	108	4,418	0.4

While we are confining our remarks to tax-exempt foundations, the Internal Revenue Service is concerned about some 40,000 tax-exempt groups of all kinds. This includes religious and educational institutions, and so forth. What annual reports are sent to the Government go to the 64 district Internal Revenue offices. These receive only a sample

screening at the district office level. Internal Revenue officials here have told me that no report is made to Washington unless the district uncovers something amiss which the district office feels incompetent to handle.

Part of the admitted laxity in screening reports is that personnel, trained primarily as tax experts and accountants, are ill suited to judge technicalities regarding philanthropy and public policy. But here again we must say that we are concerned with literally billions of dollars—all tax free—and with little or no governmental control or regulation.

Traditionally, it has been left primarily to the States to provide for registration, reporting, and correction of abuses because almost all nonprofit incorporation acts, trust acts, or other special legislation are creatures of State laws. However, the tax exemption we are overlooking so lightly is the Federal tax running into untold sums.

STATES INACTIVE

While we are giving such little heed to the care of public funds, there is another compelling reason for Congress to show greater concern about these vast accumulations of wealth and possible loss of considerable tax revenue. That simply is this: The States are not doing the job.

In 1947, Prof. Eleanor K. Taylor, author of "Public Accountability of Foundations and Charitable Trusts," sent this question to all 48 States and 2 territories:

> What provision is there in your State for keeping a list of charitable trusts as they are established by will or otherwise?

Of the 33 States responding, 32 replied, "None." Only New Hampshire could reply in the affirmative.

A second question was:

> Is there any official list in your office or elsewhere of charitable trusts now operating in your State?

Again, there were 32 "noes."

These replies are significant because a trust registry with annual reports not only include the original application for tax exemption and the initial legal instrument, but would be the lever to keep information current.

The answers also were 32 "noes" and 1 affirmative reply to the following question:

> Is there any provision whereby the attorney general periodically inspects charitable trusts to see whether they are being properly carried out?

We have mentioned before that New Hampshire was the first State to adopt a Trust Registry Act and promptly discovered a number of "slumbering" trusts of whose existence no responsible official was aware until the act was enforced.

The New Hampshire act provided for inquiries into details of administration as well as requiring financial accounting. Two important sections of the act made it enforcible: The attorney general was given authority and funds to employ the necessary personnel; he also was given interrogative powers backed up by penalties.

Several other States have approved some form of legislation. But all students of foundations attest to its lack of enforcement and generally inadequate provisions.

STATE LAWS VARY

Another objection to State laws as they currently exist—and where they exist—is the wide variations between the laws of the individual States.

F. Emerson Andrews, in his book "Philanthropic Foundations," devoted one chapter to foundation reporting, but when he came to legislative requirements of States, he simply said:

> It is not possible to detail here the widely varying provisions—and often lack of provisions—governing registration, reporting and supervision in the different States.

It appears obvious that there are three essentials to a desirable law covering tax-free charitable institutions:

First. An accurate and current register.

Second. Periodic and complete financial reporting.

Third. Effective enforcement provisions backed by adequate penalties.

Perhaps this is an oversimplification because this problem has been considered for years without satisfactory solution.

England has had many more years of experience in this field than has the United States, but has not yet found the answer. Despite England's sophistication in relation to regulation of charitable institutions, Lord Beveridge said in debate in the House of Lords in 1953:

> All charitable trusts should be registered * * * so that those who wish to use them in meeting human needs may be enabled to find out what money is available for meeting those needs. There are at present literally no means of making that discovery. * * * Recording does not mean control. It means substituting light for darkness in the use of funds given for charitable purposes.

Lord Beveridge's "substituting light for darkness" brings us to the amount of publicity that should be given to tax-free foundation operations. At present, the only information available to the public is on pages 3 and 4 of the four-page Internal Revenue Service form known as 990–A. This form is supposed to be filled out annually and to include gross income, expenses, grants, accumulation of income during preceding year, and a balance sheet as of the beginning and end of the year.

In "Philanthropic Foundations," Andrews called this list:

> The best approximation to a national foundation registry, but it leaves much to be desired.

He adds:

> Except by Presidential order, these forms cannot be consulted in any central place; the inquirer who desires information on all the foundations must travel to the offices of 64 Directors of Internal Revenue all over the United States. Filing efficiency differs radically in the various offices. In some, reports from a wide variety of exempt organizations are filed together so that much search and skilled judgment are required to single out the foundations. We have found cases where all four pages were retained in spite of instructions that pages 1 and 2 should be forwarded to Washington; we suspect that in other cases all four pages were forwarded, and the local office lacks its required record. In some instances foundations have filed only the Washington section, pages 1 and 2, apparently assuming that the near duplicates 3 and 4 were intended for their own files. In nearly all cases the extremely informing lists of grants and similar data required in the original filing are not supplied in duplicate, so that the public copies lack this information. Finally, it is doubtful whether all foundations legally required to file these forms have done so; the penalty for such failure may be a fine of $10,000 and imprisonment for a year, but few Internal Revenue offices are equipped for checking on receipt of returns.

Despite the intricate complications to be encountered and surmounted, I feel strongly that Congress should take a fresh look at tax-exempt foundations. We should not shrink from the enormity of the task, but consider what is just and fair to the truly charitable foundations. We should endeavor to protect their prestige status and let proper opprobrium accompany the character of those whose sole purpose is tax evasion with only a token gift in the noble name of charity. Is not the vast accumulation of wealth by tax-free foundations, and their ever-increasing numbers worth another look by Congress?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. WEIS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) until Tuesday, May 9, on account of death in her family.

Mr. MAILLIARD, for Friday, May 5, 1961, on account of official business in connection with the annual visit to the Coast Guard Academy of the Congressional Board of Visitors.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. ST. GERMAIN, for 5 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANDRUM (at the request of Mr. FALLON) to include a table in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SHORT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROMWELL.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. GOODELL.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CELLER.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 241. An act for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 304. An act for the relief of Anna Lekos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 395. An act for the relief of Fausto Lavari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 400. An act for the relief of Mrs. Keum Ja Asato (Mrs. Thomas R. Asato); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 847. An act to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 921. An act for the relief of Martha Uchacz Barras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 971. An act for the relief of Salvatore Briganti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 973. An act for the relief of Liliana Grazyna Swiatkowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 980. An act for the relief of Joseph Anthony Vettiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1045. An act for the relief of Alvaro Rodriguez Jimenez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1723. An act to amend the joint resolution providing for observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3935. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 8, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

874. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems for the period January 1 through June 30, 1960, pursuant to the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (H. Doc. No. 154); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

875. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), relative to a proposal by the Department of the Navy to transfer the battleship *North Carolina* (BB–55) to the State of North Carolina, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308(C); to the Committee on Armed Services.

876. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

877. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1962, involving increases in the amount of $1,513,551,000 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 155); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

878. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving an increase in the amount of $1,050,000 for the Federal Trade Commission (H. Doc. No. 156); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4321. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects of certain retired members; with amendment (Rept. No. 347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4322. A bill to amend section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of costs for certain U.S. nationals before foreign tribunals; without amendment (Rept. No. 348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4323. A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to special pay for diving duty, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 349). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4324. A bill to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4325. A bill to increase the pay of certain permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4326. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the compensation of the Academic Dean of the Naval Postgraduate School; without amendment (Rept. No. 352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4327. A bill to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office; without amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4328. A bill to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps; with amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4330. A bill to provide uniform computation of retired pay for enlisted members retired prior to June 1, 1958, under section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995); without amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6668. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 276: Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 6094, a bill to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 277. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 4130, a bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 358). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 278. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 5490, a bill to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 359). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Preliminary report on military astronautics (Rept. No. 360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6834. A bill to amend section 35 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6835. A bill to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 6836. A bill to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H.R. 6837. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico among the States which may obtain social security coverage,

under State agreement, for policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 6838. A bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6839. A bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6840. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules and regulations with respect to community antenna television systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 6841. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 6842. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 6843. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 6844. A bill to establish workmen's compensation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 6845. A bill to amend title 14 of the United States Code to provide for an expansion of the functions of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6846. A bill to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 6847. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 6848. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to bring the number of cadets at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy up to full strength and to authorize admittance of students from friendly foreign nations to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUTHERFORD (by request):

H.R. 6849. A bill to provide for the restriction of certain areas in the Outer Continental Shelf, known as the Corpus Christi offshore warning area, for defense purposes and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 6850. A bill to amend the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to authorize the construction of additional units of federally assisted low-rent public housing, and to increase from 15 to 20 percent the maximum proportion of such units which may be provided in any one State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 6851. A bill to provide for trial and appellate divisions in the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 6852. A bill to amend section 610 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the furnishing of hospital care at Veterans' Administration facilities for Gold Star Mothers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 6853. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain increases in rates of disability compensation and allowances for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 6854. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the free flow of commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 6855. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 6856. A bill to amend sections 511 and 512 of title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in pension for veterans of the Spanish-American War or the Indian wars; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H.R. 6857. A bill to amend the Desert Land Act to permit anyone who is a citizen, or who has filed his declaration of intention to become a citizen, of the United States to make entry of desert lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 6858. A bill to provide a national cemetery near LaFollette, Tenn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 6859. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 6860. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6861. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRANAHAN:

H.R. 6862. A bill to correct certain inequities in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6863. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to require disclosure by investment advisers of transactions for their own account in any investments of the type with respect to which they render advisory services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 6864. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 6865. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 400. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.J. Res. 401. Joint resolution to temporarily suspend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve consolidations, unifications, or acquisitions of control of railroad properties; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 291. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

H. Con. Res. 292. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. Con. Res. 293. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. Con. Res. 295. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, the President should transfer to the Department of Defense functions of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO (by request):

H.R. 6866. A bill for the relief of Ng Chiu Man; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6867. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos A. Vasopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6868. A bill for the relief of Milorad Rajic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6869. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis George Kanellopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6870. A bill for the relief of Joseph Anthony Vettiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 6871. A bill for the relief and benefit of Giampietro Vittorio Monetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 6872. A bill for the relief of Brian Richard Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

139. Mr. GIAIMO presented a petition of 29 professional teachers and research workers in the biological sciences in the State of Connecticut pertaining to S. 3570, H.R. 12587, H.R. 12621, and H.R. 12757, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Governor Rockefeller's Comment on Tax Advantages to Holders of Stock Options

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have today received from Governor Rockefeller together with a statement which he attaches thereto.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, May 1, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: Thank you for your telegram. Enclosed is the text of the remarks to which you refer.

As I believe you will agree, no "rebuke" or "reprimand" was intended or implied.

Sincerely,

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

EXCERPT FROM GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER'S REMARKS AT DEDICATION OF IBM RESEARCH CENTER, YORKTOWN, N.Y., APRIL 25, 1961

Stimulation of economic growth has been the central focus of my administration as Governor of the State of New York. An example of the kind of step that I have been trying to take in this State was an act to amend the tax law in relation to employees' stock options, and I'd like to read to you from my message that I made in connection with this last year:

"In passing this bill with but one dissenting vote, the legislature has recognized, as do I, the great significance of employee stock options as an incentive in attracting topflight management to New York corporations. It is well recognized today that one of the greatest problems of business is to obtain first-grade managerial and executive talent. Businesses weigh this factor heavily in deciding where to locate or expand.

"We cannot expect to induce new industry to locate here, or to encourage existing industry to expand here unless we provide a tax framework reasonably calculated to maintain incentives.

"This expansion of business is essential to creating increased job opportunities in this State."

End quote from my statement of April 24, 1959. I read by the press that a certain southern Senator is advising us in New York State what we ought to do. Maybe he is a little worried about the competition up here in trying to attract some industry away from New York State. But I'd like to say that the results have been increasingly encouraging, here in the State, of this program of encouraging the climate for economic growth.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am sure that Governor Rockefeller intended no patronizing remark when, speaking in New York, he referred to me as "a certain southern Senator." Therefore I shall not, when speaking in Tennessee, refer to him as "a certain Yankee Governor."

I should like to comment for a brief moment on Governor Rockefeller's statement with respect to the New York law, which provides tax advantages to holders of stock options. His statement refers to "employees' stock options." However, the very next paragraph deals with options held by corporation executives. Usually options granted to employees differ greatly from the options granted to the officers and key personnel. It was to restricted stock options and tax favoritism accorded them to which I had addressed my remarks.

H.R. 587, a Bill To Repeal the Tax on the Transportation of Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, with the House Ways and Means Committee now involved in hearings on the President's tax message, it was my privilege to have made part of the committee's record the following statement in support of my bill, H.R. 587, a bill to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, MAY 3, 1961, IN BEHALF OF LEGISLATION TO REPEAL THE TAX ON TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

Mr. Chairman, as sponsor of H.R. 587, introduced January 3, 1961, and designed to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons, I appreciate the opportunity to join with other colleagues in advocating favorable action on such legislation.

During previous Congresses since the close of World War II, I have had similar bills before this committee. It was a source of disappointment in 1958 when the House conferees found it necessary to refrain from concurring in the action of the Senate in repealing the 10-percent tax on the transportation of persons.

Again in 1959 Congress voted to reduce the passenger tax to 5 percent, effective July 1, 1960. This action was later nullified, solely for budgetary reasons, when the House, by a narrow margin, voted to extend the 10-percent passenger tax another year. The Senate, disregarding the vote of the Senate Finance Committee for complete repeal of the 10-percent passenger transportation tax, voted against either repeal or the scheduled reduction of the tax on July 1, 1960. As a result, under Public Law 86–564, the effective date of the 5-percent reduction was postponed to July 1, 1961.

There is no doubt that the 10-percent passenger tax paid by users of for-hire airlines, bus, rail, and water carriers is proving a detriment to for-hire carriers of all modes of public transportation.

The transportation tax on passengers was levied in 1941 at 5 percent. It was increased in 1942 to 10 percent and raised again to 15 percent in 1944. It was decreased to 10 percent in 1954 and as previously mentioned its outright repeal was favored by the Senate in 1958 but failed to win the approval of both Houses of Congress.

It is common knowledge that the passenger tax was enacted during World War II and applied to travel at home and abroad. It was levied as an emergency measure designed to curb civilian travel on the then overburdened public transportation facilities. The tax on foreign travel has since been repealed.

Purely a wartime measure, the passenger tax is now regarded as a means of revenue despite the fact that it is highly instrumental in discouraging the use of the now underutilized modes of public transportation.

It is recalled that a similar tax on passengers was levied in 1917 during World War I, but it was repealed effective January 1, 1922, or shortly after the end of the war.

It is also of significance that Canada in 1949 repealed its 15 percent World War II passenger tax. Meanwhile we continue to tax domestic travel but exempt travel to foreign countries. This is a form of rank discrimination and serves as a source of discouragement to those who wish to heed the oft-repeated admonition, "See America first." Thus it is proving detrimental not only to public carriers but to the resort and recreational industry of our Nation. The 10-percent passenger tax affects in an adverse manner all forms of public transportation at whose expense private means of transportation and private carriers not subject to the tax become the sole beneficiaries.

Revenues from passenger transportation are practically the only source of revenues for bus companies and the main source of revenue for the scheduled airlines.

It has been estimated that about 85 percent of the bus carriers are small businesses. These small carriers have been especially hurt by the impact of increased costs and the financial condition of many of them is cause for grave concern.

The financial situation facing many bus companies is further aggravated by decreasing patronage which is threatening the continuance of many bus services. Studies conducted in various States by State legislative committees since 1957 confirm the fact that a material amount of passenger traffic was being diverted from the common carriers by bus to private transportation resulting in the abandonments of bus routes and failures of bus companies. The present Federal excise tax of 10 percent on passenger travel discriminates in favor of private transportation and encourages it over essential public transportation. This is directly contrary to the recommendations of the reports filed by the various State legislative committees.

The intercity bus industry has experienced a steady decline in its volume of passenger traffic since the end of World War II. During this period there has been a decline from 32 billion passenger-miles to about 24 billion—a decrease of 25 percent—in a growing domestic market. While the total bus fleet has decreased about 30 percent during this period, the bus industry is still operating under 50 percent of its capacity. Since the majority of users of intercity buses comprise persons in the low-income level, the 10 percent passenger tax imposes a much heavier relative burden on them.

According to the recent report titled, "National Transportation Policy," released by a special study group for the Senate Commerce Committee, all of the domestic common carriers of passengers have found the number of empty seat-miles increasing since 1946. The rate of increase has been most pronounced in railroad service causing the passenger deficit to climb from less than $200 million in 1946 to over $700 million in 1957.

The report states "although bus service has improved in terms of seats and speed, the number of passenger miles in regular route service has declined since 1951."

With regard to the Nation's airlines the Senate study group found that, "while the available seat-miles for domestic trunk and local airlines from 1946 to 1959 increased from 7,490 million to 45,793 million, or almost 6 times, the revenue-passenger miles increased from 5,910 million to only 29,151 million, or a little over 5 times. The result has been an increase of empty seats from 1,580,000 to 16,642,000, or by an increase of 15,062,000 empty seat-miles."

In addition to the finds by the special study group for the Senate Commerce Committee the national trade associations for all three of the major public carriers—air, bus, and rail—report that they are currently operating below their capacity for handling passenger traffic. Both the bus lines and railroads are operating well below 50 percent of capacity, while the current load factor of the airlines of 59.5 percent is at the lowest level in 10 years.

Since I represent a congressional district in Pennsylvania that percentagewise has one of the largest railroad populations in the country, I have firsthand knowledge of the financial plight of the Nation's railroads.

The marked decrease in rail passenger travel is revealed by the fact that the volume dropped from 59 billion passenger miles in 1946 to 17 billion in 1960, a decrease of over 70 percent. This rail passenger deficit since 1946 has averaged $585 million a year and because freight revenues have had to absorb it there has been a steady decline the past 5 years of the overall railroad rate of return from 4.22 percent in 1955 to 2.13 percent in 1960. As long as freight revenue must absorb passenger traffic losses the need to seek increases in freight rates is not lessened.

Our nation as a whole is the chief beneficiary of a financially sound railroad system. With the vast investment in railroad passenger facilities and the heavy demands made upon the industry for such services in World War II, the constant decline in the railroads' percentage of passenger business handled by all classes of public carriers is of national concern. The 10 percent passenger tax is a detriment to the efforts by the railroads to increase passenger revenues and thereby avoid further curtailment of service and poorer facilities. On the other hand, constantly rising passenger deficits are a dire threat to the railroad industry and will eventually result in rendering the Nation's railroad system wholly unprepared for emergencies of peace and war.

Speaking of the ill effects of the passenger tax, the Treasury Department stated in December 1947:

"The prewar history of railroad rates indicates that coach travel is rather sensitive to changes in passenger fares. Accordingly, under normal conditions, the profits of railroads may be affected substantially by the existence of the tax. Because of large fixed costs a small decrease in passenger revenue can have an important effect on profits from passenger operations."

It is not my contention that repeal of the 10 percent passenger tax will serve as the sole remedy for the passenger deficit on our Nation's railroads. I do contend, however, that repeal of the 10-percent passenger tax will have a stimulating effect and aid immeasurably in securing an increase in the volume of passenger traffic which is sorely needed by the Nation's railroads in their battle for economic survival. We should not lose sight of the fact that during World War II we relied upon the Nation's railroads for 97 percent of all organized military travel needs. Today the future of the railroad industry is threatened by operating deficits of over $700 million a year.

We cannot afford to ignore the plight of the Nation's railroads because to do so we are turning a deaf ear to the needs of a strong arm of our national defense. In fact, we should take affirmative action to strengthen our essential public carriers by recognizing that the current 10-percent passenger tax is not only discriminatory and regressive but it tends to undermine our national defense at a time when world tensions and the threat of an all-out war were never more prevalent.

One of the strongest recommendations for repeal of the excise tax on passengers is contained in the following excerpt from the Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission on Railroad Passenger Train Deficit, May 18, 1959:

"The excise tax on passengers was designed primarily to discourage unnecessary wartime travel and only secondarily as a revenue measure. Obviously the reasons for its imposition no longer exist. More important, however, it is harmful to our transportation system and is highly discriminatory.

"Without repeating all of the reasons advanced for the repeal of the transportation tax, we wish to emphasize that it is having a serious effect upon the passenger-train service of the railroads. Since the tax on passenger travel tends to discourage the public from using common carriers, it thereby aggravates the ever-mounting passenger deficit. While we recognize that the repeal would not provide a cure-all for the passenger deficit problems, such action would remove a serious deterrent to a greater use by the traveling public.

"In strongly urging that the Congress take action to repeal the tax outright, we are not unaware of the efforts which various members of the Congress have made and are presently making in this regard. We are also not unmindful of the revenue needs of the Government. We are, however, convinced that any possible loss of revenue would be more than offset by the public interest in strengthening and preserving a transportation system capable of meeting adequately the country's need for service both in peacetime and during emergencies in conformity with the national transportation policy as declared by the Congress."

One of the chief stumbling-blocks against outright repeal of the 10-percent tax on passengers is the assumption that such action would result in a loss of tax revenues. There has been no consideration of the effect of the repeal on the increased business in the resort, recreational, hotel and restaurant industries which would result in an increase in tax revenues.

Nor has there been any consideration given to the beneficial effect from the standpoint of aiding in alleviating unemployment that would result by making it possible for the airlines, bus, railroads, and ship industries to stabilize their employment.

Finally, an increase in passenger traffic on the public transportation system of the Nation would result in a tax yield that would compensate for any decrease in revenue occasioned by the repeal of the 10-percent passenger tax.

According to information available for the fiscal year 1960, the Government collected a total of $255 million, nearly half of which, or $119 million, represented a tax-deductible expense, because it involved business travel.

There is little doubt that if the $119 million in tax-deductible expense for travel had not been allowable, it would have increased the taxable income of business firms. Assuming these firms were in the average 50 percent income bracket, the Government would have collected nearly $60 million in additional tax revenue. In addition it has been estimated that a 5-percent increase in passenger revenues would have increased public carriers taxable net income by about $114 million.

In conclusion, it is apparent that repeal of the 10-percent passenger tax would not necessarily result in a heavy loss of tax revenues. The effect would be one of considerable return in the form of higher income taxes resulting from the greater volume of passenger traffic generated and from elimination of many tax deductible expenses.

Mr. Chairman, in expressing my appreciation for the opportunity of testifying in behalf of my bill, H.R. 587, it is my sincere hope that favorable action will be taken on legislation designed to repeal the 10-percent transportation tax on persons.

Support of the Navy FRAM Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement I have presented to the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives in support of the Navy FRAM program. The statement follows:

The continuing crisis in Cuba has again made us aware of the importance of the U.S. Navy in protecting vital American interests. Yet, the material condition and readiness of that Navy, upon which we are so dependent, leaves a great deal to be desired. Indeed, as far back as 1958, the Blewett committee reported that "the U.S. fleet is not in an acceptable state of readiness; for the fleet of a leading naval power, its material condition is deplorable."

This situation is not the fault of the Navy which has been struggling for years with ships and equipment that are old, worn, and weary. The fault lies, rather, with our unwillingness to appropriate adequate funds for necessary periodic maintenance and overhaul of existing vessels and for construction of new ships.

Our failure to replace aging ships is resulting in a navy which is fast becoming obsolescent. The Blewett committee reported that 85 percent of the ships in the combat fleet in 1958 were more than 10 years old. At our present rate of new ship construction, by the end of 1963 more than two-thirds of our combat fleet will still be over 10 years old. Hulls are weakened. Machinery breaks down too frequently. Spaces are inadequate for new needs. Weapons are outdated. And the morale of our servicemen is affected accordingly.

The normal problems of obsolescence have been greatly intensified by the relentless operation of these ships over the past few years. Through a combination of inadequate funds for maintenance and almost uninterrupted operations, our ships have been badly worn out. An automobile must be tuned occasionally. It must be sent to the garage for preventive maintenance from

time to time. There has been little or no opportunity to do this with our aging Navy. The effect was demonstrated by a survey of 170 ships which showed 61½ percent of them to be in unsatisfactory condition; i.e., unable to carry out the operational functions for which they were designed.

To meet these problems, the Navy has formulated the FRAM program—a program of fleet rehabilitation and maintenance which is designed to give added periods of effective service to existing ships through extensive modernization and overhaul. This work, carried on primarily in our naval shipyards, involves the rehabilitation of hull and machinery, modernization of weapons, and installation of the latest combat equipment.

However, even this essential and economical program was slashed by the previous administration. Originally, the Navy proposed to modernize 67 surface ships in fiscal year 1962. This was cut by about one-half to 35. President Kennedy has asked the Congress for funds sufficient to increase this number to 45. For less than $24 million we can change into modern fighting ships 10 tired World War II ships inadequate for today's task and subject to frequent breakdowns. This increase in the FRAM program would also serve to maintain the work level at naval shipyards like the Brooklyn yard where fluctuations present a recurring threat to the jobs of workers.

FRAM is not a permanent substitute for new construction, but it is a proven way to get 5 to 8 years of additional effective service to ships which would otherwise be virtually useless. Properly programed, it is also a way to spread out the obsolescence of our ships. This will make it possible for us to avoid in the future the situation created today by the block obsolescence of World War II ships.

To meet the overwhelming burdens and responsibilities created by crises in Laos, Cuba, and in the Congo, the Navy must have effective, modern ships to do the job. The issue is not whether we can afford $23.7 million in fiscal year 1962 for the FRAM program. The issue is whether we can afford not to have the modernized ships it would give us. I unqualifiedly support the President's request for these additional funds.

Gen. Milan Stefanik (1880–1919)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. BROMWELL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago today Czechoslovak people lost one of their most gifted and gallant sons in the untimely death of General Stefanik. This born soldier and gifted leader is not as well known as he deserves to be. At the beginning of the First World War he was serving in the French Army, and thus had come to know French statesmen and men of public affairs who were later to champion the Czechoslovak cause. In this connection the part played by General Stefanik was of utmost importance, for it was he who facilitated the difficult task of Thomas Masaryk in France. Through his contacts he introduced Masaryk to influential French leaders whose help in the creation of the future Czechoslovak Republic was quite indispensable.

General Stefanik played an equally important role in bringing about harmony and union between the Slovaks and Czechs, thus contributing immensely to the formation of the Czechoslovak Republic. It is not by mere accident that he, with Masaryk and Benes, is credited in forming the great Czechoslovak triumvirate. In recognition of his devoted and signal services for the Czechoslovak cause he was made Minister of National Defense in the first Government of the Czechoslovak Republic. In his tragic and untimely death in an airplane accident on May 4, 1919, the Republic suffered the irreparable loss of its most gallant and gifted soldier. On this 42d anniversary of his death I join my Czechoslovak friends in paying tribute to the memory of this distinguished leader of his people, this gallant soldier of freedom and democracy.

Annual Assemblage of State Civil Defense Directors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech which I delivered today at the annual meeting of the National Association of State Civil Defense Directors held in the auditorium of the National Guard Memorial Building.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN MELVIN PRICE, OF EAST ST. LOUIS, ILL., PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NATONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE CIVIL DEFENSE DIRECTORS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 3, 1961

INTRODUCTION

It is a pleasure and a privilege to speak to this annual assemblage of State civil defense directors. I appreciate very much the opportunity you have given me to discuss some of the issues facing our country at this critical juncture in world affairs.

Recent events in Cuba and the highly sensitive developments in Laos, coupled with the stalled weapons test ban negotiations at Geneva, have brought to the American people a deeper appreciation of the continuing Communist threat to the security of our Nation. The thin veil of Communist peace and friendship, so cleverly worn in earlier times, has been replaced by the naked threat of thermonuclear devastation.

This is a grave and sobering matter. Its portent is so grim, in fact, that many refuse to contemplate its true meaning. Others, impressed by the enormity of the threat, are unable to devote rational thought to various possibilities of reducing the threat. For whatever reason, too many have failed to consider the total requirements of national security, nonmilitary as well as military.

As advocates of nonmilitary defense preparedness, I'm sure you and I share a common view on the importance of achieving a balanced active and passive defense program. Beyond that, I'm not so sure we will find ourselves in complete agreement on how we should proceed to improve the passive defense part of our security effort.

It is an unfortunate fact that the concern and the conviction which we share as to the need for a high level of nonmilitary defense, or civil defense, preparedness has not been matched on the part of the general public. Nor, in my opinion, have our military leaders exhibited an appreciation of the essential requirements of civilian preparedness in the event of large-scale military conflict. But there are some signs of change. People are beginning to ask important questions. The military are beginning to reexamine established doctrine. For the first time, we are beginning to ponder the simple question: What happens if all our efforts to deter war are frustrated, either by accident or by a calculated Soviet attack on the United States.

I have an idea that some constructive changes are in the wind at the Federal level of our Government. First, let me say that President Kennedy has been discerning in his choice of a man to pilot the nonmilitary defense program in the years ahead. Frank B. Ellis is a man of intelligence and drive. He has distinguished himself in New Orleans civic affairs and is a standout lawyer and businessman. He attacks problems with determination and diligence. From what I have seen since his appointment, Mr. Ellis has breathed new life into civil emergency planning. I am hopeful that his performance will attract additional talent and new resources to the urgent task of building a realistic nonmilitary defense program for our country. And I'm sure he looks to the members of this audience for valuable support and assistance in this undertaking.

It is not my purpose to second-guess the experts, including Mr. Ellis. But I do have some ideas which I should like to present for your consideration. I do so with the hope that they may be a constructive influence in the formulation of programs and policies equal to the requirements of national survival.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DETERRENCE

To begin with, let's talk about this word "deterrent." I know of no word which has assumed a more prominent spot in the jargon of military expertise. Advocates of all kinds of deterrents—air, sea, ground forces, and missiles—abound in the services and, I might add, in the Congress. They all have a good case to make for particular projects, and each is motivated by a strong patriotic impulse. It is a pity that the budgetary pie is just so big.

But with it all, we hear only muted voices in defense of home preparedness, and a few strident voices determined to discredit the concept itself.

There is nothing wrong with the concept. On the contrary there is everything right and necessary about civil defense and defense mobilization. Anybody who measures deterrence solely by the strength of our reprisal force has overlooked a danger which could be fatal. A potential enemy ready to accept heavy losses in exchange for a quick victory cannot be discounted. It has happened before. It could happen again. This is particularly relevant in view of our avowed national policy, consistent with our ethical and moral convictions, of never striking the first blow.

In plain fact, we must show the entire world that we can, and will survive such a blow, that loss of life will be kept to a minimum and major components of our industrial complex will remain viable.

It seems to me that such a posture is essential to protect our own society and our freedom, as well as discharging the obligations of leadership in the community of free nations.

CIVIL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

And how much do we spend on this mission? With billions poured into military defense—and I do not downgrade these expenditures—we have put nickels and dimes

into home defense. Each American paid $230 this year to maintain a modern Military Establishment. Mutual security cost each of us $25. Such burdens must be carried in these turbulent times. But I submit that the 34 cents per capita, which we currently spend for civil defense, is grossly inadequate. It does not, and cannot assure protection for our people, our plants, and our free institutions.

GAPS IN CIVIL DEFENSE PREPAREDNESS

I am certain you get reminders of the voids we must fill as you wrestle with local problems in your daily routine. I think you know, for example, that the construction of family fallout shelters has not reached epidemic proportions in the communities you serve. To be sure, such construction is rare enough to warrant space in most local newspapers. It is certainly not commonplace.

Also, I am sure you view with some apprehension the failure of governments—Federal, State, and city—to provide shelter in new construction and to modify existing buildings for that purpose. And you wonder, I suppose, how you can be expected to persuade both individuals and industry to make such preparations when government itself shows no awareness of the need.

I think you are concerned also, by the obvious weakness of our warning system. I am told that nearly half the major cities of the United States do not have adequate warning devices. And even with sirens in every principal target area we have not accounted for the millions of people who live outside the major metropolitan areas. There are pressing needs for increased medical stockpiles, for a more effective radiological defense system, for realistic resource planning and postattack recovery capabilities.

The requirements for an effective and well-coordinated civil defense are seemingly endless, but they are not really endless. They just seem so. The problem looms so large because we have been nibbling at it, and grudgingly at best.

I shall not try to assign blame for this state of unpreparedness. Perhaps it is traceable to the whirlwind surge of events and the eruption of science. In a span of 15 years we have witnessed a revolution in weapons technology of unprecedented magnitude. The lumbering 200-mile-an-hour aircraft and the TNT blockbusters of World War II have been replaced by high-speed aircraft and missiles capable of hitting any part of the world with fantastic destructiveness.

I am aware that shortcomings in nonmilitary defense cannot be attributed entirely to those charged with the conduct of our nonmilitary defense program.

I realize this program has been conducted within the limits of overall national policy, and seemingly in context with the prevailing climate of public opinion. It is natural that a society steeped in the ways of peace, comfortable in its unmatched prosperity, and traditionally optimistic, would find it difficult to address itself to the hard tasks of survival in the nuclear age.

Moreover, no official—no matter how dedicated—and no agency can operate an effective program in the absence of the necessary legislative authority and full executive branch support. The Congress itself must accept at least part of the blame for not taking the initiative and demanding that greater effort be devoted to our nonmilitary defense program.

OUTMODED LEGISLATION

I think it is important to understand that our present civil defense program has been severely handicapped from its inception by a grossly defective statutory base. Its enabling legislation, Public Law 920, is an unfortunate legacy of World War II. It was outmoded at the time of enactment in 1950, some 5 years after the development of the atomic bomb. More than a decade of weapons technology has rendered it completely obsolete.

The fundamental defect of that statute is its basic premise that civil defense is primarily a responsibility of the States and localities. That premise colors every major provision of the statute and was not changed by the amendments of 1958, Public Law 606. Those amendments did change the wording of the policy declaration and some of the restrictions on Federal action were removed but those alterations did not go to the heart of the problem.

In my view we need more in the way of basic legislation than any amendments to Public Law 920 can accomplish. We need to establish a completely new legislative framework which acknowledges that nonmilitary defense is primarily a Federal responsibility and which conceives this responsibility in the broader context of total national security preparedness.

It should be clear that a bomb falling on East St. Louis, for example, would not be an attack simply upon that city, but it would be an attack upon the United States. All of the resources of our Nation should be available not only to deter an attack on our cities but also to help minimize the destructiveness of such an attack and assist in a postattack recovery effort.

This is too large a task for our States and localities to handle on an individual basis. It is a national problem, and it must be dealt with on a national scale.

Some 4 years ago I introduced a legislative proposal, designated H.R. 4219, which would have repealed Public Law 920 and would have provided the necessary statutory authority for the creation of a national master plan for nonmilitary defense. The key features of this proposal were: A clear statement of primary Federal responsibility; an important supporting role for the States and localities; and recognition of the key measure of shelter protection against the blast, thermal, and radiation effects of nuclear weapons.

LACK OF A NATIONAL MASTER PLAN

The type of national plan of action I am speaking of would conceive of nonmilitary defense as embracing the total complex of activities, other than military, required to prepare our people and our economy against the effects of possible war, to survive and emerge from the ashes of attack, to maintain the continuity of Government and essential production, to proceed toward partial recovery, and then toward full resumption of peacetime pursuits.

In short, the action plan for nonmilitary defense must embrace the broad sweep of civilian activities which must be joined with the military for preparedness, defense, and recovery. It must be a blueprint for survival, and it must not sidestep direct and explicit assignment of responsibility.

We do not at this time have such a plan. It is true that more than 2 years ago the OCDM announced its so-called national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization, and since that time annex upon annex has poured forth from Washington. That plan, which is still in effect, is a good statement of the many functions involved in the nonmilitary defense task, but it is in no sense a plan for action. Its theme is one of suggestion. It does assign broad responsibilities to various sectors of our society, but it provides no yardstick against which the performance of assigned responsibilities can be measured. Matched against an enormous need, the plan's directives are at best exhortations. The vital link between broad planning and concrete action is missing.

IMMEDIATE REQUIREMENTS

Aside from the broad requirements which I have mentioned, there are certain specific things which need to be undertaken immediately.

First, if our State and local authorities and individual families are to carry out substantial efforts in support of our national program we shall need strong Federal leadership and example. We must demonstrate that we are serious at the Federal level before we can expect cooperation at other levels. In concrete terms, this means that we must not only provide incentives for the construction of fallout shielding throughout the Nation but we must also build such protection into our Federal buildings. It means that we must not only encourage the protection of State and local resources, but we must also take steps to protect existing Federal resources. In these and other ways we can convince our people of the seriousness of the problem we face.

Once our people are convinced that we propose to go beyond the paper-planning programs of the past, I am convinced that the resources and public support required for the full development and implementation of a realistic nonmilitary defense effort will be forthcoming.

A moment ago I said that I sense a change in the wind. I believe there is a changing general attitude toward nonmilitary defense in this country. I think the opportunity is here for us to press forward for the first time toward a serious nonmilitary defense effort. It remains now for us to set ourselves to the task.

I know of President Kennedy's personal concern for the type of protection this effort can achieve for our people and our resources. With his leadership, and under the vigorous and imaginative direction of Frank Ellis at the Federal level, I believe it is now possible to move forward at all levels to build a program of nonmilitary preparedness equal to the enormous threat we now face.

To Build a Rational City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey, challenged the National Housing Conference on March 13 to build "a rational city, a city devoid of racial, religious or even economic segregation."

In the course of his address he also gave vigorous expression to a description of the many irrational forces that now make a chaos out of urban-suburban life in so many areas of this Nation. He asks the Nation to end waste and begin greater efforts for conservation and rehabilitation. He asks for a new appreciation of original thinking about metropolitan problems; he asks us to shake off old, limited concepts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. THOMPSON's remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR., OF NEW JERSEY, MARCH 13, 1961, NATIONAL HOUSING CONFERENCE 30TH ANNUAL MEETING AND BANQUET, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

It has seemed to me in recent weeks that there is in official Washington an air of ex-

citement, a feeling that purposeful changes are afoot. I suppose this feeling is usual in the opening months of the administration of any new President. But from my admittedly partisan point of view, I like to think that something more is afoot than just a simple change of personnel in the Office of Chief Executive. Students of American history say our political habit has been to alternate periods of great governmental creativity with periods of governmental resting. Without getting into the question of whether the past 8 years were ones in which it was wise to rest, I think we can all agree—on the basis of the steady flow of Executive messages from the White House to the Congress if nothing else—that once again we are entering upon one of those creative eras.

The problems facing the 1960's, upon which this new creativity must be brought to bear, are many. But one of the most crucial is the problem of housing. The President, in his message on housing sent to the Congress last Thursday, pointed out that residential real estate, now worth about $500 billion, is the largest single component in the wealth of the American people. Yet this enormous investment is being eroded on every side—by carelessness, by bad laws, by misunderstanding of its nature. It is threatened not only by deterioration but also by wild and disordered growth.

The population of the United States is increasing at a rate which by the year 2000 will bring us to a citizenry of 300 million persons. Current trends indicate that this growth will take place almost exclusively in our metropolitan areas; the United States may be a nation of great open spaces, but in the future we are going to be a city-dwelling people and we are going to have to learn how it's done. The beginning of this shift in living habits has been inauspicious—suburbs have multiplied upon suburbs, sprawling mile upon unplanned mile across our countryside, removing working people ever farther from their places of employment, stealing from the central cities vast segments of the middle-income families which are a principal source of their tax revenue, killing our transit systems with a surfeit of automobiles, and strangling downtown areas in networks of traffic-jammed streets.

Nor have the steps taken to correct this situation had the results intended.

Public housing, intended to eradicate the slums, not only has not kept up the race against the spread of urban blight; it has on occasion turned into slum itself.

Freeway systems intended to solve the traffic problems of the inner city have rather merely increased the flow of automobiles downtown, poisoned the air with noxious exhaust fumes, and replaced the already sparse greenery of cities with jungles of concrete.

Title I developments, hailed as a means of restoring portions of the cities' lost tax base, have too often resulted only in depriving innocent people of their homes and businesses and replacing usable buildings with tracts of bombed-out blocks which stand vacant and untaxable for years and finally provide vast profits to private entrepreneurs.

I do not intend these criticisms to be interpreted as an attack on the strategies which have been developed in our efforts to build ourselves rational and attractive communities in which to live and work. I have studied the legislative recommendations of the National Housing Conference, many of which use current programs as a jumping off point, and can say that most of the recommendations I can support without qualification.

But I am troubled by the fact that liberal approaches to the problem of housing America, the type of approach I take these recommendations to be, have tended to become frozen into their own kind of orthodoxy. Obviously existing programs need more money. But also—perhaps even more—we need creative new approaches to these problems.

I'm not an expert on housing problems. I have no completely worked-out set of proposals in my briefcase which I can sell to you tonight. All I have are a few thoughts which may stimulate you, who are the experts, and grow in time into new plans and programs.

First let me remind you of those figures I mentioned in passing earlier. Present estimates are that the United States will grow to 300 million persons in the next 40 years. Since existing housing is inadequate for the needs of our present population, we know right now that in these four decades we must build new dwelling places for at least 120 million people. We know we cannot do this by rampantly destroying existing housing without multiplying our problem manifold.

Americans are the most wasteful people on earth. We are the Nation which devised the throwaway milk carton, the paper plate, the nonrefillable tin can. We have gone further than that, developing the automobile with built-in obsolescence, the furniture which scarcely hangs on to its veneer till it's paid for, the refrigerator, stove and washing machine guaranteed to be out of fashion in 5 years' time. And now we are moving in the direction of the automatically obsolescent house. In Europe, to which so many Americans travel to find the beauty they cannot find at home, there is nothing unusual in finding families occupying houses 300 and 400 years old. On this side of the Atlantic, on the other hand, we are docilely learning the dictum that if a house is secondhand it must be inferior and if it's been built more than 25 years it must be getting ready to fall down.

What lies behind this mania for consumption, consumption, consumption? Simple. The belief that high consumption will keep our manufacturers churning out goods and hence counteract tendencies toward unemployment. But once again I remind you—just 40 years from now we are going to need new dwelling units for 120 million new Americans. I tell you we can't afford to let existing housing decay and then be torn down for as yet unthought-of urban renewal plans. In my more nightmarish moments I wonder where those millions of board-feet of lumber, those countless tons of clay for bricks, those endless bags of cement needed just for the houses of that 120 million are going to come from.

No, we are going to have to learn to preserve what we have and build upon it.

We must ponder long and hard before we kill existing neighborhoods. Carelessly uprooting people from a neighborhood in which they have lived a lifetime in order to replace their houses with something better may indeed provide sounder buildings and spruce up the area. But too often it scatters around the city confused and resentful people who vent their justified hostilities upon their new dwelling places and cause more slums.

One time when families moved to public housing developments, they went voluntarily, hoping they were finally getting the break that would permit them to build themselves a new and better life. Now, too often, they go because the place they lived in previously is being torn down and public housing is all they can afford. Construction specifications of public housing units frequently are an insult to the tenants. No doors on the closets, no baseboards on the walls have become symbolic of project living. What wonder is it that projects go sour and decay from the inside out?

Would not the cost be less in the long run, when renewal of a neighborhood seems indicated, to plan it honestly, step by step, with the residents of the area, to carry it out plat by plat with a judicious mixing of vest-pocket low-income projects, privately financed middle- and upper-income units and rehabilitation and retention of the bulk of the existing structures? Then persons necessarily displaced could just move across the street, retaining unbroken their neighborhood ties, and when the renewal job reached completion, could sit back proud in the knowledge that they themselves had made their neighborhood what it was.

Perhaps we should take a new look at the consequences of our taxing systems, devising means of encouraging desirable trends in housing. Do we want homeowners to keep their residences in tiptop shape? Perhaps we should permit tax deductions for home improvements?

Do we want to launch an attack on profiteers in slum real estate?

Perhaps we should change the tax laws to forbid real estate investors from depreciating the same piece of property again and again as it goes from hand to hand. Perhaps we should determine a slum building's value for property tax purposes not on the basis of its worth as a structure but rather on the potential worth of the land it occupies and the rental income it produces.

Let me cite to you an example reported recently in Look magazine of how our present tax laws stimulate the spread of slums. An investor purchased a 6-apartment building in Chicago for $25,000, and with the aid of a little plasterboard and chicken wire he converted it into a 24-apartment structure housing 72 people. Rental collections of more than $1,800 a month enabled him to recover the full amount of his equity in less than 18 months. He was aided in his depredations by depreciation, available only to investors, not to homeowners, and by the tax base on a building with a market value of only $25,000.

Are we convinced that owner-occupied property is generally better maintained than property owned by investors? Then perhaps we would be wise to provide Government insured mortgages on houses of all vintages, not just on recently built ones.

I sometimes wonder if we Americans are not overly dedicated to the principle of ownership of property in fee simple. Perhaps we could make our Government dollars go further if instead of buying properties in entirety before redeveloping them, our redevelopment authorities just purchased selected rights within the affected areas. This type of control would be cheaper than outright seizure, yet more effective than zoning ordinances. For example, it is generally acknowledged that open spaces between built-up areas are to be desired. Yet we cannot by zoning fiat declare that there shall be no subdivision of a given tract of land if its location justifies it. And the cost of buying the section for park land appears to the affected municipality to be prohibitive. Perhaps in this case we should study the possibility of buying not the entire tract but only the right to subdivide it.

Are we concerned that the natural leaders graduate from low-income housing projects leaving a vacuum behind them because their incomes increase beyond the maximums permitted? Perhaps we should consider the possibility of abolishing these income restrictions to residents already in the projects, raising the rent instead.

Do private real estate operators really need that guaranteed 20-percent gap between governmentally subsidized rents and the bottom of the private rental market? Let's find out.

Do our cities need all these freeways? Lewis Mumford, who sometimes seems to be a voice crying alone in the wilderness, has pointed out repeatedly that the foot is the most efficient mode of transportation and urged that our cities be planned for pedestrians.

I don't know what the answers to these questions are. As I said, I have studied your legislative recommendations and found them good. More money is obviously needed for all our housing programs. Special concern must obviously be given to the needs of our older people. Especially, I can salute your backing of the proposed creation of a Department of Housing and Community Development. In such a department I can see some of these problems being considered.

But most especially I want to leave you tonight with a challenge. I want to challenge you to the problem of building a rational city, a city devoid of racial, religious, or even economic segregation. There is no reason for low-income, middle-income, high-income families to live each in their own area. So far as this segregation is caused by custom we can only preach against it. But, surely, if it results directly from our own existing housing programs, we can change the legislation to reverse the trend.

Finally, I would leave with you this quotation from the poet T. S. Eliot, the relevance of which to planning was seen not by me but by Staughton Lynd writing in Commentary magazine:

"When the stranger says, 'What is the meaning of this city?'
Do you huddle close together because you love each other?
What will you answer? 'We all dwell together
To make money from each other' or
'This is a community'."

Esther Van Wagoner Tufty—National President of AWRT

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is customary for those of us who represent the various States of the Union to voice our pride in the men and women from our States who are appointed to positions of importance in the Federal Government.

Today I would like to pay tribute to one of Michigan's most illustrious citizens. She is not in a policymaking position in the Government, but she is one of the powers just the same.

Known and admired nationwide as "The Duchess," Esther Van Wagoner Tufty is a member of a prominent, civic-minded Michigan family. But through her own talents and energy she has risen, professionally, to the top ranks not only in the newspaper world but also in radio and television.

At the present time, she is serving as the national president of American Women in Radio and Television. This nonprofit professional organization of 1,600 women working as broadcasters, executives, administrators, and creative personnel in radio and television, is currently holding its 10th annual convention in Washington. As friends of ours we bid them welcome.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent article that appeared in the Northern Virginia Sun of Tuesday, April 11, 1961. It tells the interesting story of Esther Van Wagoner Tufty.

She is fair and able and she asks no special favors.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Apr. 11, 1961]

OUR INTERESTING NEIGHBORS: ESTHER VAN WAGONER TUFTY—NORTH VIRGINIA'S "DUCHESS" HAS MANY VIEWPOINTS

(By Janet Green)

Esther Van Wagoner Tufty is a woman who lives in a state of constant crisis. Her journalistic career has been filled with continuous excitement. To begin with, she was born during a crisis—the first cyclone to strike Tuscola County, Mich. Coming from a pioneering family that has left its impact in the realm of politics, Mrs. Tufty's tall, blond, regal appearance is characteristic of her father's Dutch ancestry. Appropriately, she is affectionately known as "The Duchess."

As one of the country's outstanding women journalists, she covers politics and international relations from her viewpoint, in the Nation's Capital.

Early in her career, when she had just been elevated to the exalted position of managing editor for former U.S. Vice President Charles G. Dawes' newspaper, the Evanston News-Index, Mr. Dawes is said to have remarked boastfully that he had not only a woman editor, but the only Democrat in the GOP stronghold along the north shore of Chicago running his paper.

During the first week in this new job, the linotype operators went on strike for higher wages. As they left the composing room, they took with them all of the letter "e's"—the most frequently used letter of the alphabet. Undaunted with this crisis, Editor Tufty rushed around Chicago begging, borrowing, and buying all the "e's" she could find.

The paper was published, but in retrospect, Mrs. Tufty says "I wish I had printed it without 'e's,' for it would now be a collector's item."

She began her news bureau in Washington 26 years ago with a string of 26 Michigan papers. It has developed into a flourishing, well-established bureau, servicing papers abroad as well as in this country. Additionally, she is outstanding on the lecture platform and tours the country under the auspices of W. Colston Leigh, Inc.

Her first radio news show "Tufty Topics" was a series of crises. She recalls the day the Canadian Ambassador was supposed to be interviewed, but at the last minute was called to the White House by President Roosevelt.

What to do?

Undaunted, radio commentator Tufty grabbed her taxi driver en route from her office in the National Press Building to the studio and put him on the air.

"After all, Washington taxi drivers are supposed to be a good news source," said the resourceful Duchess. "He would have sounded better, though, if he had been more used to his new store teeth which caused an odd whistle through the entire interview," she reminisced.

Mrs. Tufty's flair for being on the spot when news breaks paid off when she covered the 1952 presidential convention in Chicago as a member of the NBC television staff. She held in reserve one of the then scarce TV cameras for 7 hours—standing by on her hunch that the switch from Taft to Eisenhower would break in a Michigan caucus. And it did, at 2 a.m.

She had been on NBC's staff at all presidential conventions since that time.

Another exciting crisis: She was the only woman reporter aboard Presidential Candidate Dewey's "Victory Special" train when it was wrecked, and is consequently a member of Tom Dewey's "Castle Rock Survivors Club." In memory of this event, the defeated candidate's autographed photo hangs in a prominent spot on the office wall.

Lord Halifax, British Ambassador to Washington in 1942, set the wheels in motion for another of her crises when he invited the Duchess to go to England as a speaker, a consultant on American British relations in the port towns where the GI's were landing, and to broadcast back to America over BBC what was going on in the Battle of Britain from her viewpoint. Her assignment took her to the most dangerous spot, which, of course, resulted in some exclusive news stories. She calls this the most dangerous and yet most rewarding period of her life.

As a foreign correspondent in 20 countries, she has witnessed and reported many critical events. One of the few women to fly the Berlin airlift, her flight was buzzed by the Commies. At this fearful moment it was discovered all aboard had parachutes except the Duchess, who was sitting calmly on top of 10 tons of coal being moved by the military aircraft from Wiesbaden to Templehof Airport in Berlin.

Foreign Correspondent Tufty has been out of the country every year for the past 20 on news gathering trips. This year she hopes to visit India and Africa. Her elder son, Harold, is cultural attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Abidjan, Ivory Coast; her other son, James, is in the advertising business in Los Angeles. She has four grandchildren.

Named "Viewpoints," because Mrs. Tufty's objective reporting insists there is more than one, the Georgian colonial house in which she lives is on a point overlooking an especially wide part of the Potomac across from Broad Creek, Md., midway between Alexandria and Mount Vernon.

The house has a harmonious combination of elegance and personal reflections of the vivid, varied and active life of the owner. It is livable and most comfortable: "It could belong to no one but Esther," her friends agree.

It contains everything from her grandmother's corner cupboard to a drum from Haiti. Her two twin Japanese procelain pillars, now made into lamps, are in contrast to the bibelots that came from such far-flung places as the Netherlands and "down under" Australia. The 42-foot living room runs the full length of the front of the house overlooking the river. Three sets of glass doors open out into the brick terrace where her many friends from the worlds of politics, government and diplomacy are to be found of a summer's evening having lively arguments on what's going on in the world.

Viewpoints has been opened to the public in the past on the Virginia garden tours when visitors have noted that Mrs. Tufty avoids anything resembling a formal garden. She wants flowers blooming from the first crocus to the last rose of summer. There are always blooms around the lily pond. An extensive rose garden is a favorite. Boxwood surrounds the front lawn and the two prize possessions are planted near the house. One is a gorgeous magnolia, the farewell gift from the local chapter of the American Women in Radio and Television when she retired as president of that group and the Michigan maple that marks the day she moved into the historic home 7 springs ago. She formerly lived in another historic house in Alexandria.

As the national head of AWRT, President Tufty is busy planning for their 10th anniversary convention which will be held in Washington at the Statler-Hilton, May 4 to 7. A number of northern Virginians are among the nationwide membership of 1,600 who will participate.

How does she combine being the president of a national organization—she is past president of the Women's National Press Club—serve on numerous committees such as the American Newspaper Women's Club, WNPC merger project and on President Kennedy's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped, with a busy lecture and journalistic career and being the mistress of a mansion on the Potomac?

"I don't combine them, I mix them, and the mixture results in a busy, exciting way of life."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. It is my pleasure to join in the tribute to Esther Van Wagoner Tufty. I know that she is a stanch Democrat in her politics. Her father, I believe, was a former Governor of the State of Michigan.

Mr. HART. If the Senator will permit me to make a correction, it was her brother who was a distinguished Governor of Michigan.

Mr. KEATING. Yes. It is true that in all her work she has been extremely fair. She graces the office of president of American Women in Radio and Television. I had the pleasure this noon of meeting with a group of these women, who are present in the city for their national convention. We are glad to have them here. We congratulate them on the leadership they have selected in Esther Van Wagoner Tufty.

Mr. HART. I congratulate the Senator from New York in being so fortunate as having been invited to be with this group this afternoon. I appreciate very much the kind remarks he made with reference to Esther Van Wagoner Tufty.

Poland's Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it was my intention that these remarks commemorating Poland's Constitution Day be included in the RECORD on the appropriate anniversary day which was yesterday, May 3. Unfortunately, I was called away from the floor before I had an opportunity to include them. It does not lessen my appreciation of Poland's continual fight for freedom.

In the lives of all nations there is always one day that more than any other symbolizes the national spirit. For Poland it is her Constitution Day, celebrated on May 3 for 170 years this year.

Poland's Constitution Day commemorates the Constitution of 1791. In that year Poland made a great, almost convulsive effort to free herself from an outmoded political and social system. The "4 years' sejm," or Parliament, led by men of great force of character and capacity, adopted the Constitution we celebrate today. It converted Poland into a limited constitutional monarchy, with ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments. Invidious class distinctions were abolished. The humble townsman might now own land, or enter the ranks of state or church, privileges formerly open only to the gentry. The protection of law was extended to the peasants, and serfdom was mitigated with a view to its eventual abolition. Absolute religious toleration was proclaimed, and provisions for periodical reform by subsequent parliaments were also embodied in this Constitution.

But this most liberal and progressive document was to be short lived. Some magnates who could not accept the new order of things sought Russian assistance, and Catherine the Great was only too happy to oblige. Prussia, a supposed ally, left Poland in the lurch. Betrayed but not broken, the tiny Polish Army put up a spirited resistance, but eventually the struggle was lost, and the second partition of Poland took place.

But neither that partition nor the subsequent travails through which Poland was to pass have ever been able to kill the spirit of liberty which lives in Polish hearts. That historic truth is being rediscovered by Poland's Communist masters today. Poland's Government may be 100 percent Communist, Poland's people are not. Poland's Government may adopt policies hostile to the United States, but Poland's people are friendly. Indeed, if a free plebiscite were to be held today can there be any doubt that Poland would opt for the West?

To keep this spirit of liberty alive it is only fitting that we in the United States should commemorate this great anniversary of Polish freedom, and take this occasion for renewed expression of our faith that Poland will once again be free.

Health Care for the Aged: Profound Issues for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I had the privilege of addressing a luncheon meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's 49th annual meeting here in Washington. The subject of my talk was health care for the aged and how this care can best be provided in America.

This subject, and the legislative proposals that have grown out of it, raise many fundamental questions, profound issues which must be carefully considered by the Congress and the people of this country.

Chief among these is the total cost, not just the dollar cost, but the cost in decreased quality of the medical care for all Americans and the effect upon the dollar benefits under social security, that meeting the particular problem by placing health care for the aged under social security would bring.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to introduce this speech at this point in the RECORD:

HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR THE AGED

(Speech of Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, Representative, St. Louis County-South St. Louis, at the health care luncheon of the 49th annual meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, May 2, 1961, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C.)

The new administration's proposal for health care benefits for aged under social security, and other proposals in this and earlier Congresses, have certain features in common. The more important of these are:

1. Use tax money by drawing on the social security trust fund, not to pay benefits in cash, but to pay for certain specified health and medical care services.

2. Such service benefits would be provided to some people under social security, usually the aged, those 65 and over.

3. Require contractual arrangements between the Federal Government and certain suppliers of health care, which would embody negotiated prices for federally approved services and treatment.

I agree with the moderator on the misrepresentations made about these proposals. Currently, some are saying the administration's proposal is really a very simple one. They say they are proposing merely to use social security as a useful device for collecting money to pay for health care for the aged. They go on to point out that it is the same device used by insurance companies in providing health insurance protection.

The issue is not this simple and advocates of the proposal know it is not. There are a number of issues, profound issues, raising several questions that all Americans should ask, and have the answers to.

For example, has a national need, a national problem, arisen because our present system of health care has failed and thus requires Federal intervention? Is insurance protection against the cost of illness out of reach of most people?

Is the quality of health care and availability of health facilities deficient and declining? Would all aged be provided for without discrimination? Can health care benefits through social security be provided for the aged only, and be stopped at that point? Will the ultimate tax costs of such a program seriously jeopardize the existing social security cash benefit program? Will the costs be no greater than what we now spend through private arrangements, and through local, State and Federal programs?

In answer to such questions, I want to give some of the reasons I am opposed to any kind of health care benefits being initiated in social security, or in any other payroll tax arrangement.

Initiating any kind of health care service benefits in social security for those 65 and over cannot be stopped, I believe, short of a comprehensive health and medical care program for everyone under social security regardless of age. The administration bill, H.R. 4222, for example, will provide certain hospital, nursing home, and home-health services to people 65 and older who are under social security. Within a relatively short time many of these individuals would find that, while they didn't have to go to the hospital or to a nursing home, they nevertheless had costly expenses for health care, such as drugs, other medicines, surgery, and so forth. In other words, they would find the administration proposal did nothing for them. Congress would soon be urged to expand the kinds of services provided.

That bill would do nothing for other social security beneficiaries, such as a widowed mother and her children. If one group of social security beneficiaries, the aged, are receiving this kind of protection, wouldn't it be logical to extend it to younger beneficiaries? And how about those receiving

social security disability benefits? Wouldn't it be just as logical to provide the same health and medical care services to them? And who could possibly need them more?

These proposals do not restrict these health care services to those 65 and over who have retired, but would provide them for those of retirement age, even though they may be working full time, perhaps making the best pay in their lives. I feel confident Congress could not long provide any health care service to some people who are working, just because they are at least 65, and deny it to other workers under social security who are younger than 65.

If we once start down this road, the final result is obvious to me. And former Congressman Forand stated in January that after they get their foot in the door, they can then expand the program.

Experience shows that providing health care services on a seemingly free basis inevitably results in overutilization, and thus increases cost. For example, in Saskatchewan, the average hospital utilization rate prior to 1947 for those 65 and over was the same as in this country; 2½ days per year. Today, they have a State-operated program for the aged and the average utilization per aged is 8 days; three times as great. Meanwhile, the U.S. utilization rate for the older people remains about 2½ days.

We can turn to the experience in Great Britain with the national health service program, where the average hospital stay for their population is nearly three times what it is in this country.

Social security health care benefits can jeopardize the financial soundness of our present cash benefit program. The present program will require 9-percent taxes on payroll by 1969. This is provided in the existing law. If we start health care service in social security, with its inevitable expansion to all kinds of services and to people of all ages, the tax cost could well be another 9 or 10 percent. Overutilization would further increase costs and tax requirements. I am seriously concerned whether workers and employers will willingly carry the tax burden for the present cash benefits, in addition to another burden of equal or greater size for a universal, comprehensive health and medical care program.

The social security health care benefits proposal will achieve the same results as socialized medicine. Certainly, if any services are to be paid for by the social security system, the Federal Government must see that these services are provided at fair and reasonable costs. Congress is duty-bound to see that Federal funds are spent efficiently. All these health care bills properly include a provision that the Social Security Administration enter into contracts with the vendors of the health care services in respect to their charges. It takes little imagination to understand what happens when a Federal bureaucracy gets into the business of setting fees and price schedules of health institutions.

The fact that the Federal Government would not own the hospitals, nursing homes, and so forth, as some claim is necessary for socialized medicine, is a superficial detail. The fact is, we would end up with Federal control of our health care institutions and professions. Call it what you will—at least the Socialist Party in this country has labeled the administration proposal "socialized medicine."

The socialization of medicine will inevitably lower the quality of health care available to all of us. In every civilized nation in the world except the United States, there exists a system of government or socialized medicine. It is no accident that by comparison we excel all these systems in the quality of medical care available to our population. We know that 30 years ago our medical students—in fact, medical students from many countries—flocked to the medical centers of Europe for their education, internship, and postgraduate study. This was before the day that governmental systems were established in these western European countries.

Today, medical students the world over travel, not to Europe, but rather to the United States. I believe there is one reason, and only one reason, why this is so. It is because they can come to this country and practice their profession in complete freedom.

In every nation in the world except our own, the ratio of doctors to population is on the decline with all the adverse effects the decline has upon the health and well-being of the population. The ratio of physicians per patient in the United States is remaining steady at about 1 to 750 people. This is despite the population explosion in this country since 1940. Contrast this with Britain, for example. In 1947—the year before they established their national health service program—the ratio was 1 to 877. In 1957, 10 years later, the ratio had declined to 1 to 149 people.

There are other reasons why I believe this type of legislation is bad for Americans, regardless of age. Having social security pay for services provided to people is a step backward. H.R. 4222 would increase social security taxes to raise more benefit money. However, this would not be paid out in cash so each beneficiary could use it as he sees fit to meet his own special needs. Rather, the Federal Government would decide how this money is to be used—for selected hospital, nursing home and other health care. Denial of the freedom to choose would destroy the dignity and self-respect of every beneficiary.

A curious phenomenon to me is to find organized labor in the forefront endorsing this denial of freedom of choice—when I recall why they were equally enthusiastic 2 years ago in their support of the new health insurance program for Federal employees and for all Members of Congress. May I refer you to their committee testimony—and to their pamphlet entitled "Labor Looks at Congress, 1959." Their number one argument in support of this plan was that it preserved individual freedom of choice.

Any compulsory health-care program will snuff out innovation and experimentation for developing better methods of health care. It will also squeeze out private enterprise and voluntary group efforts which have been devising new forms of insurance protection against the cost of illness.

I want to close by emphasizing that this is not a case of being against something. We do have a health-care system in our society today. It is the greatest in the history of the world. We need to get across to the people the various factors that have made it the best.

Make no mistake about it. The supporters of the social security approach have made every effort to cleverly undermine the people's confidence in our present system of health care. They have attacked the integrity of the medical profession, of the drug profession, of our hospitals, of the insurance companies, all the people who are responsible for our present advancements and upon whom we must rely for future progress. They have attacked the integrity of these people, not their arguments, not their facts.

The problem of our older people in obtaining adequate health care is not just a problem of their personal budget. Indeed, the main problem they face is the same problem we all face in the health field. It is the problem of medical science continuing to advance, to find new cures, new drugs, new methods of treating health problems. It is the problem of getting new hospitals, new equipment, new techniques. It is the problem of spreading quality advancement in these areas, quantitatively throughout our society.

When we boil the matter down to where the real needs are, we find they are quite within the capabilities of our present programs to deal with—and not in a degrading way as some of the promoters of the social security approach would have us believe.

By 1970, 12½ million will have joined the aged group. The proportion of the aged with health insurance protection will have increased from 50 to more than 80 percent. I hope we will not establish a compulsory program in perpetuity to deal with a temporary, transitional situation.

Smart Young Newcomers Sell Conservative View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the May 1961 issue of the respected magazine Nation's Business, there is an excellent article about some of our 58 new Members of the 87th Congress. Many of these Members have already distinguished themselves in the Halls of Congress. They have impressed all of us, I believe, with their intelligence, self-assurance, judgment, and zeal. In my opinion, they have injected vital new blood into some of our hardening arteries in the Congress. After observing these distinguished gentlemen for 4 months, I have a distinct feeling that they may be doing their bit to give the Congress some new and healthier arteries before very long. I am pleased to introduce at this point in the RECORD the text of this fine magazine article:

SMART YOUNG NEWCOMERS SELL CONSERVATIVE VIEW—NEW TREND? OLD HANDS AT CAPITOL BELIEVE THESE NEW CONGRESSMEN SIGNAL SWING AWAY FROM FEDERALIZATION

Lanky, 36-year-old freshman Congressman JIM BATTIN, of Montana, strode into the ornate, high-ceilinged offices of Republican House Leader CHARLES HALLECK one day early in the present session of Congress.

"I want you to know, sir," he said to the conservative veteran GOP leader, "that I will be with you on most issues. But on other issues I won't be, because I'm just not that liberal."

Across Capitol Hill on the fourth floor of the Old House Office Building a few weeks later, 39-year-old DON BRUCE, of Indiana, another new Member of the House, calmly dictated a letter to a labor union leader in his home district. The union chief had urged Representative BRUCE to back the Kennedy administration program to "keep America moving."

"I intend to keep America moving," dictated Mr. BRUCE, "moving in the path of individual liberty and in strengthening the basic constitutional system of Government."

He flatly stated that Government should "drastically reduce the entire tax burden and let the honest laws of economics get to working."

Warning your leader you won't always stand with him and writing your constituents that you disagree with them may seem unwise politics, particularly for new Members. But Representatives BATTIN and BRUCE don't see it that way. Like many of the 58 first-term Members of the 87th Congress, they have both independence and conservatism as part of their makeup. Not only do they have convictions, but they and many of their new colleagues have the drive and the know-how to sell their beliefs. They are helping inject new vigor into the political cause of free enterprise.

Many new Members of the House in this Congress are sharply conservative in contrast to the 86th Congress when most new Members were liberal. The change is as drastic as has been seen in recent times.

Moreover, some congressional leaders not only predict that the new wave of outspoken young conservatives is the forerunner of many more young conservatives, but also consider it more representative of the philosophy of the Nation as a whole than is the welfare-state doctrine that has dominated National Government programs over most of the past generation.

"Many people say that resistance to radical ideas and the spendthrift schemes in government is growing; I believe this is true," Minority Leader HALLECK told Nation's Business. "Many of the new Members," he said, "were running against these radicals and they pitched their whole campaigns against this philosophy."

Key Democratic conservative in the House, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH of Virginia, also believes conservatism is on the rise. One indication is that he was swamped by letters of praise from all over the country after a recent television program on which he spoke out for constitutional and economical government.

House Republican Policy Chairman JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin notes, "There has been a considerable rise in conservatism on the college level in the past several years. The conservatives in Congress could be a natural result of this, together with efforts to encourage younger people to participate in politics."

From Representative BRUCE comes this analysis: "I think we have seen the beginning of a philosophical evolution based on dedication to principle. In the recent past we have been seeing government as a false idol. Our bankrupt liberalism has been portrayed as a symbol of all good things. It has tended to erode our spiritual values that are the basis of our liberty. But I think this will be changed."

Another new Member, 32-year-old JOHN ASHBROOK, of Ohio, reports, "The temper of the people is more conservative than you would think." He concluded this after traveling and speaking in 200 cities around the country as chairman of the Young Republicans from 1957 to 1959.

Of the 58 first-term Members in the new Congress, 40 are Republicans; in the previous Congress, 59 of the 78 new Members were Democrats. Though most of the conservative freshmen wear the Republican label, the freshman Democrats also include articulate, self-reliant young conservatives.

One Democratic freshman, for example, was quizzed by the liberal chairman of a major congressional committee as to how he planned to vote on pending issues. At the risk of not winning a seat on this important committee, the new Member refused to commit himself to vote the way the chairman wanted. He lost the committee post.

Another new young Democrat pored over the administration's aid to education bill searching out cloudy phrases in its language that might make it unacceptable to him. He did this in spite of the fact that his State's political leaders were pressing him and other members of his congressional delegation to support the administration bill unswervingly.

Much has been made of the youth, scholarship, and vigor of Kennedy administration officials. It has reinforced the political cliche that links youth with liberalism and age with conservatism. The increasing age of some of the conservative congressional veterans also has served to point up the freshness and enthusiasm of members of the new executive branch. This has tended to draw attention from the youth, vigor, and intelligence that has come to Congress.

The seniority system in Congress makes legislative buck privates of all new Members. But in politics an attractive, persuasive, and sincere figure can begin to stand out and make himself heard rather quickly—as Mr. Kennedy proved.

As for the new Republicans who make up the bulk of the freshmen conservatives, "their influence is being felt already," according to Minority Leader HALLECK. Important committee assignments and wide opportunities to be heard at policy meetings also indicate the value being placed on the new men.

Congressional Campaign Chairman WILLIAM MILLER, of New York, says, "Never before have we had a young group as personable, articulate, and knowledgeable. There are lots of leaders among them."

"It's rather early to judge," comments Representative BYRNES, "but as a group, they seem outstanding in their enthusiasm, talent, dedication, desire to participate and awareness. We have been short on public relations and had difficulties getting across our true image in the past. We believed we were right, but we can't continue to take it for granted that everybody knows why we are right."

This is one reason the GOP policy committee has set up a new subcommittee on research to supply new fuel for conservative thinking. The committee is seeking fresh thoughts and information from academic and professional sources on the basic issues of our times.

A memorandum stating the objectives of the unit says its studies are "designed to provide a scholarly analysis of specific problem areas and ways of meeting these problems within the framework of our free enterprise society."

Its work will help supplement GOP policy formulation and may give extra ammunition to both older and new members of the party.

House Democrats are not without conservative organization and strategy. While the so-called Democratic study group, made up of about 70 to 80 House liberals, has developed an informal organization for concerted action and voting on liberal causes, conservative Democrats in the House also have an informal organization. An unpublicized five-man top command of conservative Democrats under Representative SMITH leads southern States-righters in legislative strategy.

The political party lineup in Congress is not nearly as important as the conservative versus liberal split. Although both Representative SMITH and Representative HALLECK deny that a coalition of Republicans and Democrats exists, rollcall votes have shown clearly a bipartisan opposition—formal or not—to excessive spending and welfare state legislation.

Conservative Republicans and southern Democrats now numbering nearly 200 members can be expected to vote the same way on many issues. Liberal Republicans and Democrats mainly from the northern or border States or the West also number about 200. Normally about 5 percent of the House is absent on rollcalls. The remaining Members of the 437 total may swing from one side to the other depending on the legislation.

With such a near-even balance in the House, the new conservatives in the freshman class, both Democrats and Republicans, are an important element. This is particularly true since they seem likely to emerge as an energetic sales force for the free enterprise viewpoint.

Though political philosophy can only be fully judged in the light of a history of rollcall votes, many of the new Members' election campaigns, their activities since Congress convened, and their voiced intentions have made them appear promising to conservative congressional leaders.

Here is a closer look at a few of the men—some more conservative than others—who exemplify the new young men in Congress:

JOHN ASHBROOK, lawyer and newspaper publisher, singled out as a key issue of his election campaign the freedom of the individual. "Unbridled national power with a resultant loss of individual freedom and local autonomy would weaken our efforts in the international field," he told the voters. He said he would help guard against "State planners, the economy wreckers, the spenders and the destroyers of local government [who try to] weave a web of socialistic control over us under the guise of solving our problems by removing them from the careful scrutiny of the State and local government officials to the banks of the Potomac."

Representative ASHBROOK is the son of a Democratic Congressman who served the same district for nearly 20 years. The 32-year-old Republican is an honor graduate of Harvard like many members of the Kennedy administration. He studied under liberal Profs. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., and John Kenneth Galbraith, but was repelled by the theories they espoused.

Mr. ASHBROOK was graduated from Ohio State Law School in 1955. He became active in the Young Republicans organizations on the county, State and National level, heading the national organization from 1957 to 1959. He is publisher of the Johnstown Independent, a weekly paper.

A member of the House Education and Labor Committee, Mr. ASHBROOK has taken a strongly conservative stand on all major issues. He voted against the liberal move to enlarge the House Rules Committee which was intended to dilute the power of the conservatives to delay or block heavy spending, welfare, and union-backed legislation.

He also voted against the bill to extend unemployment compensation benefits for additional weeks and supported a bipartisan move to block so-called back-door spending, which permits Federal agencies to borrow from the Treasury without the traditional review and control of the congressional Appropriations Committees.

JAMES F. BATTIN, the young Montana Republican, says, "Being labeled as a conservative is not a kiss of death any more. The conservative today is not against progress. He's against disorganized change."

Representative BATTIN believes a trend against Federal intrusion is starting in the country, especially among younger people. "A young fellow some years ago could go into business on $1,000. Today, if you have $1,000, you have to hire a lawyer to see if you meet all the regulations. You have to hire an accountant to set up your books for tax purposes. Pretty soon you don't have anything left for inventory."

Though Representative BATTIN, like many of his new colleagues in Congress, grew up in the depression years, this did not make him distrust the private enterprise system.

"I seek opportunity and resent regulation. I believe I was elected not on promises, but on forwarding the philosophy of less control and more initiative," he told Nation's Business. "I have no quarrel with liberals. My job is to convince people my position is right."

Mr. BATTIN is a lawyer and veteran of Navy duty in the Pacific. He has served as city attorney in Billings, Mont., was a member of the State legislature and was active in State and county civil and political affairs for 10 years before his election.

He is a member of the House Judiciary Committee and the important GOP committee on committees, which determines Republican committee assignments.

DONALD C. BRUCE comes to Congress with 19 years' experience in the broadcasting industry. He has been program director, manager of radio broadcasting companies, and a news commentator. Over the past 11 years, he estimates he has made about 4,500 talks concerning national and international problems.

An Indiana Republican, Mr. BRUCE beat a liberal Democrat for the congressional seat. He serves on the Education and Labor and Un-American Activities Committees.

Years of study and evaluation of everything from the "Federalist Papers" and Adam Smith to news and publicity releases led him to his conservative convictions, he explains.

He sees the great question of our times as this: "Is the United States going into a collectivist state with total dependence on the Government or are we to continue as a free nation, independent and responsible?"

He says that Government should protect the nautical rights of the individual, but that "Government has become the aggressor against our rights in the guise of protecting them."

DAVID HENDERSON is one of many southern Democrats who voted against liberalizing the House Rules Committee on the crucial vote early in the session. Washington is not new to him. The Wallace, N.C., attorney was assistant general counsel of the House Labor and Education Committee in 1951 and 1952, so he is familiar with some of the fundamental issues before Congress as well as the workings of the legislative body. The former Air Force major and county judge came to Congress at the age of 39.

His assignment is the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, but his past staff experience gives him a natural interest in the breadth of problems that come before Congress.

Mr. HENDERSON, who knows a Member must stay attuned to his district to stay in office, reports that after Congress first convened he got telegrams urging him to support the administration, and he feels there will be heavy pressure to bring money from Washington to his area.

But he feels that people will eventually cease their requests for more and more Federal spending. "We can't undertake these spending proposals without the prospect of higher taxes," he says. Lately some of the same constituents who urged him to support the administration pleaded with him to oppose the President's proposal to raise the tax on truckers.

Like most Democrats, Representative HENDERSON will be under some obligation to support the Democratic administration. On some legislation he will undoubtedly go along, but not before he has examined in detail each proposal to make sure it doesn't conflict with his and his constituents' fundamental beliefs.

RICHARD H. ICHORD, 34, is another new Democrat who typifies the independent thinking and high qualifications of this year's congressional freshmen.

The youngest man ever to serve as speaker of the house in the Missouri Legislature, Representative ICHORD has almost a decade of legislative experience on the State level.

"No specific political philosophy fits all cases," he believes. He feels he is not a Jeffersonian Democrat because "this is no longer the agrarian society that influenced Jefferson's thinking, but an urban society." But he believes the Federal Government has gone too far in some fields.

"I'm a little jealous of the powers of the State government," he told Nation's Business. "All our Federal programs should be set up to assure that local government has a part in the workings of the program. Money from the Federal Government isn't money that just comes from heaven, as some seem to think."

A brilliant student, he was graduated from the University of Missouri School of Business and Public Administration with a degree in accounting in 1949. He taught courses in business law and accounting while attending law school and after graduation returned to Houston, Mo., to practice law.

He served on what was known in Missouri as the "Little Hoover Commission," a body that recommended efficiencies and economies in State government as the Hoover Commission did on the Federal level.

Coming from a lead mining district with high unemployment, Mr. ICHORD is particularly concerned with this problem. He believes, however, that "the answer is retraining, not putting people on the relief rolls. It is too easy to create a philosophy in people that the Government will take care of them."

Mr. ICHORD, however, does not feel that the administration proposal for adopting a medical care program for the aged under the social security system is socialized medicine as do many of his colleagues.

But with this issue, as with others, he indicates he will study all facets and decide for himself.

He is on both the Interior and Post Office and Civil Service Committees.

HORACE R. KORNEGAY, 37-year-old former prosecuting attorney from Greensboro, N.C. is another Democratic freshman. He, too, refuses to be labeled as conservative or liberal. But he describes himself basically as a Jeffersonian Democrat.

"I don't believe that Government should compete with business," he says, "but with our role in the world today, the Federal Government has to be big, and there are activities that the private citizen can't undertake himself."

He also believes that we should not overspend our income. He says the Federal Government should not "step in and regulate the crossroads store," as has been the potential threat under the broadened coverage of some proposed minimum wage extension bills.

Mr. KORNEGAY favors a temporary Federal school construction bill, but he opposes any Federal action or legislation that encourages pirating of industries from North Carolina. He opposes the concept as well as the threat that the area redevelopment bill might attract some of his State's industry elsewhere. This bill provides loans and grants for establishing industry in labor surplus sections.

Mr. KORNEGAY is on the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, one of the new Republicans, represents former Vice President Richard Nixon's old congressional district.

Like some of his fellow Republicans, he won over a liberal Democrat in a campaign that focused on the fundamental issues of conservatism versus liberalism.

Though he is only 33, Mr. ROUSSELOT's apparent leadership qualities made him the choice of the other first-term Republicans as their acting chairman on party matters.

He received a degree in political science and business administration from Principia College in Illinois in 1949.

He has been in public relations work on the corporate level and was president of John H. Rousselot & Associates, public relations consultants, from 1955 to 1958.

He, too, is no stranger to Washington. He was Director of Public Information for the Federal Housing Administration from 1958 to 1960. In California he had broad experience in Los Angeles County Republican politics and in campaign political organization and publicity work.

Mr. ROUSSELOT was a member of the Republican State central committee in California.

He was vice president of the Los Angeles County Young Republicans and a past president of the Young Republicans of California.

"It used to disturb me in school," Mr. ROUSSELOT told Nation's Business, "that the New Deal was pictured as all virtue. I read and read to find the holes in this facade. I couldn't believe that it was right to discourage creative initiative and to abandon faith in the individual to do for himself."

Mr. ROUSSELOT campaigned hard against Federal intervention in the citizens' lives and against centralized government and its cost to taxpayers.

He broke down every issue where possible to show just what the citizens in his district would pay for any new Federal program.

He believes the ultimate choice for the Nation is constitutional government or socialism.

The conservative "has to explain in simple, clear terms what is involved and why he is right," he says.

The assumption that conservatives must come up with constructive alternatives to any program proposed by liberals can be misunderstood, he points out.

"The alternative may be no legislation. For example, my positive alternative for Federal money for school construction is free, locally controlled education.

"Our philosophy is harder to sell, but when unions or other groups attack us, we'll ask to speak before them. I think people are becoming fed up with big, centralized government. This will make the conservative philosophy easier to sell and we will sell it anywhere any time."

New Medical and Biological Applications of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1961, at Erie, Pa., it was my privilege to deliver the following address on the subject of "New Medical and Biological Applications of Atomic Energy" to the graduate seminar of the American College of Surgeons, northwest Pennsylvania chapter.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE AMERICAN COLLEGE OF SURGEONS, MAY 3, 1961, ERIE, PA.

I appreciate this opportunity to speak to you about some of the new medical and biological applications of atomic energy.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since its inception in 1947, my interest in this subject has been a continuing one.

Recently, in March 1961, the Subcommittees on Research, Development, and Radiation, of which I am a member, held hearings on the Application of Radioisotopes and Radiation in the Life Sciences.

The purpose of these hearings was to bring the members of the committee up to date on research and development in the life sciences field since 1956, the time at which we last held similar hearings.

Tonight I should like to draw on some of the dramatic facts and figures given to us by the many experts who testified at those hearings and to briefly indicate to you the remarkable progress being made every day in the application of the peaceful atom for the betterment of mankind.

Despite the fact that radioactivity was discovered by man at virtually the same time he discovered X-rays, about 1895, it was not until the atomic bomb exploded over Japan in 1945 that we, as a society, really became conscious of the powerful energy locked in the atom and the catastrophic consequences of its misuse.

Because of this possible misuse, it was essential for some years after the war to gear our research efforts toward the development of atomic weapons so as to insure our security as a world power.

Gradually, however, we began to devote more of our efforts toward the peaceful uses of the atom.

This development was highlighted by President Eisenhower's announcement in 1953 of the atoms for peace program.

The program was given further impetus by the Congress in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which specifically called upon the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with all reasonable dispatch in exploring the uses of the peaceful atom.

The program has been successful and today I should like to outline for you some of the many ways in which the lot of mankind has been improved by the atom.

The catalog of achievement is impressive for today we find the peaceful atom at work: (a) In the diagnosis and treatment of disease, (b) in the improvement of crops and agricultural practices, (c) in the study of basic life processes, and (d) in man's continuing effort to conquer space.

RADIATION IN MEDICAL TREATMENT

Let us begin with those things with which you in this audience are most familiar; namely, the medical aspects of atomic energy.

If we could step back in time to 1890 and ask a physician of that day what he needed most to assist him in the diagnosis and treatment of disease his reply might well be, "A way of seeing inside the human body."

He could not have even dreamed that 5 years later, in 1895, Roentgen would discover the X-ray.

This he did somewhat by accident when he happened to place his hand between the X-ray tube and a fluorescent screen.

This view of the bones of his hand startled him.

A few days later when he radiographed his wife's hand she was quite disturbed; the very thought of seeing your own skeleton.

Strangely enough, Roentgen did not report his findings to the physics society of the day but rather to the Physical Medical Society of Wurzburg because he recognized immediately the possible implications of the use of this technique in medicine.

The work with X-rays led the physicists to discover radioactivity in 1896 and by 1902 Madame Curie had isolated a very small amount of radium.

All of you know how the radiations from radium and X-rays have been used for medical diagnosis and treatment.

Between 1900 and about 1940 when research was started to build an atomic bomb, a tremendous amount of information was compiled on the hazardous nature of radiation.

This background of information made it imperative that medical science be brought into the Manhattan Project at its start to insure safe handling of the radioactive materials needed to make the bomb.

As a result of these early precautions there have been only four or five deaths from radiation exposure in the history of the development of atomic industry—an outstanding safety record.

Because radiation is known to cause cancer as well as cure it, the atomic energy program very early developed a number of medical research projects to study the medical aspects of radiation.

Today there are six major medical facilities worth millions of dollars with annual operating budgets totaling approximately $9 million.

In addition there is a considerable amount of similar work in medical schools.

The major medical facilities are located at the Brookhaven National Laboratory, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Argonne Cancer Research Hospital at Chicago, the Medical School of the University of California at Los Angeles, the San Francisco Medical School and the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Berkeley, Calif.

Each of these laboratories has its own special programs with large and very expensive pieces of specialized equipment including X-ray machines, cobalt and cesium radiation treatment machines, electron accelerators and, in some cases, linear accelerators and even nuclear reactors are available for medical treatment as well as for experimental use.

The electron accelerators are proving of particular value for deep penetration treatment with much less damage to surrounding tissue as compared to X-ray and gamma ray treatments.

The linear accelerators provide many different kinds of particles—protons—alpha particles, and some of the heavy atoms.

The laboratory at Berkeley has shown that certain kinds of irradiations are effective in controlling glandular cancers and offer promise in treating other diseased tissues.

The medical nuclear reactor while still largely in an experimental stage may prove to be extremely valuable in particular cases.

Its effectiveness depends upon the ability of neutrons to induce radiation in chemical substances to produce localized useful effects.

The technique may prove very useful for brain tumors.

It is doubtful whether these enormously beneficial machines would have been developed as rapidly had it not been for the needs of the atomic energy establishment and the impetus of the atoms for peace program.

We can now confidently look to a future in which these machines, after fully proven, will take their place alongside existing conventional tools to see inside the human body and cure its ills.

THE PEACEFUL ATOM AND SPACE TRAVEL

An unexpected bonus has also come from the use and development of these large radiation machines mentioned previously and their use in basic research.

You have read and heard that the first man was launched into space and returned safely by the Russians.

Clearly this offers them a fine bit of publicity to serve as a vehicle for propagandizing the uncommitted nations on the communistic way of life.

You and I recognize, however, that this flight can be likened to the first airplane flight by the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk in the early 1900's.

We still had a long way to go then and even further to go now before space travel is a reality.

We must not, however, decrease our efforts in reaching our own objectives.

Until about 1957 when Van Allen, a physicist, described two intense bands of radiation which surround the earth, radiation was not really considered as a great deterrent to man's space travel.

We know now, however, that these two belts do offer serious radiation problems and in addition that the solar flares caused by nuclear explosions on the sun generate enough proton radiation to be of rather critical concern to space travelers.

It is, therefore, imperative that we learn more about space radiations.

The large accelerators previously mentioned are capable of generating various particles including some similar to the particles found in the cosmic radiation.

By cooperative efforts we can hope to find how better to protect man from these space radiations and thus accelerate his conquest of space, that space far beyond the range established by the Russians in both time and distance in their recent flight.

THE RADIOISOTOPE IN MEDICINE

However glamorous it may be to possess large expensive radiation producing machines, their use is relatively more restricted and in many instances they are even less desirable than the radioactive atom. This is particularly true since the atom is so versatile.

One of the first isotopes to be used in medical diagnosis was iodine 131 which selectively concentrates in the thyroid gland.

With the use of this isotope and special instrumentation now available for scanning the body one can precisely locate the thyroid gland and within limits identify the size and shape of the abnormalities which are present.

Similar techniques have been developed using other isotopes which localize in other areas of the human system.

Radioactive isotopes of chromium, iodine, sodium, iron, and cobalt are some of the more valuable elements presently playing an important role in medical diagnosis on the research level.

Much time could be spent listing various other isotopes which are used for specific tests but suffice it to say that there are about 275 which might be used for diagnostic purposes in humans.

The reason these radioisotopes are not presently available for general use is that they are undergoing tests in our laboratories with animals to determine their safe limits before being used in human medicine.

Time should yield these new tools.

Because of recent developments in our laboratories the day when you will be able to use all kinds of isotopes for diagnosis in almost every human, regardless of age or physical condition, is just around the corner.

With the whole body counter, which is simply an enclosure within which a patient is sensitively "counted" for radioactivity, one can detect less than a millionth of a curie of iron-59 in the whole body.

The radiation from this amount of activity is essentially negligible, yet the sensitivity of the measurement is such as to make the radioisotope feasible for diagnosis.

A modification of this instrument to accommodate only an arm, thus reducing the cost some fiftyfold, is even now being used for research studies.

A future in which the radioactive isotope will be used for faster and more efficient diagnosis of disease is certainly close and filled with promise.

It is rather obvious that the isotopes used for diagnosis can also be used in therapy if the isotope concentrates in diseased tissue.

Thus in the case of a thyroid disorder, iodine 131 or iodine 125 is indicated.

In specialized cases of bone cancer phosphorus-32 may be used and and in other instances other isotopes are used, the only difference between the diagnostic dose and the therapeutic dose is one of concentration.

The particular advantage of the isotopic method of treatment over that using the large machines mentioned earlier is that the isotope concentrates in the diseased tissue thus giving a higher dosage to the diseased area than to the normal, healthy tissue surrounding it.

Further studies currently going on in our laboratories will no doubt provide information which you as practicing physicians will be able to use.

In some instances isotopes have been used for implantation into the tumor area to provide a local source of radiation.

The great diversity of isotopes which are available makes this approach particularly desirable since by selection of an isotope giving a particular type of radiation one can irradiate an area as large or as small as desired.

THE ATOM IN AGRICULTURE

In the area of agriculture which is perhaps not so familiar to you, atomic energy has also made major contributions—contributions which can be measured in terms of dollars.

It has been reliably estimated that the use of radioisotopes in agriculture will result in annual savings of at least $180 million per year for the next 20 years or a total of some $3.6 billion.

Fertilizer practices are constantly being improved through the use of tracers.

Thus radioactive atom tracers used in fertilizers can show us how plants take up the various ingredients, where, when, and how they should be applied for maximum effectiveness and the factors which affect leaching and movement through soil.

These improved practices for more efficient use of fertilizers through the aid of isotopes are estimated to save some $20 million annually on fertilizer costs alone.

The additional yields resulting from the improved practices would perhaps double this figure.

Agricultural losses from weeds amount to approximately $4 billion annually and labeled compounds have helped us to understand when, where, and how to apply weed killers for maximum effectiveness.

The use of radioisotopes labeled compounds has led to the development of better compounds for thinning blossoms on fruit trees resulting in the production of better fruit and in the prevention of fruit drop.

Their use has also led to better defoliants for cotton and to the development of compounds which actually increase yields under otherwise ideal conditions.

Isotopes have helped the plant pathologist to understand how plant parasites invade the roots of tomatoes and other plants; how microorganisms cause rot and wilting and how these pests enter the plant to do their damage.

They have also helped to develop better control measures for the eradication of these pests.

Atomic energy has led not only to the development of better agricultural chemicals but also to the faster approval of these materials for introduction into the world marketplace.

As you know the Congress some years ago passed the Miller bill which required the manufacturer to establish safe limits for residues left on food crops after treatment with agricultural pesticides.

This is the "no cranberries for Thanksgiving" story which you will remember 1 or 2 years ago.

The Miller bill requires that the concentrations of these hazardous chemicals must be below some certain level in the food item before the food can be sold.

Often it has been completely impossible to determine these levels of the residue without the use of radioactive compounds.

Through their use the industrial companies have been able to "clear" compounds with the Food and Drug Administration much quicker and much more economically.

Radioisotopes have been of great value in determining what happens to plant pests from season to season.

For instance the cotton boll weevil which causes an enormous annual loss in the South was labeled with radioactive Cobalt-60.

With the aid of a Geiger counter he was tracked, "bird dogged" if you will, to his hiding place in the trash at the side of the field.

By simply burning the trash at the end of the season the usual spring reinfestation by this pest could be prevented.

Studies with farm animals using isotopes have led to better feeding practices; practices which have often led to better nutrition of man himself.

Thus by radioactive tracers of different food products which the animal eats it has been possible to determine the availability of minerals from particular compounds, the availability of vitamins, proteins, and other essential factors under many conditions of feeding.

Various disease agents such as viruses, bacteria, hook worm, etc., are being studied with the aid of isotopes as are the ways in which milk, meat, eggs, etc., are formed by the animals.

RADIATION IN AGRICULTURE

External radiation itself has been used directly in the agriculture sciences.

Two specific cases warrant special mention—the control of insect pests and the development of useful plant varieties.

In both of these instances the work could have been done with X-ray machines but it took the glamour of atomic energy to provide the positive accomplishment.

One of the most striking examples is the case of the eradication of the screwworm fly.

The screwworm, which resembles a wood screw, is a serious livestock pest which lays eggs in cuts and scratches of livestock, particularly our meat animals.

The resulting grub, the worm, causes large sores, poor weight gain, permanent injury, and in some severe cases, death.

This pest did cost ranchers in the southeast alone some $20 million annually.

Those in the southwest lost another $25 to $35 million annually.

Basic research conducted in the early fifty's showed that the male screwworm fly could be made sterile by a dose of radiation from radioactive cobalt-60 which still permitted him to compete with the untreated males for the female population.

The peculiar thing about the screwworm which made it seem possible for eradication was that the female screwworms mated only once, laid their eggs, and then died.

If she happened to mate with a sterile male then none of her eggs would hatch and thus eradication would be complete after only a few generations.

It now is known that such habits are not required but this habit led to the development of the technique.

Field tests conducted on the West Indian island Curaçao showed that the insect could be completely eliminated from geographically isolated areas when the numbers of sterile males introduced into the population was sufficiently large.

This success on Curaçao led the Florida Livestock Board and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to start releases of sterile males in southern Florida in 1957.

By early 1959, some 18 months later, not a single fly remained.

Three billion flies had been released over a 70,000-square-mile area by 20 airplanes at a cost of about $8 million.

Considering that the annual losses in Florida and southern Georgia amounted to almost $20 million this was a noteworthy achievement; in fact $12 million in the bank after the first year.

This sterile male technique offers tremendous possibilities for the future and programs are now underway to develop methods to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly, the melon fly, and the oriental fruit fly.

Our Government is also interested in eradication of the olive fly which makes olives unfit for either oil production or use in Martinis.

Only the future will tell us of the success of this technique in effecting biological control of these insect pests.

Another area in which there have been almost revolutionary advances as a result of atomic energy is plant genetics.

It has been known for many years that radiation causes alterations in the hereditary materials; that is, causes mutations and plant geneticists have used the radiation technique to produce new varieties uniquely suited to particular conditions.

For instance, a new bean variety, called Sanilac, uniquely suited to grow in Michigan saved the farmers $4.5 million in 1959 when only one-third of the acreage was planted to this variety.

In 1961 it is expected that most of the acreage will be so planted with possible savings of over $12 million.

A new variety of oat which is resistant to crown rust has been developed in Florida.

A new variety of peanut which yields more and is also easier to harvest mechanically has been developed in North Carolina.

In spite of the great advances measurable in terms of dollars which have come to man from the developments cited previously, one area in which the atom has contributed most is that of basic research, both in life and physical sciences.

Without the use of the isotope as a tracer, many life processes now well understood could perhaps never have been understood.

Through our understanding of basic life processes we will be able to contribute to man's welfare, his longer and happier life.

In summary you and I can look to the future with its many benefits from atomic energy.

We are at this time only scratching the surface of its vast potential.

Many of you present can assist in helping us to reap these benefits since you are aware of what the problems are in your field and can point out most effectively where atomic energy will be most helpful.

In an age where the glamorous and the spectacular in scientific endeavors seem to preempt man's attention, the very solid accomplishments in the peaceful uses of atomic energy should not be overlooked.

I am certain that when the scientific history of our times is written it will be noted that, in our age, the peaceful atom helped to unlock the mysteries of the universe and to provide a better and more abundant life for mankind.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art the center and soul of every sphere, we, Thy children, on this wandering island in the sky, a speck amid the vastness of space, look to Thee, Lord of all being, whose glory flames from sun and star.

Let us not be confounded by the empty spaces, or affrighted by world beyond world unfathomable.

As this day we join the chorus of praise for one daring explorer of unknown space, and for the thousands whose cooperation made his exploit possible, help us with our finite minds to see behind the bewildering universe in which Thou, great God, hast put us. Lift up our hearts to say, like our fathers in times past, "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God."

In this day, as man probes for expanded knowledge of space without, make real to us the universe within, and that there lies our fortune and our destiny—for there truth may walk in shining garments and goodness grow glorious, and beauty be beautiful, indeed.

Give us to see the empty futility of any attempt to export evil to some other star, when the same evil has spoiled so much of the music of life on this terrestrial ball. Make plain to all mankind that the kingdom all good and just men seek is within, and must be regnant there before the kingdom for which we pray can cover the earth.

May an abiding sense of Thy presence and guidance rest upon the President of this body, our Nation's Vice President, as he goes on his far journey to tell nations in confusion and commotion that America's might—material, moral, and spiritual—is pledged to men of good will everywhere who unite to insure a just world peace for our children and theirs.

We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PASTORE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 4, 1961, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1027) to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. METCALF subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 6713, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961, this day received from the House of Representatives, be considered as having been read twice; that it be referred to the Committee on Public Works, for the consideration by that committee of title I, the Federal-aid highway program; that when reported by that committee to the Senate, it be immediately referred to the Committee on Finance, for the consideration by that committee of title II, the Internal Revenue Code and highway trust amendments; and that when reported by the latter committee, the bill be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Montana request that the bill be immediately processed, without complying with the usual procedure?

Mr. METCALF. No. My request is that the bill be processed in the usual way by the two committees; that, first, the Committee on Public Works consider title I of the bill; that when the bill is reported by that committee to the Senate, it be immediately referred to the Committee on Finance, for its consideration of title II of the bill; and that when the bill is reported to the Senate by the latter committee, the bill be placed on the calendar. In other words, my request is that the bill be considered in the regular order, just as if there were two separate bills, and that thereafter the bill be placed on the calendar, to be available for consideration by the Senate.

Let me say that this request is concurred in by the chairmen of both of the committees.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the request the approval of the chairman of the Finance Committee?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

As in legislative session, and by unanimous consent, the following routine legislative business was transacted:

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors, of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF BATTLESHIP TO STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of the battleship *North Carolina* to the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the month of February 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, RELATING TO MASS TRANSPORTATION IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., transmitting recommendations of that Commission, relating to mass transportation in metropolitan areas (with

an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

WAIVER OF COLLECTION OF CERTAIN ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS MADE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A letter from the Executive Director, the American Society of International Law, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the financial transaction of that society, for the period April 1, 1960, to March 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 30

"Joint resolution relative to the Camp Matthews Marine Corps rifle range

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California is deeply interested in the development of a general campus of the University of California at San Diego surrounding the present site of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography; and

"Whereas the land comprising the marine training center at Camp Matthews, now held by the Federal Government, is necessary for the complete development of this new campus; and

"Whereas plans have been proposed to transfer the activities of Camp Matthews to the marine base at Camp Pendleton; and

"Whereas, under the current program for the transfer, the work and the cost are being spread over 2 fiscal years commencing with 1962; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the change be made more rapidly if possible, and that the present rifle range site at Camp Matthews be made available for development as part of the University of California campus in that area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States to accelerate the program to transfer the activities of Camp Matthews to Camp Pendleton by increasing the proposed appropriation of $6.1 million to the total estimated cost of $12.5 million for the 1962 fiscal year, and to enact legislation to authorize the transfer of the rifle range site at Camp Matthews to the board of regents of the University of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 32

"Joint resolution relative to an international exposition in 1966

"Whereas, in the past, four international expositions have been held in California, two in San Diego and two in San Francisco, but none in Los Angeles; and

"Whereas no more fitting and appropriate site than the modern, dynamic Los Angeles area could be named for an exposition dedicated to the unity of the peoples of all nations and the dignity of man, and to the promotion of trade and industry in our new age of space; and

"Whereas the consummation of an international exposition in Los Angeles in 1966 will bring renown, prestige, and innumerable economic advantages to our entire State, and particularly to the Los Angeles area; and

"Whereas no greater contribution to peace and international good will could be made than to demonstrate to the world that the people of the State of California are dedicating the next 5 years to the preparation and consummation of the greatest exhibition of peaceful pursuits ever held in the history of the world: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to designate Los Angeles County as the site of an international exposition in 1966; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution shall not be construed to commit, nor to imply that a commitment may be forthcoming from, the State of California, or any agency or political subdivision thereof, for any financial support, contributions, or assistance for such international exposition; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 43

"Whereas Hawaii occupies a uniquely pivotal position in United States-Pacific relations, commercially as well as culturally, because of the location, the history, the ethnic composition and the enviable high level of human relations in this 50th State; and

"Whereas the groundwork for a great educational facility for the advancement of East-West understanding in the form of the East-West Center having been laid, it is now timely and desirable to advance a parallel institution to promote closer East-West commercial and business ties in bulwarking the cause of freedom; and

"Whereas the proposal for the establishment on Sand Island, in Hawaii, by the Federal Government, of a Pacific International House and Trade Mart has been advanced by Lorrin P. Thurston, president of the Advertiser Publishing Co., Ltd., and other leaders; and

"Whereas this proposed trade center would undertake to help the businessmen of the entire Pacific area by providing facilities for complete merchandise display areas located in suitable and beautiful permanent buildings, featuring every product of the workers of the entire Pacific area; and

"Whereas to expedite the buying and selling of this merchandise in Hawaii's friendly environment, assistance in the currency, language, shipping, legal, and the many other problems would be cheerfully furnished by outstanding experts; and

"Whereas the location of a Pacific International House here in Hawaii—the bridge between the United States and the countries of the Pacific—would be of the greatest service in cutting costs and travel time of both buyers and sellers; and

"Whereas this service, if provided by the U.S. Government, would be of inestimable value in stimulating the business of the Pacific area by helping to create a greater market for its merchandise, with resulting favorable effects in the well-being of businessmen, their employees and their dependents; and

"Whereas by furnishing such universal Pacific trade stimulation, the United States would be placed in the position of being a real friend to the businessmen of the Pacific, a service which through lack of a convenient location no other Nation nor State of the United States could render in a comparable manner; and

"Whereas no such cooperation in such a scale has ever been offered before by the Nation; and

"Whereas in the last session of Congress a bill was introduced by U.S. Representative DANIEL INOUYE requesting a State Department study and a report to Congress on such a project and the feasibility of the establishment on Sand Island, and a similar bill has been introduced at this session of Congress by U.S. Senator OREN E. LONG and the concept also has the support of U.S. Senator HIRAM FONG; and

"Whereas Sand Island could be devoted to no greater service to the State of Hawaii or to the United States and the lands of the Pacific: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the first State legislature, general session (the senate concurring), That this honorable legislature place itself on record as highly commending this project, as being in accord with Hawaii's responsibility of fully measuring up to the challenge of statehood, and as wholeheartedly urging the Congress of the United States to authorize the requested study in the belief that through Federal underwriting of the costs of the establishment and operation of such a Pacific International House, material goodwill, understanding and friendship could be achieved in the Pacific area and the cause of world peace thereby served; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of State, U.S. Representatives Daniel Inouye, U.S. Senator Oren E. Long, U.S. Senator Hiram L. Fong, and Gov. William F. Quinn."

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Denton, Tex., favoring the construction of a postal substation in Denton; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by chapter 14, Disabled American Veterans, Department of

Texas, San Antonio, Tex., relating to the location of a new Veterans' Administration building, San Antonio; to the Committee on Public Works.

COMMUNIST THREAT IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] I present a resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing Congress to take positive steps immediately to alleviate the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere. I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONGRESS TO TAKE POSITIVE STEPS IMMEDIATELY TO ALLEVIATE THE COMMUNIST THREAT IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Whereas the general assembly, as representatives of the people of the State of South Carolina, has become genuinely alarmed over the situation now existing in Cuba which presents a clear and present threat to the security of this Nation and the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas we view with great concern the apparent growth of communism and particularly the establishing of a communistically controlled government on the island of Cuba only 90 miles from our shores; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that no expense and no effort should be spared in militantly guarding the security of our Republic and preserving the rights and freedoms of its people; and

Whereas we believe that this Nation has too long viewed the situation with extreme apathy, which attitude, if continued, could bring us to the brink of ruin; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that the Communist dictators should be brought to understand once and for all that the United States will take whatever action necessary, no matter how great the sacrifice, to insure the security of our Nation and carry out the intent and purpose of the Monroe Doctrine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the President of the United States and the Congress are memorialized to take immediate and positive action to insure the security of our Nation at all cost and sacrifice and to eliminate the growing threat of communism in this hemisphere and in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from South Carolina.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FALLOUT SHELTER POLICY—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations adopted a resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning "the establishment of a prompt and affirmative policy" regarding fallout shelters.

In view of the critical nature of our times and of the desirability of being prepared for a possible nuclear attack and withstanding it, on behalf of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be included in the RECORD.

Mr. President, this resolution also stresses the importance of our having an adequately federally supported nationwide program of civil defense training.

I am pleased to note that my fellow Rhode Islanders have expressed concern about these most important questions.

On behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I present the resolution, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 113

Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the establishment of a prompt and affirmative policy encouraging and assisting the citizens of the United States in constructing fallout protection shelters in the event of a nuclear attack

Whereas the Governors' Conference meeting in San Juan, P.R., in 1959 urged responsible officials at all levels of government to take immediate steps to encourage and assist people to prepare themselves for survival from nuclear attacks, by the construction of fallout shelters; and

Whereas a special committee on civil defense of the Governors' Conference in January 1960, reported that fallout protection for all citizens is a prompt reality; and

Whereas in June of 1960 the Governors' Conference, meeting in Montana urged that protective steps be taken by and for the people of every State and asked that the Federal Government take further supporting action; and

Whereas the health, the safety and the survival of the individual citizen is a matter of paramount State and National concern: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations now respectfully request the President and the Congress of the United States to make prompt and effective fallout protection for all of the citizens of the United States a declared national policy and to support State, local and individual efforts by measures, among other things, providing income tax deductions for the cost of shelters up to $100 per planned shelter occupant, appropriate funds for fallout protection in all existing and future Federal buildings, making fallout protection mandatory in all construction built with Federal funds or financed by Federal loans or guarantees, and direct the promulgation of a comprehensive nationwide program of nuclear protection, warning, and training; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby requested to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States in the earnest hope that each will use every endeavor to have favorable and prompt action taken hereon.

FIRE HAZARDS ON SOIL BANK LAND—RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the fire hazard that results when soil bank land is left completely untended and not clipped is a matter of serious concern in many counties of Wisconsin. The logical solution in many of these areas is to create firebreaks, which will prevent a possible fire from spreading during the months when much of the vegetation is tinder dry.

Recently the Brown County, Wis., Board of Supervisors enacted a formal resolution asking that future soil bank contracts require the establishment of fire prevention breaks.

Because of the importance of this problem, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable Chairman and Members of the Brown County Board of Supervisors:

Whereas many soil bank acres, grown up into tall matured grass and other vegetative growth, present a fire hazard during the spring and fall months; and

Whereas many of the rural areas are not too well equipped with fire fighting equipment; and

Whereas human lives, many farm buildings and fire equipment are endangered by fires from grass areas immediately adjacent to these buildings; and

Whereas considerable acreage of wildlife habitat and area, tree-planted areas and forest land are endangered by these potential fire hazards on soil bank lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That—

1. A stipulation be included in future soil bank contracts that would require the establishment of fire prevention breaks according to the following specifications:

(a) Areas shall be disked at least once between August 15 and September 15 of each year. All land that was considered cropland at the time the farm was put into the soil bank shall be protected by a disked firebreak at least 50 feet in width, this firebreak being on the outside perimeter of the land in the soil bank.

(b) A firebreak of at least 50 feet in width shall be maintained by disking around all buildings, regardless of whether these buildings are on land in the soil bank or on adjoining lands.

(c) A firebreak shall also be maintained by disking at least 50 feet in width around woodlots and woods, tree-planted areas, or wildlife developed areas.

2. The county ASC committee be requested to contact all present owners of soil bank land, and ask them to comply with the above fire prevention measures.

3. That copies of this resolution be sent to the county agricultural, stabilization, and

conservation committee, the State ASC office, all members representing this area in the State legislature, and all Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen in the U.S. Legislature.

Respectfully submitted.

CECIL J. DEPEA,
HENRY MATHEYS,
MYRON LOTT,
CLETUS VANDERPERVA,
Committee on Agriculture, Reforestation and Conservation.

RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Mid-Winter Conference of the Wisconsin Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars adopted a formal resolution in support of the establishment of a Wisconsin moraine park, as a national park. They expressed support for the proposed Ice Age National Park, using the Kettle Moraine State Park as a nucleus.

I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING ESTABLISHMENT OF WISCONSIN MORAINE PARK

Whereas the Department of Wisconsin, Veterans of Foreign Wars, has previously gone on record in favor of legislation as well as other means, to create a national park in Wisconsin, from the meandering glacial moraines located in some 26 counties of the State, the nucleus of this area being the Kettle Moraine State Park; and

Whereas it proposed that this park shall be named, Ice Age National Park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Wisconsin, That we again go on record to enthusiastically support this project; and that we urge our representatives in Congress, the Wisconsin Legislature, county and municipal boards, to work cooperatively toward the conclusion of this proposal.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1183. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses (Rept. No. 204).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1813. A bill to extend for 4 years the period within which the Federal Government may enter into agreements with the States for controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays and devices adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to increase from one-half to 1 percent the incentive payment under such agreements; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1814. A bill to provide for the free importation of monofilament gill nets for use in fish sampling; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 1815. A bill to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1816. A bill for the relief of Elinor Tio Salcedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1817. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1818. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1819. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1820. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1821. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $35,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Blue Ridge Parkway at Tennessee Ball or Beech Gap Southwest and running into the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1822. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HRUSKA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. COTTON):

S.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to present a medal to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections; and

S.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy test qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above joint resolutions, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RESOLUTION

COMMENDATION OF COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD FOR HIS SUCCESSFUL SPACE FLIGHT

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. HUMPHREY) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 140) highly commending Comdr. Alan B. Shepard for his successful space flight, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY BILLBOARD REGULATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the objectives of the 41,000-mile Federal Interstate Highway System program is to bring into existence a nationwide road network built essentially to uniform standards. However, unless action is taken by this Congress to extend the billboard control features of the Federal Highway Act, the sought-after uniformity will not be possible.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act, under provisions adopted in 1958, specifies July 1, 1961, as the date by which the several States and the Secretary of Commerce must conclude agreements so the States can qualify for the one-half percent bonus for fulfilling the national policy for billboard control. According to information I have received from the Bureau of Public Roads, only the State of Maryland has fully qualified thus far for the bonus. Eight other States have passed laws which may qualify them for participation. These States are Connecticut, Kentucky, New York, North Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Washington, and Virginia.

Bills dealing with billboard control have been before legislatures in Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, and Vermont. These and other States may act on the matter prior to the deadline date; but it now appears that 23 States or more will not have acted by that time.

President Kennedy has urged that the billboard control section be extended for 4 more years, and the amount of the incentive bonus increased to 1 percent. A portion of the President's message of February 28, 1961, on the Federal pay-as-you-go highway program reads as follows:

The Interstate Highway System was intended, among other purposes, to enable more Americans to more easily see more of their country. It is a beautiful country. The system was not intended to provide a large and unreimbursed measure of benefits to the billboard industry, whose structures tend to detract from both the beauty and the safety of the routes they line. Their messages are not, as so often claimed, primarily for the convenience of the motorist whose view they block. Some two-thirds of such advertising is for national products, and is dominated by a handful of large advertisers to whom the Interstate System has provided a great windfall.

The Congress took a wise though very modest step in 1958 by authorizing, through section 122 of the 1958 act, the control of outdoor advertising within designated limits of the routes of the Interstate System. States electing to comply with the Federal standards promulgated under the section were to receive an incentive payment of an extra one-half of 1 percent of the cost of interstate highway projects within the State.

Unfortunately that provision expires on June 30 of this year, and a variety of pressures has prevented all but one State (Maryland) from taking advantage of this provision. I urge the Congress to extend this billboard control section for 4 more years; and to increase the incentive bonus from one-half of 1 percent of a State's allotment. Should this measure still prove to be insufficient, it may be necessary to adopt more direct means of control, or to at least charge the billboard owners for the benefits they are receiving.

Extension of the billboard control provision is necessary, lest the highway system created by expenditure of $41 billion of public funds end up as a hodgepodge, with billboard jungles intermingled with scenic roadways. The States must be given every reasonable opportunity to enact legislation needed to qualify under the Federal standards for signboard regulation.

To carry out the President's program, I introduce, for myself, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], a bill to extend for 4 years the period within which the Federal Government may enter into agreements with the States for controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to increase from one-half to 1 percent the incentive payment under such agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1813) to extend for 4 years the period within which the Federal Government may enter into agreements with the States for controling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to increase from one-half to 1 percent the incentive payments under such agreements, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last September then Senator, now President, Kennedy asked Representatives EMANUEL CELLER and me to prepare civil rights bills embodying the civil rights commitments of the 1960 Democratic platform.

This we have done.

Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, six proposals designed to implement the pledges contained in the civil rights plank of the Democratic platform.

The measures include the following:

First. A constitutional amendment to eliminate payment of poll taxes as a requirement of voting in Federal elections, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Second. A constitutional amendment to eliminate literacy tests as a requirement for voting, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Third. A bill to require every school board operating a racially segregated public school to adopt a desegregation plan within 6 months of the date of enactment of the bill and to file the plan with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The plan would state how the board intended to achieve desegregation with all deliberate speed in each of its schools and include a schedule showing the time and the manner in which desegregation would be achieved in each class and school. To meet the requirements of the act, the plan would have to provide for first-step compliance not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year. Technical and financial assistance would be given under the bill to desegregating school districts, and court enforcement would be authorized in the cases of school boards which violated the duties set forth in the act.

I ask to have this bill referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Fourth. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to initiate civil injunction suits in the Federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil right on grounds of race, creed, or color, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Fifth. A fair employment practice bill to provide administrative and court remedies for those persons discriminated against as a result of race or color. The bill would make it an unfair employment practice for any business or labor union employing more than 50 persons to discriminate in its hiring, promoting, or firing practices on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Sixth. A bill to make the Civil Rights Commission, which is due to expire on September 9, 1961, a permanent Federal agency with strengthened fact-finding powers and a new directive to act as a national clearinghouse for civil rights information, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

We have received invaluable assistance in the drafting of these proposals from civil rights experts who testified before our committee last fall and constitutional law experts in the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

One of the Nation's primary goals in the sixties must be to assure to each American his full constitutional rights and to make equal opportunity a living reality. The achievement of this goal requires both executive and legislative action. President Kennedy has already taken a number of far-reaching steps to promote civil rights, particularly in the field of equal job opportunity in Government employment and in Government contract work.

Mr. President, on Saturday the Attorney General made a stirring address on civil rights in Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ROBERT KENNEDY'S ADDRESS IN GEORGIA ON CIVIL RIGHTS

For the first time since becoming Attorney General, over 3 months ago, I am making a formal speech, and I am proud that it is in Georgia.

Two months ago, I had the very great honor to present to the President Donald Eugene McGregor of Brunswick, Ga. Donald McGregor came to Washington to receive the Young American Medal for bravery. In 12 bad hours, he led a family of four to safety from a yacht which broke up in high seas off the Georgia coast.

He impressed all of us who met him with his quiet courage. And, as the President said, Donald McGregor is a fine young American—one of a long line of Georgians who have, by their courage, set an outstanding example for their fellow Americans.

They have told me that when you speak in Georgia, you should try to tie yourself to Georgia and the South, and even better, claim some Georgia kinfolk. There are a lot of Kennedys in Georgia. But as far as I can tell, I have no relatives here and no direct ties to Georgia, except one. This State gave my brother the biggest percentage majority of any State in the Union and in this last election that was even better than kinfolk.

PRESIDENT QUOTED

We meet at this great university, in this old State, the fourth of the Original Thirteen, to observe Law Day.

In his proclamation urging us to observe this day, the President emphasized two thoughts. He pointed out that to remain free the people must "cherish their freedoms, understand the responsibilities they entail, and nurture the will to preserve them." He then went on to point out that law is the strongest link between man and freedom.

I wonder in how many countries of the world people think of law as the link between man and freedom. We know that in many, law is the instrument of tyranny, and people think of law as little more than the will of the state, or the party, not of the people.

And we know too that throughout the long history of mankind, man has had to struggle to create a system of law and of government in which fundamental freedoms would be linked with the enforcement of justice. We know that we cannot live together without rules which tell us what is right and what is wrong. What is permitted and what is prohibited. We know that it is law which enables men to live together, that creates order out of chaos. We know that law is the glue that holds civilization together.

And, we know that if one man's rights are denied, the rights of all are endangered. In our country the courts have a most important role in safeguarding these rights. The decisions of the courts, however much we might disagree with them, in the final analysis must be followed and respected. If we disagree with a court decision and, thereafter, irresponsibly assail the court and defy its rulings, we challenge the foundations of our society.

STATE COURT'S VIEW

The Supreme Court of Georgia set forth this proposition quite clearly in 1949 in the case of *Crumb* v. *The State* (205 Ga. 547–552). The court, referring to U.S. Supreme Court decisions, said there and I quote:

"And whatever may be the individual opinion of the members of this court as to the correctness, soundness, and wisdom of these decisions, it becomes our duty to yield thereto just as the other courts of this State must accept and be controlled by the decisions and mandates of this court. This being a government of law and not by men, the jury commissioners in their official conduct are bound by the foregoing ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States, notwithstanding any personal opinion, hereditary instinct, natural impulse or geographical tradition to the contrary."

Respect for the law—in essence that is the meaning of Law Day—and every day must be Law Day or else our society will collapse.

The challenge which international communism hurls against the rule of law is very great. For the past 2 weeks I have been engaged for a good part of my time in working with General Taylor, Admiral Burke, and Mr. Dulles to assess the recent events in Cuba and determine what lessons we can learn for the future.

It already has become crystal clear in our study, as the President has stated so graphically, we must reexamine and reorient our forces of every kind—not just for our military forces, but all our techniques and outlook here in the United States.

We must come forward with the answer of how a nation, devoted to freedom and individual rights and respect for the law, can stand effectively against an implacable enemy who plays by different rules and knows only the law of the jungle. With the answer to this rests our future—our destiny—as a nation and as a people.

The events of the last few weeks have demonstrated that the time has long since passed when the people of the United States can be apathetic about their belief and respect for the law and about the necessity of placing our own house in order. As we turn to meet our enemy, to look him full in the face, we cannot afford feet of clay or an arm of glass.

Let me speak to you about three major areas of difficulty within the purview of my responsibilities that sap our national strength, that weaken our people, that require our immediate attention.

In too many major communities of our country, organized crime has become big business. It knows no State lines. It drains off millions of dollars of our national wealth, infecting legitimate businesses, labor unions, and even sports. Tolerating organized crime promotes the cheap philosophy that everything is a racket. It promotes cynicism among adults. It contributes to the confusion of the young and to the increase of juvenile delinquency.

It is not the gangster himself who is of concern. It is what he is doing to our cities, our communities, our moral fiber. Ninety percent of the major racketeers would be out of business by the end of this year if the ordinary citizen, the businessman, the union official and the public authority stood up to be counted and refused to be corrupted.

This is a problem for all America, not just the FBI or the Department of Justice. Unless the basic attitude changes here in this country, the rackets will prosper and grow. Of this I am convinced.

The racketeers, after all, are professional criminals. But, there are the amateurs—men who have law-abiding backgrounds and respectable positions, who, nevertheless, break the law of the land. We have been particularly concerned lately in the Department of Justice about the spread of illegal price fixing. I would say to you, however, it is merely symptomatic of many other practices commonly accepted in business life.

Our investigations show that in an alarming number of areas the country, businessmen have conspired in secret to fix prices, made collusive deals with union officials, defrauded their customers and even in some instances cheated their own government.

Our enemies assert that capitalism enslaves the worker and will destroy itself. It is our national faith that the system of competitive enterprise offers the best hope for individual freedom, social development, and economic growth.

Thus, every businessman who cheats on his taxes, fixes prices or underpays his labor, every union official who makes a collusive deal, misuses union funds, damages the free enterprise system in the eyes of the world and does a disservice to the millions of honest Americans in all walks of life.

Where we have evidence of violation of laws by these "respectables," we will take action against the individuals involved, as well as against their companies. But in the end, this also is not a situation which can be cured by the Department of Justice. It can be cured only by the businesses and unions themselves.

The third area is the one that affects us all the most directly—civil rights.

The hardest problems of all in law enforcement are those involving a conflict of law and local customs. History has recorded many occasions when the moral sense of a nation produced judicial decisions, such as the 1954 decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which required difficult local adjustments.

I have many friends in the U.S. Senate who are southerners. Many of these friendships stem from my work as counsel for the Senate Rackets Committee, headed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, for whom I have the greatest admiration and affection.

If these southern friends of mine are representative southerners—and I believe they are—I do not pretend that they believe with me on everything or that I agree with them on everything. But, knowing them as I do, I am convinced of this:

POLICIES OUTLINED

Southerners have a special respect for candor and plain talk. They don't like hypocrisy. So, in discussing this third major problem, I must tell you candidly what our policies are going to be in the field of civil rights and why I come to you in that spirit.

First let me say this: The time has long since arrived when loyal Americans must measure the impact of their actions beyond the limits of their own towns or States. For instance, we must be quite aware of the fact that 50 percent of the countries in the United Nations are not white; that around the world, in Africa, South America, and Asia, people whose skins are a different color than ours are on the move to gain their measure of freedom and liberty.

From the Congo to Cuba, from South Vietnam to Algiers, in India, Brazil, and Iran, men and women and children are straightening their backs and listening—to the evil promises of Communist tyranny and the honorable promises of Anglo-American liberty. And those people will decide not only their own future but ours—how the cause of freedom fares in the world.

In the United Nations we are striving to establish a rule of law instead of a rule of force. In that forum and elsewhere around the world our deeds will speak for us.

In the worldwide struggle, the graduation at this university of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes will without question aid and assist the fight against Communist political infiltration and guerrilla warfare.

When parents send their children to school this fall in Atlanta, peaceably and in accordance with the rule of law, barefoot Burmese and Congolese will see before their eyes Americans living by the rule of law.

CONFLICT UNDERSTANDABLE

The conflict of views over the original decision in 1954 and our recent move in Prince Edward County, Va., is understandable. The decision in 1954 required action of the most difficult, delicate, and complex nature, going to the very heart of southern institutions.

I know a little of this. I live in Virginia. I studied law at the University of Virginia. I have been privileged to know many able southern soldiers, scholars, lawyers, jurists, journalists, and political leaders who have enriched our national life. From them I have drawn some understanding of the South, but my knowledge is nothing to yours.

It is now being said, however, that the Department of Justice is attempting to close all public schools in Virginia because of the Prince Edward situation. This is simply not true, nor is the Prince Edward suit a threat against local control.

We are maintaining the orders of the courts. We are doing nothing more and nothing less. And if any one of you were in my position you would do likewise, for it would be required by your oath of office. You might not want to do it, you might not like to do it, but you would do it, because it would be required.

For I cannot believe that anyone can support a principle which prevents more than a thousand of our children in one county from attending public school—especially when this step was taken to circumvent the orders of the Court.

Our position is quite clear. We are upholding the law. Our action does not threaten local control. The Federal Government would not be running the schools in Prince Edward County any more than it is running the University of Georgia or the schools in my State of Massachusetts.

In this case, in all cases, I say to you today that if the orders of the Court are circumvented, the Department of Justice will act.

We will not stand by and be aloof. We will move.

Here on this campus, not half a year ago, you endured a difficult ordeal. And when your moment of truth came, the voices crying "force" were overridden by the voices pleading for reason.

GEORGIANS SALUTED

And for this, I pay my respects to your Governor, your legislature and most particularly to you, the students and faculty of the University of Georgia. And I say that you are the wave of the future—not those who cry panic. For the country's future you will and must prevail.

I happen to believe that the 1954 decision was right. But, my belief does not matter—it is now the law. Some of you may believe the decision was wrong. That does not matter. It is the law. And we both respect the law. By facing this problem honorably, you have shown to all the world that we Americans are moving forward together—solving this problem—under the rule of law.

An integral part of all this is that we make a total effort to guarantee the ballot to every American of voting age—in the North as well as in the South. The right to vote is the easiest of all rights to grant. The spirit of our democracy, the letter of our Constitution and our laws require that there be no further delay in the achievement of full freedom to vote for all. Our system depends upon the fullest participation of all its citizens.

The problem between the white and colored people is a problem for all sections of the United States. And, as I have said before, I believe there has been a great deal of hypocrisy in dealing with it. In fact, I found when I came to the Depart-

ment of Justice that I need look no further to find evidence of this.

I found that very few Negroes were employed above a custodial level. There were 950 lawyers working in the Department of Justice in Washington and only 10 of them were Negroes. At the same moment the lawyers of the Department of Justice were bringing legal action to end discrimination, the same discrimination was being practiced within the Department itself.

At a recent review for the visiting leader of a new African state, there was only one Negro in the guard of honor. At the Bureau of the Budget, Negroes were used only for custodial work.

The Federal Government is taking steps to correct this.

Financial leaders from the East who deplore discrimination in the South belong to institutions where no Negroes or Jews are allowed and their children attend private schools where no Negro students are enrolled. Union officials criticize southern leaders and yet practice discrimination within their unions. Government officials belong to private clubs in Washington where Negroes, including Ambassadors, are not welcomed even at mealtime.

My firm belief is that if we are to make progress in this area, if we are to be truly great as a nation, then we must make sure that nobody is denied an opportunity because of race, creed or color. We pledge, by example, to take action in our own backyard—the Department of Justice—we pledge to move to protect the integrity of the courts in the administration of justice. In all this, we ask your help—we need your assistance.

I come to you today and I shall come to you in the years ahead to advocate reason and the rule of law.

It is in this spirit that since taking office I have conferred many times with responsible public officials and civic leaders in the South and continue to do so. I don't expect them always to agree with my view of what the law requires, but I believe they share my respect for the law. We are trying to achieve amicable, voluntary solutions without going to court. These discussions have ranged from voting and school cases to incidents of arrest which might lead to violence.

We have sought to be helpful to avert violence and to get voluntary compliance. When our investigations indicate there has been a violation of law, we have asked responsible officials to take steps themselves to correct the situation. In some instances this has happened. When it has not, we have had to take legal action.

The conversations have been devoid of bitterness or hate. They have been carried on with mutual respect, understanding, and good will. National unity is essential and before taking any legal action, we will where appropriate invite the southern leaders to make their views known in these cases.

We, the American people, must avoid another Little Rock or another New Orleans. We cannot afford them. It is not only that such incidents do incalculable harm to the children involved and to the relations among people. It is not only that such convulsions seriously undermine respect for law and order and cause serious economic and moral damage. Such incidents hurt our country in the eyes of the world. We just can't afford another Little Rock or another New Orleans.

For on this generation of Americans falls the full burden of proving to the world that we really mean it when we say all men are created free and are equal before the law. All of us might wish at times that we lived in a more tranquil world, but we don't. And if our times are difficult and perplexing, so are they challenging and filled with opportunity.

To the South, perhaps more than any other section of the country, has been given the opportunity and the challenge and the responsibility of demonstrating America at its greatest—at its full potential of liberty under law.

WILL ENFORCE STATUTES

You may ask: Will we enforce the civil rights statutes?

The answer is: Yes, we will.

We also will enforce the antitrust laws, the antiracketeering laws, the laws against kidnaping, and robbing Federal banks, and transporting stolen automobiles across State lines, the illicit traffic in narcotics, and all the rest.

We can and will do no less.

I hold a constitutional office of the U.S. Government, and I shall perform the duty I have sworn to undertake—to enforce the law, in every field of law and every region.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, regardless of present legislative priorities, the time will come in the not too distant future when the Congress will enact these civil rights measures. In the meantime, we shall do our utmost to push for prompt hearings and favorable reports to both Houses on the bills I have introduced today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the measures I am introducing today may be printed in the RECORD, together with brief statements summarizing them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolutions and bills will be received and will be referred as suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania; and, without objection, the bills and statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolutions and bills, introduced by Mr. CLARK, were received, read twice by their titles, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and the said article shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualifications.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy test qualifications for electors in Federal elections.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and the said article shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State by reason of failure to pass any literacy test.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The summary accompanying Senate Joint Resolutions 81 and 82 is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-CELLER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS TO ELIMINATE LITERACY TESTS AND THE PAYMENT OF POLL TAXES AS REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING

The first two pledges in the civil rights plank of the 1960 Democratic Party platform promise the removal of literacy tests and poll tax payments as requirements for voting:

"We will support whatever action is necessary to eliminate literacy tests and the payment of poll taxes as requirements for voting."

Two constitutional amendments proposed by Senator CLARK and Congressman CELLER would carry out these pledges.

The first would prohibit the denial or abridgment by the United States or any State of the right of citizens of the United States to vote in any Federal election "by reason of failure to pass any literacy test." Nineteen States now require that voters demonstrate their literacy according to data compiled by the Civil Rights Commission in its 1959 report, in which Chairman Hannah and Commissioners Hesburgh and Johnson joined in recommending the elimination of literacy test passage as a requirement for voting in Federal elections by enactment of a constitutional amendment. In the report the Commissioners stated:

"In its investigations, hearings and studies the Commission has seen that complex voter-qualification laws, including tests of literacy, education, and interpretation, have been used and may readily be used arbitrarily to deny the right to vote to citizens of the United States."

The second Clark-Celler amendment would forbid the denial or abridgment of the right to vote in Federal elections "by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification." The amendment, which would make unconstitutional the poll tax laws now in force in five States, is identical in form to the amendment which passed the Senate by a vote of 72 to 16 on February 2, 1960.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1617. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public School Desegregation Act".

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. As used in this Act—

(a) "Desegregation" means the assign- of all students to public schools irrespective of their race or color. No assignment system in which race or color is a factor in the initial assignment of students to particular

public schools shall be deemed to have achieved desegregation even though placement or other tests or transfers or other options may be available to change such assignment.

(b) "Public school" means any elementary or secondary educational institution operated by a State, subdivision of a State or governmental agency within a State, or operated principally or substantially from or through the use of governmental funds, or funds derived from a governmental source.

(c) "School board" means any agency or agencies, the members, agents and employees thereof, and any other person or persons, authorized to determine, control, or direct the institutions, structures or places at which particular students are assigned to or attend public school.

(d) First-step compliance means the affording of desegregated education to a substantial number of students at each public school within the jurisdiction of the school board, not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year.

TITLE II—DUTY TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT DESEGREGATION PLANS

SEC. 201. Every school board which, on the date of the enactment of this Act, has failed to achieve desegregation in all public schools within its jurisdiction, shall adopt a desegregation plan as provided in section 202 and shall file said plan, within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SEC. 202. Every desegregation plan required under section 201 shall:

(1) provide for achieving desegregation in all public schools within the jurisdiction of the school board with all deliberate speed, pursuant to a schedule setting forth the time when and the manner in which desegregation is to be achieved for each class, grade, school and district within the jurisdiction of the school board involved; and

(2) provide for at least first-step compliance not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year.

SEC. 203. Every school board required to adopt a desegregation plan pursuant to section 201 shall forthwith implement the same in accordance with its terms immediately upon its adoption and thereafter continue its implementation in good faith and with all deliberate speed until desegregation is fully achieved in all public schools within its jurisdiction.

SEC. 204. Whenever any school board subject to the requirements of this title loses or relinquishes any of its authority over public schools formerly within its jurisdiction or its authority to assign students to schools within its jurisdiction, the duties prescribed in this Act shall immediately devolve upon the person or persons to whom such authority has been transferred or relinquished.

SEC. 205. Wherever, because of overlapping or complementary jurisdiction, more than one school board is subject to the requirements of this title with respect to the same schools or students, the boards concerned shall exercise their obligations hereunder jointly.

SEC. 206. The requirements of this title shall not apply to any public school which, on the date of enactment of this Act, is subject to a court order providing for or approving a desegregation plan for the said school.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

SEC. 301. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall upon application render technical assistance to school boards by such means as he deems appropriate in the preparation, adoption and implementation of desegregation plans required by this title. Technical assistance may include, but shall not be limited to, such matters as the assembling, publishing and distributing of information, including successful case histories of desegregation, the planning, calling and holding of conferences, the appointment of advisory councils and the assisting by such other means as the Secretary deems appropriate of progress toward desegregation in the public schools of the Nation.

TITLE IV—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

SEC. 401. Every plan submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to section 201 of this Act shall be reviewed by the Secretary to determine whether it conforms with the requirements of this Act. Whenever the Secretary determines that a desegregation plan submitted to him meets the requirements of this Act, he is authorized for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of any such desegregation plan and upon receipt of application therefor to make grants to school boards, States, municipalities, school districts and other governmental units to assist in meeting costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for the implementation of such desegregation plan. Grants may be made under this section for:

(1) the cost of employing additional schoolteachers.

(2) the cost of giving to teachers and other school personnel inservice training in dealing with problems incident to desegregation;

(3) the cost of employing specialists in problems incident to desegregation and of providing other assistance to develop understanding by parents, schoolchildren, and the general public of desegregation in order to reduce the possibility of community hostility or resistance to such desegregation;

(4) the cost of replacement of funds to schools or schoolteachers withheld because such schools or schoolteachers have undertaken or may undertake desegregation;

(5) the cost of construction, enlargement, or alteration of school facilities when the Secretary finds that lack or inadequacy of existing facilities makes the carrying out of a desegregation plan impracticable or materially more difficult; and

(6) other costs directly related to the process of eliminating segregation in public schools.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is further authorized for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of desegregation in accordance with any court-approved desegregation plan not subject to the requirements of title II of this Act, to make grants to school boards, States, municipalities, school districts and other governmental units to assist in meeting costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for the implementation of such desegregation plan in the same manner and for the same purposes as provided for in the foregoing section of this title.

SEC. 403. Each application made for a grant under this title shall provide such detailed breakdown of the measures for which financial assistance is sought as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. Each grant under this section shall be made in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, which may include a condition that the applicant expend certain of its own funds in specified amounts for the purpose for which the grant is made. In determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Secretary shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this section and the other applications which are pending before him; the financial condition of the applicant and the other resources available to it; the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation; and such other factors as he finds relevant.

SEC. 404. Payments of grants under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals as the Secretary may determine.

SEC. 405. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year in process at the date of enactment of this Act and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums, not exceeding $40 million for any fiscal year, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE V—ENFORCEMENT OF DUTY TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT DESEGREGATION PLANS

SEC. 501. In the event that a school board, or its successor as provided in section 204, subject to the requirements of title II of this Act has violated any of the obligations prescribed therein, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for in the name of the United States in the United States district court for the district weherein such school board or its successor is located or meets, a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief including an application for an injunction or other order, against such school board or its successor. The court wherein such action is instituted is authorized, upon finding that there has been a violation of title II of this Act, without limitation upon the grant of such other relief as may be appropriate under the circumstances, to require the school board or its successor (1) to adopt and implement a plan of school desegration pursuant to the requirements of title II of this Act, (2) to implement any other school desegregation plan which the court may find appropriate and consistent with the requirements of this Act, or (3) to issue such other orders and grant such other relief as will most expeditiously achieve first-step compliance and desegregation with all deliberate speed in the public schools under the jurisdiction of the school board or its successor.

SEC. 502. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over proceedings instituted under section 501 of this Act, and shall exercise the same without regard to whether any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law shall have been exhausted, and in a manner calculated to achieve desegregation in accordance with the requirements of this Act.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair any right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States or any remedies already existing for their protection or enforcement, nor to prevent any individual or private organization from acting to enforce or safeguard any constitutional right in any manner now or hereafter permitted by law.

SEC. 602. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 1817 is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-CELLER SCHOOL DESEGREGATION BILL

The 1960 Democratic Party platform promises legislative action to promote compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public education in these words:

"We believe that every school district affected by the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision should submit a plan providing for at least first-step compliance by 1963, the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

"To facilitate compliance, technical and financial assistance should be given to school districts facing special problems of transition."

The Clark-Celler bill seeks to fulfill the cited provisions of the platform by placing a duty on each school board which has failed to achieve desegregation for all students in the schools within its jurisdiction, to adopt a desegregation plan and file it with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare within 180 days of the date of enactment. To meet the requirements of the proposed law the plan would have to set forth a schedule showing the time and manner in which desegregation with all deliberate speed would be achieved for each class, grade, school and district within the jurisdiction of the Board, and provide for at least first-step compliance not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year. Technical and financial assistance would be provided for desegregating school districts. The Attorney General would be authorized to bring a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief against a school board failing to adopt or implement a desegregation plan as required in the proposed law.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF CLARK-CELLER BILL, ENTITLED "PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ACT"

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

Section 101(a): "Desegregation" is achieved only when race or color is completely eliminated as a factor in assigning students to public schools.

(b) "Public school" is defined to include any elementary or secondary school operated principally or substantially from or through the use of governmental funds, or funds derived from a governmental source.

(c) "School board" includes any agency or person that controls or directs the assignment of pupils to public schools.

(d) "First-step compliance" means the affording of desegregated education to a substantial number of students at each public school within the jurisdiction of the school board, not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year.

TITLE II—DUTY TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT DESEGREGATION PLANS

Section 201 requires every school board which, on the date of enactment of this act, has failed to achieve desegregation in all public schools within its jurisdiction to adopt a desegregation plan and file it within 180 days after enactment of this act with the Secretary of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Section 202: Such a desegregation plan must provide for two things:

1. A program of ultimate desegregation to be attained with all deliberate speed, pursuant to a schedule setting forth the time when and the manner in which desegregation is to be achieved for each class, grade, school and district within the jurisdiction of the school board, and

2. A program for "first-step compliance" not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year.

Section 203 requires every school board adopting a desegregation plan pursuant to this act to implement it in good faith and with all deliberate speed until desegregation is fully achieved in its district.

Section 204 provides that the duties required of a school board under this act shall devolve immediately upon any successor should the school board's authority be relinquished. This is aimed at obviating slowdowns resulting from the resignation of school boards or from the elimination of such boards. It means that any public body, local or State, that assumes control over local schools, can be made subject to the provisions of this bill.

Section 205 provides for the joint exercise of obligations under the bill by school boards, the jurisdiction of which might overlap. Prevents a situation arising where nothing would be done under this bill because neither of two school boards would desire to exercise its jurisdiction.

Section 206 provides that this bill shall not apply to any public school which on the date of enactment of this bill, is subject to a court order providing for or approving a desegregation plan for said school.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

Section 301 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, upon application therefor, to render technical assistance to school boards in preparing, adopting, or implementing desegregation plans required by this bill. Such assistance might include dissemination of information, appointment of advisory councils, the holding of conferences, etc.

TITLE IV—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

Section 401 requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review every desegregation plan filed under this bill to ascertain that it complies with the provisions of the bill. Permits the Secretary, in the case of such plans that qualify and upon application therefor, to make grants to school boards, States, etc., to assist in meeting costs which the Secretary determines to be reasonably necessary for the implementation of a desegregation plan. Grants can be made to meet the costs of (1) employing additional personnel such as teachers and community counselors, (2) in-service training programs for school personnel, (3) replacing funds withheld from schools or teachers by local or State authorities because of desegregation, (4) construction or alteration of school facilities, and (5) other costs directly related to the process of eliminating segregation.

Section 402 authorizes the Secretary to provide grants to school boards, States, etc., to assist in meeting costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for the implementation of court-approved desegregation plans not subject to the requirements of this bill.

Section 403 requires the Secretary to prescribe regulations governing the granting of funds under this title and requires each application for such a grant to conform to the requirements of the Secretary. Provides that the Secretary might require that a grant be conditioned upon the local authority contributing similarly of its own funds.

Sets forth criteria to guide the Secretary in making the grants funds available, financial condition of applicant, etc.

Section 404 provides that grants can be paid by way of reimbursement for expenses already undertaken by a school district, or in advance for expenses to be undertaken.

Section 405 authorizes the appropriation of $40 million each fiscal year to carry out the grant provisions.

TITLE V—ENFORCEMENT OF DUTY TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT DESEGREGATION PLANS

Section 501 provides that when a school board or its successor violates any of the obligations required by this bill (filing desegregation plans and implementing them), the U.S. Attorney General is authorized to institute in the local U.S. district court, in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief against such school board or its successor. Upon finding that there has been a violation of title II of this bill, the court may require the school board or its successor to adopt a school desegregation plan or to implement any other school desegregation plan which the court may find appropriate and consistent with the terms of this bill, or to issue such other orders or grant such other relief as will most expeditiously achieve first-step compliance and desegregation.

Section 502 provides that the jurisdiction of U.S. district courts shall extend to such proceedings regardless of whether administrative or other remedies provided by law have been exhausted.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 601 provides that nothing in the bill shall be construed to impair any right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws nor prevent individuals or private organizations from acting to enforce or safeguard any constitutional right or remedy.

Section 602: Saving clause in the event any provision is held invalid.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1818. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 123. (a)(1) Whenever the Attorney General receives a signed complaint that any person or group of persons is being deprived of, or is being threatened with the loss of, the right to the equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin, and the Attorney General certifies that, in his judgment, such person or group of persons is unable for any reason to seek effective legal protection for the right to the equal protection of the laws, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for an injunction or other order, against any individual or individuals who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or territory or subdivision or instrumentality thereof, deprives or threatens to deprive such person or group of persons of the right to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin and against any individual or individuals acting in concert with them.

"(2) A person or group of persons shall be deemed unable to seek effective legal protection for the right to the equal protection of the laws within the meaning of paragraph (1) of this subsection not only when such person or group of persons is financially unable to bear the expenses of the litigation, but also when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation would jeopardize the employment or economic standing of, or might result in injury or economic damage to, such person or group of persons or their families or their property.

"(b) The Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for injunction or other order, (1) against any person or persons preventing or hindering, or threatening to prevent or hinder, or conspiring to prevent or hinder, any Federal, State, or local official from according any person or group of persons the right to the equal protection of the laws without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin, or (2) against any person or persons preventing or hindering, or threatening to prevent or hinder, or conspiring to prevent or hinder the execution of any court order protecting the right to the equal protection of the laws without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(c) The Attorney General is authorized, upon receipt of a signed complaint, to institute for or in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proceeding for

preventive relief, including an application for injunction or other order, against any individual or individuals who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or territory or subdivision or instrumentality thereof, deprives or threatens to deprive any person or group of persons or associations of persons of any right guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution, because such person or group of persons or association of persons has opposed or opposes the denial of the equal protection of the laws to others because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(d) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted under this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party or parties aggrieved have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law. In any proceeding under this section the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person.

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General under existing law to institute, maintain, or intervene in any action or proceeding."

The summary accompanying Senate bill 1818 is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-CELLER BILL AUTHORIZING CIVIL RIGHTS SUITS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL

The fourth civil rights legislative pledge in the Democratic Party 1960 platform reads:

"For the protection of all—constitutional rights of Americans, the Attorney General should be empowered and directed to file civil injunction suits in Federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil right on grounds of race, creed, or color."

The Clark-Celler bill to implement this pledge amends part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 in the following respects:

(a) Gives the Attorney General upon signed complaint, in addition to all other rights which he now has, the right to institute a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an action for an injunction, on behalf of persons who are being deprived of, or threatened with the loss of the right to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, religion, or national origin and who are unable for any reason to seek effective legal protection for themselves;

(b) Provides that persons shall be deemed unable to seek effective legal protection not only when they are financially unable to bear the expenses of litigation, but also when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation would jeopardize the employment or economic standing of such persons or their families;

(c) Authorizes the Attorney General to bring an action for preventive relief against any persons preventing or hindering, or threatening or conspiring to prevent or hinder, any Federal, State or local official from according to any person equal protection of the laws without regard to race, color, religion or national origin, or the execution of any court order under the same conditions;

(d) Authorizes the Attorney General to institute an action against persons who under cover of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of any State or territory or subdivision thereof threaten to deprive any person of any right guaranteed by the 14th amendment to the Constitution because of race, color, religion or national origin; and

(e) Gives the district courts jurisdiction of such actions regardless of whether or not administrative or other remedies have been exhausted.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1819. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Fair Employment Practice Act".

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that large numbers of qualified persons in the United States are discriminated against in employment because of their race, color, religion, or national origin, and that such discrimination interferes with the normal flow of commerce and with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce. It is the purpose of this Act, in order to promote the full flow of commerce and the full production of articles and commodities for commerce, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and to provide administrative and court remedies for persons injured by such discrimination.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, or any organized group of persons and any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any territory or possession thereof.

(b) The term "employer" means a person engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ fifty or more individuals; any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any territory or possession thereof; and any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, or educational corporation or association, not organized for private profit. Such term includes, for purposes of the provisions of this Act relating to employers, a labor organization which has fifty or more individuals in its employ.

(c) The term "labor organization" means any organization, having fifty or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, wages, hours, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

(d) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any territory or possession; or between points in the same State but through any point outside thereof.

(e) The term "territory" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(f) The term "possession" means all possessions of the United States, and includes the trust territories which the United States holds as administering authority under the United Nations trusteeship system, and the Canal Zone, but excludes other places held by the United States by lease under international arrangements.

(g) The term "Commission" means the Fair Employment Practice Commission, created by section 6 hereof.

EXEMPTION

SEC. 4. This Act shall not apply to any employer with respect to the employment of aliens outside the several States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions.

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin; or

(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of equal employment opportunities, or would limit his employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment, or would affect adversely his wages, hours, or employment conditions, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin.

(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this Act.

THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, one for a term of three years, one for a term of four years, and one for a term of five years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of five years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission, and one member to serve as Vice Chairman. The Chairman shall be responsible on behalf of the Commission for the administrative operations of the Commission. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or disability of the Chairman or in the event of a vacancy in that office. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members thereof shall constitute a quorum.

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) The Commission shall, at the close of each fiscal year, make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President stating in detail its activities during such fiscal year, including the number and types of cases it has handled and the decisions it has rendered; and shall report to the President from time to time on the causes of and means of eliminating discrimination and make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $20,000 a year, except that

the Chairman shall receive a salary of $22,500 a year.

(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. Any such agent, other than a member of the Commission, designated to conduct a proceeding or a hearing shall be a resident of the judicial circuit, as defined in title 28, United States Code, section 41, within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred.

(g) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint, in accordance with the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such officers, agents, and employees, as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, to appoint, without regard to the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such attorneys as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix the compensation of such officers, agents, employees, and attorneys in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(2) to cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies;

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States;

(4) to furnish to persons subject to this Act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this Act or any order issued thereunder;

(5) upon the request of any employer acting in good faith, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this Act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action;

(6) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this Act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies; and

(7) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this Act, and the Commission may authorize them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens, residents of the area for which they are appointed, who shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons serving without compensation; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance.

PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 7 (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 5. This power shall be exclusive, and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise: *Provided,* That the Commission is empowered, by agreement with any agency of any State, Territory, possession, or local government, to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases even though such cases may involve charges of unlawful employment practices within the scope of this Act, unless the provision of the statute or ordinance applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this Act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith.

(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission or by an officer, agent, or employee of the Commission specifically authorized by it to file charges pursuant to this section, that any person subject to the Act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall investigate such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Nothing said or done during and as a part of such endeavors may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding. Any written charge filed pursuant to this section must be filed within one year after the commission of the alleged unlawful employment practice.

(c) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful employment practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this Act, or in advance thereof if circumstances so warrant, it shall cause a copy of such written charge to be served upon such person who has allegedly committed any unlawful employment practice, hereinafter called the respondent, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than ten days after the service of such charge.

(d) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such written charge and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

(e) The Commission or the member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any written charge, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

(f) All testimony shall be taken under oath and a verbatim transcript of all testimony shall be made.

(g) The member of the Commission, or the officer, agent, or employee of the Commission, who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof, except as a witness.

(h) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision. The Commission, or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice. In its discretion, the Commission upon notice may take further testimony.

(i) With the approval of the member or designated agent conducting the hearing, a case may be ended at any time prior to the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission by agreement between the parties for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms.

(j) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that any person named in the written charge has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and conclusions of law and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring him to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of the Act: *Provided, however,* That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the written charge has engaged or is engaging in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

(k) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

(l) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any United States Court of Appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court or other U.S. court of the territory or place within the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings, conclusions, and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(b) Upon such filing, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Commission with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive.

(d) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may

order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent and to be made a part of the transcript.

(e) The Commission may modify its findings of fact and conclusions of law, or make new findings and conclusions, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings and conclusions and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

(f) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

(g) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any United States court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person transacts business, by filing in such court, within sixty days after the issuance of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings, conclusions, and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsection (a), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the petitioners or the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

(h) Upon such filing by a person aggrieved, the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(i) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (a) or (g) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this Act, the Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(b) Any member of the Commission, or any agent designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(c) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(d) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this Act, any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5, title 28, United States Code (28 U.S.C. 81 et seq.), or the United States court of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, its member, or agent, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND CONTRACTORS

SEC. 10 (a) The President is authorized to take such action as may be necessary (1) to conform fair employment practices within the Federal establishment with the policies of this Act, and (2) to provide that any Federal employee aggrieved by any employment practice of his employer must exhaust the administrative remedies prescribed by Executive order or regulations governing fair employment practices within the Federal establishment prior to seeking relief under the provisions of this Act. The provision of section 8 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee thereof. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders.

(b) The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia. Such regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

NOTICES TO BE POSTED

SEC. 11. (a) Every employer and labor organization shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of the Act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500 for each separate offense.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 12. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal, State, territorial, or local law creating special rights or preference for veterans.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 13. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act. Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 14. Whoever shall forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission while engaged in the performance of duties under this Act, or because of such performance, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 15. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

The summary accompanying Senate bill 1819 is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-CELLER FEPC BILL

The fifth civil rights pledge in the 1960 Democratic Party platform reads:

"The new Democratic administration will support Federal legislation establishing a Fair Employment Practices Commission to secure effectively for everyone the right to equal opportunity for employment."

The Clark-Celler FEPC bill would make it an unfair employment practice for any employer (business or labor union) employing more than 50 persons and engaged in interstate commerce or in operations affecting such commerce, to discriminate in hiring, promoting, or firing against any individual on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin. Both administrative remedies, administered by a five-man Fair Employment Practice Commission, and court remedies would be available to persons subject to such discrimination in employment.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF CLARK-CELLER FEPC BILL

Section 1, short title: "Federal Fair Employment Practice Act."

Section 2, findings of fact and statement of purpose: Congress finds that large numbers of qualified persons in the United States are discriminated against in employment because of their race, color, religion, or national origin, and that such discrimination interferes with interstate commerce. The purpose of the legislation is to promote interstate commerce by prohibiting such discrimination and by providing administrative and court remedies for persons injured by such discrimination.

Section 3, definitions: The prohibition against discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin set forth hereafter applies to employers and labor organizations. Domestic service and small business are exempted from the scope of the bill by a provision which defines "employer" as a person engaged in interstate or foreign commerce and who employs 50 or more individuals. In like manner, the only labor organizations covered are those which have 50 or more members. Also exempted from the operation of the act are State, municipalities, or political subdivisions thereof, and any religious, charitable, or educational corporation or association not organized for private profit. The agencies of the Federal Government are covered by the bill.

Section 4, exemption: The employment of aliens outside the continental United States, its territories and possessions is specifically exempted from the provisions of the act.

Section 5, unlawful employment practices defined: This section defines unlawful employment practices by employers as a "refusal to hire, or to discharge" or otherwise penalize any employee with respect to his employment because of race, color, religion or national origin. In addition, an employer is prohibited from using any employment agency or placement service which discriminates. Labor organizations are forbidden to discriminate against any individual or limit, segregate, or classify its members in any way which would deprive or limit an individual's employment opportunities because of his race, color, religion or national origin. Both employers and labor organizations are forbidden to discriminate against any individual because he "has opposed an unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding

under this act." In short, because such individual has undertaken to effectuate the purposes of this act.

These prohibitions do not go beyond saying that there shall be no discrimination because of factors which have no real relationship to an employee's fitness or qualifications. Management remains free to determine its hiring practices, organize its internal plant policy, and discharge employees, according to any standard it may adopt so long as there is no discrimination because of prohibited irrelevant factors. Likewise, a labor organization is free to manage its internal affairs as it deems fit, except that it may not deny any of the advantages of union membership or collective bargaining to any person because of race, color, religion or national origin.

Section 6, the Fair Employment Practice Commission: The administration of the bill is entrusted to a national commission against discrimination in employment composed of five members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The members of the Commission hold office for overlapping terms at the outset of 1 to 5 years, and their successors hold 5-year terms.

The Commission is empowered to appoint staff members; to cooperate with regional, State, and local agencies; to furnish technical assistance to persons subject to the act and to make necessary studies; and to assist employers whose employees "refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this Act." In order to foster community good will and cooperation in carrying out the purposes of the act and to help conciliate the differences and tensions between various groups and the elements of the population, provision is made for the creation on local, State, and regional levels of advisory councils.

Section 7, prevention of unlawful employment practices: The Commission is empowered to investigate the sworn written charges of any person who believes that he has been the victim of an unlawful employment practice and to eliminate the unlawful practice by conference. Provision is also made for the filing of charges of discrimination by any members of the Commission who have knowledge of an unlawful employment practice. If efforts at voluntary compliance fail, then hearings shall be held before the Commission in conformity with the Administrative Procedure Act, and it may issue an order requiring the respondent to cease and desist from such unlawful practice. If the respondent still refuses to comply with the order, the Commission may apply to the U.S. circuit court of appeals for enforcement of such order.

Recognizing the existence of State and local fair employment practice laws, the act provides that the Federal Commission may, by agrement with any agency of any State "cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases even though such cases may involve charges of unlawful employment practices * * * unless the provision of the statute or ordinance * * * is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of the act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith."

The bill contains the traditional safeguards for separation of the prosecuting and judicial functions of the Commission, for representation by council and protection of the right of confrontation and cross-examination.

Section 8, judicial review: Judicial review of cease and desist orders is provided in conformity with the Administrative Procedures Act. The Commission's orders to cease and desist from an unlawful employment practice or to reinstate an employee with or without back pay are legally enforceable only after they have received judicial approval.

Section 9, investigatory powers: The Commission is given the customary powers to issue subpenas, administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

Section 10, enforcement of orders directed to Government agencies and contractors: The bill provides that if any Government agency is found to have engaged in an unlawful employment practice the Commission is required to place the matter before the President for appropriate action. The President is also empowered to establish regulations to prevent unlawful employment practices by persons entering into contracts with the U.S. Government or any of its agencies. Such Executive regulations will be enforced by the Commission.

Section 11, notices to be posted: Persons subject to the act are required to post a notice giving sufficient information about the law to inform employees and members of labor organizations of their rights.

Section 12, veterans' preferences: The bill disavows any intent to interfere with special rights or preference for veterans."

Section 13, rules and regulations: Rules and regulations may be issued by the Commission in conformity with the Administrative Procedures Act.

Section 14, forcibly resisting the Commission or its representatives: Penalties by fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both are provided for conviction for forcibly resisting or interfering with agents of the Commission engaged in the performance of their duties.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1820. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1961".

SEC. 2. Section 101(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. § 1975(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The Commission shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than four of the members shall at any one time be of the same political party. The term of office of members appointed after the date of the enactment of the Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1961 shall be three years, except that (A) the term of office of two of the members first so appointed (as designated by the President at the time of their nomination) shall be one year and the term of office of two of the members first so appointed (as designated by the President at the time of their nomination) shall be two years, and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall serve only for the remainder of such term.

"(2) The term of office of the members of the Commission first appointed after the date of the enactment of the Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1961 shall commence on the day of the appointment of the last of such members, and the term of office of any members subsequently appointed (other than a member appointed to fill a vacancy) shall commence on the day following the day on which the term of his predecessor expired.

"(3) The term of office of the members of the Commission holding office on the date of the enactment of the Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1961 shall expire at the time of appointment of the last of the members first appointed after such date."

SEC. 3. Section 103(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975b (a)) is amended by striking out "$50 per day" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75 per day."

SEC. 4. Section 104 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975c) is amended to read as follows:

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 104. (a) The Commission shall—

"(1) investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based;

"(2) study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of due process of law or of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution:

"(3) appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to due process of law and equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and

"(4) to serve as a national clearing house for civil rights information, and to provide advice and technical assistance to communities, industries, or individuals, upon request from such parties in respect to due process of law and equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation and the administration of justice.

The Commission may, for such periods as it deems necessary, concentrate the performance of its duties to those specified in either paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) and may further concentrate the performance of its duties under any of such paragraphs to one or more aspects of the duties imposed therein.

"(b) The Commission shall, not later than January 31 of each year, submit a report to the President and the Congress setting forth its activities and findings during the preceding year and its recommendations with respect thereto. The Commission may submit such other reports to the President and to the Congress at such times as the Commission and the President deem advisable."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 105(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d (a)) is amended by striking out in the last sentence thereof "$50 per diem" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75 per diem."

(b) Section 105(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1975d (d) is amended by striking out "and members of advisory committees constituted pursuant to subsection (c) of this section," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "members of advisory committees constituted pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, and consultants appointed under authority of section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a) specifically designated in writing by the Commission (but not exceeding twelve such consultants at any time)".

SEC. 6. Section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Commission is authorized to reimburse, out of moneys appropriated under the authority of section 106, any advisory committee constituted by it pursuant to this subsection for expenses of travel, stenographic services and subsistence incurred by the members thereof in the performance of functions approved by the Commission, and for costs of using the mails incurred by any such advisory committee in the performance of any such functions."

SEC. 7. Section 105(h) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, as added by section 401 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1975d(h)), is amended by inserting after "each member of the Commission" the following: ", and

any officer or employee of the Commission designated by it,".

SEC. 8. The amendments to the Civil Rights Act of 1957 made by sections 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of this Act shall become effective on the day of the appointment by the President of the last of the members of the Commission on Civil Rights first appointed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The summary accompanying Senate bill 1820 is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-CELLER CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION BILL

The sixth and final legislative pledge in the civil rights section of the 1960 Democratic platform read as follows:

"The new Democratic administration will broaden the scope and strengthen the powers of the (Civil Rights Commission) and make it permanent.

"Its functions will be to provide assistance to communities, industries, or individuals in the implementation of constitutional rights in education, housing, employment, transportation, and the administration of justice."

The Clark-Celler bill would make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent Federal agency with strengthened fact-finding powers and a new directive to act as a "national clearing house for civil rights information." The bill would effect seven changes in the provisions relating to the Commission in the Civil Rights Act of 1957, as amended:

1. The Commission would be made permanent by eliminating the September 9, 1961, termination date in existing law. Thereafter the Commission would be required to file reports of its activities annually or more frequently at its own discretion or the discretion of the President (sec. 4).

2. One member would be added to the Commission (making a total of seven members) and staggered 3-year terms would be provided (sec. 2).

3. The maximum compensation of Commissioners and appointed consultants, not to exceed 12 in number at any time, would be increased from $50 to $75 per diem (secs. 3 and 5).

4. The Commission would be authorized to study and collect information and appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to denials of due process as well as denials of equal protection of the laws (sec. 4).

5. The Commission would be authorized in its discretion to reimburse State advisory committees for travel expenses, stenographic services, and subsistence incurred in the performance of Commission-approved functions (sec. 6).

6. Commission officers and employees specifically designated by the Civil Rights Commission would be authorized, in addition to the Commissioners themselves, to administer oaths and take statements of witnesses (sec. 7).

7. The Civil Rights Commission would be directed "to serve as a national clearing house for civil rights information, and to provide advice and technical assistance to communities, industries, or individuals, upon request from such parties in respect to due process of law and equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation and the administration of justice" (sec. 4).

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I introduced, for appropriate reference, six measures dealing with various aspects of the civil rights problem. I ask unanimous consent that the bills lie on the table for 1 week, in order that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring the bills if they so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO INTERCEPTION OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law and for other purposes.

The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee will soon resume its hearings on the subject of wiretapping, eavesdropping, and the Bill of Rights. A number of distinguished witnesses have been invited to testify, including the new Attorney General, representatives of local law enforcement departments and agencies, and members of the academic community. Prof. John E. North, of Omaha, a member of Creighton University School of Law faculty, will be among those who are participating in this series of hearings.

In light of the important decisions handed down by the Supreme Court in recent weeks there is added cause to find a legislative solution to the wiretap dilemma. Several bills have already been introduced and are now pending in the subcommittee. In order that the subcommittee might have an opportunity to consider a permissive wiretapping bill which places greater restrictions on local investigating officers and gives a proportionately broader protection to the individual citizen's right of privacy, it was deemed appropriate to introduce a measure authorizing wiretapping on a local basis only under court supervision which is limited to such telephones as are actually being used in the commission of a crime.

Briefly, the proposed bill recognizes that in some communities law enforcement may be immeasurably hampered by the flat prohibition against wiretapping now apparently specified in the Federal Communications Act. Such a bill would eliminate the embarrassment caused local law enforcement officers in situations similar to the one presented in *Pugach* v. *Dollinger* (365 U.S. 458). In that case the State law permitted wiretapping pursuant to a court order although the procedure may have violated or would lead to a violation of a Federal law.

Nevertheless, some feasible means of circumscribing the wiretapping authority granted by local court actions must be provided if the individual is to be accorded genuine protection of his basic right to privacy. This is done in the proposed bill by restricting wiretapping to telephones which have been or are being used in the commission of a crime. Neither such instruments nor the words flowing through them enjoy an absolute and unqualified immunity from search. This bill provides a workable rule respecting the interests of all.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the bill be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1822) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 223 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 3501. Evidence of intercepted communications

"No law of the United States shall be construed to prohibit the interception, by any law enforcement officer or agency of any State or any political subdivision thereof in compliance with the provisions of any statute of such State, of a wire or radio communication, and the divulgence, in any proceeding in any court of such State, of the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the communication so intercepted if such interception was made after determination by a court of such State that probable cause existed for belief that a crime has been, or is about to be, committed and that a particular telephone or telegraph instrument is being, or will be, used in furtherance of the commission of that crime pursuant to which leave was granted to intercept such wire or radio communications transmitted by that telephone or telegraph instrument for a reasonable period of time not to exceed thirty days."

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION OF REMAINS, FAMILIES, AND EFFECTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES DYING ABROAD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1458) to amend the act relating to transportation of remains, families, and effects of Federal employees dying abroad, introduced by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the next time it is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 4, 1961, the names of Senators FONG, LONG of Hawaii, and BUSH were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1809) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN on May 4, 1961.

OPPOSITION TO RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINESE REGIME AND SUPPORT OF CHINESE NATIONALISTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1961, the names of Senators KEATING, COTTON, BUSH, SCOTT, CASE of New Jersey, FONG, ALLOTT, CASE of South Dakota, BOGGS, HUMPHREY, BENNETT, BRIDGES, CARROLL, STENNIS, and HRUSKA were added as additional cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) relative to relationship of the United States with the Republic of China and communistic China, submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) on May 3, 1961.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC IMPACT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1961, the names of Senators PROXMIRE, HUMPHREY, GRUENING, BYRD of West Virginia, RANDOLPH, and SMITH of Massachusetts were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 135) establishing the Senate Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense, submitted by Mr. HART on May 3, 1961.

ORDERLY MARKETING ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the bill (S. 1735) to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States, is on the table for the convenience of Senators who may wish to consider cosponsoring the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to lie on the table until next Monday, May 15, for the same purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

Address delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL before Combined Republican Organizations dinner, at Baltimore, Md., on May 3, 1961, dealing with the mobilization of Republican resources for the future.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from radio address delivered by him over radio station WGN, Chicago, on May 7, 1961, on the subject of "The Challenge of Peace."

RETIREMENT OF THE HONORABLE PAUL BROWN

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, expressing its appreciation of the services of the Honorable Paul Brown, of Georgia, recently a Member of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Whereas the retirement of the Honorable Paul Brown, of Georgia, from the Congress of the United States has deprived the Joint Committee on Defense Production of the services of a most valuable member and officer; and

Whereas this faithful and most able public servant served the committee continuously from its inception in 1950 until 1961; and

Whereas he was unanimously elected to be chairman of the committee for the 84th and 86th Congresses and vice chairman of the committee for the 82d and 85th Congresses; and

Whereas his services contributed immeasurably to the success of the committee's functions performed under the Defense Production Act of 1950 in the critical areas of national mobilization readiness and expansion of national productive capacity; and

Whereas such services were becoming to his distinguished career of more than 27 years as Representative of the 10th Congressional District of the State of Georgia and reflected honor on himself, his State, and the Nation; and

Whereas Paul Brown is completely and selflessly devoted to the highest traditions of the Congress, to our principles of government, and to the rules of fairplay in all personal and official relationships; and

Whereas he is regarded by all who know him as a truly great statesman and patriot; and

Whereas he is dedicated to the law, both to the highest traditions of its practice and to its enactment by due and proper legislative process; and

Whereas it is fitting that we should recognize such sterling qualities and such generous service to the Congress and to the committee: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Joint Committee on Defense Production of the Congress of the United States, That we do hereby commend the meritorious service of our esteemed former colleague, Paul Brown, and extend to him our deepest appreciation and warmest wishes that the years ahead be abundantly happy and healthful; and be it further

Resolved, That we are of the sincere opinion that Paul Brown will be sorely missed in the ranks of the Congress and of the committee as a man who loves his fellow man, his country, his professions of law and politics, and the national pastime of baseball; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the records of the Congress and upon the records of this committee.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM FOR THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, candor compels me to confess that I am disappointed with the seven-point program announced by the President for the textile industry. While some parts of the program would alleviate to some degree some of the problems of the textile industry, the program will not prevent the continuing liquidation of the textile industry which has been in progress for some years. This is true because the program does not come to grips with the crucial fact that the economic ills of the textile industry are, in large measure, the inevitable result of certain unwise trade practices and policies adopted and pursued by unidentified officers of the State Department who distort and pervert the reciprocal trade concept originated by Franklin D. Roosevelt's great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

Cordell Hull laid down certain precepts in respect to American industries and foreign trade which are crystal clear and indisputable. He declared that the only mutually satisfactory trade between nations is reciprocal trade, and that any true reciprocal trade, in substance, involves an exchange of surpluses by the trading nations. As a consequence, he repeatedly said that the United States ought to enter into trade agreements with other nations under which the United States would export to such other nations goods produced in the United States in surplus quantities, and would import from such other nations goods which the United States either could not produce or could not produce effectively. He pointed out on a number of occasions this truth: When we import from abroad goods which we are producing at home in surplus quantities, the inevitable result is that American industries suffer a loss of domestic markets, Americans who work in such industries suffer a loss of their jobs, and Americans who have invested in such industries are deprived of a fair return on their investments.

This is precisely the plight in which the textile industry now finds itself. Notwithstanding the fact that the American textile industry has always produced a surplus of textile products, the unidentified men in the State Department who now manage our trade policies and practices have actually been encouraging the importation into the United States of textile products manufactured abroad by foreign workingmen, whose pay in some instances is only approximately 10 percent of the pay of American textile workers.

A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, headed by the able Senior Senator from Rhode Island, JOHN PASTORE, has made a detailed study of this entire situation, and has made it crystal clear that the only way to prevent the continuing liquidation of the textile industry in the United States is for the United States to establish import quotas on textile products by country and by category.

It is impossible to overmagnify the importance of the textile industry to North Carolina. Approximately one-half of all the North Carolinians employed in manufacturing earn livelihoods for themselves and their families in this industry.

The absurdity of the present practice of encouraging the importation into the United States of textile goods made by cheap labor abroad, when American textile workers are producing such goods in surplus quantities, is made manifest by the Fair Labor Standards Act, which was enacted by the Congress to improve the compensation and working conditions of American workers. Under the section of the Fair Labor Standards Act codified as section 215 of title 29 of the United States Code, it is made a crime to ship in—interstate—commerce goods manufactured by Americans who are paid less than the minimum wage established by the act or who are compelled to work more than the maximum hours prescribed by the act.

While the Congress undertakes in this manner to afford protection to American textile workers, the unidentified men in the State Department having charge of our trade policies and practices actually rob American textile workers of their jobs by encouraging the importation into the United States of textile products which it would be unlawful to ship in interstate commerce if they had been produced under similar conditions in America.

The remedy which ought to be applied is simple. Instead of continuing the liquidation of the American textile industry, the Federal Government should allot to friendly foreign nations quotas by country and by category, giving such nations such reasonable part of our domestic textile markets as may be necessary to enable them to maintain viable economies, and reserve the remainder of such textile markets to our own industry. By so doing, we can best promote the interest of the free world and the soundness of our own domestic economy.

THE DANGER OF TAX TINKERING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, the administration presented to the Congress a series of proposals for revision of the tax laws. These, of course, must now be examined carefully.

Taxwise, we now, regrettably, exist in a kind of hand-to-mouth practice of levying new laws and continuing ones that threaten to expire. Rarely do we repeal such laws, even though some of these have continued long beyond their originally intended time.

Generally, we have followed a pattern of economic expediency, rather than to attempt to adopt a system of principles designed to meet the long-range needs of the country.

In my judgment, however, this is exactly what we need—that is, the creation of a tax philosophy and program to serve and preserve our free-enterprise system, as well as establish a more equitable method of treating our taxpayers.

Recently, I introduced in the Senate S. 10, which proposed the establishment of a commission to carry out a full-scale tax reform.

The purpose of the commission is to make a top-to-bottom review of the tax system, to develop recommendations for more equitable laws, to try to find ways and means by which the country can first, more effectively meet its fiscal needs; second, assure fair treatment of our citizens under the law; and third, spur, not stunt, economic growth and progress.

We recognize, of course, that tax laws first, if equitable, can serve the fundamental needs of the country; but second, if inequitable, can wreak inestimable damage upon a free economy.

Recently, Business Week, an outstanding publication in the business field, published an editorial entitled "The Danger of Tax Tinkering." The editorial contains some realistic observations on the dangers of further "tinkering" with our tax laws without comprehensive reform.

I request unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DANGER OF TAX TINKERING

The tax proposals that President Kennedy has asked Congress to adopt this year are a very mixed batch of pickles. As the President himself says, this is not a comprehensive and consistent program of tax reform; it is a hastily assembled collection of separate proposals. Each of the various components of the program will require extensive analysis as Congress takes it up for action.

At this point, however, at least one of the Kennedy suggestions is clear enough to be judged on its merits or lack of them. This is his plan to give an incentive to capital spending by allowing a tax credit for investment beyond a specified percentage of depreciation allowances.

The aim of this proposal is admirable, and when some companies see the very substantial tax savings it would give them (up to 30 percent of their total tax liabilities in some cases), they will, perhaps understandably, be inclined not to look a gift horse in the mouth. Nevertheless, this gift horse is one that does require a careful dental examination.

The President's proposal, unfortunately, would do exactly the kind of thing that has so added to the complexities and inequities of the existing tax structure: It would use tax breaks to certain income recipients to encourage actions that the Government wishes to favor, or in effect, to grant subsidies to certain kinds of economic activities.

The sliding scale of tax credits would seek to induce businesses to spend money on plant and equipment rather than for other purposes—which might well contribute even more, in the case of individual companies, to their growth and the growth of the Nation. In addition, the proposal discriminates in favor of rapidly growing industries as against those laboring to generate sufficient funds for modernization or expansion.

Even worse, this legislation—in the judgment of experts in the field—is unspeakably complex and might lead to years of litigation. The very fact that the Government has put in so many qualifying clauses is testimony to the clumsy and discriminatory nature of the proposal.

This is no time to add further complexities to our already labyrinthine tax system. The reform of that system—which Kennedy himself says is a must for the next session of Congress—should aim at simplicity and equity—with tax considerations playing a minimum role in the process of making business decisions. This tax credit proposal is completely in the wrong direction.

DOUBTFUL GAINS

To raise $1.7 billion a year to offset the cost of the incentives for capital investment, the President proposes a variety of measures—including withholding at the source of the tax on dividends and interest, repeal of the dividend credit, tighter rules on deductible business expenses, and tougher treatment of income earned overseas.

It seems highly doubtful that some of these will produce as much revenue as the President hopes. Withholding the tax on dividends and interest, for instance, may catch some income that now escapes taxation, but much of the money that is collected will have to be refunded eventually because it goes to pensioners or small holders who owe no tax.

The proposal for new taxes on foreign operations of American corporations is a somewhat different matter. It is made against the background of the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. In seeking to repeal the current deferral of taxes on earnings of American subsidiaries operating in industrialized foreign countries, the administration is hoping to encourage a prompter—and larger—return of taxable earnings to the United States.

The same objective is behind the President's recommendation to abolish tax deferrals for companies operating in foreign "tax havens"—a practice that has also complicated our balance-of-payments problem. The administration charges that tax havens are being abused by tax evaders, that they not only defer taxation but sometimes manage to avoid taxes entirely in repatriating earnings.

SWITCHING SIGNALS

No one can deny the fact that the emergence of the balance-of-payments problem calls for a variety of countermeasures, including changes in taxation. Nor can there be any argument against the administration's efforts to cut down on abuses that are possible under present law.

But the fact is that ever since World War II, Washington has encouraged American companies to increase their investments overseas. In effect, the Kennedy administration is saying that this program worked too well and that it must now abolish any inducements to invest abroad, at least in the industrialized countries.

Most American corporations that have invested abroad on a long-term basis feel that this switch in philosophy amounts to putting a penalty on them for risking their capital to do what the Government once wanted them to do. They complain that they would not have made such commitments on a temporary basis, and they contend that repeal of tax deferral now will give foreign companies, which already are providing intense competition, a definite advantage in the fight for world markets.

In the long run, these companies argue, the President's proposals could increase the strain on our balance of payments rather than relieve it.

In the circumstances, it is particularly important for Congress to make sure that it has heard all sides and considered all available evidence before it acts. The final version of any legislation in this area must be carefully drawn so that it will not hurt but help the balance-of-payments situation, with an absolute minimum of injury and injustice to investors who have sent their money abroad in all good faith.

NEEDED: SPEEDUP OF U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Nation is paying special tribute to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, our first man in space.

This is a just and fitting observance in honor of a brave man; in recognition of a major breakthrough in our space exploration program; and in celebration

of a historically significant step forward in freeman's effort to explore the universe.

The American people, I believe, can be justly proud.

Now, however, we look forward to success—with, we pray, a minimum of setbacks—in our next step of launching a manned spacecraft into orbit around the earth.

In the world stadium, nations are carefully watching the contest between the major protagonists of freedom and communism in space exporation—the United States and the Soviet Union. Although we didn't plan it that way, this is, indeed, a real space race.

According to experts, the cumulative scientific-technological value of our accomplishments far exceeds that of the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore nor underestimate the psychological impact which Russian firsts in space have had upon the minds of the world.

Regrettably, the U.S. timetable has run only a short distance behind Communist launchings. After the first sputnik, for example, we shortly orbited not one, but many satellites—now outnumbering the Soviets by about 40 to 15.

Recently, the Soviets reportedly orbited the first man in space. Now, we have successfully conducted a suborbital flight.

With such a relatively short lag in timing, it would appear that by only a slight speedup of our program we could demonstrate to the world that we can accomplish space feats not only equal to and greater—but also faster—than the Soviet Union.

The question is not: Will we do these things? Rather, the issue is: When will we do them?

Will we do them before or after the Soviets? In my judgment, we should do it before.

We recognize, of course, that space feats are basically scientific-technological military accomplishments rather than weapons of propaganda warfare.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the tremendous psychological impact which Soviet triumphs have had upon the world.

The task now is to first, predetermine the next major accomplishments in space; and second, as possible, set up the timetable so that the United States can get the maximum benefit not only from the accomplishments themselves, but also from the great psychological impact of firsts in the space race.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the purpose of consideration of some of the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any reports of committees?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Julius C. Holmes and the nomination of Harold C. Doyle be passed over, and that the remaining nominations on the calendar be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be stated as requested.

U.S. ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. marshals.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of U.S. marshals will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR., AND HIS FELLOW ASTRONAUTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]; the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; and myself, and, I am quite certain, all the other Members of the Senate, I submit and send to the desk a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 140) was read, as follows:

Whereas Commander Alan B. Shepard, together with the six other astronauts originally trained in the United States demonstrated with their great courage, dedication, skill and perseverance in the arduous preparation for flight into space; and

Whereas the first flight of an American into space was made successfully by Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, United States Navy, in his flight from Cape Canaveral, Florida, on May 5, 1961, in the spacecraft "Freedom 7" propelled by a Redstone rocket; and

Whereas by the courage, skill, perseverance and devotion to duty exhibited by Commander Shepard in that flight, therefore, he has earned the admiration of all Americans; and

Whereas by his successful flight, Commander Shepard has personified the determination and capacity of the United States with respect to the exploration of space for peaceful purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby extends to Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, United States Navy, its greetings and felicitations, and its highest commendation for the invaluable contribution made by him to the Nation and to the science of space exploration by man through his historic flight into space.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit to Commander Shepard a copy of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the successful completion of the first manned flight into outer space by an American astronaut, Commander Shepard, is an event of great moment. In the scientific and technical sense, it represents an important stride in the exploration of outer space. In the realm of the human spirit, it symbolizes the unending challenge of the unknown. Some have wondered what makes a man want to stake his life on a rocket ride. The answer is simple. Outer space is like the mountain. Men take the risk because it is there.

It is fitting that the rocket should have been named "Freedom VII," for this was the first flight into space by a freeman. It was the first and the only manned space flight which was freely observed and freely reported. It was an important step toward maintaining both freedom in outer space and earthly freedom affected by the use of outer space. This is the ultimate meaning of the flight of Commander Shepard, and of our efforts as a nation in the field of space exploration.

We could also do with less talk about prestige, Mr. President, and a better understanding of the significance of space exploration for our way of life. With respect to freedom of international communication, for example, within a matter of several years we are likely to be confronted with one of the most amazing opportunities as well as one of the most serious problems in history.

By means of satellite relay, it will be possible to transmit to every corner of the globe a single television program which will be made understandable everywhere through simultaneous translation. Think of it. Yet think also of the consequences if the global television system is controlled by forces hostile to our way of life.

Equally significant for the future of freedom is the implication of space exploration with respect to the natural phenomenon of weather. Freemen have

a vital stake in the meteorological use of outer space in the years ahead.

These are only two illustrations of the importance of space exploration for the future of freedom. There are many others, and many more to come. After all, who would have dared, even a few years ago, to imagine that in 1961 the first man in the history of man should have been delivered beyond the gravitational field of this planet and safely returned to earth.

We can be grateful for the labor of all who made it possible for Commander Shepard to make the first successful freedom flight. To all of the scientists, administrative personnel, craftsmen, and tradesmen, and to the thousands who participated in the air and naval operation on the day of the flight, we express our appreciation. To the hundreds of newspaper, radio, and television reporters and technicians, as well as to the papers and stations, we express appreciation for their excellent service in communicating this momentous happening. Those in Congress and in the executive branch who have contributed to the development of the space program can also take satisfaction for their part in making the program a success.

Finally, Mr. President, every American has contributed to the space program and to the flight of Freedom VII, and I join them in saying to America's No. 1 astronaut: Well done, Comdr. Alan Shepard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that copies of the resolution in behalf of Commander Shepard be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to the six other astronauts. They are, likewise, entitled to warmest recognition and congratulations. It was the luck of the draw which designated one of them, and we know they were all ready to do their duty had they been selected. The names of the others are Walter Marty Schirra, Jr., Donald Kent Slayton, Virgil I. Grissom, John H. Glenn, Jr., Leroy Gordon Cooper, Jr., and Malcolm S. Carpenter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, about 200 years ago Peter the Great and his entourage were moving through Poland. Someone indicated there had been devised a new torture machine on which the human body could be broken. When Peter the Great asked that it be demonstrated, he was told that they had no one in prison on which to demonstrate it. Peter the Great then said:

> Take one of my entourage and break his body on it.

There we have an indication of what happens under a despotic and tyrannical government, where life has no dignity, often no value, in sharp contrast to what happens in a free country.

Sometime early last year seven young men appeared at my office. They were going to use my office briefly in anticipation of a modest reception in the old U.S. Supreme Court Chamber. They were the seven astronauts, including Comdr. Alan Shepard. I suggested we ought to have pictures taken. He said: "I am afraid it is against the rules."

I said:

> We are in my office. It is private. If you do not mind, we will have the pictures taken.

How delighted I was, after the announcement came from Cape Canaveral, that the picture of the seven astronauts is still intact. May it always be intact. May all their flights be successful. But I point out that there is no law to compel a person to become an astronaut. There is nothing in the whole lexicon of our Government that requires a man to submit himself, whether he is in or out of the armed services. This is a voluntary matter with seven fine young Americans, who are willing to take the hazards and risks which are involved for the purpose of advancing the cause of science and keeping the country in the forefront of scientific achievement.

So today, as we salute a very notable exploit, we salute also the atmosphere of freedom in which it was encompassed, the greatest moral climate, which summons up all the courage, all the sense of risk, all the talents of which human beings are capable in the cause of their country.

Today we salute the astronauts and also the great gospel of freedom.

Mr. COTTON. On this day, when the Congress and the country honor the American astronaut from New Hampshire, I ask for myself and my colleague [Mr. BRIDGES] that an editorial published in the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR., NEW HAMPSHIRE, FIRST IN SPACE (MAY 5, 1961)

Today even the Great Stone Face wears a smile because by the grace of God, the courage of a New Hampshire boy and the skill of American scientists, the United States became the first Nation to put a man in outer space.

This newspaper will never recognize the Soviet claim to have put a man in space as any more than the everlasting Communist lie. The Communists knew this Nation was about to put a man into space, so they staged their fake performance in order to try to maintain their reputation for always being first.

Today from Coos to the sea every New Hampshire man, woman, and child walks taller in the pride that it was a New Hampshire boy who rode in the space capsule, out from the murk and confusion of this world into the clear realm of outer space.

Above and belond the scientific achievement of this first man's space flight is to be remembered the sheer courage of Derry's Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

This was no buggyride to the local drug store for a sundae. One misplaced wire, one short circuit, one tiny thing gone wrong, and this would have been a one-way ride into eternity.

No one forced Alan Shepard to take this risk. He made his choice freely and consciously because of his love of country and his desire to put this Nation once again on the winning side.

This is the greatest of all human bravery. Men have, on occasion, impetuously dashed into a burning fire and performed a daring rescue, or in the heat of battle, stormed an enemy fortification in the face of almost impossible odds.

However, Alan Shepard's decision was a calm, cool, conscious choice in the tradition of his native State's motto, "Live Free or Die."

WILLIAM LOEB,
Publisher.

Mr. COTTON. To quote the editorial:

> Today, from Coos to the sea every New Hampshire man, woman, and child walks taller in the pride that it was a New Hampshire boy who rode in the space capsule.

I am indeed proud today to have printed in the RECORD this editorial extolling the heroism and bravery of this son of New Hampshire, Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

The editorial emphasizes a point well made today in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to add my word to what my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire has said about Commander Shepard. It is a very happy day for America. It was a wonderful day on Friday, when the prestige of America rode with Commander Shepard in his Mercury capsule. His accomplishment has added greatly to the standing and prestige of this country in the whole free world. We are proud that America has done it. My colleagues and I are doubly proud that Commander Shepard is from New Hampshire; that he is not only a typical American, but a typical New Hampshire boy. I have known his mother and father and his whole family for a long period of years. They are very fine citizens of our State. We share the great pride of New Hampshire with the whole Nation today.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, last Friday, when it was announced to the world that the United States had put a man into outer space, I was attending a meeting of the board of directors of Lions International in Louisville, Ky. This announcement made a deep impression on the members of the board, who within minutes adopted a congratulatory statement.

I ask unanimous consent that that statement be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I believe it expresses the joy, hope, and aspirations of the American people in eloquent language.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The 625,000 members of Lions International from 111 nations and geographical locations of the free world, through appropriate action of its international board of directors, convened in Louisville, Ky., express their joyful congratulations to the first American astronaut, Alan B. Shepard, Jr., upon the successful completion of the first space entry and return flight on Friday, May 5, 1961.
>
> It is our sincere hope and prayer, that this feat may redound to the true cause of universal peace, rather than as an adjunct to human destruction—To this end we in-

voke the enternal and merciful benediction of Almighty God.

Given under the seal of Lions International and the signature of its international president, this 5th day of May, in the year of our Lord, 1961.

FINIS E. DAVIS,
International President.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services since its inception and as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I wish to join in congratulating Commander Shepard and all those who are associated with him in the tremendous accomplishment about which we have read in the last week. We have heard much discussion on this subject with relation to the peace value of space, with relation to the military value of space; the prospective uses both for peacetime progress and in wartime activity. We have just witnessed a wonderful accomplishment.

We ought now to go forward with that endeavor and follow up with other accomplishments on the path on which Commander Shepard has so ably led the way.

I believe the six other members of the astronaut group who did not ascend at this time, but who will certainly achieve some future accomplishments in space, should be joined in our congratulatory speeches today. I join with all others who are proud of the accomplishment of Commander Shepard and what it means to the future of our country and to peace in the world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, today we are all joining in our salutes to Commander Shepard for his stupendous achievement. I was privileged to meet the commander a few minutes ago at the reception. I said to him:

> You said, "Man, what a ride." We say, "Commander, What a man."

But with all of our salutes to Commander Shepard for his accomplishment and what it has meant to the free world, we should recognize also that it is the culmination of efforts of many other people, and that he himself has been backstopped by other astronauts who have gone through a demanding period of training. It was my privilege a short while ago to visit with one of the other astronauts, Colonel Glenn, who was a stand-in for Commander Shepard. I was impressed by Colonel Glenn as, I am sure, I would have been by Commander Shepard's other associates.

Every first team is supported by the second string. For every star in a victory there are those who work with the star to make his accomplishments possible. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that immediately following my remarks there be listed the names, ranks, and immediate past assignments of the other astronauts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the Chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the listing was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alan B. Shepard, Jr., commander, U.S. Navy; project test pilot for Navy F–5D Skylancer and instructor of test pilots.

John H. Glenn, Jr., lieutenant colonel, U.S. Marine Corps, Fighter Design Branch, Naval Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington.

Virgil I. Grissom, captain, U.S. Air Force; test pilot, Wright pilot fighter.

Malcolm S. Carpenter, lieutenant commander, U.S. Navy; air intelligence officer, U.S.S. *Hornet*, antisubmarine warfare aircraft carrier.

Leroy G. Cooper, Jr., captain, U.S. Air Force; aeronautical engineer and test pilot, Edwards Air Force Base.

Walter M. Schirra, Jr., lieutenant commander, U.S. Navy; suitability development work on the F–4H aircraft, Patuxent Naval Air Station.

Donald K. Slayton, major, U.S. Air Force; Chief, Fighter Test Section, Edwards Air Force Base.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the statement made by the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, in commendation of America's first astronaut, Cmdr. Alan Shepard.

This single feat of heroism, courage, and technology has put America back into the race for the conquest of space, and I certainly hope that it presages many "firsts" for this country's space effort.

I was privileged to be at Cape Canaveral as a member of the Aeronautics and Space Sciences Committee and had occasion to watch this historic mission which was so successfully accomplished by Alan Shepard. I am equally impressed with the teamwork that I saw at Cape Canaveral, where the best of American engineering, science, and technical leadership was fused into one challenging and all-important mission.

This important success could mean much to America's future in space and to the millions of people who have historically looked to this country for scientific and technical leadership.

I salute Commander Shepard, each of the other astronauts, and every member of our space program who made this historic achievement possible.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we of the U.S. Senate, today, have been privileged to be close to greatness.

It is the greatness of Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, boy of New England and hero of America, our first man in space.

It is the greatness of his fellow astronauts, all eager to be on with the still long and challenging problems and perils of space.

It is the greatness of the team of unsung aids—the scientists and all the myriad of major and minor workers who make this historic achievement possible.

No, I will not say unsung, for modest Alan Shepard was the first to salute them and thank them for their invaluable part in this prestige performance.

In a sense, too, we have been privileged to be close to the American home of sacrifice as wife and parents of Alan Shepard symbolize the spirit of our common service—patriotism with an implicit trust in God.

Thus is written a golden page in the human history of our country. It is the power and persistence of the mind that makes such a feat practicable. It is the courage of the free heart that makes its accomplishment possible. It is the sincerity of the American spirit that dedicates its discoveries to the peaceful purposes of all mankind.

All America salutes its son: Comdr. Alan B. Shepard.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senators who have commended Comdr. Alan Shepard. I believe the other six astronauts, who were fully trained and were standing by, should also be honored on this day when we honor this American who has written a new chapter in the human race.

Commander Shepard's achievement far exceeds the achievement of Columbus and far exceeds any other exploration in history, because others moved in the environment of man, and Commander Shepard, with the help of scientists and the resources of the American Government, has moved out of man's natural environment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, all of us were proud today to participate in welcoming to Washington Lt. Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard and his courageous fellow astronauts. We salute each of these men for his part in the great drama which culminated in last Friday's thrilling space shot.

It is also a magnificent and eloquent testimonial to our scientists who got such a late start in this field and have made such giant strides in a relatively short time. But of more immediate importance, we commend Commander Shepard for his courage and voluntary willingness to risk his life in this great cause.

It is wonderful that he and the other astronauts have been greeted with such warmth and enthusiasm in Washington today. He has been received and congratulated by the President, by Members of Congress, by military leaders, and by world statesmen. This is all fitting and fully deserved.

But the ultimate in American welcome, the summit of American applause, apparently may be denied this great national hero. At the present time, a ruling has been made that Commander Shepard and the other astronauts will not be permitted a traditional heroes ticker-tape parade in New York City.

That city has officially extended an invitation for such a parade and the people of the city are waiting with open arms to extend their felicitations.

There is no question that the reception for Commander Shepard would outdo even that accorded Charles Lindbergh in 1927.

I recognize, of course, that it may be found necessary for these men to return at once to their important man-in-space mission. We must not in any way interfere with progress in that field.

But I would hope it will be possible, within the limits of national security requirements, for this great event to be

authorized at some time in the near future. It must be remembered that although Commander Shepard is from the Northeast, as has been brought out by the distinguished Senators from New Hampshire, he is a national hero, fully qualified for this traditional national welcome.

I have, therefore, sent a telegram to President Kennedy, asking him to reconsider the veto on the New York ticker-tape parade, so long as such an event would not unduly threaten the national interest in our man-in-space effort.

MILWAUKEE SENTINEL'S EXCELLENT EDITORIAL ON FIRST FREEDOM SPACE FLIGHT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel of May 6 appraising the great significance of Commander Shepard's space flight be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM TRIUMPH

Much more than a test pilot's cool courage accompanied our first spaceman on his thrilling and historic journey.

Riding with Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., in the freedom capsule were the prestige of the United States, the prayers of his fellow Americans and the good will of the free world.

This is why the success of our first man-in-space venture produced throughout all our country a great wave of elation.

"What a beautiful view," Commander Shepard exclaimed, as the capsule was climbing across the threshold of space.

"What a beautiful feeling," we here on earth could echo as the parachutes lowered him to the ocean 302 miles from Canaveral.

It is a justified elation in more ways than one.

It puts us back in the space race with the Russians.

It is true that we have yet to orbit a man around the globe. But Commander Shepard's achievement is a certain portent that we will.

This was the essential breakthrough. This was the triumph that took us out of zero in the astronaut space score.

In contrast to the secrecy with which the Russians surround their space efforts—proclaiming only those that succeed—our first spaceman attempt was announced far in advance.

It was performed in the open before the press of the world, including the Soviet Union.

If it had failed, it would have failed in the open.

Commander Shepard literally rode a freedom capsule.

Our congratulations to him and to all the hundreds of men whose intelligence, sacrifice, perseverance and dedication made his exploit possible.

We don't want to labor a lesson. But those are the qualities all of us need in the relentless cold war contest with the Russians—and if we show them, we shall win.

Mr. MUNDT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MUNDT. If I may have assurance, Mr. President, that I shall have the floor after yielding, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the resolution been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution has not been agreed to.

Does the Senator desire to address a motion to the Chair?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 140) was agreed to unanimously.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time yielded by the Senator from South Dakota not be taken from the time allotted to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was indeed glad to yield for the purpose the Senator had in mind. I had hoped the resolution would be agreed to. I wish to speak about the event which gave rise to the resolution.

AUTHORIZATION OF SPECIAL MEDAL IN HONOR OF THE GALLANT AND COURAGEOUS SERVICE OF COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Friday, May 5, 1961, will go down in history as a bright page for American freedom. Before the entire world, our Nation "put the chips on the table," so to speak, in scheduling and succeeding with the shot which carried Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., to the space frontier. I am certainly happy to be among those present and voting for the congratulatory resolution which the Senate has just adopted.

The scientific achievement of the Project Mercury success of this past weekend cannot be minimized. This was a tremendous and historic accomplishment.

However, it seems to me that even more important than the scientific and technological breakthrough achieved is that in this vital experiment we have once again demonstrated the strength and character of our people and one of the foremost reasons why a free society such as ours can fulfill the best hopes of mankind.

Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., measures up to all that we would hope to achieve in a citizenry dedicated to the preservation of freedom. His courage and fortitude in undertaking this hazardous assignment—for which he volunteered—is in the best traditions of our history in which American heroes have met and overcome tests and assignments under the most difficult of circumstances.

It is indeed fitting that today Congress should adopt a resolution congratulating Commander Shepard for his heroism. As I have stated, it is proper indeed that a measure paying tribute to Commander Shepard should pass both Houses of Congress today but it seems to me, Mr. President, we should do more than this in order to appropriately signalize this achievement and in order to establish proper recognition of the heroism displayed by Commander Shepard and by the other astronauts.

In view of that I believe it is fitting and proper we should do more than congratulate Alan Shepard, I feel that we should award to Commander Shepard a special medal for his achievement, which is deserving of the highest recognition. It clearly ranks as high in history as the memorable solo flight of Charles Lindbergh in the *Spirit of St. Louis*. Today, on behalf of myself and the two Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing a special medal in honor of the gallant and courageous service of New Hampshire's distinguished son, Commander Shepard, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 80) to authorize the President of the United States to present a medal to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. COTTON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That, in recognition of the gallant and courageous service rendered by Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, U.S. Navy, in piloting the first United States manned flight into space, and in recognition of the fortitude, dedication and perseverance exhibited by him during his preparation for and execution of this epic achievement in the history of American scientific endeavor, the President of the United States is authorized to present to Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, in the name of Congress, an appropriate gold medal. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000 for this purpose.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 296) commending Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., for his outstanding achievement in flight into space, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FLIGHT OF FREEDOM VII—TRIBUTE TO COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 296, just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 296) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby commends Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, U.S. Navy, of Derry, New Hampshire, for his outstanding achievement and the courage and skill displayed by him in his flight into space on May 5, 1961, in the Mercury capsule known as Freedom 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today, both the House and the Senate have adopted resolutions paying tribute to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

It is my hope, and I am certain it will be fulfilled, that the House concurrent resolution will be adopted unanimously by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 296) was unanimously agreed to.

JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last Friday the U.S. Chamber of Commerce concluded its week-long national meeting in Washington. What I have to say this morning I had hoped to say on the floor of the Senate on Friday, but because the Senate was not in session then, it has been delayed until this morning.

What I wish to call to the attention of Members of the Senate is the selection of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce as the recipient of the wrath and the condemnation of the organization known as the John Birch Society.

President Eisenhower, Chief Justice Warren, Allen Dulles, the late John Foster Dulles, as well as distinguished Members of this body, have been attacked by this organization. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce now joins those ranks.

Quite recently I obtained a copy of the Birch Society's so-called White Book. It is an accumulation of their once-a-month publications that the society circulates to all of its members. It buttresses two other manuscripts, the secret, or semisecret, "Politician," written by Robert Welch himself, and the Blue Book, the official organizational manual for the society. The White Book, now available to all who are willing to pay the price, discloses in its May 1960 bulletin, at pages 10, 11, and 12, its position, or the position of its leader, Robert Welch, on the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I shall only skip read, in order to save time, and I ask unanimous consent that the full paging on the U.S. Chamber of Commerce be included in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McGEE. What it says is that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—I am now quoting from the John Birch Society White Book:

> Is now offering a course in practical politics for business people all over the United States. * * * We can't help wondering whether or not the Lenin Institute in Moscow is now giving courses for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

It goes on to suggest that what the society must do, and what they must urge the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to do, is "To publicize and eliminate any Socialist teachings or pro-Communist slant" political courses.

Finally, the suggestion is made, in the tract, that "if the leftists have permeated the staff of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the extent indicated—or purposely been placed on that staff during the recent liberal administration—the informed and patriotic members of the American business community still do not have to take it lying down."

It seems to me the attack on the U.S. Chamber of Commerce by the Birch Society speaks for itself.

EXHIBIT 1

[From May 1, 1960, Bulletin of John Birch Society]

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is now offering a course in "Practical Politics" for business people all over the United States. It is also offering a course in "Free Enterprise and the American Way of Life," to plant foremen. And we can't help wondering whether or not the Lenin Institute in Moscow is now giving courses, for teachers who are later expected to give courses to Americans, on the American way of life.

For the reports that have come to us indicate that, under the guise of practical politics, the lesson being insistently hammered into the heads of the businessmen is that: (1) The important thing is for them to win elections; (2) a liberal and internationalist has a far better chance of winning any election in America today than a conservative and isolationist; and (3) that therefore the American businessmen should pick liberals as their candidates and become active in promoting the winning campaigns of such liberals for election. Maybe this line did not come directly out of Moscow—or maybe it did. But at any rate, Moscow certainly could not find a better one for promoting its indoctrination of American business and community leaders with ideas that serve its purpose.

As to the course for foremen, at least one teacher of these courses—and apparently a typical one—has stated that: First, we must forget about communism, because this is not our problem; second, the current trend to socialism is not due to Communist influences, but to other faults, especially in our educational system; third, our country exploited Japan by not paying the Japanese enough for their silk, and exploited Mexico by using up its oil resources; fourth, our marines have been sent into countries to put down uprisings against ruling regimes solely because those regimes were friendly to this country; fifth, the money we have collected on tariffs should all be sent back to the countries on which the tariffs were paid, to subsidize the workers in those countries and bring their standards of living up to ours; sixth, our country was a young nation, which lacked understanding, but is now showing signs of growing up and assuming its proper responsibilities. These are the beliefs—or the pretended beliefs—please note, of a man who is teaching free enterprise to plant foremen, on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

We urge every businessman and every foreman, who is a member of the John Birch Society, to go to one or both of these courses if possible, and to do everything he can to find out for himself—and document with notes made during or immediately after the meetings—just what is being taught and what general doctrines are being subtly and insidiously advanced. Then go to work through your local chamber of commerce, through the national chamber if you are a member, through your fellow businessmen and foremen, and through every practicable means and channel, to publicize and eliminate any Socialist teachings or pro-Communist slant that you find in the U.S. Chamber courses; and to identify, and have the chamber get rid of, those who have been responsible for such un-American propaganda.

After seeing what has happened to the National Council of Churches, after seeing the kind of leadership the American Bar Association has recently been willing to accept, and after seeing the infiltration or seizure by leftwing forces of so many solid, old American organizations which should have remained among our strongest bulwarks against the collective advance, we are no longer surprised at anything. But lack of surprise should not mean complacency. If the leftists have permeated the staff of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the extent indicated—or purposely been placed on that staff during the recent liberal administration—the informed and patriotic members of the American business community still do not have to take it lying down. And those who will stand up and fight now, in any particular community, will find that they are not alone but have allies doing the same in a great many other places as well. Such coordination is one of the primary functions of the John Birch Society in general, and of this part of this bulletin in particular.

BUDGET DIRECTOR BELL DEFENDS ADMINISTRATION'S FISCAL POLICIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from the Budget Director, Mr. David Bell, setting forth with somewhat more precision than previously the economic policy position of the administration.

Because of the significance of Mr. Bell's reply, I ask unanimous consent that his response and my questions provoking his response be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator PROXMIRE. On page 11 of your statement, at the end of the third paragraph, you say, "The relevant criterion in

determining the desirability of a proposed use of resources for a public purpose is its value to the country in comparison to the value of using the same resources for other purposes, public or private."

It seems to me that this statement raises an enormously important philosophical question. The statement seems to imply that there should not be a presumption, and a strong presumption, on the side of using resources for private rather than public purposes. I feel that in a system of freedom, the presumption should always be clearly and emphatically on the side of freedom as compared with public action. At the same time, I have been perfectly ready and willing to vote and work and speak for public action where I think the case can be clearly made. Nevertheless, the presumption, in my judgment, in our free, private enterprise system, should be on the side of private use of resources.

Does your statement on page 11, as quoted, contradict this viewpoint and mean that there is in your administration's view no presumption on the side of private, as compared with public, use of resources?

Budget Director BELL. I agree entirely that in our free, private enterprise system, the presumption should be on the side of private use of resources. Only where, as you say, "the case can be clearly made," should public action be undertaken—or, as my statement said, where the desirability of a proposed use of resources for a public purpose clearly exceeds the value of using the same resources for private purposes.

Senator PROXMIRE. On page 10 of the "Details in Support of the Statement of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget," in discussing budget changes under "Agriculture and agricultural resources," you say in part, "The largest increases are $225 million in Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures under the new feed grain legislation * * *."

This surprises me, since the Secretary of Agriculture came before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, of which I am a member, and contended that the new feed grain bill would save hundreds of millions of dollars. The Senate Agriculture Committee was convinced that this legislation would conserve roughly $500 million in obligations that would otherwise be incurred by the CCC. Members of the Senate Agriculture Committee so stated in our report to the Senate on the feed grain bill. This is one of the reasons, and one of the most important reasons, why the feed grain bill was passed.

It is easy to understand why this saving would not be realized for a period of years. In fact, the Secretary was at pains to explain that this saving would be realized over a period of perhaps as much as 10 years. At the same time, it is very difficult to understand why this particular legislation should have resulted in an immediate increase of $225 million in CCC spending. Can you give me an explanation of this?

Budget Director BELL. The increase of $225 million in Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures in 1961 results from the provision in the feed grain legislation which authorizes up to a 50 percent partial payment to producers in advance of determination of performance. Under this authorization, the Department of Agriculture will make such advance payment to the producer as soon as he signifies that he will cooperate in the program. However, it is expected that these payments will be offset in later years, as you suggest.

Senator PROXMIRE. On pages 13 and 14 of your principal statement, you argue for compensatory spending and retrenchment designed to stabilize the economy by expanding public spending in a slack time, and contracting it in flush periods.

You give several specific examples of expenditures which should not be so adjusted. Defense is one, enforcement activity is a second. No examples were given of governmental activities which are subject to speeding up and slowing down. I would appreciate it very much if you could supply me with specific governmental work which can be regulated this way, and if you could give me the approximate time between (a) a Presidential decision and time job-providing activities could actually begin; (b) a congressional decision and the time actual work would begin on the job.

I note that your statement does not contend that this governmental activity should depend upon economic forecasting. It does indicate that this governmental activity should be based on the actual economic conditions existing at a particular time. Although I consider the course you take in your statement the wisest, as I have little faith in economic forecasting, still it seems to me that there must necessarily be at least an element of economic forecasting involved unless you can show that substantial projects can be put into effect almost instantaneously.

Would it not be better to strengthen our automatic spending and revenue stabilizers such as unemployment compensation and income taxes, rather than to time governmental purchasing and hiring on the feeble and uncertain reed of economic prediction?

Also, you state on page 14 of your principal statement, "But steps to speed up public expenditure programs must always be taken with due care, lest waste and inefficiency result." Can you give me examples of specific public expenditure programs which can in fact be speeded up or slowed down without significant waste or inefficiency from the standpoint either of requiring additional spending or postponing a needed service?

Budget Director BELL. Several interrelated questions are asked here. It might be well to begin an answer by noting, as pointed out in my statement, that the increase or decrease of Federal expenditure programs for the purpose of offsetting business cycle movements can be accomplished only within limits. And such actions should be carefully evaluated to assure that they will not result in waste or inefficiency. The magnitude of the desired adjustments depends in part on the economic conditions at the time in question. Moreover, whether the timing of an activity could be properly adjusted would depend on a variety of circumstances, including the state of agency planning and programing, the extent to which agency programs have been retarded by lack of funds, and the availability of financing at the particular time when the adjustment is required. Examples of activities cannot be given merely by citing certain general classes or types of Government operations. However, some of the experience this year can be specifically cited.

First, some actions which were taken administratively, within available funds, are (1) the speedup in payments of veterans' life insurance dividends and of tax refunds, (2) the expansion and improvement of surplus food distribution to the needy, and (3) the acceleration of farm housing and direct veterans' housing loans (including speedier processing of applications on hand partly by shifting assignments of agency personnel) from funds already authorized. Moreover, in February, the President requested each Federal department and agency to review its procurement and construction plans for the remainder of fiscal year 1961 with a view toward speeding up contracts and purchases within available funds. The purpose of the speedup was to stimulate employment and production as quickly as possible without adding to the total of Federal expenditures. Agency plans reported under this directive indicated an increase of $660 million in obligations and $247 million in expenditures by June 30, over previous anticipations. Roughly one-quarter of this amount involves such defense activities as procurement of common supply items, and repair, rehabilitation, and modernization of existing physical plant. Other examples of speedups within available funds include cleaning, repair, improvement, and construction of public buildings, work on natural resources by the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior, and construction under the Federal Aviation Agency and the Public Health Service.

Thus, it was found possible to plan to shift some procurement and construction forward, with a sizable expected acceleration within weeks of the President's directive. It might be argued that these actions would serve only to defer or delay the economic problem. However, there can be no question that the Government action was aimed at providing a stimulus during a period when private demands were weak, and that the private sectors of the economy might—partly as a result of the Government action—show greater strength later.

Some expenditure changes, of course, require legislative action, either in the form of new legislation or increased appropriations. With respect to new legislation (and the necessary appropriations therefor), programs such as temporary extended unemployment compensation can and will have a substantial impact within a very short time of congressional decision.

Also, the expansion of certain types of continuing work for which increased appropriations might be required, such as small public works projects, various types of resource conservation, and repairs and renovations of public buildings, can result in job-providing opportunities within a few weeks to 3 months.

In somewhat more detail, specific examples of small projects which it might be possible to start quickly and complete within a relatively short time are:

Small water resource projects such as the Corps of Engineers levees, channel improvements, other local flood protection works, and navigation and flood control works; and watershed protection projects in the Department of Agriculture's program.

Roads, trails, and small structures (such as visitor centers, recreational facilities, public convenience facilities, miscellaneous utilities, fire towers) needed in national parks and forests, and on public and Indian lands.

Small buildings such as border and customs stations, warehouses, Coast Guard stations, fish hatcheries, wildlife refuges, and other facilities.

Resource conservation work, such as reforestation, timber stand improvement, reseeding, and range improvements.

To be put underway quickly, projects should be already authorized, thus requiring only appropriations to start them. As previously noted, for most rapid impact, they should be small projects, which would require little advance planning, on which contracts can be let quickly, and which can be completed within a year or 18 months. If it were the case that early construction of such projects brought them to completion before they were needed, some waste—idleness or underuse of facilities—would result. However, in the great majority of instances, needs are urgent and even the requests for authorization of construction are typically not made until the need is in existence. For example, requests for authorization of public

buildings usually are made only after various makeshift arrangements, including space rentals, have been resorted to. In such instances, it is possible to effect the expansion of Government activities without any waste or inefficiency.

Larger public works projects, requiring a considerable amount of advance planning and several years to complete, do not have a similar degree of short-run flexibility. Once started, they can be speeded up or slowed down only within narrow limits, and they should progress at economic rates if waste is to be prevented. On the other hand, such projects are usually not scheduled for a start until the need for the project is obvious and pressing, and after a long period of planning and negotiation. If it is possible to hasten the beginning of actual construction on these projects by speeding up the planning and negotiation stage, no waste or inefficiency should result.

In the case of procurement, it is true that, to the extent that supplies are bought and warehoused in advance of actual need, a form of waste is involved. Even here, however, there is usually some flexibility in warehouse use so that the only waste is an imputed one—the interest cost of funds spent earlier than they would normally have been spent.

It is true, as you suggest, that some economic forecasting is inevitably involved in arriving at judgments regarding a change in the timing or magnitude of governmental activities for contracyclical reasons. I agree that such forecasting necessarily involves uncertainties. However, as the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers noted in his testimony before the Joint Economic Committee in March, the timelag problem in attempting to vary or adjust certain programs for economic reasons is less serious at present than in any of the other postwar recessions, since we are now faced not only with a cyclical situation but also with the problem of persistent economic slack. Our current problem is not only to promote economic recovery from the recession, but to foster a higher rate of economic growth. Thus there is now less risk that Government actions will be effective too late or will add to inflationary pressures.

Our automatic spending and revenue stabilizers are certainly important contributors to economic stability and steps can and should be taken to strengthen them. As you know, the President has indicated that he will suggest improvements in the permanent unemployment compensation system to increase its effectiveness. However, I doubt that we can or should place complete reliance on automatic stabilizers to the exclusion of discretionary (legislative and administrative) actions in times of recession or inflationary boom. Even relying on automatic stabilizers involves an implied forecast and policy decision—a decision that the degree of effect of the automatic stabilizers will be just right for the situation.

Senator PROXMIRE. On page 15 of your principal statement you argue for an increase in taxes in wartime for economic stabilization purposes. I think almost everyone would concur with that position. Also, it seems to me that there would be no problem in persuading many that it would be wise to reduce taxes when the war is over. With the exception of war periods however, it would seem to me extremely dangerous to go much beyond the automatic stabilization impact of our progressive income taxes by raising and lowering income taxes in anticipation of an economic recession or an economic boom. In a period like the present for example, couldn't we possibly dig ourselves into a bottomless deficit pit?

Can you indicate to me how such a program would have affected the Treasury if it had been pursued between 1931 and 1940?

Budget Director BELL. I agree that there are dangers in raising or lowering income tax rates in anticipation of an economic recession or an economic boom. Certainly great care and consideration must be given in determining any course of discretionary stabilization policy, whether it be on the tax or expenditure side.

My point was threefold. First, the automatic stabilizers, while extremely useful, can and should at times be supplemented by certain governmental expenditure and/or tax actions as required by the then current and prospective economic situation. Because of the hazards in economic prediction and anticipation, the burden of proof and responsibility would have to be placed on those proposing the utilization of discretionary compensatory actions. I agree that wartime and postwar actions represent extreme cases, but they do indicate examples of the kind of situations I have in mind.

Second, as I stated, a major surge in private spending calls for an increase in tax rates, while a serious or prolonged decline in economic activity relative to the Nation's potential would call for a reduction in tax rates; such change would, as a practical matter, ordinarily be based on actuality rather than anticipations.

Third, over the longer run, tax and expenditure policies must be adjusted to assure that the economy is not being stabilized at levels far below full capacity.

Any attempt to analyze the impact of various kinds of possible changes in tax rates during the 1930's would at the very best be extremely hypothetical. Moreover, given the vast changes in the economy and in the Government tax and expenditure structure since that time, I do not think the conclusions which might be drawn would be particularly relevant to current and future periods.

In the present situation, given the limits on the use of monetary policy because of the current balance of payments situation, fiscal policy must play a greater role in promoting economic stability and growth. The economy has been operating at a level considerably below its capacity and we have had persistent and high unemployment. In such a situation, a well planned stimulus to economic recovery as well as Federal actions to foster longer run economic growth through tax and expenditure policy certainly need not place us in a bottomless deficit pit. Carefully designed and limited actions which succeed in generating recovery and growth toward full employment levels can easily result in increased total revenues and actually help us eliminate budget deficits which might otherwise be substantial and persistent.

Senator PROXMIRE. Your statement on page 16 of your principal remarks, "Now that the need for estimates of foreign exchange expenditures is more apparent, and Treasury and the Budget Bureau are taking steps to identify direct outlays for foreign goods and services, and as the President directed in his balance-of-payments message, these will be considered in making budgetary decisions," is very welcome.

Now, would it be possible for the Budget Bureau, perhaps in connection with the Treasury, to offer an alternative analysis of our balance-of-payments situation to correct some of the factors in the balance-of-payments equation to allow for the impact, direct and indirect, of governmental programs?

For example, currently the exports of the country greatly exceed imports. At the same time, it is well known that one reason for this is because of our very large foreign aid program. Much of what we ship overseas adds to our exports. It seems to me that this is a direct influence that could be easily segregated and indicated.

On the other hand, the purchases of American troops abroad unquestionably results in the export of American goods to satisfy the desire of American troops to buy American goods abroad. Is there any way this kind of indirect influence can be shown separately?

Budget Director BELL. In regard to your questions concerning the direct and indirect impact of governmental programs on the balance of payments, we are developing procedures to identify that portion of exports financed with Federal funds, and the amounts of Federal expenditures for foreign goods and services. The problems of identifying and quantifying the indirect effects of Government programs on the balance of payments are far greater and it probably will be impossible fully to analyze these effects.

For example, as to American troops abroad, we have rough estimates that approximately $250 million of U.S. goods were sold in PX's in fiscal year 1960. A large part of these goods are shipped abroad through military channels to U.S. warehouses, and are not reported as exports. As to troop expenditures in foreign economies for U.S. goods, we have no way of arriving at estimates of this indirect impact. It is unlikely, however, that the impact would be at all significant since most purchases of U.S. goods abroad would be through the PX system.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is an honor to join with Americans everywhere in wishing happy birthday to one of the great men of our time—President Harry S. Truman.

We wish him well and hope for many more years of happiness and a full life for him and Mrs. Truman. We look forward to having the benefit, in Washington and throughout the country, of his wise counsel and experience.

Mr. President, last month the mural by Thomas Hart Benton, commemorating "Independence and the Opening of the West," was dedicated at the Truman Library in Independence, Mo. The main address was delivered by the Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren.

This was an historic and moving occasion. I hope that all Americans will have the chance to view this impressive painting and to see the Truman Library in Independence, which honors the Presidency and one of our great Presidents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Chief Justice Earl Warren at the dedication ceremonies of the mural by Thomas Hart Benton at the Truman Library at Independence, Mo., April 15, 1961, a description of the mural written by the artist, and an article from the Kansas City Star dated April 16, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address, description, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN AT PRESENTATION CEREMONIES OF MURAL DONE BY THOMAS HART BENTON FOR THE TRUMAN LIBRARY INSTITUTE, INDEPENDENCE, MO., APRIL 15, 1961

It was less than 4 years ago that we met to dedicate this Harry S. Truman Library to

its high mission of service to our people and to their democratic institutions.

In that short period of time it has passed successfully through the trials of initial organization and is now firmly established as an outstanding center of research in the history of our Government in the mid-20th century.

The Truman Library has already contributed significantly to an understanding by our people of the Office of the Presidency. It has helped to create a new appreciation of the nature of that great Office, its responsibilities, its powers and its limitations. The library has attracted scholars to an early and detailed examination of a critical period of American history while the facts are still fresh in the minds of living men. It has done much to enliven the interest of thousands of our young people in the history of our Nation—and in doing so it has demonstrated again that there is no more effective material for stimulating—and satisfying—that interest than the papers of our Presidents.

It is good that President Truman's papers should be rooted here in the ground from which they sprang—as are those of President Roosevelt and President Hoover, and as those of President Eisenhower soon will be, in their States. The Presidency binds together our whole people—from the East, the Far West, the Middle West, and the South—and what better reminder could we have of our basic national unity than the establishment of centers for the study of the Office of our Presidency in points as widely separated as Hyde Park, Palo Alto, Independence, and Abilene. It is good, too, because it reminds us that our strength comes not from our unity alone, but from the combination within our Union of a rich variety of vigorously divergent strains.

Independence, Mo.—and the man from Independence to whom this institution is dedicated—symbolize for all of us the energy, the vision, the sturdy self-reliance, and the love of liberty which opened up our western frontiers. It is to this same spirit that we must look today to keep our Nation in the forefront of man's race to conquer the new frontiers of our own dangerous and exciting age.

When America moved through the gateway of Independence, Mo., to meet the challenge of the Far West, President Truman's people were in the forefront of that historic caravan. And rare judgment they had, too, for his maternal grandfather, Simon Young, and his partners soon became the owners of what is now Sacramento, the capital city of California.

Thomas Hart Benton's "Independence and the Opening of the West" captures the full drama of the epic western movement of our Nation. It cannot fail to reach the minds and hearts of all who see it. It will help to stir the imagination and the vision of our young people with whom the future of our Nation rests, and turn their thoughts to our heroic history and to the values which made this country great.

In the late 1820's and the early 1830's when Independence was being settled, our country was an agricultural community of less than 13 million people. Today, we are a highly organized, complex society of 180 million. It is all too easy, in these circumstances, to forget those earlier days and the lessons which they teach us.

That was an heroic age, with many brilliant and hard-won victories. Its heroes were not necessarily statesmen or generals, but determined individual men and women who pressed westward in search of independence and opportunity for themselves and their children. Their victories were not won in great climactic battles, but in the daily surmounting of incredible hardships, privation, and personal danger. They had a great vision for the western country—and because they had a great vision great things were done. We must not lose that vision and that enthusiasm, for they are the stuff of which true patriotism is made and upon which a nation's future is built.

As our people come to visit the Truman Library, their eyes will fall first upon this great mural—and if they see it with eyes brightened by a knowledge of our own history every figure in it will have meaning for them and will help to build within their hearts a deep and abiding patriotism. The knowledge of our heroic past will open vistas for them into our future. It is upon the nurturing of this kind of patriotism in the hearts of our young people—a patriotism born of pride in the accomplishments of our past and faith in the future of our institutions—that the real security of our Nation depends.

Our Nation's progress has been based upon the faith of Americans in themselves; upon their belief in their own institutions founded upon a knowledge of how and why those institutions came into being; and upon their vision for the future. Upon our own faith, knowledge, and vision, and not upon the things we do or say because we hate or fear something or somebody, rest both the glory of our past and the hope of our future.

When our Nation came into being we were a few scattered colonies stretched along our eastern coast. We pushed out to the Alleghenies, to the Ohio, to the Mississippi and the Missouri. From Independence our driving, searching people struck out in three resistless streams to divergent parts of the then unknown West, possessed of a determined belief in their ability to create a good life for themselves, and seeking only the opportunity to try. Each of these successive waves of migration was inspired by courage, faith, and hope—never by fear. It has often been said of these pioneers that the timid never started and the weak died on the way.

This is the same country it was then, populated by the same stock. We have the same potential—we are still young. There is still room for unlimited development—and, for those who have the faith, for the satisfaction that comes from great accomplishment.

The mural which we dedicate today, depicting the expanse of the West and the courage of the men and women who conquered it, will inspire us all to face with courage and hope the great unexplored realms of matter, mind, and soul which spread before us. It will be a symbol to all of us of the spirit of our pioneer fathers who so successfully met the challenge of their time; and it will be a symbol, too, of the great President who came from that stock and who brought to the high councils of our Nation and of the world, the courage and vision of the West.

Independence and the Opening of the West

(By Thomas Hart Benton)

THE BACKGROUND

President Truman's hometown was settled by farmers in the late twenties and early thirties of the last century. No doubt, in the pioneer American way of the time, they were looking for a quiet haven beyond the elbow jostling of crowds. This is not what they got.

Independence became rapidly after its foundation a "jumping off" place for the West, a noisy, busy and somewhat turbulent frontier outfitting station. It mushroomed with blacksmith shops, wagon builders' and wheelwrights' sheds, stock traders' corrals, general stores, gun shops, grog shops, and makeshift hotels. Milling in the new town's streets were hunters, fur trappers of the high Rockies, fur merchants from St. Louis and eastward, Indians of adjacent areas, titled adventurers from cultured lands across the sea, soldiers, literary celebrities, Frenchmen, Germans, Mexicans, and above all profit seekers of every shade and degree of honesty looking to the Indian trade or further to the Spanish trade of Santa Fe and Chihuahua. When the Oregon country beckoned in the early 1840's the settlers poured through in one of the greatest migrations of history.

For something over three decades Independence funneled through its streets and shops most of the expansionist energy of America, which, accelerated by the Jefferson administration's purchase in 1803 of the vast tracts of Louisiana, began moving gropingly but irresistibly toward the shores of the Pacific Ocean. That Independence should exercise a prime function in this movement wast inevitable for, whether her founders knew it or not, they had established their town on ancient trails over which for centuries buffalo and deer had made their seasonal passings and over which, also for untold years, the Indians had marched their bartering and warmaking expeditions eastward and westward. Independence was located at a national takeoff point for the overland routes to the Southwest and the West.

Before English speaking peoples had reached the Mississippi, French and Spanish adventurers and hunters had discovered and used the relatively easy southwestward passages offered by the trails. After the accession of Louisiana, American explorers began probing them. Organized mercantile expeditions to New Mexico, Santa Fe, and Taos began passing, now and then, through or near the site of Independence. Coinciding with these movements, and a chief factor in forwarding the rapid growth of the town and in sustaining its historic functions, came the development of effective steamboating on the Missouri River. Westward travelers because of this could move easily to the very head of the Plains trails, so much more negotiable than those eastward. They could thus start the long part of the trek with fresh animals and sound wagons. So, set up at a strategic conjunction of river and trail and at a time when American urges westward were reaching to climactic proportions, it was given to Independence to play a first and major part in the continental destiny of the United States.

THE PAINTING

The mural painting, "Independence and the Opening of the West," has obviously a large theme. It is too large, in fact, for anything but generalized treatment in the space available. No specific events of written history are therefore represented nor any of the specific individuals of record. There were too many of both. In their place are symbolic figures, symbolic happenings, representing a multiplicity of real individuals and real events. For instance, your great-grandfather who went to the high western mountains and ought to be in the picture is not. Neither are his friends Kit Carson and Jim Bridger. In their place is a generalized hunter, trapper, and mountain man who stands for all three. The same goes for the other people and things shown.

In the area about and above the door are the chief opposing elements of the drama. Here are the Plains Indians, against the hunter and trapper, and the French "voyageur" and the permanent settler who finally dispossessed the Indians. The prospective settler represented is placed in the important position directly above the door because it was he, and she, who set the seal of accomplished fact on our continental destiny. Traders, explorers, hunters, and adventures marked the paths over which

destiny took its course but it was the settler who, in the end, was most consequential in establishing the United States we now know. All settlers, hunters, trappers, and traders of the West sooner or later came in direct contact with the Indians whose hunting lands they invaded.

The Indians adjacent to the the door are Pawnees. The Pawnees ranged from what is now Nebraska to the borders of present-day Oklahoma country. Their chief wealth was in horses and they were celebrated for their ability to steal them, from other Indians as well as from the whites.

Travelers of the Plains trails might well meet them first. They would be likely to appear friendly in the hope of picking up a little coffee or tobacco, and this is indicated by the offer of the pipe to the leader of the settlers' train which is coming to a halt for supper. The whites are suspicious as they usually were with Indians whose unpredictable behaviors, volatile temperaments, and ways of thinking they did not understand. Some justification of that suspicion is indicated by the Pawnee warrior, in the foreground to the left of the door, who though probably aware of the peaceful pipe offering has ideas of his own. The Indians were individualistic and acted more frequently on purely personal initiative than the whites who traversed the prairies. The whites knew the value of disciplined cooperative action. That is one reason why they dispossessed the Indians even though obstreperous whites frequently enough forgot their group responsibilities. It was these latter who caused most of the Indian troubles, according to Josiah Gregg, the first historian of the Plains, and aside from President Truman the most distinguished citizen of Independence.

The Pawnee in the foreplane of the picture is equipped, and painted, for marauding action with ready bow and arrow and the famous Pawnee lasso entwined about his waist. Opposite to him on the right side of the door is the Jim Bridger, Kit Carson, Jim Beckwourth type of hunter, trapper, and mountain man, who first scouted the pathways of the West. He would not make trouble with the Indians. Normally he gets along with them, but he would be ready, as the dropping of his traps and the charging of his gun suggests, for any troubles which might arise. He is a dead shot and, like the Indians, inured to physical hardships. He is not merely an adventurer but is as we say, "in business." He works at his beaver hunting and trapping for a profit, but he usually expends this in a few wild days of "hoopla" with the whisky kegs, gambling rings, and acquiescent young Indian squaws assembled by more calculating fur seekers from Independence, St. Louis, and eastward, who buy his hard earned pelts at a fraction of their world market value. He it is who made possible the beaver fortunes of the Astors and other great and respectable notables of the 19th century. He himself is not notably respectable but is nevertheless one of the stalwarts of our westward destiny.

Above him is that other omnipresent actor on our western trails, the French voyageur—boatman, axman, mule skinner, and ox driver. Everywhere on the frontier from Louisiana to Canada he was the man of hard work, gay song, and perpetual good humor. His name is rarely known to record but we owe more to him, perhaps, than to his celebrated countryman Lafayette.

In the foreground to the right of the door are shown the indispensable workers of an outfitting town such as was Independence. The boy pulling the bellows rope in the blacksmith shop is not paid for his trouble. He is doing what all country town kids have always liked to do, including the artist. Beyond these, again to the right, indicating the direction of the trade which first built up the town is a Mexican gentleman with his, at the moment, refractory riding mule.

The oxen led in back of the wheelwright may be for sale or be simply on their way to the owner's wagon. In the rear, wagons form a train, the loaded ones moving out toward the prairie. 'Way back in the distance, showing that the wagons are headed for Oregon, are the famous landmarks of the Oregon Trail, Chimney and Courthouse Rocks in western Nebraska.

To the left of the door, back of the Pawnee warrior a trader displays his wares to a Cheyenne chief who has red fox furs to barter. Near the chief's hand is his rifle, a French flintlock which has likely come west from New Orleans, its journey furthered perhaps by the introduction of an arrow to the body of its original owner. Back of the trader is the persuasive whisky keg, likely full of watered alcohol, pepper, and tobacco juice, and back of that a young Cheyenne squaw bringing in more fur to trade. Near her, pack mules are being reloaded for a further westward journey. They are tardy members of the mule train going over the hill.

Above and to the left of the Cheyenne chief a number of his young warriors show off their horsemanship, no doubt stimulated by trader's beverages. Back of them is Fort Bent, a formidable adobe fortress set far out on the Santa Fe Trail along the banks of the Arkansas River, in southern Colorado. Back of the fort are the Spanish Peaks, landmarks of the way of Taos and Santa Fe.

The lower panels, right and left of the door, show Independence in the late 1840's and the Missouri River landing where arrived most of the goods and peoples which changed Independence from a quiet backwoods settlement to a gateway of destiny.

ABOUT THE ARTIST

The Benton mural was purchased for the Library by the Harry S. Truman Library, Inc., the private corporation that built the building, and the Edwin Austin Abbey Memorial Trust Fund for Mural Painting. The latter fund carried 40 percent of the $60,000 cost. The 3-year contract for the painting was signed June 6, 1958, by Mr. Benton, David D. Lloyd, executive director of the corporation, and representatives of the National Academy of Design which administers the Abbey Fund. The Harry S. Truman Library, a Federal Government institution under the National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, owns and operates the Library but bore none of the cost of the mural. After extensive preparatory work, actual painting took approximately 8 months. The work was completed in March 1961.

The artist used an acrylic polymer latex paint which was applied on a special Belgian linen surface. A sealer was applied over the original paint on the plaster wall, to prevent bleeding action, and the linen was applied with a polyester adhesive. The linen was then covered with a liquid latex gesso to provide the painting ground. The mural occupies a space 19 by 32 feet, and covers 495 square feet.

Mr. Benton wants to express his appreciation to Mr. Sidney Larson of Columbia, Mo., and Mr. Duard Marshall of Kansas City who squared off the wall in three-quarter inch squares and elevated his working design, or cartoon, in pencil—also to Mr. Charles Banks Wilson of Miami, Okla., who was an invaluable assistant in the research for Indian and frontier material.

The artist is the outstanding mural painter in America, and has done many other notable works including those at the Capitol Building in Jefferson City, Harzfeld's Store and the River Club in Kansas City, the new School for Social Research in New York City, and others for the Power Authority of the State of New York and the State of Indiana. He was born April 15, 1889, at Neosho, Mo. The mural was dedicated on his 72d birthday. For many years he has lived in Kansas City, having served as director of the department of painting at the Kansas City Art Institute from 1935 to 1941. He studied at the Chicago Art Institute and the Academie Julien in Paris, and has received a number of honorary degrees and memberships from organizations in this country and abroad. He is the author of a well-known book, "An Artist in America," and many articles.

[From the Kansas City Star, Apr. 16, 1961]

TRUMAN'S RESTRAINT AS A CRITIC EARNS PLAUDITS WITH BENTON'S ARTISTIC GENIUS

(By Joe Lastelic)

Thomas Hart Benton smoked a black cigar and listened with his head bowed yesterday as he heard his mural in the Truman Library in Independence described as an American epic.

Nearly 2,000 persons sat under sunny skies in a stiff wind in front of the library during the hour-long dedication ceremonies of the mural. Heading the list of notables was former President Harry S. Truman and Chief Justice Earl Warren.

After he listened to the plaudits, Benton was called on for some remarks. He recalled that Mr. Truman had dabbed a bit of paint on the 19 by 32-foot mural, "Independence and the Opening of the West," and now Benton joshed the former President about his help.

"If he had any ideas for the improvement of the mural he didn't tell me about them," Benton said. "This is remarkable reticence, not often found at any time between patron and saint.

"Even with such a supreme artist as Michelangelo, Pope Julius II was a frequent kibitzer," Benton said with a smile.

Benton said Mr. Truman has been his best patron.

"He possessed the equipment as a historian to be a really disturbing kibitzer if he had wanted to," the artist explained. "Instead, he permitted my work here to develop on its original plan and through its own logic to its own kind of completion. I, therefore, hope the mural turns out to be a success. If it does, the President's considerate restraint will have helped to make it so. If it doesn't, you know who's responsible."

Mr. Truman spoke of Benton in the same jocular vein.

"I succeeded in getting along with Thomas Hart Benton and that's a job that's hard for anybody to do," the former President said.

He explained Benton was chosen to do the work because he is the best muralist in the country, adding: "I think this is his best painting."

In introducing the Chief Justice, Mr. Truman called him one of the greatest in the history of this country, adding that he was honored and grateful to have Warren attend the ceremony.

The mural "captures the full drama of the epic western movement of our Nation," Warren, the dedication speaker, said.

"It cannot fail to reach the minds and hearts of all who see it. It will help to stir the imagination and the vision of our young people with whom the future of our Nation rests, and turn their thoughts to our heroic history and to the values which made this country great."

CITES WEST'S HISTORY

The builders of the West were not statesmen or generals, Warren pointed out, but determined men and women who were in

search of independence and opportunity for themselves and their children. Their victories were not won in climactic battles, but in the daily surmounting of incredible hardships, privation, and personal danger, he said.

"As our people come to visit the Truman Library, their eyes will fall first upon this great mural, and if they see it with eyes brightened by a knowledge of our own history every figure in it will have meaning for them and will help to build within their hearts a deep and abiding patriotism," Warren said. "The knowledge of our heroic past will open vistas for them into our future."

This is the same country as when the pioneers struck west on the trails leading out of Independence, Warren said. It has the same potential, and there is still room for unlimited development.

"The mural * * * will inspire us all to face with courage and hope the great unexplored realms of matter, mind and soul which spread before us.

"It will be a symbol to all of us of the spirit of our pioneer fathers, who so successfully met the challenge of their time; and it will be a symbol, too, of the great President who came from that stock and brought to the high councils of our Nation and of the world the courage and vision of the West."

In the presentation, Eugene Savage, New York, representing the Abbey Mural Fund and the National Academy of Design, called the mural an American epic that makes an outstanding contribution to our national consciousness and purpose.

David D. Lloyd, New York, a member of the library's board of directors, said Benton's art "expresses and portrays America for the eyes of the world."

Dr. Wayne C. Grover, Washington, Archivist of the United States, accepted the mural on behalf of the Government and said it's another step in making the Truman Library a great national cultural institution.

"Mr. Benton is the best muralist America has produced," Dr. Grover added, "and this is the best mural he has produced."

At the completion of the ceremony the dignitaries filed into the library, for a reception. The Chief Justice did not attend, but flew back to Washington.

In the garden room of the library Mr. and Mrs. Truman, Mr. and Mrs. Benton, their daughter, Miss Jessie Benton, and Dr. Philip Brooks, director of the library, and Mrs. Brooks, greeted more than 1,000 guests. They drank punch and viewed Benton's preliminary sketches, models and other research work for the mural.

Benton, who had expressed concern about having to shake so many hands stayed to the end.

"Mr. President, the sun did come out for us after all," Benton remarked during the reception.

"I told you it would, Tom," Mr. Truman smiled.

BENTON BIRTHDAY FETE

About 80 persons attended a birthday dinner for Benton last night at the Hotel Muehlebach at which Sam Gorman and Barney Allis were hosts.

Among those at the head table were Mr. and Mrs. Truman and Sir Roland and Lady Margaret Symonette of Nassau. They represented Queen Elizabeth II.

When the cake, shaped like a book was brought in, Benton looked at the four candles, blew them out, then made the briefest of speeches:

"When Mr. President Truman sits down with me for a birthday party I'd say, well—uh—uh—that's a helluva occasion."

Later, at a gathering of some of the artist's close friends at the Benton home to view a painting he is now doing for the New York Port Authority, Sir Roland commented of Benton: "I'm terrifically fond of him."

Sir Roland, a native and lifelong resident of the Bahama Islands, holds the title of "leader of the Government."

"You don't have anything here that corresponds to it," he said, "but in England, it would be the prime minister."

The official first became acquainted with Benton when the artist visited the tropical islands 2 or 3 years ago.

"He came to one of our dinner parties," Sir Roland said. "He's a terrific character. I don't suppose there is one in 10 million like him. He's what I suppose we might term a rugged individualist."

"We came through here in 1959 and I saw him up on the scaffold," the official said. "I met President Truman, too."

After Benton finished the Truman library mural, he repaired again to the Bahamas for revitalization. But this time, the artist became ill and returned home.

"We're not trying to shun our share of the responsibility," Sir Roland said. "But he went out on a fishing trip and got a cold."

"He told me just now," the official said, "that he had made his mistake when he got on the airplane to return here. He said he should have stayed down there and recovered. We have an excellent clinic there."

THE CHALLENGE OF OUTER SPACE TO THE LEGAL PROFESSION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KERR

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] delivered the principal address at the University of Oklahoma on the occasion of the 13th annual Law Day observance on April 27. His address was entitled "The Challenge of Outer Space to the Legal Profession." It highlighted the many facets of the legal problems in this space era.

Senator ROBERT S. KERR is a lawyer, a successful businessman, a recognized authority in the field of conservation, and, as we all know, is Chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on which I have been the ranking minority member since its inception. The judgment and insight possessed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma has been invaluable in expediting the work of the committee. Senator KERR is well qualified to appraise realistically the legal ramifications and challenges resulting from space exploration. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this learned and enlightened address delivered before his alma mater be made available to my colleagues and the public by having it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF OUTER SPACE TO THE LEGAL PROFFESSION

(By Senator ROBERT S. KERR)

I want to thank Dean Sneed, and at the same time, congratulate him. My gratitude stems from the invitation to join with you in celebrating Oklahoma's 13th annual Law Day, paricularly when this day is highlighted by a program on the problems of space exploration. My congratulations are to Dean Sneed as the newly elected mayor of Norman.

I seek your indulgence for a moment of reminiscence. Forty-five years ago as a junior in this university, I sat in the old chapel assembly room on this campus and heard what was regarded as one of the great men of that day, Dr. Raymond Robbins, speak of frontiers, new and old. I heard him recount in thrilling language his experiences in making the wild gold rush into Alaska in the last days of the previous century. He concluded his speech that morning by describing his experiences in standing on the rugged cliffs of our continuent and looking out across the Bering Sea to the frozen Siberian wastelands, where, he said, the West ends and the East begins. He then said, "As I and others stood there that stormy wintry morning, we lifted our hands to Heaven and thanked our God for having been among those who had conquered the world's last frontier.

How little he knew of the vast and glorious frontiers ahead of which he had never known or heard.

And, little did I dream when I attended the university that I would ever return here to speak before the college of law on the legal problems of space exploration. In fact, as recently as the last graduation of one of my sons from this college of law, the area of space law had not been opened.

During my 12 years in the U.S. Senate, and before that, as Governor of Oklahoma, I have had many opportunities to talk to university and college groups over the State. My favorite subject, of course, has been "Land, Wood and Water." Conservation and development of our natural resources, in order to insure future prosperity and growth of Oklahoma, has been my objective. I am profoundly grateful to the many people who have shared this dream and have helped so much to bring it so close to reality. This program has had the enthusiastic support of our younger citizens and I am confident the Land, Wood and Water blueprint that we are using here in Oklahoma holds great promise for generations of Sooners to come. Mayor Sneed and the civic leaders of Norman have a great stake in this program, for the reservoir on Little River will provide this city, and the university, with many benefits. The Little River project is part of a truly remarkable idea, an idea that harmonizes with the hope and belief that this college of law will continue to expand its services to the people of Oklahoma. And not the least of these new services is the leadership it is providing to the Nation and world in the field of space law.

Oklahoma's Land, Wood and Water program has advanced more rapidly than similar programs in other States with comparable problems. I earnestly solicit your continued study and support of it, for it is becoming more and more apparent that the technology of natural resource conservation is closely related to the more glamorous technology associated with this Nation's space program. President Kennedy pointed up the significance of this association just a few days ago. In a comment upon the Russian feat of orbiting a man around the earth, the President declared that if this Government's water research program leads to a practical method for making sea water drinkable, such a scientific breakthrough would be of greater benefit to mankind than anything accomplished so far in the race for space.

Since I became chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences in January, I have amended my long standing slogan, making it: "Land, Wood, Water and Space." I believe the new version accurately describes a new horizon of great promise for the pioneering spirit of Oklahoma.

Oklahomans have never lost the spirit of youth, of optimism and of going ahead into the future undaunted by fear of what lies

over the horizon. The qualities needed to explore the universe are the selfsame qualities that inspired our fathers and grandfathers to rush into Oklahoma's space and settle on what was, to them a new and strange land. Their spirit and initiative, their courage and their quest for adventure—all of these qualities have stood them in good stead as they struggled to establish stewardship over what so recently was wilderness. As they are harnessing our land, wood and water for the common good, so will they and their sons and daughters attack the newer problems of our time. This law day proves this. The University of Oklahoma pioneered the Law Day, U.S.A., program now observed throughout the Nation on May 1. It effectively calls attention to the American concepts of truth, fairness and justice on a day long associated with the opposite standards of communism.

The advent of the space age found this college of law in the forefront in recognizing the importance of space problems. Under the guidance of law librarian Mortimer Schwartz, a comprehensive collection of writings on space law was started here in 1957. Scholars of many countries have contributed to this space law collection. The seminar on space technology, sponsored last fall by this university in conjunction with the University of California, is another example of leadership in this field.

Leadership has long been the hallmark of this college. The graduates who have achieved distinction in the armed services, who are being honored today personify this fact. Three of the five general officers in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force are graduates of our college of law. There are others in the Armed Forces who are here today and who have brought equal distinction to our university. We commend them for the manner in which they have lived up to Oklahoma's great traditions. We are especially grateful for the manner in which our law graduates have handled hundreds of cases which have come before the Military Court of Justice.

Moreover, it seems to me that the basic principles of law are not remote from each other, whether the area of investigation is the Uniform Code of Military Justice or a code for the law of outer space. The philosophy of justice seems to me to be immutable and total. The principles that apply in one specialized portion of justice apply, in fact, everywhere.

I was asked to talk today about the problems of space. Since the Senate Space Committee has just published a symposium on "The Legal Problems of Space Exploration," I am very happy on this occasion to present this bound volume to the college of law for its permanent collection. No matter where you are sitting, I am sure you can see that this is a very thick book. It should be dear to any lawyer's heart because it is studded with legal problems.

I am sure this book tells more about outer space than we can cover in a single sitting, and I have decided to discuss those problems which are most challenging to the legal profession. At the outset I should point out that there is at least one problem the lawyers won't have to worry about. Space exploration is not unconstitutional. While the Founding Fathers did not specifically provide for space activities, they did not prohibit them. Whatever else happens, it is always comforting to know that we are proceeding along constitutional lines.

The problems for which we must seek solutions emerge from a complex of political, economic, scientific, and technological factors. To identify and understand these problems, it is necessary to ask ourselves what makes space exploration important? What objectives does the United States seek to attain? What policies have we adopted?

Space exploration is vital both to national and international security because it is a major new factor in man's quest for peace and his desire to avoid and prevent the massive destruction of nuclear war.

The Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, emphasized this point in a speech in Oklahoma City a few days ago. The Secretary said the Soviet space effort serves to dramatize the situation of the free world in a way that should fire our determination. We heartily endorse the warning he sounded when he said, "Experience tells us we cannot count on Communist exploitation of space for peaceful purposes. America and her allies have no choice but to extend our influence into space to the end that no nation shall be disfranchised in space, and no nation shall be disfranchised on earth through domination of space by another."

No one should dispute this statement. The nation that dominates space can dominate the earth. Our peril then, is this: Shall space and space law be the domain of a pagan power in which a dictator is the law unto himself?

Faced with this awesome possibility, the United States has adopted a policy that space activities should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind. We have given responsibility for our civilian program to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Civilian applications of space power now receiving much much effort would enable us to have instantaneous worldwide communications, more accurate weather predictions, and more precise guidance in navigation. The Department of Defense is in charge of space activities which are unique to military preparedness. It is our intention that the United States shall be a leader in this field, devoted to the expansion of human knowledge and to cooperation with other nations in the peaceful applications of space technology.

To achieve our international space objectives, we are simultaneously using three methods of approach. We make international agreements for such programs as our worldwide network of tracking stations where data from space probes and orbiting satellites is received for evaluation. We take unilateral action when we announce policies which may gain the support of other nations. And we follow the policy of taking whatever positive steps are open to us through the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

We participated, with other member nations, in the work of the United Nations ad hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The work of this Committee, which was established in December 1958, was based upon the premise that mankind has a common interest in space exploration and that present national rivalries should not be launched into the cosmic reaches of the universe. Although the Soviet Union, and several other nations, refused to cooperate in the task of the Committee, a report was completed in June 1959 by other members who forged ahead with a survey of the possibilities for international cooperation and organization of space activities.

The report concluded that the basic principles of justice embodied in the provisions of the United Nations Charter are not confined to the earth—they extend to all the purposes which we may undertake in outer space. The same holds true for the statute of the International Court of Justice. It was clear to the Committee that political considerations would affect legal space problems to a far greater extent than those concerned with science and technology. The result was, therefore, that the legal problems were identified in terms of their importance, and how they might be met, but no recommendations were made for their solution.

Since that time, the United Nations established, on December 12, 1959, its permanent Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The General Assembly asked for a study and report on the nature of legal problems which may arise from the exploration of outer space. Although the United States and the Soviet Union had reached agreement on the membership of this Committee, the Russians have not been willing to get started with the work.

It is in this international area that the talents and skills of the legal profession can be brought to bear upon problems whose solution may well mean the difference between using outer space for peace rather than war.

Not all lawyers agree, of course, on the same list of priority problems, but since little has been done to solve these problems, we will start with a discussion of those which have been officially identified by our Department of State and the United Nations.

A primary problem concerns the freedom of all nations to use outer space. When space exploration began during the International Geophysical Year, the assumption was that nations had permission to launch satellites around the globe regardless of the fact that they orbited over the national boundary lines of many states. The United Nations Committee concluded that as far as peaceful purposes are concerned, the fact that no nation objected to satellites may have resulted in general acceptance of a rule that outer space is free for exploration in accordance with existing or future international law or agreements.

As lawyers, of course, you will be alerted by that word "may" in this context. Although no nation has objected to spacecraft in outer space, even since the end of the IGY, we cannot be sure that none ever will. If outer space is to be free for peaceful purposes; if outer space is to be controlled so that ever more destructive weapons will not be directed toward the earth; it will be necessary to devise international agreements.

The U.S. policy of international cooperation calls for agreement on these points: (1) that no nation shall claim sovereignty over celestial bodies; (2) that none shall engage in warlike activities or station weapons of mass destruction in outer space; and (3) that the United Nations should verify the launching of spacecraft in advance. Agreement on these points would go a long way toward dispelling the fear of a surprise attack.

You may well ask—If we cannot get agreement with the Soviet Union on starting some committee work in the United Nations, how can we possibly move forward toward the goal we seek to achieve?

Freedom of outer space may be compared to the problem of freedom of the seas during the age of exploration in the 15th and 16th centuries. International custom has resulted in general recognition that the high seas are free for the ships of all nations, although territorial waters are claimed along the seaboards. The members of the United Nations ad hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space came to unanimous agreement on the necessity for studying the principles and procedures which we have already developed in controlling air space and the sea. We need to determine in what ways these areas are similar to outer space, and in what ways outer space is so unique that the rules and regulations we have developed in the past will not apply. Just as the lawyers of several hundred years ago faced the problem of freedom of the high seas, so today you stand on the threshold of a new age of exploration with an unparalled opportunity to bring law and order into our space activities. The least that mankind should do is to be able and willing to apply the principles of

justice under human law in that vast firmament where throughout limitless eons God has declared his glory and his sovereignty maintaining physical order under natural law.

Already, some agreement has been reached in certain scientific and technical areas. If the scientists and engineers can get agreement because it is essential to the success of their projects, a favorable climate may be created for the settlement of some of the political problems which are now testing our ingenuity and patience.

The problem on which we have reached some agreement is that of allocating radio frequencies to satellites. It is a scientific fact that the radio spectrum is limited and unless nations agree on how to divide the use of channels, we could have utter chaos in communications. All radio transmissions could become hopelessly garbled. To meet this problem the Administrative Radio Conference of the International Telecommunication Union met in Geneva during the latter part of 1959. The result was an agreement whose provisions will affect about 100 nations. This treaty is now before the U.S. Senate, awaiting ratification.

Solution of the radio frequency problem is vital to satellite communications systems. Many experts predict that this enterprise will be commercially profitable. Certainly as we get more deeply into this new method of communications, which involves government and industry as well as international agreements, lawyers will face many situations which challenge their ability to provide guidelines for the future.

Another problem which requires forethought is that of liability for injury or damage caused by spacecraft. Will it be possible for us to use some of the same ideas we developed for aircraft operating in air space? Should we decide that the nation which launches a space vehicle is liable for unlimited damages, or should we attempt to establish an international fund to take care of such matters? If there are questions about payment for damages, should the cases be referred to the International Court of Justice? This is certainly an area where those who have specialized in aviation law and international law will have an opportunity to study the consequences of the alternatives open to us and provide sound advice.

There are several other problems which need solution in accordance with the public interest.

Rules and regulations are needed to insure that space vehicles and aircraft will not interfere with each other.

Space vehicles need to be identified and registered, and attention should be given to the coordination of launchings.

When space vehicles reenter the atmosphere and land on territory belonging to other nations, it will be necessary to make bilateral or multilateral arrangements defining arrangements which are mutually satisfactory.

And, finally, we need to analyze the kind of organization we are likely to require for the administration of international rules and regulations. As you know, we established the International Atomic Energy Agency to deal with certain nuclear problems. We must consider whether this type of arrangement is feasible for handling the problems of space, and also whether it is politically practicable. There are numerous specialized organizations which might be called upon to administer certain types of regulation. For example, the World Meteorological Organization is already engaged in handling data about the weather. The International Telecommunication Union has special functions in the communications field. The International Civil Aviation Organization has responsibilities for aviation. These are only a few of the organizations which must be studied in order to determine what roles, if any, they may play in future satellite developments.

As lawyers, I know you must be aware of our need for definitions which will have the same meaning to all people. How are we to define spacecraft as distinguished from aircraft? Is a vehicle such as the X–15, which may operate in airspace and outer space, an aircraft, a spacecraft, or both? How shall we define spacecraft so that the definition does not also apply to intercontinental ballistic missiles? These are not theoretical questions. The exact meanings of such words and terms will be needed when international agreements and treaties are written. We cannot afford misunderstandings.

Problems in semantics will, of course, exist so long as human beings are human, but it was reassuring to learn the other day that one of the chimps in training for a space mission at Cape Canaveral was having the same trouble. We have some pretty smart chimpanzees on the cape, they tell me. One of them ran out of reading material the other night and asked his keeper to bring him a couple of books, the Holy Bible and Darwin's "Origin of Species."

The next morning, the keeper returned to the cage to find its occupant pacing the floor in deep consternation. The chimp held the Bible in one hand and Darwin in the other. He was pondering the books and the look of misunderstanding that clouded his hairy features prompted the keeper to ask what his problem was.

"I've spent a sleepless night," the chimp said. "I can't figure out from these books whether I am my brother's keeper or my keeper's brother."

Now I think the legal profession has very special qualifications for clarifying situations and preventing misunderstandings. You have training and experience in collecting facts, in evaluating all your information, and in determining the best course to follow toward a specific objective.

Above all, we need a working partnership between the lawyers and the scientists. They have a mutual interest in establishing feasible rules and regulations for the orderly conduct of space activities. Scientists can make available to the lawyers the technical facts which must be taken into account in devising controls to promote the use of outer space for peaceful purposes.

I share your pride in the great law college in Oklahoma University and her past and future. The establishment of the space law library here typifies her leadership. A new structure of law requires of its builders the same care and conscience that has brought our civilization to its present glory.

The English philosopher and critic, John Ruskin, commenting on his nation's humanitarian advancements of the 19th century, defined the ethical considerations we must keep in mind, whether our endeavor be for land, wood, water or space. Ruskin said:

"Therefore when we build let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for the present delight, nor for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for; and let us think, as we lay stone upon stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say, as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them, 'See, this our fathers did for us.'"

That admonition was heeded well at the moment in history, nearly 100 years ago, when it was uttered. The legal profession of which we are rightfully proud has built its reputation on these principles. And though only the first few stones have been laid so far in its foundation, the noble purposes of this calling can and must contribute to the building of a mighty edifice of space law—a shelter for the orderly extension of man's control over his tiny corner of God's universe.

THE COLD WAR VETERANS GI BILL ENDORSED BY ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina some time ago adopted a joint resolution steadfastly supporting the proposed cold war GI bill, S. 349, and has forwarded to our Senate Veterans' Subcommittee a copy of it, certified on May 4, 1961.

The GI bill, introduced by 37 Senators in January, would provide educational and vocational training for the 4½ million young men and women who have met the military manpower needs of the Nation during the period of the cold war.

An estimated 35,000 North Carolina veterans would go to school or enter vocational training during the first 5 years of the operation of the bill. The previous GI bills have already added some 259,000 educated and trained veterans to North Carolina's reservoir of trained manpower, and, Mr. President, I think it is safe to say that these citizens have played leading roles in the dynamic economic growth that has taken place, and is continuing, in the great State of North Carolina.

In its resolution, the North Carolina General Assembly takes particular note of the self-liquidating character of the cold war GI bill and points out that the education of cold war veterans will be more than repaid to the public treasury through increased taxes resulting from higher incomes of such veterans. The increased income to veterans, arising out of their higher education level, will more than pay the entire cost of the World War II GI training program by 1970. The resolution reads in part as follows:

Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the educational level of this country and has produced a major national asset which has contributed much to the economy of this country; and

Whereas the President of the United States by Executive order on January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational opportunities enjoyed by veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that the investment in the education of such veterans will be more than repaid to the public treasury through increased taxes resulting from higher incomes of such veterans.

Another way to look at it is to check the figures of the Bureau of the Census which show that the training received by veterans under the World War II GI bill is worth a billion dollars more a year in taxes to the Government, than without that training.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the end of my remarks a certified copy of the resolution from the General Assembly of the State of North

Carolina, with all the reasons the general assembly set out for the enactment of this much needed legislation, which I believe deals with one of the most critical subjects before the Congress of the United States.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 62

Joint resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend education benefits to veterans of the Armed Forces who entered or who enter the service subsequent to February 1, 1955

Whereas millions of veterans of World War II and of the Korean conflict have been educated under the provisions of the veterans' education program established by the Federal Government; and

Whereas many veterans were able to obtain further education through the benefits of the veterans' education program which would not otherwise have been possible; and

Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the educational level of this country and has produced a major national asset which has contributed much to the economy of this country; and

Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans arising out of their higher education level will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

Whereas the President of the United States, by Executive order on January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational opportunities enjoyed by veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that the investment in the education of such veterans will be more than repaid to the public treasury through increased taxes resulting from higher incomes of such veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. The General Assembly of North Carolina does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend GI educational benefits to all veterans who entered, or who enter, military services from and after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended so long as the provisions of the draft law exist.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution, a copy thereof shall be mailed to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of North Carolina.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 9th day of June 1959.

L. E. BARNHARDT,
President of the Senate.
ADDISON HEWLETT, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Examined and found correct:

FRED HOLCOMBE
(For Committee).

THE FIFTH WHEEL IN DEFENSE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Cincinnati Post and Times Star is one of the great newspapers of my State of Ohio. It is of importance in the Scripps-Howard newspaper organization. Its editor, Dick Thornburg, was formerly Washington correspondent for Scripps-Howard.

In the issue of May 3, 1961, under the caption of "Fifth Wheel in Defense," the Cincinnati Post and Times Star published the following editorial:

Civil defense, with its screeching sirens and its snowstorm of conflicting pamphlets, is something to frighten young children and nervous adults at a time when the Nation needs spunk. Its spending is a waste. Its arm-banded functionaries would be in the road of police and firemen, in the event of real national emergency.

Current appropriation for civil defense is $60 million. The new director has been talking about $300 million, sounds like he'd settle for $104 million. He's presenting his case to a House committee.

The editorial continues as follows:

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Ohio Democrat, speaks our piece:

"By reason of poor planning, confused thinking, negligence, maladministration, inordinately high salaries and colossal ineptitude, the paid officials and employees charged with defense of civilians in event of war have managed to squander more than $1 billion since 1951.

"My view is that the defense of civilians is too important to be entrusted to civilians wearing arm bands. As in Canada and England, it should be under the direction of those trained and experienced in defense—the Armed Forces of the United States."

I hope that later the majority of Senators will join with me in voting to curtail the sought for appropriations, because in truth and in fact civil defense as now conducted is a $1 billion boondoggle.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I am happy to cosponsor S. 1809, which has been introduced by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. This bill is identical to H.R. 6300, introduced by Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania, on April 13, 1961.

During these troubled times, it is important that we reevaluate our national goals and policies. In a reappraisal of our foreign relations at this critical juncture, the need for reform in our immigration policies stands out.

In my estimation, no more important service could be performed in the name of justice, humanity, and our own national self-interest, than improvement of our immigration laws. We must not forget that those laws reflect, in large degree, the character of our Nation. The billions of dollars appropriated annually for foreign aid cannot offset the impressions caused by inequities and shortcomings in our immigration policies.

There is much work to be done in the immigration field, but unfortunately, as in civil rights, progress is slow. If we want to continue to call the non-Communist countries our friends, we must begin improvements, for prolonged delay would be a blow to our national prestige abroad. This bill, I believe, is not the complete answer, but it would be an effective step in the right direction.

Briefly, I would like to direct attention, Mr. President, to the quota reserve program which I consider the most important feature of this bill. This bill establishes a quota reserve consisting of the annually unused quota numbers which will be allocated for the use of relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens. Every country of the world having an immigration quota of less than 7,000 annually will have access to the quota reserve proportionate to the respective country's participation in the sum total of all annual quotas under 7,000. This program, if enacted, will permit members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives already in our midst. This was the pledge in the 1960 Democratic platform, and one which in principle I believe is acceptable to all Members of this distinguished body. I hope that introduction of this bill in the Senate will expedite consideration of immigration reform which I feel is vitally important to our national self-interest. The time for action has come.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the estimated quota increase based on section 5 of this bill, and the number of persons registered for preference quota visas as of February 1, 1961.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Application of formula for redistribution of unused quota numbers under H.R. 6300 applied to quota reserve available on July 1, 1960

For the fiscal year ending July 30, 1960, there were 51,095 quota numbers unused. Ninety-nine quota areas, and seventy-six subquotas having annual limitations of less than 7,000 would participate as follows:

Quota area	Annual quota	Percentage	Share in quota reserve [1]
Austria	1,405	2.55	1,303
Belgium	1,297	2.36	1,206
China	105	.19	97
Czechoslovakia	2,859	5.19	2,652
Denmark	1,175	2.13	1,088
Estonia	115	.21	107
Finland	566	1.03	526
France	3,069	5.57	2,846
Greece	308	.56	286
Hungary	865	1.57	802
Italy	5,666	10.29	5,258
Japan	185	.34	174
Latvia	235	.43	220
Lithuania	384	.70	368
Netherlands	3,136	5.70	2,913
Norway	2,364	4.29	2,192
Poland	6,488	11.78	6,019
Portugal	438	.80	409
Rumania	289	.53	271
Spain	250	.45	230
Sweden	3,295	5.98	3,056
Switzerland	1,698	3.08	1,574
Turkey	225	.41	210
U.S.S.R.	2,697	4.90	2,504
Yugoslavia	942	1.71	874
74 minimum quotas	7,400		
76 subquotas	7,600	[2] 27.25	[2] 13,920
Total	55,056	100.00	51,095

[1] It should be noted that these quota numbers would be available only to aliens within the classes of relatives of American citizens and permanent resident aliens specified in sec. 5 of H.R. 6300.

[2] Each minimum quota and each subquota would participate at the rate of 0.18163 percent and would receive 92.8 quota numbers.

Registered demand for 2d, 3d, and 4th preference quota visas as of Feb. 1, 1961 [1]

Quota	Annual limitation	2d preference	3d preference	4th preference	Total
Albania	100	7	7	14	28
Asia-Pacific	100	10	26	6	42
Australia	100	15	2	117	134
Austria	1,405	12	25	68	105
Bulgaria	100	10	11	38	59
China	100	7	15	98	120
Chinese persons	105	814	570	945	2,329
Cyprus	100	6	5	250	261
Danzig	100		2	8	10
Denmark	1,175	3	7	7	17
Estonia	115	1	3	22	26
Finland	566	6	32	63	101
France	3,069	49	48	162	259
Guadeloupe			12	10	22
British subquotas:					
Antigua		3	13	21	37
Bahamas		9	18	21	48
Barbados		34	42	318	394
Bermuda		2	3	2	7
British Guiana		12	35	212	259
British Honduras		10	36	64	110
British Virgin Islands		1	95	131	227
Grenada		5	12	37	54
Hong Kong		1	2	13	16
Jamaica		254	77	620	951
Malta		1	2	355	358
Montserrat		1	18	48	67
St. Christopher		2	34	32	68
St. Vincent		1	7	23	31
Trinidad		9	40	190	239
Greece	308	681	949	5,548	7,178
Hungary	865	108	579	987	1,734
Iceland	100		1	2	3
India	100	12	114	69	195
Indonesia	100	1	7	29	37
Iran	100	19	17	120	156
Iraq	100	32	38	101	171
Israel	100	13	151	97	261
Italy	5,666	2,289	6,036	131,053	139,648
Japan	185	329	119	317	765
Jordan	100		2	16	18
Korea	100	5	23	68	96
Latvia	235	8	9	99	116
Lebanon	100	27	32	151	210
Libya	100	2	6	7	15
Lithuania	384	11	18	167	196
Morocco	100	18	13	298	329
Netherlands	3,136	13	27	89	129
Antilles			3	3	6
New Zealand	100	1	1	2	4
Norway	2,364		14	5	19
Pacific Islands	100			6	6
Pakistan	100		6	10	16
Palestine	100	16	143	229	388
Philippines	100	573	459	647	1,679
Poland	6,488	117	130	3,976	4,223
Portugal	438	214	478	3,433	4,125
Rumania	289	175	70	546	791
San Marino	100	1	6	27	34
Spain	250	84	75	617	776
Switzerland	1,698	8	6	12	26
Tunisia	100	11	6	201	218
Turkey	225	275	30	561	866
Union of South Africa	100	8	4	9	21
U.S.S.R.	2,697	57	28	123	208
United Arab Republic	100	66	92	457	615
Yemen	100		1		1
Yugoslavia	942	194	343	1,730	2,267
Total		6,713	11,505	155,707	173,925

[1] Data listed refers to petitions approved and not to number of aliens potentially covered by each petition.

REORGANIZATION OF THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the New Frontier is in evidence in many ways today, not the least of which is the resolute manner with which the ever-present problem of the independent regulatory boards and agencies has been attacked. Even before inauguration day, President Kennedy had before him a report on these agencies, and interest in their improvement has continued unabated. The Congress already has before it reorganization plans for the Security and Exchange Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Today I would like to draw the attention of the Senate to yet another agency—the Federal Maritime Administration, including the Federal Maritime Board. The regulatory powers of the Maritime Board are great, but are in part overshadowed by the promotional functions of the Maritime Administration.

It is not surprising that there is discontent with the performance of an agency that is vested with two such incompatible jobs, and I suggest that reorganization to terminate such incompatibility is necessary. Something very like the Maritime Administration once existed in the old Civil Aeronautics Authority established in 1938 as an umbrella agency for all matters of civil aviation, but this agency was short lived. Two years later Presidential reorganization plans divided the agency. Other changes have taken place since, but the distinction between promotion and regulation persists, and I submit that it is high time such a distinction be made with respect to maritime service.

It is my desire, Mr. President, that the Congress be given a reorganization plan for the Maritime Administration at the earliest possible date. Nowhere in the United States is effective regulation of maritime shipping more important than in my own State of Hawaii. We live by the sea, our products go to all the world by the sea, and it is urgently in our interest that sea traffic to and from our island State serve the public welfare. We doubt that the present Maritime Administration is now or ever can be equipped to do the regulatory job we need, which is comparable to the regulation of rail and truck transport in the mainland States.

We need a regulatory agency that can work unimpeded by the need to promote and uncluttered by other matters. Furthermore, Mr. President, we need this kind of an agency now. I hope that the administration can lay before us a plan to secure a truly regulatory body before too many days go by.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE AND INTER-AMERICAN TREATIES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the American people have been subjected to considerable confusing propaganda to the effect that our inter-American treaties are so worded as to preclude any so-called intervention by the United States in Cuba. This propaganda appears to rest on the false assumption that there has not already been Sino-Soviet intervention in the area covered by the Monroe Doctrine and, particularly, in Cuba. In the May 3 issue of the Washington Evening Star appeared two letters which deal knowledgeably with this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters to the editor were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONROE DOCTRINE VERSUS INTER-AMERICAN TREATIES

For the past few days I have been reading in your paper and in other papers a number of statements about the recent Cuban incident, the most recent one being the letter signed by Diego Aguila de Monteverde in the Star. Mr. Aguila de Monteverde talks about the convention on duties and rights of the states (nonintervention pact of Montevideo) as enjoining the United States from doing anything about the Communist regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

I am one of the seven Latin American delegates who in 1933, in Montevideo, drafted the nonintervention pact of Montevideo. I was one of the Cuban plenipotentiary delegates to the VII International Conference of American States; but what is happening in Cuba today, and it is a pity that Mr. Aguila de Monteverde and some other people cannot see it, is that the nonintervention pact has been violated by the Communist internationale. We never wanted to put a stop to the military and diplomatic intervention of the United States in Latin America, as practiced up to 1933, to open the way for the intervention of the Soviet Union in Latin America, that we have today. The case of Cuba is quite clear. There we have the intervention of Red China, openly flouting the principle of nonintervention.

Furthermore, all this sanctimonious respect for the convention on duties and rights of the states, of Montevideo (nonintervention pact), fails to take into consideration that inter-American treaties against intervention did not stop at Montevideo in 1933, but were reasserted in Lima, in Havana, in Panama, in Washington, in Rio de Janeiro, in Bogotá, in Caracas and in Santiago de Chile as recently as 1959, all

the time stating that the Republics of the two Americas were against intervention by the totalitarians of the right and the totalitarians of the left and should oppose it. Those who did not oppose Communist intervention in Hungary, Indochina, Greece, Tibet and so forth, by the Soviet Union and by Red China now present themselves as the champions of nonintervention when there is Soviet and Chinese intervention in Cuba. Playing with words, with the sovereignty of the nations and with the freedom of peoples dominated by the Communists.

HERMINIO PORTELL-VILA,
Professor (in Exile), University of Havana.

In the letter by Diego Aguila de Monteverde in the April 29 issue of the Star, under the caption "Monroe Doctrine Versus Inter-American Treaties," are to be found quotations from the Treaty of Montevideo and from the Charter of the Organization of American States, signed in Bogotá on April 30, 1948.

The writer, in the closing paragraph, states that the Treaties of Montevideo and Bogotá must be respected by the U.S. Government if this country is to remain the land to which the world can look as the supporter of such basic principles as self-determination, liberty, and justice for all men and for all nations.

Conceding the points in the preceding paragraph, it would be fair to ask whether Diego Aguila de Monteverde has given sufficient thought to whether his statements might further weaken the stand that must be taken in order to maintain freedom in this country and in all other countries not yet gobbled up by the Communists.

There is one thing that we must keep in mind. The Roosevelt era differs vastly from the Eisenhower and Kennedy era as far as the concert of nations is concerned. We must also remember the dignity of any one of the nations, including the United States of America. There must be a limit to the vilifications of one Castro, who, incidentally, is no respecter of the Charter of the Organization of American States. Why is it that Monteverde failed to make due note of that part of article 13 of the Treaty of Bogotá, which reads "* * * respecting, at the same time, the principle of universal morality and of human rights"? In this connection, let us ask what excuses we can find for Castro that would outweigh his betrayal of his own country, now essentially a Russian satellite and a danger to all inter-American States. In the same connection, we must also ask whether the time has come to slap down the traitor and tyrant in question and ask for the unqualified support of all other Latin American States and of those within Cuba who claim the right to be free—all in the name of human and of national dignity. Let us not forget that in the last analysis the Communists are engaging us in an unprecedented war, a real and ugly all-out war.

OSCAR E. MOLLARI.

THE INTENTIONS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post a very timely and direct article by Mr. Stewart Alsop pointing out the facts of life about the intentions and objectives of the Communists in general and Premier Khrushchev in particular. I wish that everyone in the United States could read this article and particularly those members of the President's advisory group to whom Mr. Alsop makes reference. I ask unanimous consent that this article also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KHRUSHCHEV REALLY MEANS IT

(By Stewart Alsop)

The rather special circumstance of a brother's demanding a couple of weeks of column writing as a wedding present is hardly likely to be repeated. So this is doubtless the last column under the above byline that will ever appear in this space. This reporter therefore feels a bit like a dying man who wants to be remembered for his famous last words, but can't think of any. The best I can do is: Khrushchev really means what he says.

The British could never quite bring themselves to believe that Hitler really meant the crazy things he said in "Mein Kampf." But Hitler did mean them, because he was crazy.

Nikita Khrushchev is not crazy. Unlike Hitler, he has no irrational impulse to play Samson in the temple. But it is important to realize that Khrushchev and those around him are rational within the limits imposed by the essentially irrational doctrine of Marxism-Leninism. This doctrine makes it possible for Khrushchev, like the White Queen, to "believe six impossible things before breakfast," as when he remarked, in Walter Lippmann's fascinating interview with him, that he considered President Kennedy merely an agent of the Rockefeller interests.

No doubt Khrushchev really believes this. More important, there is no doubt at all that he really believes that what his idol Lenin called "the cause of creating a world-wide Soviet Republic" is sure to triumph, and rather soon now. Indeed, in recent months he has been predicting that triumph more confidently than ever before.

He has been quite explicit, moreover, about how the triumph is to be achieved. He announced gloatingly more than a year ago that "the world balance of power has now turned sharply in favor of the Socialist countries." In his dispute with the Chinese Communists, he has ruled out the use of this power in a global nuclear war in order to insure the triumph of the "world-wide Soviet Republic." But, he says, "we shall make the imperialists jump like fishes in a saucepan, even without war."

By "imperialists" he means us, and in southeast Asia, Cuba, and elsewhere, we have indeed been jumping like fishes in a saucepan. Moreover, Khrushchev has also been quite explicit about what he means by "without war." He means without the kind of war which might destroy the Soviet Union. Other wars are dandy. "We support wholeheartedly and without reservation all national liberation wars," he said a few weeks ago.

This is the kind of war Khrushchev and the Chinese and Indo-Chinese Communists have been promoting in southeast Asia. It is wholly predictable that there will be more such wars, not only because Khrushchev means what he says, but because he must prove to the Chinese that he is, as a Communist, more royalist than the king.

Once you assume that Khrushchev means what he says, certain things become clear. One is that the cold war will go on, perhaps for generations. When the Kennedy administration took office, there were those in the Kennedy inner circle who talked hopefully of negotiating a "package deal," which would include arms control and a mutual agreement to "call off the cold war." These hopes have now, of course, turned to ashes.

The reason they have turned to ashes is simple. To ask the Communist leaders to forbear to thrust for Communist power in any area they deem vulnerable is to ask them to cease to be Communists. This is from their point of view nonnegotiable. The alternative is an agreement by our side not to respond to Communist thrusts, and to await meekly the destruction of our system. From our point of view, this also is surely nonnegotiable.

As in the Korean truce or the first Berlin blockade, it is possible to negotiate with the Soviets temporary accommodations which reflect the current realities of power. Unfortunately, the current realities of power are suggested by the fact that, if President Kennedy had intervened in either Cuba or Laos—let alone both—he would have had to commit just about the entire pathetic corporal's guard of conventional forces at his disposal. It is not surprising that Khrushchev was not much frightened by the President's bold words about Laos.

Mr. Kennedy's first job is thus to right the real power balance. If the job is done, there is no reason to despair, despite the recent disasters. For the other side has grave weaknesses which are less visible than ours, and the President, although he has blundered badly, is still capable of offering the leadership the West so desperately needs. But the job will be expensive and painful, and it will not be done unless we recognize that when Khrushchev predicts that our system will be destroyed by his, he means just that. If all this seems a bit obvious and unsubtle, so are most last words.

RECORDS OF DOCUMENTARY MATERIALS DEALING WITH THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as a part of the 100th anniversary of the War Between the States, efforts are being made in Virginia to have returned records and papers which were removed from the State during the war.

A great service would be rendered if State and local records, family papers, and documentary materials and manuscripts of all kinds carried away during the Civil War were returned to institutional repositories in the State where they would serve a useful purpose.

In this connection, the Virginia Historical Society, on April 20, 1961, unanimously adopted a resolution which I ask, with unanimous consent, to have published at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas various State and local records and family papers of great historical interest and value are known to have been carried out of Virginia by Federal soldiers during the War Between the States; and

Whereas it is believed that much of this material is still in the custody of descendants or relations of these soldiers, who, if properly approached, would be willing to return the materials to institutional repositories in the State, where the materials would serve a useful purpose; and

Whereas the Commonwealth has created a Virginia Civil War Commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the conflict during which the aforesaid losses of historical materials were sustained: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Virginia Civil War Commission be and hereby is requested to utilize the media of its organized publicity

program in soliciting, on behalf of the institutional repositories in the State, any manuscript materials which were removed or appropriated from Virginia agencies during the period 1861–65.

OLIVE BRANCH AND LIGHTNING BOLTS—THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the last time I visited the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command in Omaha I had the great pleasure of having lunch with Miss Alice Widener, one of our distinguished writers who writes for the publication "U.S.A.," published in New York City. Miss Widener has written an article about the Strategic Air Command entitled "Olive Branch and Lightning Bolts." The article was so thought provoking that I would like to give an opportunity to all Senators to read the article, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLIVE BRANCH AND LIGHTNING BOLTS—A REPORT ON THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND, U.S. AIR FORCE

(By Alice Widener)

They that have power to hurt and will do none,
That do not do the thing they most do show,
Who, moving others, are themselves as stone,
Unmoved, cold, and to temptation slow;
They rightly do inherit heaven's graces,
And husband nature's riches from expense;
They are the lords and owners of their faces,
Others but stewards of their excellence.
—*William Shakespeare, Sonnet XCIV.*

PREFACE

On March 21, 1946, the Strategic Air Command, U.S. Air Force, was established with the following mission:

Peacetime: To maintain a force capable of deterring aggression and to preserve the peace on terms acceptable to the United States;

Wartime: To destroy the enemy's warmaking capability and his will to fight.

This awesome mission is symbolized by the crest of SAC, our Strategic Air Command—a mailed fist holding an olive branch and lightning bolts.

Today, SAC bears responsibility for more than 90 percent of the free nations' nuclear striking force. Today our lives rest in SAC's mailed fist. Without aerospace lightning bolts in its grasp, this fist would be the hand of a corpse and the green olive branch would be a speck of dust fallen on an American wasteland.

Nevertheless, there are those who would persuade our country to cast away the lightning bolts in its mailed fist, and to shroud the olive branch in a white flag.

For more than a decade, I have studied the propaganda of these persuaders in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, in Pugwash statements, in many of the tracts and pamphlets put out by the more than 2,000 foundation-subsidized think centers at universities, at the Fund for the Republic's Santa Barbara Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and at the United Nations.

Professing to be an elite destined to save us from thermonuclear war, these propagandists mislead groups among us into adopting attitudes that undermine our will to resist Communist domination and that propel us toward committing national suicide.

These propagandists seek to persuade us that we must trust the Communists, that we must exert moral leadership by disarming unilaterally, that we must halt the tiresome dialogue of the cold war and accommodate ourselves to communism, that we must hold back SAC from massive retaliation against the Soviets and Red Chinese if they were to start a war, and that we must despise the officers and men of SAC as would-be mass executioners.

In all their propaganda, these persuaders—sick with fear and lusting for Socialist political power—never suggest that the Soviets and Red Chinese should accommodate themselves to us and our ways of freedom, that they should take the risk of accepting a first nuclear blow, that they should disarm unilaterally, that they should despise and repudiate the officers and men of the Red armed forces.

And all the while that these "think center" members of a self-styled elite try to persuade us to run the risk of national extermination, time, devouring time, is threatening to do its worst—to us.

Believing that time is not of the essence but is the essence, I decided to go and see SAC and try to find out precisely why the "think center" propagandists want us to hold it back.

The days I spent at SAC headquarters, Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.—April 14 to April 23, 1961—were the busiest and most strenuous of my life.

I came away convinced that either SAC will save us or the Reds will kill us.

Therefore I feel compelled to share with my fellow Americans all that I learned about the U.S. Strategic Air Command.

PART I. WHAT SAC DOES

We sleep, but SAC never does.

Sixty seconds a minute, unceasingly, SAC—our Strategic Air Command—works wide awake.

SAC's airborne alert never folds its wings to rest on earth. SAC's radar eyes never shut as they scan the skies. SAC's global signals system never stops pulsing along sound waves. SAC's positive control over the "go code" to strike back at a deadly foe never relaxes.

We sleep, but SAC never does.

What is the origin of SAC's tireless force? Is it scientific, technological, industrial? Is its constant protection over us a gift bestowed by a god sprung from a miraculous machine?

SAC's strength is indeed scientific, technological, industrial. But its origin lies in a way of Air Force life. It is a dynamic way, freely chosen by a group of men and women who are dedicated to peace as a profession, and who always are willing to watch over us.

In an airplane on the trip from New York City to Omaha, April 14, I sensed dimly a fact that later overrode all and cleared my mind of confusion derived from too much reading, at home and abroad, in English and other languages, of misleading propaganda voiced by some leading self-styled "intellectuals." Despite their claim to the contrary, it is true that each man is an individual different from every other, and that the horrors and wonders of sciences have not rendered man obsolete.

For several hours in the plane, I read, wrote, and chattered with a seat neighbor while a bridge game went on across the aisle. The players in uniform were SAC officers trained in the complex science of advanced aviation. They were not bridge experts, but their game was superior—hard fought, sparkled with wisecracks, tempered with courtesy only, and enjoyed in brotherly companionship. Playing the game, they behaved in a good traditional way which, as Plutarch described in antiquity "reflected one another's breeding."

Later, at a motel near SAC Headquarters, Omaha, I noticed that the desk in my room was too narrow for comfortable work at the typewriter and asked for a bridge table. Sitting there hour after hour, while I wrote three newspaper columns about SAC, I often thought about the airborne bridge game. Somehow, the diamonds, clubs, spades and hearts symbolically colored my writing; and my first impressions, based on the players' attitude toward one another, proved to be so truly indicative of the general man-to-man SAC relationship that I understood it better for having observed the card game.

I spent all Saturday morning at briefing sessions. SAC works on Saturdays. The officers who gave the briefings were clear-headed, well prepared and eager to answer questions. Col. Don Foster, director of SAC information, sat beside me. He was very patient, never condescending to an absolute tyro, and quietly considerate.

On a movie screen, in color and with sound, there unfolded before me a new world.

Time, so short, so long

For us Americans, it is a world in which there is at most a 30-minute interval of warning time between notice of a coming life-or-death struggle and our taking active part in it.

In the past, military commanders relied on future time for planning and they discussed the strategy and tactics of offensive and defensive action in terms of days, weeks, months, years. Today, the SAC commanders plan strategy and tactics in terms of minutes and seconds in present time and lead their lives accordingly. No member of SAC, from the commander in chief at his desk in headquarters to the lonely air watchman at a remote desert or glacier post, can while away time or let consciousness of it slip from his mind. And every man of SAC is willing to be the selfless servant of time for our defense in these times of clear and present danger.

Paradoxically, the short time element governing SAC creates extremely long working time. The Strategic Air Command keeps a major part of its 270,000-man force on continuous 24-hour, 7-days-per-week ground alert. The average workweek of a readiness plane crew is 76 hours. Alert duty entails personal and physical hardship, for the crews must endure separation from their families and confinement in close quarters located in an area suitable for immediate plane takeoff.

Marvelously, alert duty is also maintained in the air. Now, at the very moment you are reading this, a part of SAC is airborne. Heavy bombers and jet stratotankers are aloft. A duplicate command post too is airborne, commanded by SAC generals capable of making vital decisions if SAC's underground cement-enclosed command post and its three surface alternates were destroyed by the enemy's thermonuclear weapons.

Now, too, at this moment, there is instantaneous worldwide communication among all SAC bases.

Fate, in aerospace

Yes, we are living in a new world in our nuclear age. And though our feet tread on earth, our fate hangs in aerospace.

Few of us are aware that March 21, 1961, marked the 15th anniversary of SAC and the 15th year of success for our American concept of deterrence, which is to keep the peace by letting the enemy know every day that attack on our Nation or its allies will result in his own destruction.

"Since the prime purpose of our military forces is to prevent war," says Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, "they will be most effective if we never have to use them. Our power, however, will be sufficient as a deterrent only so long as it convinces potential enemies that aggression against us and our allies is profitless."

For this reason, the motto of SAC is "Peace Is Our Profession."

On a movie screen during the morning of April 15, I saw the tools of SAC's profession—the names tell a tale of scientific discoveries, of technological feats, of industrial achievements. The names also tell a tale of failure and success, of progress and consolidation, of dynamic exertion and lull, of vast sums of money spent and of far greater sums needed.

On screen, I saw the B–52 Stratofortress and the aging B–47 Stratojet, the SM-Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile, the SM-Titan ICBM and the B–58 Hustler medium bomber, the SM–80 Minuteman ICBM, the GAM Hounddog missile and the GAM–87 Skybolt.

Also, I saw an artist's drawing of the B–70 Valkyrie heavy bomber which—they say in high earthly Washington, D.C., places—we Americans are too poor to finance, make in quantity, and send aloft. However, we are rich enough, they also say in high Washington places, to try to subsidize with billions of dollars the economic growth of population explosions which—according to a statement made April 24 by Eugene Black, president of the World Bank—are timed at one birth per second in Asian and Middle Eastern lands least able to afford it.

Alone, but together

After gazing at pictures of planes and missiles meant for aerospace, it was a staggering experience to go down and down into the underground at SAC Headquarters and see the command post there.

Not being scientifically informed, I cannot describe the electronic systems set up, or rather, set down there. But I can say that this sealed-off, cement-enclosed place is like a Salvador Dali stage setting illuminated and ornamented with living, breathing jewel-like lights, and weird clocks, and panels of pushbuttons like myriad keys of an organ-like orchestral instrument to be played by military virtuosos.

In time of thermonuclear attack, the personnel of SAC's underground command post would be wholly isolated. They would breathe their own decontaminated air, eat their own uncontaminated food, drink their own purified water. Yet, unless SAC Headquarters were to suffer a direct hit, the underground generals and their staffs would be in constant worldwide communication with SAC's airborne forces and its missile sites.

Within the timespan of 3 minutes, I saw and heard underground SAC communications personnel—wearing earphones and keeping eyes glued on rows of dotlike lights—flip switches on a switchboard not much bigger than a dashboard on a car, then talk to and hear from SAC men on base at or in planes over Okinawa, Newfoundland, Saudi Arabia, England, Spain, Brazil, Morocco, and other far distant bases.

Yes, I saw electronic miracles, but it takes men to make the miracles work and to make sense out of them.

Because men are men and SAC knows it, there is a system called "positive control" in the headquarters underground command post, in the three alternate surface command posts, and in the duplicate airborne command post.

This system prevents accidental launching of SAC's nuclear striking force. Many propagandists try to persuade the American public that "one psychotic SAC sergeant can get us into a nuclear war." This is not true. If, God forbid, we should be attacked by an enemy, SAC forces will be unleashed only on coded orders, known as the "go code," issued on authority from the President of the United States himself. There is foolproof direct communication between the SAC command and the White House and Pentagon.

Officially, SAC describes positive control as follows:

"SAC aircraft on constant alert take off at reliable indication of attack and head for enemy targets. These planes can be recalled at any time in event of a false alarm, but will turn around at a positive control point unless they receive orders to continue."

The weapons in alert aircraft are not armed until the bomber is ordered to attack. No one man can arm a nuclear weapon. Arming is achieved by coordinated effort of several crew members or missile personnel under "go code" authority.

Despite these facts, certain propagandists continue to assert the contrary and thus foster unwarranted fears among some Americans, and near-hysteria and panic among others.

Why do these self-professed "humanitarians" spread such untruths? They assert that they wish to spare us all from unnecessary suffering. To my mind, fear is most terrible suffering; he who spreads unwarranted fears is sadistic.

When I went to SAC, I myself was half brainwashed by the fearmongers. At headquarters, I met men and women who do not pretend to be without justifiable fears, but who hold in rightful scorn those prophets of doom who cultivate and propagate needless fears.

No one at SAC tries to minimize the potential horrors of thermonuclear war; everyone at SAC lives a life wholly dedicated to its prevention.

PART II. WHAT SAC MEN AND WOMEN ARE

At 9 o'clock on Monday morning, April 17, I had the privilege of meeting Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief, Strategic Air Command, U.S. Air Force.

His eyes are blue and clear. Their gaze is direct, their expression realistic and inspired.

"It is our mission," the general explained, "to see and foresee the designs of an enemy, and to devise the versatile strategy and tactics that will deter and frustrate him."

Listening to General Power, I was struck by the mental similarity between him and Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It lies, I think, in each man's versatility, courage, and extraordinary geopolitical vision. These are superior qualities which characterize General MacArthur and Sir Winston Churchill. These are the special qualities that mark their greatness in military leadership. General Power will equal their stature, if put to the test by time and history. This is certain.

"It would be folly," he said, "for us to rely solely on any one weapon system."

To operate the mixed SAC weapon systems, General Power explained, there must be a professional force of officers and airmen with superior knowledge and skill. "The challenge faced by SAC in maintaining deterrent strength," he said, "is the most severe ever posed to a military organization."

The most important element for successful meeting of this challenge, the general believes, is the individual excellence of each man and woman among trained and dedicated personnel with a will to victory.

The general was not mouthing a platitude. He was speaking a truth that should be known and fully understood by every American.

I found this out when I went, that afternoon, to a trailer without wheels resting on a concrete ramp only a short sprint away from a KC–135 jet Stratotanker built to carry 250,000 pounds of fuel. Inside a trailer, a four-man crew was on alert, ready to perform the regular SAC feat of takeoff within 15 minutes after receiving an alarm signal.

In a small trailer living room, the 25-year-old navigator was studying a college textbook on English literature. At his elbow was a pile of 2-inch-thick technical manuals to be studied and restudied. Intelligent and ambitious, the navigator was lovelorn, pining away for his wife. They were married only 6 months ago.

The aircraft commander too was passionately in love—with flying. "Anything the enemy can do, we can do better," he said. "And anything we don't already know, we'll learn—fast."

The pilot loved flying and people. "We in this crew respect each other," he said earnestly. "Maybe our ideas about some things might be different. We chew the fat a lot. But we sure do see eye to eye on the job."

The boom operator was a thin, blond young staff sergeant. He told me about his job. His name is Richard D. Stafford and this is what he does: Lying on his belly and staring through a small glass window in the bottom of the tail of a KC–135 jet Stratotanker flying 600 miles an hour at an altitude of 35,000 feet, Stafford measures accurately with his own eyes the vital distance of only 20 to 30 feet between the tanker and the B–52 bomber being refueled.

The crew and I chewed the fat for a while. Then they took me through a KC–135 and down into the tail where Stafford operates the refueling boom.

"We pilots and navigators see to it that the tanker and bomber arrive at our rendezvous in the skies," the commander explained. "Then, suddenly, all depends on Stafford."

There, in the tanker tail, I understood the full import of the truth that General Power told.

If the "go code" ever were given to attack, all would depend on men like Stafford, on the highly trained, dedicated, professional SAC crews, and on all officers and men of our Armed Forces with courage and will to victory.

The captain's wife

There are many women at SAC with such attributes.

At supper in the officers' club, I had a long talk with Capt. "Chuck" Deare and his wife, Betty. She works as a secretary in the underground command post. She and Chuck have a 3-year-old son who grew bored at a children's movie being shown at the club and toddled into the dining room to join us at table.

"At first when I worked underground I used to grow terribly upset," Betty said. "I kept thinking about what would happen if I were safe there while Chuck and the baby were killed above ground."

I didn't say anything. Underground, I had had the nightmarish thought that perhaps a day would come when the staff underground were the sole survivors at the base after a thermonuclear bomb hit.

"One day, above ground, Chuck took the baby to town in the car. I stood outside in the garden and waved goodby," Betty Deare went on. "When the car was out of sight, I suddenly realized that a fatal accident could happen and I might never again see them alive. Then I would be in the same position above ground as underground."

She put down knife and fork, reached over to pat her little boy on the head, and smiled at her husband. "And so," she added, "I quit thinking fearful thoughts."

From what I heard and overheard at SAC Headquarters during 10 days, it seems everybody there does as Betty Deare did. Unusually self-disciplined and knowledgeable people, they are keenly aware that SAC Headquarters is a prime target for enemy attack. They can visualize much more vividly than most Americans the actual situation of thermonuclear war, not the fictionalized "On the Beach" version of it.

Fortunately for us all, the SAC personnel don't usually indulge in fearful thinking, and if they do momentarily fall into it, they

soon quit it—fortified by faith, commonsense, a sense of humor, and a deep feeling of service to our Nation and the cause of freedom.

PART III. WHAT SAC NEEDS

On Thursday, April 20, General Power, a rated command pilot with combat experience, invited me to go on a tour of the completed Atlas missile site in Wyoming and the Titan missile site under construction in Colorado.

During lunch in the cafeteria at Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., the general was notified that a jurisdictional labor union strike had halted work at the Titan site.

When we arrived there, the elevators had been stalled by the strikers. To go underground, it was necessary to climb down a circular staircase inside a well only 30 inches in diameter but more than a hundred feet deep. Since 85 feet is the height of six stories of a modern building, the circular but vertical descent was a physical ordeal.

I made it—backward. Going forward, I grew too dizzy. Also, I somehow controlled my tendency to vertigo when I stood on a narrow board scaffolding and looked down into the pit—178 feet below ground—where Titan will stand erect. But I could not control my indignation at the labor union leaders for halting work on a major national defense effort and thereby hurting the security of all Americans.

The climb out of Titan was a greater strain than the climb down. I gripped the wood rail so hard that next day my arms were stiff.

When at last we stood above ground the cool air felt icy on my cheeks, for I was boiling mad.

I don't know who are the labor union officials responsible for the outrageous jurisdictional strike at Titan. But I should like to see them go down and up those stairs. Also, I should like to see them forced to live for just 1 week the life led by SAC officers and airmen manning the missile sites. Believe me, they don't work a 30-hour week with 4 days off for leisure. Nor do they receive a single cent of overtime pay, much less time and a half.

Prior to visiting SAC, I had written articles and newspaper columns about the leftwing "hold back SAC" campaign. It can be fatal to America. Now, since I visited SAC, I am convinced that a part of this leftist scheme is to deny to SAC the proper personnel incentives and rewards so urgently needed to maintain its highly skilled, expensively trained and strictly professional force.

In our country, we are patsies for hue-and-cry propaganda about any group whom the leftwingers decide are overworked and underpaid. But I have seen nothing in leftwing publications such as the Bulletin for the Atomic Scientists, the New Republic, The Nation, the Reporter magazine or any left-liberal journal or newspaper about the overworked, underpaid men of SAC and of the entire Armed Forces.

Outside and inside

In the airmen's messhall, I talked to a sergeant who bears responsibility for the serving of 3,600 meals a day. The day begins at 5 o'clock in the morning and ends at midnight. Owing to the exacting nature of SAC's work and the staggered timing, many of the personnel cannot sit down to regular breakfast, lunch and dinner at customary eating hours.

The SAC mess sergeant earns $240 per month. Since many servicemen's benefits have been taken away, he must pay regular prices for much of what he and his family need. And—the mess sergeant pays income tax. Recently, he was offered a job "outside"—as SAC men say. In the outside he could earn $11,000 per year managing a series of hotel coffee shops.

"Why didn't you take the job?" I asked.

He flushed and said, "I'm kinda used to it here."

I silently doubted that this was his real motive and pressed for a more precise reason.

"Well, ma'am," he said, glancing around the messhall at the quiet, exceptionally well mannered men and women eating there, "I guess you could say it's because I know what SAC is doing. Without it, there probably wouldn't be any outside."

Probably, there wouldn't, at least, not as we know it. The United States would be a satellite state, a people's republic under domination by Khrushchev and his Red ruling circle.

My conversation with the mess sergeant led me to inquire into the SAC personnel situation. The more I learned about it, the more indignant I grew. Toward the end of my visit, I sat down late at night and typed a newspaper column which stated:

Modern warfare allows no time to correct errors and make up for lacks after the shooting starts. This is why our Strategic Air Command, SAC, must have a professional force of mentally alert, highly trained and skilled personnel.

Today, most of us civilians think of our military forces as drawn from a vast national resource of manpower easily available for our defense in time of crisis. We have the comfortable feeling that in time of dire need our men would respond to the Nation's call.

They would. But there won't be time enough for a call. And even if there were, most men would be useless to SAC.

In many ways, SAC is like a great symphony orchestra requiring only the best men and best replacements. These men must have years of training in handling delicate instruments, years of experience in teamwork, and ability to give a perfect performance. It is impossible to create such a body from untalented personnel. It is impossible to create such a body within a short space of time.

The biggest problem in SAC today is how to retain its highly trained, gifted, and dedicated personnel, and how to attract quality personnel for replacements.

SAC knows what it needs, but the public doesn't. Therefore, SAC isn't getting what it should have. Surely, an informed public will make their voices heard. Once they understand the problem, they will ask Congress to take care of it pronto, if not sooner.

From everywhere in our Nation, I receive letters from patriotic Americans asking, "What can I do to help our country?" Now that I have seen SAC, I can reply to the letters, "Help SAC."

It is easy to understand what SAC needs. The officers and men need the incentives and rewards that will in some measure compensate them for the hard way of life they lead. They do not expect to receive what civilians are paid for comparable jobs in industry and in commercial aviation. But they would like to have and certainly do deserve:

1. Promotion opportunity;
2. Alert duty pay;
3. Adequate housing;
4. Restoration of service benefits.

Modern warfare requires higher grade but fewer personnel. Restrictions of the present Officers Grade Limitations Act are such that chances for promotion in SAC above the grade of captain are very slim. Under a Defense Department directive, promotions between airman first class and chief master sergeant are too few.

The readiness of nuclear forces-in-being requires ground and airborne alert duty. This is the hardest kind of duty in which the workweek is 76 hours.

Everybody knows about civilian demands for "overtime pay" in a 30-hour work week. Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief, wants SAC's alert crews to receive an extra $10 for each 24-hour period spent on continuous alert. This is a paltry sum. The men should receive it.

Modern nuclear warfare requires that SAC maintain bases and missile sites in remote places where weather conditions and loneliness are acute. Surely, the men and their families stationed at such bases and sites should be able to have decent housing at low rents.

In civilian life, "fringe benefits" are the order of the day. In military life, service benefits have been steadily decreased. This is flagrantly unfair. Period.

Working here at SAC Headquarters, any writer in his or her right mind can soon see that SAC is our major deterrent to war and our primary hope of victory in war. Without SAC, probably there would not now be a United States of America. It is suicidal for us not to give SAC what it needs.

It was early Sunday morning, April 23, when I said goodby and thank you to newfound friends at SAC. In the plane, as it flew halfway across America during my trip home, I kept thinking about the new nuclear world I had glimpsed in Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado.

Graphically, Dr. Edward N. Teller described it when he said, "The world in which we live today will disappear, and tomorrow will be unimaginably better or very much worse. Whether the great dream of a free society composed of individuals who can be individuals and who are free, whether this dream will survive, this is up to us."

In the Soviet empire, people have no free choice.

In the free world, its exercise is our privilege and agonizing problem.

Who will prevail among us?

Lord Bertrand Russell says, "Rather Red than dead." Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief of SAC, says, "Rather dead than Red."

At home in my own room, Sunday evening, I felt tired but serene. By the time the plane had landed at Idlewild International Airport in New York, I had chosen to go along with General Power and all like-minded Americans and, like Betty Deare, I had quit thinking fearful thoughts.

In the dark at bedtime, I said an old prayer with new faith and understanding:

"Now I lay me down to sleep,
I pray the Lord my soul to keep;
If I should die before I wake,
I pray the Lord my soul to take."

Then I prayed for loved ones, for all men and women in our Armed Forces, and went to sleep, gratefully aware that up in aerospace, SAC was wide awake.

(Military strength for war becomes political strength for peace when it is supported by the sum total of every deterrent inherent in a strong and united nation. For deterrence is more than bombs and missiles and tanks and armies. Deterrence is a sound economy and prosperous industry. Deterrence is scientific progress and good schools. Deterrence is adequate civil defense and a stable professional military force. Most of all, deterrence is the determination of the American people to prevent and, if necessary, to fight and win any kind of war, whether hot or cold, big or small. So long as our citizens show such determination with both words and deeds, I am confident that the Strategic Air Command will accomplish its primary mission—to help preserve an honorable peace for this Nation and for all other nations in the free world.—Thomas S. Power, General, U.S. Air Force, commander in chief, Strategic Air Command.)

THE COST OF DRUGS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a constituent in Ravenna, Ohio, pointing out

an experience that she had in the purchase of drugs. Her husband had worked for the Pennsylvania Railroad for a period of 42 years. He was forced to retire because of an asthmatic condition. Treating her husband was a Dr. Tucker, of Mount Gilead, Ohio. He provided her husband with a drug at a cost of $4 for 2 ounces. The drug had a curative effect on her husband. Then the doctor died. The administrator of the doctor's estate sold the prescription to an Illinois drug company, the Northfield Laboratories of Northfield, Ill. Her husband again being in need of the medicine, contacted the residence of the former doctor at Mount Gilead, and was told that the prescription had been sold. In the letter the writer of the letter says that when she bought the drug from the former doctor, she had paid $4 for 2 ounces. After the prescription had been sold to the drug company, she had to pay $15 for 2 ounces, at another drugstore. She asks that this matter be called to the attention of the appropriate committee of the Senate. It is for that reason that I mention the receipt of the letter, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAVENNA, OHIO, *April 26, 1961.*

HON. FRANK LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senator, State of Ohio,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am registering this complaint to you hoping you will get it into the hands of the committee appointed for investigation of medical costs. It may not do any good but if we don't make such cases known, how are people in our circumstances ever going to be able to have medical care.

Five years ago my husband had to retire after 42 years with the Pennsylvania Railroad in Cleveland due to an asthma and heart condition. As you know railroad pensions are very meager for the percentage we paid in over the years. We had been taking him to an asthma clinic in Mount Gilead, Ohio, which was run by Dr. Tucker and Dr. Robinson. A year ago Dr. Robinson had a heart attack and passed away and about 2 weeks later Dr. Tucker was killed in an auto accident. So we could not get the medicine any longer and we were much concerned as it was the only medicine that gave Mr. Beery relief when he would have his very serious attacks.

A few months ago we received a letter from the doctor's estate telling us the prescription had been sold to a Northfield Laboratories in Northfield, Ill. If we would send in the card with our doctor's name they would get in contact with him and the medicine would be available to us again.

Last week Clark's Drugstore in Ravenna called us that the prescription was ready for us. When we bought the medicine from Dr. Tucker it cost us $4 for 2 ounces but at Clark's Drugstore it cost $15 for 2 ounces. We paid for it but only because Mr. Beery does need it so badly but it is just too expensive at this rate for our pension income. To us it seems uncalled for because the same medicine has been in use for years. It entailed no research or production of any new drug.

We folks need medical help as well as people with higher incomes but how can we have it when things like this are going on? I am registering with you a vigorous protest against such practices.

Mr. LAUSCHE, I can easily see how such revolts as Laos, Cuba, and the many others can happen in our United States with the extreme pressures on the small-income people from the exorbitant taxes collected from us and used in such extravagance; unnecessary exorbitant medical costs, terrific high costs of food and clothing, etc. From reading letters being sent to editors of newspapers; hearing the attitudes expressed in the various clubs and church meetings I attend; in the comments among our friends and my fellow employees; strikes we are having all over; and the increase in small and large thefts; from all these I can see the very beginnings of just such rebellion in the United States.

The pressures brought by the wealthy people on the lower salaried peoples have brought downfall of great nations all through history and it could be the near future destiny of the United States, which, I am sure, few of us want to see.

I sincerely feel that only quick action by our elected Government officials to alleviate such pressures and wasteful use of collected taxes can avoid terrible troubles in the United States already beginning to broil. Wasteful use of our tax money in the extravagant parties being given by the Kennedys and many other instances of unnecessary waste completely detrimental to the mental attitudes and the welfare of the citizens who can scarcely survive financially and pay the heavy taxes collected from them.

J. EDGAR HOOVER OUTLINES PROGRAM TO COMBAT JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the current issue of the Reader's Digest contains an article by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which I consider to be of great significance.

The article describes the effects of so-called juvenile delinquency on many parts of our country, and then explains how this terrible malady is being effectively combated by the Boys' Clubs of America and the Boy Scouts. Another Hoover—former President Herbert Hoover, who for 25 years has exerted his great influence on behalf of the Boys' Clubs movement—recently estimated that there is a minimum need in the United States for 1,000 Boys' Clubs serving 1 million youngsters. At present 575 clubs are serving about 600,000 boys.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE FIGHTERS AGAINST YOUTH CRIME NEED YOUR HELP

(By John Edgar Hoover)

(The appalling increase in youthful crime is a symptom of a much larger problem: a growing moral decay that affects us all. Here, the dean of American crime fighters specifies the steps we must take if we are to survive as a great nation.)

This Nation is hurtling toward a frightful internal crisis. Indeed, I am convinced that we have already reached a crossroads we have been heading for since the beginning of World War II; and that if we fail to admit the deadly nature of this crisis and to meet it quickly and aggressively, we will pay with the life of our Republic.

The crisis manifests itself in what some call juvenile delinquency, and what I call youthful criminality, for that is what it is. I refer to the vicious acts of vandalism, wanton brutality and mounting savagery which typify today's arrogant teenage gangs.

One night last summer, five youths between the ages of 15 and 18 viciously attacked two families in a Chicago park. After beating both husbands senseless with baseball bats, stabbing them with switchblade knives, and robbing them, these five terrorists turned upon the two pregnant mothers and brutally raped them while the two 3½-year-old children of one mother watched, weeping and horrified.

"They held a knife at my throat and threatened to kill my two little children if I resisted," one of the women said. "We pleaded with them, but they paid no attention."

Convicted of rape and assault each of the five young thugs received 65-year sentences. The sentencing judge recommended that the youths never be paroled.

Tragically, similar acts of brutal violence are perpetrated daily across the country by rampaging teenage criminals. Blazing headlines of murder, sadism, and gang warfare toll the depredations of youthful criminals. An 18-year-old California art student obtained money to purchase books by robbing elderly people. Known as the "mugger bandit," he committed six vicious attacks on elderly victims which netted him $70. Two of the victims, both elderly men, subsequently died as the result of the violent assaults. In describing his actions, the youth commented, "I picked on old men because they could not fight back."

Today youthful offenders account for one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests in this country and nearly two-thirds of the arrests for automobile thefts. And their rate of participation in more serious crimes—assault, robbery, rape, murder—is steadily rising.

If we are to continue living in a free and decent society, we must do much more than halt this trend; we must reverse it. Preoccupied with the pursuit of wealth and luxury, we seem to have lost touch with our basic traditions—work, discipline, duty, honor. But if this Nation is to survive, we must give our youngsters more chance to know and revere the spiritual concepts which are the real sinews of greatness.

We can help them best by committing ourselves unreservedly to a battle that an all-too-small vanguard of dedicated Americans has been fighting for us for years—the professional leaders and part-time volunteer workers of such groups as the Boys' Clubs of America, Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts, YMCA and YWCA, Police Athletic Leagues, and Catholic, Protestant and Jewish youth organizations. The results these groups achieve continually reaffirm my faith in the strength and appeal of the American idea, and my conviction that American youth, if given the opportunity, will eagerly accept honorable challenge.

Here are some heartening examples:

During the 8 years following World War II there was a 61-percent increase in juvenile crime in Louisville, Ky. But during the same period there was a 52-percent decrease in one of Louisville's poorest, toughest areas. No new industry moved into this neighborhood to upgrade incomes; there was no decrease in the youth population; housing conditions were not improved. One thing happened: a Boys' Club was established there.

Within 5 years after a Boys' Club was organized in a delinquency-ridden area of Schenectady, N.Y., there was an 80-percent decrease in youthful crime in that neighborhood. Results like these can be found in many of the 383 cities where 575 Boys' Clubs of America serve 600,000 lads.

The formula is simple. It consists of a genuine, active adult interest in youth; a deep respect and sympathy for the individual boy and girl, tempered with rigid,

tough-minded adherence to the legal and moral principles which are the cornerstones of any decent society; and, above all, an unwavering faith in our youth, and Job-like patience in helping every youngster realize the best that is in him.

This formula has worked countless times. At the end of World War II one neighborhood just west of Chicago's Loop was virtually an armed camp, torn by bloody juvenile gang wars. The streets were not safe for women, night or day; children could not be sent to the grocery store with cash.

For 10 years various social agencies tried to deal with these gangs with little success. Then, in 1955, a young Boys' Club extension worker whom we shall call Richard West began hanging about the pool halls and candy stores where the dominant, most vicious gang met. For months he studied the boys, listened to them, tried to talk with them. It wasn't easy. These boys came from homes filled with fearful frictions. Most had quit school. The gang was their refuge from the hostile world around them.

Rebuffed and threatened time and again, West doggedly shadowed the gang. When members were arrested, he would appear in court with them and speak in their behalf. He made the gang aware that arresting officers and judges listened to him. He was on call day and night for advice and whatever help he could provide.

Finally, one by one, gang members began coming to him with their problems. They found he could arrange loans when there was serious need—medical or dental problems, lack of food in the home. West kept watching, waiting for a display of interest he could seize on as a foundation for launching these youngsters into productive lives. Then he found it. Several times each week they would wander to a nearby high school to watch in absorbed silence as an ROTC unit performed military drill. Talking with the boys, West found they had deep respect for the kind of discipline which could produce precision drill. Here was a chance to get them active in a field in which they could win what they needed and wanted most desperately and had never had—adult support and praise.

From Government surplus West obtained Army uniforms. Combat helmets were painted bright blue and white. Drums and bugles were provided. The boys learned fast. As a gang this group had flourished under iron discipline. Now the same discipline drove them toward perfection in military drill. Interest in gang feuds and hoodlumism faded. They concentrated on mastering the fast, tricky cadences of the drill repertoire. Soon they were taking part in civic parades, performing at sports events, and on television.

Their success as a drill team fired the imagination of rival gangs. Before long the drill teams in this area included more than 400 youngsters who had once belonged to 17 different gangs. A Boys' Club was built in the center of the area. Here boys worked off excess energy in all kinds of sports and discovered new interests in handicrafts, science, photography, and drama. Gang structures disintegrated. Boys' Club workers stayed in close touch with parents, kept pointing to the worth and potentialities of their sons, awakened parental enthusiasm for the boys.

As a result of concerted adult direction and encouragement, many of these boys returned to high school; others found jobs and completed their high school requirements during evenings in the Boys' Club library.

Today this Boys' Club thrives with a membership of more than 1,000. This area, 5 years ago a spawning ground for big-time crime, is now a respectable neighborhood whose citizens can walk the streets unafraid, with pride in their children and hope for the future.

Some communities have done much to combat youthful criminality through wholesome recreational programs for their children. Great progress is being made in areas where men and women care enough to do something about the problem. Seven years ago, the vast Surrey Lane area of St. Louis, Mo., faced with a growing juvenile crime problem, did not have a single park or community center. Parents and youngsters of Surrey Lane went into action. With great effort and hard work they converted a tract of land, once a swamp, into a recreational area covering 31 acres. They raised money, cleared the land, built roads and constructed recreational facilities. And they did it as a family project—father and son, mother and daughter, young and old alike, united in the common endeavor. Today, with over 2,000 youths participating in recreational activities, Surrey Lane's juvenile crime rate is practically nil. Last year, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., honored Surrey Lane with the Nation's first place award for a community program.

The Boy Scout movement, too, has proved that when a worthy challenge is promoted among youngsters, it takes. In one year the crime rate in East Harlem was more than double that of any other section of New York City. Youthful gangs kept the 64-square-block area in terror. Scouters moved in. First they sold scouting to the ruler of the ruling gang, an 18-year-old whom police suspected of organizing the gang wars which racked the community. Soon that gang—11 boys—was a Scout troop, dedicated to the principle of helping people instead of hurting them.

More than 150 police departments in the United States now sponsor Boy Scout units, with some police officers serving as Scout leaders. We in the FBI are proud of the fact that nearly 50 percent of our FBI agents are former Boy Scouts.

In no instance have the Boys' Clubs of American or Boy Scouts designed special programs for dealing with problem boys. They have succeeded simply by providing adult friendship, guidance, worthy challenge, a desire for the rewards of disciplined living. Their achievements are a monument to the intrinsic worth of our youngsters, and a powerful lesson for us all.

It is long past time that every one of us understood the deadly nature of the sickness in our society and went to work on the cure. Each one of us must help turn back the tide of moral laxity and public apathy which threatens us. Our youth movements have proved it can be done. We must get interested in our children again—in what they read, see, hear and do.

And we must get tough with ourselves. We must stop governing our lives by expediency. Nothing is so infectious as example.

We must measure our every act by the same single, simple, stringent criterion that made us a great nation: "Is it right?"

IMPROPER CONFINEMENT AND TRIAL OF MOISE TSHOMBE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not pose as an expert on the internal affairs of the rapidly emerging nations in Africa. I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not know the merits or demerits of the claims of the many factions which are now contending in the Congo. Certainly I do not undertake to refute any charges of criminal acts which have been laid against Moise Tshombe, who is now being detained against his will after having left his own domain under a pledge of safe conduct which was, at least impliedly, supported by the United Nations.

Mr. Tshombe may be guilty not only of all the crimes with which he has been charged, but also of those recorded in the Decalogue. However, it is not in keeping with our generally accepted sense of fairplay to resort to palpably dishonorable means to trap even a criminal. In my opinion, as a practical matter, if this man is tried, after having been seized while operating under a pledge that he would not be molested, the usefulness of the United Nations has been destroyed from this day hence ever to settle by negotiations issues between groups within any of the newly emerging countries or to settle any controversies between any of the smaller nations of the earth.

What sane person would leave his own domain to go to an area where he knew he would be surrounded by enemies if he could not trust a pledge of safe conduct which was extended to him? I am confident that this action can have the most far-reaching consequences on the future usefulness of the United Nations, just when that organization was showing some small promise of being a real factor in achieving world peace. Furthermore, I believe that if no protest is lodged by the United Nations, it will be construed as a policy of that body of refusing to support that sense of honor inherent in men, and as an acceptance of the doctrine that the end justifies the means in all cases.

I have not heard this conduct condemned by our great metropolitan press, which so often poses as the keeper of the character and the honor of the world. They often speak of due process of law, but I have not heard that any of them has undertaken to criticize the violation of solemn promises that resulted in this man's seizure while under the white flag.

Tshombe may be so guilty that the United Nations should organize a military force and send it into his capital to arrest him and try him for his crimes; but if the United Nations approves of a procedure of luring any man from his own bailiwick under a pledge of safe conduct, and then arresting, trying, and executing him, it will be a fatal blow to the hopes of the world that the United Nations can negotiate and keep the peace by settlement of differences.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand the Senator from Georgia is taking exception to the reported method in which Tshombe was induced to move from circles where he was among friends to enter into a land where he was surrounded by enemies, under the promise that he would be given protection in his travels; and that then, when he got there, he was seized and is now to be tried for high crime.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what I am calling to the attention of the Senate and of the country. I cannot help feeling that this action goes much further than those who have dealt with it have considered. It goes to the very life of the United Nations. I do not know how much the United Nations had to do with the arrangements for the conference, but they have been, at least im-

pliedly, claiming to settle the differences in the Congo by negotiation instead of by arms.

It will never be possible to get those who have differing opinions and conflicts of interest in the new countries, and indeed between the new countries and the old countries, to sit down around a table and undertake to talk over their difficulties instead of fighting them out, if a man is faced with the certain knowledge that he may suffer the fate of Tshombe if he leaves his own domain to sit at a conference table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I express my concurrence with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. If conferences are to be had and differences to be settled, the very foundation of their success requires that when the participants come to confer, they shall be protected against the use of the power of the area into which they have come, and that they not be subjected to an abuse of promises when safe conduct has been assured.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I add my concurrence to the statement of the Senator from Georgia. My recollection goes back to the later days of the Hungarian revolution of 1956 and 1957, when one of the leaders of that revolution sought sanctuary and haven in one of the neutral Embassies located in Budapest. He was induced to leave that Embassy on the promise of the Communist leaders that if he joined in the conference and the effort to reconcile the differences between the revolutionaries and their opponents, he would be given safe conduct. He was promptly taken into custody. My recollection is that he was removed to a prison and eventually disappeared from the scene. It is my further recollection that he was actually executed.

We can expect such conduct on the part of the Communist forces and of the Communist government; but to have the United Nations suffer an incident such as that just described by the Senator from Georgia is to reduce the United Nations to a level of which it is not deserving.

I fully concur in the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Georgia has raised very properly an important question. I think a distinction can be made between the power and role of the United Nations in the Congo, and the power of Mr. Kasavubu, who is the head of the regime which arrested Mr. Tshombe.

As I understand, the United Nations is in the Congo to preserve peace and order, and to assist the states and factions in the Congo to establish a government of their choice. The United Nations representatives did not arrest Mr. Tshombe.

The Senator from Georgia is correct when he says that it is unthinkable that a leader should be asked to negotiate under a pledge of safe conduct and then be arrested and held in custody when he did not agree with those who invited him.

I doubt that the United Nations forces have authority to order the release of Tshombe. However, the United Nations could exercise the same kind of concern about the arrest of Tshombe that it exercised about the arrest of Lumumba. A resolution providing for an inquiry and investigation of the arrest of Lumumba was adopted in the United Nations. And after Lumumba was killed a resolution asking that the facts surrounding his death be investigated was adopted by the United Nations.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia. To date, I have not seen any evidence of concern by the United Nations about the arrest of Tshombe—and in saying this, we do not pass on the merits of his position—we are talking about the method of his seizure.

Mr. RUSSELL. I expressly disclaimed any judgment on the merits of the issues under discussion.

Mr. COOPER. The question is one of law and order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. As I recall, Lumumba was not arrested when he was under a pledge of safe conduct from those who seized him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As usual, the Senator from Georgia has brought up a matter which is most important; and it should worry everyone who is interested in freedom.

The Senator from Georgia has stated the fact that he is not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. However, he knows a great deal about our foreign relations.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to report to the Senator from Georgia that a man who has a high position with the United Nations in that area of the world, at an informal luncheon the other day expressed his grave concern about that proceeding. He said that it was true that Mr. Kasavubu did represent his government; but that, on the other hand, Mr. Tshombe was there as a guest. And he did not see how, under those circumstances, Mr. Tshombe could be arrested.

To the best of my knowledge, that point has not heretofore been brought out.

I wish to say that, not only because of my great respect for the Senator from Georgia; but also, because of what I know about the situation, from the standpoint of the future of the United Nations, in which I firmly believe, I am much concerned about this matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Georiga for bringing up this important matter.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to say that I, too, was very much disturbed and concerned when I read of the proceeding to which the Senator from Georgia has referred.

The Senator from Georgia has referred to an arrangement by which the United Nations brought together the representatives of certain nations, in an attempt to overcome their differences and reach an arrangement whereby they could live together. If, in connection with such an arrangement, one man is permitted to arrest his enemies and put them on trial or put them before firing squads, once that is permitted to happen, then, I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia, there would seem to be no prospect that nations would in the future listen and respond favorably when they were asked to meet for a conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Georgia has raised a very fundamental question. If it is to be possible for a man to be arrested when he comes, as the head of his nation or as the head of a group, or in any other capacity, to meet with representatives of other nations or groups to discuss an effort to end a conflict, no one will in the future attend such conferences. They will think too much of their skin, to do that.

As I understand, the meeting was encouraged by the United Nations and by our Government. So it seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Georgia is correct when he says we should take an interest in this matter.

It is my hope that the United States and the United Nations will take an interest in it, because, like the Senator from Missouri, I have always been a great supporter of the United Nations. But if the United Nations allows such a precedent to be set, I fear it will be discouraging for future negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations.

So the distinguished Senator from Georgia has performed a great service, I believe, by bringing up this matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from New York.

I merely wish to say that if one were to fire on a white flag of truce, it would be a long time before another flag of truce would be sent forward, in an effort to conduct peaceful negotiations. A flag of truce has generally been recognized as a means of obtaining immunity from attack, for the purpose of seeking a peaceable solution to issues between nations, or between nations and rebels, or even between the forces of law and outlaws. In this case, the flag of immunity is being trampled in the dust.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Under the order previously entered, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, there will be 2 hours of debate on the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran, and that time is to be equally divided between the majority leader and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senate has automatically gone into executive session.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may wish to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I should like to comment now on several aspects of the private transactions involving Mr. Holmes which were dwelt on extensively during the discussion on this floor last Thursday.

Statements were made to indicate that Mr. Holmes sought to escape the penalty on technicalities and did not, as he had testified, seek a trial on the merits.

Mr. President, I have noted the court records following Mr. Holmes' indictment. The facts are that the day the indictments were returned, February 23, 1954, Mr. Holmes was most anxious for prompt disposition of the matter. His counsel suggested the date of May 15, 1954, as a trial date.

According to the court records, counsel for the Government objected, but the court, at Mr. Holmes' insistence, set the date for May 17.

Counsel for the Government subsequently sought to postpone this date. That resulted in Mr. Holmes' counsel bringing a motion before the court on April 30 which requested that the court order the case set for trial on May 17; or, if the other defendants were not ready, sever the case as to Mr. Holmes' rights, guaranteed by the sixth amendment to the Constitution. This was in order to obtain for Mr. Holmes the right to a speedy and public trial.

The Government opposed this motion, on the representation of Government attorneys that they could not be ready and that severance of the case was not practicable. Therefore, court denied the motion.

At this point I should like to quote from Mr. Holmes' affidavit dated April 30, 1954, more than 6 months prior to eventual dismissal:

I appeared personally at the arraignment and opening of the indictments on February 23, 1954, when my counsel requested the setting of a date for trial at the earliest possible time. Chief Judge Laws set May 17, 1954, as the trial date.

Because it is necessary for me to establish my innocence of the charge made against me before I will be able to resume my career in the Foreign Service of the United States, a trial at the earliest possible date is essential to avoid further irreparable injury to me. In addition, I have been advised by competent officials in the Department of State that they consider it important to have my status determined as speedily as possible.

Holmes' motion, dated 30 April 1954:

The defendant Julius C. Holmes relies on the right guaranteed by the sixth amendment to the Constitution that in all criminal prosections the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial. In view of the fact that this indictment was returned on April 23, 1953, the Government cannot in good faith maintain that it is not as yet prepared to try the case. Indeed, if 13 months after the return of the indictment the Government is still not prepared to try the case, the case should be dismissed.

It is recognized that this is a case involving multiple defendants, and if any of the defendants in this case has reason not to desire a trial thereof during the current April term, the constitutional right of the defendant Julius C. Holmes to a speedy trial should not be prejudiced thereby, and the case should be severed as to him, and the case as so severed promptly tried.

Wherefore, the defendant Julius C. Holmes prays that this court make and enter an order:

1. Setting this case for trial on May 17, 1954, or as soon thereafter in the current April term as shall be convenient to the court; or

2. In the event any of the defendants herein does not desire a trial during the current April term, severing the case as to the defendant Julius C. Holmes and setting such case as so severed for trial on May 17, 1954, or as soon thereafter during the current April term as suits the convenience of the court.

Mr. President, on June 18, 1954, Mr. Casey and Mr. Klein moved to dismiss the indictments on claims of insufficiency and immunity.

Mr. Holmes declined to participate in these motions because, as he stated at the time—and repeated in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that he did not want to jeopardize his opportunity for a prompt disposition on the merits; and he did not, under any circumstances, want to avail himself of what might be considered a technical defense to these unwarranted charges.

I state these facts at some length to present Mr. Holmes' attitude toward the trial of these actions.

Mr. Phleger, legal adviser to the Secretary of State, had this to say regarding Mr. Holmes in the memorandum dated February 1, 1955:

Subsequent to his indictment, Holmes pressed for an early trial, volunteered to and did testify before a grand jury, waiving immunity, and in all possible ways sought to vindicate himself.

While dealing with the Phleger opinion, may I invite the attention of my colleagues to another statement made on the floor last week.

A sentence quoted was attributed, I am sure inadvertently, to Mr. Phleger.

As quoted, it omitted important words which showed that the statement was not Mr. Phleger's, but a statement of Mr. Olney, Assistant Attorney General.

I also quote the conclusions of Mr. Phleger as expressed in the memorandum of February 1955.

Based upon my examination of the grand jury testimony and other data—

Which, may I add, Mr. President, included the Hoey report—

it is my opinion that Mr. Holmes' actions in this matter do not render him unfit to be a diplomatic representative of the United States. I understand that Mr. Holmes has a record of long and valued service to the United States, both in the Foreign Service and in the Armed Forces. While his actions in this matter subjected him to an indictment for violation of law, the indictment was dismissed on motion of the Government. It is my opinion that the quality of his actions should not detract from a judgment that on the basis of his record he can be expected honorably to discharge the functions of a diplomatic assignment.

A good deal of attention was given to the fact that Mr. Holmes and his associates were the sole shareholders in the American Overseas Tanker Corp.

As was pointed out in the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, and also in several statements made last week, the record does not bear this out.

Once again, I refer to the document on page 34 of the recent hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, which lists the stockholders as of June 26, 1950.

I also invite the attention of Senators to the Tax Court opinion referred to last Thursday.

In this opinion, the Tax Court clearly recognizes the fact that there were a number of stockholders in the corporation.

It was also directly stated last week that arrangements had been made to sell the three tankers to the United Tanker Corp. even before title was taken by Mr. Holmes and his associates.

Apparently a good deal of this contention was based on the memorandum of January 19, 1948.

This memorandum is a part of the record of the Hoey committee. A careful examination reveals that it is unsigned, and contains the phrase "American Overseas Tanker is willing to consider the sale to United Tanker."

Much is also made of the letters of January 24 exchanged between National Tanker Corp. and United Tanker.

Let me emphasize again that a careful reading of these letters reveals that they contain an option to sell and are not a contract of sale, as was stated last week.

I should like to make several additional comments on the so-called three-tanker transaction. The facts as to the transaction were brought out fully in the Hoey committee report and in the hearings which preceded it. They were

brought out in the recent hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee.

We have now again in the record of these debates the contracts under which National Tanker gave a bareboat charter on its three ships to United Tanker, with the details of the financing arrangements and the option to United to purchase the stock of National. Nothing new has been added to the record in these debates.

It has been asserted and reasserted that these transactions were some sort of concealment and misrepresentation to circumvent the law.

On the question of concealment, so far as this transaction is concerned, the record is clear that the fact that Chinese interests were supplying substantially all the capital behind United Tanker was fully disclosed to the Maritime Commission. I read a paragraph giving the facts on this into the record last Thursday.

At four points in the application for the tankers, specific and accurate statements were made about details of the proposed arrangements.

Next, I want the RECORD to include the opinion of Mr. Francis Goertner, Assistant General Counsel of the Maritime Commission, dated February 3, 1948.

Mr. Goertner took note in his opinion that all the class A stock of United was held by China Trading & Industrial Development Corp., which provides substantially all the capital of the corporation.

But because of the various restrictions in the charter, including the requirement that the majority of the outstanding stock shall at all times be held by citizens of the United States, and that no person shall be eligible for election as a director who is not a citizen of the United States, Mr. Goertner concluded:

> Thus in my opinion the necessary requirements of a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, are complied with by the United Tanker Corp. and the corporation must be considered as one within the meaning of the act.

This was the opinion of the counsel for the Commission administering the law; and he had all the facts before him.

Mr. President, this is of course a complex transaction, one in which lawyers, or Senators, might differ from Mr. Goertner's opinion.

Now the Tax Court case has been cited, involving the profits on this transaction, the case which the Stettinius family and other stockholders carried to the Tax Court.

The lawyers tell me what the Tax Court really did here was hold the group of 26 stockholders who realized a profit on the National shares to have received dividends in this amount as stockholders of AOTC, the predecessor corporation which held the five tankers.

There was the Meacham case, an action brought by the Government for the forfeiture of one of the three tankers on the grounds which have been mentioned here—that these arrangements were in effect a transfer to foreign registry in violation of the act.

The case went to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Two of the judges upheld the Government's contention.

Let me emphasize, this was not a criminal case. Chief Judge Parker, however, upheld the legality of the transaction.

Because of its relevance to some of the remarks in the debate the other day, I take the liberty of quoting from Judge Parker's opinion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the opinion be printed in the RECORD without my reading it. It is a somewhat long opinion of Judge Parker, approving the position taken by Mr. Holmes and by Mr. Holmes' counsel. If any Senator prefers to have the opinion read, I should be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> I think, however, that United was from the beginning a citizen of the United States within the meaning of the statute.
>
> This was the view of counsel for the Commission who had the facts before him. It was also the view of some of the ablest and most distinguished law firms of the country in handling matters of great importance to the clients whom they represented; and I find nothing in the the record upon which to base a contrary conclusion.
>
> The fact that Chinese interests supplied the capital upon which United operated is not material, and I think it equally irrelevant that the class A stock, held by the Chinese, was to receive nine-tenths of the profits of the corporation, whereas the class B stock, held by citizens of the United States, was to receive one-tenth, and that upon dissolution the assets were to be divided in like proportion. This was merely giving to the class A stock some of the qualities of preferred stock, not taking the control of the corporation from the class B stock, which represented a majority of the voting power.
>
> It is the control of the corporation which counts under the statute, not the investment of funds or the right to earnings. * * * The majority of the stock of United was at all times in citizens, the majority of the voting power was in citizens, there was no contract or understanding by which the majority of the voting power could be exercised in behalf of a noncitizen and control of the corporation was not conferred upon or permitted to be exercised by noncitizens.
>
> At all times the control of the corporation was in the hands of its directors, who were substantial and upstanding citizens of the United States, and who owned the stock by which they could hold themselves in office. The fact that they had paid an insignificant sum for the stock is immaterial; for the ownership of the stock gave them absolute control of the corporation which any court would recognize and enforce.
>
> The amount paid for class A stock was likewise an insignificant amount compared with the business in which the corporation was engaged. The capital upon which the corporation was operating was obtained from loans; and there is nothing in the statute or its history to indicate that the sort of control which a creditor has over his debtor would suffice to nullify for the purposes of the statute the legal control inherent in stock ownership.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There is nothing in the record to justify the contention that the stock held by citizens of the United States was held by them in trust for noncitizens. On the contrary, the evidence is that the corporation was set up for the purpose of complying with the statute and there is nothing to justify an inference that U.S. citizens who accepted its stock were engaged in an attempt to evade the law or to perpetrate a fraud upon the Government.
>
> And I find nothing in the record to justify a finding that United was in fact dominated and controlled by the Chinese. No such inference can be drawn from the fact that the Chinese procured or furnished funds with which the corporation operated or that a number of Chinese were employed in its operations. * * *
>
> So far as the carrying on of the business of the corporation was concerned, this consisted for the greater part in the management and operation of vessels upon which bareboat charters were held, and such operation and management was in the hands of Sieling and Jarvis, American shipping agents.
>
> I think, therefore, that United was a citizen within the meaning of the statute.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, before the case could be taken to the Supreme Court, the Government settled the suit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator tell me what type of settlement the Government made in this instance?

Mr. SYMINGTON. This was a civil case. I honestly do not know what the settlement was in the Meacham case. I will find out, and have it established for the record.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that it is important to know. The Government apparently won the case, so far as the Court of Appeals was concerned, by a divided opinion. I was curious to know if the court ever finally decided whether the transaction was legal or not legal, even though I know there is a difference of opinion about it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think my friend from Louisiana makes a good point. I shall be glad to find out and give him the information. I wish to read the last part of the opinion of Judge Parker.

Judge Parker said:

> There is nothing in the record to justify the contention that the stock held by citizens of the United States was held by them in trust for noncitizens. On the contrary, the evidence is that the corporation was set up for the purpose of complying with the statute and there is nothing to justify an inference that U.S. citizens who accepted its stock were engaged in an attempt to evade the law or to perpetrate a fraud upon the government.
>
> And I find nothing in the record to justify a finding that United was in fact dominated and controlled by the Chinese. No such inference can be drawn from the fact that the Chinese procured or furnished funds with which the corporation operated or that a number of Chinese were employed in its operations. * * *
>
> So far as the carrying on of the business of the corporation was concerned, this consisted for the greater part in the management and operation of vessels upon which bareboat charters were held, and such operation and management was in the hands of Sieling and Jarvis, American shipping agents.
>
> I think, therefore, that United was a citizen within the meaning of the statute.

Mr. President, I mention these two cases not to indulge further in legal debate, but to show that, contrary to assertions and reassertions, this cannot

be represented to the Senate as a flimsy subterfuge which no one with a straight face could countenance.

These were seriously conceived transactions which competent counsel at the time believed complied with the law, and which as great a jurist as Chief Judge Parker held years later to have fully complied with the law, and which a number of distinguished Americans besides Mr. Holmes took part in knowingly and publicly.

Some of us agree with Mr. Goertner and Judge Parker on the law; some obviously do not.

But I submit that this record cannot be summarily disregarded or brushed aside. Nor can it be suggested that Mr. Holmes, along with Secretary of State Stettinius and Admiral Halsey, are dishonored for having had a hand in it.

One final comment on the three-tanker transaction. There has been inserted in the record, before the committee and in these debates at several points, the concluding language of the Hoey committee report which, as Senators will remember, recommended action by the Department of Justice.

Following this recommendation the Department of Justice appointed several special assistants who had the Hoey committee records and full powers of the Department of Justice for future investigation.

As I have previously stated, 90 indictments were returned on the five-tanker transaction; but I think we must take note of the fact that the Department of Justice never acted on the three-tanker transaction, and so far as I am aware, never called them in question in any criminal action of any kind.

Reference was made last week to the fact that Mr. Holmes has friends in Washington.

He does, and I am one of them, and proud of the fact.

This is an example. I now read into the RECORD a letter written to the State Department when Mr. Holmes returned to the Foreign Service in 1948.

It is brief and to the point and reads as follows:

GENTLEMEN: I am informed that Julius Holmes, former brigadier general of the U.S. Army, is seeking reinstatement in the Department of State.

General Holmes served in an important capacity under my immediate direction from September 1942 until the end of 1944. Through him and the section which he headed was handled most of the great volume of business of my headquarters that required consultation with the governments of France, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Scandinavian countries. He supervised military government in the combat areas of Sicily, Italy, and northwest Europe and was a constant adviser to me in matters dealing with foreign governments. In all these tasks General Holmes demonstrated extraordinary tact, judgment, and skill.

I consider General Holmes to be a man of highest character and of unusual efficiency and devotion to duty. Perhaps I can best express my opinion of his qualifications by saying that, if I should again be faced with problems similar to those that fell to me during the European campaigns of World War II, I would make every possible effort to secure General Holmes as an assistant for service in a capacity identical to the one he then occupied.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

That Mr. Holmes continues to be held in this high regard by the former President of the United States is evident from the remarks on Thursday by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

That the present holder of that office shares this view is evident from the nomination.

I respectfully suggest that spreading again before the Senate the details of these transactions which have been raked over many times in the past 12 years has not disclosed anything new, and in my judgment has not produced any facts on which the Senate can base a rejection of Mr. Holmes.

The question in issue, as I stated the other day, is his character and integrity.

I submit that the record does not permit any justifiable doubt as to the integrity or good faith of Mr. Holmes.

In fact, as I have stated, and now repeat, I believe that, in Government and out, he has conducted himself with the propriety expected of a man of the highest caliber and integrity.

The record is now clear that it is in the national interest to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Holmes to this important post; and I am confident that a large majority of my colleagues will do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Before yielding, I ask the Chair how much time has been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 23 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have tried to follow the debate. As the Senator from Missouri knows, I, as a member of the committee had some doubts about the nomination, but I must say that I am very much impressed with any man—Mr. Holmes or anyone else—who would decline to be acquitted of a charge of a crime on a technicality. As a lawyer, my advice to any man charged with committing a criminal act, would be to get out of the charge in any way possible. If a man declines to be acquitted on a technicality and asks to be tried on the merits of the charge, I must say that such an attitude makes a favorable impression, so far as the man's character is concerned.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able and distinguished friend from the great State of Louisiana. He is a fair and just man.

Mr. Holmes, of course, knew that his reputation was on the line and that his future in the service of his country if any, depended upon the results of a trial. Therefore, he did his very best over a period of time to obtain such a trial, to which he felt he had a right under the sixth amendment of our Constitution.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Missouri mentioned that Mr. Holmes had friends in Washington. I should like to mention that he also has friends in Kansas. Last Thursday in debate I stated that I supported the nomination. Mr. Holmes is from Lawrence, Kans. He is a Kansan, and his family is an old, established family there.

I have received a telegram from Dolph Simons, editor of the Lawrence Journal-World, which is the newspaper in Lawrence, Kans. It reads as follows:

U.S. Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Washington, D.C.:

For the good of our Nation and in fairness to the man, I earnestly hope you will strongly support approval of Julius Holmes.

DOLPH SIMONS.

I know very definitely that the people of Kansas are watching the debate today. They have a high regard for Julius Holmes and his family. I sincerely hope the Senate will confirm the nomination.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

With the permission of the acting majority leader, I should be glad to yield time at this point to my friend from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I intended to ask the Senator from Kansas a question, but I shall wait.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We have now consumed about half of our available time. I suggest that the Senator from Delaware might wish to speak at this point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Whenever the Senator from Missouri has finished.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator prefer that we continue?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I prefer that the Senator from Missouri continue until he is ready to yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am only asking the Senator his wishes. I want to observe what he would like to have done.

I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut whatever time he wishes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination, and in that connection I wish to discuss two points. The first is the question of legality, around which so much of the debate has centered, involving the ship deals, and so forth.

All of us have heard this subject discussed over and over again, and I wish to make it very clear that I believe that Mr. Holmes, in participating in the ship deals, used very bad judgment. I wish he had not done it. I rather suppose that he, too, wishes that he had not been involved in those deals. I have observed over the years that when men step out of their chosen professions and get into extraneous business deals from time to time, they exercise bad judgment and often regret it very much indeed. I believe this is such a circumstance.

The important question is, Did Mr. Holmes do anything that was illegal? Did he do anything that was absolutely

wrong in the eyes of the law, aside from the question of business judgment? I believe we have in the record some excellent advice. In the first place, the legal adviser to the Secretary of State under Secretary Dulles was Mr. Herman Phleger, one of the outstanding lawyers in the United States, a man who is as well known in the legal profession in California as any other individual in that profession, I believe. He himself made a very careful study of this whole situation. In the questioning of Julius Holmes before the Foreign Relations Committee the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], in speaking of Mr. Phleger, asked Julius Holmes whether Mr. Phleger had taken any position in this matter. Mr. Holmes said that Mr. Phleger had. He said, "He certified to the Secretary of State that he had reviewed the record and that there was nothing in it that would impair me for a Presidential appointment."

Senator SYMINGTON. He reviewed the record—will you repeat that, please?

Mr. HOLMES. He reviewed the record and gave his opinion to the Secretary of State that there was nothing in my part of these proceedings which in any way impaired me for Presidential appointment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I will not yield at this time. If the Senator will indulge me, I should like to finish my remarks; then I will yield to him if I have time remaining.

This was brought out also by the remarks on the Senate floor last week by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] who at that time recounted his conversation with Herman Phleger, Secretary Dulles, and the President. He said that the President refused to withdraw the name of Julius Holmes at that time, although it had been recommended by THRUSTON MORTON for political and tactical reasons, in order to avoid other fights with the Senate on matters like the Trade Agreements Act, in connection with which a little difficulty was being encountered at that time.

Mr. Phleger was not content with relying entirely on his own judgment, and he asked for a legal opinion from an independent law firm, which in this case was the firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland, and Kiendl, one of the outstanding law firms in the East, as everyone in the legal profession knows.

The brief they submitted is found at page 142 of the hearings. In a letter with which they submitted the brief to Mr. Phleger they make this comment—and this I believe is the clincher on the question of the ship deals:

We have attempted to make this memorandum completely factual and to avoid argument in Mr. Holmes' behalf, permitting the facts to speak for themselves. At the same time, however, we would want you to know of our firm conviction that there was no justification in fact or law for this indictment and that Mr. Holmes, as we understand the facts, conducted himself in connection with this transaction with complete propriety and honor.

With these comments I leave the ship deals and turn to other matters on the constructive side, in behalf of Mr. Holmes. There is a great deal on that side, Mr. President. I was interested, in looking at the hearings, in the questioning by the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, as follows:

I am happy to note that you are before this committee as Ambassador to Iran.

That is the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee for the past 9 years, speaking. He says he is happy to note this. He goes on to say:

I have had the pleasure of coming into personal contact with you in various parts of the world, and I must say publicly that I have always been impressed with the way you have conducted affairs and with the way you have represented our country in your assignments.

Some years ago didn't you write a rather comprehensive report about the African Continent?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes, sir; I did.

Senator MANSFIELD. Was that report ever published?

Mr. HOLMES. I think not, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. How long ago was that report made?

Mr. HOLMES. It was made at the end of 1958, after I concluded a trip, a political survey, of Africa for the Secretary of State, and I believe the date was late January of 1959.

Senator MANSFIELD. In your opinion, how did that report stack up with developments subsequent to its being made?

Mr. HOLMES. Well, I have had certain gratification, personal gratification, which one always has in such circumstances that, having foreseen in that report some of the events which have occurred.

The Senator from Montana conducted this examination to bring out that Holmes had had a special assignment on African affairs and had appraised the situation correctly.

I do not believe he could have done it without his long expert background in the Foreign Service.

We are talking about a man who served in the Foreign Service under four Presidents of the United States, and who was appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt to be Assistant Secretary of State toward the close of World War II. Under President Truman he was sent to Great Britain, to the Court of St. James, and served there under four of our Ambassadors as the First Minister. Shortly afterward he was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Ambassador to Iran. The history of that nomination was outlined by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] last week. I shall not repeat it.

I have known Julius Holmes for some 25 years. I knew him when he first represented the United States at the World's Fair in the late 1930's. I do not support him here as a personal friend, although I consider him a friend. He is not one of my close friends, but one that I have known and respected for his very outstanding service to the United States. I support him on his record.

During World War II, as has been brought out, Mr. Holmes had one of the most amazing records of any civilian soldier. He made the entry into north Africa with Gen. Mark Clark, on the famous submarine cruise, on which he was accompanied by Jerauld Wright, then Captain Wright, and now a four-star admiral, and commander of the Atlantic Fleet and of all the NATO forces.

This was a remarkable event. It took great courage and required men who could be completely trusted and depended upon, not only for their courage, but also for their intelligence. His record during the war was a distinguished one. At the end of the war he had risen to the rank of brigadier general in the Army. As the Senator from Missouri has pointed out recently, he served on General Eisenhower's staff in southern Europe. General Eisenhower has made known his feelings about General Holmes in the letter which has just been referred to, and in other ways, including his nomination of Mr. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran in 1955.

I believe that one of the most telling witnesses with whom I have ever talked regarding Mr. Holmes is Mr. Henry Wriston, formerly president of Brown University, now chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, in New York, and chairman of the American Assembly. Mr. Wriston not only holds these distinguished offices, but he has also made a special study of the State Department and the career service in the State Department. He is credited with having "Wristonized" the Foreign Service of the United States. He told me a few years ago—I think it was in 1958—at the American Assembly in Arden, N.Y.:

Julius Holmes is the ablest man in the Foreign Service Corps of the United States.

Not one of the ablest; but he said:

In my judgment, he is the ablest man in the Foreign Service Corps of the United States. The President should submit his name to the Senate and make it clear that Holmes is so good that he deserves this action by the President.

He was disappointed that Holmes had allowed his name to be withdrawn, as outlined by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] during 1955.

I think the comments of President Wriston constitute one of the highest civilian endorsements which one could ask for a Foreign Service officer, if not the highest. Accordingly, I believe President Kennedy acted wisely, fairly, and justly in submitting the nomination of Julius Holmes. I thought the same way in 1955, when President Eisenhower submitted Mr. Holmes' name to the Senate.

We have for consideration the nomination of a Foreign Service officer who has served with distinction under Franklin D. Roosevelt, under Harry S. Truman, under Dwight D. Eisenhower, and under President Kennedy.

What has Mr. Holmes been doing lately? If he were not trustworthy, if he could not have been depended upon to get results, he would never have been sent to Hong Kong, which is the most sensitive diplomatic post in the world today, right on the edge of Communist China. Hong Kong is the best source of intelligence we have as to what is taking place in Communist China. I visited our consulate there, where Mr.

Holmes is the consul general, the highest post not having ambassadorial rank; a post far more important to us than our embassies in many other countries, as I feel certain any Senator who has visited Hong Kong would agree. It is one of the most sensitive posts in the world today. Mr. Holmes has served there with distinction. We can bet our boots that the Foreign Service organization would not have sent Julius Holmes to Hong Kong if they did not believe he was a highly dependable, capable American citizen, as well as a thoroughly trained, competent Foreign Service officer of the State Department. The Foreign Service Corps is proud of his standing and jealous of his integrity and honor.

I myself doubt that even today there can be found in the Foreign Service an officer who is more widely respected than Julius Holmes. That is why I speak in favor of his nomination. That is why I ask Senators on this side of the aisle—and on the other side of the aisle, too—to support his nomination. I beg of them not to strike down a Foreign Service officer of this quality, after 35 years of service, during a critical time in our history, when our Nation is faced with the gravest dangers which have ever confronted it in time of peace. Do not strike down a man who has served his country so well, and who remains in a position to render very valuable service in another very sensitive post, in Iran, to which this administration has, in my judgment, wisely nominated him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator has been speaking of the service record of Mr. Holmes. I do not believe anyone has questioned his service record. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, as he has reviewed the tanker transactions—both the three-tanker deal and the five-tanker deal—and the participation by Mr. Holmes therein, if he believes that Mr. Holmes' participation was quite proper in these business transactions?

Mr. BUSH. I have told the Senator from Delaware, and I said on the floor a moment ago, that I do not believe Mr. Holmes was well advised to be in those deals. No; I do not think so. But I am pushing that aside. It was a mistake, which I freely grant to the Senator, but I do not believe it was enough of a mistake to strike this man down, after 35 years of Foreign Service, at a time when we need him. The Senator from Delaware may be worried about the man's integrity or honor on account of the ship deals. However, Mr. Holmes has been in places repeatedly where everything depended on his loyalty, his honor, his courage, his experience, and his integrity; and every time he has measured up to the requirements.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps, but we cannot just close our eyes to this chapter of his life.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Holmes' name would not be before the Senate today unless he had measured up to the requirements.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not wish to get into an argument on his talents. The point I make—and I do not believe we can escape it—is that Mr. Holmes had some responsibility in the tanker deals. Since we started debating Mr. Holmes' nomination, I have heard some of his friends refer to him as naive, stupid, and perhaps a little unethical when he got into these tanker deals.

Should the Senate be asked to confirm as ambassador the nomination of a man whom his own friends refer to as naive, stupid, and a little unethical? That is what disturbs me. I do not say that we should necessarily hold against a man something improper he may have done 10 or 12 years ago if that man claims it was a mistake and expresses regret.

The Senator from Connecticut is aware of the fact that Mr. Holmes insisted before our committee that he saw nothing wrong with what he did at the time. Looking back at the transaction, Mr. Holmes insists he still sees nothing wrong. He said that if a similar opportunity presented itself tomorrow he would do the same thing all over again. Therefore, we must proceed on the basis that Mr. Holmes sees nothing wrong with conspiring with a foreign group to circumvent the law and help them get title to American tankers when an easy dollar is involved.

I do not believe the Senator from Connecticut would say that what Mr. Holmes did in connection with the tanker deals, whether he was connected with the Government or not connected with the Government, should be condoned.

Mr. BUSH. I fully appreciate the position of the Senator from Delaware. I respect him highly, as he knows. There is no other Senator who holds the Senator from Delaware in higher regard than I do. I have always commended him for his watchfulness and diligence in considering these cases with great care. I can understand the feelings of the Senator from Delaware in this instance. But I have tried to explain my position, too. I have read only a part of the opinion of the eminent law firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Kiendl & Sunderland. I have explained my respect for that firm. I have quoted Herman Phleger, who I challenge anyone to say is not an outstanding lawyer in California, and the United States, too, or he would not have been legal adviser to Foster Dulles, as he was. He told Foster Dulles that this transaction was all right. Davis, Polk says it was all right. In my book, those opinions are very good opinions—very good ones indeed.

Once more, I say to the Senator from Delaware, I do not like the business deals in which Mr. Holmes participated. I would not have been involved in them myself. But I would not strike down this Foreign Service officer because I think he made a bad mistake in a field entirely foreign to his own activity. He should not have meddled in business deals about which he knew nothing. I myself believe he was used. He was used by people who thought that it would be helpful to have in their business a man who had his great war record. However, I do not believe he had enough business experience to realize that this was a bad deal.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me for a minute?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If we do not have sufficient time left on our side, I ask the Senator from Delaware if he will be kind enough to yield some of his time, if we need it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, I certainly want the Senator from Missouri to have as much time as he needs; however, I do not believe I have had a chance to use any of our time yet.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I offered time to the Senator. He is speaking on my time now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The time being used wherein I have asked question of the Senator from Connecticut may be charged against my time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Delaware for his courtesy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that in my opinion he has made the most effective and the most persuasive argument which possibly could be made in behalf of Mr. Holmes. The Senator from Connecticut has not attempted to justify the "deal." He has said it was a mistake—a mistake that a man inexperienced in business would be likely to fall into. To my mind, that is a sound argument.

But to argue that the "deal" was completely free from any infirmities, and that those who disagree are wrong, to my mind is not sound.

I respect the military career of the nominee. I respect the efficiency with which he has served. But I cannot agree when it is argued, in an attempt to convince me, that the transaction was completely free from infirmity.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

I should like to say one further word, if the Senator who has yielded to me will be so kind as to yield a little longer. I have known men—and I include my own father, who was a successful and respected businessman in the State of Ohio, and who had a great career in business—who have made mistakes when they stepped outside the field with which they were familiar. When my father stepped outside the field with which he was familiar, and in which he was active for 40 years, and became involved with a group of promoters in an extraneous deal, no matter how smart he was—and he was a smart man—he was "had" by the promoters, and that experience cost him a great deal of money. In that respect, his experience was somewhat different from that of Mr. Holmes, who made some money.

The point I make is that I have seen that sort of thing happen many times. Frequently, those who step outside the field in which they are experts make very bad mistakes of judgment. I believe that is what Mr. Holmes did in connection with the tankers.

In conclusion, if no other Senator wishes to ask me questions, I think all

four Presidents of the United States have been correct in nominating Mr. Holmes to the very important and sensitive positions to which he has been named; and I hope my colleagues on this side will support the nomination.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I must say that it is with considerable regret that I must speak and vote against confirmation of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to this very important position.

I have listened to the debate and I have read the record. I certainly wish it understood that I respect the opinions which have been expressed, particularly those expressed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

But after going through the record and analyzing the various statements which have been made in connection with this case, the thing that has persuaded me to such an extent that, in good conscience, I cannot vote to support the nomination, is the record in the Tax Court case.

That record appears in 32 Tax Court, page 564, the case of Julius C. Holmes and Henrietta A. Holmes, docket 62571, decided in 1959 by the Tax Court of the United States.

To clarify what I am discussing now, that case arose over the question of whether the sale of certain stock by Mr. Holmes and his associates constituted long-term capital gain or whether it was ordinary income.

Three corporations were involved. The first was American Overseas Tanker Corp. of which Mr. Holmes was one of the four or five stockholders. The second was the National Tanker Corp., which was organized subsequent to the formation of what we call the AOTC—the American Overseas Tanker Corp. The third was the United Tanker Corp., to which the stock of the National Tanker Corp. subsequently was sold.

The Tax Court case arose out of the sale to the United Tanker Corp. of the stock of the National Tanker Corp., owned by Mr. Holmes and his associates, the identical stockholders of the American Overseas Tanker Corp.

In order to keep in perspective the various transactions, I point out that on December 31, 1947, so the opinion of the Tax Court recites, the American Overseas Tanker Corp. filed an amendment to its original application to the Maritime Commission for tankers; and in the amendment it was recited that the Commission had approved the sale of five tankers to AOTC for Panamanian registry, and had allocated three tankers to AOTC for American registry; and it was stated that the purpose of the amendment was to restate the desire of AOTC to purchase 12 additional tankers, the unallocated portion of the 20 tankers covered by the original application and amendments thereto.

In support of the renewed request, the application stated:

> The corporation intends to operate their tankers and to remain in the tanker operating business.

So originally the Maritime Commission was under the impression that the American Overseas Tanker Corp. was to operate the tankers.

The next thing of significance occurred on January 19, 1948, 19 days later. On that date there was an unsigned memorandum in which it was stated that Mr. Casey and Mr. Klein, two of Mr. Holmes' associates, had had discussions, on behalf of American Overseas Tanker Corp., with the interests identified as United Tanker Corp., a Delaware corporation, relative to the sale of three tankers.

The memorandum recited that:

> American Overseas will form a new Delaware corporation for the specific purpose of taking title to these three ships.

The memorandum goes on to indicate how the financing of the transaction will ultimately be handled by the United Tanker Corp.

The next thing occurred 4 days later, on January 23.

On that date the National Tanker Corp. was organized, to carry out the memorandum of agreement.

On January 24, the day after the National Tanker Corp. was organized, in consideration of United Tanker Corp.'s execution of an agreement to finance all this purchase, an irrevocable option to purchase all the stock of National was given to the United Tanker Corp., but not to be exercised before September 15 of that year. The idea behind that, of course, was to permit more than 6 months to pass, so that long-term capital gains on the sale of the National stock would be achieved, for tax purposes.

The next transaction was on January 31, 1948; and this is the important transaction. On that date, the Chief of the Bureau of Operations of the U.S. Maritime Commission addressed to National a letter in which he stated:

> Reports have reached the undersigned that these vessels have been offered by you for resale to other interests. We would very much appreciate a prompt statement from you as to whether or not you have in mind the resale of these vessels now or at a later date.

The reply by Mr. Casey one of Mr. Holmes' associates, was, on behalf of the National Tanker Corp., by letter dated February 2, 1948, that National intended to bareboat charter these vessels to another American company:

> It is the present intention of this corporation to retain title to these vessels indefinitely.

That was the statement in the face of the memorandum of agreement

That was the concealment to which the Hoey committee referred, because if that reply had not been given to the Maritime Commission, we can be quite sure that the entire tanker transaction would have been off.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, would it disturb the Senator's line of reasoning if I were to ask a question at this point?

Mr. MILLER. Not at all; I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is there any evidence that Holmes knew of this letter from Casey to the Maritime Commission? Does that appear anywhere?

Mr. MILLER. There is no evidence that Holmes knew anything about this particular letter that has been brought to my attention.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may add something to the answer?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. Let me first pursue this a minute further.

Mr. Holmes was a stockholder and an officer, a vice president and a secretary, of this corporation, in whose behalf Mr. Casey, the president, wrote the letter. The inference naturally can follow that he, in that responsible position, either should have known or did know about this particular transaction. However, I know of nothing in the record which reveals that he had read it or knew of it.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Iowa that the statement was, clearly—and it was found to be by the committee—just about as much of a misrepresentation as anything could be. If Mr. Holmes was a party to that statement, it seems to me to go to the very crux of the problem we are confronted with, as to whether he was an unwitting dupe in that transaction or a part of it.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the comments of the Senator, but I would like to make clear that I am not imputing any knowledge on the part of Mr. Holmes of this transaction. I have my own reason, which I shall advance shortly, for voting against the nomination; but I want to give the background of this situation so we can see the results of the concealment and the fact that profits were obtained, not only by Mr. Casey, the principal, but by Mr. Holmes and others, under these circumstances.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. Holmes was asked about this letter which Mr. Casey wrote, saying there was no present intention of selling the tankers. I think an examination of the testimony before the committee will show that he said he would have written a letter, but not in that language.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I would be happy to yield, but first I should like to complete the chain of events.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I wish to thank the Senator from Ohio for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I confirm what he said about Mr. Holmes' opinion of that unsigned memorandum. I think it is important to note that Mr. Holmes said he did not know of the unsigned memorandum at the time it was written.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest a reading of page 73 as a reference to what I have stated.

Mr. MILLER. Following these transactions—following this letter, following this concealment—on page 583 of the Tax Court opinion appears this finding of fact:

National [Corporation] was liquidated in December 1949, and all of its assets were transferred to the United [Tanker Corporation].

Following the sale of the stock of National Tanker Corp. to United, the stockholders reported long-term capital gain on the profit. The profit amounted to $449 per share for each $1 of cost. It was out of this transaction that the tax case occurred.

The opinion of Judge Raum—and I might point out this was an opinion without any dissent by any member of the Tax Court—said this:

Respondent's determination, on the other hand, proceeds upon the assumption that the substance underlying this apparently simple sale of stock was entirely different; namely, that the purported sale of the National stock was merely the final step in a transaction designed essentially as a sale of the three American-flag tankers or the right to acquire them by AOTC to United at a profit of $450,000 to AOTC, accompanied by a simultaneous distribution of that profit to stockholders of AOTC (or their nominees), and that such distributions are taxable as ordinary income. Respondent's position treats National merely as a convenient device employed to accomplish the result which was thus planned from the beginning.

We think the evidence supports the latter view.

The Tax Court saw through this series of transactions for what it was, and held against taxpayers.

My point is, granted Mr. Holmes knew nothing about this letter from Mr. Casey to the Maritime Commission, the fact remains he benefited very materially from these transactions. If I might be permitted to, I would say this benefit constituted "tainted money."

Mr. Holmes has never, to my understanding, offered to pay back to the Federal Government the profits received from these transactions. He received the benefit and he has used these profits for his own purposes.

Granted that he may have been used by some very sharp operators in this transaction, he himself derived personal financial benefit to a great extent.

I think this is a very untimely nomination, particularly in view of the message that the President of the United States delivered to Congress just recently, asking for a code of ethical conduct in the Government. I should like to quote briefly from the President's message, in which he said:

No responsibility of Government is more fundamental than the responsibility of maintaining the highest standards of ethical behavior by those who conduct the public business * * * this principle must be followed not only in reality but in appearance. For the basis of effective Government is public confidence, and that confidence is endangered when ethical standards falter or appear to falter.

He wound up his statement by saying:

I realize, too, that perhaps the gravest responsibility of all rests upon the office of President. No President can excuse or pardon the slightest deviation from irreproachable standards of behavior on the part of any member of the executive branch. For his firmness and determination is the ultimate source of public confidence in the Government of the United States. And there is no consideration that can justify the undermining of that confidence.

I state my real reason for not being able, in conscience, to support this nomination is that I fear an undermining of public confidence in this nomination. Granted the transactions took place between Mr. Holmes' intervals of Government service, today, of all days, is not a time when we should have one iota of undermining in the confidence of the people in their Government.

I mention this particularly in the case of Iran, which is in a very strategic and critical area. I think our representatives from the United States to Iran must be above reproach, not only in their public service, but in their private lives.

For that reason, I simply cannot, in conscience, support this nomination.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. There is one point I should like to emphasize. There is no incident at any time in connection with Mr. Holmes' services to the Government of the United States where there is anything in his record except plus marks. There has not been one incident brought out that was not to his credit. The ship deals—which I wish never had taken place, and I am sure he does, too—took place while he was out of the Government service. I hold no brief for them. I defy anyone, however, to point to anything in his 35 years' service to the Government of the United States which shows anything but a distinguished or excellent record. I hope this fact may appeal to the Senator from Iowa. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I am glad he quoted President Kennedy's message on the matter of conflict of interest and the propriety of one's conduct in service. I do not yield to the Senator in the importance which I attach to the same matter about which the Senator has spoken.

I think they are of the utmost importance. I suggest that the record of Julius Holmes for 35 years can be examined without finding anything in it which is not excellent so far as the United States is concerned. I thank the Senator for giving me an opportunity to make that point.

Mr. MILLER. I am more than happy to afford the opportunity to my good friend from Connecticut.

As the Senator from Ohio expressed himself a few moments ago, I think this is the most important feature of the argument by the proponents. It is a matter of weighing equities. Perhaps I am a little old fashioned. However, I have seen cases of distinguished members of the military service, with unblemished records, whose future has been blotted out because of one incident which reflected on themselves and the service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator from Delaware yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MILLER. I would feel entirely different in regard to the nomination if Mr. Holmes had said he would return the money to the Government, but there is nothing in the record to indicate any desire on his part to do so. Everyone seems to say, "He made a mistake." If he made a mistake, let us clear up the mistake and at least have returned to the Government the profits which were made as a result of these transactions. If Mr. Holmes did not know anything about them, it seems to me the highest code of ethics would warrant his going to the Government and saying, "I will have no part of this. Here is the tainted money. I am returning it."

Nothing like that appears in the record. For that reason I simply cannot, in conscience, support the nomination.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I add, before I yield to the Senator from Kentucky, that not only has Mr. Holmes not made any effort to return the money to the Government or correct the error, if it might be said to be an error, but also when he discussed the matter before the committee, what disturbed me even more was his continual insistence that he saw nothing whatever wrong with the transaction. Not only when the transactions took place did he see nothing wrong, but he said that if he had an opportunity to do it all over again today he would do so. That was the damaging admission on the part of Mr. Holmes, so far as I am concerned.

For us to confirm Mr. Holmes on his premise that neither he nor his two associates, Mr. Casey and Mr. Klein, did anything wrong when they engaged in these questionable tanker deals is asking too much.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. What my colleague from Delaware has expressed with regard to what was stated to the committee by the nominee is undoubtedly the reason why Mr. Holmes has not come forward to say, "I will return the money." He received a benefit from it. He wants the benefit. I suggest that he should not have his cake and eat it, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much times does the Senator from Delaware yield to himself?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Holmes.

This is a very difficult decision for me. I have known Mr. Holmes for sev-

eral years. I have the highest regard for his contributions to this country, both in the diplomatic service and in military service during World War II.

I do not know of any Senators for whom I have higher regard than the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. They are friends, and men whose judgment I hold in great respect.

Because this is a difficult decision to make, I desire to say a few words about it.

I do not say that Mr. Holmes' conduct in respect to the tanker deal was illegal. It does appear to me, however, that one who spent such a long time in the service of the United States, in very important positions, should have had a better understanding of the questions involved in the transaction and should have exercised great care in finding out whether the transaction in which he engaged was within the scope of the regulations of the Maritime Commission. Most important of all, he should have inquired whether it was in the interests of the United States, because he had been a servant of the United States in very important positions.

I know that to many people this kind of argument may appear to be somewhat self-righteous. It also may appear to me of retribution against a man who has a record of long and distinguished service to his country.

It may appear to be a high standard to require, but if we cannot require a high standard of those who have served in the highest positions in this Government and of those who are nominated to serve in high positions, at what point can we require a high standard? Of whom can we require high standards?

This administration has sent many nominations to the Senate. In the main, they have been excellent nominations and they were confirmed without question. But we have been asked to confirm the nominations of a few whose records appeared to be questionable, or whose records deserved more careful consideration by the administration.

Among others, I have voted to confirm the nominations of several appointees chiefly because of the precedent that the Senate should support to the fullest extent possible, the President's appointments.

I repeat the question. If we cannot apply the highest standards of understanding and knowledge of the implications of transactions which are engaged in to those who have had experience in Government, at what point in the Senate shall we apply such standards?

I understand that in a few days there will come before us the nomination of a man who was tried for a traffic violation. According to what I have heard, later the man falsified his Form 57. We shall be requested to decide what to do about his confirmation. I do not know the man, and I do not prejudge him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. Probably he is a man without experience.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I will yield to the Senator. I think the time has come when we must look more carefully at these questions.

I shall finish in 1 minute, and then I shall yield to the Senator.

I was impressed by the remarks of the Senator from Iowa. The administration has asked correctly, that high ethical standards be observed by those in Government. The administration should ask such standards of Members of Congress as well as the executive branch. Perhaps we could do better. The administration should adhere to its own standards.

It is time for the Senate to make a start toward achieving those high standards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. How much time is there for the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. President, first I wish to say that the war record or the service record of Mr. Holmes is not an issue before us today. What we are discussing is the confirmation of a man to be Ambassador to a very important country as an official representative of the United States.

This is a man who just a few years ago was unanimously condemned by a Senate investigating committee as having taken an active part in a highly improper if not actually illegal get-rich-quick tanker deal.

At that time Julius Holmes, the man we are being asked to confirm as an Ambassador joined two others, Joseph E. Casey and E. Stanley Klein, in purchasing eight tankers from the U.S. Government and then transferred these tankers over to foreign-owned and foreign-controlled companies in obvious violation of the clear intent of the law.

In one instance this group received $450,000 on a $1,000 investment without taking any risk whatever. In another case they pyramided a $100,000 investment into $2,800,000 by turning tankers over to another foreign group, again in clear violation of the intent of the law.

This transaction was bitterly denounced in a unanimous report of a Senate committee and was denounced editorially by leading newspapers throughout the country as a slick if not actually illegal deal.

Much has been said in recent months by both congressional committees and the Attorney General of the United States about the need for higher moral standards and greater integrity in private industry.

By confirming Mr. Holmes as an Ambassador to Iran the Senate will be placing a cloak of respectability upon shady deals maneuvered for the purpose of making a fast buck when such shady deals involve Government officials.

Are we to establish a lower standard of morals for Government service than is required of private industry?

How can Congress or the Department of Justice point the finger of scorn at questionable business practices while closing our eyes to slick deals involving Government officials?

President Kennedy in a recent message to Congress emphasized the need for the establishing of a higher code of ethics and higher moral standards as a requirement for Government service. I quote from his message:

> No responsibility of government is more fundamental than the responsibility of maintaining the highest standards of ethical behavior by those who conduct the public business. There can be no dissent from the principle that all officials must act with unwavering integrity, absolute impartiality and complete devotion to the public interest. This principle must be followed not only in reality but in appearance. For the basis of effective government is public confidence, and that confidence is endangered when ethical standards falter or appear to falter.
>
> Ultimately, high ethical standards can be maintained only if the leaders of government provide a personal example of dedication to the public service—and exercise their leadership to develop in all government employees an increasing sensitivity to the ethical and moral conditions imposed by public service. Their own conduct must be above reproach.

Certainly it cannot be said that Mr. Holmes is above reproach when we consider his active participation with Joseph Casey and Stanley Klein in these two highly questionable tanker deals.

Several years ago Mr. Holmes and his two associates—Joseph E. Casey and E. Stanley Klein—were engaged in these highly questionable tanker deals in which they placed the making of a fast buck above the national interest.

Some Members of the Senate have raised the question as to whether or not Mr. Holmes had repented of the errors which he made when joining in this questionable transaction 10 or 12 years ago.

During the recent hearings before the Senate Finance Committee I asked Mr. Holmes whether he saw anything wrong with the two transactions at the time he, Mr. Casey and Mr. Klein were buying these tankers from the Government and selling them to a foreign-owned company. His answer was most emphatically that he did not see anything wrong with what he and his associates had done.

I then asked Mr. Holmes whether or not he saw anything wrong with the transaction as he looked back over the 12 years and saw how the deals had ultimately turned out. Again his answer was "no" and indicated that if given the opportunity he would do the same thing over again today—although he did qualify this last statement by saying that if he knew that a congressional committee was going to get actively interested he might decide it was not worth it.

In other words, Mr. Holmes sees nothing wrong with what he did, and he would

do it again if he knew he would not get caught.

At the time Mr. Holmes and his associates purchased eight tankers from the Maritime Commission there was a law prohibiting their sale by the Government to foreign-owned or foreign-controlled companies. It was likewise illegal for an American company after purchasing these tankers from the Government to resell them to foreign-owned or foreign-controlled companies without having obtained the prior approval of the Maritime Commission. The purpose of this provision was to guarantee that these tankers would remain under the control of the U.S. Government.

By circumventing the law, or at least the intent of the law, Mr. Holmes and his two associates sold all of these tankers to companies which were both foreign owned and foreign controlled.

Mr. Holmes tries to claim that they did get the approval of the Maritime Commission, but every member of the Maritime Commission emphatically denied when testifying under oath before a senatorial committee that any notice had been given concerning the proposed sale or that any approval had been obtained.

I quote the Hoey committee's report confirming this statement:

> There is no credible evidence that Mr. Morris or any other representative of the United Tanker Corp. group made a complete disclosure to the Commission concerning the arrangements between the Casey group and the United Tanker group which were entered into as early as January 1948.

What is even worse, one of these eight tankers, the *Kettleman Hills*, which the Holmes-Casey group turned over to a foreign owned and controlled company was subsequently leased to Soviet Russia. The tanker was then used by Russia for the purpose of transporting oil from Rumania to ports in Communist China and North Korea.

Mr. Holmes tries to shrug off responsibility for what this foreign-owned company did with the tanker after his company sold it. But we must not overlook the fact that this tanker came into the possession of these foreign owners as the result of highly irregular, if not actually illegal, maneuvering on the part of Mr. Holmes and his associates.

The Hoey subcommittee which investigated these sales in 1952 strongly denounced these transactions as morally wrong and clearly in violation of the intent of the law.

Mr. Holmes and his two associates, in violation of the clear intent of the law and without taking any financial risk at all received $150,000 clear profit for each tanker they turned over to this foreign group. Therefore, they cannot dodge some responsibility for what happened.

The most bitter denunciation of this transaction whereby one of these tankers was chartered to Soviet Russia for use in transporting oil to Communist China and North Korea came from former Secretaries of Defense Louis Johnson and George Marshall.

Beginning with October 1949 and extending through October 1950 they wrote a series of letters to the Secretary of State bitterly denouncing the use of these American tankers to transport Russian oil and emphasized that such action was definitely detrimental to the security of the United States.

It was not until December 1950, 6 months after the outbreak of the Korean war that the use of these vessels in Russian trade was stopped.

Now, what excuse did Mr. Holmes and his two associates give for selling this tanker, the *Kettleman Hills*, and two other tankers to this foreign-owned and foreign-controlled company?

They said they considered the company to which they sold the tankers—the United Tanker Corp.—to be an American owned and controlled company because the company had only four stockholders, three of whom were American citizens. Therefore they reasoned that the company was 75 percent American owned and controlled.

What Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein did not disclose was that at the time they exercised the option this company—the United Tanker Corp.—which was buying these tankers was capitalized for $2,500,006. Of this $2,500,006 capitalization the one foreign stockholder, a Chinese citizen, owned $2,500,000 while the three Americans had invested in the company exactly $2 each or a total of $6.

How naive can any man be? By what line of reasoning can anyone with a straight face claim that three men with a total investment of only $6 in a $2,500,006 corporation can control its operation? As if this claim were not ridiculous enough it developed that the foreign stockholders had an option to buy even this small amount of stock from these Americans at a price of $10,000 for each man.

Obviously, these three men merely got $10,000 each for the use of their names just as Mr. Holmes and his two associates got $150,000 per tanker for the use of their names in getting title to three tankers from the U.S. Government for the purpose of turning them over to this foreign group.

This is but one example of the many flimsy excuses advanced by Mr. Holmes and his associates to justify the series of shady and highly irregular procedures surrounding many of the transactions involved in the purchase of eight tankers, every one of which was ultimately transferred to foreign owned and controlled companies. All of these transfers were made without the legal approval of the Maritime Commission.

Last Thursday I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD details of all these transactions showing how Mr. Holmes and his two associates pyramided $101,000 into a $3¼ million profit by buying eight tankers from the U.S. Government and then transferring and selling them to foreign-owned companies in clear violation of their contract with the Government and in clear violation of the intent of the law.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] quoted at length from the legal opinion which was submitted to the Department of State by the New York law firm of Davis Polk Wardwell Sunderland & Kiendl, in which they completely exonerated Mr. Holmes of having done anything wrong. We recognize them as one of the great law firms in our country. I, too, have read that memorandum, and as the Senator from Connecticut claims, it gave a clean bill of health to Mr. Holmes.

But I point out that at the time the memorandum was prepared for the State Department by this law firm, the law firm was on a retainer and being paid by Mr. Holmes. This memorandum was prepared by Mr. Holmes' own lawyers. Certainly they cleared their client; what else would one expect?

I do not recall in my lifetime ever seeing a lawyer prepare a memorandum in which they said, "Our client is guilty." We all know that if we were to ask for the legal opinion of the law firm which represented the accused at the time of his trial, certainly the legal opinion which we would expect to get would be one that would exonerate the man. Based upon Mr. Holmes' own testimony, this law firm was on his payroll at the time it prepared the memorandum.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Taking note of what the Senator from Delaware has said about the ability of Mr. Holmes to drive a sharp bargain or to use certain ability, I ask him whether he has ever found that Mr. Holmes, when in the employ of the Government and occupying a position of trust, used his ability against the interests of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Neither do I ever recall any such instance involving Jimmy Hoffa. But surely that does not mean we would vote to confirm a nomination of Jimmy Hoffa to be Secretary of Labor.

Whether a man is working in the Government or out of the Government, he has a responsibility to be honest. The fact that Mr. Holmes was out of the Government service at the time these questionable transactions took place does not in the least excuse him of his responsibilities.

No stronger denunciation of these tanker transactions of Mr. Holmes and his associates were ever made than the statements of two former Secretaries of Defense, Louis Johnson and George Marshall. Both of these men in their official capacities denounced these ships being placed under foreign ownership and engaging in traffic which was detrimental to the interests of the United States of America.

Remember, one of these tankers which they sold to a foreign group was promptly leased to Russia for use in transporting oil to Red China and North Korea. This traffic with Russia took place in the period immediately prior to and just after the outbreak of the Korean war.

The mere fact that Mr. Holmes did not perform the acts about which I have spoken while he was on the Government payroll does not excuse him from his responsibility.

Again I say I am not passing judgment as to whether or not Mr. Holmes actually violated the law, but certainly he violated the clear intent of the law.

I join the Senator from Ohio in paying respect to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] for his approach to this question of Mr. Holmes' confirmation. Even though I differ with the conclusions of the Senator from Connecticut at least he was frank enough not to defend these tanker transactions.

Much has been said about the indictment being dropped. Last Thursday I incorporated into the RECORD a memorandum prepared by the Department of Justice pointing out that the indictment was dropped only on a technicality of the law. I was informed that the reason the three-tanker deal did not appear in the indictment was that it took place in 1948 and that the statute of limitations had run. The Hoey committee reported in 1952. Therefore the indictment was based only upon the five-tanker sale which took place in 1950.

The Department of Justice made it very clear that it was asking for a dismissal of the Holmes indictment because it felt honor-bound to do so as a result of an agreement entered into with the court at the time the court ordered the dismissal of Mr. Casey's indictment.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] quoted Mr. Goertner, an official of the Maritime Commission, as having given clearance of the sale of the three tankers on February 2, 1948, by declaring that the corporation was a citizen corporation. The record will not support this statement.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the Hoey committee report beginning at the bottom of page 13 and extending over and including all the first three paragraphs of page 14, wherein it was pointed out that Mr. Goertner had not been furnished all the facts concerning the financial backing of the United Tanker Corp. at the time of his ruling.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During this same period, and particularly during January 1948, Francis B. Goertner, assistant general counsel of the Maritime Commission, received two telephone calls from Mr. Newbold Morris and another call from Mr. Wasson requesting an opinion as to whether or not the United Tanker Corp. satisfied the citizenship requirements within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916. Both Morris and Wasson called Goertner's attention to the original application which indicated that substantially all of the capital investment in the United Tanker Corp. would be provided by China Trading & Industrial Development Corp., but no mention was made of the fact that as of that time, United States citizen stockholders had invested only $6 in a corporation which several months later would be capitalized at about $2,500,000, all with Chinese funds. On February 3, 1948, Goertner replied to the inquiries of both Morris and Wasson by stating that it was his opinion that the United Tanker Corp. was a citizen corporation. This was one of particular importance to the United Tanker Corp. in view of the language of section 9 of the Shipping Act of 1916, which reads in part as follows:

"It shall be unlawful, without the approval of the Maritime Commission, to sell, mortgage, lease, charter, deliver or in any manner transfer * * * to any person not a citizen of the United States * * * any vessel or any interest therein owned in whole or in part by a citizen of the United States and documented under the laws of the United States."

About a week previously, on January 24, 1948, the National Tanker Corp. had given United Tanker Corp. an irrevocable stock option without the prior approval of the Maritime Commission.

There is no credible evidence that Mr. Morris or any other representative of the United Tanker Corp. group made a complete disclosure to the Commission concerning the arrangements between the Casey group and the United Tanker group which were entered into as early as January 1948.

It should also be noted that at about the same time, Mr. Gerald Helmbold, Chief of the Bureau of Operations of the Maritime Commission, directed a letter dated January 31, 1948, to the National Tanker Corp. After stating in his letter of January 31 that reports had reached him that the three vessels had been offered by the National Tanker Corp. for resale to other interests, Helmbold stated:

"We should very much appreciate a prompt statement from you as to whether or not you have in mind the resale of these vessels now or at a later date."

Under date of February 2, 1948, Mr. Casey, as president of the National Tanker Corp., in a letter to Mr. Helmbold replied in part as follows:

"It is our intention to bareboat charter these vessels to another American company. It is the present intention of this corporation to retain title to these vessels indefinitely. Obviously, no statement can be made at this time as to what its position may be with respect to resale at some time in the future."

This statement was made by Mr. Casey within one week after he and Klein, as representatives of the National Tanker Corp., had turned over the actual control of the stock and business operations of the National Tanker Corp. to the United Tanker Corp. on January 24, 1948. In view of that fact, which was well known to Casey, it is obvious that Casey's reply to Helmbold was false.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the Hoey committee report, it was pointed out that Mr. Goertner, at the time he rendered this hypothetical decision, did not have access to all of the facts as they were later discovered.

I will not further delay the Senate. Last Thursday I outlined in rather extensive detail the two different transactions, one transaction involving the sale of five tankers and the other involving the sale of three tankers. These transactions are fully outlined in the RECORD of last Thursday.

These transactions were unanimously condemned by a respected committee of the Senate, under the chairmanship of the late Clyde R. Hoey.

I conclude by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point that portion of the Hoey committee report, in which the committee analyzes both the five-tanker deal and the three-tanker deal, as well as the committee's conclusions. This report referred to Mr. Holmes and his associates as "shrewd and calculating businessmen" who, by circumventing the law, were able to make a fast dollar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that the portions of the committee report identified above be printed as a part of my remarks, along with the names of the Members of the Senate who signed this unanimous report.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This entire investigation has demonstrated to the subcommittee how various groups of shrewd and calculating businessmen and attorneys, through an intricate series of corporate and financial transactions, were able to realize substantial profits by taking advantage of the confusion and mismanagement which marked the administration of the surplus ship disposal program by the old Maritime Commission. Had the Commission administered that program in a businesslike manner and in accordance with the clear intent of the law, it would have been impossible for the individuals and firms involved in this inquiry to have engaged in activities which violated the spirit and, in many instances, the actual letter of the law.

At the present time, a libel action by the Government looking toward the forfeiture of the tanker *Meacham*, which was owned by the Meacham Corp., a subsidiary of the China International Foundations, Inc., is pending in Federal courts. The Department of Justice is also making an examination into the acquisition, chartering, and resale of tanker vessels by the American Overseas Tanker Corp., the China International Foundation, Inc., the North American Shipping & Trading Co., Inc., and the United States Petroleum Carriers, Inc., as well as the various affiliates and subsidiaries of these firms involving a total of 47 vessels. It is the purpose of that inquiry to determine whether civil as well as criminal action should be taken against these corporations and the responsible officials and representatives of these firms.

The subcommittee is of the opinion that there appears to be sufficient evidence of violations of the civil provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act in these tanker transactions to warrant prompt action by the Department of Justice. In addition the concealment and misrepresentation of pertinent facts by various officers and representatives of the firms involved in this inquiry in their dealings with the Maritime Commission leads the subcommittee to believe that various criminal statutes may have been violated by these individuals. In view of the long delay which has already occurred in making final determinations in these cases, it is the recommendation of the subcommittee that the Department of Justice take prompt and vigorous action to bring these cases to a logical conclusion.

This is a unanimous report of the subcommittee.

CLYDE R. HOEY,
Chairman.
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.
THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD.
JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.
KARL E. MUNDT.
RICHARD M. NIXON.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Illinois desired to speak. I prefer to have a quorum call first, and then have the Senator from Illinois speak. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I start by making a parliamentary inquiry. What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and

consent to the nomination of Julius Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I ask that question because I wish to emphasize the point that the business before the Senate is the selection of an Ambassador to Iran. Some of the debate might have suggested to a listener that it was an impeachment proceeding; or that we were passing upon the merits of a business transaction.

Now, I do not know the merits of the question which has been discussed so ably and effectively by the Senator from Delaware but I am under the impression that it was explored by the Justice Department and dropped. However the question that seems to me to be paramount is this: Who is the best man we can find to send to Iran? I asked that question of a Senator on the floor, who who is well informed in the Foreign Service. He told me that probably Mr. Holmes was one of the finest Foreign Service officers we have ever had. He did not know where we would find his equal to send to Teheran today.

I was in Teheran in 1945, at a time when the Russians were there, along with forces of the United States. We were operating the railroad there under an agreement which the British had made. The time for the Russians to leave Iran had passed. The fear was expressed that they were not going to leave. Eventually they left and we left but it was a ticklish situation.

Iran is up against the Iron Curtain, Mr. President, and to visit Teheran is to realize how sensitive is the Ambassador's post there. The country borders directly on Russia. The situation there is one of the hot spots of the world.

I should like to feel that in selecting an Ambassador for Iran we were taking the best man we could get for that post.

If we do not take Mr. Holmes, where do we go?

Has anyone suggested a better man?

This is the man who was entrusted with the vital mission which required secrecy, ability, and courage, when he went into Africa with Mark Clark.

This man was the executive officer in Eisenhower headquarters when the plan was set up for the invasion of Normandy.

This is the man who has been in Hong Kong, possibly the most sensitive point on the Red frontier.

If we were here passing upon the merits of the business transaction which all agree took place when Mr. Holmes was not an officer of the Government, the situation could be different so far as I am concerned. But today it seems to me my responsibility is to vote on a nomination, to vote on whether I think Mr. Holmes would be a good man in the critical post of Teheran.

No one has suggested that he is ineligible for that post by reason of lack of ability or by reason of lack of experience. On the other hand, everything points to the belief that this man knows how to look after the best interests of the United States in the most sensitive posts.

Because that is so, I shall vote to confirm his nomination.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 11 minutes remaining. The Senator from Delaware has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has just expressed sentiments with which I agree. I know of no one who has been more useful in recognizing the threat of expanding imperialist communism in its onward march in Asia than has the consul general from Hong Kong, with whom I have had many discussions on the subject.

Prior to his service in Hong Kong, the consulate general was in the hands of various other persons. I recall distinctly the shock which I experienced a decade or less ago in speaking to the previous consul general there. I inquired of him whether any member of the consulate spoke Chinese. Our largest consulate general is, I believe, in Hong Kong, and surely in Hong Kong, of all places, one would expect a member of the consulate to have some familiarity with the language of China—at least, some familiarity with the Manchu dialect and with the language of the people of Canton, if nothing more. The consul general advised me that he knew of no one in the consulate who spoke Chinese. Then his face brightened, and he said:

> Oh, yes; there is one person in the consulate who speaks Chinese. He is the janitor.

Then he brightly reassured me. He said:

> As a matter of fact, he is Chinese.

That was an appalling situation, which I mentioned on my return and on other occasions in discussions with American diplomats in Asia.

I know the high esteem in which Mr. Julius Holmes is held among American diplomats in Asia. I know that since he has become consul general, the number of persons in the consulate who speak Chinese is now 19. They are political experts. They are familiar with what takes place in Red China. They are able and qualified men. Under the direction and leadership of Consul General Holmes, they have given us, indeed, an insight and a window into Red China, which under lesser leadership we were denied.

Mr. President, based on my knowledge of the qualifications of Mr. Holmes, I shall support the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I have great respect for the views and insight of both of them.

I pay a special tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, who I believe has stated the case as well as it could be.

I am chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which considers matters relating to Iran. It is especially important, in my opinion, to have representing the United States in Iran a man of experience and integrity as both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have felt Mr. Holmes to be.

We have been over and around business transactions, tax cases, the law and its implications, and records to the point where it would now take a Philadelphia lawyer to analyze this dispute fully. However, of all the committees of Congress, I know of no committee which tries harder to perform its duties and functions diligently than does the Committee on Foreign Relations. After listening for many hours to a discussion of the qualifications of Julius Holmes, this committee reported the nomination favorably by a vote of 12 to 4. Because some of the outstanding members of the committee will not be here today, I shall read their names into the RECORD. These are the Senators who supported the nomination:

J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman.

JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, who, I might add, voted for the Hoey report, and is now in favor of the nomination of Julius Holmes.

MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the majority leader.

WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana.

ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee.

FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho.

STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut.

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa.

FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.

Four members of the committee voted against confirmation of the nomination.

One member of the committee was not declared because of his absence due to illness in his family.

Mr. President, we could continue with this discussion for many days. However, I believe the record has been established, on both sides of the aisle, that the nomination of this able public servant should be confirmed, so that he may in the future represent the United States in a vital part of the world, as he has in recent years.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I reserve my 2 minutes for the majority leader.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I may as well admit that I was somewhat troubled in reaching a decision on whether to vote for the approval of the nomination of Mr. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran. I believe the President did not exercise the best judgment when he nominated Mr. Holmes for this position.

I do not question the ability of Mr. Holmes. I do not question that the deals with the Maritime Commission and with others, which were consummated during the 2 or 3 years when Mr. Holmes was not in Government employ, were legal. Probably they were legal. For many years I have questioned the pro-

priety of the laws relating to the operations of the Maritime Commission.

However, it seems to me that at this time, when we are trying to put our country in the best light before all the other peoples of the world, and particularly in view of the President's message concerning the qualifications of Government officials, which was sent to Congress recently, it would be unwise on the part of the Senate to press this nomination.

I had hoped that a position might be found for Mr. Holmes in which his talents could be used without raising questions not only in the minds of the people of the United States, but also, perhaps, in the minds of people in other countries.

In view of this situation, I have decided that I cannot vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield if I have time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the Senator from Vermont, in his study of the situation find any incident in which Mr. Holmes, as a Government official, operated against the best interests of the United States? Was he in any way incapable in the performance of his duties in Hong Kong?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know. I understand he performed his service very well in Hong Kong. Nevertheless, there were 2 or 3 years when he was not an official of the United States, and it was during that period that the question was raised, perhaps not so much as to the legality but as to the propriety of the transactions which he helped to carry out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think all the arguments on both sides of the question have been presented, except that I understand the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] wishes to speak on behalf of the nomination, and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will speak in opposition.

I wonder if we might not agree to have a quorum call, the time for the quorum call not to be charged to either side. Following the quorum call, the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois will speak, and then the Senate will vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Delaware reserve for the quorum call?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are coming to the concluding moments of the debate on the question of confirmation of the nomination of the Honorable Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador to Iran.

I think the so-called tanker deal has been threshed out on a number of occasions, so that every Member of the Senate understands the situation as it was and the implications which have been raised since that time. It is not for me to go into any more detail, because I think the record has been laid bare.

But I do wish to urge the Senate to give its most serious consideration to the fact that Julius Holmes has served in a number of outstanding positions, as a career officer in the Foreign Service of the United States. He has served in practically all continents except Australia.

I had a chance to observe him personally, while he was our Minister at London, following the Second World War, after he had completed military service with the U.S. Army.

I have watched him, personally, in his service as our consular agent—I believe that was the term—at Tangiers, in what was French Morocco. At that time he also held the rank of Minister.

I know that he worked in the Department of State, and that he conducted the earliest preliminary survey covering the future of the continent of Africa. I have had a chance to read that report, and in my opinion it was remarkable in what it had to say as to what was likely to occur in the emergent nations comprising that continent.

Just last fall I visited Hong Kong, and there I had a chance to observe at first hand what Mr. Holmes—still with the rank of Minister—was doing in behalf of our country in that most difficult and most sensitive post. As a matter of fact, I spent approximately 3 days with him, going over his activities there as consul general. I wish to say that I was tremendously impressed by his activities there, as I had previously been impressed by his activities at London and at Tangiers, because of the outstanding work he was doing in behalf of our country.

So I appeal to the Senate in behalf of a man who has served for approximately 30 years in the Foreign Service of the United States, and has served his country well, both as a member of its uniformed forces and as a member of its Foreign Service; a man who, I think, will make a great Ambassador to Iran; a man for whom I was happy to vote, when his name was before the Foreign Relations Committee, some 5 years ago; a man for whose nomination I shall be pleased to vote today.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will very shortly confirm his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, let me inquire how much time remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes remain under the control of the Senator from Delaware. No time remains under the control of the other side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognised for 11 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a great many years ago, when I was still on a college campus, pursuing, among other things, an insurance course, it was the custom to get some high-pressure insurance salesman to give the class a lecture every week. I recall one, in particular—a very fine, very distinguished gentleman, who related the story of getting an appointment with J. Pierpont Morgan. Mr. Morgan knew the insurance salesman was coming to see him, and said he would give him 3 minutes on a busy morning.

When the high pressure salesman had a chance to speak to Mr. Morgan, he said:

> Mr. Morgan, I want you to take out this very substantial insurance policy; and I will give you one reason for taking it out. When you do, the story about it will appear in all the press, in all the journals, in all the insurance magazines; and the impact upon the young people of America of the point that insurance is a good investment will be terrific.

It was on that point that he made his sale.

With respect to the pending nomination, I think I am less concerned about the capacity of Mr. Holmes, his fine family, and the possibility of marring a career, than I am about the impact of this nomination on the young people of America.

I think the record clearly shows that Mr. Holmes was in the Foreign Service. To be sure, he had an honorable career. To be sure, he is a man of capacity, diligence, and competence. To be sure, he has a son who now is in the Foreign Service. To be sure, he has a fine family. But the fact remains that Mr. Holmes got out of the Foreign Service; and that in that 2-year period he made four or five business ventures, including one which called for an investment of $10,000 in the stock of the tanker corporation, for which he received, so the testimony shows, $280,000.

We have set up all sorts of safeguards around the Interstate Commerce Commission, so that if one has ever been in the Commission, he cannot practice before the Commission for a 2-year period thereafter. We have set up safeguards so that men in the Internal Revenue Service cannot practice in that forum for a period of 2 years after they leave it.

Without reflecting for a moment on the character of Mr. Holmes, or whether there was any illegality in this action—because I doubt it very much; I do not even speculate on the morals that are involved—I do say there are going to be millions of youngsters in this country who will say, "Well, there is the technique. Get the information that is necessary. Team up with somebody. Lay a little modest chunk of money on the line, and then build it up to $280,000."

Immoral? Far be it for me to pass on it. Illegal? I doubt whether its illegality has been fully demonstrated. But I

do not believe there is any person indispensable to the Foreign Service, notwithstanding what his record may have been shown to be in all the past years. I do know youngsters will read the record, and I do know they will say, "You can put down a couple of dollars and skim off the cream, if you know where to go and whom to see."

The name of Joe Casey appears all the way through. I remember Joe Casey, of Massachusetts, when he served in the House of Representatives. I thought he was one of the most personally attractive persons I ever encountered in my life. I know he was a man of capacity. I know he was a skillful lawyer. I remember when he set up an office downtown and when these things started to happen. And so here are Stanley Klein, and Joe Casey, and Mr. Holmes, who got themselves involved in a tanker deal. His conscience can be clear. It is no sin, in my book, to make money. It is no sin to run $10,000 up to $280,000. But here was a man who dropped out of the Foreign Service, after a long and honorable career, who took 2 years off to make a wad, and then came back to the Foreign Service; and now we are expected to approve his nomination. I shall never offer anything in derogation of his character. I shall say nothing to asperse his reputation. I do not want to hurt anybody. This is an unfortunate situation, but I start from a broad premise:

No. 1, there is no indispensable man in the Foreign Service—I do not care who he is.

No. 2, in view of the moral sentiments expressed in the President's own message to the Congress on conflict of interest, and so forth, I am not going to get that close to the line today and give my approval to this nomination.

I do not know Mr. Holmes. I think Charles Lamb once said, in the essays of Elia, "You cannot dislike somebody whom you know."

But it is not a question of dislike with me. It is not a question of his capacity. It is not a question of how good a job he did at Hong Kong. The question is, How many millions of youngsters will say, "That is the way to work in Government. Move yourself up. Get a broad knowledge. Go all through the spectrum. Know where the deal is to be made. Run $10,000 up to $280,000. Get a second deal, and then go back in the Government."

That has no great appeal to me. The emphasis here has been upon the character of Mr. Holmes. I offer nothing to impute other than good character. The emphasis has been on his capacity. But if there is anything bigger or more important than Julius Holmes, it is the homefront of America and the necessity for not disillusioning a lot of young people who are now regarding the star of public service and who hope someday to come into that service, either at the Federal or State level. And so my position involves no dislike. It involves no spleen on my part. I am just thinking, Can the nominee do a better job in Iran than anybody else? Or is it far more important to preserve the confidence of our people in the character of those who are to be approved? And that has to include all the rather singular circumstances that were involved in the case.

It is a tragedy for a man of good family and an honorable career to involve himself in that kind of position, and then make it necessary, in the exercise of our responsibility as the confirming branch of the Congress, to have to pass judgment on it. In doing so, I will take the perspective of what I think would be a good juryman, put the evidence all together, and decide that the good of the country comes first, and that means the confidence of the people in the moral stamina and robustness of the country.

For these reasons I feel impelled to withhold my vote from confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Holmes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator form Delaware has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remainder of the time has been yielded back. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ERVIN (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], who is absent. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 17, as follows:

[Ex. No. 1]

YEAS—63

Anderson	Hayden	Moss
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hickey	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Burdick	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Proxmire
Cannon	Johnston	Randolph
Carlson	Jordan	Robertson
Carroll	Keating	Russell
Case, N.J.	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Long, Hawaii	Scott
Chavez	Long, La.	Smathers
Clark	Magnuson	Smith, Mass.
Cotton	Mansfield	Stennis
Ellender	McCarthy	Symington
Engle	McGee	Talmadge
Fong	McNamara	Thurmond
Fulbright	Metcalf	Wiley
Hart	Monroney	Yarborough
Hartke	Morton	Young, Ohio

NAYS—17

Aiken	Dirksen	Miller
Allott	Douglas	Prouty
Boggs	Dworshak	Smith, Maine
Butler	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Lausche	

NOT VOTING—20

Bennett	Eastland	Kerr
Blakley	Ervin	McClellan
Bridges	Goldwater	Morse
Byrd, Va.	Gore	Schoeppel
Capehart	Gruening	Sparkman
Church	Humphrey	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	Kefauver	

So the nomination of Mr. Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 173, H.R. 5000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Continental Army command

(First Army)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $626,000.

(Second Army)

Camp A. P. Hill, Virginia: Training facilities, $284,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $492,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,211,000.

Camp Pickett, Virginia: Training facilities, $396,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, $305,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, $10,524,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $521,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $618,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,571,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,240,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $455,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $3,054,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities, $8,695,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Riley, Kansas: Troop housing, $99,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,081,000.

(Sixth Army)

Camp Irwin, California: Family housing, utilities, and ground improvements, $3,650,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $524,000.

Fort Ord, California: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,357,000.

Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $388,000.

Technical services facilities

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $4,029,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, research development, and test facilities, and maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,499,000.

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland: Utilities, $472,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Utilities, $382,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $231,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Utilities, $84,000.

Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Natick, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $3,812,000.

Richmond Quartermaster Depot, Virginia: Administrative facilities and community facilities, $600,000.

Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational and training facilities, $202,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, $2,228,000.

Lexington Signal Depot, Kentucky: Utilities, $33,000.

(Medical Service)

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Medical facilities, $45,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Training facilities, $1,253,000.

United States Military Academy

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Training facilities, $4,222,000.

Defense atomic support agency

Clarksville Base, Tennessee: Utilities, $238,000.

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Operational facilities and community facilities, $1,744,000.

Army component commands

(United States Army Air Defense Command)

Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,417,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Various locations: Operational facilities and utilities, $5,951,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Aliamanu Military Reservation, Hawaii: Utilities, $36,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $918,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, $814,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Ordnance Corps)

Kwajalein Island: Research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $1,546,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $7,765,000.

Army component commands

(Pacific Command Area)

Korea: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $10,635,000.

Fort Buckner, Okinawa: Operational facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and community facilities, $6,676,000.

Camp Tomlinson, Japan: Operational facilities, $50,000.

Guam: Real estate, $80,000.

(European Command Area)

Germany: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,423,000.

Classified locations: Operational facilities and utilities, $3,105,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Allen, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $381,000.

Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Community facilities and utilities, $582,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $6,245,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1962, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Lewis, Washington, strike out "$1,085,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,257,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$110,625,000" and

"$310,535,000" and inserting in place thereof $110,797,000" and "$310,707,000", respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 86–149, as amended is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)", with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "$532,000" and insert in place thereof "$600,000".

(b) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102 the amount "$81,830,000" and inserting in place thereof "$83,876,000".

(c) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "$73,652,100", "$81,830,000" and "$189,692,100" and inserting in place thereof "$73,720,100", "$83,876,000" and $191,806,100", respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 86–500 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$9,087,000" and insert in place thereof "$11,731,000".

(b) Public Law 86–500 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 "$76,631,000" and "$143,561,000" and inserting in place thereof "$79,275,000" and "$146,205,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Shipyard facilities

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $700,000.

Naval Facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Delaware: Family housing, and utilities, $495,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Family housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,300,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $211,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,774,000.

Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, California: Operational facilities, $417,000.

Fleet base facilities

Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Family housing, and utilities, $3,300,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,951,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Operational facilities and utilities, $720,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Family housing, medical facilities, utilities, and real estate, $2,880,000.

Naval weapons facilities

(Training Stations)

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Training facilities, $639,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Community facilities, $94,000.

(Field Support Stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Supply facilities, $309,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Training facilities, $211,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational facilities, $68,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Utilities, $772,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Supply facilities, family housing, utilities, and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational ities, family housing, utilities, and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $435,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $1,480,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $161,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $190,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $4,703,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $463,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,731,000.

(Fleet Readiness Stations)

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Research, development and test facilities, $345,000.

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Supply facilities, $460,000.

(Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Stations)

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Utilities, $1,086,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Operational facilities, $1,628,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Utilities, at Point Arguello, supply facilities, medical facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, on San Nicolas Island, operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $2,791,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, $240,000.

Supply facilities

Military Industrial Supply Agency, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $825,000.

Marine Corps facilities

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $6,101,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Administrative facilities, $118,000.

Marine, Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Hospital facilities, $1,100,000.

Service school facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing, $7,730,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Medical facilities, and troop housing, $4,952,000.

Naval Schools, Mare Island, Vallejo, California: Training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,213,000.

Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey, California: Training facilities, $2,463,000.

Atlantic Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Tactical School, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $868,000.

Medical facilities

Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Hospital facilities, $60,000.

Communication facilities

Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Operational facilities, $900,000.

Naval Security Group Detachment, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, $240,000.

Naval Radio Station, Cheltenham, Maryland: Operational facilities, $151,000.

Naval Radio Station, Dixon, California: Troop housing, $165,000.

Naval Communication Station, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $77,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine: Family housing, and utilities, $459,000.

Yards and docks facilities

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Family housing, and utilities, $3,300,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Naval weapons facilities

Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain: Utilities, $115,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Futema, Okinawa: Operational facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,527,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Iwakuni, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,375,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Maintenance facilities, $1,791,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $90,000.

Marine Corps facilities

Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa: Operational facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities and utilities and ground improvements, $3,238,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permament or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $40,969,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1962, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$93,101,000", and inserting in place thereof "$129,701,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$93,101,000" and "$351,294,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$129,701,000", and $387-894,000".

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 86–500 is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, by striking out the amount "$14,855,000", and inserting in place thereof "$17,955,000".

(b) Public Law 86-500 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502, the amounts "$83,975,000" and $127,566,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$87,075,000" and "$130,666,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Air defense command

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $888,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,468,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and community facilities, $1,256,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $404,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilites, and utilities, $2,677,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, $12,400,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $373,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Real estate, $43,000.

Air materiel command

Gentile Air Force Station, Dayton, Ohio: Administrative facilities, $420,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational facilities, $160,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, and utilities, $6,770,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,280,000.

Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,639,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,107,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $881,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $1,653,000.

Air research and development command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, $18,500,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities and utilities, $1,885,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, $345,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,819,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities and community facilities, $630,000.

Various locations, Atlantic Missile Range: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $10,006,000.

Air training command

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Community facilities, $296,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop housing, $342,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Community facilities and utilities, $427,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Medical facilities and community facilities, $693,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,040,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Medical facilities, $371,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,075,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Supply facilities, $203,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, $1,256,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational facilities, $135,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Troop housing and utilities, $553,000.

Air university

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Community facilities, $86,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,413,000.

Alaskan air command

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Community facilities, $354,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $240,000.

King Salmon Airport, Naknek, Alaska: Operational facilities, $684,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,837,000.

Headquarters command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,692,000.

Military air transport service

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Maintenance facilities, $145,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $125,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Maintenance facilities and medical facilities, $441,000.

Pacific air forces

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $122,000.

Strategic air command

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $1,217,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $373,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $74,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational facilities and community facilities, $475,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $411,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $236,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational facilities, $72,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, $193,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Community facilities, $197,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $828,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $568,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, community facilities and utilities, $762,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Hospital facilities, $2,050,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $2,716,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities and troop housing, $509,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Supply facilities and medical facilities, $360,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $934,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Hospital facilities, $1,900,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational facilities, $67,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $72,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, $6,280,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, $66,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $163,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Hospital facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $4,854,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, $172,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, $415,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $490,000.

Tampa Fuel Annex, Tampa, Florida: Utilities, $48,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $3,481,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $466,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Utilities, $100,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, $8,677,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Community facilities and utilities, $458,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities and community facilities, $2,240,000.

Tactical air command

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,544,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,441,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $98,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, and community facilities, $4,663,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $512,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $16,129,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, $142,000.

Transportable family housing

Various locations: Family housing, $3,584,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Caribbean air command

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, $117,000.

Military air transport service

Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $977,000.

Pacific air forces

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $9,468,000.

Strategic air command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational facilities, $181,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $80,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, $1,988,000.

United States air forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $10,506,000.

United States air force security service

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,059,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,768,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, $651,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $285,300,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1962, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "$139,797,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "$141,797,000".

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended in section 301 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" an subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, by striking out "$110,000" and inserting in place thereof "$169,000".

(b) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts of "$299,576,800" and "$850,175,800" and inserting in place thereof "$299,635,800" and "$850,234,800", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 86–500 is amended in section 301 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND", with respect to Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, by striking out "$10,500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$11,800,000".

(b) Public Law 86–500 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts of "$204,735,000" and "$727,305,000" and inserting in place thereof "$206,035,000" and "$728,605,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. In addition to the family housing units authorized by titles I, II, and III of this Act, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to construct not more than 500 family housing units with necessary utilities at locations and in numbers specified by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee.

SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $8,250,000 to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $71,301,000; outside the United States $37,243,000; section 102, $6,245,000; section 103, $15,000,000; or a total of $129,789,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $76,482,000; outside the United States, $8,136,000; section 202, $40,969,000; section 203, $15,000,000; or a total of $140,587,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $153,171,000; outside the United States, $32,797,000; section 302, $285,300,000; section 303, $15,000,000; or a total of $486,268,000.

(4) for title IV: $8,250,000.

SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 504. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 505. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 506. As of July 1, 1962, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 11, 1959, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1962, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) notwithstanding the provisions of section 506 of the Act of June 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 166, 184), the authorization for—

(a) administrative facilities in the amount of $5,666,000 at Detroit Arsenal, Michigan, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)" of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636);

(b) troop housing and utilities in the amount of $3,749,000 at Fort Dix, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (First Army Area)" of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

(c) troop housing in the amount of $584,000 at For Benning, Georgia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)" of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

(d) administrative facilities and troop housing in the amount of $2,839,000 at Fort Hood, Texas, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)" of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

(e) troop housing in the amount of $713,000 at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)" of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

(f) medical facilities in the amount of $4,186,000 for Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND" that is contained in title III, section 301, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 338), as amended;

(g) operational facilities, and real estate in the amount of $4,352,000 for Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (MARINE CORPS AIR STATION)" of the Act of August 30, 1958 (72 Stat. 643).

SEC. 507. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1964, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near tactical military installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 508. No family housing unit may be rehabilitated at a cost in excess of that established by section 109 of Public Law 86-630 as a limitation on the cost of construction of family housing units, except where the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, has notified the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives prior to such rehabilitation: *Provided*, That no family housing unit may be rehabilitated at a cost in excess of $20,000.

SEC. 509. Section 407 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the words "July 1, 1961" in subsection (e) and inserting "July 1, 1962" in lieu thereof; and (2) by striking out the words "July 1, 1962" from subsection (g) and inserting "July 1, 1965" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 510. Section 409 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is repealed.

SEC. 511. None of the authority contained in title I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $8 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 512. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1961."

TITLE VI—RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 601. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for Reserve Forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)

Aberdeen, South Dakota: Training facilities, $158,000.

Altavista, Virginia: Training facilities, $134,000.

Altus, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $152,000.

Anacortes, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.

Atchison, Kansas: Training facilities, $93,000.

Austin, Minnesota: Training facilities, $210,000.

Baltimore, Maryland: Training facilities, $300,000.

Baraboo, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $171,000.

Batavia, New York: Training facilities, $234,000.

Baxley, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Bay Springs, Mississippi: Training facilities, $72,000.

Beaufort, South Carolina: Training facilities, $96,000.

Beaver, Utah: Training facilities, $111,000.

Bedford, Indiana: Training facilities conversion, $52,000.

Bluefield, West Virginia: Training facilities, $225,000.

Bonham, Texas: Training facilities, $87,000.

Boone, Iowa: Training facilities, $225,000.

Boston (West Roxbury), Massachusetts: Training facilities, $249,000.

Brantley, Alabama: Training facilities, $72,000.

Bridgeport, Alabama: Training facilities, $72,000.

Brooklyn, New York: Training facilities conversion, $50,000.

Caldwell, Idaho: Training facilities, $125,000.

Campbellsville, Kentucky: Training facilities, $124,000.

Chadron, Nebraska: Training facilities, $43,250.

Charleston, South Carolina: Training facilities, $128,000.

Charleston, South Carolina: Training facilities, $96,000.

Clackamas, Oregon: Training facilities expansion, $150,000.

Columbia, South Carolina: Training facilities, $400,000.

Columbus, Ohio: Training facilities, $540,000.

Dallas (number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

Decatur, Mississippi: Training facilities, $72,000.

Deer Lodge, Montana: Training facilities, $69,000.

Dermott, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Devils Lake, North Dakota: Training facilities, $135,000.

East Providence, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $266,000.

Eau Claire, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $240,000.

Edgeley, North Dakota: Training facilities, $150,000.

Elizabethtown, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Enfield-Thompsonville, Connecticut: Training facilities, $169,000.

Fairmont, West Virginia: Training facilities, $210,000.

Fallon, Nevada: Training facilities, $101,000.

Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $171,000.

Geneseo, New York: Training facilities, $233,000.

Glasgow, Kentucky: Training facilities, $136,000.

Glasgow, Montana: Training facilities, $69,000.

Glennville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Great Bend, Kansas: Training facilities, $93,000.

Green Bay, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $205,000.

Hamlet, North Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Hinesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Holly Springs, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $282,000.

Hopkinsville, Kentucky: Training facilities, $134,000.

Huntington, West Virginia: Training facilities, $250,000.

Jesup, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Kerens, Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

Kingwood, West Virginia: Training facilities, $170,000.

Lake Village, Arkansas: Training facilities, $54,000.

Lincoln, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: Training facilities expansion and rehabilitation, $156,000.

Marion, Kentucky: Training facilities, $124,000.

Mexia, Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

Monroe, Louisiana: Training facilities, $191,000.

Monticello, Indiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Monticello, Kentucky: Training facilities, $124,000.

Morehead City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $101,250.

Morgantown, West Virginia: Training facilities, $198,000.

Moultrie, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Mount Holly, New Jersey: Training facilities, $169,000.

Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Training facilities, $87,000.

Newark, New Jersey: Training facilities rehabilitation, $234,000.

Newton, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

Newport, Vermont: Training facilities, $136,000.

Nogales, Arizona: Training facilities, $83,000.

North Vernon, Indiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Oak Ridge, Tennessee: Training facilities, $117,000.

O'Neil, Nebraska: Training facilities, $43,250.

Palmetto, Florida: Training facilities, $120,000.

Panama City, Florida: Training facilities, $120,000.

Parsons, Tennessee: Training facilities, $102,000.

Philadelphia, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

Phillipsburg, Kansas: Training facilities, $92,000.

Phoenixville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities expansion and rehabilitation, $125,000.

Portage, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $150,000.

Port Gibson, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

Pueblo, Colorado: Training facilities, $135,000.

Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania: Training facilities expansion and rehabilitation, $102,000.

Raleigh, North Carolina: Training facilities, $431,000.

Raleigh-Durham Airport, North Carolina: Training facilities, $158,000.

Richmond, Virginia: Training facilities, $700,000.

Roseville, California: Training facilities, $150,000.

Rupert, Idaho: Training facilities, $75,000.

Saint Albans, West Virginia: Training facilities, $190,000.

Saint George, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Saint Louis or Saint Louis County, Missouri: Training facilities, $122,000.

Seguin, Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

Sparta, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Spartanburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, $186,000.

Spindale-Forest City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $113,000.

Starkville, Mississippi: Training facilities, $120,000.

Stockton, California: Training facilities, $254,000.

Tamaqua, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $210,000.

Tifton, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico: Training facilities, $67,000.

Turlock, California: Training facilities, $115,000.

Van Nuys, California: Training facilities, $202,000.

Wagner, South Dakota: Training facilities, $165,000.

Warrenton, Missouri: Training facilities, $150,000.

Waterville, Maine: Training facilities, $257,000.

Wayne, Nebraska: Training facilities, $116,000.

West Orange, New Jersey: Training facilities rehabilitation, $243,000.

Wheatland, Wyoming: Training facilities, $109,000.

Winston-Salem, North Carolina: Training facilities, $135,000.

Woonsocket, South Dakota: Training facilities, $128,000.

Worcester, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $328,000.

Various locations: Training facilities, minor conversions and additions, $150,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (NON-ARMORY)

Camp Blanding, Florida: Supply facilities, $177,000.

Camp Grafton, North Dakota: Troop housing, $263,000.

Camp Grayling, Michigan: Troop housing, $900,000.

Camp Ripley, Minnesota: Troop housing, $300,000.

Camp Roberts, California: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

Camp Shelby, Mississippi: Troop housing, $800,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, $800,000.

Fort William H. Harrison, Montana: Troop housing, $258,000.

Montgomery, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities and supply facilities, $582,000.

Point Pleasant, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $340,000.

Santa Fe, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities and supply facilities, $546,000.

Various locations: Minor projects, $110,000.

ARMY RESERVE

Brownsville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $190,000.

Burlington, Vermont: Acquisition and rehabilitation of training facilities, $79,000.

Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $185,000.

Chicago (number 4), Illinois: Training facilities, $778,000.

Cincinnati (number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $601,000.

Durham, North Carolina: Training facilities addition, $58,000.

Erie, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $323,000.

Fall River, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $386,000.

Fargo, North Dakota: Training facilities, $393,000.

Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Training facilities, $321,000.

Gulfport, Mississippi: Training facilities, $321,000.

Huntington, West Virginia: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Jamaica, Long Island, New York: Training facilities expansion, $237,000.

Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities, $465,000.

Kalamazoo, Michigan: Training facilities, $389,000.

Kansas City, Kansas: Training facilities, $572,000.

Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities expansion, $202,000.

Little Rock (Adams Field), Arkansas: Training facilities addition, $48,000.

Lynchburg, Virginia: Training facilities, $218,000.

Martinsburg, West Virginia: Training facilities, $181,000.

McAllen, Texas: Training facilities expansion, $197,000.

Morgantown, West Virginia: Training facilities, $181,000.

New Martinsville, West Virginia: Training facilities, $181,000.

Ontario-LaVerne-Rialto Area, California: Training facilities, $372,000.

Paris, Texas: Training facilities, $166,000.

Phoenix, Arizona: Training facilities, $572,000.

Pleasant Grove, Utah: Training facilities, $181,000.

South Charleston, West Virginia: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Springfield, Massachusetts: Training facilities, expansion, $111,000.

Terminal, Texas: Training facilities, $273,000.

Terre Haute, Indiana: Training facilities addition, $67,000.

Waycross, Georgia: Training facilities, $163,000.

Yakima, Washington: Training facilities, $236,000.

Yauco, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $226,000.

Various locations: Training facilities, minor additions, and rehabilitation, $3,038,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, $466,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Maintenance facilities, $54,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities, $575,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, $347,000.

Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $200,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Utilities, $100,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $392,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, troop housing, and maintenance facilities, $841,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Belleville, Texas: Acquisition and rehabilitation of training facilities, $47,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Brooklyn, New York: Training facilities rehabilitation, $50,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Erie, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $622,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Galesburg, Illinois: Training facilities, $62,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Midland-Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $55,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Mobile, Alabama: Training facilities, $550,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $648,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Training facilities, $364,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Vallejo, California: Training facilities rehabilitation, $151,000.

Naval Reserve Master Control Radio Station and Electronics Facility, Waukegan, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, $96,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Training facilities addition, $91,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Midland-Odessa, Texas: Training facilities and land acquisition, $373,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Mobile, Alabama: Training facilities, $207,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $237,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Bruno, California: Training facilities rehabilitation, $107,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tallahassee, Florida: Training facilities addition, $200,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Waukegan, Illinois: Training facilities, $140,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Berry Field, Nashville, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

Congaree Air Base, Columbia, South Carolina: Operational, training and maintenance facilities, $1,830,000.

Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa: Operational facilities, $770,000.

Foss Field, Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Operational facilities rehabilitation, $516,000.

Fresno Airport, Fresno, California: Operational facilities, $794,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $923,000.

Grenier Field, Manchester Municipal Airport, Manchester, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, $400,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $372,000.

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Supply facilities, $252,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $287,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $888,000.

Imeson Municipal Airport, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational facilities, $1,027,000.

Kulis Air National Guard Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational, training and maintenance facilities, $678,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Utilities, $200,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities and utilities, $1,965,000.

New Castle County Airport, New Castle, Delaware: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $774,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California: Operational facilities, $1,426,000.

Rosecrans Field, Saint Joseph, Missouri: Operational facilities rehabilitation, $360,000.

Salt Lake Municipal Airport, Salt Lake City, Utah: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

Schenectady County Airport, Schenectady, New York: Operational facilities, $620,000.

Toledo Express Airport, Toledo, Ohio: Operational facilities, $654,000.

Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $526,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, rehabilitation, $300,000.

Tulsa Municipal Airport, Tulsa, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $360,000.

Volk Field, Camp Williams, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $536,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $360,000.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Supply facilities, $138,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Supply facilities, $185,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $619,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $992,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $908,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Maintenance facilities, $350,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Maintenance facilities, $350,000.

Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Washington: Operational facilities, $608,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $715,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

SEC. 602. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (NONARMORY)" in clause (3) of section 601 with respect to Camp Butner, North Carolina, by striking out "Camp Butner" and inserting in place thereof "Camp Butner or Raleigh".

(b) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (1) of section 501 with respect to Chicago Heights, Illinois, by striking out "Chicago Heights" and inserting in place thereof "Harvey", and by striking out "$302,000" and inserting in place thereof "$375,000".

(c) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended in clause (2) of section 501 as follows:

(1) Under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)", with respect to Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts, strike out "$76,000" and insert in place thereof "$170,000".

(2) Under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)" with respect to Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas, strike out "$204,000" and insert in place thereof "$262,000".

(d) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended under the heading "AIR FORCE RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 501 with respect to General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, by striking out "$43,000" and inserting in place thereof "$72,000".

(e) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1)(a) of section 504 "$21,457,000" and inserting in place thereof "$21,530,000", by striking out in clause (2) of section 504 "$8,300,000" an inserting in place thereof "$8,452,000", and by striking out in clause (3)(a) of section 504 "$4,093,000" and inserting in place thereof "$4,122,000".

(f) Public Law 86–500 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 1 of section 601 as follows:

(1) With respect to Clear Lake, South Dakota, strike out "$63,000" and insert in place thereof "$72,000".

(2) With respect to Riverdale, New Jersey, strike out "$171,000" and insert in place thereof "$190,000".

(3) Strike out the following:

"Carmichael, California: Training facilities, $115,000".

"Spartanburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, $134,000".

(g) Public Law 86–500 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (1) of section 601 with respect to Pittsburg, California, by striking out "Pittsburg" and inserting in place thereof "Concord".

(h) Public Law 86–500 is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (3) of section 601 with respect to Foss Field, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, by striking out "$675,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,038,000".

(i) Public Law 86–500 is amended by striking out in clause 1(a) of section 604 "$18,226,000" and inserting in place thereof "$18,005,000", and by striking out in clause (3)(a) of section 604 "$13,797,000" and inserting in place thereof "$14,160,000".

SEC. 603. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 604. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 601 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for the Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, $22,386,750.

(b) Army Reserve, $12,505,000.

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $7,794,000.

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, $18,606,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, $4,865,000.

SEC. 605. Any of the amounts named in section 601 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost of all projects authorized for the Army National Guard of the United States, the Army Reserve, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force Reserve, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1)(a), (1)(b), (2), (3)(a) and (3)(b) of section 604 respectively.

SEC. 606. As of July 1, 1962, all authorizations for specific facilities for reserve forces to be accomplished by the Secretary of Defense, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization, are repealed, except the authorizations for facilities for the reserve forces as to which appropriated funds have been obligated in whole or in part before July 1, 1962, and authorizations for appropriations therefor.

SEC. 607. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1961".

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of the afternoon and also for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished leader, the unfinished business is a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

When the Senate has completed consideration of that bill, it is the intention of the leadership to proceed to consider Calendar No. 172, S. 1215, a bill to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, the so-called Battle Act.

Following consideration of S. 1215, the Senate will consider H.R. 6518, a bill making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program, and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

It is hoped that the Senate can finish the military construction authorization bill this afternoon and at least proceed to consider S. 1215, the so-called Battle Act proposed amendment, and make that the pending business for tomorrow.

At the conclusion of the consideration by the Senate of the proposed Battle Act legislation, it is the intention to call up the proposed $600 million appropriation for Latin America, $100 million of which is for Chilean earthquake relief.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wonder if the majority leader has in mind at least some tentative program for later in the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senate concludes consideration of all the measures referred to, it is the intention to go over

from Tuesday until Thursday. If that program is followed, on Thursday the Senate will consider proposed legislation from the Committee on Commerce and whatever nominations may be before the Senate, and then, tentatively, it is expected that the Senate will go over from then until Monday.

It is the hope of the leadership to bring up the aid-to-education bill next Tuesday or thereabouts and shortly thereafter follow that measure with the housing bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

STUDY OF WIRETAPPING BY THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement and memorandum concerning the activities and studies of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights relating to wiretapping.

There being no objection, the statement and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ERVIN

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce forthcoming hearings on the subject of wiretapping and eavesdropping. The hearings are scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on May 9 and 10, in room 357 of the Senate Office Building, and May 11 and 12 in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is continuing its long-term study of wiretapping and eavesdropping and how these practices and similar invasions of privacy affect our constitutional rights.

In the course of its investigation, begun in 1958 and continued in 1959, the subcommittee received the views of technical experts, law professors, a private investigator, and several law enforcement officers, including the attorney general of Pennsylvania and the present attorney general of Missouri.

In addition to the public hearings held, appendix materials have examined the constitutional issues, judicial interpretations, and statutory provisions dealing with wiretapping and eavesdropping. State legislative commission reports, law review articles, and foreign law also comprise the six-volume study.

To complete this record, the subcommittee now plans to hold additional hearings on May 9, 10, 11, and 12 to examine three pending bills, S. 1086, S. 1221, and S. 1495. The subcommittee will seek to ascertain to what extent additional Federal legislation on these subjects may be desirable or practical in keeping with the rights of the individual as guaranteed by the Constitution.

S. 1086 and S. 1221 were introduced by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York, KENNETH B. KEATING, member of the subcommittee. S. 1086 would permit State law enforcement officials to wiretap under court orders if State legislation authorizes it. S. 1221 deals with wiretapping and other eavesdropping devices.

S. 1495 introduced by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD, would permit wiretapping by both State and Federal officers under court orders in certain cases.

During the 4 days of hearings, approximately 25 witnesses are scheduled to appear, among them the Attorney General of the United States, representatives of law enforcement agencies, a representative of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., members of the legal profession, and other witnesses from interested organizations.

The problems posed by wiretapping have been examined by the U.S. Supreme Court on several occasions over the last 30 years. In 1928, the Supreme Court by a narrow margin of 5 to 4 in *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U.S. 438 (1928)) held that introduction of wiretapping evidence against the defendant, a bootlegger, neither violated his rights against unlawful search and seizure under the fourth amendment nor his rights against self-incrimination under the fifth amendment. Chief Justice Taft, speaking for the majority, said:

"The fourth amendment itself shows that the search is to be of material things—the person, the house, his papers, or his effects. The description of the warrant necessary to make the proceeding lawful, is that it must specify the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized.

"Neither the cases we have cited nor any of the many Federal decisions brought to our attention hold the fourth amendment to have been violated as against a defendant unless there has been an official search and seizure of his person, or such a seizure of his papers or his tangible material effects, or an actual physical invasion of his house 'or curtilage' for the purpose of making a seizure.

"We think, therefore, that the wiretapping here disclosed did not amount to a search or seizure within the meaning of the fourth amendment."

Three of the dissenters, Justices Brandeis, Butler, and Stone, urged that wiretapping was a violation of the fourth amendment. The other dissenter, Justice Holmes, saw another objection to the use of evidence:

"Therefore we must consider the two objects of desire, both of which we cannot have, and make up our minds which to choose. It is desirable that criminals should be detected, and to that end that all available evidence should be used. It also is desirable that the Government should not itself foster and pay for other crimes, when they are the means by which the evidence is to be obtained * * *. We have to choose, and for my part I think it is a less evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part."

In 1934, 6 years after the Olmstead case, Congress enacted the Federal Communications Act. The pertinent portion, regarding "unauthorized publication or use of communications," is section 605, which provides in part:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person."

Section 605 had its first test before the Supreme Court in *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U.S. 379 (1937)). The question raised was whether evidence procured by a Federal officer's tapping the telephone wires and intercepting messages was admissible in a criminal trial in a U.S. district court. The lower court had admitted the evidence and affirmed the judgment of the conviction.

Mr. Justice Roberts delivered the opinion of the Court:

"Taken at face value, the phrase 'no person' comprehends Federal agents, and the ban on communication to 'any person' bars testimony to the content of an intercepted message. Such an application of the section is supported by comparison of the clause concerning intercepted messages with that relating to those known to employees of the carrier. The former may not be divulged to any person, the latter may be divulged in answer to a lawful subpena.

"The Government contends that Congress did not intend to prohibit tapping wires to procure evidence.

"We nevertheless face the fact that the plain words of section 605 forbid anyone, unless authorized by the sender, to intercept a telephone message, and direct in equally clear language that 'no person' shall divulge or publish the message or its substance to 'any person.' To recite the contents of the message in testimony before a court is to divulge the message. The conclusion that the act forbids such testimony seems to us unshaken by the Government's arguments."

The judgment of the lower court was reversed and the cause remanded to the district court for further proceedings.

After the court had nullified Nardone's first conviction, the defendant was retried and again convicted of the same offense. At the second trial, the defense was denied the right to question prosecution witnesses about the use the police had made of the tapped conversations.

Justice Frankfurter delivered the opinion of the Court in the second *Nardone et al.* v. *United States* (308 U.S. 338 (1939)). He stated:

"The issue thus tendered by the circuit court of appeals is the broad one, whether or no section 605 merely interdicts the introduction into evidence in a Federal trial of intercepted telephone conversations, leaving the prosecution free to make every other use of the proscribed evidence. Plainly, this presents a far-reaching problem in the administration of Federal criminal justice, and we therefore brought the case here for disposition.

"We are here dealing with specific prohibition of particular methods in obtaining evidence. The result of the holding below is to reduce the scope of section 605 to exclusion of the exact words heard through forbidden interceptions, allowing these interceptions every derivative use that they may serve. Such a reading of section 605 would largely stultify the policy which compelled our decision in *Nardone* v. *United States, supra*. That decision was not the product of a merely meticulous reading to technical language. It was the translation into practicality of broad considerations of morality and public well-being. This Court found that the logically relevant proof which Congress had outlawed, it outlawed because it was 'inconsistent with ethical standards and destructive of personal liberty.' "

Thus, in 1939 the second Nardone decision extended section 605 to cover not only wiretap evidence, but also evidence obtained from intercepted leads; and to intrastate as well as interstate telephone conversations.

Another far-reaching and significant decision of the Supreme Court was decided in *Benanti* v. *United States* (355 U.S. 96 (1957)). The question presented by the petitioner was whether wiretapping evidence obtained by State law enforcement officers, without participation by Federal authorities, was admissible in a Federal court.

Chief Justice Warren, delivering the opinion of the Court, stated:

"Petitioner, relying on this Court's supervisory powers over the Federal court system, claims that the admission of the evidence was barred by the Federal Constitution and section 605. We do not reach the constitutional questions as this case can be determined under the statute.

"In *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U.S. 379, and 308 U.S. 338), this Court held that evidence obtained from wiretapping by Federal agents was inadmissible in Federal court. In *Schwartz* v. *Texas* (344 U.S. 199), the same type of evidence was held admissible in a State court where it had been obtained

by State agents. The case before us, containing elements from these three cases, forces a choice between the different results reached.

"The Nardone decisions laid down the underlying premises upon which is based all subsequent consideration of section 605. The crux of these decisions is that the plain words of the statute created a prohibition against any persons violating the integrity of a system of telephonic communication and that evidence obtained in violation of this prohibition may not be used to secure a Federal conviction. *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U.S. 379, 382). Moreover, as the second *Nardone* decision asserts, distinctions designed to defeat the plain meaning of the statute will not be countenanced (308 U.S. 338, 340). We hold that the correct application of the above principle dictates that evidence obtained by means forbidden by section 605, whether by State or Federal agents, is inadmissible in Federal courts."

The judgment was reversed and the cause remanded to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit for further proceedings.

Among the more recent of Supreme Court rulings on this issue was the case of *Pugach* v. *Dollinger* (365 U.S. 458 (1961)), decided February 27, 1961. In this case, a per curiam decision affirmed the judgment of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on the authority of *Schwartz* v. *Texas* (344 U.S. 199), and *Stefanelli* v. *Minard* (342 U.S. 117).

In *Schwartz* v. *Texas*, the Supreme Court previously held that evidence of this nature was admissible in the State courts where it had been obtained by State agents, and that its admission was not a ground for reversal of a State court conviction. The rule excluding, in Federal proceedings, evidence obtained and sought to be divulged in violation of section 605 was held to be a rule of evidence only. The Court found that Congress, by forbidding the interception and divulgence of telephone communications, did not intend to impose the Federal exclusionary rule of evidence on the State courts, and that States were free to make and apply their own rules of evidence on this subject matter.

The *Stefanelli* v. *Minard* case, referred to in the Pugach per curiam decision, dealt with a denial by the Federal district court of an injunction against the use in pending State criminal proceedings of the fruits of an unlawful search and seizure by the State police. It was held that the Federal courts should refuse to intervene in State criminal proceedings to suppress the use of evidence even when secured by unlawful search and seizure.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, writing for the Court, said:

"The consequences of exercising the equitable power here invoked are not the concern of a merely doctrinaire alertness to protect the proper sphere of the States in enforcing their criminal law. If we were to sanction this intervention, we would expose every State criminal prosecution to insupportable disruption. Every question of procedural due process of law—with its farflung and undefined range—would invite a flanking movement against the system of State courts by resort to the Federal forum, with review if need be to this Court, to determine the issue."

Thus, the *Pugach* v. *Dollinger* case, indicates a permissive attitude by the Supreme Court regarding the introduction in State prosecutions of evidence illegally obtained through wiretapping.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights initial hearings on wiretapping and eavesdropping have pointed out a multitude of issues and methods in these fields. The forthcoming hearings, May 9, 10, 11, and 12, will explore further the proposals and problems presented by the pending bills before the subcommittee and seek to determine to what extent Federal legislation may be desirable or practical.

This is a difficult area in which to legislate. I am cognizant of the grave problems facing the national security of our Nation. I am also cognizant of the problems facing prosecution and law enforcement agencies in their efforts to eliminate crime and punish the criminals, particularly the organized criminal syndicate rings. However, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I am also concerned with the preservation of individual liberties as guaranteed in the Constitution.

If the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights ascertains that additional Federal legislation is necessary in this area, I am hopeful Congress will find a middle ground which will adequately balance the rights of the private citizen against the public need.

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY THE STAFF OF THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ON WIRETAPPING-EAVESDROPPING

Subject: Wiretapping and the law today.

I. CONGRESS AND WIRETAPPING

A. Legislation in the 87th Congress

Three bills, S. 1086, S. 1221, and S. 1495, have been introduced in the 87th Congress regarding wiretapping and other electronic devices. These bills have been referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

S. 1086, introduced by Senator KEATING, of New York, would permit State law enforcement officials to wiretap under court orders if State legislation authorizes it.

S. 1221, introduced by Senator KEATING, of New York, would regulate wiretapping and other eavesdropping devices.

S. 1495, introduced by Senator DODD, of Connecticut, would permit wiretapping by both State and Federal officers under court orders in certain cases.

The following chart was prepared by staff members of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to illustrate the three pending bills:

Comparison of wiretapping and eavesdropping bills, S. 1086, S. 1221, and S. 1495

S. 1221 (by Senator Keating)	S. 1495 (by Senator Dodd)	S. 1086 (by Senator Keating)
Defines: "Eavesdropping": (1) Situation in which a person (not a sender or receiver) willfully and by means of instrument, without consent of sender or receiver overhears or records a telephone or telegraph communication or aids, authorizes, employs, procures, or permits another to do so. (2) When one not present during conversation or discussion overhears or records such conversation or discussion, willfully; by means of instruments; without consent of party to conversation or discussion or aids, authorizes, employs, procures, or permits another to do so. (3) When person not a member of a jury records or listens to deliberations of jury by means of instruments or aids, authorizes, employs, procures, or permits another to do so. "Person": Any individual, partnership, corporation, or association including subscriber to telephone or telegraph service excluding any law enforcement officer acting lawfully in official capacity in investigation, detection, or prosecution of crime. "Instrument": Any device, contrivance, machine, or apparatus, or part thereof, designed or used for acoustical detection, including, but not limited to wiretapping, equipment, microphones, detectaphones, spike mikes, dictaphones, radio transmitters, and recorders.	Defines: "Intercept": Acquisition through use of intercepting device of the contents of wire communication made by another person. "Person": Any individual, including investigative or law enforcement agents of the United States, any Federal agency, or any State, partnership, association, joint-stock company, trust, or corporation. "Intercepting device": Any mechanical, electrical, or electronic device or apparatus other than a telephone or telegraph instrument, an extension telephone, a switchboard, a wire communications line, cable, or system, or other part of the facilities used for the transmission of wire communications. "Wire communication": Any communication made by telephone or telegraph. "Interstate communication": Any communication from 1 State to another, or within District of Columbia or U.S. possession. "Foreign communication": Transmitted between any State or U.S. possession and any foreign country. "Contents": Any information concerning existence contents, substance, purport, or meaning of communication. "Federal agency": Any department, agency, or armed force of United States. "State": Any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, any U.S. possession. "Judge of competent jurisdiction": For court order to intercept— (a) judge of U.S. district courts, or U.S. courts of appeals in re application or order to obtain evidence of, or to prevent commission of any offense in violation of any statute of United States. (b) judge of any State court, authorized by State statute to enter orders granting such leave in re application or order to obtain evidence of, or to prevent commission of any offense in violation of State law.	No definitions; State law applies.

Comparison of wiretapping and eavesdropping bills, S. 1086, S. 1221, and S. 1495—Continued

S. 1221 (by Senator Keating)	S. 1495 (by Senator Dodd)	S. 1086 (by Senator Keating)
Prohibits eavesdropping by a person: 1. In the District of Columbia, any U.S. territory or possession. 2. For purpose of aiding, abetting, perpetrating a Federal offense. 3. Where conversation, discussion, communication overheard is by wire or radio. 4. For purpose of obtaining information re activity under Federal regulation. 5. Where information overheard or recorded is to be transmitted in interstate commerce or outside United States. 6. Where instrument used involves facilities in interstate or foreign commerce. Penalty: $5,000 and/or up to 1 year imprisonment.	Prohibits interception: Makes it unlawful for any person to intercept, procure others to do so, or conspire with any other person to intercept or attempt to intercept. Penalty: $10,000 and/or up to 2 years imprisonment.	State law applies. (No provision.)
Exceptions to prohibited eavesdropping (not specifically set forth): would include law enforcement officers acting "lawfully in official capacity in investigation, detection or prosecution of crime"—by definition of "person" in the bill.	Exceptions to prohibited interception: 1. Sender. 2. Intended recipient. 3. Person authorized by sender or recipient to intercept. 4. Officer, agent, employee of carrier in normal employment. 5. Investigative or law enforcement officer.	
No similar provision.	Prohibits divulgence or disclosure of intercepted communication: Makes it unlawful to divulge or disclose contents of any wire communication with knowledge that such information was obtained through interception. (Fine of $10,000 and/or 2 years imprisonment.)	No provision.
	Exceptions to prohibited divulgence: 1. Sender. 2. Intended recipient. 3. One authorized by sender or recipient to intercept. 4. If information has been divulged previously by such person, or by any individual while giving certain testimony in State or Federal criminal actions, or proceedings of State legislative or congressional committees. 5. Authorized disclosures to law enforcement officers; in State and Federal courts in criminal actions; to Congress and State legislatures.	
Prohibits possession of eavesdropping instruments: Under circumstances showing intent to use or employ or allow them to be used or employed for unlawful eavesdropping. Penalty: $1,000 and/or 6 months' imprisonment.	No similar provision.	
	Judge may enter ex parte order granting leave to intercept on reasonable ground for belief that— (1) the crime has been or is about to be committed, (2) evidence essential to conviction for, or prevention of the crime will be obtained, (3) no other means are readily available. Order to specify: (1) nature and location of facilities, (2) offense involved, (3) identity of officers authorized to intercept, (4) length of time interception is authorized. Applications to contain same information as listed above for Federal interception.	Do.
Permits eavesdropping without court order for 24 hours: By law enforcement officer with reasonable grounds to believe evidence of crime may be obtained; and time doesn't permit application for court order. Application for court order to be made within 24 hours.	No similar provision.	
State eavesdropping permitted: Nothing in the act to prohibit eavesdropping by any law enforcement officer or agency or any State, or any political subdivision thereof.	State interception under court order permitted: Any investigative or law enforcement officer of a State or political subdivision who is authorized by State statute to apply to judge for leave to intercept (1) when required to obtain evidence of, or to prevent, criminal offense punishable under that State's law by death or 1 year imprisonment, involving murder, kidnaping, extortion, bribery, gambling, possession, use or furnishing of narcotic drugs, or attempt or conspiracy to commit such offense.	State interception permitted under State law: Amends title 18 U.S.C. to provide that no law of the United States shall be construed to prohibit interception by State and local enforcement officer or agency in compliance with State statute, and divulgence in State court. (See below.)
Disclosure of eavesdropping evidence: State court: Nothing in act to prohibit use of eavesdropping evidence obtained by law enforcement officer or agency of State or political subdivision, in any court, where authorized by court of such State on reasonable grounds that interception might disclose evidence of crime.	Disclosure of intercepted communication: In State criminal action: Information obtained by authorized interception and received in authorized way. May be disclosed.	Divulgence of intercepted communication: In State courts: No U.S. law to prohibit divulgence, in any proceeding in any court of such State, of the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of any communication so intercepted if such interception was made after determination by a court of such State that reasonable grounds existed for belief that such interception might disclose evidence of commission of a crime.
State evidence under court order permitted in Federal court: Permits introduction in Federal courts of evidence relating to wire or radio communication intercepted by State or local law enforcement officer or agency, on determination of court of such State of reasonable ground that interception might disclose evidence of commission of crime. Federal wiretapping evidence admissible in criminal proceedings: Information obtained previous to this act by Federal law enforcement agents through interception on written approval of Attorney General in the course of any investigation of any Federal offense shall be admissible in evidence in any criminal proceedings.	In Federal criminal action: Information obtained by authorized interception and received in authorized way may be disclosed in U.S. criminal action.	
Authorizes certain interception by Federal agents—Federal: No similar provision.	Authorizes certain interception by Federal agents—Federal: By authority of the Attorney General without court order: The Attorney General may authorize any investigative or law-enforcement officer of the United States or any Federal agency to intercept if the Attorney General determines there is reasonable ground for belief that— 1. A criminal offense punishable by death or 1 year imprisonment under 18 U.S.C., chs. 37 (espionage); 55 (kidnaping); 105 (sabotage); 115 (treason, sedition, and subversive activities); or a conspiracy to commit such offense, is about to be committed. 2. Evidence essential to conviction for, or prevention of, such offense will be obtained. 3. No other means are readily available for obtaining such evidence.	No provision.

Comparison of wiretapping and eavesdropping bills, S. 1086, S. 1221, and S. 1495—Continued

S. 1221 (by Senator Keating)	S. 1495 (by Senator Dodd)	S. 1086 (by Senator Keating)
Authorizes certain interception by Federal agents—Federal—Con. Under court order: Order to be issued by any judge of U.S. district court, U.S. court of appeals, District of Columbia municipal court, District of Columbia municipal court of appeals, or any U.S. commissioner. Record kept: Procedure: Judge to keep copies of orders, papers on which application is based, etc.: 1. An authorized agent of a Federal law enforcement agency to apply for order. 2. On oath or affirmation. 3. On reasonable ground to believe evidence of Federal crime may be obtained. 4. Particularly describing persons involved and purpose, and identifying telephone number or telegraph lines involved.	Under court order after authorization of Attorney General or others: Order to be issued by judge of court of competent jurisdiction. Record kept: Procedure: Judge to send Administrative Office of U.S. Courts copies of orders, extensions, applications, denials: 1. Attorney General, or any officer of the Justice Department, or any U.S. attorney designated by the Attorney General. 2. May authorize any investigative or law enforcement officer of the United States or any Federal agency to apply to judge for leave to intercept. 3. Oath or affirmation. 4. When such action is required to obtain evidence of, or to prevent commission of criminal offense under 18 U.S.C., chs. 37, 55, 105, 115; or under any other statutes involving murder, extortion, bribery, gambling, racketeering, the possession, use or furnishing of narcotic drugs, or attempt or conspiracy to commit such offense. 5. Application to contain: full and complete statement of facts and circumstances including: the purpose, nature, and location of facilities involved, previous application to intercept involving same facilities and for same purpose and action taken by judge.	
Order effective no longer than 2 months. Renewal or extension to be by same judge if in public interest.	Court orders for (State and Federal) interception: Same. Extended not more than 30 days by same judge on reasonable grounds that extension is necessary to obtain evidence or prevent commission of offense. To Congress and State legislature: Information obtained by authorized interception and received in authorized way may be disclosed in any proceeding of a duly authorized committee of Congress or State legislature. Disclosure to other law enforcement officers: Any investigative or law enforcement officer intercepting by authority may divulge or disclose contents of the communication to any officer or employee of the United States, any Federal agency, or any State, if it is required for the proper performance of official duties of the intercepting officer (if interception is authorized, and communication provides, or may lead to discovery of evidence of actual or probable commission of offense).	No provision.
Use of illegal eavesdropping evidence: Evidence obtained in violation of the act or as a result of violation, to be inadmissible in any civil action, proceeding, or hearing: To be admissible in any disciplinary trial, or hearing, or any administrative action, proceeding, or hearing conducted by or on behalf of any governmental agency.	Disclosure of unauthorized interception: Contents of intercepted communication may not be received as evidence in any proceeding or before any court, grand jury, department, officer, agency, or regulatory body or authority of the United States or any State from any witness if disclosure or divulgence by any means other than giving of testimony would be in violation of the act.	Do.
	Reports concerning intercepted wire communications: Judge to send Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts copy of order and extension of it, the application for the orders, and application for extension; copy of application for order or extension which has been denied. Director of Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to transmit to Congress report concerning application denied, orders entered; nature of offenses involved, etc., and such other information as may be requested by chairmen of the Judiciary Committees, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees.	Do.
	Amends Communication Act: Provides that sec. 605 shall not apply to— (1) contents of any radio communication broadcast, or transmitted by amateurs or others for use of the general public, or relating to ships in distress; or (2) the interception or any wire communication, or divulgence or disclosure of contents not in violation of that act.	
Duty of carriers to report violations: 1. Imposes duty on carriers subject to Federal Communications Act to report to law enforcement agency having jurisdiction any information coming to his attention re violation of act (failure—punishable up to $500). 2. Authorizes carriers to permit authorized eavesdropping.		

B. Previous congressional action on wiretapping legislation

Congress has never authorized wiretapping by anyone, or any agency, under any circumstances.

When Congress has enacted legislation dealing with wiretapping, eavesdropping, and the interception of messages, Congress has always prohibited the interception of telephone, telegraphic or radio communications. Following are all the Federal laws enacted in these categories:

(a) An act to regulate radio communications: Act of August 13, 1912, 37 Stat. 302; Public Law 264 of the 62d Congress.

(b) An act providing for the protection of the users of the telephone and telegraphic service and the properties and funds belonging thereto during Government operation and control: Act of October 29, 1918: 40 Stat. 1017; Public Law 230 of the 65th Congress.

(c) Radio Act of 1927: Act of February 23, 1927; 44 Stat. 1162; Public Law 632 of the 69th Congress (sec. 27).

(d) Amendment forbidding wiretapping in the enforcement of the National Prohibition Act: Act of March 1, 1933; 47 Stat. 1381; Public Law 387 of the 72d Congress. (Amendment to the Appropriations Act for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, Labor and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934.)

(e) Federal Communications Act of 1934: Act of June 19, 1934; 48 Stat. 1064; Public Law 416 of the 73d Congress (secs. 605 and 501). (For text of sec. 605, see appendix A.)

For the legislative history of bills introduced in Congress during the period 1914 through 1959, to prohibit wiretapping and eavesdropping or to authorize wiretapping and eavesdropping under certain circumstances, see part 4, W–E, pages 781–1031. Bills and legislative action are summarized, followed by texts of bills, committee reports and statutes.

But, at the present time, there is considerable doubt whether any law enforcement officer may wiretap without violating section 605. This doubt persists despite State laws purporting to authorize wiretapping. (For State law citations, see appendix B hereto.)

C. Applications for Federal injunctions against wiretapping or use of information obtained by wiretapping

The Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee has no record of any action for damages or suit for equitable relief filed or tried against Federal officers wiretapping or telephone company officials for permitting interference with privacy of communications.

D. States admitting information obtained by wiretapping

Only six States purport to authorize wiretapping, five under court order and one without court order (see appendix B).

II. FEDERAL COURTS AND WIRETAPPING

A. Federal criminal prosecutions

"A single sentence can now tell us what the law concerning wiretapping is: on timely motion by a defendant who was a party to

the call, a Federal court will suppress the contents, and evidence derived therefrom, of any interstate or intrastate telephone communication overheard by any person whether a private citizen or Federal or State agent, if the listening in is without the permission of the other party to the call."

So said Georgetown law professors, Edwin J. Bradley and James E. Hogan, after examining U.S. Supreme Court cases on wiretapping from *Nardone* to *Benanti* and *Rathbun;* part 3, W–E, 589 at 613. This conclusion applies to any attempts to use evidence (obtained by wiretapping) in Federal criminal prosecutions.

In *Olmstead* v. *U.S.* (277 U.S. 438 (1928)), the Supreme Court held, in a closely divided and argued decision of 5 to 4, that wiretapping per se is not unconstitutional under the fourth or fifth amendment. (For text, see pt. 1(a), W–E, 42; plus briefs amici curiae of the telephone companies; pt. 4, W–E, 765.)

Six years later, in 1934, the Federal Communications Act was passed by Congress. Section 605, of the act, provides in part:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purpose, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person."

In a letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, dated September 10, 1959, former Attorney General William P. Rogers wrote, "There is no record of prosecution by the Federal Government, either before or after the Benanti decision, of local law enforcement officers who have intercepted and divulged conversations in the performance of their duties." (For text, see pt. 5, p. 1480.)

III. SUMMARIES OF CONTENTS OF WIRETAPPING AND EAVESDROPPING HEARINGS

Following are summaries of contents of separate volumes (parts) in Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee continuing study of wiretapping, eavesdropping, and the Bill of Rights:

Part 1, W–E, hearing, May 20, 1958:

Testimony of— Page
(a) John J. Hanselman, assistant vice president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.. 2
(b) Prof. Richard Schwartz, Moore School of Electrical Engineering, University of Pennsylvania; coauthor, "The Eavesdroppers" 8
(c) Hon. Thomas McBride, then attorney general, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 20
Part 1(a), W–E, Appendix to Hearing of May 20, 1958, background materials:
I. Bill of Rights 33
II. Statutes:
A. Sections 605 and 501, Federal Communications Act 35
B. Preliminary survey of State laws 35
III. Court decisions:
A. Tables of citations 40
B. Texts of U.S. Supreme Court opinions, Olmstead to Benanti and Rathburn 42
C. Texts of selected search and seizure cases 91
IV. Summary of foreign law, by Library of Congress 137
V. Bibliography 187
Part 2, W–E, hearing, May 22, 1958:
I. Testimony of—
A. Alan F. Westin, assistant professor, department of Government, Cornell University 194
(1) Columbia L.R. article, February 1952 215
B. Hon. Thomas F. Eagleton, circuit attorney, city of St. Louis, Mo. 259
Part 2, W–E, hearing, May 22, 1958—Con.
II. Reports of— Page
A. Savarese Committee, New York State, 1956 267
B. Savarese Committee, New York State, 1957 347
C. British Committee of Privy Councillors, 1957 459
Part 3, W–E, hearing, July 9, 1959:
I. Testimony of—
A. Samuel Dash, Esq., director, Pennsylvania Bar Association, study 503
B. Hon. Edward S. Silver, D.A., Kings County, N.Y. 532
II. Law review articles, statements, letters from law school professors and others 566
Part 4, W–E, appendix to part 3:
I. Court decisions:
A. Detailed tables of cases 719
B. Texts of decisious since Rathbun and Benanti 722
II. Legislative history of congressional bills to prohibit or to authorize wiretapping:
A. Summaries 781
B. Text of bills, committee reports, and statutes 790
III. Correspondence with Justice Department 1033
IV. Savarese Cee., N.Y., report, 1958 1041
V. Representative (different points of view) law review articles, texts 1163
VI. Bibliography 1397
Part 5, W–E, hearings, Dec. 15 and 16, 1959:
I. Testimony of—
A. Harold Lipset, private investigator, San Francisco, Calif. 1438
B. Edward Bennett Williams, attorney, Washington, D.C. 1470
C. Paul Williams, attorney, New York City 1492
D. Harris Steinoerg, attorney, New York City 1506
II. State statutes: supplement to materials in part 1(a), W–E 1526
III. Court decisions:
A. Supplement to material in part 1(a), W–E 1529
B. Texts of selected lower Federal court decisions 1532
C. Texts of selected State appellate court decisions 1646
IV. Information on purchase and use of small electronic recording equipment by Federal offices 1684
V. Telephone companies' statement, supplementing testimony in part 1, W–E 1689
VI. Law review articles and reports of State investigating and bar association commissions 1705
VII. Notes on British practices 1985
VIII. Notes on Australian practices 1997

APPENDIX A

TITLE 47—TELEGRAPHS, TELEPHONES, AND RADIO TELEGRAPHS OF THE U.S. CODE—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

§ 605. Unauthorized publication or use of communications.

No person receiving or assisting in receiving, or transmitting, or assisting in transmitting, any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio shall divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning thereof, except through authorized channels of transmission or reception, to any person other than the addressee, his agent, or attorney, or to a person employed or authorized to forward such communication to its destination, or to proper accounting or distributing officers of the various communicating centers over which the communication may be passed, or to the master of a ship under whom he is serving, or in response to a subpena issued by a court of competent jurisdiction, or on demand of other lawful authority; and

No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person; and

No person not being entitled thereto shall receive or assist in receiviny any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio and use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto; and

No person having received such intercepted communication or having become acquainted with the contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, knowing that such information was so obtained, shall divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, or use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to the receiving, divulging, publishing, or utilizing the contents of any radio communication broadcast, or transmitted by amateurs or others for the use of the general public, or relating to ships in distress. (June 19, 1934, ch. 652, § 605, 48 Stat. 1103.)

APPENDIX B

STATE STATUTORY PROVISIONS ON WIRETAPPING

EXPLANATION OF STATUTORY DATA

1. Thirty-three States prohibit wiretapping.

2. Six States permit wiretapping by police officers.

A. Five States under court order.

B. One State without court order.

3. Eleven States have no statutes on wiretapping.

1. THIRTY-THREE STATES PROHIBIT WIRETAPPING

1. Alabama: Code 1940, title 14, section 84 (18) (interception prohibited); title 48, section 414–415 Cum. Supp. 1959 (tapping of telegraph or telephone prohibited).

2. Alaska: Comp. Laws Ann. (1949), section 49–5–12 through 49–5–20 (tapping of telegraph or telephone prohibited).

3. Arizona: Rev. Stat. Ann. (1956), section 13–886 (telegraph and telephone 13–887).

4. Arkansas: Stat. Ann. (1957 replacement volume 6B), section 73–1810 (telegraph and telephone).

5. California: Annotated California Code, part 1, title 15, section 640, Annotated California Code, 1960 supplement, sections 619, 653h, and 653.

6. Colorado: Rev. Stat. (1953), section 40–4–17 (telegraph and telephone).

7. Connecticut: Gen. Stat. (1958), section 53–140 (telegraph and telephone).

8. Delaware: Code Ann. (1953), supplement (1958), title 11, section 754–757 (telegraph and telephone).

9. Florida: Stat. Ann. (1944), supplement (1959), section 822.10 (telegraph and telephone).

10. Hawaii: Rev. Laws 1955, section 309A–1 added by laws 1957, page 204, act 176 (prohibits recording telephonic conversations).

11. Idaho: Code Ann. (1948), section 18–6704 (telegraph), 18–6705 (telegraph and telephone).

12. Illinois: Ann. Stat. (Smith-Hurd, 1936), chapter 134, section 15a, 16 (telegraph and telephone) (electronic eavesdropping is defined and prohibited by chapter 38, section 206.1 through 206.5, ibid. (1959 Supp.).

13. Iowa: Code Ann. (West's 1950) section 716.7, 716.8 (telegraph and telephone).

14. Kansas: Gen. Stat. Ann. (Corrick, 1949), section 17–1908 (telegraph and telephone).

15. Kentucky: Rev. Stat. (1953), section 433–430 (telegraph and telephone).
16. Michigan: Stat. Ann. (1954 revised volume 25), section 28–807—28–808.
17. Montana: Rev. Code Ann. (1947), section 94–3203 (telegraph and telephone).
18. Nebraska: Rev. Stat. (1943) (reissue of 1958) section 86–328 (telegraph and telephone).
19. New Jersey: Stat. Ann. (West's 2A N.J.S.A. book 7, revised 1953), section 2A: 146–1 (telegraph and telephone).
20. New Mexico: Stat. Ann. (1953), section 40–37–5 (telegraph and telephone).
21. North Carolina: Gen. Stat. Ann. (1943), section 14–155 (telegraph and telephone).
22. North Dakota: Rev. Code (1943), section 8–1007 (telegraph and telephone).
23. Ohio: Rev. Code Ann. (page 1954), (telegraph and telephone) sections 4931.25–4931.29, 4931.99.
24. Oklahoma: Stat. Ann. (West's 1958), title 21, section 1757 (telegraph and telephone).
25. Pennsylvania: Stat. Ann. (Purdon's 1939), title 15, section 2443 (telegraph and telephone).
26. Rhode Island: Gen. Laws (1956), section 11–35–12 (telegraph and telephone).
27. South Dakota: Code (1939), section 13.4519 (telegraph and telephone).
28. Tennessee: Code Ann. (1955), sections 39–4533, 65–2117, 65–2118 (telegraph and telephone).
29. Utah: Code Ann. (1953), section 76–48–11 (telegraph and telephone).
30. Virginia: Code Ann. (1950), 18–214 (telegraph and telephone) section 18.1–156.
31. Washington: Rev. Code (1951), section 9.61.010(18) (telegraph and telephone).
32. Wisconsin: Stat. Ann. (West's 1957), section 134.39 (applicable only to telegraph).
33. Wyoming: Stat. Ann. (1957), section 37–295 (telegraph and telephone).

2. SIX STATES PERMIT WIRETAPPING BY POLICE OFFICERS

A. Five States under court order:
1. Maryland: Code Ann. (Michie 1957), article 27, section 556(b)(c) (supp. 1959) (electronic devices); article 35, (supp. 1959) (wiretapping), sections 92–99.
2. Massachusetts: Gen. Laws (West's 1959), chapter 272, section 99 (supp. 1959).
3. Nevada: Rev. Stat., sections 200.660 through 200.690.
4. New York: Constitution, article 1, section 12; Penal Law (McKinney's), section 739(1); Code of Criminal Procedure (McKinney's), section 813a, section 813b, sections 738–745 (eavesdropping).
5. Oregon: Rev. Stat. sections 141.720 through 141.740, section 165.540, section 165.535.

B. One State without court order: Louisiana, Rev. Stat. Ann. (West's 1950), section 14:322.

3. ELEVEN STATES HAVE NO STATUTES ON WIRETAPPING

(Title 26, chapter 26, secs. 26–2001–2004)

1. Georgia: Code Ann. (book 10, 1953 revision, supp. 1958), sections 26–3805.
2. Indiana: Stat. Ann. (Burns, 1956 replacement, vol. 4, pt. 2), section 10–4518.
3. Maine: Rev. Stat. Ann. (1954), chapter 131, section 13, section 16.
4. Minnesota: Stat. Ann. (1945), section 621.28(b), section 621.33.
5. Mississippi: Code Ann. (1942), section 2381.
6. Missouri: Stat. Ann. (Vernon 1953), section 560.310.
7. New Hampshire: Rev. Stat. Ann. (1955), section 572.3.
8. South Carolina: Code Ann. (1952), section 58–316.
9. Texas: Penal Code Ann. (Vernon 1953), article 1334.
10. Vermont: Stat. Ann. (1959), title 30, section 2528.
11. West Virginia: Code Ann. (Michie 1955), section 5970.

RED CHINA COULD FALL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a dispatch from Hong Kong this morning, Joseph Alsop reports the best political news from Asia in many a month.

Alsop has been a careful, perceptive, and accurate reporter. When he reports that the Red Chinese regime could fall, it deserves careful and thoughtful consideration by responsible Americans. It would seem to add emphasis to the wisdom of refusing to recognize Red China, and of continuing to give assistance to one of the very strongest anti-Communist forces in the free world: the Chinese Nationalists on Taiwan.

For too long the Nationalist Chinese have been subject to automatic criticism and denunciation by otherwise thoughtful citizens who should know better.

After a recent Far Eastern tour of military bases, military officials told me that the Formosan Chinese Army was far and away the best trained and enjoyed the highest morale of any they had visited.

Mr. President, because this article by Joseph Alsop is so pertinent to so many policies in controversy in our country and in the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT WAS TOO HARSH

(By Joseph Alsop)

(Some weeks ago, after studying the underground war in South Vietnam, this reporter passed a week in Hong Kong collecting the best available evidence—the evidence of recent refugees—about the mysterious evolution of Communist China. This evidence indicates the clear possibility of an internal explosion which could destroy or radically alter the Chinese Communist government. This is the first in a series.)

HONG KONG.—The articles which begin herewith mainly concern a crime almost past imagining which is perpetrated upon the Chinese masses by their Communist masters. In the simplest moral terms, the Chinese people are now being offered as a blood sacrifice on the altar of the new mammon of our times, industrial power.

But in hard political terms, the chief interest of this crime lies in the enormous political risks which it involves. For the sake of forced industrialization, the Communist masters of China are now gambling their regime's future. Although this view will seem wildly eccentric to the more fashionable analysts, it is quite possible that the Communists will lose their gamble. Oddly enough, the best proof that this view is not eccentric is to be found in the following passages from the official Communist "Outline History of China."

"In the year 209 B.C. a group of 900 conscripts on their way to the frontier for guard duties * * * killed the officer in command and revolted * * * these were the first to raise the cry for the overthrow of the Chin Empire.

"In less than a month their army had grown to more than 1,000 cavalry and several tens of thousands of infantry and owned some 700 war chariots. Inspired by their uprising, peasants all over the country took up arms."

The official history goes on to describe how the power of the Chin Empire effectively collapsed, almost within a matter of weeks, after this sudden, desperate strike in a chain gang of wretched peasant conscripts. As explanation for this astonishing collapse, the official history also approvingly quotes an ancient author, as follows:

"The more powerful the armies of Chin grew, the more its enemies multiplied. The government was too harsh toward the people and punishment was too severe."

The lessons of the past are supposed to be utterly outmoded nowadays. Yet anyone who reflects upon the real meaning of the foregoing quotations will understand why the crime the Chinese Communists are now perpetrating is also a perilous gamble. It is a gamble in their own terms, moreover. The harshness of the Chin government toward the people was as nothing—it was the merest milk and water stuff—compared with the present harshness of the Chinese Communists.

Assuming the harshness as a fact for the moment, what are the other reasons why the foregoing quotations have so much current meaning? The first and simplest reason is the inherent proof that even the most awe-inspiring facade of monolithic authority can be remarkably deceptive.

The Chin government was founded by a ruthlessly totalitarian power originally based in northwestern China. This state of Chin owed its strength to the iron program of the world's first Stalinist, Shang Wei-yang. The Chin Empire was Stalinist in character over two millenia before Stalin.

The Chin conquest of the rest of China, completed only 12 years before Chin's sudden downfall, not merely produced the first phase of the historic, long enduring Chinese empire. It also produced the most powerful single government ever founded in any part of the world, in the whole long period since the first man-ape had first used a rock as an offensive weapon. Such was the state which came to an end because of a strike in a chain gang.

This gigantic police state of the past built the first Great Wall of China to guard against external enemies. But the remedy was probably worse than the disease, because of the internal enemies created by the remorseless conscription of countless labor gangs to build the wall. The enemies who "multiplied" were certainly internal. They were the Chinese people. And Chin really fell because of the first of those sudden, unpredictable, overwhelming general strikes, for which the Chinese people have a curious knack, as their later history also proves.

The key to the success of the rising against Chin is also to be found in the quotations from the official Communist "Outline History." The Chinese peasantry in 209 B.C. could not muster the cavalry and war chariotry mentioned above, any more than the toiling masses in the Communists' peasant communes possess armored cars and tanks today. In fact, the Chin armies, being peasant armies, joined the peasant rising. Without this, the rising would have been quickly crushed. With this, the rising was irresistible, and so will a modern rising be irresistible, if it occurs and rallies the armed forces.

The real question, in sum, is not whether the Chinese Communist government can be brought down by the people. The real question is whether the conditions exist in which the people may be driven to bring down the government.

GROUND WATER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 27, Mr. George F. "Pete" Dana, chief of ground water development, Wyoming Natural Resource Board, delivered an address on the ground water development program in Wyoming. The paper was read before the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, which was held in Casper, Wyo. Mr. Dana's paper illustrates some of the possibilities in connection with the potential development of underground water in the West. It was in line with the general objective of encouraging such development on public lands that we introduced S. 1559, the Underground Water Act of 1961. Mr. Dana's paper gives such an excellent illustration of what might be done with the development of underground water that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROUND WATER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(By George F. "Pete" Dana, chief of ground water development, Wyoming Natural Resource Board)

It is indeed a pleasure for me to appear before you today to explain the newly initiated ground water program of the Wyoming Natural Resource Board, a Wyoming State agency created for the purposes of promoting and developing the water, mineral, forest, grazing, industrial and other resources of the State of Wyoming. The board is composed of nine members which are appointed by the Governor on a bipartisan basis. The staff consists of an executive director, J. A. "Buck" Buchanan, a secretary of the board, Charles Sargent, the chief of water development, E. Bruce Jones, and myself.

I would like to acquaint you with the background and goals of the board's new ground water program and explain how we are proceeding in this work.

GROUND WATER POTENTIAL

The natural resource board, realizing the potential of ground water within Wyoming and the increasing need for stock water and supplemental irrigation water, decided to undertake the program of collecting and interpreting of information concerned with ground water development. The program has been originated by the State and is financed solely by the State. On November 1, 1960, I was employed by the board to carry out this program so far as possible. Probably many of you fully realize the need for this program which is the result of near drought and drought conditions that existed in Wyoming during the past year. Even a year of normal moisture will not rectify the losses suffered in the State in 1960 and so far in 1961. In 1960, 11 of Wyoming's 23 counties were designated as drought disaster areas, and present trends indicate that conditions will not be appreciably improved during this year.

Recent figures released by the Soil Conservation Service and the State engineers' office indicate that the present moisture potential from snowpack is from 39 to 80 percent of normal over the State. One area indicates 18 percent of normal as of the April 1st snow survey.

According to predictions given at a recent meeting in Cheyenne, by a consulting meteorologist, the odds are about 10 to 1 that the State's moisture will not climb to normal between now and the commencement of the growing season.

My work is conducted through the water development division of the board and I work directly under Bruce Jones, whom I mentioned, is chief of water development.

In outlining and developing this program, the first step is the collection of any and all available data on ground water within the State's boundaries. To date, I have encountered some 28 different sources and with so many possibilities, you can realize that the assembling and evaluation of such data is a major undertaking in itself. The major sources of information are obtained from oil companies who have been very generous in their cooperation furnishing information on holes which have been drilled throughout the State in search of oil or gas.

MAJOR AQUIFERS

As a result of present investigations, I will list, so far as possible, the State's major aquifers and their potentials in the ten principal geological basins in Wyoming and also assist in any areas where special underground water problems may arise. An excellent example of such special problems is the Eden Valley area near Farson, Wyo., where the supply of irrigation water has been very short. In order to assist with the investigation in this area, the board has directed a reconnaissance study of the possibilities of developing ground water supplies for supplemental irrigation. There is not a great deal known about the ground water conditions in this area and nothing has ever been published concerning its potential.

There are a few deep wells in the area, and one of these, the El Paso Natural Gas Co., No. 1 Simpson Gulch Well, located in sec. 29, T. 25 N., R. 103 W., had an artesian waterflow from a tertiary sandstone bed from about 1,000 feet deep. Because of the apparently good pressure and volume, further study of the development of a water supply from this zone appears to be indicated in the surrounding area.

Due to the volumetric demands placed on water by irrigation we do not feel that, with the exception of isolated cases, a ground water supply can be effectively developed as the sole source of water for an irrigation project in Wyoming. This conclusion is based upon the economics of the situation. However, there is one demand for water in the State which we feel can definitely be fulfilled from ground water and that is the supplying of stock water. In some cases, this could be a supply that would also be supplemental to surface water supplies for irrigation. Water for industrial use is also of interest to us because we realize that there are very few large-scale industries which do not require considerable quantities of water in their processes of manufacturing. As a result of this overall study, we hope to be able to locate and predict areas where suitable quantities and qualities of ground water are available.

Another aspect of this program, which many of you have possibly thought of, is the location and development of water for secondary recovery programs as conducted by oil companies.

Several companies are initiating these waterflood, secondary recovery programs this spring and as new oil discoveries diminish in number in the future, more and more secondary methods will be used to recover the millions of barrels of oil which cannot be obtained by primary methods.

DEEP FLOWS

In the pursuit of any data that could be used in the location of ground water supplies, we have compiled a critical area map. On this map the green colors are basins, and these are the areas where we are concentrating our work. The red areas indicate igneous outcrops where we naturally do not expect to develop any ground water. The counties designated by red crosses through them are the 11 drought disaster counties, 1960, and several of which have been carried over to 1961. The areas outlined in blue are areas which are discussed in various papers prepared by the USGS ground water branch. In order to avoid duplication of work we will concentrate our work on the areas that have not previously been covered by the USGS papers. This program is not meant to replace work accomplished by the USGS but to actually supplement the cooperative program with them. We are interested in wells which are considerably deeper than those which are generally evaluated in USGS ground water papers. Some of the deeper wells in the State have artesian waters available from them which flow from formations as deep as 8,000 to 10,000 feet. The median depth for flowing waters in the majority of artesian wells is from 3,500 to 5,000 feet. A prime example of such quantities of water is the well located right here in Casper at the country club. The depth to an excellent aquifer is 5,000 feet and the quality of water is good.

It is necessary to pump this well but the volumes are sufficient for irrigation of the golf course. No complete cost of the operation will probably ever be compiled because so much of the work and materials was donated. This example was brought forward to emphasize that good qualities and quantities of water can be developed at considerable depths.

At present, all Wyoming basins are considered as areas of critical water supply. Some basins face a much more severe water shortage than others and also the water shortage within any given basin may vary from place to place within the basin and from year to year. If the present trend continues, this State is facing a severe water shortage during the coming growing season.

WATER OCCURRENCE RECORD

In order to make use of future information on water flows which occur in wells that are being drilled and those that will be drilled in the future by the various oil companies, we have drafted a data sheet, called the Underground Water Occurrence Record, which will be given out to all oil and drilling companies which operate in Wyoming. We are asking for the voluntary support of the companies to see that these forms are placed at the well site so that they may be filled out by a responsible person anytime and at any depth when water flows are encountered. Of special interest are shallow water wells which are drilled for water supplies for drilling operations and these forms also apply to them. This form would then be mailed to the Wyoming Natural Resource Board. We believe that we have made the form simple enough so that it will facilitate a quick and easy filling out on the part of the oil companies; however, we are always open to suggestions from them. We hope that this method will prove to be a simple and inexpensive way of gaining water information. We emphasize that this program is strictly voluntary on their part. We do not wish to infer in any way, that the forms are mandatory because they are not, they are a request for information. If at the end of the program you wish to have some of these forms, please help yourselves. They can be obtained at the back of the room.

Our program has been met with a great deal of enthusiasm and all of the people contacted to date have pledged their support. Several companies have offered information on their seismic holes as to location, depth, lithology, and water content. Some seismic holes have found artesian water and of course such information is extremely valuable to us. A number of companies have offered the use of a geologist to go back

through their reports and histories of the wells in which their company has either full or part interest and which have had water flows and report those to us. Quite often this method will reveal information which has long since been forgotten, because such water flows are normally controlled either by casing or by increase in the weight of the drilling mud.

The gathering of information as mentioned above, and by personal calls, are the only ways in which we will get a collection of the details which we can interpret. Another way in which the companies could aid our program is by sending us copies of electric logs and micrologs on wells in which water has been found in any quantities. This again is a voluntary gesture on the part of the companies and one which will be greatly appreciated by the board.

OIL COMPANY COOPERATION

The oil companies which operate in the State have never been approached for this type of information and without their cooperation, the results of the program would be sketchy and incomplete. The job of contacting all of the oil and drilling companies who operate within the State's boundaries is about 75 percent completed and after that is finished, we will begin on uranium companies, small private contractors, and anyone else who would have occasion to drill a hole anywhere in the State.

I have listed the various sources of water data which could be available from oil companies. We realize that any one company may not have all of the various answers, but they might have some information which would be of value to us in their files. These are:

(a) Well histories, daily drilling reports, tour reports.

(b) Drill stem tests.

(c) Mud records.

(d) Seismic hole information.

(e) Shallow wells drilled for water supply source.

(f) Hydrodynamic studies.

(g) Secondary recovery programs (source of water).

(h) Water sample analysis.

(i) Surface or near-surface lithologic studies.

GOALS

At this point you may wonder exactly what we hope to do with all this information. Actually, there are several goals of our program. The first of these would be the successful conversion of dry holes to water wells. To accomplish this we must be aware of beginning drilling operations so that we may approach a company who is drilling in what we consider a critical area and also in an area which may yield considerable water and put forth a proposal, in conjunction with the landowner that, if the well is a dry hole and has a sufficient quantity and quality of water, the natural resource board would be willing to act as a liaison between the company and the landowner or group of individuals who would be interested in putting the water to beneficial use. The natural resource board would enter into arrangements only if requested to do so. It is not the role of the Wyoming Natural Resource Board to promote any specific project, but merely to give assistance when requested.

In some cases the board may be able to be of assistance by loaning money to the potential water users in order to get the well completed. If this can be accomplished while the original rig is on location, the total cost of the completion can be substantially reduced. This loan money is available from the State through the Wyoming Farm Loan Board with the advice of the natural resource board.

Our second goal is the cataloging of all of the State's aquifers and the areas where they may be expected to be water producers, and when possible to predict their potential volumes and qualities.

Another goal is the furnishing of information to those interested in updating the State's existing underground water law.

COMPLETION COSTS

As a result of our work thus far, other associated investigations and problems have arisen and are listed below: (a) The correct procedure and necessary steps for assuming responsibility for completions of a hole as a water well which has no productive capacity as an oil well. The exact procedures for this transfer of responsibility to the landowner have not yet been fully established. We have been discussing this matter with the various agencies involved and also with Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association. As you can well realize, nobody wants to put money into a well that they cannot be assured of owning; (b) costs of completion of dry oil wells as either artesian or pumping water wells are always of principal consideration in our program. An example of such a completion is the No. 2 Arminto Unit well, about 40 miles west of Casper. The total cost to the surface tenant, was $4,700.45 and is itemized as follows:

1. Casing (1,400 feet of 7 inch): $3,000.
2. Perforation: $909.20.
3. Installation: $100.
4. Valve (used) and tank: $475.
5. Other, attorney fee ($50), filing fee ($2), supplies ($164.25): total $216.25.

Since the well was artesian, no pumping unit was necessary. It is capable of producing 2,800 barrels of water per day. Other costs of completion would be dependent upon several variable factors including depth, porosity, etc. We realize that each completion is an individual problem and must be discussed upon its own merits and requirements and a decision reached as to its financial feasibility as the situations arise. However, cost estimates in these matters would be of great benefit to us, and such costs will be the subject of a report which I am presently assembling.

Because there has been comparatively little development of this ground-water resource in the State, as compared to some of the other Western States, we in Wyoming are relative newcomers to this field. We are quite interested in the approach taken by other States with their problems so that we may learn from their experiences.

By the May 10 Wyoming Natural Resource Board meeting, I will have the second progress report ready and any of you who wish a copy of it may write to our office in the supreme court building in Cheyenne. You will also find copies of the board's 1960 annual report at the back of the room. Here again, these copies are free and you are welcome to them. You can see by reading the board's annual report that there is a great variety of interests in which the board is concerned.

Our ground-water program is in its infancy, and we wish to add to the work that has been done by the USGS ground-water branch, which has been of considerable value to the State of Wyoming. We hope that through contacting the oil companies, which have never previously been contacted in any degree for this type of information, that we can be of service to them and to the State of Wyoming. All of this information which we are accumulating will be placed on file in the natural resource board's office in Cheyenne. If at any time some of you would like to see our operation in Cheyenne, we invite you to drop up and visit with the staff in room 215, supreme court building. We would be most happy to confer with you concerning this or on any other matters affecting the natural resources of Wyoming.

In closing, I wish to emphasize that our program is just underway as a State responsibility, but its developmental processes are already clear and its goals established. We will locate and develop intelligently, this heretofore practically untouched resource of Wyoming.

Thank you again for the opportunity to appear before you today and inform you of the work that is being done by the State of Wyoming in regard to our ground-water program.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of H.R. 5000, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before beginning my statement on H.R. 5000, I should like to call attention to a printer's error relating to the naval air station, Miramar, Calif., which appears on page 69, line 21, of the bill before us. Lines 22 and 23 should read as follows: "facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,591,000." It is clear that instead of this proper language the printer merely repeated lines 19 and 20, which related to another installation. I ask unanimous consent that this correction be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have a statement with respect to the bill which I wish to make. It is not long, and when I have concluded I shall be glad to yield for any questions.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate provides construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States, including authority for the construction of facilities for the Reserve components. The total sum of the new authorization contained in the bill is $831,050,750. In addition thereto, approval is granted for an increase of $48,634,000 in prior years' authority for a total authorization of $879,684,750.

The Army would be authorized $134.7 million; the Navy, $180.3 million; the Air Force, $489.6 million; the Department of Defense, $8.3 million; and a total of $66.8 million for the various Reserve components.

I want to call attention to the fact that the bill as originally submitted to Congress, and upon which the House took action, called for a total authorization of $870,884,000. From this, the House deleted some $66.3 million, primarily for projects which were not included in the funding program for the coming fiscal year. After the House had acted, the Department of Defense requested several revisions, primarily based upon a reappraisal of the defense programs as announced by the President on March 28, 1961. Such changes resulted in a revised authorization request of the Senate of $942,059,000, which is $71,175,000 above the amount contained in the original bill and, of course, the amount considered by the House. The authorization granted is $62,374,250 below the amount requested.

The authorization approved by the committee does not provide for any new bases. Rather, the projects requested are for the modernization and implementation of existing facilities. There

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING

is nothing contained in the bill for any of the bases that the Department of Defense recently announced will be closed; and the committee has the assurance of the Secretary of Defense that the possibility of any bases for which items are included in this bill being closed in the near future is extremely remote. In any event, should such conditions materialize, the authorized construction would not be undertaken and the committee would be so advised.

The basic policy of the Defense Department planning continues to have as principal elements: First, possession of a powerful retaliatory ability which is considered mandatory as a war deterrent; second, the responsibility to maintain a capacity to apply military force promptly in various local-conflict areas of the free world; and, third, continue a strong Continental Air Defense and maintenance of open sealanes. The items contained in this bill support these policies.

The committee during its examination of the projects took particular care to verify that all the items were needed to support the long-term, future military plans, eliminating all items for which a compelling military necessity did not appear to exist. The closest scrutiny was given to the items deleted by the House, the appeals from the military departments for restoration of House deletions, and to the revised requests that were submitted to the committee during the process of the hearings.

For the most part, the committee agreed with the House deletions and restored only those projects of the highest priority in which there appeared to be some likelihood of their being funded out of savings that might accrue to the Military Establishment during the coming year. Other items denied consisted of those which appeared to duplicate facilities or functions under the control of the military or other Federal agencies and, in some instances, where ambitious programs were planned that were not essential to the immediate needs of the military department concerned. The committee was convinced in each instance that the deferral of the projects would not hamper planned programs and that existing facilities are sufficient for the present.

Mr. President, I should like to deal more specifically with certain areas of concern to the committee in considering the bill.

As mentioned earlier, the principal revisions to the bill resulted from a reappraisal of the defense programs by the new administration, resulting in a request for increased authorizations in certain areas. This affected both the Navy and the Air Force programs.

In this regard, some $10,250,000 in additional authorization was added to the Navy program for nine classified projects in support of the acceleration of the Polaris and antisubmarine warfare programs; $2 million of this will be applied to technical facilities for the Polaris submarine. The balance, we were told, is necessary to accelerate the activation of the security services facilities which support the antisubmarine warfare program through the augmentation of certain communication facilities.

The net increase requested for the Air Force amounts to $59,400,000. The recent reexamination of the Titan and Minuteman programs indicated to the Department of Defense that it is more desirable to accelerate the Minuteman program at this time than to activate additional Titan squadrons. Accordingly, the committee was asked to approve additional authorization totaling $120 million for three additional Minuteman squadrons, and to provide price increases for six squadrons contained in the original bill. This brings the total squadrons requested in the bill to nine. At the same time, however, two Titan II squadrons requested in the original bill were canceled for a net reduction of $74.6 million. This reexamination of the Air Force program also revealed a need for improved weapons control capability and the provision of fallout protection at selected radar sites at an estimated cost of $14 million. The overall result of this change in the Air Force program, as I mentioned earlier, calls for an increase in the authorization of $59.4 million.

After due consideration of these added requests, the committee felt that it had no alternative, because of the importance placed upon them and stressed to the committee, but to grant approval.

Again this year, the committee was faced with the ever-growing problem of providing support facilities for the multitude of military personnel in the Metropolitan Washington area. For a number of years now the committee has emphasized the need for removing military flying from the Anacostia and Bolling Airfields in the metropolitan area. Considerable funds have been provided for this purpose and it is soon to become an accomplished fact. In last year's bill, the Navy requested over $14 million to provide for the first increment of a complex of new facilities on a portion of the Anacostia site. This request was denied and the Navy was told to make a survey to see if some of the functions proposed for this site could not be provided for elsewhere, and that a further study be made of the needs of all three military services with a view toward providing for the needs for all at one central location. However, again this year, the Navy has requested some $6 million for the Anacostia site and the Army, $2.1 million for barracks and support facilities, in addition to 525 units of Capehart housing, for the Fort Myer military reservation—all for the purpose of providing for military personnel in the Washington area. Unquestionably, the Air Force has similar plans for the Bolling Air Force Base. So it goes, each military department endeavoring to provide for its individual needs at separate locations. There are some compelling reasons why some facilities should and must be provided for each of the services in this area. It is most difficult to understand, however, why a combined complex of personnel support facilities for the Washington military contingent cannot be located in one place irrespective of the service to which they belong. Both the Anacostia and Fort Myer requests were denied by the committee, and it is hoped that the Defense Department will make one last real effort to provide a consolidated facility for all three services at a single location, and come in next year with a truly workable plan that can be approved.

Another problem of deep and continuing concern to the committee is that of family housing. During the past several years, the Congress and the executive branch have tried several approaches to meet the family housing requirements of the military services. None of these in the final analysis has proved adequate from the standpoint of economy.

Both the Wherry and the Capehart programs have been costly, although admittedly they have served a purpose. The committee was of the firm opinion that the time has arrived when serious consideration must be given to abandoning the present approach and steps taken to meet this requirement through the regular annual authorization and appropriation process. The committee is convinced that this method of providing necessary housing will be more economical and satisfactory and, in the long run, will save substantial sums.

Therefore, this year in lieu of authorizing the so-called Capehart housing units requested in the bill, we have approved 2,000 units of appropriated fund housing at an average cost of $16,500 per unit. The location of 1,500 of these units was selected by the Defense Department and are identical in number and location to the Capehart units proposed in the original bill, with the exception of those for Fort Myer, Va., which I mentioned earlier. In order to provide for emergency situations that might arise, the Secretary of Defense is granted authority to select the location of the additional 500 units. The committee strongly feels that this will provide an orderly transition of the housing program and will take care of the current urgent requirements of the services.

In addition to the above, authority has been granted to the Air Force for 256 units of transportable housing for use at remote locations such as A.C. & W. sites. These units will average about $14,000 each, which will include the cost of the unit, transportation from the factory to the site, site work, utilities, and so forth. The advantage of relocatable housing is that should the requirement at one location terminate, the housing components can be readily moved to a new location where it is needed. Although this item was deleted from the House-passed bill because it was not included in the funding program for the coming year, the committee urges its approval and hopes that the Air Force might find it possible to fund some of this transportable housing in the coming year. The committee believes that, in part, this is an answer to some of the military housing problems, particularly when it is known that as a result of the recent adjustment in air defense plans, several A.C. & W. sites where permanent housing is now located are to be inactivated and closed.

To complete the housing picture, I want to call attention to section 508 of title V of the bill which places a limitation of $20,000 on the amount that may be spent for rehabilitating existing

quarters. During the past year, the committee's attention has been directed to the fact that the military in some instances have spent exorbitant amounts of maintenance and operations funds for the purpose of rehabilitating family quarters far in excess of that permitted under the law for the construction of new quarters.

As in previous years, very careful consideration was given to proposed new hospital facilities. Nine such facilities were requested in the bill this year. It is believed that the admonitions of Congress over the past several years concerning excessive hospital costs have been given consideration by the Defense Department, since the costs of the proposed facilities this year are in line with those supported by the committee in past years. Of the nine hospitals requested, the committee has approved six. Two were eliminated because it appeared that the requirements for which they were proposed could be provided for in other nearby facilities.

In other words, hospitals for the Army were closely adjacent to where hospitals were requested for the Navy, and the committee thought the existing hospitals might be utilized.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I prefer to complete my statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to complete his statement before he answers any questions?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, if the Senator would be so gracious as to permit me to do so.

The committee concurred in one of those deleted by the House because it was not included in the Air Force funding program. One hospital was added to the bill for the Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr. This hospital had been given No. 2 priority by the Air Force of the seven they hoped to obtain this year. The Bureau of the Budget denied this facility while approving others of lower priority. Testimony indicated that there is a valid need for this hospital and that local institutions, on which the Bureau of the Budget relied, do not have the capacity to provide for the needs of the military and their dependents in this area.

Contained in the bill were requests by the Army and the Air Force totaling $20.6 million in authorization to provide for unforeseen construction that might arise in connection with the Nike-Zeus and the ICBM programs. These requests which the departments hoped to fund were in addition to the emergency authorization provisions contained in the bill for each department annually. The committee denied this unscheduled authorization but increased the emergency authorization for each service to $15 million, which is $5 million above the amount approved by the House. It is believed that this amount of emergency authorization should be sufficient to provide for any unforeseen construction arising during the coming year.

Finally, I should like to address myself briefly to the Reserve forces facilities provided in title VI. Refreshing and enthusiastic testimony was heard regarding the high state of readiness of our Reserve forces, and should events again require their active service, there is every reason to believe that, as in the past, they will perform in an outstanding manner. During recent years, testimony has indicated that there is a definite need for more flexibility in the Reserve programs, particularly as it relates to the National Guard, than is now afforded under the procedure of authorizing construction by line item. The committee has been urged each year to incorporate additional projects to provide a total authority more in keeping with the amount of matching funds on hand and held by the States for these programs. This also permits substitution of line items on the basis of unforeseen contingencies. With this in mind, and to provide for urgent projects arising subsequent to submission of the bill to Congress, and to accelerate other important programs, the committee increased the total authorization for Reserve facilities approximately $13.6 million above the amount allowed by the House. The committee has concluded that the line item method of authorizing for Reserve facilities has proved unsatisfactory. Beginning with fiscal year 1963, it is proposed to return to the method followed prior to fiscal year 1959 prescribed by the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950. This act provides for a specific authorization to the Secretary of Defense for use of the Reserve components after consultation with the Armed Services Committees.

Mr. President, I have attempted to summarize the highlights of the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1962, and I shall be pleased to answer any questions Senators may have relating thereto.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. First, I commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his usually careful and excellent summary of this very complicated subject matter. I know the committee has given grave and careful attention to the various items; and the chairman has, as usual, performed outstanding service.

However, I express my deep disappointment at one action of the committee, namely, the striking of the authorization of $4 million for maintenance facilities at the naval shipyard at Philadelphia, Pa. That item was in the bill as it passed the House. I note that it has been stricken from the Senate committee amendment. There must be some good reason for thus discriminating against Philadelphia, which seems to be the only location in this particular part of the bill provision for which has been stricken. Can the Senater from Georgia give us some explanation for this unfortunate result?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in order to save the Senator from Georgia from making the same explanation twice, will the Senator yield to me in connection with the inquiry already posed by my senior colleague?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. It is indeed a disappointment that the committee found itself unable to include in the bill an authorization of $4 million for the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. As the Senator will recall, I testified on this subject before the Senator's committee, and the Senator raised the question that perhaps the amount needed would not be as high as $4 million, but that perhaps the actual construction work, as separated from the equipment—the item for equipment not being before the Senator's committee—might be finished for about $1,500,000. We had indeed hoped that the Senator's committee might include that amount in the bill, in order that this item might have a better chance for favorable action in conference.

I am quite well aware that the kind of careful work done by this committee and the very high respect in which the Senator from Georgia is held by all of us makes it most likely that if I were to offer an amendment to add this amount it would be the sense of the Senate at present not to accept such an amendment. That is why I do not offer it, although I still cherish the hope that the item may be included in conference in an amount somewhat reduced, I recognize, from $4 million.

Would the distinguished Senator from Georgia consider the inclusion of any amount—perhaps $1,500,000—as an amendment to the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can understand the deep concern of the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania with respect to this item. However, I am constrained to point out, in the first place, that there is no Bureau of the Budget clearance for this item. In the second place, representatives of the Department of the Navy, when they appeared before the committee, stated clearly, definitely, and specifically that they were not requesting at this time any additional authorization for the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

The committee was also confronted with other difficulties. A number of other naval shipyards throughout the country are located in States which are very ably represented by members of the Committee on Armed Services. Those Senators expressed great interest in these items. They said that if there was to be any new construction at Navy yards, the yards in their respective States should be considered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I did not mean to interrupt the Senator, if he had not concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. My mind is not closed to the question; neither are the minds of the prospective conferees. But with the evidence adduced before the committee, we had no alternative but to strike the item from the bill. Of course, this item will be in conference, as Senators have stated.

Mr. CLARK. It is my strong feeling that for the past several years—and I think I speak for my colleague [Mr. SCOTT] as well as for myself; he will do so, if I do not—there has been real discrimination against the Philadelphia

Naval Shipyard in terms of the maintenance force employed there, compared with other Navy yards up and down the Atlantic seaboard, without any very real explanation to us of any tactical or strategic reason for that apparent discrimination.

We feel that we have a very highly skilled force of workers there, a force which is quite competent to participate in the development of the submarine and antisubmarine warfare components of the Navy.

We had hoped that this item, which was secured in the bill in the House by the assiduous efforts of Representative BYRNE, who is a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, would enable the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard to participate in the development of submarines and thus enhance employment in Philadelphia. The unemployment situation in Philadelphia is very serious at the moment because of economic conditions.

However, although the authorization for Philadelphia has been stricken, I understand $3,300,000 has been included for a facility at New London, Conn., instead. Can the Senator from Georgia enlighten me as to why the authorization for Philadelphia was eliminated and the authorization for Connecticut was inserted?

Mr. RUSSELL. I fear that I could not answer the Senator's question.

All I know is that the Navy Department stated that it did not desire any construction authority whatever at Philadelphia this year, whereas New London, Conn., is the site of the training of the crews of the Polaris submarines, which are being stressed so vigorously at the present time. The Senator well knows that the Polaris submarine requires two crews, and that is a very expensive operation. The crews are very highly skilled, highly trained, and highly compensated; they rank among the highest in the Navy Department. The evidence shows that at New London there is a very great need for housing. As I recall, the principal item needed at New London is housing for the personnel being trained for the Polaris submarine crews.

Mr. CLARK. I note that the item for New London includes family housing, utilities, and real estate.

Our people at Philadelphia have been very much concerned about rumors—whether they have any foundation in fact, I am not in a position to say—that it was contemplated that the Philadelphia Navy Yard might be closed in the reasonably near future. Can the Senator from Georgia give us any information on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. Such rumors have not come to me; I have no knowledge of them. I know there is a continuing study by the Department of Defense in regard to the utilization of facilities. But I have not heard that closing of that yard was contemplated.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I am of the impression that such studies have been made, as the Senator says, and that if some of them are acted upon in line with the recommendations, such action will be disadvantageous to the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

I certainly hope the committee will not receive favorably any such recommendation. Aside from the work performed at that yard for the national defense and the national security, there is of course to be considered the constant increase of certain technical skills which are invaluable, and consideration must also be given to the great danger which would result from the dispersal of those skills. I know that is what a member, Representative JAMES VAN ZANDT, of the House Armed Services Committee who submitted the amendment had in mind, and I know it is what Representative BYRNE had in mind in supporting that amendment.

I believe it would be most helpful to the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard employees if we could nail down, once and for all, that rumor, and could make clear that the rumor is based on perhaps only one of several studies made for the Department of Defense, and that the one which is believed to be for closing that naval shipyard is not within the contemplation of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. We asked the Navy Department about its plans for this Navy yard, and also for the one at Boston. Although I cannot place my hands on it at the moment, we received from the Navy Department a statement that the present plans do not contemplate the closing of these yards. I cannot guarantee how long their present plans will obtain. But at least such a rumor is certainly ahead of any concrete planning in the Department of Defense.

The Philadelphia Navy Yard has a very long and historic record. It has served this country well since the very beginning of the Republic; and I have not heard that it is planned to close that yard. Of course, the work there has fallen off, as is true of all the yards.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator permit me to request the printing at this point in the RECORD of my testimony at the committee hearings, as it appears on pages 317 to 319?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I so request, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearing of March 9, 1961, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HUGH SCOTT, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Senator SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for your courtesy in giving me the opportunity to testify this morning. As I realize the heavy demands on your time, I will make my remarks as brief as possible.

Before you for consideration is H.R. 5000 which provides for certain construction at military installations.

I would like immediately to refer to that item in the bill which would authorize construction of facilities in the amount of $4 million at the Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa., to provide a capability for the yard to overhaul and repair nuclear-powered submarines (p. 12, line 3).

Mr. Chairman, we all realize in this age of atomic power and missilery, the submarine is a powerful and versatile weapon.

For this Nation to maintain its position as leader of the free world, we must not only be able to control the air above and the surface of the sea, but also the waters beneath.

The Congress has recognized this and gradually the nuclear submarine will replace the more conventional type.

It is estimated at the end of this year that we will have in our arsenal 16 nuclear-type submarines and 87 of the conventional type, for a total of 103 of the attack type, less than 20 years old.

By 1963, we will have 27 nuclear submarines but our conventional type will only be 84 in number for an overall total of 111.

The increase in the nuclear submarines is as it should be. With the retirement of the conventional submarine because of age—for example, hull deterioration, cost of repair prohibitively expensive, and so forth—and limited space because of demand for more electronic devices, the total number decreases to 55 in the year 1966. Included in this total are only 19 of the conventional type.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the nuclear attack submarine will continue to increase as the conventional type in our fleet will decrease by retirement.

With the changing times we all accept the increasing demand for more modern equipment in our preparedness force, but we must also consider the effect the change has on the economy of the country.

The national unemployment figure released by Secretary of Labor Goldberg, as recent as last Saturday, March 4, was estimated at 5.5 million. Unfortunately, Pennsylvania adds heavily to that total.

During World War II, the Philadelphia Shipyard employed greater than 40,000 employees, but the complement today is less than 10,000. Action taken by this legislation may well affect the future of the shipyard and, in turn, affect the economy of the whole Philadelphia area and the State of Pennsylvania as well.

The record of work production of the Philadelphia Shipyard is well recognized and I am sure the action you might take in relation to the above mentioned will be justified by continuing high standards.

It is my understanding that it takes approximately 3 years for the conversion of facilities at a shipyard heretofore handling only the conventional-type submarine so that it might handle also the nuclear-powered type. As I pointed out, by 1963 the conventional type will start to phase out while the nuclear submarine will be on the increase.

The funds for conversion authorized at this time will permit the shipyard and its workers to accept this transition without any disruption to the local economy.

Mr. Chairman, it is for these reasons that I strongly urge the committee in its consideration of H.R. 5000 to retain the authorization of $4 million for the Philadelphia shipyard.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add just this: That the Philadelphia Shipyard and Naval Base is the largest single employer in the entire Philadelphia-southeast Pennsylvania area.

Changes in personnel there have an immediate effect on our employment situation.

The reaction to these changes is more sharp than to that of any other employment personnel alterations in our area.

We have for a long time been concerned at the decreasing amount of work assigned to the shipyard, and particularly concerned because we have been given no opportunity to provide training in nuclear-type work in submarines or otherwise. We are very much afraid that if denied this opportunity, our shipyard will, indeed, decrease much more drastically in personnel.

The matter has been raised a number of times with the former Secretary of Defense

and others, the Secretary of the Navy, and this is a matter in which there is tremendous interest in our area.

As you know, Representative VAN ZANDT had this amendment included on the House side.

We are very much concerned about it, and are very hopeful that it will remain in the bill.

I ought to add, too, I think that Pennsylvania has about 10 percent of the unemployment in the country. We need to maintain as high a proportion of Government facilities in this area as we can, suffering as we are from migration of populations, and, in this case, from the dispersion of irreplaceable skills.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the committee's favorable consideration.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are glad to have your views on this, Senator SCOTT. I am sure you are aware that there are very practical difficulties we encounter with respect to an item of this kind. There are a number of Navy yards and naval installations over the country that are very anxious to get in this nuclear work, and I can understand that. It is a developing and growing activity, and the weapon of the future.

Senator SCOTT. We are a protected area from certain forms of attack there, in that we are up the Delaware River considerable mileage. We are not directly on the coast.

But I am no expert on the strategical or tactical considerations involved. But on the personnel, I do assure you that no matter is regarded as more urgent by the civic leaders and those interested in maintaining full employment than this Philadelphia Shipyard situation.

Chairman RUSSELL. We have a number of other installations likewise interested in this; for example, the Boston Shipyard. They ask for consideration with respect to nuclear subs.

I am sure you are aware that the Navy Department said they did not need this facility at this time.

Senator SCOTT. Yes, sir. They are not as kind to me as I am to them. I am always plugging for Polaris. I hope that the quality of mercy will be sufficiently unstrained and the openmindedness which characterizes the Navy will make itself evident ultimately in this matter.

Chairman RUSSELL. The best figures we can get also indicate that if we were to put this installation there, it would not require as much as $4 million.

Senator SCOTT. We would be, of course, happy to have that figure reexamined, but we would like very much to maintain in the bill an adequate amount to permit the conversion.

Chairman RUSSELL. The Navy estimates it will cost a little less than $1.5 million to do the construction. Of course, it requires a good deal for equipment.

Senator SCOTT. Yes.

Chairman RUSSELL. But that is not carried in this item. It is to be provided in another bill.

Senator SCOTT. It would help us greatly if the item, no matter what amount is decided on, is retained in the bill, and I would hope that an adequate amount would be contained, sir.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. This debate has been most enlightening. I hope that when the Senator goes to conference on this matter he will bear in mind the very real economic distress suffered by the employees of the Philadelphia Navy Yard as a result of a constant reduction in force; and I hope he will also bear in mind the high level of capability of those men to do first-class maintenance work in connection with submarine programs and antisubmarine programs; and I hope that in conference perhaps the Senator from Georgia will look with a little favor at least on a strong position by the House to keep at least some of this appropriation item in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can only assure the distinguished Senator that I will approach this item, as I do all items in the bill, objectively. If the House conferees make an overwhelming case for it, of course, the Senate conferees will not close their minds.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. All of us realize the great care with which the Senator from Georgia and the other members of the committee have dealt with these problems; and certainly we commend the Senator and his associates for their very thorough and conscientious work.

In connection with the bill, there is a matter which is of great concern to both my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and myself.

Before asking a question about this item, I should like to inform the Senator from Georgia, if I may do so, a little in regard to the history of the matter.

On March 28, General Kingsley, of the legislative liaison for the Air Force, sent me a letter—and I believe that a similar letter went to my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and to other Members—in which it was stated that the Air Force planned to continue Rome Air Materiel Area, at Griffiss Air Force Base, pending a complete evaluation of logistics support facilities throughout the country. It was stated then that the evaluation was not to be completed until fall. Yet in the military construction bill I notice that the other bases in the vicinity which do procurement work are getting or are planning huge expansions. For instance, at Olmsted Air Force Base, in Middletown, Pa., there are three projects—an expanded freight terminal, a shop repair depot, and a standards calibration laboratory, and they will cost more than $1,500,000.

For Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, in Dayton, Ohio, nearly $4 million was requested, and more than $1,500,000 was included, for operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities.

At Gentile Air Force Station, in Dayton, Ohio, $420,000 has been requested for air conditioning a converted office building.

Moreover, at the hearings it was revealed, in answer to some questions which were asked by the distinguished Senator from Georgia and by one of the other members of the committee, that the Air Force planned to ask, for the Gentile Air Force Station, $4,300,000, and 250,000 square feet of additional space, in the near future. I have been informed that that is for the expansion of a logistics administration facility.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia indicated, in the course of the testimony, that he expects an increase in personnel there.

At Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.—a part of the Air Research and Development Command—there is going to be an expansion of research, development, and test facilities, and also community facilities and utilities, to the extent of nearly $3 million. Although Hanscom Field is not a part of the Air Materiel Command, it is performing work similar to that now done at Griffiss Air Force Base, at Rome, N.Y.

At the same time that these very large increases are occurring, Griffiss Air Force Base will receive only $160,000; and the funds requested for apron-lighting facilities—which, as I understand, are a safety device—were deleted.

I am somewhat puzzled about the contents of the bill when I compare it with the letter from the brigadier general in the Air Force liaison, who told us a complete evaluation was being made in the logistics support facilities throughout the country and would not be completed until early fall. Yet it would appear, from the increases which I have cited, and from the hearings and other testimony I have reviewed on this matter, that the Air Force is moving right along without this further evaluation and is perhaps taking steps to cut out the Rome Air Materiel Area completely.

It has been rumored—and I know the Senator has answered certain other rumors; here is another one—that the difficult decisions on closing these facilities have been postponed until Congress adjourns, so that congressional protests will be rendered ineffective. I hope that is not the case.

I would agree that, in the interest of economy and efficiency, it may be necessary to close some installations in some areas, even in New York State, and I am perfectly willing to take the fair share of such closings; but the point we have continually stresssed, so far as Rome Air Materiel Area is concerned, that the facilities are there, the space is available now, without spending $4 million for new construction, as is contemplated, not in this bill, but later, as was brought out in the hearings, at the Gentile Air Force Station.

It does not lead to greater efficiency, it does not lead to greater national security, to close existing facilities and build new ones elsewhere to do the same work. I am puzzled by the evidence which seems to appear in the bill that these logistics bases are perhaps not being reevaluated, after all, that the Air Force is going ahead, anyway, and merely keeping the bad news quiet until after Congress adjourns.

After that preliminary statement, I ask the Senator from Georgia, with regard to Olmstead, Wright-Patterson, Gentile, and other airfields, does the Senator from Georgia have any information to the effect that the missions to those bases will be increased? Does the Senator have any information of that kind?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the distinguished Senator knows that there are two items requested for this base.

Mr. KEATING. For Rome?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, Griffiss Air Force Base; and I think the Senator can take great consolation from that fact, because we pressed the Department of Defense very earnestly not to have us authorize any expenditures for any of the fields that were likely to be closed in this closure program which the Senator has discussed. We did not want to be put in the position of authorizing money for some facilities now, and in November having the Department of Defense, in spite of the fact that Congress had authorized expenditures, notify us that those facilities would be closed.

So I think Griffiss Air Force Base is in a strong position, so far as rumors of closing are concerned.

As for the item that was eliminated, namely, apron lights, let me say this involves a new system of apron lighting. All the stations have systems of apron lighting, but they came in with 18 new ones. It seemed to the committee that was too many at one time, and we asked them to reduce it to about one-half and give us an order of priority which was based on the needs at the stations. That question involves how good their present lighting system is, what will be the load of a new system, the question of overhaul and maintenance. Griffiss was not included in the upper 10 of the 18 that qualified as against any need of a new system of apron lighting.

I feel that the Senator should be able to derive great satisfaction from the fact that they asked for new construction at Griffiss, in light of the fact that none of the stations for which construction funds were asked were in immediate danger of being closed.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Understand, I do not guarantee that; but we did try to be exceedingly careful and not to authorize anything for any station that might be closed. Of course, it is known that three-fourths of these matters could be deferred for 1 year without any danger. Perhaps the facilities would be inadequate, but it would not be impossible to do so.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator for his reassurance. I do not misunderstand him to the effect that he could or would give any guarantee with regard to this matter. But his statement is somewhat reassuring.

I wonder whether the Senator could give any explanation, or has heard any explanation, as to why, if the Air Force is completely evaluating the logistics support facilities, as it has assured us that it is, it should at this time ask for so much construction for the Air Materiel Command in these other installations?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that Wright-Patterson Air Force Base has been the center of the air materiel activity, and it nearly always leads all the others in the requests. There is a great deal of activity there at all times, from research through the entire gamut of military activity. I do not recall the other stations the Senator mentioned.

Mr. KEATING. Gentile was one where they actually asked for $420,000 for air-conditioning of a converted office building.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Senator read the testimony about that request?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are 1,800 people there. They are working in an old converted warehouse. The testimony was that in the summertime it was practically impossible for the people to keep up with their work. It had not been designed in the first instance as an office building. It was stated they had to have the $420,000 for the installation of an air-conditioning unit. It seemed to me they made a rather good case.

The Senator is referring to the $4,300,000 in futuro?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the worksheets for every one of the bases, but I would assume Griffiss may propose $4 million, $6 million, or $8 million in possible plans for the future. We do not ask such questions as to all the bases. We did as to some of them. We can get that sheet and furnish the Senator from New York with that information. The Senator will find there was a substantial amount in reserve for future planning. All of these stations have a substantial amount.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that and would like to have the opportunity to see the sheet.

Did the Senator, in his investigation into all of these bases, find evidence from which he could assure us that the evaluation by the Air Force is in fact taking place as to all these installations?

Mr. RUSSELL. Indeed. There is no question about it—not only in the Air Force, but throughout the entire Department of Defense. Every military installation everywhere is being considered, including the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

I can offer a great deal of balm to the Senator and reassure him somewhat by saying the estimated future expenditure at Griffiss Air Force Base is considerably larger than the amount proposed for Gentile.

Mr. KEATING. What I want the Senator to assure us is that when the request comes up for consideration he will treat it favorably.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator. First, I join my colleague [Mr. KEATING] in thanking the Senator for his unfailing courtesy and understanding in regard to these problems. Second, I identify myself with the inquiry which my colleague has made so very ably.

I should like to ask the Senator a specific question. We were in the midst of quite a problem with the Air Force on the Rome Air Materiel Area, which is the part of the Air Materiel Command specifically involved—because this would really be a disaster to the particular section of New York, for it would withdraw nearly the main economic support—when along came the decision on Titan, which resulted in the new attitude with respect to what is called ROAMA, the Rome Air Material Area.

I should like to ask the Senator whether, so far as he knows, as he has surveyed what is being done in regard to the item which we discussed especially, that decisions should not first be taken before negotiations and conversations are held with local people as to the economic or community soundness—and I know the Senator can give no guarantee—any decision has been reached in this particular case or whether the question is still under consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have every confidence that no decision has been taken to close the Griffiss Air Force Base. I do not say that such a decision will not be taken at the conclusion of the examination which is being made now, but, as of today, I am confident no such decision has been taken or recommended.

Mr. JAVITS. Has the distinguished Senator from Georgia at any time articulated any policy with respect to the desirability of consulting the community and the State before such a decision is taken, rather than after it is taken? In order to make the people feel a little happier, perhaps they can be consulted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very frankly, I say to the Senator from New York, I have not. I am in a position to weep with any Senator whose State has lost a military base. One of the last orders issued by the previous administration closed two airfields in my State where there were flying schools; one at Bainbridge, Ga., and one at Moultrie, Ga. Each was a thriving city of from 12,000 to 18,000 people. Each received some $18 million or $20 million spent yearly in the area as a result of the payroll at the base, the procurement program at the base, and the civilian personnel working at the base. It was a bolt out of the blue when the Secretary of the Air Force called me and said he was going to close those fields.

It is a real ordeal in respect to both ends of the closure. I have never closed one or recommended the closing of one, but I know that the people who are in the Department of Defense are keenly aware of the adverse effect any of these closures has on a civilian community.

I have felt very bad about the fact that the fields in my State were the predecessors in closure of all that came along this year. The two in my State were closed last year.

I do not know that the Air Force or any other department could afford indefinitely to operate an uneconomic base because of impact on a community. We shall have to depend upon the depressed-areas bill of the Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I suppose, to set those areas back on their feet again.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I was talking about the desirability of retaining the base in the interests of the economy and the security of the country, because in this particular instance a fine case was made for Griffiss Air Force Base on those grounds alone.

Mr. RUSSELL. Griffiss Air Force Base really is an outstanding base. It is a very efficient and effective base.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I was asking my question in terms of the propriety of consulting the local community and State upon those issues before a decision is arrived at. I think my colleague has answered the question. I thank him very much.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know it is not necessary to support the worthy and intelligent effort of the Senator from Georgia, but I sat through all the hearings, and we asked the Air Force not once, but two, three, or four times with regard to the various fields, before we authorized the money, if there was any evidence that the Air Force might close the fields. In every instance the witnesses answered categorically that there was no present intention to do so. I support the Senator from Georgia in that regard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only did we ask the Air Force that question, but also at the conclusion of the hearings I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Defense, in order that we might put him on record. The Secretary wrote a letter to the committee, a copy of which I have, which says, in part:

> I can assure you that no construction included in the fiscal year 1962 bill is planned for the installations already announced for closure.

The Secretary said further:

> It is not possible, of course, until after this evaluation is completed to state definitely that none of the construction included in the fiscal year 1962 authorization bill is located on bases which may subsequently be announced for closure. From our studies to date, and in view of the meticulous screening which is given to projects in the military construction program, this possibility is extremely remote.

Mr. KEATING. That is very helpful.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
> *Washington, April 29, 1961.*
>
> Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
> *Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate.*
>
> DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of April 26, 1961, in which you advise that the committee wishes to receive assurances that none of the construction requested in the fiscal year 1962 military construction authorization bill, now before your committee, is located on bases which will be designated for discontinuance.
>
> I can assure you that no construction included in the fiscal year 1962 bill is planned for the installations already announced for closure in our initial release of March 30, 1961.
>
> As I am sure you will agree, however, it is necessary that we continue our evaluation of the remaining military installations to determine those minimum military requirements to support peacetime and mobilization operations, and to comply with the President's objective of disposing of those installations which are no longer required. Great care is being exercised in this review and its completion is not scheduled before the latter part of the current calendar year.
>
> It is not possible, of course, until after this evaluation is completed to state definitely that none of the construction included in the fiscal year 1962 authorization bill is located on bases which may subsequently be announced for closure. From our studies to date, and in view of the meticulous screening which is given to projects in the military construction program, this possibility is extremely remote. Nevertheless, if this condition should materialize I wish to assure you that the construction concerned will not be undertaken and your committee will be informed at the earliest possible date.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

Mr. CARROLL and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado, and then I shall be glad to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention that Lowry Air Force Base was previously authorized 200 units of Capehart housing. I think 100 were authorized in 1959 and 100 were authorized in 1960. The design and planning have been completed, and the contracts are ready to be let. As a matter of fact, there is a ground breaking ceremony for the project scheduled for July of this year.

I have been informed that the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate has sort of abandoned the Capehart concept in favor of appropriated fund housing and we are caught in the squeeze with the 200 units previously authorized under the Capehart program.

The able Senator knows that these units are essential to the operation of the Titan missile base at Lowry Air Force Base. This important ICBM missile base will become operational in June.

I have no quarrel at all with the finding of the committee that the Capehart housing program should be abandoned and that appropriated fund housing programs should be adopted as a solution to the military housing problem, especially in the light of recent disclosures, but I wonder if there is not some way we can meet this immediate problem. How shall we obtain housing for Lowry Air Force Base? How shall we move ahead, in view of the planning which has taken place?

Mr. RUSSELL. There are some 5,900 Capehart housing units which have heretofore been authorized, which have been carried over from year to year, and which for some reason have not been let to contract. We are aware of the fact that there are some hardship cases. The whole problem will be in conference when we discuss military housing with the House. If there are any specific areas where the hardship is unendurable, we might authorize construction of enough of the units previously authorized and carried over to eliminate any real hardship.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator that if the condition at Lowry Air Force Base is unusually bad, as he states, we shall give the situation at Lowry consideration in our discussion of the item.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

When the 100 units were assigned in 1959 the Air Force housing authorities thought that number would be uneconomical to construct. They really needed and had requested 500 units. It was thought not to be in the interest of economy to construct only 100 units so they waited until they could get 200 units. Now the designing and planning have been completed and the program is ready to move in the month of July.

I appreciate most sincerely the remarks of the able Senator from Georgia.

I believe we have a special case, not because Lowry Field happens to be in my area, but because the circumstances speak for themselves. In view of the fact that the Titan missile base will be operational in June, the need for moving ahead on the 200 units authorized is urgent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the bill provided for 135 additional units for Lowry, which would have made a total of 335.

Mr. CARROLL. I would be glad to have the conferees agree to include the 135 additional units but the immediate concern is for the 200 units.

Mr. RUSSELL. That subject is one which we shall have to discuss in conference.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator from Georgia will permit me, I should like to make a brief factual statement and then ask a question with respect to one item in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I speak in support of the item of $8,763,000 recommended by the executive branch of the Government and by the U.S. Navy for a new naval hospital in Long Beach, Calif.

In 1942, when we were engaged in war, the Federal Government authorized the construction in Long Beach of a great naval hospital. It well served the health needs of the military during the war. At the conclusion of the war, and in 1950, the Secretary of Defense made an order transferring jurisdiction of the naval hospital at Long Beach to the Veterans' Administration. Military installations were being cut back and vessels were being decommissioned and placed in moth balls. Men on active duty were being sent back to civilian life, and it was deemed by the head of our Defense Establishment that the naval hospital there was no longer necessary for military personnel on active duty and their dependents. But the needs of American veterans were, of course, increasing. And thus the hospital and its facilities were transferred to the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration. It, too, through the intervening years has served well the veterans of American wars.

In 1954, a need for additional facilities for the paraplegic veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict arose, and together with other Senators, I urged the

Senate Appropriations Committee to consider an amendment providing a $8 million appropriation to enlarge the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital to take care of those who had given their limbs in the service of their country during World War II and in Korea.

In May of 1954 the Senate approved that amendment, and sent it to the House. Subsequently it became law.

The veterans' hospital at Long Beach, which formerly was a naval hospital, then commenced a program of construction. As a result, I think it is fair to say that today the gallant soldiers, sailors, and airmen who are paraplegics have better care available in that city in the State from which I come than otherwise would be the case.

The executive branch of the Government has now recommended that a new naval hospital be authorized for construction at Long Beach, in response to the urgent request of the Navy that such be done.

Long Beach has the third largest concentration of United States naval vessels of any area in the continental United States. There are 112 U.S. naval vessels in commission which call Long Beach their home port. There are 180,000 naval and military personnel and their dependents in that area. Their health needs, under the law, require, as I see it, our approval of the request made by the excutive branch.

I was delighted to see the recommendations of the executive branch receive first the approval of the House Committee on Armed Services and then the approval of the House of Representatives itself.

I share the respect and the high esteem that other Senators have indicated today for the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and those on both sides of the aisle who serve under him. That respect is shared by all Senators.

But to my able colleague and friend I must say I believe in this instance an error has been made; I believe the Armed Services Committee was wrong in deleting this item which the House had approved. The words that I use in the floor of the Senate today are spoken to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and his colleagues and not to the Senate as a whole, for it is to them, their judgment and their fairness, that I make this appeal.

I most respectfully ask whether or not my friend from Georgia and his colleagues on the forthcoming conference committee will reevaluate and reconsider the recommendation of the Navy Department and of the executive branch of the Government and of the position of the House of Representatives in conference, so that, in that fashion, justice, as I see it, may be done to 180,000 American citizens, most of whom serve our Government in the uniform of the U.S. Navy, together with their dependents.

I most respectfully ask the able Senator if he and his Senate conferees will reexplore in conference the wisdom of the executive branch as concurred in by the House of the recommendation for a new naval hospital at Long Beach.

Mr. RUSSELL. The graciousness of the distinguished Senator from California is enough to soften me and the entire Senate Committee on Armed Services considerably to entertain any request that he might make.

This is the first year a hospital at Long Beach was suggested or that we had any indication one was needed. The subject was presented to us as one of the largest hospitals that have been contemplated for a number of years. There are other facilities in the area.

The young men whom the Senator discusses as being likely patients in such a hospital, most of them members of the U.S. Navy, are probably the healthiest group percentagewise that there is on earth. Some hospital facilities are available on their ships. The Navy has a number of fine doctors. Some vessels have considerable hospital facilities.

We would not knowingly work any hardship on any of the personnel of our armed services or their dependents and, of course, we shall give the subject very careful consideration in conference with the other body. The committee was not adamant that a hospital should not be built at that location. We felt that it was one of the items that might be carried over for another year without causing any great disruption or hardship in our military services.

Mr. KUCHEL. I can understand the thinking of the chairman and the members of the committee. I must say that a question is quite logical: Why did the Government transfer jurisdiction of a naval hospital to the Veterans' Administration? I think with the background of facts, however, the decision to transfer is understandable.

On behalf of my colleague and myself, I repeat that in our judgment there is a justification for a naval hospital at Long Beach for the men who are on active military duty at this time and their dependents.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank my friend very much.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services gave very careful and patient consideration to the problem of the Long Beach Hospital. The chairman and other members of the committee have been concerned about the fact that hospitals are scattered around numerous areas and in separate services; and each service insists upon its own hospital and does not use other hospitals.

The question was raised in the Committee on Armed Services as to why the Navy gave away a hospital of 1,000 in 1950 and now wants the Government to build a new one for $9½ million.

I thought the inquiry was pertinent, and I asked the Navy to come up with a pretty good answer as to how circumstances had changed between 1950 and the present time so as to justify the Government in building a hospital costing that amount of money, after the Navy gave away a hospital at that location in 1950. The Navy came up with a piece of paper and a pretty lame explanation. Navy representatives told me confidentially and off the record that they never did concur in the decision, which the Secretary of Defense told them they had to make. I told them whether they liked it or not, the decision made in the Defense Department amounted to a finding that there was not a military requirement for that hospital in 1950.

Of course, they could not say very much about their disagreement with them. However, they were asked to please come up with a statement as to what hospitals are available in the area in other services which could be used for this 500-bed requirement of the Navy; in addition, they were asked to explain why they believe the hospital facilities which they had used since 1950 and up to the present time are not adequate now.

They supplied a memorandum on that subject which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REQUIREMENT FOR U.S. NAVAL HOSPITAL, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

During the late 1940's, because of the large reductions in the force levels of the Navy which had taken place over the years following World War II, the Navy had to reduce the number of its operating bases on the west coast. At that time, the decision was made to reduce the level of operations in the Long Beach area. The Naval Air Station at Reeves Field was closed; the shipyard operation was greatly reduced in scope; and the number of ships based at Long Beach was greatly reduced. As a result, the Navy no longer had a valid requirement for a large hospital in the Long Beach area.

Therefore, the naval hospital which had been built during World War II, largely of temporary construction was, by executive decision, turned over to the Veterans' Administration in February 1950, to obviate the need for construction of a new Veterans' Hospital in the area.

In June 1950, the Korean conflict started. During the subsequent buildup of naval forces incident to the Korean war it was necessary to reestablish Long Beach as a major fleet base. Force levels in the Pacific since the war have required continued use of Long Beach as a major fleet base.

However, since the former Navy hospital had been turned over to the Veterans' Administration, required material support to fleet personnel is not now available.

The Navy has a responsibility for medical care in the Long Beach area for approximately 102,500 active and retired military personnel and their dependents, as follows:

Active	36,000
Active dependents	22,900
Retired	21,800
Retired dependents	21,800

Additionally, 3,400 Army and 5,900 Air Force service personnel are stationed in the area and require medical support. The only military medical facilities at Long Beach are the U.S.S. *Haven* and the naval station dispensary. The Army facility at Fort MacArthur is 12 miles away.

Inpatient care is provided for 36,000 active naval personnel in the U.S.S. *Haven*, a hospital ship with 421-bed capacity, designed for combat fleet use, totally inadequate for

peacetime use as a substitute hospital, and scheduled for inactivation in 1964, due to obsolescence. Patients requiring extended treatment are transferred by ambulance to the naval hospital at Camp Pendleton or at San Diego.

Although the primary concern of the Navy is and must be for its active duty personnel, a secondary and vital concern relates to its retired personnel. Outpatient care is provided to active duty and retired personnel and their dependents in the naval station dispensary. Such care at civilian institutions is not authorized under medicare. Fort MacArthur provides 14 beds for inpatient care of dependents. Dependents of active-duty personnel only are eligible for inpatient care under medicare. The 21,800 dependents of retired personnel are not eligible for medicare, but receive inpatient care at a military hospital. The nearest military hospitals of adequate size are naval hospitals at Camp Pendleton, 74 miles away, and at San Diego, 102 miles away.

Construction of the proposed 500-bed hospital will also permit the closing of the Fort MacArthur Hospital, and will provide for care of Air Force patients formerly referred to March Air Force Base, 65 miles from Long Beach. Obstetrical care for dependents is not included and medicare will continue to provide this service.

ADDITIONAL JUSTIFICATION FOR U.S. NAVAL HOSPITAL, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

In response to your request of April 26, 1961 the following additional information in support of the Navy's requirement for a naval hospital at Long Beach, Calif., is provided:

1. A summary of all military medical support facilities and their workloads in the Long Beach area indicating conditions as of April 1961 is appended as enclosure (1).

2. A summary of all civilian medical support facilities and their workloads in the immediate Long Beach area indicating conditions as of August 1960 is appended as enclosure (2).

3. The U.S.S. *Haven* is a most unfortunate solution to an important problem and, at best, can be considered as only a temporary expedient for the present lack of anything better. The ship was originally laid down as a tanker but was converted to a hospital ship to meet pressing wartime demands. By providing four-tier bunks, the ship could evacuate in excess of 700 battle casualties from the combat zone, administer to the wounded while en route to continental United States, and upon arrival, transfer the casualties to a shore-based hospital for advanced treatment. *Haven*, however, is patently unsuited to serve as a peacetime hospital. The ship essentially remains as an evacuation ship, notwithstanding the fact that four-tier bunks have been temporarily reduced to two. The arrangement of spaces peculiar to ship construction and stability criteria impose severe limitations on the operation of the ship as a hospital, a purpose for which it was never designed. In the sense that a hospital ship is a seagoing ambulance, it is not properly equipped, arranged, nor designed to render the kind and degree of medical support which is best provided by a shore-based facility.

The material condition of U.S.S. *Haven* (AH–12) is such that the ship should not be continued in service beyond 1964 as an interim hospital without an extensive overhaul. Such an overhaul would require inactivation of the hospital for at least three months, and when completed, would have served only to return the ship to a satisfactory material condition. The basic character of the ship and its limitations as a medical facility would remain unchanged.

Minimal overhaul and repairs costing about $128,000 were completed 2 years ago. Remaining repairs estimated to cost $508,000 were not done due to lack of funds. Repairs proved to be a slow, tedious process because, in lieu of a normal overhaul, the alterations were done piecemeal, compartment by compartment, in order that the hospital might continue to function. These alterations corrected many leaks in fire mains, ventilating ducts, and other piping in *Haven*. Minor alterations including cutting doors to improve access have been done with some sacrifice in the watertight integrity of the ship which was initially a tanker hull. The fire and flushing system is seriously fouled with marine growth. The fresh water system is badly deteriorated and requires continuous and excessive maintenance to keep the system in operation. Vent ducts lack adequate access openings for cleaning and have no provision for filters, even in the surgical operating spaces. Considerable active corrosion is in evidence in various compartments, particularly the angle irons near decks adjacent to the hull. This corrosion has been accelerated by the high humidity in many spaces due to improper ventilation for 2 years. Corrosion was also noted behind the lagging on ventilating ducts which are harbingers of serious and extensive alterations for the future. In view of the active corrosion in various parts of the shell and the fact that a great part of the ship machinery spaces is still inactivated, the commanding officer was asked to install flooding alarms in all bilges to prevent accidental flooding of *Haven* with possible sinking at its present berthing. The *Haven* must remain at one of the active fleet berths in order that it can receive logistics support from the pier as it is completely dependent upon the firefighting facilities of the shipyard and immediate adjacent ships.

The Navy has received criticism for having "given" its former hospital to the Veterans' Administration after the Navy's need for it declined in the years following World War II. The Navy would like to point out that we did not give the Long Beach hospital to the Veterans' Administration. By Executive decision, this facility was turned over to the VA in February 1950 to obviate the need for construction of a new VA hospital in the area.

This hospital was originally built largely of temporary construction. It is understood that approximately 2 years ago the VA replaced 561 beds and installed a new surgical suite and physical therapy spaces at a cost of $8 million; is asking for an additional $1 million in fiscal year 1962; and plans to request another $8 million in fiscal year 1965 to complete the replacement and renewal program.

Military medical support of all services around Long Beach, April 1961

	Normal bed capacity	Current operating beds	Average patient load, calendar year 1960	Distance from Long Beach
Hospital ship: U.S.S. *Haven*	421	300	229	0
Hospitals:				
Army hospital, Fort MacArthur	85	60	33	12
Navy hospital, Camp Pendleton (temporary)	1,004	600	489	74
Navy hospital, San Diego	1,891	1,750	1,390	102
March Air Force Base	176	95	79	65
Norton Air Force Base	125	80	51	73
George Air Force Base	110	50	28	105
Edwards Air Force Base	63	45	34	136
Station hospitals:				
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow	30	20	13	114
Station hospitals—Continued				
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro	29	30	26	38
Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake	60	10	9	206
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme (temporary)	172	25	21	93
Dispensary with beds:				
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos	44	5	3	11
Dispensary without beds:				
Naval Stations, Long Beach	0	0	0	0
Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach	0	0	0	9

Civilian hospitals, Long Beach area: Civilian hospitals located within 15 miles or 30 minutes' driving time, whichever is greater, from the proposed facility, August 1960

	Normal bed capacity	Average daily census	Type of service
Long Beach:			
Bixby Knolls General	41	25	General.
Harriman Jones Clinic and Hospital	48	33	Do.
Long Beach Community	194	131	Do.
Long Beach General	414	357	Tuberculosis.
Long Beach Hospital (corporation) (not accredited).	41	25	General.
St. Mary's, Long Beach	272	236	Do.
Seaside Memorial [1]	316	258	Do.
Veterans' Administration	1,500	1,354	Do.
Adjacent areas:			
San Pedro (9 miles), San Pedro community	105	75	General.
Compton (9 miles), Compton Sanitarium	115	83	Psychiatric.
Torrance (10 miles):			
Jared Sidney Torrance Memorial	96	67	General.
Los Angeles County Harbor General	715	502	Do.
Lynwood (10 miles), St. Francis	387	332	Do.

[1] Replacement under construction.

Mr. ENGLE. The import of the explanation is that on the first point, what is available—there are about 576 beds available in other military hospitals; and I have made the chart a part of the RECORD. Some of them are at some distance from Long Beach. There are also a number of beds in civilian hospitals, which are also available. I am not able to determine how much of a cushion these hospitals require under normal operation, or to what extent a distance of 102 miles in one instance or 105 miles in another instance would make the use of a military hospital infeasible.

In line with the statement made by my colleague, the senior Senator from California, I should like respectfully to suggest a very careful consideration by the Senate conferees of this subject matter, and to request that they take a good hard look at the figures to see whether or not these people have come up with an adequate justification to show that there are not bed facilities now available in other service hospitals close enough to take care of the military needs of the Navy.

On the second point, with respect to the U.S.S. *Haven*——

Mr. RUSSELL. I overlooked that. They have a hospital ship that is being used, and that will be available until 1965. That is another thing the committee took into consideration.

Mr. ENGLE. That is true. The exact date they gave in the memorandum is that it should not be continued in service beyond 1964 as an interim hospital without extensive overhaul. Their memorandum says that if something is not done it will either sink or roll over. I assume it will last until 1964. In any case, they go on to point out that this naval ship is not a very good place for a hospital because it is small and crowded and not adequate.

As I see the situation, it all boils down to the fact that the time is coming when the vessel will either roll over or sink. As a consequence, eventually we will have to come up with some new hospital facilities for the Navy. I leave that to the very able consideration and the very considerate judgment of our conferees, because in their consideration of this matter they have, as the chairman has indicated, not been adamant, but merely wanted to know why the facilities were required at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad the Senator has put his material in the RECORD, because we want to go into this matter with the utmost care. We will see what can be done. Of course, I do not understand how the Navy is able to be so sure in picking the very year when a vessel will roll over or sink. We have had an old Spanish cruiser, which was captured in the Spanish-American War, tied up at the Naval Academy at Annapolis for 60 years. It has not rolled over or sunk. It is being used as quarters for enlisted personnel at the Naval Academy, and has been used for that whole period of time.

We will go thoroughly into the subject in conference. I do not think there is any question that there will be a need for additional naval hospital facilities in this area at some time in the future. There is some question as to the need for this larger hospital in the light of other hospital facilities being available.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to have the Chairman's permission and the permission of the Senate to place in the RECORD several communications which I have received on this subject. I urge the very able Senator from Georgia once again to study the figures, because I believe the limit of availability and the limit of capacity of the U.S.S. *Haven* does not make it a competent facility for the personnel who need to use it. The record apparently indicates that in 1964 the *Haven* will require extensive overhaul, which will be expensive. Its use by dependents of military personnel is restricted. I urge the Senator once again to give this item the fair consideration for which he is noted.

Mr. RUSSELL. We will be glad to give it careful scrutiny.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senator from California,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Flabbergasted by Senate Armed Services Committee action deleting Long Beach Naval Hospital funds. Would appreciate your correction of reported erroneous impressions and underscoring totally inadequate facilities of *Haven*.

KENNETH W. MCLAREN,
President, Long Beach Council,
Navy League of the United States.

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senator from California,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The discouraging and disheartening news item appearing in yesterday's Los Angeles Times stating "The Senate Armed Services Committee Thursday rejected the Navy's request for authorization of a new 500-bed hospital in Long Beach, Calif." It is hard to understand why a majority of this committee was not convinced of the need for a naval hospital in this area since it is obvious the Navy would not request it if it was not urgently needed. This article implies that particularly the committee acted as it did since a 1,000-bed naval hospital in Long Beach was turned over to the Veterans' Administration because it was not needed. This was not the reason this hospital was turned over to the Veterans' Administration in Long Beach.

As the national authorized representative of the Fleet Reserve Association in the northern section of the 11th Naval District (Garden Grove north to and including Santa Barbara) I spent 3½ months on doing research trying to find out the real reason why this hospital was transferred to the Veterans' Administration. I received many different stories, one blaming Congressman DOYLE. The story that rang true however, was the VA had requested a hospital in California in addition to the many they had. They wanted this hospital north of Los Angeles, they did not want the Naval Hospital on Seventh Street, Long Beach. However, on a compromise they agreed to accept the Naval Hospital, and the career naval personnel lost out. Subsequently they also lost the naval hospital at Corona, Calif.

There are thousands of naval career veterans and their dependents living in this area who were promised in shipping articles they signed, drawn up in contractual form, when they first entered the naval service, "That if they served honorably for a period of 30 years they would be entitled to retired pay and in addition receive medical and hospital care for yourself and dependents as long as you live.

There are only two real naval hospitals in California, one in Oak Knoll, Calif., 420 miles north and one in San Diego 130 miles south of Los Angeles. Neither of these hospitals are of much benefit to the veterans in the area mentioned above. These veterans have been pleading and fighting for this hospital for over 5 years. Many that I know personnally have suffered very much because they have no hospital to go to.

Will you please do everything possible you can to get this hospital started? These naval career veterans have been waiting patiently for a long time for a hospital near enough to their homes so that they could receive proper treatment if they needed it. There is no other single thing they will tell you they desire more.

Respectfully yours,

PHILIP G. CRONAN,
National Treasurer Emeritus.

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: I have just learned that the Senate in their report, Senate Report No. 200, page 6, dated May 3, 1961, deleted, among other items, the funds requested by the Navy Department for a 500-bed hospital in the Long Beach-San Pedro area.

There is an urgent need for more adequate hospital facilities for Navy and Marine Corps personnel and their dependents in this area. I hope we may count on your support in insuring that this worthy item is again inserted in this appropriation bill when the Senate and House conferees meet.

Respectfully,

FRED J. SCANLAN.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *April 30, 1961.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I hope you will do your utmost to see that appropriations are restored for a naval hospital for this city. Over 10,000 naval families need the services of this hospital and the reasons given for removing it from the list by the Senate Appropriations Committee are ridiculous.

We need the services of the hospital very much.

Yours sincerely,

M. W. GRAYBILL.

INDEPENDENT BUSINESS
MEN'S ASSOCIATION
OF GREATER LONG BEACH, INC.,
Long Beach, Calif., May 1, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: We urgently request your attention to the naval hospital proposed for Long Beach, Calif. A recent newspaper item leads us to believe that this facility might be abandoned and we are greatly disturbed.

As you know there was a Navy hospital in Long Beach, but at no time did the Navy approve release of that institution. It is now operated by the Veterans' Administration which is doing a splendid job with every bed occupied and a waiting list. This change was due to an administration order to cut back.

Now there is even a greater need for a Navy hospital in Long Beach because of the increased Navy personnel homeported in

Long Beach. As a matter of fact the need for care in a hospital is easily five times that of 10 years ago and it will increase rapidly as the Navy population grows in Long Beach.

Will you please direct your effort to the end that there shall be a Navy hospital built and operated in Long Beach.

Respectfully,

PAUL R. RIOTH,
President.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to an item on page 4 of the bill which was deleted by the Senate committee. It deals with the Redstone Arsenal, Ala.; for research, development, and test facilities, $5,038,000.

I may say that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is now on an important mission overseas, and I are very much interested in this item. As the Senator knows, this project is to provide the capability for the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to effectively perform its essential military mission, which involves the planning, directing, guiding, and evaluation of contractors' development of ballistic missile systems needed by the Army. At present, the principal development effort is being concentrated in the Pershing, Sergeant, and Little John missile systems and several future weapons, with continuing development and support effort being expended in the Jupiter, Redstone, Honest John, and Corporal missile systems now in the hands of troops.

To provide the needed space for ABMA, serious consideration was given to displacing certain Ordnance Guided Missile School functions located at Redstone Arsenal to another location. This is impractical because it would involve a multi-million-dollar requirement including duplication of certain training equipment and possible degradation of essential ordnance military training. Such a move would also deprive the staff and faculty of the school of the benefits of intimate contact with development personnel.

Second. The critical facilities shortage, which this project seeks to alleviate, was generated directly by the transfer to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on July 1, 1960, of all modern missile laboratory facilities, used by ABMA. These total approximately 1.5 million square feet. To replace this loss, this project provides ABMA only 187,300 square feet of laboratory space for the execution of its continuing and essential mission in development of military missile weapon systems.

Third. This work is now being done as far as practicable in World War II barracks, quonset huts, warehouses, and obsolete ammunition loading lines which are basically unsuitable for scientific and technical development work.

Fourth. In addition to the loss of morale of the scientific and technical personnel displaced from the modern laboratories transferred to NASA, the lack of an efficient consolidated laboratory will result in continuous inefficiency in existing buildings used on a "make do" basis. Further crowding, dispersal of activities, loss in operational effectiveness of ABMA and increased costs will result. This must ultimately be reflected in a delay in missile progress and in a degradation in quality of weaponry.

Fifth. This facility will enable ABMA to perform its essential mission of planning, technically guiding, administering, and evaluating missile system development by R. & D. contractors. No capacity is planned or provided for Government manufacture of missiles. Technical laboratories are required for three main purposes:

(a) To accomplish such advanced studies of feasibility and applicability of scientific principles and techniques to specific weapons projects as are essential to define and direct the developments contractors activity.

(b) To test and evaluate components, assemblies, and systems at appropriate stages of development and furnish advanced technical guidance to contractors in their missile development efforts.

(c) To maintain as an element of the foregoing activities, laboratory experience and competency of essential scientific staff in the state of the art to insure capable scientific direction and evaluation of development contracts.

I wish to say to my distinguished, longtime friend from Georgia, that I know how able he is and how fair he is and how thorough and how painstaking he is, and that I know that no man could be more devoted to the defense and security of our country than he.

The chairman and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], have given much time and thought and study to the subject of military construction. The Senator from Mississippi is also very fair, as is my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the ranking minority member of the committee, who has been a member of the committee for a long time. In fact, I had the honor of serving with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I know how able they are and how thorough they are, and I know how they always desire to do that which is best for the defense and security of our country. I commend this project to their honest, careful, and sympathetic consideration of the item when it comes up for consideration in the conference committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's compliment. I hope we may deserve it. I should have tied the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in these halls, but I am afraid that they have already surrendered without discussing it from the standpoint of the Senate.

I have great sympathy for the Redstone Arsenal, particularly for the Army, in the missile field. The Army has not received the credit which its great contribution to missilery demands. The Army did the first research and made the first breakthrough. The Army's basic research has been utilized by the other services, in all the success that followed. My sympathy is for the Army.

However, a great many buildings have been built in recent years at Redstone Arsenal and NASA has moved in and taken over most of the new ones. We at least wanted the dust to settle before we authorized this building, which is a rather expensive one.

This work is now being done in a number of small buildings. Undoubtedly it would be more effective if all the activities were consolidated under one roof, if the cost of consolidation were not prohibitive.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I have been informed in detail as to the activities of Redstone Arsenal since the Senate took this action, and that, in conjunction with the other members of the committee, I shall give very careful consideration to the item in the conference with the other body.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire if the distinguished Senator from Georgia has finished his presentation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 62, in the committee amendment, beginning with line 9, it is proposed to strike out all through the period in line 11.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my amendment is to eliminate an authorization of $3,812,000 for the purpose of transferring the Food and Container Institute, at present located in Chicago, to Natick, Mass.

In the report which the House Committee on Armed Services submitted, the same authorization was contained. There was a debate on the floor of the House, however, and the amendment was defeated by a vote of 267 to 145. In its place, there was substituted section 108, which authorized the expenditure of $10,000 for an impartial study to determine whether the Food and Container Institute should be transferred; and if so, where. The House of Representatives rejection of the committee's proposal was unusual and we can be sure the House took that action only in response to overwhelming evidence.

The amendment which I have offered would strike out the direct authorization for $3,812,000 which the Senate committee has put back in the bill, and would allow the House language to prevail in conference.

I always try to take a national point of view, and not a parochial attitude, on these issues. On occasions when installations in Illinois have been closed, and I have believed it was in the national interest that they should be closed, I have made no objection. In other cases, when it seemed to be in the national interest to transfer an installation or a facility from Illinois to some other State, I have made no objection. It is only because I think this authorization for $3,812,000 is not in the national interest that I oppose it.

The Food and Container Institute, with its predecessors, has been operating in Chicago for almost 40 years. In its present form, it has been operating for 15 years. A very competent staff of approximately 300 persons has been built

up. They are skilled in food research and container research. They have sunk their roots deeply into this region. It is now proposed to break up this organization and transfer the facility to Natick, Mass., with some inevitable loss of personnel, variously estimated at between 35 and 70 percent.

The proposal contains a number of very extraordinary features. First, when plans were made in 1952 for the creation and expansion of the Quartermaster's facility at Natick, Mass., some of us felt that this was a prelude to the transfer of the Food and Container Institute. We made inquiries of the Department of the Army and received assurances from the Secretary of the Army that no such transfer was contemplated.

Last year an attempt of an identical nature was made. Objections were made by Representative YATES and other Members of the House and by me. As a result, no action was taken. The effort of the Army has been renewed again this year. They never give up.

On the very face of things, this is an uneconomic transfer. The Middle West, not Massachusetts or New England, is the center of the food industries of the country. I was born in Massachusetts; I grew up in New England. I have great affection for that region of the country. It is beautiful country, but it has never been noted as a great producer of food commodities. We all like baked beans. We all appreciate codfish. We know that Massachusetts cranberries are excellent. However, I think these items, exhaust the list of food products which Massachusetts and New England have contributed to the diet of the Nation.

The Midwest is the center of the livestock industry. It is the center of wheat, corn, soybeans, and the feed grains. It is the dairy center of the country. Certainly, it is closer to citrus fruits than Massachusetts. In general, the Midwest is the breadbasket of America. Chicago is the center of the Midwest. Until recently we have been the center of the livestock industry. Although Chicago has suffered losses in recent months, much slaughtering is still carried on there. Chicago is also the center of the candy industry. It is, I believe, the center of the container industry. So we have in Chicago the broad industrial base upon which any research institute should be built.

We appreciate the excellence of the educational institutions around the city of Boston. We have no words of disparagement for them. However, there are excellent educational institutions in Chicago, as well. One of those institutions, the Illinois Institute of Technology, which is certainly a very fine research and teaching organization, has made offers to house the present Food and Container Institute on its grounds. It is admitted by all hands that the present location of the Food and Container Institute, in a large five- or six-story building of the southwest side of Chicago, is not an economic location. It is a former warehouse which has been converted to its present purposes. It is probably true that a more efficient location could be found elsewhere. What we say is that there is no evidence to indicate that Natick, Mass., is the most efficient point of location.

The Army in general and the Quartermaster Corps in particular have not given to the Illinois Institute of Technology and to the affected groups in Chicago a fair chance to make alternative bids. Last year the Illinois Institute of Technology asked the Army to make available the specifications for the building which the Army wanted constructed, so that the people at Illinois Tech might make a bid. That information was denied them. From time to time we have asked the Army to furnish these specifications, so the Illinois Institute or any other group, anywhere in the country, might have an opportunity to bid; and we were willing to abide by the results of those bids. But such opportunity has always been denied. In March, the Chicago Association of Commerce made such a request; but no reply was received. Representative YATES has again and again asked for specifications. At an extraordinary hearing which the Army convened in Chicago, on March 31, and I hold in my hand a copy of the transcript made at that hearing which after much effort I finally obtained—Representative Yates again asked that the specifications be made public. Senators who read the transcript made at that meeting will find that it is clear that, once again, that request was denied.

I do not know that there is anything of a secret or high-security character about a food research institute or a container institute.

No great secrets of national security are involved. But the Army refuses, and says it is going to transfer the Institute, and that it will be cheaper if it is transferred to Natick. The Army does not give those in other parts of the country any opportunity whatever to bid. I say that is highhanded and arbitrary, and I regret that such a plan is being carried through. They do their deeds in darkness and shun the light.

I attach no blame whatever to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. In the face of a very insistent Army and a very determined Quartermaster Corps, I suppose the committee did what was inevitable. But I think that was a very arbitrary procedure.

Now I shall say something that ordinarily I do not say, but I think it needs to be said in this instance. I do not believe in attacking public officials, and I am not doing so now. But the man who has been most insistent upon making this change is the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development, one Richard S. Morse. Mr. Morse has been quite vehement in his telephone conversations with the Illinois Institute of Technology and with my office; in fact, vehemence is an understatement. On occasion, his language has verged very close to insulting; and he was so vehement and so determined and so condemnatory of our efforts to get at the facts that I felt I should look up Mr. Morse's record.

If Senators will examine the 1960–61 edition of Who's Who in America, on page 2073, they will find the biography of Mr. Richard S. Morse, as submitted by himself.

He was, first, president of the Minute Maid Corp., beginning in 1944; president of the National Research Corporation Equipment Corp.; a director of the Vaculite Corp.; and a director of similar affiliated organizations. If Senators will turn to Moody & Poor's Manual, they will find a very thorough description of those companies. The Minute Maid Corp. is the leading producer of frozen citrus juices, and it produced a number of similar products. The Vaculite Co. produces containers. The National Research Corporation Equipment Corp., a subsidiary of the National Research Corp.—indeed, it is wholly owned by it—produces high-vacuum equipment. It would be very convenient for those organizations to have the Food Research Institute or the Container Institute transferred to Natick, Mass., so it would be close at hand.

The headquarters of those companies are on Memorial Drive, in Cambridge, Mass.; and when Mr. Morse was a civilian, his office was located there.

I am informed that Mr. Morse is to leave the Government on approximately June 1. I do not know what his future plans will be. But it is quite possible that he may return to the companies whence he came.

I have previously stated that to conduct research on food in Massachusetts is equivalent to conducting research on tropical diseases in Alaska, or to developing cures for frostbite in Florida. On the fact of it, this is an uneconomic expenditure of funds.

Even though the Illinois Institute of Technology was deprived of the specifications upon which it could make a detailed bid, and was refused them, it has made a tentative estimate that, on the basis of a similar building, it could construct a building containing 150,000 square feet—which is the approximate amount of space the Army says it wants to develop at Natick—for $3,500,000, or about $23 a square foot, instead of the $3,812,000 authorized by the bill. Therefore, there is no indication that any economy would be effected by the proposed transfer. On the contrary, there is every indication that there would be losses—losses in the building itself; losses from the breakup of a skilled staff, which necessarily will be decimated by the transfer; losses from transferring this work from the area of the country where food is grown extensively and canned, to an area of the country where very little food is grown; in fact, the other area is relatively isolated from the mainstream of activity in this particular branch.

Mr. President, that is all I wish to say. I submit that, on the basis of those facts, we should return to the House language and authorize an expenditure of $10,000 for a nonpartisan study. With the departure of Mr. Morse from Government service, it is quite possible that in the future we may get a more dispassionate study of this matter than has occurred up to date.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I associate myself with the observations made by my distinguished senior colleague. I have taken note of this question on other occasions, and realize we are confronted with a $3,810,000 appropriation. Far be it for me to reflect on members of the task force or the advisory committee which made the report. In all candor, though the report favored the transfer, I point out that those people are located in Chicago. There has been no reflection on the efficiency of the work done. The scientific talent in Chicago certainly would equal, if not exceed, that at Natick. By transferring the facility, those who have been doing the work would be discommoded. Whether there would be greater efficiency as a result of the transfer is a question.

I certainly concur in what the Senator has said, and will support the amendment of my colleague.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is one of the unfortunate questions that arise from a conflict between a State that has a facility of the Department of Defense, and one that will receive it if the recommendations of the Department are adhered to. I, of course, have no technical training that would enable me to weigh all the facts involved in this controversy and arrive at an independent decision. I do wish to say, in passing, that I deplore and condemn any position of the Department of Defense in failing to furnish to any Member of the Congress, of either party, any information with reference to the laboratory.

The two distinguished Senators from Illinois have delayed this transfer for an exceedingly long period of time. This issue arose first back in 1950, 1951, or 1952, when some part of the facility was established at Natick. The issue was discussed on the floor of the Senate. Substantial effort has been made by the Department of Defense on other occasions to commit the removal of these facilities to Natick, Mass. Each time the move has been proposed, it has wound up with a survey. I do not know of any issue in the Department of Defense that has been surveyed with more different task forces or with more regularity than the proposal to remove the Food and Container Research Institute from Chicago to Natick. It has been studied by task forces, and by the Secretary of the Army, and by the Secretary of Defense, in both Republican and Democratic administrations, and in both Republican and Democratic administrations the report to our committee has been that it was in the interest of economy and efficiency to consolidate all the services at Natick, Mass.

With that testimony before us, the committee had no alternative, as a faithful servant of the Senate, than to report that issue to the Senate. All kinds of reports have been made as to vast savings that would accrue. The Army stated it would start by saving $1,100,000 a year. The General Accounting Office was not quite so optimistic, but the General Accounting Office concluded that for the first 7 years it would save $250,000, and after that there would be a saving of $1 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We admit that there would be savings in a new building as compared with the present building. We do not deny that. What we say is that a new building conforming to the specifications, if we could find out what they are, built in Chicago, could save as much, if not more, money.

What we have been trying to do is to get the Army to give us and other regions in the country the specifications and the opportunity to bid. If, for example, Minneapolis should come forward with a cheaper bid, we would be willing to have the facility go to Minneapolis. Or if it should be found that Atlanta, Ga., had a better bid than Chicago, we would be willing to have still another facility, in addition to the large number of facilities already in the State of Georgia, go to that State. Or if Houston, Tex., made a satisfactory bid, we would be willing to have the facility in Texas. All we ask is that the Quartermaster Corps not be permitted to force the proposed transfer to Natick without other sections of the country having a chance to bid. That is all we ask. And if open bids are submitted in accordance with open specifications, we are confident that Chicago would win out. All we ask is fair play and not judgment by a biased kangaroo court.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not limit the saving to the building. I have a letter from Dr. Herbert F. York, who has been the able and distinguished Director of the Defense Research and Engineering, and I should like to read this paragraph from the letter:

> The relocation of the Institute at Natick will mean that certain important technical facilities, such as the radiation facility, will be readily available for the work of the Institute, while in Chicago these facilities would have to be separately provided. Furthermore, Natick is the site of the main body of Quartermaster research facilities, and the relocation of the Food and Container Institute at Natick will result in considerable administrative economies, eliminating the duplication of plant and facilities as well as eliminating the need for 32 additional support personnel. The proposed relocation will also eliminate a substantial amount of travel between Chicago and Natick, and should expedite considerably the awarding of contracts, thereby shortening leadtime. By reason of such economies, I believe the cost of the additional construction will be amortized in approximately 3 years.

That is the advice of the man who was selected to advise the committee on this technical matter. In the absence of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, I do not see how the committee or the Senate can do other than to follow his advice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the chairman permit me to make an observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The chairman has quoted the statement that there would be radiation facilities at Natick which would be lacking at Chicago. I remind the Department that the Argonne Laboratories, devoted to the peaceful use of atomic energy, are located just outside Chicago. The Armour Research Institute, which is an integral part of the Illinois Institute of Technology, has nuclear facilities. Pioneer work in the use of atomic energy on meats has been carried out in Chicago.

It may well be that the facility at Natick has a nuclear reactor, but certainly the facilities are no better than—and I would doubt whether they are equal to—the facilities at Chicago, and the distance is as great to travel from Chicago to Natick as it is from Natick to Chicago.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have a memorandum which has been furnished by the Army. I do not know of any reason why the Army should wish to take undue and unfair advantage of one State as against another. It is stated in the memorandum that the technical characteristics of the reactor at the station described by the Senator from Illinois, the Armour Research Institute, are not of the type which can be utilized in the Army food-irradiation program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that subparagraphs (c) and (d) of the memorandum may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paragraphs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> (c) The technical characteristics of this reactor do not adapt it for the Army's needs in its food-irradiation program. This Armour research reactor was placed in operation in June 1956; has been in operation intermittently since that time with a maximum power level of 10 kilowatts, the originally maximum licensed power. Armour desired to increase the normal operating power level to the designed level of 50 kilowatts, and prepared the report referenced in 2b above for this purpose. Any representation that this reactor could supply the requisite radiation services needed by the Army's revised food-irradiation program would be either a complete distortion of fact or indicate a complete lack of knowledge of the technical requirements.
>
> (d) Armour Research Foundation is a well-qualified research organization for accomplishing research within its available facilities. During the past 8 years of the Army's food-irradiation program, Armour has been given three contracts in connection with the program. One contract, No. DA-49-007-ND-609, "Subacute Toxicity of Irradiated Foods," was for the period of 1955 and was with the Surgeon General. The food used in this study was irradiated at the General Electric Laboratory at Milwaukee, Wis., frozen and returned to the Armour Foundation for the experimental work. Another contract, with the QM, No. DA-19-129-QM-405, "Irradiation of Lipid-Protein Systems," was during 1956. The third contract, with the QM, No. DA-19-129-QM-1387, "Non-Chemical Methods of Enzyme Inactivation," was during 1959-60. The fact, however, that in the course of this program at least 150 other research foundations, universities, and industrial laboratories have participated in the contractual research would seem to indicate that Armour Research Foundation has not played a major role in the Army's program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since it was created. I get lost in the bog in respect to work done at one of the atomic energy plants which cannot be done at another, but the scientists claim that is the case.

I have a letter from the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., with reference to the House amendment. He says:

On Wednesday, March 22, the House amended the fiscal year 1962 military construction authorization bill (H.R. 5000) to strike out certain construction planned at Natick, Mass., for the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute. The amendment also directs further study of the relocation of that agency from its present quarters in the Chicago Administration Center.

This is an unfortunate development in a very important program which has been carefully thought out and is a positive move toward economy and efficiency in the Army.

The planned move from Chicago to Natick has been the subject of extremely careful review and analysis. Last year the Army proposal was studied by the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and extensively by the General Accounting Office. In addition, a special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee was established to visit both sites and to determine the desirability of the proposed move. This subcommittee, with due consideration for the technical, managerial, and operational aspects, concluded that the move should be made, even were the costs at Chicago and Natick identical. The subcommittee concluded, in agreement with the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and General Accounting Office studies that there would, in fact, be substantial savings. This is in addition to the important scientific advantages that will result from consolidating the Food and Container Institute with its parent organization in one location.

I continue to read the letter from Secretary Stahr:

The possibility of relocating the facility to the campus of Illinois Institute of Technology has been carefully considered as an alternative, in view of intense local interest in the facility. This alternative was not found to be desirable in that it presented none of the advantages which would accrue from relocating the Food and Container Institute to Natick. The Army has determined that even apart from economic considerations, good management demands the choice of Natick, in agreement with the findings of the House subcommittee.

Thus the Army's position in this matter is sound and has been reaffirmed by the most searching review. I hope you will do everything you can to assure final authorization for this construction and passage of the necessary appropriations at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter written for Dr. Herbert F. York, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1961.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been advised that the Secretary of the Army has transmitted to you a study dealing with the feasibility and advisability of relocating in new quarters the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute now located in Chicago, Ill. H.R. 5000, the Military Construction Act of 1961, as passed by the House, provided for this study, and deleted the authorization requested by the Department of Defense for the construction of facilities for the Institute at Natick, Mass.

The study confirms the position of the Department of Defense that the Institute should be relocated in Natick, and this position has received the concurrence of the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, whose views on this question have been incorporated in the study pursuant to section 108 of H.R. 5000. As you are aware, this is only the latest of a number of such studies, and I strongly believe that the time they have consumed, which has already resulted in a longer delay in relocating this facility than was consistent with good management policy, makes it imperative that the relocation be effected as promptly as possible, and that the authorization for construction at Natick be restored in the present bill.

The relocation of the Institute at Natick will mean that certain important technical facilities, such as the radiation facility, will be readily available for the work of the Institute, while in Chicago these facilities would have to be separately provided. Furthermore, Natick is the site of the main body of Quartermaster research facilities, and the relocation of the Food and Container Institute at Natick will result in considerable administrative economies, eliminating the duplication of plant and facilities as well as eliminating the need for 32 additional support personnel. The proposed relocation will also eliminate a substantial amount of travel between Chicago and Natick, and should expedite considerably the awarding of contracts, thereby shortening leadtime. By reason of such economies, I believe the cost of the additional construction will be amortized in approximately 3 years.

Accordingly, I am strongly of the view that the relocation of the Food and Container Institute is urgently required, and I earnestly request that the authorization for construction be restored. If you wish any more detailed views on this subject, I shall of course be happy to provide them.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. RUBEL
(For Herbert F. York).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to make it clear that the Army has never permitted the Illinois Institute of Technology or any other group to know the specifications for the building, and the Illinois Institute of Technology has never been allowed to make a bid. Although the Institute has been completely shut out, it is said the facilities there are inadequate and not as good as those at Natick. How can it be said that is the case, unless there is an opportunity to bid?

We would like to see Detroit, Mich.; Atlanta, Ga.; Providence, R.I.; Houston, Tex.; Montgomery, Ala.; Jackson, Miss.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; or any other city given an opportunity to bid.

I am not saying, "Hold the Institute at Chicago." I am only saying, "Let us have all the facts" instead of providing, "It must go to Natick: the plans are top secret; nobody else will have an opportunity to look at them and nobody else will have an opportunity to bid."

That seems to me to be the height of arbitrary procedure, not on the part of the Senator from Georgia, but on the part of the Quartermaster Corps and on the part of the Secretary of the Army.

The truth of the matter is that those people made up their minds in 1952 that no matter what the evidence showed they were going to consolidate everything at Natick. That is what I feared at the time. At that time the Secretary of the Army and the Quartermaster General said there was no intention to move the Food and Container Institute. The same disclaimer was made in regard to the Clothing Institute. I believe that has been moved. What we see is "empire building" by the Quartermaster Corps.

It may well be that the cultural opportunities, to hear the Boston Symphony and to listen to the lectures at the Lowell Institute, are attractive to the highly cultured officers in the Quartermaster Corps. There are such opportunities at Chicago. Perhaps we should provide a season ticket to the Chicago Symphony, and we might throw in tickets for the ballet, in addition.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Illinois. He has shown an ability in regard to this facility which surpasses anything I have ever known to be shown by anyone else who was about to lose a facility.

I do not know that it is wise as a matter of fact to undertake to do all the research by letting it out to bid. In some instances we might be able to do that, but I doubt whether we could operate a laboratory with as wide a range as the one under consideration on a bid basis.

I point out again that the House urged that a study be made, and that the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council be consulted. They have been consulted. They support the General Accounting Office, the subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, and the task group of the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development, which made the study in consultation. We have that study available. It is the third or fourth study made in pursuance of the activities of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, but still the finding of all the people—who do not live in Illinois or in Massachusetts—is in favor of Massachusetts and against Chicago, Ill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hold in my hand the transcript of the alleged hearing held on the 31st of March by the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development. It is the most absurd transcript I have ever seen in my life. No evidence was considered. There was a direct refusal to allowing specifications to be known.

I had hoped that I would not be compelled to make this a part of the RECORD, but since the Senator from Georgia has referred to this as the profound research of the Advisory Board task group——

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator puts words in my mouth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the hearing, beginning at 1 p.m., be printed as a part of the RECORD. Out of their own lips the

Advisory Board task force will be condemned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the only profundity I would attribute to anyone on this question would be that of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I stated nothing about this endeavor being a profound task force. I stated that the profundity of the Senator from Illinois had prevented the accomplishment of the proposed transfer for several years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator gives me too much credit.

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been dilatory action after dilatory action from year to year, even though last year the Senate voted against the proposal and voted finally, after all these years, to approve this transfer. I did refer to the fact that the Board, with the advice of these people, had made a recommendation supporting one theretofore made by the General Accounting Office and by the Department of the Army, and urged by Dr. York. One of the reports that he cites shows "all existing installations of the Quartermaster General were considered in possible sites."

These included installations in Virginia, New York, Texas, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, California, Utah, and Massachusetts.

I believe a pretty thorough study has been given to this subject, and I believe it is about time that the Senate terminated it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. While I have a deep and abiding interest in the entire subject of culture, I am not so interested in culture as I am in keeping the Container Institute in Chicago. I am a little less liberal, I believe, than my distinguished colleague. I feel a little like one of the two sailors who were marooned on an island. Their plight was desperate. Finally, they erected a pole with a shirt on it. One of them got on his knees and began to pray. He said, "Oh, Lord, if Thou wouldst save us, we would give you everything we have. Oh, Lord, if Thou wouldst save us, we will do anything for you."

Just then the other sailor spoke up and said, "Wait a minute. Don't promise too doggone much. I think I see a ship."

I am not going to promise anything. I am not interested in sending the facility to Houston, Detroit, or to any other place.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Nor am I.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to keep the facility in Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, and I am confident that if we have fair competition, it will be in Chicago. Let there be fair competition and let the best city win; and I am confident that if this is done, the Food and Container Institute will be in Chicago and in no other place.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not want that extraneous note to creep into the discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are ready to rest on the truth, the facts, and the comparative advantages.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Notwithstanding the suggestions and recommendations by the distinguished groups—and I am sure that everyone who served on the task force of the Quartermaster Board was distinguished—of course, even distinguished people can make mistakes. Consider the mistakes that are made in the Senate, where all are distinguished. So they could have made mistakes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Army has risen to great heights in this case in retaining its position over the years. Last year they came in and ruled against the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who was the leader of the proponents in the Republican administration; this year they have consistently ruled against the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is, of course, one of the great leaders in the Democratic administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Such action shows how they can persist in error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I was impressed by the demonstration of saving that the distinguished Senator from Georgia suggested as a result of several studies, but I was curious because of an inquiry directed to me from a food processing firm in Michigan as to whether the several studies, all of which suggest economy, that would result from the establishment of this facility in Massachusetts included evaluation as to the overall economic impact of moving that facility from what I am advised is relatively the center of the food processing industry to the east coast, or whether it was limited simply to the payroll and service costs of the Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that I cannot answer the question with respect to the economic impact. I have received no testimony. I am sure, however, that the distinguished Senator from Illinois can answer the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly can answer it. The answer is that no attention was paid by the Army to anything except the alleged narrow effects within the building itself. In Chicago, we can duplicate that building at less cost, with greater efficiency, and without breaking up an organization. And in addition we can serve the great private food and container industries of America far better from a centrally located and long established institution in Chicago than they can possibly be served by an isolated and new institution in the Far Northeast of the country.

Mr. HART. In explanation of my support for the amendment offered, I wish the distinguished chairman of the committee to understand that the point that was made to me this morning by, I believe, one of the largest food processors in America situated in Michigan was that the removal of the facility would have an impact upon his ability to obtain services.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me on the amendment under consideration be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MASSACHUSETTS

There are six questions that must be raised and answered concerning the proposed transfer of the Quartermaster food and container research. These six are:

1. Why is it necessary?

2. What are the savings for our national defense effort?

3. Why is it advisable from a scientific viewpoint?

4. Why is it advisable from food and container research viewpoint?

5. What research activities would Quartermaster food and container research be combined with?

6. Have proper studies been made of this proposed transfer?

1. What makes it necessary to move the Food and Container Institute from its present quarters in Chicago?

The buildings now occupied by the Food and Container Institute in Chicago are 40-year-old six-story buildings originally constructed for warehouse purposes and have become increasingly inefficient to operate. All interested parties and studies conducted by the Army, Department of Defense and by outside groups agree on the essentiality of the move from present quarters.

There is considerable urgency in obtaining construction authorization this year. The move has been under discussion since 1958. There must be an adverse effect on employee morale and effectiveness resulting from the uncertainty of the relocation plans.

The Army, after very thorough study and restudy, has chosen to request authority to move to Natick. The primary reasons for choosing Natick over any other site in the United States are in the area of administrative economies, integration of research programs with important directly related work now at Natick, and long term economic savings.

2. What will be the annual savings resulting from the Natick location rather than the location elsewhere in the United States?

The Army estimates operating savings of $1,100,000 per year. This includes approximately $300,000 in direct mission costs and about $800,000 in overhead support.

3. What research equipment, if any, is or would be available at Natick which would have to be provided separately at another location?

The following specialized Army-owned equipment now at Natick would provide research capabilities not now available at the Chicago location, except by rental or contract: Van de Graff electron accelerator, solar furnace, large hot and cold climate chambers, mass and infrared spectrographs, vapor phase chromatographs, food extraction plant, electron miscroscope, X-ray diffraction equipment, psychophysiological equipment, biophysical equipment.

4. It has been suggested that the research environment at the Chicago area is better for the kind of work the Food and Container Institute does than is the Boston area. In what extent is this true?

The essential communication between personnel of the FCI and their colleagues in

closely related disciplines could be more easily effected in Natick than Chicago.

In a 6-State area, within a 300-mile radius of Boston; that is, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Connecticut, there are 147 laboratories engaged in food research. Within a few miles of Natick are the world famous food technology laboratories of the MIT and the University of Massachusetts. General Foods has erected one of the Nation's most modern food research centers in Cambridge, less than an hour's drive from Natick. The contract program in food research and development is distributed throughout the United States. This program is expected to continue unchanged. Scientific and technical libraries are readily available in the Boston area.

The Army alleges that there will be mutual benefit to the Food and Container Institute and the rest of the QM research program through joining the F. & C.I. scientists and the Natick staff.

5. What related work is now being done at Natick?

The technical program at Natick amounts to approximately $8 million annually. It encompasses many fields of R. & D., virtually all of the QM research other than that done at the Food and Container Institute. These fields include:

(1) Clothing and personal equipment for protecting the soldier from all wartime environments; (2) materials of many kinds including materials for containers and for packaging food and other Quartermaster items; (3) mechanical and special purpose equipment, including field cooking and messing equipment, refrigeration equipment, aerial delivery equipment, materials handling equipment, etc.; (4) environmental research; (5) human research; and (6) pioneering research in chemistry of food flavors and odors, micro-organisms, ionizing radiation effects, and thermal effects.

The movement of the Food and Container Institute to this established research and engineering center, from which it is now administered, will result in greater overall efficiency and effectiveness of the technical program by consolidating the food and packaging work now performed in Chicago with the related research work on taste, odor, materials, and environment now underway at Natick. It will put the food technologists and package and container development people in direct contact with those researchers working on taste, odor, and flavor, and on materials.

6. How can we be sure that all relevant factors have been considered in selecting the Natick site over any other site in the United States?

The Quartermaster General initiated an extensive study in November 1958 to determine how the efficiency of the QM Food and Container Institute research and development mission could be improved. Sites considered to improve the physical plant included the following:

1. First, all existing installations of the QMG were considered as possible sites. This included installations in Virginia, New York, Texas, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, California, Utah, and Massachusetts.

2. Next, other governmental facilities in the Chicago area such as Fort Sheridan.

3. Finally, consideration was given to the construction of a new Government installation in the Chicago area such as at the Illinois Institute of Technology. In considering what should be done it became apparent that the greatest increase in efficiency of operations would result from joining food and container work with the balance of the QM Corps research and development now being performed at Natick.

The QM decision has been subjected to extensive review. I understand that the DDR&E conducted an independent review in February of 1960 which resulted in Defense Department support of the fiscal year 1961 budget request. The General Accounting Office conducted a review to determine the validity of the cost advantages inherent in the move to Natick. It concluded that there would be a substantial savings from transfer of the facility to the Natick establishment.

A special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee investigated the proposed move and, in its May 1960 report, recommended proceeding with the move to Natick. Significantly, the subcommittee also concluded that there would be substantial savings and that even if there were no savings, the move should be made in the interest of increased efficiency of the research operations.

In January 1961, the Illinois Institute of Technology made a study of the problem of relocating the Food and Container Institute out of its present location in the Chicago administrative center and concluded that the Illinois Institute of Technology campus would be a suitable location. This study further suggested that the problem be reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences; that they study and make recommendations as to programs, facilities, and site for the Institute.

Finally, in April of this year, the Secretary of the Army ordered a special study to review the validity of the Army position. As a part of his study, the Secretary of the Army requested the comments and recommendation of the Advisory Board on QM Research and Development of the National Academy of Science-National Research Council. This was appropriate in view of section 108 of H.R. 5000, the House amendment to this bill. This study reaffirmed the Department of Defense position in concluding that activity should be moved to Natick at the earliest possible opportunity.

Therefore, I urge that the Senate committee's bill be adopted by defeating the proposed amendment to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia?

I wish to offer an amendment on page 68 of the committee amendment, line 10, to strike the figure "$3,300,000" and substitute therefor "$13,200,000."

We have a very serious situation in the New London area and in Groton, where the submarine base is located.

The House bill originally authorized 800 new units of family housing, which was to be the Capehart type of housing. The Senate committee, in considering all the difficulty, to put it mildly, that we have had with Capehart housing, especially in connection with the Hayes deals in California, struck out all of the Capehart housing and substituted some appropriated funds housing therefor.

That action cut the New London submarine base area down from 800 units to 200 units. Due to the Polaris missile system program, the submarine program has been stepped up very rapidly. We already had a shortage of housing at that location before the work was stepped up. Now the work is stepped up and the New London area is the headquarters for training submariners.

We already have a serious situation. Unless we get more housing than the 200 units allowed in the bill, the situation will be untenable. My amendment would provide four times as much housing as would the Senate bill under the appropriation process. It would give us the 800 units of housing proposed in the House bill. So I am only going as far as the House went in asking for enough to construct the proposed 800 units.

In order to show statistically the status of family housing at the submarine base in New London, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks a memorandum which was prepared for me by the Navy be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1961.

Memorandum for Senator PRESCOTT BUSH.
Subject: Status of family housing at NSB, New London, Conn.

1. In accordance with your request the following information is provided:

Number of units now available (adequate)	486
Number of units under contract	1,000
Number of units authorized not yet under construction	0
Total	1,486
Estimated additional requirement	3,264

In addition to the above units the House Armed Services Committee approved 800 Capehart units in the fiscal year 1962 MCON bill H.R. 5000. However, these were deleted from the Senate bill and 200 units of appropriated fund housing substituted therefor.

There are 300 units of World War II housing (low cost rental units) which will be disposed of as housing accommodations if the 800 units are approved in the 1962 program.

FRANK L. JOHNSON,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy, Director Shore Activities, Development and Control Division.

Mr. BUSH. I ask that another memorandum that was prepared on this same subject for the use of myself and others entitled "The Need for Capehart Housing in New London," also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED FOR CAPEHART HOUSING IN NEW LONDON

The requirements for Capehart housing in the New London area are not new. They have been recognized as valid since 1957. Efforts have continued toward procuring from all sources sufficient units in order to provide adequate and suitable quarters for military families at modest living standards, at reasonable rents or within acceptable commuting distances. The Capehart housing can provide a solution to this New London housing shortage perhaps more economically and rapidly than any other known plan.

Early in 1957 the submarine base housing survey showed an accute shortage of available rentals even including those which could not meet the DOD criteria in regards to suitability, rental pay scale of the military man or within a commuting distance of 15 miles to the submarine base. This situation has not changed. On the strength of the need existing in 1957, the Navy and Congress approved the submarine base request for

1,050 units by location for New London. Because of the DOD limitation on the number of starts during the forthcoming fiscal year, this figure was cut to 500 units. A request was made for the 1959 fiscal year supplemental but was not funded although fully supported by the Navy Inspector General as a justified item. The second increment of 500 units was held in abeyance by DOD and the Navy until the first increment could start construction.

The real setback came when the contractor for the first 500 approved units was unable to get financial backing and this project had to be readvertised. This misfortune caused a full year's delay in starting construction at a time when the FBM program was being accelerated. The contract for the first 500 Capehart units was finally awarded to Blitz Corp. in early 1960. Construction was started in March 1960 and at the present rate of construction will not be completed until October 1961.

When requirements for support of the FBM Squadron 14 were made known, it became apparent that previous estimates of housing requirements would have to be revised upward to accommodate the 1,150 additional families of submarine crewmen of the Polaris submarines. The second increment of 500 Capehart units was reinstated on the 1960 execution list on the strength of the new impact the additional squadron would have on the already critically short housing condition in New London.

The contract for this second increment was awarded in January 1961 but the earliest completion date is October 1962. This entire block of housing is scheduled to be assigned exclusively to families of the Polaris submarines although originally approved to alleviate the previously known housing deficiency before the additional assignment of the Polaris Squadron to New London.

Annual housing surveys are taken each March. Due to the accelerated FBM program the military population in the New London area has increased even more rapidly than predicted. For example, on March 31, 1958, there was a net housing deficit of 1,019 units. On May 1, 1959, there was a net housing deficit computed on the same criteria of 2,679. This figure is broken down as follows:

On waiting list for Dolphin Gardens and Conning Towers, 360. Occupy substandard private housing (within rental allowance but have to share kitchen or bathroom with one or two other families, basement or attic apartments with excessive fuel costs during winter months, or in summer rental units without central heating and available only during September 10 to May 25 period at reasonable rent. Fuel cost often exceeds rent), 422. Living in adequate housing but located in excess of 15 miles from submarine base, 243.

Living in adequate private housing but paying rents at least 15 percent above rental allowance, 1,654.

Net deficit of inadequate housing, 2,679.

This is the deficit before assignment of 1,150 families of the FBM squadron who desire housing. In addition, 800 men have families who reside beyond 100 miles of New London and have elected not to move their families because of the excessive costs to maintain a household there. On the brighter side there are some 2,059 military families who have been able to rent adequate housing from private sources in New London at a fee within 15 percent of the military rental allowance. The Housing Office since August 1960 has rented 460 units of private housing and reports only 76 units available which have been inspected to meet minimal standards and remain in the bracket of military rental allowances. On February 15, 1961, the waiting list was 840.

When Capehart housing was approved for New London, the Navy, by law, had to take over the title VIII housing, Dolphin Gardens, and convert it to public quarters. Best estimates point to rehabilitation of the Dolphin Garden units, 400 in number, being completed about September 1, 1961. Currently 138 units have been completed and occupied. Also the first units of the Capehart first increment will be completed starting in March at the rate of about 10 units per week through September 1961.

The rate of arrival of families of crewman attached to FBM squadrons homeported in New London is as indicated:

Ship	Arrival date	Crew members	Number of families (housing requirements)
George Washington (SSBN598)	1959	220	
Patrick Henry (SSBN599)	1959	220	170
Theodore Roosevelt (SSBN600)	March 1961	220	[1] 142
Ethan Allen (SSBN608):			
Blue	January 1961	100	66
Gold	April 1961	120	66
Robert E. Lee (SSBN601)	March 1961	220	174
Abraham Lincoln (SSBN602)	May 1961	220	122
Thomas A. Edison (SSBN610):			
Blue	July 1961	100	66
Gold	October 1961	120	66
Sam Houston (SSBN609)	April 1962	220	122
John Marshall (SSBN611)	August 1962	220	122
Total			[2] 1,116

[1] 34 after school is out.
[2] 34 about July 1961.

Incident to the population growth in southeastern Connecticut, civilian housing construction has likewise lagged the population input. The local civilian employees of General Dynamics, Chas. W. Pfizer and Dow Chemical Co., have their housing problem to compound the Navy's. The News and Views of the Greater New London Chamber of Commerce (April 4, 1960) states, "A report from the State labor department shows that one out of four persons working in New London is from outside the New London labor market area.

A total of 7,500 outside residents commute to jobs in the New London area from 80 towns in Connecticut and Rhode Island. Three thousand and ten of these come from Norwich area (over 15 miles) and 3,350 from the Westerly, R.I., area (over 20 miles).

Based on the March 1960 survey, the Navy submitted a request to the Department of Defense for 800 Capehart units. This was done after a meeting with the local real estate and civic officials whereby resolutions to support the Navy request were made. The civic group was requested to assist in providing an additional 768 units to fall within the enlisted rental allowance.

The New London area needs the 200 Capehart units to be included in the fiscal year 1961 execution list and the remaining 600 units of the 800 originally programed to be reinstated in the fiscal year 1962 project. Of the 800 originally programed for fiscal year 1962, 300 units are slated as replacement of the 300 low-cost rental units of Conning Towers (a World War II temporary Government housing development still maintained by the Navy). Experience dictates that these 300 units should not be demolished until the need for their use has subsided and the Capehart units are completed.

Military personnel assigned to units in New London area

From DD854 as of April 1960:	
On board:	
Officer	1021
E4 and above enlisted	3724
Below E4 enlisted	3232
Total	7977
One year projected:	
Officer	1077
E4 and above enlisted	4415
Below E4 enlisted	3194
Total	8686
Two years projected:	
Officer	1225
E4 and above enlisted	4978
Below E4 enlisted	3201
Total	9404
Current as of February 15, 1961:	
On board:	
Officer	1102
E4 and above enlisted	4564
Below E4 enlisted	3362
Total	9028
One year projected:	
Officer	1150
E4 and above enlisted	5043
Below E4 enlisted	3580
Total	9773
Two years projected:	
Officer	1235
E4 and above enlisted	5578
Below E4 enlisted	3252
Total	10,065

Mr. BUSH. I ask this because that additional memorandum, while it was prepared for Capehart housing, nevertheless outlines even more clearly than the previous one the crying need for these additional units at New London, Conn.

Without wishing to prolong the debate, and in conclusion, I say that this is a very pressing situation. I have great reluctance in asking to increase the authorization bill by $10 million, because I am in sympathy with the general objective of the committee, of which I am a member, in delaying the Capehart program for a while, until we can see whether we can get it back on the track and cut out some of the nonsense connected with the costly procedures of the kind we experienced in California. I am in general sympathy with that endeavor. I do not like to increase the authorization for an appropriation in the face of a budget which is already in prospective deficit by about $4 billion next fiscal year, on top of a billion dollar deficit this year. Therefore, I say I am doing this with reluctance. I would not do it unless I very greatly feared the effect this cutback will have on the whole submarine program and the training of the men.

After all, the families of these men must have housing on the station. The situation, at the rate the men are coming in and are expected to come in during the years immediately ahead, will be intolerable, unless we get approximately the amount of housing that is contained in the House bill. I beg my great leader and my good friend the Senator from Georgia to accept the

amendment. I throw myself on his mercy.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not a question of mercy, so much as it is a question of justice. There is a great need in New London for additional housing. There is a great need for additional housing at a number of other stations. In some cases it is just as great as at New London. New London has fared pretty well. Of a total of 1,500 housing units in the bill, New London gets 200. In addition, there are 500 units in the bill which can be allocated at the discretion of the Department of Defense. If the need is greater in New London than anywhere else, the Secretary of Defense can allocate some additional housing units there. I do not believe we would be justified in appropriating $13 million for military housing at New London, Conn., when we weigh those needs against the needs of the rest of the country. I would like to be helpful to my good friend the Senator from Connecticut, who is a very hard working member of the Committee on Armed Services, but I would not be justified in accepting the amendment which he offers. I will have to ask the Senate to vote against the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. I am sorry to get that message from the Senator from Georgia. His experience in these matters, of course, is vast, and we all respect him for it. I have the strong feeling that this is a very unusual situation. I had hoped that the Senator would be willing to take the amendment to conference, where I am sure he would find the Members of the House very sympathetic toward it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House bill contains 800 units for New London. The subject will be in conference, and I am sure the members of the conference committee will bear in mind what the Senator from Connecticut has said. However, I do not believe that we would be justified in accepting an amendment of this size.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for those assurances.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I propose, following the disposition of the Senator's amendment, to submit an amendment to restore the Capehart housing, as provided in the House bill, which will include an 800-unit authorization for the submarine base at New London, Conn. It will restore the pattern of housing which has been in effect since 1935, and which originated under the chairmanship of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], when he was chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for that information. It give me no comfort, however, because I feel that the committee has probably acted wisely in deferring the Capehart housing program until we get to the bottom of some of our problems which have developed in connection with it. So I am afraid the Senator only poses a dilemma for me, rather than giving me any comfort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 68, line 10, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$3,300,000," and insert in lieu thereof "$13,300,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to ask the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] about the Airmunitions Surveillance Facility at Hill Air Force Range in Utah. Authorization for this facility was included in the bill by the House but taken out by the Senate committee. I hope I am correct in understanding that the Senate committee will be willing to consider again its position when it meets with the House on this matter in conference.

The facilities requested for the Hill Air Force Range will enable the Air Force Logistics Command to continue its airmunitions surveillance program on the larger and newer solid propellant rocket engines. The program includes environmental simulation, radiographic, ultrasonic, pressure leakage, laboratory analysis, and ultimate destruct testing of solid propellants. The proposal does not establish a new test center and does not duplicate existing facilities.

The objectives of the surveillance program are totally at variance with research and development testing procedures. The difference in test objectives dictates the need for different equipment and personnel of different skills. Surveillance testing has long been recognized as a proper Air Force Logistics Command function. It is further recognized that this project is better related to Hill Air Force Base because of personnel, equipment, and function.

The need for this facility is dictated by safety criteria. Engines in excess of 50 pounds can no longer be destruct tested on Hill Air Force Base. Weapon systems affected are Minuteman, Skybolt, Bomarc B, Bull Pup, Hound Dog, Genie, and Falcon.

The economic benefits of the surveillance program over the past 5 years are significant. The program has already saved the taxpayers over 140 million dollars by extending the shelf life of propellant engines. It is expected that even greater savings will accrue on the larger and more costly solid propellant engines. As an example, if the shelf life of the Minuteman can be extended as little as 2 months, the cost of the Hill Air Force Range will be more than paid for.

Immediate approval of this project is required if the Air Force is to continue to assure the performance, reliability, and serviceability of Air Force explosives and solid propellants. Without this facility, the Air Force has no capability to evaluate the products of industry nor a yardstick against which it can measure the status of solid propellant weapon systems on these larger and newer weapon systems.

I ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to consider this subject in conference. I shall not propose an amendment at this time, but merely wish to make this request to the chairman.

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator from Utah had discussed the perplexing question the committee had before it, whether we were justified in proceeding to establish this very large research center at Hill Air Force Range in Utah. If it is to be established, that is the proper place for it. It undoubtedly has all the natural advantages one could ask for in connection with research in this type of development work on missiles. The committee decided, in view of such a large anticipated expenditure, because the first appropriation is only a small part of it—it will cost vast sums of money to complete the project once it is inaugurated—that we would like to take another look at it. That feeling was accentuated by the fact that the Department of the Air Force, in the recent reorganization of the Air Material Command and ARDC has shifted these agencies around.

Prior to that time the work at Edwards Air Force Base was under one agency of the Air Force, and that at Hill Air Force Range was under another agency. I believe I am correct, that under the new organizational structure, the work at these two facilities would come under the same command.

That led the committee to indulge the hope, which more often than not proved futile in the end, that a system might be devised to save large sums of money by doing both jobs at Edwards Air Force Base. However, the Air Force says that is not practicable. We shall have to give further consideration to the whole subject in conference, to determine whether it is wise to carry this work over for 1 year.

I assure the Senator from Utah that the conferees appreciate receiving this information and will consider it during the course of our negotiations with the other body.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed without reading.

There being no objection, the amendment to the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 67, between lines 21 and 22 in the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

"SEC. 107. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 250 units.
"Fort Benning, Georgia, 500 units.
"Fort Stewart, Georgia, 160 units.
"Fort Sam Houston, Texas, 200 units.
"Camp Irwin, California, 240 units.
"Fort Meyer, Virginia, 525 units.
"Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado, 40 units.
"Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, 34 units.
"Sharpe General Depot, California, 50 units.

"OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"Canal Zone, Atlantic side, 200 units.
"Canal Zone, Pacific side, 500 units."

On page 75, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 206. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina, 500 units.

"Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

"Naval Facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Delaware, 30 units.

"Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, 500 units.

"Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 800 units.

"Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia, 600 units.

"Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, 400 units.

"Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, 30 units."

On page 88, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"SEC. 307. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 135 units.

"Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, 300 units.

"Lawrence G. Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 200 units.

"Hill Air Force Base, Utah, 380 units."

On page 88, beginning with line 16, strike out all down through line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 401. Section 803 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *'And provided further,* That no more mortgages shall be insured under this title after October 1, 1962, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date, and not more than thirty-seven thousand family housing units shall be contracted for after June 30, 1959, pursuant to any mortgage insured under section 803 of this title after such date.'"

On page 89, line 22, strike out "III, and IV" and insert in lieu thereof "and III".

On page 90, strike out line 11.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this amendment would restore the House provisions on Capehart housing. These provisions are summarized in the report of the House Committee on Armed Services, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. New Capehart housing:

The committee increased the number of authorized new Capehart housing units which could be initiated by the departments from the 2,025 units requested in H.R. 2743 to a total of 7,074 new units.

This change was initiated by the committee after it had learned that the individual service departments had originally requested more than 22,000 additional Capehart units for inclusion in this bill. This figure was then drastically reduced by the Department of Defense to 7,074 units. However, the Bureau of the Budget, for reasons not evident to the committee, required a further reduction to 2,025 units.

Department of Defense and various service witnesses all testified that the 7,074 figure represented the absolute minimum number of new Capehart units that would be required to meet new high-priority housing needs.

Under these circumstances and in view of the great deficiency in military housing assets, the committee unanimously approved the higher authorization for Capehart housing.

2. Ceiling on Capehart units:

The committee increased the ceiling on the total number of Capehart units that could be built by the departments from the present ceiling of 25,000 to a new ceiling of 37,000.

The departments pointed out that under the present ceiling contained in the last proviso of section 803(a) of the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 635), as amended, the services are prohibited from contracting for more than 25,000 units after June 30, 1959. However, Congress has, to date, authorized the construction of 35,061 units subsequent to June 30, 1959. The net result, therefore, is an inability of the departments to execute the total program actually authorized. To date 5,160 units have been deferred because of this ceiling. Therefore, the committee agreed to raise the ceiling a total of 12,000 units to accommodate the 5,160 deferred units previously authorized and also to accommodate the 7,074 additional new units contained in this bill.

(3) Capehart authority continued:

The committee, extended, as originally requested by the departments, until October 1, 1962, the termination date for the Capehart program as contained in the National Housing Act, as amended. The present termination date is October 1, 1961. The committee supports a continuation of the Capehart program since it has proven to be an excellent mechanism for the development of new housing for military families.

* * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

TABLE 5.—*Family housing*

	June 30, 1960			June 30, 1961			June 30, 1962		
	Total	United States	Overseas	Total	United States	Overseas	Total	United States	Overseas
Estimated total requirements [1]	930,772	735,748	195,024	920,937	765,965	154,972	871,954	765,965	105,989
Total assets	643,638	519,657	123,981	644,926	522,958	121,968	635,085	520,264	114,821
Military owned or controlled, total	415,420	311,616	103,804	409,950	308,327	101,623	407,320	305,633	101,687
In being or under construction, total	(385,425)	(284,324)	(101,101)	(396,089)	(296,096)	(99,993)	(400,937)	(300,790)	(100,147)
Adequate housing, total	313,864	221,578	92,286	332,458	240,504	91,954	341,824	249,374	92,450
Public quarters [2]	125,576	48,859	72,717	122,536	50,639	71,897	123,095	50,829	72,266
Wherry:									
Military acquired and operated [3]	62,409	61,414	995	69,504	68,272	1,232	72,916	71,684	1,232
Privately operated	19,954	19,643	311	12,437	12,363	74	8,632	8,558	74
Capehart Act	89,266	86,990	2,276	106,018	103,492	2,526	115,091	112,565	2,526
Rental guarantee	5,590		5,590	5,620		5,620	5,620		5,620
Surplus Commodity	9,298		9,298	9,982		9,982	10,109		10,109
Other (leased)	5,771	4,672	1,099	6,361	5,738	623	6,361	5,738	623
Substandard housing, total	71,561	62,746	8,815	63,631	55,592	8,039	59,113	51,416	7,697
Public quarters	15,655	12,443	3,212	14,563	11,401	3,162	13,705	10,685	3,020
Other (Lanham Act, title III, trailers, etc.)	55,906	50,303	5,603	49,068	44,191	4,877	45,408	40,731	4,677
Funded or programed but not under construction, total [4]	(29,995)	(27,292)	(2,703)	(13,861)	(12,231)	(1,630)	(6,383)	(4,843)	(1,540)
Public quarters [5]	2,055	443	1,612	1,439	36	1,403	1,761	221	1,540
Capehart Act [6]	26,033	25,783	250	12,195	12,195		4,622	4,622	
Rental guarantee	30		30						
Surplus Commodity	811		811	227		227			
Other (leased)	1,066	1,066							
Available from community sources (adequate housing)	228,218	208,041	20,177	234,976	214,631	20,345	227,765	214,631	13,134
Estimated net requirements:									
Utilizing substandard housing	287,134	216,091	71,043	276,011	243,007	33,004	236,869	245,701	−8,832
Including replacement of substandard housing	358,695	278,837	79,858	339,642	298,599	41,043	295,982	297,117	−1,135

[1] Requirements for military personnel who receive quarters allowance under permanent legislation (officers and enlisted men in grade E–7, E–6, and E–5; and in E–4 with 7 or more years of service) and key civilians. Does not include attaché, rotational and student personnel, etc. Requirements for 1961 and 1962 reflect reduction due to new oversea "dependents" policy calculated on the basis of all exceptions made by the Secretary of Defense through Jan. 25, 1961.

[2] Substandard quarters in process of rehabilitation under Public Law 85–241, sec. 407, are reported under this category.

[3] Data reflects elimination of units through conversion (for example, consolidation of 2 single bedroom units into a multiple bedroom unit).

[4] Data shown for June 30, 1962, are based upon a preliminary review by OSD of proposed service programs and are subject to change.

[5] Substandard units programed for rehabilitation under Public Law 85–241, sec. 407, are reported under this category.

[6] Includes 4,467 units which may not be built because of the last proviso of sec. 803(a) of the National Housing Act as amended.

NOTE.—United States includes the 50 States and District of Columbia.

MILITARY HOUSING

H.R. 5000 contains authorization for the construction of 7,074 Capehart housing units for military families. The committee on armed services is of the opinion that these additional authorizations for Capehart housing represent only a relatively modest increment of the total of new housing required by the military departments.

The table below reflects the total housing assets of the military departments as contrasted to estimated total requirements beginning June 30, 1960, and ending June 30, 1962. An inspection of these figures reveals that more than 63,000 of the housing units presently occupied by our military families are substandard and do not qualify as "adequate public quarters."

It is apparent to the committee that no significant reduction in the number of "substandard housing units" will be achieved until "adequate public quarters" are made available in sufficient quantity to replace such substandard units. Consequently, the committee accepted the minimum recommendation of representatives of the Department of Defense and authorized the 7,074 units determined by the Department as essential to meet the high priority housing requirements of the individual services.

A REVIEW OF THE SOURCES OF HOUSING PREVIOUSLY MADE AVAILABLE TO THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

A. Appropriated funds construction:

There was little construction of family housing of any sort in the period immediately following World War II, partly as a result of the uncertainty of the Nation's long-range military plans, partly because of the existence of large numbers of temporary World War II housing assets. Most of the funds which Congress did appropriate in this period were used to convert these temporary rental units into adequate public quarters. In 1947, for example, Congress appropriated funds for 8,625 units for the Army, but all were either shell type structures or conversions. In 1948 the Army received no housing appropriation at all.

The passage of the Department of Defense housing bill in 1954 marked the beginning of an appropriated fund housing program of major significance. This legislation authorized 11,967 family units in fiscal year 1955, but appropriations were made for only 40 percent of the authorization. In the following year appropriations were granted for most of the unfunded portion of the fiscal year 1955 program as well as for the fiscal year 1956 authorization of 16,582 units, but construction continued to fall short of authorizations while projects were reviewed to see if they could more suitably be developed under the newly authorized title VIII (Capehart) program. In 1956 an additional 3,790 units were authorized in Public Law 84–968, making a total of 32,339 for fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957. Of these and subsequent authorizations only about 18,000 units were actually funded and built.

Appropriated fund housing, although less significant quantitatively than the Wherry or Capehart programs, has been important to the Defense Department's comprehensive plan for reducing the military housing deficit. It has proved a flexible source of new construction both in the United States and overseas, wherever any of the other special programs is impracticable. In the United States, for example, it has met the need for small projects (less than 20 units), where it is felt that a new Capehart project would not be feasible. It is useful in a few high-cost areas or in projects for senior officers.

B. The Wherry program:

As noted above, between 1948 and 1954 there was a gap in appropriated funds housing programs, which was largely filled by our first major privately financed program. This was the so-called Wherry program, authorized by Public Law 81–211, enacted August 8, 1949. This act added to the National Housing Act a new title, "Title VIII—Military Housing Insurance," created a "military housing insurance fund," authorized the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on military family housing projects, and enlarged the then existing authority of the military departments to lease land for such projects and to sell utility services to the project developers.

Wherry projects for the most part were built on Government-owned land located on or near the various installations, and outleased to the developer or sponsor for a period of 50 years (in some early cases 75 years). The sponsor undertook to organize the mortgagor corporation which actually held the lease, and to finance, build, maintain, and operate the completed units, which were made available on a rental basis to tenants designated by the local base commander. Military tenants retained their basic allowance for quarters. Normally, the units were rented unfurnished. Wherry mortgages were generally limited to $8,100 per unit, based on 90 percent of an estimated replacement cost of $9,000 per unit.

Altogether the Wherry program was successful in producing a substantial number of relatively low cost, but reasonably adequate units to meet an acute shortage. A total of 268 projects were built for the three military departments, comprising a total of 83,742 units.

C. The Capehart program:

By 1955 the Wherry construction program came to a halt. This resulted from increased construction costs, and from legislative enactments which made it impossible for prospective Wherry sponsors to mortgage out—that is, to acquire a 10 percent equity interest in projects with little or no cash investment. Since there was some doubt as to the volume of appropriated funds housing which could be actually funded, efforts were made to devise a new privately financed program without certain of the Wherry defects. Specifically, the departments sought a program under which the mortgages would cover all construction costs, and ownership of the completed projects would vest in the military departments.

Title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (Public Law 84–345, approved Aug. 11, 1955) authorized the acquisition of military family housing under an amended title VIII of the National Housing Act, the so-called Capehart program. The statute contemplated that housing projects be constructed on Government-owned property, pursuant to competitive bidding by private contractors, and financed by the proceeds of 100-percent mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

Under the Capehart program the winning bidder forms a mortgagor corporation which takes the land under a 50-year lease, and is the "owner" of the leasehold and improvements thereon. Upon completion of construction and receipt by the builder of his final payment, the capital stock of the mortgagor corporation is delivered to the sponsoring military department, which thereupon undertakes the maintenance and operation of the housing, and the amortization of the mortgage over a 25-year term. Capehart units are public quarters, occupied on the basis of forfeiture of quarters allowances, which are used to pay the principal and interest on the Capehart mortgages. The mortgages may not exceed an average of $16,500 per unit. Appropriated funds (not to exceed $1,500 per unit) are authorized to be spent for site acquisition, rough site improvements, and offsite utilities.

Of the 98,700 Capehart units completed or under contract on December 31, 1960, the average mortgage was $15,850 and the average appropriated funds expenditure was $850, for a total average unit cost of $16,700. The Defense Department has recognized that the interest charges under the Capehart program were somewhat higher than the cost of long-term direct Treasury borrowing, but as previously noted, it has felt that the size of the housing program, together with competition with priority military items for available funds, has precluded a large-scale use of direct appropriations for military family housing.

* * * * *

CONSTRUCTION DELAYS AT CAPEHART HOUSING PROJECTS

During the latter part of May 1960, work stopped on seven Capehart projects which were being constructed, for practical purposes, by the same organization.

The projects affected were the following:

	Units
Army: Fort Bliss, Tex	410
Navy: Camp Lejeune, N.C	800
Air Force:	
Beale Air Force Base No. 1, Calif	570
Beale Air Force Base No. 2, Calif	400
Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak	220
Grand Forks Air Force Base No. 1, N. Dak	744
Grand Forks Air Force Base No. 2, N. Dak	304
Total (all projects)	3,448

The work stoppage occurred as a consequence of a dispute between the prime contractor and various subcontractors and material suppliers over the amount of claims remaining to be paid.

Unfortunately, because of the nature of the contract documents and procedures, the military departments were not in a position to take direct action to cause a resumption of work on the projects. Consequently, the departments were necessarily required to observe the legal procedures involved in situations in which a builder of a FHA insured project has defaulted on his contract on Government property.

Representatives of all parties in interest have met frequently since the beginning of the work stoppage and it now appears that effective final arrangements have been made to immediately resume work on these projects.

The Department of Defense has advised the Committee on Armed Services that on Friday, February 24, 1961, authority to enter into completion contracts for the seven projects was given to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Title VIII (Capehart) housing program—Summary of program development as of Dec. 31, 1960

	Total, all services		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	Projects	Units	Projects	Units	Projects	Units	Projects	Units
Total authorized	309	116,091	112	36,385	60	19,806	137	59,900
Completed	187	71,233	77	22,819	21	5,873	89	42,541
Under construction	66	27,496	15	7,142	18	7,430	33	12,924
Bidder accepted	10	4,343	3	1,867	6	2,076	1	400
In process	46	13,019	17	4,557	15	4,427	14	4,035

In the meantime, Defense and FHA are continuing their efforts to develop changes in the Capehart procedures which will enable both agencies to act promptly in event of future defaults on Capehart projects. Changes now under consideration would enable FHA to take control much sooner following default so as to arrange for a resumption of work.

The Department of Defense has advised that it is now anticipated that the period of work stoppage, should cases of this type reoccur, can be reduced from 9 months (as in the current cases) to 6 or 8 weeks.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, for purposes of comparison, the action of the Senate Committee on Armed Services is summarized in its report. I ask unanimous consent that the summary be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAMILY HOUSING

This year, in lieu of authorizing so-called Capehart housing units requested in the bill, the committee has approved 2,000 units of appropriated fund housing at an average cost of $16,500 per unit. The locations for these units were selected by the Defense Department and are identical in number and location to the Capehart units proposed in the bill as originally submitted to the Congress, with one exception. This exception is the 525 units proposed for Fort Myer, Va., which has been dealt with earlier in this report. These 2,000 units consist of 1,500 at specific locations and 500 at locations to be designated by the Secretary of Defense or his designee. The Secretary of Defense is requested to advise the Committees on the Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives within 30 days after such allocations are made as to the service and the location.

During the past several years the Congress and the executive branch have tried several approaches to meet the housing requirements of the military. None of these, in the final analysis, have proved adequate from the standpoint of economy. Both Wherry and Capehart housing have been costly programs, although admittedly they have served a purpose. The committee believed that the time had come when serious consideration had to be given to abandoning the present approach and steps taken to meet this problem through the regular annual authorization and appropriation process. The committee is convinced that this method of providing necessary housing will be more economical and satisfactory and will save the Government substantial sums in the long run. No housing program can be successful, however, unless carefully thought out ground rules are promulgated by the Defense Establishment and realistic appraisals are made of community support before approval is granted for the construction of military housing units.

The units approved by the committee are as follows:

Department	Location	Number of units	Amount
Army	Camp Irwin, Calif.	200	$3,300,000
Navy	Naval Base, Charleston, S.C.	200	3,300,000
	Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif.	200	3,300,000
	Naval Facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Del.	30	495,000
	Naval Station, Mayport, Fla.	140	2,310,000
	Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn.	200	3,300,000
	Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, Calif.	200	3,300,000
	Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine	30	495,000
Air Force	Hill Air Force Base, Utah	300	4,950,000
Title IV	Army, Navy and Air Force	500	8,250,000
Total		2,000	33,000,000

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senate committee bill will prevent the the construction of houses previously authorized by Congress because it contains a construction ceiling lower than past authorizations. Final plans are prepared and that construction is ready to proceed at several locations. The housing units involved approach 6,000 as follows. Army, 1,734 units, located as follows: Fort Bliss, Tex., 494 units; Fort Lewis, Wash., 500 units; Fort Campbell, Ky., 400 units; Fort Sill, Okla., 350 units. For the Navy, 2,384 units, located as follows: Alameda, Calif., 900 units; Camp Pendleton, Calif., 400 units; Sugar Grove, W. Va., 142 units; Oceana, Va., 40 units; Great Lakes, Ill., 142 units; New Iberia, La., 178 units; Point Mugu, Calif., 100 units; Monterey, Calif., 100 units; Yuma, Ariz., 40 units; Memphis, Tenn., 250 units; Twentynine Palms, Calif., 50 units. For the Air Force, 1,830 units, located as follows: Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., 500 units; Truax Field, Wis., 280 units; Kincheloe Air Force Base, Mich., 190 units; Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., 200 units; Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., 260 units; Lowry Air Force Base, Colo., 200 units; Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Okla., 100 units; Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex., 100 units. These units were authorized by the Congress in the past 2 years and cannot proceed to construction because of an imposed ceiling and no increased ceiling is provided in this bill, as recommended by the administration and contained in the House bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the Senator from Oklahoma anticipates, as of the moment, that he will ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment. Not a sufficient number of Senators is present at this time, because of the press of other duties, to have the Senator's request granted. However, it will be my suggestion that the Senate convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Committee on Armed Services has scheduled a meeting at 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning to mark up the authorization bill for military procurement. If the majority leader could arrange to have the Senate meet at 12 o'clock instead of 11 o'clock, it would be a great convenience to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are trying to report bills to the Senate. The bill which we are marking up is an important bill. It involves some $12 billion in procurement of missiles, aircraft, and ships which the committee is authorizing this year for the first time in many years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Twelve o'clock will be perfectly acceptable. I am delighted to reach this agreement with the Senator from Oklahoma, because his amendment will be the pending question.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no votes tonight.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma wish his amendments to be considered en bloc?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for the consideration which he always shows to Senators.

I also wish to express my appreciation for the fine bill which the Committee on Armed Services has reported. The fact that we disagree on one point, namely, how best to provide military housing, whether through direct appropriations or as Capehart housing, is a question which the Senate should decide in its own right, rather than to leave it to the conference. Otherwise, I think the committee has performed excellent service in reporting this fine bill. Moreover, I appreciate the understanding of the committee in providing for the vital needs of Oklahoma.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his complimentary words. We will let the Senate pass on this issue.

If the Senate wishes to continue Capehart housing, it will have an opportunity to say so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as one who has listened to the hearings on military housing authorizations for several years, I suggest to the Senate that I do not recall any year when I believe more complete hearings have been held than in this year. The 989 pages which constitute the hearings portion of the transcript comprise only a portion of the total record which was taken. Many projects were of a classified nature, and much time was devoted to them.

I make this statement with the intent of paying tribute to the splendid leadership given by the two ranking members of the Committee on Armed Services; namely, the chairman of the committee,

the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The hearings can, of course, speak for themselves, with the exception of the testimony which was taken concerning classified items. However, it seemed to me that very thorough hearings were conducted in all respects. At least, the hearings were complete so far as any interest was evidenced on any particular project. The chairman and the staff cooperated in the presentation of questions which brought out facts about many projects which ordinarily are not brought into the testimony which is recorded and printed.

I desired to make this statement because of my belief that excellent work was done by the two ranking members of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am exceedingly grateful to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his complimentary statement. It is not mere mutual back slapping when I say I consider that "praise from Sir Hubert is praise indeed." No member of the Committee on Armed Services is more diligent in following through a line of thought which he believes will enlighten the Senate than the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I join with the Senator from Georgia in expressing my thanks to the Senator from South Dakota, and I also join with the Senator from Georgia in saying that no Senator is more conscientious in making certain that every detail of so comprehensive a bill as this is worked out correctly.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, S. 1215 will be brought up for discussion tomorrow. Because I shall be absent from the Senate tomorrow on official business, I should like to discuss Senate bill 1215 tonight.

The bill proposes important and far-reaching amendments to the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, known as the Battle Act.

One amendment grants authority to the President to extend economic and financial aid to certain Communist countries even though these countries export armaments or strategic materials to the U.S.S.R. or to U.S.S.R.-dominated countries. The only remaining Communist countries to which the President still could not extend aid would be in Soviet Union and Communist-held areas of the Far East.

Further, S. 1215 permits the President to furnish assistance to a country which does not effectively cooperate with nor furnish sufficient information to the United States as required by section 203 of existing law so that we may determine whether that nation is cooperating.

Still another change proposed in S. 1215 would allow the Administrator of the act, instead of the President, to continue aid to a recipient country even though that country knowingly permits shipment of items of primary strategic significance to Communist-bloc countries. The only restriction imposed is that the President must first determine that such aid is important to the security of the United States.

All of these Battle Act amendments were requested by President Kennedy, who, while serving in this body, sponsored similar amendments. In 1958, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee adopted the Kennedy amendment; but on a rollcall vote of the entire Senate, the amendment was defeated, 43 to 42.

The following year, 1959, the Senate approved these Battle Act amendments by a vote of 49 yeas to 40 nays. The Senate-passed bill lay before the House for a year, but that body took no action on it.

Now, for the third time, these far-reaching Battle Act amendments are before the Senate.

It is not easy for a comparative newcomer like myself to take a stand contrary to that taken by the President of the United States, and contrary to that taken by the chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee, including my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who cosponsored this bill. This is a matter of judgment on which honest men disagree. Past history shows the Senate has been closely divided on this issue.

For my part, I am strongly opposed to this bill, because I believe that any aid given to any Communist country can only advance the Communist drive toward world domination.

By definition, all Communists are the mortal enemies of freemen. Would not it be wiser to confine our aid to our friends and allies who are resisting communism?

Since 1951, Federal law very wisely has placed an embargo on U.S. shipments of armaments and strategic materials to any nation or bloc of nations threatening America's security. On the embargo list are arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

The Battle Act specifically bars U.S. exports of these items to the Soviet Union and all countries under its domination. It also prohibits our Government from giving military, economic, or financial aid to any country which ships to Communist nations any item in the United States embargo list.

There is one loophole, however. The law gives to the President discretion to continue U.S. aid to such a country, provided he makes a finding that cessation of aid would be detrimental to America's security.

At present, two Communist countries receive U.S. economic aid: Yugoslavia and Poland. Because our Government does not regard Communist Yugoslavia as "Soviet-dominated," the Battle Act prohibitions are deemed not to apply to Yugoslavia.

Although Communist Poland exports to the Soviet Union items that would disqualify her by the Battle Act for aid, our Government has extended aid to Poland under a provision of the Mutual Security Act which permits the President to waive the Battle Act. There is, however, a ceiling of $30 million on mutual security funds that may go to Poland under this provision.

Under still another U.S. law, Public Law 480, Poland has been permitted to use Polish currency to buy American surplus farm commodities. Such transactions are regarded as sales, rather than as economic assistance. Therefore, it is held that such transactions do not violate the Battle Act. But the use of these Polish currencies, which have accumulated over the years, is restricted by the Battle Act. Senate bill 1215, as requested by President Kennedy, would permit these Polish funds to be used for projects in Poland—a form of assistance now prohibited by law.

The Battle Act also prevents loans to Poland under the Export-Import Bank Act and other acts which make U.S. aid available to foreign nations. The effect of the Battle Act changes proposed by President Kennedy would be to permit him to use any authority under any U.S. economic or financial aid statute to dispense such aid to Poland, despite shipment of war items to the Soviet Union.

I have been advised that, under the language of S. 1215, U.S. economic and financial aid could legally go to Czechoslovakia—a Communist country now supplying military equipment to Fidel Castro, in Cuba.

In the past, the rationale advanced for aid to Communist Yugoslavia and Communist Poland is that our assistance would encourage so-called national communism in those countries. Admittedly a calculated gamble, assistance has been urged in the hope those governments would assert independence from the U.S.S.R., and thereby crack the solid wall of the Soviet bloc.

Experience has amply demonstrated that the concept of national communism is sheer fiction. As long ago as 1957, both the Communist Party of Poland and Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia publicly proclaimed there is no such thing as national communism. Their subsequent actions bear out their denials.

We have had 4 years of experience with Communist Poland under this theory.

We have had 11 years of experience with Communist Yugoslavia under this theory.

The time has come for honest, realistic appraisal of our policies which permit American tax dollars to go to the Communist governments—which by definition seek to topple all free governments and replace them with Communist regimes.

The theory has been tried—11 years with Yugoslavia and 4 years with Poland—and has been proved fallacious. It has not worked.

Since the Poznan riots of 1956, the United States has furnished more than $360 million in aid to Poland. Yet Mr. Gomulka remains a faithful servant of Premier Khrushchev, and his regime has

steadily retracted most of the concessions wrung from him by the Polish rioters.

Since 1956, Communist Poland has consistently voted with the Soviet bloc in the United Nations. Last November, Poland signed the Communist Party manifesto, after the big conclave in Moscow, reaffirming with Communists of 80 other countries their determination to rule the world. Where is the evidence that Poland is independent of Moscow? I fail to find it.

Only yesterday it was publicly disclosed that Poland has loaned $13 million—without interest—to Cuba, as part of the $245 million in aid extended to Fidel Castro by the Communist bloc.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of a news item which appeared yesterday in the Washington Post. The headline of the article is "Red-Bloc Aid to Havana Now Totals $245 Million." From reading the article, we learn that $13 million was loaned by Poland to Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1961]

RED-BLOC AID TO HAVANA NOW TOTALS $245 MILLION

(By George Bryant)

HAVANA.—Cuba has received $245 million in loans from Communist lands since Fidel Castro came to power.

That figure was revealed recently by Ernesto (Che) Guevara, Minister of Industrialization and one of the brains of the revolution.

Cuba, he said, could not have survived without that help.

Speaking at an interview with 100 newsmen—mainly from Latin America and the world's leftwing press—he listed some of the contributions: Russia, $100 million; China, $70 million; Czechoslovakia, $40 million; Poland, $13 million; East Germany, $10 million; Hungary, $7 million; and Bulgaria, $5 million.

Other points made by Guevara:

Cuba had been "forced to accept and even ask" help from the Communist lands by the U.S. economic blockade.

The recent invasion was "militarily sound. In any such future action, Cuban troops will take no prisoners."

Guevara, in the first detailed statement of Communist-Cuba relations, said interest on these loans was mainly 2 percent. China's loan was singular in that no interest was charged.

Communist nations, he added, also help in other ways. Among other things, Russia buys sugar and tobacco, sells Cuba oil and is developing nickel and copper production here. China assists with technicians.

Since taking power, he said, the revolutionary government has spent $200 million on agriculture, $195 million on industry and $125 million on the fight against illiteracy.

"That is very good work," he added, "when you consider that when the revolutionary government took power the national bank had reserves of only $20 million and $70 million in dividends. Its debts were greater than that and more than $50 million had been stolen by the brother of a former president."

Industries in this country, he said, are 82 percent nationalized. Banks are 100 percent government-owned and the land 50 percent. The produce of the other 50 percent is bought by the government. The government has a monopoly on imports.

The greatest change taking place now is the mass movement of farmers to cooperatives, he said. There is, however, no thought of nationalizing small shops and businesses until "the future."

Guevara said the counter-revolutionary invasion of 2 weeks ago was militarily sound. Not many people would be needed to take Cuba, he said, if the population of the country supported them. In this instance they did not have that support.

Asked about guerrilla movements in other Latin American countries, the author of a book on hit-and-run fighting said he had no wish to interfere in the affairs of other nations. But, he said, most other Latin American countries had better conditions for guerrilla warfare than Cuba, which is mainly flat, with only three small mountain ranges.

The social conditions in a number of countries, he said, were similar to those in Cuba before the revolution and guerrilla bands might operate. However, he warned, such guerrillas would need patience, and above all the support of the populace before they would have any hope of success. He refused to be drawn into discussions on any particular country.

He said he believed there would be another attack on Cuba but not a direct one by the United States because Cuba had been promised help by Russia. The United States "will have to think twice before attacking."

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, if Poland can lend Communist Cuba $13 million, why should we extend aid to Poland? Does it make sense to help Poland, so that she can help Cuba build herself into a strategic Communist beachhead against us?

Since Marshal Tito's break with Stalin in 1948, the United States has furnished nearly $1½ billion in economic aid and $700 million in military aid to Communist Yugoslavia. Yet Tito openly sides with America's opponents in the United Nations, and has joined in Communist propaganda attacks on U.S. policy. On the rare occasions when Tito parts company with the Soviet bloc, seldom does he join the free world. He merely selects another plan to further Communist goals.

In appraising the results of America's generous aid to Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia, what do we find? Are the present Polish and Yugoslav governments on our side regarding the Congo? Are they on our side regarding Laos? Are they on our side regarding Cuba? The answers are clearly, "No."

Regardless of whether Communists are Polish Communists, Czech Communists, Soviet Communists, Chinese Communists, Yugoslav Communists, or Cuban Communists, their goal is identical. Premier Khrushchev has warned those who fancy that the Communists may abandon these goals; he has said, "You may as well wait until the shrimp learns to whistle."

The Communists have already gobbled up Eastern Europe and mainland China, North Korea, Tibet, and Cuba; and now they are on the march in Laos and in South Vietnam. So that they may sustain their secret and open aggressions against other nations, Communist rulers go to any extreme, even to starving their own people. It is futile to cling to the hope that our economic and financial aid would go to help the needy people of lands where the Communists have an iron grip on the people. Our aid would only further entrench the Red rulers.

Despite the hard, harsh facts of actual experience, it is still contended that we should continue aid to Communist Yugoslavia and Communist Poland, and remove Battle Act restrictions on economic aid to Communist countries outside Soviet Russia and the Communist-held areas of the Far East.

The Senate first considered these Battle Act amendments on June 5, 1958. Since I was not at that time a Member of the Senate, I reviewed the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD debate. The then minority leader, Senator Knowland, of California, delivered some very telling arguments against these amendments. These arguments are still valid today, and they merit repetition. Senator Knowland pointed out that as we help to relieve the famine and economic pinch in these Communist countries, here is what happens:

Life becomes more tolerable for the people. They are less rebellious, and the pressures on the local Communist rulers decline.

This in turn means less hardship on Soviet Russia itself to keep her empire intact.

Thanks to American dollars, communism then appears to be a workable system.

As long as satellite states remain economically satisfactory, politically stable, and even remotely tolerable, the chances of open rebellion are slim. The strength of the Communist rulers is correspondingly greater.

Without outside help, the Communist rulers could not meet the minimum needs of their people. More stringent measures would be needed to increase production, including longer hours for workers.

Dissatisfaction among the millions who would work harder and get less would increase. This would build up pressures on the rulers. There would be fear of uprisings. Strong-arm tactics would intensify, and this would further arouse the people.

Restless satellites would force greater hardships on Soviet Russia proper and further weaken the economic base of the entire Russian imperialist system.

Moscow might be forced to part with consumer goods—always scarce in Russia—and this would be unpopular with the Russian people.

It would require more direct Russian intervention in the local affairs of the satellites. This in turn would create more friction and unrest.

The propaganda value to the West of such dissatisfaction within the satellites would be immeasurable in our ideological struggle with uncommitted or neutral nations. With the gross failures and inhuman brutalities of the Communist bosses thus exposed, as it was in Hungary, there would be less orientation toward Russia by the neutral nations.

Senator Knowland pointed out:

What is far more likely to happen if we continue this calculated risk of aid to Communist nations is a powerful commonwealth of Communist nations acting in concert.

Such a prospect poses a greater menace to the United States than restless satellites in a far-flung Russian empire which can only be kept in line by the might of the Russian Army.

By aiding the satellite countries, we play into the hands of the Soviets: We enable her to keep many of her own troops at home, thereby lessening possibilities of disillusionment and defection in the Russian Army itself, something greatly feared by the men

in the Kremlin * * *. We lend credibility to Russian propaganda which claims the Communist satellite governments are not directed from Moscow.

Like Senator Knowland, I am opposed to the United States giving aid to Communist-dominated countries. To give succor and sustenance to governments who publicly proclaim their undying enmity of all that is free is like supplying them with arms to destroy us. To paraphrase it in the vernacular, we are deliberately cutting our own throats.

Mr. President, experience is a great teacher. But, unless we are apt pupils, we will not profit by our experience. The lessons of recent history regarding American aid to Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia are to me clear and inescapable: these policies are not weaning them away from the Communist bloc—these policies have not changed in one iota their hatred for us. They still say they will destroy us.

I therefore urge my colleagues to reject Senate bill 1215.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Paul R. Ignatius, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

William L. Batt, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Area Revelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce.

U.S. MARSHAL

R. Ben Hosler, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years, vice Xavier North, deceased.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain, USAF (Chaplain)

Edwin H. Braly, AO2077018.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Charles K. Beyer, AO3077930.
James B. Harris, AO3075197.
Leonard R. Howard, AO3078916.
Norbert J. Weikers, AO3088634.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Paul F. Kiecker, AO699074.
Jerome B. Marshall, Jr., AO3043035.

To be captains, USAF (Veterinary)

John W. Cable, AO2248328.
Keith L. Kraner, AO2247722.

To be captains, USAF (Nurse)

Irmina T. Burkhardt, AN2214437.
Otill A. Chaszar, AN2214259.
Lillian T. Howard, AN1912851.
Billye Masten, AN804188.
Johnena K. Moore, AN2241998.
Joan R. Powers, AN2244131.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Dennis D. Barber, AO3090415.
William R. Bullock, Jr., AO3088638.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Quentin T. Barrett, AO3047948.
Domenic A. Maio, AO3079311.
Edward F. Schenkel, AO3001499.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Geraldine M. Bendickson, AN3091758.
Helen A. Boggess, AN3045725.
Norene E. Cowling, AN3089329.
Mary A. Del Moro, AN3091315.
Mary B. Greene, AN2243364.
Ellen M. B. Kernan, AN3091793.
Joy A. Lane, AN3078616.
Maye L. Liebeck, AN3091565.
Nina P. McMichael, AN2243128.
Monna L. Mumper, AN3045700.
Estella J. Nicholson, AN3088717.
Joan A. Sumner, AN3089939.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (medical specialist)

Donna J. Oldenburg, AJ3075491.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major

Douglas S. Christie, Jr., AO682797.

To be captains

Harold B. Burton, AO3026441.
Eleas Casillas, AO3026338.
George A. Dodds, AO3019311.
Thomas R. Hataway, AO3019795.
Donald E. Majors, AO3018727.
Marvin C. Mayfield, AO3025985.
Roland McCabe, AO3025916.
Donald F. Mead, AO3017833.
James R. Mitchell, Jr., AO3025800.
Robert G. Morrison, AO3025860.
Robert F. O'Rourke, AO3025849.
Maurice E. Quirke, AO1859937.
Wayne E. Robinson, AO1855288.
Robert D. Sidwell, AO3019600.
John H. Slevin, AO3019580.
Rolland C. Smiley, AO3016951.
Rudolph J. Stanislav, AO3016049.
Ray B. Sutton, Jr., AO3015222.
Jack B. Titus, AO3019221.
Robert J. Troxell, AO3019938.
Walter J. Turner, AO3019603.
William E. Underwood III, AO3018941.
Rinaldo F. Vachino, AO3014562.
Dawson N. White, AO3016999.
Frank H. Zander, AO3019826.

To be first lieutenants

Gerald L. Allen, AO3073909.
Frederick S. Battey, AO3087770.
Billy M. Bowen, AO3073895.
James M. Boyer, AO3085632.
Arnold W. Brock, AO3072109.
Robert W. Caldwell, Jr., AO3053384.
William A. Carlton, AO3074242.
Thomas A. Childers, AO1908017.
William A. Christians, AO3087814.
Ervin A. Cogdell, AO3085059.
David W. Cox, AO3082550.
Richard D. Daigle, AO3072831.
Howard A. Dean, AO3085064.
Richard T. Dixon, AO3085216.
Ernest C. Dodson, AO3083309.
Robert D. Engel, AO3085208.
John W. Epperson, Jr., AO3084773.
Frederick C. Erickson, AO3051469.
Denton M. Garner, AO3083259.
Stanley A. Garriss, Jr., AO3074154.
John P. Ham, AO3072969.
Raymond E. Hamilton, AO3087918.
Robert P. Harlow, AO3074459.
Douglass R. Hoadley, AO3072253.
William H. Jackson, AO3073993.
Charles W. Jenkins, AO3072151.
Edward E. Johnson, AO3087938.
Montie R. Keller, AO3074390.
Lee R. Kershner, AO3085309.
Duane E. Knutson, AO3074178.
Erich A. Koch, AO3084501.
Bruce R. Kowol, AO3081555.
James H. LaFon, AO3073913.
Herbert E. Langford, AO3072939.
John L. Larrison, AO3083768.
Jack A. Leach, AO3083898.
Clarence W. Lee, AO3074291.
John T. Loftus, AO3074017.
Thomas J. Margle, AO3074468.
Warren K. Marler, AO3083292.
Alfonso Marquez, AO3074141.
Lawrence F. McArdle, AO3084592.
Gary B. McIntire, AO3072141.
Harlan W. Messick, AO3073885.
Bruce M. Miller, AO3054579.
Madeline A. Moore, AL3060537.
James W. Neal, AO3083950.
Harold E. Neller, AO3073894.
George E. Nelson, AO3085240.
Benard M. Novak, AO3072996.
Donald A. O'Nesky, AO3082641.
Robert T. Otto, AO3073874.
Robert H. Parker, AO3074551.
Jose A. Parodi, AO3082984.
Parker C. Peedin, AO3073887.
Barton J. Pfautz, AO3086210.
William N. Pierce, Jr., AO3084625.
James L. Pruitt, AO3074312.
Robert A. Resuali, AO3073859.
David G. Sanborn, AO3085104.
Don E. Sanders, AO3074478.
Galen E. Savage, AO3073868.
Stanley O. Schaetzle, AO3074195.
William L. Schrader, Sr., AO3070512.
Robert M. Schverak, AO3074317.
Phillip W. Shields, AO3085197.
Fred D. Smith, AO3082942.
Howard J. Steen, AO3084573.
Donald E. Straley, AO3074590.
O. L. Taylor, AO3101007.
Ottis F. Teuton, Jr., AO3084067.
Raymond D. Thomas, AO3093022.
John D. Thomson, AO3083569.
Charles H. Weidman, Jr., AO3085637.
Henry H. Woolard, Jr., AO2215732.
Thomas J. Zimmerman, AO3085124.

To be second lieutenants

Distinguished Aviation Cadet Graduates

Richard L. Byerly, AO3116211.
Theodore J. Conrad, AO3116103.
James B. Lawhon, AO3116283.
William L. Nellans, AO3116295.
Alan M. Uliss, AO3104006.
Arnold M. Visnick, AO3116199.

Distinguished Officer Candidate Graduate

Wayne E. Mabrey, AO3115375.

Distinguished Officer Training School Graduates

Samuel J. Cox, AO3115685.
Spencer C. Frost III, AO3115614.
Jerome A. Michel, AO3115723.
Thomas E. Rodgers, AO3115736.
Edward J. Songy, AO3115746.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

John J. Beck, Jr.	Howard R. McClain
Richard B. Curtin	Michael J. Morea
Kenneth A. Gale	Jack D. Morris
George H. Labovitz	

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299.

To be lieutenant colonel

Hancock, William F., O45013.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

Audet, Harold H., O85124.
Bradley, John L., O56869.
Chapman, Ralph R., O43217.
Martin, George W., O43210.
Schoepflin, Adolphe J., O43207.

To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps

Blanchard, George, O31269.
DiJoseph, Benjamin J., O88657.
Keeton, Melvin, O78077.
Kruszewski, Edward P., O78594.

To be lieutenant colonels, Veterinary Corps

Burns, Kenneth F., O31210.
Davies, Frank J., O40126.
Faust, Herbert R., O52036.
Gochenour, William S., Jr., O31211.
Miller, Everett B., O40132.
Reid, Joseph E., O31237.
Ross, Martin A., O31224.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps

Alexander, Eugene S., O37488.
Allen, James F., O49955.
Arnold, Ralph D., O49947.
Barnett, Herbert C., O56236.
Barney, Leonard C., O37487.
Beaudry, Stephen J., O37503.
Breyfogle, William V., O37534.
Britt, Arthur E., O37551.
Brown, John A., O49963.
Buchanan, Dee C., O37509.
Buckler, Phillip J., O37564.
Butler, Jesse N., O26983.
Caito, Thomas P., O37478.
Clegg, William J., Jr., O37542.
Coleman, Tyler S., O84821.
Collier, George T., O30898.
Conrad, George F., O37473.
Creamer, Raymond J., O37472.
DeGraff, George J., O49935.
Dempsey, Richard W., O37529.
Edwards, Thomas R., O37499.
Egense, Stanley W., Jr., O37475.
Flatter, Findlay F., O49941.
Funston, Howard J., O41136.
Gaines, Sidney, O39344.
Gans, Harry L., O37536.
Gelby, Walter H., O37560.
Gibson, Wilmot L., O37562.
Godwin, Frank D., O37525.
Gray, John T., O37480.
Greer, Richard S., O39343.
Grindell, James D., O37515.
Grow, George L., O37573.
Hallahan, John M., O37479.
Hammaker, Bernard W., O37492.
Handorf, William G., O49954.
Hill, Harold E., O41142.
Holt, John W., O41154.
Hooker, Claude L., O37482.
Howard, Kenneth G., O87550
Huffman, James V., O37507.
Jewell, Dean M., O49924.
Keegan, Hugh L., O49928.
Kowalsky, Matthew J., O37496.
LaManche, Philip L., O37501.
Maher, Dale R., O37559.
Martin, Edward J., O41143.
Mikuluk, John A., O81867.
Nashold, Donald K., O37500.
Newton, Arthur, O83551.
Plemmons, Sam A., O37517.
Powell, Harry C., O39336.
Richards, Ralph J., Jr., O37485.
Rivenbark, R. V., O49956.
Robbins, Walter F., O56939.
Rockstroh, Henry J., O56942.
Saling, James T., O37553.
Sandman, Otto H., Jr., O37476.
Swall, Ross F., O37511.
Thomas, Hughie C., O37462.
Thompson, Jerry V., O37451.
Thompson, Willard E., O37495.
Van Sickle, Floyd E., Jr., O41145.
Watts, Foster L., O37569.

To be majors

Aaron, Jerome, O89901.
Abelson, Albert N., O57434.
Abt, Alan B., O60323.
Accorti, Peter J., O84448.
Achee, Sidney W., O60583.
Acheson, Leonard D., Jr., O84932.
Acker, Ivan B., O60474.
Acuff, Earl C., O60178.
Adams, Howard E., O57244.
Adams, Robert E., O78690.
Adams, Robert F., O78691.
Adcock, Robert L., O60565.
Adkins, Aaron C., O60512.
Adoue, Eugene L., O58805.
Affleck, David W., O58806.
Agee, Charles D., O78692.
Albertson, James J., O62197.
Alfonso, Albert F., O57240.
Alford, Emanuel P., Jr., O85826.
Allard, Henry G., O58808.
Allen, Donald E., O75135.
Allen, Herbert B., O60349.
Allen, Robert L., O92057.
Allen, Warren P., O62825.
Allis, John D., O60616.
Allison, William A., O60176.
Amenson, Raymond C., O80033.
Amity, Richard F., O60407.
Ammerman, Edwin F., O63841.
Anderson, Allen R., O62116.
Anderson, Burton L., O78701.
Anderson, David M., O80538.
Anderson, Philip C., O80034.
Anderson, Reuben L., Jr., O57129.
Anderson, Richard C., O58810.
Anderson, Richard L., O60567.
Anderton, Edward C., O61094.
Andres, Charles, 3d, O58811.
Andrews, James L., O58812.
Anthony, Thomas J., O58813.
Applegate, William H., O65007.
Apt, Robert, O58814.
Arendt, Morton, Jr., O65942.
Armstrong, Nemesio A., O59898.
Armstrong, William H., O87467.
Arnett, Vern R., O60369.
Arnold, Emmett R., O60396.
Arnold, Richard D., O58815.
Arnold, Richard J., O58816.
Arnwine, Henry B., O78705.
Asbury, Harold D., O81950.
Astarita, Edward F., O60821.
Atchison, Frank E., O58817.
Athanason, Frank A., O58818.
Atkinson, Donald E., O65071.
Austin, Henry M., Jr., O80037.
Avery, Albert M., Jr., O59894.
Avery, William H., Jr., O58819.
Axelson, Rudolph A., O59838.
Baie, John J., O85127.
Bailey, Jack S., O62209.
Bailey, James, O78707.
Bailey, John F., O78708.
Bailey, Paul O., O60515.
Baker, James O., O60316.
Baker, John W., O63380.
Baldy, Paul A., O59773.
Balitis, John J., O60414.
Ballard, Donald S., O58821.
Ballinger, Eldon L., O61202.
Balmforth, Edmund E., O80552.
Bang, John D., O63056.
Bangs, Robert R., O78710.
Barber, John W., O65009.
Barbero, Eugene C., O61994.
Barker, Edmund J., O60330.
Barnett, James W., Jr., O57087.
Barnett, Robert B., O58823.
Barr, William H., O59470.
Barrett, George B., Jr., O60601.
Barrick, Thomas M., O60493.
Bartholdt, William E., O60630.
Barton, Deforest A., O80558.
Barwick, William R., Jr., O61089.
Bass, Marshall B., O62204.
Baswell, Carl F., O58826.
Batiste, John O., O58827.
Baxley, James W., O78714.
Beard, Daryl A., O60506.
Beard, Kenneth R., O61095.
Bearden, William A., O60491.
Beasley, Thomas A., O65074.
Becicka, Leonard, O58828.
Beck, William J., O58829.
Beckett, James E., O59839.
Beckman, Paul E., O66135.
Behenna, Douglas L., O65034.
Bein, Robert K., O60379.
Beinke, Walter, Jr., O57357.
Bell, Eugene J., Jr., O63676.
Bellinger, John B., Jr., O57136.
Beninate, Nicholas A., O59464.
Bentley, Robert D., O65044.
Benton, Lucien C., O60549.
Berger, Alvin C., O65948.
Bernard, Robert J., O58830.
Berry, Milton M., O59886.
Berry, Sidney B., Jr., O57233.
Bertholf, Russell W., Jr., O63083.
Bertram, Edward H., Jr., O57327.
Best, Charles E., O58831.
Betz, John J., Jr., O58832.
Biere, Emerson T., O58834.
Big, Bernard, O58835.
Bilharz, Dwight L., O65952.
Birdsong, Eff W., Jr., O80045.
Bithos, Franklin J., O81958.
Blackford, James C., O58836.
Blair, Robert C., O59840.
Blakeslee, James A., O57272.
Bledsoe, James E., O78720.
Blumenthal, Peter J., O81960.
Boehm, William C., O63051.
Boisvert, Joseph R., O65018.
Boland, Richard H., O78723.
Boone, George M., Jr., O60335.
Booth, Dale R., O70078.
Booth, Merritt B., Jr., O65698.
Borcheller, Karl H., O57038.
Boutelle, Guy C., O78726.
Boutelle, Maurice H., O62126.
Bowen, Thomas W., O57090.
Bowen, William C., Jr., O61201.
Bowman, James H., O78730.
Boy, Edmund G., O63073.
Boyd, Donn T., O62181.
Boyle, Peter J., Jr., O58839.
Boylston, William L., O59775.
Bradford, Robert K., O62173.
Brambila, Robert M., Jr., O88584.
Brandewie, Robert A., O60373.
Brannock, Robert C., O64995.
Brannon, Otis E., Jr., O50783.
Brash, William W., O65042.
Bratton, William D., O60190.
Braun, Walter R., O60509.
Breen, Patrick J., O62129.
Brennan, John W., O57124.
Bridges, Wayne W., O78734.
Briggs, John L., O58840.
Brigham, Bruce A., O78736.
Brizius, Charles A., Sr., O58841.
Brockett, Charles K., O60199.
Brooks, Roland St. J., Jr., O60336.
Brouillette, Frederick, O65057.
Brown, Albert J., O60321.
Brown, George K., Jr., O58842.
Brown, Halden D., O62136.
Brown, Hugh M., Jr., O58843.
Brown, Richard F., O59841.
Brown, William A., O60315.
Brown, William D., O60426.
Browne, Mark L., Jr., O58844.
Bruger, Edward J., O60516.
Brummer, James L., O78739.
Brunt, Julian G., O78741.
Bryant, Jackson M., O62151.
Bryant, John T., Jr., O58845.
Buchanan, Everts R., O59842.
Buchanan, Thomas E., O78742.
Buckley, Harry A., Jr., O57335.
Buie, David M., O59777.
Bullard, William P., O58847.
Bullock, Frank E., O60319.
Bundy, Robert E., O60633.
Burch, Charles T., O63060.

Burch, Gerald C., O63283.
Burget, Frank R., O62120.
Burhoe, John M., O90258.
Burke, Martin J., Jr., O61098.
Burns, George T., O78743.
Burns, William C., O57092.
Burpo, Frank W., O65026.
Burrer, John D., O61208.
Burt, Robert E., O63053.
Bush, Francis J., O64997.
Bush, Harry L., O59843.
Bush, Hugh W., Jr., O60626.
Bush, Sydney A., O78746.
Byers, William E., O57200.
Byrd, Billy W., O58848.
Byrne, Daniel K., O58849.
Cadman, Walvin M., O60554.
Cain, Lloyd R., O58850.
Caldwell, Elmer I., O59778.
Caldwell, William B., 3d, O57280.
Call, Raymond L., O60618.
Callagy, Thomas A., O61093.
Callahan, Robert F., O58851.
Callahan, Vincent J., O60325.
Callanan, Edward F., O57215.
Cancelliere, Francis P., 2d, O57287.
Candal, Miguel A., O61096.
Cannon, J. Parry, O58852.
Cantlebary, Leland R., O60350.
Cantor, David L., O60539.
Caponegro, Michael A., O60206.
Capps, Jack L., O57322.
Capuano, Joseph, O58853.
Carpenter, Dalton O., Jr., O62188.
Carper, William C., 3d, O58854.
Carr, William D., O60420.
Carrig, Stephen J., O60378.
Carrigan, Kevin F., O62159.
Carrigo, Edward A., Jr., O58856.
Carroll, James H., Jr., O65000.
Carson, Eugene T., O89434.
Carter, James T., O60358.
Carter, Leslie D., Jr., O57270.
Carter, Sherman F., O60550.
Cartwright, Roscoe C., O63039.
Caruthers, Lawrence W., O67554.
Casey, Herbert T., Jr., O59891.
Casey, Warren C., O63233.
Catlin, Rupert W., O58859.
Cerow, Donald A., O57315.
Chapman, Lorin P., O58860.
Charron, Frederick E., O78756.
Chase, Lawrence R., O81972.
Chelenza, Nicholas J., O78757.
Chesnut, James W., O65046.
Chester, Sigmund R., O58861.
Childress, Herbert J., Jr., O63301.
Ching, Kenneth E. Y., O78758.
Chitty, John H., Jr., O57254.
Christianson, George H., O60500.
Churchill, Lake G., Jr., O57312.
Ciley, Colin D., Jr., O65484.
Citrak, Michael, O30655.
Clare, George F., O80656.
Clark, Alphus R., O63059.
Clark, Harlow G., Jr., O60339.
Clark, Thomas R., O57148.
Clark, William R., O60521.
Clarke, Carter W., Jr., O57314.
Clarkson, Richard L., O60792.
Clausen, Hugh J., O70302.
Clayton, Frank W., O60617.
Clement, William J., Jr., O65039.
Cleveland, John H., O59468.
Cockerham, Samuel G., O57340.
Cody, Henry L., O60443.
Coffey, William D., Jr., O60341.
Coggins, Bruce T., O68335.
Cole, Earl F., O64999.
Cole, Jack H., O60456.
Coleman, Bruce S., O58862.
Coleman, James F., O58863.
Coleman, John D., Jr., O60785.
Coles, Clarence J., O60432.
Collier, William H., O58864.
Collins, Clarence G., Jr., O56988.
Collins, John M., O80060.
Collins, John W., O63332.
Collins, Michael G., O65485.
Condrill, Donald R., O63309.
Connelly, Frank P., Jr., O84600.
Conner, Donald A., O58866.
Connor, George C., O60557.
Conrad, Charles E., O58867.
Conrad, Clifton H., O63071.
Cook, Carroll M., Jr., O60638.
Cook, Dewitt, O60510.
Cook, William B., Jr., O76861.
Coon, John E., O59847.
Cooper, Richmond J., O57155.
Cope, Edward H., O65037.
Cordero, Virgil N., Jr., O60181.
Corey, Jim, O57464.
Corley, Arthur V., O78773.
Cormack, Thomas B., O57125.
Cormier, Robert A., O65970.
Correll, David R., O60440.
Corrington, Roger A., O60621.
Coveny, Robert F., O62167.
Cowan, Kenneth L., O60607.
Craft, Floyd G., O60627.
Crandall, Walter M., Jr., O58869.
Crane, Ray T., O80681.
Crane, William H., O62222.
Crenshaw, Leon, O59457.
Crochet, Harold J., O81982.
Crockett, John J., O59848.
Cronin, Morgan J., O58870.
Cronk, Robert A., O58871.
Crouchet, Jack H., O69893.
Crowder, Thomas H., Jr., O62178.
Crozier, Bruce U., O50885.
Cruikshank, Ralph H., O60803.
Cruz, Alfred J., O90215.
Culbertson, Paul V., O59849.
Culpepper, Vernon M., O66145.
Cummings, Lloyd R., O81983.
Cunningham, John D., O62223.
Cunningham, Robert F., O58873.
Curles, Cecil M., O63298.
Currey, Wallace H., O62212.
Curtis, Walter R., O65005.
Cushing, Robert H., Jr., O57147.
Custis, Harry N., O65027.
Cutler, Cecil L., Jr., O67913.
Dale, Thomas W., O58874.
Dalton, David N., O63289.
Dalzell, Robert C., O60183.
Dambrosio, Eugene J., O78783.
Daniel, George M., O60551.
Darden, Jack M., O60595.
Daugherty, Robert M., O78173.
Daum, William B., O58875.
Davis, David L., O60365.
Davis, Glenn A., O63295.
Davis, Gordon R., Jr., O58876.
Davis, Joseph A., O78786.
Davis, Ralph J., O60619.
Dawson, Albert F., O59850.
Day, Philip S., Jr., O57349.
DeFranco, Theodore J., O60417.
DeMarcus, John B., O59851.
DeSantis, Joseph A., O60362.
DeWeese, Robert E., Jr., O78790.
Decker, Charles DeF., Jr., O58878.
Decker, James W., O78791.
Deehan, Donald E., O57181.
Del Vitto Jon M., O78792.
Dellinger, Lawrence M., O65011.
Denison, Paul S., Jr., O58880.
Denney, Darel D., O60408.
Dent, James R., O78794.
Devall, Sherral C., O78796.
Devan, Vernon C., O62194.
Diaz, George F., O78798.
Dickerson, Gerald T., O84976.
Dickson, Ervin W., Jr., O69479.
Dietrich, Frank L., O78799.
Diggs, Walter F., O80071.
Dileanis Leonard P., O60614.
Dillard, Oliver W., O60564.
Dillard, Robert J., O58881.
Dille, Richard T., O58882.
Dillon, William H., O58883.
Dingeman, James W., O57260.
Dobson, William C., Jr., O65982.
Doerflein, Donald P., O60547.
Dolan, Bernard J., Jr., O63321.
Domenech, John, O60487.
Donahue, Richard E., O60620.
Donnelly, James D., O60205.
Donnelly, Paul E., O59852.
Donovan, Thomas W., O58884.
Doody, John J., O57360.
Doren, Donald M., O78803.
Dorr, Colgate, O80713.
Doty, Mercer M., O57221.
Dougherty, Jack D., O65476.
Dougherty, John E., O60314.
Douglas, Leslie M., O58885.
Dowds, Peter M., O86082.
Doyle, Lee T., O57115.
Dragotta, Harry A., O63336.
Drake, William T., O60429.
Drane, Elbert E., O60449.
Duarte, Stanley J., O78805.
Ducote, Warren S., O60826.
Dufresne, George R., O62812.
Duggins, George J., O58886.
Duke, James O., O60502.
Dukes, Lonzie J., O58887.
Duncan, James R., O62221.
Duncan, Samuel K., O60393.
Dunham, William H., 3d, O60419.
Dunn, Wellington J., O63287.
Durant, Robert N., O63803.
Duruz, Paul B., O58889.
Dyer, Joseph A., O60376.
Eagan, Warren C., O69638.
Earle, Frank H., O60831.
Earles, Carl T., O58890.
Earnest, George C., O78813.
Eaton, Richard J., O62227.
Echols, James E., Jr., O63334.
Eckes, Leroy J., O78815.
Edington, James E., O50734.
Edmunds, Joseph A., O60390.
Edwards, Ralph, O62827.
Edwards, Robert B., O60562.
Egan, Frank J., O58891.
Egbert, John S., O57103.
Egg, Eugene C., O60609.
Eggers, George D., Jr., O60555.
Eggert, Dalton D., O85318.
Eickhoff, Albert P., O59853.
Elam, John K., Jr., O65986.
Ellard, Uell W., Jr., O58892.
Ellis, August V., O58893.
Ellis, Ernest W., Jr., O65596.
Ellis, Walter G., O80738.
Ellis, William R., O62814.
Ellison, Richard W., O78817.
Elmer, Bryce L., O58894.
Ely, Robert L., Jr., O60211.
Embley, William H., O58895.
Emerick, James C., O80742.
Emerson, Duane L., O57106.
Emery, Jean R., O60544.
Emmons, Harris, O59854.
Emrich, Robert F., O78821.
Enderle, Wallace O., O57196.
Endres, Edward P., O60571.
Epps, Jones N., O60328.
Ericsson, Eric A., O88670.
Ertischweiger, Herman, O58896.
Escola, Albert R., O60569.
Etchemendy, William W., O62152.
Etkin, Max, O60793.
Evans, Harry E., O62150.
Eyer, Arvine J., O62824.
Fahs, Robert B., O50824.
Fairfield, Ronald, J., Jr., O62135.
Falkenstein, Richard C., O81993.
Fallon, Rudolph A., O62225.
Farkash, Eugene J., O80750.
Farmer, William K., O60486.
Farrington, Thomas H., O60796.
Farwell, Faris T., O65063.
Farwell, Lester C., O78829.
Fazakerley, Richard G., O58898.
Felix, Russell E., O60475.
Fenstemacher, Edgar R., O59780.
Fiorelli, Michael C., O88677.
Fisher, Bruce C., O60329.
Fitzpatrick, John R., Jr., O50883.
Fix, Joseph, 3d, O60527.
Flake, Glade F., O69921.
Fleet, Robert G., O91983.
Fleming, Eugene C., Jr., O57372.
Fleshman, William H., O80085.
Fletcher, Paul M., O60189.
Flick, John E., O64988.
Flournoy, Robert W., Jr., O78834.

Fogel, William H., O58899.
Fontana, Joseph A., O60439.
Foote, Ashby M., Jr., O57229.
Forbes, William A., O58900.
Ford, Francis J., O84857.
Forner, Herschel W., O84608.
Forrester, Eugene P., O57250.
Fort, Alvin E., O62163.
Foster, James E., O58901.
Francis, Robert, O62122.
Frank, Alva B., O65991.
Franzen, Walter C., O63082.
Freed, Cleo S., O59463.
Freeland, Robert L., O65051.
Freeman, George L., O59781.
Freund, Benedict L., O60631.
Frye, Wayne E., O84056.
Fulsang, Ejner J., Jr., O60452.
Gabardy, Robert L., O58902.
Gaffke, Frank M., O65997.
Gaines, Melvin R., O83598.
Galing, Bernard W., O60574.
Galloway, James V., O59782.
Galloway, Robert M., O62166.
Gambrell, John C., O58904.
Garcia, Orlando, O62138.
Gardner, Richard W., O87521.
Garman, George A., Jr., O78842.
Garner, Milton P., O68187.
Garrett, Edward J., O58905.
Garrett, Felix R., O60436.
Garrett, Franklin T., O59783.
Garwood, Charles E., O60552.
Gatrell, Wallace B., O78844.
Gay, Joseph M., Jr., O62214.
Geiger, Robert A., O58907.
Gellnicht, Donald L., O58908.
Genero, Peter P., O63063.
Gentry, William H. L., O78846.
George, Jack M., O69653.
Gerecke, Henry H., O62160.
Gerlach, Shirl L., O63049.
Gerrity, John F., O58910.
Gettman, Richard P., O80785.
Giesen, Robert J., O78848.
Giggey, Frederick W., O60532.
Gilbert, Robert R., O78849.
Gillert, Gustav J., O80790.
Gillis, John P., O60313.
Girton, Ralph H., O57588.
Glasgow, William M., Jr., O56771.
Glikes, Richard J., O60197.
Glinski, Douglass E., O65020.
Goad, Lewis H., O60450.
Goodell, Roscoe H., O60377.
Gordon, James H., O60784.
Gore, William E., O58911.
Gough, Robert B., Sr., O78854.
Graber, Gordon L., O78855.
Graf, Robert E., O57083.
Gramling, Freddie W., O62115.
Grandelli, Charles M., O80803.
Grandinetti, Dominick J., O85326.
Grant, Robert T., Jr., O60346.
Graver, Herbert A., O78858.
Graves, Harold K., O59855.
Graves, Robert P., O58912.
Gray, Columbus E., Jr., O59460.
Gray, Harvey W., Jr., O60582.
Greene, George V., Jr., O80805.
Greene, Maurice C., O60435.
Gregory, Arthur P., O60788.
Gresham, William A., O59471.
Grezaffi, Joseph, O60613.
Griffin, Leonard F., O61092.
Griffin, Lorayne M., O63084.
Griffin, Robert W., O80810.
Griffith, Stephen M., O57165.
Grimsley, James A., O60632.
Groff, Guy, Jr., O89816.
Grogan, John F., O65040.
Grogan, Owen R., Jr., O63052.
Grout, Gilbert J., O65588.
Grubbs, Alfred T., O82017.
Guinan, Warren A., O82018.
Gunter, Benjamin L., Jr., O62202.
Gutting, Louis J., O62822.
Gutzmann, Leslie E., O89217.
Hagan, James A., O66003.
Hagar, Bailey W., O80823.
Hagerty, James J., Jr., O82020.
Hagman, Charles A., Jr., O63291.
Haines, Albert E., Jr., O65048.
Hale, John D., Jr., O60830.
Hall, Charles E., O60578.
Hall, Harry H., O58913.
Hall, Robert L., O88717.
Hallahan, Robert F., O57251.
Halloran, Joseph E., Jr., O78865.
Hamilton, John D., O57343.
Hamlet, James F., O60412.
Hamlin, Guy A., O63740.
Hammack, Ralph B., O66004.
Hamscher, George M., O62174.
Hanks, William R., O58914.
Hansen, George K., O58916.
Harbort, Walter J., O65478.
Harp, Clifford E., O63800.
Harper, Adam W., O60399.
Harper, Douglas P., O58918.
Harper, Joseph W., Jr., O58919.
Harrelson, Joseph S., Jr., O62119.
Harrington, James R., O66158.
Harrington, Richard H., O65038.
Harris, Carl W., O58920.
Harris, Harry B., O62165.
Harrison, Dennis J., O58921.
Harsh, Keith R., O80099.
Harstad, Leroy O., O60453.
Hart, Edsel F., O60186.
Hart, Robert E., O78633.
Hartman, Carl W., O62171.
Hartnell, George W., O57302.
Haskell, Louis W., Jr., O57283.
Haszard, Sidney S., O60457.
Hatch, Jay A., O57143.
Hathaway, William S., O60588.
Hawkins, William S., O60808.
Hawley, William B., O78870.
Hayden, Oakes M., O60327.
Hayes, Herbert W., Jr., O58922.
Hayler, Rodney G., Jr., O60528.
Hays, Marshall C., O78872.
Heath, Ralph M., O66013.
Heekin, David P., O60888.
Heilman, Daniel P., O60563.
Helms, John L., O60513.
Hendricks, Jess B., Jr., O57168.
Hennes, Donald J., O63297.
Henry, Lee S., Jr., O63337.
Herbert, Bueford G., O64986.
Herigstad, Bert H., O78877.
Herron, Howard M., O59465.
Hertzog, Frank S., O80104.
Hettlinger, Walter, O59857.
Heuston, Harold W., O78878.
Hibbard, Walter, Jr., O59858.
Hickerson, Elzie, O62141.
Hicks, Harold A., O65694.
Hiestand, Harry H., O65012.
Hieta, Clifford W., O78879.
Hill, Alfred G., O58924.
Hill, Herbert R., O65073.
Hill, Lucius G., Jr., O58925.
Hinojosa, Ernest A., Jr., O57585.
Hinton, William S., O78881.
Hitchcock, James M., O60198.
Hodgdon, Raymond F., O60187.
Hodges, Genous S., Jr., O58926.
Hodges, Morris D., O65549.
Hodson, Fremont B., Jr., O60543.
Hoff, Forest E., O63310.
Hoffman, Albert R., O63234.
Hoffman, Hugh F. T., Jr., O57259.
Hoffman, John H., O62140.
Hoffman, Paul M., O78883.
Hoke, Ray R., O50886.
Holliday, Sam C., O57336.
Hollowell, Harry W., Jr., O84454.
Holper, Ambrose C., O78885.
Honour, Charles M., Jr., O65060.
Hooker, James F., Jr., O57138.
Hooker, William P., O78887.
Horn, Charles S., O57205.
Horn, Maurice R., O59472.
Horne, Paul R., Jr., O82027.
Horne, Willard V., O60800.
Horton, Warren H., O74949.
Hoskin, Charles E., 3d, O78890.
Hotaling, Robert P., O62177.
Houtz, James W., O62821.
Houtz, John W., O63326.
Howard, Charles W., O59785.
Howard, G. B., O88269.
Howard, Kenneth A., O67581.
Hoyt, Lawrence V., O57218.
Hubbard, Jack A., O71370.
Hubbard, Wallace H., O57172.
Huck, Frederick R., O60421.
Huetter, John J., O63316.
Huff, Douglas A., O65062.
Huff, John S., O59859.
Hughes, John A., Jr., O61995.
Hughes, John B., Jr., O57160.
Hughes, John C., O58930.
Humberd, Quentin L., O59897.
Hume, Albert G., O58931.
Humphrey, William L., O59786.
Hunter, David H., O63335.
Huray, Frank T., O66025.
Hurd, George R., Jr., O60437.
Hussey, Stanley J., O63323.
Hutchison, James H., O60282.
Hutson, Albert L., Jr., O58932.
Hylander, Walter R., Jr., O76887.
Iaderosa, Alfonso J., O60635.
Ingram, Earl, O78894.
Irby, Chester P., Jr., O60366.
Irick, Edward F., Jr., O60791.
Irvin, I. J., Jr., O62131.
Isaacs, Thomas R., O58934.
Ivie, Carl W., Jr., O59787.
Jamison, Robert W., O60355.
Jarrett, John A., O65016.
Jeffers, Henry A., Jr., O60795.
Jeffers, Heyward G., Jr., O66166.
Jennings, John M., O60587.
Jersey, Donald H., O65699.
Jessup, John E., Jr., O62219.
Johns, Leo D., O78899.
Johnson, Albert C., O66028.
Johnson, Carl A., O58936.
Johnson, Haskell L., O80118.
Johnson, Jasper R., O62170.
Johnson, Marshall D., O58937.
Johnson, Raymond E., O63281.
Johnston, Walter F., O63302.
Johnstonbaugh, Merle A., O60590.
Jones, Gilbert C., O64998.
Jones, James L., O57150.
Jones, Louis R., O57214.
Jones, Rees, O57235.
Jones, Russell B., Jr., O59860.
Jones, Thomas H., O65059.
Jones, Thomas T., O57113.
Jones, William J., O91613.
Joost, Horst K., O60353.
Juskowiak, Joseph L., O88272.
Kachavos, Charles J., O59491.
Kaczmarowski, Jerome H., O60454.
Kampe, Raymond L., O60430.
Kanelis, Tom, O58940.
Kaplan, Edward N., O60180.
Karst, Ralph A., O78908.
Kean, John P., O57345.
Keator, Hervey E., O58941.
Kelley, Eugene, Jr., O63320.
Kelly, George P., O84637.
Kelsey, Jesse T., O57274.
Kennedy, Reid W., Jr., O68366.
Kent, Graham G., O50859.
Kern, Bernard S., O62201.
Kerns, Raymond C., O78911.
Kerr, Richard L., O59458.
Kersey, Irwin J., O78912.
Kershaw, Charles G., 2d, O58942.
Kiernan, Joseph M., Jr., O57075.
Killpack, Paul E., O58944.
Kincy, William P., Jr., O78916.
King, Monroe D., O60322.
King, William P., O58945.
Kinley, Gordon L., O65693.
Kirby, Pierre P., O60624.
Kirchenstein, John, J., O68123.
Kirchman, William W., O62185.
Kirk, Henry C., O60422.
Kirwan, Robert L., O57252.
Kiser, John F., O58946.
Kneisl, Jerry A., O60499.
Kobbe, Eric, O62175.
Koch, Kenneth W., O62190.
Koch, Richard P., O78922.
Koenig, James R., O59475.

Komoto, Yasuro, O78923.
Komp, John S., O58947.
Kone, Kenneth M., O63330.
Kortum, Zane B., O69717.
Kranyak, Louis W., O63296.
Krause, Frederick C., O60702.
Kravitz, Seymour, O59492.
Kryzanowsky, Constantine D., O62162.
Kunkel, Charles E., O58949.
LaLonde, Wilfred G., O62195.
Labadie, George V., Jr., O62118.
Lamison, Kenneth R., O58951.
Landers, Joseph F., O65023.
Lane, Albert G., O65003.
Lange, Arthur G., Jr., O78931.
Lanier, Donald H., O60559.
Lawrence, Clyde K., O78936.
Lawrence, James R., O58952.
Lawson, William F., Jr., O62176.
Lawton, William S., Jr., O60505.
Layton, Victor J., O59862.
LeClair, John H., O58954.
Leahey, William E., O58953.
Lechner, Roy J., O60503.
Leddon, John W., Jr., O63605.
Lee, Donald C., O78940.
Lee, Harold H., O63324.
Leer, James M., Jr., O61204.
Lehman, Robert H., O62168.
Lennon, Daniel A., Jr., O78634.
Leonhauser, Paul C., Jr., O82043.
Lesniak, Walter J., O80967.
Leu, Bernard J., Jr., O62205.
Lewis, Marion A., Jr., O69727.
Liles, Roy L., O58955.
Lindley, Joseph H., O78946.
Lindsay, William B., O61203.
Lineker, George B., O66038.
Lippman, Gordon J., O60536.
Litschgi, Albert W., 3d, O59863.
Liana, Theodore, Jr., O59864.
Lockhart, Leon H., O62117.
Loftin, Joseph R., O60312.
Lomax, Arthur E., O60488.
Long, Carl L., O78949.
Lorch, Robert C., O58957.
Lorentzen, Lloyd E., O59487.
Lorenz, Robert M., O63036.
Louis, Eugene, O78950.
Lovejoy, Norman B., O57118.
Lovett, Frank P., Jr., O60825.
Lowman, Harry F., Jr., O59459.
Lowman, Theodore R., O58958.
Luce, Edward G., O60356.
Luckie, Lorenzo F., Jr., O58959.
Ludy, Garland A., O65049.
Lukens, James R., O63331.
Lundquist, Roy W. C., O63042.
Lutz, Roman J., O58961.
Lycas, John, O62137.
Lynch, Camille L., O78954.
Lynch, James E., Jr., O78955.
Lynes, Donald L., O63080.
Lynn, Otis C., O65066.
Lyons, Joseph W., O59466.
MacGarvey, Paul D., O62132.
MacLane, Robert C., O59865.
MacLean, Angus B., O60530.
MacLeod, William A., O60397.
Macklin, James E., Jr., O57225.
Madden, Everett I., O65070.
Maddox, John H., O59912.
Mahoney, Arthur E., O60523.
Maier, John E., O63058.
Maier, Robert J., Jr., O63075.
Mainer, George W., O60811.
Malone, Michael J., O58963.
Maloney, William L., O60600.
Manning, James A., O64996.
Manning, William E., O60466.
Marciniec, Walter F., O57133.
Marden, Martin, O83607.
Maricle, Louis J., O65055.
Marsh, Robert D., O60387.
Marshall, David S., O63288.
Marshall, James E., Jr., O60794.
Marshall, Robert W., O57284.
Marshall, Tandy G., O66046.
Martin, Hugh G., Jr., O78959.
Martin, James C., O58965.
Martin, James E., O61012.
Martin, Jason H., O58966.
Martin, Merritt P., O62215.
Marx, George H., O58967.
Mathews, Harry T., O60428.
Matteson, James S., O87847.
Matthews, Stanley L., O60315.
Mattingly, Leroy B., O58968.
Mattoon, Hugh M., O78963.
McAllister, Henry J., O60332.
McAmis, James C., Jr., O60372.
McAuliffe, John F., O60354.
McCain, Malcolm L., O64989.
McCann, Samuel E., O61200.
McCarthy, Leo C., O62123.
McCartney, Nevin L., O60508.
McCaslin, James K., O65031.
McClellan, Stan L., O58969.
McClelland, Don S., O57247.
McCormick, William F., Jr., O63076.
McCowen, George A., O65480.
McCoy, Clarence E., O82054.
McCoy, Paul G., O59501.
McCray, James G., O57277.
McCuen, John J., O57185.
McCullar, Francis M., O60174.
McCurley, Henry H., O60802.
McDade, Robert A., O78967.
McElhenny, John F., O76894.
McEnery, John W., O57184.
McFadden, Charles A., O60175.
McFall, Kenneth T., O60586.
McFarland, Richard DeL., O58971.
McGiffert, John R., 2d, O58972.
McKee, James O60427.
McKenty, Samuel H., Jr., O63328.
McMath, Robert P., O60603.
McMillan, Jenis C., O65036.
McNeely, David W., O57364.
McNeese, Frank J., O60577.
McNeil, William E., O61040.
McPherson, Robert B., O65013.
McSpadden, Garland R., O57139.
Meadow, Sam, O62142.
Mearns, George, O78976.
Meers, Boyce R., O78978.
Meinzen, Walter E., O57242.
Meiss, Jack M., O62146.
Mejia-Flores, Francisco, O88289.
Merigold, Frank A., O63050.
Merrell, George D., Jr., O60812.
Metcalf, Edward A., 3d, O72521.
Metosh, Cyril P., O78979.
Metzdorf, Jack R., O62139.
Metzner, Warren H., O62191.
Meyer, David W., O59867.
Meyer, Joseph H., O57153.
Meyer, Walter P., O63314.
Miescher, Walter H., Jr., O65017.
Millard, Alfred J., O60489.
Miller, Allen W., 3d, O78984.
Miller, Darwin C., O60538.
Miller, David I., O78985.
Miller, Jack R., O57296.
Miller, James W., O82061.
Miller, Kurtz J., Jr., O65024.
Miller, Paul H., O63325.
Millett, Lewis L., O78988.
Millican, Henry D., O88154.
Milton, John M., O57341.
Minkel, Edward J., O78989.
Mitman, Henry D., O59911.
Mittelstadt, Jack, O78992.
Moffitt, John P., O58979.
Monroe, Keith L., O62182.
Montgomery, Burton W., O82063.
Montgomery, John J., O59968.
Montgomery, Raymond J., O60391.
Moore, Donald P., O87570.
Moore, Euless B., Jr., O63300.
Moore, Gene D., O63280.
Moore, Russell E., O60615.
Morath, Eugene E., Jr., O58980.
More, Berkeley D., O58981.
Morehead, Thomas G., O59869.
Morehouse, Richard C., O78995.
Morgan, John T., Jr., O60814.
Morgan, Thomas L., O78996.
Morrison, James L., Jr., O50881.
Morrisroe, William J., O62186.
Morse, Herbert E., O60498.
Morton, Paul A., O62127.
Morton, Robert E., O60483.
Moseley, Lonnie L., O78998.
Mulligan, James R., O60191.
Mulvany, Floyd R., O60459.
Mundie, William L., O58984.
Munn, Richard A., Jr., O59461.
Munroe, Roscoe H., O79003.
Murnane, James J., O62144.
Murphey, James A., Jr., O60501.
Murphy, Eugene C., O66059.
Murphy, Francis J., O62156.
Myron, Harold L., O88854.
Nagata, George M., O60799.
Nance, Marvin L., O62161.
Neal, Harold, O79007.
Neff, Orrin D., O62189.
Neitz, Ravellan H., O81087.
Nelson, Shelton R., O65687.
Nemeth, Stephen A., O59870.
Neumann, Edward J., O79009.
Newell, Roscius C., O58985.
Newman, Gilbert H., O59790.
Nichols, Glen L., O58986.
Nichols, William L., O58987.
Nickel, William F., O63293.
Nisbet, Andrew, Jr., O58988.
Noble, Thomas P., O60334.
Nocita, John W., O65045.
Noice, Charles G., Jr., O63303.
Nolde, Hubert E., O60542.
Noll, Robert J., O58989.
Norby, Allen R., O65696.
Noreen, Albert T., Jr., O60438.
Norrie, George, Jr., O65025.
North, Louis J., O62199.
Norwood, Leonard L., Jr., O58990.
Novick, Jehiel, O61993.
Nunn, Clifford C., Jr., O60465.
Obradovich, Francis S., Jr., O63055.
O'Connor, Richard C., O62187.
Ogden, Dorward W., Jr., O58991.
Oldham, Thomas C., O66188.
Oliver, Tillman C., O63299.
Oliver, Wiley E., Jr., O70005.
Olow, John L., 3d., O65067.
Olsen, Raymond M., O81106.
Olson, James C., O60207.
Olson, Kenneth W., O57146.
O'Neill, Brian B., O59896.
Orfalea, George A., O60455.
Osborne, John R., O60537.
O'Shaughnessy, John E., Jr., O63317.
Osiecki, Frank S., O60425.
Osteen, John L., Jr., O57285.
Otto, Charles B., O88169.
Overstreet, Gerald L., O65050.
Overstreet, Lewis D., O79016.
Owen, Tom H., O81116.
Oxford, William B., O65065.
Pabst, Alfred A., O57169.
Packard, Donald F., O57162.
Packett, Wilbern L., O65004.
Padgett, Wade H., Jr., O62145.
Page, Alexander C., O60556.
Paradis, Joseph F., O63305.
Parker, John F., O65015.
Parker, John M., O58992.
Parker, Orville L. R., O66065.
Parker, Robert L., O58993.
Parks, Robert H., O59872.
Passell, David W., O62211.
Patch, William A., O57281.
Patterson, Edwin D., O57110.
Patterson, Robert W., O58994.
Paulmann, Edwin, O65010.
Payne, Charles G., Jr., O60637.
Payne, Thomas A., O80163.
Pecoraro, Anthony, O59873.
Penick, Jack G., O62218.
Percival, Allen C., O80165.
Perkins, Richard A., Jr., O59890.
Perry, Gerald L., Jr., O60184.
Perry, Harrison, O57096.
Petersen, Robert J., O57334.
Petrelli, John, O60413.
Phillips, Milton B., O62210.
Phillips, Robert L., Jr., O58997.
Phillips, William R., Jr., O63304.
Piburn, Edwin W., Jr., O60380.
Piccirilli, Albert A., O60342.
Picou, Lloyd J., O58998.

Pierce, John W., O59874.
Pierce, Leon A., O58999.
Piercy, James E., O59000.
Pineau, George P., O80169.
Pipkin, William P., O84461.
Pitchford, Harold I., Jr., O67738.
Plowman, Harry B., O60324.
Plumb, John F., O59001.
Plummer, Walter W., Jr., O57182.
Policastro, John J., O62226.
Polifka, Donald K., O60522.
Pollard, William F., Jr., O79029.
Pope, George Van W., Jr., O63485.
Porta, James R., O60431.
Post, Alton G., O60317.
Post, Charles M., O59002.
Pottle, Arthur F., Jr., O79031.
Powell, Charles M., Jr., O65475.
Powell, Elbert W., O79032.
Powell, George B., O65043.
Praeger, Herman A., Jr., O81149.
Prawitz, Leeland R., O81151.
Presson, David R., O60195.
Price, James R., O87889.
Price, Wilbur F., O60847.
Pritchard, Charles E., O63041.
Procter, Gilbert, Jr., O62155.
Proctor, Frank D., O61097.
Psaki, Nicholas G., Jr., O62121.
Pulliam, George W., Jr., O62208.
Putnam, William T., O59004.
Quinnelly, James L., O60177.
Radcliff, Edward C., O60533.
Rafferty, John H., Jr., O60804.
Ramundo, Bernard A., O65586.
Randolph, Jacob A., Jr. O63081.
Raney, Thompson L., O63054.
Raum, Mark, O59006.
Rawlins, Claude H., O60594.
Rawn, William A., O60461.
Ray, William B., O60568.
Reade, Robert A., O60514.
Reaugh, Vern W., O65029.
Redman, Albert., Jr., O62157.
Rehm, Walter R., O79044.
Reid, Tom, O63040.
Reid, Wallace G., O60361.
Reidy, James F., O60636.
Reinikka, Arnold J., O82084.
Reisacher, Robert W., O80173.
Renneisen, Daniel J., O62133.
Rettie, Robert G., O79046.
Reynolds, Clifford C., Jr., O63279.
Reynolds, Donald H., O63035.
Reynolds, John W., O60829.
Rhoads, Homer E., O59010.
Rhodes, Richard G., O59876.
Rhodes, Samuel T., O56992.
Rice, Marvin E., O59011.
Rice, Richard L., O65690.
Richards, Barton F., O60471.
Richardson, Walton K., O59013.
Richmond, Melvin E., O60388.
Richwine, Francis K., O66084.
Ride, Walter T., Jr., O63290.
Rider, Vance D., O60518.
Rinaldi, Eugene, O59015.
Ring, Kenneth G., O59016.
Ringel, Eugene J., O59017.
Rios, Edwin T., O63038.
Roach, Andrew J., O56994.
Roark, Carl F., O61996.
Robbins, Oliver L., O62153.
Roberts, Harold B., O65008.
Roberts, William G., O59018.
Robertson, Claron A., Jr., O57107.
Robinson, George R., O65542.
Robinson, Howard F., O63077.
Robinson, Neil, O59019.
Robinson, Norman L., Jr., O57210.
Robinson, William B., O62813.
Robitshek, Irving H., O82087.
Rock, Fairfield, O79053.
Rodenbeck, Eric O., O60375.
Rogan, John F., O62203.
Rogers, Benton M., O59020.
Rogers, Ernest R., Jr., O60374.
Roley, Ronald J., O79057.
Roper, George M., Jr., O60359.
Rose, Charles W., O60400.
Ross, Charles G., O60623.
Ross, John P., O60404.
Ross, Paul E., O84885.
Rountree, Wadie J., O60606.
Rousseau, William J., Jr., O59022.
Rovegno, Eugene S., O88487.
Row, Henry C., Jr., O60433.
Royce, Newton C., O60415.
Rudd, Edwin A., O57211.
Runft, Harold W., O63046.
Rusanowsky, Alexander P., O62823.
Russell, Donald K., O62817.
Russell, George C., Jr., O59877.
Russell, George H., O59499.
Russell, James W., O60424.
Russell, Jay V., Jr., O60634.
Russell, Robert C., O62125.
Ruthe, Hans G., O62164.
Ryan, James W., O63070.
Sachs, William H., Jr., O60464.
Safar, Benjamin B., O60331.
Salvador, Felix., O79066.
Salzman, Charles N., O79067.
Sampson, Samuel F., O59023.
Samson, Jack, O81199.
Sapp, Bernard B., O62143.
Sargeant, Arnold M., Jr., O57313.
Satterfield, Robert A., O60482.
Saum, James B., O59878.
Sawyer, Robert K., O79070.
Schabacker, William, O59792.
Schach, Raphael J., O65056.
Schaner, Louis T., O62200.
Schless, William F., O57278.
Schlotterbeck, Walter B., O57195.
Schmidt, Edwin M., O63677.
Schofield, Frank C., O81207.
Schreiber, Thomas S., O57918.
Schrinel, Paul J., O79076.
Schultz, Robert D., O79077.
Schuster, John P., O69666.
Schwartz, William C., O80183.
Scott, Beverly S., O60580.
Scott, Craig C., O63079.
Scott, Dwain L., O63078.
Scott, Ebbin P., Jr., O60467.
Scott, James I., O63319.
Scott, Willard W., Jr., O57098.
Sears, Robert E., O60311.
Sebastian, Nicholas H., O91686.
Secan, Frank D., O60201.
Seddon, John A., O63057.
Seely, Chesley K., O59025.
Seibert, August G., O59026.
Shaffer, Jarvis K., O59888.
Shaneyfelt, Donald L., O64987.
Sheffield, Merle G., O57173.
Shell, Claude O., Jr., O60798.
Sheppard, Jerome S., O60468.
Sheppe, Frank W., O59803.
Shidler, Robert W., O63329.
Shields, Selvin E., O60382.
Shilling, Harold E., O60473.
Shipman, Kenneth, O60411.
Shirley, Courtney R., O59027.
Shockley, James W., O59028.
Shoemaker, Leo W., O65028.
Shriver, Rowland B., Jr., O60495.
Shuffer, George M., Jr., O59029.
Shuman, Billy J., O66098.
Sikes, Arthur E., O60531.
Simon, James E., O70150.
Simpson, Arthur R., O59030.
Simpson, Paul W., O65706.
Sims, Morton D., O81224.
Sinclair, Edgar M., O59031.
Singleton, Jack, Jr., O79087.
Sites, George E., Jr., O79089.
Sittner, Homer H., O60492.
Skogsberg, Paul L., O62134.
Slade, Arthur R., O63741.
Sleeper, Earl S., O63045.
Sliger, Ira T., Jr., O59032.
Slominski, Martin J., O59892.
Smith, Charles A., O60566.
Smith, Dewitt C., Jr., O80187.
Smith, Eb W., Jr., O64994.
Smith, Harold T., O59795.
Smith, Homer D., Jr., O59805.
Smith, Jack E., O60347.
Smith, John A., Jr., O63843.
Smith, Joseph S., O59033.
Smith, Kingsley J., O59034.
Smith, Paul V., O79096.
Smith, Richard C., O60477.
Smith, Samuel C., O59036.
Smith, Wilfrid K. G., O60548.
Smith, William A., Jr., O60546.
Smolenski, Felix S., O63037.
Snow, James A., O60385.
Snow, Marvin H., O63043.
Sollitto, Basil J., O59796.
Solt, Lowell K., O60200.
Spahr, Delbert D., O60789.
Spector, Sam, O59037.
Spence, Soren E., O85263.
Spettel, Frank J., Jr., O59038.
Spigarelli, Americo W., O60822.
Spinelli, Joseph D., O63488.
Spitzmiller, Bob F., O60188.
Stacy, James E., O63285.
Stacy, Thomas J., O82102.
Stamey, Roderick A., Jr., O59804.
Staples, James T., O60444.
Stark, Lloyd J., O79104.
Starr, Comfort K., O63292.
Starr, Robert N., O60351.
Starry, Donn A., O57249.
Steen, Jud O., O79105.
Stein, Harold, O60540.
Stendeback, William, Jr., O63327.
Stenger, John E., O87933.
Sterling, William R., O79106.
Stevens, Carlton E., Jr., O65033.
Stevens, Richard R., O59039.
Stevenson, Charles B., O60639.
Stevenson, James R., O79107.
Steward, Cleveland R., Jr., O59040.
Stewart, Loren F., O59462.
Stinson, Gerald C., O61997.
Stodgel, James E., O67963.
Stone, Frank J., O60442.
Stone, Virgil M., O59923.
Stone, William M., Jr., O60485.
Street, Robert W., O59042.
Stringer, James K., O62184.
Stryker, Emil J., Jr., O59043.
Sunder, Charles H., O57337.
Swangren, Gordon L., O59045.
Swann, Ralph J., O59046.
Swanson, Paul A., O59047.
Swearengen, George A., O57321.
Sweeney, Harvey E., O59048.
Swenson, Richard W., O79113.
Swilley, George R., O79114.
Swinehart, Lewis S., Jr., O59880.
Swomley, Neely M., O59881.
Swope, Leslie J., O62216.
Sylvester, Allan T., 2d, O50882.
Tackaberry, Thomas H., Jr., O60504.
Taibbi, Raymond V., O63044.
Tank, Albert K., O79117.
Tavzel, Harold S., O50780.
Taylor, Charles H., O66641.
Taylor, John F., O59049.
Taylor, William E., O63308.
Teagle, Charles R., O65053.
Thatcher, David C., O59051.
Thaxton, Halbert C., O59052.
Thevenet, Stanley E., O89840.
Thomas, Henry R., O65548.
Thomas, Lawrence M., O60318.
Thomas, Raymond P., O85271.
Thomas, Wesley E., O60368.
Thomas, Wray R., O60535.
Thompson, John W., O59053.
Thornley, Robert M., O63802.
Thornton, Paul E., O62815.
Tibbetts, Frederick E., 3d, O57164.
Tiller, Norman L., Sr., O81293.
Tilton, William S., O89301.
Timberman, William H., O62811.
Tippins, Bedell A., Jr., O65479.
Todd, John A., O60511.
Tomlinson, Robert P., O65545.
Tousley, Pershing, O60204.
Townsend, Harry W., O60481.
Tracy, Ollie L., O63722.
Trainer, Clark W., O65006.
Trigg, Harry E., O60470.
Troiano, Lawrence V., O59797.
Tucker, Douglas B., O62169.
Tucker, William H., Jr., O63322.

Tudder, Elwin B., O60541.
Tugman, Robert F., O66110.
Tumlinson, Jack M., O60572.
Tupper, Fred A., O65032.
Tuthill, Jack K., O60833.
Tye, Hiram S., O60692.
Tyree, Thomas B., O57111.
Tyson, Charles M., O63047.
Uffmann, Milton F., O60383.
Ulatoski, Joseph R., O62224.
Ungerleider, Alvin D., O61306.
Van Buskirk, William D., O62147.
Van Eaton, John H., O60497.
Van Horn, Robert O., O60173.
Vaught, James B., O60570.
Vessey, John W., Jr., O65047.
Vincent, Howard, O65703.
Vogelgesang, Ernest J., O60507.
Vranish, Robert L., O60386.
Wadsworth, John B., Jr., O57297.
Waggener, John G., O57084.
Wagner, George I., O60185.
Wagner, Matt R., O80200.
Wagoner, Fred E., Jr., O57253.
Wales, Perry W., O60608.
Walk, James F., O57300.
Walker, Faris T., O79133.
Walker, Fred M., O63333.
Walker, Homer L., O62220.
Walker, Sidney J., O63484.
Walker, William L., O65022.
Wallace, Jerry G., O59812.
Walsh, John J., Jr., O59055.
Walter, Lyle E., O57178.
Walters, Vernon J., O63074.
Wampler, Norman H., O60398.
Ward, David E., O60403.
Ward, Richard H., O62130.
Ward, Robert M., O57158.
Ware, Thomas A., Jr., O57219.
Ware, William B., O62114.
Waters, Ace L., Jr., O65019.
Watson, Edwin A., O59469.
Watt, William A., O63742.
Weaver, Wilburn C., O63407.
Webb, Lloyd E., O60575.
Webb, Ralph J., O65014.
Webber, Kenneth E., Jr., O57220.
Weddle, Charles E., O65695.
Weeks, Milton D., O62128.
Weeks, Robert J., O79138.
Weggeland, Henry N., Jr., O59882.
Weibel, Rodney W., O79139.
Weinzettle, John J., O82119.
Weisinger, Sherman, O59057.
Weisser, Seymour T., O62148.
Wellde, Raymond L., O60423.
Wells, Donal C., O60828.
Wendt, Irving R., O81326.
Wentzel, Donald B., O59800.
Wesley, Craig T., O60193.
West, Luther C., O65704.
Wester, William A., O79141.
White, Charles I., Jr., O59059.
White, Kent B., O65748.
White, Nevin C., O63286.
White, Wolfred K., O59883.
Whitehead, Ennis C., Jr., O57093.
Whitesel, William M., O59806.
Whitledge, Charles H., O62198.
Whitley, Arthur L., O57099.
Whitney, Philip M., O57318.
Whitson, Wiliam W., O57097.
Whittemore, Kenneth S., Jr., O62999.
Whittington, Charles W., O59884.
Wigner, Charles C., O59061.
Wilhide, Glenn C. Jr., O57189.
Wilkinson, Richard F., O59062.
Willard, Leroy L., O63313.
Williams, Dudley A., O60445.
Williams, Harry E., O61091.
Williams, John D., O60446.
Williams, Vernon C., O63062.
Williams, Virgil H., O59064.
Williams, Walworth F., O57310.
Williams, Wayne G., O65550.
Wilson, Charles D., O82124.
Wilson, James J., O85703.
Wilson, Kermit J., O60172.
Wilson, Melville C., Jr., O66646.
Wilson, Raymond C., O63723.
Winget, Kingston M., O62206.
Winston, Sanford H., O62154.
Winter, Leonard M., O82126.
Witko, Andrew B., O57170.
Wittlinger, Frederick J., O59069.
Wolfe, Hiram M., 3d, O61090.
Wolman, Gus A., Jr., O57583.
Wood, Edwin, O60525.
Wood, Roy L., O59071.
Wood, Samuel C., O60598.
Wood, William S., O59072.
Woods, Altus L., Jr., O59885.
Woodside, William W., O63315.
Woolard, Reginald W., O59073.
Wortham, James T., O79152.
Worthen, Robert D., O62207.
Wright, Madison C., 2d, O88533.
Wyckoff, Theodore, O63312.
Wyrick, William E., O65072.
Yakimovicz, Floryan L., O85392.
York, Dennis A., O66212.
Young, Frederick L., O79157.
Young, James W., O60410.
Young, Raymond E., O60484.
Youngblood, Kenneth L., O65543.
Youngs, Evert C., O59074.
Zigmund, Frank J., O59075.
Zobrist, Paul S., O59076.
Zuccardy, Charles A., O64991.
Zuppann, Charles W., O60534.

To be majors, Chaplain

Benson, John D., O89748.
Bloxham, Earl S., O69862.
Blunk, James B., O68080.
Burgreen, Charles L., O71905.
Calter, John T., O71651.
Campbell, Harry G., Jr., O75096.
Carroll, James C., O73211.
Coleman, James V., O69885.
Cowhig, Edward D., O75056.
Gilbert, Bertram C., O72595.
Harris, Thomas A., O71675.
Harvester, James V., O71924.
Huffman, Cloma A., O69688.
Justice, Willard M., O71684.
Malanowski, Thaddeus F., O75072.
McCarthy, Thomas H., O69983.
McMinn, Thomas L., Jr., O78602.
Meek, Charles A., O70431.
O'Neill, John J., O71945.
Paul, William E., Jr., O67603.
Price, Ben S., O70021.
Roth, John D., O71958.
Rowland, Ray M., O70032.
Spence, Edward L., O70510.
Stewart, Duncan C., O71728.
Sullivan, John J., O70520.
Wallace, Francis X., O78146.
Wessman, Willis W., O78152.
Wood, Robert J., O81865.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Abbott, Howard G., O69448.
Bishop, Raymond H., Jr., O69592.
Breen, James L., O69866.
Burham, William A., O71454.
Butler, Donald E., O73990.
Copen, Estis G., O69626.
Cowgill, Herbert F., O72329.
Cupp, Claude M., O70178.
Czarnecki, Stephen W., O69894.
Fisher, William C., O72387.
Geiger, James P., O69489.
Gelinas, Joseph A., O71190.
Gerard, Earl S., O69655.
Gomez, Alphonse C., O69493.
Gorby, Earl W., O69658.
Graham, Harvey P., O73254.
Hanna, Homer H., O69499.
Hardie, Philip W., Jr., O71923.
Hathaway, Robert G., O81799.
Hoagland, Peter W., O73100.
Howard, August A., O71809.
Jaffurs, William J., O70101.
Kilpatrick, William C., Jr., O72338.
Konwinski, Edward S., O69520.
Larson, Arlan P., O69522.
Mahin, Dorsey T., O73453.
Maier, John G., O76365.
McCabe, Lloyd B., O68029.
McKeown, Eugene P., O67846.
Neidlinger, Robert W., O67852.
O'Shaughnessy, Edward J., O71946.
Patton, Maurice G., O70012.
Pedrotty, Francis W., Jr., O69539.
Ransone, James W., O69547.
Sheffield, Frederick J., O67616.
Siebert, Paul E., O69557.
Staats, Robert E., O76661.
Thomas, Paul A., Jr., O69565.
Uhrig, Henry T., O88984.
Westerfield, Frank McC., O74937.
Zamora, Pablo J., O72668.

To be majors, Dental Corps

Everhart, Robert J., O68002.
Fox, Walter H., O66619.
Hare, Charles M., O70361.
Hathaway, John P., Jr., O66624.
Jeronimus, Robert D., O67585.
Karlson, Fredrick A., Jr., O66627.
Knapp, Milton J., O67589.
Lundquist, Donald O., O65685.
McGrew, Billie D., O67941.
Millard, Robert J., O70142.
Miller, Claude R., Jr., O76393.
Mooney, Samuel C., O63842.
Osterholtz, Raymond H., O68392.
Pacocha, Edmund C., O65697.
Schmitz, John F., O70120.
Schneider, Fred, O63845.
Sheridan, Roland C., Jr., O65686.
Smith, Thomas J., O68050.
Sumner, Charles F., 3d, O70049.
Uohara, George I., O67971.
Williams, James F., O76754.
Worcester, Hal C., O65483.
Zislis, Louis, O68066.

To be majors, Veterinary Corps

Anthony, Wallace L., O69849.
Beerwinkle, Milton A., O70269.
Benson, John H., O71642.
Garner, Floris M., O69930.
Gibbs, Roland J., O75060.
McConnell, Stewart J., O68383.
Morley, William J., O73473.
Morris, John H., 2d, O73474.
Raulston, Gilbert L., O70025.
Riley, William E., O65553.
Rosser, William W., O67610.
Slider, Howard B., Jr., O68403.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Bost, William L., O58787.
Calmes, Paul M., O84827.
Clovis, Ernest R., O68022.
Coner, Charles E., O78643.
Cook, Maxwell A., O59846.
Cook, Richard A., O67561.
Deakins, John A., O58788.
Devlin, John P., O68796.
Dicker, Frank W., O79676.
Diercks, Fred H., O60890.
Dolson, James F., O78646.
Eddinger, Clyde C., O60292.
Fels, Robert D., O84034.
Foster, Jay W., O84316.
Foubare, Louis H., O65076.
Goldstein, Bernard L., O78647.
Hoffmann, Kenneth L., O78649.
Hume, Joseph W., O84829.
Kneepkens, John A., O78651.
Kotchin, Stanley P., O83554.
Lauterbach, Carl G., O69523.
Lewis, Harold J., O84321.
Luckman, Otis N., O84322.
Mandel, Adrian D., O60889.
McCoy, John P., O84323.
Medcalf, Rex M., O84037.
Morgan, Ralph W., O60887.
Muzyka, Joseph C., O84325.
Nation, Marvin E., O78654.
Newton, Carlos E., Jr., O61082.
Osterhaus, Leo B., O84326.
Packo, Andrew, Jr., O84751.
Parkinson, Ralph W., Jr., O78655.

Power, Earl H., O84327.
Schenker, Hanssen, O63181.
Schlarb, William E., O84753.
Schwarz, William X., O84754.
Snyder, Allan J., O84329.
Swieter, Kenneth L., O84038.

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Berman, Thelma L., N2856.
Bond, Margaret M., N1780.
Clift, Mildred A., N1832.
Coxwell, Geraldine V., N1834.
Douglas, Maxine, N1810.
Dunlap, Lillian, N1785.
Galgano, Emma A., N1760.
Gallagher, Eleanor R., N1826.
Gaynor, Eleanor A., N1807.
Gieldseth, Betty M., N2583.
Gilson, Shirley M., N1824.
Goldsmith, Dorothy, N2841.
Hammerly, Aloha B–M., N1815.
Jones, Lois, N1771.
Madden, Betty L., N1778.
McCormick, Helen L., N2914.
Moore, Leota M., N2913.
O'Brien, Mary R., N2846.
Perkins, Sarah E., N2989.
Pettey, Florence L., N1792.
Phillips, Margaret P., N1758.
Ratcliff, Patricia A., N1795.
Roslonowski, Helen I., N2916.
Sheridan, Vivian C., N2917.
Snartemo, Alfa M., N2825.
Tierney, Marian A., N1750.
Wright, Helen E., N2848.

To be majors, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Blanton, Lottie V., J57.
Hathcock, Eva M., M10090.
Knickerbocker, Barbara M., J33.

To be captains

Ackerman, Albert A., O75132.
Adams, Robert L., O70579.
Addison, Richard L., O73541.
Alexander, Lyle K., O81366.
Allan, Walter F. D., O85474.
Allen, Wayne C., O81572.
Alley, Wayne E., O89174.
Alliason, John R., O89587.
Almy, Donald C., O77249.
Altland, Robert W., O71059.
Amisano, Italo B., O72569.
Anderson, John A., O77251.
Anderson, Richard L., O77253.
Andrews, Donald A., O71970.
Andrews, Donald G., O77254.
Andrews, William G., Junior, O78206.
Andy, Charles W., O82134.
Ansted, Genoa W., O71311.
Arciero, Robert G., O77255.
Ardizzione, Leo A., O78207.
Arnold, Thomas W., O81576.
Arnzen, Chester L., O72671.
Arthur, Billy A., O71971.
Ashby, Peter B., O71061.
Austin, Clinton W., O71639.
Austin, Freddie C., O82136.
Austin, Kenneth B., O77256.
Axup, William A., O71974.
Babers, Donald M., O75137.
Badovinac, Nick J., Jr., O78211.
Bailey, James B., O72570.
Bailey, William R., Jr., O77261.
Baker, Frank H., O71440.
Baker, Jack E., O77263.
Baldwin, Noland Y., O75141.
Barber, Richard L., O72437.
Barker, James E., O71975.
Barker, Llyle J., Jr., O85850.
Barnhill, David B., O72572.
Barnwell, Kenneth V., O90521.
Barrere, Richard P., O88562.
Barrett, Francis X., O78220.
Barry, James G., Jr., O79176.
Bartholomew, Roger J., O91750.
Bartos, Robert E., O71140.
Basil, Benjamin J., O91157.
Batchman, Gilbert R., O71976.
Bate, Milford C., O72439.
Bauer, Philip O., O81579.
Bausler, Donald R., O77267.
Baxter, George M., O84947.
Bazilwich, Paul, Jr., O71978.
Beal, Bruce T., O78224.
Bean, Richard J., O71979.
Bean, Robert H., O81580.
Bear, David A., O91159.
Bearden, Winston H., O84948.
Beasley, Lewis E., O80208.
Becker, Donald L., O83102.
Bedsaul, Clare D., O81582.
Bell, Glenn N., O71141.
Bell, Dale M., O91552.
Bell, James F., O71142.
Bell, Joel H., O84949.
Bennett, Joseph D., O71760.
Benoit, William R., O88570.
Berg, Roland E., O77268.
Bergen, James P., O71981.
Bergquist, Robert L., O85291.
Bernard, Paul H., O71643.
Bernhardt, William R., O89180.
Bettinger, Francis D., O85481.
Bickston, Walter J., O71316.
Bill, Gary R., O82142.
Bishop, Ted E., O71982.
Bittl, Frederick E., O72366.
Bjorn, Edward D., O77270.
Black, Ira W., Jr., O71983.
Black, William T., O68904.
Blackburn, Paul L., O72442.
Blahuta, Norman G., O71984.
Blake, Richard J., O77271.
Blandeburgo, Gasper, O87680.
Blasingame, Josiah, Jr., O71646.
Bliss, Charles F., 3d, O71986.
Boden, William C., O71068.
Boehnke, Roger H., O91764.
Boling, Douglas L., O77273.
Booras, Danny, O71150.
Booras, Peter D., O71987.
Borris, Roger J., O78233.
Bossert, Paul W., O71318.
Bourgeois, Edward J., Jr., O85295.
Bowdoin, William R., Jr., O77275.
Bowman, Ronald N., O71647.
Boyd, Bobby K., O71448.
Boyd, Sidney H., O71151.
Boyd, William P., O71989.
Boyer, Gene T., O79193.
Boynton, Marshall E., O71319.
Bracewell, Roland A., O77277.
Bradberry, William N., Jr., O77278.
Bradford, Wilson E., Jr., O78237.
Bradley, William C., O71069.
Brady, Harlan J., O84474.
Bragalone, Raymond A., O89418.
Bramblet, William B., O71451.
Bramlett, James T., O77281.
Brandenstein, Howard C., O89322.
Branscum, Billy R., O87687.
Breedlove, Smedley D., O71764.
Breithaupt, Marvin P., O75153.
Brendel, William J., O84958.
Brokenshire, James R., Jr., O71990.
Brooks, Leo A., O75154.
Brooks, Thomas J., O71991.
Brown, Dallas C., Jr., O71156.
Brown, Donald R., O84901.
Brown, Edward M., O81593.
Brown, George A., O81594.
Brown, Hugh R., Jr., O78174.
Brown, James E., O87695.
Brown, Joe A., O78244.
Brown, John M., O71992.
Brown, Lewellyn A., O91772.
Brown, Raymond V., O75157.
Brown, Robert B., O71993.
Browning, Robert A., O77286.
Brumback, Robert M., O91773.
Brumit, Charles D., O78245.
Brummit, Philip A., O71070.
Bruno, Vito J., O81596.
Bryan, Clyde M., Jr., O82150.
Bryan, Thomas F., O77288.
Buchanan, Gerald H., O71071.
Buchwald, Donald M., O71996.
Bundren, Alva B., Jr., O71997.
Bunyard, Jerry M., O77290.
Burbach, Frederick J. L., O73300.
Burchell, Troy D., O81391.
Burkard, Danny J., O77292.
Burkhart, George A., Jr., O71998.
Burnham, Charles A., O88020.
Burns, Charles W., O88347.
Burns, Joseph C., O82152.
Burns, Paul P., O79559.
Burns, William F., O71074.
Burrus, William S., O71999.
Burton, James, O71159.
Bush, Charles E., O77296.
Bussey, Charles D., O72448.
Butterfield, Dennis O., O72449.
Cage, Willie R., Jr., O91783.
Cairns, Ronald L., O72000.
Cameron, Duane G., O77300.
Camp, Robert E., O72002.
Campbell, Donald R., O71323.
Campbell, Jack P., O72003.
Campbell, Walter E., O72004.
Campbell, William W., Jr., O71769.
Cantrell, Jack R., O71160.
Cantwell, Franklin D., O84477.
Cardillo, Richard G., O72005.
Cardwell, Kenneth E., O77305.
Carlson, Raymond R., O85973.
Caron, John E., O82154.
Carpenter, Robert D., O72006.
Carr, Robert F., O71652.
Caswell, Philip P., Jr., O77311.
Cate, Hugh C., Jr., O71326.
Cathcart, James E., O77312.
Caudill, James M., Jr., O71162.
Cauthen, Lewis J., Jr., O75163.
Cecil, William I., O71164.
Chambers, Andrew P., O71458.
Chambers, John A., O71327.
Chance, Billy J., O72009.
Chandler, Edwin W., O71328.
Chandler, John R., O89041.
Chapin, Gordon R., O77313.
Chapman, Charles W., O78258.
Chapman, Robert B., O72010.
Chikalla, Gerald G., O72012.
Child, Paul W., Jr., O89190.
Childs, Wendell A., O91792.
Ching, Edmund K. S., O71653.
Chitwood, Thomas E., Jr., O71166.
Christensen, John E., O71461.
Cini, Alfred A., O72013.
Cipriano, Alexander W., O77319.
Clark, Robert H., O71655.
Clayton, John B., 3d, O72014.
Click, Edwin F., O77322.
Closs, William R., O77324.
Cochran, John R., O89960.
Coggins, James E., O71330.
Cole, Donald J., O77328.
Coleman, Alton H., O72015.
Collins, Harold E., O71464.
Collins, Harry D., O89046.
Collins, Lonnie L., O83624.
Collins, Marion H., O81604.
Collins, Patrick W., O81605.
Colson, Keith Q., O77330.
Congleton, Roy E., O71656.
Cook, John J., Jr., O72455.
Cooper, James A., O72016.
Cooper, Joe L., O71468.
Corley, William L., O91569.
Cornell, Robert K., O77336.
Corning, Terence C., O71076.
Correll, John E., O81609.
Costino, Michel, O77338.
Cottrell, Walter A., O87496.
Couvillion, Herbert H., O78266.
Coverdale, Craig G., O82509.
Cowan, Robert E., O78267.
Cowden, Carl, Jr., O77341.
Coyle, Lionel R., O72017.
Cozad, Jack G., O79238.
Crabtree, Sidney J., O71774.
Crancer, John W., O72018.
Craven, Thomas T., O72020.
Crawford, William R., O77342.
Crawley, Paul K., O77343.
Creel, Tilford C., O71473.
Cronin, Daniel W., O71333.
Crook, George R., O78270.
Crosby, John S., O71662.
Crosby, Richard D., Jr., O77345.
Cross, Ray S., O78271.
Croswhite, James L., O71334.

Crow, Marvin S., O85148.
Crowell, Howard G., Jr., O71168.
Crum, Luther G., Jr., O81614.
Cuba, Paul J., Jr., O71911.
Cummings, William T., O72022.
Dahl, Winston A., O72457.
Daley, Edmund K., Jr., O81406.
Daniel, John S., Jr., O71335.
Daniels, Geoffrey M., O83103.
Dankers, William H., O72460.
Darling, Allan L., O77350.
Darrah, James T., Jr., O72024.
Darrah, Robert F., O84972.
Dart, Frederick R., O71169.
Davis, Bobby J., O71476.
Davis, Dwight A., O77352.
Davis, Roger K., O71337.
Davis, Thomas H., O89876.
Dax, Raymond E., O72025.
DeAmaral, Charles F., Jr., O78278.
DeFatta, Vincent P., O72696.
DeLong, Clarence A., O72026.
DeMaris, Edgar E., O72027.
DeWitt, William W., O77353.
Deacon, Reynolds J., O82314.
Dean, Bobby J., O71338.
Dearborn, William H., O75170.
Deardorff, Robert E., Jr., O72028.
Dekle, Thomas A., O72462.
Delaney, Robert F., O81409.
Denman, Jerry L., O72029.
Deringer, Clifton H., Jr., O88253.
Detyens, Joseph W., O72698.
Dextraze, William P., O87729.
Dickinson, John R., O78280.
Dickinson, William G., O77358.
Dienst, Daniel W., O72031.
Dill, Bobby M., O77359.
Dillon, James W., O71080.
Dimsdle, Arthur, O73317.
Dinwiddie, Richard W., O72032.
Dirmeyer, Robert P., O77361.
Disbrow, David C., O81622.
Dixon, Allen C., Jr., O77363.
Dixon, Malcolm R., O81623.
Dixon, Philip W., O78175.
Dockler, Gordon S., O71171.
Domeck, Charles R., O72035.
Domenicucci Louis, O71172.
Donohue, John E., O81625.
Dorschler, Richard K., O82165.
Doust, Arol R., O81415.
Doyle, John P., Jr., O72037.
Draper, Leo, O88661.
Dreher, Henry E., O77368.
Drewyor, Richard A., O84479.
Drexler, Charles H., O75179.
Driscoll, Jerome W., O85527.
Drummond, James E., O72038.
Drury, Peter F., Jr., O77370.
Dryer, John E., O72039.
Dubovick, Richard R., O72703.
Duerr, Richard D., O78176.
Dugan, Daniel C., O72040.
Dukes, William C., O77371.
Dulin, Ralph W., O71484.
Dulk, George A., O72041.
Dunaway, Roy S., Jr., O72042.
Dunkelberger, William F., O71342.
Dunn, Earl C., Jr., O71784.
Dunn, Robert F., O71081.
Durbin, James J., O71785.
Durkee, Richard Y., O78177.
Eddins, Watha J., Jr., O72043.
Eddleman, Kenneth T., O89469.
Edmonson, Frank A., O72588.
Edwards, Alfred Y., O71898.
Edwards, William H., Jr., O72044.
Egeland, Edgar, O89472.
Elder, Perry B., Jr., O84777.
Elliott, Bernard V., Jr., O87508.
Ellis, Alvin C., O71175.
Ellison, Henry L., O71176.
Elton, Robert G., O90582.
Enslow, Philip H., Jr., O72045.
Epstein, Marc H., O91222.
Erickson, Roland S., O77379.
Evans, Bobby G., O71489.
Everett, William M., O72386.
Fair, Cecil G., Jr., O72864.
Falbo, John J., O77380.
Fallon, Thomas F., O77381.
Farmer, Garry H., O87738.
Farr, Robert A., O71179.
Farrington, John S., O72047.
Farrow, James H., O77382.
Fasolino, Rosario P., O84693.
Faugust, Robert E., O85321.
Feagin, John A., Jr., O72048.
Felker, Dale R., O77383.
Fene, William R., O85322.
Feore, Patrick L., Jr., O71082.
Fernander, Bobbie B., O77385.
Fernandes, Vincent R., O71491.
Fickett, William A., O77387.
Finger, Herbert C., O72051.
Finkbiner, Glenn G., O78299.
Fiora, Edward F., Jr., O78300.
Fischer, Daniel J., O71083.
Fiscus, James E., O72053.
Fisher, Harry C., Jr., O78301.
Fisher, Saul H., O84904.
Fitzpatrick, William F., O71085.
Fleeger, James E., O72054.
Fleming, Norwood W., O72055.
Fletcher, David F., O82171.
Focht, Charles W., O71493.
Follett, Arthur G., O72056.
Folta, Russell J., O77391.
Foster, Donald G., O71920.
Fraher, James D., O71087.
Fralen, Clifford J., O72058.
Franklin, Joseph P., O72059.
Frear, Harold D., O72061.
Freeman, William C., O81429.
Freeze, Richard S., O87746.
Freshley, Robert L., O78308.
Froelich, James W., O86165.
Fry, Dudley L., Jr., O71187.
Fuellhart, Joseph M., O77396.
Fujii, Eugene I., O85325.
Fuller, Bernard E., O73448.
Fulp, Charles A., O71669.
Furlong, George P., O81432.
Fust, John W., Jr., O71189.
Gabrielli, Robert J., O77398.
Gage, Walter G., O83104.
Gallagher, Robert J., O88692.
Gallup, Elisha, L., Jr., O72065.
Gannon, James V., O91835.
Gantt, Gerald D., O78313.
Garcia, Eliseo J., O72370.
Garcia, Santiago A., O71088.
Garn, Harvey A., O72066.
Garneau, Lucien R., O78315.
Garvais, Donald F., O77400.
Gatti, Michael A., 78317.
Gavin, David C., O81435.
Gay, Forrest T., 3d, O72067.
Geasland, Floyd E., O71348.
Gebelt, Henry F. C., O81437.
George, James R., Jr., O82326.
Gerich, Robert A., O71349.
Gerkey, George E., 3d, O71497.
Gersitz, Chares R., O72068.
Giddings, John H. J., O72069
Gilbreth, Lee E., O70725.
Gillard, Robert W., O71191.
Gillespie, Vernon W., Jr., O81439.
Gilpatrick, David D., O72070.
Ginger, Walter D., O82175.
Ginish, Michael, Jr., O88073.
Ginn, Charles J., O71498.
Ginter, Kenneth E., O72071.
Gminder, Russell, O77406.
Goeben, Oscar E. K., O84481.
Goetzinger, James E., O84482.
Goldstein, Jack, O72072.
Gontarski, Joseph W., O77408.
Gooch, Charles D., O72714.
Goodall, Billy R., O90118.
Goodrich, Charles R. O., O72596.
Gordon, James C., Jr., O71671.
Gorey, Paul J., O77409.
Gorman, Irving T., O78321.
Gosney, Durward D., O71192.
Gosney, Robert R., O77410.
Gotte, Jack E., O81644.
Gottron, Richard N., O72073.
Graham, Todd P., O72074.
Graham, William A., Jr., O72075.
Gramly, Pyne A., Jr., O81645.
Granger, John D., O75197.
Gransback, Donald H., O72076.
Grant, John C., O77415.
Graves, James R., O71195.
Gray, Richard H., O72077.
Greeley, Ira E., O84484.
Green, Donald J., O77417.
Green Gilbert R., O87764.
Greenberg, William M., O71503.
Grey, James W., O72079.
Griffith, Gerald S., O81647.
Griggs, John C., O72080.
Grimes, Donald B., O81447.
Grubbs, Edward F., Jr., O72081.
Gruene, Ernest K., Jr., O71351.
Grummt, Otto C., O71201.
Grundvig, Daniel A., O88082.
Guettler, Gerald C., O71352.
Gunderson, Raymond E., O72082.
Gunter, Arlie LaW, O71353.
Guptill, Colin K., O88265.
Guthrey, William L., O78327.
Guthrie, Edward R., O72083.
Haar, Franklin R., O72478.
Haas, William E., O72084.
Hadly, William McK., O72085.
Haendle, Karl V., O77421.
Hagan, Jerome F., O72086.
Hagedorn, Zach, Jr., O72087.
Hale, Marvin L., Jr., O78178.
Hall, David R., O71354.
Hall, Lawrence H., O78331.
Hally, John E., Jr., O77423.
Halsted, Thomas A., O73339.
Haltiwanger, Marion E., O72723.
Hamberlin, Lawrence M., O88086.
Hamel, Albert W., O89497.
Hamel, John F., Jr., O72888.
Hamilton, John M., Jr., O72088.
Hamlett, Ellis H., O71091.
Hanchey, Jennings B., Jr., O78335.
Hancock, Don F., O81649.
Haney, Kenneth W., 2d, O78336.
Hargrove, Richard L., O72089.
Harmon, Leonard J., 2d, O71506.
Harper, Oscar R., O90115.
Harrington, Robert E., O71355.
Harris, James T., Jr., O73155.
Harris, William I., O72480.
Hart, Edward P., O70753.
Hartrick, William L., O77433.
Hasbrouck, Robert W., Jr., O72090.
Hawk, Robert T., O87780.
Hawkins, Douglas K., O92062.
Haydon, James F., O78346.
Hayes, John T., O72725.
Hayes, Moody E., O72092.
Hayward, Arnold C., O71204.
Hayward, Donald P., O78347.
Haywood, Willie M., Jr., O75207.
Heinsoo, Heino, O77437.
Heintz, John P., O82185.
Heiss, John L., 3d, O77438.
Helm, Gunther A., O72727.
Hendon, William A., O71358.
Henne, Carl, Jr., O72600.
Henry, Robert B., O72094.
Hergenroeder, Leo A., O72095.
Herndon, George W., O71510.
Herren, Thomas W., Jr., O72096.
Hertzberg, Hugo H., O71359.
Hess, Carl H., O77441.
Hesson, James M., O90068.
Heuschkel, Donald G., O77443.
Hicks, Conrad O'F., O71360.
Highfill, James K., O77444.
Hilbert, Donald C., O72097.
Hilbert, Donald E., O77445.
Hill, Elbert B., O71361.
Hill, Frank J., O71925.
Hill, Houston C., O81454.
Hill, Michael E., O71515.
Hilton, Maynard E., O77446.
Himmel, Daniel L., O72732.
Hines, Thomas G., O71516.
Hinkin, Paul E., O77447.
Hinrichs, Robert M., O72098.
Hissong, Fred, Jr., O71518.
Hix, Preston D., O81658.
Hobbs, Harry V., O77449.
Hock, Robert C., O77450.

Hodges, Stanley W., O85184.
Hoeferkamp, Harold R., O72099.
Hoey, Stanislaus J., O81456.
Hoffman, Robert L., O81659.
Hoge, Philip R., O78351.
Holbrook, Willard A., O72100.
Holland, Evan F., O71520.
Holland, John J., O77455.
Holmes, Alan K., O71366.
Holt, Daniel R., O78180.
Holt, Xavia M., Jr., O71367.
Honor, Edward, O71368.
Hope, Fred H., O72488.
Horbert, Walter G., O84697.
Horne, William C., Jr., O84489.
Hornish, William E., O77458.
Horst, Thomas G., O72101.
Holster, Howard K., O71807.
Hough, Henry A., O77460.
Houts, Francis C., O78356.
Hrncir, Oran T., O75211.
Hubbard, Charles J., O72491.
Hudson, Samuel R., O77464.
Huff, Don B., O77465.
Huff, William S., O76248.
Hufnagel, David A., O72102.
Huggins, Charles B., O85004.
Huggins, Edward B., O81663.
Hughes, Douglas A., O72493.
Hughes, Frank A., Jr., O84491.
Huhn, John N., O78358.
Hull, Frederick B., Jr., O79337.
Hunter, Kelvin H., Jr., O71523.
Huntley, James E., Jr., O88108.
Hurd, Chetwin M., O77469.
Hurdle, Karl V., O7[illegible]61.
Hurley, William P , Jr., O81664.
Hymes, Morris A., O72390.
Ikeda, Kenneth K., O72104.
Imholz, Robert E., O77472.
Isbell, Don, O72105.
Jackemeyer, Robert, O77476.
Jackson, James C., O88754.
Jackson, Tracy H., O77478.
Janet, Stanley A., O81667.
Jarrett, Richard S., O77480.
Jellison, Cecil D., O72108.
Jennings, Robert H., Jr., O71373.
Jeter, John R., Jr., O72109.
Jimenez, Adam, O72495.
Jobert, A. Philip R., O72910.
Johnson, Charles R., O72110.
Johnson, Jack O., O77484.
Johnson, Richard D., O72112.
Johnson, Robert P., O72113.
Johnson, Stanley M., O72114.
Jones, Beauford Z., O87806.
Jones, Burton D., O77489.
Jones, Cecil P., O81464.
Jones, Charles E., O82278.
Jones, Clifford, Jr., O72115.
Jones, David W., O88762.
Jones, Ed E., Jr., O88113.
Jones, Robert A., O71211.
Jones, Samuel H., Jr., O81675.
Jones, Thomas S., O75220.
Jones, Warren A., O72116.
Jordan, Donald H., O78372.
Jordan, Horace E., O77492.
Joseph, Robert E., Jr., O72117.
Justiss, Robert E., O77493.
Kafonek, Richard H., O72742.
Kallestad, Richard D., O78375.
Kanamine, Theodore S., O77494.
Kanzler, Norbert A., O78377.
Kastner, Joseph H., O71685.
Katenbrink, Irvin G., Jr., O72118.
Kause, Kaye D., O81467.
Keenan, George E., O78378.
Keller, Donald F., O71374.
Keller, Leonard, O85339.
Kelley, Paul B., O71531.
Kelley, Victor R., O77498.
Kellogg, Kenneth E., O91896.
Kelly, Alan C., O81677.
Kelly, Edward J., O78182.
Kelly, Edward J., 3d, O77499.
Kelly, Richard P., Jr., O78383.
Kelly, William H., O77501.
Kemp, Donald T., O91605.
Kennedy, Bruce, O77503.
Kennedy, Donald R., O71213.
Kennedy, George I., Jr., O72375.
Keolanui, Lawrence K., Jr., O72744.
Kershner, Clark LaV., O75007.
Keyes, William G., O77506.
Kilgallen, John E., O78385.
King, John W., O85017.
King, Whitfield, O88276.
Kingsbury, Dave R., O72498.
Kirk, K. Leslie, O78388.
Kleis, C. Frederick, O71688.
Knauss, David S., O90218.
Knight, Emmett F., O81469.
Kohler, Glenn, O71096.
Komarow, Ronald M., O75383.
Konkle, Carl H., O77513.
Kowalczyk, Chester A., O71690.
Kraak, Charles F., O77514.
Krebs, James M., O77515.
Kros, William J., Jr., O77075.
LaCour, Hugh, Jr., O84495.
LaFrenz, Robert L., O72120.
Lamb, David O., O71379.
Lander, Robert B., O77080.
Landkammer, Theodore E., O81476.
Lapinskes, George S., O78183.
Larkin, Phillip S., O82197.
Lasker, Paul E., O77522.
Lassiter, Edward A., O89244.
Lathrop, Lloyd W., O81682.
Laudati, Roger C., O81683.
Lawson, Lawrence L., O81684.
Leach, Robert A., O71546.
Lehnert, Edwin D., O78398.
Leighton, James P., 3d, O89353.
Leisy, Henry J., O71382.
Lemon, Gilman J. K., O72618.
Lenio, Paul T., O72123.
Leonard, Richard J., O78399.
Leslie, George W., O81478.
Levinson, Stanley R., O85024.
Lewi, Kenneth E., O78400.
Lewis, Gerald, O72124.
Lewis, Thomas M., O81480.
Liesman, John S., O85025.
Light, Clarence O., O78403.
Livesay, Theodore J., O72125.
Lizardo, Alex R., O74922.
Lloyd, Joseph W., O77533.
Lloyd, Luther R., O77534.
Lo Re Jesse D., O71935.
Locke, Jimmie M., O88130.
Lokie, Andrew P., O72341.
Long, Arthur W., O88794.
Longanacre, Louis E., O71547.
Lopes, John F., Jr., O71220.
Lopez, Ramon R., O77537.
Lorigan, Robert E., O77538.
Lovelace, Richard S., O77540.
Lowery, George B., O71828.
Lowry, Samuel N., Jr., O72128.
Lozier, William E., O72129.
Lucido, Jack A., O82201.
Ludolph, Anthony A., Jr., O81690.
Ludwig, Daniel D., O72131.
Lumpkin, Walter L., O84699.
Lund, Robert E., Jr., O77542.
Luthultz, Gene H., O74016.
Lybert, Elmer J., O71551.
Lyles, Jesse D., O77545.
Lynn, Charles T., Jr., O78410.
Lynn, Robert G., O91449.
Lyons, Gerald E., O91915.
MacDonald, Bruce S., O72132.
MacDonnell, Thomas A., O77547.
MacManus, Frederick O'N., O77549.
MacDonald, Alexander R., O72133.
MackIntosh, Robert, O75243.
MacMillan, Richard H., Jr., O82202.
Main, Robert G., O77552.
Malone, Daniel K., O72134.
Malone, Howard E., Jr., O75015.
Malooley, Rudolph S., O72135.
March, Miles B., O71936.
Marchioli, Alexander D., O78185.
Marden, Jack M., O87553.
Mariani, John, O82203.
Marion, Charles B., O85618.
Marko, George F., O91919.
Marks, Malcolm L., Jr., O85031.
Marshall, Charles McL., O81696.
Marshall, Raymond E., O71554.
Marshall, Thomas W., 3d., O77557.
Martin, David C., O73568.
Martin, George L., O86458.
Martling, John E., O72136.
Mason, Sidney E., O72137.
Massey, Clyde, Jr., O72138.
Matheney, Harold D., O81483.
Matson, James M., O85034.
Matteson, John R., O72139.
Mattson, Bertil E., O85036.
Mauerhan, Karl E., O71387.
Maurer, David F., O72141.
Maus, William C., Jr., O72142.
Mawhinney, Perin, O70847.
May, William S., O72143.
Mayson, Preston B., Jr., O72144.
McCarthy, John W., O88285.
McCarthy, Thomas W., O72145.
McCarthy, Walter R., Jr., O71388.
McClain, Richard A., O71223.
McClary, Jack D., O85433.
McClelland, Robert R., O72146.
McCloskey, John C., O72147.
McConnell, Richard M., O90446.
McCool, James M., O74017.
McCoole, Delos A., O71224.
McCormack, J. Gordon, O72148.
McCulla, William L., Jr., O72149.
McCusker, George E., O71225.
McDaniel, Cecil D., Jr., O77562.
McDonald, Donald F., O72511.
McDonald, Thomas F., O72512.
McDowell, Billy J., O71226.
McDuff, Charles R., O78423.
McElrath, William T., O72513.
McFather, Bennie S., O72343.
McGar, Robert D., O78424.
McGee, Bernard A., Jr., O71557.
McGee, Carl D., Jr., O71389.
McGee, Ronald R., O72622.
McGregor, Harold W., O88820.
McGrevey, Thomas P., O72150.
McGuire, Martin C., O72151.
McHugh, Thomas E., O77570.
McIlroy, Wilmer L., Jr., O72152.
McKee, Kenneth J., O88824.
McKee, Richard W., O71704.
McKellips, John L., O77573.
McKenna, Thomas P., O86499.
McKenney, Hubert F., Jr., O71390.
McKinley, David J., O71392.
McKinney, Boyce C., O91928.
McKinney, Leon E., O72154.
McLay, Orville K., O75019.
McMillen, Earl J., Jr., O78427.
McNair, Carl H., Jr., O72155.
McNair, Jeptha L., Jr., O77574.
McNamee, Martin L., O72156.
McNeil, Darrell O., O83959.
McNerney, David A., O72157.
McNider, Henry B., O90281.
Meaders, Barney R., 3d, O71560.
Meeker, Don E., O72519.
Meeker, Jo O., O72625.
Meekison, Malcolm V., O72158.
Meetze, Henry W., O72159.
Mellish, James R., O71229.
Mendelson, Joseph R., Jr., O87563.
Mendenhall, Thomas D., O81487.
Mendoza, Joseph A., Jr., O71230.
Metallo, Vincent J., O85044.
Meyer, Gerald J., O78434.
Mikula, Joseph G., O81488.
Milani, John A., O71100.
Miller, Henry T., O71398.
Miller, James R., O72162.
Miller, James R. C., O72163.
Miller, John W., O72164.
Miller, Louis G., O72523.
Miller, Raymond H., O72764.
Miller, Ronald W., O78436.
Millimet, Stanley, O82209.
Miluszusky, Raymond J., O77580.
Minich, Cecil M., O72165.
Mino, Paul L., O81492.
Misajon, Herman G., O77582.
Mitchell, Frederick H., O71564.
Mitchell, James L., Jr., O72525.
Moir, Raymond C., O77584.
Momeier, John L., O75255.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Monaghan, Michael F., O84501.
Moody, Herbert E., O71565.
Moore, David R., O77587.
Moore, George D., Jr., O78440.
Moore, James M., O71401.
Moore, Robert J., O88845.
Moore, Virgil E., Jr., O78444.
Moore, William B., O82289.
Moran, William J., O85221.
Moreau, Thaddee F., O77588.
Morgan, Abbott R., O78186.
Morgan, Jerry T., O71566.
Morris, Eddie L., O71235.
Morris, Patrick W., O82352.
Morrow, Robert D., O71569.
Morse, James W., O81704.
Mort, Bruce M., O84502.
Morton, Bryan D., O72526.
Moscovic, Paul S., O90320.
Moses, Dan, O72166.
Mounts, James A., Jr., O90514.
Mueller, Frederick, O71847.
Muhlherr, Joseph J., O71236.
Mullan, Thomas L., Jr., O72167.
Mullen, Gordon R., O71572.
Mullin, William E., O71102.
Munier, Paul L., O78448.
Munroe, Gary W., Sr., O72169.
Murphy, Charles K., O72346.
Murphy, Clyde L., O81496.
Myers, Maynard D., O78451.
Nack, Thomas P., O72378.
Nakamura, Leslie K., O92103.
Napier, James W., 3d., O72172.
Nave, Billy J., O72767.
Neal, Charles A., O88857.
Neal, James W., O77595.
Negaard, Gordon R., O72173.
Neroni, Frederick J., O71579.
Neroutsos, George H., O75257.
Newman, Jesse K., O72768.
Newton, Robert W., O72174.
Nichols, Sterling R., Jr., O72175.
Nidever, Edward W., O72176.
Nidever, Richard L., O71238.
Nodland, Stanley K., O72769.
Nolan, John D., O71239.
Nork, William G., O89267.
Norwalk, Frank E., O82215.
Nourse, Robert H., O72179.
Nuckolls, Donald R., O90554.
Nunziata, Salvatore W., O71104.
Oakley, Howard H., O77605.
Obermire, John P., O83632.
Oblock, Louis W., O71944.
O'Brien, Francis E., O72180.
O'Connell, Marvin G., O78457.
O'Connor, James J., O89268.
Okazaki, Kenneth T., O71241.
O'Leary, Arthur J., O77608.
O'Leary, Francis D., O77609.
O'Leksy, William G., O71105.
Oliver, Hebren W., O91963.
Olvey, Lee D., O72181.
Ordway, Godwin, 3d, O72182.
Osborn, Phillip C., O77613.
Oshesky, Gerald K., O84504.
Ottinger, Joseph B., O72533.
Owel, William R., O75262.
Owens, Frank E., O77614.
Owings, William M., O71852.
Pacelli, Vincent A., O77615.
Pacha, Leonard E., O71106.
Page, George W., O72184.
Page, Louis V., O81505.
Parchinski, Edward S., O81506.
Parham, Paul B., O77618.
Parker, Alton B., Jr., O72185.
Parker, Don L., O71107.
Parks, Paul F., O72186.
Parks, William T., O72187.
Parrish, Glenwood N., O72771.
Parry, Rafael P., O71584.
Parsons, Russell L., O72188.
Passafiume, John F., O72189.
Pate, Robert I., O71409.
Patnode, Clarence A., Jr., O71109.
Pattakos, Arion N., O72635.
Patterson, Earl A., Jr., O84715.
Patterson, Theodore B., O72190.
Patton, Joe W., O85066.
Payne, Lloyd A., O87877.
Pearson, John C., O72192.
Pede, August R., O72348.
Pemberton, David L., O72193.
Perkins, Rex VanN., O72194.
Perrotto, Anthony J., O85233.
Perry, John W., Jr., O71247.
Perry, Ronald C., O82221.
Perschetz, Gerald, O77622.
Pershing, Jay W., O77623.
Peters, William G., O72195.
Petersen, Darwin A., O85068.
Pettet, Joseph D., O72196.
Pettit, Lewis W., O71855.
Pfaller, Eberhard W., O81508.
Philbrook, Wilbur W., Jr., O77625.
Philippsen, Werner C., O91484.
Phillips, Calvin F., Jr., O82223.
Phillips, Clyde W., O75267.
Pierce, Fred W., Jr., O81717.
Pierce, James R., O71587.
Pierce, John A., O72538.
Pierce, Wilbur R., Jr., O71950.
Pohlod, Leonard G., O85070.
Poor, Thomas D., O70914.
Poorman, Donald C., O72200.
Pospisil, Vladimir A., O91485.
Powel, Ben F., Jr., O81720.
Poydasheff, Robert, O71856.
Pratt, Willis G., O77627.
Prawl, Sherlund D., O78187.
Principe, Martin A., O88883.
Prothero, Ronald P., O77630.
Pruniski, Stephen A., Jr., O81722.
Purchase, Collins J., O84505.
Purdy, Harry E., Jr., O72380.
Putorek, William P., Jr., O78472.
Putz, Robert A., O84506.
Quinn, Hugh, 3d, O72203.
Quinn, James R., O75273.
Raab, Kenneth E., O78188.
Rackley, Jerry D., O71250.
Radtke, William P., O88184.
Ralls, Rawleigh H., 3d., O72204.
Randall, Donald A., O81724.
Randall, Eugene J., O82226.
Randolph, James W., O77637.
Rasmussen, Ronald R., O71411.
Ray, Howard, O71252.
Raymond, Allen D., 3d., O72205.
Reddell, Gerald W., O77639.
Redmond, Robert S., O71412.
Regan, John P., O77641.
Register, Benjamin F., Jr., O77642.
Reid, Donald E., O72206.
Reid, Robert C., O72641.
Reid, Robert L., Jr., O77643.
Reniker, Gene B., O71254.
Rhodes, Roy P., O89949.
Rhyan, Earnest W., Jr., O85077.
Rice, Harley E., O77648.
Richey, Eugene C., O75276.
Rider, Archie A., O77650.
Rider, James D., O77651.
Rimbach, Douglas O., O80227.
Risteter, Vincent A., O81726.
Riviere, George L., O88899.
Rixon, Malcolm D., O91991.
Roberts, Benjamin D., O72207.
Roberts, William P., O75277.
Robertson, Frank J., O72208.
Robinson, George R., O71258.
Robinson, Jerry L., O71861.
Robinson, Thomas J., O78480.
Robinson, Willard L., O72209.
Rodeman, Dean A., O87598.
Rodenhiser, Carl L., O88903.
Rodgers, William E., O78481.
Rohrbach, Roger B., Jr., O82228.
Roop, John R. C., O77656.
Rose, Charles E., O71415.
Ross, Vaughn C., O71261.
Rosser, John C., Jr., O71716.
Roth, Bernard J., O77660.
Rowan, George R., Jr., O71262.
Rudzki, John E., Jr., O72211.
Rungee, James L., O87904.
Rupert, Harry W., Jr., O85798.
Russell, Benjamin B., O77664.
Russell, Cledie B., O70149.
Russell, Dean F., O71264.
Rutledge, Howard L., O77665.
Ryan, James H., O72213.
Ryan, Walter J., O72214.
Rydel, Albert S., Jr., O78487.
Saffold, Albert T., O84918.
Sager, Robert A., O71266.
Sammt, Carl J., O86716.
Sanders, Ralph D., Jr., O73077.
Sands, Clifton A., O88911.
Sands, Robert S., O92000.
Sanford, Jackie W., O90430.
Saunders, Joe W., O84510.
Savoldi, William R., O75284.
Schauer, Franz P., O72216.
Schepps, Madison C., Jr., O72217.
Schick, John L., O72218.
Schick, Robert L., O77671.
Schlotter, Frank J., O72219.
Schmidt, Robert C. H., O72220.
Schnabel, Robert H., O81734.
Schneider, Finis E., O77674.
Schneider, Robert L., O75289.
Schott, Richard S., O82294.
Schouman, Hazen C., Jr., O81518.
Schow, Horace, 2d, O72221.
Schuh, Charles A., O72222.
Schumann, John R., O84511.
Schwartz, James L., O89951.
Schwarz, Henry E., O71268.
Scott, Charles H., O71270.
Scott, Edward M., O91685.
Scott, Frank H., O78493.
Scott, Richard L., O71596.
Scott, William T., O71271.
Screen, Donald D., O71119.
Scribner, Edwin G., O77679.
Seagrave, David A., O78494.
Sears, James M., O84512.
Seaton, Peter P., O78189.
Seguin, Raymond J., O81738.
Selig, William L., O78190.
Senay, David C., O71867.
Senn, Thomas J., O92008.
Serra, Robert R., O90534.
Setzer, Howard L., Jr., O85376.
Seward, John M., O77682.
Shaffer, Robert L., O72224.
Shalikashvili, Othar J., O73583.
Shalz, Roger M., O85254.
Shamblee, Curtis G., O71273.
Shanahan, Norman K., O78497.
Shannon, Robert, O82295.
Sharp, Benjamin F., Jr., O71274.
Shaul, Rollin E., O84513.
Shaylor, Thomas C., O90480.
Shea, Thomas F., O84269.
Shelby, Jerry L., O71419.
Shepard, William C., O78500.
Shilko, Edwin M., O74842.
Shimunek, Richard D., O72226.
Shiraishi, James T., O71275.
Shoemaker, Ronald Z., O72650.
Shreeve, Caleb A., Jr., O71598.
Sietman, William F., Jr., O72227.
Silvanic, George, O89290.
Simmons, Eugene F., Jr., O71276.
Simmons, Frank J., O87916.
Simpson, Billy S., O85257.
Sims, Billy G., O89607.
Siner, Albert P., O88494.
Sisman, Lawrence, O78191.
Skaff, Joseph J., O72228.
Skladal, George W., O71278.
Sliva, Norman E., O77691.
Sloan, John F., O72229.
Slocum, Frederick V., Jr., O79478.
Smith, Alfred L., Jr., O77693.
Smith, Glenn N., O81740.
Smith, James L., Jr., O73196.
Smith, John J., O71874.
Smith, Lawrence D., O90500.
Smith, Lloyd D., O92012.
Smith, Nelson H., O71726.
Smith, Norman M., O72231.
Smith, Richard R., O77695.
Smith, Robert J., O71122.
Smith, Thomas A., O81743.
Smith, Wayne R., O72232.
Smith, William A., O87622.
Smor, Paul R., O72233.
Solinsky, Harold, O86790.

Sontag, Paul D., O88950.
Soupene, James C., Jr., O72358.
Soyster, Frank L., O87919.
Spain, Harold D., O81531.
Spann, Bobby G., O87625.
Sparks, Norman W., O72235.
Spaulding, Alfred J., O72236.
Spegele, John A., O81532.
Spellman, John G., O72237.
Spruill, Joseph L., O71285.
Stallard, James E., 3d, O71123.
Stallings, James D., O82239.
Standeven, Ernest J., O78514.
Stanley, Robert F., O72239.
Stapleton, John R., O77702.
Steakley, John W., O72241.
Steckley, Kenneth D., O89386.
Steine, Joel R., O91694.
Steinman, Charles A., O72242.
Stevens, Charles H., 3d., O72245.
Stevenson, Joseph M., O88960.
Stevenson, Michael A., O72246.
Stewart, Israel W., Jr., O81536.
Stewart, Joe F., O78517.
Stewart, William A., Jr., O77708.
Stockett, Lawrence E., O72247.
Stommel, Raymond R., O87937.
Stone, George J., O75300.
Stone, Howard F., O72248.
Stone, Leon H., Jr., O77711.
Stovall, Don O., O86821.
Strang, Charles W., Jr., O71729.
Strati, Robert A., O72249.
Street, Clover B., Jr., O72359.
Streett, William B., Jr., O72250.
Strickland, James R., O72251.
Strom, John H., O72252.
Strom, Roy M., O77713.
Stuart, Theodore M., O90478.
Stumpff, George F., O89387.
Subotky, Gerson J., O71126.
Sullivan, Andrew J., O89147.
Sullivan, Robert D., O87632.
Sullivan, Roy F., O77717.
Summers, James T., O83107.
Surmiak, Edward P., O82368.
Sutherland, James C., O71421.
Swanson, Robert L., O75302.
Swartwout, Donald C., O77719.
Sweet, William E., O87633.
Sydenham, Stanley R., O72255.
Talbot, Bailey M., O71964.
Tandy, Donald F., O72794.
Tanimoto, Robert H., O71287.
Tawoda, Robert J., O71730.
Taylor, James O., O77723.
Taylor, Richard F., Sr., O74031.
Taylor, William J., Jr., O78522.
Teague, Martin W., O78192.
Templeton, James L., Jr., O78193.
Tennant, Billy M., O72258.
Terrio, William A., O72259.
Terzopoulos, Nicholas, O77727.
Thames, Peter H., O71965.
Thayer, Henry J., O77728.
Thomas, Billy J., Jr., O81750.
Thomas, David L., O75305.
Thomas, Max E., O89300.
Thomas, Richard W., Jr., O88973.
Thomer, Joseph N., O72260.
Thompson, Donald K., O78194.
Thompson, Duayne B., O82246.
Thompson, Harold N., O85092.
Thompson, John U., O77732.
Thompson, Lonnie E., O72796.
Thorp, Lee LaV., O71611.
Tigh, Leland F., Jr., O77736.
Todd, Rouse J., O90149.
Tomberg, Ralph T., O78526.
Toner, Francis J., O77737.
Top, John J., O88980.
Torbett, William C., 3d, O77738.
Torrence, James E., O72262.
Towle, Thomas J., O77739.
Town, James I., O72263.
Trail, Carl F., O92137.
Treadway, Thomas J., O72360.
Treadwell, Millard L., Jr., O71884.
Trent, Warren T., Jr., O77740.
Trevethan, Alexander, O78196.
Trobaugh, Edward L., O72266.
Trosper, Robert L., O78197.
Trowbridge, Clarence A., O78528.
Troyan, Frank D., O72267.
Truitt, Gene A., O86872.
Turner, Gary L., O72798.
Tuten, Jeff M., O71885.
Ueltschi, Donald R., O77746.
Ulcak, Ben J., O72555.
Underwood, Frank E., O78531.
Underwood, Joe D., O84518.
Underwood, John R., O72556.
Valentine, William L., O81547.
Valverde, Robert A., O92141.
Valz, Darwin K., O77748.
Valz, Donald J., O77749.
Van Camp, James P., O71736.
Van Houten, William, 3d, O77750.
Van Pool, Jack L., O77751.
Vanden Bosch, Jon C., O72269.
Vaughan, Charles U., O82302.
Vaught, Ralph R., O71292.
Vavra, George R., O89306.
Ventrella, Rocco F., Jr., O87651.
Vincent, Joseph F., O72271.
Viney, John A., O72272.
Voetsch, John A., 3d, O81549.
Von Gortler, Frederick C., 3d, O77754.
Vosbein, Henry M., Jr., O77755.
Vought, Donald B., O71293.
Vulgas, Edmund, O72274.
Waible, Leo C., Jr., O88990.
Waite, Hugh G., O71295.
Walker, Billy M., O80231.
Walker, Travis L., O90581.
Wall, Harold R., O81756.
Wall, Kary D., O81757.
Wallace, Joel B., Jr., O72661.
Wallace, John R., O73420.
Walter, Francis J., Jr., O71129.
Walter, Paul B., O88993.
Walther, Harry J., O71888.
Walton, Frank G., O72275.
Ward, Gayle G., O71425.
Ward, Stanley D., O77763.
Warner, Leo V., Jr., O72276.
Warren, Carl W., O71622.
Warren, Wilford N., 3d, O90556.
Waterstrat, Rodney L., O72277.
Watson, Henry G., O72431.
Watts, James R., O81553.
Watzling, John K., O77768.
Weatherall, Marcus L., O91413.
Weatherby, Yale D., O71022.
Weaver, John L., O71893.
Weckerling, John H., O71426.
Weiher, Ronald G., O78540.
Weiskirch, Thomas N., Jr., O72362.
Welborn, Carl W., O87661.
Welling, Gerald R., O84519.
Wells, Macon W., O72279.
Welter, William L., Jr., O72280.
Wendelken, William H., O77771.
West, Thomas C., O72282.
Wharrie, Robert E., O72405.
Wheaton, Robert L., O72283.
Wheeler, David E., O72284.
White, Chad B., O71623.
White, Charles E., O77773.
White, Fredrick B., O77774.
White, Marion F., O71300.
Whiteley, Frank G., O71624.
Whiteley, James E., O85101.
Whitmore, Wesley C., O71625.
Whittaker, Howard C., O72285.
Wiegand, Robert D., O72286.
Wiggers, Ralph G., O77776.
Wiggs, Jimmy D., O72665.
Wilcox, William H., O72288.
Wilde, Forrest B., O81557.
Wilkie, James B., 3d, O71302.
Willemse, Cornelius W., O71303.
Willey, Burr McB., O87969.
Williams, Clinton L., Jr., O91725.
Williams, James D., O84070.
Williams, Lewis E., O92148.
Williams, Louis F., Jr., O71428.
Williams, Norman H., O71304.
Williams, Robert C., Jr., O78550.
Williams, Sylvanus J., 3d, O77779.
Williams, Thomas L., Jr., O78551.
Williamson, Rayburn L., O77780.
Williamson, Robert L., O81764.
Willis, William, Jr., O71306.
Wilmes, John J., O71427.
Wilson, Charles E., O89012.
Wilson, Richard A., O81765.
Wilson, William E., O78554.
Wing, John R., O72290.
Wingfield, Damon D., O85285.
Winney, Walter E., Jr., O84520.
Winston, Neil C., O77784.
Winter, William J., Jr., O72667.
Wintz, Edward K., O77786.
Wise, Lynn J., O81561.
Witek, James E., O71308.
Witter, Robert A., O77788.
Wix, William M., O72291.
Woerner, Frederick F., Jr., O72292.
Wood, Graham W., O72293.
Wood, Hector, O81562.
Woodall, James R., Jr., O88531.
Woodmansee, Donald R., O75129.
Woods, Eugene R., O77793.
Wright, William J., Jr., O81564.
Wyatt, David L., O81770.
Yore, Joseph A., O77796.
York, Harry M., O72294.
Young, Carl L., O82304.
Young, Raymond H., O71132.
Young, Roger Q., O78199.
Yuengel, William W., O85395.
Zaborowski, Edward J., O72296.
Zeigler, Charles S., O78562.
Zenk, Daniel R., O72564.
Zimmerman, Fred R., O81771.
Zurbriggen, Donald J., O77801.

To be captains, Chaplain

Adickes, Donald K., O90080.
Combs, Louis K., Jr., O85739.
Cox, Billy H., O88248.
Forrest, Alfred T., O88683.
Garrell, Hubert, O89488.
Graber, Howard M., O88704.
Johnson, Charles M., O88760.
Knowlton, Robert L., O88770.
Kovacic, Francis, O88773.
Lapp, Ernest D., O89085.
Magalee, John E., O89100.
Maguire, Francis N., O86446.
Nelson, Harold E., O88458.
Polhemus, David W., O88878.
Shelton, Wayne G., O89603.
Stover, Earl F., O88961.
Trobaugh, William P., O89157.
Yarborough, Jimmie W., O89168.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Albright, Ruth M., L516.
Archambault, Claire A., L547.
Etheridge, Wanda J., L541.
Griffin, Norma B., L589.
Haynes, Christine, L571.
Hunter, Onie R., L543.
Husband, Patricia R., L549.
Keil, Barbara J., L550.
Maybin, Patricia J., L578.
O'Rourke, Kathleen R., L551.
Raidmets, Margaret M., L548.
Roffee, Ruth O., L554.
Shippee, Audrey B., L518.
Steelman, Lois M., L522.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3304.

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps

Bowling, Pauline J., N578.
Brown, Helen E., N2558.
Burchfield, Muriel, N276.
Burrows, Mary L., N2152.
Cannoles, Margaret H., N1211.
Cavanaugh, Dorothy W., N2384.
Fischer, Mercedes M., N2089.
Hays, Anna Mae M., N905.
Kammeraad, Angie C., N1529.
Phillips, Kathleen W., N2458.
Schuchmann, Amanda E., N2147.
Tessen, Dorothy A., N1858.
Treacy, Jeanne M., N2093.
Votava, Mary T., N448.

DIGITIZED BY BILLERICA LIBRARIES

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Brigham, Agnes A., M10100.
Marshall, Eleanor M., M10040.
Stack, Mary E., R10072.
Summers, Evelyn G., R10122.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298.

To be first lieutenants

Anderson, John L., O81774.
Evans, William R., O91820.
Martinka, Gerald R., 092092.
Mills, Harry L., O91646.
Napper, John L., O91474.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 1211, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288.

To be colonel

Thackston, Albert J., Jr., O16607.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be lieutenant colonel

Bachelor, William E., O303253.

To be major

King, Grover C., O449492.

To be captain

Beam, James D., O4012716.
Bertrand, Milton A., O4018908.
Davis, Jonah B., Jr., O4011964.
Davis, Willie L., O4012032.
Dewey, Desmond D., O4006822.
Falter, Vincent E., O4009872.
Fisher, Robert J., O4009747.
Flenniken, David B., O4019789.
Grant, Donald E., O4009881.
Guffey, Howard R., O4009606.
Murtha, James D., O4020836.
Tallon, Richard J., O4026543.
Tom, Harry K. L., O4006805.
Trim, Carl J., O1913498.
Warren, James R., O988693.
Wheeler, William P., O1935824.
Williams, James R., Jr., O4000659.

To be first lieutenants

Ballew, Bobby G., O5301728.
Beaver, Joseph M., O4015444.
Bozeman, Paul, O5302259.
Clark, Davis, O4063734.
Collings, J. Elmer, O5701773.
Dorward, Neil L., O2298722.
Kunard, Donald D., O4071622.
Large, Darrel R., O4074510.
Miles, Jerry M., O5400990.
Miner, William R., O5504199.
Shunk, William A., O5506455.
Stevens, Ronald B., O4063761.

To be second lieutenants

Bennett, Roger M., O5505286.
Britt, James J., O5404474.
Cooke, Charles B., W3150425.
Custer, Leslie L., O5504811.
Gray, Josef E., O5701931.
Johnson, Richard G., O5305693.
Juhnevicz, William B., O5001347.
Koehl, Jacob O., O5411108.
Lane, Harry G., RA11353467.
Lanzotti, Robert E., O5510733.
Leverette, Thomas E., O5311564.
McKenzie, George R., O5409465.
McKeon, James E., O5206150.
Moore, John E., Jr., O5209869.
Regan, Carl J., O5307395.
Robertson, James A., O5306240.
Simons, William H., RA11348877.
Stahlman, John R., O5308731.
Thomas, James E., O5704378.
Ulm, Donald S., O5208902.
Wallace, Richard B., O5212086.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294 and 3311:

To be major, Women's Army Corps

Wood, Nancy B., L402096.

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Ware, Jean M., N792766.

To be captains, Chaplain

Dryer, Richard E., O1873651.
Stevey, John E., O4403456.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Burger, Robert B., O5206961.
Chandler, Hubert T., O5202550.
Older, Alva H., Jr., O4073668.
Parker, Warren A., O5210350.
Shannon, Charles J., Jr., O4035921.
Shaver, Lloyd F., Jr., O5206862.
Smith, Paul E., O5500984.
Tye, Edward J., O5501115.
Williams, Robert W., O4030303.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Altman, Robert S., O2289688.
Ballard, Michael D.
Bebak, Donald M., O5004195.
Boccagno, Patrick M., O5213481.
Burkhart, Cecil R., O2291439.
Caplinger, Carl B., O4033063.
Cataldo, Joseph R., O2248202.
Clark, Paul K., O2298944.
Conley, William R., O5518006.
Danforth, Howard B., O2291356.
Duley, Norman D., Jr., O2300406.
Friedlander, Harvey L., O2289835.
Froker, Lowell D., O2289700.
Galdieri, Louis G., O2289702.
Grodsky, Leonard H., O4043835.
Hunt, Walter L., O2290105.
Jones, Billy E., O4044644.
Jones, Edward H., O4014662.
Kriz, Francis K., O2295078.
Lambert, Fred M., O4028649.
Mani, John R., O5703113.
Mayes, Hubert A., O2289724.
Montegut, Ferdinand J., Jr., O2291537.
Mulholland, Philip L., O4037754.
Nelson, Roald A., O5703132.
Neumann, Peter H., O5207321.
Palmbaum, Paul J., O5703136.
Peterson, Richard B., O2300704.
Phillips, Ran L., II, O5301194.
Poindexter, James L., O4073448.
Reed, John H., Jr., O2295023.
Reiss, Walter E., O2289712.
Schochet, Howard L., O5501127.
Scotti, Louis N., O4042434.
Sledden, Richard E., O4037771.
Stark, Donald B., O5703194.
Stuart, Ronald R., O4013830.
Warner, Phillip O., O2295028.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Mancini, Lawrence H., O2208611.
Sabol, Donald E., O2266007.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Scott, Marvin T., O4044312.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Bryant, Barbara J., N2290044.

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

King, Billie C., O5306783.

To be first lieutenant, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Holtman, Donald R., O2300930.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Aldrich, Robert C., II, O2298290.
Alexander, Jack L., O2300484.
Anderson, Kirby V., O4060444.
Burdick, Richard E., O2300478.
Butkus, Donald E., O4066594.
Cleary, Jimmie R., O4076004.
Cranston, John P., III.
Edwards, John B., O2298141.
Eisenstein, Elliot M., O2300498.
Lodmell, John G., O2298144.
McClure, Hubert L., O2298156.
Montgomery, Robert C., O2298157.
Stevenson, Robert S., O5703591.
Townsley, James T., III, O5301069.
Watanabe, Henry K., O4078133.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Kaperick, Donald P., O2295354.

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps

Ferrell, John F., O2298289.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Gosling, Bernadine J., N2298142.
Kucha, Delores H., N2298682.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Benson, Warren D., O5512909.
Fitzgerald, Barry E., O5311206.
Fuller, Gary L., O5705182.
Gilchrist, Robert E., O5705649.
Harris, Leonard G., O5206735.
Monk, Merrill E., O5409671.
Norton, George T., O5003775.

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Morris, Sarah L., L5302023.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Arroyo, Francisco
Blair, Robert A.
Buckingham, Stuart R.
Goodstein, Richard K.
Green, Thomas
McMichael, James H., Jr.
Swain, Richard H.
Winn, William M.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Agnew, Ramon B.
Anderson, John R., III
Austin, Thomas S., Jr.
Avila, Carmelo
Boesch, John C.
Bowen, James R.
Bradley, Larry E.
Bradley, Robert N.
Bridgman, Cain A.
Brown, Robert A.
Bublys, Romualdas
Byrd, Johnnie P.
Callander, Robert D.
Cantrell, Charles L.
Carpenter, John F.
Carroll, Robert H.
Carter, Russell L.
Ceccon, Claude R.
Cleveland, Conley R.
Cohen, Franklin S.
Collins, Donovan M.
Collins, Samuel L.
Conger, Richard W.
Conway, Peter
Cruz-Gonzales, Guillermo
Cunningham, Harold R.
Dahl, Robert A.
DeRubbo, Daniel J., Jr.
deRubertis, Kim P.
DeWitt, Richard L.
Edwards, Fred C.
Eichorn, Peter K.
Emanuel, Peter J.
Evans, Charles E., Jr.
Flores, Jose M.
Garth, Robert W., Jr.
Hager, Henry F., III
Harper, Donald W.
Henderson, Thyrone L.
Hill, Ramen A.
Hocking, John W.
Holder, Alex M., Jr.
Holder, James R.
Hope, Terrill C.
Iverson, John F.
Johnson, Milo P.
Johnston, Benjamin C.
Josten, David A.
Kienlen, Ronald A.
Krajewski, Robert J.
Lemp, James F.
Leslie, Larry L.
Lopez-Alonso, Juan R.
Lord, Gerald
Lovelace, Guy M.
Marrero, Humberto
Martin, Larry L.
McClendon, Miles R.
McGurk, Floyd F.
McKinnon, James K.
McKissock, William T., Jr.
Melendez, Hector N.
Melton, Otis H., Jr.
Mercado, Alejandro
Miller, John C.
Mordeaux, Corry
Oliveras, Manuel
O'Sullivan, John
Pentz, William H., Jr.

Perez, Carlos J.
Perez, Enrique
Perino, George H., Jr.
Peters, Jon R.
Pinkerton, Billy B.
Poe, Phillip W.
Price, Hugh A.
Prince, Ronald Z.
Remmert, Richard L.
Roberts, William M.
Runion, Keith B.
Sampson, Donnie G.
Sanabria, Agripino
Schmit, John W., Jr.
Scholz, Garret A.
Sheffield, Robert W.
Shields, Ronald R.
Shugart, James W., III
Simpson, Allan R.
Skaggs, Frankie L.
Smith, Frank T.
Spampani, Pedro B.
Stokes, Charles E., Jr.
Stone, Ronald P.
Stubbs, Frederic H.
Sucher, Theodore R., III
Tanner, Howard C.
Thompson, Raymond
Thorson, Glen J.
Velez, Agustin E.
Wade, Larkin H.
Walinsky, Samuel H.
Warner, James I.
Warrington, Terrell L.
Welsh, Elbert A.
West, Ronald P.
Whitehead, Joseph D.
Wilson, Terril E.
Windon, Jackson T. O. P., III
Winslow, Sidney W.
Woodfin, John H.
Wynn, Charles W.
Yeates, Clayne M.
Young, Danny A.

The following-named officer for appointment as professor of electricity, U.S. Military Academy, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 4333:

Saunders, Edward A., O27904.

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1961, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Aaronsohn, Jonathan B.
Abraham, Bruce R.
Ackerman, David L.
Adams, Joseph G.
Alexander, Terry L.
Altmeyer, James E.
Angstadt, Richard W.
Anselm, Donald C.
Armstrong, Alan P.
Armstrong, Charles H.
Armstrong, Roy L., Jr.
Babbitt, Leroy A., Jr.
Bacon, Carlton E.
Baird, Thomas H.
Baldwin, Byron S.
Barbour, Donald A.
Barney, Daniel G.
Battle, Brendan J.
Bayless, Harry K., III
Beckett, Ronald L.
Behrenhausen, Richard A., Jr.
Belknap, Willard S.
Bender, Lynn A.
Bennett, Andrew F., Jr.
Benz, Herbert T. G., Jr.
Benzinger, Peter L.
Berinato, John J.
Bernard, Robert K.
Berra, Louis C., Jr.
Biddinger, David E.
Blanda, Frank T.
Blesse, James S.
Boeve, Lucas, III
Bonko, Donald R.
Born, William J. T. M.
Boylan, Peter J., Jr.
Bradford, William B.
Brady, Michael J.
Bragg, Stacy C.
Breslin, Michael G.
Brown, Edward A., III
Brown, Harvey L.
Brown, Reginald J.
Bruner, Edward F.
Buckner, Richard A.
Budge, Larry D.
Burchell, Gail P.
Burgess, Peter D.
Burns, Charles P.
Burns, Robert A.
Buesiecker, Roy F., Jr.
Butterworth, Larry R.
Cain, Robert S., Jr.
Cairns, Robert B.
Campbell, Dale G., Jr.
Campbell, John L.
Cargile, James P., Jr.
Carlson, Gunnar C., Jr.
Carlton, Forrest R., II
Carroll, Patrick J., Jr.
Carroll, Thomas F., III
Casani, Andrew B.
Cerasoli, Roger
Chambers, Barton P.
Chandler, William S.
Chelberg, Robert D.
Cherry, George M., Jr.
Chism, J. W.
Claassen, Walter E., Jr.
Clancy, William E., Jr.
Clarke, Richard D.
Clements, Gerard H.
Clough, Stanley M.
Coddington, Clinton H.
Compton, Martin A., II.
Conant, Richard C.
Conley, Willard C.
Conner, Dan A.
Connolly, James C., II.
Connors, James W., Jr.
Cook, Bromley N., Jr.
Cook, Garry M.
Cook, Jay C.
Corcoran, James R.
Cornelius, Roger L.
Cornelius, Russell M.
Cornelson, John C.
Coulter, Holland B.
Counts, Edward T.
Couvillion, Donald A.
Covington, Benjamin W., III.
Cowan, Bruce M.
Coyle, James M.
Coyne, Michael.
Crews, Ephraim W., Jr.
Crowther, James I., Jr.
Cullum, Richard O.
Cunningham, Norman N.
Custer, Bert H.
Cuthbert, Thomas R.
Czuberki, Joseph A.
Dahle, Joseph S.
Dalgleish, Grant B.
Daniloff, Frederick D.
Davis, Richard J.
DeVries, Paul T.
DeWitt, Howard S.
Denney, Steve H.
Deuel, William T.
Dewar, John D.
DiCarlo, Daniel M., Jr.
Dickson, Robert C.
Dillard, Walter S.
Dluzyn, David A.
Doherty, James W.
Dombrowski, Philip G.
Dorr, John M.
Downey, Arthur J., Jr.
Downey, Gordon K., Jr.
Downing, Harry E.
Dunning, Robert M.
Dyer, Travis N.
Eaton, David G.
Egan, Francis C.
Eggleston, Michael A.
Elelson, John A.
Eiland, Michael D.
Ekman, Michael E.
Enfield, Samuel W.
Erhardt, Franklyn A.
Ericksen, Gordon T.
Esselstein, William D.
Evans, Alexander H.
Eveleth, Robert G.
Evetts, James K., Jr.
Eyler, Frank B.
Fanning, Richard H.
Fischer, John E.
Fishburne, Francis J., Jr.
Flack, Gary L.
Ford, William R.
Fox, George
Frazier, Dean S.
Freeman, Samuel D., III
Fritz, Martell D.
Frix, Robert S.
Gabriel, Henmar R.
Gaither, Harold C., Jr.
Ganderson, Martin L.
Gants, Robert M.
Garens, Ralph W., Jr.
Garretson, Ralph B., Jr.
Geiger, Kenneth H.
Gibson, Francis L.
Gilbert, Nicholas C.
Gillespie, Dallas K.
Gillespie, Frank W., Jr.
Gilmore, Earl W.
Glass, Robert R., II
Gleichenhaus, David P
Goldstine, James A.
Goldtrap, John W.
Goodell, Eugene K.
Gordon, Thomas R.
Grannemann, Rodney F.
Grant, Clayton, I., Jr.
Graves, Howard D.
Green, Charles S., Jr.
Greene, Channing M.
Griffiths, William R.
Grigg, Neil S.
Gronich, Bruce J.
Guerzenich, Robert H.
Guthrie, John D.
Haas, Charles N.
Habic, Frank J., III
Haise, James R.
Hale, William M.
Hallenbeck, Gilman J.
Halpin, Daniel W.
Halstead, Bruce B.
Hamilton, Robert B.
Hampton, Robert D.
Hannon, Harold M.
Hansell, Charles R.
Hansen, Carl T.
Hanson, Morris F., Jr.
Harden, Monroe B.
Hardiman, Robert R.
Harmon, James J.
Harrell, Robert G.
Harrington, Marshall E.
Harris, Robert F.
Hartford, George A., Jr.
Hastings, David A.
Hathaway, William E.
Heiberg, William L.
Heiman, Charles N.
Heindahl, Peter D.
Henderson, George
Heron, Bruce G.
Herrick, Robert M.
Hersant, Darryl E.
Hiester, David W., Jr.
Higginbotham, Heston W., III
Hillier, Pringle P.
Himes, Howard D.
Hines, Ronald D.
Hodell, Charles B.
Hodge, Walter W.
Hodges, Harold H.
Holmberg, Bruce P.
Holton, Quinton, II
Holz, Roland R.
Horan, Earl C., Jr.
Hoy, Pat C., II
Hricz, George M.
Hruby, Kenneth L.
Hughes, Talbert W.
Hyde, Gary R.
Jackson, James D.
Jackson, Richard K.
Janoska, Robert L.
Java, John J., Jr.
Jenz, James E.
Joulwan, George A.
Kammerdiener, John L.
Kampfer, John B.
Kee, Robert J.
Kemp, John A.
Kenny, Henry J.
Kewley, Robert H.
Kilkenny, John J.
Kirkpatrick, William T.
Kovac, Bruce R.
Kremer, Alvin W., Jr.
LaBorne, Eugene F., Jr.
Lammers, Bruce T.
Lancaster, Dudley C.
Landry, Donald E.
Laurence, John W., Jr.
Leech, Thomas E.
Legge, Barnwell I.
Leinbach, Conwell B.
Leland, Edwin S., Jr.
Lenhart, George D.
Lewis, Donald H.
Liebman, Robert A.
Ligon, Walter B., Jr.
Lilienthal, Henry E.
Lionetti, Donald M.
Livingston, James L.
Lockey, Donald V.
Lombardo, Michael J.
Looram, James F. X.
Lord, Gary R.
Lubke, Alan H.
Lund, Thomas J.
Lynch, James F.
MacLean, John R., Jr.
Mace, David H.
Mack, John H.
Madden, Jim L.
Magness, Thomas H., III
Maio, Joseph R.
Mallory, Glynn C., Jr.
Mallory, Philip H.
Maloney, Michael
Manning, James C.
Marshall, Morris L.
Martin, Jack M.
Mathison, James S.
Matson, Thomas D.
Matthews, Douglas F.
Maus, Reynold M.
McBee, Donald L.
McCann, Joseph J., Jr.
McCarthy, Robert E.
McCollister, Kenneth W.
McCormick, John R.
McCreary, Howard E., Jr.
McCurdy, Robert A.
McGinnis, James P.
McLaughlin, John F.
McNear, Richard E.
Meissner, Kenith E.
Mercer, Thomas K.
Middlesteadt, Roger W.
Miller, Arlen C. T.
Miller, David L., Jr.
Miller, Donn G.
Miller, Hugh H.
Minnehan, Thomas J.
Minor, Henry D., Jr.
Moobs, Thomas T.
Muiznieks, Nikolajs R.
Murphy, Patrick J.
Navarro, Roland M.
Neiger, John J., III
Nesbeitt, William D., Jr.
Nevins, John R.
Nichols, Bruce P.
Nichols, John J.
Nicholson, Robert J.
Nitkowski, Jon F.
Nutt, Samuel C.
O'Neill, Michael E.
Oaks, James F., III
Obermeier, Roger W.
Offringa, Peter
Ogden, William
Olejniczak, Julian M.
Olive, Sergei V.
Oliver, John B.
Oliver, Robert L.
Olson, Edwin N., Jr.
Palmer, Paul C., Jr.
Paone, Joseph F.
Parks, Basil M., II
Parks, William I., Jr.
Parmele, Harmon R.
Paskewitz, Thomas W.
Pearl, Quinn F., Jr.
Pesek, Joseph F.
Peters, Glenn M., Jr.
Petty, John R.
Phelps, Russell M. M.
Ploger, Wayne D.
Popovich, Marko L.
Potter, Howard M.
Potts, Robert L.
Powell, Beverley E., Jr.
Prather, Lawrence H., Jr.
Price, David S.
Protzman, Robert R.
Pryor, James F.
Pusser, Thomas W.
Quinn, Kenneth L.
Raible, John L.
Randall, Howard W.
Randolph, Charles T., Jr.
Rauch, Frank C.
Raynis, James B.
Regan, Raymond R., Jr.
Rennagel, Harry G., Jr.
Reno, William H.
Reynolds, Regis J.
Richards, Darwin L.
Richards, Lawrence A.
Ringdahl, Phillip H.
Ritchie, David M.
Rittgers, Courtney M.
Roberts, Howard H., Jr.
Roberts, James J., III
Robertson, Walter G.
Rooney, Dennis M.
Rosenkranz, Robert B.
Rousseau, Thomas H., III
Royce, James B.
Russo, Joseph P.
Sager, Lee H., Jr.
Sanders, Eugene P., Jr.
Sands, Philip J.
Sarzanini, Andrea A.
Sawtelle, Donald W., Jr.
Schall, James E., Jr.
Schell, Tarey B.
Schultz, Brian G.
Sciple, Carl B.
Scott, James A., III
Seckinger, George M., Jr.
Seidel, Bruce R., Jr.
Seitz, William E.
Seylar, Roland F.
Shaffer, Rohlf A.
Shearer, Cyrus N., Jr.
Sheeder, Richard D.
Sherburne, Thomas N.
Shipley, Dale W.
Showalter, Ted A.
Shroyer, John B.
Sievers, William H.
Sigg, John C.
Silverman, Mark N.
Sisk, Francis G.
Skaggs, Richard C.
Skillman, John E., III
Skotzko, Michael
Sloan, Monte T.
Smalley, Larry F.
Smith, Edgar D.
Smith, George S., Jr.
Sollohub, Charles J.
Solomon, John K.
Starsman, Raymond E.
Steege, Robert J.
Stewart, Joseph W.
Stiehl, Gustav H., IV
Stokes, James M.
Stone, Thomas R.
Stoneham, Laurence J., Jr.
Stork, James L.
Strachan, James D.
Stricklen, William A., III
Stringham, Joseph S., III
Struve, James E.
Stuart, Alexander J., III
Swain, Charles M.
Sykes, Philip A.
Taylor, James B.
Teal, David J.
Tedrick, James L.
Tilghman, Ray L.
Tilton, Franklin T.
Tobin, William G., Jr.
Trinkle, Patrick M.
Tschamler, Joseph R., III
Turnage, John O.
Tyler, James W.
Underwood, Michael L.
Urette, Michael E.
Vader, Paul F., Jr.
Vallely, Paul E., Jr.
Van Gorder, Henry P.

Van Riper, Richard W., III	Wetzel, Allan R.
Vander, Els T.	White, David W.
Vanderbush, Albert, III	White, Lyman G., Jr.
Vass, Steven, Jr.	Wilder, Samuel D., Jr.
Vaughn, Hubert B.	Wildermuth, John G.
Vay, Nicolas R.	Williams, Francis M.
Veatch, John D.	Williams, Richard G.
Vedder, Sanford E., Jr.	Williams, Wayne R.
Vick, Gerald A.	Williamson, William R.
Votaw, John F.	Willis, Benjamin L.
Wadlington, Warwick P.	Winters, James M.
Wagner, Hans O. C.	Witherspoon, Eugene S.
Walker, Steven C.	Wold, Douglas A.
Walsh, Donald A.	Woodward, Harry E.
Walsh, Martin W., Jr.	Wooten, R. J.
Walters, Anderson H.	Worthy, Robert C.
Wanner, F. W., Jr.	Xenos, Michael J.
Watlington, Donald W.	Yost, William D., III
Watt, Joseph F.	Younkin, William M.
Weis, William A.	Yule, Richard G., Jr.
Wells, Albert L.	Zailskas, Roger W.
Welsh, Charles R.	Zaldo, Martin J.
Welsh, Lawrence E.	Zielinski, Robert F., Jr.
Westpheling, Charles T.	Zimmerman, John B.
	Zingsheim, Gerald A.

The following-named midshipmen, graduating class of 1961, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Barineau, John N., III	Harvey, Jan V.
Bullene, Roger	Kieffer, Pierre V., III
Chapman, Eveleth W.	Kleindorfer, Paul R.
Decker, Edward T.	Martin, Lowell L.
Doherty, Alfred C., Jr.	Moynahan, Michael J.
Doherty, Dennis E.	Schroeder, Daniel R.
Gardner, Charles E.	Spencer, Archie W.

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1961, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Clarke, Gordon M.
Pattie, Thomas N.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 8, 1961:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADOR

Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

U.S. ATTORNEY

James B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for a term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHALS

Peyton Norville, Jr., of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Alabama for the term of 4 years.

Fred F. Hoh, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

William J. Andrews, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Georgia for a term of 4 years.

Clayburne A. McLelland, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the district of the Canal Zone for the term of 8 years.

John E. Maguire, Sr., of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Florida for a term of 4 years.

Anton T. Skoro, of Idaho, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Idaho for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Amos 5: 24: *Let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.*

Almighty God, in these days of crises when our hearts are strangely stirred, we are being constrained more urgently then ever to turn to Thy throne of grace in prayer, for we have nowhere else to go.

May we have the faith to believe and the insight to understand that Thou alone canst give us wisdom to guide us in our perplexities and courage to sustain us when we are in danger of faltering.

We are confident that we are fighting for a cause that is just and righteous but we penitently confess that our own conscience again and again indicts us and convicts us before the judgment of the God of all holiness that we ourselves are far from being just and righteous.

Grant that it may be our daily prayer to have a heart cleansed of sin and desires, and ambitions that are disinfected of selfishness.

Hear us in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1961, was read and approved.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have just received and honored today a fine American, Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., of the U.S. Navy, who recently performed not only an outstanding but a heroic feat that is dedounding to the credit and the glory of our beloved country.

We can pause for a moment and visualize in our minds the thoughts that ran through his mind and the minds of his associates, any one of whom might have been selected as the first astronaut, in relation to the dangers he was to undergo with reference to his loved ones, and we can also pause and picture in our minds the thoughts that were running through the minds of the loved ones of any of those astronauts that might have been selected by our country for the performance of a feat of this extraordinary nature. Commander Shepard was selected.

Commander Shepard had the mind of a warrior. The very act that he performed shows that he possesses the mind of a warrior. In the world today the totalitarian nations and the leaders of those totalitarian nations might well take heed of the fact that Commander Shepard, with the mind of a warrior, represents the minds of the American people, because the American people are warriors. There is nothing weak in the spirit of America, particularly if the occasion arises when it is necessary to defend our beloved country and the institutions of government we possess.

In paying tribute to Commander Shepard, I think we should also pay tribute to that sweetheart of his, Mrs. Shepard, and their children; also the parents of this great man. We can imagine the thoughts running through the mind of Mrs. Shepard, and other loved ones, knowing the grave danger that husband, father, and son was undergoing.

There is an old saying that the real soldiers are the wives of the members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. They are the ones who are the real soldiers, the real sailors, the real airmen. The husbands are performing their duty, but the wives are at home and they go through a great mental suffering connected with the husband in the performance of his serious, grave, and responsible duty.

I think special tribute should be paid to Mrs. Shepard because it was her inspiration and her guidance that kept alive the dynamic thoughts of this brave American who brought such honor and glory to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly happy because I was chairman of the Select Committee on Outer Space out of which committee came the bill, now law, establishing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. And I know I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues on that special committee, without regard to party, in expressing our feelings of appreciation for this remarkable feat which, in connection with advances made in outer space, means so much and particularly has a tremendous effect throughout the world at this time from many angles, particularly from a psychological angle.

I congratulate Chairman BROOKS of the standing committee and all the members of his committee for the fine contribution that they have made and the members of the Committee on Appropriations of both the House and the Senate for giving NASA the appropriations necessary to bring about this great feat and this great result in our country's national interest. This feat shows that America has the brains; it shows that America has the facilities; it shows that America has the warriors, the men and women with an intense love of our country, willing if necessary to fight and die for our country. All we have got to do is to coordinate those brains and those facilities; not to catch up with the Soviet Union in the field of outer space, particularly in the field of booster strength, but to go ahead of the Soviet Union.

So, we of the Congress are very happy and we congratulate Commander Shepard and Mrs. Shepard and their fine children and his parents for the courage that they displayed, because their courage was not only a personal cour-

age but a courage in the national interest of our country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the very appropriate words being spoken by the eminent gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question but that last Friday, May 5, 1961, will go down in history as one of the great days for America. It was a day of magnificent accomplishment; a magnificent accomplishment not only on the part of Commander Shepard, who was in the capsule on the space flight, but for the untold numbers who have worked so diligently and so effectively and so well to make this exploration possible.

One thing impresses me about the whole operation, and that is that in contrast with some other similar events, the proceedings in this country were open to the world at all times. The most remote citizen in the land knew virtually minute to minute what was going on. Although there was the possibility of a failure, there was no effort to hide any failure that might occur. Rather there was a determination that this great event be kept open for all the people over the world to hear or to witness.

For Commander Shepard it was, of course, a glorious feat, demonstrating the courage, the capacity and the strength that I am sure we all like to think pretty much characterizes the men and women of the United States.

It demonstrates, as the majority leader has so well pointed out, that there is no lack of scientific capacity or ability in this great land of ours. Beyond that, for me this event demonstrates again as well as any event in my time, that the productivity, capacity, and efficiency of freemen can never be surpassed by men anywhere else under any sort of system.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Commander Shepard. We are happy to welcome him here to the Capitol that we may show our great admiration and respect for him. We wish him well for the future. May he have many, many more similarly successful rides.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad my friend, the minority leader, has called attention to the openness of this feat. It clearly shows to the world one of the basic differences between our way of life and the way of life practiced by totalitarian governments. This is one of the great and powerful lessons that flows from this remarkable feat. Again, we are all, as a nation, indebted to Commander Shepard for his great feat and to that fine girl of his, Mrs. Shepard, and his children and parents, for the bravery they displayed during the many months of his preparation and during the actual feat itself.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people watched with greatest pride, today, as the President presented Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., U.S. Navy, the Distinguished Service Medal of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in recognition of his bravery in furthering our scientific experiments toward our ultimate conquest of outer space.

Our fellow Member in Congress, CHESTER MERROW, has our admiration for introducing a resolution of thanks to Commander Shepard.

On behalf of the Congress, I have submitted a joint resolution that the President of the United States be authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to our first astronaut. I believe I speak for all my colleagues when I say he has fully earned the greatest recognition we can give him, for no man could display greater courage than he, in his historical flight through outer space. Commander Shepard's name will be recorded in history as the embodiment of America's courage, wisdom, and progress.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been my high privilege this morning to join in welcoming Commander and Mrs. Shepard as honored guests of the Congress of the United States. It was in all respects fitting that we should do this.

Here is an accomplishment that gives us renewed faith in things American, faith in the strength of our industry, faith in the capacity of our science, and, above all, faith in the devotion and courage of our people.

Well done, Commander Shepard.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, every American heart beats more strongly and proudly today in the wake of last Friday's heroic space flight by Comdr. Alan Shepard, Jr., U.S. Navy.

This is a great forward stride in America's space effort, and represents real progress in our continuing effort to establish a world of peace and justice for future generations.

I am sure that every citizen of Oklahoma's Second Congressional District would want me to express today, as we welcome this splendid young American to our Capitol, the warmest congratulations and best wishes of a grateful people.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate to express the gratitude, the pride and the relief of all Americans at the successful conclusion of the man-into-space effort on May 5, 1961. Comdr. Alan Shepard, the scientists who planned it, the members of the Armed Forces, and all civilian helpers in this epochal achievement must know that the thanks of the Nation are theirs. And let us not forget to give praise to the other six astronauts who stood by, ready and willing to assume the heavy responsibility, if called upon.

From an entire Nation to those who participated in this history-making event I add my own words, "Well done."

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I was thrilled to see the young naval officer, Alan B. Shepard, Jr., and his very attractive wife, in the old Supreme Court room this morning. He represents the spirit of youth and the New Frontier. His achievement will inspire others and will develop a strong determination in Americans to lead the world in scientific and space activity. I am delighted in Pennsylvania's participation through the person of Mrs. Shepard who undoubtedly was one of the inspirations which led to his extraordinary and outstanding accomplishment. I join in supporting the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, less than an hour ago I had the thrill of my life in that I had the great privilege and high honor of meeting and actually shaking hands with Comdr. Alan Shepard, Jr., American astronaut, and his lovely wife. Vice President JOHNSON of the United States of America was there by me as I did so. Actually, Mr. Speaker, I find it impossible to define exactly how I felt as I shook hands with him, but it seemed somewhat as though he was trying to impart to me some of the thrill he had in behalf of the scientific achievements of our beloved Nation. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, I cordially join in all the very deserved and magnificent tributes which have already been extended him and his wife and which will be so extended. I adopt as and for my own, all of these magnificent and deserved tributes; may I likewise extend to each and every person in the military and civilian administration of our beloved Government, and in the executive and legislative branches too, and in the field of the contractors and consultants also—I extend to them, one and all, my heartiest congratulations and appreciation for their individual and group dedicated contributions to this worldwide historical, scientific achievement exemplified by the daring, trust, and confidence of this freedom-born American citizen, Comdr. Alan Shepard, Jr. Thus it is that a freedom-born and freedom-dedicated civilization has again contributed materially to the elements and factors which lead toward a safe and a sound America in a world of enduring peace.

And, Mr. Speaker, I had an additional and exceptional pleasure in meeting the distinguished commander and his wife because as I was about to advance toward him, some man in the huge crowd standing behind me whom I did not know by name, sort of pushed his small son of about 10 years of age into my care and asked if I would see to it he might see our distinguished astronaut. And it so happened that other adults about me

cooperated and we thus saw this American lad whom I did not know or meet by name, also had the experience of meeting this great American hero and his wife and the Vice President of the United States.

Needless to say, Commander Shepard and his lovely wife, and the Vice President of the United States were all very gracious in extending a cordial handshake to this American lad. Who knows? Who knows but that this lad may some day, as partly result of this unexpected event in his life, lead out and forward also to great scientific achievements in behalf of our beloved Nation.

Mr. Speaker, with pleasure and pride, as I always have occasion to feel, I noted the very gracious and timely words by your own good self in the former chambers of the U.S. Supreme Court when you presented our illustrious hero, Commander Shepard. I know that every Member of the Senate and House there present, and the hundreds of others, were also aware of the nice and proper way in which you presented Commander Shepard and his wife. And then, too, as is always the case, the distinguished majority leader, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, promptly returned to the House Chamber where he opened a very appropriate and timely tribute session to Commander Shepard and his lovely wife so that the Members of the House could participate in accordance with their desires to pay tribute to all concerned on this historic day.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today by our cheers, our prayers, our medals for achievement, and in a thousand separate ways, we Americans honor Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, America's first astronaut, for his courageous, intelligent, effective mission into space.

In him we have found a vision of the kind of American we want to be; in his accomplishment the kind of initiative coupled with courage, resourcefulness, and competence that has been, and for all times will be, the benchmark of America and Americans.

ASTRONAUT SHEPARD EPITOMIZES AMERICA AT ITS BEST

And, no one knows better than Alan Shepard that for that brief half hour of glory he epitomized America at its best; he flew his Mercury capsule in honor of the many people whose efforts pushed him into the skies—the American taxpayer who paid the bill, the Congressmen and Senators who saw the need and translated that need into laws and appropriations; the officials who had to make the hard decisions on policy and direction; the scientists and technicians who had to translate ideas to paper, to hardware, to rockets, capsules, ground and air equipment; to the testers who had to be sure that lives were not risked unnecessarily; and most of all, to the six other Astronauts who stood by assisting Alan in his, and their, day of peril, ordeal, and victory.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee concerned with National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs, I congratulate all of these and the many more who in their own specialized way helped to push American Alan Shepard into space and to catch him neatly, safely, and affectionately as he returned to earth.

NASA OFFICIALS HAD CONFIDENCE IN SUCCESS OF MISSION

We members of the Appropriations Committee tend to get very cautious about promises of things to come made by Government agencies. This perhaps is why I was so impressed by the quiet confidence in the success of this experiment that was shown by those in NASA's man-in-space program. These, the men who knew most about the problems and the promises of this program, most of its difficulties and potential heartbreaks, were sure they could do it and they did put Alan Shepard into space and brought him back.

Mr. Speaker, I was impressed with the confidence before the shot was made. I am more impressed with it now because with that confidence came the courage to make this experiment before the whole world. Millions of Americans and non-Americans were at Cape Canaveral via their television screens. Every form of public news media was fully used to bring to those who agreed to see the immediate, firsthand, down-to-the-second incidents of the entire experiment in America's first pilot-flown space effort. It is a shame that Russian Astronaut Gagarin's countrymen could not be given a similar history of his famous flight.

COMMANDER SHEPARD'S SUCCESS SOMETHING WORTHY TO BE REMEMBERED

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no words more appropriate for this occasion of welcoming Astronaut Shepard to the U.S. Capitol than those uttered decades ago by a fellow New Englander serving in the Congress from Commander Shepard's home State of New Hampshire, Senator Daniel Webster. These words appear on the plaque on the wall behind me, directly over the Speaker's chair:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include with my remarks editorials from the Springfield, Mass., Daily News and the Springfield Union of May 6, 1961, concerning Astronaut Shepard's space feat:

[From the Springfield Daily News, May 6, 1961]

NATIONAL MORALE UP

Astronaut Alan B. Shepard, Jr.'s 302-mile trip yesterday was by no means, and was never intended to be, evidence that the United States has taken the space lead over the U.S.S.R.—not by a long shot down range.

But it was the kind of pulse-tingling, bated-breath experience that this country has sorely needed, and morale, which has been taking all kinds of buffetings on many fronts, rose just as surely skyward as the test pilot's booster rocket.

And what is more, all parts of the world in which communications remain free were invited, nearly, to look over the astronaut's shoulder.

Tons of communications equipment, not to mention a huge assemblage of reportorial manpower, were assembled to cover both launching and descent.

This was in marked contrast to the secrecy which continues to surround the orbiting flight of the Soviet's Yuri Gagarin last month.

Perhaps it would be unduly prideful to say that this event somehow expresses the adventure that is America. But it had many of the qualities that Americans most admire—courage on the part of the pilot, a focusing of many skills, and, beyond these things, a willingness to let endeavor stand forth on its own merits before what, in the case of failure, would have been the harsh judgment of the people.

National spirits today are much higher than they were the day before yesterday.

[From the Springfield Union, May 6, 1961]

THE PROOF IS IN THE PERFORMANCE

The cheers that greeted Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., on the decks of the *Lake Champlain* yesterday morning were raised on behalf of all America. His ride to the fringe of space was the triumph of his own courage, and of the patience, care and planning of the Project Mercury team.

This combination had cut the risk to a minimum and reduced the procedure to clockwork. The reward was a perfect operation and the desired proof that a man can function under the conditions imposed by blast-off, weightlessness and descent.

Confidence had been born of preparation, but the moments of national tautness were understandable. The hazard of last-minute malfunction haunted this flight as it has all rocketry, and the consequences of failure in the eyes of the world were greater than ever.

Yet, we would not have wanted it otherwise. Space exploration is the people's business. This is a field where the national interest depends as much on the people knowing what is afoot as it does on keeping the American image of success bright. The difficulty in the past has been due to the newness of the entire space adventure. Disappointments we have had and everyone has known about them, but there was no other way to learn. We are reaching the point now where the apparent failures of the past fit into the context of gradual progress. Scientists learn the techniques and the public learns the pattern of advance.

The Mercury success was a major milestone, and it was necessary. It did not appear so to a segment of scientific opinion that believed the money and effort could be better spent on instrumentation capable of gleaning more secrets from space than a man. This debate will continue, but the barrier to manned space flight has long been ripe for breaking. If the pressure of adventurous spirits were not enough alone, the Soviet Union has provided the difference by drawing us, willingly or not, into a competition that cannot be ignored.

This competition, unfortunately, is not measured by scientific facts, one of which is that we have gained a lot more of them than the Soviet Union.

A simple, unscientific fact is that Commander Shepard and his Mercury capsule did not score a world "first." But they did what they had to do, and that was to succeed admirably in keeping America in the race before spectators who expect such feats. Commander Shepard's valor, coolness, and determination have given the greatest impetus yet to expanding our space program.

Space yields its dominion slowly. We will best move into it with a combination of instrument and manned ventures supported by our strongest weapon, a free flow of the knowledge we gain. Meantime, we owe a debt to the Mercury team that worked and waited for its time of glory.

For Commander Shepard, it makes no difference that doubt of eventual success was cast off long ago. The deed itself, performed in the face of the unknown, required a bravery that few of us ever are called upon to summon. There should be no hesitation about the award of the Medal of Honor to the first American astronaut.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues of the House in expressing congratulations to Commander Shepard for his courage, achievement, and for his great contribution to our Nation and the cause of freedom.

In connection with the remarks which have just been made concerning the openness of our space exploration which is in sharp contrast to the secrecy of the Russian space shot, I would like to include with my congratulations my weekly newsletter which was written Friday immediately after Commander Shepard's successful space flight and commending him for this outstanding achievement.

The newsletter follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By Hon. JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee)

The big news in Washington, the Nation and the world this week was the successful U.S.-manned flight into space.

The eyes and ears of the Nation and much of the world were fastened to the 1-ton Mercury space capsule carrying Navy Commander Alan B. Shepard, Jr., as it vaulted off the launching pad at Cape Canaveral, Fla., on its spectacular flight into near space. Members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and of the Science and Astronautics Committees were privileged by invitation of Director James E. Webb of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to witness here in Washington a special viewing of the historic effort.

The televised flight with every possible detail made available to the public was in marked difference to the Russian space flight some 23 days ago which was surrounded by secrecy with very few details revealed to the press and the public.

Although there was some criticism about announcing America's space flight in advance for fear that a failure might result, the perfect flight has demonstrated our Nation's capabilities and renewed America's confidence in this Nation's space program, in designing and perfecting sophisticated instruments which meet the severest of tests.

Our advance announcement of the test and time schedule might be compared to Babe Ruth's most famous home run which came after he pointed to the right field stands in Yankee Stadium and indicated to the cheering crowd what he intended to do. Certainly, all Americans applaud Commander Shepard and the Space Agency in this successful scientific achievement. The ball game is not over and the winner will be the United States.

Commander Shepard will go down in history for his 115-mile-high rocket into space, along with Wilbur and Orville Wright and Charles A. Lindbergh as a pioneer and as a hero of the space age.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, all America was thrilled on Friday, May 5. This day will go down in history as a day of hope, joy, and rebirth. The successful flight of Astronaut Alan Shepard is a demonstration of democracy in action, teamwork, and complete faith. The television and radio rendered a service to freedom greater than it has ever done before.

As the countdown reached its climax, all America stopped. I, for one, stopped to say a silent prayer for the success of this intrepid astronaut, for the American people, and for peace. Not for one moment did I feel that the exploration into space into new frontiers would fail. Alan Shepard had proven his capacity, ability and confidence. Our scientists had proven their ability to put a missile in space and into orbit. The only question which was uncertain was whether man could live in space or in orbit. Prior events by the Russians demonstrated that this was not only possible but a reality. Only a technical flaw could prevent our American scientists and our astronaut from succeeding. The success not only revived the hopes of mankind, but it also neutralized advantages, psychological or otherwise, that Russia might have obtained by putting Yuri Gagarin into orbit. While the Russians performed their accomplishment in secrecy, ours was done before the eyes and within the hearing of all people. Our technical superiority in having our astronaut control the descent of the missile and capsule dimmed the luster of the Russian accomplishment.

Just as the minuteman fired the shot at Lexington which was heard around the world, so did the scientists fire the astronaut into space which was heard and seen around the world. Neutral nations will recognize, not only our humanitarian and generous attitudes, but also our capacity to overtake and surpass any scientific and bold people. The implications of Alan Shepard's exploit are many. The greatest one is that it will neutralize the belligerency of the Russian leaders and will prove to be a lodestone for the uncertain, the doubtful, and the neutrals to the cause of freedom and to America. We salute Alan Shepard, our first frontiersman and let us redouble our efforts to follow successfully in the path which he has blazed.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, millions of Americans joined in silent prayer, first for the safety of a brave young astronaut and secondly for the success of a flight which could play havoc with our national prestige if it had failed. And when the huge Redstone missile paused momentarily on its pad seconds before the actual lift-off there were the same millions who were literally "pushing" the rocket onward and upward.

The flight was a huge success and a grateful Nation is now taking time to thank those who had a part in it.

It is my good fortune to represent the First Congressional District of Virginia and in this historic and unique area there are thousands of people who have more than the usual reasons to be immensely proud.

First and foremost we are proud that Lt. Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., the man whose bravery and scientific abilities are now apparent to the world, is a resident of Virginia Beach, Va. He and his lovely wife, whose courage matched that of her husband's, along with their fine children have graced this delightful area for many months. We sincerely hope that they will see fit to make it their permanent home.

And then too, no one should forget the team of astronauts who originally trained at Langley Field NASA near Hampton, Va., and at Wallops Island, Va. Only one man could make the epochal ride in space but the entire team was necessary to insure success. And that was what all seven wanted more than anything else. The courage of one was the courage of seven combined into that one.

We should be extremely proud of Dr. Robert R. Gilruth, the brilliant director of Project Mercury. Upon his shoulders rested the responsibility of the whole venture. If the project had failed it would have been his failure. Now that it has succeeded, it is his success.

Then there are the employees of the great agency, NASA, who have both directly and indirectly contributed so much to the scientific advancement of our aeronautic and space programs. Without them, the accomplishment we celebrate today would have been virtually impossible. These dedicated men and women have met and are meeting the almost impossible demands thrust on them.

These and others too, no less dedicated, are the reasons we are joyous today. We are grateful for their untiring efforts and limitless abilities.

This achievement as great as it is, is only the beginning of an endeavor which could go beyond the realm of reasonable imagination. It is like the first simple flight of the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk. We will not rest on our laurels to be sure, but for the moment Americans everywhere can be justly proud.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express in behalf of the people of Syracuse and Onondaga County, N.Y., the tremendous sense of pride we all have in the accomplishment of Commander Shepard, his fellow astronauts, and the hundreds of hard-working and dedicated persons whose efforts were responsible for the success of the Mercury-Redstone shot last Friday.

Mere words are not adequate to describe the feelings of millions of people whose hearts literally stood still during that countdown, during the perfect lift-off of that Redstone rocket, and during every subsequent step in Commander Shepard's historic flight.

Millions of prayers were with him during those fateful few moments in space, and millions of hearts rejoiced when, with each passing second, it became more and more apparent that countless hours of devoted effort had produced a masterful blending of man and machine.

The final result was particularly gratifying to those of us who have maintained steadfast confidence in the ultimate success of Project Mercury, and who have explicit faith in our ability to forge ahead in the conquest of outer space and to surpass any Soviet efforts in this field.

Every man and woman involved in the many months of preparation for Friday's flight and for the flights that will follow deserves a genuinely heartfelt "Thank you" from America.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 296

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby commends Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, United States Navy, of Derry, New Hampshire, for his outstanding achievement and the courage and skill displayed by him in his flight into space on May 5, 1961, in the Mercury capsule known as Freedom 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, a happy and grateful Nation is elated over the eminently successful space flight completed by Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., last Friday. Every American is proud of this unparalleled achievement, and the free world acclaims the commander as a great pioneer in man's exploration of space.

I am proud and pleased that Commander Shepard is from East Derry, N.H., located in the First Congressional District which I have the honor of representing. This son of New Hampshire has brought glory to his town, to his State, and to his Nation. His name is now in history as one of the greatest explorers of all time. He is a pioneer in blazing the pathway to space. We applaud him, we applaud the great host of scientists and all those who had a part in making possible his historic flight which has given us so much knowledge and so many answers to the problems that would be obtained from an orbital flight.

We are exceedingly grateful that this first step in space by an American has resulted in the collection of so much data, that it was completed with such great perfection and precision and that it has paved the way for a successful orbital journey. The space era is definitely opened. In the future, there will be many space flights. Today mankind stands at the opening of one of the most challenging and exciting ages of all history. For centuries he has looked upward at the stars wondering what the vast recesses of the universe contain. Now he has moved outward. Commander Shepard and those who made his flight successful have blazed the trail which will ultimately lead to new universes in the vast recesses of the now unknown. We acclaim him; we congratulate him; and we extend to him and his fellow astronauts our best wishes for the future.

FDIC—BANKING AND PUBLIC BULWARK

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the body of the RECORD the following article from the U.S. Investor entitled "FDIC—Banking and Public Bulwark":

FDIC—BANKING AND PUBLIC BULWARK

There are several approaches to the recent rash of bank embezzlements. The one representing the greatest disappointment is the number and magnitude of the happenings.

Everybody in the banking business knows that bankers' associations everywhere have been engaged in a mission designed to cut drastically the volume of embezzlements. The cause of inner controls and of bank audits has been preached vigorously. The preaching ought to be showing its effect by this time, but recent figures seem to imply at least that no great headway is being made.

There is one area, however, in which present day developments show a good deal of improvement. Time was when such considerable stealings that have occurred at some of the banks would have brought distress to the entire community and not only to the stockholders as is today the normal condition.

We refer to those cases where the stealings have not only greatly exceeded the bank's fidelity bond coverage but have seriously impaired the bank's capital position. The bank has had no option but to go into receivership. That is, of course, to be regretted, for the community needs the services of live banking institutions.

The forward step to which we refer is that thanks to the existence of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the closing of the bank does not now bring loss to any large number of depositors, if to any at all. It does not embarrass them or their employees, or their customers, by tying up their deposits; it does not prevent local businessmen from their usual transactions with outside manufacturers and wholesalers, and probably does not throw anybody out of work. If the bank must close, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation hurries to the scene and within a surprisingly short number of days, is paying off the depositors in full if their accounts are less than $10,000 or up to $10,000 if their accounts exceed that figure. Experience shows that a number of accounts paid in full is high up in the 90 percent bracket. Indeed, the final liquidation of banks under FDIC auspices has shown that 99 percent of its depositors have been paid in full and that 98 percent of the deposit dollars have so fared. Of course, the accounts that are over $10,000 have received their pro rata share of additional funds in the liquidation.

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

It seems to us that with so much publicity given recently to bank embezzlements, and what with the great service which is being done for the public, a few paragraphs are quite in order about the FDIC itself. It has recently completed 27 years of operation. It has changed banking sentiment and public sentiment, too, concerning itself, in the course of those years, from a considerable degree of skepticism at the outset to a high degree of confidence in its effectiveness today. It has accumulated an insurance fund of over $2,232 million besides paying off every dollar, with interest, of the $289 million of original capital which the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Banks provided. The outstanding quality of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is preparedness. It has earned the public confidence in its ability to rectify ailing bank situations. Its activity is much broader than the mere insuring of deposits. That might mean no more than the liquidation of an ailing bank and the return of the depositor's principal up to $10,000 in each case. Instead, the corporation does splendid preventive work, turning banks back to better procedures when they are erring. We shall see, in a later paragraph, how effectively the Corporation can use its funds in such curative action.

Of course, the factor which enables the Corporation to turn banks back before they have gone too far in error, is the examination of banks which the Corporation conducts. It will be remembered that of the more than 13,000 banks which the Corporation insures, some 7,000 are examined every year by the Corporation's own examiners. That is, it examines all State-chartered banks not members of the Federal Reserve System. It has access also to the reports of all the national bank examiners and to the reports of those who examine the Reserve System members. Thus, it knows the internal condition of the banks the country over and is put on notice, promptly, if any bank's condition calls for curative measures.

A volume could be written about the helpful conferences which the FDIC has had with banks, how it has persuaded them to raise credit standards, to be more discriminating in the making of loans, and in some instances, to increase their capital to sturdier proportions. If worse comes to worse, the Corporation has power to deprive any bank of its insurance and you may be sure that in the rare cases where this has been necessary, the bank so punished has concluded to retire from business rather than try to operate without insurance. Thus, the FDIC has brought to the banking scene an influence which did not exist previously. It is a great preventive of bank failures and a highly efficient one at that.

INSURANCE FUND

Turning now to the Corporation's insurance fund and the activity in connection therewith, an interesting story could be written. Back in 1934 when the Corporation began business, the entire capital of the Corporation was only $289 million. A not infrequent criticism of the Corporation, therefore, was that it was undertaking too huge a job in the insurance of the Nation's bank deposits with so modest a reserve. That capital reserve amounted to only about eight-tenths of 1 percent of the deposit dollars which it was undertaking to protect. The feeling was rather general that the deposit insurance so financed would have to have aid from the Government if any serious demand upon it came into being. On the contrary, as it turned out, the Corporation, quite without such aid, has built up an insurance fund of its own of $2,232 million through regular bank assessment, has increased from $2,500 to $10,000 the amount of coverage it will provide for each deposit, has paid back with interest every dollar of capital provided by the Treasury and by the Federal Reserve banks, and has given our whole banking system a sturdy support which has contributed much to public confidence.

It can fairly claim a large measure of credit for the fact that bank runs have

ceased to be. Rumors of internal weakness of individual banks such as used to send depositors scurrying to tellers' windows, no longer have that effect. Bank customers dispose of such rumors with a shrug of the shoulders and the comment that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is on guard and will let no harm come to them.

ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS

Indeed, there are some people who declare that the annual assessment of banks for building up the FDIC insurance fund could be discontinued. They argue that the income from the Corporation's own investments will provide any such capital growth as is needed. The Directors of the Corporation do not share this belief. They have, it is true, joined in the changes of law that have reduced the assessment from the original figure of one-twelfth of 1 percent of each bank's deposits to the current ratio of about one thirty-second of 1 percent. But to abolish the assessment entirely is against their own judgment. Huge as the insurance fund is, it is still less than nine-tenths of 1 percent of the insurance coverage which it undertakes to provide. Furthermore, the Directors see further sturdy increases in the deposits of the American banking system and therefore, a need for keeping the growth of the insurance fund in pace with the expansion of the risks which it is covering. Rather interesting, isn't it, that a ratio of approximately eight-tenths of 1 percent in the early days was rated as inadequate whereas today almost the same ratio is regarded as a comfortably sufficient reserve?

We have already mentioned, when discussing embezzlements, that the closing of a bank no longer throws a pall of business suspension and discouragement upon a whole community. Again, the credit for such better business conditions goes to the FDIC. It does not believe in classifying itself as an insurance organization and nothing else and acting accordingly. If that were its only function, it could operate in a leisurely manner paying off deposits as the liquidation of the bank proceeds. Instead, it charges itself with the double task of paying off depositors promptly and of preserving banking service to the community with as little interruption as possible.

The failure of any bank has little more than come to pass when the FDIC has headed for the scene with ample funds readily available. It obtains access to the books and other records of the failed bank—frequently acting as receiver of the same—and as soon as lists of the depositors and the amounts of their deposits can be made available, it begins paying them off in full or up to $10,000 if their balance exceeds that figure. The time the Corporation requires for getting ready to pay is a matter of only a few days. Thus, the pall of business quietude or discouragement does not take shape. Business, as usual, becomes pretty much the order of the day in the community.

PRESERVING BANKING SERVICE

The technique of the Corporation is actually more flexible than is implied herein. Under the law, the Corporation can choose an alternative method. Instead of with cash, it can pay the depositor with an equivalent account in another bank in the same vicinity, thus preserving banking service for him. The Corporation stands back of the other bank. The deposits so presented are payable in cash at once if so desired—which, of course, the depositor prefers not to do. He prefers a good safe bank account subject to check or to passbook, as the case may be. You see, the Corporation regards itself as charged with preserving banking service to a community, particularly if the failed bank would leave the community without a bank. It can arrange for this other local bank to take over the deposit obligations and such of the assets of the failed bank as it regards to be wholesome. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation provides cash to the bank for the difference between the aggregate deposits and the asserts which it is taking over. Congress has given the Corporation power to do this either through purchase of sufficient unsound assets or through a loan or through a deposit of its own made subordinate to the other deposits.

How essential deposit insurance has become for banks is indicated by the almost universal character of the Corporation's membership. Ninety-five percent of the banks of the country are insured. Although the $10,000 maximum coverage applies to all of these accounts, 98 percent of all accounts are in actual fact insured.

RECENT BANK EMBEZZLEMENT FIGURES

Although the figures for bank embezzlements are not yet available for the full year 1960, they can be had for the first 6 months of the year. It is a regrettable fact that the number of embezzlements of $10,000 or more in each case for the first half of 1960 exceeded the number for the first half of 1959. There were 49 of them in the first half of 1960 as against 39 in the first half of 1959. Measured in dollars the losses for the 1960 half-year were $3,812,478. Due to a single defalcation of $3,719,710—an astonishing total—the loss in dollars was heavier in 1959.

That the number should have increased in the first half of 1960 over the number for the first half of 1959 can possibly be explained by the greater interest banks are taking in inner controls and audits.

COMDR. ALAN SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, join my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire in his tribute to Commander Shepard, but I should like to advise the Speaker that Commander Shepard is a Pennsylvanian.

Today I have introduced a joint resolution calling upon the Congress to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a special gold medal to be presented to Commander Shepard by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in behalf of the Congress.

THE LATE ROLLA C. McMILLEN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I announce to the House the death of one of our former beloved colleagues, Rolla C. McMillen, of Decatur, Ill. Our former colleague died Saturday, in Evanston, Ill. The funeral is today at 1 p.m., at Westminster Presbyterian Church, in Decatur, and burial will be in Greenwood Cemetery, in Decatur.

Rolla McMillen was my predecessor from the 22d Congressional District of Illinois. He was born at Monticello, Ill., where he grew up and was educated in the Monticello schools. He later attended the University of Illinois and was graduated from the University of Michigan Law School in 1906. Since that time he had been practicing law at Decatur and for many years was a member of a prominent firm in Decatur, McMillen, Garman & McMillen. He was one of the prominent members of the bar of Illinois and had an excellent reputation in the particular field of estates. He was a delegate to the National Republican Convention in 1940.

On the death of the late William H. Wheat, of Rantoul, Mr. McMillen succeeded Mr. Wheat in an interim election and served from 1944 until his voluntary retirement in 1950. While in the Congress, he was a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and was considered one of the more knowledgeable members of that committee on the Republican side. He was elected by very substantial majorities, which demonstrated that he had the backing of the people in the 8 counties of the 22d Congressional District.

He was married to the former Ruth Roberts and they have three children, Thomas R., Mrs. William C. Beall, and Martha H. I know that Mr. McMillen's many friends now in the Congress will be bereaved to learn of his passing. He was indeed an able lawyer, a gentleman of the old school, and a distinguished Member of this body. I know that all of us extend to Mrs. McMillen and to the children our deepest sympathy upon a loss so great.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

STUDY NEEDED TO PRESERVE FOUNDATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have cited for the RECORD the phenomenal growth of the uncontrolled, tax-exempt foundations. These have included:

First. The astronomic growth in number and accumulations of wealth of foundations with every indication that both will continue.

Second. The withdrawing from our economy, for tax purposes, of more than $11.5 billion of the Nation's wealth.

Third. The dangers of perpetuating vast fortunes and industrial empires in a single family or closed group.

Fourth. The potential power and influence of large foundations over many segments of our economy.

Fifth. The lack of adequate Federal or State regulation of foundation assets, their grants, or their purpose for existence.

These matters, it seems to me, call for further study, not with any intent to abolish tax-exempt foundations, but to preserve for them a purpose. I have no doubt they have served worthy and beneficial causes. In some instances, however,

they may have bypassed their legally stated reasons for existence.

As far as accumulating vast wealth is concerned, Congress added section 504 to the Internal Revenue Act of 1950 to prohibit an unreasonable accumulation of funds. But Internal Revenue officials have told me this provision is ambiguous, and leaves a serious question as to what constitutes an unreasonable accumulation of resources.

The pattern among the larger foundations appears to be to make grants at between 3 percent and 3.5 percent of total assets while assets accumulate at an undetermined, but varying, higher rate.

IRS NEEDS SHARPER TOOLS

With the tools available the Internal Revenue Service has done a creditable job of policing activities of tax-exempt organizations, but two important questions arise:

First. Should not the Congress provide IRS with more efficient instruments to cope with a growing problem?

Second. Can we not improve coordination in this area between the Federal and State Governments?

Some thoughts of this nature were expressed by the House Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations when it submitted its report in 1954.

That committee recommended a continued study to look into avenues of tax-exemption for which that group had neither the time, staff, or resources. In whatever manner the study was to be continued, the special committee said, it should be primarily a matter of research. "Facts are best secured by this method, rather than through the examination and cross-examination of a parade of witnesses," the committee report said.

A major reason for recommending continuation of the study was the astonishing growth of tax-exempt foundations in numbers and wealth. In 1954 the committee talked of capital assets totaling $7.5 billion. As of 1959 we have referred to assets totaling $11.5 billion. Surely, this leaping growth should challenge, not just our curiosity, but constructive action to help worthwhile foundations and to correct existing abuses.

To indicate the size and growth of tax-exempt foundations, I am listing here, the names of the 30 foundations having assets in excess of $20 million, followed by the names currently available from the Library of Congress of the 757 foundations with assets of $1 million or more.

Please notice how the assets of the larger group of foundations have swollen between 1953 and 1959—the latest year for which complete figures are available. Only a few show lower asset totals. For instance, the John A. Hartford Foundation, chartered in New York City, was not large enough to be included in the list of foundations having assets of $20 million or more in 1953. In 1959 Hartford Foundation assets were in excess of $413 million.

I have suggested before that we should take another look at the economy of our country—how the giant industries and interstate chains are draining the wealth of our smaller communities by withdrawing their profits. We should be concerned whether these giant corporations have drained smaller communities to the extent they no longer have means to support their local education and welfare needs and provide the facilities necessary to a healthy community life.

This is the "seed corn" money that deprives your local banks of adequate reserve funds. It is the "seed corn" money that could have been planted to help smaller communities grow and prosper.

Foundations with assets of $20,000,000 or more in 1959 along with comparison to 1953 assets

Name and address of foundation	1953 assets	1959 assets	1959 grants
Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.	$520,232,000	$3,316,000,000	$110,132,848
Rockefeller Foundation, 49 West 49th St., New York, N.Y.	318,229,000	647,694,858	22,599,735
Carnegie Corp. of New York, 589 5th Ave., New York, N.Y.	196,007,000	261,244,471	7,935,175
W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.	109,812,000	215,184,419	7,747,199
Duke Endowment, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.	108,000,000	414,754,543	7,276,387
Commonwealth Fund, Harkness House, 1 East 75th St., New York, N.Y.	96,308,000	119,904,614	3,448,496
Kresge Foundation, 2727 2d Ave., Detroit, Mich.	86,233,000	95,316,048	3,497,722
Philadelphia City Trusts, Philadelphia, Pa.	70,168,000	76,690,760	3,901,064
Carnegie Institution of Washington, 16th and P Sts. NW., Washington, D.C.	65,168,000	80,838,528	[1] 2,389,256
Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.	59,785,000	53,174,210	3,841,169
Hayden (Charles) Foundation, 25 Broad St., New York, N.Y.	56,124,000	67,385,801	1,066,000
Lilly Endowment, 914 Merchants Bank Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.	53,856,000	157,013,165	4,057,940
Olin Foundation, 1 East 44th St., New York, N.Y.	52,531,000	39,723,742	[2] 1,900,000
James Foundation of New York, Inc., 39 East 19th St., New York, N.Y.	47,720,000	78,417,589	2,477,772
Mellon (A. W.) Educational and Charitable Trust, 525 William Penn Pl., Pittsburgh, Pa.	43,612,000	43,571,273	3,963,448
Mayo Association, 102 2d Ave. SW., Rochester, Minn.	43,478,000	59,109,000	1,054,009
Sloan (Alfred P.) Foundation, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.	$38,188,000	$175,553,110	$5,779,120
Guggenheim (John Simon) Memorial Foundation, 551 5th Ave., New York N.Y.	31,992,000	45,000,000	1,492,506
Anderson (M. D.) Foundation, First National Bank in Houston, Houston, Tex.	31,966,000	37,443,237	2,656,730
El Pomar Foundation, in care of Broadmoor Hotel, Colorado Springs, Colo.	31,290,000	23,809,212	1,892,754
China Medical Board, 30 East 60th St., N.Y.	31,216,000	39,698,954	598,777
Avalon Foundation, 713 Park Ave., New York, N.Y.	28,447,000	74,326,593	2,342,727
Woodruff (Emily and Ernest) Foundation, Post Office Box 4418, Atlanta, Ga.	27,826,000	26,409,750	71,000
Markle (John and Mary R.) Foundation, 511 5th Ave., New York, N.Y.	25,132,000	38,033,275	1,047,293
Reynolds (Z. Smith) Foundation, 1206 Reynolds Bldg., Winston-Salem, N.C.	24,837,000	50,000,000	967,700
Macy (Josiah, Jr.) Foundation, 16 West 46th St., New York, N.Y.	22,856,000	33,721,316	813,346
New York Community Trust, 71 Vanderbilt Ave., New York, N.Y.	21,423,000	35,528,485	1,586,366
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 345 East 46th St., New York, N.Y.	20,684,000	22,577,134	54,048
Hartford (The John A.) Foundation, Inc., 420 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y.	3,680,486	413,229,391	3,945,813
Danforth Foundation, The, 835 South 8th St., St. Louis, Mo.	[3] 7,803,369	110,292,491	2,817,505

[1] Expenditures. [2] Toward grants and reserve fund. [3] 1950 figure.

FOUNDATIONS WITH ASSETS OF OVER $1 MILLION

Key: (1) Assets [M=Market value; L=Ledger value], (2) Expenditures, (3) Grants, included in expenditures.

ALABAMA

Avondale Educational and Charitable Foundation, Inc., Sylacauga, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,926,240 (L), (2) $159,644, (3) $154,720.

Ingalls Foundation Inc., Birmingham, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,171,000 (L), (2) $62,494, (3) $59,350.

Ingco Foundation (Incorporated), Birmingham, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,061,574 (L), (2) $15,107, (3) $15,000.

Meyer (Robert R.) Foundation, Birmingham, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,202,936 (M), (2) $358,850—all in grants.

Warner (David) Foundation, Tuscaloosa, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $1,270,933 (L), (2) $7,577, (3) $7,000.

ARIZONA

Lincoln Foundation, Inc., Phoenix, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $2,805,821 (L), (2) $189,457, (3) $171,974.

CALIFORNIA

Atkinson Foundation, South San Francisco, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,118,505 (L), (2) $192,649, (3) $192,279.

Atkinson (Myrtle L.) Foundation, Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,169,017 (L), (2) $80,602, (3) $80,337.

Babcock (William) Memorial Endowment, San Rafael, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,614,430 (L), (2) $102,073, (3) $72,402.

Bank of America—Giannini Foundation, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,276,391 (L), (2) $110,331, (3) $108,885.

Bing Fund, Inc., Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $9,657,456 (L), (2) $309,280, (3) $307,775.

Boswell (The James G.) Foundation, Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,574,767 (L), (2) $266,091—all in grants.

Bothin Helping Fund, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,880,116 (L), (3) $129,500.

Boyar Foundation, Beverly Hills, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,582,599 (M), (2) $166,738, (3) $95,656.

Braun (Carl F.) Trust, Pasadena, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,392,823 (L), (2) $71,569, (3) $71,000.

California Community Foundation, Los Angeles, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $9,955,162 (M), (2) $366,742, (3) $295,126.

Campbell (Ina T.) Trust, Santa Barbara, as of January 1, 1956: (1) $1,603,611 (L), (2) $77,040, (3) $53,050.

Christopher (L. J.) Trust, Los Angeles, as of January 1, 1956: (1) $1,728,604 (L), (2) $16,982.

Clune Memorial Trust, Los Angeles, as of October 31, 1957: (1) $2,500,000 (M), (2) $282,087, (3) $70,000.

Connell (Michael J.) Charities, Ltd., Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $6,500,000 (M), (2) $370,000, (3) $332,000.

Cowell (S. H.) Foundation, San Francisco, as of 11 months ended August 31, 1959: (1) $14,520,000 (L), (2) $359,265.

Crown Zellerbach Foundation, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,200,000 (M), (2) $675,000, (3) $635,000.

Fund for the Republic, Inc., Santa Barbara, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $6,667,022 (M), (2) $2,157,127, (3) $574,937.

Goldwyn (The Samuel) Foundation, Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,785,260 (L), (2) $169,847, (3) $164,533.

Haynes (The John Randolph Haynes and Dora) Foundation, Los Angeles, as of August 31, 1958: (1) $2,569,412 (L), (2) $336,717, (3) $299,708.

Hearst (William Randolph) Foundation, Los Angeles, as of March 31, 1957: (1) not reported (according to 1956 press reports, the foundation will receive $43,732,407 as a result of the settlement of the estate of William Randolph Hearst), (2) $50,934, (3) $50,316.

Hilton (Conrad N.) Foundation, Beverly Hills, as of February 28, 1958: (1) not reported; accumulated income, $1,420,336, (2) $173,011, (3) $172,721.

Hoag Foundation, Hollywood, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,500,000 (M), (2) $165,000, (3) $150,000.

Hollywood Canteen Foundation, Los Angeles, as of February 28, 1958: (1) (1959) $1,000,000 (M), (2) $132,716, (3) $127,889.

Hunt Foods Charitable Foundation, Los Angeles, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,087,200 (L), (2) $112,969, (3) $112,489.

Irwin (The William G.) Charity Foundation, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,303,581 (L), (2) $77,475, (3) $77,473.

Kaiser (The Henry J.) Family Foundation, Oakland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $16,140,279 (L), (2) $27,279, (3) $26,760.

Layne Foundation, Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,388,399 (L), (2) $26,973, (3) $14,500.

Lloyd (The Ralph B.) Foundation, Beverly Hills, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,044,634 (L), (2) $745,535, (3) $745,186.

Lockheed Leadership Fund, Burbank, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,345,611 (L), (2) $217,478, (3) $105,835.

Lux (Miranda) Foundation, San Francisco, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,471,695 (M), (2) $44,650, (3) $30,000.

Mayer (The Louis B.) Foundation, Beverly Hills, as of year beginning January 1, 1956: Net worth zero; expenditures $24,952, including $19,600 in grants. News reports indicate the foundation will receive assets of more than $10,500,000 upon settlement of Mr. Mayer's estate.

Mayr (George Henry) Trust, Beverly Hills, as of year ended July 31, 1957: (1) $2,521,388 (M), (2) $184,804, (3) $121,000.

McBean (The Atholl) Foundation, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,107,123 (M), (2) $37,870, (3) $37,405.

Newhouse Foundation, Inc., San Francisco, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,252,814 (L), (2) $135,984, (3) $103,058.

Putnam Foundation, San Diego, as of April 1, 1956: (1) $1,305,497 (L), (2) $299,236, (3) $282,672.

Richards (The Mabel Wilson) Scholarship Fund, Los Angeles, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $2,466,852 (M), (2) $85,944, (3) $64,195.

Rosenberg Foundation, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,274,110 (M), (2) $423,364, (3) $362,697.

San Francisco Foundation, San Francisco, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $1,813,561 (M), (2) $388,127, (3) $363,689.

Santa Barbara Foundation, Santa Barbara, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,270,648 (L), (2) $78,254, (3) $68,372.

Trust Funds, Inc., San Francisco, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,044,860 (L), (2) $91,968, (3) $71,724.

Volker (William) Fund (formerly William Volker Charities Fund), Budlingame, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $16,936,331 (L), (2) $911,763, (3) $823,029.

COLORADO

Bemis-Taylor Foundation, Colorado Springs, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,660,658 (M), (2) $78,204, (3) $73,353.

Boettcher Foundation, Denver, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $10,601,543 (L), (2) $2,939,684, (3) $1,420.075.

El Pomar Foundation, Colorado Springs, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $23,809,212 (L), (2) $1,907,619, (3) $1,892,754.

Hunter (A. V.) Trust, Inc., Denver, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,319,885 (L), (2) $133,677, (3) $126,210.

Johnson (Arthur E.) Foundation (formerly the Johnson Foundation), Denver, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,010,206 (L), (2) $42,816, (3) $42,171.

Mullen (the John K. and Catherine S.) Benevolent Corp., Denver, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,563,158 (L), (2) $59,855, (3) $59,657.

Phipps (The Lawrence) Foundation, Denver, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,337,874 (L), (2) $189,881, (3) $180,145.

CONNECTICUT

Auerbach (The Beatrice Fox) Foundation, Hartford, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,270,832 (L), (2) $56,449, (3) $56,443.

Bedford Fund, Inc., Fairfield County, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $1,982,386 (L), (2) $86,338, (3) $78,755.

Beinecke Foundation, Greenwich, as of December, 31, 1956: (1) $1,849,664 (L), (2) $246,968, (3) $238,498.

Bissell (J. Walton) Foundation, Hartford, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,315,333 (L), (2) $58,380, (3) $52.055.

Childs (The Jane Coffin) Memorial Fund for Medical Research, New Haven, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $10,507,637 (M), (2) $294,762, (3) $264,290.

Concordia Foundation, Hartford, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,475,905 (L), (2) $48,133, (3) $44,525.

Dana (The Charles A.) Foundation, Inc., Greenwich, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $9,007,938 (L), (2) $824,718, (3) $810,109.

Eno Foundation, Saugatuck, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,576,962 (L), (2) $131,333, (3) $950.

Ensworth Charitable Foundation, Hartford, as of year ended May 31, 1958: (1) $2,131,000 (M), (2) $52,260—all in grants.

Foundations' Fund for Research in Psychiatry, New Haven, as of June 30, 1958: (1) (Research Grant Program) $4,582,332 (L), (Training Grant Program) $561,033 (L), (2) (Research Grant Program) $447,638, (Training Grant Program) $181,727, (3) (Research Grant Program) $415,357, (Training Grant Program) $140,168.

Fuller (The Anna) Fund, New Haven, as of March 5, 1958: (1) $2,201,438 (M), (2) $88,329, (3) $80,639.

Hartford Foundation for Public Giving, Hartford, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $9,264,347 (L), (2) $345,068, (3) $324,829.

Hazen (The Edward W.) Foundation, Inc., New Haven, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,118,050 (M), (2) $175,473, (3) $117,705.

List (Albert A.) Foundation, Inc., Byram, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $3,289,079 (L), (2) $45,116, (3) $27,530.

McLean Trust Fund, Hartford, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,713,401 (L), (2) $111,364, (3) $103,201.

New Haven Foundation, New Haven, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $12,800,000 (M), (2) $389,800, (3) $385,501.

Palmer (The Frank Loomis) Fund, Hartford, as of July 31, 1957: (1) $2,129,121 (L), (2) $126,854, (3) $119,685.

Porter Foundation, Greenwich, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,077,292 (L), (2) $7,472, (3) $6,600.

Public Health Foundation for Cancer and Blood Pressure Research, Inc., Stamford, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $5,931,818 (L), (2) $275,327, (3) $185,442.

Rogoff Foundation, Rowayton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,989,185 (M), (2) $47,968, (3) $35,700.

Stanley (Alix W.) Charitable Foundation, New Britain, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,053,779 (L), (2) $75,658, (3) $73,600.

Suisman Foundation, Inc., Hartford, as of April 30, 1957: (1) $1,007,862 (L), (2) $117,731, (3) $111,103.

DELAWARE

Beneficial Foundation, Inc., Wilmington, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,963,078 (L), (2) $35,721, (3) $34,400.

Dietrich (The Daniel W.) Foundation, Inc., Wilmington, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,489,133 (L), (2) $106,956, (3) $106,781.

Longwood Foundation, Inc., Wilmington: (1) not reported. A 1955 press report indicates receipt of a "major portion" of an estate appraised at $60 million.

Raskob Foundation for Catholic Activities, Inc., Wilmington, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $17,744,796 (L), (2) $838,429, (3) $771,700.

Welfare Foundation, Inc., Wilmington, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $1,521,770 (L), (2) $161,733, (3) $160,450.

Winterthur Corp., Wilmington, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $12,374,935 (L), (2) $617,691, (3) $24,738.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

American Foundation for Pharmaceutical Education, Washington, as of August 31, 1958: (1) $1,674,958 (L), (2) $229,896, (3) $181,043.

Automotive Safety Foundation, Inc., Washington, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,259,835 (M), (2) $1,688,811, (3) $830,724.

Brookings Institution, Washington, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $11,334,455 (L), (2) $945,581, (3) $72,580.

Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $80,838,528 (M), (2) $2,389,256.

Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $4,410,006 (M), (2) $508,562, (3) $403,361.

Fellowship Fund of the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation, Washington, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,748,772 (M), (2) $254,119, (3) $209,781.

Link Foundation, Washington, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,041,129 (L), (2) $43,483, (3) $28,975.

Meyer (Eugene and Agnes E.) Foundation, Washington, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $10,988,920 (L), (2) $129,762, (3) $512,779 (1958).

Resources for the Future, Inc., Washington, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $6,187,049 (L), (2) $862,779 in grants and for direct operations.

Stewart (Alexander and Margaret) Trust, Washington, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,499,611 (L), (2) $332,238, (3) $292,100.

Strong (Hattie M.) Foundation, as of August 31, 1956: (1) $1,036,356 (L), (2) $52,565, (3) $4,147 in loans.

FLORIDA

Crane (Raymond E. and Ellen F.) Foundation, Miami, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,978,436 (L), (2) $316,178, (3) $297,900.

Wolfson Family Foundation, Inc., Jacksonville, as of September 30, 1956: (1) $1,151,055 (M), (2) $293,602, (3) $275,717.

GEORGIA

Bradley (W. C. and Sarah H.) Foundation, Columbus, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,822,500 (L), (2) $125,318, (3) $118,866.

Callaway Community Foundation, La Grange, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $15,844,792 (L), (2) $1,351,301, (3) (grants approved during the year totaled $730,848).

Callaway (Fuller E.) Foundation, La Grange, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,999,235 (L), (2) $115,299, (3) $73,919.

Callaway (Ida Cason) Foundation, Pine Mountain, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $1,960,105 (L), (2) $206,958, (3) $157,920.

Campbell (John Bulow) Foundation, Atlanta, as of December 31, 1958; (1) $15,078,020 (M), (2) $172,530, (3) $117,527.

Community Enterprises, Inc., Thomaston, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,222,004 (L), (2) $127,360, (3) $124,352.

Evans (Lettie Pate) Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $10,578,665 (L), (2) $577,118, (3) $567,164.

Manget Foundation, Inc., Newman, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,387,125 (L), (2) $209,315, (3) $127,801.

Pickett and Hatcher Educational Fund, Inc., Columbus, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $4,255,912 (M), (2) $515,383, (3) $446,981.

Rich Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, as of January 31, 1959: (1) $1,825,000 (M), (2) $51,198, (3) $48,790.

Schwob (Simon) Foundation, Inc., Columbus, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,701,278 (L), (2) $84,480, (3) $84,129.

Southern Education Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $6,804,390 (M), (2) $276,678, (3) $235,551.

Steiner (Albert) Charitable Fund, Atlanta, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,193,170 (L), (2) $48,050.

Trebor Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,100,353 (L), (2) $79,133, (3) $78,800.

Whitehead (Joseph B.) Foundation, Atlanta, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $5,801,963 (L), (2) $341,535, (3) $334,375.

Whitehead (Lettie Pate) Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,020,884 (L), (2) $122,871, (3) $120,000.

Woodruff (Emily and Ernest) Foundation, Atlanta, as of December 31, 1957, (1) $26,409,750 (L), (2) $85,113, (3) $71,000.

HAWAII

Atherton (Juliette M.) Trust, Honolulu, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,810,057 (L), (2) $207,933, (3) $196,198.

Castle (Samuel N. and Mary) Foundation, Honolulu, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,707,935 (L), (2) $148,293, (3) $140,767.

Wilcox (G. N.) Trust, Honolulu, as of December 31, 1957, (1) $2,661,414 (M), (2) $133,742, (3) $124,625.

IDAHO

Anderson (C. C. and Henrietta W.) Foundation, Inc., Boise, as of February 28, 1957: (1) $1,752,995 (L), (2) $82,661, (3) $21,986.

ILLINOIS

Allstate Foundation, Skokie, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,395,260 (L), (2) $412,364, (3) $407,132.

Beidler (Francis) Charitable Trust, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,580,231 (L), (2) $131,245, (3) $115,000.

Borg-Warner Foundation, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,000,000 (L), (2) $382,006, (3) $382,005.

Chicago Community Trust, Chicago, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $28,911,238 (M), (2) $1,313,563, (3) $1,188,400.

Concora Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,898,392 (L), (2) $247,069 all in grants.

Crown (Arie) Memorial Fund, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,427,606 (L), (2) $223,828, (3) $223,807.

Cuneo Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,056,890 (L), (2) $263,451, (3) $257,734.

D. and R. Fund, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,348,703 (L), (2) $56,656, (3) $48,782.

Division Fund, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,079,420 (L), (2) $123,642, (3) $123,563.

Deere (John) Foundation, Moline, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $3,771,317 (M), (2) $156,056, (3), $155,967.

Ecko Foundation, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,669,780 (L), (2) $107,878, (3) $86,795.

Farm Foundation, Chicago, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $5,011,122 (M), (2) $193,395, (3) $91,323.

Forest Fund, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,271,828 (L), (2) $179,903, (3) $179,896.

Forest Park Foundation (formerly Forest Park Home Foundation), Peoria, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $5,500,000 (M), (2) $154,076, (3) $138,536.

Gardner-Denver Foundation, Quincy, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,131,400 (M), (2) $38,175—all in grants.

General Service Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,063,213 (L), (2) $923,486, (3) $919,261.

Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,124,663 (L), (2) $117,897, (3) $56,305.

Hales Charitable Fund, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,167,512 (L), (2) $27,869, (3) $27,409.

Illinois Philanthropic and Educational Foundation, Elsah, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $2,591,924 (M), (2) $205,549, (3) $201,402.

Illinois Health Foundation, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,804,807 (L), (2) $110,318, (3) $49,247.

Inland Steel-Ryerson Foundation, Inc., (formerly Inland Steel Foundation, Inc.), Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,298,586 (L), (3) $999,266.

International Harvester Foundation, Chicago, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $2,220,859 (L), (2) $950,821, (3) $950,793.

Kemper (The James S.) Foundation, Chicago, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $2,161,997 (M), (2) $91,092, (3) $84,956.

Kettering Family Foundation, The, Hinsdale, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,689,880 (L), (2) $383,952, (3) $56,058.

Kettering (Charles F.) Foundation, Hinsdale, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $69,313,071 (M), (2) $515,714, (3) $497,714.

Marquette Charitable Organization, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,361,416 (L), (2) $175,086, (3) $167,231.

McCormick (Elizabeth) Memorial Fund, Chicago, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $3,513,671 (M), (2) $124,424, (3) $86,851.

McGraw Foundation, Chicago, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $3,016,136 (M), (2) $37,263, (3) $36,286.

Meyer-Ceco Foundation, Cicero, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,427,346 (L), (2) $37,431, (3) $36,462.

Moorman Foundation, Quincy, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $2,004,934 (L), (2) $199,950, (3) $196,024.

Morton (Mark) Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,351,374 (L), (2) $224,659, (3) $213,892.

National Merit Scholarship Corp., Evanston, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $10,607,991 (L), (2) $2,748,690, (3) $2,432,116.

Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., East Alton, as of October 31, 1957: (1) $6,426,119 (L), (2) $438,968, (3) $429,205.

Pullman (George M.) Educational Foundation, Chicago, as of July 31, 1959: (1) $8,450,000 (M), (2) $290,300, (3) $241,200.

Pullman, Inc., Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,445,006 (M), (2) $199,824, (3) $195,755.

Regenstein (The Joseph and Helen) Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,526,493 (L), (2) $225,705, (3) $80,500.

Rotary Foundation of Rotary International, Evanston, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $3,172,636 (L), (2) $404,186, (3) $323,434.

Santa Fe Foundation, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,402,357 (L), (2) $457,007 all in grants.

Schwab (Charles H. and Rachel M.) Memorial Foundation, Chicago: as of February 28, 1959: (1) Not reported. A 1959 press release reports that the foundation is beneficiary of Mr. Schwab's $2,450,000 trust estate. (2) $76,000—including grants.

Seabury Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,270,661 (L), (2) $98,895, (3) $63,650.

Sears-Roebuck Foundation, Chicago, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $22,430,770 (M), (2) $1,880,738, (3) $1,862,038.

Sprague (The Otho S. A.) Memorial Institute, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,693,965 (L), (2) $213,186, (3) $207,275.

Standard Oil Foundation, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $22,268,587 (M), (2) $1,048,932, (3) $1,048,033.

Swift & Co. Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,244.021 (L), (2) $284,929, (3) $284,688.

Wieboldt Foundation, Evanston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,147,023 (M), (2) $292,266, (3) $246,944.

Wilkie Foundation, Des Plaines, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,167,053 (L), (2) $102,573, (3) $63,187.

Woods Charitable Fund, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,121,000 (M), (3) $424,661.

INDIANA

Baxter Foundation, Indianapolis, as of July 31, 1958: (1) $2,006,621 (L), (2) $105,820, (3) $92,310.

Christian Foundation, Columbus, as of November 30, 1956: (1) $3,495,419 (L), (2) $229,790, (3) $227,083.

Honeywell Foundation, Inc., Wabash, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $5,720,958 (L), (2) $267,652, (3) $96,496.

Indianapolis Foundation, Indianapolis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,529,447 (L), (2) $288,752, (3) $275,565.

Inland Container Corporation Foundation, Inc. (formerly Inland Foundation, Inc.), Indianapolis, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,220,709 (L), (2) $141,782, (3) $85,574.

Jordan (Arthur) Foundation, Indianapolis, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $5,680,000 (L), (2) $126,000 all in grants.

Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $157,013,165 (M), (2) $4,127,762, (3) $4,057,940.

McMillen Foundation, Fort Wayne, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,056,947 (L), (2) $48,653, (3) $48,652.

Storer (The Oliver W.), A Scholarship Foundation, Indianapolis, as of February 28, 1957: (1) $2,174,571 (L), (2) $79,879, (3) $71,276.

IOWA

Cowles (Gardner) Foundation, Des Moines, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,313,927 (L), (2) $318,435, (3) $318,417.

Meredith (Edwin T.) Foundation, Des Moines, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $2,155,023 (L), (2) $71,290, (3) $67,125.

Norris Foundation, Marshalltown, as of November 30, 1956: (1) $1,042,514 (L), (2) $52,437, (3) $52,020.

Wahlert Foundation, Dubuque, as of November 30, 1957: (1) $1,698,137 (L), (2) $42,690, all in grants.

KANSAS

Schowalter Foundation, Inc., Newton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,035,158 (L), (2) $92,962, (3) $60,195.

KENTUCKY

Bernheim (The Isaac W.) Foundation, Louisville, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $5,493,000 (M), (2) $161,774.

Brown (James Graham) Foundation, Louisville, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,394,260 (L), (2) $206,270, (3) $197,681.

Robinson (E. O.) Mountain Fund, Lexington, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $2,607,348 (L), (2) $124,241, (3) $87,400.

LOUISIANA

Hurley (Ed E. and Gladys) Foundation, Shreveport, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,489,896 (L), (2) $22,890.

Rosa Mary Foundation, New Orleans, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,175,352 (L), (2) $81,610, (3) $80,500.

Schlieder (Edward G.) Educational Foundation, New Orleans, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,996,461 (L), (2) $172,844, (3) $157,771.

Stern (Edgar) Family Fund, New Orleans, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,960,271 (M), (2) $630,983, (3) $622,280.

MAINE

Davenport (George P.) Trust Fund, Bath, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,910,225 (L), (2) $85,514, (3) $75,520.

MARYLAND

Blaustein (The Louis and Henrietta) Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,494,269 (L), (2) $447,965, (3) $447,949.

Commercial Credit Companies Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,829,960 (L), (2) $124,281, (3) $121,110.

Frederick (George A. and Mary E.) Memorial, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,276,027 (L), (2) $99,499, (3) $89,613.

Gottschalk Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,016,379 (L), (2) $34,428, (3) $32,246.

Heller (The Ralph C.) Foundation, Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,038,433 (L), (2) $56,332, (3) $54,772.

Hoffberger Brothers Fund, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,336,030 (L), (2) $66,658 all in grants.

Straus (The Aaron Straus and Lillie) Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,194,322 (L), (2) $600,104, (3) $204,755.

MASSACHUSETTS

Adams (Frank W. and Carl S.) Memorial Fund, Boston, as of March 20, 1959: (1) $2,900,000 (M), (2) $82,000 (1958), all in grants.

Alden (George I.) Trust, Worcester, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,707,807 (L), (2) $353,960, all in grants.

Ames (Hobart) Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2 million (M), (2) $202,709, (3) $197,603.

Bay State Charitable Trust, Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,454,129 (L), (2) $72,802, (3) $69,750.

Beveridge (Frank Stanley) Foundation, Westfield, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,386,018 (L), (2) $230,952, (3) $208,694.

Blanchard Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,410,980 (L), (2) $151,035, (3) $139,295.

Boston Foundation, Boston, as of August 31, 1957: (1) $4,289,565 (L), (2) $72,497, (3) $24,200.

Crabtree (Trustees under the Will of Lotta M.), Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,532,300 (L), (2) $311,672, (3) $90,101.

Daniels (Fred Harris) Foundation, Inc., Worcester, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $2,505,108 (L), (2) $158,391, (3) $153,580.

Dexter (Eugene A.) Charitable Fund, Springfield, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,250,599 (M), (2) $93,435, (3) $86,739.

Eaton Foundation, Inc., Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,068,914 (L), (2) $91,201, (3) $84,000.

Edwards Scholarship Fund, Boston, as of July 31, 1958: (1) $2,288,844 (M), (2) $78,557, (3) $66,975.

Elks National Foundation, Boston, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $8,509,410 (M), (2) $218,328 all in grants.

Filene (Lincoln and Therese) Foundation, Inc., Boston, as of January 31, 1959: (1) $1,347,078 (L), (2) $130,039, (3) $129,250.

Fuller Foundation, Inc., Boston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,297,409 (L), (2) $751,957, (3) $745,329.

Fuller (George F. and Sybil H.) Foundation, Worcester, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,096,902 (L), (2) $39,736, (3) $39,700.

Gillette Charitable and Educational Foundation, Boston, as of December 30, 1958: (1) $1,022,174 (L), (2) $33,380, (3) $30,891.

Hood (Charles H.) Dairy Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,333,924 (L), (2) $181,760, (3) $164,054.

Hyams (Sarah A.) Fund, Inc., Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,001,716 (M), (2) $84,840, (3) $83,505.

King (Charles A.) Trust, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,459,398 (L), (2) (1956) $101,742, (3) $77,000.

Lahey Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,202,938 (L), (2) $70,627, (3) $16,085.

Levy (June Rockwell) Foundation, Inc., Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,218,597 (L), (2) $76,508, (3) $66,645.

Moses (Horace A.) Foundation, Inc., West Springfield, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,613,253 (L), (2) $201,262, (3) $175,963.

Parker (Theodore Edson) Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,200,000 (M), (2) $125,536, (3) $115,400.

Permanent Charity Fund, Inc., Boston, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $27,775,381 (M), (2) $751,601, (3) $721,872.

Peters (G. Gorham) Trust, Boston, as of May 1, 1957: (1) $1,530,860 (M), (2) (1956) $26,043, (3) $18,800.

Pilgrim Foundation, Brockton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,192,244 (L), (2) $52,762, (3) $40,466.

Sagamore Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,133,739 (L), (2) $101,420, (3) $101,400.

Schrafft (William E. Schrafft and Bertha E.) Charitable Trust, Charlestown, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,773,716 (L), (2) $78,644, (3) $70,525.

Smith Charities, Northampton, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $2,242,717 (L), (2) $76,832, (3) $48,966.

Stevens (Nathaniel and Elizabeth P.) Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,921,357 (L), (2) $175,753, (3) $175,500.

Stoddard Charitable Trust, Worcester, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,306,652 (L), (2) $108,975, (3) $108,400.

Thompson (Thomas) Trust, Boston, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $1,735,602 (L), (2) $79,047, (3) $68,102.

Webster (The Edwin S.) Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,555,038 (L), (2) $245,838, (3) $236,400.

World Peace Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,400,000 (M), (2) $70,000.

Ziskind (Jacob) Trust for Charitable Purposes, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,660,538 (L), (2) $116,778, (3) $102,494.

MICHIGAN

Besser Foundation, Alpena, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $2,762,326 (L), (2) $63,947, (3) $59,950.

Chrysler Fund, Detroit, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,526,292 (L), (2) $1,079,328 all in grants.

Cranbrook Foundation, Bloomfield Hills, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $9,317,178 (L), (2) $456,105, (3) $151,368.

Dow (The Herbert H. and Grace A.) Foundation, Midland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,913,248 (L), (2) $334,262, (3) $324,529.

EPH Foundation, Highland Park, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,710,085 (L), (2) $87,494, (3) $87,279.

Earhart Foundation, Ann Arbor, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,703,913 (L), (2) $191,044, (3) 156,564.

Ferry (D. M.), Junior Trustee Corp., Detroit, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,447,520 (L), (2) $61,434, (3) $59,537.

Ford (Eleanor Clay) Fund, Detroit, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,135,574 (L), (2) $294,198, (3) $293,496.

Ford Motor Co. Fund, Dearborn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $16,818,824 (D), (2) $4,545,737; (3) $4,384,607.

Fruehauf (Roy) Foundation, Inc., Detroit, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,302,806 (L), (2) $75,086, (3) $70,989.

George (The Edwin S.) Foundation, Birmingham, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $1,394,563 (L), (3) $431,890.

Gerber Baby Foods Fund, Fremont, as of May 31, 1959: (1) $2,552,413 (M), (2) $121,705, (3) $114,968.

Gordon (The Josephine E.) Foundation, Detroit, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $9,060,678 (L), (2) $73,652, (3) $50,800.

Grand Rapids Foundation, Grand Rapids, as of June 30, 1956: (1) $500,129 (L) (according to a 1959 press report, the foundation has received a $5 million bequest, the income from which is to be spent at the discretion of the trustees), (2) $21,458, all in grants.

Herrick Foundation, Detroit, as of September 30, 1956: (1) $5,519,696 (L), (2) $301,016, (3) $299,662.

Hudson-Webber Foundation, Detroit, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,562,699 (M), (2) $188,336, (3) $185,505.

Joy (The Helen Newberry) Fund, Detroit, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,024,147 (L), (2) $67,262, (3) $63,600.

Kalamazoo Foundation, Kalamazoo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $21,087,000 (M), (2) $642,000, (3) $578,000.

Kellogg (W. K.) Foundation, Battle Creek, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $215,184,419 (M), (2) $8,147,434, (3) $7,747,199.

Kresge Foundation, Detroit, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $95,316,048 (M), (2) $3,623,689, (3) $3,497,722.

McGregor Fund, Detroit, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $21,799,115 (M), (2) $1,506,213, (3) $1,440,820.

Mott (Charles Stewart) Foundation, Flint, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $23,582,249 (L), (2) $1,025,108, (3) $930,845.

Pardee (Elsa U.) Foundation, Midland, as of January 1, 1953: (1) $4,287,614 (L), (2) (1956) $132,771, all in grants.

Ranson Fidelity Co., Lansing, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,445,269 (L), (2) $126,511, (3) $97,451.

Relm Foundation, Ann Arbor, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,733,564 (L), (2) $304,658, (3) $257,038.

Sackner (Wade E. and Viola) Foundation, Grand Rapids, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $2,273,113 (L), (2) $94,372, (3) $72,000.

Upjohn (W. E.) Unemployment Trustee Corp., Kalamazoo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,089,000 (L), (2) $126,517, (3) $124,838.

Webber (Eloise and Richard) Foundation, Detroit, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,550,947 (L), (2) $123,427, (3) $119,425.

Whiting Foundation, Flint, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,027,000 (L), (2) $69,200, (3) $69,000.

Wickes (Harvey Randall) Foundation, Saginaw, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,236,736 (L), (2) $55,293, (3) $52,315.

MINNESOTA

Bayport Foundation, Inc., Bayport, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,742,000 (L), (2) $107,824, all in grants.

Bean (F. A.) Foundation, Inc., Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,585,050 (L), (2) $246,077, (3) $237,878.

Bigelow (F. R.) Foundation, St. Paul, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,225,565 (L), (2) $51,008 all in grants.

Blandin (Charles K.) Foundation, Grand Rapids, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,088,000 (L), (2) $73,000, (3) $70,000.

Bremer (Otto) Foundation, St. Paul, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,466,123 (L), (2) $245,232, (3) $243,978.

Bush Foundation, St. Paul, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,025,385 (M), (2) $45,553, (3) $44,131.

Cargill Foundation, Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,245,341 (L), (2) $83,322, (3) $83,250.

Dayton Foundation, Minneapolis, as of November 30, 1956: (1) $2,687,405 (L), (2) $146,176, (3) $146,150.

Hamm Foundation, Inc., St. Paul, as of August 31, 1958: (1) $1,321,416 (L), (2) $359,842, (3) $332,250.

Harris Foundation, St. Paul, as of May 15, 1957: (1) $1,053,409 (M), (2) $32,017, (3) $29,936.

Hill (Louis W. and Maud) Family Foundation, St. Paul, as of February 28, 1959: (1) $22,375,972 (L), (2) $1,243,985, (3) $1,164,835.

Hormel Foundation, Austin, as of November 30 1957: (1) $2,338,984 (L), (2) $195,452, (3) $105,150.

Mayo Association, Rochester, as of December 31, 1958, (1) $59,100,000 (L), (2) $1,121,000, (3) $1,054,000.

Minneapolis Foundation, Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $4,177,519 (M), (2) $129,352, (3) $113,557.

Minneapolis Star and Tribune Fund, Minneapolis, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $1,650,121 (L), (2) $83,478, (3) $83,434.

Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Foundation, Inc., St. Paul, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,471,859 (L), (2) $210,589 all in grants.

Ordean (Albert and Louise) Charity, Duluth, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $4,257,278 (L), (2) $162,979, (3) $107,310.

O'Shaughnessy (I. A.) Foundation, Inc., St. Paul, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,875,091 (L), (2) $1,035,378 all in grants.

Phillips Foundation, Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,966,509 (M), (2) $564,192, (3) $136,517.

Tozer Foundation, Inc., St. Paul, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $4,055,247 (M), (2) $101,440 grants and scholarships.

Walker (Archie D. and Bertha H.) Foundation, Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,809,940 (L), (2) $71,381, (3) $61,791.

Walker (T. B.) Foundation, Inc., Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,912,019 (L), (2) $294,334, (3) $214,611.

Western Foundation, Inc., Minneapolis, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $2,522,619 (L), (2) $138,896, (3) $138,505.

Wilder (Amherst H.) Foundation, St. Paul, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $26,073,373 (M), (2) $736,206.

MISSISSIPPI

None.

MISSOURI

Anheuser-Busch Charitable Trust, St. Louis, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $2,656,557 (L), (2) $324,112, (3) $314,090.

Blewett (Parsons) Memorial Fund, St. Louis, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $3,537,527 (M), (2) $45,606.

Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $110,292,491 (M), (2) $2,913,664, (3) $2,817,505.

Falstaff Foundation, St. Louis, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,868,426 (L), (2) $160,247, (3) $123,744.

Gaylord (Clifford Willard) Foundation, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,555,466 (L), (2) $180,198, (3) $163,875.

Gaylord Foundation, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,326,284 (L), (2) $159,580, (3) $140,710.

Hallmark Educational Foundation, Kansas City, as of January 1, 1956: (1) $2,253,016 (L), (2) $47,293, (3) $47,280.

Loose (Carrie J.) Fund, Kansas City, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,799,681 (M), (2) $123,940, (3) $111,140.

Loose (Ella C.) Fund, Kansas City, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,634, 876 (M), (2) $166,010, (3) $151,206.

Loose (Jacob L.) Million Dollar Charity Fund Association, Kansas City, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,133,395 (M), (2) $40,000, (3) $36,304.

May Stores Foundation, Inc., St. Louis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,472,299 (L), (2) $474,078, (3) $473,853.

McDonnell Aircraft Corp. Foundation (formerly McDonnell Aircraft Corp. Charitable Trust), St. Louis, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $2,557,891 (L), (2) $43,286, (3) $35,648.

Monsanto Charitable Trust, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,118,567 (L), (2) $559,718, (3) $553,614.

Nelson (The William Rockhill) Trust, Kansas City, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $12,308,131 (L), (2) $630,209, (3) $335,061.

Ralston Purina Charitable Trust, St. Louis, as of August 31, 1957: (1) $1,074,318 (L), (2) $168,406, (3) $162,478.

Steinberg Charitable Trust, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,390,187 (L), (2) $903,133, (3) $888,518.

Sunnen Foundation, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,138,298 (L), (2) $137,961, (3) $135,479.

Swinney (Edward F.), Kansas City, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,784,912 (M), (2) $61,970, (3) $55,570.

Wohl Foundation, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,716,174 (L), (2) $350,000 all in grants.

MONTANA

None.

NEBRASKA

Cooper Foundation, Lincoln, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,529,274 (L), (2) $523,119, (3) $85,975.

Eppley (Eugene C.) Foundation, Inc., Omaha, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $21,470,836 (L), (2) $1,019,822.

McDonald (J. M.) Foundation, Inc., Omaha, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $21,470,836 (L), (2) $1,019,822.

McDonald (J. M.) Foundation, Inc., Hastings, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,391,427 (L), (2) $190,000, (3) $176,500.

Swanson (Carl and Caroline) Foundation, Inc., Omaha, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,778,918 (L), (2) $120,516, (3) $100,465.

NEVADA

Fleischmann (Max C.) Foundation of Nevada, Reno, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $66,759,400 (M), (2) $1,957,409, (3) $1,771,987.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Cogswell Benevolent Trust, Manchester, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,314,210 (L), (2) $69,809, (3) $59,797.

Spaulding-Potter Charitable Trusts, Concord, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,519,634 (L), (2) $2,545,042, (3) $2,467,263.

NEW JERSEY

Borden (The Mary Owen) Memorial Foundation, Rumson, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,971,033 (L), (2) $283,287, (3) $117,271.

Campbell Soup Fund, Camden, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,263,821 (L), (2) $235,021, (3) $228,750.

Fuld (Helene) Health Foundation, Trenton, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $8,184,604 (L), (2) $410,124, (3) $400,928.

Huber Foundation, Red Bank, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,758,402 (L), (2) $62,160, (3) $62,050.

Johnson (John Seward) Charitable Trust, New Brunswick, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,431,528 (M), (2) (1956) $57,059, (3) $56,809.

Johnson (Robert Wood) Foundation, New Brunswick, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $4,456,494 (M), (2) (1956) $71,887, (3) $71,343.

Ladd (Kate Macy) Fund, Newark, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $19,304,651 (M), (2) $686,483, (3) $651,031.

Rippel (Fannie E.) Foundation, Newark, as of April 30, 1958: (1) $21,201,511 (L), (2) $866,278, (3) $800,000.

Schering Foundation, Inc., Bloomfield, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,025,464 (L), (2) $101,420, (3) $100,333.

Turrell Fund, East Orange, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $15,224,993 (M), (2) $504,057, (3) $468,803.

Victoria Foundation, Inc., Glen Ridge, as of December 31, 1957; (1) $10,294,765 (L), (2) (1958) $247,199, (3) $237,750.

NEW MEXICO

None.

NEW YORK CITY

Allen (Vivian B.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,528,000 (M), (2) $128,781, (3) $120,296.

Allied Stores Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,983,770 (L), (2) $49,703, (3) $48,438.

Altman Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $11,156,622 (L), (2) $498,558, (3) $476,017.

Altschul Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,983,460 (L), (2) $240, 540, (3) $224,135.

American Fore Loyalty Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,431,583 (L), (2) $98,854, (3) $98,600.

American Missionary Association, New York: (1) $19,259,915 (L), (2) $2,610,869, (3) $2,423,061.

American Scandinavian Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,349,605 (L), (2) $156,423, (3) $60,418.

Aron (J.) Charitable Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,015,462 (L), (2) $223,750, (3) $220,925.

Ascoli (Marion R.) Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,082,252 (L), (2) $159,913, (3) $146,594.

Association for the Aid of Crippled Children, New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $21,436, 653 (M), (2) $776,375, (3) $475,927.

Astor (The Vincent) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,896,598 (M), (2) $187,645, (3) $185,300.

Avalon Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $74,326,593 (M), (2) $2,473,701, (3) $2,342, 727.

Bagley (The Nancy Reynolds) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,564,139 (L), (2) $89,386, (3) $85,000.

Baird (David, Josephine, and Winfield) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $8,699,628 (L), (2) $695,866, (3) $685,395.

Baird (Winfield) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $14,622,258 (L), (2) $8,421,937, (3) $8,061,431.

Baker (The George F.) Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $14,487,808 (L), (2) $696,610, (3) $596,450.

Banbury Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,782,173 (L), (2) $99,525, (3) $96,425.

Bay (Charles Ulrick and Josephine) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $9,069,832 (L), (2) $388,179, (3) $367,484.

Belgian American Educational Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,421,212 (M), (2) $200,716, (3) $99,366.

Benenson (Robert and Nettie) Foundation, New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $5,575,725 (L), (2) $23,260 all in grants.

Biddle (Margaret T.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,509,072 (L), (2) $107,156, (3) $106,164.

Bodman Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $7,804,848 (L), (2) $386,513, (3) $379,226.

Bollingen Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $6,057,181 (M), (2) $1,058,395, (3) $835,223.

Booth Ferris Foundation, New York, as of October 1958: (1) Not reported—Assets not fully determined, but reported by the press to be in the neighborhood of $17 million.

Brez Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,140,116 (M), (2) $71,534, (3) $65,500.

Bronfman (The Samuel) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,380,662 (L), (2) $62,456, (3) $62,156.

Brookdale Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,333,801, (2) $295,717, (3) $75,318.

Brooks (Walter) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,857,682 (M), (2) $577,311, (3) $556,572.

Bunbury Co., Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,019,311 (L), (2) $104,473, (3) $102,992.

Calder (The Louis) Foundation, New York, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $26,776,780 (L), (2) $783,121, (3) $614,734.

Campe (The Ed Lee and Jean) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,370,001 (L), (2) $63,764, (3) $61,690.

Carnegie Corp. of New York, New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $261,244,471 (M), (2) $8,715,682, (3) $7,935,175.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $22,577,134 (M), (2) $770,744, (3) $54,048.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $20,043,859 (M), (2) $1,463,908, (3) $1,427,418 (chiefly for retiring allowances and pension grants).

Cheatham (Owen) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,214,181 (M), (2) $34,964, (3) $26,797.

China Medical Board of New York, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $39,698,954 (L), (2) $746,056, (3) $598,777.

Clark Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $8,504,843 (L), (2) $252,947, (3) $105,000.

Coe Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,698,179 (L), (2) $407,439, (3) $312,400.

Collins (Joseph) Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,995,871 (M), (2) $90,966, (3) $83,865.

Commonwealth Fund, New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $119,904,614 (M), (2) $3,972,862, (3) $3,448,496.

Compton Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,388,670 (L), (2) $1,226,695 (1956), (3) $1,226,143.

Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,520,539 (M), (2) $500,717, (3) $397,328.

Cowles Charitable Trust (formerly The Fleur and Gardner Cowles Charitable Trust), New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,105,166 (L), (2) $121,010, (3) $121,000.

Culpeper (Charles E.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,311,256 (L), (2) $255,712, (3) $245,919.

Deering Milliken Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,891,461 (L), (2) $441,380, (3) $439,354.

de Hirsch (The Baron) Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,271,177 (L), (2) $185,600, (3) $152,185.

Dillon Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,197,194 (L), (2) $144,244, (3) $136,956.

Dodge (Cleveland H.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,645,162 (L), (2) $473,220, (3) $467,350.

Doherty (The Henry L. and Grace) Charitable Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,322,044 (L), (2) $302,456, (3) $289,176.

Dreyfus (The Camille and Henry) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,099,520 (L), (2) $232,089, (3) $224,826.

Duke (Angier B.) Memorial, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,253,968 (L), (2) $120,323, (3) $104,012.

Duke Endowment, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $414,754,543 (M), (2) $7,913,866, (3) $7,276,387.

Dula (The Caleb C. and Julia W.) Educational and Charitable Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,694,725 (L), (2) $310,986, (3) $261,500.

Educational Foundation for Jewish Girls, New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $2,963,799 (M), (2) $103,148, (3) $87,657.

Engineering Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $1,651,446 (L), (2) $88,302, (3) $72,000.

Esso Education Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,614,768 (L), (2) $1,644,050, (3) $1,638,715.

Farfield Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,262,063 (L), (2) $853,730, (3) $811,744.

Field Foundation, Inc., New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $32,662,385 (L), (2) $2,038,513, (3) $1,849,424.

Fischel (Harry and Jane) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,411,702 (L), (2) $63,489, (3) $50,981.

Ford Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $3,316,000,000 (M), (2) $112,145,678, (3) $110,132,848.

Frasch (Herman) Foundation for Chemical Research, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,091,659 (M), (2) $124,721, (3) $110,730.

Frueauff (Charles A.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,258,618 (L), (2) $489,083, (3) $427,308.

Fund for the Advancement of Education, New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $6,298,648 (M), (2) $2,435,205, (3) $1,929,504.

General Education Board, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,112,706 (M), (2) $2,155,256, (3) $690,452.

Gilman Foundation, Inc., New York, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $2,207,125 (L), (2) $209,370, (3) $207,205.

Gottesman (D. S. and R. H.) Foundation, New York, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $1,709,261 (L), (2) $467,266, (3) $427,617.

Grand Street Boys' Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,700,033 (M), (2) $314,230, all in grants.

Grant Foundation, Inc., New York, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $13,687,212 (M), (2) $942,491, (3) $840,970.

Griffis Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,260,529 (L), (2) $49,389, (3) $45,245.

Guggenheim (The Daniel and Florence) Foundation, New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $4,879,794 (L), (2) $497,034, (3) $447,487.

Guggenheim (John Simon) Memorial Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $45 million (M), (2) $1,760,568, (3) $1,492,506.

Guggenheim (The Murry and Leonie) Foundation, New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $18,300,000 (M), (2) $807,000, (3) $730,000.

Guggenheim (The Solomon R.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $17,665,759 (L), (2) $501,999, (3) $44,097.

Gulbenkian (Gulabi) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,235,242 (L), (2) $41,291, all in grants.

Haas (Leo Oppenheimer and Flora Oppenheimer) Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,286,065 (L), (2) $187,801, (3) $135,992.

Haggin (Margaret Voorhies) Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958, (1) $6,511,429 (L), (2) $197,726, (3) $180,882.

Harkness (William Hale) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,961,279 (L), (2) $101,943, (3) $89,250.

Harriman (Mary W.) Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,454,120 (L), (2) $190,489, (3) $178,922.

Hartford (The John A.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $413,229,391 (M), (2) $3,998,697, (3) $3,945,813.

Haskins & Sells Foundation, Inc., New York, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $1,012,325 (L), (2) $76,378, (3) $73,173.

Havens Relief Fund Society, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,840,271 (L), (2) $96,002, (3) $83,617.

Hayden (Charles) Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $67,385,801 (M), (2) $1,273,481, (3) $1,066,000.

Heckscher Foundation for Children, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,925,748 (L), (2) $147,661, (3) $131,768.

Hineman Foundation for Research, Educational, Charitable, and Scientific Purposes, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,979,556 (L), (2) $52,822, (3) $48,261.

Herskowitz (Harry) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,965,119 (L), (2) $223,185 all in grants.

Hirschman (Henrietta and Stuard) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,581,682 (L), (2) $599,550, (3) $587,466.

Hofheimer (Nathan) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,635,512 (L), (2) $139,514, (3) $131,800.

Hutchins (Mary J.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,419,552 (L), (2) $54,841, (3) $53,953.

Hyde (The Lillia Babbitt) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $9,249,494 (L), (2) $438,712, (3) $399,200.

Ingersoll-Rand Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,146,652 (L), (2) $52,741, (3) $49,283.

International Paper Co. Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $5,781,927 (L), (2) $410,491, (3) $377,632.

Ittleson Family Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $9,812,927 (M), (2) $361,223, (3) $318,195.

J. M. Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,205,296 (L), (2) $216,715, (3) $216,532.

James Foundation of New York, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $78,417,589 (M), (2) $2,618,646, (3) $2,477,772.

Jones (W. Alton) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,035,308 (L), (2) $799,184, (3) $792,184.

Joseloff (Morris) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,313,244 (L), (2) $93,676, (3) $89,843.

Juilliard Musical Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $22,932,867 (M), (2) $635,119, (3) $563,270.

Kade (Max) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,877,912 (L), (2) $408,929, (3) $395,961.

Kaplan (The J. M.) Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $16,496,739 (L), (2) $404,073, (3) $358,269.

Kaufmann (Henry) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,313,115 (M), (2) $421,757, (3) $409,292.

Kennedy (The Joseph P.), Jr., Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,191,768 (L), (2) $1,937,378, (3) $1,826,550.

Kevorkian Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,235,994 (L), (2) $159,270, (3) $31,823.

Klau (The David) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,783,518 (L), (2) $154,021, (3) $153,996.

Klingenstein (The Esther A. and Joseph) Fund, Inc., New York, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $3,641,591 (L), (2) $234,068, (3) $234,050.

Knapp Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,113,188 (L), (2) $78,492, (3) $75,047.

Kress (Samuel H.) Foundation, New York: as of August 31, 1958: (1) $45,000,000 (M), (2) $1,663,235, (3) $1,113,468.

Lasker (Albert and Mary) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,783,225 (L), (2) $967,852, (3) $869,389.

Lavanburg Corner House, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,652,939 (L), (2) $967,852, (3) $869,389.

Lavanburg Corner House, Inc., New York: as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,652,939 (L), (2) $87,857, (3) $83,800.

Lavanburg (Fred L.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,300,000 (M), (2) $100,366, (3) $69,150.

Lesavoy Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,270,106 (L), (2) expenditures none.

Leviton Foundation, Inc.—New York, Brooklyn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,075,827 (L), (2) $171,872 all in grants.

Levy (Adele R.) Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,062,101 (L), (2) $336,800, (3) $323,700.

Li Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,023,660 (L), (2) $51,638, (3) $51,498.

Life Insurance Medical Research Fund, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,753,914 (L), (2) $1,055,655, (3) $980,779.

Lindsley (John) Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,076,704 (L), (2) $113,856, (3) $104,430.

Littauer (The Lucius N.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,218,694 (L), (2) $159,079, (3) $111,591.

Lowenstein (Leon) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $7,526,-753 (L), (2) $552,421, (3) $504,589.

Luce (The Henry) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,697,250 (L), (2) $113,230, (3) $113,000.

Macy (Josiah), Jr., Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $33,721,316 (M), (2) $1,303,776, (3) $813,346.

Markle (The John and Mary R.) Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $38,-033,275 (M), (2) $1,208,973, (3) $1,047,293.

Martin Foundation, Inc., New York, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $1,680,329 (L), (2) $128,619, (3) $49,759.

Mazer (The Abraham) Family Fund, Inc., New York, as of July 31, 1957: (1) $1,283,371 (L), (2) $152,824, (3) $135,682.

Memton Fund, Inc., care of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,433,364 (L), (2) $63,404, (3) $60,950.

Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Foundation, Inc., partners of (formerly the Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane Foundation, Inc.), New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,245,659 (L), (2) $434,313, (3) $433,864.

Mertz (Martha) Foundation, Inc., care of the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,248,455 (L), (2) $49,112, (3) $45,500.

Milbank (the Dunlevy) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,-726,399 (L), (2) $82,730, (3) $82,450.

Milbank Memorial Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $21,639,685 (M), (2) $668,482, (3) $373,568.

Monell (The Ambrose) Foundation, care of W. Barrett Brown, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,541,459 (L), (2) $516,836, $502,500.

Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York Foundation, (formerly Guaranty Trust Co. of New York Foundation), New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,741,858 (L), (2) $220,500, all in grants.

Morgenstern (Morris) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,648,545 (L), (2) $140,342, (3) $66,384.

Morris (The William T.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $8,995,-741 (L), (2) $311,870, (3) $275,059.

Moses (Henry and Lucy) Fund, Inc., care of Moses & Singer, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,022,461 (L), (2) $150,148, (3) $149,547.

Mosler Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,291,853 (L), (2) $52,411, all in grants.

Munitalp Foundation, Inc., The, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,021,-942 (L), $125,186, (3) $26,600.

Music Performance Trust Funds of the Recording Industries, care of Samuel Rosenbaum, New York, as of June 30 1958: (1) $7,770,146 (M), (2) $4,070,848, (3) $3,708,005 (musical performances).

National Biscuit Co. Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,252,641 (L), (2) $45,700, all in grants.

National Lead Foundation, Inc., The, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,372,-715 (L), $224,750, all in grants.

New World Foundation, The, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,390,000 (M), (2) $307,000, (3) $242,000.

New York Community Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $35,528,485 (M), (2) $1,675,008, (3) $1,586,366.

New York Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $18,578,192 (M), (2) $1,022,541, (3) $958,334.

Newhouse (Samuel I.) Foundation, Inc., Jamaica, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $6,164,-279 (L), (2) $174,627, (3) $174,100.

Nias (Henry) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $2,663,369 (L), (2) $153,662, (3) $142,500.

1907 Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,005,281 (L), (2) $127,077, (3) $83,460.

Noble (Edward John) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $13,520,-352 (M), (2) $413,253, (3) $218,985, leadership grants, $164,015, charitable grants.

Norman (The Aaron E.) Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,232,184 (M), (2) $207,883, (3) $201,485.

Noyes (Jessie Smith) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,913,358 (L), (2) $331,853, (3) $228,080.

Nutrition Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,917,856 (M), (2) $654,378, (3) $545,180.

Oaklawn Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,373,841 (L), (2) $65,165, (3) $62,327.

Old Dominion Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $43,172,902 (M), (2) $17,777,229, (3) $17,631,729.

Olin Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $39,723,742 (L), (2) $2,085,167, (3) $1,900,000.

Ottinger Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,203,543 (L), (2) $68,909, (3) $66,804.

Overbrook Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,510,230 (L), (2) $248,553, (3) $220,869.

Palmer (Francis Asbury) Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,243,529 (L), (2) $25,406, (3) $22,906.

Parshelsky (Moses L.) Foundation, Brooklyn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,-528,959 (L), (2) $159,433, (3) $107,522.

Pfeiffer (Gustavus and Louise) Research Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,113,776 (L), (2) $500,536, (3) $445,543.

Pforzheimer (The Carl and Lily) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,632,836 (L), (2) $205,409, (3) $133,699.

Pope (The Generoso) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,-797,319 (L), (2) $163,163, (3) $163,115.

Population Council, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,770,899 (M), (2) $849,639, (3) $650,749.

Reeves Brothers Foundation, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $1,066,177 (L), (2) $90,358, (3) $81,325.

Reid Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,736,000 (L), (2) $34,317, (3) $30,000.

Research Corp., New York, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $11,980,684 (M), (2) $1,615,098, (3) $1,222,662.

Richardson Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $13,025,114 (L), (2) $603,471, (3) $427,326.

Rockefeller Bros. Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $53,174,210 (L), (2) $4,053,411, (3) $3,841,169.

Rockefeller Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $647,694,858 (M), (2) $25,106,079, (3) $22,599,735.

Rogosin Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,208,539 (L), (2) $477,398, (3) $458,105.

Rosenstiel (Dorothy H. and Lewis) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $5,394,315 (L), (2) $389,800, (3) $351,813.

Rosenthal (Benjamin) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $15,-000 (L) (corpus of trust, $4,886,000), (2) $227,500, (3) $202,300.

Rubicon Foundation, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $2,973,062 (M), (2) $402,-458, (3) $400,326.

Rubin (Leah and Joseph) Foundation, Inc. (formerly Leah Rubin Foundation, Inc.), Brooklyn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,080,257 (L), (2) $28,697 (all in grants).

Rubin (Samuel) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $9,498,-758 (L), (2) $553,988, (3) $551,799.

Sage (Russell) Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $28,506,033 (M), (2) $882,778, (3) $730,317 (project expenditures).

Sams (Earl C.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,303,-468 (L), (2) $439,738, (3) $426,273.

Schepp (The Leopold) Foundation, New York, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $3,226,442 (L), (2) $186,402, (3) $127,650.

Scheuer (S. H. and Helen R.) Family Foundation, Inc., New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,536,801 (L), (2) $96,582, (3) $95,778.

Schweckendieck (Edith M.) Trusts, New York, as of January 1, 1959: (1) $1,500,000 (M), (2) $51,900, all in grants.

Schweitzer (The Peter J.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,064,489 (L), (2) $175,050, (3) $173,179.

Scott (Walter) Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $1,205,350 (L), (2) $46,763, (3) $24,082.

Scriven Foundation, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $6,258,301 (L), (2) $252,-933, (3) $208,423.

Sealantic Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $13,250,000 (M), (2) $5,523,042, (3) $5,494,185.

Shell Cos. Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,232,600 (L), (2) $1,098,064 all in grants.

Shubert (Sam S.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of May 31, 1959: (1) $2,371,091 (L), (2) $66,771, (3) $66,746.

Sloan (Alfred P.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $175,553,110 (M), (2) $6,208,110, (3) $5,779,120.

Smithers (The Christopher D.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,807,083 (M), (2) $463,331, (3) $447,341.

Social Research Foundation, Inc., New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $1,202,959 (L), (2) $61,188, (3) $20,000.

Sprague (The Seth) Educational and Charitable Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $11,540,936 (L), (2) $617,632, (3) $502,000.

Statler Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,235,469 (M), (2) $737,657, (3) $618,180.

Stetson Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,420,252 (L), (2) $84,622, (3) $79,283.

Summerfield (Solon E.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,-336,335 (L), (2) $332,845, (3) $271,621.

Teagle Foundation, Inc., New York, as of May 31, 1959: (1) $3,472,866 (L), (2) $233,-151, (3) $229,331.

Tiffany (Louis Comfort) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,551,-169 (M), (2) $42,808, (3) $24,000 (scholarships).

Tuch (Michael) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,021,-436 (L), (2) $51,241, (3) $37,546.

Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $17,552,441 (M), (2) $832,248, (3) $345,311.

Union Bag Charitable Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,344,333 (L), (2) $191,809, (3) $188,812.

United States Steel Foundation, Inc., New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $22,127,-809 (L), (2) $3,299,224, (3) $3,297,225.

Warburg (Felix M. and Frieda Schiff) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,636,367 (L), (2) $409,504, (3) $404,990.

Watson (The John Jay and Eliza Jane) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,000,000 (M), (2) $175,769, (3) $171,186.

Weinstein (J.) Foundation, Inc., Brooklyn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,200,614 (L), (2) $183,106, (3) $178,867.

Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Inc., New York, as of January 31, 1959: (1) $6,631,864 (M), (2) $330,-797, (3) $265,162.

Western Electric Fund, New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $2,163,761 (L), (2) $541,161, (3) $540,870.

Whitehall Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,857,030 (L), (2) $779,006, (3) $746,712.

Whitney (Gertrude Vanderbilt) Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,500,304 (L), (2) $27,614, (3) $11,150.

Whitney (The Helen Hay) Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $11,773,-701 (M), (2) $479,254, (3) $399,480.

Whitney (John Hay) Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $1,614,014 (L), (2) $433,283, (3) $368,360.

Whitney (William C.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,516,-770 (L), (2) $77,851, (3) $56,763.

Wiggin (Albert H. and Jessie D.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,302,540 (L), (2) $57,890, (3) $48,950.

Wilson (Woodrow) Foundation, New York, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $1,771,898 (M), (2) $162,740, (3) $24,000.

Winfield Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $1,086,225 (L), (2) $73,949, (3) $72,000.

Wollman (The William J.) Foundation, New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $2,305,-125 (L), (2) $1,632,678, (3) $1,620,585.

Woodward Foundation, New York, as of July 31, 1959: (1) $1,087,020 (L), (2) $18,-428, (3) $15,000.

Wurzweiler (The Gustav) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,680,353 (L), (2) $250,521, (3) $212,134.

Ziegler (The E. Matilda) Foundation for the Blind, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,478,191 (L), (2) $80,527, (3) $75,500.

NEW YORK STATE

Arkell Hall Foundation, Inc., Canajoharie, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $3,820,192 (L), (2) $91,323, (3) $9,010.

Baird Foundation, Buffalo, as of September 15, 1955: (1) $1,865,931 (L), (2) $111,457, (3) $94,287.

Baird (Frank B.), Jr., Foundation, Buffalo, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $1,556,030 (L), (2) $47,120, (3) $47,050.

Bell Foundation, Inc., Buffalo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,082,938 (L), (2) $274,295, (3) $271,023.

Buffalo Foundation, Buffalo, as of December 31, 1958, (1) $3,474,093 (M), (2) $158,147, (3) $143,683.

Burke (The Winifred Masterson) Relief Foundation, White Plains, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $13,342,506 (M), (2) $940,249.

Carrier Foundation, Inc., Syracuse, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $1,472,316 (L), (2) $477,700, (3) $475,700.

Corning Glass Works Foundation, Corning, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,270,230 (L), (2) $613,502, (3) $603,502.

Emerson (Fred L.) Foundation, Inc., Auburn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $16,-547,824 (L), (2) $571,032, (3) $553,484.

Fund for Adult Education, White Plains, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $11,837,244 (L), (2) $3,309,132, (3) $2,987,630.

General Electric Foundation (formerly General Electric Educational and Charitable Fund), Ossining, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $26,538,000 (M), (2) $1,100,000, all in grants.

Gifford (The Rosamond) Charitable Corp., Syracuse, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $6,-510,116 (M), (2) $262,671, (3) $220,384.

Julia R. and Estelle L. Foundation, Inc., Buffalo, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,856,-453 (L), (2) $212,861, (3) $212,799.

Knox (Seymour H.) Foundation, Inc., Buffalo, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,230,228 (L), (2) $121,876, (3) $119, 322.

Lasdon Foundation, Inc., Yonkers, as of November 30, 1957: (1) $3,100,000 (M), (2) $982,994, (3) $168,979.

Manning Gallagher Foundation, Inc., Troy, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,367,526 (M), (2) $75,610, (3) $72,400.

Merrill (The Charles E.) Trust, Ithaca, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $2,635,000, all in grants; assets, none.

Ogden (Ralph E.) Foundation, Inc., Mountainville, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,-574,547 (L), (2) $15,528, (3) $5,800.

Potts Memorial Institute, Inc., Hudson, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,172,426 (L), (2) $26,343, all in grants.

Reader's Digest Foundation, Pleasantville, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,375,471 (L), (2) $192,829, (3) $192,390.

Surdna Foundation, Inc., Yonkers, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $25,546,235 (L), (2) $3,417,-672, (3) $3,397,801.

Tucker (Marcia Brady) Foundation, Inc., Mount Kisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,393,150 (L), (2) $88,681, (3) $88,150.

Weed Foundation, Inc., Buffalo, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,140,102 (L), (2) $21,-856, all in grants.

Western New York Foundation (formerly the Wildroot Foundation), Buffalo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2 million (M), (2) $69,985, (3) $69,167.

NORTH CAROLINA

Babcock (Mary Reynolds) Foundation Inc., Winston-Salem, as of August 31, 1957: (1) $17,368,644 (M), (2) $711,633, (3) $680,773.

Burlington Industries Foundation, Greensboro, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $6,200,000 (M), (2) $636,300, (3) $622,600.

Cannon Foundation, Inc., Concord, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $16,638,056 (L), (2) $677,150, (3) $571,778.

Morehead (The John Motley) Foundation, Charlotte, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $7,159,089 (M), (2) $239,348, (3) $174,590.

Reynolds (Kate B.) Charitable Trust, Winston-Salem, as of January 1, 1956: (1) $5,128,998 (L), (2) $200,137, (3) $183,162.

Reynolds (Z. Smith) Foundation, Inc., Winston-Salem, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $50,000,000 (M), (2) $972,050, (3) $967,700.

Winston-Salem Foundation, Winston-Salem, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $11,660,731 (M), (2) $537,910, (3) $505,714.

NORTH DAKOTA

None.

OHIO

Akron Community Trusts, Akron, as of October 31, 1959: (1) $1,114,000 (L), (2) $26,266, (3) $21,187.

Alms (Eleanora C. U.) Trust, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $1,147,734 (L), (2) $19,699, (3) $15,063.

American Foundation, Cleveland, as of 6 months ended June 30, 1959: (1) $3,132,465 (M), (2) $56,350, (3) $49,328.

Armco Foundation, Middletown, as of September 30, 1958: (1) (January 1, 1959), $5,053,024 (M), (2) $286,721, all in grants.

Ashtabula Foundation, Ashtabula, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,127,870 (L), (2) $486,549, (3) $36,370.

Austin Co. Foundation, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,055,533 (L), (2) $57,562, (3) $57,555.

Beaumont (The Louis D.) Foundation Inc., Cleveland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $18,486,686 (L), (2) $1,266,467, (3) $1,216,752.

Bentz Foundation, Columbus, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $2,195,674 (L), (2) $121,000, all in grants.

Bingham (The William) Foundation, Cleveland, as of April 30, 1957: (1) $1,455,779 (L), (2) $80,005, (3) $80,000.

Champion Paper Foundation, Hamilton, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $3,697,003 (L), (2) $152,358, (3) $144,223.

Charities Foundation, Toledo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,241,015 (M), (2) $455,503, (3) $452,200.

Cincinnati Milling Machine Foundation, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,034,429 (L), (2) $131,014, (3) $124,300.

Cleveland Foundation, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $36,009,930 (M), (2) $1,104,724, (3) $1,018,422.

Columbus Foundation, Columbus, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $1,468,595 (L), (2) $205,547, all in grants.

Emery (The Thomas J.) Memorial, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $7,190,-262 (L), (2) $432,269, (3) $95,615.

Firestone Foundation, Akron, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $5,845,139 (L), (2) $370,344, (3) $362,766.

Firestone Trust Fund, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,069,783 (L), (2) $339,118, (3) $330,750.

Goodrich (The B. F.) Fund, Inc., Akron, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $4,752,953 (L), (2) $444,651, (3) $439,067.

Hankins Foundation, Shaker Heights, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,195,483 (L), (2) —, (3) $44,462.

Hanna (Leonard C.), Jr. Fund (Formerly Hanna Fund), Cleveland, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $10,784,523 (L), (2) $22,739,124, (3) $22,625,843.

Hayes (The Rutherford B. Hayes and Lucy Webb) Foundation, Fremont, as of October 4, 1959: (1) $2,000,000 (M), (2) $48,000.

Hoover Co. Charitable Trust, North Canton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,048,338 (L), (2) $64,274, (3) $60,025.

Humphrey (George M. and Pamela S.) Fund, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,008,087 (L), (2) $28,874, (3) $28,873.

Kroger Company Charitable Trust, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,195,637 (L), (2) $293,258, all in grants.

Kulas Foundation, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,634,779 (L), (2) $278,696, (3) $237,375.

Kuntz Foundation, Dayton, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,180,285 (L), (2) $51,951, (3) $51,945.

Libbey-Owens-Ford Philanthropic Foundation, Toledo, as of 10 months ended October 31, 1959: (1) $1,150,883 (L), (2) $238,725, all in grants.

Lubrizol Foundation, Wickliffe, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,140,000 (L), (2) $114,000 all in grants.

N.C.R. Foundation, Dayton, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,488,280 (L), (2) $123,144, (3) $120,000.

National Machinery Foundation, Inc., Tiffin, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,976,-744 (L), (2) $94,742, (3) $78,605.

Ohio Oil Co. Foundation, Inc., Findlay, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,324,948 (M), (2) $295,891, all in grants.

Polk Foundation, (formerly the Sheffield Foundation), Dayton, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,037,877 (L), (2) $37,490, (3) $36,535.

Prentiss (The Elisabeth Severance) Foundation, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $14,600,000 (M), (3) $528,616.

Procter and Gamble Fund, Cincinnati, as of June 30, 1956: (1) $6,305,836 (L), (2) $923,630, (3) $917,897.

Republic Steel Corp. Educational and Charitable Trust, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $10,880,282 (L), (2) $608,479, (3) $607,558.

Ritchie (The Charles E. and Mabel M.) Memorial Foundation, Akron, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,275,083 (M), (2) $41,013, (3) $34,500.

Schmidlapp (Charlotte R.) Fund, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $1,276,-534 (L), (2) $30,131, (3) 29,845.

Schmidlapp (Jacob G.) Trust, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $1,606,057 (L), (2) $81,451, (3) $71,920.

Seinsheimer (Walter) Trust, Cincinnati, as of year beginning January 1, 1956: (1) $1,036,984 (L), (2) $8,113, (3) $2,250.

Stranahan Foundation, Toledo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,988,635 (L), (2) $137,658, (3) $129,800.

Timken Foundation of Canton, Canton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,113,127 (L), (2) $1,101,868, (3) $1,095,500.

Timken Roller Bearing Co. Charitable Trust, Canton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,035,393 (L), (2) $299,940, (3) $297,450.

Wade (Ellen Garretson) Memorial Fund, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,-260,234 (L), (2) $259,281, (3) $247,441.

Wagnalls Memorial, Lithopolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,518,313 (L), (2) $61,-976, (3) $32,664.

Wean (the Raymond John) Foundation, Warren, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,430,-307 (L), (2) $122,882, (3) $120,121.

Wehrle Foundation, Newark, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,734,225 (L), (2) $580,713, (3) $543,586.

White (Thomas H.) Charitable Trust, Cleveland, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $3,-481,423 (M), (2) $39,093, (3) $37,513.

Willson (the Alfred L.) Charitable Foundation, Columbus, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,546,444 (M), (2) $80,159, (3) $75,529.

Youngstown Foundation, Youngstown, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,600,000 (L), (3) $92,500.

OKLAHOMA

Alexander Memorial Fund, Tulsa, as of October 31, 1957: (1) $1,493,022 (L), (2) $109,345, (3) $52,871.

Broadhurst Foundation, Tulsa, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,233,637 (L), (2) $50,930, (3) $38,171.

Kirkpatrick Foundation, Inc., Oklahoma City, as of April 30, 1957: (1) $1,145,563 (L), (2) (1958) $45,382, (3) $41,609.

Mabee (The J. E. and L. E.) Foundation, Inc., Tulsa, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $10,-762,000 (L), (2) $1,750,522, (3) $1,747,055.

McMahon Foundation, Lawton, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $3,033,130 (L), (2) $180,390, (3) $160,373.

Noble (The Samuel Roberts) Foundation, Inc., Ardmore, as of October 31, 1957: (1) $15,767,824 (L), (2) $818,482.

Phillips (The Frank) Foundation, Inc., Bartlesville, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $7,604,196 (L), (2) $197,744, (3) $179,590.

Warren (The William K.) Foundation, Tulsa, as of December 31, 1956: (1) Not reported; accumulated income $3,940,148, (2) $825,782, (3) $482,267.

Young (The R. A.) Foundation, Oklahoma City, as of November 30, 1957: (1) $1,000,-788 (L), (2) $1,857, (3) $1,025.

Brown (The E. C.) Trust, Portland, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $1,045,037 (L), (2) $35,-626, (3) $27,616.

Collins Foundation, Portland, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,884,462 (L), (2) $116,031, (3) $111,300.

PENNSYLVANIA

Alcoa Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $14,330,222 (L), (2) $743,949, (3) $730,347.

American Foundation, Inc., Philadelphia, as of April 30, 1955: (1) $5,800,000 (L), (2) $170,000.

American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,892,960 (L), (2) $613,813, (3) $251,950.

Annenberg Fund, Inc., Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,416,895 (L), (2) $93,917, (3) $92,499.

Annenberg (The M. L.) Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,-666,038 (L), (2) $574,303, (3) $573,704.

Beatty (Helen D. Groome) Trust, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,-925,123 (M), (2) $71,462, (3) $59,000.

Benedum (Claude Worthington) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $12,984,108 (M), (2) $401,129, (3) $393,460.

Board of Directors of City Trusts, City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $76,690,760 (L) (excluding value of real estate), (2) $4,271,989, (3) $3,901,064.

Bok (The Mary Louise Curtis) Foundation, Philadelphia, as of May 31, 1959: (1) $14,-082,814 (L), (2) $404,695, (3) $366,100.

Buhl Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $16,866,512 (M), (2) $569,871, (3) $358,397.

Cairncrest Foundation, Bryn Athyn, as of April 30, 1958: (1) $2,067,386 (L), (2) $85,-200, (3) $84,855.

Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,-137,320 (M), (2) $328,896, (3) $200,271.

Cassett (Louis N.) Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,574,-268 (M), (2) $62,966, (3) $62,452.

Coxe (The Sophia G.) Charitable Trust Fund, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,010,517 (L), (2) $52,306, (3) $22,052 (and $17,156 for maintenance and operation of home).

Davis (The Arthur Vining) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,627,440 (L), (2) $184,333, (3) $176,000.

Dolfinger-McMahon Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,500,-000 (M), (2) —, (3) $141,010.

Donner Foundation, Inc., Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $40,972,121 (M), (2) $1,453,320, (3) $1,350,729.

Elkin (The Lewis) Fund, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,786,489 (M) (Oct. 15, 1959), (2) $109,057, (3) $103,272.

Falk (The Maurice and Laura) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $17,083,434 (M), (2) $558,133, (3) $487,-135.

Fels (Samuel S.) Fund, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $19,191,358 (M), (2) $1,356,307, (3) $1,202,459.

Finley (J. B.) Trust, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,050,000 (M), (2) $27,150, (3) $16,000.

Food Fair Stores Foundation, Philadelphia, as of April 30, 1958: (1) $1,637,177 (L), (2) $177,160, all in grants.

Frick (Childs) Corp., Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,385,647 (L), (2) $153,546, (3) $96,040.

Gibson (Addison H.) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,299,-696 (L), (2) $166,038, (3) $133,954.

Glencairn Foundation, Bryn Athyn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,946,332 (L), (2) $177,905, (3) $175,935.

Greenfield (The Albert M.) Foundation, Philadelphia, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $2,-236,000 (L), (2) $117,256, all in grants.

Heinz (Howard) Endowment, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $20,792,191 (M), (2) $653,130, (3) $618,904.

Hershey (The M. S.) Foundation, Hershey, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $1,329,959 (L), (2) $277,225, (3) $276,225.

Hillman Foundation, Inc., Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,016,357 (L), (2) $136,334, (3) $135,000.

Hunt Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,374,835 (L), (2) $49,-403, (3) $43,200.

Janssen (Henry) Foundation, Inc., Reading, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,407,028 (L), (2) $73,857, (3) $64,800.

Koppers Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,100,221 (L), (2) $204,-497, (3) $200,878.

Laurel Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,618,569 (M), (2) $28,580, (3) $22,450.

Mack (J. S.) Foundation, McKeesport, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,098,242 (L), (2) $38,084, (3) $23,629.

McShain (John) Charities, Inc., Philadelphia, as of March 31, 1958: (1) $1,472,759 (L), (2) $94,761, (3) $92,290.

Mellon (The A. W.) Educational and Charitable Trust, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $43,571,273 (M), (2) $4,200,780, (3) $3,963,448.

Mellon (Richard King) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $58,867,-325 (M), (2) $2,987,497, (3) $2,903,300.

Moore (The Hugh) Fund, Easton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,073,959 (M), (2) $77,702.

Murphy (G. C.) Company Foundation, McKeesport, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,029,708 (L), (2) $63,250 all in grants.

Pew Memorial Trust (formerly The Pew Memorial Foundation), Philadelphia, as of June 3, 1957: (1) $3,582,058 (L), (2) $725,-500, (3) $700,500.

Philadelphia Foundation, Philadelphia, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $5,334,823 (M), (2) $204,361, (3) $200,057.

Pitcairn-Crabbe Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,996,080 (M), (2) $98,680, (3) $90,352.

Pitcairn (Theodore) Foundation, Bryn Athyn, as of April 30, 1958: (1) $1,405,102 (L), (2) $67,949, (3) $67,600.

Pittsburgh Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,869,860 (M), (2) $455,706, (3) $434,642.

Pittsburgh Plate Glass Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $13,135,-312 (M), (2) $619,377, all grants.

Presser Foundation, Philadelphia, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $7,987,243 (L), (2) $277,-212, (3) $102,816.

Rittenhouse Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,282,240 (L), (2) $111,608, (3) $43,554.

Robinson Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,326,115 (M), (2) $42,164, (3) $42,150.

Rockwell Charitable Trust, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,745,199 (L), (2) $139,722, (3) $58,722.

Scaife (Sarah Mellon) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $23,252,-472 (M), (2) $2,835,232, (3) $2,792,645.

Scholler Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958, (1) $1,773,551 (L), (2) $51,383, (3) $49,883.

Scranton Area Foundation, Scranton, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,293,478 (L), (2) $63,969, (3) $60,550.

Seybert (Adam and Maria Sarah) Institution, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,874,511 (L), (2) $110,948, (3) $105,234.

Smith Kline and French Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,210,630 (L), (2) $706,117, (3) $706,110.

Thomson (the John Edgar) Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,783,850 (L), (2) $82,306, (3) $48,823.

Trexler Foundation, Allentown, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $19,451,869 (M), (2) $527,065, (3) $439,737.

Ware Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,374,823 (L), (2) $48,289, (3) $48,250.

Waterman (Phoebe) Foundation, Inc., Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,177,173 (L), (2) $182,106, (3) $164,900.

Westinghouse Educational Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $4,565,977 (L), (2) $869,426, (3) $869,101.

Westinghouse Electric Fund, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956, (1) $1,251,929 (L), (2) $772,042, (3) $768,960.

Wurts (Henrietta Tower) Memorial, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,000,000 (M), (2) $42,019, (3) $38,457.

Wyomissing Foundation, Inc., Reading, as of December 31, 1957, (1) $6,152,594 (M), (2) $140,497, (3) $136,630.

RHODE ISLAND

Harris (The Edward Harris and Abby Metcalf) Foundation, Providence, as of November 19, 1956: (1) $1,393,689 (M), (2) $45,568, (3) $33,025.

Harris (Emma G.) Foundation Fund, Providence, as of January 1, 1957: (1) $1,405,745 (L), (2) $42,672, (3) $30,350.

Howard (The George A. and Eliza Gardner) Foundation, Providence, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $1,170,000 (M), (2) $18,300, all in grants.

Rhode Island Foundation, Providence, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,809,824 (L), (2) $116,344, (3) $104,251.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Arkwright Foundation, Spartanburg, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,518,298 (L), (2) $47,567, (3) $44,899.

Daniel Foundation, Greenville, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,126,006 (L), (2) $85,-134, (3) $74,775.

Gregg-Graniteville Foundation, Inc., Graniteville, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,289,-267 (L), (2) $36,123, (3) $13,291.

Self Foundation, Greenwood, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $6,531,114 (L), (2) $399,019, (3) $291,140.

Spartanburg County Foundation, Spartanburg, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $1,502,745 (L), (2) none, (2) $34,819.

Springs Foundation, Inc., Lancaster, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $4,102,780 (L), (2) $221,168, (3) $205,225.

SOUTH DAKOTA

None.

TENNESSEE

Benwood Foundation, Inc., Chattanooga, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $9,839,296 (L), (2) $1,258,449, (3) $1,244,036.

Evans Foundation, Inc., Chattanooga, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,222,829 (M), (2) $6,204, (3) $6,000.

Gooch (The C. M.) Foundation, Memphis, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $1,224,854 (L), (2) $90,791, (3) $76,075.

Jarman Foundation, Nashville, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,184,333 (L) (2) $116,016 all in grants.

Southern Baptist Foundation, Nashville, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,277,196 (M), (2) $175,767, (3) $45,103.

TEXAS

Abercrombie (The J. S.) Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,-933,634 (L), (2) $43,365, (3) $18,000.

Amarillo Area Foundation, Inc., Amarillo, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $1,147,337 (L) (2) $14,727, (3) $12,763.

Anderson (M.D.) Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $37,443,237 (M), (2) $1,893,976, (3) $1,656,730.

Braniff Foundation, Dallas, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,915,661 (L), (2) $252,695, (3) $251,700.

Brown Foundation, Inc., Houston, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $1,181,301 (L), (2) $127,-363, (3) $127,350.

Brown (T. J.) and C. A. Lupton Foundation, Inc., Fort Worth, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,011,466 (L), (2) $138,235, (3) $122,550.

Buchanan (The William) Foundation, Inc., Texarkana, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,-692,184 (L), (2) $1,033,204, (3) $1,007,823.

Caldwell (D. K.) Foundation, Tyler, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,186,312 (L), (2) $29,033, (3) $21,056.

Carter (Amon G.) Foundation, Fort Worth, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $16,041,066 (L), (2) $1,532,422, (3) $1,101,993.

Clark Foundation, Dallas, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,564,926 (L), (2) none, (3) $50,380.

Clayton Foundation for Research, Houston, as of January 1, 1958: (1) $9,084,668 (L), (2) $270,783, (3) $208,610.

Clayton Fund, Houston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,324,047 (L), (2) $35,275 all in grants.

Cooper Foundation, (Also known as The Madison Alexander Cooper and Martha Roane Cooper Foundation), Waco, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $3,148,426 (L), (2) $167,096, (3) $112,550.

Cullen Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,373,089 (L), (2) $388,-718, (3) $154,052.

Dallas Foundation, Dallas, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,500,000 (L), (2) none, (3) $25,500.

Davis (Hale) Foundation, Dallas, as of year beginning August 1, 1958; (1) $1,405,-975 (L), (2) $170,033 all in grants.

DeGolyer Foundation, Dallas, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,465,846 (31 August 1959) (M), (2) $2,050, (3) $1,000.

Dougherty (The James R.) Jr. Foundation, Beeville, as of November 30, 1957: (1) $1,-217,510 (L), (2) $142,328.

Farish Fund, Houston, as of June, 30, 1957: (1) $1,934,302 (L), (2) $111,052, (3) $111,000.

Favrot Fund, Houston, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $1,273,112 (L), (2) $38,223, (3) $35,350.

Fleming Foundation, Fort Worth, as of November 30, 1956: (1) $3,663,285 (L), (2) $311,699, (3) $282,174.

Fohs Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,500,000 (M), (2) $80,792, (3) $73,454.

Fondren Foundation, Houston, as of October 31, 1957: (1) $2,981,378 (L), (2) $543,466, (3) $543,000.

Hoblitzelle Foundation, Dallas, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $8,088,199 (L), (2) $320,408, (3) $267,159.

Hogg Foundation for Mental Health (formerly the Hogg Foundation for Mental Hygiene), Austin, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $6,500,000 (L), (2) $326,000, (3) $274,864.

Houston Endowment, Inc., Houston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $35,108,823 (L), (2) $3,287,336, (3) $2,342,328.

Kempner (Harris and Eliza) Fund, Galveston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,525,-411 (L), (2) $98,229, (3) $92,018.

LeTourneau Foundation, Longview, as of May 31, 1958: (1) $3,951,135 (L), (2) $371,-857, (3) $356,000.

Luling Foundation, Luling, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,057,121 (L), (2) $16,496, (3) none.

McAshan Educational and Charitable Trust, Houston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,602,117, (2) $178,622 (all in grants).

McManis Mission Fund, Houston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,204,384 (L), (2) $140,073, (3) $133,178.

McMillan (Bruce) Junior Foundation, Overton, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $1,989,-153 (L), (2) $125,044, (3) $30,515.

Navarro Community Foundation, Corsicana, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,403,-922 (L), (2) $43,903, (3) $27,203.

Oldham Little Church Foundation, Houston, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $3,114,-596 (L), (2) $156,788, (3) $118,158.

Peyton (The Mary L.) Foundation, El Paso, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,710,-336 (L), (2) $32,142, (3) $23,938.

Piper (Minnie Stevens) Foundation, San Antonio, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,-586,746 (M), (2) $135,193, (3) $48,753 (grants), $73,053 (student loans).

Rockwell Fund, Inc., Houston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,878,149 (L), (2) $131,318, (3) $130,823.

Scanlan Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,005,517 (L), (2) $177,889, (3) $105,819.

Schlumberger Foundation, Houston, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $3,929,507 (M), (2) $172,233, (3) $72,650.

Southwestern Medical Foundation, Inc., Dallas, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $3,357,-710 (M), (2) $229,081, (3) $181,262.

Strake Foundation, (Formerly Strake Charities Foundation), Houston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,537,916 (L), (2) $71,000, (3) $67,728.

Texas Educational Association, Fort Worth, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,-749,494 (L), (2) $170,900, (3) $146,968.

Welch (The Robert A.) Foundation, Houston, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $50,-698,451 (M), (2) $968,946, (3) $628,853.

West Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,240,827 (L), (2) $170,-686, (3) $157,600.

UTAH

None.

VERMONT

None.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

None.

VIRGINIA

Camp Foundation, Franklin, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,843,527 (L), (2) $60,326, (3) $56,050.

Keesee (Charles B.) Educational Fund, Inc., Martinsville, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,378,466 (L), (2) $96,454 (1957), (3) $82,150.

Norfolk Foundation, Norfolk, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,272,769 (L), (2) $44,-231, (3) $44,119.

Public Welfare Foundation, Inc., Washington, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $5,163,635 (L), (2) $372,523, (3) $287,023.

WASHINGTON

Boeing Airplane Co. Charitable Trust, Seattle, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,067,-718 (L), (2) $458,354, (3) $455,844.

Comstock Foundation, Spokane, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,595,108 (L), (2) $43,-285, (3) $23,682.

Medina Foundation, Seattle, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,195,170 (L), (2) $109,261, (3) $104,225.

Weyerhaeuser Co. Foundation (formerly Weyerhaeuser Timber Foundation), Tacoma, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $2,432,358 (L), (2) $186,304, (3) $118,168.

WEST VIRGINIA

None.

WISCONSIN

Allen-Bradley Foundation, Inc. (formerly Lynde-Bradley Foundation, Inc.), Milwaukee, as of July 31, 1959: (1) $3,358,551 (L), (2) $344,869, (3) $338,032.

Allis Chalmers Foundation, Inc., West Allis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,860,991 (L), (2) $531,233, (3) $530,929.

Beloit Foundation, Inc., Beloit, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,417,014 (M), (2) $70,748, (3) $60,987.

Cudahy (Patrick and Anna M.) Fund, Milwaukee, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,-940,934 (L), (2) $30,803, (3) $30,706.

de Rance' Inc., Milwaukee, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $5,230,815 (L), (2) $246,110, (3) $246.000.

Janesville Foundation, Inc., Janesville, as of February 28, 1959: (1) $1,306,627 (M), (2) $43,295, (3) $35,000.

Johnson Foundation, Racine, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $1,230,951 (L), (2) $681,726, (3) $490,075.

Kohler Foundation, Inc., Kohler, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,118,916 (L), (2) $186,809, (3) $186,520.

Milwaukee Foundation, Milwaukee, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,115,111 (M), (2) $30,148, (3) $26,090.

Nekoosa-Edwards Foundation, Inc. (formerly Nepco Foundation), Port Edwards, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,732,393 (L), (2) $79,889, (3) $60,055.

Oshkosh Foundation, Oshkosh, as of March 1, 1959: (1) $1,180,311 (M), (2) nothing, (3) $19,609.

Rennebohm (The Oscar) Foundation, Inc., Madison, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,787,153 (L), (2) $32,762, (3) $12,525.

Rutledge (Edward) Charity, Chippewa Falls, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $1,135,406 (L), (2) $60,374, (3) $33,510.

Schlitz Foundation, Inc., Milwaukee, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,277,429 (L), (2) $190,199, (3) $175,908.

WYOMING

Whitney Benefits, Sheridan, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,083,371 (M), (2) $25,038, (3) $15,000.

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE, 1954 AND 1961

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1961 we will again confer with the Communist bloc on a cease-fire in Laos. It would be well to review the previous Geneva conference and see what lessons history has taught us.

On April 26, 1954, the Geneva Conference met to discuss the possibility of restoring peace in Indochina.

During July 1954, agreements of cessation of hostilities in Indochina were issued by the Conference.

By mid-August 1954 protestations of violations of these agreements by the Communists began to pour into the International Central Commission.

The President of the United States is going to deal with the same vicious cunning enemy. I believe he has the courage and intelligence to confront them with the facts of their past actions and face up to their usual tactics and methods employed in past conferences.

In addition the President will be faced with the same advisers and policymakers in the Department of State, who led us into this present situation. He should be careful of such advice which when followed ends up in Communist advances. Examples of this thinking are, I quote "we must enter the conference in a spirit of negotiation and not appear intransigent and we should not make strident statements such as the U.S.S.R., Communist China and the Vietminh are coconspirators" unquote. Above all he should not fall into the trap, "that we must consider the sensitivities of our Allies at all costs."

I am sure the President will not let the same people lead us into the same situation with the same end results—more Communist doubletalk, broken agreements and the loss of another country to the Communists.

I wish, therefore to review the agreements of the Geneva Conference of 1954 and especially the long record of Communist truce violations.

VIETMINH VIOLATIONS OF THE AGREEMENTS ON CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES—INDOCHINA

Reasons: The Vietminh has given clear evidence that its activities are a part of Communist world strategy rather than a local Vietnamese movement. The death of Stalin gave Vietminh leaders a perfect opportunity to reassert openly both their allegiance to international Communism and their aim of establishing an integrated Communist regime based on that of the Soviet Union and the Peiping regime.

In an article in "The People's Army," March 1953, General Vo Nguyen Giap, Defense Minister of the Vietminh, quoted President Ho Chi Minh's oath "always to be strictly bound to the Soviet Union and to follow exactly the doctrines of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin." This was only one of many statements made by top party officials. Viewed in the light of such utterances, and the experiences in China and Korea, the Vietminh can be expected to comply with the tenets of international communism of which cease-fire violations are a part.

History: In Communist doctrine a truce or cease-fire is a means to an end, not the ultimate objective. Therefore, the Communists will violate a cease-fire whenever it appears advantageous to do so. As in China during the political negotiations in 1946 the cease-fire was—and still is—a means of gaining a respite. The respite gives the Communists an opportunity to strengthen their forces or increase subversive activity while their opponent abides by the "cease-fire rules," relaxes his guard, and loses whatever advantage he may have possessed. The period of truce is accompanied by a propaganda barrage of "peace" or "coexistence," while a gradual build-up of Communist forces takes place. Subversive cadres infiltrate non-Communist areas and set up their Communist administrations either overtly or covertly.

The overall program for southeast Asia was formalized in Peiping 11 years ago—1949. At that time and in that place the World Federation of Trade Unions, the WFTU which organizes congresses, meetings and training courses has provided an opportunity for meetings of Communists and sympathizers all over the world. At the meetings they discuss the most effective methods of local application of the directives laid down by the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union sponsored what was termed a Trade Union Conference of Asian and Australasian countries. Actually, it was a meeting to set up the usual program of guerrilla warfare and terrorist activity, subversive "united front" arrangements, labor strife and intensive pro-Communist and antidemocratic propaganda.

To maintain a facade of peaceful intentions, the Communists depend largely on infiltration and subversion.

In South Vietnam all conditions for subversion are favorable; in addition the population is faced with constant terror and a powerful military threat from the north.

In such fertile ground the Communists are busy at one of their favorite tasks, that of absorbing and disrupting by politico-subversive methods the functions of a government. Contrary to the provisions and spirit of the truce agreement they have been establishing Communist forms of government in areas under control of the South Vietnam Government, and thus are threatening existence of that government.

POLITICO-SUBVERSIVE CADRES AND GUERRILLA OPERATIONS

Although much publicity has been given to guerrilla operations, the main threat is in the politico-subversive cadres which establish the underground movements. In Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam, these cadres are guided and controlled by the Lao Dong Labor Party—Communist Party—while the guerrillas are under the control of the Defense Ministry. Thus the guerrillas receive orders from the political cadres whom they support. It has been estimated that 4,000 of these political workers infiltrated South Vietnam and spread throughout the country.

In South Vietnam the combined politico-guerrilla operations of the Viet Minh have three primary missions:

First. Establishment of Communist local governmental control machinery in areas nominally under non-Communist control. This technique enables the Communists to establish "base areas" in support of military operations long before the actual consolidation of the "Revolutionary" government.

Second. Support of military operations.

Third. Intelligence.

The steps in the process of forming Communist underground governments are:

Politico-subversive cadres, organized with great care and detail, with armed (guerrilla) support are sent into the area to establish provincial, county and city governments. Governmental functions are set up. On paper these functions, listed below, give an appearance of benevolence and efficiency but in practice show up the duplicity and sham of the Vietminh, the illusory nature of the benefits they promise, ending in the final subjugation of the population for the benefit of the state.

PROVISIONAL PEOPLE'S COMMITTEE (UNDERGROUND)

Section and duties:

First. Staff member guidance: Selects and recommends persons for appointment in provisional people's committee.

Second. Confidential: Processes important documents; inspects districts.

Third. Finance: Taxes, records government property and issues licenses.

Fourth. Labor: Handles pensions, insurance planning; settles labor disputes, improves conditions, conscripts labor.

Fifth. Health: Inspects facilities; distributes relief planning of medical supplies and sanitation.

Sixth. Purchasing: Purchases monopoly goods for resale to public.

Seventh. Education: Establishes primary level schools; selects, appoints, discharges teachers; inspects schools.

Eighth. Planning: Compiles and maintains statistics and records.

Ninth. Food administration: Maintains food rationing system.

Tenth. Agriculture production: Handles agriculture affairs, provides aid to farmers, taxes farm products.

Eleventh. Livestock production: Improves, immunizes livestock; grants permission for slaughtering.

Twelfth. Propaganda: Explains government policies, conducts indoctrination, propaganda, and agitation.

Thirteenth. Forestry: Maintains conservation of forest.

Fourteenth. Road and building: Maintains road and buildings, community planning.

Fifteenth. General affairs: Miscellaneous affairs not covered in other sections.

Once the above functions take some semblance of order, the Communists immediately begin to establish training courses for all new members, they found "liberation schools" to indoctrinate the population, organize party programs and newspapers for propaganda purposes. While "investigating" the problem of land distribution, the Communists actually start distribution, a favorite Communist tactic, in order to secure popular support. The peasant who yearns to own land is unaware that upon the completion of the communization process he will neither own the land nor the fruits of his own work.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSIONS AND THEIR PROBLEMS

A control commission can only be effective if both sides act in good faith. In Indochina, through its many violations the Vietminh has flaunted the authority of the commissions. It has substantially increased the capabilities of its regular army in North Vietnam and has retained a significant capability for political and paramilitary operations in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. The Vietminh has:

First. Augmented the material strength of its armed forces by shipments of military equipment from Communist China;

Second. Failed to evacuate all military personnel from South Vietnam and Cambodia;

Third. Consistently sought to consolidate administrative and political authority in areas under the de jure authority of the Governments of South Vietnam and Laos;

Fourth. Failed to permit the free movement of refugees; and

Fifth. Failed to observe the cease-fire in Laos.

The Commissions are working under handicaps which are directly due to the provisions of the accord. This was true in China during the cease-fire negotiations; it was true in Korea and now in Indochina. The composition of the Commissions, which includes Communists, makes unanimous agreement almost impossible on certain questions. In China, Korea, and Indochina, the Commissions have the choice of uncritical acceptance of assurances given by the Communists or the almost impossible task of carrying out an effective investigation in an atmosphere of terror and deceit.

II. COMMUNIST REACTION TO EXPOSURE OF CEASE-FIRE VIOLATIONS

The Communists will continue to resort to their usual technique of using a highly organized propaganda machine to accuse others, especially the United States, of the type of violations of which they are guilty. This technique has been successful in the past in propagandizing people under their control as well as in neutral countries. Any confusion works to the benefit of the Communists since they violate the cease-fire deliberately for strategic reasons.

III. REASONS FOR COMMUNIST VIOLATIONS

The Communists' aim is a united Indochina, including Laos, Cambodia, North and South Vietnam, under a Communist government. In a public statement on the ninth anniversary of the Vietminh independence, Ho Chi Minh declared that "victory will be ours." Throughout the speech the goal of unity, independence and democracy was repeatedly emphasized. He reiterated anti-United States and anticolonial sentiments and appealed for united opposition. The speech indicates the Vietminh determination to gain control of all Indochina. He implied that this control will be achieved by political action, but that the Vietminh intends to regroup their army and hold it in readiness for any eventuality.

The Vietminh efforts will continue to take the following shape in the three associated states:

First. Laos: Expanded Pathet Lao Communist forces will continue to consolidate their control over northern Laos and resume attacks on the Lao national army units when it is to their advantage. These will be designed to enlist popular support by chalking up Pathet Lao successes.

Second. Vietnam: The Vietminh will expand underground in the south using their politico-subversive and terror techniques. They will be aimed at having de facto control pass to Ho Chi Minh without too much overt disturbance. If the Communists fail, a swift military attack may be attempted. On December 19, 1946, Ho Chi Minh openly broke the then cease-fire agreement with massacres in Hanoi, Tourane, and Hue.

Third. Cambodia: The Vietminh foothold is the weakest in this area, especially since the strong and successful stand by the Cambodians at Geneva against a Vietminh regrouping area inside the state. But once the Communists control all Vietnam and Laos, Cambodia may be powerless to resist.

IV. CONCLUSION

The International Control Commission has been prevented by Communist delaying tactics and by collusion between the Polish delegation and the Vietminh from investigating and fixing responsibility for major Vietminh violations of the Geneva agreements. Violations may be expected to continue until such a time as the indigenous governments become considerably stronger, the Communists take over all of Indochina by politico-subversive methods or there is a resumption of hostilities.

VIOLATIONS OF AGREEMENTS (JULY 1954) ON CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES IN INDOCHINA

This annex on the violations of the agreements on cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia presents evidence of the premeditated pattern of the numerous violations committed by the Communists. Pertinent examples were chosen from the compilation of violations in order to illustrate how a cease-fire is one of the instruments of Communist policy. The main points of this Communist cease-fire policy are:

First. Strengthening and regrouping of military forces, articles 15, 17 and paragraphs 4, 12, Joint Conference Declaration—Vietnam; articles 4(c), 13(2), 15 and paragraphs 3, 4, 12, Joint Conference Declaration—Laos; paragraph 3, 4, 12, Joint Conference Declaration—Cambodia.

Second. Establishment of politico-subversive cadres or underground governments, articles 14(a), 14(b), 15—Vietnam; 4(c), 13(2)—Laos; article 4—Cambodia.

Third. Creating an atmosphere of fear and terror by reprisals and impeding refugee travel, articles 14(c), 14d and paragraph 8—Vietnam.

Fourth. Failure to exchange all prisoners of war and liberate political prisoners, article 21.

Article 4, Cambodia, deals with the withdrawal of the foreign armed forces and foreign military personnel from the territory of Cambodia.

Official estimates at the time of the cease-fire agreement held that the number of Vietminh regular and irregular forces in Cambodia totaled 8,000. The Vietminh informed the International Control Commission that 4,050 Vietminh regulars were to be evacuated from Cambodia by October 19, 1954. Only about 2,700 regulars were withdrawn. These evacuees carried a bare minimum of armament far below the actual strength of the units. The Vietminh have intentionally left behind substantial cadres and arms depots for subversive purposes and future armed dissidence.

In Battambang Province the Vietminh had announced an anticipated 450 evacuees; only 250 materialized.

The Khmer-Vietminh forces in Cambodia were not disarmed by the Vietminh by August 22, 1954, as specified in the cease-fire agreement.

Articles 4(c) and 13(2), Laos, deal with the routes for withdrawal of forces of the Vietnamese People's Volunteers in Laos from Lao territory which are to be fixed on the spot by the Joint Commission.

The Vietminh have utilized secret withdrawal routes to avoid detection of abducted Lao personnel. The specific charge against the Vietminh, laid before the plenary session of the International Control Commission on September 29, 1954, was the use of secret routes

in the transport of troops or transport of troops on stipulated routes without notification to the Commission of the exact time in order to avoid inspection.[1]

Articles 14 (a) and (b), Vietnam, state that the conduct of the civil administration in each regrouping zone shall be in the hands of the party whose forces are to be regrouped, and that after transfer and complete evacuation of troops the other party shall assume responsibility.

Provisional assembly areas: Most of the Vietminh areas south of the 17th parallel, that is, the provisional assembly areas for CA Mau, Xuyen Moc, and Plaine des Joncs, have been technically evacuated by Vietminh forces. Repeated and consistent reports reveal that Vietminh military-political cadres continue to retain de facto control of the local administration and to conduct activities designed to maintain the population under Communist control. In the Plaine des Joncs area alone, only an estimated 14,000 Vietminh evacuees have been withdrawn from an announced quota of 20,000.

Articles 14(c), Vietnam; 15, Laos; 6, Cambodia; declare that each party undertakes to refrain from any reprisals or discrimination against persons or organizations on account of their activities during the hostilities and to guarantee democratic liberties.

The Vietnamese Government has formally charged that on July 31, 1954, the Vietminh assassinated Le Van Qui, noncommissioned officer of the regional militia—Bao Chinh Quan—at Ngo Duong Huyen de An-Duong, Kien An Province, North Vietnam. Intellectuals and landowners were forced to wear military uniforms so their forced evacuation with Vietminh troops will go undetected.

Refugees from the Red River Delta asserted that some teachers who had chosen to stay within the Vietminh zones and had declared their loyalty to the Vietminh had, nevertheless, been arrested and thrown into cages for public exhibition. A Vietminh agent was carrying secret orders for the assassination of certain Vietnamese in the Phu Tien area prior to the withdrawal of the Vietminh forces. The marked men were those believed to be strongly anti-Vietminh and possibly aware that the Vietminh was leaving behind cells and arms cadres.

Article 14(d) and paragraph 8 of the Joint Conference Declaration, Vietnam, state that from the date of entry into force of the present agreement until the movement of troops is completed, any civilians residing in a district controlled by one party who wish to go and live in the zone assigned to the other party shall be permitted and helped to do so by the authorities in that district.

[1] The intention of the Pathet Lao Communists in Laos, according to a captured Vietminh document, is ostensibly to conform with the cease-fire agreement but actually to leave cells behind them as they withdraw; to take with them for training and indoctrination as many young Lao as possible; and to build up the Pathet Lao with the intention of ultimately taking over the country. (This document was dated in 1954.)

The Vietminh prevented evacuation of people from North Vietnam by:

First. Intimidation and force: Refugees encounter roadblocks where soldiers refuse them permission to pass, separate children from parents and arrest leaders of groups. Armed Vietminh junks patrol the coastal waters to prevent escape by sea, and departing boats are fired upon.

Second. Barring refugees from transportation: Almost all travel in the Tonkin Delta requires water transportation, but Vietminh officials control passenger boats, ferryboats, and bridges and prevent their use by refugees. Trucks, buses, and bicycle carts are forbidden to carry refugees.

Third. Economic penalties: A would-be refugee is not allowed to sell his property but must forfeit all except that which he can carry.

Article 15, Vietnam, states that there shall take place a disengagement of the combatants, transfer of military forces, equipment and supplies of each party. The two parties shall permit no destruction or sabotage. They shall permit no interference in local administration.

The Vietnamese Government has cited truce-violation incidents such as:

First. The clandestine reinforcement of troops in South Vietnam. Secretary of State Dean Rusk on May 4, 1961, set these troops at a strength of 12,000.

Second. The incitation of popular demonstrations against the authority of the Vietnamese Government and Army.

Third. The organization of guerrilla units below the 17th parallel.

Fourth. The propagation of pro-Vietminh propaganda below the 17th parallel.

Article 17, Vietnam, declares that the introduction into Vietnam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions and other war material is prohibited.

The Joint Sino-Soviet-DRV Supply and Service Command in Nanning, China, has moved large quantities of prohibited war material such as heavy artillery and Soviet rocket launchers to North Vietnam. Since the cease-fire, artillery, including 105 mm. cannon, was sent across the Sino-Vietnamese border. Material received since the armistice represents a substantial increase in the inventory of Vietminh artillery pieces, bazookas and mortars. New items in Vietminh hands include tanks and 88 mm. antiaircraft weapons. Aside from these, military-type aircraft have been sighted at Hanoi.

The Vietminh Regular Forces have been expanded. Reorganization of their forces indicates that up to nine new divisions have been formed, including three artillery divisions and six infantry divisions. These increases are the result of transfers from regional and popular forces. In addition, support elements of existing units are being augmented to include a larger proportion of organic artillery, heavy mortar, and recoilless gun components at divisional and regimental level. The expansion and reinforcement of unit firepower was made possible by continuing large shipments of Chinese Communist supplies.

Articles 21, Vietnam; 16, Laos; 8, Cambodia; deal with the liberation and repatriation of all prisoners of war and civilian internees within 30 days.

The Vietnamese Government has charged that the Vietminh had failed to liberate prisoners of war and civilian internees.

Officials in Saigon have estimated that at the end of hostilities, 55,000 members of the French Union forces were unaccounted for. Of this number 25,000 were of Vietnamese nationality.

The Vietminh returned only 3,795 of the Vietnamese Army personnel captured by them during the war. Although some of the men not officially returned are either still interned as politically dangerous or have been clandestinely released after indoctrination, the major portion has been removed from the category of prisoners of war and integrated into the Vietminh forces.

Hundreds of legionnaires and north Africans were returned to Europe and north Africa via Communist China and the Soviet Union. This method of releasing European POW's to their home country is a prominent aspect of Vietminh POW policies.

Another favorite Communist practice is to sentence large numbers of prisoners of war as war criminals.

Paragraphs 3 and 12 of the Joint Conference Declaration, Laos, state that in their relations with Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, the Vietminh will respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the above-mentioned states.

As early as August 27, 1954, the Lao Government protested to the Joint Armistice Commission for Laos that Vietminh units in Laos were forcing young men in the villages to join Vietminh forces and move to northern Laos for military training.

Official Laos reports on October 17, 1954, asserted that through threats, intimidation and false promises, the Vietminh had forcibly taken away between 4,000 and 5,000 persons.

As early as January 31, 1955, Vietminh elements crossed the Lao border into Laos to reinforce the Pathet Lao—Communist.

In addition to the above violations of which only a few examples are listed, there have been for 7 years violations of articles 10, 11, and 15c—attacks against Vietnamese Army and militia units—violations of articles 1, 2a, 4d and 19—attacks against Laos National Army units—violations of articles 2 and 4(4)—cessation of hostilities in Cambodia—and violation of article 5—demobilization of Khmer resistance forces.

I hope that we will not let history repeat itself, because if we do, it will mean the loss of Laos, South Vietnam, and then all of southeast Asia.

COMMANDER SHEPARD'S FLIGHT AND THE SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to especially congratulate all the members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics for the fine job which has been done—on both sides of the aisle—in this committee.

I have taken this time to say a few words about the great event that has occurred in the space program over the weekend. Comdr. Alan Shepard, who is from New England, is a real American. I talked to him before he made the pioneer flight down range from Cape Canaveral; I talked to him since. I have never seen a more typical American boy than is Alan Shepard of New England.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute at this time also to the leadership in the House for supporting this program of space development and for having the vision and the foresight to see a long way ahead what could be done and what would be the important thing in the development of space. We have had the support of the Speaker all the way through. Our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK, was chairman of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Outer Space 3 years ago. He and his committee wrote the legislation that laid the foundation for the great American space program. I want to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts was notably interested at that time in the space program and devoted hundreds of hours of personal effort to that end. Since then he has maintained a most active interest in the program under the permanent committee which has been set up by the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARL ALBERT, by the way, presented the resolution to create the permanent Committee on Science and Astronautics. Oklahoma has shown an active interest in the space program. On that committee we have had support from both sides of the aisle. While this country has done a good job, we have had before us the possibility of failure as well as the possibility of the success.

In this flight of Commander Shepard's, I think we have captured the imagination not only of the people of America, but also we have captured the imagination of the peoples of the world. We did one thing entirely different from the Soviets, we gave to the peoples of the world an opportunity to actually see a man go up into space 115 miles above the surface of the earth and the surface of the sea and go down range 302 miles. We gave hundreds of millions of the people of the world the opportunity to see this event unfold before their eyes. I think, therefore, that we have captured the imagination of the peoples of the world.

You ask, What is ahead of us in the space program? Of course, there should be other flights just like this, perhaps with a longer range and a higher trajectory than this flight. There may be two more of those, and then toward the end of the year there should be an orbital flight around the earth.

Of course, when you are dealing with tremendous speeds that go up to 25,000 and 30,000 miles per hour you are apt to have failures as well as successes; and I would in this hour of achievement and of a great success caution the people of the United States of America not to expect that everything that happens is going to be so wonderfully successful as has been Alan Shepard's flight down range from Cape Canaveral. We will have our disappointments, yes; we may have our failures also; but out of it all is coming a determination by the people of the United States of America to move on in the space program to overtake and leapfrog the Russians and get ahead of them in every respect, in every category, and then to develop space first for the security and preservation of the United States of America and free government; and then, second, for the use and benefit and comfort of mankind generally throughout the world.

THE HONORABLE OVERTON BROOKS OF LOUISIANA

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the previous speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics for his very fine statement, and for the leadership he has provided in the House of Representatives on this very important question. The new members of that committee have been greatly impressed by his leadership and understanding of the importance of space and the exploration of that new frontier. He is to be commended for his statement here this morning.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in commending the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. He has certainly given his committee the type of leadership that has produced programs which today are bringing great glory to the entire United States, and I want to join in paying tribute to this committee and its chairman. Mr. BROOKS rightfully deserves the gratitude of all Americans who are today able to experience the pride of knowing that our Nation has successfully launched Commander Shepard into space. This great feat would not have been made possible without the legislation which Congressman BROOKS and his committee steared through the House.

May I also point out it is my sincere hope that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will forward our scientific data on the successful flight of Commander Shepard to the Federacion Aeronautique Internationale in Paris as quickly as possible with a request that the United States be recognized as the first nation to scientifically support its claim of putting a man in space. The Soviet Union has made no scientific data available to support its claim of putting a man into space, and until the Soviet Union can give such scientific data to the world, we have the right to make the claim on behalf of Commander Shepard and the American people.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MR. TRUMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am grateful to have the privilege to join with my colleagues to say "Happy birthday" and to congratulate a great American and an esteemed friend, Harry Truman, on this his 77th birthday. It is a source of continuing pride and inspiration to me that I was so fortunate as to be sent to this Chamber by the good people of the same congressional district which gave to the Nation and to the world one of the greatest statesmen of the 20th century.

It will not be my intention today to once again call the roll on Harry Truman's brilliant accomplishments, which, of course, will grow with even more luster as history unfolds. Rather, I would like to express my deep admiration for the qualities of character and mind embodied in the personality of Harry Truman, which carried him to the heights of greatness as President of the United States and leader of the free world.

Above all else, Harry Truman as President revealed an extraordinary courage and an unusual capacity to rise to unprecedented challenges. He was catapulted into the Office of President with a very minimum of notice and under circumstances practically barren of any ordinary advantage. He came to the Presidency without the benefit of having been briefed on the processes and problems of the executive branch, without having in the Cabinet a single member who was personally devoted, and without knowing for any length of time the people to whom he would have to turn for counsel. The Roosevelt papers reveal that, during the 82 days that Harry Truman was Vice President, the President was not in Washington for the sum total of 30 days. The two men met by appointment only twice. Mr. Truman, himself, estimated that he saw the President only eight times during the year before his death and these meetings contributed only slightly to his preparation for the Presidency. Three weeks after Harry Truman took office, the "thousand-year Reich" surrendered, and 4 months later, Japan. Few men in our history have faced a greater challenge or graver responsibilities. Few men have made a more heroic response.

While Harry Truman on his own had all the hard decisions to make, his quality of courage dominated them all.

This mark of fortitude was demonstrated in his acceptance of the awesome responsibility for the use of the atom bomb; in his confrontation of Stalin at Potsdam; in the faith which carried him to victory in the 1948 campaign against all the predictions of press, prophets, pundits and polls; and in his unhesitating answer to the challenge in Korea, to enumerate but a few of his acts of faith and fortitude. From Harry Truman's burdens and the extraordinary courage he displayed in shouldering them, the great office of the U.S. Presidency gained added strength. Great leaders have various virtues in varying degrees, but the courage to accept responsibility and to act upon it belongs as much to Harry S. Truman as to any President our Nation has ever had.

It would have been impossible to find another man better qualified by virtue of his personal strength to embody and exemplify greatness of democracy of America. Harry Truman shared with Thomas Jefferson an instinctive understanding of the aspirations of the average human being. He did not have to learn how to communicate with the man in the street. Quite frequently as men grow, they grow away from their origins and the associations of their birth and youth. Not so with Harry Truman.

Our former President's belief in the ability of men, given a fair and unconfused choice, to make a wise choice led him to his conviction that all men, everywhere on earth, were worthy of freedom and capable of government. This faith, best expressed in point four of his inaugural address in 1949, became the cornerstone of an inspired humanitarian program which earned for Harry Truman and the United States the gratitude of freedom-seeking men in the far reaches of our planet.

Harry S. Truman's deep feeling for humanity added new dimensions to the Presidency. He was the first President to give this office an enduring peacetime global orientation. Because communism fought everywhere with every means, the Presidency too had to cast its nets wide. "I have been trying," Mr. Truman declared in 1950, "to mobilize the moral forces of the world—Catholics, Protestants, Jews, the Eastern Church, the Grand Lama of Tibet, the Indian Sanskrit moral code—I have been trying to mobilize all these people to the understanding that their welfare and the existence of decency and honor in the world depend on our working together, and not trying to cut each other's throats."

Truman's faith in his fellow men enabled him to provide leadership to a half dozen alliances around the globe. He became an important force in the United Nations, appearing before the U.N. General Assembly and proposing concrete programs for its sessions. He became a principal contributor on the Voice of America which beamed its message to many lands. And he provided succor to the aspirations for independence of Israel, Indonesia, Burma, among other countries.

For this great man, it must be a deep and abiding satisfaction on his 77th birthday to know he enjoys, as former President of the United States, the admiration and respect of the free world for the contributions he has made to the progress of freemen. And it must be a source of equal satisfaction to know that, for his courage and unfaltering devotion to the cause of democracy at home, for his faith and trust in all mankind, today he is one of America's best loved citizens.

I am sure that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in saying, God bless you, Harry Truman, may you and your loved ones enjoy together many more years of health and happiness.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, appropriate ceremonies were held throughout the Nation to mark the occasion of Rumanian Independence Day, May 10. In my own city of Cleveland, numerous friends of Rumania gathered in Carpatina Hall to observe this day, thus renewing historic ties of friendship with a freedom-loving people.

Every effort is being made by the Communist rulers to extinguish the spark of freedom from Eastern Europe. Public observance of Independence Day has been forbidden in Rumania, and celebrations have been shifted to the 9th of May, the anniversary of a Soviet victory.

Despite the dark years of Communist repression, the Rumanian people maintain their resolute courage and steadfast faith in freedom. While they have been under the heel of harsh totalitarianism for many years, they have never ceased in their profound love of liberty. We may be certain that this day will be commemorated in the hearts and minds of all Rumanians.

The city of Cleveland is proud to include many persons of Rumanian descent among its populace, and I am privileged to represent many of them in my constituency. They have contributed substantially to the richness of our community life, and are among our most responsible citizens.

On this anniversary of her independence day, let us unite in the prayer that independence will be restored to Rumania, and her people may again live in freedom and justice.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof may be permitted to sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania), from May 8 to May 22, on account of serving as the U.S. delegate to the meetings of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Immigration to Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. INOUYE, from May 9 to and including May 11, 1961, on account of an official trip to Honolulu, Hawaii, with Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 40 minutes, today and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 45 minutes, today, and 15 minutes on Wednesday, May 10, 1961.

Mr. RANDALL, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. KEOGH in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALGER in three instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 4, 1961, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1723. An act to amend the joint resolution providing for observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

879. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and

Logistics), transmitting a report for February 1961 on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

880. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

881. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

882. A letter from the executive director, the American Society of International Law, transmitting the annual audit of the American Society of International Law for the period April 1, 1960, to March 30, 1961, pursuant to 64 Stat. 869; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4940. A bill relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco; without amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. Report on defense highway needs (Rept. No. 363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. Report on highway construction practices in Oklahoma (Rept. No. 364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1372. An act to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments; with amendment (Rept. No. 365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 6873. A bill to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 6874. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6875. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6876. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6877. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 6878. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty on shrimps and to provide for duty-free entry of unprocessed shrimps annually in an amount equal to imports of shrimps in 1960; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6879. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency of the United States, to broaden the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6880. A bill to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6881. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 6882. A bill to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 6883. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 6884. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain State and local employees who have elected (under the divided retirement system procedure) not to be covered under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program may have an additional opportunity to elect such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 6885. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 202) to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State and local penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 6886. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6887. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to give its protection to employees of certain large hotels, motels, restaurants, and laundries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6888. A bill waiving the limitations of section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Fort Pierce, Fort Myers, and West Palm Beach, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 6889. A bill to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6890. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 6891. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship-repair yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6892. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 6893. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation of the home of John Philip Sousa, and to protect the homes of residents and the businesses and goodwill of the small businessmen in the vicinity of the U.S. Capitol Building; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 6894. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy test qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 404. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 405. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H. Con. Res. 297. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the present tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 279. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate personnel and procedures in the Department of State of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an international exposition in 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take positive steps immediately to alleviate the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 6895. A bill for the relief of James S. Cornett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 6896. A bill for the relief of Wong Ngook Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6897. A bill for the relief of Maria Zofia Dworzecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 6898. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Kulikowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 6899. A bill for the relief of Youssif Barakat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.J. Res. 406. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committe on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.J. Res. 407. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 408. Joint resolution to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to present a medal to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., U.S. Navy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.J. Res. 409. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 410. Joint resolution to authorize the Speaker of the House of Representatives to confer a medal on Alan Barlett Shepard, Jr., commander, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Res. 280. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 1544 and accompanying papers to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

140. By Mr. COHELAN: Petition of Edward H. Brown and others opposing the wholesale stripping of natural growth of trees, bushes, etc., on levees in the delta area of California by U.S. engineers and State water resources board; to the Committee on Public Works.

141. By Mr. GIAIMO: Petition of 82 signers, 81 of whom are from the Third Congressional District of Connecticut, pertaining to President Kennedy's legislative program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

142. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles W. Hancock, Jersey City, N.J., relative to a grievance relating to being denied equal rights under the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Results of a Poll of Citizens of the First District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years it has been my custom, early in the session, to send questionnaires to the citizens of the First Arkansas District seeking their views on national problems and matters of current interest.

The tabulation of the latest poll has been completed and it is my wish to share with other Members the information contained in it. I would like to point out that the response to this effort was highly gratifying and the poll gives an excellent cross section of opinion in eastern Arkansas. Farmers, bankers, wage earners, housewives, and people in all walks of life favored me with their replies to these questions and—in a great number of cases—added to the response by writing detailed letters as to why they favored or did not favor certain questions raised. Nor was the tabulation confined to merely the questionnaires mailed from my office. Arkansas newspapers printed copies of the questionnaire which many people clipped, answered, and mailed to me. Area radio stations publicized the questions and cooperated in the effort. The interest in their Government and in the problems that face our Nation by Arkansas citizens has resulted in a definitive and a significant expression of opinion.

The poll results are as follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you endorse the proposal to increase minimum wages to $1.25 per hour?	20	77	3
2. Do you approve or disapprove the expansion of the public housing program?	45	41	14
3. Do you favor medical and health care for social security beneficiaries financed by increased social security taxes?	32	64	4
4. Do you favor Federal aid for education for school construction and teachers' salaries?	37	59	4
5. The Post Office Department has an annual deficit of more than $500,000,000. Do you favor increasing postal rates to eliminate it?	55	40	5
6. Do you believe we should pay as we go in the building of the Interstate Highway System instead of going further into debt even if an increase in taxes is necessary?	79	15	6
7. The Secretary of Agriculture believes in increasing the prices received by farmers through higher supports coupled with acreage controls to keep production in line with demand. Do you agree with him?	50	44	6
8. Do you approve a food stamp plan under which needy persons would be issued certificates to buy surplus foods through regular business channels?	54	36	10
9. Our Government has warned the Russians "Hands off the Congo." Do you approve or disapprove this U.S. policy even though serious consequences could result?	78	9	13
10. Do you favor the passage of a law establishing the Peace Corps on a permanent basis to enable Americans to assist in U.S. aid programs in underdeveloped countries?	47	32	21

Is Dictatorship America's Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the continuing concentration of power in the hands of the Executive at the expense of the legislative branch of government is a threat no American should overlook or condone.

If a gasoline motor could run without a carburetor, it would advance the efficiency of that motor for the carburetor to be taken out.

What is the use of having a Congress, either/or, for that matter, a Constitution—if an administration persists in running without them?

That, in essence, is the revolution which is going on today.

The Central Intelligence Agency is spending hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars every year. How many Americans, how many Congressmen—elected by their fellow Americans—know what the CIA does do or does not do?

A costly organization which might well involve this Republic in global conflict, the so-called Peace Corps, is very much in existence. Did the elected Congress create this mid-20th century children's crusade? No. It was established by Executive order.

More recently, the area development bill's conference report, containing a financing clause which bypasses the legitimate action of the Appropriations Committee, was approved by the House. This back-door financing method is rapidly becoming the rule, rather than the exception.

Congress has already given up its constitutional controls over the tariff. It is being heavily pressured to relinquish its controls over appropriations by giving the President an item veto.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has proposed a bill which would relieve Congress of the need for ever acting again on important aspects of American

agriculture. This, in my opinion, is the first instance of a free man advocating a return to the slavery of the Dark Ages.

I serve notice that I will continue, that I will step up my fight on this insidious attempt to undermine and destroy Congress and the Constitution.

I speak for myself. I commit no other man.

Oh yes, there are still some individualists in Congress. But, as a current writer has so well put it, "The trouble with today's individualists is that they are getting harder and harder to tell apart."

I welcome others to join me in this conflict. Still, if need be, I will fight alone. I hope it will never come to be a one-man battle. Still—if it should be—I will be proud to fight my own "Algerian" counterrevolution.

Partisan Nominations Held Without Effect on Judicial Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the preliminary discussions which accompanied the recently passed bill increasing the number of judges in the U.S. courts, some commentators sought to make political capital from the fact that all of the appointments under this bill would be made by a Democratic administration.

The basis of this argument was that such appointments would necessarily be objectionable because they would be made under the auspices of a political party.

One of our colleagues the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], in a letter to the New York Times skillfully and effectively demolished this argument. I feel that the rebuttal which he made is important enough to be brought to wider attention than that of the readers of the letters column of the New York Times and I append Representative MONAGAN's letter herewith:

PARTISAN NOMINATIONS HELD WITHOUT EFFECT ON JUDICIAL ATTITUDE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

When one considers the history of judicial appointments to the Federal bench nothing could be less founded in fact than Prof. Robert Dixon's contention in his recent letter that partisan nominations lead to judicial partiality.

Without going so far as to advocate purely political designations, one must conclude that a review of past nominations clearly demonstrates that there is little connection between the nominal political affiliation of an appointee and his approach to the legal questions with which he deals as a member of the judiciary.

Justice Black is perhaps the greatest example of the fallacy of this argument. When he was named to the bench his nomination was criticized as being a threat to civil liberties. A former member of the Klan, he was opposed on the grounds that he could not, because of his former associations, exercise impartiality in the consideration of constitutional cases in the field of civil rights.

ACCUSATION OF CONSERVATIVES

Yet today Hugo L. Black is the archprotector of civil rights, a Justice who is accused by some conservatives of desiring to strike down without discrimination all laws directed at the elimination of subversion and the restraint of freedom of expression.

Harlan L. Stone was Attorney General under President Coolidge and was named to the bench as a Republican. Yet many of his opinions—notably his dissent in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration case—rank as landmarks in the liberal approach to constitutional questions.

Earl Warren, a Republican Governor of California, and a candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket, is the author of the liberal opinion in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, a milestone in liberal opinion in the field of racial discrimination.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.—sounded out in advance by Theodore Roosevelt, and nominated as a Republican Justice—gravely disappointed the President who named him. In the National Securities case, he was described by the ebullient Chief Executive as being a judge "with a backbone like a banana" and went on to become a darling of the liberals and an outstanding proponent of freedom of legislative action in the field of social legislation.

CRITICISM OF LIBERALS

Felix Frankfurter, a leading critic of the course of the judicial process in the Sacco and Vanzetti case, is today criticized by some as being hypertechnical and overconservative in civil liberties and free speech cases which reach the Supreme Court.

From these examples, it can be clearly seen that there is little connection between a man's political affiliation or his prior station in life and the attitude he takes when, as a member of the Federal bench, he deals with questions of great import.

His prior party allegiance may qualify him for nomination under our system. But when he is a member of our great Federal Court, relieved of obligation and sworn to the impartial administration of justice, he usually deals with the matters which come before him on their merits and in what he considers to be the best interests of the country.

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.
WASHINGTON, *March 27, 1961.*

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, May 3 last week was the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. It is celebrated each year as a national holiday to commemorate that date when the Polish Diet enacted a constitution to place the power of the nation in the hands of the people. Poland was a frontrunner among the nations of Europe in asserting the right of men to be free and to chart their own destinies; and although liberty has been wrenched from the Poles by Soviet Russia, the love of freedom—the desire to restore liberty to Poland—still lives in their hearts. Someday, Mr. Speaker, the will of the Polish people will prevail, and they will realize the true destiny of their country—which was sounded on May 3, 1791, with the passage of a constitution inspired by our Declaration of Independence and the French proclamation of the rights of man. Two years ago I visited Warsaw to attend the 48th annual Interparliamentary Union Conference, and I sensed then the fact that the Poles yearn again for freedom. If there is a weak link in the Soviet chain of satellite nations, I think Poland is it. The peoples of free Europe and of our own Nation join the Poles in holding forth the hope that they soon will enjoy liberty under a government truly responsible to the will of the people. It is because the torch of liberty is held so close to the hearts of the Polish people that I call upon my colleagues in the Congress to remember Polish Constitution Day and to cherish their hope for freedom.

Major Aspects of World Crises—The Challenge of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, I was privileged to review major aspects of world crises in an address over radio station WGN, Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, OVER RADIO STATION WGN, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 7, 1961

Friends, the world—and we, as Americans—today are faced with serious issues which affect our progress, our survival, and the future of mankind.

The establishment of peace—or at least a climate in which differences among nations—can be accommodated or negotiated—still remains as the No. 1 challenge.

If this can be accomplished successfully, the world may progress to new, unparalleled heights of good living for all people.

If we fail, however, the erupting conflicts could well wreak catastrophe upon humanity.

In such tumultuous, complex times, then, the grave questions which require realistic answers include:

Can we stop the Reds without a global war; can we create machinery for resolving the great differences between East and West; can we encourage respect for, and adherence to, international law—not tolerate lawlessness, as now committed by the Communists?

Today, Mr. Khrushchev and his henchmen—now controlling about 1 billion people, or one-third of the earth's population—are throwing more manpower and resources into battle for attaining the ultimate goal of communism: that of world conquest.

What can we do about it?

First, as a leader of the free world, we have a great responsibility for providing not only

the military power, but also the political-economic-ideological leadership to combat the Red offensive.

Second, the free world alliances—NATO, SEATO, ANZUS—need to assume a greater role of leadership in their areas of the world.

This includes:

Creating military forces adequate to combat Communist penetrations by force; developing more effective programs to meet the nonmilitary needs of the people—particularly the less-developed have-nots.

Third, we need to take a new analytical look at the role of the United Nations in world affairs.

This would involve the following:

1. Providing a United Nations military force to more effectively meet obligations in troubled areas.

2. Take measures to assure that the members meet their financial and other obligations—not shove off more of the burden on Uncle Sam.

3. Stop the Communists from using the U.N. as an international forum for propaganda.

Time after time, the United States and other non-Communist nations find themselves—unjustly, in many cases—as defendants against false and irresponsible charges by the Reds.

This should be stopped.

Unless we fight back more effectively, however, we can expect to fail—in the future, as in the past—to win battles in the court of world opinion.

NEEDED: GREATER NATIONAL UNITY

Now, how can we, as individual citizens, best face these challenges?

At this time in history, we need greatness, unity, dedication, and leadership and followership, to win the global battle against communism—as well as to fulfill the growing domestic, peaceful needs of a fast-expanding population.

In these critical days, there is no time for:

Unwarranted political sniping; headline seeking, at the cost of national prestige or policy; for defeatism or passitivity; or isolation or disillusion.

Rather, this is a time for stiffening our backbone, for reinvigorating the moral and spiritual, as well as the manpower and material strength of the Nation.

Then, we need to take a new, hard look at our domestic and foreign policies. The purpose would be to determine how or where these may be failing to effectively meet the challenges.

The new administration has had its baptism of fire, in Cuba and Laos. The results are today's headlines—regrettably not favorable.

Nevertheless, the task now is to learn a lesson; to revamp, as necessary, our policies; and to go forward in a united effort to meet the global threat to our security and freedom.

Struggle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks a day of importance to millions of Poles throughout the world, for on this day in 1791 the Polish Constitution was officially adopted.

To the Polish people of that year and to the generations that have followed, this document remains as a symbol of liberty and independence. It remains in the hearts and spirit of the Poles even though officially it came to an end a little more than a year later. Under circumstances that have followed a recurring pattern in Polish history, the full fruits of independence were never fully savored.

Russia, always an ominous threat to Polish independence and fearing a united Poland on her western front intervened with military might and forced the Poles to abandon the constitution they had sworn to uphold. Since then Poland has faced a series of partitions and divisions which have tried and tested the Polish dream of a free and united Poland. That dream has not been forsaken.

We in the United States have always felt a strong bond with the Polish people. Some of the outstanding figures in our own struggle for independence were Polish. The names of Kosciusko and Pulaski are as much a part of our history as those of Nathaniel Green and General Gates.

The Polish Constitution was based on the same principles and beliefs as that of the United States and in 1791 only 2 months after the May 3 constitution was proclaimed, George Washington himself acknowledged the stride toward liberty that Poland had made.

Today the same bond remains between our countries. For once again we stand behind Poland as she struggles for freedom and unity. Although Russia has attempted to subjugate this country, the Polish People's Republic is far from a docile Communist satellite. The real Poland of today is a paradox—an example of Communist orthodoxy and Polish individualism.

And it is this individualism plus the proud and courageous spirit of the Poles that we in the United States recognize and admire. It is this spirit that carried the Poles through the ravages of World War I, saw them recoup their strength after the Germans had invaded in 1939, and finally it is this same courage, bravery, and spirit that would not permit them to be crushed under the Russian tanks that rolled into Poznan.

The hope of Poznan has not been fulfilled but the hope itself remains and will continue to live. The paradox of Poland will not endure forever and the Communist system will never completely transform Poland. No one yet has been able to destroy the Poles ability to survive as Poles.

Mobilization of Republican Resources for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, if we are to preserve the two-party system we cherish so deeply, Republicans and Democrats alike must speak out freely on their political philosophies and their goals.

One of the most forthright, forceful, and definitive discussions of the position and aims of the Republican Party was presented recently by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL at a dinner sponsored by the GOP organizations of Baltimore City. Senator SALTONSTALL's address was extremely inspiring and thought provoking, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL AT THE COMBINED REPUBLICAN ORGANIZATIONS DINNER MAY 3, 1961, LORD BALTIMORE HOTEL, BALTIMORE, MD.

We are gathered tonight to mobilize our resources for the future, to consider what we've got to do for Republican victories in the months and years immediately ahead, and to dedicate ourselves to the job of doing it. The glamour and the recognition for political effort comes during campaign time. But the rewards come only when the preparation is done thoroughly every day of every month of every year—when the spotlights are turned elsewhere. Politics is not a part-time job.

What is the current status of the Republican Party? What disadvantages do we have to overcome? What factors do we have basically working in our favor?

Nineteen hundred and sixty saw us lose the national elections for President and Vice President. After 8 years of sound performance under President Eisenhower, the Republican Party lost the White House. The House and Senate are still under the control of the Democrats by large margins.

But in losing the White House we won a majority of votes in more than half the States and more than half the congressional districts. We lost the Presidency by 112,000 votes—Vice President Nixon carried 26 States to the 23 won by Senator Kennedy. Nixon won 49.9 percent of the two-party vote and 49.55 percent of the total vote. In the Senate we elected three new Republicans and all who ran for reelection. In the House we find 44 new Republicans—only 3 who sought reelection failed, and we won a net gain of 21 seats. We picked up two more governorships and made a net gain of approximately 300 State legislature seats.

We were beaten in the big cities which dictate the electoral vote. But one of the most striking examples of Republican power is found in our party's performance in winning last fall's so-called independent vote. The Democrats went into the elections with a tremendous advantage over us in the "hard core" party vote—in the number of registered Democrats over registered Republicans. The incredibly close result means that we won this independent vote in a big way.

The fact that Senator Kennedy only won by sixteen one-hundredths of 1 percent in the popular vote leaves him without a clear-cut mandate from the American people. The American voter repudiated neither the 8 years of Republican leadership nor its platform and candidates of 1960. Our party improved its position at the polls following consecutive losses in 1954, 1956, and 1958. As Columnist Roscoe Drummond has pointed out, Senator Kennedy ran behind his party as its strength was receding while Vice President Nixon ran ahead of his party as it was on the upswing.

Now these statistics are of limited value. We didn't win, we lost. We lost a heartbreaker, and we are now, emphatically, the "out-party." But to overlook some of the heartening aspects of the last election would be foolish, particularly when they speak well

for the future. The position of the Democrats is not without worry and danger. As Senator THRUSTON MORTON, our national chairman, recently said:

"In many respects I commiserate with the Democrats. They are in an unenviable position. They have come to power at a time when the public mind is strongly influenced by vivid memories and deep appreciation of those good Eisenhower years—years of peace and record prosperity.

"I would suggest that the Democrats will find little comfort or magic in the campaign image which projected them as would-be rescuers of a nation on the brink of disaster. Our ailments must not be minimized. The Nation must be informed, but it need not be informed in a manner which gives aid and comfort to those bent on destroying us. Any balanced assessment of the national economy, freed of political frenetics, will underscore the enduring potency of the great gains which the new administration inherited."

We have great leadership within the Republican Party which over the forthcoming months can clarify its energy and purpose for the benefit of all the people. You know the quality of your Republicans here in Maryland. President Eisenhower has sustained his massive public popularity and respect. Former Vice President Nixon spoke in Greenville last night and appears in New York tomorrow night. Within a week's time, he will also visit Chicago, Des Moines, Detroit, and Columbus. In March alone, Chairman MORTON delivered over 30 major addresses in many areas of the Nation. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is so much in demand for speaking dates that he is booked up solid for well over a year. The minority leadership of Congress is applying Republican principles to the legislative arena with vigor. And throughout the Nation in State capitols we find strong, dynamic leadership from Republican Governors. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, Mark Hatfield of Oregon, and my own Gov. John Volpe are obvious examples. Let's add right now the name of former Labor Secretary James Mitchell, who has an excellent chance of becoming New Jersey's next Governor in the fall.

So we have strong men of proven capability to lead us, who, through their ideas and their experience, give the broadest possible representation of the American people, men of differing shades of political philosophy united behind the conviction that the Republican Party, in principle, purpose and performance, can best serve the Nation and her citizens.

Finally, the greatest resource of the Republican Party is the American people themselves. This is as it should be. Today American citizens want moderate action by Government. They have demonstrated their alliance with the middle of the road rather than with the far left or far right. They want to avoid extremes, trusting in balanced use of public and private resources. This desire for moderation is best met by Republicans, not by the Democrats. We, as a party, traditionally advocate the creative balance between extremes, steady performance over the long haul, and a close relationship between principle and practice.

Now it has been suggested that the fortunes of our party for 1962 and 1964 lie in two missions: developing strong, attractive candidates and building a strong organization—door to door and street to street, precinct to precinct and town to town. I agree. But I would like to discuss first what is absolutely fundamental to all of this—what we stand for. We must, in a meaningful contemporary context, vigorously demonstrate the vitality, applicability, and long-term validity of our principles, and we must do it right now. The best candidates and the most powerful organization mean nothing unless the beliefs that justify their existence are kept strong and vital and are boldly articulated.

While the ease of communication by telephone, radio, TV, and even through space, has brought the world closer together, the greatest practical problem which the Republican Party faces is one of communication. We must make clear to the average citizens of America, the man and woman on Main Street, what we stand for. As Republicans what we need to do most of all is to identify ourselves, as a party, with them in terms of personal interest, economic interest, and national interest. We have not been sufficiently convincing. We have not identified our fundamental nature as a party with their best interests. During a time characterized by the similarity of party platforms, by the desire on the part of each party to appeal to the whole political spectrum, and by the increasing tendency to obscure party arguments by the direct appeal of a candidate's individual personality, we must make clear what we stand for—what we have to offer that the Democrats don't.

Sometimes people ask me what I am, whether I'm a conservative or a liberal. I answer that I'm a Republican. Period. What do I mean by this; what do I regard as the basic differences between our two parties?

First of all, the Republican Party stands for the freedom of the individual—not in the abstract—but in the real sense. We do not hedge this principle. We do not cover it up with other immediately popular, emotional or more expedient ideas. We believe in advancing the genuine dignity of the individual in the most profound manner, to offer the most thorough opportunity for his growth and advancement physically, intellectually and spiritually.

Our concept of American Government is that it be committed to preserve individual reliance, individual vitality and individual resourcefulness within the framework of a Federal system equipped to deal efficiently with the great national and international problems that give us such anxiety today. The Government simply cannot answer all our dilemmas. If it attempts to play that role, the individual citizen's capacity to solve his own problems, to make decisive judgments with respect to them, will diminish, and soon he will be incapable of participating in the democracy of his society. He will lose his initiative, his energy and his courage, and, above all, his self-respect. Policies, programs, institutions which tend to interpret the role of Government as solving all of the individual's problems for him are first of all impractical, secondly, will gradually imprison him, and thirdly, are just plain disrespectful to the ideal of his freedom.

We think in terms of that individual. The Democrats think primarily in terms of groups of individuals or even the state itself. Real reliance on the freedom of the individual enables us as Republicans to consider more deeply the overall national interest, to disassociate ourselves from special interest groups. Our party has traditionally striven to represent the whole rather than the special interests of various groups, to advance the common purpose over often contradictory and divisive ends. We intend to pursue the common bond for the common good, rather than indulge for emotional gain in hostile in-fighting among classes and categories of people. Such activity saps the spirit of community loyalty, mutual helpfulness, and finally the ability to act in unity as a free people. The Democrats simply do not have as strong or consistent a record in this regard as do we.

Let me emphasize two more beliefs which are closely related to this conviction about individual freedom and which express differences between the two parties rather clearly. One is that the Republican Party emphasizes the principle of voluntary rather than compulsory participation in Federal aid programs, while the Democrats do not. The other is that we stress the concept of equality of opportunity among our citizens rather than the more recent "everyone gets the same deal" tendency to emphasize automatic equality per se, in which our Democratic colleagues frequently indulge.

Now the second major principle that we as Republicans stand for is a government close to the people. I have always liked to think of government starting from the family itself, and moving out to the community, to the State institutions and finally to the Federal level in Washington. The Democrats appear to believe now—though if you read Thomas Jefferson you will quickly find that this was not always the case—that it should work approximately the other way 'round.

The Republican concept of government's role emphasizes that State and local government must remain strong, that unless there is vigor, responsibility and purpose at the levels of government closest to the people themselves there can be no real governing "of, by, and for the people." The functions of institutions at the sub-Federal level may certainly change—they should never remain static—but they must always exist. Here we see how the Republican concepts of individual freedom and government by the people are combined for the benefit of all. Without the opportunity to participate in self-government, the individual cannot be alert, informed, and able to influence the course of events about him. Without the presence of State and local institutions which are easily accessible to him, that opportunity is lost.

A related idea to the Republican belief in government close to the people is the conviction that private enterprise must be the ally of government, not its adversary; whereas the Democrats often seem to make private enterprise the whipping boy. We want to move forward to meet the grave new problems before us, and at the Federal level of government, without at the same time undercutting the open, free system upon which we really depend. We believe that this can be done. We believe that it must be done—or else we must radically revise our whole system of life in the United States. This is not to say that we can tolerate the violation of the law by business and industry any more than we can in the case of a labor union or an individual citizen. When business is found in any way lacking in public integrity it must be immediately and strongly called to task.

These two fundamental beliefs, individual freedom and partnership government, must be put across to the people by us who believe in them. It is from these two basic convictions that flow the ideas which have characterized Republican leadership over the past 8 years. From them President Eisenhower drew the policy that problems are not solved by dollars alone and that problems must be approached on a long-term rather than short-term basis, for instance. It is on these two basic convictions that I believe the victory and the survival of the Republican Party depend. We must market them. We must make them real.

How do we do it? Attractive candidates, money, topflight organization. You have good candidates, and you're coming up with more, of young blood. Encourage them. Tonight you are engaged in a money-raising effort. That is essential if your candidates are to win and your work is to succeed. It will succeed if the candidates encourage the workers and the workers have financial backing.

I was a candidate last autumn. Tonight I am here as a Senator from Massachusetts, which as you know is our new President's home State, too. Our statewide organization, which we had been working on for well

over a year before the election, was a major factor in my reelection. We had a highly productive volunteer operation with a powerful emphasis on youth and great enthusiasm that did wonders. Other than that I did my best to get around the State as much as I could—again, starting the fall prior to the election to establish early momentum—to meet as many voters and their families as possible. I ran what is referred to as a "positive" campaign, that is, concentrating on my own experience and service and the kind of record I had developed in the Congress. On the other hand, particularly in the last few weeks before election day, I did not hesitate to fight back hard to counter attacks made by my opponent and do some punching of my own when this was clearly called for. Like all campaigns, it involved some fun, considerable exasperation, but above all—on the part of everyone concerned—hard, hard work.

Tomorrow, your good Senators GLENN BEALL and JOHN BUTLER, Congressman MATHIAS, and I will again take up our imperative responsibilities as members of the "loyal opposition." This is a delicate task, which must attempt to strike the dynamic balance between hard criticism when it is called for and solid support when it is merited. Without dissent—which in this case is the minority party in Congress—there is dictatorship. So we must be vigilant on the broadest plane in defense of the national interest. This involves the condemnation of reckless decisions by the administration, the spelling out of better courses, the backing of sound action when it is taken. We must keenly appraise the promises and performance of the Democrats in the official positions of leadership in the executive branch, for our constitutional system demands it.

Above all, the loyal opposition must develop programs of its own, to deal in our terms rather than exclusively with regard to theirs. We cannot strike a clear, dynamic image unless this is done. Many of the new administration's programs on the domestic front are continuations or enlargements of the Eisenhower policies. We can claim credit for these when they are ballyhooed as Democratic accomplishments. But we must move beyond them, building rather than standing on that record, as Dick Nixon has so well said.

On foreign policy, we will largely stand with the President, although never failing to bring our own ideas to bear in counsel with him and his advisers. On domestic issues, where the security of our country is not immediately at stake and where the philosophical differences between us are more striking, we must oppose the administration wherever its programs contradict our principles, and give those principles a new vitality with specific recommendations which embody them. We will not obstruct for its own sake; we will not rubberstamp in any event. I hope that we will be of some help to you here in Baltimore and Maryland in our mutual endeavor. I'm sure you will help us.

Thank you very much.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 6, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER,
Fifth District, Texas)

MAY 6, 1961.

At the end of the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration we find U.S. prestige apparently at its lowest in history and our domestic programs merely an extension and acceleration of the New Deal-Fair Deal programs, which the President admires, but which many consider proven failures. Worldwide Russian leaders are accelerating their Communist subversion, stimulated by Kennedy's failure to follow firm talk with firm action. Bipartisan harmony to show the world U.S. 'unity of purpose' fails on two counts, at least: (1) Our purpose is not clear, thanks to contradictory programs; (2) past mistakes are not only buried from view, such as the Cuba fiasco, but so, too, are the lessons we might have learned. Our contradictory programs are daily delineated on the House floor. This week's crop includes (1) the minimum wage final version; (2) Federal aid for water pollution; (3) $9 billion tax increase to highway users.

The minimum wage House-Senate conference was a capitulation by the House Members. The Speaker selected as House conferees (POWELL, ROOSEVELT, DENT) Members committed to the dollar volume view already voted down by the House. The House had endorsed the interstate commerce principle as the basis for Federal participation in wage setting. The Senate bill embraced the dollar volume view and it prevailed contrary to the legislation passed by the House. Once again we witnessed the House views flouted by the Senate and the administration. So now we will have a minimum wage forced on our people based on $1 million gross and $250,000 of goods crossing State lines—with some businesses exempted. It is apparent that some of the exemptions were politically motivated, such as laundry workers and cotton gin employees, in an effort to secure more Members' votes in support of the administration plan. Despite a determined Republican stand, the bill passed 230 to 196—30 Republicans voted for it; 57 Democrats against. Federal Government wage setting must and will be accompanied by direct or indirect Federal price control—neither of these is compatible with a free, private enterprise system—there's the basic contradiction. In other words, it's unconstitutional.

The water pollution bill doubling the amount of Federal aid for construction of local sewage disposal plants passed 307 to 110. The bill provided $1 billion total at $100 million per year—a doubling of amount in a program only 4 years old. What business the Federal Government has in this, I don't know. Stream pollution, which everyone disapproves, can be prevented in other ways (State compacts, for example). The construction of sewage plants is a local matter. Here again is the basic contradiction—Federal intervention in a local-State matter.

The highway taxes were increased $9 billion without House Members even demanding a record vote (only 24 arose, not a sufficient number). It was late in the day (6 p.m.) and, also, the Members don't want to appear to be against highways, even though disapproving somewhat the increase of taxes. I opposed it for several reasons, including (1) taxes are high enough now, on motorists, truckers and all related industries which pay taxes as highway users—$1.6 billion of highway users excise taxes annually now go into the General Treasury beyond the amounts spent on highway construction; (2) as alternatives, we can either cut spending on welfare programs or stretch out the construction timetable.

The omnibus judgeship bill was probably our most ignominious action of the week. Instead of 35 or 59 additional judgeships (last year's maximum declared needs) or even the 70 passed by the House (see Newsletter, Apr. 22), the Senate version was adopted providing 73 new judgeships. The actions of Members of both Houses is quite transparent. Many have hopes for such an appointment, a lifetime job. The House leadership, under the Speaker's guidance, can receive the credit and blame for our legislative accomplishments to date.

Worldwide, meanwhile, we are losing ground in the Communist-free world contest. Daily Cuba is importing the sinews of war—oil, weapons, and Russian technicians. Every hour is irretrievably lost to the United States which must mount the offensive to free Cuba. When will the American people demand action? The State Department only now has released a study of Cuba, acknowledging officially and warning the American people of the socialism and communism the American people have recognized for months. Our inaction now, following our earlier mistakes, is almost unbelievable. In Laos, Africa, Vietnam, Berlin, Mexico, South America, we face Communist subversion. We know that under present policy a temporary slowdown will not prevent a later takeover. Day by day, we see the showdown coming closer. It will be with Russia, not just with Cuba, Laos, Congo, Vietnam or other peripheral areas. So what are we doing? Meanwhile, we learn that supposedly patriotic union leaders and members have struck again and again at our missile sites pushing up wages to fantastic amounts of $400 to $700 weekly; legalized blackmail, you might call it. It's beginning to look as though our Nation, the leaders and/or the people, is suffering from mass hypnosis or sickness, making sensible conduct as the free world's leader an impossibility. Foreign aid to our enemies and neutrals is a leading example of this sickness. Our lack of firm action another.

The astronaut's successful flight, fully publicized, was a tremendous success for the United States way of life over Russia's secrecy and propaganda. Uncommitted nations may well be influenced to recognize (and emulate) the advantages of our way of life which combines a free society with military might, a happy and tough combination (if we don't sell ourselves short).

Duval Engineering & Contracting Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 of this year I voiced, on the floor of this great body, my opposition to the awarding of a Government contract to the Duval Engineering & Contracting Co., of Jacksonville, Fla., for the construction of a Saturn rocket complex at Cape Canaveral. My objections to this company's receiving any Federal Government contract was founded on the basis of proven fraud perpetrated by two of its supervisory employees who, before a Federal district court, were found guilty of fraud against the Federal Government in lightloading asphalt on the Mayport Naval Base under a construction contract awarded to the Duval engineering firm.

At that time, I pointed out that the Federal district judge who tried them concluded that they were taking the rap for the management of the company and this was borne out by the fact that they are still employed by Duval. At that time I also pointed out that Duval was removed from the State of Florida's bidding list because of fraud committed against the State as well as making payola to State employees a common practice. I further cited the conclusion of the Federal district judge concerning Duval's philosophy which, in the words of the court, was "to cheat the Government if you can."

On April 21, in spite of my objections, in spite of the Federal court's conclusion, in spite of two convictions, in spite of Duval's removal from the State of Florida's bidding list, and in spite of their record of fraud perpetrated against both State and Federal Governments, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers awarded this company a one-quarter million dollar construction contract for construction of the Saturn complex at Cape Canaveral. May I point out that this company was denied a State contract, on which they were low bidders, the same day they received the Federal contract.

Following the awarding of this contract, I held a meeting with four representatives of the Corps of Engineers at which time I requested an explanation for their awarding this contract before thoroughly investigating my revelations, I having notified them about the highly questionable activities of this company 2 days in advance of their awarding the contract.

I received the Corps' reply today and it reveals that they have no intention of withholding the contract.

Paradoxically, I also received today a copy of a letter sent to the Governor of Florida, Hon. Farris Bryant, by the senior U.S. district judge who was assigned to and tried the Duval case, the Honorable Albert L. Reeves, of the western district of Missouri. Judge Reeves said:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI,
Kansas City, May 2, 1961.

Re Duval Engineering & Contracting Co., Jacksonville, Fla.

Hon. FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor of Florida,
Capitol Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

DEAR GOVERNOR BRYANT: While holding court in Jacksonville, I tried a criminal case involving short loading on the part of the employees of the above-named company. They were both properly convicted for the reason that habitually, and almost daily, they caused a shortage of concrete designed for the runways of a Government airport.

It was obvious from the testimony that the acts of these employees were mere symptoms. The contracting company was performing a Government contract. Because of the extreme shortage in concrete loading, and because the Government knew about it, the company made a refund on the basis of a shortage of 451 tons; this, however, did not cover the entire shortage. From the testimony of witnesses, including the president of the contracting company, it appeared that the Government had not only been defrauded on the basis of a greater shortage than was accounted for, but that the employees were acting for the contracting company and were simply obeying orders. They did not profit—the company did.

I considered that the treatment of symptoms was of no value in the enforcement of the law, and granted probation to the two employees.

An effort should be made to remove the cause of wrongdoing and such an effort would reach fruition by denying an unworthy contracting company the right to be awarded Government contracts under any circumstances.

It is for these reasons that I commend the authorities in the great State of Florida for denying Duval Engineering & Contracting Co. any further contracts. Companies of this character and repute should be taught that fair dealing is not only proper, but necessary in doing business with municipalities.

I take occasion to congratulate you on the splendid executive work you are doing in a great State.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT L. REEVES.

This letter certainly evidences the degree of concern in this matter by the judiciary and is, to be sure, a highly unusual statement for a district judge to make. Obviously, he is incensed at what he believes to be a great miscarriage of justice, and I most emphatically concur with him. I believe this letter to be most significant in that Judge Reeves is probably the man most familiar with the case, having tried it recently.

In light of this mounting evidence against Duval, I can see no alternative but to have the Corps of Engineers revoke this contract. And, in light of the fact that, since 1957, Duval has been awarded nearly $18 million worth of Federal-aid highway contracts, I will repeat my request that the Roads Investigating Subcommittee, on which I am ranking minority member, thoroughly investigate these projects in order to find out if the Federal Government has been defrauded on this $18 million worth of Federal-aid highways.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, ranking minority member of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, presently conducting hearings on defense contracts, has already taken the lead in that body having requested an explanation from the U.S. Corps of Engineers concerning Duval's being awarded this Government contract.

"Youth Wants To Know"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 16, Secretary of Labor Goldberg appeared as guest on Theodore Granik's award winning television program "Youth Wants To Know." This was the premiere showing over WABC–TV, channel 7, in New York City and the program received wide acclaim. It may be interesting to note that Secretary Goldberg had the following to say at the conclusion of the program, "This is the most inquisitive and best informed panel that I have appeared before since I took my office."

Mr. Speaker, WABC–TV is to be congratulated on bringing this excellent program to the great metropolitan area of New York City. A special word of praise should go to Mr. Joseph Stamler, vice president and general manager of the station, and Mr. Al Hollander, channel 7 program director, as well as all other personnel associated with making this fine program possible.

As a Member of Congress from the borough of Brooklyn in the city of New York, I am proud and delighted to note that the Hotel St. George, the largest hotel in the city of New York which is located in Brooklyn, is presenting this program over WABC–TV and I should like to pay special tribute to Milton Kestenberg, president of the Hotel St. George Corp., for pioneering in this public service effort.

Without objection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD a complete transcript of Secretary Goldberg's appearance on "Youth Wants To Know" at the conclusion of my remarks:

"YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW," SUNDAY, APRIL 16, 1961, THE HONORABLE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, SECRETARY OF LABOR, GUEST

Mr. BARBER. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to "Youth Wants To Know." Our guest is Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg.

Secretary Goldberg is faced with many problems concerning the economic health of our country, but none is more urgent than the unemployment problem. Last month the number of unemployed represented 6.9 percent of the Nation's work force, a 20-year high for the month of March. Recently Secretary Goldberg said that within the coming year, the U.S. economy must turn up 10½ million more jobs. We will have our first question for the Secretary in just a moment.

[Announcement.]

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Secretary, it is a pleasure to welcome you to "Youth Wants To Know."

Secretary GOLDBERG. Mr. Barber, it is a pleasure to be with this panel, one of the most informed and inquisitive panels in Washington.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you. Now let's begin our questioning with Jerry.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, what indications of an economic upturn do you see currently?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Jerry, there are some signs of an economic upturn, but I want to warn that a few swallows don't make a spring or even a summer. And steel production has moved up and that is helpful. It has moved up several percentage points over the last period. As a result of the weather, construction activities have moved up. And then retail sales although they are not what they should be, are beginning to respond. Maybe they are responding to the fact that all of our women, those of us who are married, maybe some of your dates, went out and got some Easter hats and we have had a little upturn in retail sales as a result of Easter business, and finally there is a slight upturn in the amount of hours worked in our Nation's factories. Not enough to bring a 40-hour week, but a little benefit over the period that existed during the last several months.

Question. Do you believe then that certain parts of the Kennedy antirecession program may prove unnecessary?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Oh, no. We need all of the recession program and I just left the President and we were discussing whether or

not it was not necessary to have further programs. That is a matter which is under study in the administration at the present time.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what can be done about this hard core unemployment, and what is being done during this administration right now?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, first of all, on the hard core of unemployment which some people call structural unemployment, the Congress of the United States has before it right at the present moment in conference an area redevelopment bill. This bill is designed to promote business opportunity and job opportunities in the areas which have been hit by chronic unemployment—structural unemployment as some economists call it.

Question. How would you furnish this so-called feed money to badly depressed areas where they haven't money to start over again?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, the bill before the Congress which I hope Congress will enact in the next few days after they get through with the conference, provides for loans and grants of several hundred million dollars to enable these communities to develop businesses that will replace the businesses that have ceased to grant full employment because of technological and other developments.

Question. Mr. Secretary, we have been talking about quite a few recession measures. I think one of the important things to consider is the cost of these measures. Exactly how much is this going to cost the Government?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, this is hard to say, but the Kennedy administration has been very conscious of cost considerations. Now, for example, our unemployment compensation extension bill, the temporary unemployment compensation extension bill, that is going to cost about a billion dollars and that is a very substantial sum of money by anybody's reckoning. But we have imposed a tax on employers starting in 1963 to take care of the cost of that program.

So the Kennedy programs have been based upon realistic considerations and also based on sound fiscal responsibilities.

Question. But sir, if there is any increase in taxes at all, which you say will be necessary to finance these programs, is this a good measure in times of a recession, and won't this aggravate the economic situation?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Not necessarily. It depends on how you impose your tax. In this particular situation we are granting the benefits in the next 12 months, but we are postponing the tax for 2 years. In that way we think we have an ideal prescription. We meet the problems of the recession. We do not add to the tax burden at the same time. We hope by that time that we will have recovered from the recession and then it is appropriate to collect the taxes that will pay for the program that we put in during times of recession.

Question. Mr. Secretary, if local areas are willing to sacrifice, can't they solve most of their unemployment problem?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, local areas are doing a fine job. Take Scranton, Pa., for example. They have a great community effort. They have a great State effort in the State of Pennsylvania, headed by their fine Governor, Governor Lawrence, and Mr. Batt, their commissioner in this area. But this problem is more than a local problem. We need a working partnership between local government, National Government, community groups, labor people and management people to try and solve this problem.

Question. Since you cited the example of Scranton, Pa., couldn't other areas similar to this and in similar conditions solve this problem, thus making it not necessary for the Federal Government to intervene?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I wish they could. But the taxing powers which are basic, here, to a sound antirecession, and in fact a recovery program, have been really exhausted by many of the States and localities. They have reached the maximum power to tax. They are unable to cope with the magnitude of the problem which is becoming nationwide, by themselves.

Let me give you a figure: We have classified—I want to refer to the figure—101 major labor market areas of about 150, now, with a substantial labor surplus. This means that throughout the country, north, south, east, and west, we have a problem of substantial unemployment. And this means that we have a national responsibility as well as a State and local responsibility to deal with this subject.

Question. Mr. Secretary, don't you think it would be a great burden on many of our country's employers to pass a bill to raise wages and at the same time encourage them to hire more people?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, the amount of tax we have imposed for example for unemployment compensation is four-tenths of 1 percent additional tax. That is a very small tax. But because it is a small tax spread largely over all the employers in the country, we are able to raise a billion dollars, and a billion dollars is very important for the relief of people who have been unemployed many long periods. We have 1,800,000 people right now who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more.

Question. Well, don't you think it will be kind of a burden to ask them to raise the wages and then hire these other people and raise their wages to the same wages the other people working with them get?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Are you dealing now with our minimum wage law?

Question. Yes.

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, that is another subject. First we were dealing with taxes. On taxes we have imposed a very modest tax and we hope by the time that that tax takes effect we will have substantial business recovery in the country. If we do there will be an adequate profit base to take care of that tax.

Now on minimum wage, the studies of our Department indicate that when we raised the minimum wage last time in 1955, which took effect in 1956, we expanded employment opportunities rather than contracted unemployment opportunities. Now we think it adds up to improvement in the economy rather than retrogression in the economy.

Question. Mr. Goldberg, would you consider a 3 percent unemployment rate the normal rate, and would you work strongly to lower this rate?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I think 3 percent is a high rate of unemployment. It is hard for me to accept the concept that any man who wants to work should be denied the opportunity to do useful and fruitful work.

Now it is true that there will always be a certain margin of unemployment in the country. This is because we are a tremendous country, this is because some people will be changing their jobs, this will be because some factories will be adjusting their product, so I suppose, and this is a very reluctant admission for me to make, that we have to live with a certain amount of unemployment.

Now some countries believe that 2 percent is a high rate of unemployment. When the President mentioned 4 percent, and Mr. Heller, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, mentioned 4 percent, they were not talking about desirable goals, they were saying we immediately or in the near future have to move the rate of unemployment down from 6.9 to 4 percent as the first measure of our achievement. They were not saying that 4 percent was the ideal goal for unemployment. Four percent is too high an unemployment rate.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Secretary, at a recent news conference did you not use the figure 4 perdent, even though we would have a business upturn this year, the unemployment rate still would be 4 percent?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I said that unless Government, labor, and management did what they ought to do in this area, as I looked at the future employment and unemployment figures, I was very fearful that we would have several million jobs that we have to provide—about 7 million—and still leave the rate of unemployment at 4 percent. And I mention this, not as a desirable situation, but as pointing up the challenge of the problem that lies ahead.

Question. What percentage rate would you be satisfied with, of unemployment?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Personally?

I would like to see everybody who wants to work and has the capacity to work fruitfully employed and I would not like to deal with this in percentage terms. I don't like to play the numbers game.

Question. I mean practically, not ideally.

Secretary GOLDBERG. All I would say is that we ought to strive toward the goal of bringing down unemployment to normal cyclical unemployment and normal employment of transitional people in the work force.

I have mentioned that in some countries this is regarded to be 2 percent. Ours is a larger country and maybe there has to be a little more play in the joints. But I would certainly believe personally that 3 percent is the top rate in the area that we are discussing.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, shouldn't Government play only a position of leadership in solving our problems while management and labor supply the action?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No, I don't agree with that. I think the great action that has to be taken in the country is of course in the private sector of our economy. I have repeatedly said that the best answer to unemployment are jobs at decent American wages in private industry. But Government has a responsibility in this area as well as industry and labor and the responsibility was written into our Constitution and first in our preamble when we said we had to provide for the general welfare, and secondly in the powers of Congress. When Congress was empowered to tax, to promote the common defense and the general welfare of the United States.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in a recent 11-point proposal for migrant workers, one point was that a collective bargaining program be established for farm workers. How could this be done for this generation without further education and possible corruption?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, first of all I just testified yesterday on migrant farm labor. This is a sadly neglected area in our economy. These are the forgotten people of the country. They not only do not enjoy the benefits of collective bargaining, they often do not have adequate housing. They have inadequate education. They have inadequate health. They employ child labor. They do not have registration of contractors who deal in migrant labor. So that what we have to deal with first, since this is a sadly neglected area in our society, our first measure, and yesterday I appeared in support of first measures, but to see to it that on the farms no child works. I exempt from that family farms because the family environment protects against too much heavy labor and too much hazardous labor.

But I believe it ought to be a consensus in the United States as it is in industrial employment, that children less than 14 years of age do not work on the Nation's farms. We ought to house the migrant laborers adequately. We ought to see to it that a public group is created to watch over them. We ought to see to it that crew leaders do not

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

exploit them. We ought to see to their education.

These are what I regard to be priority measures in the area of migrant farm labor.

Question. Mr. Goldberg, could not the local, possibly the State, governments handle these problems that you have mentioned better than the Federal Government?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No, I don't think so, and as a matter of fact I have received letters from the States indicating that they need the help of the Federal Government in this area. For example, we have crew leaders. About nine States have enacted laws regulating crew leaders who recruit migrant labor. Six of the nine States have been in touch with me and they have said, "While we have regulated crew leaders, to evade our regulations crew leaders will take migrant labor to other States which do not regulate farm labor and protect them." So you see, since they move across States lines, the constitutional test of interstate commerce is fully met, and we have a national responsibility to see to it that these citizens are afforded real protection.

Question. How can the Federal Government move into this area which is obviously unorganized? The union representatives haven't even been able to unionize these workers. To have collective bargaining, you have to have this type of organization.

Secretary GOLDBERG. The Federal Government can move in by doing what they did for people when they enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act which originally some of the unions opposed.

The test for the Federal Government and for State governments is not whether unions support it or oppose it. The test is what is in the national interest and what is in the interests of people. The fact that unions either do or do not organize the migrant laborer does not excuse Government from its responsibility to provide minimal standards, just as we have in the Fair Labor Standards Act, for wages, for children, and so on in that area.

Now immediately in the migrant labor area we have not come to the wage problem. We are trying to deal with the elemental things: Health, hygiene, education, housing, crew leaders and matters of that type.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, at present under the Mexican labor program there are thousands of jobs on American farms being filled by Mexican citizens. Shouldn't Americans fill these jobs and therefore help to alleviate the farm problem?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I am now dealing with proposals on the Mexican farm labor program. One of the tests of the program, which is written into law and which will be written into the new law, is that domestic labor is not available to do the job. Only then do I and will I certify that foreign labor, Mexican labor, or labor from other countries is admissible for the purpose of doing farm labor.

Question. Mr. Secretary, getting back to domestic migratory laborers, after the season is over and they pick their crops, they are then, shall we say, dumped in northern cities: Baltimore, Buffalo, New York. Whose responsibility is that now, the Federal Government or the State or local?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Unfortunately under present laws this is the responsibility of local governments and you have correctly portrayed what happens. The average farm laborer of the migrant character works 100 to 130 to 170 days a year and then he has unemployment unless he is able to get employment in factories or other areas.

I think this problem, which is the problem of sending hundreds of thousands of people across State lines in interstate commerce, is a problem which commands national attention.

Question. Well, now if he doesn't get into other employment, Mr. Secretary—Senator WILLIAMS I think says he makes about $790 a year. That means he must with his family go on the local welfare rolls. Do you see any chance for the Federal Government giving more money to areas impacted with migratory workers? The welfare aspects?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Senator WILLIAMS has been one of our great leaders in the area of trying to protect migrant labor. As pointed out, this statistic that you mentioned, seven hundred and some dollars, we have to add to it and I am sure he would agree—he agreed with me yesterday when I testified—that they earn in nonfarm employment a few hundred dollars more. The total is about $930, but that can't support a family. So that is true that when we advance standards, despite the common conception we are always increasing costs, that does not necessarily follow, because we are not going to allow these people to starve. And so cost exists in one area or another. The best way to do it is to do what has been done in the distressed areas bill and the area redevelopment bill, where we are now making provisions to encourage the employment of rural labor as well as industrial labor.

Question. Mr. Goldberg, now that there are approximately five and a half or six million people unemployed and continually more being let off their job because of automation, how do you see that we can employ these people and what types of jobs do you think we can fit them in?

Secretary GOLDBERG. You have put your finger on a very important problem. I have estimated that next year we will have to create, if we have full employment, 10½ million jobs. I have estimated that even if we had 4 percent unemployment we would have to create 7 million jobs.

Now part of this is, we hope, the programs we have advanced already will help. We hope to create better opportunities for business so that private jobs can be created. And we are giving our continuing attention right now, the President and his advisers, to the whole question of whether or not the programs we have thus far advanced are adequate to realize our goal of reasonably full employment in the country.

Question. Mr. Secretary, are our present laws adequate to deal with the gangsterism and corruption in our labor unions?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, we have a new set of laws which was enacted about a year ago. It has been my philosophy first of all that laws don't solve all problems, any more than the Ten Commandments solved all of our moral problems in the country. Before I will be ready to go to the Congress for additional laws in this area, I want to study the laws that have already been entrusted to me. After I do so, if I am of the opinion as a Government official in charge of this area that existing laws are not adequate, I will not hesitate to go to the Congress for additional legislation.

Question. Mr. Secretary in relation to the Communist problem, why has it been necessary for the Federal Government to enact laws preventing members of the Communist Party to hold office in a labor union?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, because this has been the theory of the Federal Government, and I must say with considerable justification, that Communists do not enter labor unions for the purpose of really working in labor unions, but that they enter labor unions for the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Communist Party.

I have had some experience in this area, when I represented the CIO and participated in the expulsion of the Communist unions. And I must say there is considerable validity to this position of the Government.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, in a recent news story of last week it was rumored that Mr. Reuther is rather upset with the President, saying that he has paid far too much attention to foreign affairs and has not put enough attention on the domestic problems of job opportunities and the unemployed.

What answer would you have to that?

Secretary GOLDBERG. First of all it is highly natural and understandable that our President should at the moment be devoting his prime attention to the great questions of survival. This is the question which is involved in foreign affairs, but I must say in all fairness to the President and with due respect to my friend Walter Reuther, I have never had any difficulty going to the President and discussing with him important questions of domestic policy. I have just, 45 minutes ago, finished a 45-minute discussion with our President on the whole area of employment and unemployment.

Question. Sir, William Morton of the Federal Reserve Board said that productivity should be increased and the gain should be passed on to the consumer through lower prices rather than to the unions through—to labor through higher wages or management through higher prices. Don't you agree with this?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, I hope the consumer and labor and management benefits from our increased productivity. One of the things we must remember in the country always is that we believe in not a stationary standard of living but we believe in advancing our standard of living. And we have many people in the country who still do not enjoy an adequate standard of living.

Question. Mr. Secretary, here is a theoretical question—utopian one, I guess: We have Mr. Stevenson at the U.N. seeking peace, we have diplomats in Geneva seeking peace. If we did get peace and then a demobilization of the people in the Army, just how would they be absorbed in the labor movement?

Mr. BARBER. Excuse me. I am very sorry to tell you that we will not have a chance to hear the Secretary's answer because we are almost completely out of time. I am sorry, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary GOLDBERG. I am sorry, too, because this was a very good question, but after Korea we had full employment without a tremendous armament budget. I am confident we can achieve it.

Mr. BARBER. Now we will have a final word from our guest in just a moment after this very important message.

[Announcement.]

Mr. BARBER. Secretary Goldberg, thank you very much for being our guest.

Secretary GOLDBERG. It is a great pleasure and I ought to correct myself. I said "after" Korea to you, Tom. I meant before Korea. I am delighted to share these thoughts with you and this bears out that this is the most inquisitive and best informed panel that I have appeared before since I took my office.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, very much.

Farm Cost Prices as Compared to Prices Received for Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session, acting under authority granted by House Resolution 86, Representative HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, directed the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower to inquire into

the cost of farm production and to study the impact of the cost-price squeeze on American agriculture.

Since that time hearings have been held in Washington, in Memphis, Tenn., and in Sioux City, Iowa. On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, May 15, 16, and 17, the committee will hold additional hearings here in Washington to fill in the picture of the situation as outlined earlier by farmers and spokesmen for their organizations in all fields of agriculture.

That this inquiry is vital to American agriculture is evidenced not alone by the statement by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman that such a study is the most important facet to a solution of our agricultural problems but by the truly startling attendance of farmers at our field hearings. In Memphis the hearings had to be scheduled in the Memphis Civic Auditorium to provide for the large group who attended. In Sioux City, as in Memphis, many farmers had to file statements because of the large numbers waiting to counsel with the committee. At Memphis farmers from throughout the Midsouth were in attendance. In Sioux City the committee heard farmers and livestock men from Kansas, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Illinois, and in many other sections of the midwest Farm Belt.

Members of the subcommittee have worked diligently to gather the pertinent information on this vital problem. I wish to commend each of them for their vital contributions to this inquiry. Members of the committee are JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina; WATKINS M. ABBITT, of Virginia; CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas; FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, of Kentucky; HAROLD B. MCSWEEN, of Louisiana; CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California; DELBERT L. LATTA, of Ohio; PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois; BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota; and Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, of Puerto Rico. Chairman HAROLD COOLEY and Representative CHARLES HOEVEN, both as ex officio members, have made excellent contributions to the work of the subcommittee as have other members of the full committee. And, we have enjoyed the assistance of interested Members who are not assigned to the Committee on Agriculture but who recognize the vital aspects of the problem and the work underway.

We have employed the talents of the Honorable John Mac Smith, of West Memphis, Ark., who has served as the general counsel for the inquiry. He has worked long and hard at the task assigned the subcommittee by the Congress.

As a means of better acquainting Members with the scope of this study, at this point it is proper to place in the RECORD a copy of the memorandum submitted to the committee last March 14 by the general counsel, John Mac Smith.

Much information—not only statistical, but in the nature of human problems as presented by the farmers and their families—has been submitted to the committee. More information of great significance is expected at the additional hearings. From this great compilation of information and comment by farmers and agricultural interests, it will be the task of the subcommittee to bring forth to the House Committee on Agriculture, and through that committee to the Congress, those recommendations and proposals that will seek to counter this erosive impact of the cost-price squeeze on our farming families and the farming communities of the Nation:

MARCH 14, 1961.

Memorandum to: Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives; Hon. E. C. GATHINGS, chairman, Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives; Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives.

From: John Mac Smith, general counsel, Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives.

Subject: Investigation and survey relative to farm cost prices as compared to prices received for farm products.

Pursuant to your direction, I have made a preliminary study in regard to the survey and investigation relative to the above subject to be made by the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, and I am pleased to submit the results of that study to you.

I. AUTHORITY

A. The basic authority for the survey and investigation on the part of the subcommittee is House Resolution 86, 87th Congress, 1st session, which was agreed to February 9, 1961.

B. In addition, Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, has directed that the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, proceed immediately with the survey and investigation in order that a prompt but accurate report as to the conditions relative to the subject be submitted at the earliest practicable date so that appropriate action may be taken.

II. NEED FOR THE SURVEY AND INVESTIGATION

A. The consumer has a distorted understanding of farm income and farm conditions, which redounds to the detriment of the farmer.

1. By reason of information which has been furnished over recent years to the news media the farmer has been pictured day after day as constantly at the public trough, and the primary cause of the rise in the price of consumer goods.

Chairman COOLEY stated the condition accurately and succinctly in his remarks in the House of Representatives, 86th Congress, 2d session, on September 1, 1960, when he said that there had been over the years "a design and calculation to inflame consumers against farmers."

2. This misunderstanding as to the farm problem must be corrected, and the consumer must be apprised as to the true farm condition. Actually, the farmer isn't getting anything like his equitable share of the price which the consumer is paying, for example: the consumer pays approximately $3.94 for a broadcloth shirt, and of this amount the farmer receives 28 cents; thus, if the farmer gave the cotton for the shirt the consumer would still have to pay $3.66 for the shirt. (S.P. 119, Agricultural Extension Service, the University of Tennessee, August 1960.) This is only one example of the disparity in prices received by the farmer and prices paid by the consumer, and similar figures, can be furnished as to every article processed from a farm product, which the consumer purchases. Despite this fact, the consumer constantly reads, hears, and sees the farmer as the ward of a beneficent Government. It is believed the survey and investigation can do much to correct the false pictures of the farmer in the event the survey and investigation is thorough.

B. The true picture of the farm problem must be presented to Congress and the general public.

1. The real need, however, for the survey and investigation is to point out to Congress and to the general public the sorry plight of the farmer who is being crushed out of existence by the squeeze between rising cost prices and falling prices for the products which he produces. I quote from a few of the letters and telegrams which Representative GATHINGS has received since the publication of news items in regard to the investigation of farm machinery costs.

"Unless we have help like you are going to give us, in 3 more years the farmers will begin to fall by the wayside like a bunch of flies in a DDT bomb.

"This section of the United States is very dependent on farming and this action is long overdue. As you well know, the cost-price squeeze has been working us over. If some of it can be alleviated through this investigation, then you have certainly performed a great service for this section as well as the country as a whole.

"This investigation is long overdue, and I hope and pray your committee will not only get the true facts, but better still will find some solution to a very serious problem affecting (farm machinery) dealers and the farmers they serve."

"I think the investigation of farm machinery, spare parts, and maintenance is justified and you are to be commended for pushing it."

"The cotton farmers of the State and Nation * * * most interested in your attempt to lower cost of machinery. Not many years ago 10 bales of cotton would buy one heavy-duty farm tractor, and it now takes 40 bales of cotton."

"I know 15,000 to 20,000 people directly and indirectly who make their living farming and these farmers are trying to hold up a great burden by paying $10,000 for a combine and $20,000 for a cottonpicker. What is very alarming to me is that some of our best farmers are giving up and hoping that they can get someone else to rent their land. If prices keep going up as they have been, the whole situation is in danger of collapse and will fall in on top of labor and the manufacturers."

2. The economic position of the American farmer is tragic when it is noted that his net income has dropped from $17.3 billion in 1947 to $11.6 billion in 1960, which is an income reduction of more than 30 percent. It cannot be argued that the 1960 recession was in anywise responsible for this miserable condition for the farmer received even less in 1959, that figure being $11.3 billion (Economic Report of the President, January 1961).

What was happening to the cost prices of the farmer while the price he was receiving for his products was plummeting to new lows? Between the years 1946 and 1960 the farmer's cost for farm machinery more than doubled; his cost for motor vehicles increased 87 percent; the cost of fertilizer increased 25 percent; and his interest, taxes and wage rates increased 45 percent ("Agricultural Prices." U.S. Department of Agriculture, Oct. 15, 1960).

3. Unless the farm income is increased or the farm costs are reduced, the future of a large segment of our society is confronted with immediate tragedy.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

III. WHAT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED BY THE SURVEY AND INVESTIGATION

A. A forum will be offered to the farmer and the manufacturer.

1. The farmer will be given an opportunity to tell his own story. This is a story of pathos, a story when told by the farmer rather than by someone for him, will appeal to the spirit of fairness and equity which have always been characteristic of the American people. When a true word picture is painted by the farmer himself it is entirely possible that prejudice on the part of the consumer will, to say the least, be dissipated.

2. The manufacturer likewise has a story to tell, for he has been beset by increasing costs. However, he has had the means by the use of public relation experts and paid advertisement to tell his story to the public. Regardless of this, he should be made welcome to tell his story before the subcommittee with the same degree of welcome as will be extended to the farmer.

It is possible, although not probable, that the manufacturer may come to the conclusion he is pricing himself out of the farm market, and should make some concessions as to price relative to the articles he is selling to the public. This hope is based upon the fact that the two largest farm machinery manufacturers showed a substantial decrease as to earnings in 1960 by comparison to the 1959 earnings, as follows:

	Per share
International Harvester:	
9 months, July 1959	$4.12
9 months, July 1960	2.51
Estimated earnings in 1960	3.25
Deere & Co.:	
9 months, July 1959	5.99
9 months, July 1960	1.33
Estimated earnings in 1960	2.45

3. Congress will be furnished an accurate and complete report upon the plight of the American farmer in order that its membership may take such action as may be deemed appropriate to remedy this situation.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The cooperation on the part of the executive branch of the Government should be requested. A copy of this memorandum may be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture in order that he will be advised as to the intended survey and investigation.

B. Preliminary hearings should be held in the farm areas.

1. It is suggested that a hearing be arranged in the cotton section, preferably Memphis, Tenn., and also a hearing be arranged in the grain section, preferably Sioux City, Iowa.

2. These local hearings should attract numerous farmers who are unable to come to Washington for hearings. The local witnesses who have an important statement upon the subject of the investigation could then be invited to the hearings in Washington.

C. Manufacturers and processors should be contacted.

1. Manufacturers and processers of farm machinery and other products used by the farmer should be contacted and their story obtained. It is believed these companies will send representatives to Washington, if representatives are not here on a permanent basis, for informal discussion, thus eliminating the expense of trips for this purpose. Representatives of these firms should be invited to the Washington hearings.

D. Government and other lending agencies should be contacted.

1. It is believed that a substantial portion of the credit extended to farmers is extended by Government lending agencies. As indicated the rise in interest is an important cost factor to the farmer, and these agencies will, no doubt, be willing to cooperate.

2. Insurance companies and other companies making mortgage loans to farmers should be contacted in order that interest costs to the farmer may be explored.

E. Farmers' organizations should be contacted.

1. The Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, National Grange and other farm organizations should be fully advised and their assistance requested.

V. CONCLUSION

This memorandum, as above stated, is preliminary as to nature, and as the survey investigation proceeds additional memorandums will be furnished.

White Paper on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the State Department white paper was summarized in a recent newspaper article which is here included as a condensation:

UNITED STATES PUTS CUBA IN RED BLOC

(By Robert Young)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The United States today designated Cuba a member of the Communist bloc and declared that the government of Premier Fidel Castro has taken on aspects of the Hitler and Mussolini dictatorships.

The State Department said it appears that Castro considers Cuba "further along the Communist road" than some of the other countries in the bloc dominated by Russia and Red China.

The Department issued a long statement in response to Castro's May Day actions proclaiming Cuba a Socialist state, abolishing elections and clamping new restrictions on the Roman Catholic Church.

ON WAY A LONG TIME

The Department said Castro's planting Cuba solidly in the sphere of international communism should come as no surprise because Castro has been heading into the open embrace of the Sino-Soviet bloc for some time.

The statement, made public by Lincoln White, State Department press officer, advised the American people not to be confused by Castro's use of the word "Socialist" rather than "Communist" in describing Cuba's form of government.

The Department noted that only Russia and Czechoslovakia call themselves Socialist republics in this stage of their projected development toward communism, whereas the other satellite countries in the Communist bloc, including Red China, describe themselves as people's republics.

TRAGIC FOR CUBAN CITIZEN

"It would therefore appear," the statement said, "that Castro considers Cuba farther along the Communist road than some of the other countries in the bloc."

In reference to Castro's declaration that Cuba was abandoning the free elections he had promised in favor of people's mass meetings, the State Department commented that the Cuban citizen under the Castro regime is in really a tragic situation. Even Russia has so-called elections, although there is no real choice among candidates, the statement continued, so again Castro seems to have gone the other members of the Communist bloc one better.

"The Cuban has but one choice; namely, to say 'si,' and even that not in a duly-constituted election but in a contrived mass meeting," the Department said.

A SHRUG MIGHT BE DEATH

"The average Cuban is in trouble if he so much as shrugs his shoulders. He is in real trouble—he can be put in jail or put to death—if he says 'no'."

The State Department asserted that Castro's election-substitute, mass meetings, "sound very much like Hitler and Mussolini's mass gatherings."

The Department quoted Jose Marti, Cuba's 19th century "George Washington," as warning that the socialist idea is dangerous in two ways.

Marti, a Cuban national hero, said socialism introduces a "confused foreign doctrine" and permits ambitious men to rise in the world, "to stand above the crowd by faking arrogance and fury and by pretending to be impassioned defenders of the underprivileged."

My concern is not in criticizing the findings which appeared to be accurate, but the fact that this report is many days, if not weeks or months, late in being released. Indeed, the American people, I feel sure, had reached these conclusions long ago, and now the State Department assessment so belated is almost comical in its pronouncements. It would be comical if it were not so tragic, our conduct as Cuba went communistic. The tragedy is in two parts. First, that American lives and property were taken and the United States did nothing to protect them. Such protection is clearly within our rights, and the failure to act becomes patently an admission of weakness, vascillation, and indecision in the eyes of our neighbors in the world. No one, then, would have contested our right to invade Cuba, as we have done some 30 times in Latin America to protect our citizens against the threat of loss of life or property. The tragedy was our failure to act immediately when we clearly had the right.

Second, the tragedy is compounded and made the grounds for additional loss of life and property by our second failure to act to prevent a greater Communist buildup in Cuba. Why, oh why, does our Government let the precious hours and days slip away while Castro beefs up Cuba's military might for the showdown which most assuredly will come and most assuredly must and will be lead by the United States.

I, for one, am appalled at our failure to act, and over the condoning of our mistakes and/or our inability to learn from our mistakes which results from our alleged bipartisan harmony to show the world a unity of purpose. My undying belief is that the United States should protect by force of arms when necessary the lives of her citizens and their property when jeopardized unfairly and illegally by any other nation. I shall never agree to a weak and supine policy underlying our foreign aid and our foreign relations as they exist today. It is late, but I suggest and I pray that it is not too late for tough action, not just

tough talk. We must tell the world our terms in maintaining freedom and justice and peace. Terms which preclude Communist subversion and our pronouncements firm and clear should be overtly backed up by military power and our willingness to use our armed strength. Only as we get tough can we prevent world war III. A weaker policy will surely bring on the holocaust.

While I am just one voice, I am sure a majority of the American people would rather risk their lives now than to invite Communist enslavement by appeasement. The showdown is approaching. Every American citizen and every nation must now go through an agonizing reappraisal, freedom or slavery, if communism's total conquest of the world is to be stopped in its tracks and driven back.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who turneth Thy face toward those who work Thy will in the world, as on yet another day we take anew the cup of our freedom, crimsoned with great cost, may we be gratefully mindful of its sacred meaning. As those lifted to pedestals of public office, may we be reverent in its use. Make more worthy in faith and uprightness the hands of those who hold it high in trust for all.

Keep us faithful when others falter; keep us still pursuing when others give up the quest; keep us hopeful when our fairest dreams seem as but mocking mirages of the desert; keep our integrity unsullied when the siren songs of selfish expediency assail our ears, as we labor on with valor for the enthronement on earth of Thy reign of law and love, of equity and righteousness, nor ever doubt the final triumph of Thy redemptive purposes for all men.

We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 8, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1961, RELATING TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— (H. DOC. NO. 159)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization in the Federal Trade Commission.

This Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961 follows upon my message of April 13, 1961 to the Congress of the United States. It is believed that the taking effect of the reorganizations included in this plan will provide for greater efficiency in the dispatch of the business of the Federal Trade Commission.

The plan provides for greater flexibility in the handling of the business before the Commission, permitting its disposition at different levels so as better to promote its efficient dispatch. Thus, matters both of an adjudicatory and regulatory nature may, depending upon their importance and their complexity, be finally consummated by divisions of the Commission, individual Commissioners, hearing examiners, and, subject to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 241), by other employees. This will relieve the Commissioners from the necessity of dealing with many matters of lesser importance and thus conserve their time for the consideration of major matters of policy and planning. There is, however, reserved to the Commission as a whole the right to review any such decision, report or certification either upon its own initiative or upon the petition of a party or intervenor demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Commission the desirability of having the matter reviewed at the top level.

Provision is also made, in order to maintain the fundamental bipartisan concept explicit in the basic statute creating the Commission, for mandatory review of any such decision, report or certification upon the vote of a majority of the Commission less one member.

Inasmuch as the assignment of delegated functions in particular cases and with reference to particular problems to divisions of the Commission, to Commissioners, to hearing examiners, to employees and boards of employees must require continuous and flexible handling, depending both upon the amount and nature of the business, that function is placed in the Chairman by section 2 of the plan.

By providing sound organizational arrangements, the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the accompanying reorganization plan will make possible more economical and expeditious administration of the affected functions. It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1961.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Elmer W. Disspayne, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the Middle District of Tennessee, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Flood Control-Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, the American Legion, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial report of the organization, as of December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON PERSONAL AND REAL PROPERTY RECEIVED BY STATE SURPLUS PROPERTY AGENCIES FOR DISTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personal and real property received by State Surplus Property Agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organization, for the period January 1, through March 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ELIMINATION OF RIGHT OF APPEAL FROM SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO TO COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate the right of appeal from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico to the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered, granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Mineral Wells, Tex., relating to administrative procedures before regional directors of the Department of Labor, under the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point House Concurrent Resolution 11 adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, April 10, 1961, and congratulating Robert E. Hansen, of South St. Paul, presently national senior vice commander in Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Mr. President, Mr. Hansen is a very respected and esteemed friend of many years and one whose selection for high office in this great national organization of veterans has been a source of keen pleasure and pride on the part of his many friends in Minnesota and throughout the country.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11

Concurrent resolution expressing appreciation to the Veterans of Foreign Wars for selecting Minneapolis and St. Paul as its 1962 convention site; and congratulating Robert E. Hansen, who is to be installed as national commander in chief of the organization

Whereas the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is scheduled, for the first time in the history of the organization, to be held in Minneapolis and St. Paul during the week of August 10 to August 17, 1962; and

Whereas it is estimated that approximately 35,000 members from every State in the Nation will be in attendance at this convention; and

Whereas Robert E. Hansen, South St. Paul, Minn., former past department of Minnesota commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and presently national senior vice commander and chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars will be in command as national commander in chief during the aforementioned convention: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the Legislature of the State of Minnesota hereby expresses appreciation to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for selecting Minneapolis and St. Paul as the 1962 convention site; and be it further

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That Mr. Robert E. Hansen is hereby congratulated and commended for having attained national prominence as the first Minnesota member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be selected as national commander in chief; and be it further

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring therein), That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Veterans of Foreign Wars national headquarters in Washington, D.C., to Mr. Robert E. Hansen, and to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, department of Minnesota.

E. J. CHILGREN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
KARL F. ROLVAAG,
President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives April 10, 1961.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Passed the senate, April 12, 1961.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SAMOAN LEGISLATURE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, by Senate Resolution 330, 86th Congress, the Senate directed the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make a study of conditions in American, or Eastern, Samoa. This strategic area, the only American territory south of the equator, has been under our flag for 60 years, and while we have accomplished a great deal, there yet remains much to be done.

On behalf of the committee, Senator OREN E. LONG, of Hawaii, agreed to head a study group to Samoa, and in December of last year visited the islands and made an extensive on-the-spot survey and study. So highly do the people of Eastern Samoa think of the efforts of the able junior Senator from Hawaii that their popularly elected legislature has enacted a formal concurrent resolution expressing the gratitude of the people for his visit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution of the Seventh Samoan Legislature appear in the RECORD as it was transmitted to the committee.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15

Concurrent resolution offering the thanks of the people of American Samoa to Senator OREN E. LONG, of Hawaii, for his efforts on their behalf

Whereas Senator OREN E. LONG, of Hawaii, has given instinctively of his time and energy as a member of the U.S. Senate, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and its Territories Subcommittee, on behalf of the people of American Samoa; and

Whereas Senator LONG has shown his interest and concern for American Samoa during his recent official trip to Samoa and the investigations and studies of the problems of American Samoa in connection therewith which he initiated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Seventh Legislature of American Samoa (the Senate concurring), That the people of American Samoa, acting through their legislature, extend their heartfelt gratitude to Senator OREN E. LONG for his untiring efforts on their behalf, including his efforts to seek the enactment of congressional legislation which would permit American Samoa to be represented in the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress by a nonvoting delegate; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution shall be sent to the Honorable OREN E. LONG, U.S. Senator from Hawaii.

RAPI SOTOA,
President of the Senate
MUAGUTUTI'A F. TUIA,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Council of the City of Rochester, and the Common Council of the City of Yonkers, both of the State of New York, have adopted resolutions favoring the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 61–33

Resolution by Council of City of Rochester, N.Y.

Whereas problems facing urban communities all across our Nation are becoming larger and more pronounced; and

Whereas two-thirds of our Nation's population now reside in urban communities and are in desperate need of a strong spokesman of the highest Cabinet rank and authority as has been the case for farmers, business and commercial people, and labor for many years; and

Whereas this council recognizes the necessity for strong, vigorous and healthy local governments, yet fully realizes the urgent

desirability of seeking better solutions to the many complex problems of today's urban living; and

Whereas it would be definitely advantageous to all municipalities if they had a central place to turn to for leadership and coordination of the various Federal activities affecting cities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this council enthusiastically endorse in principle the proposed Federal legislation now, or soon to be, before the Congress of the United States which would establish a Federal Department of Urban Affairs; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our area congressional Representatives and the two U.S. Senators from New York State.

RESOLUTION 286–1961

Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Yonkers

Resolved, That this common council endorses the recent recommendation by President Kennedy to the Congress that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing be created and raised at the same time to Cabinet level. It appears that at present approximately 70 percent of our national population resides in urban areas and with the continuing trend to the cities many serious problems have resulted, to which Yonkers is no exception—such as the deterioration of central business areas, the growth of slums and simultaneous decrease in adequate and decent housing, the decline in transit and transportation facilities, the squeeze in education caused primarily by the lack of funds, the developing shortage in parks and recreational facilities and finally the question of air and water pollution. It would seem to be advisable for a single agency to treat with all of these difficulties on a national scale so that their solution may be ultimately achieved through active cooperation and leadership.

It is requested that a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the city clerk to both of our U.S. Senators and to our Congressman urging them to fully support the recommendation by the President.

RESOLUTIONS OF YOUNG PEOPLE OF THE CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE IN UPSTATE NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the young people of the Church of the Nazarene in upstate New York, protesting against the sale of pornographic literature, the increasing propaganda of the liquor industry, and all forms of gambling, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE YOUNG PEOPLE OF THE CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE IN UPSTATE NEW YORK

Jesus said, "Ye are the salt of the earth." We believe this is His directive that, we as Nazarene young people, should exert every effort to instill Christian influence and morality into the society in which we live, thus to preserve it, and give it a spiritual flavor pleasing to Him.

We believe that we have a very great responsibility to those who live in our communities, to our civil authorities, to our State and Christian heritages, and to our descendants, that we must protest and work to destroy all manner of moral evil and commend and cooperate with every force that promotes moral integrity.

We further believe that society can be changed only as human nature is changed individually, and this by the saving grace of Jesus Christ, and that our first responsibility is to witness to the redeeming grace of our Lord Jesus Christ. However, we cannot turn away indifferently from a concern for the moral climate around us and from our obligation to help make our society a better and safer place in which to live.

Whereas our communities today are being victimized by those who seek financial gain in trafficking in moral evil, appealing to man's worst nature, and whereas there are many movements afoot which we believe would lead to eventual spiritual, moral, and national decay; Be it

Resolved:

1. That we protest the sale of pornographic literature in our respective communities and that we encourage and cooperate with our local authorities in enforcing Section 1141, et seq., of the New York State Penal Law;

2. That we protest the increasing propaganda of the liquor industry through the existing forms of mass media, and especially the sale of alcoholic beverages to young people under 21 years of age;

3. That we protest all forms of gambling, lewdness, violence and dishonesty, and encourage and cooperate with our local authorities in bringing about a lawful end of all such forms of immorality; and

Whereas we recognize the Christian responsibility to pray for, support and cooperate with our governmental officials; be it

Resolved:

4. That we encourage our societies to regularly and sincerely pray for our civil leaders and that realizing the heavy burdens that rest upon their shoulders and the far-reaching effects of their decisions, we especially ask our societies to pray for our President, John F. Kennedy and our Governor, Nelson A. Rockefeller;

5. That we commend President John F. Kennedy in his recent forthright stand in support of our constitutional guarantees of religious freedom and the separation of church and state;

6. That we commend the overall efforts and ask for the continuation of the House Un-American Activities Committee in their endeavor to investigate and ferret out subversiveness and preserve our American freedoms under authorization and power contained in Public Law 01, 79th Congress;

7. That we recognize the holiness and sovereignty of God, that He has a divine purpose for all men, that He is vitally interested in the affairs of the state and that we seek to promote individual and national repentance that will renew our faith in Him who is able to put to flight the enemy and deliver us from evil; and

8. That we encourage our Christian young people to enter fields of public service, and that in the tradition of Daniel, they bring a godly witness into government.

Rev. ROY E. CARNAHAN,
Chairman.

Rev. CARL BAKER,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF YONKERS' COMMON COUNCIL IN SUPPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the cities of the United States are at the present time facing very serious problems. Some of these problems can best be handled at the levels of State or local government, but others undoubtedly must receive the attention of the Federal Government.

In recognition of that fact, the Federal Government already has undertaken a number of programs granting financial and planning assistance to urban communities. A major difficulty in administration of these programs has been that so far they have not been unified under the leadership of a single department with representation at the top level of government.

My bill, S. 289, and several similar bills introduced this year into both bodies, would establish this much-needed Department.

I was very pleased to learn that the Common Council of the City of Yonkers has passed a resolution endorsing this proposal.

The action of the common council gave me particular satisfaction, because Yonkers, while a large and important city in my State, is not one of the major metropolitan political divisions that are usually identified with this proposed new Department.

The Common Council of Yonkers has indicated its realization that problems of community development stretch far beyond the limits of the few recognized big cities in the United States, and that the new Department that I have proposed will not serve the major metropolitan concentrations alone.

I, therefore, request unanimous consent that Resolution 286–1961 of the Common Council of the City of Yonkers be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 286–1961

Resolved, That this common council endorses the recent recommendation by President Kennedy to the Congress that a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing be created and raised at the same time to Cabinet level. It appears that at present approximately 70 percent of our national population resides in urban areas and with the continuing trend to the cities many serious problems have resulted, to which Yonkers is no exception—such as the deterioration of central business areas, the growth of slums and simultaneous decrease in adequate and decent housing, the decline in transit and transportation facilities, the squeeze in education caused primarily by the lack of funds, the developing shortage in parks and recreational facilities, and finally the question of air and water pollution. It would seem to be advisable for a single agency to treat with all of these difficulties on a national scale so that their solution may be ultimately achieved through active cooperation and leadership.

It is requested that a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the city clerk to both of our U.S. Senators and to our Congressman urging them to fully support the recommendation by the President.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 201. A bill to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land (Rept. No. 206).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 104. A bill to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with re-

spect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico (Rept. No. 205).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1719. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code with respect to Indian reservation roads (Rept. No. 213); and

H.R. 2195. An act to convey certain land of the Pala Band of Indians to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corp. (Rept. No. 212).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 322. A bill to make certain funds available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho (Rept. No. 207);

S. 507. A bill to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinaielt Tribe (Rept. No. 210); and

S. 751. A bill to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act (Rept. No. 208).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 870. A bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act to extend Federal supervision of the Menominee Indian Tribe, and provide necessary assistance, to enable such tribe to make an orderly transition to its status after such supervision ends (Rept. No. 209); and

S. 1208. A bill to amend Public Law 86-506, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960 (Rept. No. 211).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walworth Barbour, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Israel;

Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Morocco;

A. S. J. Carnahan, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Sierra Leone;

Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be the representative of the United States of America to the ninth session of the Economic Commission for Latin America of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; and

David H. Popper, of New York, and sundry other officers, for appointment and promotion in the diplomatic and Foreign Service.

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Commerce:

Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, of Minnesota, to be U.S. commissioner for the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition, now known as Century 21 Exposition.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1823. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the construction of a dam on the Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1824. A bill to create an additional judicial district for the State of Florida, to be known as the Middle District of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1825. A bill for the relief of Dr. Constantine Velesiotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 1826. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to provide a minimum support price for the 1961 crop of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1827. A bill to provide for more meaningful assistance in the development of Latin America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. GORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND (by request):

S. 1828. A bill to provide for investment of the civil service retirement and disability fund, for appropriations to such fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1829. A bill to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Leif J. Sverdrup, U.S. Army Reserve (retired), to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S.J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

TIME FOR HOLDING NATIONAL CONVENTIONS FOR NOMINATIONS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. KEATING submitted a resolution (S. Res. 141) to express the sense of the Senate on time for holding national conventions for nominations of President and Vice President, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. KEATING, which appears under a separate heading.)

MINIMUM SUPPORT PRICE FOR 1961 WHEAT CROP

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleagues on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and myself I wish to address the Senate briefly in connection with a situation concerning the wheat farmers of America.

It is our opinion that the "forgotten man" of the new administration seems to be the American wheatgrower.

In recent weeks, price supports for the 1961 corn crop have been increased from $1.06 per bushel to $1.20 by an act of Congress. The Secretary of Agriculture has, in addition, used his discretionary powers to order substantial increases in 1961 crop supports for such nonbasic commodities as dairy products, oats, barley, rye, grain sorghums, soybeans, flax, and honey to name a few.

Although there were rumors that wheatgrowers would receive similar consideration as the beginning of the 1961 corp season draws near and nothing has been done by the Secretary of Agriculture to assure the Nation's 1.5 million wheatgrowers of an improved price support adjustment for their 1961 crop. Wheat price supports for 1961 crop wheat were tentatively set at 75 percent of parity, or $1.78 per bushel national average, by the preceding administration. The present Secretary of Agriculture cannot lower this figure but he can, however, increase it by a mere stroke of his pen just as he has increased the levels of price support for some other farm commodities previously mentioned.

In the absence of constructive action by the administration, I am today introducing proposed legislation which would set wheat price supports at not less than $2 per bushel for the 1961 wheat crop. This would represent a percentage increase in support price about equal to that which has been provided for most of the other commodities. For instance it would increase the wheat support level from 75 percent of parity to a minimum of 83.7 percent of parity which is an increase of 8.7 percent. Corn was increased by congressional action from 65 percent of parity to 74.1 percent of parity or an increase of 9.1 percent. Soybeans by action of the Secretary was increased from 64 percent of parity to 79.3 percent of parity or an increase of 15.3 percent of parity price support. The soybean farmer has been immeasurably better off in our area of the country than has the wheat farmer. Therefore I feel that the support price for wheat for the 1961 wheat crop should receive similar treatment in the interests of equity.

It will be recalled that in 1956, President Eisenhower ordered an increase in wheat price supports to $2 per bushel as a means of bolstering farm income until a long-range farm program could be enacted. Today we are virtually in the same position. Congress has before it a long-range farm program which could not apply to any year earlier than the 1962 and subsequent wheat crops. However wheatgrowers need further price and income protection now, in the year 1961.

This is the only way in which they can get that increase in income.

Furthermore there are persistent indications that Congress might approve some version of the domestic parity wheat program under which the farmer would presumably receive 90 percent of parity for that portion of the 1962 crop wheat utilized for food purposes in the United States or a price of about $2.15 per bushel for approximately 600 million bushels of wheat.

What would this mean if either Congress or the Secretary does not now take action to increase the price support on 1961 wheat to at least $2 per bushel? Flour millers and processors, knowing they would have to pay $2.15 or thereabouts per bushel for 1962 crop wheat would certainly buy ahead against the 1961 crop support rate of only $1.78 as much wheat for 1962 needs as they could finance and store. This could be a tremendous quantity—a figure that could conceivably run to 200 or 300 millions of bushels. Such action would make it most difficult if not impossible for any new wheat program designed to improve the supply and demand relationship to get off to a successful start in 1962. Clearly an interim increase in wheat price supports is needed for 1961 as a means of insuring a smooth transition from the present wheat program to any new program which the Congress might enact and which could not become effective until 1962. It is my sincere hope that the administration will either give its support to the wheat price support adjustment bill which I am proposing or else exercise its authority to raise wheat price supports by executive action to at least $2 per bushel for the 1961 crop.

Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and myself, I introduce the bill, for appropriate reference, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1826) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to provide a minimum support price for the 1961 crop of wheat, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by inserting after subsection (d) thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the 1961 crop of wheat shall be supported, in the case of cooperators, at a price not less than $2.00 per bushel."

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President I am pleased to be associated with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in the introduction of a bill which would raise the price supports for wheat to not less than $2 a bushel. As has been said, all the farmers under the price-support program have had their price supports increased in recent months. That is true of corn, and all the feed grains, dairy products, and soybeans. The price support for wheat now is lower than it has been in the past 10 years or more. This comes at a time when the cost of operation to the wheat farmer is at the highest point it has ever been.

In addition, wheat producers are subjected to the toughest kind of production controls. It is possible that production controls will be even tougher in the next year. This is not the time to reduce price supports, but is a time when they must be increased if the farmers are to survive financially. I believe it is only fair that the wheat farmer be given at least the same treatment that the other producers have been given.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota is exactly correct in pointing out that the level of $2 a bushel for wheat set in 1956, by Executive order of President Eisenhower, in 1961, for the same amount of wheat, nets the wheat farmer less this year because the costs of operation have gone up, the inflationary fires have continued to burn, and the inflationary wave has increased costs. Therefore the farmer will actually be making less in 1961 at $2 a bushel than he was making 5 years ago.

The bill is designed to give authority to the Secretary of Agriculture in specifically providing:

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the 1961 crop of wheat shall be supported, in the case of cooperators, at a price not less than $2 per bushel.

It is my hope that if the bill is passed, it having been introduced as an expression of the sentiment of the wheat area, the Secretary of Agriculture will set the minimum price at more than $2 a bushel but certainly not less than $2 a bushel.

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and 43 other Senators, I introduce a joint resolution to establish an American Indian Day.

Last year I received a letter from a 7-year-old girl, Lynn Michaelson of 33-50 74th Street, Jackson Heights, Queens, N.Y. In pencil, she wrote:

Why don't we have a day called Indian Day as a national holiday? We should have that day because we shouldn't forget the poor Indian who used to live on this land. We have Columbus Day and Washington's Birthday and even Mother's Day. Why don't we honor the Indians because we took their land away? Let's have the day during a school week.

As a result of that letter, I decided to introduce a joint resolution calling on the President to proclaim American Indian Day on the fourth Friday in September of every year, to coincide with traditional Indian festivals held in many States. I introduced the resolution late in the session last year with 28 other Senators as cosponsors. Since then, I have received from the Y-Indian guides of the YMCA petitions signed by more than 2,000 schoolchildren from 22 States urging enactment of the joint resolution. Many other national organizations have expressed their support.

I am delighted that public schoolchildren are aware of the indelible imprint the American Indian has made on our national character and culture. Lynn Michaelson's solicitude toward the American Indian should be shared by all of us. It is my hope that an annual celebration of American Indian Day will focus the public's attention on the cultural, social and educational growth of the American Indian and that it will remind us to treat the American Indian with more respect and equality and to make sure that his rights are not abused again.

The 43 other Senators who are joining me in cosponsoring the joint resolution are: Senators ALLOTT, BENNETT, BURDICK, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CAPEHART, CARROLL, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, CURTIS, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, ERVIN, FONG, GOLDWATER, GRUENING, HART, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, KEATING, KEFAUVER, KERR, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, McGEE, METCALF, MONRONEY, MOSS, MUNDT, NEUBERGER, PELL, SCHOEPPEL, SYMINGTON, THURMOND, WILEY, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

I think it is perhaps almost as important as the joint resolution itself that we do pay attention to letters, and I hope very seriously that people thereby will be encouraged to write.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution be appended to my remarks, together with the names of the distinguished Senators of both parties who sponsor it. I send the joint resolution to the desk for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, together with the names of those sponsoring it.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 84) to establish the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Senators ALLOTT, BENNETT, BURDICK, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CAPEHART, CARROLL, CASE of New Jersey, CASE of South Dakota, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, CURTIS, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, ERVIN, FONG, GOLDWATER, GRUENING, HART, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, KEATING, KEFAUVER, KERR, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, McGEE, METCALF, MONRONEY, MOSS, MUNDT, NEUBERGER, PELL, SCHOEPPEL, SYMINGTON, THURMOND, WILEY, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and or-

dered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American Indian is the original American and has resided on this continent since time immemorial; and

Whereas he has made an indelible imprint on our national character and culture, and history is replete with names and deeds of many outstanding American Indians who have contributed immeasurably to our way of life, our moral standards, and our love of nature; and

Whereas Indian woods and water lore, arts and handicraft are basic in the manuals of the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, Y-Indian Guides of Young Men's Christian Association, and the many other American patriotism-building youth groups, while outdoor enthusiasts, young and old, all over the world, rely on Indian folkways for guidance and inspiration; and

Whereas the American Indian has made such other outstanding contributions to our American economy as the cultivation of corn, cotton, tobacco, beans, squash, tomatoes, peanuts, and melons, which have today become basic American industries; and

Whereas a number of States celebrate "Indian Days" in September when traditional Indian festivals are held in recognition of the contributions the American Indian has made to our national life; and

Whereas the special responsibility of the Federal Government for the American Indian makes national recognition particularly fitting: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the fourth Friday in September of every year is designated as American Indian Day, and the President of the United States is authorized and directed to issue annually a proclamation setting aside that day as a public occasion and inviting the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies.

THE TIMING OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee is about to begin hearings on a number of bills relating to the holding of Federal elections.

As is always the case, after any national campaign, a number of proposals are put forth to make our electoral system work more effectively.

I am particularly interested in the timing of campaigns. I have already introduced a bill calling for the holding of Federal elections on 2 days in order to increase voter turnout. In another and somewhat related area, I am much in sympathy with the suggestion put forth by President Eisenhower that Presidential inaugurations be moved back in order that the new President will have time to prepare his program and budget before the Congress convenes. This would, of course, involve an amendment to the Constitution.

Today, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution relating not to the timing of the inauguration and election, but to the timing of political campaigns.

It is rather widely agreed that there is a certain diminishing return in permitting a political campaign to be extended over too long a period. With modern mass communications and rapid transportation, candidates can reach and appeal to voters more easily than ever before.

There is, therefore, a real danger of overexposure if campaigns are so long that arguments become repetitious and voters lose interest. One simple, partial solution to this problem would be to hold the national political nominating conventions somewhat later in the year. The resolution which I introduce today expresses the sense of the Senate that nominating conventions should be held after Labor Day, instead of in July and August as is the present practice.

I think it is entirely appropriate that the Senate, which represents all of the States equally, should agree to a policy statement on the scheduling of political conventions, although for all other purposes conventions are not directly under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 141) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas rapid communications and mass transportation today enable candidates for President and Vice President to reach voters more easily and expeditiously than was formerly possible; and

Whereas the practice of holding political nominating conventions for selection of candidates for President and Vice President during the summer months has resulted in prolonging presidential election campaigns beyond the time needed to reach and appeal to the national electorate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the conventions held by the political parties for the purpose of nominating candidates for President and Vice President should not be commenced prior to the first Monday in September of the year in which the election is to be held.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MILLER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1215) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON FEDERAL-STATE WATER RIGHTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I announce, for the information of the Senate, that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has scheduled an informative hearing on the important subject of Federal-State water rights for Thursday, June 15, at 10 a.m., in the committee hearing room.

I would also like to announce that June 22 and 23 have been set aside as dates for hearings by the committee on Senate Resolution 105, to create a Special Committee on National Fuels Study. This bill has generated a great deal of interest, and I am sure that Senators will be happy to learn of the hearing. Those who wish to testify may do so by contacting committee staff.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

R. Ben Hosler, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal, for the northern district of Ohio, for a term of 4 years, vice Xavier North, deceased; and

Elmer W. Disspayne, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Tennessee, vice Herbert E. Patrick.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, May 16, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. THURMOND:

Remarks by him in regard to inspection of the Combined Arms School of the 7th Army Training Center recently.

"ISSUES AND ANSWERS"—RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on last Sunday the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I appeared on the American Broadcasting Co.'s television program "Issues and Answers."

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the interview conducted by Robert Fleming, director of the ABC Washington News Bureau, and Peter Clapper, Capitol Hill correspondent, be incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISSUES AND ANSWERS—SUNDAY, MAY 7, 1961

Guests: Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, from Montana, and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, from Vermont.

Panel: Robert Fleming, director, ABC Washington News Bureau and Peter Clapper, Capitol Hill correspondent.

The ANNOUNCER. From Washington, D.C., the American Broadcasting Co. brings you "Issues and Answers."

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, what are the issues?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, there are so many issues in the field of domestic and foreign policy that it is almost impossible to delineate them. I am sure though that our interrogators during the course of this broadcast will bring many of those issues to the attention of the American people.

The ANNOUNCER. Senator GEORGE B. AIKEN?

Senator AIKEN. I would say that the principal issues or challenges of today are to recognize the dangers, the responsibilities and the opportunities that confront our Nation in these days of stress and strain.

The ANNOUNCER. You have heard the issues, and now for the answers. Here to explore the issues are Bob Fleming, chief of ABC's Washington News Bureau and Peter Clapper, ABC's Capitol Hill correspondent. To give us the answers, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, both ranking members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Now with the first question, Mr. Fleming.

Mr. FLEMING. Senator MANSFIELD, certainly one of the major issues today is the situation in Laos. Must we write off Laos as another victory for the Communists or if not, where can we save something?

Senator MANSFIELD. I am afraid that events look very discouraging in Laos at the present time. It does appear as if the Communists in gaining the upper hand have control of approximately two-thirds of the country at the present time and their control seems to be increasing. It would appear to me that in view of the circumstances that the best place where a stand could and perhaps should be made would be in the Thailand or the Vietnam area.

Mr. FLEMING. Does this mean a writeoff of Laos?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not necessarily. It all depends on the type of neutralist government, if any, which comes out of the meeting to be held in Geneva on Friday of this coming week.

Mr. FLEMING. Senator AIKEN, you, too, have watched a lot of these cease-fires. Haven't they generally led to partition of the country? This time Senator MANSFIELD suggests that the country seems to be hoping for some kind of a coalition government.

Would this go into a Communist victory do you think?

Senator AIKEN. Well, I think Laos would be about the worst place in the world for us to undertake a showdown with the Communist forces, either in a cold war or in a hot war, and it seems to me that it would be folly to send armed forces into Laos at this time.

The question is, How do the Lao themselves feel about it? It is true they have had what they call a civil war, but at the same time it has been, as I understand it, almost a bloodless war; their hearts haven't been in it and it doesn't seem to me that we should send our forces in to support a government that hardly makes any effort to defend itself.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, where do we draw the line in southeast Asia, then?

Senator MANSFIELD. May I say, Pete, that is up to the President of the United States. We are, of course, in the so-called Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, under which, for example, if Thailand is attacked we automatically come to its assistance.

As far as Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia are all concerned, we would come to the assistance of those nations only if they were attacked by Communists from the outside and if they requested assistance.

Mr. FLEMING. Are we a prisoner, to a certain extent, of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, Senator? There has been reluctance on the part of some members, apparently even Britain and France, to participate in activities in these areas.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, it is not the strongest treaty organization in the world. I would have preferred, for example, to have seen a strictly Asian, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization setup.

Mr. FLEMING. Without us, too?

Senator MANSFIELD. Without us. But as long as they would not do so on their own, I think the only thing that could have been done was what was done in 1954, I believe, when the treaty was consummated, and that was to bring in other powers interested in that area, in addition to Pakistan, Thailand, and the Philippines.

Mr. FLEMING. Well, now, you say there would be great question what the President would do. Do you think the Congress would approve of sending troops to any of those countries?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, I am quite certain that the President would confer with the necessary individuals in the Congress before any action was undertaken, but we must remember that under the Constitution, the President is charged with the conduct of our foreign policy, and he is the Commander in Chief of our armed services, and furthermore, we do have this treaty which we are obligated to adhere to.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator AIKEN, Thailand professed to support the Allies in World War II, and yet when it came to a showdown they sided with the Japanese, I believe.

Now, is it possible that in a showdown this time Thailand might side with the Communists?

Senator AIKEN. No. I would expect that Thailand would side with us in the showdown this time because now the crucial area is much nearer Thailand than it was back in the days of World War II, and the very existence of Thailand itself would be threatened should the Communists succeed in taking over Laos and then taking over South Vietnam.

Thailand would be left very much exposed. So I would say if they do make a serious effort to take over South Vietnam or any of the other south Asian countries, that the U.S. security would be heavily involved and that we would have to take some steps to assist them, very vigorous steps, perhaps.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, George, I think we ought to bring out, too, that as far as the Thai are concerned, they did not abjectly surrender to the Japanese because they fought as long as they could—it wasn't very long, but they did try to put up a struggle to maintain their independence.

Senator AIKEN. That is true; they did. And last fall I was at the United Nations and during the debates that came up and the votes that came up, Thailand stayed very solidly with the West and with the democratic governments of the world.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, you have mentioned SEATO. I was wondering, sir, if SEATO isn't strictly organized according to overt military necessities and that it has no paramilitary capability and if so, should it not be stressed that this is the next move for SEATO?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, your interpretation, Pete, is correct, it is set up for the purpose of meeting overt threats from Communist countries against the members of the SEATO organization.

As far as paramilitary organizations or concepts are concerned, I wouldn't know how to answer that at this time.

Mr. FLEMING. Do you find these nations mere symbols of the reason why the West must make a stand against communism or do you find they are actually important, Senator, to our security?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think they are quite important because they do represent an area into which Communist China may well eventually try to expand and if they do then I think the population balance is going to shift the other way.

Mr. CLAPPER. Do you think it is worth risking a global war to keep the Communists from getting, say, Vietnam, Thailand, and Cambodia?

Senator MANSFIELD. You are raising a question, Pete, that no one can answer at this time. I would again have to refer you to the responsibility of the President of the United States as far as this country is concerned.

Mr. CLAPPER. Is this your feeling too, Senator AIKEN?

Senator AIKEN. Yes, I would go along with that position of Senator MANSFIELD. The final determination is up to the President of the United States. He would supposedly act upon the best advice which he could get and the best opinions which he could secure and I am sure that the Congress of the United States would support him in whatever his decision might be.

Mr. FLEMING. You think there would be no division on partisan lines on this issue?

Senator AIKEN. Oh, no, no, I am sure there would be no division on partisan lines in matters as serious as that.

Senator MANSFIELD. And may I say that I think the Republicans have shown themselves to be above party in the light of the difficulties which have confronted the President of the United States in recent weeks.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, you visited southeast Asia in 1953, I believe. What could we have done in the intervening years to have prevented this crisis from arising there?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, as a matter of fact, Pete, I visited southeast Asia on three different occasions and one of the things that I have always found fault with is the aid program which we in effect forced upon the Royal Lao Kingdom. I felt we put in too much money, that we used it indiscriminately, that we emphasized military aid at the expense of economic and that in large part what has happened there now is our own fault.

Mr. CLAPPER. Can you comment on that, Senator AIKEN?

Senator AIKEN. Well, Pete, I am not on the Asian Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and I have depended largely on the advice of Senator MANSFIELD in making my decisions as they relate to that part of the world and I am sure it is the best advice that I could possibly have.

Mr. FLEMING. Let's draw Senator MANSFIELD out a bit more on that question, then.

Do you think, sir, that the aid went to too few people? Was there a good deal of corruption in Laos?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, there was waste, there was graft, there was corruption. I think the record will show that. At the end of this fiscal year—that is, June 30, 1961—we will have spent approximately $350 million in Laos since 1954, and we have nothing to show for it.

Now, there are lots of cars over there, but they have only 25 miles of road in the kingdom on which cars can travel. We know that many families have become enriched because of our support and we know also, I must repeat, that the emphasis we placed on military assistance, which has been useless and not to the extent that it should have, on the economic development of the country as a whole.

Mr. FLEMING. Would a country with a people as proud as the people of this country have stood for the kind of supervision that would have spread this aid out over the great mass of the people?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed. They would have been very willing to have done so, but we had control, we told them what to do and to get the funds they did what we told them.

Mr. FLEMING. Now, Senator, is this at all the fault of the Congress? Is the Congress able to watch things like this——

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, it is partly our fault because some of us—GEORGE and I

among others—have tried to bring this up at various meetings held for considering the question of foreign aid. We haven't gotten very far because we have been told that this is needed, that Laos was a bulwark against communism, that this money was vital and we went along because we felt that in the case of any doubt we ought to resolve the benefit of it in favor of the administration.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator AIKEN, in view of the Red Chinese in southeast Asia, do you think that Red China poses a greater threat to world peace than Russia, looking at the large picture, now?

Senator AIKEN. I think my answer to that would be yes. I think that Red China would be delighted to get us involved in even a shooting war in that part of the country, particularly in Laos, because as has been said, it is about the worst place in the world that could be chosen for a showdown from our viewpoint.

Red China has unlimited men that could be thrown into a war. She undoubtedly lacks weapons, but would like—I believe she would like to get involved in a war which would require Russia to furnish Communist China with modern weapons. I expect Russia is very reluctant to do so, for very good reasons.

Mr. CLAPPER. What are those reasons, sir?

Senator AIKEN. Because the position is, eventually there must be a showdown between Communist China and Russia. We don't know whether it will be Red Russia, imperialist Russia. Maybe by the time that comes, it may be a Russia under some other form of government, because apparently they are changing over there. But at the present time, I think that Red China would welcome a real shooting struggle and that Russia actually does not want one.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator AIKEN, why is this showdown between Russia and China inevitable?

Senator AIKEN. Because Russia has 200 million people and a lot of unused land. China has 700 million people and not enough land. They have hardly enough land to stand on, much less live on. And so it is inevitable that some day that China will undertake to get some of that land which presently is under the control of the Russians.

Mr. FLEMING. In this area, Senator AIKEN, Senator MANSFIELD, and Senator DIRKSEN have introduced a resolution that it is the sense of the Senate that Red China should not be admitted to the United Nations. From your experience at the United Nations, what do you think are the pros and cons of this question?

Senator AIKEN. Red China does not in any way qualify for admission to the United Nations at this time. Red China openly advocated as late as last September the use of force in the settlement of international disputes. Red China is in defiance of the United Nations as regards Korea and other places, as well, and Red China certainly does not qualify for admission to the United Nations at this time and should not be admitted.

Mr. FLEMING. Is it your feeling though, sir, that the time will come when this question will be a rather difficult one for a government of ours?

Senator AIKEN. Well, I think the question may be debated this fall at the next session of the United Nations. But if there is a vote, it will probably come on the question of seating the Communist Chinese delegation as the representative of all China. That would have the effect of throwing out the Nationalist China delegation which now is seated as the representative of China.

It would also have the effect of ripping a great hole in our Pacific defenses, requiring us to go to the support with military means, if necessary, of Formosa, because we do have a treaty with Formosa in which we guarantee their independence, so it would be a very serious matter for us, but I do not believe that although the United Nations may debate the matter of seating Red China, that they will get even a majority to agree to seat the Chinese Communists as the representatives of all China.

They might vote for two Chinas, Nationalist China, and Communist China, but the Communist Chinese have repeatedly indicated they would not accept membership on those terms.

Mr. FLEMING. In other words, the very fact that we still are for the Formosa Chinese of Chiang Kai-shek and there is support for that country in the United Nations may well keep the Chinese Communists from accepting a seat.

Senator AIKEN. I don't believe they would accept membership on the basis of two Chinas. Only if they represented all of China, including Formosa, and there again they want Formosa because of the agricultural production that is possible there.

Mr. FLEMING. Senator MANSFIELD, did you have a point on this?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, all I wanted to say was that Communist China has never to my knowledge requested admission to the United Nations and as far as the question of recognition is concerned, Great Britain was one of the first countries to recognize Peiping and Peiping has yet to acknowledge or receive a British Ambassador.

Senator AIKEN. You are right, Senator MANSFIELD. Red China never has by herself requested admission to the United Nations. It is always some other Communist nation that requests it for them.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator MANSFIELD, turning to the Cuban problem now, Russia's Khrushchev has called on the United States to take a live-and-let-live attitude toward Castro's Communist Cuba. Can we do it?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think what we ought to do is isolate Cuba as much as we possibly could regardless of what Mr. Khrushchev says. I would like to see us concentrate on the rest of Latin America, beef up the alliance for progress, the proposal advanced by President Kennedy in his inaugural address, initially advanced by the way by the previous Republican administration, and consummated by the Act of Bogotá, of September, last year. I think that is the best way to attack the evils of Castroism which could spread to these other Latin American countries and make them rather insecure. We've got to give people hope, better housing, we've got to give them pieces of land—I don't mean we, the United States, but these people in the countries comprising the nations of the hemisphere are entitled to something in the way of security and hope and one way they can do it is through such programs as better education, better health, a vested interest in the land, more housing and things of that sort.

So I would say, let's concentrate on the Western Hemisphere and let Cuba for the time being at least, go by.

Mr. CLAPPER. But you said to isolate Cuba. What did you mean by that, Senator MANSFIELD?

Senator MANSFIELD. By concentrating on the rest of Latin America and ignoring Cuba as much as we possibly could.

Mr. CLAPPER. You are not talking about a military blockade or anything of that kind?

Senator MANSFIELD. No, we have a blockade in effect, in operation—that is a unilateral embargo by means of which everything but food and medicines are forbidden to be exported from this country into Cuba but that does not mean the rest of the countries of the world cannot and will not export materials to that nation.

Mr. CLAPPER. How do you feel about that, Senator AIKEN?

Senator AIKEN. I would not let Premier Khrushchev dictate our relationship with the Cubans. As a matter of fact, it isn't a matter of our living and letting live, as far as the Castro government is concerned because the Cuban people themselves will undoubtedly decide sooner or later that the Castro government has lived long enough. Castro himself indicated that last week when he announced that there would be no more free elections—no more elections of any kind in Cuba.

Now every dictator wants to be a great national hero and one way that he can demonstrate that he is a great national hero is by being overwhelmingly elected to the office. Mr. Castro undoubtedly recognizes the fact that the majority of the Cuban people no longer think very highly of him and undoubtedly wouldn't reelect him to office by any overwhelming majority and therefore he admits it when he says that there will be no more elections.

Mr. FLEMING. I take it then that you both take the State Department position that Cuba or communism is not negotiable. We don't discuss matters with Castro?

Senator MANSFIELD. There is nothing to discuss at the present time although I would say I don't think we should be so brusk and immediate in turning aside any proposal which comes forth from any quarter. We ought to at least go through the motions of considering them before making a reply.

Mr. CLAPPER. Do you somewhat disapprove of that statement by the State Department, Senator MANSFIELD?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not the statement, just the way it was handled.

Senator AIKEN. I would not have shut the door abruptly in the face of President Dorticos. I don't think anything could have come from any consideration or talks with the Cuban Government, but I would not have slammed the door on any offer of peace no matter where it came from, even though I might not have any hopes of accomplishments from it.

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Nixon said last week that he believes we should take any further shipment of arms to Cuba as cause for action. He has not spelled out what he means. Do you think we should see to it that communism does not supply more arms and equipment to Cuba?

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Nixon is not charged with the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign policy and it is far easier for Mr. Nixon to speak out on foreign policy in his present position than it was while he was Vice President of the United States or as he would have had he been President of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. I would say if it appears that the Communist countries are building an arsenal in Cuba so much larger than that which the Cubans themselves could ever hope to need, and which would obviously be intended as an arsenal to be used in the carrying out of revolutions in other American countries, that then we should sit up and take notice. However, I don't know that we have reached that point yet. In fact, I doubt if they have.

Senator MANSFIELD. But when you say "we," GEORGE, you mean the rest of Latin America. It is a greater danger to them than it is to us.

Senator AIKEN. That is right, and I think the events of the last 3 weeks have had the effect of making all the other Latin American countries realize the danger that confronts them and the necessity of cooperation between all of the Western Hemisphere nations in meeting this danger.

Mr. CLAPPER. Senator Aiken, you mentioned you didn't think it was necessary to do anything about Cuba until the arms situation there became obviously aimed at

subversion or military action throughout Latin America—the spread of communism.

But isn't it true that right now Castro's militia numbers almost a quarter of a million men, far more than he would ever need for Cuba itself?

Senator AIKEN. I understand that that is true but as the size of his militia increases, the effect on his economy becomes more adverse and I have faith that the Cuban people themselves will stand this tyranny just so long and then they will take the situation in hand.

Mr. FLEMING. Senator MANSFIELD, do you feel we can actually make a good case for taking steps to keep communism from getting closer and closer to the United States? At the same time are we not in bases right on the edge of the Iron Curtain?

Senator MANSFIELD. Oh, yes. I think the comparison is not as logical as your question would seem to make it appear because after all what you have in the NATO setup is a defensive organization. There is nothing aggressive about it, no matter what the Soviet Union says. It is for the protection of those countries and personally I think that the idea of containment is such, which brought about the creation of these bases and armaments of various kinds is not as important a factor today with the advance of missiles as it used to be, but it is there and it is certainly not aggressive in intent. We have stated time and time and time again that it is defensive in purpose and that is what it is.

Mr. CLAPPER. Well, Senator MANSFIELD, I would like to ask you a question bearing on the Cuban situation—did I interrupt you, Senator AIKEN? I am sorry.

Senator AIKEN. No.

Mr. CLAPPER. About the CIA role in the Cuban fiasco, there are analyses under way now of what went wrong, analyses of the CIA and our general intelligence activities.

Do you plan to ask the Senate to make a probe of the CIA?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, we have measures before us seeking to bring about the creation of a joint congressional committee to supervise to an extent the activities of the CIA. There will be hearings held on that proposal by Senator MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, and it is our intention to do what we can to strengthen the organization of the CIA and to differentiate and define the duties which have been assigned to it.

I would say also that the President has created a committee of sorts to look into this matter as well. It will not be an investigation. It will be an inquiry and a hearing.

Mr. FLEMING. Senator AIKEN, do you find any residue of the old complaint that the previous administration, the Republican-appointed committees that are getting things done? What do you think of the progress?

Senator AIKEN. I think President Kennedy took care of that situation the other day when he said we could not put the blame on any one particular person or agency. After all, President Eisenhower had the same career advisers that President Kennedy had had, and therefore it is impossible to pinpoint the responsibility for the failure on any one person or any one agency.

Now, we may all have our ideas that one person or one agency was more responsible than anyone else, but at the same time, the expedition failed. It is water over the dam, now. We want to make sure if there is any other undertaking of that kind that it doesn't fail and that should be our principal purpose from now on.

Mr. FLEMING. I think, sir, I did not make my question clear. What I am more concerned about is, Are you satisfied with the way this administration is learning lessons from the experience?

Senator AIKEN. I think this administration is learning lessons very fast. This administration was too ambitious in stating what their accomplishments for the first 100 days might be, because it takes the first 100 days to get appointments made—in fact, they are not all made yet—and they will have to have time to set down the administration before you can get it into working order.

I would rather give the President a year, rather than 100 days, before judging his accomplishments. Possibly a year is too long, but certainly 100 days has proven too short.

Mr. CLAPPER. Would you care to comment on this, Senator MANSFIELD? I might want to see whether or not there is a different view.

Senator MANSFIELD. No; I have no comment.

Mr. CLAPPER. I would like to ask a question of both of you and get your comments on it.

The United States has a record of reaction and inaction in foreign affairs. We don't have too good a record for action in foreign affairs. Do either of you have any positive suggestion on how we can improve our effort?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think we are taking steps in that direction in reassessing and re-evaluating the aid program on a long-term basis. I think it will be less expensive and more productive as a result.

I think that the Kennedy administration has tried to bring about a change in the foreign policy situation wherever it could, but, of course, we are up against Mr. Khrushchev and the same old tactics. We will just have to feel our way, make changes as they occur and do what we think is best for the country and the free world.

Senator AIKEN. I would suggest the injection of a little more imagination in the State Department. After all, foreign policy is not made overnight; it is made over a period of years and it is made primarily by the career employees of the Department of State.

To be sure, we have a few political appointees at the top, but the foreign policy by and large is formulated by the career employees and they are assured security, they are assured retirement. They will only be disciplined if they make mistakes and, therefore, there is a temptation not to make mistakes, and if you don't want to make mistakes you are not likely to exercise the imagination that you otherwise would do. So I think that our method of formulating foreign policy could be improved upon.

Mr. FLEMING. Could you suggest, sir, how these people could be made more imaginative, more aggressive in their feeling, if anything?

Senator AIKEN. Well, you might make a few more political appointments in the Department and not give quite so much security, we will say, to the second level down or the third level down.

Mr. FLEMING. Do you mean the security conscious——

Senator AIKEN. Security consciousness, and that applies not only to the State Department, but to other departments of Government as well.

Mr. FLEMING. You think we have had more success, sir, on the Hill with the turnover in committee and staff; when you get new blood at times on the Hill, that is a great help?

Senator AIKEN. I think the system on the Hill works very well. I don't like to go along with proposals for changing it very drastically.

Mr. CLAPPER. I have another question for both of you, a quickie. What is the future of Allen Dulles in the CIA?

Senator MANSFIELD. As far as I know, he is continuing as head of the CIA. I know of no proposals to oust him from his present position. That, of course, will be up to Mr. Dulles, and I suppose it would depend in part, at least, upon the findings of this special committee set up by the President to look into the activities of intelligence agencies.

Senator AIKEN. I have no idea what his future might be.

Mr. FLEMING. I am sorry, Pete, but we have to stop at this time. I am sure there are a great many other questions we would like to go into.

We certainly want to thank Senator MANSFIELD and Senator AIKEN for being with us this afternoon.

The ANNOUNCER. You have seen another in ABC's headline-making series in which leading authorities bring you answers to the issues of today.

Next week "Issues and Answers" invites you to meet Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon. Two weeks from today we present Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert.

"Issues and Answers" is produced by Peggy Whedon, assistant to the producer, Alan Hoffard, directed by Richard Armstrong.

"Issues and Answers" is a presentation of ABC News and Public Affairs.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader a rather speculative question, but he may have the answer. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will meet tomorrow in executive session, in accordance with notices that have already been issued. I think it is a fair assumption, and I take it as a member of the committee, that tomorrow no doubt the Federal aid-to-education bill will be reported. I apprehend that there will not be a prolonged committee discussion to such a point that it cannot be encompassed in a single day.

I therefore inquire of the majority leader whether he has in mind a day when that bill will be set for floor attention. I ask the question because the subject is of such high interest and there is so much controversy, or has been so much controversy, that if all Members of the Senate can be notified in advance when it can be set, it will be most convenient, because they can arrange their schedules accordingly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, and with the assurances—tentative, I know—that it may well be that the aid-to-education bill, that is, the administration's aid-to-education bill, may be reported out of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, it would be my belief that we should start floor debate on the aid-to-education bill on Tuesday next, to be followed immediately thereafter by the housing bill, which I understand will be reported out of committee next week. I hope that it will be possible to devote all day tomorrow, if need be, to the consideration of the aid-to-education bill in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and also other legislation in other committees, and that the Senate will go over from this evening until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday.

I also urge all Members of the Senate, in view of the tentative schedule which has been outlined in response to

the questions raised by the distinguished minority leader, that they be prepared to be in session from Tuesday next until the consideration both of the important bills I have mentioned shall be completed, because the bills are of great significance, and, I am quite certain, of importance to every Member of the Senate. So I urgently request every Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle to be prepared to assist in keeping the Senate in session from Tuesday next until the aid-to-education and the housing bills are out of the way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

PUBLIC SERVICE COSTS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, Members of Congress are not alone in seeking a solution to the question of proper costs of public service performed by the Post Office Department.

Other users of the mail know, as we do, that establishing equitable rates is dependent on a sound postal policy; otherwise any attempt at ratemaking becomes a hit or miss proposition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of an excellent report of the American Newspaper Publishers Association during its 75th convention being on this subject be printed in the RECORD.

The part that I asked to have printed begins on page 4, with the words, "Report of ANPA Postal Committee," and goes over to the top of page 7, at the end of the first full paragraph, ending with the words "by the Post Office Department."

I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD in order that all Senators and members of the public may be informed on this vital matter.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF ANPA POSTAL COMMITTEE

Your postal committee believes that the wisdom of the longstanding ANPA postal policy was never more evident than in the present controversy over proper determination of postal rates for all classes of mail.

ANPA has stated many times that we know daily newspapers want no subsidy and want to pay 100 percent of the cost of carrying their second class mail but not costs that belong elsewhere. The ANPA favors fair and equal treatment of all users of the mails in accord with the Postal Policy Act of 1958.

Your postal committee chairman and the ANPA general manager called on the new Postmaster General J. Edward Day on March 17 to get acquainted, to explain our policy, and to offer to cooperate in all proper ways with the new Post Office administration in exchange of information and comment.

Unfortunately, Mr. Day is confronted with an existing policy of the Post Office Department that only a relatively insignificant amount of postal costs represent public service costs as specified in the Postal Policy Act of 1958.

This is the essence of the problem of fair determination of postal rates. Until the Postal Policy Act is complied with, your committee cannot see anything but continued controversy which benefits no one. Instead it makes the problems of the Post Office Department more difficult.

Accordingly, your postal committee is presenting in this report a chronology of events which we think is pertinent to our consideration of present problems of establishing fair second class postal rates on daily newspapers.

September 19, 1951: John F. Kennedy, then a Member of the House of Representatives from Massachusetts, made a speech on the House floor advocating lesser increases in second-class rates than had been proposed by the Truman administration. Mr. Kennedy advocated an amendment subsequently adopted calling for three 10-percent increases in second-class rates. He said:

"Obviously, the deficit is so large that it cannot be wiped out by any amount of rate increases. It seems to me that 60 percent is a pretty big jump—one that many small publications could not survive."

March 24, 1954: A Citizens Advisory Council appointed by the Senate Post Office Committee when Senator CARLSON of Kansas was its chairman, included in its recommendations:

"Any sums expended for free postal services, for international postal services, and for services performed for other Government departments should be covered not from post office revenue but from the general funds of the Treasury. Any loss of revenue due to preferential rates as described in the Price Waterhouse report should be offset by the general funds of the Treasury. Any expenditures which can be justified only on a national welfare basis, as described in the same report, should be reimbursed from the general funds of the Treasury."

Price Waterhouse estimated that these costs amounted to $274 million in fiscal year 1952. H. W. Brawley, now Assistant Postmaster General, was director of postal investigations for the Advisory Council and engaged the services of Price Waterhouse, an independent accounting firm.

February 26, 1957: Another Citizens Advisory Council appointed by the Senate Post Office Committee when Senator JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, was its chairman enumerated public welfare costs of the Post Office Department in fiscal year 1955 which added up to a total of 392.4 million and also listed many other items of hidden costs not properly chargeable to users of the mails. The report strongly recommended enactment of a clear-cut statement of postal policy on ratemaking. H. W. Brawley, now Assistant Postmaster General, was Executive Director of this Citizens Advisory Council.

May 27 1958: The Postal Policy Act of 1958 became law including statement that public services of the Post Office Department should not constitute direct charges in the form of rates and fees upon any user or class of users of such public services, or of the mail generally. The law itemizes public services in substantially similar form to the report of the Citizens Advisory Council report in 1957.

July 12, 1960: The Democratic Party platform included the following language in its plant on the Postal Establishment:

"We pledge ourselves to: one, restore the principle that the postal service is a public service; two, separate the public service costs from those to be borne by the users of the mail; three, continue steady improvement in working conditions and wage scales reflecting increased productivity; four, establish a long-range program for research in capital improvement compatible with the high standards of business efficiency.

January 26, 1961: Senator JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Post Office Committee, wrote Postmaster General Day a long letter reciting past problems of Post Office accounting and ratemaking, and stated:

"Assuming a deficit of approximately $900 million, I would urge that at least $300 million of this amount be set aside as a public service pursuant to law and so presented to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress. * * *

"Without a clear resolution of this controversy involving public services, the setting of future rates is impossible because we wind up with nothing but confusion confounded insofar as basic costs and the rate formula in the 1958 law are concerned."

February 1, 1961: President Kennedy at a press conference commented on postal rate increase proposals as follows:

"I think the President's (President Eisenhower's) budget called for revenue action by the Congress of $843 million. In view of the fact that Congress has been reluctant in the past I think we have to consider carefully whether we could expect a Congress to ever vote $843 million new revenue on mail and postage. But nevertheless, we are going to go ahead."

April 14, 1961: Postmaster General Day transmitted to Congress proposed legislation calling for increases in first class, air mail, second class, and third class sufficient to provide $741 million in additional revenue for the Post Office Department. His proposals included increases of $78 million in second-class mail to be derived primarily from a surcharge of 1½ cents per copy in addition to the present zone rates on newspapers and magazines. Within county of publication the new rate would be 1½ cents per pound plus one-fourth of 1 cent per copy.

These proposals would mean increases for some newspapers far beyond the 79-percent average for second class stated by the Post Office Department.

FLOODS IN KANSAS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the disastrous flood which is now occurring in southeastern Kansas and central Kansas, particularly on the Elk and Cottonwood Rivers, is causing an enormous loss of property in our State.

This morning I had information from communities on both of these streams that stresses the severe flooding which is now taking place. I want to read a telegram that I have just received from Emmett E. Wilson, president of the Verdigris Valley Flood Control and Water Conservation Association, Independence, Kans., which states:

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

The Elk River watershed area has experienced its worst flood in history. This Elk River overflowed Friday and Saturday into Elk City, flooding the homes and business firms there. In addition, the water plants at both Elk City and Longton were knocked out and the one at Independence below the confluence of the Elk and Verdigris rivers was threatened. The property damage will be staggering, particularly to farmers whose fields have been under water now for several days, thus completely destroying all of their crops. Many farm dwellings were completely inundated, along with homes in Independence and Coffeyville. Industries in the area were also knocked out of operation. Transportation has been at a standstill because all major highways in the area have been closed. Some railroads have been washed out. It is believed the damages will run into the millions. Unquestionably, this is the greatest flood disaster in history for this area. Fortunately, both the Fall River and Toronto Dams have kept this from being even worse. It is certain were Elk River Dam a reality, Elk City and cities and towns downstream on into Oklahoma would not have suffered this great loss. Elk River Dam and Reservoir was authorized by the Flood

Control Act of 1948, the same time that Fall River and Toronto Dams were authorized.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has spent $1 million in complete planning of the Elk River Dam and these plans have been ready for construction money for a period of 4 years. Many of us have likewise appeared before the Senate and House Appropriations Committees pleading for funds for the start of construction. The Corps of Engineers advise us that they can start the Elk River Dam and Reservoir with a $1 million construction appropriation.

This latest flood should be ample proof, without any shadow of a doubt, of the great need for the Elk River Dam and Reservoir. Unless the appropriation is forthcoming, southeast Kansas will continue to lose population and fail to attract new industry and cause it to be even more of a distressed area than is now recognized by the Federal Government.

EMMETT E. WILSON,
President, Verdigris Valley Flood Control and Water Conservation Association.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, had the Elk City Reservoir on the Elk River, which is authorized and on which planning is complete, and the Marion and Cedar Point Reservoirs, which are authorized, been constructed, it would have meant a great saving to this section.

Senator SCHOEPPEL and I have on previous occasions stressed the need for these reservoirs and their importance for flood control.

I expect to appear later before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions and request $1 million in construction money for Elk River and needed moneys for planning and construction on the Marion and Cedar Point Reservoirs on the Cottonwood River.

The flood losses to the citizens on these watersheds are enormous, and, in addition, there is much personal suffering which could have been largely avoided had the reservoir system been completed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kansas. These dams not only would be beneficial to Kansas, but much of the floodwater dumps over into Oklahoma and creates a situation which is beyond our control.

It has been a great pleasure to work with the distinguished Senator, as well as with the other distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. The Senators have forthrightly and diligently attempted to speed up these projects. I regret deeply we have not been able to advance them farther, because great loss will be created in Oklahoma as a result of floods originating in Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, it has been a great pleasure to work with the Senator from Oklahoma in respect to these projects. We have also had valuable assistance from the senior Senator [Mr. KERR]. I trust in the present session we shall be able to cooperate so closely as to be able to convince the Congress to give us needed funds for the commencement of work on these reservoirs.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I made some comments in regard to the floods which are occurring in southeastern Kansas. Since making that statement I have received additional information regarding this flood area, and I ask unanimous consent that I may add this additional information to the remarks that I made earlier today.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD REPORTS AS OF MAY 8

Following highways are closed at present time:

Kansas State Highway 135, west of LaCygne; U.S. Highway 59 at Ottawa; U.S. Highway 160 east of Independence and west of Oak Valley; U.S. Highway 66 at Riverton.

Santa Fe Railroad closed between Chanute and Humboldt.

M. K. & T. Railroad closed at Osage, Okla., Coffeyville, Paola and Erie, Kans.

M. K. & T. Railroad closed between Parsons, Kans., and St. Louis in two places.

Major flooding is occurring on the Little River, tributary of the Arkansas River, in the upper reaches, but is expected to be minor to moderate in the lower reaches.

Minor to moderate flooding is occurring on the Grand Neosho River watershed from Neosho Rapids, Kans., to Pensacola Reservoir.

Major flooding is occurring on the Verdigris River watershed from Independence, Kans., to Oologah Dam site and is expected to continue to the mouth during the next few days.

State and local interest are active in all areas of flooding. At Coffeyville, Kans., on the Verdigris River local interest had sandbagged the local levee on Saturday and Sunday and the levee is still holding.

Highway patrol and local authorities in Kansas and Oklahoma are maintaining close surveillance in all areas.

Coffeyville levee has been sandbagged and has about 1.5 of freeboard.

Lowlands flooding in Neosho Falls, Kans., area. Approximately 100,000 acres of land is flooded on the Grand River from Iola to Chetopa and numerous agricultural levees have been breached.

At Erie approximately 10 city blocks have been flooded and 14 homes were affected and seven families were evacuated on Sunday.

Operation of Wichita Valley central flood project resulted in benefits in amount of $500,000.

Operation of existing Fall River and Toronto Reservoirs during the present flood prevented $3,360,000 damages in the Verdigris River watershed above Hulah project.

Existing Fall River and Toronto Reservoirs and authorized Elk City Reservoir would have had benefits in amount of $5 million in the flood to date.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT DURING RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committees of the Senate may have the authority to file bills, reports, and nominations during the recess or the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN NEWSPAPER OF 1960 AWARD BY MISSOURI SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM TO ST. PETERSBURG TIMES

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the people of Florida, and particularly those of St. Petersburg and the Suncoast area, have good reason to be exceedingly proud of the fact that the St. Petersburg Times, the morning newspaper of St. Petersburg, has been presented the annual award as the Distinguished American Newspaper of 1960 by the Missouri School of Journalism. The citation to the Times was presented on May 5 at Columbia, Mo., to Hon. Nelson Poynter, editor and president of the paper, by Dean Earl F. English of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, as part of that fine school's 52d Journalism Week activities. In presenting the citation and the beautiful bronze medal, which is the symbol of the award, to Mr. Poynter, Dean English read the citation, which is as follows:

To the St. Petersburg Times, in recognition of its record of serving aggressively and courageously the true functions of a daily newspaper for more than three-quarters of a century; its faith in the future of the State of Florida and particularly its own locality, which it has helped develop into an ideal home and business community; the development of a planned training program for young journalists, while at the same time providing educational incentive through the granting of Poynter Fund college scholarships; and an enlightened employer-employee relationship which has made the production of this newspaper the result of a truly exceptional team effort.

Speaking for my colleague and myself, I wish to express our very great satisfaction and pride because of this high recognition which has been given the St. Petersburg Times, its publishers and staff. By this recognition, the St. Petersburg Times, which has now become the distinguished newspaper of 1960, joins ranks with 40 previous winners, including among others the New York Times, the Baltimore Sun, the Christian Science Monitor, and the Wall Street Journal, which was the winner for 1959. This award, which is recognized throughout the Nation as one of the most prized awards made annually in American journalism, is based on recommendations presented by a special committee of the faculty of the Missouri School of Journalism.

In warmly congratulating the Times publishers, and its capable staff, I wish for them and for the paper many added years of dedicated service to their public and to their community and State, to which they have made such notable contributions.

AMERICA'S TECHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, America's capacity to put a man in space is tied directly to our scientific and industrial capability. The problems of space assume a magnitude far greater than any technological challenge in America's history. The effort to conquer these problems must be of a corresponding magnitude.

If there ever was a time in the history of our Nation when efficient, experienced, and imaginative industry of all sizes was needed, now is that time.

My esteemed colleague from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has some very pertinent remarks on this subject and I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER TO REPUBLICAN FUND-RAISING MEETING, FLINT, MICH., MAY 8, 1961

Mr. Chairman, fellow Republicans, I know we have all enjoyed the wonderful entertainment here tonight. My old friend, George Murphy, has brought together for us some of the brightest talent in all of show business.

You know, George sent me a letter several weeks ago telling me all about his ideas on how to brighten up political meetings with top talent like this we have seen here tonight. But George was a little worried. He wasn't sure he could put over something so different from the usual style of political meeting. This is what he told me. He said if this thing does not go over, I am going to climb into one of those rocket capsules and go right off into outer space. I won't be back.

Well, George, you don't have to blast off into the blue. It was a wonderful show.

We all have good reason tonight for a carnival spirit. The flight of Commander Shepard into outer space, and his safe return, brought pride and joy to every American. We have something to celebrate tonight.

The whole free world has something to celebrate.

When the Communists put their man into space a few days ago, it was clear that the Soviet achievement constituted a threat to everyone in the free world. Now, it has been clearly demonstrated that we are not helpless, not defenseless, in the face of Soviet power in outer space.

In a world where superior technology can mean survival, we have amply demonstrated that our technology is still a great protective shield for the free world. No one can now believe that we stand helpless before the Soviet threat in outer space. If there was any doubt, it is now clear to everyone that we can successfully build the great and complicated new machines required not just for survival in this new age, but for the assurance of a free world.

In the last world war, many historians, many students of military problems, agreed that it was our ability to build great, efficient machines of war that was a decisive factor in our victory. Our enemies in that war deliberately planned their technology for years in order to win a war. We all knew that the total national economies of those who opposed us were pointed toward a military objective. In those days, the best imaginations of scientists, engineers, and industrial managers in enemy countries had been turned toward the achievement of military superiority for many years before the war actually broke out. At the same time, our people—always reluctant to turn their whole attention to war, always hating war—continued peaceful production of machines to enhance life, rather than to machines designed for military destruction.

I can remember—we can all remember that we began that last war a little behind our enemies both in quantity and in the design of certain important elements of our military equipment.

The imagination of our scientists, the skill and judgment of our industrial managers, were turned, as I said, to the enhancement of life. Theirs were focused on the technology of war.

In the face of this, how could we win a war?

Well, one very important reason for our victory was a great secret weapon. We had at our disposal the talent and the free imagination of industrial managers, used to an atmosphere of freedom. We had the priceless advantage of great industrial teams whose keen initiative and flexibility had not been dulled and demoralized by the constant interference of professional politicians.

And we had, in being, management teams capable of doing the very biggest jobs—because they were used to doing big jobs. They knew how to do big jobs.

We have to remember that it is the nature of totalitarianism to be able to direct an entire national economy toward a single purpose. Such a centrally directed economy pointed toward a military objective can bring a kind of slavery to its people. It can stultify the imagination. But, over the short run, it can develop a sheer size—a concentration of scientific and technical energy—which cannot be matched by an economy composed entirely of small enterprises, accustomed only to small-scale tasks.

There was a time when the sheer mass-power of a despotic empire gave it only a small advantage. We can go back to the time, 2,500 years ago, when the great Persian king drove his hundreds of thousands of slave soldiers against a few hundred free Greeks who were determined to keep their freedom. I ask you to remember that the great concentration of power in the mass army of Persia could do nothing against the fierce bravery of the free Greek soldiers.

The spirit of freemen, determined to keep their freedom, is still the decisive factor.

But now, in our times, there is a new factor which was unknown until recently. The modern world has developed a technology which requires organized skill ranging from the smallest—the lone scientist in his laboratory—to the largest—the General Motors with its irreplaceable team of many thousands of skilled managers and scientists—the kind of experienced team which alone can do the kind of immense jobs demanded by the challenge of our times.

We are now in the stage of history where the application of our scientific ideas requires organizations of great size to manage the immense technical tasks demanded of us, for survival.

Somehow we must know how to preserve the unconquerable spirit of freemen in the midst of technical organizations, from the smallest to the very largest.

In the face of our struggle for survival in an increasingly hostile world, we must no longer ask ourselves whether an industrial organization is too big, but rather is it big enough to do the job.

Does anyone suppose we can match the technology of the Communist world if we set about breaking into small pieces the big industries that supplied the technical muscle for us in the last war? Today we have jobs to accomplish that are so big they dwarf the tasks of World War II.

Who will do these jobs? Who can do these jobs if we continue to pursue the suicidal antibigness mania of some of our professional reformers?

The only alternative is to turn the tasks over to big government. That is your choice: Big business or a much bigger government. There is no other alternative.

Now I don't believe there is any chance of preserving the spirit of freedom if all the big tasks are turned over to government. And we cannot, if we wished, escape these big tasks. They must be done if we are to survive.

The challenge of our life, as freemen, is to accomplish the great, the unprecedented, technical tasks ahead of us, and to keep our freedom a vital reality.

Now there has been a great deal said about free enterprise and about socialism. I think these words are getting pretty worn. I wonder, sometimes, whether some of the people who use the terms have not forgotten that they represent a genuine reality; that they represent a real choice, in a specific, concrete situation.

Now I must confess, as a small businessman myself, I have always had a preference for small business. At least, our own business in Arizona is small compared to the business most of you know here in Flint. If I had to make a choice between a great manufacturing corporation and one of the independent dealers handling its product locally, I lean almost instinctively toward the independent dealer.

Ideally, I should like to see an economy where bigness was a rarity and small businesses were typical.

But we must face this brute fact: the technology of our era demands a range of size from the smallest to the very largest. And this same technology has created a potential military situation where, as I said, the deliberate breakup of our bigger, more efficient companies will be, in my opinion, nothing less than suicidal.

The most dangerous demagogs in this country today are those who are still mouthing the cliches of the thirties. The really dangerous demagogs are those who are using the term "monopoly" to cover what is not really an attack on monopoly at all, but actually an attack on companies simply because they are big.

It is an interesting fact that the Communist Party in this country is fully aware of this present use of the term "monopoly." Of course, it is the primary purpose of the Communist Party in the United States to soften us up, and particularly to break up the centers of industrial effectiveness, without which we would be technically helpless as we face the Soviet Union. In a word, the Communists know that the attack on monopoly can be made the vehicle for an attempt actually to break up into ineffective fragments our central and most efficient industrial operations.

American Communists have a highbrow journal they circulate among Communist intellectuals. It comes out once a month, and its title is "Political Affairs." In the April issue just past, they report on the program of the Communist Party in the United States for the immediate future. I will read you the opening paragraph:

"The 17th convention of the Communist Party of the United States placed the struggle against monopoly as the central strategic task."

Now, this is the important question: Why, in the midst of the cold war, should the Communist Party of the United States suddenly decide to make the problem of monopoly its central strategy?

What is new about the antimonopoly struggle? Why should the Communist Party in its official pronouncement to its members tell them this struggle against monopoly has suddenly become a central strategic task?

Why should the Soviet Union instruct its local branch in America that their main task is to promote the struggle against monopoly?

I don't think there is any mystery here. It is plainly evident that the Soviet Union realizes that in technological warfare their greatest danger will come from the continued existence of the great American industrial corporations, which alone can match and outproduce the Soviet.

At the end of this same article, published for their members only a month ago by the Communist Party, was this very telling statement—and I quote—"the fight against monopolies in present-day conditions becomes more and more linked with the struggle for socialism."

It is no mystery. It is very clear, indeed, why international communism has made it a central task to push the antimonopoly efforts in this country. It is obvious that they do not object to monopoly per se. After all, the whole Soviet system is one large monopoly. Nor did they earlier make it a central issue in their American propaganda. Of course, they have always mouthed the usual cliches about monopoly, but it was wordy stuff—propaganda, window dressing. Now it is central strategy. And their members have been so informed.

Now I wish to clarify a point, if I may. I am not suggesting that anyone genuinely opposed to monopoly in this country is somehow allied to the Communists, or even that he knows that this drive has now become a central Communist strategy. Or even that a man genuinely opposed to monopoly may not also be very opposed to communism.

Teddy Roosevelt, a great Republican, was the first great trust-buster. Republicans generally have long opposed genuine monopoly.

Under conditions of relative peacefulness, I firmly believe, myself, that great vigilance should be exercised to prevent the destruction of the free market by such methods as the use of coercion, misinformation, and bribes. To keep an economy even relatively free, we cannot, as a free nation, tolerate such practices.

No, I am by no means suggesting that some men now deeply concerned with the problem of monopolistic practices should not continue this concern. Nor am I suggesting that a deep concern regarding the problem of monopoly is somehow unpatriotic. Indeed, I feel the reverse is true.

But I do believe that the whole concept of monopoly as it was understood 50 years ago should be carefully reviewed. It would seem that modern technology—the kind with which you, here in Flint, are so familiar—has rendered certain attitudes toward monopoly hopelessly obsolete.

The really great danger, as I see it, is that a subtle change is taking place in the meaning of the term "monopoly," among some of those who are most frequent users of the term. Somehow, just to be big has now become a bad thing. Somehow, just simple bigness in itself is being increasingly used as a target for the term "monopoly." The fact is that bigness is a complicated problem, in peacetime.

But now, in the midst of a life-and-death struggle with international communism, the problem of bigness is, certainly for the time being, not complicated at all.

Let us by all means root out wrongdoing, but let us deal with this problem with the greatest care. Let us not, in the name of "monopoly," bring such damage to the great basis of our technical capacity, so that we, ourselves, accomplish for the Communists what they have defined as their objective.

If the destruction of "bigness" in itself becomes the objective of the monopoly investigations and legislation, then we are aiming at our own destruction. If reckless demagogs, or blind partisans who are victims of the slogans of an earlier day continue along this route, we will be brought into a position of the gravest national danger.

This problem has been a matter of increasing concern with me. It seemed to me that here, in this city of Flint, called the arsenal of democracy in the last war, I could say some of the things it seems to me need to be said about the dangerous attacks which are being directed against the very basis of our technical capacity.

As an officer in the Air Force Reserve, I often fly the immense jet bombers of the Strategic Air Command. As I look out of the cockpit across one of these gleaming wings that stretch away from me half the length of a football field, I know that small business alone could never do the job for us now.

We are past all that.

And I say to you, tonight, anyone who, using the term "monopoly" or any other label, succeeds in reducing our capacity to build machines like that SAC bomber, is putting us in the hands of our enemies.

Indeed, as we watched that great and complex machine rise from its launching pad last Friday, to soar into outer space, we all knew that a new era had arrived.

We can be justly proud of the accomplishment.

But, now, as Republicans and even more, as Americans, we must guard with care that our capacity to compete in this technical race with international communism is not destroyed in false crusades, under the banner of righteous causes.

The official Soviet agents in America, the Communist Party, believe the antimonopoly drive of the U.S. Government is its best vehicle for conquering us from within.

I say again: Let us not be their dupes.

Tonight all of us—as Republicans and especially as Americans—have a right to celebrate.

It is a time for the carnival spirit.

But let me say this in closing: This is no time for easy optimism. There is a long, hard road ahead of us, and we, as Americans and freemen, will be, for years to come, under constant attack, both from outside and from within.

Where we find the present administration tending in a direction we believe will expose the country to great danger, it will be our duty and our responsibility to criticize with firmness and determination.

And I say to you again that any wholesale effort to break up or seriously weaken our great industries and technical centers would constitute a grave threat to our national safety, in these dangerous times.

As we face the swiftly growing threat of international communism let us be sure we are asking the right questions.

We should not be asking the question of the first half of the 20th century, Is industry getting too big? We are now face-to-face with the big question of the second half of the 20th century: Is our industry big enough, strong enough and imaginative enough to do the job we have to do now, as we face a ring of powerful and determined enemies bent on our destruction?

The trouble with the liberals is not that they are too progressive. No, not at all.

Their weakness is that they are out-of-date. They are frozen in the posture of the thirties. They are prisoners of the propaganda slogans of a past generation. They are caught in a web of rigid formulas which may never have had much reality and which today amount to nothing less than complete and absolute lunacy.

It will be the task of us Republicans—of us conservatives—to bring these archaic liberals up to date.

If we have to do it, I promise you, we will drag them kicking and screaming into the second half of the 20th century.

SHAMEFUL PLIGHT OF MIGRANT WORKERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recently the Migratory Labor Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee concluded hearings on legislation which will alleviate the plight of the migratory farmworker and his family.

The chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], deserves the commendation of all Americans for the magnificent job he has done and is doing in bringing this situation to the attention of the public and in urging action to remedy it.

The conditions under which our migratory farmworkers live and work are a blight on our Nation. It is a shameful disgrace that here in the richest Nation in the world we have 2 million people caught in a system that is not far removed from the serfdom of the middle ages.

While we concern ourselves, and rightly so, with raising the standard of living for hundreds of millions of peons in Latin America and untold millions of peasants in Asia and Africa, we at the same time have been brushing under the carpet the shocking fact that millions of our fellow Americans exist under similar conditions.

The soaring sixties will never leave the launching pad for these unfortunate Americans if we in Congress do not at once begin to do something about their deplorable living standards and lack of governmental protection.

Migratory workers are people who have been forgotten by our so-called affluent society. They are the forgotten Americans of today. Yet, the crisp fruits and vegetables that come to the American dinner table are, for the most part, picked by people laboring 10 hours a day for $6 or $7 at back-breaking labor in a blue-sky sweatshop.

Their average income is less than $1,000 a year. Their children seldom receive an education above the elementary level. Indeed, they are lucky if they receive that much. They rarely see a doctor or are entitled to local public health services. They do not live long enough in any one community. Until they are old enough to work, their days are spent in sitting in the fields and watching their parents toil from dawn to dark. Home to them is one unsanitary, decrepit shack after another.

These people are totally excluded from protection of social security and fair labor standards laws. They have yet to benefit from the measures passed over 20 years ago during the New Deal.

More often than not American migrant laborers are Negroes. Even lower on the economic scale are the 400,000 Mexicans imported temporarily each year under an agreement with their Government. At least these foreign workers receive certain minimum protection, free housing, and free insurance against occupational hazards under our agreement with the Mexican Government. They have somebody to look after them.

At the same time our native Americans are exempted from almost all the welfare provisions enjoyed by their fellow Americans.

State and local governments and organizations have in many instances acted to aid these people. However, unfortunately, in many cases there is no responsible State or local force at work. This is a national problem concerning all Americans. We can no longer bury our heads in the sand and pretend that the problem does not exist.

Action must be taken by Congress immediately to bring these people and their children into the 20th century. It is true that they are a comparatively small minority in a Nation of 180 million but nevertheless they are significant beyond their numbers. If we believe in economic and social justice for all Americans, it must include these two million people.

We must help the States to provide better education for transient youngsters and establish programs for their parents in fundamental education and practical training in use of sanitary and other modern facilities.

We should guarantee low-interest loans to encourage official agencies and local groups to provide satisfactory housing for farm workers. The minimum wage law should be extended to include these workers, and there is no valid reason why they should not be entitled to participate immediately in our beneficent social security program. These and other recommendations of the subcommittee should be acted upon during this session of Congress. With each month that goes by without our doing so, thousands of children are denied the right to a full education and a better life while their parents continue to toil under deplorable conditions.

In doing these things America will once again prove that it is a nation where no one is forgotten, where the young have faith and their elders have hope, and where all working men and women may trust and love their Government and be trusted by it.

RESOLUTION OF FREEDOM HOUSE ON THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Freedom House, which is one of the best known and most dedicated organizations in this country in the fight against communism as well as totalitarianism on either the extreme left or the extreme right, had adopted through its board of directors a statement on the Birch Society, which I believe will be of interest to all Members of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the board of directors of Freedom House on the John Birch Society be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF FREEDOM HOUSE

Freedom House and its officers wish to state their beliefs in regard to the John Birch Society without participating in the flame fanning which often is a byproduct of this type of statement. Given time, many who have joined the society will recognize that they have been attracted to it by a false appeal. Certainly they will not condone the ridiculous charges leveled by their leaders against General Eisenhower, Chief Justice Warren, and other distinguished Americans.

Freedom House does not believe that the John Birch Society is fighting communism or that it is in any sense conservative. Those who join the society should be under no such delusions. They are serving the cause of destruction and chaos, which is a requisite for a successful Communist advance.

First, the John Birch Society is not fighting communism because no Communist operative was ever apprehended or diverted by its methods. Communist subversives do not leave trails for the telephone threatener, the student informer, the boycotter, or any of the other sneak warriors of Birchism. Catching Communist spies is a job for professionals; casting suspicion on the FBI and the CIA only makes the job harder and gives Communists a better chance to do their work.

Second, the John Birch Society is not fighting communism because such tools as doubt, suspicion, and prejudice employed by the society are also standard Communist weapons. These tactics are written into every agitator's manual that comes out of Moscow. Every one of the score of countries taken over by the Communists was first prepared by the injection of these community poisons. Every country now marked for takeover is being similarly prepared.

Third, the John Birch Society's targets are the most imaginative and effective of the free world's defenses against the Communist threat: the Marshall plan, the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Consider these targets and the fulminations of Communists from Stalin to Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung against the same targets. Who is allied with whom?

Fourth, the John Birch Society is not conservative; it is not even reactionary. Its declaration of war upon "the greatest enemy of man (which) is government" is a call to anarchy. Disguised in that call is the threat of new tyranny and oppression. Note some of its domestic targets: civil rights, collective bargaining, the social gospel of religion. Then ask whether the John Birch Society does not seek to destroy those same human rights which are suppressed in every Nation under Communist rule.

Fifth, the John Birch Society is neither "left" nor "right" but of that perfect circle where both sides join and merge completely in extremism for its own sake. When the left and the right forsake ethics and morals for "goals," means for ends, moderation for violence, they lose their separate meanings. A social order built by false witness, fear and hatred can never be anything but a world of falsity, fear and hatred. This is why the American people have in the past rejected the Know-Nothings, the Ku Klux Klanners, the Black Legion vigilantes, the Coughlinites and the McCarthyites, as well as the Communists.

Freedom House does not dispute the Birchers' rights to drape themselves in garments of their own styling, nor their right to proselytize and recruit among the well and not-so-well intentioned. As another Chief Justice once remarked, it is "the God-given right of the people to make damned fools of themselves." But the truth must be offered up alongside the falsehoods in the marketplace of ideas. Let us hope that those in the John Birch Society who are well-intentioned will see the light before suffering further public humiliation at the hands of their self-appointed leaders.

REMAINING TRUE TO THE PRINCIPLES UPON WHICH OUR NATION WAS FOUNDED

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, an extremely pertinent article by Walter Lippmann appeared in the Washington Post this morning. It takes its headline from the admonition made in farewell to Laertes by his father, Polonius, in the first act of Hamlet:

This, above all, to thine own self be true.

It discusses the need of remaining true to the principles upon which our Nation was founded and has grown, if we are to prevail in the struggle against the Communist ideology. I ask unanimous consent that this unusually timely and articulate article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO OURSELVES BE TRUE

(By Walter Lippmann)

We have been forced to ask ourselves recently how a free and open society can compete with a totalitarian state. This is a crucial question. Can our Western society survive and flourish if it remains true to its own faith and principles? Or must it abandon them in order to fight fire with fire?

There are those who believe that in Cuba the attempt to fight fire with fire would have succeeded if only the President had been more ruthless and had had no scruples about using American forces. I think they are wrong. I think that success for the Cuban adventure was impossible. In a free society like ours a policy is bound to fail which deliberately violates our pledges and our principles, our treaties and our laws. It is not possible for a free and open society to organize successfully a spectacular conspiracy.

The United States, like every other government, must employ secret agents. But the United States cannot successfully conduct large secret conspiracies. It is impossible to keep them secret. It is impossible for everybody concerned, beginning with the President himself, to be sufficiently ruthless and unscrupulous. The American conscience is a reality. It will make hesitant and ineffectual, even if it does not prevent, an un-American policy. The ultimate reason why the Cuban affair was incompetent is that it was out of character, like a cow that tried to fly or a fish that tried to walk.

It follows that, in the great struggle with communism, we must find our strength by developing and applying our own principles, not in abandoning them. Before anyone tells me that this is sissy, I should like to say why I believe it, especially after listening carefully and at some length to Mr. Khrushchev. I am very certain that we shall have the answer to Mr. Khrushchev if, but only if, we stop being fascinated by the cloak and dagger business and, being true to ourselves, take our own principles seriously.

Mr. K. is a true believer that communism is destined to supplant capitalism as capitalism supplanted feudalism. For him this is an absolute dogma, and he will tell you that while he intends to do what he can to assist the inevitable, knowing that we will do what we can to oppose the inevitable, what he does and what we do will not be decisive. Destiny will be realized no matter what men do.

The dogma of inevitability not only gives him the self-assurance of a man who has no doubts but is a most powerful ingredient of

the Communist propaganda. What do we say to him, we who believe in a certain freedom of the human will and in the capacity of men to affect the course of history by their discoveries, their wisdom, and their courage?

We can say that in Mr. K.'s dogma there is an unexamined premise. It is that the capitalist society is static, that it is and always will be what it was when Marx described it a hundred years ago, that, to use Mr. K.'s own lingo, there is no difference between Governor Rockefeller and his grandfather because a capitalist society cannot change, in its dealings with the underdeveloped countries it can only dominate and exploit. It cannot emancipate and help. If it could emancipate and help, the inevitability of communism would evaporate.

I venture to argue from this analysis that the reason we are on the defensive in so many places is that for some 10 years we have been doing exactly what Mr. K. expects us to do. We have used money and arms in a long losing attempt to stabilize native governments which, in the name of anti-communism, are opposed to all important social change. This has been exactly what Mr. K.'s dogma calls for—that communism should be the only alternative to the status quo with its immemorial poverty and privilege.

We cannot compete with communism in Asia, Africa, or Latin America if we go on doing what we have done so often and so widely—which is to place the weak countries in a dilemma where they must stand still with us and our client rulers, or start moving with the Communists. This dilemma cannot be dissolved unless it is our central and persistent and unswerving policy to offer these unhappy countries a third option, which is economic development and social improvement without the totalitarian discipline of communism.

For the only real alternative to communism is a liberal and progressive society.

THE HEALTH OF OUR DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, many of us have been greatly concerned with the continuing health of our domestic industries in the face of increased foreign competition. Various programs have been put into practice to give our own enterprises a proper opportunity to successfully compete in the modern-day marketplace. In many respects, these have not proved effective enough, and therefore the search for new plans to accomplish a creative balance between adequate protection for domestic industries and realistic international trade policies must go on.

My colleague from Massachusetts in the House of Representatives from our Fifth District, Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE, was recently complimented in a lead editorial in the Lowell Sun for his comments with regard to textile imports. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be placed in the body of the RECORD at this place in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CURB ON IMPORTS

A movement to curb the flood of imports coming into this country from foreign lands has been started in Congress. A bipartisan group has recommended to the Kennedy administration that immediate steps be taken to dam this flood and to give American manufacturers and American workers some relief from this form of unwarranted competition.

Congressman BRAD MORSE, of Lowell, was among those who shouted down the present loose, vacillating policy of the Government in respect to textile imports.

"The 1960's have been called a decade of decisions for the United States," the Lowell solon said. "We must soon decide how we are going to save some of our basic industries—industries vital to our economy and essential to our security—or we must be prepared to accept the responsibility for their demise."

We agree with Mr. MORSE that there is a serious challenge ahead. That becomes much more vivid and realistic when the gloomy events of the 1950's are reviewed. American industry, production, and labor suffered during the past decade through a policy of "let down the bars." We were striving to make friends and keep old ones by a policy that actually encouraged imports from lands where labor makes only a pittance and the quality of goods is not expertly checked.

We recall the downfall of the great New England textile empire which failed to get adequate protection from the policies of both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations.

In other lines, there has been the flood of foreign compact cars to plague the big American auto industry. And it might be mentioned that as late as last Christmas the toy market of this country was glutted with a vast quantity of inferior products from Japan.

Yes, we believe that industry and labor of the United States needs much greater protection from oversea competition than it has been getting from Washington.

The excessive flow of foreign imports must be stopped, or, at least, reduced.

If this is truly a time for decision, then the administration and the Congress must act without delay. A long delay could be fatal to the national economy.

MODERN CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF LAOS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President. Laos has been uppermost in the news for several months now, and all of us realize the importance of the struggle taking place in that small kingdom thousands of miles from our shores. All of us, too, are familiar, I am sure, with the recent events that have taken place in Laos. But, I wonder how many of us know very much about the past history of that country.

In the April 20 issue of the Senate Republican Memo, No. 16, there was printed a concise history of that country. The study, made by the staff of the Republican policy committee, starts in 1893—the year France established the protectorate known as the Indochina Union—and stops in the early part of this year, 1961, with the establishment of the anti-Communist Government, under Prince Boun Oum as Premier.

Mr. President, I feel that this study would be of value to all Members of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent to have the "Modern Chronological History of Laos" printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERN CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF LAOS

The year 1893: The modern history of Laos dates from the establishment of a protectorate by France over what then was two kingdoms—Luang Prabang and Vientiane (now Laos)—and included Cambodia and what is now North and South Vietnam. This protectorate was known as the Indochina Union.

The year 1925: Although the French managed relatively well in the area up until the time of World War II, by the middle 1920's Ho Chi Minh was organizing nationalist independence movement with the Communists.

The year 1940: After the fall of France in World War II, the Japanese occupied the area of Laos for a time.

The year 1945: French rule was restored at the end of the war, but by this time Ho Chi Minh's organization was the most powerful in North Vietnam which borders Laos.

The year 1946: By this time, the French were engaged in the Indochina war with the Viet Minh Communist forces of Ho. This bloody struggle continued for 8 years.

The year 1947: On May 11, the King of Laos promulgated a constitution providing for a constitutional monarchy under the Luang Prabang dynasty and for a parliamentary government. The two former kingdoms were formed into what is now Laos.

The year 1949: Laos became an independent sovereign state by treaty with France on July 19 of that year.

The year 1953: During most of the Indochina war, Laos was isolated from the struggle. But in April, Ho Chi Minh's forces invaded the northern provinces of Laos and were joined by Pathet Lao Communist guerrillas who had been organized, equipped, and trained by the Viet Minh.

The year 1954: With the French defeat at Dien Bein Phu on May 8, the same day nine nations, including the United States, began negotiations at Geneva for a cease-fire and armistice for the war on Indochina. This cease-fire agreement was signed July 21, and in it the Laos regime was recognized by the Communist forces in Indochina and most members of the United Nations.

However, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles walked out of the conference in disgust and refused to sign the Indochina War Truce. U.S. recognition of the Laos regime did come at that time. Mr. Dulles issued a U.S. unilateral pledge not to use force to upset the agreements, adding that the United States "would view any renewal of the aggression in violation" of the agreements "with grave concern."

At that time, so little was known about the Pathet Lao movement, that when Red China's Chou En-lai proposed at this Geneva conference that they be represented, Secretary of State Dulles and the American delegation plus most of the other Western delegates asked: "Who are the Pathet Lao?" So, they were represented at the conference, and the Geneva armistice acknowledged their existence.

In relation to Laos, this armistice provided two things: (1) that the Pathet Lao troops should withdraw to the northern provinces of Laos, Sam Neua and Phongsaly, and be integrated with the Royal Laotian Army, and (2) that there would be created an International Control and Supervisory Commission, made up of representatives of Canada, Poland, and India, to implement the armistice terms.

The year 1955: Laos joined the United Nations in December.

The year 1957: After lengthy haggles about the political settlement within Laos, it was agreed in November, by the Royal Laotian Government and the Laotian Communists that (1) government authority would be restored in the two northern Communist-held provinces, and (2) 1,500 men of the Red Pathet Lao force would be integrated into the Royal Army. Communist political leaders also were to be taken into the government and a Communist Party, called the

Neo Lao Hak Xat (Laotian Patriotic Front), was to be recognized.

Since the Geneva conference, Laos has gone through intermittent periods of crisis and of relative calm, depending on the strength of the three political factions: the pro-Communist Pathet Lao led by Souphanouvong; the neutralists led by Souvanna Phouma; and the anti-Communists led by Gen. Phoumi Nosavan. U.S. moral, military, and financial aid has been on the side of strong man Gen. Phoumi Nosavan.

The year 1958: May 4 of this year saw the end of the first relatively calm period dating from July 1954, when the Government had been primarily in the control of the neutralists, under Souvanna Phouma. On that day, elections were held to fill 21 new seats in the National Assembly. The Neo Lao Hak Xat Party and its allies captured 13 of the 21. It appeared to the West that the Communists might pull off another Czechoslovakia, particularly since for 6 months two Pathet Lao representatives, including Souphanouvong, had been members of the Cabinet. Also, the Pathet Lao had begun a campaign of sabotage of the collaboration.

In July 1958, Souvanna Phouma resigned, the International Commission suspended its operations, and the coalition Cabinet quit. The anti-Communist Lao leaders set up a new pro-Western regime with Phoui Sananikone as Premier and Gen. Phoumi Nosavan as "strong man." The Assembly was suspended for a year, the Pathet Lao was thrown out of the Cabinet, and the leftists were imprisoned, including the Communist Party leaders. The two battalions of Communists were split up, one being integrated into the Royal Army, the other fleeing to Communist Vietnam.

But, the move from a neutralist regime, including Communists, to a pro-Western regime, without Communists, brought about Communist response. Guerrilla warfare broke out again.

The year 1959: The new Cabinet renounced the 1954 Geneva agreements, including neutralism for Laos, and said that it would recognize only the United Nations as an arbitration body for disputes.

By the fall of 1959, the warfare between the Government and the Communist guerrillas led to an appeal to the United Nations, with the Lao Government charging Laos had been invaded by North Vietnam. In September, the U.N. Security Council, circumventing two Soviet vetoes, sent to Laos a factfinding group with a Japanese as chairman. In November, the group reported that, while there had been guerrilla fighting, it had discovered no evidence of the direct aggression the Lao Government had charged against the Viet Minh, but did find that North Vietnam had supported the Pathet Lao with "equipment, arms, ammunition, and the help of political cadres." With the investigation of the U.N. group and a subsequent visit to Laos by U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, the fighting subsided.

The year 1960: The anti-Communist, pro-Western government continued in power until August 9, 1960, when the young, American-trained Capt. Kong Le and his 2d Paratroop Battalion seized Vientiane in a surprise coup d'etat, ousting the rightist regime and restoring neutralist Souvanna Phouma to power. However, the new neutralist government included several pro-Western ministers from the previous Cabinet and Kong Le was ordered to resume his army duties.

But strong man Gen. Phoumi Nosavan rallied his forces in the south in a new government under Prince Boun Oum, while the Pathet Lao advanced from the north to try to help Kong Le.

On October 4, Souvanna Phouma announced that peace negotiations with the Pathet Lao would begin within a week. Immediately American aid to Laos was halted. The State Department tried to persuade Souvanna Phouma to join Boun Oum and Phoumi Nosavan in an anti-Communist alliance. Souvanna Phouma refused, stating that if the United States did not respect his country's neutral position and did not resume aid, Laos would look elsewhere for aid.

On October 13, the first Soviet Ambassador to Laos arrived in Vientiane and Souvanna Phouma began negotiating for Soviet aid and to establish friendly relations with Communist China.

U.S. military aid was resumed to Gen. Phoumi Nosavan's rightwing rebels, after Souvanna Phouma had been assured that it would not be used against the neutralist government. However, Gen. Phoumi Nosavan could not be restrained, and he advanced on Vientiane. On December 9, Souvanna Phouma fled into exile in Cambodia with most of his Cabinet, still claiming to be the legal Premier. Quinim Polsena, leader of the Neutralist (Santiphab) Party, assumed control as Premier, and Kong Le remained as head of the forces defending Vientiane against Phoumi Nosavan. On December 15, Kong Le was driven out of Vientiane and joined the Communist Pathet Lao.

Also during December 1960, the Soviets added a new, ominous element to the chaos in Laos—an airlift of arms by Soviet planes from Ho Chi Minh's capital of Hanoi to the Pathet Lao forces.

The year 1961: The anti-Communist government, headed by Prince Boun Oum, chosen Premier by "strong man" Gen. Phoumi Nosavan, was endorsed as the legal government of Laos by a unanimous vote of the National Assembly on January 4. It was immediately recognized by the United States, and this anti-Communist nonneutralist government is still in power.

Fighting, with few casualties, has continued up to the present.

MODERN CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF ALGERIA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, trouble spots seem to be appearing fast and furiously all over the world these days. And I, for one, find it hard to keep up with all of the happenings each day in the various "hot spots" of the world. So, this leaves me little time to refresh my memory on the past histories of various parts of the world.

For that reason, I was quite pleased to read a study, made by the staff of the Republican policy committee, in the recent issue of the Senate Republican Memo No. 18. This study is entitled "Modern Chronological History of Algeria," and quickly and accurately goes over the major events in Algeria from 1830, when it was captured by the French, up to April 22 of this year when the revolt against President de Gaulle took place. I found this study a very easy way to refresh my memory, and commend it to the other Members of the Senate for that reason.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this study on Algeria printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERN CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF ALGERIA

The year 1830: Algeria was captured by the French in July 1830, and after several years more of warfare, the bases of political and administrative organization of Northern Algeria were established by the French.

The year 1890: The French commenced occupation of the Algerian Sahara and brought it under their control in 1891. In the following year the southern part of Algeria was consolidated into an administrative unit. The administrative system established during 1898–1901 promoted the rapid industrial, political, and social development of Algeria under the Third Republic.

The year 1919: French citizenship was granted to monogamous Algerians who had fought in World War I and were able to speak and read French.

The year 1930: All natives who were not citizens became judicable in French courts under the same conditions as those natives who were citizens.

The year 1940: With the surrender of France, Algeria declared its adherence to the Vichy regime, and within a few months all vestiges of democratic administration disappeared.

The year 1942: Anglo-American forces invaded North Africa, taking over Algerian ports and making Algiers the Headquarters of Allied Forces in the Mediterranean.

The year 1943: The French Committee of National Liberation moved to Algiers, repealed the Vichy repressive decrees, and approved an important series of political and social reforms. The French Army was reformed in Algeria, composed in large part of Algerian troops, and it participated in the liberation of France.

The year 1944: A French decree was passed on March 7, conferring citizenship on all French-speaking Algerians without requiring renunciation of the Islamic law.

The year 1946: With the end of World War II, the French Union was formed and Algeria was constituted a government-general. This special status was further defined in the Algerian statute of 1947, as follows:

The Governor General is appointed by the French Minister of Interior and has administrative powers in all fields except justice and education. He is assisted by a six-member Council of Government.

The Algerian Legislative Assembly, elected for 6 years, consists of 60 representatives of the first electoral college (whites and a few Moslems of full French citizenship) and 60 of the second electoral college (the Moslem majority). Algeria sends 30 deputies (15 whites and 15 Moslems) to the French National Assembly, 14 senators to the French Council of the Republic, and 18 representatives to the French Union Assembly.

The three oversea departments of northern Algeria (Alger, Constantine, and Iran) have the same status as metropolitan France, itself, and the territories of southern Algeria are constituted as a fourth department.

DEVELOPMENT OF ALGERIAN REVOLT

The year 1954: On November 1, the rebellion began, near Tunisia in the Aures Mountains, under the command of Mohammed Ben Bella.

The year 1955: In February, the government of French Premier Pierre Mendez-France was overthrown on the issue of his program of increased home rule and reform for Algeria.

On September 20, France walked out of a United Nations session after a debate on Algeria was scheduled, insisting that the rebellion was an "internal" matter within metropolitan France. The U.N. dropped the debate and France returned.

The year 1956: In February, Socialist Premier Guy Mollet, who came into office with a liberal Algerian program, was pelted with tomatoes by Europeans at Algiers. He switched to a tougher Algerian policy. On April 21, Ferhat Abbas, along with other moderate nationalists, joined the rebel National Liberation Front (FLN).

On October 22, Ben Bella and four FLN colleagues were seized while on a flight from Rabat to Tunis, taken to Algiers, and later transferred to France.

The year 1957: On January 9, the FLN refused Mollet's offer of a cease-fire as a prelude to free elections.

The year 1958: On May 13, army and European settlers seized control of Algiers—the beginning of a string of actions culminating in the collapse of the Fourth Republic.

On June 1, Gen. Charles de Gaulle became Premier of France. He stated that his mandate was to change the French political structure and end the Algerian war.

Between June 4 and 6, De Gaulle visited Algeria to reassert the authority of his government and to start action toward a settlement.

On August 24, De Gaulle toured French oversea territories, and offered independence to France's other African possessions by giving them the privilege of a "no" vote in a proposed referendum on a new constitution. The offer did not apply to Algeria because, technically, it was a part of France.

On October 9, an attempt was made by General de Gaulle to bring the French army in Algeria under control by ordering officers to quit Algerian politics.

Five days later, Maj. Gen. Jacques Massu and 11 other officers resigned their posts in the Rightist All-Algeria Committee of Public Safety.

On October 23, General de Gaulle extended invitations to FLN leaders to come to France under safe conduct to discuss a peace of the brave.

On October 25, Ferhat Abbas declined the invitation as "a request for unconditional surrender," but left the way open for future negotiations on "a real solution."

The year 1959: On September 16, General de Gaulle, for the first time, raised the possibility of Algerian independence. He offered Algerians a chance to choose their political future in a referendum within 4 years of a "restoration of peace."

On September 28, the rebel provisional government stated that it was not ready to start negotiations, but insisted that political discussions begin immediately. This proposal was rejected by General de Gaulle.

The year 1960: On January 24, Europeans at Algiers rioted over dismissal of Massu, who was a leader in the 1958 coup. They set up street barricades, and the army, commanded by Gen. Maurice Challe, refused to disperse them, but did seal them off.

Five days later, General de Gaulle's command to the army to restore order was broadcast. The French settlers' barricades were gradually abandoned, without a clash with the army. Civilian leaders, including Pierre La Gaillarde, were jailed, and the transfers of disobedient officers were effected by General de Gaulle.

On June 14, an address was made by General de Gaulle, for the first time, to FLN leaders in an appeal for peace negotiations.

On June 14, the FLN broke off plans for cease-fire talks after the French had imposed rigid conditions which, the rebels stated, deprived them "of every liberty inherent with the dignity and status of negotiators."

On September 7, General de Gaulle stated that France would not negotiate on Algeria's political future until the FLN laid down its arms.

On October 23, Abbas stated that the FLN would not lay down its arms until a political decision on the future of Algeria had been reached, and announced that he had found "the support we need among the Communists—in Peiping and Moscow."

On November 4, General de Gaulle accepted the idea of Algerian independence—"an emancipated Algeria with her own government, her institutions and her laws." However, he still demanded a cease-fire before negotiation, and the FLN made a request for U.N. supervision of any vote.

On November 16, in the face of rightist opposition, De Gaulle set January 8 for a referendum on his Algerian policy. The aim was to demonstrate popular support in France and Algeria.

The year 1961: On January 8, De Gaulle's plan to give Algeria self-determination won 75.2 percent of the French vote, and 65.4 percent of the Algerian vote.

On March 17, General de Gaulle's offer for peace talks was accepted by FLN.

On April 7, the peace talks scheduled to begin in Evian-les-Bains were not held. The FLN refused to attend because French intent was to stage parallel talks with a rival group, the Algerian National Movement, headed by Messali Hadj.

On April 12, De Gaulle began another trip through France to rally support for his Algerian policies. He stated that he foresaw a major role for the FLN, but that he expected an independent Algeria to preserve ties with France.

On April 22, the French troops at Algiers revolted and took control of the city, in defiance of De Gaulle.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION OPPOSING RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, between January 1951 and August 1959, the Senate or the House of Representatives, either separately or jointly, passed by floor action at least 16 resolutions or amendments to other measures expressing opposition to admission of Red China to the United Nations. On specific resolutions limited to that question all votes were unanimous for a total of 2,161 opposing the seating of Communist China in the United Nations to not one single favorable vote.

I doubt that any other issue ever came before the Congress over a period of 9 years with at least 16 record votes where such unanimity can be found. The results on the votes speak more eloquently than any other argument I can think of as to the sense of the Congress on the question of the United States continuing opposition to sitting in the United Nations with the murder regime of Mao Tse-tung and company.

I ask unanimous consent to have the "Congressional Action Opposing Recognition of Red China" printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION OPPOSING RECOGNITION OF RED CHINA, 1951–59

1. Eighty-second Congress, first session, January 23, 1951: Senate Resolution 36, declaring that it is the sense of the Senate that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China. On agreeing to the resolution: Yeas 91, nays 0 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 1, p. 560).

2. Eighty-second Congress, first session, May 15, 1951: House Resolution 96, resolving that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Chinese Communist authorities shall not be permitted to represent China in the United Nations. Passed under unanimous consent proceedings (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 4, p. 5376).

3. Eighty-third Congress, first session, June 3, 1953: H.R. 4974, Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations Act, 1954. On Bridges amendment on behalf of committee declaring it to be the sense of Congress that the government of Communist China should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China. The amendment was adopted: Yeas 76, nays 0 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 5, p. 5973).

4. Eighty-third Congress, first session, July 21, 1953: On the Clevenger motion to concur in Senate Amendment No. 17 (sec. 111 of State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations Act, 1954) that "It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China." The motion was agreed to: Yeas 379, nays 0 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 99, pt. 7, p. 9406).

5. Eighty-third Congress, second session, July 15, 1954: House Resolution 627 reiterates the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations. The resolution was agreed to: Yeas 381, nays 0 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 8, p. 10649).

6. Eighty-third Congress, second session, July 29, 1954: H.R. 9678 Mutual Security Act, 1954. The Congress hereby reiterates its opposition to the seating in the United Nations of the Communist China regime as the representative of China. In the event of the seating of representatives of the Chinese Communist regime in the Security Council or General Assembly of the United Nations, the President is requested to inform the Congress insofar as is compatible with the requirements of national security, of the implications of this action upon the foreign policy of the United States and our foreign relationships, including that created by membership in the United Nations, together with any recommendations which he may have with respect to the matter. The amendment was adopted: Yeas 91, nays 0 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 100, pt. 9, p. 12520).

7. Eighty-fourth Congress, first session, June 30, 1955: Section 12 of the Mutual Security Act of 1955 (Public Law 138). It is hereby declared to be the continuing sense of the Congress that the Communist regime in China has not demonstrated its willingness to fulfill the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations. Adopted by the House on a division vote: Yeas 221, nays 0 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 101, pt. 7, p. 9664).

8. Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, June 20, 1956: H.R. 10721 section 110 of the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1957 (title I of Public Law 603). It is the sense of Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China. Passed as part of the appropriations bill (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 7, pp. 9988, 10071).

9. Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, July 11 and July 24, 1956: Section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1957 (Public Law 853). The Congress hereby reiterates is opposition to the seating in the United Nations of the Communist China regime as the representative of China, and it is hereby declared to be the continuing sense of the Congress that the Communist regime in China has not demonstrated its willingness to fulfill the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations. In the event of the seating of representatives of the Chinese Communist regime in the Security Council or General Assembly of the United Nations, the President is requested to inform the Congress insofar as is compatible with the requirements of national security, of the implications of this action upon the foreign policy of the United States and our foreign

relationships, including that created by membership in the United Nations, together with any recommendations which he may have with respect to the matter. Bill was passed by the House on July 11, 1956, and by the Senate July 24, 1956 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 9, p. 12381, and pt. 10, p. 14225).

10. Eighty-fourth Congress, second session, July 18 and July 23, 1956: House Concurrent Resolution 265 Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) that it is the sense of the Congress that its previous expressions should be and are hereby reemphasized that the Communist regime in China should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies as the representatives of China; and that the Congress hereby expresses its conviction that such admission would gravely injure the United Nations and impair its effective functioning in accordance with the aims, principles, and provisions of the United Nations Charter. Passed by the Senate July 23: Yeas 86, nays 0; passed by the House July 18: Yeas 391, nays 0 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 102, pt. 10, pp. 13378, 13943).

11. Eighty-fifth Congress, first session, April 17 and May 15, 1957: Title I, section 105 of the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1958 (H.R. 6871) (Public Law 85-49). It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China. Passed the House by voice vote April 17, 1957. Passed the Senate May 15, 1957: Yeas 77, nays 0 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 5, pp. 5908, 6997).

12. Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, August 29 and 30, 1957: Section 109 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1958 (H.R. 9302) (Public Law 85-279). The Congress hereby reiterates its opposition to the seating in the United Nations of the Communist China regime as the representative of China, and it is hereby declared to be the continuing sense of the Congress that the Communist regime in China has not demonstrated its willingness to fulfill the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations. In the event of the seating of representatives of the Chinese Communist regime in the Security Council or General Assembly of the United Nations, the President is requested to inform the Congress insofar as is compatible with the requirements of national security, of the implications of this action upon the foreign policy of the United States and our foreign relationships, including that created by membership in the United Nations, together with any recommendations which he may have with respect to the matter. Passed by the Senate August 29, 1957; passed by the House August 30, 1957 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 12, pp. 16485, 16751).

13. Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, May 15 and June 11, 1958: Title I, section 105 of the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1959 (H.R. 12428) (Public Law 85-474). It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China. Passed by the House May 15, 1958; passed by the Senate June 11, 1958 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 7, p. 8896, and pt. 8, p. 10871).

14. Eighty-fifth Congress, second session, August 23, 1958: Section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1959 (H.R. 13192) (P.L. 85-853). The Congress hereby reiterates its opposition to the seating in the United Nations of the Communist China regime as the representative of China, and it is hereby declared to be the continuing sense of the Congress that the Communist regime in China has not demonstrated its willingness to fulfill the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations. In the event of the seating of representatives of the Chinese Communist regime in the Security Council or General Assembly of the United Nations, the President is requested to inform the Congress insofar as is compatible with the requirements of national security, of the implications of this action upon the foreign policy of the United States and our foreign relationships, including that created by membership in the United Nations, together with any recommendations which he may have with respect to the matter. Passed the House and Senate August 23, 1958 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 104, pt. 15, pp. 19534, 19686).

15. Eighty-sixth Congress, first session, July 1, 1959: Title I, section 105 of the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1960 (H.R. 7343) (P.L. 86-84). It is the sense of the Congress that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China. Passed by the Senate and House July 1, 1959 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 10, pp. 12410, 12479).

16. Eighty-sixth Congress, first session, August 17, 1959: House Concurrent Resolution 369. Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), that it is the sense of the Congress that its opposition to the seating in the United Nations of the Communist China regime as the representative of China should be and is hereby reiterated; and be it further

Resolved, That it is hereby declared to be the continuing sense of the Congress that the Communist regime in China has not demonstrated its willingness to fulfill the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations and should not be recognized to represent China in the United Nations. Resolution passed under suspension of rules August 17, 1959: Yeas 368, nays 0 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 12, p. 16094).

It should be noted that all of the above resolutions and amendments to, or sections in other bills which came to a floor vote before either House were limited to the question of admission of Communist China to the United Nations. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Legislative Reference Section of the Library of Congress were unable to cite any votes registering congressional opposition to the diplomatic recognition of Communist China by the United States.

TAX REFORM

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, everyone knows there is a need for reform of our Federal tax structure. There are widespread criticisms on one hand of high tax rates and on the other hand of loopholes which permit some favored groups to escape paying their fair share of taxes. Many proposals for changing the tax system have been made by business organizations, labor unions, lawyers, accountants, and others. Congressional committees have held extensive hearings on the need for tax revision both to increase the fairness in distributing the tax burden and to improve the tax system so that it will contribute more to sustainable economic growth. But little has been done along these lines. Tax reform involves controversial issues, and there has been a virtual stalemate on questions of reform.

The President has set out a sound and practical program—one that will provide important improvements in the tax system this year and move on to additional reforms in the following year.

The basic ideas underlying the President's recommendation for tax revision are unquestionably sound. We can broaden the income tax base—the income subject to tax—by eliminating or restricting many of the special preferences which have been adopted over the years for this group or that group of favored taxpayers. With a larger tax base we can revise the tax rates and still obtain the revenues needed to finance essential Government activities. Reduction of high tax rates in all income brackets will lessen the repressive effects of taxes on incentives for individual effort, for investments, and for the undertaking of new business ventures. The elimination of special preferences will mean that persons with equal incomes will pay equal taxes. The removal of many of these special provisions from the tax law will give us a simpler tax system. The need for simplification is particularly evident to most of us at this time of year, when we have just gone through the process of working out our own tax returns.

Obviously, special preferences are of benefit to some of our citizens and they will probably urge that provisions which favor them must not be changed. In approaching these problems it is important that we take the broad view. If each favored group would rather have its special provision than general tax reform which will benefit taxpayers across the board, we will remain in stalemate. Then tax relief will come only piecemeal as other groups of taxpayers or income recipients succeed in getting narrow special preferences for their particular situations. This course leads to a narrower and narrower tax base, higher tax rates and multiple discriminations in the way the tax burdens are distributed.

The President has taken the right approach to tax reform. He has outlined a constructive and gradual program for reappraising these issues and revising our tax system so that it can meet our national needs adequately and fairly. We should give him our full support and best efforts to carry through this program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Killjoy," from the Washington Post of May 6, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KILLJOY

They looked upon Franklin Roosevelt as a traitor to his class, and if you listen hard perhaps you will hear the screams about Douglas Dillon now being generated in some of the country's finest clubs and night spots. Here is the Secretary of the Treasury, a Republican of indisputable credentials, turning out to be the nemesis of the expense-account gymnast.

Well, we're all for him. He won't begrudge the sales manager a martini or two for the prize customer as a business expense, but those tax-deductible yachts and hunting safaris to Africa just have to go. The groans

will be simply awful, but somehow we imagine that American business, put to its ingenuity, can survive this kind of austerity.

In blunt terms the business expense account has become in too many instances a racket financed by Uncle Sam. Mr. Dillon's proposal to the House Ways and Means Committee for revised rules governing deductible expenses—for example, a $10 maximum annual outlay on business gifts to any individual and a $7 daily limit on entertainment of one individual—looks in the right direction. There is no good reason why the U.S. Government, meaning all of us taxpayers, should underwrite the high living of a few. One wonders at the past flexibility—perhaps "credulity" is the word—of the Internal Revenue Service in some of the cases described to Congress.

More seriously, the practices thus chronicled confirm before the world the worst stereotypes about the capitalist system. They make a mockery of fairness in taxation. The firms which have sought to avoid such abuses, and the others which have guilty conscience, ought to recognize that Mr. Dillon actually is doing business a favor.

INTERVIEW WITH REPRESENTATIVE OLIN E. TEAGUE, OF TEXAS, APPEARING IN NATION'S BUSINESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the May issue of Nation's Business carries a most informative and interesting article on a subject which is of importance to all Members of Congress, as well as to millions of Americans. The article contains an interview with Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, on the basic question of: What our Nation owes its former servicemen.

Mr. TEAGUE's frank answers to these challenging questions will, I believe, stimulate thought on the overall question of a veterans' program for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Where U.S. Debt to Veterans Ends," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE U.S. DEBT TO VETERANS ENDS

(An interview with Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee)

Costly new veterans' programs being debated in Congress are raising a basic question: What does the Nation owe its former servicemen?

Already, veterans' benefits are costing taxpayers $5 billion a year. Yet pressure is applied each year for broader and broader programs. Major proposals this year include extension of educational benefits to servicemen who serve only in peacetime, pensions of $100 a month for all World War I veterans, more Federal loans for veterans' housing, higher disability compensation, and reopening GI life insurance eligibility.

Except for the President, the most influential man in deciding the fate of these and most veterans' programs is Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, the Texas Democrat who heads the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. His panel has no Senate counterpart and, as its chairman for 7 years, Representative TEAGUE is the leading congressional authority in this field. Seriously wounded three times in World War II, he is a sincere friend of deserving veterans, but a determined opponent of waste in these programs.

In this exclusive interview with Nation's Business, Representative TEAGUE discusses his philosophy toward veterans' benefits, assesses the current legislative situation and the long-range prospects for ex-servicemen.

Congressman TEAGUE, what does the United States owe its veterans?

"First I think we should consider what the citizen owes the United States. My philosophy is that every American man owes it to this country to be ready, willing, and able at any time to fight for his country.

"When it comes time for the Nation to repay them, I firmly believe that veterans who contributed the most, or made the greatest sacrifices, should receive the most consideration.

"Overall, I think that our country has been generous to our veterans. It has been too generous to some, while others have suffered to the extent we will never be able to repay them."

How much has the United States spent in all for veterans' benefits since the American Revolution?

"Almost $105 billion. A little more than half of that has gone to World War II veterans and about one-fourth to the far smaller number of World War I veterans."

Now that the Government has so many general welfare programs, is the need for special veterans' benefits lessening?

"Yes, it is. But the pressures for special programs still continue. For example, this year some of the new Members of Congress have written me, or dropped by, to tell me they are veterans, or their fathers are veterans. The next thing they say is, 'We want you to pass that bill giving World War I veterans $100 a month pension with no strings attached.' "

Do you support that bill?

"No, I do not. I never have, and I don't think I ever will."

Why?

"Because I don't think there is any justification for paying a non-service-connected pension to a veteran who is not in need.

"In our veterans' program, we must decide on priorities. We start with the men who gave their lives and take care of their widows and orphans. Then we provide for the men disabled in combat, on duty, or at least in connection with their service, and who cannot take care of themselves.

"A good share of the available money must be allocated to hospitals.

"Then we come to the veterans who are 100 percent disabled. How can we pay them for the loss of arms and legs? These are the men who may have a hard time getting by. They deserve the most help, while the veteran who is not disabled at all may need little or no help."

How much would the $100-a-month pension for World War I veterans cost?

"The total extra costs above what such veterans now get, according to reports of the Veterans' Administration, would be about $27 billion. Many of the men who served in that war are now receiving social security, and many others also are eligible for veterans' pensions or compensation."

Are changes being considered in the compensation program?

"Yes, I expect an increase in some of the compensation rates. Compensation is the money we pay a man because of a disability he received in service or because his service aggravated a disability.

"Since the compensation system was last overhauled, the cost of living has gone up about 5 percent; Federal employees' salaries have gone up about 7 percent. A boost of 5 to 7 percent in compensation payments may be in order.

"We are also trying to make the compensation program more realistic. For example, two men may have disability ratings of 40 percent. But one man's disability may reduce his life expectancy by 6 or 8 years, and the other may really not be affected. These two 40 percent disabilities are not actually comparable, and should not be compensated the same. The problems of the disabled are highly specialized. We are trying now to enact some amendments to take care of the special problems of certain deaf persons and veterans with certain combinations of losses, such as loss of a leg in combination with loss of an eye."

Any changes coming in pensions?

"We are still dissatisfied about the way the changes made in 1959 are working out. In the new law, pensions were tied more closely to the veteran's income and assets. Pensions are grants to veterans and their survivors, as distinguished from compensation for disability, and thus should be even more closely related to their needs.

"The 1959 law was designed to help the needy veteran, and reduce payments to future claimants with less need. But it may need some revision before it works the way it should."

Should peactime ex-servicemen get the same benefits as wartime veterans?

"I have questioned extension of the GI program to peacetime veterans. The peacetime veteran today is not the same as the veteran of World War II or Korea.

"It's true, however, that some of the men drafted today draw hazardous duty.

"We send some men to the defense lines in the hills of Korea, some go to the West German-Czech border, where they live under field conditions, and we have men flying the RB–47's and other Air Force planes all over the world under operational conditions. Many Air Force men have been killed or wounded by hostile attack even though their service is legally classed as peacetime service.

"Now, it's rather hard for me to tell one of these men that he isn't as much of a veteran as someone who served here in the United States during World War II or the Korean situation. A very small percentage of the men who are now legally classed as war veterans were never in any danger during their military service.

"For the ones whose present duty is similar to wartime duty, I think we might consider some kind of moderate loan, grant, or scholarship program."

Is the veteran paid for disabilities incurred while in service, but not on duty?

"Unless it is determined to be due to his own misconduct, any serviceman can draw compensation for any injury he receives—even when on leave.

"Practically all of the so-called service-connected disabilities for which we are paying compensation today came as a result of an accident to a serviceman who was on official leave.

"About 15,000 servicemen are injured or killed in automobile accidents each year, mostly on leave. They or their survivors receive compensation."

For the rest of their lives?

"Yes. Say a young serviceman leaves Bolling Air Force Base in the District of Columbia, going to New York, and is in an automobile accident. If he loses a leg, and it is not determined that it was due to his own misconduct, he will be paid for the loss of that leg the rest of his life."

Do you think this should be changed?

"Yes, and I have done considerable work on it.

"But I have certainly had no encouragement from the Defense Department. They are violently opposed to it."

Do you favor the proposal to permit veterans to reinstate their GI life insurance where they have let it lapse?

"I'm against it, because I feel that, in every way we can, we should get the Government out of competition with private business. It seems to me that private insurance companies are entirely able to provide coverage and there's no reason for the Government to expand its program.

"I think we should concentrate on fundamental things, such as hospital care for the sick and compensation for the disabled, and avoid programs which are less essential."

What would this insurance program cost?

"The first year's administrative cost would be about $7 million, the second year $4.5 million, and it would go down from there.

"The catch is that the veteran would be paying considerably more for his insurance than backers of this proposal indicate. This bill is advertised as giving him a chance to reinstate his GI insurance, but it is really more than that.

"The veteran's premiums would be much higher. He is 15 years older now than when the program was closed and the rate will be based on his current age."

Looking ahead, Congressman, should veterans' benefits continue as a separate program, or be merged with other similar Government activities?

"Some will fade away as separate programs, others will continue. Veterans' housing benefits will probably be extended for a few years more, but they are going to be phased out before too long. By 1967, anyway, the VA should be out of the housing business for World War II veterans.

"As for the veterans' hospital program, I'd say it would continue separately.

"It's possible this program could be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but I do not believe it would result in better medical care and I don't think it would have any money. I do not know that it would be administered as well."

How many veterans in hospitals are being treated for disabilities not connected with their service?

"The average daily patient load is 114,575. Approximately one-third of this total, or 38,000 patients, are receiving care for a service-connected disability. Of the remaining 76,500 patients, about 10,500 are veterans getting compensation for a service-connected condition, but requiring care for a non-service-connected condition.

"Of the 66,000 other non-service-connected patients, 39,500 are under treatment for disabilities which are unquestionably classified as chronic, such as tuberculosis, psychosis, or some other condition which requires more than 90 days of continuous hospitalization."

Does the Veterans' Administration have difficulty determining whether a veteran's disability or disease is service connected?

"It has been relatively easy to establish service connection for the actual wounds which servicemen received during the war. Establishing service connection for disease is much more difficult. Since we know so little about such diseases as mental illness and multiple sclerosis, it has been necessary that we establish presumptive periods. In other words, if these diseases develop within a certain period of time from the date the serviceman was discharged, the decision is automatically reached that the disease is service connected.

"Service aggravation of a disease or disability is difficult to establish and requires application of medical judgment. Secondary diseases and disabilities are sometimes difficult to evaluate.

"The VA is required to make a decision on all of these types of cases in order that the veteran's eligibility for hospitalization can be established and so that he can be properly compensated."

What stake do veterans themselves have in economical administration of veterans' benefits?

"Veterans, their dependents, and survivors total about 80 million people, or about two-fifths of our population. Presumably, they pay about two-fifths of our taxes. Therefore, they should be concerned about how the money is spent."

Veterans' benefits since 1776

	Number of participants	Amount of benefits
Revolutionary War	200,000	$70,045,000
Civil War [1]	2,213,000	8,553,472,000
World War I	4,744,000	26,341,962,000
World War II	16,535,000	55,834,499,000
Korea	6,807,000	7,503,940,000
Other	973,000	6,455,174,000
Total [2]	31,562,000	104,759,092,000

[1] Union servicemen; few Confederates received U.S. benefits.

[2] Total cumulative through June 30, 1960.

Source: U.S. Veterans' Administration.

NEEDED: EXPANSION OF FOREST RESEARCH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the expansion of research for better management and utilization of our forest resources is absolutely essential if the country is to economically meet the needs of the present and future.

The Nation—and particularly States with rich forest reserves, such as Wisconsin—will benefit from further research for better utilization of our valuable forest resources.

Recently, in the proposed 1962 budget, the administration recommended $300,000 for expansion of research facilities at the Forest Products Laboratory. Unfortunately, the House of Representatives cut out this money.

In my judgment, this was a mistake. Therefore, I am urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to reinstate the funds for this much-needed research.

In addition, I wish to bring this urgent need to the attention of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my letter to Chairman HAYDEN, of the Appropriations Committee, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to respectfully urge reinstatement of $300,000 for expansion of forest research at the Forest Products Research Laboratory in Madison, Wis.—regrettably "cut" by the House of Representatives in the appropriations bill, H.R. 6345.

Over the years, the Forest Products Laboratory has made a splendid contribution toward better preservation, management and utilization of our forest resources.

These have included such specific accomplishments as development of prefabricated home construction; improvement of processing of wood products; participation, with private enterprise, in creation of new products; encouragement of better management practices; engaged in research for better marketing for wood products; and generally contributed to better maintenance and utilization of forest resources by Government and private enterprise.

Overall, this has made a contribution, not only to better preservation, utilization and expansion of our forest resources, but also to the economy, and to improved living for our people.

Is further research a good investment?

In my judgment, definitely, yes. According to estimates, the Government gets back in taxes about $70 for every dollar spent for forest research. And these are only the direct returns. The revenue would be further multiplied many times, if the wage factors of additional jobs could also be accurately computed.

The administration, I believe, was wholly justified in recommending the $300,000 for purchase of land and planning for expansion of research facilities at the Forest Products Laboratory.

I deeply regret the action by the House of Representatives in cutting such funds.

In the interest of carrying forward an effective program for best management and utilization of our forest resources, as well as for economic reasons, I believe that Congress can, and should, approve it.

Therefore, I am sincerely urging your committee to reinstate the $300,000 for expansion of research facilities.

Sincerely,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

THE CITY THAT WOULDN'T DIE

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the city of Lawrence, Mass., calls itself "The City That Wouldn't Die."

It has known many years of economic distress since 1952 when the textile industry, employer of 80 percent of the city's work force began to have serious problems.

More than 24,000 workers lost their jobs as the mills closed their doors. Yet Lawrence refused to give up the fight for economic stability. Under the leadership of Mayor John J. Buckley, it went out and found new industry to replace the lost jobs.

The story of Lawrence's long uphill battle, as told in the Boston Herald of May 7, 1961, is a fine tribute to the initiative and ability of Mayor Buckley and the citizens of the city. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAWRENCE, THE MILL-DESERTED CITY THAT REFUSES TO DIE, LOOKS TO FUTURE—NEW INDUSTRY ATTRACTED BY SKILLED HANDS

(By Joseph T. Sullivan)

LAWRENCE.—Most cities today come equipped with slogans boasting magnificent industrial growth. In some cases the claims are based more on civic pride than facts.

This community of 70,933 persons is an exception.

It calls itself "The City That Wouldn't Die," and that's exactly what it is.

ERA HAD ENDED

Few cities in the Nation have been hit so hard in the seat of its industrial pants. Few have recovered so admirably.

Once the greatest wool and worsted center in the world it woke up one morning in 1952 to find itself the Nation's No. 1 disaster area.

Such textile powerhouses as the Arlington Mill, of the Whitman Co., and the Wood, Shawsheen, and Ayer mills of American Woolen, battered by blows from new fabrics, overexpansion and foreign competition either liquidated or were forced to move south, economically unable to resist the lure of lower wages and tax concessions.

In the wake of their padlocked gates more than 24,000 were left jobless; the giant, sprawling factories along the Merrimack River became red brick tombstones. An era had ended.

TASK FORCES

But while national magazines were writing its epitaphs and Edward R. Murrow flew in to intone a documented requiem, Lawrence itself refused to attend the funeral; instead, it worked to resurrect the ghost.

Mayor John J. Buckley, just in office, pumped $50,000 into the coffers of the Industrial Development Commission and cleared the way for the group to have the leadership of a full-time executive director.

Private investors picked up the ball. One group of businessmen and merchants pooled $150,000 to take over a closed mill. Later, Raytheon in nearby Andover leased the three, 10-story Shawsheen buildings, put 7,000 men and women to work and task forces left the city almost weekly to entice business leaders in other areas of the Nation to come to Lawrence.

Today, 9 years later, the reporter in Lawrence reveals a far different story, a story reflected on many levels.

Said Mayor Buckley: "The present is bright, the future is brighter."

Said T. Richard Hurley, executive director of the Lawrence Development and Industrial Commission: "Six years ago we had 12 million square feet of empty mill space. Now we have under a million and one-half."

In 1952, the crisis year, there was 12 million square feet of empty space, an area almost six times larger than the Boston Common.

Said a downtown bartender: "Today we got more customers and they drink because they got a future. Back then, they drank, I guess, to dull the fact they were out of work. And most had to put it on the tab."

RUNS GAMUT

Learning the hard way never to put your industrial eggs in one basket, Lawrence now runs a diversified gamut that includes the manufacture of almost everything from plastics, clothing, and machine parts, to transistors and iron lungs.

Where once 80 percent of the work force was employed in textiles the figure is now less than 8 percent and for the first time in several years the city was recently taken off the Federal rolls as a distressed area.

Unemployment, today, amounts to about 6,000, most because of seasonal layoffs expected to end shortly. There are less than 100 people on general relief, said Mayor Buckley, a decisive barometer of the city's comparative well-being.

Besides its vast promotion and a stubborn refusal to throw in the sponge, Lawrence also owes its comeback to its skilled help.

NOT WAITING

"Our people were always talented with their hands," said John Cahill, auditor. "They were menders and burlers and weavers. This dexterity alone made possible the influx of delicate electronic work we have."

Currently, though, the talk in city offices centers not so much on the past and present as it does about the future, particularly Interstate Routes 495 and 93.

Route 495, when completed in about 5 years, will snake through southwest Lawrence on its 88-mile trail from northeastern Massachusetts to southeastern Rhode Island.

Route 93, expected to be completed in Lawrence late next year, presently stops at Methuen.

Lawrence isn't waiting, though. A 133-acre industrial park is already being graded where highways intersect.

Mayor Buckley calls the park the city's ace-in-the-hole for the years ahead.

It is being developed by the Agawam Equipment Co., which purchased the site from the city for $167,000.

Originally, Lawrence took the land under a Federal "open blighted area" law. It was the first city in the Nation to take advantage of the law.

VALUATIONS INCREASED

Pressed by its less than 7 square miles of land, Lawrence is also in the midst of a 35-acre urban redevelopment project in the heart of downtown which will ultimately be utilized for commercial and industrial development, offstreet parking, and erection of middle-income apartments, not to exclude a new post office.

Already, three bids are in to build the apartments and at least three firms said they will definitely move there.

"We expect to clear the entire area by fall," said John A. Griffin, chairman of the Redevelopment Authority. "We anticipate that the project will increase valuations by between $4 and $6 million."

Lawrence is also increasing its airport facilities and plans are being made for combination regional high and vocational school—other developments to be chalked up in the asset list.

But far from drifting around in a cloud of endless optimism, Lawrence officials continually temper their hopes with down-to-earth reality.

The past has taught them only too well.

REAL PROBLEMS

Paul J. Greeley, executive director of the chamber of commerce, like Mayor Buckley, realizes that progress and stability doesn't come with a guarantee.

"Some cities are going to die," Greeley said. "Some are going to survive. The choice is up to each one. We can have a helluva city here but we've got to continue with bold, imaginative action.

"We also have some real problems, no kidding about it. We have a shrinking tax base (blighted areas). We have whole business blocks with over 50 percent of empty floor space. Some others are in a serious state of depreciation. Others are overassessed by current market yardsticks. We have 65 empty stores.

"Urban redevelopment is our salvation. We've got to stay in the urban redevelopment business for the next 10 years."

It is only too obvious that the city that "wouldn't die" is losing none of its momentum.

AID FOR THE COTTON TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, it is with considerable interest that I note that last week the majority leader of the House of Representatives introduced H.R. 6783, to aid the cotton textile industry.

I note this with much personal interest, because that bill is verbatim with my own bill, S. 314, which I was able to get the Senate to pass unanimously, not just once, but twice. The Senate first passed my S. 314 on August 26, 1957, or nearly 4 years ago. But S. 314 died in the House of Representatives because it was never reported out of the House Agriculture Committee.

Again, on July 16, 1959, I was able to get the Senate to pass S. 314 for the second time. But it suffered the same fate in the House, and died there because it was never reported out of the House Agriculture Committee.

I sincerely hope that Representative JOHN MCCORMACK will be able to exert his tremendous influence and power as House majority leader and get the House Agriculture Committee to do what it refused twice to do—and over a period of nearly 3½ years—when it refused to act on the Smith bill, S. 314.

The McCormack bill, H.R. 6783, is identical to the Smith bill, S. 314. For the good of the cotton textile industry, I pray that the difference in the name on the legislation now will prompt the House Agriculture Committee to reverse its past position and to act favorably on this legislation.

PEACETIME "GI BILL OF RIGHTS"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Army & Navy Union U.S.A., organized in 1886 and incorporated in 1888, the oldest veterans' organization in America, has wholeheartedly endorsed the cold war GI bill.

Commenting on the action of the Mississippi Legislature in endorsing this bill, past national commander and national historian, James M. Callahan, mayor of Victor, Iowa, has written as follows:

The Army & Navy Union U.S.A., the country's oldest veteran organization, now celebrating our 75th year of continued existence, strongly supports your stand, and that of the State of Mississippi in eminently fair treatment for the so-called peacetime man now in service, who is the first to fall in action against the enemies of our beloved country, as Pearl Harbor so tragically proved, that the time element between war and peace, is but seconds.

We are authorized to make public this support by National Commander Rowland N. Chamberlain of Norfolk, Mass.

The honorary commander in chief is Gen. Douglas MacArthur, C.M.H.

The growing recognition of the great need for the GI bill of rights to strengthen the economy of our country is duly recognized by the oldest veterans organization in America. Mr. Callahan's letter shows the growing popular support for this GI bill, which support will, I predict, grow into such a storm that this Congress cannot avoid its duties toward these veterans and toward the educational and economic needs of America.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Callahan's full letter from the Army & Navy Union national headquarters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY & NAVY UNION U.S.A.,
Victor, Iowa, May 6, 1961.

The Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 1, pages 6952–6953, under title "Cold War GI Bill," in your remarks on the floor of the U.S. Senate, supports S. 349 in the matter, and refers to the concurrent resolution of both houses of the Mississippi Legislature supporting same.

This Army & Navy Union U.S.A. the country's oldest veteran organization, now celebrating our 75th year of continued existence, strongly supports your stand, and that of the State of Mississippi in eminently fair treatment for the so-called peacetime man now in service, who is the first to fall in action against the enemies of our beloved country, as Pearl Harbor so tragically proved, that the time element between war and peace, is but seconds.

The national commander has authorized me to write you of our organization's support, and further if one reads the columns of the National Tribune, Stars and Stripes of February 9, 1961, under "Peacetime GI Bill of Rights," by the department commander of New York, Army & Navy Union U.S.A., Commander Rocco Belmonte, you will see that our desires are mutual in this

type bill. Therefore by direction of our National Commander Rowland N. Chamberlain of Norfolk, Mass., you can quote our support of the bill, and we wish to thank you personally, and the officials of the great State of Mississippi for the forward thinking and progress for the GI of today.

With kindest regards to you, and wishing you all that is best, I am, sir,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. CALLAHAN, P.N.C.
National Historian.

MINNESOTA PROFESSOR'S LECTURES TRANSMITTED BY VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is with pride that I draw the attention of my colleagues to the achievement of a native son, Prof. Clarke A. Chambers, associate professor of history at the University of Minnesota. The achievement to which I refer is one which brings honor not only to the State of Minnesota, but also to our great Nation, for Professor Chambers, through the Voice of America, is bringing the message of freedom and democracy to those people enslaved behind the Iron Curtain of totalitarianism.

On April 8 Voice of America initiated transmission, to 110 countries, 10 lectures given by Professor Chambers on the University of Minnesota campus late last summer to a group of foreign students. In these lectures Professor Chambers stimulates intellectual curiosity through the discussion of American history from the colonial days to the emergence of the United States as a world power. His analysis of the sociological and psychological forces which moved our Nation forward as a leader in foreign as well as domestic affairs, while being objective, does not fail to embody those symbolic characteristics which have made America great.

Mr. President, I cannot think of a more effective way to combat the tyrannical Communist propaganda flooding the world today than with the truth. This fact has long been recognized by the Voice of America, and its wisdom and foresight in utilizing the enlightening lectures by Professor Chambers is to be commended. I wish further to pay tribute to Professor Chambers—we all are certainly proud of him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may substitute a corrected amendment for the one I offered last night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I send the amendment to the desk. It makes no substantial change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 61, lines 6 and 7, strike out "Family housing, utilities, and ground improvements, $3,650,000", and insert in lieu thereof "Ground improvements, $350,000".

On page 67, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

"SEC. 107. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"Fort Belvoir, Virginia, two hundred and fifty units.

"Fort Benning, Georgia, five hundred units.

"Fort Stewart, Georgia, one hundred and sixty units.

"Fort Sam Houston, Texas, two hundred units.

"Camp Irwin, California, two hundred and forty units.

"Fort Myer, Virginia, five hundred and twenty-five units.

"Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado, forty units.

"Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, thirty-four units.

"Sharpe General Depot, California, fifty units.

"OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"Canal Zone, Atlantic Side, two hundred units.

"Canal Zone, Pacific Side, five hundred units."

On page 68, beginning with line 7, strike out all down through line 10.

On page 68, strike out lines 19 and 20.

On page 69, lines 1 and 2, strike out "Family housing, medical facilities, utilities, and real estate, $2,880,000", and insert in lieu thereof "Medical facilities, $570,000".

On page 69, line 19, strike out "family housing, utilities,"; and in line 20, strike out "$3,579,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$279,000".

On page 69, beginning with "Operational" in line 21, strike out all down through line 23 and insert in lieu thereof "Supply facilities, and ground improvements, $279,000."

On page 72, strike out lines 22 and 23.

On page 73, strike out lines 1, 2, and 3.

On page 75, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 206. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina, five hundred units.

"Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, five hundred units.

"Naval Facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Delaware, thirty units.

"Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, five hundred units.

"Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, eight hundred units.

"Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia, six hundred units.

"Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, four hundred units.

"Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, thirty units."

On page 77, line 4, strike out "family housing,"; and in line 5, strike out $6,770,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$1,820,000".

On page 88, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"SEC. 307. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, one hundred and thirty-five units.

"Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, three hundred units.

"Lawrence G. Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, two hundred units.

"Hill Air Force Base, Utah, three hundred and eighty units."

On page 88, beginning with line 16, strike out all down through line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 401. Section 803(a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: *"And provided further,* That no more mortgages shall be insured under this title after October 1, 1962, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date, and not more than thirty-seven thousand family housing units shall be contracted for after June 30, 1959, pursuant to any mortgage insured under section 803 of this title after such date."

On page 89, line 22, strike out "III, and IV", and insert in lieu thereof "and III".

On page 89, line 24, strike out "$71,301,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$68,001,000".

One page 90, line 2, strike out "$129,789,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$126,489,000".

On page 90, lines 3 and 4, strike out "$76,482,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$59,982,000".

On page 90, line 6, strike out "$140,587,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$124,087,000".

On page 90, line 8, strike out "$153,171,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$148,221,000".

On page 90, line 10, strike out "$486,268,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$481,318,000".

On page 90, strike out line 11.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered has as its purpose putting back into the military construction authorization bill the provisions which the House adopted in its bill. It would have the effect of restoring the Capehart system of providing for military housing on military bases within the United States. Under the program, which was originally generated in the Senate, we have built approximately 90,000 units. The program is being discontinued in the Senate version of the bill. It is a system which has worked very well, with one exception, since 1955, when the act was passed.

I believe that even the committee admits that the system met a very great need more adequately than that need would have been met had the customary system of direct appropriation of funds been required for this type of military housing.

The bill before the Senate authorizes approximately 2,000 housing units to be constructed out of appropriated funds, and would discontinue entirely construction under the Capehart program. I feel that the Capehart system, by making available the kind of houses that our sailors and airmen and soldiers have lived in back home, the kind of house which is planned for household efficiency and livability, has met the needs and adequately than they would be met if the

housing were provided out of appropriated funds, which requires appropriation of the entire cost in 1 fiscal year.

The construction of these houses has given us maximum value for the dollar that was spent to retire the mortgages on a 25½-year payout. That is so because they were built as houses. They were not built as a part of a military construction system, which is likely to produce something which more resembles an arsenal or fortress or an ammunition depot, built to last 100 years or 200 years, than it does a house which meets the needs of the modern military man and his more modern wife. They want livable family quarters in which they and their children can feel at home and enjoy the same standards of living that people in other walks of life can enjoy, with relatively the same standard of income.

I feel that we have learned through experience that hundreds of homebuilders have developed a great money-saving system through the mass production of houses. These men have gone together in various consortiums to provide competent building; they have bid in competition for the right to build Capehart houses; and, save for one exception, they have met the test of providing adequate family housing.

I believe that we all are sufficiently aware of the budget requirements for the military to know that if we proceed by the appropriated housing route, this program will have the lowest priority in the military bill. We will take care of our missile bases, our aircraft procurement, and on our forward bases, our hospitals, and our other straight military needs. However, this is a system which is beginning to work well through trial and error and experience, at a cost which has not had a great impact on the budget for any particular year, and which has provided a vast number of family homes.

I have talked to a great many military commanders throughout the country at various bases, and I believe that every one of them has told me that wherever there is good Capehart housing, the highly skilled technical men, who are required to learn the duties of a modern army or of our modern Air Force, do not hesitate to reenlist. However, when they lack adequate housing for their family, that is not true of these men, who have been trained at tens of thousands of dollars in expense to the Government, who are dedicated military personnel, and would like very much to continue with the military if they could maintain a decent homelife. In other words, they would stay on until the time of their retirement, and thus become more and more valuable to the Military Establishment, if adequate housing were provided for them and their families.

I have not spoken to the military commander of any base in my State or elsewhere who did not speak with pride of what is being done for the enlisted men, the noncommissioned officers, and also the junior officer grades who live in the Capehart housing units, and who were formerly forced to locate in completely substandard commercial housing, or in housing which was built under Government guarantees in so-called defense housing areas. In some cases commercial housing means commuting as much as 30 or 50 miles from the base in order to find some type of quarters, in an attempt to hold their families together; instead of forcing the enlisted man into a barracks type of existence.

My amendment does not change the system which, with one recent exception, has worked so well in the past. Section 803 of the Housing Act prohibits the military services from contracting for more than 25,000 family housing units after June 30, 1959. We have come to the peculiar situation that Congress actually has authorized by legislation 35,000 units, or 10,000 more units than the ceiling will permit to be placed under contract. I am advised that construction is ready to proceed on between 5,000 and 6,000 units of the previously authorized housing, but it has had to be deferred because of the ceiling.

If the Senate fails to adopt my amendment and takes the amendment of the distinguished and able Committee on Armed Services, then the 5,000 to 6,000 units cannot be built, although the authorities are ready to begin construction work.

The House bill raised the ceiling to permit the construction of 5,000 previously authorized units. It also authorizes some 7,000 new units to be built as Capehart housing, including the 2,000 units which the committee has recommended be built with appropriated funds. Under the bill a total of 12,000 additional units would be constructed. It seems to me that it would be a mistake to renege, on our previous authorization, and in this way disappoint those who are depending on housing provided by this type of construction.

I should like to read from the House report on this subject, because the House committee made a clear-cut statement about it. The House understood the program. The House Committee on Armed Services was as diligent in their research as was the Senate Committee on Armed Services. The House report states:

1. New Capehart housing:

The committee increased the number of authorized new Capehart housing units which could be initiated by the departments from the 2,025 units requested in H.R. 2743 to a total of 7,074 new units.

This change was initiated by the committee after it had learned that the individual service departments had originally requested more than 22,000 additional Capehart units for inclusion in this bill. This figure was then drastically reduced by the Department of Defense to 7,074 units. However, the Bureau of the Budget, for reasons not evident to the committee, required a further reduction to 2,025 units.

Department of Defense and various service witnesses all testified that the 7,074 figure represented the absolute minimum number of new Capehart units that would be required to meet new high-priority housing needs.

Under these circumstances and in view of the great deficiency in military housing assets, the committee unanimously approved the higher authorization for Capehart housing.

2. Ceiling on Capehart units:

The committee increased the ceiling on the total number of Capehart units that could be built by the departments from the present ceiling of 25,000 to a new ceiling of 37,000.

The departments pointed out that under the present ceiling contained in the last proviso of section 803(a) of the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 635), as amended, the services are prohibited from contracting for more than 25,000 units after June 30, 1959. However, Congress has, to date, authorized the construction of 35,061 units subsequent to June 30, 1959. The net result, therefore, is an inability of the departments to execute the total program actually authorized. To date 5,160 units have been deferred because of this ceiling. Therefore, the committee agreed to raise the ceiling a total of 12,000 units to accommodate the 5,160 deferred units previously authorized and also to accommodate the 7,074 additional new units contained in this bill.

3. Capehart authority continued:

The committee, extended, as originally requested by the Departments, until October 1, 1962, the termination date for the Capehart program as contained in the National Housing Act, as amended. The present termination date is October 1, 1961. The committee supports a continuation of the Capehart program since it has proven to be an excellent mechanism for the development of new housing for military families.

Mr. President, I feel that the report of the House committee fully explains the nature of the amendment I have offered. I have offered the amendment with the greatest respect for the vast knowledge, experience, and understanding of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. I respect the committee's judgment on all matters military. However, I disagree with the view that Congress should kill a program which has provided the greatest amount of new housing for military personnel—the Capehart program—simply because one contractor failed to meet his obligation to fulfill satisfactorily the contract which he entered into. I believe I am correct in this statement; I have not been able to learn whether there are others. This default, I feel, should not be allowed to go unnoticed, especially if any loss is likely to accrue to the Government. I understand the FHA has assumed all the costs of completing the project in default. Certainly either the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Banking and Currency can propose a simple amendment to the Housing Act which will prevent such an occurrence in the future. It seems to me that a surety bond could guarantee full compliance with the construction contract and would afford adequate protection for the military. The cost of whatever inspection or double checks were deemed necessary could be added to the loan, and the Government protected by vigorous enforcement, rather than by putting to death a program which we all know will provide a vastly larger amount of family housing, which is urgently needed on many military bases. Should we return to a system of appropriations for military housing which will, by its own figures, require annual appropriation for the construction of houses that will cost in the neighborhood of $26,000 a unit?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the Senator examined the figures provided for military housing? If he will examine them, I think he will find that the housing proposed cannot cost an average of $26,000, because the figures contemplate a cost of $16,500.

Another aspect of the cost factor is that the figures on Capehart housing do not always reveal the full cost, because several Capehart projects have been built upon Government-owned property. Also, several Capehart housing projects have had the advantage of utilities which have been provided by other costs assessed upon the installation itself.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; I recognize the fact that some land that has not been needed on military posts has been used for Capehart housing purposes. However, a limitation in the Capehart law restricts these projects to the acquisition of new sites, where necessary, and to a much lower figure than can possibly be obtained in private housing. In this way, I think we utilize only the land from which we get some value, because then only the cost of the house is subject to a 25-year amortization, whereas if the land must be bought, the cost of the land must be included.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished author of the Capehart housing program, which the Senate language now proposes to abandon at this late date.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not true that the costs can be as large or as small under the Capehart plan as under the appropriations plan; that the houses can be built on Government-owned land, and that the cost of the house has nothing to do with the way in which the houses are financed?

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand, if additional land must be acquired, it is acquired at a very low figure, for the site of the houses; and that cost is carried forward under the 25-year amortization, and is paid for in full, under the housing allowance that we authorize for military families. As a matter of the ultimate cost—a point which the committee discussed at some length—that cost is added to the cost of the house, at a 4½ percent interest rate. But does anyone imagine that if we tried to meet the actual needs which exist, the Government would not have to borrow the funds needed in order to build the houses under the appropriation method? The Government also would pay an interest rate of from 3.5 percent to 3.8 percent. So there is very little difference in the ultimate cost, unless one considers that the Government has a large surplus, so that rather than add the cost of the houses to the public debt, we would pay on the barrelhead in order to build these houses.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the Capehart plan the Government issues mortgages for 25 years. Under the appropriation method, the Government sells bonds. If bonds are sold, they become an addition to the $290 billion Federal Government debt which now exists.

Under the Capehart plan, at the end of 25 years the mortgage is amortized, and no more interest is paid, and then the Federal Government owns the house, free of further cost. If, for instance, the Government proposes to build houses which will cost $1 million, and thus issues $1 million worth of bonds, the chances are the Government will be paying interest on those bonds for 50, 75, or 100 years. Therefore, the cost, as a result of selling the bonds, would be much more over a period of years than the cost of proceeding by means of 25-year mortgages which will be amortized at the end of the 25-year period.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, the distinguished author of the bill is saying that if there were not Capehart housing, those who now occupy Capehart houses would have to occupy, instead, inferior housing downtown or in small villages 20 or 30 miles away, and would be paying rent for those houses. But, instead, under the Capehart housing plan, the money is spent, instead, for the purchase of the houses on a 25-year plan, by means of which the Government actually acquires valuable houses. These houses will last much more than 25 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. Under the law the Congress passed, all married military personnel above a certain grade receive a housing rental allowance. They can spend it if they wish for renting a house. Let us say the rental allowance is $100 a month. They can rent a house for $150 a month, if they wish, and pay the extra $50 out of their own pocket; or they can rent a house for less than $100 a month

Under the Capehart plan, the Government builds the houses and amortizes the cost over a 25-year period, by means of a 25-year mortgage. Private industry builds the houses and private industry purchases the mortgages; and the rental allowance goes to amortize the mortgages and pay for the homes over a period of 25 years.

By the appropriation route, of course, the housing is acquired by means of selling bonds and paying interest on the bonds for X number of years.

Mr. MONRONEY. But if the allowance is done away with, the money paid for the rental of quarters does not go into a separate fund to be used to amortize the cost of the housing. The money goes into general revenues, I presume, or into miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the houses are built with appropriated funds, the same amount of money that would be required under the Capehart plan would be deducted from the officers' rental allowance.

Mr. MONRONEY. But under the Capehart plan the money goes into the actual liquidation of the cost of building the house.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct; and eventually the Government owns the house, just as it would if the money required for construction of the house were appropriated.

Mr. RUSSELL. At a higher rate of interest, and under a more expensive arrangement. But regardless of whether the housing is built by means of the use of appropriated funds or by means of the use of Capehart funds, the housing allowance is used for the same purpose, except that when appropriated funds are used, there is no separate account.

Mr. MONRONEY. In the suggestion I made, I assumed that the Government is paying 4½ percent. However, the Government is paying it to itself, through the Federal National Mortgage Association, which purchases the mortgages. So by means of that system, most of the money comes back to the Federal Government, does it not?

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator from Oklahoma please repeat the question?

Mr. MONRONEY. The 4½-percent interest that is paid—because these mortgages are generally taken by the Federal National Mortgage Association—goes into a Government agency, and therefore the money is returned to the Federal Government.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct; and, of course, at the moment the mortgage rate is higher than the bond rate, although that might not be true several years from now.

Mr. MONRONEY. But from the bookkeeping point of view, the Government amortizes the cost of the housing investment.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Whereas under the appropriations system, the money goes into general receipts, which do not apply directly to the housing. For that reason, the congressional committees have been very reluctant ever to authorize large-scale housing accommodations on that basis.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think it makes any difference, particularly, whether the money is appropriated or whether mortgages are sold. If the the houses are needed, the Government should build them. If they are not needed, the Government should not build them.

So I think the question for the Senate to decide, after all, is whether the houses are needed. Fifty years ago, most men under the same circumstances in the armed services were single, and the Government provided barracks for them. But today, in most of the categories, 80 or 90 percent of the men are married, and in many instances they are college graduates and technicians. They could receive attractive pay if they worked for private employers. So I believe the Government must provide them with good houses, or else they will not remain in the armed services. That was the original purpose of the bill, namely, to provide a good house for families in the military.

The question is whether the houses are needed or whether they are not needed. I think they are needed.

I do not think the Capehart plan is necessarily superior to the appropriation plan. But the question is whether we shall appropriate the money or whether we shall not appropriate the money.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator

from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement, and then I shall yield to the chairman of the committee.

On the point that the payments made to the officers or to the enlisted men—in other words, their quarters' allowance—pay the bill for the so-called Capehart houses, that statement is subject to challenge from the point of view of completeness as to the facts. Later, when I can obtain the floor, I shall go into the details, and shall point out just how this money is used and what the housing costs the Government. So a little later I expect to discuss that matter fully.

But at this time I suggest, with great deference, that those figures will not pan out. There is a great deal of difference, and the Capehart houses do not pay their own way.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator mean to say they do not amortize the mortgages?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. This is the first time I have heard that stated. I know that in certain instances the utilities are provided and in certain instances the houses are built on Government-owned land. But is not the same thing true in the case of appropriated fund housing? After the houses are built, would not the Defense Establishment in many, many instances provide the utilities and the other things which now are being charged against the Capehart housing?

Mr. STENNIS. My contention is that they are not the same, and the situation would not be the same, and neither would the money cost be the same. I propose to answer that point in detail in my own time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Mississippi think we need more family-type houses for the married men who are in the armed services; or does the Senator think that we now have all we need?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall go into that in my own time. This bill authorizes as many family-type houses as orginally were requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator will yield, there is also a loss on some 5,000 units which the Congress had previously authorized and which are presumed to be going through under the Capehart program.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi will explain what has happened over the last 3 or 4 years, with reference to the 5,000 units which the Senator from Oklahoma mentions.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to disabuse the Senator's mind of the idea that we are going to get ready to build post office buildings, or bastilles, or strange, formidable looking buildings. The truth is that the buildings will be exactly the same type. The Senator from Indiana has correctly stated that, so far as the families are concerned, in many instances they will not know whether they are living in Capehart housing or houses for which money has been appropriated. The houses will be identical. We do not propose to build any unusual types of houses.

The Senator from Indiana asked about the need for these houses. There is not any question that there is a need for additional houses on some of our stations. There is a very serious question as to whether Congress ought to authorize any large number of housing units under the Capehart program at this period, when studies are being made with a view to closing down a large number of installations. We are closing some bases today where we have just completed spending large sums of money on houses. People are being moved away. We are going to have millions of dollars in funds tied up in houses with nobody to live in them.

We thought it would be well to provide for in these appropriated funds, only the hard-core housing that we knew was probably necessary at permanent stations, until we knew something more about the shape our military system will take as to bases in the future. We are losing funds in astronomical figures on construction at bases that will be closed. Why should we add to that loss by housing provided by appropriated funds, or even Capehart housing, in such large amounts, until we know something more about the future of our Military Establishment?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. Let me answer. Then I shall yield. The same man who will be deciding the need to build houses with appropriated money will be deciding the need for Capehart housing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma picks up the projects that were in the bill as it was passed by the House, but they are not the projects which the Defense Department originally said were needed, or which the Senator from Indiana said were needed.

Here is the picture:

Out of nine proposals for the Army that are contained in the Senator's amendment, only one was originally asked for by the Defense Department in the 1962 budget. The others were put in the bill by members of the committee in the House.

Out of the projects carried for the Navy in the Senator's amendment, several were asked for by the Navy Department, but originally all in lesser amounts than were carried in the bill.

The Defense Department originally said that at the naval base at Charleston 200 units were needed. The Senator's amendment provides 500.

A similar statement is true for the Naval Air Station at Lemoore, Calif. The Defense Department asked for 200; the House provided 500.

In Florida, the Defense Department originally said 140 units were justified at this time. The Senator's amendment provides 500.

At New London, Conn., the Defense Department originally asked for 200, and the Senate committee provided 200, but the House provided 800 units.

In California, at Port Hueneme, the Defense Department asked for 200. The House provided 400, and the amendment proposes 400.

At Norfolk, Va., 600 units were provided by the House; and the Senator from Virginia, a member of our committee, said it was not desired to have 600 units there.

In the Air Force, out of four projects which the Senator's amendment provides for, only one of them, at Hill Air Force Base, in Utah, was originally asked for in the 1962 program.

The problem is, Who does determine the need—the members of the Armed Services Committee, or the Defense Department, or the Bureau of the Budget? There is some difference of opinion evidently either as to need or as to policy.

Mr. MONRONEY. I point out to the Senator that it is a fact that the military services felt there was a need for 20,000. Officials of the Defense Department testified before the House committee, and I presume before the Senate committee, that there was a need for 7,074 new units. The Bureau of the Budget reduced the figure to 2,000 units. The Defense Department having cut the request from 20,000 down to 7,074, there is an attempt now to skeletonize the program to 2,000 units, which the bill as reported from the committee provides. I do not think those in the Defense Department felt that it was unnecessary to provide this much housing. Certainly, the distinguished chairman of the House committee [Mr. VINSON], is not a man who ever wastes money or accepts casual estimates, and the committee unanimously approved the 7,000 new units. I do not believe there is logrolling to that extent in the House. Representatives of the Defense Department appeared before the House committee and testified as to the need for 7,074 new units, which they found were necessary after having thinned the request down from 20,000 new units.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Military Construction Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee over the years has found that the estimates of need for houses differ, and that difference depends upon the one with whom one is dealing. Two factors we have generally tried to take into consideration in authorizing the units, whether the units have been authorized under the Capehart housing plan or by military appropriation. The object is to determine what is a fair proportion of houses to be furnished by the community and what is a fair proportion to be furnished by military construction, either directly or through the Capehart program.

We have found that in many instances it is desirable, both from the standpoint of economy and the standpoint of the local community, to leave room for a certain proportion of the houses to be supplied by the community. We have found there is a tendency on the part of those from the Military Establishment who testify to ask for a maximum number of housing units. If the Budget Bureau found it desirable to place some ceiling

upon these units, it is not exactly good practice for the Members of the Congress, including Members of the Senate, and of course I include myself in that, to insist that their individual judgments are correct as to how many houses should be built on a station in my State, for example.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator mentioned the Bureau of the Budget. He was referring to the Defense Department just before that reference.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the Bureau of the Budget approved 7,000 units?

Mr. MONRONEY. No; it approved 2,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It approved 2,025.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator said a moment ago that the Defense Department was against what is proposed. My understanding, from the House report, is that the witnesses testified that the figure of 7,074 represented the absolute minimum number of new Capehart units that would be required on the basis of high priority housing needs. This appears from the House report. I am not attempting to disagree with the Senator, but I feel that the members of the House committee have competence and their report should not be brushed aside on the basis that the Defense Department does not want more than 2,020 units.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Defense Department asked the Senate committee for 2,025 units. That was the figure which was originally submitted.

Senators who represent States which have installations are often told there is a need for more. Based upon what I regard as a good authority, there should have been authorization for additional housing units for Minuteman families at Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak. However, I am perfectly willing to leave that to the discretion of the Defense Department and to let the base take its chances as against other places in need if the Department is given a reasonable number within which it can exercise discretion. I question whether the figures adopted by the House represent a completely objective judgment as to the priorities for needed housing.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota a question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Surely.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not true that before one single unit or contract of Capehart housing can be built on any base the unit has to be cleared and approved by the Installations Subcommittee and the full Armed Services Committee both in the House and in the Senate?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is exactly what is done by action in the bill. The Senate Committee on Armed Services took a look at the problem and did what it thought was logical under the circumstances, considering the history of Capehart projects as brought to our attention and the requests made by the military departments. By direct appropriation we would provide the housing units in the number originally submitted and suspend new construction under the Capehart Act until the provisions of the act can be reviewed and possibly tightened up to meet some of the problems encountered in its operation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think some figures will answer the question of the Senator concerning the proof of need. The Senator from South Dakota and I have served for many years on the subcommittee which has dealt with military construction.

Capehart housing was originally authorized by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and it got to be such a large proportion of the cost of the military construction that we asked the Senate to require the authorizations be referred by line items not only to the committees but also to the Congress. That is the point before the Senate now.

All through many years, as I remember the proof, the military departments requested a great number of units more than were authorized. Very strong testimony was given in support of their demands. There has been a growing amount of testimony coming in every year from the cities and communities where these units are proposed to be located, showing very clearly in many cases that there is not an actual need—that is, facilities are available; there are houses to rent and apartments to rent.

On the point concerning need, beginning with the year 1955, in round numbers, there was a military strength of 2.8 million. The military departments at that time said there was a housing deficit of 247,000 units. In 1960 there were, in round figures, 2.4 million men in the military services, and it is now said that the housing deficit is 446,000 units.

Therefore, in spite of the fact that $1½ billion worth of houses have been built and in spite of the fact that there are fewer people in the military services than there were in 1955, according to the figures presented there is a housing deficit of nearly twice as much. It is claimed there has been a 100-percent increase in the military housing deficit.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. My point is, if we take that as a guide, this whole program will go up as high as Commander Shepard did, before it starts back down.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. May I have another minute, please?

The large requests are always made by the military departments. I propose to go into that subject later.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would not the Senator agree that many of the bases are being intentionally placed in outlying areas which are surrounded by very small towns, which are incapable of furnishing the needed housing?

Mr. STENNIS. Almost without exception those problems have been taken care of on a preference basis. Presumably, if there were any such need, the military departments submitted the request to us and we adopted it, as shown on page 9 of the report. That is the military priority list and not the committee's priority list. For good measure we added 500 units, loose, undesignated, to permit the military departments to place them where they wished.

Mr. MONRONEY. That was the military priority based on a budget figure of 2,000 housing units?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. For the 2,000 we provided in accordance with the military priority list.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from Mississippi says that the defense establishment states there is a 446,000-unit housing deficit. Is it not very, very simple for the Armed Services Committee, or for any committee of the Congress, to ascertain how many married men there are in the service who are entitled, under the law, to rental allowances?

Why is there any secret about that? How can there be any argument about it? How can there be any misunderstanding as to how many people are entitled to housing?

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator will yield, the Senator from Mississippi did not suggest there was any misunderstanding. The Senator from Mississippi merely addressed the figures to the query concerning the military request for housing, and how we tried to arrive at a proper figure.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was under the impression that the statement was made that there is now a deficit of 446,000 housing units, whereas in 1955 there was a deficit of 247,000 housing units.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct in regard to the figures.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not very simple to find out exactly the number of married men who are in the services?

Mr. STENNIS. According to the calculations that can be done. There is a congressional question as to how many will be supplied housing.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, we do not supply a housing unit to every married man in the military service. There are over 100,000 who are stationed in the Washington metropolitan area today. Are we going to build 100,000 Capehart housing units for them, as a monument to the distinguished Senator from Indiana?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are about 100,000 married men who serve in the military establishment who are assigned in the Washington metropolitan area today.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have said time and again, that I do not wish to have the Government build a single housing unit, under the Capehart plan or using the appropriated route, which is not needed. On the other hand, I have said 1,000 times that I think we owe it to those who serve in the military establishment today, under existing conditions, to furnish them decent housing in which to live. All a man who is in the service

has to do is to resign from the service, after we have spent $100,000 training him, and he is privileged to buy a house under the GI bill of rights, or under VA housing regulations. A new house can be bought with no downpayment and payments over 30 years.

If that man stays in the service, with his wife and family, we do not seem to be willing to furnish him with a nice house in which to live.

Mr. RUSSELL. We give these men a tax-free housing allowance.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course we do.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is part of the compensation.

Mr. RUSSELL. These men get a tax-free housing allowance, based upon rank or grade, as long as they are in the military service.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. If a man resigns and goes out into civilian life to buy a house, he does not buy the house with a tax-free allowance and he does not receive the allowance.

Mr. CAPEHART. The rental allowance is part of the man's compensation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. The reason why there is a rental allowance is that the Government doesn't own enough housing units to provide enough housing for all military families.

Mr. RUSSELL. The subject is more involved than that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Some of us have some doubts about that feature.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, there are so many Senators who have contributions to make far beyond my poor ability that I should like to finish my remarks and then yield the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before doing so?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator brought up the point that the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense talked in terms of an authorization of 2,025 units, and we indicated priorities for only 1,500 units. The Senator indicated that perhaps we overlooked 500 units which had been requested.

Mr. MONRONEY. No. Those were free housing units to be located wherever it was felt there was a need.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason why there is room for 500 units is that the Senator from Virginia asked that the 525 units indicated for some Virginia stations not be included in the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I should like to yield the floor in one minute.

There are military bases in Oklahoma. I am concerned about those bases. I am speaking about the 5,000 units which have been previously authorized, some of which affect bases in my State. The proposal for 7,000 units, under the amendment, for new additions, does not affect those.

Landlords in my home State have claimed that there is an oversupply of housing. If we should look at the housing, we would find that it consists of, for example, a remodeled fireproof attic, a remodeled garage, or a type of housing that is not fit for rental unless the prospective tenants were compelled because of military service to be close to a base, and that were the only housing available.

I know of no city in my State in which military housing has been built where there is a surplus of housing that could be considered first-class habitable housing that would be conducive to a man with a family wishing to remain in the Army.

I see no reason for selecting one disgraceful failure of a man to deliver on his contract, and based upon that case to say, "We are going to shoot the whole program because that one man failed." The man who was the cause of the disgraceful failure should be called to justice through prosecution, claims, or whatever suits are necessary. In many branches of our military and civil expenditures there have been failures, but the long arm of the Government can catch those who have offended. We do not propose to kill a highway program because there has been overpayment for rights-of-way. There have been such overpayments in many States. We do not kill aircraft contracts because some expense accounts have been padded.

I say we should not kill the Capehart program on the basis of one bad case. We should tighten up the law, which can very easily be done, and go forward with the program. I believe it would mean a great deal to the servicemen who are serving our country in places that are isolated from other decent housing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have listened to the discussion. In my opinion there is no question that there is need for additional housing. Personally, I voted to support the report of the committee for a completely different reason. We can increase the appropriation by $33 million or to any amount the Senate sees fit. But a question arises with respect to the method of building the proposed houses. Not alone in one instance, but in the entire testimony of the Housing Administration, the Air Force administration, and the Department of Defense administration it was brought out that the Capehart housing is being poorly administered today. I thoroughly believe in the Capehart principle and thoroughly believe we should construct this type of housing on an installment basis so that we would not be required to appropriate a great deal of money in 1 year, but could spread the appropriation over a period of years. We should do so if it is practicable. But in this instance the project has shown itself to be impracticable because of the looseness of the administration by two or three different agencies.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would be more convinced if we did not have men at the Cape Canaveral project receiving $80 a day, and things of that kind. When we discover such a situation, we do not abolish the system. We do not throw Pan American out of the operation of the base, for example, simply because investigation reveals failures or excessive cost. I feel that if such failure is the reason—and I have been told repeatedly off the floor that it is the reason—then we would not be giving the system a fair run. I believe if it is not a proper system, we surely have been letting things go through for 6 years without a proper look at them. We have been proud to boast of our accomplishments. I suggest that we can find all throughout the military, the highway construction program, and in every area of Government examples of failure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me that the committee did not kill the Capehart program. What we have done is to say that this year a number of houses will be built, but they shall be built by direct appropriation rather than under the Capehart housing program.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Capehart program dies in the bill, the consortiums of the small homebuilders, who have done such a great job, will disband and forget about the program, and it would perhaps be 5 years before we could begin to get the kind of houses, the kind of architecture, and the kind of planning that has featured the latter years of the Capehart housing program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not agree with the Senator from Oklahoma on that point, because I believe the same architects and builders can go forward, if they want to go forward, under the Government appropriation rather than under the extended mortgage plan.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have had experience for approximately 23 years, and I have never seen a Government contract that ever approached arriving at a total cost figure as low as that which can be arrived at when a man is actually working hard to produce his product under a competitive system. Under the system of direct appropriations there would be competitive bids, but there would be all the redtape that the Army Engineers and Government agencies require.

The Capehart houses have proven less expensive on a turnkey job, and a better house has been produced than we shall ever get with appropriated funds.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We have found from going into a number of houses that the maintenance is so bad in a number of instances that the entire situation should be gone into. That is why I voted in committee, and will vote on the floor, to support the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am in favor of going into any situation of that type we can find. However, I say that we should not kill the system because perhaps there has been a lack of inspection.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that only about 1 builder out of some 80 Capehart housing builders for military construction has defaulted?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the figure is only 1 builder out of a great many more than that, because the 80, or what-

ever the figure is, is a consortium of many small contractors who have been able to bid on this work and who, in the future, I believe will not bid because they are not big enough to handle the overall Government contract.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that one builder gummed up approximately nine projects in the past year?

Mr. MONRONEY. I understand that it is a disgraceful situation. I do not know how many projects were involved. I had nothing to do with the selection of the contractor, and I believe the law could be tightened to whatever degree the committee finds necessary through a bill which could pass both Houses of Congress by unanimous consent.

Mr. CAPEHART. When I stop to think about the many scandals there have been in connection with the Defense over the past years, as a result of which there have been prosecutions—situations in which contracts have been let and the contractors have not lived up to their obligations—and when we stop to consider that under the Capehart Act $1,600 million worth of houses were built and only one contractor defaulted or failed to deliver on some $22 million of them, I believe that is a fairly good record. Before the debate is concluded I shall have printed in the RECORD a statement showing that the Government would take little or no loss on the so-called housing contracts. I hold the statement in my hand, and I shall ask to have it printed when the time comes.

We have had trouble with defections on contracts over the years. I suppose if we live 100 more years we shall have more trouble. I believe it is human nature, and we will always have that problem.

As the author of the Capehart bill, I repeat what I have said many, many times. I do not want to see a single house that is not needed built under any plan. Under any plan I do not want to see a single house built that would cost more money than it should cost.

On the other hand, having had personal contact with military personnel, and particularly those who are married, I think that we would be doing a very grave injustice to the married personnel in the service if we did not provide them, either under the appropriation route or the Capehart route or some other route, with decent houses in which to live. In my opinion, if we do not do so, we will not be able to keep our married personnel in the service. I ask what good it would do to spend $100,000, $200,000, or $300,000 to teach a man to operate a jet airplane, only to have him resign when he has learned to fly, making it necessary to teach someone else to follow the same course. I point out that 80 percent of the men in the service are married. There are very few of them who could not make more money working for private industry. Of course, the personnel receive fringe benefits. But I do not think it is simply a question of money with them.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Indiana for his contribution. I yield the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief general statement with reference to this subject. The detailed presentation on behalf of the committee will be made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. He will be assisted, I am sure, by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and other Senators, who have served with the Senator from Mississippi on the subcommittee over a period of years. This year the construction bill has been handled by the full committee, but for a number of years the Senator from Mississippi and Senators who serve with him on this great committee have lived with this great program of construction on our military bases.

I wish to make a few general observations. First, I wish to allay all fears expressed by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] that we would wind up with post office type buildings and strange monstrosities if we should proceed on an appropriation basis.

Identically the same type of construction that has been carried on under the Capehart program will be carried on under the proposal of the committee. The difference is that we will be appropriating funds to pay for the construction, instead of amortizing it under the housing provisions of the so-called Capehart Act.

The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma apprehends a very bleak future for the people who have been engaged in the construction of such housing throughout the United States over the past several years. He believes that in the future their outlook will be bleak indeed. Mr. President, a very small part of the total construction in the United States has gone into military bases, even when we have had a very much larger construction program. That is the first point.

In the second place, as has been pointed out already, those who have been engaged in constructing such housing under the so-called Capehart program will be able to pursue their vocation in constructing houses under the committee program, under appropriated funds. There will be no plumber or carpenter or bricklayer or mason or electrician who will care whether the money he receives for his day's work comes from funds borrowed under the Capehart program or from appropriated funds, which, too, unfortunately, will in some part at least be borrowed money.

There are two outstanding issues which are involved in this discussion, and which the Senate must decide today. The first issue relates to the method of procedure. Is it advisable to construct houses under a continuation of the Capehart program, or is it preferable to revert to the appropriated fund program until we can clean up the so-called Capehart program?

The presentation on behalf of the committee will demonstrate to the Senate that the Capehart program has degenerated into a great deal of waste and extravagance and sharp practices on the part of some contractors. I do not believe that even the strongest advocate of the Capehart program will deny that fact. The evidence will be placed before the Senate, for the Senate to decide. We contend that the housing can be constructed for $2,000 per unit less, when we consider all the interest charges and other costs today than under the Capehart program. The only difference is that the Capehart program deludes people with the idea that we will not have to pay for the housing, because it postpones it all into the future. If we do not do away with that kind of delusion, sooner or later it will not only destroy the Government of the United States, but also the people who live in this great country of ours. Under either plan it is necessary for the housing to be paid for. We will undertake to show that the housing can be built cheaper under the appropriated funds method.

There is one other very important element which is involved here, and that relates to the number of units which shall be authorized. As has been stated, the original request from the Bureau of the Budget authorized 2,025 housing units. One can adopt any measure he wishes as to need. Let me say that the Army alone requested 14,000 Capehart units. That is only one of the three military branches. That is the number the Army requested in its original request to the Defense Department. These military organizations all know that their request is going to be scanned all down the line until it reaches the Bureau of the Budget, and they always make their requests quite ample in the beginning, in the hope of getting a substantial return at the end of the evaluation process.

Mr. President, we have provided for every instance of construction that was contained in the original budget program, with one exception, and that was the original budget estimate provision for the construction of 525 Capehart units on the Fort Myer Military Reservation, here in Washington, for the benefit of personnel stationed in this area. We have had for a long time the controversy about whether we should proceed to develop Fort Myer, the naval air station at Anacostia, and Bolling Field. The Air Force wants to build a great deal of housing at Bolling Field, the Navy at Anacostia, and the Army has been pressing for a program which runs into millions of dollars at Fort Myer.

The committee has taken the position that we ought to confine all that construction of military housing at one place. There is no need for three little separate military communities supported at taxpayer expense within the Washington area.

For that reason we have deferred authorizing the construction of 525 units at Fort Myer, Va. We did not take that housing away from the services. We put 500 units back into the bill, to be allocated by the Secretary of Defense on the basis of need. Where there is a real need for a program a request can be submitted to the Secretary of Defense for the allocation of some of these 500 units, which are available for allocation.

The amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma picks up every one of the line items which were approved in the other body. If the amendment shall be adopted we will not have any conference at all on this item. We will have approved out of hand every housing unit which was approved by the House.

The housing item in the bill is very generous insofar as it affects my State. If the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma is adopted there will be 500 units to be built at Fort Benning, Ga. At Fort Stewart there will be 100 units. That is for the Army alone. Under the bill reported by the committee there would be no units constructed at any place in Georgia. The Bureau of the Budget had not approved these units in Georgia.

We would have come to a sad pass in the Senate if we could not thrash out these matters in the Senate, but would have to take the findings of the House committee out of the hand. No Member of the Senate would have one word to say as to what should be done on a bill of this magnitude. I do not believe the Senate will take that position.

If the Senate sustains the committee, this is the position we will be in. We will have in the House bill all of the housing under the Capehart provision, including the 5,000 carryover referred to by the Senator from Oklahoma. We will have in the Senate version of the bill the budget estimate of the housing provided for by appropriated funds. We will go to conference with the rest, and we will have to settle that. I do not know what will come out, but at least we will have something to represent on the part of the Senate, and we will at least have an opportunity to eliminate any items that were placed in the bill solely because some fortunate Congressman happened to be a member of the committee when units were being added, and we will have a chance to evaluate them on the basis of merit in each situation.

I have supported the Capehart program. However, we will be making a mistake if we now authorize 12,000 or 15,000 housing units, when we know that our whole Military Establishment is in a state of flux and reorganization. I have seen with my own eyes airfields on which there have been stationed as many as two wings of the Strategic Air Command and which have been closed down. There were a large number of Wherry and Capehart houses that had been abandoned even before they were completed. There is a hospital, 3 or 4 years old, which cost the taxpayers several million dollars, which has been left because the Air Force has moved away under the reorganization program.

Therefore, for my part, I believe we ought to be very careful in the construction we authorize until we know what will be the shape of the physical assets of our airbases all over the United States, and not willy-nilly authorize thousands of units of Capehart housing because a Congressman was fortunate to have them included in the bill.

We should proceed carefully and judiciously in this matter. Under the Senate version, Senators may be assured that we are following the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget and will be constructing housing units on a basis upon which they will be fully utilized, and not, forsooth, abandoned in the next two or three years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is one point, it seems to me, the Senator did not emphasize, and which should be emphasized. The committee did not in any way attempt to repeal the Capehart Housing Act. It simply said that until the Housing Act was revamped and worked over and determined to be more economic and efficient, this year the houses would be built by appropriation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee did not undertake to repeal the Capehart housing law, because that did not come before our committee.

We only undertook to rewrite the bill which came from the House Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. That, in effect, is what we have done on this issue in the Senate committee. We are trying to be careful and prudent. We have endeavored throughout the year to recognize the interests and needs of our military personnel so far as possible. We have not embarked on any voyage to fortify the moon in advance of getting astronauts there, as members of the military have asked, and as Members of the House of Representatives might ask for their own States, or—and I say this in a very low voice—as some Members of the Senate would like to do for their own States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The first thing that will be in conference, if the Senate adopts what the committee has recommended, is the difference in the number of houses between 2,000 and 7,074 and the amount of the appropriation in the bill. In other words, we will go into conference saying that we will build what the Department of Defense recommended should be built. They will be built by appropriation this year, because we believe the Capehart housing program should be very thoroughly revamped.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. All of that will be in conference if the Senate position is agreed to. If the Monroney amendment is adopted, the door will be closed, and the Senate will approve only the amendment sent to us from the other body. I do not believe that will be good legislation, and I do not believe the Senate will approve it.

I apologize to the Senator from Mississippi for detaining him and trespassing on his time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall present the high points and the bare facts connected with the housing program, and shall also cover the high points of some recent developments.

What the committee proposes with reference to the military housing is simply this. For this year we take a new start because, first, of the swiftly changing military situation with reference to many bases. Second, we are fully convinced that a better system must be devised and placed on the statute books if there is to be privately financed military housing. The illustrations which I shall present will thoroughly cover the second point.

With respect to the requests and the requirements of the military, the record shows that even though there are fewer men in the Service than there were in 1955, since that time the Government has constructed more than $1.6 billion of military housing. Still, the requirements according to the presentations have almost doubled, being 446,000 units.

According to the present cost of construction, if we were to allow all the houses which are requested, the total cost would be $12.9 billion. That, I think, clearly shows that we must use some discretion and slow down some of the programs.

The Government cost of maintaining all the requested items out of appropriated funds for the $12.9 billion worth of houses would be $401 million a year. It costs the Federal Government, out of appropriated funds, about $900 a year per dwelling unit to maintain the military housing. I cite that figure now to fully refute the loose idea that this program pays its way. I shall cite other instances before I complete my statement to show that the program does not pay its way.

In round numbers, the number of units in the bill, as reported by the committee, is exactly what was approved by the Bureau of the Budget of the last administration in January of this year. In round numbers, it was 2,000 units. We provide though, during the interim, until a better plan can be devised, that for the 2,000 units the money to be appropriated—and it is authorized in this bill—will build almost the same type of house, but it will be, beyond all doubt, a better quality house. The houses will be built under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers, under the regular statutes that apply to the building of military construction.

If the bill passes as is, 2,000 units will be guaranteed; and we take the priority system, as furnished by the military as to 1,500 of them. Then, to allow some further discretion, 500 additional units have been provided for, to be located wherever the military sees fit. So another 500 are to be added to the 2,000 which were taken out of the bill and disallowed on the merits, so to speak. That was mentioned by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] out here at Fort Myer. So allowing for the 500, the Senate committee virtually cut in half the number of authorizations which it has approved in the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. May I yield briefly to the Senator? I wish to cover these facts.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator stated that the previous administration, through its budgetary officers, recommended the number of houses which are now authorized in the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. In round numbers, that is correct—2,000.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has there been any change of opinion on the part of the new administration concerning the number?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a good question. The new administration later submitted for approval a request for a total—using always round numbers—of 7,000 units. In round numbers, that is the number provided by the Monroney amendment. So there is budget approval for that many as of now. However, my point in the beginning was that the 2,000 provided in the bill represents the original number approved by the budget, when someone considered all the needs of the military and approved only that amount. They will cost, as I said, somewhere in the neighborhood of $33 million. That amount of money is authorized in the bill. The houses will be built under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers, by competitive bids, and under the system which is ordinarily used in military construction. In our opinion, better work will be done, and the Government will get more housing for less money. I shall be specific as to figures later.

The program is an outgrowth of the old Wherry program. I use the word "old" with deference to the late Senator Wherry, for whom I had great respect. The Wherry law was improved upon by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], when the present plan, which has become known as the Capehart program, was adopted. My reference to the Capehart program by that name is also, certainly, with great deference to the Senator from Indiana. Some of the buildings may have fallen into disrepute, but certainly the Senator from Indiana is held in high esteem.

As early as the fiscal year 1958, the Senate committee was warning the Senate against this system of financing and building. In fiscal 1958 our report stated that we vigorously opposed the credit card system of continuing to build family housing under this system.

The next year the committee said the housing could more economically be provided by appropriated funds.

The next year we reiterated those sentiments.

This year, for the reasons I have already given, we have taken the Capehart program out of the building and have provided for appropriated funds.

Under the so-called Capehart program, the Government pays all the costs. All the burden falls ultimately upon the Government. To start with, it is borrowed money.

If appropriated funds are used in a year when the budget is balanced, it will not be necessary to pay an interest charge. The total accumulated interest for which the Government obligates itself in building a Capehart unit runs, in round numbers, to a total of $10,807. That is the guaranteed interest on that obligation for the period it has to run. The obligation is guaranteed by the Government.

Under the appropriated funds plan, the Senate plan, even if the Government borrowed money, the cost would come to only $9,136. However, if the construction is in a year when the budget is balanced—there are such years, and we hope there will be more—the cost is $9,136 for each dwelling unit which is eliminated, to start with.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on that point, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I dislike to interrupt; but I believe this point is quite important. Even though the budget were balanced, so that we had the necessary funds, we could retire that much in public debt, and we would have the same interest-yield saving. So I do not think one can say the cost of the money would be greatly different under either program.

Mr. STENNIS. I stand on my statement that in any year when the budget was balanced—and the Congress has a part in determining whether it is balanced—there would be no interest charge in that year against the appropriated funds. But whether the budget were balanced or were not balanced, there would be a charge in that year against the Capehart funds. This arrangement moves in a very mysterious way. We have to underwrite the mortgage cost for all this period; and the sworn testimony taken before our committee was that the contractors have to pay a bonus of from 3 to 6 percent in order to get the construction money. Of course that cost goes into the amount of their bids. So that is an item to be added.

Also under this program they must have title insurance. The Government already owns the land, in effect; nevertheless, it is necessary to pay for the title insurance, which runs along with the mortgage insurance premium, and amounts—in round numbers—to approximately $600 per unit. That is another item that it is not necessary to have under the Senate plan of building these military housing units.

There is a 100-percent performance bond, for which there is a premium which must be paid by the contractor, under the Capehart plan. And then there is a payment bond of 100 percent, which has to be paid by the Government, because it is figured into the contract. Those are items that are high in cost—although I do not have the exact figures before me at the moment; but the premium for the performance bond as well as the premium for the payment bond under this private financing plan is considerably more than the premium for the performance bond under the appropriated funds plan.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSH. Why is that so? I would think the cost would be the same, regardless of the one with whom the contractor was contracting.

Mr. STENNIS. The reason is that the United States Engineers require a 100-percent performance bond, as does the FHA. But when it comes to the payment bond, they require only a 50-percent or, in the case of a large contract, even less than a 50-percent payment bond, and therefore the premium is less. They have more direct surveillance, I think, and a better system and more experience in dealing with this matter; and therefore they consider the lesser bond sufficient.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is not quite clear to me why there should be any difference in the cost of those bonds, regardless of which system or practice is used—whether the Capehart plan or the appropriated funds plan—because it is being handled by the same people—the Defense Department—and under the same laws and the same circumstances. So I do not understand why there is any difference between the cost of the payment bonds and the performance bonds, because the Defense Department handles them in any event.

Mr. STENNIS. I beg the Senator's pardon; the appropriated funds are handled by the U.S. Engineers. The FHA and the Department of Defense handle the privately financed housing or the Capehart-plan housing, and they require a 100-percent performance bond and a 100-percent payment bond. There is a difference in those premiums.

Mr. CAPEHART. But the Army Engineers require a performance bond.

Mr. STENNIS. They require a 100-percent performance bond; the Senator from Indiana is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. And they require a payment bond.

Mr. STENNIS. They require a payment bond, but not as large, and not as complete.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why is it necessary to have a larger payment bond on a Capehart project than it is on an appropriated-funds housing project?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not understand that, myself; but that is the practice of the Department of Defense and the FHA.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not believe the act requires that.

Mr. STENNIS. In many instances, as I understand, the U.S. Engineers require a considerably lower performance bond. But they do require one, as I have already stated, in this case.

Mr. CAPEHART. A moment ago the Senator spoke of the cost of maintenance of the houses. Is not the cost of maintenance exactly the same, regardless of whether the Capehart route or the appropriation route is used?

Mr. STENNIS. The committee went into this matter some 2 or 3 years ago, and found that, on the average, it had run around $900 a year, in connection with these units; and, on the average, for the other units, approximately $35 to $40 a month; in other words, $75 a month for these buildings, as compared to $35 or $40 a month for the others.

Mr. CAPEHART. What causes the difference? Both are handled by the same people, insofar as maintenance is concerned, and they are lived in by the same people, and the Defense Establishment handles both.

Mr. STENNIS. There is also much difference because of the complicated appliances and cooling systems and similar things which go into the Capehart houses. Some of them are rather expensively equipped, and some of them are very expensively equipped. I say equipped, not furnished.

Mr. CAPEHART. Many of them today enjoy many advantages that Army houses built 25, 40, or 50 years ago did not. So there is a difference in that respect.

Mr. STENNIS. That contributes to the difference. But they are new houses, as compared to the old ones.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has laid some stress on the difference in the cost of supervision—on the one hand, by the Department of Defense and the FHA; and, on the other hand, under the appropriated-funds housing program, by the Corps of Engineers. I must say I have the greatest respect for the diligence with which the Senator from Mississippi has gone into these problems, and the Senate is very fortunate in having him serve as chairman of this subcommittee. But, lately, I have been much disturbed by what I found out and by what has been shown before the Senator's committee as to the contracts that are definitely under this supervision.

The Senator from Mississippi will recall the case at Fort Allen, in Puerto Rico, where we found that the contractor did not really do a single stroke of work on a direct basis, but, instead, subcontracted all the work there; and within a period of 2 years the work had fallen a year behind schedule. I think the Senator from Mississippi will agree that that situation should be investigated further. But what we know thus far presents a very shocking situation, indeed.

So I am not greatly comforted by the assurances that because the Army Engineers would handle the supervision of the housing, that necessarily would insure that the work would be done any better than it would be under Capehart housing supervision.

I wish to ask a question in that connection: When the Senator from Mississippi says the supervision under the Capehart plan is by the FHA and the Department of Defense, let me ask who in the Department of Defense does the supervision?

Mr. STENNIS. I beg the Senator's pardon?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator said the supervision of the contracts in respect to the Capehart housing was done by FHA and the Department of Defense. My question is, Who does it within the Department of Defense? Is it the Engineers?

Mr. STENNIS. No. The responsibility in this program has been at the Secretary of Defense level, and was handled out of that office by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Installations. In that way they exercise whatever authority is used by the military and the U.S. Engineers. As a practical matter—and this was only natural—when these units were being constructed at an Air Force installation, naturally, they conferred with the Air Force officers connected with the military construction. They have only a limited authority. If it was a Marine Corps base, they conferred with Marine Corps officers, and I think properly so.

The law itself provides that this is an FHA program, but that there shall be consultation, more or less, between the two authorities. As a practical matter, the sworn proof showed, according to the FHA, that it looked to the military to make the decisions, or help make the decisions, in looking after the matter. The legal situation was, after there was a default the FHA had whatever legal authority was left. I shall go into that phase of the matter later.

Mr. BUSH. Let me say it is natural to look to the one who has to pay the bill, the obligor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To what extent did the Corps of Army Engineers participate in the supervision of the work done at the various bases about which stories are now being written relating to wages being paid, numerous times, at the rate of $500 or $600 a week, and in some instances $700 a week?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi really has not been into that matter. The Senator refers to the missile program in Florida, which contract was let on a cost-plus basis. The Senator cannot answer the question directly, but he would think the U.S. Engineers had a part.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to make the observation, for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio, that I have been talking to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] about this question, and I believe the question should properly come up when the missile program comes before the Senate, which will follow this bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has any thought been given to including in this bill a provision to make impossible the high rates of pay that have been perpetrated upon the taxpayers of the Nation by the conditions which have been reported by the McClellan committee? I do not know whether this is the appropriate place to do it. Probably it is not, but somewhere it should be done.

Mr. BUSH. I will say to the Senator that when the next bill comes up, the $13 billion bill, which will follow this one, I think it will be a highly appropriate place to ventilate this matter.

Mr. STENNIS. It seems to the Senator from Mississippi it would be more germane at that time than to discuss it in the consideration of the bill before the Senate today. A question of time is involved. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. The Senator from Connecticut has done some very fine work and has made some very constructive suggestions with reference to what is taking place on one of our military bases. The Preparedness Subcommittee is going into the matter. The Senator from Mississippi does not know the facts well enough to be able to make a statement, but he wishes to state that the Senator from Connecticut has done a very constructive and outstanding job and has made some helpful suggestions.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not want to interrupt the chain of thought of the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think what the committee was seeking to do this year was to get to a place where it could fix responsibility. If the housing is built this year by the Corps of Engineers by appropriated funds, it will be built by the Corps of Engineers, and we shall know the agent with whom we are dealing.

The basic problem we have run into in connection with Capehart housing, as has been brought to our attention through the Hayes operations, has been the indefiniteness of the agent with whom we were dealing. If we go to the Air Force, or the Army, or the Navy, and we talk to them about the delays in housing, they will say, "We have not any authority in the matter. The FHA is involved." We go to the FHA, and they will say, "We cannot put our finger on the responsibility for the stoppage, because this is an insured loan, and you have to go to the bank or insurance company, or whoever put the money up." We go to them, and they say, "We cannot do anything, because the Continental Casualty Co., or the insurer of the loan, has the authority and responsibility at this point."

The result of that was a delay in needed housing.

While contractor, agencies, and lawyers played "Button, button; who has got the button?" the project stopped, subcontractors went unpaid, and military dependents waited in vain for promised housing.

The basic reason for the Hal B. Hayes situation was the indefiniteness in finding any party with whom we could deal. Where does the responsibility rest? We found ourselves getting chased from the Air Force, Navy, or Army to the FHA, from the FHA to the banker, from the banker to the casualty company or insurance company. That is why we had these problems.

We found Hayes could get his money paid to him on one project, perhaps in North Carolina, and spend it in California. He said it took too many bookkeepers to keep track of which project got the advance of funds; so he commingled them.

A situation was created that demanded cleaning up. The committee came to the conclusion that the way to clean it up was by means of the proposal of the Senator from Mississippi that we fix responsibility for housing this year, and then allow an opportunity for the Capehart statute to be examined and strengthened to meet the problems encountered.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has well stated the matter. If the procedure were suspended for a year, we could move in with construction of emergency units by this means.

I propose to discuss the highlights of facts disclosed in the Hal B. Hayes case. With all deference, after the facts were in, I did not see how the Senate could ignore them and authorize additional funds without the system being cleaned up and modified and improved.

I am not trying to cast any discredit on any official, but the facts are that from August 1958 to October 1959 Mr. Hal B. Hayes was awarded $55.9 million worth of contracts for military housing, extending all the way from California to North Carolina, and north to the Canadian line, at five different military installations. These included seven separate housing projects, and totaled 3,348 housing units that he contracted for.

According to the sworn proof, he got these contracts, with all this liability and responsibility on the part of the Government, the local people, and all the locations concerned, without ever having put up $1 of his personal money.

He said in his testimony that later these contracts cost him $1 million, or $2 million, or perhaps $3 million, but that fact was not verified in any way and no record was cited to show where he put up any money of his own except corporation fees running from $250 to perhaps $1,000.

Mr. BUSH. May I ask the Senator a question, for clarification?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Hayes was awarded these contracts on a competitive bid basis?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The bids were awarded on a competitive basis, and he made the bond. He made the bond with a responsible surety company.

That is another thing which is amazing to the Senator from Mississippi, at least. This man had a Dun & Bradstreet rating. He had some assets. He was working in all these places in a short time, with many contracts, but he was able to make the bond. No one required him, with respect to all these separate projects all across the Nation, to keep his funds in separate accounts. So far as the Preparedness Subcommittee could determine, money which was paid for the Lejeune project was paid to material men or subcontractors in North Dakota and all across the country, through the ramifications of some 10 or 12 corporations, as Senators will recall.

The Federal Government found this man to be an eligible bidder. That is what the Government had to find, under the law. There was some evidence of his rating, and he was worth some money, and he made the bond. At the same time, the two agencies, the military and the FHA, approved at least one and I think two of the contracts, while there was in the files, from the FHA area supervisor at Grand Forks, N. Dak., a written report saying that on one unit at Grand Forks—there were two different contracts—there had been poor progress, the subcontractors were unpaid, and they were out of money.

The area supervisor made a recommendation in writing. The man has passed away since then, but his recommendation is in the files. In his memorandum he said:

> I recommend he not be accepted as an acceptable bidder.

There is a memorandum in the file in that regard.

The supervisor received a message from Washington, telling him to comply with the previous telephone conversation. His memorandum says that the previous telephone conversation was to the effect that "notwithstanding all these things, certify this man as an eligible bidder."

As I say, that testimony comes from a memorandum. The gentleman who made it has passed away since that time.

While all the contracts were running and while all these units had been started, none were completed, and a question arose at Beale Air Force Base on May 20, 1960. I think they were really moving in on Mr. Hayes there. There were reports everywhere that subcontractors were unpaid, material men were unpaid, and there was trouble of all kinds. The money all the time was floating around for the different building projects, from one to another. Mr. Hayes refused to comply with some of the demands of the military and the FHA, walked off and left all of the units standing May 20, 1960.

As I say, all of the units had been started but none had been completely finished. The units in different States stayed that way from May 20, 1960, until January of 1961 before anything substantial was done toward closing or completing them and finishing them up.

I feel that Mr. Hayes thumbed his nose at the great Federal Government on a $55 million contract. The Government had let itself get into a legal position in which it could not act or would not act. I will give the facts on which I base that statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that after Mr. Hayes walked off, in the latter part of May, nothing was done in the Housing Administration until sometime in October? Because of complications of divisions of authority between the Housing Administration and the Department of the Air Force in the Pentagon, nothing happened until January, as the Senator has mentioned.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is a fair statement which is rather accurate. I shall give some of the details as to those facts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That, to me, was one of the most impressive features in the whole case.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. It is a compelling reason, if none other is sufficient, why we cannot simply go along and say, "Everything will be all right next time."

We must move in on this problem and do something about it. We do not propose to kill any housing program or to let the military suffer or anything like that. We provided the 2,000 units and provided money so that the units could be built without delay and without any hangover, so that the Government will have control. We will not go around through these corporations.

When Mr. Hayes walked away from those contracts the Federal Government, through the FHA and the military, had operated in such a way that it had lost legal control over the contracts and was unable to promptly close out, to call the mortgage due, or to call the obligation due and move in to take over and complete the work.

There is a long story in connection with what happened. The act provided that a building corporation should be formed. Mr. Hayes formed one. It was a small corporation. Only the preferred stockholders, I think, had voting rights. There was little capital. The Government left itself out. Neither the FHA nor the military had any stock or any controlling stock in the corporation. Therefore the Government's hands were tied.

As a lawyer, I think the Government could have applied for receivership in a court as to one of the contracts, or all of them. I cannot understand yet why the Government waited to proceed as to all five. At the five military installations there were eight contracts, I believe. Anyway, the Government waited.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was not a part of the problem which was brought out the fact that the Housing Administration could not move directly, that the only way it could move was through the guarantee companies and through the banks, and those companies would not move?

Mr. STENNIS. As I have said, the Government agencies had maneuvered themselves into a legal situation. I think there was a defect in the law and a defect in management, but the Government lost control over this vast enterprise which was incomplete, standing out in the rain, so to speak. The Government could not move at all, except after a certain delay. I think the Government could have gotten a receivership. That is my opinion, as a lawyer.

This is a most material fact: They would not let the surety company take over and complete the housing units. It never has been clear as to why, but month followed month and year followed year, and the surety company was not allowed to take over and to finish the job, although it did make some payments. I believe up to now the surety company has paid approximately $9 million to the material men and subcontractors.

Next is where the pinch comes. The Senator from South Dakota was the first to call this to the attention of the Senate committee. The subcontractors

were unpaid and the material men were unpaid and the money was being drawn down, although the men were not being paid. That is what caused the racket. That is what caused the storm.

I think we had the first hearing on this problem in September of last year.

As I said, all of this, for some reason, was treated as a unit. At least the Government could have tried to close out one project. There might have been some good reason why they kept all of them together, but nothing was done and the problem rocked on.

An interesting point is that those who had loaned the money to Mr. Hayes—the mortgagees, the bankers, and other institutions—under the legal situation were the ones who had the legal authority to move in and to declare a default, but they did not do so.

This situation continued to rock on under the circumstances that I have stated until January of this year, when finally some solution was arrived at. As of now, May 9, 1961, those houses are still unfinished, but contracts for their completion have been let within the past few days.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The project is off dead center and is going ahead.

I ask the Senator why the bankers would not foreclose. Was it because they had the FHA guarantee and they were not concerned about it?

Mr. STENNIS. I could not speak for the bankers, of course. We have not had testimony from them. Representatives of the FHA testified in substance that they declined to foreclose. A reasonable time was provided in which negotiations could well have proceeded, with good faith on the part of all parties. That allotted time expired after 30, 60, or even 90 days, and they did not move in a legal way to exercise their power to declare all the obligation in default, and let the FHA and the military come in. The last section was completed in January of this year. I do not know why, but as a fact of life the interest was running all the time, and the Government was guaranteeing it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was any explanation given as to why money was paid to the contractor without adequate information being available that the contractor was paying his materialmen and his subcontractors?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know of any explanation with respect to that question, except that the contractors were under bond. Material had been delivered and the work had been performed, so the Government paid the bill. However, I emphasize that there was no accounting and no requirement even that the money be deposited in a bank account which was limited to funds of that project. The money was commingled with other funds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not correct that the banks had FHA guarantees that their mortgages would be paid?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. The banks had Government guarantees on the loans and interest.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Government had performance and payment bonds, so in a measure the representatives of the Government felt that the Government was secure, and the result was that no one acted.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that statement is fair. The process went along from week to week and month to month. The contractor was under bond, and everyone was drawing interest, but no one was getting any results. The surety companies were paying some of the contractors and materialmen.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the able Senator said a minute ago that the Government had paid. I believe the record will show that the Government has not yet paid out 1 penny. The surety company has paid.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall come to that question. The Government was responsible for the interest that was accruing to the lenders of the money.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point is that the Government has not paid out 1 penny at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall come to that question in a minute. The Government is liable for that interest. If it is not otherwise paid, some agency of the Government finally will be required to pay.

Mr. CAPEHART. The surety company, of course, has paid considerable money.

Mr. STENNIS. That is true. I think the amount is approximately $9 million at this time.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. I will put the figure in the RECORD a little later, but I believe the Senator from Mississippi will find that the total amount involved in the transaction is $55 million. There will be a loss of approximately $500,000.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not think anyone can tell yet. A great number of the claims of subcontractors and materialmen are in dispute and doubtless will be in litigation. The surety is not certain as to where the surety's liability will stop. It is refusing to pay a great number of the claims. I shall cover that subject as far as the facts go now.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think in all fairness we should not leave the impression that the houses are not needed because of the Hal Hayes episode. I do not think the Senator from Mississippi wishes to leave the impression that the Hayes situation is unusual or something that has never happened before in our Government, because I happen to know that in Indiana, at Bunker Hill Air Force Base, there are subcontractors who are waiting to be paid for the parts they contributed to the construction of that base.

In the Hayes case an irresponsible contractor took advantage of the situation, either intentionally or unintentionally. That is not an unusual thing. Many times during the past 150 years of Government contracting a contractor has not lived up to the terms of his contract. I believe the law requires that the lowest acceptable bidder be awarded the contract. I think the record will also show that in this instance the contractor had built many Government projects in the past and had been very successful.

Mr. STENNIS. On that point, if the Senator from Indiana will permit me, I should like to say that since the failure, about which we have been speaking, many complaints have come in with respect to units that this contractor had built previously, but those complaints were not known at the time the contracts in question were let. A determination had to be made by Government agencies that the contractor was an eligible bidder. An eligible bidder is defined in law as being one who is responsible, and so forth. At the time the last contracts were let, the contractor already was in a bad way with respect to other contracts, and the area representative of the FHA was already certifying in his records and by telephone calls that the business was bad. He was at the same Air Force base where the first contract had been let.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. My point is that the law is not responsible for the problems with that contractor. The responsibility is with the administration of the law.

Mr. STENNIS. There was nothing in the law to prevent those things from happening. That is one of the major points in the minds of the committee members. We did not write the law, with all deference to those who did. We say that those events show it will not work. There is too much chance to take.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With respect to what the Senator from Indiana has said, my action, and I believe the unanimous action of the committee, was taken to prevent these things from happening again this year until they could be cured, either by a change of law or by a change of administrative practice and administrative rulings. Therefore, we said that for this year we would build houses which we believe are needed through appropriations, rather than carrying out the construction program through the other law.

Mr. STENNIS. The summary of the Senator from Massachusetts is correct. The Senator from Mississippi thinks that the U.S. Engineers, under their pattern and system, could and would have moved in on this problem immediately when the defaults occurred and the situation was shown. They would have declared the contract breached and the contractor in default. Under the general authority they have over contracts they would have moved in on the situation. Certainly they would have done so if they had done what they were supposed to have done. The Senator from Mississippi thinks that is one of the things that makes a great deal of difference.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wish I had the same comfortable feeling about the Engineers that the Senator has, but I again remind him that there was evidence before his committee that the Engineers have been very derelict in the supervision of a very important contract.

We know that, and I cannot understand why we can expect them suddenly to act in a proper businesslike way in respect to the housing program we are discussing when the record at the present time looks very bad. That disturbs me very much.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Connecticut has a concrete illustration in his mind. It happened offshore, a long ways from here. I believe that the record of the Engineers is much better than he indicates, because, after all, he refers to one situation. However, if something needs to be done, it should be done before the money is appropriated. We are talking about a time-tested system which has been carried out by competent people in the Army Corps of Engineers, with an established fine record.

Mr. BUSH. I have always had great admiration for the Corps of Engineers. However, I have been very much disconcerted by the revelations which appeared recently in respect to the matter in Puerto Rico, just as I have been very much disconcerted by the Hayes affair, as the Senator has been, too.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator knows that the situation is that these contracts have been let, but there is no way now to determine with any accuracy at all just what the loss to the Government is going to be in dollars and cents. Of course, we already know that a great deal of time has been lost, and the use of these dwellings has been lost, and the deterioration in quality has been sustained. I am satisfied on the facts I believe to be true, that certainly there is going to be quite a sizable sum lost in the end. Mr. Hayes in testimony under oath estimated that the Government is going to lose from $3 million to $6 million on the project. He laid all the blame on the FHA and the military. I do not believe they should bear all the blame. At any rate there is going to be a sizable sum of money lost besides the time and the use and the deterioration that has already set in.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Defense Department now estimates, after giving very careful consideration to the subject, that on the Hal B. Hayes projects the loss will be only about $551,000 and that is covered by the armed services housing insurance fund. That is the amount the Department estimates after reletting the contracts to finish the projects and after having many weeks to study the subject. Their estimate is $551,000, not $3 million to $6 million.

Mr. STENNIS. I hope that is correct. However, with all the claims and litigation and the unknowns and uncertainties, and to what extent they can proceed against the sureties on the basis of what has occurred, there is no way of telling how much is going to be lost, but on my responsibility I say it is a sizable sum.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. May I just finish? We had that testimony, and we asked the military. I do not accuse them of evasiveness. The FHA, as I recall, did not give us any more information. I was not there, but I understand that they both testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency that everything was all right now and that the program should go on. I do not see how everything is all right about the program after hearing those facts. I cannot reach any such conclusion.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is not any question about the fact that Hal B. Hayes defaulted in his contract. I believe he made money on it. I believe he took advantage of it. However, he is only 1 out of some 80 contractors who altogether have built $1,600 million worth of housing. Now the Defense Department comes up with the figure of $551,000, which is covered by the armed services housing insurance fund. The Federal Government has lost no money. There has been some delay; there is no question about that. I do not know how we can protect ourselves against unscrupulous contractors from time to time, not only in housing, but in every other conceivable construction. We find it in other places too. To come back to the original question: Do we need military housing? If we need housing, which is the better route to follow, to go the so-called Capehart-plan way or the way of appropriated funds?

I do not particularly care which method is followed. It makes no difference to me. However, I think it is to the best interest of our Nation that we have good family housing for our married people in the service. Beyond that I have no interest. I do not like to see one bad apple in a barrel of good ones condemn a plan and policy which has worked very well.

Mr. STENNIS. The number of housing units in the bill is the same number, in round figures, as the number approved by the Bureau of the Budget before we had a change in the administration. Certainly there must not be anything unreasonable or anyone being caught or mistreated, or anything like that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not arguing for 7,000 units or 2,000 units. I was perfectly willing, when the idea was brought up, for the Armed Services Committees of both Houses to approve the number of units that were to be built at each base in the entire United States under the Capehart plan. I was very happy with the idea, and I still am. I am not arguing about that at all. I am arguing that we do need good family housing units for our married men in the armed services. I believe that the plan of having the Armed Services Committee approve of the number of units is a good one.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has a choice of offering an amendment making it 5,000 units rather than 2,000 units, or 7,000 units rather than 2,000 units. That would supply the housing that anyone could possibly claim was needed, and would also give time to amend the law. The defect remains in the law. It is a defect that is going to give us trouble in the future. There is no telling what could be uncovered in all these projects. I do not believe that all the rest of them are all right and that only this one is all wrong.

Mr. CAPEHART. Where is the defect in the law?

Mr. STENNIS. We should certainly write into the law a mandatory provision that the corporation shall be located where the Government can reach it and declare the default, and move in and take over.

Mr. CAPEHART. The law gives that right now.

Mr. STENNIS. It is not mandatory. That is where they let the cat out of the bag.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I was convinced to vote the way I did in committee because the Housing Administrator and the Air Force Administrator both said that an administrative ruling was needed or a change in the law to make it effective. We felt that perhaps more was needed than merely an administrative ruling, and that a change in the law was necessary. At any rate, whether an administrative ruling or a change in the fundamental law is required, we believe that we should go forward in this way in this year. The Senator speaks about the financial loss. Let us think of the loss in housing between May 1959, and January 1961, when over 300 houses were left unoccupied because of these questions of law and questions of administrative ruling and questions of getting these units finished.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his contribution. Certainly any contract should be written to provide control over a defaulted situation. It was not done in this case. I do not know why. Certainly any plan that is approved should have in it a mandatory provision that the contract will not be effective until the contract contains such provisions.

That has been attempted by the FHA. The proposal is that there be an escrow agreement. In the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi, speaking as a lawyer, the parties are acting in good faith, and the escrow agreement would have the same effect as now exists, because the lenders would still question whether the escrow agreement had been breached. It is a question of fact. The Government would still have to sit with its hands tied. This system must be cleared up and cleaned up by mandatory provisions of the law. It will not be done if we authorize the number of houses now proposed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not true that Mr. Hayes, as of today, says that the Government does not have the right to step in; that he has the leasehold; and that any attempt to proceed with the completion of these houses will be in violation of his contract?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from South Dakota is correct. That is a new point. The leasehold of all these military housing units now is owned, by default, by Mr. Hayes. He has notified the military that they are trespassers when they come on the property under the new contract. That is a legal situation which is ridiculous on its face.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not further true that many subcontractors who had subcontracts under the original Hayes contract have been unable to find where they can be paid for the work they have done?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from South Dakota is correct. He understands the situation. It practically burst in his face at one of the airbases in South Dakota.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield for a comment?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. If Hayes made that statement—and he made a great many which I doubt—I do not believe his contention that he has the right to that property. The fact that he says he does does not make it true. He has made many such statements.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It certainly illustrates the defects of the existing law.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have the regular order? I will yield to any Senator for a question; but I desire to yield the floor. Other Senators desire the floor.

As the Senator from South Dakota said, this situation shows up another grave, serious defect in the law. However, even though the Senator from Mississippi has not been fully briefed on the subject or has not considered it thoroughly, I think there is substantial ground for Mr. Hayes' legal position that he now has legal rights which have not yet been cut off under the contract he had.

Mr. President, to sum up, the committee provides for a reasonable amount of military housing. It is, in effect, about half the number which the House allowed, although we took out 500 and did not put them in under any system, leaving 2,000, with 500 to be selected at will by the military, the other 1,500 already having been selected under other priorities. We provide that the money will be appropriated and that the houses will be built under regular military construction contracts.

The program will be suspended for 1 year, under our legislative responsibility, to make certain that reasonable safeguards and reasonable precautions and reasonable safety are written into the basic law and the contracts.

Otherwise, I respectfully submit, we have fallen far short of our legislative responsibility in the face of proved, uncontradicted facts as to what can happen, and what did happen, under the law as it is written now.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I commend the Committee on Armed Services for eliminating from the bill authorization for mortgage housing. If ever there was any reason for financing military housing in this manner, except to avoid revealing the cost in appropriation bills and in the public debt, the reason does not exist today.

The committee has been recognizing this fact in increasing degree.

It has been putting the brakes on mortgage housing for military departments for several years. I am pleased to see the return to provision for military housing under appropriation control.

Mr. President, this mortgage housing program is the worst instance of backdoor spending that has come to my knowledge. Virginia has a large number of military installations. I have received complaints from every section of Virginia where housing has been constructed under this program, especially at Fort Myer and Fort Belvoir.

This program has been characterized by fallacies from the beginning. One of the fallacies is the loose, but frequently used, contention that military housing could be built under this mortgage program at no cost to the Government.

The contention is based on the false argument that quarters allowance funds, which are paid with appropriated money but withheld from members of the military services, are sufficient to amortize the mortgages and pay interest and insurance over 25 to 30 years.

This concept of so-called free housing without cost to the taxpayer has been so implanted in the minds of military and housing officials, and others, they seem to have lost all interest in the need for economy and efficient administration.

The mortgage program for military housing has been a horrible example of how to raid the Federal Treasury through the back door. It is a program in which hidden costs for the life of the housing are inherent in the method used to finance the projects.

To date construction of more than 116,000 units has been authorized under the program. For these the Federal Government is obligated to repay approximately $2 billion, including interest, over 25 to 30 years, but these mortgages are excluded from the public debt figures.

The Department of Defense recently had a study of this mortgage housing made by an independent architectural-engineering firm, and the study showed the cost of maintenance and operation of this housing is almost as great as the expense of amortizing the mortgages.

The maintenance and operation estimate was $1.9 billion. This, added to the cost of amortizing the mortgages, would total nearly $4 billion for 116,000 units authorized to date. The average cost would be about $34,000 per unit.

It is not only a fallacy to say housing under this program does not cost the Government anything; the fact is that it is more expensive than housing financed directly with appropriated funds and there are Department of Defense figures to prove it.

Official estimates show interest and loan discounts add about $2,000 to the cost of each housing unit of the program as compared with housing built with appropriated funds. For 116,000 units to date this totals more than $230 million.

The costs of this mortgage housing mentioned to this point are identifiable. It is practically impossible to estimate the hidden costs in the program resulting from loose and poor administration, but undoubtedly they run into multimillion-dollar figures.

The recently publicized Hal Hayes case is an example of one brand of hidden costs. Through amazing inefficiency in the program, the Government now finds itself in a position of incurring additional and unnecessary expense in substantial amounts.

Situations similar to the Hayes case are not unusual. Claims by other contractors participating in the program at other locations are arising against the Government. They run to millions of dollars. Some will go through the courts; but taxpayers can expect to foot the bill.

The provisions under which the program operates are so involved, it is necessary for the courts to determine the legal entitlements of the Government, the contractor, and the lender. The Hayes case demonstrates how separation of legal responsibility complicates settlement of issues.

The whole procedure to provide this mortgage housing makes little sense. The Defense Department owns the land, but it leases it for 55 years to a private corporation. But the corporation keeps the land only until the project is completed when its stock reverts to the Department.

Meanwhile the corporation contracts for the construction of the housing, but in many cases, such as the Hayes project, the corporation leasing the land from the Government and the corporation doing the building are, for all intents and purposes, the same outfit.

In turn, the corporation leasing the land generally will sign a power of attorney over to the institution making the loan. So at the outset of a project under the program, the matter of control exercised by the U.S. Government becomes negligible.

In contrast, military housing built with appropriated funds on Government land remains under firm and complete control of the Government, through the military departments, from the beginning of construction until settlement with the contractor-builder.

When the Capehart law was enacted, it was expected that the Federal Housing Administration would be a balancing factor in determining the needs under the program. This did not develop; the Federal Housing Administration has not met its responsibilities in this matter.

In many instances the impact of this housing program on the local economy

has been serious. The FHA has blamed military housing for default in mortgage loans and other difficulties arising in its regular programs at numerous locations.

These difficulties involve more than 1,000 Government-insured housing units, according to the latest Comptroller General's report. It is too early to estimate the losses to be incurred on these properties, but there is reason to believe they will be substantial.

In other cases local real estate dealers by the thousands have reported business hardship resulting from unnecessary projects. Voluminous complaints have been made about projects at Fort Myer and Fort Belvoir, in Virginia. I am glad that Capehart housing at Fort Myer and Fort Belvoir has been deleted from the bill.

It has become obvious that military departments are unable properly to administer the program. This is particularly so where large projects are involved; for all intents and purposes, effective competition for such projects has been eliminated.

Only a relatively few contractors are able to obtain financing. Local builders are usually frozen out. Bid brokers, with little actual experience, but with good lending-institution connections, have largely captured the military mortgage housing field.

Military spokesmen have argued that big housing segments are in the interest of economy. But many builders find that, when a project exceeds 100 units, control diminishes and volume production savings are eaten up by faulty construction, planning, and so forth.

Inclusion of nonessentials and exclusion of essentials are characteristic of planning in this program. It is not unusual to find decorative picture moldings, but no sidewalks, gutters, downspouts, or drainage facilities.

There are uncounted cases of deficiencies which proper inspection should have caught for correction before the warranty period expired. But contractors complain of excessive inspection in the interest of personal whims of prospective occupants.

A great many of the mortgage projects will not stand close examination. The study by the independent architectural-engineering company found need for improvement in site planning, material selection, finishes, equipment, and so forth.

There is strong evidence that this housing has been overbuilt in many localities, and that in some instances military departments have given little consideration to changes in their requirements. A new program of deactivation and curtailment has just been announced.

Laughlin Air Force Base, at Del Rio, Tex., is on the list. A Capehart project of 500 units was recently completed there, at a cost of millions of dollars. There is precedent for deactivating the base; but deactivating a 20- to 30-year mortgage is not so simple.

At Fort Polk, La., the Government contracted for 500 mortgage housing units. The contract was subsequently canceled. But the contract contained no provision for termination at the Government's convenience. The Government is being sued.

Fallacies built up around this mortgage program seem endless. The military originally justified the program on the ground that it was losing key personnel, due to lack of adequate family quarters. Defense Department statistics indicate the cause has not been helped.

In the fiscal year 1957, the career regular reenlistment rate was 85.6 percent; in 1958, it was 86.3 percent; in 1959, it was 86.6 percent; and in 1960, 116,000 Capehart housing units later—the reenlistment rate was 85.3 percent.

There is no question about the fact that adequate housing must be provided at many locations for members of the military services. But I find no evidence that it can be provided more economically or efficiently under the Capehart housing program.

There is strong reason to believe that better housing will be provided where it is needed for less money under the controls of the appropriation procedure, as the committee bill provides. I hope the committee bill prevails, in this and in other respects.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to emphasize that the mortgage system amounts to back-door spending. It does not go through the budget; it is not revealed as debt; and it is impossible to check adequately on it. I think it is high time that program be eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to repeat what I have already said today, namely, that I do not want to have a single house built for the military services if it is not needed—regardless of the plan under which the house might be built. I have said that repeatedly.

I have also said repeatedly, that from the very beginning I would have much preferred to have had these 116,000 housing units built by means of the use of appropriated funds, because I am a great believer in paying cash, if that is possible; and I am a great believer in paying in full for what is needed, rather than to purchase it on the installment basis.

On the other hand, our Military Establishment today is such that, in most categories, the men in the services are married; and I believe it will be found that among the officers, both the commissioned officers and the noncommissioned officers, from 80 percent to 90 percent are married, and the great majority of them have children. The Government has always provided housing for its armed services personnel; from the very beginning of our Nation, the Government has provided housing for those who have served it in the Defense Establishment. Barracks were provided for the single men.

When I was in the Army in World War I, 80 percent of the men were single and 20 percent were married. Today, just the opposite is the case—20 percent are single and 80 percent are married. In World War I, the best soldier was the best rifle shot or the strongest in using a bayonet. At that time the services did not have the extreme problems of training and maintaining highly specialized forces. But today the armed services are composed of some of the most highly educated persons in the country. Many of them are college graduates or technicians of the highest caliber. If they were in private life, many of them could draw the highest pay as technicians, electronics specialists, and aircraft pilots. In private industry, aircraft pilots earn from $10,000 to $30,000 a year.

General LeMay testified, when we were considering the Capehart Military Housing Act, that he felt that if we had proper housing for our military personnel, we could save a billion dollars a year in the cost of the turnover of military personnel. In other words, the Government spends thousands and thousands of dollars to train its pilots, its electronics specialists and engineers and, today, its missile and rocket experts. General LeMay testified that if proper housing is provided, we can keep these highly trained experts in the service and can eliminate the expense of training replacements, and, in addition, we can have a better national defense, because then we have what he calls a professional army—men highly trained, with much experience, after serving for many years in the Armed Forces, rather than to have them leave after serving a few years, and then have to train replacements. That was the testimony; and that is why these housing units are needed. In particular, the testimony was that the housing units are needed near the bases, especially near the Air Force bases. The crews of the aircraft should be housed near the bases, so that in case of attack, the aircraft can quickly be put into the air.

Those were the main reasons for the Capehart Military Housing Act.

I have served on the Banking and Currency Committee for 16 years, and I have been very active in connection with housing. I proposed the Capehart Military Housing Act for those reasons.

Now the members of the Armed Services Committee say the construction of such housing should be handled by means of appropriated funds. I agree 100 percent. However, the Capehart Military Housing Act has resulted in the construction of 116,000 housing units. There never would have been such an act if the Armed Services Committees had authorized the necessary appropriations for the construction of the needed housing. The Capehart Military Housing Act was an emergency measure, inasmuch as the necessary funds were not appropriated.

I shall not argue further about the number of units or about who will handle them. I am perfectly willing to have

the Senate proceed to vote on the matter as it now stands.

I believe that the questions facing the Senate are as follows:

First, are any more housing units needed?

Second, were the 116,000 housing units which were built under the Capehart Military Housing Act needed?

I think those are the questions. If we need more, I will vote for appropriated funds to build them. I would much prefer to do it that way than by the mortgage route. The only difference between the appropriated funds route and the Capehart military housing route is that in one instance we sell bonds to pay for the housing, and in the other we sell mortgages. The interest on bonds is a little less than the interest on mortgages. If we decide to go by the appropriation route rather than the mortgage route, the FHA will be eliminated from having anything to do with it. As the able Senator from Mississippi and the able Senator from Virginia have stated, the Corps of Engineers would handle the construction.

So it gets down to a question of, Do we need the houses? If we do not need them, let us not build them. If we do need them, let us build them.

Again I wish to say that I felt that we needed the houses. I felt it was a good thing. Some years ago I visited my daughter, who was married to a young Air Force officer, who had been transported all over the United States. He was one of the many officers that are transferred from one field or base to another. They may save a little money. Then they are transferred again and usually spend all the money they had saved or more than they had saved by living in trailer camps and the like, and hardly ever have a satisfactory place in which to live.

As a result of my visits, and also as a result of traveling around and talking to people in the service, I ascertained that appropriate housing was needed far above every other need for the improvement of the morale of the service. In talking to the men, I learned that, when they were transferred, with their wives and their children, they would use up all the money they had saved in renting undesirable houses. Then the wives would write home to the folks and say, "We cannot find a decent place to live in. The rent is costing more than we can afford." In one instance if my daughter and her husband could have bought a house, under the Veterans Act, and the monthly payments would have been about half what they were charged for rent.

So I came to the conclusion that, notwithstanding the fact that the FHA and the Veterans' Administration handled most of the financing on houses for men who got out of the service, a man who remained in the service could not find a decent place to live. He did not have a decent place to live, but if he retired from the service, the very day he retired he could buy a new house, with no downpayment, and have 30 years in which to pay off the loan. He could then have a decent place to live, and go to work and receive wages higher than he was getting in the service.

I came to the conclusion that something ought to be done about the situation, if only from that standpoint. I was merely trying to render a service, and a similar service was rendered by every member of the Banking and Currency Committee who supported the bill and every Senator who voted for it.

Perhaps the act has outlived its usefulness. I am not saying it has not. I think there has been some maladministration of it.

I think some phases of the act could have been carried out better within the Defense Department and the FHA. But I am happy to know that only 1 contractor out of the 80, who have contracted for 116,000 units has defaulted.

There seems to be a tendency on the part of some persons to put this act on the basis of personality.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me finish. I think the act has been a good thing. I think it has served the Nation well. I think there have been 116,000 happily married men in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, who would not have been happy if we had not put the act into law.

If the act needs amending, let us amend it. If we can do it, and we are now ready, as the Senate, or as the Congress, to take the appropriations route, let us take that route. I have always been in favor of it. I am today. I will vote tomorrow to provide funds for 2,000 or 7,000 houses, if that is what is needed.

I was delighted when the Armed Services Committee decided that it would like to pass upon the number of Capehart units that would be built each year. I still am. I am simply asking, Do we need the houses? How many, I am not wise enough to know, or whether they should be built at a particular field or camp or base. I do know we are going through a reorganization with respect to housing, and I think it is perfectly all right to slow down a little. It may be a good thing. I do have a little quarrel with the idea that there is something sinister about the Capehart Act. I do not think there is anything sinister about it at all. I think it has been a good thing. I think it may not have been administered as well as it should have been, but I think that if 116,000 married couples could stand up on the floor of the Senate, they would say they think it has been a wonderful thing.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, to whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator made some suggestion that there has been a personal reference to the Senator from Indiana. I have had the greatest respect for and friendship with the Senator from Indiana for many years. I do not agree with him in this matter. But when we use the word "Capehart," in connection with this program, it is because the act is usually referred to in that manner.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand. I detected a little something—implication—I do not know just what it is—and I wanted to get it off my chest.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I assure the Senator there was no personal reflection on him in what I said. I have admiration and affection for the Senator from Indiana. He is an able and industrious Member of the Senate.

I regret that my views and his differ with respect to this particular program. But I know he is prompted by the highest motives in trying to provide housing for military personnel.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not been on the floor every minute, but I have not heard anyone attribute any improper purpose or motive to the distinguished Senator from Indiana. Certainly, no one knows better than a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee that there are tens of thousands of housing units on military bases today, occupied by our military personnel, that would not be in existence but for the act that bears the Senator's name. Nobody has attributed any improper motives to the Senator personally. Unfortunately, Congress cannot administer the acts it passes. It just happens that there has been at some time a lack of good administration in handling the act, but I am sure no one has imputed any improper motives to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I had hoped the Senator would yield to me earlier, when the Senator mentioned the services rendered by Capehart housing, because I would have said some of the same things the Senator from Indiana has said with reference to the housing that has been provided under the act which bears his name. I think the act has served a useful purpose. Many of the houses were of excellent quality, but some have not been well built, and, as we discovered this year, there were opportunities, apparently, under the law for an absence of responsibility.

What the committee sought to do was to provide a way so that we could move forward with housing this year and give an opportunity for amending the present law. The Committee on Armed Services did not feel it really had original jurisdiction to deal with amendments to the Housing Act or to the act which bears the Senator's name. Those amendments more properly should be considered by the committee which deals with that type of legislation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the House of Representatives wrote in the provision for 7,000 units; it was not suggested by me.

As I said before, I was delighted when the Senate Committee on Armed Services took over the responsibility of trying to control the number of units to be built in the United States as a whole and in the respective camps, because the last thing in the world any of us wish to do is to overbuild.

We get down to the fact that there is a dispute as between the Senate and the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives wrote a provision into the bill for 7,000 units. The able Senator from Oklahoma has offered an amendment reading exactly the same as the House bill covering 7,000 units. The able Senate committee would limit the program to 2,000 units.

I do not know which is proper. If we take the committee bill as it is written, it will go to conference. The conferees on the part of the Senate will be in conference with those of the House. They might reach a compromise on 5,000 units, or 4,000 units. Perhaps the conferees will retain 2,000 units, or make it 7,000 units; I do not know. I do not know that I care, so long as a proper number is provided to serve the best interests of our married men in the service and the best interests of our Nation. I am not the one who brought up the amendment to change the committee bill, I do not intend to do so now.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the able Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I have listened to the discussion this afternoon without participating in it. I have heard all that has been said. I was very highly elated, thinking that the summation of all which was said contained no adverse implication against the Senator from Indiana. In my opinion praise was given to the Senator from Indiana for the work which has thus far been done. It has been clearly stated that the Capehart Act has served a useful purpose. However, there are some new developments which require a new look. I merely wished to say this to the Senator from Indiana, because I think that is the tenor of all that was said today.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, again I say I am not the author of the amendment to change the committee bill. I am not the author of the House bill, passed by the 437 members of the House.

I was delighted that 3 or 4 years ago the Armed Services Committee took over the responsibility of naming the number of housing units which should be built. I have said repeatedly, and I say again, I do not wish to have a single unit built which is not needed. I should like to see built all units which are needed. I should prefer to have it done by appropriation.

Since we have a $290 billion debt, I simply do not think we ever would have appropriated the necessary amount of money to get the job done. We did the next best thing. We traveled what we called the mortgage route. I took the position that if a man who gets out of the service can be sold a new house with no downpayment and 30 years to pay for it, the least we can do for a man who will stay in the service and become an experienced soldier, sailor, or airman, is to find some basis to provide housing, particularly for the married personnel, and particularly at the bases far away from the cities, at which there is no opportunity to rent property even at high prices.

I think we ought to do that. That has been my position in the past. That is my position today.

I do not think anyone was putting this on a personal basis, but at times it has seemed close to it.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, this is a very difficult question. I have found it to be so both in the committee and in the Senate. As I said yesterday, I find myself in somewhat of a dilemma.

I think the debate this afternoon has been quite revealing. In the committee there was no attack on the method of financing as provided by the Capehart housing program, but the whole objection in the committee and in the subcommittee arose over the execution of the contracts, as to which there has been great delay and perhaps malfeasance, and a thoroughly unsatisfactory situation. That has been due to a lack of supervision or to a lack of proper planning or something. Nobody seems to know quite what caused it.

In order to study the problem more closely, it is said that we should set aside the Capehart procedure and use appropriated funds.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that so far I have not heard in the committee or in the Senate any real attack upon the method, unless it was in the statement presented by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] a few minutes ago. I am sorry I did not hear the Senator's statement.

In all of the committee discussion the attack was on the execution, and not on the plan involved in Capehart housing.

If we are going to throw out a program like Capehart housing on this basis of execution, what shall we do about the missile bases, Mr. President? I had a discussion today with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], in which the Senator stated that we have had unconscionable delays in connection with the missile bases due to strikes, strikes against the Government of the United States and strikes against the missile program. Some of the workers have been receiving time and a half and double time as a result of overtime authorized to make up time lost because of strikes, and are making in excess of $500 a week, or more than the Secretary of Defense makes. Payments to workers have at times been as high as $700 a week in connection with the contracts at the missile bases.

These are shocking revelations which the McClellan committee is making in connection with its hearings in regard to Cape Canaveral, Vandenberg Air Force Base, and Edwards Air Force Base, and the committee is not through yet.

What shall we do? Shall we set aside the missile program for a year until we go into the problem to see whether there is a better way to proceed? I have not heard anybody suggest that, Mr. President. I do not think we can afford to do so. I do not think we can afford the time.

I think the Department of Defense had better give an explanation pretty soon as to why it permits these things to go on. If legislation is needed to put an end to this kind of monkey business, the Department should come to the Congress and tell us what is needed, so that the Department can efficiently prosecute these programs at the missile bases.

Mr. President, I do not see very much difference between the missile base situation and the housing situation insofar as the point at issue is concerned. They are two different things, but the complaint is the same; it is a complaint about the execution of the contracts.

During the debate with my able friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] I reminded him of the situation at Fort Allen, P.R., which I visited last November. A contract was awarded to a contractor which turned out to be a firm of lawyers in Brooklyn. What did they do? They took the contract and subcontracted the project to subcontractors, and they in turn further subcontracted. We saw the result of this entire operation, which is directly under the supervision of the Army Corps of Engineers. It is the Army Corps of Engineers that we want to supervise the appropriated funds housing. In 2½ years, I believe, they have gotten a year behind on their schedule at Fort Allen. It is one of the most shocking conditions I have ever seen. The project happens to be on a smaller scale than the amount of money we are talking about now. But it is the same principle. There was lack of proper supervision on the part of the Government itself. There was lack of responsibility. It was the result of an irresponsible letting of a contract to an unqualified contractor and inability to see that he fulfilled his contract.

Are we going to set all those things aside, as is now proposed with respect to the Capehart housing program? I do not quite see it. If we set aside the Capehart plan, we shall come smack into the budget with whatever amount is needed to do the job with appropriated funds. I do not know what will come out of a conference with the House, but certainly I think it is likely that more will come out than is contained in the Senate bill, because I personally think there is a demonstrated need for more.

However, in that connection, I cannot speak with authority about the need in other parts of the country. I happen to know something about the problems of the Navy in the New London-Groton area, where is located a major submarine base of the U.S. Navy. There all the training of submariners takes place. There we have an accelerated and augmented Polaris submarine program. Men are coming into that area by the hundreds for training, and to man the Polaris submarines. They will be there for many years in the future. The housing situation is intolerable. The 200 units that are set aside in the Senate bill are totally inadequate to meet the need. We will have a very serious situation—a situation which might be serious enough to affect the entire submarine program. As I say, I do not know how serious it is in other places where more housing is said to be needed, but I know about the seriousness of the problem in the New London-Groton area.

I have come to a conclusion reluctantly. I say "reluctantly" because of my great respect for the chairman of our full committee and for the chairman of the subcommittee, who has led the way in this subject for a long time, and for whose good faith, integrity, and diligence I have the greatest respect. There is no Senator for whom I have greater respect than I do for these two particular men. But in this case I have reached a different conclusion than they have, because I do not think we have time to stop all programs in which execution seems to be bad. I do not believe it is wise to single out one which, one might say, is least vulnerable of all because of the alternative method of financing under the Capehart plan, and say, "We are going to set that project aside and operate the program on an appropriated funds basis."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on this subject entitled "Department of Defense Report on a Review of the Analysis of the Comparative Costs of Capehart Versus Appropriated Fund Housing," from page 253 of the House hearings.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORT ON A REVIEW OF THE ANALYSIS OF THE COMPARATIVE COSTS OF CAPEHART VERSUS APPROPRIATED FUND HOUSING

In computing the cost of Capehart housing (time payment plan), consideration must be given not only to the cost of initial construction, but also to the cost of interest and mortgage insurance premiums over the 25-year amortization term. To compute the cost of appropriated fund housing on a comparable basis, consideration should be given to the cost of money to the Government, since it is fair to assume that Treasury borrowing would be increased to the extent that authorized housing is built with appropriated funds rather than under the time payment plan. Moreover, expenditure of appropriated funds is required in connection with Capehart housing and the cost of borrowing such funds must also be considered.

If we assume that initial construction costs were identical under the two programs, then the total cost of Capehart housing would be greater than the total cost of appropriated fund housing because of the difference in financing costs. This is shown in the following hypothetical unit comparison:

Cost items	Capehart housing	Appropriated fund housing
Total development cost	$28,950	$26,999
On-site costs [1]	16,200	16,200
Interest on principal [2]	10,807	9,453
Mortgage insurance premium [3]	597	0
Off-site costs [4]	850	850
Interest on off-site costs [5]	496	496

[1] Covers house, including kitchen and laundry equipment, and all on-site improvements, such as streets, sidewalks, landscaping and utility distribution systems.
[2] Computed on the basis of 300 monthly payments over a 25-year term; rate for Capehart is 4½ percent as specified by current FHA rules and regulations; rate for appropriated fund is 4 percent, the current cost of long-term Treasury borrowing.
[3] Based on one-fourth of 1 percent of declining balances.
[4] Covers site acquisition and preparation and off-site utilities and access roads.
[5] Based on 4 percent rate, the current cost of long-term Treasury borrowing.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi made reference to these figures in his prepared remarks earlier today. In summary, when all things are considered, and financing on both the appropriated fund and the Capehart basis is taken into account over a period of 25 years, the on-site cost of the housing would be $16,200 in each case, and would over the period of 25 years cost $28,950 for Capehart housing and $26,999 for appropriated funds housing. The difference between those two figures is entirely in the finance charges, which would be greater in connection with the Capehart financing. But when we consider that $2,000 difference and allocate it over a period of 25 years, we find that it amounts to $80 a year. I believe that is a preferable way to finance this type of military asset than the budget at the present time, because it would be financed with user payments, through housing allowances which we pay to the military. It would be like the financing of the Federal highway system and the State highway system on a pay-as-you-go basis or a pay-as-you-use basis.

I personally believe that the Capehart plan is a sound way to finance Government housing, when we have guaranteed tenants for the housing, as we do, and we certainly should, in connection with all of these developments.

So reluctantly I say that I shall support the Monroney amendment, because I believe that this is not the time to scrap the Capehart housing bill. However, I thoroughly agree with my senior colleagues on the Armed Services Committee and the subcommittee that this investigation should go on.

We should not stop at the Capehart housing level. We should go into all contracts in which military construction is involved, as well as not only airports and barracks buildings and this type of construction, but also missile bases and plants that are making missiles and aircraft for the Government of the United States in this critical hour. We should be certain that we are getting our money's worth and are receiving cooperation from the contractors and businessmen who are operating these facilities and from leaders of organized labor. We should not tolerate so-called "flash" strikes against the United States, which are adding greatly to our burden of expense and also slowing up the program at a time when we cannot afford to slow it up.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I certainly hope that the Senate will uphold the Committee on Armed Services in this instance. It was once my pleasure and honor to serve on the Armed Services Committee under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from Georgia, who is still the chairman of that committee. I also had the honor and privilege of serving on the Banking and Currency Committee during the period when the so-called Wherry program was in effect, which was the predecessor of the Capehart program, which is now in effect.

In my judgment, if we follow the approach that is advocated by the Armed Services Committee, the Government will save a vast amount of money and will provide better housing for the servicemen. That is what our objective should be, and that is what the committee is asking us to do.

We should keep this in mind. In either event the Federal Government will pay for all the housing. In the event we follow the committee approach the Federal Government will build the housing and rent it to the service families, and the service families will pay the Federal Government. The Federal Government will at all times own the housing.

If we follow the so-called Wherry or Capehart approach, we will use a system of bookkeeping to delude ourselves from recognizing the fact that we owe this money. How do we do that? We appropriate the money and then forbid the Government to build the housing it needs. The Government goes to a private contractor. He borrows the money and pays an interest cost which is much higher than the Federal Government would have to pay. It is all paid for by taxpayer money in the end. Then we pay the serviceman, and the serviceman pays the private owner of the housing. We must then retire the private owner's mortgage at a 4-percent interest rate, whereas the average interest rate that the Government has to pay is approximately 3 percent. Therefore, we pay a great premium on the cost of borrowing the money, in order to preserve the fiction that we do not owe the money. The private builder has a Government guarantee on every nickel he invests, and that is money that has been raised by taxes on the citizens of this country and paid to servicemen. The servicemen, in turn, pay it to the private owner.

What is the difference? The difference is that we wind up paying a lot more, and we do not own the housing.

If we take the approach advocated by the committee we save a great amount of money by eliminating unnecessary middlemen, and we own the house, instead of paying a large premium and not owning the house.

What is there to the so-called private enterprise approach that would make it appear to be more desirable than building it with Government money and charging the serviceman?

The best that can be said is that we maintain a fiction that the Government does not owe the money, because while the Government ultimately pays for the construction, we impose an intermediary who is the serviceman, and he pays the money to the private builder. So we maintain the fiction that the Government does not owe the money. But premium cost is paid; and when the tenant gets through paying for it, he does not own it, nor does the Government.

I have seen this type of housing. I invite anyone to look at it. Go to Annapolis. See what the Government built for itself. Then see what the Government had built under the so-called private enterprise approach. Unit for unit, the servicemen get 50 percent more housing for the same price; or else they pay 50 percent more for the same type of accommodation.

The committee has tried to give the serviceman a better break. The only thing in favor of the other approach, in my judgment, is the strong support behind the idea of paying 50 percent extra for the privilege of not owning this housing.

The Government has set up its books in such a ridiculous way that there is no capital account. In other words, when the Government pays the money and gets something, the Government takes the attitude that the money has gone, never to return again. By taking that ridiculous approach, we are placed in the position of saying that we should not spend money to build houses when we get them much cheaper and get better housing, because it would appear on the Government's books that we owe the money. But we do owe it. It is Government currency. The Government will pay for it. The only difference is that instead of paying directly, we give the money to a serviceman to make the payment, and the serviceman will pay for it.

In my judgment, the committee is trying to render a real service to the servicemen and their families, resulting in an ultimate saving to the Government of many millions of dollars.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will support the Committee on Armed Services. As one who had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Banking and Currency, where much of the private approach type of legislation originated, and who also served on the Committee on Armed Services, where I had to study the problems of the servicemen, I am completely convinced that what the Committee on Armed Services seeks to do is in the national interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, while it was my intention last night to ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment, it appears now that that will not be necessary. Apparently there are not sufficient votes.

I think the record will present a rather clear picture of why some of us feel it is necessary to have Capehart housing. The amendment I have offered provides for 12,000 units of housing; 5,000 of these have been previously authorized in line items by this very committee, and have been awaiting construction orders but are frozen under a ceiling that barred building more than a fixed number.

The remaining 7,000 units are those which have been supported by the Department of Defense before the House, according to its report. So there is a difference between the 2,000 houses to be built by appropriated funds and the 12,000 houses proposed to be built by my amendment.

I fear the ratio of need to construction of about 6 to 1 in military housing units will continue to be the pattern because the high priority military items, which must always go into our appropriation bills, will be provided ahead of the lower priority item of adequate housing to enable the master sergeant or the airman or the second lieutenant to have a place to raise their children in decency and in good neighborhood surroundings.

The statement on page 253 of the House hearings, which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana quoted, which relates to the cost of housing being 50 percent cheaper by building it under Government auspices, is not in line with the statement of the Department of Defense, which gives a total development cost, inclusive of interest on the principal, mortgage insurance premium, off-site cost, interest on off-site cost, and the interest rate on both Capehart housing money and Government money. There is a half of 1 percent difference in the interest cost. The cost of Capehart housing at the end of 25 years—paid out of the housing allowances which we pay the man, paid back through the retirement of the mortgage—comes to $28,950. Under the appropriation method, the cost comes to $26,999. This makes a difference over 25 years of $1,961. Divide that by 25, and we reach the staggering difference of $78 a year in the ownership of the house.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Apparently the Senator is referring to a time when the Government was paying an extremely high interest rate on its borrowings. There was a time when the Government was paying as much as 4 percent on its borrowings. The Government is now paying an average of about 3 percent, and the interest rate on a private housing loan costs about 5½ percent.

Mr. MONRONEY. Four and one-half percent on the FHA plan. We will be paying it to ourselves, because we finance through a Government mortgage. There may be an interest spread of a half percent difference, but I do not think this makes up for holding out on tens of thousands of men who are remaining in the military service, feeling that a time will come when they will be entitled to onpost housing in a kind of neighborhood where they want to raise their children.

I fear that the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services will not find it possible, considering all the other demands which are made for fighting hardware, to provide the adequate number of housing units necessary to keep in the service men whom it has cost the Government $10,000 to $15,000 to train. They will be lost to the Government because they will not reenlist simply because they will have no adequate hope held out that decent housing will be provided for them.

The best argument for killing the program—because I am afraid that is what will be done—is that one man, Hal Hayes, out of all the builders and consortiums of builders, went sour. Because of that one man, a scandal arose, and now it is proposed to deny 12,000 families the hope of securing housing, and untold more thousands of men on the posts the hope that next year or the next year the housing situation will improve.

I think the law could be corrected with much less serious results than this. There are ways of making the bill meet the standards required for appropriated funds. There have been examples of bad contracting and bad subcontracting as a result of appropriating money.

I feel that the amendment is a reasonable one. I hope it will be adopted. If it is not adopted, I hope that in conference some consideration will at least be shown to making provision for the 5,000 units which already have been authorized by the Senate committee, the Senate, the House committee, and the House, to provide for the housing that already has been found necessary—housing which, under President Kennedy's accelerated construction program, needs to go forward at this time, when men are unemployed and when useful work needs to be done on military bases.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee about the Dayton, Ohio, Wright-Patterson Airbase situation, and also about the situation at the Columbus, Ohio, depot. Certain items have been eliminated from the Wright-Patterson program; and I should like to have the Senator from Georgia state why they were eliminated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the two items to which the Senator from Ohio refers are in connection with a modification program for the headquarters command—an item of $1,924,000, and a radiological and health laboratory, $310,000, making a total of $2,234,000. Those items were eliminated under a policy of dropping from the bill all authorizations for construction that were not in the President's budget. In other words, all the unfunded items—with possibly two minor exceptions—were stricken out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That means that the principle was applied to all the recommendations; and that under the application of that principle, the elimination of these items was required?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. A large number of them, in almost every part of the country, and in bases for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, suffered a similar fate, because they were not funded.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In Ohio, there is a belief that there is in the mind of officials of the Department of Defense a gradual erosion of the operations at the Wright-Patterson Base. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether,

judging from the testimony and the statements he has heard, it is contemplated that the Government's $500 million investment there is to be abandoned, and the work moved to other places. The fear arises from the fact that 200 top-echelon workers have been moved from Dayton to Andrews Field, near Washington, D.C.; and in Dayton there is a lurking suspicion that there is in contemplation a gradual erosion of that operation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the details in regard to the removal of the 200 workers from Wright-Patterson to Andrews Air Force Base. That may have come about in the recent reorganization of the Department of the Air Force, whereby there was a merger under one command of all the research and development projects, and certain other elements were merged under another; and, by virtue of that merger, there will be some transfers throughout the Nation. I do not know whether that is the reason for this particular removal, but it seems highly likely that that is the case.

Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that if I had been asked to point out one installation of the Air Force which was not likely to be affected by all the rumors about erosion and depletion, I would have picked out the Wright-Patterson Base. Certainly more activities of the Air Force are carried on there than anywhere else in the country; and the Government has an enormous investment there, in all kinds of facilities. If Wright-Patterson is in any danger, I shall have to take back what I have said to all of my friends who represent sections of the country in which other Air Force bases are located, for if Wright-Patterson is closed, all the others will no doubt be out. But I cannot feel that that will be the case.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree that Wright-Patterson has been the basis and the backbone from which all the other Air Force operations have stemmed; and, in particular, the research and development work done there has been a yardstick for the measurement of what private researchers have done.

Based upon what the Senator from Georgia has said, I should judge that he would be greatly surprised if any such thing were to happen.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be greatly surprised to find that there is in contemplation any program to close or to write off the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. In fact, I would be shocked to learn of any such plan, because I think that for a number of years all other Members of this body have looked with great envy at that installation and have wished that similar ones were located in their own States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Now I wish to direct the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the Columbus Depot. An item in connection with that depot was eliminated, and I wish to ask about the reasons for its elimination.

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been some confusion attendant on this item. The committee was advised that the item was to be refunded. Therefore, the committee eliminated the item from the bill. It now appears that the Department of the Army wishes to restore at least one of the items; namely, that for conversion of Warehouse No. 11 to Quartermaster Stock Control; and it probably will request that of the conference committee. I am not in a position to give the Senator from Ohio any assurance about what will be done about that item.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe that an examination of the testimony will show that the purpose in mind, in connection with the conversion of the building, is to improve the efficiency and to create for the workers an environmental circumstance which will be highly helpful.

So I urge that in conference, consideration be given to that item. I am not asking for the application of any special principle for Ohio; I merely wish to make certain that it is dealt with fairly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand, and we shall give consideration to all these items.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield briefly to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. During the debate in regard to Capehart housing, I was absent from the Chamber when, so I am informed, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] mentioned the possibility of some reference to him in the course of the debate. I wish to assure him and the entire Senate that any such reference was furthest from my mind. I said nothing from which such reference could have been inferred. When the hearings began, I told the staff that nothing was to be said and no inference was to be left except what would reflect the greatest credit on the distinguished Senator from Indiana; and I think his prestige has carried that program much further than it would otherwise have gone.

In addition, I wish to thank and commend the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] for the attention he gave throughout the hearings and in the writing of the bill and its presentation in the Senate Chamber. The bill is far better than it would have been in the absence of his very skillful leadership and the many long hours of work, day and night, for weeks and weeks, that he devoted to the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi overwhelms me. I am most grateful.

Mr. President, a printer's error appears on page 72, in line 23; a transposition of the figures was made. As printed, the figures at that point are "$459,000." They should be "$495,000." I ask that the correction be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

The committee amendment is open to amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed to the committee amendment, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 5000) was passed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as passed by the Senate be printed to show the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 172, S. 1215.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1215) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL GRANTS FOR ACCELERATION OF STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am glad to announce that the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, will hold hearings on May 17, 19, 22, and 23 on S. 986. This is a bill which I have introduced, with the cosponsorship of Senators RANDOLPH, GRUENING, and PELL, to provide for Federal grants for the acceleration of State and local public works to help speed our recovery from the current economic slump.

Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, has accepted an invitation to

be the leadoff witness on May 17. Mr. Meany recently addressed a letter and statement to President Kennedy endorsing legislation along the lines of S. 986.

We are inviting representative Governors, mayors, and county officials to give us their views as to whether such a bill would be useful and practical, both to counter the recession and to help communities all over America catch up on their immense backlog of public works needs.

We will also hear the views of a representative group of academic economists who are experts on business cycles and fiscal policy, and spokesmen for employer organizations.

I wish to take this opportunity to extend an invitation to any Senators or Representatives who may wish to testify regarding this measure.

As has been noted in various accounts in the press, the administration has this measure under active consideration, but has not yet determined its position. When the administration has reached a conclusion regarding the bill, its spokesmen will be scheduled.

The bill, as now written, provides $500 million in Federal grants for State and local public works of all kinds, which represents a net increase in the level of capital expenditure of the State or local jurisdiction concerned. The Federal share would be 45 percent. Another $500 million is made available to the President for use if he determines, after the first $500 million is exhausted, that additional public works are needed to expedite economic recovery. Authority to enter into assistance contracts terminates automatically when unemployment falls below 4 percent.

I am immensely gratified that the Joint Economic Committee, in its recent report, recommended enactment of a program such as that provided by S. 986.

Those who remember the depression of the 1930's will note that this program is patterned after the Public Works Administration of that period—the PWA—as distinguished from the WPA—which was one of the most successful and respected of the New Deal agencies.

When the last recession came to an end, Federal revenues rose about $10 billion in a single year. That was the difference between revenues in the fiscal year 1959, when the impact of the recession was felt, and the fiscal year 1960, the first year of recovery. These figures show the importance to the Federal budget of getting out of this present slump a good deal faster than we now appear to be moving. If we can lick this recession, through public works expenditures and other measures, these expenditures will in large part pay for themselves through the increased Federal income which would be generated by a stronger economic recovery.

On March 29, I inserted in the RECORD a series of 60 letters from municipalities all over the country, received by the American Municipal Association in response to a questionnaire which it circulated to its member cities asking whether they would undertake additional public works if S. 986 were passed. Three-quarters, or 45, of the responding cities answered "yes," while 15 were either negative or noncommittal.

Since that time, the AMA has received 26 additional letters in response to its inquiry. Of these, 22 report that they would be able to take advantage of the bill, none are negative, and four either express uncertainty or are noncommittal. So that my colleagues may get a clearer picture of how this bill would affect the municipalities in their States, I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation of the 26 replies, and the individual letters, be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. Most of the letters are addressed to Mr. Patrick Healy, Jr., executive director of the American Municipal Association.

I also ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. George Meany to President Kennedy and the statement accompanying that letter, to which I referred earlier, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Additional replies to American Municipal Association survey concerning public works acceleration bill, S. 986

Reply from	Would take advantage of bill	Estimated additional amount to be put under contract
Ed E. Reid, executive director, Alabama League of Municipalities.	Yes	
H. R. Bennett, city manager, Burbank, Calif.	Noncommittal	$500,000.
K. K. Dettenrieder, mayor, Hayward, Calif.	Yes	$425,000.
Arch L. Field, president, Board of Public Works, Los Angeles, Calif.	Yes	$1,275,000.
John Ball, mayor, Palo Alto, Calif.	Yes	$1,850,000.
Sherman P. Duckel, chief administrative officer, San Francisco, Calif.	Yes	Up to $9,000,000.
Robert King High, mayor, Miami, Fla.	Noncommittal	
Anna B. Stockwell, clerk, City Council, St. Petersburg, Fla.	Yes	
Frank Lawler, city manager, West Palm Beach, Fla.	Yes	$2,000,000.
Maxwell Oliver, mayor, Valdosta, Ga.	Yes	$1,500,000.
Nathan L. Rice, village clerk, Philo, Ill.	Noncommittal	Up to $17,000.
Richard V. Brown, village manager, Western Springs, Ill.	Yes	$500,000.
John Christian, mayor-president, Baton Rouge, La.	Yes	At least $5,000,000.
James W. Haley, public works commissioner, Boston, Mass.	Yes	$440,000.
Alex P. Smekta, mayor, Rochester, Minn.	Yes	$500,000.
H. Roe Bartle, mayor, Kansas City, Mo.	Yes	
Russell F. Bonesteele, mayor, Salem, Oreg.	Yes	$100,000.
B. J. Rogers, mayor, Springfield, Oreg.	Noncommittal	
Arthur J. Gardner, mayor, Erie, Pa.	Yes	$16,300,000.
William L. Rafsky, development coordinator, Philadelphia, Pa.	Yes	$20,000,000 to $30,000,000.
P. R. Olgiati, mayor, Chattanooga, Tenn.	Yes	$1,500,000.
A. P. Johnson, Jr., city manager, Portsmouth, Va.	Yes	$1,000,000 to $2,000,000.
Horace H. Edwards, city manager, Richmond, Va.	Yes	$1,000,000.
H. O. Domstad, mayor, Bremerton, Wash.	Yes	
Gordon S. Clinton, mayor, Seattle, Wash.	Yes	$11,000,000.
Harold F. Raybourn, mayor, Evanston, Wyo.	Yes	Up to $705,000.

ALABAMA LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES,
Montgomery, Ala., March 28, 1961.

DEAR MR. HEALY: We sent out a summary of Senator CLARK's bill, S. 986, to our membership several days ago and we have had an amazing response to this subject. Municipal officials throughout the State have written us the passage of the Clark-Randolph bill would be a real incentive to them to make a special effort to put public works projects in operation at the earliest practical time. Many of these letters actually listed for our Senators the type and cost of projects that would get underway immediately upon passage of the legislation.

As a result of the remarkable response to our inquiry directed to the officials we have no reluctance in wholeheartedly endorsing the Clark-Randolph bill. As a matter of fact, we are having Senator RANDOLPH as one of our convention speakers next week to discuss this subject further with our officials.

Cordially yours,

ED E. REID,
Executive Director.

CITY OF BURBANK, CALIF.,
April 7, 1961.

DEAR MR. HEALY: The AMA has requested this city to supply data on needed public works programs which might fit the requirements of the proposed Emergency Employment Acceleration Act of 1961 and to express an opinion on the merit of the proposal.

We have found that the biggest drawback to the proposal is the time limits imposed—especially the 90-day limit for letting the contract. We have several projects which could be undertaken, but would require more than 90 days to complete the design and let the contract. These projects include a sewage treatment facility ($850,000), two grade separations ($1,500,000 each), and a mountain fire suppression road ($450,000). Each of these projects would require 6 to 9 months for the completion of design plans.

Other projects which would require less time for completion of design include street widenings ($240,000) and storm drain installations ($275,000). Both of the above cost estimates include right-of-way acquisition.

As will be noted, we have many needed improvements, but unfortunately virtually no design work has been done on any of them. The additional design work required for the above extra projects would require a curtailment of design work on present projects to accommodate the additional load. This would mean that the normal amount of yearly work would be reduced, thereby offsetting somewhat the effectiveness of the extra projects. Moreover, at the present time we are finding it difficult to add additional competent engineering personnel to our permanent staff.

Actually the effectiveness of a large accelerated program such as is proposed is somewhat doubtful in our area. At the present time the construction industry in this area is operating at a relatively high level of employment due to the extensive freeway construction program and Los Angeles County's storm drain improvement program.

Major gains in the reduction of unemployment could probably be made more effectively in some area other than public works construction.

I do believe, however, that a gradual solution to the problem could be obtained through the increased use of existing programs such as Public Law 660 which provides for Federal aid to construct facilities to reduce public pollution problems, or through the acceleration of programs conducted by the Corps of Engineers such as construction of flood control facilities.

In the event the proposed legislation is enacted, this city would have approximately $500,000 in additional construction work which could be put under contract within the specified time limits. No estimate of the additional employment is attempted.

Sincerely yours,

H. R. BENNETT,
City Manager.

CITY OF HAYWARD, CALIF.,
March 22, 1961.

GENTLEMEN: We have reviewed S. 986 introduced by Senator JOSEPH CLARK to increase employment opportunities by making Federal funds available to local governments for increased public works expenditures. It is our belief that passage of this bill, together with a subsequent grant, would permit the city of Hayward to begin construction on two public works projects which would raise employment considerably above the current level.

Plans and specifications are available for a new corporation yard to house city equipment and maintenance facilities. The estimated cost is $425,000, with only $100,000 of this amount budgeted this year. Should additional funds be made available construction could begin within 90 days with a resultant increase in employment of 50 men for more than 4 months.

Also plans and specifications can be completed for the installation of a new sewer main to handle the waste flow generated by a local cannery. The cost of this project would be approximately $100,000 and would employ 20 additional men for 3½ months.

In addition to the immediate increase in employment both projects would require purchase of materials from manufacturers in the Hayward area thereby indirectly stimulating local employment.

The city of Hayward urges favorable action on the Clark bill since it offers an immediate means of stimulating the economy through increased employment.

Very truly yours,

R. K. DETTENRIEDER,
Mayor.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
April 19, 1961.

DEAR MR. HEALY: His Honor, Mayor Poulson, has requested me to furnish you with my reactions to the merits of Senator CLARK's bill, S. 986, and specifically to answer the following questions:

1. Whether the city of Los Angeles could take advantage of the proposed legislation.

2. The additional amount of public works which could be put under construction over and above the amount planned for the next year.

The city of Los Angeles has for many years conducted its capital improvement program on a continuing 6-year basis wherein projects are scheduled over a 6-year period based on the average annual budgetary appropriations for this activity. Even though there are minor changes made each year to this list we have found this procedure works very well in scheduling the design effort of our bureau of engineering and the acquisition of necessary rights-of-way. Generally, we endeavor to finance design and right-of-way costs in one fiscal year and construction costs in the next year. We have found that this scheduling eliminates the dissipation of engineering design effort on projects that may never be financed for construction.

In 1960, at the request of the State department of public works, the city of Los Angeles made a study of anticipated street deficiencies projected from 1960 through 1980 and estimated this cost to be $1,444,272,000. The immediate public works projects deficiencies for this city are estimated to be in excess of $567 million. The average budgetary allocation for capital improvement projects for this city for the last 5 years has been approximately $6,300,000.

We have endeavored to supplement this figure, through bond issues, but it is evident that, without additional financing through new taxes or increased State or Federal aid, we cannot maintain the desired level of elimination of deficiencies in our public works program.

I have requested the two bureaus of this department, engineering and public buildings, who are responsible for the design of capital improvement projects, to report on Senator CLARK's bill. Both bureaus agreed on the merits of the bill; the bureau of engineering stated, in part:

"The city of Los Angeles is in the position to take advantage of this legislation if enacted, but the extent is contingent upon budgetary appropriations and increased revenues from sales tax over and above those conservatively estimated for fiscal year 1961–62. Even though no funds were made available from present sources, it is possible that additional revenue measures could be enacted considering the vital need to reduce unemployment and the fact that these funds would represent the city's 55-percent share of urgently needed projects, the remaining 45-percent share of which would be furnished by Federal grants.

"During the past 6 years, the annual expenditures for public works capital improvement projects (streets, sewers, storm drains and bridges only) have averaged about $6,300,000 including right-of-way costs. It is currently estimated that only gas tax and permanent improvement funds will be available next year in the amount of about $7 million. Therefore, if allocated properly, about $700,000 of city moneys would be eligible for Federal grants. This amount would result in about $1,275,000 of additional public works contracts. The city of Los Angeles could proceed immediately on this additional construction program since plans are already complete for projects which require funds substantially in excess of $1,275,000. An even greater amount of improvements could go to construction if needed additional city revenues could be obtained. Construction contracts in the amount of $1,275,000 would result in about 15,000 mandays of direct labor."

The bureau of public buildings reports there are two street maintenance yards which are completely designed where construction contracts could be awarded as soon as financing became available. The total estimate for both yards is $1,060,000. However, additional city revenues would be necessary.

If I can be of any further assistance to you in this matter, please let me know.

Very truly yours,

ARCH L. FIELD,
President, Board of Public Works.

CITY OF PALO ALTO, CALIF.,
March 27, 1961.

DEAR MR. HEALY: The city of Palo Alto would be in a position to take advantage of Senator CLARK's bill S. 986, if enacted. The firm projects which could be activated would be:

1. New public safety building ($600,000).

2. New corporation yard ($750,000).

3. Improvements to the 1,000-acre Palo Alto Foothills Park property ($500,000).

A potential project to be considered if an incentive plan were established would be a cultural center.

Sincerely,

JOHN BALL, *Mayor.*

CITY OF SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
April 5, 1961.

DEAR MR. HEALY: Your letter of March 10, 1961, to Mayor George Christopher regarding proposed Senate bill 986 has been referred to me for reply.

I have reviewed this legislation proposed by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK as well as the speech he made in presenting this bill to the Senate.

I believe that San Francisco could and would take advantage of this legislation in the speedup of its capital improvement program.

The 1961–62 budget requests for capital improvement projects are now in the process of review and include requests totaling $13,176,000 in the ad valorem tax budget.

Following the policy of the past several years, it is reasonable to assume that no more than $4 million will be made available for this program, thus leaving about $9 million worth of projects which will be deferred to subsequent budgets. I am reasonably certain that with the availability of a 45-percent Federal grant, the mayor and board of supervisors would appropriate the funds required to complete some of the projects included in the $9 million total.

The major projects making this total include police stations, fire houses, health centers, hospital improvements, recreational facilities, and library improvements.

San Francisco voters approved the issuing of $12,500,000 in bonds for sewer improvement construction in November 1960. Work on these projects could also be expedited and extended with the 45-percent Federal aid grant.

In addition to the above, such aid could probably be put to good use in public utility work including water supply projects and airport improvements.

Very truly yours,

SHERMAN P. DUCKEL,
Chief Administrative Officer.

CITY OF MIAMI, FLA.,
April 25, 1961.

DEAR MR. HEALY: In reply to your inquiry pertaining to Senator CLARK's bill, S. 986, we are of the opinion that this would be good standby legislation for the Congress to pass in order for the President of the United States to have at his disposal.

The present economic recession that exists in southern Florida I hope will be alleviated before the provisions of S. 986 would become a reality.

Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

Sincerely,

ROBERT KING HIGH,
Mayor.

CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.,
April 4, 1961.

GENTLEMEN: We are enclosing resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Fla., on the 21st day of March 1961, urging Congress to adopt bill S. 986 which will provide certain Federal matching funds for capital improvements.

Yours very truly,

ANNA B. STOCKWELL,
Clerk of the City Council.

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ST. PETERSBURG, FLA.

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a proposed bill S. 986 which will provide certain Federal matching funds for capital improvement programs within municipalities; and

Whereas the city of St. Petersburg has developed a capital improvement program which far exceeds the resources of the city of St. Petersburg to accomplish; and

Whereas the enactment of the proposed bill will be of great assistance to the municipalities of this country including the city of St. Petersburg: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of St. Petersburg, Fla., That we urge the Congress to adopt said bill S. 986; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS and Congressman CRAMER; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the American Municipal Association.

CITY OF WEST PALM BEACH, FLA.,
March 27, 1961.

DEAR MR. HEALY: The City Commission of the City of West Palm Beach, Fla., has directed that I advise you of the city's concurrence with the proposed Senate bill 986, by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, and to advise you that we already have projects of a lasting capital investment nature which are in the design stage and which would qualify for the aid as proposed by Senate bill 986 and have other projects which could qualify as well. For example the city commission has directed the preparation of a study and recommendations for what public building facilities the city of West Palm Beach needs, the area required for them and a supplemental financial capital budget that would permit them.

We would estimate that, if Senate bill 986 was authorized and our projects were qualified, these projects would add additional public works to our economies in the neighborhood of $2 million and we estimate that this would provide direct employment for approximately 300 people and improve indirectly the supplemental services of other businesses and industry.

I hope this information will be of service to you. I might mention in closing that the types of structures we are contemplating include the following: (1) a new police station, jail and civil defense headquarters; (2) a new city hall; (3) a new stadium in the park and we already have plans underway for a new auditorium and new library.

Sincerely,

FRANK LAWLER,
City Manager.

CITY OF VALDOSTA, GA.,
April 6, 1961.

DEAR MR. HEALY: Please accept my apologies for the delay in replying to your letter of March 10 concerning Senator CLARK'S bill, S. 986, providing for public works grants to local governments.

Please be advised that the city of Valdosta could take advantage of such legislation and could schedule approximately $1,500,000 in public works construction over and above the amount which would otherwise be constructed. This amount is the total that we could schedule during the next 2-year period.

I hope this is the information desired.

Very truly yours,

MAXWELL OLIVER, *Mayor.*

PHILO, ILL., *March 23, 1961.*

DEAR SIRS: In answer to your bulletin requesting information about possible benefits this community might derive from Senator CLARK'S 45 percent public works grants bill, we submit the following:

In the past several years we have considered drilling an additional municipal water well, and resurfacing Main Street, but have not undertaken these projects due to the cost involved. The estimated costs are approximately $7,000 to $10,000, and $7,000, respectively.

I will bring this to the attention of the village board at their next meeting on April 5, and then write to you again, answering the specific questions in your bulletin.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT B. RICE,
Village Clerk.

WESTERN SPRINGS, ILL., *April 6, 1961.*

GENTLEMEN: Recently we were informed by our State municipal league that there has been a bill introduced into Congress by Senator CLARK designed to "increase employment opportunities" by authorizing 45 percent public works grants to States and local governments. The Illinois Municipal League bulletin requested us to write your office concerning our position on these matters:

1. As to whether or not Western Springs would be in position to take advantage of such legislation—the answer is "yes". We have a number of pending projects which we know must be done and are in the stage of planning where work could proceed almost immediately.

2. At the present time the village would have somewhere in the neighborhood of $250,000 to $300,000 in public works construction to be done during this year. Other projects aggregating at least $500,000 could readily be added providing funds were made available.

3. It would be difficult to estimate the additional employment that would result. A rough estimate would indicate that perhaps increased activity as a result of additional grant in aid might provide somewhere in the neighborhood of 100,000 man-hours of employment.

We hope that this letter will provide some of the answers to your questions and give you an indication of our response to this proposed legislation. This letter does not indicate that the village or the elected officials of the village would promote passage of this bill, but strictly from a practical viewpoint, if the legislation was passed the village would be in position to take advantage of it.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD V. BROWN,
Village Manager.

BATON ROUGE, LA., *April 3, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: In answer to your letter of March 10, 1961, referring to the AMA national legislative bulletin on public works acceleration, dated February 23, 1961, this is to advise that:

1. Our community will be in a position to take advantage of this legislation if enacted.

2. We could accelerate over $8 million of construction for which funds are available and with the incentive provided by 45 percent matching funds, we could expedite at least another $5 million in needed construction.

3. This would result in employment for several thousand workers now unemployed in this community.

It would be appreciated if you would keep me advised as to the status of this bill.

Sincerely,

JOHN CHRISTIAN,
Mayor-President.

BOSTON, MASS., *March 30, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: As you suggested, we have reviewed Senator CLARK'S statement and S. 986, and wish to advise that Boston could take advantage of the proposed legislation. The city of Boston could put in about $440,000 of construction over and above the amount planned for next year.

Boston favors the proposed legislation.

Yours truly,

JAMES W. HALEY,
Commissioner of Public Works.

ROCHESTER, MINN., *April 25, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: The public works committee of the city of Rochester, Minn., has reviewed the proposed public works bill, S. 986, and we feel that (1) we could take advantage of this legislation if enacted, (2) the additional amount of public works that could be put under construction next year above the amount otherwise planned, could be approximately $500,000.

Incidentally, you might be interested in knowing that our city has advanced our public works projects by approximately 3 months in order to increase employment for our local people.

Sincerely yours,

ALEX P. SMEKTA,
Mayor.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *April 19, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: Thank you very kindly for your thoughtfulness in sharing with me the contents of Senator CLARK'S bill, S. 986, and I have had the opportunity to review it and discuss our own particular construction program with our director of public works.

As regards my reaction to Senator CLARK'S bill I definitely feel it will provide the necessary stimulus; things of late are picking up in Kansas City, however are still sufficiently recessed where I definitely feel that this proposed crash program as interpreted by Senator CLARK'S bill, will provide the necessary emergency measures to increase employment opportunities and give the boost to our economy that is necessary. Our city council has been taking some steps of their own in a much lesser degree, of course, whereby much of our construction that is proposed is being advanced and passed on the same day that it is introduced so a contract can be awarded, jobs started, men employed for that purpose. We are doing this invariably with every public works contract that is approved and ordinance submitted.

Our present capital improvement program for the fiscal year 1961–62 shows a scheduling listed at the total of $6,871,000, however there are debit services available for next year of $2,200,000, which means a project totaling $4,671,000 will necessarily have to be deferred for future construction. So you can see naturally our community would be very willing to take advantage of this particular legislation.

Faithfully yours,

H. ROE BARTLE,
Mayor.

SALEM, OREG., *April 5, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: Regarding Senator CLARK'S bill, S. 986, the city of Salem does have an annually revised 6-year capital improvement program. However, as in all such programs, the final amount of annual public works must be determined by financial ability. Consequently, our planning commission is continuously bringing additional needs to our attention which we cannot afford.

Therefore, I feel confident in saying that the city of Salem probably could afford to take advantage of this legislation by putting an additional $100,000 ($55,000 city, $45,000 Federal) of public works under construction over and above the amount planned for the next year.

On the basis of past experience, I would estimate that $40,000 of this would be used for direct labor purchases, or an additional employment of approximately 10 man-years.

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL F. BONESTEELE,
Mayor.

SPRINGFIELD, OREG., *March 27, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: This is in response to your letter of March 10 regarding Senator CLARK'S bill, S. 986. At this time we are not in a position to give you an opinion as

to whether we could take advantage of this legislation if it were passed. At the present time we have an urban renewal project in progress as well as a $2 million sewer bond issue. These are about as much as we can handle at one time.

I think I can say it will always be our policy to take advantage of Federal legislation that will help our city if we find an appropriate occasion on which to use such assistance.

We will put this information in our "follow" file and call it to the attention of the council. If there should be some positive action on the part of the council, we will inform your office.

Sincerely yours,

B. J. ROGERS, *Mayor.*

ERIE, PA., *April 11, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: In answer to your letter of March 10, we have reviewed Senator CLARK'S bill, S. 986, and statement, and below are listed our comments on the three questions you asked:

1. Our community would definitely be in a postion to take advantage of the legislation if enacted.

The impact of fast changing patterns in urban development has created a host of problems and projects that need immediate attention and yet cannot be fully undertaken at this time for lack of available funds. The backlog of public works projects accumulated during the war years and postwar demands would be alleviated by public works bill S. 986.

2. It is estimated that $16.3 million of additional public works money could be placed under contract over and above what our community had planned for the ensuing year.

The dire need of a city hall, construction of new highways to improve circulation in our central business district, and to tie in our lake port development with the industrial complex of the Pittsburgh area and the Interstate Highway System would have high priority. A program of training courses would be extremely beneficial, especially to the assembly line work force that is unemployed due to industrial plant relocation to another State.

3. One thousand one hundred additional employment would result from this program.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR J. GARDNER,
Mayor.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *April 7, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: This is in answer to your inquiry of February 23 about the public works bill introduced by Senator CLARK.

We would be able to take some advantage of this bill in any case, but due to the normal lag of starting public works, we would be able to start a great many more projects if the time of completion required in the bill were lengthened from 12 to 18 months or 2 years.

A guess about the amount of additional public works we could undertake is difficult, particularly as we do not know at what time these grants would become available. Normally, the speed with which we undertake public works is guided by: (a) our ability to complete the project within a reasonable period of time, i.e., we want to make sure that projects are undertaken in logical order; (b) by the capital market for municipal bonds which may make it more advisable to float bonds at one time rather than another. Furthermore, we have, at President Kennedy's request, undertaken to speed up public projects to the fullest extent of our financial capacity. As this bill will greatly increase this capacity, we would be able to undertake more projects, but have to take into consideration the amount of heavy equipment and skilled labor available at any one time.

In terms of our financial capacity at this time, the 45 percent grant would permit us to add something like $61 million worth of public works construction projects to those already planned. This figure, however, is in every respect a maximum: in most cases of larger projects it will be impossible to start them within a very short period of time, and it may even be too short a period to figure on a lag of 6 months between the time we start planning and the time we let the contract. Secondly, at the moment we know that construction firms are very far from working at capacity. By the time the bill goes through and the lagtime just mentioned is added, this situation might be different, in which case it would be hard to get contractors to start work on public projects right away.

On the other hand, if at that time contractors work closer to full capacity, the need for the remedies of this bill would be decreased to the same extent.

In other words, it is impossible for me to say whether the $60 million figure should be cut in half or cut to one-third to be realistic. If it were cut in half, we would request less than $10 million in Federal grant money.

As to additional employment, such a figure is of course subject to the same qualifications. The maximum addition would be approximately 10,000 jobs, or its equivalent in additional man-hours.

I hope that this answer helps you in your very useful endeavors to support Senator CLARK'S bill.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. RAFSKY,
DEVELOPMENT COORDINATOR.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *March 22, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: In reply to your letter of March 10, we certainly feel that Senator CLARK'S bill, S. 986, has considerable merit. Municipalities of this Nation are finding themselves with more and more capital improvements to make each year with less means of revenue.

If such a bill was passed, we believe that we could increase our public works program by $1½ million during this coming year. We certainly would encourage the American Municipal Association to support this bill.

Very truly yours,

P. R. OLGIATI,
Mayor.

PORTSMOUTH, VA., *March 27, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: In answer to your letter addressed to Mr. B. W. Baker, mayor of the city of Portsmouth, Va., which has been referred to me, please be advised that the city of Portsmouth is most interested in Senator CLARK'S bill S. 986 as it could be very helpful to our city on pending public works projects that are being held in abeyance due to the lack of funds.

The city of Portsmouth will definitely be in a position to take advantage of this legislation and we could do approximately $1 to $2 million worth of construction. I would estimate the additional employment to be between 75 and 100 persons.

Very truly yours,

A. P. JOHNSON, Jr.,
City Manager.

RICHMOND, VA., *March 27, 1961.*

GENTLEMAN: We have reviewed your bulletin of February 23, concerning Senator CLARK'S legislation to increase employment opportunities.

The city of Richmond budgets its public improvement on an annual basis beginning with July 1 of each year. The size of this budget varies from year to year depending on the priority of need and the availability of funds. We are presently in the process of executing many of the projects already budgeted. We are also in the process of preparing our budget for the coming fiscal year of 1961–62.

Based on our interpretation of the proposed legislation, it appears that Richmond may be able to qualify for Federal aid for public works acceleration ($1 million), however, we do not have plans ready nor will city funds be available until after July 1, 1961.

Sincerely,

HORACE H. EDWARDS,
City Manager.

BREMERTON, WASH., *April 6, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: Thank you for your letter of March 10 enclosing S. 986 by Senator CLARK. This bill would certainly be a help to the local communities.

Bremerton is in need of many public works projects that are left undone as we do not have the money for public outlay. It would help us in our planned street repair program, improving and widening streets that should and need to be done, and our public works program as a whole. Our front street dock must be torn down, but working under limited funds we can accomplish just the very essentials.

Very truly yours,

H. O. DOMSTAD,
Mayor.

SEATTLE, OREG., *March 28, 1961.*

DEAR MR. HEALY: In answer to your letter of March 10 there is common agreement in our board of public works that bill S. 986, if passed, would assist in stimulating our community's public works program.

Approximately $11 million of public works could be placed under contract during the next year if the Federal grants contemplated by the bill were made available.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON S. CLINTON,
Mayor.

TOWN OF EVANSTON, WYO.,
March 27, 1961.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your letter concerning Senator CLARK'S bill S. 986. After having read it I am wholeheartedly in favor of it and I think the bill, if enacted soon, would help the country very much. We need such a stimulus as this, now, and also for the future.

Yes, I believe we would be in a position to consider the possibility of taking advantage of the help given to us by legislation such as this on several projects, such as the following.

1. Remodel or new police department building.
Answer. Approximately $10,000.
2. Rejuvenate city street lighting system.
Answer. No estimate.
3. City water intake system.
Answer. Approximately $600,000.
4. New sewage stabilization ponds.
Answer. Approximately $60,000.
5. Cemetery revitalization.
Answer. Approximately $15,000.
6. Recreation program buildings.
Answer. Approximately $20,000.

The additional employment would vary with whatever projects we would undertake, but an approximate estimate would be, say, 10 additional men for a year's time.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD F. RAYBOURN,
Mayor.

APRIL 21, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: Because of continuing high level unemployment and the prospect that the recovery will not substantially reduce it in the immediate future, I urge your support for the enactment of legislation which would rapidly accelerate public construction at all governmental levels.

As the enclosed statement indicates, we believe it is now urgent to enact three kinds of measures to encourage the rapid increase in public works of permanent value:

The first would immediately spur State and local short duration projects—for which planning is now completed and the work is ready to go—through a Federal grant program of the kind proposed by Senator CLARK in S. 986.

The second would help our most hard-pressed States and localities raise their matching funds by providing interest-free Federal public facility loans during periods of abnormal unemployment.

The third would give the President discretionary power to speed up Federal and federally assisted public construction during periods of economic slowdown, by authorizing him to transfer unobligated balances of appropriations from one executive department or agency to another, as he may deem to be necessary.

It is our view that passage of this kind of legislation is now urgent. It will help stimulate the employment and economic growth we so much need. Moreover, as permanent public works legislation it will give the President an important economic tool—as a supplement to the monetary and fiscal powers now available—for future discretionary use for countercyclical purposes.

It is our hope, Mr. President, that in addition to supporting the above program you will also continue to give consideration to our other proposals to alleviate continuing serious unemployment problems. These include a temporary income tax reduction, a more vigorous effort to reduce interest rates generally, a maximum 4½ percent rate on federally guaranteed home mortgages to be achieved by direct Federal loans if necessary, and other measures.

At this time of reappraisal of the immediate and longer run economic outlook, we feel that action to accelerate public construction—as well as our other proposals—merits most serious consideration.

Respectfully,

GEORGE MEANY,
President, AFL–CIO.

STIMULATING RECOVERY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH THROUGH ACCELERATED PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION

As long ago as last January the executive council of the AFL–CIO urged the immediate speed-up of public construction to help counteract unemployment and business stagnation. Because the need continues, we make this plea once again.

In February, at a subsequent meeting of the executive council, we applauded the statement in President Kennedy's economic message that Federal construction would be accelerated and that the States and localities would be encouraged to do likewise. At that time, we again urged immediate congressional action to insure the mounting of a rapidly expanding public works effort, particularly at the State and local levels.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that the unemployment rate continues to remain at an intolerable level, the Congress has not acted. Furthermore, the prospect for an adequate increase in public works outlays is not reassuring.

For years it has been evident that Federal power to stimulate recovery solely through the use of monetary and fiscal measures is not enough. An effective national economic stabilization program must also include standby power to quickly stimulate public construction during a period of business stagnation or inadequate economic growth.

In seeming recognition of this need, the Congress has taken several forward steps. But they have never been sufficient to adequately accelerate public construction when the need has been most urgent.

I. FEDERAL GRANTS FOR STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC WORKS

In the first place, the Congress has already provided Federal funds to encourage advanced public works planning by the States and localities and a substantial shelf of projects is now in readiness. However, Congress has failed to take the next logical step—the enactment of legislation to help our hard-pressed State and local governments finance the construction of these standby projects at a time when action is most urgently needed.

According to a recent survey of the U.S. census, there are nearly $22 billion worth of State and local construction projects on which all advanced planning will have been completed during the 18-month period between July 1960 and December 1961. Plans for $7½ billion of such projects were completed during the last half of 1960; planning of a like amount is being completed during the first 6 months of this year; nearly $7 billion of additional project plans will be completed by the last half of 1961.

It is noteworthy that about 60 percent of the value of these projects have been planned or are being planned by local governments. Furthermore, many are of a type on which construction can be completed within 1 year. Although some of these projects are already underway, it is evident that a tremendous backlog of additional projects of permanent worth are now ready to go and many more soon will be in a state of readiness.

If Federal financial aid could be obtained, scores of State and local governments would quickly seize the opportunity to increase their public works construction. This is particularly true of local governments, many of which—although already heavily committed financially—desperately desire to initiate additional sewerage, water and drainage projects, street and sidewalk improvements, fire and police station construction, railroad overpasses, and other capital improvements for which plans are already completed.

According to a sample survey just completed by the American Municipal Association, 75 percent of our cities and other local governments would immediately undertake hundreds of million of dollars worth of additional short-run construction projects if a reasonable amount of Federal financial aid could be provided.

Unfortunately, even during our fourth post-World War II recession no authority for such Federal aid exists. Surely, now is the time to act, not only to meet the present need, but also to provide standby power to meet emergencies which will arise again in the future. Toward this end, the AFL–CIO urges the immediate passage of legislation which would:

1. Provide at least $1 billion to be used for Federal grants-in-aid to the States and their subdivisions for permanent and essential public works construction during periods of substantial unemployment.

2. Provide these grants only on the condition that they bring about a net increase in the level of capital improvement expenditures, and are not substituted for funds that otherwise would be provided locally. These grants should not be available for projects for which Federal money is provided by other acts of Congress.

3. Give priority to projects on which construction can be let within 90 days and which can be completed within 1 year thereafter.

4. Provide for the termination of new grants after the unemployment rate has returned to a tolerable level.

5. Provide Presidential authority for a resumption of the grant program on the recurrence of a business downturn. A standby fund should be made available to the President for this purpose.

An emergency Federal grant-in-aid program to help accelerate construction at the local level during periods of economic stagnation will be particularly effective because many local projects can be quickly started and completed and their initiation will aid the unemployed at places where the jobless are most numerous.

II. INCREASING THE AVAILABILITY OF STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Under the previous acts of Congress, the States and their subdivisions have been assisted in obtaining long-term, low-interest community facility loans when financial assistance has not otherwise been available on equally favorable terms and conditions. This form of Federal aid has substantially helped to encourage the building of essential public facilities.

Federal funds available for community facility loans should now be increased, their duration extended and their cost reduced to the lowest feasible level. In new legislation, a particular effort should be made to underpin the borrowing ability of our most hard-pressed local governments during periods of excessive unemployment—perhaps by granting interest-free loans—so that they, too, may obtain Federal matching grants and thus accelerate their public works programing.

III. SPEEDING-UP FEDERAL AND FEDERALLY ASSISTED PUBLIC PROJECTS

In addition to enacting Federal legislation to help accelerate State and local public construction during periods of economic slowdown, the President also should be given discretionary power to substantially accelerate Federal and federally assisted public projects already authorized by law.

To accomplish this purpose, legislation should be enacted which will allow the President to transfer up to $2 billion from the unobligated balances of appropriations already made to certain executive departments and agencies to such other departments and agencies as he may deem necessary, during periods of extreme unemployment.

The AFL–CIO is encouraged by the fact that several bills have already been introduced which incorporate various of the proposals listed above and are receiving widespread attention and support. This is particularly true of S. 986, introduced by Senator CLARK of Pennsylvania, and S. 726 introduced by Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

Today, America suffers from vast unmet public facility needs. At the same time, there are hundreds of thousands of idle workers who should now be engaged in public construction and in producing the steel, cement and other materials required for these projects. This Nation can no longer afford to tolerate the needless human want, the wasted skills, and the ignored social needs which continued failure to utilize public works acceleration as a countercyclical tool perpetuates.

Surely, now is the time to enact legislation not only to meet the present need to quickly stimulate employment and economic growth through public works expansion, but also to make sure that the Federal Government will have standby power to accelerate public construction in the future whenever unemployment and stagnation again overtake the economy.

The fiscal and monetary measures through which the Federal Government now can exert some countercyclical control over the direction of the American economy can be made far more effective if used in conjunction with public works acceleration measures.

It is our view that the time has arrived when the denial of this important additional tool to the President and to the Nation's welfare no longer can be tolerated.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTER-AMERICAN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1215 be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 174, H.R. 6518.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the Inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the President in his inaugural address called on the American people to ask not what the country could do for them—but what they could do for their country.

Since then millions of Americans have asked to be called upon for deeds, not words. They have asked, What can I do?

The bill now before the Senate is a small but important call on Americans for action. It asks every American to put about $3.75 into a fund to help Latin Americans move from poverty toward self-sufficiency. This is less than millions of our citizens put into Metrecal in a week. It is much less than we put into tobacco, liquor, and other luxuries of life ranging from eye shadow and deodorants, to slot machines.

I suspect with Castro on our doorstep most Americans will feel $3.75 is not enough. But it is a beginning. Certainly a visit to most of Latin America away from some of the luxury hotels would show that the $600 million bill before us is only a small start.

But the very mention of luxury hotels suggests one of the basic problems which confronts efforts to promote progress there. That is the problem posed by governments that too often have permitted the rich to get richer while the poor stayed poor.

It is essential, therefore, that our small start in this program be soundly conceived and executed. And in order to assure that sound start, aid must be conditioned on the basic premise that it must promote the welfare of the common man. Only if the poor man knows his son will be better off than the father, will it be possible to maintain some semblance of order and to promote individual freedom in Latin America.

Powerful forces of dissatisfaction in Latin America must be put to productive use. If we do not work with these forces, they will work against us.

Latin Americans have felt the domination of the United States. They have been on the receiving end of preachments of the advantages of capitalism and free enterprise. But these words have been at best meaningless to most of them, and at worst in their countries a source of exploitation. During the last century most Latin Americans have seen their neighbor to the north growing richer; they have seen the elite elements in their own societies growing richer—but the man in the street or on the land in Latin America today still lives the hand-to-mouth existence of his great, great grandfather.

In vast numbers Latin Americans are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with their traditional social structure. They are less and less happy with situations in which, to cite one example, 40 percent of the land is owned by 1 percent of the people, and in which, typically, a very thin upper crust lives in grandeur while most others live in squalor.

Continuation of situations of this kind can only lead to social explosions. The radios and the airplanes of the 20th century are bringing news of the outside world to the haciendas of the 17th century.

Our security and the protection of individual human freedom requires that we and responsible elements in Latin American society act to influence these forces. We know that even now in Cuba there are men in positions of power who will use every alleged injustice, real or imagined, to promote the Communist dictatorship.

There are two ways to deal with these rising tensions.

On the one hand are those in Latin America and in the United States who believe social evolution must be controlled by force. They want to increase the size and scope of military assistance programs. They have a tendency to believe that tensions of the kind I have been describing can be controlled by the marines. Basically their philosophy is not too different from that of the Communists themselves. What they cannot control by democratic means, they would dominate by force.

But there are many others who believe social evolution should not be stopped, but encouraged, not pent up, but directed. Steam in a boiler can be productive or destructive. The program before us is a first step toward putting the pent-up forces generated by the demands of the common man in Latin America to productive use—the first pipefitting, so to speak, to put the alliance of progress into business.

This is an approach we have not tried. And the history of our relations with Latin America suggests the need for a more realistic assessment of our relationship. There have been over 150 years of companionship and example and yet many Latins think we have taken more than we have given.

They believe, and let us not forget that in revolutionary situations beliefs are often more important than facts—that U.S. private investment has mined the wealth of Latin America and sold it abroad for profit; they believe that we have been prone to protect those investments with military intervention when necessary; and they are shocked to realize that the United States which gave billions to Europe, has been lending only millions to Latin America. They have seen this Nation associate with dictators, and they think this is because the dictators have protected American investments.

Actually, of course, many of our private ventures have done much to improve the lot of the common man in Latin America. But other investments have been characterized by excessive profits and by the exploitation of natural and human resources of our neighbors.

Fortunately the era of this kind of investment is largely behind us. But it is only in the last few years that we have recognized that the best protection business enterprise can have against expropriation is joint ownership with nationals of the country of investment. Joint enterprises, however, are no protection against social unrest when those enterprises are characterized by usurious returns on investment, and tax structures designed for the benefit of the few rather than the many.

We have now an opportunity—and it may be our last—to put our relationships with Latin America in order. We have now an opportunity to begin a program that will provide things for the people, not for the governments—not for the upper crust.

The problem of the United States in its relations with Latin America is not with governments; it is with the people, particularly with workers, peasants, and students. And this is part of the dilemma we face—a dilemma that this bill will, I hope, help to overcome.

Although Latin America now has the best group of governments it has ever had, most of them are still heavily influenced by the traditional elite classes who give only lipservice, if that, to social reform. They do not really have it in their hearts to promote land reform and to revise tax structures. We must, of course, continue to deal with these governments. We must attempt, however, to make the most conservative groups see that their survival—the continued independence of their own nations from the domination of Moscow—depends upon their willingness to come to grips with the needs and demands of their own people. We must make clear to them that the time for their conversion is short. If they are not soon converted and follow words with deeds, they will be overthrown. We must make clear to these governments that if they are converted to the cause of genuine social reform, we will help them; but if they are not, we do not propose to be swept away with them.

As I have suggested, we must perforce deal through governments. This bill, however, is primarily designed to help the common man. It will help promote land settlement, low-cost housing, community water supplies, sanitation, and education. It should be administered so as to encourage—indeed, require—cooperating governments to bring about changes in their own economic and social structures. We cannot do this job for them. But we can refuse to help those governments which give only lipservice to the demands of the great mass of their people.

This program should be supported for its own sake. There are some Americans, however, who will support it because recent events in Cuba have scared them. They feel the need of action. They want us to do something—anything.

The real question concerning the effect of the Castro regime on Latin America and our policies, however, is whether Castro can in fact succeed in providing a better life for the Cuban people. Can he make Cuba into a little paradise, a real pearl of the Antilles? Can he, with the help of the Communist bloc, do a better job in this respect in Cuba than the United States and its friends can do in Latin America?

We have talked for years of the advantages of the American way; of the advantages of free enterprise; of the power of individual freedom. Now we have the challenge on our doorstep.

It would be a fatal confession of lack of faith in ourselves and our values if we decreed—as we could—that Castro must go because he might succeed. I, for one, have confidence that our faith in human values, if supported by vigorous and intelligent action of the kind proposed in this bill, will be more than adequate to meet the competition of Castro and his partners in Moscow or Peking.

I think the time will not be long delayed until Moscow will find the Castro government a running abscess in the Caribbean. Already Moscow has loaned Cuba over $245 million. That island so long dependent on sugar exports to the United States and on U.S. tourists may soon become an albatross around Khrushchev's neck.

But our concern in this program, Mr. President, is not with Cuba. Our job is to help bring into being a new world. The North American Nation must devote more attention to helping our fellow Americans in the hemisphere move into the 20th century of sanitation, housing, communications, and production.

This will not constitute an unbearable drain on the United States. Rather, what we do today will plant the seeds for mutual growth. As President Kennedy said in his inaugural address:

> If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

I foresee an America that could put all other societies to shame. Between the nations of North and South America we have natural and human resources as great as, and perhaps greater than, those in any other relatively contiguous area in the world—Asia and Africa not excepted. We encompass every climate.

While our geographic extremes may compete—wheat and cattle, for example—by and large our resources are complementary. The United States is the best market for many resources of Latin America, and Latin America is a vast market for many of our products.

The challenge of the next decade might well be whether the people of our two continents can begin to think of themselves as Americans—not North Americans, or South Americans. Should we not jointly explore the advantages of a customs union, of required instruction in our respective languages, of vast exchanges of students and teachers and technicians?

I would say in conclusion, Mr. President, that Latin America is not up for auction; it is not ours to exploit. The friendship of the people and representative governments in Latin America is certainly as important to us, as is our friendship for them. We are as interested in their rapid and democratic growth, as they are in our continued economic health.

Together and with mutual cooperation and sacrifice we can produce in the Americas a society in which our cultural, political, and economic values may flourish.

Mr. President, there was published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald an extremely farsighted and profound article, written by Walter Lippmann, entitled, "To Ourselves Be True." I think what Mr. Lippmann has to say in the article has great pertinence to the program which the appropriation bill under consideration is designed to accomplish.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO OURSELVES BE TRUE

(By Walter Lippmann)

We have been forced to ask ourselves recently how a free and open society can compete with a totalitarian state. This is a crucial question. Can our western society survive and flourish if it remains true to its own faith and principles? Or must it abandon them in order to fight fire with fire?

There are those who believe that in Cuba the attempt to fight fire with fire would have succeeded if only the President had been more ruthless and had had no scruples about using American forces. I think they are wrong. I think that success for the Cuban adventure was impossible. In a free society like ours a policy is bound to fail which deliberately violates our pledges and our principles, our treaties, and our laws. It is not possible for a free and open society to organize successfully a spectacular conspiracy.

The United States, like every other government, must employ secret agents. But the United States cannot successfully conduct large secret conspiracies. It is impossible to keep them secret. It is impossible for everybody concerned, beginning with the President himself, to be sufficiently ruthless and unscrupulous. The American conscience is a reality. It will make hesitant and ineffectual, even if it does not prevent an un-American policy. The ultimate reason why the Cuban affair was incompetent is that it was out of character, like a cow that tried to fly or a fish that tried to walk.

It follows that, in the great struggle with communism, we must find our strength by developing and applying our own principles, not in abandoning them. Before anyone tells me that this is sissy, I should like to say why I believe it, especially after listening carefully and at some length to Mr. Khrushchev. I am very certain that we shall have the answer to Mr. Khrushchev if, but only if, we stop being fascinated by the cloak and dagger business and, being true to ourselves, take our own principles seriously.

Mr. K. is a true believer that communism is destined to supplant capitalism as capitalism supplanted feudalism. For him this is an absolute dogma, and he will tell you that while he intends to do what he can to assist the inevitable, knowing that we will do what we can to oppose the inevitable, what he does and what we do will not be decisive. Destiny will be realized no matter what men do.

The dogma of inevitability not only gives him the self-assurance of a man who has no doubts but is a most powerful ingredient of the Communist propaganda. What do we say to him, we who believe in a certain freedom of the human will and in the capacity of men to affect the course of history by their discoveries, their wisdom, and their courage?

We can say that in Mr. K.'s dogma there is an unexamined premise. It is that the capitalist society is static, that it is and always will be what it was when Marx described it a hundred years ago, that to use Mr. K.'s own lingo there is no difference between Governor Rockefeller and his grandfather because a capitalist society cannot change, in its dealings with the underdeveloped countries it can only dominate and exploit. It cannot emancipate and help. If it could emancipate and help, inevitability of communism would evaporate.

I venture to argue from this analysis that the reason we are on the defensive in so many places is that for some 10 years we have been doing exactly what Mr. K. expects us to do. We have used money and arms in a long losing attempt to stabilize native governments which, in the name of anticommunism, are opposed to all important social change. This has been exactly what Mr. K.'s dogma calls for—that communism should be the only alternative to the status quo with its immemorial poverty and privilege.

We cannot compete with communism in Asia, Africa or Latin America if we go on doing what we have done so often and so widely—which is to place the weak countries in a dilemma where they must stand still with us and our client rulers, or start moving with the Communists. This dilemma cannot be dissolved unless it is our central and persistent and unswerving policy to offer these unhappy countries a third option, which is economic development and social improvement without the totalitarian discipline of communism.

For the only real alternative to communism is a liberal and progressive society.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum entitled "Observations on U.S. Policy Toward Latin America," prepared by a distinguished Latin American scholar.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVATIONS ON U.S. POLICY TOWARD LATIN AMERICA

The purpose of this paper is to analyze certain ways in which U.S. policy toward Latin America can be strengthened. The Cuban problem, as such, is not considered.

As must be true in any paper dealing with 20 countries, statements of fact will be made which are generalities, and which cannot be equally true in each of the countries.

U.S. foreign policy has a number of objectives in Latin America. By far the most important is to insure that the other American States identify themselves positively with the free world in the cold war. This in itself implies a number of subordinate, intermediate objectives. We also have long-term, continuing goals—the improvement of living standards, the strengthening of democratic forms of government and political institutions. These are significant in the cold war, but would be valid in any event.

To achieve one or another of these objectives our Government carries on a wide variety of economic, social, cultural, and political programs. The very extent and diversity of our efforts makes it easy to lose sight of our most urgent objective—to win the cold war. Until that is accomplished the importance of all our efforts must be measured by the effect on this issue. This does not mean that unrelated goals or programs designed to achieve them should be abandoned. But

we must not confuse progress toward those objectives with progress in the cold war. Often one has no effect on the other.

The masses of Latin America will decide the outcome of the cold war. That side which achieves their support will eventually win.

Today, in a number of Latin American countries, the attitude of the government in the cold war is profoundly influenced, if not determined, by the masses. Present indications are that within a few years this will be true in substantially each country of the area.

Historically, this is a new phenomenon, and one whose causes are not always understood.

From the days of the conquest until the second decade of this century, the political, social, and economic affairs of each Latin American country were administered with the objective of serving the interests of a small minority—the wealthy, educated, landholding class. The loyalties and aspirations of this class determined the course of government, society, and economy. The wishes of the masses were a factor of little consequence.

In 1910 the masses of Mexico revolted against the upper classes, captured the government and have since controlled it. Either through revolution, as in Bolivia and Cuba, or through political evolution, as in Brazil and several other countries, the same result has occurred. The many revolutions which have simply shifted control from one sector of the ruling class to another have little to do with this historic trend.

The U.S. Government is today properly throwing the full weight of its influence behind the establishment of constitutional, representative governments which, as elections become effective, will be controlled by the masses. The elimination of dictatorships in all important countries of the area save Cuba during the period from 1954 to 1960 has given the United States its first opportunity to adopt such a policy openly without the serious economic, political and military exposures which its adoption had theretofore implied. Our present policy is both morally and politically sound, for it identifies the United States with an inevitable trend in the area.

The masses will support that side which offers greater assurance of satisfying their aspirations.

They have two basic aspirations. The first, and by far the most important, is to improve their material standard of living. The second is to avoid the disfavor of the church. That the second is held in less importance should not be misinterpreted. Were it not for the church, the masses would have been far more receptive toward communism. To date, it has been the most effective single obstacle to the spread of communism. But the influence of the Church in the cold war is diminishing. Where it supports the established order, its influence is impaired.

Whichever side offers greater promise of satisfying these two basic aspirations will win the cold war. This gives an advantage to the free world, for the Communists cannot satisfy the second aspiration.

The masses are satisfied that the established order—free enterprise-democracy—will not satisfy their aspirations.

Historically, free enterprise has meant poverty, disease and ignorance for the masses. This has been true because, despite the growing number of wholesome exceptions, the traditional characteristics of the Latin American business community have been:

(a) Concentration of productive land and sources of production in the hands of the small minority.

(b) Industry geared to a high margin of profit and with little interest in increasing volume through modernization and new investment.

(c) Opposition to improvements in wages, working and social conditions.

(d) Opposition to organized labor.

(e) A tendency to use profits for unproductive investments or for consumer goods and services.

The political order has been labeled democracy, but it has brought to the masses few of the benefits which U.S. citizens associate with democracy.

In some countries the benefits of the representative form of government prescribed in constitutions have been withheld from the masses through force or dishonest elections.

In some, the venality of public officials has meant that governments do not exist "for the people," but for officials and groups with political influence. Where this has been true, the cost of government has been exaggerated, and the masses have been deprived of those personal rights and safeties which democracy should assure.

The masses understandably feel that satisfaction of their aspirations can be achieved only through a change in the established order, in the "system."

It is unfortunate that, in countries where the conditions described have prevailed, the system should be identified as free enterprise and as democracy. These are terms which have completely different connotations in the minds of U.S. citizens. The latter overwhelmingly reject communism because they are convinced that free enterprise and democracy assure far greater material benefits and personal freedoms. It is difficult for them to understand how the masses of Latin America might prefer communism, and for precisely the same reasons. The difference lies, of course, in the connotation which each attributes to the terms "free enterprise" and "democracy" as reflected in their own established orders.

Communism promises to change the established order. On the economic front it promises an improved material standard of living. It is taking a growing number of representatives of the masses behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains and giving them visual proof that it can fulfill this promise.

On the political front the Communist argument is that any sacrifice of personal freedom and independence which communism imposes is only temporary. Only those nations and individuals who are strong enjoy political freedoms. Strength presupposes a period of self-discipline which, in turn, means a temporary relinquishment of those freedoms.

Those U.S. information programs which directly attack communism often do not persuade the Latin American masses. They are not convinced by our assertions that free enterprise provides greater material rewards than communism, and that democracy assures greater political freedom. The material rewards of private enterprise, as they understand it, surround them. They will accept any system that offers a change. The political freedoms which their own democracy has given them are not so attractive as to make them fear communism.

Our programs publicizing the well-being of the U.S. masses have helped communism in the cold war. First, they provoke the resentment that normally accompanies jealousy. Second, if this is what free enterprise has provided to the people of the United States, then they must have a vested interest in the continuation of the free enterprise system in Latin America. Yet the experience of the masses there convinces them that realization of their aspirations requires a change in the established order. Thus, the United States becomes an obstacle to realization of their aspirations.

Our present economic programs are very important in the cold war. They have helped strengthen economies; they have contributed to improving standards of life. However, they will not solve the cold war's basic issue.

In order to defeat communism in the cold war, the masses must be convinced that a change is occurring in their own established order, that free enterprise system which they know, and which historically has depressed their standard of life. That change must extend to the principles and methods of the whole apparatus which produces the goods and services comprising the national product.

Government enterprise at one end, and U.S. enterprise at the other, constitute only small parts of this apparatus. Its great bulk lies in between and is comprised of one form or another of purely Latin American private enterprise. This is the part that is responsible for the popular image of the whole system. This is the part that must change if the masses are to conclude that in Latin America free enterprise, and not communism, offers the most promising road to achievement of their aspirations.

Foreign loans for government programs can be justified on a number of grounds, but they will not achieve this basic change and, therefore, will not have a decisive effect on the outcome of the cold war.

Government programs in the social field, such as roads, hospitals, and schools, are good. They contribute to improving standards of life. They merit U.S. support. However, they will not change either the hostility of the masses to the Latin American private enterprise system or their willingness to embrace communism or any other movement that promises a change in that system.

Loans for government programs in the field of production, such as powerplants and steel mills, contribute to some of our foreign policy objectives. But in the cold war itself, they may have been harmful rather than helpful.

Government enterprise can never provide the improvement in living standards that must occur in Latin America. It forms far too small a part of the nation's total productive apparatus. To become a decisive factor, government industries would have to proliferate to a point approaching establishment of a socialist system. This will not occur because, even if the United States were disposed to do so, it simply could not provide the capital necessary for so vast an expansion; nor is any other source of adequate capital available.

U.S. loans to government-owned industries associate the United States with the conviction of the masses that their own Latin American free enterprise system offers no hope for the achievement of their aspirations.

In a number of obvious ways, government-owned industries impair the strength and discourage the growth of Latin American free enterprise itself. There is no prospect that Latin American official enterprise can successfully replace free enterprise. Yet, being subsidized as a rule, they discourage the development of healthy, privately owned competitors.

Finally, government enterprises too often have been inefficient and overstaffed, with products of high cost and poor quality. As a result, they have depressed the entire national economy.

Foreign credits to U.S. enterprises in Latin America are sound and justifiable. They should be continued, for they help our own economy as well as those of the Latin American countries. Moreover, when it is efficiently operated and socially conscious, a U.S. enterprise can set a constructive example for the local business community. However, we must recognize that these loans have little effect on the basic problem of the cold war. As in the case of government enterprise, a U.S. industry does not constitute a sufficiently important sector of a national

economy for its expansion to assure an adequate improvement in the standards of living of the masses. Moreover, the contrast between the wage scales and working conditions in U.S. enterprises and those in nationally owned companies at times intensifies, rather than diminishes, the hostility of the masses toward purely Latin American free enterprise; and it cannot be said too often that this hostility is the key factor in the outcome of the cold war in the area.

In short, the image and essence of the purely Latin American and privately owned sector of the various economies must change. Unless this occurs, the masses will not choose the free enterprise system over communism. That change presupposes two simultaneous efforts. The first is of an educational nature, designed to convince the masses that in Latin America the free enterprise system has evolved into something quite different, something that offers greater promise of achieving their aspirations than does communism. The second is the effort required to make that promise a reality. The basic principles which determine the decisions and actions of businessmen must change. When this is accomplished, then, for the first time, there will be real assurance of a broad and continuing improvement in the standards of life of the masses. For the first time, the volumes of capital and the numbers of trained human minds required to solve the problem will be directed into channels which will assure that solution.

Communist propaganda does not identify the real cause of the problem; and it does not suggest the real solution. This would be constructive; it would contribute to a solution. Communist strategy is to aggravate the problem, to obstruct its solution, to exploit the hatreds it breeds. Here, as throughout the world, communism preaches that it was the United States that created the established order which frustrates the ambitions of the masses. The fact is that, certainly in Latin America, both the U.S. Government and U.S. private enterprise are powerful factors working for realization of the aspirations of the masses. Yet, strangely, certain of our own people accept the Communist thesis, and believe that somehow the United States is an obstruction.

The established order in Latin America is the creation, not of the United States, but of the class which has controlled those countries since the conquest. The accuracy of this statement is not refuted by the other problems of race, climate and topography which in some areas have also depressed the standards of life of the masses.

The differences between the established orders in a number of the other American republics and that in the United States may explain, as it does, why the Communist problem is not serious in this country. However, that is no cause for self-satisfaction on our part. Until a few decades ago private enterprise here reflectd all the qualities which today aggravate the problem in Latin America. Circumstances beyond the control of our business community compelled it to evolve. That same process of evolution has been apparent for years in Latin America and has produced some outstanding examples of modern socially conscious business leaders who have long understood the problem and worked to solve it. Until recently, however, they have made slow progress in changing the established order.

It appears now that this process of wholesome evolution can be and will be greatly accelerated.

The Cuban situation has deeply disturbed the Latin American business community. It foresees the possibility of irreparable loss. Many businessmen are for the first time willing to consider as an alternative the partial sacrifice of benefits and privileges which they had always held to be inviolable.

During the past year and in several countries, organizations of business leaders have appeared with a common determination to modernize the private enterprise system as the only effective answer to communism. One such group states that the only alternative to class suicide is that free enterprise must actually provide better solutions for social problems than does communism. They recognize that this will entail more taxes, less profits, support for responsible organized labor movements and for socially significant programs. They see that, unless an improvement in material standards of living comes through the normal processes of free enterprise rather than through government effort, the free enterprise system will not survive.

This is clear thinking. It identifies the essence of the problem. It accepts responsibility for those efforts and that sacrifice which are essential if communism is to lose the cold war, and if the victor is to be free enterprise rather than socialism.

If these movements can be multiplied and encouraged to aggressive action, there will be no doubt as to the outcome of the cold war. This would not simply be another counterblow in that war. This would be an assurance of ultimate victory.

Several ways to strengthen our position in the cold war in Latin America suggest themselves.

First, U.S. policy should concentrate on correcting the basic cause of our present disadvantage. That is the unenlightened practices and traditions of that large part of the business community who are responsible for the hostility of the Latin American masses toward the private enterprise system. We have not identified this cause as clearly as we should, and our programs have not accorded sufficient importance to its correction.

Second, there are a number of ways in which the United States can contribute to modernizing and strengthening the Latin American free enterprise sector, making it a decisive factor in the cold war. We should encourage and strengthen in every way possible organizations of businessmen such as those now forming. We should help them establish efficient coordination between different national groups. However, this must be done without in any way impairing the essentially national character of such groups.

Wherever a Latin American private enterprise gives assurance of following modern, socially conscious principles in its operations, we should do everything possible to contribute to the expansion and business success of that enterprise. Greater attention should be devoted to channeling foreign credits to such enterprises. Such credits should carry with them—and this is perfectly achievable—procedures to keep under continuing observation the policies and actions of those enterprises with respect to the payment of taxes, improvement of wages and working conditions, and other areas in which the system has traditionally been weak. The Inter-American Development Bank can be particularly effective in this area.

Technical assistance in the modernization of their business policies and practices should be provided to these Latin American enterprises. Their representatives should be invited and encouraged to visit other countries in order that they may become closer to the philosophy of modern collective capitalism and its practical application.

One of the principal objectives of U.S. programs discussed in this section should be to persuade private enterprise of the desirability and, indeed, the essential necessity of using profits to form capital for use in productive investments. The Latin American business community is able to provide the amounts of new capital required for real economic progress. No other source, national or foreign, has that capacity.

Third, our Government should be vigilant to insure that its citizens charged with the implementation of its programs in Latin America are men imbued with the deep conviction that modern, socially conscious free enterprise, collective capitalism, offers the best hope for achievement of the aspirations of the masses. Only such men can convince Latin American governments and businessmen of this truth. We have at times been too prone to accept the premise that any alternative to communism is acceptable. This has weakened our resolve to assist and establish 20th century collective capitalism, which is the only system which really has the capacity to defeat communism in Latin America.

Fourth, we should undertake to persuade Latin American governments to channel their resources into projects of a social nature rather than into productive enterprises. For the reasons suggested above, the latter as a rule are liabilities in the cold war.

Fifth, we should redirect our information programs to focus them on the real issues of the cold war. It is essential that businessmen, even more than the masses, understand clearly what a Cuban-exported revolution will mean to them.

We should place less emphasis on the issue of the image of the United States in the minds of the masses. This is a subordinate issue. The masses could have the very highest opinion of the United States and still choose communism as the most viable alternative to an existing order which they abhor. The choice which they will make is not between the Communist system and that of the United States. It will be between communism and the private enterprise-democracy system which they see around them. The real issue is their attitude toward their own existing order and its real nature.

Communism has encouraged the United States to engage in propaganda battles on such peripheral issues as our popularity. It knows that if we win such battles, the outcome of the cold war will not be affected.

On the propaganda front we should force communism to meet us on issues of our own choosing, not theirs. Those issues are suggested above.

Sixth, in deciding whether to undertake or reject every program, its effect on the attitude of the masses of Latin America toward their own private enterprise system should be considered. As is suggested above, we are today engaged in some programs which will unquestionably strengthen the local economies, but which intensify the hostility of the masses to free enterprise. To the extent that such programs cause the masses to support socialism as an alternative to communism, they contribute to our defeat in the cold war. The resources of men and capital available to socialistic programs in the area are so inadequate as to assure that adoption of that course will mean defeat in the cold war. It simply cannot provide that improvement in material standards of living which the victor must provide.

The assurance of victory lies, first, in changing the image and essence of Latin American free enterprise and, second, in assuring that a system so reconstructed accomplishes its mission.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate would appropriate $500 million for the Inter-American Program for Social Progress. The institution of this program marks a milestone in our relations with our Latin American neighbors because it represents a departure from previous policies: a program new in scope, new on concept, and with new objectives.

The program is new in scope because it is aimed directly at achieving social

progress; it will help the ordinary people. Housing, rural living, public health, and education need improvement in most of Latin America. These conditions need to be alleviated.

It is clear that the main impetus for making such changes must come from the Latin Americans themselves. And it is good to report that progressive leaders in these nations are urging the adoption of these new policies. It is because the program recognizes these facts that it is new in concept. This program will encourage the governments in Latin America to mobilize the resources of these countries, to make reforms both in the statutes and in their administration, and to put forth the maximum amount of self-help. The fact that such reforms and actions are needed is specifically recognized by the Act of Bogotá.

The funds to be made available by this appropriation bill will be allocated for administration between the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Cooperation Administration, and the Organization of American States. The administration of nearly 80 percent of the funds by a bank in which Latin Americans participate illustrates that this program is a cooperative venture among the nations of the Western Hemisphere.

I should like to reemphasize that the purpose of this program is to aid the people of Latin America. The projects and programs will directly improve the lot of farmers by aiding them to own their own land, to borrow money at a reasonable rate, and to organize cooperatively to solve farm problems. It will improve the lot of the ill-housed by making it possible for them cooperatively to build and to own their own homes; it will aid all Latin Americans by providing more schools.

I urge the appropriation of the full $500 million for this bipartisan program and also the $100 million for loan to Chile for reconstruction from the earthquake disasters.

Mr. President, the committee report explains the program in detail and contains, on pages 6 and 7, specific recommendations of the committee. I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from the committee report printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

A tabular summary of the estimates and the amounts recommended by the House and by the committee in the bill follows:

H. Doc. No.	Item	Budget estimate	Recommended by House	Recommended by Senate committee
58 and 105	Inter-American Social and Economic Cooperation Program	$500,000,000	$500,000,000	$500,000,000
103	Chilean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Program	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000
	Total	600,000,000	600,000,000	600,000,000

INTER-AMERICAN PROGRAM FOR SOCIAL PROGRESS

Section 2 of Public Law 86-735, signed September 8, 1960, authorizes the appropriation to the President of $500 million, which shall remain available until expended, and which the President may use on such terms and conditions as he may specify for the Inter-American Program for Social Progress. The committee recommends that the $500 million be provided.

Objectives

This authorizing legislation was passed last year upon request of President Eisenhower to enable the U.S. representatives at Bogotá, Colombia, to give substance to a new program of development for Latin America. The objective of this development program is different from past programs in Latin America and its purpose is to implement the Act of Bogotá, signed by 19 American nations in September 1960. President Kennedy stated in his message to the Congress requesting the appropriation concerning the Act of Bogotá:

"This act, building on the concept of Operation Pan America initiated by Brazil in 1958, introduced two important new elements to the effort to improve living standards in South America.

"First, the nations of Latin America have recognized the need for an intensive program of self-help—mobilizing their domestic resources, and undertaking basic reforms in tax structure, in land ownership and use, and in education, health, and housing.

"Second, it launches a major inter-American program for the social progress which is an indispensable condition to growth—a program for improved land use, education, health, and housing."

In helping to carry out the Act of Bogotá, the funds involved in this appropriation request will be aimed directly at the Latin American people through advances in fields which directly affect their lives. The President stated in his message to the Congress:

"The fund which I am requesting today will be devoted to social progress. Social progress is not a substitute for economic development. It is an effort to create a social framework within which all the people of a nation can share in the benefits of prosperity and participate in the process of growth. Economic growth without social progress lets the great majority of the people remain in poverty while a privileged few reap the benefits of rising abundance. In addition the process of growth largely depends on the existence of beneficial social conditions. Our own experience is witness to this. For much of our own great productivity and industrial development is based on our system of universal public education.

"Thus the purpose of our special effort for social progress is to overcome the barriers of geographical and social isolation, illiteracy and lack of educational opportunities, archaic tax and land tenure structures and other institutional obstacles to broad participation in economic growth."

Background

The antecedents of this appropriation request run back a number of years. Numerous congressional studies have indicated that a new approach to U.S. foreign policy with respect to Latin America is needed. Progressive Latin American leaders have demanded changed policies on the part of the Latin American countries themselves. In 1958 President Kubitschek of Brazil called for Operation Pan America. A committee which became known as the Committee of Twenty-One, was formed under the aegis of the Organization of American States to study the problem. After several meetings, the work of the Committee of Twenty-One culminated at its third meeting, in September 1960, in the Act of Bogotá, which document was signed by all of the Latin American nations except Cuba, which failed to do so, and the Dominican Republic, which was not present. The appropriation of the $500 million was requested by President Eisenhower in January 1961, and the request was repeated by President Kennedy on March 14, 1961, who asked the Congress to appropriate these funds as a matter of urgency. The accompanying bill before the Senate appropriates the full amount of the request and was passed by the House of Representatives on April 25, 1961.

Program description

This program is different in concept from past U.S. assistance efforts with respect to Latin America, but nevertheless it builds upon such past efforts. There has been a substantial flow of capital—public and private—into Latin America which has been directed toward economic development. There also has been a long history of the provision of technical assistance. But between these programs of technical assistance and of capital development there has been a great gap—a gap which concerns the social progress of the ordinary people of the Latin American nations. The fruits of the economic development process have not been spread throughout the populace of many of these nations. This imbalance in the development process has created a breeding ground for unrest as major segments of the population in Latin American countries see the benefits that economic development bring but fail to participate in those benefits. It is this unrest upon which communism is seeking to feed in order to strengthen its influence. It is this serious gap which the new program will begin to help the nations of Latin America fill.

The committee heard testimony from Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon; Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs George W. Ball; Mr. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Chairman of the President's Task Force on Latin America; Dr. Lincoln Gordon, consultant to the task force, and other administration officials.

The committee was advised by the administration officials that the following division of funds is contemplated:

Inter-American Development Bank	$394,000,000
International Cooperation Administration	100,000,000
Organization of American States	6,000,000
Total	500,000,000

The basic criterion for division of operating responsibility is to assign to the Inter-American Development Bank the functional areas where projects are generally suitable for financing through loans (whether repayable in dollars or in local currencies), and to assign to the International Cooperation Administration the areas where most projects should be on a grant basis or are otherwise unsuited for IDB administration, and in which the ICA has considerable experience. These fields of activity are interrelated and have been separated for administrative purposes only.

In practice, this means IDB administration for projects or programs designed to achieve improved conditions in the countries concerned in the fields of:

(1) Land settlement and improved land use, including access and feeder roads, assist-

ance to agricultural credit institutions, assistance to supervised credit and agricultural extension, and development of storage and marketing facilities; provided that the resources of the Fund shall not be used for the purchase of agricultural land;

(2) housing for low-income groups through assistance to self-help housing and to institutions providing long-term housing finance, and engaged in mobilizing domestic resources for this purpose;

(3) community water supply and sanitation facilities;

(4) such supplementary financing of facilities for advanced education and training related to economic and social development as may be agreed upon from time to time between the United States and the Bank.

In addition, the IDB shall provide technical assistance related to projects in the fields set forth above, as well as technical assistance related to the mobilizing of domestic financial resources and the strengthening of financial institutions. Such technical assistance may be on a grant, loan, or reimbursable basis.

The International Cooperation Administration will be primarily responsible for the administration of the following:

(1) education and training programs;

(2) public health (other than water supply and sanitation);

(3) projects for social improvement for the federation of the West Indies and other territories within the Western Hemisphere which are evolving toward economic and political maturity;

(4) support of governmental institutions for the provision of general services in the improvement of land use and rural living conditions, low-cost housing, and the mobilization of domestic resources for the furthering of economic and social progress; and

(5) applied research and surveys in fields related to social progress.

While most ICA assistance will be on a grant basis, loans are not ruled out for suitable projects (e.g., under (3), above) or in any case where repayment is desired by the government concerned.

Six million dollars is to be used to help the Organization of American States in connection with this program of social development. These funds will be used to reinforce the movement toward adequate self-help and institutional improvement through the Inter-American Economic and Social Council of the OAS. This will include expert assistance in preparation for annual review meetings, regionwide studies and surveys and sponsor conferences directed toward bringing about tax reform, improved land use, educational modernization, housing, urban and rural planning, community development, and sound national development programing. It is also working out cooperative arrangements with the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the IDB.

The most important new element in this program is the emphasis upon self-help efforts, mobilization of the resources of each recipient nation, and the appropriate measures of reform that may be needed. These subjects are recognized in the Act of Bogotá and by progressive Latin Americans as needing attention. Administration officials stated that assistance under this program to be given by both the IDB and the ICA will be conditioned upon related improvement measures.

It is estimated that approximately 80 percent of the funds made available will be in the form of loans to participants in the applying countries.

Applications for loans will be passed upon by the Board of Directors of the Bank according to the terms of the trust agreement. The committee noted particularly that in this way representatives of the Latin American countries themselves will work out with countries requesting loans the terms of appropriate self-help agreements. The committee also noted that loans under the trust agreement will require a two-thirds vote and that for this purpose the U.S. representative votes over 40 percent. The committee believes that it is essential to the success of this program that assistance be dependent upon efforts of the recipient countries toward achieving national progress.

The materials and testimony presented to the committee give a justification of the program in terms of needs of Latin America, objectives to be attained, the kind of assistance to be rendered, standards to be applied before assistance will be given, methods of administration, and allocation of responsibility. Illustrative projects, totaling in excess of the appropriation request, were presented for the committee's review to demonstrate the scale of need and the nature of activities contemplated. No fixed country aid levels were proposed since assistance under this program is to be dependent upon maximum self-help and progress on reform measures. It is because of the importance attached to this standard that the executive branch proposes an essentially similar method of administration by the Inter-American Development Bank and by ICA for their respective interdependent fields of concentration.

Under Secretary Ball said to the committee:

"Let me stress that these are not refined projects negotiated in detail with the governments concerned. Two factors make it unwise and impracticable to go further in refining specific projects without funds in hand. The first is that the ICA cannot commit funds for specific projects until those funds are appropriated—and we do not believe you would wish it to. Similarly, we cannot permit the Bank to commit funds, nor would it be willing to do so, until funds are available to it. The second factor is that we do not want to and do not intend to commit funds for these social development projects until the governments which are to be beneficiaries have given evidence of their determination and ability to carry through essential institutional and legislative changes."

The funds requested are to be available on a "no-year" basis, and the committee is informed that the executive branch contemplates that the actual commitments would take place over a period of approximately 2 years.

Interest rates

The committee concurs in the objectives sought to be accomplished through the programs described herein. However, it wants to be assured that the funds made available to the Inter-American Development Bank are not going to be reloaned at usurious interest rates.

In this connection, the committee recommends that the Department of State establish a firm policy of interest rates at which the funds may be reloaned so that such rates of interest cannot be considered to be usurious. Whenever it is brought to the attention of the IDB that a lending agency, bank, or other institution has violated or obviated its policy in any manner by the charging of higher interest rates to the ultimate consumer of the loan, then it should be the policy of the IDB to cease to transact future business with such agency, bank, or other institution.

Cooperatives

It must be borne in mind by the administrators of the funds made available herein that this program is addressed squarely to the critical lags in the economic and social development of the Latin American countries. In this connection, it is the sense of the committee that in the allocation of funds by the IDB, as well as the ICA, particular emphasis be given to the needs of agricultural cooperatives, such as producer cooperatives, marketing cooperatives, farm credit organizations, credit unions, and consumer cooperatives, cooperative training programs and facilities, housing, cooperative health facilities, and other related projects.

Self-help and reforms

In addition, the committee wishes to emphasize that these funds are made available because this program is based on selfhelp, and because it has been assured by the witnesses who testified that land reforms, tax reforms, and social reforms will be among the principal objectives. The committee urges our administrators to withhold the commitment of funds made available in this bill until some of the aforementioned reforms have been accomplished or are in the process of being accomplished.

Project financing and capability

Furthermore, the committee wants it clearly understood that no project should be undertaken unless the local people or the local government is prepared to make a sizable contribution to the total cost of such undertaking. Our administrators should make the necessary study and evaluation of every project in order to determine that the local country has the capability to operate and maintain it once it has been completed. It should not be necessary for our Government to furnish funds or personnel to operate and maintain a project beyond a training period.

Repayment of loans

The committee is convinced that in the making of loans to participants from the funds herein appropriated, the best interests of the United States will be served if the loan agreements are so drawn that they will provide for both the interest and amortization payments to begin not later than the end of the first year following the making of the loan. The committee, therefore, has given its approval of the funds herewith appropriated with the understanding that the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration will follow this practice.

The Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives should be provided with semiannual reports on the loans made with the funds appropriated in this bill. If exceptional cases should develop in connection with loans where it is necessary to limit first-year payments to interest such exceptional cases should be reported in the aforementioned semiannual report, together with the reasons why exceptions were made to the policy outlined herein.

In supporting the objectives of this appropriation, the committee desires to emphasize its expectation that these funds can be administered in such a way as to advance the free enterprise concepts already firmly rooted in the Western Hemisphere.

CHILEAN EARTHQUAKE RECONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM

The committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends an appropriation of $100 million for the Chilean earthquake reconstruction and rehabilitation program.

On May 21 and 22, 1960, a series of severe earthquakes rocked southern Chile. Huge tidal waves and volcanic eruptions following in their wake added to the destruction and the heavy loss of life in the disaster area which comprised the 10 southern provinces and included nearly 20 percent of the country's land area. Total damage is now estimated at approximately $372 million.

The immediate response of the American public to the tragedy was a widespread desire to help through private as well as public channels. Relief supplies and two complete field hospitals were airlifted by the

U.S. Government to the stricken area. Further emergency assistance was provided by the Latin American Republics and other countries. Shortly thereafter, the United States granted $20 million from the mutual security program contingency funds to help meet interim reconstruction needs until longer range rehabilitation plans could be developed. In addition, credits were provided by the Export-Import Bank. U.S. voluntary agencies stepped up their deliveries of surplus foods made available under title III of Public Law 480 and other relief supplies.

On September 8, 1960, in Public Law 86–735, the Congress authorized $100 million for use in meeting further costs of the longer term reconstruction and rehabilitation of Chile. The Government of Chile has adjusted its new 10-year economic development plan to provide for the unforeseen disaster recovery requirements and now intends to expend $130 million and $120 million in calendar years 1961 and 1962 to meet the costs of reconstruction and development in the devastated area.

This appropriation provides the full amount of $100 million authorized in section 3 of Public Law 86–735. The funds appropriated will be loaned to the Government of Chile and will assist in financing specific reconstruction projects and activities within the development plan during calendar years 1961 and 1962. Reconstruction requirements for the current calendar year are estimated at more than $60 million.

Although direct costs of reconstruction activities supported by this appropriation will be primarily in Chilean escudos, the dollars made available to the Government of Chile will be utilized to purchase goods and services from the United States. Thus, in addition to permitting the Chilean Government to move forward in the important work of rebuilding the foundations of southern Chile's economy, the U.S. funds will play an important role in dampening inflationary pressures through the provision of additional foreign exchange.

ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES

Although funds appropriated pursuant to Public Law 86–735 can be used for administrative and related expenses incident to carrying out programs of assistance under that act, the executive branch has explained that it intends to use for such purposes funds available under the Mutual Security Act and in accordance with the regular administrative authorities of that act. This procedure will also avoid the alternative of complicated accounting procedures or the requirement for separate, duplicating staff and the committee fully approves it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I doubt if the Latin-American people or the Latin-American countries have a better friend in the U.S. Senate than I am now and have been for many years, but the appropriation of $500 million could either be a good thing or a bad thing. My best judgment is, the way the bill is written, that it may turn out to be a very bad thing, for the simple reason that we do not place any controls on how the money is to be loaned or how it is to be spent. We likewise do not place any restrictions on how the money should be loaned.

In other words, the money could be loaned to a Latin-American country which is unfriendly to the United States or which becomes unfriendly to the United States. The money could be loaned to a Latin-American country which might be in the process of expropriating American property. The way the bill is written, no controls are provided.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the Senator aware that no loan can be made by the Inter-American Development Bank which does not have the approval of a two-thirds majority of the directors, and that the United States controls 40 percent of the vote?

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand that.

Mr. HAYDEN. There would be a complete veto power over every loan to be made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand that. I am not quarreling with that part of the arrangement. What I criticize is that there is no control provided even over the 40 percent of the vote, and no control provided over the bank itself. At least, I do not think a sufficient control is provided.

I do not believe that we should continue to loan money or to give money away unless we have an understanding with a nation that it will be cooperative, that it will be friendly, that it will not expropriate American property, and that it will not give comfort to communism or to Russia. I do not believe we should do otherwise. There are 21 countries in Latin America. We know that one country has recently gone Communist.

I think we ought to control the loans in some way. I think the Congress ought to write in some restrictions or controls for the program. To that end, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks, from Report No. 1838 on Calendar No. 1910 of the 86th Congress, 2d session, an excerpt from page 4, under the title "Committee Action," which is three paragraphs long.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Relations on August 15 held public hearings on the requests contained in S. 3839, and on the related considerations contained in Senate Resolution 353. Under Secretary of State C. Douglas Dillon and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury T. Graydon Upton testified on behalf of the administration.

Also at that time, Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, presented to the committee and explained his amendments to S. 3839. As was the case with the other members of the committee, Senator CAPEHART was much disturbed over the highly amorphous nature of the administration proposal to assist Latin American development. Therefore, as an amendment to that proposal, he introduced a bill to be entitled "The Americas Cooperative Bank Act." The CAPEHART proposal authorized the Secretary of State to conclude agreements with all interested American Republics for the establishment of cooperative banks under the laws of such Republics. The stock would be purchased in agreed proportions by the respective country and the U.S. Export-Import Bank, with the proviso that the latter's interest could be bought out at any time. The banks would have great flexibility in their operations and, specifically, would be able to loan directly to the common people in Latin America.

On August 16 the committee in executive session considered the various proposals before it, and composed a separate new bill by combining some of the best elements of S. 3839, the CAPEHART amendments, and the MANSFIELD resolution. The committee was greatly interested in the CAPEHART proposal for cooperative banks. It nevertheless believed that it must honor the administration request to be permitted the latitude to refrain from detailed planning until actually in touch with representatives of the other American Republics at Bogotá; it also believed that the time was not available for the mature scrutiny to which such a proposal was entitled. However, the committee urges the administration to give the most serious and sympathetic consideration to the CAPEHART proposal in connection with its multilateral development of new plans and programs.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, this has to do with an amendment which I prepared and offered in the Committee on Foreign Relations to set up a bank in each of the respective Latin American countries in which the United States would own X amount of capital stock and the country in which the bank was located would own X amount of capital stock, and the bank would be operated as a bank. The provision would have authorized the bank to make loans to individual farmers, to farm groups, to homesteading organizations either governmental or private, to small businessmen, to large businessmen, to other banks or loan firms, and to builders of either homes or business places.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement I made in respect to the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT FROM THE OFFICE OF U.S. SENATOR HOMER E. CAPEHART

WASHINGTON, August 15.—U.S. Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican of Indiana, announced that he will introduce today a bill providing for the Americas Cooperative Bank Act as an amendment to the administration's proposed Latin American assistance program.

The Americas Cooperative Bank Act establishes a program of assistance to the 20 American Republics that will be immediate, effective, and continuing and conducted on a businesslike basis.

The program would be initiated through an existing agency, the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which has sufficient financial authorization to meet the needs of the program.

Under the act a cooperative bank would be established in every American Republic which wishes to join in the program.

An Americas cooperative bank would not be restricted in its loaning powers except as determined by its own board of directors. It could make loans to individual farmers, farm groups, homesteading organizations, either governmental or private, small businessmen, large businessmen, other banks or loan firms, and builders of either homes or business places.

Government agencies for such purposes as new, expanded or improved public utilities; new, expanded or improved health, education and welfare institutions or programs; or, any other governmental function determined to be for the betterment of the country's citizens or economic position; communications operations, either by government or private enterprise; transportation operations, either public or private; scientific development, either private or public; shipping and other trade facilities, either private or public. The loans would be made in either dollars or the currency of the partici-

pating country, but loans could be repaid in either currency.

Interest rates and terms of the loans would be determined by the directors of each bank.

Creation of each cooperative bank would be through the joint purchase of stock by the participating country and the Export-Import Bank. Each country may purchase with its own currency any portion of the stock of the bank and the Export-Import Bank of Washington would purchase the balance with dollars.

The individual bank directorship would be proportioned by the ownership of the stock. The cooperative bank may sell stock to private individuals, corporations or other entities. Each cooperative bank may, at any time, retire the Export-Import Bank stock by purchase of the stock in dollars.

Each cooperative bank will bear the name of the participating countries, for example the Brazil-United States Cooperative Bank. Provision is made in the act for the Export-Import Bank to use up to $1 billion of its existing loan authorization to make purchase of the stock in the cooperative banks.

The Export-Import Bank would not be required to pay interest to the U.S. Treasury for the funds used in the Americas Cooperative Act. However, any dividends from the Americas Cooperative Banks would be paid into the Treasury of the United States up to an amount equal to the interest charged against the other operations of the Export-Import Bank.

Through the use of loan repayments and interest each cooperative bank will create a revolving fund which enables the bank to continue its helpful operations indefinitely.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments I offered to S. 3839 likewise be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In section 425, after, "DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—" insert "(a)".

Insert at the end of section 425, the following new matter:

"The accomplishment of these objectives calls for a plan of hemispheric development, open to all American Republics which cooperate in such plan, based upon a strong production effort, the expansion of foreign trade, the creation and maintenance of internal financial stability, the growth of free economic and social institutions, and the development of economic cooperation, including all possible steps to establish and maintain equitable rates of exchange and to bring about the progressive elimination of trade barriers. Mindful of the advantages which the United States has enjoyed through the existence of a large domestic market with no internal trade barriers, and believing that similar advantages can accrue to all countries, it is the hope of the people of the United States that all American Republics will jointly exert sustained common efforts which will speedily achieve that economic cooperation in the Western Hemisphere which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity. Accordingly, it is declared to be the policy of the people of the United States to sustain and strengthen principles of individual liberty, free institutions, private enterprise, and genuine independence in the Western Hemisphere through assistance to all American Republics which participate in a joint development program based upon self-help and mutual cooperation.

"(b) It is the purpose of this title to effectuate the policy set forth in subsection (a) of this section by furnishing material and financial assistance to the participating countries and to private enterprise in such countries in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to achieve a satisfactory and self-sustaining rate of economic growth within the period of operations under this title, by—

"(1) promoting industrial and agricultural production in the participating countries;

"(2) furthering the restoration or maintenance of the soundness of currencies, budgets, and finances in each such participating country;

"(3) facilitating and stimulating the growth of international trade of participating countries with one another and with other countries by appropriate measures including reduction of barriers which may hamper such trade; and

"(4) encouraging the growth of the free political, economic, and social institutions which are necessary to provide greater opportunities for the individual."

Strike out all in section 426 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 426. COOPERATIVE BANKS.—(a) The Secretary of State, after consultation with the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank, is authorized to conclude, with individual American Republics or any number of such Republics or with an organization representing any such Republics, agreements providing for the establishment, under the laws of such Republic, of cooperative banks to carry out the purposes of this title.

(b) Each cooperative bank shall be organized under a charter or articles of incorporation under which it is established as a body corporate governed by a board of directors and administered by officers elected by the board. It shall have such authorized capital stock as may be provided in its charter or articles of incorporation and in the agreement concluded under subsection (a) of this section. Such agreement may provide that the Export-Import Bank will subscribe for an agreed amount of capital stock, said subscription to be payable in dollars. The balance of the capital stock may be subscribed in either dollars or other currencies by the foreign government concerned or by individuals, corporations, or other entities.

"(c) The agreement provided for in subsection (a) of this section and the charter or articles of incorporation of any cooperative bank established thereunder shall also contain provision that:

"(1) So long as any of the cooperative bank's stock is held by the Export-Import Bank, the Export-Import Bank shall have the right to designate a number of the cooperative bank's directors, which is proportionate to the portion of the outstanding stock of the cooperative bank held by the Export-Import Bank, with the other directors to be elected by the other stockholders.

"(2) The cooperative bank may, at any time, at the option of its other stockholders, retire the stock held by the Export-Import Bank by paying to the Export-Import Bank the issue price of the stock plus an amount of the profits of the cooperative bank which is proportionate to the portion of the outstanding stock of the cooperative bank held by the Export-Import Bank.

"(d) Each cooperative bank established under this section shall have power—

"(1) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially recognized;

"(2) through its board of directors, to prescribe, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations (not inconsistent with the provisions of this title) governing the manner in which its business shall be conducted and its powers exercised;

"(3) to make contracts;

"(4) to lease, purchase, sell, or otherwise dispose of such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business;

"(5) to sue and be sued, to complain and defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction;

"(6) to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, experts, technicians, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of its business;

"(7) subject to the provisions of this title, to determine, by its board of directors, the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for;

"(8) subject to applicable national laws, to engage in foreign exchange transactions;

"(9) to establish within the participating country such agencies or branch offices as may be necessary for the execution of its powers;

"(10) to create and control subsidiary corporations organized under the laws of the participating country when necessary for the execution of its powers;

"(11) to make loans on such terms and conditions and to engage in such other financial transactions with such persons or other entities as the board of directors may determine in order to accomplish the purposes of this title. Its functions shall include, but not be limited to, loans or other financial transactions designed to increase industrial or agricultural production, to improve housing, education, or public health, or to finance programs of land redistribution or resettlement. Each cooperative bank shall give particular and continuing attention to the needs of small private business and small farmers.

"(e) A cooperative bank organized pursuant to this section shall not—

"(1) permit the payment of any fee or commission by any applicant for financial assistance in connection with any such application; or

"(2) permit any director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of such cooperative bank to participate in any manner, directly or indirectly, in the deliberation upon or in the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, association, or other public or private entity of which he is a member or is directly or indirectly interested.

"(f) The property of each cooperative bank (including its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, income, and those of any other public or private corporation, firm, or enterprise wholly financed or managed by it) and that of the Export-Import Bank shall be exempt from all taxation of any kind imposed by the national government of the participating country, or by any political subdivision thereof, except that real property owned by such cooperative bank may be subject to special assessments for local improvements and to real estate taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real estate of like character situated in the same locality is taxed.

"(g) Each cooperative bank shall transmit quarterly to the Export-Import Bank a report of its operations (containing such information, including detailed accounts of its financial transaction, as the Export-Import Bank may request) so long as the Export-Import Bank shall hold any stock of such cooperative bank.

"SEC. 427. AUTHORIZATION.—(a) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (12 U.S.C. 635), or of any other law, the Export-Import Bank is hereby authorized to subscribe to the capital stock of cooperative banks organized pursuant to section 426 of this title: *Provided*, That the total amount of such stock in all such cooperative banks held at any one time by the Export-Import Bank shall not exceed an issue value of $1,000,000,000.

"(b) Obligations of the Export-Import Bank purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purposes of enabling the Export-Import Bank to subscribe to the capital stock of cooperative banks shall bear

interest either at a rate determined in accordance with the third sentence of section 6 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended (12 U.S.C. 635d), or at a rate equal to the dividends received by the Export-Import Bank on such capital stock, whichever is lower.

"SEC. 428. EXEMPTIONS.—The provisions of sections 451, 501, 507, 509, 510, and 517 of this Act shall not apply to activities carried on under authority of this title."

Mr. CAPEHART. One would have to read the committee report with respect to the idea of a separate bank in each country, together with the amendments I offered and the remarks I made before the committee on this subject.

I am wondering when we in the Congress are going to learn. What will be required to teach us that we must start lending and granting money only to people who will agree to stay with us, be our friends, and uphold the private enterprise system and the representative form of government? Why have we not the right to ask each country in the world to which we lend money or make grants to agree to be our friends, to cooperate with us, to stand by us, and to help us, and not expropriate money or permit communism to influence them? Have we not the right to make such request? Should we not do so? If we are not willing to do so, why do we make loans or grants at all? We are told that the purpose of the grants and loans is to stop communism and to raise the standards of living of the people in those countries.

It is perfectly all right with me, and should be with our own country, if a country is not willing to agree to those conditions, to say, "All right. We are not angry with you. We are not trying to force this loan upon you. We are not trying to force help upon you. We are not trying to force you to imitate us. But if you want our help—and we are glad to give it to you—you ought to be willing to do certain things."

Those countries should make their commitment in writing for the American people and for the people of the world to see.

If we do not take this attitude we will not win the battle of the cold war, in my opinion. In time we shall bankrupt ourselves, and we shall have accomplished nothing.

Look at what has happened in Cuba. I suggest that similar activity may well take place in other Latin American countries. We ought not to permit such things to happen.

If the bill were not an appropriation bill, I would offer the amendments which I sent to the desk, but since it is an appropriation bill, it is not subject to legislation. However, I want to make a record. I am perfectly willing to vote to lend money to countries on a sound, practical basis.

I believe such a basis should be that a recipient country would agree in advance to be friendly to us and not expropriate the property of our citizens, that it would not become socialistic or communistic, and if it did, we would automatically discontinue our help.

In a few minutes we shall consider the Battle Act. It is proposed to repeal the Battle Act under which we agreed to lend money or give help to Communist satellite nations. If we give such help, why do we go to all the trouble of saying that we are trying to stop communism?

Perhaps I do not understand, but I think I do. I think we are losing the cold war and losing this fight because we are afraid of offending someone. We are afraid that we will lose some friends. We do not have the courage to do things in a simple, direct, and practical way. We ought to have the courage to say to any one of these countries in Latin America—and my record proves that I am fond of all of them—"Yes, we will lend you some money. We will help you raise your standard of living. We will help you eliminate poverty. But we want an understanding with you that you will not undermine the United States, or expropriate the property of our citizens, that you will not go communistic or permit communism to make inroads into your country, and that you believe in the private enterprise system and in a representative form of government."

Such an approach is opposite to the one contained in the proposed legislation. We would simply lend or give money to those countries and receive nothing in return. Perhaps those recipient countries will remain with the private enterprise system and a representative form of government; perhaps they will go communistic. Maybe they will expropriate the property of American citizens. We would ask no questions at all.

We have a right to ask questions. We have a responsibility to the American people—the American taxpayers—to ask questions, and to make sure that we will have our money returned. Particularly after the Cuban fiasco, we have a right to ask those questions of countries in Latin America, that want our help in order to raise their standards of living. I want to help them, but I do not want to pour $500 million down the drain, nor do I want to pour down the drain $100 million and get absolutely nothing in return for it. And I am not pointing my finger at any single country. I love them all. I have traveled down there, and I am anxious to help them. But I think we have the right to ask them those questions; I think they would appreciate our doing so and would have more respect for us if we did.

I believe we would get further than we have in the fight against communism throughout the world if we would cease giving them money without any strings attached, without any agreements or understandings. We would suggest that a country come and get $50 million, when we do not know whether it will be friendly with us or not. That is why I believe the world is losing respect for us.

We do not seem to have courage.

The world and the average person have respect for people who have courage, people who are practical and stand up for their own families, their own friends, their own country, their own State, and their own cities. But to a great extent we have lost that respect. We are afraid of offending someone. We are afraid they will not like us because we ask them some questions and say, "In return we want this. We will give you this, yes. But in return, we want something from you."

I wish we could amend the bill. I would certainly like to offer my amendments, but I cannot.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to support the bill. I invite the attention of the Senators to the pertinent portions of the report of the Committee on Appropriations, which are to be found on page 3, a program description, and pages 6 and 7, relating to some of the more fundamental parts of the appropriation bill, such as the emphasis that is placed upon the use of funds and the self-help reforms, the interest rates, the repayment of loans, and the emphasis on social welfare, social development, and the improvement of living standards on the part of the people of Latin America.

Every discussion today about Latin American policy is dominated by the Cuban situation. The presence in Cuba of Iron Curtain technicians and a massive arsenal of Soviet Migs, T–34 tanks, and Czech ZPU's is a sobering spectacle which has alarmed the American people.

The anxieties sparked by the abortive Cuban invasion are reflected by editorial comment throughout the Nation. There is great frustration with our self-imposed restraint in the face of constant provocations. The impatience is understandable. We are the mightiest nation in the world, and close to our shores is an island whose bewhiskered dictator has pulled his country into the Communist orbit, thumbed his nose at the inter-American regional system, and vowed to spread his brand of revolution throughout Latin America. The result has been a strong tendency to advocate clobbering Castro and his cohorts once and for all.

The widespread, nervous reaction to the Cuban situation could precipitate decisions with disastrous consequences. The primary danger of Castro's Cuba is not military. It is ideological. Military intervention will not halt Communist penetration in this hemisphere. A conspiratorial apparatus, or an idea backed by heavy financing, propaganda, subversion, and determination cannot be killed by striking off one tentacle. We must weigh soberly the cost of military intervention—in world prestige, moral position, and human lives.

Preoccupation with Cuba, and its consequence—a growing desire for a military crackdown—could entangle the United States in a fruitless and dangerous policy. A show of force in the Caribbean will not deter Communists from plying their wares elsewhere in the hemisphere. Indeed, it might even encourage them. Loyal Communists would jump at the chance to ensnarl the United States in additional military ventures in Latin America.

We cannot deceive ourselves that our military power would insure quick, definitive, and final victories. It is likely that armed intervention, by reviving latent Latin American fears, would drive sincere patriots—along with Communists and fellow travelers—into the

hills or into sullen resistance. Thus Communist agents, risking little themselves, could induce the United States into a wholly untenable position. We simply cannot hold the Latin American countries by deploying troops.

Eagerness to dislodge Cuba's entrenched Communist regime must not blind us to the wider interests at stake in the hemisphere. Spending our emotions on Cuba only diverts attention from our real concern: How to prevent spread of the Castro brand over the vast continent to the south.

It is time to turn our attention to the whole of Latin America instead of confining it only to the Cuban crisis. That is exactly what the pending bill does. It concentrates its attention upon all of Latin America, the entire hemisphere, with the possibilities and the opportunities of a constructive program.

The Cuban experience, for all its frustrating aspects, could prove to be an asset. If the shock electrifies thoughtful Americans on both sides of the Rio Grande to the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, if it inspires them to bolder and more determined action to meet the threat, Castro's Cuba will work against the Sino-Soviet bloc in the long run.

There are valuable lessons to be learned from the Communist takeover in Cuba. A major point to emerge is that some of the basic assumptions underlying our Latin American policy are erroneous.

Past policy was based on the premise that Latin America is not a primary target of Communist penetration. In addition, it was believed that traditions of Western culture and inter-American solidarity, proximity to the United States, close trade ties, distance from the centers of Communist power, and catholicism—separately or all together—safeguarded the region against serious Communist penetration.

Cuba has shattered these tranquilizing illusions.

With the props pulled out from under our old policy, a revaluation of the situation in Latin America becomes imperative.

It now is painfully clear that Latin America is a major arena in the cold war. It is equally apparent that the region is no safer from Communist ideological and subversive tactics than any other area of the world.

A realization of these bitter facts is not a signal to panic. Rather, it is a first essential step toward devising a meaningful Latin American policy.

Next, we must admit to ourselves that shouting "Monroe Doctrine" will not stop Communist maneuvers in the hemisphere. The principle of the Monroe Doctrine—that the Western Hemisphere is not a happy hunting ground for alien doctrines—is as valid to our security as ever. But once we have stated the principle, we are still faced with how to make it stick. Aiming the Monroe Doctrine at Communist infiltration and subversion is like shooting a cannon at an invisible enemy.

I believe continued outcries to invoke the Monroe Doctrine merely confuse public opinion and delay the recharteringof urgent modern techniques to combat a wholly new brand of threat to the hemisphere.

What, then, can we do to insure hemisphere security? I am convinced that we can help the Latin Americans render their soil sterile for Communist machinations. With one-tenth the expenditure of manpower, talent, and expense that military invasions would entail, we can launch a program of hemisphere development, which is exactly what we are doing in the inter-American aid program under consideration now. We must provide visible rays of hope to exasperated millions. Democracy must do the job that communism promises to do.

We need, in effect, a crash program in Latin America. By this I do not mean the outpouring of billions of dollars. I mean the mobilization of U.S. talent, of people from all walks of life—from free trade unions, from cooperatives, agricultural extension programs, public health services, builders, teachers. If the plight of Latin America and our stake in it were spelled out to the American people with the same fervor with which the dangers of Castro's Cuba have been portrayed, I am certain that thousands would respond to the call.

The stories of misery in Latin America which occasionally are reported by our news media are reminiscent of Paris on the eve of the French Revolution. Consider the account of the Haitian peasants who have no door on their hut because they used it to fashion a casket for their dead child. Or of the Nicaraguan peasant who stood at the gate of the local cemetery with his dead child in his arms, unable to bury his son for want of the equivalent of 75 cents for the fee. Then there was the pitiful tale of a school in South America which was attended by 400 children. An attempt was made to serve free lunches consisting of one roll of bread and a glass of reconstituted milk. There was enough food for only 60 percent of the children, so a matron stood by with club in hand to keep the remaining 40 percent of the hungry children in line.

The despair of change coming through evolutionary, peaceful means is what is driving Latin Americans into the arms of false prophets. If we have not the ingenuity or desire or determination to help tackle Latin America's basic problems of poverty, hunger, and illiteracy, then we deserve to lose.

I wish my position to be clear. The major enemies facing freedom today are the ancient enemy of poverty, which we can defeat; of illiteracy, which we can do away with; and of disease, which we can cure. If the United States and other nations will recognize that the enemy is not merely a man or an institution, but, rather, pestilence, illiteracy, ignorance, fear, and frustration, I believe that we will be on the road to victory.

Of course, only the Latin Americans themselves can change the rigid economic and social structures which are stifling progress in many countries.

It is they who must vote tax and land reforms and pay decent living wages to their employees.

It is they who must broaden the base of opportunity for their fellow countrymen.

And it is the Latin American leaders who must put into the development of their own countries capital which is available to them.

The proposed aid program is a supplement to that which the Latin American people and their governments must do for themselves. I call to the attention of the Senate that this particular program is based upon the Act of Bogotá, which calls for reforms, social and economic and political. I recognize that no oligarchy ever voted itself out of existence. But the Act of Bogotá has introduced a remarkable innovation in the affairs of mankind. The Latin American governments are on record at least as realizing that basic institutional changes are vital to the peaceful development of their countries. Perhaps the oligarchies who control the economic and political life of some of the American Republics hope to pay only lipservice to the new program, while doing business as usual. We must make it resoundingly clear that, whatever their nominal anticommunism, we regard them as enemies of Western culture since it is their selfishness which creates the climate for Communist activities.

In other words, the bill calls for reforms. The appropriations call for our Government, working through the Inter-American Development Bank, to work with these governments who are instituting reforms. The measure emphasizes housing, it emphasizes agricultural reforms, it emphasizes cooperatives, it emphasizes homebuilding, and it emphasizes social improvements.

Meanwhile, we must work generously and enthusiastically with those who are on the road to reform, and not merely spread our aid to everyone, but give aid to those persons and governments which have demonstrated a willingness to make dramatic reforms within their own countries. The amount of aid proffered should be an incentive for reform.

Once the bottleneck presented by shortsighted oligarchies has been cleared from the path of progress, the mass of despairing people in Latin America will be drawn into participation in the economic and political life of their nations. I am certain that given a choice between communism and effective democracy, the Latin American people will choose bread with freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD, in order that the inter-American social and economic cooperation program, as provided for by the appropriation, may be fully understood, the marked paragraph on page 3 under the subhead "Program Description," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

This program is different in concept from past U.S. assistance efforts with respect to Latin America, but nevertheless it builds upon such past efforts. There has been a substantial flow of capital—public and private—into Latin America which has been

directed toward economic development. There also has been a long history of the provision of technical assistance. But between these programs of technical assistance and of capital development there has been a great gap—a gap which concerns the social progress of the ordinary people of the Latin American nations. The fruits of the economic development process have not been spread throughout the populace of many of these nations. This imbalance in the development process has created a breeding ground for unrest as major segments of the population in Latin American countries see the benefits that economic development bring but fail to participate in those benefits. It is this unrest upon which communism is seeking to feed in order to strengthen its influence. It is this serious gap which the new program will begin to help the nations of Latin America fill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent that the paragraphs on page 6, under "Interest Rates, Cooperatives, Self-Help, and Reforms" and "Project Financing and Capability" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object, because I wish to have this material made a part of the legislative history on the bill--I have been reading the paragraphs on page 6 and I am impressed by the fact that the committee saw fit to add that information to the report. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] said that he would like to amend the bill, but thought he could not do so because it is an appropriation bill.

However, if it were regarded as important enough to insure that there would be a sizable contribution by local communities to the total cost of the undertaking, I think that could be done as a limitation on the bill. I do not propose to offer an amendment; but merely as a part of the legislative history I should like to bring to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota this possible statement of that purpose in an amendment which, in my opinion, would be in order as a limitation.

At the end of the paragraph which relates to the $500 million, on page 2, line 7, such an amendment would strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following:

Provided, That funds herein appropriated shall not be available for expenditure to provide more than 90 per centum of the estimated cost of projects outside the United States.

This, in effect, would require 10 percent of the cost of such projects to be provided by local contributions.

I recognize that a hard and fast rule on this point might operate to defeat some projects. Yet I suggest the language here for the purpose of clarifying the point which is made in the paragraphs which the Senator from Minnesota has proposed to be inserted. I should like to read from two of the paragraphs which he mentioned:

SELF-HELP AND REFORMS

In addition, the committee wishes to emphasize that these funds are made available because this program is based on self-help, and because it has been assured by the witnesses who testified that land reforms, tax reforms, and social reforms will be among the principal objectives. The committee urges our administrators to withhold the commitment of funds made available in this bill until some of the aforementioned reforms have been accomplished or are in the process of being accomplished.

The next paragraph which the Senator from Minnesota seeks to place in the RECORD begins at the bottom of page 6 of the committee report, and reads as follows:

PROJECT FINANCING AND CAPABILITY

Furthermore, the committee wants it clearly understood that no project should be undertaken unless the local people or the local government is prepared to make a sizable contribution to the total cost of such undertaking. Our administrators should make the necessary study and evaluation of every project in order to determine that the local country has the capability to operate and maintain it once it has been completed. It should not be necessary for our Government to furnish funds or personnel to operate and maintain a project beyond a training period.

Mr. President, I thoroughly applaud the objectives of the bill. I thoroughly applaud the broad purposes as outlined by the Senator from Minnesota. The one mistake for which history would never forgive our generation would be if we failed to meet the challenge which is necessary to maintain freedom in the Western Hemisphere. Already we have seen what can happen by simply observing what has taken place in Cuba. It is hardly credible that it has been permitted to develop and occur. Yet if from the lesson of Cuba we can develop policies, an awareness, and a resourcefulness which will preserve freedom for the world and the capability and the resources of the people of South America, there will have been some benefits. We should live and learn.

The bill seeks to implement our purposes. For that reason, I do not wish to hamstring it. I have merely suggested the language of limitation as evidence of what might be done, if it were determined to be necessary to have a formal provision in the law which would require a 10 percent contribution by local interests. The language of the report clearly indicates to the administrators that there should be some local contribution.

I am glad the Senator from Minnesota is making certain that these portions of the report are placed in the RECORD today as a part of the legislative history leading to the passage of the bill. I do not propose as an actual amendment the language I have suggested; I merely suggest it as an indication of how, if it were necessary, we could require a 10 percent local contribution.

Mr. President, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEREST RATES

The committee concurs in the objectives sought to be accomplished through the programs described herein. However, it wants to be assured that the funds made available to the Inter-American Development Bank are not going to be reloaned at usurious interest rates.

In this connection, the committee recommends that the Department of State establish a firm policy of interest rates at which the funds may be reloaned so that such rates of interest cannot be considered to be usurious. Whenever it is brought to the attention of the IDB that a lending agency, bank, or other institution has violated or obviated its policy in any manner by the charging of higher interest rates to the ultimate consumer of the loan, then it should be the policy of the IDB to cease to transact future business with such agency, bank, or other institution.

COOPERATIVES

It must be borne in mind by the administrators of the funds made available herein that this program is addressed squarely to the critical lags in the economic and social development of the Latin American countries. In this connection, it is the sense of the committee that in the allocation of funds by the IDB, as well as the ICA, particular emphasis be given to the needs of agricultural cooperatives, such as producer cooperatives, marketing cooperatives, farm credit organizations, credit unions, and consumer cooperatives, cooperative training programs and facilities, housing, cooperative health facilities, and other related projects.

SELF-HELP AND REFORMS

In addition, the committee wishes to emphasize that these funds are made available because this program is based on self-help, and because it has been assured by the witnesses who testified that land reforms, tax reforms, and social reforms will be among the principal objectives. The committee urges our administrators to withhold the commitment of funds made available in this bill until some of the aforementioned reforms have been accomplished or are in the process of being accomplished.

PROJECT FINANCING AND CAPABILITY

Furthermore, the committee wants it clearly understood that no project should be undertaken unless the local people or the local government is prepared to make a sizable contribution to the total cost of such undertaking. Our administrators should make the necessary study and evaluation of every project in order to determine that the local country has the capability to operate and maintain it once it has been completed. It should not be necessary for our Government to furnish funds or personnel to operate and maintain a project beyond a training period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations discussed this subject. A number of members of the committee are now present. Surely some contribution should be made by the recipient countries, and the guidelines, which have been set forth in the report, were carefully worked out. In the light of the commentary which has been made on the floor of the Senate, I feel certain that the guidelines take on an even more precise meaning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to ask the Senator a question in connection with the $500 million for inter-American social and economic cooperation. I am in complete agreement with the objectives of the bill, but I want to be sure that our aid goes to the people. I have spoken with some of the administrators concerning the problems under

our present program, and I shall comment first on the housing projects.

For one particular housing project, the U.S. Government is putting up the money at around 5-percent interest, but in turn the home buyer is being charged 12 percent.

In other areas the interest rates are even more prohibitive, running as high as 20 to 25 percent.

Homes are being built which are supposed to cost about $5,000. Yet the homes are being sold to the people in that area at these prohibitive interest charges. The people who buy the homes know that they are financed with American capital. Anyone who buys these homes certainly cannot afford to pay 12-, 14-, or 20-percent interest. He looks upon those who are charging these rates as exploiters. The United States is being charged with exploiting the people of these countries, when in reality we are not getting either interest or principal in return.

I think the main criticism of our foreign aid has been that the aid has not gone to the people themselves. I wonder if we could not amend the bill so as to prohibit any interest rates in excess of 6 percent to the ultimate borrower under any circumstance.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wholeheartedly agree with the statement of the distinguished Senator from Delaware. However, as he knows, an amendment of the type he proposes would be legislation on an appropriation bill and would be subject to a point of order.

I favor what the Senator from Delaware advocates. I suggest that he offer an amendment to the authorization bill; that hearings be held on it as soon as possible; and that the bill be reported. In that way we can make certain that the low-interest rates which the Senator from Delaware has in mind will become a part of the act rather than, in this way, to be subject to an objection based on the fact that an amendment to the bill now under consideration would be legislation on an appropriation bill, and would be subject to a conference, which might knock it out, and therefore not be conducive to what the Senator from Delaware has in mind.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think we would be bothered by a conference, because I cannot conceive of the House conferees not being in agreement with us.

I realize that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. However, I think an acceptable amendment could be drafted which would be in the form of a proviso or a restriction; then it would be in order. I believe our problem in the past with respect to foreign aid programs has far too often been that we have moved through existing facilities which are perhaps not too popular with the people, or that we have operated through a group which has exploited the people. The result is that the United States is condemned for exploiting the people when in reality we have been giving aid in its entirety.

I know the Senator from Montana is in agreement with my basic proposal; but in this instance let us be realistic—the money, while we call it a loan, will not return to the U.S. Government.

Therefore, at the very least, we should make certain that we are creating good will by channeling the benefits directly to the people. I do not think we accomplish anything when we go into a country and charge the small businessmen, the farmer, or the ordinary citizen who is buying a home, 12 to 14 percent, and sometimes 25 or 30 percent interest. Those rates are outrageous.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am in full and wholehearted accord with the statement of the Senator from Delaware. However, I point out that if a proviso such as the Senator advocates were adopted and were not subject to a point of order in the Senate, and it went to conference, the same objection could be made in the House; and it would take only one objector in that body to knock out the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is my understanding that any provision that is approved by one body is not subject to a point of order by the other body.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This subject was brought up at length in the committee; and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and, I believe, the Senator from Idaho and other Senators commented on the subject; and there was inserted in the committee report language which was included for the purpose of trying to take care of this situation. It was the clear understanding of the committee, as I recall, that the respective agencies involved would have to report back to the committee; and quite detailed language was included in the report, on page 6, as follows:

INTEREST RATES

The committee concurs in the objectives sought to be accomplished through the programs described herein. However, it wants to be assured that the funds made available to the Inter-American Development Bank are not going to be reloaned at usurious interest rates.

In this connection, the committee recommends that the Department of State establish a firm policy of interest rates at which the funds may be reloaned so that such rates of interest cannot be considered to be usurious. Whenever it is brought to the attention of the IDB that a lending agency, bank, or other institution has violated or obviated its policy in any manner by the charging of higher interest rates to the ultimate consumer of the loan, then it should be the policy of the IDB to cease to transact future business with such agency, bank, or other institution.

That was discussed in the light of small business financing, housing cooperative financing, and the very point the Senator is making.

It seems to me that at this point we can be satisfied with that language. We have asked for information in regard to the interest rates being charged; and we included this language in order to be sure that the interest rates do not rise, but, instead, go down.

I think the point the Senator has made, in terms of having a reasonable rate, surely is well taken. I believe a 6-percent rate would be a good one, not only for Latin America, but also for our own country. I know of cases in which farm loans, and also some small business loans, are made at rates higher than 6 percent.

We are asking for a reasonable interest rate. If the Senator will read what I said on this very point in the committee, he will see that not only am I in sympathy with his objective, but, in addition, I was making exactly the same point, although perhaps not as effectively as the Senator from Delaware has made it—but with the same spirit and the same purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I realize that, and I know how the Senator from Minnesota feels about this matter. I also know that the intention of the committee is to achieve this same objective.

However, a committee report has no effect insofar as law is concerned. This afternoon I talked with one of the men who is to administer the fund, and he admits that this is a problem in a country which has a standard interest rate of 15 percent or higher. Our problem is that in some of these countries an interest rate of 10, 12, or 15 percent is not regarded as usurious.

However, I do not believe that we can build any good will in these countries when we endorse or support interest rates of 10, 12, or 15 percent. After all, if an interest rate of 15 or 20 percent is charged, it does not take long for the amount of the interest payments to exceed the total amount of the loan. As a result the people will believe that we are exploiting them, whereas that certainly is not our intention.

I think, therefore, that consideration should be given to this point in connection with any aid extended.

An amendment should be adopted protecting against such exorbitant rates being charged in connection with any program in which the U.S. Government participates.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Senator's point about restricting the interest rate on loans made from these funds is a very good one. In my opinion, the bill could be amended to accomplish his purpose. If the Senate were to adopt an amendment simply restricting the use of the funds in loans to those carrying 6 percent or less it should be in order.

And if the amendment passed the test of being a limitation, it could be agreed to by the House conferees. But the House conferees would not have authority to agree to an amendment which was legislation, even if it were adopted in the Senate, unless it were taken back to the House and were agreed to by a separate vote there.

But I believe it is in order for the Senate to write an amendment in the nature of a limitation—although I am not wholly persuaded as to the wisdom of making such a provision.

However if the language were something like the following:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at an interest rate in excess of 6 percent.

I believe that would constitute a limitation, would not be legislation, but would be in order here, and would be within the power of the House conferees to accept.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the suggestion. I think such an amendment could be drafted and would be in order, and I will attempt to draft such a provision.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AID TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Act of Bogotá is a document of far-reaching implications. Conceived with vision and understanding, it must now be implemented. Today, we are taking a first step in putting some muscle on the skeletal framework of this act.

The Act of Bogotá at long last recognizes the realities we face, and have for a long time faced, in Latin America. All too often in the past we have undertaken programs which have actually reinforced the tragic conditions which have thwarted real progress there.

I hope we are not under the impression, as has been the case so often in the past, that we can cure our Latin American problems by making large gifts or soft loans of money. As a people, we are prone to rush pellmell into critical situations with large sums of ready cash. In the present instance we are on more sound footing, provided we fully understand, and provided we are prepared to follow the guidelines laid down by the Act of Bogotá and by the act of the U.S. Congress of September 8, 1960, which authorizes the appropriation we are now considering.

In countries—and there are many in Latin America—where the privileged rich daily become richer, and the poor masses remain poverty stricken and miserable, where illiteracy continues virtually unimproved, where housing is in all too many instances wretched, where governments are more interested in maintaining the status quo than in improving the lot of those at the base of the economic and social pyramid, where taxation according to ability to pay is entirely foreign in concept, where monetary, banking, and credit systems are so archaic that interest rates are too high to permit legitimate economic expansion, no amount of money spent by the United States can be effective.

At best, foreign aid can be but peripheral. At best, foreign aid can truly be helpful only if it spurs the kind of social and economic development that will provide a foundation for progress by the people. We are today appropriating, in addition to the funds specifically earmarked for the rehabilitation of Chile, $500 million for the new programs outlined in the Act of Bogotá. This may sound like a great deal of money; and, indeed, it is. But when measured against the almost overwhelming problems of our Latin American friends, we find that it amounts to only about $3 for each person in Latin America. Therefore, unless this money is properly spent, it will amount to very little benefit, if any. If it is properly spent, however, it can act as a catalytic agent to start a beneficial chain reaction throughout this hemisphere.

For altogether too long we have dealt with the existing governments and institutions of Latin America, often to the detriment of the majority of the people of the affected countries. Now we are to establish programs by this act, by the act of Congress of 1960, and in accordance with the terms of the Act of Bogotá, which directly affect the aspirations of the people.

For all too long we have followed a "trickle-down" theory in foreign aid. We rejected this concept domestically at least 30 years ago, and, for the most part, 50 years ago.

This new approach today does not bypass governments. Obviously the governments of the host countries must cooperate. Indeed, they must wholeheartedly enter upon this self-help program if it is to be beneficial. But the benefits of this new approach will inure, if our aims are fulfilled, directly to the masses of the people. At least, this is the design. We must see to it that the design materializes. Otherwise the program should be stopped in any country that fails in social and economic improvement.

Mr. President, this is truly a bipartisan program. The Act of Bogotá was accomplished during the Eisenhower administration, as was the authorization act, which made possible today's appropriation. Therefore we can approach this problem, and we can hope for this new venture, unitedly.

I hope every Member of Congress and all the peoples of the Americas will recognize that we are embarking on a truly revolutionary program. This program is designed to promote change, not to reinforce the status quo. This program will not work unless those affected, especially the wealthy and socially elite, are willing to accept the change. The program might do more harm than good if the host governments seek to obstruct the basic changes sought by the program.

Many countries in Latin America need tax reform, need to adopt and to enforce the principle of taxation according to ability to pay. In many of these countries the tax system, instead, is highly regressive, rather than progressive; and enforcement of a progressive tax program is just as important, and just as necessary, as its institution.

Many of these countries need land reform to liberate the peasant from the control, political and social, as well as economic, of a few land-holding families.

Many of these countries lack even rudimentary credit machinery, and their monetary and credit policies are such that inflation and exorbitantly usurious interest rates go hand in hand.

Education for the masses is too often lacking altogether.

Housing, health, and sanitation measures are deplorable.

I have seen some of these conditions, and I have observed the social, economic, and political repercussions.

It is upon these unfortunate conditions that the Communists play; and let us be warned that there is a tight core of well organized Communist machinery in almost every Latin American country.

The principal danger of the success of communism in achieving complete seizure of Cuba is the example it provides. It is to remove the conditions upon which communism feeds that the Congress and the administration are today supporting this program.

A few weeks ago I had the privilege of going to Mexico, our great neighbor, as a member of a congressional delegation, to meet with a delegation of the Mexican Congress. I met and talked with many people, both in and out of government. The people were most hospitable and friendly, but I was unprepared for their sympathy for the Cuban revolution, or their toleration of Castro and his subversion of the stated aims of the Cuban revolution.

I did not hear one Mexican, citizen or official, high or low, express opposition to Castro's efforts to liberate the Cuban people. I heard widespread sentiment against Yankee exploitation. Indeed, when the Mexican people see a factory owned by a United States company exploiting men, women, and children, under working conditions and at wages and at hours which we would never tolerate at home, this is Yankee imperialism as they see it. They do not see a farmer toiling faithfully and loyally on the plateau of Idaho, not a small businessman in Tennessee or Arizona.

In some way we must require our businessmen and business institutions operating abroad to conform their conduct to our national interest.

I do not wish to leave the impression that all businessmen set a bad example. Indeed, I found in Mexico, as I found in other countries, American business institutions which have an enlightened policy, a social consciousness, which are popular with the people. There are some whose activities deserve our special attention, such as the "freebooters," the true exploiters.

I heard complaints about lack of credit and high rates of interest being charged by banks and other lending institutions. Some of this is blamed upon the United States, perhaps unjustly in most instances.

Upon my return, I took up this question with the president of the First National City Bank of New York, because his bank operates many branches throughout Latin America. The president of the bank was most cooperative. I wish now to express publicly my appreciation for this. I have privately done so already.

This bank makes loans at 12 percent interest in Mexico and up to 19½ percent interest in Chile. Of course, these posted rates do not begin to tell the whole

story. As the August 1960, newsletter of the First National City Bank states:

> It must be borne in mind that money is frequently scarce at the bank's minimum rates. Most borrowers able to obtain funds must pay higher rates. In many countries, there are commissions and other arrangements which increase the cost of borrowing. The effective interest costs thus are generally higher than the rates shown in the table; for a number of countries the posted rates are, in fact, nominal.

Mr. President, if the subsidiaries of American banks charge high interest rates by our standards, the rates charged by Mexican banks will be indeed shocking.

I learned of business loans by Mexican banks at 34 percent interest.

No economy can support genuine social progress under these conditions. These conditions are stifling to the economy and stultifying to social progress.

One of the best ways to start this new program is effectively to encourage the governments of the host countries to make needed reforms. If such reforms are not made, we had better not extend credit and not expend U.S. Government aid funds in those countries.

Fortunately, the guidelines are laid down in the authorization act. Perhaps they are not rigid enough, but the meaning and the intent are, I believe, clear. I hope they will be rigidly followed.

The administration has given assurance that the guidelines laid down in the act last year will be followed, and that it is not intended to commit funds for these social development projects until the governments which are to be beneficiaries have given evidence of their determination and ability to carry through essential institutional and legislative changes.

I want the administration to understand that the Congress, and particularly the Committee on Foreign Relations, will keep a close eye on the administration of the program, insofar as I can accomplish this. I believe other Senators share this view.

No projects whatsoever should be undertaken in countries ruled without essential democratic tenets.

No project should be undertaken in any country in which there are oppressive interest rates and adequate credit machinery is nonexistent, unless steps are being taken to overcome these deficiencies.

I would not impose a rule of perfection. A proper start, with good will and intent, is important in some countries. The ability to carry through, and the determination and dedication to achieve change, to accomplish an enlightened social objective, are necessary.

I hope it is clear to the Kennedy administration and to all the governments of Latin America that we have indeed undertaken a truly new departure. We are not supporting the status quo. We are deliberately seeking to promote change, to promote a social revolution—a peaceful revolution but nevertheless change—as rapidly as we can accomplish it throughout Latin America. We must do this if we are to avoid other Castros.

We can be on the wave of the future only if we act wisely and determinedly. We cannot be on the wave of the future if we continue to ignore the hopes, aims and aspirations of the masses of the people of Latin America. We cannot hope to be on the wave of the future if we support the status quo and if we overlook the misery of the masses of the people. If we continue to ignore those hopes, aims and aspirations, no amount of money expended in Latin America or anywhere else on military and economic programs will be of the least assistance in the long run either to the recipients or to the United States of America in the cause of freedom.

In order to illustrate this I have prepared a bill to implement these intentions on my part. I introduce, for appropriate reference, the bill to amend the authorizing legislation for the Latin American aid program. It spells out pretty well the restrictions I have in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1827) to provide for more meaningful assistance in the development of Latin America, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTER-AMERICAN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the Inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments of the Senate's time to talk about the so-called amendment to the Battle Act.

Whatever sentiment I may have toward the bill under consideration—and I assure my colleagues that it is not favorable—I must admit that the proponents of this legislation have displayed a dogged determination which I would commend were it asserted with equal force in some other direction or for some other cause.

This is not the first time that the senior Senator from New Hampshire has found himself in the position of defending the so-called Battle Act and trying to discourage those who would submerge it in the softening lotion which now bears the label of "S. 1215."

Neither is it the first time that such a bill has come to the floor with the added impetus of a favorable report from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Yes, Mr. President, the supporters of legislation to amend the Battle Act have been persistent. Those of us of opposite belief have been persistent too, but our ranks have thinned and the prospect of S. 1215 being rejected at this time is rather dim.

Irrespective of the probable outcome, however, I want my position on this matter to be perfectly clear.

I believe the Battle Act is a sound and necessary law.

I believe this attempt to water down the act is unwise just as previous efforts in this direction were unwise.

Because of these convictions, I have opposed similar legislation in the past, and I shall vote against this bill.

In 1958, the then junior Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, introduced an amendment to the Mutual Security Authorization Act which sought to modify the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, more commonly known as the Battle Act. I opposed this amendment and joined with former minority leader, Senator Knowland, and Senators of both parties, to defeat this bill by one vote.

Then in 1959, the junior Senator from Massachusetts joined with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in cosponsorship of S. 1697 which contained precisely the same language as the bill before this body today. The bill passed the Senate by 9 votes over strong opposition. The House showed excellent judgment, in my estimation, in not taking action on the measure.

Now, here we go again—the same bill, just as unsound and impractical as ever, and perhaps more so under current world conditions.

To vote for this bill, in my judgment, is to place a stamp of approval on extending economic aid to Communist satellite nations, and on condoning trade in strategic materials between Communist-dominated countries and nations who are receiving mutual security assistance from the United States.

Frankly, I am not prepared to put my stamp of approval on either of these proposals.

Each new day brings further proof of the need for firmness in our approach to the international Communist conspiracy.

Certainly there is nothing firm in the approach provided by this bill.

I believe that such a change in policy will not help the unfortunate people who are living in Communist-dominated countries, but will assist only the present regimes of these countries and strengthen the puppet leaders who take their orders from Moscow.

The sponsors of this amendment apparently believe in the theory that economic aid to a Communist-dominated country will somehow, through the process of osmosis, filter through to the oppressed people of that country. That is one theory.

The Senator from New Hampshire does not for one moment agree with that theory. I believe that such aid will only help strengthen the stranglehold which the Communist masters maintain on their victims. I want to help the victims of Communist aggression just as much as any Member of this body, but I want to be sure the people, and not their Red oppressors, receive our assistance. If we allow ourselves to pump aid—American supplies, equipment, and funds—to puppet governments under Red control, we are simply easing the economic pressure on Moscow, at the expense of American taxpayers.

I submit that the Communist bloc has already grown to Frankenstein dimensions and I hardly think this is the time for us to begin feeding the monster vitamin pills. I would feel a whole lot better if we were spending our time at the moment seeking ways and means of strengthening the free world rather than trying to help countries which are linked politically, economically, and militarily to a force dedicated to our destruction.

The bill may pass, Mr. President, despite the efforts of the senior Senator from New Hampshire; but, if it does, I will at least have the satisfaction of knowing that I opposed it. I do not want the history books to record that a blunder such as the one being contemplated failed to arouse strong dissent in this body.

I sincerely hope that a majority of my colleagues will recognize the dangers of amending the Battle Act and will join with me in casting a negative vote on S. 1215.

I have in my hand an article from the Washington Evening Star of May 9, 1961. It states as follows:

CZECHS PLEDGE SUPPORT TO CUBA

KEY WEST, FLA., May 9.—The Czechoslovakian Ambassador to Cuba says his country will back Fidel Castro's revolution with economic and, if need be, military assistance.

Valdemar Tolbichek told a television audience in Havana last night that "Czechoslovakia avows full support of the revolution, economically and, if need be, by direct military assistance to the end."

The statement is that of the official representative of Czechoslovakia in Cuba. I point out that although our State Department contends that we will not give aid to such a country as Czechoslovakia, under this bill the Department would be allowed to do so.

I now have in my hand an article from the Washington Post, issue of April 29, 1961, relative to another country. It states as follows:

GOMULKA HITS KENNEDY FOR DECEIT

WARSAW, April 28.—Poland's Wladyslaw Gomulka today lashed out at President Kennedy for what he called "pitiful and deceitful" statements about this country.

"The Polish people do not need American lectures on freedom—even if the lecturer is the President himself," Gomulka said.

(Gomulka apparently referred to a speech which Mr. Kennedy made on April 20 to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington. Speaking of the effort of Cuban refugees to overthrow the regime of Fidel Castro, Mr. Kennedy spoke of "the long rollcall of refugees who cannot now go back—to Hungary, to North Korea, or to North Vietnam, or to East Germany, or to Poland, or to any of the other lands from which a steady stream of refugees pours forth.")

The Polish Communist leader's remarks were the first personal attack on the President since Mr. Kennedy's election. Gomulka spoke at a Polish-Rumanian friendship rally of 1,500 persons. A Romanian delegation headed by Communist Boss Gheorghe Gheorgiu-Dej was present.

Gomulka said the Polish people support their government's international policies and those of the socialist bloc.

I do not always agree with President Kennedy. I certainly do not agree with his support of this proposed legislation. When the President made his statement to the newspaper editors which Gomulka attacked he was speaking correctly. It ill becomes the head of a Communist country to attack the President of the United States especially when we have been helping that foreign country, in this case Poland, over the last few years, at the expense of American taxpayers.

This is the type of thanks which America is getting. I can see no sense in our permitting a further lowering of the bars to allow the shipment by the United States or by our allies of goods to Communist countries. How anybody can believe for a moment that Czechoslovakia or any of the other countries which are dominated by the Soviets will in any way be helpful to us, I do not know. I do not see how the unfortunate people of Red satellite countries can be aided in this way, because the aid goes to the governments of these countries. The only possibility of aiding the people is, apparently, through the process of osmosis—by letting the aid trickle down—but, frankly, this is a naive and ridiculous theory.

If we were able to give the aid directly to the Polish people or directly to the individuals who are suffering in some other Communist dominated country, I would feel differently about this bill to amend the Battle Act. However, when it comes to strengthening the hands of those who are grinding the people into the dirt, I am against it.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to commend the able and distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire for the magnificent address he has just made. I should like to ask him if he was informed some time ago, when we furnished wheat to Poland, that the Polish Government received the wheat and distributed it to the people of Poland without giving them the information that it had come from the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is my understanding.

Mr. THURMOND. Is not a policy of that kind of assistance to a Communist-dominated country, such as Poland, simply a move to support the economy of the Communists?

Mr. BRIDGES. It certainly is.

Mr. THURMOND. Since they are Communist-dominated, if the economy of Poland has become so weak and so much in need of assistance, it is apparent that Russia would have to furnish the assistance, or the people of Poland would then know what has caused that situation. Is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Whereas, if we send assistance over there, they will feel that the United States is doing it out of the goodness of their hearts and the Polish Government will get the credit for it and the people will not know where the aid comes from.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Is it not unsound for our country to support the Communist-dominated countries regardless of where they are located?

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the distinguished Senator and great patriot from South Carolina in the position he takes. Whatever assistance we give to the Moscow-directed puppet regimes relieves the economic strain on the Kremlin.

Mr. THURMOND. Does not the bill also give to the President the authority to extend financial or economic aid to any Communist-dominated country, except the Soviet Union, Communist China, North Korea and North Vietnam, and also transfers from the President to the Battle Act Administrator the authority to continue aid to a country which knowingly has permitted the shipment of strategic materials to a Soviet bloc nation?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is an accurate statement.

Mr. THURMOND. How does the Senator from New Hampshire feel about it?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am naturally opposed to it. Under the provision which the Senator describes, this country could find itself in the position of sending financial aid to a country outside the Iron Curtain only to have that aid translated into armaments destined for the Communist bloc. As I said to the Senate, if I could be sure that we would be assisting only the helpless people behind the Iron Curtain, I would be in favor of it. However, when the aid may go to a government which is at the same time attacking the United States, and giving aid to our potential enemy, and insulting our President, then I must oppose it in principle.

Mr. THURMOND. The very governments which would receive the aid and would not tell the people where the aid came from are at the same time attacking our form of government, our President, and the people of this country. Is that not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is certainly right.

Mr. THURMOND. Are they not tearing down the foundations of our Government at the same time that we are assisting their government to stay in power by giving them aid, which they in turn would give to their people, without letting the people know where the aid came from?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The distinguished Senator has a complete grasp of the situation and the dangers involved.

Mr. THURMOND. Is there not a danger in allowing the Battle Act Administrator to continue to aid a country which knowingly has permitted strategic shipments to be made to a Soviet bloc nation, and would that not be putting into the hands of a Soviet-dominated country strategic materials which it could use against us in time of emergency or war?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I remember very well that in 1937 and 1938, prior to World War II, I submitted in the Senate a resolution prohibiting the shipment of scrap iron and steel to Japan. It was opposed by the administration at that time and by many in the Senate. I predicted that the material would some day come back to us in the bodies of American boys. It did, at Pearl Harbor and for

the next 4 years. I am sure that if we foolishly permit ourselves to get involved in a similar situation after first weakening the Battle Act, then we will have learned little from this lesson of history.

Mr. THURMOND. Again I congratulate the able Senator from New Hampshire for his sound and sane position on this subject. I feel encouraged by his expressions.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For the purposes of the record and to ascertain whether or not the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Ohio have a common understanding of the substance of the bill, may I ask whether the Senator from New Hampshire concurs with this description of what the bill provides? In the discretion of the President of the United States, when he deems that the security of the country will be served thereby, he may extend financial or economic assistance to a country other than the Soviet Union and a Soviet-dominated nation in the Far East, even though the recipient country is sending to Communist Russia or to a Communist-dominated nation arms, ammunitions, implements of war, atomic energy material, or materials of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is my understanding. I have just read a statement about Czechoslovakia. While it is indicated by representatives of our Government that we have no intention of furnishing aid to Czechoslovakia, we know that a part of the equipment that repulsed the recent landing of Cuban patriots on Cuban soil consisted of arms and ammunition and equipment that Czechoslovakia had sent to Cuba.

There is no one who would like to help the people of Poland, for example, more than I, if the aid went directly to the Polish people. But when we are asked to give aid to a regime which is attacking our country, our people, and our President, when all that the aid will do will be to strengthen the grip of that regime upon the oppressed people, I simply cannot and will not support it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I fully realize that there is overwhelming support in this body for H.R. 6518, which would appropriate $500 million for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and $100 million for Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation aid. Recently there was overwhelming support for the bill in the Committee on Appropriations, where I cast a negative vote. There will be no yea-and-nay vote on the bill so I think, in order to make the record clear, I must say that I share the concern of Senators like the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who have indicated that as we face the serious threat of Communist aggression and infiltration in Latin American countries, we must tighten our belts and cooperate in every way to stabilize the social conditions and improve the economies of our neighbors to the south, so as to enable them better to withstand the Soviet onslaught.

As we consider committing ourselves now to another program, which will probably involve the expenditure of $2,500 million in the next 10 years, attention must be called to the fact that in 1960, by an overwhelming vote, the Senate approved participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank. We committed the U.S. Government to contribute $450 million to that cooperative program with our Latin American friends.

Because I wish to strengthen the economies in Latin America, I voted last year for the participation by the United States in that program. However, it seems illogical at this time, before the first program actually gets underway, to initiate a second program. According to Secretary of State Dillon and Under Secretary of State Ball, in testimony before the Committee on Appropriations, this will be a long-range program, one which will probably last at least 10 years. If we make this commitment, it will be extremely difficult to break faith with our neighbors in Latin America.

While there is an overwhelming desire on the part of Congress to demonstrate vividly and emphatically that we wish to help our Latin American neighbors, I believe we are initiating a program without giving very careful consideration to the far-reaching impact, because we know there will be controversies over the various policies involved in the program.

Last week one Washington newspaper published an article reporting that President Frondizi, of Argentina, was already taking issue with President Kennedy over the terms and policies incorporated in the inter-American program for social progress. It was reported that President Frondizi said he wanted this money utilized to build business installations of various kinds. President Kennedy indicated, according to the press report, that he believes emphasis should be placed upon the social revolution which is involved in this program.

If our government and our country are to continue to assert the enlightened and forceful leadership which is essential, if we are to continue to strengthen the countries of this hemisphere, then let us realize that we cannot adopt a program which may contribute to the bankruptcy of our own Government.

An hour or so ago, I took from the news ticker a United Press International dispatch under a Washington dateline, from which I quote:

> President Kennedy is considering a $600 million boost for the U.S. space program. A usually well informed congressional source told UPI today the President has just about decided to recommend to Congress a $500 million increase for the civilian space agency and $100 million for space projects in the Department of Defense. Other sources said the increases under consideration for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 were understood to be just the beginning of a greatly expanded long-range space effort.

So Congress will soon receive a budget request for $600 million, and we will very enthusiastically accept this proposal to provide $600 million to accelerate our space development program, because we know it is essential in the competition with the Soviet nations.

Within the past week, the House Committee on Armed Services provided more than $100 million in excess of the budget requested by the President to procure bombers for the Strategic Air Command. I understand that within the past 24 hours the Senate Committee on Armed Services approved an authorization bill which includes about $12,500 million to expand our national defense.

What is significant is that the Senate committee increased the budget request of the President by about half a billion dollars to procure additional manned bombers for the Strategic Air Command.

I shall probably very vigorously support the proposal to provide additional bombers, because about 10 days ago I attended a hearing before the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, at which it was indicated that no funds will be sought in the coming year to provide B–52 bombers or B–58 bombers. We are phasing out the B–47's, and we are cutting back research and development of the B–70 bombers, because complete reliance is placed upon potential missile developments and their effectiveness.

WILL EXPAND FEDERAL SPENDING

I feel certain that Senators realize that not only will these highly meritorious proposals receive wholehearted support, but that many proposals will be made to expand Federal spending on the domestic front. What does this mean? It means that in the next fiscal year we shall probably face a deficit of $4 billion or $5 billion, thus accentuating inflation, which constitutes the greatest threat to the solidarity of our country today.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly it is false security for us to believe that in the field of foreign relations or in the national defense program we can win a war merely with a checkbook. The McClellan committee has spent the last 2 weeks taking testimony concerning the work stoppages and the slowdowns in missile development at Cape Canaveral. Approximately 90,000 man-days have been lost. Witness after witness said that this occurrence set our program back many months, because the delays cannot be measured simply by enumerating 90,000 man-days. The delays set in motion a chain reaction, because one department, one experiment, or one building is dependent upon what happens ahead of it.

So it results in many delays. I hope the Congress and the administration will give attention to this situation, and will realize that we are not behind in the missile race because of a lack of dollars; we are behind because there have been, among other things, work stoppages and workers leaving the job, slowdowns, and other acts that our Government has wrongfully tolerated.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his contribution.

SPECIAL FINANCING NEEDED

Mr. President, when Secretary Dillon and Under Secretary of State Ball testified before the Appropriations Committee on this appropriation bill, I asked whether there would be submitted to the Congress any recommendations for increasing taxes in order to finance this new, long-range spending program in Latin America—which, of course, will automatically increase our annual deficits by the amount of the annual appropriations. The reply by Secretary Dillon indicates that too frequently those in charge of formulating our foreign policy, especially the economic and financial aspects of that policy, are completely blind to the fact that when we incur deficits, we are not helping ourselves and we are not helping the recipient nations.

At this time I wish to emphasize that while I wholeheartedly approve of programs which will stabilize conditions in Latin America, I am fearful that we are making commitments which will not achieve those objectives, will not gain us friends, and will not solidify all the nations in this hemisphere; and that once more we shall be making a tragic mistake and shall be blundering by trying to provide money with which to dictate to the countries which are to be the recipients of this financial aid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief colloquy which appears on page 46 of the hearings. It deals with the necessity to increase taxes, just as we adopted a new tax program in order to finance the highway program. It is time for us to become realistic; and we should not deliberately jeopardize either the security of our Republic or the security of our friends in Latin America.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearings was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator DWORSHAK. As a part of this long-range program, which is commendable in many ways as compared to an annual program, are you recommending to the Congress any means for increasing taxes to finance this plan so that we will not automatically increase our annual deficits by this amount?

Secretary DILLON. I would say that question should come to me.

We do not expect that we will have any increases in taxes.

Senator DWORSHAK. How are you going to finance this?

Secretary DILLON. Except such increases as compensate for the investment incentive program which we are suggesting, we do not feel that this program in itself will lead to U.S. Government deficits.

It is true we have a deficit this year and we will have a deficit next year, but not due solely to this program or even to a major extent to this program.

Senator DWORSHAK. How do you finance this money, then, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary DILLON. Through the general revenues of the United States.

Senator DWORSHAK. Does it not to that extent contribute to the expenditures and thereby will be reflected in the final computation of the deficit or surplus?

Secretary DILLON. That is correct.

But we don't think we need any extra specific taxes for the purpose of taking care of this particular appropriation any more than we need extra additional taxes to take care of the unemployment compensation.

Senator DWORSHAK. We did on the highway program, did we not?

Secretary DILLON. We had to take care of that. We had to ask specific taxes.

Senator DWORSHAK. We might follow the same procedure on this.

Secretary DILLON. We are not suggesting it in this case, Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in speaking briefly on the bill, it is my purpose to call the attention of my colleagues and the attention of the administration to the fact that what we are doing—laudable though it is, and even though I will support it—is inadequate. This is a very important point, but I do not believe it has been made thus far. I think it is essential that we understand it, because in our attempts to make this program adequate, we can do some effective things which will not cost us money. I make this point in response to the remarks made by our friend, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. So I point out that in our attempts to make this program adequate, some of the things we can do may very well involve investments, both public and private, from our friends and allies in Europe, as well as from the private economic system in the United States and in other countries.

Our objective is success. But if we imagine that we can successfully counter the Communist economic offensive, as it is manifesting itself in Latin America, by appropriating the amounts called for by this bill, and if we believe that will be sufficient, we shall find that to be a snare and a delusion.

Therefore, in connection with this matter, I cannot remain silent.

Mr. President, as to the need, let me say that the latest estimates indicate that for the next 10 years, the foreign public loan and grant needs of Latin America will average between $1,500 million and $2,500 million annually. Mr. President, generally speaking, the broad average of our public investments in Latin America during the last 10 years has been at the rate of approximately $600 million a year, which is about the amount this bill provides; $1,500 million to $2,500 million is roughly 3 or 4 times that amount. Yet that is needed in order to bring about a 2 percent per capita growth rate in the development of Latin American countries; and it is generally conceded that that is about the minimum growth rate with which we can get by and still can offer a really competitive factor to what the Communists promise to achieve by means of the iron discipline and the deprivation of freedom which they seek to impose upon countries.

Mr. President, the fact that Castroism is rife in Latin America—and it is, and that has been testified to here, today—is attributable to what the committee itself states in the report. In that connection, I now read from page 3 of the report:

The fruits of the economic development process have not been spread throughout the populace of many of these nations. This imbalance in the development process has created a breeding ground for unrest as major segments of the population in Latin American countries see the benefits that economic development bring but fail to participate in those benefits. It is this unrest upon which communism is seeking to feed in order to strengthen its influence.

So, Mr. President, first and foremost, we are satisfying only a small part of the need.

Aside from the need for public funds, let us also understand that we carry on an enormous trade with Latin America. Indeed, approximately 44 percent of Latin American exports are taken by the United States. Let us also remember that 35 percent of all Latin American exports are taken by Western Europe. Let us also remember that Latin America is in very grave trouble in terms of its development, because Latin America's share of world exports has dropped very materially—from 11.1 percent in 1950 to 7.1 percent in 1959, the last year for which we have such figures.

So in Latin America there is not only a challenge by the Communists, but there is also social injustice, as the committee report states, and there is also a declining rate of Latin American exports, which in a real sense and a direct financial sense is far more important to Latin America than even aid itself.

Mr. President, what is to be done? This is the main point I should like to leave with the Senate, in connection with this matter.

First, Mr. President, we need at least to double the aid to Latin America, which in this bill is fixed at $600 million. I agree that we cannot appropriate all that is needed, nor should we be called upon to appropriate it. But we can give diplomatic leadership to our NATO allies. Mr. Rusk is now in Oslo, and perhaps is discussing this very matter with our NATO allies. This approach, Mr. President, is the approach of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which the Senate ratified only a short time ago. This is one way in which Europe's new-found prosperity can be manifested most effectively.

I urge our administration to move into that situation with the boldness and the vigor it promised in the course of the campaign last year, in order to make good on the opportunity really to do the job in the massive way that Latin America needs, and which we have found from hard experience is the only real answer to the Communist drive itself. For where we have acted massively, as we did in Europe, by means of the Marshall plan, we have been successful; but where we have "piddled," we have been unsuccessful; and that has been the postwar history of the economic aid and technical assistance given by the United States. Where we have "piddled," we have been unsuccessful. This has been the postwar history of the economic and technical assistance of the United States.

First, let us get the Europeans into the act with us, and double the amount which is contemplated for Latin American economic development plans, from $600 million to $1,200 million. It can be done. It requires our leadership to bring it about.

Second, the economic system is critically important in this whole situation. Just as South America cannot long survive without trade, so it cannot long survive without private investments.

In recent years our private investment in Latin America has averaged about half a billion dollars a year. Indeed, we have a private investment of more than $8 billion. The trouble is that half of it is in the extractive industries, such as oil, in Venezuela, and in very few countries. So we must attract private investment by favorable tax consideration, by diplomatic treaties with respect to taxes which do not provide double taxation, by making investment guarantees far more attractive than they are today, and by getting the Export-Import Bank to be far more liberal than it is now, though I am confident that under Mr. Linder, it will be—all this so there will be at least a doubling in the amount of private investment in Latin America.

The third point is what Latin America itself must do. I like very much what President Kennedy said, in sending his message to Congress on this subject, to the effect that we should expect an intensive program of self-help from Latin America. I hope every Senator who speaks will encourage the President to keep his back stiff on that subject.

I thoroughly endorse what the Senator from Delaware proposes to do, namely, to establish an interest standard so that Latin Americans will not be victimized on interest rates which prevail there, but which interest rates should not tolerate when our money is being loaned to that area of the world.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator not interpret the intent of the legislation as set forth in the committee report as opposing the lending of money in any Latin American country at higher than the legal bank loan rate in that country?

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator. Whether the amendment is adopted or not, although I hope it will be—it may be thought to encumber and make difficult the matter of legislating—I shall take the report to mean precisely that. I hope very much, from what the Senator, who is a member of the committee, has said, and from what I and others say, it will be crystal clear to our administration that we expect it to keep its back stiff on this issue.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the maximum legal rate in many Latin American countries is 12 percent. Yet they are unable to get loans from the banks. As I understand, they must go to finance companies, which in some cases are undoubtedly established by the banks, and must pay as high as 36 percent to get the money, even though the legal limit of a bank loan is 12 percent. I think we ought to have an understanding that the money shall not be loaned in any country or to any person or institution that will exact from the people more than the legal bank interest rate in that country.

Mr. JAVITS. Under the practicalities of the situation, that may be all we can do. In view of the urgency for getting this done, we will have to do it that way at this time.

I also hope this legislation will help our Government throw itself behind the general process of bringing down the interest rate structure in the Latin-American countries.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it will.

Mr. JAVITS. One way to do it is through the fact that there will be more development if we help other countries do it effectively, but the other way to do it is to have an impact on interest rates in order to bring them down to a lower basis by the terms which we fix with respect to the way our money is to be used.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the report of the committee will effect a cure in the situation which exists in many countries to the south of us, but I think it will exert an influence on the rate structure, and perhaps improve the situation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I agree with him. I hope very much the statement of the eloquent and distinguished Senator, and the committee report, and my own humble efforts will help make the situation crystal clear. I am certainly delighted to be joined by so distinguished a Senator as my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Before the Senator gets too far away from his comments on the need for private capital investment, I should like to join him in agreeing that this is the great area we must encourage. I think the Senator will agree that the help the Government can give in creating new jobs or developing the economy is extremely limited, and that there must be more private capital investment.

Is it the Senator's understanding that, because of Castro's ability to expropriate American property at will, instead of dollars flowing into the Latin-American countries in the quantities that prevailed 2 or 3 years ago, they are now flowing out of the Latin-American countries?

Mr. JAVITS. My understanding is that the kind of thing that took place in Cuba sets back capital investment and scares it. I am not acquainted with the figures, as to whether the outflow from Latin America is greater than the inflow. Nevertheless, it is entirely true that when there is a Castro situation or, as happened in Mexico some years ago, there is an expropriation of the oil interests, there is immediately a deleterious effect, a reverse effect in private investment through the whole hemisphere.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not know the amount of the outflow, either. I have inquired from the two major sources. Unfortunately, I did not ask in time to get the information for this debate. I am told, however, on unimpeachable authority, that in the last year one billion American dollars flowed out of Venezuela and either came back to this country or went into foreign countries where it has been deposited for those people.

It is my fear that we may with the right hand try to do some good and with the left hand do much harm by two things: First, if we adopt certain tax proposals that would discourage foreign investment, as contained in President Kennedy's tax program, and, the other, by allowing the Castro situation to continue, which is bound to have a bad effect all over Latin America.

I think, as we consider what we can do for our Latin-American friends, we should also consider what we must do to put our own political house in order, so we can adequately take care of the people in South and Central America and Mexico.

We often tell our Latin-American friends that they must put their house in order. I think they are perfectly proper in looking to the north of them and telling us to get our political house in order, so that our help is not offset by harm we may do in other fields.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator has underlined and emphasized the point I wished to make, that this is the major effort we must make. When someone in Congress says, "This is inadequate," others jump up and say, "Let us double the appropriation," instead of using the boldness that President Kennedy talked about, and our brains in order to bring about two and three times what is here involved by using ingenuity and enterprise in terms of getting our European allies, who can afford it, to join. Also we should think in terms of having our free enterprise system join in the effort, in which it can make a profit as well as do something in the interest of being constructive in terms of strengthening the domestic economy.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks in a minute.

To summarize, the need is very great. We can help to meet the need with European partners, called for by the OECD, and Europeans can assist because of their new-found, more prosperous condition.

We need large private investment. We must encourage it in our own legislation.

I now come to the administration. We must have encouragement also from the countries in which such investment is required, first, by some respect for investments, perhaps through an investment code; or, second, by a willingness to enter into treaties of friendship and commerce which provide for proper tax treatment of private investment; or, third, through the understanding that the people investing their money occasionally will want someone in the country to look after it. Therefore, many policies which are pursed in Latin-American countries which prevent anybody from entering the country in a supervisory capacity must be reconsidered.

All this, our Government should understand, can be at least as important as aid in stimulating other sources of capital quite apart from government, since capital is critically important to all of these countries.

I now come to the question of trade, which is along the same line. It is a

fact that through restrictions on the importation of such things as coffee and sugar from Latin American countries European governments are materially restricting the amount of trade they ought to be doing with Latin America now, also in view of their new-found prosperity. Our Government can help Latin America by using its influence with our European allies in order to reduce barriers to Latin American trade.

Finally, there is the matter of technical assistance. The private economic system of the United States has an enormous potential for technical assistance, for providing technicians out of its tremendous reserves of technical skills to help in Latin America. Our Government has not yet developed ways and means for inducing business to give up a man or a woman for 2 years or 3 years in order to do this kind of job. The same technical assistance resources are available among our European allies, just as the same private economic system can be extremely useful in private investment, together with our own, in supporting what our Government should do with respect to Latin America.

I hope the administration understands that this program will be completely inadequate to do the job of beating the Communists in Latin America. I hope the administration will use its boldness, initiative, and ingenuity along the lines to which I have referred, which have been developed in the NATO Parliamentarians, an organization with which I happen to be closely connected, and in other organizations, and perhaps along other lines it can discover itself, in order to at least bring about a measure of progress by devoting to this task the amount of resources required for the progress we seek.

Let us understand that every doctrine of "hands across the sea" is now subordinated to the fact that we are in a tough, grim war. The only thing that will count in terms of survival is success. We must make available the means and the men with which to attain that success. Nothing less than success will do, no matter how deserving the effort.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I commend my distinguished colleague for the fine presentation he has made. I agree entirely with the views he has expressed. I find great comfort in the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I hope our Government will administer the program with good judgment and sympathetic understanding for the Latin American problems, so that the money we appropriate will bring maximum benefits to our neighbors to the south.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the purpose of the authorization now before the Congress is to provide funds for the program of aid and assistance outlined last year in the Act of Bogotá. This aid will go into works and projects that can be expected directly to affect the peoples of Latin American countries and bringing about perceptible improvements in living conditions and aspirations.

The program, which was outlined last year by President Eisenhower and authorized at that time, is not a hasty move to combat Castro's efforts. It has been under study and development since 1958 when then President Kubitschek of Brazil suggested Operation Pan American to meet the problem of social and economic betterment as well as development throughout the hemisphere.

The aim of the program is social progress, by overcoming the barriers of geographical and social isolation, individual illiteracy and lack of educational opportunities, archaic tax and land structures, and any other such institutional or traditional obstacles to broad participation in economic growth.

The cooperative efforts that are being exerted by the United States and other Latin American nations present a stark and vivid contrast to the tactics now being pursued by Castro and his Communist mentors. Government by firing squad, expulsion of priests, closing of mission schools, and a continued influx of Soviet military advisers reveal beyond doubt that Castro is a lot more concerned with maintaining his own position than he is with helping the people of Cuba. Under Castro's guidance, Cuba is rapidly becoming a horrible example for the whole hemisphere, a warning more effective than mere words, as to what communism really means.

The appropriation now under consideration should give the United States a welcome opportunity to show our true colors, our genuine concern for economic progress and for political freedoms. I hope that the Government will administer the program with good judgment and sympathetic understanding for Latin American problems so that the money here appropriated will bring maximum benefits for our neighbors to the South.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at an interest rate in excess of eight per centum per annum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, after conferring with the Treasury Department and members of the committee, we have placed the ceiling at 8 percent rather than the first proposed 6 percent.

Mr. President, I should like for the RECORD to show that this is a ceiling and not a suggested interest rate. The RECORD should also show that even 8 percent will represent a substantial reduction as compared to existing interest rates in many countries involved. In many of these countries the interest rates today are from 10 to 12 percent, and in some they are as high as 20 to 25 percent.

I understand that some of the housing loans being financed by the government under other programs provide interest rates as high as 14 to 15 percent.

If this amendment is adopted it will mean that the assistance being furnished by the U.S. Government under the terms of the bill will go to the people themselves. I think it is very important that the administration accept this 8-percent rate, not as a suggested interest rate, but as a ceiling on the interest rate which can be charged. If we are to assist these people at all with American taxpayers' money, it is very important we make sure that our assistance go to the people of the country and not to a group which can use it to exploit these people, as has been done very often in the past.

Certainly, when someone buys a farm or a $5,000 home and has to pay an interest rate of 20 to 25 percent it will actually mean that every 4 or 5 years he will pay for the home without owning it.

When the U.S. Government puts up its money and cooperates with such practices we will lose rather than make friends.

I believe it is very appropriate that we should put a ceiling on the interest rate; and, as I said before, I want the administration to accept it as a ceiling and not as a suggested rate.

It should be pointed out that under the amendment the rate will be applicable on the funds appropriated under this section of the bill. It does not cover any other bill. It will, however, cover money appropriated under this section of this bill whether in the form of dollars or in the form of the local currencies of the respective countries obtained with these dollars. In other words, the ceiling on interest rates would cover all loans which are generated under the bill as a result of this $500 million appropriation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe we should be clear with respect to one point. In the form in which the amendment is offered, it applies only to the paragraph relating to the $500 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not believe it applies to the $100 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. It would apply to one section and not to the entire bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I wish to support the Senator in this respect. Whatever may be the manner in which the amendment must be drafted when the bill goes into conference, whatever practical problems may be encountered, I believe the thrust of the amendment is right. I congratulate the Senator from Delaware for de-

veloping the idea. This is the influence we ought to stress when we talk about self-help in Latin America, and I support the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from New York for his support.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The point raised with respect to the amendment stating a maximum rate for the most unusual cases should be emphasized. The rate should not be looked upon as an established rate, but rather as the ceiling rate.

Furthermore, as was indicated earlier, the committee discussed the subject. The purpose of the amendment was discussed in the committee. It was the consensus of the Committee on Appropriations, as the chairman has indicated and as the report indicates, and I am confident something can be worked out as to the technical application of the amendment so that it will fulfill the purpose expressed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. He is correct. The committee in its report did clearly spell out that such was their intention. By adopting the amendment we are placing in the bill itself language to carry out the intent of the committee as expressed in the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator knows, many of us have always been in favor of the general idea now pinpointed by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. However, in the interest of making sure that we are moving in the right direction, I am glad to note that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations will take the amendment to conference, because in conference, once again, the Treasury officials and others interested in the program will be given the opportunity to express their opinions, as I believe they have already expressed them to the Senator from Delaware and others, who have indicated a close interest in this meritorious move to meet a need which has been all too apparent in the history of Latin America for too many years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Montana. While the Treasury Department has not endorsed the specific language, it has approved the principle which we are trying to set forth and has agreed that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I listened to the discussions in the Committee on Foreign Relations concerning the disparity between interest rates which are charged in some of the South American countries and those charged in this country. I wish to subscribe, as did the Senator from New York, to the thoughts expressed by the Senator from Delaware. In substance, they conform with the views expressed by the members of the committee, and it would seem to be a paradox and an injustice to provide this money and then to have the high rates of interest of 12 and 15 percent charged to the borrowers of the money in the South American nations when they wanted to make use of it. I commend the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his support. As I pointed out earlier, in one particular instance we put up the money for one housing project, and the rate charged by our Government was around 5 percent. Yet the man who was buying the home was paying 14 or 15 percent interest. Rather than generating friendships, we were in effect being looked upon as shylocks cooperating with a group to exploit the people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 6518) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1215) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, may I inquire what the pending business is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate bill 1215, to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the further information of the Senate, as the Chair has pointed out, the unfinished business is the proposed amendment to the Battle Act, which will be taken up immediately at the conclusion of the morning hour on Thursday. It is my understanding that there are at the desk several amendments, which will be printed in the RECORD. There may be some debate. It is anticipated that at the conclusion of the debate on the amendments to the Battle Act, the Senate will consider various measures on the General Calendar and any nominations which may be available for consideration at that time.

FAVORABLE BALANCE OF TRADE IS EXPOSED AS A DANGEROUS FALLACY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, despite almost continuous vocal evidences of concern at rising unemployment and economic inactivity exhibited by the administration and Congress, there continues to be widespread refusal in the same circles to admit that one of the basic causes of such conditions is the inflexible trade program to which the United States adheres in practice. When the situation became so critical as to cause a deficit in our balance of payments and a serious and alarming outflow of gold, the absurdity of our inflexible trade policy and practice was and is defended by assertions that our exports exceed imports and that any relaxation of our inflexible position in order to limit the quantity of imports would bring about retaliation which, in turn, would destroy our favorable balance of trade. In the April 20 issue of America's Textile Reporter there appears an article entitled "Favorable Balance of Trade Is Exposed as a Dangerous Fallacy." This article reveals our so-called favorable balance of trade as a large part fiction, and the alleged fear of retaliation against import quotas as a paper tiger. I ask unanimous consent that this splendid article be reprinted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAVORABLE BALANCE OF TRADE IS EXPOSED AS A DANGEROUS FALLACY

Much has been said of late of our favorable balance of trade. This surplus in our import-export account has been stressed repeatedly by Government and private officials as the chief reason why the United States should not resort to protectionism to correct its balance of payments deficit. As President Kennedy phrased the argument less than a week after taking office: "We should realize that the balance of trade has been in our favor and the gold flow would have been substantially worse if we had not had this favorable balance of trade."

By definition, balance of payments is the difference between our receipts and expenditures in all our transactions with other countries. In 1960, for example, the United States spent a total of $32 billion abroad while taking in $28 billion, leaving an unfavorable balance or deficit of about $4 billion. That portion of our balance of payments which deals exclusively with the exchange of physical goods or merchandise is called balance of trade. Last year, the United

States had a balance of trade surplus of about $5 billion as a result of exports of about $20 billion and imports of around $15 billion.

Advocates of our present course in international commerce are fond of citing these figures to prove we're on the right track. They argue convincingly that the $4 billion balance of payments deficit would have been much greater if it had not been for the $5 billion balance of trade surplus.

On closer scrutiny, however, the Government figures break down into part fiction and part fact. This was brought out recently by Representative JOHN H. DENT, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who has just been named chairman of a Special Subcommittee To Study the Impact of Imports on Employment. Mr. DENT disclosed that the import side of the ledger has been generally understated while exports have been subjected to considerable padding.

For example, about $1 billion can be deducted from the $20 billion export column for U.S. Government transactions, that is, foreign aid purchases of American goods, etc., which, as Congressman DENT pointed out, by "no stretch of the imagination can be called commercial exports." Another half-billion can be subtracted for subsidies paid on wheat and cotton exports made necessary by Government farm programs which price American farm products out of world markets. Also included as exports are foreign sales of American agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 (that is, sales for local currencies), emergency relief, sheer donations and barter deals. "Stripped of subsidized farm products, sales for foreign currencies, outright grants, foreign aid sales and so forth, genuine exports reached about $16 billion last year—not $20 billion as reported," Mr. DENT declared.

"The import side of our trade figures is equally misleading if taken at face value," Representative DENT continued. "First, the United States, unlike other major trading nations of the world, uses a system of foreign evaluation of imports rather than domestic or landed cost. Charges such as ocean freight and marine insurance are not included and this omission minimizes their value.

"Secondly, evaluation without a comparable physical volume figure is next to meaningless because foreign prices are 10 to 50 percent or more below American prices. All else being equal, foreign manufacturers can send in two items for the price of a single unit of the same American item. While the dollar volume may appear insignificant, the quantity of imports may be substantial."

To illustrate his point, Congressman DENT cited $15 million of artificial flower imports in 1959. "This $15 million became $30 million in the hands of the importer, jumped to $60 million with the wholesaler, and finally landed on the retail shelves for sale at $120 million," the Pennsylvania Democrat explained. "And while they easily undersold American flowers by a substantial amount, it can be seen that the original $15 million flower imports packed a wallop far beyond anything the initial figures might indicate.

"The point is that $15 million of foreign-made flowers represent many more flowers than $15 million worth of ours. To varying degrees, the same situation applies to our balance of trade figures. Government statistics fallaciously compare the $20 billion export sum with the $15 billion import figure and deduce that we are $5 billion in the clear. These figures are no more comparable than apples and oranges, because imports are pegged to a foreign valuation and a foreign economy far below ours."

In other words, cut to the bone, our import-export account—far from showing a huge surplus—probably shows a small deficit. In 1959, when the surplus was officially pegged at less than $2 billion, the balance of trade was almost certainly against us. Hence, while it is true that a high level of commercial exports is a favorable item in our balance of payments, the balance of trade can hardly be used as an argument in favor of current trade policies. Since the balance in true commercial trade is probably against us, it is more logical to argue that our trade program is a flop.

Many authorities include the exchange of services in our balance of trade. In 1960, we had receipts of $7.4 billion and expenditures of $5.5 billion in our service accounts (excluding military spending) for a favorable balance of almost $2 billion. But services are not directly affected by tariffs and quotas; these restrictions apply only to imports of physical goods. Obviously, a surplus in our service accounts cannot be used as an argument for our trade program. In fact, the one item in our service accounts most directly influenced by trade policy—transportation—consistently runs against us. In 1960, the deficit was over $150 million.

Another favorite argument of freetraders is that protectionism would provoke retaliation which, in turn, would reduce our export earnings. In his February 6 balance-of-payments message to Congress, President Kennedy phrased the argument this way: "A return to protectionism is not a solution. Such a course would provoke retaliation; and the balance of trade, which is now substantially in our favor, could be turned against us with disastrous effects to the dollar."

This is what Tariff Commissioners Walter R. Schreiber and Glenn W. Sutton said of this argument in their dissenting opinion to the Commission's decision rejecting the cotton industry's section 22 request for new restrictions on cotton textile imports: "The major error of this position is that it obfuscates the realities of international trade. Such trade between two nations is something more than a vendetta, usually covering a variety of products, and usually determined by germane economic considerations. Since retaliatory action hindering the use of U.S. cotton could have no economic value for a foreign country supplying U.S. imports of cotton articles, and since such action might even impair other important aspects of trade with the United States, it would be most unlikely that foreign countries would even seriously consider invoking retaliatory measures."

But accepting the premise for the sake of argument, it certainly does not follow that retaliation would turn our balance of trade against us, with or without disastrous effects to the dollar. As retaliation assumes a reduction in exports, a return to protectionism assumes a reduction in imports. Since there would be offsetting decreases in both imports and exports, there would be no major change in either our balance of trade or balance of payments.

In fact, as Congressman DENT points out, inflexible free trade policies, coupled with expanding foreign aid programs, pose a more serious threat to the dollar than any prospective return to protectionism. The interaction of these programs either forces American competitors out of business or forces them to invest overseas in hope of gaining similar advantages.

"Examine the effect of these policies on our gold reserves, which were at their peak of almost $25 billion when the Marshall plan started in 1948," Congressman DENT told the House of Representatives. "By 1955, they had descended to $22 billion, then $20 billion in 1959, $18 billion in 1960, and are currently nearing $17 billion.

"On the surface it would seem that even $17 billion is a rather sizable and comforting nest egg. Our editorial-writing economists assure us almost weekly that this is the case. But is the reserve free and clear? We are required by law to backstop every $4 in currency with a dollar in gold. Therefore, the $40-odd billion which now exists in currency must have a foundation in gold of about $11 billion. Subtract $11 billion from $17 billion and the remaining $6 billion represents our surplus reserves—or do they?

"Our trade and aid policies during the past decade have built up foreign claims on our reserves to almost $20 billion, of which we can honor only $6 billion, leaving us short about $14 billion. For this reason, we are hearing much comment today about confidence in the dollar. In light of what we have just described, this is very understandable. Without at least a thin line of confidence in the dollar, foreign governments may wish to activate their dollar claims and reinvest their funds in more fruitful investment climates elsewhere.

"The new management in Washington seems to show an awareness of the balance of payments problem, but current steps to deal with it so far touch only on the fringes. Even if the gold outflow is stopped, dollar claims will continue to grow and someday will have to be met. The proposed reduction of duty-free purchases by our returning tourists, the economies made in restricting the expansion of officers' clubs and the like in our bases overseas, as well as a few other modest penny-like efforts in this direction, will neither reduce the already outstanding claims against the dollar nor will improve our competitive position. Actually it seems certain that our deficit will increase rather than decline.

"This is not idle speculation. On February 14, at hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the OECD treaty, Senator SPARKMAN asked the new Under Secretary of State George Ball: 'Might we reasonably hope that our burden in the field of foreign aid would be lessened?'

"Mr. Ball answered: 'I should say that the answer is probably "no" because I think that our foreign aid effort at the moment * * * must be increased rather than diminished.'

"It should be obvious to everyone that some investments that would be made in this country, if the competitive situation with respect to imports were better, will be made outside the country. Why, for example, did Mr. Ford send $360 million to England rather than investing it here? Evidently, in his judgment, the outlook was for a better return over there. Therefore, this country lost the employment value of a $365 million investment. This happens to be a dramatic example. It is, however, duplicated several times over in the aggregate. Foreign investment is fine so long as it does not mean that much less investment here.

"There has been a great deal of talk about growth in this country and the great need of it. How otherwise will we put the nearly 6 million unemployed back to work? Yet, how will we get this growth so long as foreign investment pastures continue to look greener than those in the United States. Is it not time that we grow up and look the facts of our foreign trade program in the face?"

Obviously, one of the facts to be faced is the padding of our favorable balance of trade.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the last few months the American people have heard repeated cries for sacrifices

and contributions to our Nation's security. These appeals have not fallen upon deaf ears. The American people, in my opinion, are waiting and ready to respond to the demands called for in the defense of freedom. From the mail which comes to my office daily, I feel that Americans are anxious and determined to meet the challenges of our times.

In an open letter to the President, Alicia Patterson, editor and publisher of Newsday, asked:

What do we do? Where do we sacrifice?

I express the hope that Miss Patterson's questions are answered in detail so that all Americans can rise to the challenge of the sixties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the Newsday editorial of May 5, 1961, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER

(By Alicia Patterson)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In your great inaugural speech, January 20, you called upon the citizens of the United States "to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out." You reminded us that "only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum dangers." And you said to us: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

These were words in the tradition of Winston Churchill when, in the hour of England's greatest danger, he offered its people only blood, toil, sweat, and tears if they wished to remain free of Nazi tyranny.

All of us wanted to respond to your call, although you did not spell out what the American people must do in order to measure up to the challenge. We have heard the same message from you again and again, most recently in Chicago, the last weekend in April. At that time you said: "Our greatest adversary is not the Russians. It is our own unwillingness to do what must be done."

But still we do not know what it is that must be done, and how you as our elected leader want us to do it. The American people are willing to make any sacrifice to preserve this system of government and the freedom that is its warp and woof. What do we do? Where do we sacrifice?

We want to know so that we can let our readers know. For "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" (I Corinthians xiv: 8.)

NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, 1964–65

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the building and construction industry of New York City to Robert Moses, the president of the New York World's Fair Corp., and the accompanying declaration of purpose and principles adopted by all members of the industry, both management and labor. The declaration is most worthy of attention, for it is a joint management-labor pledge to facilitate the expeditious and uninterrupted completion of all construction and building work at the 1964 World's Fair site.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUILDING TRADES EMPLOYERS ASSOCIATION, INC., NEW YORK, N.Y.; THE GENERAL CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.; BUILDING CONTRACTORS EMPLOYERS ASSOCIATION, INC., NEW YORK, N.Y.; BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL OF GREATER NEW YORK, AFL–CIO, NEW YORK, N.Y.,

March 16, 1961.

Mr. ROBERT MOSES,
President, New York World's Fair 1964–65 Corp., Flushing, N.Y.

DEAR MR. MOSES: We, of the building and construction industry of the city of New York, have observed with admiration your vigorous and determined efforts to organize and create a New York World's Fair—1964–65. This venture will again illustrate your magnificent record of achievements in public service over the many years.

However, we are concerned as to whether or not the public and business generally in our city realize the enormity of the task with which you are confronted and their obligations to actively and enthusiastically support this project. Our city, and all those who reside and work here, will derive innumerable advantages and benefits from a successful fair. It will enhance the prestige of our city, State, and Nation in world affairs and prove again that the city stands in the forefront in seeking international peace, good will, and understanding among all nations and peoples. It will bring to the city millions of visitors from all parts of the world and afford to them the opportunity of observing at firsthand a free democracy in action and what it is capable of accomplishing.

It goes without saying that it will likewise bring prosperity to the city and work for many thousands in all walks of life.

Our industry looks forward to the privilege of participating and aiding you in this great work. As some evidence of our desire to help and support you, we are submitting to you herewith a "declaration of purpose and principles to facilitate the expeditious and uninterrupted completion of all construction and building work at the fair site," which has recently been adopted by all in the industry—both management and labor.

We hope that all others in the city will become alive to the greatness of this project and will wholeheartedly join in a concerted effort to assure the success of the fair.

With all good wishes.

Cordially yours,

I. ROY PSATY.
DAVID J. MARTIN, Jr.
JOSEPH J. FATER.
PETER BRENNAN.

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE AND PRINCIPLES

Mindful that the 1964–65 World's Fair affords our Nation, State, and city creative opportunity to further the cause of international peace and good will through mutual understanding, and,

Desirous that our city be kept in the vanguard of the effort to achieve these high purposes; and recognizing the need of assuring to all participants in the fair that construction and building be not impeded by disputes, the building and construction industry of the city of New York and each operating and established segment of the industry, including management and labor, and other allied services and enterprises, as together represented by the Building Trade Employers' Association, General Contractors Association, Building Contractors Employers' Association, and the Building & Construction Trades Council of Greater New York, AFL–CIO, have formulated and adopted the following declaration of purpose and principles to facilitate the expeditious and uninterrupted completion of all construction and building work at the site of the fair and all work related thereto:

1. There shall be no lockouts, strikes, picketing or interference with the progress of construction and building at the fair site and on all work relating thereto.

2. To assure the peaceful and equitable consideration and resolution of all disputes which may arise during such fair construction, building and related work, the industry hereby establishes and expresses its firm purpose to adhere to the program and procedures hereinafter set forth.

(a) An advisory committee of the building and construction industry has been established consisting of 10 members, 5 from management interests and 5 from labor. The Fair Corp. is invited to designate two representatives to sit with the committee, having voice but no vote in the deliberations of the committee.

Peter W. Eller is the chairman of the committee and Walter M. Colleran, its secretary.

The committee is to serve throughout the period of construction and building of the fair. It is to meet regularly, keep itself informed of all developments and of all disputes which arise and use its best efforts and influence to assure adherence to the program and procedures set forth herein.

It shall be the duty of the chairman to preside over meetings of the committee and to perform the functions indicated below and the duty of the secretary to keep an accurate record of the minutes of all meetings and of all disputes which arise, the status and disposition of all disputes and facilitate the prompt referral and resolution of such disputes by the proper forum having jurisdiction thereof.

In the event the office of chairman or secretary of the committee becomes vacant, the members of the advisory committee shall promptly designates the successor.

(b) Disputes covering wages, hours or working conditions or involving application or interpretation of existing trade agreements shall be promptly referred by any party thereto to—

1. the mediation processes provided in the agreement of the particular trade involved, and failing resolution, to—

2. the arbitration procedure, if any, provided in said agreement for final and binding decision, or

3. if arbitration is not provided in such agreement, or if the parties thereto jointly so elect, to Peter W. Eller for final and binding arbitration.

(c) Jurisdictional disputes shall be promptly referred by the complaining union to—

1. The president of the Building Trades Council for mediation. Failing resolution, it shall be referred, or if in the first instance the dispute was not referred to him by a union then the contractor involved may refer the same, to—

2. Peter W. Eller and the president of the Building Trades Council for mediation, and if this step fails, to—

3. The executive committee of the Building Trade Employers' Association for final and binding arbitration. Peter W. Eller shall sit with the executive committee when it acts as arbitrator.

(d) Disputes of any other character shall be promptly referred—

1. By any party thereto to step 2 of the procedures prescribed herein for the settlement of jurisdictional disputes, and failing settlement, shall be referred to—

2. Peter W. Eller for final and binding arbitration.

The settlement and decisions of any disputes involving the fair and the criteria therefore shall not constitute or be deemed to establish any precedent for disputes arising outside the fair. Moreover, in the resolution of disputes involving the fair, due consideration shall be given to the purposes and unique character of the fair and its significance generally. The importance of participation in it by other nations and interests and the need to afford those nations and interests reasonable opportunity to express at the fair their native culture, developments and progress, shall be recognized. If deemed necessary, the U.S. State Department and the international section of the national AFL–CIO may be consulted.

Advisory committee: Peter W. Eller, chairman; Walter M. Colleran, secretary.

Labor: Peter Brennan, Michael DiSilvestro, Charles Johnson, Jr., Richard H. Nolan, Harry Van Arsdale, Jr.

Management: William B. F. Drew, Joseph J. Fater, James B. Martin, Nicholas B. O'Connell, I. Roy Psaty.

CAMPAIGN TO SPUR WHEAT SALES

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on Tuesday, May 9, there appeared in the Wall Street Journal a very important article with reference to spurring wheat sales. The article is entitled "Campaign To Spur Wheat Sales Stresses New Products; Instant Variety Offered."

The article is a report of what is happening in many of the wheat producing States. One of the greatest of the wheat producing States happens to be my State of Kansas. Through their own State legislatures, States are arriving at methods and means of assisting in the better marketing of products made from wheat.

That statement applies to a number of States, including Kansas, and shows what the States themselves, and certain organizations interested in wheat growers and wheat products, are able to do in their respective areas.

This article is so well written that I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks. I am sure that great strides not only will be made in the situation referred to in the article but may be utilized generally in many of the other surplus areas with respect to agricultural products.

Seven years ago, the Oregon Wheat Growers League pioneered the farmer side of the movement, getting the State legislature to adopt a production tax on every bushel of wheat sold in the State. The money was earmarked for wheat marketing projects. One by one, other major wheat States have adopted such a tax: Kansas, Washington, Idaho, Colorado, Nebraska, North Dakota, and this year South Dakota. Present taxes range from one-fifth of a cent to one-half cent a bushel. A total of some $1,250,000 is collected every year.

Income from production taxes is being used to run the Redi-Wheat test in Kansas. In Nebraska, a State laboratory has been set up to explore new industrial uses for wheat. Colorado is concentrating on transportation problems; North Dakota on the possibilities of Durum wheat, the kind used to make spaghetti and macaroni. The wheat growers' organizations also are farming out research projects to private laboratories on contract.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture is making its knowledge and research facilities available when it can. New wheat products are a major field of inquiry at the Department's Western Utilization Research and Development Division at Albany, Calif., which developed instant wheat. New industrial uses for wheat, such as starch, are the responsibility of the Department's Northern Regional Research Laboratory at Peoria, Ill.

RECORD EXPORTS

In cooperation with Government market developers, emissaries of two regional growers' groups, Great Plains Wheat, Inc., and Western Wheat Associates—a Pacific Northwest coalition—are striving to promote wheat exports in Europe, Africa, Latin America, southeast Asia, and Japan. Such efforts, backed by Government subsidies to keep export prices down, have been winning customers. Wheat men expect exports to reach a record 620 million bushels for the marketing year ending in June, 80 million above last year and more than double the recent low of 274 million in 1954.

At home and abroad, the wheat men must fight uphill. Americans persist in eating less and less wheat—only 164 pounds per capita last year compared with 315 pounds 50 years ago. As incomes rise, Americans are buying more meat, fruits and vegetables, and weight-watchers are cutting down on starchy foods such as bread and pastry. Overseas, changes in eating habits are less an obstacle, but competition can be fierce. World wheat production is rising; outside the United States wheat output in 1960 is estimated at about 7 billion bushels, compared with an annual average of about 5.9 bushels as recently as 1950–54.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMPAIGN TO SPUR WHEAT SALES STRESSES NEW PRODUCTS; "INSTANT" VARIETY OFFERED

(By Joe Western)

WASHINGTON.—And now, instant wheat. It's the wheat kernel itself, not ground into flour but simply stripped of most of its covering, cooked and partly dried. The kernels, light brown in color, look something like the delicacy, wild rice. Just open a can, add water, heat and serve.

Instant wheat can be purchased plain, or seasoned with chicken broth and spices. The plain kind tastes "sort of neutral," says a housewife, and that's considered a strong point. The blandness of ready-to-eat wheat, its backers claim, makes it versatile, usable in almost every way that rice is—in meat loaf, for stuffing peppers, and even in salads and desserts.

Under the trade name "Redi-Wheat," the product is showing promise in a marketing test in the greatest wheat State of them all, Kansas; not surprisingly, the wheat involved is Kansas-grown. The tryout began in March and probably will end this month. The Kansas Association of Wheat Growers, handling the test, cautiously offered only 250,000 10-ounce cans as a starter. Sales have been so brisk that a batch 6 times that big, 1,500,000 cans, has since been delivered to wholesalers. So far about half the total has been sold to retail customers, at 19 cents a can. Though local pride may be a special help in Kansas, the sponsors are optimistic about Redi-Wheat's nationwide prospects.

PART OF A BROADER EFFORT

Instant wheat is considered the first new convenience wheat product in years. Its promoters hope to get Americans, who have been shying away from wheat, to eat more of it. The development of Redi-Wheat is only a small part of an effort by wheat farmers and Uncle Sam to solve the wheat surplus problems. They want to develop new markets, new wheat products, and new ways of marketing quality wheat that will claim premium prices at home and abroad.

Wheat men hope to overcome these problems with a whole family of new products. Redi-Wheat may be little more than a beginning. Other products are in the research stage. Here are some of the possibilities for eventual introduction in the United States:

A hot drink made of toasted ground wheat dissolved in milk or water.

Wheat chips, like potato chips and corn chips, designed for picnic, cocktail party or between-meals nibbling.

Wheat foams similar to whipped egg whites for use in dessert toppings, cakes, and other foods.

New high-protein flours that would be combined with fruits, vegetables and cheeses to give new appeal to bread and pastry.

Gelatin made from wheat instead of animal tissues, for use in desserts and pastry fillings.

To expand markets overseas, the wheat researchers envision:

High-protein dry concentrates of wheat flour soluble in cold water to form bland, milk-like products for infant feeding.

Flour-like wheat concentrates for instant use in soups, stews and porridges.

Meat-like products made of a combination of whole-kernel wheat and gluten, the substance in wheat that gives dough adhesiveness. The combination, it's said, could be made to resemble smoked sausage and even hamburger.

Conversion of raw wheat kernels via broiling, husking, drying and cracking into an ancient product called bulgur that's similar both to rough rice and to Redi-Wheat. Bulgur usually comes in dry form, while the new product is canned semimoist. It's hoped that bulgur, a staple for centuries in the Middle East, may appeal to rice eaters elsewhere in Asia.

Use of gluten as a binder for irregular pieces of meat formed into loaves and cooked.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 9, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there any further business to come before the Senate? If not, I express the hope that all committees will put in a fruitful day tomorrow so that when we return on Thursday next we shall have more in the way of additional business.

I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, May 11 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 9, 1961:

U.S. MARSHAL

Elmer W. Disspayne, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Tennessee, vice Herbert E. Patrick.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Louis R. LaPorte, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Civil Engineer Corps of the U.S. Naval Reserve subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Walter C. House, Baptist chaplain, Louisville, Ky., offered the following prayer:

Father, when we lift up our petitions to Thee, we offer countless prayers of thanksgiving in Thy name. For we have been the recipients of so much of Thy love, and divine direction as a nation.

We are thankful for these men of high devotion to duty here assembled and for all the leaders of our great Nation—a Nation that Thou hast ordained to greatness because of the integrity and sacrifice of its forebears who were godly patriots and statesmen. We are thankful because so many of our leaders have sacrificed their personal ambitions to give themselves in high service to our Nation.

We are thankful that Thou hast given unto our Nation, its people and its leaders, a sacred trust to preserve freedom for the world and to foster the idea of the individual dignity of man.

We are thankful that Thou hast allowed our Nation to excel in so many achievements, but keep us mindful that this is all a part of Thy divine plan and that we are stewards accountable to Thee.

May every man of responsibility in our great Government realize as written in Thy Holy Book: "The powers that be are ordained of God." May this keep men humble as they seek Thy counsel in times of great stress and international intrigue.

Father, we earnestly make these petitions in the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 296. Concurrent resolution commending Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., for his outstanding achievement in flight into space.

CONGRATULATIONS FROM JAPAN ON FIRST MANNED ROCKET SPACE FLIGHT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to advise the Members of the House of a very warm, cordial, and sincere cablegram received this morning by our distinguished Speaker. I shall read it for the information of the Members of the House.

MAY 6, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C.:

The House of Representatives of Japan begs to offer its sincerest congratulations upon the full success in the United States first manned rocket space flight. It confidently expects this brilliant feat will form an immensely rich contribution to human happiness and world peace. Accept its profound respect to your country and its citizens.

ICHIRO KIYOSE,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Japan.

We are very grateful for this message.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 159)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization in the Federal Trade Commission.

This Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961 follows upon my message of April 13, 1961, to the Congress of the United States. It is believed that the taking effect of the reorganizations included in this plan will provide for greater efficiency in the dispatch of the business of the Federal Trade Commission.

The plan provides for greater flexibility in the handling of the business before the Commission, permitting its disposition at different levels so as better to promote its efficient dispatch. Thus, matters both of an adjudicatory and regulatory nature may, depending upon their importance and their complexity, be finally consummated by divisions of the Commission, individual Commissioners, hearing examiners, and, subject to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 241), by other employees. This will relieve the Commissioners from the necessity of dealing with many matters of lesser importance and thus conserve their time for the consideration of major matters of policy and planning. There is, however, reserved to the Commission as a whole the right to review any such decision, report or certification either upon its own initiative or upon the petition of a party or intervenor demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Commission the desirability of having the matter reviewed at the top level.

Provision is also made, in order to maintain the fundamental bipartisan concept explicit in the basic statute creating the Commission, for mandatory review of any such decision, report, or certification upon the vote of a majority of the Commission less one member.

Inasmuch as the assignment of delegated functions in particular cases and with reference to particular problems to divisions of the Commission, to Commissioners, to hearing examiners, to employees and boards of employees must require continuous and flexible handling, depending both upon the amount and nature of the business, that function is placed in the Chairman by section 2 of the plan.

By providing sound organizational arrangements, the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the accompanying reorganization plan will make possible more economical and expeditious administration of the affected functions. It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1961.*

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MORE EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THE RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 278 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5490) to provide for more effective participation in the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 278 provides for the consideration of H.R. 5490, a bill to provide for more effective participation in the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for a straight open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 5490 is:

First. To provide for the deferment of a member of the Ready Reserve who, before being ordered to report for induction, agrees or has agreed to perform 3 to 6 months' active duty for training, so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily in the Ready Reserve;

Second. To provide for a draft exemption for a member if he serves satisfactorily in the Ready Reserve for the period that he is required by law to remain in the Ready Reserve, or who during such service has performed active duty for training with an armed force for not less than 3 consecutive months;

Third. To authorize the priority induction of certain members in the Ready Reserve who are subject to induction and who fail to serve satisfactorily as such members;

Fourth. To authorize the Army or the Air Force, at the request of the State or other appropriate authority, to order certain members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States who fail to participate satisfactorily in National Guard training to additional active duty for training for 45 days;

Fifth. To provide for flexibility with respect to the term of enlistments in the National Guard;

Sixth. To provide for flexibility with respect to the active duty for training obligation and the Reserve obligation of ROTC graduates; and

Seventh. To provide more flexibility in the law relating to the right of Federal employees to take 2 weeks' annual leave for purposes of military training.

Each of the purposes of the bill outlined involves various considerations which make the proposed legislation both desirable and necessary.

The only increased costs which would result from the enactment of this legislation are those incident to the 45-day active duty for training of the National Guard members who will be ordered to that duty by reason of unsatisfactory participation.

There will, however, be substantial savings due to the changes in National Guard terms of enlistment. Savings will result from elimination of the indirect administrative cost of time spent in effecting discharges and reenlistments, and more directly in the reduction of the number of discharge certificates and forms now used in effecting reenlistment.

In addition, representatives of the Department of Defense estimate that an annual saving of almost $2 million will be realized by virtue of the proposed flexibility in the active duty training requirement for ROTC graduates.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 278.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take the full time in discussing this bill. The bill is highly technical and has been well reported to the Committee on Rules, who reported it favorably, with an open rule providing for 1 hour of general debate.

According to a letter from former Secretary of the Army Brucker, who I think expresses well and briefly what this bill does, the purpose of this legislation is to provide for the deferment of a member of the Ready Reserve who, before being ordered to report for induction, agrees or has agreed to perform 3 to 6 months' active duty for training, so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily in the Ready Reserve; and to provide for a draft exemption for a member if he serves satisfactorily in the Ready Reserve for the period that he is required by law to remain in the Ready Reserve, or who during such service has performed active duty for training with an armed force for not less than 3 consecutive months.

Mr. Speaker, this bill elucidates several questions that have been rather nebulous. It provides for the solution of a great many pressing questions for the Reserve Officers' Training Corps and the National Guard. I feel sure that in general debate this bill will be very thoroughly and completely explained.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5490) to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5490, with Mr. BASS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes, and yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to announce for the information of the Members of the House that tomorrow the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means will ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the following bills:

H.R. 311, relating to gifts to reduce the public debt;

H.R. 4940, relating to imports of Philippine tobacco;

H.R. 4317, relating to annuities for widows of Tax Court judges;

H.R. 3668, relating to informal entry of merchandise;

H.R. 1877, relating to the pension trust of the Plumbers Union; and

H.R. 6413, relating to permitting fishermen the same privileges as farmers in filing estimated income tax.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Have you anything for Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. If we dispose of what we have on the program we have nothing for Friday.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is just what you said—if we get through with that?

Mr. McCORMACK. These bills will come up by unanimous consent tomorrow. They have been unanimously reported, as I understand, out of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as stated in the purpose of this bill, it is intended to provide more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces.

MAJOR OBJECTIVE OF THE BILL

The major objective of this legislation is to expand the provisions of existing law which permit the armed services to establish a special enlistment program which contemplates a minimum period of active duty for training of 3 to 6 months and thereafter continuing the young man in the Reserve for a total of 8 years.

At the present time, this program is limited in its statutory application to young men between the ages of 17 and 18½. Under the terms of this proposed change to existing law, the statutory basis of this program would be expanded to also include young men between the ages of 18½ and 26.

Before explaining in detail the effect of this proposed change in existing law, permit me to provide background information which I think is essential to a complete understanding of the purpose of this change.

BACKGROUND

As you all know, the Congress in 1955 reduced the Reserve military obligation of all young men inducted or enlisted in the armed services from the then total of 8 years to a maximum of 6 years.

At the same time, the legislation passed by Congress provided that any combination of active duty and Ready Reserve participation amounting to not more than 5 years would exempt such Reserve member from any requirement to continue active participation in the Reserve program.

These provisions of law continue to apply. However, at the same time, Congress authorized the establishment of a special enlistment program whereby young men between the ages of 17 and 18½ could both satisfy their draft liability and military Reserve obligation by enlisting in a program which required their participating in active duty for training for a minimum period of 3 to 6 months and thereafter required their participation in the Reserve program for a total of 8 years.

Therefore, this statutory provision established the so-called 6 months' training program. This program, therefore, for practical purposes, is the only exception to the general Reserve military obligation which contemplates a total of 6 years of Reserve service.

I have emphasized this point to insure that it is well understood that the modifications proposed by this legislation in the Reserve obligation of enlistees are limited to the so-called 6 months' trainee program and in no way affect any of the other regular enlistment programs.

As you know, the young men who enlist or are inducted into the armed services must, under existing law, serve a minimum of 2 years on active duty after which time they remain in the Reserve for a period of 4 years. Thus, as I had mentioned previously, their total Reserve obligation is limited to 6 years. Most young men in America today are meeting their Reserve and draft obligations in this manner.

On the other hand, the 6-month trainee program, as originally conceived by Congress, provided for an 8-year obligation since it permitted young men to satisfy their Reserve obligation and draft liability by serving on active duty for training for a period considerably less than the normal 2-year period of active duty served by other individuals. Thus, the 8-year period of Reserve obligation in this special enlistment program is certainly justified as contrasted to the 6-year requirement for those people who actually serve on active duty for 2 years.

Now this program, as I previously indicated, has by statute been limited to people between the ages of 17 and 18½. However, the armed services found that their requirement for young men with this type of training and Reserve obligation was greater than the number actually enlisted in the program. Therefore, the services instituted a program whereby young men between the ages of 18½ and 26, inclusive, could enter a similar 6-month training program. This program has proven exceptionally popular and has met the requirements of the services.

In this connection, I might point out that prior to the development of this program the enlisted strength of the Army Reserve was less than 100,000. Today, largely due to this special enlistment program, the enlisted strength of the Army Reserve has been increased to 300,000.

As of December 31, 1960, there have been more than 355,000 young men enlisted in the various 6-month training programs provided by the Reserve components. The largest proportion of enlistments in these programs occur in the 18½ year group and above.

INEQUITY IN PRESENT 6-MONTH PROGRAM

The administratively established 6-month training program for the 18½ year group and above has, therefore, proven most successful. However, because it had been established administratively, the special 8-year Reserve requirement which applies to the 17 to 18½ year group does not apply to individuals above 18½. Therefore, these individuals only incur a total Reserve obligation of 6 years, the same Reserve obligation that is required of the man who performs 2 years of active duty.

Thus, if a young man delays his enlistment in the 6-month program until he is 18½ years of age he will thereby succeed in avoiding an additional 2 years of Reserve obligation required of his contemporaries who enlist before reaching age 18½. It is this inequity which the Committee on Armed Services feels should be corrected.

Consequently, the Committee on Armed Services has recommended that the special enlistment program provided by statute for the group between the ages of 17 and 18½ be now expanded to include those young men who enlist in this 6-month training program up to the age of 26. The net result of this expansion of the 6-month training program in the statute is to accomplish the following:

First. It will provide the 18½- to 26-year group with the same statutory deferment which is now available to those below the age of 18½.

Second. It will provide the 18½- to 26-year group with this same Reserve obligation of 8 years that is now provided those below 18½ years of age; and

Third. It will make this 18½- to 26-year group equally liable for priority induction for failure to perform their Reserve obligation as is presently the case with those below 18½.

I am sure that every Member will agree that this inequity in the law should be corrected in the manner recommended by the Committee on Armed Services.

In addition to this primary objective of H.R. 5490, the bill will accomplish other purposes which I will treat individually and separately.

EXTENDING TO NATIONAL GUARD THE 45-DAY ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING PROVISION

The bill will extend to the Army National Guard and Air National Guard authorities the right to have ordered to active duty for training for 45 days annually those guardsmen who fail to perform satisfactorily as members of the Ready Reserve.

At the present time, the wording of the statute restricts its application to members of the Reserve components other than the National Guard. As a consequence, the only way in which the guard authorities can invoke this punitive or deterrent feature of the law to stimulate and encourage more active participation in the Reserve is by discharging the member who fails to perform and transfer him to the Army Reserve.

Thereafter, if the member continues to perform unsatisfactorily he may then be sent to 45 days of active duty for training by Army Reserve authorities. However, in the meantime the individual has been lost to the guard program and has required a great deal of unnecessary paperwork to insure his continued performance in the Reserve.

This bill would correct the deficiency and permit the guard to invoke this authority if it deems necessary.

I wish also to point out that this authority cannot be invoked except after a request by the individual State guard authority and, therefore, as provided in this bill, we retained the historical element of State control.

FLEXIBLE ENLISTMENTS FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD

Another purpose of this legislation is to make more flexible the terms of enlistment available to National Guard personnel. At the present time, the law provides that original enlistments in the National Guard shall be for a period of 1 or 3 years.

The disadvantages of these provisions are their lack of flexibility with respect to length of enlistment. Because of this lack of flexibility concerning enlistments, unnecessary administrative burdens are placed upon the National Guard, and, in addition, this inflexibility in enlistment procedure often precludes the reenlistment of certain guard personnel.

For example, the requirement that original enlistments in the National Guard be for a period of 3 years has acted as a deterrent for enlistments in the case of individuals who have a remaining Ready Reserve service obligation of less than 3 years.

The National Guard has a need for trained personnel, especially those who have served 2 or more years in the active Army or Air Force, and every effort is being made to encourage such individuals to enlist in the National Guard. It is desirable, therefore, to remove any obstacles, statutory or otherwise, which would tend to discourage such enlistments.

The bill would amend existing law to permit the enlistment of nonprior servicemen for 3 years or more and prior servicemen to enlist for 1 year or more. This will provide the flexible enlistment program required by the guard and will permit them to enlist in the guard for their total remaining service obligation regardless of its duration.

In summary, the statutory provisions relating to enlistments in the guard will be modified to permit the flexibility which is now enjoyed by the Regular components.

ROTC ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING REQUIREMENT

Another objective of the bill is to provide a change in the required training of ROTC graduates from the present statutory minimum of 6 months to a

more flexible and realistic minimum of from 3 to 6 months.

Under the law today, an ROTC graduate commissioned in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, whose services are not required on extended active duty, must be given a period of 6 months' active duty for training.

Representatives of the services have testified that, in most instances, these ROTC officers who are called to 6 months' active duty for training can receive all the training necessary to prepare them for their mobilization assignment in approximately 4 months. However, because of the law, they are required to be retained on active duty for the prescribed 6 months.

As a consequence of this statutory requirement the services are required to retain these officers beyond the point at which their continuation on active duty for training results in any benefit to either the officer or the service concerned.

In view of this fact and because of the obvious savings which will occur, the Committee on Armed Services recommended that this provision of law be modified to permit this period of training to vary between 3 and 6 months, depending on the needs of the services.

I wish to emphasize that this program for ROTC personnel is not to be confused with the so-called 6-month trainee program which I had discussed earlier. This requirement in the law for 6 months of active duty for training stems from the UMTS Act and not from laws relating to an individual's Reserve obligation.

The proposed change relating to ROTC personnel was found acceptable by the Director of Selective Service, General Hershey.

ANNUAL TRAINING DUTY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The final objective of this bill is to correct a difficulty experienced by reservists who are Federal employees to coordinate their annual military training leave privilege with the availability of annual training duty.

As you know, Federal employees are by statute authorized 15 days' annual leave for the purpose of performing military training duty. This annual leave privilege is currently authorized on a fiscal-year basis. Previously, this right was based on a calendar-year bisis. However, by virtue of a change in the Reserve Officer Personnel Act amendments last year, this language was changed to read "fiscal year" to coincide with the availability of annual training duty.

However, it now appears that this change was not in the interest of thousands of Reserve and guard personnel who are required to obtain their annual training duty in the summer months of June and July of each year. Thus, a reservist who had performed his training duty in July of 1960 would be precluded from accompanying his unit to training duty in June of 1961 since it falls within the same fiscal year, unless he waives his right to the 15 day annual leave privilege.

I am sure it was not the intention of Congress to cause this type of situation. The Committee on Armed Services has, therefore, provided a legislative change which would increase the flexibility of this provision of law so as to permit its utilization by Federal employees in a manner which will not conflict with the actual availability of training duty.

I would like to emphasize, however, that the language proposed by the Committee on Armed Services does not in any way expand this leave privilege but does simply eliminate some of the technical difficulties which presently confront the Reserve forces in attempting to schedule annual training duty so as not to deprive Federal employees of this annual leave privilege.

FISCAL DATA

This legislation has been recommended by the Department of Defense, and, as indicated in the committee report, may involve an expenditure of a total of approximately $1 million over the next 5 years.

The annual increased cost of this program should not exceed $300,000 and probably will be far less. These costs will arise from the implementation of the 45-day active duty training authority which would be provided the National Guard.

However, I wish to point out that substantial savings should be realized by enactment of other features of the bill.

Savings will undoubtedly occur as a consequence of modifying the enlistment requirements of the National Guard. In addition, substantial savings amounting to perhaps as much as $2 million a year will occur by virtue of the reduced requirement for active duty for training for ROTC graduates.

In summary, I believe this legislation is sound, and I recommend its enactment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman repeat his designation of the group that has to serve 6 years?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The 18½ to 26 year group, but that was not by statute. The purpose of this bill is to put the 17 to 18½ year olds and the 18½ to 26 year group under the same obligation by statute.

Mr. GROSS. For 7½ years.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Seven and one-half years after his 6 months of active duty for training.

Mr. GROSS. But from 18½ to 26, if they enlist for 6 months they have to serve only 6 years?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They completely escape it now, since the 8 year Reserve obligation applies at the present time only to the 17 to 18½ year group in the 6-month trainee program.

Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. I do not see how that could ever have occurred.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It was an agreement between the services and the Selective Service Board to permit these young men, in the 18½ to 26 year group, to have the 6 months' active duty for training. They were never covered by statute. They had a 6-year obligation after they got out, and that was it.

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand how that ever occurred. Why was there such a differentiation between the two age groups?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It has been a very successful program. We now want to make them all the same

Mr. GROSS. Has it really been a successful program, may I ask the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Generally, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Are you not having trouble in connection with these young men reporting for weekly drills and summer encampments?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know of any trouble. They got 350,000 Active Reserves. It has been generally successful.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOLL. Will this statutory provision include all branches of the service, like the Coast Guard, and so forth?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Anyone who is under the 6-month program.

Mr. TOLL. It applies to any branch of the service?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. To any branch of the service.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman cannot give us any estimate of the cost of this bill?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I have given the gentleman an estimate. I think there will be a saving. The annual cost should not exceed $300,000. On the other hand, I think we will save as much as $2 million by not requiring these ROTC boys to stay the whole 6 months.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly hope the gentleman is right as to the saving. May I ask the gentleman this question: Does this bill in any way deal with that harebrained Peace Corps business?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. It does not deal with airplanes and it does not deal with the Peace Corps.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. Can the gentleman tell us whether there is any legislation pending before his committee with respect to the Peace Corps? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, to answer that question.

Mr. VINSON. I can state to the gentleman that there is no legislation that I know of.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5490.

I wish to commend Mr. RIVERS, my colleague and chairman of the subcommittee which considered this legislation, on his most complete and understandable explanation of the bill.

I will not presume on your time by attempting to review this proposal in further detail. However, I do think it important that the Members of the House fully recognize the importance of the 6-month training program to the continued strengthening of our Reserve forces.

As Members of this body are aware, the mission of our Reserve components is "to provide trained units and qualified individuals for active duty in time of war or national emergency in support of war plans and at such other times as the national security may require."

The key to the accomplishment of such a mission includes both adequate strength and genuine readiness.

The Congress in 1952, upon the recommendation of the armed services and the Department of Defense, agreed on specific strengths required within the Ready and Standby Reserves and the authorization of these strengths was set forth by enactment of pertinent statutes.

Following such enactment and after further careful evaluation, commanders at all echelons and from each service advised Congress that to obtain the degree of readiness desired, it was absolutely essential that basic training be provided the individuals by the active establishments. When accomplished, the Reserve units could then concentrate on training the unit as a fighting machine without the necessity of attempting to provide within the local unit, a program of basic training for recruits.

It was further pointed out that ideally the unit should be able to enlist an individual for a specific assignment within the organization and send him to 6 months' active duty for training at an established training base or camp with the specific understanding that he would be basically trained, qualified in a military occupational specialty, and returned to the unit to perform in this specialty.

The requirement for such a program was clearly defined by the services, and as a result the Congress on August 9, 1955, enacted the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 initiating such a program.

The cornerstone of this entire revitalized Reserve program, as contemplated by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, is the so-called 6-month training program.

The outstanding results of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 which, among other things, provides a means of enlisting the young man between the ages of 17 and 18½, sending him to an active establishment for 6 months' training, and returning him to his Reserve component, are plainly evident today.

Before June 1956, the inception of the 6 months' training program into the National Guard, only 24 percent of all National Guard personnel had prior service and only 66 percent were basically trained. By the end of fiscal year 1960, 65 percent had prior service or 6 months' training and virtually 100 percent were individually basically trained. This meant that the National Guard, one of our vital Ready Reserve Forces, could concentrate on unit training as opposed to the previous treadmill of individual basic training. In this connection, on February 23 of this year, the Chief, National Guard Bureau, Major General McGowan, made the following statement to a congressional committee:

I am sure you realize the key importance the 6 months' program has played in our roles and missions. More than anything else, the 6 months' program has enhanced the mobilization of the Army and Air National Guard. We can now produce mobilization ready units, fully prepared to meet the deployment schedules contained in approved war plans. Such was made possible by this program.

In the U.S. Army Reserve, the degree of readiness was even less than that of the National Guard. Prior to the inception of the 6 months' training program, only 82 percent of their personnel had 4 months or more training; however, today 95 percent are basically trained. There is no doubt that the comment by General McGowan would apply equally well to the USAR. The readiness of the Reserve Forces is at the highest degree ever attained in the peacetime history of our Nation. I might add that although the value of the 6 months' program to our Reserve Forces cannot be underestimated, the person completing 2 years or more of active duty, who subsequently serves in the Reserves, should receive recognition. It is this individual that provides our Reserve units with the hard skill or technical knowledge so necessary in modern day operations.

In addition, I'm sure you are aware of the very favorable reception given the 6 months' program by parents, educators, civic and religious leaders and the young enlistees themselves. Attitude surveys by the various military departments have consistently reported this program as one of their finest efforts.

The value of the 6 months' program to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces cannot be overemphasized. Every individual who is in a position to know, understand, and speak to this program has commended it highly. This program has been referred to as the very backbone of the Nation's Reserve Forces, and it is not difficult to understand and fully agree with this statement.

Gentlemen, another aspect of this bill to which I would like to address myself deals with providing the Army and Air National Guard the authority to order guardsmen to 45 days' active duty for training to make up for training missed because of unsatisfactory participation with their units. At present, the National Guard authorities have three means for dealing with those enlistees who fail to perform the required training:

First. They may be tried by State courts-martial in those instances where appropriate State laws exist.

Second. They may be discharged from the National Guard and reported to Selective Service for routine or priority induction, or

Third. They may be discharged from the guard and required to complete their obligated period of service in the Army Reserve.

None of these means strikes at the real crux of the problem for none of them enhances the state of training of the individual and returns him to his community as a more useful soldier, better prepared to serve his unit and his country in an emergency. The fact that this legislation when enacted cannot be invoked, except upon the specific request of the National Guard authorities, retains for the guard the historic element of State control. Its enactment will further enhance the status of the National Guard whose combat readiness is more essential to us today than at any time in our Nation's history.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. TOLL. Will the gentleman explain whether this would affect reservists now on the rolls, or only new reservists?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. When this bill is written into law it becomes effective immediately.

Mr. TOLL. And it affects every person now in the service, stretching the period from 6 to 8 years?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. This applies to prospective reservists in the special enlistment program—the 6-month trainer.

Mr. TOLL. Only new reservists?

May I ask another question? Has the committee considered equalization by making it 6 years instead of 8 years? In other words, where a person is between the ages of 17 and 18½, an 8-year period for a young man of that character is practically keeping them in a youthful stage and if you apply 8 years to a 25-year-older, that makes him quite old. Has the committee considered equalizing it by making it all 6 years instead of 8 years?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. There would be no reason for reducing the Reserve obligation 2 years. You would then be treating the boy who has to serve perhaps 2 years overseas on active duty the same as the boy who has been in the service only 6 months. That would obviously be unequal treatment so far as that boy who has served 2 years on active duty.

Mr. TOLL. I am only raising the question with respect to the time element. When you apply an 8-year period to a youngster between the ages of 17 and 18½, and you apply the same 8-year period to a 25-year-old reservist, you get a different result as to age.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They both have the same opportunity to make a choice. The boy does not have to take the 6-month program with an 8-year obligation. He can go for 2 years of active duty and thus only have a 6-year obligation. But, if he selects the 6-month program he will acquire an 8-year obligation, or 7½ years of Ready Reserve service, the same as the 17-year-old. We think that is fair.

Mr. TOLL. In other words, the committee would not consider making all serve an equal 6-year period?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. The services would not recommend it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, in concluding my statement in support of this legislation, it might be well to inform the committee that when the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1955 was

signed into law it represented what we might say was the first attempt on the part of Congress to establish a program providing equitable treatment to all participating in the Reserve program. From time to time we have discovered inequities and here today the amendments we are discussing constitute nothing more than an effort on our part to remove these inequities and thus perfect the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1955 so that all who serve are treated alike.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], such time as he may need.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 5490.

In order to achieve the purposes of H.R. 5490, which is to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, it is necessary that several seemingly unrelated statutes be amended. However, let me assure my colleagues that the need for these amendments has been carefully considered and thoroughly studied by the Armed Services Committee. In my judgment, each of these amendments will contribute to the efficiency and capability of our Reserves, will better equate the obligations of military service between and among the various age groups and categories of our young men, and will correct and clarify anomalies which currently exist in the law.

First, the bill grants a statutory deferment from induction by Selective Service to young men between the ages of 18½ and 26 who enlist in a unit of the Ready Reserve. Coincidentally, it equates the period of their military obligation to agree with the period they are required to serve in order to maintain their deferment from the draft and earn eventual exemption.

Second, it extends the authority for priority induction to the 18½–26 age group in the event they fail or refuse to serve satisfactorily as a reservist. This places them under the same liabilities in this respect as are those young men in the 17–18½ age group.

Third, it provides authority to order a member of the National Guard without his consent to active duty for training for a period of not more than 45 days, but only upon the request of the appropriate authorities of the State concerned, thus preserving the sovereign rights of the States. This authority is already in the law for other reservists, and its extension to the National Guard will make its application uniform.

Fourth, it overhauls the present statutory terms of enlistment in the National Guard and brings them into line with terms of enlistment in the other Reserve components. This is a step long overdue and one which will save many long, unproductive hours of administrative paperwork which can better be devoted to training.

Fifth, it provides flexibility with respect to the initial period of active duty training required of those of our young men who have been commissioned as officers upon completion of ROTC. While there is no question that the Armed Forces will need these young officers in the event of emergency or war, there is no present requirement that each of them serve on active duty for a minimum period of 6 months. There is a requirement, however, that they enter active duty for that period of time sufficient to qualify them for mobilization assignment. H.R. 5490 wisely recognizes this feature and, accordingly, provides the necessary flexibility to the program.

Lastly, the bill provides additional flexibility and opportunity for Federal employees who are members of the Reserve components to participate in their military training. This is accomplished without modification of the basic policy that such employees be granted not to exceed 15 days annually to perform full-time military duty.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation was developed by the military departments and is supported by the interested Reserve organizations. I am convinced that it is necessary and desirable, and urge that it be supported by each Member.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I just want to know something about the bill. I ask the subcommittee chairman, Do we still have legislation drafting young Americans?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Certainly we have legislation on the books. The selective service law is still on the books. It has not expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have a couple of great-grandsons. I think one is 2 months' old, and one is 8 months' old. Assuming that the present draft legislation remains in force until they reach the age where they will come under it, would they, if they did not enlist, be subject to draft?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. They would unless the Draft Act is suspended.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Assuming the draft legislation stays, would those great-grandsons still be subject to the draft?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If the act is extended, positively, certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Assuming we continue in United Nations and other international organizations, would these grandsons be required, say, to fight in some far-off place, the Congo, Laos, or some other place in the world where an international organization might have a war? Would they be required to fight there?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would prefer that the Congress declare war if we go to war, not the United Nations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So would I. If we stay in United Nations and they continue on with trouble everywhere in the world—would those great-grandsons still be required to participate wherever some member of the United Nations was at war?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I cannot look that far ahead.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know you cannot state a fact, but what is your opinion on that hypothetical question? You are an expert on these defense matters.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I am not an expert on anything.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I assume you are, and I will be glad to have your opinion even if you do not actually know everything about it; what is your opinion?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. My opinion is not worth very much in foreign affairs. I would venture the assertion, however, that the gentleman has about the same affection for the United Nations that I have. I would rather not get mixed up in that on this day.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was not worrying about myself; at my age they would not get me, but my great grandsons, 15 or 20 years from now. I was wondering, I suppose things in the Congo may be settled by then but I was wondering if they would have to go to fight in a war which was not our war?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. As I said before, Congress will have to take care of that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If Congress does not do any better than we have done or are doing now they would have to go.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Probably so.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Probably so.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I have a young son too.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But this bill that you have here today, if that gets through and this program continued, then they would get into that.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I would believe, seriously, that as long as the Draft Act is in force this program would remain in force.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then if they went into it and served under it, then when they came out would they get the same benefits, privileges, and preferences that now go to our veterans?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Not unless they served on active duty.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What do you mean by "active duty"? I know a young man who went to Camp Custer and drove mules for 6 months but got veterans' benefits.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. My committee does not deal with veterans' statutes. I do not know what type of war they might be involved in. I would not know, because we do not handle veterans' legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was just trying to get your opinion as to what these boys might look forward to.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. My opinion is not very good in that area.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But the gentleman does believe that if we continue along present lines that they may be—would be asked to serve in active combat somewhere.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But that would be your opinion as of today, would it not?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know how this would affect them that far in the future. As I said before,

I would rather Congress deliberated on whether or not we became involved in war, rather than the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the leader of our party yield so I can ask a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know just which party you refer to today.

Mr. GROSS. Well, your party. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. These 3 to 6 months enlistees, if war broke out in Laos or some other reptile-ridden area of the world, would they be held for service in that area?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Let me say to the gentleman that it would depend on whether his unit were mobilized as to whether he went anywhere.

Mr. GROSS. What does the gentleman mean by "unit"?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. He is in the Ready Reserve. Unless the unit is mobilized it does not go any place.

Mr. GROSS. But he can be made to serve as I have indicated.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. If this is localized, the Congress may extend it, but he still has his obligation. As to the extent of the conflict, I do not know. I do not know what the Congress would do. But his unit is the same. He is attached to a unit, and if that unit is mobilized he will go.

Mr. GROSS. Then his obligation is for 8 years?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think the gentleman from Iowa probably is of the same opinion that I am; that is, just as long as we continue this foreign policy we have had for the last few years, and these appropriations, we will be in debt and future generations will fight whereever some foreign government tells them to fight.

Mr. GROSS. As long as we keep sticking our long noses into everybody's business all over the world, that will be the situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman ready to vote tomorrow to increase the national debt?

Mr. GROSS. I have not yet, and I do not anticipate that I will tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] for yielding this time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 456), is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (c)(2)(B) to read as follows:

"(B) Any person who after attaining the age of eighteen years and six months but prior to attaining the age of twenty-six years and prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction, enlists or accepts appointment in an organized unit of the National Guard shall be deferred from training and service under this title so long as he continues to serve satisfactorily as a member of such organized unit. No such person who has completed eight years of satisfactory service as a member of an organized unit of the National Guard, and who during such service has performed active duty for training with an armed force for not less than three consecutive months, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this Act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress."; and

(2) by striking out the words "in such unit" in the seventh and eighth sentences of subsection (d)(1) and amending the fifth and sixth sentences of that subsection to read as follows: "If, at the time of, or subsequent to, such appointment, the armed force in which such person is commissioned does not require his service on active duty in fulfillment of the obligation undertaken by him in compliance with clause (B) of the first sentence of this paragraph, such person shall be ordered to active duty for training with such armed force in the grade in which he was commissioned for a period of active duty for training of not less than three months or more than six months (not including duty performed under section 270 (a) of title 10, United States Code), as determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned to be necessary to qualify such person for a mobilization assignment. Upon being commissioned and assigned to a reserve component, such person shall be required to serve therein, or in a reserve component of any other armed force in which he is later appointed, until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of such commission pursuant to the provisions of this section".

SEC. 2. Section 262(b)(3) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (50 U.S.C. 1013 (b)(3)) is amended by striking out the words "eighteen years and six months" and inserting the words "twenty-six years" in place thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 270 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(c) Any person who becomes a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States after the enactment of this subsection and who fails in any year to perform satisfactorily the training duty prescribed by or under law for members of the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, as determined by the Secretary concerned, may, upon the request of the Governor of the State or territory, Puerto Rico, or the Canal Zone, or the commanding general of the District of Columbia National Guard, whichever is concerned, be ordered, without his consent, to perform additional active duty for training for not more than forty-five days. A member ordered to active duty under this subsection shall be ordered to duty as a Reserve of the Army or as a Reserve of the Air Force, as the case may be."

SEC. 4. Section 651(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Each male person who, after August 9, 1955, becomes a member of an armed force before his twenty-sixth birthday, other than a person enlisted under section 1013 of title 50 or deferred under the next to the last sentence of section 456(d)(1) of title 50, appendix, shall serve in the armed forces for a total of six years. However, such a person who, after the effective date of this amended subsection, becomes deferred under section 456(c)(2) (A) or (B) of title 50, appendix, shall serve in the armed forces for a total of eight years. Any person covered by this subsection may be sooner discharged because of personal hardship under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense or, if he is a member of the Coast Guard while it is not operating as a service in the Navy, by the Secretary of the Treasury. Any part of such service that is not active duty or is active duty for training shall be performed in a reserve component."

SEC. 5. Section 3261 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the designation "(b)" in subsection (a) and inserting the designation "(c)" in place thereof; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection "(c)" and inserting the following new subsection (b):

"(b) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, a person who enlists or reenlists in the Army National Guard, or whose term of enlistment or reenlistment in the Army National Guard is extended, shall be concurrently enlisted or reenlisted, or his term of enlistment or reenlistment shall be concurrently extended, as the case may be, as a Reserve of the Army for service in the Army National Guard of the United States."

SEC. 6. Section 8261 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the designation "(b)" in subsection (a) and inserting the designation "(c)" in place thereof; and

(2) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection "(c)" and inserting the following new subsection (b):

"(b) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force, a person who enlists or reenlists in the Air National Guard, or whose term of enlistment or reenlistment in the Air National Guard is extended, shall be concurrently enlisted or reenlisted, or his term of enlistment or reenlistment shall be concurrently extended, as the case may be, as a Reserve of the Air Force for service in the Air National Guard of the United States."

SEC. 7. Title 32, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 302 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 302. Enlistments, reenlistments, and extensions

"(a) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, original enlistments in the National Guard may be accepted for—

"(1) any specified term, not less than three years, for persons who have not served in an armed force; or

"(2) any specified term, not less than one year, for persons who have served in any armed force.

"(b) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, reenlistment in the National Guard may be accepted for any specified period, or, if the person last served in one of the highest five enlisted grades, for an unspecified period.

"(c) Enlistments or reenlistments in the National Guard may be extended—

"(1) under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary concerned, at the request of the member, for any period not less than six months; or

"(2) by proclamation of the President, if Congress declares an emergency, until six months after termination of that emergency."

(2) The analysis of chapter 3 is amended by striking out the following item:

"302. Enlistments."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"302. Enlistments, reenlistments, and extensions."

SEC. 8. The amendments made by sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of this Act do not affect any enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment entered into or made before the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 9. Section 29(a) of the Act of August 10, 1956, chapter 1041, as amended (5 U.S.C. 30r), is amended—

(1) by striking out the words "fiscal year" wherever they appear therein and inserting the words "calendar year" in place thereof; and

(2) by inserting the following new sentence immediately after the first sentence thereof: "However, all or any part of such leave which is not used by the officer or employee during the calendar year in which it accrues may be used by him during the first six months of the next calendar year."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bass of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5490) to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 278, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESSENING THE IMPACT OF THE TERMINATION OF FEDERAL SERVICES TO THE MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE OF WISCONSIN

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 277 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4130) to amend the Menominee Termination Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now in the bill. No other amendment to the bill or committee substitute shall be in order except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but such amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOFFMAN], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 277 provides for the consideration of H.R. 4130, a bill to amend the Menominee Termination Act. The resolution provides for a closed rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate, making it in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The purpose of H.R. 4130, as amended, is to furnish assistance to the people of the Menominee Indian Tribe during the first years after termination of Federal supervision over the affairs of the tribe and thus to avoid many harsh results which might follow from a too sudden transition from a protected status to complete freedom.

In order to accomplish this result, the amendment to the bill provides for a loan to Menominee Enterprises, Inc., of $2,500,000 at an interest rate approximately equal to the cost to the Government of borrowing money. The loan will be used to expand and modernize existing tribal enterprises and to develop tribal resources. The amendment also provides for grants totaling approximately $2,600,000 over a 6-year period for essential health, education, and welfare services. These grants will be handled, after appropriations are made, by responsible officials of the State of Wisconsin. Except for a capital grant for completion of construction of sewerage facilities for the towns of Neopit and Keshena, the grants will be scaled down year by year during the 6-year period until they reach zero.

The total cost of this legislation will not exceed $4,613,000, of which the $2,500,000 in the loan fund will be reimbursable to the Federal Government. As an offset against this sum it must be remembered that the cost to the Federal Government of administering the affairs of the Menominee Tribe since 1954 has approximated $4 million, of which over $2½ million have been appropriated in the form of special benefits relating to the termination program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 277.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard a very able explanation of H.R. 4130 by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL]. I would like to add my little bit to it, if I may.

As you know, this bill was brought in by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This is a 1-hour closed rule, providing for a motion to recommit and only committee amendments to be considered.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for a loan to the Menominee Indian Tribe, situated in the northern part of Wisconsin, up to $2.5 million for an educational program, sanitation, and public welfare. This bill was introduced for the purpose of helping them over the rough spots that came about from the change of supervision to complete freedom. The loans and grants that will be given to them total some $4,612,000. The interest that they will pay on the loan is the interest that it will cost the Government to borrow the money. They expect to repay these loans by the operation of a sawmill which they have set up on the Indian reservation. While it has been a good many years since I have seen that sawmill, I know that it has operated well; that it has been handled very economically, and they have made a great deal of money from it. Their real property up there is appraised at $35 million. The sawmill and the equipment that goes with the sawmill and their other resources is appraised at $1.9 million. They have been a very thrifty organization. They have been able to make money and to divide it among the tribe; not all of it but about half of it.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind but what they will repay in a period of 20 years the loans that are made. They will repay it without any question.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4130) to amend the Menominee Termination Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4130, with Mr. BASS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Fifty-five Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 50]

Alford	Green, Pa.	Morrison
Auchincloss	Gubser	O'Brien, N.Y.
Barrett	Harrison, Va.	Osmers
Bonner	Healey	Philbin
Boykin	Hemphill	Pillion
Broomfield	Henderson	Poage
Buckley	Herlong	Powell
Cahill	Hiestand	Rabaut
Celler	Holifield	Rains
Chelf	Holtzman	Ray
Cooley	Inouye	Riley
Cramer	Jennings	Rodino
Daddario	Jonas	St. Germain
Daniels	Jones, Ala.	Scherer
Dawson	Kearns	Shelley
Devine	Kelly	Sikes
Dominick	Kilburn	Spence
Dooley	Kilgore	Steed
Durno	Kirwan	Thompson, La.
Ellsworth	Lindsay	Tupper
Feighan	Lipscomb	Walter
Flood	Loser	Whalley
Frelinghuysen	McSween	Williams
Gallagher	McVey	Willis
Garmatz	Macdonald	Wilson, Calif.
Gary	Miller, N.Y.	Winstead
Gilbert	Moore	Zablocki

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BASS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4130, to amend the Menominee Termination Act, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 351 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs brings to this Committee at this time legislation which is most technical and which has received much study and lengthy consideration.

In a moment I shall explain to you briefly, but I hope satisfactorily, the reason for the request for the kind of a rule under which this debate is being had. Only once before during my 12 years of experience with this committee have we ever asked for a closed rule.

The presentation to be made by the committee has been so arranged that I feel it will answer most of the questions which may come to the minds of the Members.

First, I shall speak briefly concerning the Menominee Tribe, its relationship to this legislation, and the need for the bill we are considering today.

Then, Mr. SAYLOR, the ranking member of the minority, will speak on the subject of the history of the termination legislation as it has affected the Menominees and the efforts that they and others have made to make the program successful.

After Mr. SAYLOR's presentation, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. HALEY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, will give a detailed account of the steps taken by all concerned on the termination of Federal supervision over the Menominees and the reasons for the currently proposed legislation. This will be an account of the expenditure of great labors by many interested parties.

Then, Mr. BERRY, of South Dakota, Mr. HALEY's counterpart on the minority side, will finish the committee presentation by reference to the full meaning of "termination" in this particular instance, together with a final statement as to the particular programs of assistance which this legislation makes available to the Menominees.

STATEMENT ON WAIVER OF POINTS OF ORDER

I was glad to accept the suggestion for a rule waiving points of order since I believe that, whatever the technical parliamentary situation may be under the rule of germaneness, Members will appreciate that the committee is, in fact, accomplishing what the author of the bill was interested in but is doing so with greater certainty and at less cost to the Government.

The bill, as introduced, called for an extension of time before Federal services to the Menominee Indians would be completed. How long this period would be was left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, but, judging from expenditures for these services over the last few years, it would have cost the Government anywhere from $500,000 to $800,000 a year.

Under the committee amendment, the termination date remains as it was—April 30, 1961—but funds to finance essential services in the education, welfare, and health fields are authorized during a transition period. During the first year, the maximum will be $540,000. For the second year we authorize 80 percent of this amount, for the third year 60 percent, and so on. This means an average payment of not more than $280,000 a year during these 6 years.

In addition, the committee amendment provides for a loan, repayable with interest, of $2,500,000 to help to put Menominee Enterprises, Inc., on its feet and a grant of $438,000 to complete construction of sanitary facilities required by the State of Wisconsin. Both of these items would have been required even if termination had been delayed and would, therefore, have to be added to the estimates I gave above for costs under the original bill to arrive at a proper comparison with costs under the amended bill.

The amendment, in brief, recognizes and deals with the same problem that the original bill did but does so on, I believe, a more realistic basis.

Mr. Chairman, over the past 8 years our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has held many hearings dealing with the Menominee Tribe of Indians. We in the committee are well acquainted with the tribe and its problems. We have listened patiently as its representatives presented requests to us. We believe the Menominees to be one of the outstanding tribes in the country. They have intelligence and resources which if properly integrated can be made to function well in our modern society. I am confident the Menominees will work out their problems under the legislation before us today.

Let me present a short background of the Menominee Tribe of northern Wisconsin. The Menominees are an Algonquin Tribe whose residence in the present area dates from 1671. The reservation was created in 1854 and two additional townships were ceded to the reserve in 1856.

The reservation was never allotted. The forest lands, 220,000 acres, which constitute about 95 percent of the reservation area, 234,000 acres, yield some of the finest hardwood timber in the United States. All claims against the United States have been settled. The most recent award was for $8,500,000 in 1951.

The tribe voted to accept the act of June 18, 1934—Wheeler-Howard Act—but operates under a constitution promulgated and adopted in 1928. There are about 3,270 enrolled members of the tribe of whom fewer than 2,800 are presently living on the reservation. Many members have been successfully relocated in the cities of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Illinois. Few of those living on the reservation are in the country. Most dwell in the four principal settlements of Neopit, Keshena, Zoar, and South Branch. Practically all of the Menominees can read, write, and understand the English language.

Many of the resident families derive their livelihood from employment in the tribal forest and sawmill industries. Family income, in addition to the mill, is derived from small scale farming, operating tourist cabins, retail stores, filling stations, guide services, and fishing and trapping in season. A sizable number of families depend on welfare payments for subsistence.

Even before the enactment of the 1954 Termination of Federal Services Act the tribe had taken over many of the functions normally handled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and was financing all but a small portion of services provided on the reservation.

The Menominee Tribe was one of the first recommended some 15 years ago as being ready to take over its own functions and to release the Federal Government of its supervisory responsibilities. It was for this reason that our committee held extended hearings on legislation which became Public Law 399, 83d Congress, the law which we are seeking to amend today.

Under Public Law 399, 83d Congress, as amended, the Federal Government was, on April 30, 1961, 10 days ago, relieved of further supervisory responsibilities over the Menominees solely because they are Indians.

As the Indians begin their new experience, they have a new county, Menominee County, in northern Wisconsin. They have a corporation, Menominee Enterprises, Inc., chartered by the State of Wisconsin. They have current assets of $1,390,000 in cash, a timber inventory of $1,913,000 and $106,000 in accounts receivable for a total of $3,409,000. Under the terms of the legislation before us, they will have a $2,500,000 loan to renovate and improve their sawmill, $438,000 to complete their sewerage and water project, and they will be entitled to $540,000 from Government funds for the coming year, providing that figure can be justified before the Appropriations Committee.

The Menominees have had 7 years to prepare for this new experience. They have had excellent assistance from the State of Wisconsin and the Departments of the Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare. They will meet obstacles in their new venture but I have reason to believe they will be successful.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What other tribes in this country have been liberated on the same basis? Could this be called the first civil rights bill for Indians?

Mr. ASPINALL. I am glad to advise my friend that we have passed legislation in the 83d and successive Congresses which provided for the termination of some 12 tribes. Among those tribes were small tribes like those in Mississippi and the Paiutes of Utah. One of the largest tribes is the Klamath Tribe, which has already been terminated. The Klamaths have been carrying on as individual citizens, some taking

their share of the tribal assets in cash and others taking their share in the corporation which was formed at that time. I will be glad to list the names of these tribes if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. GROSS. This is the second one they have relieved?

Mr. ASPINALL. This is the second largest tribe. There have been 10 other tribes.

Mr. GROSS. We do have here, do we not, an undeveloped area in the liberation of this tribe?

Mr. ASPINALL. No, this is not an undeveloped area. These Indians have had practical control of their own operations for a good many years. Sure, they have had services from the Indian Bureau too. They will have a county, practically as their own, as they accept their new responsibilities.

Mr. GROSS. You are lending them money to take care of basic sanitary and health measures, are you not?

Mr. ASPINALL. No, my friend is wrong there. We are giving them that. That is a part of the grant. The reason for that is, and I wish to be perfectly honest and fair with my friend from Iowa, that we have made some mistakes in this program just as in all research matters. This is research on social and community levels. In a way this is a research program similar in objectives as a research program in physical areas.

Mr. GROSS. I have no quarrel about that, and no opposition to helping these people get started, to liberating them and helping them get started, but I wonder why, in view of the nature of the help, the $4 million appropriation-plus, we cannot get this under the Mutual Security Act. Why cannot this money, since it is for a similar purpose, be taken from the mutual security fund or a loan made out of the Redevelopment Loan Fund?

Mr. ASPINALL. My friend knows how I stand on that program. I understand his position, too. But I do not want to get into that question. I would say I, too, believe in taking care of our problems at home. This is one of our problems, and it is one which the Congress of the United States should proceed with as we originally intended. I think all of us will be very, very proud of our action in this particular matter within the next 6 years.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any reason why they should not get these loans from the Development Loan Fund?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes, I do.

Mr. GROSS. Why should they not get this money from the Development Loan Fund and then let the Indians pay back in wampum? That would be getting more than we do from foreign countries.

Mr. ASPINALL. I will make my final answer to the gentleman. These are not foreign citizens of foreign countries. These are citizens of the United States of America, and they should be treated as such.

Mr. GROSS. Therefore, as Americans, the money ought to be more readily available to them.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to speak on behalf of H.R. 4130, as amended, and urge its favorable consideration. This legislation recognizes the abilities of the Menominee Indians and will encourage them to function up to their capabilities. I can see little reason for having the Federal Government continue to do what the tribal members can do for themselves. I am the first to agree that the Indians need the kind of help this bill provides. I make this statement advisedly because I do not want anyone to say Congress is abandoning the Indians and is preparing them for their annihilation. The Indians need this legislation and Congress will be wise in enacting it if we expect other tribes to accept willingly a termination program.

The Menominee Tribe was the first tribe for which termination of Federal services legislation was enacted in the 83d Congress. Perhaps it was the most difficult of the following 12, undertaken since 1954:

Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin by Public Law 399, 83d Congress.

Klamath Tribe of Oregon by Public Law 587, 83d Congress.

Certain tribes of western Oregon by Public Law 588, 83d Congress.

Alabama-Coushatta Tribes of Texas by Public Law 627, 83d Congress.

Uintah-Ouray Tribes in Utah by Public Law 671, 83d Congress.

Certain tribes in Utah by Public Law 762, 83d Congress.

Ottawa Tribe of Oklahoma by Public Law 887, 84th Congress.

Peoria Tribe of Oklahoma by Public Law 921, 84th Congress.

Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma by Public Law 943, 84th Congress.

Forty-one California Indian bands, groups, or rancherias, by Public Law 671, 85th Congress.

Choctaw Tribe of Oklahoma by Public Law 192, 86th Congress.

Catawba Tribe of South Carolina by Public Law 322, 86th Congress.

I believe the record should indicate what was provided in Public Law 399 because of the bearing it had on the bill before us today.

First, the 1954 act provided for the orderly termination of Federal supervision over the property and members of the Menominee Tribe and set up machinery for closing the tribal roll 90 days after the enactment of the act, to be followed by a 90-day waiting period for approval or disapproval of applications to the appropriate enrollment review board.

Second, the act provided for the roll to be published in the Federal Register after which certificates of beneficial interest were issued to all enrolled members.

Third, the act provided for tribal financing of all operations at the agency level. The tribe had been paying for substantially all operations for some years; however, a total of $84,000 of gratuity funds had been spent in the 1953 fiscal year, primarily on roads.

Fourth, provision was made for an immediate payment of $1,500 to each member listed in the Federal Register.

Fifth, provision was made for the tribe to select and contract for, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the services of management specialists, including tax consultants for the purpose of studying the tribe's resources and industrial potentials to determine the tax loads and the resultant effects on tribal assets and of the various management problems that would confront the tribe after the termination of Federal supervision. These reports were to be prepared and completed by December 30, 1954—18 months. All services were to be paid from tribal funds.

Sixth, plans for future control of tribal property and service controls were outlined. The tribe, with the assistance of the Secretary of the Interior, was to prepare plans for future control of the tribal property and service functions previously performed under Federal supervision. Provision was made for necessary consultations with Federal and State agencies and officials. The date of December 31, 1956, or earlier if agreed to by the tribe and the Secretary, was set as the time when the responsibility of the United States to furnish services because of the status of the Menominees as Indians would cease.

Seventh, the Secretary was authorized and directed to transfer tribal property to the tribe by December 31, 1956. If the tribe decided to incorporate and requested the transfer to such corporation, the Secretary was directed to comply.

Eighth, provision was made to exempt from income tax payments the distribution of assets, with the exception that there would be no exemption for that portion of the judgment fund since July 14, 1950.

Ninth, provision was made for the proclamation in the Federal Register of the transfer of tribal property and of the fact that the Indians of the Menominee Tribe were no longer subject to statutes specifically applicable to Indians.

At the time the committee was considering the original termination legislation, the tribe had approximately $10,280,000 in the U.S. Treasury. Under section 6 of the act, the 3,200 enrolled members were entitled to a per capita payment of $1,500. This reduced the assets by some $4,800,000, leaving a balance in excess of $5,500,000 which provided a reserve fund of about $3 million for sawmill operations and more than $2,500,000 for any unforeseen contingencies which might arise.

In February 1955, the Department of the Interior Solicitor interpreted the act of March 28, 1908, as amended by the act of June 15, 1934, as providing for the use of both fully matured and ripened green stumpage profits for per capita payments. This had not been done previously and the Bureau of Indian Affairs advised against depleting the Treasury in so doing. Nonetheless the tribe voted to distribute some $2,275,000 per capitawise and thus reduced the trust fund by nearly half. Other expenses and service costs have

further reduced the tribal funds to approximately $1,300,000.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the record a copy of the Solicitor's opinion relating to these stumpage payments and a copy of a letter signed by Commissioner Glenn L. Emmons of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and sent to the Menominee Advisory Council under date of April 15, 1955. Mr. Emmons warned of the danger of depleting the Menominee Mill reserves and of the impact the depletion would have during the "difficult transition period ahead." The letters follow:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D.C., February 9, 1955.

To: Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs.
From: Acting Solicitor.
Subject: Determination of per capita payments to Menominee Indians under the act of March 28, 1908 (35 Stat. 51), as amended by the act of June 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 964).

In your memorandum of December 30, 1954, you requested the opinion of this Office as to whether per capita payments made to Menominee Indians pursuant to the acts quoted above as a matter of law have been properly calculated and, if not, as to the proper method of their calculation. Attached to your memorandum was a memorandum dated September 7, 1954, to you from the Branch of Forestry discussing these issues.

Briefly, the 1908 act (supra) provided for the establishment of a timber operation on the Menominee Reservation. It authorized the cutting annually of specified amounts of timber, directed that a sawmill and other buildings and equipment necessary to the manufacture of lumber products be erected on the reservation, authorized the sale of logs, lumber and lumber products, and directed that the net proceeds from such sales be deposited in the Treasury and bear interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum, the interest to be used for the benefit of the Indians in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior might prescribe. Section 4 of that act authorized the Secretary to pay out of the funds of the Menominee Indians all the necessary expenses for the conduct of such operations including the preservation of the forest. It appears that every year or two thereafter, at the request of the Menominee Indians, the Congress enacted legislation providing for specific per capita payments to the Menominee. (78 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8230, 8231.) To avoid further recurring requests for such legislation and to provide in lieu thereof legislation of a permanent type authorizing per capita payments to be made to the Menominee Indians upon the basis of a statutory formula, in 1934 the Congress amended section 4 of the 1908 act to read as follows:

"The Secretary of the Interior shall at the end of each fiscal year ascertain and fix the fair market stumpage value of the fully matured and ripened green timber cut on said reservation during the fiscal year and shall during the succeeding fiscal year pay said amount in equal shares to each member of the Menominee Tribe of Indians, living and on the tribal rolls, on the last day of said fiscal year: *Provided*, That said amount so distributed during any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount actually earned from timber operations on said reservation during the previous fiscal year. The expenditures proposed for the purposes specified herein shall be submitted to the tribal council, or its authorized business committee, for its advance review and approval" (48 Stat. 964).

From the information contained in the memorandum of the Branch of Forestry, supra, it appears that at first per capita payments made under the 1934 amendment were based on estimated volumes of stumpage used. Later, the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1940 (54 Stat. 628, 642), provided for a lump sum per capita payment to be made to the Indians in lieu of the amounts which would have been due under the 1934 act for the fair market stumpage value of timber cut during the fiscal years 1940 and 1941.

Commencing in 1941 and continuing to date, however, per capita payments have been made annually which were intended to comply with the provisions of the 1934 amendment to the 1908 act. It is my understanding that such payments have been computed on an annual basis as follows:

From the total dollar income of the complete timber operation there has been deducted the dollar cost of carrying on such operation.[1] From the net cash income thus determined, there has been subtracted as an item of cost of sale and as a bookkeeping transaction the fair market stumpage value of the fully matured and ripened green timber cut on the reservation during the fiscal year involved and the resulting figure was reflected in the books of account as "Operating profit." For each fiscal year there was then paid out as per capita payments either such stumpage value (reflected as "Stumpage income" in the bookkeeping accounts or the "Operating profit," whichever was less.

In my opinion, such a procedure for the calculation of the amounts available for per capita payments to the Menominee Indians does not conform to the requirements of the 1934 amendment. It will be observed that the amendment requires primarily that the stumpage value is to be paid to the Indians, subject only to the limitation of the proviso. The proviso, in turn, requires that the amount distributed during any fiscal year shall not exceed the amount actually earned from timber operations on said reservation during the previous fiscal year. The amount actually earned from timber operations on said reservation is the woods operation income (called "stumpage income") plus the mill and manufacturing income (called "operating profit"). To require that the value of stumpage be deducted as an item of cost before determining whether the total operation sustained a profit or a loss is to ignore the fact that the woods operation is an integral part of the total timber operation of the tribe.

The question is whether Congress intended that the stumpage value should be a capital item which the accountant should enter as a depletion figure when the timber is cut, or whether it should be considered as income from the entire timber operation. In other words, should it be paid out as part of the gross operating profit or retained in the depletion account for distribution on liquidation? The logging operation on the Menominee Reservation has been conducted on a sustained yield basis which results in no depletion of their timber capital asset.

It is my opinion that Congress intended that the fair market stumpage value should be distributed annually in equal shares to each member of the tribe, but in the event that their mill operations result in any year in a gross operating profit which is less than the stumpage value of the timber cut, the distribution should be limited to such gross operating profit. When the operations result in a gross operating profit greater than the stumpage value, the stumpage value should be distributed, and the difference should be credited to the capital account.[2] Therefore, the method used for distribution of the profits since 1941 has not been correctly reflecting the congressional intent of the act.

J. REUEL ARMSTRONG,
Acting Solicitor.

April 15, 1955.

CHAIRMAN,
Menominee Advisory Council.

DEAR SIR: Superintendent Bitney has forwarded to the Office of the Commissioner by letter of April 5, 1955, a certified copy of the resolution of the Menominee General Council of April 2, 1955, in which it is requested that there be distributed to the members of the Menominee Tribe the "entire stumpage payment amounting to $2,275,752 declared under the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior to be due to the tribal members under the act of June 15, 1934," etc. Mr. Bitney comments that in the general council the tribal chairman presented "the stumpage issue in a clear and excellent manner, giving all the facts and figures available."

As you recall, in our meeting in my office on March 11, 1955, you presented a draft of a compromise proposal by which you would recommend to the tribe that a per capita distribution be made with shares not to exceed $400, and proportionally smaller payments to those on the rolls for fewer years when underpayments were made. At that time the Bureau committed to you that we would hold in abeyance action on the stumpage adjustment until the Menominee Tribe made known its wishes in this matter.

Since that time the Menominee Agency published a special issue of the Menominee News, on March 21, 1955, to counsel your people on the serious impact that a full distribution would have on the Menominee economy. It was pointed out that the Menominee people actually had received benefits from the lesser payments in the form of extensive services, that depleting the Menominee Mill reserves would jeopardize almost 500 irreplaceable jobs, that sustained yield forestry management and lumber manufacturing on the reservation is contingent on sound mill financial stability, and that finances for Menominee planning for future independent management would be disadvantageously depleted in the difficult transition period ahead in the event of a full stumpage distribution. We note that the advisory council held three district meetings in order to counsel the membership on the wisdom of limiting the per capita distribution to approximately $1 million in the interest of the future welfare of the tribe. We commend you on that responsible effort.

Although we believe that the general council was entitled to an unrestricted option in making this decision, it is unfortunate that those present gambled so dangerously with the future of the tribe for the sake of an additional few hundred immediate dollars. The vote is particularly perplexing in that Mr. Al Dodge presented to the Bureau on March 23 a petition with over 200 Menominee signatures advocating a maximum per capita payment of $500; then Mr. Dodge led the general council in amending the advisory council motion by authorizing a full distribution of the entire $2,275,000 stumpage fund.

In any event, we note that a mere 6 percent of the 1,500 adult Menominee members participated in the voting, and that the issue was decided by a margin of only 30 of the small number of participants. We feel that one day the Menominee people may decide

[1] Throughout this memorandum it is assumed, for purposes of illustration, that the books of the timber operation are kept on a cash basis. Such assumption is not intended to reflect any legal opinion as to the propriety of keeping such books on an accrual basis.

[2] The amount to be actually distributed, of course, will then turn upon the tribe's action taken in accordance with the last sentence of section 4 as quoted above.

that such a crucial issue should not have been determined by so unrepresentative a number of people, and that the judgment may be that an irreparable result may have been brought about capriciously.

Therefore, while the very extensive work that must be done by the agency staff in computing stumpage adjustments year by year and member by member gets underway, I would recommend that the advisory council initiate a move for reconsideration to reach a more financially responsible decision. If you so request, the Superintendent and his staff will assist you by reproducing again the factual data involved in order to assure that the people are thoroughly informed, and the agency will also assist by arranging a referendum vote by mail ballot of the membership if the advisory council requests that it be done.

We do not challenge the propriety of the April 2 vote of a duly convened general council with a quorum present; but we believe that a larger vote of the tribe, viewing their future needs soberly, may avert a possible financial reverse that will be more enduring than the temporary bonus of a few hundred additional dollars.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN L. EMMONS,
Commissioner.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to complete the record by including an itemized statement from the Department of the Interior of the Bureau of Indian Affairs appropriated funds used at the Menominee Agency since 1950. I call particular attention to the years since 1954 when there has been a total accrued cost to the Federal Government for administering the affairs of the tribe of $2,940,466. In addition these figures do not include health, education, and welfare gratuities for school construction, school operations, sewer and water facilities, and health program assistance in excess of $1,040,000 for fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961. Thus a total of almost 54 million in Federal funds has been spent on behalf of the Menominees. The statement follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Indian Bureau gratuity appropriated funds used at Menominee Agency, Wis.

Appropriations and activities	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961 (programed)
Education and welfare services:												
Educational assistance, facilities, and services			$44,588	$50,053	$56,446	$94,912	$315,520	$350,658	$164,168	$54,129	$66,256	$158,780
Relocation services			500						11,536	13,518	13,681	7,675
Total			45,088	50,053	56,446	94,912	315,520	350,658	175,704	67,647	79,937	166,455
Resources management:												
Fire suppression						510						
Economic development												20,200
Maintenance of roads	$24,007	$34,500	35,000	36,376	31,744	31,162	34,726	46,345	43,239	67,066	41,367	24,000
Land management												10,000
Repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities	4,000	4,371	3,800	3,821	5,065	750	4,672	4,447	640	898	1,526	1,200
Total	28,007	38,871	38,800	40,197	36,809	32,422	39,398	50,792	43,879	67,964	42,893	55,400
Construction: Buildings and utilities	3,138	17,357				1,048	897				1,800	
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization): Federal-aid highway roads	18,500	13,708	5,839	32,327	35,000	50,158	86,280	103,732	111,949	92,940	478,519	
General administrative expenses							8,190	8,526	9,654	10,497		
Liquidation of Klamath and Menominee Agencies											72,798	50,000
Tribal termination expenses reimbursed by United States											167,539	102,438
Grand total	49,645	69,936	89,727	122,577	128,255	178,540	450,215	513,708	341,185	239,048	843,476	374,293

NOTE.—These totals do not include HEW gratuities for school construction, school operations, sewer and water facilities, and health program assistance estimated in excess of $1,040,000 for fiscal years 1959–61.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the Menominees today have been released from Federal supervision. While Congress enacted the termination legislation in 1953, Congress is not responsible for financial plight of the tribe. The nearly depleted treasury is attributed to an unwise interpretation by the Solicitor's Office in the Department of the Interior which not only permitted but encouraged the tribal members to obtain per capita payments from stumpage payments.

Now we are asked to provide funds to augment the treasury. Had forethought been displayed a few years ago, the treasury would not have been depleted and we would not have needed these additional funds.

Mr. Chairman, we have a continuing responsibility to the Menominees. Let us help them in their efforts to fit themselves into our society by enacting this legislation.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, today I believe we are bringing to a climax the ramifications of the Menominee Termination Act of 1954. Once again the members of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have given serious consideration to this act and its effect on the Menominees, the State of Wisconsin, and the Federal Government.

Congress took a big responsibility upon itself in 1954 when it enacted the original law. Those of us who helped prepare this legislation knew that the path the Menominees would have to follow would not be strewn with roses. We also knew they were competent to work out their problems if they were given the responsibilities. We commend them for their accomplishments and for the manner in which the State of Wisconsin has met the challenge of Public Law 399, 83d Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I want the RECORD to show the amendments that have been made to the original bill. Each was carefully considered and worked out following conferences with the Menominees and their attorneys, the State officials, the Bureau of Indian Affairs representatives, and our Senate counterparts.

In the 84th Congress three amendments were made to Public Law 399, 83d Congress, as follows: Public Law 715, Public Law 718, and Public Law 721.

Public Law 715 provided for reimbursement to the tribe from Federal funds for any tribal expenditures that are approved by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Termination Act.

Public Law 718 amended the Termination Act by first, requiring that a plan for future control of tribal property for the future performance of service functions previously performed by the Federal Government should be submitted not later than December 31, 1957; second, by providing that said plan should contain provisions for the protection of the forest on a sustained yield basis; and third, by conferring authority on the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the tribe, tribal organization, or individual member of the tribe any federally owned property acquired, withdrawn, or used for the administration of the affairs of the tribe or to transfer to a public or nonpublic body on such property which he deemed necessary for public use and from which members of the tribe would derive benefit.

Public Law 721 amended the 1908 act relating to timber cutting to authorize an increase in the allowable annual cut of 20 million feet by an additional annual cut equal to 2 million board feet of pulpwood, bolts, posts, poles, and similar products.

During the 85th Congress it was necessary to amend the 1954 act by the enactment of Public Law 488 to provide additional time for the tribe to carry out its program. This law deferred the date for formulating and submitting the Menominees' plan for future management and control of the tribal property to February 1, 1959, and postponing the final termination date to December 31,

1960. It also authorized the appropriation of Federal funds equal to all expenses incurred for the termination program prior to the date of its enactment and, in addition, one-half of such expenses incurred thereafter, or the sum of $275,000, whichever is less.

In the 86th Congress, the 1954 act was amended by the enactment of Public Law 733.

This law amended the act in four respects. First, it again extended the final termination, this time from December 31, 1960, to April 30, 1961. Second, it exempted the tribe and its affiliated corporation created under the 1954 act from payment of certain Federal and State taxes when transferring property or issuing stocks and bonds in connection with the termination plan. Third, it provided that if the tribe failed to implement the provisions of the termination plan with respect to the tribal corporation and voting trust by March 1, 1961, the Secretary of the Interior would transfer the assets to a trustee of his choice. Incidentally, it was not necessary to do this since the plan was submitted on time. Finally, it provided for the establishment, under contract with the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, of a vocational or college undergraduate program for certain deserving Menominees.

Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed the legislative history relating to the Menominee Termination Act to show the continuing interest we have had in the matter and the concern that was taken to insure that the program would be carried out in a reasonably satisfactory manner.

Statements have been made, Mr. Chairman, that little has been accomplished by the Menominees, the State of Wisconsin, or the Bureau of Indian Affairs since the enactment of the 1954 Termination Act. I take exception to these statements and am submitting a listing of the principal accomplishments under the 1954 act.

Distribution of the $1,500 per capita payment began on August 3, 1954. Payments due minors were invested in U.S. savings bonds to be delivered to the owner on his 18th birthday.

The final Menominee roll, listing the names of 3,270 enrolled members of the tribe who were alive on June 17, 1954, was approved by the Secretary on November 26, 1957.

Since 1954 the tribe has taken over from the Federal Government full responsibility for law and order—pursuant to the act of August 24, 1954—68 Statute 795—the policing of the reservation was shifted to State jurisdiction, with a Menominee constabulary functioning as deputy sheriffs and with prosecution in county courts—welfare, public utility, agricultural extension; and a large part of the educational, health, and general tribal administration. Agency functions are now largely confined to advisory and trust activities.

At the tribe's request, the Wisconsin Legislature in 1955 by act permitted the tribe to operate its lending program under State law. Following passage of this law the tribe took over the $100,000 credit program from the Federal Government. A board of trustees now makes loans from tribal funds to tribal members under regulations approved by the State commissioner of banks.

A reorganization of Menominee activities resulted in concentration of the Agency and tribal government headquarters at Keshena, apart from that of the lumber mill management at Neopit. The Menominee mill was set up as a sole entity, more readily accountable on a business basis in the processing and marketing of forest produce and for commercial activities allied to the mill. During this transition period, however, the Agency has continued to supervise management of the forest and sawmill. The Menominee garment factory, long a losing operation as a tribal enterprise, was leased to private operators.

The tribe's general council in 1957 elected a special coordinating and negotiating committee of three members to handle all pretermination planning.

At an election September 9, 1958, on preferences in regard to future county government, 622 adult members, or 89 percent of those voting, stated they preferred the reservation being accepted by the State as a single, new county, rather than being merged with 1 or more existing counties.

The State of Wisconsin has cooperated with the tribe in preparing for the end of Federal trusteeship in the following ways:

The Wisconsin Legislature in 1955 established the Menominee Indian Study Committee, chaired by the State's attorney general, to work with the tribe in reaching solutions to mutual problems raised by the 1954 act of Congress.

The Wisconsin Department of Taxation in 1957 placed a tentative, mass assessment value of about $35 million on the Menominee lands, forest, and other resources. After termination the Menominees' forest lands will be taxed on the basis of a substantially lower assessment. See discussion of 1959 Wisconsin legislation.

The University of Wisconsin has been actively engaged in studying the economic, legal, social, and land-use problems involved.

The Wisconsin Governor's Commission on Human Rights financed a study by a social scientist on the attitudes, views, desires, and so forth, of the Menominee people.

The State department of public instruction, financed by Federal funds, has carried on an adult education program which offers citizenship, vocational, and college training to qualified Menominees.

On January 26, 1959, the Menominee Tribe conditionally submitted a termination plan, the main features of which were the setting up of a corporation to operate the tribe's forest and mill activities, the indenturing with a trust company to hold and invest all funds belonging to Menominee minors, and the creation of a new county, Menominee, within the State to manage its civic affairs. For details of these proposals, see the Menominee News of July 28, 1958, and of August 28, 1958.

By midsummer of 1959 the tribe's proposals for State legislation, on which its plan was in large part conditional, had undergone extensive revision by the Wisconsin Legislature but were signed into law by the Governor on July 30, 1959. The Secretary of the Interior, replying on July 31 to the tribe's termination proposals of January 26, stated that he was approving the plan "in principle," but that time would be needed by the Department to analyze the plan thoroughly for its conformity to Federal and State laws and as to its equity. The tribe agreed to any changes consistent with the principles of the plan.

The Menominee legislation enacted by the Wisconsin Legislature consisted of three laws. Chapter 258 of the laws of 1959 provided a new method of taxation of forest lands required by Federal law to be operated on a sustained yield basis. It, in effect, provides that a forest required to be operated on sustained yield has a fair market value of 40 percent of the fair market value of a forest operated without such restriction. The law authorizes the State commissioner of taxation, after certain requirements have been met, to enter sustained yield forest lands on a special property tax roll, and to assess such lands at 40 percent of their fair market value if they were unrestricted. As a consequence, the Menominee forest lands will be taxable locally, after termination, on an assessment of only about $12 million.

Chapter 259 created Menominee County from all reservation areas now included in Shawano and Oconto Counties, to become effective on date of publication of the termination plan in the Federal Register by the Secretary of the Interior, as required by the act of June 17, 1954, as amended. Chapter 259 attached Menominee County to Shawano County for certain judicial and educational functions. It established one political town to consist of the entire Menominee County.

Chapter 260 was a technical enactment required to distribute to Menominee County its proportion of certain moneys derived from State taxes on income, intoxicating liquors, and utilities. These moneys, now held in escrow by the State treasurer, are not expected to total more than $20,000.

Four new Menominee bills were introduced in Congress in early 1960. The bills provided that the trust period should be extended beyond December 31, 1960, until such time as, in the discretion of the Secretary, it should be revoked; that a $2,500,000 loan fund be created for the Menominee Tribe from Federal sources; that the tribe be reimbursed for all costs incident to the termination process; and that the tribe be exempted from documentary stamp taxes on stock and other security issuances under the Internal Revenue Code.

After hearings before both the House and Senate subcommittees, Congress voted by the act of September 8, 1960, to extend the trust period to April 1, 1961, to direct the Secretary to begin negotiations for trustees immediately in order to be prepared to act in the event the tribe had not organized under its own termination plan by March 1, 1961, to exempt the tribe from the documentary stamp taxes on security issuances, and

to authorize the Bureau to finance the completion of any authorized educational courses begun by Menominee members before the termination date.

Since September 1960 the tribe has devoted itself to organizing under the plan which was published in the Federal Register of April 29, 1961, along with the Secretary's program providing for the election of voting trustees by the tribe in general council—pages 3726–3755. The voting trustees have elected a board of directors of the corporation. The articles of incorporation have been filed and accepted by the State of Wisconsin. The board of directors appointed a general manager for the Menominee Enterprises, Inc. The board of directors has issued certificates of beneficial interest to adult members and deposited those issued to minors with a competent trust company. The county government has been organized, the officials were appointed by the Governor of Wisconsin, and installed on May 1. On April 29, 10 days ago, the Superintendent of the Menominee Indian Agency met with the corporation officers and the county officers and made the transfers required by the act.

Mr. Chairman, the termination announcement which appeared in the Federal Register on page 3726, dated April 29, 1961, and signed by the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, is as follows:

Pursuant to the authority contained in section 10 of the act of June 17, 1954—Public Law 83–399; 68 Stat. 250—it is hereby proclaimed that the title to all property, real and personal, held in trust by the United States for the Menominee Tribe has been transferred in accordance with section 8 of the act of June 17, 1954, supra, and that effective midnight April 30, 1961, individual members of the Menominee Tribe shall not be entitled to any of the services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians; all statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall no longer be applicable to the members of the Menominee Tribe; and the laws of the several States shall apply to the Menominee Tribe and its members in the same manner as they apply to other citizens or persons within their jurisdiction.

As required by section 7 of the act of June 17, 1954, supra, the plan for the future control of Menominee Indian tribal property and future service functions is published and appears immediately below this notice.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I support this legislation. I think it is necessary and desirable, and I trust it will be passed overwhelmingly by the House. I did want to take this time to express the appreciation of a Member of the House who represents a large number of Indians for the patience and the understanding and the statesmanship which the gentleman from Florida has given to this measure and to others dealing with the problem of our Indian people. The Indians of America owe a real debt of gratitude to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for his kind remarks.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I have watched the developments on the Menominee Reservation for many years, particularly since 1954 when the termination program got underway. I want to commend those who have helped bring the program to its conclusion. Congress has had fine cooperation from the State of Wisconsin, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Division, and the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for the most part from the Indians themselves. Our colleagues in the House and the Senate have been patient in reconsidering and restudying the 1954 Termination Act in the 84th, 85th, 86th, and now the 87th Congress. I believe the objectives of the 1954 act have been achieved: The Menominees are now on an overall par with other citizens, they are entitled to all the benefits of citizenship and they are to be required to assume all burdens which go with their new status. They are relieved of supervision by the Federal Government.

Congress and the responsible Federal and State agencies have learned that the termination process over a major Indian tribe is not a simple undertaking. The difficulties are due, in part at least, to the long period during which the Federal Government has handled the business affairs of most tribes and to the fact that the Indians had not been adequately trained in the details of administration.

I wish the Menominees well in their new venture. In the legislation before us, Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has recommended financial assistance for the Menominees over the next 6 years.

The committee is recommending a low interest-bearing loan of $2,500,000 to the Menominee Enterprises, Inc., in order to modernize and enlarge the sawmill, kiln, and storage facilities. A competent engineering firm has assured the committee that this expenditure is essential. A topnotch lumberman has been hired to operate the mill and he plans to enlarge the cut and to increase the sales force.

With respect to other assistance recommended, the levels of health and sanitation must be brought to the level of other communities in Wisconsin. The Federal Government recognizes deficiencies and is offering assistance in four fields:

First. Completion of water and sewerage facilities for Keshena and Neopit, the two major communities in the new county. This will necessitate a grant of $438,000.

Second. Grants for public health: Arrest and prevention of tuberculosis is very essential. A program is underway and must be continued. It is also appropriate and necessary to provide, for a limited time at least, a public health nurse, a sanitary aid, immunization against communicable diseases, collection and recording of vital statistics, and the collection and disposal of garbage and refuse. The sum of $90,000 has been suggested for the first year for these purposes.

Third. Grants for education: For the 1960–61 school year the Federal Government provided $53,780 under the Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934 for Menominee schoolchildren and $96,220 under Public Law 874 funds for Government impacted areas. There will be no more Johnson-O'Malley funds for the 1961–62 school year because those funds are available only for schools educating Indian children and the Menominees will not fall into that class now that the termination date has arrived. Impacted area funds will be allocated for an additional year. It is well-nigh impossible to ascertain how many children will attend the public schools in Menominee County next year. It is anticipated that some of the children in the parochial schools will transfer to the newly constructed public school. The sum of $250,000 is being set aside for educational purposes but with the understanding that this amount will be necessary only if the needs are not met by Public Law 874 funds or State aid. Requests for these funds will have to be fully justified before the Appropriations Committees.

Fourth. Grants for public welfare: In this category are included direct relief due to unforeseen unemployment, surplus commodities, indigent medical care services, child welfare, public assistance and services of State hospitals, mental institutions, industrial schools and veterans services. Two hundred thousand dollars is being allocated for these purposes.

All of these are maximum authorizations and will be scaled down by 20 percent in fiscal year 1962, and successively in 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966 until 1967 when only 10 percent of the original amount is authorized. Each year the need for these authorizations will have to be approved by appropriate authorities. After 1967 the Federal Government will not be obliged to make any more payments. These are transitional expenses resulting largely from the termination process. The committee is convinced that they are reasonable and ask for their approval as well as the legislation contained in H.R. 4130.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, this is a proposal of principle. It is not a compromise. Certainly it is remarkable in many respects.

I hope that all Members of the House and of the Senate will study the purpose as well as the technique of the measure. The bill breathes a new philosophy of hope for America's Indians. It gives them a new alternative with worthwhile goals.

No one would argue that this bill is perfect—or that the resulting law will work without defect or problem. Indeed, the very fact that so much responsibility is placed in the hands of individuals—the fact that they have an opportunity to shape their own futures—is an advantage of the legislation.

Commendation is in order to the State of Wisconsin for its complete cooperation. Further, the assistance already given and promised for the future by business leaders of that State has been most gratifying.

I believe the greatest contribution made by this bill is in the recognition that our Indian people can accept a full-citizen role in our society. I congratulate the Menominee Tribe and pray that their efforts will serve as both inspiration and example for all American Indians.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an announcement?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to make an announcement to the Members that tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock in the caucus room will be shown the preview of the capsule pictures taken in the ballistic missile wherein was Commander Shepard. All the Members of the House of course are invited. We hope you will all attend. It will be a short showing, taking some 20 to 30 minutes, but I think it will be well worthwhile.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. If the gentleman will yield, will the members of the staff and others be allowed to come in?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think so. All the Members of the Congress of course are expected, and we will certainly have the committee staff members, and their families, too.

Provision will be made for the House Members at the first showing and, in the event that the public and staff members cannot be fully cared for, arrangements have been made for a repeat of the preview.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to commend the gentleman from Colorado, chairman of the full committee and the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the subcommittee, on this excellent job. As many of you know, I come from a State that has many large Indian tribes, so to us this is more than just an experiment, this is a venture in human beings that cannot fail. We have to be successful, not only in the eyes of the Indians in this country, but the oppressed minorities around the world have their eyes on our conduct in solving this problem of terminating the trusteeship of these people. It is a terrifying experience that they face, because it is human beings that are involved. It is a question of whether they will have jobs or poverty, whether they will have food, clothing, and shelter, or whether they will have stark denial of necessities facing them.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say that in this particular instance it is very reassuring, is it not, that the committee did have the representatives of the tribe make their acknowledgment in support of this legislation.

Mr. OLSEN. Yes, it is very reassuring. I want my chairman to know that my Indians in Montana as well subscribe to and support the activity of the committee in this particular instance. They look to the Congress to perform successfully with the Menominees. It will give faith and assurance to the Indians elsewhere, whose trusteeship has not been terminated yet, that the Congress intends to see them to success in embarking upon their terminations somewhere in the future. Because it is a wonderful experience, too, that faces them if the termination is successful, I am particularly happy that there is this outstanding leadership in the Congress assuring the Indians of success in the termination of the trusteeships, success in embarking on their own self-reliance.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, a major portion of what has been the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin has been in the congressional district which I represent. I say "has been" because, as of 12:01 a.m. on April 30, 1961, the area known legally since 1854 as the Menominee Indian Reservation ceased to exist—it became Menominee County, the 72d county of Wisconsin. This new county became the 11th county of the 7th Congressional District which I have represented since 1952.

During these past 9 years I have worked long and hard to present the problems of the Menominee Indian people to the Congress in as clear and forceful a manner as humanly possible. Today I want to review some of the congressional history of the past 9 years that brings us to the bill we have under consideration. In my speech opposing termination on the floor of this House on August 1, 1953, I predicted the problem we face today.

I am not a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. But I feel almost like a member because, ever since I came to Congress, I have been dealing with that committee on affairs of the Menominee Indian tribe; specifically, problems relating to the termination of our Government's trust responsibility over the property and people of that tribe. This continuing relationship with the membership of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has left me with the highest regard for the membership of that committee. This results not only from that committee's attentive and serious consideration of the problems relating to the Menominees—and this I attest to—but also to its genuine concern for the people and the fair attitude with which it has approached the multiplying problems from year to year—many problems which were unforeseen. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and particularly the Indian Affairs Subcommittee under the able leadership of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] has devoted an unbelievable amount of time to the consideration of Menominee problems. The committee has not always agreed with me, but it has had sound reason whenever it has disagreed. I salute it for its wisdom, fairness and devotion to duty.

It behooves me, on this occasion, which may be the last one on which the House will be required to consider Menominee problems, to review somewhat the background which leads to consideration of the bill before you today.

Prior to the time I came to Congress, the Menominee Tribe had in excess of $10 million on deposit in the U.S. Treasury. This was drawing interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum. During the 82d Congress, my colleague, Mr. BYRNES, had introduced H.R. 7104, a bill to authorize a per capita distribution of $1,000 to each individual member of the Menominee Tribe. Although reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House, that bill did not become law.

When I became a Member of this august body, I was approached by representatives of the tribe to introduce a somewhat similar bill. I introduced such a bill, H.R. 2828, early in the 83d Congress. That bill in due course passed the House with minor amendments agreed to by the Menominee Tribe and myself. But a most unexpected development occurred when the bill reached the Senate. A simple bill designed to allow the Menominees to withdraw somewhat less than half of their money reposing in the U.S. Treasury was converted into a complicated and controversial bill "to provide for termination of Federal supervision over the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin." The Menominees were unhappy, but they faced a dilemma: They were convinced contrary to my advice that they could not obtain withdrawal of their own funds from the Treasury unless they accepted the principle of termination. At their request, the then chairman of the Indian Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee made a trip to the Menominee Reservation. He explained his views in a day-long session, and listened to the views of the Indians. At that meeting, the Indians accepted the principle of termination. However, representatives of the Indians and members of the Senate subcommittee could not agree upon particular provisions of the proposed legislation then pending before the Senate. The Senate nevertheless passed a bill, the House at my request rejected the Senate amendments, the two Houses appointed conferees, and a conference report was ordered to be printed on July 29, 1953. On August 1, 1953, the conference report came before the House providing for termination of Federal control and a $1,500 per capita payment. My colleague from Wisconsin's Eighth Congressional District [Mr. BYRNES] and I joined forces to attempt to persuade the House to vote it down. Our efforts were rewarded with success and the termination proposal was once again rejected in the House by the defeat of the conference report.

This, of course, did not mean that our job was finished. The Menominees were anxious to obtain some of their funds—and by this time they were generally resigned to the fact that they must accept some form of termination in order to obtain some of those funds. I advised them that if they would be willing to

forgo a per capita payment in the 2d session of the 83d Congress, beginning in January 1954, there was a possibility of again defeating termination. The tribe, in general council assembled in December, however, voted for a $1,500 per capita payment tied with a termination plan. For that reason I introduced H.R. 7135 at the request of the Menominee Indian Tribe during the 2d session of the 83d Congress on January 11, 1954.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress, the Indian Subcommittees of the two Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs adopted a policy of holding joint hearings. That joint committee held formal hearings and participated in many informal conferences in an effort to arrive at a fair legislative proposal. Representatives ASPINALL, BERRY, WESTLAND, and HALEY, all of whom are still with us, participated actively on that joint committee. The House acted favorably on legislation following the Menominee General Council recommendation. A different bill, less acceptable to the Menominee Tribe, was passed by the Senate. Again a conference report was rejected by the House and a further conference subsequently agreed to. The House agreed to the later conference report on June 8, 1954, and the Senate followed suit. The President's signature was affixed on June 17, 1954, to the legislation at the request of the elected tribal delegates and in their presence at the White House.

But our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was to learn that this troublesome legislative pilot project was not yet perfected. Two additional amendments were sponsored by me and approved by the Congress in 1956. These amendments provided that the Federal Government reimburse the tribe for termination costs and provided that the excellent Menominee Forest should be maintained on a sustained yield basis. The amendments became law on July 14, 1956.

Additional amendments were considered by the 85th Congress, and Public Law 85–488 became law on July 2, 1958. This contained amendments to the termination cost reimbursement provision and required that the Menominee Tribe formulate a plan for future control of tribal property satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

Still feeling that the Federal Government should pay the cost of termination, I introduced H.R. 10450 on February 16, 1960, for this purpose. I also introduced bills—H.R. 10451 and H.R. 11476—to relieve the tribe and successor entity of the necessity to pay Federal stamp taxes and to provide a Federal loan to assist the tribe or its successor entity in the conduct of its affairs. Again, the House committee gave careful and sympathetic consideration to my requests. It agreed to extend the termination date of July 1, 1961—a 1-year extension—and excuse the tribe from the necessity to pay Federal stamp taxes on transactions required by the termination law. But the Senate had different ideas. It placed in the bill some additional target dates for completion of the business plan, provided for appointment of a trustee in the event of default, and shortened the termination date approved by the House to April 30, 1961. Because that session of Congress was near its close, the House was forced to agree to the Senate amendments, and Public Law 86–733 became law on September 8, 1960.

Because the House committee had indicated a willingness to consider additional amendments during the 87th Congress, the Menominee Tribe again dispatched delegates to Washington during the current session. They sought three additional amendments: First, a Federal loan authorization of $2,500,000, second, appropriation authorization to cover transitional costs, and third, a further extension of the termination date. The House committee, after its usual careful and attentive consideration, agreed to the first two requests but declined the latter because of the adamant position expressed by the Senate last year. The other body has not been so liberal and fair in its treatment. I recognize that because the other body has reported out legislation that does not go as far in helping the Menominees as this bill, that if the House adopts the report of its committee, this bill will eventually go to conference. I urge, as the climax of my 9-year struggle to achieve fair and equitable treatment for the Menominee Indians, that the House adopt the bill reported by our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. To do otherwise, I submit, would constitute a grave injustice, a slap at a dedicated and burdened committee, and constitute another inequity for the Menominee Indian Tribe.

This bill provides loan authority in the amount of $2,500,000 for industrial development and plant modernization. It provides appropriation authorization for health, welfare, and educational aids in the amount of $1,674,000 during the next 6 years. These aids will be paid to the proper Wisconsin State agency for distribution on the same basis as this past year or 100 percent of costs during 1961. Aids will be paid on an 80-percent basis beginning May 1, 1962; 60 percent, 1963; 40 percent, 1964; 20 percent, 1965; and 10 percent, 1966; for the total over this 6-year period of $1,674,000.

Mr. Chairman, this chart shows the aid authorizations made by this bill.

Year	Education including joint school district	Health and sanitation	Public welfare	Total
1962	$250,000	$90,000	$200,000	$540,000
1963	200,000	72,000	160,000	432,000
1964	150,000	54,000	120,000	324,000
1965	100,000	36,000	80,000	216,000
1966	50,000	18,000	40,000	108,000
1967	25,000	9,000	20,000	54,000
Total	775,000	279,000	620,000	1,674,000

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the loan authority and the continuation of health, welfare, and educational aids to be paid on a phased out basis during the next 6 years, this legislation provides for a grant in the amount of $438,000 to complete the sanitation work started last year to bring the sanitation system in Menominee County up to Wisconsin State standards. Last year I was successful in having added to the HEW appropriation bill $117,000 to start this program which the Public Health Service estimates will cost $555,000. This program should be completed and the grant provided in this bill will do this job.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this House to approve my bill, H.R. 4130. I plead with this Congress to support this most needed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of Saturday, May 6, 1961. The editorial follows:

MENOMINEES STILL NEED HELP

There is good reason for the uncertainty with which Wisconsin's Menominee Indians enter upon self-government after more than a century of Federal supervision.

New Menominee County, formed from the reservation, has too few people (about 3,500) and a too small tax base. The tribe, however, voted overwhelmingly for a county of its own, and operations have been simplified. There will be a single town and a joint county-town board. Menominee County will share various services with Shawano County. The State has hired a consultant to help the new county get off on the right foot, and the law creating the county requires reconsideration of the situation within 8 years.

A tribal corporation has been set up to run the forest and sawmill, with safeguards to protect assets from greedy outsiders, and from tribal members who might sell their interest for a song if given the chance. To protect the timber, the termination act requires continuation of sustained yield management practices.

What worries Menominee leaders and prompted their last minute effort to delay termination is the economic outlook. The tribe's lumber business is operating in the red and employing only half its normal complement of 400.

The Senate Indian Affairs Committee refused to consider further delay, but in the House, Representative LAIRD, Republican, of Marshfield, has won committee approval of his bill that would "phase out" various Federal health and welfare aids over 6 years and provide $2.5 million in loans for industrial development.

The aids would help tide the tribe over the transitional period. The Federal Government would not be committed to indefinite assistance. The loans would help provide essential diversification of industry.

The tribe and the State have the major stake in making termination work. But the Federal Government has a stake, too. Because the Menominees are the first tribe to be freed from Federal control, Congress should be deeply interested in seeing them gain self-sufficiency. It should therefore be willing to vote funds, such as the Laird bill calls for, that provide reasonable assurance of assisting the Menominees to that goal.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend and revise his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend Mr. LAIRD and the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for their untiring efforts to alleviate the sorry conditions imposed upon a segment of our people from whose ancestors we wrested the land. It is my conviction that the pur-

pose of our Government is not to do for people what they can and should do for themselves but rather to create the atmosphere in which people can on equal terms help themselves. The reduction of our Indians to a state of second rate citizens through a system of paternalism which made it virtually impossible for the Indians to exist and which stripped the Indian of his self-respect has been a blot on our noble historic record. It is with pride that I am a Member of the Congress that now acts to remedy a long-standing wrong. It is high time we as a Nation take a long look at our tendencies toward "welfarism" which if allowed to continue unchecked might well reduce all our citizens to the same plight out of which we now act to pull our Indians because of past mistakes. It is well we correct our mistakes. At the same time it is unwise to make the same mistake over and over again under the guise of a different name.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would like very much to associate myself with the views expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD]. I think he brought out the salient features which justify this legislation and the action taken.

I would like also, to pay tribute to the untiring efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin in working with the Menominee Tribe and with the Department of the Interior, with the committees of Congress involved, in helping solve the many minute problems involved in this whole process that culminates in the action we take today. I think this tribe and all the people involved in this matter owe the gentleman from Wisconsin a great debt of gratitude for his untiring service.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I would like to join, if I may, with my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], in all he has said about the work of my good friend and colleague, MELVIN LAIRD, who happens to represent the Seventh District of Wisconsin, while I represent the Seventh District of Ohio. He as author of this bill and I as a member of the Committee on Rules, have discussed this legislation many times. He has been unceasingly active in his work in behalf of the Indians of his district, and I think all America owes him a debt of gratitude for the job he has done in perfecting this piece of important legislation.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from the Seventh District of Wisconsin and commend him for his devoted efforts on behalf of the Menominee Tribe. I would also like to join with the gentleman from Oklahoma and others who expressed their gratitude for the work this committee has done and the understanding way in which they have worked to solve these problems.

I want to say to the committee that the problems of the Indians will not end with the passage of this legislation, but I and other Members have exceedingly high hopes that it may lead to a policy of having an earlier and more extended transition period for other tribes. We in Wisconsin are proud of the record of the Menominees. The Menominee Tribe has an enviable record in the management of its resources, particularly a sustained yield of timber. That timber has been used for 50 years but there is just as much timber there today as there was 50 years ago, due to good forest management. The Menominee Indians and all of us are very hopeful that their transition to full citizenship will be successful. Certain it is that it could not have been without this legislation; and I join with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], in commending the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for this fine work.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my other colleagues in commending our friend from Wisconsin, Mr. LAIRD, on introducing this very worthy piece of legislation. But I would like to bring something to the attention of this House that I think we should ponder a little bit and take home to ourselves.

We are pictured today all over the world as the power most strongly opposed to colonialism. I would like to ask my fellow Members of the House of Representatives just where they think they would be today if there had not been some colonialism. I am sure that what is now the United States of America would not be in existence.

I would also like to point out to you something that we all too conveniently forget, that our treatment of the Indians, who were the original inhabitants of this country, was absolutely shocking to the *n*th degree. In urging some of our friends in Europe that they should get out of their colonies, that what they are doing is highly reprehensible, do we realize that the Portuguese had colonies in Angola more than a hundred years before Christopher Columbus discovered this continent?

So you see, there is some truth still in that old saying:

> And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

Anything we can do for the Indians of this country is little enough. I commend anyone who is trying to bring justice to these people who have been so unfairly treated and to whom we now bestow a few favors. It is high time that they came into their own, and it is high time that we as a people realize when we do these things we are only doing justice where it should have been done many long years ago and that we are only restoring to these people what our ancestors took away from them.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], for bringing this legislation to the well of the House for consideration.

It was my pleasure in 1945 and 1946 to serve on the Committee on Indian Affairs with the late Bill Stigler of Oklahoma. During that time we wrote legislation providing for the setting up of a commission to adjudicate the claims of the several Indian tribes with the proviso that when those claims were adjudicated the tribe would no longer be wards of the Government but that they be made full-fledged American citizens.

I am glad to note that the life of that Commission has been extended and that this committee is following through. This is evidenced today in the case of the Menominee Tribe; namely, we can do what the Congress as early as the 79th Congress thought was wise to do and that was to cease this idea of continuing the Indians as wards and making them full-fledged American citizens.

I compliment the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Under the rule, the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute. No amendments are in order to the bill or committee substitute except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and such amendments shall not be subject to amendment.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to lessen the impact of the termination on April 30, 1961, of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin pursuant to section 7 of the Act of July 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 251), as amended (25 U.S.C. 896), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(a) to make such loans to Menominee Enterprises, Incorporated, as are required for the expansion and modernization of existing tribal enterprises and for the development of tribal resources, said loans to be made at such time, in such amounts, and on such terms and conditions as the said Secretary deems appropriate. The total amount of all such loans shall not exceed $2,500,000, and each loan shall bear interest at a rate (which rate shall be certified by the Secretary of the Treasury) equal to the estimated rate of interest on new long-term borrowings by the United States as of the first day of the month immediately preceding the month in which the loan is made; and

(b) to make grants for the following purposes and in not more than the following amounts to the State of Wisconsin for distribution to Menominee County or to other

appropriate State agencies or political subdivisions for the benefit of said county:

(i) during the year ending April 30, 1962—

for education services (including administrative costs, aid to common schools, agricultural and home grants, tuition for outside training, and contributions to joint school district costs), $250,000;

for health and sanitation services (including hospitalization of the tubercular, employment of a public health nurse and a sanitary aide, immunization against communicable disease, the collection and disposal of garbage and refuse, and the collection and recording of vital statistics), $90,000;

for public welfare (including administrative costs, public assistance, indigent medical care services, child welfare, veterans services, surplus commodities, general relief, and the services of State hospital, mental institutions, and industrial schools), $200,000;

(ii) during the year ending April 30, 1963, 80 per centum of each of the amounts aforesaid;

(iii) during the year ending April 30, 1964, 60 per centum of each of the amounts aforesaid;

(iv) during the year ending April 30, 1965, 40 per centum of each of the amounts aforesaid;

(v) during the year ending April 30, 1966, 20 per centum of each of the amounts aforesaid;

(vi) during the year ending April 30, 1967, 10 per centum of each of the amounts aforesaid.

(c) to make a grant or grants in the manner aforesaid for continuation of construction of sanitation facilities, not in excess of $438,000.

SEC. 2. Any grant made under this Act shall be made only upon such written assurances relating to control and supervision by responsible State officials to insure that the grant is used for the purposes intended as the Secretary may require. No grant shall serve to diminish the amount which Menominee County or other political subdivisions of the State of Wisconsin are entitled to receive from the State as provided by its laws, except so far as such diminution arises from treating the grants as if they were taxes raised by said county and subdivisions for purposes of determining what amounts, if any, the State is required to pay to said county and subdivisions under its laws.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not in excess of $4,612,000, as are required to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any committee amendments to the committee amendment?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: On page 2, line 5, after the words "Act of" strike out the word "July" and insert in lieu thereof "June".

The committee amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Page 4, after line 22, insert a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 4. No payments shall be made under the Act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1100), as amended (20 U.S.C. 236 et seq.) for or on account of the education after June 30, 1961, of children who reside or whose parents are employed on the former Menominee Indian Reservation."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, after our report on this bill had been prepared, we learned that the Office of Education will probably have available between $140,000 and $150,000 of impacted school district funds under Public Law 874 for Menominee County during the fiscal year 1962. It was not the intent of the committee, and I am sure it will not be the intent of Congress, that this amount be available to duplicate the appropriations made under the present bill. I therefore offer a committee amendment which will have the effect of providing that Public Law 874 money shall not be available after June 30, 1961, and that all school costs to the Federal Government shall be picked up under the present bill.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Is my understanding of this committee amendment that the fund will be made available under the same basis as Public Law 874 for the next fiscal year?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is correct. The amount will be the same.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are the Indian workers in this lumber industry or timber industry exempt from an employee tax?

Mr. ASPINALL. Well, I would not think so. I would think that they would come under the rules and regulations and laws that are acceptable and applicable to other citizens.

Mr. LAIRD. The Menominee Indian mills are operating under the Minimum Wage Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bass of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4130) to amend the Menominee Termination Act, pursuant to House Resolution 277, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TELEPHONE SERVICE TAX TERMINATION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I include a statement by me before the House Committee on Ways and Means on May 9, 1961, in support of H.R. 691, to terminate the tax on long-distance telephone service simultaneously with the termination—presently provided for—of the tax on local telephone service:

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, a budget deficit is not always injurious to economic progress. Tax relief that temporarily reduces Government revenues but stimulates business activity that leads to a long-range increase in Government income * * * is good for all concerned.

The telephone is the most important means of communication in our society. Without it, we would be set back 50 years or more. But when its present use is limited and curtailed because of the tax burden imposed on it, there is hardly a person in the United States who is not affected by this restriction.

The tax on long-distance telephone calls was justified by the emergency of World War II for the dual purpose of raising revenues and keeping the circuits open for the priority needs of Government in winning the war. We are now in the 16th year of this emergency excise tax and unless we succeed in repealing this wartime emergency measure, it will continue to inhibit the full and productive use of an essential service.

I do not appear in behalf of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which is one of our largest and most efficient corporations. But I do plead for the millions of users—business and private—who would utilize long-distance communication service to a greater degree for their own progress and that of our national community * * * but for the continuing nuisance tax that they have to pay on toll calls.

But how would we recoup the loss of revenue that would result from the discontinuance of this tax?

Many business and professional men have told me of their resentment toward the excise tax on long-distance calls. Instead of telephoning, they write, with consequent delays that are inconvenient and costly.

Repealing this tax is one of the incentives that will spur economic activity. The revenue lost will be regained through regular channels of taxation as incomes and business profits go up.

I believe that enactment of H.R. 691, a bill to terminate the Federal tax on long-distance telephone service will provide a constructive stimulus to economic growth.

GOLD RESERVE LEGISLATION

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 16, Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on H.R. 6900, a bill to repeal the 25-percent gold cover requirement and to repeal the limit on interest rates which certain commercial banks may pay on time deposits of foreign governments and central banks.

The Federal Reserve Act now requires the Federal Reserve System to maintain a gold reserve equal to 25 percent of Federal Reserve notes outstanding, plus 25 percent of the deposit liabilities of the Federal Reserve banks. This has been characterized by respected economists as an outmoded holdover from the days of the gold standard; the subcommittee will seek to determine whether it serves any useful purpose.

The subcommittee will also consider whether this gold cover requirement could undermine the dollar in the event of a real crisis in our international balance of payments. On the face of it, it would seem that world confidence in the dollar could be more easily maintained if it were made perfectly clear by statute that our entire gold stock—now about $17.4 billion—is available to meet liquid dollar holdings of foreign countries—now about $18.5 billion. There is of course no prospect of these foreign dollar holdings being presented for payment in gold all at once. At the same time, the 25-percent gold cover requirement may create the impression in some quarters that only a third of our gold stock is available to meet our international obligations—because two-thirds is held as a reserve for Federal Reserve note and deposit liabilities. H.R. 6900 would make it crystal clear that, as the President declared in his February 6 message to the Congress on our balance of payments, "the full strength of our gold stocks and other international reserves stands behind the value of the dollar for use if needed."

The bill would reemphasize our determination to maintain the value of the dollar at the present ratio of $35 an ounce of gold. It is well at this time to repeat that our Government has no intention of devaluing the dollar.

The bill also contains an amendment requested by the President on March 14, as a part of his program to prevent excessive gold outflows, which would remove Federal limits on the interest rate insured banks and Federal Reserve member banks may pay on time deposits of foreign governments and central banks.

The opening witness on May 16 will be Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon. Further witnesses will be announced later.

HOSENSOCK FLOOD PREVENTION DAM

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 7, 1961, I had the pleasure of attending the dedication of the Hosensock Flood Prevention Dam in my neighborhood and district.

The Hosensock Dam is one of four dams to be constructed, which together with the dredging of the Little Schuylkill River comprises the Little Schuylkill River Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention project.

With the dedication of the Hosensock Dam in Schuylkill County, Pa., our area has the distinction of being the first dam to be dedicated in the watershed protection and flood prevention program of the U.S. Agriculture Department in the State of Pennsylvania.

As you know these projects are authorized by Public Law 566 passed by Congress in 1954 and provides Federal assistance to small watersheds—250,000 acres or less—in planning and carrying out a soil and water management program. It describes the flood prevention structures needed to control floodwaters. The Federal Government provides all costs for designing and construction of flood prevention structures. Local groups provide land, easements and rights-of-way. They do the contracting and maintain structures.

Federal assistance also includes cost sharing up to 50 percent on approved fish and wildlife projects.

The Little Schuylkill River Watershed has a total area of 136 square miles. Together with the four floodwater retarding structures and the channel improvement will be soil and conservation practices for farm and forest lands of the watershed. These practices will be accelerated through technical and financial assistance under the direction of the Soil Conservation District.

These works of improvement will offer a high degree of protection from serious damage if a flood of the same magnitude as the 1955 storm were to reoccur.

TEAMWORK

Local groups and State and Federal agencies have cooperated from the time of the application for assistance to the completion of the Hosensock Dam.

Sponsors carrying out the work plan include Schuylkill County Soil Conservation District and County Commissioners, Carbon and Berks Counties Soil Conservation Districts and the Tamaqua borough council. Many other groups passed endorsing resolutions.

Sponsors carrying out the work plan include Schuylkill County Soil Conservation District and County Commissioners, Carbon and Berks Counties Soil Conservation Districts, Pennsylvania Fish Commission, Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters, and the water and power resources board.

The Schuylkill County Commissioners have been the contracting local organization and provided the contracting offices. They are assuming maintenance responsibilities of the Hosensock structure, while the soil conservation district is responsible for getting soil and water conservation practices on the land.

The U.S. Soil Conservation Service and U.S. Forest Service provided technical assistance in the preparation of the work plan. The Forest Service, cooperating with Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters, is providing assistance and materials for developing the forest resources. Soil Conservation Service is providing technical and financial assistance for the flood prevention features as well as technical assistance for land treatment.

COSTS

The five flood-prevention structures will cost $2,092,565 (including 100-acre permanent pool); land treatment, $325,092; total installation cost, $2,417,657. Local cost, $379,602. Public Law 566 cost—Federal—$2,038,055.

BENEFITS

The average annual damage without project, $120,000.

The average annual damage with project installed, $8,000.

Average annual damage reduced by 93.3 percent.

Mr. Speaker, included on the program at the dedication of the Hosensock Dam were Mr. Ivan McKeever, State conservationist of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service; Mr. Benjamin Boltz, chairman, Schuylkill County Board of Commissioners, and myself, and I am pleased to include their remarks.

REMARKS BY IVAN MCKEEVER, STATE CONSERVATIONIST SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Your program this afternoon is another significant event in the field of soil and water conservation. I wish to compliment your local leadership for the fine job they are doing in this field. Your soil conservation district directors, your county commissioners, and many others have given liberally of their time and talent to achieve the progress that we recognize this afternoon. Your plans for the Little Schuylkill have been a significant achievement in your total county soil conservation district program. You can look forward to a very high percentage of flood prevention. The program is also enabling you to develop at your Locust Creek site an excellent State park. This is being made possible through the fine cooperation of the State department of forests and waters. In addition to the Locust Creek branch, the other structures will provide permanent pools for recreation. Due to the watershed program the land treatment of the watershed will be accelerated.

The Hosensock structure which we are here to dedicate as well as the entire Little Schuylkill program is in fact a dedication to the fine cooperation of local, county, State and Federal governments joining together to accomplish what could not have been accomplished working separately. In a larger sense, then, this dedication is a tribute to the leadership at all levels which has made this cooperation possible. The Congress, through its interest in our natural resources, made possible Federal participation through the passage of Public Law 566. In that connection it is fine that you have arranged to have your Congressman, the Honorable IVOR D. FENTON on your program this afternoon. Congressman FENTON was at your first meeting and followed your work plan until it had final approval by the appropriate committees of Congress.

Representing the Soil Conservation Service I want to assure all of you that we have

enjoyed working with you in the development and carrying out of your program for the Little Schuylkill. We are looking forward to continuing our work together until your watershed plan is completely established. I am sure this will be carried out rapidly through the able leadership you are receiving from your county commissioners and district directors.

Your program in Schuylkill County is a part of a large and important soil and water conservation program in the State. The dam we dedicated this afternoon is another milestone on the road to conservation in Pennsylvania. It is a road that is already well marked across the landscape of the Commonwealth. The markers include about 750,000 acres of strip cropping, 3,000 miles of diversion terraces, 10,000 farm ponds, 100,000 acres of tree planting and numerous other conservation practices. "You can see it on the land in Pennsylvania" has become a byword of conservationists throughout the State. The ever-changing landscape of square fields to contour farming; the eroded hills changing to green pastures and forest plantations is not only increasing our natural resources, but is making the State a more enjoyable place in which to live.

You can be proud of your achievements to date. You have the distinction of dedicating the first dam under Public Law 566 in Pennsylvania. You can be prouder still of the contribution you are making to the conservation and wise use of our most important resources, soil and water.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE IVOR D. FENTON, DEDICATION OF THE HOSENSOCK DAM, LITTLE SCHUYLKILL RIVER WATERSHED, MAY 7, 1961

It is a pleasure for me to join with you here today in the dedication of the first dam in the Little Schuylkill watershed protection and flood prevention project. This is an excellent start toward raising your objectives of managing the soil and water in this watershed. You are to be complimented for your efforts.

I am familiar with the work you are trying to accomplish in the Little Schuylkill River. I have seen this stream cause serious damages to Tamaqua and other communities in this area. We are all aware of the flood damages this stream has caused to industries, utilities, roads, bridges, and other structures in the watershed. I believe that we can term the Little Schuylkill River a "bad actor," which seems to give us trouble here in the watershed regularly. You can be assured that I fully support your program for taming the Little Schuylkill River.

It appears to me that the watershed program you have planned for the Little Schuylkill is sound. This new approach of planning the entire watershed to benefit agriculture, industry, and the watershed communities is a logical way to manage our natural resources. Watershed development offers an opportunity for the farmer, the businessman, and the town dwellers to work with their local and Federal governments toward a common goal. It is an opportunity for all of us to join together to do a job which we cannot do individually.

Since the passage of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act by the U.S. Congress in 1954 over 289 projects covering 17 million acres have been authorized for operation in the country. The U.S. Soil Conservation Service and the Forest Service are providing leadership in working with the local people in developing watershed plans.

The program offers an opportunity for the local people to work with their State and Federal Governments in solving some of the difficult problems of watershed management. Cost-sharing in the completion of these watershed programs is available from the Federal Government. The Soil Conservation Service provides the necessary engineering designs and assists in the completion of these structures. Technicians of the Soil Conservation Service also assist the farmers with speeding up the needed land treatment measures in the watersheds.

Here in Pennsylvania 60 applications from 30 counties have been submitted for assistance in developing their watersheds. Thirty-six flood prevention measures are now in the operation stage, and many others are being planned. Many of these structures will be used to provide not only flood prevention but they will help in providing a great deal of the much needed water for industrial development.

In creating the Watershed Act Congress recognized the need for assisting the local people in flood prevention on the smaller streams of the Nation.

Estimates show that about 70 percent of the Nation's annual flood damages occur on these small streams. The act fills the gap which existed between the large flood prevention dams and the conservation work on the farms in the headwaters of these streams.

Another excellent feature of this act enables the local people to develop the flood prevention dams for multiple purposes in many projects in Pennsylvania and the Nation. The dams are being planned to provide both flood prevention and water storage. Needed water for residential and industrial uses will become available from the permanent pools in some of the multiple purpose dams. In other areas large permanent lakes are being treated to provide fish and wildlife habitat. They will be ideal recreational areas for our growing population.

This particular dam, known locally as the Hosensock Dam, is designed to hold back floodwaters during periods of heavy runoff. Three other dams on Locust Creek, Koenig Creek and the Quakake Creek, will be built in this watershed in the near future. These four dams, plus the channel work planned, will practically eliminate flooding to the communities in this watershed.

According to your schedule you are planning to build a rather large multiple purpose dam next year on Locust Creek. This dam will provide both flood prevention and store water for recreation. In addition, I understand that you are now in the process of developing a park around this flood prevention measure. This will undoubtedly add to making the Little Schuylkill Watershed a better place in which to live.

In addition to watershed work, the entire soil and water conservation program is being applied rapidly by farmers. I see the evidence wherever I go. The evidence of good work is especially noteworthy in Pennsylvania. The outstanding progress of the two Soil Conservation districts in our congressional district, Northumberland and Schuylkill, shows what can be done when farmers band together to take care of their soil and water resources.

I am proud to say that I had a small part in helping with this project. You might recall that I attended your first meeting in Tamaqua when you first expressed an interest in getting this project underway, and I have been interested in it since then.

And right here may I pay my respects to the valiant work done by Ted Applegate of Tamaqua Chamber of Commerce in helping promote this project. He was a real dynamo in his efforts. In Washington I have had several opportunities to help move the project ahead. Every effort has been made to speed the plan through the Secretary of Agriculture's office, the Bureau of the Budget and the congressional committees. But yours has been the big job of getting the necessary easements, contracts, local financing, and getting all the people working together for a common goal.

This project is worthy of all these efforts for it will mean much to the people of this watershed. To the farmers it offers a program of conservation and better land use; to industries and communities in the watershed it offers a great deal more flood prevention; to the sportsmen there is hope for increasing the hunting and fishing areas. It offers something to all in the Little Schuylkill watershed.

We have no more important National, State, or local interest than the conservation of our natural resources. With the rapid increase in population, water is becoming a resource we cannot take for granted. Increased needs of water for industry, agriculture, recreation, fish and wildlife, and for you and me in our daily living all indicate that we cannot do too much to better conserve and properly use this commodity. I am pleased that the people in my district are doing something about it.

REMARKS BY BENJAMIN BOLTZ, CHAIRMAN, SCHUYLKILL COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this dedication. I feel that this flood prevention dam is another step in the direction of progress in Schuylkill County. Already some benefits, however difficult to measure, have been experienced—both from a flood prevention standpoint and an economic standpoint.

The time, effort, and money which the county has invested here will bear dividends—I am sure. I might say that the launching of a program of this type is not always easy. It is virtually impossible to please everybody in a program which is for the common good, however, we of the board of commissioners have had a minimum of complaints on this project. For that, of course, we are most grateful.

We are well aware that many, many people and several agencies have participated in this. It would be most difficult to recognize all of these civic-minded citizens at this time. I would, however, like to personally thank the landowners who donated the land for this construction at no cost to the county. They are: the Guinan brothers, on whose land the dam breast is located; Carol King and Joseph Klitsch on whose land most of the permanent body of water you see is located; Joseph and John Fogarty who own the land at the western tip of the pool; Dr. Fetterer whose land falls in the flood pool area; and Gust Pappas whose land also falls in the area of possible flooding.

As has been pointed out—this is the first of four dams which will be constructed to prevent flood damages along the Little Schuylkill and its tributaries. Recreation and other public use will seriously be considered by the commissioners for all other sites. Already you probably know of the State park which will be established in conjunction with the Locust Creek Flood Prevention Dam. Recreation of some kind is being seriously considered for the Koenig's Creek structure which will be built this summer. This, we know, will add to the value and public benefits of the entire program.

The commissioners would also like to thank the Soil Conservation Service for its technical and financial assistance which, of course, along with local participation, made this dam possible. We would also like to publicly pledge our cooperation in the construction of the other four projects in this program. We will encourage the development of other Public Law 566 programs in the county and give our cooperation to the limits of our resources. I might add that we will continue to strive for the public enjoyment of all such projects which might be developed.

The county at this time accepts the responsibility for the maintenance of this structure.

In conclusion, I must warn the citizens of Schuylkill County not to forget that structures of this type are serving them. As I understand it the benefits can kind of sneak up on you. I recall a story which was told

at one of the meetings regarding this program.

It seems as if a program similar to this was completed in Ohio some years ago. One town being protected had a high rate of annual damage before the program was started. Some years after it was finished and well established a reporter thought he would get an opinion on the effectiveness from the townspeople by interviewing citizens on the street. He approached one old-timer and asked him what he thought of the program. The old fellow said he did not think it was worth what it cost. The reporter asked why. The senior citizen replied that it was just a big waste of Government money because the town had not had any floods since the project was completed.

I sincerely hope that the citizens being protected by this project will remember the time, effort and money that went into this when the town of Tamaqua and points south no longer have floods.

Thank you.

RAISES IN MILITARY PERSONNEL SUBSISTENCE AND QUARTERS ALLOWANCES, 1941-61

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, within the past 20 years there have been only three major increases authorized for subsistence and quarters allowances for military personnel, as illustrated by the charts below—the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, the Career Compensation Act of October 12, 1949, and the amendment to that act, May 19, 1952. The 1958 act—Public Law 85-422—did not cover subsistence and quarters allowances.

The U.S. Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation—Cordiner Committee—reported in May 1957 that quarters allowances had generally been increased only 14 percent since 1942. During the same period—1942 through 1956—the committee noted, the nationwide price index for rent had risen 48.5 percent, and the combined index for applicable shelter items, including rent and utilities, had risen 46.6 percent. The 14-percent increase in quarters allowances provided in 1952 fell short of the actual increase of 32.6 percent which occurred between 1942 and 1952 in the nationwide costs for housing.[1]

The Cordiner Committee observed that in order to obtain the same quality of housing in December 1956 as was obtainable by the 1942 allowances, an increase of 28.6 percent in allowances rates would have been required.[2] This report was made nearly 4 years ago. There has been no increase in allowances since that provided in the 1952 amendment to the 1949 Career Compensation Act.

The following tables set forth the subsistence and quarters allowances provided for military personnel in the 1942, 1949, and 1952 acts:

[1] U.S. Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation. Report: Military Personnel, vol. 1, May 1957. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957, p. 124.

[2] Ibid.

RATES OF MONTHLY MILITARY PERSONNEL SUBSISTENCE AND QUARTERS ALLOWANCES

Pay Readjustment Act as amended to Jan. 1, 1940, June 10, 1922 (44 Stat. 625), 37 U.S.C. 17

Pay grade	Quarters allowance		Subsistence		Pay grade	Quarters allowance		Subsistence	
	With dependents	Without dependents	With dependents	Without dependents		With dependents	Without dependents	With dependents	Without dependents
Commissioned officers:					Commissioned officers—Continued				
General, admiral, Chief of Staff [1]	[2] $120	$80	$36	$18	Colonel, captain	$120	$80	$36	18
Lieutenant general, vice admiral, Army commander [3]	[2] 120	80	36	18	Lieutenant colonel, commander	[2] 120	80	36	18
Major general, rear admiral (upper half) [4]	[2] 120	80	36	18	Major, lieutenant commander	[2] 120	80	54	18
Brigadier general, rear admiral (lower half)	[2] 120	80	36	18	Captain, lieutenant (senior grade)	80	60	54	18
					1st lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade)	60	40	36	18
					2d lieutenant, ensign	40	40	36	18

[1] Chief of Staff: entitled to rank and title of general, pay and allowance of major general, and to a money allowance of $2,200 per year.

[2] The maximum allowances which will accrue to an officer below the grade of brigadier general or rear admiral (lower half), a brigadier general or real admiral (lower half), or a major general or rear admiral (upper half) will be such that the total of base pay, pay for length of service, and allowances for subsistence and rental of quarters will not exceed $7,200, $7,500, and $9,700, respectively, per annum. Deduction of the necessary amount should be made from the rental allowance.

[3] Army commander: entitled to rank and title of lieutenant general, pay and allowance of major general, and to a personal money allowance of $500 per annum.

[4] Rear admiral serving in higher grades shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance per year as follows: when serving in the grade of vice admiral, $500; when serving in the grade of admiral or as Chief of Naval Operations, $2,200.

NOTE.—All warrant officers are entitled to the rental and subsistence allowances authorized to officers receiving pay of the 1st pay period (2d lieutenant, ensign). Enlisted men not furnished quarters or rations in kind are entitled to an allowance for quarters and subsistence not exceeding $4 per day under regulations to be prescribed by the President.

Source: U.S. laws, statutes, etc. The Pay Readjustment Act, approved June 10, 1922, as amended to Jan. 1, 1940, inclusive with related acts, decisions, and opinions. Army pay tables, January 1940. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1940.

Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, June 16, 1942

Pay grade	Quarters allowance		Subsistence		Pay grade	Quarters allowance		Subsistence	
	With dependents	Without dependents	With dependents	Without dependents		With dependents	Without dependents	With dependents	Without dependents
Commissioned officers:					Warrant officers:				
General of the Armies of the United States [1]	(1)	(1)			Chief (especially designated), commissioned (over 20 years)	$150.00	$90.00	$63.00	$21.00
General, admiral [2]	$120.00	$105.00	$42.00	$21.00	Chief (especially designated), commissioned (over 10 years)	90.00	75.00	42.00	21.00
Lieutenant general, vice admiral [3]	120.00	105.00	42.00	21.00	Masters, Army Mine Planter Service	90.00	75.00	42.00	21.00
Major general, rear admiral (upper half)	120.00	105.00	42.00	21.00	Chief (except masters, AMPS) and chief engineers, AMPS; commissioned	75.00	60.00	42.00	21.00
Brigadier general, rear admiral (lower half)	120.00	105.00	42.00	21.00	1st mates and 1st assistant engineers, AMPS	60.00	45.00	42.00	21.00
Colonel, captain	120.00	105.00	42.00	21.00	Junior grade, 2d mates and 2d assistant engineers, AMPS; warrant officer	60.00	45.00	42.00	21.00
Lieutenant colonel, commander	120.00	105.00	42.00	21.00	Enlisted personnel, grades 1-7 [4]	37.50	37.50	31.50	31.50
Major, lieutenant commander	105.00	90.00	63.00	21.00					
Captain, lieutenant (senior grade)	90.00	75.00	42.00	21.00					
1st lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade)	75.00	60.00	42.00	21.00					
2d lieutenant, ensign	60.00	45.00	42.00	21.00					

[1] Allowances fixed by the President: suitable quarters in kind or in lieu thereof commutation of quarters at rate of $6,500 per annum; necessary fuel and light for quarters in kind, or in lieu thereof commutation of fuel and light at rate of $1,500 per annum.

[2] Officers serving in the grade of general, admiral, Chief of Staff of the Army or as Chief of Naval Operations shall be entitled to the rank and title of general or admiral and to the pay and allowances of a real admiral (upper half) or major general, and to a personal money allowance of $2,200 per year.

[3] Officers serving in the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral shall be entitled to pay and allowances of a major general or rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $500 per year.

[4] Current allowances applicable to personnel authorized to ration and live separately, generally restricted to married personnel, grades 1-3.

NOTE.—Enlisted men not furnished quarters or rations in kind are entitled to an allowance for quarters and subsistence not exceeding $5 per day, under regulations to be prescribed by the President.

Career Compensation Act of 1949, Oct. 12, 1949, Public Law 81–351

Pay grade	Quarters allowance		Subsistence	
	With dependents	Without dependents	With dependents	Without dependents
Commissioned officers:				
O–8, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff [1]	$150.00	$120.00	$42.00	$42.00
O–8, General of the Army, General of the Air Force, Fleet admiral [2]	150.00	120.00	42.00	42.00
O–8, Chief of Staff to the President [3]	150.00	120.00	42.00	42.00
O–8, general, admiral [4]	150.00	120.00	42.00	42.00
O–8, lieutenant general, vice admiral [4 6]	150.00	120.00	42.00	42.00
O–8, major general, rear admiral (upper half)	150.00	120.00	42.00	42.00
O–7, brigadier general, rear admiral (lower half)	150.00	120.00	42.00	42.00
O–6, colonel, captain	120.00	105.00	42.00	42.00
O–5, lieutenant colonel, commander	$120.00	$90.00	$42.00	$42.00
O–4, major, lieutenant commander	105.00	82.50	42.00	42.00
O–3, captain, lieutenant (senior grade)	90.00	75.00	42.00	42.00
O–2, 1st lieutenant (lieutenant (junior grade))	82.50	67.50	42.00	42.00
O–1, 2d lieutenant, ensign	75.00	60.00	42.00	42.00
Warrant officers:				
1	105.00	82.50	42.00	42.00
2	90.00	75.00	42.00	42.00
3	82.50	67.50	42.00	42.00
4	75.00	60.00	42.00	42.00

Pay grade	Quarters allowance				Subsistence	
	1 dependent	2 dependents	Over 2 dependents	Without dependents	With dependents	Without dependents
Enlisted personnel: [7]						
1	$67.50	$67.50	$85.00	$45.00	$31.50	$31.50
2	67.50	67.50	85.00	45.00	31.50	31.50
3	67.50	67.50	85.00	45.00	31.50	31.50
4	67.50	45.00	85.00	45.00	31.50	31.50
Enlisted personnel—Continued						
5	$45.00	$45.00	$85.00	$45.00	$31.50	$31.50
6	45.00	45.00	85.00	45.00	31.50	31.50
7	45.00	45.00	85.00	45.00	31.50	31.50

[1] The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall receive the basic pay and basic and personal money allowances prescribed by law for the Chief of Staff.

[2] General of the Army (5 star), General of the Air Force (5 star), and fleet admiral shall receive the same pay and allowances as a major general or rear admiral (upper half), plus a personal money allowance of $5,000 per annum.

[3] A general officer appointed as Chief of Staff to the President, unless he be entitled to rank, title, or grade, and the pay and allowances of a general, or a higher grade under some other provisions of law, shall, when appointed to such position, have the rank, title, pay and allowances of a general.

[4] A general or admiral, in addition to any other authorized pay and allowances, is entitled to a personal money allowance of $2,200 per annum. Officers serving as Chief of Staff of the Army, Air Force, Chief of Naval Operations, Commandant of the Marines or Coast Guard, unless officer holding such position is serving as General of the Army, Air Force, or as a fleet admiral, shall, in lieu of any other personal money allowance, but in addition to any other authorized pay and allowance, be entitled to a personal money allowance of $4,000 per annum.

[5] A lieutenant general or vice admiral will, in addition to any other authorized pay and allowance, be entitled to a personal money allowance of $500 per annum.

[6] A senior member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations, shall, while so serving, be entitled to the rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant general or vice admiral, and, in addition thereto, a personal money allowance of $2,200 per annum.

[7] Allowance applicable to personnel authorized to ration and live separately, generally intended for married personnel, grades 1 to 3 and grade 4, with at least 7 years' total service.

Career Compensation Act of 1949 as amended by act May 19, 1952 [1]

Pay grade	Quarters allowance		Subsistence [2]	
	With dependents	Without dependents	With dependents	Without dependents
Commissioned officers:				
O–8, [3] Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, etc. [4]	$171.00	$136.80	$47.88	$47.88
O–8, [3] general, admiral [4]	171.00	136.80	47.88	47.88
O–8, [3] lieutenant general, [6 7] vice admiral	171.00	136.80	47.88	47.88
O–8, major general, rear admiral (upper half)	171.00	136.80	47.88	47.88
O–7, brigadier general, rear admiral (lower half)	171.00	136.80	47.88	47.88
O–6, colonel, captain	136.80	119.70	47.88	47.88
O–5, lieutenant colonel, commander	136.80	102.60	47.88	47.88
O–4, major, lieutenant commander	$119.70	$94.20	$47.88	$47.88
O–3, captain, lieutenant (senior grade)	102.60	85.50	47.88	47.88
O–2, 1st lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade)	94.20	77.10	47.88	47.88
O–1, 2d lieutenant, ensign	85.50	68.40	47.88	47.88
Warrant officers:				
W–4, chief, commissioned	119.70	94.20	47.88	47.88
W–3, chief, commissioned	102.60	85.50	47.88	47.88
W–2, chief, commissioned	94.20	77.10	47.88	47.88
W–1, junior grade, warrant officer	85.50	68.40	47.88	47.88

Pay grade	Quarters allowance				Subsistence	
	1 dependent	2 dependents	Over 2 dependents	Without dependents	With dependents	Without dependents
Enlisted personnel:						
E–9, [8]						
E–8, [8]						
E–7, master sergeant, chief petty officer	$77.10	$77.10	$96.90	$51.30	$31.50	$31.50
E–6, sergeant, 1st class petty officer	77.10	77.10	96.90	51.30	31.50	31.50
E–5, sergeant, 2d class petty officer	77.10	77.10	96.90	51.30	31.50	31.50
Enlisted personnel—Con.						
E–4, corporal, 3d class petty officer	$77.10	$77.10	$96.90	$51.30	$31.50	$31.50
E–3, private, 1st class seaman	51.30	77.10	96.90	51.30	31.50	31.50
E–2, private, seaman apprentice	51.30	77.10	96.90	51.30	31.50	31.50
E–1, private, seaman recruit	51.30	70.10	96.90	51.30	31.50	31.50

[1] Military Pay Act of May 20, 1958, did not affect military personnel subsistence and quarters allowances.

[2] Basic allowance for subsistence, except the amount payable to enlisted persons when permission to mess separately is granted, is increased by 14 percent.

[3] Officer grades O–10 and O–9 established by Military Pay Act of May 20, 1958.

[4] Allowances for officers serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General of the Army, Chief of Staff to the President, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Chief of Navy Operations, or Commandant of the Marine Corps not changed by act of May 19, 1952. (See footnotes 1–4 of table for Career Compensation Act of 1949.)

[5] A general or admiral, in addition to any other authorized pay and allowance, is entitled to a personal money allowance of $2,200 per annum.

[6] A lieutenant general or vice admiral, in addition to any other authorized pay and allowance is entitled to a personal money allowance of $500 per annum.

[7] A senior member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations, shall, while so serving, be entitled to the rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant general or vice admiral, and, in addition thereto, a personal money allowance of $2,200 per annum.

[8] Enlisted grades E–9 and E–8 established by Military Pay Act of May 20, 1958.

PROPOSED KLM AIRLINE CONCESSION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, our State Department recently announced that it has agreed to reopen negotiations with the Netherlands for the purpose of considering granting the Dutch Government airline, KLM, access to Los Angeles as an additional route to this country.

The far-reaching implications of this announcement cannot be allowed to pass with silence. The Department's willingness to yield to Dutch pressures for this concession might be shrugged off if it were not for the adverse impact it would have on our American-flag carrier system. No one can doubt the increasing importance of that system to the defense of the free world, not to mention the United States itself, and to the needs of world commerce.

In 1956 the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reviewed the sorry record of the State Department for giveaways of the United States air market to foreign governments and their carriers. The committee concluded that "We have tended to bargain away too frivolously the value of the U.S. market" and this has "resulted in the loss of American dollars to American-flag carriers."—Senate Report 1875, 84th Congress, 2d session. Warning of the consequences of such bargaining, the committee said that—

> It would be no contribution to the welfare of the free world, and certainly not to the welfare of the people of the United States, if America's international air transport system were to follow the deplorable downward path of the U.S.-flag maritime industry.

Responsible government could not let this happen. Our very survival in the present world conflict of economics and ideologies is inescapably linked to our strength in the air—and this includes our commercial air transport system. However, at the moment our State Department seems unaware of these considerations which are basic to our vital interests.

The history of air route exchanges and related negotiations with the Dutch is a disturbing example of the Department's habit of carving up the U.S. international air market for the enrichment of foreign carriers without an exchange of economic benefits. The Dutch Government airline was granted New York-Amsterdam and Miami-Curaçao air routes shortly after World War II in exchange for similar routes for American carriers. The best of that bargain went to KLM. New York and Miami generate far more traffic than Amsterdam and Curaçao.

Still the Dutch were not satisfied. It did not take long before they were pressing for rights between Los Angeles-Amsterdam and Houston-Amsterdam as well as New York-Curaçao. A vigorous campaign was waged for these rights. The Queen of the Dutch Kingdom was prevailed upon to use the full influence of her office of public trust to advance the commercial interests of KLM by demanding from the throne that the rights be granted. Dutch participation in NATO was thrown into the scales of negotiations with the veiled threat of withdrawing all or a part of Netherlands' contribution to the alliance. The resourcefulness of skilled Dutch negotiators proved too much for the State Department. Even though that country had no economic benefits to exchange for the rights sought the Department overrode the expert opinion of the Civil Aeronautics Board and other aviation interests in the United States, which opposed the Dutch proposal, by granting Houston-Amsterdam and New York-Curaçao routes to the Netherlands in 1957.

Mr. Speaker, no time was lost by the Dutch in renewing their demand for a Los Angeles route. Immediately after the agreement was signed for two new routes they advised the Assistant Secretary of State that they were dissatisfied without access to Los Angeles, and that they intended to seek renegotiation of this matter.

There followed one of the most aggressive and well organized propaganda efforts the State Department has ever faced in regard to air rights. A special brief was prepared and given widespread distribution in support of the aspirations for Los Angeles. Civic groups in that city were induced to give their aid to the Dutch efforts. Unrelenting diplomatic pressures were applied. A Dutch magazine with national circulation—the Knickerbocker—devoted one entire edition to a plea for the Los Angeles route.

In 1960 the State Department again considered this question. That time it refused to grant the new route because the Dutch could offer no economic benefits in exchange and further KLM operations in this country's air market would, under these circumstances, simply enlarge the alarming outflow of gold from the United States.

The Dutch were undaunted. They repeated their demands this year and the State Department has apparently capitulated. This could be a shocking blemish in the Department's record and it should receive the attention of the Congress.

The Department seems oblivious to the fact that there are two glaring deficiencies in the Netherlands case for this new route. The first is that they are absolutely unable to offer any economic benefits whatsoever in exchange for enlarging their share of the U.S. air market. They can grant no new cities or points in Dutch territory to American carriers.

Since this country entered into the so-called Bermuda agreement with the United Kingdom in 1946, it has been established policy that air routes are to be traded with foreign governments on the basis of an equitable exchange of economic benefits. In back of this policy is the understanding among nations that the primary justification for air routes between countries is to provide air transportation for the nationals of the countries to travel between them. The transportation of persons going to or from third countries is to be allowed only as secondary traffic for the purpose of topping-off airplane loads. When a country steps up its flight schedules beyond the needs of primary justification traffic it contravenes the purposes of exchanges of air routes. These principles are expressly included in the Bermuda agreement and in the 1957 agreement with the Netherlands.

The Dutch have never been faithful to these principles. They have so increased their flight frequencies between the United States and Dutch territory for the benefit of third country traffic beyond the United States and Dutch points that over 72 percent of the passengers carried by KLM to and from the United States in 1960 did not originate or terminate in Dutch territory.

This is a flagrant violation of the capacity clause of the existing air agreement. It is the second major deficiency in the Dutch position.

In 1957, Mr. Speaker, the State Department was warned that the Dutch habitually disregarded the capacity-clause principle which was to be incorporated in the agreement for the new routes granted at that time. The then Secretary of State solemnly assured the Congress that such violations would not be permitted. They have nevertheless continued.

The result is that the Department's latest announcement of negotiations with the Dutch appears to be rewarding a persistent violator of capacity principles for past transgressions. It is reported that the Department has conditioned its agreement to reopen negotiations on a Dutch undertaking not to expand the present scope of violations. One might expect such forgiveness to be about as reasonable as any violator could hope for. Not so the Dutch. It is reported that within the past week Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands has complained in person to the President about this condition.

It might well be asked why the Dutch would go to such extremes to obtain this route. It is not needed to strengthen their balance of payments position and foreign exchange holdings. The Netherlands closed last year with a surplus of payments amounting to 1.3 billion guilders. Their gold and foreign exchange holdings are among the highest in the world, exceeding those of France, Italy, and other comparable countries.

The U.S. balance of payments deficit of more than $3 billion last year hardly makes us a proper candidate for adding to the Dutch surpluses. We have already done that to an alarming degree. It is estimated that our balance of payments will be adversely affected in 1961 to the extent of $30 million by Dutch operations which are due to violations of the existing air agreement between our countries. The unwarranted drain on our balance of payments would be even greater if Los Angeles were added to KLM's present routes.

It cannot be that the Dutch need access to Los Angeles to keep their airline strong and healthy. KLM has a monopoly from the Netherlands and advertises that it serves over 100 cities in 77 countries on 6 continents, giving it the second largest network of international routes in the world. It ranks third in international traffic volume. In

1960 it received gross revenues of $161 million and earned profits of nearly $4 million. Its profits were more than three times the profits reported by the domestic trunk airlines of the United States. It is big business regardless of the measure used.

The Netherlands do not want this route for the 7,000 passengers per year they claim will fly on KLM between Los Angeles and Dutch territory. This is only a minor fraction of the passengers they now transport between our countries.

Their real purpose in seeking Los Angeles is to further their exploitation of third country traffic. Since the United States is the heaviest generator of air traffic in the world, another route to this country offers the best opportunity the Dutch could obtain anywhere to boost their ambitions for third country traffic.

Amsterdam is used by KLM as a focal point through which it can route traffic to cities blanketing Western Europe, Africa, the Middle East and beyond to Asia, the East Indies and Australia. Curaçao is the funnel for traffic between the United States and Latin America. With this kind of operation working systematically in both directions the Dutch can parley U.S. air concessions into worldwide service for U.S. traffic to and from a myriad of global points.

This is why the frequency of KLM schedules between our countries is several times the number that is justified by traffic movements to and from Dutch territory. This high frequency of operations exists to serve passengers who never originate or terminate in Dutch territory. It also, incidentally, gives KLM such a competitive edge that it is able to carry 90 percent of the traffic moving between the United States and Dutch territory.

About 35 percent of KLM's total transportation revenues are derived from its operations to and from the United States. In 1960 it gained $53 million in gross revenues from its U.S. rights. Only $2¼ million was realized by American-flag carriers from service between the United States and Dutch territory last year.

It is difficult to understand why the Dutch are not content with a 24-to-1 revenue advantage over American-flag carriers in the air rights exchanged with them. Understanding is not helped either by the use of Dutch participation in NATO and acquisition of American manufactured aircraft—said to amount to $255 million worth of planes delivered and on order since 1946—as bargaining weapons in support of the effort to expand their revenue advantage. Air rights are exchanged on the basis of an equitable trade of economic benefits. Participation in NATO and plane purchases are not relevant considerations.

Moreover, we cannot take very seriously any implied threat to withdraw from NATO. The Dutch participate in NATO because it serves their own interests in defense of their country.

Similar reasons of self-interest motivate the purchase of American manufactured aircraft. We are pleased that they have purchased aircraft made here. But we must also recognize Dutch business acumen. They buy our airplanes because they are superior equipment. There can be no question about this in view of the recent announcement of the Dutch in their publication Air World that—

> The company's (KLM) policy has always been to use the best type of aircraft equipment available irrespective of nationality.

It has been estimated that for each $30 million spent in this country for aircraft and maintenance, the Dutch can expect to earn $72 million in revenues from U.S. air travel. Thus, the Dutch have purchased U.S aircraft because it has been good business to do so besides being in keeping with their policy of using the best equipment available.

American-flag carriers also purchase superior American built aircraft in substantial quantity. These purchases stimulate our economy and provide essential airlift for augmenting our military air capability in times of emergency. Each time a foreign air carrier is granted air rights which take dollars from American-flag carriers, we go that much further toward a weakened international air carrier system, being unable to acquire modern aircraft as the national interest requires, and, also, being unable to compete against foreign carriers enjoying low wage rates and the protection of their governments, as well as, in many instances, direct financial support.

Our flag carrier system has already been weakened by route awards to foreign carriers. Its participation in U.S. international traffic has declined in the last 10 years from 75 to 55 percent. Over the North Atlantic the decline was from 48.36 percent in January 1960 to 36.6 percent in January 1961.

Mr. Speaker, certainly this ominous downward trend will not be arrested by giving the Dutch a new share of the U.S. market. To reward them for repeated violations of the existing bilateral and to forego the accepted principle of an exchange of economic benefits, is foolish bargaining at best. When, in addition, it harms our own flag carrier system it irresponsibly courts disaster. The Department should consider the perils of this situation before taking further action.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. BOW. I am delighted the gentleman has brought this matter to the floor today. I think the gentleman has in mind the preservation of an industry of this country. We have worked hard and long between the Congress and the airlines to do away with the subsidizing of our American-flag carriers. Today they are subsidy-free and by their own efforts. But I am fearful, as I know the gentleman is, that if the State Department continues to give away rights and opportunities and take passengers away from American-flag carriers that the day is not far away when we will have these companies again back on subsidies.

Another thing that I think is sometimes overlooked by the American people is the fact that in the American-flag carriers we have a great reserve fleet for military purposes. This great fleet can be changed very quickly into troop carriers. If we destroy this industry we are just putting ourselves in the position where we will have to maintain in the armed services a much greater reserve for a carrier wing for our Nation. This is something else that I think the State Department should keep in mind when they start dealing away and giving away American markets and industries.

I am greatly indebted to my colleague from Oklahoma for having taken the lead in exposing the implications of the recent State Department announcement that it intends to reopen negotiations with the Dutch regarding their request for landing rights at Los Angeles. It may strike my colleagues that the grant of Los Angeles is a small thing which a great nation could easily concede to a small nation. However, nothing could be further from the truth. There are issues of principle at stake which are of transcendent importance to the future of civil aviation in the United States. If the State Department capitulates again to Dutch pressure, it will indicate that the United States is prepared progressively to trade away the economic health of the U.S. airline industry in return for trifling political considerations.

To me the result of such a policy is absolutely plain to see. The result will be that the U.S. civil air fleet will either go under economically or that the U.S. Government will have to subsidize the American-flag carriers. American-flag wage costs are considerably higher than those of its competitors. They can reduce this wage disadvantage only by operating at high volume. I am convinced that the sound policy for the Nation to follow is to assure that the American-flag carriers are able to operate at a high volume. If they cannot, they will become applicants for subsidy. This means to me that the State Department must say "no" to the Dutch on Los Angeles.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has long been a student of this problem, and I appreciate his comments.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to argue against the gentleman's major thesis, or disagree with the gentleman's objection that there is "no economic benefit to exchange." In fact, I kind of like that. I do think this is a rather picayune place to start. Most important, I want to note the following and note it abundantly for the RECORD lest there be any misunderstanding from previous remarks. The citizens of the Netherlands are friends of the citizens of the United States, and they have earned that friendship over many, many years.

Mr. JARMAN. I would say as to the gentleman's last statement, that certainly there would be no contest here on the floor of the House. As to the gentleman's earlier statement, I would add that if we reach the point where we do not protect our domestic economy, if we do not make sure that in exchanges

with other countries our own country is getting substantial benefits, we are in serious difficulty.

Mr. KYL. Let me assure the gentleman that I would be willing to assist him in every way to achieve that.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. There are two things I would like to say: One is that, commenting about the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa, of course the Dutch people are friends of the American people, but I do not necessarily think that friends have to be courted by giving them undue advantages commercially. As a matter of fact I would be inclined to think that they might have a little more respect for us if we were a little more astute bargainers than we seem to be.

The second, of course, is the deplorable, in my opinion at least, attitude of the State Department in negotiations of any kind. I do not know whether they have a defeated attitude or exactly what they have in mind, but they have so seldom been successful, it seems to me, in carrying out tough, hard bargaining negotiations.

As chairman of the State Department Personnel Subcommittee, I have been quite concerned about this, not only in the field of commercial negotiations that this is but in the field of international negotiations. I have attempted from time to time to find out why this is so. I do not know whether my committee could be helpful or not, but I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has brought this to my attention. I might say to the gentleman if this situation continues, if it seems as though the Department is going to insist on overriding people who know the answers, or presumably do, the Civil Aeronautics Board, although I have had some doubts about certain of their domestic decisions, I would be inclined to call these people from the State Department before my subcommittee and try to learn what motivates their thinking and why they want to give away a concession they are really not called upon to give away.

The gentleman has made a revealing statement. We all realize this KLM is a good airline and a well-run airline, but I think the gentleman has made a telling point when he points out that they have a 24-to-1 advantage in their ratio. It seems to me that we ought to be hardheaded enough to want to have our people keep at least a toehold in this very highly competitive business on these very lucrative transatlantic runs.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Ohio is one of the leading members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, has traveled extensively, and has a background upon which to make what I believe is an accurate and substantial contribution to this subject today.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. NORBLAD] may extend and revise his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned to learn that the State Department plans to award landing rights at Los Angeles to KLM. It plans to do this despite the opposition of the CAB which considers that a further grant to KLM is not justified by aviation considerations. It proposes to justify this giveaway on the same artificial grounds as it used in 1957; namely, "overriding political considerations."

I am convinced that the State Department is prepared to sacrifice piece by piece the economic health of the American air transport industry for the sake of political expediency. We must stop this foolish and suicidal policy.

Our air transport fleet is indispensable to our national security and our national defense. In time of war or emergency these planes must serve as auxiliaries to the military air transport. Indeed, in the jet age, these planes are even more important to our national defense than the merchant marine. We spend $150 million a year to subsidize the merchant marine and we would beyond question do the same if necessary to sustain the air transport industry.

Therefore, I ask why should we allow the State Department to give away lucrative rights in the U.S. air transport market? The effect will surely be to hasten the day when the Congress will be called upon to subsidize the airlines, who already suffer the disadvantage of wage costs which are more than double those of their competitors. We cannot allow the State Department to drive this essential industry into bankruptcy.

TAX REVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ASPINALL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with very genuine concern I rise to discuss certain aspects of the astonishing tax message sent to Congress on April 20 by the President.

In describing my reactions I shall do my utmost to avoid inflammatory or partisan language. Frankly, however, I must say that anyone who carefully reads the President's document is hard put to use restrained words in characterizing the greater part of it.

The Committee on Ways and Means has begun hearings on these New Frontier tax recommendations. The hearings began on May 3 even though specific legislative proposals to implement these far-reaching tax changes are yet to be received by the Congress. In fact, it was originally planned that the administration would submit only the detailed memorandum made public on May 3 as the guideline on which to base legislation rather than offering proposed legislative language. We have succeeded in obtaining some modification of those plans so that now drafts of legislative language pertaining to specific recommendations are to be made available by the Treasury as those drafts are prepared. This inadequate procedure virtually compels withholding a detailed evaluation until the hearings are completed or at least until the drafts can be studied and the specific identity of the Treasury approved language becomes known.

Nevertheless, it is not only appropriate but necessary that there be examination and discussion of the administration's tax objectives as revealed in the tax message and the testimony of the administration spokesmen. A reading of the message is cause for a reaction of dismay and disbelief. The message contains inaccurate and misleading statements. The testimony of the administration advocates of the recommendations in the message was no more reliable. Far worse, destructive results would irresistibly flow at home and abroad from enactment of a number of the tax proposals. So evident is this, even on first reading of the message, that I am forced to conclude that the President has been unforgivably misled by trusted aids. Once again—this time at home instead of in the Caribbean or Indochina—we see that the staff mechanism at the topmost level of our Government has virtually disintegrated. Here in taxation as well as in other fields, we find that academic theorizing, ivory tower economics, leftwing biases, dialectics, and preconceptions cannot take the place of a practical understanding of the Nation's economic and industrial life.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman state whether or not Secretary Dillon is one of its leftwing dialectics?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. He has adhered to their advice, whether he is or not.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, he is one of those the gentleman has in mind; is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thought I answered the gentleman in suggesting that at least he is adhering to that kind of advice. I was not selecting certain individuals, I may say to the gentleman. If I were going to do that I would do it off the floor for one thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman would say off the floor what he says on the floor, like myself. But I was curious. I always thought Secretary Dillon was a man I would consider to be conservative minded.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Like the gentleman, I consider him a friend, but I do not have to agree with him in all that he advocates; and I certainly disagree with those things he is advocating here, except I think in many cases he is taking the advice of others in making these recommendations.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not mean to say that Secretary Dillon is the type of a man who would take the advice of others if he thought the advice of others was not correct, does he?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wish the gentleman would not put words in my mouth. I did not say that. I say he is acting on the advice of others.

Mr. McCORMACK. You said you thought he was taking the advice of others; is that correct?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am convinced he has, and I am convinced that any Secretary of the Treasury has to rely on advice from the staff and other people. I do not think the Secretary, if he were here today, would suggest that he could do it without the advice and counsel of others.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true, but he is making up his own mind, is he not?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I did not say that he was not.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no. I understand. But, I am just trying to probe a little.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman is trying to put words in my mouth, and I wish he would not.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. You said you thought he was following the advice of others. When he follows and expresses it, then he confirms the advice of others. You and I do.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. He has to be held accountable for his own action; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, he was giving dialectic, leftwing testimony.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In this particular case, I believe he has.

By way of illustration of shortcomings in the tax recommendations let me point out—

First. Undeniably the Nation needs, and has long needed, a major tax reform, but instead the new administration requests a hodgepodge of conflicting plans, many of which do violence to tax policy and practice, and none of which effects basic, urgently needed tax improvements.

Second. The reinvestment tax credit gimmick proposed by the President is poorly received by most of the industrial community it is supposed to encourage.

Third. The adoption of the tax credit gimmick could well operate to defeat basic reform of our outmoded depreciation practices.

Fourth. The tax credit departure from sound tax law is a dangerous precedent opening a Pandora's box of other gimmickry, which in turn could, I believe, undermine the entire tax system.

Fifth. The recommended discontinuance of the 4 percent dividend credit and $50 dividend exclusion runs exactly opposite to the purposes sought by the President with his tax credit for new equipment and plants. On the one hand he would attempt to encourage new building and manufacture; on the other he would discourage private investors. This is unintelligible folly. It suggests a deliberate endeavor to substitute Government gimmickry for private enterprise.

Sixth. The withholding tax on dividends and interest raises many problems of an administrative character that will have to be carefully considered. It is important that we not impose an unreasonable administrative burden and possibly even hardship on a large group of conscientious taxpayers to prevent negligent tax abuses by the few. On the other hand, I could hasten to add that our tax structure would be strengthened by the development of a feasible approach to closing any existing dividend and interest gap.

Seventh. The taxation of unrepatriated profits of foreign subsidiaries of American companies is no less than preposterous. It proposes to tax as income earnings of a foreign corporation not in fact received by the American shareholder—a novel and radical doctrine. The arguments presented in justification of this drastic plan torture the facts. Unstated but implicit in the plan, as proposed by the President, are these results: A withdrawal of American private investment from abroad; an increase in foreign aid spending at the expense of private spending abroad; increased joblessness in America; aggravation in both the long and the short run of our severe balance-of-payments problem; and economic retreat on the part of the United States in the face of the Communist menace; and a reduction in tax revenues from abroad.

This program of Government enforced retreat by American private enterprise from world commerce, Mr. Speaker, is indescribably bad for us all, both at home and abroad. We have all heard of certain crackpots in some foreign countries crying "Yankee go home." I never dreamed that they would be joined by the administration advocating legislation which says, "Yankee come home" and "Yankee stay home." Indeed the implications of this policy are so serious and so little understood that I will devote the principal portion of these remarks to that aspect of the tax message. First, however, I will refer very briefly to the investment tax credit item and to the proposed tax treatment of dividends.

The investment tax credit item developed by the rash economic planners of the New Frontier is little more than an unsolicited Government handout contrived as a fatuous technique to bolster the business confidence these economic meddlers have done so much to destroy. The proposal is to allow a complicated dollar-for-dollar credit against tax based on prescribed percentages of capital investment.

With respect to this tax subsidy plan the President said in his message:

> Our objective is to provide the largest possible inducement to new investment which would not otherwise be undertaken.

He also said—

> It may prove desirable for the Congress to modify the credit from time to time so as to adapt it to the needs of a changing economy.

It is patent that these are the words of one who is dedicated to bureaucratic management and manipulation of the economy. These are the blandishments of one who would subordinate sound tax policy to pursuit of untrustworthy procedures seeking governmentally decreed objectives.

By his own admission the President seeks to encourage investment which must be supported by a tax giveway and which may not be justified on the basis of economic expectation. He proposes that this be undertaken on an on-again, off-again basis as the need may be defined by the infallible wisdom of the Government planner. The fallacy in stimulating uneconomic investment was acknowledged by administration spokesmen appearing before the Committee on Ways and Means. Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, in commenting on another aspect of the message, recognized the need to "avoid artificial encouragement to invest" and Under Secretary of Commerce Gudeman observed that it was "not enough to get a large total capital investment—investment must be made correctly."

Mr. Speaker, the New Frontier investment credit provides artificial encouragement for investment that may not be made correctly. It would be destructive of sound planning of long-range and continuous plant modernization and improvement; it would tend to postpone indefinitely urgently needed basic depreciation reform; it would be a backward step with respect to tax simplification and Bulletin F revision, both so sorely needed by small business; and the plan necessarily must be protected by a baffling network of safeguards and qualifying conditions that will inevitably operate as a costly trap to the unwary.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the tax investment credit scheme is fraught with self-defeating complexity, dangerous recapture and other restrictive provisions, and uneconomic lures leading to certain disillusionment. It should be rejected in the interest of adopting now sound and meaningful improvements in depreciation provisions of our Federal tax structure. This is the way along with tax rate reduction to more jobs that are better jobs—jobs that have a future—for our American people.

Mr. Speaker, the President's proposals to revoke the $50 exclusion and 4 percent credit on dividend income betray some wornout fuzzy thinking by the drafters of the administration's tax message. Running through these proposals is the tired old notion that only the wealthy receive dividend checks.

The New Frontier thinking ignores the fact that some 15 million Americans are now shareowners—a large majority of them, not incidentally, in the middle and lower income ranges. The shareowner population is more than double the number in 1954, when the exclusion and credit were written into the law as fairplay incentives to individual investors.

The proposal would strike a cruel blow at the 3 million shareowners with low incomes, who need, and now receive, complete relief from double taxation of their dividend income.

The administration's tax planners ignore the inequity of twice taxing only those people willing to risk their funds in America's business enterprises.

Then they argue that the way to encourage the investment and resulting economic growth we need so badly is to compound this inequity.

By 1970 industry will have to provide 20 percent more jobs and invest an average of $30,000 in plant and machinery

for each new worker. Clearly, retained earnings and debt financing will not be sufficient alone to raise the $400 billion needed by our corporations to finance their growth in the next 10 years. The critical balance must come from individuals willing to risk their savings and invest in American business. This privilege should not be reserved to the very rich.

And how does the administration propose to encourage these people to invest their savings—by blindly recommending a full double tax on individual equity investment? The administration does not seem to understand that double taxation on dividend income penalizes and discourages the equity investments needed for future economic growth. It impairs job opportunities while breeding tax inequities.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal to invoke the full double tax on investment income should not be accepted by the Congress. It is totally inconsistent with the endeavor to encourage capital investment—an objective that is at least given lipservice elsewhere in the tax message. We must recognize the simple truth that it is only through investment that we can create jobs and improve productivity.

Mr. Speaker, as I previously indicated it will be my purpose to devote the balance of my comments to that portion of the President's message that deals with the taxation of foreign income.

We should take a hard look at the fantastic proposal foisted upon the President in the field of taxation of U.S. business overseas. If, as the press indicates, the Cuba and Indochina catastrophes have shaken the President's confidence in some of his top security advisers, then I suggest a new look at his tax advisers, for obviously they too have led inexperienced leadership to the brink of disaster.

Incredible though it is, the New Frontier has evidently decided that a great part of U.S. oversea business should "come home" and that we should abandon such areas as Western Europe to foreign competitors. Six months ago we heard a Niagara of words to the effect that "America must move." In recent foreign affairs we have seen some of the fateful meaning of these words. Not until now have we seen their frightening implications in foreign tax policy where "America must move" means that American business should no longer venture in areas such as Western Europe and Japan. The new slogans of the New Frontier are: "America must remove" and "Yankee stay home."

The President recommends that foreign corporations which operate in the economically advanced countries and in which American companies or individuals have an interest, should be made currently exposed to the U.S. corporate and individual income tax, no matter whether the income of the foreign corporation is distributed to the American stockholders or not.

This proposal to inflict our income tax on foreign corporations—on businesses not in any way in the United States, on businesses whose activities are exclusively in foreign lands—is the first serious attempt since the Federal income tax began 48 years ago to project our income taxes into foreign countries.

The President proposes to tax each year American corporations on their current share of the undistributed profits realized by a foreign corporation in which they have a financial interest. But the always lilting prose of the New Frontier cannot disguise the fact that this means simply imposing the full impact of our onerous income tax structure on a legal entity of a foreign country operating entirely outside of the United States. This is a radical—indeed, radically destructive—doctrine. Not only is this subject to very serious constitutional question but if adopted it would be another major blunder in our foreign affairs.

We need to understand that foreign corporations operating abroad have never been subjected to U.S. income tax, but their earnings become subject to our income tax when distributed to U.S. shareholders. At that point only do these earnings become the income of an American taxpayer and therefore properly subject to our taxation. This has been the law ever since an income tax was imposed—for almost 50 years.

It should be clearly understood that at the present time Americans investing abroad do pay full U.S. taxes on income from such investments when the income is received by them. All earnings of foreign corporations distributed to American shareholders are subject to U.S. taxes.

During very recent years, however, a catch phrase called tax deferral has come in for rough demagogic usage. Now the new administration takes the position that as long as earnings of foreign corporations are not distributed into the United States there is a deferral of payment of U.S. income tax. This ignores the fact that there never has been a current liability to U.S. income tax of a foreign corporation operating abroad. Hence, there has been nothing to be deferred.

Most important, foreign trading nations have refrained from subjecting to home income tax the foreign subsidiaries of their national companies. They adhere to this policy in order to allow their companies freely to compete in the markets of the world in the light of local conditions and local taxes where they must operate.

But, no; this will no longer do for America. The President expects foreign companies with American investors to survive under a severe tax handicap, while their competitor companies with foreign investors would be spared such a handicap by their home governments.

The President's message has the merit of frankness in one respect at least. It casually concedes that the rate of expansion of some American business operations abroad may be reduced. Then it goes on to say—and imagine this—abandonment of foreign business and foreign markets to foreign competitors would be consistent with the efficient distribution of capital resources of the world. I don't know whether it is efficient to drive American business out of foreign markets. But I challenge its good sense for America.

Until January 20, 1961, the buildup of U.S. foreign trade and oversea business was considered indispensable to the economy of our country, to our national defense, and to the growth and vigor of the free world. Now, oddly, our buildup abroad is to be curtailed. We are to abandon it in order to be consistent with the efficient distribution of capital resources of the world. What country, indeed, is writing such a policy for the United States? Surely, not our own nationals.

The recommendation is based in part on the claim that American controlled foreign corporations operating entirely overseas, under local conditions and local income tax systems, not touching the United States in any way, are given tax advantages that are not available to American companies operating solely in the United States. This is an astonishing concept. It overlooks the simple business fact that the survival and growth abroad of such an oversea corporation depends mostly on being able to survive in competition, not with American companies, but with foreign corporations.

It overlooks the fact that such American controlled foreign corporations largely are not competing with domestic companies operating in the United States. They are competing in a foreign country with foreign competitors. Taxwise, at least, they can successfully meet this competition only under the same ground rules. Among these rules is the foreign country's tax system, income tax and otherwise.

Another justification put forth for the recommendations is that "efficient distribution" of international resources is upset when the U.S. controlled oversea corporation makes investment decisions in the light of foreign tax considerations. This ignores another truism: such a company lives its life in a foreign world, in the light of foreign conditions, and under a foreign tax system, just as its competitors abroad must do. The foreign company is not in Wisconsin or Massachusetts competing with American businessmen. It is in France, or the Netherlands, or Italy. That is where its competitors are. That is where competitive conditions exist.

This foreign company established by an American company is building up local business in a country abroad. It is developing markets and generating profits not otherwise available to the American economy—markets and profits that would go to foreign competitors and foreign countries if the American parent company had stayed home. The record shows foreign profits generated after tax of these companies are vital and valuable international resources.

Mr. Speaker, destruction of all this will not redirect investment, as the President puts it, by Americans to other parts of the world. Instead, it will simply reduce the volume of funds available for investment. Such funds do not evolve out of thin air or the golden words of a speechwriter. They will just not be generated if the American parent stays home. Abroad they can be generated only in foreign markets.

We find another addled justification of this recommendation. We hear that a curbing of the flow of investment to developed countries will help our country balance its international accounts. Here we find the balance of payments used as a crutch for sabotaging American business abroad. The argument is devoid of sense for either the short run or long run.

Another remarkable argument advanced by the President is that profits of a U.S. foreign business corporation, operating entirely abroad, if forced into the United States, would then be invested in our economy here at home. There are no facts whatsoever to support this.

Another theory, no less insupportable, is advanced by the President. It is argued that by curbing in major part U.S. oversea business investment in the developed countries, American business at home will divert oversea business ventures to the underdeveloped countries. Mr. Speaker, the very opposite will be the case. The argument, like the others, is absurd. The earnings of American businesses in developed countries are a major source, right today, of U.S. venture capital in the underdeveloped countries. Many of the Swiss base companies, so roundly condemned in the message as tax havens, are themselves parent corporations of subsidiaries in the underdeveloped countries. Such base companies are a prime source of venture capital for enterprises in underdeveloped countries.

Obviously American controlled, foreign base corporations, which are now engaged in promoting exports in the process and creating U.S. jobs at home as well as royalty income not otherwise available, will fold up if this radical innovation is enacted. These corporations were established to generate earnings abroad which in the main are reinvested abroad. This source of American exports and other foreign earnings needed to balance international accounts will disappear with the enactment of this proposal of the administration.

As to the Swiss base companies, the recommendation will destroy a source of U.S. tax revenue. Many sales transactions, otherwise taxable in Western European countries at high tax rates, are made by such companies under the relatively low Swiss income tax burden. Most of each dollar of sales profit ultimately goes to the American parent as dividend income to be taxed at home. This process puts most of that dollar into the U.S. Treasury, not in the treasury of a foreign country.

Let us understand that American controlled foreign subsidiary corporations compete abroad in many countries with, to name a few, the subsidiary corporations of such well-known international industrial giants as Imperial Chemical, Bowater Paper, Phillips Lamp, I. G. Farben, Unilever, Royal Dutch Shell, Volkswagen, and others. This competition is formidable. The numerous competitor companies operate with the benefit of all forms of tax incentives, freedom from national taxation by the parent's home country, many forms of common market, trade area, and commonwealth preferences, relative antitrust immunity—for cartels are a way of life to foreign industry—access to many forms of credit, and so on. Evidently the New Frontier expects that somehow American controlled foreign corporations can survive in such a jungle of competition, saddled with the full burden and scope of our own Federal income tax structure in addition to the burdensome tax structures of foreign countries in which they operate. This problem is blandly dismissed, virtually as of no importance, in the President's message. We find nonsense like this:

> American enterprise abroad will continue to compete with foreign firms.

And then we run into this brilliant passage:

> American firms will continue to occupy their rightful place in the markets of the world.

Their rightful place indeed. This clearly does not mean first place. This does not mean second place. "America must move," they say, but her rightful place after moving will be well down the competitive list in the world because of New Frontier fuzziness in the face of the realities of world competition.

Mr. Speaker, in this part of the President's tax message there is glaring omission. There is no effort to forecast the likely lively response of foreign governments should this recommendation become law, and I have already described how the message badly misjudges the reaction of U.S. corporations. It is reasonable to assume that foreign governments will contend that our Government has repudiated its tax treaties with them. The governments of developed countries whose effective corporate tax rate is under 52 percent will find ways and means to devise legislation that will, in indirect ways, bring their effective income tax rate on U.S. controlled subsidiaries up to the U.S. rate of 52 percent.

The foreign course is crystal clear—to match quickly the U.S. income tax burden and enrich the local treasury at U.S. Treasury expense. And, Mr. Speaker, this also should be noted: The foreign country will be deprived of the slightest reason to give a new American business venture favorable tax concessions, such as rapid plant amortization. The President's recommendation cavalierly would destroy that and, along with it, the aborning American business venture. All of us know that the launching of many of our ventures abroad are contingent upon such concessions.

Nor will this recommendation, if it becomes law, stimulate investment in the underdeveloped countries of the world, even though the authors of this message would have us believe otherwise. The result will be exactly the opposite of what the administration asserts. The source of much of the venture capital for investment in underdeveloped countries in oversea earnings. These would be killed off. With respect to the developing countries I would add that no company management could have any assurance that the administration will not change at any time the list of countries which would be treated as developing for tax purposes.

My understanding is, by the way, that in the Treasury press briefing the day before the President's tax message was sent to the Congress, the list of developed nations was changed in the very midst of the conference. I hear that one top Treasury official insisted that Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Turkey were developed. Another official of rank persuaded him then and there that they were developing. What a stable platform this is from which to launch business ventures.

In some degree the foreign income recommendation appears to be based on the idea that there have been some instances of tax evasion in the case of oversea situations controlled from the United States. There is no doubt that such abuses should be cured.

But the answer is not to obliterate all U.S. business overseas. The answer is a selective statute, targeted only at the avoidance area. Broadly, this seems to be the foreign incorporated pocketbook, having no business substance, and usually existing only as a set of account books and a name on a door. Oversea evasion situations as they existed 25 years ago were effectively blocked by the foreign personal holding company statute of 1937. This law can be modernized, and no doubt it should be, to meet new developments. But in 1937 it was not thought necessary to declare war on all U.S. business overseas. Only the evasion area was attacked. Let us show, in 1961, no less good sense in what we do. Let us move against the abuse situations but not destroy the legitimate foreign corporations that have committed the offenses of: first, having American shareholders; second, having built up American oversea business; third, having generated a flow to the United States of foreign-earned dollars; fourth, having aided the economy of the free world; and fifth, of having, in the process, created many thousands of jobs at home and abroad for our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt this long upon the foreign subsidiary taxation problem because so few of the general public seem to have paid any attention at all to this part of the President's tax message. I repeat: Here we face a proposal that is radical, destructive, and in today's world an economic Pearl Harbor to be inflicted by our own hand. It will irretrievably injure America in a host of ways, and in its support we are offered a mass of erroneous and misleading statements.

Mr. Speaker, the conclusion is inescapable that the New Frontier tax policies are designed to add to the tax burdens on productivity, employment, and capital formation. The administration would reverse certain considered policy decisions of previous administrations and Congresses, both Democrat and Republican, by characterizing those decisions as loopholes. They would substitute therefor an investment giveaway that makes considerably less sense in terms of equity and efficacy than the provisions the administration attacks.

The inconsistency and conflicting purposes of the administration recom-

mendations comprise an illy conceived concoction that will do nothing to strenthen business confidence. These proposals are not new but never before have they ever been muddled together in such a self-defeating mishmash. Specific examples of inconsistencies in administration policy are—

First. The tax credit proposal to increase capital investment is contrary to the proposal to reimpose a double tax on investment income;

Second. The foreign income proposal designed to make it more difficult for American private enterprise to engage in foreign commerce contradicts the administration's request for more foreign aid appropriations; and

Third. The President acknowledges that our tax structure "must encourage efficient use of our resources" but proposes tax changes that would increase bureaucratic control of our private enterprise economy.

Mr. Speaker, in its tax recommendations the New Frontier fails to measure up to the challenge of an urgent subject. Because the administration has not provided the called for leadership, the task necessarily must be assumed by the Congress. Our goal must be an objective of fiscal responsibility that provides restrained Government spending fully paid for under a taxing system that fairly distributes the required tax burden at the lowest possible tax rates. In this way our free enterprise system can flourish at home and operate as our best ambassador abroad with minimum Government intervention in private economic affairs.

Tax revision is both desirable and necessary but in revising our tax structure we must be certain that we are moving ahead—and not backward.

THE IMAGE OF FRUSTRATION

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am fed up. I am fed up with public announcements to our enemies—and to our friends, if any—as to what we are not going to do to defend our interests against those dedicated to our destruction, as has repeatedly been done with respect to Cuba.

I am fed up with the pronouncements of fatalistic inevitability, a la Adlai Stevenson and Madam Roosevelt: such as the inevitability of seating Red China in the U.N.; such as the inevitability of "more and more adverse votes" in that forum of frustration.

I am fed up with pious warnings that we must not permit these inevitabilities to lead us into neoisolationism—again a la Adlai—which is to say that we must shun all independent action by the United States in behalf of the United States, even though the alternative is to acquiesce in our own progressive liquidation.

I am fed up with the nicey-nice advice not to even try to find out who the dunderheads—or worse—are who are responsible for the Cuban fiasco and numerous other incredible blunders—much less, perish the thought, doing anything about firing the incompetents.

I am fed up with the notion that each blunder and setback, each failure of wisdom or will on our part, must have as its sequel vast new outlays of American billions in foreign aid without any firm commitment from the recipient that they will help us—or even themselves.

I am fed up with American officials deliberately lying to the Nation and the world—as, for example, denying in U.N. debate that we had intervened in Cuba and later admitting to the press that we had trained, financed, and equipped the Cuban invaders.

I am fed up with the colossal clumsiness of the lies that made inevitable our being caught in our falsehoods.

I am fed up with official lectures to the press about responsibility and self-censorship, while Iron Curtain representatives attend an off-the-record White House press conference and a Castro agent sits in on the Inter-American Defense Board even after the United States has broken off diplomatic relations with Cuba.

I am fed up with reminders about what we cannot do in our own—and the free world's—behalf because of treaty commitments, while no one has the courage to recommend that we act to revise those commitments and rid ourselves of diplomatic straitjackets which hamper our struggle for survival.

I am fed up with the silly preoccupation with our prestige and our image abroad—and with its accompanying suggestion that we ought to have a deep sense of national guilt and foreboding if everyone throughout the world does not always approve of us and everything we do.

I am fed up with the suggestions that it is somehow disloyalty and a contribution to national disunity in a time of crisis for American citizens—and their representatives in Congress—to make it unmistakably clear that they are fed up with these goings-on.

Most of all, I am fed up with anyone and everyone—and especially those in positions of authority and responsibility—who offer the counsel of default and defeat; who openly assert or covertly imply that nothing very much can be done about the mess.

It is time for Americans to heed the ancient admonition: "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."

ANTIRACKETEERING ACT OF 1961—THE NEED TO FIGHT ORGANIZED OR SYNDICATED CRIME AND TO PREVENT COMMISSION OF TERRORISTIC OFFENSES PERPETRATED BY SUCH ORGANIZED ACTIVITIES

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and may revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, during the past three Congresses I have introduced a number of bills which I think will go a long way in rooting out the $20 billion take of organized crime, together with the criminal activities involved in protecting that illicit gold mine, such as extortion, bribery, blackmail, racketeering, narcotics, liquor, prostitution, or gambling, or the commission of murder or other acts of violence in the perpetration thereof, together with other gangster-type criminal activities.

I continue to believe this is one of the major challenges facing Congress, and apparently my position is substantiated by the recent recommendations forwarded to Congress by former Attorney General William Rogers, and his successor, Attorney General Robert Kennedy, both of whom have recommended specific legislation to strengthen the hands of the Department of Justice in fighting national gangsterism.

I am highly gratified that many of the anticrime bills, which I have been introducing ever since I came to Congress—because of my realization of the serious impact, not only economically but morally, on the people of this country, caused by organized racketeering—have been accepted in principle by the previous Attorney General and, to a greater extent, by the new Attorney General.

A number of new proposals are included in the omnibus bill I introduced today which I think are deserving of the full consideration by Congress and the committees thereof.

Ever since the special antiracketeering team, under Milton Wessel, made its report to the former Attorney General, I have been giving special consideration to the form of other legislation needed to strengthen the hand of our law enforcement agencies through the Attorney General's office in combating syndicated crime by establishing an elite specialist group for the purpose of ferreting out the gangsters and criminals operating under cover, often on a nationwide organized basis, and for strengthening the State authorities' fight in this area as well.

The Wessel group recommended the establishment of some type of weapon to fight such organized crime, and I have today introduced the Antiracketeering Act of 1961, which includes under title I an Office on Syndicated Crime, under the control and jurisdiction of the Attorney General, for this specific purpose.

I have previously discussed the Wessel report in the House of Representatives, and my previous remarks will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1959, starting on page A–1841.

The Antiracketeering Act of 1961 includes the following 11 titles, with appropriate subsections:

"Title I—Office on Syndicated Crime," "Title II—Terroristic Crimes," "Title III—Criminal Expenditures," "Title IV—Transmission of Gambling Information," "Title V—Gambling Devices," "Title VI—Wagering Paraphernalia," "Title VII—Immunity of Witnesses," "Title VIII—Extension of the Fugitive Felon Act," "Title IX—Wiretapping," "Title X—Obstruction of Investigations," and "Title XI—Interstate Travel in Aid of Syndicated Criminal Activities."

A brief explanation follows:

TITLE I—OFFICE ON SYNDICATED CRIME

This title would establish within the Department of Justice an Office on Syndicated Crime, whose duty it would be to combat the increasing menace of organized and syndicated crime to our free institutions and to our citizenry.

The need for an agency providing centralization of information concerning known racketeers is best evidenced by the multifarious setup existing in the Federal Government and the lack of coordination between them. Examples of such disjuncted investigative and enforcement agencies are:

Secretary of the Treasury: Coast Guard, 14 U.S.C. 89; Bureau of Customs, 19 U.S.C. 1581, 1587, 1701–5; Bureau of Narcotics, 26 U.S.C. 7607; Internal Revenue Service, 26 U.S.C. 7601–6; and Secret Service, 18 U.S.C. 3056.

Department of the Army: Corps of Engineers, 33 U.S.C. 436, 446, 451, 471.

Department of Justice: Federal Bureau of Investigation, 18 U.S.C. 3052, 3107; and Immigration and Naturalization Service, 8 U.S.C. 1357.

Post Office Department: Post Office Inspection Service, 39 U.S.C. 700.

Department of the Interior: Fish and Wildlife Service, 16 U.S.C. 631j, 706; National Park Service, 16 U.S.C. 10, 10a; and Bureau of Mines, 30 U.S.C. 451–473.

Department of Agriculture: Agricultural Marketing Service, 7 U.S.C. 1592–1603; Agricultural Research Service, 7 U.S.C. 151–164a; Commodity Exchange Authority, 7 U.S.C. 1–16; and Forest Service, 16 U.S.C. 559.

Department of Commerce: Federal Maritime Board, 46 U.S.C. 813–830.

Department of Labor: Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, 29 U.S.C. 201–219.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Food and Drug Administration, 21 U.S.C. 371–374; and Public Health Service, 42 U.S.C. 264–272.

Civil Aeronautics Board: Federal Aviation Agency, 49 U.S.C. 1482–1489.

Federal Communications Commission, 47 U.S.C. 401–416.

Federal Power Commission, 16 U.S.C. 825f–825n; 15 U.S.C. 717M–717u.

Federal Trade Commission: Division of Wool, Fur and Flammable Fabrics, 15 U.S.C. 68d, 68e, 69f.

Interstate Commerce Commission: Bureau of Inquiry and Compliance, 49 U.S.C. 12–16; Director of Locomotive Inspection, 45 U.S.C. 22–34; and Bureau of Safety and Service, 45 U.S.C. 15, 19.

Securities and Exchange Commission, 15 U.S.C. 77s, 80a–41.

National Labor Relations Board, 29 U.S.C. 160–162.

General Services Administration, 40 U.S.C. 318–318b.

Atomic Energy Commission, 42 U.S.C. 2201, 2231–2239.

Headed by a Director appointed by the President, the Office on Syndicated Crime would have the duty, under section 102(a), of assembling, correlating, and evaluating intelligence relating to organized and syndicated crime. It would also undertake studies of the organizations, operations, and individuals connected with such activities.

Operating as a clearinghouse for such information, the Office, under section 102(b), would be directed to make available intelligence relating to syndicated crime to all Federal agencies and to non-Federal agencies at the discretion of the Director.

The Office, under section 102(c), would be charged with the development of specialized techniques which would aid in the prosecution of syndicated crime and would be authorized, under section 102(d), to "advise and assist" in prosecutions of persons for syndicated criminal offenses, both in the State and Federal courts.

A key feature of title I is the definition therein contained of syndicated crime. It is defined to include "substantial concerted activities in, or affecting, interstate or foreign commerce, where any part of such activities involve violations of law, Federal or non-Federal."

Enactment of section 102(e) will, for the first time, confer statutory authority upon a Federal intelligence agency to look into the penetration of organized crime, financed by massive illicit profits from purely criminal activities, into the legitimate business sphere. This Nation cannot sit idly by while syndicated crime becomes a partner in our economy.

Another feature of title I is the requirement of section 103 that "routine procedures" be established within the Federal Government to channel all information relating to the operations of syndicated crime to the Office on Syndicated Crime. Coupled with the further provision that the Director may request other agencies to conduct studies of the operations of organized crime, the Office is armed with the necessary intelligence tools to discover how far the insidious activities of syndicated criminal elements have penetrated into the fabric of America, and, under careful supervision, is authorized to assist State law enforcement authorities as partners in the fight against it.

TITLE II—TERRORISTIC CRIMES

Title II of my bill would outlaw national conspiracies perpetrated by gangsters and hoodlums who use interstate commerce or interstate communications in furtherance of terroristic activities, crimes, and rackets.

My bill would create a new crime known as a "terroristic offense" which is intended to be a catchall for all types of conspiracies of a violent nature which presently, because of their interstate character, have been largely beyond the effective reach of local law enforcement.

The definition of a terroristic offense is "any offense proscribed by the laws of, or the common law as recognized in, any State relating to extortion, blackmail, murder, racketeering, narcotics, maiming or assault with intent to inflict great bodily harm, and punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary or by death." The penalties range from fines for lesser offenses to death for terroristic offenses involving murder.

I have been deeply disturbed for a number of years upon reading about gangland-style killings in my own district, 21 of which remain unsolved. The nature of these killings and the fact that the perpetrators remain unpunished lend credence to the presumption that they are a part of an interstate conspiracy where the killer is shipped in for the job, or, in the alternative, the code of the maffia seals the lips of all parties involved. Some of these killings are identified with the multi-million-dollar bolita racket in Florida.

When I requested the FBI to investigate one killing and consider supplementing the efforts of the local law enforcement officials, I was advised that even though the killing was of a gangland nature, there was no Federal crime involved and that, therefore, the Federal law enforcement authority had no jurisdiction in the matter. The services of the FBI were even requested by the local law enforcement officials, but, again, the answer was that no Federal crime was involved. With the enactment of my proposal, the FBI would no longer be shackled and a nationwide dragnet could be put into operation. This is the only method by which this national and international kill-for-money syndicate can be stamped out.

Generally, murder is not a Federal offense. While it is a State crime, local authorities may be incapable, because of the lack of personnel, scientific crime detecting equipment, and so forth, to properly investigate the crime and bring the perpetrators to justice. Since these perpetrators often cross State lines and use interstate communications to carry out their nefarious deeds, their actions are, in truth and fact, interstate in nature and therefore should properly come within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

In addition, there are many State crimes either recognized by State statute or State common law, in which interstate instrumentalities are used, and because of this latter circumstance, local authorities not having extraterritorial powers cannot adequately go out to look for and ferret out evidences of the crime. The Federal Government could, however, and should be empowered to do this.

It is the intent of my bill to bring the crime detection and prevention powers of the Federal Government into play principally by making available to the States the services of the FBI, the Federal Narcotics Bureau, the Secret Service, and Federal scientific laboratories for the detection of the activities of secret criminal organizations, such as the maffia and Murder Incorporated,

and for the apprehension of its offending members.

I trust that my fellow Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle will take the same deep interest in this horrible situation as I do. I have stated how it operates in my own congressional district, and you will find that its network extends into all of your districts.

TITLE III—CRIMINAL EXPENDITURES

During the 86th Congress I introduced H.R. 7394, for the purpose of disallowing tax deductions for racketeering business expenses. I have again introduced the bill during this session of Congress, and have incorporated it into my omnibus bill as title III.

This title would deny persons engaged in illegal activities, such as gambling and racketeering, certain tax deductions which are allowed to legitimate businesses. These deductions were given some semblance of legality in the decision of *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan* (356 U.S. 27), in which the Supreme Court refused to disallow such deductions on the part of gamblers and criminals in the absence of express declaration by Congress. This title is broadened and made more comprehensive by the Attorney General's recommendations, and it would deny tax deductions to persons engaged in illegal activities such as gambling, and clearly shows the congressional intent that such business expenses cannot be deductible for tax purposes. This is one of the recommendations made by Attorney General Rogers in submitting his proposals to Congress. Concerning the elimination of such tax deductions the Attorney General had the following to say:

Organized crime has derived huge profits from certain businesses carried on illegally. It is obvious that a business conducted furtively and unlawfully will yield larger profits than one transacted openly by law-abiding citizens. It is equally clear that the furtive character of such a business increases the expense and difficulty of tax collection. The Government is entitled to be reimbursed for this drain of its resources, and to secure its full share of taxes from these illegal ventures.

One example of this type of business is organized crime's illegal gambling enterprises—perhaps its principal source of ill-gotten funds. Almost all of the States have laws prohibiting bookmaking, slot machines, and related activities of the organized gambling fraternity. Policing illegal gamblers is primarily a State and local responsibility.

There are, however, areas where the Federal Government can properly assist local authorities in the enforcement of their anti-racketeering and gambling laws. This bill is designed to deny persons engaged in illegal activity, such as gambling, certain tax deductions allowed to legitimate businesses. This would deal a severe blow to the organized racketeer by hitting him where it hurts most—in his pocketbook. (See *Commissioner* v. *Sullivan* (356 U.S. 27).)

TITLE IV—TRANSMISSION OF GAMBLING INFORMATION

This title of my bill is designed to aid in the prevention of interstate transmission of gambling information by requiring persons who pay the gambling tax to state, under the penalty of perjury, whether they have or will engage in the interstate transmission of gambling information. It is assumed that the information derived will assist Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials.

The first section of title IV defines the terms "gambling information" and "wager." It should be noticed that "wager" is defined here in the same terms as it is defined in the Internal Revenue Code. The definition, basically, defines wagering as betting on a sporting event or playing the numbers game, policy, or similar types of wagering.

The second section would require each person who is required to pay the wagering tax to file an affidavit stating whether he has or has not, during the last year, sent or received gambling information in interstate commerce, and whether or not he intends to do so while his registration is in effect. A provision is included to permit revised affidavits where a change occurs in the intention expressed. The penalty provided for filing a false affidavit is a fine of up to $5,000 or imprisonment for up to 1 year, or both. For failure to file, the maximum fine is $10,000, and the maximum imprisonment is for 2 years.

This section of my bill also makes it a crime for a telephone or telegraph company, and certain of its employees, to provide services to a person they have reason to believe should be registered under the gambling tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, unless the Department of Justice has been informed of the circumstances giving rise to the belief.

TITLE V—GAMBLING DEVICES

The Attorney General has further recommended that the 1950 law forbidding the "interstate transportation of any gambling device," which now applies to slot machines, should be broadened to include any other device manufactured specifically for gambling purposes, and also to prohibit the shipment of such gambling devices out of the country. In submitting that proposal the Attorney General had the following to say:

In 1951 Congress passed the Johnson Act (64 Stat. 1134; 15 U.S.C. secs. 1171–1177), which in general forbids the interstate transportation of any gambling device and requires manufacturers of and dealers in gambling devices to register annually with the Attorney General.

Experience with the enforcement of this act has demonstrated a need for its amendment in several respects. It is proposed to broaden the definition of gambling device so that not only the slot machines would be covered, but also additional types of machines and mechanical devices designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling.

The proposal would also enlarge and more clearly define the categories of persons to whom the registration and filing provisions apply. It would require the maintenance of detailed records with respect to the acquisition and disposition of gambling devices, with provision for inspection and copying of such records by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Provision is made in the bill for the granting of immunity to persons who assert their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination with regard to the maintenance of the required records or testifying before a grand jury or court of the United States. Thus, our enforcement authorities would be able to compel the disclosure by underlings of information necessary for reaching the upper echelons of the crime syndicates.

Finally, the bill would extend the scope of the act to apply to the transportation of gambling devices in foreign commerce; at present it applies only to the interstate transportation of such devices. This extension would not only eliminate a possible area of gambling device activity, but would further strengthen enforcement of the act with respect to interstate violations, since it is difficult to segregate from an investigative standpoint interstate and foreign shipments.

I introduced H. R. 3024 earlier this session, the same as the bill I introduced last session, to implement that recommendation, with certain modifications, which I believe to be sound. Those provisions which I have incorporated as title V of this omnibus bill are:

"(2) any other machine or mechanical device (including, but not limited to, roulette wheels and similar devices) designed and manufactured primarily for use in connection with gambling, and (A) which when operated may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, or (B) by the operation of which a person may become entitled to receive, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, provided that the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to parimutuel betting equipment or materials used or designed for use at racetracks where betting is legal under applicable State laws; or".

SEC. 2. Section 1 of such Act is further amended by adding thereto the following subsections:

"(d) The term 'interstate commerce' includes commerce between one State, possession, or the District of Columbia and another State, possession, or the District of Columbia.

"(e) The term 'foreign commerce' includes commerce with foreign country.

"(f) The term 'intrastate commerce' includes commerce wholly within one State, the District of Columbia, or possession of the United States."

SEC. 3. The first paragraph of section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport any gambling device in interstate or foreign commerce: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to transportation of any gambling device to a place in any State which has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such State from the provisions of this section, or to a place in any subdivision of a State in which such subdivision is located has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such subdivision from the provisions of this section."

SEC. 4. Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person during any calendar year to engage in the business of manufacturing, repairing, reconditioning, dealing in, or operating any gambling device if in such business he buys or receives any such device knowing that it has been transported in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers such device in interstate or foreign commerce, or sells, ships, or delivers such device knowing that it will be introduced into interstate or foreign commerce, unless such person shall, during the month prior to engaging in such business in that year, register with the Attorney General of the United States his name and trade name and the address of each of his places of business, designating his principal place of business within the United States.

"(b) Every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall maintain an inventory record of all gambling devices owned, possessed, or in his custody as of the close of each calendar month. The record shall show the individual identifying

mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and description of each separate subassembly or essential part, together with the location of each item listed thereon.

"(c) Every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall maintain for each place of business a record for each calendar month of all gambling devices sold, delivered, or shipped in intrastate, interstate, or foreign commerce. The record of sales, deliveries, and shipments for each place of business shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and description of each separate subassembly or essential part sold, delivered, or shipped together with the name and address of the buyer and consignee thereof and the name and address of the carrier.

"(d) Every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall maintain for each place of business a record for each calendar month of all gambling devices manufactured, purchased, or otherwise acquired. This record shall show the individual identifying mark and serial number of each assembled gambling device and the quantity, catalog listing, and description of each separate subassembly or essential part, manufactured, purchased, or otherwise acquired together with the name and address of the person from whom the device was purchased or acquired and the name and address of the carrier.

"(e) Every manufacturer required to register shall number seriatim each assembled or partially assembled gambling device which is to be sold, shipped, or delivered, and shall stamp on the outside front of each such assembled or partially assembled gambling device so as to be clearly visible the number of the device, the name of the manufacturer, and the date of manufacture. And every person required to register under the provisions of this Act shall record the data herein designated in the records required to be kept.

"(f) Each record required to be maintained under the provisions of this Act shall be kept for a period of five years.

"(g)(1) It shall be unlawful for any person required to register under the provisions of this Act to sell, deliver, ship, or possess any gambling device which is not marked and numbered as required by this Act or for any person to remove, obliterate, or alter the manufacturer's name, the date of manufacture, or the serial number on any gambling device;

"(2) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to make or cause to be made, any false entry in any record required to be kept under this section; and

"(3) It shall be unlawful for any person who has failed to register as required by this Act or who has failed to maintain the records required by this Act to manufacture, recondition, repair, sell, deliver, ship, or possess any gambling device.

"(h) Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall, at the principal place of business within the United States of any person required to register by this Act, at all reasonable times have access to and the right to copy any of the records required to be kept by this Act, and in case of refusal by any person registered under this Act to allow inspection and copying of the records required to be kept, the United States district court where the principal place of business is located shall have jurisdiction to issue an appropriate order compelling production.

"(i) No person shall be excused from maintaining the records designated herein, producing the same or testifying before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect thereto for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a criminal penalty or forfeiture. But upon asserting the privilege against self-incrimination any natural person may be required to open the records designated herein to inspection or to testify before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect thereto: *Provided*, That no such person shall be criminally prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing disclosed as a result of the inspection of such records or testimony with respect thereto. No witness shall be exempt under this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this Act.

"(j) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to make and enforce such regulations as may in his judgment be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act and the breach of any of such regulations shall be punishable as provided in section 6 of this Act."

SEC. 5. This Act shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of its amendment.

This is a continuation of my efforts to get strong antigambling legislation written into law in areas where it has been proven to be needed by recommendations of the Attorney General and reports from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with other reports made available to the Congress. These proposals are directed primarily at syndicated gambling and criminal activities largely nationwide in scope, which is an element that is readily admitted to be in existence and has to date proven itself beyond the grasp of criminal legal processes under existing law. My previous bill, H.R. 7393 of the 86th Congress, received no objection from the Post Office Department, the Secretary of Commerce—although the Department did indicate it was in sympathy with the objective of the proposed legislation. It received favorable recommendations of the Attorney General and there was no objection received from the Interstate Commerce Commission.

TITLE VI—WAGERING PARAPHERNALIA

This title of my bill would make it a felony to send or carry knowingly in interstate or foreign commerce any wagering paraphernalia or device used, adapted, or designed for use in bookmaking, wagering pools with respect to a sporting event, or numbers, policy, bolita, or similar illegal games. The enactment of this section of my bill would be of material assistance in bringing about a curtailment of such interstate wagering by vesting jurisdiction in the Federal Government to investigate and prosecute when such criminal activity is disclosed.

Bookmakers and lottery and policy operators presently thrive on widescale interstate operations. State law enforcement agencies have been handicapped by jurisdictional limitations to deal with such operations, and the Federal Government is handicapped by lack of statutory authority to assert its full power.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy stated on April 6 of this year:

Our revisions are more specific about the material involved and would ban the interstate transportation of sports betting forms, certificates or devices used in bookmaking, numbers games, or other gambling.

I strongly urge the enactment of this proposal which will provide the Federal Government with another tool to combat the forces of organized crime.

TITLE VII—IMMUNITY OF WITNESSES

Both the present and the past Attorneys General have proposed legislation for granting immunity to persons who claim the fifth amendment in Federal gambling cases, and thus law-enforcement officers could compel underlings to give them information needed to reach the upper echelons of crime syndicates. This legislation would also apply to labor racketeering cases granting immunity to needed witnesses who now claim self-incrimination.

I have already introduced H.R. 3021 this session to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith. My previous bill, H.R. 7392 of the 86th Congress, received a favorable report from the Department of Justice, and I include herewith a letter from the Deputy Attorney General to the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, dated June 17, 1960:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1960.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice concerning the bill (H.R. 7392) to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, "to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith." The measure was introduced at the request of the Attorney General as one part of a three-point Department of Justice legislative program designed to supplement the efforts of the States to eradicate from the American scene the so-called organized criminal.

In labor racketering cases the experience of the Department of Justice demonstrates an urgent need for legislation to permit the compelling of testimony before grand juries and courts in Hobbs Act and certain Taft-Hartley Act cases. The Hobbs Act (18 U.S.C. 1951) makes it unlawful to interfere with commerce by robbery or extortion, as defined in the act. Section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act (29 U.S.C. 186) makes it unlawful for an employer in an industry affecting commerce to pay money or make gifts to representatives of any of his employees under circumstances that would constitute such action a bribe. The close connection between the offenses proscribed in these two acts often inhibits cooperation with law enforcement officers. For example, an employer who is a victim of labor extortion may be reluctant to testify in a Hobbs Act case for fear that he may be incriminating himself under section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act.

H.R. 7392 will add a new section to the "Racketeering" chapter of our criminal code, in which the Hobbs Act is contained. As amended, the chapter will provide that whenever in the opinion of the U.S. attorney it is necessary to the public interest that a witness testify or produce evidence before a grand jury or court of the United States, in a matter involving a violation of the Hobbs Act or section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act, he may, with the approval of the Attorney General, seek an order of the

court instructing the witness to do so. The witness may not then be excused from testifying or producing the evidence on the ground that the act required of him may be self-incriminating, or the measure accords him immunity from prosecution (except for perjury or contempt) with respect to transactions concerning which he is compelled to testify or produce evidence after claiming his privilege against self-incrimination. Legislation such as this is not uncommon; there are many such immunity statutes and they have been of considerable assistance in accomplishing the more effective administration of justice.

The Department of Justice urges early enactment of this important legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE E. WALSH,
Deputy Attorney General.

I would also like to insert at this point a letter from the present Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, under date of April 6, 1961:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1961.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is now pending in your committee the bill (H.R. 3021) "to amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith." The measure was introduced at the request of the Department of Justice on January 18, 1961.

I affirm and endorse this proposal for the experience of the Department of Justice demonstrates an urgent need for legislation to permit the compelling of testimony before grand juries and courts in Hobbs Act and certain Taft-Hartley Act cases. The Hobbs Act (18 U.S.C. 1951) makes it unlawful for an employer in an industry affecting commerce to pay money or make gifts to representatives of any of his employees under circumstances that would constitute such action a bribe. The close connection between the offenses proscribed in these two acts often inhibits cooperation with law enforcement officers. For example, an employer who is a victim of labor extortion may be reluctant to testify in a Hobbs Act case for fear that he may be incriminating himself under section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act.

H.R. 3021, in substance, provides that whenever in the opinion of a U.S. attorney it is necessary to the public interest that a witness testify or produce evidence before a grand jury or court of the United States, in a matter involving a violation of the Hobbs Act or section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act, he may, with the approval of the Attorney General, seek an order of the court instructing the witness to do so. The witness may not then be excused from testifying or producing the evidence on the ground that the act required of him may be self-incriminating, for the measure accords him immunity from prosecution (except for perjury or contempt) with respect to transactions concerning which he is compelled to testify or produce evidence after claiming his privilege against self-incrimination.

This bill effectively supplements the current Department of Justice legislative program aimed at organized crime. I recommend its early enactment.

However, one amendment is suggested for committee consideration. To provide for greater flexibility of administration, it may be desirable to insert the words "or an Assistant Attorney General designated by him," after the words "Attorney General" on line 6 of page 2 of the bill. This would permit the Attorney General to delegate to the appropriate Assistant Attorney General the responsibility of acting for him in approving applications by U.S. attorneys for orders compelling testimony or the production of evidence.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

The enactment of H.R. 3021 as title VII of my omnibus bill would effectively supplement the current Department of Justice legislative program aimed at organized crime.

TITLE VIII—EXTENSION OF THE FUGITIVE FELON ACT

One of the most important titles of my bill would amend section 1073 of title 18, U.S.C., the Fugitive Felon Act. The purpose of this section is to amend the act so as to broaden the scope of existing law in order that a number of serious crimes not presently included within the statute will be included in order to assist local law enforcement agencies in the apprehension of fugitives through the services of the Federal Government.

Under existing law it is provided that anyone who moves in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent to avoid prosecution or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which he flees, for certain specified crimes is, upon conviction, subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years or both. The crimes specified are murder, kidnaping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson punishable as a felony, or extortion accompanied by threats of violence, as well as an attempt to commit any of the enumerated offenses. The section further provides that these offenses shall be considered under the definition of either common law or under the law of the place from which the person fled.

Under title VIII of my bill, the scope of the act is broadened so as to include all felonies or offenses punishable by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year under the laws of the place where the fugitive flees, or second, to avoid giving testimony in any criminal proceedings in such place in which the commission of an offense punishable by imprisonment in a penitentiary is charged. The effect of the proposed amendment will permit local law-enforcement agencies to seek Federal assistance in locating offenders who have fled in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution, custody, or confinement for a number of serious criminal offenses which are not presently included within the statute. It will supplement the powers of the States in criminal law enforcement through the assistance of the agents of the Federal Government's investigative forces. It will provide either for Federal trials of the persons apprehended or their return to the proper State jurisdiction for prosecution or other appropriate State action. Customarily the State's jurisdiction is honored by the Federal Government.

The Department of Justice has stated that despite the broadening of the jurisdiction under this proposed section, the FBI will not be unduly burdened with unwarranted investigations.

During the 86th Congress I introduced H.R. 11890 for this purpose, and the provisions of this bill passed the House of Representatives. I have already reintroduced it this session as H.R. 3023, and its provisions are included as title VIII of the Antiracketeering Act.

I would like to insert at this point a copy of a letter from Attorney General Kennedy to the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, in which he states, "It would serve as another weapon in the attack on the criminal elements in our population. I therefore urge prompt and favorable action on this legislation."

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 468, a bill to amend section 1073 of title 18, United States Code, the Fugitive Felon Act. This bill was introduced at the request of the Department of Justice. An identical bill, H.R. 3023, is also before the committee.

The Fugitive Felon Act now provides that those persons who travel in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or custody or confinement after conviction for certain specified crimes such as murder, kidnaping, burglary, etc., shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years or both. These bills would amend the act to include all crimes, or attempts to commit crimes, punishable by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year.

The proposed amendment will permit Federal law enforcement officers to assist State and local officers in locating persons sought for all serious offenses, that is, offenses which would, under Federal law, constitute felonies, making the interstate flight of such persons punishable as Federal offenses. It would serve as another weapon in the attack on the criminal elements of our population. I therefore urge prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

TITLE IX—WIRETAPPING

By far the most controversial proposal of the Antiracketeering Act of 1961 is title IX, relating to wiretapping. One of the issues over which the Founding Fathers fought the war for independence was the security of the individual from "unreasonable searches and seizures." The fourth amendment was written into the Constitution to protect against such unwarranted intrusions upon a citizen's right of privacy. The fourth amendment provides:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall

issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

The security granted by the constitutional concept that each man's home is his castle, is not absolute, however, as proven by the fact that no "immunization" from searches and seizures was contemplated by the Founding Fathers. What they afforded was a constitutional protection against "unreasonable" intrusions of privacy only. This concept they also embodied in the Constitution outlining the sine qua non procedures for the issuance of search warrants for what might be termed "reasonable searches."

In recent years, the concept against "unreasonable" searches has run head-on into new technology. The advent of telephone and radio, on the one hand, and the development of wiretap and revolutionary eavesdropping techniques, on the other, have created serious new problems. The fearful specter of a 1984-like society intruding upon each citizen's constitutional castle is not one which can be lightly ignored.

But in our zeal to avoid abuses of new techniques, we must not go overboard. The Founding Fathers had experienced unreasonable searches and they guarded against them in a most reasonable manner. They could have provided for constitutional bans against all searches, but they were far too wise to follow that extreme course. Rather they tempered their approach to suit the legitimate needs of a free society.

It is my conviction that we cannot be less realistic than they were. Following the standard they set for us, we must protect against unreasonable intrusions occasioned by irresponsible use of these new techniques, while, at the same time, insuring the Government reasonable means to protect our citizenry. As Alan F. Westin said in a recent article in Commentary:

"To accept the argument that conversations of innocent persons might be overheard as reason for immunizing all telephone or room conversations from authorized search is to create an island of absolute privacy which is at variance with the American tradition, not in keeping with it."

Mindful, as I am, of the serious threat of organized and syndicated crime to our institutions and conscious, as I am, that the threat must be effectively combated if we are to survive as a free society, I have incorporated title IX into the Antiracketeering Act of 1961. A new chapter, chapter 119, dealing with the subject of wiretapping, would be added to title 18 of the United States Code.

Wiretapping, without proper authorization, and unauthorized disclosures secured therefrom are specifically prohibited in sections 2502 and 2503, respectively. Penalties are provided for violation of either section. Section 2504 additionally outlaws the illegal possession of wiretap equipment.

The Attorney General, under section 2505, is, however, authorized to intercept telephone communications to obtain evidence of syndicated crime. A statutory procedure is established which the Attorney General would be required to follow in order to secure court approval for wiretaps. The application, to be made to a district court or court of appeals, would have to satisfy the hearing judge of the existence of reasonable grounds to warrant the telephone interception. Protections are built into the proposal to guard against abuse. Wiretap evidence not secured in compliance with title IX would be specifically barred from receipt into evidence in any case.

Section 2507 fills the law enforcement gap created by the confusion of decisions as to the effect of interceptions by State officers. Such wiretaps, if made pursuant to a court determination of reasonableness, are specifically held not in violation of Federal law.

To my mind, title IX is a necessary and reasonable approach to a most serious problem. It is one that is certainly consistent with the approach of the Founding Fathers, embodied in the fourth amendment. As with that amendment, the constitutional castle concept is preserved from intrusions which are "unreasonable."

TITLE X—OBSTRUCTION OF INVESTIGATION

No crackdown on organized crime can succeed without the cooperation of a citizenry freed from fear of reprisal from gangland elements. As the Attorney General stated: "Experience has shown that potential witnesses are often intimidated, threatened, or coerced when a matter is in its investigative stage, prior to the initiation of a proceeding."

As the law now stands, the obstruction of justice statutes (18 U.S.C. 1503, 1505) prohibit the intimidation of witnesses after formal proceedings have begun. But during the investigative stage, the potential witness is not so protected. Thus, by intimidating witnesses during an inquiry, the subsequent initiation of formal proceedings may be effectively thwarted, without violating the obstruction prohibition. In effect, because the gap exists, the Federal Government is put into the position of sanctioning what might be called "back-door obstructionism."

The Attorney General has advocated that the situation be remedied and I support him in his effort. I fear, however, his proposal may be too broad for comfort, for it would not only prohibit intimidation, threats, and coercion to obstruct justice, but would also carry severe penalties for the furnishing of false or misleading information to any Government department or agency engaged in a lawful inquiry. While I am in sympathy with the end the Attorney General seeks to achieve with this latter provisions, I am fearful that his approach is too dangerous for this body to sanction. The grant of such authority, unless zealously restricted, might well constitute a long, long step toward a Gestapolike government control over the people.

In my opinion, to hold a citizen criminally liable for giving false information during an investigation when that information was given under oath could result in deterring witnesses from volunteering much needed information. In cases of statements under oath, present laws adequately deal with the problem.

Title X, therefore, deletes that portion of the Attorney General's proposal. It is restricted to prohibiting obstruction of inquiries or investigations by intimidation or injury of any person and is further restricted to cases involving syndicated criminal activities.

I believe that such a proposal would give the Government an effective investigative tool against organized criminal elements, while, at the same time, protecting our people from unwarranted governmental persecution.

TITLE XI—INTERSTATE TRAVEL IN AID OF SYNDICATED CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES

Title XI of the Antiracketeering Act of 1961, deals with unlawful travel in aid of syndicated criminal activities. Adapted from my bill, H.R. 5186 of the 86th Congress and adopted in principle by the Attorney General, involving interstate travel, the proposal is designed, in the words of the Attorney General, "to impede the clandestine flow of profits from criminal ventures and to bring about a serious disruption in the far-flung organization and management of coordinated criminal enterprises."

Title XI makes illegal the crossing of State lines or national boundaries to promote, manage, establish, carry on, or distribute the proceeds of syndicated criminal activities. As defined, such activities comprehend "substantial concerted activities in, or affecting, interstate or foreign commerce, where any part of such activities involve violations of law, Federal or non-Federal."

As modified, title XI is broader, while, at the same time, narrower than the approach recommended by the Attorney General, since only organized criminal activities are comprehended by the prohibition on unlawful travel.

Additionally, the provision has been further limited to nonviolent activities since "terroristic" offenses have been adequately dealt with in title II of the Antiracketeering Act of 1961.

Under present law and even with the adoption of title VIII of this act, and without this title and title II, it is essential for there to be a known suspect before the Federal Government can even give limited investigative aid to the States and even on their request. This title will cure this obvious weakness.

CONCLUSION

I am delighted to know that the present Attorney General has accepted the basic concepts of practically all the anticrime legislation I have introduced over the last 6 years, and which is, with additional proposals, now embodied in the Antiracketeering Act of 1961.

I trust that serious consideration will be given by the Department of Justice and by the Congress to this omnibus bill. I believe it to contain the basic essential tools as a minimum for starting an organized, effective fight against syndicated crime.

This, by no means, is the ultimate, and I believe that further tools can be molded only after lengthy consideration by the Congress as a result of studies and possibly investigations into the activi-

ties of syndicated crime and the need for proper means of further buttressing the local law enforcement activities and strengthening their hand to combat this menace.

I trust that the Congress will take effective and immediate action on this much needed legislation which I have been pressing for ever since I became a Member of Congress.

I am of the opinion that Congress would be derelict in its duties not to go forward with this bill. My bill encompasses many provisions that the Attorney General, of either the previous or present administration, has failed to recommend. I think serious consideration should be given to all of these proposals if we are to effectively root out syndicated gangsterism and crime.

It is noteworthy that my bill goes much further than the Attorney General's recommendations, and further than other bills introduced. I think these measures are worthy of serious consideration by the Congress and the additional provisions are included in order to secure proper study of other means of combating crime in addition to those proposed by the Attorney General.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 10, and to include minority views.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, for 30 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SAYLOR to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter and tables.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. LAIRD to include extraneous matter and tables in the remarks he made in the House today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEPHENS) and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. CAREY.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 912. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 10, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

883. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to eliminate the right of appeal from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico to the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

884. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the authority contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

885. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including the period ending December 31, 1960, pursuant to Public Law 47, 66th Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

886. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving an increase in the amount of $35,650,000 for the Housing and Home Finance Agency (H. Doc. No. 157); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

887. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving a net increase in the amount of $434,000 for the Executive Office of the President (H. Doc. No. 158); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

888. A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, transmitting a portion of a forthcoming report which relates to certain recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations regarding mass transportation in metropolitan areas, pursuant to Public Law 86–380; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 311. A bill to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt; without amendment (Rept. No. 366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2017. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 2554. A bill to repeal section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code requiring an annual report by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the bonding of officers and employees of the Federal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5760. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6346. A bill to include Ackia Battleground National Monument, Miss., and Meriwether Lewis National Monument, Tenn., in the Natchez Trace Parkway, and to provide appropriate designations for them, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6422. A bill to add federally owned lands to, and exclude federally owned lands from, the Cedar Breaks National Monument, Utah, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RUTHERFORD: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6519. A bill to provide additional lands for the Tupelo National Battlefield site, Mississippi, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 712. An Act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 306. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; without amendment (Rept. No. 374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 398. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation; without amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 5432. A bill to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; without amendment (Rept., No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on Project Rover (Rept., No. 377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; with amendment (Rept., No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6900. A bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposit and note liabilities, and to permit domestic banks to pay interest on time deposits of foreign governments at rates differing from those applicable to domestic depositors; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 6901. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain State and local employees who have elected (under the divided retirement system procedure) not to be covered under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program may have an additional opportunity to elect such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6902. A bill to provide the same life tenure and retirement rights for judges hereafter appointed to the U.S. District Court for the District of Puerto Rico as the judges of all other U.S. district courts now have; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H.R. 6903. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain State and local employees who have elected (under the divided retirement system procedure) not to be covered under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program may have an additional opportunity to elect such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 6904. A bill to amend section 202(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for partial exemption from the provisions of part II of such act of terminal area motor carrier operations performed by or for common carriers by water in interstate commerce subject to the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 6905. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the waiver of indebtedness to the United States arising out of a veteran's default in payment of a guaranteed home loan where the default occurred because of compelling reasons without fault on the part of the veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POFF:

H.R. 6906. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 6907. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1960, Public Law 86-559, with respect to commissioned officers of the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 6908. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional $2,400 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6909. A bill to strengthen the criminal laws so as to further protect all persons from the menace of organized and syndicated crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6910. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 6911. A bill to incorporate the Junior Midshipmen of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6912. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, to permit Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or lend to business development credit corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6913. A bill to provide that railroad employees may retire on a full annuity at age 60 or after serving 30 years; to provide that such annuity for any month shall not be less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6914. A bill to provide for the construction of hospital facilities in the State of Florida to provide not less than 1,000 additional beds for the care of disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 6915. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the county of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6916. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such programs on grounds of conscience or religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6917. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide certain increases in rates of disability compensation and allowances for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARY:

H.R. 6918. A bill to provide that the official flag of each State in the Union shall be flown around the base of the Washington Monument in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6919. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend appropriated funds to acquire approximately 12 acres of land for the Richmond National Battlefield Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H.R. 6920. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, entitled "The Postal Service"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 6921. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a research program in order to determine means of improving the conservation of game fish in dam reservoirs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6922. A bill to provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6923. A bill for the protection of marine mammals on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6924. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas through their incidental or secondary use for public recreation, and for other purposes; to the committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6925. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any Federal water resources project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 6926. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1960, Public Law 86-559, with respect to commissioned officers of the Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NORRELL:

H.J. Res. 411. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 412. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 298. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that an immediate air and naval blockade of Cuba should be imposed for the purpose of implementing the Monroe Doctrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H. Res. 281. Resolution to provide for the placing of a plaque in the Hall of the House of Representatives honoring the First Defenders of the Civil War; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIBONATI: Senate Resolution No. 37 adopted in the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative to the predicament of the veterans of World War I, and memorializing the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to legislation providing benefits to the aged, ill, and disabled veterans of this great war in the form of pensions or any other means which will provide relief so vitally needed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas voicing its approval and urging the continuation of the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee in exposing and halting the infiltration of subversive elements in our country; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the study of the possibility of establishing a Pacific International House and Trade Mart in Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to voicing its approval and urging the continuation of the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee in exposing and halting the infiltration of subversive elements in our country; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6927. A bill authorizing issuance of patent in fee to Ruby Rogers Connery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6928. A bill authorizing fee title to Ruby Rogers Connery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 6929: A bill for the relief of Douglas A. Smithers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 6930. A bill to authorize the disposal of surplus equipment, materials, books, and supplies under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to the Georgia Sheriffs' Boys Ranch, Inc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 6931. A bill to authorize the disposal of surplus equipment, materials, books, and supplies under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to Boys' Ranches; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6932. A bill for the relief of Christos and Chrissoula Viahakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6933. A bill for the relief of Gregorio Di Gregorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6934. A bill for the relief of Leokadia-Danuta Kleban; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 6935. A bill for the relief of James H. Mackin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 6936. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Topor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6937. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julianna Kadlecsik (nee Polaraczki) and her son, Istvan F. Kadlecsik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6938. A bill for the relief of Dr. Robert E. Hiller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 6939. A bill for the relief of Stephen (Szee Yuen) Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 6940. A bill for the relief of Henry Armstrong, administrator of the estate of Ella Armstrong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 6941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Saleema Kouri Hamra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 6942. A bill authorizing the award of the Silver Star or other appropriate decoration to Roman Solomka; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 6943. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Calliope Hassialis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.J. Res. 413. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.J. Res. 414. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Soil Stewardship Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to pause with me a few moments today to reflect upon the importance and significance of soil stewardship which is observed this year from May 7 through May 14.

Soil stewardship is simply our account to the Maker for the use we have made of His land.

This applies to all of us alike and not only to the man who cares for the large acreage; the home gardener is equally as responsible as the home developer. If our soil is destroyed and abused, our future generations are doomed.

The custom of giving special recognition to soil stewardship has been brought to prominence by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts together with churchmen from several denominations. In 1955 they undertook the first national observance. A committee of churchmen from several denominations, working with an association committee, develops each year appropriate materials which the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts prints and distributes to local districts and church groups throughout the country. These include booklets, programs, posters, and related materials.

Each spring, thousands of rural and urban churches, in cooperation with a local soil conservation district, devote time to recognition of the urgency of good stewardship of the land as a fundamental of moral and civic responsibility.

At the national meeting of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts in Minneapolis in 1958, one of the outstanding features of the program at the annual banquet was an impressive stewardship ceremony written and presented by the Reverend E. W. Mueller, secretary, rural church program, National Lutheran Council. Entitled "The Gift of Precious Soil," it included the presentation and blending of soil from each State of the Union. Subsequently, a tree was planted in this soil on the grounds of the Minnesota State Capitol.

Earlier mention of stewardship was made in the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts prayer written by Director W. F. Hall, of Sparta, Ga., during the fall meeting of the national board of directors held at Galveston, Tex., November 1955. It was given for the first time at a luncheon there.

On motion of Director Dave J. Doneen, seconded by southeastern area Vice President A. D. Holmes, the board voted to adopt this blessing officially and use it on all occasions when the board met together for breakfast, luncheon, or dinner.

It has since been used on numerous occasions by individual soil conservation districts and State associations at formal luncheons and banquets:

OUR PRAYER OF STEWARDSHIP

Our kind Heavenly Father, giver of all good gifts. As we partake of this food and drink, may be realize that You willed it so in the beginning. May we know that Thy promises are everlasting.

Give us wisdom, O Lord, that we may know Thy will; give us courage to do Thy will. Convince us that we really owe nothing, but that by Thy grace we are stewards of Thy many resources and that Thou dost rejoice in the service of a good and faithful steward.

As this food and drink restores our strength and energy may we render pleasing service to Thee. Help us to be worthy of Thy many blessings.

All of this we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

Soil Stewardship Week is a modern version of Rogation days. Observance of Rogation Days began centuries ago. In the observance, man has given thanks to Almighty God for His bountiful gifts.

Many thousands of people each year now are participating in soil stewardship and Rogation day prayers in city, village, and open country churches.

"Rogation" comes from the Latin word "rogare" meaning "to ask." Rogation Day began at Vienne, France, in the year 470. It was a time of crop failure—due to earthquakes and bad weather. It was a time of hunger.

St. Mamertus, bishop of Vienne, ordered prayer and penance on the 3 days preceding the Ascension. The clergy and the people called upon God to help in their desperate need.

Other communities took up the custom, and from France it spread throughout the world. At the end of the eighth century the observance had been formally accepted by the church. It has been the custom to hold each year before Ascension Thursday a special rogation service.

On Rogation days people implore the mercy of God that He may keep us from all evils of soul and body, and give to the plants of the field an increase. In the spring, when the fields are green and there is promise of a good harvest—but also the possibility of destruction by frost, hail or rainstorm—prayers and processions have served as a reminder to feeble man to turn with humility and confidence to the Giver of all good. For, it is not the earth alone which brings forth fruit, nor is it alone on the busy hand of man that increase depends; but it is God who gives the increase.

Utah is equally conscious of the proper use of other vitally important natural resources like forests and ranges, fish and wildlife, minerals and petroleum. The vacationer who chooses Utah for his holiday has in store for him a breathtaking wealth of natural beauty.

Over 12 million acres of farmland are benefiting today in Utah from one or many of the practices sponsored by the

Soil Conservation Service. We have five excellent watershed protection projects in my congressional district and the sixth lacks only congressional committee approval.

These accomplishments would not have been possible without the work of many dedicated people who pioneered the field of today's progress.

One such outstanding individual is Mr. A. R. Croft, a personal friend of mine for many years who was recently honored upon the completion of 30 years of distinguished work. The Salt Lake Tribune of May 1 gave such a fitting tribute to Mr. Croft that I feel it is worthy of your attention:

HE MENDS WATERSHEDS

The outstanding performance rating and cash award given A. R. Croft, watershed management specialist and hydrologist for the regional office of the U.S. Forest Service, Ogden, caps 30 years of distinguished work.

Mr. Croft's scientific treatises on erosion problems appear regularly in professional journals and he is in demand as a speaker before both laymen's and academic societies. Four years ago he received the Agriculture Department's Superior Service Award, recognizing among other things his work in establishing analytical criteria for and gaining public support for scientific watershed management.

Formerly a research forester for the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Mr. Croft helped develop and improve the contour trenching system on the steep Davis and Box Elder Counties watersheds, a system now widely used throughout the Nation and abroad to prevent floods and mud-rock flows.

Through the work of Mr. Croft and other dedicated ecologists, the flood peril which has plagued Wasatch Front communities since the turn of the century eventually may be eliminated.

However well the State of Utah and other States have heard and heeded the advice and direction of the conservationists, there is still much to be done. After all, our natural resources are a direct gift of the Almighty for which we will be required to give an accounting. It behooves all of us, therefore, to use them prudently and yet preserve them for our children.

Perhaps it is well for us to ponder the wisdom propounded in the so-called 11th Commandment which begins: "Thou shalt inherit the Holy Earth as a faithful steward, conserving its resources and productivity from generation to generation."

Inspection of the Combined Arms School of the 7th Army Training Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, last November while on a Reserve officers tour of duty with other Members of Congress, I had the pleasure of inspecting the Combined Arms School of the 7th Army Training Center. This school, under the training center command of Brig. Gen. Edwin H. Burba, is operated by Lt. Col. Carl G. Witte, assistant commandant, in Vilseck, Germany, near the Czechoslovakian border.

The itinerary afforded an excellent opportunity to observe field exercises of the combat arms which stressed realistic tactical conditions, leadership training, and teamwork within and between the arms. A tour of the academic facilities disclosed a remarkably high degree of ability on the part of the staff and faculty. The efficient planning, conduct, high standards, and excellent quality of instruction proved to be an exceptional example of the formal military training program in Europe. It is a recognizable fact that the Combined Arms School, as part of the 7th Army Training Center, plays a very important role in the readiness mission of the 7th Army.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks I have prepared on my inspection of this fine service school.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THURMOND

The Combined Arms School, as it is known today, was originally the Tank Training Center of the U.S. Constabulary. Established as a school in 1948, its primary mission was to train the personnel of the Constabulary to accomplish border surveillance duties. The 7th Army commander, realizing the shortage of well-trained personnel during the transitional period following the war, directed that the school be expanded to include training for all armor personnel. As a result, in 1951 the U.S. Constabulary School was redesignated the 7th Army Tank Training Center and again in 1958 was renamed the Combined Arms School in consonance with the addition to the curriculum of training that applied to all arms.

The mission of the Combined Arms School is threefold in nature and accomplishes the following:

1. Prepare and conduct instruction in communications, gunnery, small unit tactics, wheeled and tracked vehicle maintenance, and chemical, biological and radiological warfare, reflecting the latest Department of the Army doctrine, as applicable to the needs in Europe and foreign students.

2. Conduct studies, experiments, and tests for the purpose of developing the capabilities of equipment and supplies, and adapting existing doctrine and techniques to requirements peculiar to 7th Army operations.

3. Control, operate, and maintain live fire combat ranges for armor, artillery, infantry, and engineer units.

In accomplishing the primary mission, the Combined Arms School's curriculum includes courses for the advanced armor crewman, the turret mechanic, reconnaissance leader, track vehicle mechanic, motor officer, motor sergeant, chemical, biological and radiological courses for officers and noncommissioned officers, and special courses that are conducted relative to new equipment. These courses vary in length from 2 to 6 weeks and are programed to graduate in the vicinity of 3,200 students per year.

In addition to these courses the school also conducts classes and special training for units that come to the training center for field work on a request basis in over 200 related subjects. Since its inception, the Combined Army School has graduated over 30,000 officer and enlisted students in programed classes and 103,000 in the nonprogramed field.

Tactical training on combat ranges consists of small unit live fires, day and night exercises which provide integrated, progressive training for infantry and armor units with support from mortar and artillery units.

The personnel of the staff and faculty are imbued with a special sense of responsibility toward the student and his unit in that they make certain he learns his required skills. To accomplish this, small group instruction and practical work or "hands on equipment" instruction is emphasized. Through these methods much individual attention can be given to the student thereby turning out an exceptionally high rate of successful graduates who have been rapidly taught and are trained so that they in turn can serve as instructors in their own units. This system gives unit commanders the highly trained specialists, supervisors, and leaders needed to fill the gaps in the trained personnel ranks of 7th Army and other NATO commanders.

The activities of the Combined Arms School are under constant observation by visiting military and civilian representatives. These visits are practically daily affairs and consist of representatives of many foreign countries as well as many senior commanders of our units in Europe. The school's methods of instruction are being emulated widely.

Of particular note, disclosed by this visit, was the sincere attitude of the instructors in the conduct of their duties. This fact was repeatedly reflected by the interest and attention of the students to the instruction. The school undoubtedly is an outstanding model for military schools of this type and should be considered a pattern to follow by other military institutions of learning.

In addition to the normal functions of a school, the Combined Arms School is also conducting a searching study in methods of instruction in a constant endeavor to teach more to more students in less time. In this respect the school is now programing selected subjects for presentation by the teaching machine method.

The school's knowledge of educational psychology, coupled with its sense of urgency and the spirit of a crusader, is well worthy of our recognition.

Research Will Help Redevelop Coal Areas, but Elimination of Unfair Competitive Practices Is a Prerequisite to Permanent Economic Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week a very distinguished executive in the coal industry, Walter F. Schulten, vice president of the Consolidation Coal Co., spoke before the Altoona Lions Club. His subject was research, and I would like to have unanimous consent to include portions of his address in the RECORD. At the moment, however, I submit this single sentence from Mr. Schulten's address:

The policy of opening our fuel markets to the production of alien refineries has left deep scars upon the economy of this area.

Mr. Schulten was, of course, alluding to the great volume of residual oil imports that have captured east coast fuel

markets and left a severe impact back along the right-of-way of the Pennsylvania Railroad—from unloading piers, through the yards and shops of transportation centers, and right up into the coal mines. Over the years that this type of unfair competition has been accepted and even nurtured by the Federal Government, many of those mines have had to close and are now hopelessly flooded. Others may possibly be reactivated if sufficient hard work and cold cash are engaged.

These conditions have persisted since foreign oil began to flood traditional coal markets on the Atlantic seaboard shortly after the conclusion of World War II. Except for a control program put into operation by the White House in 1959, the Federal Government has done nothing to check the imports. In fact, since the new administration took office in January, controls have been relaxed to such an extent that the whole program has been rendered ineffectual.

Last February 21 I submitted to the Secretary of Interior a statement explaining the hardship that Pennsylvania is undergoing as a consequence of too much foreign oil. I protested the Department's unexpected increase in residual oil quotas, a decision that took place less than 1 month after Inauguration Day. On the assumption that the new Secretary was unfamiliar with many facets of the import control program, I urged that he reconsider his hasty judgment and cut import volumes at least to the levels provided for when the program was created as a security measure. Last week I received a letter from L. J. O'Connor, Oil Administrator, acknowledging receipt of my statement but containing no indication that a revision of the allowable import volumes is in prospect. I remind the White House that increasing the quota levels is in direct contradiction to preelection promises to help coal areas bring about economic recovery.

Within the past several weeks the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been replete with statements by Members of Congress from all sections of the country whose constituents are experiencing economic suffering as a result of our unwise foreign trade policies. Paradoxically, some members of the New England delegation who vehemently denounce restrictions on residual oil imports have taken lead parts in the chorus clamoring for protection for their native industries. While I am in complete accord with their wishes and demands for safeguards against foreign products that create havoc in America's marketplaces, I trust that the experience of having to endure business losses in home constituencies will tend to make them more sympathetic to the problem perennially facing coal producing areas.

I am convinced that our whole international trade program requires close inspection and a complete going over before any serious thought is given to renewal of the reciprocal trade program next year.

Mr. Schulten was a witness to depressed conditions when he visited Altoona this week. He is not a stranger to our area and for years has recognized that a high degree of unemployment in central Pennsylvania can be directly attributed to excessive imports of residual oil. Never in the past two decades, however, has the mining situation been in such disastrous economic straits as it is at the present time.

We are anticipating better times, Mr. Speaker. We are looking to an economic upturn when the new area development program gets rolling. There is no question but that this type of artificial economic stimulus can set many industrial machines back into motion. To keep them running without continuous Government dollar-pumping operations however will require a rearrangement of foreign trade policy. America must return to the logical philosophy of enabling products of its own workers to find an outlet in the marketplaces of its own people.

The coal industry has made an heroic effort to keep its product competitive but there is no competition when international oil shippers are allowed to discharge their cargo in defiance of established marketing practices. As Mr. Schulten points out, the coal industry has made spectacular gains in production efficiency; it is going forward with a research program that will unquestionably prove beneficial to the consuming public.

I commend to the attention of Congress the portions of Mr. Schulten's address which I am enclosing in the RECORD. Meanwhile, I ask that you bear in mind that thousands of miners, railroaders, and industrial neighbors in my State and in other areas of the Appalachian region are without work today wholly because of the unreasonable and unrealistic trade policies pursued by the Federal Government.

Unless these policies are revised drastically and based on the premise that protection of American industry and labor is essential to the Nation's economy and security, there will be no permanency in the economic gains anticipated under the depressed area legislation which became effective this week; nor can the United States be assured that adequate fuel resources will be available in an emergency.

Portions of Mr. Schulten's statement follow:

Perhaps the best testimony to coal's progress in research is the stabilized price structure that has prevailed over the past decade or so. Today, coal sells at the mine on an average variously estimated to be from the same price to 26 cents per ton less than it did in 1948. The answer is mechanization. Through research and development, mining machines and techniques have more than doubled output per man-day in the short space of 10 years. Our skilled American mineworker can now get out as much coal in 1 day as his counterpart elsewhere in the world can produce in a week.

* * * * *

Altoona is a railroad town. It has depended and still depends a great deal upon the coal traffic that moves between our producing fields and the east coast. You will be happy to know that coal and the railroads are cooperating in the constant struggle to keep down the delivered price of coal. The railroads have introduced volume rates and trainload rates in an effort to remain competitive and thus provide coal a greater opportunity to share in the fuels market.

Neither this cooperation nor continued research, however, are adequate to overcome the handicaps that we face in dealing with competition from foreign residual oil and dump natural gas. Congressman VAN ZANDT has carried on a never-ceasing campaign for legislation to protect coal's markets against the rising tide of foreign residual oil engulfing many of our markets on the east coast. The policy of opening our fuel markets to the product of alien refineries has left deep scars upon the economy of this area.

The coal industry and our producing regions have sustained similar losses through the illogical Federal Power Commission policy of permitting natural gas pipeline companies to invade coal markets by offering natural gas to industry at whatever rate is necessary to undersell coal. A recent Supreme Court decision may be instrumental in checking this invasion. The Court affirmed the authority of the Federal Power Commission to take conservation into consideration when deciding on applications for transportation and use of natural gas. In addition, the general public is becoming increasingly resentful of having to pay two or three times as much for natural gas as industrial customers are charged for the same product. These factors can bear heavily in coal's favor and restore at least a modicum of the business that has been lost through prevailing inequitable competitive practices in the fuel industries.

* * * * *

To attempt to predict the outcome of a research effort is hazardous, but at least I can say with confidence that 1961 will be a key year in the field of coal research. If not the year of greatest accomplishments, certainly it will mark the start of more important coal research programs than have ever previously been undertaken in this country.

At Monroeville, near Pittsburgh, is the site of the new Bituminous Coal Research laboratory. To the unsuspecting passerby, this cinder block and grayish brick structure beginning to take form could be the makings of a schoolhouse, an office building, or even a small manufacturing plant. Come back in another 6 months, however, and you will find the likes of which has never before existed in America. You will see scientists and engineers delving into projects designed to do something fast for the coal industry—to develop new markets, to expand old ones, to keep prices down, to get coal to market at less cost and whatever other research approaches seem to be most feasible for quick action. The complete facilities will be valued in excess of a million dollars. There will also be fundamental research activity, but for the time being emphasis will be on applied research and immediate results. The building, incidentally, will be entirely fueled by electricity, "coal by wire," in advancing and increasing utilization for coal.

Capital funds for construction of the research center have come from electric utilities, equipment manufacturers, railroads, chemical companies, and engineering firms. This joint effort reflects the general confidence in the future of coal. Bituminous Coal Research has for some time carried on research activities in smaller laboratories in Columbus, Ohio, and in the Oakland section of Pittsburgh. This work is now being consolidated and expanded.

The Monroeville Research Center cannot alone make 1961 a monument to coal research. There are also things stirring in Washington. Last month with the swearing in of George Lamb as Director, the Office of Coal Research in the Department of the Interior started to get into motion. This

office is the outcome of a long effort initiated by Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR of Johnstown, and supported enthusiastically by Congressman JIMMY VAN ZANDT. In his capacity as Director, Mr. Lamb will be charged with responsibility for selecting the research proposals submitted to his office that have the most likelihood of immediate favorable results. He will decide where the best results are likely to be obtained—whether in our own industry laboratory in Pittsburgh, at a university, in the development facilities of an allied industry, or through a private operation.

* * * * *

Coal is, of course, not dependent upon research alone to answer its problems. The national security demands that present coal output be increased by approximately 20 percent if our industry is to have the capacity to meet emergency demands. Idle mines and idle facilities of allied industries are a definite threat to our defense structure. There is a good possibility that research will gradually account for important increases in coal tonnage. Meanwhile, however, every responsible citizen should demand cutbacks in the residual oil imports that are depriving coal of its legitimate markets. Dump sales of natural gas at rates tilted to undercut coal must be checked in the name of fuel security and conservation of a scarce natural resource.

The National Coal Association has invited officials of chambers of commerce from coal areas who are attending the meeting of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to meet there this afternoon. The local chamber representatives will be informed that the National Coal Association is ready to assist coal areas in attracting new industry. NCA's Economics and Transportation Department has been conducting a pilot study based on business conditions, natural resources, and transportation facilities in Cambria County. The pilot study has now been completed and NCA is ready to make similar information available to interested groups in Blair and all coal-producing counties.

From the foregoing you will deduct that the coal industry is more and more expanding its research activities. Current concentration is upon the development, through research, of immediate ways, means, and processes by which the use of coal may be immediately increased. With population increases and increased energy requirements, coal production and use will increase in the next decade. Our problem now is to develop a market to sustain the present production capacity. To this effort research will make a considerable contribution.

The John Philip Sousa Home in Nation's Capital Now Threatened With Destruction by Officials Inspired by Proposed Razing of Historic Buildings on Lafayette Square

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 6893, to provide for the preservation and maintenance of the home of John Philip Sousa, one of America's most beloved composers. The home is located at 318 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

The building was the first home Mr. Sousa owned, and he occupied it from about 1900 to World War I. The home, a Victorian-type house, has been condemned by the officials of the District of Columbia despite the fact that it has been planned as a shrine by those concerned with the advancement of American music for at least 20 years.

The destruction of the Sousa home by insensitive officials is just one more example of the present disregard for America's historic and culturally important buildings by top Government officials. During the past 20 years one-fourth of our significant buildings have been destroyed, many of them by Government action.

Last week William Walton, a painter, was revealed as the gentleman who, despite his lack of any official status, had advised leading Federal Government officials to destroy the Dolly Madison House, and the Benjamin Tayloe House, and the Belasco Theater on Lafayette Square. Various groups of citizens of this Nation have been trying to save the historic buildings on Lafayette Square for 20 years.

Mr. Walton was reported by the Washington (D.C.) Star, of May 3, 1961, as saying that—

> The Dolly Madison House was completely gutted by the Cosmos Club in 1895 so that it no longer has any historical meaning. Inside of the outside stucco are some original brick walls, that's all. If rebuilt it would be essentially a replica. The same thing is true of the Tayloe House, which is of less historical importance.

The Washington (D.C.) Star report went on to say:

> As for the Belasco Theater, it is so outdated, he said, no theater company would want it. And since its facilities are too limited for theater, the stage would be hopelessly inadequate for the opera.

The argument over whether the John Philip Sousa home, and the historic buildings on Lafayette Square should be preserved will doubtless continue until the present criteria are revised, or until some new and more competent advisers are found.

Miss Gertrude Carraway, honorary president general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, indicates that the problem is really a national problem in a recent letter in which she declares:

> I am having a similar argument with the National Park Service over their failing to include Tryon Palace in their Registry of Historic Landmarks that you seem to be having in Washington over the failure of "some national authorities" to recognize Lafayette Square as possessing exceptional value in commemorating and illustrating the history of the United States.

Mr. Walton would have us believe that no one is interested in the Belasco Theater. The Citizens Committee to Save Lafayette Square was formed last year by the Washington Opera Society which was intensely interested in saving the Belasco Theater in a city which has been called a hick town and a cultural backwater by such national publications as the New York Times and Time magazine, because of its lack of cultural facilities.

Other groups interested in preserving the buildings on Lafayette Square are the DAR, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and the National Federation of Music Clubs. In fact, there is not a single national organization which has demanded the destruction of the buildings on Lafayette Square.

Only one short year ago the President introduced legislation to save the Lafayette Square buildings in the form of a bill, S. 3280, and he made a strong speech to rally support for his measure.

One can only guess at the number of history-minded Americans who voted for this history-minded candidate in last fall's political campaign on the basis of his well-known and widely heralded drive, in which he was joined by eight leading Democratic Senators, to preserve the Lafayette Square buildings. These votes might have been decisive since the results were close.

If the Lafayette Square buildings are destroyed, then this will amount to a repudiation of his position of last fall.

The New York Times recently reported how the President intervened to save Harvard Yard at Harvard University from an office building:

> Kenneth P. O'Donnell, class of 1949, and Special Assistant to the President, phoned leading (Massachusetts) State Democrats urging them not to make the (15-story office building) project a party issue.
>
> McGeorge Bundy, Yale 1940, and a Republican, former dean of the Harvard faculty, and now Special Presidential Assistant for National Security Affairs, passed the word to some Republicans.

One can only surmise that there is not a single Presidential assistant with the courage to face up to William Walton and defend Lafayette Square at this crucial period in our history.

The New York Times reported on April 8, 1961, that the President asked Congress on April 7 to—

> authorize U.S. participation in an international effort to save antiquities marked for inundation by the Soviet-financed Aswan Dam, which is being built in the United Arab Republic.
>
> The President suggested that the United States finance alone the estimated $6 million cost of preserving the Pearl of Egypt, a group of temples on the Island of Philae, between the old and new Aswan Dams. They now are submerged part of the year.
>
> Mr. Kennedy also proposed that the United States take part in preserving lesser temples both in the United Arab Republic and in the Sudan, at a cost of $2,500,000, and that it contribute $1,500,000 to speed extensive archeological and prehistory research in areas now unexplored but threatened with flooding.

One way, perhaps the only way, to save such buildings as the John Philip Sousa home, and the Dolly Madison and Benjamin Tayloe houses, would be to replace some of the students of the history of Egypt or Harvard University on the President's staff of advisors with students of the history of our own Nation. A start could be made by bringing in such cultural leaders as Gertrude Carraway of the National Society, DAR; or Helen Sousa Abert, a surviving daughter of John Philip Sousa; Joseph Watterson, editor of the Journal of the American Institute of Architects; Mrs.

Ozbirn, national president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; or Mrs. Bullock, president of the National Federation of Clubs.

I include as part of my remarks the text of my bill, H.R. 6893, and articles from the Washington (D.C.) Post on the John Philip Sousa home:

H.R. 6893

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation of the home of John Philip Sousa, and to protect the homes of residents and the businesses and good will of the small businessmen in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (D.C. Code, sec. 5–706) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(j)(1) For the purpose of providing for the preservation, and maintenance as a shrine, of the former home in the District of Columbia of John Philip Sousa, there is hereby established a board consisting of the conductor of the band of the United States Army, the conductor of the band of the United States Navy, the conductor of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and the conductor of the band of the United States Air Force, ex officio, plus ten additional individuals appointed by the President, which shall acquire the home of John Philip Sousa at 318 Independence Avenue, in the District of Columbia, and shall preserve and maintain such home as a shrine dedicated to his memory, and as a museum for the preservation of memorabilia of John Philip Sousa.

"(2) For the purpose of obtaining funds for carrying out this subsection, the board is authorized to accept donations of funds, services, and property, and to conduct a nationwide fund-raising campaign. All departments and agencies of the United States, upon request by the board, shall transfer to the board all memorabilia of John Philip Sousa in the custody or control of such departments and agencies.

"(3) Members of the board shall serve without compensation for their services as such, but they shall be reimbused for their expenses of travel and subsistence while actually engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the board. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

"(k) Until a comprehensive plan has been prepared for the proper development, preservation, and improvement of the physical environs of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings, including the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, and the United States Supreme Court, no funds shall be expended for the acquisition of real property or for the purchase or demolition of existing buildings located in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings.

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1961]

HOME SLATED AS SHRINE TO SOUSA IS CONDEMNED

(By Stephen S. Rosenfeld, staff reporter)

The Capitol Hill home of John Philip Sousa, the man who put a nation on march time, planned as a shrine for 20 years, now faces destruction.

The District has condemned as unsanitary the Victorian edifice at 318 Independence Avenue SE., the first home Sousa owned and where he lived from about 1900 to World War I. Unless the Condemnation Board is dissuaded or the home repaired, it will be razed.

With it will go the last chance to memorialize America's premier bandsman within walls that he knew, since his birthplace at 636 G Street SE., was chopped up into apartments.

Efforts to make the home a museum in the early forties and middle fifties flopped. But another effort has been mounted.

Sousa's daughter, Helen Sousa Abert of New York, who owns the house, entrusted it a few years back to the Sousa Memorial Committee.

So when the District told her last week she had only until May 9 to ask for a stay, she turned to the committee.

This, apparently, is fine by the Condemnation Board. At its meeting Wednesday it probably will shelve the matter until the committee acts, Director Richard L. Mattingly said.

The committee itself will meet informally this week in Coral Gables, Fla., where its chairman, Lt. Col. William F. Santelmann of Arlington, former Marine Band director, will be visiting Otto Kraushaar, president of the American Bandmasters Association.

Kraushaar, who played in Sousa's band, said a fund-raising scheme would be mulled over. Mrs. Abert estimates $50,000 to $100,000 is needed.

She stands ready, she said, to furnish several rooms with her father's belongings and to give a roomful of his trophies, his music library, books of press clippings, pictures and such memorabilia as batons. The Library of Congress already has the manuscripts of his marches.

"There's so much talk about culture and the arts in Washington," said Mrs. Abert, "it would seem rather wicked to drop this. It's unique."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 9, 1961]

MEMORIAL TO "MARCH KING"—HOUSE BILL TO PRESERVE SOUSA HOME WOULD BLOCK CAPITOL HILL EXPANSION

Legislation was introduced yesterday to preserve the Capitol Hill home of John Philip Sousa. The bill includes a provision which would block efforts of the Government to purchase a block of Capitol Hill property.

The bill, introduced by Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, Republican of Pennsylvania, besides providing for the Sousa memorial, would require a comprehensive plan for development, preservation and improvement before any Federal money could be spent to purchase or demolish buildings in the area around the Capitol.

The Republicans' Capitol Hill Club, at 214 First Street SE., has already been purchased for $600,000 but other residences and small businesses in the area scheduled to be taken over, bounded by Independence Avenue, First and Second Streets SE., are still to be affected. The eminent domain proceedings have come under attack by area residents who charge that the payments to be made are both inadequate and inequitable.

The Kearns bill would establish a 14-member presidentially appointed board to acquire the Sousa residence at 318 Independence Avenue SE. and maintain it as a shrine.

Kearns submitted the measure after reading in the Washington Post that the residence of the famed bandsman had been condemned by the District as unsanitary.

If it is razed, it will end years of effort to memorialize Sousa within a home that he knew. His birthplace at 636 G Street SE. is no longer available for a shrine. His birthplace was restored by R. C. King & Associates into a home quite similar to the original home, but with an apartment on the first floor.

In view of the Condemnation Board's pending action, the Sousa Memorial Committee, which has been entrusted with the preservation of the Independence Avenue dwelling by Sousa's daughter, announced it intended to consider a fund-raising effort to save the home.

Under KEARNS' bill, however, the proposed 14-member board would be authorized to conduct a nationwide fund-raising campaign. The board would include 10 members appointed by the President and the conductors of the Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force bands.

The proposed legislation, amending the District Redevelopment Act, goes beyond the preservation of the Sousa home and seeks to protect other Capitol Hill residences and businesses.

The Late John Cashmore—"Mr. Brooklyn"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, in all its history the Borough of Brooklyn, N.Y., has had no more able proponent than its late President John Cashmore. To his waning moments his life was given to his office and his people. About the duties of the borough president he said: "I love the work and I love Brooklyn and I never want to do anything else."

The 20 years he served as chief executive of the Nation's most populous county followed 18 years during which he was a distinguished legislator in the State assembly, member of the city council, and alderman. World War I began his upfront career; he joined the infantry. Returning to Brooklyn in 1922 he became the candidate of the fifth assembly district for the State legislature. His opponent was seemingly unbeatable. The young candidate and his supporters staged a dynamic campaign.

He was 1 of 10 children of a proud, devoted mother who had immigrated from Canada. She had been widowed when John was 14 and she had seen him leave school to help support the family. He worked as a bellhop, newsboy, truckman, and eventually became the proprietor of a furniture business. On behalf of her son she wrote a letter to every mother in the district—John was always proud of that letter which read:

My youngest son, John, is running for the assembly. He is a good boy and I do wish you'd vote for him.

The young campaigner won the election to the surprise of everyone but his friends and family and never again left public office.

His abilities, vigor and warm personality won him many new friends. Among them, James A. Farley, who became his Albany roommate, Alfred E. Smith and James J. Walker. Like General Farley he became a party leader of stature as well as an outstanding public official. In the troublous postwar years he became leader of the Kings County Democratic organization and helped build it to its position as the strongest in the State of New York.

John Cashmore knew not only how to campaign, he knew how to win, fairly and cleanly. And as his first victory was an upset, so were others.

In 1924 he defeated an incumbent on the board of aldermen by 37 votes. No one in New York City ever came that close to defeating John Cashmore for office again.

He was a striking 6-footer, whose warmth, wit and wisdom made him a platform natural. No smile was more engaging because none was more genuine. He was hailed as a speaker because his words packed the power of truth and sincerity. He was that rare combination of dauntless leader and capable administrator. In 1940 he succeeded Raymond V. Ingersoll as borough president. He won reelection to that office in 1941, 1945, 1949, 1953, and 1957. In the last two elections the Republican Party, to its credit, recognized that on his record of merit, no one could displace John Cashmore as long as he chose to run. They endorsed him.

Of his extraordinary accomplishments the New York Times in its editorial of May 8 said:

JOHN CASHMORE

In the nearly 40 years John Cashmore was in public life enormous changes have taken place in Brooklyn. As borough president for the past 20 years he was responsible for a great many of them. Some of these will serve as monuments for many years to his tremendous interest and pride in the borough where he was born and where he lived all his life.

Probably the best known and admired of the improvements for which he was responsible are the $250 million civic center, which has completely altered the appearance of downtown Brooklyn, and the downtown Brooklyn educational complex which now provides educational opportunities for 36,000 high school, public and private college students daily.

And on the same day, the New York World Telegram, "Voice of Brooklyn," by Roland Eckman:

CASHMORE'S WORK STANDS AS MEMORIAL TO HIM

It's a little early, just a few hours after his death, to speak of memorials to John Cashmore. We do so today, in the full shock of his loss, because among our first thoughts when we heard the news was the idea that Mr. Cashmore's memorials—the ones we're sure he would prize most—are already here and are destined to survive.

The first of these is the almost universal affection he inspired in his fellow Brooklynites. Mr. Cashmore was in public life 39 years. He was borough president since 1940. That's a long time in politics and in the course of it he undoubtedly made some enemies. It is a tribute to John Cashmore that he made many more friends.

The second memorial is the Civic Center. The borough's younger citizens probably can't imagine the snarl and tangle and blight that surrounded Borough Hall not so many years ago. All of that has been swept away and has been replaced by public and private buildings, acres of greenery, a smooth flow of traffic, in short, a downtown Brooklyn that is a model of city planning.

There are those who may argue with this or that aspect of the plan, this or that building design. But all can respect the vision of the overall plan and the fight to see it realized, and for this Brooklyn can thank John Cashmore.

We are sure all citizens of Brooklyn will join us in extending their sympathies to Mr. Cashmore's wife and family. It will be a long time before the borough again will have someone it can call "Mr. Brooklyn."

Sunday evening, May 7, John Cashmore was doing what he loved best, aiding the underprivileged at a fundraising dinner to assist the work of the Williamsburgh Settlement House. On the way home, in the words of Michael O'Brien (the Daily News Reporter who is Brooklyn's best biographer)—"God did what no man or woman on this crazy whirling globe could to—tell John Cashmore to quit."

Among his friends, those of us in Brooklyn who learned from John and leaned on him for counsel will miss him most. His advice was sage and sound because he knew and loved Brooklyn. But our loss is not to be compared to that of his family's—a devoted husband, father, and grandfather. I trust that his wife Edythe Cashmore and his son James and his family will find solace in the realization that his deeds, monuments, and memorials will long surround them. John Cashmore found Brooklyn as an adolescent. While it raised him, he raised Brooklyn. He made his mark—everywhere. He is "Mr. Brooklyn."

Address By Hon. Clark W. Thompson, of Texas, at Rice Millers Convention, Galveston, Tex., May 5, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, some men have the happy faculty for making difficult tasks appear easy—and that is the way in which our colleague, the Honorable CLARK THOMPSON, of Texas, handles his duties as chairman of the Subcommittee on Rice—now the Oilseeds and Rice Subcommittee—of the House Committee on Agriculture.

As an indication of how he works effectively to represent not alone the constituents of the Ninth District of Texas, but the Nation and the Congress in its relations with our citizens, it is a pleasure and a privilege to call attention to the address given by Representative THOMPSON before the Rice Millers Association convention held last weekend in Galveston, Tex.:

ADDRESS OF CLARK W. THOMPSON, OF TEXAS, AT RICE MILLERS CONVENTION, GALVESTON, TEX., FRIDAY, MAY 5, 1961

I am very highly complimented by the invitation to confer with you in behalf of the Rice Subcommittee at your annual convention. I have worked, for many years, with the Rice Millers Association and I think it is safe to say that all of our relationship has been pleasant and I hope that you have profited by it.

You will be interested in the background of the various commodities subcommittees in general and the Rice Subcommittee in particular. Some 6 years ago, when the Democrats reorganized the Congress, our chairman, the Honorable HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina, and our vice chairman, our own BOB POAGE, of Waco, conceived the idea that each basic commodity should have a special group with which to resolve the various problems peculiar to that commodity.

Perhaps because the congressional district which I represent produces more rice than any other in the United States, I was named to head this particular subcommittee. With me since the beginning on the Democratic side is E. C. ("TOOK" as we call him) GATHINGS, of Arkansas, who has always been a grand member for me to work with and I am sure that you would say the same.

GRANT, of Alabama, MCMILLAN, of South Carolina, ALBERT, of Oklahoma, ABBITT, of Virginia, COAD, of Iowa, and MCSWEEN, of Louisiana are the other Democratic members.

On the Republican side, the senior member is PAGE BELCHER, of Oklahoma, with FINDLEY, of Illinois, DOLE, of Kansas, BEERMANN, of Nebraska, and REIFEL, of South Dakota.

We have not transacted much business thus far, but I have already learned very much to my satisfaction that these members are all interested in the subject of rice and also oil seeds which is a new responsibility of our subcommittee.

I note with particular pleasure the presence here, today, of HAROLD MCSWEEN, of Louisiana, and BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, who have come here to take part in our conference.

In the years gone by, this subcommittee has been blessed with the most pleasant kind of relationship with the entire rice industry. It is an industry which we have always found is particularly easy to work with whether it be producers, warehousemen, or millers. When you have a problem, you have the habit of thrashing it out beforehand among yourselves. Then, you take it up with the Department of Agriculture, and finally you bring it to our committee all wrapped up in a nice package and generally ready for me to simply write it in bill form and drop it in the legislative hopper.

Since any differences of opinion have been ironed out before Congress ever sees the legislation, we generally pass our bills by unanimous consent. When we have had opposition in the past, it has never been of a serious nature. Let's hope that as long as I serve you, we can say the same thing.

Later this year, I would like to bring this subcommittee back to the rice belt to spend a few days observing the production and the operations of all phases of your business. Speaking for myself, and I believe I voice the opinions of the rest of us, we have a lot to learn. You in the industry can certainly teach us. Both sides would profit tremendously from such a visit.

If there are problems confronting us at the time, we could hold some hearings, something which I always like to do at the grassroots, to give producers who could not otherwise present their views to the Congress the opportunity which the Constitution provides to every citizen to make his voice heard in the Legislative Halls.

Maybe they can't come to Washington, but we can bring Washington to them.

At the moment, two pieces of legislation are before the committee. One is our succession of interest bill which is ready for action as soon as we receive the Department report. The measure is a very simple one and I have informal advice that the report will be favorable as it was last year.

It provides for the transfer of acreage history where a producer withdraws from the production of rice. It lets him transfer to a son, son-in-law, grandson, or nephew.

The Secretary has covered the provisions of this bill by written regulations in the past, but the attorneys for the Department feel that there should be statutory expression to protect both sides.

Since you are all more familiar with it than I am, I shall not take the time today to elaborate.

I see no reason why we should have any legislative problems in passing the bill since it does not affect any commodity except rice, and as a matter of fact, it only gives the rice industry in Texas and California, where we have hip-pocket allotments, the same privileges that the producers in other States already have.

Another piece of legislation which I recently introduced is designed to make rice more attractive for the school lunch program. There is constant resistance to the inclusion of rice because some who administer the school lunch program think that it should be enriched and that it should be packaged in a more sanitary container than is presently the practice.

Another very important factor is the size of the packages.

This bill would require rice which is stored in commodity credit warehouses to be in packages of not more than 25 pounds so that they could be easily handled by the cooks and thus be more attractive for the school lunch program. So much for rice legislation.

I don't see why we should have any particular trouble passing that bill but, of course, I always run scared on legislation and never count it in the bag until it is signed by the President. However, at the moment, it looks all right to me.

Now as to legislation generally, the so-called Cooley bill, H.R. 6400, is in the mill and is being thoroughly aired out in the committee. There are some basic differences of opinion and, as is so often the case, the good parts of the bill are lost sight of and the snipers get busy on the part they don't like meanwhile condemning the entire legislation which, of course, is very foolish. The bill contains such things as the school milk program, Public Law 480, and various other generally noncontroversial items.

The real controversy is over the proposal of the Secretary of Agriculture to consult with the grassroots committees in the various commodities to find out what sort of program the farmers, themselves, desire; then to thrash out the legislative features in the Department of Agriculture, and finally to submit the proposal to the Congress.

The original idea was to give Congress the veto power just as it has in the Hoover committee recommendations. This has not proven to be acceptable to the Congress and whatever happens, we will have to retain, in the Congress, legislative jurisdiction—in other words, we will pass laws; we will naturally consider any recommendation which the Secretary sends up; but we will act on it affirmatively rather than negatively.

This is not a serious difference of opinion at all. The basic idea of consulting with the producers is as sound as it could be, and it reflects what I believe to be an excellent attitude on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture. After all, this is exactly what we do in the rice industry. You get your heads together, decide what you want, clear it with the Department, and then bring it to the Congress. And, that is just exactly what he wants the other commodity groups to do.

I shall not undertake any detailed discussion of the legislation because it is so uncertain at the moment that we might just be spinning our wheels.

I do strongly recommend that you consider with open minds whatever proposals come from the Secretary of Agriculture. Please realize that now, for the first time in many years, we have a Secretary who is trying to do something for agriculture and to stabilize the position of agriculture in the broad economy of the country.

It is a refreshing change, and any man who tries as hard as Secretary Orville Freeman is trying surely deserves a friendly consideration on our part.

This day has been a great pleasure and privilege for me. You are here in my hometown and I am glad that you have been so cordially received. It has been wonderful to work with and for you. I trust we will be together for a long time.

The Need for a Naval Hospital at Long Beach, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 the House passed H.R. 5000, the military construction authorization bill for this year. Included in its provisions was a sorely needed item for construction of a naval hospital at Long Beach, Calif. The sum authorized was $8,763,000. No cost for land acquisition is involved because land required is being donated to the Government.

Subsequently, the Senate Armed Services Committee deleted this item from the bill. The bill passed the Senate in this form.

The priority for this item is great. The Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget fully support the project. It is respectfully submitted that it should be restored. This can be done in conference.

Long Beach, Calif., has the third largest concentration of naval ships in the country, exceeded only by Norfolk, Va., and San Diego, Calif. Long Beach is the home port of 112 Navy ships. There are approximately 32,000 active-duty personnel in ships homeported at Long Beach and 16,700 active-duty personnel ashore of all services within a 30-mile radius of the proposed hospital site. Additionally, there are 3,400 Army and 5,900 Air Force personnel stationed in the area requiring medical support.

Long Beach is the hub of the large military community, afloat and ashore, in the entire Los Angeles-Long Beach metropolitan area of over 5 million population. If a naval hospital is not provided, these thousands of active-duty personnel in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area will continue to be without the adequate and timely medical and hospital care to which they are legally and morally entitled, and continued deterioration of the welfare and morale of these personnel can be expected.

The mission of the naval base at Los Angeles is to provide logistic support to fleet units and other designated commands. In addition to assistance to the forces afloat of ships repair, supply, and other support elements, a naval base must provide for the care and the hospitalization of the sick, injured, or wounded entrusted with the complex and hazardous task of maintaining our fleet in readiness for war. To do this adequately, medical facilities must be available. This moral responsibility of our Government is understood and fully met in most instances throughout the Naval Establishment, but in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area it is paradoxical that our naval base, supporting the third largest group of ships homeported in the United States, does not include a naval hospital. Other than an 86-bed Army station hospital at Fort MacArthur and a 40-bed dispensary at the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, there is no existing similar-type facility within 80 miles of Long Beach.

The hospital ship *Haven* berthed at the naval station in an in-service-in-reserve status, is being used as an interim hospital facility and although it has an authorized allowance of 425 beds, only 350 of these can be considered to be usable for this interim mission. In addition, the facilities of *Haven* are such that only active-duty and retired males can be accommodated. There are no suitable accommodations for servicewomen. The ship is old. It was designed as a seagoing ambulance, which may have been adequate for the evacuation of casualties from forward areas in World War II, but is entirely unsuitable as a substitute for a hospital ashore. Its deficiencies include lack of facilities to promote a healthful, rapid convalescence. Crowded compartments, bunks in tiers of two and three, critically excessive noise levels, lack of accommodations for visiting, and exposed ducts, piping, etc., which preclude proper cleanliness, are included among the factors which militate against fully satisfactory hospital services being provided forces afloat and ashore in the Long Beach area.

This naval base is the only naval base in the continental United States that does not have a naval hospital. Below is a recap of the other naval bases, their attendant naval hospitals, and approximate distance of hospital from base headquarters area:

Naval base	Hospital located at—	Approximate miles from headquarters area
Boston, Mass	Chelsea, Mass	0
Newport, R.I	Newport, R.I	0
Portsmouth, N.H	Portsmouth, N.H	0
New York, Brooklyn, N.Y.	St. Albans, N.Y	15–20
Philadelphia, Pa	Philadelphia, Pa	0
Norfolk, Va	Portsmouth, Va	8–10
Key West, Fla	Key West, Fla	0
Charleston, S.C	Charleston, S.C	0
San Diego, Calif	San Diego, Calif	0
San Francisco, Calif	Oakland, Calif	15–20
Bremerton, Wash	Bremerton, Wash	0
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.	Pearl Harbor, Hawaii.	0

While there are no naval bases in the 8th or 9th naval districts, a naval hospital is located at Corpus Christi, Tex., and Great Lakes, Ill., to serve the needs of these respective areas.

The limited number of beds previously mentioned at Fort MacArthur, San Pedro, and at the dispensary, Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, added to those of the hospital ship *Haven*, whose inadequacies have been previously stated, cannot begin to provide the required and expected medical care for this vast military population. Continual reliance

cannot be expected from *Haven* due to the possibility of an emergency commitment elsewhere such as could be caused again by a limited war or disaster. *Haven* was active during the Korean crisis and the "Passage to Freedom" evacuation in Indochina in 1954.

Other than the limited facilities mentioned above, the nearest adequate hospitals are located at Camp Pendleton—600 beds—and at San Diego—1,750 beds—distances of 80 and 110 miles respectively. Long Beach-based personnel use these hospitals, but this situation is analogous to Washington, D.C., personnel traveling to Richmond, Va., or Wilmington, Del.; to Charleston, S.C., personnel traveling to Savannah, Ga.; to Norfolk, Va., personnel traveling to Richmond, Va.; or to Boston personnel traveling to Portland, Maine, for hospital care.

Although of secondary importance as compared to the active forces, the requirements of service dependents and retired personnel should also be considered. There are 21,800 Navy and Marine Corps retired in the area, 22,900 dependents of active-duty personnel, and 21,800 dependents of retired personnel. The disadvantages of the distances to Camp Pendleton and San Diego are obvious, particularly in the case of the dependent women and children who either do not have private cars or do not drive. The net result of the absence of suitable medical and hospital facilities in the Long Beach area is that adequate care is not readily available for the personnel to whom the Government has this responsibility. As a consequence, their welfare and morale have deteriorated and will continue to suffer unless the situation is corrected. The recently expanded Medicare program wherein dependents can consult civilian doctors and use civilian medical facilities under certain restrictions has tended to alleviate this condition. However, it does not authorize outpatient care for many medical needs, and when the medical care is authorized the serviceman pays part of the expense.

With the mounting cost of Medicare in civilian hospitals, it is considered that the Long Beach Naval Hospital would pay for itself in a few years. From information obtained from the Blue Cross office in Los Angeles, 4747 West Sunset Boulevard, in the Greater Los Angeles area alone since January 1960, average monthly hospital cost for Armed Forces dependents under Medicare has been $363,000. This amount does not include approximately $145,000 per month cost of doctors' fees under Medicare. Sixty-five percent of the Medicare costs in the Greater Los Angeles area are incurred by Navy and Marine dependents. It is a conservative estimate that funds in the amount of $225,000 per month would be saved in dependent medical costs alone, that is, tonsillectomies, examinations, laboratory tests, X-rays, and the like, if a naval hospital were constructed in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area.

When the former naval hospital, which the Navy had to vacate and transfer to the Veterans' Administration in 1950 under a preemptory order of then Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, was started in 1941, the fleet based here had its own hospital ship. There were so many hospital cases requiring treatment in facilities ashore, however, that a convenient hospital was needed. Before the hospital was completed, the patients were sent by ambulance to San Diego. Traffic conditions were hazardous and numerous accidents occurred. To accommodate such patients, the Long Beach Naval Hospital was built. During the year before it was closed, even during the slump in military activity following World War II, about 550 active military personnel were being cared for at all times.

The proposed hospital will be smaller than the former one but the need for a naval hospital in Long Beach is just as urgent today as it was in 1941. Under today's world conditions the fleet and its shore support activities must operate with much greater intensity than in the period between World War II and Korea. The availability of proper medical care is a necessary prerequisite for the morale and operating efficiency of this fleet.

The logical means of correcting this military medical problem in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area is to construct the 500-bed naval hospital. Approval of this project is urgently needed. This can best be accomplished most economically on the land which the city of Long Beach has so generously set aside for this purpose at the nominal cost to the Government of $10.

Healthy Economic Growth With Economic Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 21, 1961, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon made a most important address at the annual meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It is worthy of the attention of every Member of Congress. I set it forth in full:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 21, 1961

It is a pleasure to be here and to share with you the administration's thinking about some of the pressing economic problems that have a bearing upon our Nation's present and future well-being.

To begin with, I think one can fairly say that there is a substantial consensus in our country today on national economic goals:

We want a steadily expanding economy, based upon a strengthened system of free enterprise;

We want a rate of growth sufficient to give us an ever-rising standard of living and to provide jobs for all;

We want to assure the education of our youth and the health and security of those who are growing old;

We want an economy that can adequately provide for our national defense and furnish our fair share of the development needs of less fortunate peoples in Africa, Asia, and Latin America;

We want to accomplish all of this in an atmosphere of relative price stability.

Inevitably there will be differences among us over the means we should employ to achieve our objectives. But we must not permit such differences to obscure our basic agreement. We must recognize that unless all elements in our society work together, we cannot mobilize the massive effort required of our Nation in meeting the challenge of the sixties.

Before considering the fiscal and monetary policies we should follow to achieve our objectives, let us look briefly at ourselves as we are today:

We are a people who have built what is clearly the strongest and most advanced economy on earth. But, as recent experience demonstrates, we have not mastered the art of keeping our economy operating at the highest sustainable levels.

The recession from which we are now beginning to emerge has been relatively mild. For example, in terms of constant dollars which allow for inflation, gross national product is now only 2.2 percent below last year's peak, compared with a decline of 4.7 percent in the 1958 recession. Personal income and industrial production have also fallen less than in previous postwar recessions.

However, before we take too much satisfaction from these figures, let us remember that they are relative. The absolute figures tell a far different story: Current unemployment, with 6.9 percent of our labor force out of work, approaches the worst days of the 1958 setback. A record number of our cities are classified as areas of substantial unemployment.

Why, in view of the relative mildness of the recession, do we have 5½ million people unemployed?

The answer is clear: We have not been producing at our full capacity for some years. Even last year, at the point of highest production in our history, our economy was operating well below its potential, and we still had 5 percent of our labor force unemployed. We can and must do better in the future. Meanwhile, until we find ways to improve the overall performance of our economy, the extent of current unemployment demands prompt and forthright action by the Federal Government. President Kennedy has, therefore, taken a number of steps to speed recovery:

The annual veterans' dividend of $250 million, ordinarily paid out over the course of a year, was paid in full during March.

Tax refunds were speeded up, and we are now $500 million ahead of last year's pace.

Government programs have been expedited by the prompt obligation of available funds.

Most important, a temporary unemployment compensation bill has been enacted.

These actions, together with increased defense spending that got underway last fall and reduced revenues stemming from the recession, have created a budgetary deficit of about $2 billion in the current fiscal year. Such a deficit is not a cause for alarm in times like these. On the contrary, it is a stimulus to recovery that can, and should, be readily offset by surpluses as prosperity returns.

Another deficit is in prospect for fiscal 1962: $1 of about $3 billion. This, too, will be entirely appropriate. The economy will require the stimulating effect of a modest deficit in the coming fiscal year if it is to move forward at an adequate pace.

The innate strength of our economy, the increase in Government outlays which I have mentioned, and the automatic action of the so-called built-in budgetary stabilizers, are apparently putting an end to the current

recession. Looking backward we may well find that the turning point was reached early in March. But, unless we act energetically, recovery is likely to be sluggish, just as the decline was gradual and slow.

No matter what the pace of our recovery from the recession, there are major problems confronting us which must be solved if we are to realize our full economic potential. We must find ways first to achieve and then to maintain production at full capacity. We must insure employment for our steadily growing labor force. At the same time, we must preserve reasonable price stability.

If we balance these goals against our accomplishments, I think it obvious that new and forward looking governmental action is called for.

Excessive Federal spending is clearly undesirable. But our minimum national needs must be met. Let me cite those which merit highest priority:

First. After careful reexamination, the President has concluded that we must increase our defense expenditures in the coming fiscal year by 1½ percent, or about $650 million. Surely, no one can logically question our need or our capacity to spend whatever is required for our Nation's security.

Second. We are confronted by a shameful lag in education. More education will, of course, assure the flowering of our national culture. But, beyond this, we must recognize that education today lies at the very root of a nation's power and well-being. Without adequate education, we cannot hope to achieve the economic growth we desire. Our shortcomings in providing our citizens with education according to their needs and capacities is a blight upon our future. The problem has grown so large that an additional Federal contribution is clearly and urgently required.

Third. We must supply the ever-growing needs of our municipalities: slum clearance, improved transportation, modern sewage facilities, and increased water supply. These needs are placing an unbearable burden upon our larger cities.

We can and we must fulfill these needs. Fortunately, if our economy operates at full capacity, our present tax system can yield a surplus of several billion dollars. Our problem is not, therefore, how to raise additional revenues but to get our economy operating at higher levels. Moreover, in setting tax policy, our most difficult task is not obtaining more revenue but strengthening and modernizing our whole tax system so as to stimulate growth and improve equity. One of our major objectives is thoroughgoing tax reform. An extensive review is now underway and we expect to present concrete recommendations to the Congress next January.

In the meantime, there is one important tax reform that cannot wait: This is legislation to spur the modernization of our plant and equipment. It is an unpleasant fact that our plant equipment is growing older year by year. By contrast, thanks to more liberal investment incentives than are available under our laws, Western Europe and Japan are modernizing at a much faster rate. We must step up our rate of modernization if we are to maintain our Nation's competitive position. The installation of new and more efficient equipment is of prime importance in enabling us to meet foreign competition in the drive for export markets which are so essential to improving our balance of payments.

Since the installation of modern equipment means that labor can produce more, we must recognize that it may complicate the problem of unemployment. However, modernization will also increase jobs in the capital goods industries. Indeed, we estimate that the tax incentive President Kennedy has recommended should lead to an increase of from $2 to $3 billion a year in expenditures for plant and equipment. Some 250,000 new jobs would be required to provide this equipment. In addition, at least as many more people would find employment as an indirect result of these expenditures. Although major benefits to economic growth will accrue over the longer run, it is also clear that this tax incentive will have a substantial effect in speeding our recovery from recession. And, as our economy speeds up, increased consumer and business demand will expand the variety and volume of goods produced, thus creating new jobs to replace those eliminated by increased productivity. This is the way of future progress.

The legislation the President has requested is carefully designed to promote increased spending for modernization and expansion. Its enactment is necessary to speed full recovery and promote rapid growth thereafter. Initially, it will result in some loss of revenue. To compensate for this loss, he is asking that a number of serious tax defects be corrected:

First. Expense accounts—an area where abuse has virtually become a national scandal. Tighter enforcement of the present law is not an adequate solution, for it would put an unacceptably heavy discretionary burden upon Government tax auditors. What is needed is a new and stricter legislative definition of allowable deductions. This is what we are asking.

Second. We are asking for withholding at the source of interest and dividends. Our best estimate is that about $3 billion of income from interest and dividends goes unreported every year. This situation is clearly unfair to all wage earners and, indeed, to the majority of taxpayers. We are asking that it be corrected by a workable withholding provision that, as in the case of wages, will collect at the source a substantial portion of the tax on interest and dividend income.

Third. We are asking for repeal of the 4 percent dividend credit. This credit was adopted in 1954 in an attempt to lighten the double taxation of dividend income. But, at only 4 percent, it has not served its purpose. Furthermore, it gives considerably greater benefit to those in the higher income brackets than to the vast majority of stockholders. This favoritism in the law is unhealthy and should be ended. The related $50 exemption should also be dropped.

Finally, we seek an end to tax provisions that encourage American business operations abroad through the use of tax havens. We also want to withdraw preferential tax treatment for American capital going into industrially advanced countries, for such treatment discriminates against the investment of capital at home. These changes will have a needed and favorable impact upon our basic balance of payments deficit. We are not, however, recommending changes in tax inducements for investment in underdeveloped countries which are an essential part of our overall program to help these countries grow.

I have briefly outlined our overall fiscal and budgetary thinking. I have also told you something of our plans for the immediate future as regards taxation.

Now, let me take up monetary policy. This is a field where we face an entirely new situation brought about by the recently achieved convertibility of foreign currencies. Convertibility permits owners of liquid funds to shift them freely from one world financial center to another in search of higher interest rates. Therefore, the extremely low short-term interest rates of previous recessions could have dangerous repercussions today. Short-term interest rates much below present levels might well touch off a renewed outflow of dollars that could imperil our balance of payments and the soundness of our dollar.

Nevertheless, we need low long-term rates to stimulate borrowing for modernization, plant expansion, housing construction and the like just as much today as in previous periods of recession. Accordingly, the administration is attempting to promote lower long-term interest rates without putting downward pressure on present short-term rates. For one thing, the Federal Reserve is now purchasing securities of all maturities, instead of restricting itself to short-term Treasury bills. For another, President Kennedy has taken direct action in the housing credit field which has helped to lower average mortgage rates by more than a quarter of 1 percent since the turn of the year.

Far more meaningful than interest rates, however, is the quantity of funds flowing into investments. Here, we see evidence of improvement in the mortgage credit area, where, although rates are still on the high side, availability of credit is no longer an inhibiting factor. We also see increasing evidence of growing municipal and corporate borrowing.

Finally, since the budgetary deficits that are presently envisioned are modest and bear no comparison to the deficit of 1959, monetary policy will remain free to act in support of business recovery. Therefore, the substantial increases in interest rates that characterized the 1958–59 period are not likely to recur this time.

To sum up:

Our policies—be they budgetary, tax, or monetary—should have one overriding goal: the promotion of a healthy rate of economic growth within a reasonable atmosphere of economic stability. We must meet the needs of the day in the fields of defense, education, housing, highway construction, urban development, and other essentials. Fortunately, we are in a position to meet them—this year, and the next, and in the long run—without undue strain on our economy.

We must overhaul our tax system to provide greater fairness and incentives for efficiency and growth, beginning with an investment incentive this year, and following with a basic overhaul next year.

We must maintain an interest rate structure conducive to the steady flow of funds into investment.

To achieve all these things will not be easy. But with determination and perseverance we should be able to attain our goals. In the process, we can look forward to a period of growth and prosperity during the sixties such as this Nation has never known.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that everyone will agree with the Secretary's statement of national and international goals.

He also properly indicates that there will be some disagreement on the methods to be used to accomplish our desires and our needs.

I, for one, sincerely hope the administration will abandon its attempt to remove the tax exemption on dividends. That request weakens the overall tax plan.

The reason for the exemption was to lighten the burden of double taxation. No one can deny that double taxation is unfair and inequitable. The enactment of this small exemption recognized that principle. We should not now back away from it but should seek an early opportunity to further implement it.

In fact, the same exemption should be extended to interest and dividends paid on savings accounts.

The capital that makes up the backbone of our economy comes from investors' stock purchases and savers' thrift accounts. They supply our long-term funds. They need the incentives to invest that the administration avowedly wishes to encourage.

There is no favoritism in giving everyone an exemption of the first $50. No one should complain that an across the board 4-percent exemption favors the recipient of $1,000 in dividends with a $40 exemption as against a $4 exemption on $100 of dividends. Both dividends are an aliquot part of what was left of corporate earnings after the full share of municipal, State, and Federal taxes was taken out of the profits. The $100 dividend was probably the return on a $2,500 investment, while the $1,000 dividend was on a $25,000 investment. The amounts might differ but the participation was exactly equal. Both investments were undoubtedly made from funds retained as net income from earnings or profits that had already been fully taxed at least once and more likely two or three times.

Federal Aid to Education: One View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1961

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, in the current discussion of the administration's bill for general Federal aid for elementary and secondary public schools, I have gone on record both in the Education and Labor Committee and on the floor of this House in stating that there is even less need now for such Federal aid than there has ever been in the past.

It has been my constant position that one of the strengths of our education system in this country has been the responsibility for elementary and secondary school education on the local school district level with assistance from the State. I believe that if this is in any way weakened by the assumption of general responsibility by the Federal Government—our educational system as a whole will be weakened.

In school construction, President Kennedy says that we need 600,000 new classrooms in the next 10 years. At first glance, that seems to indicate a pressing need—almost an emergency situation that might justify Federal aid. At first glance, it might also suggest that local and State governments are overburdened to the extent that they cannot solve their primary and secondary educational needs. If these first impressions were, in fact, borne out by a deeper research into the problem, then I know my views would be far different on this subject than they are today. But a further study of the problem does not verify the widespread need that is implied in the essence of the administration's proposal.

Bearing in mind the need for 600,000 new classrooms in the next decade, the facts are that State and local communities are building classrooms at a rate of 10,000 per year greater than the President's estimated needs. In other words, if State and local communities continue to build at the rate they have for the past 6 years—a rate of approximately 70,000 per year—in the next 6 years on a national average all of the backlog will be eliminated, classrooms will be provided for all increase in enrollment, and obsolete classrooms will be replaced. Coupled with these facts is also the fact that the average number of pupils per teacher has now dropped to 24.4.

In spite of this outstanding progress, I do not hesitate in recognizing that there will always be a need to assist in some areas of the country which are unable to provide adequate educational opportunities by themselves. But this is Federal aid based on actual need—a far different formula from that proposed in the administration's bill—a formula that would distribute Federal money to all States regardless of need.

An example of Federal aid based on actual need has been aid to impacted areas under Public Laws 815 and 874. These laws—which have been on the books since the 81st Congress—simply provide Federal funds for school construction and maintenance in areas which are overburdened by a Federal project like a military installation—calling for the local community to provide education for the children of Federal workers or military servicemen. This, I contend, is the justifiable responsibility of the Federal Government. Now, we note, that the administration has made the extension of these acts as a part of the general aid bill in a not very subtle attempt to gain support of the general aid section which, I maintain, should be considered on its own merits by the Members of this House. The inclusion of Public Laws 815 and 874 in this bill is a "vote getting gimmick"—pure and simple.

The big question to be answered in this session of Congress is whether the people of our country will be given the opportunity to continue to assume their responsibility in Government themselves or whether a progressive erosion of this responsibility will be caused by the assumption of this responsibility by the Federal Government.

It is not a difficult decision to make when the question of aid to higher education is considered, for in higher education there is no political subdivision which has complete responsibility similar to the case of a local school district in elementary and secondary education. There has been a great tradition of Federal assistance in higher education and enrollment in colleges and universities will increase by one-third in 5 years and just about double in 10 years if the same proportion of high school graduates go on to college as now do so. For that reason I think it is important for the Federal Government to expand its support if it is soundly conceived. But when it comes to the consideration of Federal aid for elementary school construction, the story is not the same. In effect, the administration is asking to give Federal aid to correct a need that local and State governments are rapidly correcting themselves each year, and which will be corrected through such efforts in a comparatively short time. As I have pointed out, this need is being corrected on a national scale. On a local scale, I believe that my First Congressional District in Minnesota is typical of the progress which has been made—progress that shows the willingness of the people themselves to solve their own educational needs on the primary and secondary school level.

Recently, the Albert Lea Tribune published a series of four articles by Al Schmahl, the newspaper's managing editor. I believe the story which is so ably told by Editor Schmahl will make rewarding reading for my fellow Members:

WHAT OUR SCHOOLS HAVE DONE (1)—CONSTRUCTION, SALARY PICTURE IN AREA REFUTE SECRETARY RIBICOFF'S STATEMENTS

(By Al Schmahl)

Some weeks ago Abraham Ribicoff said, in effect, that there were no States in the Union nor any school districts in any of the States that did not have serious problems of financing education.

Ribicoff, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the Kennedy administration, was speaking in behalf of the administration's Federal aid to education proposals. These proposals if passed by Congress, would provide assistance to States and local communities for the purpose of constructing schools and increasing teachers' salaries.

In an attempt to assess Ribicoff's statement, the Tribune followed two steps: (1) It surveyed area school superintendents to determine school construction progress and needs, and (2) it worked up a list of salary levels in these schools.

DON'T ANALYZE PROPOSAL

The studies in no way attempt to evaluate the aid to education proposals. Certainly it is recognized that there are areas, notably rapidly expanding suburban communities or financially depressed, aging districts in which financing is a problem.

The Kennedy administration's $2.5 billion aid bill, while for the announced purpose of aid to construction or teachers' salaries, is apparently built around aid per pupil units. The richer States (Minneseota and Iowa included) would receive less than those less wealthy, although exact terms have not been learned as yet. Amounts received in this area would not likely be more than about 5 percent of the normal total expenditures of some $400 per pupil unit.

Arguments about the merits of such a proposal are not being considered here. The studies do, however, throw light on the Ribicoff statement. It would appear that most school districts in this area, contrary to what Ribicoff said, are in fair financial shape, and they have been doing the job with the burden falling on local taxpayers.

TWO AREAS STUDIED

In this and subsequent articles, the Tribune will examine in detail the school construction and salary picture in this area.

Studied were 14 school districts in this area—Albert Lea, Alden, Blooming Prairie, Bricelyn, Delavan, Ellendale, Emmons, Freeborn, Frost, Glenville, Kiester, New Richland, Northwood-Kensett, and Wells. Information was not obtained from Lake Mills and Minnesota Lake.

In some case figures were estimates, in others those received were rounded off. But despite the fact they are not accurate to the final degree, they point up some interesting things.

ENROLLMENT GOES UP

Total enrollment in the 14 districts advanced from 8,000 in 1950–51 to 14,000 in 1960–61, the decade studied.

Part of that increase was attributable to population gains. But population in this area did not increase as rapidly as in other States, or in the suburbs of large cities. So

the enrollment increases were more likely due to elimination of common and independent school districts through consolidation. There were variables, too. Glenville wasn't organized in 1950–51. Its students were divided among various districts then. Today it has an enrollment of 604.

But the point is that enrollments went up, in this area's present districts by 75 percent. And it was up to the districts to provide facilities for these additional students.

JUST BUILT SCHOOLS

How did the 14 schools handle this job? They passed bond issues and built new schools.

The districts, in fact, expended almost $15 million, an average of over $1 million each, on new facilities.

Today they have a bonded indebtedness of almost $12 million, again an average of almost $1 million each. But none indicate they are nearer than four-fifths of their debt limitation, and most are well below this figure.

For this expenditure the 14 districts got some 280 new classrooms, to say nothing of a variety of gymnasiums, libraries, office space, etc. Only 53 of the classrooms were listed as replacement rooms.

AND THE FUTURE

That was the picture for the progress made in the last decade. But what about the future? What building needs still remain?

To answer those questions, the Tribune had three additional queries: (1) How many of your classrooms will you need to replace in the next decade; (2) how many additional classrooms will you need; and (3) what are your present building plans?

Total classrooms which will need to be replaced numbered 72 in the 14 districts. Additional classroom needs totaled 47.

That means that more classrooms are expected to become obsolete in the decade ahead than in the one just past. But compared to over 220 new classrooms needed in the past 10 years, only 47 more are expected to be needed in the 10 years ahead.

(Next: What is the building picture in the individual schools?)

WHAT OUR SCHOOLS HAVE DONE (2)—SEVENTY-NINE NEW CLASSROOMS LOCALLY IN DECADE; OTHER SCHOOLS REPORT SIMILAR BUILDING

(By Al Schmahl)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Today's article continues a series of school construction and teachers' salaries in this area in light of Federal aid proposals being studied in the U.S. Senate this week. Today's article deals with construction in a portion of the area schools surveyed. The reader should be aware that no valid attempt can be made to compare classrooms obtained for dollars spent by the area schools, for too many variables are involved. For example, all the schools surveyed except Emmons and Northwood included gymnasiums in their construction in the past decade, but other items such as cafeterias, libraries, offices, etc., varied. For purposes of this study, only actual classrooms were considered, and they may be of different sizes. Also, construction costs were lower in the first part of the decade, so time of construction would affect costs materially.)

Because district 241 has the largest enrollment, and had the greatest enrollment increase in the last decade, much of the school construction and needs is concentrated here.

But despite the difference in size, Albert Lea actually typifies the 14 schools surveyed. All had to build in the last decade to meet needs.

Supt. Lorne S. Ward of Albert Lea says enrollment here is 6,100 this year, compared to 3,426 a decade ago.

The local district built 79 new classrooms in that time. Hawthorne, Halverson, Clarks Grove, Hayward, Sibley, and Oakwood Elementary Schools; Southwest Junior High School, and a high school science wing were among schools built during the period.

NO REPLACEMENTS

Ward says none were replacements for obsolete rooms.

The district spent some $6 million on this construction, and has a current indebtedness of $4,885,000. But the debt limitation is $8 million.

Ward estimates an enrollment of 7,000 in another 10 years, and says the decade ahead will see a need for 45 more classrooms. But unlike in the past 10 years, 30 of these will be replacement rooms.

Current plans are to build a junior high on the Northside. But Ward adds, "We are no longer as certain about future growth in Albert Lea as we once were. This may affect our plans for the future."

While Albert Lea still foresees a need for more construction in the decade ahead, most of the neighboring districts anticipate very little additional construction. Property taxpayers will undoubtedly welcome that situation, but where it will leave these districts when it comes to distribution of Federal aids is problematical.

In alphabetical order, these are the enrollment and building statistics for neighboring schools:

A BIG JUMP

ALDEN.—Enrollment increased from 296 to 586 in the decade just past, and the district built 18 classrooms. Eight were replacement rooms. The district spent $750,000 on building in the last 10 years and has a bonded indebtedness of $720,000. Debt limitation is $960,000. Projected enrollment for 1970–71 is 625, but no additional building needs are forecast by Supt. C. W. Porter.

MORE THAN DOUBLED

BLOOMING PRAIRIE.—Blooming has had an enrollment increase from 464 in 1950–51 to 1,048 in 1960–61, Supt. Maurice McFarlin reports. The district built a 4-room addition in 1952 and entire new building with 24 rooms in 1957. Some $1,200,000 was spent on this construction, and the present debt is $930,000 compared to a debt limitation of $1,300,000. Projected enrollment for 1970–71 is 1,100, and McFarlin says 2 and possibly 4 additional classrooms will be needed in the next 10 years.

REPLACED MANY

BRICELYN.—Bricelyn had an enrollment gain of just 10, from 313 to 323, in the last decade, but Supt. Walter Babitzke reports 16 classrooms were replaced. Total expenditure on construction was $565,000 and present indebtedness is $490,000 compared to a limitation of $568,000. Enrollment 10 years from now is corecast at 360, and 2 additional classrooms will be needed by that time.

REMAINED SAME

DELAVAN.—Delavan is another district which has seen steady enrollment, 335 now and also 10 years ago. But 10 classrooms, 6 of those replacing obsolete rooms, were built in the decade. Supt. Henry W. Marten says building costs were $545,000 and the present indebtedness is $455,000. Enrollment figures in 1970–71 are expected to be about the same, and no additional classrooms, "unless possibly a kindergarten room," are needed.

WORKING ON ADDITION

ELLENDALE.—Enrollment at Ellendale more than doubled in the last decade, from 300 in 1950–51 to 620 this year, according to Supt. Harold F. Harris. The district built six classrooms in that period. No classrooms became obsolete. Current indebtedness is $418,000, compared to a limitation of $1,350,000. Projected enrollment is 650. Harris says eight replacement classrooms and seven additional rooms will be needed in the decade ahead, and the district is presently working on an addition to meet these needs.

(Next: Construction at Emmons, Freeborn, Frost, Glenville, Kiester, New Richland, Northwood, and Wells.)

WHAT OUR SCHOOLS HAVE DONE (3)—NO MATTER WHAT THE DISTRICT, BUILDING HAS BEEN EXTENSIVE IN THE LAST DECADE

(By Al Schmahl)

Area school districts have been busy in the last decade—busy building new schools to meet the needs of increasing enrollments.

Few foresee a need for a great amount of additional construction in the decade ahead, indicating that Federal assistance for school construction may be years too late for this area.

Reports from Albert Lea, Alden, Blooming Prairie, Bricelyn, Delavan, and Ellendale school districts were printed Tuesday. Following is the story in other districts in the Tribune's circulation territory:

HAS BUILT EIGHT

EMMONS.—Emmons foresees no need for new classrooms in the next decade, but to meet an enrollment increase from 175 to 280 since 1950–51, the district built eight classrooms in the last decade. Supt. M. P. Edman says $315,000 was spent on this construction, and the present indebtedness is $300,000 compared to a debt limitation of approximately $500,000. Enrollment in 1970–71 is forecast at 300.

SIX WERE REPLACED

FREEBORN.—While enrollment gained only from 317 to 330 in the decade just past, Freeborn built 11 new classrooms since 1950–51. Six of these were replacement rooms. Supt. Elwood C. Guanella lists construction expenditures to the penny: $572,158.95. Current indebtedness is $320,000 and the limitation is $644,780. Enrollment projected a decade ahead is only 300, and just 1 replacement classroom and no additional classrooms are foreseen. "Freeborn will probably remodel the old building to the extent of removing cloakroom walls to make classrooms larger, modernizing the heating system, adding acoustical tile and revamping the wiring," Guanella adds.

NO FURTHER NEEDS

FROST.—Another district that anticipates no building needs in the decade ahead is Frost. Enrollment jumped from 250 in 1950–51 to 318 in 1960–61, so Frost built 9 new classrooms, 6 of those replacements, in the last decade. Total expenditure was $350,000, Supt. L. O. Tenold reports, and present indebtedness is $240,000. Debt limitation is not listed.

STARTED AT BOTTOM

GLENVILLE.—Starting from scratch, Glenville had to build an entirely new high school plant in the last decade. Not organized in 1950–51, the district has an enrollment of 604 today. To meet the situation, the district built 15 classrooms in its junior and senior high school. This cost $775,000, and indebtedness at present is $735,000. Supt. E. A. Gussner foresees an enrollment of 800 by 1970–71. He also sees the need to replace 10 elementary classrooms—4 at Glenville and 3 each at Myrtle and Gordonsville. Four additional classrooms will probably be needed, but Gussner adds the district has no building plans at present.

MOSTLY NEW

KIESTER.—With an enrollment gain from 480 to 540, Kiester had to build 13 new classrooms the last decade. Four of these replaced obsolete rooms. A total of $675,000 was expended on construction and present indebtedness is $602,000 compared to a limitation of $872,500. Supt. F. D. Tveten says 2 replacements and 2 new classrooms will be needed in the decade ahead to meet a projected enrollment of 600. But he adds that building plans "depend on such things as further consolidation."

ALMOST DOUBLED

NEW RICHLAND.—A gain in enrollment from 460 in 1950–51 to 809 this year prompted an extensive building program at New Richland. About 30 new classrooms were constructed, 3 replacing obsolete rooms. Total expenditure was about $1,100,000, and indebtedness is $840,000. Supt. G. T. Norswing says 925 is the expected enrollment in 1970–71, but says no additional rooms will be needed. "Present building space can accommodate about 1,000 pupils, 500 in elementary and 500 in high school," he says. "We don't expect enrollment to exceed that figure in the next decade."

JUST UNDERWAY

NORTHWOOD-KENSETT.—Big building period at Northwood is just ahead, with construction on a new high school starting this summer. To obtain this building, district residents approved a $684,000 bond issue. A primary building in the district is being replaced by the present high school and eight other classrooms have been built in the last 10 years. Six replacement rooms will be needed in the next decade. Consolidation has brought rapid enrollment gains in the past decade, from 460 to 1,087. More gains, particularly in high school, are anticipated in the next 10 years. Present construction starts with a comparatively small indebtedness, only $150,000, now listed. Expenditures in the last decade were $184,000.

NO FURTHER NEEDS

WELLS.—With 37 classrooms constructed in the last decade, Wells now foresees no need for replacement classrooms in the 10-year period ahead. This comes despite some anticipated enrollment gains. Enrollment in 1950–51 was 683, today it is 952. By 1970–71 it is expected to be 1,100, according to Supt. G. A. Hanson. The district spent $1,135,000 for its construction in the last decade and has a present indebtedness of $890,000. The debt limitation is $1,748,250.

That, then, is the construction picture by schools. Of the 14 districts in the area, only Albert Lea anticipates any extended construction needs in the next 10 years, although Northwood has a building program just ahead and Ellendale has one underway.

(Next: But What About Teachers' Salaries?)

WHAT OUR SCHOOLS HAVE DONE (4)—ARE TEACHERS' SALARIES ADEQUATE? HERE'S WHAT AREA SCHOOLS ARE PAYING

(By Al Schmahl)

Congressional action designed to provide Federal aid to education in two areas—school construction and teachers' salaries—is presently being considered.

Previous articles in this series have shown that area schools have been able to keep up with construction needs in the past decade, and that with the exception of Albert Lea needs are slight in the decade ahead.

But what about teachers' salaries? Is this area keeping pace with the rest of the Nation? Are salaries adequate, or is Federal assistance needed to bring them to higher levels?

A study of what has happened in this area on salary levels might provide some answers to these questions.

Comparisons of salaries in this area to other portions of the Nation is difficult. Statistics are always some years behind. Most frequently, figures are listed on a statewide basis, and do not necessarily reflect individual situations. And finally, figures on one hand might be averages, in another case medians, so that comparisons are not valid.

REPORT CITED

Nevertheless, it is interesting to note the most recent report of Foundation, Inc.

The Foundation says average teachers salaries (including principals) for Minnesota were $1,288 in 1941–42, the school year in which World War II started. By the end of the war, in 1945–46, the average was up to $1,878. It jumped to $3,013 in 1949–50 and by 1957–58, the last year for which figures were listed, had risen to $4,655.

For Iowa the average was $1,061 in 1941–42, $1,676 in 1945–46, and $2,420 in 1949–50 and $3,482 in 1957–58.

Those figures left Minnesota 24th of 50 States in 1957–58. Iowa was down at 41st in averages. Low was Mississippi at $2,698 (the only State below the $3,000 mark) and high was New York at $6,071. California, at $6,010, was the only other State over $6,000.

In 1941–42 Minnesota ranked 22d of 47 States for which averages were available, and in 1949–50 was 21st of 49 (figures in Alaska and Hawaii are included even though they were not States at the time). Iowa was 34th of 47 in 1941–42 and 35th of 49 in 1950–51 before slipping to 41st in the most recent count.

AREA PICTURE

But these figures are statewide and they're several years old. What are area schools doing today?

According to the Minnesota Education Association's report on salary schedules for the present school year, Albert Lea's schedule ranges from $4,500 to $6,900 for B.A. degree holders, which includes most of the teachers in the system. Of 270 teachers, 135 are at the maximum, which means they have been in the system some 12 years or more. Next year's minimum will be the same, but another step has been added to the schedule and the maximum for B.A.'s will go up to $7,100.

Alden's 1960–61 schedule range on B.A.'s is $4,200 to $6,200. As is often typical of a smaller system, its teachers are somewhat younger, with only 3 of 30 at the maximum step. Maximum for B.A. holders is reached after 10 years. Next year's range will be from $4,300 to $6,300.

At Blooming Prairie the range this year is $4,300 to $6,500 on B.A.'s, with the maximum reached after 11 years. But only 2 of 49 teachers are at the maximum. Next year Blooming Prairie's top salary will remain the same on B.A.'s, but the minimum will be $4,400 and two steps will be added to the schedule.

Base at Bricelyn next year will be $4,250 for B.A.'s, with eight increments on the schedule at $200 each.

NOT ON SCHEDULE

Delavan has a range from $4,000 to $6,000 for B.A.'s, with 10 steps. But of 19 teachers in the system, only 4 are on the schedule, according to the MEA.

Ellendale has 22 of its 26 teachers on a schedule, the MEA report shows, but none have reached the maximum step. Minimum is $4,300, maximum is $6,100 after 9 years for B.A. holders. Next year the range will be from $4,400 to $6,200.

At Emmons, the schedule for B.A.'s start at $4,100, and after 12 years reaches $6,100. Of 16 teachers, 13 are on the schedule, with 3 at maximum. Next year at Emmons the schedule will go up to a $4,300 minimum and $6,300 maximum.

Freeborn has 11 of 18 teachers on its schedule, with none at the maximum this year. Range for B.A.'s is $4,200 to $6,500 after 12 years. Next year's minimum will go up to $4,200 with the maximum remaining the same.

Glenville's schedule this year calls for a range of $4,100 to $5,500, with 7 years of increment at $200 yearly. Of 31 teachers, 29 are on the schedule and 10 are at the maximum. But Glenville teachers will get a big boost next year, with the B.A. schedule jumping to $4,300 minimum and $6,100 maximum.

New Richland's range on B.A.'s this year is $4,300 to $6,350 after 13 years. Only 1 of 25 teachers on the schedule is listed at the maximum by the MEA. There are 37 teachers in the system.

MOST AT THE TOP

At Wells this year's B.A. range is from $4,250 to $6,650 after 12 years. Thirty-six of 51 teachers in the system are at the maximums on the schedule, according to MEA.

That's what some area schools are paying today compared to the averages of several years ago. And the increases listed reflect the manner in which they are trying to approach the problem.

But are these salaries high enough? Would Federal assistance be of value in the area of salaries?

These are the questions which taxpayers must ponder as they consider the Federal aid to education question.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Philippians 4: 8–9: *Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, think on these things, and the God of peace shall be with you.*

O Thou God paternal and God eternal may our life be exalted with a sense of the sanctity of these words of Scripture and may we never downgrade them to fit the lower goals of compromise and expediency.

Grant that in this time of hatred and hostility in which we are living we may cultivate those attitudes and feelings which will make for brotherhood and good will.

Show us how we may share in the great enterprise of keeping the estrangement and rift between nations from widening.

May the temper of our minds and the tendencies of our hearts be inspired by an adventurous faith as we daily walk difficult and untried ways, not knowing where they may lead us.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord, who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5000. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with

the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6518. An act making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference of the two Houses on the disagreeing votes thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON, members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the U.S. Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States, numbered 61–7.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the administration deliberately disassociated itself from a series of civil rights bills introduced in the House of Representatives by the chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, Congressman CELLER. I take it that this is a flat repudiation of a campaign pledge made by Candidate Kennedy and by the Democratic platform.

In September of 1960, in a key campaign speech, the then Senator Kennedy stated, without equivocation, that he had—

asked Congressman CELLER of New York to prepare a bill embodying all the pledges of the Democratic platform, and that bill will be among the first order of business when a new Congress meets in January.

By refraining from submitting a Presidential message to Congress on civil rights—and it is now May—a campaign pledge was broken. Now the administration, by disassociating itself from legislation introduced not in January but in May, has compounded this breach of faith with the public. This is not even standing still. It is a step backward.

THE LATE HONORABLE RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 282) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the House Committee on Appropriations fifteen hundred copies of a publication dedicated to the memory of the late Richard B. Wigglesworth in recognition of his three decades of devoted service to this Nation.

SEC. 2. It is further ordered that said publication be appropriately bound and contain two illustrations, and that its distribution shall be determined by the House Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a companion resolution to one introduced in the other body by Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY. It would set up a joint committee to examine into the conduct and operations of Government intelligence agencies. It is time that Congress exercised some measure of supervision over the Central Intelligence Agency. The circumstances surrounding the ill-fated invasion of Cuba will probably never be fully known. Enough has been reported already to make it clear that the Central Intelligence Agency planned, managed, trained, equipped, armed, and paid for a military expedition. Surely Congress never contemplated giving the Central Intelligence Agency such authority when it was established. In addition, reports make it evident that the Central Intelligence Agency was formulating foreign policy and had predetermined the composition and orientation of the proposed provisional Cuban Government.

The function of gathering intelligence should be separated from operations; policymaking should be removed from the Agency; and Congress should exercise close supervision. I hope that both Houses will act promptly on this important question.

TEMPORARY RELEASE AND REAPPORTIONMENT OF POOLED ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1372) to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HOEVEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, is this the bill that was unanimously reported out of the Committee on Agriculture a day or two ago?

Mr. GATHINGS. It is.

Mr. HOEVEN. I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest the gentleman explain the provisions of the bill.

Mr. GATHINGS. This bill would provide that pooled acreage allotments may be transferred by the owner within a particular county where they are put in the pool and the land is taken by virtue of eminent domain. Under the present law if the land is taken under eminent domain the pooled allotments would be available for use of the original owner of the land. He could use the allotment himself but no other farmer in the county could plant it. The farmers in a particular county may plant this acreage for not to exceed a 3-year period of time. The legislation would not increase the acreage of cotton 1 acre in a county or the State. This bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman call up the bill S. 1372 or the Rains bill? We reported the bill S. 1372 with amendments. It is identical with the House bill except for an amendment in line 6 and another amendment in line 7.

Mr. ALBERT. We called up the Senate bill.

Mr. COOLEY. That was my inquiry.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I understand time is of the essence in connection with this bill.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right. If we are going to have the bill applicable to 1961 immediate action needs to be taken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 378(a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "During any year of the period the allotment from a farm remains in the allotment pool, the displaced owner may, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, release for one year at a time any part or all of such farm allotment to the county committee for reapportionment to other farms in the county having allotments for such commodity on the basis of the past acreage of the commodity, land, labor, equipment available for the production of the commodity, crop rotation practices, and soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of the commodity; and the allotment reapportioned shall, for purposes of establishing future farm allotments, not be regarded as planted on the farm to which the allotment was transferred."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "of the" insert "3-year".

Line 7, strike out "remains" and insert "may remain".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

"MR. FBI"

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the completion of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover's 37th year as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It marks 37 years of tremendous accomplishment, of incomparable contribution to law and order, and of a record for himself and his Bureau that has earned the respect and admiration of every American.

Mr. Hoover was appointed Director of the FBI by Attorney General Harlan Stone, on May 10, 1924, and from that day on he worked to create a skillfully organized law enforcement agency which approaches its job in a meticulous and highly scientific manner.

He established the FBI National Academy which has graduated more than 4,000 highly qualified law enforcement agents who, under his direction, carry on the crime detection which has broken up criminal gangs and protected our country from espionage, sabotage, and subversion. Thanks to his drive against kidnaping, the crime has become relatively rare in America today.

J. Edgar Hoover has the respect and gratitude of every American and I wish him many more years of good health and hope he will remain as "Mr. FBI" for a long time to come.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, KILDAY, RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, HÉBERT, ARENDS, GAVIN, VAN ZANDT, and BATES.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS TO REDUCE THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 311) to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to reserve the right to object to each of these bills if I may have an understanding with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], that he will briefly explain each of these bills as they come up.

Mr. MILLS. Let me say to my friend from Iowa that the first four bills that are proposed to be called this morning are identical with bills that passed the House of Representatives in the last session of Congress but too late to be considered by the other body. They are bills having to do with gifts to be used to reduce the public debt; relating to the provision of annuities for widows of Tax Court judges; relating to the extension to fishermen of the same privileges accorded farmers under present law in relation to the estimated income tax; and, the bill by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS], relating to the importation of Philippine tobacco.

The fifth bill that would be proposed to be called up is a bill that has not yet passed the House. It was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL], as a companion bill to the one introduced by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and deals with the tax-exempt status of the pension fund of the Plumbers Union Local No. 12 that has now been declared to have that status by the Treasury Department. This bill is comparable, I might say, to the seven similar union pension fund bills that did pass the House and Senate last year, I think by unanimous consent.

Mr. GROSS. Could we now have an understanding with the gentleman from Arkansas that he will take 1 or 2 minutes on these bills, as they are called up, to explain them?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, I will be glad to do that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to afford to the people of the United States an opportunity to make gifts to the Government of the United States to be used for the purpose of reducing the public debt—

(a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States (1) any gift of money made on the sole condition that it be used to reduce the public debt of the United States, (2) any gift of obligations of the United States included in the public debt of the United States, if made on the sole condition that the obligations be canceled and retired and not reissued, or (3) any gift of other intangible personal property made on the sole condition that it be sold, and the proceeds realized from the sale be used to reduce the public debt of the United States; and

(b) the Administrator of General Services is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States any gift of other property, real or personal, made to the United States on the sole condition that it be sold and the proceeds realized from the sale be used to reduce the public debt of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of the Treasury or the Administrator of General Services, as the case may be, is authorized to reject any gift under this section whenever he determines such action to be in the interest of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall convert into money, at the best terms available, any gift accepted by him under the provisions of paragraph (a)(3) of the first section of this Act; and the Administrator of General Services shall convert into money, at the best terms available, any gift accepted by him under the provisions of the first section of this Act.

SEC. 3. If under applicable law any gift accepted under section 1 is subject to a gift or inheritance tax, the Secretary of the Treasury or the Administrator of General Services, as the case may be, is authorized to pay such tax out of the proceeds of the redemption, or sale, of any such gift.

SEC. 4. There is hereby established on the books of the Treasury a special account into which shall be deposited all money received as gifts under this Act and all money received as a result of the conversion into money of gifts of property other than money received under this Act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time utilize the money in the special account for the payment at maturity or the redemption or purchase before maturity of any obligations of the United States included in the public debt of the United States. All obligations of the United States paid, redeemed, or purchased with money out of the special account shall be canceled and retired and shall not be reissued. All money deposited in the special account is hereby appropriated and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of the Act.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 311, which was introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], and which was unanimously reported by your Committee on Ways and Means, specifically authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services to accept gifts of money or other property which are made on the sole condition that they are to be used for the reduction of the public debt. This bill provides that gifts made on this condition shall be deposited in a special account on the books of the Treasury and the money in this account shall be utilized solely to retire obligations of the United States which are part of the public debt. However, both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services are also given authority to reject any such gifts whenever they determine such action to be in the interest of the United States.

At the present time, when gifts of money or other property are made to the U.S. Government for the purpose of reducing the public debt, no absolute assurance can be given that the gifts will be so used since such gifts are generally treated as unconditional gifts and have been deposited in the general fund of the Treasury. Your committee has been advised, however, that the donors of such gifts may prefer to provide specifically that their gifts shall be used solely for reduction of the public debt and not for

incorporation in the general funds of the Treasury.

The Treasury Department has indicated that it has no objections to the enactment of this bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, this legislation which has just been approved by the House would provide specific authority for the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of General Services to accept on behalf of the United States gifts of money or other property which are bestowed on the condition that they be used to reduce public debt.

At the present time gifts to the Federal Government for the purpose of reducing the public debt are generally treated as unconditional gifts and deposited in the general fund of the Treasury. This is done on the rationale that such action meets the condition under which the gift is granted because the gift has the effect of increasing the budgetary surplus or reducing the budgetary deficit and therefore contributes to minimizing the public debt.

The purpose of this legislation is to make it clear that authority does exist for accepting gifts for the specific purpose of debt reduction so that a question cannot be raised by other possible claimants to the property as to whether or not the Government was fulfilling the condition of the gift.

The legislation was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

ANNUITIES TO WIDOWS AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF TAX COURT JUDGES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4317) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subchapter C of chapter 76 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the Tax Court of the United States) is hereby amended by adding immediately following section 7447 the following new section:

"SEC. 7448. ANNUITIES TO WIDOWS AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN OF JUDGES.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'Tax Court' means the Tax Court of the United States.

"(2) The term 'judge' means the chief judge or a judge of the Tax Court, including any individual receiving retired pay (or compensation in lieu of retired pay) under section 7447 or under section 1106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 whether or not performing judicial duties pursuant to section 7447(c) or pursuant to section 1106(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

"(3) The term 'chief judge' means the chief judge of the Tax Court.

"(4) The term 'judge's salary' means the salary of a judge received under section 7443(c), retired pay received under section 7447(d), and compensation (in lieu of retired pay) received under section 7447(c).

"(5) The term 'survivors annuity fund' means the Tax Court judges survivors annuity fund established by this section.

"(6) The term 'widow' means a surviving wife of an individual, who either (A) shall have been married to such individual for at least 2 years immediately preceding his death or (B) is the mother of issue by such marriage, and who has not remarried.

"(7) The term 'dependent child' means an unmarried child, including a dependent stepchild or an adopted child, who is under the age of 18 years or who because of physical or mental disability is incapable of self-support.

"(b) ELECTION.—Any judge may by written election filed with the chief judge within 6 months after the date on which he takes office after appointment or any reappointment, or within 6 months after the date upon which he first becomes eligible for retirement under section 7447(b), or within 6 months after the enactment of this section, bring himself within the purview of this section, except that, in the case of such an election by the chief judge, the election shall be filed as prescribed by the Tax Court subject to the preceding requirements as to the time of filing.

"(c) SALARY DEDUCTIONS.—There shall be deducted and withheld from the salary of each judge electing under subsection (b) a sum equal to 3 percent of such judge's salary. The amounts so deducted and withheld from such judge's salary shall, in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of a fund to be known as the 'Tax Court judges survivors annuity fund' and said fund is appropriated for the payment of annuities, refunds, and allowances as provided by this section. Each judge electing under subsection (b) shall be deemed thereby to consent and agree to the deductions from his salary as provided in this subsection, and payment less such deductions shall be a full and complete discharge and acquittance of all claims and demands whatsoever for all judicial services rendered by such judge during the period covered by such payment, except the right to the benefits to which he or his survivors shall be entitled under the provisions of this section.

"(d) DEPOSITS IN SURVIVORS ANNUITY FUND.—Each judge electing under subsection (b) shall deposit, with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the survivors annuity fund, a sum equal to 3 percent of his judge's salary and of his basic salary, pay, or compensation for service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, and for any other civilian service within the purview of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2253). Each such judge may elect to make such deposits in installments during the continuance of his service as a judge in such amount and under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the chief judge. Notwithstanding the failure of a judge to make such deposit, credit shall be allowed for the service rendered, but the annuity of the widow of such judge shall be reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount of such deposit, computed as of the date of the death of such judge, unless such widow shall elect to eliminate such service entirely from credit under subsection (n), except that no deposit shall be required from a judge for any year with respect to which deductions from his salary were actually made under the Civil Service Retirement Act and no deposit shall be required for any honorable service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States.

"(e) INVESTMENT OF SURVIVORS ANNUITY FUND.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest from time to time, in interest-bearing securities of the United States or Federal farm loan bonds, such portions of the survivors annuity fund as in his judgment may not be immediately required for the payment of the annuities, refunds, and allowances as provided in this section. The income derived from such investments shall constitute a part of said fund for the purpose of paying annuities and of carrying out the provisions of subsections (g), (h), and (j).

"(f) CREDITING OF DEPOSITS.—The amount deposited by or deducted and withheld from the salary of each judge electing to bring himself within the purview of this section for credit to the survivors annuity fund shall be credited to an individual account of such judge.

"(g) TERMINATION OF SERVICE.—If the service of any judge electing under subsection (b) terminates other than pursuant to the provisions of section 7447 or other than pursuant to section 1106 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, the amount credited to his individual account, together with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of his relinquishment of office, shall be returned to him. For the purpose of this section, the service of any judge electing under subsection (b) who is not reappointed following expiration of his term but who, at the time of such expiration, is eligible for and elects to receive retired pay under section 7447 shall be deemed to have terminated pursuant to said section.

"(h) ENTITLEMENT TO ANNUITY.—In case any judge electing under subsection (b) shall die while a judge after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in subsection (n), for the last 5 years of which the salary deductions provided for by subsection (c) or the deposits required by subsection (d) have actually been made or the salary deductions required by the Civil Service Retirement Act have actually been made—

"(1) if such judge is survived by a widow but not by a dependent child, there shall be paid to such widow an annuity beginning with the day of the death of the judge or following the widow's attainment of the age of 50 years, whichever is the later, in an amount computed as provided in subsection (m); or

"(2) if such judge is survived by a widow and a dependent child or children, there shall be paid to such widow an immediate annuity in an amount computed as provided in subsection (m) and there shall also be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to one-half the amount of the annuity of such widow, but not to exceed $900 per year divided by the number of such children or $360 per year, whichever is lesser; or

"(3) if such judge leaves no surviving widow or widower but leaves a surviving dependent child or children, there shall be paid to or on behalf of each such child an immediate annuity equal to the amount of the annuity to which such widow would have been entitled under paragraph (2) of this subsection had she survived, but not to exceed $480 per year.

"The annuity payable to a widow under this subsection shall be terminable upon such widow's death or remarriage. The annuity payable to a child under this subsection shall be terminable upon (A) his

attaining the age of 18 years, (B) his marriage, or (C) his death, whichever first occurs, except that if such child is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical disability his annuity shall be terminable only upon death, marriage, or recovery from such disability. In case of the death of a widow of a judge leaving a dependent child or children of the judge surviving her, the annuity of such child or children shall be recomputed and paid as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection. In any case in which the annuity of a dependent child is terminated under this subsection, the annuities of any remaining dependent child or children, based upon the service of the same judge, shall be recomputed and paid as though the child whose annuity was so terminated had not survived such judge.

"(i) DETERMINATION OF DEPENDENCY AND DISABILITY.—Questions of dependency and disability arising under this section shall be determined by the chief judge subject to review only by the Tax Court, the decision of which shall be final and conclusive. The chief judge may order or direct at any time such medical or other examinations as he shall deem necessary to determine the facts relative to the nature and degree of disability of any dependent child who is an annuitant or applicant for annuity under this section, and may suspend or deny any such annuity for failure to submit to any examination so ordered or directed.

"(j) PAYMENTS IN CERTAIN CASES.—

"(1) In any case in which—

"(A) a judge electing under subsection (b) shall die while in office (whether in regular active service or retired from such service under section 7447), before having rendered 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in subsection (n), or after having rendered 5 years of such civilian service but without a survivor or survivors entitled to annuity benefits provided by subsection (h), or

"(B) the right of all persons entitled to annuity under subsection (h) based on the service of such judge shall terminate before a valid claim therefor shall have been established,

the total amount credited to the individual account of such judge, with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of the death of such judge, shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, to the person or persons surviving at the date title to the payment arises, in the following order of precedence, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person:

"(i) to the beneficiary or beneficiaries whom the judge may have designated by a writing filed prior to his death with the chief judge, except that in the case of the chief judge such designation shall be by a writing filed by him, prior to his death, as prescribed by the Tax Court;

"(ii) if there be no such beneficiary, to the widow of such judge;

"(iii) if none of the above, to the child or children of such judge and the descendants of any deceased children by representation;

"(iv) if none of the above, to the parents of such judge or the survivor of them;

"(v) if none of the above, to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such judge; and

"(vi) if none of the above, to such other next of kin of such judge as may be determined by the chief judge to be entitled under the laws of the domicile of such judge at the time of his death.

Determination as to the widow, child, or parent of a judge for the purposes of this paragraph shall be made by the chief judge without regard to the definitions in subsections (a) (6) and (7).

"(2) In any case in which the annuities of all persons entitled to annuity based upon the service of a judge shall terminate before the aggregate amount of annuity paid equals the total amount credited to the individual account of such judge, with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the date of the death of such judge, the difference shall be paid, upon establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the order of precedence prescribed in paragraph (1).

"(3) Any accrued annuity remaining unpaid upon the termination (other than by death) of the annuity of any person based upon the service of a judge shall be paid to such person. Any accrued annuity remaining unpaid upon the death of any person receiving annuity based upon the service of a judge shall be paid, upon the establishment of a valid claim therefor, in the following order of precedence:

"(A) to the duly appointed executor or administrator of the estate of such person;

"(B) if there is no such executor or administrator payment may be made, after the expiration of thirty days from the date of the death of such person, to such individual or individuals as may appear in the judgment of the chief judge to be legally entitled thereto, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other individual.

"(k) PAYMENTS TO PERSONS UNDER LEGAL DISABILITY.—Where any payment under this section is to be made to a minor, or to a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the State of residence of such claimant or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate. Where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the State of residence of the claimant, the chief judge shall determine the person who is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate.

"(l) METHOD OF PAYMENT OF ANNUITIES.—Annuities granted under the terms of this section shall accrue monthly and shall be due and payable in monthly installments on the first business day of the month following the month or other period for which the annuity shall have accrued. None of the moneys mentioned in this section shall be assignable, either in law or in equity, or subject to execution, levy, attachment, garnishment, or other legal process.

"(m) COMPUTATION OF ANNUITIES.—The annuity of the widow of a judge electing under subsection (b) shall be an amount equal to the sum of (1) 1¼ percent of the average annual salary received by such judge for judicial service and any other prior allowable service during the last 5 years of such service prior to his death, or prior to his receiving retired pay under section 7447(d), whichever first occurs, multiplied by the sum of his years of judicial service, his years of prior allowable service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, his years of prior allowable service performed as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States, and his years, not exceeding 15, of prior allowable service within the purview of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2253), and (2) three-fourths of 1 percent of such average annual salary multiplied by his years of any other prior allowable service, but such annuity, reduced in accordance with subsection (d), if applicable, shall not exceed 37½ percent of such average annual salary.

"(n) INCLUDIBLE SERVICE.—Subject to the provisions of subsection (d), the years of service of a judge which are allowable as the basis for calculating the amount of the annuity of his widow shall include his years of service as a member of the United States Board of Tax Appeals and as a judge of the Tax Court, his years of service as a Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in Congress, his years of active service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States not exceeding 5 years in the aggregate and not including any such service for which credit is allowed for the purposes of retirement or retired pay under any other provision of law, and his years of any other civilian service within the purview of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (5 U.S.C. 2253).

"(o) SIMULTANEOUS ENTITLEMENT.—Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to prevent a widow eligible therefor from simultaneously receiving an annuity under this section and any annuity to which she would otherwise be entitled under any other law without regard to this section, but in computing such other annuity service used in the computation of her annuity under this section shall not be credited.

"(p) ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURES.—The chief judge shall submit to the Bureau of the Budget annual estimates of the expenditures and appropriations necessary for the maintenance and operation of the survivors annuity fund, and such supplemental and deficiency estimates as may be required from time to time for the same purpose, according to law. The chief judge shall cause periodic examinations of the survivors annuity fund to be made by an actuary, who may be an actuary employed by another department of the Government temporarily assigned for the purpose, and whose findings and recommendations shall be transmitted by the chief judge of the Tax Court.

"(q) TRANSITIONAL PROVISION.—In the case of a judge who dies within 6 months after the date of enactment of this section after having rendered at least 5 years of civilian service computed as prescribed in subsection (n), but without having made an election as provided in subsection (b), an annuity shall be paid to his widow and surviving dependents as is provided in this section, as if such judge had elected on the day of his death to bring himself within the purview of this section but had not made the deposit provided for by subsection (d). An annuity shall be payable under this section computed upon the basis of the actual length of service as a judge and other allowable service of the judge and subject to the reduction required by subsection (d) even though no deposit has been made, as required by subsection (h) with respect to any of such service.

"(r) WAIVER OF CIVIL SERVICE BENEFITS.—Any judge electing under subsection (b) shall, at the time of such election, waive all benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act. Such a waiver shall be made in the same manner and shall have the same force and effect as a waiver filed under section 7447(g)(3).

"(s) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—Funds necessary to carry out the provisions of this section may be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

SEC. 2. The table of sections for part I of subchapter C of chapter 76 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 7448. Annuities to widows and dependent children of judges."

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4317 is to provide a system of annuities for the surviving widows and dependent children of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States. The provisions of this bill are the same as those that were contained in the bill H.R. 8732 which was unanimously approved by the House on June 29, 1960,

but which was not acted upon by the other body prior to the adjournment of the 86th Congress.

In 1953, Congress provided a retirement system for judges of the Tax Court of the United States, Public Law 219, 83d Congress. That system was incorporated in what is now section 7447 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. The retirement system in question was enacted in recognition of the fact that the civil service retirement system was inadequate and unsatisfactory for Tax Court judges, since the particular qualifications for appointment require that they be men of maturity and experience prior to entering service, which would result in their receiving an inadequate civil service annuity in the usual case. The retirement system in effect since 1953 provides that a judge may retire after 18 years' service or after reaching the age of 70 if he had at least 10 years' service. Retired pay is the same as active pay if the judge retires after 24 years' service. Retired pay upon retirement with less than 24 years' service is a lesser amount. Retired judges may be recalled to active service, for which they receive full pay.

In 1956, Congress provided a survivor annuity system for members of the judiciary generally, including judges of the district courts of the territories who serve for a term of years. That system includes judges of the courts of appeal, the district courts, the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Customs Court, and the Court of Military Appeals. A special system covers the Supreme Court. Of the Federal courts, the Tax Court of the United States alone remains without an adequate system of survivorship protection.

Judges of the Tax Court today must depend upon the civil service retirement system for survivorship protection. As in the case of retirement protection, this system is inadequate to the needs of the judges. The benefits of the civil service system are keyed to career employees who have served as such for most of their working lives. Judges, on the other hand, typically are not appointed to the bench until a relatively late point in their professional careers. Thus, generally they are unable to build up an adequate level of survivorship benefits under the civil service system. Not only is the present absence of an adequate survivorship system a hardship insofar as the judges now on the court are concerned but it also imposes serious problems in attracting qualified individuals to accept appointment to the court.

The pending bill provides for judges of the Tax Court the same survivorship protection as is already in effect for judges of the other Federal courts, with such minor, technical modifications as have proven necessary in view of certain differences in the situation of the Tax Court.

Under the bill, Tax Court judges may within 6 months after taking office—either after appointment or reappointment—or within 6 months after the date of becoming eligible for retirement under section 7447(b) of the 1954 code, or within 6 months after date of enactment, elect to come under the system. Once such an election has been made, contributions of the judge at the rate of 3 percent of salary will be withheld from his salary and upon his death his widow and surviving dependent children will receive annuities. The annuity in each case will depend upon the years of public service of the judge. Provision is made for deposits into the Tax Court judges survivors annuity fund by the judge with respect to prior years' service. Such deposits will be based at the rate of 3 percent of the salary received in such prior years, plus interest. In case of failure of a judge to make such deposits with respect to prior service, the bill provides for a reduction in the amount of the annuity.

The maximum annuity payable to a widow under the system is 37½ percent of the judge's average annual salary received during the last 5 years prior to his death, or prior to his receiving retired pay under section 7447(d), whichever first occurs. The present salary of a Tax Court judge is $22,500 per annum. Thus, assuming in a given case that the average annual salary for the computation of a widow's annuity is $22,500, the maximum widow's annuity will be $8,437.50. In order to attain such a maximum, the judge will have to have had at least 30 years of allowable service as defined in the bill. If such service had been on the Tax Court at the present salary, the total contributions of the judge over the 30-year period at the 3-percent rate would be $20,250, without regard to any interest earned over the period involved.

The bill sets up a Tax Court judges survivors annuity fund into which the deposits of the judges electing coverage shall be made and from which the annuities shall be paid, and authorizes the appropriation of funds necessary to carry out its provisions.

This bill was reported unanimously to the House by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GROSS. Do Tax Court judges make any contribution to help pay for the annuity?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, they do so specifically just as other judges would to the extent in this instance of 3 percent or 3½ percent. I have forgotten the exact figures, but I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. LINDSAY. How long do the Tax Court judges have to be in office before being eligible to participate?

Mr. MILLS. I think 10 years of service is the minimum.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4317 would provide a system of annuities for the surviving widows and dependent children of judges of the Tax Court of the United States. The bill would have the effect of providing for Tax Court judges essentially the same survivorship protection as is available for judges of the other Federal courts.

At the present time judges of the Tax Court must rely upon the civil service retirement system for survivorship protection. The civil service retirement system is designed to take care of career employees who for the most part devote the bulk of their working lives to Federal service. Judges, on the other hand, usually are unable to build up an adequate level of survivorship benefits under civil service because their appointments to the bench typically do not occur until a relatively late point in their professional career.

This legislation was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARATION OF ESTIMATED INCOME TAX BY FISHERMEN

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 6413) to extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by inserting "or fishing" after "from farming" each place it appears:

(1) Section 6015(f) (relating to treatment of return as declaration or amendment).

(2) Section 6073(b) (relating to time for filing declarations of estimated income tax by individuals).

(3) Section 6153(b) (relating to installment payments of estimated income tax by individuals who are farmers).

(4) Subsections (b) and (d)(1)(C) of section 6654 (relating to additions to tax for failure by individual to pay estimated income tax).

(b) Section 6073(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to time for filing declarations of estimated income tax by individuals other than farmers) is amended by striking out "individuals not regarded as farmers" and inserting in lieu thereof "individuals regarded as neither farmers nor fishermen".

(c) The headings of subsections (a) and (b) of section 6073, and subsection (b) of section 6153, of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are each amended by inserting "OR FISHERMEN" after "FARMERS".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 18, strike "1960" and insert in lieu thereof "1961".

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 6413, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means, extends to fishermen the same

treatment accorded farmers in the matter of the payment of estimated income taxes. Except as to effective date, the provisions of this bill are the same as those that were contained in H.R. 1925 which was unanimously approved by the House on June 29, 1960, but which was not acted upon by the other body prior to the adjournment of the 86th Congress.

The Congress has in the past recognized that farmers have peculiar problems compared to other businessmen with respect to declarations of estimated income tax. In many cases farm income is not known until late in the year when the sale of a fall crop is completed. In other cases there may be substantial income earned from a winter crop which would be on hand in the early part of the year which would provide a very inadequate basis for forecasting what would be the income and expenses for the remainder of the year.

It is the opinion of your committee that fishing operations are very similar to farming operations in this regard as well as others. Fishermen have been well described as the farmers of the sea. It is frequently the case that income earned in the first part of the year is a very unsatisfactory basis for forecasting the year's income and very frequently no income will be realized until very late in the year. For these reasons the committee bill includes the term "fishing" in the same provisions relating to the estimated income tax where the term "farming" appears.

With this change, this special rule will apply to individuals who obtain two-thirds of their income from farming or fishing. In lieu of the regular quarterly declarations of estimated income tax, these individuals will be permitted to make a declaration of estimated income by January 15 following the close of the taxable year when they are on the calendar year basis of reporting. In addition, under this bill, fishermen, like farmers, who file their final returns for the calendar year and pay the tax shown to be due by February 15 will not be subject to any penalty for underpayment of their estimated tax.

The bill was amended by the committee to make its provisions effective with respect to fishermen for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman, then, thinks this would be helpful to the fishermen.

Mr. MILLS. I think it is fair, because I think the fishermen live with the same general hazards—maybe not the same, but comparable hazards to those faced by the American farmer; yes.

Mr. GROSS. I would say to the gentleman that anything we can do within reason to be fair to the fishermen of New England, fishermen who are practically "on the beach" because of foreign imports, I think we ought to do because of this free trade policy that the Democratic Party espouses. I think we ought to do anything we can to help them.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have long supported permitting the fishermen the same privilege as farmers with regard to filing estimated income tax forms, and I congratulate the Committee on Ways and Means for bringing H.R. 6413 to the floor of the House.

Back in 1957, I introduced similar legislation and joined the sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] in urging that fishermen be treated as farmers and not be required to estimate their income or to pay at least 17½ percent of the estimated year's taxes by April 15 with similar payments by June 15 and September 15.

The variation of fishery resources from year to year and price fluctuations make it difficult to forecast anticipated income in the fishing business. Therefore, I have favored legislation to provide for equal treatment of fishermen with the farmers of the Nation. Of course, a fisherman is a sea farmer and needs a delay in estimating his tax.

I urge passage of H.R. 6413.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6413 would grant to fishermen the same treatment as is presently accorded to farmers with respect to the requirements for making a declaration of estimated income tax.

Rather than filing a declaration of estimated tax by April 15 of the taxable year and making quarterly payments of such tax, farmers are presently allowed to file the declaration of tax and paying the tax by January 15 following the taxable year.

Similar legislation passed the House during the 86th Congress. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under present law, fishermen are required to file a declaration of estimated tax on April 15 and to make quarterly payments during the year on this estimated tax. This is a burdensome requirement because of the difficulty of estimating by April 15 what the fisherman's income will be for the full year. This bill makes available to fishermen the special system of paying estimated tax which is presently available to farmers.

Under the bill, a fisherman would not have to file any declaration of estimated tax until January 15 following the year and at that time he would have to pay the full amount of the estimated tax shown on his declaration. Probably there would not be time to have closed the books on the year by January 15 but by that time he should be able to make a close estimate of what he earned during the prior year. He would still have until April 15 to file his final tax return for the year. There would be no penalty for an underestimate of the tax if the estimate was as much as two-thirds of the actual tax due.

In addition, if the fisherman files his final return for the year and pays the tax shown to be due on his return by February 15—instead of the usual April 15—he would not be subject to any penalty because of his January 15 estimate being too low.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTIFICATION OF QUOTAS ON CERTAIN PHILIPPINE TOBACCO

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 4940) relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the duty-free treatment provided for cigar-type tobacco and filler tobacco described in item B in the schedule to paragraph 2 of article II of the agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines concerning trade and related matters during a transitional period following the institution of Philippine independence, signed at Manila on July 4, 1946, as revised by the agreement of September 6, 1955, shall apply to only such Philippine articles falling within the class specified in item B in the schedule to that paragraph 2 of article II which were imported into the United States on or prior to said September 6, 1955, and are certified by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines to have been allocated for exportation to the United States of America free of duty under the paragraph.

SEC. 2. This Act will enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "cigar-type" and insert: "scrap".

Page 2, beginning in line 1, strike out "which were imported into the United States on or prior to said September 6, 1955, and", and insert: "as".

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4940 which was introduced by our colleague on the committee, the Honorable JOHN WATTS, of Kentucky, and which was unanimously recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to limit imports of certain Philippine tobaccos that may be charged to the United States duty-free quotas on such products to those Philippine tobaccos exported from the Philippines which have been specifically licensed by the Philippine Government for export to the United States under the quota.

In the trade agreement between the Republic of the Philippines and the United States, there is a provision for a duty-free import quota of 6,500,000

pounds of imported scrap and filler tobaccos of Philippine origin each year. This quota is to be progressively reduced until January 1, 1974, when the amount of the quota becomes nil. The present quota is 5,850,000 pounds per year.

There is no provision in the trade agreement or in the U.S. legislation authorizing the Philippine-United States trade agreement regulating the types of tobacco that can be entered duty free under the quota, other than that the tobaccos shall be of Philippine origin and it shall be scrap and filler tobaccos. Historically the trade in Philippine tobaccos has been of the cigar-filler type and it was understood when the trade agreement was negotiated that the U.S. duty-free quota would be filled by the importation of this traditional type of tobacco. This was in the interest of U.S. cigar manufacturers and of domestic tobacco growers who were anxious to see that cigarette tobaccos would not be imported duty free under the quota.

Recently, however, considerable quantities of low-quality flue-cured tobacco, grown in the Philippines have been exported to the United States. Although such tobacco was not licensed by the Philippine Government it was shipped to a third country and later transshipped to the United States. The U.S. customs authorities have not, under existing law, been able to exercise discretion and were obliged to admit such tobacco duty free under the quota. As a result, the quantities of duty-free tobacco which licensed exporters in the Philippines might otherwise have shipped to the United States has been reduced. This has adversely affected the traditional trade in cigar tobaccos and has caused concern to the U.S. tobacco growers.

Our committee's bill would merely give effect to the basic purposes of the United States-Philippine trade agreement by providing that only those tobacco exports licensed by the Philippine Government for shipment to the United States would be eligible for admission into the United States under the duty-free quota applicable to Philippine tobacco. Any nonlicensed Philippine tobacco would be subject to duty.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under a trade agreement in effect between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines, provision is made for a duty-free import quota of 6.5 million pounds of certain tobaccos from the Philippines in a calendar year. Provision is made for the progressive reduction of this quota every 3 years. The present quota is 5.8 million pounds per year. The Philippine Government has allocated the tariff-free quota among its tobacco producers and has controlled exports of such merchandise to the United States in order to make the quota allocations effective. Recently tobacco not licensed by the Philippine Government for export to the United States has been shipped to a third country and later transshipped to the United States. The purpose of H.R. 4940 is to prevent the circumvention of the control by the Philippine Government over exports of Philippine tobaccos to the United States and would provide that U.S. customs authorities shall admit free of duty under the Philippine tobacco quota only such tobacco as the Philippine Government has license for export to the United States.

The Committee on Ways and Means was unanimous in favorably reporting this legislation to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLUMBERS UNION LOCAL NO. 12 PENSION FUND

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 1877) relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported unanimously by the members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 1877, which was introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., would provide relief for the pension fund of the Boston Plumbers Union Local No. 12 by treating such fund as an employees' pension fund which would qualify for tax exemption from the date of its establishment on September 1, 1954 to June 3, 1959, the date on which the Internal Revenue Service ruled that this fund would qualify for tax-exempt status prospectively. I have introduced an identical bill on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, pension funds of the type to which this bill relates have much difficulty in complying with the qualification tests prescribed under present law as a condition to receiving tax-exempt status. The reason is that unlike the typical pension fund which has only one employer, these funds typically are negotiated under collective bargaining contracts with many employers and it is oftentimes difficult, if not impossible, to obtain appropriate data which present law requires in order to determine qualified status. Sometimes these funds initially fail to qualify under the law because of an inadvertent failure to comply with a technicality. However, in all of these cases, it has been the intent of both employers and employees that these funds would qualify under the intent of the law.

If the relief provided in this bill is not granted, contributions made by employers to a fund prior to June 3, 1959, would not be deductible and income of the fund would be taxable to such fund. This is too severe a penalty to be imposed by reason of failure to comply with a technicality, particularly when in order to obtain the relief provided under the bill, an amendment added by the Committee on Ways and Means would require a showing to the appropriate Government officials that the fund had never been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interest of the beneficiaries.

I strongly urge favorable consideration of this bill in order to provide the relief that is warranted by this situation.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1877 would provide relief for the pension fund of the Boston, Mass., Plumbers Union Local No. 12. In effect, this bill would treat this pension fund as a qualified employees' tax-exempt fund from September 1, 1954, when it was established, to June 3, 1959, the date on which the Internal Revenue Service ruled that this fund qualified as a tax-exempt pension fund. In the absence of the relief that would be granted by this bill, contributions by employers on behalf of employees prior to June 3, 1959, would not be deductible and any income earned by the fund would be taxable to the fund.

Failure of this fund to qualify as a tax-exempt fund upon its inception was due to an inadvertent failure to qualify with a technicality of present law which was occasioned by the fact that funds of this type are negotiated under collective bargaining agreements with many employers, and it often takes considerable time to obtain the appropriate factual data with respect to the operation of the fund which is required to establish its actuarial soundness. Similar relief was granted during the last session of the Congress to seven similar funds that were faced with a like problem.

Under the bill, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, a provision has been added to assure that during the period for which relief would be provided under this bill it must be shown to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the fund has not been operated in any manner which would jeopardize the interest of the beneficiaries. In order to provide true equity in this situation, I strongly urge favorable consideration of the bill H.R. 1877.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Plumbers Union Local Numbered 12 Pension Fund, which was established by a collective bargaining agreement effective September 1, 1954, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust, under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of said Code, for years ending on or after June 3, 1959, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under said section 401(a), and to have been exempt from taxation under said section 501(a), for the period beginning on September 1, 1954, and ending on June 3, 1959.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "qualified" strike out the word "trust" and insert in lieu thereof the word "trusts".

Page 2, line 5, strike out "1959." and insert: "1959, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interests of its beneficiaries."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 1877, which was introduced by our colleague, the Honorable THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., of Massachusetts, would provide relief for the Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund, Boston, Mass., by treating the fund as a qualified employees' trust which would be exempt for taxation for the period from its inception on September 1, 1954, to June 3, 1959, the date on which the Internal Revenue Service ruled that this fund would qualify for tax-exempt status. An identical bill for the relief of this union pension fund has been introduced by the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, union funds, such as the one for which relief would be provided under this bill, often have difficulty in complying with the test prescribed in present law for qualification as tax-exempt funds prior to the time they receive contributions from the employers involved and have been in operation for some time. The reason for this is the fact that these funds are negotiated under collective bargaining agreements with many employers, large and small, and it often takes considerable time to obtain sufficient factual data with respect to the fund's operation to establish its actuarial soundness. Sometimes the initial failure of such a fund to qualify for tax-exempt status has been due to a technicality inherent in the operation of a fund with multiple employers as contributors.

Where a pension fund of this nature operates for a period without receiving tax-exempt status, any income it may earn during this period is subject to income tax and any employer contributions made thereto during this period are not deductible.

Last year, the Congress in seven similar cases concluded that this loss of exemption for the fund and the denial of deductions to employers for the initial period of their operation was too severe a penalty where it was the intention of both the employers and employees to qualify the fund as a tax-exempt fund but failure to do so was occasioned by inadvertence. Therefore, last year the Congress provided that in the case of these seven funds they were considered to be qualified in the initial period of their operation and up through the time they actually qualified for tax exemption, but only if the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate found that in this period they had not been operated in a manner to jeopardize the interests of the beneficiaries.

The bill, H.R. 1877, provides the same treatment for the Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund for the period from its inception to June 3, 1959, the date on which it was ruled to be a qualified tax-exempt fund by the Internal Revenue Service. As amended by your committee to include the requirement that the fund must not have been operated in a manner to jeopardize the interest of its beneficiaries from its inception, the bill was unanimously reported.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with a matter that is similar to matters the Congress has previously dealt with concerning employee pension funds.

The problem involved is whether or not a pension trust is qualified for income tax exemption and whether or not employer contributions to the trust are deductible. Occasionally it is difficult for a pension trust to achieve qualified status before employer contributions are received by it. H.R. 1877 would provide that the Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund of Boston, Mass., will be considered as a qualified and exempt trust from the time of its establishment in 1954 up until June 3, 1959, subject to certain findings by the Secretary of the Treasury. Thus employer contributions to the fund will be deductible to the extent made during the period affected by the bill and income earned by the trust during the period would be exempt from tax.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and I may have permission to extend our own remarks in further explanation of these bills immediately after the passage of each one of them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 271 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2010) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 51]

Alford	Gray	Roberts
Anfuso	Hemphill	Shelley
Blitch	Henderson	Sibal
Bonner	Holifield	Spence
Breeding	Inouye	Springer
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Thompson, La.
Byrnes, Wis.	Kelly	Thompson, N.J.
Celler	Libonati	Utt
Cook	McSween	Walter
Dawson	Machrowicz	Williams
Devine	Miller, N.Y.	Willis
Dominick	Morrison	Wilson, Calif.
Dooley	Moulder	Winstead
Downing	Powell	Zablocki
Evins	Rains	
Gallagher	Riley	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 385 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONTINUATION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] 30 minutes, and yield myself 8 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 271 provides for the consideration of H.R. 2010, a bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate.

In 1951, the Congress approved Public Law 78, 82d Congress, which added title V to the Agricultural Act of 1949. The authorization provided by Public Law 78 for the temporary employment in U.S. agriculture of Mexican workers expires December 31, 1961. H.R. 2010, as amended, would extend this authority for an additional 2 years, until December 31, 1963.

This statute has been implemented by an agreement with Mexico which sets forth in substantial detail the procedures, terms and conditions of the contract of employment, and other matters.

The program is almost entirely self-supporting and will not burden our financial structure.

Since 1950, the average number of hired farmworkers on U.S. farms has declined from 3,190,000 to 1,869,000 as a result of technological developments. Despite this, some farm operations, such as weeding vegetables or harvesting fruits and vegetables, are performed in approximately the same manner as decades ago. Much of this work is generally called stoop labor. It is a kind of work that few U.S. citizens will do and it is this kind of work that most Mexican workers are engaged in.

Mexican nationals are used primarily in the production and harvesting of such crops as lettuce, sugarbeets, tomatoes, cotton, peaches, berries, and other fruits and vegetables. For these commodities virtually any commercial producer must hire workers for weeding and harvest operations which he cannot use the rest of the year.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am again supporting the extension of Public Law 78 as I have supported it throughout my service in Congress. I wish to make it irrevocably clear, at this time, however, that it is my opinion that this will be the last time I shall take the floor in defense of this program. Certainly this is true unless there are substantial changes either in circumstances or in the application of the law as it applies across the country.

I have always defended Public Law 78 and the use of Mexican nationals because it was my opinion that they were desperately needed to meet emergency conditions which arise in the harvesting of particularly perishable commodities. That situation still exists in my own area of California and I feel that the farmer is entitled to the protection of a stable labor force and some assurance of being able to harvest the crop in which he has invested, in many instances, his total savings.

However, Mr. Speaker, conditions have arisen and do exist in other areas of our Nation which have led me to have grave concern about this program. They have to do primarily with the very low wage which is paid in some areas of our country; a wage which I feel is totally inexcusable since, in many instances, they are growing the very same crops as are the California farmers and where our wage today in agricultural labor is averaging $1.10 per hour, in other areas of the country the crops identical to ours are being harvested at from 40 to 50 cents per hour. As I have said before, this to me is without reason and inasmuch as Public Law 78 may be construed to influence and continue this type of a situation, I think the time has come to stop and consider making such changes as will correct this situation.

Let me say in addition, Mr. Speaker, that I have come to the firm conclusion that the only proper and correct answer to this situation is a national minimum wage law for agricultural workers. I am prepared to support the enactment of such a law since to me there is no possible justification for the differing wage scales which exist at the present time in various areas of the country.

I would like to give an example of a situation which exists right in my own State which I feel to be without justification. This has to do with the fact that agricultural wages in the Imperial Valley of my own State are as much as 30 cents per hour lower than the wages paid in my area of the San Joaquin Valley of California. This is inexcusable; there is no possible justification for it. There is no reason why the growers of the Imperial Valley cannot pay $1 or $1.25 per hour, the same as the growers in central California are paying at the present time. I know that many Members of this House are aware of certain labor problems which occurred during the lettuce harvest in the Imperial Valley this past winter. Frankly, I have little sympathy for the lettuce growers of the Imperial Valley or, as a matter of fact, any growers anywhere who are attempting deliberately to keep wages substantially below $1 per hour.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that some of the statements that I am making may appear to place me in an inconsistent position in view of my already expressed support for the extension of Public Law 78, but I do not feel such to be the facts.

I have found it impossible to support the administration bill—the so-called Coad bill—because I am opposed to the principle involved in the proposal which, in essence, would turn over to the Secretary of Labor the power to set up or prescribe a national minimum wage for agricultural workers.

Now as I have heretofore stated, I am supporting and shall continue to support a national minimum wage law for agricultural workers. I feel that it is the prerogative of the Congress to act in this field and I will oppose, as a matter of principle, any abrogation of our jurisdiction over this matter in the legislative field.

My only justification at the present time for supporting the 2-year extension of Public Law 78 is to give us an opportunity to work out the problems which at present exist and to which I have referred. I well realize the cost-price squeeze in which our farmers find themselves at the present time, and I think we have a definite obligation and responsibility to do everything in our power to improve the income of the farmer in order to place him in a position where he can pay a living wage to our American citizens who must make their living from agricultural labor.

I wish to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a lot of criticism of this program with reference to the fact that only a few large growers can benefit. In all fairness, the small growers need this program in many instances more than the big growers. Our large operators are in a position to mechanize and buy machinery to harvest mechanically their crops, whereas the small farmers cannot afford to do that. So for that reason I do want to make it clear that this is not a situation of pitting the big farmer against the small farmer. The small farmer needs a reliable labor force just as much as the large farmer because he is particularly dependent upon this type of labor and he must have it to harvest his perishable commodities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it implicitly clear that I am tired of the unfair competitive picture with which my farmers are faced in the production and harvesting of our crops and that because of my strong feelings about the unfairness of this situation, I felt it necessary to outline as clearly as possible my own position with reference to the urgent need to extend a minimum wage law to the agricultural workers of our Nation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just want to know the attitude of the Associated Farmers of America. Are they for or against this bill?

Mr. SISK. Well, it is my opinion, I might say to my good friend, that they are probably in favor of this particular piece of legislation. However, I have not heard directly from the Associated Farmers of California. The Farm Bureau Federation is supporting it, and a great many farm organizations across the country are supporting it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is there any place in the United States where an American citizen, working in this field, gets less wages than the Mexican workers?

Mr. SISK. Did the gentleman ask that in the form of a question? Are there such circumstances existing?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. SISK. It is my understanding that there are some areas in the country where this situation has been found to exist. However, I personally do not know of them of my own knowledge. Now, it has been reported, and I know there have been statements by the Department of Labor to this effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is not the American worker entitled to at least the same pay that the Mexican worker gets?

Mr. SISK. He certainly is. I completely agree with my leader that they are entitled to as much and in many cases more.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, it was only last week that the Congress passed a bill to raise the minimum wage and to extend its coverage to more workers through the medium of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1961. A majority of the Senate and the House, together with the President, regarded this as a step forward. Public opinion agreed.

Now, in considering the bill to continue the Mexican farm labor program, we are in danger of contradicting ourselves if we authorize and encourage the import of cheap labor from another country that would undercut the wage standards of our own agricultural workers.

I seriously question whether any overall wage policy can succeed by going forward and backward at the same time. H.R. 2010 sidesteps the substandard wage factor by focusing attention on the emergency need for seasonal or temporary agricultural workers.

If the need is so urgent, higher wages should attract a sufficient number of our own people to these seasonal tasks. Rather than do this, the growers tell us that they cannot survive unless they are permitted to import cheap foreign labor. This is a throwback to the early part of this century, when owners of textile mills sent agents to recruit help

in Europe. The surface reason was the need for textile operatives. The hidden reason was the determination to secure a labor surplus that would hold wages at substandard levels.

In reading the Committee on Agriculture's favorable report on H.R. 2010, I noticed that, while such words as "farm wages" and "index of farm wages" were mentioned, there was no reference whatsoever in dollars and cents to give us a clear picture of the minimum wage paid to Mexican workers who are recruited for seasonal farm employment in the United States. This is a curious omission of a vital fact. There is no minimum wage to protect the 2½ million farmworkers of the United States, that former Secretary of Labor Mitchell described as "the excluded Americans."

This is the opening; the invitation to import braceros who are eager to work for wages higher than they would receive in Mexico, but lower than American fair labor standards.

Apparently there was no need for Mexican seasonal workers up to World War 2, when this program got its foot in the door due to a wartime shortage of domestic or domestic agricultural labor. Through the device of extension, an emergency program is being stretched out into a permanent policy.

By playing off Mexican farmworkers against our own, the net effect is to exert economic pressure against the agricultural workers of our country.

The whole case for the continuation of the Mexican farm labor program is rooted in expediency. Even some of the Members who vote for H.R. 2010, must wish that we had the opportunity to legislate a constructive solution to the problem of temporary agricultural employment.

For my part, I cannot go along with a program that depresses the standards and hopes of seasonal farmworkers who reside in, and are citizens of, the United States. For this reason, I oppose H.R. 2010.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, although I do not know personally because I was not here, some of the senior Members have just told me that it was this particular matter that was being debated some 8 years ago when the shooting occurred in these Chambers. So, if I see any of you looking around from time to time today, I will know why it is.

Mr. Speaker, on the particular bill here, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], and I are new members of the Committee on Rules and, for the most part, on controversial matters, we have found ourselves voting in opposite directions. But, I am pleased to say that today we are both in support of H.R. 2010, which will continue this program, we hope, for another 2 years. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate. It is an open rule. Points of order are waived against the bill, which I think is necessary, because it calls for an implied appropriation of about $15 per person in the revolving fund. The bill is about as simple, from a language standpoint, as any we will consider this year. It simply strikes out a date. The act is now scheduled to expire on December 31 of this year. It substitutes in place thereof December 31, 1963, which means it is a 2-year extension of this particular program.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to express to the gentleman the disappointment of many of us who surely hoped, after this length of time, that certain amendments to this legislation would be offered and, at least, accepted by the committee before it was brought to the floor. And I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that in the failure to recognize the need for amendments we are not only failing to meet some of the needs of the Mexican migrant workers but also depressing the situation of our own workers within the United States. Does the gentleman feel that the bill is as meaningful as he seems to indicate and that a simple extension, just changing the expiration date, actually meets and cures the situation?

Mr. SMITH of California. It is an open rule and amendments may be offered and, I anticipate, will be offered. If this program is to be further studied, which I think it should be, and if the minimum wage principle is brought in, then I think we should bring in further legislation and have it disposed of on the floor.

In my opinion it should not be tied in with this program. It would not be fair to the agricultural people, particularly in the State of California, in which I am most keenly interested, to have this program just stopped. If that were done, we would not be able to harvest our crops in this season.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, may I say further to the gentleman that one reason why I with some reluctance for some time have supported this program is because I do recognize that there is a need; or at least it has been continually stated to me that there is a need, for this Mexican stoop labor. But I am still unwilling to accept the fact that we cannot give more protection to the imported Mexican laborers, and particularly more protection to our U.S. migrant farm laborers. Merely to extend this act, without consideration of connected problems that must be faced is not adequate or responsible action.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], if I may, that the Committee on Agriculture considered a great many amendments but declined to adopt any of them, by a vote of 27 to 3. In my remarks during general debate I shall discuss these amendments and explain why 27 out of 30 members of the committee felt that they were not necessary, appropriate, or practical.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I know that all these arguments both for and against this particular bill will be set out in the general debate. The report on the bill is well written. I should like at this time to take a few minutes to explain one particular reason why I happen to be in favor of this bill. I may be accused of witch hunting in these remarks, but for a number of years I was in charge of the subversive activities section of the FBI, in the Los Angeles office; that is, un-American activities—communism, espionage, sabotage, and the like. One of our problems, of course, was the possibility of the encroachment or the extension and development of communism amongst our Mexican neighbors who are closest to the south. We had that problem for some period of time and anticipate that it will continue.

We have seen what Russia has done so far as Cuba is concerned, our neighbor only some 90 miles away. We have this problem today, I can assure you. I still have some of the contacts that I had at that particular time, who tell me that it is a problem.

Now, how do I tie that in with this bill? We have some 315,000 workers who come up here from Mexico. If we do not provide them with this work at this time, work which they are looking forward to, if we just cut off this program, there will be that large number of people out of work in Mexico. They anticipate coming to the United States to earn some money, to help them live, buy clothes, and return back to Mexico, taking the money with them, which will help the economy of Mexico, at least to that extent.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield.

Mr. COHELAN. Is the gentleman suggesting that the use of foreign agricultural labor in this case is a sort of a point 4 program?

Mr. SMITH of California. I shall answer that in just a few minutes. My thought simply is that those people, going back with this extra money, will help their economy. But if we cut off these 315,000 people, they will have to find employment in Mexico, employment which they were anticipating getting here, and which will be difficult, in my opinion. What happens? I think we must admit that communism tends to spread in bad times, sore times, cankerous conditions, when unemployment is high. That seems to be when it will spread. We have a foreign aid program under which we give away money. Why is it not logical to consider this as a type of foreign aid program, to help their economy, in return for which we will get some help for our agricultural growers in the United States? We will be getting some return for our money.

If we had people in the State of California who would do this work, or people who would come from other States who would do the work, I would not make that statement. In such case they would be taking employment away from our people. But we do not have anybody out there who will do this stoop labor at the present time.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield.

Mr. COHELAN. I asked the question whether this could not be considered a kind of point 4 program. I wonder if the gentleman could clarify this point for me, whether or not this matter was taken up with the Department of State. Does the gentleman think the Department of State would approve this program?

Mr. SMITH of California. The comments that I made were made out of my own personal experiences and were my own opinion. But I have not taken this matter up with the Department of State.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman from California, but it is true that every year, including this year, the Department of State has sent one of its representatives before our committee supporting this program. That occurred again this year.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my distinguished colleagues on the House Agriculture Committee, I do not believe they have considered all the ramifications of Public Law 78. Their report gives scant consideration to the great body of testimony submitted during the committee's hearings by small farm organizations, church groups, labor organizations, consumers groups and citizens groups—testimony against the extension of Public Law 78 without reform.

Unless all of this testimony is considered, the Members of the House will not have the opportunity to vote on H.R. 2010 intelligently. It would be impossible for me or my colleagues to present our material in 1 hour. This is a tremendously complicated subject, and we need time to present our side of the story.

I, therefore, urge that the 1-hour open rule on H.R. 2010 be defeated.

We need time to present materials relating to the following areas, not covered in the report of the House Agriculture Committee which accompanies H.R. 2010:

Area No. 1: H.R. 2010 is based on the proposition that American agriculture cannot solve its labor problems without the help of the Federal Government. Approval of H.R. 2010 would constitute a congressional okay to the exploitation of about 2 million American farmworkers who are already at the bottom rung of the economic ladder. As a result it would foster the theory that the U.S. Government owes growers who benefit from Public Law 78—less than 2 percent of the growers in the United States—a labor force.

Area No. 2: Public Law 78 makes the law of supply and demand in the labor market inoperative; growers cannot hypocritically support this basic economic law as it applies to commodities, while denying it as it applies to human labor.

Area No. 3: According to the Secretary of Labor and the present administration, the mass importation of Mexican labor has had, and is having an adverse effect on the wages, working conditions and employment opportunities of domestic farmworkers—men, women, and children who are the poorest of the poor in our society.

Area No. 4: A vote for H.R. 2010 would constitute a vote against the Negro and Mexican-American families who for the past 50 years have been the backbone of the U.S. seasonal farm work force. These people have been described by the proponents of Public Law 78 as unreliable, winos, skid row derelicts, the dregs of the American labor force. We need time to defend these workers—one of the hardest working and least compensated groups in the American labor force.

Area No. 5: The proponents of Public Law 78 are inflicting an insult on the proud Mexican people by claiming that they are willing to perform labor that is below the dignity of American working men and women.

Area No. 6: Despite allegations to the contrary, Public Law 78 has an adverse effect on small farm operators and the members of their families. We would like to have time to introduce testimony presented before the Gathings subcommittee by representatives of the Grange and the Farmers Union which was not included in the report of the House Agriculture Committee.

To sum up, we need time to present our argument that the U.S. Congress—representing all of the people of the United States—cannot continue to condone a farm labor system in the United States rooted in poverty, unemployment, and underemployment both at home and in Mexico.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. The gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] spoke very fervently about the need for time. I would like to remind the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] and other advocates of his position that our subcommittee held weeks, or days at least, of hearings and there was no appearance by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] or the distinguished majority leader presenting their cases there. There was no appearance really before the main Committee on Agriculture and also, I understand, there was not any appearance before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COAD. I believe the gentleman should be corrected on that matter. I think you were aware that in the committee, I made a complete presentation of the bill, H.R. 6032. The full committee considered the merits of that and the gentleman knows that, he was there.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. That is quite correct, and I stand corrected on that. It is true, however, that there was no plea made at the time of the hearings, before the subcommittee, and there was plenty of opportunity to do so.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. As you say, I was advised that the gentleman from Iowa did not appear before the subcommittee and advocate what he is now proposing. He came to the meeting of the full committee on the morning we were preparing to report the bill, and just as we started to call the roll, he asked recognition, according to my recollection, and we stopped the rollcall and adjourned until the next day in order to give him the opportunity to present his views. His views were presented and were considered by the committee, and the proposal was rejected.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. By a vote of 27 to 3, as I recall.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a further correction, this bill was to be brought up at the very tail end of a session of the House Committee on Agriculture at 12 o'clock noon on a certain day, the date of which I do not recall at the present time. But, I asked it be put off to another date so that it could be given more complete and adequate consideration. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, was kind enough to put it off and at that time, it was more thoroughly discussed. It was not just a matter of my asking for recognition when the rollcall vote was about to be taken.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, my recollection is that the gentleman from Iowa did not present his proposal until we were preparing to vote the bill out. Then, he wanted to be heard and we continued the hearing to give him an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. That is my recollection.

Mr. COOLEY. He was fully heard and was defeated on his proposal.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. That is exactly right.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I decline to yield further at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no subject about which there is more misconception than the arrangement between the United States and the Republic of Mexico to bring Mexican national farmworkers into this country to do farmwork.

Prior to the existing treaty, some 1 million Mexicans crossed the border each year illegally to do the harvesting work now being done by a much smaller number of legal workers. These illegal entrants were called wetbacks. They roamed around the country, principally in the West, under no control or regulation, and sometimes greatly added to our law-enforcement problems. The number of illegal entrants has decreased from the former million to a total of about 30,000. The 315,000 Mexican nationals coming in legally under the treaty cause only a very small percentage of the problems formerly created by the wetbacks.

The treaty requires that these nationals be properly transported, housed, fed and insured. Mexican and United States Government officials travel throughout the areas of our country using braceros to make certain the treaty provisions are followed to the letter. When they return to Mexico, in most cases at least, they—the Mexicans—are emissaries of good will for the United States. While they are here, they earn as much per hour as they earn per day in Mexico. Part of that money they spend in America, and part, of course, they take home with them. Much of it comes back to this country in the form of payment for our exports to Mexico and we have a favorable balance of trade with that country. Their savings enable the braceros to start businesses and farms of their own in Mexico. They also learn modern farming methods while working in the United States.

People frequently ask: "Why should we bring in workers from Mexico when we have 4 or 5 million unemployed persons in this country?" The answer is: "Not enough domestic American workers are willing to do hard farm labor."

Several persons appeared before our subcommittee and stated that the program should be abandoned. All of these people were well intentioned, and some of them were clergymen. They did demonstrate, however, an abysmal ignorance of the real situation.

Along with scores of persons, mostly farmers—small, middle-sized, and large—testifying for a continuance of the program were two clergymen from California who, for years, have had the opportunity to make first-hand observations of the bracero program in action.

They stated that, without question, there are simply not enough domestic workers to get the crops in. One of the clergymen, the Reverend Loyal Vickers of San Bernardino County, Calif.—an area with substantial unemployment—told us that 68 churches in his region conducted a recruitment drive and were able to sign up 500 persons who said they wanted to pick oranges. In spite of the fact that these people were paid well over $1 an hour, only 30 of them stuck with the job more than a few days. The Reverend Mr. Vickers personally followed through and found that those who quit did not do so because of the wages involved, but frankly said they just did not want to do farmwork of this nature.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I would like to invite the gentleman's attention to some confirmation of this from labor organizations. There was a story in the Examiner-News containing this paragraph:

> Clive Knowles, international representative of United Packinghouse Workers of America, said "it is clear that for the present some Mexican bracero supplemental labor will be needed in many areas."

And only recently in California a representative of the Teamsters Union said publicly that there is not enough domestic labor available for "stoop jobs" and said they would support the use of Mexican workers on the Antle farms when necessary. This was with reference to a farm that had some kind of agreement with the teamsters local.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

It is sometimes stated that the bracero program works only for the benefit of the large farmers. This is simply not true. There are two good reasons why it is not: One, large farmers can afford to mechanize, and most small farmers cannot; and two, if our total domestic farm labor supply were not supplemented by the braceros, a shortage of available workers would surely develop. Then, the large farmers could afford to outbid the small ones because the former could afford to take a financial loss for a year or two. On the other hand, the small operators would go bankrupt and would be forced out of business entirely. The larger farmers would be in a position to gamble that the subsequent drop in production would tend to force up farm prices—and consequently food prices—so that they could again make a living.

With respect to the amendments to the existing law which have been suggested, it is the conviction of all but 3 out of 35 members of the House Committee on Agriculture that:

First, the Secretary of Labor presently does have, through the system of certification, all the authority necessary to limit the number of foreign workers used by any employer. He has done this on many occasions.

Second, the proposal of the Secretary of Labor to guarantee domestic workers the same conditions of work afforded the Mexican nationals is completely impractical—except in the matter of wages, for which equality is required under existing law.

For instance, Public Law 78 and the treaty with Mexico require that the farmers provide transportation and decent housing. When an employer transports Mexican nationals to his farm, he has reasonable assurance that they will work for him. If they do not, they are returned to Mexico. This rarely happens because they want farmwork. But if that same farmer is required to transport, again at his expense, domestic workers from Chicago to California, he has no assurance whatsoever that they will work, and the evidence is conclusive that in the great majority of cases most of them will not. They have just come along for the ride.

Many small farmers use Mexican nationals for only a few days out of a year. These men do not have their families with them and they live at one of the local camps—under State and Federal supervision. How, possibly, can that small farmer afford to provide comparable housing for a domestic worker who almost always has his family with him?

Third, the Secretary has sufficient authority in the present act to limit the kind of work for which a foreign worker can be used. This, again, he has done on many occasions in the past under the present act.

Fourth, the request of the Secretary of Labor for authority to set wages of domestic American citizen workers is improper as an amendment to Public Law 78. That was a point Mr. HAGEN made so effectively. It should be considered under the Fair Labor Standards Act—minimum wages—or in a separate piece of legislation and not tied into a bill of this nature as an extraneous amendment.

You will note the Department of Labor agrees that the legislation should be extended for 2 years.

The only argument, then, is whether the amendments are necessary or practical. I hope that I have demonstrated that they are neither. Remember, please, that no farmer may employ a Mexican national unless both the Federal and State Departments of Labor certify that there is no domestic worker available to do the work.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss H.R. 2010 extending the bracero program for 2 years.

H.R. 2010 demonstrates a callous disregard for the criticism raised against the bracero program. It shows contempt for the respect and dignity of the farmworker in a dignified industry, agriculture. It brushes aside the recommendations of the farm consultants who reported in 1959 to the Secretary of Labor that the Mexican farm program was undermining the deplorable economic conditions of the farmworker. It rejects the recommendations of the present Secretary of Labor which are incorporated in the Coad bill H.R. 6032. It says to this body we shall continue to import Mexican workers despite the adverse effect upon domestic labor, despite the substandard housing conditions and unsanitary conditions under which the bracero is living.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman, I am certain, wants to be perfectly fair with the membership of the House. The Secretary of Labor must find that the employment of Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I have seen the program work. It is a farce, it is ridiculous, especially in California and in Arkansas, because those approvals are being automatically done. There is improper investigation, there is cooperation between the growers and the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor and Immigration Service. I would like to finish my statement. I shall offer an amendment and I would like to amplify my remarks.

The American community rejects the idea that the power and authority of Government should be used in such a manner as to perpetuate a farm labor system that is based on poverty and destitution, not only at home but in neighboring countries as well.

Yet, at the present time, that is the kind of a farm labor system we have in

the United States. The proof of this thesis lies in the answer to two basic questions:

First. Where would growers who employ Mexican labor obtain their hired hands if poverty and unemployment were not widespread in Mexico?

Second. Where would growers find domestic workers willing to migrate from harvest to harvest at substandard wages, working, and living conditions if there were not poverty and unemployment in the home areas of our migratory farm work force?

The answer to these questions is simple. If this pool of underprivileged workers were not available, American growers would have to compete on the open market for their labor. They, like industrial employers, would have to plan their production schedules in accordance with the labor market situation. They would have to offer wages and working conditions that would appeal to domestic workers. They would have to see to it that farmworkers, like industrial workers, were covered by such protective legislation as unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and minimum wage laws. In short, they would be forced to raise employment standards in agriculture.

However, because there is poverty at home and in nearby countries, the American grower does not have to worry about such things. Because his workers are exempt from most social and labor legislation, he can ignore taxes for unemployment insurance, insurance rates for workmen's compensation, industrial child labor laws, minimum wage laws, and laws which guarantee workers the right to organize into unions. If he pays piece rates, he doesn't even have to deduct withholding taxes.

The American grower is indeed a privileged employer. The average small businessman or industrialist would like to be in such an enviable position.

Take the case of foreign labor, for example. If growers in the Southwestern part of the United States find it impossible to recruit domestic labor at the prevailing wage rate, they can petition the U.S. Secretary of Labor to declare a labor shortage and recruit cheap labor from Mexico.

No wonder growers fight to maintain the status quo. Free enterprise and the law of supply and demand were never like this.

Does anybody seriously question the fact that the presence of these foreign workers has an adverse effect upon domestic workers? If so, consider these facts:

Each year approximately 60,000 domestic workers leave the State of Texas because the wage rates offered them by Texas growers are so low. They are replaced by Mexican nationals.

Several areas in California, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona which at one time employed mostly domestic workers are now considered bracero-dominated areas by the Department of Labor.

Wages paid by growers who employ both domestics and Mexicans are lower than those paid by employers who hire domestics exclusively.

The total labor costs of New York State tomato growers—who hire mostly domestic labor—are $14 per ton. In California, where tomato growers depend almost exclusively—95 percent at peak season—on Mexican nationals, the total labor costs are only $9 per ton.

Approximately 50,000 braceros are employed in skilled occupations, some on a year-round basis. The jobs at which these braceros are employed include: tractor and truck drivers, irrigators, ranch hands, packing and sorting operations, among many others. The employment of braceros in these jobs definitely has an adverse effect on the opportunities of domestic farmworkers to move from common laborer into higher paid skilled farm occupations.

These examples can be multiplied many times. Despite what has been said by the proponents of Public Law 78, the consultants appointed by former Secretary of Labor Mitchell to review Public Law 78 have made some very valuable recommendations—recommendations that have been incorporated in the administration's bill, H.R. 6032. I, for one, cannot believe that men such as Senator Thye, Chancellor Von Kleinsmid, Monsignor Higgins, and Mr. Garrett could have been completely biased, as has been charged, in their report to the Secretary. Nor do I think these distinguished men are so naive or uninformed—after studying the program for months—to have been completely erroneous in their report.

The amendments proposed by the administration would incorporate most of the reforms recommended by the consultants.

It would restrict the employment of Mexicans to unskilled, seasonal jobs.

It would give the Secretary of Labor greater authority to require farmers to make direct, positive efforts to recruit domestic workers and to compete for available domestic labor.

It would authorize the Secretary of Labor to establish clear criteria for adverse effect.

The question we have to decide is whether we are going to perpetuate a system which amounts to little more than indentured labor, or whether we are going to begin now to eliminate a farm labor system based on poverty.

It is my opinion that the conscience of the American people will soon rebel against this program which is of benefit to less than 2 percent of the total number of farmers in the United States; a system which exploits the poor of an underdeveloped nation, and by so doing, lowers labor standards at home.

It is my privilege, therefore, to give my unqualified support to these amendments.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, to truly understand the bracero problem is impossible unless one understands the mechanics of operating a farm which requires the hiring of a tremendous supply of labor. Without casting aspersions on the sincerity of some remarks which have been uttered here today, I must say in all candor that I suspect that some of the people making these statements do not have the understanding of which I speak.

I do not believe that the bracero program, Public Law 78, has had an adverse effect upon domestic labor. I think quite the contrary is the fact.

Let us look at the record. It is found on page 5 of the committee report. Farm wages in the United States have increased steadily. In 1950, the index of farm wages published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture was 432. In 1960 the index was 629, or an increase of 46 percent. I do not have the figures before me, but I am willing to wager that this increase in farm wages compares favorably with increases for industrial labor.

The bracero program has resulted in an increase in farm wages, and here is why. The law requires that you pay the bracero the prevailing rate paid the domestic worker. And, by interpretation and regulation, the transportation which is furnished to the bracero, the health insurance, and other perquisites have come to be considered part of his wages. The result is that domestic labor is gradually coming to enjoy these benefits as well. In my own district, where a number of braceros are employed, I have found that the effect is to accelerate the domestic wage rate rather than depress it. Most farmers would prefer to pay 5 or 10 cents more per hour than accept the extra problems involved in hiring braceros. Wage surveys are made only for domestic workers. Therefore the prevailing rate goes up and so does the rate for the braceros. Then the cycle starts over again.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot ignore that there is some relationship between ability to pay wages and the wage paid. How can we absorb a faster increase than 46 percent in 10 years when over the same 10-year period the price of farm commodities has gone done? In 1942 you could buy a D–4 Caterpillar tractor for $2,600. In 1945 you had to pay $4,000 for it, and today you pay $12,000 for that tractor. In our farm bills we have recognized consistently that the farmer is caught in a price squeeze; that the price of what he buys goes up and the price of what he sells goes down. I think the record of a 46 percent increase in 10 years is a remarkable record, and the American farmers are to be congratulated for having accomplished it.

Just 2 weeks ago I was out in my district. I talked to a farmer who asked a man if he wanted to come to work for him at $1.50 an hour. Do you know what the answer was? "No, I will disqualify myself from my unemployment insurance."

In my hometown newspaper every week we see headlines "Strawberry pickers needed." The farm labor office says "We need workers here and workers there," and every time they publish such an announcement, they also announce hundreds of new claimants for

unemployment insurance and hundreds of continuing claims. These people who are drawing this unemployment insurance are experienced farmworkers, but for reasons better known to themselves than to me—they will not do farmwork.

Our wages in California are not as bad as some people contend they are. Our average wage is $1.09 per hour. We are paying 15 to 18 cents a box to pick tomatoes. Nothing in the world can keep any man, with reasonable diligence, from picking 150 boxes of tomatoes in a single day. That means he makes from $22.50 to $30. This is not a starvation wage.

I suggest to some of the Members who perhaps have fallen victim to a bit of distorted propaganda that they come out to the fields of California and see the opportunity for employment that is there and the opportunity for work at decent wages that is there.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, once more I find it necessary to come down to the well of the House to oppose this type of legislation. I had hoped that this law would be permitted to expire with its present termination date. It does mayhem to every other piece of labor legislation on the statute books. Under this the Mexicans brought into this country are exempt from the payment of income taxes; they are exempt from the requirements of social security, from the payment of any of the compensation provisions. In other words, if they run away from the farmer in Texas or southern California who employs them, they become public charges and have to be taken care of and may have to be sent back to Mexico at Government expense.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that one of the worst features of this bill is the minimum wage limitation of 50 cents. In all of the farm sections in the Eastern part of the country from Florida to western New York the minimum wage is 75 and 85 cents to migrant farmworkers who come up from Florida into western New York. Under this arrangement, with a limitation of a minimum wage of 50 cents, a large producer of farm products in southern California can grow tomatoes on that farm, squeeze the juice out of them and ship the juice to the Campbell Soup Co. in New Jersey for less money than they can grow it on the farm next to the plant in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should not be before the Congress today. It had no business going to the Committee on Agriculture. It belongs to the Committee on Labor and I can assure you that no legislation of this kind would reach the floor of the House if it were sent to the Committee on Labor. I would like to see it defeated.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD].

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I come to address myself to the rule on the bill to extend Public Law 78. This is not a new subject to me as some have tried to indicate in the House today. Last year I was one of the signers of the minority report in opposition to this bill. At that time in the minority report we said the following:

> Public Law 78 is a major factor in creating the extremely low income and the great underemployment of American farmworkers. It not only helps to prevent wages and working conditions from improving, but in many areas it actually makes them worse.
>
> The Mexican farm labor importation program quite simply exploits the poverty among Mexicans to increase poverty among farmworkers in the United States. It provides corporation farms with a means of competing unfairly with the family farm.

Not only did I testify to that fact a year ago, but I am here today witnessing to the same fact, because the problem has been increased, it has been enhanced. Underemployment of the rural people of the United States is today estimated at the equivalent of 1,400,000 fully unemployed workers. Partially this situation is created by this very program we have under consideration today.

There are those who have come to the well of the House and tried to say, "Well, this actually increases the income to our domestic farmworkers." How in the world can this kind of program increase the wage level of domestic workers under the way it works?

What happens? When there is available Mexican farm labor in any State to any employer at any rate, you know as well as I that those employers are not going to go out and offer any wage level higher than what they can offer to the Mexican worker and get the Mexican worker.

There are those who say this is a sort of foreign aid program, a point 4 program for the Mexicans. Let us be really honest about this. While we are not here today attacking Mexican labor, we are not attacking the Mexican Government or the Mexican people at all, we are here, and I am here in the well of the House today, to fight the battle for the domestic laborers on the farms of our country.

Why do we have a foreign aid program, if that is what it is? Why are we espousing a foreign aid program at the expense of our poor unorganized domestic migratory workers in the United States? Why do we go out to these people who are poor, underpaid, and impoverished, and say to them, "You are the ones who are paying for the foreign aid program to the Mexicans"?

Let us look at this thing in just a slightly different sense. There are many in this House who are members of the law profession. There are some who are medical doctors. There are dentists, engineers, and members of other professions. Would we say to our own lawyers, doctors, dentists, engineers, and all the rest, "You take a substandard wage because we are going to import doctors from Germany, we are going to import engineers from Japan, and thereby you are the ones who are going to be underemployed and unemployed"? You know as well as I that the American Medical Association has put its foot down on bringing in foreign doctors to practice medicine in our State hospitals across this land. They have a very rigorous program to stop this very sort of thing.

Why are some today trying to defend this kind of program, saying that our migratory workers have to be placed under bondage because of the importation of Mexican nationals? Obviously, the lawyers, doctors, dentists, and engineers would organize strong opposition to this kind of program if it affected their professions. But if we pass this bill without amendment we are saying it is all right because the migratory workers in this country are unorganized, they are impoverished, they have no one to speak for them, so we will pounce upon them and we will permit the 2 percent of the producers in this country—and this program involves only 2 percent of the producers in this land—to bring in foreign workers because they can be hired at a lower level than what will be required under the amendments I will offer.

I should like to say in announcement that I will have several amendments to offer. One of them simply says that the Mexicans who are brought in under this program cannot be hired to operate power-driven machinery, that we should let our own people do the skilled jobs on the farm.

Another amendment is that the Mexicans can be brought in only for seasonal labor, they cannot come in and take year-round jobs from our people.

The third amendment is that anyone who attempts to employ Mexican labor must first offer the same rates of compensation to the domestic people before he qualifies to be permitted to hire Mexican people.

Fourth, we must have a pay scale at least equivalent to the State or national average, whichever is less, but in no case shall any employer be required to raise his rates from the previous year over 10 cents an hour.

Fifth, the Secretary of Labor should have the authority to stop the bringing in of Mexican workers. In other words, we cannot just flood the American labor market with Mexican labor imported from Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, these are the essentials of the amendments I will offer a little bit later under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COAD. I yield.

Mr. COHELAN. I wonder if the gentleman could help me out and tell me what the attitude of the Department of Agriculture was on the extension of Public Law 78?

Mr. COAD. It is my understanding, according to the statement of the Secretary of Labor, Arthur Goldberg, yesterday that the administration stands and speaks with one voice, and that the administration in all of its aspects is opposed to the simple extension of Public Law 78 unless it is amended.

Mr. COHELAN. That certainly includes the Department of State notwithstanding the fact that one of the gentlemen present stated that somebody appeared before the committee from the Department of State.

Mr. COAD. As I understand it, from the import of his statement, that includes the entire administration.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a statement that appears in the hearings on this bill, the statement from Michael J. Coleman, Jr., national president of the Young Christian Workers. This is what he said:

I would like to point out to this distinguished committee that in each of the areas where an inquiry was made, we discovered similar social, economic, family, and moral problems.

And he is talking about the migratory worker problem. His statement continues:

I would like to point out to this distinguished committee that in each of the areas where an inquiry was made, we discovered similar social, economic, family, and moral problems. It was true in housing which could consist, we found, in a barn with 30 men living inside, or 5 men quartered in a cinder-block building next to a pig tank. Whether we speak of his wages, his power to bargain collectively, his working and living environment, his health conditions, or his benefits under social legislation, the migrant worker is at the bottom of the ladder. Credit is due, however, to those farm employers, who have in some instances provided such things as accident insurance or fairly decent housing for the migrant and his family. These, we found, were exceptional.

Further, we have seen the direct and adverse effects which the entry of braceros into our country under Public Law 78 has had upon our own domestic workers. First, the availability of 400,000 foreign workers last year forced domestic workers and their families to seek work in other States. We have learned that for the most part migrant farmworkers in the North Central States are U.S. citizens of Mexican ancestry whose residence is in Texas. With the presence of thousands of braceros in Texas, wage rates were lowered to a level which forced the migrant worker and his family to seek work elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I solicit the opposition of my colleagues to a simple extension of this bill, and ask for their support for the amendments I intend to offer.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of the resolution and urge the House to adopt the resolution and to pass the committee bill without amendment. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that by passing this legislation today we can restore, in part at least, the damage done to our prestige by Edward R. Murrow and the now famous CBS film, "The Harvest of Shame."

Much has been written and said about this film that was shown with other documentaries during the winter months in a series called "CBS Presents." I want to make it clear at this point that I have no prejudice in this matter. Kansas employs practically no migratory laborers and I do not own even one share in any broadcasting facility. I do have a share in America, however, as does every other Member of this House; and accepting our responsibility not only as Members of this body but as citizens, I feel we must make every effort to dispel the distorted image of America that has been portrayed in foreign countries by this film presentation by Edward R. Murrow, now Director of the U.S. Information Agency. Of course, we know that Mr. Murrow was not in an official capacity in Government when this film was shown. We know, too, that a disclaimer both preceded and followed the film when it was shown by the British Broadcasting Co. Apparently even that disclaimer did not make it clear to our British friends that Mr. Murrow was not speaking in an official capacity, and by now we do not know how much further the image of America reflected by that film has gone beyond the British Isles.

Now, in all fairness I think we should consider the position of CBS in this matter. Personally, I am critical of CBS for permitting this film to be shown as a documentary. Parenthetically, let me say that I feel at liberty to be critical of CBS in this matter, because I can remember not many months ago when Attorney General Hogan exposed the quiz scandals I was one of the few Members of the House to defend the integrity of the networks in connection with the quiz scandal charges. It seemed to be a popular pastime then to be vindictive and critical of the networks when they were found guilty of presenting the so-called fixed quiz shows. I felt like they were being criticized completely beyond reason at that time, and by the same token I feel at least one network is vulnerable to criticism in connection with the filming and showing of this documentary now under discussion. I think possibly the filming and presentation of the "Harvest of Shame" and other similar documentaries may have been an unconscious reaction to the bitter criticism directed at the networks, particularly by Members of Congress. As a result of the quiz shows, there followed an admonition to the networks by the Federal Communications Commission and Members of Congress to adjust their programing to better serve the public interest. In an effort to meet that admonition, I think perhaps they have overreached reasonable definitions of a documentary film, and the result was the distorted presentation of an admitted social and economic problem in the United States.

One further statement in reference to the manner in which this problem was presented. I am a firm believer that it is the privilege and perhaps the responsibility of a licensee to take an editorial position on a matter in the public interest. However, such an expression should be clearly identified as an editorial and not as a news commentary or news report or a documentary. If CBS had presented this show as expressing their point of view and criticism of an undesirable situation, they would have had a clear privilege to do so. The manner in which it was presented, in my opinion, was unfair.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 6 commencing on page 1756 contains several citations replete with misrepresentation. But, even more serious, in my opinion, was their failure to their public responsibility in presenting the other side of this problem. They should have shown what has been accomplished in the way of improving the standard of living, wage rates and school opportunities for the migratory workers in some States.

The only logical conclusion is that Mr. Murrow and Mr. Lowe were so completely carried away in their effort to be dramatic and to produce a show arousing the emotions of the viewers that they lost sight completely of their public responsibility to be objective and to present both sides of a controversial social public problem.

Now, let me refer again to my opening statement that this film, "The Harvest of Shame," has done violence to the social imagination of America. Further, this damage could not have occurred at a worse time as our national prestige was suffering from other misfortunes. Here are a few quotations from stories appearing in British newspapers after the showing of this film in that country on March 21. These statements are taken out of context in a technical sense, but I assure you they do not misrepresent the viewpoint expressed in the British publications.

From the Daily Herald on March 22, under the caption of "Murrow Tells of America's Shame," by Phil Diack:

I am sure that the appointment means a clear and decent official expression of the American conscience, but I cannot help fearing that our TV as well as theirs is bound to be the poorer. Murrow's documentary blazed fiercely with his incomparable and indispensable indignation * * * fury backed by hard facts, harshly framed on film.

In the Daily Sketch of London, March 22, by Neville Randall, "How I Saw It":

I have seen five TV films on the American way of life this year. All were critical. But none matched the devastating condemnation of Ed Murrow's "Harvest of Shame," screened—under protest from America—by BBC last night.

From the London Daily Telegraph of March 22, 1961, "Sordid Living—U.S. Harvest Migrants":

Wages are pathetically low. One Negress described how she spent almost 9 hours in the sun picking beans for a mere dollar while four children waited at home to be fed. But despite the sordid conditions there seemed little despair among the workers.

From the London Daily Mail of March 22, 1961, "Peter Black's Teleview":

According to Murrow, the Eisenhower regime allotted $6,500,000 to preserve migrant bird life, but failed to implement the $3,500,000 budget for the education of the children of these workers.

The principal point I want to make is this: This is not new legislation, it is merely an extension of an existing law. If we now retract in panic or act in any way that reflects a national guilty conscience in our treatment of this legislation, it could be interpreted as consent and agreement by the Congress to all of the ills that were pictorially and orally misrepresented in the "Harvest of Shame." If we pass this legislation as proposed by the committee we are in effect saying: "Yes; we recognize that

the standard of living, the wage structure and educational opportunities for the migratory workers are not as high as we want them to be." We have evidence in every State that there has been continual improvement in the status of these workers and we are dedicated to the objective that the improvement shall continue. We are not, however, going to recede from a perfectly honorable and established position in regard to these workers. If we do not stand our ground and adopt the committee bill, it can only be interpreted by our friends and foes alike that we are admitting all of the inequities and discomforts and disillusions in the "Harvest of Shame" and that we have no capability of improving the same.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, we have had quite a discussion on this particular subject with reference to the merits or demerits of this legislation. I am firmly of the opinion that it is neither as bad as it has been pictured by the opponents of the legislation nor probably quite as good as some of the proponents may have pictured it. It is a program, however, that has worked generally very well in some parts of our country. In my opinion, for the next 2 years it is a program that is needed by our farmers who deal with particularly perishable commodities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt the rule and to permit the Committee on Agriculture to present its case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. Some reference has been made to the appearance of a representative of the Department of State. On page 330 of the hearings, at the bottom of the page, this language appears:

> The Department believes, from the standpoint of public relations in Mexico and joint conduct of the program with the Government of Mexico, that the program should be extended for a period not longer than 2 years.

That would indicate clearly that there was not any real objection on the part of the Department of State to the extension of the program.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were denied.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2010) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2010, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I shall be very brief.

We bring this bill here for an extension that will continue in operation a program which we think has worked reasonably well in past years. It is desperately needed, since this labor coming in from Mexico works in about 24 States of the Union.

I believe that our committee and the Department of Labor have provided every possible safeguard and made every reasonable provision pursuant to authorizations which Congress has provided in the past. I do not want to burden the House by reading these pages of procedures and safeguards. The Department has provided minimum acceptable housing standards in great detail, minimum standards for living and sleeping quarters, and cooking and eating facilities, sanitary facilities, laundry facilities, lighting facilities. These agreements are negotiated in the form of treaties between the Republic of Mexico and our own country.

The Department is charged with the responsibility of enforcing the law.

The program has been very severely criticized here on the floor today. I say that if the program has not been properly administered, someone in the executive branch of the Government is entirely responsible. All these safeguards have been provided: The employer has to assume certain fixed responsibilities, provide certain fixed conditions of labor, certain minimum standards; and the wages are fixed by the Department of Labor which must find that the wage in the contract is the prevailing wage in the community and area where the labor is to be used.

Here is what you should know about it: It restricts the use of Mexican labor to instances or areas where the Secretary of Labor certifies that, first, domestic workers, able, willing, and qualified, are not available; second, the employment of Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed; and third, reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers at comparable wages.

What else can you ask? The whole proposition before this House, or which will soon be before this House, is obviously an effort to turn over to the control of the Secretary of Labor all of the farmworkers of America, and let the Secretary of Labor hereafter fix minimum wages and maximum hours, as well as providing standards of working conditions for all domestic workers. If you want to do that, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] will soon provide you with a vehicle which will enable you people from the farm areas of America to put the Secretary of Labor in charge of all workers of America, perhaps even including those who now labor in our fields. Yes, that is the purpose behind the Coad amendment. There is nothing new about it. We have had to face it every time we have come to the House for an extension of this law.

Mr. Chairman, representing an agricultural area, as I do, I want no such authority vested in the Secretary of Labor under this administration or any other administration, regardless of partisan politics. I have no Mexican workers in my district or in my State, but as I look over the information here on this desk I know that these workers are vital in many areas. Look at page 5 of the report and you will find where the workers are being used. If you will look at the document embodying the regulations of the Department of Labor, I may say to my friend from Iowa [Mr. COAD], you will note something about how this law is administered.

It is difficult for me to believe that the gentleman has ever read the minimum requirements provided here. If you have, and you have concluded that the program has not operated well, then I ask the gentleman, Why have you not complained to the Department of Labor? Those who represent areas in which these programs have operated seem to be very well satisfied. None of the labor is used in the great State of Iowa from which this amendment comes.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. COAD. I would like to refer to the fact that the point my distinguished chairman has made is one which I have not labored at all. I have no quarrel with the fact that the program as it involves Mexican workers has broken down. I say it is working, but it has a detrimental effect on the migratory workers of this country.

Mr. COOLEY. If that is true, that is an indictment of those administering the program. I just got through saying that the Secretary of Labor must affirmatively find it does not adversely affect domestic workers. If the gentleman has any evidence of that, submit it to the Department of Labor.

Mr. COAD. What I have submitted today is that this program has a detrimental effect on the migratory workers of this country.

Mr. COOLEY. But the gentleman has not substantiated the statement with any evidence.

Let me say this and I am through. Under this program only able-bodied Mexicans who have been screened from a medical standpoint are permitted to come in here for seasonal work. They are not permitted to bring their wives and their families with them.

Now the gentleman is proposing by his amendment to shift our population from State to State. You would then really have a harvest of shame. You would see these workers dragging their wives and

children across this land into these agricultural areas, carrying with them a health problem, a housing problem, and a school problem. We would have to provide facilities for men, women and children, and we would have to provide schools for the children in the areas where the workers are to be employed. If that is what you want in Iowa, you bring it to Iowa, and we will let you shuffle your population around. Some of these domestic workers would simply go to California for the ride, work 2 or 3 days, to have their transportation paid.

Mr. Chairman, I shall yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], chairman of the subcommittee that has handled this matter from the very beginning. The gentleman has conducted long hearings and brings us a book of hearings consisting of 370 pages. Everybody desiring to be heard was accorded the opportunity to be heard. I think this bill should be enacted, and I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has raised the question of adverse effect on our domestic agricultural work force. I would like to refer to a sheet that appeared in the hearings before our committee under date of March 23, 1960. In the testimony that was presented there on that page there was a table giving 1958 agricultural statistics for Arkansas—average wage rate for picking 100 pounds of seed cotton by States up to November 1. Now, this covers a period of 10 years under this table. It reflects definitely that in those States that do not use Mexican labor the wage rate for picking 100 pounds of cotton is less than it is in the State of Arkansas where we do have to use this labor to a great extent to harvest our crop.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Would you be kind enough to state for the Committee exactly what the wage is in Arkansas, in absolute terms?

Mr. GATHINGS. I will give the Arkansas rate for cotton picking and all these other States if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. COHELAN. Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, that the rate is 50 cents an hour or less in Arkansas?

Mr. GATHINGS. No, it is not true that the rate is 50 cents an hour or less in Arkansas. It is the prevailing rate in the particular community where the Mexican labor is used. I am going to give you the wage information right here, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. COHELAN. I would appreciate it and thank the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. In South Carolina, which does not use any of the Mexican labor, in 1958—and that is the last year that this table covers—the rate for picking 100 pounds of cotton in that State was $2.45. In the State of Georgia the wage rate paid in the communities all over the State of Georgia was $2.65 for picking 100 pounds of cotton. In the State of Tennessee the wage rate was $2.75 for picking 100 pounds of cotton. In Alabama the wage rate was $2.50 a hundred pounds. Now, in all of those States they do not use Mexican labor.

Now let us look at the rate in Arkansas. The Arkansas rate was $2.85 a hundred pounds. So, that shows without a question of a doubt that we are paying a higher rate for picking our cotton in the State of Arkansas than those States that do not use that labor, and by the use of the Mexican labor in the State of Arkansas there is no adverse effect on our own labor and people.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. In addition to paying the prevailing wage rate in the area, the employer has to provide transportation, housing, and all of these other benefits for the worker.

Mr. GATHINGS. The chairman is right.

Mr. COOLEY. And by this regulation they even require the employer to furnish a 12-inch frying pan, a 6-inch cooking pot and a coffeepot and other items which the employer is required to furnish for the worker.

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right. The employer pays for this whole program, practically every dollar, with the exception of the cost for the salaries of the compliance officers of the Department of Labor.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. COHELAN. According to figures which I have here, and which I shall insert in the RECORD, I understand that Arkansas has 95,009 farms and that about 2.8 percent of this total use braceros. I ask the gentleman if the domestic workers who must be used in this program are provided the same amenities in those Arkansas fields.

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman has said that only about 2 percent of the farmers throughout the land use Mexican workers. That is right.

Mr. COHELAN. I said 2.8 percent.

Mr. GATHINGS It is 2.8 percent for the Nation; that is correct, but I don't know what the percentage is for Arkansas. So much of the harvesting is done by mechanized methods. It does not require but one or two people to operate a combine to harvest the grain out in the Midwest. So much of our agriculture is grain and livestock, and the like. We have to have supplemental labor in fruit, vegetable, pickle sugar beet, cotton, and other harvest work. Americans just do not like to do stoop labor. That is natural. They would prefer to work in a factory at a higher wage. They do not like to pick cotton.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, he has not responded to my question. I ask the gentleman again, if they are only using 2.8 percent of the total work force in agricultural labor, and we know the stringent requirements covering Mexican nationals, do the farmers in the gentleman's State provide the same amenities for the American workers?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. You pay the American worker the same for picking 100 pounds of cotton as you pay the imported labor, do you not?

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right. The Secretary of Labor makes that determination in the particular community. The wage rate paid to domestic workers in the particular area is the same as that paid to the foreign worker.

Mr. COOLEY. And the domestic worker who wants to pick cotton gets $2.85 a hundred, is that right?

Mr. GATHINGS. That is right.

Mr. COHELAN. Is it not a fact that you are not required to provide the American worker with the same amenities that you are required to provide the Mexican bracero?

Mr. GATHINGS. The gentleman is absolutely right. As the chairman of the committee so well pointed out a few moments ago, that if the provision of the Coad substitute is written into law, it would mean carrying across State lines great numbers of men, women and children; it would increase the stream of migratory domestic workers in this country and bring about health, relief and problems of unemployment in a particular area and school problems for the children. A farmer could not know whether the worker he acquires from distant places would work 1 hour or 1 week. He could get the free ride and is not obligated to remain on that farm and work.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, 97 percent of the work force now is in that same category, or it is roughly that percentage.

Mr. GATHINGS. The greater number of the farmers use mechanized methods to harvest their crops. They also get local labor. You know, the Mexican labor coming to this country represents only one-ninth of the total force in this program.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] talked about the services that the braceros were getting, so far as sanitary facilities are concerned. Some of the people do not dispute that the Departments of Labor and Agriculture are supervising this program well but I do, from my own observation in the States of Arkansas and California. I ask the gentleman, Does he know of any housing facilities which had to be closed down in his State because they were unsanitary and not maintained properly?

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not know that there has been any specific housing closed in Arkansas; there could have been. But I want to say to the gentleman that we were proud that he came to Arkansas and looked over our housing. There has not been one complaint, so far as I know, from the Mexican worker. I will ask the gentleman, Does he know of one complaint that was lodged by a

Mexican bracero against a house in Arkansas or in any other State in this Nation?

Mr. SANTANGELO. Yes, I do. When I went out there, together with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI], inspecting housing conditions in Arkansas, and in the gentleman's own section, we observed several places which were unfit for human habitation. We brought this to the attention of the Department of Labor and they closed them down immediately.

Mr. GATHINGS. I have not had an opportunity to discuss this bill. Let me have that privilege.

Mr. SANTANGELO. The gentleman asked me a question and I am trying to answer it.

Mr. GATHINGS. There are an awful lot of poor farmers in Arkansas that cannot provide adequate facilities, as the gentleman from New York would like to see them do. We do provide for the migrant workers from Mexico houses that are as good or better than what the farmer himself lives in.

Mr. GUBSER. I should like to suggest to the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from New York that they should look at the cubic footage required in the living quarters for the Mexican nationals, and then go back to their own offices, and they will find that the Congress of the United States offers their own people, in their own employ, less space to work in and fewer facilities.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why should he not go back to New York and take a look at his hometown?

Mr. GATHINGS. The number of Mexicans that came into this country in 1960 was less than those that came in in 1959. In 1959 there were 437,643, and in 1960 the figure had gone down to 315,846.

Our people would not use this program at all if they had enough workers at home within the county that were ready, willing, and able to do this work. They would much prefer to have local workers.

A man came here with an REA group the other day. He came from my district. He said he had heard that some labor was available over at Potts Camp, Miss. He understood that there were 20 or 30 of them who wanted to work in agriculture. He said he sent a truck over there and was able to bring back only one laborer. That is all he was able to get. He desperately needed workers.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill simply extends Public Law 78, known as the Mexican labor bill, for another 2 years. This bill was most carefully considered after extensive hearings and it was overwhelmingly supported by both Democrats and Republicans in the House Committee on Agriculture; in fact, the bill was reported out by a vote of 27 to 3. There are 370 pages of testimony and over 100 witnesses were heard. No one can say, therefore, that this subject matter has not been thoroughly considered. The substitute proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] and others was fully considered by the full committee and also voted down by a vote of 27 to 3.

As far as my home State of Iowa is concerned, this program has little direct significance. Last year, in 1960, there were less than 100 foreign farmworkers employed in the entire State of Iowa at the peak of the harvest season, so this legislation presents no problem for those of us living in that section of the country.

My interest and support for this legislation is based first on the real need for seasonable farm labor in many areas of the Nation. It has been conclusively shown throughout the hearings that American labor simply refuses to do this type of stoop labor. No one can realize unless he is in close touch with the situation how fruits and vegetables in certain areas of this country need to be harvested within a period of a very few days. It is highly essential that crops be harvested on time, and many farmers stand to lose their entire crops because they cannot find domestic labor available at the very time it is needed.

Furthermore, this bill merits your attention because it is very important as far as American-Mexican relations are concerned.

Third, this program has had a very fine result as far as alleviating the wetback situation is concerned.

In fact, Public Law 78 was passed by the Congress in 1951 to combat the wetback problem, and we have made significant progress in that regard.

Under the Mexican farm labor program, seasonal farmworkers, called braceros, are brought into the United States pursuant to the agreement between the Republic of Mexico and the United States. These temporary workers assist in the harvesting of a number of crops, and without them there would be pandemonium in the harvest field in many States. I want to stress at this point that the law restricts the use of Mexicans to areas and situations where the Secretary of Labor has found that no American citizens are ready, willing or able to do the needed work. So the American worker is protected in every respect. The Secretary must also find that the employment of Mexican workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of American farmworkers and that farmers have made reasonable efforts to obtain domestic labor. So there is every protection thrown around the American laborer.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a short statement?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been interested in what attitude the Department of State might have about this, and I wrote a letter very recently to the Department of State and would like to read the concluding statement of a letter written to me on May 10, 1961, signed by Mr. Brooks Hays. The statement is as follows:

> The Department of State supports the extension of the legislation for a 2-year period including the amendments to it, as proposed in H.R. 6032.

I would be glad for the gentleman to comment on that statement.

Mr. HOEVEN. The State Department favors the 2-year extension.

I now yield to my chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], to make any further comment he desires.

Mr. COOLEY. I assume they are the amendments which will be offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD], and I might say to my friend from Texas that these amendments were considered fully by our committee.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, a second reason for supporting this legislation is its beneficial effects on the Mexican economy—315,846 braceros who came to the United States in 1960, for seasonable farm labor created an important source of dollar exchange to the Republic of Mexico second only to the U.S. tourist trade. Those dollars earned by Mexicans were used to a great extent to purchase American goods and to help develop a growing middle class of landowners in Mexico. I want to remind the House also that it is the Communist Party of Mexico which is one of the most vocal opponents of this program, and for the reason no doubt that a growing and prosperous middle class in Mexico would spell the end to the chaos and poverty on which world communism flourishes.

It is important, I think, that we keep this in mind as our relations with Mexico are of the utmost importance in the context of our overall Latin American foreign policy.

Finally, the record is clear on the wetback problem. In fiscal year 1954, there were over 1 million illegal entrants, or wetbacks coming into this country. In fiscal 1960 there were only 29,651 such cases. The orderly and supervised system provided by Public Law 78 is so much superior to the most undesirable wetback method that no further comparisons need be drawn.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2010 is needed in many areas of the country. It is important to Mexican-American relations and it is important because the legislation is helping to eliminate the wetback problem which is a very undesirable economic and social problem.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN.]

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I attended all the hearings on this legislation, although I am not a member of the subcommittee which held such hearings. I represent an area which makes some use of bracero labor and, therefore, I have an immediate interest in the program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my compassion for the welfare of these people who work on the farms. It could be—and should be—improved, but the termination of the bracero program or the burdening of it with unworkable restrictions will not greatly change the condition of our citizens who have to migrate to work on farms. Such actions, however, would effect a great change in the price and availability of those perishable commodities on which these braceros are employed, and this would be reflected in the price and quality of the market basket of the housewife in

every congressional district in the country.

The people who are really familiar with this problem have stipulated that the labor is necessary and would be provided subject to protection of the job opportunities and working conditions of U.S. workers. I have talked privately with labor people who are really familiar with this problem and they privately admit that this labor is necessary; and earlier I read quotations that were printed in newspapers from representatives of two different labor organizations stipulating that there was a need for this bracero labor.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman has cotton in his district, does he not?

Mr. HAGEN of California. Yes.

Mr. COHELAN. I call the gentleman's attention to the following excerpt from an article in a Mexican labor magazine entitled "Comercio Exterior de Mexico":

> Among the causes of the serious disequilibrium of the Mexican foreign trade, Mr. Zevada pointed out the country's position of inferiority, shared with all other raw material exporting nations, in respect to the industrial centers of the world, whose import and price policies give no consideration to the raw materials' suppliers. The situation is further aggravated by certain cases of open disregard for the vital interests of the Mexican economy, exemplified by the U.S. cotton dumping on the international markets. Besides Mexico's terms of trade are increasingly deteriorating. Mexico has to pay more every day for her imports and, at the same time, she receives less for her exports. Finally, Mexico continues to be too dependent commercially on the United States, a country which buys half of Mexican exports and supplies 80 percent of Mexican purchases abroad. In spite of being such an important outlet for U.S. producers, Mexico does not receive fair treatment from her northern neighbor, as witnessed by the U.S. import quotas and raw materials price policy. Notwithstanding all this, Mr. Zevada pointed out, Mexico remains friendly to the United States and will go on trying to obtain through negotiations better trade conditions in the deals with that country.

The thesis of this article is that surplus cotton is produced by Mexican citizens working in the United States.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I will say to the gentleman that he is not completely familiar with cotton production in California, for braceros are not used in producing cotton in California with some minor exceptions.

Mr. COHELAN. But as a national program.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I am speaking solely of California. The kind of crops on which braceros are used in California are the row vegetable crops, the fruit and nut crops, and the vine crops.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman is not arguing that the bracero program does affect directly the supply and price of these crops.

Mr. HAGEN of California. If you terminated the bracero program tomorrow there would be merely a change in the pattern of production in the cotton business. In other words, the other areas of the country which do not use mechanization as we in California do would convert to a mechanized program and the jobs would just disappear for everybody, including both domestic and Mexican workers.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that cotton that is now being grown in the United States can be produced by this same labor in Mexico at about one-quarter of what is being paid in the United States?

Mr. HAGEN of California. The gentleman is entirely too high in his figures. Among competing crops in Mexico are cotton and tomatoes. Anyone familiar with the problem knows that a worker in Mexico gets about $1 per day whereas in this country on the same crops the workers make about $12.

Mr. COHELAN. Are we to infer from the gentleman's statement that if producers in Mexico are unable to market their crops that they are going to make money by exporting braceros instead? Is that what the gentleman is arguing?

Mr. HAGEN of California. I am not arguing that. What I will say to you is that this bracero program has permitted the development of independent farming in Mexico, the beginnings of an independent rural middle class. Mexico has a type of homestead program, the ejido program. Large numbers of these homesteaders have been successful only because of capital they have acquired in the United States through working in the bracero program. I say "large numbers" advisedly because the identity of persons in the bracero program shifts annually with respect to almost the entire complement of personnel. These farmer-landlord bracero returnees are a stable middle-class element in Mexico. The termination of the program would cause riots in these rural areas of Mexico, resulting in great political instability for the Mexican Government, and perhaps resulting in a radical shift to the left in the Government of Mexico. In the past the termination of recruiting of braceros in particular areas has caused disturbances.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DURNO].

Mr. DURNO. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to commend and associate myself with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I believe that gentleman has pointedly and dramatically stated exactly what this whole situation amounts to.

It would seem to me to be a far better idea to separate the problems of the migratory workers on the domestic level from the Mexican nationals.

I want to speak briefly about the problems of my own State of Oregon. We are one of the 24 States that utilize Mexican labor. Last year we employed 350. There are two valleys in Oregon that utilize these nationals, the Hood River Valley and the Rogue River Valley where I live. Our economy in the pear industry amounts to approximately $16 million a year, which would be partially destroyed if it were not possible for us to utilize these Mexican nationals. The reason is that we are isolated geographically. We are 300 miles from Portland and 300 miles, approximately, from Sacramento. We get our domestic source of labor from children who are anxiously awaiting the start of school and who are interested in getting started in football. We get workers off the streets of Portland. They are brought down to us; they work 1 or 2 days and get enough money to buy a bottle of wine, and then they are on their way back home.

The average turnover in the pear orchards of the Rogue River Valley is three times in the course of a 7- or 8-week season. Then we have the transitory worker on his way from California to Washington. He stops off in the Bartlett season. That is good money. They stop off while the Bartlett picking is going on, and then they move up to the apple orchards of Washington.

The result is we have no workers to handle this very perishable crop. So it is important that we have these Mexican nationals, and that is the time when we get them.

We have good laws in Oregon for the migratory workers. We have health measures, we have school measures, we have facilities in which they live. The Mexicans come back up there year after year, the same Mexicans to the same orchards. They make approximately $20 a day, and if the white domestic workers that come and go from day to day do not make that much it is because they are not worth it. This is all piecework.

So I say to you that in the State of Oregon it would be a severe tragedy, a real tragedy, and I beg of you to seriously consider the passage of this measure when you vote on it today.

NORTHWEST HORTICULTURAL COUNCIL,
Yakima, Wash., May 5, 1961.

Hon. EDWIN R. DURNO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We are advised that H.R. 2010 which would extend the Mexican farmworker program for 2 years will be brought onto the floor of the House on Wednesday, May 10, 1961.

Passage of this legislation is extremely important to agriculture in the State of Oregon. It assures an extra supply of labor when sufficient domestic labor is not available to harvest our fruit crops and to do stoop labor and other agricultural work.

We sincerely urge your support of this bill to the end that fruit and other valuable crops will not be lost through lack of adequate harvest labor.

Yours very truly,

ERNEST FALK,
Manager.

ROGUE RIVER ORCHARDS,
Medford, Oreg., March 18, 1961.

Hon. EDWIN R. DURNO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDDIE: We have been notified that Public Law 78 is docketed for consideration in the near future and I want to point out some of the reasons why renewal of this law is so important to pear growers in the Rogue River Valley.

Our fruit harvest in this area is usually about 7 to 8 weeks in duration, with normal starting dates around the 10th to the 15th

of August. Bartletts are always harvested first; they grow on smaller trees; they are the easiest to pick; and they have the most consistent crop from year to year. Pickers like to work in these and we have very few labor problems with this variety.

Following Bartletts we get into Anjous. These trees are large and the crop usually is scattered much more widely than on Bartletts. Pickers have to handle this fruit much more carefully in that it is much more subject to skin breaks, punctures, or bruising. Daily production per picker always drops off when we switch over to this variety and even though we increase the box rate paid, many of the pickers just plain lose interest in further work. Right about this same time of the Anjous switchover, we hit the Labor Day weekend—schools start immediately after that weekend and many family pickers leave to place their children in school. On top of this, the early apple harvest farther north is beginning and many of the experienced fruit workers leave here in order to be early birds on those longer harvest jobs. Likewise many others leave to return to the later harvest items in California. The Rogue River Valley is an isolated area—we have no nearby production areas from which interchange of labor can be depended upon.

Even this year, with our economic unemployment being at a high figure, it is our belief that a very, very small percentage of those unemployed would either be capable or willing to undertake pear harvest work and stay with it through the period when we needed them most. Adding all these things together leaves our area with a most serious labor shortage during the latter part of our harvest and it is at this time that we are most needful of supplementing our labor force with Mexican nationals.

We are sincere in asking that extension of Public Law 78 be very carefully considered.

Sincerely,

MARTIN LUTHER,
Manager.

HOOD RIVER TRAFFIC ASSOCIATION,
Hood River, Oreg., March 30, 1961.

Hon. EDWIN R. DURNO,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We urge your support of the extension of Public Law 78 which would grant a continuation of the Mexican labor law for a 2-year period. This will come before the House in the form of H.R. 2010.

As you know, Oregon uses very little of the Mexican help. However, the availability of Mexican help in other areas releases to Oregon and Washington farm operators migratory workers that otherwise would not be available to us. Thus, indirectly we here in Oregon benefit greatly by having available to other agricultural areas workers that come into this country under Public Law 78.

We trust we can count on your support for a favorable vote for the extension of Public Law 78 for the 2-year period proposed.

Yours very truly,

R. G. SCEARCE,
Secretary.

DUCKWALL BROS., INC.,
Hood River, Oreg., March 29, 1961.

Hon. EDWIN R. DURNO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DURNO: We understand hearings on H.R. 2010 have been completed. This is the bill extending Public Law 78, the Mexican labor law.

Here in the Hood River Valley we have not used Mexican nationals for the past 4 years. However, in 1955 and 1956 if it had not been for the help of between 300 to 400 Mexican nationals, the fruit loss would have been disastrous. Since those years we have not needed Mexican nationals; however, one of the reasons we haven't needed them was that the Medford area did bring them in, and as a result there was sufficient labor for both areas.

We feel the continuation of this program for at least the next 2 years is vital to the fruit interests here in Oregon. Moreover, we do not feel that the recommendations offered by the Labor Department are workable.

We urge that you support the extension of the program as it now exists.

Yours very truly,

WILSON APPELGREN.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee bill and in support of the amendments which will be offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD].

My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DURNO] has spoken of the need which Oregon has for the continuation of the bracero program. With all deference, I must differ with my friend and colleague.

The Oregon State Bureau of Labor, under the leadership of Labor Commissioner Norman Nilsen and his able assistant, Mr. Tom Current, has conducted exhaustive studies of the impact of the entire migrant labor program—both domestic and bracero—on the farm economy of Oregon. That study contains evidence of the so-called value of the bracero program to Oregon—evidence which makes me, as an Oregonian, feel that it makes little positive contribution to Oregon agriculture and no contribution to Oregon's economy.

For example, in the final report of the labor bureau, based on surveys made during 1958, it was determined that out of a total of 35,159 migrant agricultural workers in Oregon, exactly 199 of them were braceros, and those 199 were found in one of Oregon's 36 counties. Less than 1 percent, Mr. Chairman, of Oregon's agricultural work force is provided by Public Law 78. With high unemployment in Oregon—even at pear-picking time—there are, I am willing to suggest, 199 people in the State of Oregon who would be willing to work on the farms and in the orchards if decent minimum wages are paid to the domestic workers.

In its final report to the legislature, the Bureau of Labor of the State of Oregon—the official public body assigned the job of working with this problem—makes the following statement:

Because of the exploitation of the Mexican immigrant in years past, and in the present, he has been subjected to different economic treatment. As the result of the poorer condition of the native of Mexico, the immigrant has been more likely to accept low standards of wages and conditions. This has resulted in unfair competition with the Anglo-American for jobs.

The net result was unfavorable social acceptance for the Spanish-speaking immigrant and a continuing bondage from which he has had difficulty escaping because of this unfavorable social acceptance. This vicious cycle has had its effect on the second, third and further generations of the Mexican immigrant.

In the migrant labor field a further factor is present in that the Mexican immigrant has come from an agrarian economy and he and his descendants in large numbers regard farming as their lifetime occupation. As individuals they have developed physical endurance by working in the fields from childhood through adulthood. The Anglo-Americans who have followed the same pattern, of course, have developed the same endurance.

Because of the precarious economic existence he leads and the lack of alternatives, the Mexican immigrant is less demanding and less apt to voice his grievances.

The Anglo-American does not like to compete with such standards of conduct and regards the Spanish-American as a threat to his livelihood. This is further intensified when Mexican nationals are brought in under contract. The Anglo-American believes, with good evidence, that the movement of Mexican nationals into this country, either with or without contracts, is the agricultural industry's way of holding down wages and conditions. It does, in fact, interfere with the free interplay of labor supply and demand factors which in other industries mean better pay when more workers are needed.

The Oregon Labor Bureau report goes on to say:

Without getting into the international complications, nor commenting on whether or not the contract with the Republic of Mexico should or should not be renewed, it does not appear reasonable for one of the highest farm wage States in the country to have to import Mexican nationals.

The State of Oregon, Mr. Chairman, does not believe that the importation of braceros into Oregon under Public Law 78 is reasonable. Apparently, since a total of 199 braceros sufficed to meet the entire needs of the State of Oregon in a year when over 35,000 seasonal workers were employed, there is no substantial evidence that the growers need them. Unless the suspicions of the domestic migrants—and the bureau of labor—are true, and the purpose of the bracero program is simply to keep wages and working conditions depressed for domestic workers, then I, for one, cannot see why there is such pressure to continue this program.

The concern of many groups, both in the United States and in Mexico, for the conditions under which bracero labor is transported, for example, is highlighted by a story which appeared in the Inter-American Labor Bulletin of May 1961. Under unanimous consent, I include a news story at this point in my remarks:

NINETY-SIX MEXICAN WORKERS BADLY INJURED AS OVERCROWDED, UNSAFE TRUCKS COLLIDE—FULL DETAILS NOT AVAILABLE 5 DAYS LATER AS EMPLOYEES TRY TO COVER VIOLATIONS

At least 96 braceros being transported to their place of employment in Arizona in two greatly overcrowded and unsafe trucks have been reported badly injured in the worst highway accident in the history of the Mexican contract labor program.

The accident occurred in the desert 2 miles from the Arizona camp from which the workers were being moved, 43 miles west of Buckeye, Ariz., at 6 a.m., April 20. Because the braceros were widely dispersed to different hospitals, nursing homes, and farms after the accident in an apparent effort by the farm employers to cover up the details and the number injured, full information had not been obtained by State or Federal authorities even 5 days after the accident, when this issue of the IALB went to press.

Both the U.S. Department of Labor and the Arizona Corporation Commission immediately sent investigators into the field

and promised that a full report would be forthcoming. The penalty for violation of Labor Department rules for transporting workers is denial to the employer involved of any future use of Mexican workers.

Preliminary information gathered from these agencies and by field investigators of the U.S. section of the Joint United States-Mexico Trade Union Committee is that the braceros involved were employed by Calzona, a big corporation farm, which had obtained the workers through a labor contractor from a farm association in California.

PACKED LIKE SARDINES

E. P. Theiss, AFL–CIO regional director in Arizona, said he had been told that a total of between 150 and 199 workers had been packed liked sardines in two trucks with plywood sides, having only four benches and no backs. The trucks were licensed by the State of California to haul a maximum of only 70 and 72 workers each. Four more workers than the permissible total of 142 had already been located at press time.

One of the trucks plowed into the back of the other when it had to stop quickly on the highway. The front vehicle had no rear bumper. Neither driver had an Arizona driving permit.

Spare tires had been thrown in the back of the truck with the men instead of being attached properly in a carrier. On impact, bodies hit the front of the truck with so much force that they flattened a water tank there.

SEVENTY-ONE INJURED TAKEN TO FARM

Twenty-five of the braceros were immediately hospitalized. Six hours after the accident 71 others were located by an investigator for the State on a nearby farm and in need of medical attention. They were immediately ordered to the hospital.

Asked why he had not called a doctor, the farmer replied merely that he had been thinking about doing so.

The accident was the third serious accident involving the hauling of farmworkers in Arizona to occur within the last 18 months.

The importation of Mexican contract labor was begun to meet a shortage of labor for the harvesting of our Nation's crops. If the unemployment reports in the daily newspapers do not convince my colleagues that there is no shortage of labor today, anywhere in the Nation, I invite him to visit the employment services, the hiring halls, the breadlines, and the rescue missions in any part of our great Nation. He will find no labor shortage, no lack of men willing and able to work at any job which will offer a living wage. The rub may be in those last four words—"offer a living wage."

The low level of wages in this field, and the availability of Mexican nationals in substantial quantities, is not a reflection of a labor shortage, but rather a cause of a domestic labor surplus. To be sure, the domestic migrants forced off the large corporate farms by braceros can find work in other areas, on other farms. But the wages which they can expect to receive, the treatment which they can look forward to, are all held down by the fact that braceros are always available—just beyond the horizon. Last year, when efforts were made to organize some of the domestic migrants, those attempting to organize unions found braceros, imported under Public Law 78, doing the work instead. Under other circumstances, the braceros might be considered as "scabs," but I think it a little unfair to apply the word to them as the situation stands.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that a red flag is raised when there is talk about the possibility of organizing the men and women who work on America's farms. Many of my colleagues have made ringing speeches about labor monopoly and big unionism and the other things that are supposed to menance the small businessman. But I have noticed that even the strongest opponents of everything organized labor does today, usually begin their remarks with a statement to the effect that unions were necessary in the bad old days, and they have done much good for the workers. I suggest that the conditions on our farms today are the conditions which the unions of long ago were organized to banish from the factories and mines and mills. If ever a segment of the industrial population needed organization, and the benefits that flow from it, it is the agricultural labor force of 1961.

But the amendments offered by the gentleman from Iowa do not seek to unionize the farmworker. This we leave to his own initiative, and to his own choice. What it does seek to do is to prevent the use of imported labor to continually depress the domestic worker's living standards, his wages, and his conditions of labor.

Many of our colleagues, during the recent debate on minimum wage legislation, spoke of the evils of foreign competition, and the spectacle of low-paid workers abroad being able to undercut the wages of Americans at home. But the committee bill, Mr. Chairman, is not content with allowing underpaid workers abroad to depress domestic wage scales. It goes so far as to encourage the importation of these workers. Let me suggest to those who have spoken so movingly about American jobs being priced out of the market, that here is an opportunity to do something about it. Here is an opportunity to protect the living standards of essential American workers—without whose labor we could not eat.

Thus far, I have talked primarily about the effect of Public Law 78 upon our own people. I believe that these effects are, in themselves, sufficient reason to amend the program substantially.

But let us turn to another aspect of the entire controversy. Let us look at the effect this program has on our relations with our nearest Latin American neighbor—our sister Republic—Mexico.

It is quite true that the Mexican Government, officially speaking, has approved of the Public Law 78 program, and has certified its approval by negotiating the contracts governing conditions of employment and recruiting. But in this program, might we not have the proverbial tiger by the tail?

It seems to me Mr. Chairman, that tremendous harm could be done to our relations with our nearest neighbors to the south if some Mexican Fidelista should take to the airwaves and the television screens, and, for anti-American purposes, discuss the bracero program, not as it might be described in the pages of some propaganda journal, but as it really exists.

The spectacle of the United States as a vast market for underpaid, exploited Mexican labor could do more to wreck the Alliance for Progress than all the rantings about "Yanqui imperialismo" that emanate from Havana.

These considerations, of course, deal with our foreign policy—with our hopes to let the Western Hemisphere become an impregnable fortress against the infection of totalitarianism.

We cannot expect to see those high hopes come to fruition if allegations of "Yankee exploitation" join the myth of "Yankee imperialism" in the vision which our southern neighbors accept as a true picture of the United States.

But, we do not have to look abroad for arguments against the extension of Public Law 78 under its present terms. There is ample evidence of a purely domestic nature for demanding amendment.

If the House will approve the substitute amendments of the gentleman from Iowa—substitutes which enjoy the support of the White House, the Labor Department, the National Council of Churches, the National Catholic Welfare Council, and a host of other organizations dedicated to decency in agricultural employment—if the House will approve this substitute, the importation of Mexican nationals can continue where needed, but not where they are imported for the purpose of undercutting the wages of American workers. Employers will be required to offer domestic labor conditions of employment roughly comparable to those already enjoyed by the Public Law 78 employees.

The Coad amendment will bring a much needed change and will undo a situation in which hundreds of thousands of Americans and hundreds of thousands of imported workers are chasing each other around a merry-go-round of declining wages, subhuman working conditions, and exploitation of which we can only be ashamed.

Mr. JOELSON, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose any program designed to encourage the importation of Mexican agricultural workers to harvest our crops at substandard rates of pay, especially at a time when millions of Americans are unemployed.

We hear the argument advanced that under the proposed law, Mexican workers would not be admitted unless the Department of Labor certifies that domestic workers are not available. However, this argument loses sight of the fact that if it were not for the easy availability of exploitable Mexican workers, domestic workers would become available because the growers would be obliged to pay agricultural workers a living wage.

Farmworkers are deprived by law of the benefit of minimum wage legislation. The importation of Mexican labor will

further deprive American workers of the operation of the economic law of supply and demand. It is beyond dispute that if Mexican labor were not available, American workers would be able to obtain higher wages.

Many of the workers involved are in the cotton-growing regions. The cotton-growers receive Federal subsidies, and are apparently very happy to receive this bounty from the Federal Government. Yet they oppose wage and hour legislation for farmworkers, pay as little as 50 cents an hour in some cases, and want the Government to aid them to import foreign labor when Americans refuse to work for such pay.

I say that the Government should not be party to this peonage, and I shall vote against the proposed law.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the minute. It has become very apparent in our argument against the rule that we are certainly not going to have a very good chance to defend our action or to make our case. I, however, will extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I hope they will be read by the House, and we will also have full opportunity to present our case under the 5-minute rule.

The Mexican farm labor importation program is a disgrace to a Nation which prides itself on its affluence and high standard of living.

It is a program which feeds on poverty in Mexico, and which increases poverty at home. It has been denounced by religious leaders of all faiths—both in the United States and Mexico—and has been repudiated by responsible citizens from all walks of life. In its present form, it is a black mark against the domestic policy of the United States—a black mark which needs to be erased as quickly as possible.

To me, it seems incredible that the U.S. Government should continue to perpetuate such a program for the benefit of less than 2 percent of the farm employers in the United States. Over 98 percent of our farmers employ citizen labor exclusively. Yet, those who use foreign labor—chiefly large growers in a few Western and Southwestern States—have the audacity to tell a committee of the U.S. Congress that American workers will not do stoop labor on the farm. What is even more incredible is that a distinguished committee of the House of Representatives will believe these growers, despite all of the evidence to the contrary.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program which makes a mockery of the free enterprise system. It says, in effect, that if American workers refuse the rock-bottom wages and working conditions offered them by farm employers that the U.S. Government will bring in poverty-stricken foreign workers to satisfy the employers' needs. Repeatedly the proponents of Public Law 78 are heard to espouse their love and undying loyalty to the free enterprise system and the law of supply and demand. But where, may I ask, does the law of supply and demand operate here?

The effect of this program has on the workers who are displaced is as disastrous as the program itself. These depressed workers must pack their families, like cattle, into decrepit trucks, buses, and jalopies and "hit the road." They must accept work wherever they can find it, and if the wages offered are too low for the combined efforts of mothers and fathers to support their families, the children must go into the fields. If any of you have seen the conditions under which most of these American migratory laborers work and live, you know it is not necessary to go abroad to see people living in abject poverty.

The implications of the substandard labor conditions which exist on U.S. farms are not solely economic—they are moral as well. This is a nation which prides itself on its moral stature—yet it allows a system such as this to continue unchecked. As the leader of the free world, the United States cannot afford to perpetuate a farm labor system which is rooted in poverty and destitution.

H.R. 2010, by providing a carte blanche 2-year extension of Public Law 78, would merely perpetuate this deplorable system without relief. It would give congressional approval to the destitution, the underemployment, and the exploitation of about 2 million domestic farmworkers who are already at the bottom rung of the economic ladder.

The Mexican farm labor program has been denounced not only by church groups, labor unions, consumer and civic bodies; it has been denounced by farm groups as well—especially those farm organizations representing small, family farmers. These organizations realize that if a large grower or processing corporation is able to obtain an unlimited quantity of labor for low wages, the labor performed by a farm operator and the members of his family is of equally low value. They also realize that that availability of Mexican labor causes overproduction and a resulting decline in the prices small growers receive for their products.

The American Grange has gone on record as saying that—

> Continued extensions of Public Law 78 are [not] in the best interests of a majority of American farmers.

The Farmers Union has stated:

> We do not believe that a majority of American farmers favor a future for our Nation's agriculture that is built on a mud sill of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, the question we must decide then today is this—"Shall we make it a matter of public policy to perpetuate a farm labor system based on poverty and destitution both at home and in Mexico, or shall we attempt now to eliminate this blight from the American scene?"

The American Farm Bureau Federation and its bracero-using allies want us to vote for H.R. 2010 and perpetuate these conditions. I say that the time has come when these people must be told by the Congress of the United States that this country no longer considers labor a commodity to be bought at the lowest possible price.

We in this Congress represent the people of the United States. Can we put the American public into the position of condoning the importation of cheap labor from destitute foreign countries for the benefit of some of the richest agricultural producers in the world, notwithstanding the decline in farm prices? Can this Nation, as the leader of the free world, stay smug in the belief that the rest of the world will remain blind to the fact that we are exploiting the poor of both the United States and Mexico so that less than 2 percent of America's farmers can have cheap labor?

I hope that the House of Representatives will answer these questions with a resounding "No."

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to include a table indicating a breakdown by States of how braceros were employed in 1959. I believe that table has particular pertinency to our discussion today.

Total number of farms and number of farms on which Mexicans were employed, by States using Mexicans, 1959

State	Total number of farms	Number of farms on which Mexicans were employed	Farms on which Mexicans were employed as a percent of total farms
Total, 25 States	2,314,652	48,788	2.1
Total, 48 States	3,700,000	48,788	1.4
Arizona	7,219	923	12.8
Arkansas	95,009	2,641	2.8
California	99,260	12,176	12.3
Colorado	33,390	2,060	6.2
Georgia	106,347	102	.1
Illinois	154,640	3	(1)
Indiana	128,160	46	(1)
Iowa	174,707	10	(1)
Kansas	104,345	5	(1)
Kentucky	150,984	9	(1)
Michigan	111,817	3,921	3.5
Minnesota	145,662	21	(1)
Missouri	168,673	206	.1
Montana	28,957	749	2.6
Nebraska	90,475	562	.6
Nevada	2,350	27	1.1
New Mexico	15,919	1,888	11.9
North Dakota	54,928	13	(1)
Oregon	42,573	15	(1)
South Dakota	55,726	76	.1
Tennessee	157,688	65	(1)
Texas	227,054	22,310	9.8
Utah	17,811	211	1.2
Wisconsin	131,215	213	.2
Wyoming	9,743	536	5.5

[1] Less than 0.05 percent.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Office of Program Review and Analysis, Farm Labor and Migration Studies, Mar. 10, 1961.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 509 of such Act, as amended, is amended by striking "December 31, 1961," and inserting "December 31, 1965".

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "December 31, 1965" and insert "December 31, 1963".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COAD: On page 1, add the following new paragraph: "That section 501 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by deleting the semicolon at the end of clause numbered '(1)' and adding the following at the end of the clause, *'Provided, however,* That no workers recruited under this title shall be made available to any employer or permitted to remain in the employ of any employer for employment involving the operation of or work on power driven machinery, except in specific cases when found by the Secretary of Labor necessary for a temporary period to avoid undue hardship.'"

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, it had been my original plan to offer an amendment in the form of a substitute, H.R. 6032. However, I would like to announce, as I have previously—at least, I would like to repeat what I previously said—that I am going to offer a series of amendments which, in substance, is H.R. 6032 broken down so that we will have the opportunity to vote on the several provisions that it contains.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that H.R. 6032 embodies the amendments which have been supported and are supported by the administration. It is only upon the adoption of these amendments that the administration supports the extension of the Mexican farm labor bill.

Now, this first amendment, which has just been read, is a very simple amendment. I am sure we are aware of its simplicity when we realize that all that it does is this: It states that the Mexican workers imported into this country are not to become operators of or to work on power-driven machinery except in specific cases when found by the Secretary of Labor that it is necessary for a temporary period to avoid undue hardship.

What is being done here is this: The operation of power-driven machinery on a farm is still classified as at least a semiskilled job. If we are to import labor—and a case is being made that American workers will not do stoop labor—then I think we ought to recognize the fact that the operation of power-driven machinery is the kind of work which our American people will do. I know enough from my own relationship to actual farm operations that people who have to operate power-driven machinery must obviously be trained. They have to know what they are doing.

Mechanized implements are very technical, what with power lifts and hydraulic systems, and so on. So this is work that should be done by Americans, and I believe it is not asking too much to place some of our 1,400,000 unemployed and underemployed in this semiskilled position of operating power machinery.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COAD. I yield.

Mr. GATHINGS. Can the gentleman state to the committee to what extent Mexican nationals are used in this type of work?

Mr. COAD. I do not know exactly what the percentage would be, but I understand that in this last year approximately 20,000 Mexican workers were involved in work of this nature.

Mr. GATHINGS. Where were they doing this work, in what locations?

Mr. COAD. There are 18 States in which this kind of work is going on. I am not qualified to say that there are just so many in certain States.

Mr. GATHINGS. I cannot understand why the gentleman would make a statement unless he could give us some facts to back it up.

Mr. COAD. I am stating the fact that any time a Mexican worker is operating a machine he is obviously displacing an American worker who should be operating the machine. This is merely language to be placed in the law to prohibit that. If the point is valid, then it is valid whether there are 10 or 10,000 that are involved.

Mr. GATHINGS. I have been working on this program for a great many years and I do not recall any testimony of them being used in the operation of machinery.

Mr. COAD. I am confident that there are. I understand the authority for that is the Department of Labor. Whether it has been witnessed by the gentleman from Arkansas or not, it is happening. And as I said, the point is just as valid whether there are 10 who are operating machines or 10,000. If American workers are being displaced in this kind of semiskilled or skilled work, then something should be written into the law to prevent that. That is all that I am asking.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise merely to make one observation; and that is that operation of machinery as contemplated by this amendment has no place in this bill. No Mexican worker could possibly be employed to operate machinery if in fact there was a domestic worker available. That ought to end it. I ask for a vote against the amendment.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD], the author of this amendment, about this situation: I represent a district of small farmers. The average size of their farms is under 100 acres, and it is the major single industry of the district I represent. The farmers in my district depend on Mexican migrant labor for about 30 percent of our crop. One of the things the farmers of my district have been concerned with is the matter of the regulations and their enforcement, particularly enforcement. May I ask the gentleman from Iowa what is meant by the operation of farm equipment? Does this mean the moving of irrigation pipe which the farmers in my district have been stopped from doing? Does it mean turning on valves, which the farmers have been prevented from doing? There are a number of us who might be sympathetic to the position of the gentleman from Iowa who find it impossible to go along because of the method in which these regulations have been enforced in the past. I should like the gentleman from Iowa to address himself to what he means by his amendment as it applies to the operation of these mechanical means of farming.

Mr. COAD. The gentleman did not hear correctly, perhaps, the wording of the amendment. It did not state "mechanical." The words were "operating power-driven machinery." Power-driven machinery refers to the actual operation of a tractor or a combine. I would certainly state for the legislative record on this that irrigation where the water flows by power pumping, that the handling of irrigation pipe, certainly would not qualify; but if he is the operator of a power station that pumps the irrigation water, then it would come under the power-driven concept.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I think this should be plain in the RECORD. It is very difficult in the assignment of agricultural labor to know just when something can be done and when it cannot be done. This means penalizing the efficient operation of those farms. I believe the legislative record should be absolutely explicit for those of us who might be in favor of the amendment otherwise.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if under his amendment a Mexican national could even assist in changing a tire on a tractor. His amendment refers to working on machinery. If the laborer is working on a tractor he is working on machinery.

Mr. COAD. The operation is work on power-driven machinery.

Mr. COOLEY. You would not let him operate it or work on it in any way. Even if it broke down in the field and they had to move it along the road and they called in some Mexican nationals to help, they could not even touch it? That is how we think the amendment is.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Would not the Mexican bracero have a right to haul cotton to the gin?

Mr. COAD. On what?

Mr. POAGE. If he did not use a cart, and we do not have many carts left, naturally he would haul it on a truck.

Mr. COAD. No, I do not think he has a right to drive a truck and haul it to the market.

Mr. POAGE. Can he help load it on the truck?

Mr. COAD. Certainly he can.

Mr. POAGE. Is not that the operation of power-driven machinery?

Mr. COAD. No, certainly not.

Mr. POAGE. How are you going to get it on there without operating machinery? How are you going to get the end boards off without operating on the power-driven machinery?

Mr. COAD. I think anybody can drive anything to the point of ridiculousness, and I appreciate the gentleman's doing it.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. May I ask the gentleman, in this answer to the gentleman from North Carolina, does he mean operation?

Mr. COAD. That is exactly it, it is the operation.

Mr. COOLEY. It says work on power-driven machinery. It does not say operate, it says work on it.

Mr. COAD. That is your point, and as I said, it goes to the point of ridiculousness, the same as the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COOLEY. And it is a good point.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have come down to the crux of some problems that we face here. I think I have tried to make our position fairly clear on this issue. I supported Public Law 78 in years past, and I have said I propose to support the present extension because I think in a couple of years, we may be able to work out some of these problems. I want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, I am completely sympathetic with what I believe to be the objectives of his amendment. So, for that reason, I would like to direct some questions to him. I have been on this floor, I think, every year since I have been in Congress for the past 7 years, and I have made a plea for the continuation of this program because of our need for stoop labor. To my good friends, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], and the gentlemen on the committee, I say—let us be consistent. We are talking about a need for stoop labor. I am talking of the people who harvest our vegetables and who harvest our fruit and who actually do the work, even in picking your cotton and so on. But, I am opposed to the use of these Mexican nationals to drive our tractors and to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], I want to say I would certainly oppose the driving of a tractor to town to haul a bale of cotton because we have plenty of Americans who are happy and ready to do that kind of work. I ask the gentleman from Iowa this question. Is it not a fact that the gentleman simply seeks by his amendment to preclude the use of Mexican nationals so far as driving a tractor is concerned and the operation of harvesting machinery and other farm machinery; is that right?

Mr. COAD. That is exactly right.

Mr. SISK. Let me suggest to the gentleman, I think the wording of his amendment may not be, at least in my opinion, probably as good as it could have been if he had authorized the Secretary by regulation to have required that no nationals be used in this field which would have given him some flexibility. I believe the amendment in such a form would be somewhat better. The interpretations that some of our friends have attempted to place on this, of course, as the gentleman realizes, can be a little ridiculous. The point is—I am heartily in favor of restricting this Mexican national labor to those situations where justification can be found for the use of this Mexican labor to stoop labor and to keep them off machinery and the handling of equipment. I do not care if it even is the matter of changing a tire because there are plenty of Americans in this country who are in the tire business, and they would be glad to do the work of changing a tire. So I am not in favor of having Mexican nationals change tires.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not think the gentleman wants to do anything to weaken this bill or to lessen the chances of passing this bill. Why should we accept an amendment that is just as ridiculous as this discussion has indicated it to be?

You know and I know and this committee knows that this situation can be very aggravated if the Secretary of Labor must first affirmatively find that there is no tractor driver available in the domestic labor market before he can permit a Mexican national to get on that tractor.

Mr. SISK. I agree completely with the chairman's contention—that is right—but let me say this. It seems that for some peculiar reason, however, they seem to find justification for a need even for a tractor driver, and yet, I know to my own knowledge that a reasonable rate for tractor driving of $1.50 or $2 or $2.50 an hour is being paid. I am sure my friend will agree that if we are going to pay that kind of money, they can get tractor drivers; is that not right?

Mr. COOLEY. What you are saying, and I do not think you intend to do it, what you are doing is indicting the administrators of this program—the labor officials in the Department of Labor.

Mr. SISK. No, I do not think I am indicting them at all.

Mr. COOLEY. As I say, I do not think you intend to do that, but you are saying that they can always find a justification for this and find that there is nobody there to do that work.

Mr. SISK. Of course, you cannot find them and I think my friend will agree with me that you probably cannot get a tractor driver for 40 cents and 50 cents an hour. Let us just be frank about this. I think the gentleman and I are on the same side with reference to the need to extend this program, but I think we should at least be consistent and let us use these people to do the stoop labor which Americans do not want to do and are unwilling to do; is that not right?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman does not think this program is well administered why does he not have his committee go down to the Department of Labor and suggest that they amend their rules and regulations? I think he ought to admit that this program has been properly and well administered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SISK. I am sorry to say that I cannot agree that this program has always been perfectly administered at all times or in all areas.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] a few questions.

My understanding is, and certainly in my district it is prohibited, for any Mexican national under the bracero program to operate any mechanically driven vehicle. I have had at least a dozen farmers in my district have their entire allotment of Mexican labor withdrawn from their farms because one Mexican bracero moved a tractor from the field into a shed when it was raining.

If this law is not being administered uniformly throughout the State of California, it should be. I do not know about the rest of the country. I wish the gentleman from Fresno would give me an instance of any farm in his district where the Mexican bracero is operating mechanically driven vehicles.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield.

Mr. SISK. I shall be happy to answer the gentleman's question. So far as I know, in my own district we are not using braceros as tractor drivers or operators of harvesting machinery. The statement that I made was a quotation of a statement that the Department of Labor made as late as yesterday, a statement that in some areas of the country these braceros are being used to operate power-driven equipment.

In my opinion, this is contrary to the plea I have made and that many others have made throughout the years. We want stoop labor. Generally, in my area I know of none used in this way, and I do not think they should. But if the law needs strengthening to take care of this, I think the gentleman's amendment does have merit.

Mr. UTT. I would like to ask the gentleman why do they not drive tractors in his district?

Mr. SISK. It is my understanding that under the regulation and the requirements of the people who are in control of the program they simply are not permitted to use them for that purpose.

Mr. UTT. That is absolutely correct, and I cannot understand why there is not universal administration of this law. They have the administrative power, why are they not using it? Why should we have an additional law to which they can add a peculiar regulation that will throw us all out of kilter again?

Mr. SISK. I think I find myself in complete agreement with my colleague from California. It seems to me that this should be true all across the belt where they are being used. That is a statement made by Department people. This is not true in all areas of the country. I do not know where they are using them, whether in Arkansas, Texas, or somewhere else. I have been told they are using them as tractor drivers and operators of mechanical equipment.

What is fair for the goose is fair for the gander.

Mr. UTT. The gentleman's testimony is entirely hearsay, and so is the testimony of these other gentlemen.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. The gentleman has had extensive practical farm experience, as many others in this body have had that experience. Would the gentleman, or would any other Member having had such experience, be so foolish as to take an expensive piece of farm equipment which requires skill in its operation and maintenance and entrust it to a Mexican bracero who has had no experience with that type of equipment? Would it be good business?

Mr. UTT. No.

Mr. GUBSER. Would the gentleman do it?

Mr. UTT. No.

Mr. GUBSER. And no other experienced farmer would do it.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. COAD. I would like to refer to the Mexican Consultants Report that was put out. This was actually made for the Secretary of Labor. On page 5, paragraph 2, they refer to skilled occupations. There are two paragraphs where this whole situation is gone through, and I would like to read a sentence or two.

> In addition to those employed in tractor operations and as ranch hands, thousands are engaged in skilled and semiskilled jobs.

Mr. UTT. What is the authority for that statement?

Mr. COAD. That is what I am saying.

Mr. UTT. Is this the report authored by Norman Thomas, the Socialist? and Helen Gahagen Douglas?

Mr. COAD. One is Edward J. Thye of Minnesota. Is he a Socialist? He is of your own party and a former Senator. If he is a Socialist, I will let the gentleman's remark stand.

Also, in addition, it says:

> Recently, the Department has been confronted with the problem of Mexican workers penetrating into field packing and sorting of vegetables as new machine methods were introduced and the work transferred from the shed to the fields. This work was formerly done by packingshed operators at higher wage rates in sheds.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, it has been my privilege on several occasions to try to include in the minimum wage and hour law of this country the individuals who are working on about 3,600 industrial farms in our Nation.

Let me say that my purpose in trying to bring them in under the minimum wage law was to prevent these big organized farm groups, such as the Di Georgia farm in the San Joaquin Valley of California employing these people. They are driving what we know as the ordinary farmers out of business because they cannot compete with that mass production of these big farms.

It was my pleasure in 1950 to conduct a labor hearing in Bakersfield, Calif., growing out of the strike on the Di Georgia farm. The Federal immigration and naturalization inspector who testified there said that in the previous 90 days he had taken 315 Mexican individuals off of that farm and deported them to Mexico. They are brought in here under these contracts. No attention is paid to them. They leave the farm to which they are under contract and they appear somewhere else miles away. They report to one of these big farms and go to work.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Was this in 1950, that the gentleman spoke of?

Mr. BAILEY. That was 1950. I agree that conditions may have changed, but at that time there were only 2,100 of those mass production farms. Now there are between 3,600 and 3,700 that belong under the provisions of the Minimum Wage Act. Certainly the 50-cent wage limit carried in this bill is no comparison to the $1.25 minimum we fixed on the floor of the House the other day.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Is it not true that in 1950 these men must have been wetbacks, here illegally, whereas now the workers on these farms are here legally under treaty with the Republic of Mexico?

Mr. BAILEY. I say that this legislation has been lousy legislation all along. It does not belong on the statute books. And, I repeat again, if it would have come before the Labor Committee, where it belonged, it would not be here today.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. COAD. This advisory committee that made this consultants' study to the Secretary of Labor consisted of the following gentlemen:

The four men who reported to the Secretary of Labor were: Ex-Senator Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota, one of the men who helped write Public Law 78; Rufus B. von Kleinsmid, chancellor of the University of Southern California and ex-president of the University of Arizona; Glenn E. Garrett, executive director of the Good Neighbor Commission and chairman of the Texas Council on Migratory Labor; and Msgr. George G. Higgins, social action director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The gentleman from West Virginia spoke a few minutes ago of the number of braceros who do not return to their country. In the report to the Mexican bishops who, by the way, oppose this bracero program—a report not of 1950 but of 1957—it is pointed out that since 1942 about 2.5 million braceros, have entered the United States under legal contract. Four out of every ten have not returned to their homes and families in Mexico, which I certainly think supports the contention made by the gentleman from West Virginia a few minutes ago.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentlewoman for her very important contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to make a couple of comments. In the first place, as you undoubtedly know by this time, I am opposed to the extension of Public Law 78. However, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has introduced and will continue to introduce certain amendments which are well known to us, and I shall support those amendments. Should these amendments by some chance not be approved, I shall have some amendments to suggest myself at the appropriate time. I want to take this opportunity to also point out that the amendments which are being introduced by the gentleman from Iowa have the full support of the administration.

In a press release dated April 24, 1961, Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg stated, and I quote:

> It is my view and the view of the administration that the power and authority of government should not be used in a manner which tends to perpetuate or lower the already depressed economic condition of U.S. farmworkers. Evidence accumulated by the Department of Labor proves beyond doubt that the mass importation of Mexican labor has had, and is having, an adverse effect on the wages, working conditions, and employment opportunities of U.S. farmworkers. At a time when unemployment is a major problem in the United States, there can be no justification for continuing such a program unless action is taken to protect the interests of U.S. farmworkers.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to move from that for a moment and take this opportunity to discuss a couple of points quickly. One is in connection with the effect this is going to have upon the Republic of Mexico. I would call attention to the report that was filed by my distinguished colleague from Iowa [Mr. COAD] wherein he refers to this precisely in an item that is labeled on page 28, "Effect on Mexico":

> The Mexican farm labor importation program is, in effect, a point 4 program to Mexico, the supporters of Public Law 78 have testified. The fact is that Public Law 78 is not a foreign aid program, but a program to supply American farmers with supplemental labor. It must be examined on this basis, and not on the basis of a point 4 program. While it is true that the money brought home by Mexican braceros is of help to the Mexican economy, it cannot be argued that this is a legitimate justification for a program which is undermining the economic position of American farmworkers.

And as was stated in the minority report of this committee in 1960:

> One can hardly expect the American farmworker to shoulder the burden of providing foreign aid to Mexico. If Mexico is to be helped, let us do it through our regular aid program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the majority leader is always very clear and cogent and convincing, but somehow he does not convince me that his position on this bill at the moment is right. He says he has in the past voted for the Mexican labor bill because he was anxious to do something to improve the lot of the Mexican workers. This bill has the same reasons behind it as the original bill. It was primarily to protect the Mexican worker, who before the program was referred to as a wetback. He was slipping across the border, staying away from the immigration authorities, being mistreated and exploited. Since we have had the program that situation has greatly improved. The Mexican worker is by this program protected by regulations of the Department of Labor. The Mexican workers are not mistreated, as this debate has indicated. If the Mexican worker is mistreated the Mexican Government can insist on the cancellation of the contract. It can refuse to enter into a contract or into an agreement with our Government for the use of this labor. This program is important to the economy of Mexico because these workers come here and work in our fields and earn from $100 million to $150 million a year, and then take it back home to support their families.

Mr. McCORMACK. My remarks were not in connection with the Mexican workers. I was talking about the American citizens. The gentleman is trying to bring it back to the Mexicans. I was talking about American citizens.

Mr. COOLEY. I will talk directly about that. I do not think the gentleman comprehends the scope of his amendment or the effect of it. The effect of his amendment would be to create a terrific problem in all the areas where the workers would be used. You have the problem of housing, you have the problem of health, you have the problem of schools. You will have the population of the American States being shifted from one area of the country to the other, and then we will have a real harvest of shame, as was said in this debate. I know the gentleman's heart is right, he wants to do the right thing, but I am afraid if we adopted this amendment we would not only destroy the program but bring about a situation which would be intolerable.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman referred to housing. My amendment refers to terms and conditions of employment, which includes wages, hours, housing, and so forth, reasonably comparable to those offered to foreign workers. That is what my amendment calls for.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right so far, but do not stop. Just read it all. It says: "at terms and conditions of employment" and "wages and hours of work" and "employment guarantees, transportation." Transportation from where? From remote and distant places in this great vast Republic—to any other place.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows that that is not so.

Mr. COOLEY. What?

Mr. McCORMACK. You know that that is not so.

Mr. COOLEY. It says "transportation."

Mr. McCORMACK. I know and you know that you do not take them from Mississippi, as you tell me, and ship them out to California.

Mr. COOLEY. We certainly did in the old farm security days. When I went out to investigate in the old farm security days, I found a whole colony of them from Mississippi sitting on a main street in Portland, Oreg. Don't tell me that they do not transfer them around. It says "housing." We have described the housing and the regulations that are now in effect. One member of my committee told me that he had studied this carefully and he had concluded that his fraternity house back in his college days could not meet the minimum requirements set up by the Department of Labor.

Mr. McCORMACK. But it is all comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do you object to American workers getting the same wages and housing and so forth as are given to foreign workers?

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly do object to this amendment. It would mean transporting workers and their wives and children across the country, providing free housing, meals, and other benefits without any assurance that they would work even one day in the job they had been recruited for.

Mr. McCORMACK. Apparently, you take this position in opposition judging by the attitude you are taking now.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to make one thing perfectly clear.

Mr. McCORMACK. You cannot read into my amendment something that is not there—not while I am present on the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. I cannot hear them when they are both talking at once.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not trying to read anything into the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has the floor.

Mr. COOLEY. It says further "occupational insurance and subsistence, reasonably comparable"—and so forth. Now I would like to state my objections.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would you object to what is reasonable?

Mr. COOLEY. All right, I will read it all. I do not want to fuss about it. None of this has any effect in my State or district. It says, "reasonably comparable to those offered foreign workers." My objection to it, Mr. Chairman, is that it will bring about a situation in this country which we hope will never happen again. We will go right back to the wetback days. We will go back to the situation where we had these people traveling from one end of the country to the other dragging their little children with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have listened intently to this debate this afternoon, and as of this time and this very moment, I have not heard what Edward R. Murrow's position is on this.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know what Mr. Murrow's position is. I have not seen the movie that the gentleman has reference to, but I understand it is called "The Harvest of Shame" and is not based upon the use of Mexican labor but of domestic labor and it does not truly reflect the situation that exists in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment do now close.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment. Would that be cut off?

Mr. COOLEY. My request would not cut that out. I asked that debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. This is an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. May I have a couple of minutes?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Tennessee may have all the time as far as I am concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BASS of Tennessee to the amendment offered by Mr. COAD: Strike out the words on line 7 "or work on."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS] to the Coad amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division demanded by Mr. COAD there were—ayes 52, noes 125.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COAD) there were—ayes 75, noes 130.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, in the beginning of the maneuvering on this bill, I asked the gentleman from North Carolina, my beloved and distinguished chairman, if in the Rules Committee he would make a request for 2 hours. Upon the basis he was going to request 2 hours of general debate I made an agreement with him I would not oppose this bill in the Rules Committee. I thought I made a firm agreement. However, the request was made before the Rules Committee for only 1 hour of general debate.

I would appreciate it if the gentleman would not choke this off at this time.

Mr. COOLEY. I am perfectly willing to let the gentleman proceed for 35 minutes.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire how many amendments we have at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair informs the gentleman that there are six amendments at the desk.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture to give us a little more than 2 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 4:15 today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COAD: On page 1 add the following paragraph:

"That section 501 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by deleting the semicolon at the end of clause numbered '(1)' and adding the following at the end of the clause, '*Provided, however,* That no workers recruited under this title shall be made available to any employer or permitted to remain in the employ of any employer for employment in other than temporary or seasonal occupations, except in specific cases when found by the Secretary of Labor necessary for a temporary period to avoid undue hardship.'"

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, this, like the other amendments which I will offer, is a very simple one. It is a very fair one to the American workers. Public Law 78 does not limit the use of Mexican nationals to seasonal occupations, although the history and background of this program indicated generally that it was considered to be for the purpose of meeting emergency needs. However, approximately 1 percent of the Mexicans that are brought in are known as specialists and they are employed on a year-round basis. These are the workers with specialized knowledge and experience who are specifically requested at reception centers and whose contracts are renewed every 6 months. Most specialists are employed in the border States of Texas and New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, what this amendment says simply is this, that "except in specific cases, when found by the Secretary of Labor necessary for a temporary period to avoid undue hardship," those Mexican nationals cannot be employed in any other than temporary or seasonal occupations. They cannot be brought in and put to work on a year-round basis. This year-round basis program actually involves normally the semiskilled and skilled operators. They are used as ranch hands and as general farm hands. This is a matter of fact. What we are saying in this amendment is: Let us give American workers these year-round jobs, and if we do require and need stoop labor, if we do need harvest seasonal help, then let us bring in the Mexicans in order to fulfill this requirement. So, we are simply saying: Let us have a program of helping out our unemployed American domestic and migratory farmworkers and, indeed, if we have year-round work, let us give it to our people here at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I come from a district where a number of growers, principally in apples, sugarbeets, and pickles, use migrant labor. I have discussed this program with some of them at great length. In my district they use bracero labor for seasonal work only, as the program originally intended, and not year round. Nor do they use bracero labor to operate farm machinery.

The growers in my district believe they need Public Law 78 labor and want to use it for the purposes for which the bill was originally enacted; that is, to supplement the domestic labor force at peak seasons. They want to see Public Law 78 extended and they do not object to amendments that would cure abuses such as the one aimed at by this amendment.

The administration has put us on notice that they will veto an extension that does not contain strengthening amendments. If you want to see this program continued for the growers of your area who make honest and legitimate use of bracero labor, you should support reasonable amendments like the one before us at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this amendment. It is not going to hurt the growers in my district or any other grower who is making legitimate use of this program and it will correct a serious abuse.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of this amendment. I should like to say simply that I heartily endorse the words just spoken by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA]. I, too, am in support of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD], or that will be offered by him. I think there can be no question, if we look at the record and if we read what the Department of Labor has to say about the implementation of Public Law 78, that without these amendments there is very little likelihood of what perhaps could be and I believe would be a very useful program being enacted. Therefore I hope that this House will consider carefully the amendments and will vote in favor of them.

H.R. 2010 has the purpose of continuing Public Law 78 without any additional authority to the Secretary of Labor to prevent adverse effect to American farmworkers who work in the same areas and often in the same field as Mexican braceros. In other words, it seeks to maintain the privileged position of a small group of farmers who have been able to manipulate Public Law 78 in a way which makes it unnecessary for them to offer competitive wages.

The majority report points out that farm wage rates have been going up in the last 10 years, leaving the implication that the Mexican national importation program does not hinder the economic progress of American farm labor. A closer look at the facts, however, reveals that in areas and crops where Mexican workers are used—mainly in the border States of Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, and in Arkansas—the upward wage trend has not kept pace because of the ready availability of Mexican nationals.

Under Public Law 78, Mexican workers must receive rates prevailing in the area, for similar work performed by U.S. farmworkers. State agencies affiliated with the Bureau of Employment Security of the U.S. Department of Labor are required to make surveys during active seasons to determine prevailing wages paid to American workers in each of the activities in which Mexican nationals are employed. The Department of Labor does not set wages but merely attempts to determine what rates prevail.

A study made by the Department of Labor shows that in the great majority of areas where Mexicans have been employed, wages for American workers employed in similar activities have remained virtually unchanged year after year. In the Arkansas Delta area, for example, farmers have been paying American workers 30, 40, and 50 cents an hour for cotton chopping while at the same time thousand of Mexicans are employed in this activity. In New Mexico, the rate for cotton chopping and other general farm chores has remained 50 cents an hour for several years because employers have not felt the necessity to attract American workers or to

adjust wage levels to keep those farmworkers who live in the area. In California, where average farm wages are among the highest farm wages in the country—about $1.20 per hour—the rate paid to American workers in the Imperial Valley, which is largely dominated by Mexicans, has remained approximately 70 to 75 cents an hour.

This is a situation that feeds on itself. If low farm wages are permitted to continue, more and more farmworkers must either become migrants or seek nonfarm jobs. Each year tens of thousands of American workers leave Texas for higher paying jobs in the Northwest and Great Lakes States, while Mexicans are brought into Texas for lower paying jobs. Thousand of workers migrate from New Mexico each year to Colorado and other States because they are unwilling to toil at the prevailing, but substandard, rate of 50 cents an hour.

Before extending Public Law 78, Congress should take a good look at it from the standpoint of how this law affects the American farm wage structure, general wage standards in the United States, and the domestic farm labor supply. There is no evidence in the majority report on this bill that adequate consideration has been given to these questions. If consideration were given, the conclusion would inevitably be reached that the Secretary of Labor needs more authority to cope with the complex problems of the importation program. H.R. 2010 merely maintains the status quo.

Farmworkers receive the lowest wages of any group in the United States. During 1959, wages in agriculture averaged only 80 cents an hour—about one-third the average wage for manufacturing and less than one-half the hourly earnings for the retail-trade employees. It is inconceivable that the American people will permit the authority of government to be used to further depress the wage levels of more than 2 million hired farmworkers who are engaged in the essential job of producing food and fiber.

Some badly needed reforms were contained in H.R. 6032 and can be summarized as follows:

First. The Secretary of Labor is given authority to limit the number of foreign workers who may be employed by an employer, so as to stimulate active competition for domestic farm labor.

Second. To obtain foreign workers a farm employer must offer U.S. workers terms and conditions reasonably comparable to those guaranteed Mexican workers.

Third. Employers must pay U.S. farmworkers the same wages and other benefits as those given foreign workers.

Fourth. Employers of braceros would be required to offer American workers at least as much as the average hourly rate for farmworkers in the State or Nation, whichever is lower, but any yearly increase required would be limited to 10 cents an hour. This amendment is designed to restore wages where the presence of foreign labor has had a depressing effect over the years.

If amendments are not adopted substantially accomplishing these purposes I recommend the defeat of H.R. 2010.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, not because I am not sympathetic with what I believe is intended, but because this amendment is entirely unnecessary. The existing law is very clear. The Secretary of Labor has all the powers he needs right now to prevent the hiring of braceros for any work which would in any way adversely affect domestic labor. The intention is good but this is not necessary. The law is clear now. I urge that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COAD) there were—ayes 46, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COAD: On page 1, add the following paragraph:

"That title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by renumbering section 504 as section 505, and adding a new section 504 to read as follows:

"'SEC. 504. No workers recruited under this title shall be made available to any employer or permitted to remain in the employ of any employer unless the employer offers and pays to such workers wages equivalent to the average farm wage in the State in which the area of employment is located, or the national farm wage average, whichever is the lesser: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this subparagraph a wage offer equivalent to 10 cents per hour above the highest wage rate prevailing during the last previous season in which Mexican workers were employed in the area and in the activity involved, shall be deemed to fulfill the requirements of this subparagraph: *Provided further*, That in no event shall Mexican workers be permitted to be employed by any employer who is paying domestic workers less than he offers and pays Mexican workers for the activity in the area.'

"SEC. 2. Sections 504 through 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, are renumbered sections 505 through 510, respectively. The reference to section 507 in section 508, renumbered as section 509, is changed to section 508."

Mr. COAD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which is probably the most comprehensive of any of the amendments which were involved in H.R. 6032, is a matter of very great importance in actually raising the wage scale for our domestic farmworkers. What it says is that the wage level to be paid either to the braceros who come from Mexico to work or to the domestic laborers who may be employed is to be the prevailing State wage level or the national wage level, whichever is less. For those States which are considerably below either the State or the national wage level it would be a requirement for them to raise their wage rate 10 cents per year. In the case of a State such as Texas which is paying a little more than 72 cents they would not be required to raise it all the way to 97 cents which is the national average.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss the Mexican farm labor importation program from the point of view of city people. Some of my colleagues might wonder what a Congressman representing a district in the heart of the largest city in the world has to do with a program which imports over 300,000 Mexicans principally into five States remote from my city and State. But this program concerns my district very directly.

First of all, the Mexican farm labor importation program concerns my district because we are shocked at the idea of importing human beings. A nation imports goods. A civilized nation does not import people as if they were inanimate objects. The virtual peonage to which Mexicans are subjected when they enter this country to help harvest our crops to feed our people is a disgrace to a civilized nation. And it is because they are peons that they are imported. They are docile, dependent, intimidated. They are not a free labor force of which our free Nation can be proud.

Second, the peonage of the Mexican farmworkers is degrading to them and to our own American farmworkers. Our own farmworkers being free men and women are unable to compete with this imported captive labor force. They cannot and should not work for 50 cents an hour. Being free men and women they refuse to do so. If an adequate minimum wage were paid, domestic labor would be available. They say, "Give us a decent wage and we will give you a good day's work." This is the quid pro quo they reasonably demand. But this is the quid pro quo which is denied them because the grower says "if you won't work at the conditions we wish, we will get Mexicans to do the job for us." This offends our sense of freedom and human dignity.

Third, I am not persuaded by the argument offered by the proponents of the continuance of the Mexican farm labor program that to reform and curtail the abuses of the program would cause an increase in the price of food and fiber to consumers in cities and throughout the Nation. We are offended that those who make such an argument believe us capable of tolerating pitiful wages and working conditions in order to save a few pennies on our food and clothing bills. We do not really see any evidence to show that food and fiber products would increase substantially in cost if farm wages were increased. The only figures I have seen indicate that a 10-cent-an-hour wage increase for workers employed on cotton would increase an entire family's yearlong supply of cotton goods by only 50 cents. A 10-cents-an-hour increase in the wages of sugar workers would result in an increase of one-fiftieth of 1 percent per pound of sugar to consumers. These are not amounts which frighten us. Furthermore, even if the cost were more, we do not believe that city consumers should benefit from the exploitation of laborers in the fields of this country.

Therefore, remote as the 20th District of New York is from the fields of Texas, New Mexico, California, Arizona, and Arkansas, I say that we are affected by the abuses of the Mexican farm labor program. I believe that the serious and well-documented abuses should be remedied, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOEVEN yielded his time to Mr. GUBSER.)

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and to reiterate a point I made earlier, namely, that the bracero program escalates domestic wages rather than depressing them.

I do not care where you get all your figures. I have seen this actually work in operation. Here is the way it works.

A farmer does not want to hire a bracero because he is a lot of trouble. You have to take one of them to the doctor almost every day; you must house them, feed them, transport them. They are extra expense and extra trouble. When you hire them you submit to harassing and time-consuming regulations. So you willingly pay 5 or 10 cents an hour more to get a good domestic worker. We all prefer to do that.

Now, wage surveys are conducted to determine the prevailing domestic wage. Braceros are not surveyed; only domestic workers. The survey finds the increase of 5 or 10 cents per hour and under the law the bracero must be brought up to an equal rate. Then the cycle starts all over again, and the farmer who prefers domestic labor, as we all do, pays 5 or 10 cents more. The practical effect of this program is that it escalates domestic wages rather than depressing them. Therefore I think the amendment should be defeated because it is not necessary and is based upon a false major premise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, the language of the pending amendment is illustrative of the poor draftsmanship which typifies all of these amendments. It is my personal belief they were rather hastily drawn. This provision, for example, would determine the wage of braceros in the job categories in which they are permitted to work by a comparison with a composite farm wage, which would include the salary of a farm manager and all other categories of employees of farmers, including even bookkeepers. Under this formula there would be a distortion of the wage picture relating to the wages for work that braceros are permitted and qualified to do by relating their wage to a composite farm wage. This is illustrative of the problems of attempting to handle by indirection a problem of minimum wage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if you will refer to page 5 of the report on this legislation you will see what the situation is with respect to the increase in wage rates on American farms. I will read from this report:

Farm wages in U.S. agriculture have increased steadily. In 1950 the index of farm wages published by the U.S. Department of Agriculture was 432 (the index for the years 1909 to 1914 equaling 100).

In 1960 the index had risen from 432 to 629, an increase of 46 percent in a 10-year period of time.

Mr. Chairman, this is one amendment which we should consider very carefully. It provides you will have an increase of 10 cents an hour in wage rates for domestic workers. You write that in each year, year by year there is an increase of 10 cents an hour, or the wage rate across the State or across the Nation whichever is the lower. You will have that increase, whatever the increase is, across the Nation or across the State. It at least would be 10 cents an hour each year from here on out. My colleagues, I ask you to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, a vast amount of evidence accumulated by the Department of Labor proves conclusively that the importation of Mexican labor has had a definite adverse effect on the wages offered to American labor. The following facts, based on wage surveys made by the Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security and requested by the signers of this report, are to the point:

1. Hourly wage rates, without room and board, reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture rose about 16 percent from 1953 to 1959, but Labor Department surveys show that wages in most areas and activities employing Mexicans remained relatively stable. Fifty percent of the studies show no significant change in rate, from earlier to later years within this period, 32 percent show an increase, and 18 percent show a decline. Declines would not be expected to occur in labor shortage situations.

2. In 43 percent of the cotton harvest wage surveys in Mexican-using areas compared within the 1953–59 period, wage rates remained stable; and in 32 percent declines were reported.

3. A study of 1960 trends shows that in 52 percent of the cotton harvest wage surveys in important Mexican using areas, wage rates remained the same as in 1959, while 28 percent declined. Most Mexican Nationals are employed in the cotton harvest.

4. In some sections of Arizona, wage rates in the cotton harvest have remained virtually unchanged from 1953 to 1960, and in other areas of the State, cotton wage rates have dropped 50 cents per hundredweight.

5. In Mississippi County, Ark., wage rates for cotton picking were virtually unchanged from 1953 to 1960, despite the fact that the USDA hourly rate for the State as a whole rose 28 percent. (This area uses 11,000 Mexican braceros.)

6. Phillips County, Ark., had an hourly cotton chopping rate for domestic workers of 30 cents in June 1954. Although the average rate in June 1960 was 37 cents, rates as low as 30 cents were still being paid. Mexicans are paid contract rates of 50 cents. The USDA average hourly rate for Arkansas was 69 cents in July 1960.

7. In Texas and Arkansas widespread declines occurred between 1959 and 1960 in cotton harvest rates (pulling in Texas and picking in Arkansas). Typically, the decline was from $1.75 to $1.50 per hundredweight in pulling (Mexicans are paid the contract rate of $1.55), and from $3 to $2.50 per hundredweight in picking. A notable exception resulting from Department of Labor action under earning policies, occurred in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, where the picking rate rose from $2.30 to $2.50. But this followed a period of several years in which there had been no change in rate until 1959, when, also by virtue of Labor Department action, the rate rose from $2.05 to $2.30.

8. In the Imperial Valley of California, wage rates remained unchanged at 70 cents an hour between 1951 and 1959. Recently the average hourly rate has increased to ninety cents an hour. Nevertheless, this rate is about 35 cents below the average for the State as a whole. (The Imperial Valley is a bracero-dominated area.)

Mr. COHELAN. This is just some of the evidence accumulated by the Department of Labor. There is much more. For example, Department of Labor studies have shown that in many areas growers who hire foreign labor tend to pay lower wage rates to the Americans they hire than growers who hire American labor exclusively. Even more important, the Labor Department has found that Mexican braceros are employed at approximately 20,000 skilled, semiskilled, and year-round occupations.

At a time when American farmworkers are the victims of a high degree of underemployment and unemployment, the employment of foreign workers in these jobs is a disgrace. It is difficult to imagine, in an employment situation such as this, by what set of mental gymnastics bracero using growers can justify the employment of foreign workers in skilled occupations. It is true that Public Law 78, as it is presently written, does not specifically limit the employment of Mexican labor to unskilled occupations, but it is our contention that it was the intent of Congress to so limit their employment. The use of Mexicans for skilled work reduces the opportunities of domestic farmworkers to advance from unskilled to higher paid skilled jobs and tends to lower the wage levels of domestic farmworkers employed in skilled occupations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2010) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. While the Committee of the Whole was considering the bill H.R. 2010, a unanimous consent request

was granted to limit all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto to 4:15 this afternoon. In the meantime, the Committee has risen. My parliamentary inquiry is, in view of the fact the time limit was set at 4:15, which is some 25 minutes from now, does not that mean that debate tomorrow will be limited to 25 minutes?

The SPEAKER. It means, unless there is another consent agreement, that there will not be any more debate.

Mr. HALLECK. There will be no more debate?

The SPEAKER. Not unless there is an agreement to extend the time.

Mr. HALLECK. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Could that agreement be had except by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think so. It would require unanimous consent.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I merely propounded a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. This situation is a little unusual, because many of us had been given to believe, and we had every reason to believe, that this bill would be concluded today. If it takes unanimous consent to have further debate tomorrow, I would rather suspect there would be no more debate tomorrow. My suggestion, therefore, is, the Committee having risen, that we go ahead and complete action on the bill.

The SPEAKER. There were reasons for asking the gentleman from North Carolina to move that the Committee rise now. The Chair asked the gentleman from North Carolina to move that the Committee rise.

Mr. HALLECK. The limiting of debate to 4:15 was for everybody's convenience, as I understood the situation. There will be a straight motion to recommit from our side. Then the vote will be on the passage of the bill. No amendment has been adopted. I did not expect any would be adopted, and we could have disposed of the bill with not more than one record vote.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly thought we would complete the bill this afternoon, but a situation has arisen that made it necessary for the Committee to rise. I thought, just as did the gentleman from Indiana, that we could finish the bill tonight.

Mr. HALLECK. I, of course, would not raise the question at all if it had not been for the 4:15 limitation. I realize this is a matter of personal concern to many Members with whom I am in sympathy.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from North Carolina so desires, he might submit a request now for 25 minutes debate on the bill tomorrow.

Mr. COOLEY. I personally do not desire to have the matter debated further, so personally I do not want to ask for 25 minutes additional debate.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House. The Chair has merely suggested to the gentleman from North Carolina that he could ask unanimous consent now that there be 25 minutes debate tomorrow.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have not heard anyone ask for the right to speak on tomorrow. I would not want to cut anyone off.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, at the time the chairman of the committee moved to terminate debate I asked him to extend the time because I have an amendment at the desk which I think is very important. I have been foreclosed by the motion to rise. At this time I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow we continue debate for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the circumstance that the bill has been very well debated and the amendments, as I understand it, may be presented in order without further debate, I am compelled to object.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has the floor. The gentleman reserved the right to object and then did object. If the gentleman from Iowa desires, he may withhold his objection and yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The Chair has asked the gentleman from Iowa if he will withhold his objection and yield to the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Iowa objected, and therefore I withheld my own objection. He cannot withdraw his objection. He objected. Therefore an objection has been made.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Iowa is now withholding his objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has not said anything to the Chair about that.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa reserves his right to object.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that I know he has acted in the utmost good faith. I want to say to him that I had no idea of objecting to this debate continuing. I thought it would continue, and I am perfectly willing for the gentleman to be heard on the amendment. I just want to say I am not the one responsible for making the objection to his being heard.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I do not hold the gentleman responsible.

Mr. Speaker, I move at this point that on tomorrow we have 25 minutes of debate to complete the pending amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's motion is not in order.

PER DIEM ALLOWANCE FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 283, Rept. No. 385), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3279) to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Mr. SISK, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 284, Rept. No. 386), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4614) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the con-

sideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider on Wednesday next, May 17, the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments appropriation bill for 1962. I am making this announcement at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the report on the bill be available? The hearings are available. Will the report on the bill be available prior to that time?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, they will have to be.

Mr. GROSS. No; they do not have to be.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I will see that they are.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I understand that the full committee is meeting Monday morning to consider this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I so understand.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL reserved all points of order on the bill.

INCOME TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include a statement made by me before the House Committee on Ways and Means May 9, 1961, in support of H.R. 5601, "To provide for income tax purposes new property may be depreciated over a 5-year period."

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, it has come as a shock to most Americans that the United States which for many years was considered to be the world leader in economic enterprise, has actually fallen behind several other nations in the rate of its growth.

Modernized industries in Western Europe and Japan are selling their goods in the domestic market of the United States, and after discounting the effects of wage differentials and tariffs, we must concede that in some cases they are offering a better product. Coincident with this, we are concerned about the number of American firms that are establishing plants overseas. Their purpose is not only to compete in foreign markets, but to escape the smothering effects of our antiquated tax program.

The profits of these migrating firms are not taxed until they are returned to the United States. Corporations get around this by building new plants or by expanding facilities in foreign countries, because most countries levy no taxes on profits when they are used in this way.

Walter Lippmann in his March 30, 1961, column in the New York Herald Tribune referred to the problem which is central to almost all others: "* * * the problem of overcoming the sluggishness which has characterized the American economy since the end of the Korean war."

The Harvard Business Review of November–December 1960 asks: "Do outmoded tax policies threaten to send the U.S. 'superior industrial machine' to the junk pile? Do American producers compete at a disadvantage with foreign firms, which operate under more progressive depreciation policies than our own?"

The Review believes that the Federal Government should "move toward the goal of allowing business sufficient deductions before taxes to replace its wornout or noncompetitive equipment of today's cost * * * not at what it cost 15 or 20 years ago under completely different conditions."

I will describe one example which illustrates the slowdown effect of inadequate depreciation allowances upon American enterprise.

The Lithographers & Printers National Association represents an industry composed of thousands of medium and small lithographers and printers throughout the United States. The industry employs over 300,000 people, and some 28,000 companies, excluding newspapers, are involved. The president of the association has informed me that: "We are especially handicapped by the long periods of time over which we are required to write off the costs of heavy equipment. A classic example is a printing press installed in 1935 at a cost of $31,400. To replace it in 1958, 23 years later, an investment of $128,000 was required.

"Even conceding that the replacement was technologically improved, and more productive than the old one, the cost of the new press was four times the cost of the old one * * * an obvious hardship on the taxpayer."

Tax deductions spread over shorter periods of depreciation would release capital for reinvestment, and open the way for unlimited economic growth.

In order to provide such incentives, I ask favorable consideration of H.R. 5601, the bill I have introduced "To provide that for income tax purposes, new property may be depreciated over a 5-year period."

AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since we have before us numerous proposals in the field of education, all of which would have an effect on the present State administration of our public school system, I was pleased to receive a copy of House Joint Resolution 6, adopted by the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois on March 7 of this year, which I submit for your study.

This resolution urges the Congress to enact legislation allowing a tax deduction for all tuition, whether paid to a public or private school, from the elementary to the university level. Furthermore, the resolution specifically states opposition to any other form of Federal aid to education and contains a very clear, firm and vigorous statement maintaining the inherent rights of the States and our home communities in the field of education.

However, one other important point in this resolution should be noted for your consideration. It displays the bipartisan approach of the Illinois General Assembly, since the house of representatives in Illinois is controlled by the Democrat Party, and this resolution was overwhelmingly adopted in committee and on the floor of the House.

Therefore, I call to the attention of the Democrat Party New Frontiersmen that their stable party brethren in the Illinois General Assembly are in support of aid to education in the sound manner that we have used in developing our schools into the great educational system that we have. I would hope that the New Frontier spenders here in Washington place a little faith and confidence in local school boards in the respective States to meet the educational challenges as they have so nobly performed in the past.

Whereas it is undisputedly recognized that there is an urgent need to expand our schools and colleges, both public and private, to provide our exploding school-age population with the best possible education; and

Whereas private schools should be encouraged in their efforts to attract students in order to lighten the burden which will fall upon the taxpayer for the enormous expansion of State-supported schools and colleges; and

Whereas private schools and colleges should be allowed to compete on a more equal basis with tax supported schools and colleges; and

Whereas the citizen who pays taxes to meet all or a large portion of the tuition for students who attend public schools and State universities is allowed to use such tax payments as a deduction in reporting his Federal income tax but is denied such tax deduction for tuition paid private schools and colleges to which he may elect to send his children; and

Whereas the Federal Government is now considering some form of aid to education and also the possibility of some tax relief to stimulate the national economy; and

Whereas by making all tuition a tax deduction, whether paid to a public or private school, the Congress would be providing an effective form of Federal aid to education without any risk of Federal control of education; without the diluting process of having such aid filtered through Washington; and would, at the same time, be providing a stimulant to the economy by this form of tax relief: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, (the Senate concurring therein), (1) That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation allowing a tax deduction for all tuition, whether paid to a public or fully accredited not-for-profit private school, or to any fully accredited college or university and, in addition, allowing parents a tax deduction of $1,500 for each child or dependent they may send to any fully accredited college or university. (2) That this resolution does not constitute an approval of any other form of Federal aid to education. (3) That suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United

States and the Members of Congress from the State of Illinois.

Adopted by the house, March 7, 1961.

PAUL POWELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
CHAS. F. KERWIN,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Concurred in by the senate, March 22, 1961.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President, of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

UNFORTUNATE PUBLISHED FALSE RUMORS

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the anniversary of the birth of our 18th President of the United States, Ulysses Simpson Grant, I had the privilege of addressing those who saw fit to gather at the Grant Monument at the foot of Capitol Hill on this date to honor this great patriot.

It seemed appropriate to direct my remarks to the bearers of false rumors which plagued General Grant's career and are now being visited upon his grandson. Since that time considerable interest has been indicated in what I had to say, and because it was not possible for many of the Members of Congress to be present, I would like to have this brief speech appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that they can read it. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it at this point:

UNFORTUNATE PUBLISHED FALSE RUMORS

(By FRED SCHWENGEL)

About 100 years before the time of Christ, Titus Maccius Plautus, a dramatist and poet of the Roman Empire, whispered an epigram into the ear of posterity. His observation—"Where there's smoke there's fire"—has since become the slogan of human credulity. Ever since that day, and, in fact, through all recorded history, rumor has played an important part, sometimes a vicious one, in the story of man's strivings.

In all history, the sagas of human deeds, the chronicles of man's waking thoughts, his dreams of boundless hope, and his excuses in the hour of defeat, are closely woven with threads of falsehood and rumor. Rumor transfigures and exploits simple human fancies. Human belief is artfully perverted by rumor mongers motivated by greed, envy, and hatred.

The pattern of rumor and the speed with which it travels are so insidious that journalists, and even the most objective scholars, are sometimes led astray. Too few have had the integrity of Sir Walter Raleigh, who, when imprisoned in the Tower of London, was writing the second part of his History of the World. It is said that one day his work was interrupted by the noise of a fight in the courtyard below his cell. Through the barred windows, Raleigh carefully watched each detail of the incident. The following day he was visited by a friend who had been in the brawl.

Upon discussing the event, Raleigh discovered that his own version of the fray was incorrect throughout. Realizing that he was unable to present an accurate account of one little incident, Raleigh abandoned the writing of his History of the World and, in disgust, destroyed the manuscript.

As rumors spread by word of mouth they tend to grow and intensify. Once sheltered in the pages of newspapers or between the boards of books, they become almost immutable as they pass from generation to generation. Efforts to dispel rumors and lies have been many. Often they have resulted only in confusion.

In every individual, as in his father and grandfather before him, are concealed elements of hope and defeatism, complacency and anxiety, social responsibility and personal self-interest. The compounded proportions of these elements define the scope of man's ability to compare information. They limit human judgment to the extent that man is seldom able to evaluate the truth or falsehood of the rumors that come to his ears.

Governments have recognized that rumors and their ugly effects have a deleterious influence upon individuals and upon the Nation as a whole. During World War II our Government conducted a campaign urging our citizens to refrain from spreading rumors and to guard against being misled by them. The Civil War witnessed many examples of the crippling effect of rumor upon national morale and the efficient prosecution of the war.

Among those who were the object of such vicious attacks was the great American general and statesman we honor here today, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant. For a day or two after the Battle of Shiloh, the newspapers exulted over the great Union victory. Then as they felt the need to supply additional details to their readers, they began to print ugly and false rumors ferreted out by some of the correspondents.

Some Army officers, moved by petty jealousies, and would-be experts moved only by a desire to be heard, contributed to the vicious attack. Grant's absence at Savannah was first questioned, then condemned, then reported as a drunken stupor.

In 10 days the Battle of Shiloh plummeted from a glorious triumph to a shameful disaster. It was given at last the damning military label, surprise. The newspapers seized upon the label with no effort to weigh its importance, with no consideration of any mitigating factor, almost without remembering that the Confederates had not, after all, prevailed.

During the Vicksburg campaign the newspapers again circulated ugly rumors. Men were dying by thousands of disease and neglect. Plans were adopted at random and abandoned for as little reason. The commander, they said, was a muddleheaded incompetent utterly unfitted for his great charge, and had lost the confidence of officers and men alike. There were stories of how he sat in sodden indifference to the waste of human lives of which he was guilty, stories presented in detail in Washington to the President and Secretary of War Stanton.

It was not in Grant's nature to defend himself against these malicious charges, but others have done it for him. Grant's adjutant, Rawlins, writing to Representative Elihu B. Washburne, on December 30, 1861, said in part: "I will answer your inquiry fully and frankly, but first I would say unequivocally and emphatically that the statement that General Grant is drinking very hard is utterly untrue and could have originated only in malice."

Troubled by the rumors about Grant, Lincoln sent Charles A. Dana, Assistant Secretary of War, to Grant's camp at Vicksburg as an observer. He arrived early in April, 1863, and his coming probably saved Grant's career. His letters to Washington were, from first to last, full of confidence in Grant.

Another witness whose testimony should carry considerable weight was Mrs. Annie Wittenmyer, who served with the soldiers in the field as Iowa State sanitary agent, and later established hospital diet kitchens for the U.S. Christian Commission. She served as head of the Women's Relief Corp and was a great Methodist woman leader. When the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union was established in 1874, she was made its first president and served as its president for 5 years.

Thus, it seems fair to assume that she would not condone lapses from sobriety. During the war she was under fire at Pittsburg Landing and at the siege of Vicksburg, and had frequent opportunity to meet General Grant.

In her book, "Under the Guns," a story of her experience in the war, published in 1895, she speaks in the highest terms of the "noble qualities of General Grant, and the strength and purity of his character."

The originating, repeating, and publication of the false rumors about public officials and especially about great leaders like General Grant is a needless and most unfortunate reflection on the life and character of this fine American.

Moreover, it is a sad reflection on our own country and the wonderful thing it seeks to represent for us and for the world. And, most certainly, the printing of these stories is no credit to the great free press of our country.

Sometimes it seems as though the fate of the ancestor is visited upon the descendant. In some quarters it seems to be felt that scurrility is inheritable, that it descends—yes, descends is the word—from an earlier to a later generation.

I refer to press reports about the recent meeting of the Fourth National Assembly of Civil War Centennial Commission in Charleston, S.C. These reports state, quite erroneously, that some persons were demanding that Maj. Gen. U.S. Grant III resign as Chairman of the Commission.

So false were these reports that their supposed author, the chairman of the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission, promptly, publicly, and unequivocally repudiated them before the assembly itself and in the presence of reporters of some of the same papers, news services, and news photographers who were a party to the publishing of the false and unfortunate rumors originally.

But did truth finally overtake error? Not at all.

One is reminded of the late Cordell Hull's remark that a lie can travel halfway around the earth before truth can get its pants on and give chase.

One also wonders about the famed remark of the late Justice Holmes that "the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market * * *," especially when the market is rigged, when access to it is controlled by those who purveyed the error in the first place.

And one also recalls that the framers of our Constitution emphatically rejected the idea that punishment, just and lawful punishment, is transmissible from father to son—or grandson. Indeed, even in the case of the only crime actually defined by the Constitution, that marvelous document declares that "no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood. * * *" (Art. III, sec. 3.)

One well-known newspaper even commented editorially on a discredited false rumor in connection with the Civil War Centennial at Charleston, S.C.

Thus to visit, or revisit, defamation upon the grandson of a defamed grandfather is a little like a private bill of attainder by the fiat of those who should know better.

This has impugned the character of a great living descendant of the great man we honor

today. It has curtailed his effectiveness as chairman of the Civil War Centennial Commission which is trying to do so much to commemorate this tragic experience in our national life in such a way that it will strengthen rather than weaken the great idea and ideals that are inherent in our system.

It might be well to quote Shakespeare as a reminder to those who are contributing to misunderstanding rather than to common sense and reason. Shakespeare once responded to a similar situation by saying, I quote, "Rumor is a pipe blown by surmises, jealousies, conjectures and of so easy and so plain a stop that the blunt monster with uncounted heads, the still-discordant wavering multitude, can play upon it."

Also, the fourth commandment might be noted. It says, simply, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor."

I now address my remarks to all who have believed the rumor and to those who planted it by suggesting that, "in these times man should utter nothing for which he would not willingly be responsible through time and eternity."

These words by Lincoln, spoken almost 100 years ago, need to be noted today more than ever for we need to build confidence in our institutions rather than do those things that will undermine our faith and our confidence.

I now call on all newspapers and news services who profess to be unbiased and fair and who normally decry unfair and smear tactics, to investigate all the facts in connection with the rumors of which I have spoken and to set the record straight.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Rumanians have lived in their historic homeland in the Balkans since the most ancient days of their national history, and they have always fought for freedom and independence. During most of their modern history they have found it impossible to cope with their powerful foes. The country was overrun by the Ottoman Turks, and the Rumanians lived under the sultans for centuries. They endured the oppressive alien rule, and they revolted against it whenever there appeared any chance for success. But all their attempts to free themselves ended in failure and disaster, until the middle of the last century. The Crimean War gave them an opportunity, and they made the most of it. At the end of that year in 1856, Rumanians were allowed autonomy, and this was guaranteed by the European powers. The next step toward liberation was taken in 1877 during the Russo-Turkish War. On May 10 of that year, Rumanians proclaimed their independence and fought against their oppressors. Four years later, in May of 1881, the country was united under a king, forming the Kingdom of Rumania.

For the last 84 years May 10 has become a national holiday for Rumanians, and they observe that anniversary, their independence day, everywhere in the free world. Of course, under Communist totalitarian dictatorship Rumanians are not allowed to celebrate their national holiday in Rumania, but we in the free world join Rumanian people on the 84th anniversary celebration of this great national holiday.

A REPORT ON THE SHIPBUILDING AND SHIP REPAIR INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES BY ALONZO F. YOUNG

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to hear an excellent report on the status of our shipbuilding and ship repair industry in the United States. The report was made by Mr. Alonzo F. Young, administrative director to the third annual conference of the Iron Shipbuilders International Marine Council, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers, AFL–CIO. It was a most timely message which pointed up the need for an increased program of ship construction, conversion and repair in our country. The report shows that our country is rapidly losing its position as a strong maritime nation, while Russia is hurriedly building up its merchant marine in an effort to control the seas. Mr. Young is certainly to be commended for his efforts to stimulate the growth of our own merchant fleet.

The report follows:

It is again a happy and distinct privilege to welcome each and every one of you to the annual conference of the Iron Shipbuilders International Marine Council of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers, AFL–CIO. This is a unique occasion, particularly in that we meet on the eve of our 21st consolidated convention and in a city other than Washington, D.C.

At our conferences of 1959 and 1960, circumstances prompted me to embody in my remarks from the platform detailed statistics, notwithstanding the boresome aspects thereof. This year my office has prepared such data for distribution which, in conjunction with the consummate officers' report to the forthcoming convention will, I am confident, be recognized as the most comprehensive portrayal of world shipbuilding in the annals of trades unions' history.

Although my observations at the Washington level in recent weeks indicate a glimmer of hope for the future, I cannot honestly advise you that an adequate program of accelerated ship construction, conversion, and repair is imminent. Our vigorous efforts to assure a merchant marine of modern concept must be incessant. The preeminence of American-flag vessels on the high seas is essential to global prestige. Our status as the universally recognized leader of the free world cannot rest on past achievements. Yes, we built the *Nautilus* and *Savannah*, and we also built the first atomic bomb. That was yesterday. What about today and tomorrow? Several nations have obviously made relatively greater progress in varied fields since the Korean conflict—Great Britain, Japan, West Germany, and others, and now Russia, in the area which is of primary concern to us, shipbuilding.

The Soviet Union clearly sees the necessity of seapower as shown by its prospective plan for the development of naval transportation from 1959 to 1965. On February 15, 1961, Russia had in operation under its own flag over 800 merchant ships, totaling 4½ million deadweight tons. In addition, the Soviet satellites have another million deadweight tons. (There were 947 vessels of 1,000 gross tons and over in the U.S. merchant fleet on March 1, 1961.) By 1965 the Soviets plan an increase of 120 percent in their dry cargo fleet and 80 percent in their tankers. These ships will be modern and fast with nuclear energy, used in both dry cargo and tanker ships of large tonnage. The atomic icebreaker (*Lenin*) is an example of their progress. Russian maritime activity becomes increasingly evident. The number of ships visiting Italian ports, mostly tankers, has multiplied tenfold in the last 5 years. Regular shipping service linking the Black Sea with the United Arab Republic and also one to Indonesia are in operation. Their vessels are calling at African ports, both north of the Sahara and in the newly liberated countries of that continent. Soviet ships are arriving in Cuba at the rate of one a day. One hundred percent of all petroleum products are entering Cuba in Russian-owned or chartered tankers. On any day of 1961, to date, at least 15 Russian ships could be found in Cuban harbors.

We submit that these facts prove that a new challenge now confronts us which makes it imperative that sagacity displace nugacity the all too prevalent attitude pertinent to our fourth arm of defense, the merchant marine. We can anticipate support from many areas of our economy but unfortunately not from all. The memory of what transpired in those years immediately preceding Pearl Harbor are a grim reminder that some are blinded to reality by their avarice for profits. The scrap steel among other exports delivered to Japan were returned in the form of bombs and bullets, and so forth, during the horrible holocaust of World War II. We cast no aspersions on the loyalty and patriotism of anyone. We do, however, aver that greed breeds madness.

The vast proportion of our U.S.-flag merchant tonnage was constructed under the World War II building programs; 79 percent of our dry cargo and 54 percent of our tanker tonnage are in the 15–19-year-old age bracket. They have long been outmoded. Only 1.7 percent of the U.S.-flag tonnage of dry cargo ships are under 5 years of age; 5.9 percent are from 5 to 9 years old.

American shipowners have built a number of modern tankers in recent years—a few constructed in the United States for registry under U.S. flag but most built abroad for registry under foreign flag. Seven new passenger ships have been built since World War II and three have been converted from mariner class cargo ships. The seven new ships are the 25-knot *Constitution* and *Independence*, the 33-knot *United States*, the 20-knot *Santa Paula* and *Santa Rosa*, and the 21-knot *Brasil* and *Argentina*. The mariner conversions are the 20-knot *Mariposa*, *Monterey*, and *Atlantic*. The 19-knot *President Cleveland* and *President Wilson* were converted from troopships. These ships, however, are basically World War II types. The majority of our ships are old, deficient in speed, and lacking in other features that are important.

The 85th Congress authorized, but did not appropriate funds for, the construction of two large high-speed passenger ships—one of 33 knots and one of 30 knots speed. The New York Shipbuilding Corp., was the low bidder for these ships. We have consistently urged the immediate construction of these two superliners and have appealed to

the White House to use its influence to expedite the contract award.

The present rate of new shipbuilding is completely fatuous if we are to offset the rapidly approaching block obsolescence of U.S. merchant-type tonnage.

It is, therefore, mandatory that we of the trades unions redouble our efforts to persuade Congress to appropriate the necessary funds and enact such new legislation as may be essential to insure immediate impetus to a shipbuilding program in American shipyards designed to reestablish, qualitatively and quantitatively, our maritime predominance. Periodic press releases state we now have underway the greatest shipbuilding program in peacetime history. What they don't say is that we are merely trying to make up, to a degree, our lethargy of previous years. Although hackneyed the adage of too little too late seems currently apropos. We have the skills; we have the materials; we have the facilities, the maximum utilization of which are contingent upon our generating the ingredients of need and purpose. We do not underestimate our task. The record of the last half-century is a sorry one. In 1910 American-flag ships carried about 9 percent of our total foreign commerce. The same figure (9 percent) applies to 1960. During this period our population increased 100 percent (90 million in 1910, 180 million in 1960) and our total foreign commerce more than 1,500 percent (3.3 billion in 1910 to 50 billion in 1960). When you consider that 99 percent of our foreign commerce, excluding that with Canada and Mexico, is transported by ship and represents close to 10 percent of our $500 billion gross national product, you can get a true picture of our colossal torpidity which makes the legendary sleep of Rip Van Winkle seem like a momentary nap. Notwithstanding the lessons of two World Wars, we as a nation continue to abandon our shipbuilding industry. I regret the necessity of suggesting that unless the malignancy of foreign ship construction by American owners diminishes, we have no alternative but to boycott the products of those who flagrantly disregard the economic well-being of hundreds of thousands of shipyard and collateral employees. The major oil companies are conspicuous malefactors and at the same time are receiving favored tax treatment.

Although this is a very proper forum to explore all aspects of our naval and merchant marine policy, any attempt to cover such a gamut would be illogical and inutile. Therefore, I shall confine myself to a few facets which in no sense should be interpreted as inferring that they are of any greater or lesser importance than those too numerous to enumerate.

Before World War II, our shipping in the coastal and intercoastal trade was the largest segment of the U.S. merchant marine. Shortly after our entry into the war, practically all of the 700 ships of our coastal and intercoastal fleet, representing 60 percent of our total ocean-carrying capacity, was put into transocean service directly supporting the war, and this domestic trade was absorbed by other modes of transportation. These deepwater common carriers have never regained their former status. Today there are only two companies with a total of 10 ships in this trade. The preponderance of ships in domestic trade would be at sea at any given time and would escape damage in the event of direct attack. In their normal operations they were always close to our ports and immediately available in any emergency. At the onset of a major nuclear war, this fleet would be a vital link between our coastal cities when in all probability our systems of land transportation would be disrupted. The feasibility of hydrofoil craft in this field is being explored. In any event, ways and means must be found to stimulate this industry.

Thousands of our members depend upon the ship repair yards for their livelihood. Employment in 91 ship repair yards in 1957 was 37,600; 1958, 25,230, and in 1960 only 20,200 in 77 yards. This represents a decline in employment since our last convention of more than 46 percent and presumably the shutdown of 14 yards. It is obvious that the yards capable of handling the repair of oceangoing vessels are in desperate need of work right now if this country is to maintain a skeleton of ship repairing defense potential.

The average level of employment in our naval shipyards was 99,000 in 1958, 95,000 in 1959, and 91,000 in 1960. This persistent decline when compared with the 1957 figure (105,000) reported at the 20th Consolidated Convention, shows a decrease of approximately 13½ percent.

The appropriations for naval ship construction, conversion, etc. for the fiscal years subsequent to our last convention are as follows: 1958: $2,481,000,000; 1959: $2,069,400,000; 1960: $1,330,700,000; 1961: $2,316,360,000. In view of world tensions, we believe that our naval ship construction and conversion program constitutes a gross delinquency, and we advocate the immediate construction of 100 Polaris submarines in addition to other important naval ships and facilities.

Our naval shipyards have long been a bulwark of our defense system. All of our navy yards are vital to our national security and we will fight any curtailment thereof. We seek expansion, not constriction, of naval facilities.

We reiterate that the record of membership, when compared to the potential, is extremely disappointing. This challenge to continuous progress by the navy yard segment of our jurisdiction must be remedied. Aggressive campaigns of organization are imperative at all installations. A substantial increase in members is vital to the perpetuity of effective representation at the local and national level.

I cannot overemphasize the beneficial impact upon our Brotherhood resulting from the prestige of International President Calvin. He is known and esteemed by an amazing number of our Senators, Representatives and departmental heads charged with the responsibility of administering Federal programs. This has infinitely facilitated my access to many offices. The recent selection of President Calvin as one of the 27 members comprising the executive council of the AFL–CIO speaks for itself as to his universally recognized stature.

I would be devoid did I not once again acknowledge and express my appreciation for the advice and cooperation afforded me by Vice President Boggs, International Representative Buoy, and Walter Mason, legislative representative of the AFL–CIO.

MAJ. GEN. EDWIN A. WALKER

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the following comments were sent me in a memorandum from one of my very fine constituents, Comdr. N. H. Black, U.S. Naval Reserve, retired, of Arcadia, Calif. I believe his comments regarding Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker are of sufficient interest to have them inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so others may be made aware of these opinions. I think they are well stated and represent a very important analysis of this particular situation. Under permission granted, I include Commander Black's comments at this point in my remarks:

IMPORTANT COMMENTS ON THE CASE OF MAJ. GEN. EDWIN A. WALKER

It is highly improbable that the following facts will be brought out in the case of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker:

1. A masterly job of negative conditioning is being done on Americans by the Soviet through every medium of mass communications.

2. It is a military operation, devised by military scientists and carried out by Soviet agents.

3. A prime target is every member of the American Armed Forces, at home and abroad.

4. The Soviet method (which we learned in Korea) simply stated is this, "Separate an American from his everyday faith—in his God, his country, and his outfit, and his friends—and you've got him."

5. Red techniques in Korea were educational group psychotherapy—in reverse. It separates, tears down instead of builds up, faith and courage. (The export version aimed 24 hours a day at all Americans they now call cybernetic warfare.)

6. Our men in Korea whose everyday faiths were strong inside them, didn't break, didn't get fooled, and lived. Those who were educated or separated from their everyday beliefs gave up. Many died for no physical reason.

7. President Eisenhower and Defense Secretary Thomas Gates ordered corrective training in moral and spiritual leadership as a military countermeasure to this new technique in warfare—"cybernetic" attack on the will to resist.

8. Optimum purpose in the Navy's leadership program, for example, is for each man to reexamine, restudy, and reaffirm the moral and spiritual values of his own life and those of his faith, his country, and his service in the Navy. In discussions of national values, he is familiarized with the rise of communism and the Soviet threat to the American way of life.

9. General Walker, like any military commander, is responsible for the combat readiness of the men in his command. The measures and background materials he uses to safeguard his men against the Soviet cybernetic softening process are matters of command responsibility and judgment.

10. It is both coincidental and unfortunate that some of the best background material on Communist subversion and Soviet cybernetic operations is from civilian sources. Most is researched and condensed from thousands of reports and documents on file in Washington. The same facts and figures have been used continuously in hundreds of publications and films issued by scores of anticommunism organizations, as well as as by the training materials departments of the armed services.

At first glance, General Walker's recall is like permitting the Squodunk Gazette to dictate dismissal of the Joint Chiefs of Staff over the editor's disagreement with training policy. The problem here is far more serious than stupidity. This is an example of how extremely sensitive our services have had to be to political pressures.

Political pressure from the left has more power than we realize, to hamstring and paralyze. This is true of business and industry, especially Government regulated industry such as mass communications. It is doubly true of government, at any level, and the armed services.

The technique of continuous pressure applied to pressure sensitive areas in the American complex has been termed "Soviet

Principle No. 10." It is "the application of paralysis as a principle of Soviet global warfare." What it is and how it works is found in hearings before the U.S. Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, February 19–28, March 3–4, 1958. The immediate answer might well be a complete briefing of the President on the kind of sophisticated psychological and subversive war being waged against us. We have many experts eminently qualified to do this. The same people should be appointed as a task group to devise countermeasures for all Americans. Training aids and materials now used by the Armed Forces and many patriotic groups is readily available.

The enemy is far more sensitive and vulnerable to this type of warfare than we are. To the criminal mind exposure is tantamount to failure and death. That is why hell hath no fury like a Soviet dupe under the white spotlight of truth.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to find a newspaper reporter who will look into the facts before writing about the John Birch Society. George Todt is such a reporter. Mr. Todt has discussed the society in six articles which have appeared in the Los Angeles Herald-Express, a leading newspaper in Los Angeles, Calif., two of which follow:

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express, Feb. 10, 1961]

A VIEW OF THE NEWS—GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

Do more than 100 American patriotic societies possess the right to press for the impeachment of the Chief Justice of the United States by Congress in these modern times?

Many members of the press consider this such a ticklish question that they would prefer to see it swept under the rug.

Frankly, I think the question deserves to be aired. Why not put the cards on the table for everybody to see? Who is afraid of the truth? Let the chips fall where they may.

What are the facts in this case?

They are, quite simply, that the John Birch Society—a rapidly mushrooming anti-Communist organization in the United States—has requested a large number of American patriotic societies to join with it in whipping up popular support in Congress to impeach Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

There seems to be a lot of grassroots sympathy for this action and the movement is apparently growing by leaps and bounds.

QUESTIONS WISDOM

I do not believe that there has been any false inference that Mr. Warren is a Communist, which he most certainly is not. The John Birch Society merely claims that he has performed his official duties poorly and in such manner as to bring considerably less than terror to the hearts of the Reds. It questions the wisdom of certain key decisions.

According to Robert Welch, founder of the society, one of these was *Brown* v. *Brown* because it overturned numerous previous decisions by the same court on nothing more substantial than "a set of psychological and sociological theories advanced by a Swedish Socialist named Gunnar Myrdal and a group of American Communist fronters with whom Myrdal had been associated."

Here are three more decisions which have particularly incensed Welch and his supporters, as seen through his eyes:

"In the Steve Nelson case the Warren court wiped out the antisedition laws of more than 40 States, and denied those States the right to protect themselves against treason, on the ground that the Federal Government had preempted the sedition field by passing the Smith Act (which act this same Supreme Court has done everything it could to vitiate).

"OF HIS ACTS

"In the Konigsberg case the Warren court canceled the right of any State to deny a license to practice law to a man merely because he would not say whether he was a Communist or not.

"In the Sweezy case the Warren court reversed the New Hampshire Supreme Court and held that the attorney general of New Hampshire was without authority to question a lecturer at the State university—supported by the taxpayers of New Hampshire—concerning reported subversive activities.

"There have been dozens more which we cannot even mention here."

Welch bases his argument for impeachment on article III, section 1 of the Constitution, which provides that Federal judges "shall hold their offices during good behavior."

HERE ARE SOME

Since the Constitution specifies no other arrangement for limiting the tenure of Federal judges to the periods of their "good behavior," Welch believes it is to be considered obvious that impeachment is to be used for those who violate this requirement.

Now it appears that there is a considerable body of American citizens who express themselves as dissatisfied with the behavior of Mr. Warren as Chief Justice of the United States.

They want Congress to bring impeachment proceedings against him.

I am not arguing the merits of this case, pro or con.

But the question has been raised as to whether these people are within their legal rights to take this kind of action.

Actually, it seems to this writer that no officeholder in this democratic Republic of ours ought to be beyond the reach of the people should they become dissatisfied with his public action.

UNDENIABLE FACTS

I say this impartially with reference to any position and regardless of the political party, race, creed or color of the person holding it.

Those in public life who arouse the wrath of the people must expect to settle their account with the people thereafter.

Impeachment by Congress under special circumstances is a legitimate kind of accounting in the Republic of the United States.

I am not a member of the John Birch Society, although I know fellow citizens who are enrolled in the organization.

From all outward appearances I have been impressed with their dedication to anti-communism and constitutional Americanism.

I cannot see where they have overstepped their right here.

[From the Los Angeles Herald-Express, Mar. 15, 1961]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION

There is no dearth of "Committees for Fair Play" in the United States nowadays whenever Communist-dominated organizations become the justified targets of the wrath of the American people.

They even have one of these things for Castro.

Now that an anti-Communist organization is under fire—the John Birch Society—let's see if the forces of liberalissimo observe the same high standards of conduct toward their opponents that they constantly whine for themselves. Where is the spirit of Voltaire here?

BEWARE, BEWARE

I am not a member of the John Birch Society, but I think that, in their case, a great number of innocent, patriotic Americans have been already much maligned by ideological hatchetmen who should have stood in bed as the saying goes.

As a member of the press who is interested primarily in fairplay—and above all, the truth—I think it is time to set the record straight. What's the score?

Let me make this suggestion to my readers in advance: Don't permit cunning voices with axes to grind stampede you by the unholy smear technique before you have a chance to investigate this matter without bias or prejudice to your own satisfaction.

Go and find out for yourselves.

Let your own eyes and ears—and conscience—be the judge.

OF INTERPRETATION

There is a John Birch office in Los Angeles, located at 3750 W. Sixth St., zone 5. Telephone: DUnkirk 5–2389. Its manager is a young man named Kent Steffgen. He told me he would be glad to answer your questions. Ask him about the side of the story he represents before arriving at any hard and fast decision.

When I first perceived the gigantic smear shaping up against the members of the John Birch Society—which numbers some of our finest citizens in its ranks here in the southern California area and elsewhere—I interviewed Steffgen about the matter.

Knowing the lofty American ideals of the society from some of my friends who are members, I considered it nothing less than lunatic to attempt to link this dedicated organization to the likes of Karl Marx, Adolf Hitler and Gerald L. K. Smith.

If I ever wrote a lie of that dimension, I would forever hang my head in shame.

The patron saints of the John Birch Society are George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Teddy Roosevelt.

GUILTY ONLY

To go to the heart of the problem, it is true that the founder of the John Birch Society once wrote a pamphlet for circulation among about 100 friends in which he was extremely critical of men like former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, former Vice President Richard Nixon, former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, and his brother, the present Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen Dulles.

These are all men whom I, personally, warmly admire and whose patriotic Americanism I have extolled on innumerable occasions in this column. I deplore any intemperate language used against any of these four fine men. And I won't buy a comma of it.

But having said this, there are other factors to be considered. In the first place, Robert Welch, the John Birch founder, wrote these intemperate statements before he had founded the society. It was in a book called "The Politician"—never in the society's "Blue Book." So what the author wrote before the society came into existence is certainly not binding—and has never been intended to be—upon the later membership.

BY ASSOCIATION

To condemn the membership for something Welch stated before the society came

into existence is little short of what our liberalissimo friends would call guilt by association. Now we can't have that, can we?

In the second place, let's look at the forest instead of the trees in this case. Granted that Robert Welch used intemperate language against four men whom I greatly admire—am I still to write off his magnificent fight against communism because of this personality factor?

I think the most important thing about the John Birch Society lies not in the personality of its founder—who likely needs a good public relations director like crazy—but in the fact that it is dedicated to the overthrow of communism and the protection of constitutional government in the Republic of the United States.

We can afford to overlook some faults of these dedicated anti-Communists on that account.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is of vital importance that this body, truly the most representative of the American people, be constantly mindful of the plight of every nation dominated and held captive by Soviet Russia.

With this thought in mind, the following message is intended for the American people as well as the people of Rumania.

It is with a mixture of great sorrow and little joy that I greet the people of Rumania today, May the 10th, the 84th anniversary of Rumanian Independence Day. My great sorrow is that I cannot greet a free Rumania whose people commemorate this day openly in jubilant nationwide celebrations. My joy is that I can greet the people of Rumania, still desirous of liberty and freedom, through the Rumanian National Committee which is working zealously for that freedom all over the world today.

In 1877, your nation united and proclaimed its independence, joining the community of nations as a sovereign kingdom. You valiantly preserved your precious independence from outside domination through the many years of turbulence and war in the Slavic states. With the advent of World War II, forces of violent determination imposed their brutal will on you only by sheer military might. After driving these forces of nazism from your borders and being assured of territorial integrity by the Soviet Union, the people of Rumania were subjected to the insidious techniques of Russian imperialism. Slowly seizing power from within, the Soviet Union finally forced the abdication of King Michael on December 30, 1947. From that day on, Rumania has been a captive nation. We of the free world have not let time change our deep conviction that you are held against your will by a totalitarian form of government in no way representative of the feelings of your people. There is not adequate evidence that your people want communism. On the other hand, we know of the suffering and the trials under the present Communist regime. If you were allowed to vote under totally free elections, and the results of those elections showed that you preferred a communistic form of government, then we would be convinced. Until that time, we will continue to have faith in your determination to one day live again under a government of your choice and within a society of your choice.

It is with these ideas in mind that we in the United States join in commemoration of your independence day, hoping that each of you will celebrate this day in your hearts and minds in anticipation of the day that you can freely celebrate it with your shouts and thanksgiving.

WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, Dayton and the Great Miami Valley are both the birthplace and the cradle of aviation—a fact of which all our folks are justifiably proud.

In the short period of time since the first powered aircraft was conceived and built in Dayton, Ohio, by Orville and Wilbur Wright, the most phenomenal progress in the history of the world has been made in the areas of speed and distance in transportation. The first powered flight was made by the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk, N.C., on December 17, 1903. From that very short flight just 58 years ago manned aircraft has continued to go forward until recently when a U.S. experimental aircraft attained a speed of greater than 3,100 miles per hour. This U.S. aircraft not only responded perfectly to the will, skill, and desire of the pilot but it also landed safely. Thus transportation by aircraft, commercial as well as military, from the most widely separated places in the world can be accomplished in a relatively few hours.

In recognition of these facts our U.S. Armed Forces used military aircraft with tremendous success in World War I and to progressively greater advantage during World War II and the Korean war.

Back in the early days of aviation the center of the research, development, and testing for the Armed Forces was McCook Field in Dayton, Ohio. It soon became apparent that the increased size and speed of military aircraft required a larger airfield and more extensive research, development, and testing facilities. Through the cooperation of the citizens of Dayton and the surrounding area a site was selected just east of Dayton, Ohio, and was appropriately named Wright Field in honor of the Wright brothers.

Wright Field is located partly in the Third Congressional District which I have the honor to represent here in the Congress of the United States and partly in the Seventh Congressional District which has long been so ably represented by my distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable CLARENCE J. BROWN.

Fairfield Air Supply Depot was later developed near the village of Fairfield in Greene County, Ohio, and subsequently renamed Patterson Field in honor of a distinguished pilot.

These two fields were later joined together in what is now known as Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The Wright-Patterson Air Force Base complex now includes some of the most vital and important functions of the entire U.S. Air Force and all of the folks in our area, as well as throughout the Nation, are justly proud of it.

The number of discoveries and techniques developed by the outstanding personnel and facilities at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base are legion and would read like a novel. Our U.S. Government has developed facilities on Wright-Patterson Air Force Base conservatively estimated to cost originally some $300 million and which could not be duplicated elsewhere for many times that amount.

Everyone in "Who's Who in Aviation" has either been stationed at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base at some time or has had frequent and personal contact with the many developments there.

Personnel, Mr. Speaker, now stationed or employed at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base are among the most knowledgeable and able research, scientific, management, and operational personnel anywhere in the world. Their daily contributions to the progress of flight, whether it be by manned aircraft or missiles, are beyond the comprehension of all of us.

Our Nation, Mr. Speaker, is in one of the most serious races against time in our history. Time is of the essence, and time lost, while it can never be regained, is especially critical at this point in our history.

Many changes are occurring constantly, Mr. Speaker, as a result of the development of technologies and new scientific discoveries.

All the thinking people in our area, Mr. Speaker, fully recognize these changes and realize that changes in functions must be made from time to time in the best interest of our Nation.

Recently announced changes in organizational duties, responsibilities, and procedures in the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base complex have caused considerable unrest and misgivings among many who have devoted the greatest part of their lives and abilities at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Congressman BROWN and I, together with others, have sought and held conferences on these matters with the Secretary of the Air Force, his staff, and many vitally concerned civilians. We have been pleased, Mr. Speaker, with the words of assurance

we have received from the Honorable Eugene Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force, high ranking Air Force Headquarters officers and others. But somehow, Mr. Speaker, rumors of further changes create a great deal of consternation and doubt in the minds of many and this has a bad effect upon the morale and progress of folks employed in the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base complex.

My purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress today, Mr. Speaker, is to make the Members aware of the danger inherent in uncertainty and the effects these uncertainties can have on the proper progress of the very important mission of the U.S. Air Force.

Congressman BROWN and I, along with all our constituents, believe most sincerely and deeply that the best interest of our Nation demands that the outstanding facilities and the highly skilled and trained personnel at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base require the continued highest and best use of these facilities and personnel. We pledge our continued and best efforts to assure these results.

An unusual and extremely helpful spirit of cooperation and understanding in this entire area has been developed between the scientific, professional, business, industrial, and civic leaders of our entire area with the operating and management officials of the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base complex. Our newspapers, radio stations, and television stations are also deeply concerned in these many problems of mutual interest. As an illustration of this and as just one example of the solidarity of our entire area in these objectives, I include editorials from the Dayton Journal Herald and the Dayton Daily News:

[From the Dayton Journal-Herald, Apr. 1, 1961]

THE LABS OF WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE

Two weeks ago, following the announcement regarding the change in the Air Force command structure, we emphasized that the space and aeronautical research laboratories at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base should not be overlooked in assessing the future of the base.

Yesterday, Generals Davis and Holzapple elaborated on their importance. Not only will such space-age projects already assigned to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base remain here but, according to the two Air Force spokesmen, the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base labs will continue to perform a major portion of the research work essential to the ever-expanding Air Force defense mission.

In short, the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base facilities are an integral, irreplaceable part of the whole Air Force establishment, and should continue to grow in importance. General Davis said the laboratory complex is, and will remain, the gravitational center for Air Force research and development.

This has been said repeatedly in recent years. But, as Generals Davis and Holzapple observed in their opening remarks yesterday, a reaffirmation was in order. It helps to dispel many apprehensions regarding the importance of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in the military field and in preserving the economic balance of the Dayton area.

The two generals were freshly home from Andrews Air Force Base and duly authorized to make the statements they did. Our community will now expect the Air Force to regard their commitments as seriously as we shall do.

[From the Dayton Journal-Herald, Apr. 22, 1961]

A STRONGER WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE PROMISE

This area has received assurances from several sources that there is a solid future for Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and the Dayton Air Force Depot on Wilmington Pike, but none until now from as high a level as Air Force Secretary Eugene M. Zuckert.

Secretary Zuckert, in a letter to Dayton area Representatives in Congress and Ohio's two Senators, has promised no foreseen appreciable reduction in the size, activity, or importance of the Dayton complex.

This promise would be strongly undergirded in the minds of Dayton area civic leaders if Mr. Zuckert would start soon to fulfill his implied intention to expand the Air Force Institute of Technology at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The postgraduate training center for Air Force officers long has needed a more adequate building. Increasing the activities of the Institute surely is justified by the demands of an expanding defense technology now reaching into outer space.

[From the Dayton Daily News, May 1, 1961]

POLITICS STILL PREVENTING FULLEST USE OF WRIGHT-PAT

Air Force Secretary Eugene Zuckert, in his recent statement on the future of Wright-Patterson, offered Ohio a generous helping of Job's comfort.

He spoke in vague and general terms when he talked of using to the full the base's matchless resources. But when he got down to specifics, he said, "only a few hundred personnel will be transferred" to the Washington area.

The few hundred was translated by a knowledgeable newsman, Jerry Kluttz of the Washington Post, as 300 senior employees. Presumably they will be added to the burgeoning Systems Command Headquarters at overcrowded Andrews Field, Md. Andrews is located in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area.

Meanwhile Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara is advising the Nation, and properly so, to avoid playing politics with defense when the national interests require the phasing down or closing of military bases.

His preachments are sound. Dayton always has tried to follow them. But they would go down better here if Pentagon did not stand passively by while they are being widely trampled. Andrews Field, a political pet if ever there was one, will do for an example.

A LITTLE HISTORY

Ten years ago, the research and development function was taken out of Air Materiel Command at Wright-Patterson. The idea was to give it more emphasis, to get the scientists moving in a hurry. It was a necessary goal. But one upshot was a harmful split between the development of complicated weapons systems and their later purchase, maintenance and supply.

As this division deepened, the need for more coordination became evident. The Air Force, which was then forced to move its research headquarters out of jammed Baltimore, proposed to relocate it at Wright-Patterson. That way the two commands could work together as they should.

Two Maryland Senators, BEALL and BUTLER, acting entirely out of selfish motives, managed to block the transfer. They threatened to balk Air Force appropriations. Overnight the Pentagon backed down. It had no stomach for a fight against politics in 1955. It moved the research command to Andrews, thus keeping it in Maryland.

Andrews is a horribly overcrowded base, just as Washington is an overcrowded city. Housing is almost nonexistent at Andrews. Airmen and junior officers regard being assigned there as the next thing to punishment.

After the move, research headquarters remained, as it had been before, split off from the buying, the maintenance, and the supply of the combat Air Force.

As research and development's role grew, taking more and more of the defense dollar, the need to tie the buying and the research together again got to be overpowering. So what did the Pentagon do? It shifted the buying responsibility from Dayton to Andrews, leaving logistics responsibility in Dayton.

There is hardly a knowledgeable senior officer in the Air Force who does not realize that this is an illogical answer, that elementary commonsense calls for a research and logistics command, recombining all these functions. The logic of locating that combined command at Wright-Patterson is equally clear.

The brainpower is here. The expensive facilities are here. Housing is not a problem. Wright-Patterson is attractive to service people. No big spending would be needed to get Humpty Dumpty together again.

Secretary Zuckert knows all this. So does Secretary McNamara, if he has had time to think about it, with all the studies piling up on his desk.

The only thing standing in the way of commonsense in 1961 is politics—the politics of Congress, the politics of industry which has a hand deep in the Pentagon's pocket, the politics of service ambitions.

When somebody in the Defense Department gets enough sand in his craw to stand up and say these things, all the piety about politics will start to command more respect.

J. EDGAR HOOVER—37 YEARS AT FBI

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, today J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, completes his 37th year in that position. While the Director himself may regard this as just another working day, I regard it as another milestone in his career of public service and welcome this opportunity to add my thanks to those of our grateful country.

Among the many accomplishments of the FBI under Mr. Hoover are two of special interest. The first is the FBI National Academy which has been training police officers since 1935. To date some 4,000 men have graduated from this course of special training and have returned to strengthen their local police departments. Along with this individual training the FBI will aid local authorities, on request, through the FBI Laboratory. In this way even the smallest police force can get the very best scientific and technical help in evaluating evidence.

A second development within the FBI has been of special interest to me because of my membership on the Health and Safety Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This is the FBI disaster squad,

established 20 years ago following an air crash near Washington. This group is always ready to be of assistance in identifying disaster victims. Since the FBI Identification Division is the world's largest repository of fingerprints, with over 158 million sets in its files, the disaster squad always has this effective Division available.

The disaster squad of the FBI is always ready to go directly to the scene of an accident or disaster to aid in identifying the dead. In the last 2 years the FBI has identified victims in 16 major disasters. This has been of great help not only to local authorities but also to the relatives of the victims.

While it is not pleasant to think of crime or accidents, it is reassuring to know that the FBI, under J. Edgar Hoover, is continually working on crime detection and stands always ready to respond to emergenices which might arise in any part of our Nation.

SAFETY BELTS

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey.

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, on January 25, I introduced H.R. 3295, a bill which would require that all automobiles sold in interstate commerce a year after enactment would be equipped with approved seat safety belts.

I hope this measure will become law. If the Congress in its wisdom does not approve the legislation, publicity attending our deliberations will at least sharpen awareness to highway safety necessities.

It is not my purpose to make a dramatic presentation of the torture, the sorrow, and the suffering which is part of the annual highway slaughter. I seek a partial solution of a tremendous problem through enactment of law. Though we are moved to act partially by emotion, our deliberations must be based on fact. Even so, I know that as you study the following cold statistics you will reflect as I have inevitably reflected—knowing that each number represents a human being.

Last year 37,910 died as a result of automobile accidents. Of these, three were personal friends of mine—others were friends and acquaintances or relatives of yours. Each number represents a personal tragedy for some family.

Many of these fatalities were young. One of each five deaths was a male citizen aged 20 to 24. Furthermore, the National Health Survey estimates that 4.2 million persons are injured annually in motor vehicle accidents. Highest injury rates are in the 15- to 24-year age category. Indeed, motor vehicle injuries account for more than half of all injuries requiring inpatient hospitalization.

We must speak of facts. In addition to the immeasurable loss resulting from death and injury and personal suffering, there is a measured cost in money—in medical and hospital care, in repairs, damage to personal and public property, and insurance which has to reflect in its cost, the frequency and severity of accidents.

WHAT CAN SEAT BELTS DO TO ALTER THE PRESENT SITUATION?

There are scientific studies which provide partial answers. It has been found, for instance, that auto doors open frequently during accidents. In injury producing accidents doors open more than 40 percent of the time and in fatal accidents more than 70 percent of the time. These figures are not yet conclusive, but they offer the best scientific sampling to this date. There is definite reason to believe that people ejected through open doors during an accident suffered more severe injuries than those who remained in the car. This leads to the conclusion that if ejections could be completely eliminated, thousands of lives could be saved annually. Preliminary studies indicate that 35 percent of fatal and serious injuries could be avoided by use of seat belts.

It is also interesting to note that those who must help prevent accidents, the safety conscious, law enforcement officers, and investigators with few exceptions endorse the belt as a realistic and valuable safety device. Many governmental agencies have provided for the installation of seat belts and many individuals who have utilized seat belts pursuant to that policy have credited the seat belt with preventing serious injury or even death in accidents.

It is obvious that seat belts accomplish nothing unless they are used all the time. We know, however, that the person could not use a belt if he did not have one installed. All the weight of fact indicates the advisability of their use.

Someone will perhaps argue that making seat belt installation compulsory adds to the cost of car accessories, one which some people might not want. I submit that installation at the factory will be cheaper, and probably better than if done later. I say further that this equipment is as vital as safety glass, or adequate brakes, turn indicators or the many other safety devices which we now accept as necessary. Investigators indicate that the belts under normal use should be safe and useful for at least 5 years. The annual cost would not be great.

Leaving provable fact for a moment, I would suggest a few opinions for your consideration.

With competition the keynote of our auto industry, I feel that this legislation would give impetus to improvement of design for safety and convenience factors. Actually, seat belts reduce the strain of arduous driving. I have spoken to many individuals who have had belts installed in their cars. None has noted an inconvenience factor. Similarly, I have asked many airline hostesses if they have encountered any resistance to use of seat belts on the part of airplane passengers. I have been told of three individual instances—three out of thousands of experiences. Of course, if the airline passenger refused to use the safety belt, he is not permitted to start the flight or continue after the next stop.

I believe the availability—or presence—of this equipment in an automobile and its full use each trip the passenger makes, would heighten the concern for safe driving by serving as a constant reminder of accident possibility.

The belt further promotes safety by enabling the driver to keep the car under control. The driver who is secured by a belt is not normally jostled from his seat—and his hands and legs are free to operate the vehicle.

Mr. Speaker, an eminent authority, Dr. Leroy E. Burney, former Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, has said:

> The seat belt is the most effective available means to bring about an immediate reduction in automobile accident deaths and injuries.

This is a summation of our thoughts in the matter. Delay in implementing total use of this equipment can result only in further needless waste of human life and resources. This is the time to act.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for appropriate reference today, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1949 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to set the minimum support price on wheat for 1961 at $2 per bushel.

The wheat farmers of Kansas and elsewhere are the forgotten frontiersmen of agriculture when considered in light of recent support increases on other basic commodities for 1961.

I wish to point out that wheat is now supported at a national average level of $1.78 and though the Secretary of Agriculture has administrative authority to raise this, he has given no indication he will. The $2 minimum figure contained in my bill corresponds with price increases provided for other agricultural commodities for 1961.

Some examples of increases are as follows:

	Unit	1960	1961
Corn	Bushel	$1.06	$1.20
Oats	do	.50	.62
Barley	do	.77	.93
Rye	do	.90	1.02
Grain sorghums	do	.85	1.08
	Hundredweight	1.52	1.93
Soybeans	Bushel	1.85	2.30
Flaxseed	do	2.38	2.80
Cottonseed	Ton	38.00	49.00
Dairy products (manufactured milk)	Hundredweight	3.22	3.40
Peanuts	Ton	201.02	221.00
Cotton	Pound	.324	.33
Rice	Hundredweight	4.42	4.71

It is my conviction the great majority of wheat farmers desire greater freedom from Government controls, but like other segments of our agricultural economy, our wheat farmers are threatened by the same cost-price squeeze. In all fairness why should wheat farmers go it alone? Until the many agricultural problems are resolved, let us have some semblance of uniformity.

My bill if enacted, would give wheat farmers approximately the same percentage price increase for the 1961 crop as already given farmers engaged in the production of other basic agricultural commodities listed above.

The 1961 wheat harvest is fast approaching and if the Secretary of Agriculture refuses by administrative action to give wheat consideration given other crops, the act of 1949 should be amended as I propose, to make the increase mandatory.

THE LATE HONORABLE GUY L. MOSER

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to call the attention of my colleagues to the death of a former Representative, the Honorable Guy L. Moser.

Mr. Moser served for three terms as a Member of the House, representing Berks County, the district in Pennsylvania which I now have the honor to represent.

Mr. Moser served his district with distinction in the 75th, 76th, and 77th Congresses. I last saw him when he visited me last November during my short confinement in the Community General Hospital in Reading, Pa., where Mr. Moser died yesterday after a short illness, at the age of 75.

To his only surviving relative, a nephew, Mr. Robert Althouse, I extend my deepest sympathy.

RIGHTS OF WIVES OF CONGRESSMEN

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, according to the press there seems to be very, very close cooperation between the leadership of the House, especially between the Speaker and the administration. Scarcely a day passes that we do not read something about pressure from the administration and from some Members of the House for additional so-called civil rights legislation or the enforcement of laws we already have.

It is encouraging to be told that the civil rights of all of us must be protected, though it is a little discouraging at times to see so much effort being made by both the administration and the leadership of the House to advance the civil rights of first one, then another, pressure group, which, according to common report, supported the President during the last campaign—at the expense of so many other good, worthy, and patriotic citizens.

There seems to be a forgetfulness on the part of some that, after all, the welfare of all of us is more important than the granting of special privilege or benefits to the members of a minority group.

The press, under date of May 9, carries a statement that our Speaker, affectionately known as "Mr. SAM," has advised the wives of Congressmen, who circulated a petition calling for a congressional vacation while school is out this summer, that their suggestion is—and I quote from the press—"the greatest nonsense I ever heard of, and I wouldn't mind being quoted on that."

We can all agree that the Congress is duty bound to make the public business its first consideration, that Congress should stay in session and give its continuous attention to legislation that is vital to the country as a whole.

We should make an earnest effort to comply with the statutory provision—United States Code, title 2, section 198, page 59—which provides that—

> Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

However, when we recall, as those who have served here more than one term will, that, under the Rules of the House, during the last few days of the session it is comparatively easy to get through legislation of interest to some individual members or groups, but with which the overwhelming majority of the House is not familiar, some think the Congress would do well to each day meet and consider legislation instead of following a practice of adjourning from Thursday until Tuesday or avoiding discussion of legislation 2 or 3 days a week.

Perhaps the leadership wishes to avoid discussion on the floor of the foreign situation and the dangers which now confront us, but surely Members of the Congress should have enough sound discretion to avoid endangering our country by discussing matters which are for the consideration of the Executive whenever that discussion would give aid and comfort to our enemies or indicate to them that we were not of one mind when the security of our country was involved.

All too often, the House fails to meet or limits its session to a few minutes, cuts short a session, adjourns—usually because some politically influential individual or group wishes to attend some party or social function.

Following is a news dispatch from the Chicago Tribune press service which carries the story of the petition being circulated by wives of Congressmen:

HOUSEWIVES TOLD OFF BY BACHELOR SAM—AGITATION FOR RECESS STIRS RAYBURN

WASHINGTON, May 9.—House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, in effect told the wives of House Members to mind their own business today and to leave the operation of the Congress to the men.

The wives have been circulating a petition for a congressional vacation while school is out this summer. They do not care whether Congress winds up its business in a hurry and quits, or takes a recess and reassembles here next fall.

"That is the greatest nonsense I ever heard of, and I wouldn't mind being quoted on that," RAYBURN told reporters at his morning press conference.

"I DON'T WANT IT"

"If we recess and come back in the fall, we may be here forever," the 79-year-old bachelor grumbled as the reporters reminded him that this was the proposal of the congressional wives.

"I don't want it; I don't believe in it," were his final words.

RAYBURN said that if Congress sticks to the business at hand "we can clean up and get out of here in 2 or 3 months." He said that he was unwilling to set an adjournment deadline.

"Nobody with any sense would attempt to put a time limit on it now," he snapped. "But we will get through faster than some people think."

Senate Democratic Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, who was holding his own press conference on the other side of the Capitol while RAYBURN was talking, said that Congress probably would adjourn between July 15 and August 1.

PETITION FOR RECESS

The number of young men in Congress having school-age children has increased tremendously since World War II, according to congressional officials. These young men and their wives complain that they are denied any vacation when Congress stays in session all summer. They are petitioning for a summer recess.

Some of the older Members, who have nothing at home to compare with the air-conditioned luxury of the Capitol and its office buildings, have no objections to spending the summer in Washington. They remind their younger colleagues that a summer in Washington is one of the hazards of their jobs.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, May 10 of each year is marked out by history as Rumanian Independence Day. That day is as indelibly marked in the heroic chapters of mankind's fight for freedom as is the 4th day of each July, our own National Independence Day. No tyrant, no dictator, no Russian commissar can alter that unchangeable fact of life. The meaning of this day burns in the hearts of all Rumanians worthy of that proud name, whether they live on our side or the other side of the Russian Iron Curtain. We Americans who know the blessings of liberty and human freedom share and cherish this day with the Rumanian people. We are bound together in an unbreakable union which finds its strength and purpose in the

highest aspirations of civilized mankind. The dignity of man, the satisfaction of which is the only valid test of any system of government, is the hallmark of Western civilization. Rumania is just as much a part of that civilization as is the United States of America.

Today the people of Rumania are separated by brute force from the free, Western World. They suffer under an alien occupation which is neither West nor East in origin; an alien way of life which can only be described as Muscovitic. All the evils of the ancient past have rallied their forces to the banner of Moscow and legions of terror have been sent forth to conquer the world. Rumania was overrun by these forces on March 6, 1945. Then the legal Government of Rumania was overthrown by force, backed up by the Red army, and a handful of quislings loyal to Moscow were installed as puppet rulers. From that day forward the people of Rumania have been engaged in a silent but determined war with their foreign occupiers.

Now, these 16 years later, the global struggle between human freedom and Russian despotism is reaching its point of climax. The alarm bells have sounded within the citadel of human freedom as the enemy stands without our very gates. Ninety miles from our shorelines, the legions of Moscow have established a beachhead and are now making Cuba into an island fortress. At long last the American people are thoroughly aroused by the penetration of Red Russia into the Western Hemisphere. The threat is no longer a theory or a far distant event involving the future of freedom's cause. It is clear and present. This fact has been crystallized by President Kennedy who has bluntly warned that a war is being waged against us, not a classical war, but a war far more dangerous than we have experienced in the past. There is one basic question before the American people today. It is: How shall we respond to this threat, where and by what means shall we engage the enemy? Should it be in Laos or in Vietnam where an invitation to engage in armed conflict awaits our decision? Should it be in Africa where the weapons would be political and economic actions? Or should we carry the fight to the heartland of the enemy, behind the Russian Iron Curtain where we have millions and millions of proven allies and where the weapons would be political pressure backed up by all the military power we can muster?

To me the choice is clear. It would be a tragic blunder if we allowed the enemy to choose the place and time and circumstances where we would engage him in battle. Laos, Vietnam, Africa, or any other theater of operations in the free world must be regarded as purely secondary battlegrounds. We must carry the battle to the territories and nations occupied by the enemy, at times and places of our choosing, with political weapons which the enemy cannot match and which stir fear among his motley legions.

For too long the Russians have been undisturbed in their game of presiding over an empire of captive nations. For too long the Russians have been allowed to exploit hundreds of millions of peoples in these non-Russian nations. For too long we have failed to support the aspirations of the common man behind the Iron Curtain for national independence and a return of his liberties.

Rumanian Independence Day, which we observe in freedom today, serves as a reminder that our legions of allies behind the Iron Curtain anxiously await the opportunity to join with us in the peaceful dismemberment of the Russian Communist empire. We shall have no peace until this task is accomplished. The longer we wait the more secondary wars will be forced upon us by Moscow at places and times of their choice. We must not allow this to happen. We must now face up to total political engagement of the enemy, unafraid of the consequences, and confident of the victory which shall surely be ours. Then and only then will the United States be safe and secure. Then Rumania will again be free and independent.

POPULAR SUPPORT FOR HOUSE RESOLUTION 211 ESTABLISHING SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago I had the privilege of introducing a resolution calling for the establishment of a Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Several Members submitted similar resolutions. The discussion that took place in this Chamber on "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," and in which over 20 Members participated, was not only most impressive but also quite effective in terms of the popular interest and support it has generated (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 8, 1961, pp. 3518–3543).

For the past month I regularly released some of the letters and communications received in support of House Resolution 211. Space permitting, the RECORD contains dozens of these letters sent in by groups and individuals from all parts of the Nation. Many of these letters indicate not only a spirited favorable reaction to my proposal and that of my colleagues but also the thinking of our citizens and friends on this vital issue. I am happy to report that all the major general organizations with a knowledgeable interest in this basic subject have endorsed House Resolution 211, and their representation exceeds 20 million American citizens.

ENDORSEMENTS BY MAJOR GENERAL ORGANIZATIONS

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 27, 1961—pages 4928–4929—the detailed endorsement received from the National Captive Nations Committee, Inc., enumerates many reasons why the creation of a Special Committee on Captive Nations is a national necessity. It was with great personal pleasure that I introduced this letter of endorsement into the RECORD then because, along with many other Members, I enjoy honorary membership in this national organization. As is generally known, the organization inspired and guided the first anniversary observance of Captive Nations Week in 1960. This nationwide group consists of a membership representing labor, management, religious institutions, the press, educational bodies, civic and veteran groups, fraternal and various ethnic organizations.

In addition to the National Captive Nations Committee, Inc., other major organizations have placed themselves on record in support of House Resolution 211. In the order in which they were received, I take this occasion to introduce into the RECORD the important endorsements of these major general groups.

The first is that received from the Assembly of Captive European Nations. This assembly, as we all know, consists of free representatives from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. Their contributions to the cause of freedom everywhere are monumental, and it is most gratifying indeed, to introduce at this point the letter of support sent by the Assembly of Captive European Nations:

ASSEMBLY OF CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., March 24, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I am glad to convey to you the congratulations and the appreciation of the Assembly for the initiative you have taken in the House of Representatives to revive your last year's proposal for establishment of a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

The imperative necessity for the West, and especially the United States, to move on to the offensive on the issue of the East-Central European countries under Soviet colonial rule, is even more evident today than it was a year ago. The resistance spirit of the captive peoples has become an even more important factor in deterring the Kremlin from an outright aggression that would provoke a nuclear war.

We were very impressed by the scope and depth of the data you marshaled to support your case and we rejoiced in the ample and instantaneous support you received in the House. It is our hope and trust that the resolution on the Captive Nations Committee will be adopted in this session of the Congress and we extend to you our best wishes for the success of this most important proposal. Your resolution, and especially its eventual adoption by the Congress, will doubtlessly have a very favorable impact among our captive peoples, who desperately need proof that the West has not written them off but is actively working for their self-determination.

Sincerely yours,
VACLOVAS SIDZIKAUSKAS,
Chairman.

Another strong endorsement of House Resolution 211 has been received from the Conference of Americans of Cen-

tral and Eastern European Descent. This important conference consists of member organizations which are national in scope and represent over 15 million American citizens. Included are the Albanian American Literary Society, the American Bulgarian League, the Czechoslovak National Council of America, the Estonian National Committee in the United States of America, the American Hungarian Federation, the American Latvian Association, the American Lithuanian Council, the Polish American Congress, the Rumanian American National Committee, and the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. The indispensable support of this conference and its member organizations is most gratefully acknowledged, and I introduce here the endorsement of House Resolution 211 by the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICANS
OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN
EUROPEAN DESCENT,
New York, N.Y., April 13, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives, New House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent and all of its member organizations, we are indeed pleased to express to you our sincere thanks, and assure you of our fullest support, in connection with the draft resolution, introduced by you in the House of Representatives, for the establishment of a permanent Congressional Committee on Captive Nations.

The member organizations of our conference represent over 15 million American citizens of Albanian, Bulgarian, Czechoslovakian, Estonian, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, and Ukrainian descent, dedicated to the preservation of our freedoms and independence and especially equipped with knowledge and information pertaining to the captive nations of central and eastern Europe. We hailed the adoption by the Congress, and the proclamation by the President, of the Captive Nations Week resolution, but we feel that it is imperative in the interests of the U.S. Government and the general public to establish a clearinghouse for information on the captive nations of the kind proposed by your draft resolution. Only in this manner will it be possible to counter effectively Soviet propaganda, which hypocritically attacks colonialism in Africa and Asia, while maintaining the most backward colonialism for the captive nations within its own empire.

Thank you again for your initiative in this matter. We are requesting our member organizations and all of their branches to extend to you their fullest support.

Sincerely yours,
VRATISLAV BUSEK,
Chairman, Executive Committee.
JOHN G. LEXA,
Secretary.

Joining these representative national organizations in support of House Resolution 211 is also the American Conference for the Liberation of the non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R. This national conference likewise consists of member organizations whose representation extends throughout the United States. Making up the conference are the American Committee for Independent Armenia, the American Council for Independent Idel-Ural, the Azerbaijani-American Association, the Byelorussian-American Association, the Cossack-American National Alliance, the Georgian National Alliance, the North Caucasian National Committee of America, the Turkestanian-American Association, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and the Whiteruthenian Congress Committee of America. The powerful endorsement sent by the American Conference's president, the Honorable Stephen J. Jarema, former assemblyman of New York, is most welcomed, and I introduce it now in the RECORD:

AMERICAN CONFERENCE FOR THE
LIBERATION OF THE NON-RUSSIAN
NATIONS IN THE U.S.S.R.,
New York, N.Y., April 27, 1961.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: At our recent meeting of the conference, of which I am privileged to head, I was requested to communicate our appreciation and gratitude for your concern on behalf of the captive nations.

The respective organizations of this conference are keenly appreciative of the tremendous value that the enactment of your resolution, establishing a special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives, would have in compiling factual material in relation to the imperialistic designs of Communist Moscow.

World events clearly mandate the existence of a House committee, such as proposed by you. We believe, as you, such a House committee would be to the best interests of our country in the increasing arenas of propaganda warfare. Unless we are prepared to meet the challenge of the future, the list of captive nations will grow in number.

The passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution 2 years ago, brought forth upon your colleagues vilification and abuse in the Communist periodicals. This by itself is proof of their weakness and vulnerability. Karl Marx believed that the Russian power could only be defeated with a tough and fearless policy. Communism succeeds only because we have been indecisive and prone to conciliate.

The permanent House committee, such as suggested, would be an avenue of overcoming the propaganda of the Communists in their ever-seeking quest for world domination. Where the State Department, through protocol, fears to probe, your colleagues and you will have an excellent media to show the world the truth of the Communist plan for world domination through bloodless conquests.

We offer to you, sir, our best wishes and support for the passage of your House Resolution 211 to establish the House special Committee on Captive Nations.

Sincerely on behalf of the conference,
STEPHEN J. JAREMA,
President.

Mr. Speaker, also supporting the passage of House Resolution 211 is the American Friends of Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, Inc. Similar to the American Conference for the Liberation of the Non-Russian Nations in the U.S.S.R., this organization consists of hundreds of thousands of American citizens of East European and Asiatic background. In a recent memorandum sent to the President, this group endorsed the proposal of establishing a special Committee on Captive Nations. Because much of the memorandum represents further justification for the creation of such a committee, I request that it be printed in full at this point in my remarks:

SOVIET RUSSIAN CHALLENGE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MR. PRESIDENT: The American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations AFABN), representing hundreds of thousands of American citizens of Central and Eastern European and Asian background and extraction, is gratified to express its wholehearted congratulations and good wishes on the occasion of your ascendancy to the White House as Chief Executive of the United States of America.

Our organization derives its membership from the U.S. citizens springing from Albanian, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Bulgarian, Byelorussian, Cossack, Croatian, Czech, Estonian, Georgian, Hungarian, Idel-Uralian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, Serbian, Slovak, Slovene, Turkestanian, and Ukrainian descent, all of whom are wholly dedicated to the preservation of our freedom and the independence of the United States of America. Moreover, as American citizens of European and Asian background, our member organizations are also deeply interested in the plight of our brethren who are languishing in the enslavement and despotism of Communist Russia. As people of various national and religious origins, they are in possession of valuable unbiased knowledge and information concerning Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism which they should like to impart to you. This knowledge and data cannot but be useful and practical in the policymaking area.

We are writing to you, Mr. President, in the secure conviction of your awareness of the deplorable status and plight of the captive non-Russian nations; you have demonstrated your sympathy for and understanding of their desire for freedom and independence by supporting every measure in their behalf in the U.S. Congress, including the passage of the bold Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959, which tended to alleviate their condition under the oppressive yoke of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism.

We are particularly gratified by your reserve with regard to Moscow-inspired summitry, which Nikita S. Khrushchev, the dedicated enemy of the United States and of the free world at large, is trying to exploit in order to expedite his grand plan for a global Soviet state under the domination and control of Moscow.

Our confidence in your understanding of the menance posed by Moscow is even more solidly strengthened by your latest warning to Khrushchev in the matter of the Congo. You firmly stated: "There should be no misunderstanding of the position of the United States." In your challenging Inaugural Address, Mr. President, you unequivocally gave the position of the United States on the problem of our freedom and our survival, when you stated:

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

It is with this in mind, Mr. President, that we are respectfully submitting to you this brief memorandum on the Russian challenge to the United States. We trust it will

throw penetrating light upon an area which is obscured by alien propaganda, emanating domestically as well as from abroad, and illusorily constricted in importance by the timid and the ignorant among us. It is this area, we believe—our relationship with the Soviet colonial and imperialist power—that will determine our fate.

For the Executive Council of the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevic Bloc of Nations.

IGNATIUS M. BILLINSKY,
Chairman.
CHARLES ANDREANSZKY,
Secretary General.

SOVIET RUSSIAN CHALLENGE TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1. Soviet Russian policy and strategy with respect to the United States

There are many political analysts who naively believed that the Soviet Russian official policy with respect to the United States would undergo fundamental changes and modifications upon the ascendancy of the new administration in Washington. Such reasoning, of course, was a product of wishful thinking rather than a result of sober and searching analysis of the overall international goals and objectives of Soviet Russia. Many of our so-called experts on the Soviet Union erroneously saw an evolution in the U.S.S.R. toward a more liberal system of government; they pointed to a relaxation of Soviet secret police activity and the decentralization of authority. But the entire behavior of the Soviet Russian leaders and, especially, the recent cynical and reckless Soviet policies in the Congo, Laos, and Cuba only confirm what has long been established as undeniable truth: no "peaceful coexistence" is possible with Moscow, because Communist Russia is irrevocably determined to conquer the entire world and to establish a global Soviet state. None other than Khrushchev himself has repeated time and again his conviction that he will "bury" the United States and that our children will "live under communism." These predictions and prophecies by the Soviet Russian leaders are, regrettably, taken lightly by Western leaders, although the Russian Communists believe devoutly in them and are doing everything in their power to bring about their swiftest realization and fulfillment.

2. Russian imperialism and colonialism

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has made some outstanding progress in science, especially in the field of space navigation and rocketry, the Soviet Union remains ridden with the perennial weakness of the unrest and discontent of the vast majority of the population, especially among the enslaved non-Russian nations, which constitute a majority of the entire population of the Soviet Union.

It is to be recalled that during the 15th session of the United Nations General Assembly last fall, Khrushchev raised the issue of colonialism and almost wrecked the international body. He severely castigated the United States, Great Britain, France, Belgium, and other Western powers, and claimed that he spoke for some "100 million colonial peoples" of Asia and Africa. It is most regrettable that, with the exception of such countries as Canada, Chile, and the Philippines, no representative of a great Western power dared to challenge Khrushchev on his own slave empire and to demand that his own slogan of "national liberation" and self-determination be applied in the first place to the captive non-Russian nations, oppressed to a degree that is unprecedented in the world's history.

Contrary to the frequent use of such terms as "nation" or "country" with regard to the Soviet Union, the U.S.S.R. is not a homogeneous "nation" in the sense that the United States, France, Japan, Germany, or Italy is. The U.S.S.R. is a slave empire consisting of many conquered nations, which the Russians dominate, and whose economic, cultural, intellectual, and manpower resources they exploit in the drive for the expansion and aggrandizement of the Russian empire.

According to a legalistic definition, the present Soviet empire consists of two types of satellite and colonial dependencies:

(a) External satellites: These are the non-Russian countries which were subjugated after World War II and which, although nominally independent, are directed and exploited by the local Communist parties controlled by the Kremlin: Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Albania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Outer Mongolia, North Korea, and North Vietnam;

(b) Internal satellites: These are the non-Russian countries and nations which were first subjugated by the Russian czars, and which had attained their full independence in 1918–20, but then again were subjugated by Lenin and Stalin. They allegedly form a "free" Soviet Union and can "freely" secede from the U.S.S.R., according to their constitutions; but in reality these are par excellence Russian colonies: Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Georgia, Armenia, Cossackia, Azerbaijan, and Turkestan (the latter, following the Russian precept of divide et impera, has beeen divided into five Moslem states—the Soviet Kazakh, Kirghiz, Tadzik, Turkmen, and Uzbek Republics).

The Russian Communist regime was imposed upon these captive nations by Moscow-directed aggression and expansion. Economic exploitation, Russification, execution, and deportation—these are the characteristic features of Russian rule in these hapless non-Russian countries.

If the United Nations, as Khrushchev proposed, should be united in opposition to colonialism, it is then its solemn duty to oppose and combat Soviet Russian colonialism, the scourge of our time and civilization, a prime menace to mankind.

Russian colonialism and imperialism is undoubtedly the greatest danger which today confronts the West, including the United States. Yet it is distressing how unaware the West is of its dire peril and how little is being done to capitalize those perennial strains and stresses which are created inside the U.S.S.R. by the systematic revolts, resistance, and opposition of the captive non-Russian nations in their undying quest for complete freedom and independence.

Western statesmen have become so myopic and unimaginative that when they do manage to attack Moscow for its colonial oppression, they usually refer only to the recent captive nations, the "external satellites" of the U.S.S.R. Yet the backbone of Russian imperialism and colonialism lies in the occupation of the non-Russian nations, inhabiting the large land masses from the Baltic to the Black Sea, around the Caucasus and the Urals, and in Central Asia as well. It is these areas which provide the huge economic resources, manpower, and military and strategical bases for the continuous expansion and drive of Russian imperialism. Without access to the Black and Baltic Seas, for example, Russia would be deprived of its strategic and geopolitical springboards, and would be compelled to develop its own, relatively limited economic resources and to care for its own people rather than engage in foreign conquests and expansions by both overt act and by infiltration.

3. No double-standard measure with regard to colonialism

Recently, G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, incurred the ire of some of America's European allies, notably Great Britain, for his forthright and honest statement made in Kenya, Africa, in which he expressed a belief that "Africa is for the Africans." He was promptly backed up by yourself, Mr. President. Also a few months ago, members of the House Subcommittee on African Affairs, upon their return from a study trip to Africa, advocated a "complete divorcement" of the United States from colonialism.

These announcements are heartily endorsed and approved by representatives of all the captive nations, who fully realize that the era of colonialism has come to an end and that no people or nation, be it small or large, can ever be denied its freedom and independence.

These considerations, again, bring up the matter of the colonial subjugation of the non-Russian nations, which have the same God-given right as any African people or tribe to the blessings of freedom and independence.

However, the Western Powers, and the United States in particular, not only have not supported, but have even been hostile to the claims of the enslaved non-Russian nations to freedom and political independence. Only a year or two ago the Voice of America, our chief psychological warfare instrumentality, reduced the Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian services and completely eliminated the Uzbek-language program from its broadcasting, claiming as the cause a "lack of transmitters." The American Committee for Liberation, which claims that its contributions come from "private American sources," deemed it expedient to change its Munich "Radio Liberation" to "Radio Liberty," apparently in fear of offending the sensitivities of the Russians, who presumably were more concerned over the name of the station than the contents of the broadcasts themselves.

By ignoring the plight of the captive non-Russian nations the West, and the United States as well, has substantially helped to build up an image of a "unified and non-colonial Russia," and by doing so has helped make Communist Russia attractive and appealing to the many colonial peoples of Africa and Asia—who highly resent certain Western powers in the first place.

In the area of international politics, particularly where colonialism is concerned, the United States of America lost one of its greatest opportunities to score before the enslaved nations in the U.S.S.R., especially during the 15th session of the United Nations General Assembly last fall, when the U.S. Representative failed to challenge Khrushchev on his colonial oppression and domination of the non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

HOW TO MEET THE RUSSIAN CHALLENGE?

The present international tension and uncertainty—created by the persistent and systematic Russian drive to divide the West, to stir up domestic disturbances, to win new adherents and friends by promising economic assistance or liberation—cannot be alleviated by naively hoping that Khrushchev will become a sensible and amiable person and begin to talk sense. Those who think so forget that those who rule the Soviet Russian empire are fanatical and dedicated men who will stop at nothing until their political objectives are attained. To be sure, they might well not declare a war against us; but, as experience demonstrates, they have attained many of their objectives without war. They progress on the road to world domination only through threat of war, forceful negotiations, and peaceful coexistence.

You, Mr. President, have already demonstrated political sagacity by not accepting Khrushchev's bid for a summit meeting. We hope for the sake of the free world that such ability to espy Communist motivations will continue to be evident in all dealings with the Kremlin clique.

But other steps must be taken by the U.S. Government in order to win the friendship and sympathy of the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain, thereby stimulating them as well as undermining any hold that the Kremlin may have upon them.

1. Recognition of legitimate aspirations to freedom

One of the most urgent steps to be taken by the U.S. Government is recognition of the legitimate aspirations of the enslaved non-Russian nations to their freedom and independence. The U.S. Congress has already taken a great forward stride by enacting the Captive Nations Week resolution in July 1959. This act, it will be recalled, precipitated a storm of protests and denunciations of the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States by Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Soviet press and the Soviet and satellite delegates at the United Nations. The whole U.S.S.R. was enraged and frightened at the idea that the U.S. Congress should concern itself with the plight of peoples that Moscow hoped had been forgotten.

2. Permanent "Captive Nations Committee"

In order to capitalize upon the great weapon which the "Captive Nations Week resolution" constitutes, a permanent "Captive Nations Committee" should be established by Congress which would gather all data and material concerning the situation of the captive nations and make factual analyses, which would then be made available for the U.S. Government's executive agencies. In judging the establishment of such a committee, it is to be recalled that in Moscow the Soviet Government has created a "Freedom University," at which hundreds of students from every country of the world, and especially those from Africa and Asia, are given free training in Communist philosophy, sabotage, espionage, and other revolutionary sciences and doctrines. Such a committee would at least partially compensate for any Soviet gains made in this area. True, Moscow would violently object to the establishment of such a committee, but we should be guided primarily by the interest of the United States and its overall necessity to survive as a free and independent nation, and as the leader of the free world against the forces of Communist despotism and oppression.

3. "Freedom Academy"

The United States also should establish a "Freedom Academy," an official training school, which would take upon itself the task of training and educating young Americans, and be dedicated to the maintenance of freedom at home and its expansion abroad. It would be much on the same level as the "Peace Corps," another bold innovation by the new administration. Such a "Freedom Academy" should especially produce specialists in the affairs of the non-Russian nations, their histories, economic conditions, and above all, their quest of liberation from Russian Communist tyranny, an area which is sadly neglected in official circles as well as in our educational institutions.

4. World anti-Communist organization

The recent influx of refugees from communism-infected Cuba demonstrates the sore need for unified anti-Communist centers, which would take care of anti-Communist refugess not only with regard to shelter and resettlement, but also in providing them with political leadership and training, so that eventually they might again become productive leaders and citizens in their home countries upon the fall of the communist dictatorship. Since the end of World War II the United States has accepted close to 1 million anti-Communist refugees, while many hundreds of thousands have settled in other free countries. These people possess special knowledge, experience and, above all, an immeasurable opposition to and hatred for communism, which energies could be harnessed and directed for the purpose of strengthening the cause of freedom here and elsewhere.

In conclusion, the United States is the only power in the world today that can effectively resist the onslaught of Moscow. Moreover, the United States is unique in that it is the only power in the world which can rally all the freedom fighters. This it can achieve by stressing time and again that it will never become reconciled to Russian domination of the captive non-Russian nations, and that their liberation, as well as the disfranchisement of the colonial peoples in Asia and Africa, is a prime goal of U.S. foreign policy, and the cornerstone of a future peace and justice and freedom for all.

TEN SOLID REASONS FOR THE CREATION OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. Speaker, from these endorsements and scores of letters supporting House Resolution 211 one can extract over a dozen sound and convincing reasons for the necessary creation of a special Committee on Captive Nations. In brief form I should like to advance these 10 solid reasons:

First. From his vantage point President Eisenhower in two proclamations on Captive Nations Week summoned the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations."

Second. President Kennedy in answer to a question raised on this subject during the presidential campaign said:

I am, of course, in agreement with the Presidential proclamations. The captive nations should be studied intensively. If a joint congressional Committee on the Captive Nations is the best way to insure such popular study, I would naturally not be opposed to it.

Third. There is a hazardous gap in our official and private facilities as concerns this necessary task of studying systematically, objectively, and continuously all of the captive nations, especially those in the U.S.S.R. Nowhere is there any agency, public or private, performing this essential task.

Fourth. Passage of House Resolution 211 would be the first concrete implementation of the Captive Nations Week resolution, passed by Congress in 1959. The fearful reaction of Moscow to this resolution shall never be forgotten. We can show now that we meant what we resolved then.

Fifth. House Resolution 211 is realistically based on the aggregative concept of the captive nations—meaning those inside the U.S.S.R. as well as outside, in Asia as well as in Eastern Europe. It emphasizes the strategic importance—indeed, the primary strategic value—of all these nations for peace and also for cold and hot war purposes.

Sixth. As advocates of freedom everywhere, we must always realize that the cold war is not just between Moscow's totalitarian empire and the free world but also and essentially between the captive peoples and the imposed puppet governments. House Resolution 211 is based on this realization, and its passage would provide the necessary and prudent leverage for the captive nations in their cold war against colonial Russian domination.

Seventh. The studies, facts, and truths educed by a special committee would give the constant lie to the propagandized and overblown Russian image, particularly in the underdeveloped areas of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

Eighth. Such a committee, engaged in continuous work based on the aggregative captive nations concept, would become a rich reservoir of new dimensions of thought, of new and fresh ideas, of solid and grounded recommendations for positive and constructive action against the traditional imperialism and colonialism of Moscow.

Ninth. The existence of such a committee would be a permanent reminder to Khrushchev that we do not now nor shall we ever write off the captive nations. This committee would give concrete evidence to the position expressed by the President in his state of the Union message:

We must never forget our hopes for the ultimate freedom and welfare of the Eastern European peoples.

Tenth. With the second anniversary of Captive Nations Week observance only 2 months hence, the House can take the lead in making this year's observance a still more successful one by creating this special Committee on Captive Nations. The vital and basic subject of the captive nations in the aggregate perhaps deserves the resources of a joint committee and also the steadfast attention of a Cabinet officer, but we can take this first step to insure that the subject will receive adequate and continuous attention in the troublesome days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, these 10 solid reasons underlying the necessity of a special House Committee on Captive Nations are in complete consonance with the many forceful declarations made by the President these past few weeks. As a matter of fact, the committee contemplated by House Resolution 211 would be a proper congressional medium giving concrete expression to these remarkable declarations. In his note to Khrushchev, the President stated:

The great revolution in the history of man, past, present, and future, is the revolution of those determined to be free.

The special committee will relate and record for the benefit of our people the forces of this revolution in Eastern Europe and Asia. In his address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors the President warned:

We dare not fail to see the insidious nature of this new and deeper struggle. We dare not fail to grasp the new concepts, the new tools, the new sense of urgency we will need to combat it.

The special committee could help immensely in this by showing our people and others in the free world how these new concepts and new tools were employed also in the rape of formerly independent nations in Eastern Europe and Asia.

In a second note to Khrushchev, the President emphasized that "the people of the United States believe that the

right of self-determination is fundamental and should apply throughout the world." In the full spirit of this fixed belief our special committee would focus steadfast public and world attention on those over 20 nations in Eastern Europe and Asia whose expressed right of national self-determination has been nullified by Moscow's imperialism and colonialism.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish again to stress the need for factfinding studies and hearings which would disclose the real colonial and imperialist Russian image. In this connection I documented heavily my address on "Russian Colonialism and the Necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee" of last March 8, using as one of my sources an engaging article on "Nine Lingering Myths on Russia," written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University. A reading of this article explains in part why the creation of a special House Committee on Captive Nations is a must.

It has been brought to my attention that a sequel to that article appeared recently in the authoritative organ on East European and Asiatic affairs, the Ukrainian Quarterly. Published in the winter 1960 issue of the journal, the article is titled "The Russian Image and United States."

It was written by Dr. Dobriansky in reply to many queries that were raised with regard to the previous article. The article shows further how we have been bamboozled by skillful Russian propaganda and how the ostensibly power-packed Russian image cast throughout the world could be easily deflated. It supports further my arguments for the necessary passage of House Resolution 211, establishing a special Committee on Captive Nations. I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, to be followed by the full text of the aforementioned resolution, House Resolution 211:

THE RUSSIAN IMAGE AND UNITED STATES

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Readers' interest in the recent article written by the author on myths pertaining to Russia is both gratifying and surprising[1] Naturally it is quite satisfying to witness the amount of interest stimulated by that article. But, more important, it is surprising to observe the critical reaction and the bewilderment shown in response to it. Some have taken the writer to task for maintaining that Soviet communism is complete myth: Others have severely critized him for extending the captive nations thesis beyond the commonly accepted limits of the so-called satellites in Central Europe. The majority who corresponded with the writer expressed mental discomfort over the myths they have been clinging to and readily admitted that their impressions of Russia have been badly shaken.

Of course, this is all to the good. But even these people are not totally convinced that their mythical conceptions of Russia are thoroughly invalid. Somehow they can't believe that the notions and impressions they have become accustomed to are rooted in sand. In this respect they are not alone. Confronted by the same situation, millions of others react in the same way. To help them break through this predicament is the sole aim of this sequel to the lingering myths. The points raised by the critics and the bewildered form the basis of this article. As in the previous essay, the net effect sought here is the demolishment of the Russian image carried in the minds of Americans who have become special objects of methodical Russian propaganda.

PROPAGANDA AND THE RUSSIAN IMAGE

Guided by evidence, one can truly say that perhaps more than anything else, the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in Congress, in July 1959, crystallized what we Americans don't really know about Russia. The 86th Congress cannot be thanked too greatly for this national service. For this resolution, now Public Law 86–90, signified for the first time official recognition of the existence of the majority captive non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union itself. The law lists most of them. Yet, when it was passed, our citizens in general were stunned by the new names in the captive family of nations. Many never heard of White Ruthenia or Cossackia and others inquired as to where Turkestan or Idel-Ural is located. Holy mother Russia exponents in this country seized upon this ignorance and down to this day have the brash mendacity to claim that no such entities exist. Ten years ago these Russian emigres used the same technique of obscurantism with reference to Ukraine. Meanwhile, a number of writers and analysts continued along their merry but blind way to apply the resolution solely to the minority of captive nations in Central Europe. However, muddied as our situation was, Khrushchev, above all, clearly understood the content and meaning of the resolution, particularly as concerns his projected image of Russia, and he exploded.

Now, how does one account for this blatant disparity in reaction and understanding? On the one hand, Nekulturny Nikita fumingly displays troubled concern over this action; on the other hand, millions of Americans are literally mystified by the action, no less the commotion. There is no doubt that the answer lies in the dangerous lag of our knowledge and understanding of the many nations imprisoned in the Soviet Union. We are faced by an enemy who consistently capitalizes on this lag. Yet he was openly frightened by the prospect that the captive nations resolution would spell the end of this free capitalization and convert his propaganda profits into serious losses.

The importance of this lag was recently touched upon by President-elect Kennedy in a message sent to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on the occasion of its 20th anniversary celebration. In part it reads as follows: "I stated that I deplored the monolith term often used by the Republican administration in Washington, 'Soviet Nation' or 'Soviet people.' In essence, it is contrary to the Captive Nations Week resolution enacted last year. Its use implies that we condone the status quo of the Communist takeover of all the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain."[2] This statement strikes at the spurious Russian image, and it will be interesting to observe to what extent that image will be emasculated in the course of the Kennedy administration.

That this ersatz image must be destroyed is one of the most pressing necessities challenging U.S. propaganda efforts. It is no exaggeration to say that if—God forbid—we should lose in the cold war to Moscow, it would basically be the result of this intellectual lag in our appreciative understanding of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. than of any missile gap, sputnik superiority, or economic catchup. Also without an iota of exaggeration, the present supremacy of Russian propaganda is based on the existence of this lag. Since Khrushchev's visit to the United States, Russian propagandists have been depicting the U.S.S.R. as "the greatest power in the world." Don't for a second think that there isn't an increasing number of people throughout the free world who are beginning to take this seriously. Even here in the United States the belief is spreading that this may be so in 10 years. The lag serves their purposes and, as a recent tourist to the Soviet Union put it, "Communist China and Soviet Russia's understanding of the value of constant repetition, of association of ideas, of persuasion, indicates a profound knowledge of human reactions."[3]

But knowledge, too, is power. And a working knowledge of the basic politico-economic realities of the Soviet Union certifies to a blustering giant with clay feet. This is not to suggest that the clayfooted giant is not a real threat to our free national existence. On the contrary, it is and will continue to be as long as we fail to know and analyze its synthetic nature; even beyond this, so long as we fail to act upon our knowledge, particularly in the all-important field of methodic propaganda. In a very real sense, Russia's Iron Curtain extends to our shores as concerns a working understanding of what is unthinkingly called Russia. It may, for example, astonish some of our critical readers to learn that despite the fact that over half of U.S.S.R.'s population is non-Russian, the policy planning group in our Department of State scarcely concerns itself with the majority non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union. The writer's own experiences have shown that our policymakers know more about diverse peoples in Asia and Africa—most of them relatively unimportant in terms of the major struggle—than they do of the different nations and cultures in the U.S.S.R. In short, as the French under Napoleon in the 19th century and the Germans twice in this century, we are missing the boat when it comes to understanding Russia.

THE PRISONS OF OUR CONCEPTS

As emphasized in our previous article, in contending with any opponent commonsense dictates that we examine his background and record, his makeup, weaknesses, and strength. We certainly must do this if his weaknesses are to be transformed into real vulnerabilities. We then form certain conceptions of him which are to guide our behavior toward him. The same logical process applies to Russia. The concepts we employ in relation to it are the true reflectors of our understanding—or misunderstanding—of it.

Descartes once said that men become prisoners of their own thoughts. Since thoughts without concepts are impossible, they thus become prisoners of their ruling concepts. Perhaps nowhere is the prisonhold of our habitual concepts stronger than in the field of the Soviet Union, Russia, and the captive non-Russian nations. Indeed, after one gives his intellectual assent to all that is said regarding each of these entities, he invariably slips back into the groove of his accustomed concept of Russia and his momentary understanding again becomes blurred and distorted. Obviously time is required for us to alter our concepts for more effective insights into the issues discussed here.

One needn't look far for the standard and also misleading concepts used by our opinionmakers. Take, for example, the recent report released by the President's Commission on National Goals.[4] This is supposed to be a vital and guiding report prepared by knowledgeable citizens. The sections deal-

[1] Dobriansky, Lev E., "Nine Lingering Myths on Russia," The Ukrainian Quarterly, summer 1960, pp. 125–138.

[2] The Ukrainian Bulletin, Nov. 1–15, 1960, p. I.

[3] "Reds Held Expert in Some Ad Fields," the New York Times, July 19, 1960.

[4] Text of the report, the New York Times, Nov. 28, 1960.

ing with the Russian threat should be the most important and accurate of all since once this threat is eliminated, the others on the international scene become very minor in character as concerns our national security. According to the members of this Commission, the Soviet Union is a nation. They declare: "The power and opportunities of the Sino-Soviet nations are such that it will be a major task to prevent their expansion in the coming decade." The report is studded with similar conceptual inaccuracies, and the section on Communist-dominated areas is almost worthless. The section displays no understanding of the strategic nature of the captive nations, no less what to do with them.

In the report one finds the usual references to Communist doctrine and orientation, as though communism were the real ideological threat. It is clearly evident that the Commission failed to avail itself of many sources which have established the myth of communism. As a matter of fact, it could have profited from those who have had the closest truck with Russian totalitarianism in one form or another. For instance, the experiences of Morros which led to the Soble spy case would alone have been most instructive in demonstrating the ideological expediency of totalitarian Moscow. "I want to emphasize," he says, "that the Russian plot is far more strongly organized in this country and throughout the world than is generally understood by our people. I say 'Russian plot' because the schemes of the present military dictatorship in the Soviet Union go beyond communism. They are for pan-Slavism on a scale more ambitious than Hitler's fanatical dreams of world conquest. The Russians are realists. The present regime in Moscow has been hatching a vast imperialistic plot for a Slav-dominated world."[5] Morros explains pan-Slavism as "the bill of goods which has been sold to the Communist leaders in control of all the Slav countries which are Russian satellites." This and related viewpoints easily show that the Russian image, cast by Khrushchev and the Moscow propaganda machine and uncritically accepted by too many circles in the free world, is only the modern mask of Russian totalitarianism.

Read any newspaper, listen to the radio and TV comments, pick up any periodical dealing with Eastern Europe or central Asia and you cannot but be impressed by the ignorant confusion of the Soviet Union and Russia. In pointing this out, we could almost sense the reader's immediate reaction: "Oh, why be so technical? This stress on semantics appears picayunish." The fact is that this is not solely a matter of superficial semantics but, fundamentally, a matter of sound and realistic conception. Surely, if you are a gentleman or a lady, and someone persists in calling you a coarse sot or a harlot, you don't shrug it off with, "Oh, just a matter of semantics." That is, if pride with dignity and personal integrity is at all determining. Words expressing a false conception of you, your background, your character, and intentions, and some even denying them, may prove to be quite provoking. So with peoples and nations. The non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union have suffered too much to preserve their identities, no less to advance their aspirations. Even the Russian totalitarians have had to take fitting notice of this undying instinct for national self-preservation.

In addition, concepts and conceptions which are not in rational conformity with distinguishable realities hardly form a basis for intelligent action. Not only do defective concepts disclose an equally defective understanding, they also preclude the possibility of imaginative thinking along lines of alternative courses of action. This is our dire plight today in connection with the Soviet Union. Many opportunities for effective action in the United Nations and elsewhere on issues of imperialism, colonialism, and the like are actually muffed and lost because of the trained inability of some to see things in a different and truer light. In 1956, Vice President Nixon uttered precious words when he declared: "We must be ready to meet Soviet moves, but we must also be prepared with all peaceful and honorable means to take the initiative in advancing everywhere the cause of human freedom. Our record in support of the dignity of man and the independence of peoples needs no apologies any place in this world."[6] Much the same was uttered in his acceptance speech in July 1960, but at no time in this period was the electorate given an inkling into the concrete content of any program based on these principled propositions, particularly in relation to the Soviet Union. And yet much could have been furnished without inciting any scare of a precipitated war.

Yes, whether you wish to believe it or not, even on the highest levels of our Government the above plight exists. Our leaders in public and private life parrot the same errors which can only benefit Moscow. It isn't necessary for one to study intensively the histories of Eastern Europe and central Asia to become aware of the fact that many different nations exist in these areas. One does not have to be a scholar to know that the Soviet Union is not a nation. For this purpose all that is required is a quick glance at the constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and read some of Khrushchev's speeches intended for home consumption.

To easily satisfy his critics, the writer could offer hundreds of examples illustrating this plight in the highest echelons of our Government. Some were given in the previous article. Here let us just cite the State Department pamphlet entitled "Realities of Soviet Foreign Economic Policies." It begins a sentence in this vein: "Thus, because of its economic system, the world's second largest industrial nation in its dealings * * *." According to this conception, if Poland, like a dozen non-Russian nations since 1923, were forcibly incorporated into the U.S.S.R., "the world's second largest industrial nation" would supposedly be that much greater. And some economists would, no doubt, absurdly continue to use the concept of gross national product with reference to the U.S.S.R.

ROOT CAUSES OF OUR MISCONCEPTS

Now, as before, it should be quite evident that there is something radically wrong with our conceptions and concepts of Russia. They are defective, inaccurate, and perilously misleading because of what we don't fundamentally know and thus can't appreciate and evaluate with vivid understanding. First and foremost, the basic fact that the Soviet Union is in essence an empire of many subjugated nations escapes most of us. For our various analyses, policies, and objectives there is a world of difference between the false view of the U.S.S.R. as a nation and this historically grounded fact. Most of us have little patience for historical analysis. It is amazing how many have apparently forgotten the forcible incorporation of the three Baltic nations into the U.S.S.R. in 1940–41. Yet this imperialist annexation by Moscow in itself should suggest the empire nature of the U.S.S.R. But it is not surprising that few of us are aware of how the Soviet Union was established in the first place. The Russian image is entirely different when the U.S.S.R. is viewed from the imperial angle rather than that bearing myths spawned by Moscow and also some incorrigible Russian emigres in the free world.

Moreover, it should also be always firmly borne in mind that although officially the Soviet Union is paraded about as a federal union of republics, in reality it is nothing more than a legalistic facade for Moscow's primary empire. The U.S.S.R. is no more a voluntary federal union than the nations in central Europe are independent peoples' democracies. The concept of U.S.S.R. is today just an expedient and thin legal line between Moscow's external satellites in central Europe and its internal satellites within the territorial confines of the U.S.S.R. At the close of World War I these internal satellites also were newly independent states. Like Poland, Finland, and others, Ukraine, Lithuania, Georgia, Armenia, and other non-Russian nations in the collapsing Russian Empire declared their independence and founded their free republics. Ukraine and Georgia were even recognized by Lenin's Soviet Russia.

An accurate and true orientation toward the U.S.S.R. also demands the steadfast retention of another essential general fact. The fate that befell independent Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, and others in the 1940's was the tragedy of the similarly independent republics of Georgia, Ukraine, White Ruthenia and others in the early 1920's. Trotsky's Red Russian Army picked them off one by one after they were softened up by infiltration, subversion, ideological deception, and additional techniques of intensive revolution. Many of these cold war techniques we are witnessing today in every quarter of the free world.

One must also constantly remember the paramount fact that following this first wave of Red Russian imperialism, by 1923 these non-Russian nations were forced into the spurious federation called the U.S.S.R. Considering their population and resources, it should be quite obvious that these nations formed the captive base for Moscow's further imperialist thrust into central Europe. Today they constitute the base for Russian colonial designs and operations in the Middle East, Asia, and Africa. It is certain that we would not be concerned today with any threat from any U.S.S.R. had the Allied Powers, on the very basis of the Wilsonian principle of national self-determination, actively supported these new non-Russian states in Eastern Europe and central Asia following World War I.

Not ever to be forgotten either is the history for freedom on the part of these non-Russian nations since 1923. Including the fifties, there isn't a decade when serious friction, resistance, pressure, and even rebellion haven't scalded Moscow's hold over these non-Russian colonies. The data on this are simply overwhelming. Most outstanding, of course, were the millions of non-Russians who deserted to the supposedly liberating Germans in Ukraine during the earlier stages of World War II. Trotskyism, Bukharinism and other threats to the Moscow regime have faded away long ago, but bourgeois nationalism, or in our words, the drive for national independence, of these non-Russian peoples is persistent and undying. A month does not go by without some attack against it by Moscow and its puppets. It was this patriotic nationalism that basically pressured Stalin to bid for the inclusion of Ukraine and Byelorussia as charter members of the United Nations. From time to time Moscow simulates the independence of the non-Russian republics. Amendments to the U.S.S.R. constitution provide for their own war ministries and the right to enter into direct diplomatic relations with other states.

With these several determining observations in mind, it obviously doesn't make sense for us to show more interest in the independence urges of the Bakongos and the

[5] The New York Times, Aug. 13, 1957.

[6] Republican National Convention, the New York Times, Aug. 24, 1956.

Watusis in Africa than of these non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. In the latter case, we are dealing with large populaces whose histories extend back even before Christ and whose forebears enjoyed their periods of national freedom. Ukraine alone has a population of about 45 million, qualifying it as the largest non-Russian nation not only in the U.S.S.R. but also behind the Iron Curtain. When Khrushchev and others speak of 177 or 182 different nationalities in the U.S.S.R., they are dealing out a myth. Small tribal units scattered about the Arctic and in Asia could hardly be classified as national units. On a unifying religious basis there are about 35 million Moslems who offer another point of distinction to the approximately 96 million Russians. Moscow exploits this fact in its policies toward the Islamic world; we aren't even aware of it.

Also beyond the ken of our appreciative understanding is the economic and military significance of this non-Russian–Russian ratio in the U.S.S.R. Our present economic and military comparisons between the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America make as much qualitative sense as comparing the British Empire and the United States in the 19th century. An economy based on extensive captive resources is hardly comparable with our free national economy. It can be easily shown that most of the essential resources in the U.S.S.R. are concentrated in the non-Russian areas. In short, the Russian image isn't what it appears to be.

REALITIES FOR SUPERFICIAL ACTUALITIES

It is hoped that the points elaborated here achieve the purpose of this sequel article. Those raised by the many critics of the article on myths have been met squarely. The writer cannot emphasize too strongly that our crucial need today is the substitution of realities for superficial actualities in our thinking and doing about the Soviet Union. It doesn't require much imagination to see that propaganda out of Moscow on the economic progress of the U.S.S.R. would take on different color and meaning if it were subjected to the prism of the realities of economic colonialism and imperialism within the U.S.S.R. In the military field, with about 43 percent of the armed forces in the U.S.S.R. being non-Russian—and aside from likely individual Russian defection—the so-called military might of the U.S.S.R. also takes on a different shade of meaning. Hungary furnished only the most recent example of Ukrainian, Russian, and other defections.

The problem thus is one of political psychology, not rival philosophies, comparative economics, an arms race and the like. The struggle today is being waged basically on the propaganda level. The minds and hearts of men are the chief targets. This has always been Russia's empire-building mode of attack. We can crush it once we begin to substitute realities for the actualities of our misconceptions about Russia. The Captive Nations Week resolution was such a start; and Moscow feared it profoundly. Much, much more can and must be done to unmask the Russian image if the United States is to win the cold war and avoid a hot global war. But this will require taking to heart and mind, even in this nuclear age, the following words by Colonel Maillard:

"No, the secret of victory does not reside in instruments of destruction. It is a power old as the world, yet always young, more redoubtable than arms; apt to give birth to great surprises, because it creates in an hour the most unexpected means of action, the most varied artifices, applying them to circumstances with admirable precision. It is moral power resulting from three forces: the Intelligence which conceives; the Will which executes; the Courage which faces death."

HOUSE RESOLUTION 211

Whereas on the issue of colonialism the blatant hypocrisy of imperialist Moscow has not been adequately exposed by us in the United Nations and elsewhere; and

Whereas two Presidential proclamations designating Captive Nations Week summon the American people "to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the people of those captive nations"; and

Whereas the nationwide observances in the first anniversary of Captive Nations Week clearly demonstrated the enthusiastic response of major sections of our society to this Presidential call; and

Whereas following the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution in 1959 by the Congress of the United States and again during the observance of Captive Nations Week in 1960, Moscow displayed to the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of an interest in all of the captive nations, and particularly the occupied non-Russian colonies within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas the indispensable advancement of such basic knowledge and interest alone can serve to explode current myths on Soviet unity, Soviet national economy and monolithic military prowess and openly to expose the depths of imperialist totalitarianism and economic colonialism throughout the Red Russian Empire, especially inside the so-called Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

Whereas, for example, it was not generally recognized, and thus not advantageously made use of, that in point of geography, history, and demography, the now famous U–2 plane flew mostly over captive non-Russian territories in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas in the fundamental conviction that the central issue of our times is imperialist totalitarian slavery versus democratic national freedom, we commence to win the psychopolitical cold war by assembling and forthrightly utilizing all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and other subjugated nations; and

Whereas the enlightening forces generated by such knowledge and understanding of the fate of these occupied and captive non-Russian nations would also give encouragement to latent liberal elements in the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic—which contains Russia itself—and would help bring to the oppressed Russian people their overdue independence from centuries-long authoritarian rule and tyranny; and

Whereas these weapons of truth, fact, and ideas would counter effectively and overwhelm and defeat Moscow's worldwide propaganda campaign in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and specifically among the newly independent and underdeveloped nations and states; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon us as free citizens to appreciatively recognize that the captive nations in the aggregate constitute not only a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by Moscow's totalitarian imperialism, but also a prime positive means for the advance of world freedom in a struggle which in totalistic form is psychopolitical; and

Whereas in pursuit of a diplomacy of truth we cannot for long avoid bringing into question Moscow's legalistic pretensions of "noninterference in the internal affairs of states" and other contrivances which are acutely subject to examination under the light of morally founded legal principles and political, economic, and historical evidence; and

Whereas in the implementing spirit of our own congressional Captive Nations Week resolution and the two Presidential proclamations it is in our own strategic interest and that of the nontotalitarian free world to undertake a continuous and unremitting study of all the captive nations for the purpose of developing new approaches and fresh ideas for victory in the psychopolitical cold war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a committee which shall be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations. The committee shall be composed of ten Members of the House, of whom not more than six shall be members of the same political party and of whom five shall be members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. (a) Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(b) The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. In the absence of the chairman, the vice chairman shall act as chairman.

(c) A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum except that a lesser number, to be fixed by the committee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee shall conduct an inquiry into and a study of all the captive non-Russian nations, which includes those in the Soviet Union and Asia, and also of the Russian people, with particular reference to the moral and legal status of Red totalitarian control over them, facts concerning conditions existing in these nations, and means by which the United States can assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their national and individual freedoms.

(b) The committee shall make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deems proper, and shall make its first comprehensive report of the results of its inquiry and study, together with its recommendations, not later than January 31, 1962.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times within or outside the United States to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee may employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER), for 30 minutes, on May 10.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER), for 30 minutes, on May 11.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. TOLL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include a newspaper article, and to extend his remarks at the end of proceedings of today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WHARTON.

Mr. COHELAN to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. SCRANTON.

Mr. WEAVER.

Mrs. BOLTON.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. AVERY.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. SAYLOR.

Mr. DURNO to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. BRADEMAS.

Mr. FASCELL.

Mr. PETERSON.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 11, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

889. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the relocation housing program for small homes as administered by the Office of the Administrator and the Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, pursuant to section 221 of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

890. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a report covering personal property received by State surplus property agencies for certain distribution, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

891. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

892. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 302(1) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to extend the period of time for which individuals may serve as members of advisory committees appointed by the Administrator"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1986. A bill to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter; without amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 6151. A bill to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 929. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the prepaid dues income of certain membership organizations to be included in gross income for the taxable years to which the dues relate; with amendment (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2244. A bill relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to charitable organizations whose sole purpose is making distributions to other charitable organizations, contributions to which by individuals are deductible within the 30 percent limitation of adjusted gross income; with amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4449. A bill to amend paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of certain articles for religious purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6611. A bill to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 283. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 3279, a bill to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SISK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 284. Resolution for the consideration of H.R. 4614, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 6944. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 to facilitate and promote the transfer of common-use items to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration from the other departments and agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 6945. A bill to amend the act of May 25, 1920, relating to conveyances of certain parts of rights-of-way by railroad companies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 6946. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to provide a minimum support price for the 1961 crop of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6947. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, to confer upon the Federal Power Commission authority to exercise control over the allocation of the available supply of natural gas moving in interstate commerce during periods of shortage or under certain other circumstances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6948. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, to give the Federal Power Commission authority, in certain cases, to order natural gas companies to increase rates where necessary to correct undue discrimination; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6949. A bill to amend section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act, to authorize a gas distributing company to complain about a rate schedule filed by a natural gas company and to give the Federal Power Commission authority to suspend changes in rate schedules covering sales for resale for industrial use only; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6950. A bill to amend section 12 of the Natural Gas Act, with respect to the issuance of securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6951. A bill to authorize the Federal Power Commission to exempt small hydroelectric projects from certain of the licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6952. A bill to amend section 202 of the Federal Power Act, to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6953. A bill to amend section 4(d) of the Natural Gas Act, with respect to the making of changes in rates and charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6954. A bill to amend section 205(d) of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the making of changes in rates and charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6955. A bill to amend section 308(a) of the Federal Power Act with respect to intervention in Federal Power Commission proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6956. A bill to authorize the Federal Power Commission to delegate its functions;

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6957. A bill to amend section 7 (c) and (e) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6958. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act with respect to the importation and exportation of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6959. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act with respect to the interconnection of facilities for the transportation of natural gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6960. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural gas companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6961. A bill to amend section 7(f) of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6962. A bill to amend section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6963. A bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act, with respect to investigations and reports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6964. A bill to amend section 15 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 6965. A bill to make the evaluation of recreational benefits resulting from the construction of any Federal project an integral part of project planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 6966. A bill to provide for the extension of rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 6967. A bill to provide for the incorporation of certain nonprofit corporations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 6968. A bill to suspend for a temporary period the import duty on jet aircraft and jet aircraft engines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 6969. A bill to amend section 417 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that death pension may be paid in lieu of dependency and indemnity compensation in certain cases involving service-connected deaths occurring after December 31, 1956; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6970. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to provide a minimum support price for the 1961 crop of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 6971. A bill to conform the provisions of section 802 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with those of section 510 thereof as amended by Public Law 86-575, approved July 5, 1960, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6972. A bill to encourage and promote safety in the merchant marine by requiring that seamen on vessels of the United States meet certain physical requirements; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6973. A bill to amend section 88 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 6974. A bill to amend section 607(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 6975. A bill to extend and improve the National Defense Education Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 6976. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 6977. A bill to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6978. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to include a pro rata share of the income of foreign corporations in the gross income of taxpayers owning, directly or indirectly, 10 percent or more of the voting stock of such foreign corporations, to repeal the foreign tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6979. A bill to amend section 2310 of title 10 of the United States Code, relating to determinations and decisions as to procurement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6980. A bill to designate judicial precedents which shall be binding in the administration and enforcement of the internal revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 6981. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, in order to provide a minimum support price for the 1961 crop of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6982. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy for the development of the science of counteraction to the world Communist conspiracy and for the training and development of leaders in a total political war; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H.R. 6983. A bill to provide for a term of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to be held at Duncan, Okla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 6984. A bill to provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at universities, colleges, and other educational institutions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 6985. A bill to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6986. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 415. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GLENN:

H.J. Res. 416. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.J. Res. 417. Joint resolution to designate the lake formed by Terminus Dam on the Kaweah River in California as Lake Kaweah; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.J. Res. 418. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.J. Res. 419. Joint resolution amending the act of June 18, 1929, to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 438 Members beginning with the 88th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H. Con. Res. 299. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the present tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. Con. Res. 300. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the present tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Con. Res. 301. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 302. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H. Con. Res. 303. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 285. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 27, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 286. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 27, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 287. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 3 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 3, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 288. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 9, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the present FHA laws to permit FHA insurance on loans on leases with less than 50 years remaining; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Secretary of Commerce of the United States to appoint to the Travel Advisory Board a person from the State of

Hawaii; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an equal rights for women amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the purchase of the site of the Isaac Graff House on the southwest corner of Seventh and Market Streets in the city of Philadelphia, as an addition to the Independence National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 6987. A bill for the relief of Maj. William R. Cook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 6988. A bill for the relief of Yick T. Jew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H.R. 6989. A bill to authorize the disposal of surplus equipment, materials, books and supplies under section 203(j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to the Georgia Sheriffs' Boys Ranch, Inc.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 6990. A bill for the relief of John Kish (alias John Mihai); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6991. A bill for the relief of Danuta Janina Poremba and Maria Janina Poremba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 6992. A bill for the relief of Ng Shu Kan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6993. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Liwszyc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 6994. A bill for the relief of Yuehhwa Chu and her son, James C. C. Lu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIX:

H.R. 6995. A bill for the relief of Maria Podraznik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.R. 6996. A bill for the relief of Harry Weinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6997. A bill for the relief of Wlodzimierz Miska and Wanda Miska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 6998. A bill for the relief of Anthony Pirotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6999. A bill for the relief of Henry Massari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 7000. A bill for the relief of Mr. Lie Kiem Tjhing and Mrs. Liem Gien Tjwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.J. Res. 420. Joint resolution to authorize the Speaker of the House of Representatives to confer a medal on Alan Bartlett Shepard, Jr., commander, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 421. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.J. Res. 422. Joint resolution to authorize the continued use of certain lands within the Sequoia National Park by portions of an existing hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

143. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Forrest Cooper, secretary-treasurer, Western Association of State Highway Officials, Salem, Oreg., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Western Association of State Highway Officials pledging full cooperation and support to Rex M. Whitton in performing the duties associated with his new position and wish him Godspeed and good luck, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

She Sings for the Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in the hurry and bustle of daily life we are sometimes prone to forget how important it is to maintain the morale of our Armed Forces, the guardians of the peace and the security of our Nation. Whether these young people are stationed at home or abroad, they are still away from their loved ones. It is, therefore, most important that their morale be kept high and that we give them all possible assurance of a strong, secure and free America.

I have written these words as I was listening to an album of favorite recordings by the popular singer, Jennie Thomas, who has made it a part of her career and duty to visit military installations all over the country and sing for the boys. She has selected 12 of the songs most frequently requested by the boys at the Army camps, the Air Force bases, the Navy installations, and these she has recorded for them. In fact, she calls her album "Jennie Thomas Sings for the Boys."

One really grows nostalgic listening to such well-known favorites as "Summertime," "Carolina in the Morning," "I'll See You in My Dreams," "Stardust," "Night Train," and others. Miss Thomas is not only popular at the military camps where thousands of the boys have heard her, but she has also appeared on radio and television. She can sing a hymn as inspiringly as a popular melody. Miss Thomas and all those associated with her in the production of this album deserve to be congratulated for a job well done.

The Common Situs Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the fundamental reason for consideration of common situs legislation, as shown by the testimony, is that there is a basic dispute between unions themselves. This is a family squabble between industrial and craft unions for jurisdiction.

Testimony before the Senate committee in regard to the construction of missile and test centers has brought out a swarm of problems. The chief one is rivalry between craft unions and industrial unions as to whose members are to perform the work. In addition, craft unions have squabbled amongst themselves over jurisdiction. This has resulted in a greatly increased cost of missile site construction and a subsequent delay in our missile program.

The common situs bill would greatly aggravate this situation because it makes legal the secondary boycott on construction jobs. The secondary boycott is the most vicious weapon—and at the present time is outlawed by the statutes. The passage of this bill would greatly aggravate the irregularities which have been disclosed to exist at our missile sites. The unions are treated fairly under the present laws, and the bosses are not entitled to receive the big whip which the passage of the common situs bill would give them.

Are a few union bosses going to dictate to the Congress of the United States what action should be taken? Is Jimmy Hoffa going to be made more powerful than the very Government of this country?

Such would be the result if this vicious piece of legislation was passed.

Rivers Needs No Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I rise in defense of a Member of the other side of the aisle, L. MENDEL RIVERS, of South Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this body, I take exception to the contents of an article by a well known Washington columnist on Monday of this week reflecting on the character, the reputation, and the integrity of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. Mr. RIVERS is a veteran Member of this House and enjoys the respect and confidence of all who know him. I have known him pleasantly during my membership in the Congress. He is a dedicated Member of the Congress of the United States.

While columnists make a livelihood of this kind of writing, it is the first time I have read such a criticism of Mr. RIVERS. With his accustomed dignity, Mr. RIVERS elects to treat such a tirade with quiet disdain. This is admirable.

Mr. Speaker, I have never traveled outside the continental limits of the United States, consequently, I am not defending myself or my record. However, I have complete confidence in Mr. RIVERS, his judgment, his conduct, and his responsibility. I am sure he represents the best interests of the great Committee on Armed Services and of the Congress of this Nation in his travels.

I am sure the people of South Carolina will not be swayed, in the slightest, by an unwarranted and highly inaccurate article.

Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, on the face of the matter, it would appear that this body stands in rather a ridiculous position of now considering the importation of Mexican farm labor. Last week we were engaged in assisting our unemployed in distressed areas and previously we were engaged in extending and raising unemployment benefits—all hailed in turn by this administration as emergency matters of the greatest importance. I can well appreciate that our colleagues now approach the subject with trepidation and apologies.

The subject of farm labor certainly deserves the consideration of the best Harvard minds in the White House and it would be well to include as much commonsense as possible. My own district, for instance, is one of the leading dairy areas of the New York City milkshed. We are operating under a marketing order that has effectively been maneuvered by the milk corporations in a manner that has all but eliminated the family farm. This situation, in my opinion, is extremely bad with 9 out of 10 of our family farms already added to the ranks of the unemployed at the present time. High costs have all but eliminated farm labor in the area and farm operators in many cases cannot even afford the necessary machinery to put themselves in a competitive position. There has been much talk of committees and do-it-yourself, but no positive action.

If this administration is sincere in its belief that unemployment should be curbed, the lot of the farmer improved and his economic position strengthened, I would respectfully suggest that we forget about committees, investigations, and do-it-yourself programs; and that the Secretary of Agriculture under the complete authority heretofore extended him in these matters, correct the evils which the farmers are operating under—I refer to Marketing Order No. 27 in the New York-New Jersey marketing area.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the traditional national holiday of the people of Rumania in commemoration of that nation's independence and the formation of the kingdom of Rumania. Since Rumania is one of the unfortunate nations now held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain, it is especially significant that we cooperate with the Rumanian people throughout the world in energetically perpetuating their goal of eventual freedom for their oppressed nation.

The Rumanian people and their vigorous monarch, King Michael, fought courageously to maintain their freedom before engulfment by the Soviet hordes in the closing days of World War II, and under the unfortunate wartime blunders of President Roosevelt and his advisers, Rumania and the other nations now behind the Iron Curtain suffered their present enslavement.

We, as Members of the U.S. Congress, have an obligation to the cause of true freedom throughout the world to rededicate ourselves on occasions such as this to the proposition that Rumania and its fellow satellite nations will, as soon as practical, see a rebirth of freedom.

Rumania has had a long, unique history marked by numerous battles for survival. As is the case in all small nations, the danger of domination by huge neighbors has always been present, but the Rumanian people have maintained their spirit of resistance to oppression, their nationality, their culture, their distinctive customs and observations, and they are maintaining them today.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the Rumanian national holiday, it is well for us to appreciate the Rumanian historical contributions but also to emphasize that we look forward to the future when these heroic people will once again share in true freedom and be permitted to establish a government of their own choice.

I also wish to take this opportunity to commend the Americans of Rumanian ancestry for their great contributions to the United States. They are honest, hardworking, dedicated people, who have made great contributions to the development of this country, just as their people in Europe for centuries who were the bulwark of Christianity against the Moslem invaders, and who always stood for sound principles in government, and freedom and legitimate nationalistic aspirations for all men.

Golden Spike Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. BLAINE PETERSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant and dramatic events in the history of our Nation took place exactly 92 years ago today. I refer to the completion of the first transcontinental railroad route in America.

It was at high noon on May 10, 1869, that the famous Golden Spike was driven at a point called Promontory in the mountains north of the Great Salt Lake in my native and historic Utah, connecting the tracks of the Central Pacific—now the Southern Pacific—and the Union Pacific railroads.

In order that nationwide recognition may be given to the 100th anniversary of this great achievement, I have asked the Postmaster General to issue a special stamp. By my advance request I hope to reserve 1969 for the observance of this spectacular and meaningful occasion which, even today, in the age of almost inconceivable scientific progress remains one of man's greatest engineering feats.

But more important, at least as I see it, is the fact that it marked the beginning of a new and vital era of national development. Immense regions were opened up to farming, mining, lumbering, and manufacturing. Struggling, pioneer settlements found themselves linked to new life and growth. Distance was no longer a barrier to trade.

Early in life my father taught me a respect for the importance of the railroads. He was a conductor on the Southern Pacific for 45 years and remembered the days when towns sprang into being and commerce developed wherever the rails were laid down or were extended. Millions of acres of land were put under cultivation, and land values were multiplied.

In short, the railroads encouraged expansion at a time when both encouragement and expansion were sorely needed, and they have ever since been an indispensable part of everyday American life.

When that first transcontinental rail route was completed, there were about 50,000 miles of railroad in the entire United States. Today, a network of some 220,000 miles of railroad line and 370,000 miles of track stretches between our cities and towns. And for all the vision of those who were present at the

driving of the golden spike, for all their faith in the future of transportation by railroad, I feel sure they would still marvel at the transportation job done by the railroads of 1961 and at the tremendous technological advancements which have been brought about in the industry.

Last year, the class I railroads alone produced 572 billion ton-miles of freight service. This is the equivalent of moving nearly 9 tons of freight a mile each day for every man, woman and child in the United States. And in passenger service, they transported more than 325 million travelers.

Altogether, the railroads today carry nearly half of the Nation's intercity freight load, more than a fourth of all commercial passenger traffic and three-fourths of all nonlocal mail. It strikes me that it is worth remembering that were we ever to be without railroads our American way of life, based upon large-scale production and consumption, would be utterly impossible.

In addition, of course, the railroads are major employers with some 800,000 people on their payroll. They provide work for many additional thousands through purchases of the Nation's products to the healthy tune of $2½ billion annually. And their tax payments average a billion dollars a year.

This great transportation complex, representing a total investment of $36 billion, is indeed a far cry from the railroads of 92 years ago. And it is reassuring to see the many evidences of the railroad industry's determination to continue to move ahead.

Thus it is that in taking this opportunity to pay a tribute to these important facilities on which the welfare of our Nation is so dependent, I am also mindful of the fact that a further safeguard of the national interest would be an updated national transportation policy suited to a truly balanced transportation system. The new and growing demands of an expanding America have need of ever better transportation services and our total effort to that end is essential to the economy and defense of this Nation.

Law Enforcement Speaks to Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, last Monday, May 8, the second annual law observance exhibit was dedicated at the Philadelphia National Bank, Broad and Chestnut Streets, at 12:30 p.m. It was again sponsored by the Philadelphia Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, law observance committee. This exhibit was entitled "Law Enforcement Speaks to Youth."

The Attorney General of the United States, Robert F. Kennedy, in writing to the chairman of the committee about the exhibit, said:

Many persons who will see your exhibit will gain a new insight into the high caliber of law enforcement in our country.

He also remarked in a letter attached to these remarks:

The vigor, dedication, and skill of the Philadelphia chapter in making this unique contribution sets a high standard and an excellent example which I hope other public-spirited organizations will see fit to emulate.

I have included a copy of the splendid remarks by Harry D. Shargel, Esq., the indefatigable chairman of the law observance committee, as well as a memorandum on the highlights of the exhibit and the personnel who participated.

This type of program may well be a factor in the effort to reduce crime by encouraging the people to observe, respect, and obey the law:

REMARKS BY HARRY D. SHARGEL, CHAIRMAN, LAW OBSERVANCE COMMITTEE, MAY 8, 1961

The Federal Bar Association (Philadelphia chapter) through its law observance committee is engaged in a year-round program to promote respect for law and those who enforce it.

Our activities are designed to educate the public in the functions of the Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies; to urge the public to respect and uphold the law; and to improve the morale of law enforcement personnel, broaden their training, enhance the prestige of law enforcement as a career and help attract the highest caliber of personnel to this field. We have promoted coordination among law enforcement agencies, prosecuting attorneys, the judiciary, penologists and welfare organizations.

As part of our endeavors we have caused posters to be displayed bearing the slogan, "The Law Protects You, Respect It, Uphold It, Obey It"; published a directory of law enforcement agencies; sponsored television programs designed to educate the public concerning the fine work of law enforcement agencies; organized coordination conferences among those concerned with crime and delinquency; arranged the distribution to teachers, parents and students of relevant literature; established a speakers' bureau which furnishes speakers in furtherance of our program; arranged for the establishment of a degree course in police science and administration at Temple University and organized exhibits.

Today we inaugurate our second annual law observance exhibit under the theme of "Law Enforcement Speaks To Youth." We have chosen to emphasize the message to youth because we live in a period of an ever-mounting crime rate among our young people. It is important that they realize the importance of law observance—that respect for law and law observance are essential to the preservation of America's freedoms. They and all of us should become familiar with the fine work of each law enforcement agency and realize that the law enforcement agent, whether a local policeman, State official, or Federal agent, is a friend dedicated to public service and the protection of each of us.

We want to make parents and children alike, aware of the fine career opportunities in the law enforcement field and to attract the best of our youth to seek this field as a career. The higher educational facilities available in this area through the degree course of police science and administration offered by the Community College of Temple University, and the courses in public administration offered by the Fels Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, emphasize the high professional opportunities available to those who have the ambition, ability, and willingness to dedicate themselves to the public service. The opportunities for advancement are unlimited.

I want to express my appreciation to the Philadelphia National Bank for making this space available and to especially commend the bank's Vice President Charles Hoeflich and Federal Bureau of Investigation Field Supervisor Norris Harzenstein for organizing and coordinating this exhibit.

MESSAGE FROM ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, READ AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES, MAY 8, 1961

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1961.

Mr. HARRY D. SHARGEL,
Federal Bar Association,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR MR. SHARGEL: The law observance committee of the Philadelphia Chapter of the Federal Bar Association, in promoting respect for the law and those who enforce it, is making an outstanding contribution to law enforcement.

I wish to express my appreciation and best wishes to the Philadelphia chapter in its latest endeavor to aid and assist law enforcement. Many persons who will see your exhibit will gain a new insight into the high caliber of law enforcement in our country. The vigor, dedication, and skill of the Philadelphia chapter in making this unique contribution sets a high standard and an excellent example which I hope other public spirited organizations will see fit to emulate.

I wish you all success.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE LAW OBSERVANCE EXHIBIT, "LAW ENFORCEMENT SPEAKS TO YOUTH"

District attorney's office: The display of the district attorney's office focuses upon the problem of juvenile delinquency in Philadelphia and specifically the relationship of the courts and the district attorney's office in the handling and supervising of juveniles who find themselves in trouble with the law.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: Extensive and dramatic exhibit depicting the training of special agents, identification through finger prints and scientific solution of a bank robbery. Portrays career opportunities for young people at various tasks at headquarters in Washington and at local office. Shows samples of educational materials furnished to schools, young people and parents, industry and police. Many of these will be available to the public at the bank. The exhibit is keynoted by quotation from J. Edgar Hoover, "The American people can solve any problem they want if they wake up to the facts, and go into action." This applies whether the problem is that of the mounting rate of crime or the dangers from communism.

Fairmount Park guard: Feature canine corps with live dogs and trainers to depict their remarkable record in holding down crime and delinquency in park areas. Portray area of jurisdiction including 7,700 acres of park area, 60 miles of bridle paths, recreation centers, playground and swimming areas. Also 85 miles of parkways and drives which carry a large amount of auto traffic in Philadelphia.

Police department: The Philadelphia Police Department's exhibits depict several facets of interest: the variety of civilian career opportunities in the department all the way from clerk-typist to administrative analyst; the new adjutant group, which was established to recruit and train promising young men for police work; additional education available to police of all ranks through the board of education, Community College of Temple University and Fels Institute of

the University of Pennsylvania; the application of electronic data processing to police work in analyzing the time, place, etc., of crime as well as anticipating where accidents are prone to happen; how to keep a business burglary proof; and an analysis of the occurrence of accidents by day of the week. Pamphlets on how to aid police in preventing burglaries and on how to guard against shoplifters will be distributed to the public. Literature relative to educational opportunities for police will also be made available.

Postal inspector: An exhibit furnished by the Bureau of the Chief Inspector, Post Office Department portrays the history of the postal inspection service beginning with its inception in 1737 when Benjamin Franklin was first appointed by the British Colonial Postmaster General as postmaster of Philadelphia and given the additional duties of regulating the several post offices and bringing the postmasters to account. The display shows an outline of functions and graphically portrays the general areas of investigation: Post office burglaries, holdups of mail custodians, poisons and bombs sent through the mail, extensive direct mail selling of pornography, and fraudulent schemes by unscrupulous promoters.

U.S. TREASURY ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

Alcohol and tobacco tax: Will have photographs of illicit alcohol and "moonshine" stills and contraband firearms.

Coast Guard: Display depicts their enforcement activities with relation to the safety and security of the port of Philadelphia.

Customs Bureau: Official photographs will show the smuggling of contraband into the United States by various schemes and devices.

Secret Service: Will display genuine and counterfeit currency and photographs depicting their work in the fields of counterfeiting and the protection of the President.

WHYY–TV and radio: The exhibit depicts the use of educational television and radio as a weapon in the fight against delinquency and crime.

DEDICATION OF THE LAW OBSERVANCE EXHIBIT, "LAW ENFORCEMENT SPEAKS TO YOUTH"

HOST

Philadelphia National Bank, Frederick A. Potts, president; Charles Hoeflich, vice president.

EXHIBITORS

District attorney's office: James C. Crumlish, Jr., district attorney; Paul M. Chalfin, first assistant district attorney.

Fairmount park guard: Francis C. Deegan, superintendent; Philip J. Cella, inspector.

Federal Bureau of Investigation: Fred A. Frohbose, special agent in charge, Philadelphia.

Police department (Philadelphia): Albert N. Brown, commissioner; Howard R. Leary, deputy commissioner.

Post Office Department: A. J. Harkins, postal inspector in charge, Philadelphia.

Treasury Department: Alva M. Meyers, regional commissioner. Alcohol and Tobacco Tax: Louis DeCarlo, assistant regional commissioner. Coast Guard: Henry U. Scholl, captain of the port of Philadelphia. Customs Bureau: Charles Belswinger, customs agent in charge. Secret Service: Joseph P. Jordan, special agent in charge.

WHYY–TV and Radio: Richard S. Burdick, managing director.

Temple University Community College: Dr. William A. Schrag, dean.

University of Pennsylvania Fels Institute: Dr. Stephen B. Sweeney, director; Dr. Thomas J. Davy, assistant director.

SPONSOR

Federal Bar Association: Thomas G. Meeker, national president; A. S. Harzenstein, national vice president, third district.

Federal Bar Association (Philadelphia chapter): President, Congressman Herman Toll; first vice president, Harry D. Shargel; second vice president, Judge Earl Chudoff; third vice president, Russell J. Borden; treasurer, Herman R. Testan.

Law observance committee: chairman, Harry D. Shargel, special assistant to general counsel; Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency. Members: David Berger, city solicitor; Paul M. Chalfin, first assistant district attorney, Philadelphia; Earl Chudoff, judge, court of common pleas, Philadelphia; Louis DeCarlo, district coordinator of Treasury enforcement agencies; Ephraim Gomberg, executive vice president, Philadelphia Crime Commission; Norris S. Harzenstein, Federal Bureau of Investigation, field supervisor; James McGirr Kelly, assistant U.S. Attorney; Herman Toll, Member of U.S. House of Representatives; Harold K. Wood, judge, U.S. District Court.

Community relations adviser; Milton A. Eisenberg, director of public relations, Yellow Cab Co., of Philadelphia.

Adviser on radio and television: Martha A. Gable, director of radio and television, Philadelphia public schools.

Adviser on municipal police problems: Howard R. Leary, deputy police commissioner, Police Department of Philadelphia.

Goodby to Manlio Brosio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, two stories appear in the Washington Post today which, though unrelated, bear on a matter close to my heart.

The first one appears on the editorial page, and I quote:

GOODBY TO BROSIO

More than 5 years as Italian Ambassador in Washington have earned Manlio Brosio a wealth of respect and a wide circle of friends. This blue-eyed native of Turin, once described by a Londoner as having "the look of an austere minor saint from a medieval mural," has been anything but austere in his relations here. An expert on the Soviet Union in the Stalin era, he has been a warm friend of the United States and an alert and effective representative of the interests of Italy. As he and Signora Brosio leave for their new assignment in France they will take with them a host of good wishes.

The second appears on page A16, and is a report of certain statements made by our distinguished colleague in the other House, the junior Senator from Arkansas. The Senator deplores the policy of shifting our capable ambassadors from country to country after but 2 years' service.

We are fortunate that the Italian Government is more liberal than ours, for we have had the privilege and pleasure of Ambassador Brosio's representation for over 6 years. In that time he has done much—officially and personally—to improve our already pleasant and healthy relations with his Government and country. "An alert and effective representative" of Italy and "a warm friend of the United States" describe him well. I was perhaps more fortunate than many, for over these 6 years I came to know Manlio Brosio as a thoroughly delightful, understanding social associate, as a keenly intelligent, inspirational professional colleague.

We shall all miss the distinguished Ambassador and his gracious lady. I shall miss them both, and I shall envy Paris.

A Great American Marks an Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like today to join my colleagues in the Congress and millions of Americans across the Nation in wishing Godspeed to a great American who today celebrates his 37th anniversary of incomparable service to his fellow citizens. It was on May 10, 1924, that the then Attorney General, Harlan Stone called in young John Edgar Hoover and told him that he was to head up the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

From that date, the course of American history was changed. Mr. Hoover took command of an agency which had become the haven for political hacks. He changed it promptly into a hard-working organization whose members produced—or got out.

His first great job was to tackle the organized crime of the lawless decade. Under his forceful leadership the FBI developed into an agency capable of meeting the challenge of the Dillingers and their kind. Under his leadership the FBI became the scourge of the underworld and the guiding force in developing sound and scientific police methods throughout America.

To improve this universal police protection to all of our citizens at every level of Government, Mr. Hoover established in 1935 the FBI Academy and since that time more than 4,000 outstanding police officers from every State have attended to improve their ability to cope with crime at the local level.

Mr. Hoover and his many dedicated coworkers in the Bureau have held thousands of conferences with police officers throughout the country, designed to bring to the local level the know-how and organizational ability built up within the FBI itself.

In a real sense of the word, Mr. Hoover's personality has been stamped on law enforcement agencies everywhere.

During World War II the already heavy burden carried by the FBI was increased to include counterespionage and sabotage work within this country. Again, his men made spectacular contributions to the Nation and its safety. As a result of careful, scientific work by the Bureau there was not a single case of enemy-inspired sabotage in our World

War II defense effort within the continental United States.

Since then his men have been hard at work protecting the American people against the inroads made by communism. His men uncovered the plot and developed the evidence which brought to justice the atomic spies, Julius and Anna Rosenberg. His agents have been active in trying to prevent subversives from invading the Government to destroy its effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, a man like J. Edgar Hoover did not win this high position of esteem he holds with his fellow citizens today by being a great personality, a great politician or even a fine administrator. He has won that position because he has done the job so well. He has held the post now for 37 years. If he wishes, I am sure that the American people will want him to keep it another 37.

The Lillian Diebold Poling Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, next Sunday, May 14, is Mother's Day, founded over 40 years ago. For the past 27 years the American Mothers Committee, Inc., has had as one of its major functions the selection of an outstanding mother to be honored annually. This committee is dedicated to the development and strengthening of the moral and spiritual foundations of the American home and to give to the observance of Mother's Day a spiritual quality which highlights the standards of ideal motherhood in the significant role of the mother in the home, the community, the Nation, and the world. The committee, a nonprofit organization, is recognized by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—and each year the Mother of the Year is graciously received at the White House. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has said, "The fact that the American Mothers Committee, Inc., has indicated its determination to take action on a problem nationwide in scope and bearing the seeds of great danger to the future of our country is most encouraging."

With the cooperation of Governors, educators, civic leaders, and major organizations, each State selects from many worthy nominees its choice for the State mother. This is a fact of which each Member of this body is personally aware because many of the wonderful women from each district have been so honored. From these fine women the American mother is chosen after prayerful consideration by a national jury. This year, in addition to the national mother just announced this week, the committee will pay tribute to the president, Mrs. Daniel A. Poling, naming her their first honorary president. Nineteen hundred and sixty-one has been declared the Lillian Diebold Poling Year. Numerous tributes will be paid to this remarkable 81-year-old mother. As a fellow Ohioan, it gives me great pleasure to call attention to her achievements.

Fourscore years and one. And all but her very young childhood years have been dedicated to the service of humanity. Lillian Diebold Poling was born on May 7, 1880, in Canton, Ohio, and educated in the schools of that city. She received her certificate for teaching in home economics from the University of Ohio, in Columbus. At a very early age her interest was centered upon the home and the great need for improving the living conditions of the underprivileged. In Canton, Ohio, with this thought uppermost in her mind, she became chairman of an Americanization committee, organized a nursery during the flu epidemic of World War I, and as a teacher of home economics in a school district with 14 nationalities she founded the Little Nell House. Here young girls were given instruction in homemaking and the boys were taught worthwhile trades—they helped build the Little Nell House. As this indomitable young woman went about her teaching, the need for adequate meals for little children drew her attention. She pioneered in the Middle West the program of serving milk to underprivileged children in the public schools. But it was to all humanity that she was devoted. From the neglected and undernourished children to the young girls in need of counseling and direction, and then to the older forgotten mothers—shut-ins in hospitals and institutions, no longer remembered by their families, with few pleasures in their daily lives—these were another concern of Lillian Poling.

In Philadelphia she founded the religion-in-life group, bringing together Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish women for the purpose of interfaith understanding. Now for nearly a decade she has been president of the American Mothers Committee. To her determination to develop and strengthen the moral and spiritual foundation of the homes of America goes the major credit for the basic program of the committee—family life institutes and counselor motherhood services, reaching young mothers with preschool-age children, helping them with the problems of their new lives and in the rearing of their little ones—the future hope of America.

At the age of 81, this most remarkable woman, in addition to her duties as the wife of one of the world's most prominent ministers and editors, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, sustains a daily schedule of activities that would tax the stamina of a 60-year-old. Mrs. Poling's chief interests and activities have always centered in the church. She has organized and conducted prayer groups, taught Sunday school classes and for several years, served as president of the international and interdenominational Woman's Board of Home Missions. Her achievement with her own family is a beacon light for all, bringing to her the recognition of her State. In 1945 she was chosen the Pennsylvania mother of the year. Dr. and Mrs. Poling are the parents of eight wonderful children.

In 1955 Mrs. Poling was awarded the medallion of honor of the Women's International Exposition as a woman of achievement for that year. Already in 1961 Stetson University, of De Land, Fla., has conferred upon Lillian Poling the university's distinguished service award. On November 2 a testimonial dinner will be given in her honor in the Sert Room of the Waldorf-Astoria, New York.

We salute this illustrious mother, Lillian Diebold Poling, president of the American Mothers Committee, Inc.:

GOD FASHIONED HER

He took the laughter of a child,
A naiad's grace; a spirit kind
And innocent; a voice as mild
As waters deep,
And whatsoe'er was undefiled
To have and keep.
All things soever pure and good
By mortals known or understood;
All charms of healthful solitude
And social grace;
He mingled in divinest mood
To light her face.
He took the softness of the dove
To make her gentle; looked above
As if to catch the glamor of angelic art,
And then He breathed a mother's love
Into her heart.

Proposed KLM Airline Concession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a word to what has already been so ably said by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] yesterday in the RECORD on page 7673, regarding the proposed approval by the United States of an air route to Los Angeles for the Dutch-flag line KLM.

If the State Department justifies each fresh concession to Dutch diplomatic pressure on the ground that the concession will remove friction, I do not see how it can ever end. We cannot continue to reward the Dutch for creating the friction.

There is another element of the Dutch campaign for Los Angeles rights which I find deeply disturbing. It has been alleged that the Dutch have been in flagrant violation of the capacity and frequency clauses of the 1957 agreement, ever since that agreement was signed. I am advised that this is not a matter which is disputed on the United States side. I understand that even the State Department concedes that the Dutch are in violation of the 1957 agreement.

Under these circumstances, why do we not say—"The United States will not negotiate regarding Los Angeles until KLM comes into compliance with the capacity and frequency clauses of the 1957 agreement"? If KLM is operating more than four times as many flights to and from the United States as can be justified under the agreement, the State

Department at the very least should certainly bring this situation under control before discussing the Los Angeles route for KLM.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the average man on the street has become familiar with many strange new countries since the beginning of World War II. Rumania, however, remains relatively unknown. Indeed to many people the word suggests haunting melodies played on the violin but little else. Even the geographical location of this country of 17 million people is remote—it is east of Hungary and west of the Black Sea with the Danube flowing along its southern border.

Even less known is the history of Rumania. Since the beginning of modern times, Rumania has been overrun again and again by Huns, Goths, Turks, and others. For nearly 700 years, from the 13th to the 19th centuries, they lived under the harsh rule of the Ottoman Empire. After several unsuccessful attempts during the last century they finally achieved independence on May 10, 1877. This is the date which we commemorate. Unfortunately, their freedom was not to endure. In December 1947 King Michael was forced to abdicate under Communist pressure and the country is now completely dominated by the U.S.S.R. The Russians "liberated" Rumania primarily to make use of its rich oil reserves.

Since the country is so far removed from the lives of most Americans—the question may be asked—why is Rumanian Independence Day being celebrated in the House of Representatives of the United States of America?

The answer can be found in the quotation from John Donne—

> No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

Like the Poles, the Hungarians, and other mid-European peoples, the Rumanians loved freedom and fought gallantly and stubbornly for it. Their unfortunate position, flanked on every side by greedy and unscrupulous neighbors, has doomed them to subservience time after time.

Just as John Donne reflects that the death of one person diminishes all of humanity, so the loss of freedom in one country, even though a small and remote one, is a loss of freedom to all mankind.

How can we encourage people suffering under foreign domination as the Rumanians are today? One way is by being very conscious, very aware of our own privileges. Such dedicated men as Comdr. Alan Shepard are an inspiration to all who love freedom. But his achievement was only possible because he had complete faith in the vigilance of the hundreds of other people working on the Project Mercury. In the same way we cannot for one moment be unmindful of our responsibilities. We cannot, as participants in the government of this great Nation, "cut corners" or in any way jeopardize those values which differentiate our system of government from the communistic system.

There is another reason for our awareness of the plight of captured nations. Here in the security of the United States, long accustomed to our advantages, there is a tendency to use such words as "freedom" and "justice" lightly. In our efforts to be tolerant of all opinions we sometimes become fuzzy minded. Tolerance is an innate part of our philosophy of government but it requires thorough knowledge. When we fail to be cognizant of the real meaning of such words as freedom and justice, we can quickly clear our minds by observing the plight of a conquered people. There is nothing indistinct about the difference between our system of government and that of the so-called people's republics. This is an euphemistic term for a government which is not of the people, nor by the people, nor for the people, but on the people.

We must keep faith with the Rumanians, and the other captive nations in bondage. The Rumanians, who have continued the struggle for freedom over the centuries can be trusted to keep up their resistance to this sinister new ideology. We cannot be an island entire of ourselves, we cannot forget the ordeal of this small and remote country, we must offer all encouragement to these valiant people.

This is why Congressmen of widely divergent racial backgrounds come down to the well of the House of Representatives of the United States of America to commemorate Rumanian Independence Day for a nation which today is without independence.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the turbulent history of Eastern Europe May 10 is one of the most glorious of dates. For on that day 84 years ago, the Rumanian people achieved their long sought independence.

One of the richest countries, one of the largest in area and population, Rumania had for centuries been a part of the Roman, then the Ottoman, Empire. In the 19th century the Sultan's grip was at last loosened, and the Balkans broke free. In 1877 while the Turks were engaged in a defensive war against the Russians, Rumanian leaders took their destiny into their own hands and proclaimed their independence from Turkey. Thus, 1,776 years after its beginnings as a Roman colony, Rumania was a nation of free people.

For 64 years she remained free; but in the last 20 years she has again been under the yoke—first of the Germans, then of the Russians.

Today in their Communist-dominated homeland, unhappy Rumanians cannot publicly observe their most important national holiday. But in their hearts, I know they join with me and my Rumanian friends everywhere in the free world in celebrating this historic occasion. May the day soon come when Rumania will again be a free and independent nation.

The Centre Daily Times, State College, Pa., Launches a Campaign as a Public Service To Revive the Grand Old American Custom of Displaying Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the early part of this century the time-honored American custom of displaying the Stars and Stripes from homes and business establishments was observed with pride and fervor on many national holidays. In recent years the custom has been abandoned to the extent that it has prompted the burning question by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate:

> What has happened to the exultant surge of pride in the hearts of Americans when anywhere the Stars and Stripes are unfurled?

Dr. Harris' piercing question has been echoed by many Americans who deplore the lack of ardor for displaying our national emblem on various days of the year when a tribute to the American flag by every family would not only be highly appropriate but also warmly commended as further evidence of love of country.

Despite a negligent attitude regarding public display of Old Glory, there is none of us who lacks thrill in reading the following stanza from the stirring poem by Henry Holcomb Bennett titled "The Flag Goes By—Hats Off."

> Along the streets there comes
> A blare of bugles, a ruffle of drums,
> A flash of color beneath the sky:
> Hats Off!
> The flag is passing by.

It is realized that on certain occasions such as parades or celebrations involving military units, the flag is displayed and heads uncovered as it passes by thus creating the impression that deep reverence for Old Glory has never been at greater heights.

On the other hand, since the close of World War I, the custom of displaying our national emblem from homes and business establishments has vanished to the extent that our negligent attitude is an indictment on this generation. As a matter of fact, criticism is being voiced throughout the Nation over the abandonment of the grand old custom of unfurling the Stars and Stripes from nearly every American home on important national holidays.

In my congressional district the Centre Daily Times, State College, Pa., one of the prominent daily newspapers in central Pennsylvania, has launched a campaign for what it terms "a chance for reviving a rich American custom."

Beginning its campaign with an editorial which appeared in the April 29, 1961, issue, the Centre Daily Times has made available to its readers at the cost of $3 postpaid, a flag kit which includes a 3- by 5-foot, 50-star flag with a 6-foot brass-jointed hardwood staff with top decoration, halyard, and metal window socket.

Reminding its readers on the handy order blank printed in the form of a coupon that "The Crusade for Freedom Starts Right at Your Door," the Centre Daily Times urges "Fly this flag which we offer you at cost as a public service." In addition, there is listed a total of 11 national holidays when the flag should fly from every home in the Nation.

In congratulating the publishers of the Centre Daily Times in its campaign to overcome complacency regarding public display of the flag, I hope that other newspapers and business firms in the Nation will conduct similar campaigns designed to revive the honored custom of publicly displaying our national emblem. Such concerted action can succeed in carrying the following message of the Centre Daily Times to every hamlet in our Nation:

Let none say America is losing the spirit of freedom, or that her people are growing soft and complacent. Fly the new 50-star flag at your home on every holiday. The more homes that fly our flag * * * the more the whole world will know that the Spirit of '76 is just as fresh in our hearts today as it was 185 years ago.

The editorial previously referred to follows:

[From the Centre Daily Times, Apr. 29, 1961]

A CHANCE FOR REVIVING A RICH AMERICAN CUSTOM

(An editorial)

It wasn't too many years ago that the American flag was flown proudly from virtually every home, every place of business in the United States.

And, in Centre County, it was particularly noticeable.

On every national holiday of importance, anyone traveling the streets was reminded of the occasion as flag after flag came into view, lined up, as it were, as emphasis on the rich traditions which it signified.

The most beautiful flag in the world—the Stars and Stripes—still flies proudly over military installations, Government and public buildings at all times. But it's just plain absent at most homes and most places of business.

We believe the flag should fly on every home in Centre County on, at least, our national holidays. We believe it's a patriotic duty for everyone to return to the heartwarming custom. It's one way our Nation, our county and the communities within it, through its citizens, can show our ideological opponents that the Spirit of '76 is just as strong in American hearts today as it was 185 years ago.

And we believe, too, that failure to fly the flag is due more to lack of opportunity to fly the proper flag than a lack of patriotism. Indeed, we'd guess few homes have available the 50-star flag.

That's why the Centre Daily Times has obtained a quantity of handsome 50-star flags. Their size is suitable for flying from front porch or window. We offer these 3- by 5-foot flags in kits which include flag, staff and metal socket for mounting. And we offer these kits to our readers at cost as a public service. The price of the complete kit is only $3.

We believe that the people of Centre County will respond to this wonderful chance to buy and fly the flag. We hope that all civic groups will encourage their members to respond.

No reward can be greater than to help bring about a revival of the old heartwarming custom of flying the Stars and Stripes proudly on all our national holidays and other days set aside to honor those who have died for it. Decoration Day on May 30, Flag Day on June 14 and Independence Day on July 4 provide early opportunities for "Long May It Wave" observances.

It's a timely move, too, in these times of tension when the press of selfish interests and unrest elsewhere may pressure us into forgetting the basic inspiration which we all need if we're to remain free and, indeed, if we're to strengthen that freedom.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. SCRANTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, Rumania has been the source of contention for many centuries between Western and Eastern forces. Containing territorially the mouth of the Danube, this great artery into the heart of Europe, the Rumanian nation has passed under the suzerainty of Hungary, Russia, Austria, the Ottoman Empire, and Poland. Its aspirations for independence were not realized until the great powers were engaged in a struggle among themselves. At that time only was Rumania able to declare itself at war with the Ottoman regime, the dominating power then, and to declare itself independent. The date was May 10, 1877.

From that time on, the Rumanian people have celebrated that date as their official national holiday, a day always to be cherished. Coincidentally, too, this day, May 10, marks the emergence of the kingdom of Rumania. For, on May 10, 1881, the elected Prince Carol was proclaimed king.

Today, we in America must celebrate this momentous self-determination of an ethnic group for the people of Rumania since they are prohibited from honoring this holiday by their Communist overlords. Let us hope that once more the yoke of captivity will be overthrown and that Rumania will stand free and independent among the freedom-loving nations of the world.

Address by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy at the University of Georgia Law School, May 6, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most eloquent and inspiring statements on the problem of civil rights that I have ever seen was the address delivered by the distinguished Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, on May 6, 1961, at the Law Day exercises of the University of Georgia Law School, Athens, Ga.

The courage and candor and, I believe, understanding with which the Attorney General spoke in Georgia are clear evidence of the intention of President Kennedy's administration to uphold the rule of law and the Constitution of the United States in the field of human rights.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Attorney General's address on this occasion will come to be regarded as one of the finest affirmations in many years of the American tradition of equal rights under the law.

The text of the address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT F. KENNEDY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

(Prepared for delivery at the Law Day exercises of the University of Georgia Law School)

For the first time since becoming Attorney General, over 3 months ago, I am making something approaching a formal speech, and I am proud that it is in Georgia. Two months ago I had the very great honor to present to the President, Donald Eugene McGregor, of Brunswick, Ga. Donald McGregor came to Washington to receive the Young American Medal for Bravery. In 12 bad hours, he led a family of four to safety from a yacht which broke up in high seas off the Georgia coast. He impressed all of us who met him with his quiet courage. And, as the President said, Donald McGregor is a fine young American—one of a long line of Georgians who have, by their courage, set an outstanding example for their fellow Americans.

They have told me that when you speak in Georgia you should try to tie yourself to Georgia and the South, and even better, claim some Georgia kinfolk. There are a lot of Kennedys in Georgia. But as far as I can tell, I have no relatives here and no direct ties to Georgia, except one. This State gave my brother the biggest percentage majority of any State in the Union and in this last election that was even better than kinfolk.

MUST PRESERVE FREEDOMS

We meet at this great university, in this old State, the fourth of the Original Thirteen, to observe Law Day.

In his proclamation urging us to observe this day, the President emphasized two

thoughts. He pointed out that to remain free the people must "cherish their freedoms, understand the responsibilities they entail, and nurture the will to preserve them." He then went on to point out that "law is the strongest link between man and freedom."

I wonder in how many countries of the world people think of law as the "link between man and freedom." We know that in many, law is the instrument of tyranny, and people think of law as little more than the will of the state, or the party, not of the people.

And we know, too, that throughout the long history of mankind, man has had to struggle to create a system of law and of government in which fundamental freedoms would be linked with the enforcement of justice. We know that we cannot live together without rules which tell us what is right and what is wrong, what is permitted and what is prohibited. We know that it is law which enables men to live together, that creates order out of chaos. We know that law is the glue that holds civilization together.

ACCEPT COURT DECISIONS

And, we know that if one man's rights are denied, the rights of all are endangered. In our country the courts have a most important role in safeguarding these rights. The decisions of the courts, however much we might disagree with them, in the final analysis must be followed and respected. If we disagree with a court decision and, thereafter, irresponsibly assail the court and defy its rulings, we challenge the foundations of our society.

The Supreme Court of Georgia set forth this proposition quite clearly in 1949 in the case of *Crumb* v. *the State* (205 Ga. 547–552). The court, referring to U.S. Supreme Court decisions, said there and I quote:

"And whatever may be the individual opinion of the members of this court as to the correctness, soundness, and wisdom of these decisions, it becomes our duty to yield thereto just as the other courts of this State must accept and be controlled by the decisions and mandates of this court. This being a government of law and not by men, the jury commissioners in their official conduct are bound by the foregoing ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States, notwithstanding any personal opinion, hereditary instinct, natural impulse or geographical tradition to the contrary."

Respect for the law—in essence that is the meaning of Law Day—and every day must be Law Day or else our society will collapse.

The challenge which international communism hurls against the rule of law is very great. For the past 2 weeks I have been engaged, for a good part of my time, in working with General Taylor, Admiral Burke, and Mr. Dulles, to assess the recent events in Cuba and determine what lessons we can learn for the future.

COMMUNISM CHALLENGES LAW

It already has become crystal clear in our study that as the President has stated so graphically, we must reexamine and reorient our forces of every kind. Not just our military forces, but all our techniques and outlook here in the United States. We must come forward with the answer of how a nation, devoted to freedom and individual rights and respect for the law, can stand effectively against an implacable enemy who plays by different rules and knows only the law of the jungle. With the answer to this rests our future—our destiny—as a nation and as a people.

The events of the last few weeks have demonstrated that the time has long since passed when the people of the United States can be apathetic about their belief and respect for the law and about the necessity of placing our own house in order. As we turn to meet our enemy, to look him full in the face, we cannot afford feet of clay or an arm of glass.

Let me speak to you about three major areas of difficulty within the purview of my responsibilities that sap our national strength, that weaken our people, that require our immediate attention.

CRIME SAPS NATIONAL STRENGTH

In too many major communities of our country, organized crime has become big business. It knows no State lines. It drains off millions of dollars of our national wealth, infecting legitimate businesses, labor unions, and even sports. Tolerating organized crime promotes the cheap philosophy that everything is a racket. It promotes cynicism among adults. It contributes to the confusion of the young and to the increase of juvenile delinquency.

It is not the gangster himself who is of concern. It is what he is doing to our cities, our communities, our moral fiber. Ninety percent of the major racketeers would be out of business by the end of this year if the ordinary citizen, the businessman, the union official, and the public authority stood up to be counted and refused to be corrupted.

This is a problem for all America, not just the FBI or the Department of Justice. Unless the basic attitude changes here in this country, the rackets will prosper and grow. Of this I am convinced.

The racketeers, after all, are professional criminals. But, there are the amateurs—men who have law-abiding backgrounds and respectable positions, who, nevertheless, break the law of the land. We have been particularly concerned lately in the Department of Justice about the spread of illegal price fixing. I would say to you, however, it is merely symptomatic of many other practices commonly accepted in business life.

Our investigations show that in an alarming number of areas of the country businessmen have conspired in secret to fix prices, made collusive deals with union officials, defrauded their customers and even in some instances cheated their own Government.

COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE BEST HOPE FOR FREEDOM

Our enemies assert that capitalism enslaves the worker and will destroy itself. It is our national faith that the system of competitive enterprise offers the best hope for individual freedom, social development, and economic growth.

Thus, every businessman who cheats on his taxes, fixes prices, or underpays his labor, every union official who makes a collusive deal, misuses union funds, damages the free enterprise system in the eyes of the world and does a disservice to the millions of honest Americans in all walks of life.

Where we have evidence of violation of laws by the respectables, we will take action against the individuals involved, as well as against their companies. But in the end, this also is not a situation which can be cured by the Department of Justice. It can only be cured by the business and unions themselves.

The third area is the one that affects us all the most directly—civil rights.

CONFLICT OF LAW AND LOCAL CUSTOMS

The hardest problems of all in law enforcement are those involving a conflict of law and local customs. History has recorded many occasions when the moral sense of a nation produced judicial decisions, such as the 1954 decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which required difficult local adjustments.

I have many friends in the U.S. Senate who are southerners. Many of these friendships stem from my work as counsel for the Senate Rackets Committee, headed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN of Arkansas for whom I have the greatest admiration and affection.

If these southern friends of mine are representative southerners, and I believe they are, I do not pretend that they believe with me on everything or that I agree with them on everything. But, knowing them as I do, I am convinced of this:

Southerners have a special respect for candor and plain talk. They certainly don't like hypocrisy. So, in discussing this third major problem, I must tell you candidly what our policies are going to be in the field of civil rights and why.

First let me say this: the time has long since arrived when loyal Americans must measure the impact of their actions beyond the limits of their own towns or States. For instance, we must be quite aware of the fact that 50 percent of the countries in the United Nations are not white; that around the world, in Africa, South America, and Asia, people whose skins are a different color than ours are on the move to gain their measure of freedom and liberty.

From the Congo to Cuba, from South Vietnam to Algiers, in India, Brazil, and Iran, men and women and children are straightening their backs and listening, to the evil promises of Communist tyranny and the honorable promises of Anglo-American liberty. And those people will decide not only their future but how the cause of freedom fares in the world.

In the United Nations we are striving to establish a rule of law instead of a rule of force. In that forum and elsewhere around the world our deeds will speak for us.

In the worldwide struggle, the graduation at this University of Charleyne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes will without question aid and assist the fight against Communist political infiltration and guerrilla warfare.

AMERICANS LIVE BY RULE OF LAW

When parents send their children to school this fall in Atlanta, peaceably and in accordance with the rule of law, barefoot Burmese and Congolese will see before their eyes Americans living by the rule of law.

The conflict of views over the original decision in 1954 and our recent move in Prince Edward County is understandable. The decision in 1954 required action of the most difficult, delicate, and complex nature, going to the heart of southern institutions. I know a little of this. I live in Virginia. I studied law at the University of Virginia. I have been privileged to know many able southern soldiers, scholars, lawyers, jurists, journalists, and political leaders who have enriched our national life. From them I have drawn some understanding of the South, but my knowledge is nothing to yours.

It is now being said that the Department of Justice is attempting to close all public schools in Virginia because of the Prince Edward situation. This is not true, nor is the Prince Edward suit a threat against local control.

We are maintaining the orders of the courts. We are doing nothing more nor less. And if any one of you were in my position you would do likewise for it would be required by your oath of office. You might not want to do it, you might not like to do it, but you would do it.

For I cannot believe that anyone can support a principle which prevents more than a thousand of our children in one county from attending public school—especially when this step was taken to circumvent the orders of the court.

Our position is quite clear. We are upholding the law. Our action does not threaten local control. The Federal Government would not be running the schools in Prince Edward County any more than it is running the University of Georgia or the schools in my State of Massachusetts.

In this case—in all cases—I say to you today that if the orders of the court are circumvented, the Department of Justice will act.

We will not stand by or be aloof. We will move.

Here on this campus, not half a year ago, you endured a difficult ordeal. And when your moment of truth came, the voices crying "force" were overridden by the voices pleading for reason.

And for this, I pay my respects to your Governor, your legislature, and most particularly to you, the students and faculty of the University of Georgia. And I say, you are the wave of the future—not those who cry panic. For the country's future you will and must prevail.

ACCEPT 1954 COURT DECISION

I happen to believe that the 1954 decision was right. But, my belief does not matter, it is the law. Some of you may believe the decision was wrong. That does not matter. It is the law. And we both respect the law. By facing this problem honorably, you have shown to all the world that we Americans are moving forward together, solving this problem, under the rule of law.

An integral part of all this is that we make a total effort to guarantee the ballot to every American of voting age, in the North, as well as in the South. The right to vote is the easiest of all rights to grant. The spirit of our democracy, the letter of our Constitution and our laws require that there be no further delay in the achievement of full freedom to vote for all. Our system demands upon the fullest participation of all its citizens.

The problem between the white and colored people is a problem for all sections of the United States. And as I have said, I believe there has been a great deal of hypocrisy in dealing with it. In fact, I found when I came to the Department of Justice that I need look no further to find evidence of this.

GOVERNMENT ACTS TO HALT DISCRIMINATION

I found that very few Negroes were employed above a custodial level. There were 950 lawyers working in the Department of Justice in Washington, and only 10 of them were Negroes. At the same moment the lawyers of the Department of Justice were bringing legal action to end discrimination, that same discrimination was being practiced within the Department itself.

At a recent review for the visiting leader of a new African state, there was only one Negro in the guard of honor. At the Bureau of the Budget, Negroes were used only for custodial work.

The Federal Government is taking steps to correct this.

Financial leaders from the East who deplore discrimination in the South belong to institutions where no Negroes or Jews are allowed and their children attend private schools where no Negro students are enrolled. Union officials criticize Southern leaders and yet practice discrimination with their unions. Government officials belong to private clubs in Washington where Negroes including ambassadors are not welcomed even at mealtime.

My firm belief is that if we are to make progress in this area—if we are to be truly great as a Nation, then we must make sure that nobody is denied an opportunity because of race, creed, or color. We pledge, by example, to take action in our own backyard, the Department of Justice, we pledge to move to protect the integrity of the courts in the administration of justice. In all this, we ask your help, we need your assistance.

ADVOCATES REASON AND RULE OF LAW

I come to you today and I shall come to you in the years ahead to advocate reason and the rule of law.

It is in this spirit that since taking office I have conferred many times with responsible public officials and civic leaders in the South on specific situations. I shall continue to do so. I do not expect them always to agree with my view of what the law requires, but I believe they share my respect for the law. We are trying to achieve amicable, voluntary solutions without going to court. These discussions have ranged from voting and school cases to incidents of arrest which might lead to violence.

We have sought to be helpful to avert violence and to get voluntary compliance. When our investigations indicate there has been a violation of law, we have asked responsible officials to take steps themselves to correct the situation. In some instances this has happened. When it has not, we have had to take legal action.

These conversations have been devoid of bitterness or hate. They have been carried on with mutual respect, understanding, and good will. National unity is essential and before taking any legal action, we will, where appropriate, invite the southern leaders to make their views known in these cases.

WARNS AGAINST ANOTHER LITTLE ROCK

We, the American people, must avoid another Little Rock, or another New Orleans. We cannot afford them. It is not only that such incidents do incalculable harm to the children involved and to the relations among people. It is not only that such convulsions seriously undermine respect for law and order, and cause serious economic and moral damage. Such incidents hurt our country in the eyes of the world. We just cannot afford another Little Rock or another New Orleans.

For on this generation of Americans falls the full burden of proving to the world that we really mean it when we say all men are created free and are equal before the law. All of us might wish at times that we lived in a more tranquil world, but we don't. And if our times are difficult and perplexing, so are they challenging and filled with opportunity.

To the South, perhaps more than any other section of the country, has been given the opportunity and the challenge and the responsibility of demonstrating America at its greatest—at its full potential of liberty under law.

WILL ENFORCE CIVIL RIGHTS STATUTES

You may ask, will we enforce the civil rights statutes. The answer is: "Yes, we will."

We also will enforce the antitrust laws, the antiracketeering laws, the laws against kidnapping and robbing Federal banks, and transporting stolen automobiles across State lines, the illicit traffic in narcotics and all the rest. We can and will do no less.

I hold a constitutional office of the U.S. Government, and I shall perform the duty I have sworn to undertake—to enforce the law, in every field of law and every region.

We will not threaten, we will try to help. We will not persecute, we will prosecute.

We will not make or interpret the laws. We shall enforce them vigorously, without regional bias or political slant.

All this we intend to do. But all the high rhetoric on Law Day about the noble mansions of the law; all the high-sounding speeches about liberty and justice, are meaningless unless people—you and I—breathe meaning and force into it. For our liberties depend upon our respect for the law.

On December 13, 1889, Henry W. Grady of Georgia said these words to an audience in my home State of Massachusetts: "This hour little needs the loyalty that is loyal to one section and yet holds the other in enduring suspicion and estrangement. Give us the broad and perfect loyalty that loves and trusts Georgia alike with Massachusetts—that knows no South, no North, no East, no West, but endears with equal and patriotic love every foot of our soil, every State of our Union.

"A mighty duty, sir, and a mighty inspiration impels every one of us tonight to lose in patriotic consecration whatever estranges, whatever divides. We, sir, are Americans, and we stand for human liberty."

Ten days later Mr. Grady was dead, but his words live today. We stand for human liberty.

The road ahead is full of difficulties and discomforts. But as for me, I welcome the challenge, I welcome the opportunity, and I pledge my best effort—all I have in material things and physical strength and spirit to see that freedom shall advance and that our children will grow old under the rule of law.

Study of the Effects of Imports and Exports on American Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, my friend and our distinguished colleague Mr. DENT who represents the 21st District of Pennsylvania is to be congratulated on his plans as chairman of the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor to make a study of the effects of imports and exports upon American employment. I have received his invitation to provide information that might be helpful in the pursuit of his study; I and my entire office force will, of course, cooperate in every way possible.

There is no doubt but that the Dent special subcommittee can make an invaluable contribution toward a new approach to international trade. Now is the appropriate time for this investigation to begin. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act expires in 1962. Before Congress even considers its extension, all the facts about the impact of imported commodities should be available to Members of the House Committee on Ways and Means. Because of the many important measures that will be before that committee during the second session of this Congress, Congress itself will understandably not have sufficient time to delve into the subject to the extent that is warranted and necessary. The Dent subcommittee, by undertaking to probe all facets of the subject, will thus have obtained vital data that can be used by the committee responsible for initiating the trade agreements extension.

I have today written to local civic, labor, management, and other relevant organizations in my district inviting them to cooperate with the new subcommittee. I submit that my friend, a colleague, will be welcomed enthusiastically should he decide to hold hearings in the 22d Congressional District of Pennsylvania, but I am fully aware of the demands that will be made upon him in

various areas of the country. Our particular region offers especial evidence of the destructive consequences of unfair competition from abroad.

The wide varieties of manufacturing and processing industries in central and western Pennsylvania can provide vital evidence for the import-export study. The textile industry has suffered severe damage from the inequitables of foreign goods. This product of alien countries has been entirely responsible for depriving our people of many man-years of employment.

Our glass industry has experienced continuing damage from imported products made in countries where wages are a small percentage of those made in this country. The effect of excessive imports extends into machine tools, electrical equipment, pottery, dental and medical equipment, and even household furnishings and kitchen appliances.

While the Dent subcommittee's assignment may primarily relate to economic implications of international trade, the study will unquestionably provide documentation that will prompt Congress to insist upon substantial cutbacks in the imports of numerous commodities because of their threat to the national security. Many of the industries enumerated above as well as other independent and allied industries, have been reduced to the level of uncertainty with respect to their role in a national emergency.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to comprehend how the State Department can continue to insist upon policies that are not reconcilable with fundamental defense requirements. What Congress must begin to do is review the accomplishments of State Department activities at least in the postwar years. Such an investigation would disclose one of the most consistent records of failure and tragic frustration ever compiled, and Congress might finally come to realize the absolute source of our difficulties in the field of international trade. The next step is for this legislative body to reassume the obligation entrusted to us by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution. Had the State Department enjoyed any measure of success in its diplomatic overtures and negotiations, its apologists might have some excuse for the policy of disregarding domestic need in favor of diplomatic expediency.

Each succeeding failure in the field of international policy places a greater responsibility upon the defense mechanism of our own country. For this reason alone, progressively tighter restrictions on imports that affect the national security should have been imposed during the past decade. Must we continue to have failure upon failure in our international affairs without even an occasional victory to cheer us?

The crisis in the Caribbean must surely have jolted even the most inert minds into realizing that it is foolhardy to rely on foreign sources for fuel to drive our domestic economy and to stand ready to serve the military machine.

American refineries were expropriated with least difficulty and far less time than it takes two railroads to merge in this country. Regardless of how soon the Peril of the Antilles is deposed, his brief career should stand as a monument to the ineptitude of our State Department and its spokesmen. It should be recorded indelibly in handbooks to be used as primers for Members of Congress and all Government officials concerned with this Nation's self-sufficiency in an era of global tension.

I am certain that the evidence generated by the Dent subcommittee hearings in the months ahead will be invaluable to Congress when it considers reciprocal trade policies next year. I urge all Members of Congress whose constituencies are affected by excessive imports to cooperate closely with the subcommittee. Whatever be your local domestic problem, caused by unfavorable trade agreements, whether it be the result of too much oil, too much fish, too many textile products, too many farm products from foreign countries, or too much of anything else that affects the people in your district, your State, and your country it is time that we get together on common ground and work out our problems to the best advantage of the Nation and our constituencies—from both the defense and the economic standpoint.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the Balkan Peninsula has been the home of a large number of peoples differing in race, language, history, and traditions. However, throughout their long and eventful history they have shared one thing in common: they all have fought for their freedom, and thus have shared the same fate. The Rumanian people, constituting one of the largest of the group in the area, have suffered a similar fate.

Early in modern times their country was overrun by the Ottoman Turks, and they were subjected to the unwelcome and harsh rule of their conquerors. For centuries they struggled for their freedom from the oppressive yoke of their overlords, but most of their attempts ended in disasters and bloodbaths. In the middle of the last century, however, they had better luck. At the end of the Crimean War in 1856, they gained autonomous status, and this status was guaranteed by the great powers of Europe. The next and more important move was made in 1877, during the course of the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78. On May 10, 1877, they took their destiny into their own hands and proclaimed their independence. Since that memorable date, for 84 years May 10 has been celebrated as their national holiday, their Independence Day.

Today on the observance of this anniversary I join the Rumanian National Committee and voice my heartfelt sympathy for the sad plight of their compatriots in Communist-dominated Rumania.

Legislative Views as to the Value of the Sentencing Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 10, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address I made before the Sentencing Institute for the Fifth Circuit in New Orleans, La., Tuesday, May 9, 1961:

LEGISLATIVE VIEWS AS TO THE VALUE OF THE SENTENCING INSTITUTE

This is a particularly gratifying occasion for me—attending a sentencing institute in pursuance of the authorizing legislation which I sponsored in 1958. I am indebted to Judge Clayton for his kindness in inviting me and for the opportunity to renew so many old acquaintances among the judges.

It is a difficult but most worthwhile task that you have before you. We are living in troubled times. We are living in the midst of vast social changes, changes which have brought with them conflicting political philosophies and a rapidly developing technology that has uprooted old ways of life. Inevitably under these circumstances the traditional values of our society and particularly the administration of justice must struggle to maintain some semblance of stability.

But times of change are also times of challenge. I am confident that what we do today will eventually bring about a more orderly society, one that will enhance the moral values of the past and make them more meaningful in the future. As President Kennedy, in his historic and beautifully drafted inaugural address, said: "And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungles of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor—not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

If we are to create that new world of law, we must, of course, look to our own laws and see to it that they are carried out firmly and fairly and with justice for all. In our system of government the judge inevitably occupies a central role in this all-important endeavor. On judgment day he is the one who speaks for society, and translates into his decisions the values and objectives of that society.

This central and difficult role of the judge is perhaps best illustrated in the realm of sentencing. As my good friend Judge Irving R. Kaufman wrote in the Atlantic Monthly last year: "If the hundreds of American judges who sit on criminal cases were polled as to what was the most trying facet of their jobs, the vast majority would almost certainly answer 'sentencing.' In no other judicial function is the judge more alone; no other act of his carries greater potentialities for good or evil than the determination of how society will treat its transgressors."

Apparently in recognition of the magnitude of this responsibility, the House Judiciary Committee has received over the years a number of proposals which would restrict a judge's discretion in imposing sentence or take that function out of his

hands entirely. Every year there are introduced into the Congress a number of bills which would provide minimum mandatory penalties for certain types of crimes. We have had proposals to establish a method of sentence review, with the argument that at present the United States is the only nation in the Western World where, with the exception of a few states, one judge can determine with utter finality the minimum period of time which a convicted defendant must remain imprisoned. We also have had proposals to establish sentencing tribunals along the lines of the California plan which leaves the length of sentence and time of release on parole to a State commission.

Personally I am convinced that sentencing is inherently a judicial function and that the judge, equipped with the necessary resources and advice, can carry out this function with more regard for principles of justice than persons untrained in the law and unfamiliar with the facts of a case. But a judge cannot, acting alone, be the end-all and the be-all as to whether the offender shall be incarcerated, and if so, for how long. He must and should take advice and counsel from various sources.

Judicial sentencing has been subject to considerable criticism, not without some justification. The inconsistencies that account for this criticism have stemmed from the fact that until relatively recently the judges have lacked the expertise, the resources and information that they have needed to accomplish the task of sentencing as skillfully as might be desired. Also, the courts themselves have not yet reconciled their individual viewpoints into a common sentencing philosophy. I emphasize that it is not exact mathematical uniformity that is important but rather an agreed upon approach to sentencing.

When eventually the courts have succeeded in working out the principles which underlie sound sentencing philosophy, I am sure it will be done through general acceptance of a set of values.

As you know there are different schools of thought as to the purpose of a sentence. Some believe that punishment of the offender is the primary objective of sentencing. And punishment does have its role in vigorously reaffirming the moral standards of our society.

Others believe that the sentence must be severe enough to scare potential criminals into compliance with the law. And I am not so sure that the deterrent purposes of the law have been adequately effective to keep down certain types of crimes. If the deterrent concept were absolutely true, there should really be no criminals. But as you know we have been punishing criminals for centuries and crime is still with us.

Still others believe that the offender should be kept in prison to immunize him physically, so to speak, from the commission of further crimes. None among us questions that there are criminals who must be treated in this fashion. They must be set aside as pariahs. Society must be shielded from them.

Then too there is the school which subscribes to the philosophy that the sentence must be adjusted mainly to the rehabilitative potentialities of the individual offender. This of course is most difficult to calculate but it is certainly one of growing importance in our search for civilized social justice.

But behind all of these purposes is the single objective—the protection of society. This is the judge's prime responsibility, and to fulfill that responsibility he must, in varying degrees, apply each of these philosophies to the formulation of an equitable and fitting sentence. It is not a matter of choosing a rigid sentencing philosophy but a matter of finding a reasonable middle ground between competing considerations.

You are here today to search these considerations and to work toward a common meeting ground for the viewponts which you individually hold. No one expects that the formula for equitable sentencing will be found today or tomorrow, but your efforts here will contribute to an eventual solution to a problem which has existed as long as there have been judges.

You are here to give and take various opinions and viewpoints. You are here to discuss the various aspects of sentencing. On the anvil of discussion you may forge some helpful solutions of the vexatious problem.

The characters, personalities, mental makeup, education, experiences on and off the bench, differ with judges. Their philosophies, mental processes and judgments differ—hence their sentences differ. This is natural. Nonetheless patterns of sentencing can evolve that the judiciary will support.

You know there are 437 Members of Congress, representing all sections of the United States having many differing points of view and attitudes. Somehow, in the legislative process, despite the varying attitudes, a common ground is found on which the majority can agree. With the exception of a very few bills, the acceptance of the common ground always is unanimous or nearly unanimous. So, too, I feel that the judges who come from as many sections of the country as do Congressmen, can agree upon a set of values and rules for their guidance in the sentencing of offenders.

The existence of sentence disparities has long been the subject of anxiety among those associated with the administration of justice. Every Attorney General since the Hoover administration has voiced his concern about it. Every Congress since the Roosevelt administration has considered bills to deal with it. And the Judicial Conference of the United States has had it under continuous study since 1938.

There still remains much basis for concern. Disparities are widespread and in many instances flagrant. For example, one of the last acts of President Eisenhower was to commute or reduce the sentence of a first offender to the time he had then spent in jail. This first offender was a combat veteran of two wars, who had been given a term of 18 years for forging six small checks. Only last year another first offender, out of work and desperate for funds to pay for the medical care of his sick wife, received a term of 15 years for cashing a check illegally for $58.40. At about the same time another defendant, whose background and crime were almost the same as the other man's, received a term of 30 days in Federal court for illegally cashing a check for $35.20.

At a Federal institution in the West a 47-year-old embezzler, with an unblemished past record, is serving 20 years, with 5 years probation to follow. This sentence was imposed despite experience which demonstrates that embezzlers are among the most hopeful prospects for rehabilitation and despite data indicating that across the Nation the Federal courts impose sentences averaging less than 2 years upon this type of offender.

Under appeal at the present moment is the case of a tax accountant who received a term of 31 years and 31 days on tax fraud charges last year. It was an extremely harsh sentence, and, of course, there is little the appellate court can do about the sentence directly. It cannot substitute its judgment for the trial judge. It can find some other ground, some technicality I suppose, to reverse the trial court and thus negate the sentence. In doing so, however, its own decision and opinion may be so strained as to handicap our legal system in future cases.

The sensitivity of Members of the Congress to disparity in sentencing is illustrated by a sentence that was imposed after my bill, the Celler sentencing law, was passed. A middle-aged bank clerk had embezzled approximately $70,000, much of which he used for the benefit of harassed debtors of the bank. This defendant was not motivated by personal gain, instead he manipulated the books of the bank to cover up the accounts of delinquent depositors. A judge, on assignment from another district, imposed a 12-year term without securing even as much information as could have been provided by a presentence report by the probation officer. One of my colleagues promptly introduced a bill which would make immediately eligible for parole any Federal offender who has been sentenced without the benefit of a presentence investigation report. This bill is again under consideration in the current session of the Congress.

In contrast to the excessively severe sentences I have cited, there are also the sentences which are excessively lenient. In 1960 a youth with a sex offense record was given 98 days for robbing a bank of $5,000. In another case an offender who was on probation on a robbery charge at the time of his crime received 1 year for holding up a bank at gunpoint and obtaining $600. Again in the same court an offender with a similar background received a 1-year term for robbing a bank of $2,100 armed with a sawed-off shotgun. An eastern court imposed the so-called split-sentence on two defendants who also used a sawed-off shotgun in robbing a bank of more than $12,000. As you know, under split-sentencing, this amounted to only 6 months in jail.

From the data I have secured it appears that some courts are as prone to identify themselves with the plight of the defendant as other courts are prone to throw the book at him. Unduly lenient sentences fail to give the institutions sufficient time to reeducate and resocialize the offender. And they provide the basis for further doubt in the minds of the criminal element and the public alike that our laws are being administered impartially. It is this type of sentence, moreover, that lends so much strength to the group in the Congress who propose and favor minimum mandatory penalties for a growing number of offenses.

Thus it is that sentence disparities bring about both bad laws and bad interpretations of the law, as well as many other undesirable effects which undermine the purposes and prestige of the law.

I have heard the claim that such cases are rare, but they can be backed up by innumerable similar examples. Statistics tell the same story although, dealing as they do with averages, they tend to conceal the extremes in brevity and length of sentences. In the 1960 fiscal year the proportion of all types of convicted defendants placed on probation in Federal courts ranged from 69 percent in New Hampshire to 17 percent in eastern Louisiana. Forgers receive average terms of 63 months in western Oklahoma, but average terms of 9 months in southern New York. For auto theft, usually an offense involving the unauthorized use of an auto for a short-lived joyride, southern Iowa imposed terms averaging about 46 months, while western New York imposed terms averaging about 11 months.

The existence of marked disparities in sentences is undeniable. And I think it was to the credit of the Federal judiciary and a healthy augury for the future resolution of this problem that you acknowledged their existence and wanted to do something about it when, in 1958, I wrote you on the subject. Over 80 percent of the Federal judges who responded to my inquiry favored the establishment of these institutes as a means of finding some way to minimize these disparities. The proposal was also backed formally by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

It is also to the credit of the judiciary that they have acted promptly on the congressional authorization for these institutes. The first such institute, held on a national

basis in Boulder, Colo., in 1959, did much to bring to light many of the issues which apparently account for disparities. I hope at this institute and at others scheduled for this year that further progress can be made on achieving the objective of the law, to formulate sentencing principles and criteria which will assist in promoting the equitable administration of the criminal laws of the United States.

The institute program assumes particular importance at this time. As you know, the Congress has under consideration a bill to authorize 70 or more new judgeships, and it is a measure which I strongly favor. However, many of the persons appointed to these offices will know little about sentencing philosophy when they reach the bench. Few, if any, will have had the awesome responsibility of imposing one. The institute program is ideally suited for their orientation in this difficult task which they will have to assume so abruptly.

Moreover, there is legislation pending in the Congress which will add substantially to the burden of their task. A number of bills have been introduced which, if enacted, will bring many new categories of offenders under Federal jurisdiction—gamblers, racketeers, almost anyone who might use some interstate facility in the commission of crime. The proposed broadening of the Fugitive Felon Act alone will bring thousands of offenders who have violated State laws under the purview of the Federal courts.

The courts may receive some badly needed assistance in the event the public defender bill which I have sponsored passes. For example, more than 80 percent of the defendants presently convicted in Federal courts have waived counsel and entered pleas of guilt. The public defender can insure that these actions are taken more intelligently and that worthy cases will have a competent defense. The role of the public defender in providing the court with a more balanced knowledge of the defendant should do much to help the court in its efforts to achieve an equitable and fitting sentence.

The sentencing institute also seems an ideal forum for more experienced judges, affording them an opportunity to exchange views and evaluate the rapidly accumulating knowledge in the field of sentencing. Some senior judges have reported to me that their participation in these seminars has given them new insights into sentencing problems and in some instances have changed viewpoints which they have long held.

Inherent in the statute authorizing the institutes is the desire that any accord and common agreement reached in these institutes be circulated to the entire Federal judiciary. An ideal instrument for the circulation of this information appears to me to be the sentencing Desk Book, first developed for the Boulder institute and now being extensively revised by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the Department of Justice. I have read this document. It is a comprehensive and concise treatment of the sentencing alternatives available to the courts in disposing of various types of cases. It should prove to be a valuable handbook for the individual judge, for it would otherwise take his law clerk many months to research and gather together any comparable material.

You will recall that the same statute which authorized these institutes also provided for an indeterminate method of sentencing by which the court could impose a minimum term up to one-third of the maximum imposed for parole eligibility or leave this determination to the board of parole. Unfortunately, this provision has not seen much use thus far. Last year, out of more than 8,600 commitments to which the law is applicable, only about 700 were sentenced under this indeterminate provision. It is my hope that a better understanding of this provision can be achieved through the institute program and the data contained in the Desk Book, and that this will lead to an increased use of the indeterminate sentencing procedure.

In my opinion, the indeterminate sentence offers one of the chief means by which the disparity problem can be minimized. It is difficult for the court—virtually impossible in many cases—to predict when a given offender will have been rehabilitated in prison to the point where he can safely be released. The judge loses jurisdiction over the sentence after 60 days, but through the indeterminate procedure the actual time to be spent in prison by the offender can be adjusted by the parole board in the light of later developments. The indeterminate sentence is a means by which the judge can make the original sentence a continuously fitting instrument in the treatment of the offender. It should also prove to be a most effective means of motivating the offender to work earnestly to demonstrate his fitness for parole and release.

Through the sentencing institute program, the judge can also learn more about the resources he has available to him in the sentencing process. In this respect, I am pleased to learn that the diagnostic and observation procedures of the new Federal Sentencing Act have proved extremely valuable to the courts. Mr. Bennett, of the Bureau of Prisons, informs me that he received at least one of these cases a day, on the average. Some of the individuals involved have turned out to be mentally ill and should have been handled under the competency procedures of the Criminal Code. I understand that practically all of the commitments under section 4208(b), the so-called presentence observation procedure, have been defendants whose problems were so profound that the courts were well advised in seeking the extended period of study for them that the statute authorizes.

I was particularly interested in the case of the offender who became involved in a minor Dyer Act automobile theft offense and who was committed to a Federal institution for study as John Doe, when he steadfastly refused to give his true name or any information about himself to the court, the probation officer, or his court-appointed attorney. The institution circularized identification data to various police departments and eventually succeeded in uncovering his true name and the fact that he had once been arrested for carrying a homemade bomb. Further, he had a history of mental illness, and the institution psychiatrists felt that he was currently psychotic. The case was further complicated by the circumstance that one of our States still wanted to prosecute him for carrying the bomb. With the assistance of this information from the Bureau of Prisons, the court worked out what appeared to me a wise solution. The court felt that the several months the defendant had already spent in the Federal institution was a sufficient penalty for the minor offense he had committed, and authorized his immediate release to the State authorities who wanted to prosecute him. The court at the same time expressed the hope that they would commit him to a State mental institution, where all the facts indicated he belonged. Through the Prison Bureau this was done. There are, I am sure, many others with equally interesting and perplexing problems which the new procedure makes possible of solution prior to final sentence.

I am hopeful too that the sentencing institute program will encourage and stimulate the individual judge to take it upon himself to learn more about the problems involved in sentencing. The social science disciplines, for example, are developing a large body of knowledge that has direct implications for sentencing. I commend to your attention in this connection the growing body of literature dealing with human behavior and also the many conferences and seminars now being held in various parts of the country by our social scientists. In this respect I note that a recent report of the Senate Judiciary Committee recommends that the Federal judges adopt as a part of the sentencing institute program the practice of visiting the penal and correctional facilities of the Federal Government. Certainly a knowledge of the resources of these facilities is indispensable to the judge if he is to make his dispositions intelligently. A number of Federal judges, I am informed, have already embarked on an extensive program to familiarize themselves with these institutions.

It is further heartening to note that the institute program has encouraged other measures on the part of individual judges to achieve higher standards of consistency in sentencing. I am advised that Judge Theodore Levin, of Detroit, holds a weekly conference of the judges of his court for the purpose of discussing the appropriate dispositions of cases currently under sentencing consideration by each of them. Judge George H. Boldt of Tacoma, Wash., records the reasons behind his sentencing dispositions and explains their consistency with those he has previously imposed. Judge Emett C. Choate, of Miami, attempts to get the views of both the defense and the prosecution when considering his own dispositions. And Judge Wallace S. Gourley, of Pittsburgh, has developed a checklist of factors to be considered when formulating a sentence in an individual case.

I might add here one fairly old suggestion that every modern judge might follow. Sir Matthew Hale, Lord Chief Justice of the Kings Bench from 1665 to 1676, also had a checklist of factors to be considered in carrying out his own sentencing duties. The first item on the list was: "That in the execution of justice, I carefully lay aside my own passions, and not give way to them, however provoked."

The even-handed administration of our criminal laws remains a vital concern of the Congress and particularly my committee. In the report which accompanied my Federal sentencing bill to the floor in 1958 we commented: "The prevalence of such disparities weakens respect for the administration of justice, both on the part of the criminal element and on the part of the general public. Consequently, much of the potential for the prevention of crime inherent in a wholesome respect for the law is not realized." I am fully aware that the sentencing legislation that I sponsored holds within it the potential for bringing about more disparities rather than less if the expanded discretion it conferred upon the courts is not used knowledgeably. In the institute program lies our hope and our trust that the new discretion of the courts will be exercised in what might be termed a "common Federal sentencing philosophy."

As I have said, if we are to achieve the new world of law that President Kennedy described, we must retain in our own Nation unquestioned confidence in the fairness and justice of the law. The Congress has provided the statutory means through the institute program and sentencing discretion. But it is only you judges who can make these instruments work.

In conclusion, I would be very much interested in hearing from Judge Clayton, when the institute is over, as to the conclusions you may reach as to the causes and remedies for sentencing disparities. I have every confidence that this report will be encouraging and that we will continue to strengthen our procedures so as to make equal justice under law a reality for all our citizens.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen, a Senator from the State of Illinois.

His Grace, Valerian D. Trifa, bishop of the Romanian Orthodox Episcopate of of America, Jackson, Mich., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

O Lord, Creator and Protector of our world and our country, grant to the Members and officers of this august body Thy heavenly blessings and guide them to do Thy will. Help them to make their deliberations and decisions channels of blessings and helpfulness to all in need: to those who are near and to those in distant places.

Remember, O Father of Mercy, on this Rumanian national holiday all those tried by tyranny who feel helpless, downhearted and disillusioned; comfort them in their distress, relieve them and strengthen them in body, mind, and spirit so that where there is hatred, there be love; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light.

And to us Americans who enjoy the blessings of freedom, human dignity, and an abundance of earthly needs, grant, O Lord, charity of mind, purity of heart, depth of faith, steadfastness of purpose, so that we may be to the world what is expected of us. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. DIRKSEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 9, 1961, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 9, 1961, Mr. MAGNUSON, on May 10, 1961, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 684) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers, reported it favorably, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 214) thereon, which report was printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 9, 1961, the following executive report of a committee was submitted on May 10, 1961.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive I, 87th Congress, 1st session. A proposal to modify article 3(e) of the International Load Line Convention, signed at London on July 5, 1930; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 5).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1372) to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. GAVIN, Mr. VAN ZANDT, and Mr. BATES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 311. An act to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt;

H.R. 1877. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local Numbered 12 Pension Fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 4130. An act to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin;

H.R. 4317. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States;

H.R. 4940. An act relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco;

H.R. 5490. An act to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6413. An act to extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 311. An act to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt;

H.R. 1877. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H.R. 4317. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States;

H.R. 4940. An act relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco; and

H.R. 6413. An act to extend to fishermen the same treatment accorded farmers in relation to estimated income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4130. An act to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin; placed on the calendar.

H.R. 5490. An act to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORT ON EDUCATION BILL—MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate, following the session today, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to file a report on the education bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that minority and individual views accompanying the aid to education bill, S. 1021, to be reported during the adjournment, be printed with the committee report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO SERVICE OF MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 302(1) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to extend the period of time for which individuals may serve as members of advisory committees appointed by the Administrator (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF RELOCATION HOUSING PROGRAM FOR SMALL HOMES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of relocation housing program for small homes, as administered by the Office of the Administrator and the Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, April 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, fiscal years 1959 and 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SPARE PARTS PROCUREMENT AND REPAIR REQUIREMENTS, SAN ANTONIO AIR MATERIEL AREA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of reciprocating engine spare parts procurement and repair requirements, San Antonio Air Materiel Area, Department of the Air Force, dated May 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

VALIDATION OF PAYMENTS MADE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS AND FORMER MEMBERS OF U.S. COAST GUARD

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to validate payments of certain per diem allowances made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard while serving in special programs overseas (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO PAYMENT OF UNUSED COMPENSATORY TIME EARNED BY DECEASED POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide for payment of unused compensatory time earned by deceased postal employees, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 48

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to permit FHA insurance on loans on leases with less than 50 years remaining

"Whereas there are houses on the market today, either in good condition or capable of being put into good conditon, which will be suitable for displaced persons; and

"Whereas a lease with less than 50 years to run is ineligible for a new FHA loan; and

"Whereas lessors in many cases are not willing to grant an extension of the lease to permit refinancing: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1961 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to amend the present FHA laws to permit FHA insurance on loans on leases with less than 50 years remaining where the leases were originally for terms in excess of 50 years; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG and the Honorable OREN E. LONG, Senators to Congress from Hawaii, to Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE, Representative to Congress from Hawaii, to the local manager of the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Housing Administrator in Washington, D.C."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 42

"Concurrent resolution urging the Secretary of Commerce of the United States to appoint to the Travel Advisory Board a person from the State of Hawaii

"Whereas the Senate of the United States of America did on February 20, 1961, pass Senate bill 610 providing for the establishment within the Department of Commerce of a United States Travel Service to be headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel; and

"Whereas Senate bill 610 provides also for the establishment of a Travel Advisory Board composed of 20 members to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce who shall serve for such terms as the Secretary of Commerce may designate; and

"Whereas Senate bill 610 is designed to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce, improve the foreign payments position of the United States, and promote international understanding and appreciation of the United States of America by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally; and

"Whereas tourism is one of the major industries in the State of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the State of Hawaii is most frequently the first place of visit in the United States for visitors from the Far East, Australia and the Pacific Basin; and

"Whereas the State of Hawaii is a major resort and recreation area servicing visitors from this vast and important region; and

"Whereas within the State of Hawaii are many people especially knowledgeable on the development of travel and tourism facilities servicing the Pacific area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1961 (the Senate concurring), That the Secretary of Commerce of the United States be, and hereby is, respectfully urged to appoint to the Travel Advisory Board a person from the State of Hawaii upon enactment of Senate bill 610; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, the Secretary of Commerce of the United States, the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG, U.S. Senator from Hawaii, the Honorable OREN E. LONG, U.S. Senator from Hawaii, and the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE, U.S. Representative from Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION 17

"House joint resolution in support of an equal rights for women amendment to the Federal Constitution

"The General Assembly of Maryland, voicing the sentiments of the women of this State, fully supports an equal rights for women amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and is requesting the Congress to submit such a proposed amendment to the States for a vote.

"The women of this country now have certain rights of citizenship, and the right of suffrage, but there are still many instances of inequality in their rights as contrasted with those of men under both Federal and State laws. These inequalities are contrary to the basic principles of a republican form of government. For this reason, the Constitution of the United States should be amended to incorporate in this basic document a positive guarantee of equality under the law regardless of sex.

"An equal rights for women amendment would remove from women any remaining common law and statutory disabilities and it would provide a standard by which to measure policies and customs which are not directly controlled by law.

"This vital change should be made by constitutional amendment in order to accomplish the change in the fundamental law of the United States.

"Both majority parties, in planks adopted by their national conventions, have fully endorsed a constitutional amendment providing equal rights for women.

"The women of Maryland have shared equally with men in the hardships and sacrifices necessary and incident to the building of this Nation. They have shared equally with men in the pain and distress which have been involved in the maintenance of the American Republic and in the preservation of the ideals of free government.

"This Nation was 'conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.' An equal rights for women amendment, for the first time, would give validity to this outstanding principle of the American system.

"The rights of women before the law are abridged in many States. This legal discrimination on the basis of sex constitutes an intolerable burden upon thousands of women who are solely dependent upon their own efforts for their livelihood. Such discrimination is a source of irritation and of injustice to them and to many thousands of others who recognize in it a flat contradiction to the American principle of equality. This contradiction is entirely out of accord with the status of American women and with

the levels they have reached through their achievements in all fields of human endeavor.

"The General Assembly of Maryland supports an equal rights for women amendment: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States is requested to adopt and to submit to the several States, an equal rights for women amendment in order that it may speedily be added as an integral part of the Constitution of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Maryland be requested to send copies of this resolution, under the great seal of the State of Maryland, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas Jefferson Medical College commemorates the name of Thomas Jefferson, author of the immortal Declaration of Independence, in the city of Philadelphia, where this fundamental statement of American principle was drafted and adopted; and

"Whereas Jefferson Medical College traces its origin to 1802 when the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania honored President Thomas Jefferson and paid tribute to his lifelong interest in education by chartering Jefferson College in Canonsburg, Washington County, Pa.; and

"Whereas Jefferson College in 1824 brought this recognition of Jefferson's achievements home to the city of Philadelphia by establishing a medical faculty there, a branch which in 1838 became a separate institution, Jefferson Medical College; and

"Whereas Jefferson Medical College has grown into one of the world's great institutions of medical learning and research; and

"Whereas Thomas Jefferson drafted the Declaration of Independence in his room on the second floor of the Isaac Graff house, which formerly stood on the southwest corner of Seventh and Market Streets, in Philadelphia, not far distant from the present location of Jefferson Medical College; and

"Whereas the southwest corner of Seventh and Market Streets lies immediately westward of the Independence Mall and within only two blocks from the Independence National Park enclave, it can be considered as most fitting for inclusion into the area of the Independence National Park; and

"Whereas this fortunate set of circumstances links together in a common heritage of greatness the historic site where the Declaration of Independence was drafted and the great medical institution which bears the name of its author: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States to provide for the purchase of the site of the Isaac Graff house on the southwest corner of Seventh and Market Streets in the city of Philadelphia, as an addition to the Independence National Park, and for the development of this site as a medical historical museum in connection with Jefferson Medical College, the great medical institution which now commemorates the name of the author of the Declaration of Independence in the city where it was written and adopted.

"PAUL C. MOOMAW,
"Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania."

A petition signed by Kashin Ozato, mayor of Katsuren-son, Seigi Kurato, Chairman, Katsuren-son Assembly, and Minoru Maeno, Chief, Land Committee of Katsuren-son, of the Ryukyu Islands, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for a contribution to the Government of the Ryukyu Islands for the purpose of providing compensation for use of private property and damage to persons and property arising from acts of the U.S. forces before the entry into force of the Japanese Peace Treaty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the 40th Annual Conference of the Western Association of State Highway Officials, at Las Vegas, Nev., pledging their support to the Federal Highway Administrator; to the Committee on Public Works.

Resolutions adopted by the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 68. A bill for the relief of Kay Addis (Rept. No. 216);

S. 130. A bill for the relief of Ioannis F. Kostakis (Rept. No. 217);

S. 219. A bill for the relief of Doctor Nobutaka Azuma (Rept. No. 218);

S. 268. A bill for the relief of Hok Yuen Woo (Rept. No. 219);

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Aiko Shinzato (Rept. No. 220);

S. 441. A bill for the relief of Rodopi Statherou (Statheron) (Rept. No. 221);

S. 442. A bill for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris) (Rept. No. 222);

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Charles Edward Pifer (Rept. No. 223);

S. 967. A bill for the relief of Wong Gar Wah (Rept. No. 224);

S. 1093. A bill for the relief of Sze-Foo Chien (Rept. No. 225);

S. 1168. A bill for the relief of Edward C. Tonsmeire, Jr. (Rept. No. 226);

S. 1204. A bill for the relief of Sirijo Tanfara (Rept. No. 227);

H.R. 1320. An act for the relief of Edward P. Wall (Rept. No. 233);

H.R. 1329. An act for the relief of Kim Hyoung Geun (Rept. No. 234);

H.R. 1351. An act for the relief of Danica Dopudja (Rept. No. 235);

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen (Rept. No. 236);

H.R. 1368. An act for the relief of Maurice Devlin (Rept. No. 237);

H.R. 1397. An act for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell (Rept. No. 252);

H.R. 1424. An act for the relief of Benjamin E. Campbell (Rept. No. 238);

H.R. 1447. An act for the relief of Wladyslaw Figura (Rept. No. 239);

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Mario Menna (Rept. No. 240);

H.R. 1535. An act for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh (Rept. No. 241);

H.R. 1896. An act for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego (Rept. No. 242);

H.R. 2138. An act for the relief of Raymond G. Greenhalgh (Rept. No. 243);

H.R. 2188. An act for the relief of Lieutenant Mathew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired) (Rept. No. 244);

H.R. 2331. An act for the relief of Peggy Loene Morrison (Rept. No. 245);

H.R. 2681. An act for the relief of Terata Kiyoshi Johnston (Rept. No. 246);

H.R. 3493. An act for the relief of William Joseph Vincent (Rept. No. 247); and

H.R. 3842. An act for the relief of James Delbert Hodges (Rept. No. 248).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 415. A bill for the relief of Margaret Jean Dauel (Rept. No. 228);

S. 570. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Alonzi (Rept. No. 229);

S. 1073. A bill for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis (Rept. No. 230);

S. 1343. A bill for the relief of Doctor Tung Hui Lin (Rept. No. 249); and

H.R. 5178. An act for the relief of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex. (Rept. No. 250).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 32. A bill for the relief of Jenno Becsay (Rept. No. 231);

S. 264. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Leong (Rept. No. 232); and

H.R. 1346 An act for the relief of John Napoli (Rept. No. 251).

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May 1961 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week (Rept. No. 215).

PRINTING OF PUBLICATIONS OF INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) relating to printing of publications of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and submitted a report (No. 254) thereon, which concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there shall be printed, for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the numbers of copies specified of the following publications of its Internal Security Subcommittee:

(1) "The Technique of Soviet Propaganda" (committee print, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session), ten thousand copies;

(2) "Khrushchev's Strategy and Its Meaning for America" (committee print, Eighty-sixth Congress, second session), five thousand copies;

(3) "Communist Leadership 'Tough Guy' Takes Charge" (hearings before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, February 2 and 3, 1960), five thousand copies;

(4) "The Korean War and Related Matters" (committee print, report, Eighty-fourth Congress, first session), five thousand copies;

(5) "Subversive Influence in the Educational Process" (committee print, report dated July 17, 1953, Eighty-third Congress, first session), five thousand copies;

(6) "Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments" (committee print, report dated July 30, 1953, Eighty-third Congress, first session), five thousand copies;

(7) "Activities of United States Citizens Employed by the United Nations" (committee print, report dated March 22, 1954, Eighty-third Congress, second session), five thousand copies; and

(8) "Documentary Proof That the Communist Party, U.S.A., Teaches and Advocates the Overthrow and Destruction of the United States Government by Force and Violence" (committee print, Eighty-second Congress, second session), five thousand copies.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutons were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1830. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the free flow of commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1831. A bill for the relief of Chaza Lucia Wurm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1832. A bill for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1833. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jorge Amante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1834. A bill to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; by extending the time in which grants may be made; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1835. A bill for the relief of Freda Feller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 1836. A bill to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz. and Nev., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1837. A bill for the relief of Chang-lo Wu and Ping-tuan Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1838. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to establish an improved system of longevity steps for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1839. A bill to amend sections 216(c) and 305(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the establishment of through routes and joint rates; and

S. 1840. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1841. A bill for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL (for himself and Mr. HART):

S. 1842. A bill to provide uniform 10-year terms for members of certain administrative agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 1843. A bill to authorize the President to establish and enforce ethical standards for the conduct of the business of the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1844. A bill to establish standards of conduct for agency proceedings of record; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARROLL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. JACKSON);

S. 1845. A bill for the relief of Moorland Court, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PELL:

S. 1846. A bill for the relief of Pedro A. Generao and Teodora Flores Generao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 1847. A bill for the relief of Doctor Chuan-Tseng Wei; and

S. 1848. A bill for the relief of Ivanka Vladimirovna Tindek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1849. A bill for the relief of Stephen S. Chang and Grace Hsin Lee Zia Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1850. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ per cent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1851. A bill for the relief of Draya (Samec) Leskovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1852. A bill to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See the reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. RUSSELL, which appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1853. A bill relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL):

S. 1854. A bill to provide for the establishment of a moisture conservation research center at the Federal land-grant college at Fort Collins, Colo.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1855. A bill to provide for the division of the State of North Dakota into two judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1856. A bill to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 1857. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

By Mr. BUSH:

S.J. Res. 85. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant representation in the Congress to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S.J. Res. 86. Joint resolution providing that each Presidential press conference held during a session of Congress shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. LONG of Missouri, and Mr. McCARTHY):

S.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution designating the corn tassel the national floral emblem of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PRINTING OF PUBLICATIONS OF INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) relating to printing of publications of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. EASTLAND, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. MUNDT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 142) opposing Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1961, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, which appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 143) opposing Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MUNDT, which appears under a separate heading.)

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1845 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. JACKSON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 144) to refer S. 1845 to the Court of Claims, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MORSE, which appears under a separate heading.)

ADMINISTRATION OF LAKE MEAD NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the distinguished junior

Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area.

The recreation area outlined in the bill encompasses the shoreline of Lake Mead and Lake Mojave, reservoirs created by the construction of Hoover and Davis Dams, on the Colorado River, between my own State of Nevada and Arizona. Literally millions of visitors visit this unique area every year.

The land under consideration was withdrawn by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1930, prior to the construction of Hoover Dam. Since that time, it has been administered by the Park Service under an interbureau agreement.

The purpose of the bill is to provide the 1,951,928-acre area with regulations that will bring about the maximum beneficial use of the tremendous recreation potential, while still protecting the water storage projects.

A portion of the Hualapai Indian Reservation is within the boundaries. The tribe has indicated its willingness to be included, and to participate in and benefit from its creation.

We expect that the bill will bring harmonious adjustment to the various activities and will stimulate development in accordance with the mounting demands of the public and the growing populations in Nevada, Arizona, and other Western States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1836) to provide an adequate basis for administration of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Arizona and Nevada, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THROUGH ROUTES AND JOINT RATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend sections 216 (c) and 305(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the establishment of through routes and joint rates. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a justification of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and justification will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1839) to amend sections 216(c) and 305(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the establishment of through routes and joint rates, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and justification presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1961.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration and introduction a copy of a draft bill, together with a statement of justification therefor, which would give effect to Legislative Recommendation No. 12 in the Commission's 74th Annual Report.

Your assistance in introducing this bill and scheduling hearings thereon will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

EVERETT HUTCHINSON,
Chairman.

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to provide a means of extending to the users of motor-water services and to the users of a combination of water services [1] between Alaska or Hawaii and the other States the benefits of joint rates similar to those now enjoyed by shippers by rail and water on such traffic.

Under the Transportation Act of 1940, the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission over water carriers was limited to commerce between the States. Jurisdiction over waterborne traffic between the States and the then territories of Alaska and Hawaii, as well as between the States and other areas, was continued in the Federal Maritime Board. Except for provisions in the Alaska and Hawaii statehood acts preserving the jurisdiction of the Maritime Board over water transportation between Alaska, Hawaii, and the other States, such jurisdiction would have devolved automatically upon the Interstate Commerce Commission upon the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union, and the through route and joint rate problem which the draft bill proposes to solve would not have arisen. However, under existing law, common carriers subject severally to the jurisdiction of different Federal regulatory agencies may not, in the absence of statutory authority, establish through routes and joint rates with each other.

Such authority exists under part I of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the voluntary establishment of joint rates between railroads subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and water carriers operating between Alaska or Hawaii and the contiguous States, including water carriers regulated by the Maritime Board. Such authority does not exist, however, with respect to motor and water common carriers subject to the Commission's jurisdiction and common carriers by water subject to the jurisdiction of the Maritime Board. There is also no authority for the establishment of single-factor through rates on rail-water-rail movements between Alaska and the other States because the Government owned and operated Alaska Railroad is not subject to the jurisdiction of any regulatory agency.

With the advent of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, the regulatory pattern for transportation between those and other States became exceedingly complex, involving a number of statutes, several regulatory agencies, and certain water carriers which, because of the effect of the aforementioned provisions in the statehood acts, remain unregulated by any Federal regulatory agency. This entire situation represents a novel departure from the traditional regulatory scheme insofar as transportation in interstate commerce is concerned; hence the need for special legislation if shippers in the Alaska or Hawaiian trade are to enjoy the benefits of single-factor through rates on traffic moving by motor and water or by a combination of water services.

The establishment of such through routes and joint rates would permit a shipper to make one contract with the originating carrier on behalf of all carriers participating in the arrangement and would enable him to ascertain the rate for such through movement by consulting a single tariff instead of many as may be necessary at present. The shipper and consignee would also have the advantages given by section 20(11) and similar provisions in other parts of the Interstate Commerce Act of recovering from either the originating or delivering carrier for loss or damage caused by any carrier participating in the through movement. In addition, experience has shown that because of the economy of established channels of commerce through which substantial traffic may flow, and because of reduced accounting and freight rate calculation costs, joint rates are generally lower than a combination of local rates of connecting carriers not participating in through-service arrangements.

While it is recognized that this proposed measure would not, because of the unregulated status of the Alaska Railroad, permit full realization of the benefits to be derived from the establishment of through routes and joint rates, it is an important and necessary step in that direction. It is therefore urged that the Congress give early and favorable consideration to the enactment thereof.

[1] Performed by a water carrier regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission and a water carrier regulated by the Federal Maritime Board.

ADEQUACY OF NATIONAL RAILROAD FREIGHT CAR SUPPLY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, together with a justification of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and justification will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1840) to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and justification presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1961.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration and introduction a copy of a draft bill, together with a statement of justification therefor, which would give effect to Legislative Recommendation No. 2 in the Commission's 74th Annual Report.

Your assistance in introducing this bill and scheduling hearings thereon will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

EVERETT HUTCHINSON,
Chairman.

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to grant the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to prescribe per diem charges for the use of railroad freight cars on a basis that will provide an economic incentive to the railroads to acquire and maintain a supply of freight cars adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

The diminishing supply of railroad freight cars has been a matter of considerable concern to the Commission for many years. Despite the generally expanding economy of the country, the ownership of freight cars is now less than it was during World War II. As a result critical shortages of varying duration and severity have occurred in almost every year during periods of peak loadings. Studies made in 1950 indicated that a total of 1,935,500 freight cars would be required by 1956 to meet the anticipated needs of shippers. As of January 1, 1956, however, freight-car ownership and control of class I railroads (including railroad-owned or controlled refrigerator cars) totaled only 1,774,616 cars. As of February 1, 1961, this figure had fallen to 1,725,421 cars.

In addition to inadequate car ownership, one of the greatest contributing factors to recurring freight-car shortages has been the failure of some carriers to utilize the existing fleet of equipment more efficiently. During periods of critical shortages the Commission has resorted to every means at its command to cope with the problem. Greatly stepped up demurrage charges have helped to insure prompt loading and unloading by shippers and receivers. Such action is ineffectual, however, when the equipment is in the hands of the carrier.

Since the earning value of the average freight car greatly exceeds the current per diem charge of $2.88, some of the carriers have found it cheaper to pay the per diem or car rental charge than to own cars. These carriers, therefore, have no economic incentive to provide their fair share of an adequate car supply.

Some time ago the Commission attempted to take the profit out of "renting" equipment by imposing a penalty per diem charge which it believed would furnish a pecuniary spur to deficit railroads to acquire a sufficient number of cars to at least take care of their own loading obligations. However, in *Palmer* v. *United States* (73 F. Supp. 63 (1947)), a three-judge district court held that the use of the word "compensation" in section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, which authorizes the Commission to fix reasonable compensation for the use of cars, precluded it from establishing a per diem charge in excess of any purported reasonable recompense to the owner.

If the advantages of owning equipment could be made more attractive, there should be a greater willingness on the part of every railroad to make its just and equitable contribution to the national freight-car fleet. The draft bill proposes to accomplish this objective by amending section 1(14)(a) of the act so as to authorize the Commission in establishing a per diem charge for the use of freight cars to determine whether such charge should be computed upon the basis of the elements of ownership expense involved, including a fair return on value, or on elements reflecting the value of their use, or upon such other basis or combination of bases as, in the Commission's judgment, will provide reasonable compensation to the owner, contribute to sound car service practices, and encourage the acquisition of an adequate national supply of freight cars.

In essence, the proposal would authorize the Commission to fix per diem charges which would motivate every railroad to maintain its ownership of freight cars at a level which will meet the needs of the shipping public during normal times and provide a reasonable supply during periods of emergency. Its enactment would thus overcome the effect of the decision in the Palmer case and would be of substantial assistance to the Commission in its efforts to alleviate the crippling economic effects of freight car shortages.

UNIFORM 10-YEAR TERMS FOR MEMBERS OF REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide uniform terms of 10 years for members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Maritime Board, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

This bill carries out one of the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, as set forth in the second annual report of the subcommittee. I believe that the statement of the subcommittee in that report constitutes a complete statement of the reasons which motivate this bill. The subcommittee said:

Under present laws we have a crazy quilt of tenure. The arbitrariness of this patchwork is obvious. While no particular term length is more heaven-sent than any other, 10 years seems to be far more defensible to this subcommittee than the present jumble.

Security, at least of a sort, is important to an officeholder, and we firmly believe that the President should be armed with an offer of 10 years when he sets out to find the very best possible appointee for a specific regulatory agency. In the past many Presidents have had to settle for less than the very best.

There is the added circumstance that with the longer term there will come greater expertise and greater usefulness, but we base our recommendation for a 10-year term chiefly on the ground first stated above.

It was the view of the subcommittee that the regulatory agency members should be independent, and that their usefulness would be increased by lengthening the terms of their office. However, we do not believe that they should be completely immune to the changes in public opinion reflected by a change of the President's party. For that reason, the bill authorizes the President, if he is a member of a political party different from that of his predecessor, within 6 months from the date of his inauguration, to remove one commissioner of the opposite party. However, he can remove only the agency member who has most nearly completed the term for which he was appointed. The bill provides that the removal of that member shall not deprive him of any benefits he would receive if he completed that term.

The bill would thus permit the President's appointing power to provide the President with a voice in any agency but would effectively protect any member who might be removed, and would permit the agency to remain independent.

It is the view of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure that improvements in our administrative system will come, not from the spectacular, but from changes which appear to be prosaic. One such improvement is this effort to increase the security, and therefore the independence, of the members of the regulatory agencies.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1842) to provide uniform 10-year terms for members of certain administrative agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARROLL (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is designed to implement the provisions of the Executive order issued last Friday by which the President provided for the establishment of standards of ethical conduct for Government employees.

I have no doubt that all of the Members of the Congress are in basic agreement with the premise upon which this Executive order was based. In his message to the Congress, the President said:

I have firm confidence in the integrity and dedication of those who work for our Government. Venal conduct by public officials in this country has been comparatively rare—and the few instances of official impropriety that have been uncovered have usually not suggested any widespread departure from high standards of ethics and moral conduct.

Nevertheless, in the past two decades, incidents have occurred to remind us that the laws and regulations governing ethics in Government are not adequate to the changed role of the Federal Government, or to the changing conditions of our society. In addition, many of the ethical problems confronting our public servants have become so complex as to defy easy commonsense solutions on the part of men of good will seeking to observe the highest standards of conduct, and solutions have been hindered by lack of general regulatory guidelines.

I welcome the conscientious and effective work demonstrated by the President's Executive order in this most difficult field. The formulation of the necessary specific standards and regulations is, as the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure observed in its second annual report, a task for which the executive department is better prepared than is the Congress. We simply do not have the time in Congress to deal with the myriad variations of the specific problems which arise in the conduct of the executive department.

I have no doubt whatsoever of the legal effectiveness of the Executive order. As the responsible head of the execu-

tive department and in carrying out his constitutional responsibility for the faithful execution of the laws, the President has the unchallengeable right to establish standards of conduct for the members of the executive branch.

The bill which I am introducing today provides effective implementation of the Executive order in two ways. First, by its express ratification of the power of the President to issue that order, it places the authority granted to the Congress by the Constitution squarely behind the President in his effort to lay down standards of conduct. As the Supreme Court noted in the Youngstown case, any power of the President becomes more effective when it is backed by the legislative power.

Nor can we minimize the moral effectiveness of the Executive order which will be added by the express statement of the Congress that we believe that the prescription of ethical standards is a matter meriting the attention of the Congress as well as that of the President.

But the bill is important also because it provides effective sanctions for the enforcement of the ethical code prescribed by the President. Those sanctions are directed against the erring Government employee. But, also, they are directed against those who would, for their own advantage, provide an opportunity for any Government employee to depart from the high standards of conduct which the Congress and the President alike expect the employee to maintain.

The sanction provided against the Government employee who departs from the standards enunciated by the President is suspension or removal from office. Moral dereliction is now, as it has always been, a clear ground for such removal.

But the bill also provides the executive departments with the power to bar from practice before them any one who, while engaged in representing any other person, engages in conduct which violates the code of conduct prescribed by the President. I doubt that any bribe has ever been taken when there was no one to offer it. I doubt that any Government employee has ever been swayed by unfair influence until someone had brought that influence against the employee to serve the private interests of the outsider. Because I do not believe that any Government employee departs from ethical standards unless there is an outsider who encourages, and enables, him to do so, I propose that the penalty apply equally to the Government employee and to the outsider.

In addition to these sanctions, the bill provides a readily available method of applying them. But it also provides reasonable protection for those who might be unjustly accused. Neither the sanction of removal nor the sanction of disbarment may be applied until after a fair hearing, in which all of the tools necessary to arrive at the truth have been provided. Notice and hearing upon the record are required. The subpena power is provided, and is backed by contempt proceedings if anyone disregards the subpena, whether issued on behalf of the Government or on behalf of the person accused.

This bill will provide effective sanctions for the enforcement of the President's code. I believe that it will be rarely used, because I believe that the overwhelming majority of Government employees and of those with whom they deal intend to act fairly, and do act fairly. But for those few who are venal, it provides a stern and effective punishment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1843) to authorize the President to establish and enforce ethical standards for the conduct of the business of the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARROLL (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

BACK-DOOR INFLUENCE IN AGENCY PROCEEDINGS

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to establish standards of conduct in agency proceedings of record.

The purpose of this bill is to increase the fairness of agency proceedings by insuring that all parties to such proceedings are fully and fairly informed of all relevant matters which come to the attention of those who are charged with the making of the decisions.

Testimony in hearings before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, as well as that before other committees and assertions which have been authenticated in court proceedings, have demonstrated beyond reasonable dispute that there is need for legislation to protect the public and the agencies from attempts privately to influence proceedings which are supposed to be decided upon a public record.

There can be no question that there have been enough instances of private communications between one of the parties and deciding officers to cause the public to lose respect for and confidence in the departments and agencies and their decisions. Donald C. Beelar, testifying on behalf of the American Bar Association, told the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure:

> Let me emphasize our problem this way in dealing with clients and the client's own problems. He needs something more than just expectation that there are not going to be any misdeeds in his particular matter.
>
> He needs to have assurance at the outset that his proceeding is going to be tried fairly, impartially and on the record and this is very difficult to give him today.

Why the giving of such assurance is difficult is obvious in the light of a variety of incidents which have been recently revealed. I shall not spell out these incidents. Regretfully, they are all too familiar to us and to the public, and such incidents are merely symptomatic of a general problem. Back-door influence has been all too common in the affairs of the departments and agencies. This is so, notwithstanding the unchallengeable fact that most Government employees are and always have been honest and conscientious.

Private conversations between regulators and regulatees are a matter of gravest concern. No one can deny that such meetings, during the pendency of cases involving millions of dollars, offer opportunities for illegal and immoral conduct. Even those who argue that nothing improper occurs in any of these many conversations must concede, as Mr. Justice Holmes remarked in *Hazelton* v. *Sheckells* (202 U.S. 71, 79), that it is the tendency to corruption and not what may be done in a particular case which justifies the concern of the Congress.

The fundamental reason for a rule prohibiting ex parte communications lies in our concept of fairness between man and man, and more especially between man and his government, a concept which is the essence of due process. Fairness demands that administrative hearings be conducted in the open and that the decision be an honest conclusion based on a record about which all opposing parties know. Private communications from one party to the deciding officer cannot be reconciled with the need for a fair decision after an open hearing.

Yet there is no clear statutory expression against such private communication. Indeed, such activities, while admittedly improper in judicial proceedings, have been defended as legal and therefore proper in at least some types of administrative contests.

The bill which I introduce today is a revision of a proposal drafted by the American Bar Association which I introduced, at the request of that organization, as S. 2374 in the 86th Congress. The principle has found general support. However, the original draft was said to create difficult problems in the balancing of the various aspects of the public interest. Many of these objections were raised by agency heads who supported the aim and general structure of the bill in hearings before the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure.

A statute which attempted to forbid all communication between the agency officers and the public would undoubtedly injure the public interest. A free flow of information is a prerequisite for effective solutions of the complex problems with which regulatory agencies deal. Nor should agency personnel be isolated from the complaints of citizens or representations on their behalf by their elected spokesmen.

The revised text is based upon the philosophy that communications should be limited only in that area in which a decision after notice and opportunity for hearing is required by the Constitution, or a statute, or in situations in which the agency has represented that the decision will be based on the record. This bill does not prohibit anyone from saying or writing anything to anybody. Its remedy for the evils of private communication is the requirement that full information be made available to all concerned of everything which might

affect the final outcome of the proceedings. Its postulate is that if the opposing parties are fully informed, they can protect their own interests as they may be advised. For that reason, no communication is prohibited, but every communication must be made public. The principal remedy for concealed communications is the requirement that the party who makes them must run the risk of losing whatever he has gained.

Section 2 of the bill contains a series of definitions which eliminate uncertainties.

An "agency proceeding" is defined as one in which notice and opportunity for hearing are required by the Constitution, any statute, or by agency regulation. When the Constitution or the Congress requires a hearing, it must be a fair hearing. *Wong Yang Sung* v. *McGrath* (339 U.S. 33). A fair hearing is impossible unless all parties know all the information upon which the decision is based. The requirement is extended to hearings required by agency regulation or rule on the ground that such a regulation is an implicit representation to the public that the hearing will be fairly conducted.

While it is true that this line of demarcation may present some questions of applicability in connection with specific procedures, there is no real lack of specificity. Section 6(a) of the revised text requires the department or agency expressly to state in its first public notice whether the proceeding is to be governed by the statute. That an agency might conceivably refuse to exercise a fair judgment in the making of the required statement is possible, but not probable. The omission of the statement, if obviously required, would be a tacit invitation by the agency of private communications, an act which could result only in lowered agency prestige. Statutes must be predicated on the assumption that the vast majority of Government officials will honestly follow guideposts established by Congress. Moreover, the failure to include the required statement will make the situation perfectly clear to all of the parties. Each can thereafter act in accordance with his own best judgment. This was emphasized by Gardner Symonds, president of Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., who told the House Oversight Committee:

> As to what can be done about it [the generally accepted practice of private communications], I think you have got to put the adversary, the staff, and the company in exactly the same position. Whether that is a completely insulated position or a completely open position, I will accept and try my best to work with either one. Personally, I would prefer the same rules for everybody, and those rules to be rigid, to require the staff, both in certificate, initial license, that is, and rate cases to put their evidence on the record, to make their recommendations, to be governed by them. I would prefer tight rules but I think the same rules ought to apply to both of them.

"Deciding officer" is defined as anyone who participates in the hearing process by presiding over a hearing or by participating in a preliminary or final determination. This definition should be read in connection with section 6(b) which requires that the agency maintain a current list of its employees who are within the definition in specific agency proceedings.

Section 2(c) defines "private communication" to include any communication about a pending agency proceeding as defined in section 2(a), if it is made without notice to other parties, and if it is made while the matter is pending in the agency after the agency's publication that the proceeding is one governed by the act. It is this definition which most clearly expresses the philosophy of the bill. Anyone can say anything openly, but no one can say anything secretly.

The final paragraph of section 2 has been inserted to meet the fears of the agencies that restrictions on private communications may prevent adequate and efficient use of the skill and information of their staffs. Obviously, the agency heads need the technical and research assistance which can be supplied by the staff. But parties in positions adverse to the agencies have bitterly resented the supposed easy access of staff members to deciding officers. The bill meets this problem by allowing free consultation among all those listed by the agency as "deciding officers" in a particular matter. This list may be as great or as small as the agency believes necessary for its effective operation. But once that group has been designated by the agency, the line of isolation is fixed, and private communications to anyone who will in any manner participate in the decisional process in that case come within the restrictions imposed by the act. This paragraph also contains an express statement that the act does not authorize any communication which would otherwise be prohibited.

The bill distinguishes private communications made by persons not directly involved in the proceeding and those made by the parties or their paid agents.

Communications made by outsiders are not forbidden, but must be disclosed. This provision rests upon the recognition that persons acting in what they conceive to be the public interest have a right to make their views known to the agencies. Elected officials—mayors, Governors, Members of Congress and the State legislatures—have a duty to speak out in behalf of their constituents. However, no one has a right to say privately what he will not say publicly. And those whose interests may be adversely affected have a clear right to know what has been said. It is fair to assume that they will exercise their own judgment in protecting themselves from any adverse effects. When this section is read in conjunction with section 5, the bill is explicit that the agency must provide an effective opportunity for such rebuttal.

Section 3(b) is an express declaration that parties must make their representations in the open or not at all. Parties and the representatives whom they pay are expressly forbidden to say anything to any deciding officer except after notice to all other parties.

Section 4 establishes a mechanical procedure for making sure that the required disclosures are made. A written communication is itself to be placed in a file to which the public has access. The original draft prepared by the American Bar Association required the giving of notice to adverse parties of the existence of such a communication. The agencies were uniform in their complaint that this might make an intolerable load on them. However well or ill founded this fear may be, it seems clear that parties can be expected to defend their own interest by keeping abreast of the matters included in the public file. The original draft placed the burden of publication on the deciding officer. The revised text places that burden on the agency.

The provisions for the disclosure of oral communications are detailed. The deciding officer must summarize the contents of any oral communication or attempted oral communication, and state the circumstances surrounding the event. He must make this summary within 3 days and it must be placed in the public file forthwith. In order to avoid the criticism of the original draft that the act might be construed to require a correct disclosure at the officer's peril, the bill makes it explicit that the summary is to represent the officer's best information, recollection, and belief. Thus, a good faith attempt to make the required disclosure will protect the deciding officer.

The ABA text was criticized because, it was said, the summary might constitute a charge of a criminal offense which would become a matter of public record, against which the accused was afforded no opportunity to protect himself. The revised text gives any such person a fair opportunity to reply, if he chooses to do so.

Section 5 again emphasizes that the purpose of the disclosure is to enable adverse parties to protect themselves against unfair communication. Any relevant material they wish can be put into the record, even if the proceeding must be reopened to permit this.

Section 6 contains specific mechanisms for providing knowledge as to proceedings affected by the act. The agency is required to state, in its first public notice of the proceeding, whether the act is applicable. It must designate a special officer to maintain the required public files. This same officer must maintain a current list of pending proceedings subject to the requirements of the act, and a current list naming the specific persons in any proceeding who may not receive private communications about it.

The revised text provides vigorous sanctions to insure compliance. These sanctions are directed against deciding officers, parties, and their representatives.

Sanctions are imposed against deciding officers only for failure to disclose communications.

A failure to disclose, whether negligently or intentionally, requires the disqualification of the deciding officer in the particular proceeding. Inasmuch as his judgment may have been affected by

the communication which he did not disclose, fairness and a respect for appearances requires that some other officer continue with the case. Admittedly, this requirement that the proceeding be retraced sufficiently to enable a new officer to decide the case will be burdensome. But either the party or the agency can avoid this by the simple expedient of disclosure. A second sanction is the provision for the removal from office, or such lesser penalty as the appointing authority may determine, for an intentional failure to make disclosure. As a final sanction, the bill provides that a willful and intentional failure to disclose a private communication is a criminal offense. The revised text extends this criminal penalty to any one who attempts to persuade an officer not to make the required disclosure.

The principal sanction against a party who violates the act by attempting to use unfair methods is the requirement that he lose any fruits he might have gained. The revised text explicitly states that the decision, insofar as it is favorable to the offending party, must be set aside, and the matter reconsidered. The imposition of this penalty is required at the instance of any adverse party, including the agency.

The paid representative of a party who makes a private communication may, at the agency's discretion, be suspended or disbarred from practice before the agency. Moreover, if the attempt to communicate is an intentional effort to affect the decision of the proceeding on the merits, the offender is subject to a criminal penalty.

None of these sanctions has any applicability, under section 2(c), if the communication is preceded by notice to other parties. This delimits the act's aim to clearly unfair communications, and fully justifies the imposition of the severest sanctions if the party chooses to attempt to convey privately what he could, without any difficulty, convey upon full notice. Thus, any person who might be subject to the imposition of the sanctions possesses a simple and nonburdensome means of avoiding them.

Mr. President, the back door to agencies must be closed. The bill I am introducing does that fairly and effectively. It interferes with no one's right to make his views known to an agency.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1844) to establish standards of conduct for agency proceedings of record, introduced by Mr. CARROLL (for himself and Mr. HART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MOORLAND COURT, INC.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, and JACKSON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill and a resolution for the relief of Moorland Court, Inc.

The bill would authorize the Federal Government to compensate Moorland Court, Inc., for losses sustained in connection with the partial construction of a rental housing unit at Fairbanks, Alaska. The construction began in 1953, but was halted because of the failure of the Federal Housing Administration to supply an insured mortgage. The corporation had proceeded on its understanding that the mortgage would be issued.

The accompanying resolution would authorize the referral of the relief bill to the Court of Claims for consideration of the equities in favor of the claimant.

I have read the extensive file of technical facts relative to this case, and I am convinced that there are strong equities in favor of the corporation. It is my hope, therefore, that the committee to which the bill is referred will act promptly in authorizing the submission of the case to the Court of Claims where the matter may be aired thoroughly on the merits.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief résumé of the facts supplied by the claimant, be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill and resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the résumé will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1845) for the relief of Moorland Court, Inc., introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The resolution (S. Res. 144) submitted by Mr. MORSE, for himself and other Senators, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1845) entitled "A bill for the relief of Moorland Court, Inc.," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

The résumé presented by Mr. MORSE is as follows:

STATEMENT OF FACTS IN THE MATTER OF MOORLAND COURT, INC.

SUMMARY

This statement is submitted on behalf of Moorland Court, Inc., an Alaskan corporation, Moorland contractors, comprised of Rushlight Automatic Sprinkler Co., an Oregon corporation, A. G. Rushlight Co., an Oregon corporation, and Tice Electric Co., an Oregon copartnership, Earl W. Morrison and Donald N. McDonald, Seattle architects, and G. R. Sumpter of Seattle, president of Washington Mortgage & Insurance Co., Inc., a Washington corporation. This statement summarizes the essential facts in the Moorland Court-FHA matter. A detailed and documented statement is attached to the summary.

On June 3, 1953, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) issued a 90-day commitment to insure a $2,556,300 39-year loan to finance construction of a $3 million multiple housing project in Fairbanks, Alaska. The housing project known as Moorland Court was to be constructed by Moorland Court, Inc., an Alaskan corporation, to meet an immediate and urgent housing shortage in the Fairbanks area. As no private money was available for such construction in Alaska, Federal National Mortgage Association authorized a loan of $2,556,300 conditioned, among other things, upon FHA's commitment to insure. FHA's commitment to insure required the mortgagor, as a precondition to insurance, to obtain a final binding loan agreement with FNMA.

Because of numerous financing, title and construction design problems connected with such projects, closing of the financing transaction ordinarily takes longer than the original FHA commitment period of 90 days. "Closing" means endorsement of the note by FHA as insured and FNMA's acceptance of the credit instruments and final approval of the loan. Provision is made in the FHA regulations for the Administrator in his discretion to extend the commitment for successive periods of 30 days until closing is finally accomplished. In this instance, FHA continued to extend the commitment until October 1954.

After the original commitment issued in June 1953, FHA and Moorland Court's sponsors realized that if construction did not commence before closing, the 1953 fall construction season would be lost. Permafrost subsoil conditions in Alaska would then prevent excavation and foundation work until July 1954. Both FHA and Moorland Court wanted the foundation work substantially completed before winter, 1953, as this would permit completion of the project in 1954 rather than 1955. Commencement of construction prior to closing, however, is unusual and requires special permission from FHA and FNMA. Moorland Court, Inc., would not and did not start any construction until it had received written authorization to do so.

On August 31, 1953, FHA, with FNMA's concurrence, gave Moorland Court, Inc., permission by letter dated August 24, 1953, to start construction prior to closing, chiefly because the Commissioner found an immediate and urgent need for housing in the Fairbanks area.

The letter referred to a "letter agreement" which prescribed certain conditions such as approval of plans and specifications, determination of prevailing wages and provisions for adequate inspection of construction, all of which were met by Moorland Court, Inc., and stated that until the insured mortgage was recorded, all construction was to be at the risk of Moorland Court, Inc. The mortgage was recorded on April 21, 1954.

Implicit in FHA's authorization to commence construction was the understanding that FHA would continue the commitment in effect for a resonable period of time to permit closing.

Construction commenced September 1, 1953. When weather forced construction to cease in mid-November 1953, most of the site preparation, excavation, foundation work, and flooring was completed with liabilities of approximately $350,000 incurred therefor. All construction was inspected by FHA and was in accordance with approved plans and specifications. The general contractor at the project was Moorland Contractors, a joint venture formed to construct this project and consisting of Rushlight Automatic Sprinkler Co., an Oregon corporation; A. G. Rushlight Co., an Oregon corporation; and Tice Electric Co., an Oregon copartnership.

Meanwhile, efforts to close the financing transaction with FHA and FNMA were proceeding successfully. But then, after construction commenced and because of a claim by an officer of Moorland Court, Inc., who held one qualifying share of stock, FHA and FNMA questioned the validity of the corporate note and mortgage prepared for FHA to insure and to evidence and secure FNMA's loan. Continuous efforts to resolve this matter were made during the winter and by April 1954, the corporation was able to satisfy FHA that the note and mortgage

were valid. Closing could then have taken place if FNMA had concurred in the judgment of FHA, its sister agency. This FNMA did not choose to do. It refused to execute a loan agreement with Moorland Court, Inc., without additional assurances, and consequently FHA refused to endorse the credit instrument for insurance. FNMA persisted in its refusal to concur in FHA's judgment even though FHA was willing to insure the loan and title companies were willing to insure against any defects in the note and mortgage arising from the intracorporate controversy.

From April 1954, to November 1954, Moorland Court, Inc.'s representatives negotiated with FNMA and with the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, who had jurisdiction over both FHA and FNMA, in an effort to assure FNMA. Meanwhile, the 1954 construction season was lost for lack of financing and immense sums of money were owing by Moorland Court, Inc., to material men and laborers, some of whom had filed liens against the project. Finally, in November 1954, FNMA was satisfied and was prepared to close.

Meanwhile, Congress enacted the Housing Act of 1954 effective August 2, 1954. This act deprived FNMA of power to make direct loans on Alaskan property except if insured under commitments of FHA issued prior to August 2, 1954. It also required new FHA regulations establishing additional requirements for FHA insurance.

Then, on November 16, 1954, FHA notified Moorland Court, Inc., and FNMA that the original commitment of June 3, 1953, would not be extended again and that the mortgagor must apply for a new commitment. Moorland Court, Inc., immediately advised FHA that a new commitment would be worthless, as FNMA could not lend under a commitment issued after August 2, 1954, and asked FHA to extend or reissue the June 3, 1953, commitment which would support such a loan. The FNMA loan was a necessity as no other public or private money was available to finance the project. The investment in construction would be a total loss without financing to complete the project. After negotiations lasting until the early part of February 1955, FHA refused with finality to extend or reissue the original commitment of June 3, 1953, though FNMA was prepared to close and the mortgagor had met all the additional requirements of the Housing Act of 1954. FNMA thereupon, on April 11, 1955, canceled its authorization to lend, which was conditional upon FHA's commitment of June 3, 1953.

If FHA had not refused to extend or reissue the original commitment, closing would have taken place not later than March 1955, and the project would have been completed by the end of 1955, approximately at the time the parties originally contemplated. The time lost in 1954 had been offset by commencement of construction in the fall of 1953. Thus, FHA terminated the commitment before what, under the circumstances, was a reasonable period of time. The reason for FHA's decision not to extend or reissue the commitment of June 3, 1953, which in effect was a decision not to insure any loan obtained by Moorland Court, was given on March 25, 1955, by Henry M. Day, Assistant Commissioner for Operations, FHA, in a letter to FNMA:

"The matter of commitment extension in the subject property was discussed at length with people representing the corporation, and in view of current lack of market demand and lack of any evidence that a future market demand would arise, it was determined not to extend the commitment."

FHA has decided that the immediate and urgent need for housing which it found in the summer of 1953 was no longer present. FHA's decision was made with knowledge that it would mean abandonment of the project for lack of financing and a total loss of all the work done. FHA decided that it "would prefer abandonment of the project" because "in our judgment if it were carried through to consummation, all parties and interests would suffer even greater loss than now experienced." (Memorandum of J. A. Woods, Acting Regional Director, FHA, Washington, D.C., to Virgil P. Reimer, Alaskan Director, FHA, January 21, 1955). FHA's judgment was not shared by Moorland Court, Inc.

After Moorland Court was advised by housing officials that FHA had no authority to settle the claims arising out of the cancellation of the commitment, suit was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon by Moorland Court, Inc., against the FHA Administrator in June 1955. Moorland Court, Inc., as plaintiff, claimed that under the circumstances of the case the Administrator, by authorizing construction prior to closing in August 1953, impliedly promised to continue the commitment of June 3, 1953, in effect for a reasonable time to permit closing, and that he had failed to do so. All efforts to settle the case failed, though Moorland Court permitted the FBI to make a thorough audit of its books to substantiate the amount of its expenditures and liabilities and agreed to accept those figures and indeed compromise their claim for substantially less. Illness of the trial judge compelled transfer of the suit after trial to a different judge, thereby creating further delay, but in February 1959, a decision was finally reached. The district court held that it was within FHA's discretion to refuse to extend the commitment further in November 1954, and to refuse in effect to insure any loan Moorland Court, Inc., might acquire. The court dismissed the suit and no appeal was taken because of time and cost factors.

The total effect of this transaction has been disastrous for Moorland Court, Inc., and its stockholders, associates, architects, and others. In the partial construction of the housing project Moorland Court, Inc., has expended and incurred the following liabilities:

Amount expended by Moorland contractors for materials, supplies, and freight	$284,676.94
Liabilities incurred for materials, supplies, and freight:	
Fairbanks Block Co	1,728.50
Fairbanks Roofing Co	2,741.25
Solid Construction Co	18,979.05
Federal Pipe & Tank Co	1,708.01
L. B. McKinney Co	3,917.84
Mac's Dozer & Crane Service	870.00
Ready Lumber & Plywood Co	653.98
Total	30,599.23
Insurance:	
G. R. Sumpter Agency	2,237.74
Washington Insurance Co	506.97
Title Insurance	2,301.40
Total	5,046.11
Mortgage service fees: Washington Mortgage & Insurance Co	12,780.00
Architect's fees: Earl W. Morrison and Donald N. McDonald, Seattle, Wash	25,563.00
FHA fees:	
Application fee	4,009.50
Commitment fee	3,659.40
Inspection fee	12,781.50
Total	20,450.40
Miscellaneous:	
Rent to city of Fairbanks	9,000.00
Personal taxes assessed by city of Fairbanks, July 1, 1956	2,100.00
Travel expenses	2,341.08
Total	13,441.08
Grand total	392,556.76

No dispute existing between Moorland Court and the Federal Housing Administration regarding these expenditures and liabilities, particularly as Moorland Court permitted the FBI to audit its books to substantiate its losses, and at the trial in the district court said expenditures and liabilities were established by a stipulation of the parties without the necessity of Moorland Court offering any proof thereof.

The sum of $392,556.76 will not reimburse Moorland Court, Inc., or its associates for the following additional items:

1. Administration or general overhead expenses borne by Moorland Contractors conservatively equal to 10 percent of the sums expended or incurred for labor and materials used in the project.

2. Attorney's fees incurred in connection with the project prior to the suit against FHA, attorney's fees incurred during and by reason of the suit against FHA, and attorney's fees incurred subsequent to termination of the suit.

3. The interest factor for loss of use since 1953 of the sums invested in the project.

Of this vast expenditure the plaintiff has recovered only the sum of $12,000, representing the unearned portion of the inspection fee paid by plaintiff on August 31, 1953.

Thus, Moorland Court, Inc., in good faith and only after authorization to commence construction was given, invested a very large sum in 1953 in construction of a housing project in which agencies of the Federal Government were then vitally interested. Because of a reanalysis of the Fairbanks housing market in late 1954 the FHA lost interest and decided to withdraw from the transaction and place the entire burden of loss upon the private parties who made the investment. The totality of this loss was confirmed by the Housing Act of 1954, which barred FNMA, the only available financier, from making Alaskan loans on FHA commitments issued after August 2, 1954, and by the Federal district court which denied judicial relief.

A detailed statement of facts in this matter with extensive documentation attached, is available for further assistance should you desire a fuller explanation. This summary is meant to provide you with a concise, though accurate, review of this matter.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant representation in the Congress to the people of the District of Columbia; and I ask that the joint resolution be held at the desk, for additional sponsors, through next Tuesday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 85) proposing an amendment to the Consti-

tution of the United States to grant representation in the Congress to the people of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President I have always felt that the District of Columbia should be the model of perfection in municipal government, and showplace for our Nation for all who visit the Nation's Capital to see. Foreign visitors to the United States almost invariably come to Washington. American citizens from all over the United States come here with their children, to see the Nation's Capital. They should see the very best in municipal government at work.

But Congress has treated the District with slight consideration. We have treated it like a stepchild, in comparison to the way we have treated other States.

Yet, Mr. President, the District has a population of approximately 764,000, which exceeds the population of 11 States which now are represented by two U.S. Senators each, and have proportionate representation in the House.

Those States are South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Hawaii, North Dakota, New Hampshire, Delaware, Vermont, Wyoming, Nevada, and Alaska.

Some of these States actually vote less than 100,000 ballots in statewide elections. Yet they have two Senators and proportionate representation in the House, while the District is denied a voice in the Congress.

As a result of ratification of the 23d amendment, the people of the District are now entitled to vote for President and Vice President.

This is not enough. They should also be entitled to representation in the Congress. Indeed, representation in the Congress would be much more valuable to the citizens of the District of Columbia than the simple privilege of voting for President and Vice President of the United States. I believe the effectiveness of representation in the Congress, in the interest of the citizens of the District of Columbia, would be much greater.

Various proposals for home rule in the District have been made. I have opposed these proposals, and I still do. Because of the large ownership of property in the District by the Federal Government, and because of the great impact which activities of the Federal Government have upon the District's affairs, I believe that representation in Congress would provide a better method of insuring fair treatment of the District's residents, and at the same time would protect the interests of the U.S. Government. Two U.S. Senators and Representatives in the House could act as effective spokesmen for the people of the District, and could make certain that the interests of the District were adequately considered by the Congress.

DESIGNATION OF THE GOLDEN CORN TASSEL AS THE NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to designate the golden corn tassel as our national floral emblem. I am pleased to be joined by Senator CASE of South Dakota, Senator HICKENLOOPER, Senator LONG of Missouri, Senators MCCARTHY, and HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. I will welcome others who may wish to join us in our endeavor. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may lie on the table until May 15 for additional cosponsors.

Mr. President, our country, often called the young Republic, but which is now probably the oldest constitutional democracy continuously under the same form of government in the world, nevertheless lags behind other and younger countries today in that it does not yet have a national flower, or floral emblem.

England has the rose—important in her history and native to her soil—and the rose is also the national flower of Iran. Canada has the maple leaf. France has the fleur-de-lis or blue iris. Scotland has the thistle, and so on down the line. It is high time that we, too, adopted a floral emblem appropriate to our own country.

Emblems are symbols, and they should have meaning. We are all proud of the American bald eagle, our national bird. We should choose a floral emblem with equal care, and it should symbolize valued qualities of our country.

Maize, or Indian corn, grows in every State of our Union. It was developed from its wild predecessors on this continent and cultivated by the Indians at least 7,000 years ago. It grows in nearly every extreme of climate and soil. It was the Indian corn the natives gave to the Pilgrims which saved their lives and carried them through the first bitter winters at Plymouth. Similarly it saved the lives of the Jamestown settlers. It came into wide cultivation rapidly and became the staff of life of the frontier.

To the present day, corn has maintained its importance to our agriculture, and is today our most valuable single crop. Industry as well uses many of its byproducts.

Corn symbolizes American abundance. It connotes the gratitude we have for its indispensable presence in the days of our ancestors' need, our present magnificent productive capacity, and the past, present, and future bounty our citizens have furnished to hungry peoples all over the world. It is a fitting symbol of our country in the plant world.

The corn tassel itself is a cluster of tiny flowrets, shaped in a beautiful plume standing at the top of a tall stalk. We may refer to it as a floral emblem, but it is much more a flower than the thistle, the maple leaf, or even than the leek or wild onion—the emblem of Wales.

I believe that the importance of corn both in our past history and in our society today clearly call upon us to recognize this useful plant by making its golden corn tassel our national floral emblem. I am proud to introduce the golden corn tassel resolution for this purpose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 87) designating the corn tassel the national floral emblem of the United States, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1961

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I submit a resolution indicating that the Senate does not favor Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1961, transmitted to Congress by the President April 27, 1961. This is the reorganization plan which would affect the Federal Communications Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 142) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1961 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 27, 1961.

RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I submit a resolution expressing the opinion of the Senate that it does not favor Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President May 3, 1961. The plan deals with the Civil Aeronautics Board, and would transfer most of the powers of the Commission to the Chairman thereof, which I think is unwise.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 143) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1961 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 3, 1961.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. KEATING) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at the next printing of Senate bill 1021, the

Federal aid to education bill, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNDERGROUND WATER ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1559) to provide for the production of underground water on the public lands, the name of the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] may be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EMERGENCY LIVESTOCK LOANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, on the 24th of April I introduced in the Senate a bill known as S. 1710, to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency livestock loans under such Act until July 14, 1963, and for other purposes. Since that time I have had requests from two of my distinguished colleagues to appear as cosponsors of the bill. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that on future printings of the bill the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] appear as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESERVATION OF THE INDIANA DUNES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be listed as an additional cosponsor of S. 1797, the bill to provide for the preservation of the Indiana Dunes and related areas in the State of Indiana, and that at the next printing of the bill his name be added.

The junior Senator from Utah has been a leader in the effort to save the dunes for the people, and I regret that through a clerical error his name was excluded from the list of original sponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INFORMATION AND INTELLIGENCE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] may be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 77) to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and other Senators) on April 27, 1961.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES WITH THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND COMMUNISTIC CHINA—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] be added as a cosponsor on the next printing of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) relative to relationship of the United States with the Republic of China and communistic China.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ellis Maylett, of Utah, to be U.S. marshal, for the district of Utah, vice Howard Call; and

William M. Parker, Jr., of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal, for the middle district of Alabama, for a term of 4 years, vice Charles S. Prescott.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, May 18, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE CONCERNING HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE SYSTEM OF FEDERAL ELECTIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on May 23 the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments will begin a series of hearings on Senate joint resolutions referred to it which propose amendments to the Constitution concerning our system of Federal elections.

The matters under consideration are Senate Joint Resolutions 1, 2, 4, 9, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 23, 26, 28, 48, 54, 58, 67, and 71. These involve the method of nomination and election of the President and Vice President, including electoral college reform, and qualifications for voting in Federal elections.

During the mornings of May 23, 24, and 25, the subcommittee will hear Senators who are sponsors or cosponsors of the resolutions under consideration. The subcommittee will meet in room 457 of the Old Senate Office Building at 9:30 a.m. on each of these days.

Further hearings will be held on June 20, 21, and 22, when other Senators and witnesses will be invited to appear or submit statements concerning these proposals. Former Presidents, distinguished political scientists, representatives of the executive branch and interested organizations will be invited to give the subcommittee the benefit of their views at that time.

CHANGE IN NOTICE OF HEARINGS RELATING TO CREATION OF A SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL FUELS STUDY

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a correction in an announcement previously made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] concerning hearings by the Interior Committee on Senate Resolution 105, to create a Special Committee on National Fuels Study.

The hearings have now been scheduled for June 20 and 21, at 10 a.m., in room 3110, New Senate Office Building, the Interior Committee hearing room. Dates previously announced were June 22 and 23.

ELIMINATION OF OATH REQUIREMENTS RELATIVE TO CERTAIN EXPORT MANIFESTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 175, Senate bill 1289.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1289) to amend section 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirements with respect to certain export manifests, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment on page 2, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That section 337 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (15 U.S.C. 174) is amended by striking out "oath" in the third sentence of the paragraph numbered "Fifth" and inserting "certification."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (46 U.S.C. 92) is amended—

(1) by striking out "oath" in the first two sentences and inserting in lieu thereof "certification";

(2) by striking out "upon oath" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "by certification"; and

(3) by striking out that portion of the fourth sentence preceding the proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "The certifications shall be in writing".

SEC. 2. That section 337 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (15 U.S.C. 174) is amended by striking out "oath" in the third sentence of the paragraph numbered "Fifth" and inserting "certification".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report which gives the background of this measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 202) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 1289, as reported, would amend sections 337 and 4200 of the Revised Statutes (15 U.S.C. 174 and 46 U.S.C. 92) by eliminating the requirement for an oath on cargo manifests filed by shippers, and substituting therefor a requirement for certification by the shipper. It would do this by deleting the word "oath" and substituting the word "certification" in the third sentence of the paragraph numbered "Fifth" in section 337; by making the same substitution in the first two sentences of section 4200; by striking out "upon oath" in the third sentence of section 4200 and inserting in its place "by certification", and by striking out the clause: "The oaths shall be taken and subscribed in writing" in the fourth sentence of section 4200 and inserting "The certifications shall be in writing."

Testimony at the hearing on the bill was to the effect that the oath requirement occasioned an entirely unnecessary workload on both shippers and customs personnel, since the interests of Government in the truthfulness of these export declarations is amply protected otherwise. Section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code provides that false or fraudulent statements concerning any matter within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States are punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. In this connection, your committee expresses the view that a notation calling attention to the fine/imprisonment penalties for false declarations be included in the forms on which certification is to be required.

Also it was brought out at the hearing that there is no longer a requirement for oath or seal on income tax returns, and that there is no oath requirement on export licenses, or on export documents for plane, truck, or rail shipments. Illustrative of the extra paperwork and personnel time required under present statutes were the figures cited by witnesses as to the numbers of export manifests filed: 100,000 yearly in the Philadelphia district, 24,000 monthly in the San Francisco customs district, Los Angeles, 13,000 per month. A letter in support of the bill from the Quaker Oats Co., Chicago, sums up the situation succinctly in one paragraph:

"In a year of normal business the Quaker Oats Co. exports in excess of 10,000 shipments. As it takes an average of 3 minutes per shipment to notarize this oath we spend about 500 hours per year in this activity which serves no purpose and benefits no one. This absolute waste must cost the U.S. Government, shippers, and steamship companies many millions of dollars annually."

The Department of Commerce reported that it would prefer the enactment of H.R. 2032, which would include repeal of the statutes requiring an oath on export declarations, in addition to providing a modernized and a more efficient and economical method of collecting and compiling foreign trade statistics. Your committee is of the opinion that S. 1289 should be approved and sent to the House for such action as that body sees fit to take.

Speaking for an important segment of the maritime industry, the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., submitted a letter favoring enactment of S. 1289. Stating that: "A considerable amount of time is spent by the employees of exporters who must wait their turn for notarizations at customhouses throughout the country," Alvin Shapiro, institute vice president, estimated that the saving of 2 minutes for each declaration (of more than 3 million filed each year), would amount to about 100,000 man-hours per year.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "To amend sections 337 and 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifests."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend sections 337 and 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifests."

WAIVER OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS OF THE NEW MEXICO ENABLING ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 178, Senate bill 104.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 104) to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 3, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 2. (a) Consent is hereby given to the State of New Mexico and the qualified electors thereof to adopt an amendment to the constitution of the State for the purpose of—

(1) validating sales by the State of New Mexico on or before September 4, 1956, of lands to which paragraph (1) of the first section of this Act applies and patents issued by the State with respect thereto; and

(2) authorizing sales by the State of New Mexico after September 4, 1956, of lands to which paragraphs (2) and (3) of the first section of this Act apply and the issuance by the State of patents with respect thereto.

(b) In the event an amendment to the constitution of the State of New Mexico as described in subsection (a) is adopted, consent is also granted to the State to enact such laws and to establish such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out such constitutional amendment.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

Consent is hereby given to the State of New Mexico to adopt any amendment to the constitution of the State or to enact any laws necessary to carry out the purposes hereof.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That those provisions of section 10 of the Act entitled "An Act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States", approved June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 563), which provides that, in the case of the sale by the State of New Mexico of lands granted or confirmed to the State by such Act, legal title shall not be deemed to have passed until the consideration shall have been paid and any sale not made in substantial conformity with the provisions of such Act shall be null and void, are hereby waived with respect to the following sales by the State of New Mexico of lands which constituted, or constitute, a portion of a tract of land for the sale of which a contract had been previously entered into, but only insofar as such sales would (but for the enactment of this Act) violate the terms and conditions contained in section 10 of such Act because of the fact that the full consideration for the entire tract was not, or is not, paid prior to the time of the sale of such portion and the issuance of the patent therefor:

(1) Any sale of any portion, if the patent with respect thereto was issued on or before September 4, 1956;

(2) Any sale of any such portion, if the patent with respect thereto is issued after September 4, 1956, and if the right to purchase such portion is derived from an assignment, made on or before September 4, 1956, under the contract to purchase the entire tract; and

(3) Any sale of any such portion, if the patent with respect thereto is issued after September 4, 1956, and if the right to purchase such portion is derived from the contract to purchase the entire tract or from a contract entered into in substitution of such contract, and if the right or rights to purchase all other portions of such tract were, on or before September 4, 1956, assigned or relinquished by the person who entered into such contract.

Consent is hereby given to the State of New Mexico to adopt any amendment to the constitution of the State or to enact any laws necessary to carry out the purposes hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report which gives the background of this measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 205) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED FOR S. 104

This bill would waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State of New Mexico by the United States, and consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico.

Section 10 of the New Mexico Enabling Act specifically provides that "no sale or other disposal (of lands) shall be made unless accompanied by ample security, and the legal title shall not pass until the consideration shall have been paid."

Article 13, sections 1 and 2, of the State constitution provides that lands granted by the Congress to the State are declared public lands of the State to be held and disposed of by the commissioner of public lands as provided by law.

The law under which State lands are sold is found in section 7–8–9 of the 1953 Compilation of the New Mexico Statutes. It provides that State land shall be sold for cash or upon payment of one-twentieth of the purchase price and the balance in 30 years from date. The balance is to bear interest at 4 percent per annum. Section 7–8–10 of the New Mexico law provides that on any anniversary date the full amount may be paid or one-thirtieth of the balance may be paid.

Section 7–8–21 provides that assignments of contracts not in default may be made provided a certified copy of the assignment of a contract is filed with the commissioner of public lands.

The New Mexico attorney general rendered opinions on March 28, 1924, December 12, 1931, August 27, 1932, and December 22, 1932, which in effect held that the commissioner of public lands may permit one who purchases land under contract pursuant to section 7-8-9, New Mexico Statutes Annotated, 1953, before paying the total price bid in full, to break the land into smaller tracts by assignment, allow payment in full on any one or more of these tracts, and issue a patent therefor.

The land commissioners, relying upon these opinions, permitted contracts to be split and accepted payment for portions of original contracts and issued patents to individuals for the acreages segregated and paid for in full.

A great many ranchers applied for and purchased land and entered into 30-year State contracts. Subsequent to these purchases, some ranchers determined to sell off part of their ranch holdings or, in some cases after advent of the Taylor Grazing Act, they found some of their land purchases, due to terrain, to be so located that it would fall within another's range allotment. Under these circumstances it was desirable to split the contract and issue a new contract to each of the ranchers on the land within his particular ranching unit or allotment. In some instances, one or the other of the ranch owners would desire to pay off his contract and receive a patent. Under the rulings of the attorney general the land commissioner permitted this.

On March 16, 1955, the New Mexico attorney general, in response to certain questions of the State land commissioner, held that the above practice constitutes more than one sale, that one of the ranchers may forfeit his contract on land that might be of less value than the land patented, and that such practice was not in substantial conformity to law.

Due to this ruling there followed the case of *Zinn* v. *Hampson* (61 N. Mex. 407), in which the New Mexico Supreme Court, on October 3, 1956, held that the commissioner of public lands had no authority to execute a patent to a portion of a tract of land sold under an installment contract prior to final payment thereon, and, therefore, title held by vendors under a patent issued to them before final payment of the entire contract was not merchantable.

The State has many old contracts which, over the years, were split up by assignment to various individuals; some of these have been relinquished, canceled, or patented. In view of the New Mexico Supreme Court ruling, these contracts and patents are null and void. Under existing law it is therefore the duty of the land commissioner to take the necessary legal and administrative steps to cancel them on the records.

To do this would be unconscionable, because most of these lands have passed into the hands of innocent purchasers without knowledge of the defects in title.

The New Mexico State land commissioner, attorney general, and the attorneys representing individuals concerned hold that in view of the above court decision, an act of Congress will be required giving consent to the State of New Mexico to amend its constitution in order to remedy this situation.

There is precedence for this kind of legislative action by Congress. The situation was in regard to oil and gas in New Mexico, wherein oil and gas leases were issued for periods in excess of 5 years without competitive bidding contrary to the enabling act. Thereafter, article XXIV of the New Mexico constitution (ch. 28, New Mexico laws), and the act of February 6, 1928 (45 Stat. 58), were passed which validated certain leases and provided for procedure. The legislative history of the amendment is found at page 2094, volume 69, Congressional Record, 1st session, 70th Congress, January 28, 1928.

The question may well arise as to why interested parties in New Mexico have waited so long to initiate action. Apparently, the *Zinn* v. *Hampson* case received little publicity, and it was not until 1959 when Mr. W. D. Peveler, of Tatum, N. Mex., applied to the State land office for a patent to a portion of a split contract and was refused, that the full impact of this decision was realized. At the same time, it was discovered that a new 40-acre addition to the city of Truth or Consequences, N. Mex., is land that was formerly assigned from a State contract and patented. This clouded the title to many homes in Truth or Consequences. The whole problem then came to light and steps were taken to try to correct the situation. On advice of New Mexico officials and attorneys it was finally decided that the New Mexico Enabling Act and State constitution would have to be amended.

The committee recommends the enactment of the reported legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DONATING TO THE ZUNI TRIBE APPROXIMATELY 610 ACRES OF FEDERALLY OWNED LAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 179, Senate bill 201.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 201) to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report which gives the background of this measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 206) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 201 is to convey approximately 610 acres of federally owned land in New Mexico to the Zuni Tribe.

The lands affected by this legislation were a part of a larger tract acquired in 1937 by the United States under the provisions of title 3 of the Bankhead-Jones Act. In 1938 jurisdiction of these lands was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior by Executive order. By the act of August 13, 1949, several thousand acres of these Federal lands were donated to the Zuni Tribe. The acreage included in S. 201 was not conveyed under that legislation since the land was then being used for administrative purposes in connection with the Zuni livestock enterprise. The land is completely surrounded by other Zuni land and is currently being used by the tribe for grazing purposes.

By Resolution No. 607-60-10, dated October 24, 1960, the Zuni Tribal Council requested the introduction of this legislation. The Department of the Interior reports that it has no further use for these lands and states that had it not been for the reservation of this land for an administrative site, it would have been conveyed to the Indians by the 1949 act. The improvements on the land consist of an adobe house, a frame barn, well, and windmill, valued at approximately $4,300.

The favorable report of the Department of the Interior is set forth below:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Your committee has requested a report on S. 201, a bill to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land.

We recommend that the bill be enacted.

The bill conveys to the Zuni Tribe all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in approximately 610 acres of federally owned land in New Mexico.

This land was originally acquired by the United States in 1937 by purchase under the provisions of title III, Bankhead-Jones Act. The purchase price was $12,510. The Department of the Interior obtained jurisdiction from the Department of Agriculture by Executive Order 7972, dated September 15, 1938 (FR Doc 38-2715, 9-16-38). This transfer of jurisdiction affected a total of 28,573.70 acres lying north of the western portion of the Zuni Reservation.

By the act of August 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 604), an area composed of parts of townships 10 N. and 11 N., ranges 19 W., 20 W., and 21 W., and known as the Zuni north purchase area was donated to the Zuni Pueblo. The 610.89 acres covered by S. 201 was not included in that donation because it was needed for administrative purposes to provide an operating base for Bureau personnel then employed to assist the Zuni people in developing their livestock enterprise.

The land is semiarid grazing land with scattered stands of pifion and juniper which have no marketable value. Estimated carrying capacity is five animal units per section. Improvements on the land consist of an adobe house, frame barn, well, and windmill. Card value of the house and barn combined is $2,577. Estimated value of well and windmill is $1,800. The records do not indicate whether the improvements were included in the original acquisition.

The introduction of this bill was prompted by Resolution No. 607-60-10 of the Zuni Tribal Council dated October 24, 1960. The tribe intends to use this property in connection with the tribal cattle enterprise as grazing land and as a range subheadquarters. It has been informally used in this manner for the past 8 or 10 years when the Bureau stockman was withdrawn. The Zuni Agency has not had an employee stationed at this site during this time and does not intend any further use of the property.

This land is entirely surrounded by trust land, with no access to public highways. Due to its location, it cannot be used effectively by any entity other than the Zuni Pueblo. Had it not been for the reservation for an administrative site the land would have been included in the area granted to the Zunis in 1949.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 201) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in approximately six hundred and ten and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres of land in section 22, township 10 north, range 20 west, New Mexico principal meridian, and any improvements thereon, that were excepted from the conveyance made by the Act of August 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 604), and retained as Federal land for administrative purposes, is hereby declared to be held in trust for the Zuni Tribe.

MAKING CERTAIN FUNDS AVAILABLE TO THE NEZ PERCE TRIBE OF IDAHO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 180, Senate bill 322.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 322) to make certain funds available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment in line 3, after the word "the", where it appears the first time, to strike out "Treasurer of the United States" and insert "Secretary of the Interior", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior make available the unexpended balances of funds in the Treasury of the United States under the following symbols and titles:

(1) 14X7063 Nez Perces of Idaho fund;

(2) 14X7563 interests and accruals on interest, Nez Perces of Idaho fund;

to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho for purposes the tribe requests and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report which gives the background of this measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 207) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 322, introduced by Senator CHURCH, is to make available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho the unexpended balances in two special accounts in the Treasury:

1. Nez Perces of Idaho fund, $2,193.33.

2. Interest and accruals on interest, Nez Perces of Idaho fund, $4,261.38.

The balance in the first account is the remainder of a $1,626,000 payment to the tribe for lands ceded to the United States in 1894. All of the moneys were distributed per capita many years ago except for the small balance that is still in the account.

The balance in the second account is the remainder of the interest that has accumulated on the principal account.

The funds from this transaction were distributed more than 60 years ago, and the sum that remains cannot be distributed because the identity and location of the persons entitled to it is unknown. Under these circumstances, the committee believes it would be appropriate to let the tribe have the balances in these two accounts since it is highly unlikely that any Nez Perce Indian entitled to submit a per capita claim will do so.

The Secretary of the Treasury has recommended an amendment to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall make available the funds in the two accounts referred to rather than the Treasurer of the United States. The committee has adopted this suggestion.

The reports of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Treasury recommending enactment of S. 322 are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Your committee has requested a report on S. 322, a bill to provide that certain funds shall be made available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho.

We recommend that the bill be enacted.

The bill gives to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, the unexpected balances in two special accounts. One is a principal account and the other is an interest account. The amounts in the accounts at the present time are as follows: Nez Perces of Idaho fund, $2,193.33; interest and accruals on interest, Nez Perces of Idaho fund, $4,261.38.

The balance in the principal account ($2,193.33) is the remainder of a $1,626,222 payment to the tribe for lands ceded to the United States by an agreement that was ratified by section 16 of the act of August 15, 1894 (28 Stat. 286, 326–332). Of this amount $626,222 was paid and distributed per capita at the time the agreement was ratified. The balance of $1 million was paid in installments between 1896 and 1900, and it also was distributed per capita, except the small balance that is still in the account.

The balance in the interest account ($4,261.38) is the remainder of the interest that has accumulated on the principal account. The 1894 statute required the $1 million sum to be deposited in the U.S. Treasury and to bear interest at 5 percent until distributed per capita.

The identity and location of the persons entitled to these unclaimed per capita funds cannot be determined. In view of the lapse of more than 60 years the probability that any of them will submit a per capita claim is remote. Under these circumstances it would be appropriate to let the tribe have the balances in the two accounts.

Similar legislation was enacted for the Kickapoos of Oklahoma in the 86th Congress: the act of June 29, 1960 (74 Stat. 276, Public Law 86–548).

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 322) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDING THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 181, Senate bill 751.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 751) to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 4 of said Act is amended by inserting after "such other employees" the phrase ", including hearing examiners,".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 23 of the Indian Claims Commission Act approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049, 1055; U.S.C. sec. 70v), as amended by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 624), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of ten years from and after April 10, 1957, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of said Act is amended by inserting after "such other employees" the phrase ", including hearing examiners,".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report which gives the background of this measure.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 208) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 751, as amended, is to extend the life of the Indian Claims Commission until April 10, 1967, and to authorize the use of hearing examiners in order to accelerate the work of the Commission.

The Indian Claims Commission was established to provide for a final disposition of all claims of Indian tribes against the United States that existed on the date of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049). The Indian tribes were given 5 years within which to file their claims, and the Commission was given an additional 5⅔ years within which to adjudicate the claims. The Commission was to terminate on April 10, 1957. The time allotted in the original act to adjudicate the many claims filed proved to be inadequate, and the Congress extended the life of the Commission for 5 years by the act of July 24, 1956 (Public Law 84–767), until April 10, 1962.

NEED

The Indian tribes filed a total of 852 separate causes of action with the Claims Commission. These claims have been consolidated into a total of 596 dockets. To date 128 docket numbers have been adjudicated and the files sent to the National Archives. Of this number, awards were made to Indian tribes in 28 dockets for a total sum of $37,127,116.25. There are 468 dockets now pending and active, some of which have been partly adjudicated and others are in early stages of processing.

Testimony on S. 751 was presented to the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs by representatives of the Claims Commission, the Justice Department, and the Department of the Interior. It was unanimously agreed by spokesmen for these agencies that the claims

still to be adjudicated cannot possibly be completed in the next year, and that it is essential that further time be granted the Commission to complete its work. In the departmental reports it has been requested that the Commission be extended for a period of 10 years from and after April 10, 1962. However, after examining all of the factors involved, it is believed that a 5-year extension is advisable.

The committee would like to point out that the Commission has had 10 years in which to adjudicate the claims filed with it. Only a small fraction of those claims have been processed to completion. According to the testimony of the Chief Commissioner of the Claims Commission, the delays in completing the cases before it have arisen, in part, from postponements requested by the tribal attorneys and those representing the Government. For example, in one case there have been 36 extensions of time granted. The committee believes that in the number of years that have been made available, attorneys for the tribes and those representing the United States have had adequate time in which to prepare for trial. If 10 years were added to the life of this Commission, there is every reason to believe this practice would increase. It is recommended, therefore, that an additional 5 years be afforded the Commission, and this committee strongly recommends to all parties in interest that real effort be made in the course of the next 5 years to complete as many cases as possible.

The committee has amended the legislation to provide for hearing examiners to assist the Commission in expediting its work. By assigning additional attorneys in the Justice Department to these claims cases, and attempting to reach settlements in cases where liability has been determined, a great many dockets could be disposed of. The length of time that has been involved in this matter should have produced more progress in settling, once and for all, the long-standing claims that the Indian tribes have.

The extension of the life of the Commission, as provided in S. 751, is highly desirable in order that claims which the Indians have filed may be properly heard and decided. Otherwise, the Indians will again resort to petitioning the Congress for special jurisdictional acts to have their claims adjudicated, the very practice Congress sought to overcome in adopting the Indian Claims Commission Act of 1946. It cannot be stressed too strongly that the Claims Commission Act was passed by Congress to give the Indians their day in court to present their claims of every kind, shape, and variety.

Until all these claims are heard and settled, we may expect the Indians to resist any effort to terminate Federal supervision and control over them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 751) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SETTING ASIDE CERTAIN LANDS IN WASHINGTON FOR INDIANS OF THE QUINAIELT TRIBE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 183, Senate bill 507.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 507) to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinaielt Tribe.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. This Act shall not become effective until the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians shall have agreed to eliminate from their suit now pending before the Indian Claims Commission under the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049), any claim based on alleged inadequate compensation for said lands and to renounce any other claims they may have with respect thereto. Neither the lands herein authorized to be disposed of nor the cost or value of said lands shall be considered by way of offset under section 2 of said Act. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed as an admission of liability on the part of the United States with respect to these or any other lands and improvements.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That lands heretofore set aside under the provisions of the Act of August 22, 1914 (38 Stat. 704), for lighthouse purposes at or near Cape Elizabeth on the Quinaielt Indian Reservation, State of Washington, and consisting of 85.05 acres, more or less, in lots 1, 2, and 3 in section 34, township 22 north, range 13 west, Willamette meridian, which lands are excess to the needs of the Treasury Department, shall be, and the same are hereby, set aside in trust for the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, in the same manner and to the same extent as other real property held in trust by the United States for said tribe.

SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the report which accompanied the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 507, introduced by Senator JACKSON, is to set aside in trust approximately 85 acres of land within the Quinaielt Reservation for the benefit of the Quinaielt Tribe.

In about 1905 the Department of Commerce requested that the Secretary of the Interior make available approximately 206 acres of land on Cape Elizabeth for lighthouse purposes. By the act of August 22, 1914, the Secretary of the Interior was authorized to set aside the 206 acres, provided the Secretary of Commerce paid the Indians a price agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce. In 1915 the Department of Commerce reduced its request from 206 acres to 85 acres, and the Indians were paid a total of $581.12 for the land and timber.

In 1921 the Department of Commerce decided it did not need the lands for lighthouse purposes, and the lands are now excess to the needs of that Department. The current value of the acreage and timber involved in S. 507 is $9,350, excluding minerals, which had been reserved for the use and benefit of the tribe.

AMENDMENT

As introduced, S. 507 provided in section 2 that the act should not become effective until the Quinaielt Indians had agreed to eliminate from their suit pending before the Indian Claims Commission any claim based on inadequate compensation for said lands and to renounce any other claim with respect thereto.

A number of bills pending before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs that donate surplus Federal lands to Indian tribes contain language specifying how gifts of lands shall be considered in relation to tribal claims. In some cases the lands are simply eliminated from the suits now pending before the Indian Claims Commission. In other instances there is a provision for a setoff against any claim recovered by the tribe of the present market value of the land. In other instances no mention is made of whether a setoff shall apply.

In an effort to arrive at some uniformity in this regard, the committee recommends language directing the Indian Claims Commission to determine, in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the 1946 Indian Claims Commission Act, the extent to which the value of the title conveyed to the Indians should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission. It is the committee's belief that the Indian Claims Commission is in the best position to examine all of the factors surrounding the claim of the tribe and to decide on the merits whether any setoff should be made against any judgment awarded the tribes. Moreover, the Claims Commission Act gives the Commission authority to determine setoffs generally, after examining all of the equities involved, and it seems appropriate to leave this function with the Commission rather than for Congress to attempt to determine the equities.

The favorable reports of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Treasury follow:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 30, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: This is a report on S. 507, a bill to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinaielt Tribe.

We have no objection to the enactment of the bill if it is amended as suggested below.

The bill sets aside in trust for the Quinaielt Tribe 85.05 acres of land that were purchased by the United States from the tribe for lighthouse purposes. The land is located inside the boundaries of the Quinaielt Reservation. The circumstances of the purchase were as follows:

Prior to 1905 the Department of Commerce asked the Secretary of the Interior to make available for lighthouse purposes about 206

acres of land on Cape Elizabeth. The allotting agent was instructed not to allot any of these lands to the Indians, and in 1908 the lands were temporarily withdrawn for lighthouse purposes.

The act of August 22, 1914 (38 Stat. 704), authorized the Secretary of the Interior to set aside for lighthouse purposes not more than 206 acres of land on Cape Elizabeth, provided the Secretary of Commerce paid the Indians therefor a price agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce. All minerals in the lands were reserved for the use and benefit of the Indians.

In 1915 the Department of Commerce reduced its request from 206 to 85 acres and an agreement was reached on the price. It was $2.50 per acre, totaling $212.62, plus $368.50 for the timber, making a grand total of $581.12. This amount was paid by the Department of Commerce to the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of the Indians.

In 1921 the Department of Commerce decided that it did not need the Cape Elizabeth lands for a lighthouse, and they were never used for that purpose. The Department of Commerce has advised us that the lands are excess to its needs.

The current value of the 85.05 acres, excluding minerals, that were purchased by the Government in 1915 for $581.12, is estimated to be $850 for the land and $8,500 for the timber, a total of $9,350.

The Quinaielt Tribe is prosecuting a claim against the United States in the Indian Claims Commission. The litigation is not yet finished. The tribe's claim involves the dealings between the tribe and the United States with respect to the Quinaielt Reservation, including the lands under consideration. Under these circumstances, we believe that the 85 acres conveyed to the tribe by this bill should not merely be removed from the scope of the tribe's claim, but that the Indian Claims Commission should be allowed to determine under the provisions of the Indian Claims Commission Act the extent to which the value of the land conveyed to the tribe should or should not be set off against any judgment recovered by the tribe. The Indian Claims Commission is responsible under the law for making that determination. The following amendment is recommended for that purpose:

On page 2 delete section 2 and insert a new section 2 as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission."

Your attention is directed to the fact that the bill provides for a trust title as distinguished from an unrestricted fee simple title. A general policy on this subject has not been established.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 86–506, 86TH CONGRESS (74 STAT. 199), APPROVED JUNE 11, 1960

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 184, Senate bill 1208.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1208) to amend Public Law 86–506, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported with amendments, on page 2, line 12, after the word "from", to strike out "such" and insert "any", and in line 15, after the word "from", to strike out "such" and insert "any"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 86–506, Eighty-sixth Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Until a determination has been made of the beneficial ownership of the lands on the Colorado River Reservation, Arizona and California, that were set apart by the United States for the Indians of the Colorado River and its tributaries, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to lease any unassigned lands on the reservation and to approve leases made by the holders of assignments heretofore made, for such uses and terms as are authorized by the Act of August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539), and by the Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347): *Provided, however,* That the authorization herein granted to the Secretary of the Interior shall not extend to any lands lying west of the present course of the Colorado River and south of section 25 of township 2 south, range 23 east, San Bernardino base and meridian, California, and shall not be construed to affect the resolution of any controversy over the location of the boundary of the Colorado River Reservation. Income received from any leases of unassigned lands may be expended or advanced by the Secretary for the benefit of the Colorado River Indian tribes and their members. Income received from any leases of assigned lands may be expended or advanced by the Secretary for the benefit of the assignee."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report accompanying the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of S. 1208 is to amend the act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 199) that authorized the Secretary of the Interior to lease lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation. The 1960 statute specifically excluded leasing authority with respect to any reservation lands located in the State of California.

Ownership of the Colorado River Indian Reservation is in dispute. Therefore, in order that the Indians on the reservation might enjoy income from these lands, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior, in Public Law 86–506, to lease reservation lands for the purposes and terms authorized under the Indian Long-Term Leasing Act of 1955. The 1960 legislation excluded lands in California because it was thought that leasing of these lands might prejudice conflicting ownership claims and possibly affect the litigation in the *California* v. *Arizona* case. The additional lands that would be leasable under this bill are not in dispute, and there is no reason for excluding them from the leasing authority that applies to the remainder of the reservation. Leasing authority is needed because there are many commercial operations on the California side of the river which are now operating under temporary permits, and further development of enterprises in that area is being held in abeyance because long-term leasing authority is not available. If these developments could go forward, they would be of great benefit to the Colorado River Indians in terms of both income and job opportunities.

The Department of the Interior recommended language in its report to permit leases of up to 99 years on this reservation. The amendment was not adopted because the Senate passed on March 30, 1961, S. 108, a bill that would, if enacted, authorize up to 99-year leases on all Indian reservations.

AMENDMENTS

Two technical amendments recommended by the Department of the Interior were adopted. Their purpose is to provide for the use of income from leases made prior to the authority granted by S. 1208. Several such leases were made prior to 1956.

The favorable report of the Department of the Interior follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Your committee has requested a report on S. 1208, a bill to amend Public Law 86–506, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960.

We recommend that the bill be enacted with the amendment suggested below.

The bill extends the authority of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to leases on the Colorado River Reservation to include leases of some but not all of the lands on the California side of the Colorado River. The California lands that would be made leasable are those in section 25, township 2 south, range 23 east, San Bernardino base meridian, and the lands north thereof. The bill also provides that no lease made or approved by the Secretary shall affect the resolution of any controversy over the location of the boundary of the reservation.

The act of June 11, 1960 (74 Stat. 199), authorizes the leasing of all lands in the Colorado River Reservation except the reservation lands on the California side of the river. This exception was written into the law in 1960 because of a fear that leases of the California lands might prejudice conflicting ownership claims to the lands and possibly affect the litigation in *California* v. *Arizona*.

We understand that the California lands that would be made leasable by this bill are not now in dispute and that there is no longer any reason for excluding them from the leasing authority that applies to the rest of the reservation. More important, however, is the fact that an affirmative need for leasing authority exists. Before the ownership of the reservation came into question a few years ago, several 5-year leases for commercial operations on the California side of the river were made. The expectation was that when the 5-year terms expired 50-year lease authority would be available and such long-term leases would then be granted.

Instead, however, the right to issue any leases at all became questionable, and as the 5-year leases expired they were replaced with 1-year revocable permits.

The development of substantial commercial enterprises is being held up by the absence of lease authority. The present investments are in excess of $400,000. The operator at Lost Lake wants to proceed with a $2,500,000 capital expansion program. The operators of Cal's Place (motel) and Jack LaMar's (trailer camp) have definite expansion plans. The operator of Palm Beach trailer camp is considering expansion but has no definite plans yet. The Indians would benefit greatly if leases could be granted for these purposes.

In addition, the bill will open up additional areas along 26 miles of frontage on the west bank of the river for commercial and homesite purposes. This will create both lease income and job opportunities.

Your attention is directed to the fact that the Colorado River Indians have asked for, and have a need for, 99-year lease authority. We recommend that it be granted for the same reasons we have explained in prior reports with respect to the Palm Springs Reservation, the Navajo Reservation, the Dania Reservation, and the Torres-Martinez Reservation. This can be done by the following amendment to the bill:

On page 2, line 3, after "August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 539)," insert "including the uses and terms specified in the amendment thereof by the Act of September 21, 1959 for the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation, the provisions of which amendment shall be equally applicable to the land subject hereto,".

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LAND OF THE PALA BAND OF INDIANS TO THE DIOCESE OF SAN DIEGO EDUCATION & WELFARE CORP.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 185, House bill 2195.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2195) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey land to the Diocese of San Diego Education & Welfare Corp.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the report accompanying the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 2195, as amended and passed by the House, conveys without compensation, all the right, title, and interest of the United States and the Pala Band of Indians in three-quarters of an acre of land on the Pala Indian Reservation in California to the Diocese of San Diego Education & Welfare Corp.

NEED

Three years ago the diocese enlarged the Mission San Antonio de Pala to include a parochial grammar school. Most of the pupils in the school are children of the Pala Indian Band. The tract in question is being used as a school playground. During February 1960 the members of the band approved this legislation by a vote or 34 to 16 with 10 members not participating. The conveyance will be subject to reversion of title if the land ceases to be used for educational purposes. The diocese will pay an irrigation lien amounting to $139.51.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 2195) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDING TITLE 23 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE WITH RESPECT TO INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 186, Senate bill 1719.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1719) to amend title 23 of the United States Code with respect to Indian reservation roads.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the report accompanying the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the report (No. 213) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the bill is to amend title 23 of the United States Code with respect to Indian reservation roads. The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to accept contributions from State, county, or local subdivisions in connection with construction of Indian roads and bridges in accordance with a cooperative agreement.

On many Indian reservations part of the land is owned by Indians and part by non-Indians. When roads are constructed in these areas, the local governments are willing to pay part of the construction cost because of the non-Indian lands. However, under present law they cannot do so. The local government and the Bureau must each assume responsibility for a specific part of the construction. One may agree to do the surfacing and the other the grading. This is an inefficient procedure, and it cannot be used at all when the construction work is to be done under a contract let by competitive bidding. The bill, if enacted, would overcome this objection by permitting the Secretary to accept funds from the local government and to use them for integrated road construction program under Bureau control.

The executive communication, dated April 14, 1961, requesting the enactment of S. 1719, is set forth below:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code with respect to Indian reservation roads.

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept the cooperation of any State, county, or local subdivision in connection with the construction of Indian reservation roads and bridges. Cooperation will ordinarily take the form of contributions of either materials or funds, or both. The bill will permit the Secretary to accept those contributions and to use them in accordance with the terms of a cooperative agreement.

It frequently happens that an Indian reservation road is constructed through an area that has a checkerboarded pattern of ownership. Part of the lands are owned by Indians and part of the lands are owned by non-Indians. The local governments recognize that they should pay a part of the construction cost because of the non-Indian lands involved, and they are willing to do so. A typical case is one where the local government is willing to assume future responsibility for the maintenance of a road if it is first improved to a standard that meets local needs, and the local government is willing to make a limited contribution to the cost of the improvement.

In many cases, however, the local government has no road engineers, and instead of participating directly in the construction of the road it prefers to turn over its funds or materials to the Bureau of Indian Affairs which will then be responsible for doing the entire job.

This procedure is not possible under the present law. The local government and the Bureau of Indian Affairs must each assume responsibility for a specific part of the construction. For example, one may agree to do the grading and the other may agree to do the surfacing. This is an inefficient procedure, and it cannot be used at all when the construction job is to be done under a contract let by competitive bidding. If the Secretary could accept funds from the local government and use them for an integrated construction job under Bureau control, a more efficient job could be done.

The enactment of the bill will involve no cost to the Federal Government.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1719) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 208 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Cooperation of States, counties, or other local subdivisions may be accepted in such construction and improvement, and any funds, received from a State, county, or local subdivision shall be credited to appropriations available for Indian reservation roads."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Presiding Officer for his courtesy and my other colleagues for their patience.

DEATH OF FAMILY OF CHARGE D'AFFAIRES ALAN LUKENS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I rise this morning with a sadness of heart to comment on the tragic air crash which took the lives of 79 people in the Sahara, which involved an airplane of Air France. All these catastrophes bring great sorrow to many families, but in particular in this instance it involves the family of an American diplomat, and I single out this family and that diplomat because in our recent fact-finding tour in Africa, and in the Congo in particular, we had the privilege of spending many, many hours with Alan Lukens and his wife and their children, and observing at firsthand the heroic work they were performing, under very trying and dangerous circumstances, in Brazzaville at that time

Since that time Mr. Lukens has been transferred as Chargé d'Affaires to one of the new, blossoming African republics, the Central African Republic, in an even more remote area of that continent.

Mrs. Lukens and her three children and Chargé d'Affaires Lukens' mother all lost their lives in that crash. I remember well the effectiveness of Mrs. Lukens in her relationship and in her conduct in purchasing missions among the residents of Brazzaville, again in circumstances that were always trying, but, as I observed them, in ways that were constructive and helpful to the Government of our own country, and in ways that made an impression on the people in that part of Africa.

It comes as a note of considerable tragedy that Mrs. Lukens was on her way to London to prepare for the arrival of the fourth Lukens child. Again, raising a family even of one on the frontiers of Africa requires a deep sense of dedication on the part of these people who have chosen to serve our country in the Foreign Service. I think Alan Lukens and his family have shown a notable sense of dedication, which has also been shown by many American personnel, in many parts of Africa. They have shown a genuine sense of committed devotion and dedication to our cause in an area of the world that is so critically important to our success at the present time.

I want the RECORD to show that in this moment of observance of the tragedy this morning the Senate of the United States shares in the sorrow that has come to Alan Lukens, who deserves commendation because, nonetheless, under these personally tragic circumstances, he continues to serve his country in the Foreign Service on the frontier of the battlefields of the world.

TIMELY SPACE FEAT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last evening it was my privilege to speak with a very distinguished official of a foreign country. The subject of our discussion was the result on world thinking of the recent action of Comdr. Alan Shepard. He said, among other things, that the step-by-step performance which was given to the world, from the very inception of the activity when the astronaut stepped into the capsule, to the time when he landed in the water and was taken on the carrier *Lake Champlain,* had resulted in a great renewal of confidence in the West. Of course, by the West we mean the nations of the West.

He said that if the attempt had failed, the effect could not have been measured by anyone. However, it did not fail. The result was not only renewed confidence in the West, but in the unity exemplified, one might say, by what has taken place at NATO in Oslo. It was a military man who was talking, and he stated that the performance was quite in contrast with what the Kremlin had done. The Kremlin's performance did not show the Russian astronaut coming out of the capsule. It did not show the capsule. It did not show anything which could prove the astronaut had been in the capsule. This official said:

> While I do not question that he was there, there are millions of people who feel that he never was in the capsule.

After I had the talk I went home, and I came across an editorial by the editor of the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Timely Space Feat." In a few words it expressed definitely just what the foreign military man had said. It was timely. Yes, it was more than that—it was necessary.

Let me read a paragraph from the editorial:

> The timing of the astronaut triumph could scarcely have been bettered. It came just when the United States, and the free world, badly needed reassurance. Defeat in Cuba, uncertainty in Laos, many dangers elsewhere, the Soviet apparent success in orbiting a man, all combined to give the free world in general and the United States in particular a sensation of somber doubt.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in full in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIMELY SPACE FEAT

The timing of the astronaut triumph could scarcely have been bettered. It came just when the United States, and the free world, badly needed reassurance. Defeat in Cuba, uncertainty in Laos, many dangers elsewhere, the Soviet apparent success in orbiting a man, all combined to give the free world in general and the United States in particular a sensation of somber doubt.

One successful exploit does not entirely turn the tide. But it helps a lot. And it was a success with such significant elements: the enormously laborious and precise technical preparation that was necessary, the long, rigorous training to which the astronauts had been subjected, the problem of publicity, and finally in the moments of success the attractive, modest character of Commander Shepard himself and his wholesome, appealing family.

It was as if some of the finest values of what is called "the American way of life" had been built into this young man, and hence were exemplified and vindicated in his success. His tidy efficiency, his calm personality and manifest confidence in the whole range of thought, planning, and action which had gone into the project, the deeper elements of his own character and thought—all these stood out and raised the experience from the commonplace, much as they did in the exploit of Charles A. Lindbergh a third of a century earlier.

At the point where personal and impersonal meet, it was clear that America and the forces striving for individual freedom throughout the world had been given not so much a new hero as a new and characteristic embodiment.

SECRECY VERSUS OPENNESS

Of comparable import was the justification of working out in the open. Many persons, including many Americans, have been distressed at the publicity of past failures, and the buildup which often resembled ballyhoo, for the astronaut attempt. The iron hand with which the Soviet Union hides its failures and publicizes its apparent successes seemed appealing to some Americans.

It is no doubt true that there were elements of excessive sensationalism in the year's long buildup. But that is part of the nature of the American news media. The alternative of censorship and rigid controls is not attractive. Cooperative restraint though not suppression on the part of the zealous authorities and the zealous press would certainly have been better. But with all these defects, the whole world can now see the difference between a covert, dictator-operated experience and a flight into space the free way.

Even now, while natural scientists and technicians do not seem to doubt very seriously the authenticity of the Gagarin flight—and it is folly to assume deceit just to protect national pride—general public opinion throughout the world cannot be perfectly sure just what went on in the Soviet episode. Nor will it be finally convinced unless records of an unshakable sort are made public. Even that will be difficult to do convincingly after the event.

The whole world knows just what took place in the flight off Cape Canaveral last Friday. The simultaneous broadcast and telecast, and a little later the sound track of Commander Shepard's own words and voice, constitute one of the most simply impelling and dramatic scraps of history that the world has ever recorded. The same thing—or better—may be in the Soviet archives, but it can never be as persuasive as the contemporary document.

And so the policy of disclosure has been vindicated. If it can be combined with a policy of reasonable restraint in terms of advance claims and ballyhoo, the American face to the world will again exemplify honesty and candor along with good taste and

the regard which the Nation's Founding Fathers had for what, in the Declaration of Independence, they called "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." That is the finest description of the function of public relations that you will find in any of the books.

COMPENSATION IN MISHAPS

Indeed, the very mishaps which the United States has experienced both in space experiments and in diplomacy have their compensatory side. As to Cuba, the worst of the fiascoes, it is being pointed out that obviously the United States did not intervene with force, for had it done so it could have crushed the Castro regime. And there is some credit for this restraint. Throughout most of Latin America, leaders and newspapers are calling out for revision of the doctrine of nonintervention. It is better they should do so than Washington should.

Even after last summer's ill-starred U–2 incident, there were many who admired the United States for its candid disclosures, even including and compromising the President, rather than utter diplomatic fictions which were plain lies. Credibility, confidence, trust, are all great values which the United States and any other honorable society should always seek and deserve.

As a final step in the discreet and admirable handling of the Shepard flight, the National Government has firmly rejected appeals of various cities for ticker-tape parades. Commander Shepard is going right back to work, with his fellow astronauts, after the brief but thrilling ceremonies planned for Washington. He is evidently not going to be ballyhooed further, which is as it should be, and his plucky comrades will have their chances for further space work.

It is quite clear that the United States has a considerable way to go to equal the Soviet successes in rocketry. But these efforts need not be in a sense of mere rivalry. The sole and real value in such undertakings lies in the contribution they may make to the well-being of all mankind. Along the way, they will shed light and some glory on the respective systems from which they spring.

DEDICATION NEEDED

But to get there first might reveal a worse system, rather than a better, if the effort to reach the Moon or Mars or anywhere else were made by sacrificing deeper values. Freedom is one of those values. The meeting of the needs of human beings for food and housing, for education, and inner progress are among the values.

It is relatively easy for a totalitarian system to focus its efforts and get to almost any material objective first, but at a cost which does more harm than good. We must have equal reminders that the free—and sometimes soft and relaxed—societies need the kind of zeal and dedication, and more, which Marxist totalitarianism seems to have mustered.

That is one of the problems which arises acutely in such places as Laos. There, as well as in neighboring Vietnam and many another spot, Communist guerrillas, infiltrators, subverters have a drive and force and a commitment to their philosophy which is often sadly lacking in the peoples the free societies are trying to build up.

What is wrong? For one thing, the West has all too frequently been allied with the worst element in the countries it was seeking to help: profiteers, grafters, petty despots. These people were only seeking to retain their own privileges and feather their own nests, usually in comfortable exile. Such false leadership offers no basis on which to build, and arouses popular disgust rather than popular support.

Even some genuine and dedicated leaders need to communicate to their peoples a truer sense of purpose and reform as they are assailed by Communist propagandists or deluded political opponents. As is increasingly pointed out, the struggle in which the free world finds itself is not being fought with nuclear bombs and conventional military forces, but by tough guerrilla warriors, shrewd political infiltrators, clever propagandists, astute economic penetrators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may I ask for additional time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the unusual circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am very thankful for the gracious consideration of the majority leader. I have not impinged upon the rule in the past, so far as I know, so now I shall say something on another subject, not as serious as the previous subject, but quite important.

PROPOSED POSTAGE STAMP COMMEMORATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PORT AUTHORITIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today I received a resolution passed unanimously by the U.S. members of the American Association of Port Authorities.

I ask that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

There accompanied the resolution a letter from Harry C. Brockel, which speaks of the association's action, urging J. Edward Day, Postmaster General, to authorize a commemorative postage stamp of suitable design to recognize the seaports of the Nation in this 50th anniversary year.

I have written the Postmaster General also, asking him to comply with that suggestion.

There is accompanying the letter by Mr. Brockel, municipal port director, a copy of the letter written to J. Edward Day, Postmaster General, which gives the reasons and the background for compliance with such request.

I ask that all this material be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS,
Milwaukee, Wis., May 4, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The American Association of Port Authorities, the professional port association of the Western Hemisphere, will commemorate its 50th anniversary in September 1961. Its constituent members are the public port authorities, representing practically all ports of North America, and many of the Latin American ports.

The United States is the leading world trade nation of the globe and the economic functional role of our Nation's seaports in handling the great volume of international commerce generated by the United States is beyond question. The port gateways of the United States were a major factor in the global logistics of World War II and are a pertinent factor in the present tense international situation in effectuating the various assistance programs between this country and recipient nations abroad.

American cities and States have invested billions of dollars to provide this Nation with modern port facilities and gateways on four coastlines. This remarkable demonstration of the initiative of local and State governments deserves recognition from our National Government.

The American Association of Port Authorities has urged J. Edward Day, Postmaster General to authorize a commemorative postage stamp of suitable design to recognize the seaports of the Nation in this 50th anniversary year. An impressive brief has been submitted to the Postmaster General by officers of AAPA, in support of this objective.

The Organization of American States is expected to recommend to its 21 member nations the issuance of a seaport commemorative stamp to honor the 50th anniversary of AAPA.

We enclose for your review a copy of the communication which has gone to Postmaster General Day and a statement by the American Association of Port Authorities entitled "A Commemorative Stamp for U.S. Seaports," which interestingly develops the historical contribution of our seaports to the growth and survival of this Nation.

We hope that you will take time from your busy schedule to review this material. The Port of Milwaukee would very much appreciate your addressing an appropriate letter to the Postmaster General on behalf of the ports of the Great Lakes and of the Nation, urging that among the various commemorative issues to be authorized for 1961, the Post Office honor the seaports of the Nation for the first time—appropriately enough, during the 50th anniversary year of the leading port association of the world. Thank you for your interest and assistance.

Cordially.

———.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PORT AUTHORITIES, OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1961.

Hon. J. EDWARD DAY,
Postmaster General,
U.S. Post Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DAY: Submitted herewith is material bearing upon the desirability of a commemorative issuance for the U.S. seaports.

The functional role of the Nation's seaports in handling the great volume of commerce generated by the United States as the leading world trade nation is beyond question. We have supplemented, in the attached, with background briefly outlining historical, economic, transportation and international factors.

Local government, cities and States, have under their own financial arrangements invested a sum ranging several billions of dollars in providing this Nation with modern-day port facilities on four coastlines. This remarkable demonstration of the effectiveness of the dual form of government deserves, we believe, high recognition from the national administration.

Respectfully submitted.

PAUL A. AMUNDSEN,
Executive Director.

A COMMEMORATIVE STAMP FOR U.S. SEAPORTS

The American Association of Port Authorities, whose members are the city, county, or State agencies, boards, or bodies responsible for the development of the Nation's seaports, will celebrate its 50th anniversary conven-

tion week of September 25, 1961. The convention location is at the Port of Long Beach, Calif.

By resolution attached, the association respectfully requests the Post Office Department to issue a stamp in commemoration of the Nation's seaports on or about that date. The merits of such an issuance are as follows:

HISTORICAL RECOGNITION

U.S. seaports as an entity have been of extreme significance in every phase of the Nation's development. American colonization centered in what are now our major eastern port cities; and in the Revolutionary War the colonial seaports became a predominant military factor. The blockade of the Confederate ports during the Civil War is one of history's major examples of the military significance of a seaport system.

In the days of the industrial revolution the Nation's ports received the thousands of immigrants which are the broad foundation of American population today. As the Nation expanded westward, the role of San Francisco and the Golden Gate, and the Puget Sound and Columbia River ports of the Northwest are beyond question as influences in the development of the West.

Throughout two global wars in this century the ultimate decision rested in the quantities of men and materiel which could be funneled out through the Nation's seaport gateways. History continues to be made as very recently the United States in a joint partnership with Canada expended millions in the opening of a fourth seacoast with the advent of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

ECONOMIC RECOGNITION

The economic significance of the seaports of the United States is illustrated by the following examples:

1. The Port of New York Authority has estimated that the port and its port-linked industries are responsible for 25 cents of every dollar earned in the New York metropolitan area.

2. The American Merchant Marine Institute has stated that in the port of Baltimore 50 cents of every dollar earned can be ascribed to port industry.

3. In the port of New Orleans the figure of 70 cents of every dollar earned has been estimated.

Such figures and estimates are derived from studies which show that every ton of cargo unloaded at a seaport produces a direct dollar expenditure in the port area ranging from $12.46 per ton of general cargo to $32.78 per ton of raw sugar.

Such figures do not take into consideration the Nation's enormous stake in export-import trade originating in or destined to inland areas, where the manufacturing or sale of the goods involved is a factor of great economic significance. The Nation's exports and imports, funneling through the seaport gateways, are estimated at $19.5 billion exports and $15 billion imports in the current 1961 forecast.

TRANSPORTATION RECOGNITION

By their function, the seaports of the Nation are the vital link joining various modes of surface transportation into a continuous transportation network. It is important to note that the Post Office Department has previously honored by commemorative stamp every phase of the U.S. transportation industry party to this network except the Nation's seaports. There have been railroad and steamship commemorative issues; merchant marine issues; and a trucking industry issue. Other closely allied transportation and communications issues have consisted of air transportation issues; the shipbuilding issue; Atlantic cable issue; a Coast and Geodetic Survey issue; and closely allied waterway issues such as those of the Soo Locks in 1955 and the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959.

INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION

Should the Post Office Department at this time find favorably toward the U.S. seaport commemorative stamp, much can be accomplished in the field of international unity and good will throughout the Americas. The American Association of Port Authorities embraces in its corporate membership the entire Western Hemisphere, including the national port administrations throughout Central and South America and the public port administrations of Canada. The association holds formal status as a cooperating technical organization with the Organization of American States and under that status the Economic and Social Council of OAS, in plenary session on March 30, 1961, voted to recommend to all of the member nations of OAS adoption of a seaport commemorative stamp by each nation in behalf of its own seaports, such issuance to coincide with the association's 50th anniversary mentioned.

Similarly, the postal authorities of Canada have been advised of the appropriateness of such an issuance independently through the National Harbours Board of Canada.

Should this program meet with even partial success, it will be helpful to the new administration's major objective of improved relationships with Latin American nations and the program of economic assistance to these nations. The San Jose Conference on Ports and Harbors of 1956 and the resultant Permanent Technical Committee on Ports formed by the OAS, is ample testimony to the economic significance of Latin American seaports in the development of the nations to the south.

ASSOCIATION RECOGNITION

The American Association of Port Authorities is one of the Nation's oldest major industry groups. Orderly harbor development under local government auspices began to make itself needed at the turn of the century for two basic reasons:

1. The enormous capital outlay for marine structures over water, with often slow return on the investment, began to make the development of such facilities unattractive to private capital and require that they be publicly financed.

2. Haphazard development of natural waterfronts, and poor utilization thereof, began to create major problems.

In 1912 a group of port authorities held an organizational meeting for purposes of technical interchange, and formed an association under the name of "National Association of Port Authorities." A few years later, the name was changed to "The American Association of Port Authorities" because of interest in Canada and Latin America in this type of technical interchange on seaport development. This is the pattern of the association's activity today with the exception that United States members retain provision for unilateral vote and action on matters affecting U.S. ports only, including matters relating to the Federal Government of the United States. It is under these latter auspices that the attached resolution has been unanimously adopted by U.S. members, formally requesting this issuance.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of U.S. corporate members of the American Association of Port Authorities.

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PORT AUTHORITIES

Whereas the world ports of the United States serve as this Nation's gateways of international commerce, and

Whereas the flow of world commerce through these seaport gateways is most vital to the Nation's economy as well as to its primary objectives of world peace and world understanding, and

Whereas the American Association of Port Authorities which is composed of the State and municipal authorities in this country engaged in the operation of port facilities will hold its 50th annual meeting in 1961 at Long Beach: Now, therefore, it is

Resolved, That the Postmaster General of the United States be urged to issue a semicentennial commemorative stamp during the year 1961 in recognition of the value of the Nation's seaports to economy and welfare of the country.

Unanimously adopted by U.S. members only, December 11, 1959.

OBSERVANCES OF NATIONAL BARBERSHOP HARMONY WEEK

Mr WILEY. Mr. President, recently the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and other Senators rendered the assistance to the Chorus of the Potomac in its historic appearance on the Capitol grounds.

The time has come, after the performance by the astronaut, for us to have more singing, more sense of feeling that it is time to let go of fear, of doubt, and of worry, and to get on our feet again so that as a Nation we can realize the significance of singing hearts.

Mr. President, across the Nation, observances were recently held in recognition of National Barbershop Harmony Week. Governors of 22 States, and scores of mayors issued Harmony Week proclamations.

The 28,000-member Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barbershop Quartet Singing in America, Inc.—headquartered in Harmony Hall, Kenosha, Wis.—also sponsored special events in its 650 chapters in the United States and Canada.

The District of Columbia, too, observed Barbershop Harmony Week by giving a concert on the main Senate steps of the Capitol.

Over the years, my home State of Wisconsin has produced some of the world's greatest barbershop quartets, including the Schmitt Brothers of Two Rivers; the Four Teens of Eau Claire, and the U S. Air Force; the Chordettes, of Sheboygan; and the Quarternotes of Racine—the latter two groups being made up of talented young women. It has been my privilege to receive some of these championship quartets at the Capitol.

Now, I wish to congratulate International President John B. Cullen of SPEBSQSA and his D.C. chaptermates, Ed Place and Dee Paris of the International Public Relations Committee; Production Manager Wallace Nadeau and Stage Manager William Bennett on the success of the first Capitol concert by the Magnificent Chorus of the Potomac.

At the Watergate next July 17, there will be another opportunity for Senators and America to hear this famous group. At full strength, the Chorus of the Potomac numbers 400 men. It is the largest barbershop chorus in the world—and certainly one of the most brilliant and talented, including, as it does, the past international champions, the Singing

Capital Chorus of the District of Columbia.

Throughout history, man's efforts to meet opportunity and challenge have found a "voice in song." The musical repertoire of our own Nation includes songs reflecting fighting spirit in times of war, patriotism, and homage to God. In our personal lifetimes, too, all of us have found words and meaning in song for feelings and emotions which we, ourselves, could not well express.

The perpetuation of the theme of these chorusters, "Keep America Singing," can do much to buoy and strengthen the spirit and heart of our people, as we face the great challenges of the times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

IMMIGRANT BOY TO U.S. SENATOR—JOHN O. PASTORE, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the New York Daily Mirror on May 10 there appeared a very interesting article on the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. It is part of an informative series on the many major contributions our citizens of Italian birth and heritage have made to our history and society.

Because of the deep respect and admiration we all have for Senator PASTORE, I believe the article will be of interest to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRANT BOY TO U.S. SENATOR

(By Ara Piastro and Harry Altshuler)

"Don't look at it as a hyphenated-American story," said U.S. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, "it's just an American story. Nothing unusual about it. It happens all the time."

He was talking about his own career.

It isn't often, however, that a boy orphaned at the age of 8 finances his own education, rises to the governorship of his State, and becomes a Member of the U.S. Senate.

PASTORE, born in Providence, R.I., on March 17, 1907, is the only man of Italian parentage in the Senate. He is conscious of the Old World heritage, and proud of it—but he has never traded on it or tried to turn it into a political asset.

"Though I am very proud of my ancestral background and wouldn't allow anyone to belittle it," he said, "I feel wholly American. I wouldn't wear my heritage on my sleeve or attempt to enhance my career with it. My feeling is that it's not wise to fence yourself in with groupism, a form of self-segregation. In my State, with only a nominal population of Italian background, I had to be everybody's Governor—and I try to be everybody's Senator."

His father, Michele, came to this country as a young man from San Archangelo, near Naples. Here Michele married a young woman named Erminia, also from Italy. Together they sought in the new land the same shining light that brought so many others—"a better life."

Michele, a tailor, died at the age of 41, leaving his widow with five children to bring up. John was 8. Almost from the time he could walk, he learned to work. When he was going to grammar school he had errand boy jobs after class. Through high school, he worked in jewelry shops and for a power company. It didn't appear to hurt his schooling; he was an honor student at Classical High School in Providence.

Impelled—he doesn't quite know why, it just seemed natural—toward the study of law, he took his law degree at Northeastern, a Boston-based university which at the time ran an extension division in Providence.

Getting involved in a political career seemed inevitable for him. He was intensely interested in government problems on all levels. He began to do a lot of public speaking because he enjoyed being with people. All of this catapulted him into the State assembly in 1934, when he was 27, and ever since then his career has been one of public service.

He was reelected in 1936; served as an assistant State attorney general for several years, Lieutenant Governor in 1944–45, and Governor from 1945 to 1950. In 1950 he went to the U.S. Senate.

He was married in 1941 to the former Elena Elizabeth Caito, and they have three children—John, Frances and Louise.

As a legislator he prefers not to be labeled as specially interested in a particular field, but he admits a profound concern for what he calls the consumer panorama. He thinks like an ordinary citizen, a consumer, and tries to represent that point of view on matters as varied as civil rights, naturalization, trade and the other things that affect the average family.

He is a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Defense, Appropriations, Commerce Committees, and chairman of a subcommittee working out a new policy to help the textile industry.

He is busy enough—and sure enough of himself and his ground—so that petty prejudice against Americans of Italian birth or descent has never troubled him.

"As a people," he remarked, "we have withstood the vicissitudes of the ages; we are virile and strong enough to withstand this offending trivia which will wash away like footprints in sand. Let us not give it credence that it doesn't deserve. Within the scientific community, for instance—in the worlds of scholarship, music, art also—in the courts where there are many judges of Italian ancestry—there is no such prejudice."

For himself, his area of concern is the problems of all people, because political life stands in his estimation next to the ministry as the human instrument for helping everyone.

PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY: PUBLIC SCHOOLS DIED HERE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the saddest consequences of opposition to the enforcement of the Supreme Court's antisegregation decisions in the public school field is to be found in Prince Edward County, Va., which was involved in one of the original desegregation cases before the Supreme Court in 1954. Rather than abide by the law of the land, as laid down in the decision of Brown against Board of Education, Prince Edward County chose to close down its public school system and to abandon public education, which had had such a long and proud history in the State of Virginia.

The recent action by the Attorney General of the United States in intervening in a case brought by local Negro parents for the reopening of the schools again focused attention on this area, where there is only makeshift education for most white students and none at all for the majority of Negro children. This action also focused attention on the need for congressional action to give the Attorney General power to initiate school desegregation cases—known as part III of the Civil Rights Act—so that he would not have to await the filing of suit by local persons, subject to all the economic, social and physical pressures at the local level and who were really unable to undertake the costs of such litigation before joining the action.

A recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post contained an article setting forth the plight of the Negro children of Prince Edward County—who are losing years of education which can never be made up.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS DIED HERE

In Virginia's Prince Edward County some weeks ago I watched a Negro boy, 8 years old, sitting in his yard, scratching in the dirt with a stick—not letters or numbers or lines of a pattern, but marks without meaning. After a while he scuffed out the marks with his shoe and scratched again.

The little boy had never been to school. No one knows when he will be able to go to school. He is trapped, as are so many other people in Prince Edward County, in a struggle between losers and heavier losers. For Prince Edward, in an attempt to avoid school desegregation, has abandoned free public education.

In May of 1959, Prince Edward, a rural county some 60 miles southwest of Richmond, was ordered to end segregation in its public schools. In June the county's governing body, the board of supervisors, shut down all the schools, 13 of them for Negroes, 8 for whites, simply by not voting any funds for them. In September the white community opened private schools, for white children only.

From that September to now, almost 2 full school years, Prince Edward has been the only county in the Nation without public education. While the padlock has been on the public schools, some 1,400 white children have received their education on the run, in church basements and unrented stores and, for physical education, out on the streets. The 1,700 Negro schoolchildren have been shut out.

It is an uneven struggle. The whites are the power structure of Prince Edward. They call the shots. Yet the losers pile up on both sides of the barricades.

A white gas-station owner complains that his Negro customers don't stop by any more. A white clothier wishes it were 15 years ago, before school segregation was unconstitutional. An elderly Negro woman says all she has left is faith. A white minister declines to speak out from his pulpit because he sees no moral issue involved in shutting down the schools. A Negro contractor finds it necessary to run an advertisement in the local newspaper announcing that he is not a member of the NAACP.

And, of course, there are children. Negro children are on the streets at noon, walking or sitting on the steps of the post office or standing on a corner or throwing rocks in what was once a public-school playground. White children, an hour or so later, come out the side door of a church, books under their arms and singing, "We are the b-e-s-t of all the r-e-s-t." And a teenage boy, asked how

he liked his private school, answers, "No comments."

It would be inaccurate to call the private school system for the white children an educational sham, as some of its critics do. But it would be equally untrue to report it as the unadulterated success it is made out to be by its supporters. The system can perhaps be best described as a makeshift complex of classrooms scattered throughout the county, teaching fundamental education.

The system, called the Prince Edward School Foundation, has 1,376 students in its six elementary schools and one high school. The students attend classes, in their church Sunday school rooms and stores, under a tight schedule from 8:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. There is a brief break to get from one class to another, often in different buildings, and no recess for study hour or lunch. Extracurricular activities in the high school consist of an annual magazine, a monthly newspaper, the usual student government, a cheerleader squad and teams in the three sports that were maintained in the public school—football, basketball, and baseball. Home games are played in privately owned facilities.

The foundation has an administrator, a headmaster, a librarian and 63 teachers, most of whom moved directly from the public to the private schools with the children. Twelve of the teachers have no college degrees. (In Virginia, a teacher may teach after only 2 years of college study.) The headmaster was the athletic coach in the public high school. The administrator, a retired oil executive named Roy R. Pearson, had no prior experience in education. "I'm just interested in the private schools," he says. "I have a daughter going there."

The system is run on a somewhat casual basis. All classrooms have been made available without charge. Most of the tools and equipment in the industrial arts and science classes are borrowed. The 11,000 books in the high school library—mounted on shelves given by a Farmville druggist who had installed new fixtures in his store—have been donated or loaned.

The county pays up to $35 a year per child for transportation supplied, in old school buses, by a private nonprofit company calling itself Patrons, Inc. The buses are driven by high school students, and there have been a few minor accidents, "but nothing serious," according to Administrator Pearson.

The private schools cost Prince Edward parents next to nothing—$15 per child per school year. The rest of the tuition is paid with public funds, including the tax dollars of Negroes. State and county laws provide tuition grants, on request, for any child who wishes to attend a private, nonsectarian school. For the Prince Edward School Foundation, the State grant is $125 for an elementary school child, $150 for a high school child. The county contributes another $100 for each of the schoolchildren. Each total grant—$225 for the lower school, $250 for the upper—is $15 short of the foundation's tuition charges. Since the foundation claims it costs $216 to educate a child for a year in the system—ths cost being teachers' salaries, administration and supplies—there would appear to be a profit margin at the moment.

Some observers—in Prince Edward they are called outsiders—consider the private school system a delaying tactic in a losing battle. But its leaders insist there is nothing temporary about the foundation, and they have gone to impressive lengths to make their point. A six-building campus to house the high school division is being built on a hillside at the edge of Farmville, the county seat and only town in Prince Edward. Called the Prince Edward Academy and scheduled to be completed by September, the campus will have a library, an industrial-arts plant and four buildings of six classrooms each, to handle 550 students. On the drafting board are plans for an auditorium, a gymnasium, an administration building and four more classroom units.

The foundation reports it has collected $285,000, half in cash and half in pledges, for the construction, some of the money coming through an ingenious fund-raising device. A tax-credit law, permitted in Virginia and adopted in Prince Edward in July of 1960, allows a citizen to contribute 25 percent of his personal property and real-estate taxes, which he must pay anyway, directly to the private schools. The donation costs the taxpayer nothing and puts him in good standing with the foundation.

To facilitate the contribution for him, the county tax authorities compute and pencil in the exact amount of the allowance on the tax form. At last report, this device had produced $56,866 in cash contributions for the foundation.

The decision to build the Prince Edward Academy campus followed an attempt by the foundation to take over some public school property. Virginia law permits a county school board to rule a school "surplus" and to sell it at auction. In January of 1960 the foundation asked the school board—six members, all white—to put Farmville High on the block. After public meetings and many arguments, the school board voted against the sale, 4 to 2. After still more arguments and an attempted packing of the school board failed the project was abandoned.

Foundation supporters talk about their private schools the way new fathers brag about their babies—often, but with limited objectivity. For example, much is made of the fact that the foundation received accreditation from the State board of education within 5 months of its opening. (It has neither requested nor received any other accreditation.) A popular boast is that 39 of the 62 members of the first high school graduating class took college entrance board examinations and all passed. The point is not made, however, that these graduates had had 11 years of public education and only 1 year at the private school, and that it is reasonable to assume the public schools left some scholastic mark on them.

"Our children," Administrator Pearson said, "are well behaved." True, but "our children" were given the word at the start of the adventure that "this is serious business" and no foolishness would be tolerated. The students have been made a part of the fight, and they root for their side. A dozen high school pupils were asked how they liked their private school. Except for the boy who would not answer, all said the same thing: "Great." Why? Again the response was unanimous. "Because we get out so early."

What of the Negro children? In a pamphlet, prepared by a foundation supporter, that alleges to tell the story of what has happened in Prince Edward, there is the following passage: "Regardless of the fact that certain Negro leaders precipitated the problem in Prince Edward County, the circumstance of these [Negro] youngsters is not overlooked. They will not be forgotten, nor forsaken to their own people's dim, faint, undisciplined groping."

This is either eyewash or hypocrisy. The Negro youngsters of Prince Edward are forgotten by the white people and forsaken, too, to the desegregation fight.

About 50 Negro teenagers are at the high school division of Kittrell College, a private, sectarian Negro school across the border in North Carolina. Their tuition is billed to the Prince Edward County Christian Association—PECCA—a Negro group formed, when the schools were closed, "to meet the crisis." PECCA has been able to pay about half of the bill. The rest has been conveniently ignored by Kittrell officials.

The American Friends Service Committee sent 47 of the oldest and ablest youngsters who wanted to go to integrated schools in the North, at AFSC expense. The Virginia tuition grants, although available, were not used for these youngsters. Five Negro children in the county are using the grants to attend schools elsewhere in the State.

An estimated 200 Negro youngsters have left the county to receive "bootleg" education. That is, they were shipped by their parents to relatives or friends outside the county, even outside the State. There the children live as make-believe members of the family they are visiting and attend school without having to pay nonresident charges. It is a practice as old as the concept of "separate but equal" education itself.

Most of the Negro schoolchildren—some 1,400—remain in the county. Volunteer training centers have been set up for them, and about 600 children attend, either regularly or part time and more for morale than for learning. The 800 or so other children are lost, completely and perhaps permanently, to any known attempt at education. Some have gone to work, some play at home, some wander.

The Negro children at the centers are better off. They are supervised. In February, 573 of them were attending 16 centers around the county. The month before there were 652 children in 14 centers. Some of the centers have only temporary status. An unused, often abandoned, building is found, a housewife volunteers to serve as "leader," and the children come. Then, as the children become bored, or their mothers less anguished, the center closes up.

During the first year of the school shutdown most of the centers were run by teachers. There were 71 Negro teachers in the county when the schools closed. Now there are two, and both run centers. The others have gone elsewhere to find jobs. Today's center leaders are mostly well-meaning housewives who are inadequately trained to teach children, but do what they can during the 3½ hour daily weekday sessions. They review a few spelling words or play games with the children or invite them to cut up newspapers.

The largest of the centers, in the basement of the Farmville First Baptist Church—Negro—has two blackboards, four worktables, a collection of old theater seats, piles of used books, and 80 children, ages 6 through 18. The youngest of the children are given their lessons by an 18-year-old girl and a 15-year-old boy. The others receive mostly review work from the center leader, a former schoolteacher.

Another center, on a wooded hill near the hamlet of Prospect, is in a 2-room schoolhouse closed down in the 1930's as unfit. The leader, a local housewife, started the center on her own last December. She bought a stove to heat the one bare room she uses, supplied a bucket and dipper for drinking water and, at Christmastime, began selling penny candy to the children to raise money for a door. In February, with a sheet still covering the doorway and the children wearing their hats and coats against the cold, a visitor from Richmond donated the $10 needed to buy the door. In March, the door still wasn't up.

In these surroundings the housewife supervises 17 children, the youngest her 4-year-old son, the oldest 2 17-year-old boys who came to her "to get some spelling and arithmetic." Very little schoolwork is done. There is a record player, brought by one of the children, and the leader's portable radio. The children sit on two benches at the far end of the room and listen to music or play games or talk quietly among themselves.

Perhaps the best physical facility is the Loving Sisters of Worship Hall, a white, wooden two-story building mounted on concrete blocks, on the road to Hampden-Sydney. It has the appearance of a colonial county schoolhouse, clean and neat and utilitarian. Here Mrs. Julia Anderson, 15 years a teacher in the county, works with 36 children between the ages of 11 and 17. The day I visited the center the children were learning Roman numerals.

The worst facility I saw was in a deserted tenant farmer's shack, no more than 50 feet away. In a room 10 feet by 10 feet, with no plumbing and a tiny wood-burning stove, there are up to 34 children between the ages of 5 and 10. Magazines are stuffed into the sides and top of the rear door in an attempt to keep out the cold air.

When I visited this center, 27 children were present, seated two to a desk. Two other little boys were outside gathering firewood. The children wore their hats and coats and squirmed in their cramped space.

Yet, strangely, this shabby shack felt the most like a schoolroom. The leader, sitting on a chair in a corner, wearing her coat, too, was Mrs. Victoria Brown, who had undertaken to teach her students how to read and write. Mrs. Brown has a master's degree in education from New York University and has been a teacher in Prince Edward for 35 years. She had each of her little students read for me, from work on scraps of paper mounted on all four walls. "See Betty ride," one little girl read. "Three plus four is seven," a little boy recited. There wasn't a laggard in the bunch; each child performed flawlessly. Mrs. Brown beamed. A month later, Mrs. Brown was gone. She had secured a teaching job in a nearby county, a job she had had difficulty finding before because of the salary her experience and master's degree command. The children remained at their center, caught even tighter now in the educational bind.

What lies behind the plight of Prince Edward, where today children have either makeshift education or no education at all? The answers don't fall easily into place. The county is not in a border State, where there has been voluntary compliance with desegregation, or in the less than Deep South, where there has been involuntary yielding. Nor is it an urban center, where the issue is now being met. Prince Edward is rural, remote and resolute in its way. Here fears run deeper and prejudices grip tighter, civil rights has a long, hard road ahead.

Prince Edward County—some 25 miles wide and 15 miles deep—lies buried away in the heart of southern Virginia's Black Belt, so called because the Negro population of the region nears, equals, or surpasses the white population. (For Prince Edward's 15,000 residents, the breakdown is 53 percent white, 47 percent Negro, almost the reverse of the school population. The county, mostly a farming and light-industry community of middle-income whites and poor Negroes, has a reputation for docility bordering on apathy. The claim of its resident admirers is that it has never had a lynching, a strike or a sit-in demonstration.

Farmville, population just over 5,000, is a trading center for neighboring counties. What distinguished it from other small and remote southern towns is Longwood College, a State teachers school for girls, in the heart of town, and Hampden-Sydney, a private college for men established in 1776, a few miles away. Other than that, Farmville is Main Street with a railroad track running across it, trucks tooling through and not stopping. The marquee on the State Theater, the only movie house, reads, "Escape Your Worries in Movieland."

The imprint of southern tradition and behavior is clear in Prince Edward. Farmville's one bowling alley, one skating rink, one swimming pool, one golf course, and one library are for whites only.

The county had had 200 years of absolute segregation before the current struggle began a decade ago. On April 23, 1951, 5 members of the senior class took the 450 students of the county's Negro high school out on strike, in protest against what they considered separate but unequal school facilities. (Segregationists concede that the facilities were unequal. They had plans for a new Negro high school, they explain, but lacked funds. In 1953, 2 years after the strike, a $900,000 Negro high school was erected.)

The high school, built in 1939 as a PWA project, had no cafeteria or gymnasium, and its classrooms became overcrowded within a year. Three tar-paper shacks, heated by oil drums with long stovepipes running the length of each building, were put up in 1940. Two-thirds of the high school classes were held in these shacks at the time of the strike.

The students and their parents took their complaint to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, but NAACP lawyers advised them that the organization was no longer interested in fighting for "separate but equal" school facilities, as it had been. The NAACP was now prepared to challenge the constitutionality of the State segregation laws themselves and would take on complaints directed toward that end. The parents agreed, and a petition, seeking an end to racial segregation on behalf of 33 of the students and their parents, was filed with the school board. The children returned to school; they had been out 2 weeks.

When, as expected, the school board rejected the petition, a complaint was filed with the U.S. District Court for Eastern Virginia. In May of 1952 a special three-judge court, convened to study the case on its merits, ruled that the school's facilities were unequal, but held that school segregation laws were valid. The NAACP then appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Court combined the Prince Edward suit with four similar petitions—from Kansas, Delaware, South Carolina, and Washington, D.C.—and began hearings on all in December 1952. These produced the historic Court ruling of May 17, 1954, that "segregation in the public schools is unlawful, in direct conflict with the 14th amendment."

Implementation decrees which followed a year later ordered the involved schools desegregated "with all deliberate speed." But in January 1957, Federal District Judge Sterling Hutcheson in Richmond ruled that Prince Edward needed time for desegregation and set no starting date for the action. A year and a half later, after further court delays, the judge was ordered by the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals to set a desegregation date. He set one—for 1965. This, too, was appealed; and finally, in May of 1959, a new judge ordered desegregation for that September.

The white citizens of Prince Edward had not been idle during this time. Within hours of the 1955 implementation decree, the county board of supervisors met, at 10 o'clock in the evening, and voted unanimously to approve only that portion of the school budget required by law, a minimum of $150,000 for school-debt amortization. Four days later the PTA met, with 1,500 people present, and voted to raise privately $212,830 to guarantee the salaries of the 63 white teachers for the coming school year and to charter Prince Edward Educational Foundation to conduct private schools—in the event an immediate desegregation order came through. When it became apparent that desegregation would be delayed, the county adopted a month-to-month payment plan to teachers and was prepared to cut off expenditures whenever necessary. In 1956 a public hearing produced a declaration by the white community that it would turn to private schools if desegregation was ordered.

On June 2, 1959, only days after the final desegregation order was issued, the whites of Prince Edward were ready. The board of supervisors rejected the school-board budget request for the next school year and, instead, passed a budget without money for the schools. In September the private schools were functioning.

Generally credited by his associates as the architect of the private-school plan and chief strategist for its survival is J. Barrye Wall, editor and publisher of the Farmville Herald, the county's semiweekly newspaper. A militant segregationist, Wall has written such lines as: "In the South, neither the white race nor the Negro race would be happy in an integrated society," and, "An attempt to force oneself socially is not only ill-mannered but lacks consideration for the rights of others."

When I first met Barrye Wall, in his newspaper office, he told me he had nothing to say, he had done all the talking he was going to do. But reticence is not an instinct of the crusader. Wall, a cigar chomper in his middle sixties, talked for almost 3 hours.

"We had no choice," Wall said at one point. He and his friends could have established a private school system for white children and kept the public schools open for the Negroes. But Wall rejects this alternative. The county could not afford to maintain both a public and a private system. More than once he said, "The Negroes could have the same thing we have. Nobody makes that point."

Wall was talking about a corporation, called Southside Schools, Inc., set up by members of the white community in December of 1959 after the foundation schools were underway. The idea of Southside Schools was to supply similar but separate private facilities for Negro children. The Negroes could request the tuition grants, hire teachers and, presumably, find rent-free classrooms. A letter of explanation and an application form were sent to every Negro family in the county. One application was returned.

"Don't get the idea we're against public schools," Wall said late in the day. "We're not. We're against integration. And we've stopped it. We're just not in the public-school business any more. That's all there is to it."

Isn't it illegal to do away with public schools? "We don't think so," he said. "The State of Virginia permits it." But what if something should happen? What if the tuition grants should be ruled illegal? "No problem," Wall said. "We'll go without grants. The parents here will raise the money one way or another. They want these private schools badly."

The other spokesman for the private schools is Farmville businessman B. Blanton Hanbury, president of the foundation, formerly president of the PTA, and father of six children. "Five in school and one on deck," is the way he describes them. He feels they are six good reasons why he is against integration.

"You have to live in the South to understand our problem," Hanbury said. "We don't have Negroes like there are in the North. Most Negroes around here are quiet, rural people. They don't have a lot of energy. They're used to our way of life. Those who aren't go up North. I was in Washington last summer and I watched Negro policemen handling traffic on busy corners. They were sharp. They moved that traffic. In Prince Edward you couldn't find one Negro in a thousand who could handle the job. Negroes around here just aren't cut out for it.

"I know the NAACP calls this bigotry, but it's not. We have segregation, but not discrimination. What's the difference? When a Negro goes into a restaurant in the North, he doesn't know if he'll be served or not. Around here, he knows. That's the difference."

Does knowing mean the Negro likes it? Does he accept the fact that he can't go to a movie or a bowling alley in the county? "These, remember, are all private facilities," Hanbury said. "Both races can have what they want. If the Negroes wanted a library or a swimming pool, we'd even help them get it. But they're not interested. They want poolrooms and dance halls. They're more interested in drinking and carousing than in reading or swimming. That's what they've got and they're happy with it. We have a saying around here—be a Negro on Saturday night and you'll never want to be a white man again.

"I like to look at it this way. The whites around here aren't ready for integration either. If the county were richer, if it had more educated people, more of a middle class and more of an upper class, if the better Negroes didn't leave, then maybe."

The buildup of Negro leadership that has been evident elsewhere in the South in recent years is absent in Prince Edward. The only Negro leader to hold out for integrated public schools is the Rev. L. Francis Griffin, minister of the First Baptist Church in Farmville, local coordinator for the NAACP, and president of PECCA. Griffin is 43 years old, heavy set, and slightly disorganized. He accepts speaking dates outside the county and often fails to appear. He says it costs $2,650 a month to run the centers, but is unable to produce an accounting of the funds. He claims he is too busy to visit the centers and he knows little of what goes on there.

Stories in two northern newspapers produced a shipment of donated desks and chairs and books for the centers. The material was piled in a Farmville garage, and Griffin asked the center leaders to come to town to help themselves. Much of the pile remains in the garage.

His organization, PECCA, is little more than a weekly prayer meeting in his church, with perhaps 75 people gathering for some hymn singing, a sermon and the passing of the collection plate. Griffin skips a few of the meetings himself.

Last year he moved his wife and five children to New Jersey, where the children are going to public schools. Not even the NAACP lawyers, who were planning to use one of his children as a plaintiff in their court case, knew that the youngsters were no longer in Prince Edward.

To give Reverend Griffin his due, he is a lonely leader in a lonely fight. People in the county don't offer to help lead the fight. One of the other resident Negro ministers is not eager to have a center in his church. His congregation, he has told Griffin, fears reprisal.

When the struggle first began, the NAACP expected that the five high school seniors who had engineered the strike would become, in time, the needed Negro leadership of the county. But these five youngsters, sophisticated enough to organize 450 other youngsters, were also sophisticated enough to leave Prince Edward.

An attitude of defeatism seems to be spreading among the Negro population. Some parents are unhappy that their children don't learn much at the centers. Others show a disinterest in integrated schools. Too many have had too little schooling themselves. Most seem to have lost what little appetite they had for the fight.

In the midst of this, Griffin stands alone, feeling the pressures from Negroes and whites. The segregationists say he is no longer "one of our Negroes." The few white moderates claim he seeks publicity, not victory. Some Negroes complain he is more interested in token integration than he is in education. Two years ago he had a congregation of about 200. Today it is well below 100.

Those whites not fully in sympathy with the private-school movement add up, at the moment, to about 5 percent of the community, and they do very little talking. Pressures are too strong for them to speak out. A member of the school board who voted for the private schools but was opposed to selling the public schools was called "a nigger lover." He has withdrawn from the fight. A barber who questioned the wisdom of having only private schools later reported that people stayed away from his shop. In 1955 a Presbyterian minister said it was wrong to close the public schools; he lost his pulpit.

Last spring some white businessmen began to meet in secret to seek a settlement to the school problem. These were not integrationists, but less than hardened segregationists who wanted to resume public education and were willing to accept whatever integration was unavoidable. Their fifth meeting was discovered and exposed by segregationists.

An unsigned letter about the meeting was circulated through the county. "It has come to the attention of those of us who have worked so hard and sacrificed for the preservation of segregated schools that an insiduous [sic] movement instigated by certain businessmen who are willing to sell their honor and the moral upbringing of our children for a few dollars which they allegedly lost by a business slump that was felt nationwide, have allowed greed to compromise them into an alliance with these Socialists, integrationists, 'do-gooders,' and educationalists who would sacrifice our children in order to further themselves economically and politically."

There then followed "a confidential report of a secret meeting held outside the county" and the names of 34 of the 41 men present. This was last June. There has been no meeting since. "We say nothing any more," a business man told me wearily. "We have to be all for the private schools. Otherwise they say we're all against."

While I was there, I found only one white person in Prince Edward speaking against the closing of the schools—a college professor. He was meeting with Negroes in private and in public; he was expressing his opinion at gatherings of the white citizenry; he was buttonholing former friends in the street and making them talk to him.

A native Virginian, he had been more segregationist than integrationist when the struggle began. "I grew up with all these prejudices," he said. "As a boy once in Washington, D.C., I jumped up from a streetcar seat when a Negro sat down next to me. As recently as 20 years ago I avoided eating with Negro teachers at educational conventions. I am not an integrationist in the sense that I believe the two races can mingle closely. But I can't see why this mistreatment is necessary."

It shocked the college professor that white supremacy in the county was strong enough for the public schools to be abolished without any substantial protest. It offended him that public education was destroyed because white parents feared to have their children sit alongside Negroes in a classroom. It disillusioned him that the ministers would not speak out.

"It is my theory," he said, "that integration is less than the cause for the private schools than the excuse for them. The leaders of this movement have been looking for a long time for the opportunity to get private schools. It is the few people of some wealth who pay most of the taxes. We have all heard the argument about how little the Negro pays in taxes for what he gets. These people believe that educating only the white children, in private schools, will be much cheaper for them. And it will keep the supply of cheap, unskilled Negro labor available in the county. There can be no tobacco crop without this cheap labor, and tobacco is our only significant money crop."

The professor was pressured because of his open opinions. Letters were sent to the Governor and State superintendent of schools condemning his public statements. In town he was called "nigger lover" and "integrationist." Delegations went to the college president complaining about him. While I was in the county, a petition was circulated demanding his dismissal.

Then, a week after I left Prince Edward, I received what I think is the saddest letter I have ever read. It was from the professor and read in part: "I was told yesterday by the president of my college that should I open myself to renewed attack, he believed the State board of education would find it necessary to be relieved of so controversial a person as I seem to have become. Since I have three children wholly dependent upon me for support, I have no recourse but to submit to withdrawing from the battle. There is nothing else that I can do."

Such are the fears and hatreds that fester in Prince Edward. The climate is so unsettled, the position of the white community so unsure that one voice—a mild soft-spoken, educated voice—is a threat and must be silenced.

On May 8, Federal judge Oren Lewis in Richmond will hear arguments on all legal motions outstanding as of that date on the subject of Prince Edward—complaints, appeals, supplemental amendments to complaints and any other business hanging over in what is now a 10-year-old court case.

Conceivably the school crisis could end there, but no one in Prince Edward really thinks it will.

"We'll have the public schools open in September," Reverend Griffin says, but he admits he is being optimistic. "What we've done here is done," says Blanton Hanbury. "It's the coming thing in the South." "It will take a generation," says the silenced professor, "to heal the scars."

Whatever else happens, this much remains: With white children watching and Negro children waiting, Prince Edward has turned its back on the principle of free public education for all.

THE CHARLES COOLIDGE PARLIN MEMORIAL LECTURE, 1961, BY HAROLD L. ZELLERBACH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently a very dear friend of mine and a distinguished American, chairman of the executive committee of Crown Zellerbach Corp., Harold L. Zellerbach, delivered the 17th Charles Coolidge Parlin memorial lecture at the University of Pennsylvania, of which he is a trustee, on the subject "Are People the Diminishing Ingredient in the Future Marketing System?"

The lecture explains magnificently the genius of our country in respect to stimulating mass consumption as well as mass production. Since this is a most distinguished economic forum, I ask unanimous consent that the foreword by Mr. Wroe Alderson, chairman of the board of governors, Parlin Memorial Lecture, and the lecture by Mr. Zellerbach, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the foreword and lecture were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE PEOPLE THE DIMINISHING INGREDIENT IN THE FUTURE MARKETING SYSTEM?

It is with profound gratitude that I accept the honor of being named to receive the Charles Coolidge Parlin Award. It is a privilege for me to be here with you tonight, especially since I have learned that during the almost 20-year history of these lectures, this is the first time that a representative of the far western business community has been invited to appear before this forum.

I accept this distinction and acknowledge it as a very splendid tribute to all of the men engaged in the marketing processes in the western area of our country.

My brother, J. D. Zellerbach, and I represent the third generation of our family in America. Your great Keystone State, incidentally, was the first place my grandfather, Anthony, settled after immigrating to this country fram Bavaria. The lure of gold, which stimulated the first great westward migration, drew him to California. The prospects of business reward proved more attractive than the goldfields, and in 1868, he became a merchant of stationery in San Francisco.

Tonight represents a particularly sentimental experience for me. A century later finds me in the place of our family's beginning in America, talking to you, in part, about the business philosophy of my grandfather.

Stated simply, his philosophy, which is the heritage of my brother and myself, is a basic interest and sincere concern with people—with the well-being of our employees, the prosperity of our customers and shareholders, and the welfare of the communities in which we do business.

It is my impression that in this age of specialization, mechanization, and automation of the business processes, these interests are tending to disappear from general business consciousness.

The happiness of employees easily becomes a matter of punchcard efficiency; the prosperity of customers is based upon sterile mechanized credit formulae. Contributions of a company to its community life frequently are evaluated on the basis of what is expected, rather than on the simple value of good community citizenship.

In my opinion, this is a most unfortunate and regrettable trend in business, and one which I fervently hope may be reversed.

This brings me to the thesis of this lecture which is: "Are People the Diminishing Ingredient in the Future Marketing System?"

As I discuss this question with you, I hope to stimulate some thought upon this subject.

Charles Coolidge Parlin would have found much in common with my grandfather, Anthony, had they lived in the same era.

Each possessed an insatiable curiosity concerning people—their needs, hopes, dreams, frustrations, and ambitions. What made buyers react as they did? What motivated them to accept certain goods or services while rejecting others seemingly as attractive?

These matters constantly intrigued them throughout their respective lifetimes.

Charles Parlin sought answers to these questions through original and pioneering consumer research.

Grandfather Anthony's approach was strictly from the heart. His success was assured from the start, for he possessed in great abundance those principles upon which so much of American business was founded; strength of character, high integrity, humanity, and an understanding of the weaknesses and frustrations of those with whom he traded.

If customers failed to keep their promises or meet their obligations, they had but to look him in the eye, state their reasons honestly, and, more likely than not, his patience and their credit would be extended.

These principles he handed down to his son, Isadore, who became the motivating force in the development of the business. The extent of my father's application of what he learned about customer relations came to a real test on that tragic day of April 18, 1906, when the great earthquake and fire struck San Francisco to its knees, destroying virtually all of the Zellerbach properties. Fortunately, the firm had just acquired an office in the nearby city of Oakland which came through this holocaust unscathed. From this office he impartially rationed the remaining stock to regular customers at normal prices.

This was possibly the first incident in American business of the allocation of insufficient stocks. His policy of equitable treatment and the extension of liberal credit to customers under the crisis of earthquake and fire, consolidated the company's reputation for progressive customer relations. This remains today one of the most important assets of our business.

Now in its 91st year, our company operates 48 mills and converting plants and 36 distributing centers in the United States and Canada, employs more than 26,000 people, and had sales last year of more than $500 million. Though we have grown a great deal, I am confident that the traditions of personal service which built Crown Zellerbach will never be forgotten or abandoned.

There is a direct corollary between these traditions and my thesis.

I am fully aware that the great advancements in the efficiency of business during the last decade have been accomplished in the areas of automation and electronics.

In these times of large-unit volume and small-unit profits, no manufacturer of any size can long survive the enormous competitive pressures which exist without recourse to the cost-saving opportunities which mechanization offers him.

There is a wealth of editorial material available on the subject. I shall cite this evening only a few examples most closely associated with my personal experience and interests.

Among these is the somewhat disturbing trend in modern business practice for the traditional storage of inventory to revert from the distributor-retailer level to the warehouses of the manufacturer.

Developments in rapid transportation and communication, methods of more accurate measurements of peak sales, and such competitive devices as the drop-shipment are a few of the many reasons this movement is progressing so rapidly.

This evolution has had far-reaching economic effects. In order to minimize losses and maximize profits, the manufacturer has had to apply rigid inventory controls at the major points of warehousing. This has created the need for the installation of electronic equipment capable of analyzing such diverse demographic factors as income, sex, size of family, population, distribution of buying power, seasonal variations, and many others.

Studies indicate that the manufacturer who fails to adopt these innovations for customer service will be forced to tie up a 20 percent greater inventory investment than his more progressive competitors.

It is predicted that the universal application of effective inventory controls will ultimately result in the reduction of national inventory by 10 percent, while sustaining existing gross national income.

Order processing, formerly handled laboriously and with doubtful accuracy, has rightfully given way to automation. Machines now organize and analyze information contained on innumerable orders received from widely scattered sales points. Instantaneously, these data are disseminated to manufacturing plants and warehouses. This not only saves costs but makes order processing more precise.

This directly leads us to warehouse automation which has long been a pet project of mine. Our company was a pioneer in this field.

Our paper manufacturing lines have grown to the point that we now produce and sell more than 400 items. These may range in paper products from a standard roll of newsprint weighing 1,400 pounds to a package of paper napkins the housewife can easily hold in her hand.

While our customers cover a variety of categories, the product mix that must be assembled and shipped to any one of them can become a complicated affair of varying weights and sizes. In our research for better methods of economically handling these loads, we long ago abandoned the original vertical multi-story type of warehouse in favor of the open-area, one-story building where continuous horizontal flow can be achieved.

A fully automated facility, located in Portland, Oreg., is the repository for much of the production of a half dozen of our Pacific Northwest mills, and the distribution center for many items to our customers throughout the Pacific coast. The installation ships some 12,000 tons of materials in a week's operation. Linked with an automated order entry system from our headquarters office, we are able to fill our customers' orders on the day we receive them.

The advantages of such a highly sophisticated system of automated warehousing is of tremendous benefit to integrated companies such as ours in lowering costs and rendering better services.

Business owes a debt to the creative genius of the scientists and engineers who have provided this new approach to the solution of one of our distribution problems. Without their aid it is probable that the inflationary influences on production costs would be even greater.

Scientists and engineers have accomplished marvels with this new machine technology. They have programed machines to exercise judgments in chess playing, discover proof for theorems in logic and geometry, to design motors, to compose music, to translate languages. They are even working on electronic neurons to build into a computer a network as versatile for memory as the human brain.

Recently in San Francisco a computer, utilized by an oil company, designed a complete chemical plant from top to bottom—more cheaply, more rapidly, and more efficiently than could any group of humans.

The plant is now being built. It will cost about half a million dollars less than a competitive design produced by human engineers. And it will be so efficient it will cut production costs by 5 to 10 percent.

The machine whipped through 16,000 possibilities in 16 hours and finally picked the single best design. A team of human engineers worked out three alternate plans for the plant in a year of work, but their best effort was not as good as the machine's.

It seems to me that this one isolated incident gives validity to the question which I originally posed.

There are certainly times when it would seem so.

If we might think of the mechanical procedures which we have been discussing as the science of business, then let us consider the productive creativity of people as the arts.

It is my concern with what appears to be an overemphasis on automation to the neglect of the human factors available which gives me pause.

I am fearful that the growth of this mechanization carries with it the inherent threat

of subordinating the creativity and productivity of the individual.

I am afraid also that too great entrancement with the capacity of machines to make our decisions for us will have the lasting effect of producing a mass individual with a mass personality.

Could it be that by more and more making the individual's function a routine, we will breed a mass mediocrity?

Could it be that mass production, mass marketing, and automation have already brought us perilously close to this point?

Preoccupation with quantitative data is inhibiting the individual from giving recognition to his own ability to develop strong, sound, personal judgments.

We must learn to use the new electronic wonders to help us create products and marketing programs with unique, distinctive characteristics. By so doing, we shall be able to retain the most important rewards in business—those of self-identity, personal participation, and creative fulfillment.

Let me say that our new mechanical electronic world is not going to replace people. I am sure we can develop a relationship with our machine friends so that we can live compatibly one with the other, and so that man can use the machine as a servant for intelligent purposes.

Certainly there will be a change in the nature of jobs in many areas of business. This we must expect. The change in the nature of jobs will be, for many people, a far more satisfying experience.

The new man-machine relationship will permit the relegation of routinized duties to the care of machines, freeing man for more interesting work. Much of the worry of those of us in marketing over normal expediting work will be eliminated.

There will be new challenges against which to apply professional coordination skills in balancing the manufacturing and selling operations of companies. And, because efficient processing systems require a good deal of centralization, each marketing man will be a more responsible member of the team.

And I can't help but add, since I have spent my entire business career, in one way or another, in selling, that there will always be a need for personal contact between a company and its customer. The machine can help get the right products in the right amounts to him at the right time, but it cannot help build the most valuable of selling assets—the trust, faith, and confidence of personal relationships.

Despite all the sophistication of modern selling, there are still a few man-to-man cracker barrel methods that are as good today as they ever were, and, I suspect, they always will be.

I think one of the important things that characterizes Western businessmen is the warmth they instill in their business relationships.

The impersonalization of a mechanized world poses a problem to those of us in marketing. We should guard the human relationships within a company, and externally between the company, its prospects, suppliers, stockholders, and community. We must learn how to balance the business life of man with the usefulness of machines.

Another concern of mine is the growing responsibility we have for improving our management skills.

Regardless of the helpfulness of machines in innumerable areas of manufacturing and marketing, there continues to be a great deal of marketing conducted by sheer guesswork which passes for so-called informed judgment.

Marketing men only will take their rightful place in the leadership of companies when they learn to apply the same precision to their planning as is done in other areas of their management. Because of the mortality rate of products today, the rapid duplication of new products by competition, the changing forces of market prices, the degree of reliability of the marketing man's programs must be higher than ever before.

Improvements must be made in the area of long-range planning in order to provide security of capital investments in plants. We must learn to improve our prediction skills—to be able to predetermine expected shares of markets more surely and predict with greater accurancy the velocity of our programs in reaching those goals.

We should know more about the behavioristic purchasing patterns of our customers so we can predetermine their reactions. We can little afford to fly into the future "by the seat of our pants."

I think the use of the computer and such procedures as mathematical models can help us immeasurably to improve our skills in marketing management.

Important also is the growth of the individual marketing man's responsibility in his performance as a team member.

The rigid demarcation between manufacturing and distribution departments is beginning to break down. As these two functions blend more closely and as sophisticated liaison work between all departments becomes routine, it will be important for the marketing man to understand a great deal more of the workings of departments other than his own. He must grasp the conceptual whole and provide for himself a complete framework of knowledge about his total company operations that permits him to work toward overall maximum corporate results.

The arena of tomorrow's marketing man will be much larger. With new responsibilities, opportunities for the marketing man's advancement into the top echelon of his company will multiply.

Now, in most integrated companies, classic tensions build up between production and marketing.

For example, in the paper industry where complete manufacturing efficiency is only achieved by the operation of a machine 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, every hour of time that such a machine is shut down for any reason reflects directly on the operating statement.

Having started out, however, as a marketing operation, Crown Zellerbach has long held the philosophy that "the sale comes first." Experience has taught us that we function best when we take one product, or family group of products, and develop strong distribution on it before we attempt to add another.

We have never dignified this practice of solidifying position before moving ahead by calling it by any special name. In today's business terminology I believe it would be called market orientation.

This concept is carefully nourished at Crown Zellerbach. Our production and marketing departments work closely together in all phases of planning and executing programs. This joint effort makes a maximum contribution to corporate profits.

In another area, marketing men have an opportunity to enhance their importance by giving more attention to developing those efficiencies which reduce selling costs.

We must apply more intelligent pretesting to product and expansion programs before we adopt them. We must be vigorous in evaluating these programs as they progress, and we must be more apt in analyzing our failures. Better knowledge of our markets will enable us to better direct our thousands of salesmen when they make their calls.

Advertising must be directed to selected targets with preknowledge of the market's response. If we will improve our management skills and these kinds of things, we will conserve the talents, time, and energies of people in many other departments in our companies, and will minimize total operational costs.

Developing more flexibility in programing plant and marketing investments promises great rewards.

The velocity of marketing changes today is staggering. To be committed completely to a single course of action in the face of population shifts, competitive moves, and the frequent intrusion of new competitive products can produce disastrous results even for long-established and successful companies. We find our customers expanding, merging, moving from one geographical area to another, and engaging in new kinds of diversified activities.

If we are to match the vigorous pace of our customers, our operations must be more adaptable to the market's requirements.

Many large businesses today provide basic training courses for both men and women within the corporation. However, we tend to delegate their supervision to middle-management personnel, and seldom seriously interest ourselves in the results which these courses achieve.

Thus, we are losing a great opportunity for the nourishment of the natural talents of our people, as well as acquainting them with the fact that top management is interested in their development.

It is my firm belief that these training programs should periodically be reviewed and strengthened and that those of us charged with the final responsibility for conducting business should be completely aware of the progress being made.

Employees should be encouraged to participate in such outside training programs which are locally offered by schools, colleges, and marketing organizations, such as your own. Some incentive, such as company-paid tuition and allowing time off to attend classes, can be provided.

The productive man, on his way to executive responsibility, should be given his chance at management training through such excellent courses as those provided at Harvard, Syracuse, Stanford, Pennsylvania, Northwestern, and others. My own corporation has systematically conducted a most rewarding program in this area.

The growth and decentralization of business requires managers capable of handling greater responsibilities. Managerial duties are becoming more complex.

The need is intensifying for more professional approaches. We must provide management training programs within our companies in a systematic way. Each manager, first, has the responsibility for self-development, and second, for encouraging development for the men under him.

At Crown Zellerbach we encourage our managers to engage in individual reading and study plans, to attend outside, as well as company, business-management courses. We then try to present them with sufficient opportunity and challenges for the application of the principles learned.

Currently, our company is considering the addition of a new comprehensive course which will provide broad general training for our middle marketing management. The course will cover the basic management functions of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling. The program will also stress the importance of team responsibilities on the part of each department toward the objective of producing the maximum profit.

Junior management groups should be formed and given complete freedom of expression. This is an area where American business is sadly remiss.

By the very manner in which staff echelons are organized in most companies, business is inhibiting and stifling the possible contribution of its young minds. Junior management and in some cases, middle management, frequently lacks the means by

which thoughts and ideas can be communicated upward to top management.

This is a serious charge, but one which I believe to be demonstrable, and one which I equally believe needs our serious attempts at correction.

I agree with Marion Harper who, in his address last year, commented on the need for generalists. Training of the well-rounded businessman should begin during his academic years. We must see that our college recruitment programs secure from the reservoir of new talent, not only the specialist but the man who has been broadened in the social science sphere.

I was especially pleased to read recently the announcement by the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School that a new curriculum of undergraduate education for business, designed to meet the changing requirements of business leadership, will be introduced at the freshman level in September of this year.

This new program places increased emphasis upon courses in the arts and sciences essential to a better understanding of the political, technological, and social forces which affect business today.

Certainly the initiation of this kind of curriculum underscores the recognition being given by our colleges to the business manager's need for a broad understanding of the physical and social sciences. I give hearty endorsement to my alma mater's initiative in this regard. I am delighted to see this kind of educational training started during the undergraduate years.

Both at the academic level and within the framework of the organization, the desire of the individual for self-expression, especially in the formative years, is never fully satisfied. It he has capacity for independent thought, we must encourage his self-reliance so that his native powers of originality will emerge.

Then, it is important that we provide him with the corporate framework so that he may make his contribution to his own sense of personal satisfaction and to the maximum profitability of the corporation.

There is no question in my mind—our most important asset is people. Business leaders must recognize that the human mind is our most valuable resource and that it contributes more to economic growth and our national welfare than physical capital, factories, or machines.

On this, the 50th anniversary of the first marketing research operation conducted in America, and undertaken by the man whom we honor here tonight, Charles Coolidge Parlin, I would like to leave these final thoughts with you:

That we readdress ourselves to the personal aspects of the business relationship;

That we rededicate ourselves to the development of the creative capacities of our people; and

That we utilize the strengths we find within the mechanical processes, hand-in-hand with the enormous power which can be generated by the human mind.

If we recognize the validity of this philosophy, our progress will surge with the swelling stream of new, unique, and vastly more productive concepts and ideas.

Then no one of us need fear that people will become a diminishing ingredient in the future marketing system.

EIGHTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF RUMANIA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, yesterday, May 10, was the 80th anniversary of the independence of Rumania and it was celebrated as a national holiday during the period of the kingdom. Although the Communist regime of Rumania has suppressed all outward observance of this day, it still lives in the hearts of the people of Rumania as a symbol of the freedom and independence which they hope to regain in the future.

Rumania was freed from Turkish rule in 1856 at the conclusion of the Crimean War, but it was not until 1881 that Prince Carol was crowned king of that land. A prosperous country, rich in natural resources, it has been overrun in two World Wars by its enemies, and was seized by the Soviet Union even before the end of World War II. Under the shadow of the Kremlin's armed might, the people of Rumania have nevertheless kept the flame of freedom burning brightly in spite of harsh restrictions and repressive measures.

American interest in this Balkan country goes back to the 19th century, and in addition to a lively diplomatic history, there are also strong ties of blood between the two countries. Many of our citizens can trace their ancestry to this land, and they have helped to keep alive the hope that freedom will once again flourish in Rumania. I welcome this opportunity to join in the expression of that hope and that wish.

PROPOSED OREGON SAND DUNES SEASHORES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the second of a series of articles written by Anthony Netboy about the proposed Oregon Sand Dunes Seashore. Mr. Netboy is a faculty member at Portland State College, and was executive secretary of the interim committee on natural resources of the 50th legislature.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREA SOUGHT FOR DUNES PARK HAS PUBLIC, PRIVATE OWNERS

The proposed national seashore, somewhat modified in extent from Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER's original bill, is about half publicly owned and half privately owned. About 15,000 acres are in national forest and additional small parcels of land are controlled by the Bureau of Land Management and Department of Defense. Florence, with 1,750 people, and Reedsport, with 3,450, are major centers of population but are excluded from the boundary proposals.

An economic study of the area in 1959 by Prof. Granville Jensen, chairman of the Department of Natural Resources of Oregon State University, found that the most important land uses in order of their importance are recreation, forestry and agriculture. Nearby Honeyman State Park, not now within the seashore boundary, attracts more than 400,000 visitors annually.

As for forestry, much of the timberland has been cut over and is covered with brush, reproduction and immature second growth. The amount of commercial timberland is some 1,750 acres. Much of it is on lands that have been subdivided for lake front homesites whose owners place a high esthetic value on it and refuse to have it cut.

Agriculture has little economic significance, since most of the area is too steep or the soil too sandy for plowing or pasture. What agriculture there is occurse on the alluvial soil of the bottom lands along the creeks that feed into the lakes. In 1958 there were six occupied farmsteads, comprising 200 acres of tillable land and 130 acres of grassland, providing a gross income to their owners of some $12,000.

The economy of the dunes area is mainly dependent on service establishments catering largely to visitors to nearby Honeyman State Park and people who have cottages on the lakes. In 1958 there were 21 small business establishments, mostly situated along Highway 101. Their combined gross income was about $140,000.

Another measure of the economy is given by tax records of Lane and Douglas Counties. In 1958 the total assessed valuation of private property within the proposed seashore was $550,000. Total taxes paid were about $38,000 of which most went to the Florence school district.

In contrast to its present relatively undeveloped state, the proposed seashore, according to Professor Jensen, would bring millions of tourist dollars to the area, thereby creating new payrolls and income. Within 30 years—by 1990—3 million persons would visit the national seashore annually with recreation as a primary objective if facilities and services were made available. They would spend an estimated $26 million.

To attain this level of development, the Federal Government would invest some $16 million in land acquisition, recreation facilities—visitor centers, fishing, camping, picknicking and boating facilities and utilities—highway relocation, roads, trails and parking areas, and dune stabilization. Since all service establishments would be private concessions in line with National Park Service policy, it is estimated that an additional $14.5 million would come from private investment in motels, hotels, restaurants, filling stations, grocery stores and sporting goods stores. Annual payrolls would amount to some $6.6 million.

In contrast, according to Jensen, the area can expect only a moderate economic growth in the next 30 years if the movement to create a national seashore fails.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, all of us in the Senate have been following closely, and with deep interest in recent weeks, the news from New York about the efforts of the Republican Party of New York and its leaders, to persuade our colleague, Senator JAVITS, to become a candidate for the important position of mayor of New York and I am sure that many Democrats and independent voters hoped also that he would become a candidate.

We can understand the difficult decision which the senior Senator from New York has faced.

The office of mayor of New York City is one of the most important political positions in the United States. As a native of that city, we know that he would like to serve its great interests. And we know that he would be an outstanding mayor. Today the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], announced that the grave domestic and world problems facing our country had led him to the conclusion that his duty is in the U.S. Senate.

We have come to know him well in the Senate since he has been a Member since 1957. We know his ability, his courage, and his humanism. He is a great fighter for freedom in the world. And he has expressed his convictions by his never-ending struggle for full freedom for all the people of the United States of what-

ever race, creed, or color. We know him also as a man of warm sympathies, of integrity and of principle.

He is a true liberal, one who is tough and practical about expenditures, but who, like Lincoln, sees our free system as one whose great purpose is to extend equality of opportunity to our people, and freedom in our land, and the world.

Whatever decision he makes, whatever position he may hold, and whatever work he may choose, he will continue to grow in service to our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times about Senator JAVITS and the mayoral race, and also his statement.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAVITS BARS MAYORAL RACE; GOP LEADERS ACQUIESCE—SENATOR MEETS GOVERNOR—CITES IMPORTANCE OF WORLD PROBLEMS

(By Douglas Dales)

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS asked Governor Rockefeller and State and city Republican leaders last night to remove his name from consideration as a possible Republican candidate for mayor this year.

The five county leaders in the city announced that they would respect the Senator's wishes "to continue his important work in the Senate of the United States."

Senator JAVITS cited the importance of national issues in asking that his name be removed from the list of possible candidates.

After a three-hour meeting with the Governor and the five county leaders at the Roosevelt Hotel here, the Senator made his request in a statement that was interpreted as eliminating him from the race.

Asked whether his decision was irrevocable, Senator JAVITS said:

"I do not wish in any way to qualify my statement. I think it is pretentious to make Shermanesque statements."

He was referring to a statement by Gen. William T. Sherman at a Republican nominating convention in which he asserted that if nominated for President he would not run, and if elected he would not serve.

Attending the meeting at the Roosevelt besides Governor Rockefeller and Senator JAVITS were L. Judson Morhouse, State chairman, and the county leaders, Bernard Newman of Manhattan, Frank Kenna of Queens, John R. Crews of Brooklyn, James Flood of Richmond and Representative PAUL A. FINO of the Bronx.

Also present were William L. Pfeiffer, former State chairman, who has been acting in a liaison capacity between the State committee and New York City; Carl Spad, appointments secretary to the Governor, and Harry O'Donnell, press assistant to Mr. Morhouse.

The statement by the five county leaders indicated that they accepted Mr. JAVITS' position as final. They had requested the meeting.

"He reaffirmed his position," they said in a statement, "and we respect his decision to continue his important work in the Senate of the United States.

"We are continuing our discussion and meeting with other potential candidates who are also equipped with positive qualities of competent, courageous leadership so critically needed today in the government of the city of New York."

"In selecting a candidate for mayor," the county leaders continued, "we are firmly encouraged by growing evidence that the people of this city are ready and anxious to replace the present easygoing, inefficient handling of their municipal affairs with aggressive, progressive leadership.

"We are determined to offer a candidate who will be an eminently acceptable alternative to Mayor Wagner, whose failures in executive leadership and administrative discipline have burdened the people with a depressing, often disgraceful, series of crimes and problems in every area of municipal responsibility."

RESISTS PRESSURE

In asking that he be removed from consideration, Senator JAVITS resisted strong pressure brought by Governor Rockefeller and by national leaders of the party, including former Vice President Richard M. Nixon.

Mr. Nixon told the Senator at a recent meeting here that he had a duty to the party to run. The former Vice President sought to impress upon him the importance of a Republican mayoral victory in rebuilding the party nationally.

Recent statements by Senator JAVITS, including one to Alex Rose, vice president of the Liberal Party, had led to the belief that the Senator might be getting ready to revise his position against running.

The development returned the situation to about where it was a week ago.

Senator JAVITS recalled last night that he had made it clear some time ago that he did not wish to be considered for the city election.

He said he had agreed to renew consideration out of respect for friends and political associates who recently had urged him to reconsider.

After reconsidering, he said, he adhered "to the view I had expressed some time ago."

SAYS HE'LL HELP

Mr. JAVITS said he felt the party had a number of excellent candidates for mayor. He said he would do what he could to work for a Republican victory.

The Senator reiterated that he felt the great national issues of peace and war, prosperity and depression, of justice, and civil liberties were as critical to the people of New York as its city government.

He had said he believes he can be of greater service to the people in the Senate than in city hall.

TEXT OF JAVITS STATEMENT

I have today met with the county chairmen of the five counties in the city at their request, with the Governor and Mr. William Pfeiffer and the State Chairman L. Judson Morhouse, and have asked them to remove my name from consideration as a candidate for the mayoralty.

It will be recalled that I made it clear some time ago that I did not wish to be considered for the mayoralty race, but friends and political associates for whom I have the highest regard recently urged me to reconsider. Out of respect for them I gave renewed consideration to the possibility of my running for Mayor and advised the leaders today that I adhere to the view which I had expressed some time ago.

I feel that my party has a number of excellent candidates to offer to the people for this very high office.

Our city is badly governed and has suffered seriously as a result as a good community in which to live and work. The greatest city on earth should be the greatest in every way in the excellence of relationships between people of all faiths, races and color who live here; in a concept of metropolitan government congenial to its majesty and power; in being a center of the arts, culture, education and sciences; as a setting for the capital of the world—the United Nations—and as a decent home and business community of which every New Yorker should be proud.

In the coming campaign, consistent with my duties in the Senate, I shall do everything humanly possible in the choice of candidates and in the waging of the campaign to realize these opportunities for my native city.

As I have stated before, I feel that the great issues of peace and war, of prosperity and depression, of justice and civil rights and civil liberties which are being fought out in the Congress not only for ourselves in New York but for everybody in the United States and indeed in the whole free world are as critical to the people of New York City as our own municipal government. I am thoroughly engaged in this activity, hope very much the people will see fit to continue me in it, and will do my utmost as always to justify their confidence.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] about the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. Like the Senator from Kentucky, I recognize that Senator JAVITS would make an outstanding mayor of the great city of New York.

I am happy that the decision of the distinguished Senator from New York has been, as I understand, to remain with us in the Senate, where he has made a real contribution and where, by reason of his ability, intelligence, and understanding he can make further contributions.

I do not always agree with the Senator from New York in decisions he has reached. Sometimes we approach problems with a different philosophy. However, I do believe he is one of the very valuable Members of this body, and has made and will continue to make a contribution that will be of service to this country and to the world.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] concerning the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I watched with some apprehension the efforts of our party to draft him to be mayor of the city of New York. I know he would be an excellent mayor of that city and a very effective one, but I think it would be a shame for the United States Senate to lose one of his congressional experience and his great ability in the legislative halls of this Nation.

The Senator from New York has been a catalyst for the Republican Party for a great many years. I think we need a catalyst in our midst. We need more than one. But certainly none has been more effective as such than he. I am very glad to associate myself with those who rejoice that he will remain in the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I wish to join my Republican colleagues who have been paying tribute to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. A Democrat, I have much less of a mixed feeling about it. I am delighted that our Democratic candidate for the mayorality, whoever he may be, will not have as formidable an opponent as obviously the Senator from New York would have been. I am also very happy that this extremely competent, brilliant, and fair-minded Senator will continue indefinitely to grace the Hall of the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the decision of my distinguished senior colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr.

JAVITS], to remain in the Senate rather than to run for mayor of the city of New York is good news for the citizens of the United States and the citizens of the State of New York. The announcement, however, I am sure will be greeted with keen disappointment by many persons in New York City.

There is no Senator who works harder for his constituents than does Senator JAVITS. There is no Senator who is more fully versed on legislation and on the problems of his State. I do not know of any Senator who battles harder for the welfare of the people who elected him.

I know that the decision of Senator JAVITS was reached after considerable soul searching and thought, because he was under great pressure to accept the high honor of nominee for mayor of New York. Many of us are convinced that he could have been elected mayor and that he would have performed outstanding service in that position. He could have restored good government to a city which deserves it and needs it, but which has been denied competent and inspired leadership for far too long a time.

But my colleague has made his decision, and we respect him for doing so in his usual forthright manner. It is at least reassuring to know that his considerable talents and energies are pledged to the election of a new mayor in the city—a change which I am confident can still be achieved.

In the meantime, I am pleased to join all Members of the Senate in expressing my gratification that my senior colleague will remain here to carry on his important work. I look forward to standing shoulder to shoulder with him as we work for the best interests of the State of New York and of the Nation.

EXPULSION OF CATHOLIC PRIESTS FROM CUBA

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, more than a year ago in an extended speech, "Red Poison With Our Sugar," made on this floor, I warned what to expect from Castro and his bearded beatniks. In this speech I listed the 21 typical Communist steps to total power which I showed Castro was following in Cuba. The last or 21st step is always the suppression of all forms of religion moving as fast as the resistance of those defending religion can be overcome.

Newspapers recently report that Castro has announced that all foreign-born Catholic priests are to be expelled from Cuba. This would number at least 500. It is significant that the Chinese Communists did precisely the same thing in China 10 years ago—all foreign-born religious leaders were driven from that unhappy land—if they were not tortured, brainwashed and imprisoned.

The Tablet of Brooklyn is one of the largest circulation and influential Catholic papers in this country. I invite the attention of the Senate to an article appearing in the Tablet on April 29, "The Church Is Target of Cuba Reprisal." It reports the arrest of over 100 priests by the Castro secret police and also that a reign of terror is being pursued against the Catholic Church in Cuba.

Many schools and churches have already been seized and closed. Because of the importance of this article I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCH IS TARGET OF CUBA REPRISAL—EDIFICES AND SCHOOLS CLOSED; PRISONS OVERCROWDED

The initial rebel attempt to liberate Cuba from Marxist rule resulted in new and large-scale losses of liberty, with the Catholic Church bearing the brunt of the Castro regime's recriminatory raids.

Police and vigilante committees organized by the Government made waves of arrests throughout the country. Estimates of the numbers put in prison ranged in the tens of thousands. Among them was at least one bishop.

RADIO HITS CASSOCKED THUGS

Havana radio stations stepped up their invective against "cassocked thugs," and one broadcast said 100 priests were arrested. One United States-born Augustinian and two Canadian priests of the Foreign Mission Society of Quebec were known to have been seized.

Four other priests were said to have been taken captive along with other members of a landing force which tried to set up a beachhead in southern Cuba.

The Catholic churches and parochial schools in Havana and in many other parts of the country were reported to have been sealed by Government forces—their doors barred by armed militiamen and women. The Catholic University of Villanueva was closed.

Government propaganda units charged that Catholic institutions were being used as rebel supply centers, hiding places for fugitives, and depots for subversive literature.

CARDINAL REPORTED IN REFUGE

Unconfirmed reports aid that 81-year-old Manuel Cardinal Arteaga y Betancourt, Archbishop of Havana, who has been living in semiretirement, had taken refuge in the Argentine Embassy with two other bishops.

The bishop under arrest is Auxiliary Bishop Eduardo Boza Masvidal of Havana, the rector of Villanueva University. Bishop Boza has long been an outspoken critic of Communist influences within the government of Premier Fidel Castro.

Havana's FIEL radio network reported that Bishop Boza had been arrested at the Church of Our Lady of Charity, of which he is rector. One of the curates of the parish, Father Arnelio Blanco Blanco, was seized with him.

The Havana radio said it had been "revealed that Boza Masvidal had stepped up his activities against Cuba, using La Caridad Church for the purpose. Members of the (vigilance) committee therefore proceeded to search the church."

It continued: "In Boza Masvidal's private office they found great quantities of counter-revolutionary propaganda, two caps of the tyranny's army, one of them bearing a major's insignia, and in addition $236 in bills in various denominations and considerable change in American money.

"In an adjoining room, much hidden medicine was found; some had already been measured out by several counterrevolutionary groups which were planning to rebel. The arrest of Blanco Blanco was effected by the defense committee of the district because he was found with the priest Boza Masvidal and because he refused to open the door of the church."

Subsequently, other militiamen arrested three Augustinian priests at Havana's Christ of Good Voyage parish under similar accusations. They are Father John McKniff, O.S.A., the pastor, who is from Philadelphia, and Fathers Jose Luis Villacosta, O.S.A., and Jose Blanco Suarez, O.S.A.

* * * * *

It was reported that among the priests under arrest outside Havana were Augustinians from Canada, whose school at Colon, in Matanzas Province, was seized. The names of the men were not immediately available.

Canadian sources said, however, that at least two priests of the Foreign Mission Society of Quebec were taken into custody by Castro elements early in the reign of terror. They were identified as Fathers Jean Menard, P.M.E., and Paul Emile Chenard, P.M.E.

Reports from other sources indicated that priests and religious were being harassed in various provincial centers of Cuba, including Santiago. There was no immediate word concerning the whereabouts of Santiago's Archbishop Enrique Perez Serantes, who once befriended Fidel Castro, but whose series of pastoral letters denouncing communism has earned him the personal castigation of the Premier.

NEW PASTORAL LETTER

Church sources meanwhile were citing a document said to be a pastoral letter issued by Archbishop Perez Serantes which calls for Cuba's Christians to be firm and serene, strong in the faith, increasingly attached to the Holy Cross, the tree of strength and of life.

The letter states that what is being demanded in Cuba is "the extermination of those who stand unconditionally with the church." But it holds that the church in Cuba is doing well. The reason, it states, is that the ranks of the Catholics gain "stronger cohesion" day by day, and "because our priests, in spite of insults and threats hurled at them daily, remain steadfast in their places."

The letter concludes by saying: "Brothers, live serenely and hopefully. Despite the fact that the tempest grows stronger and is increasing have no fear: We are doing well. We are going forward in the boat of the expert Fisherman of Galilee and traveling in it is the Lord, who allows these things to test and to temper our faith."

Hard hit in the arrests throughout Cuba were the homes of the middle class—the source of the leadership of Catholic organizations. Entire families, including children, were being seized and sent to improvised detention centers, including movie theaters, hotels, and Havana's giant Sports Palace. In many cases, the arrests were made by vigilante groups composed of adolescents who drafted their own lists of "suspicious persons." By the weekend following the unsuccessful rebel landing, a total of 29 executions had been reported.

But Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticos reportedly had visited at least one prison compound to see to it that captives were treated with "humanity due to any prisoner of war." One Cuban army officer was quoted as stating that the Castro forces were "more Christian than the rebels: We buried their dead in wooden coffins, while our own boys were buried where they fell."

Despite the "more Christian" claim of the Castro forces, access to Catholic churches was barred in much of Cuba. In Guantanamo, Cuban city near the U.S. naval base on the eastern tip of the island, both churches were surrounded by militiamen. So was La Salle College.

At St. John Bosco Church in Havana, militiawomen blocked the entrance. But Catholics, particularly women, knelt on the pavement to recite the rosary in front of the church.

MR. NIXON'S COMMENTS ON SOME OF THE ISSUES PRESENTED BY THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, last week, on May 5, former Vice President Richard Nixon made a speech on national issues before the Executives Club of Chicago, his first since the election.

Mr. Nixon commented in a responsible, constructive manner on some of the issues presented by the Kennedy administration, stating he was speaking as a private citizen, not as a candidate for public office, not as a self-appointed leader of the Republican Party, nor as a representative of the former administration.

Mr. Nixon pointed out that the new administration has made proposals which would impose upon the Nation, over a 2-year period, an additional $5 billion burden in Federal spending, an additional $10 billion in new obligational authority, with the result of a new deficit of at least $5 billion even if revenues are estimated on the optimistic side.

Of this new total of $15 billion in spending and obligations—

Mr. Nixon commented—

Less than one-third is to be spent for defense and national security over and above the Eisenhower estimates. Fully $11 billion are budgeted for spending and obligational authority in nonmilitary areas such as health, welfare, education, housing, and public works.

Mr. Nixon called for first things first and, in outlining the threat imposed by the Communists, particularly in Cuba, he stated—

We should not start things unless we are prepared to finish them.

This speech, made by the man who lost the Presidency by an eyelash, has many sound, constructive suggestions, both in foreign and domestic fields. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY RICHARD NIXON BEFORE THE EXECUTIVES CLUB OF CHICAGO, MAY 5, 1961

My first speech on national issues since the election presents a difficult problem. It isn't that I am not receiving plenty of advice. As Gov. James Byrnes told me on his 82d birthday, Tuesday, unsolicited advice is the cheapest commodity you can find because the supply is so great and the demand so little.

The trouble is that no one agrees as to what I should do. Some say—continue to be a good loser; speak but don't say anything controversial. Others say, "Pour it on." Still others say, "Don't make any speeches; the new administration has been in power for only 100 days, the new President is popular and, therefore, it would be very unpopular for the losing candidate to make public statements that might be interpreted as critical of the administration.

I must admit that this last type of advice is tempting, to say the least. It has been somewhat of a relief to be out of the arena, to be free from the attacks of the political opposition. And, in any event, the role of a defeated candidate, if he does choose to speak, is not an easy one to define. He has no official position. As a result, the members of his own party who do hold elective offices understandably believe that they, rather than he, should speak for the party. And he always runs a risk that the members of the other party will accuse him or bad sportsmanship if he does anything other than compliment the new administration.

I shall have to admit, therefore, that the more popular course for me to follow would be either to be silent or, when I do speak, to limit myself to the generalities and pleasantries which satisfy everybody and displease no one.

This course would be an easy choice if the situation were normal—that is, if our problems, no matter how pressing, were of the type that could be solved in time without serious risk to our existence as a nation. The situation is far from normal. Our existence is threatened and in recent weeks the threat has manifestly increased.

I have therefore reached the conclusion that the time has come for me to speak out on national issues. But, in doing so, I want the country to know exactly the role in which I shall be speaking.

I do not speak as a candidate or as one planning to be a candidate for any public office. I do not presume to speak as the self-appointed leader of the Republican Party. Nor do I speak as the representative of the administration in which I was proud to serve. I shall speak as a private citizen, saying those things I believe are in the best interests of the Nation, without presuming to claim that my views represent those of my party or of the administration of which I was a member. I am convinced that in this independent role, I shall best be able to serve the Nation. Among the guidelines I intend to follow are these:

Our criticism of the administration should be responsible, constructive, on issues of real substance. This is no time for nit picking.

The type of fundamental issue that I have in mind is how our national effort is being mobilized to meet the threat to our existence. For example, the new administration has made proposals which would impose upon the Nation, over a 2-year period, an additional $5 billion burden in Federal spending, an additional $10 billion in new obligational authority, with the result that we shall have a new deficit of at least $5 billion even if revenues are estimated on the optimistic side.

Of this new total of $15 billion in spending and obligations, less than one-third is to be spent for defense and national security over and above the Eisenhower estimates. Fully $11 billion are budgeted for spending and obligational authority in nonmilitary areas such as health, welfare, education, housing and public works.

These programs include an education bill which in providing Federal subsidies for teachers' salaries would, in my opinion, inevitably mean Federal dictation of what is taught in our schools; a housing act that would stifle private initiative; a farm program that will make the American farmer hopelessly dependent upon and controlled by Federal bureaucrats; a health program for the aged that will, in my opinion, inevitably lead to compulsory health insurance for all.

During the recent campaign, I set forth in detail alternative programs in the fields of health, education, housing and agriculture which I deeply believe then and now were more consistent with our American principles because, as distinguished from the Kennedy programs, they recognize individual and private enterprise rather than Government action as the primary instrument of progress on which we should rely.

I shall continue to fight for those principles in the domestic area which I believe are so important for the future of the country.

At a time when the frontiers of freedom are under constant attack abroad, I believe that the national interest requires that we resist such programs as I have described which would chip away at the freedoms we enjoy at home.

And, before we embark on any new spending programs at home, we should put first things first and be ready and able to do what is necessary to strengthen America and the free world so that we can meet the increased threat of Communist aggression which now confronts us abroad.

In view of recent world developments, there is an obvious need for us to develop more effective programs to meet this threat. How can those of us in the loyal opposition play a constructive part in developing such programs?

The easiest and, on the surface, most popular course would be simply to abdicate any responsibility in this regard and endorse the programs past, present, and future of the new administration in the name of bipartisanship. I submit that such a course on my part or other members of my party would not be in the national interest. Bipartisanship once a decision is made and the Nation's prestige is committed is one thing. The situation is entirely different in the period when policies are developing and before a final decision is made.

President Kennedy speaking on September 20, 1960, during the period that Mr. Khrushchev was visiting the United States endorsed this principle in this way: "Some people say it is wrong to say that we could be stronger. It's dangerous to say that we could be more secure. But in times such as this, I say it is wrong and dangerous for any American to keep silent about our future if he is not satisfied with what is being done to preserve that future."

With these principles in mind, I should like to make some general observations with regard to the conduct of our foreign policy during this critical period.

From having served 8 years as a member of the National Security Council and the Cabinet, I know the perils of recommending or criticizing specific decisions, without all the relevant facts, including the classified information which entered into the making of those decisions.

And I also consider it the height of irresponsibility when our President makes a decision which backfires, to gloat over the country's misfortune and to give our enemies abroad the verbal ammunition they want to fire at us around the world.

I have been glad to note that members of my party have not resorted to the disgraceful tactics used by some members of the other party after the U–2 incident last year, proclaiming to the world that our prestige had fallen to a new low as a result of President Eisenhower's policy with regard to that program.

The test in each instance is whether criticism is going to help or hurt America. We certainly do not help America by running her down in the eyes of the world. Further, I believe that the current obsession about the level of America's prestige in the world obscures the principles that should guide us in developing foreign policy. Those who talk constantly of our prestige would seem to believe that we are in a popularity contest with other countries to see who was most liked and admired.

What we must remember is that we are in a fight for our lives. Public relations and popularity will have some bearing on the outcome of that struggle. But what will count in the long run is not how popular our policies are in the short run but how right they are.

The United States is the leader of the free world. Many of our good friends and allies might like us better if we did not lead as strongly on critical issues as we may believe it necessary to do. But it is the responsibility of the leader to do more than simply take counsel of the fears or follow the wishes of those who lack the power or desire to lead effectively.

These are some of the principles which I believe should govern American policy in the critical years ahead:

We must become accustomed to living in a time of crisis. The Communists are determined to conquer the world. Our problem this week is Laos. Last week it was Cuba. Next week it may well be someplace else. We must be mature enough to understand that we are not going to succeed in every venture we undertake in the foreign field. This does not mean that we should ever be satisfied with our failures. It does mean—and this I say with particular reference to the Cuban operation—that we must not allow a failure to paralyze our will to undertake decisive action in the future.

The worst thing that could flow from our failure in Cuba is not the temporary drop in prestige which seems to obsess too many observers but that this failure may discourage American policymakers from taking decisive steps in the future because there is a risk of failure.

I have noted that some political commentators have suggested that President Kennedy cannot risk action which might involve a commitment of American forces because of the fear of political criticism he would receive for being another Democratic war President. I can think of nothing more detrimental to our national interest than for a consideration of this type to have any effect in the high councils of the administration. That is why I gave to President Kennedy the assurance that I now reiterate to you—that I will support him to the hilt in backing positive action he may decide is necessary to resist further Communist aggression.

In deciding what our action should be, however, we should not forget one lesson we learned from recent events. Whenever American prestige is to be committed on a major scale we must be willing to commit enough power to obtain our objective even if all of our intelligence estimates prove wrong. Putting it bluntly, we should not start things unless we are prepared to finish them.

In the propaganda area we must recognize that what we say can have a great effect on the outcome of our struggle with world communism. Words do count and the new administration has set an exceptionally high standard for its words. But in the end when the balance sheet of history is added up, our deeds must match our words. We must never talk bigger than we are prepared to act. When our words are strong and our actions are timid, we end up appearing aggressive and weak at the same time.

As we plan our long-range policy, I believe the time has come for a searching reappraisal of the free world's ability, and particularly America's ability, considering the strategy and tactics to which we are presently limited—to deal with the kind of aggression in which Communists are now engaging.

Present Soviet strategy rules out world war. The Communists are trying to pick off smaller nations one by one, without war if possible, but willing to risk war if necessary. To implement this strategy, Mr. Khrushchev says he will openly support a Communist revolution anyplace in the world, and that he will openly support those resisting a revolution against any Communist government not just with words, not with a plea for collective action, but with arms, unilaterally and instantly provided.

There is no easy way to meet this threat. We can't wish away the problem by brushing off nations like Cuba and Laos as unimportant peripheral areas. If the smaller nations get the idea that we don't consider them important enough to fight for and that the Communists do, they will go down the Communist line like a row of dominoes.

Billions more in economic assistance will not, by itself, meet this threat. Moral support is important and necessary, but it is a poor shield against Communist tanks and planes. A fortress America with intercontinental jets and missiles which could destroy the Soviet Union can't deal with this type of threat. A giant propaganda offensive to make people understand us and like us better won't do this job.

Such programs are necessary and have their place. But, beyond this it is imperative that we develop new programs that can deal more quickly and decisively with the political, subversive and paramilitary tactics which the Communists use so effectively in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Collective action through the United Nations, the OAS and through our various treaty organizations is preferable where possible. But in many cases the time collective action is agreed to the Communists will have taken over.

Where the situation is critical and the only way a Communist victory can be avoided is through fast action, we must find methods through which we can act on our own and hold the line until collective support can be obtained.

America must eventually face up to the fact, as President Kennedy implied in his speech before the Nation's editors, of whether we can continue to be limited to multilateral action where the Communists can always act decisively on their own.

I would add that we must also face up to another terribly difficult decision—whether in a case like Cuba we can continue to follow a policy of giving only moral or covert support to the forces of freedom when the forces of slavery have open support from the Communists.

While we should continue to negotiate with the Communists wherever there appears to be any reasonable chance for success, we must always assume that when the Communist negotiates he is not negotiating for the purpose of reaching an agreement but he is using the negotiation as a camouflage for a Communist takeover. It has often been said that talking is always better than fighting. But we must remember that when we are talking with Communists, they usually are continuing to fight.

In this connection, there is one current situation which disturbs me greatly. While it is not now occupying the same headline space as Cuba and Laos, in the long run it could be far more fateful in solving the issue of survival of the United States as a nation and of freedom as a fundamental human concept than any other.

I am thinking of the newest breakdown of nuclear test negotiations at Geneva. It is becoming increasingly obvious that Mr. Khrushchev has no more intention of coming to a workable agreement with the new Kennedy administration on this question than he did with the previous Eisenhower administration.

As I have warned before, time is running out with alarming rapidity on this question. It is now more than 2 years since we have advanced our own atomic technology by testing and simple prudence cannot have us believe other than that the Soviets have concealed nuclear tests in the innumerable seismic disturbances recorded during this time in their territory.

The pace of technological advance in this area is fully as rapid as it is in rocketry and we now know to our dismay what happened when we let the Russians get ahead of us in rocketry. If we permit them to get ahead in nuclear weaponry the result will be no mere humiliation of us as a great world leader but can put us completely at the mercy of the Kremlin. It is enough simply to say this to know that it is unthinkable. And I assure the President he will have my fullest support in whatever action he deems necessary to break this fateful stalemate.

Speaking in Chicago last Friday, President Kennedy said: "Our greatest adversary is not the Russians. It is our own willingness to do what must be done."

In his inaugural speech, he said: "Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

I believe the great majority of Americans, regardless of party, applaud this ideal. Up to this time, however, the administration has sent program after program to the Congress which would have the Government do more for the people.

Now is the time for the President to tell the American people what they can do for their country.

I say today that the American people are ready for action, ready for sacrifice and President Kennedy will have overwhelming support in a program of action to deal with the deadly threat which confronts freemen everywhere.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SUCCESS OF PROJECT MERCURY—TRIBUTE TO ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, I was very much impressed by an article in Tuesday's Washington Evening Star spotlighting the significance of last week's Project Mercury success and paying tribute to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., who made this historic flight.

The article, entitled "U.S. Did It Where All Could See," is an exceptional commentary on this singular achievement in our space efforts.

I am, of course, very proud of Commander Shepard not only for the tremendous courage he displayed in taking part in this history making space lob, but also for the commendable manner in which he has conducted himself in subsequent days. I am proud not only because he is a native of New Hampshire but because he has been a fine example of American manhood.

Mr. President, I believe that comments by David Lawrence on America's space shot and his interesting comparison between our success in this field and that of Soviet Russia is worthy of the attention of all Senators. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, May 9, 1961]

U.S. DID IT WHERE ALL COULD SEE—THE OPENNESS OF AMERICA'S SPACE SHOT COMPARED TO SECRETIVENESS OF SOVIET'S

(By David Lawrence)

For the first time in the history of the world, a man has gone up into space who was watched by millions of people both before he ascended and when he came down to earth.

This is, however, only one of a series of firsts.

For the first time, a man in capsule was able to control and guide his flight while in the air. The Soviet astronaut who orbited the earth was just an inanimate passenger.

For the first time, a man who flew into space was photographed as he entered the capsule before he ascended and immediately after he came down. The Soviet astronaut, on the other hand, was not photographed by anyone except Government representatives. No free press was present afterward to make its own record or freely to interrogate the astronaut.

For the first time, a nation sent a man into space and paid for the project out of a small fraction of its tax receipts. No class of human society was deprived of anything by reason of that expense—and no hardship was imposed upon the people. The enormous sums spent to send Soviet satellites aloft have been taken from a people deprived of the necessities of life. All this was ordered merely to advance the propaganda of totalitarian rulers.

America is rightfully emphasizing to the world that its achievement was in the open where nothing was hidden. To this day, the true facts about the flight of Major Gagarin of Russia are still unavailable, either to the press or to the international scientific organization which must eventually pass judgment on the validity of the claims.

Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., who made the great flight for the United States, captivated Washington. He is a credit to his country in general and to the U.S. Navy in particular. He handled himself with modesty, tact and skill, not only in his public appearances at the White House and at the Capitol but in the press conference that was televised to the Nation.

Here was an example of a naval officer trained, of course, for the physical hardships he might have to endure. But where did the training come from that enabled him to take in his stride the adulation and applause that were showered upon him? American manhood—the product of a free environment and the heritage of sturdy American parents—can be given the real credit. For the risks were great and a steady-nerved young man took them bravely for the cause of science and the advancement of man's knowledge.

Undoubtedly there has been a spirit of competition aroused ever since the Russian sputnik circled the earth. The Soviet press and radio played up the Gagarin flight, and there was a big celebration in Moscow, too, as Premier Khrushche made speeches and bestowed the accolade on the Russian astronaut.

While doubts still persist as to what Major Gagarin really did—perhaps he also only went up and down at a given place in the air—the disposition of officialdom here is to credit him with his claim. But at the same time there is a natural pride here that America did everything in the open and made all facts available immediately to the public. Meanwhile, the Soviet people have been given skimpy accounts of Commander Shepard's feat, which is being deliberately played down inside the Soviet Union by orders of the Moscow government.

Why should the Kremlin be afraid to concede the significance of Commander Shepard's flight? Because it is important to the Communists to make the Soviet people feel that their sacrifices must be continued and their hardships borne in the interest of a patriotic spirit. The rulers of Russia rely heavily on patriotism to help them to excuse their failure to provide food and decent living quarters for the millions who are enslaved.

It has been of incalculable value to the prestige of American democracy in the free world to demonstrate the virtues of freedom to the smaller nations just emerging from bondage. For years to come the exploit of Alan Shepard will be remembered, not only because of the bravery of a man who ventured into the vast unknown of space, but for his dedication to the cause of science for which he was ready to risk his life.

Commander Shepard will remain a national hero because of what he has accomplished, but everlasting credit will also go to the scientists, engineers, and devoted leaders in our Government who, with cautions and faithful adherence to scientific research, refused to be stampeded prematurely into a manned flight and ordered it only after many experiments, including failures, had shown them it could be done with a reasonable chance of success. How many lives the Russians lost in their experiments may never be known.

As for a manned flight in orbit around the earth by the United States, this will come in due time. Already this country has 21 satellites circling the globe, while the Soviets have only one. A trip 115 miles up and then 302 miles across the ocean through space is an indication that at the proper time the United States will make the flight around the earth with an astronaut who will keep the world informed with his own voice, as did Commander Shepard—the first of all firsts. He talked and sent messages from the suborbital space ship, and all the world knew it simultaneously—a truly great first.

TRIBUTE TO J. EDGAR HOOVER, DIRECTOR, FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. BRIDGES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted at the May meeting of the District of Columbia chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates, which was held in Washington, D.C., on May 10, 1961.

This resolution commemorates the 37th anniversary of J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the FBI, and expresses the respect and warm feelings for Mr. Hoover, which I feel confident are shared by all Americans throughout our country. The FBI National Academy, created by Mr. Hoover, has achieved tremendous results in training and strengthening local law enforcement agencies throughout the Nation and I am very pleased that the District of Columbia chapter, under the able leadership of its retiring president, Capt. James M. Powell, of the Washington Metropolitan Police Force, and its new president, Capt. Lawrence A. Hartnett, also of the Washington Metropolitan Police Force, have made this fine gesture of appreciation.

I commend the reading of this resolution to all of my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas law enforcement has achieved professional status as a result of the inspired efforts of the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, who recognized that the future of America depended upon effective, efficient, and dedicated law enforcement, respected and supported by the citizens of our Nation; and

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover established in 1935 the FBI National Academy, the West Point of law enforcement, for the training of specially selected outstanding law enforcement officers as police instructors and police executives; and

Whereas the FBI National Academy, through its graduates, has made available outstanding police training to practically all law enforcement officers in America; and

Whereas the District of Columbia chapter of the FBI National Academy Associates is deeply grateful for the outstanding leadership of Director Hoover and is most appreciative of the training it has received at the FBI National Academy which has enabled it to more efficiently discharge its great responsibilities to the people of the District of Columbia: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the District of Columbia chapter of the National Academy Associates, on this the 37th anniversary of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, do hereby express its most sincere and warmest congratulations to Director Hoover on his 37th anniversary, and do hereby express its sincere appreciation to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and pledge its wholehearted and unreserved cooperation and support.

FCC CHAIRMAN MINOW BEARDS BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, on Tuesday the new Chairman of the FCC, Newton Minow, delivered a courageous and provocative address at the annual Convention of Broadcasters.

This speech has caused more controversy in the radio-television industry than anything that has happened in a long time. I attended the convention myself briefly, after Minow's speech. The brave words of the new Chairman were not calculated to make friends. They did not.

But this speech may have historical significance. It may mark the beginning of a driving effort by Government to improve the quality of television and radio in the public interest. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY NEWTON N. MINOW

Governor Collins, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for this opportunity to meet with you today. This is my first public address since I took over my new job. When the New Frontiersmen rode into town, I locked myself in my office to do my homework and get my feet wet. But apparently I haven't managed to stay out of hot water. I seem to have detected a certain nervous apprehension about what I might say or do when I emerged from that locked office for this, my maiden station break.

First, let me begin by dispelling a rumor. I was not picked for this job because I regard myself as the fastest draw on the New Frontier.

Second, let me start a rumor. Like you, I have carefully read President Kennedy's messages about the regulatory agencies, conflict of interest, and the dangers of ex parte contacts. And of course, we at the Federal Communications Commission will do our part. Indeed, I may even suggest that we change the name of the FCC to "The Seven Untouchables."

It may also come as a surprise to some of you, but I want you to know that you have my admiration and respect. Yours is a most honorable profession. Anyone who is in the broadcasting business has a tough row to hoe. You earn your bread by using public property. When you work in broadcasting you volunteer for public service, public pressure, and public regulation. You must compete with other attractions and other investments, and the only way you can do it is to prove to us every 3 years that you should have been in business in the first place.

I can think of easier ways to make a living. But I cannot think of more satisfying ways.

I admire your courage, but that doesn't mean I would make life any easier for you. Your license lets you use the public's airwaves as trustees for 180 million Americans. The public is your beneficiary. If you want to stay on as trustees, you must deliver a decent return to the public—not only to your stockholders. So, as a representative of the public, your health and your product are among my chief concerns.

As to your health: let's talk only of television today. 1960 gross broadcast revenues of the television industry were over $1,268 million; profit before taxes was $243,900,000, an average return on revenue of 19.2 percent. Compared with 1959, gross broadcast revenues were $1,163,900,000, and profit before taxes was $222,300,000, an average return on revenue of 19.1 percent. So, the percentage increase of total revenues from 1959 to 1960 was 9 percent, and the percentage increase of profit was 9.7 percent. This, despite a recession. For your investors, the price has indeed been right.

I have confidence in your health, but not in your product. It is with this and much more in mind that I come before you today.

One editorialist in the trade press wrote that "the FCC of the New Frontier is going to be one of the toughest FCC's in the history of broadcast regulation." If he meant that we intend to enforce the law in the public interest, let me make it perfectly clear that he is right—we do. If he meant that we intend to muzzle or censor broadcasting, he is dead wrong.

It would not surprise me if some of you had expected me to come here today and say in effect, "Clean up your own house or the Government will do it for you." Well, in a limited sense, you would be right—I've just said it.

But I want to say to you earnestly that it is not in that spirit that I come before you today, nor is it in that spirit that I intend to serve the FCC. I am in Washington to help broadcasting, not to harm it; to strengthen it, not weaken it; to reward it, not punish it; to encourage it, not threaten it; to stimulate it, not censor it. Above all, I am here to uphold and protect the public interest.

What do we mean by "the public interest"? Some say the public interest is merely what interests the public. I disagree. So does your distinguished president, Governor Collins. In a recent speech he said, "Broadcasting, to serve the public interest, must have a soul and a conscience, a burning desire to excel, as well as to sell; the urge to build the character, citizenship, and intellectual stature of people, as well as to expand the gross national product. By no means do I imply that broadcasters disregard the public interest. But a much better job can be done, and should be done."

I could not agree more. And I would add that in today's world, with chaos in Laos and the Congo aflame, with Communist tyranny on our Caribbean doorstep and relentless pressure on our Atlantic alliance, with social and economic problems at home of the gravest nature, yes, and with technological knowledge that makes it possible, as our President has said, not only to destroy our world but to destroy poverty around the world—in a time of peril and opportunity, the old complacent, unbalanced fare of action-adventure and situation comedies is simply not good enough.

Your industry possesses the most powerful voice in America. It has an inescapable duty to make that voice ring with intelligence and with leadership. In a few years, this exciting industry has grown from a novelty to an instrument of overwhelming impact on the American people. It should be making ready for the kind of leadership that newspapers and magazines assumed years ago, to make our people aware of their world.

Ours has been called the jet age, the atomic age, the space age. It is also, I submit, the television age. And just as history will decide whether the leaders of today's world employed the atom to destroy the world or rebuild it for mankind's benefit, so will history decide whether today's broadcasters employed their powerful voice to enrich the people or debase them.

If I seem today to address myself chiefly to the problems of television, I don't want any of you radio broadcasters to think we've gone to sleep at your switch—we haven't. We still listen. But in recent years most of the controversies and crosscurrents in broadcast programing have swirled around television. And so my subject today is the television industry and the public interest.

Like everybody, I wear more than one hat. I am the Chairman of the FCC. I am also a television viewer and the husband and father of other television viewers. I have seen a great many television programs that seemed to me eminently worthwhile, and I am not talking about the much bemoaned good old days of "Playhouse 90" and "Studio One."

I am talking about this past season. Some were wonderfully entertaining, such as "The Fabulous Fifties," the "Fred Astaire Show," and the "Bing Crosby Special"; some were dramatic and moving, such as "Conrad's Victory" and "Twilight Zone"; some were marvelously informative, such as "The Nation's Future," "CBS Reports," and "The Valiant Years." I could list many more—programs that I am sure everyone here felt enriched his own life and that of his family. When television is good, nothing—not the theater, not the magazines or newspapers—nothing is better.

But when television is bad, nothing is worse. I invite you to sit down in front of your television set when your station goes on the air and stay there without a book, magazine, newspaper, profit and loss sheet, or rating book to distract you—and keep your eyes glued to that set until the station signs off. I can assure you that you will observe a vast wasteland.

You will see a procession of game shows, violence, audience participation shows, formula comedies about totally unbelievable families, blood and thunder, mayhem, violence, sadism, murder, western badmen, western good men, private eyes, gangsters, more violence, and cartoons. And, endlessly, commercials—many screaming, cajoling, and offending. And most of all, boredom. True, you will see a few things you will enjoy. But they will be very, very few. And if you think I exaggerate, try it.

Is there one person in this room who claims that broadcasting can't do better? Well, a glance at next season's proposed programing can give us little heart. Of 73½ hours of prime evening time, the networks have tentatively scheduled 59 hours to categories of "action-adventure," situation comedy, variety, quiz, and movies.

Is there one network president in this room who claims he can't do better? Well, is there at least one network president who believes that the other networks can't do better? Gentlemen, your trust accounting with your beneficiaries is overdue. Never have so few owed so much to so many.

Why is so much of television so bad? I have heard many answers: demands of your advertisers; competition for ever higher ratings; the need always to attract a mass audience; the high cost of television programs; the insatiable appetite for programing material—these are some of them. Unquestionably, these are tough problems not susceptible to easy answers. But I am not convinced that you have tried hard enough to solve them.

I do not accept the idea that the present overall programing is aimed accurately at the public taste. The ratings tell us only that some people have their television sets turned on and of that number, so many are tuned to one channel and so many to another. They don't tell us what the public might watch if they were offered half a dozen additional choices. A rating, at best, is an indication of how many people saw what you gave them. Unfortunately, it does not reveal the depth of the penetration, or the intensity of reaction, and it never reveals what the acceptance would have been if what you gave them had been better—if all the forces of art and creativity and daring and imagination had been unleashed. I believe in the people's good sense and good taste, and I am not convinced that the people's taste is as low as some of you assume.

My concern with the rating services is not with their accuracy. Perhaps they are accurate. I really don't know. What, then, is wrong with the ratings? It's not been their accuracy—it's been their use. Certainly, I hope you will agree that ratings should have little influence where children are concerned. The best estimates indicate that during the hours of 5 to 6 p.m. 60 percent of your audience is composed of children under 12. And most young children today, believe it or not, spend as much time watching television as they do in the schoolroom. I repeat—let that sink in—most young children today spend as much time watching television as they do in the schoolroom. It used to be said that there were three great influences on a child: home, school, and church. Today, there is a fourth great influence, and you ladies and gentlemen control it.

If parents, teachers, and ministers conducted their responsibilities by following the rating, children would have a steady diet of ice cream, school holidays, and no Sunday school. What about your responsibilities? Is there no room on television to teach, to inform, to uplift, to stretch, to enlarge the capacities of our children? Is there no room for programs deepening their understanding of children in other lands? Is there no room for a children's news show explaining something about the world to them at their level of understanding? Is there no room for reading the great literature of the past, teaching them the great traditions of freedom? There are some fine children's shows, but they are drowned out in the massive doses of cartoons, violence, and more violence. Must these be your trademarks? Search your consciences and see if you cannot offer more to your young beneficiaries whose future you guide so many hours each and every day.

What about adult programing and rating? You know, newspaper publishers take popularity ratings too. The answers are pretty clear: it is almost always the comics, followed by the advice to the lovelorn columns. But, ladies and gentlemen, the news is still on the front page of all newspapers, the editorials are not replaced by more comics, the newspapers have not become one long collection of advice to the lovelorn. Yet newspapers do not need a license from the Government to be in business—they do not use public property. But in television, where your responsibilities as public trustees are so plain, the moment that the ratings indicate that westerns are popular there are new imitations of westerns on the air faster than the old coaxial cable could take us from Hollywood to New York. Broadcasting cannot continue to live by the numbers. Ratings ought to be the slave of the broadcaster, not his master. And you and I both know that the rating services themselves would agree.

Let me make clear that what I am talking about is balance. I believe that the public interest is made up of many interests.

There are many people in this great country and you must serve all of us. You will get no argument from me if you say that, given a choice between a western and a symphony, more people will watch the western. I like westerns and private eyes, too, but a steady diet for the whole country is obviously not in the public interest. We all know that people would more often prefer to be entertained than stimulated or informed. But your obligations are not satisfied if you look only to popularity as a test of what to broadcast. You are not only in show business; you are free to communicate ideas as well as relaxation. You must provide a wider range of choices, more diversity, more alternatives. It is not enough to cater to the Nation's whims—you must also serve the Nation's needs.

And I would add this—that if some of you persist in a relentless search for the highest rating and the lowest common denominator, you may very well lose your audience. Because, to paraphrase a great American who was recently my law partner, the people are wise, wiser than some of the broadcasters—and politicians—think.

As you may have gathered, I would like to see television improved. But how is this to be brought about? By voluntary action by the broadcasters themselves? By direct Government intervention? Or how?

Let me address myself now to my role not as a viewer but as Chairman of the FCC. I could not, if I would, chart for you this afternoon in detail all of the actions I contemplate. Instead, I want to make clear some of the fundamental principles which guide me.

First, the people own the air. They own it as much in prime evening time as they do at 6 o'clock Sunday morning. For every hour that the people give you, you owe them something. I intend to see that your debt is paid with service.

Second, I think it would be foolish and wasteful for us to continue any wornout wrangle over the problems of payola, rigged quiz shows, and other mistakes of the past. There are laws on the books which we will enforce. But there is no chip on my shoulder. We live together in perilous, uncertain times; we face together staggering problems; and we must not waste much time now by rehashing the cliches of past controversy. To quarrel over the past is to lose the future.

Third, I believe in the free enterprise system. I want to see broadcasting improved and I want you to do the job. I am proud to champion your cause. It is not rare for American businessmen to serve a public trust. Yours is a special trust because it is imposed by law.

Fourth, I will do all I can to help educational television. There are still not enough educational stations, and major centers of the country still lack usable educational channels. If there were a limited number of printing presses in this country, you may be sure that a fair proportion of them would be put to educational use. Educational television has an enormous contribution to make to the future, and I intend to give it a hand along the way. If there is not a nationwide educational television system in this country, it will not be the fault of the FCC.

Fifth, I am unalterably opposed to governmental censorship. There will be no suppression of programing which does not meet with bureaucratic tastes. Censorship strikes at the taproot of our free society.

Sixth, I did not come to Washington to idly observe the squandering of the public's airwaves. The squandering of our airways is no less important than the lavish waste of any precious natural resource. I intend to take the job of Chairman of the FCC very seriously. I believe in the gravity of my own particular sector of the New Frontier. There will be times perhaps when you will consider that I take myself or my job too seriously. Frankly, I don't care if you do. For I am convinced that either one takes this job seriously—or one can be seriously taken.

Now, how will these principles be applied? Clearly, at the heart of the FCC's authority lies its power to license, to renew or fail to renew, or to revoke a license. As you know, when your license comes up for renewal, your performance is compared with your promises. I understand that many people feel that in the past licenses were often renewed pro forma. I say to you now: renewal will not be pro forma in the future. There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license.

But simply matching promises and performance is not enough. I intend to do more. I intend to find out whether the people care. I intend to find out whether the community which each broadcaster serves believes he has been serving the public interest. When a renewal is set down for hearing, I intend—wherever possible—to hold a well-advertised public hearing, right in the community you have promised to serve. I want the people who own the air and the homes that television enters to tell you and the FCC what's been going on. I want the people—if they are truly interested in the service you give them—to make notes, document cases, tell us the facts. For those few of you who really believe that the public interest is merely what interests the public—I hope that these hearings will arouse no little interest.

The FCC has a fine reserve of monitors—almost 180 million Americans gathered around 56 million sets. If you want those monitors to be your friends at court it's up to you.

Some of you may say, "Yes, but I still do not know where the line is between a grant of a renewal and the hearing you just spoke of." My answer is: Why should you want to know how close you can come to the edge of the cliff? What the Commission asks of you is to make a conscientious, good faith effort to serve the public interest. Every one of you serves a community in which the people would benefit by educational, religious, instructive or other public service programing. Every one of you serves an area which has local needs—as to local elections, controversial issues, local news, local talent. Make a serious, genuine effort to put on that programing. When you do, you will not be playing brinkmanship with the public interest.

What I've been saying applies to broadcast stations. Now a station break for the networks. You know your importance in this great industry. Today, more than one-half of all hours of television station programing comes from the networks; in prime time, this rises to more than three-fourths of the available hours.

You know that the FCC has been studying network operations for some time. I intend to press this to a speedy conclusion with useful results. I can tell you right now, however, that I am deeply concerned with concentration of power in the hands of the networks. As a result, too many local stations have forgone any efforts at local programing, with little use of live talent and local service. Too many local stations operate with one hand on the network switch and the other on a projector loaded with old movies. We want the individual stations to be free to meet their legal responsibilities to serve their communities.

I join Governor Collins in his views so well expressed to the advertisers who use the public air. I urge the networks to join him and undertake a very special mission on behalf of this industry: you can tell your advertisers, "This is the high quality we are going to serve—take it or other people will. If you think you can find a better place to move automobiles, cigarettes, and soap—go ahead and try."

Tell your sponsors to be less concerned with costs per thousand and more concerned with understanding per millions. And remind your stockholders that an investment in broadcasting is buying a share in public responsibility.

The networks can start this industry on the road to freedom from the dictatorship of numbers.

But there is more to the problem than network influences on stations or advertiser influences on networks. I know the problems networks face in trying to clear some of their best programs—the informational programs that exemplify public service. They are your finest hours—whether sustaining or commercial, whether regularly scheduled or special—these are the signs that broadcasting knows the way to leadership. They make the public's trust in you a wise choice.

They should be seen. As you know, we are readying for use new forms by which broadcast stations will report their programing to the Commission. You probably also know that special attention will be paid in these reports to public service programing. I believe that stations taking network service should also be required to report the extent of the local clearance of network public service programing, and when they fail to clear them, they should explain why. If it is to put on some outstanding local program, this is one reason. But, if it is simply to carry some old movie, that is an entirely different matter. The Commission should consider such clearance reports carefully when making up its mind about the licensee's overall programing.

We intend to move—and as you know, indeed the FCC was rapidly moving in other new areas before the new administration arrived in Washington. And I want to pay my public respects to my very able predecessor, Fred Ford, and my colleagues on the Commission who have welcomed me to the FCC with warmth and cooperation.

We have approved an experiment with pay TV, and in New York we are testing the potential of UHF broadcasting. Either or both of these may revolutionize television. Only a foolish prophet would venture to guess the direction they will take, and their effect. But we intend that they shall be explored fully, for they are part of broadcasting's New Frontier.

The questions surrounding pay TV are largely economic. The questions surrounding UHF are largely technological. We are going to give the infant pay TV a chance to prove whether it can offer a useful service; we are going to protect it from those who would strangle it in its crib.

As for UHF, I'm sure you know about our test in the canyons of New York City. We will take every possible positive step to break through the allocations barrier into UHF. We will put this sleeping giant to use and in the years ahead we may have twice as many channels operating in cities where now there are only two or three. We may have a half dozen networks instead of three.

I have told you that I believe in the free enterprise system. I believe that most of television's problems stem from lack of competition. This is the importance of UHF to me: with more channels on the air, we will be able to provide every community with enough stations to offer service to all parts of the public. Programs with a mass market appeal required by mass product advertisers certainly will still be available. But other stations will recognize the need to appeal to more limited markets and to special tastes. In this way, we can all have a much wider range of programs.

Television should thrive on this competition, and the country should benefit from alternative sources of service to the public.

And, Governor Collins, I hope the NAB will benefit from many new members.

Another and perhaps the most important frontier: television will rapidly join the parade into space. International television will be with us soon. No one knows how long it will be until a broadcast from a studio in New York will be viewed in India as well as in Indiana, will be seen in the Congo as it is seen in Chicago. But as surely as we are meeting here today, that day will come—and once again our world will shrink.

What will the people of other countries think of us when they see our western bad men and good men punching each other in the jaw in between the shooting? What will the Latin American or African child learn of America from our great communications industry? We cannot permit television in its present form to be our voice overseas.

There is your challenge to leadership. You must reexamine some fundamentals of your industry. You must open your minds and open your hearts to the limitless horizons of tomorrow.

I can suggest some words that should serve to guide you: "Television and all who participate in it are jointly accountable to the American public for respect for the special needs of children, for community responsibility, for the advancement of education and culture, for the acceptability of the program materials chosen, for decency and decorum in production, and for propriety in advertising. This responsibility cannot be discharged by any given group of programs, but can be discharged only through the highest standards of respect for the American home, applied to every moment of every program presented by television.

"Program materials should enlarge the horizons of the viewer, provide him with wholesome entertainment, afford helpful stimulation, and remind him of the responsibilities which the citizen has toward his society."

These words are not mine. They are yours. They are taken literally from your own television code. They reflect the leadership and aspirations of your own great industry. I urge you to respect them as I do. And I urge you to respect the intelligent and far-sighted leadership of Gov. LeRoy Collins, and to make this meeting a creative act. I urge you at this meeting and, after you leave, back home, at your stations and your networks, to strive ceaselessly to improve your product and to better serve your viewers, the American people.

I hope that we at the FCC will not allow ourselves to become so bogged down in the mountain of papers, hearings, memoranda, orders, and the daily routine that we close our eyes to the wider view of the public interest. And I hope that you broadcasters will not permit yourselves to become so absorbed in the chase for ratings, sales, and profits that you lose this wider view. Now more than ever before in broadcasting's history the times demand the best of all of us.

We need imagination in programing, not sterility; creativity, not imitation; experimentation, not conformity; excellence, not mediocrity. Television is filled with creative, imaginative people. You must strive to set them free.

Television in its young life has had many hours of greatness—its Victory at Sea, its Army-McCarthy hearings, its Peter Pan, its Kraft Theaters, its See It Now, its Project 20, the World Series, its political conventions and campaigns, the Great Debates—and it has had its endless hours of mediocrity and its moments of public disgrace. There are estimates that today the average viewer spends about 200 minutes daily with television, while the average reader spends 38 minutes with magazines and 40 minutes with newspapers. Television has grown faster than a teenager, and now it is time to grow up.

What you gentlemen broadcast through the people's air affects the people's taste, their knowledge, their opinions, their understanding of themselves and of their world. And their future.

The power of instantaneous sight and sound is without precedent in mankind's history. This is an awesome power. It has limitless capabilities for good—and for evil. And it carries with it awesome responsibilities, responsibilities which you and I cannot escape.

In his stirring inaugural address our President said, "And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country."

Ladies and gentlemen, ask not what broadcasting can do for you. Ask what you can do for broadcasting.

I urge you to put the people's airwaves to the service of the people and the cause of freedom. You must help prepare a generation for great decisions. You must help a great Nation fulfill its future.

Do this, and I pledge you our help.

THE RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED TO

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, yesterday the New York Times carried two eloquent expositions on the necessity for governmental frankness and honesty in dealing with the press in our democracy.

One was a fine editorial, the other an article by the Times head of its Washington bureau, Mr. James Reston. I ask unanimous consent that both these items be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1961]

THE RIGHT NOT TO BE LIED TO

The Cuban tragedy has raised a domestic question that is likely to come up again and again until it is solved. The cause may be something that is happening in Laos, in central Africa or in Latin America, but the question remains the same: is a democratic government in an open society such as ours ever justified in deceiving its own people?

In this period of cold war, with its nightmares of hot war just around the corner, there must be secrets kept from the American public in order to preserve them from our adversaries. The Central Intelligence Agency is specifically authorized to "correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government." The existence of the cold war implies secret operations on our side in self-defense against the normal subversive operations of the other side that cannot be revealed, nor would the responsible American press want to reveal them.

But the Government has a duty also. Neither prudence nor ethics can justify any administration in telling the public things that are not so. A year ago this month, when an American plane was shot down over Russia, the State Department said that "there was no deliberate attempt to violate Soviet space and there never has been." This wasn't true. It was not even usefully untrue, for the Russians already held the pilot, Francis Gary Powers, and had secured a confession from him.

The recent Cuban espisode has not been so clear. As has been reported in this and other newspapers, there is no doubt that men were recruited in this country for the projected attack on Cuba. The fact was well known in and around Miami prior to the attack and could not be kept secret from Castro's own spies.

What some leaders of our Government stated in this regard did not square with the facts. If they could not reveal the facts, they would have done better to remain silent. A democracy—our democracy—cannot be lied to. This is one of the factors that make it more precious, more delicate, more difficult and yet essentially stronger than any other form of government in the world.

The basic principle involved is that of confidence. A dictatorship can get along without an informed public opinion. A democracy cannot. Not only is it unethical to deceive one's own public as part of a system of deceiving an adversary government; it is also foolish. Our executive officers and our national legislators are elected on stated days, but actually they must be reelected day by day by popular understanding and support.

This is what is signified by a government by consent.

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1961]

THE PRESIDENT AND THE PRESS—THE OLD DILEMMA

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 9—When President Kennedy invited the newspaper editors and publishers to the White House today his concern was precisely the same as George Washington's complaint against the press 188 years ago this month.

"It is much to be wished," General Washington wrote to the President of the Congress in May of 1777, "that our printers were more discreet in many of their publications. We see in almost every paper * * * accounts transmitted to the enemy of an injurious nature."

The need for discretion is obviously greater today. President Kennedy is engaged in an underground war all over the world. Most of his moves are publicized while his enemies' moves are concealed. The American press has a publish and be damned tradition, highly skeptical of Government power, especially concealed power, and unlike the British press it does not have to worry about a severe libel law or an official secrets act.

THE DISADVANTAGES

Accordingly, the United States clearly operates this kind of dirty-tricks war at a disadvantage, and when things are going badly, as they now are, it is easy to get the whole thing out of perspective.

The Cuban fiasco illustrates the point. This whole operation was not only planned, financed and armed by the Central Intelligence Agency, a branch of the Federal Government, but CIA officials imprisoned the Cuban refugee leaders during the landings and put out misleading information in their name.

When the landings started, American reporters in Miami were told that this was an invasion of around 5,000 men—this for the purpose of creating the impression among the Cuban people that they should rise up to support a sizable invasion force.

When the landing, not of 5,000 but of around 1,000 men, began to get in trouble, however, officials here in Washington put out the story—this time to minimize the defeat in the minds of the American people—that there was no invasion at all, but merely a landing of some 200–400 men to deliver supplies to anti-Castro guerrillas already in Cuba.

Both times the press was debased for the Government's purpose. Both times the Castro government and its Soviet advisers knew from their own agents in the anti-Castro refugee camps and from their own observation on the beaches that these pronouncements were false and silly. And both times the American people were the only ones to be fooled.

It is therefore one thing to ask the press not to publish information about specific

landings or weapons, and another to encourage the press to publish information known by the Government to be false.

Officials here not only encouraged the publication of false information on the Cuban exercise but resented publication of the fact that the CIA actually imprisoned Cuban refugees because the latter didn't like the way the CIA was running the show.

A POOR EXAMPLE

It is unfortunate, in a way, that President Kennedy chose to raise this problem of a free press in a cold war immediately after the Cuban episode. For while it is a serious general problem, Cuba is a poor example. The trouble with the press during the Cuban crisis was not that it said too much, but that it said too little. It knew what was going on ahead of the landing. It knew that the U.S. Government was breaking its treaty commitments and placing the reputation of the United States in the hands of a poorly trained and squabbling band of refugees.

This same press roared with indignation when Britain and France broke their treaty commitments to invade Suez, but it had very little to say about the morality, legality or practicality of the Cuban adventure when there was still time to stop it.

If the press had used its freedom during this period to protest, it might have been influential even in the White House, where, instead, it was being encouraged to put out false information and was actually putting it out.

No doubt the press does have to learn greater restraint than in the days when the United States was an isolated country, but the Government has to do the same. For the truth that makes men free is very often the truth they do not like to hear and also the truth that the Government does not like to see published either.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to announce that I associate myself with the sentiments expressed in the editorial from the New York Times just presented for printing in the RECORD by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

DR. ALBERT BURKE'S ELOQUENT PLEA FOR IMPROVED PUBLIC INFORMATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, Dr. Albert Burke has rapidly become one of the most profound and eloquent commentators on the American scene. Dr. Burke's programs appear Sunday nights on a number of television stations. He is the former dean of graduate studies at Yale University.

His broadcast last Sunday was one of the finest expositions I have seen of the importance at this stage of history of a more honestly and fully informed American public.

I ask unanimous consent that the script of Dr. Burke's broadcast be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORDS AND SURVIVAL

(Transcript of "A Way of Thinking," with Dr. Albert Burke, Sunday, May 7, 1961)

Ling Chen, Chinese fisherman, about to make headlines around the world one night early in 1955. He's lost, and while trying to find his way home, paddles his sampan into a restricted defense area just off the Chinese Nationalist island of Matsu. The sentries on Matsu see him, and they fire a few warning shots over his head to get him out of there. He gets out—fast: and leaves behind a problem. This problem, here in the headlines which told about that incident the next morning. An American Army observer on Matsu saw that incident that night involving a Chinese sampan—but the next morning you read about a fleet of Chinese Communist war junks, carrying many men, sailing to Matsu in an invasion attempt. Those few warning shots are reported here as a night-long battle, during which the invasion was turned back, after the loss of many Communist ships and men.

What you read, and heard, in the news that morning was not true. What you read and heard that morning was managed news—deadly stuff, as we will get into this tonight—on a way of thinking about "Words and Survival."

A very important night in American history. The President of the United States speaks to the Nation in a special telecast to explain where we stand as a science power in the race for space with the Soviet Union. A month earlier, the U.S.S.R. had placed Sputnik I into orbit around the earth, taking man's first step into space. The Nation hadn't been prepared for this Soviet accomplishment, and it was troubled. How far behind Russia were we—if we were? What were we doing to catch up?

Mr. Eisenhower briefed the Nation about what had been done—what was being done—what would be done. It was a reassuring talk, and at no point was it more reassuring than when the President pointed to a kind of pyramid-shaped object several feet tall near his desk, and announced that it was a nose cone which had been recovered from a long-range missile which had come back to the earth's surface after traveling hundreds of miles into outer space. "Here it is," Mr. Eisenhower said, "completely unharmed. Intact. Our scientists and engineers have solved that problem."

That announcement made quite a few of the world's headlines, in a particularly important way. Because it meant that America's space science and technology had made about as important a step toward man's eventual exploration of space, as Soviet science and technology had done in sending Sputnik I into orbit. That announcement meant that we were not far behind the Russians. We were simply working on another part of a big problem. There, in that nose cone next to the President was proof. We had solved the reentry problem. The U.S.S.R. may have been first in putting a satellite in space, but we were first in bringing an object back from space. Now a man could be brought back one day from space. All this was quite clear in Mr. Eisenhower's special telecast that night in November 1957. Few of the Nation's press failed to carry that story—the part of it about the nose cone, at least. The President's facts had been given to him by the Defense Department. It was a good thing to hear. It made everybody feel much better about where we stood in the race for space with a Communist Russia. There was only one thing wrong with that announcement, though. It wasn't true. It was "managed news"—deadly stuff to any free people concerned about staying a free people.

Mr. Eisenhower did not manage that news about the nose cone in that special telecast. He was as much the victim of news that's only partly true as you or I. The fact about that nose cone was that it had come back from outer space into the earth's atmosphere at a speed slower than would have been necessary for what's called an operational long-range missile. At that lower speed, the re-entry problem had not been solved. It has been solved since then. It was not solved at the time of that telecast. You were not given the facts. Which touches the heart of the problem Mr. Kennedy pointed up in several important speeches during the month of April 1961. The gist of his remarks was: "The more I get to know the facts, the more I am convinced that we face the hour of maximum danger in our history—the problem of the survival of our way of life—not so much because of what the Communists are doing to win the future, but because of what we are not willing to do." This is strong talk and it leads to a strong question: the one pointed up in this pamphlet put out by the House Subcommittee on Government Information. According to testimony given before this committee, there are now more than a million Americans in Government who have the right to use this stamp—to keep you from knowing the facts that make this hour what President Kennedy has called America's hour of maximum danger. These are not just facts about how to build a hydrogen bomb, or missile guidance systems, or where our ICBM sites are—not just operational facts which no sensible American would want to know about, or would expect to know about, for obvious security reasons. This stamp is used to keep you from knowing about nonoperational things, which have nothing to do with security—from statistics about peanut production to information about the States over which migratory birds fly every year. From the kind of furniture we put into our military transport planes, to the names of farmers paid not to grow certain foods under one or another agricultural program.

The question pointed up by this pamphlet is: Is it possible that managed news—in which Americans are given only such facts as certain people, or agencies in and out of Government decide they should know—is it possible that managed news can't pass on to the average American citizen the sense of urgency, the sense of danger to our way of life, which leaders in Government from Mr. Kennedy on down know? Can it be that what a free people, in a free society, do not know, can hurt them—and the Nation?

This has been an important question before the Nation, almost from the start, as for example, Thomas Jefferson was concerned about when he asked this man, Philip Freneau, to come to Philadelphia back in 1791. Phillip Freneau played an enormously important but little known part in American history. The part of a critic, through his newspaper, which was called the National Gazette. Jefferson asked Freneau to set up shop in Philadelphia, which was the Nation's Capital at the time, because the young Republic wasn't going well. There were strong pressures in the then United States to have the Republic changed over into a monarchy. Those pressures were particularly strong in Philadelphia, where they were backed by a Federalist newspaper. Freneau was this Nation's first opposition editor. He proved Jefferson's faith that in a free market of ideas, through the competition of ideas, lay the best safeguard for that days' Republic. Freneau's criticism of that day, according to Jefferson saved the Republic. He showed what power a critical press could have in public affairs.

Now, the important thing about that historical incident involving Freneau back in 1791 is that word criticism. Because that word played a very important part in saving this democratic republic at other, earlier hours of maximum danger in our history, when it had a different meaning than it has today. Right at the heart of today's hour of maximum danger for this Nation is the fact that the word "criticize" has practically become a dirty word. To criticize is to condemn, for people who do not know what any good dictionary will point out—that the word has two meanings: the more important of which is to evaluate with knowledge. To judge, with knowledge. To review, with knowledge. To question, with knowledge. To get at the facts, to get at the truth. Although a kind of American history too many of today's Americans have never

learned, the Philip Freneaus and our free press have criticized their way through our hours of maximum danger through wars, national scandals, like Teapot Dome, corruption—from the Boss Tweeds to the Hoffas—to get a better democratic product. There has been no more important word in the history of this Nation. There is no more neglected, unused word in the Nation today.

As it was neglected and unused in that nose cone incident back in 1957, and in this growing problem of managed news in Government right now—by that very special group of Americans with a very special license to exercise a very special responsibility: the license of the first amendment to safeguard the Republic, by that special group, the press. How many members of the press know enough about the new science of rockets and missiles to realize there was something not quite right about the Defense Department's managed news about a solved re-entry problem back in 1957? How many are prepared now to evaluate with knowledge the kind of news that's given out about our space program: about our place in the world as a science power? How many journalists, editors and publishers understand and believe what James Madison said when he welcomed Philip Freneau to Philadelphia as an opposition editor back in 1791, "that a popular government, without popular information or the means to get it, is but a prologue to a farce, a tragedy, or both." How many journalists editors and publishers, particularly those in the 20 States of this country where not a single city or town has an opposition paper, how many know that President Madison's words were never truer, than they are right now? For reasons we will tackle after a short break.

A very few Americans, perhaps numbered in dozens, knew that just outside the Manchurian village of Wan-Pao-Shan the prolog to a tragedy was written the morning of June 27, 1931. The prolog began when on that morning, a man named Nakamura—Captain Nakamura of the Imperial Japanese Army—was shot and killed by a Chinese soldier. That shot wasn't important enough to be mentioned in this Nation's press, that day in 1931. But by 1941 it was very much in our news. Ten years later, because of what had happened to a man there Americans didn't know, in a place they had never heard of—their lives were disrupted. And their world changed permanently. That bullet fired in 1931 touched off the Chinese-Japanese war, which led directly to Pearl Harbor. The line of history from a Japanese Army officer killed in 1931, to 390,000 Americans killed during World War II, was a direct line. This wasn't clear to us before Pearl Harbor. There was every reason to think it would be after World War II.

There was, until something happened again over in China, which made very clear that the lesson starting with Nakamura and running through to World War II, hadn't been learned too well. It happened during what history books now used in Europe describe as the second 10 days that shook the world. What happened was this—on a side street in the city of Chungking, not far from a building in which two men were meeting to decide what may, some day, turn out to be the destroyer, not only of China, but the world. The two men were Chou En-Lai, who is now the Premier of a Communist China, and Chiang Kai-shek.

The reporters covering that conference found what was going on to be heavy stuff, dialectical stuff hard to understand, harder to make understandable for readers over in America. Much harder to explain than this Chinese egg trick, which several foreign correspondents saw a Chinese magician perform on that side street one day while taking a break away from the conference that was to break up, turn into civil war and lead to a Communist China. You can read about what went on between Chou-En-Lai and Chiang Kai-shek during that time, in the few paragraphs that told about this in news reports across this country; but you can read page after page, not paragraphs, but pages of information giving every detail about the Chinese technique of egg standing. This story, about an egg trick almost pushed the story of the meeting between China's Communists and nationalists out of the news. Why? Well. Because as editors and publishers across this nation have been measuring your taste, and judging your interests in the news—they believe you prefer to be amused and entertained by stories about eggs that will stand on an end; rather than informed about a possible line of history reaching from Chungking off in a faraway China to a possible World War III.

That's quite a trick by the way. Try it some time. Try balancing an egg on its end. It's quite a trick but is this the kind of news you prefer? After the lesson of Pearl Harbor, and China and Indochina and Cuba and now Laos?

Because it's only a short step from the people in the press who hold this view of your tastes—and the public's intelligence—to the problem spelled out in this pamphlet about increasing secrecy among people in government who, in many cases, are more afraid of this kind of public than an enemy of these United States. Which is one of the more important reasons why something called "Operation Candor" fell apart back in 1953 soon after Mr. Eisenhower moved into the White House. Mr. Eisenhower came into office with pretty much the same strong desire to put a stop to unnecessary secrecy in government, as Mr. Kennedy had when he took office early in 1961. Back in 1953, Mr. Eisenhower put his White House staff to work for 2 months preparing a detailed carefully worked out report of the facts of life at home, and in the rest of the world. But that report was never made. A strong argument against it was that the kind of public interested in this kind of news would find the truth too unfamiliar—the facts too alarming. It was best not to stir up such people. Things were best left as they were.

Instead of "Operation Candor," letting the people know as much as possible about what was going on, there is this report from the House Subcommittee on Government Information: which tells about Government stopping more and more facts: which explains why so few life-and-death facts are discussed or reported intelligently in the press: which explains why there is no informed, realistic public opinion about such facts—to match President Kennedy's concern about the Nation, in its hour of maximum danger. And at this point, nothing does more to make this the hour of maximum danger for the Nation, than the fact that the public is not informed about the Nation's life-and-death problems. An informed, realistic public opinion was always intended to be the life of this democratic Republic; just as the first amendment to the Constitution was written to insure that there would always be a free press around to keep the public informed.

At which point, it would be very easy to get involved in another egg routine—the chicken and the egg—which comes first? Does the press decide what the public shall know, or does the public decide what the press shall print?

Where do we go from here? First, back to that line of history which reaches from the Wan-Pao-Shans of the world—the Chungkings, Vientianes and Havanas—directly into our futures. Outside a few major cities, and the radio and television networks, most of the press simply isn't prepared to work on that line of history, as it must be worked on if, in our time, we are to survive our hour of maximum danger. There may be as many as 20 out of the 1800 newspapers in the nation this minute, with qualified and capable foreign news editors on their staffs—able to explain how and why the economic and military facts of life have changed for us from the days of Wan-Pao-Shan, to today's Havanas. In 1931, we were a pretty much self-contained nation with a national economy. We did not need the world around us. Today, we are no longer a self-contained nation. We are the center of a free-world, almost international, economy. We depend heavily on the world around us. What the press can't do to make this understandable and clear, our local and national clubs and organizations can: from the Leagues of Women Voters to Rotarians. More than a few such organizations have what amount to study groups to do this now. One I have been working with the past few months tackled this incident, for example, as it happened along the Pakistan-Indian border a few years ago.

The news report simply told about the shooting down of an Indian plane by Pakistani fighter planes: but buried in that incident was an enormously important story that touches directly on some of our most important problems, particularly in Asia, this minute. We have no greater concern in Asia, than preventing the spread of Chinese communist power there. To this end, we have carried out a military assistance program to places like Pakistan, for years. It was some of that kind of power which we put into Pakistani hands, that was involved in shooting down that Indian plane in a way that weakened our China policies. Chinese communist power is not just military, it's also economic-cultural-political. The most important battle for power in Asia since the end of World War II has been the competition between a communist China and India to see which nation could do the quickest and best job of catching up with the 20th century.

In China, economic development is forced by the full power of the state. The needs of the people are kept down to a minimum—and whatever "profits" the Chinese economy produces every year, is plowed right back into new factories, new railroads, new farms and so on.

In India, economic development is planned, but not forced by the full power of the state. Not just all Asia, but Africa and South America, too, have been watching that competition, right into Fidel Castro's plans for economic development in Cuba. Our own future will be affected very much by what results from that competition, which over the years, during which there were poor relations between Pakistan and India, we helped tip against India. To match Pakistan's military power, from us India had to set aside money needed badly for economic development to buy weapons. Our policy to contain China's physical power worked against India's economic power. This is the kind of analytical, interpretive stuff a free people must have if the power to make final decisions in public affairs is to stay in their hands, and for reasons we'll go into in a moment.

An idea that's been kicking around our universities and colleges for the past half century is the theory of least effort which sees all of human history as one long drive by man to find a way to do more work with less effort. From the lever and the wheel as man's first success in doing this—today's automatic computers—theory of least effort has worked: in all ways but one. It hasn't worked where the human brain is concerned. To make today's kind of technical society work, takes more mental effort than ever before—not less.

Which is what makes the topic we've just gone over in this session critical. Americans, running one of the most complicated technical societies in history are not being given information they need to keep it running.

From the long haul of history, if it fails to run into a future with a place in it for our way of life—it won't make much difference whether the Government denied the facts of life and death to the people: or the press failed to inform the people, for whatever reason; or the people simply didn't want to be informed. Because when any people, for any reason, reach that point in their affairs where they can no longer explain themselves, to themselves—they have no future.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, an excellent series of articles has recently begun in the Milwaukee Journal by one of the outstanding reporters in the country, in my judgment, Harry S. Pease. The series is on a subject which has been too sadly neglected by Congress. The subject is that of civil defense. I shall read the first few paragraphs of the first article and indicate to the Senate how directly this series of articles deals with a very important problem:

A great weakness in our diplomatic and military posture—and a great threat to our survival under the American system—lies in our almost total lack of preparation to protect our civil population in a major war.

Few military leaders are willing to be quoted beyond generalities, but they voice specific worries in private conversation. They recognize that ability to withstand attack plays a part in battle as important as the ability to strike the enemy.

And they recognize that the strategy of deterrence hinges on the potential enemies' estimate of how a battle would come out.

Four points deserve to be stated quickly:

Civil defense, like military defense, has an importance for the nation entirely apart from the fortunes of the individuals involved in combat.

Effective civil defense is possible—simply, quickly, and at relatively low cost.

Civil defense is no more cowardly, no more aggressive, no less logical than a combat infantryman's digging a foxhole.

Pitifully little has been accomplished thus far.

DOGGED BY DEFEATISM

If war were to break out tomorrow, for every one of us who died as an inevitable consequence of enemy action, nine of us would die of our own stupidity and our leaders' inertia in instituting a more effective civil defense.

I ask unanimous consent that the three articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 7, 1961]

OUR CAPACITY FOR SURVIVAL IS VITAL TO NATION IN WAR—LAGGING PREPARATION TO PROTECT CIVILIAN POPULATION IN CASE OF A MAJOR CLASH IS VIEWED AS GREAT WEAKNESS; EFFECTIVE CIVIL DEFENSE CONSIDERED FEASIBLE

(By Harry S. Pease)

A great weakness in our diplomatic and military posture—and a great threat to our survival under the American system—lies in our almost total lack of preparation to protect our civil population in a major war.

Few military leaders are willing to be quoted beyond generalities, but they voice specific worries in private conversation. They recognize that ability to withstand attack plays a part in battle as important as the ability to strike the enemy.

And they recognize that the strategy of deterrence hinges on the potential enemies estimate of how a battle would come out.

Four points deserve to be stated quickly:

Civil defense, like military defense, has an importance for the Nation entirely apart from the fortunes of the individuals involved in combat.

Effective civil defense is possible—simply, quickly and at relatively low cost.

Civil defense is no more cowardly, no more aggressive, no less logical than a combat infantryman's digging a foxhole.

Pitifully little has been accomplished thus far.

DOGGED BY DEFEATISM

If war were to break out tomorrow, for every one of us who died as an inevitable consequence of enemy action, nine of us would die of our own stupidity and our leaders' inertia in instituting a more effective civil defense.

This is no place for a catalog of civil defense errors. The whole movement, it seems to many, has proved a magnet for nonsense and a focus for defeatism. Point-by-point refutation of the conflicting and confusing pronouncements that made headlines would be as useless as it is tedious.

CASUALTIES PROCLAIMED

The truth is, however, that our civil defense leaders have vastly overstated the menace of nuclear war and vastly understated the capacity of the country to recover from grievous atomic wounds.

With the enthusiastic cooperation of self-appointed experts on genetics, they have exaggerated the dangers of radioactive fallout beyond all reason.

Annually, after the Operation Alert national civil defense drills, they have announced that everybody involved performed satisfactorily and—in the next breath—that the country would have suffered millions of casualties had this been the real thing. The rest of the year is spent in puzzling over the apathy that keeps people from flocking to the tattered banners of civil defense.

Hopelessness must be dispelled before civil defense is paid more than lipservice, and in this case a realistic view of the shape an atomic war might take is the best antidote.

First, let's review the state of our continental defense as it was mirrored in earlier articles of this series.

We have no defense against the long range missile now, even though we can probably detect it 12 to 30 minutes before it hits us.

Against the superior Russian missile threat, we depend on counterthreat; if they attack us, we will attack them. This might be hard on Russians, but it would not save Americans who were victims of an initial Russian attack.

Against their manned bombers, we can fight effectively—probably well enough to destroy the Soviet air fleet as a combat weapon—as long as the vulnerable electronic machines for communications and control of our defenses are permitted to function.

To these ingredients let reason add a few others.

We are committed as a matter of national policy to let the enemy strike first. That means that he will make final preparations in the calm of peace and attack at a time that suits him. We will fight on his terms under conditions imposed by the outbreak of war.

72 MILLION DEATHS SEEN

There is no credible reason for believing that the threat under which we live will be reduced for at least a decade, and it probably will continue much longer. Even if we achieve some disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union, it will be a step by step affair over a long period. Meanwhile, other nations will acquire nuclear weapons and each may constitute a new problem.

Since the atomic bomb will not just go away, let's consider its effects on the cold war under two different sets of conditions.

First, let us assume a United States like the one we live in today. Estimates of the casualties we might suffer in an attack are little better than imaginings, but let's take the 72 million immediate deaths and injuries suggested by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for an attack by 146 H-bombs.

Second, let's assume a United States that had made modest civil defense preparations that would hold civilian casualties to 15 million.

Suppose you are a Kremlin planner, trying to decide whether or not you have enough to gain in Laos or Cuba or Berlin to justify war with the United States.

Under our first set of conditions, you know that your weapons would hurt this country so badly that it could not recover for 50 years.

Under our second set of conditions, you know that the harm you could do would be less than that suffered by your own country in World War II, and you recovered completely from World War II losses of population and industry within a decade.

The damage your own country received might be the same in either case. Is it not possible that you would choose to fight in the first case but would negotiate in the second one?

Or suppose you are an American diplomat facing some equally delicate international problem.

In the first case, you know that if you talk tough enough to thwart the Russians, you risk final, ultimate destruction of your homeland. In the second case you know that even if war comes, the United States would survive.

In which case would you be most likely to surrender to Russian aggression?

MORE WEAPONS REQUIRED

About a year ago Gen. Laurence S. Kuter, commander in chief of the North American air defense command, told the State civil defense directors' staff college at West Point:

"I suggest another thought which may be simple and direct enough to accept as an axiom:

"As both the free world and communism amass more and more highly destructive weapons, we will enter an era of deterrence because of the assurance of mutual suicide. Obviously, the side which can first produce an effective defense against the other's weapons will enjoy an overwhelming advantage. I mean effective military and civil defense."

The point cannot be overstressed.

A military commander judges his actions by their probable effects on his enemy. An attack capable of imposing Russian conditions on a United States without civil defense would be wholly inadequate if we had the means of protecting ourselves. The Russians would need more weapons, more time to prepare, more manpower.

In short, effective civil defense could force the Russians into the same position that a big boost in American armament could. It could make the enemy pay a higher price for attacking us. It probably could be achieved more quickly and more cheaply than any military defense with an equal potential.

One final point must be made.

The whole purpose of any defense, military or civil, is to protect our people and our way of life. If it fails to do that it is a total failure no matter how much havoc our death throes may cause in some other country halfway around the world.

Offensive military power serves its purpose as long as it frightens the enemy into keeping his finger away from the trigger. But

the moment he overcomes his fear and shoots, our counterattack becomes mere revenge.

Failure of our national leaders to recognize civil defense as a matter of national policy may turn out to be the greatest military defeat we have suffered since World War II. Some further aspects of this question will be considered next.

[From the Milwaukee Journal May 8, 1961]

CIVIL DEFENSE LACKS FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY—VACUUM LEAVES CITIZENS TAKING INDIVIDUAL APPROACH TO SURVIVAL ISSUE; NATIONAL CONTROL WOULD PERMIT PRACTICAL PLANNING; PESSIMISTIC TALK CLOUDS REALITIES

(By Harry S. Pease)

Failure of the Federal Government to accept responsibility for civil defense has limited the protection of civilians to a petty, parochial effort far too weak for the problems it faces.

Leo A. Hoegh, Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization under former President Eisenhower, wrote in the introduction to a pamphlet on the national civil defense plan:

"It (the plan) provides the Federal leadership, direction, coordination and guidance necessary * * *." Not a word is said about responsibility for doing anything.

Most State governments, including Wisconsin's, followed suit with legislation that provides for suggestions to and bossing of local units of government but relieves the higher echelon of responsibility for accomplishment. As a result, civil defense has been reduced in most communities to the flashlight and first aid kit level.

It becomes an intensely personal thing in which each citizen weighs his personal chance of survival, satisfies himself that the Government is not prepared to help him and demonstrates his "good sense" by ignoring civil defense from then on.

Do it yourself civil defense was attempted in Great Britain before World War II. It was as much of a failure there as it has been here. Under the pressures of war, the British learned that national effort was needed.

Even the emotional approach changes under a national program.

The basic purpose of any conceivable war in which our civilians would be involved would be to insure the survival of our Nation and the things it stands for. As a replacement for the current view that "civil defense should guarantee that I don't get hurt," the wider view would permit some practical planning.

NO GUARANTEE POSSIBLE

No civil defense program can guarantee that any given individual will be saved or that all of a given local population will survive.

As far as the Nation is concerned, neither makes any difference. As long as enough people survive somewhere to keep the Nation agoing, the fate of specific individuals does not matter.

To some this attitude may appear cold-blooded totalitarianism. To others it will appear to be simple patriotism, putting country above self in the way that members of the Armed Forces are expected to do.

IMPROVEMENTS FOR ALL

Such a change of emphasis would not reduce the chances of any individual to survive an attack. It would, in fact, improve everybody's chances by giving impetus to programs that have foundered because they were not perfect but only good.

Take, for example, the evacuation of a city in the face of enemy attack. Under the present "save me" system, evacuation has fallen into disrepute.

When you think, as an individual, it is too easy to imagine yourself caught in a traffic jam when the bomb goes off; to imagine that you have driven the car to work and your wife is at home without transportation; to think about the sick who cannot drive or the poor who have no cars at all. Evacuation, you say, is no good.

Suppose the goal were stated forthrightly as the saving of 500,000 out of Milwaukee county's million people. Which 500,000 we save makes no difference as long as we get somebody out.

The people on the outskirts will have a better chance than those caught downtown. So what? As far as the survival of the country is concerned, a resident of South Milwaukee or River Hills is just as good an American as a resident of the fourth ward. A traffic jam makes no difference if somewhere, farther along the street, carloads of Americans are streaming to safety.

Actually everybody would have a better chance than some pessimistic talk might lead you to believe.

Some civil defense officials are fond of multiplying the horrors of atomic war by imagining that a nuclear missile warhead will descend on the city with 15 minutes warning, or none at all. Calm military judgment makes that unlikely.

OTHER INVITING TARGETS

The enemy must take out our strategic air command bases with his first blows if he is to escape savage retaliation. This cannot be a minimum attack; he cannot take a chance on misfires, aiming errors and the other mischances that beset missiles. Our own batting average with attempted satellite launchings is a fair index of missile reliability, and the record reads 38 successes in 72 attempts, for a percentage of .528.

There are other high priority military targets. For example, the SAGE (semiautomatic ground environment) installations at Madison are so important to our antiaircraft defenses that the enemy might well put them ahead of Milwaukee on his list.

Finally, there are a dozen cities more important than ours to the defense effort.

STADIUM EXODUS CITED

Liquid fueled missiles like those the Russians use cannot be fired in quick succession like machinegun bullets. Between the first and second shots from a launching pad, hours or even days may elapse. Chances are that manned bombers could be over the United States before the second salvo of missiles arrived.

Traffic engineers estimate that if cars move as fast getting out of town as they do leaving the stadium parking lots after a capacity ball game, Milwaukee County could be emptied in 8 hours. The 500,000 we set out to save could get away in less than half as long.

There is always a chance that the Russians will miss, and that some who flee the city will be under a bomb that would not have killed them had they stayed home. But the chance of this happening is relatively small for any individual.

This is where calculated risk comes in. Civil defense officials and others in Government are fond of using those words as a substitute for "trusting to luck," but they are meant literally here. We can calculate.

Normally Milwaukee County's million people occupy about 240 square miles, at an average density of roughly 4,500 per square mile. An H-bomb might kill all the people in a 20-square-mile area and substantial numbers beyond. Thus we would expect 90,000 dead in the area of total destruction.

CONDITIONS ARE AVERAGE

Suppose that by means of evacuation we spread out the county population in a semicircle that passes through Sheboygan, Watertown, and Kenosha. This would contain more than 3,800 square miles, even though all of it is within an hour's drive of the county borders. The population density would be cut to less than 300 people per square mile or, by our other standards, 6,000 in the equivalent bomb burst.

Everybody would have 15 times the chance of surviving that he had before he left town.

Of course, these conditions are averages and do not reflect reality exactly. They are intended only to illustrate the point that we improve our chances by spreading out, even though some individuals have the bad luck to retreat in the wrong direction.

In actual fact, the Russians have a better chance of hitting the county than of missing it, so the evacuees would enjoy an even higher percentage in their favor.

CONCENTRATION IS PERIL

There is nothing new in this idea. Ever since World War I soldiers have known that even though it was a lonely feeling, they had a better chance if they stayed 10 to 20 yards apart than if they bunched up where a single artillery shell could kill them all.

No individual gets any guarantee of safety under such a plan, but the Nation gets a guarantee that substantial numbers will survive to carry on.

The bulk of the evacuees would have passed the first hazard—fire and blast from the bomb burst. They would still face the menace of radiation, which will be the subject of the next article.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, May 9, 1961]

RADIATION'S DEADLINESS HAS BEEN OVERSTATED—YOU CAN DEFEND YOURSELF AGAINST THIS HAZARD QUITE EASILY, BUT EXAGGERATION OF ITS SIGNIFICANCE HAS BEEN CHIEF CAUSE OF APATHY ON CIVIL DEFENSE

(By Harry S. Pease)

Radiation can kill you, but you can defend yourself against it quite easily. The roots of despair are hard to trace, but it seems safe to assert that exaggeration of the radiation hazard has contributed more than any other single factor to public apathy about civil defense.

And in the field of radiation protection, the failure of Government to do what is necessary is more complete than anywhere else.

In civil defense literature, radiation is almost always described as deadly or lethal; the area it covers after a single bomb burst is described as hundreds or thousands of square miles. Those figures are carelessly prepared.

First, the area of deadly radiation is outlined by seemingly assuming that everyone in it will stand naked on a pedestal in the middle of an open field for 36 hours.

Second, there are good scientific indications that the amount of radiation many civil defense authorities call certain death is a dose many people could survive.

Bomb tests and the accompanying fallout talk have done their share to confuse the issue, because the basic conditions of peace and war are different.

FOE BLOCKS DECENCY

In peacetime every life is precious and every deformity is a tragedy. Every decent person shares these feelings.

But in a nuclear war this path of decency would be blocked by an enemy whose morals we cannot control. The diseases, the deformities and the deaths will be caused by his action. We are left with only two questions to answer: How can we minimize the ill effects? How seriously will they interfere with our preserving a Nation and a moral system that forbids such violence?

Let's talk a bit about your personal problem with radiation after a nuclear bomb burst. Suppose you have left the city and a bomb has fallen in Milwaukee, Madison or Minneapolis.

DUST THREATENS YOU

If you are far enough away to avoid injury by blast or heat from the bomb burst itself, you probably are far enough away to

escape injury from the radiation that flares at the moment of explosion.

What you have to worry about is the radiation from dust clouds swept up by the bomb and coated with its invisible radioactive debris.

Much of the radiation will be a kind that cannot penetrate a piece of paper. It will do you no harm unless you inhale it or eat it. You can wash it off. A plastic rain outfit and an efficient dust mask would vastly improve your chance to live.

At this point two major failures of civil defense become apparent. There are few meters to tell you where the radiation is, and there are no masks at all.

For at least 5 years Federal civil defense authorities have promised to make a mask available for purchase at a price of $2.50. Only experimental models exist.

COST IS ALMOST $20

Except for a few hundred radiation meters here and there in urban areas, there is no way for the citizen to tell whether he is in a danger zone. What is needed is something everybody can carry—a simple, direct reading instrument that will say whether there is no radiation, a little, a moderate amount, or a lot.

The best that civil defense can suggest is a privately manufactured unit that costs almost $20. Yet any high school boy with a radio tube and a soldering iron can build a good enough instrument for less than $10.

If this reporter is any judge of the public temper, no substantial number of citizens will spend family funds for such equipment when the Government shows no signs of considering it important. The British refused to buy their own gas masks before World War II, so the Government distributed them free at the time of Munich.

DEPENDS ON RADIO

But we left the fugitive citizen somewhere outside of town, possibly with radiation around him. His only information under the existing plan will come from radio—the weatherman will look at his upper air maps and estimate the distance and direction and speed at which the radioactive dust cloud travels.

The farther you are from a bomb burst the more time you will have to protect yourself. Fallout from a Minneapolis bomb could hardly menace Watertown within 4 hours, no matter how hard the upper air winds were blowing. And it would spread in a band so narrow that an hour's drive would carry you clear if you were caught in its path.

TRENCH WILL SHIELD YOU

Suppose you are caught in an area where radiation is so intense that you cannot risk driving at all. Lying down in a simple slit trench will cut your exposure to one-fourth. Getting into a corner of a basement might reduce the radiation that hits you to one-tenth or one-hundredth of what you would get in the open.

If there were a quonset hut covered with 3 feet of earth and with air intakes screened against dust, you could get into it and escape practically all the radiation. The Government has always said, however, that it cannot afford such shelters.

FACT IS IGNORED

It expects you to build your own and conveniently ignores the fact that the people who would need such shelters worst—the urban dwellers—cannot buy land for such construction and probably would not be able to get to any specific location in the countryside in the confusion of a full-scale evacuation anyhow.

Within the target area, such a shelter would be a death trap.

What about long term effects of the inevitable radiation exposure, even if the immediate ones were not fatal?

Herman Kahn, a physicist employed by the Rand Corp. on an Air Force contract to investigate the problems, came up with conclusions that are a comfort to the Nation if not to the individuals who suffer.

EXPECTANCY WOULD DROP

Enough people would die young from leukemia, cancer and other radiation-associated ills to lower the average life expectancy in the country to what it was in our grandfathers' day.

Instead of the 4 percent of children born deformed now, 5 percent would be born with deformities.

The tragedy inherent in these facts cannot be denied. But neither can it be argued that the Nation would cease to exist. It could flourish.

Critics will note that conditions in the relatively open spaces of Wisconsin would tend to produce bands of relative safety between the lanes of fallout, but that in the thickly settled areas of the northeastern United States, fallout patterns would tend to overlap.

This is true, but in terms of the Nation's history, it is not vitally important. Our aim should be to save as many people as possible to win the war and build the new America, and the difficulty of saving Manhattan Island should not deter us from saving an equivalent number of people in the Midwest.

This idea will be further explored in the final article of this sequence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator on his interest in the subject of civil defense. I fully concur in the sentiments he has expressed. It is good to have another ally in the cause of civil defense, which I believe is an integral part of our total defense effort.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator.

THE OLD MOOD AND THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, it is rare indeed that current comment on basic political trends and problems reflects the historians' perspective. Most of us, embroiled in the day-to-day decisions and controversies which characterize the political scene, find it difficult to see the forest for the trees. Occasionally, however, an article is published which, although it deals with contemporary events, seems to be the product of a mind which discriminates between the significant and the insignificant, the temporary and the lasting.

Such an article has been written by Sidney Hyman, author of "The American President," and published in the May issue of the Progressive magazine.

I ask that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OLD MOOD AND THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Sidney Hyman)

When John F. Kennedy took his inaugural oath, he seemed a new Adam at the start of a second creation. No force from the past could shove him where he did not want to walk nor check his step on paths of his own choice. He seemed wholly free to find within himself the means for whatever future he chose to will into being.

The sense of this being so was underlined by the contrasting figure of a gray and worn President Eisenhower who sat nearby. Here, in visual form, was the end of the era that had begun with Franklin D. Roosevelt. There would still be quarrels over the kind of monuments the chief actors merited. But the actors themselves had played out their parts to their curtain lines. In the days ahead, events would be shaped by the new generation Mr. Kennedy led.

So it seemed on Inauguration Day—but no longer.

A paradox has become quite plain since then. On the one side, the personality of Mr. Kennedy is now held in high favor by a great post-election majority of the people. On the other side, the hesitant national response to his program strongly suggests that the Eisenhower Presidency, formally ended on January 20, 1961, has retained an ongoing power to dominate the Nation's political psyche.

President Kennedy and his chief aids are aware of this paradoxical gap between personal popularity and political assent. They are also troubled by it. They have an action-program in mind whose agenda is far more extensive than that so far revealed. Yet they know that even their minimal objectives might be denied to them, unless they succeed first in winning to their own side the political mind of the Nation that remains under the posthumous control of the Eisenhower Presidency.

I know of no modern case like the present one—no case where the Presidency passed in a regular election from the control of one political party to the control of another, yet the vanquished still managed to chain the motions of the victor to a short leash. William Howard Taft, for example, could not do this to his successor, Woodrow Wilson. Wilson could not do it to Warren G. Harding. Herbert Hoover could not do it to Franklin D. Roosevelt, nor could Harry S. Truman do it to Dwight D. Eisenhower. When the predecessor stepped down, the public adhered to the successor and allowed him a fairly wide latitude for action in his early months.

Why should the case between Dwight D. Eisenhower and John F. Kennedy be different?

It is not because Mr. Eisenhower left office at the height of any political success. Affairs at home and abroad were in gross disarray. Nor is it because Mr. Kennedy won only a hairline victory in the popular vote on election day. Woodrow Wilson in 1912 and 1916, and Harry Truman in 1948, were elected with a minority of the total popular vote, yet in no way were they held in check by that fact.

The key to the difference, it seems to me, rises from a complex of things.

The first is that, along with a cultural crisis, the Nation under the Eisenhower Presidency suffered a loss in its power of self-education through the instruments of self-government. Specifically, in the years 1953–60, we grew accustomed to functioning as a state but not as a society. There was a government for, and in some degree, of the people, but not a government by the people. Willful not seeing—an old method by which the human mind corrupts itself—had as its natural consequence an anti-political kind of politics. Rips in the social fabric, economic troubles, decay in institutions of learning, weakness in the Defense Establishment, cracks in the alliance—these were dealt with either by walking away from them entirely, or in ways that compounded existing troubles.

With the White House as the stylesetter, sentimentalism displaced argument. The will to believe displaced proofs. Personal magic displaced the rule of reason. Administration displaced policy purposes.

Heady sensations displaced critical intelligence. The retreat into privacy displaced a life in the public forum. The freedom to act politically, to seek the good of democratic opportunities, seemed limited to the act of hiring a group of managers to manage the people. Good intentions, to be sure, abounded on every side. But even when the best was attempted, either the springs of the transaction were hidden from public view, or the act was announced as an accomplished fact—as if the world itself had arrived at a stage where the people could not be trusted to govern their own interests in it.

To say that this is the legacy of the Eisenhower Presidency is not to say that all would now be easy for Mr. Kennedy if only our constitutional morality was in good health. Even then, in domestic matters, he would be strained to bridge the gap between his own Presidential constituency formed by voters on a nationwide basis and a rival congressional constituency entrenched behind the rural-ridden mechanism of the Congress. Even then, in matters of foreign policy, he would be strained to bridge the gap between the physical ability of the United States to have its way in matters of war and peace, and the ability of other nation-states to deny the United States the objects on which it would exercise its will.

There was a time, perhaps as late as 1945, when the options with respect to the issue of war and peace seemed to reside mainly in the hands of the United States. The political question presenting itself was whether or not we would wish to intervene in, and so decide, a particular case or controversy. This is no longer so. On the one side, our options cannot go beyond those permitted to us by the coalition of nation-states in which we are, of necessity, a member. On the other side, there is arrayed against us the countervailing physical power of the Communist-bloc states, and the intervening political power of the so-called neutralist or uncommitted nation-states. In combination, these elements render obsolete the agreeable notion that if only we choose to act we can, in our own good time, and on our own terms, settle all earthly troubles. The new truth is that we are now only one of many lords of the universe, and in our contests with the other lords, we are in for our own share of profound frustration.

Difficulties of the kind just mentioned would harass the new administration even if it worked in the context of a healthy and vigorous constitutional morality. But the natural difficulties President Kennedy would face are now compounded by the dulling of the Nation's political sensibilities during the Eisenhower years. Indifference, not-seeing, sentimentalism, privacy, noncommitment, and, above all, managerialism still hang like a curtain of brass over the American earth. And the problem Mr. Kennedy faces of stirring things up outside Washington—in order to stir them up inside the legislative order in Washington—is as difficult as trying to breathe through brass.

There can be no criticism of Mr. Kennedy's own efforts to stir things up in case-by-case situations. His inaugural address did honor to the power of human speech. His state of the Union message was the first true inventory in 8 years of where the Nation stood. The 20-odd policy statements he has issued have all been carefully documented and cogently argued. He has restored gallantry to politics, along with some gayety. He has been careful to avoid needless irritations in the conduct of foreign affairs, while making it plain that he will not rattle under pressure.

Within the Executive order proper, he has been, in ways that have been widely reported, a one-man revolution. His appointments have regenerated the human quality of a President's chief aids. He has swept away the clutter of interagency committees piled up by the Eisenhower Presidency. He has, as the Constitution intended, reunited power and responsibility in the person of the President. He has shown himself a master of detail, and a restless searcher for the truth about the things into which a man in his position ought to inquire. In these and in similar ways, he has more than silenced his election-time critics who said that he was not to be trusted with the Presidency because he lacked executive experience. From a purely managerial standpoint, it is doubtful whether he has any equal in the modern history of the Presidency.

If the public sense that this is so accounts for much of Mr. Kennedy's popularity, as I believe it does, one would be warranted in saying something further: To the extent that the basis for the President's popularity sprouts from the same management root of Mr. Eisenhower's own popularity, it affirms the continued dominance of the managerial values that came prominently to the front in the years 1953–60. The Nation, that is, is content and asks for nothing more from a President than that he should seek the possible instead of the good, let the part pass for the whole, manipulate rather than create, make workability the mark of truth, usefulness the test of value, and efficiency the proof of value.

From this follows a cruel argument which threatens to catch the Kennedy administration—and the Nation—in its net. First, the more the Nation is indifferent to the need of self-education by joining in the decisions about its own political affairs, the less is it inclined to join Mr. Kennedy in any kind of purposeful political dialog. The less it is inclined to do that, the more does it force Mr. Kennedy to adhere to the work of management and not to step forward into the realm of creative politics. And the more it does this to him, the less inclined is the Nation to ask why its own direct involvement in the political process is necessary, when Mr. Kennedy is skillfully managing things all by himself.

Can President Kennedy break out of this vicious circle, and lead the Nation out of it with him? His desire to do so is abundantly present. The question is how. Minute factual knowledge, however indispensable to the political process, will not lead the way out of the circle. Nor does the way out lie by way of case-to-case pragmatic judgments, however indispensable these, too, also are to the political process. The way out, if there is one at all, must begin with a restoration of the Nation's political mentality as a whole—with a restoration of its power to interpret the events affecting its interests, to care that a correct interpretation be given to them, and to be ever watchful of how the interpretation agreed upon is carried out by the chief officers of the Government. The way out, in short, is to revitalize American society so that its own political health can restore the health of the American state.

If this is agreed to, then a final thing remains to be said. Perhaps Mr. Kennedy has not exhausted all his Presidential means to reawaken in the Nation a sense of its existence as a community of men sharing a common destiny. Perhaps an updated resort to the device of the fireside chat can win a greater degree of national assent to his purposes, where that assent is now confined primarily to his person. Yet the work of social reawakening in so vast a country as the United States goes beyond the power of any one man, even if that man is the President.

The work of social reawakening is everyone's task. It is the task of every teacher, every magazine and newspaper editor, writer, clergyman, poet, dramatist, novelist, every leader in the economic, scientific, and technological realm of our communal life. All these now stand apart from each other, so that each tends to sound tunelessly like an unattended harp when a draft of wind sweeps across its strings. There must instead be a mutual seeking for one another's spirit; a new conversation where each talks to the other; and by talking, ignites the spark that brings a self-sustaining social flame into being.

All of us in our own way must place ourselves under the injunction of a law Solon once gave to the Athenian people. Peace and order in the community, he said, are goods ardently to be desired. But if there should be a division of opinion among the people about where the best interest of the community lies, then the man who does not take sides in that division shall be punished. For, said Solon, such a man places himself above the human community on a plane reserved for the gods, and thus is guilty of blasphemy.

U.S. POLICY AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, the May 1 issue of the New Leader contains another article—this one by Edward P. Morgan—which also seems to me to reflect an unusually perceptive view of the current scene.

Mr. Morgan has identified the central problem which confronts us in devising policies to govern our relations with the nations of Latin America: How can we stand for social revolution in this hemisphere in the best sense, without communism attached?

I ask that this article may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. POLICY AND SOCIAL REVOLUTION

(By Edward P. Morgan)

The forces of history seem to have a way sometimes of manipulating figures on the current scene with such a dramatic flair that the effect is more like a bad television script than reality. Consider the following sequence:

Two years ago last week, the main attraction at the annual gathering of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington was a beatnik-looking character dressed in a beard and army fatigues. His name was Fidel Castro. He was fighting for the acceptance and support of his 3-month-old revolutionary regime in Cuba. A year ago, the featured speaker at the same ASNE convention was a man fighting for his political future in a crucial primary in West Virginia.

Last week these same two men were back in the same hall, John F. Kennedy in person as President of the United States and Castro, despite the mystery over his actual whereabouts and condition, as a symbol of a widening threat to the peace of the Western Hemisphere. Though one man was present in the trim if somewhat tired flesh and the other was there only in defiant spirit, there was a portentous clash between them.

In a limited sense, Castro, or at least the regime with his name, had already won this first encounter by crushing rebel resistance before the President was able to confirm to the editors that the news was bad. But since there are bound to be future collisions between Washington and Havana, it behooves us to examine the prospects carefully.

The President's brief remarks were widely hailed as a "fighting speech, laying it on the line." Indeed it was and indeed it did. Our restraint against intervention is not inexhaustible. Our other Latin American neighbors have got to get more of a move on to

help us fight the incursions of communism in the Western Hemisphere.

Kennedy finished with a pledge which brought the editors to their feet in a stirring ovation. "As President of the United States," he said, "I am determined upon our system's survival and success, regardless of the cost and regardless of the peril."

These are brave and obviously sincere words. But under what circumstances should we Americans be prepared to intervene and to what ends? I have a very uncomfortable feeling that we have not really thought these questions through, that our basic ambitions are limited to heaving the Communists out of the hemisphere—a man-sized job in itself—and reestablishing a kind of stability that will make travel safe for U.S. tourists and investments safe for U.S. dollars.

If this is our objective, and we intervene on this pretext, however camouflaged the action may be in lofty language, then we deserve to be accused of some latter-day imperialism. Under such conditions, there will be grounds for saying that we have tacitly accepted Khrushchev's concept of dividing the world into spheres of influence—Cuba would lie in our sphere and Laos and Berlin in his.

But if our objective is larger than anti-communism, how much larger is it? "It is clear," the President told the editors, "that the forces of communism are not to be underestimated, in Cuba or anywhere in the world." When one European diplomat heard that, he remarked, "I wish he had added that the forces of social revolution are not to be underestimated either, and that U.S. policy is identified with them."

There, perhaps, is a key to the problem. Events are moving so swiftly that in some cases military opposition to the Communists seems the only way out. However, President Kennedy warned that it should now be clear that traditional military postures—armies prepared to cross borders, missiles poised for flight—are no longer enough. "We intend to reexamine and reorient our forces * * * and our institutions," he said. "We intend to intensify our efforts for a struggle in many ways more difficult than war."

If this statement signifies anything in our relation to the crisis in Latin America, it means that we must stand for social revolution in this hemisphere in the best sense—without communism attached. It is highly doubtful that Congress is prepared to go this far. It is highly doubtful that it would embrace and endorse Castro's expropriation of plantations and making landowners of the peasants, even if the Kremlin had never been heard of in Cuba. Yet if we do not meet the Communists with something better in the dynamics and dynamism of change, we will surely be left behind in the struggle for men's minds.

PREVALENT THEORIES FOR KEEPING THE PEACE—THEIR LIMITATIONS AND CHANCES OF SUCCESS

Mr. MOSS. Madam President, about 3 weeks ago the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] delivered a very penetrating and significant address to the Norwegian Parliament—Storting—sitting in Oslo, Norway.

I believe the address of the Senator from Pennsylvania was of particular significance preceding, as it did, the meeting of the NATO Community in Oslo.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR JOSEPH S. CLARK TO NORWEGIAN PARLIAMENT (STORTING), TOWN HALL, OSLO, NORWAY, APRIL 21, 1961

I

A parliamentarian from an Atlantic Community nation can receive no greater honor than to be asked to speak to the Parliament of a long-time, trusted ally in the community. I am deeply appreciative of the privilege you have conferred on me today and the challenging opportunity to discuss with you a topic of basic, common concern—world peace through world law.

Western parliamentarians are subject to a strange conflict when we speak about advancing the rule of law in the international community. As legislators, especially those of us who are lawyers, we are keenly aware of the essential role of law in the peaceful development of our national and local communities.

As politicians, however, serving at the will of free peoples, we must be conscious of the ever-present pulls of parochialism and nationalism and the widely-held popular view that the cession of any sovereign national right is wrong. This conventional thinking makes it difficult for us to face up to the patent need for a sound legal basis for international relations.

I would like to speak today about some prevalent theories for keeping the peace, their limitations and chances of success: First, certain nonlegal theories; and second, those based on advancing peace through law by means of U.N. Charter review or the creation of new international peace-keeping machinery concomitant with general disarmament. I will conclude with a few suggestions for parliamentary initiative in promoting world peace through world law.

II

A large, and presently dominant, body of opinion in my country holds that the peace and security of the Western World will continue indefinitely to depend, as it does today, on the maintenance of the delicate balance of terror of the armed forces of the East and the West to deter aggressions. Those who place their faith in the balance of power usually fall into two main groupings.

One school believes that war can be prevented by amassing an overwhelming force of mobile, nuclear-powered, intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles, capable of air, land, sea and underwater launching, technically equal or slightly superior to any opponent's or group of opponents' forces and sufficient in destructive power to deter any serious aggression. These strategists, by and large, see little need for maintaining large conventional forces since they feel the massive deterrent power of the West will forestall all open armed aggression by the Communists for fear of triggering an all-out response.

The massive deterrent theory would appear to have several massive flaws. It ignores the unmistakable historic lesson that power balances tend to become imbalances. Weapons breed counterweapons. Military scientific breakthroughs result in intensified new research and development programs which lead, in turn to new breakthroughs and new and more destructive weapons systems. Neither side dares to pause in the race to achieve more effective means of annihilation. Acceptance of the power balance deterrent theory condemns us to an arms race without end which would become ever more consuming and debilitating. The present arms expenditure of all nations, now totally a staggering $100 billion annually, would inevitably double and redouble with the growing complexity of future weaponry. Increasing expenditures for arms would surely prevent adequate assistance of underdeveloped countries and assure the continuation of desperately depressed living standards there.

The possibility of war set off accidentally in response to spurious electronic alarms or intentionally by the mentally deranged or malevolent who may control nuclear weapons, clearly grows with increasing arms preparedness. The military planners usually say that this danger is slight (1) because the latest deployed or tested weapons, such as Polaris submarines and roving railroad-based, solid-fuel Minuteman ICBM's permit a delayed response and an opportunity to check on the authenticity of the warning signals, and (2) because no nuclear attack could be launched without attack signals from two or more responsible sources. The new U.S. Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, does not take this possibility of accidental war so lightly. He stated earlier this month that in the "present state of the art" of electronic and other types of warning system, the United States cannot be "wholly sure of unambiguous warning."

A tacit admission of the weakness of the superpower balance theory is the small but influential faction of military thinkers who believe that thermonuclear war may not be deterrable and who plan and write about waging and winning such a war.

These strategists think that the enemy in such a war will concentrate its fire on our nuclear striking force in order to receive the fewest blows in return, and that we in turn will retaliate, or strike first if we have proof positive that a strike is coming, at the enemy's nuclear firing points. Because of the recognized difficulty of searching out and destroying mobile enemy firing targets, this type of war is expected to last for a considerable period of time until one side or the other reduces the firepower of its opponent below the threshold of endurance. Although the enemy is expected, ironically, to stick to the rules of the game and not fire at unarmed population centers, it is believed that the United States would sustain 30 million casualties in this sort of encounter, even if proposed vast underground shelter systems were constructed.

In addition to the other objections already cited, this strategy, of course, suffers from a fatal internal inconsistency. Far from deterring a potential enemy the preparations necessary to fight such a war, including the movement of people into costly underground cities, would be an open invitation for a first strike by the enemy and if preemption ever became accepted doctrine, the dangers of accidental warfare would increase geometrically. The demoralizing effect of making such preparations and the question of whether any viable government entity would remain to proffer surrender after such a war raise further unanswered questions.

Another school of military thought, sometimes called the combined-deterrent theory, holds that thermonuclear world war would be too destructive for any nation to seriously contemplate launching; that such total war would be deterred more effectively by increasing its terror to the ultimate degree, by improving the accuracy of the means of delivery and by achieving invulnerability of firing points. Old-fashioned, conventional wars and foreign-supported revolutions in limited theaters, these people believe, represent the greatest danger. Without a marked build-up of conventional forces to deter them, small wars will continue and we must be prepared to fight them since they will not be deterred by threat of an all-out response which no state would rationally be expected to make because of its self-destructive effect.

Thus the spread of nuclear weapons to reliable allies is accepted by the combined-deterrent theorists as merely enhancing the deterrence against all-out nuclear war. Likewise the deployment of small tactical atomic weapons and certain incapacitating bacteriological and chemical weapons among Western armies is usually defended as providing a better deterrence against small wars.

Added to the objections alreadys stated to the massive-deterrent view, all of which are applicable here, the combined-deterrent theory (which would clearly involve greatly increased arms expenditures) suffers from other basic defects, and offers little hope as a means of achieving international stability. Deployment of tactical atomic weapons or gasses by one side clearly invites their deployment by the other. Use by one side virtually compels their use by the other, or its allies. Escalation, or use of larger and larger nuclear weapons and more lethal gasses in retaliation, would almost certainly occur.

Those who do not quail at the thought of nuclear weapons in the hands of reliable allies are seldom sanguine when reminded of published intelligence estimates that the Chinese Communists will explode their first nuclear device in the next 2 or 3 years. C. P. Snow, the eminent English scientist-novelist, stated on a recent U.S. lecture tour: "Within at most 6 years, China and several other states will have a stock of nuclear bombs. Within, at the most 10 years, some of these bombs are going off."

Yet another school which thinks in terms of military solutions to international disputes places reliance on arms-controls measures, designed to remove some of the guesswork in the power balance game by permitting control teams from each of the armed camps to inspect part or all of the other's terrain, and verify the types and quantities of weapons at the disposal of the adversary, thus contributing to maintenance of an actual balance of forces at a less advanced, or even a reduced level of armaments. Arms control proposals are sometimes coupled with suggestions for establishing atom-free or arms-free zones in which weapons would be proscribed entirely.

Proponents of arms control generally deride disarmament as a practical solution until major East-West political differences have been settled. They assert that the tensions of the world do not result from the arms race, but from the unresolved political disputes between the free and the Communist worlds. To disarm before settling the quarrels which led us to arm in the first place, they say, is both illogical and dangerous.

Needless to say, many of the objections voiced to the military theories outlined above, such as continuing scientific breakthroughs, cost of maintenance, and accidental war—are fully applicable to arms control measures as well. Such measures, without achieving substantial reduction in arms, eliminate neither the cost nor the threat of the arms race. The intricacy of inspection facilities required to ascertain that arms are kept at agreed, balanced levels, would surely be as great as that proposed in disarmament plans. The Soviets' reluctance to open their society to international monitoring and inspection teams without a general disarmament agreement has been sadly emphasized by the discouraging backtracking by Mr. Tsarapkin at the Geneva test ban talks in the last few weeks.

The argument that political settlement must precede disarmament is as senseless as the argument about the chicken and the egg. It doesn't matter which comes first. Both problems must be attacked without delay. Of course, we must seek solutions to political problems such as Berlin, Laos, the Congo, and the Chinese offshore islands. But we must also seek disarmament under sound and enforcible agreements because the very existence of thermonuclear weapons systems is the source of serious international tensions. As Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, chairman of the Senate Disarmament Subcommittee, has said, "the arms race has taken on a life and a will of its own."

At the other extreme of public opinion on ways to achieve world peace, there are in the United States, in Norway, and elsewhere, respected members of the community who are convinced that war in any form in the nuclear age is unthinkable; that the Western World must lead the rest of the globe away from the holocaust of a third world war by undertaking to disarm unilaterally and to turn our arms resources to humanitarian ends at home and abroad; that if we do disarm in this manner the pressures on the Communist bloc to do likewise will be too great to withstand, and the Soviet and Chinese leaders, it is thought, will have to follow suit.

Without disparaging this point of view in any way, because the good people who favor unilateral disarmament have a noble view of mankind, I fear that human nature, East-West distrust and almost universal habits of thinking in terms of military solutions cannot be eliminated solely by setting a peaceful example. The West is not ready to take actions involving such risks, and if it were, it would take a bold prophet to say the East would follow its lead. But even assuming that the good example were followed and swords were beaten into plowshares, the world would be without any peace-keeping sanctions or enforcement machinery. Any one of the 120 nations, which retained or acquired nuclear weapons, and reverted to aggression against another would have an enormous advantage. Engrained hostilities, such as those entertained by the Arabs and Israelis, and long-held doctrines about the duty to export revolution would have to be cast aside.

I confess to a more Hobbesian view of our species than one which would count on the sudden arrival of the millenium.

III

Common to all of the views discussed so far—those who put their faith in unlimited arms, unilateral disarmament, and controlled power balances, is failure to consider seriously another alternative for achieving peace: The cession of sufficient authority and power to an international organization to allow it to maintain the peace.

And this is hardly a cause for wonder, since our entire orientation since the Middle Ages has been to think of nation-state solutions to international disputes. Even today, as some persons in the older states have come to realize, the illusions and limitations of unfettered national sovereignty, the newly-emergent states of the Southern Hemisphere are gripped with the full fervor of nationalism, just as we were in earlier times.

The sheer magnitude of the problems of establishing genuine international authority to prevent war begets inertia and diffidence about seeking its achievement.

And yet if the alternatives to seeking the rule of law in the international community are as bleak as I have indicated, and time is as short as the scientists predict, seek world law we must, and soon, or we ignore the plain duty history has imposed on this generation of leaders.

Two paths to the goal of world peace through world law have been suggested: To strengthen the United Nations and vest in it the authority and power to prevent war; secondly, to vest such prerogatives in a new international entity.

Reason and experience indicate that every possible method of strengthening the authority of the United Nations by the process of charter review should be exhausted before the formation of a new organization was attempted. With all of its inherent defects, the U.N. has been the best hope for peace we have had in many crises during the last 16 years. A forum where spokesmen of nations, no matter how hostile, can speak out their differences in the calming presence of other national representatives whose tempers are not inflamed, has provided an all-important safety valve for national emotions what might otherwise have exploded on several occasions. The U.N.'s actions in the Congo, with all of the problems that remain, still demonstrate an encouraging evolution of U.N. executive authority under the most trying conditions.

And yet the limitations of U.N. operations under the present charter, drafted before the nuclear age, are equally clear; perhaps more so to the friends of the U.N. than to its opponents. The veto, used almost 100 times since 1946, makes the U.N. totally ineffective in the big power disputes which most endanger peace. Even after the admission of 20 nations last fall, almost a billion persons (one-third of the earth's population) in 30 countries, are still not represented in U.N. councils. The one-vote-per-member rule governing Assembly considerations permits the 50 smallest countries with a total population of less than 200 million to outvote the 49 largest states with 1.5 billion people.

Because my Government had no current, position papers representing the best thinking in the United States on ways to strengthen the United Nations, I submitted a resolution in the Senate last year, sponsored by more than a quarter of the Members of the Senate, including our new President, calling for U.N. Charter review studies at the highest level of our Government and an affirmative position by the United States at the next biennial meeting of the U.N. Committee of the Whole to consider the convening of a charter review conference.

Fortunately, a detailed plan for charter review and revision does exist. In a work of the first importance, Grenville Clark, Esq., and Prof. Louis B. Sohn set forth the results of 9 years of research on this problem in "World Peace Through World Law," published by the Harvard Press in 1958 and since then reprinted and published in a dozen languages.

The Clark-Sohn book comprises a set of precise and interrelated proposals to strengthen the authority of the United Nations to prevent war. At any place at which the question of charter review is approached the book sets forth carefully drawn suggestions for strengthening the powers of the U.N. needed to keep the peace.

The book's basic theme is that genuine peace will not be achieved unless there is an effective system of enforcible world law. Such a system would include (a) clearly stated laws applicable to all nations and persons prohibiting the use of force in international relations; (b) world judicial tribunals to interpret and apply the law, and mediation and conciliation facilities to adjust disputes between states; (c) a permanent world police force, composed of volunteers rather than national contingents, with careful safeguards against subordination to the will of any one nation or group of nations but capable of forestalling or suppressing illegal use of force between any powers; (d) total and complete disarmament by each nation in phased, inspected stages down to the levels needed to maintain internal order under effective international control; (e) a revenue system sufficient to meet current expenditures and the proposed increased expenditures with taxes apportioned among the states on the basis of ability to pay; and (f) expanded authority to channel economic and technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. U.N. membership would be made as nearly universal as possible.

Conversely the increased powers of the U.N. proposed in the Clark-Sohn plan would be limited strictly to matters directly related to the maintenance of peace and all other powers would be reserved expressly to the nations and their peoples.

It is painfully clear that the development within the U.N. framework of world executive, judicial, and legislative machinery capable of preventing war would require numerous, fundamental changes in the structure of the world organization as we now know it.

While the obstacles are enormous and possibly insurmountable, it is interesting to note that both the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recognized officially for the first time in the year 1960, after the summit collapse, the need for fundamental U.N. revision or reinforcement in the event of general disarmament.

On June 2, 1960, the Soviet position put forward at the 10-nation disarmament talks in Geneva, stated that in the final stage of disarmament "measures for preserving peace and security in accordance with the U.N. Charter shall be implemented. States shall undertake to place at the disposal of the Security Council, when necessary, formations from the contingents of police-militia—remaining at the disposal of the states."

The Western position put forward by the United States on June 27, stated that "an international peace force, within the United Nations, shall be progressively established and maintained with agreed personnel strength and armaments sufficient to preserve world peace when general and complete disarmament is achieved."

True, the 10-nation talks broke off in June, and last September, Premier Khrushchev, goaded by reverses in the Congo and the Communists' continuing minority position in the U.N., launched his attack on the Secretary-General and more basically on the U.N.'s slowly evolving executive power to act in time of crisis.

And yet the very virulence of the Soviet attack on the U.N. and the more recent, disappointingly derogatory remarks about the U.N. by President de Gaulle, should invite constructive proposals for betterment of the U.N. by other governments. Let us not be lured into defending a status quo we know to be inadequate merely because of attacks from other quarters.

On the positive side of the ledger, the tentative agreement, subject to an understanding on the number of participants, to resume general disarmament talks next August 1, is encouraging. It is to be hoped that Western leaders will heed the nearly unanimous advise of the scientists and seek Peiping's participation in these talks, since failure to do so would make any disarmament agreement meaningless.

It should also be recalled that the Soviets' last utterance concerning U.N. reinforcement in the event of disarmament, made after the attack on the Secretary-General, did not retreat from their earlier position. The draft resolution submitted by the U.S.S.R. to the first political committee of the 15th General Assembly of the United Nations on October 13, 1960, read, in part, as follows:

"Under conditions of general and complete disarmament the necessary measures shall be adopted, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security, including an undertaking by states to make available to the Security Council, where necessary, units from the contingents of police retained by states for maintaining internal order and insuring the personal security of citizens."

The vagueness and incompleteness of these proposals by both sides is apparent. I am glad to say that the Government of the United States since the change of administrations in January has undertaken as part of its preparations for the resumption of disarmament talks next summer to restudy and refine our objectives for the peace-keeping machinery needed in the event of disarmament.

Surely if there is a key to the achievement of world peace through world law it lies in disarmament. The leaders of East, West, and neutral blocs have expressed their agreement repeatedly that disarmament is the No. 1 problem facing the world today. The representatives of all member states of the United Nations have twice expressed a similar view without dissent.

And yet with all the lipservice given to the need for disarmament to avoid war, distressingly little thought has been given to the obvious need to build up, concomitant with the disarmament process, an international authority capable of maintaining peace under law.

Ideas must come from all quarters where the need for peace through law is understood and appreciated. Surely the citizens of the United States and Russia can claim no monopoly here. Indeed, by virtue of the history of the cold war, proposals from other nations, even though committed to East or West, would be far more apt to provide the basis for agreements acceptable to both sides.

The March 17 communique of the British Commonwealth prime ministers is particularly noteworthy in this regard: "At the appropriate (disarmament) stage, a substantial and adequately armed military force should be established, to prevent aggression and enforce observance of the disarmament agreement; and an international authority should be created, in association with the United Nations to control this force and to insure that it is not used for any purpose inconsistent with the charter."

IV

Western parliamentarians, intimately schooled in the legal foundation of peace in our own communities, bear a heavy responsibility in educating, first ourselves, and then others in the fundamental need for and basis of a sound legal order in the international community.

Is it possible to say today that there is a consensus in the Storting or in the Congress about the probable results of the current nuclear arms race; the need for total and permanent disarmament; the need to strengthen the United Nations authority to prevent war or to establish new international peace-keeping machinery?

I regret to say the answer is negative in each instance as far as the Congress of the United States is concerned.

I leave with you a few suggestions for legislative initiative in this area.

Clearly the first need is for wider understanding of the facts. Two years ago I helped to establish an informal committee called Members of Congress for World Peace Through the Rule of Law. Our group, which has numbered from 15 to 40 Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, meets at irregular intervals to hear speakers, experts in foreign policy planning, disarmament, the U.N. and related fields discuss long-range goals and to question the speakers. Mr. John McCloy, the President's chief disarmament adviser, met with our group yesterday. Ambassador Stevenson will be our guest early next month. Plans to hold such briefings on a more regular and intensive basis are being explored.

I have consulted with some of the new officials at our State Department and other U.N. experts about the reintroduction of the Charter Review resolution referred to earlier, broadened perhaps to authorize top-level executive studies of new international peace-keeping machinery to fit in with staged disarmament plans as well as U.N. revision depending on which is found to be the most hopeful way to proceed. The resolution should be ready for introduction shortly.

At a later date, when our views about world law in a disarmed or disarming world are more advanced, it may become timely to propose by congressional resolution or by encouragement of executive action, the holding of an informal East-West meeting of political scientists to consider the need for a strong international legal authority to prevent war. It seems relevant to recall that a similar informal meeting of nuclear physicists from eight countries at Geneva in the summer of 1958 resulted in the statement of understanding about the feasibility and means of stopping nuclear tests and led to the three-power test ban talks. Such a gathering, free from the rigid offer and counteroffer procedure at formal international gatherings, seems far better adapted to result in productive proposals in largely unexplored fields. This may be the only means, to borrow a phrase used by Prime Minister Macmillan in the United States earlier this month, "for political men to match the successes of scientific men."

In my country the main legislative task is to promote and encourage bold executive leadership in attacking the all-important long-range problems of achieving world peace; to create a legislative climate of opinion sympathetic to such leadership; and to use the forums at our disposal to foster public understanding of the problems and a public demand for their solution.

None of these suggestions or any others designed to promote world peace through enforceable world law may work. The arms race may have gone too far to be reversed. The political scientists lag so far behind the scientists and militarists that they may never be able to catch up by meeting the challenge to devise an acceptable world legal order in the nuclear age. Maintenance of an East-West power balance in an ever accelerating, increasingly more consuming and dangerous arms race may be the best objective of mankind in the future. If so, the sooner we establish that fact the better, because the military effort we will have to make to keep the race in balance in coming years as well as the risks of failure will be stupendous.

But challenges are made to be picked up. Surely the challenge to design and present to the world a legal system of controlled disarmament and international peace-keeping machinery which provides greater security for all than the present uneasy truce based on the balance of terror, is worthy of man's best efforts. There is much common ground to build on here—the common hopes and aspirations of people everywhere for a just and lasting peace.

President Kennedy sounded the call in his inaugural address in these words: "Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations. Let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar beginning with page 2 under "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair) laid before the

Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Fern V. Miller, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wesley H. Petrie, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii;

Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma;

Joseph F. Radigan, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Vermont;

B. Andrew Potter, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Oklahoma; and

Joseph Peter Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio.

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Cato Ellis, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Tennessee; and

John H. Reddy, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee.

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Joseph C. Swidler, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

By Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

William L. Batt, Junior, of Pennsylvania, to be Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with page 2, under "New Reports."

WORLD SCIENCE-PAN PACIFIC EXPOSITION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, of Minnesota, to be U.S. Commissioner for the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition, now known as Century 21 Exposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walworth Barbour to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip W. Bonsal to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Morocco.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of A. S. J. Carnahan to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sierra Leone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert F. Woodward to be the representative of the United States of America to the Ninth Session of the Economic Commission for Latin America of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

FLOOD DAMAGE IN ARKANSAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, over the last weekend northern Arkansas suffered widely scattered flood and tornado damage.

Most severely damaged was the city of Harrison, Ark., one of the most progressive towns in the State, with a population of approximately 6,500 people.

Cabell Phillips, in an article which appeared in the New York Times on Wednesday, has eloquently described the tragedy of Harrison and the reaction of its fine citizens. As he says:

At 3:20 o'clock last Sunday morning, while a tornado-whipped thunderstorm lashed the heavens, a 10-foot wall of water from rain-swollen Crooked Creek roared suddenly through the heart of town killing 3 persons, demolishing 15 homes and wiping out or severely crippling 80 percent of the local business establishments.

It was all over by daylight when the muddy tide had spent its fury. But what the citizens saw when they ventured outdoors left them in a state of shock and despair. A dozen buildings either vanished wholly or collapsed in piles of rubble; merchandise, fixtures, furniture, and crumpled automobiles strewn in tortured drifts against trees, light poles and brick walls; ankle-deep mud on the streets and overlaying the walls and floors of once-tidy shops, churches, and homes.

Today the people in Harrison are facing life again with some return of their accustomed equanimity. For one thing, the sun shone brilliantly in a sky that had remained menacingly black through last night, threatening more rain and possibly tornadoes.

For another, they had tested the therapy of hard work as a cure for despair. The very act of digging out, it seemed, had brought the indispensable ingredient of hope into their lives again. And they had, moreover, the assurance that massive help was on the way.

I ask unanimous consent that this article in its entirety be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD-HIT TOWN IS FIGHTING BACK—HARRISON, ARK., STILL DIGGING OUT, REBOUNDS WITH VIGOR

(By Cabell Phillips)

HARRISON, ARK., May 9.—This pleasant little town in the Ozarks is digging itself out of the mud and debris left behind by one of the worst natural disasters in western Arkansas.

At 3:20 o'clock last Sunday morning, while a tornado-whipped thunderstorm lashed the heavens, a 10-foot wall of water from rain-swollen Crooked Creek roared suddenly through the heart of town killing 3 persons, demolishing 15 homes, and wiping out or severely crippling 80 percent of the local business establishments.

It was all over by daylight when the muddy tide had spent its fury. But what the citizens saw when they ventured outdoors left them in a state of shock and despair. A dozen buildings either vanished wholly or collapsed in piles of rubble; merchandise, fixtures, furniture, and crumpled automobiles strewn in tortured drifts against trees, light poles, and brick walls; ankle-deep mud on the streets and overlaying the walls and floors of once-tidy shops, churches, and homes.

SUN SHINES BRILLIANTLY

Today the people in Harrison are facing life again with some return of their accustomed equanimity. For one thing, the sun shone brilliantly in a sky that had remained menacingly black through last night, threatening more rain and possibly tornadoes.

For another, they had tested the therapy of hard work as a cure for despair. The very act of digging out, it seemed, had brought the indispensable ingredient of hope into their lives again. And they had, moreover, the assurance that massive help was on the way.

Today the town elders sat down with a representative of the Small Business Administration who laid out for them a program of Federal grants and low-interest loans that presumably will cover all the costs that the businessmen, the homeowners, and the municipal authorities of Harrison will need to rehabilitate themselves—$7 million to $10 million. The money will start flowing in about 2 weeks.

FED BY THREE TRIBUTARIES

"I've been saying all along that we wouldn't let this thing whip us," Mayor Deane Hester said pridefully afterward. "Now I know it. We'll make as fast a comeback as any town in the United States. That's the kind of people we are here."

Harrison is ideally situated for just such a disaster as it has now experienced. Its topography resembles a celery bowl, and the town of 6,500 lies in the center of a narrow valley with mountains on all sides.

Crooked Creek, fed by three large tributaries a few miles upstream, flows southward within a block of the town square. The creek has acted up before and there has been some local agitation for years to get a conservation and flood control project going on its watershed. Nothing, however, happened.

Many here thought apprehensively about all of this last weekend when, under almost continuous heavy rain for 3 days, the waters began to rise. On Saturday local civil defense officials issued a warning about high waters, but no one became too alarmed. The warnings were repeated in the early evening and a few businessmen came downtown just, as one of them put it, "to move goods off the lower shelves in case some water came in under the door."

Then at 1:30 o'clock Sunday morning the local fire siren began to wail and the town came suddenly alive—and frightened. One of those was Ben Henley, coproprietor of one of Harrison's largest department stores.

"When my partner and I got here about 2 o'clock," he said yesterday, "water was already up into the street and I knew the levee up by the high school had either given or was about to give away.

"The first thing we did was to stuff some carpeting under the two front doors to keep the seepage out. Then, to be on the safe side, we started moving stuff toward the back and taking clothes off the lower racks."

Standing in the midst of the tumbled filthy chaos that a few hours before had been a neat display of women's blouses and dress goods, he pointed to a rack of men's suits along the wall caked with mud and stuck together in a sodden mass, like autumn leaves in a gutter.

"Suddenly," he went on, "I heard my partner yell for me to come help him with a door. When I looked, I saw a wall of water 4 feet high piled up against the outside of the door. Before I could get to him the show windows and the door all gave way at once.

"It just poured in like Niagara. In not less than 15 minutes, I'd say, the water was 10 feet above the floor—you can see the line on the wall there—and we decided to get the hell out."

There were many other incidents of terror and heroism that happened Sunday night.

SOME HEROES RECALLED

"Those fellows with their boat—Ben Garrison, Harold Holt, and Terry Pillow were among them—were the unsung heroes Sunday night," Mayor Hester recalled today.

"It took a lot of courage and a lot of skill to handle them in that water, what with all the debris and the speed of the current. If it hadn't been for them I hate to think how many deaths we might have had."

Even before the flood had receded the work of cleaning up and rehabilitation had begun. During the day Sunday a large detachment of State police moved in to assist the local police and sheriff. That evening several nearby companies of the National Guard had been mustered into service and rolled into town with their trucks, bulldozers, water purifiers, and mobile communication equipment. Civil defense and Red Cross disaster specialists also arrived.

Flood damage is not insurable. Since many of the business concerns affected here have suffered total loss of their inventories as well in some cases as their buildings and fixtures, the problem of rehabilitation here would be very nearly insuperable, a local banker explained, without such Government aid as is being offered by the Small Business Administration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, on hearing of this disaster, Senator McCLELLAN, Congressmen MILLS and TRIMBLE, and I wired the Governor assuring him our cooperation in obtaining Federal assistance.

I ask unanimous consent that our telegram and the Governor's reply be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 8, 1961.

The Honorable ORVAL FAUBUS,
Governor of Arkansas,
Little Rock, Ark.:

We are distressed to learn of the widespread flood and tornado damage in our State over the weekend. You have our assurance of complete cooperation in obtaining Federal assistance.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senator.
JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
U.S. Senator.
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Member of Congress.
JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
Member of Congress.

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Little Rock, Ark., May 8, 1961.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: Thank you most sincerely for the wire on Monday morning, May 8, signed by you, Senator McCLELLAN, and Congressmen TRIMBLE and MILLS.

Everything that can be done is being done to assist the people in Harrison, Ark., and the victims of other storm-ravaged areas.

I believe these were the worst floods ever to hit some sections of the Ozarks. Not a single county road was passable for any distance on Sunday and Monday of this week. Bridges and culverts were gone, roads were blocked with debris and fallen trees, and in some places holes 8 to 12 feet deep yawned in the roadways. Severe damage was also inflicted on State highways and bridges.

It will take a great deal of Federal assistance to restore the roads to a passable condition. The work of inspection and estimates as to cost is already going forward. The damage also covers areas other than in the second and third districts.

It seems that the sensational news of the flash flood in Harrison and the tornadoes obscured the news of even wider and more extensive damage to roads, bridges, crops, etc.

I know that each of you and all of you collectively can be a great deal of help to us when the requests are lodged with the proper Federal authorities for assistance.

Most sincerely,

ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.

P.S.—One trucker with a milk route in Madison County was unable to pick up and deliver the milk for a single farmer on his route on Sunday, the day following the worst floods. This will give you some idea of the extensive damage to roads and highways.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, as the Governor's reply indicates, the damage was much more widespread than first indicated. He says:

I believe these were the worst floods ever to hit some sections of the Ozarks. Not a single county road in Madison County was passable for any distance on Sunday and Monday of this week. Bridges and culverts were gone, roads were blocked with debris and fallen trees, and in some places holes 8-12 feet deep yawned in the roadways. Severe damage was also inflicted on State highways and bridges.

It seems that the sensational news of the flash flood in Harrison and the tornadoes obscured the news of even wider and more extensive damage to roads, bridges, crops, etc.

We also telegraphed the Honorable Frank B. Ellis, Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of our telegram and his reply be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 8, 1961.

The Honorable FRANK B. ELLIS,
Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Urge your immediate attention to flood and tornado disasters in Arkansas the past few days.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senator.
JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
U.S. Senator.
WILBUR D. MILLS,
Member of Congress.
JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
Member of Congress.

ASHTON, MD., *May 9, 1961.*

The Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate:

In response to your telegram concerning the recent flood and tornado damage in Arkansas, our regional director at Denton, Tex., has been in close contact with State officials. If a request for Federal assistance is made, it will receive our immediate attention.

FRANK B. ELLIS,
Director, OCDM.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have also received a report from the regional office of the OCDM which indicates their prompt response to our request.

I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 9, 1961.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a result of widespread damages to State of Arkansas caused by tornadoes, heavy rain, and flood May 6, 7, and 8, representatives of this office with members of the bureau of public roads and State officials are inspecting damages throughout area. High waters now subsiding and damage information now being evaluated. Weather conditions much improved. Any pertinent information will be forwarded as received. My representative from this agency coordinating our efforts to assist the State is J. B. Gren, located in State Civil Defense Office, Conway, Ark.

LES HOLLAND,
Deputy Regional Director, OCDM.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I wish to express for the record my appreciation of this prompt action on the part of the OCDM.

We also telegraphed the Honorable John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and I ask unanimous consent that this message be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 8, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator,
Small Business Administration,
Washington, D.C.:

Arkansas received widely scattered flooding and tornado damage over the weekend. We urge you to initiate immediate steps looking toward the declaration of the affected areas as disaster areas for small business rehabilitation loans.

J. W. FULBRIGHT, U.S.S.
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, U.S.S.
WILBUR D. MILLS, M.C.
JAMES W. TRIMBLE, M.C.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I also talked with Mr. Horne on the telephone on Monday morning, asking him to look into the situation immediately and specifically to send to Harrison Mr. Chris W. Ferguson, Dallas Regional Director of the Small Business Administration, to set up a field office for the handling of SBA disaster loan applications.

I wish to express my appreciation and commendation to Mr. Horne and his agency for their prompt response. Within a very short time, on the same date, Mr. Horne declared Baxter, Boone, and Marion Counties and all counties adjacent thereto as disaster areas. He promptly dispatched Mr. Ferguson to Harrison and he arrived the following day. I know the citizens of this area are deeply appreciative of this action. Its importance can be demonstrated by the concluding paragraph of the New York Times story which I have inserted in the RECORD. This paragraph reads as follows:

Flood damage is not insurable. Since many of the business concerns affected here have suffered total loss of their inventories as well in some cases as their buildings and fixtures the problem of rehabilitation here would be very nearly insuperable, a local banker explained, without such Government aid as is being offered by the Small Business Administration.

Madam President, these Federal programs for relief of disasters are often underrated. However, when such a disaster occurs, it is a source of comfort and encouragement to those of us representing the affected areas, and particularly to the people residing there, to know that their Federal Government can be responsive to their needs.

Madam President, the disaster at Harrison could have been prevented if the proper flood prevention works had been installed. In 1958, the Corps of Engineers made a survey of the feasibility of constructing such works, but found that, under existing criteria, the project was not economically justified. It has taken a major disaster costing several lives and millions in property damage to prove that this project was needed. Unfortunately, this is another case of closing the barn door after the horse is out.

It is a prime example of the penny-wise, pound-foolish approach which is so often taken toward conservation and resource development problems. Nothing that is done now can bring back the lives that were lost or the property destroyed in this disaster. A major natural disaster is a very irretrievable act. Perhaps this tragedy may serve a useful purpose if it results in focusing additional attention on the pressing need for reevaluation of the outmoded criteria used in project studies.

The Soil Conservation Service recently began a survey of the Crooked Creek area under the small watershed program. Attention could have been given to this watershed much sooner if this had been funded adequately in previous years. The President has asked for additional funds to expedite this program. This is certainly a step in the right direction. Flood losses each year in these small watersheds are consistently far greater than the small sums devoted to the watershed protection programs. Any additional funds for this work would be a sound investment which would pay ample dividends to both the Federal Government and the area concerned.

The small watershed program is also hampered by restrictive benefit-cost criteria. This is particularly true in a hilly area, such as Harrison, where there is a narrow flood plain with steep slopes and narrow valleys. This results in small agricultural benefits, although such terrain is ideally suited for "gully washers" such as the one that struck Harrison. The President has called for a restudy of existing feasibility standards for water projects, and I hope that the problem of the hill areas will be given special consideration.

I understand that the Corps of Engineers will cooperate with the Soil Conservation Service in its study of the Crooked Creek watershed. I hope that there will be complete coordination of effort between these agencies. In order to insure that there is no doubt as to the extent of authority for the Army Engineers to restudy the flood control problems at Harrison, I have asked the Senate Public Works Committee to adopt a resolution specifically authorizing them to do so. This should remove any doubt as to the extent that the Army can go in studying plans to prevent a similar disaster in the future. I feel sure that this committee will take prompt and favorable action on my request.

Madam President, we cannot prevent every natural disaster but we can take prudent steps to minimize the damage from these floods. A more realistic attitude toward water development projects would be one positive way to cut down the all too frequent occurrence of such tragedies. This is the lesson to be learned from Harrison.

THE POLICY OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE APPOINTMENT OF AMBASSADORS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I seldom comment upon newspaper articles which comment on me, but I am compelled to complain today, not about the substance of an article which appeared in the Washington Star, written by Mr. Jack Bell, because the article itself is correct, but with respect to the headline. Headlines persistently try to interpret these matters as if I were engaged in a feud with the administration. The particular story I have in mind is entitled "Fulbright Sharply Raps Kennedy Envoy Policy."

The truth is that there has been a long continuing debate between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the previous administration and, I believe, also with the administration previous to that one, with regard to the policy of the State Department in this regard.

The only thing that distresses me with headlines of several articles on this subject is that they have misinterpreted the substance of the bodies of the articles themselves. This occurred in a most outrageous manner last week, in an article published in the Herald Tribune, with a subhead which read, "Why Fulbright's in a Rage." The article itself has nothing whatever to do with or indicates any rage.

I should like to register a plea with headline writers—not with the reporters who write the stories—to give some credence to the substance of a story itself and try to make the headline more or less in accord with the subject of the article, so as to indicate what is involved in the story itself. The headlines have been quite erroneous.

BRIDGING THE GULF BETWEEN THE RICH AND THE POOR NATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, a report has been issued on the recent visit to India and Pakistan of a mission consisting of three leading bankers from Europe and the United States: Mr. Hermann J. Abs, chairman of the Deutsche Bank of Frankfurt; Sir Oliver Franks, chairman of Lloyds Bank, Ltd., London; and Mr. Allen Sproul, formerly chairman of New York Federal Reserve Bank.

This mission was prompted by a resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) passed by the Senate unanimously on February 19, 1959. The resolution had been cosponsored by the then Senator John F. Kennedy and by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

I think this important report deserves wide consideration, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I should like to take this opportunity to commend the two sponsors of a resolution for initiating this constructive step. In joining in the sponsorship of the resolution, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, and former Ambassador to India, acted with his customary intelligence. This is another example of his continuing contribution to the work of the Senate, and to the building of a better and more effective foreign policy.

There are several features of the report which deserve particular attention. Bear in mind that this was a factfinding mission, consisting not of enthusiastic proponents of foreign aid, but of three hardheaded bankers. These were not men with any particular commitment to foreign aid. They did not make the

trip for the purpose of confirming or verifying any preconceptions. They did not go on the mission for the purpose of justifying a previously established position. They were chosen because of their expertise as financiers, and they made the trip for the purpose of studying economic conditions in these two countries, together with the current and projected development programs in those countries.

What are the facts as they found them? The facts are, as the three bankers state in their report to the International Bank, that in both India and Pakistan there is a vicious circle of low income, low savings, and a continuing low-income trap which cannot be broken effectively without a substantial increase in the flow of capital funds from abroad.

They found that the very modest development plans for India and Pakistan for the next 5 years will require, in addition to very great savings by these two countries, capital funds from abroad in the amount of $8.5 billion. In other words, Mr. President, if the development plans of India and Pakistan for the next 5-year period are to succeed, $8.5 billion must be made available over the 5 years to these two countries from outside sources.

The bankers also report that a substantial portion of this amount will have to take the form of grants, or loans which are not made on strictly commercial terms. Although they do not specify what percentage of the total figure will have to be made available in nonreimbursible grants, it would seem to be implicit in the report that a considerable part of the assistance will have to be made in the form of grants.

The report also states that much of the aid will have to be provided in the form of government-to-government assistance. Resources available through the International Development Association are simply not adequate, even though they will provide a part of the lending which will be required.

It is also implicit in the report that this assistance is vitally necessary not only for the preservation of freedom in these two key countries, but also for the security and progress of the rest of the free world. Even after 5 more years of development, if projected plans meet with complete success, the per capita income in India is expected to rise only from the present $65 a year to about $74 a year.

I think it is fitting, at a time when we are paying so much attention to the question of economic growth in our own country, to reflect on the sobering fact of life in the underdeveloped world expressed by these statistics. It is difficult for Americans to realize what life must be like in a country where the average income of each person is only $65 a year, and where after 5 years of the most concerted and vigorous action, each person's income will have increased by only $9 a year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota be permitted to continue for another 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Iowa.

But even the small increase indicated, Madam President, will represent a substantial gain when compared with the present situation. It is shocking to realize that in 100 of the countries of the world, annual income per person averages only $100 and that in the 10 years between 1950 and 1960 this amount increased by only 1 percent a year. In other words, each person in each of these 100 countries had a net increase of only $1 a year for the entire decade. If this rate of growth continues, annual per capita income in these 100 countries will rise to only $125 by 1970.

Madam President, I find this situation deeply disturbing. When we consider the time it will take for the people of these countries to reach anything approaching a civilized standard of living, we begin to see how easy it would be for unfulfilled rising expectations to lead to rising desperation.

In the decade during which the people of these 100 countries were earning $1 more each year, Mr. President, per capita income in the United States increased by more than $250. The rich have been getting richer, and the poor have been getting relatively poorer.

Various studies have pointed out the alarming implications of this widening gap between the developed and the underdeveloped countries—between the one-quarter of the world's population which is getting richer, and the three-quarters of the world's population which is getting relatively poorer. This is a moral and ethical problem of very serious dimensions. It is a human problem of enormous proportions. But more than that, Mr. President, it is a situation which strikes at the very foundation of peace and security. Indeed the future of mankind may depend upon finding ways by which this rising disparity can be corrected.

In this connection, I wonder whether we appreciate the meaning of the race between India and China with respect to economic growth. In a very real sense, this race symbolizes and represents the struggle between communism and democracy.

The report of the three bankers says that the process of development in India and Pakistan will be quite extended as a result of the low starting point in terms of per capita income. The bankers comment that this process might be accelerated somewhat by forced draft measures which would have the effect of speeding up economic development. But as the report states, this would result at the same time in a grave loss of individual freedom.

Although there is some question about the comparative rates of economic growth in India and China, it would appear that the rate of growth in China has been accelerated by the forced draft measures of communism. But this has led, as we all know, to a loss of freedom for the Chinese people.

India and Pakistan represent the democratic approach to the solution of human problems, and to the pursuit of human happiness. Both governments have rejected the forced draft methods of communism. I consider this one of the most heartening facts of present international life. India, which in terms of population and territorial size is the largest democracy in the world, could be the nation which will determine the future of democracy in Asia and even in the entire world. India has been a target of Russian imperialism for centuries. It remains the prime target of Russian and Chinese Communist imperialism. If India should fall, the future of freedom itself would be in doubt.

The decision of India and Pakistan to choose the free democratic approach to the solution of the problems and governing of their people imposes upon the friends of freedom, and especially upon the United States and its allies, a deep obligation to provide the necessary assistance to enable these countries to achieve satisfactory economic, social, and political progress.

Let me add, parenthetically, that besides development assistance, it is incumbent upon the developed countries to assist India and Pakistan, as well as other underdeveloped countries, in their economic development by the removal of barriers to international commerce. It is a simple fact of international economic life that in order to live, nations must trade. If the developed countries should resist increased trade from the underdeveloped countries, economic development in the underdeveloped countries could be seriously retarded, and greater aid would have to be given to make up for the loss of trade.

At the same time, as the report of the bankers' mission states, this is a mutual obligation and commitment. Not only do India and Pakistan have a commitment to assist each other toward common goals, as was so well represented by the successful conclusion of the agreement on developing the Indus River; there also needs to be a recognition on the part of India and Pakistan, as well as all other developing nations, of the interest which nations providing such assistance must take in the development plans of countries receiving assistance. By this I mean that discussions between aid-giving and aid-receiving governments about the terms of aid, as well as about aid plans and achievements, are a necessary consequence, as the report of the three bankers states, of the democratic process. For this reason, it is to be hoped that the Governments of India and Pakistan will pay close attention to the suggestions for improving projected development plans which are made in the report of the mission.

We are on the threshold, Madam President, of a new dimension in the relations between nations, and in human experience. With so much emphasis on the exploration of outer space, it is easy to lose sight of the great and urgent challenge to mankind to bring hope and

new life on our own planet to the millions of people who are, in a sense, seeing the world for the first time. This requires not only a recognition of their need, and of our moral and human obligation to help them to help themselves, but action by our Nation, together with other economically advanced nations, to provide the necessary assistance before it is too late.

This excellent report by three of the leading bankers of three of the greatest banks in the free world should be studied with great care by every Member of Congress, every official in the Government, and by all our citizens.

With respect to problems of economic development discussed in the report, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article written by the Commissioner General for Economic Affairs of India, the distinguished Indian economist, B. K. Nehru, and published in the April 16, 1961, issue of the New York Times magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD. (See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, in this cogent analysis of the gulf between the rich and the poor nations, Mr. Nehru compares the violence and conflict between nations in the 20th century with the violence and conflict within nations during the 18th and 19th centuries. He points out that inequality of wealth was a principal cause of violence within nations in the 18th and 19th centuries. He suggests that the steps taken to reduce this inequality were directly responsible for reducing the discontent and dissatisfaction which had bred internal revolution. He further points out that it is now the policy of all developed countries to maintain a reasonable level of economic well-being in all sectors of the society.

According to Mr. Nehru, the same situation exists at the present time between nations as existed within nations a century or more ago. In his opinion, inequality of wealth between nations now generates international violence and conflict in much the same manner as did inequality of wealth within nations during the 18th and 19th centuries. It is his view that the have-not rioters of the world, like the have-not rioters of Paris or the have-not chartists of England, consider that poverty is not the will of God, and are aware that there are nations in which poverty has been eliminated by man.

Mr. Nehru says that this situation cannot be allowed to continue. Unless adequate steps are taken to alleviate the great inequality of wealth presently existing between the have and the have-not nations, he expresses the fear that have-not nations will be forced to turn to a form of social, economic, and political organization better suited for a crash program of economic development, with consequent destruction of the liberties of the individual.

Mr. Nehru recognizes the responsibility of the needy nations to help themselves, but he points out that without external assistance, the gap between the rich and poor countries will increase. He also points out that unless adequate assistance is provided, there is a danger that the assistance which has already been given, as well as assistance which might subsequently be given, will come to naught. With adequate assistance, developing nations can remain free, and achieve a greater measure of freedom and independence. Without adequate assistance, there may be no alternative other than a drastic program of economic regimentation and coercion which would violate the basic principles of democracy.

I think Mr. Nehru's analysis deserves thoughtful and serious consideration. The hour is later than we think, and the situation about which he writes is of the utmost urgency. We actually have very little time in which to act, and unless we act soon, we may very well be confronted with an increasingly hostile world organized along lines inimical to our interests as Americans and freedom-loving people.

I also call attention to the very direct relationship between these statements by the bankers' mission and Mr. Nehru and our own interests in the development of the American economic system. It is widely recognized that the increasing competition confronting American business in world markets will be more than offset by the new markets for American products being created by the process of development around the world, provided that there is a sufficiently rapid rate of development.

The advantages for American business resulting from economic development of underdeveloped countries are stated very persuasively, Madam President, in a recent issue of Nation's Business, published by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. This article says that prospects for American business in the less developed countries should improve in the next 10 years.

There is a vital need, according to Nation's Business, for a rapid acceleration of economic growth in the underdeveloped countries. The article states:

> This can only result from international capital transfer on an increasing scale.

As development takes place, according to this statement by the chamber of commerce, the underdeveloped countries will be:

> A growing market for American goods.

I submit, Madam President, that the comments by the bankers' mission report, by Mr. Nehru, and by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce represent a clear and compelling statement of the importance and the urgency of strengthening our program of economic assistance to the underdeveloped nations. There is a striking concensus among leaders in all walks of life, including the leaders of American and European business, that the future of the free world may rest upon the success of the free world in applying to problems between nations some of the same techniques which have produced stability within the more developed countries.

For the good of all the free nations, the more developed as well as the less developed, we as Americans must rise to one of the greatest challenges that has ever faced the human race. This is the challenge presented to one-quarter of the world's population to help the other three-quarters achieve a more tolerable and meaningful life. I have a feeling that we may be judged by history according to our ability to meet this challenge, while at the same time providing the shield of defense against Communist aggression behind which this noble enterprise can be carried forward.

EXHIBIT 1

BANKERS' MISSION TO INDIA AND PAKISTAN, FEBRUARY–MARCH, 1960

(A letter to Mr. Eugene R. Black, president, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, from Mr. Hermann J. Abs, chairman of the Deutsche Bank of Frankfurt; Sir Oliver Franks, chairman of Lloyds Bank Ltd., London; and Mr. Allan Sproul, formerly chairman of New York Federal Reserve Bank)

FOREWORD

(By Eugene R. Black)

In response to my suggestion, three well-known bankers visited Pakistan and India for 6 weeks in February and March of this year to study economic conditions there and acquaint themselves with the current and planned development programs in the two countries. The bankers were Mr. Hermann J. Abs, chairman of the Deutsche Bank of Frankfurt; Sir Oliver Franks, chairman of Lloyds Bank Ltd., London; and Mr. Allan Sproul, formerly chairman of New York Federal Reserve Bank.

In making this suggestion, which was prompted by the terms of a resolution introduced into the U.S. Senate by Senators John F. Kennedy and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, and passed unanimously by that body, I was guided by the conviction that visits by prominent members of the business and financial communities of the industrially developed countries would help to achieve a wider understanding of the problems confronting the less developed areas of the world.

Mr. Abs, Sir Oliver Franks, and Mr. Sproul were not asked to prepare a formal report, nor was a detailed assessment possible in the time available. But they had extensive opportunities during their visit to observe the economic conditions and problems of India and Pakistan, and to discuss with leaders of the two countries the issues involved in carrying out economic development programs. At the end of their visit the three bankers wrote a joint letter to me recording their general impressions; their letter is reproduced on the following pages.

In deciding to publish the letter, with the permission of its authors, I felt that it would make an important contribution to public discussion of the problems of economic development, both in India and Pakistan and in the industrialized countries which have been and expect to be providing assistance for economic development in the sub-continent.

NEW DELHI, INDIA,
March 19, 1960.

MR. EUGENE BLACK,
President, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR MR. BLACK: The proposal that we should visit India and Pakistan was sponsored by you, as President of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and was welcomed by the Governments of India and Pakistan. We accepted the invitation as independent private individuals. We received no terms of reference or instructions either from the International Bank, or from the governments of our own countries. We have, therefore, had to consider what an independent mis-

sion of this kind, with a limited amount of time at its disposal, could most usefully attempt. You told us that we were not expected to submit a formal report: and, indeed, it would have been impossible for us in the course of a month to undertake any detailed assessment of the economic situation and development programs of India and Pakistan. We have concluded that the most useful task which we can set ourselves is to try and form broad general impressions about the problems of development in these two countries. In doing so, we have approached the question of the scale and balance of development plans in qualitative rather than quantitative terms, and we have tried to see how the kind of proposals for development which are at present under consideration in these two countries fit into the broad pattern of what has already been achieved. We hope that the bundle of impressions which we have formed will help toward the understanding of some of the problems of policy which seem to us to confront both the countries which we have visited and those countries and international institutions which are, or may be, concerned with providing finance for development.

Despite the many differences and contrasts between India and Pakistan, the basic economic problem confronting them is the shortage of capital resources in relation to the needs of development. In both countries there is the familiar vicious circle of low income, low savings, and continuing low income, which cannot be broken effectively without an inflow of capital funds from abroad. Both countries are suffering from a serious shortage of foreign exchange, and have been forced to impose strict import licensing. But perhaps the most striking feature of the sub-continent's development problem is its sheer scale: not only are real incomes low, but, with a population of about 500 million—about 90 million in Pakistan and over 400 million in India—the capital resources required to generate even modest increases in real income are very large.

The numbers already involved are large, but in both countries the problem is made much more intractable by the rate of growth of population. While precise information is lacking, it seems that the principal cause of the rapid growth of population is not an increase in the birth rate—the birth rate may be little higher than that in the United States—but a sharp decline in the death rate, which is the result of the provision in recent years of basic medical and sanitation facilities long familiar in more advanced countries. It is true that governments have endorsed programs of education in family planning, though the results of this may not be realized for some time. Moreover, as the populations of both countries achieve a higher degree of literacy, and become more aware of the possibilities of achieving an improved standard of life, the present trend toward smaller families in the urban areas may become more widespread. However, it is impossible to say when a significant fall in the birth rate will occur, and in the meantime both governments are confronted with the task of providing the extra food and other necessities required by increases in population of the order of 18 to 20 percent over the next 10 years, while at the same time struggling to bring about an increase in per capita income.

In visiting India and Pakistan one of our first tasks has been to try and form a judgment about the qualities of character, vigor, and honest endeavor to be found in the two countries. On these questions we have gained a sense of considerable confidence from our discussions with the ministers, officials and private individuals whom we have met. We have also been impressed by the capacity of the senior officials and prominent businessmen in both countries. Nevertheless, once one goes beyond this, managerial talent is scarce and it may prove difficult to carry through decisions effectively in their detailed application to the individual at the level of worker and farmer.

The shortages of foreign exchange, domestic saving and managerial capacity in both public and private sectors have caused both countries to adopt economic planning. Both countries are using the framework of 5-year plans, with Pakistan embarking on its second 5-year plan in July 1960, and India beginning its third 5-year plan in April 1961. In both countries we have tried to review the broad outlines of these plans in the light of earlier experience and present economic policies.

The two sections which follow set out the impressions which we have formed in each of the two countries. The concluding section indicates briefly some more general ideas which we believe to be relevant when considering the problems of development and foreign assistance common to both countries.

PAKISTAN: THE SECOND 5-YEAR PLAN

We began our tour of Pakistan on February 14, and during the following 10 days visited Rawalpindi, Peshawar, Lahore, and Karachi, with brief stopovers at several industrial and hydroelectric projects. We also flew over the Indus irrigation system in west Pakistan. We subsequently made a trip to east Pakistan from March 5 to 8, visiting Dacca, Jessore, and Khulna, where we were shown other industrial installations and given a flying tour over a number of flood-control and irrigation projects. During our visit, we met President Mohammad Ayub Khan and members of his cabinet, most of the senior officials concerned with economic policy in the central and provincial governments, and many private businessmen. In these meetings, we were impressed by the enlightened leadership which the present Government is bringing to bear on the problems of economic policy and development.

With the partition of the Indian subcontinent in 1947, Pakistan emerged as an independent country including both the semiarid regions of Baluchistan, Sindh, and the western Punjab and, separated by more than a thousand miles of Indian territory, the subtropical area of east Bengal. The differences between east and west Pakistan are striking, but both provinces are predominantly agricultural, deficient in industrial materials, and since partition, hemmed in by frontiers which cut across the natural and traditional lines of communication and trade with India. After partition, Pakistan also faced the problem of receiving and integrating into its economy an influx of many million refugees; and the combined problems of physical separation, refugee assimilation, and economic development have created serious difficulties for a country in which there are shortages of skilled manpower stemming from educational deficiencies.

More deep seated has been the problem of the continuing loss of good agricultural land through waterlogging and salinity in west Pakistan. We were told that of about 30 million acres of cultivated land in west Pakistan about 70,000 acres are entirely lost each year and hundreds of thousands of acres are suffering losses in productivity as a result of the inroads of salinity and waterlogging.

Until the present Government came into power, a succession of governments had made only halting progress toward developing a more viable pattern in the economy. In 1955, the Government sought to introduce a more coordinated approach in the form of a first 5-year plan, to cover the period 1955–60, but ministers and officials have told us that the plan failed in a number of important ways. The basic cause of the failure to make progress was the stagnation of agricultural output. This was due to an inadequate recognition of the priority of the agricultural problem, and to the lack of effective action to educate the farmer in improved production techniques, or to provide him with adequate supplies of seed, fertilizers, pesticides, and credit. With food output stationary and population rising, food imports increased and the balance of payments deteriorated. At the same time, an upsurge of private import demand, which fiscal and monetary policy failed to control, led to the foreign exchange crisis of 1957–58.

In 1959, the new Government succeeded in regaining control over the economic situation. Firm action was taken to bring the budget into better balance and to restrain credit. Drastic restrictions on less essential imports effectively halted the decline in reserves, while the introduction of an export bonus scheme somewhat strengthened export incentives. The inflationary trend in prices was checked by price controls, which are being progressively relaxed now that the more fundamental financial measures are proving effective. Nevertheless, the economy remains heavily dependent on foreign aid, not only for supporting development but also for covering current import requirements. But, most important of all, the new Government has succeeded in restoring confidence.

Much has been learned from the failure of the first 5-year plan, and this is reflected in the draft outline of the second 5-year plan which covers the period July 1960 to June 1965. In aggregate terms, the objective of the plan is to achieve a 20-percent increase in national output by 1965. With population expected to increase by about 10 percent during the period, the plan thus envisages an increase in income per head of about 2 percent per annum.

The plan aims to spend about Rs.19,000 million ($4 billion) over the 5 years. Of this Rs.11,500 million is in the public sector, and Rs.7,500 million in the private sector. The general composition of the proposed expenditure is shown below:

Total development expenditure

	Million rupees	Percentage
Agriculture	5,530	28
Industry, fuels, and minerals	4,170	22
Public utilities (transport, communications, power, water supply)	4,450	24
Commercial and residential buildings	2,710	14
Education, health, welfare, etc.	1,640	9
Inventories	500	3
Total	19,000	100

The Government has told us that it expects to be able to finance Rs.11,000 million of this expenditure from domestic resources, while direct private foreign investment is expected to provide about Rs.1,500 million, leaving Rs.6,500 million to be financed by foreign aid in one form or another. In addition to the aid needed to finance the development program itself, the Government estimates that a further Rs.1,500 million will be required to cover the excess of ordinary imports not directly connected with development over export earnings, so that the total external assistance required (excluding Public Law 480 funds) is put at Rs.8,000 million (or $1.7 billion).

The second plan gives first priority to achieving agricultural self-sufficiency by the end of the plan period. Success in achieving this objective is a necessary precondition for the success of the whole plan. This involves supplying the farmer with adequate amounts of fertilizer, improved seed, pesticides, and credit, and ensuring their effective use. Warehousing and marketing arrangements will also have to be improved. If all this is to be done, the Government will have to overcome the extremely difficult problem

of building up an effective organization that will reach down to the individual farmer. Next, the plan proposes to take immediate steps to halt the progressive loss of agricultural output from waterlogging and salinity. Priority will be given to drainage in order to prevent further loss of good land. At the same time, a start will be made on longer term measures, some of which may still be experimental, to reclaim land which has gone out of use. There are also plans to bring new land under cultivation.

These proposals for conserving existing acreage and reclaiming lost land form part of a longer term overall water resources plan designed to make the fullest use of Pakistan's water supplies. This longer term plan includes proposals for the construction of dams, barrages, canals, and tube wells, and will in the aggregate involve large amounts of capital expenditure over a decade or more. In certain instances these schemes form part of multipurpose projects designed also to supply industrial power. A certain number of these large slow-maturing projects are essential to provide for the future growth of the demand for power and to extend irrigation over the wider area required by a growing agricultural population. But there is a risk that too much capital and technical resources can get locked up in these big schemes so that the investment program becomes inflexible. We feel that, in striking a balance between large projects and smaller schemes which yield more immediate returns, this problem of phasing should be kept under constant review.

The pattern of industrial development which the plan proposes is largely directed to the need for supplying the agricultural sector with manufactured equipment and supplies, and providing for the processing of agricultural output such as jute, cotton, and sugarcane. Of equal importance in determining the pattern of industrial development is the chronic shortage of foreign exchange which, as the plan recognizes, must imply concentration on investment in industries which will either save imports or increase export earnings. In consequence, the Government will be forced to exercise a selective control over the establishment of new firms and industries for some time to come, and will hold the power to prevent expansion or enforce contraction in existing industries. The exercise of this power in a country in which administrative talent is spread so thinly obviously presents certain hazards.

A critically important aspect of the second 5-year plan is the problem which it poses for internal financial policy. We were told that, if the plan is to be implemented without undue inflationary pressure, about 25 percent of the projected increase in per capita income will have to be absorbed by saving, public or private. In a country such as Pakistan where real incomes are so low, and much of the increase in income will be widely spread over a population living near subsistence level, this is a formidable task. We were impressed by the determination with which the Minister of Finance is approaching the fiscal problem. We also feel that it is important that the fiscal and monetary authorities should be alert as to the part monetary policy can play in restraining inflationary pressure, and helping to bring about a more economic allocation of investment resources.

The Government is quite clear as to the role which it assigns to public and private enterprise within the plan. Apart from certain social needs which are met in almost all countries by public expenditures, and apart from the qualification that whenever private funds and initiative are not forthcoming in other essential areas the State will have to undertake the investment itself, the Government believes that as much as possible should remain within the private sector. Again, officials have told us that outside the field of public utilities it is Government policy to return to the private sector any publicly owned or operated enterprises as soon as feasible.

To summarize our main impressions: First, the rates of increase in output and per capita income envisaged by the plan are modest. But if they are to be achieved the problem of mobilizing the necessary domestic resources will require strenuous efforts by the Government and continuing austerity for the people of Pakistan. On the assumptions of the plan an increase in external foreign assistance of about 30 percent will also be required for development purposes.

Second, we would like to endorse the priority which the plan gives to increasing agricultural output. We have been impressed by the determination of the Government to achieve this objective. Our only uncertainty is whether the organizational problem of arranging adequate and timely supplies of fertilizer, seed, and credit together with improved marketing arrangements will take longer than the plan envisages.

Third, the emphasis on industries which save imports or increase exports, and are based on local skills and resources, seems to be dictated by the realities of Pakistan's economic circumstances.

Finally, we have been told that, under the administrative procedures which the new Government has introduced, all development expenditure will be reviewed annually, and that each year's budget will only sanction development expenditure to the extent to which resources are available to meet it. We believe that this kind of year-to-year review of the progress of the plan is essential if expenditure is to be adjusted to meet changing economic conditions, and, we feel that we must stress the need for the plan to be so phased that it can be kept flexible.

In making these observations we have not taken into account, indeed it would have been impossible for us to do so, the impact of the Indus waters scheme on Pakistan. We understand that while the scheme is of great importance to both India and Pakistan, the finance planned under the scheme is mainly for works in west Pakistan. It appears to us therefore that when the scheme is being realized it must have a significant impact on the Pakistan economy. It will be of real importance to assess this impact correctly in relation to the second 5-year plan from the point of view of the incomes it will generate among a large labor force and the inevitable calls on technical and professional manpower which will arise even if the works are undertaken by foreign contractors.

INDIA: THE THIRD 5-YEAR PLAN

We arrived in Delhi on the 24th of February and spent the next week in discussions with ministers and officials. Between the 2d and 5th of March we visited Jamshedpur, Rourkela, Maithon, Asansol, Sindri, and Calcutta. After visiting east Pakistan, we returned to Calcutta on the 8th of March, and then left for southern India, visiting Madras, Bangalore, and Mysore. During this time we were able to visit a range of industrial installations, community development projects and other development schemes, and to talk with many officials of state governments and private businessmen. We returned to Delhi on the 12th of March to complete our work. Pressure of time prevented us from visiting Bombay, as originally planned, and we very much regret that we did not have the opportunity of visiting this important center.

The Indian Government just finished the preliminary draft outline of its third 5-year plan, to take effect from the 1st of April 1961. A great deal of work has already been done in bringing the draft plan into a form in which decisions on it can be taken both by Union Ministers and by the state governments, which is necessary under a federal constitution. But, as these decisions are still in the course of being taken, the Indian Government has not been able to do more than explain to us the way in which they were approaching the third plan, and provide us with estimates of the general orders of magnitude in which they were thinking so that we could see broadly how the scale and balance of the plan was taking shape. In these circumstances, we can do no more than discuss the problems of the third plan in rather general terms.

The problems facing those responsible for drawing up the third 5-year plan need to be looked at against the background of experience with the two preceding plans. When India achieved independence in 1947, she was faced not merely with the problems left by the war and the consequences of partition, but with the need to speed up the process of development which would yield higher living standards for a population the bulk of whom were living near subsistence. The economy was largely agricultural, the main industries being the traditional manufacture of cotton and jute textiles, and, while some other industries had grown up in the decades before independence, their rate of expansion had not been strong enough to meet the needs of an increasing population, let alone provide an adequate base for further development.

In 1951 India embarked on its first 5-year plan, although officials have told us that the word "plan" is something of a misnomer since it did little more than pull together various schemes for economic development that had been started by the Central Government and the states in the postwar years. Although the planned increases in investment were relatively small and not entirely fulfilled, unusually good harvests during the last 3 years of the plan contributed to an atmosphere of achievement. The expansion of agricultural output and income not only supported economic growth elsewhere in the economy, but also strengthened the balance of payments position and exerted a strongly stabilizing influence upon the price level.

Perhaps influenced in part by the good fortune attending the first 5-year plan period, the Indian Government raised its sights considerably in developing the second 5-year plan. This called for major increases in investment in agriculture and there was a new emphasis on investment in basic industry and in various resource development projects in the public sector. Partly because the tempo of investment was stepped up so sharply, and partly because of the swing of fortune in the other direction, the second 5-year plan ran into difficulties. Unexpectedly heavy food import requirements appeared as lean years in agriculture succeeded the unusually good harvests during the first 5-year plan; budgetary difficulties generated inflationary pressures; and a burst of private import demand so heavily drained India's foreign exchange resources as to force abrupt cutbacks in the program in 1957. Emergency assistance provided by a number of foreign countries prevented a breakdown of the plan, and with this help the Indian Government has succeeded in carrying the plan ahead on a somewhat reduced scale.

Despite the disruptive effects of the foreign exchange crisis, much of the heavy investment undertaken since 1956 is beginning to bear fruit. Three new steel plants are coming into operation and will shortly increase India's steelmaking capacity from about 2 million tons to 6 million tons. There has also been a substantial growth in industries such as locomotives, vehicles, machine tools, chemicals, and electrical engineering. Agricultural production has been rising, but the rate of increase has lagged considerably behind the growing food requirement of an expanding population. This is partly attributable to unfavorable weather, but also to delays in fertilizer production and various irrigation schemes, and

to difficulties in securing effective action at village level.

In brief summary, India's experience with planning since 1951 has inevitably involved a number of miscalculations from which much seems to have been learned. Despite all the difficulties the basic result of the first and second 5-year plans has been to start the process of development moving at an accelerated pace. The third 5-year plan proposes to take this process one stage further.

The main objectives of the 5-year plan as outlined to us by senior officials are:

(a) to secure during the third plan a rise in national income of at least 5 percent per annum, the pattern of investment being designed also to sustain this rate of growth during subsequent plan periods;

(b) to achieve self-sufficiency in foodgrains, and increase other agricultural production to meet the requirements of industry and exports;

(c) to develop basic industries such as steel, fuel and power and, in particular, machine-building capacity, so that the requirements of further industrialization can be met within a period of 10 years or so mainly from the country's own resources;

(d) to ensure a substantial expansion in employment opportunities; and

(e) to bring about a reduction of inequalities in income and wealth and a more even distribution of economic power.

In framing the plan the Indian Government is faced with a number of exceedingly difficult decisions. On the one hand the Government feels that if it is to achieve the twin objectives of a gradually rising standard of life for the Indian people and reducing their dependence upon foreign aid, a very substantial investment effort is required now. In the mind of the Government the urgency of stepping up the investment effort during the third plan period is further reinforced by the expectation of a substantial growth in population over the next decade. On the other hand, both ministers and officials recognize that the political pressures existing in a democratic society, which has only recently gained independence, impose a definite limit on the sacrifices of immediate consumption to the needs of the future which the Government can ask of its people. Further, even if the community is prepared to accept the maximum sacrifice called for by the Government, there would remain the complex administrative task of actually securing the requisite increases in taxation and saving from a population most of whom are living dangerously close to the subsistence level. This dilemma of choice between present and future needs is particularly acute in the balance-of-payments area where Indian officials are aware of the risk that an excessively high investment level might overtax India's foreign exchange resources, including whatever aid may be supplied by friendly foreign governments, and precipitate another balance-of-payments crisis.

In its present tentative form the plan calls for a very substantial increase of investment from the $13.8 billion now scheduled for the second 5-year plan to $20.9 billion during the third 5-year plan, distributed as follows among the major sectors of the economy:

Investment in the third plan

[In billions]

Economic sector:	
Agriculture and community development	$2.8
Irrigation	1.3
Power	2.0
Village and small industries	0.9
Industry and minerals	4.8
Transport and communications	3.5
Social services	3.4
Inventories	2.1
Total	20.9

This volume of investment is expected to raise per capita income, after allowing for an expected population growth of nearly 50 million, from about $65 to about $74 per annum. Mobilization of the internal financial resources required for an investment program of this magnitude would require an increase in the rate of saving, public and private, from 8 to 12 percent, including substantial increases in taxation. On the balance-of-payments side, over the 5-year period this investment program is expected to open up a gap requiring $6.5 billion in foreign aid. In terms of annual rates, this would imply an increase of nearly 45 percent over the amounts (including drafts upon exchange reserves) utilized by India during the second plan.

Without attempting an overall judgment on the dimensions of the plan, we would like to put forward the following observations:

(a) the targets set by the plan in terms of increasing per capita income and laying the foundations for self-sustaining growth are in themselves relatively modest;

(b) whether the volume of investment projected will reach, fall short of, or overshoot the income and other targets specified depends on certain assumptions with respect to capital-output ratios, which inevitably involve a great deal of guesswork. Quite apart from the statistical difficulties inherent in estimating and applying such capital-output ratios, the unpredictable effect of changing monsoon conditions upon a predominantly agricultural economy introduces into the plan an element of chance which should be realistically assessed both by the Government of India and by the governments from which development assistance is sought;

(c) the plan would unquestionably require sacrifices in the form of increased taxation and savings which present a challenge to the political possibilities and the administrative efficiency of the Indian Government;

(d) the plan calls for a sufficiently large increase in external assistance to require detailed study of the plan by aid-giving governments who have to consider domestic claims upon their resources, and the investment needs of a number of other underdeveloped countries.

On the question of the balance struck by the plan in allocating investment expenditure among the various economic sectors in accordance with relative priorities, we can only put forward some tentative impressions. The principal ones are:

(a) agriculture is stated to have first priority. We have been told that if more could be done for agriculture by diverting additional investment resources to this sector, it would be done. We believe that this should be done if it proves to be appropriate, and we hope that regional and departmental demands upon India's limited resources will not override the order of priorities set by the national interest. In this context we have been impressed during our tour by the extent to which the demand for fertilizer by the farm community appears to have grown. We hope that every effort will be made to find within the plan adequate resources for constructing the fertilizer plants upon which the objective of agricultural self-sufficiency so heavily depends;

(b) the industrial program is solidly founded upon the availability of domestic raw materials and power, and offers extensive scope for providing not only producer's goods, but also the kinds of consumer's goods which an expanding economy will need, while simultaneously saving foreign exchange. We are impressed with the comparative cost advantages India at present holds in producing steel and certain other metal manufactures, both heavy and light.

(c) the industrial program is likely to encounter difficult problems of phasing. For example, the plans for further expansion in steelmaking capacity do not seem to be ambitious when they are set against the present level of imports and the probable growth in the demand for steel. But it will probably be some time before the steel plants which are nearing completion are working at optimum rates, and the desirability of achieving the most efficient utilization of existing capacity needs to be looked at when deciding upon the desirability of expanding capacity further. Again, as an example, the expansion of coking coal output needs to keep pace with the growth in steelmaking capacity and the requirements of the fertilizer industry. Efforts should be made to see that difficulties in expanding coal output do not prove a bottleneck;

(d) both the agricultural and industrial development programs will impose heavy demands upon scarce resources of managerial and technical skills. This is particularly true in the case of agriculture, where the problem of educating more than 50 million farmers in improved cultivation techniques must clearly be approached on a selective basis rather than thinly dispersed over the entire agricultural front.

Public versus private

In framing their development plans, the Indian Government has also faced a serious dilemma of choice between direct public action and reliance on private enterprise. While certain major projects of power and water development are beyond the capacity of private enterprise, it has proved extremely difficult to establish clear-cut dividing lines in other areas in which the relative efficiency of private as against public enterprise still remains to be tested. There has also been some tendency for cutbacks in development planning to fall primarily upon the private sector where relative priorities are less readily identifiable than in the public sector. On the other hand, the prevailing scarcity of all types of manufactured goods has created the risk that Government allocation of exchange credit and other resources to individual private enterprises may confer a virtual monopoly position with the consequent danger of abuse. While recognizing the natural desire of the Government to prevent such abuse, it should be remembered that intervention in the form of extraordinary taxation or price controls designed to protect the general public may sometimes frustrate the normal market process through which high profits in one area attract capital and other resources from other less profitable uses. If the issue of public versus private enterprise has lost some of its sharpness, it is because it has become more widely recognized that both sectors of the economy have their contribution to make.

The pattern of industrial development in India has been primarily conditioned by the shortage of foreign exchange, and the consequent necessity of giving priority to industrial projects which either earn or save foreign exchange. In this stage of economic development, it is perhaps natural that import saving projects can be more easily defined and incorporated into policy than export projects for which markets still have to be found. On the import saving side, much progress is being made. In a number of important instances, moreover, import saving possibilities have coincided with major opportunities of exploiting rich natural resources in the way of iron and coal. India is now among the cheapest steel producers in the world.

The emphasis given in the program of industrial development to import savings by no means implies, however, that the import requirements of India will necessarily follow a declining trend over the next 5, 10, or 15 years. On the contrary, it is likely that, as the Indian economy moves toward progressively higher stages of development, new types of imports required to sustain this progress will outweigh the economies

achieved in other areas. The greater the pressure for rapid industrialization and general economic development, the greater the likelihood that there may be a progressive racheting upward of import requirements. This further underlines the necessity of giving high priority to the investment of effort, money, and talent in the export field where the development of markets often takes a considerable time. But, in fact, India's exports have tended to stagnate in recent years and we have found no firm basis for confidence that export performance will materially improve in the near future. It is beginning to be realized that India's export base must be extended well beyond the traditional export items if sustainable economic development is to be realized. But an adequate export effort will require not simply export incentives for specific items in which India holds a comparative advantage in the world markets, but the creation of a state of export-mindedness.

The achievement of a substantial increase in exports will depend, too, on securing an appropriate degree of control over domestic consumption. For years to come the Indian Government will be constantly confronted with the harsh decision of choosing between consumption and export earnings. Perhaps the most basic policy decisions involved in such a choice between exports and consumption are those of fiscal and monetary policy. It is clear that inadequate coverage of Government spending by taxation or savings can generate inflationary pressures which may be restrained by import controls from directly using up scarce exchange resources but may nevertheless indirectly impair reserve availabilities by diverting potential exports to domestic consumption. Quite aside from this basic consideration, it may well be that selective tax measures will be required to restrain domestic consumption of specific export items for which foreign markets are available.

Monetary policy is also relevant to the choice between consumption on the one hand and exports and investment on the other, and clearly has a useful role to play in restraining any buildup of inflationary pressure. In this connection, there would appear to be some scope for mopping up excess liquidity still remaining in the Indian economy, and for a consideration of the appropriateness of the present level of interest rates. It may be that the relatively low rates prevailing create an illusion that capital is not actually a scarce resource. In general, we feel that it would be worth examining ways in which monetary action might be made a more effective weapon of economic policy.

In seeking to summarize our impressions of key aspects and problems of the plan, we should be inclined to stress the following:

(a) Our impression in talking to officials is that a good deal has been learned both about techniques of planning and techniques of economic control from the difficulties encountered during the second plan.

(b) The need for effort to insure success in agricultural policy cannot be overstressed, and we have found it difficult to be certain whether the implications of this have been fully realized in all quarters: success will involve not merely effective management and administration over a very wide area, but the coordination of the activities of a number of Government departments working in conjunction with voluntary organizations, and perhaps most important of all insuring that the overall policy of the Union Government is effectively implemented by the individual states with whom the executive responsibility for agricultural policy rests.

(c) If inflationary pressure develops as the program moves ahead, fiscal and monetary action will need to be prompt and decisive.

(d) A strenuous effort should be made to diversify the export base and enter foreign markets.

(e) Without passing judgment on the precise scale of the plan we would suggest that during the process of finalizing the plan it would be desirable to reexamine the importance of the marginal projects. To all appearances the plan is a big plan, and it can be made more manageable by the omission of some projects the need for which is less immediate. This in our view would be worth doing.

Finally, we have tried to assess the extent to which the third 5-year plan will be flexible; that is, the extent to which it can be modified year by year to meet short run changes in the economic situation. Officials have told us that they are working out a detailed phasing of the plan designed to allow the necessary room to maneuver; and that they are thinking in terms of different plan variants which may be adopted to meet different circumstances; and that in terms of the allocation of foreign exchange they are trying to form a view about the relative priorities which will allow a hard core of essential industrial projects to go ahead, even if others have to be held back. We consider the maintenance of such flexibility critically important to the success of the plan and to the effective utilization of such foreign assistance as may be made available to India.

Some problems of foreign assistance

The development programs of India and Pakistan discussed above can only be made effective if a very substantial increase in foreign assistance above the amounts provided during the course of the Pakistan first 5-year plan and the Indian second 5-year plan is forthcoming. The rough breakdown of figures of economic assistance both public and private required by India and Pakistan for their forthcoming 5-year plan periods is as follows:

[In billions]

Development Imports:	
India	$4.0
Pakistan	1.4
Balance of payment support (including foreign debt service):	
India	1.5
Pakistan	0.3
Total	7.2
Aid in food supply (in particular Public Law 480):	
India	1.1
Pakistan	0.2
Total	1.3
Grand total (for 5 years)	8.5

The decision as to how much aid should be provided is a matter for governments, and an independent mission of private individuals cannot be expected to give a judgment on matters of this kind. There are, however, a number of general questions concerning the scale, character and organization of aid to which we feel we should draw attention.

The problems of the development of India and Pakistan cannot be approached in terms of a Marshall plan concept embodying a fixed period of foreign aid assistance to highly developed industrial countries and designed to reach more or less visible targets of economic recovery. The fact that average per capita income in India and Pakistan is so low will inevitably mean that development will be a lengthy process possibly extending over a considerable period of time. It is possible that this process might be accelerated somewhat by political measures designed to operate the economy under forced draft with consequent grave loss of individual freedom. Both governments have rejected this approach, but we recognize that this decision renders both countries more heavily dependent upon outside assistance than would otherwise be the case.

If the assistance required were made available entirely in the form of long or short loans on normal commercial terms, the resulting debt service liabilities would almost certainly impose an intolerable strain on the Indian and Pakistani balance of payments. This means that a substantial proportion of any aid provided would have to take the form of grants or loans not made on strictly commercial terms. The proposed International Development Association represents a recognition by governments of the need for this kind of assistance to developing countries, but the IDA is still in process of being established and its resources will be too small for it to play more than a minor role in providing external resources for India and Pakistan during the next 5 years. This means that if aid is provided on a considerable scale, a substantial proportion of this aid would have to take the form of government-to-government assistance of one kind or another on liberal terms.

It is expected that a considerable number of governments will participate in providing assistance for India and Pakistan, and this is likely to involve ultimately bilateral agreements between each of the aid-giving and aid-receiving countries. It will be of the first importance therefore to insure that the policy of the aid-providing governments with respect to the scale, form and terms of the assistance provided should be adequately coordinated. Otherwise there is liable to be a waste of resources and effort and unnecessary international friction. In the context of bilateral aid extended by a considerable number of governments, a reasonable measure of coordination should make possible the provision of aid which is not tied to the exports of a particular country. Multilateral aid of this kind provides the best way of getting the greatest benefit from a given volume of aid.

Foreign assistance on anything like this scale would create problems and responsibilities for both the countries providing and the countries receiving aid. It is the responsibility of the country providing aid to recognize the national sovereignty and aspirations of the countries that they are assisting. On the other hand, countries receiving aid must recognize that the governments of the aid-providing countries must satisfy their legislatures, and that legislatures will require to be assured that the aid-receiving countries' methods of handling their economic policies are realistic and that aid provided is spent on the purposes contemplated by the aid-providing countries. It would be natural for the aid-providing countries to pay particular attention to the determination which the aid-receiving countries show in pursuing such tasks as growing enough food to meet their needs and expanding exports. The necessity for discussions between aid-giving and aid-receiving governments which this implies must be accepted as a necessary consequence of the democratic process.

Now that postwar reconstruction has been completed and substantial progress has been made in restoring a measure of international equilibrium, a beginning has been made with the problem of providing assistance for the economic development of less advanced countries. This beginning has largely taken the form of the provision by the Government of the United States of funds to meet particular needs, together with relatively smaller measures of assistance by the United Kingdom and other governments. The growing aspirations of developing countries and their desire to undertake larger scale development are becoming increasingly evident and seem to demand a broader basis of aid embracing a larger number of aid-giving countries. This is likely to pose major problems for international economic policy in the years ahead.

Governments such as those of India and Pakistan when formulating their develop-

ment plans would naturally wish to have some assurance about the foreign aid that will be forthcoming over the periods of the plans. The governments of aid-giving countries for constitutional reasons are not in a position to appropriate expenditure for more than 1 year. We draw attention to this problem because of the genuine difficulties it creates both for those who receive and those who give aid.

There is another point to which we should refer. Both India and Pakistan face the risk of crop failures from time to time. Over the period of the forthcoming plans it cannot be expected that either country's foreign exchange resources will be large enough to finance imports of food on the scale which would be necessary. In recent years, the U.S. Government has made food supplies available under Public Law 480 to meet these needs. Should such crises recur, additional foreign assistance in some form over and above such support as may have been given to development plans, would be required if economic progress is not to be completely checked.

Private investment

The role of private investment as a source of assistance for development must not be forgotten or underestimated although its immediate impact is not likely to be large. It is important that the governments of countries seeking aid should recognize that the flow of private long-term funds is one of the sources of investment finance which more developed countries wish to foster and that if they are to use the potential sources of aid to the full they will need to create conditions which will attract private capital from abroad. Private foreign investors on the other hand should be prepared to accept that the Indian and Pakistani balance of payments difficulties imply that these countries can in general only accept private foreign investment of a kind that will either be import saving or export earning. An increased flow of private foreign investment will also depend upon the willingness of the capital-supplying countries to foster such an outflow of private funds. We are the more concerned to stress the importance of private capital from abroad because, as the economic structures of those two countries is brought nearer to viability with the help of government to government assistance, it should be possible to substitute the ordinary flow of private investment for the more exceptional forms of aid.

The more highly industrial countries can further assist the course of development by removing the kind of barriers which restrict the export opportunities of developing countries. The process of development, and the growth of new areas of industry which it brings with it, must inevitably exert a profound influence on the whole pattern of international trade. If countries with longer established manufacturing industries resist this process of change by maintaining barriers to the free flow of trade, the pace of development will be retarded, and more aid will be required.

We should also emphasize the need for economic cooperation between the developing countries themselves. We have been impressed by the disruptive impact of partition upon the economies of India and Pakistan. While considerable progress has been made in cooperation between the two countries, we would like to emphasize the need for policies which would promote further cooperation and foster trade of a complementary character, and reduce the danger of economic separatism. The trend of the times not only in Western Europe but elsewhere in the world is strongly oriented toward international economic cooperation. Here on the subcontinent similar opportunities for cooperative efforts in the field of trade and exploitation of natural resources exist. It is obvious that such economic cooperation between India and Pakistan is not only to the advantage of both countries but also to the capital supplying nations of the Atlantic Community.

Finally, whatever may be the final program developed by the two countries both Governments need to bear in mind that there can be no assurance that the governments of the more highly industrialized countries will be in the position to provide aid over the period of the plans to the full amount requested. This underlines the necessity to establish flexibility in both plans so that cutbacks in expenditures of lower priority can be made without disrupting the whole plans.

Before concluding, we should like to express our thanks to the Governments of India and Pakistan for the courtesy and hospitality with which they have received us. We are grateful for the opportunities which we have been given to see something of the progress of development in India and Pakistan, and we have been greatly helped toward better understanding of the problems confronting these two countries by the full and free discussions which we have had with Ministers, officials, and private individuals. We were given every assistance in accomplishing the purpose of our mission, and we would like to thank all those who have contributed to this end.

Yours sincerely,

HERMANN J. ABS.
OLIVER FRANKS.
ALLAN SPROUL.

EXHIBIT 2

$2,700 A YEAR OR $70 A YEAR

(By B. K. Nehru)

One of the most disquieting features of international society today is the continuous state of unrest that prevails over large parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America. We seem to move from crisis to crisis, with the Security Council of the United Nations in almost permanent session. As soon as a measure of stability is achieved in one part of the world, a new conflict erupts somewhere else; and about the only thing one can predict with some certainty is that there are many more crises brewing which have not yet got to the stage of catching the headlines.

Complex and bewildering as the crises of our times appear to us, however, they are not without a parallel in human history—and comparatievly recent history, at that. And the gratifying part about the historical experience I have in mind is that it points to the only permanent remedy for our present-day ferment of discontent.

I venture to suggest that the violent upheavals in many parts of the world today are but an international version of the conflicts that raged within the nation-states of Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries. If the nation-states of Europe have not collapsed under the pressure of internal conflicts among different classes, but have emerged instead as dynamic and harmonious societies, it is as a result of certain definite policies adopted to bridge the difference between group and group. It is precisely the kind of measures which saved the nations of Europe from erosion from within that are required today, on an international level, for the preservation and strengthening of international society.

The American people have long considered, and rightly, that their own revolution found a natural echo in many lands for many years to come. "The shot heard round the world" was followed a few years later by the storming of the Bastille. For a hundred years thereafter and more the states of Europe, when they were not at war with each other, were engaged in dealing with revolution at home, opposing to it sometimes the organized force of the state, and attempting at other times to deal in a more sophisticated manner with the causes of the revolutionary outbreaks from which they suffered.

Why was it that the people of France revolted in 1789? Why were there revolutions, uprisings, and widespread national unrest in 1830 and in 1848 in France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Hungary, and Poland? Why was even the mature and stable society of Great Britain rocked to its foundations by popular agitation? What was the genesis of Nihilism in Russia, the St. Petersburg uprising in 1905, the bread riots which followed, and, finally, the holocaust of the October Revolution?

The human race is not prone to indulge in disorder for its own sake; if there is a history of continuous disorder, it is obvious that the people occupied with it lack something which they regard as more valuable than the maintenance of the regime, of the law under which they live. All the European revolutions, and the disorders which did not reach the stage of revolutionary violence, can be traced to the frustration of two of the most fundamental desires of man: the desire for liberty and the desire for bread.

The European system of the time concentrated political power in the hands of a hereditary monarchy tempered sometimes by a hereditary nobility. As almost invariably happens, this political power was exercised for the benefit of those who wielded it, while those outside the pale suffered the consequences. One of the consequences was an extreme inequality in the distribution of wealth; so much so that in countries not lacking in production there were large segments in society which could not earn enough to live a life that could by any standards be regarded as human.

The system was unjust; but it had prevailed with little change for centuries. Why was it that at this particular period of history large masses of people in Europe became so dissatisfied with it that they were willing to shatter to bits old institutions hallowed by tradition at great material cost to themselves?

There was, of course, the force of ideas, for it is ideas that guide the action of those who wield the arms. The philosophers and the men of the age of reason had preached the virtues of liberty and equality. And it was these ideas, born of the meditations of secluded philosophers, that filtered down ultimately to the illiterate and "swinish multitude," "the great unwashed," and made them resolve to rebuild the system under which they lived.

But the intellectual acceptance of ideas does not provide a sufficient motive force for those great earthquakes of humanity which are known as revolutions. Nor does emptiness of the human stomach—a very powerful force indeed—explain why revolutionary forces erupted at the time they did in Europe. The poor had, of course, always been poor since the dawn of history. But the poor had been in good company for, apart from a very small handful of those who lived somewhat better, the entire mass of humanity had been poor.

It was during the late 18th and 19th centuries, when the winds of technical change began to sweep across Europe, that this began to be no longer true. The wealth created by trade and commerce, and later by the industrial revolution, had been substantial. The rich had become very much richer and were using their wealth for luxury and ostentation and display. The poor had had no benefit at all from this accumulation of wealth to the nation; they were as poor as they ever had been before, if not, on occasion, poorer. And it was this new spectacle of poverty in the midst of plenty and the growing realization that poverty was no longer inevitable that essentially sparked the revolutions of the time.

The remarkable thing about the nation-states of Western Europe, however, is that

despite the trials and tribulations to which they were subject throughout the 19th century, and contrary to the dire prophesies of Karl Marx, they have managed to survive. And they have survived not as weak and feeble organisms, but as vital, dynamic, growing societies, integrated within themselves. What was it that effected this change?

What effected this change was that the nation-state took steps to see throughout the 19th century that the causes of discontent were removed. Political power was gradually transferred from those who held a monopoly of it to the entire mass of the adult population. Economic inequality was reduced so that the benefits of the new productive powers which humanity had discovered were not restricted to any one group but were shared by the community as a whole. Combinations of workingmen were permitted in order that the bargaining power of the poor should be increased.

Laws regulating factories insured that those working in them were not reduced to the level of animals. Acts governing education insured that the children of the poor, not only those of the rich, were given access to knowledge. Medical care was continuously made cheaper and more easily accessible.

In essence, all these reforms meant a reduction in the inequality of real incomes. And the great overall instrument which enabled all these reforms to be financed was the progressive income tax.

It is the policy of all nation-states today, whether they are governed by parties of the right or by those of the left, to insure that there are transferences of wealth from the rich to the poor; not only from rich individuals to poor individuals, but also from the richer areas within the community to the poorer areas within that same community. With growing evidence of sufficiency for all and the development of a sense of responsibility on the part of those who have more, the discontents of yesterday and the scars of hurt pride they produced have all but disappeared.

Few people in the 19th century could have analyzed clearly the basic causes of the discontents of their times. To them the times were merely out of joint. It is only the hindsight of history that enables us to get a glimpse of what really was then happening.

Equally understandable, the basic causes responsible for the turmoil in the international world today are not always apparent to those who are living through them. But if we look around today at conditions in the world, can we really escape the conclusion that much of the contemporary stresses and strains in international society are the exact counterparts of the stresses and strains with which the nation-states of the 19th century were faced?

At the same time, are not the methods of restoring stability to, and of strengthening, international society today exactly those which were applied during the 19th century within the nation-state? The difference, of course, is that whereas the discontent within the nation-state was that of individuals, the discontents within international society are those of nations.

I said earlier that the two fundamental causes of the revolutions and disorders of the 19th century were the desire for liberty and the desire for bread. Internationally, the 20th century started off with an equilibrium which though manifestly unjust, seemed so stable as to be able to endure for eternity.

The colonial system which had deprived the majority of the human race of political liberty caused, by the very act of that deprivation, a great intensification of the desire for liberty. One consequence of that deprivation of liberty was the growth of nationalism, for nationalism never develops so fast nor grows so strongly as in opposition to an alien power.

The nationalist movements of Asia and Africa were a constant threat to the maintenance of the status quo in the earlier half of this century. The demand for freedom could, at last, no longer be resisted and the internal strength which the colonies developed, together with changes in the ideas of the majority of the colonial powers themselves, has led to the rapid liquidation of colonial empires since the end of the last world war.

While the desire for liberty is thus in the process of being satisfied, the desire for bread is not. There are, internationally speaking, the same inequalities of wealth between nations that were prevalent between individuals within the nation-states of the 19th century. Also, as happened in those states before they took themselves in hand, these inequalities are growing.

The average per capita income of the developed parts of the world (Europe, North America, Australia, and Japan) is $1,200 per annum. The same figure for the underdeveloped world is $125 per annum. These averages conceal the true contrast, which is better illustrated by comparing the two ends of the scale.

At one end is the United States, with a per capita income of $2,700 per annum; near the other end of the scale is India, with one-third of the population of the non-Communist underdeveloped world, with a per capita income of $70 per annum. The existing discrepancies are so great that even if the underdeveloped societies develop at a much faster rate than the developed ones the difference between them would still continue to grow.

A 3-percent rate of growth in the American economy would increase per capita incomes by $81 per annum—the increase being more than the total income of the Indian. An increase at the presently unimaginable rate of 10 percent would increase the Indian income by only $7 per annum, so that at the end of 12 months the difference between the American's income and the Indian's income would be even greater than it is today.

The people in the underdeveloped world are not content with this situation any more than the underprivileged European in the 19th century was with his. Once again, poverty is nothing new and its continuance would not have aroused discontent had it continued to be regarded as inevitable. But, like the have-not rioters of Paris or the have-not Chartists of England, the have-not nations of the world see today that poverty is not the will of God and that there are nations in which it has been removed by the hand of man.

Unfortunately, the analogy between the nation-state of the 19th century and international society today breaks down in one vital respect. In the case of the nation-state, the gradual spread of political power among the masses of the people, combined with the growing accumulation of capital and technical know-how within the nation-state itself, provided the natural means for eradicating the contrast between the haves and the have-nots.

In the case of the international society of today, however, the achievement of political independence among the have-nots provides no automatic means of harnessing the growing wealth of the haves for the betterment of the have-nots.

The great reforms within the nation-state of the 19th century consisted in essence in raising the standard of living of the mass of the citizenry by taking a part of the annual growth in the already large incomes of the rich and devoting it, through public expenditures, to ends which helped the underprivileged to increase their incomes.

In international society today there is no such mechanism. The United Nations is very far from a world government. The means through which it operates are not the organized force of the state, but moral persuasion. It cannot abolish colonialism by force, as slavery was abolished by force. It cannot tax rich nations for the benefit of poor nations, as the nation-state taxed the rich for the benefit of the poor.

And yet it would appear to me that what is required today is precisely to fashion ways and means which would enable the have-not nations to share in the prosperity that is technically available to the whole human race.

It is true that, left wholly to themselves, the poorer nations will, in due course of time, be able to banish poverty from their midst. But they will have to pay a price in social organization which must necessarily result in the destruction of the liberty of the individual—for a totalitarian form of government is demonstrably better suited for the initial economic development of poor societies than the slow-moving and complicated processes of democracy.

It would, therefore, appear essential for organized international society, if it wishes to insure the continuance of the values of justice and freedom on which it claims to be founded, to respond to the needs of its weakest members and help them to overcome the difficulties with which they are faced. These needs are multifarious, but they can be comprehensively described as the need for economic growth.

The factors restricting the growth of the economies of the underdeveloped countries—or in other words, the factors which keep them poor—are many and they vary from country to country. For the removal of some, no help can come from the outside. People must by themselves develop the strength to face the sacrifices necessary for economic development and must by themselves learn how to organize so that they can work together for the attainment of their national aspirations. What can be supplied from the outside is technical assistance—in its widest sense—and developmental capital.

There are societies which require teachers, doctors, administrators, lawyers, and the like. The outside world can surely provide the means by which personnel of this kind can be trained in large numbers. There are others which are short of technicians in certain branches of industrial or agricultural practice; these can be supplied from abroad. But what all underdeveloped countries are short of is developmental capital—a poor society, like a poor man, cannot save enough and, therefore, invest enough, to enable its income to grow at a rapid enough rate.

Many of the underdeveloped countries are at a stage of development where large amounts of capital cannot be usefully absorbed; in those countries conditions have first to be created which will enable investment to be usefully carried out. There are, however, some countries which have reached a stage where the only shortage is that of capital; and the absolute amounts required are so large and in such fields that they are wholly beyond the capabilities of the private investor to supply.

It is for this reason that government-to-government and international programs of foreign aid have come into being. No firm estimates have ever been really made as to what it would cost either the developed or the underdeveloped world to pursue a program of rapid economic development in the underdeveloped countries. But the general consensus seems to be that the figure involved for external aid is somewhere around $7 billion a year, matched by several times this amount from the underdeveloped world itself.

This figure may seem high in absolute terms, but when it is remembered that the income of the developed parts of the world

is somewhere around $1,000 billion a year, that this income is increasing between $30 to $40 billion a year, and that the expenditure on armaments alone is around $100 billion a year, the figure seems to fall into its correct perspective.

A certain amount of capital does flow at present from the industrially advanced countries to the less developed lands either by way of private investment or by way of loans and grants from governmental agencies and international organizations. The precise measurement of the net developmental capital that is presently available, however, is not as simple a matter as one might suppose. A number of adjustments have often to be made to what commonly passes as aid in order to arrive at figures which represent truly the net addition to the amount of capital available for the development of the less developed countries.

According to one estimate, the net capital outflow to the non-Communist developing countries amounted to some $4.5 billion a year in 1959 and 1960. Of this, $2.6 billion was from the United States—$1.7 billion by way of economic assistance, $0.2 billion as technical assistance and $0.65 billion as net private foreign investment.

Other countries in the West supplied a total of about $0.9 billion, and the U.S.S.R. another $0.5 billion. The remainder came in the form of economic assistance from the International Bank ($0.35 billion) and in technical assistance from non-U.S. sources ($0.15 billion).

If the critical minimum level of net capital outflow to the developing countries is accepted as of the order of $7 billion per annum, what we need is an increase of 50 percent over the level already attained. Whether this increase should come mainly through international agencies or through bilateral channels, and how it should be distributed among the contributing countries, are questions that need not detain us here.

It is, I think, fairly clear that for some years to come, at any rate, the bulk of the increase that is required will have to come from bilateral channels of government-to-government assistance as distinguished from private funds or international agencies.

At the same time, there is no reason why even essentially bilateral effort cannot admit of a measure of coordination and common determination among a group of countries. But whatever the method employed for increasing the flow of developmental capital to the newly emerging nations, there is, I think, no doubt that unless this flow is increased without delay to the critical minimum level I have mentioned above, there is every danger that the significant effort already being made will itself be frustrated.

The U.N. General Assembly at its last session adopted a resolution recommending that there should be a transfer of capital from the developed countries to the underdeveloped equal to 1 percent of the national income of the former. It would appear that the Kennedy administration is in sympathy with this proposal, for there are welcome indications that it wishes to urge that the burden of financing the external needs of the underdeveloped world should be shared by the richer countries on some such basis.

The essence of the argument that I have endeavored to develop is that the roots of the threat with which national societies were faced in the 19th century lay in the maldistribution of political power and economic well-being; that the roots of the present international discontents are exactly the same, except that the maldistribution is between nations and not individuals; that the nation-states stabilized themselves by correcting this maldistribution, first through broadening the base of political power, and next through using the authority of government to reduce inequalities of income; that international society should endeavor to achieve the same ends by ending colonialism as soon as practicable and transferring wealth to the poorer nations; that the sacrifices involved in the task are by no means great; but that, whereas in the case of national governments this was done compulsorily, in the case of international society this will have to be done on a voluntary basis, since we do not as yet have a government of the world.

THE NEED FOR GREATER GERMAN COOPERATION IN AID TO INDIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, in recent days a very important meeting took place here in Washington at the office of the International Bank. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss assistance to India in connection with the new Indian 5-year plan, based on the report of the bankers' mission to which I referred earlier. As I indicated in my earlier remarks, the upcoming Indian 5-year plan is of the greatest importance for the entire free world. It can succeed only if there is adequate assistance from the more developed nations.

These discussions resulted in tentative offers of aid from all of the 10 participating nations. The United States is reported to have made a billion-dollar offer, conditional on both congressional approval and commensurate contributions from other nations. Great Britain is reported to have offered substantial aid, despite its meager foreign exchange reserve. France, Canada, and Japan are reported also to have made sizable commitments. This is very encouraging news.

According to an article published in the Washington Post on May 2, however, the conference recessed abruptly until the end of May. While no explanation was given for this interruption, it would appear to have been caused by the reluctance of the West German Government to offer its fair share of funds for the Indian 5-year plan. The German Government is reported to have offered only half of what was expected, and to have insisted on hard terms of interest and maturity for the funds which it would lend to the Indian Government.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "Laggard in the Club," published in the Washington Post of May 9, 1961, and an article entitled "Bonn Reluctance Blocks World Bank Aid to India," written by Warren Unna, and published in the Washington Post of May 2, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I express my deep disappointment and concern about the reluctance of the Bonn Government to commit its fair share of funds for this highly important purpose. The world has been promised by the West German Government that it will increase its assistance to underdeveloped countries. This is the first real test of that promise.

The West German Government is in a good position to make a much greater contribution to the development of underdeveloped nations than it is presently making, and I think we have a right to expect a considerably larger contribution to the Indian 5-year plan from the West German Government than was offered at the meeting the other day.

It should be pointed out again that one of the three bankers who submitted the report to the International Bank on Indian and Pakistan development programs on which these discussions were based, is a leading German banker. Yet unless the Bonn Government makes a greater contribution than it is presently disposed to make, the minimum amount needed by India, according to the bankers' report, will not be available.

I suggest that the Bonn Government take a second look at this situation, that it reexamine the survey in which one of its own nationals played such an important part, and that it come back to the conference at the end of this month with a firm and fair commitment. I think this would be the best demonstration of the willingness of the Bonn Government, according to its own public pronouncements, to participate fully as a partner in the free world community.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "United States To Offer India $1 Billion Aid," written by Paul Grimes, and published in the New York Times of May 4, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

LAGGARD IN THE CLUB

The success of India's third 5-year development plan presents an enormous challenge to the wealthier free nations. Not only does India comprise the largest democratic country in the world—438 million people—it also has made admirable use of its own resources to raise living standards. Despite certain shortfalls, the second 5-year plan was a substantial gain, and the net impact of accelerated growth upon development may be greater than the statistics show.

To help India progress toward a self-generating economy is clearly one of the most important tasks before the developed nations. Because this task is so important, the disagreement in the 10-nation "aid India" club meeting under the auspices of the World Bank is dismaying.

There is cause for satisfaction, to be sure, in some of the proffers of help for India's foreign capital requirements. The United States made a very substantial offer—$1 billion over 2 years, at nominal interest and repayable over as much as 50 years—and Britain made a proportional commitment. France and Japan, among other nations, signified a desire to carry their share (and France has received too little acknowledgment of the massive aid she already is giving many countries of Africa).

But the response of Germany is disappointing. Germany has offered $200 million over 2 years (and a total of $310 million over 5 years)—but at 5½ percent interest and repayable in only 15 years or less. This does represent a commitment of public funds which is novel for Germany. But much of it would replace present short-term private loans to India and thus is not a net addition to the capital available.

On the basis of 1 percent of the gross national product, which has been set as a rule-of-thumb standard for foreign aid, Germany's total annual obligation would come to some $625 million. The offer to India is not an inconsiderable part of this total. But when it is considered that Germany is

bearing very little of the free world defense burden outside her own borders, that she benefits from orders financed by American aid to other countries and that the total United States economic and military aid including Public Law 480 transactions is well in excess of 1 percent of the gross national product, the German response is disproportionately small.

Apart from the sums involved, the really disappointing part is the terms. They suggest that Germany still looks upon foreign aid as a flinthearted banker, and they appear to repudiate what the Kennedy administration thought was an understanding from previous conversations with German officials. If Chancellor Adenauer is really concerned about some of the foreign criticism of Germany, the cause is not far to seek.

EXHIBIT 2

BONN RELUCTANCE BLOCKS WORLD BANK AID TO INDIA

(By Warren Unna)

West Germany's reluctance to give any sizable assistance to help India in her new 5-year plan has caused a 10-nation gathering of the World Bank to recess abruptly its aid-India conference.

Instead of coming up with a large assistance offer in which they would be sharing some of their postwar prosperity, the Germans offered India $100 million for each of the first 2 years of her plan—half of what was expected—and on what is known as hard terms, 5½ percent interest repayable in 6 to 12 years.

The United States, on the other hand, has come up with a mammoth billion-dollar aid offer to India for the next 2 years, repayable over 50 years at little, or possibly no interest.

But the United States is conditioned on both congressional approval and the willingness of other nations to increase their previous aid commitments to India.

Of the other assisting nations, Britain has now offered to increase aid to India to a little more than $100 million, repayable at low interest over the next 25 years. And this money comes out of no "fat" as it does in the United States and Germany—but out of Britain's own meager foreign exchange reserve.

France, which now spends more money per capita in foreign aid than any other country in the world—primarily to assist her old African colonies—also is believed to be carrying her share of the burden.

The other two members of the World Bank's Indian-aid group, Canada and Japan, are believed to have made sizable commitments. But these commitments, together with the British, presumably would be increased once these countries see that Germany is carrying its share of the free world's foreign aid load.

Germany in February announced she was prepared to spend $600 million to $700 million annually for foreign aid. India, with a well-organized economy plan and clearly defined economic need, is considered to be the first real test of Germany's promise.

Heinz Dittman, a German Embassy economic official concerned with the Indian-aid talk, explained that the important thing about the new German offer is that it will be shifting loan money from private to public sponsorship.

The World Bank abruptly recessed its aid discussions last week until May 31, discreetly making no mention of the cause.

However the other nations concerned privately were furious, feeling that India offers the free world a tremendous opportunity to help a powerful underdeveloped nation gain its economic feet and become a long-term hope for world stability.

The current, or third, 5-year plan will cost India more than her other two plans put together—$21.4 billion. It has been labeled the "take off" plan because it is aimed at giving India an economy of self-sustained growth, one which will eventually provide India with enough of her own industries to make her independent of further foreign aid.

EXHIBIT 3

UNITED STATES TO OFFER INDIA $1 BILLION AID—LOAN REPORTED CONTINGENT ON OTHERS' MATCHING THAT AMOUNT OVER 2 YEARS

(By Paul Grimes)

NEW DELHI, INDIA, May 3.—The Kennedy administration was reliably reported today to be prepared to lend India $1 billion in the next 2 years to help meet the foreign exchange requirements of India's third 5-year plan.

The offer was said to be conditional on the provision of an identical amount by Britain, Canada, West Germany, and Japan, the other countries in a consortium known popularly as the Aid to India Club. The U.S. outlay would require congressional approval.

An appropriation of $500 million for the fiscal year beginning July 1 would represent about an eighth of the total outlay envisaged by President Kennedy for foreign economic and military aid this year. It would be almost double the amount lent to India in the 1958 fiscal year, the peak year so far.

Informed sources indicated that the United States was also giving second thoughts to the possibility of helping India build a nuclear powerplant and a steel mill. Government and private interests in the United States previously had been reported cool to both projects, which would be publicly owned.

However, the Kennedy administration was said to feel that the Government should not be too concerned about whether nuclear power was wise for India. As for the steel mill, the administration was said to take the view that the importance of helping India to build outweighed the argument that helping a public enterprise might imply support for socialism.

Britain, West Germany and the Soviet Union are helping India build three publicly owned steel mills with a total initial output of 3 million tons a year. Under the third 5-year plan, which began April 1, their total outputs are to be increased to nearly double that figure.

The fourth mill is planned for Bokaro in the eastern States of Bihar. It would produce 1 million tons a year initially but would be able to expand its capacity to 3 million to 4 million tons. This would make it the largest steel mill in India.

PROPAGANDA VALUE A FACTOR

The United States was said to feel that the foreign-exchange allotments should be made as a whole, not to particular projects. The propaganda value that could be derived from assisting with the nuclear powerplant and the steel mill was said to make them exceptions.

The potential increase in U.S. dollar aid to Indian would be in addition to rupees provided under Public Law 480. Under this legislation, the United States has shipped nearly $2,500 million worth of surplus agricultural commodities to India. They have been sold here for rupees, most of which then were granted or lent to India for economic development.

U.S. aid to India in all categories now totals about $3,843 million. It is by far India's largest source of external aid and she is by far the largest recipient of assistance from the United States.

OFFER MADE AT MEETING

The offer of $1 billion in 2 years was reported to have been made last week at a meeting in Washington of the consortium, which includes the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development besides the five countries. Observers attended from Austria, Denmark, France, Norway, Sweden, and the International Monetary Fund.

Eugene R. Black, President of the World Bank, submitted an Indian appeal for $638 million in immediate foreign credits as part of the $5,500 million she is expected to need in the third plan period. Informed sources said her needs for the first 2 years would be about $3,100 million.

The Kennedy administration was said to envisage meeting this with $1 billion from the United States, $1 billion from other consortium countries, $400 million from the World Bank and at least $600 million from such other sources as private investment, commercial borrowing, and aid from countries that attended the meeting as observers.

OTHER OFFERS REPORTED

Britain was said to have offered the equivalent of $204 million for the first 2 years, West Germany $331 million, Japan $80 million, and Canada $36 million.

The United States was said to feel that Britain, Canada, and West Germany could have offered more. It was said to hope particularly for a bigger German offer when the consortium meets again May 31.

Increased United States aid was also said to be planned for Pakistan.

The Soviet Union, India's second biggest benefactor, has made available credits totaling slightly more than $800 million. About $378 million of this is earmarked for the third plan.

UNITED STATES HAS TWO OBJECTIVES

WASHINGTON, May 3.—The United States offer has two objectives—to cover India's projected deficit in international payments and to schedule orders firmly now for future delivery.

There was considerable disappointment at the West German offer since an impression had been gained during the visits of Chancellor Adenauer and Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano that Bonn would offer substantially more than it did.

Sources here also pointed out that $75 million of the German commitment would be used for the payment of the short-term private credits extended 3 and 4 years ago by German banks for the construction of the Rourkela steel plant. While the payment of this debt will save India foreign exchange, the feeling here is that the German banks could well afford to extend the payments so that all of the German Government's money could be used for new projects.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1215) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, after consultation with the leadership on the other side of the aisle and with Senators who expect to offer amendments, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning hour and upon the return of the Senate to the consideration of the bill (S. 1215), the amendment of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, debate on all amendments be limited to 30 minutes apiece, that 1 hour be allowed on the bill, and that at the conclusion of that time a vote be had on the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, reserving the right to object, does the pro-

posal relate to the amendment of the Battle Act?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to have 10 minutes to discuss the bill. I inquire of the leadership on my side of the aisle whether that much time will be available to me.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, so that there may be no misunderstanding concerning the rights of Senators on this side of the aisle, I ask the distinguished majority leader if time will be available for the comments which the distinguished senior Senator from New York desires to make.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Absolutely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered.

THE NEED TO PRESERVE OUR PROUD HISTORY

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, for all too many years the Federal Government has lacked an overall policy which fully would take into account what visibly remains of our great American heritage, such as historical sites, buildings, and areas.

In 1935, Congress enacted the so-called Historical Sites Act. This law has proved valuable in designating for preservation those sites and buildings which have a national significance. Surveys can be made and technical cooperation can be provided by the Department of the Interior to aid State, local, and private groups in restoring and rehabilitating these buildings and areas. The sites actually owned by the Federal Government are few, but range in variety from the home of President John Adams to the Old Philadelphia Customhouse.

Unfortunately, however, this policy which applies to national sites does not aid the cause of preserving areas or sites or edifices which have a local, State, or regional significance and which are under local jurisdiction. What of the old bank and hotel which played an important role in the early history of Sonora; or of the romantic early day structures which yet remain in Monterey, the colorful city which was California's capital under three flags; in such an old settlement as Benicia, another early capital; or in the present capital city of Sacramento; and, indeed, throughout the State—all of which give us an insight into the conditions of life which confronted our early California forebears? Should these indiscriminately be leveled by progress in the guise of a high-speed freeway or of crass modernization? Once these few remaining ties to another, earlier era are gone, gone, too, is a part of our illustrious history as a State, county, or city. Once they are gone, something else is taken away as an inspiration to our youth of the struggle which our fathers faced in building the foundation on which California has grown to greatness.

In the 87th Congress, I heartily support the proposed legislation now before both Houses, and sponsored in the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other Senators, which would broaden the Federal Government's authority under the Historical Sites Act, so that before a Federal or federally assisted program is designed, due consideration would be given to the need for preserving these examples of our history. The Secretary of the Interior, upon the receipt of a petition from a State or local public body or some civic group such as the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historical Preservation, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, or our own great Native Sons and Native Daughters of the Golden West—all of whom have taken a keen interest in preserving and restoring such treasures—would be empowered to authorize an investigation and to hold public hearings to adduce testimony from those living in the area. As a result of his findings, the Secretary would make a determination whether or not the structure is truly of historical significance. He would then take appropriate action to bring his decision to the attention of the Department head whose programs would affect the area.

Madam President, the proposed legislation is in the public interest. I hope that Congress shortly will have occasion to approve it.

TELEVISING CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, one of the questions on which Members of Congress have divided opinions, and in an area in which Senate practices sharply differ from those of the House, is whether any television cameras should be allowed in the hearing rooms of congressional committees. Ever since I presided over the first televised hearings on Capitol Hill, involving the historic confrontation of Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers, I have always supported the idea that TV is a full-fledged and legitimate news medium, and, therefore, is entitled to a place in the committee room during public hearings.

I was happy to note, from reading the current TV Guide, that my reactions to this question are shared by a veteran Senator, one with whom I have spent many hours before TV cameras in the course of our committee work, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], chairman of the Senate Committee on Investigations of which I am the ranking Republican member.

In his article entitled "The Case for Televising Congressional Hearings," the Senator from Arkansas presents many of the problems involved when TV cameras are moved to the hearings, but he also points out the many advantages to our Nation which result from this effort to keep the American people informed. The Senator knows that an informed public demands legislative reforms, and he can cite instances where such reform resulted from televising committee hearings. I believe the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill is a recent case in point. For the information of Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have this important article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From TV Guide, May 6, 1961]

THE CASE FOR TELEVISING CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS

(By Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN)

"Should congressional hearings be televised?"

A Senator who has conducted many televised inquiries votes "yes" and explains why.

Probably the largest audience in history gathered around the millions of television sets throughout the country last fall to hear and observe the two presidential candidates debate issues. Not even the World Series or the football bowl games have been able to bring so many people together in concentration upon a single event.

This evidence of the increased interest of our citizens in world affairs, in domestic problems and in the functions of government is a reassuring sign of strength in our democracy. No one can doubt that this interest is genuine. It should be encouraged.

But the question of televising congressional hearings still provokes earnest argument. There is no Senate rule on the subject. (Senate hearings have been televised at the discretion of committee chairmen.)

I agree with the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, which reported to the Senate in January 1955 that "the test of time will satisfy Congress that radio, motion pictures and TV are intruders no more objectionable than the reporters scribbling at the press table."

It has been said that unobtrusive coverage of committee hearings by television would require facilities not presently available in congressional committee rooms. To me this is not a valid argument against permitting television coverage. If anything, it is a sound reason for taking steps to install the necessary facilities.

Perhaps the greatest objection that can be urged to the televising of committee hearings is that occasionally some Member, as well as a witness, may exaggerate or demonstrate in speech or mannerism for the benefit of the audience. But such conduct is readily recognized by the viewing public, and he who engages in it does so to his own adverse interest and injury. Furthermore, any harmful influence that might result from such actions, even an influence toward disruption of a hearing, is clearly outweighed by the advantages that accrue to the public from a televised report of committee proceedings.

Televising committee hearings tends to insure that the committee's proceedings will be fair. Committee members who know that the whole country may be watching will likely exercise greater care to see that the rights of witnesses are not infringed and that the proceedings are conducted with decorum and purpose. It is also harder for a witness to get away with a lie when the hearing is televised. Sometimes there are those watching to whom the truth is known and who will be prompted by the spectacle to get in touch with the committee and provide it with information to contradict the false testimony—information which the committee might not otherwise obtain.

A witness should not have an absolute rights to have the lights turned off or the cameras turned away from him while he is testifying. The applicable rule of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations provides: "A witness may request, on grounds of distraction, harassment, or physical discomfort, that during his testimony television, motion picture, and other cameras and lights shall not be directed at him,

such requests to be ruled on by the subcommittee members present at the hearing."

The attitude, cooperation, and demeanor of the witness are factors to be taken into account by the committee and possibly most doubts should be resolved in the witness' favor. If it becomes evident that the witness is making the request capriciously or as a subterfuge, or if the witness proves noncooperative or manifests an antagonistic attitude, his request should be denied. Likewise, if a witness takes the fifth amendment there can be no justification for granting the request. Certainly he can read from a slip of paper that he takes the fifth amendment without any handicap in the way of distraction or discomfort by reason of the cameras and lights.

It is interesting to note that the chairman of the board of directors of the American Civil Liberties Union, testifying before the Senate Rules Committee in 1954, put that organization on record as opposed to giving any witness the right to bar the use of cameras or microphones by claiming distraction, asserting: "Once fair procedures have been set up, we do not believe any witness should have the unilateral right to deprive millions of viewers of the right to see legislative hearings."

I have been asked if I would favor a Senate rule representing the televising of committee hearings. I would favor a rule which made it clear that hearings might be televised at the discretion of the committee concerned. I would therefore oppose a rule prohibiting the televising of Senate committee hearings, and I would also oppose a rule which took final discretion away from the individual committees.

Most of the hard work in grinding out essential legislation is done in committee rooms, not on the floors of the legislative chambers. It is in committee that pertinent information on proposed legislation is collected, analyzed and evaluated; and from such committee deliberations legislation is evolved.

The primary purpose of any congressional hearing is to obtain facts on which to base sound legislative judgments, but it is a widely accepted principle in our Government today that this is not to be done secretly. The public needs to be kept informed.

The question of whether radio and television coverage of a congressional hearing should be permitted ought to be decided altogether on the basis of whether the committee's purposes or conveniences are served by their coverage. Certainly of equal importance are such factors as the interest of the public in viewing congressional activity and the right of each news medium to equal access to the news.

Not all committee sessions can be public. Closed or executive sessions are often necessary to work out rules and procedures. Sometimes prudent judgment also dictates that the testimony of certain witnesses should be heard in closed session to safeguard the security of the Nation or to protect the reputation of innocent persons from possible injury.

But the normal working sessions of a committee should be public.

Radio and TV are as much entitled to freedom-of-the-press privileges as are newspapers and magazines. Any legislative action or proceeding of Government that the press and radio are permitted to cover and report—including public hearings before congressional committees—should also be made available to the public through the media of film and television.

When the public sees and hears what is said and done by Government officials in the performance of their duties, it is better able to appraise the quality of their labors and correctly assess the results of their efforts.

Television already is, and can become in even greater degree, an important instrument of democracy.

The editors of TV Guide have asked me if I have any recommendations for improving the television coverage of congressional hearings. In making them I want to recognize that technical reasons under particular circumstances may make one or more of them impracticable to follow.

1. Wherever possible, the full hearing (or hearing session) should be televised. As a normal minimum, if a witness is televised his entire testimony should be covered. A hearing does not follow a script, and it is usually impossible to tell or even guess with any certainty just what moments are likely to be the most important and informative. Even when only a limited time on the air is to be given to the hearing, if the whole hearing is filmed or taped it can be intelligently edited; but if the crew covering the hearing tries to take only enough footage to fill the time slot, much that is important and interesting is almost certain to be lost.

2. The witness should be on camera more and the questioners less. When a question is asked, of course its content is of interest; but it is the demeanor and reaction of the witness, rather than the questioner, which is revealing and important.

3. Television cameramen should be made to understand that they are recording a legislative proceeding and not a drama; that it is their prime purpose to disseminate the news and information that is being developed rather than to place emphasis on that which may be merely incidental or irrelevant.

Television can push back the walls of every congressional committee room beyond Alaska, beyond Hawaii, east to the Atlantic, and south to the Caribbean, and let any American anywhere open a magic door in his own living room and see the committees of Congress in action. Such a public service and benefit should be made available and welcomed, rather than be denied and suppressed.

WESTERN MILITARY STRENGTH AND SECURITY—ADDRESS BY HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, on April 14 the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] delivered an address entitled "Western Military Strength and Security," before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, at Philadelphia.

The remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts on this subject were characteristically objective and unpolitical. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN MILITARY STRENGTH AND SECURITY

(Address by U.S. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, at the 65th annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, Pa., April 14, 1961)

There are two statements from President Kennedy's special defense message of March 28, 1961, which I think are helpful to cite in initiating any appraisal of Western defense strength and security:

"The primary purpose of our arms is peace, not war; to make certain that they will never have to be used; to deter all wars, general or limited, nuclear or conventional, large or small; to convince all potential aggressors that any attack would be futile; to provide backing for diplomatic settlement of disputes; to insure the adequacy of our bargaining power for an end to the arms race.

* * * * * *

"Our arms will never be used to strike the first blow in any attack. We must offset whatever advantage this may appear to hand an aggressor by so increasing the capability of our forces to respond swiftly and effectively to any aggressive move as to convince any would-be aggressor that such a movement would be too futile and costly to undertake. We shall never threaten, provoke, or initiate aggression, but if aggression should come, our response will be swift and effective."

The principle of deterrence and how to apply our overall military strategy to it constitutes the overriding problem for U.S. defense policy planners. The fact that, in effect, we are building our defense force so that it will never have to be used has a profound influence on the nature of that force. The fact that our Defense Establishment will never be called to use until it has sustained the initial attack of an enemy likewise profoundly influences its nature.

I believe that perhaps the best service I can perform, in analyzing our defensive proficiency, is to report on the nature of the new administration's defense policies and developments as I interpret them. What is being done to improve the capability of our military force in line with current overall military strategy? What is the quality of the organizational and administrative structure to direct and control the activity of our massive Military Establishment?

These are questions which I shall touch upon in this talk. Western military strength and security will rely to a tremendous degree, an unhealthy degree perhaps, on the nature of U.S. defense forces; and since this is the area that I am personally most acquainted with, I shall concentrate largely on comments relative to our own situation.

We have heard a good deal recently about two different theories of deterrence, both of which have support from various quarters among defense experts. They are the concept of "finite deterrence" and the concept of "counterforce." Professor Henry A. Kissinger of Harvard University tells us the issue is determined by the nature of the primary goal of the deterrent force—should this be the elimination of the enemy's war-making potential and civilian population, or should the target be the elimination of the opposing military establishment? Finite deterrence would require that our military force threaten the enemy's social substance. We should develop a well protected retaliatory force which can ride out an attack and still be able to inflict devastation on the enemy which would be unacceptable to his values. To do this a nation does not need an extremely large military force.

The counterforce strategy sets as its target the opponent's striking force, in addition to industry and civilian population. His military establishment, as well, must be destroyed. This requires a huge retaliatory power to be maintained. And in order to remain effective, our destructive military force would have to keep sufficiently ahead of the enemy's strength to insure the chances of victory. Therefore, under this theory, the military build-up is virtually unlimited and would probably reach massive proportions.

As Kissinger himself points out in his new book, "The Necessity for Choice":

"The difficulty with the dispute is that our options are often vastly oversimplified. The choice is not between a complete counterforce capability or none at all nor between a strategy of pure devastation or a strategy which guarantees victory in all circumstances. Between these limiting conditions many other possibilities exist, each with its

own implications for deterrence and for strategy."

I believe that present U.S. defense strategy relies on some combination of these two concepts of deterrent strength and that perhaps the real importance of the distinction between the two is a matter of style rather than substance, of emphasis rather than of essence. Counterforce, emphasizing the successful fighting of a war per se, is unlimited in its dimensions and therefore may appear to be more provocative—you might say "war oriented." Finite deterrence, on the other hand, gives the impression of being "peace oriented" since it is more restricted quantitatively and emphasizes survivability and the avoidance of accidental war.

There are two prominent issues concerning defense posture which have a particularly important relationship to the philosophy of deterrence. These are: (a) the strengthening of weapons and equipment suitable to fight in situations of limited conflict, and (b) the efforts to bring about dependable agreements on weapons tests, arms control and eventual disarmament.

Under an effective or stable strategic deterrent, there should theoretically be more tendency to settle conflicts in limited and conventional military action. Since the East-West nuclear stalemate has largely brought this situation about, there is an increasing need for adequate forces of the limited-war variety. The chances are that the Communists will not dare to "bite" with their nuclear strategic power, but rather that they will "nibble" with their own or their allies' tactical conventional forces around the free world perimeter. The Lebanon danger in 1958 and the threat in the Formosan Strait in 1953 are good examples of this. In both cases we were sufficiently prepared to take quick, mobile action demonstrating our readiness in the faraway trouble spots. The need for this capability is even greater at the present moment, however, and action to answer this need for improved limited-conflict strength is therefore compatible with the theory of finite deterrence. It is less provocative, more restricted in its effect, and stresses survivability rather than near-inevitable massive devastation.

Likewise, efforts to bring about genuine weapons control are much more consistent, more feasible, under a system of finite deterrence. Anyone associated with the frightening proportions and problems of defense on a day-to-day basis almost necessarily is convinced of the urgent need for progress in limitation and control of these incredible weapons of mass destruction. Finite deterrence stresses a limited nuclear retaliatory deterrent to begin with; it emphasizes giving up weapons rather than adding them and a general feeling that there is some chance for peace and rational negotiation between states away from the balance of terror. It should be pointed out that of course finite deterrence does not automatically lead to progress on arms controls—the same guarantees of control and inspection must be included before that strategic deterrent is in any way curtailed, as we learn now at the frustrating impasse at Geneva. The basic deterrent must always be strong and effective, because we cannot negotiate arms agreements uccessfully if we do not bargain from a position of strength.

On Tuesday, April 4, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara came before the Senate Armed Services Committee to outline the administration's new recommendations for the defense of our country for the coming fiscal year 1962. A review of these proposals is extremely helpful in evaluating the approach of our defense planners. Generally, the new prospectus very largely continues basic policies laid down during the Eisenhower administration. There is no drastic shift either between the two concepts of deterrence which I have discussed or between nuclear strategic force and conventional tactical capability.

The new plan does include increased expenditures for the modernization and improvement of forces to fight in conventional situations. These increases, however, are modest and do not come at the expense of our reliance on nuclear power. There has been some press comment recently to the effect that, because of efforts to make stronger and more mobile our limited capability, there is less dependence on the concept of "massive retaliation." The merit in that observation depends on what one means by that phrase, which has been bandied about out of context enough so as to make it largely meaningless. The new administration obviously endeavors to keep United States deterrent strength finely balanced between tactical and strategic capability and has taken certain steps to improve that balance of which I heartily approve. The most encouraging aspects of the new recommendations in my opinion are these: (1) The Pentagon has speeded up action on immediately affected programs to strengthen quickly the quality of our dual deterrent; and (2) the Pentagon has demonstrated a decisive selectivity in making hard choices with regard to various weapons systems, their development and their utilization.

Secretary McNamara emphasized at the outset that the evolution in prime threat from a manned bomber attack to an ICBM surprise attack complicates our counterstrategy. He posed the question: Should the United States depend on weapons that could be utilized within the expected time of warning of such an attack, or should we rather depend upon riding out a massive attack? His answer is as follows:

"In reevaluating our general war position, our major concern was to reduce our dependence on deterrent forces which are highly vulnerable to ballistic missile attack or which rely for their survival on a hair-trigger response to the first indications of such an attack. Conversely, we sought to place greater emphasis on the second approach—the kind of forces which would ride out a massive nuclear attack and which could be applied with deliberation and always under the complete control of the constituted authority."

With that basic emphasis let us look at some specific proposals for change in weapons and their use in a budget request for defense totaling over $43 billion, or about $240 for each American man, woman, and child. This represents a $2 billion increase over the Eisenhower request submitted in January.

The new proposals emphasize a shift from the first generation liquid-fuel Atlas and Titan to the more advanced solid-fuel Polaris and Minuteman, both of which have a high degree of survivability under ballistic missile attack. Starts on Polaris submarines are doubled and ships already under construction accelerated. At the same time plans for equipping the nuclear-powered cruiser *Long Beach* with Polaris missiles were canceled since such use would contradict the characteristics which make the Polaris so valuable strategically.

The Minuteman, still in the development and test phase, has been stepped up, with emphasis on fixed base rather than on mobile squadrons in order to move the weapon into operation faster and at less cost. The current program for the Atlas is left alone and a cutback has been indicated for the final two Titan squadrons scheduled.

The new administration is placing its emphasis on strategic bomber readiness rather than on building more B–52 heavy and B–58 medium bombers. Therefore money is requested to increase from one-third to one-half the number of our strategic bombers on permanent ground-alert status. Two of the new program's major decisions involved a cutback of the B–70 mach 3 manned bomber and a cut-out of the nuclear-powered aircraft program. The B–70 could not be operational until 1968, when missiles will have largely taken over as the most efficient strategic weapon. And, according to the Pentagon, the nuclear-powered aircraft project simply carries no specific military requirement.

The new recommendations assist the Midas satellite-borne warning system and put the new administration right in the middle of one of the most difficult problems confronting our defense experts: what to do with the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile? This problem exemplifies the type of intensely complex and delicate decision-making which our Military Establishment faces. The Secretary pointed out that the Nike-Zeus was well along in development and had made satisfactory progress. His decision, a tentative but specific one, was to continue in the development, testing and evaluation phase of the program, but not to take any steps with the production and deployment of the system.

Concerning efforts to strengthen and make more versatile our limited war deterrent, the new proposal emphasized three points: proper deployment, proper training and proper equipment. Secretary McNamara commented there had been a tendency since the end of the Korean war to emphasize the nuclear capabilities of limited war forces. Although such use is essential, the Pentagon is careful to point out, the nonnuclear capability of conventional forces is stressed in the current plan in order to provide greater versatility.

The McNamara request asked for over $820 million for the strengthening of conventional weapons and equipment through procurement, rehabilitation and modernization. This included substantial assistance for new guerrilla and antiguerrilla warfare programs—so that local Communist terrorist and subversive activities in underdeveloped areas can be effectively met. It included money to institute indestructible command control systems to insure a real understanding of developments and effective authority for U.S. military action at any stage during enemy attack. The Secretary also recommended elimination of certain unneeded defense facilities—including 52 installations in the United States.

These are the most noteworthy decisions reached in the new proposals. It is interesting to note that, from the nature of its decisions and the general tone of its pronouncements on military strategy, the plan reflects a slight tendency toward alinement with the definite-deterrence concept. Specifically this can be seen by the new emphasis on conventional and nonnuclear modernization, second-strike retaliatory weapons, and a generally passive rather than active defense posture.

So much for new weapons. Now, what is the nature of the organization structure of our Military Establishment which has the responsibility of administering these programs?

It is amazing how the civilian head of our Military Establishment has greatly increased his real authority over the last 15 years. This carries out the theory of our Constitution and is good in practice. Our first Secretary of Defense James Forrestal was plagued by a lack of effective power to make and execute unified decisions. His effectiveness as Secretary depended largely on his powers of persuasion and personal prestige. Today Secretary McNamara wields strong power over his farflung establishment. In my opinion there are four basic areas in which his administration of the Defense Department is endeavoring to strengthen further this control. These are unification and centralization in departmental organization and programs, a speedup in the making of decisions and their execution, increase in civilian

over military control, and tightened organizational discipline in general. These activities indicate the spirit of the new administration's approach to its duties in the Defense Establishment.

First, the trend in unification of control and function is a continuation of a development during the Eisenhower administration. The national strategic target plan initiated by Secretary Gates is an example of this. It was responsible for the selection, classification and allocation of targets and was carried out by a joint targeting committee. Secretary McNamara has picked up another idea which his predecessors had studied. This would combine the intelligence operations of the various services under one office. Another rather far-reaching suggestion under consideration would merge the Army's Strategic Army Corps and the Air Force's Tactical Air Command under one unit. This action obviously moves in the functional rather than the service-oriented direction. In addition, other plans are being considered to bring about a greater functionalization in weapons systems. Unified commands for research and development are also being given greater scrutiny, due to the great success of the nuclear submarine and Polaris missile project which was organized along these lines.

Second, the Secretary generally has emphasized increased speed in the reaching of decisions. The move to give the Air Force greater dominance in space research, for instance, is a good example of this. Follow-up on decisions reached in preparing the new budget reflects a speedup in the actual execution of programs once judgment is reached concerning them.

Third, the Secretary has acted generally to emphasize civilian control in his Department. This is evident in the vigor and dispatch with which he and his chief civilian advisors are operating. It is reflected in the control and command apparatus which I have mentioned emphasizing that continuous civilian command remain in uninterrupted control even in the most critical circumstances. Also, it appears that whereas the individual service Chiefs have had an opportunity to make their views known on recent studies, the JCS as a body has sometimes been bypassed in the process.

Fourth, President Kennedy laid down proposed steps to provide better technical administrative and political control of the military at all times. Increased emphasis on public relations discipline throughout the various segments of the Pentagon again suggests a tighter organization. To further this endeavor Secretary McNamara has recommended extensive systems planning and analysis projects for the Pentagon, and has set up a special organization and management unit in the office of the General Counsel.

All these efforts seem to indicate a realization of the basic disadvantages under which a democracy suffers when competing with the more efficient mechanisms of a totalitarian state. They seem—again, perhaps as a matter of style—calculated to minimize the inherent bureaucratic disadvantages of our system. How successful they will be remains to be seen.

It is too early to say how Congress as a whole will respond to these developments in the Pentagon. There will be no quarrel in my opinion with plans to revise the nuclear arm of our deterrent strength and to increase the modernization of the conventional arm. There may be a demand to increase expenditures for the strategic bomber forces.

Undoubtedly there will be extensive controversy concerning the cutback in the B–70 program. With regard to the "housekeeping" renovations of Secretary McNamara, Congress will want to keep a very careful eye on developments, but for now I would hazard the comment that the new Defense Secretary's unusual combination of decisiveness, moderation, and expedition in his duties will find a more, rather than less, sympathetic response on Capitol Hill.

As soon as we look beyond the immediate questions of Pentagon planning and defense funding, we realize the immense importance of interdependence for military policy. First, there is the need for interdependence with other nations of the free world partnership, specifically participants of the NATO, CENTO, and SEATO alliances, of which we are a member. Second, there is the need for interdependence between our defense policy and the other aspects of our total international strategy.

The United States is firmly committed to close, vigorous, cooperative alliances with her free world friends. The whole structure of our foreign policy since World War II has emphasized this, and new strains on the policy of containment of Communist expansion, as well as new strains on the political and economic fabric of the free world, make such unity all the more essential. From the military point of view alliances with foreign nations give us both the opportunity to encourage strong military forces with our defense support and the opportunity for proper dispersal and deployment of our own forces in such a way as to strengthen our nuclear deterrent and to mobilize our forces for limited war in a really effective manner. Let me quote briefly from former Secretary Gates' testimony before the Senate Committee on Appropriations last June:

"The whole posture of the United States and the basic tenet of its foreign policy is in collective support arrangements; what is known as a forward strategy. * * *

"The bases that we have, permit our forces to remain deployed, ready and alert, on the scene of action in the far-flung areas of the world, the Far East, the Mediterranean, and so forth.

"Their primary mission is to preserve the peace, but if the peace cannot be preserved and some limited threat gets started, they can move quickly and put out the fire or they can be augmented if this fire grows larger.

"Furthermore, the forward strategy in building bases for our allies gives them determination, self-respect, permits them to have a sense of security for themselves, to stand up and remain members of the free world, and backs up their own determination. This probably would not exist, and they would probably become victims of subversion, infiltration, or some other method of attack if they did not have some forces to maintain at least internal security."

The free world alliance is continually beset by new strains, both economic and political. Whether the new administration can improve the overall strength and stability of the partnership is a matter of doubt. It is self-evident that the United States must continue to carry the great burden of responsibility and action. With reference to NATO, which the Kennedy administration has pledged to build up, two difficulties immediately come to mind. The U.S. vote in the United Nations on Angola paints a clear picture of our dilemma in helping the aspirations of the new emerging underdeveloped countries while at the same time meeting the demands of our Western allies. Another example is symbolized by President Kennedy's decision to travel to Paris to meet with President de Gaulle in the near future. The United States would like France to play a stronger and more cooperative role in the NATO alliance, yet we have serious difficulty in cooperating, in turn, with France on her policies in Algeria, the Belgian Congo, and Laos.

Militarily, we face difficulties in working out a unified nuclear force for the 15-nation NATO alliance and in persuading other NATO members to increase their contribution of ground forces to the group. I am very doubtful that Congress at this time would agree to amend the McMahon Act allowing any dispersal of nuclear power within the NATO alliance. Under the present law there can be no independent nuclear force for NATO, since the United States must retain effective control of all the nuclear weapons it produces. At any rate, statements by NATO leaders stressing the organization as the core of Western security or calling for a real unity of purpose and method in the Western alliance will obviously not be enough, and hard decisions of compromise will have to be made on all sides in order to bring about real progress.

The CENTO and SEATO alliances face parallel difficulties. In the Lao crisis the SEATO nations seem to have reached some degree of unanimity as to possible action, but how far they actually go is another question. Both these alliances are largely untested and will depend in any event to a heavy degree on the United States and Great Britain. Increased emphasis on the means with which to fight in limited or guerrilla conflict will, of course, be helpful for these defense blocs.

Our defense policies must be closely alined with the allied fields of disarmament, economic aid, and United Nations affairs. At least two of these subjects will be covered in detail by men far more expert than I during this conference. I believe that our policy of deterrence must be as consistent as possible with efforts to bring about adequately protected weapons tests and disarmament agreements. To the extent that the finite deterrence versus counterforce debate has any validity, the former emphasis will be most constructive in this regard, and I have already suggested that the new budget request for defense is, if anything, more rather than less compatible with this philosophy.

This reconciliation between two apparently contradictory ends—military power and its reduction and control—must progress. As Prime Minister Harold Macmillan said at MIT recently: "We must take care lest by building up our own security we perpetuate and encourage a nuclear arms race. That is one reason why I so earnestly hope for the successful outcome of the present negotiation in Geneva." And Sir Charles P. Snow, the noted British scientist, has pointed out that within 6 years China and several other states will have a stock of nuclear bombs and within 10 years the chances of some of these weapons being exploded is very real indeed.

Finally, we come to the compelling question set as the theme of this conference, "Is International Communism Winning?" The important thing to recognize is that neither the East nor West has gained substantially over the other in the last decade. Because of the fact that in the short run, at least, an aggressive, totalitarian machine holds many basic advantages when competing with a defensive, democratic endeavor, we make take some modest encouragement from this stalemate of mutual frustration. Certainly, for instance, in the underdeveloped areas, the Communists carry great initial leverage in both appeal and action. Yet the West has held the line.

From the point of view of my part in the discussion, let me say that the United States is the strongest nation in the world militarily. Her joint Defense Establishment maintained with the help of her free world allies is superior to that of the Soviet bloc. The Western deterrent at the present time is effective; that is, it is capable of preventing major aggression by our enemies. Yet we constantly face both new external threats and pulls on our inner strength. So it is our job to dedicate ourselves constantly to hard reappraisal, combined mobilization of joint resources, and decisive action to make and carry out new policies on the national

and international levels. Such action depends on an alert and intelligent electorate capable of generating a powerful national will and unified resolve to support the strong policies that will be needed. Consider the accomplishment the Russians have reported just this week in launching a man into space and returning him from orbit, for instance. The U.S.S.R. must be commended for a powerful breakthrough. But we cannot indulge in inferiority complexes, which we are rather prone to do as a nation. We must not be disheartened, or lose sight of the fact that our own overall scientific progress in space research is superior to that of the Russians. It would be foolhardy to trust complacency on any score, but our outlook must be confident and resolute if we are to continue increasing our great strength.

This is why I am particularly pleased and honored to address you here tonight.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill authorizing the procurement of military aircraft, ships, and missiles, as provided in section 412 of the Military Construction Act of 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to state that we hope we may be able to take up the bill early next week.

Subsequently, Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 253) thereon; which bill was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, for the information of the Senate, let me state that it is anticipated that at the conclusion of business today, the Senate will go over until Monday.

On Monday, the Senate will take up two treaties on the Executive Calendar—Executive C and Executive I; and, on the basis of the authority just granted to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, the Senate will take up the military procurement bill on Monday, as well.

On Tuesday, we shall bring up the aid-to-education bill, which was reported this morning from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I wish to take this means to serve notice on the Senate—and I have discussed this matter with the minority leadership—that all Senators should, from next Monday on, plan to be in the city and in the Chamber, because following the aid-to-education bill, we shall have the housing bill.

In addition, let me state that insofar as the two treaties are concerned, there will be no record vote on them until Tuesday, at the conclusion of the morning hour. Later, I hope to work out an agreement with the minority leader, to see whether we can be more specific.

But I do wish to put the Senate on notice that from Monday next, all Senators should remain in the city and should be in the Chamber, for the consideration of this most important legislation to which I have referred.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, will the distinguished Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. If, unhappily, the Senate were not able to dispose of the school legislation and the housing legislation by Friday, would the distinguished majority leader feel inclined to have the Senate hold a Saturday session, or would he feel inclined to have the Senate go over from Friday to Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. From next Friday to the following Monday, and no Saturday session, so far as I can see.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Montana.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, if no other Senator seeks recognition in the morning hour, I now seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I should like to take a few minutes to discuss the apparent policy decision of President Kennedy not to seek the enactment of civil rights legislation at this session. That was reported as of May 9; and in the New York Times of May 10 appears the following statement by President Kennedy's press secretary, Pierre Salinger:

> The President has made it clear that he does not think it is necessary at this time to enact civil rights legislation.

Madam President, the President himself said, in answer to a question at a news conference on March 8:

> When I believe that we can usefully move ahead in the field of legislation, I will recommend it to the Congress.

Madam President, what needs to be made clear is whether this policy of the administration also includes modification of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate regarding debates and filibusters, because I have been advised by the chairman of the Rules Committee that there is every intention—as we were assured at the beginning of this session—to move into the effort to amend those rules later during this session of Congress, with the holding of the necessary hearings, and the expectation that action will then be taken on the floor. That is the first point I make, Madam President.

My second point is as follows: I believe I would be less than honest with myself and less than fair and would not be acting in pursuance of my duty here if I did not protest strongly against the apparent decision of the administration at the very most to go no further than some effort to have a modification made of rule XXII of the Rules of the Senate—the so-called filibuster rule. I say that for the reason that the administration has shown commendable activity with respect to executive action, especially in moving into the Prince Edward County school cases, through the Department of Justice. But there is no substitute for legislation, not even in the Prince Edward County school cases. For example, if funds and technical assistance were to be utilized for the purpose of providing some schooling for the Negro children there, who now are being denied any schooling whatever, congressional action would be required. Let me also point out that cases involving the Prince Edward County schools are pending; it was in those cases that the administration took action, through the Department of Justice. There would be nothing in which the Department of Justice could move unless we provided authority—by means of the famous provision called Part III, which has been defeated in the Senate before, but always has had substantial support—for the Attorney General to move in those cases.

In addition, Senator CLARK and Representative CELLER, in pursuance of a campaign promise by the President, and with the backing of the administration, have introduced a package of six bills, one of which, for example, calls for ratification of a constitutional amendment to eliminate the literacy test; and others deal with some of the matters to which I have already referred in connection with civil rights legislation.

If that is the administration's work originally, in initiating such legislation, the administration certainly should go through with it, by backing up those bills.

In short, Madam President, I have never made partisan issues of civil rights matters, and I hope not to do so now; for I introduced, in January 1961, a civil rights legislative program which had bipartisan sponsorship and which covers these same broad areas. But I feel that every one of us who is deeply concerned with this subject must protest very strongly against the apparent attitude of the administration that it must appease Senators from one section of the county in order to get the rest of its "must" legislation through, at the price of the critically important civil rights bills which deserve a place on anyone's "must" list, including the administration's "must" list, in view of its campaign pledges, and also in view of the campaign pledges of those of us on the Republican side.

I shall do everything I can to see to it that action is had at this session on civil rights bills; and I hope the administration will yet come around to a realization of the stern necessity for taking this course of action.

PRICE OF FARM EQUIPMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, the other day I found in the Washington Star a very brief article entitled "Farm Equipment Rise Predicted." The article is by the Associated Press, and reads as follows:

> FARM EQUIPMENT RISE PREDICTED
>
> A leading investment service predicts better days for agriculture under the Kennedy administration and a revival in the farm equipment industry.

In its current report, the Value Line Investment Survey has this to say:

"While it is a bit too early to be specific as to the benefits that will accrue to farmers during President Kennedy's administration, we feel relatively safe in making this statement: President Kennedy will drive hard to improve the economic position of the farmer and he will achieve some success."

Madam President, let me say that the "leading investment service" is a much better prophet about the future of agriculture than is the ex-Vice President of the United States, who has been making a few comments about agriculture. Of course, he predicted that the agricultural situation would be worse; and let me say that he has some expert knowledge of those matters, having been a part of the administration which attempted to preside over the liquidation of the family-farm system, only to be relieved of his responsibilities in time for the farmers to be saved from that situation.

I wish to compliment the investment service for its vision, sense of enlightenment, and sene of fairplay. I predict that with this investment service there will be a decided improvement in agriculture under the Kennedy administration, and I want to compliment the Secretary of Agriculture for the fine thing he is doing.

DEVELOPMENT OF NAVIGATION POTENTIAL OF MISSOURI RIVER

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, acting in accordance with congressional policy, the Corps of Engineers has made great progress in developing the navigation potential of the Missouri River. Those of us who live in Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota have a particular interest in seeing establishment of a 9-foot channel in the river at the earliest practicable date to enable this area to achieve the economic and industrial growth needed to absorb those people who are leaving the farms. This development can also quicken the decentralization of defense and industrial plants, which is long overdue.

In the April 15 and May 7 issues of the Sioux City Journal appeared two timely editorials on this subject, which point out the findings of a recent survey on the economic impact of channel improvement and also the desirability of letting the Corps of Engineers continue to handle the navigation problem with the good sense and judgment which have characterized the corps activities heretofore.

I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux City Sunday Journal, May 7, 1961]

RIVER SHIPPING: KEY TO AREA GROWTH

A study of the economic potential of any region inevitably leads a researcher's discussion seemingly in circles because of the "which came first, the chicken or the egg?" interrelationship of marketing, production and related factors.

Although an economic survey may not succeed in solving the riddle, it has made progress if the reading has revealed the influence of the more important economic factors on one another.

Helpful in that way is the recently released study, "Economic Impact of Channel Improvement on the Iowa Segment of the Missouri River," made by the Midwest Research Institute of Kansas City, Mo., for the Iowa Development Commission and sponsored by the Iowa Public Service Co. and the Iowa Power and Light Co.

Basically, the study report finds that a 9-foot navigation channel in the Missouri River, on the basis of experience in other river basins, will result in economic growth that will radiate from the riverfront inland to broaden the economic base of county towns if there is the community will and the capital to guide and integrate the development. The findings seem to us to apply equally well to similar Nebraska and South Dakota river areas along the Missouri River.

Northwest Iowa's basic industry, agriculture, will receive some early benefits in lower costs of fertilizer and imported feed supplements and in lower freight costs on grain it exports. Indirect and somewhat delayed but nevertheless significant to steel-using industry, including farming, would be the movement of scrap steel downstream and of machinery and other finished steel upstream.

The report emphasizes the rural population decline in the 18 western Iowa counties of the Missouri segment and the scarcity of industry in some of them as obstacles to much direct and immediate benefit from navigation. Nevertheless, savings in bulk transportation rates for grain and fertilizer could stimulate the agricultural economy of the industry-short middle and southern counties and thus help to reverse the rural-small town population decline, the report indicates. This would be an assistance to location of new industry because it would tend to keep a younger, more productive labor force at hand in the region.

One facet of agriculture developing with the river, regarding which no statistics could be available to the Midwest report, but which could well have been mentioned in conjunction with its observation that some 100,000 acres of marginal rough land has gone out of farming in this area in recent years, is the fact of up to 200,000 flood-free acres of Missouri bottoms added permanently to full-time output of high-yield grain and specialized crops under intensive, easily irrigated and heavily fertilized tillage.

The Midwest report finds in the Iowa-Missouri River area many of the things new industry seeks—a surplus of diligent, easy-to-train labor; good overland transportation facilities including the interstate highway; excellent petroleum pipeline service; water, fuel, and power in abundance; and basic raw materials ranging from limestone to farm crops.

The conclusion to be drawn from the report is that with river transportation, the areas facing the Missouri River can expect to broaden and diversify their industrial bases and to reverse much of the local population decline.

Without river transportation, the outlook for these rural town areas for 1975 is a still smaller and older working force less able to accept new industry, a declining market for local industries, and for those remaining on the farm, continuing economic disadvantage of high-cost transportation for bulk supplies and marketable commodities.

Thus, though the Midwest Research Institute study report opens with an admonition that there are no panaceas, no cure-alls, it shows navigation to be imperative if the river region is to achieve anything more than a drastically retarded, below national average growth rate.

[From the Sioux City Journal, Apr. 15, 1961]

NO URGENCY IN NAVIGATION DECISION

Conflicting statements regarding decisions as to the length of the 1961 navigation season on the Missouri River have come from Washington, D.C., and Omaha, Nebr., in recent days.

The first, from Senators Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf of Montana and Congressman Quentin Burdick of North Dakota, all Democrats, after a conference with Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for water and power, and Maj. Gen. William Cassidy of the Army Corps of Engineers, was to the effect that the navigation season would have to be curtailed due to water shortage upstream and that the decision would be made at the June 1–2 meeting of the river coordinating committee.

The second and last interpretation comes from Brig. Gen. William R. Shuler, Missouri River engineer at Omaha, who says he understands the consensus of that conference to have been that the current water outlook of the upper basin indicates a possible shortening of the navigation season but that the actual recommendation was referred to the coordinating committee.

Brigadier General Shuler further pointed out that adequate information on the year's runoff will not be available for making the curtailment decision until the committee's August meeting, which through practice has proved the most feasible time for making such decisions.

Remembering last year's heavy summer rain runoffs in the middle and lower tributaries, which enabled the engineers to bank much of the water that would have otherwise been released to support navigation, we can see no reason for rushing a decision to shut down Missouri River navigation early next fall.

Aggregate precipitation in the Missouri Valley is still much too unpredictable a factor to assume that a lighter than usual spring runoff portends a summer drought. A repetition of last summer's rains in the lower and middle basin could easily forestall a serious drawdown in the large upstream reservoirs even if the summer runoff from the mountains fell below normal.

There's no need for hurrying such an emergency decision except in the minds of those who would, if they could force their will on the rest of the basin, have the Missouri River dam operation favor preference power users at the expense of others rightfully entitled to orderly use of the various other important community benefits the harnessed Missouri has made possible.

RAMPART: THE BIGGEST OF THEM ALL

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, Col. C. Hanburger, district engineer of the Alaska U.S. Army Engineer District, spoke Tuesday of this week before the Fairbanks, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce. He told the chamber of the construction work in Alaska for this year over which the Corps of Engineers will have supervision.

Principally, however, Colonel Hanburger's remarks had to do with the proposed hydroelectric project at Rampart on the Yukon River. He told of the start of field investigations under most trying and unfavorable climatic conditions. He told how electricity could be generated there to supply the needs of 10 million homes. He told of an installation that would produce more than two and one-half times the amount of power generated by Grand Coulee. He told how a great inland sea would be

created if the dam were constructed. He told of the estimated construction costs to make available 2-mill power to supply cheap electricity for industry and many other things.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have Colonel Hanburger's speech printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY COL. C. HANBURGER, DISTRICT ENGINEER, U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, ALASKA, AT FAIRBANKS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON MAY 9, 1961

I welcome this opportunity of speaking to you about the proposed Rampart Canyon hydroelectric project which neighbors Fairbanks to the northwest.

First, I should like to mention the military construction program in the Fairbanks area for this year. The Alaska district of the Corps of Engineers will supervise construction at Eielson, Fort Yukon, Indian Mountain, Galena and Clear, which will amount to about $10 million worth of work. This amount is down about 50 percent from last year, when we were doing considerably more work at the Clear Ballistic Missile Early Warning Station to meet urgent defense scheduling.

Reduced as it is, the $10 million program is far from a small one, as I am sure you will agree. It is too early yet to see clearly what the 1962 military construction program will be valued at, but I think it is probable that it will be no larger than this year's.

The Rampart investigations are a part of the district's civil works program, which has as its mission to assist the civilian economy of Alaska by the development of needed public works such as boat harbors, navigation channels, flood control projects, hydroelectric power dams, and other water resource developments.

We expect to be engaged in about $2,400,000 worth of construction work on small boat harbors in Alaska this year at Dillingham, Homer, Ninilchik, Seldovia and Douglas.

The Rampart investigation is an authorized special study of one of the potential major developments inventoried in the district's comprehensive water resource survey which was started in 1949. Since then, the survey has examined this resource in all sections of Alaska and has located over 150 potential hydroelectric development sites ranging from the very small, to those of enormous capability on the Yukon River.

House Document No. 501 published in 1934 examines water resources in southeastern Alaska. House Document No. 34 published in 1957 is concerned with the resources in the Cook Inlet and tributaries region. House Document No. 137 published in 1955 examines the Tanana River Basin area. The Copper River and gulf coast area report is contained in House Document No. 182 published in 1953. Southwestern Alaska report is contained in House Document No. 390 published in 1957. Northwestern Alaska's report is contained in House Document No. 99 published in 1959. The Yukon-Kuskokwim report is submitted to Congress, and I expect that it will be published in the next 6 months.

This one State, Alaska, has a hydroelectric potential equal to two-thirds of the developed hydroelectric power in the other 49 States.

At Rampart this winter, the district began field investigations. The work has progressed satisfactorily despite problems which have compounded the effort. The work has been severely hampered by extreme cold, and by supply problems. Men at the site reported temperature readings as low as 54° below zero. The first crew that went overland to the site knew that temperatures frequently dipped to 45° below. They suspect that it was colder than this, but their thermometer wasn't calibrated to register any lower temperatures.

Supplies for the investigation camp were first brought overland from Fairbanks. Two attempts failed to reach the site due to natural obstacles before the third attempt succeeded in reaching the mouth of Texas Creek on the Yukon on February 18.

The trailmen started leveling the warped surface of the river ice immediately for a strip to land cargo planes which would bring in the bulk of the needed camp supplies.

The airlift of supplies from Fairbanks commenced the following day, and it was essentially completed within a week. Interior Airlines of Fairbanks was the successful low bidder for the airlift contract. The crew at Rampart unloaded the planes and transported 120 tons of supplies from the airstrip 2 miles to camp. In between planes, they erected the camp at the mouth of Texas Creek.

A churn drill, the largest of three drill rigs used on the survey, as well as several tons of other equipment were transported from Anchorage by Alaska Air National Guard C–123's during the early part of March. The C–123 plane, as you know, is built to haul heavy equipment and to land on relatively short airstrips. They are made to order for airlifting heavy bulky equipment, such as the churn drill, which could not be transported and unloaded from other aircraft.

Drilling began on March 6. Drillers have completed six test holes, using 5 feet of ice covering the river as a platform from which to work. They have also drilled for core samples at the island located near the site. They have found that the rock underlying the Yukon at the damsite is a good grade of granite suitable for placing the foundation of a large dam structure. Core samples of rock have been taken through as much as 90 feet of solid granite, and down as much as 200 feet below the surface of the ice.

The core samples are important in the district's field survey. They will be scrutinized with great care for data which will be included in a report of investigations on Rampart's feasibility—from an engineering standpoint.

More test holes will be drilled at the site during the summer, to complete the general subsurface explorations. I would like to emphasize this: no amount of good rock at the site, or other favorable construction factors can of themselves prove Rampart's feasibility. Nor does the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers desire to build Rampart Dam merely because it can be built—if that proves to be the case. We must know that there will be a market for the power; in other words, it must be proven that what can be produced can be used to benefit Alaska and the Nation.

Studies made by other organizations and government elements are essential to the study of the Rampart project. These studies must be completed and analyzed in establishing the overall project feasibility. The conclusions and recommendations of these essential studies and surveys must be considered, evaluated, and weighed as a whole to determine any recommendations and conclusions that should be made regarding the Rampart Canyon development.

Currently, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, assisted by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game, is making a survey of the project to determine the effects it will have on salmon runs and resident fish, the waterfowl and other birds, and on big game and other furbearing animals inhabiting the reservoir area.

A contract has just been awarded to an independent firm, the Development and Resources Corp. of New York City, to make a study on the economic aspects of the proposed Rampart Canyon dam. Members of this firm include Mr. Lilienthal and Mr. Clapp, both of whom have had extensive experience in the development and utilization of large blocks of power.

Mr. Lilienthal, chairman of the Board of Directors for the corporation, is a man of national prominence. He was chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission during the formative years from 1946 to 1950. During that period he also served as Chairman of the U.S. State Department Board of Consultants on International Control of Atomic Energy. Since his graduation from Harvard University with a bachelor of law degree in 1923, he has held a variety of positions, all with large responsibilities. He is an authority on business, industry and government in 20th century America, and the author of several books on these themes.

Mr. Gordon R. Clapp, president of the Development and Resources Corp. likewise has a prominent record in positions of wide responsibility and authority. From 1933 to 1954 he has been associated with the Tennessee Valley Authority. First he was assistant director of personnel until 1935, and director from 1935 to 1939. He was general manager of TVA from 1939 to 1946; from that year until 1954 he was chairman of the board of directors for TVA. He has been a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Education from 1936 to 1939. He was chairman of a committee on employee relations in public service of the Civil Service Assembly in 1942. He was editor-in-chief of the Public Administration Review from 1943 to 1945, and in 1949 he was chairman of the United Nations Commission for the economic survey of the Middle East. In 1945–55 he was deputy city administrator for the city of New York.

The Development and Resources Corp. was established in 1955. It has served in advisory capacities to Government and private enterprises in the planning and execution of river, land, and mineral development programs.

Since its formation it has assisted in numerous large undertakings. The largest has been in helping the Government of Iran to develop a comprehensive, long-range plan for the integrated development of the Khuzestan regions consisting of five watersheds. The program has involved the construction of a dam to curb flooding, provide hydroelectric power and irrigation; the development of a sugarcane plantation and a sugar refinery; an agricultural research and development program; the installation of a high voltage transmission line and the management and interim operation of the electric distribution system in Ahwaz, capital of Khuzestan province.

The corporation also has assisted in the formation of Cauca Valley Corp., a regional development in Colombia; it has served in an advisory capacity for a program to develop southern Italy; it has appraised one of the major hydroelectric sites in South America. Also, it is preparing a plan for expanding the municipal water supply of the capital of Ghana. Recently it has undertaken a survey of mineral resources for the Government of the Ivory Coast.

This widely recognized corporation will make the survey of Rampart's economic feasibility. Men who are members of the firm, and other consultants from outside the firm whom they will employ during the course of the study, will determine if there is or will be a market for Rampart's enormous electric product. The study will go into the effects of such a large block of power on the Nation, the State, and on the free world, and will determine the economic areas in which such power would be useful.

Here, I would like to stress two factors: First, Rampart cannot be justified for construction on the basis of a present need for low-cost power in Alaska. Second, it cannot be justified for a $1½ billion appropriation on the basis of anticipated near future needs in Alaska indicated by the current economic trend showing a 10 to 12 percent annual growth factor. In other words, what we are saying here is that while we have a dire need for cheap electric power in Alaska, we cannot afford to go out and develop power to the extent that we will have a large block of it sitting around unsold, as to do so would mean that the small amount that could be sold would have to pay for the development of all the rest. This is a very important consideration that must not be lost sight of in any development. In other words, we must not invest a large amount of money and have it sit idle; it must be a wise investment.

In this, I do not overlook your present needs for low-cost power in Fairbanks. I would be happy if Rampart power were to go on the line today; it would cut your power bill to one-fourth or less.

I would certainly like to have a part in reducing the power cost in Fairbanks. Yet, in Rampart we have a project capable of supplying the power needs for 10 million homes. Ten million homes are more than there are in New York City and many of its suburbs combined.

There must be a proven industrial market for Rampart's power if it is to be built in the near future. Industry must be the main consumer.

We estimate that the feasibility studies will be completed in 2 to 3 years. Upon their completion, the decision will rest with the U.S. Congress, the President, and ultimately with the American people. They will decide on the basis of the district's findings whether Rampart Dam should be built or not, and if so, how soon.

If the decision should be made to build as rapidly as possible, and adequate funds are provided, then Rampart could be generating power by 1971 and 1972. Whatever the decision is, it will be formed on data that as yet have not been fully developed.

There is something exciting about Rampart, probably the vastness of its reservoir and its power capacity. These dimensions are staggeringly large. The dam itself is not as large as Grand Coulee Dam. It is not as high as several existing dams. Its reservoir and power capacity are the things about Rampart that are nearly beyond comparison. The installed power capacity would be more than two and one-half times the amount of Grand Coulee's.

It would create what is, in effect, an inland sea by its reservoir stretching 370 miles toward the Canadian border at its longest axis, and reaching more than 80 miles across at its widest axis.

Rampart's cost would be very large. It poses a paradox of being at once extremely expensive and extremely economical. Although the costs of construction would be $1½ billion, the cost of power produced by Rampart at the dam is estimated at one-fifth of a penny per kilowatt, or 2 mills.

So cheap and so enormous an amount of power does not exist anywhere in the Free World today. To my knowledge, no potential source of additional power anywhere in the free world can compare with Rampart on the basis of power quantity and low unit power cost.

I urge you to consider the scope of this project well. It is not properly a candidate for a popularity contest. Its ramifications may be both immediate and prolonged, for you in Fairbanks as well as for all of Alaska and the United States. I am sure that many generations to follow, and millions of people will be affected by Rampart if it is built.

Should Rampart be built, Fairbanks would play, I am sure, a very large part in its construction. It would be the base from which many supplies, men, and construction items would leave for the damsite. I am sure that for many years it would be a large base of operations even though other bases were established closer to the site itself.

Towns undoubtedly will develop nearer to the site where there are none now. There will be roads and airports, possibly even railroads and barge lines where there are none today.

If all the studies prove that Rampart should be built, and then Congress appropriates the money, you can reasonably expect to see many towns grow, based on a stable industrial complex which would be located in Alaska and would expand the cities of Alaska.

I'm sure that you do agree that much now hinges on what current studies of Rampart will show. The future of Alaska will be influenced significantly by what is learned in the surveys.

At this stage, I can give you only a bare minimum of facts of interest on Rampart. They are these: It could produce power by 1971 or 1972; with future full development of its prime energy, it can produce 3,735,000 kilowatts. This can be generated at a cost of about 2 mills, and transmitted to distant load centers at an additional cost of about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour.

In addition, I will say that it is certain that Rampart is a magnificent concept. It is one, in my opinion, which articulates the promise of Alaska such as no other project has. We are moving ahead in our determination to discover whether this great promise will be fruitful.

NEW CULTURAL CLIMATE

Mr. PELL. Madam President, last Sunday's New York Times carried a most interesting article by the distinguished senior Senator from New York regarding the need for Federal programs in the field of art. I have closely followed the work of Senator JAVITS on this question and I have had the pleasure of conferring with him and other Senators who are interested in legislation which would assist the arts.

Therefore, I am especially pleased to ask unanimous consent that Senator JAVITS' article entitled, "New Cultural Climate," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CULTURAL CLIMATE

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

WASHINGTON.—The climate has been improving in the country for a national arts program. I believe the people are ready through their elected representatives in the Congress, to enact a Federal program to help the development of our Nation's cultural resources in the performing and visual arts. I have been trying to get Federal help for the arts since 1949, and this is the first year that I am confident our country has reached the point when the needed public support can be marshaled to bring about the adoption of the legislation.

The President's Commission on National Goals in the previous administration has cited the importance of supporting the arts and there is increasing need for Congress to concern itself with the problem of broadening the basis of our cultural activities. Both candidates for President expressed themselves as favoring Federal help for the arts in the 1960 campaign.

THREE IDEAS

There are three proposals for Federal help to the arts before the Congress. The Federal Advisory Council on the Arts, proposed by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, and in which I and other Senators have joined as cosponsors, is essentially a planning group to develop a plan for Federal aid to the arts and requiring a next step in legislation to activate it. It would be appointed by the President and be composed of 21 members who are recognized leaders in the arts and who collectively would provide an appropriate balance of representation among the major art fields. They would serve 6-year terms and their major duty would be to propose ways and means of encouraging private initiative in the arts and closer cooperation with local, State, and Federal agencies. It carries no authorization for funds.

Another approach was offered by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, who proposed a plan to aid State-sponsored programs for the arts by granting each State up to $100,000 in matching Federal funds. This would be used to help the State to inventory existing programs, survey the need for additional programs, and develop new as well as existing nonprofit activities in the arts. Funds also could be used to build public and other nonprofit centers for the performance, exhibition, or teaching of the arts; to preserve sites of historical or artistic significance, and to help States to develop projects designed to supply leadership, training, and experience in the arts.

The U.S. Arts Foundation was my proposal to help by Federal subvention to make possible live performances and art exhibitions in areas that could not otherwise receive and support them. There are functioning arts councils along the lines I propose in the United Kingdom and in Canada, and they have proved strikingly successful. At least one of our own States, New York, also has taken the forward-looking step of establishing a State council on the arts. The U.S. Arts Foundation would stimulate a revival of the arts in entire regions through the work of private nonprofit groups, municipalities, or State agencies able to operate because the subvention available under the foundation would cover the difference between costs and admission fees.

The U.S. Arts Foundation would bring about wider dissemination of the arts and, within the framework of free enterprise and voluntary association, expose more people and more places to the best in American culture than any other measure before the Congress. It would accommodate aid to the States also as contemplated by the Clark bill. It also would help in the development and training of new talent in the arts field.

SIGNIFICANT STEP

This is a conservative proposal, providing $10 million a year from the Federal Government for the entire country, but it is most important as a first step in obtaining from the Federal Government some recognition of its responsibility for the encouragement of American culture. Spent in conjunction with matching funds from interested and producing public or private agencies in the performing and visual arts, this modest Federal appropriation could stimulate the creation of as much as $50 million in non-Government activity on behalf of the arts. We are long past due as a people in coming to realize that the visual and performing arts are not a luxury but a necessity in our free society.

The U.S. Art Foundation would be authorized to accept donations and utilize the services of volunteers, so that a minimum of appropriated funds would be required. It would function through panels or committees composed of artists and representatives of education and the general public who would judge the artistic worth and cultural significance of submitted programs to determine whether they qualify for support by the Foundation.

President Kennedy, during the campaign, even indicated support for legislation for a U.S. Art Foundation. In October 1960 he said in a statement to Equity magazine:

"I am in full sympathy with the proposal for a federally supported foundation to provide encouragement and opportunity to nonprofit private and civic groups in the performing arts. When so many other nations officially recognize and support the performing arts as part of their national cultural heritage, it seems to me unfortunate that the United States has been so slow in coming to a similar recognition."

It seems to me, too, that this tells the story very well.

HOUSE ACTION

Counterparts of the three proposals I have described have been introduced in the House of Representatives—the Council bill by Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, Republican, of Pennsylvania, the State-grants proposal by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of Brooklyn, and the U.S. Arts Foundation by Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican, of Queens.

I believe a U.S. Arts Foundation, an arts-council type of Federal program, could enable us to look forward in the very near future to the time when our Nation will be served by theater, opera, ballet, music, sculpture, painting, photography, and graphic and crafts arts in all sections of the land—so that no part of the country will suffer from cultural starvation.

I have urged the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to hold hearings on my bill and those of my Senate colleagues as soon as possible. I believe we really do not need an intermediate step of an Advisory Council, but that we are ready to come to grips with the actual problem of aiding the arts with funds from governmental and private sources. Yet, even an Advisory Council would be some progress.

Let us get off the ground. A television set is fine, but it is no adequate substitute for a family excursion to the theater, a concert, or an art exhibition. We are the only major nation on earth whose government still does so little about the nation's cultural treasure in the performing and visual arts, and it is high time that we caught up.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PELL. Madam President, on May 10, Rumanians throughout the free world freely celebrated the founding of the Kingdom of Rumania. It is a sad commentary on the present world situation that those Rumanians who still live in their native country could not openly take part.

As a person who has traveled in Rumania and other countries behind the Iron Curtain and who has represented the U.S. Government in Czechoslovakia, I know personally that few people have resisted attempts by the Soviets to extinguish their national pride as have the citizens of Eastern Europe whose countries have been swallowed up by their large and powerful neighbor. Even though Rumania has been behind the Iron Curtain for a number of years now, her spirit and her wish to be free remains undaunted.

I know that all Americans are united in their hope that all those who are crushed under the Soviet colonial heel will some day be free again. This is indeed an appropriate time to reiterate our determination never to condone the enslavement of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

As freemen we join today in extending our warm hearted fraternity to all those who long for freedom. We pledge again that we shall never forget them.

WATERFOWL REFUGES AND BREEDING GROUNDS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a statement which I recently made before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, regarding proposed legislation for the expedition of acquisition of waterfowl refuges and breeding lands.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR J. W. FULBRIGHT BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. Chairman, the bills introduced by Congressman REUSS and Congressman DINGELL are of great importance to duck hunters throughout the Nation.

Arkansas has long been noted for its excellent duck hunting. The eastern half of the State lies within the heart of the Lower Mississippi Flyway. Our duck hunting is unexcelled anywhere in the country and as a consequence sportsmen come to Arkansas by the thousands during duck hunting season. The rice production area and our abundant river bottoms and reservoirs make eastern Arkansas a natural waterfowl habitat. The money spent by hunters makes a substantial contribution to the State's economy and continuation of good duck hunting is important not only to sportsmen but to the entire State. We want to keep duck hunting good and in order to do this it is urgent that acquisition of waterfowl refuges and breeding lands be expedited.

Several years ago Congress increased the duck stamp cost from $2 to $3 and specified that the entire proceeds from such sales would be used for purchase of waterfowl conservation areas. Although this was a step in the right direction it is not enough to do the job that is needed. Fish and Wildlife Service officials estimate that it will take at least 30 years, at the present rate, to acquire the refuges and breeding grounds needed. Our waterfowl population is declining at an alarming rate and we cannot delay this long in acquiring these conservation areas. Both waterfowl refuge and breeding ground lands are disappearing rapidly. Wetlands are being drained for farming, housing developments, industrial development, and other purposes. In 3 or 4 years much of the choice land for waterfowl conservation will not be available, and what is available will be at a much higher price. If the waterfowl population is to be kept at an adequate level, this land acquisition program must be speeded up.

The proposal sponsored by Congressmen REUSS and DINGELL would insure that these wetlands could be acquired without undue delay. It authorizes, in addition to the duck stamp funds, the sum of $150 million for wetlands purchases. This money could be obtained either through direct annual appropriations or by Treasury borrowing. The Department of the Interior has indicated that at least $150 million will be needed, in addition to the duck stamp funds, to complete a minimum wetlands acquisition program. If the lands are acquired through Treasury borrowings, the advance would be repaid out of duck stamp revenues, starting in 1971.

This bill presents a constructive approach to solution of a critical waterfowl conservation problem and I hope that the committee will give sympathetic consideration to it.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the Oregon State Legislature has adopted two measures memoralizing Congress on Federal legislation.

Both have been forwarded to me by Harry Boivin, president of the Oregon State Senate. One is an endorsement of the proposal introduced by Senator HUMPHREY and cosponsored by myself to establish a Youth Conservation Corps.

The second is an appeal to Congress for an expanded program of access roads on the national forests. This would be carried out by my bill, S. 501.

I ask unanimous consent that these memorials be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 21

Whereas the Honorable WAYNE MORSE and the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY have introduced legislation relating to the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps; and

Whereas such legislation will provide a healthful, sound and constructive outlet and opportunity for boys between the ages of 18 and 21 seeking gainful employment; and

Whereas the State of Oregon is blessed with vast reaches of Federal forest lands that would greatly benefit from legislation providing means for supplementing application of forestry practices and recreational development not otherwise afforded by private enterprise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring):

1. We urge the Oregon delegation in the Congress of the United States to work for the passage of legislation envisioning, through a youth conservation program, the supplementing of existing Federal forestry practices and development of recreational facilities not otherwise provided by private enterprise.

2. Copies of this resolution shall be sent to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 11

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas there are extensive forests and public domain areas under Federal control in this State which do not have adequate forest access roads; and

Whereas lack of proper access limits the harvesting of mature timber, the salvaging of accumulating dead and down timber, the thinning of surplus growing stock in young stands, and prelogging small timber in old growth; and

Whereas it has been estimated that in the Douglas fir region of Oregon and Washington alone, 2½ billion board feet could be available if adequate roads were provided; and

Whereas the present annual flow of logs cannot be maintained at the current rate of private cutting and at present allowable rate of cut on public lands, and consequently the industrial capacity production and employment must suffer; and

Whereas a program for Federal forest and public domain roads is good business and

will benefit the State of Oregon and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring):

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to authorize a greatly expanded Federal program for the construction and development of forest access roads.

2. Copies of this memorial shall be sent to the President of the United States, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further business under the morning hour? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1215) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I had two amendments to Senate bill 1215 printed, and they are lying on the table. I wish to state that I do not intend to take up those amendments. However, I now send an amendment to the desk to Senate bill 1215. I shall have it taken up shortly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, after the word "East," it is proposed to add the following: "and Communist controlled nations (or areas thereof) in arrears in their advances to the working capital fund of the United Nations or in their contributions or assessments payable to the United Nations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time will not be taken out of the limited time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I yield 15 minutes from the time on the bill to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I expect to support the bill. I have some comments to make on the subject of "the People's Right To Know."

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, by tradition the first period of stocktaking for a new administration comes after the first 100 days. Both parties agree it takes about that amount of time for the executive department to begin making a record that might show significant trends.

Transitions are supposed to be accomplished in 100 days and policy directives, with the requisite number of carbon copies, have had their chance to be written, circulated, and leaked to newspapers.

The 100 days—and a few more—of the Kennedy administration have come and gone and the trends certainly are becoming apparent. My colleagues on this side of the aisle are discussing such trends this week. I shall discuss the people's right to know what its Government is doing.

I do not believe that there is any other policy of Government which has taken so drastic and dangerous a turn. Within the past few months the Kennedy administration has tried a variety of ways to suppress, manage, and regulate the flow of news which should be going to the American public.

It began in a clumsy, heavyhanded way on the part of the upper echelon of the public relations marketeers. Finally we had a top-level speech before the American Newspaper Publishers Association, which spoke of "the need for far greater official secrecy." Is this to be the watchword of this administration, to put the burden of censorship right into the hands of publishers—the people who are responsible for the dissemination, not the regulation, of news?

This policy of suggested news suppression comes in stark contrast to the manner in which the presidential campaign itself was conducted and in contradiction to the pious words heard throughout that campaign.

Never in the history of the United States was there such intensive news coverage of a presidential campaign. In addition to the reporting by the older and more traditional news media, like newspapers and magazines, the several television debates between Senator Kennedy and Vice President Nixon brought the political contest into the homes of almost every American family. There was no wanting for news during the campaign. And — significantly — there was no wanting for promises that there would be a continued free and frank policy of keeping the public informed after the inauguration of a new President.

Early in the campaign the then Senator Kennedy made this statement:

> Within the rather narrow limits of national security, the people of the United States are entitled to the fullest possible information about their Government—and the President must see that they receive it.

He made other specific pledges to reform and revise the system under which millions of Government papers are classified every month.

Then, in his state of the Union Address, the new President declared:

> For my part, I shall withhold from neither the Congress nor the people any fact or report, past, present or future, which is necessary for an informed judgment of our conduct and hazards.

The commitment was clear. But immediately after the new Administration took office, the performance failed to live up to the commitment.

Pierre Salinger, White House News Secretary, announced that there will be new "coordination" between his own office and press officers of the various departments and agencies.

This euphemistic "coordination" had lightning-like effect.

Several respected military leaders discovered that the judgment they were permitted to use in making speeches in December was not sufficient for speeches in February.

Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations was ordered to rewrite a speech. Gen. George H. Decker, Army Chief of Staff, also had a speech rejected, and Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff had a speech questioned and later cleared.

Then word "leaked out" that a so-called missile gap which existed for purposes of campaigning in 1960 did not in fact exist in 1961. The American public was confused and the press was justifiably critical of this kind of juggling with the facts.

It has been said that Government is a vessel which leaks most frequently from the top. Some Cabinet members soon demonstrated knowledge of the science of leakage. To this day the American people have never been informed, for example, about what was said at the background briefing conference which preceded the "missile leak" nor have they ever been informed about the actual case of missile gaps—closed or open.

Then, two American RB–47 pilots, who had been released with much fanfare after several months imprisonment in Russia, suddenly were ordered to remain silent. This was particularly puzzling to Washington correspondents because they had been permitted to interview the pilots shortly after their release. Why the clampdown? The only words of explanation came from Pierre Salinger. It was "in the best interests of the United States," he said, and there the story rests. Mr. Salinger himself becomes the custodian of our best interests.

In order that no stone may be unturned, Mr. Salinger revealed that cooks, maids, valets, and other household employees of the White House have had to sign statements pledging not to write of their experiences.

I can imagine some of the forthcoming experiences headed "I Was a Censored Maid at the White House."

The lid was clamped down on the release of information throughout the Government, but particularly severe was that affecting the Department of Defense.

The Navy Times described it editorially by saying:

> Americans generally ought to be having some misgivings over the current trend at

the Pentagon. There's an air of secrecy, of censorship, of arbitrary rulings.

The Chicago Sun-Times reported that General Lemnitzer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had complained in writing that the Nation's military chiefs were being bypassed on critical decisions by the new civilian leaders of the Department.

The office of Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, described the Sun-Times story as "simply without foundation."

Whereupon, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., called attention to a memorandum by General Lemnitzer which said in part:

I feel that in general the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be given a full opportunity to study carefully matters of this sort which have far-reaching military implications. In my opinion the new directive goes too far.

The Washington Star said after the flurry:

This [situation] raises a serious question for the Kennedy administration. Was the Defense Department in its statement to the press fully and frankly informing the American public?

The new censorship program at the Pentagon worries military officials who see a threat to the free exchange of ideas among military men. They report that articles have been rejected for the Naval Institute Proceedings, the Air University Quarterly Review, the Military Review—of the Army Command and General Staff College—and the Navy's Judge Advocate General Journal.

They were particularly distressed at the lack of guidance on what could be said on certain subjects. As recently as last month, they maintained that their only formal guidance on foreign policy statements was one note, "DOD Public Affairs Guidance No. 18—Public Statements in the Foreign Policy Area and Related Activities." It was the transcript of a Dave Garroway television interview with Secretary of Defense McNamara in which the Secretary answered briefly several informal questions about military speeches.

And so the Pentagon is expected to rely upon the Dave Garroway guide.

The Army, Navy, Air Force Journal commented, in an article dated April 22, 1961:

A new restriction has been imposed on release of information about missile firings. The Pentagon order affects the services and industry. They have been told that henceforth "information concerning missile firings conducted in remote areas and not within public view or access will not be released" unless authorized by the office of Assistant Secretary Sylvester. * * * The Navy has been unable to announce publicly the success of a 19th underseas firing of the Polaris missile. The official tabulation is 18.

The Army Times commented editorially:

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs—the title of whose office would lead one to suppose it was set up to dispense information to the public and the troops—would probably be offended to learn his shop was being referred to by Pentagon reporters as the "Department of News Suppression." Still, we must, reluctantly, so declare. Under strict rules laid down by the Defense Secretary and enforced at almost all levels, there is now operating in the limestone foxhole on the Potomac the strictest censorship of news in the memory of veteran Washington reporters.

The seriousness of the situation throughout the Government was summed up in a report by the chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee in his report to the American Society of Newspaper Editors, when he wrote:

President Kennedy, both before and after his election, was on record in writing as believing in freedom of information and his duty to see that the people are informed. To date, neither he nor his administration has completely lived up to his promise.

But all has not been suppression. The other side of the coin of censorship is "managed news." Plenty of managed news has come pouring out of Washington.

The White House is ready with all the information any one would want about the President, his immediate family and his next of kin. Whenever the news was "good," it came pouring out—not once, but many times. One correspondent described the White House news policy as one of "planned double-exposure." This writer said:

It's like the coming attractions that urge moviegoers to come back next week. It is a way of holding the floor by simply announcing that you are going to announce something.

The President is a past master at it. His cabinet officers and aides have picked up the trick to the extent that hardly anything ever happens until after somebody tells you it's going to. In the matter of appointments, the intentions to appoint and the leaks have been so numerous that some people have gotten the idea that it is all happening twice.

The President has been the most conscientious press agent the administration has. He is always sending out advance notice on messages and programs. His first press conference provided a perfect example of announcementship. He was asked about plans he had for quick Federal aid for the unemployed. The President in his answer didn't say yes and he didn't say no. What he said was that people should wait and see what was coming.

The White House apparently has directed all Government Departments that "good" news must not be allowed to come out unless it has been gilded. Herbert W. Klotz, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, wrote in a confidential memorandum to Department heads:

At a White House meeting of Cabinet Assistants, we have been advised again that speeches of Cabinet and Sub-Cabinet officers do not contain sufficient reference to the President and his personal interest in, and compassion with, the problems which face the Nation. Liberal quotations from his speeches, past or present, should be used.

The above was not deemed to be a reflection on the speeches delivered by Commerce Department officials, but was in the nature of a general comment on all executive departments.

It is also to be kept in mind that, in making announcements of local projects, the President should be given a credit line in the lead paragraph.

I notice that it does not say whether any action was taken by the President on it, but it is important to note that the President is to be given a credit line. I understand that we have the beginning of a northeastern storm outside today. I suppose we will have an announcement shortly that due to the compassion of the President the storm will last only 2½ days, instead of 3 days.

In another confidential memorandum, Orren Beaty, Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior, wrote to his colleagues:

It is mandatory that we give the White House 48 hours notice before we announce contracts of this sort. It is not enough to send a draft press release to Pierre Salinger's office. We must also notify Lawrence O'Brien. On the Florida matter, for example, a press release went to the White House Friday, but O'Brien's office was not notified, when considerable mileage could have been made by giving the White House a chance before the weekend of notifying interested Members of Congress.

Early in this administration the Philadelphia Inquirer detected the trend which seems to have prevailed. The Inquirer said in an editorial:

Despite the new President's succession of news conferences, televised live and on tape, and his virtually nonstop series of messages to Congress since his inauguration, a serious information gap between the Government and the public remains.

All of the foregoing has special significance in view of the speech President Kennedy made on April 28 to the American Newspaper Publishers Association. He said:

This deadly challenge imposes upon our society two requirements of direct concern to both the press and the President—two requirements that may seem almost contradictory in tone, but which must be reconciled and fulfilled if we are to meet this national peril. I refer, first, to the need for far greater public information; and second, to the need for far greater official secrecy.

The President went on to say that America's enemies have boasted that they acquire through our newspapers information they would otherwise have to hire spies to obtain. He did not say in so many words that newspapers had contributed to the terrible defeat of the troops who attempted to land in Cuba, but the implication that newspapers were involved in that defeat was clear.

Then he said to the editors:

Every newspaper now asks itself, with respect to every story: Is it news? All I suggest is that you add the question: Is it in the national interest?

That is a demand that the American press establish its own system of censorship.

It seems curious indeed when we learn that in the very same week when the President asked the press to withhold information obtained through news leaks, he himself addressed 250 American newspaper editors at an off-the-record "background" conference. At this conference, which Americans were not privileged to read about, Henryk Zwiren of Warsaw took everything down for the Communist Polish Press Agency.

How can we ask the American press to be its own censor when this censorship cannot be enforced against Communist agents posing as correspondents?

After the President made his request for censorship, Representative JOHN E. Moss, chairman of the Special Government Information Subcommittee of the House of Representatives, declared:

In the past, the subcommittee has investigated repeated charges that information damaging to the national security has been published in the press, and we will look into the items mentioned by President Kennedy. In almost every past instance the so-called security breach has turned out to be a carefully controlled leak of information favorable to the viewpoint of some Government official, Federal agency, or military service.

The problem is, indeed, that the need for far greater public information and the need for far greater official secrecy is contradictory. It has been thus since the beginning of free society, and no warping of the meanings of words will make these terms any less contradictory. It is in the failure to distinguish between secrets for security and information to which the public is entitled, that the difficulty arises. Secrets to avoid the impact of public comment should carry no immunity.

The average American citizen—be he newspaper publisher, newspaper reader, or student of American history—knows that this Nation prides itself on the free flow of information which keeps all people informed and able to make the decisions which we demand of responsible citizens. The free flow of information is a heritage of Americans which antedates the establishment of the Republic itself. All citizens are protected against the infringement of that free flow of information by the first amendment in the Bill of Rights.

To a Government functionary, however, there are often ways of reconciling what is contradictory to the average person. A Government press officer can define public information as that which pleases his superiors. It is "information" when the data makes the Government or one of its functionaries look good. It is Government secrecy, subject to censorship, when the data makes a Government official or an agency look bad. It is, in short, "all the news that fits our views."

The current request for voluntary censorship implies that the American system of government cannot withstand criticism, cannot survive against the news of failures or temporary setbacks. It implies that persons high in the councils of Government fear that our salvation lies in "managed news."

I cannot accept that reasoning. I remember that it was Thomas Jefferson who said:

Were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

A century and a half later we can understand why governments of free people speak for the people themselves, and governments of slave states speak only for the state.

Richard Pipes, a member of Harvard's Russian Research Center, writes in the current Harper's magazine of the average Russian's attitude toward claims made by his government. He says:

Statistics have been so atrociously manipulated for the past 40 years that they are widely ignored—much as we in this country discount advertising claims. Many people—especially the more sophisticated—even question Soviet achievements in rocketry and space exploration.

Such assumptions are dangerous and government should not nourish them.

We have just witnessed the public exaltation over U.S. achievements in space exploration. The news of these achievements was given fully and freely, just as was the news of our missile and space setbacks. The treatment of this aspect of the news is on the credit side. Let us not debase the currency of our achievements—in space, in government, in foreign affairs, in affairs of state—by substituting a new and alien method of informing our people about their Government.

What we are entitled to is more information and less personal and political propaganda masquerading as public relations.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wish to compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania on the speech he has just delivered, and to emphasize on my own behalf that we must be extremely accurate in setting forth the operations of our Government, particularly before our people, and also before the rest of the world. I hope that the people of the United States can be assured that the administration will tell the people of the United States just what the facts are relative to the operations of our own Government, and that it will be made plain also that the facts relating to our democratic operations will be placed before the rest of the people of the world, making sure that that information is accurate.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Vermont. If the words of St. Paul are true, "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," the obverse of that statement is equally true: "If you shall be denied the truth, you shall be enslaved."

Our Government must trust the people. I expect our people to trust the President when he is considering crises and to support him during those crises, and to comment freely about them after the crises are past. Under those circumstances we should trust the President, and the President should be willing to trust the people and the press. The press, of course, is challenged at all times to be worthy of that trust.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I yield myself 3 minutes on the time on the bill.

I have listened with keen interest to the Senator from Pennsylvania in his comments concerning the President of the United States and the manner in which the public information of this Government is handled.

All citizens are rightly concerned about the availability of accurate news. I am happy to say that this administration, through its President, has given the American people access to news and information such as they have never had in the history of the Nation. No other President has stood before television cameras and before the most able and competent newsmen and reporters in the world to face the issues placed before the President by those reporters and commentators—a news conference, unrehearsed, uncensored, uncontrolled.

The press reports have been made available without any rewrites or limitation as was the custom for 8 years—in fact, up until January 20. The President of the United States, in his first press conferences on television, appeared, as we say, "live." The television cameras were focused upon the President and the reporters, and the President of the United States answered all questions then, as he does now.

The President of the United States makes himself available regularly to the press and the distinguished representatives of the fourth estate, for the purpose of providing information to our fellow citizens. This is freedom of speech and freedom of press in action.

I feel that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] downgrade the ability and the competence of our great free press and its representatives, who are the reporters, editors, and other technicians of the press services. They get the news because in this country there is freedom—freedom of inquiry and freedom of information.

The President asked the editors and publishers to meet with him to discuss some of the perplexing problems relating to our national security. The results are now known to the public.

I feel certain that the press of America will continue to report the news as it finds it and will attempt to interpret it in the public interest. The public interest is served by the truth and that is what we want.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

The Cabinet officers hold press conferences, as they should, subject to inquiry, and interrogation by representatives of the press. Those conferences are made available to the public, and they are reported generously on the radio and television and in the newspapers. This is public information not "managed or controlled information" as implied.

So far as the military are concerned, they are the servants of the civilian population. Some generals and admirals have spoken as if they were the President, as if they were the Secretary of Defense, or as if they were the Secretary of State. This is not their function or privilege.

A part of our present trouble is due to the fact that some military officials and military advisers have spoken and committed us too often without full knowledge of the overall foreign policy requirements of our Nation.

It is to the credit of the President and his Cabinet, who have the responsibility for public policy, that the military experts are now being kept on tap, not on top. The public policy of the United States is best served by the elective officials in a representative government making official policy.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to permit me to make a brief comment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I am in charge of the time. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas for an inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is time being used on the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. On the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When will the bill be taken up so that I may state the purpose of the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We shall proceed to the bill shortly.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, if the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will be soyez tranquil, I shall be very brief.

I merely comment that the distinguished majority whip has, by his own statement, confirmed precisely what I was getting at; that is, that he shares the fears of others in the administration that some persons will speak too freely. He characterized them as military men. There have been times in our history when the failure of military men to speak out might well have been extremely disastrous to the Nation.

By lumping all the persons with whom he disagrees as merely military men, he admits in his own presentation that he indeed approves of the type of muzzling which this administration has used. No matter how glibly and fluently a master of the language may speak—and the Senator from Minnesota is, indeed, the greatest master of language I know——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. He uses language to explain without explaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I always appreciate a compliment, even a back-handed one, from the Senator from Pennsylvania. I assure the Senator from Pennsylvania that the senior Senator from Minnesota does not speak from fear; he speaks from confidence in representative government and this Democratic administration.

President John F. Kennedy has given the American people more news per day, more news per week, and more news per month than any other President in our history. I compliment him. He is like the beloved Franklin D. Roosevelt, bringing government to the people. He seeks to educate and inform. Those who say that the news is censored have very little to talk about when they defended the concealment of the Gaither report.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from Minnesota confuses censorship with news.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1215) to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, has the bill been laid before the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand the bill has been laid before the Senate. I have not had an opportunity to make a statement on the bill. I think a statement on the bill should have appeared in the RECORD before statements which seek to solve all political problems.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I suggest that the Senator from Arkansas proceed with his statement. He was not present when the other discussions took place.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, how much time remains to the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes remain to the opposition.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself seven minutes on the amendment; then I shall seek, from the time on the bill, whatever additional time I need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on the amendment, how much time remains to the opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). On the amendment, the opposition has 15 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Then I yield myself 15 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. President, S. 1215 would give the President of the United States some discretion to make exceptions, in the interest of the security of the United States, to the policy laid down in the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1951, better known as the Battle Act.

The policy of the Battle Act is an old and much respected policy. The Battle Act has not been amended since it was enacted in 1951.

In my opinion and in the opinion of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the policy of the Battle Act is still sound. It is wise for the U.S. Government to continue its embargo on trade with the Communist bloc in arms or strategic materials. It is also wise, as the Battle Act provides, to discourage other countries from trading in strategic goods with Communist countries. As Senators know, the Battle Act provides that U.S. assistance shall be denied to countries which do not abide by the system of controls on strategic items which has been in effect for a number of years among the countries of the free world.

The existing system of strategic trade controls is basically sound. Senators who from time to time have seen the President's reports on the Battle Act controls know that the system has worked effectively. The list of strategic items is continually being revised and brought up to date to keep up with changes made by scientific advances in the definition of what is considered to be strategic. This system of controls has worked so well and cooperation among free world countries has been so good that the President of the United States over the years since 1951 has been obliged to use his limited power to make exceptions to Battle Act policy on only a few occasions.

It may well be asked, Mr. President, if the Battle Act system is working so well, why should it be that both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have asked for this somewhat broadened authority to make exceptions. I shall try to explain the reasons. I shall do so by describing hypothetical cases. It is quite proper to use hypothetical cases because that is precisely what they are. The administration has no plans for any change in the Battle Act strategic-trade-control program.

It has no program of substantial aid to the European Communist satellites. The only planned use of the authority which would be granted in S. 1215 concerns the use of some Polish currency which has already been generated through the sale to Poland of some surplus agricultural commodities. It is expected that Poland and the United States will agree over a period of time to use this Polish currency in the field of health, education, and community facilities. These projects have not been agreed upon yet, and I can describe them only in this summary fashion.

Except for this immediate problem in Poland, then, all of the other authority in S. 1215 is being sought on a standby basis. It will not be used until the President declares that it is important to the security of the United States that it be used. As I said before, its use can be described only hypothetically. Let me give some examples.

The first hypothetical example might concern one of the eastern European satellites of the Soviet Union. There might arise in the future an occasion in which it would appear that the Communist authorities in such a country might be interested in securing some degree of independence. It might be that in that process it would be helpful if the U.S. Government could offer assistance of some kind. It might be technical assistance. It might be the provision of agricultural commodities. Whatever the circumstance, the President would have to balance, on the one hand, the risks of bolstering a Communist regime against, on the other hand, the likelihood that assistance from the United States would have a sufficient advantage from the point of view of increasing the independence of the country or keeping alive the hopes of the people of the country for eventual freedom. It would be that kind of weighing of pros and cons which the President would go through before deciding to use the proposed discretionary power.

A second example, Mr. President, might involve a country somewhere on the border of the Communist bloc. It might be a neutral country which, however, due to its nearness to one of the major Communist powers, might be obliged to enter into trade agreements with the Communist country.

In some cases that agreement might involve items prohibited for shipment to the Communist country by the Battle

Act control system. The circumstances might be such that this neutral country would be obliged to include some strategic items in its trade, whether it wanted to or not. The circumstances might also be such that the provision of assistance to the neutral country by the United States might prevent that country from becoming more heavily dependent upon trade with the Communist country than it already was. The President might feel that it would be important to the security of the United States to provide assistance to the neutral country, notwithstanding its forbidden trade with the Communist country.

Mr. President, my third example might involve any one of a great many new nations which during the last 3 or 4 years have gained independence. Some of these countries are very much in the cold war zone. Their leaders are trying hard not to become involved in the cold war. For this reason or for other internal or political reasons, they may have undertaken to do business both with the Communist bloc and with the United States and its allies. Such a country might, for example, have within its boundaries groups of technicians from the Soviet Union or Czechoslovakia, who might be advising in some of its government departments. In these circumstances, it might be impossible for the leaders of the country to undertake adherence to the strategic trade control system which is required by the Battle Act. I do not mean that it would be physically impossible to participate in the trade control system. I mean that the internal politics of the country might be such that joining the Battle Act control system might be considered an unneutral action, if the country's leaders were to take such action. In such a case, the President might well decide that the balance in that country between the groups favoring cooperation with the free world and the groups favoring dealings with the Communists was so delicate that an exception to Battle Act policy should be made.

My final hypothetical example also concerns newly independent countries. Some of these countries are as yet quite primitive, and have scarcely enough persons who have sufficient education to run the government. In these circumstances, it may be a practical impossibility to administer the rather sophisticated trade controls which the Battle Act system proposes. At the same time it might be very important from the point of view of the United States to begin, or to continue, to provide economic and technical assistance to the country. The President may decide that it is important to the security of the United States to provide such assistance, even though the country, because of its backwardness, might not be able to institute a trade-control program.

Mr. President, the amendments contained in S. 1215 are designed to cover such situations as those I have described. The language of the bill, however, is broad enough to cover other cases. It is not hard to imagine a case which would fit within the language of the amendment, and yet would be such that no reasonable person would agree that the legal authority should be used. Does this mean that the bill is not well drafted? In the committee's opinion, the answer is "No." These amendments must be drafted in rather general language. It is not possible to spell out precisely all the possible cases in which the discretionary Presidential power might need to be used. In other words, we are dealing here with matters of delicate judgment and matters of delicate balance between advantage and disadvantage. The Congress should provide the legal flexibility. If the President abuses the new authority, the Congress can repeal the flexibility.

It should be pointed out that although the President, under this new authority, could give economic or financial aid in some cases in which he cannot now do so, the bill would not in any case permit the President to provide U.S. military assistance to a Communist country or to provide military assistance to a country which fails to live up to the requirements of the Battle Act.

Mr. President, let me state again that the policy contained in S. 1215 has been, and is, a bipartisan policy. In the last Congress, an identical bill was proposed by the Eisenhower administration.

It was introduced by Senator Kennedy and Senator AIKEN, and passed the Senate on September 12, 1959; but the House did not act on it.

President Kennedy, in his state of the Union message, listed this Battle Act amendment as one of the measures on which he sought congressional approval.

I shall close this brief explanation and justification for S. 1215 by quoting the recommendation which appears at the end of the committee report.

> The committee is fully aware of the importance of the policy change which underlies the proposed amendment to the Battle Act. It believes that any risks involved in the enactment of this bill will be far outweighed by the opportunities it opens to assist Communist-dominated nations peacefully to gain greater independence of action. The committee urges the Senate to approve the bill a second time.

Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes on the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I reserve that time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time required for it not be charged to the time available to either side on either the amendment or the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I request the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is most amazing that, at this late date in wrestling with the problem and menace of world communism, anyone should be so naive as to fancy the idea that we can, through a program of trade and aid, lure away from the Kremlin its Communist satellite countries. This is what is being proposed here today in S. 1215, a bill which would, as a practical matter, emasculate one of the few sensible pieces of legislation the Congress has approved in recent years, the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, which is commonly referred to as the Battle Act.

The purpose of the Battle Act was to insure that funds appropriated under the foreign aid program would not be used to give aid or comfort to our arch enemy, world communism, which ideology made it necessary for this Nation to embark on the most gigantic giveaway program the world has ever known. The authors of this legislation had enough vision to realize that State Department planners would, in view of their fuzzy thinking up to 1951 in dealing with communism, conjure up some idea to beat the enemy by giving him foreign aid dollars and by trading with him, possibly even in items of a strategic nature. Almost from the day the Battle Act was approved the State Department planners and others have been hacking away at the act trying to soften it up so that their naive notions for fighting communism might be put into effect.

Fortunately, the Congress has thus far acceded to the wisdom of retaining the Battle Act intact, and I trust—although the odds seem to be stacked against the Battle Act today—that the Senate will again reject this proposal to amend this important act.

It is most difficult for me to conceive how anyone can expect to beat Communist dictatorships by helping them. We must realize that the aid which would be authorized under S. 1215 must of necessity be given to the Communist dictatorship governments in the satellite countries, and that, even if the dictatorships should decide to pass any of this assistance on to the people, this assistance will certainly not be labeled "Courtesy U.S.A." Surely we can remember that only a few years ago we sent shipments of wheat to Poland, and when some of this wheat was passed out, it was not credited to good, generous "ole Uncle Sam." What we succeeded in doing in that instance was to alleviate the economic strain on the Kremlin and the Communist dictatorship in Poland, and to give the false impression to the people of Poland that, after all, communism does have a heart.

I think it is wonderful to want to help the non-Communist peoples behind the

Iron Curtain, but we must be careful not to at the same time do anything that could result in tightening the grip of Communist oppression on their backs by strengthening the Communist totalitarian governments through trade or aid.

S. 1215 is but another of many examples of the naivete of the self-styled humanitarians in this country—whom I prefer to call misguided radicals.

The principal argument they advance for amending the Battle Act is that we are not at war with communism at present, as we were when the Battle Act was passed during the Korean conflict. They would confine the act's usefulness to periods in which the United States is engaged in an actual shooting war. As I have pointed out time and again, they believe that war exists only when bullets are flying, apparently being blind to the carefully aimed and executed political propaganda and diplomatic bullets that have been sending the free world reeling and reacting to Communist aggression during the past 16 years. Furthermore, they ignore the actual bullets that are spilling blood in Laos, South Vietnam, and recently in Cuba. Of course, they may be under the delusion that neither the United States nor the forces of communism are involved in these struggles. Mr. President, such a thought on their part would not be much of a shock or surprise to me judging from their previous naive notions on how to get along with communism.

I remember well, Mr. President—and I am sure every Member of this body likewise recalls—how we were overly generous in sending scrap metal over to Japan prior to World War II, only to get it thrown back at us in explosive form at Pearl Harbor and for several eventful years thereafter.

Our errors of the past are never going to prove to be of any value whatsoever to us in the present or future if we do not study them and learn the lessons which they offer for future guidance in similar situations. There may have been some reasons why we could have misjudged the intentions of the Japanese warlords during the period of the 1930's, Mr. President, but we have been living with the stated aims and intentions and the nefarious acts and deeds of world communism for too many years not to have learned a few basic lessons about the Communist goal to enslave the world with communism.

Mr. President, if we consider no other arguments against authorizing extension of aid to all Communist countries except the Soviet Union, Red China, North Vietnam, and North Korea, I hope that the Members of this body will at least give consideration to the fact that we cannot afford it from a monetary standpoint. Calm reflection should bring to mind the fact that the present national debt is approximately $290 billion, not to mention the other future obligations and c.o.d.'s of our Government which, together with the national debt, totals $750 billion.

I am unalterably opposed to the passage of S. 1215, Mr. President, and I urge that the Senate reject this proposal, as the Congress has done on previous occasions since 1951.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. MILLER. I yield myself 15 minutes from the time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered is not designed to curtail the discretion of the President in his efforts to protect the security of the United States. In the first place, I find it difficult to believe that the President would actually extend economic and financial assistance to Communist-controlled areas and Communist-dominated countries at a time when we are sorely pressed to prevent the takeover of neutral and pro-Western countries. In the second place, I think this is an appropriate time to take a position which will encourage some of our allies and the neutral nations to join with us in financially supporting the United Nations.

There is only so much financial and economic assistance available from the United States to other nations. In fact, as a result of the domestic spending proposals of the present administration and the budget deficit which it has either brought about or will aggravate, not to mention proposed increases in the national defense budget, appropriations for foreign aid may actually have to be cut. In this situation, we must be highly selective in regard to the nations to which our economic and financial assistance will be given. I can think of nothing more discouraging to the morale of pro-Western nations and, indeed, even of neutral nations, than for the United States to pass over them in favor of economic and financial assistance to Communist-dominated nations or areas therein.

Moreover, I can think of nothing more discouraging to the United Nations than for this country to furnish economic and financial assistance to nations or areas under domination of Soviet imperialism which are draining away the lifeblood of the United Nations by their calculated refusal to pay their assessments to the United Nations. By furnishing economic and financial assistance to such Communist-dominated areas or nations, we would, in the end result, be helping to foot their bill in the United Nations so that they can continue to vote with Soviet Russia and so that they can, in the future, vote to take up the question of the admission of Red China to the United Nations and, they hope, ultimately vote to admit Red China to the United Nations.

Mr. President, it seems appropriate to point out that in the Battle Act itself the Congress has stated its policy:

> The Congress reiterates its opposition to the seating in the United Nations of the Communist China regime as the representative of China. In the event of the seating of representatives of the Chinese Communist regime in the Security Council or General Assembly of the United Nations, the President is requested to inform the Congress insofar as is compatible with the requirements of national security, of the implications of this action upon the foreign policy of the United States and our foreign relationships, including that created by membership in the United Nations, together with any recommendations which he may have with respect to the matter.

Mr. President, the pro-Western and neutralist nations would look upon such action as an insult to them and as contradictory to our stated policy of supporting the United Nations. And they will look upon legislative action which would permit such action in the same light.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask a question, to help me understand the Senator's argument.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to the fact that the amendment we are discussing is the mimeographed amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Is the amendment I hold in my hand the proper amendment? It is the printed amendment.

Mr. MILLER. The printed amendment is not the amendment we are considering. We are considering the mimeographed amendment.

Mr. COOPER. If I correctly understand the effect of the Senator's amendment, it would prohibit aid being advanced to any Communist-controlled country.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my amendment would prohibit the furnishing of economic and financial assistance to any Communist-controlled nation which is in arrears in its assessments to the United Nations.

Mr. COOPER. Then there is a change in the mimeographed amendment as compared to the printed amendment?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator can tell us how much behind Poland is in payments to the United Nations?

Mr. MILLER. I thank my colleague from Vermont for his question. If the Senator will be patient, I shall cover that in a moment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I shall not ask the Senator to answer the question now, if he plans to cover the subject later. Can the Senator tell us what other countries are in arrears? Will the Senator cover that?

Mr. MILLER. I shall cover the other bloc countries, yes.

Mr. President, how do Senators think these friendly nations would react to the thought of the United States putting economic and financial assistance into Poland, which is consistently voting with Soviet Russia and has a balance due the United Nations for assessments of $1,301,000, or into Rumania, with a balance due of $320,796, or into Hungary, with a balance due of $718,215, or into

Czechoslovakia, with a balance due of $627,401?

With respect to Czechoslovakia, the Battle Act itself provides that:

This chapter shall be administered in such a way as to bring about the fullest support for any resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, supported by the United States, to prevent the shipment of certain commodities to areas under the control of governments engaged in hostilities in defiance of the United Nations.

We read that Czechoslovakian arms have been shipped into the Congo. How do Senators think our allies and the neutral nations in the United Nations would react to our furnishing economic assistance to Czechoslovakia, or even to Cuba, which now has a balance due of $265,439?

I have a report from the United Nations Secretariat dated April 12, 1961, which shows a statement of collections of contributions as of December 31, 1960. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United Nations Secretariat, statement on the collection of contributions as at Dec. 31, 1960

I. ADVANCES BY MEMBER STATES TO THE WORKING CAPITAL FUND FOR 1960 (ESTABLISHED AT $25,000,000, INCLUDING TRANSFER OF SURPLUS ACCOUNTS FOR 1957 AND 1958 ($1,079,158))

[Cash advances apportioned on the basis of the 1960 scale of assessments]

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Total advances for 1960	Credit re transfer of surplus account for 1957 and 1958	Cash advances received	Balance due
Afghanistan	15,000	648	14,352	
Albania	10,000	431	9,569	
Argentina	277,500	11,979	254,732	10,789
Australia	447,500	19,317	428,183	
Austria	107,500	4,640	102,860	
Belgium	325,000	14,029	310,971	
Bolivia	10,000	431	9,180	389
Brazil	255,000	11,007	243,993	
Bulgaria	40,000	1,727	38,273	
Burma	20,000	863	19,137	
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	117,500	5,073	112,427	
Cambodia	10,000	431	9,569	
Canada	777,500	33,561	743,939	
Ceylon	25,000	1,079	23,921	
Chile	67,500	2,914	61,962	2,624
China	1,252,500	54,066	1,198,434	
Colombia	77,500	3,346	74,154	
Costa Rica	10,000	431	9,569	
Cuba	62,500	2,698	57,372	2,430
Czechoslovakia	217,500	9,388	208,112	
Denmark	150,000	6,475	143,525	
Dominican Republic	12,500	540	11,960	
Ecuador	15,000	648	14,352	
El Salvador	12,500	540	11,960	
Ethiopia	15,000	648	13,769	583
Federation of Malaya	42,500	1,835	40,665	
Finland	90,000	3,885	86,115	
France	1,600,000	69,066	1,530,934	
Ghana	17,500	756	16,064	680
Greece	57,500	2,482	55,018	
Guatemala	12,500	540	11,474	486
Haiti	10,000	431	8,800	769
Honduras	10,000	431	9,180	389
Hungary	105,000	4,533	100,467	
Iceland	10,000	431	9,569	
India [1]	615,000	26,547	588,453	
Indonesia	117,500	5,073	112,427	
Iran	52,500	2,267	50,233	
Iraq	22,500	971	21,529	
Ireland	40,000	1,727	38,273	
Israel	35,000	1,511	33,489	
Italy	562,500	24,281	538,219	
Japan	547,500	23,634	523,866	
Jordan	10,000	431	9,569	
Laos	10,000	431	9,569	
Lebanon	12,500	540	11,474	486
Liberia	10,000	431	9,569	
Libya	10,000	431	9,569	
Luxembourg	15,000	648	14,352	
Mexico	177,500	7,662	169,838	
Morocco	35,000	1,511	32,128	1,361
Nepal	10,000	431	9,569	
Netherlands	252,500	10,900	241,600	
New Zealand	105,000	4,533	100,467	
Nicaragua	10,000	431	9,569	
Norway	122,500	5,288	117,212	
Pakistan [1]	100,000	4,317	95,683	
Panama	10,000	431	9,180	389
Paraguay	10,000	431	9,180	389
Peru	27,500	1,187	26,313	
Philippines	107,500	4,640	102,860	
Poland	342,500	14,784	327,716	
Portugal	50,000	2,158	47,842	
Rumania	85,000	3,669	81,331	
Saudi Arabia	15,000	648	13,769	583
Spain	232,500	10,036	222,464	
Sudan	15,000	648	14,352	
Sweden	347,500	15,000	332,500	
Thailand	40,000	1,727	38,273	
Tunisia	12,500	540	11,960	
Turkey	147,500	6,367	141,133	
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	450,000	19,425	430,575	
Union of South Africa	140,000	6,044	133,956	
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	3,405,000	146,981	3,258,019	
United Arab Republic	80,000	3,454	73,436	3,110
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1,945,000	83,958	1,861,042	
United States of America	8,127,500	350,834	7,776,666	
Uruguay	30,000	1,296	27,538	1,166
Venezuela	125,000	5,396	114,744	4,860
Yemen	10,000	431	8,800	769
Yugoslavia	87,500	3,777	83,723	
Total	25,000,000	1,079,158	23,888,590	32,252
Guinea	10,000		10,000	
Total	25,010,000	1,079,158	23,898,590	32,252

[1] An advance of $790,000 was made in 1946 by undivided India to the working capital fund. After division, the advances to be made by India and Pakistan separately were $650,000 and $140,000 respectively. The question whether India should receive credit for the total advance of $790,000 or whether India and Pakistan should share proportionately is the subject of consultations between the two governments. In the meantime the sum of $140,000 is held in suspense.

II. 1960 CONTRIBUTIONS PAYABLE BY MEMBER STATES

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Gross amount of contributions	Total credits [2]	Cash receipts	Balance due
Afghanistan	34,980	4,551	30,429.00	
Albania	23,320	2,720	19,811.00	789.00
Argentina	647,130	99,514		547,616.00
Australia	1,043,570	152,518	891,052.00	
Austria	250,690	28,861	95,820.00	126,009.00
Belgium	757,900	105,720	639,544.00	12,636.00
Bolivia	23,320	4,607		18,713.00
Brazil	594,660	69,549	525,111.00	
Bulgaria	93,280	10,785	20,625.00	61,870.00
Burma	46,640	5,535	41,105.00	
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	274,010	31,960	118,751.00	123,299.00
Cambodia	23,320	2,720	20,600.00	
Canada	1,813,130	253,101	1,560,029.00	
Ceylon	58,300	6,847	51,453.00	
Chile	157,410	25,438		131,972.00
China	2,920,830	367,243		2,553,587.00
Colombia	180,730	21,317	158,987.00	426.00
Costa Rica	23,320	2,720	14,679.01	5,920.99
Cuba	145,750	22,956		122,794.00
Czechoslovakia	507,210	84,498	341,543.00	81,169.00
Denmark	349,800	53,194	296,606.00	
Dominican Republic	29,150	4,125	24,539.00	486.00
Ecuador	34,980	4,247	8,036.92	22,696.08
El Salvador	29,150	4,130	25,020.00	
Ethiopia	34,980	4,317		30,663.00
Federation of Malaya	99,110	11,797	87,313.00	
Finland	209,880	24,480	185,400.00	
France	3,731,200	509,231	3,221,969.00	
Ghana	40,810	4,760		36,050.06

See footnote at end of table.

United Nations Secretariat, statement on the collection of contributions as at Dec. 31, 1960—Continued

II. 1960 CONTRIBUTIONS PAYABLE BY MEMBER STATES—Continued

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Gross amount of contributions	Total credits [2]	Cash receipts	Balance due
Greece	134,090	22,199	97,764.00	14,127.00
Guatemala	29,150	3,933		25,217.00
Haiti	23,320	3,884		19,436.00
Honduras	23,320	2,998		20,322.00
Hungary	244,860	28,418		216,442.00
Iceland	23,320	2,720	20,600.00	
India	1,434,180	231,385	1,062,795.50	139,999.50
Indonesia	274,010	32,102	241,908.00	
Iran	122,430	18,278	104,152.00	
Iraq	52,470	8,017	44,453.00	
Ireland	93,280	10,974	82,306.00	
Israel	81,620	9,615	20,000.00	52,005.00
Italy	1,311,750	151,958	915,446.00	244,346.00
Japan	1,276,770	147,642	1,129,128.00	
Jordan	23,320	2,720	20,600.00	
Laos	23,320	2,720	20,600.00	
Lebanon	29,150	3,400		25,750.00
Liberia	23,320	2,720	20,600.00	
Libya	23,320	2,720	20,600.00	
Luxembourg	34,980	5,352	29,628.00	
Mexico	413,930	52,261	361,669.00	
Morocco	81,620	9,425	81.00	72,114.00
Nepal	23,320	2,720	20,600.00	
Netherlands	588,830	93,056	496,774.00	
New Zealand	244,860	38,985	205,875.00	
Nicaragua	23,320	2,875	4,686.25	15,758.75
Norway	285,670	43,207	242,463.00	
Pakistan	233,200	27,863	65,337.00	140,000.00
Panama	23,320	4,147		19,173.00
Paraguay	23,320	2,720		20,600.00
Peru	64,130	9,881	54,249.00	
Philippines	250,690	29,098	130,796.00	90,796.00
Poland	798,710	122,875	326,683.00	349,152.00
Portugal	116,600	13,789	102,811.00	
Rumania	198,220	23,830	134,390.00	40,000.00
Saudi Arabia	34,980	4,128		30,852.00
Spain	542,190	64,092	478,098.00	
Sudan	34,980	4,317	30,663.00	
Sweden	810,370	118,041	692,329.00	
Thailand	93,280	19,074	74,206.00	
Tunisia	29,150	3,400	25,750.00	
Turkey	343,970	46,064	297,906.00	
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	1,049,400	122,399	454,772.90	472,228.10
Union of South Africa	326,480	58,304	268,176.00	
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	7,940,460	941,014	3,433,531.00	3,565,915.00
United Arab Republic	186,560	26,484		160,076.00
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4,535,740	643,418	3,892,322.00	
United States of America	18,953,330		18,953,330.00	
Uruguay	69,960	13,263		56,697.00
Venezuela	291,500	37,059		254,441.00
Yemen	23,320	2,720		20,600.00
Yugoslavia	204,050	42,078	161,972.00	
Total	58,300,000	5,238,783	43,118,473.58	9,942,743.42
Guinea:				
1960	23,320	2,531	20,789.00	
1958–59	24,194		24,194.00	
Grand total	58,347,514	5,241,314	43,163,456.58	9,942,743.42

[2] Credits resulting from: (1) The tax equalization fund ($4,591,848), and (2) the League of Nations assets ($649,446).

III. ARREAR CONTRIBUTIONS PAYABLE BY MEMBER STATES FOR 1958 AND 1959

1959 CONTRIBUTIONS

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Gross amount of contributions	Credits [3]	Cash receipts and credits readjustment of cash advances to working capital fund	Balance due
Argentina	682,650	94,464.00	538,370.90	49,815.10
Bolivia	24,600	4,399.00	820.00	19,381.00
China	3,081,150	344,776.00	3,766.00	2,732,608.00
Ethiopia	36,900	3,919.00	10,431.00	22,550.00
Guatemala	30,750	3,656.00	23,926.00	3,168.00
Haiti	24,600	3,702.00		20,898.00
Honduras	24,600	2,816.00		21,784.00
Hungary	258,300	26,742.00		231,558.00
Paraguay	24,600	2,538.00		22,062.00
United Arab Republic	196,800	24,777.00	21,164.00	150,859.00
Total	4,384,950	511,789.00	598,477.90	3,274,683.10

Member states	Gross amount of contributions	Credits [3]	Cash receipts and credits readjustment of cash advances to working capital fund	Balance due
1958 Contributions				
Bolivia	25,750	4,915.00	9,075.00	11,760.00
Honduras	20,600	2,699.00	17,270.28	630.72
United Arab Republic:				
Egypt	180,250	26,568.20	153,681.80	
Syria	41,200	4,883.92	18,068.00	18,248.08
Total	267,800	39,066.12	198,095.08	30,638.80

[3] Credits resulting from (1) the tax equalization fund, and (2) the League of Nations assets.

IV. 1960 ASSESSMENTS PAYABLE BY MEMBER STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE SPECIAL ACCOUNT

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Assessments for 1960	Credits from special financial assistance [4]	Credits from tax equalization fund for 1958	Amount received	Balance due
Afghanistan	11,991	5,955	70		5,926.00
Albania	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
Argentina	221,831	110,916	1,321		109,594.00
Australia	357,728	[4] 178,864	1,866	176,998.00	
Austria	85,935	42,968	406		42,561.00
Belgium	259,803	[4] 129,901	1,437	128,465.00	
Bolivia	7,994	3,997	58		3,939.00
Brazil	203,845	101,923	1,229	100,693.00	
Bulgaria	31,976	15,988	162		15,826.00
Burma	15,988	7,994	116	7,878.00	
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	93,929	46,965	545		46,419.00
Cambodia	7,994	3,997	46	3,951.00	
Canada	621,528	[4] 310,764	3,582	307,182.00	
Ceylon	19,985	9,992	128	9,865.00	
Chile	53,959	26,980	336		26,643.00
China	1,001,239	5,635	5,807		989,797.00
Colombia	61,953	30,977	417		30,559.00
Costa Rica	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
Cuba	49,962	24,981	302		24,679.00
Czechoslovakia	173,868	86,934	951		85,983.00
Denmark	119,909	[4] 59,955	742		59,212.00
Dominican Republic	9,992	4,996	58	4,938.00	
Ecuador	11,991	5,995	58		5,938.00
El Salvador	9,992	4,996	70		4,926.00
Ethiopia	11,991	5,995	128		5,868.00
Federation of Malaya	33,974	16,987	255	16,732.00	
Finland	71,945	35,973	417	35,555.00	
France	1,279,028		6,444	1,272,584.00	
Ghana	13,989	6,995	81		6,913.00
Greece	45,965	22,983	220		22,762.00
Guatemala	9,992	4,996	81		4,915.00
Haiti	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
Honduras	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
Hungary	83,936	41,968	452		41,516.00
Iceland	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
India	491,627	245,813	3,361		242,453.00
Indonesia	93,929	46,964	580	46,385.00	
Iran	41,968	20,984	302	20,682.00	
Iraq	17,986	8,993	139		8,854.00

See footnote at end of table.

United Nations Secretariat, statement on the collection of contributions as at Dec. 31, 1960—Continued

IV. 1960 ASSESSMENTS PAYABLE BY MEMBER STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE SPECIAL ACCOUNT—Continued

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Assessments for 1960	Credits from special financial assistance[4]	Credits from tax equalization fund for 1958	Amount received	Balance due
Ireland	31,976	15,988	209	15,779.00	
Israel	27,979	13,989	185	13,805.00	
Italy	449,658	224,829	2,353	222,476.00	
Japan	437,668	[4] 218,834	2,225	216,609.00	
Jordan	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
Laos	7,994	3,997	46	3,951.00	
Lebanon	9,992	4,996	58		4,938.00
Liberia	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
Libya	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
Luxembourg	11,991	5,995	70	5,926.00	
Mexico	141,892	70,946	788		70,158.00
Morocco	27,979	13,989	139		13,851.00
Nepal	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
Netherlands	201,847	[4] 100,923	1,298	99,626.00	
New Zealand	83,936	41,968	487	41,481.00	
Nicaragua	7,994	3,997	46	987.75	2,963.25
Norway	97,926	[4] 48,963	556	48,407.00	
Pakistan	79,939	39,970	626		39,343.00
Panama	7,994	3,997	58		3,939.00
Paraguay	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
Peru	21,983	10,992	174		10,817.00
Philippines	85,935	42,967	464		42,504.00
Poland	273,792	136,896	1,762		135,134.00
Portugal	39,970	19,985	278	19,707.00	
Rumania	67,948	33,974	568		33,406.00
Saudi Arabia	11,991	5,995	81		5,915.00
Spain	185,859	92,929	1,287		91,643.00
Sudan	11,991	5,995	128		5,868.00
Sweden	277,789	[4] 138,895	1,657	137,237.00	
Thailand	31,976	15,988	185	15,803.00	
Tunisia	9,992	4,996	58	4,938.00	
Turkey	117,910	58,955	707	58,248.00	
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	359,727	179,863	2,086		177,778.00
Union of South Africa	111,915	55,958	777	55,180.00	
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	2,721,932		15,786		2,706,146.00
United Arab Republic	63,951	31,976	498		31,477.00
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1,554,819		8,832	1,545,987.00	
United States of America	6,497,064			6,497,064.00	
Uruguay	23,982	11,991	185		11,806.00
Venezuela	99,924	49,962	487		49,475.00
Yemen	7,994	3,997	46		3,951.00
Yugoslavia	69,947	34,974	406	34,567.00	
Total	19,984,818	3,471,003	78,223	11,169,686.75	5,265,905.25
Guinea:					
1960	7,994	3,997		3,997.00	
1958–59	7,188			7,188.00	
Grand total	20,000,000	3,475,000	78,223	11,180,871.75	5,265,905.25

V. ARREAR ASSESSMENTS PAYABLE BY MEMBER STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE SPECIAL ACCOUNT FOR 1957, 1958, AND 1959

1959 ASSESSMENTS

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Assessments for 1959	Credits from tax equalization fund for 1957	Amount received	Balance due
Afghanistan	9,123	31		9,092.00
Albania	6,082	20		6,062.00
Argentina	168,776	596		168,180.00
Bolivia	6,082	26		6,056.00
Bulgaria	24,328	71		24,257.00
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	71,464	245		71,219.00
Chile	41,053	153		40,900.00
China	761,771	2,620		759,151.00
Colombia	47,135	189		46,946.00
Costa Rica	6,082	20		6,062.00
Cuba	38,012	138		37,874.00
Czechoslovakia	132,284	428		131,856.00
Ecuador	9,123	26	6,332.97	2,764.03
El Salvador	7,602	31		7,571.00
Ethiopia	9,123	56		9,067.00
Greece	34,971	124		34,847.00
Guatemala	7,602	36		7,566.00
Haiti	6,082	20		6,062.00
Honduras	6,082	20		6,062.00
Hungary	63,861	234		63,627.00
India	374,043	1,514		372,529.00
Iraq	13,684	61		13,623.00
Jordan	6,082	20		6,062.00
Lebanon	7,602	26		7,576.00
Liberia	6,082	34	2,123.00	3,925.00
Libya	6,082	20		6,062.00
Mexico	107,956	392		107,564.00
Nepal	6,082	20		6,062.00
Panama	6,082	26		6,056.00
Paraguay	6,082	20		6,062.00
Peru	16,725	76		16,649.00
Philippines	65,381	209		65,172.00
Poland	208,309	795		207,514.00
Rumania	51,697	255		51,442.00
Saudi Arabia	9,123	36		9,087.00
Spain	141,407	581		140,826.00
Sudan	9,123	56		9,067.00
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	273,690	943		272,747.00
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	2,070,921	7,116		2,063,805.00
United Arab Republic	48,656	224		48,432.00
Venezuela	76,025	219		75,806.00
Yemen	6,082	20		6,062.00
Total	4,973,554	17,747	8,455.97	4,947,351.03

1958 ASSESSMENTS

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Assessments for 1958	Amount Received	Balance due
Afghanistan	15,000		15,000.00
Albania	10,000		10,000.00
Argentina	285,000		285,000.00
Bolivia	12,500		12,500.00
Bulgaria	35,000		35,000.00
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	117,500		117,500.00
Chile	72,500		72,500.00
China	1,252,500		1,252,500.00
Costa Rica	10,000	2,075.00	7,925.00
Cuba	65,000		65,000.00
Czechoslovakia	205,000		205,000.00
El Salvador	15,000		15,000.00
Ethiopia	27,500		27,500.00
Greece	47,500		47,500.00
Honduras	10,000		10,000.00
Hungary	97,500		97,500.00
India	725,000	578,355.80	146,644.20
Iraq	30,000		30,000.00
Jordan	10,000		10,000.00
Lebanon	12,500	231.00	12,269.00
Libya	10,000		10,000.00
Mexico	170,000		170,000.00
Nepal	10,000		10,000.00
Panama	12,500		12,500.00
Paraguay	10,000		10,000.00
Peru	37,500		37,500.00
Philippines	100,000	14,773.00	85,227.00
Poland	380,000		380,000.00
Rumania	122,500		122,500.00
Saudi Arabia	17,500		17,500.00
Spain	277,500		277,500.00
Sudan	27,500		27,500.00
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	450,000		450,000.00
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	3,405,000		3,405,000.00
United Arab Republic:			
Egypt	87,500		87,500.00
Syria	20,000		20,000.00
Venezuela	105,000	55,641.00	49,359.00
Yemen	10,000		10,000.00
Total	8,307,500	651,075.80	7,656,424.20

See footnote at end of table.

United Nations Secretariat, statement on the collection of contributions as at Dec. 31, 1960—Continued

ASSESSMENTS FOR THE FINANCIAL PERIOD ENDING DEC. 31, 1957

[In U.S. dollars]

Member states	Total assessments	Amount received	Balance due	Member states	Total assessments	Amount received	Balance due
Afghanistan	8,814	6000	2,814	Nepal	5,876	4,000	1,876
Albania	5,876		5,876	Panama	7,345	6,056	1,289
Argentina	171,869		171,869	Paraguay	5,876		5,876
Bolivia	7,345		7,345	Peru	22,034	15,000	7,034
Bulgaria	20,565		20,565	Poland	229,159		229,159
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic	70,510		70,510	Rumania	73,448		73,448
Chile	44,069	30,000	14,069	Saudi Arabia	10,283		10,283
China	755,048	200,000	555,048	Spain	167,462		167,462
Cuba	39,662	27,000	12,662	Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic	271,759		271,759
Czechoslovakia	123,393		123,393	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	2,050,676		2,050,676
Ethiopia	16,159		16,159	United Arab Republic:			
Greece	29,379		29,379	Egypt	52,883		52,883
Hungary	67,572		67,572	Syria	11,752		11,752
Iraq	17,627	12,000	5,627	Yemen	5,876		5,876
Jordan	5,876		5,876	New member state: Sudan	16,159		16,159
Libya	5,876		5,876				
Mexico	102,828	70,000	32,828	Total	4,423,056	370,056	4,053,000

VI. SUMMARY OF CONTRIBUTIONS DUE AND RECEIVED AS AT DEC. 31, 1960

[In U.S. dollars]

	Total amount assessed	Amount received (including credits)	Percent received	Balance due		Total amount assessed	Amount received (including credits)	Percent received	Balance due
Working capital fund	25,010,000	24,977,748.00	[5] 99.87	32,252.00	UNEF 1958 assessments	25,000,000	17,343,575.80	69.37	7,656,424.20
1958 contributions	51,500,000	51,469,361.20	[6] 99.94	30,638.80	UNEF 1959 assessments	15,205,000	10,257,648.97	67.46	4,947,351.03
1959 contributions	61,500,000	58,225,316.90	[7] 94.68	3,274,683.10	UNEF 1960 assessments	20,000,000	14,734,094.75	[8] 73.67	5,265,905.25
1960 contributions	58,347,514	48,404,770.58	[8] 82.96	9,942,743.42					
UNEF 1957 assessments	15,028,988	10,975,988.00	73.03	4,053,000.00	Total				35,202,597.80

[4] In response to Resolution 1441 (XIV), par. 4, the member states listed below decided not to avail themselves of the total or part of the 50-percent reduction in their UNEF assessments arising from special financial assistance voluntarily contributed by other governments. Consequently, the following amounts have been credited to sec. 9 of the UNEF budget for 1960.

Amount paid as at Dec. 31, 1960:

Australia	$178,864
Belgium	68,553
Japan	50,000
Netherlands	100,923
Norway	48,963
Sweden	138,895
Total	586,198

Paid in 1961:

Canada	310,764
Denmark	59,212
Total	369,976
Grand total	956,174

[5] Corresponding figure on Dec. 31, 1959: 99.79 percent.
[6] Corresponding figure on Dec. 31, 1959: 99.87 percent.
[7] Corresponding figure on Dec. 31, 1959: 94.95 percent.
[8] Corresponding figure on Dec. 31, 1959: 80.70 percent.
[9] The amount includes credits from (1) special financial assistance, $3,475,000 paid in full, and (2) the tax equalization fund, $78,223.

Mr. MILLER. Lest anyone not know what a serious situation the United Nations is now in from a financial standpoint, aggravated as it has been by the refusal of Soviet Russia and the Communist-dominated bloc of nations to pay their assessments, I should like to point out that as of December 31, 1960, there was a deficit of over $35 million, which is broken down in the report which I have had printed as a part of my remarks.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield at that point for a question?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Are there any Communist-controlled nations or areas which are not in arrears in their advances or assessments with respect to the United Nations?

Mr. MILLER. To my knowledge, there are none.

I invite the attention of Senators to an article which appeared in the U.S. News & World Report for February 20, 1961, on page 39 entitled "Is Russia Now Wrecking the United Nations?"

Among other things the article points out that a glance at the finances of the United Nations helps to explain what the Russians have in mind. The article states in part:

In 1960, it cost $334.7 million to operate the United Nations and all its allied and associated agencies. Of this amount, the United States paid $146.2 million; Soviet Russia paid $18.2 million.

That's only part of it. In the Congo, the Russians are busy feeding arms to trouble-making political elements. With these arms, dissident Congolese tribes under pro-Communist leaders are creating turmoil that the United Nations is attempting to control.

Cost of United Nations policing operations is more than $8 million each month, or about $100 million a year. Soviet Russia has refused to pay to the United Nations a penny of the cost. The same is true of Soviet satellites, although they, too, have their own votes in the United Nations.

The article goes on to point out:

DEFICIT OVER GAZA

It is somewhat the same in the Gaza Strip in what used to be Palestine, the area that separates Egypt from Israel. U.N. forces are policing that strip to keep these two hostile forces apart.

Cost of U.N. operations in the Gaza Strip is $20 million a year. Soviet Russia and the Soviet bloc of nations refuse to pay 1 cent of this cost. As a result, a U.N. deficit of $22.6 million has been run up.

I repeat, my amendment is not designed to curtail the President's discretionary powers to take action necessary for the security of this Nation. My amendment is designed to firm up our position before the allied and neutralized nations in the United Nations, and assure them that, so long as we have only a limited amount of economic and financial assistance, they will not be passed over in favor of the Communist-dominated nations, which are not even paying their assessments in the United Nations.

I think it is a most unfortunate time for this bill even to be presented, but I believe the amendment would make it palatable, so that at least I could vote for it.

I shall be glad to yield for any further questions.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have 3 or 4 minutes to speak in opposition to the bill?

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Ohio does not wish to speak in opposition to the amendment, but only in opposition to the bill?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the Chair how many minutes remain on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are remaining 2 minutes on the amendment and 16 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MILLER. I yield 2 minutes from the amendment and 2 minutes on the bill to the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, when the present subject was before the Senate 2 years ago I voted against the proposal to amend the Battle Act. At that time I stated that in my opinion one of

the great problems of Communist governments was to provide the necessities of life for the people who live within them. It is my belief that the people of the satellite nations want to be free. They want to be emancipated from the shackles of Communist regimes and control and, above all, they want to be free from the exploitation of imperialistic Red Russia.

The problem of the Communist governments to provide necessities for those people in my opinion will become unsolvable. Red Russia is now having difficulty. I invite the attention of my colleagues to what happened in 1956 in Poland. Talks began about the domination and tyranny of the Communist government.

Then the people began to yell "Hleba," which means "bread." They kept yelling, "bread, bread." Out of those calls began the rhythm of a march, and they began marching from the center of the town shouting "Hleba, hleba, hleba." The Communist government could not give them the bread they wanted. Out of that incident came the great demonstration of the people of Poland, and simultaneously with it came the Hungarian revolt. I respectfully submit that to the extent that we provide financial and economic aid to Communist governments, we are creating confusion in the minds of millions of people who believe in our system of government—the Slavs, the Croatians, the Poles in Poland, the Serbs in Yugoslavia. They are wondering in solitude, "What does this all mean? Why is the U.S. Government providing financial and economic aid to a Communist government it wants to overthrow?"

In my judgment, when we give financial and economic aid, we are helping to perpetuate Communist governments in office.

The travesty of the bill is that it provides that even though a government is selling ammunition, equipment of war, or fissionable material to be used in atomic bombs to Red Russia or Red China, we still will give it financial and economic aid if the President determines it will be in the interest of our country to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MILLER. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us look within our own boundaries. Let us suppose that I was selling fissionable material to Soviet Russia or to Communist China. I would be labeled a traitor to my country. Yet we say we shall give economic and financial assistance to nations which are doing these very things. I cannot see the justification for it at all. We can help the Polish people, the Rumanian people, the Lithuanian people, the Hungarian, the Yugoslav people, and all the other enslaved people by following a course which will precipitate the Communist governments into collapse. They will not collapse if we help them to escape the avalanche that will occur when it is clearly demonstrated that they cannot meet the economic needs of their people.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, if the pending amendment to the Mutual Defense Assistance Act is carried to its logical end, the U.S. Government could extend economic and financial aid to Castro's Communist Cuba. I base my conclusion on the amendment which grants authority to the President to extend aid to certain Communist countries even though those countries export armaments or strategic materials to the U.S.S.R. or to U.S.S.R.-dominated countries.

This bill is aimed at increasing aid to such so-called "friendly" Communist countries as Poland. But we recently learned that "friendly" Poland has contributed $13 million to Cuba since Castro came to power. American aid to Poland made the Polish contribution to Castro possible.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. With reference to the statement the Senator has just made, I am sure he recognizes that if we extend aid to a Communist satellite, even though the bill excludes Communist Russia, we are doing the same thing as if we were extending the aid to Russia.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; it is exactly the same thing.

If the pending bill is passed, the President will be able to increase American aid to Poland, which in turn will be able to pass along more assistance to Castro who will in turn be able to tighten his grip on a once-free Caribbean island.

Mr. President, that is why I say that if this bill is passed we shall, in effect, be condoning American aid to a Communist enemy only 90 miles from our shores.

It is argued by proponents of this bill that incidents like the Hungarian rebellion and the election of the Gomulka regime in 1956 are manifestations of fissures in the Communist bloc, and that these fissures would grow wider and perhaps split the bloc if more American aid were given to countries like Hungary and Poland. But who would receive this aid? The dissidents and rebels within these countries or the incumbent party officials who would reward their supporters with our money? The answer is obvious. Gomulka will hold out his hand and pocket our money, while remaining a Communist dedicated to the overthrow of the Western World.

It is further argued that the absence of support from the free world in a nation's attempt to loosen its bonds from Moscow would convince the people of the futility of the effort. But who rebelled in 1953 without Western aid? East Berlin. Who rebelled in 1956 without Western aid, and whose cries still ring in the minds of certain Americans? Hungary. On the other hand, what country has received aid from this country and remains Communist? Yugoslavia. Perhaps it is not now a part of the Soviet bloc, but it broke with the Soviet Union long before we began giving it financial and military aid.

In any event, this is a matter in which the legislative branch has grave responsibilities. If unique circumstances in the future suggest that economic aid from the United States to a particular satellite nation might reasonably prove beneficial to both the free world and the people of the nation involved, I am confident that the Congress can act quickly and decisively as it has on previous occasions involving other foreign-policy decisions.

Let me repeat, a man like Gomulka is not a Pole; he is a Communist, and he will support Polish nationalism only if he is made to. Funds from a capitalist country like America will not encourage him to try capitalism; he will use those funds to bypass Polish freedoms and to impose communism that much sooner upon the people and the country. If he does not, he will be deposed, shot, and another Polish Communist put in his place. That is the method and the cold madness of communism.

It is argued that through this amendment the United States shall demonstrate its sympathy toward the aspirations of those peoples to throw off Soviet domination. In my opinion, this country if it passes this amendment shall be strengthening satellite countries, Poland, Hungary, and the rest, who are members of the Warsaw Pact and are in a military alliance with the Soviet Union. We shall be giving them bread to eat while they make guns to destroy any rebellion within their own boundaries or any attack from outside.

There is not one iota of evidence that economic aid from the United States, as proposed in this amendment, is needed for these countries to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact and from their military and economic alliances with the Soviet Union, which is, in spite of the upcoming exchange of visits between our President and their Premier, our dedicated enemy and anxious to "bury us" if we give them the opportunity to do so.

Economic aid to a government that is interested in only one world where we all sing the "Internationale" would be a cruel and devastating blow to millions of people behind the Iron Curtain for they would view the sad spectacle of the free peoples of the Western World supporting and sustaining the tyranny of Communist states. And I think it would be an equally clear lesson to many of our allies and the neutral nations who have remained non-Communist for they would be forced to conclude that it makes no difference what form of government they follow that the United States, in all its generosity and gullibility, will give money to anybody in the hope that it might do some good.

I believe that Lenin once declared that when "the time comes to hang capitalism, the capitalists will trample one another in their effort to buy the rope." Lenin lives today in the minds and bodies of men like Gomulka and Kadar. I do not intend to support legislation which in effect buys rope for Communist countries which they shall use to hang us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes on the bill.

In looking at the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] it appears to me that the purpose of the amendment is, in effect, to kill the proposal before the Senate. The bill vests in the President discretionary authority, which he may use for the best interest, welfare, and security of the United States, with which he is charged under the Constitution.

It might be interesting to note that, in addition to the countries in Eastern Europe, which I assume are the ones in question, there are other nations within the United Nations who are behind in their assessments. The source of my information is the Office of International Administration of the Department of State. Countries like Argentina, Austria, Belgium, and Bolivia are behind. So is Nationalist China. Nationalist China's assessment was $2½ million. Of that amount it has paid $367,000. According to the information at my disposal for the years prior to 1960, it still owes $14 million.

There are other countries which are behind in their payments. There are Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Israel. Israel owed $81,000, and of that amount it has paid $22,000.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. May I ask the Senator whether any of the countries which the Senator has just named, except Hungary, could be considered a Communist-controlled nation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am continuing to read the list. There are Italy, Morocco, Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Paraguay, Poland——

Mr. MILLER. Do I understand the Senator to say that Italy is a Communist-controlled nation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. I stopped the reading of the names with Poland. I was continuing to read the list. I am giving the general picture, rather than pinpointing it to the Eastern European area. Hungary has been mentioned as being in arrears. Poland is the next country. Rumania, also. That is a Communist satellite which is in that category. Then, in addition, not Communist countries, there are the United Arab Republic, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen.

Mr. MILLER. I wonder whether the Senator was clear in understanding that my amendment would not have anything to do with the nations whose names he has read, except Communist-controlled nations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; I was very clear in my understanding in that regard. I tried to make that clear in the beginning of my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 1 more minute on the bill.

I stated that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Utah, in effect, pinpointed the Communist-controlled or Communist-dominated areas of Eastern Europe. My intention in giving this general list was to indicate that on the basis of those countries being in arrears, other countries, which are certainly non-Communist and for the most part quite democratic, are in the same category.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] in opposition to the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD. The Senator from Nebraska has given much time and study to the question. He is absent today because of a death in his family.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HRUSKA

The bill, S. 1215, seeks to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 enacted during the Korean war, and which came to be known as the Battle Act.

I oppose the amendment of this act as provided in S. 1215.

This law when enacted placed an embargo on U.S. shipments of armaments and strategic materials to any nation or bloc of nations threatening America's security. On the embargo list are arms, ammunition, implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

The Battle Act prohibits U.S. exports of these items to the Soviet Union and all countries under its domination. It also bars our Government from giving military, economic or financial aid to any country which ships to Communist nations any item in the U.S. embargo list.

However, the law gives to the President discretion to continue U.S. aid to such a country when unusual circumstances show that secession of aid would clearly be detrimental to America's security.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Among the amendments proposed to the Battle Act of 1951 are the following:

One grants authority to the President to extend economic and financial aid to certain Communist countries even though these countries export armaments or strategic materials to the U.S.S.R. or to U.S.S.R.-dominated countries. The only remaining countries to which the President still could not extend aid would be to the Soviet Union and to Communist held areas of the Far East.

Another amendment permits the President to furnish assistance to a country which does not effectively cooperate with nor furnish sufficient information to the United States as required by section 203 of existing law so that we could determine whether that nation is cooperating.

Another amendment proposed in S. 1215 would transfer from the President to the Secretary of State or to the administrator of the act, the authority to continue aid to a recipient country even though the country knowingly permits shipments of items of primary strategic significance to Communist bloc countries. The only restriction imposed is that the President must first determine that such aid is important to the security of the United States.

Also, through the 1954 Mutual Security Act, as amended, the President has authority to provide economic aid to certain Communist countries with an annual limit of $30 million per country. The proposed amendment would permit aid through use of any amount of mutual security funds, without regard to the present ceiling, and would also permit aid through use of funds of Export-Import Bank and local currencies accrued through sales of surplus U.S. agricultural goods (under Public Law 480).

In brief, it is proposed that the powers of the President to make exceptions to the Battle Act be extensively liberalized. It would also transfer from the President to the Secretary of State or to the administrator of the act, much authority heretofore residing in the discretion and judgment of the President himself.

REASONS FOR OPPOSITION

It should be remembered that the Battle Act in its statement of policy refers to the U.S. cooperation with other free nations. It is based on the idea not only of increasing the national strength of the United States and of the cooperating nations by utilizing all of our resources wisely and well, but also by impeding the ability of nations threatening the security of the United States to conduct military operations.

It has been pointed out that two Communist countries receive U.S. economic aid, Yugoslavia and Poland. The Senate has been told that since 1948 when Yugoslavia broke with Soviet Russia the United States had given Yugoslavia about $1.5 billion in economic aid and $1 billion in military aid; and had given Poland approximately $700 million in grants, loans, surplus food and other aid.

Such aid has been justified on the ground that it would help those countries to remain independent or partially independent of Soviet control.

For 15 years, ever since conclusion of World War II, Poland has been a servile and docile vassal of the Soviet Union notwithstanding the Poznan riots of 1956. The fruits of its labor, the harvest of its fields and the natural resources from its earth have been skimmed off and shipped to Russia, there to serve the master race of the U.S.S.R. Whenever their effort and resources have improved, the degree of excess or excellence thus reflected does not come to their Polish people. They are kept at a constant, virtually subsistence, level. Any dividends which they may produce are exported to their masters or disposed of subject to their order.

The votes of Poland in the United Nations and its signature of the 1960 Communist Manifesto are not the acts of a free, and independent nation. Rather they are proof of a tight, unrelenting control by Communist masters.

One of the most recent and dramatic proofs that this control by Russia is unswerving and undeviating is found in the fact that recently Poland has loaned $13 million without interest to Cuba. In fact, public announcement of this loan was made earlier this week.

Mr. President, the people of Poland are freedom loving and liberty loving people. They would not willingly and in their better independent judgment, aid or assist in any fashion in the oppression and barbarism which is now prevailing in Cuba under the brutal, Communist-type police state existing in that unhappy island. The fact that Poland is participating in the loan to Cuba is proof positive that it is under the restricted directions and instructions from Moscow that this is being done.

It is not difficult to imagine the dismay and the despair which must be experienced by freedom loving Cubans when they witness an attempt to liberalize our policy of aid to Poland, and simultaneously see Poland

strengthen the hand and the sinews of oppression of Dictator Fidel Castro.

This is difficult to explain. It is in fact difficult to understand, not because we would not sympathize with the people of Poland in their hunger and in their misery. Certainly we would like to be of assistance to them by shipping them agricultural foodstuffs under Public Law 480 in order that human misery and suffering could be in some degree alleviated.

But when such action is used as the basis for depriving the Polish people of the benefits thereof by taking of their resources to strengthen the hand of tyranny elsewhere in the world, then indeed the logic and the reason for such actions are hard to perceive.

As to Communist Yugoslavia, we know from the record compiled by its votes in the United Nations that Tito has openly sided with America's opponents in that body. He has joined in Communist propaganda attacks on U.S. policy and only seldom do votes of Yugoslavia coincide with votes of members of the free world group.

On two previous occasions this Senate has considered amendment to the Battle Act. One occasion was in 1958 when that effort was turned back by a close vote of 43 to 42.

Again in 1959 attempt was made to amend the Battle Act. In that year the proposed amendments were adopted in the Senate, but the House refused to act and no amendments were perfected.

In reviewing my files of 2 years ago, I found an editorial sent to me by our former colleague, Senator William Knowland, of California. It was published in the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune on April 17, 1959. In it, reference is made to the fact that the best argument Senator Kennedy could bring up in introducing the second attempt in 1959 to amend the Battle Act was that "there is a real opportunity for giving our foreign policy a flexibility which might exploit cracks in the Iron Curtain." Senator Knowland's editorial calls that argument "as flimsy as it is unrealistic." He goes on to give reasons why. The editorial is as follows:

"FINANCING COMMUNISTS

"For some years, a sturdy piece of legislation known as the Battle Act has stood against those who would scatter the U.S. taxpayers' dollars around the world with indiscriminate judgment in promotion of their role of global do-gooders.

"Now a new attack has been made upon that barrier which was designed to prevent the funneling of any large share of the American economy into any country that classes our economic system as an enemy to be overcome.

"Under a bill offered by Senator John Kennedy and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, American economic aid could be sent into Communist satellite countries as a wedge to pry loose Moscow control.

"The Battle Act, which specifically forbids aid to any nation controlled or dominated by Communists unless there is a Presidential decision that such aid is merited and can be beneficial to the United States, would be practically destroyed by the Kennedy-Aiken measure.

"A similar attempt was defeated in the Senate last year by the slim margin of 43 to 42.

"The best argument Senator Kennedy could bring up in introducing the second attempt Tuesday was that 'there is a real opportunity for giving our foreign policy a flexibility which might exploit cracks in the Iron Curtain.'

"That is as flimsy as it is unrealistic. Hungary stands as an outstanding example of what comes when the people of any satellite state shows opposition to Moscow. Poland is an example of a satellite state that has received U.S. assistance, showing in return only a still closer subjugation to Moscow.

"And what have we received in return for the hundreds of millions of dollars sent to Yugoslavia? There has been no evidence of a desire to aline foreign policy with that of the West. There has been no departure from communism. There has been nothing at all from Marshal Tito that serves the interests of the United States.

"It is particularly unwise at this time to earmark our dollars for any Communist country. Rather than contribute to the economy of any Red state now is the time to draw tighter, not loosen, the Treasury strings, to be more selective, not less, in the countries to which our help is given.

"In effect what we will be doing is to tax American free enterprise in order to make communism work.

"The totalitarian Communist rulers will claim any improvement they achieve demonstrates that communism is a huge success.

"To the burdens of helping the free world we now find a move to burden the American taxpayers with the support of Communist satellite regimes. This is the straw to break the camel's back."

The arguments set out in this Oakland Tribune editorial are as valid today as they were 2 years ago. In some respects they are even more pursuasive and forceful because of developments on the international scene in the intervening period.

It is still good logic to say that it is unwise at this time to earmark our dollars for any Communist country.

It is still sound doctrine that rather than contribute to the economy of any Red state, now is the time to draw tighter and not loosen the Treasury strings; now is the time to be more selective, not less, in countries to which our help is given.

The title "Financing Communists" for this editorial was chosen 2 years ago. How well it fits today's scene. And especially the $13 million interest-free loan by Poland to Cuba.

The Battle Act has served well these last 10 years. It has served to retain for the Congress some measure of control and supervision of such funds as are expended in foreign aid.

In S. 1215, we find an effort to relax even further in the field covered by the Battle Act such congressional control as still exists. The loss of congressional powers over expenditure of foreign aid funds has been far too great to date to enable this country to suffer even more such loss such as that provided in S. 1215.

It is my earnest hope that the action of the Senate will be decisive in rejecting the proposed amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the opponents yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KEATING (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote, I find I have a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If the Senator from New Jersey were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business.

The pair of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] has been previously announced.

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 28, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 37]

YEAS—28

Allott	Dirksen	Russell
Beall	Dworshak	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hartke	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Scott
Bush	Johnston	Talmadge
Butler	Lausche	Thurmond
Capehart	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Case, S. Dak.	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	Miller	
Curtis	Mundt	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Douglas	Holland
Bartlett	Eastland	Humphrey
Bible	Ellender	Jackson
Boggs	Engle	Javits
Burdick	Ervin	Jordan
Byrd, W.Va.	Fulbright	Kefauver
Cannon	Gore	Kerr
Carroll	Hart	Kuchel
Church	Hayden	Magnuson
Clark	Hickey	Mansfield
Cooper	Hill	McCarthy

McGee	Pastore	Smith, Maine
McNamara	Pell	Stennis
Metcalf	Proxmire	Symington
Monroney	Randolph	Wiley
Morse	Robertson	Williams, N.J.
Moss	Smathers	Yarborough
Neuberger	Smith, Mass.	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—18

Anderson	Dodd	Long, Mo.
Blakley	Fong	Long, Hawaii
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Morton
Carlson	Gruening	Muskie
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Prouty
Chavez	Keating	Sparkman

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas are 28; the nays are 54——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has been rejected, by a vote of——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me inquire how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me ask how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, let me ask how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me ask how I am recorded on this vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, let me ask how I am recorded on this vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, would it be in order for me to ask the Chair to state how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be in order.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Let me ask, then, Mr. President, how I am recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am very happy to have courtesy extended to Senators who wish to come in and vote. But I understand that the Chair has twice announced, at least in part, the result of the vote. I shall not object; but I hope it will not continue to be the policy of this body, after the result of a vote has twice been announced, to postpone the announcement of the result.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the yeas are 28, and the nays are 54; and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the question of passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I submit an amendment for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, in line 8, after the words "United States," it is proposed to insert: "and is satisfied that the people of the nation or area receiving the assistance will be informed that the United States is the source of the assistance."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have serious qualms about this measure. It would give the President power to extend American economic assistance to Communist-controlled nations except in the Far East if such aid is found to be "important to the security of the United States." I do not really think that there is much hope of winning over the regimes of the Communist satellites in Eastern Europe by any amount of aid.

But there is a chance, small though it may be, that we can get across to the peoples of satellite countries, the innocent victims of Communist aggression, our friendliness for them and our sympathy for their legitimate aspirations. Therefore, I suggest an amendment to the amendment of the Battle Act now being considered, in order to insure that American aid is not offered except in cases where the President is satisfied that the people of the country will be informed that the aid they receive did come from the United States.

There is no justification whatsoever for aid to Communist countries except when the people of the country do realize that it has come from the United States and from the generosity and good will of the American people. I am sure this is the intent behind the measure now proposed, but I believe it should be clearly stated and emphasized within the text of the bill so that there can be no misunderstanding. My amendment would establish this.

I realize, Mr. President, that it will not always be easy to determine that the people of the nation will be informed, but I would leave it to the President to work out the exact methods to be used.

The clear labeling of any goods sent to Communist countries, perhaps a notice in the press, an announcement over the radio, or something of this sort, would get the information across. It is not that the United States is greedy for credit, but, rather, that there is no point in sharing our resources if, as we suspect, the Communist countries would try to hide the fact that this aid was provided by Americans.

We are all aware, Mr. President, of how the majority of the people in Communist nations feel about their Russian dictators and captors. The revolt in Hungary, the revolt in Poland, the riots in East Germany, the continued unrest throughout eastern Europe—all this has made abundantly clear the smoldering desires of those people for freedom. If they do receive any assistance from the United States, and if they are aware that the aid has come from the United States, there is a reasonable chance that their morale might be boosted, their hopes for eventual freedom buoyed. Under no circumstances should aid be offered to Communist countries except where that would be the expectation.

Mr. President, I am very skeptical about this measure as it now stands. I think it would be greatly strengthened by the amendment which I have proposed. But, of course, it must be emphasized that S. 1215 is no blanket permission to give aid to Communist countries or the people of Communist countries. It is merely permission to make a few limited exceptions in the small number of instances where this would be in the U.S. interest. And I believe it should be further limited, by the amendment I have offered, to cases where the President is satisfied that the people of the recipient country will be informed that the aid they get comes from the American people.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr AIKEN. I am glad the Senator from New York has brought this matter up. During my conversation with our people who have done work abroad, I became convinced that there are no people in any country in the world to whom we have sold commodities on liberal terms who appreciate more what we have done for them than do the people of Poland. I doubt whether anywhere in the world are people more appreciative than are the people of Poland for such assistance as we have been able to give them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the amendment is a good one. I do not think it means that every single individual in each country must personally be informed, but if there is reasonable knowledge, under the auspices of the USIA or some other means, that would be sufficient. I think that is what the amendment means. With that understanding, I am willing to accept the amendment. I think it is a good amendment. I think the President should see that this information is spread around in the recipient country.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I appreciate his statement that the amendment is helpful to the bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from New York, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks. I think the appreciation of aid to these countries, particularly those behind the Iron Curtain, is absolutely necessary. I see no reason why there should not be a provision in the bill which expresses the need for recognition of what the United States is doing from time to time for the people behind the Iron Curtain.

I congratulate the Senator on his thoughtfulness. It is not unusual. It is characteristic of him to see a point like this. I am glad to associate myself with his statement.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator in support of the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to indicate my support of the amendment, which I have seen before this time. I saw the good morale resulting from what the United States was doing under the Marshall plan. This proposal gives an opportunity for the people to become aware of what the United States is doing, and the aid is more likely to be appreciated by the people of those countries when they know it comes from us. I commend the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. I think it is particularly important, if the President decides on extending aid to a country dominated by communism, that the aid should not be extended therein until the President is satisfied that the people know about it and that they know it comes from this country.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. If the letters "U.S." or "U.S.A." should be changed by the Soviets to "U.S.S.R.," I would hope our intelligence forces would immediately advise us so we could protest and take appropriate action.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure the President would not approve such aid if that occurred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Does the Senator yield back his time?

Mr. KEATING. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 30 seconds to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I received this morning through the office of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] a cable from Quemoy, where the distinguished Senator stopped on a 2-week tour of trouble spots in the Far East.

In his usual straightforward manner, the Senator states in the cable his strong opposition to attempts to revise the Battle Act. I commend him for his complete understanding of the situation and I applaud his courageous stand against tearing the heart out of this necessary law.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator DODD's cable from Quemoy be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the cablegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(TEXT OF SENATOR DODD'S CABLE FROM QUEMOY)

I am strongly opposed to the revision of the Battle Act that would permit the United States to give economic and financial aid to Communist satellite governments, and to governments shipping arms and strategic materials to the Sino-Soviet bloc. I oppose this revision for the simple reason that when we aid a Communist government anywhere, de are aiding an avowed enemy and we are at the same time depriving our friends and allies of assistance which could otherwise have gone to them.

In the past 12 years, we have spent $3½ billion on aid to Poland and Yugoslavia. What benefit has this aid brought to the free world? None. On the contrary, it has only served to strengthen the Communist world.

Our massive aid to Poland in food and in cash has made it easier for the Gomulka regime to impose forced collectivism upon the peasantry. Our aid to Tito has made it easier for him to strengthen and entrench his Communist dictatorship over the people of Yugoslavia. The Communist regimes have created economic chaos in the countries they oppress. And the American taxpayer has been called upon to bail them out and is now being asked to bail them out still further. The present world crisis should cause us to ask ourselves some basic questions before we extend our foreign aid program to the Communist world. On whose side are Poland and Yugoslavia and the other Communist regimes on the question of Laos, or Berlin, or Cuba, or the Congo, or any other major issue that divides the free world from the Communist aggressors? On whose side will these governments be if it comes to a showdown between the Communist World and the free world?

Within the past ten days I have visited the Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, Laos, Taiwan and the offshore islands. Everywhere I have seen evidence of the increasing tempo of Communist aggression. We have stanch friends in this part of the world who do not have sufficient military and economic resources to preserve their freedom. There are millions of Asians who are prepared to fight and die if necessary on our side if we give them the arms and the help they need. Our resources are limited. Every penny that is presently going to Poland or Yugoslavia, every penny that is now being planned for other Communist governments should be withheld and used instead for the strengthening of the anti-Communist nations of Asia.

I am sending this message from Quemoy because I wish to be on record against the proposed destruction of the Battle Act.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to focus attention on a suggestion contained in the cable that Senators, before deciding to extend aid to the Communist world, should ask themselves a basic question:

On whose side are Poland and Yugoslavia and the other Communist regimes on the question of Laos, or Berlin, or Cuba, or the Congo, or any other major issue that divides the free world from the Communist aggressors? On whose side will these governments be if it comes to a showdown between the Communist world and the free world?

I have asked myself that two-part question, Mr. President. The answer is that they have always sided on key issues with the forces dedicated to our destruction. And, in the last analysis, they would side hand in hand with the rest of the Red bloc against the free world in a final show-down which we pray will never come to pass.

It is significant that the junior Senator from Connecticut should issue his statement from Quemoy, the offshore island which has been shaken by Red shelling. It also comes on the heels of visits by the Senator to Laos and Vietnam, where Communist aggression is very much in evidence.

As a strong opponent of S. 1215, I wish it were possible for the Senator from Connecticut to be on the Senate floor today to lend his persuasive voice to the arguments against this unwise legislation. I agree with his position wholeheartedly.

The senior Senator from New Hampshire expressed his views before this body earlier this week on the matter under discussion. I shall not repeat myself, but I want my colleagues to know that I feel passage of this bill would be a serious blunder and a setback for the free world.

At this point, I am beginning to wonder how far Communist aggression will have to go before we wake up to the fact that we do not discourage a bully by kowtowing to him or offering a small gratuity in return for his future good behavior.

I say the only way we can halt the advances of Communism is to stand up to the challenge, and we in the Senate can move a long way in this direction by defeating this bill and allowing the Battle Act to remain intact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. President, the Battle Act—and I quote from the committee report—"places an embargo on shipments of war materials from the United States to the Communist bloc and penalizes other nations which fail to do likewise by prohibiting military, economic, or financial assistance from the United States to them. The power of the President to make exceptions to this policy has been extremely limited."

The bill now before the Senate would provide an additional exception by giving to the executive branch of the Government the right to furnish economic or financial assistance to Communist bloc countries, except the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communist-held areas in the Far East.

I have the greatest respect for the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee as a great statesman and a great leader in the field of foreign relations. He and his committee favor the bill. The problem which confronts us is a difficult one. It is made much more difficult by the fact that the chief executive of one Communist bloc country in Europe just the other day scurrilously denounced and vilified the President of the United States—your President and my President alike. Is this a sound basis on which the Senate should approve legislation granting loans to a Communist government? In my opinion, it is not. And it was just last Saturday that, 90 miles off the coast of the continental United States, an infamous and degenerate Communist Cuban held a press conference. Mr. Che Guevara, Minister of Industrialization of Castro's Cuba, with great glee, pointed out that his Communist-dominated country has received, on the basis of loans, $100 million from Soviet Russia, $70 million from Soviet China, $40 million from Czecho-

slovakia, $13 million from Poland, $10 million from East Germany, $7 million from Hungary, and $5 million from Bulgaria, for a total of $245 million, all of it coming from the Communist-dominated areas behind the Iron Curtain, to sustain the economy of Castro's Cuba.

The record is clear that, likewise from behind the Iron Curtain, have come over 100,000 tons of military material to Castro's Cuba. The record, I think, is also clear that Cuban pilots today are being trained behind the Iron Curtain to fly jet military aircraft.

In view of all these facts, how can Senators today, in this particularly grave and dangerous time through which the free world is passing, find any justification for giving economic assistance to Communist-bloc countries, outside the U.S.S.R. and Soviet China, when at the very same moment many of these Communist satellites are underwriting the cancerous growth of international communism in this hemisphere?

I object to the bill, and I shall vote against it. I cannot, in conscience, approve loaning American dollars to Communist countries in Europe who are loaning their own wealth to Castro's Cuba.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the Senator desire to speak in opposition to the bill?

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from California is persuasive and eloquent, as usual. I wish to recall to the Senator the visit of the former Vice President of the United States to Poland. Upon that occasion, without any official notice but only by word of mouth that an American Vice President was visiting Poland, there was an enormous outpouring of the people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield additional time?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield 15 seconds more.

Mr. GORE. Because of this and because of information in many other instances there seems some hope that the gallant Polish people will not permit themselves to be completely submerged. There is, in my view, yet some hope for the Polish people. For that reason I have in the past voted for such bills, and for that reason I expect to vote for the bill today.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds more.

I respect my colleague. In this case a decision is an extremely difficult one to make. My colleague is a patriotic and able Senator. He has a right to his opinion, as I have to mine.

As I see the light, I cannot at this time support the proposed legislation, only a few days after Cuba gloats that Poland, to use one example, has made a loan to Cuba. I remember the gallantry of the Polish people. The Polish people are great people. Their Government is not. And the bill provides that we deal with the Government, not the people. The Cuban people are our friends, yet we see them in thrall by a Communist-dominated clique.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, before we vote on the bill I think the Senate should have some information in regard to our relationship with Poland and the amount of business we have done with Poland over past years, as well as the status of that business at the present time.

Since the program started in 1957, we have exported goods worth $322.1 million to Poland and have received zlotys in payment. This has consisted primarily of wheat, cotton, the cost of ocean shipping, and some other items. I am sure wheat and cotton are the largest items.

There are at present contracts with Poland for additional goods to be delivered worth $43 million. That will make a total of $365 million in sales to Poland over the 5-year period.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I have only about 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator referred to zlotys. Does the Senator mean payment in dollars?

Mr. AIKEN. Poland has deposited zlotys in the amount of $322.1 million. That is the amount stated to me. Our Treasury has withdrawn and deposited to its own account $30.8 million. The U.S. has facilities in Poland and I assume that we have been able to use zlotys for payment of our expenses.

We are also engaging Polish institutions to conduct agricultural experiments and to do research work for us. There are about 25 contracts with the Polish people, who are doing some of the best work being done for the Department of Agriculture. Of course, the results of these experiments are available to the Poles as well as to Americans.

If there were time, I could read into the RECORD the list of research projects for which we are hiring Polish people. They include such fields as entomology, utilization of agricultural products, forestry, soil and water conservation, animal diseases, and animal husbandry.

In addition, the Export-Import Bank has loaned Poland $61 million over the last 3 years, with which Poland will buy American products. The largest item involved is wheat.

The second item is ocean transportation. There are other commodities and manufactured goods included in that total of $61 million.

Poland will have to begin to repay the loan from the Export-Import Bank at the end of 5 years from the date of each loan. I think the first payment will be due in 1962. In the meantime Poland must pay 4½ percent interest, and will make her payments in dollars.

In regard to the handout by Poland to Cuba to which reference has been made, I understand that Cuba has received approximately $250 million not as a loan but as a credit from the Soviet bloc. The figures in the newspaper the other day were not quite correct, although they were substantially correct. Poland has granted Cuba, according to the best information I can get from the State Department, a credit of $12 million to be expended over the next 5 years. That is a little more than $2 million a year.

Mr. President, we sell more to Cuba every 2 weeks than Poland sells in a year. If we wish to go into that situation, last year the United States sold to Cuba $222,733,506 worth of goods. We have cut that down, so now we are permitting about $3 or $4 million worth of goods a month to be exported to Cuba.

Let us see what our friends are doing in this regard.

The United Kingdom last year sold Cuba over $20 million worth of goods. France sold Cuba over $10 million worth of goods. And there are others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, since I have 1 more minute I shall put into the RECORD what seems to me to be most important.

I do not believe we can starve people into democracy. I do not know of any country in which the people are completely controlled by the government in which there is not a food shortage. When there is no food shortage, people stand up to their governments.

We have agreements with Poland as well as with Yugoslavia which we do not have with other satellite countries, such as extradition treaties.

Furthermore, Mr. President, what do we gain by advocating strong-arm methods all the time?

I know how hard it is to take insults from people in other countries, but what do we gain by belligerency? I invite attention to the fact that 3 weeks ago in this very Chamber, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, Foreign Minister Dr. Heinrich von Brentano of Germany, and Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany Wilhelm G. Grewe were standing in front of the Vice President's desk. In the rear of the Senate Chamber were four Members of the Japanese Diet. All of them were applauded by the Senate. Yet we were trying to kill one another 16 years ago. How much did we accomplish? Do we accomplish more by keeping people from going hungry, or do we accomplish more by threatening to kill them if they get out of line?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, due to an unfortunate mixup at the time the Senate agreed to a limitation of debate, it is not possible for the leadership to keep its word to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I therefore ask unanimous consent that 5 additional minutes be allowed so that the Senator from New York may be granted the privilege of the floor, which is his due, and which he had been promised.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that Senators have made engagements.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from New York wishes to speak for only 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, though I shall not object, I should like the word of the majority leader that if the request is granted to enable the distinguished Senator from New York to speak, additional time for other Senators will not be granted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I concur.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the time for debate was fixed by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from New York was promised the time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. While still reserving the right to object, I call attention to the fact that I wish to make a statement. I have been here all afternoon hoping to be able to speak for a few minutes. I have been very patient.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from New York wishes only 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is perfectly all right, but I want it understood that there are other Senators present who have something they wish to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it will probably be a subject of considerable entertainment to the country that so many Senators found it necessary to object to my speaking for 5 minutes, when the Senate has remained in session for many hours to consider much less important business.

I wish to observe only one point about the bill, which I favor, which is illustrative of what we must do. I think the bill is illustrative of what we must do if we are to have any hope of really succeeding in a cold war. We must find techniques for untying the hands of the Chief Executive, if the Chief Executive is to conduct our foreign policy. The bill would certainly provide a very small measure of authority for the Chief Executive to deal with the highly delicate situation in respect to Communist satellites. The adherence of the Communist satellites to the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc is one of the most delicate elements of their policy.

Many Senators say, "Let us be bold. Let us be courageous. Let us show the Communists that we have a counter offensive and can shake them in their home seat of power." When we attempt to unshackle the Chief Executive so that he may have some ability to make a counter offensive, we become very worried about the fact that he will have that kind of flexibility.

We must seek not less, but more, techniques in order to accomplish our objective. I realize that we must protect the prerogatives of Congress, the dictates of the Constitution, and all the safeguards of checks and balances. But when we find an opportunity to give the President, within the fully recognized confines of safety so far as constitutional processes are concerned, some element of that capability to make a dent in the Communists, let us not be concerned about how to find ways and means of tying his hands. We now have an opportunity to untie them.

I make the point only because it is so significant in respect of the anti-Communist struggle, if we really mean all the speeches we make about waging that war effectively. The measure before the Senate provides the kind of opportunity which we have to prove that we mean what we say, and the kind of opportunity which may prove far more significant than many other things which we do.

The Communist satellites can be detached. This is one of the great weaknesses of the entire Communist bloc. I think we would do something extremely effective in this regard if we were to give the President this kind of potential authority with respect to the whole Communist power.

I thank my colleague for providing time for me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 1 minute remaining on the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield the remaining time to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think the best proof in the world that this sort of argument and legislation is wrong is the fact that no nation could have been more helpful that we have been to Cuba over many years. Yet, in spite of our great friendship, help, and cooperation with Cuba, Cuba has gone communistic. It is now dominated by Russia. What more proof do we want than our experience with Cuba? Are we against communism or are we not? If we are not against it, let us help every communistic country in the world. If we are against communism, let us have no favorites among them. We are either for or against them. Cuba is the best example in the world that we cannot keep such countries from going communistic by lending money, by buying their sugar at high prices, and doing all the other things we did for Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. All time has expired.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I, therefore, withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were free to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business.

The respective pairs of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] have been previously announced.

On this vote the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 36, as follows:

[No. 38]

YEAS—43

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Burdick	Hickey	Moss
Bush	Hill	Neuberger
Byrd, W.Va.	Humphrey	Pastore
Carroll	Jackson	Pell
Church	Javits	Proxmire
Clark	Keating	Randolph
Cooper	Kefauver	Smith, Mass.
Douglas	Kerr	Symington
Ellender	Magnuson	Wiley
Engle	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McGee	Yarborough
Gore	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Hart	Metcalf	
Hayden	Monroney	

NAYS—36

Allott	Bible	Cannon
Bartlett	Boggs	Capehart
Beall	Bridges	Case, S. Dak.
Bennett	Butler	Cotton

Curtis	Kuchel	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Lausche	Scott
Eastland	Long, La.	Smathers
Ervin	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Hartke	Miller	Stennis
Holland	Mundt	Talmadge
Johnston	Robertson	Thurmond
Jordan	Russell	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—21

Anderson	Dodd	Mansfield
Blakley	Fong	Morton
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Muskie
Carlson	Gruening	Prouty
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Saltonstall
Chavez	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Young, N. Dak.

So the bill (S. 1215) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 102 of title I of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (22 U.S.C. 1611a) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. Responsibility for giving effect to the purposes of this Act shall be vested in the Secretary of State or such other officer as the President may designate, hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator'."

SEC. 2. Section 303 of title III of the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (22 U.S.C. 1613b) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 303. (a) This Act shall not be deemed to prohibit furnishing economic and financial assistance to any nation or area, except the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Communist-held areas of the Far East, whenever the President determines that such assistance is important to the security of the United States and is satisfied that the people of the nation or area receiving the assistance will be informed that the United States is the source of the assistance: *Provided,* That, after termination of assistance to any nation as provided in sections 103(b) and 203 of this Act, assistance shall be resumed to such nation only in accordance with section 104 of this Act. The President shall immediately report any determination made pursuant to this subsection with reasons therefor to the Committees on Foreign Relations, Appropriations, and Armed Services of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(b) The Administrator may, notwithstanding the requirements of the first proviso of section 103(b) of this Act, direct the continuance of assistance to a country which knowingly permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials to any nation or area receiving economic or financial assistance pursuant to a determination made under section 303(a) of this Act."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, so that the membership will be advised, will the majority leader state whether any other substantive business is to come before the Senate today and whether he anticipates any more yea-and-nay votes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be substantive business in the form of a speech by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who has been waiting patiently all afternoon. No other proposed legislation will be considered today, unless the Senate receives the nomination of the Director of the Mint at Denver. There will be no yea-and-nay votes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, with respect to the nomination of the Director of the Mint at Denver, I understand an extraordinary circumstance is involved, wherein the incumbent is seeking to make his departure and to have the new nominee take office. If we wait—if action on the nomination is not consummated today—the nomination will have to go over until next week, and there will be a full week's delay. So far as the minority leader is concerned, I advise the distinguished majority leader that there is no objection to having the nomination considered, even though it is not printed on the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate consider on Monday two treaties, Executive C and Executive I, and also the military procurement authorization bill. There will be no yea-and-nay votes on Monday, but there will be on Tuesday.

On Tuesday the aid to education bill will at least be laid before the Senate.

WORK STOPPAGES AT MISSILE BASES

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I need not remind the Senate of the arduous work which was performed for some 3½ years by the Senate select committee that was established to investigate improper practices and activities in labor-management relations. From time to time that committee made reports to this body; and in the course of the committee's existence, Congress passed what was intended to be remedial legislation to deal with the problems which the work of the committee had disclosed to exist and which Congress felt should be corrected.

At the expiration of the select committee early last year, it will be recalled that by an appropriate resolution, which the Senate adopted, all of the powers and the authority of the select committee were transferred to and vested in the Committee on Government Operations, and under the rules of that committee in what is known as the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. It was my privilege and honor to be the chairman of the select committee, and it is now my privilege and honor to serve as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations and also of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

In the course of its work, the select committee heard, I believe, more than 1,500 witnesses, and held more than 500 days of public hearings—during the period of 3½ years—and filed a great number of reports.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which is now vested with the same powers, is undertaking to faithfully carry out the mandate of this body as expressed in the resolution placing such powers in it as were formerly reposed in the select committee.

During the work of the select committee, and at the conclusion of each series of hearings, it was my practice, as chairman, to summarize or to place in the RECORD what was termed a closing statement by the chairman. That practice we are still pursuing in the work of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

The subcommittee recently conducted some hearings into practices which have occurred and still prevail at some of the Nation's missile sites and in the missile and space programs. Some of the revelations which have been brought forth in the course of these hearings are astounding.

The series of hearings had not been closed when I adjourned the committee on last Friday, because it was contemplated at the time that another hearing would be held one day this week. In the meantime, however, there were other developments, namely, action indicated on the part of the executive branch of the Government to deal with some of the shameful revelations which had been made. In view of the assurances that prompt action will be taken, and because further preliminary work must be done and tentative investigations made in this field, I, as chairman of the committee, have temporarily suspended further hearings. But they will be resumed later.

However, in view of the practices heretofore established, I think it appropriate to place in the RECORD a closing statement by the chairman. At this time I shall make the statement that I have ordered placed in the hearings record a part of my remarks here this afternoon by reading it into the RECORD. It is in fact a summary of some of the practices and activities which were disclosed in the course of the committee's proceedings.

For the past 2 weeks, during the 8 hearing days, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has heard testimony from 38 witnesses on labor conditions at missile sites.

I consider the disclosures made by this testimony to be as shocking as anything that has been revealed in the nearly 5 years of labor-management relations investigations conducted by the two senatorial committees to which I have just referred, it not more so.

The missiles and space programs, upon which our survival in the struggle with world communism depends, have been deliberately and callously delayed during the last 4½ years by some who have placed greed and profit ahead of their devotion to and the safety of our country.

Wildcat strikes, work stoppages, slowdowns, featherbedding, and a deliberate policy of low productivity on the part of some unions and workers may well be responsible to a substantial degree for whatever gap or lagging behind exists in our space and missiles programs.

In addition, we have demonstrated that many of these workers—through strikes and other pressure tactics—collected millions of dollars in exorbitant,

unnecessary overtime pay in a brazen "gouge" of the U.S. taxpayers.

Testimony we have heard shows that we would be at least many months ahead of our present man-in-space timetable had it not been for an incredibly low work-production output—only 40 percent of normal—by workers at Cape Canaveral, Fla., and a loss of 87,000 man-days of labor there, through work stoppages.

An important witness on the space question was B. G. MacNabb, base operations manager in charge for Convair-Astronautics at Cape Canaveral of the plan to fire the first American into an orbital space flight. Mr. MacNabb's testimony was in part as follows:

> If we place a man in orbital flight within 6 months after the Russians, it will mean that we could well have been first in this achievement, if there had been no work stoppages at our missile bases, and if everyone had been working at full productive capacity, instead of at only 40 percent of their capability.

It should be pointed out also that Mr. MacNabb testified that he did not hold labor solely responsible for this delay. He attributed part of the blame to indecision on the part of the Air Force and to mistakes made by management.

There is reason to believe that in some instances subcontractors tolerated, acquiesced in, and encouraged slowdowns by the workers, where management also profited by the delays and excessive costs that were incurred.

The military services likewise must share the blame. Their attitude in these situations has been far too passive and ineffective. They failed to take aggressive and affirmative action to curb these abuses.

I shall now review some of the appalling disclosures that have been made during this series of hearings. The testimony has demonstrated that:

First. While the Soviet dictator, Nikita Khrushchev, has been threatening to "bury" us, wildcat strikes, jurisdictional disputes, and work stoppages at our intercontinental ballistic missile sites and test centers have cost this country a loss of more than 162,000 man-days of labor.

In one sense it may be said that some of this time lost was recouped by the payment of exorbitant overtime wages; but, nevertheless, it is irrefutable that much of it is forever lost in our desperate struggle to complete a missiles system that will serve as an adequate deterrent to any enemy aggressor who would seek our destruction.

Many of these work stoppages were deliberately called to create the need for overtime work. The testimony has shown that both the unions and men knew scheduled target dates had to be met and that postponing the work would necessitate lucrative overtime if the jobs were to be finished on time.

Second. The overtime pay some of these workers managed to grab reached fantastic amounts. One electrician made $748 in a week, which is more than the combined salaries paid Dr. Wernher von Braun, the missiles expert, and Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, the atomic submarine specialist.

A spot check of a contractor's payroll during a single week showed that 90 pipefitters and electricians at Vandenberg Air Force Base were each paid more than the $365 received weekly by the commanding general at Vandenberg.

A foreman of common laborers at Cape Canaveral received $434 in a week, just $1 more than the pay of the Secretary of the Air Force. We have a number of illustrations of instances in which workers on these sites have been making as much as $26,000 annually.

Third. Some of these missile site workers also have been engaged in the most scandalous kind of jurisdictional make-work projects, the so-called blessing of equipment being a case in point.

In this instance, pipefitters at Vandenberg Air Force Base refused to install a manifold, which is a prefabricated complex device of stainless steel piping, on grounds that all pipe under 2 inches should be assembled by them on the site under their contract.

Told that this might harm the equipment, they finally agreed to "bless" the manifold. This so-called "blessing" of the equipment was achieved by putting a scratch on the equipment and by the men then sitting around doing absolutely nothing, but at full pay, for the time they estimated it would take to tear the manifold down and reassemble it.

Fourth. Evidence has revealed that the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers is collecting a 3-percent assessment from workers' wages. This money is deducted by the employers and forwarded to the IBEW local. This work assessment is collected even from those who are not union members. More than a half million dollars have been collected by local No. 756 in this fashion.

A serious question arises in this connection as to whether there has been a violation of the Copeland Anti-kickback Act. This matter needs to be explored further and called to the attention of the Department of Justice.

Fifth. A typical example of union irresponsibility was shown when we questioned Joseph Morgan, a Teamster business agent, about an organizational strike by the Teamsters that stopped all work on Cape Canaveral for a month. Rather than cooperate with the committee, Morgan invoked the fifth amendment, thus demonstrating that we do have some fifth-amendment patriots calling the shots in some areas of our missile program.

Sixth. It has been clearly established that there have been instances where the Government has been bilked by the imposition of higher wages on missile sites than the prevailing rates are off the sites. Overtime rates at Canaveral, for example, were found to be higher than those paid at non-Government installations nearby. The wage rate at another base was found to be 10 cents an hour higher than the rate off the base. These cases were typical.

Seventh. The gouge on the taxpayers was shown to have been especially flagrant at Cape Canaveral. Contractor after contractor testified that, because of low labor productivity at the cape, they doubled the normal labor costs in bidding on jobs. Therefore, the Government paid twice as much as it should have paid.

By way of parenthesis at this point, Mr. President, I may say also that a number of contractors told us that they have long since stopped bidding. They refuse to bid, for two reasons. If they made a lump-sum bid, there were prospects they might go broke, because no one could adequately make allowances for the conditions that prevail. Secondly, they did not want to be a party to this form of racketeering.

Eighth. Officials of electronics companies testified that their work should not come under the purview of the Davis-Bacon Act. They said that if they used their own specialized electronics union technicians, they could do their work more efficiently and 2¼ times cheaper than the building trades unions, such as the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Nevertheless, at the urging of the Air Force, they have subcontracted the work to electrical contractors using building trades union workers at twice the cost to the Government.

Again by way of parenthesis, these are things being done to buy labor peace. In other words, it is in effect a submission to hijacking. That is what it amounts to.

Ninth. In one case the testimony showed that a test conductor for Convair used idle Convair technicians to disconnect 1,000 wires in a blockhouse. The following day, when the IBEW union learned of this, in order to buy labor peace and prevent an immediate walkout and work stoppage, Convair technicians were forced to reconnect the same wires and then allow IBEW workers to disconnect them a second time.

There are many additional instances of waste, extravagance, and impropriety which I cannot, for reasons of brevity, list here. In due time, however, they will be fully covered in the subcommittee's official report.

As previously announced, I am suspending the current series of hearings temporarily in the hope that the conditions we have exposed will greatly improve following anticipated, immediate administrative action now being considered and expected to be taken by President Kennedy and Secretary of Labor Goldberg.

In the meantime, I am hopeful that administrative action expected to be taken by the executive branch of the Government will be effective, at least to the extent of serving to prevent many of the shameful conditions these hearings have exposed. The President of the United States and the Secretary of Labor will have my cooperation to that end. But I wish to state for the RECORD that I am fully convinced that the Congress needs to meet its responsibility and pass legislation that will outlaw strikes and concerted work stoppages on Government contracts, and particularly so in areas of national defense.

Conditions such as those that have prevailed in this program are intolerable. They challenge the very efficacy of government itself. The Congress should meet that challenge by passing laws

that will put a stop to these damnable practices that are undermining our defense projects and sapping our national strength and vitality.

That ends the quotation of the insertion I am today making in the record of hearings as a summary and closing statement by the chairman.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to commend the Senator from Arkansas for the presentation of his statement today. I commend the Senator most earnestly though I cannot understand how he has been able to control his reactions so well in the presentation of this despicable condition. I cannot understand how any warmblooded American could stand by and hear a description of what is being done to our country without speaking up, as the Senator from Arkansas has done. I simply cannot understand such a situation.

My hopes are that the Senator will prepare proposed legislation to carry into effect the suggestions made at the conclusion of his talk. We cannot suffer work stoppages in this important work of trying to equip our nation for its defense and security.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If and when the Senator prepares the proposed legislation I hope he will permit me to become a cosponsor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be happy to do that, and I shall invite all Members of this body to join as cosponsors of proposed legislation I shall offer to outlaw strikes on defense contracts and to set up some tribunal to which workers may go to seek redress of wrongs they think they have suffered. I do not wish to be unfair, but there can be no dispute which should transcend in importance the interests, the welfare, the security and safety of our Nation.

I shall make further reference to this later, but it is unthinkable that any government would tolerate such conditions and claim to be the supreme power or the supreme law of the land.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Arkansas to state that 87,000 man-days of labor were lost?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, just at Cape Canaveral. One hundred and sixty-two thousand were lost at all of the bases, I believe, and approximately half of that amount was lost at Cape Canaveral.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If there had not been abject surrender to inordinate demands, would the number of days of work lost have been substantially decreased?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is hard to answer that question, for it is hard to estimate how obstinate these workers would have been or how much more unpatriotic than they have been they would have been if the Government had stood firm and had said it would not pay such unjustified amounts. In short, I do not know how much less patriotism would have been exhibited or demonstrated than what has already been demonstrated by their attitude of not being concerned with getting the program moving and keeping it going and expediting it to an early conclusion. In other words, I do not know. But, again, I point out that I think the fault falls somewhat on our military, and in some instances, on the contractors, who, I believe, yielded without any great struggle or resistance.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator state again how many work stoppages there were?

Mr. McCLELLAN. All together there were 327, over the period we have covered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. They dealt with this vital work, which is of such great importance to our country, did they not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, they occurred in the missile and the space program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The work stoppages occurred in connection with that program, did they?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, those are the work stoppages I have identified.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator made some reference to connecting wires in a blockhouse. What type of equipment were they working on? Was this work on a missile?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. These blockhouses are where they control the missiles, where all the equipment that launches a missile and guides it are. The blockhouse is where the men who actually launch a missile do their work and where they have their equipment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Arkansas made the statement that in one situation the work stoppages were deliberately effected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is no question about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That was done for the purpose of creating a dire need and requiring overtime work. Will the Senator discuss that in greater detail?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. Many of the work stoppages were work stoppages over a disputed jurisdiction, as I pointed out in regard to the manifold. We have all heard of manifold blessings, all our lives, and we often give thanks for manifold blessings, but I never heard of blessing a manifold until this incident occurred.

I point out, that was a dispute between unions. The construction union, which was on the job, said, "That manifold is a part of construction; therefore, we will not permit another union, which built it, to install it. Although the company had working union men in another union who built it, we will not permit them to install it. We are going to tear up the pipe they put into the manifold, and then we will put it back in."

It was finally pointed out that to do what they suggested might injure the manifold or might damage it, and that they might not be able to put it back in to meet the requirements necessary to make it function properly. Then they devised the scheme of giving the thing a blessing and sitting down and forgetting about the time which would have been necessary to do the work. It would have taken 10 hours, or 5 hours, or 15 hours, whatever it was; I did not get the amount of time involved. The workers just sat down to draw their pay during that period of time, and then let the blessed manifold go on into place.

If that is not gouging, if that is not sandbagging, if that is not blackmail, if that is not hijacking, if that is not a form of robbery, if it is not the most sordid kind of extortion in the worst fashion against a government and against a people at a time and in a place and under circumstances when the only one on earth who would benefit from it is the enemy, who is determined to destroy us, I simply do not know what those terms are—what they mean. It is that serious. I do not know whether the American people will wake up to it or not. I do not know whether the Congress will meet its responsibility or not. I do not know. I hope it will.

I do not care what executive order is issued and what no-strike pledge is given. I hope both of those things will be done, and I hope both will be effective in the situation, but I say to Senators that we shall not do right by the country or by the people if we permit such a situation to occur again without it being a violation of the law of the land.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the inference justified and sound that the greater the delay and the greater the pay obtained, the larger was the receipt by the union under the 3-percent levy which was made?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true. The union would receive more money from a pay check for double time than it would from a pay check for regular time.

I will cite for the Senator another illustration of something which is going on to obtain double-time pay. It is not in the closing statement which I have read, but it will give an illustration.

At times there would be two work shifts instead of three. The work shifts would start at noon and at midnight. The reason for starting the work shifts at those times is that the union has a contract which provides that the regular work hours begin at 8 o'clock in the morning and expire at 4 o'clock, or 4:30, in the afternoon. Thus the workers would get regular pay only for the regular work hours. The crew which went on duty at 12 o'clock noon would draw regular pay for the first 4 hours, and then time and a half, or in some cases double time, for the next 8 hours. Vice versa, the crew which went on duty at midnight would draw double time in some instances, or overtime for the first 8 hours, and regular pay for the last 4 hours. That was forced upon the Government. There is no reason why three shifts could not have been provided, in my judgment, if the work needed to be done.

Another thing which is required is 9 hours' pay for 8 hours' work, or at least 9 hours' work, with one hour presumed to take care of travel, no matter whether the workman lives close outside the gates at the cape, or some miles away.

I have only touched upon some of the things involved. I did not have in mind doing other than presenting a brief summary for the RECORD.

I think I may be speaking for a number of other members of the committee with respect to the proposed legislation,

for I believe other members feel as I do, but whether they do or not, I wish to make my position clear. I could not sit quietly and let the RECORD close without, in a sense, standing up to be counted and to express my indignation, in this fashion pointing out that I am not only ready and willing to remedy the situation by legislation, but also that I hope to draft and to present proposed legislation for the consideration of my colleagues at a very early date.

I think I should be derelict and completely remiss in my duty as a Senator, entertaining the convictions I have about the situation, if I did not take affirmative action in that way, by the presentation of proposed legislation which I think is necessary to deal with the problem.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The proposed legislation would prohibit work stoppages on important defense work, but would also substitute a mediation board to settle the disputes that might occur.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is correct. In this country we do not tolerate a man pointing a gun at another's head to collect a debt. We provide a tribunal for wronged citizens to seek redress of their grievances. I do not know why our Government cannot provide some kind of tribunal—a board, commission, or some other authority—that could resolve disputes arising between management and labor or between government and management or between government and labor, as the case may be, where work stoppages would impede, retard, hinder, or prevent this country from developing and maintaining whatever is necessary to defend itself against totalitarian aggression, and to insure not only its survival, but the survival of freedom throughout the world. I hate to think that my Government has become so impotent that it cannot take such action.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I commend the Senator with all my heart, not only for going into the atrocious situation about which he has spoken, but for the position which he takes now and will take. I ask that he permit me to join in the introduction of the proposed legislation to which he has referred.

I think we ought to remember that constantly throughout this period of time there has been legislation on the books under which the Nation, through action appropriately taken by national officials, could have required 80-day cooling-off periods in such walkouts or strikes, and could have insisted that the work continue.

I recall that on one occasion there was a strike at Oak Ridge, and the legislation to which I have referred was used. I recall other occasions when the application of that legislation was just as badly needed. One of these was the occasion the Senator has mentioned, which took place at Cape Canaveral last year. At that time, I called attention on the floor of the Senate with all the strength I could command to the need for such administrative action. No action of that sort was taken. I believe it will require not only legislation, but some willingness on the part of officials charged with the responsibility—meaning both civil officials and military officials—to keep these outrageous activities from continuing at the various defense bases.

I hope the Senator will persist in bringing such proposed legislation to the floor of the Senate as promptly as possible. I commend him on his endeavor, and ask that he add my name as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my friend from Florida, and I will be most happy to have him cosponsor the bill.

I emphasize again that the foregoing closing statement in the series of hearings does not, by any means, cover all that the committee has exposed. The subcommittee also received evidence that certain companies at Cape Canaveral were charging Government contractors exorbitant rates for rental equipment tools. Inasmuch as cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts are involved, these excessive rates were ultimately paid by the Government.

These situations, therefore, are nothing more than a case of gouging the Government. As I have referred to some of the other practices as gouging, I would also place this practice in the same category. Testimony revealed that tool rental companies were charging 300 percent, 400 percent, and sometimes 500 percent of the original cost of the equipment rented for comparatively short periods of time. At the end of the rental period the tools, of course, were returned to the rental company. These situations are permitted to exist because of the absence of an adequate cost surveillance program on the part of the Government prime contractors. These situations point up the necessity for close cost surveillance on cost-plus-fixed-fee-type contracts.

In all the cases presented in hearings on wages paid, there was not a worker who did not exceed a salary of $221 weekly, which is more than the salary and allowances paid to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, the first American to make the flight into outer space.

Two elevator operators at Vandenberg Air Base, who are members of the Operating Engineer Unions, were paid $360 a week, including overtime. Think of that. With the shortage of work in this country, as claimed, and with high unemployment, there was never any necessity for paying overtime, bringing earnings to $360 a week for an elevator operator.

Truck drivers earned $324 a week. Warehouse clerks earned $262 a week. Common laborers at Vandenberg were found to be earning $287 a week for such unskilled chores as digging ditches and cleaning up around the premises. Those earnings are considerably more than the pay and allowances received by our astronauts, who are majors, lieutenants, colonels, and commanders. The earnings are more than those of full colonels who are in charge of missile programs.

The top echelon of organized labor cannot escape blame for this deplorable situation. The labor leaders whose members were involved could have stopped these wildcat strikes and work stoppages during the past 4½ years. Almost all international unions have the power under their constitutions to place under trusteeship any local that acts irresponsibly. Moreover, labor leaders could have suspended union business agents who failed to require members to stay on the job. They could have warned rank-and-file members engaging in unauthorized strikes that they would be barred from obtaining jobs through union hiring halls if they acted irresponsibly and walked off the job and deliberately slowed down the work. All these stoppages, slowdowns, and overtime payments could have been prevented if top leaders had exercised the authority they have and had acted with resolution and purpose.

A no-strike policy, applying to missile bases, was announced in February by C. J. Hagerty, president of the building and construction trade department, AFL–CIO. While this policy has had some beneficial effect, it has not done the job. Since that policy was announced, a little more than 2 months ago, there have been 39 strikes on missile bases. Eight of these strikes were jurisdictional in nature. At least 5 of them came by the unions under the jurisdiction of those international unions that had given the no-strike pledge or announced the no-strike policy. The trouble with the no-strike policy is that it covers only 18 locals of the building trades unions, and has failed to touch upon the principal problem, jurisdictional disputes between the craft and industrial unions. Obviously this has proven inadequate. More will be required to stop these strikes and work stoppages.

Mr. President, I received a letter this morning from a high school student in my State. I wish to read two paragraphs of it. I do not know how to answer the letter. Our students all over the country and our young people generally are hearing of all these things, and they are reading of these conditions. They are beginning to wonder about it. This young lady wrote to me:

> Is Americanism dead? Why don't more people care about our Government's success or failure in affairs so important that they could destroy our whole way of life? Is there nothing that those of us who still care can do about it?
>
> I would appreciate so much an answer to my questions as they lay heavy on my mind. I realize you are quite busy but as soon as you can write I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues in the Senate to meditate upon this and, in view of the disclosures the committee has made, in view of the impact the condition is having on our effort to survive in our competition with the greatest enemy mankind has ever known on the face of the earth, and tell me how I can write to that high school student and give her and all other students and young people in the country the reassurance that people do care, that things are well with our country, and that American liberty and human freedom throughout the world is safe. I cannot do it. I cannot give her any such false reassurance. And neither can you.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks some editorials which have appeared in some of the leading newspapers of the country. I have noticed with some measure of disappointment that a few newspapers, supposedly leading newspapers, did not think the committee's work and the disclosures it made very important and gave it very little news coverage. But others did and I hold in my hand some editorials from newspapers which recognized the gravity and importance of this problem and published these editorials, which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The list of the editorials is as follows:

From the New York Times, dated May 9, 1961, "Standstill in Space."

From the Miami News, by Victor Riesel, dated May 9, 1961, "Why We Were Second—Strike-Happy Unions."

From the Boston Herald, dated May 9, 1961, "Bordering on Subversion."

From the Washington Daily News, dated April 27, 1961, "Profiteering on Defense."

From the Washington Star, dated May 10, 1961, "Missile Base Strikes."

From the Philadelphia Inquirer, dated May 4, 1961, "End the Shameful Missile Base Strikes."

From the Chicago Daily Tribune, dated April 28, 1961, "Union Gouging in Orbit."

From the New York Herald Tribune, dated April 30, 1961, "Strikes at Missile Bases—A Sordid Tale of Greed."

From the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., dated May 9, 1961, "End This Form of Treason."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, with respect to the no-strike pledges and administrative action, I entertain serious doubt that whatever administrative action is taken will be sufficient to provide a complete remedy. Nothing short of a law with teeth in it, one that can be enforced, will, in my judgment, meet the exigencies and dangers of this situation.

In the meantime, the military services should start today—not tomorrow—to take affirmative, positive action wherever slowdowns, wildcat strikes, and flagrant low productivity are encountered.

Their neutral and passive attitude in this crisis simply cannot be condoned. Persons who engage in wildcat strikes on these bases are endangering the security of the Nation.

Wherever these conditions are found, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the base commanders should see to it that the security clearance badges are withdrawn from workers who put their personal greed ahead of the security of the Nation. These irresponsible men would then be barred from future work on missile bases. If workers knew that such firm action would be taken, we would soon see an end to some of these scandalous abuses.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that if our Government has become so supine and impotent that it is either indifferent or powerless to prevent such flagrant imposition, extortion, and blackjack tactics on its defense construction projects, if it cannot and will not enact laws to stop these evil practices which are undermining our national strength and vitality, then our Republic is doomed and American liberty and freedom as we know it cannot long survive.

I believe that Congress must act in this crisis. If it refuses to act and fails to meet the challenge, and if it does not pass legislation which will remedy this condition, it will be derelict in its solemn duty to the country and it will become, in my judgment, by its passiveness, indifference, and inaction, a party to our Nation's peril and possibly to its ultimate destruction.

I hope Congress will act.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I am very glad that I have been here this afternoon to have heard the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. He always speaks with great conviction. The story he has told is a shameful story. Those who participated in it have shown nothing but their own greed, and their record in this instance is devoid of patriotism and even decency.

I should like to ask the Senator if this situation suggests that there is a deeper source. We have always wondered about the waste and lack of control in the Department of Defense.

I am shifting somewhat from the charge the Senator has made against individuals and unions. I must say that when the story is told, what has been done cannot be condoned. However, my question is whether this action suggests a more fundamental weakness elsewhere than in the Department of Defense to permit practices and waste of this kind, if they occurred, at a missile base, especially the one which is most important. Is it possible that similar practices exist throughout the whole structure?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not wish to make accusations. These facts are, so far as I know, indisputable. At least one business manager, perhaps two, on the witness stand said, "I am ashamed of what is taking place." When they were confronted with the evidence, they frankly admitted they were ashamed of what had taken place.

It simply does not make sense for the Department of Defense, the organization on which we depend to protect us in the crucial time of war, to make surrender after surrender to inordinate demands which are made upon it in a defense program.

I do not want to do anything which would not be right toward labor. When men work overtime, they are entitled to be paid for overtime. But a man who is working on a defense project has no right to slow down the work or has no right to walk off the job on a flimsy pretext, or no pretext at all, simply to bring pressure upon the employer for double time or time and one-half for overtime, and thus increase the cost to the Government, in order to meet the target date of the project. We failed to meet a target date which we had to beat Russia. We cannot permit that to occur too often if we expect to win in this struggle for supremacy and survival.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We will not meet future target dates with a program operated like this one has been. This condition must be corrected if America is to be safe. We survive or we perish—the choice is ours.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Miami News, May 7, 1961]

WHY WE WERE SECOND—STRIKE-HAPPY UNIONS

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The inside story of why Commander Shepard was not the first man in space involves preposterous demands by local unions—and an Air Force surrender.

Air Force brass entrusted with some of the man-in-space Mercury capsule production were bullied by a strike-happy union at Cape Canaveral. The Air Force turned tail. And one of its spokesmen told a capsule contractor—whose job it was to prepare communications systems between Commander Shepard and the ground—that the firm would not be "welcome" at the cape if the manufacturer did not play ball with the union.

All the union wanted of the firm, the Bendix Radio Division of Towson, Md., was that cables already produced be destroyed and new ones be made up at the base by the local unionmen; and that tests already made of the communication and tracking system at the home factory be retested again at the cape; and that work which could be done on sensitive wiring connections five times as swiftly in Towson be done at Canaveral.

This doubled the cost and increased the time needed for many Project Mercury operations. But E. W. Kiffmeyer, industrial relations chief at Patrick Air Force Base, surrendered to these demands and more, according to sworn testimony before the new McClellan committee. It was after such testimony that McCLELLAN angrily announced that we'd have been up there before the Russians, if not for union-made delays.

When I asked the ever-crusading Senator just how much all this had cost the United States, his scorn matched his bitterness:

NO MACHINE COULD DO IT

"No calculating machine," said the Senator, "yet invented can ever figure the cost. Disrupted work backs up the line all the way to the source of supply. The days lost down there are just a slight beginning in the cost involved."

After the Bendix people were forced by the Air Force to knuckle down to the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers local, the cost on some items, the corporation figures, was fully 100 percent higher. This enforced surrender to the regional labor chief, Brother Palmer, provoked the Bendix firm into putting its anger into an official letter.

The letter said, in effect, it was one hell of a way to buy labor peace.

"Dear Mr. Kiffmeyer," the letter said on May 20, 1960, "The Bendix Radio Division (of) Bendix Aviation Corp. is fully aware of the fact that Project Mercury is another important effort on the part of the U.S. Government to preserve and enrich our democracy. We are proud to be a part of that

effort. We recognize the need for labor peace at Cape Canaveral and we have a sincere desire to cooperate with you in your efforts to have good labor relations at the Cape Canaveral Base.

"But if labor peace at Cape Canaveral can only be achieved by sacrificing the rights which we and our employees (also unionized—V.R.) have under the U.S. laws, it seems that we are losing the benefits of the same democracy that Project Mercury is intended to help preserve. For example, some trade unions are claiming the sole and exclusive right to perform any work at the Cape Canaveral Base."

This claim is being made by building and construction unions down below. But, as the letter points out, the Bendix contract was for "the purpose of tracking and communicating with space vehicles."

Such equipment is in no way associated with the construction or even the operation of a building there. The Bendix material and systems are simply inside the apparatus as a telephone and its wires are inside a skyscraper. But the union insisted that its local people handle the wiring, though it could be done more efficiently and therefore more cheaply at the home factory.

So the company, facing a united front of the Air Force and the local labor leadership, agreed to make it possible for the Florida union to unload, place, and anchor the equipment in the positions specified. There is more. But no sense in describing the technical operations. Suffice to report that after agreeing to all this, the company received a call from the Air Force. The union wanted more. Now it also wanted the right to string the wires between the control consoles. And would the company rush a man down. The union was set to strike the next day if it didn't get what it wanted. The company dispatched its official, A. H. Bode, director of industrial relations.

He met the Air Force official. They asked the union leader to come in. There were new concessions. The labor leader deigned to initial a letter of agreement. Then at last it was possible to rig up the communications system over which Commander Shepard finally sang out, "What a beautiful view."

But what a dismal view earlier.

[From the Boston Herald, May 9, 1961]

BORDERING ON SUBVERSION

"This situation borders to a degree on subversion, does it not?" (Senator MCCLELLAN on labor slowdowns and strikes at missile bases)

Labor unionists at Cape Canaveral and other missile bases did not ask what they could do for their country—they asked what their country could do for them.

And what they asked they got, by strikes and slowdowns.

They got big pay, bigger pay in some cases than the Secretary of Defense. Wages of $450 to $500 a week were commonplace at Cape Canaveral.

They got all kinds of make-work. Pipefitters sat idly at full pay for as long as it would take to disassemble preassembled manifolds and put them together again—the blessing of the manifold.

They got hundreds of millions of dollars out of American taxpayers above what the work they did should have cost.

And in getting all this, they weakened American security and apparently cost us the crucial prestige of being first to put a man in orbit.

This is a grim harvest that the McClellan labor-management subcommittee has reaped from its investigation of delays in the Nation's missile programs. If this is a sample of America's dedication to her own survival, our fate is sealed. Greed triumphs over patriotism, and her own citizens use the country's urgencies to extort special benefits. Some management has been guilty of this, too.

Is this really a picture of America today?

Surely it is not a picture of the workers themselves. These men cannot have worked on the Nation's great undertakings of defense and space research without experiencing some of the thrill of that effort. These men must have exulted, as all exulted, when finally we put a man in space.

What we see so bleakly in this labor picture is the operation of our still undisciplined and still uncontrolled competitive unionism. What one union gains must be matched by greater gains by every rival union, and every jurisdictional right must be jealously guarded and even expanded.

Contractors on missile work were soft to union demands, ready to concede anything just to get the job done in time. The pickings were easy.

What it was in missiles is what it has been in railroads, in steel, in automobiles, in the whole gamut of production—but in missiles the extortion was easier.

If it borders on subversion in the case of missiles, does it not also border a little on subversion when the whole productive effort of the country is hampered by unwarranted union demands?

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 27, 1961]

PROFITEERING ON DEFENSE

Anyone seriously concerned with common decency, never mind America's military chances, must get a little sick at the stomach, reading the testimony before a congressional committee headed by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.

Through overtime devices pipefitters at one missile base have averaged more than $365 a week. Common laborers have been making up to $287. Pipefitters insisted on tearing apart factory assemblies for Titan missiles and putting them back together again. They agreed to let them alone when they were paid to stand idle for the estimated time it would take to do the job.

Despite the urgency of the missile-installing job and despite the fat paychecks, there have been 327 strikes at 22 missile bases in the last 4½ years, involving 162,872 lost man-days.

A main cause of strikes appears to be quarrels over who gets the jobs. "Swag" might be a better term, considering that some of these workmen have drawn down more than the top boss of the defense effort—the Secretary of Defense.

It is interesting that this holdup, plus slowdown, isn't a new thing. It has been going on more than 4 years and is worse this year than last. There is something seriously wrong with a system which permits this continued outrage without abrupt action.

As the record of recent years shows, there is no lack of people ready and willing to rob and slight the Government—from common laborers to corporation executives. When the Government tolerates it, the Government must share the blame.

The Labor Department has started an investigation of the jurisdictional problem and, as Senator MCCLELLAN observed, it was time. Purpose of the hearing is to determine whether legislation is needed to protect against strikes and excessive labor demands on defense projects. This need, it seems to us, is obvious.

[From the Washington Star, May 10, 1961]

MISSILE BASE STRIKES

It is unconscionable that jurisdictional strikes, generally of the wildcat variety, should be tolerated in the construction of bases for our intercontinental ballistic missiles. For this is a matter which bears directly upon the national security. The fact is, however, that many thousands of days have been lost to these strikes, not to mention the needless millions of dollars which have been added to the taxpayers' bill.

This is something which should be kept in perspective. It probably is true that construction difficulties—changes in base design required by missile modifications—have been responsible for more lost time than strikes. But these are difficulties which it may not be possible to avoid if the missile program and the base program are to be completed as quickly as possible. Certainly they are not in the same category as strikes and slowdowns over the issue of which union is to do what work. It probably also is true that some contractors, knowing that the extra cost can be passed on to the taxpayers, have yielded too readily to unwarranted union demands. But the temptation to avoid a strike, even by resort to what amounts to bribery, is strong.

These jurisdictional fights have erupted mainly between locals of the building trades department of the AFL–CIO and the federation's industrial union department. The responsible union leaders have tried to stop them, but have failed. Consequently, intervention at the governmental level has become necessary, and the indications are that the President, Defense Secretary McNamara and Labor Secretary Goldberg intend to move in. We hope that their efforts will be successful, but the history of executive action in problems of this kind hardly gives rise to optimism.

If the danger which our country faces is as great as the President says, there is much merit, we think, to Senator MCCLELLAN'S proposal that Congress should act to outlaw strikes, especially jurisdictional strikes, on defense projects.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, May 4, 1961]

END THE SHAMEFUL MISSILE BASE STRIKES

Testimony of Cape Canaveral union leaders before the McClellan Senate Investigations Subcommittee that they had tried to curb the wave of strikes that have helped to delay America's great missile projects should not, it seems to us, be permitted to end there.

It should prompt vigorous action by both Government and top labor agencies to prevent strikes at missile bases which, at a time when the Soviet Union is boasting loudly of its achievements in space, set up disastrous roadblocks to progress by the United States.

Not all the hampering of our missile programs has been caused, it is true, by labor troubles. There has been bungling by inept bureaucrats and a lack of speed and decisiveness on the part of some technological specialists. Yet the fact remains, as the union leaders told the McClellan committee, that over the past 4½ years 108 strikes have occurred at Cape Canaveral, the large majority due to jurisdictional disputes.

Whatever the causes, these work stoppages have not only delayed operations on the missile phases of this Nation's defenses but have added immensely to costs. As a shocking instance, it was testified last week that plumbers and pipefitters at Cape Canaveral were paid $420 to $733 a week; one electrician $647 a week; ditch diggers up to $287 a week; elevator operators $360 and warehouse clerks $262.

Part of this inflated pay was due to overtime resulting from delays caused by strikes. But part of the high pay also went for idling. In short, not only was work on vital defense essentials held up—also held up were the country's taxpayers.

Much to the point was Senator MCCLELLAN'S comment to the union leaders that the strikes amounted to "trifling with the freedom of children yet unborn" while the

United States is in a race with Russia for space supremacy and possibly for life itself.

It seems to us about time that George Meany, Walter Reuther, James Carey, and other moguls of the AFL–CIO, along with Pentagon chiefs and expediters, take steps to insure the security of the United States against greedy, shortsighted employees at the missile bases who apparently don't care whether this country survives or perishes.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 28, 1961]

UNION GOUGING IN ORBIT

The testimony on union practices at the Cape Canaveral and Vandenberg Air Base missile launching sites can't be called incredible because nobody disputes it. It is incontrovertible that the unions have, in these years of national peril, hampered missile development by means of strikes, slowdowns, and working at 20 to 30 percent of the efficiency expected of them.

These tactics have been pursued in total disregard of patriotism or the national safety, solely in order to enforce an extortionate wage scale in a field that is vital to America's survival. These scandalous practices have gone unhindered for years, with never a word of remonstrance from either the National Government or the central union administration.

Only now that the story is coming out through the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee have the taxpayers become acquainted with the full details of what they are paying union racketeers to sabotage the Nation's defenses. Among the facts are these:

1. There have been 327 strikes or work stoppages since missile site construction began in 1957, at a cost of 163,000 man-days.

2. Workers have forced an abnormal 12-hour shift on contractors, rigging the starting time so that they collect the regular rate of pay the first 4 hours, time and a half the second 4 hours, and double overtime the last 4 hours.

3. While Secretary of Defense McNamara is paid $480 a week, all 14 ironworkers at Cape Canaveral average between $520 and $611 a week.

4. An apprentice electrician, brother-in-law of a union boss at Canaveral, collects $673 a week, equal to the salary of the Vice President of the United States.

5. Another electrician at the cape has earned as high as $748 a week, more than the combined pay of Vice Admiral Rickover, developer of the nuclear submarine, and Dr. Wernher von Braun, space and rocket expert.

6. Pay of plumbers and pipefitters ranges from $402 to $733 a week. Electricians averaged between $413 and $670 a week.

7. Plumbers and pipefitters at Vandenberg base refused to handle manifolds that came assembled for installation in missiles. At first the so-called workmen were allowed to estimate the time it would require to assemble the mechanisms and were permitted to sit idle an equivalent time, starting at the manifolds, while drawing full pay. Now they have enforced delivery of the manifolds unassembled.

The chief of the racket at Canaveral is the local boss of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. He exercises control over 30 unions engaged at the missile base. It seems unlikely that the extortion against the taxpayers is permitted to operate merely to enrich the rank-and-file workers. The committee should pursue the possibility of kickbacks.

This disgusting business is to be read against the background of the platform pronouncement of President Kennedy's New Frontier:

"The right to a job requires * * * repeal of the antilabor excesses which have been written into our labor laws."

The evidence from the missile sites points to the exact opposite. Far from compelling reasonable union practices, existing labor laws are so feeble and ineffective that union bosses have been freed of all restraint and are engaging in highway robbery against the Government itself.

May we expect Mr. Kennedy to correct these abuses? Considering how deeply he is committed to the unions, we wonder how far he will go.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 30, 1961]

STRIKES AT MISSILE BASES—A SORDID TALE OF GREED

It's a sordid tale of selfishness and greed the McClellan subcommittee has been unfolding in its hearings on missile base construction.

These bases add up to one of the largest, most intricate and most demanding construction jobs in history. They are also one of the most pressingly urgent: without bases, the missiles might as well not be built, and the Nation's stake in these missiles needs no reemphasis here.

Testimony about actual weekly pay at construction sites has put the bases boondoggle in dramatic focus: $413 to $670 a week for electricians, $420 to $733 a week for plumbers and pipefitters—with taxpayers footing the bill. This included overtime at up to four times base pay.

But the paychecks themselves were less a disgrace than the behavior of local unions. From the start of the base-building program through March 31, 1961, there were 327 major work stoppages at the 22 sites; in 1960 alone, 84,000 man-days were lost through strikes. A lot of these were petty jurisdictional disputes. Some, according to documentary evidence produced by the subcommittee, were called to force agreements to pay unnecessary overtime. Construction has fallen months behind schedule.

Union rules required workers at Vandenberg and Cape Canaveral to tear apart missile equipment already assembled at the factories and put it back together again—all while the Nation waited for its defenses to be secure, and all at the taxpayers' expense.

Some workers got in the habit of simply calculating the time this silly featherbedding would take, then sitting idly beside the equipment until the time was up. "Blessing" the items, they called it.

Labor hasn't been the only cause of lagging progress and skyrocketing costs. Bad planning, divided authority and plain mismanagement have contributed their share, as has the fact that the whole venture is an experiment with the untried. But the strikes, the frequent wildcat walkouts, the slowdowns and the featherbedding have been deliberate acts. There is a moral difference between the stupid and the venal.

One witness said he thought it was more a matter of "personal greed" than of any lack of patriotism. This is an odd distinction. Caught as this Nation is in a race for survival, any sabotage of so critical an element of its defense program for personal gain can hardly be squared with patriotism.

On a national level, the AFL–CIO has called for an end to the work stoppages. But the call hasn't worked. Only last week, 4,000 workers went on strike at Atlas and Titan sites near Denver. If labor can't police its own house where the national defense is at stake, it's up to Congress.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, May 9, 1961]

END THIS FORM OF TREASON

The War Labor Board method of short-circuiting outrageous gouging and work stoppages in this country's missiles base program is being considered.

If President Kennedy and his advisers believe that it has even half a chance of getting needed results let's have it and fast.

The situation has passed the point of outrage and is becoming downright treasonable. Treason has many definitions and this one qualifies.

These facts have been developed by the Senate Investigations Subcommittee:

There have been 327 strikes at 22 missile bases in 4½ years.

One-third occurred at Cape Canaveral from which the United States belatedly launched its first man in space last week.

The total of man-days lost was 162,872.

Thirty unions were involved.

These figures add to one of the chief reasons why a gap exists between the American and Soviet missile and space programs. If this isn't treachery, what is?

We have previously commented on the "revolting" spectacle of some workers getting as much as $700 a week and many getting between $500 and $600 a week. Victor Riesel, one of our columnists, says that in checking missile base payrolls, "with no trouble at all you run into a blizzard of $250 to $350 a week checks."

It is the taxpayer who gets gouged for this—for excessive costs stemming from jurisdictional stoppages and forced slowdowns. He gets hit two ways—in the pocketbook and from consequential weakening of his defense cover.

The War Labor Board approach to ending an intolerable condition, actually constituting a threat to the Nation's safety, would involve the setting up of a panel on which public representation would sufficiently outnumber labor and industry members to prevent panel deadlocks.

Industries and unions engaged in missile base construction would be asked to make a no-strike pledge and every type of disagreement, frivolous and serious, would be submitted to the panel for settlement. Its decisions would prevail. Work would continue at the bases while disputes were under consideration.

If this method is not adopted another equally effective must be. Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Investigations Subcommittee, is exploring the matter with Labor Secretary Goldberg. Whatever their conclusion, we hope Senator MCCLELLAN will not let it interfere with his announced intention to sponsor legislation to curb strikes at defense installations.

That is something the country should have had 20 years ago when it was trying to prepare to meet the Axis assault. It would have saved time and lives.

Do readers recall the North American Aviation plant strike of that period? It was chiefly the result of the work of agents of the same enemy who now threatens our very existence—an enemy who is now immeasurably stronger and totally implacable and ruthless.

No nation hoping to survive can afford the luxury of labor banditry in its missiles base programs.

I thank the members of the press, who have supported the committee in this effort. The press has been cognizant of the tremendous task we have undertaken to perform and has given us its support in news column and editorials. The effort to correct this condition is something which every loyal American should rally behind.

Again I say: Congress should fulfill its responsibilities.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

"WHAT DOES MY FLAG MEAN TO ME?"—PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Harold Withnell, principal of the Yoncalla High School, Yoncalla, Oreg., enclosing a prize-winning essay entitled "What Does My Flag Mean to Me?" This essay was written by a student in the Yoncalla High School for the essay contest sponsored by the local American Legion post.

I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the letter from the principal of the Yoncalla High School.

There being no objection, the letter and essay were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YONCALLA HIGH SCHOOL,
Yoncalla, Oreg., March 7, 1961.

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: A short time ago we held an essay contest sponsored by our local Legion post on the subject of What My Flag Means to Me and this is one of the prize-winning essays.

It expresses a thought that I believe that all of us need to work on. I thought that you would like to have a copy of this student's essay as it certainly brought to all of our minds that we can never be too vigilant on teaching the American ideals in our schools. I feel quite strongly about the matter and have worked in this high school for quite some time on the subject, but still here is one of our very best students bringing it to mind once more.

Very truly yours,
HAROLD WITHNELL,
Principal.

WHAT DOES MY FLAG MEAN TO ME?

What does my flag mean to me? Will you consider my patriotic education neglected when I say that I feel very little concerning the flag?

I had barely arrived in grade school when I had my first lesson in memory work. That lesson was the memorization of the Flag Salute. Memorization came easily, but the whys were not answered. Why do I pledge allegiance; what is indivisible; why don't we say Amen at the end?

When my grandparents, and even my parents, were growing up, the flag and flag ceremonies were an important part of their child and adulthood. Flags were displayed in church—one on either side of the altar; one waved from the top of the town hall. To them the Fourth of July was as important as Christmas, but to me it is just a hot summer day. Flags flew unfurled on all occasions—the announcing of election day, the return of a soldier, war's end.

Please understand, I am not disloyal—I am proud of my country, of its symbols, of its people, but through neglect of important emphasis, I have not derived the keen sense of importance the flag should play. No longer do the two flags stand stately in my church; there is no flag on our town hall; and the Fourth of July and Armistice Day are as any other. Oh, I stand when the Star Spangled Banner is played and when the flag is saluted; I place my hand over my heart and say the words, but I do it as the mass, and not as the individual.

I hope never to witness war in any form, but I know that uniformed men, marching bands, and waving flags are inspirational. Can there be another way? Is it possible to return to the Independence Day feeling of a generation ago? Why can't we say "amen" at the end of the Flag Salute? It is a prayer, a very fervent one and, as we all know, by men's prayers, greatness is accomplished.

To be inspired by a symbol of one's country, as was Francis Scott Key, is truly greatness. From my generation may come another, if united we are one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Amen.

FREEDOM AND THE UNIVERSITY IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at the Law Day Banquet at Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., on April 28, 1961, Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS, a distinguished Representative in Congress from that State, delivered an inspiring address entitled, "Freedom and the University in Latin America." I was on the platform during the address. I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Representative BRADEMAS on that occasion be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM AND THE UNIVERSITY IN LATIN AMERICA

(An address by Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, at Law Day Banquet, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., April 28, 1961)

Mr. Chairman, Dean Wallace, distinguished members of the Supreme Court of Indiana, members of the board of trustees of Indiana University, members of the faculty and student body, I am honored indeed to have been invited to address you on the occasion of Law Day, U.S.A.

This is the first time I have had the opportunity to speak at Indiana University and I am particularly proud to be here during the presidency of one of the most distinguished leaders in American higher education and one of the outstanding citizens of our country, Dr. Herman B. Wells.

Just a few days ago, in my own congressional district, I had the pleasure of sitting at breakfast on the campus of the University of Notre Dame as the guest of the president of that university, Father Theodore M. Hesburgh. Another of the guests at the breakfast, an official of one of the outstanding private foundations that deals with higher education in the United States, said then that there were all too few university presidents in the United States who could be described as genuine leaders in the world of higher education.

He went on to say that the State of Indiana could take particular pride in the fact that all three presidents of our three largest universities were to be included among the select few who help mold and give direction to the course of higher education in the United States. He cited of course President Hesburgh of Notre Dame, President Hovde of Purdue University and President Wells.

I am also honored by the opportunity to address an audience which contains members of the highest court in our State as well as distinguished members of the Indiana Bar and students of the law. I think you are all to be commended for your courage in inviting a nonlawyer to address a group of lawyers on the occasion of Law Day.

April 1961 is certainly an appropriate time at which to discuss one of the chief purposes of ceremonies recognizing Law Day U.S.A., which is "To foster an increased respect for law, as an indispensable element in our national life."

Throughout the world today, we see the idea of the rule of law being ruthlessly challenged. Two examples serve to make my point.

Our great ally in Western Europe, France, has been shaken this week by a revolt of some generals against the legitimately constituted authority of the Government of France. The generals sought, happily without success, to put themselves beyond the rule of law.

MORSE WARNED ON CASTRO

Just as dramatically, here in our own hemisphere Fidel Castro has made a mockery of legal institutions by erecting a Communist-oriented dictatorship just 90 miles off the coast of our country. A few days ago at the law school on the campus of the University of Notre Dame I was speaking with Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon, who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I was struck by the way in which Senator MORSE related the abuse of law to the ascendancy of Fidel Castro.

The Senator told me that very early in the Castro regime he warned that Castro would not be able to lead his country out of the Batista tyranny; worse, that he would crush democracy in Cuba. Senator MORSE said he realized this would happen when Castro began to hold trials more in the spirit of the coliseum than the courtroom and to deal out firing squad justice. Castro in every way violated the procedural safeguards which we have come to associate with a country in which the individual citizen's freedom is guaranteed under law. When procedural safeguards are destroyed, Senator MORSE concluded, it will not be long before the substantive protections of democracy have gone down the drain.

COMMUNISTS EAGER TO HELP

I might add here that having rejected the traditional Western institutions of law and government, Castro developed no new ones of his own. He cynically turned to the Communists for ideas and for men and the commissars were eager to help.

It is not, however, about the law directly that I plan to speak tonight, but about education, and not education in the United States but in Latin America. And neither the subject nor the lands, I suggest, are irrelevant to Law Day.

Law does not develop in a vacuum. Legal institutions do not spring full-fashioned from men's minds. The rule of law as we know it in the United States is based on a widespread sense of community among the citizens of our country. There is a generally shared agreement that it is better to resolve our differences by democratic methods, that is to say, by law. If the law is to prevail, there must be respect for law.

This respect for law, this sense of community, depends largely on the existence in a nation of social institutions and economic conditions which will unite the people and make possible the rule of law. In the United States these circumstances exist.

UNIVERSITIES CALLED KEY

To the south of us, it seems to me that the question of whether Latin American nations will continue to develop legal institutions characteristic of free nations will depend upon their success in developing the economic and social institutions essential to a democracy. And I would argue strongly

that the universities of Latin America must show the way.

The unhappy events in Cuba of the last few days have brought to bear with greater force than ever before on the consciousness of the American people the immense importance to our own country's security of what happens in Latin America.

A few days ago this week I returned from a trip to Argentina, one of the largest and most powerful countries of Latin America. The purpose of the visit, which my colleague Congressman ROBERT GIAIMO, of Connecticut, also a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, and I paid to Argentina, was to look into the possibilities of increased cooperation between the United States and the countries of Latin America in the field of higher education.

SHADOW OF CASTRO

Our visit to Argentina convinced us both that the universities of Latin America are an indispensable key to achieving the economic development and social reform which these nations must have if they are to create democratic societies and free political institutions that will endure.

It is up to the universities of Latin America to produce the engineers, the agricultural specialists and the technicians needed to fight hunger, poverty, and disease and move the Latin American economies into the 20th century. Otherwise, we can expect to see Castro-like movements spread to other parts of Latin America.

Congressman GIAIMO and I also concluded that the United States can be of considerable help in enabling the universities of Latin America to meet this formidable challenge.

Because most of you are university students and soon to be lawyers, I think you will find it both interesting and helpful to understand something of the role of the university in the countries south of us.

During our stay, most of which was in the city of Buenos Aires, we talked with hundreds of people, including the rectors of three universities, student groups, professors, Argentine newspapermen, the only Argentine Nobel Prize winner, top Argentine politicians, including the Minister of Education, President Arturo Frondizi of Argentina himself, and our own United States Ambassador and his staff.

We discussed with all of these people the universities in Argentina and the problems that confront them.

Let me at the outset make clear that there are significant and substantial differences between the university in the United States and the university in Latin America. I should like to analyze some of these differences for you now, with particular reference to Argentina and our visit.

First, Argentine universities are based on the Spanish tradition that universities play a vital role in the life of the community.

SPANISH TRADITION

The Spanish university tradition was also highly aristocratic; universities were for the elite only.

In the year 1918, however, shortly after the Bolshevik revolution, there took place in the early 17th century University of Cordoba what has come to be known as "La Reforma de Cordoba." The central thrust of the reform of Cordoba is best summed up by one of its early proponents who said, "The university is a republic of students."

The Cordoban reform represented a revolt against control of the universities by the pro-Spanish aristocracy and a return to the medieval practice of student control of the university.

La Reforma Universitaria can be summed up in the following way:

Professors should no longer be handpicked by the aristocracy. There should be more direct contact between students and professors. Compulsory attendance in classes should be abolished. Perhaps most important of all, students should be assigned an important role in the governing of the university itself.

All these demands were accompanied by a strongly anti-Yanqui declaration.

Even today in Argentina and elsewhere in Latin America one encounters a division among university students and professors between the Reformistas and the anti-Reformistas.

CRITICISM OF STUDENTS

Certainly one of the chief criticisms of the university that we encountered during our visit to Latin America was that students have far too much to say about running it.

The Reforma meant that students were to be seated on the governing bodies of the universities and thereon to help determine university policy.

For example, students have one-fifth of the total membership of the governing counsel of each faculty and of the superior counsel of the University of Buenos Aires, with professors and alumni having a somewhat larger percentage of votes. In other universities in Latin America, the students have as high as one-third of the votes on the governing bodies of each faculty and of the governing body of the entire university.

This power means that students feel free on some occasions to make and break professors, to judge what research ought to be undertaken and what is most important, to pronounce themselves on university organization and to take the university into national politics whenever they feel like it.

BIRTHPLACE OF FREEDOM

Examples may often be cited of students ousting individual professors by the device of the strike.

For example, a day or two after we arrived in Buenos Aires, Congressman GIAIMO and I flew with Ambassador Roy Rubottom of the United States to the city of Cordoba, the birthplace of the university reform movement to which I have been referring. The purpose of our visit to Cordoba was to dedicate a new Argentine-United States institute for the study of English. During the day we paid a visit to the University of Cordoba. We decided to visit the law school, where you law students will be interested to learn, all your fellow students of the law were on strike. As I recall, the dean had decided examinations were to occur somewhat more frequently than before.

We walked through the library and into a small room just off it which houses a bust and the papers and writings of the leading scholar-hero of the University of Cordoba. As we looked at the books, the large doors leading from the library into the room swung open and a group of 20 young people—whether they were students at the university or not is a matter of dispute—strode into the room.

One of their number, a young man in his twenties, came up to Ambassador Rubottom, and in very strong and very rude Spanish, boldly declared, "Senator Embajador, repudiamos el imperialismo norteamericano."

"We support Fidel Castro," he said, as the group stomped out of the room, shouting "Cuba, Cuba," showering us with mimeographed sheets which, in extravagantly left-wing language, attacked the United States, all our recent Ambassadors to Argentina, John Foster Dulles and the United Fruit Co.

The university authorities were of course greatly embarrassed by the event, and I think it would be most unfair to conclude from this incident that all or even a majority of Latin American university students are so hostile to the United States. But the incident does serve to dramatize the fact that many students do feel such an animosity toward the United States and, which is more to the point for my analysis here, that students are far more likely to indulge in political demonstrations than they would be in our country.

Many Argentines were astonished when I told them I often spoke on university campuses in the United States in order to urge American college students to take a more active interest in politics. No such admonition is necessary in Latin America.

Another tenet of the university reform movement is that there shall be no tenure for professors but that they shall be elected periodically, for example, in some universities, every 7 years. This requirement does not make for professors who speak out candidly and clearly their views on controversial matters.

In our conversations with university rectors and political leaders, we found substantial differences on what the role of students should be, and of course the students themselves have their own views. Suffice it to say that many Argentine leaders feel that students have far too much power in the governing of the university and that this view clashes with that of the students themselves who feel that they have a right to such a voice.

FEW FULL-TIME PROFESSORS

One of the most serious problems confronting Latin American universities is the lack of full-time professors. The title of professor is one in very high esteem in Latin America and most of the people who hold it are professional people in their own right, lawyers or physicians, for example, who teach only part time at the university. The result of this "taxi professor" system is often a low standard of lectures and little attention to intensive research.

They are called "taxi professors" not only because they travel to and from the universities from their offices but also because their salaries sometimes pay little more than taxi fare.

An analogous problem is that there are few full-time students because most of them must work in order to support themselves and there are few substantial scholarships available.

I have spoken of the power of the students within the university, but in Argentina students also have considerable voice and influence in national politics.

Consider first the fact that voting is compulsory in Argentina; if you fail to vote, you are fined. Second, the legal voting age is 18 years. Then remember that many students do not regard the university primarily as a place of learning as we do in the United States, but rather as a springboard from which to vault into political life.

Given these circumstances, the 55,000 to 60,000 students (the estimates vary) at the University of Buenos Aires, in Argentina's capital and largest city, must clearly be considered a significant force in Argentine national politics. In addition to being potential voters, and articulate ones, they all have mothers and fathers and sisters and brothers and cousins and uncles and aunts.

FINANCIAL HELP REJECTED

Argentina's only Nobel Prize winner told us how student pressure had in some cases caused the university to refuse financial aid for certain programs because it came from the United States.

Another problem with which those concerned to improve higher education in Latin America must necessarily deal is one not unknown to us in the United States right now, and that is the relation between church and state. In Argentina, and elsewhere in Latin America, the church-state issue often resolves itself into a feud between national universities, which are supported with public funds, and private universities, which in almost every case means Catholic universities.

In some Latin American countries, such as Chile, the Catholic university has high

scholastic standards and therefore exercises a beneficial influence on raising standards in the national universities. In Argentina, however, it has only been within the last 3 years that Catholic universities have been permitted to grant degrees and they have therefore not represented any great influence in determining academic standards. One of the problems that we in the United States who are interested in cooperating with Latin American educators must consider is whether or not, and to what extent, private universities should be assisted as distinguished from the national universities.

UNIVERSITIES AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Now I have outlined for you some of the major differences between Argentine universities and those in the United States. What I should now like to do is discuss with you what seems to me to be the highly significant, indeed essential, role which the Latin American university can play in moving those nations, economically and socially speaking, into the 20th century.

Studies in recent years in the United States have shown that in our own country, the most important cause of rapid economic and technological growth has been highly trained and skilled human beings, rather than physical resources. This is a thesis which has been developed particularly by Prof. Theodore Schultz of the University of Chicago.

This same thesis has been argued by former U.S. Senator William Benton of Connecticut following his visit with Adlai Stevenson to Latin America last year.

Senator Benton contends in the recently published report on "Cooperation for Progress in Latin America" of the Committee on Economic Development that "the direct help the United States can give Latin America is not substantial at the lower economic levels." Rather, suggests Senator Benton, and I am inclined to agree, what we must do is help develop a group of well-trained persons in the economic and technical fields, through emphasis on higher education.

The Latin American universities themselves must be built up. It is simply impossible for us in the United States over a protracted period of time to serve as the postgraduate school for Latin Americans. Of course, we can train some and perhaps should train more Latin American students in the United States. In the long run, however, only Latin American universities themselves can be expected to meet their national needs for training enough persons in what have been appropriately described as "the strategic fields." The strategic fields are those that lead to rapid economic progress. As one American authority who has done a great deal of work in this area has put it, "We must help other countries build strong, indigenous institutions which can produce locally most of the technologists and managers that developing countries need in order to speed up their economic growth."

TOO MANY LAWYERS, TOO FEW AGRONOMISTS

Let us look, for example, at the situation in Argentina. A recent student census at the University of Buenos Aires indicates that nearly 20 percent of the students were studying law while, in this great beef country of the Western Hemisphere, only 2 percent of the students were studying agronomy and veterinary medicine.

It is not that the Argentines are so litigious a people that the practice of law is such a major industry. Rather is it true that the heavy enrollments in law at Buenos Aires and in the law faculties of the other Latin American universities are evidence of deeply ingrained social attitudes.

It is a legacy of the traditional Spanish view that the law is one of the old and honored professions and the lawyer can claim a superior place in society to that of the engineer or the administrator or the technician. And also, for those who regard the university as an apprenticeship to politics, the law school is an anteroom to power.

So while Argentina is a land noted for the production of beef, it has lived in technological isolation for the last 20 years in this field. The Argentines know little about genetics, fertility, supplementary feeding, artificial pastures, and land management.

It is therefore not enough for us to provide capital assistance to the nations of Latin America. They are in serious need of remedying their technical as well as their financial deficit. This is especially true in such fields as agricultural engineering, industrial engineering, and economics.

Here is a good example of what can be done. The University of Chicago contracted with the University of Santiago in Chile, operating with funds from the International Cooperation Administration, to send U.S. economics professors from Chicago to Chile to take the places of a number of Chilean students of economics who then came to the University of Chicago to take their doctorates. Upon completion of their graduate studies, they returned to Chile, there to strengthen greatly the faculty of economics and indeed the teaching of economics throughout Chile generally. Until that time, I understand, the teaching of economics in Chile had been monopolized by the Marxists.

In a few days, Congressman GIAIMO and I hope to offer some specific recommendations to the House Education and Labor Committee on what the U.S. Government as well as American private foundations and universities might do to help Latin American universities play their indispensable role in developing within their own countries groups of top technical and economic personnel.

I do not here wish to suggest that we should ignore the nontechnical and nonscientific fields. But our resources are limited, and my own view is that emphasis should be given to assisting the Latin American universities to build up strong departments in those subjects which provide the greatest spur to economic and social development. A graduate school of agriculture, for example could mean a great incentive to improving agricultural productivity in Latin America.

We may even decide to single universities out of three or four major countries, such as Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico, and encourage their development as regional universities to which other Latin American nations may send their students without the language or cultural barriers which they encounter in the United States.

We should, I repeat, strengthen these universities in the strategic fields of engineering, industrial sciences and agriculture.

In undertaking such a program of aiding Latin American higher education, we must, I think, keep in mind certain given facts.

First, we must understand that we are not likely to change radically the present structure of Latin American universities stemming from the Cordoban reform of 1918.

Second, we shall have to realize that the way in which we give our help is often as important as how much we provide. The Latins to whom we spoke were extraordinarily sensitive to receiving funds which they held to be directly from the Government of the United States, especially those that could be ascribed to our Department of State. This means that private foundations, some of which, such as the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, have already done an extraordinarily useful job in developing Latin American universities, can play an even more fruitful role in the future.

It is my own view that private business in the United States might well give consideration to helping some of the universities in Latin America, especially those private firms that have enterprises in Latin America and, therefore, may feel some particular sense of social responsibility. Such help might also give impetus to the development in the other nations of the Western Hemisphere of private philanthropy from Latin Americans themselves to their own universities, a tradition which is now sadly lacking.

SOME PROGRESS IN ARGENTINE UNIVERSITIES

One authority with whom I spoke about the plight of Latin American universities warned me that significant progress was being made in Argentina and that the picture was not all black.

My acquaintance, who has spent many years in Latin America, told me of some of the victories that have been won by the rector of the University of Buenos Aires, Dr. Risieri Frondizi. Although Dr. Frondizi happens to be the brother of the President of Argentina, Arturo Frondizi, the President did not appoint him rector and the two are strongly at odds on a number of matters.

Rector Frondizi, for example, has begun to break down the system of jealously autonomous faculties, by which I mean he is seeking to end the present tradition of prohibiting, within the same university, the transfer of credits from one faculty or college to another.

Frondizi has won the acceptance by nearly every group within the university of the proposition that full-time professors with good pay are essential, and he is making some headway in translating this ideal into reality.

Dr. Frondizi has also urged that more student scholarships be provided, a relatively recent innovation.

Since 1958 there has been no intervention by the government in the running of the university, a signal achievement, and the universities in Argentina can now be considered autonomous. During the Peron dictatorship, the Government used the university as an instrument of its purposes.

Finally, Rector Frondizi has breached the isolationism of the university. The University of Buenos Aires has accepted both Government and foundation aid from the United States.

I should make clear that all these gains have been made in the last 3 years, and that they are gains away from the traditional Spanish aristocratic attitude toward a more scientific, 20th century idea of a university.

These signs of progress, and they are not the only ones that could be cited, offer hope that Latin American university leaders are trying manfully to build 20th century institutions of higher learning.

That we in the United States should in every appropriate way encourage their efforts seems to me clear. As President Kennedy said in his magnificent address of March 13 calling for an "alliance for progress": "Our hemisphere's mission is not yet complete. For our unfulfilled task is to demonstrate to the entire world that man's unsatisfied aspiration for economic progress and social justice can best be achieved by freemen working within a framework of democratic institutions."

KENNEDY ASKS DECADE OF PROGRESS

Just this week the House of Representatives voted to appropriate $500 million to support President Kennedy's program for stimulating economic and social development in Latin America. Among the 10 points the President urged for a decade of democratic progress were proposals for helping strengthen Latin American universities in what I have earlier called the strategic fields.

The President told the Latin American diplomats gathered at the White House last month, "We must rapidly expand the training of those needed to man the economies of rapidly developing countries. This means expanded universities, graduate schools, and research institutes."

"With steps such as these," concluded the President, "we propose to complete the revolution of the Americas—to build a hemisphere where all men can hope for the same high standard of living—and all can live out their lives in dignity and in freedom."

But President Kennedy was careful to tell the Latin American nations that "to achieve this goal, political freedom must accompany material progress," that "our alliance for progress is an alliance of free governments" and that "it must work to eliminate tyranny from a hemisphere in which it has no rightful place."

From what the President has said, and from my own observations, I think there are two lessons we should have in mind about Latin America. One of the lessons is for us in the United States to learn and the other is for the Latin Americans.

The Latins should not try to delude themselves, as the President warned bluntly in his speech last week on the Cuban situation, that they can flirt with communism and expect to survive as free nations. Those Latin American political leaders who believe they can cooperate with the Communists and maintain their own freedom and their nation's ought to turn their eyes to Castro's police state in their own backyard.

We in the United States, on the other hand, should be cautious of branding every movement which presses for social and economic reform in Latin America as a "Communist-inspired" operation. We must learn to distinguish. And we must also remember that the rhetoric of Spanish-speaking politicians is more florid than ours.

You are students of the law gathered to recognize the contribution which the law makes to the life of our country and of the world. The national theme of Law Day this year is "World Peace Through Law." Now I have never been an advocate of that school of thought which holds that if only we erect appropriate legal institutions within a country or if we write the correct sort of constitution for a federation of nations, peace is likely to follow, either domestic or international.

Law develops upon the basis of a sense of community both within a country and among nations. Where there are poverty, hunger and disease, it is unlikely that such a sense of community will develop and therefore most unlikely that the legal institutions which we identify with political freedom will develop either.

If therefore we are to build the peace we all so earnestly desire and yet maintain the freedom of which the rule of law is both a symbol and a bulwark, we must begin here at home.

We must continue to work for economic and social progress for our own citizens.

And we must, as President Kennedy said, "again transform the American continents into a vast crucible of revolutionary ideas and efforts—a tribute to the power of the creative energies of freemen—an example to all the world that liberty and progress walk hand in hand."

TEMPORARY RELEASE AND APPORTIONMENT OF POOLED ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 1372. The amendments are minor. The bill is practically the same as that passed by the House.

One amendment is to strike out "remains" and insert in lieu thereof "may remain"; the other amendment provides for the 3-year period which exists with respect to other agricultural crops.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1372) to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments, which were, on page 1, line 6, after "the", where it appears the first time, insert "3-year", and in line 6, strike out "remains" and insert "may remain".

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, has the action which the Senator from South Carolina proposes been cleared by the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It has not been cleared by speaking to him, but I cannot believe that he would object to striking out "remains" and inserting "may remain."

Mr. CURTIS. Neither do I; but before such action is taken, I hope that someone on the minority side might pass on the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

WORK STOPPAGES AT MISSILE BASES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, speaking as the ranking Republican member of the Senate Permanent Committee on Investigations, first I desire to emphasize a point which was alluded to in the address just made by the chairman of the committee. I think it needs to be reemphasized because of conditions which are continuing to be developed in the area of the chairman's discussion. It is true that temporarily the committee's hearings have been suspended. However, I think it should be clearly understood by all concerned that the investigations have not been suspended or concluded. We have currently before us new and startling cases which have come to light during the course of the very hearings which have been held in order to take corrective action against incidents which have occurred in the past.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield at that point?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, a member of the committee who has been diligent in his attendance and penetrating with his questions.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota may yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield only for a question.

Mr. CURTIS. Were not the hearings suspended only because of the interest shown by the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. MUNDT. So I understand.

Mr. CURTIS. The picture is as bad as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas stated; perhaps worse. We are concerned now with whether this is a request made in good faith on the part of the administration and the Department of Labor. If they are unable to remedy the condition by executive action, then the test will be what will happen to legislation which is proposed to be introduced and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. MUNDT. While I am hopeful, as the chairman has expressed his hope, that the Secretary of Labor will take steps which will succeed in correcting the situation at Cape Canaveral and other missile bases, I do not believe either that he can or that he will make recommendations which will be specific and binding enough to solve the problem. I doubt whether he has the authority to go beyond certain stipulations, which are now cloudy, under the Davis-Bacon Act. I doubt that he will make recommendations which will be firm enough and specific enough to correct the condition.

I think perhaps the Secretary of Defense, if he will interest himself in the problem, has plenary authority in this direction, which by insistence on performance or in precontractual arrangements might be able to prevent a recurrence, at least, in any new contracts or new endeavors or new construction taking place on missile bases.

Mr. CURTIS The committee took much testimony to the effect that one union, in particular, would put up a sign such as "Iron Workers Not Working Today." Then perhaps 25 or 26 crafts would refuse to go on the job and work. That created the problem of common situs picketing, which is outlawed by the Landrum-Griffin Act.

If the Secretary of Labor is sincere, one of the things he could do would be to withdraw the administration's request to legalize common situs picketing, because the approval of common situs picketing would legalize one of the principal abuses which was found at Cape Canaveral.

Mr. MUNDT. That was one of the reasons why I rose to emphasize the point that this investigation has not been concluded. The hearings are in a status of suspense, but the investigation is going forward, because I share with my colleagues the skepticism as to whether the Secretary of Labor will take action sufficiently specific and sufficiently firm to correct the abuses. I also share with the Senator from Nebraska and with the chairman of the committee the conviction that before this session of Congress adjourns, Congress should pass legislation which will specifically meet problems of the kind we are discussing in connection with the report made this afternoon.

The Senator from Nebraska served for more than 30 months with us on the Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field of which I was vice chairman and that work was antecedent to the present investigation and the present authority, which I think the Senate very wisely reposed in the committee making this investigation, thus amplifying our authority, so as to permit us to

make this investigation and report; and the Senator from Nebraska knows that there is nothing particularly new or novel about slowdowns and common situs picketing, except in this instance it struck at the very heart of our security, because it struck at the missile construction program.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for another question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that one of the most disheartening things experienced at the hearing not only was the callousness and greed of those conducting the slowdowns, the walkouts, and the work stoppages, but also the silence and the inaction and the passive attitude—which have been referred to by the distinguished chairman of the committee—of the Government officials who were there? Is it not also true that one of the first constructive moves to protect the taxpayers and to speed up the program was instituted by private enterprise? I refer to Convair's cost surveillance program, which it instituted in order to prevent some of the slowdowns, stoppages, and gouging by individuals there, including excessive charges for the rental of equipment.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct; and a little later in my remarks I expect to allude to some of the constructive suggestions which came from Convair, Boeing, and other responsible contractors there, who sought to do something salutary about that situation.

Illustrative of the point to which the Senator from Nebraska has referred, I state that, for some reason or other, there has not been an animated or an aggressive attitude by the Department of Defense, in an endeavor to correct the situation, as disclosed by the startling testimony given by Ewell H. Hodge, formerly an Air Force contracting officer at Vandenberg Air Force Base. He testified that as jobs neared their end, he noted attempts by various means to prolong the jobs. He noted such instances in connection with what were called first check-out on equipment. On the first check-out, the equipment worked perfectly; but then, for some mysterious reason, the union insisted on a second check-out; and, for some strange reason which no one could detect, on the second check-out the equipment did not work correctly; so the check-outs and refinements were prolonged. Ultimately Mr. Hodge resigned his position; and he said he resigned because of a "lack of support of the contracting officer's position"—a lack of support by the officials in charge, and including, perhaps, a lack of support by someone at the Pentagon—and a lack of determination to stop such inordinate delays.

So I hope the Secretary of Defense will step into the picture, and will use his great power and, now that the facts have been disclosed, will see to it that at least the new contracts contain provisions which will eliminate the kind of skulduggery we have been discussing this afternoon.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the end is not yet in sight. Near the end of our recent hearings, a new situation bobbed up at Malmstrom Air Force Base, in Montana, under a contract dated March 18, between the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the Montana Line Contractors Association. That situation is no better or no worse than those which have been developing at Vandenberg Air Force Base and at Lowry and at Cape Canaveral, but it indicates that, as yet, neither the Department of Defense nor any other instrumentality of our Government—including the Secretary of Labor—has taken action to keep the taxpayers from being gouged so unconscionably.

According to the contract signed March 18 in Montana, while our investigation and hearings were underway, foremen and cable splicers will receive $4.35 an hour on isolated projects—namely, dams, powerhouses, airbases, and missile bases; but, according to another schedule, the same kind of electrician, doing the same kind of work, would receive only $3.75 an hour for work done elsewhere—which would cover most of the line construction work and the commercial construction in Montana. Journeymen linemen will receive $4.10 an hour for work done at missile bases, where Uncle Sam pays the freight; but they are to receive $3.50 an hour for work done elsewhere.

However, Mr. President, it is interesting to note that the isolated area of Malstrom Air Force Base is only approximately 5 miles from the city of Great Falls, Mont. It is also important to note the fact that craft electricians receive varying rates of travel pay, ranging up to $8.40 a day. They must ride in rather plush circumstances, in order to get that much pay to go 5 miles out and 5 miles back; but they receive that much travel pay because they are covered by the part of the contract which seems to have included the post offices at Billings, Helena, and Glasgow, Mont., as the respective focal points, instead of Great Falls, which is only 5 miles away from the Air Force base itself.

All that is bad enough; but we also have an instance which involves the Duvall Engineering Co., in Florida—a concern whose supervisory employees were convicted in the courts, after being charged with gouging the public unconscionably, in connection with construction work which that firm did. The Governor of Florida has, under his authority, banned that concern from obtaining further State business until and unless its record is purged of wrongdoing. However, we find that the Department of Defense granted a contract to that firm, even after it had been banned from doing business with the State of Florida.

Mr. President, someone must call a stop to such things. Action by the Congress cannot come fast enough. Therefore, it seems to me that the Secretary of Defense should devote his great talents and his great authority to taking—and taking now—the necessary steps; so should the Secretary of Labor. I believe that the Defense Department contract officers also can show a little more stamina in this area and in this field of activity.

Mr. President, while I view with favor any action which would tend to result in the establishment of new criteria in connection with these matters, in an endeavor to prevent such inordinate payments to the members of craft unions and industrial unions and also to nonunion workers, I still do not believe that the issuance of new criteria by the Secretary of Labor will suffice. The Congress itself must act in connection with this situation. The Secretary of Labor can, and should, take steps to correct the situation now, and the Secretary of Defense himself should take similar steps this very week. I also believe that the Congress itself should proceed to close the door to such practices of sandbagging the taxpayers, with the result of weakening our internal security. For instance, as the chairman of the committee has pointed out, under such a system the craft union workers do not obtain the security clearance at the base that the industrial union workers are required to procure. Moreover, all should bear in mind that improved practices in this connection will result in faster and cheaper programs of national defense.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not incumbent upon the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Labor, after they have gone as far as they can to correct this situation and cannot completely cure it, to come to the Congress and immediately ask for the necessary legislative tools or necessary laws, so that this shameful practice can come to an end?

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is, but since they have waited so long and have been so tardy in action, it is incumbent on our committee to go into session and to evolve legislation which we can in turn hand to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Having had the testimony indicating the need for fast action in our committee, we must ask the essential and pertinent legislative committee to bring the legislation from that committee to the floor of the Senate for fast action.

Mr. CURTIS. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator, but I think we should make it clear that the executive departments should not use this promise of action as a means of ending the hearings and delaying or preventing passage of legislation.

However, is it not true that while some 87,000 or 90,000 man-days were lost at Cape Canaveral, that is only a part of the story? The testimony indicated that every work stoppage, even of half a day, set in motion a chain reaction of delays, because one step or experiment depended on another, and so there is no way of measuring the total delay in our missile program brought about by this wrongdoing.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. I think he is also correct when he implies that the work of our committee has not concluded. We have not finished

the job. I think we should continue to resolve whatever issue was pending, go into executive session, and try to draft necessary legislation, in an attempt to meet this particular problem. While we have no legislative jurisdiction in this field, we have the evidence necessary to tailor the legislation to meet this problem.

The Davis-Bacon Act was first enacted in 1931, and subsequently amended in 1935 and 1940. It is applicable to contracts in excess of $2,000, to which the United States is a party, for construction, alteration, and/or repair, including painting and redecorating, of public buildings and public works, requiring the employment of laborers and mechanics. Its primary purpose is to set forth the minimum wages that may be paid to each classification of laborers or mechanics who perform work which comes within the scope of the act. The act, of course, does not require that such work be performed only by regular construction-type contractors, and it does not give unions sole jurisdiction over such work.

This I should repeat, because there seems to be some illusion in some quarters that that is so, but the Davis-Bacon Act does not give unions exclusive jurisdiction over that work.

If the Secretary of Labor merely issues new criteria in the field of "construction," as stated in the act, it is safe to assume that the act continues to express the intention of Congress, even in the light of technological advancements in the missile field, which I do not believe is actually the case. Furthermore, there already are in existence volumes of rulings, interpretations, and findings that have been developed by the Labor Department. These include rulings on the Davis-Bacon Act in the field of atomic energy. It might be said that this establishes a great deal of precedent upon which to base subsequent rulings, but those who are working directly in this field tell me that it has only served, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] said in posing a question in our recent hearings, to "compound the confusion." In addition, new criteria will still take a great deal of our vital time before they are completely interpreted. Therefore, while they are a step in the right direction, I believe that we should go further, and that the Congress should enact amendatory legislation to the Davis-Bacon Act, spelling out specifically those areas, and covering specifically the all-important missile field.

I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that the Congress should find a way to outlaw strikes and work stoppages on Government defense contracts, especially as they concern the vital missile program. I am not confident that the proposed executive order alone would do this, although, of course, I have not had occasion as yet to see such an order. I hope it will be forthcoming before the end of the week.

A news story in yesterday's paper concerning General Electric in Philadelphia indicates that these strikes and slowdowns are still continuing, and it is readily discernible that something must be done to remedy such situations.

I read a headline, "$25 Million Project—Philly Strike Hits Missile Program." The article begins with the words:

> Another construction union strike—this one in Philadelphia—has hit the Nation's missile-space effort.

This was only yesterday, after it had been announced we had suspended our hearings. I hope these people will realize that we have not suspended our investigation, and they may very well come in the purview of the resumed hearings.

I continue to read from that article:

> Picketing by 30 members of the Operating Engineers Union, according to information here, has halted all work on a $25 million project which includes the free world's most advanced device for testing space vehicles.
>
> As of last night, 800 other building trades workers had been off the job since Monday morning because of the engineers' picket line.

I reiterate the question of the chairman: Is our Government entirely impotent? Is there not someone in the executive department, somewhere, willing to take a step now to at least close the gate a little, until Congress has time to act? I can think of no challenge before Congress today on which we could act more expeditiously and do something effective to protect our security at a time when it is being sabotaged by activities of this type.

In general, I feel that any action to be taken in this direction should include provisions to the effect that any labor disputes and/or grievances must be decided on the spot, with dispatch. While the initial decision by the neutral person so designated could be appealed or reviewed, I believe that such a decision should remain in force pending the appeal, and that the results of the appeal should not be retroactive. It would be incumbent upon the one making the decision, to base his decision on how the work could be advanced with the greatest efficiency in terms of man-hours, time, and money. Enforcement provisions should also be included so that the initial, and reviewed, decision would have some "teeth" and binding effect.

Returning to the subject of the Davis-Bacon Act, at the time of its enactment in 1931, "public works" consisted primarily of roads, dams, public buildings, jails, schoolhouses, and work of that kind, which long have been recognized as work areas for the construction trades. However, such things as intercontinental ballistic missile weapons systems were unknown. It is straining an interpretation to say that Congress intended that the term "construction" should be applied, therefore, to work such as installing a highly technical weapons system, with all of its maze of electronics, or to the equally technical ground-support equipment, considering the infinitely complicated nature of that work, the variety of coordinated skills needed to accomplish it, and the complete dissimilarity between public works in 1931 and public works as they exist today, if indeed we are going to classify the building and testing of missiles as a public works project, as some of the union leaders insist on doing.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that the act, which our hearings showed some people were only too anxious to interpret to include not only the installation of a missile system manufactured in an industrial plant but also the components of an intercontinental ballistic missile system, as being "construction," should be updated so as to redefine either "construction" or "public works," or both, so as to more realistically determine and distinguish between the construction of a public work and the installation and operation of equipment which is not an integral part of the facility.

While I believe that this should require some study, I might just pose, by way of illustration, how the term "public works" as used in the act might be redefined:

> Whenever used in this act, the term "public work" means permanent structural improvement of a piece of real estate owned and operated by the Government of the United States such as a bridge, dam, or fortress, but shall not incldue removable equipment such as ordnance, machinery, ground control, ground support or communications systems—even the word "missile" or "missile and its ground support systems" or some such, could be spelled out—even though such equipment may by attachment to the permanent structure, have become a fixture under ordinary rules of the law of property, and irrespective of whether the installation, assembly, repair or alteration of such equipment is performed at the site of the public work.

Another definition, that of "construction," which the chairman of the committee used during the hearings, is also quite similar in effect. It was:

> If what is being done becomes real estate and would be conveyed or transferred by deed of conveyance conveying title to the land and all appurtenances there and to belonging, this would be considered as "construction." If it is something being installed, it can be removed whenever the tenant walked out, it is not "construction."

In checking this proposal with some distinguished witnesses who appeared before our committee from Convair, from Boeing, and from Martin, it was learned they felt that the definition which the chairman suggested was not comprehensive enough and not inclusive enough, and that we should spell out the terms of the legislation so clearly that even Philadelphia lawyers could not disagree about the content.

Some of the union leaders who appeared at the hearings said this would be helpful to them in efforts to make their men understand where a public works project ends and where a missile construction project or a missile installation project begins.

Mr. President, I have available a whole list of additional disclosures which are pretty serious in this connection. I shall not recite them, for the hour is late.

I believe I should point out that despite the fact that Florida has a right-to-work law, there were 23 work stoppages and total man-days lost of 9,045 because of the presence of nonunion workmen on the Cape Canaveral job.

Although there is a right-to-work law in the State, and perhaps in the constitution of the State, it was not made an issue in any court that we know of.

Mr. Rose, the general manager of a small electronics corporation in Florida, told of not being allowed to install a sequencer. He had nonunion men. The installation part of contract was taken away to "buy labor peace." By innuendo or by implication, Mr. Rose was told that if his company instead of the electrical union insisted on installing the equipment, there would be a strike on the cape. It was suggested by one union leader to Mr. Rose that it was his patriotic duty to capitulate to the union. Mr. Rose called it patriotic blackmail.

It seems to me that in this case, too, the enforcement machinery of existing law applied by an aggressive Department of Labor could erase a situation which has gotten pretty bad and pretty serious.

I shall not belabor the RECORD any more today, Mr. President, by citing other incidents on such situations as that which recently came to light in Philadelphia. These situations must be corrected immediately. I know our investigators will continue to follow the evidence wherever it is and that we shall hold committee sessions and public hearings whenever the evidence discloses unsavory conditions. I hope deeply that our committee will shortly go into executive session to tailor proposed legislation to meet the specific problems the investigation has disclosed.

Beyond that, I again express the hope that the Congress, before adjournment this year—I hope before the end of June—will pass legislation to make the type of situations which have been discussed today impossible, with penalties sufficiently great so that if there are violations in the first instance there will not be many of them because those engaging in making such violations will recognize that the American public has made up its mind "first things come first" and that no selfish group has the right to jeopardize the security of every American for temporary gain for itself.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session for the consideration of the nomination at the desk.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT OF THE UNITED STATES AT DENVER, COLO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fern V. Miller, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, apparently I am temporarily the only Republican Senator in the Chamber. Has this nomination been cleared?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. This is the nomination to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver, and it has been cleared with the minority.

Mr. MUNDT. I heard the earlier colloquy. I have no objection.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PRINTING IN THE RECORD OF PRESIDENTIAL PRESS CONFERENCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the printing in the RECORD of the transcript of Presidential news conferences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 86) providing that each Presidential press conference held during a session of Congress shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the relaxed Presidential press relationship which we are familiar with today is the result of a long evolutionary process in our American history. The first press relations conducted in a modern sense began with President Cleveland, with regular news conferences being initiated by President Wilson. Throughout this period, from Presidents Cleveland to Eisenhower, direct quotations required the special permission of the President. Under the Eisenhower administration, for the first time Presidential press conferences were rebroadcast on radio and television, while President Kennedy has contributed to the public's interest in Government by conducting live TV and radio press conferences.

Of what greater importance is the free, unedited communication system between a President and his people. Only through a well-informed public can a President hope to attain the cooperation so vitally necessary to make a democracy work. However, this is not a one-way street, for in freely communicating with the public the President is better able to ascertain what the public's opinion is on leading issues of the day.

Furthermore, since our great Nation is a world leader, the uninhibited press conference serves to inform while reaching out a hand of friendship across the seas. In no better way can we promote a clearer understanding of the United States and its policies than through the official words of our President.

It is with the aforesaid facts pertaining to the significance and importance of the Presidential news conference in mind that I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing and directing the Joint Committee on Printing to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a transcript of each Presidential press conference held while the Congress is in session.

Presently, only nine newspapers in the whole United States print the conferences in their entirety. I compliment those nine newspapers for their great public service. Thus, printing the conferences in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will make them a readily accessible public document to Americans, as well as to our neighbors overseas.

Of course, this could be done by any Senator asking unanimous consent at any time following a press conference that the transcript be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It seemed to me, however, it would be much more desirable to have some official action, and to have the transcripts of press conferences made a part of the RECORD automatically, by passage of a joint resolution, as I have indicated today.

These press conferences will serve a very valuable function for students, for thought leaders, for community leaders, for editors, and others who are keenly concerned about the course of American history.

It is essential for the social and political leaders of a country to keep abreast of U.S. policy statements. Since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is widely distributed among the world's opinionmakers, the verbatim reporting of Presidential news conferences would eliminate the ofttimes endless search for the exact statement on any one issue.

Any possible distortion of facts due to the human element of the news processes will have been eliminated. This is most important in light of the world posture of the United States and its desire to honestly and sincerely promote world peace through understanding.

Mr. President, because President Kennedy has taken a bold approach to his press conferences, I sincerely believe the resolution I have introduced today will serve to complement and implement the free exchange of ideas.

The publication of the transcript of the conferences would be a great public service for all educational institutions and all media of communication.

"TRUTH IN LENDING" BILL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on April 27, 1961, on behalf of myself and 21 other Senators, I introduced the "truth in lending" bill, which would require all lenders to fully disclose to any borrower the cost of consumer credit prior to the consummation of credit transactions.

On Wednesday, May 3, a lengthy speech was made by Senator BENNETT on the Senate floor attacking this bill. There were a number of charges made against the bill and its sponsors. I have prepared a reply answering the major

charges against the bill. I do not choose to reply to those charges of a personal nature which were included in Senator BENNETT'S speech, since an exchange of personalities is seldom productive and it is better to let one's life and conduct answer these imputations rather than to refute them with words.

First, however, let me quote some of the statements made in the speech in opposition to this legislation:

Those who embark on a crusade in the name of truth take on themselves a great moral obligation. They must search for truth diligently with open minds—minds that are not so prejudiced that they reject, oppose, or ignore all facts that do not fit into their conceived goal or purpose.

Is this bill, S. 1740, conceived and supported in the clear spirit of truth? Do its requirements meet its stated objectives? Are the examples used and the arguments made to support it clearly relevant, internally consistent, and free from concealed purpose? Speaking as a member of the Subcommittee on Banking and Currency, which heard a similar bill last year, my answer to all of these questions would be an unqualified "No."

Those who have read S. 1740 will have no difficulty in understanding the purpose of this bill. The remarks which I made on the floor of the Senate at the time of the introduction of this bill will, I think, demonstrate that the examples and arguments made in support of this bill are both relevant and internally consistent.

I shall not comment on the accusations of "prejudice," "ignorance," and "concealed purpose" levied against the sponsors of this bill.

However, the charges leveled against the bill itself do require a complete and detailed response. Therefore, I have prepared a reply listing the major charges raised by the Senator from Utah and providing the facts which, it is submitted, refute these allegations.

CHARGE

It is charged that this "bill may conceal an antibusiness bias, including an apparent belief that businessmen must be immoral, ipso facto."

FACTS

Since this is a charge against all of the sponsors of the bill, I shall not attempt to answer this accusation on their behalf. Their record is a complete defense.

For my part, I expressed my own intentions on the floor of the Senate when S. 1740 was introduced as follows, and I did so without any mental reservations or any ulterior purposes.

We want to correct a situation which has existed for many years. We ask only for improvements in the future and are not concerned with apportioning the blame for the present or the past.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I am not trying to indict the American business community. Undoubtedly, the overwhelming majority of lenders and sellers wish to be completely honest and ethical, but in pursuing the elusive consumer at the retail level, too many lenders have fallen into a competitive jungle where survival seems to have depended upon camouflaging, hiding or understating the real price of credit.

The record of the hearings last year clearly demonstrates that the majority of borrowers are not fully informed about the true cost of credit.

Mutual savings banks, credit unions, legal aid societies, and better business bureaus all testified to the abuses arising out of the nondisclosure of the cost of consumer credit.

They also supported this bill.

Most of the reports from executive agencies last year were favorable. Many agencies recommended enactment of this bill.

I cannot believe that these groups would support legislation which conceals an antibusiness bias including an apparent belief that businessmen must be immoral.

Also, Dr. Theodore O. Yntema, vice president in charge of finance, Ford Motor Co., testifying before the Senate hearings on auto financing, stated:

The variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension. It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates for the finance and insurance services offered as compared with alternatives available elsewhere.

Is the vice president of the Ford Motor Co., guilty of harboring "an antibusiness bias?"

CHARGE

The lurid examples, presented in the testimony, actually involve fraud and other crimes which are already punishable by local law.

FACTS

It is true that some of the lurid examples presented in the testimony before the committee last year might have been violations of State and local laws. If they were not, they certainly should have been, since they involved gross fraud or exploitation, particularly of our less educated and lowest income groups.

However, the majority of the examples presented in the testimony were demonstrations of misleading and deceptive statements of the cost of credit. Most of these techniques of hiding credit costs have been labeled "misleading and deceptive" by the Federal Trade Commission.

However, I urge every Senator to read the record of the hearings last year and determine for himself whether this charge is accurate. The hundreds of pages of testimony about abuses in the field of consumer credit are ample evidence of the widespread use of techniques to camouflage the cost of credit. Furthermore the legal process is so costly and time consuming that it is not an adequate remedy for those with limited incomes and little leisure with which to prosecute complaints.

CHARGE

S. 1740 asks Congress to ignore these elementary commercial facts. This is legislative irresponsibility. * * * In fact, at least 31 States have passed laws dealing with various types of merchandise credit, including measures establishing maximum rates and compelling comprehensive disclosure of consumer credit charges, but in dollars or monthly rates of service charge. They have acted responsibly. They have known better than to saddle the merchants of America with the impossible liability inherent in the simple annual requirement of the bill.

FACTS

The majority of the States have passed laws requiring small loan companies to state their charges in terms of simple interest. Generally, these laws provide that the simple interest rate must include all charges incident to the extension of credit. However, these lenders are permitted to state the simple interest rate on a monthly rather than an annual basis.

Over 40 States require State-chartered credit unions to state their charges in terms of simple interest. Again, the simple interest rate must include all costs incident to the extension of credit. The simple interest rate is usually permitted to be stated on a monthly, rather than on an annual basis.

Most retailers disclose their credit costs on revolving charge accounts and simple credit plans in terms of a simple interest rate on the unpaid balance on a monthly basis.

However, to my knowledge, no information was presented to the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee last year to indicate that any State law prevents lenders from disclosing their changes in terms of a simple interest rate on an annual basis rather than on a monthly basis.

Therefore, it should be clear that—

First. The majority of the States require the use of the simple interest rate method of disclosing the costs of many types of consumer credit.

Second. Where many State laws, in regard to the disclosure of the cost of credit are silent, such as in the case of charge account and revolving credit plans of retailers, the established business practice has been to use a simple interest rate on a per month basis because it is the easiest rate computation and disclosure method to use.

Most mortgage lenders disclose mortgage costs in terms of a simple annual interest rate.

Third. To convert a monthly simple interest rate into a simple annual rate only requires multiplying the monthly rate by 12—there are 12 months in a year.

Such a requirement does not appear to me to be irresponsible. I find it difficult to construe this as saddling the merchants of America with the impossible liability inherent in the simple annual requirement of the bill.

If rates can be quoted on a monthly basis, why can they not be quoted on a yearly basis?

CHARGE

I have considered it my duty to urge the Congress to be especially watchful of this legislation. Its alleged banner of truth is a tempting one to follow. But this truth label is a deceptive cover for a misleading package—a hidden bill trick.

It is then charged that this bill—

could not be enforced except with the aid of a vast army of Federal price control bureaucrats. If rigid enforcement of S. 1740 were attempted it would burden the taxpayer with heavy cost of a supersnooper agency, bring both weakness and chaos to our credit-based system of retail distribution, and lessen, rather than increase, the consumer's knowledge of truth in lending.

FACTS

Last year opponents complained about the self-enforcing features of the bill. A careful reading of section 7 of the bill will indicate that this bill has been designed to be self-enforcing with a minimum of compliance burden or expenditure. The bill permits the borrower to recover from the lender twice the finance charge involved, up to $2,000 if the lender does not disclose the information required by the bill.

Of course these charges are not new. Every time Congress has considered a bill to require full disclosure or accurate labeling of any goods or services, it has been charged that such a requirement would bring chaos to that industry.

The truth in securities or SEC legislation was opposed on these same grounds over 25 years ago.

More recently the automobile price labeling legislation was opposed on the same grounds.

CHARGE

Finally, we come to the question which should have basic and ultimate concern for all of us, who, as I said at the beginning, should be dedicated to truth in legislation. Is the bill constitutional?

FACTS

This bill (S. 1740) does rest on a sound constitutional basis.

The *Legal Tender* cases (79 U.S. 457 (1870)) support the following propositions:

First. The power conferred on Congress by article I, section 8, of the Constitution "to coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin" does not limit by its terms the power of Congress with respect to the currency.

Second. This power, coupled with (i) the "necessary and proper clause," and (ii) the denial to the States—article I, section 10—of any power to coin money, emit bills of credit, and to make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts, vests whatever power there is over the currency in Congress.

Third. For an act to be constitutional it is not necessary to show that it is indispensable in order to give effect to a specified power. Congress has the choice of means to a permissive end.

From these general propositions one may reasonably contend that a requirement by Congress to disclose the cost of credit is an exercise of its power over the currency; such disclosure having been determined by the Congress to be necessary in order to stabilize the economy and protect the value of the currency.

CHARGE

It is charged that—

The language which describes the stated objective of the bill conceals the true purpose.

The alleged true purpose is later identified. It is said by the opponents that—

1. The bill as drafted would require Federal regulation of the methods and procedures by which merchants may extend credit. Even the author of the bill denies this purpose.

2. This legislation would require the establishment of a full-blown Federal price control agency to fix maximum cash ceiling prices for every merchant and on every item in every corner of the United States, and to compel the separate statement of the percentage credit rate.

3. The proponents of the bill have maintained a discreet silence on these points, and although price control may not be the ultimate objective of the bill, it is meaningless without such control. This silence is understandable because it hides the unpalatable truth.

FACTS

These charges that the hidden purpose of the sponsors of this bill is "the establishment of a full-blown Federal price control agency" are certainly without foundation. I think everyone recognizes tactics of desperation. When one cannot find fault with the substance of a bill, the motives of the sponsors are questioned.

It is amazing to discover that this opponent can read the minds and motives of the 22 Senators sponsoring this legislation with such complete assurance.

Of course, anyone who has bothered to read this bill can determine for himself whether or not there is one single word in the bill to suggest or imply any sort of Federal price fixing.

I do not claim any similar extrasensory perception or omniscience. Therefore, I cannot, and will not, attempt to explain the rationale for these accusations.

Furthermore, the language of this bill which allows State regulation when Federal standards are completely met refutes these charges.

Section 6(b) of the bill:

6(b) The Board shall by regulation except from the requirements of this act any credit transactions or class of transactions which it determines are effectively regulated under the laws of any State so as to require the disclosure by the creditor of the same information as is required under section 4 of this act.

Obviously any State can assume the responsibility for administration of the disclosure requirements of this act and take away the job by merely conforming to the simple standards laid down in this bill.

This is a Federal standards bill. It sets criteria for full disclosure of the costs of credit. But the purpose of this section is to encourage the States to improve their disclosure laws so that they may assume the responsibility for enforcement and administration.

It is also interesting to note that some of the same parties who complain most vocifierously that States rights are being invaded have opposed this same type of legislation at the State level. One of the arguments used against such full disclosure legislation at the State level is that it would be unfair to require lenders in one State to fully disclose the costs of credit in a meaningful manner while their competitors in other States with inferior credit cost disclosure laws could continue to woo away customers through the use of misleading methods of stating the cost of credit. That is why Federal standards are needed.

CHARGE

The futility of the bill as it stands needs no intricate explanation. [A merchant] would be free to fix his prices at levels which would take care of his credit losses and could remain free to advertise to consumers that he made no charge for credit, no matter how long the period of payment was extended.

This is no figment of my imagination; the point has never been denied.

As a matter of fact, if the bill were passed, every merchant in the land would be under heavy pressure to set his prices so as to avoid any separate credit charges. And this could easily be done.

FACTS

This point was discussed and refuted by witnesses from the Credit Union National Association appearing before the committee last year.

There seems to be some fear that if this bill were enacted, merchandisers who are extending credit concurrently with the purchase of goods would simply lower their financing rates and boost up or "pack" the prices of articles sold. This fear, we believe, is groundless. Normal price competition in the sale of goods in local markets would prevent this from occurring and protect honest merchants for the following reasons:

(a) The merchandiser must first sell his product before customers will use his credit plan.

(b) Consumers carefully shop for goods and services when prices are fully disclosed or stated explicitly.

(c) Attempts by a merchant to hike prices on goods to make his finance charges appear to be more attractive would simply drive his customers into the stores of his competitors.

(d) Those customers who needed credit to purchase particular goods would shop for credit at "independent" lenders and make cash purchases or patronize a lower priced, cash-and-carry merchant.

In short, honest merchants should have nothing to fear. The normal workings of price competition in the marketplace would deter any unscrupulous merchants from attempting to pervert the intent of the bill.

[Source: Hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency on S. 2755, 86th Cong., 2d sess., consumer credit labeling bill, p. 542.]

This is such an artful argument that a fuller refutation is in order.

If merchants can easily hide the cost of credit by raising the price of their goods and services, why have they not done so already?

Most merchants do disclose the dollar cost of credit on monthly bills sent to customers. Also merchants do disclose the true interest rate on their financing charges on a monthly basis.

I fail to see why merchants make a disclosure of the cost of credit now if it is so easy to hide these costs in the prices of their goods.

Later Senator BENNETT suggests that this type of disclosure legislation should be left to the States.

Again, I fail to see why lenders would conscientiously comply with State laws which were adequate but would deliberately evade any such Federal law. I hope that the distinguished opponent of this legislation, with his personal experience in the lending field and his deep interest in the problems of consumer credit, will be able to explain why lenders would comply—and have complied—with State full disclosure laws where they are effective but would evade any such Federal law requiring the full disclosure of the costs of credit.

This is, indeed, a peculiar States rights argument.

Moreover, a little analysis of how free competitive markets work will also demonstrate the fallacy of this charge.

It should be obvious that in a free and competitive market, merchants are not free to fix prices on their goods at any level they desire in order to absorb or hide the costs of credit. Retail merchants operate in an extremely competitive market. Merchants who attempted such price fixing to hide the costs of credit would quickly find their business diverted to other retailers—cash and carry stores, discount stores, and other retailers who had not raised their prices on the same articles to conceal the cost of credit.

In fact, there are only two circumstances under which merchants could fix their prices at a higher level so as to conceal the cost of credit.

First. If the retailer were a monopolist. That is, he has no effective competition which would force his prices down to a competitive market level. I seriously doubt that there are many monopolists in the field of retailing. Even the single retailer in the small town must compete vigorously with the many mail order houses which are soliciting his customers.

However, if there are unusual circumstances in which a retailer has been able to establish an effective monopoly, we have antitrust laws which can correct this situation.

Second. The only other circumstance under which retailers can fix prices so as to conceal the cost of credit is if they all enter into a collusive agreement for that purpose to prevent price competition from operating.

Such collusive agreements are obviously conspiracies in restraint of trade, and we have adequate laws to deal with such occurrences. We are all keenly aware that a little price fixing has existed in the electrical manufacturing industry. If the opponent of this legislation feels that such conspiracies do exist now in the field of retailing, it is his public duty to notify the antitrust authorities for appropriate investigation and possible prosecution.

Therefore, I must strongly disagree with Senator BENNETT when he claims that such price fixing "could easily be done." It may be easy to enter into such price-fixing agreements, but retailers, I am sure, are perfectly aware that these arrangements are illegal. Indeed, I must also strongly disagree again with any suggestion that retailers will attempt to evade this law by violating other laws.

CHARGE

Let us start at the beginning with the objective. Does it state great truth—or, in fact, is it truth at all?

Senator BENNETT then read the declaration of purpose of the bill:

The Congress finds and declares that economic stabilization is threatened when credit is used excessively for the acquisition of property and services. The excessive use of credit results frequently from a lack of awareness of the cost thereof to the user. It is the purpose of this Act to assure a full disclosure of such cost with a view to preventing the uninformed use of credit to the detriment of the national economy.

It is then charged that—

This premise is at best highly debatable. Not a single line of testimony was presented to support this proposition at hearings on a similar bill last year.

FACTS

I explained the relationship between full disclosure of credit costs and economic stabilization in a speech on the Senate floor as follows:

Since the end of World War II, mortgage credit has increased almost six times—from $18.6 billion in 1945 to $140 billion in 1960. Consumer credit has increased more than eightfold—from less than $6 billion in 1945 to approximately $55 billion by the end of 1960.

Untimely shifts in this massive consumer debt may well initiate and carry booms too far; retrenchment of purchasing could intensify future recessions. This danger is even greater because the cost of much of the consumer debt is not advertised or quoted accurately.

The consumer-debtor is not adequately informed of the shifts in consumer credit rates over the business cycle. A law to require disclosure of the amount and rate of change of consumer credit costs would give consumers information which would lead any rational family manager to control and stabilize buying and borrowing. When rates are increased in boom times, the increase would become apparent and encourage consumer restraint. Conversely, as rates drop as economic activity recedes, consumers might be encouraged to undertake previously postponed purchases.

Also, part I, volume I, of the 1956 study by the Federal Reserve Board contained a chapter entitled "Consumer Credit and Economic Instability," which discusses this relationship in detail. A few excerpts from this study should suffice to remove any doubt about this relationship.

The borrower may be ignorant of, or deceived as to, the cost of borrowing or the terms, and this may result in uneconomic decisions. To the extent that a misallocation of the borrower's resources does result, a burden arises from this source.

Burdens that arise out of deceit and ignorance are not unique to the costs of consumer borrowing. They can arise in connection with any purchase made in ignorance or under induced misinformation. In the area of consumer installment credit, however, the exact costs frequently are not known, or the information on costs is not readily available or readily calculable in a form that the borrower can use. The same problem of lack of knowledge also may exist with respect to the "effective" price of the good itself as well as to the credit terms. This is true, for example, when prices are stated in terms of monthly payments.

* * * * *

A prime factor in business fluctuations: Consumer installment credit has often been a factor in changes in the level of business activity, but it has not been the principal cause of such changes. Although consumer credit has been associated with economic fluctuations, other factors have been of greater importance. This was clearly evident in 1929–33, 1937–38, 1949, and the downturn in 1953.

* * * * *

A leading and amplifying force: Although not the principal factor in any cycle, consumer installment credit has been both a leading and an amplifying force in economic fluctuations. In an impressive number of times, credit extended appears to have moved ahead of other economic changes—to have led at turning points. Time leads appear to have been longer in recoveries than in downturns. This differential experience may be due partly to the fact that consumer installment credit has been growing so strongly. But the lead record remains impressive even when allowance for growth is made.

As an amplifying factor, consumer installment credit has been rather similar to other forms of credit in that its movements have conformed to the general business cycle. The secondary and stimulating effects of credit extensions come more during booms; the secondary and retarding effects of repayments have often hung over into periods of recession. This amplifying effect is probably of greater relative importance in the modest turns in business activity.

* * * * *

A growing influence in credit market fluctuations: Consumer installment credit has grown in influence as a factor in the credit market and in credit market fluctuations. The rapid rate of growth has increased the relative importance of consumer credit institutions as borrowers. One of the basic problems of economic stabilization is to adjust the fluctuating flow of saving. Since all forms of credit fluctuate, it is difficult to select one form that has been more responsible than others for instability; however, the statistical record of consumer installment credit seems to put it among the less stable kinds of credit.

[Source: Consumer Installment Credit, Growth and Import, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, pp. 191, 232–234.]

CHARGE

Our search for truth should lead us to try to discover whether there is any justification for legislation in this field at the Federal level. Have the States been asleep to the desirability of accurate, workable laws to provide truth in lending?

FACTS

It would appear from the testimony before the committee last year that many of the States do not, at the present time, require adequate disclosure of the cost of credit. The record of the hearings contains several tables which indicate the inadequacies of State laws in this respect.

The record of the hearings last year shows that only one State requires that the cost of credit be described in terms of a true interest rate on the unpaid balance on an annual basis.

Moreover, a nationwide survey submitted to the committee by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan showed that a majority of American consumers were either uninformed or misinformed about the cost of credit.

Thirty-nine percent of those polled did not have any idea of the consumer credit costs. The study found that the remaining 61 percent were not much better informed about the cost of credit. The report stated:

Obviously many people believed that the cost of installment buying is lower than it actually is.

The relatively great frequency with which costs of 4 or 5 and especially 6 percent were mentioned may be interpreted as a carryover from other information. Especially better educated people dislike to confess to an interviewer that they do not know the answer to a simple question. Other studies conducted a few years ago showed that the rate of interest paid on U.S. Government savings bonds is well known [3 percent or about 3 percent was the common answer] and the

same is true of the interest rate obtained on savings accounts. Most people also know that borrowing costs more than what one gets on savings. On the basis of these pieces of information, some people appear to have surmised an answer to the question of cost of installment buying. They mention some percentages with which they are familiar and which seem appropriate to them. Actually, their answers are uninformed guesses.

Even Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve System, admitted that he was confused by many of the present practices of stating the cost of consumer credit. Certainly, Chairman Martin's confusion is eloquent testimony to the need for legislation requiring full and accurate disclosure of the cost of credit.

However, Senator BENNETT also asks:

[Is] there any justification for legislation in this field at the Federal level?

This suggests that legislation to promote economic stabilization is not a proper function of the Federal Congress.

Earlier in this brief, the relationship between inadequate disclosure of the cost of consumer credit and economic instability was demonstrated.

If the Federal Government should not be concerned about economic stability and should not enact laws to promote economic stability, then in the name of consistency the Federal Reserve System should be abolished, commercial banks should be permitted complete power to print currency, and all other tools of the Federal Government which are utilized to promote economic stabilization should be returned to the States.

It is indeed strange to see those who profess such great concern about the evils of inflation suggesting that the prevention of inflation and the promotion of economic stability are not proper functions for the Federal Government.

PROFESSIONAL TEAM SPORTS AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in the last 10 years 37 bills which concern themselves with the legal status of professional team sports under the antitrust laws have been introduced in the Congress. Extensive hearings have been held and informative materials have become a part of the RECORD over this period of time. Notwithstanding all this attention, the uncertainties and inconsistencies in professional sports have not been resolved. No legislation has passed Congress.

The basic reason for the concern reflected by this legislative history is the inequality of treatment under the law now accorded professional team sports. In 1922 the Supreme Court held that professional baseball was exempt from the antitrust laws. This remains the rule of law with respect to baseball. In 1957 the Supreme Court held professional football was subject to the antitrust laws. The Supreme Court acknowledged this anomaly. While I oversimplify the explanation, careful reading of the several cases in this field indicates that the Court looks to Congress to clarify its intention with respect to the treatment of professional sports under the antitrust laws (*Federal Baseball Club* v. *National League*, 259 U.S. 200 (1922); *Toolson* v. *New York Yankees, Inc.*, 346 U.S. 356 (1953); *Radovich* v. *National Football League*, 352 U.S. 445 (1957)).

Today, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for myself and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], a bill which, if adopted, will resolve the conflict and, in our judgment, treat fairly the claims of all the persons concerned with this problem, most especially the American public which supports and enjoys these national games. Senator KEATING for many years has given leadership in this effort and I am gratified and believe it significant that he would join in this bill. The bill would treat equally all professional team sports. These games have been described as being too much a business to be a sport, and too much a sport to be a business. This bill would affirm our intention that the antitrust laws apply to professional sports, but exempt the agreements and practices of baseball, football, hockey, and basketball, which are essential and peculiar to the games. These practices, developed over the years by those whose interests and imagination and money have brought the games to their present level, are essential to the conduct of these sports.

Adoption of this bill would give professional football, whose rapid and responsible growth all of us enjoy, a measure of the heretofore unlimited protection enjoyed by baseball. Adoption of the bill would bring baseball under the reach of the antitrust laws just as are all other sports and, as with each of the sports enumerated in this bill, entitled to the limited protection essential to the operation of the game.

The major leagues are now expanding. This action by organized baseball, we believe, will bring support to the effort to clarify the antitrust laws in this field. This action by organized baseball is the most dramatic but, certainly, not the only example of the growth and change which has occurred in this game in recent years; growth and change which have been constructive. In clarifying the status of professional sports under the antitrust laws, there is one caution which hardly needs be voiced. It appears wise that Congress sketch broadly an outline of the application of the antitrust laws to team sports and to establish identical positions under the law for the several team sports. But except for this action, Congress should remain in the grandstand. This bill does not authorize the Congress to decide who is a big league nor what constitutes a big league.

In this bill we seek to protect college football from threat of serious harm. With the increasing popularity of professional football, college athletic authorities are very concerned that professional football will compete with college football's traditional days—Friday and Saturday. This bill, of course, does not attempt to suggest the days on which games of these sports should be scheduled. But it does require that if a game of professional football is played on any day other than Sunday, it must not be televised from a television station located within 75 miles of the site on which an intercollegiate football game is scheduled to be played if such telecasting may harm the sport of football at that college. If the written consent of the college is given, then telecasting the professional game would be permitted. Absent this protection, college football is placed in serious jeopardy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at this point in my remarks; that the bill be received and appropriately referred; and that it may lie on the table for 1 week for any Senators who may wish to do so to cosponsor it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

The bill (S. 1856) to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 2, 1890, as amended (26 Stat. 209); the Act of October 15, 1914, as amended (38 Stat. 730); and the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (38 Stat. 717), shall not apply to any contrtct, agreement, rule, course of conduct, or other activity by, between, or among persons conducting, engaging, or participating in the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey which relates to—

(1) the equalization of competitive playing strengths;

(2) the employment, selection, or eligibility of players, or the reservation, selection, or assignment of player contracts;

(3) the right to operate within specific geographic areas; or

(4) the preservation of public confidence in the honesty in sports contests.

SEC. 2. No contract, agreement, rule, course of conduct, or other activity by, between, or among persons conducting, engaging in, or participating in the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey shall constitute a violation of the acts named in section 1 of this title to the extent to which it relates to the regulation of the granting by one or more clubs of the right to telecast reports or pictures of contests in the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, or hockey: *Provided, however,* That the granting by one or more clubs in one league of the right to telecast reports or pictures of its contests in such organized professional sports from telecasting stations located within seventy-five miles of the home community of another club in a different league in the same sport on a day when such club is scheduled to play there a regularly scheduled league game, or with respect to telecasting football contests only from telecasting stations located within seventy-five miles of the game site chosen by a college on a day other than Sunday when such college is scheduled to play there an intercollegiate contest in football, shall be unlawful whenever such granting of the right to telecast has not been consented to in writing by the other professional club or

such college and the effect of such telecasting is injurious to or may tend to destroy such other club or the sport of football at that college.

SEC. 3. As used in this Act, "persons" means any individual, partnership, corporation, or unincorporated association or any combination or association thereof.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall affect any cause of action existing on the effective date hereof in respect to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, or hockey.

SEC. 5. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to deprive any players in the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, or hockey of any right to bargain collectively, or to engage in other associated activities for their mutual aid or protection.

SEC. 6. Except as provided in section 1 of this Act, nothing contained in this Act shall affect the applicability of the antitrust laws to the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, or hockey.

Mr. HART. While I was in the Chamber during the past few minutes I was advised by the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that they wish to join the Senator from New York and me in cosponsoring the bill. I ask unanimous consent that their names may be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Senator from Michigan in sponsoring the measure. I am delighted to have the support of the majority whip, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The interest of the distinguished majority whip is particularly significant. He has not been the author of a bill in this field in the past, I believe, but we heard him speak eloquently the other day of the abilities of the baseball team in the Twin Cities area. It is significant that he is joining with us in the sponsorship of the bill. The strength of his support will be very helpful, because although over the years a great many bills on this subject have been introduced, and a great many hearings have been held, we have been a little short on action. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is a man of action, as is the Senator from Michigan. I am gratified that he has recognized the merit of the proposed legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The able Senator from Michigan explained the bill in some detail to me. It seems to me to represent an excellent job of draftsmanship, as well as of substance in respect of meeting some of the complaints which have been registered in the past on proposed legislation of this kind. At the same time it will reconcile differences among many factions involved in the professional sports field, and with respect to disputes which exist in that field.

When I saw the sponsorship of Senators HART and KEATING, I knew that two of the most brilliant minds in the Senate had been centered upon the proposed legislation, and that it must be very worth while and valuable.

I wish to make one further observation. The last time I spoke in the Senate on the subject of baseball I was extending a plea for the good fortunes of the Minnesota Twins. At that time the Senator from Michigan was the Presiding Officer. The Minnesota Twins were in first place. The Detroit Tigers were struggling along in the league, and the New York Yankees, as usual, were near the top. I was carried away, I am sure, with the spirit of understandable enthusiasm which grips one when a major league baseball team comes to a metropolitan area. Now I feel that I should perhaps set the record straight. At the time I indicated to the Senator from Michigan that I was saving him from making any statement about the Detroit Tigers which might be embarrassing later on.

Of course, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], in his usual kindly, generous, and gracious manner, wished me well and wished my team well, and he replied that he hoped the Senator from Minnesota would be as considerate of the Senator from New York at the end of the season, which I, of course, will be more than happy to be.

However, since that time the Detroit Tigers have gone into first place, the Yankees are in second place, and the Minnesota Twins are in third place.

I thought that possibly by joining in the sponsorship of the bill, the Minnesota Twins might move up to first place with the help of the Yankees and the Tigers. I hope the Senator from New York will be as generous in that regard as he was with his words the other day.

Mr. KEATING. The bill under discussion will not help my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a very serious disappointment to me.

Mr. KEATING. I am afraid the Senator has not studied the bill as thoroughly as he should have, if he had that hope. The bill will not put his team in first place, and it will not even raise it in the standing. Nevertheless, it is quite significant that those of us who come from States with the three top teams are in there pitching together. I am sure that something can be accomplished by reason of it.

Mr. HART rose.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, does the Senator from Michigan wish me to yield to him?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's kindness in inquiring. I shall not presume to speak for the minority leader on any matter of broad public policy, because he has left the chamber. But since he is the fourth cosponsor of the bill, it is my impression that the present status of the two Chicago teams suggests that he must have a reason different from the reason just suggested for his cosponsorship. Basically, I assume the reason is that the bill is a good one.

Mr. KEATING. I feel certain that it is. Like all proposed legislation, it is not the last word, and it is not put forth as such. However, it seems to me that the approach is the soundest and most realistic one to resolve the dilemma of the unique business nature of organized team sports and their relation to the antitrust statutes.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join in sponsoring this measure to provide equal treatment under the law to the professional sports of baseball, basketball, hockey, and football. As we consider again the problem of organized sports and the antitrust laws, the main goal of Congress must be to serve the best interests of the millions of sports fans throughout our Nation. We must prevent the transfer of sports clashes from the playing fields to courtrooms. By providing a healthy climate in which organized sports can expand and thrive, Congress will be best serving the interests of the American people.

It is the duty of Congress to keep our antitrust laws up to date so that they serve their vital function of encouraging the preservation and growth of a competitive free enterprise system which provides the finest goods and services for all the American people. In this context, the uniqueness of the team aspects of organized sports presents a special challenge. It is whether the application of existing antitrust laws to professional sports would enable the American public to enjoy the finest sports attractions possible. In my judgment, unless the antitrust laws are modified along the lines of the bill we are introducing today, the quality of American professional team sports will decline considerably. In this case, it would be to the loss of the American public.

The status of organized professional team sports under the antitrust laws has been the subject of controversy not only in Congress but in the courts of our land as well for many years. Debate on this subject was brought to a head by several recent Supreme Court decisions which resulted in an anomalous situation. In the now famous baseball case, Toolson against New York Yankees, handed down in 1953, the Supreme Court concluded that—

> Congress has no intention of including the business of baseball within the scope of the Federal antitrust laws.

Following this decision, however, the Court held in the football case, Radovich against National Football League, decided in 1957, that the professional team sport of football was subject to the antitrust laws.

The Supreme Court, in handing down the Radovich decision, fully acknowledged that it was illogical to treat football differently from baseball, and openly invited the Congress to clarify the confused situation. The Court in no way suggested that the matter could be properly resolved by the simple procedure of making antitrust laws either wholly applicable or wholly inapplicable to team sports. On the contrary, the Court, in specifically indicating that the industry and the public needed protection, stated:

> Congressional processes are accommodative, affording the whole industry hearings and an opportunity to assist in the formulation of new legislation. The resulting product is, therefore, likely to protect the industry and the public alike.

It is my feeling that the bill offered today can best meet the test of helping to preserve professional team sports as a growing and healthy industry, while at the same time best protecting the interests of the American public by reasonable application of our antimonopoly statutes.

While in the House of Representatives, I engaged in extensive Judiciary Committee hearings on this subject. As a Member of the other body, I sponsored several bills which, in brief, attempted to place the purely business aspects of professional team sports under the antitrust laws while exempting the purely playing aspects. This approach is the soundest and most realistic approach to resolving the dilemma of the unique business nature of our organized team sports and their relation to the antitrust statutes.

The basic provisions of this proposal would exempt certain aspects of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey from application of the antitrust laws. The exemptions would relate to the right of these professional teams to operate within a specific geographic area and make arrangements for the equalization of competitive playing strengths. In addition, the bill would allow the clubs to enter into agreements to set up rules pertaining to the employment of players and the terms of player contracts. The bill would also permit agreements by the various teams to assist in the preservation of public confidence in the honesty of sports contests.

Another very important provision of this bill would guarantee the right of players in the organized professional team sports of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey to bargain collectively or engage in other associated activities that would inure to their mutual aid and protection.

This bill also permits the clubs of organized team sports to enter into agreements for the purpose of regulating the granting of television rights to their contests. In addition, the bill would make unlawful the telecasting of a contest within 75 miles of the home community of another club in a different league which is playing a regularly scheduled home game without the consent of that club in writing. A similar provision would apply to the telecasting of football contests from stations within 75 miles of a game site chosen by a college for an intercollegiate football game. This provision would be applicable only if "such telecasting is injurious to or may tend to destroy such other club or the sport of football at that college."

The omission from this proposal of a specific reference to minor-league baseball should not be taken as a lack of concern for the special problems facing this segment of the baseball business.

It is my impression at this time that the television provisions of this bill are broad enough to enable the major league teams to enter agreements for the protection of minor league baseball. I have said in the past that some kind of television protection is absolutely essential for the survival of the lifeblood of organized baseball—the minor league system. I am sure that the major leagues will give this subject considerable attention. It may, however, be necessary, after further deliberation, to amend the bill in such a way as to safeguard the legitimate interests of minor league baseball. Without a strong minor league system, the majors would not be able to develop the material needed to insure vigorous team competition from all major league participants. This fact has been emphasized in recent weeks by weaknesses that have been displayed in newly organized teams in both the American and National Leagues, although those weaknesses are not so apparent in the case of the Twins as in the case of some other teams.

It is my intention to discuss the television provisions of this bill with representatives of major- and minor-league baseball, with college football officials, with members of the television industry, and in many respects the most neglected participants of all, the sports fans of our Nation. This exchange of thought should be most productive in determining the best course of action to follow in handling the telecasting of professional team sports.

Mr. President, I hope that this matter can be handled in an expeditious manner. The proposal we offer today is not new. Similar bills have been introduced in both the 85th and 86th Congresses. The subject of professional team sports and the antitrust laws has been analyzed, dissected, and investigated by both the House Judiciary Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee. Except for a solution to the dilemma of television, ample evidence is now on the record. The need for legislative clarification has been established.

The Congress has many other matters of great concern to the Nation and to the world to consider at this time. For that reason, I would not like to see the problems of team sports bogged down in a prolonged senatorial debate. I would urge that my colleagues give careful consideration to this measure, for I am confident when it is fully appraised on its merits, it will be accepted as a reasonable solution to settling the confused status of professional team sports and the antitrust laws.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. HART. It causes those of us who have given thought to this subject some concern. There is a very human tendency, when we are faced with resolving our relations with a nation the location of which we can scarcely describe, to defer that decision if there is available at hand a subject matter with respect to which every American, by right of birth, can assign himself the title of expert. There is no field in which our free American society can encourage its expertise more freely than in an American's right to conceive of himself as the best manager in baseball if he had only had, perhaps, the proper breakfast food as a child to make himself probably the strongest pitcher or the longest hitter.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], suggests that the proper food is made in Minneapolis. However, Battle Creek, Mich., would stand aghast at such a statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Wheaties.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have the floor. Niagara Falls produces Shredded Wheat; so I do not want this colloquy to be carried too far.

Mr. HART. In our kitchen, by reason of a number of children of many ages and sizes, there is no problem along that line.

The danger is that we will seize upon this bill as something about which we can with comfort say we know so much that we ought to spend much time on it. The truth is, as the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] knows, from his long service in the other body, in which he effectively participated in the consideration of such a measure, that very little further study is required.

Mr. KEATING. I think that is true. None of us who are interested in this subject wishes it to interfere with the vastly more important work which we have to do; and I know of no reason why it should interfere.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the first newspapers in the Nation to call the attention of its readers to the secret John Birch Society and its vocal leader, Robert Welch, was the Chicago Sun-Times.

The two editorials which were published in the Sun-Times, one April 9, 1961, entitled "How To Fight Communism," and the other on April 19, 1961, entitled "Inexcusable Abuse," are excellent examples of the first rate coverage given the Birch Society by that paper. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD to point out further, the insidious attack which Welch has launched against men such as our respected conservative colleague from North Dakota, Senator MILTON R. YOUNG.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sun-Times, Apr. 9, 1961]

HOW TO FIGHT COMMUNISM

The arguments that have welled up in the debate about the John Birch Society are reminiscent of the arguments made during the heyday of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy. Now, as then, they show an appalling misconception by a frightening number of well-intentioned Americans about communism—and about the American system of free speech and opinion as well.

When Senator McCarthy was active, his supporters angrily answered criticism of his methods by saying: "McCarthy is fighting communism. Anyone who is against him helps the Communists."

The same theme runs through many of the letters we have received from readers in praise of the John Birch Society since the Sun-Times printed a series of articles on the history, goals, and methods of the organization. (Up until noon Friday our letters count was 43 for the society, or critical of our articles, 92 against the society or in praise of the articles.)

The Birch Society was founded as a secret organization by Robert Welch, a former candy manufacturer, who once labeled President Eisenhower and other eminent Ameri-

cans as tools or agents of communism. Welch believes that social security and the Federal income tax are Communist schemes to soften up America for Communist conquest.

Welch is entitled to hold these views and to preach them, if he wishes. He and his followers may, if they wish, hold the view that Chief Justice Earl Warren of the U.S. Supreme Court should be impeached because of the Court's school segregation decision, which Welch believes was brought about by Communists to foment civil war.

By the same American right to free speech and opinion, other Americans are entitled to disagree with Welch and to consider him and his followers as crackpots, without being subject to abuse, gossip and community ostracization. These are precisely the methods and weapons used by Communists to impress their views on communities; in Red China, for example, brainwashing and ostracization are employed to force acceptance of communism.

Americans have a right to voice opinions critical of Welch and his associates without, in turn, being accused of being anti-anti-Communist, whatever that means.

Because the Sun-Times told the story of the Birch Society and its members, some of its sympathizers wrote in that we were discrediting other good anti-communist organizations, such as the American Legion, the Knights of Columbus, et cetera. This is manifest nonsense. The Birch Society is discredited in the minds of its critics because it pursues the methods used by Communists themselves. Moreover, as Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy said last week, the Birch Society is making no contribution in the fight against communism and is, in fact, a hindrance in the fight.

And how, the Birchists argue, should the Communists be fought?

A good answer for that question will be given in Chicago starting tomorrow when some of the Nation's most important industrialists, educators, military and professional men meet here to conduct the seventh annual military industrial-educational conference of the Institute for American Strategy. They will discuss and exchange ideas on the most fundamental step in fighting communism: Teaching what communism is—and isn't—and what democracy is.

Americans can't fight communism if they don't know what it is or what democracy is. There is an ignorance on those subjects in the United States that is appalling. That ignorance is reflected in support for Welch.

The conference to be held tomorrow at the Hotel Sherman will tackle the problem of dispelling ignorance by improving methods of teaching about communism and democracy at the high school level.

This is the same objective recently set forth by the American Bar Association. Some of the cooperating agencies of the conference to be held in the Hotel Sherman are the American Legion, Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge, Loyola, De Paul and Notre Dame universities, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, Armour Research Foundation and the armed forces.

When we say that this organization is taking an effective and important attitude toward fighting communism—as distinguished from an organization such as the Birch Society—we have in mind some of its basic tenets. Here in the words of Dean John H. Fischer, Teacher's College, Columbia University, a member of the institute's Educational Advisory Committee, are some appropriate observations:

"There are Americans * * * whose attitude toward communism is under all circumstances to avoid it. * * * To follow such a policy in schools would make selective ignorance a goal of education.

"A somewhat more aggressive approach, rooted in fear rather than hope, sees communism as a menace to the unwary and would counter the danger by teaching Americans to hate it. Those who espouse this line are unwilling to trust students ever to reach reliable value judgments through the objective study of facts and principles involved. These people prefer to teach for the specific purpose of inducing a predetermined negative emotional response.

"The unfortunate practice of using the word 'Communist' as a political epithet will not be eliminated unless it is recognized and attacked through education. One of the outcomes of our teaching should be the development of an awareness on the part of students that a person is not to be labeled a Communist merely because his views on racial segregation may be somewhat more liberal than his Senator's, or because he sees merit in the TVA. The silly nonsense that calls an experimental school report card in a primary school a machination of the Kremlin should be exposed for what it is. In order to understand the actual threat of communism, Americans must learn to distinguish between the Leninist and the liberal, between what is communistic and the nonconforming."

This is a primary lesson not only on communism but democracy. To be effective, this lesson must be learned and believed. Members of the Birch Society who do learn it, we expect, will change their procedures or resign and join up with an organization such as the Institute for American Strategy, which is helping, not hindering, the fight against communism.

[From the Sun-Times, Apr. 9, 1961]

INEXCUSABLE ABUSE

Those who doubt the efficacy of the John Birch Society in dealing with its selected foes would do well to examine the society's current activity against North Dakota's Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, a rock-ribbed Republican and in many respects as conservative as any Member of the U.S. Senate.

In 16 years in Congress, YOUNG has consistently voted the rightwing, anti-Communist position. He has opposed foreign aid, supported the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act and opposed repeal of the loyalty oath for students. In 1954, he was one of 22 Senators who sided with Senator Joseph R. McCarthy when the Senate voted to censure the Wisconsin Republican.

A more unlikely target for the ultraconservative Birch Society's enmity than YOUNG is impossible to imagine.

The society, recently the subject of a series of articles in the Sun-Times, was founded as a secret organization for the avowed purpose of fighting communism. Its founder, Robert Welch, a former candy manufacturer, has labeled President Eisenhower and other eminent Americans as agents of communism, and has called for impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren on the ground the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision was Communist inspired.

But it was on none of these questions that the society's fury against YOUNG was aroused. Rather, the Senator, in his capacity as a member of his State's delegation to Congress, took the liberty earlier this year of opposing measures before the North Dakota Legislature which the Birch Society supported.

Among other things, the measures urged repeal of the U.S. income tax and called for abandonment of a number of Federal activities, including irrigation and flood control. The State's representatives in Washington, meanwhile, were pressing for approval of a dam project in North Dakota.

YOUNG explains he thought it was ridiculous for the State to be seeking the very benefits its legislature was being asked to vote against. His efforts to induce the legislature to kill the measure succeeded.

Immediately, mail vehemently denouncing him began to flood the letters columns of North Dakota newspapers and to pour into Washington.

"You have become a dictator," wrote one constituent.

"We have known you for many years," wrote another, "and thought you were enough of a conservative to be working for the good of your country, not tearing it down from your seat in the U.S. Senate."

Still another letter read: "I suggest that you drop a line to Kamerad K. from the U.S.S.R. He will without doubt show his appreciation by nominating you for the Stalin Cross for service in furtherance of the international Socialist criminal conspiracy."

To these and other attacks, YOUNG replied last month from the Senate floor, denouncing the society's pressure tactics. The occasion is remembered as the first time national attention was called to the society.

The result: The Birch Society has disclosed it may seek an outlet for its vehemence by forming a third party in North Dakota for the special purpose of splitting the GOP vote in the State and defeating YOUNG when he runs for reelection in 1962.

"A lot of people actually think I am getting communistic," said the Senator recently of his clash with the society.

As we have said before on this page, Welch and the society are entitled to hold their views and preach them if they desire. By the same American right of free speech and opinion, YOUNG and other Americans are entitled to disagree with the society and challenge its views without being subject to abuse, gossip and inflammatory pressure.

The practice of using the word "Communist" as a political epithet to attack disagreement or nonconformity is a pernicious one indeed.

NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE AWARD TO DAVID ROCKEFELLER

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am happy to call attention today to the fact that a distinguished New Yorker, David Rockefeller, will today receive the 6th annual award of the mercantile section of the New York Board of Trade. Mr. Rockefeller is to receive this award for "his outstanding civil program of long-range rehabilitation for the downtown Manhattan area, his imaginative projects for enhancing the city's future progress, and his role as a forward-planning citizen of New York City."

Mr. President, I am happy to add my congratulations to those of the members of the New York Board of Trade. I am well aware of the fine work which David Rockefeller has done on behalf of urban redevelopment in New York City generally and especially on behalf of the establishment of a World Trade Center in downtown Manhattan. His vigorous efforts have meant a great deal, and I know will continue to mean a great deal, to the city of New York.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the article from Business Speaks, the publication of the New York Board of Trade, concerning the award to be presented today to David Rockefeller.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAVID ROCKEFELLER SELECTED BY MERCANTILE TO RECEIVE 1961 AWARD

David Rockefeller, president of The Chase Manhattan Bank, will receive the Sixth Annual Award of the Mercantile Section of

the New York Board of Trade at a luncheon in his honor on May 11th at the Hotel Pierre, it was announced by the section's chairman, Peter F. Lynch, president of A. Sulka & Co.

Mr. Rockefeller was named for the award because of "his outstanding civic program of long-range rehabilitation for the downtown Manhattan area, his imaginative projects for enhancing the city's future progress, and his role as a forward-planning citizen of New York City," Mr. Lynch said.

BACKGROUND

Born in New York City, Mr. Rockefeller is the youngest son of the late John D. Rockefeller, Jr. After receiving a B.S. degree from Harvard University in 1936, he did postgraduate work and in 1940 received a Ph. D. degree in economics from the University of Chicago.

His activities with the Chase Manhattan Bank started in the foreign department in 1946 and until January 1961, when he became president, his various positions included supervision of the bank's business in Latin America and later supervision of customer relations in the metropolitan area and the economic research department. At present he is concerned with all aspects of the bank with emphasis on forward-planning activities abroad and domestic expansion.

AWARD COMMITTEE

Richard W. Seeler, of Braislin, Porter & Wheelock, Inc., as program chairman is assisted by the following committee: Harry M. Anholt, president, Realty Hotels, Inc.; Robert V. Cronan, vice president, Charles F. Noyes & Co.; Donato V. Carnevale, vice president, Harry Winston, Inc.; James M. Irvine, vice president, The Chase Manhattan Bank; Monroe Green, adv. dir., The New York Times; and Joseph D. Johnson, vice president, Western Union.

PAST AWARD RECIPIENTS

When the mercantile section's award was established in 1956, the recipient that year was Bernard F. Gimbel, chairman of the board of Gimbel Bros. The following year the award was presented to Arthur Hays Sulzberger, publisher of the New York Times. In 1958 the guest of honor was the late Dorothy Shaver, president of Lord & Taylor. In 1959, Keith S. McHugh, then president of New York Telephone Co., and now State Commissioner of Commerce, received the award. Last year, Erwin S. Wolfson, chairman of the board, Diesel Construction Corp., was the guest of honor.

RESOLUTION ON CUBA BY YOUNG REPUBLICANS OF RICHMOND COUNTY, N.Y.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I submit a resolution adopted by the Young Republican Club of Richmond County, Inc., with regard to our policies in Cuba, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the pro-Communist government of Fidel Castro has denied freedom of speech, press, and radio; and

Whereas thousands of Cubans who have opposed the Castro regime have been enslaved or murdered; and

Whereas international communism is now directly endangering the freedom of the United States and free countries of North and South America: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Young Republican Club of Richmond County, Inc., That—

1. that full support be given to our current national administration by the members of this Club, as the U.S. Government endeavors to protect the security of our country against enemy subversion and aggression,

2. that all citizens be urged to rally behind the President of the United States, regardless of political affiliation, in this time of national crisis; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, U.S. Senators KENNETH KEATING and JACOB JAVITS, and to Congressman JOHN H. RAY.

JANICE WOODRUFF,
Secretary.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Wednesday, May 17, the House of Representatives will take up the appropriation bill for the 1962 fiscal year for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The occasion will offer another historic opportunity to advance the Nation's war against disease and disability.

This particular appropriation bill holds more meaning for the well-being of the American people and the human race than does virtually any other fund bill.

The United States may, if the President and Congress so decide, spend upwards of $40 billion to launch a man to the moon. Less than one-fortieth of that amount, in the form of funds for medical research within the HEW bill, can help speed man's journey to a target of incalculable meaning—the goal of the conquest of cancer, heart disease, and other scourges.

I earnestly hope, therefore, that our colleagues in the House will help our country advance still more rapidly to a New Frontier of health. I hope that through the most generous possible support of Federal efforts in preventive, curative, and restorative medicine, the Congress will give to medical science the resources it needs for accelerating progress.

TRIBUTE TO SENATE AND HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEES

On April 21 it was my privilege to testify before the Subcommittee for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, of the House Committee on Appropriations, headed by Representative JOHN FOGARTY.

This subcommittee and its counterpart on the Senate side, headed by the dean of Congressional health legislation, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], are esteemed throughout our land for the care and diligence with which they review appropriations for medical research.

In my testimony I urged that our country set its sights on the target of a billion dollars for federally sponsored medical research in the not too distant future.

In addition to my prepared statement I filed with the subcommittee a detailed memorandum. It elaborated on several suggestions which were based on evidence which I have compiled as chairman of a Senate Government Operations subcommittee, which has studied medical research—particularly international medical research—since August 1958.

The suggestions which I made are, however, my personal views, and were not offered as the judgment of the subcommittee.

REGIONAL CENTER AUTHORITY NEEDED

What I regard as the heart of these suggestions is my proposal for Regional American Institutes of Health.

Already, there are being set up throughout the United States numerous clinical centers—some categorical, some noncategorical—under sound National Institutes of Health support.

The need is for full authority—not merely for clinical centers or institutional grants, but also for a regional center program. It would, in effect, establish area headquarters for the most advanced research and training at several of the great universities of our land.

ENDORSEMENT BY A MEDICAL SCHOOL DEAN

In a letter, just received, the dean of a great U.S. medical school—one outside my own State—endorsed both my general and my specific suggestions. He praised them as a "comprehensive, statesmanlike, and scholarly analysis." He also wrote:

> Yours is an imaginative and forthright plan which, if implemented, would go a long way. The specific recommendations * * * are extraordinarily wise. In my own mind, a key to successful implementation of the program lies in the suggestion for Regional American Institutes of Health.

Such institutes would be part and parcel of existing university structure and administration; that is, they would be integral units within the university-teaching hospital complex, but would serve an extensive area, not just one city or State.

MINNESOTA PILOT PROGRAM

Two pilot programs should be launched, in my judgment: one for a regional rehabilitation center, and one for a regional medical instrumentation center.

The case for these centers was described, in personal testimony before Representative FOGARTY's subcommittee, by two of the great rehabilitation experts of this Nation, Dr. Frank A. Krusen and Dr. Frederic A. Kottke.

The case for a regional instrumentation center was presented in a separate memorandum filed by another great scientist, Prof. William Kubicek, Ph. D.

These men—who, I am proud to say, are Minnesotans — are respected throughout American and international science. All three presented the case for a regional center as a matter of sound principle for the good of science. Each pointed out, factually and carefully, that the University of Minnesota would be an ideal site for such a center and for these two pilot programs.

Final decision as to selection of the site would, of course, be the responsibility of scientific review panels, in accordance with standard Federal procedure.

The tide is running irreversibly in the direction of regional centers.

Last year, a distinguished consultative group recommended, for example, to the Senate Committee on Appropriations that regional instrumentation centers be

authorized. And an N.I.H. proposal to implement that recommendation was, I understand from other sources, submitted for the 1962 budget; but it was, unfortunately, deleted by the Bureau of the Budget. I am asking the congressional committees to restore those items.

The decision is, therefore, now up to the Congress. I hope the decision will be to flash the green light to medical science.

YOUTH FITNESS PROGRAM

Similarly, I hope the 87th Congress will authorize certain other programs referred to in my testimony, such as a coordinated Federal-State-local effort for youth fitness.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD my prepared statement before the House Subcommittee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY—A PROGRAM FOR TOTAL WAR AGAINST DISEASE AND DISABILITY

Mr. Chairman, I want to express appreciation to yourself and to this subcommittee for the opportunity to submit a few thoughts on the 1962 appropriation bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The comments which I offer today are based, as you know, on a study by a Senate Government Operations subcommittee, of which I am chairman.

Fifteen publications have been issued to date by the subcommittee.

All of the comments today represent, however, only my own views. They are not intended as a subcommittee statement.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT IN OUR GROUP'S JURISDICTION

Incidentally, in our formal subcommittee publications, we have carefully pointed out that we have no jurisdiction whatsoever for recommending how much should be spent; that is, of course, exclusively, the responsibility of the Committees on Appropriations.

We have instead, developed a Government-wide financial picture of who and what is spending what, where, and why—for health, particularly, for research, at home and abroad.

But, on the basis of evidence compiled, I have come to my own conclusions, and that is what I submit today.

OUTSTANDING WORK BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

First, however, let me say that in our 2 years of work, we have found invaluable the hearing volumes and reports issued by your subcommittee.

As I have stated in several of our own publications, great credit is reflected upon the Congress by the devoted and diligent efforts by your subcommittee and by Senator HILL'S subcommittee.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY

I want to say to you, Congressman FOGARTY, that I have been inspired for many years by the work which you have personally performed. Your efforts for a national environmental health center (which would study problems of air, water, and ground pollution, among many other factors) represent, I believe, one of the most fruitful proposals of our time.

Now, I will touch upon a few of my own suggestions.

With your permission, I would like to have the opportunity to send over to you within the next few days—before you close this hearing record—a more detailed memorandum, elaborating upon these points.

NEED FOR REGIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

1. First, may I respectfully suggest that this subcommittee consider what I believe to be the next logical step in the development of medical research in our Nation—the concept of regional American institutes of health.

Such institutes would carry out intramural research, training, and demonstration. They would perform for their surrounding region what the National Institutes of Health now perform for the Nation as a whole. Such institutes would be established at the most logical home, the medical schools of a few of the Nation's leading universities.

Specifically, I would hope that in this year's appropriations bill, you might incorporate an amendment to authorize establishment at each of two such institutions—two pilot programs. One might be for a regional institute of physical medicine and rehabilitation, another for a regional institute on biomedical instrumentation.

How much would each such institute cost? There would be (*a*) Building-space costs; (*b*) Equipment costs; (*c*) Operating costs.

A reasonable figure, it seems to me, might be: $1½ million for each pilot program for the initial year. I leave it to yourselves as to what proportion of the sum might be assigned for each of the above three types of costs.

Two pilot programs at a university would cost $3 million and at two institutions, a total of $6 million.

I would like to make it clear that I do not envision these institutes as branches of the National Institutes of Health.

Much as I admire that magnificent Federal organization, I feel that the control of each regional institute should be left in the hands of the respective universities.

Ultimately, I would hope that each such university would have an entire complex of regional centers—that is, a regional institute on child health, a regional institute on neurology, etc.—which would become area headquarters within a radius of hundreds of miles.

TWO WITNESSES ON REHABILITATION INSTITUTE

Immediately after I conclude my suggestions, I will introduce two outstanding physicians from my State who will elaborate on one of these proposed centers.

The case for the second proposed center will be made in a supplementary memorandum to be filed in writing by another Minnesota scientist—Prof. William Kubicek.

Let me make it clear that, I envision that the University of Minnesota would be the home for one of the regional complexes. But the choice of the sites would be the responsibility of scientists, in accordance with the standard grant council-study section procedure.

THE CENTRAL ISSUE OF NIH APPROPRIATIONS

2. One of the central problems which this subcommittee faces is the issue of how much overall research funds should be appropriated to the National Institutes of Health for the seven "categorical institutes," for the Division of General Medical Sciences, and for the other units. Last year, as we recall, the Senate-House Conference Committee approved $590 million.

I am delighted that President Kennedy has proposed an increase in what had been recommended by the previous administration in January 1961. In my personal judgment, however, an exceedingly strong case can be made for still larger amounts.

The reason is that, in disease problem after problem, I have received messages from distinguished medical scientists, stating that there is an imperative need for funds of a greater magnitude than are provided even under the President's proposed budget. Such larger funds are needed for more modern research facilities, for more research manpower, more institutional grants, as well as more project grants.

Now, I know that it will be pointed out that Federal research funds have considerably increased in recent years, thanks in large part to what you gentlemen have wisely decided.

Our Senate Government Operations Subcommittee has provided as frank and comprehensive a picture of recent Government-wide increases in biomedical research as has been provided by any other committee.

But the fact that research expenditures have increased does not mean that actual research needs are now being met; far from it. It simply means that the Congress is wisely responding to the wishes of the American people and to the needs of our time by increasing the investment in our greatest resource—our people and their health.

A $1 BILLION A YEAR RESEARCH TARGET

This Nation, according to most experts, can afford to spend $2 billion a year—that is—$30 billion in the next 15 years to rocket a man to the moon. Surely, therefore, we can afford to spend in the not too distant future a sum of perhaps a billion dollars a year for Federal support of biomedical research, so as to help advance 180 million Americans to better health.

This Nation cannot afford to lose an estimated $35 billion a year to disease and disability. But we can afford to spend, let us say, around 1/35 of that sum to prevent disease and disability.

We spend $43 billion a year for national defense. Surely, we can afford to spend—some time soon—1/43 of that sum for defense against killing and crippling diseases.

Let me make it clear—I am not proposing a specific figure for the 1962 fiscal year. I do not offer the $1 billion figure as an absolute sum for the combined total of NIH and other agencies' biomedical research, but rather as a relative figure. Issues of manpower have to be considered. Several agencies' present and future programs are involved, in addition to those of NIH—which is the most important of the agencies engaged in biomedical research. The actual needs and budgetary possibilities would have to be examined in detail by your expert subcommittee, and by Senator HILL'S group.

In addition, other appropriations subcommittees would have to examine the budgets of other agencies which have more limited biomedical research activity. The total of such non-NIH activity now aggregates around $200 million. When added to the NIH figure of $590 million, we see that the combined sum is not far from the billion dollar target of which I speak.

MUCH FUNDS NOT USED IMMEDIATELY IN RESEARCH

I should like to make an additional point clear: To some extent, these overall figures may prove unintentionally misleading. Some people may not be aware that of the $590 million appropriated to NIH, a considerable portion is necessarily allocated for education, training, fellowships, and other essential long-range purposes, as distinguished from immediate medical research projects.

Such allocation is sound. We must, for example, add to the supply of trained personnel for the future. But this allocation means that right now—this year—we are actually putting into the task of day-to-day research less than the amounts which might be suggested by the overall budget figure. In other words, for the millions of Americans anxiously waiting today for results from current research on cancer, heart disease, and other problems, less money is being spent for day-to-day research than they might think.

As a matter of fact, when the overall total of all Federal funds available is broken down into all of the many categories which must be served, we find how relatively thinly the research money must be spread. The detailed charts, compiled by our Senate subcommittee, prove that when you get down

to the level of how much funds are supporting a particular line of research attack against a particular disease, you see that the Federal funds, far from being plentiful, are actually very modest in relation to what the experts know that they need. In innumerable disease and basic research problems, they can certainly use more than is now available.

USE OF DOLLARS AND FOREIGN CURRENCIES OVERSEAS

3. Next, I should like to urge the fullest possible support and encouragement to the HEW programs for support of international research, research training, and research demonstrations—through both U.S. dollars and foreign currencies.

Our own subcommittee's work has been concentrated on the oversea phase.

It is my view that there is an enormous frontier of opportunities in international collaboration in research.

In my judgment, the 10 million U.S. dollars and $10 million in foreign currencies, which have been proposed under the budget for the National Institutes of Health for the 1962 fiscal year to support oversea research, are grossly insufficient for the purpose.

A single dollar in U.S. greenbacks or in U.S.-owned rupees, pesos, or dinars, would have a seed—a multiplier effect—abroad.

Thus far, the actual use of foreign currencies for health research abroad represents one of the smallest of all the many uses authorized under Public Law 480, as amended; yet it is the one use, which perhaps more than any other, has universal appeal, universal interest, and universal value.

SPECIFIC APPROPRIATION FOR INFORMATION RESEARCH

4. I propose that a specific sum be set aside in the HEW appropriation bill for research on medical information and medical communications.

It will be recalled that the consultative committee, headed in 1960 by Mr. B. Jones, appointed by Senator HILL's committee, had recommended a specific sum of not less than $4.5 million for medical information and communication research.

The purpose of such a specific appropriation would be to help assure better management of the information which is now "buried" in an estimated one-quarter of a million articles a year which appear in medical journals, alone.

In my judgment, there are few greater issues facing American medicine than the use of more modern methods for the storage, retrieval, dissemination, and utilization of information.

Information management has been the central focus of our subcommittee; here, I refer not only to information on completed research but on research which is still in progress. Much of the current research may never be written up perhaps, because an experiment failed. The result may be that other researchers later on needlessly repeat futile experiments because they never knew prior research was carried on, in the first place.

Registration of all current research by the science information exchange is therefore a key to avoiding unknowing duplication.

HIGHLIGHTS OF A FEW OTHER SUGGESTIONS

Now, I know that your time is limited this morning, and so I am going to simply present in a few sentences some of the other challenges which, it seems to me, might be considered in developing your subcommittee's recommendations.

These other matters concern medical audiovisuals, better estimates of the costs of disease, a Federal youth fitness program, and interagency coordination in biomedical research.

5. I propose that the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service be directed either in the HEW bill or in the report on the bill—to appoint two consultative groups:

(a) One such consultative group should explore the possibility of the establishment of an international medical audiovisual exchange program.

The second group—consisting of the leading experts of the land—should explore the problems of making better estimates of the cost of disease and disability to American society.

Small sums, e.g., $10,000 each, might be set aside for both of the consultative groups; or your subcommittee may feel that these minor costs of the two studies should be absorbed within the Public Health Service's budget.

YOUTH FITNESS PROGRAM

6. It seems to me that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be asked to render a report to the Appropriations Committees on the Nation's youth fitness program.

President Kennedy has demonstrated great interest in the physical fitness of our people. Secretary Ribicoff—just a month after the President's inaugural—convened an outstanding conference on this subject. In prior years, some small progress was made by what has been known as the President's Council on Youth Fitness.

But there has not been developed a coordinated Federal-State-local, public-private program. A grant-in-aid program needs to be developed, so as to get this program rolling throughout the schools of this Nation, for example.

Neither the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, nor any other committee have ever received the kind of report which is necessary to come to grips with the fitness-softness problem. I urge the requesting of such a report.

STRENGTHENING COOPERATION

7. Next, I would hope that this subcommittee might see fit to incorporate within its report your views, as regards improved coordination of the various agencies' programs in biomedical research.

In my judgment there is already considerable interagency coordination, both at the policy level and at the researcher level; but far more could be done, as I believe our subcommittee hearing in August 1960 indicated.

On Wednesday of this week, I asked our staff director to meet with Dr. Jerome Weisner, the President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology on this issue of interagency coordination. He reported back Dr. Weisner's accord with the need for strengthening interagency teamwork in research.

INTRODUCTION OF WITNESSES

I will not take the further time of this committee, because I know time is limited.

I do, however, want to introduce, now, the two distinguished Minnesota physicians who have interrupted their busy schedule in order to submit to you today their expert judgment.

The first of these individuals is, in my view, the most qualified man in all of America to comment on a proposed Regional Rehabilitation Institute, Dr. Frank Krusen. He is the acknowledged father of physical medicine and rehabilitation. It was he who, 2½ decades ago, established this discipline in the Mayo Clinic. He is the chairman of the AMA Committee on Rehabilitation and is guiding light of the Elizabeth Kenny Foundation and of the American Rehabilitation Foundation. He can speak not only for American medicine, but for American voluntary organizations, interested in this field, as well.

After him, you will hear from Dr. Frederick Kottke, chairman of the University of Minnesota's Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, a former president of the American Congress of Physical Medicine, whose outstanding professional qualifications are respected by his peers in the United States and throughout the world.

On the separate, proposed Instrumentation Institute, you will be receiving a written presentation from another of Minnesota's great scientists, Prof. William Kubicek. Unfortunately, he could not rearrange his crowded schedule to be with us today. But I suggested that his expert views, as both a Ph. D. and an electrical engineer, would be of great value to the Congress.

CONCLUSION

I want to express my personal appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the Members for your courtesy in hearing me this morning.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no other business to come before the Senate, I now move that the Senate adjourn, under the order previously entered, until Monday, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 15, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 11, 1961:

U.S. MARSHALS

Ellis Maylett, of Utah, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Utah, vice Howard Call.

William M. Parker, Jr., of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Alabama for the term of 4 years, vice Charles S. Prescott.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Thomas J. Michie, of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the western district of Virginia, vice Roby C. Thompson, deceased.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

John H. Rubel, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Frank Dattilo III
Michael J. Moynahan

Joseph M. Sullivan, midshipman (Naval Academy), to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps as previously nominated, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard L. Cluever
Arthur G. Fitzgerald

Francis G. Smith (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidate) to be a permanent ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert M. Irick
Richard H. Paul
Louis V. Miller

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Thomas P. Briant	William C. Head
Melvin C. Britton, Jr.	William H. Hix
Nicholas T. Catanuto	Donald M. Kurtz
Dennis G. Crockett	John A. Lanning
Richard M. Deaner	Robert L. McDonald
Jerald J. Dihl	James D. McGath
Sheldon Farber	Edward K. Poole
Bernard H. Feldman	John H. Ramlo
William V. Griffin III	Charles C. Rogers

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Angelo A. Ciliberti	Richard L. Davis
Thomas L. Curtin	William Z. McLear III

Ernest H. Meese (Naval Reserve officer) to be a lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Joseph W. Vercher, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be reappointed a permanent commander in the line of the Navy, limited duty only, in the classification "administration," subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and in the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Ronald D. Murphy.
James W. Newcomb, Jr.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

Stephen Charlesworth	Ralph L. Robie, Jr.
John E. Greenhalgh	Robert C. Wiley

George P. Johnson, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade), temporary lieutenant and permanent lieutenant when eligible.

Roger L. Grant, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named line officers of the Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

Gordon W. Bawden	Fredric D. Fogle
Eugene J. Flath	Roger L. Grant

The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the staff corps as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY CORPS

Nix, Harvey W., Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Harkless, Gerald A.	Lyons, James R.
Holmes, Henry A.	Murphy, Martin R.
Krauter, George E.	Schroeder, Clyde C.
Lanoue, Robert J.	

The following named (Naval Academy graduate) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

George E. Yarbrough

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David F. Cloud

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Martin F. O'Connor

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Gerald W. Boston	Michael R. McDonough
Floyd C. Lewis	Joseph F. Prochaska
Ronald E. Merrihew	Merrill A. Sweitzer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James D. Care	Claude M. Holifield
Leiland M. Duke	Charles M. Isbell
Edward C. Goldhill	Donald P. Klingler
Bruce A. Greene	Guy H. Morley
Charles R. Gruning	Robert M. Reed
James G. Grunwaldt	Claude K. Snow
John H. Helm	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 11, 1961:

WORLD SCIENCE-PAN PACIFIC EXPOSITION

Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, of Minnesota, to be U.S. Commissioner for the World Science-Pan Pacific Exposition, now known as Century 21 Exposition.

AMBASSADORS

Walworth Barbour, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

Philip W. Bonsal, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Morocco.

A. S. J. Carnahan, of Missouri, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sierra Leone.

UNITED NATIONS

Robert F. Woodward, of Minnesota, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister to be the representative of the United States of America to the 9th session of the Economic Commission for Latin America of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for appointments and promotions as indicated:

David H. Popper, of New York, to be class 1 and to be also a consul general.

Paul F. Geren, of Texas, for reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, a consul general and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, in accordance with the provisions of section 520(a) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended.

To be consul generals

David M. Bane, of Pennsylvania.
Forrest K. Geerken, of Minnesota.
John Evarts Horner, of Washington.
Miss Rebecca G. Wellington, of the District of Columbia.
David G. Wilson, Jr., of Oregon.

To be class 2, consuls and secretarys

David S. Burgess, of Massachusetts.
Floyd L. Whittington, of Michigan.
James M. Wilson, Jr., of Maryland.

To be class 3, consuls and secretarys

Henry B. Cox, of Maryland.
Anthony Geber, of Virginia.
Louis Mark, Jr., of Connecticut.
Edward A. O'Neill, of Pennsylvania.
Earl W. S. Churchill, of Georgia, to be class 4, consul, and secretary.
Miss Lillian A. Ross, of North Carolina, to be class 5, consul, and secretary.
Charles R. Stout, of California, to be consul.
Guido C. Fenzi, of California, to be class 6.

To be class 7

Richard W. Faville, Jr., of Oregon.
John A. Froebe, Jr., of Ohio.
William Bruce Harbin, of California.
Donald A. Kruse, of Pennsylvania.

To be class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries

Miss Margaret J. Barnhart, of Pennsylvania.
Guy F. DiNocenza, of Connecticut.
Bernard A. Femminella, of Minnesota.
James H. Lassiter, of California.

To be class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries

Miss Mary C. Alexich, of Pennsylvania.
Charles A. Anderson, of California.
Charles E. Angevine, of Colorado.
Francis J. Barrett, of Pennsylvania.
C. Thomas Bleha, of Michigan.
William T. Breer, of California.
Joseph R. Breton, of Massachusetts.
Richard G. Brown, of New York.
James A. Budeit, of Nebraska.
Robert C. Cary, of Washington.
Malcolm H. Churchill, of Iowa.
William P. Clappin, of Virginia.
Harry L. Coburn, of New York.
Charles M. Cole, of Minnesota.
Trusten Frank Crigler, of Arizona.
Ernest B. Dane III, of Massachusetts.
Ted A. Dienstfrey, of California.
Michael Dowling, of Georgia.
William J. Dulker III, of the District of Columbia.
Emil P. Ericksen, of California.
Joseph G. Fandino, of New York.
James Ferrer, Jr., of California.
Samuel Edwin Fry, Jr., of Massachusetts.
J. Guy Gwynne, of Arkansas.
Samuel J. Hamrick, Jr., of Kentucky.
Benjamin Hill Hardy III, of Virginia.
Richard B. Howard, of the District of Columbia.
David A. Hughes, of Washington.
Herbert H. E. Hymans, of California.
John K. Jessup, Jr., of Connecticut.
Stephen Tillman Johnson, of California.
Ralph T. Jones, of Wisconsin.
Harmon E. Kirby, of Ohio.
Robert S. Littell, Jr., of Connecticut.
Raymond B. Lombardi, of Rhode Island.
David McMeans, of Texas.
Miss Marian L. Maims, of Idaho.
Robert A. Martin, of Pennsylvania.
Philip R. Mayhew, of the District of Columbia.
Harlan G. Moen, of Wisconsin.
Nuel L. Pazdral, of California.
Carl Pearl, of California.
Robert L. Pugh, of Washington.
Alexander L. Rattray, of California.
Ronald F. Rosner, of Louisiana.
William E. Ryerson, of New York.
Raymond W. Seefeldt, of Illinois.
Charles Arthur Semones, of Virginia.
Robert E. Service, of the District of Columbia.
Norman T. Shaft, of Minnesota.
Miss Mary Lou Shantz, of Michigan.
Frederick Owen Shoup, of California.
Lester P. Siezak, of Pennsylvania.
Harry C. Sorensen, of New York.
John P. Spiliane, of Indiana.
Charles Steedman, of Rhode Island.
John J. St. John, of Pennsylvania.
Roscoe S. Suddarth, of Tennessee.
Courtenay P. Worthington, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Ronald R. Young, of California.
Robert L. Dowell, Jr., of Florida.
Lawrence A. Fox, of New York.
John C. Hawley, of Virginia.

Herman J. Jelinek, of Nebraska.
William N. Lyons, of Kansas.
Eugene F. Siliari, of New York.
Richard H. Webster, of Virginia.
Anthony Winkler-Prins, of New York, to be consul.

To be vice consuls

Charles E. Behrens, of Massachusetts.
John D. Clayton, of Oklahoma.
George T. Colman, Jr., of Colorado.
William S. Dickson, of New Jersey.
Darrell I. Drucker, Jr., of Maine.
William F. Frederick, of California.
Hugh G. Haight, of Georgia.
George G. Jespersen, of New Jersey.
Lee G. Mestres, of New Jersey.
David T. Morrison, of Michigan.
James P. Mullen, of Minnesota.
Jaroslav J. Verner, of Minnesota.
Otto H. Wagner, of Michigan.
David D. Whipple, of New York.

To be vice consuls and secretaries

Alfred L. Jazynka, of Florida.
James Kim, of Hawaii.

To be secretaries

Robert W. Peart, of Virginia.
Dean S. VandenBos, of California.
Hugh R. Waters, of the District of Columbia.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT

Fern V. Miller, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Galatians 6: 10: *As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men.*

Almighty God, at the noon hour of this new day, we are uniting our thoughts in the sacrament of penitence, of praise and petition.

Fill us, we beseech Thee, with the light and power of Thy divine spirit that we may discharge our duties and responsibilities with a patient faith and a joyful confidence.

May Thy truth be in our minds and Thy love in our hearts as we go forth with all nations of good will in a fraternal effort to establish peace on earth.

Grant that the heroic tradition of our forefathers and the freedoms which we cherish as a precious treasure may be protected and made potent by the life of all mankind.

Guide our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress in bringing into action a new and strong alinement of the forces of freedom, for we know that in the great crusade against communism we must have the strategy, the influence, and the impact of a united front.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord in whom and through whom Thou hast revealed the riches of Thy grace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BAN ON TESTING OF ATOMIC WEAPONS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arthur Dean, the representative of the United States in the Geneva negotiations for a ban on the testing of atomic weapons, resumes his task at that vital conference this week, and with him go the prayerful good wishes of the American people.

Tragically, the results of the Geneva Conference have been negligible. In spite of the fact that the new administration under the direction of President Kennedy and with the able supervision of John J. McCloy, the President's adviser on disarmament, has sought to wipe the slate clean and write a new treaty through the able and devoted efforts of the chief American negotiator, Mr. Arthur Dean, nevertheless the Russian position toward agreement has not softened. In fact, in the more recent negotiations, the Russians have moved farther away from agreement than the position they had previously taken.

Not to reach agreement on this question is madness in today's world. Even the possibility of an atomic disaster, which could be touched off by accident, without military reason, should impel the conferees and their governments to bring to this conference a new determination to make it successful.

This does not mean that we Americans should capitulate to the Russians simply to obtain a result. We are entitled to a reasonable approach by the other side. The main objective which we are seeking is to have a reasonable provision for inspection. Without such inspection, a test ban would not be meaningful. The Russians' proposal for three inspections a year is so inadequate as to be practically meaningless.

If the Russians were to yield on this point, however, it seems clear that a worthwhile agreement could be reached. If the Russians are not willing to agree, however, it is obvious that the test ban can be continued no longer. It has already gone on for 2½ years and we have no proof that the Russians are not testing bombs underground. Obviously, this situation cannot continue without serious implications for the security of the United States.

We earnestly hope that the Russians will see the light of reason; that they will recognize the dangers for themselves as well as for us, if the negotiations are broken off. We hope that the Russian Government will instruct its negotiator to make the concessions that will bring about the treaty that is so urgently needed for the security of the world.

ANTARCTICA CLAIMS TREATY

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House a resolution adopted by the 66th State conference of the Minnesota Daughters of the American Revolution in March, 1961. The conference opposed the action of the Senate in ratifying the Antarctica Treaty freezing the status quo of claims to that area for 30 years.

Since the treaty has not yet taken force, the Minnesota Daughters of the American Revolution make the following recommendation:

Resolved, That Minnesota Daughters of the American Revolution petition the President and the Congress to bring this treaty up for reconsideration and renegotiation.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AGENCIES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, POSTPONEMENT OF ROLLCALL VOTES FROM MONDAY AND TUESDAY TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the majority leader there are primaries in Pennsylvania next Tuesday and a number of Members have told me they would like to be home over the weekend, and would prefer not to be here on Monday, if possible; and some of the rest of us have made arrangements not to be here on Monday. Monday is suspension day and I understand there are some suspensions that might be called up, and probably will be called up. I wonder if the majority leader might be inclined to seek unanimous consent that if there are record votes on Monday that they could be carried over until Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if there are primaries in any State, even though they do not directly concern the Members, the Members of that State are directly interested and, of course, that applies to members of both parties and the suggestion is a justifiable one. If the gentleman from Indiana will yield to me, I will make such unanimous consent request.

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent in the event any rollcalls are called for on Monday and Tuesday, other than on a rule and, of course, and quorum calls, that further consideration of the rollcall be postponed until Wednesday of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the general nature of these bills to be called up under suspension on Monday? Are these controversial bills?

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will permit me, Monday is the regular suspension day and the matter of determination as to what bills, if any, are to be called up on Monday next would be within the province of the Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. HALLECK. What I have suggested does not involve anything at all in respect to the scheduling of bills because, as I say, that is for the Speaker to determine, and whether or not there has been any firm determination about any of them, I do not know. Some have been suggested to me; but, all I am suggesting, and I appreciate the majority leader going along with the suggestion, is that if there are record votes on Monday, and there might be none, but if there are that they go over until Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will say further in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Iowa, I have not conferred with the Speaker yet as to which bills he has decided would come up under suspension on Monday. There was one bill that was going to come up, but it has been postponed and will not come up—that is the so-called Keogh bill.

Mr. GROSS. I was going to ask if that bill was coming up.

Mr. McCORMACK. It was going to be programed, but now it is not going to come up from what I understand. I know of only one other bill. Also, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] spoke to me this morning and I told him to see the Speaker about three bills that were reported out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I asked if there was any controversy about those bills and he said, "No." Of course, we always ask that question because we try to be as careful as possible on that score so that bills called up under suspension would be only such bills where there is no great controversy unless it is a matter of emergency. That is about the best answer I can give to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that any rollcall votes on Monday and Tuesday, other than on a rule, go over to Wednesday?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

Alford	Donohue	Macdonald
Ashbrook	Dooley	Morrison
Becker	Downing	Mosher
Blitch	Durno	O'Hara, Mich.
Boggs	Edmondson	O'Neill
Bolling	Finnegan	Powell
Bonner	Fino	Rains
Boykin	Ford	Riley
Breeding	Gavin	Roberts
Buckley	Gray	Rogers, Tex.
Cederberg	Hays	Slack
Celler	Hébert	Thompson, La.
Chamberlain	Henderson	Van Pelt
Chelf	Inouye	Walter
Conte	Kearns	Wharton
Curtis, Mo.	Kelly	Whitener
Dawson	Keogh	Willis
Dent	Knox	Winstead
Devine	Libonati	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics may have until midnight Saturday to file a report to accompany the bill H.R. 6874.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the extraordinary situation in which the House found itself on yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that when the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2010, that each of the authors of the two pending amendments now on the Speaker's desk may be given 2 minutes to present their amendments and that the committee be given 2 minutes in opposition.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What happens to the allocation of other time other than on the amendments?

Mr. COOLEY. We have no other time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr Speaker, reserving the right to object, how many amendments does this request cover?

Mr. COOLEY. I understand there are only two amendments now at the desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2010) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 2010, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANTANGELO: After line 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 507(1) of such Act is amended (1) by striking out 'cotton ginning', and (2) by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: *'Provided*, That such term does not include any services or activities performed with respect to commodities or products which are not to be used for food supplies'."

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful that the House has given us an opportunity to discuss the amendments after last evening's parliamentary confusion. This opportunity for a frank, but limited, discussion restores my confidence and faith in the integrity of congressional agreement to have full debate.

My amendment would permit the use of braceros only for farms cultivating, harvesting, and processing food supplies. My amendment would prevent the authorization of the entry of Mexican nationals for farm labor in cotton.

The joker in H.R. 2010 which no one has noticed and which nobody wants to talk about is that 60 percent of the Mexican nationals or 60 percent of the braceros work on the cotton farms. The great bulk of these braceros work in two States, Texas and Arkansas. Some work in California, Arizona, and New Mexico. Since this program started, the number of braceros has risen from 107,000 to 437,000 in 1959. In 1960, it was 315,000; 60 percent of these Mexican nationals are working on cotton farms and not on food farms which are producing the lettuce, the tomatoes, the grapes, the legumes. These are the perishables, and from my investigation, these are the farms which need braceros. Not so with cotton farms because they can mechanize it and do not need these braceros.

Read the report on this bill and you will find no specific justification for continuing the bracero program on the cotton farms. You will only find a plea and a justification for braceros on the food farms. Does it make any sense to import Mexican braceros to produce a crop which is in surplus, which costs our Government millions of dollars in price supports and which we must subsidize when we export cotton to meet foreign competition? What is the cost to us in the United States to increase cotton production? Last year the Commodity Credit Corporation paid a total of $31.9 million for storage of cotton alone. CCC paid to the farmers in fiscal year 1960 for cotton $1,425 million, and realized a loss in the price support program of $212 million. Our Government subsidized cotton exports to the extent of $253 million in 1960. In 1961, the Government is increasing the export subsidy and that it is estimated that cotton production will exceed our domestic needs by over 7 million and this will cost the U.S. Government in export subsidies an additional $325 million. We need for domestic consumption approximately 8 million bales of cotton, and it is estimated that the cotton farmers will produce from 13 to 15 million. The new export subsidy will be 8½ cents a pound to compete in the world markets. Because we are exporting over 200,000 braceros to work on the cotton farms, we are causing and bringing about a surplus, whose cost of storage costs and distribution costs, must be met by the taxpayers of America.

I want to make one fact crystal clear. As a result of my inspection in California and in Arizona, and in my investigation on the Appropriations Subcommittee of Agriculture, I can state without fear of being successfully contradicted that the wages in California are reasonable, that the braceros are needed there for the harvesting, the processing, and the production of food supplies. In my opinion, there is no need for braceros on the cotton farms which serves the public interest as well as the private interests of the cotton farmers. The following figures indicate where the bulk of the braceros work. They work in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Arkansas. In 1960, Texas used 122,800; California, 113,000; Arkansas, 27,400; Arizona, 19,300; and New Mexico, 10,400. The bracero program has served a need. It has had harmful effects upon the American economy by depressing wages of the domestic workers. It is causing our gold supply to leave this country to the extent of $120 million a year, which the Mexican workers earn on American farms. It is costing the Government approximately one-half billion dollars a year to obtain a surplus in cotton.

For these simple and substantial reasons, the bracero program should be discontinued in the production of cotton on American farms. I trust this amendment will pass.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York were approved by this body it would really amount to punitive action against a great segment of American agriculture.

I wish the gentleman from New York had come before our subcommitte and discussed his amendment. I wish he had come before the full committee and given us his views. He did not appear and urge for any such amendment as this.

The gentleman from New York wants the braceros to be used for one type of program and not for another. It is essential that we do have the necessary labor supply for use in the cultivation and harvest of fruit crops as well as fiber crops.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I have too short a time in which to yield; I am sorry.

I wish to say to the gentleman that in August of 1959, 1,100,000 fewer bales of cotton were produced than were needed in this country for domestic use and for export. In 1960 the same situation prevailed; we grew a million fewer bales in 1960 than was necessary for domestic consumption and for export.

Our cotton supply has dwindled in recent years. We have just barely enough to make ends meet now, and we do not have any appreciable cotton surplus.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Regardless of the cotton supply situation would not the adoption of the Santangelo amendment be an open invitation to return to the old wetback situation both in the matter of cotton production and fruits and vegetables?

Mr. GATHINGS. That situation would be brought back if this amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York were adopted. In 1953 a million wetbacks were apprehended. Last year there were only a little over 29,000.

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SANTANGELO) there were—ayes 66, noes 125.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN, of California: To amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as follows:

"SEC. 509. The number of workers which may be made available under this title shall, effective with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, be reduced by 33 percent of the total made available in the preceding fiscal year and in no event will any worker be made available under this title for employment after June 30, 1964."

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the evils inherent in the Mexican farm labor program are apparent to everyone—even to the proponents of H.R. 2010. The very fact that there is no bill before Congress which would make Public Law 78 a permanent part of the American agricultural scene is mute evidence of this truth.

The bill reported by the Agriculture Committee, however, contains no provisions for correcting the abuses of Public Law 78, or for setting a termination date on a program which is supposed to be a temporary measure.

Proponents of this bill claim that American agriculture is dependent upon Mexican labor. What they really mean is that American farmers who use foreign labor have been unwilling to offer wages and working conditions which would appeal to domestic farm workers and, therefore, have forced the domestics to look for work elsewhere, or go on public relief. Throughout the years, these growers have come to believe that the Government owes them a labor force.

Only one group, the Farm Bureau and its bracero-using satellites, have spoken in favor of H.R. 2010. On the other hand, Protestant and Catholic Church groups, the Secretary of Labor, the AFL–CIO, the National Consumers League, and many other organizations of responsible citizens, have testified against this bill.

The same groups have expressed approval for the safeguards proposed by the administration; safeguards which squarely face the implications of Public Law 78. Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, in fact, has warned bracero-using growers that unless they are willing to accept these safeguards, they may find themselves without any extension of Public Law 78 at all.

I for one believe that since the administration's amendments were not adopted, the program should be terminated immediately. The administration's proposals were moderate in their approach. They would have alleviated many of the abuses inherent in Public Law 78 by, first, providing greater protection for domestic workers against adverse effects resulting from the mass importation of Mexican nationals; and, second, clarifying the rules so that the Labor Department may administer the program in a manner equitable to both employers and workers.

It is my opinion, however, that even the administration's position did not get to the roots of the problem. I believe that a further amendment must be offered which would provide for the final termination of Public Law 78. Growers who have become dependent on Mexican labor will never set about solving their problems until they are given notice that the program is running out—until they are informed in no uncertain terms that Mexican farm labor will no longer be available to them.

I have, therefore, introduced an amendment which would phase this program out over a period of 3 years, which would reduce by one-third the number of Mexican nationals available in the preceding year, and which in no event would make Mexican nationals available for employment under this program after June 30, 1964.

The time has come when we should make it public policy to accomplish in agriculture what we have already accomplished in other sectors of our economy—the restoration of respect and dignity based on good wages, good working conditions, and steady employment for the men and women who labor for hire on U.S. farms. The time has come when agriculture, the Nation's largest industry, should seek ways and means of discontinuing its dependence on poverty both at home and in Mexico to satisfy its labor needs.

We will never accomplish this goal until the infamous Mexican farm labor program is finally put to rest. Only then will economic pressure force braceros-using growers to seek and find real solutions to their labor problems.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, Mr. COHELAN.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, the important question that faces this committee is, Will the amendment offered by the gentleman from California make any more domestic workers, a single one, available to harvest the crops of this Nation? It will not.

Let me tell you what would happen if this amendment were adopted. First, you would have 30 percent fewer farmworkers to harvest the crops. You would cause great economic distress on the part of the small farmers because those farmers hold small allotments. For instance, a farmer with a small cotton allotment cannot buy an $8,000 one-row cottonpicker to harvest his cotton. He has to do it by hand labor.

In 1958 the farmers of New Mexico spent $5,000 between January 1 of 1958 and June 1, 1958, in an extensive effort to recruit domestic workers. We went to Oklahoma, we went to Missouri, we went to Texas, we went to Arizona, we scoured the Indian reservations of the State of New Mexico. In all, we interviewed 741 workers. We offered jobs to over 600 of them. We got 120 acceptances. We paid the transportation of 60 of these workers from their homes to New Mexico. They were the only ones of the 120 that showed up to be transported to farms in New Mexico. We paid their way. Five weeks later we only had one worker.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Chairman, the four consultants appointed by former Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to advise him on the operation of Public Law 78 have been attacked by growers and their lobbies, as well as by the Farm Bureau influenced House Committee on Agriculture.

The reason for these attacks is that this group of consultants has the temerity to suggest in their report to the Secretary that citizen farm workers have as many rights as alien contract workers. Such a concept, according to the Farm Bureau Federation and its braceros-using friends, is not only presumptuous, it is also un-American.

According to the American Farm Bureau Federation, it should be the policy of the Congress of the United States to provide American corporate growers with as many Mexican nationals as they want—whether they need them or not and with no strings attached. The Farm Bureau also believes that the Congress of the United States should see to it that a farm placement service is provided for growers at public expense—or rather, at the expense of industrial employers. In other words, the Farm Bureau Federation wants the Congress to pass H.R. 2010.

This bill extends Public Law 78 without any of the safeguards recommended by the consultants to the Secretary of Labor.

Because the consultants' report received so little consideration by the House Agriculture Committee, I would like to summarize the unanimous recommendations it contained, recommendations which have been included in H.R. 6032, the administration bill, introduced by Representative COAD of Iowa. These recommendations are designed to protect citizen farmworkers against adverse effect from the importation of Mexican nationals, and to gradually eliminate the use of foreign labor on farms. They include the following:

First. Mexican nationals should be confined to crops in temporary labor shortage situations and to unskilled nonmachine jobs.

Second. The Secretary of Labor should be authorized to establish wage rates for Mexicans at prevailing levels in the area or in the closest similar area for like work, and at no less than a rate necessary to avoid adverse effect on domestic wage rates.

Third. The Secretary should be authorized to insure active competition among employers for the available supply of U.S. workers by being empowered to refuse to certify employment of Mexicans unless (a) employers have made positive and direct recruitment efforts to obtain U.S. workers; (b) employment conditions offered are equal to those provided by other employers in the area who successfully recruit and retain U.S. workers; (c) U.S. workers are provided benefits equivalent to those provided Mexican workers; and (d) employers of Mexicans offer and pay U.S. workers wages which are not less than those paid to Mexicans.

Fourth. The Secretary should be empowered to set up standards for judging adverse effects resulting from employing Mexicans based on wages, earnings, and employment trends information.

Unless these minimum protections are afforded U.S. farmworkers, Public Law 78 should not be extended at all. Certainly H.R. 2010, which is a bully's club to better an already depressed group of American laborers, should be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the remarks I am about to make are in my individual capacity as a Member of the House and not as majority leader. Because I am majority leader I do not completely abdicate all my rights as a Member of this body.

I can remember this legislation through the years. Not so many years ago we were fighting to bring about better conditions for the poor, unfortunate Mexican workers. More should be done. Now we are trying to do something for Americans.

I supported this legislation in the past. I recognized the necessity for it in past years. But our fight then was to try and have the Department of Labor get some authority to go in and use its offices to protect human beings, Mexican workers, who were being exploited, not by all the farmers, but by a sufficient number so that it was a public scandal. Now we are trying to do something for American workers.

Those who favor the bill—and I have no quarrel with them—talk about the need for Mexican workers. That is not our immediate concern today. What we are concerned about today is to try and get some fair consideration given to American citizens.

I offered an amendment to the committee which I thought might solve the situation, in trying to help this problem as I saw it, and I knew it would arise today. I know you are going to put your bill through. You are going to win a battle, but you might lose a war later on. Some of you members of the Committee on Agriculture, all of whom represent agricultural districts, must recognize that sometimes some of us Members from the urban districts have a thought. I have a 1,000-percent voting record on agriculture and I do not think many agricultural Members are able to say that they have a 1,000-percent voting record on agriculture. I offered a single amendment, but a fair amendment. What was the substance of it?

> No workers recruited under this title shall be made available to any employer or permitted to remain in the employ of any employer unless the employer has made and is making reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers—

What is wrong with that? Then I give some criteria. Then I add a paragraph as follows:

> Provided further, that in no event shall Mexican workers be permitted to be employed by any employer who is paying domestic workers less than the prevailing wage rate for the activity in the area.

That is the combined effect of my amendment. Yet they opposed it. They declined it. If they had accepted that amendment we would not have been completely satisfied, but the bill would have gone along. Of course you are going to put it through, but later on there will be other legislation coming up and you might regret that you rode roughshod over some of us who have humanitarian considerations in our minds, who had them years ago for the Mexican

worker and who have them now for the American worker.

You are going to bring a bill out of your committee in the near future entitled the Agricultural Act of 1961. And what is a part of the declaration of principle of that bill? One part is, "to afford farmers the opportunity to achieve parity of income with other economic groups."

I am for that. But there are some of us today who are trying to give consideration to American citizens, who are trying to get economic parity for American citizens in connection with this type of work.

So where are you going to be when you get up?

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will our distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am talking now as an individual Member.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts state what he thinks the position of the Department of Agriculture would be in connection with the amendment that he offered?

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand it, this amendment would be satisfactory. That is my understanding. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD]. We conferred on this. I should like to ask that of the gentleman with whom I consulted about trying to draft one simple amendment to try to iron out the situation for the House purposes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I was informed yesterday in the presence of many other Members of the House that the administration speaks with one voice, that is, it favors the extension of Public Law 78 only if it is amended, and that includes the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say to the gentleman without changing his position at all, if this amendment had been accepted we would gladly have gone along.

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is correct, if the administration would accept it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would go along with this if the administration would accept it, but I hear no voice from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2010) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 271, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. REIFEL. I am, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REIFEL moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2010 to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 231, nays 157, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—231

Abbitt	Grant	Minshall
Abernethy	Griffin	Montoya
Adair	Gross	Moorehead, Ohio
Albert	Gubser	Morris
Alexander	Hagan, Ga.	Moss
Alger	Hagen, Calif.	Murray
Andersen, Minn.	Haley	Natcher
Anderson, Ill.	Hall	Nelsen
Andrews	Halleck	Norblad
Arends	Harding	Norrell
Ashbrook	Hardy	Nygaard
Ashmore	Harris	O'Brien, N.Y.
Aspinall	Harrison, Va.	O'Hara, Mich.
Auchincloss	Harrison, Wyo.	Ostertag
Avery	Harsha	Passman
Ayres	Harvey, Ind.	Perkins
Baldwin	Harvey, Mich.	Peterson
Bates	Hébert	Pfost
Battin	Hemphill	Pilcher
Beermann	Herlong	Pillion
Belcher	Hiestand	Pirnie
Bell	Hoeven	Poage
Berry	Hoffman, Ill.	Poff
Betts	Hoffman, Mich.	Quie
Blatnik	Horan	Ray
Boggs	Hosmer	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolton	Huddleston	Richlman
Bow	Hull	Rivers, Alaska
Boykin	Ikard, Tex.	Rivers, S.C.
Breeding	Jarman	Robison
Bromwell	Jennings	Rogers, Fla.
Brooks, La.	Johansen	Roudebush
Brooks, Tex.	Johnson, Calif.	Rousselot
Broomfield	Johnson, Md.	Rutherford
Brown	Jonas	St. George
Broyhill	Jones, Ala.	Saund
Bruce	Jones, Mo.	Schadeberg
Burleson	Judd	Schenck
Byrnes, Wis.	Keith	Scherer
Cannon	Kilburn	Schneebeli
Casey	Kilday	Schweiker
Chenoweth	Kilgore	Scott
Clancy	King, N.Y.	Seely-Brown
Colmer	King, Utah	Selden
Cooley	Kitchin	Short
Cramer	Kornegay	Shriver
Dague	Kyl	Sikes
Davis, James C.	Laird	Sisk
Davis, John W.	Landrum	Smith, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.	Langen	Smith, Miss.
Dawson	Lankford	Smith, Va.
Dole	Latta	Springer
Dominick	Lennon	Stafford
Dorn	Lipscomb	Stephens
Dowdy	McCulloch	Stubblefield
Elliott	McDonough	Taylor
Ellsworth	McFall	Teague, Calif.
Everett	McIntire	Teague, Tex.
Evins	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Fascell	McSween	Thompson, Tex.
Findley	McVey	Thomson, Wis.
Fisher	MacGregor	Thornberry
Flynt	Magnuson	Trimble
Forrester	Mahon	Tuck
Fountain	Mailliard	Tupper
Frazier	Martin, Nebr.	Ullman
Frelinghuysen	Matthews	Utt
Friedel	May	Van Zandt
Garland	Meader	Vinson
Gary	Merrow	Wallhauser
Gathings	Miller, Clem	Watts
Glenn	Miller, George P.	Weaver
Goodell	Miller, N.Y.	Weis
	Mills	Westland
Whalley	Williams	Young
Whitten	Wilson, Calif.	Younger
Wickersham	Wilson, Ind.	
Widnall	Wright	

NAYS—157

Addabbo	Fogarty	Morse
Addonizio	Fulton	Mosher
Anfuso	Gallagher	Moulder
Ashley	Garmatz	Multer
Bailey	Giaimo	Murphy
Baker	Gilbert	Nix
Baring	Goodling	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Granahan	O'Hara, Ill.
Barry	Gray	O'Konski
Bass, N.H.	Green, Oreg.	Olsen
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Pa.	O'Neill
Beckworth	Griffiths	Patman
Bennett, Fla.	Halpern	Pelly
Bennett, Mich.	Hansen	Philbin
Boland	Healey	Pike
Brademas	Hechler	Price
Bray	Holifield	Pucinski
Brewster	Holland	Rabaut
Burke, Ky.	Holtzman	Randall
Burke, Mass.	Ichord, Mo.	Reifel
Byrne, Pa.	Jensen	Reuss
Cahill	Joelson	Rhodes, Pa.
Carey	Johnson, Wis.	Rodino
Chiperfield	Karsten	Rogers, Colo.
Church	Karth	Rooney
Clark	Kastenmeier	Roosevelt
Coad	Kearns	Rostenkowski
Cohelan	Kee	Ryan
Collier	King, Calif.	St. Germain
Conte	Kirwan	Santangelo
Cook	Kluczynski	Saylor
Corbett	Kowalski	Schwengel
Corman	Lane	Scranton
Cunningham	Lesinski	Shelley
Curtin	Lindsay	Shipley
Curtis, Mass.	Loser	Sibal
Daddario	McCormack	Siler
Daniels	McDowell	Slack
Delaney	Macdonald	Smith, Iowa
Denton	Machrowicz	Spence
Derounian	Mack	Steed
Derwinski	Madden	Stratton
Diggs	Marshall	Sullivan
Dingell	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Donohue	Mason	Thomas
Doyle	Mathias	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	Michel	Toll
Dwyer	Milliken	Tollefson
Fallon	Moeller	Vanik
Farbstein	Monagan	Yates
Feighan	Moore	Zablocki
Fenton	Moorhead, Pa.	
Flood	Morgan	

NOT VOTING—44

Alford	Durno	Powell
Becker	Edmondson	Rains
Blitch	Finnegan	Riley
Bolling	Fino	Roberts
Bonner	Ford	Rogers, Tex.
Buckley	Gavin	Sheppard
Cederberg	Hays	Staggers
Celler	Henderson	Van Pelt
Chamberlain	Inouye	Walter
Cheif	Kelly	Wharton
Curtis, Mo.	Keogh	Whitener
Dent	Knox	Willis
Devine	Libonati	Winstead
Dooley	Morrison	Zelenko
Downing	Osmers	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Durno for, with Mr. Hays against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Knox for, with Mr. Zelenko against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Van Pelt for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Dooley for, with Mr. Libonati against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Becker against.

Mr. Alford for, with Mr. Staggers against.

Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Finnegan against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Chamberlain.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. COLLIER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, MAY 15

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that call of Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 4 OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 276, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6094) to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 276 provides for the consideration of H.R. 6094, a bill to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946. The resolution provides for a straight open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 6094 is to increase the ceiling on appropriations for salaries which may be granted the Council of Economic Advisers from the present $345,000 to $2 million. The ceiling was established in the Employment Act of 1946 and has not been changed in the intervening years.

The bill was based on a request made of the Congress by President Kennedy and referred to the Committee on Government Operations. President Kennedy asked that the ceiling on salaries contained in the Employment Act be eliminated leaving to the regular appropriations machinery of Congress to decide each year what sums are required to support the expanding work of the Council.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 276.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has explained the rule, making in order consideration of this bill, which is a very simple one. It would increase from $345,000 to $2 million the amount the Council of Economic Advisers may spend each year as the total cost of that operation.

Originally the bill as introduced called for authorization of an unlimited amount; or in other words, it would provide that any amount which might be appropriated could be spent. This might mean, of course, any amount requested in the budget for this operation.

As a member of the subcommittee considering the bill, I felt very strongly there should be some limitation placed by our legislative committee as a ceiling on the amount of money which might be spent on this particular operation. Frankly, I believe the $345,000 originally fixed when the act was passed in 1946 is now inadequate if this activity is to continue. However, perhaps a million dollars would have been a more appropriate figure to fix as a ceiling, with the Appropriations Committee having authority to appropriate a less amount of money if it desired. But finally an agreement or compromise was reached, setting the amount at $2 million as a ceiling or limitation on the appropriation.

I wish to point out again that the Appropriations Committee itself should have the final say, with the House passing final judgment on the action of the Appropriations Committee. The Council of Economic Advisers would have to justify, and the Budget Bureau would have to justify, any request for funds under this limitation.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday, bills on the Consent Calendar will be called. There will also be five suspensions, as follows:

First. H.R. 6611: Temporary reduction in duty-free allowances for returning residents.

Second. H.R. 3247: Amend United States Code, section 2385, title 18, define the term "organize."

Third. H.J. Res. 384: Acceptance by United States of agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Organization.

Fourth. H. Con. Res. 226: O.A.S.—Sanction against Cuba.

Fifth. H. Con. Res. 209: Cuban refugee student assistance program, and H.R. 3279: Increase travel allowances, Federal employees.

Of course, we have agreed that any votes, except on rules and quorum calls, will go over until Wednesday.

On Tuesday we will take up the Private Calendar and H.R. 4614, establishing an office of international travel and tourism.

On Wednesday, Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for 1962.

Thursday, H.R. 5741, the mine safety bill, if a rule is reported out.

Then there is the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and any further program or changes will be announced later and as quickly as possible for the information of the Members of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did the Committee on Rules obtain any information as to the justification for increasing this appropriation from $345,000 to $2 million? How was the figure of $2 million arrived at?

Mr. BROWN. It was not arrived at in the Committee on Rules, I might say to the gentleman, but rather first in the subcommittee, and then in the full committee, of the House Committee on Government Operations. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will note the original measure carried an open end authorization.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. It amended the present law so that the Council of Economic Advisers could use any amount which might be appropriated, any amount which might be requested by the Bureau of the Budget, or the President, and authorized or voted by the Committee on Appropriations. Many of us on the Committee on Government Operations felt that there should be some limitation placed on the authorization by our committee. The proposal was first made the limitation be fixed at $1 million. Then finally it was agreed to make it $2 million, which, in my opinion, was more than needed, and I thought the committee should not have authorized that much. Under present law the authorization is only $345,000, and that has been in effect for a good many years, with the result the work of this Council has been limited, and a great many employees have been laid off as the result of salary increases voted by Congress.

Mr. GROSS. The Committee on Rules then was given no justification for $2 million, and no questions were asked as to how they arrived at the figure of $2 million?

Mr. BROWN. Oh, yes. The justification was just explained to the gentleman, how the amount was arrived at. Of course, there was testimony as to the need for an increased amount. No direct justification was given, in my opinion, to fix the amount at exactly $2 million. Instead, that amount was fixed as a ceiling so that there would be no "sky high is the limit" in this bill. That was in it originally, and that was what we tried to eliminate, because I have a very strong feeling, and I believe the gentleman has, that legislative committees should at least place some limit or some ceiling on authorizations, and not just give blank authorizations.

Mr. GROSS. I doubt that an increase from $345,000 to a figure of $2 million is very much of a limitation.

Mr. BROWN. Well, it may not be a limitation that you would like, but it is a limitation. It is much more of a limitation than to say only the sky is the limit.

Mr. GROSS. I think that is really putting this thing in orbit, if you want my personal opinion.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6094) to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6094, with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6094 was introduced to carry out a recommendation to the Congress of the President of the United States. President Kennedy, in his April 10, 1961, letter to Speaker RAYBURN, asked that the ceiling on appropriations for salaries for the members and employees of the Council of Economic Advisers be eliminated, leaving to the regular appropriation machinery of Congress to decide each year what amounts are required to support the work of the Council.

The present ceiling of $345,000 was put into the Employment Act when it was first enacted in 1946. It was quite adequate at that time. But in the 15 years that have elapsed, it has become an unrealistic limitation on the work of the Council. The functions of the Council have steadily grown in importance since it was established, and President Kennedy plans to assign it new responsibilities which may require additional appropriations. As the President said in his message to the Speaker:

> The work of the Council is one of the major staff services available to the President. The Council advises the President on the state of the economy and policies to promote full employment, economic growth, and reasonable price stability. Problems of international economic policy as they relate to these goals are demanding an increasing share of the Council's attention. I am also asking the Council to take on additional responsibilities with respect to natural resources and public works, manpower problems, economics of disarmament, and several other fields. For example, I have already announced that the Council will report to the President, the Congress, and the public on the status of natural resource problems in relation to national needs.

As all Members know, the Council of Economic Advisers issues its annual report, which is referred to the Joint Economic Committee for consideration. In 1947, the Council had a total of 43 positions, 19 of which were professional economists. Because of successive pay increases voted by the Congress, the Council in fiscal year 1961 had a total of only 32 positions, 11 of which were professional economists. The Council, then, has actually been forced to reduce its staff because of the legislative ceiling on appropriations. There seems no question but that the ceiling enacted in 1946 is clearly unrealistic for the needs of today.

As you will note, the Committee on Government Operations did not fully agree with the President on the removal of the ceiling and at the suggestion of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] the limitation was increased to $2 million rather than eliminated altogether. The gentleman from Ohio proposed that some legislative restriction on appropriations be maintained, even though we are all fully confident that the Appropriations Committee will require in the future, as in the past, strict justification for all expenditures of the Council.

The committee agreed that the limitation be raised to $2 million and the bill has been amended accordingly. This should not be considered as a suggestion in any degree that an appropriation in that amount should be approved. We only wish to place a realistic limitation so that the Appropriations Committee may properly work its will. There is no indication at the present time that the President will request for the Council a figure even approaching this amount. But if the new limitation must stand for 15 years, as did the old, we should be prepared for eventualities in that lengthy period.

The chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] testified in favor of H.R. 6094 in the committee hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps the gentleman from Wisconsin can answer the question which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was unable to answer. How did you arrive at this figure of $2 million, since this goes for salaries. I believe it is all for salaries, is it not, to pay the salaries of employees?

Mr. REUSS. That is correct. I should be very glad to tell the gentleman my understanding of how this figure was arrived at. I think I can, because I was one of those who participated in the discussions along with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. First let me say this was entirely a bipartisan venture, and it was discussed and worked out harmoniously by both the majority and minority members.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield on that, there are a lot of bipartisan ventures around here to which I do not subscribe.

Mr. REUSS. I appreciate that. I simply mentioned the bipartisan character so that the gentleman could indicate his position on it.

On the specific question that the gentleman has asked, about the $2 million, let me say that it is my understanding that the budget figure currently before the House Committee on Appropriations for salaries of employees of the Council of Economic Advisers for the upcoming fiscal year is something around $500,000 greatly less than $2 million, I might point out.

The reason the $2 million is in here, and I support it, is that this is an effort by the Committee on Government Operations to retain a jurisdiction which it has always had. As I said, in no other case, so far as I know, has any legislative committee of Congress imposed a budgetary authorization ceiling on salaries of employees. The Committee on Government Operations has had jurisdiction for the last 15 years over the Employment Act of 1946. It felt that it should retain it, and it did so. We do not anticipate that anything like the sum of $2 million will be even requested of the Committee on Appropriations. We do not, however, want to be in the position of having to come back to the Congress in a year or 2 or 3 and burden the legislative calendar with a further amendment to this basic authorization law, which is the Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. GROSS. I still have not heard the gentleman give any real justification for this $2 million. Is it designed to put on enough people to take up the difference between the $345,000 and the $2 million, or to increase present salaries, or both?

Mr. REUSS. Emphatically not. The justification for the $2 million, I say to the gentleman from Iowa, is that in the opinion of the House Committee on Government Operations this is thought to be a better limitation than the no-limitation that was in the bill as originally introduced and as requested by President Kennedy. In other words, the Committee on Government Operations has felt that there should be some dollar limitation. It has taken the figure of $2 million, which was arrived at in a bipartisan discussion. It was in no way intended that the Council of Economic

Advisers should have such an appropriation in the near future at all and, indeed, this is solely a ceiling.

I point out again to the gentleman from Iowa that in all of the other thousands of legislative authorizations passed by this Congress, there are no limitations whatever on salaries, this being left to the sound discretion of, first, the Committee on Appropriations, and then to the eagle eye of such able Members as the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman, we do supervise them. We have pending before our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a request for some 578 additional supergrades. We have not started hearings on those supergrades as yet. But, I still do not have an answer to the question as to what you propose to do with the $2 million.

Mr. REUSS. I would hope the gentleman will join us in approving this as a ceiling, mindful of the fact that it is merely a ceiling and does not in any way encourage an appropriation request of anything like that amount. I point out to the gentleman that for some years in the history of the Employment Act of 1946, the appropriation granted was only a fraction of the ceiling. That indicates, of course, that one wants to make the ceiling considerably larger than any immediately foreseeable budget request in order to avoid taking up on the floor year after year two separate things—one, an appropriation which, of course, should be taken up and will be taken up each year and, second, a ceiling authorization which is admittedly a very roughshod sort of thing because it really does not come to grips with the current needs of the Council. We know in general the current request is on the order of $500,000, give or take a few thousand dollars one way or the other.

Mr. GROSS. Just what would be bad about the executive branch of the Government coming to the Congress every year to justify the money they spend? What is bad about that?

Mr. REUSS. Far from there being anything bad about it, there is everything good about it. They come before the House Committee on Appropriations and every year have to justify every penny they get. I would certainly back the gentleman from Iowa in his rigorous insistence that complete justification be made. But, that is not what we are talking about here. We are talking about an appendix, a vestigial organ which it was suddenly discovered existed in the Employment Act of 1946, and I hope the gentleman will help us in the appendectomy, because we do require his help.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman with his medical terminology is losing me fast and all I can say is I will have to go to somebody else because I cannot understand that.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentlemen will remember that I opposed the ceiling for the very reason that the gentleman from Iowa is pointing out, it looked like an indication that we wanted to raise the amount to $2 million, when as a matter of fact there is no desire at all to raise the amount to $2 million. It is just a ceiling for the future. I think an investigation will disclose that when the Employment Act passed in 1946, it was a very much contested act, I will say, and as the gentleman remembers we had to compromise on lots of things. For the first time in the history of this Nation, a ceiling was placed upon salaries of all the agencies in our Government. I think this is the only one, and I hope the gentleman from Iowa listens to this, this is the only agency where an effort was made to place a ceiling on salaries.

The Committee on Appropriations handles that exclusively, in all other agencies or committees, and they must justify or they cannot get it. I share the view of the gentleman from Iowa that it should not be in in that way because it leaves the indication that we want the $2 million expended when we do not want the $2 million expended. But looking into the future, we want a ceiling high enough so that the Council of Economic Advisers can properly work and act just as former President Eisenhower's Council on Economic Advisers. They left a recommendation to their Democratic successors that the first thing that should be done is to raise this amount—that it is too low. When both parties agree to it, it occurs to me there must be some merit to it, and I sincerely hope the gentleman from Iowa who believes in a prosperous country and an opportunity to expand and full employment of the people and full purchasing power, and this full employment act is certainly vital in that direction, certainly, we ought not to do anything that will hamstring, hinder, or limit in any way the ability of the Council of Economic Advisers properly to perform their duties.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman, incidentally, of the Joint Economic Committee which has jurisdiction over the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that I fully agree with the purposes of the bill to increase funds available to the Council of Economic Advisers.

I feel at this time that if the advice of these gentlemen could result in lessening unemployment in this country by one one-hundredth of 1 percent, it would be money well spent. I am sure that in a time when we are shooting at the moon, we need the advice of these people at least as much as we need the advice of scientists.

I wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and to urge that this bill be passed.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin tell me briefly—I know he is the author or coauthor of this legislation—just what the purpose was in creating the Economic Council?

Mr. REUSS. The purpose of creating the Council of Economic Advisers was to give the President and the Congress, and through them the people of the United States, expert and continuing advice on the state of the economy and such measures by Government, by private industry, by State and local governments, as might be necessary to achieve maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. That is the object of the act.

The Council of Economic Advisers was assigned the task of advising the President, and of submitting to the Congress at least once a year, and oftener if necessary, a comprehensive economic report which would analyze the factors bearing upon production, purchasing power, employment, and economic stability.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not ask for their accomplishments; I just asked what the purpose was in creating the Council.

Mr. REUSS. I think I have stated the purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Am I right, then, in saying that an objective or purpose was to employ individuals who had exceptional knowledge and were experts on the economy to tell the President and the Congress what kind of legislation we should enact, what sort of policy we should follow?

Mr. REUSS. No. In the first place, the purpose was not to employ anyone; the purpose was to see that Congress and the President were advised of the results of their studies.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not to employ anyone? Why do you want $2 million for employees, then?

Mr. REUSS. The second point I would like to make, in answer to the gentleman's question, is that the purpose of the Council of Economic Advisers was not necessarily to suggest legislation; it was primarily to analyze the state of the economy so that the Congress might have the facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me interrupt you right there—to find out what was wrong with our economy?

Mr. REUSS. Or what was right with it—and there is plenty.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, and then to tell us—pardon me for interrupting—and then after they found out what was wrong, to prescribe a remedy?

Mr. REUSS. Congress, of course, is the sole body that can prescribe a remedy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They could suggest a remedy, could give the people that advice.

Mr. REUSS. They can recommend, but they have a much more important duty.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Pardon me if I seem discourteous. But, as I understand it, and I have the same understanding from what the gentleman just said, here is a group—we will skip

the employees—who would donate their services or render the information they have and make it available to the President and the Congress and tell us what the country as a whole should have prescribed in the way of legislation or policy.

Mr. REUSS. When the gentleman states it that way, I believe it places an undue emphasis on the recommending functions of the Council of Economic Advisers. Its primary function is to present an analytical, honest, straightforward story of the state of the economy. In some cases they do make recommendations. Of their two functions, the analytical function is far and away the more important.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And that would be of no value if not given to the President and the Congress after the Council makes its study and reaches conclusions; certainly they are to give the benefit of those conclusions to the Congress and the President, are they not?

Mr. REUSS. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now we are back where we started. That is the whole purpose of it?

Mr. REUSS. I would not agree with the gentleman that that is the whole purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the main purpose of it?

Mr. REUSS. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is this not true: Whoever created this organization felt that the President and the Congress needed additional expert advice as to how we could better our economy. That is it, is it not?

Mr. REUSS. That is it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure.

On this Council there are two members, as I understand it, who were students of Professor Hansen; is that right?

Mr. REUSS. I have no idea about that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The U.S. News & World Report so states.

Is the gentleman familiar with that article appearing in the U.S. News & World Report, February 27, 1961?

Mr. REUSS. I do read that estimable magazine, I am not familiar with it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Permit me to say to my personal friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, inasmuch as there is only an additional $1,650,000 involved in this bill, and although there are less than 75 Members of the House on the floor, it would not do any good to call for a quorum because the majority will pass almost any bill the administration sends down. We might just as well forget it and put our protest on the record.

This bill adds that $1,650,000 for the purpose of increasing the salaries of the members of the Council and its employees. That is what it is for. The previous year they had 42 employees, then salaries in Government went up and they dropped down to 32.

This being an administration which apparently, from the legislation which comes in and the statements that are being made, is determined to present views to the voters generally which will induce them to support the administration, because each one of these measures that has come before us gives certain groups something more.

Someone said the other day in the press that the wage and hour bill passed because votes were bought. Now, they did not mean by money, but that some people changed their positions on the wage and hour bill because judgeships were promised. Now, I do not place any reliance on that. I doubt any Member of the House could be influenced by an appointment. I listened to the deliberations on the floor, the statesmanlike statements.

Then others said that some voted for the wage and hour bill because certain groups who were employees in their districts, as, for example, in the sawmills in the South, that they were interested in, and because the Congressmen wanted to please them, they changed their votes and voted now directly opposite to what they had in previous years on the same type of legislation. We are all influenced, of course, by our constituents.

The overall purpose of the administration, as I get it—and I get it from the statements of Mr. Goldberg and others—the overall purpose of the administration is to convince the people generally that they can get more by supporting the Kennedy administration than they can by economizing. I will not burden you with further statements along that line, but that seems to be it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. How does the gentleman explain what happened to the cotton gin workers? That was not giving anybody anything; that was taking something away.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The wages?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I am not an expert. I assume that the people of the South are continuing their effort to get industry from the North to move South and, if the wage-and-hour bill went through, perhaps those southern workers would want more money and the South could not induce so many businessmen to move down there. That is just pleasing some industries to go down there and establish factories.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. They have two rules to go by, then. Some they want to put under the protection of the minimum wage and others they take out for certain advantages. The announcement was made that this was for the purpose of buying votes. Would the gentleman agree?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would not want to pass judgment on the motives of anyone, but I understand from gossip that that is the way the South induces some factories to leave New England and go south where the wages are a little lower.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman, I happen to know, along with Mr. Rich of Pennsylvania and others, sat on the committee that conducted hearings on this bill which lasted for weeks, and I know that the gentleman interrogated every witness; he interrogated me.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman who is now speaking, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. He knows as much about the full employment bill as any Member of the House. I know that he does. He might make constructive suggestions——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield any further.

This bill would authorize appropriations up to $2 million in the aggregate for each fiscal year "for the salaries of the members and the salaries of officers and employees of the Council." This would be in addition to "such sums as may be necessary" otherwise to enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties.

A review of the legislative history of the Employment Act of 1946 suggests that at the time of its enactment there was a fear that the agency would become too large and try to control the economy.

Is there any foundation to such fears today? Permit me to call attention to the views of a man described as the "Man behind the men who are reshaping U.S. economic policy."

Under the title of "A Master Plan for United States for the 1960's" the U.S. News & World Report for February 27, last, reviews a book by Prof. Alvin H. Hansen, of Harvard. Three of the President's advisers on economic policy—two of them members of the Council of Economic Advisers—were students of Professor Hansen.

While the entire article will be included in the extension of my remarks, attention is specifically invited to two paragraphs which indicate the possibility that, uncomfortable and disagreeable as it may be, if the Nation or we as individuals are to remain economically sound, there are a few things we will be forced to forgo:

> U.S. resources, Mr. Hansen believes, are being squandered on frivolous gadgets. He notes: "Machines with 300 horsepower, weighing 2 tons or more, are standard utility conveyance for one single person—the typical scene on any American highway. * * * Never before has there been so great a waste of productive resources on things that have little or no inherent value."
>
> While private wealth has increased, Professor Hansen states, public services have failed to keep pace. He has two recommendations: Impose a sales tax to cut back spending on "extravagant or useless gadgets," and set up, by law, a "Council of Social Values." This council would aid in setting cultural goals for the American people. The President would be required to report each year on whether these goals had been met.

Perhaps the Council needs more money to pay more people higher salaries to think up the cultural goals to which Mr. Hansen refers.

With the big spenders sounding off every day with new ideas for more Federal projects, there would seem to be little need for 2 million of the taxpayers' dollars to be expended by the Council of Economic Advisers.

The overall purpose of the bill seems to be to give the Council additional funds to find new ways to spend tax dollars.

The U.S. News & World Report article reads:

A MASTER PLAN FOR UNITED STATES FOR THE 1960's

A new book by a man who taught economics to top Kennedy aides is attracting wide interest.

It outlines thinking the administration is likely to follow on taxes, inflation, cities, unemployment, sales taxes, cultural goals, other big issues.

Maybe you wonder about the broad direction of economic policy and the goals of the Kennedy administration. If so, you can look to the views of Prof. Alvin H. Hansen, of Harvard, for guidance.

Mr. Hansen, 73, is littauer professor of political economy, emeritus, at Harvard. He taught three of President Kennedy's advisers on economic policy and sometimes is referred to as the American Keynes.

In a new book, "Economic Issues of the 1960's," published by McGraw-Hill, Mr. Hansen outlines the problems that he sees ahead and describes the policies that he thinks will be necessary to deal with them. Many of his ideas appear to coincide closely with the economic thinking of the Kennedy administration as it is revealed in its early days.

Go down the line and you find this—

Taxes: Mr. Hansen favors an increase in income taxes: "If we are to meet at all adequately our growing public needs, we shall, I believe, need higher tax rates."

In addition, he calls for tougher treatment in some cases. Examples: a withholding tax on interest and dividends, a reduction in depletion allowances, and stricter rules on expense accounts.

Growth: Mr. Hansen thinks the U.S. economy has not been expanding fast enough. He places growth in total output of goods and services at an average rate of 3 percent a year—and figures this is less than half Russia's rate.

These recommendations are made to speed up U.S. growth: Spend more Government funds on education, basic research and natural-resource development; allow faster tax writeoffs on investments in plant and equipment, and provide lower long-term interest rates to encourage industry.

Unemployment: Mr. Hansen sees unemployment as one of the most serious problems facing the Nation. He places the jobless total between 1948 and 1959—omitting the years of the Korean War—at an annual average of 3.5 million.

Faster growth is counted on to create more jobs in the years ahead. In the meantime, Mr. Hansen urges a Government program to train or retrain the unemployed, "the vast majority of whom are unskilled and therefore unfit for modern industry."

Cities: An even more challenging problem, according to Mr. Hansen, is what to do about the fast growth in urban areas. Right now about 100 million people live in 168 metropolitan areas. That number is expected to grow to 160 million in 20 years. Says Professor Hansen:

"This tidal wave will throw up economic, fiscal, and social problems, the magnitude of which we have scarcely yet glimpsed."

Mr. Hansen sees the need for "a stupendous program of demolition and rebuilding." To handle traffic, there must be elevated highways. And he makes it plain that the Federal Government must play the major role: "The Federal Government * * * is the one instrument by which the Nation as a whole can overcome the local roadblocks to progress."

Inflation: Mr. Hansen expects problems of mild inflation in coming years. He does not expect big increases in prices. To combat inflationary pressures, he makes these recommendations: Raise taxes in time of boom; impose controls over consumer and mortgage credit; tighten up Government spending, and give the public a voice at the collective-bargaining table. Mr. Hansen is opposed to raising interest rates to battle inflation.

Consumers: U.S. resources, Mr. Hansen believes, are being squandered on frivolous gadgets. He notes: "Machines with 300 horsepower, weighing 2 tons or more, are standard utility conveyance for one single person—the typical scene on any American highway. Never before has there been so great a waste of productive resources on things that have little or no inherent value."

While private wealth has increased, Professor Hansen states, public services have failed to keep pace. He has two recommendations: Impose a sales tax to cut back spending on extravagant or useless gadgets, and set up, by law, a council of social values. This council would aid in setting cultural goals for the American people. The President would be required to report each year on whether these goals had been met.

Government: Mr. Hansen urges acceptance of the dual economy—the partnership of Government and private enterprise. He states that a bigger role must be played by Government—and that this will not destroy private enterprise. "The role of Government will increasingly be that of providing a wide range of services—those services which we have come to associate with the welfare state—social security, health, housing, education, recreation and cultural programs, and community projects."

Education: Mr. Hansen thinks that spending on education in the United States, now amounting to $18 billion a year, should be doubled. For college students, he recommends a broadly based system of federally financed scholarships.

One reason why many of the Kennedy administration's economic proposals seem to reflect Mr. Hansen's views may be that three of the President's closest advisers were students of Professor Hansen at Harvard. They were: Prof. Paul A. Samuelson, now teaching at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and James Tobin and Kermit Gordon, both members of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Professor Hansen is the man behind the men who are reshaping the economic policy of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get this straightened out, if I can. Just what do you propose to do with this additional $1,655,000?

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, in answer to that question, it is proposed that the difference between the new ceiling and the old ceiling be kept in the Employment Act of 1946, which is the place for it, as a ceiling; and that the Committee on Appropriations each year will view with consummate care the requests made to it by the Council of Economic Advisers. It is not proposed that we impose a ceiling of some lower amount, which would simply require a reconsideration of this from year to year.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. I understand all about the ceiling. I know the ceiling is $2 million. I want to know what you propose to do with the increase from $345,000 to $2 million. Do you propose to increase the salaries of those presently employed? Do you propose to put more people on the payroll? What do you propose to do with the difference between $345,000 and $2 million? I understand all about the ceiling. And along with that, can the gentleman tell me whether his committee had any hearings on this bill and if it did, why were the hearings not printed?

Mr. REUSS. The gentleman has asked two questions.

Mr. GROSS. Three questions, I think.

Mr. REUSS. I heard only two, and when I get through answering the two, if the gentleman will ask me the third, I should be glad to answer it. I get confused when I get more than two questions on the spindle at one time.

Mr. GROSS. I shall ask only one at a time for the benefit of the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. Two at a time is all right; I cannot use more than that.

On the first one, it is proposed by the Council of Economic Advisers to request what they conceive to be the needs for the upcoming year. As I said before, the Council, if the ceiling is lifted, will request in the upcoming fiscal year 1962 budget a sum which I understand is of the order of $500,000. This is to permit it to carry out the functions of the Council of Economic Advisers. Both Dr. Raymond Saulnier, President Eisenhower's Chief of the Council of Economic Advisers and Walter Heller, the present Chairman, have asked that this ceiling be removed so that they may make a request that is better designed to carry out the obligations that face them.

That is question No. 1.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not answered the question. I still do not know for what it is proposed to spend the money. How many is it proposed to put on the payroll? Did you have hearings on this?

Mr. REUSS. We certainly did have hearings on it.

Mr. GROSS. Where are they?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer that question?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They did not need to have them printed. That committee does not need any hearings printed. The gentleman asked a question, and the answer is this: They propose to put on more employees at higher salaries and also to get rid of any Republicans who might be around, and put on faithful believers in the administration's political philosophy, which is to spend more money.

Mr. GROSS. So hearings were held but they were not printed. This, then, is a blank check, is it not?

Mr. REUSS. No, it is not a blank check.

Mr. GROSS. Of course it is a blank check.

Mr. REUSS. The members of the House Committee on Appropriations who are being in effect told by the gentleman that they are not conscientiously attending to their duties would, I think, not agree that it is a blank check. I have confidence that the members of the House Committee on Appropriations will take an adequate and searching first look at any appropriation requests that are made year in and year out and I have confidence that this body can then conduct a second searching look.

Mr. GROSS. With all due respect to the gentleman, I am not getting anywhere with him. Maybe if I can get the gentleman from Texas to take the floor I can get some information from him, and I do not want him to read me anything about a ceiling or anything like that; tell me first how many people do you propose to employ and what do you propose to pay them? That is what the House ought to be interested in.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, I think that is a good question. I will state, No. 1, that the number will necessarily have to be increased, not to any large number.

Mr. GROSS. How many?

Mr. PATMAN. Eight, ten, or twelve; I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says 12. Let us put down 12 as a minimum, although it might be a hundred.

Mr. PATMAN. The same number that Mr. Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisers had. I do not know what it is. I am not trying to bind anybody.

Mr. GROSS. How much will you pay the 12?

Mr. PATMAN. Here is the main thing. We have passed bills here to increase salaries of public officials. This is the testimony, just one little paragraph, and I will read it.

Mr. GROSS. Make it short.

Mr. PATMAN. It is this:

> This amendment has been made necessary because of the seven Federal employees salary increase measures, and the statutory change in the Council members' salaries since the Employment Act was passed in 1946.

That was Mr. Heller's testimony. In other words, we do not want to go back on our commitment.

Mr. GROSS. All right. We have finally got a number, that you want 12 employees, and you want to take up the slack for the pay increases.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. What would you propose to pay the 12 people you want to put on the payroll?

Mr. PATMAN. Whatever is customary and legal. I do not have the power of decision on this. That is for the executive branch.

Mr. GROSS. Would it be $15,000, $20,000, $25,000, or $50,000 a year?

Mr. PATMAN. Far be it from me as a member of the legislative branch to attempt to commit the executive branch.

Mr. GROSS. Will not the gentleman admit that if we increase this from $345,000 to $2 million we are in fact issuing a blank check to this Council of Economic Advisers?

Mr. PATMAN. No, not that at all.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Texas does not like blank checks, does he?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I do not.

Mr. GROSS. No, because the gentleman from Texas opposed last year the International Development Association, did he not, because it was in the nature of a blank check?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman so stated. But with the greatest of facility the gentleman turned around this year and voted for a $600 million blank check for South America.

Mr. PATMAN. Let us get back on the subject, that the Committee on Appropriations will pass on this, the very committee that the gentleman has always insisted should pass on these things. The gentleman should be consistent.

Mr. GROSS. If this bill had ever come before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I would be able to come here and tell you how many people they wanted put on the payroll and what they wanted to pay them.

Mr. PATMAN. This is the executive branch of the Government, and you cannot speak for the executive branch.

Mr. GROSS. If the executive branch coming before your committee did not tell you how many people they wanted and what they wanted to pay them, you were remiss in your duty if you did not get that information.

Mr. PATMAN. It happens I am not on that committee.

Mr. GROSS All right, then; I have been dealing with the wrong people all the time. Is there somebody around here on the committee who can give me some information?

Mr. PATMAN. I happen to be chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and I testified for this bill. I know something about it. We are not trying to dictate to the executive branch. That would be wrong. We will leave it up to the executive branch.

Mr. GROSS. That is the philosophy of the gentleman: Write a blank check, let them hire anybody they want to and pay them as much as they want to within the limit of $2 million. That is the philosophy of the gentleman.

Mr. PATMAN. No, my philosophy is just the opposite of that.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRUCE. Surely the gentleman from Iowa recalls during the last campaign the writings of one of the philosophers concerning what he termed "The Affluent Society," and how the American people are literally incapable of managing their own affairs? Certainly the gentleman from Iowa does not want to cut down on the salaries of those who are capable of managing the affairs of the American people?

Mr. GROSS. I do not subscribe to that philosophy.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not either. I was just raising the question as to whether that is not what we are being asked to do, to provide funds for the planners.

Mr. GROSS. Another question I would like to ask somebody that handled this bill, how many economic advisers does the President now have exclusive of this National Council?

Mr. REUSS. The present President has, I think, no economic advisers, as such, exclusive of three appointed by statute as opposed to President Eisenhower who had quite a few.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You asked the question as to why they want this additional amount. It is to hire more people at higher salaries to give more bad advice as to how individuals at home should operate their business. That is it—you got it.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from Michigan who has spent many years trying to keep a little sanity in this Government, that I join with him in refusing to vote a blank check to any agency or department of Government to hire anybody and to pay them any salary they want to—and believe me they could hire a lot of people and pay them fantastic salaries under the terms of this legislation.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I would want the record of this committee to be clear on this point. The measure before this body today has nothing whatever to do with the number of people they can hire and the salaries they can be paid.

Mr. GROSS. There is no limit up to $2 million, and this Council has operated for years on $345,000.

Mr. REUSS. This is purely and exclusively a ceiling, and the House Committee on Appropriations will screen the specific requests of the Council of Economic Advisers and at that time they should impose a searching surveillance over their requests.

Mr. GROSS. Just one moment, I have heard before about the searching surveillance of the Committee on Appropriations. We had a demonstration of that the other day with reference to the $600 million blank check giveaway to South America. We are here passing an authorization bill today and saying that they can go up to $2 million. If the Committee on Appropriations wants to give this outfit $2 million, then it is $2 million. I want to see a limitation that is reasonable. The gentleman spoke of $500,000 a little while ago. Would the gentleman agree to cut the figure of $2 million down to $500,000? That is what the gentleman indicated would be adequate.

Mr. REUSS. No, the figure has been arrived at by discussion between the majority and minority members. This is not giving the administration what was requested. The figure of $2 million should be retained.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I have listened to the colloquy here and I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin would agree to this. He says he will not accept any amendment to lower the amount. Would he agree that the debate here on the floor this afternoon should serve as an admonition to the Committee on Appropriations that, generally speaking, we do not expect more than 12 additional employees and not to expect more than $500,000 to be expended for the next fiscal year?

Mr. REUSS. We can do it this way then; I will entirely agree with the gentleman from Kansas that we should make it clear to the House Committee on Appropriations and to Members that

this is purely a ceiling and that we expect the House Committee on Appropriations to give the Council of Economic Advisers only what they can fully justify.

Mr. GROSS. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman, that is intent, nothing more, and it is not binding. I am just not willing to write legislation, or be a party to writing legislation, on that basis. The Appropriations Committee can go right ahead and appropriate a million, a million and a half, or $2 million. I am not willing to accept that as any answer to spending without specific justification. The gentleman said they probably would ask for only $500,000 next year. I will support an amendment which I expect will be offered to put it at an even $700,000, which gives them a little more leeway.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Is it my understanding that the gentleman is somewhat skeptical of this bill because he has a feeling that we are here being asked to underwrite a process which will probably mean the conditioning of the American public for a different type of economic system? Is that the concern of the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. That could happen. My first concern is giving the White House a blank check to spend this money as they see fit. I think it ought to be justified, but there is no justification except for an increase above $345,000 sufficient to take care of certain pay increases. That is the only justification I have heard for this legislation.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Does the gentleman feel that we are being asked to underwrite the Council of Economic Advisers with the view probably to conditioning the American public for a different type of economic system, a different type of approach to our problems?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know. I imagine if there are enough Harvard boys in this Economic Council that anything could happen.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Iowa wil give me his attention and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], it has always been our custom here in Congress to cooperate with the executive branch of the Government regardless of party, certainly on matters of procedure, and certainly to make it possible for the Executive to carry out his duties.

I would like to read just two or three excerpts from the testimony of Dr. Heller, who is Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to the President, when he appeared before the Committee on Government Operations April 25, 1961. Mr. Heller testified:

> Beyond this, as the President pointed out in his letter of March 30, to the Speaker of the House, President Kennedy has asked the Council to take on additional responsibilities, going beyond the more general responsibilities.
>
> The President on the state of the economy and the policies to promote high level of employment and growth and economic stability, the President has asked us, as the previous witness has pointed out, to perform specific economic staff functions with respect to natural resources and public works, manpower problems, economics of disarmament, and the broader functions relating to the international economics sphere.
>
> This simply would not be possible within the present overall salary ceiling without impairing the performance of the Council's traditional functions.
>
> Now, as the third table that I distributed shows, even with a considerable increase in the Council's budget since 1948, which is the real starting point there, Council staff has shrunk considerably since that time.
>
> While average salaries in the GS–10 and 15 ranges have risen over 50 percent since 1947, that was roughly 70 percent since 1945, this does not count the supergrades that were created, the Council's expenditures have risen only 37 percent in this period.
>
> Some of the staff has shrunk, as pointed out before. The professional staff as shrunk from 19 in 1948 to 1952, to 11 in the fiscal year 1961.
>
> The overall staff has shrunk from 42 in 1948 and 1949, to 39 in 1952, and to 32 at the present time.
>
> The Budget Bureau studied other appropriations, and authorizations, and found no comparable salary ceiling at all in its survey.

This is the only time it was ever attempted to be done. The Bureau of the Budget made the survey and found out this was very unusual. For some reason unknown to many there was a budget limitation put in. I know that reason. I have in my hand the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which was a predecessor of the Government Operations Committee. On that committee in 1945 that conducted hearings on the full employment bill, H.R. 2202, that I was the author of and was the first witness before that committee supporting it, the Honorable CLARE E. HOFFMAN was the ranking minority member. We have testimony here in this book of hearings of nearly 1,200 pages. I think you will find in that testimony that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], was a very active participant. He asked a lot of questions. His questions were always to the point and always very helpful.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And never answered.

Mr. PATMAN. He rendered a constructive service in connection with the full employment bill of 1946 by his constructive criticisms. But there was one thing: In order to get this bill, H.R. 2202, of the 79th Congress out we had to make certain concessions and agreements. One of them was a limitation on the salaries for the professional staff, which had never been done before in the history of the U.S. Government. Instead of having $2 million in here, it ought to be taken out then to be consistent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As the gentleman stated, I was on the committee and asked some questions. The purpose at that time, we were told we had to establish 8 million jobs to take up the slack in unemployment.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, we did, and they were achieved after this act was passed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They were?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is entitled to a great deal of credit for that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I remember that. But all we did was spend Government money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

HEARING BEFORE THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, H.R. 6094, APRIL 25, 1961, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Statement of Hon. HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin.

Statement of Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

Statement of Walter Heller, Chairman, Council of Economic Advisers.

A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 4 OF THE EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,

Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in room 1501, New House Office Building, Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives DAWSON, BROWN, FASCELL, SMITH, and HOFFMAN.

Also present: Elmer Henderson, counsel; James A. Lanigan, counsel; Arthur Perlman, investigator; Delores Fel Dotto, clerk; Orville Montgomery, investigator; and Philip Carlson, minority counsel.

Mr. DAWSON. This meeting of the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization is called to consider H.R. 6094 introduced by our colleague, Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, to amend the Employment Act of 1946.

The purpose of the bill is to eliminate the present ceiling on appropriations which may be made to the Council of Economic Advisers. The limit placed by the Employment Act of 1946 when it was established was $345,000, and it has not been changed since then. This limit, it should be noted, applies only to salaries of Council members and of officers and employees of the Council.

The legislation was recommended to the Congress by President John F. Kennedy.

Our first witness will be our colleague, HENRY S. REUSS.

STATEMENT OF HON. HENRY REUSS, OF WISCONSIN

Mr. REUSS. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear briefly in support of H.R. 6094. My interest in it stems not only from my membership in the full Government Operations Committee, but from my membership in the Joint Economic Committee, which is charged with general surveillance over the activities of the Council of Economic Advisers.

When the Employment Act of 1946 was enacted, it contained, as you have just said, Mr. Chairman, this quite unusual limitation of $345,000 in the annual appropriations for officers and staff of the Council.

For years, it worked perfectly well, and it did not inhibit the excellent job the Council was performing. But in the 15 years following the establishment of the Council, some seven pay increases have been voted by the Congress. In order to honor

these pay increases, the Council of Economic Advisers has had over the years, despite its increase in duties, to actually decrease its staff. Whereas at the start, they had something like 42 members, now there are only 32, of whom only 12 are top level professionals.

While its staff has been decreasing, the functions and responsibilities of the Council have been increasing. In the Joint Economic Committee, we have had an opportunity to observe the tremendous burden of reporting accurately on the Nation's economy, which is the duty of the Council on Economic Advisers.

More recently, President Eisenhower expanded the functions of the Council. Moreover President Kennedy has added responsibilities with respect to natural resources, public works, manpower, the economics of disarmament and other matters.

So far as I know, no other agency has a similar ceiling. One can understand why it was imposed in 1946. Here was an utterly new agency. No doubt, Congress wished to prevent empire building. If H.R. 6094 is enacted, and I hope it will be, Congress will, of course, still retain complete and full jurisdiction through the Appropriations Committee. The Congress will still be able to see that the Council does not get one penny more than it requires to carry out its functions, and the removal of the artificial ceiling will merely permit the Council to perform its expanded duties with greater effectiveness.

I accordingly hope that your subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, will view favorably H.R. 6094.

The executive branch through the President, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Bureau of the Budget, has indicated that this is in accordance with the President's program.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity.

Mr. BROWN. I have just one question in my mind. You evidently anicipated it. You have spoken somewhat on it.

I don't think there is any question but what more funds to this particular activity would be required and are required now and should be granted. The only question I do have in my mind is whether or not this committee, which is a legislative committee, and which under our system, as a legislative committee, should authorize expenditures; whether or not we should give such a broad grant of power to the Appropriations Committee of this House, just fixing an amount, and having them decide what is best; or whether we should first determine some ceiling, perhaps sufficiently high to meet any emergencies, any requirements. The general method here is for the legislative committees not only to give authorization but quite often, for the Appropriations Committee to cut down the amount appropriated under the authorization, which gives you a double-edged, or a double-barreled, review of these matters.

I am just wondering if the gentleman would be willing—he knows more about the activities of this agency than I do—if he would be willing to just amend this, to preserve the jurisdictional rights of this committee by fixing some limitation on the amount and then, if, in 15 years, as has been the case here, or 10 years or 5 years, there is necessity for increasing that limitation, that this committee would still have jurisdiction to decide it, rather than the Appropriations Committee.

Now, there is a great deal of complaint that reaches another committee, of which I am a member, which reaches the rest of us, that the Appropriations Committee sometimes exercises too much power and sometimes invades the rights of the legislative committee.

I am interested in whether or not it is not wise to protect the authority of this committee, at least, to review—to see—and not to just say, "We will give you an open door or a blank check here, members of the Appropriations Committee. You can decide what we should decide under normal legislative procedure."

I wonder what your reaction would be to a suggestion like that. I will let you name the figure.

Mr. REUSS. I have given a good deal of thought to this. Indeed, when I was drafting this bill, I wondered if it might not be possible to specify a ceiling, and I would like to give you, Mr. Brown, my reasons for not doing so.

First, as I have said, ceilings have not been imposed by legislative committees. That does not answer your question.

Mr. BROWN. I want to intervene and say, of course I don't agree with you, because 90 percent of the appropriations that are made in this Congress are made, are based, on authorizations before the legislative committees. Whether or not that is the case in our own committee, I won't say, but I certainly know that it is the case in Banking and Currency. They fix an authorization of so much money for this activity and that activity, and the Appropriations Committee is confined to that limitation. When it begins to make appropriations, sometimes you don't appropriate the full amount, but there is a limit, and I don't want to see us get in the position in this Congress where the legislative committee just begins to say, "Well, we just authorize whatever the Appropriations Committee decides is necessary."

Mr. REUSS. Well, my study indicated that the general procedure of Congress was not to impose such a limitation. However, let me go on to the next point which is really more important.

There is a great practical difficulty, Mr. BROWN, in imposing a dollar limitation. If you place it too low, you don't accomplish your purpose. If you place it too high, you provide an incentive to bump against the ceiling. The executive agency can come before the Appropriations Committee and say, "Well now, you surely should give us 95 percent of what we have been authorized."

But finally, I think this is the real answer to your point. The Government Operations Committee is by no means giving up our legislative jurisdiction over the Council of Economic Advisers by passing H.R. 6094.

Mr. BROWN. No. No.

Mr. REUSS. At any time, if we felt that the Appropriations Committee was going hog wild, we could not only attack its action on the floor, but more importantly, we could reimpose a ceiling at whatever level we want, at the existing $345,000, or at any other figure. I share the gentleman's concern for the preservation of the jurisdiction of this great committee. I think, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, this could probably be achieved by including in the report a reference to the point raised by Mr. BROWN, and a statement that, of course, we do not relinquish the committee's jurisdiction in any way.

Would that not answer your point?

Mr. BROWN. Well, you made a good argument. You always do, Mr. Barrister; but you are experienced enough around here to know that once we grant a general authority, that we never take it back from the Appropriations Committee, or you never limit something you already granted, which you have a full-fledged right to do. We don't do it. Practically, that is out of the picture. Once you grant this general authority for the Appropriations Committee to decide in its wisdom, how much an agency of the Government, which comes under the jurisdiction of this committee, should have for its operation, you are on your way, and our hands are tied from then on.

Now, under our system, as we have established it here with the legislative committee usually—and I said 90 percent of the time—fixing the limitation on an authorization, you still have a further safeguard—or have you—by the Appropriations Committee in case they feel that authorization is too much, or the amount authorized is not needed; and in many cases, as you know, where they do not vote for the complete authorization—that is, the Appropriations Committee and the Congress does not vote; but that is my only thought about it.

I think this additional help is needed; additional staff is needed for the Economic Advisers Group, but I just feel that we are making a mistake if we just give blanket authorization to the Appropriations Committee of this House to decide what we should decide, upon whom the responsibility is placed—that is, on us.

That is all.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. SMITH?

Mr. SMITH. No questions.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. FASCELL?

Mr. FASCELL. No questions.

Mr. DAWSON. Thank you very much.

Congressman PATMAN will be our next witness.

STATEMENT OF HON. WRIGHT PATMAN (TEXAS)

Mr. PATMAN. I will be brief, Mr. Chairman.

I only have a few words I would like to say.

First, I would like to disagree with my good distinguished friend from Ohio about the limitation, for the reason that there is no real need for it and if there was any threat, any possibility of the Appropriations Committee getting out of line, and doing something that is against the public interest, I would favor what the gentleman has suggested, but knowing the Appropriations Committee as we all do, there is no danger of them going hog wild on this deal and besides, you know an appropriation for this Council of Economic Advisers will first be tested by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. A judgment will be passed by that committee. Then it will go to the whole committee and then the whole committee passes it.

Mr. BROWN. I understand the procedure fairly well, after 25 years.

Mr. PATMAN. This is for the record.

Mr. BROWN. Well, I am glad the record understands it.

Mr. PATMAN. Then it goes to the House of Representatives, and it is passed on there. Then it goes to the Senate, and then it is referred to the committee over there, and it goes to a subcommittee and they pass judgment on it. Then it goes to the whole committee. It goes to the Senate floor, and then, almost invariably, there is a conference.

That is seven committees that have passed on this.

Mr. FASCELL. By that time, everybody is so confused, even the Executive doesn't know what they have.

Mr. PATMAN. The amount is so small in comparison with the great good that will be done, I don't think there is any danger.

Mr. BROWN. There are those among us who don't feel there should be any limitations or authorizations at all.

I would be very much interested in seeing what the gentleman may say about bills out of his own committee, as to whether or not he feels his own committee should have some power to limit appropriations and authorizations, or whether they should turn it over to the Committee on Appropriations to make those decisions for you, as well as for the rest of the country.

Mr. PATMAN. I think this should be viewed from a different light, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly, you are interested in this bill, but you are interested in the others, the other way.

Mr. PATMAN. It is so small in comparison with the great good that it does; it is important generally, to the economy.

Mr. BROWN. Mighty oaks from little acorns grow.

You heard that, did you not?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir. When this committee framed the Employment Act of 1946, it put a salary authorization of $345,000 to the Council of Economic Advisers. This sum was entirely adequate at that time. Through the years, new problems have developed. The principal problem is this: The price of a great many things has gone up since 1947, and happily or unhappily, so has the price of economists.

In the years between 1947 and 1952, the Council was able to retain 19 professional experts, in addition to the three Council members, and in addition to adequate clerical and statistical staff; but its budget was growing increasingly. At the time when President Kennedy took office, these 19 professional experts had shrunk to a total of only 11, or a drop of over 40 percent in the size of the professional staff.

When President Kennedy announced the appointment of Dr. Heller as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, he held a news conference on December 23 and stated that it was his plan to give the Council enlarged responsibilities in the new administration.

The President has said the same thing several times since and indeed, has given the Council several very large responsibilities which it never had before.

For example, I believe that the Council had recently been on a mission to Europe, along with Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve System and other high ranking officials, on matters concerning our balance-of-payments problems.

The President's announcement that the Council will also have top responsibility for matters pertaining to our natural resources, is another example of a new responsibility placed on the Council.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will give favorable consideration to H.R. 6094, introduced by Mr. REUSS, one of our colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee. The bill would simply remove the ceiling so that the Appropriations Committee can recommend the amount of appropriations it believes necessary for the Council. Dr. Heller has said that he would like to be able to build up the professional staff to the number of professional people the Council had in 1952 and this seems to me to be a very modest request.

As you know, the committee also created the Joint Economic Committee of the Senate and House when it succeeded in obtaining passage of the employment bill in 1946. It is my good fortune to be chairman of the Joint Economic Committee during this term of Congress, and I can assure you that we work very closely with the Council of Economic Advisers and know something about its needs.

I recommend H.R. 6094 without any reservation whatever, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BROWN. I have one question before I leave.

I have a pretty good memory, the same as the gentleman does. I am going to trust to my memory. If I recall correctly, when this act originally passed back in 1946, the gentleman from Texas was one of those who spoke in favor of that.

Mr. PATMAN. I was the author of the bill and the first to testify to it.

Mr. BROWN. I was going to get to that.

You were the author of the bill. You spoke for it in the House, but if I recall correctly—and don't you ever bet against my memory—you provided in there, a limitation, and at the same time, you never offered any amendment on the floor, or ever made any suggestion that the limitation be taken off, and that you have an open authorization for the Appropriations Committee to decide what amount they want to spend and so forth and so on.

All I can remark is that it is very peculiar, how the passage of a few years makes changes in some of my most beloved colleagues. You were for a limitation back at that time; you are against a limitation now.

Of course, I know that the gentleman will have some explanation because I have never been able, in all these many years we served together, to catch him without an alibi and always a good one.

Mr. PATMAN. May I answer that?

Mr. BROWN. Yes, you answer that.

Mr. PATMAN. This was pioneering legislation. We were plowing new ground. Three-hundred forty-five thousand dollars then would be equal to a million or two now; and in view of our experience and the importance of this fine group, I don't think there should be any objection to taking this limit off, knowing the legislative processes through which any increase would have to go. The public is certainly protected.

Mr. BROWN. May I say these days are the days of the New Frontier.

Of course, we must always have pioneers on the New Frontier. You were pioneering then. Why don't you continue to pioneer now and find out what may be necessary.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, experience is the best teacher. Experience is the best teacher, and experience has taught us.

Mr. BROWN. Some learn from it. Some don't. I learned when we give open authorizations, that it always costs the people more money than if we limit it.

Mr. PATMAN. This is so little—so little—considering its importance.

Mr. FASCELL. I have no questions.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. I just have one.

Mr. Patman, when you say Dr. Heller thinks the staff should be the same size as it was in 1952, do you know how much that would cost?

Mr. PATMAN. No, but of course, it would require an increase; but I don't know how much it would come to; whatever it is, we have done it for ourselves. You know, every time we increase the salaries, we make it possible for the Members to get the benefit of it. You see, that same thing we have done for ourselves, is not applied to this fine agency.

Mr. BROWN. You pioneered in that, I recall.

Mr. DAWSON. Thank you very much, Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. HOFFMAN?

Mr. HOFFMAN. At that time, in '46, we were trying to create 60 million jobs, were we not? Were we not? Was that not the drive?

Mr. PATMAN. No. The slogan was 60 million jobs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How many?

Mr. PATMAN. 60 million. That was the slogan; 60 million. That was all jobs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I happen to have been on the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. I know you were. I will never forget it.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Heller is the next witness.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Inasmuch as there is a quorum, may I be excused.

Mr. DAWSON. Certainly.

STATEMENT OF WALTER HELLER, CHAIRMAN, COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, you invited me to bring my colleagues Kermit Gordon and James Tobin.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the opportunity to be heard on H.R. 6094, which is the bill that proposes a removal of the overall ceiling of $345,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers, as it was contained in section 4–F of the Employment Act of 1946, and as otherwise has been pointed out, a ceiling that has been in effect ever since.

In the immediate sense, the need for the amendment in our view, grows out of the seven salary increases enacted by the Congress since 1946.

As my predecessor, Dr. Saunier stated, in the briefing materials that were prepared for the new Council at the request of General Persons of President Eisenhower's White House staff, and I quote:

"The only problem needing action early in 1961," that was with respect to the Council, "is the amendment to the Employment Act of 1946, to remove the $345,000 salary limitation for the Council.

"This amendment has been made necessary because of the seven Federal employees salary increase measures, and the statutory change in the Council members' salaries since the Employment Act was passed in 1946."

In other words merely to continue the Council's previous work would involve a lifting of the salary ceiling. Now, we have prepared for your use, three tables which I have several copies of for the members of the committee.

The first of these three tables shows the seven salary increases to which I referred a moment ago.

The second shows the development of the Council's budget over the years, and the third, I will refer to in a moment.

Beyond this, as the President pointed out in his letter of March 30, to the Speaker of the House, President Kennedy has asked the Council to take on additional responsibilities, going beyond the more general responsibilities.

The President, on the state of the economy and the policies to promote high level of employment and growth and economic stability, the President has asked us as the previous witness has pointed out, to perform specific economic staff functions with respect to natural resources and public works, manpower problems, economics of disarmament, and the broader functions relating to the international economic sphere.

This simply would not be possible within the present overall salary ceiling without impairing the performance of the Council's traditional functions.

Now, as the third table that I distributed shows, even with a considerable increase in the Council's budget since 1948, which is the real starting point there, Council staff has shrunk considerably since that time.

While average salaries in the GS–10 and GS–15 ranges have risen over 50 percent since 1947, that was roughly 70 percent since 1945, this does not count the super grades that were created, the Council's expenditures have risen only 37 percent in this period.

Some of the staff has shrunk, as pointed out before. The professional staff has shrunk from 19 in 1948, to 1952, to 11 in the fiscal year 1961.

The overall staff has shrunk from 42 in 1948 and 1949, to 39 in 1952, and to 32 at the present time.

The Budget Bureau studied other appropriations, and authorizations, and found no comparable salary ceiling at all in its survey, and we therefore respectfully request that the ceiling be removed, leaving it to the regular appropriations machinery to make annual determinations of the sums needed to carry out the Congress' work.

Thank you.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Fascell?

Mr. FASCELL. Who did you say made a study and found no other appropriations or authorizations acts that contained a salary limitation?

Dr. HELLER. The Budget Bureau made a survey to see whether there was any comparable ceiling on total salaries, to that in the Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. FASCELL. Do we have that survey?

Mr. HENDERSON. No.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I would think that that is the only pertinent thing we need, bearing on the question of whether or not we are going to remove the limitation, and we certainly ought to have it as part of the record, if we don't.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not familiar with the survey, Mr. Fascell, but from listening to Dr. Heller, my belief is this distinguishes between general appropriations, and appropriations for salaries and personnel. That may be the only agency of that kind. Of course, there are many agencies that have limitations.

Dr. HELLER. As far as the statutory ceiling is concerned, embedded in the act itself, they found no comparable ceiling. Please don't misunderstand me. I am not saying that their study necessarily covered every possibility, but they conducted a pretty lengthy study and found no comparable ceiling.

Mr. FASCELL. Well, I would, as an individual, I would take that into consideration a lot quicker than the logic that we need an increase, therefore, we ought to eliminate the authorization.

As far as I am concerned, that is non sequitur.

If it is an unusual case, the limitation does bear on practical aspects of the operation, appearing before two committees instead of one. That is something. I think those are factors which we ought to consider as a committee although I think indirectly, the necessity for an increase does bear on the question. But we can get this survey, can we not?

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. FASCELL. At least one of our own, if necessary.

Mr. HENDERSON. We will get the information.

I have one question.

Mr. Heller, in the event that the committee decided that it would merely raise the ceiling instead of removing the ceiling, do you have a figure in mind that you want to suggest?

Dr. HELLER. We have not come to any particular figure; no.

Mr. HENDERSON. Thank you.

Mr. FASCELL. In other words, you are hanging your hat all the way.

Mr. DAWSON. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Dr. HELLER. Thank you.

Mr. DAWSON. That concludes the witnesses on H.R. 6094.

(Thereupon, at 10:40 o'clock, p.m., the hearing on H.R. 6094 was adjourned.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can add any light to this discussion or not, but I will make a modest attempt to try to bring some degree of understanding out of this.

I feel that the result of the previous dialog has been somewhat confusing to Members who are not acquainted with this matter. I hasten to say I am not on the subcommittee which considered this matter, but I was on the committee at the time the Full Employment Act of 1946 was passed.

In that particular act we authorized in section 4–F of that act such sums as would be necessary to carry on the function of this Committee on Economic Advisers. That is a blanket authorization. It was given without any limit at all, with the exception of one limitation, and that limitation was that no more than $345,000 could be expended for the salaries of the three Commissioners and the professional employees, the secretaries, and so forth.

For several years we had an average of about 42 employees, including the 3 Commissioners. As these different salary raises came along we had to reduce the number of employees. So the 42 became 32 because of the limitation on salaries.

This bill is to take off the $345,000 limitation on salaries only. The blanket authorization for such necessary sums to carry on the work still remains.

Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa that if the Economic Advisers wanted to contract it could contract 5,000 people under existing authorizations to do the work by contract because the authorization is already there. But, what they are asking is not that. They are asking that this $345,000, after 14 years, be raised, and they are not asking that it be raised to $2 million. Their current budget request is around $500,000 for this purpose. But, the committee, after consultation with both sides—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is not here, but he participated in it as one of the ranking members of the committee—thought that rather than to come back to the Congress occasionally for this particular function, they would put a ceiling of $2 million in the place of $345,000. Now, this does not mean that they should use everything under it any more than a blanket authorization for necessary sums means that they should spend an inordinate sum, because in both instances, when the appropriation is justified, the salary schedule is given to the Committee on Appropriations, and the Committee on Appropriations at that time passes judgment on whether the amount shall be increased by 10 people or by 12 people. That is when the screening takes place.

This is merely a legislative convenience, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. It does not mean that they are going to spend $2 million, and when the appropriation comes to the floor, if they come in with any such program as that, I would help the gentleman strike it out, because that is not the intention. It is merely a legislative convenience, and a great deal has been made of this matter this afternoon, I think, through a misunderstanding of the purpose. This is the regular legislative process.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the $2 million figure was not a figure which was recommended by the witnesses but was rather a figure agreed on by the committee itself?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. It is a legislative convenience. It was not recommended by the economic adviser's representative. They did not want any kind of a limitation. I will say to the gentleman that in putting $2 million limitation in the bill, you do put a ceiling on authorization for salaries. There still is no ceiling on the other sums, as you can see by reading on page 2 of the report at the bottom of the page.

Now, if the gentleman wants to see what the money has been spent for, if he will turn to page 6, he will see that over the years the total positions have run from 43 in 1947 down to 32 in 1961, and that the Council members have remained at 3 all of these years and that the professional experts have run from 19 down to 11. That is on page 6. The secretarial positions have run from 17 to 16, and your consultants have run from 2 to 1 and your messengers have run from 2 to 1.

So, this is not anything out of the ordinary, and I hope the gentleman understands it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, it is out of the ordinary.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the committee amendment to strike out the $345,000 and insert in lieu thereof $2 million.

There is no testimony to indicate the need or to justify the amount of $2 million for increased salaries for the Council of Economic Advisers. This is just an invitation to employ more people and raise salaries.

I will support an increase in the amount authorized to $750,000 and trust the Committee on Appropriations to set the final figure which is necessary, but as one who consistantly opposes big government I shall vote against H.R. 6094 if on final passage it contains an authorization with a total as a salary ceiling in excess of the $750,000.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (f), of section 4, of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1023(f)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) To enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That subsection (f) of section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1023(f)) is amended by striking out '$345,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,000,000'."

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL to the committee amendment: On line 11, strike the figure "$2,000,000" and substitute the figure "$700,000".

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief. I want to assure you that this amendment is offered in good faith. Frankly, I do not know why anyone should object to this amendment, because the highest estimate of the use of the $2 million, which is in the original committee amendment, was not $2 million but $500,000.

In the course of the discussion this afternoon we have heard it said that

this agency limitation is unusual. In this I would concur. I would say it is unusual because it offers unusual good sense to have some limitation written in. This principle was adopted by the committee.

A couple of weeks ago the Department of the Interior brought to the House an appropriation bill for the next fiscal year. This bill was commended by Members on both sides of the aisle as a realistic, and excellent bill. The figures asked were low, and they were so specifically made. I think a part of the reason why that bill was such a good bill is the fact that the Committee on Interior under the direction of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] no longer uses the terminology, "There shall be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act," but instead specifies limitations in actual dollar figures.

This amendment would more than double the amount which is in the present limitation. Certainly there is no attempt to hamstring this Council. We are certainly trying to cooperate with the President. We are giving him more than 100-percent increase. At the same time we are also aiding him in his very earnest and sincere desire to cut down on the number of agencies, the number of people employed, and the expenditures of those agencies.

There is a matter of principle involved here. Someone has talked about the necessity of spending money on space shots, on getting to the moon, and so forth. I think this is as good a time as any to point out the fact that while we are shooting at the moon, while we have our head in the clouds, we can still keep our feet on the ground and get some business sense into this matter of appropriations.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment; and I shall be very brief.

I recognize that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], offers his amendment, as he says, in good faith. But from the standpoint of the gentleman from Wisconsin, this is not a constructive amendment, for this reason. The Chief of the Council of Economic Advisers for President Eisenhower, Dr. Saulnier, as the testimony before the House Committee on Government Operations shows, asked that the limitation be lifted entirely, so that the Council of Economic Advisers would be treated in the same manner as any other executive agency. This is what President Kennedy requested. The subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations which heard the bill originally agreed with the testimony of Chairman Heller of the Council of Economic Advisers that the ceiling should be lifted entirely, with the representation to that effect made by Dr. Saulnier, President Eisenhower's economic adviser, and with the request of President Kennedy. It was only when the measure reached the full Committee on Government Operations that, in the discussion between the minority and majority members, the decision was made to put in a limitation. That limitation was deliberately selected as $2 million in order to allow plenty of leeway and to obviate the necessity in the years to come of coming up here for further tinkering with the ceiling. The ceiling that is placed in this bill as amended by the House Committee on Government Operations is one that this House can live with. It is one that I am confident will be satisfactory to the administration and to the Council of Economic Advisers. But to change the ceiling now in H.R. 6094 to some other amount would simply load upon this bill a burden which it would be most time-consuming to bear.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, the House Committee on Appropriations is currently looking very closely at the appropriations request of the Council of Economic Advisers and will continue to do this. In answer to a question propounded a moment ago by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY], I made it very clear as a matter of legislative history that the imposition of any ceiling in the legislative authorization act is in no way intended to guide the House Committee on Appropriations, other than to impose an outside ceiling.

The main point of that ceiling is so that the House Committee on Government Operations may retain some legislative control. I appreciate the good faith in which the amendment has been offered by the gentleman from Iowa, but I trust that the House will not accept the amendment because it would interfere with the economical and efficient functioning of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Is this a correct quotation from the hearings? Dr. Heller was asked a question:

> In the event that the committee decided it would merely raise the ceiling instead of removing the ceiling, do you have a figure in mind that you want to suggest?

The reply by Dr. Heller was:

> We have not come to any particular figure.

Mr. REUSS. That is a correct statement. I would say to the gentleman further on that point, that after the discussion of a specific ceiling between the majority and minority members of the House Committee on Government Operations, which discussion occurred after Dr. Heller's testimony, I called Dr. Heller and mentioned the figure of $2 million, which, incidentally, had been suggested by the minority members and proposed in an amendment by the minority side. Dr. Heller's response to me in our telephone conversation was that while the administration would have preferred to have the Council of Economic Advisers treated as all other executive branch agencies are treated, namely, without any specific limitation on their salary expenditures, nevertheless the $2 million would be agreeable.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been no justification for an increase to $2 million. The gentleman from Wisconsin has said that probably all they need in the fiscal year is $500,000. So $700,000, the figure provided in the amendment offered by my colleague from Iowa, ought to be more than ample.

I heard the word "convenience" used several times this afternoon; that this $2 million figure is a convenient figure.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me about that convenient figure, or convenient act on the part of the committee?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was the one who used the term "legislative convenience." I meant by that that this was a $2 million limitation. It was put there preferable to no limitation at all, which was the request of the administration. The request of the administration was just to take off the ceiling. In conference between the majority members and the minority members on the committee, I think the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was very much interested in this matter, and we finally agreed that in place of just taking off the limitation completely we would put in the figure $2 million. Then if they needed to use this they would come in and justify it. Does that explain it to the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. No. I just do not get this business of convenience.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The convenience was that if they wanted to come in and ask for $500,000 this year, and then wanted to raise it to $600,000 next year, we would have to raise it next year.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps, the word should have been "comfortable."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No.

Mr. GROSS. This is a comfortable figure. It provides comfort for the committee and the Members of the House in that they would not have to exert a little energy and scrutinize this spending year by year.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, it is not the prerogative of the Committee on Government Operations to scrutinize these budget figures. It is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to scrutinize them and approve the schedule of salaries. It is not our prerogative.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman also mentioned consultants and said something to the effect that the council could put some 5,000 people on the payroll over there, if it wanted to. In connection with that, I want to say the gentleman well knows that this House would never tolerate the hiring of 5,000 consultants.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, the gentleman knows that I spoke in the context of the legislative intent here, and I will read the language where it says:

> (f) To enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated (except for the salaries of the members and the salaries of officers and employees of the Council) such sums as may be necessary.

The gentleman knows I did not mean they would bring in 5,000 or 1,000 or 2,000.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure the gentleman knows that the Congress would never tolerate the hiring of that many consultants.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The Committee on Appropriations would stop that just the same as they would stop any inordinate demand as to salaries.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking of the Congress. I still have faith enough in the Congress to believe it would not tolerate that kind of hiring.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And I would help the gentleman. I would help the gentleman because it would be unreasonable.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I would like to make this one observation as one who has served many years on the House Committee on Government Operations. Unfortunately, my experience in the past is that an authorization is used as a device to get the full appropriation when the matter goes before the Committee on Appropriations. I know the gentleman from Iowa has sat here on the floor on many occasions, and listened to that same argument.

Mr. GROSS. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and urge the adoption of the amendment by my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL]. I point out again that no one sponsoring this legislation has been able to tell the Members of the House how many employees are to be added to the payroll or what they will be paid out of the $1,655,000 that is sought to be added. This is another blank check operation that is becoming all too common in the House of Representatives.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the present administration has a great challenge. Conditions are not as good in the country as we would like for them to be. I do not know of any group that can make a greater contribution toward helping Congress to pass laws to bring this country back than the Council of Economic Advisers. Certain, I do not believe the Members of this House should want to restrict them on a few dollars, the expenditure of which would mean billions of dollars in gross national products and millions of unemployed people getting jobs. I want to appeal to the minority Members. I know the Members on the minority side. I do not dislike any Member on either side of this House. I have served with every one of them over a long period of time. I know they are sincere, honest and conscientious in their efforts to do what is best for the country. But sometimes we get into a situation where we do things we do not want to do. The minority, during this session of the Congress, and I hope you listen to this and I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] listens to this because this is going to apply to you, the minority whether you intended it or not, has gotten itself in a position in this Congress of fighting the unemployed and of being in opposition to the unemployed. Now you did not intend to do that, but you are in that position just in this session of the Congress. You are also in the position of opposing aid to the depressed and distressed areas. You are in opposition to them and vigorously fighting them. Just a few days ago, you came out even against pure water for the people and you voted against the antipollution bill. Polluted or unclean water has been known to cause polio. I would not accuse my friends on the Republican side of being for polio. I know they are not, but they did vote against the antipollution water bill.

Here you are now in the position of wanting to deny the President of the United States enough money to employ sufficient people as consultants and experts to advise him and the Congress as to how he can help bring this country back to a full employment basis. Now I do not believe on reflection that you want to add that to the record I was talking about. I do not believe you do, but you are in that position. I know you did not intend to get in that position.

Mr. HOFFMAN. of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are telling us about the minority and the position it has gotten itself in.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman will admit that he fought the distressed areas bill and that he fought the pure water bill by voting against the antipollution bill.

He was against antipollution.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I voted against every one of them.

Mr. PATMAN. Why certainly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let me tell you where you have gotten yourselves.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can take his own time for that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I will not yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then we will have a quorum, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My question is, then, have you not gotten yourselves in the position where your administration has promised practically everything and that you have appropriated far more than we have, and are ever increasing our debt?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely not; absolutely not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Next week you are coming in with a proposition to increase the debt still further.

Mr. PATMAN. During the Eisenhower administration we increased the debt every year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Sure you did.

Mr. PATMAN. Every year we increased the debt.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And you voted for it.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not so sure that I did.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, you did. You voted for every spending measure that we have ever had, every one of them, and cried on the floor of the House because we did not appropriate more.

Mr. PATMAN. So I plead with the Members of the minority not to carry this thing as far as you have today where you are against the unemployed, against depressed areas, against pure water; now you want to deny the President the power and privilege of just selecting enough consultants and experts to help restore this country to the economic level that it should be restored to.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Not right now.

Let me plead with you, I am pleading with the minority now: Did you know that out of the hundreds and thousands of agencies and commissions in the position comparable to this Council of Economic Advisers, that this is the only one in the history of the U.S. Government, from 1789, that has ever had a restriction placed upon it? It has always been left up to the Appropriations Committee.

So instead of placing another restriction upon it why not remove this one? Why do you want to hobble, why do you want to hamstring, why do you want to limit the Executive in his efforts to help bring the country back and to give the unemployed jobs? Do you want to go on record again as against the unemployed the third time?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment because I believe the limitation would hamper efforts to do something about the serious problem of unemployment in this country.

My understanding is that less than one-half of the $2 million would be necessary. But during the discussion I could not help but feel that the opposition to the legislation was not so much because of the ceiling requested as it was opposition to the implementation of the full Employment Act of 1946.

When we talk about the cost of legislation of this kind it seems to me we fail to recognize the tremendous loss in productivity and the untold billions lost in real wealth because of the millions of unemployed in our country.

Only 32 employees are on the staff of the economic advisers. It seems to me that is a very small number to do the important job which needs to be done.

I was interested in a statement which I believe is true that the John Birch Society has many more employees on its staff of economic advisers.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. KYL. The gentleman misses the motives for the amendment such as I have offered. I would just ask a couple of questions of the distinguished gentleman, who I believe is a member of the Committee on House Administration: When the Committee on Government Operations comes to the Committee on House Administration to ask for funds, and justifies $500,000 expenditure for this year, does the Committee on House Administration then suggest that they be given a million dollars so they can be

safe, so that it cannot be said they were hamstringing our group?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. No. I think that is a much different situation than we have here today. Let me say that I am not questioning the motives of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota who introduced the amendment. I must repeat, however, that I could not help but feel that the real objection to this legislation is because it implements the provisions in the Unemployment Act of 1946.

Mr. KYL. This is an allegation with which we cannot agree. To say that someone votes for or against a measure because he is for or against unemployment, or anything like that, is absolutely inexcusable.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I have not made that statement.

Mr. KYL. When I vote on a measure, the depressed areas bill, or anything else, I vote in the way which I think will do the greatest good for the greatest number of people in the country. Naturally the gentleman from Pennsylvania would not always agree with me, but I certainly would never impugn his motives or desires.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I do not impugn the motives of the gentleman. I believe all of the Members who participated in this discussion are sincere. They have a right to oppose legislation, for whatever reason they may have and to oppose the objectives of the Full Employment Act of 1946. As a matter of philosophy such legislation is opposed by conservative groups. I respect that right. I would not say that anyone in this House favors unemployment. We differ, however, on what should be done about it, or if the problem should be ignored and to trust that it will suddenly disappear.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman referred to the staff of the John Birch Society. Can he tell me how many they have on the staff of the ADA, the Americans for Democratic Action?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I do not know. I do not belong to the ADA.

Mr. GROSS. And I do not belong to the John Birch Society either.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Members of the John Birch Society, I believe, can well afford a big paid staff. They have great funds at their disposal. That is something I am sure that the ADA does not have.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise as a result of the inferences that were stated a few moments ago that those of us who cast votes in the negative on some of these bills do so apparently, according to the inferences, because we are not concerned about unemployment, we are not concerned about distressed areas. But I say the reverse is true. Many of the "no" votes that are cast on this side of the aisle, and some on the other side of the aisle, on this legislation are cast out of a most deep concern for the unemployed.

There are many of us who are not at all convinced that the answer to our economic problems lies in the expansion of Government bureaus or by increasing Government expenditures. There are some of us who believe that historic evidence indicates that expansion of the bureaucracy is by no means the way of solving the problems of the unemployed. We are mindful of the various bureaus that were expanded endlessly in the thirties under the pretext of solving our economic problems. You all remember the conglomeration of alphabet soup of agencies that was imposed on the American people. The fact remains that in spite of the great expansion of the bureaucracy that we have had, we have not solved the unemployment problem. By 1937 we had not appreciably solved the problem and the wartime economy pulled us out. This same thing happened again with the advance of the Korean war. There are those of us who sincerely believe that the siphoning off of the funds of the American people to be spent by the bureaucracy is harmful to the challenge of solving the problem of the unemployed and is detrimental to the entire economy. There are those of us who sincerely believe, on the basis of a study of economics, that the best solution to the problem of unemployment in depressed areas, the best answer to solidifying the economy, is to cut down on the bureaus and put a much greater restriction upon the social planners who impose upon America their ideas of what they think is best for the American people. I suggest when we ask for $2 million authorization, what we are obviously doing by precedent is saying you may spend up to $2 million, when facts presented here show that $700,000 would be most adequate. I suggest that it is the responsibility of the House of Representatives, of this Congress, to support a reasonable ceiling, one that we need, and I do not think that it is an imposition upon the Congress or its committees to take it up again next year or the following year or every year. I say it is the responsibility of the Congress not to write a blank check for the next 5 years but to meet our responsibility year by year in such an event.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would like to associate myself with the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana. I think he has brought an extreme amount of clarity to this debate. I would like to commend him for the very fine remarks that he has made.

Mr. BRUCE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PELLY) there were—ayes 44, noes 59.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6094) to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946, pursuant to House Resolution 276, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 6094) to the Committee on Government Operations with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 1, line 11, strike out the figure "$2,000,000" and insert the figure "$700,000".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Did the Speaker say that the "noes" had it?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 152, nays 196, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—152

Adair	Bass, N.H.	Bromwell
Alger	Bates	Brooks, La.
Anderson, Ill.	Battin	Broomfield
Arends	Beermann	Broyhill
Ashbrook	Belcher	Bruce
Auchincloss	Bell	Cahill
Avery	Bennett, Mich.	Chiperfield
Ayres	Berry	Church
Baker	Betts	Collier
Baldwin	Bolton	Conte
Barry	Bow	Corbett

Cramer	Kyl	Riehlman
Cunningham	Langen	Rivers, S.C.
Curtin	Latta	Robison
Curtis, Mass.	Lennon	Rousselot
Dague	Lindsay	St. George
Davis, James C.	Lipscomb	Saylor
	McCulloch	Schadeberg
Derounian	McDonough	Schenck
Derwinski	McIntire	Scherer
Dole	McMillan	Schneebeli
Dominick	McVey	Schweiker
Dorn	MacGregor	Schwengel
Dowdy	Mailliard	Scott
Ellsworth	Marshall	Scranton
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Seely-Brown
Findley	Martin, Nebr.	Short
Flynt	Mason	Shriver
Garland	Mathias	Sibal
Goodell	May	Siler
Goodling	Meader	Smith, Calif.
Griffin	Michel	Springer
Gross	Miller, N.Y.	Stafford
Gubser	Milliken	Taber
Haley	Minshall	Taylor
Hall	Moore	Teague, Calif.
Harrison, Wyo.	Moorehead, Ohio	Thomson, Wis.
Harsha		Tollefson
Harvey, Ind.	Morse	Tuck
Harvey, Mich.	Murray	Tupper
Hiestand	Nelsen	Utt
Hoeven	Nygaard	Van Zandt
Hoffman, Ill.	O'Konski	Weaver
Hoffman, Mich.	Osmers	Westland
Horan	Ostertag	Whalley
Hosmer	Pelly	Whitten
Jensen	Pirnie	Widnall
Johansen	Poff	Williams
Jonas	Quie	Wilson, Calif.
Kearns	Ray	Younger
Keith	Reifel	
Kitchin	Rhodes, Ariz.	

NAYS—196

Abbitt	Granahan	Moeller
Abernethy	Grant	Monagan
Addabbo	Gray	Montoya
Addonizio	Green, Oreg.	Moorhead, Pa.
Albert	Green, Pa.	Morgan
Alexander	Griffiths	Morris
Andrews	Hagan, Ga.	Moss
Anfuso	Hagen, Calif.	Moulder
Ashley	Halpern	Multer
Ashmore	Hansen	Murphy
Aspinall	Harding	Natcher
Bailey	Hardy	Nix
Baring	Harris	Norrell
Barrett	Hébert	O'Brien, Ill.
Bass, Tenn.	Hechler	O'Brien, N.Y.
Beckworth	Hemphill	O'Hara, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Herlong	O'Hara, Mich.
Blatnik	Holifield	Olsen
Boland	Holland	O'Neill
Boykin	Huddleston	Passman
Brademas	Hull	Patman
Breeding	Ichord, Mo.	Perkins
Brewster	Ikard, Tex.	Peterson
Brown	Jarman	Pfost
Burke, Ky.	Jennings	Philbin
Burke, Mass.	Joelson	Pike
Burleson	Johnson, Calif.	Poage
Byrne, Pa.	Johnson, Md.	Price
Cannon	Johnson, Wis.	Pucinski
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Rabaut
Chenoweth	Jones, Mo.	Reuss
Clark	Judd	Rhodes, Pa.
Cohelan	Karsten	Rivers, Alaska
Colmer	Karth	Rodino
Cook	Kastenmeier	Rogers, Colo.
Cooley	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Daniels	Kilday	Rooney
Davis, John W.	Kilgore	Roosevelt
Davis, Tenn.	King, Calif.	Rostenkowski
Dawson	King, Utah	Rutherford
Delaney	Kirwan	Ryan
Denton	Kluczynski	Santangelo
Diggs	Kornegay	Saund
Dingell	Kowalski	Selden
Donohue	Lane	Shelley
Downing	Lankford	Shipley
Doyle	Lesinski	Sikes
Dulski	Loser	Sisk
Elliott	McCormack	Smith, Iowa
Everett	McDowell	Smith, Miss.
Farbstein	McFall	Staggers
Fascell	McSween	Steed
Feighan	Macdonald	Stephens
Fisher	Machrowicz	Stratton
Flood	Mack	Stubblefield
Fogarty	Madden	Sullivan
Fountain	Mahon	Teague, Tex.
Frazier	Matthews	Thomas
Friedel	Merrow	Thompson, N.J.
Gallagher	Miller, Clem	Thompson, Tex.
Gary	Miller, George P.	Thornberry
Gathings	Mills	Toll
Giaimo		Trimble
Ullman	Watts	Young
Vanik	Wickersham	Zablocki
Wallhauser	Wright	

NOT VOTING—84

Alford	Fallon	Norblad
Andersen, Minn.	Finnegan	Pilcher
	Fino	Pillion
Becker	Ford	Powell
Blitch	Forrester	Rains
Boggs	Frelinghuysen	Randall
Bolling	Fulton	Riley
Bonner	Garmatz	Roberts
Bray	Gavin	Rogers, Tex.
Brooks, Tex.	Gilbert	Roudebush
Buckley	Glenn	St. Germain
Byrnes, Wis.	Halleck	Sheppard
Carey	Harrison, Va.	Slack
Casey	Hays	Smith, Va.
Cederberg	Healey	Spence
Celler	Henderson	Thompson, La.
Chamberlain	Holtzman	Van Pelt
Clancy	Inouye	Vinson
Coad	Kelly	Walter
Corman	Keogh	Weis
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Wharton
Daddario	King, N.Y.	Whitener
Dent	Knox	Willis
Devine	Laird	Wilson, Ind.
Dooley	Landrum	Winstead
Durno	Libonati	Yates
Dwyer	Magnuson	Zelenko
Edmondson	Morrison	
Evins	Mosher	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Becker for, with Mr. Magnuson against.

Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Daddario against.

Mr. Chamberlain for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Devine for, with Mr. Corman against.

Mr. Dooley for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Ford for, with Mr. Libonati against.

Mr. Knox for, with Mr. Gilbert against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Van Pelt for, with Mr. Holtzman against.

Mr. Alford for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mr. Van Zandt for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Wharton for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. King of New York for, with Mr. St. Germain against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Healey against.

Mrs. Weis for, with Mr. Yates against.

Mr. Pillion for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Clancy for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Laird for, with Mr. Zelenko against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Durno for, with Mr. Carey against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mrs. Kelly against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Norblad.

Mr Rains with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Riley with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Inouye with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 209, nays 137, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—209

Abbitt	Addonizio	Alexander
Addabbo	Albert	Andrews
Anfuso	Harding	Norrell
Ashley	Hardy	O'Brien, Ill.
Aspinall	Harris	O'Brien, N.Y.
Ayres	Harvey, Mich.	O'Hara, Ill.
Bailey	Hébert	O'Hara, Mich.
Baring	Hechler	Olsen
Bass, Tenn.	Hemphill	O'Neill
Beckworth	Herlong	Ostertag
Bennett, Fla.	Holifield	Passman
Bennett, Mich.	Holland	Patman
Blatnik	Huddleston	Perkins
Boland	Hull	Peterson
Brademas	Ichord, Mo.	Pfost
Breeding	Ikard, Tex.	Philbin
Brewster	Jarman	Pike
Brooks, La.	Jennings	Poage
Brown	Joelson	Price
Burke, Ky.	Johnson, Calif.	Pucinski
Burke, Mass.	Johnson, Md.	Rabaut
Burleson	Johnson, Wis.	Reuss
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Pa.
Chelf	Judd	Riehlman
Chenoweth	Karsten	Rivers, Alaska
Clark	Karth	Robison
Cohelan	Kastenmeier	Rodino
Colmer	Kee	Rogers, Colo.
Cook	Kilday	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Kilgore	Rooney
Curtis, Mass.	King, Calif.	Roosevelt
Daniels	King, Utah	Rostenkowski
Davis, John W.	Kirwan	Rutherford
Davis, Tenn.	Kitchin	Ryan
Dawson	Kluczynski	Santangelo
Delaney	Kornegay	Saund
Denton	Kowalski	Saylor
Diggs	Lane	Selden
Dingell	Lankford	Shelley
Donohue	Lennon	Shipley
Downing	Lesinski	Sikes
Doyle	Loser	Sisk
Dulski	McCormack	Smith, Iowa
Dwyer	McDowell	Smith, Miss
Elliott	McFall	Smith, Va.
Everett	McSween	Staggers
Farbstein	Macdonald	Steed
Fascell	Machrowicz	Stephens
Feighan	Mack	Stratton
Fisher	Mahon	Stubblefield
Flood	Mailliard	Sullivan
Fogarty	Matthews	Taylor
Fountain	Merrow	Teague, Tex.
Frazier	Miller, Clem	Thomas
Friedel	Miller, George P.	Thompson, La.
Gallagher		Thompson, N.J.
Gary	Mills	Thompson, Tex.
Gathings	Moeller	Thornberry
Giaimo	Monagan	Toll
Granahan	Montoya	Trimble
Grant	Moorhead, Pa.	Tuck
Gray	Morgan	Ullman
Green, Oreg.	Morris	Vanik
Green, Pa.	Moss	Wallhauser
Griffiths	Moulder	Watts
Hagan, Ga.	Multer	Whitten
Hagen, Calif.	Murphy	Wickersham
Haley	Murray	Wright
Halpern	Natcher	Young
Hansen	Nix	Zablocki

NAYS—137

Abernethy	Dague	Kyl
Adair	Davis, James C.	Langen
Alger		Latta
Anderson, Ill.	Derounian	Lindsay
Arends	Derwinski	Lipscomb
Ashbrook	Dole	McCulloch
Ashmore	Dominick	McIntire
Auchincloss	Dorn	McMillan
Avery	Dowdy	McVey
Baker	Ellsworth	MacGregor
Baldwin	Fenton	Marshall
Barry	Findley	Martin, Mass.
Bass, N.H.	Flynt	Martin, Nebr.
Bates	Frelinghuysen	Mathias
Battin	Garland	May
Beermann	Goodell	Meader
Belcher	Goodling	Michel
Bell	Griffin	Miller, N.Y.
Berry	Gross	Millikin
Betts	Gubser	Minshall
Bolton	Hall	Moore
Bow	Harrison, Wyo.	Morse
Broomfield	Hasha	Nelsen
Broyhill	Harvey, Ind.	Nygaard
Bruce	Hiestand	O'Konski
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoeven	Osmers
Cahill	Hoffman, Ill.	Pelly
Cannon	Hoffman, Mich.	Pirnie
Chiperfield	Horan	Poff
Church	Hosmer	Quie
Collier	Jensen	Ray
Conte	Johansen	Reifel
Corbett	Jonas	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cramer	Jones, Mo.	Rivers, S.C.
Cunningham	Kearns	Rousselot
Curtin	Keith	St. George

Schadeberg	Shriver	Tupper
Schenck	Sibal	Utt
Scherer	Siler	Van Zandt
Schneebeli	Smith, Calif.	Weaver
Schweiker	Springer	Westland
Schwengel	Stafford	Whalley
Scott	Taber	Widnall
Scranton	Teague, Calif.	Williams
Seely-Brown	Thomson, Wis.	Wilson, Calif.
Short	Tollefson	Younger

NOT VOTING—86

Alford	Finnegan	Mosher
Andersen, Minn.	Fino	Norblad
Barrett	Ford	Pilcher
Becker	Forrester	Pillion
Blitch	Fulton	Powell
Boggs	Garmatz	Rains
Bolling	Gavin	Randall
Bonner	Gilbert	Riley
Boykin	Glenn	Roberts
Bray	Halleck	Rogers, Tex.
Bromwell	Harrison, Va.	Roudebush
Brooks, Tex.	Hays	St. Germain
Buckley	Healey	Sheppard
Carey	Henderson	Slack
Casey	Holtzman	Spence
Cederberg	Inouye	Van Pelt
Celler	Kelly	Vinson
Chamberlain	Keogh	Walter
Clancy	Kilburn	Weis
Coad	King, N.Y.	Wharton
Corman	Knox	Whitener
Curtis, Mo.	Laird	Willis
Daddario	Landrum	Wilson, Ind.
Dent	Libonati	Winstead
Devine	McDonough	Yates
Dooley	Madden	Zelenko
Durno	Magnuson	
Edmondson	Mason	
Evins	Moorehead, Ohio	
Fallon	Morrison	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. Becker against.

Mr. Daddario for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Chamberlain against.

Mr. Corman for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Dooley against.

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Fino against.

Mr. Libonati for, with Mr. Ford against.

Mr. Gilbert for, with Mr. Knox against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Holtzman for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Alford against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Wharton against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. King of New York against.

Mr. St. Germain for, with Mr. Glenn against.

Mr. Healey for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Yates for, with Mrs. Weis against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Pillion against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Roudebush against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Mr. Zelenko for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Carey for, with Mr. Durno against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Evins with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Norbald.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Riley with Mrs. Dwyer.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Winstead with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Inouye with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.

Mr. NELSEN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR INTER-AMERICAN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC COOPERATION PROGRAM AND CHILEAN RECONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM, 1961

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 6518, an act making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and disagree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain to the House what the amendment does?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is only one amendment fixing a ceiling on the interest rates that can be charged by the recipients of loans from the fund. I have discussed this amendment with the several Department heads concerned, and they tell me they cannot live with it, and that if we are going to get along with the program they would have to have the right to establish the interest rates.

So I am not asking for a conference. I am merely disagreeing to the Senate amendment and hope the Senate will accept the House version of the bill.

Mr. TABER. You mean see the light?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the committee today and to include extraneous matter; also to include the testimony of three witnesses who appeared before the Government Operations Committee on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I just want to observe that this would be the first time the House would have the opportunity to know what the hearings contained.

Mr. PATMAN. I read a part of them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed, H.R. 6094.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I was detained on official business and missed answering two rollcalls today. However, had I been present I would have voted no on the motion to recommit and aye on final passage.

THE UNITED STATES MUST IMPROVE ITS RATE OF PROGRESS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, sooner or later, every problem is discussed at the center of our National Government—Washington, D.C.

As a Member of Congress I have learned that, out of the confusion of issues, each clamoring for attention, the real ones finally stand forth, bold and clear, and inescapable.

No one questions the need for strong, efficient, and well-balanced military forces to protect our national security.

The American people also realize that we must have constructive leadership in our foreign policy for the sake of human freedom and opportunity in a changing world.

It is not so apparent to most people that the growth of the American economy upon which all else depends is not as good as it should be.

Experts tell us that the gross national product should increase by at least 4 percent each year. But our rate of economic growth only averaged 2.4 percent during the 8-year period 1953–60.

As our population is increasing by about 3,500,000 annually—and more young people are looking for jobs—the present unemployment of plant and manpower poses a serious problem.

We recovered from the recession of 1958, but did not then go forward.

We are emerging from the 1960–61 recession that saw unemployment rise to more than 5,500,000, but unless we take steps to stimulate the economy, we shall not provide openings for all those who are able and willing to work.

The rapid development of automation or machines to do the jobs once done by men means that we must create new jobs to replace those that have been lost.

Some Americans wonder how we can do this, when we already have overproduction in certain lines like the automotive industry, and agriculture.

Although we have been doing well in providing for the expanding needs of the American consumer, we have been neglecting the public areas of development. We have tens of millions of cars, but

not enough modern highways to accommodate them.

We have proceeded on the assumption that, except for an occasional new building here and there, the aging structures in our cities would last forever. We have not kept up with the construction program to provide facilities for the rapid growth of our school-age population.

Generally speaking, we have not been investing enough in new plant and equipment to produce the things we need. This is noticeable in the once-prosperous textile communities of New England. Most of the five- and six-story mills, now occupied in part by second-rate enterprises that filled the vacuum after the textile industry migrated to the South, are 50 and 60 years old.

The Federal Government, through area redevelopment legislation that will be enacted at this session, will help those communities to replace or modernize their industrial properties, and retrain the displaced workers in new skills.

In order to provide for public as well as private needs, we must not only produce food and clothing and shelter, but must utilize the services of many people.

With a rising standard of living we are coming to depend more and more upon the services of the doctor, the teacher, and the scientist, and other specialists.

It is obvious that we must encourage and assist higher education if we are to have enough trained personnel to meet our modern needs.

To make up the shortages in health and educational facilities will require the effort that in turn will create more opportunities.

While we have been occupied with the production of consumer goods, services, and even luxuries, we have overlooked the spreading blight in the heart of many communities.

As the slum areas have spread, they have pulled our cities backward, causing health and social problems, and economic deterioration.

One of the major challenges facing us is the job of eliminating slums and replacing them with a bright spacious environment for people and business that will renew hope and stimulate further progress.

There is a deficit of good housing for Americans in the middle and lower income brackets. The public housing projects, and the current emphasis on projects for the aged, have solved only part of the problem. Twenty-six years ago the Federal Housing Administration was organized to direct money into the home market. Mortgage credit was made available on easy terms to anyone who would build specified kinds of housing. Many of the homes we see in the suburbs might not be there but for this encouragement and assistance.

As the population rises, the rate of economic growth must do even better percentagewise, to meet the private demand of individuals and to enable the various levels of government to fulfill their responsibilities.

With more people there will be a greater demand for goods and services, and more employment opportunities.

Reducing the average of hours worked per week, although this will come gradually over a period of time, is not the one and only solution because it would simply adjust hours worked in relation to the gross national product.

What we seek is a steadily expanding economy in which more people will participate.

The uneven prosperity of recent years, impressive at first glance, but contradicted by a higher than average level of unemployment indicates a sluggish economy that is falling short of its real capacity.

We have the manpower resources and the improving technology to provide for a higher standard of living, and essential public programs, if we put these assets to work.

It is estimated that our population will increase from 180 to 208 million—up 28 million by 1970.

The number of workers will grow faster, by nearly 20 percent, reaching a total of 87 million within the same period. Young workers will account for a major share of the changes in the working population, and the number of women workers will increase at nearly twice the rate for men, until one out of every three workers will be a woman.

Even now, there are more people employed in the service industries—trade, government, transportation, public utilities, finance, insurance, real estate, and all other services—than are employed in the production industries which include manufacturing, agriculture, construction, and mining.

As our technology advances, proportionately fewer workers will be needed to produce the goods we need. More workers will be sought to provide the increasing services required as our standard of living goes up.

During the decade of the 1950's, professional, office, and sales workers as a group exceeded for the first time in our history the number of persons employed in manual occupations—skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled jobs.

During the coming decade, this trend will continue. The fastest growth will occur among professional and technical occupations, especially engineers, scientists, and technicians. Among the manual occupations, the need for skilled craftsmen will increase, but the number of unskilled jobs will stay about the same, continuing their long-term relative decline.

A survey conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor shows that these anticipated changes will result from several major causes:

The continuing shift from an agricultural economy to one that is predominantly industrial.

The rapid expansion in research and development activities.

The tremendously rapid increase in application of technological improvements.

The increasing size and complexity of business organization.

The widespread growth of recordkeeping among all types of enterprises.

The growing need for educational and medical services.

To some Americans, Khrushchev's boast that the Soviet Union's production would equal that of the United States in 1967 was reason enough for shifting our economic effort into high gear. To others, the military reason was more urgent. Defense, at a time like this, cannot be bought in a bargain basement.

The strongest reason is the need of the United States and its people. Defense, aid to underdeveloped nations, prestige, and every other consideration depends upon the economic growth and economic leadership of our country.

Any American with an observing eye can see right in his own community the many needs that have been postponed year after year. But, how to take up the slack?

Through private and public demand.

We must first revise tax and credit policies and thus release the enterprising spirit and energy of our production and service industries. This will create jobs for those who are now unemployed.

The Federal Government, by raising the minimum wage, and by increasing social security benefits will extend and strengthen purchasing power.

As Leon H. Keyserling, a Washington economist, and former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers says: "It is estimated that public outlays have a multiplier effect, with each additional dollar of public spending adding $2 or more to the private spending stream. Thus, the $30 billion increase in public outlays—from 1959 to 1964—would add $60 billion or more to private spending of all types."

No nation, no matter how prosperous, is economically sound and progressive while more than 6 percent of its labor force is unemployed, and 10 to 15 percent of its productive resources are idle.

This unused capacity, human as well as material, has slowed our rate of economic growth.

There is so much to be done, and we have the ability to do it, but we shall not succeed unless we help our economy to run at a level that is close to full production.

To this we must bring a sense of purpose, urgency, and pride.

The challenge confronting the United States, now in competition with other economic and political systems, is to prove that freemen, with their rights and responsibilities, can show the way to humanity by achieving the highest levels of economic performance and social justice.

This calls for the maximum employment of our skills and our aspirations.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR., WORLD'S FIRST TRUE ASTRONAUT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 5, 1961, from the capsule named "Freedom 7" that was curving 115 miles above the earth, came this radio message from its commander, Alan B. Shepard, Jr.: "Switching to manual controls."

The development of space vehicles that will open the way to the exploration of distant planets has passed a historic milestone. The free world, true to its mission, is determined that man must be the master of this technological progress, and not its robot slave.

We were thrilled and inspired by pioneer Shepard's accomplishment because the work and intelligence and faith of so many thousands of individuals found fulfillment in the building of a complex and powerful machine that carried one of their fellow human beings beyond the confines of this earth, lifting him toward the limitless frontiers of the universe.

Americans prayed, not only for the efficient functioning of the vehicle that would carry him up to and safely return him from his courageous venture, but they prayed for the man, Alan Shepard, who represented the aspirations of all freemen.

Not in conspiratorial secrecy to hide previous failures; not with the soulless intent to exploit science for the regimentation of life; but in open and honest view of observers from all over the world, the United States launched the first space vehicle that was under human control. And we will make the knowledge gained from this exploration available to all in the name of man's freedom and dignity under the creative fatherhood of God.

Commander Shepard was born in Derry, N.H., which is only 18 miles from my home city of Lawrence, Mass.

As a boy he learned to do things for himself and to test his venturesome spirit with his companions in the streams and wooded hills of the New Hampshire countryside.

During his school years he was trained by conscientious teachers in the discipline of knowledge and in the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. In this Yankee community of 6,987 people where all the folks know one another as friends and neighbors, "town meeting" democracy, self-reliance, and personal integrity are values that are nourished by example.

From this wholesome environment that encourages and helps a boy to do his best, Alan Shepard went on to graduate from the U.S. Naval Academy, to win honors as an outstanding naval officer, and to become the first man ever to maneuver a craft in space.

Commander Shepard carries forward an old but ever-young American tradition; to part the curtains leading to the unknown, in man's search for a greater understanding of himself and his total environment.

We congratulate this daring explorer who has encouraged all of us to go forward toward discovery.

KENNEDY IS ON THE MOVE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the "bloody nose" in Cuba, and the strategic retreat from Laos, obscure the fact that President Kennedy who took over the administration of a nation that was "marking time" up to 3½ months ago, is working coolly and thoroughly to strengthen the United States before assuming the initiative.

On the domestic front, he has succeeded with legislation to repair the damage caused by the receding recession. Extension of unemployment compensation; a higher and broader minimum wage; and redevelopment aid for labor-surplus areas are programs to help the human beings who have suffered from the policy of economic drift. Forthcoming are measures to stimulate business recovery and growth.

President Kennedy is charting a course of progress for health, education, acceleration of our missile and space programs, coupled with a determination to negotiate international differences from a position of moral and military strength.

It is obvious, as he confers with leaders in all fields, that he is developing national unity to back up the realistic initiative in world affairs that he will propose, implement, and lead.

American public opinion is building up to support him in these objectives.

As an illustration of this action trend, I bring you the editorial titled: "J.F.K. Measures Up" from a recent issue of the Lynn Sunday Post, which serves readers in the metropolitan area of Lynn, Mass.

J.F.K. MEASURES UP

Our recent space achievement and the possible establishment of Derry, N.H., as a national shrine may have a tranquilizing effect upon those citizens who were concerned about the Nation's loss of face over the ill-fated Cuban revolt.

Possibly the record of the Kennedy administration may appear more attractive in the second 100 days of the stewardship of the man from Massachusetts. Certainly those first 100 days struck terror in the hearts of editorial writers in many sections of the country, but a review might show that they were terror stricken from the very moment that the glamorous locks of John Fitzgerald Kennedy began to emerge above the national political level.

Sober-minded Americans, dedicated to the future peace and progress of our Nation, are not concerned over comparing the performance of President Kennedy with that of his predecessors in any given period. What they are concerned about is this: "Is he making a capable leader of the free world?" Most of those not blinded by political torment or twisted philosophy will probably agree that the President has measured up completely and seems well equipped to handle the gargantuan tasks confronting him.

Much has been said of Cuba, but it must be pointed out that President Kennedy did not create the Cuban dilemma. He inherited it. The President had a decision to make on the Cuban crisis, and he made it. Maybe it did not turn out so good. It all depends on how one looks at it.

He could have done nothing, but that might have been worse. Experienced diplomatic sources believe that nothing will aid in eliminating the Castro regime save the intervention of armed U.S. troops. That is a pretty big decision for President Kennedy to make. There is small wonder that he has taken his time on it. War is not pleasant. We need not be reminded of that fact.

President Kennedy faced up to his decision in the French crisis when the regime of General de Gaulle was threatened by the Algerian rebels. This decision turned out well.

On the homefront the President's program is going forward smoothly. The new minimum wage law has been enacted, and aid has been extended to depressed areas. Health and medical care for our elderly folks seems assured.

These measures should not be considered incongruous to the President's remarks that the American people will be called upon to make sacrifices. They are simply an effort to alleviate the plight of those persons who have been making the sacrifices to date. If we, as taxpayers, are called upon to donate a little more money to the Government to support these improvements, we then will be in the position of joining in the sacrifices.

TRIBUTE TO DR. THEODORE VON KARMAN

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today we tip our legislative hat to one of the great scientists of this or any other time. Dr. Theodore von Karman is 80 years young today.

Dr. von Karman was born May 11, 1881, in Budapest, Hungary, but came to our country and become a naturalized citizen of the United States in 1936. While he is probably most prominently known to us as the father of aerospace science, his career and service to this country and all of mankind are virtually without equal.

Today, distinguished leaders of science from all over the world are gathering in Washington and will pay him homage at a banquet tonight in recognition of this significant occasion of his 80th birthday. He is a man who has had innumerable honors heaped upon him by colleges, universities, men of science, and by a grateful nation. On May 3, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 133, expressing that body's gratitude to Dr. von Karman and its admiration for the great contributions which he has made to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join our Senate colleagues in paying tribute to Dr. von Karman. May he continue for a long time to set benchmarks for the world, and provide wise counsel to America's leaders as he has in the past. I would like permission to include with my remarks an editorial from yesterday's Washington Daily News entitled "The Team of Genius and Courage" relating to Dr. von Karman, and Astronaut Comdr. Alan B. Shepard:

THE TEAM OF GENIUS AND COURAGE

Just as the country is enjoying a feeling of elation over the space flight of that most personable and articulate young man, Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, it is equally appropriate that the National Capital also is about to mete out long-deserved recognition to another hero of the space age.

Dr. Theodore von Karman will be 80 tomorrow and will be given a day of honors, capped by a banquet. Dr. von Karman is not the public idol Commander Shepard suddenly has become—but scientists from all over the world will be here to pay their respects.

It would be too much to say that without Dr. von Karman, Commander Shepard might not have made his space flight. Somebody else doubtless would have found the way. But it is not too much to say that the theories and their applications he developed had a lot to do with the success of the flight.

Dr. von Karman is known to scientists as the "father of aerospace science." He is, officially, an aerodynamist. His pioneering has led to many of the triumphs in aeronautics—the supersonic aircraft and guided missiles. He is a research chairman for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and a chief adviser to the Air Force.

His current preoccupation is investigation of a theory that may lead to the use of the thin gases of outer space as a fuel for space vehicles.

These are the ingredients of progress, especially in the overwhelming area of the space sciences—the genius of a von Karman and the pioneering courage of a Shepard. The von Karman celebration in Washington is evidence that we do not forget: Without genius there would have been little opportunity for courage.

LEGISLATION TO GIVE DISTRICT COURTS JURISDICTION OVER MATTERS IN THEIR AREAS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take but a minute to call to the attention of the House an extremely important bill, H.R. 1960, which has been introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF]. The bill would, first, confer jurisdiction on U.S. district courts to compel an officer or employee of the Government to perform his duty and, second, permit civil actions against such officers or employees or an agency of the United States to be brought in any judicial district where the plaintiff in the action resides, or in which the cause of action arose, or in which any property involved in the action is situated.

The problems involved that give rise to the need for this legislation have long been of concern to me as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to many members of our committee. Our concern has stemmed from the fact that actions for the review of administrative determinations in cases involving the appropriation, disposition, or use of public lands must at the present time be brought in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Inasmuch as the public lands are for the most part located in the Western States, this has been a burden that westerners have had to carry.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior, John A. Carver, Jr., himself from Idaho and familiar with the basic problems, indicated at a meeting of the Public Lands Subcommittee on February 21, 1961, that he had recommended to Secretary Udall that the Department of the Interior concur in proposed legislation to permit actions for the review of administrative determinations in grazing cases to be instituted in the judicial district in which the land is situated. He then made this observation with which I concur:

> The pendency of these actions, of these appeals in grazing cases particularly, has been a source of considerable concern, because to bring the witnesses to Washington and to force the appellant to go to this expense is in effect to deny him the right of appeal.

This problem is not, however, restricted to grazing cases. The situation is just as serious in connection with appeals from administrative determinations involving mining locations and mineral leasing applications. This is true even though I recognize that the monetary considerations involved in mining and mineral cases will in some instances provide sufficient inducement for appellants to expend the funds necessary to bring their cases to Washington.

There is a further consideration in connection with appeals in mineral applications in that the Mineral Leasing Act Revision of 1960 (Public Law 86–705; 74 Stat. 781, 790) established a 90-day statute of limitations within which an action may be brought contesting a final decision of the Secretary of the Interior involving any oil and gas lease. It therefore appears to be a logical extension for Congress to permit contestants, in this limited time, to bring their actions in the local U.S. district courts.

On careful consideration of these problems, however, I find that they are not peculiar to cases involving public lands in the West. If compelled to bring suit in the District Court for the District of Columbia here in Washington, D.C., in a suit involving other matters, it would be even more burdensome for citizens in Hawaii and possibly just as burdensome for those in the nonpublic land States in the Northeast or Southeast.

While the Secretary of the Interior has advised me that legislation of this type is under consideration but that the Department's position has not yet been established, he did confirm my belief that there is no reason to differentiate between grazing cases and mineral cases. He further pointed out that a procedure that would authorize initiation of suits in the judicial district in which the land is situated, to the same extent that such cases are now authorized to be heard in the District of Columbia, would probably permit a more expeditious handling and final determination of cases. This is true because, as we all know, dockets in the western courts are, generally speaking, less crowded than those in the District of Columbia. Such more expeditious handling would therefore not only be less costly to the individuals but might even prove to be more efficient for the Government.

Accordingly, I have concluded that it would be in the interest of maximum justice to support a proposal that would go beyond the public land cases and permit U.S. district courts to have original jurisdiction of any action to compel an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof to perform his duty and further to permit civil actions to be brought against the United States or its representatives in the district where the property involved is situated. A similar bill—H.R. 12622—passed the House in the 86th Congress but unfortunately was not acted upon in the other body.

Because of the need for this type of legislation, affecting all agencies, I am giving my wholehearted support to this proposal. In doing so I am pleased to know and wish to call to the attention of all Members and particularly those who are supporting legislation for the review of grazing determinations, that this broader type of legislation has been endorsed in principle and received the support of the Committees on Court Administration and Revision of the Laws of the Judicial Conference. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this proposal.

WHY NOT IMPORT QUOTAS?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the calendar of May 11, wherein, on motion of Mr. WALLHAUSER and by unanimous consent it is ordered that on Thursday, May 11, 1961, immediately after all legislative business of the day, Mrs. Moore may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

May I say that perhaps this is an endeavor on the part of the congressional wives to get the floor of the House for the purpose of replying to the Speaker's remarks scuttling the congressional wives' summer recess proposal.

Mrs. Moore not being present and wives of Congressmen not being permitted on the floor of the House this attempt must therefore fail. I ask unanimous consent to take up the subject matter of my special order for which the original request granted.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Knowing the charm, the attractiveness and the high talents of Mrs. Moore, I would like to go along with that unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I join with the gentleman from New York in my high regard for Mrs. Moore and would like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may now address the House today.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, with the number of industries that are plague ridden by imports, increasing from year to year, and with the need for proper safeguards

mounting with this tide, I think the time has come when we as legislators must examine the instrumentalities of trade regulation that are available to us.

The usages of the tariff by itself are, of course, well known and I need not pause except incidentally to appraise the tariff as an instrument of protection.

I am particularly interested in the merits of the import quota, and have introduced legislation to implement quotas, among the other instruments that have been extensively used by other countries, such as exchange controls, import licenses, commodity agreements, barter systems, and bilateral trading arrangements, as means of regulating imports.

I am fully aware that the import quota has been frowned upon by our State Department for years and that it was that Department that was principally responsible in 1947 for having inserted into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade a provision renouncing import quotas as a means of regulating trade among the nations.

This renunciation was flatfooted and complete but was then subjected to three exceptions that were necessary to accommodate other countries and to obtain their adherence. These exceptions were, however, to be transitory and after an unspecified period were to be set aside.

These exceptions were:

One, permitted the use of import quotas to protect financial reserves if a country found itself in balance of payments difficulties; another permitted quotas to help establish industries in underdeveloped countries, and the third condoned resort to them in order to restrict agricultural imports in those instances in which a governmental program cutting back domestic crops was in effect.

In any case, as already stated, these exceptions were to be transitory, and we were to pass into a pure quotaless world after a time.

In passing, I think it should be said that the State Department's notion of the constitutional powers of the executive branch and of that Department in particular, must have been rather commodious. How the Department could otherwise have agreed that it was within the power of the executive to agree in an international agreement, such as GATT, that Congress was to foreswear the use of a very useful instrument of regulating foreign trade, merely because some people in the State Department disliked that instrument, has never been explained.

Surely each successive Congress should have the untrammeled right to determine for itself whether it should impose or authorize the imposition of import quotas as a means of controlling the flow of imports. Yet the State Department did sign an international agreement, namely, GATT, mentioned above, binding the United States neither to establish nor to maintain import quotas, with the transitory exceptions noted. If that did not constitute interference with the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate our foreign commerce it would be difficult to find such interference.

Now, as indicated before, the problem of regulating import competition is becoming more pressing as time passes.

As we examine the available instrumentalities we find some of them inadequate and others more suitable under particular conditions. The reason for this variation is to be found in the different competitive levels of the countries from which the imports are derived.

Should all countries that ship goods to this country be on the same cost level a single duty rate applicable to all of them would meet the need. This is not the case, however, as anyone knows who is familiar with the low wage levels of the Far East and the higher levels found in some of the European countries.

A tariff that would be suitable on imports from Europe would hardly touch those coming from Japan. On the other hand, if the rates were tailored to meet competition from the Far East, it would exclude imports from Europe altogether. The difficulty lies in the most-favored-nation clause, which requires that our tariff rates be the same to all countries. The present exception to this are the Communist countries.

The problem could be overcome if this country were free to impose different duty rates on imports from different countries. The low-cost countries would then face higher rates on their goods; and it would be possible to adjust the tariff to take account of the different competitive levels. This cannot be done so long as we adhere to the most-favored-nation clause; and this is deeply imbedded in our treaties with other countries.

This fact, more than any other, has turned industries to a search for a more flexible, equitable, and suitable instrument. The import quota lends itself better than the tariff to equal treatment of the different countries without exposing our own industries to ruinous competition from some countries while shutting others out of our market. The dilemma is inescapable. A rate of 200 to 300 or 400 percent might be necessary to apply the brakes to imports from Japan, Hong Kong, or other Far Eastern countries. Not only would this seem exorbitant on the face of it, but while it would fit the competitive level of those countries, it would effectively keep goods from Europe and elsewhere, with their higher costs, out of this country.

Yet, despite the merits of the import quota its use is opposed by the State Department.

There is, of course, nothing wrong with the State Department view in the matter so long as it is merely a view. Unfortunately the Department has not confined itself to an expression of views on the subject. As pointed out above, they have taken a hand in the regulation of our foreign commerce, precisely as if this were indeed a function of the executive branch of the Government in general and of the State Department in particular.

The State Department has not only said in effect "We do not like import quotas. We favor free trade," but has added, in effect, "therefore we will see to it that the United States renounces import quotas."

This is what they undertook to do in the Geneva general agreement in 1947. The highhandedness of this action has never been acknowledged by the Department. Nevertheless it was the same as saying to Congress "This is one instrument thou shalt not use."

In doing so the State Department placed itself not only above Congress but above the Constitution. Article I, section 8, of the latter document empowers Congress to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States.

Article XI, section 1, of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, on the other hand, says:

> No prohibitions or restrictions other than duties, taxes or other charges, whether made effective through quotas, import or export licenses or other measures, shall be instituted or maintained by any contracting party on the importation of any product of the territory of any other contracting party.

The United States is one of the "contracting parties" and this provision of GATT says that as such we cannot "institute or maintain" import quotas.

Evidently the U.S. Constitution is a mere scrap of paper rather than the organic law of the land. Evidently the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has pushed the Constitution aside.

The State Department would perhaps say that Congress itself authorized the negotiation of the general agreement by granting the President the power to enter into trade agreements.

According to this view Congress could authorize the President to do anything, such as raising the taxes, declaring war or instituting Government censorship of the press, and having done so, all executive action taken in pursuance of such an act of Congress would be constitutional.

This is ridiculous doctrine, of course; and no one would take it seriously. Yet that is the very doctrine upon which the State Department rests its claim of authority to outlaw import quotas. Actually, the Department has not one scintilla of right to do so; nor has the Congress the right to authorize the President or anyone else to do so. The Congress cannot by passing a law divest itself of a constitutional responsibility. Only a constitutional amendment could accomplish such an alteration; and no constitutional amendment has been offered to transfer the power to regulate foreign commerce from the Congress to the President.

If the State Department does not have the power under the Constitution to regulate our foreign trade how does it obtain the power to do so in fact? It did so by the simple process of binding the United States in an international agreement not to institute or maintain import quotas. Thus the Department renounced on behalf of Congress a very useful instrument of control, an instrument, moreover, that has been used extensively and successfully by European countries and others.

Many of these countries regulated their trade through a variety of restrictive measures and, with foreign aid from

the outside, were to stage a remarkable economic recovery. One of the instruments used by them was the import quota. Were this instrument as objectionable and noxious as the State Department free-trade philosophers would have us believe, the countries that resorted so freely to import quotas should still be on the flat of their economic backs.

It is no accident that the President—meaning the State Department—has never submitted GATT to Congress for approval. Congress might not wish to officiate at its own burial. The powers exercised under GATT make that organization a second Congress in the field of foreign commerce. It can do this because in GATT the U.S. spokesman is the State Department. What Congress thinks or would think of particular actions under GATT is not important because Congress does not speak for the United States in GATT. The State Department has assumed that function; and in so doing has made a fraud of congressional representation of the electorate in the matter of foreign trade policy. What Congress thinks might as well be forgotten.

That is how matters stand today.

Mr. Speaker, industry after industry has concluded that import quotas rather than a tariff are the only way of meeting their need. This is true of industries in particular that are faced with competition from Japan; but is not confined to them.

The pottery industry is an example. A few years ago the Tariff Commission found that a duty of 270 percent would be needed to equalize the cost of production between American and Japanese producers of earthenware. Such a rate would keep other countries out of this market. A similar thing is true of many other items, such as textiles, hardwood plywood, athletic and sporting goods, among them baseballs, baseball gloves, tennis rackets, golf balls, and so forth. Having just testified before the Tariff Commission in the Flat Glass case, urging a finding that relief should be forthcoming in that case, quotas would certainly help the employees and employer of that industry.

Yet the outlook is bleak for import quotas. The White House itself took its cue from the State Department and began frowning on import quotas some years ago. This is not good sense. Under circumstances in which the tariff is wholly unsuitable the quota is the best answer, unless we wish to resort to import licenses and exchange control. Certainly the quota is simpler and requires much less control than these latter instruments.

We need a change of view, away from the doctrinaire views of schoolroom economists who seek to set themselves up as economic czars in the State Department and other executive departments in disregard of Congress. Mr. Speaker, the time is here for a complete exposure of these State Department presumptions to a power that does not belong to it.

It is very clear now that Congress cannot regulate the foreign commerce of this country if the present administrative system is not changed.

The Tariff Commission has recommended import quotas on several occasions. In only one case, namely lead and zinc, has the White House given its approval. Their favorable finding in the Ceramic Tile case of yesterday is a hopeful sign and I urge the President to accept their findings regardless of what the State Department says.

Executive domination of the whole field of trade regulation has indeed reached the point where congressional interference is barely tolerated. It is time to redress the balance if we are to be true to our oath of office.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] for the statement he has made and for the light he has thrown on the question of import quotas. May I also say I am delighted with the sympathetic attention to this problem that is presently being given by President Kennedy and his administration—a very welcome change.

There is no question in my mind that the use of import quotas is unavoidable if we are to give proper protection to many of our industries. I have urged this view on the President. When imports come from countries that are far apart in their competitive levels, as are Europe and Japan, for example, an import quota represents the best means of controlling imports because no single tariff rate will answer the purpose. Yet, under the most-favored-nation clause, we can have only one rate on a given product no matter where it comes from, with the exception of the Communist controlled countries. They pay the 1930 rate rather than the trade agreement rates.

As the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] has said, a rate suitable to imports from Europe would give low-cost countries of the Far East or elsewhere a tremendous advantage in supplying our market; whereas a rate that would meet the Japanese and similar competition would be so high that it would exclude imports from Europe and other higher cost countries. An import quota would permit regulation of imports on a nondiscriminating basis and give all countries exporting to this market an appropriate share of it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an aspect of our trade balance that I believe has been misconstrued and that should be put forward in its true light so that false conclusions may be avoided.

It has been customary by those who deny that this country is in an unfavorable international competitive situation to respond by saying that in 1960 our commercial exports exceeded our imports by nearly $5 billion.

Factually this might be defended if we are talking about balance of payments only. Even then, this excess of exports fell short by about $3.8 billion of balancing our total outgo for imports, services, military expenditures, foreign investments, and so forth.

Unfortunately the bare statement about our export surplus conceals some very important facts and is used not merely in relation to our balance of payments position but also to demonstrate that we are in a superior competitive position in international trade. In both these respects the statement would in fact not be correct and, if uncontested, would produce unfortunate results.

It should not be necessary to repeat that our nearly $20 billion in exports in 1960 were not all composed of commercial exports merely because our military exports are not included in the figure. Commercial exports, to have any meaning, must be confined to those that are exported in the usual course of trade and should not include those that are given away or that move only because of a governmental program, including heavy subsidization.

Yet the $20 billion export figure does exactly that. It includes not only the agricultural shipments under Public Law 480 which are of several categories, including outright grants—gifts—and sales for foreign currency. It also includes heavy shipments of raw cotton and wheat that move into exports only because they carry a subsidy in the magnitude of 30 to 40 percent of the world price. In 1960 exports of wheat amounted to $1.02 billion while those of cotton came to $980 million. Between them these exports cost the Federal Treasury well over $500 million, arrived at as follows. Wheat exports came to 601 million bushels. With a subsidy of 60 cents to 65 cents per bushel the outlay would come to more than $350 million. Cotton was subsidized at 6 cents to 8 cents per pound. This would be from $30 to $40 per bale. With 7.5 million bales exported in 1960 the Treasury put up from $225 to $300 million.

Between the two crops exports amounted to $2 billion in 1960. Yet these items are counted as commercial exports. Except for the subsidy, exports of these products would shrink to a low point. Cotton exports indeed had dropped to about 2½ million bales without the subsidy, but still including Public Law 480 exports.

According to Mr. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, in a speech before the U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, $2 billion of the total of $2.8 billion spent on foreign economic aid in 1960 by this Government were expended in this country. This is a case of the Treasury providing the money with which to buy from us. It hardly seems proper to designate such imports as "commercial."

Thus between wheat and cotton and foreign economic aid alone we should cut $4 billion from our commercial exports. This would reduce the 1960 figure to $16 billion. Other agricultural products are also sold abroad for foreign currencies or are given away. These also are not commercial exports.

If our commercial exports were stripped of those several artificial export

stimuli, they would certainly shrink to the level of our imports. There would then be no merchandise export surplus in any true commercial sense. In fact a great part of this surplus, as we have seen, comes out as a direct drain on our own Treasury instead of representing a foreign drain, as might at first be inferred.

Let us assume in any case that our truly commercial exports did balance, in terms of dollars, our total imports. Using a round figure, we would then have had $15 billion in exports to balance our $15 billion in imports. Imports were a little below that.

Would this mean that we had balanced our imports with exports? Obviously in terms of dollars there would be a balance.

Today, however, we are concerned not only with the dollar balance but also with employment and economic growth and expansion.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is safe to say that every dollar of imports represents at least $2 in exports expressed in terms of man-hours of employment. This is the same as saying that the $15 billion in goods that we imported in 1960 would have been valued at least $30 billion had they been produced in this country.

Let me offer a few examples that can be verified.

Our imports in terms of dollars represent foreign value, generally manufacturers' wholesale values. They do not include ocean freight, marine insurance, the importers' markup, or the tariff.

The real question with respect to imports then is their impact on the domestic industry with which they compete, including employment.

In 1960, for example, imports of portable radios amounted to $56 million. What does this mean? U.S. factory shipments of such radios were an estimated $112 million. Imports then were equal to 50 percent of domestic shipments, on the basis of value.

Is this all? Is this the true measure of the competitive impact?

The more meaningful question is: How many portable radios came in, never mind the import value? The number was 6 million. This is the real figure. It expresses the displacement carried by the imports. The domestic portable that was displaced was sold at wholesale by the manufacturers for about $25 per set. Six million of them would be valued at $150 million.

What a difference between this figure and the $56 million of imports at $9 per set, which was the import value per set.

Another way of saying this is that while imports by value were only 50 percent of domestic shipments, by number of sets three out of five of those sold in this country were imported. Unfortunately, unless imports are given in terms of quantity, their real impact may be hidden.

Another example is at hand in the case of shirt imports.

Nineteen hundred and sixty shirt imports were valued at approximately $14 million. This, again, represented foreign value.

In this country the factory cost of a shirt would be from $1.50 to $2. On the basis of this value the imports would represent from 7 to 9 million shirts. That would be the case if the Japanese shirts cost as much as American shirts.

Such a calculation would, however, lead us far astray; for the number of shirts covered by the imports of $14 million was actually 24 million.

That is the measure of displacement represented by the imports and it also reflects the labor displacement involved.

Had the imported shirts borne the American cost of $1.50 to $2 the value would have been not $14 million but $36 to $48 million.

Here again we see the great spread between value and quantity in our import statistics. In terms of quantity the imports were nearly three times as great as the foreig. value figures would lead us to believe.

That this great gap between import values, as published figures on our trade balance always present our imports and exports, is not confined to a few items but is widespread can be determined by making comparisons between imports and domestic products in many fields. In some cases the gap is not as wide as it is in portable radios and shirts. In some cases it is even wider.

Let us have a look at portable typewriter imports. In 1960 the imports amounted to $16 million. In that year domestic factory shipments came to $40 million. This meant that imports were equal to 40 percent of domestic factory shipments, by value.

Now, let us examine the quantity of imports and compare it with the quantity of domestic factory shipments. We get a very different result.

The $16 million in imports represented 436,000 portable typewriters; domestic shipments of the same product came to 535,000 units. While the value of imports was 40 percent of domestic shipments, the import quantity was equal to 80 percent of it.

Had the typewriters that were displayed by imports been built here production would have been $33 million higher than it was. Thus, imports of $16 million in portable typewriters caused a loss to our manufacturers and their employees twice as great as the import figures by value on their face would indicate.

Imports of sewing machines show a similar situation. In 1960 our imports were valued at $28 million. This represented 1 million machines.

Unfortunately no data are available on domestic factory shipments; but we do have export figures. This country shipped 37,000 sewing machines at a total value of $2,236,000. This comes to $60 per machine.

The imported machines on 1 million were valued at $28 per machine.

Here we have a ratio of 2 to 1 on a value basis. If the 1 million machine imports had been supplied by domestic manufacturers the value would have been $60 million instead of $28 million. The displacements of sales and employment in this country was therefore much greater; that is, by a ratio of 2 to 1, than the import value figures would indicate.

In the case of window sheet glass the ratio is not quite so sharp, perhaps because the imports come principally from Belgium, a country of higher wages than those prevailing in some other countries.

The 1960 imports of this type of glass were valued at $28 million. This came to 7 million boxes.

In this country these 7 million boxes would be worth $42 million at the factory, or 50 percent higher.

In bread-and-butter talk this means that while the work of 2,145 workers would be required to make $28 million worth of window sheet glass at American prices, the displacement created by imports of that value would be 50 percent higher, or 3,217 workers.

Mr. Speaker, many other examples could be provided but these are sufficient to tell us that when we judge the impact of imports on our economy and on our prospects of growth and expansion, we should not regard our trade as balanced when dollar imports are balanced by dollar exports. Our exports, it seems safe to say, would have to be double the imports by value to strike a balance.

In view of these observations our so-called surplus of exports of $5 billion still leaves us in a hole. I think it is time that we stopped fooling ourselves about our "favorable" trade balance and instead of talking about imports and exports in terms of dollars, that we look at them in terms of employment and factory use.

OUR BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, no one is more concerned than I with the balance-of-payments position of the United States. I admire the vigor with which the present administration has approached this very serious matter and I am certain that their efforts will ultimately be rewarded. In fact, we are already noting a reverse in the previous gold-flow pattern which I am sure everyone here is glad to see.

We are asked to approve H.R. 6611 in the interest of contributing toward a solution of our balance-of-payments problem. I think we should all recognize that the estimated saving in gold outflow of about $150 million will not carry us too far along this path. I have deep reservations that the pending proposal will save that much money. But that is another matter.

What concerns me most is that in taking this measure, which, as I have said, will do little to balance our payments position, we will unquestionably unbalance the deep friendly ties we have painstakingly built up over the years

with our neighbors to the north and south—Canada and Mexico. This result is inevitable. And this action will be taken at a time when we need these ties of friendship more than ever before. We should be striving to solidify and strengthen these ties in the interest of the long-range challenge now presented to nations of the Western Hemisphere by the establishment of a Communist regime at our doorstep in Cuba. But I submit, the pending proposal will serve to weaken these bonds and might prove to be much more disastrous than any imbalance in our payments position.

There is a further point which must not be overlooked in the case of our contiguous neighbors. Over the years, in the field of tourist trade, we have continuously enjoyed a favorable balance with our northern neighbor. In 1959, for instance, Canadian tourists spent some $100 million more in the United States than our citizens spent in Canada on tourism. The figures for 1960 are not as yet compiled but it is certain that much the same balance in our favor persisted. Should the Canadian Government retaliate, and who would blame her, this might very well serve to cut down on Canadian tourist purchases in the United States and negate this attempted move to assist our balance of payments position.

While tourist trade with Mexico shows, in 1959, a balance in favor of Mexico of some $190 million, we cannot overlook the effect this measure is certain to have on the sizable quantities of money which our tourists spend on lodgings and meals in the border States. As you know, the special absence requirements applicable to tourists who would claim present U.S. exemptions are waived, in large part, for travel to Mexico. The reason for this is that the greater number of U.S. border tourists visit Mexico by day and spend the evening and night in one of the border States. Many hotel and dining facilities have been constructed for this purpose. If we discourage this tourist trade, which we no doubt will if this proposal becomes law, then many of these border interests will be severely hurt.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, can we ignore the fact that on overall trade, we sell about twice as much to Mexico as we buy from her. In 1960, U.S. exports were $806.8 million while our imports from Mexico were some $443 million. Here again, any retaliation on the part of Mexico could serve to cut down the very large favorable balance of trade we now enjoy to the ultimate detriment of our balance-of-payments position.

Mr. Speaker, I come from an area of New York State which has fostered and built up a large part of the world-renowned friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Canada. We have played a major role in nurturing these ties of amicable and peaceful, side-by-side existence with the people of the great dominion to the north. The people in my district look upon our Canadian friends as their brothers in democracy. I urge this great body not to disturb these links which have been forged over the years by mutual trust, understanding, and respect.

If I am able to introduce an amendment to the proposed legislation, I would offer an amendment which would continue the present customs treatment of U.S. tourists returning from Mexico or Canada. Under unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the amendment which I would offer—if permitted to do so:

Amendment to H.R. 6611, as reported:

Page 1, strike out line 5 and all that follows down through page 2, line 4, and insert the following:

Is amended—

(1) by striking out "$200, if such person" in subdivision (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "$200 if such person arrives from a contiguous country before July 1, 1963, $100 if such person arrives from a noncontiguous country before July 1, 1963, or $200 if such person arrives from any country on or after July 1, 1963; and he either", and

(2) by striking out "$300 in addition, if such person" in subdivision (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "$300 in addition, if such person arrives from a contiguous country before July 1, 1963, or $300 in addition, if such person arrives from any country on or after July 1, 1963, and in either case he".

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 the Treasury Department announced a ruling by the Attorney General construing the law so as to permit advance refundings of Government bonds where the new issue bears a coupon rate not exceeding 4¼ percent. Even though it is not contemplated that bonds will be sold or exchanged in the near future under circumstances requiring application of this ruling, I believe that Members of the House will be interested in the details of this matter. Therefore, I include herein correspondence relating thereto between the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 7, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I would greatly appreciate your opinion as to whether the Secretary of the Treasury has authority under sections 1 and 20 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, to issue bonds bearing a coupon rate not in excess of 4¼ percent at a discount which would raise the investment yield or the cost to the Treasury of the bonds above 4¼ percent.

While currently prevailing low interest rates may make the question appear academic, and while no specific borrowing operation to which this opinion could apply is now contemplated, I believe your opinion would be timely in two respects. In the first place, considerable interest in this problem has been and is being expressed by both the Congress and the press. Additionally, to request such an opinion with respect to a specific proposal to issue bonds for cash, exchange, or an advance refunding would inevitably promote speculation and have a generally undesirable effect on the market. Thus it would appear appropriate to obtain your opinion now so that if at some future time the Treasury Department should propose to issue securities at a discount which would raise the investment yield or cost to the Treasury above 4¼ percent, the question would have been resolved and the integrity of Government securities maintained beyond question.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1961.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in reply to your request for my opinion as to whether you have the authority under sections 1 and 20 of the Second Liberty Bond Act to issue bonds for cash, exchange, or on advance refunding [1] where such bonds bear a coupon rate not in excess of 4¼ percent but are issued at a discount which would raise the effective rate or cost to the Treasury of the bonds above the rate of 4¼ percent. For the reasons set forth hereinafter in detail I conclude that you possess such authority.

Section 1 of the Second Liberty Bond Act authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, to borrow on the credit of the United States and to issue therefor bonds of the United States which shall be subject to a "rate or rates of interest, not exceeding 4¼ per centum per annum" and shall "be offered at not less than par."

Section 20 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended by section 3 of the Public Debt Act of 1942, 56 Stat. 189, 31 U.S.C. 754b,[2] provides that the bonds authorized by section 1 of the act "may be issued on an interest-bearing basis, on a discount basis, or on a combination interest-bearing and discount basis, at such price or prices and with interest computed in such manner and payable at such time or times as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; and any such obligations may be offered for sale on a competitive or other basis under such regulations and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; and his decision with respect to any such issue shall be final."

On May 1, 1958, my predecessor concluded that the 1942 amendment of section 20 had repealed the earlier enacted requirement set forth in section 1 that bonds issued thereunder shall "be offered at not less than par" (41 Op. Atty. Gen. No. 62). He based this opinion on the conclusion that the two sections are irreconcilable and that the legislative history of the 1942 amendment of section 20 disclosed a congressional purpose "to give the Secretary of the Treasury greater flexibility in determining the terms upon which Treasury bonds, bills, notes, and certificates of indebtedness may be issued." [3]

---

[1] Section 1 of the Second Liberty Bond Act of September 24, 1917, 40 Stat. 288, as amended, 31 U.S.C. 752, authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, to borrow on the credit of the United States for a number of purposes including "the purchase, redemption, or refunding, at or before maturity, of any outstanding bonds, notes, certificates of indebtedness, or Treasury bills of the United States * * *."

[2] Sec. 20 was added to the Second Liberty Bond Act by sec. 14(a)(4) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 343.

[3] H. Rept. 1876, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 4. See also S. Rept. 1178, 77th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 1, 2; "Public Debt of 1942," hearings before the Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate, 77th Cong., 2d sess. on H.R. 6691, p. 3; 88 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2184.

That opinion, however, did not purport to consider whether the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue bonds, bearing a stated coupon rate of no more than 4¼ percent, for cash, exchange, or on advance refunding, if, as the result of a discount at which the bonds are issued, or for some related reason, their effective rate, investment yield, or cost to the Treasury should exceed the statutory rate of 4¼ percent per annum.[4] I base my conclusion that you have this power on the following considerations: First, when Congress uses the term "interest" in connection with bonds without further explanation, it refers to the coupon or stated rate, the usual meaning of that term, and not to the accountants' concept of effective rate; second, when a statute limits only the coupon rate of a security issue, and permits it to be offered at less than par, it authorizes sales at an effective rate in excess of the maximum permissible coupon rate; and third, when Congress seeks to limit the effective rate of securities which may be sold at a discount, it does so expressly.

I

As originally enacted, section 1 of the Second Liberty Bond Act provided that the interest rate of the bonds should not exceed 4¼ percent per annum, and that they should not be issued at less than par. In view of the latter prohibition, the effective rate could not exceed the coupon rate, and it was therefore unnecessary to determine whether the 4¼-interest rate referred to the coupon rate or to the effective rate.

The 1942 amendment of the Second Liberty Bond Act, while leaving the 4¼ percent limitation on interest untouched, permits bonds to be issued on a discount basis, or on a combination interest-bearing and discount basis. In view of this amendment, it becomes material to ascertain whether the words "rate or rates of interest" in section 1 refer to the coupon rate or to the effective rate. The pertinent judicial decisions indicate that the first alternative is the correct one; hence, that a limitation on interest has no direct bearing on the effective rate

In *Old Colony R. Co.* v. *Commissioner*, 284 U.S. 552 (1932), the Supreme Court was confronted with a situation closely related to the one at hand. A corporation which had sold its bonds at a premium sought to deduct the entire interest payments on those bonds from its gross income for income tax purposes. The Government claimed that this was not permissible because these payments included in part the repayment of the premium, which constituted a loan and consequently had to be amortized over the life of the bond. Hence the interest payments constituted in part genuine interest which was deductible, and in part payments on a loan which could not be deducted. In a nutshell, the Government's position was that where bonds were sold at a premium, the effective rate of interest was lower than the coupon rate, and that the excess of the coupon over the effective rate did not constitute deductible interest but a repayment on capital (284 U.S. 552, 559).[5]

The Supreme Court held that when Congress uses the word "interest" without further amplification it refers to the normal meaning of the word, i.e., the stated or coupon rate, and not to the accountants' concept of the effective rate. The Court said (284 U.S. 560–561): "* * * the usual import of the term [interest] is the amount which one has contracted to pay for the use of borrowed money. He who pays and he who receives payment of the stipulated amount conceives that the whole is interest. In the ordinary affairs of life no one stops for refined analysis of the nature of a premium, or considers that the periodic payment universally called 'interest' is in part something wholly distinct—that is, a return of borrowed capital. It has remained for the theory of accounting to point out this refinement. We cannot believe that Congress used the word having in mind any concept other than the usual, ordinary and everyday meaning of the term, or that it was acquainted with the accountants' phrase 'effective rate' of interest and intended that as the measure of the permitted deduction."

The holding in *Old Colony* that Congress and court use and interpret statutory language according to its usual meaning and not on the basis of accounting theories[6] does not constitute an exception to the general course of decisions.[7]

This, indeed, has been a source of complaint on the part of accountants, see, e.g., May, "Accounting and the Accountant in the Administration of Income Taxation," 47 Col. L.R. 377; 4 Mertens, "The Law of Federal Income Taxation" (1960 revision), sec. 23.162.

The State courts also hold that the term "interest" without explanation normally refers to the coupon rather than the effective rate.[8]

II

The limitation on the interest rate set forth in section 1 therefore refers exclusively to the coupon rate of the bonds. The original prohibition on the offering of those bonds below par, however, constituted a bar on their sale at an effective rate in excess of the coupon rate. Indeed, it has been recognized by students of public finance that one of the functions of a statutory prohibition of the sale of securities below par is to prevent their sale at an effective rate in excess of the coupon rate. Thus it was stated by Dr. Love in his treatise on "Federal Financing," at p. 210:

"We are accordingly justified in thinking that the ever-present restriction against sale below par is in reality a logical teammate of the restriction on the nominal rate of interest, and that it was only by combining the two that the public's wishes in respect to limiting the net yield on securities were carried out."

It follows that prior to 1942, bonds authorized by section 1 of the Second Liberty Bond Act could not be issued at an effective rate in excess of 4¼ percent because the statute barred the sale of those securities below par. When the Public Debt Act of 1942 repealed that prohibition and expressly authorized the sale of those bonds at a discount, the basis of the restriction on the effective rate of interest disappeared.[9]

III

In view of the fact that the limitation on the effective rate was tied inextricably to the ban on sales below par, it would appear inappropriate to view the 1942 amendment of section 20 as being designed merely to permit greater flexibility in financing[10] and therefore to conclude that Congress had no intention to modify the then existing limitation on the effective rate. As already explained, once express permission had been given to sell the bonds issued pursuant to section 1 at a discount, there remained no legal basis for a limitation on the effective rate. Moreover, the history of the Second Liberty Bond Act and of its amendments reveals sophisticated awareness on the part of Congress that, if securities may be sold below par, any limitation on the effective rate must be express.

Section 6 of the original Second Liberty Bond Act (40 Stat. 291) authorized the issue of war savings certificates "on which interest to maturity may be discounted in advance." There was no limitation on the interest rate of these certificates; thus, it was not necessary to distinguish between the coupon and effective rates.

Section 14 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 343) added to the Second Liberty Bond Act a section 20, the predecessor to the present section 20, which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to issue obligations having a maturity of less than 1 year "on a discount basis and payable at maturity without interest." Again, there was no limitation on the interest these obligations could bear.

The problem created by the difference between coupon rate and effective rate of securities issued below par was first raised and dealt with in section 6 of the act of February 4, 1935, 49 Stat. 21. That section added to the Second Liberty Bond Act a section 22, 31 U.S.C. 757c, which authorized the issuing of U.S. savings bonds.[11]

These bonds were to be issued "on a discount basis to mature not less than 10 nor more than 20 years * * *: *Provided*, That the issue price of the savings bonds and the terms upon which they may be redeemed prior to maturity shall be such as to afford an investment yield not in excess of 3 percent per annum, compounded semiannually."

Section 3 of the Public Debt Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 7) amended and broadened section 22 of the Second Liberty Bond Act. It provided in pertinent part:

"Savings bonds and savings certificates may be issued on an interest-bearing basis, on a discount basis, or on a combination interest-bearing and discount basis * * *. Such bonds and certificates may be sold at such price or prices, and redeemed before maturity upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided*, That the interest rate on, and the issue price of, savings bonds and savings certificates and the terms upon which they may be redeemed shall be such as to afford

---

[4] In the interest of brevity I shall use only the term "effective rate" when referring to the three related concepts of "effective rate," "investment yield," and "cost to the Treasury."

[5] See also brief for the United States in No. 349, October T. 1931, pp. 6–7, 10–14, 50–52. Significantly, the brief and the accounting authorities quoted in it stressed that these considerations applied conversely where bonds had been sold at a discount.

[6] The holding in Old Colony therefore applies with equal force to an advance refunding of bonds at an increased interest rate which according to some accountants constitutes the issue of the bonds at a discount.

[7] See e.g., *Woolford Realty Co.* v. *Rose*, 286 U.S. 319, 326–327 (1932); *Crane* v. *Commissioner*, 331 U.S. 1, 3–7.

[8] *Golden Gate Bridge etc. District* v. *Filmer*, 217 Cal. 754, 21 P. (2d) 112 (1933); *Stanley* v. *Mayor etc. of City of Baltimore*, 146 Md. 277, 301–302, 126 Atl. 151, 160 (1924); *Rowland* v. *Reno County*, 108 Kan. 440, 195 Pac. 863 (1921); *Kiernan* v. *City of Portland*, 61 Or. 398, 122 Pac. 764 (1912).

[9] The decisions of the State courts agree that where a statute permits the sale of securities at a discount, the investment yield may exceed the statutory coupon rate; cf. the authorities cited supra, fn. 8, and Jones, Bonds and Bond Securities (4th ed., 1935), sec. 369.

Where a statute establishes a limit on the coupon rate and does not expressly authorize the sale of the security below par, the courts are split on the question whether the sale at discount is prohibited because it would result in an evasion of the statutory coupon rate; see, e.g., *Ohio ex rel. Laskey* v. *Board of Education*, 35 Ohio 519, 524; 43 American Jurisprudence, Public Securities and Obligations, sec. 135, 91 A.L.R. 7, 12–13. These considerations, however, are inapplicable where, as here, the sale at a discount has been expressly permitted.

[10] Cf. supra, fn. 3.

[11] On the legal and financial history of U.S. savings bonds, see H. Rept. 1148, 86th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2–7; S. Rept. 909, 86th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2–7.

an investment yield not in excess of 3 percent per annum, compounded semiannually."

In the following year the same Congress, which amended section 22 with its express reference to the investment yield, amended section 20 so as to permit the sale of bonds below par. It is significant that when modifying section 20, Congress did not start out from the original version of that section contained in section 14 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, but that it followed almost verbatim the language of the 1941 amendment of section 22, with the significant omission of the proviso limiting the investment yield of securities issued at a discount.[12]

The act of April 20, 1957, Public Law 85–17, 71 Stat. 15, amended the proviso in section 22 to read: "*Provided*, That the interest rate on, and the issue price of, savings bonds and savings certificates and the terms upon which they may be redeemed shall be such as to afford an investment yield not in excess of 3.26 per centum per annum, compounded semi-annually."

Finally, section 101 of the act of September 22, 1959, Public Law 86–346, 73 Stat. 621, added a section 25 to the Second Liberty Bond Act (31 U.S.C. 757c–1) which is indicative of the full congressional awareness of the difference between interest rate and investment yield:

"SEC. 25. In the case of any offering of U.S. savings bonds issued or to be issued under section 22 of this act, the maximum limits on the interest rate or the investment yield or both may be exceeded upon a finding by the President with respect to such offering that the national interest requires that such maximum limits be exceeded: *Provided, however*, That in no event may the interest rate or the investment yield exceed 4¼ percent per annum."

The various sections of the Second Liberty Bond Act are in pari materia. Sections 22 and 25 disclose the congressional awareness, at least since 1935, that when used in that statute the term "interest" refers only to the coupon rate and not to the effective rate. Consequently, I conclude that when Congress permitted the sale at a discount of the bonds referred to in section 1 for cash, exchange, or advance refunding, without placing a limitation on their investment yield, it fully realized that such bonds could be sold or exchanged below par at an effective rate, investment yield, or cost to the Treasury in excess of the statutory coupon rate.

My interpretation of the legal effect of the 1942 amendment of section 20 is not novel. Your predecessor testified before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to the effect that "since March 1942 the Treasury has had the right to offer securities at a discount. It is permissible under present statutory authority, therefore, for the Treasury to issue a bond with a 4¼-percent coupon rate at a price below par to yield any rate of interest to the investor above 4¼ percent which may be required by market conditions."[13]

Secretary Anderson, however, did not wish to exercise that authority without specific congressional leave because he did not consider it appropriate "to circumvent the 4¼-percent ceiling in this way."[14] Considering that the 4¼-percent ceiling applies—as recognized by Secretary Anderson himself—only to the coupon rate, the issue of bonds below par, as authorized by section 20, and bearing a coupon rate of 4¼ percent, as authorized by section 1, does not "circumvent" any congressional prohibition. The power to do so plainly exists,[15] and I cannot see anything inappropriate in exercising it if you believe that the circumstances require such action. I therefore answer your question in the affirmative.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General.

[12] The same 77th Cong. again showed its awareness of problems resulting from securities sold at a premium or a discount by enacting sec. 126 of the Revenue Act of 1942, 56 Stat. 822, which added a sec. 125 to the Internal Revenue Act of 1939 (now I.R.C. 1954, sec. 171). This section permits a bondholder who purchased a bond at a premium to treat part of the bond "interest" as amortization of the premium. Cf. the discussion of the Old Colony case, supra.

[13] Public Debt Ceiling and Interest Rate Ceiling on Bonds, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 18; see also H. Rept. 1297, 86th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 3, 13.

[14] Supra footnote 13.

[15] I cannot see any significance in the failure of Congress to enact H.R. 10590, 86th Cong., 2d sess., favorably reported by the House Ways and Means Committee in H. Rept. 1297, 86th Cong., 2d sess., which conferred on the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to exceed the effective rate of 4¼ percent in certain circumstances. In view of Secretary Anderson's statements, Congress may have considered this legislation redundant. In any event a statutory power remains in effect until it is repealed, limited, or modified. Its existence is not affected by the failure to enact such repealing, limiting, or modifying legislation.

STEPHEN E. SMITH

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to yesterday morning's Washington Post, among those accompanying Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON on his southeast Asia trip, in the capacity of an expert on Asian affairs, is one Stephen E. Smith. Mr. Speaker, I would not be concerned about a Stephen Smith and his wife accompanying the Vice President, except that this Smith, traveling under the guise of an Asian expert, is the President's brother-in-law, the heir to a tugboat and barge fortune in New York. I would appreciate it very much if some of my friends on the other side of the aisle could enlighten me as to Mr. Smith's qualifications as an Asian expert. I wonder if his 100 days' experience at a $50-a-day job with the Development Loan Fund as a consultant on something or other provides the basis for this new title—or is it his 3 days' experience on the new "emergency desk" at the State Department? It seems as if this sort of experience is in abundance in this administration. Whatever it is, Mr. Speaker, it does appear that the taxpayers of the United States are stuck with a 2-week junket for Smith and his wife to southeast Asia.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning I appeared before the Rules Committee to testify in favor of House Resolution 111, which I introduced to create a new select committee to investigate the Federal-aid highway program. I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the Rules Committee be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also ask that the newspaper articles and my speeches referred to in my prepared statement be reproduced following my remarks here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, my testimony before the Committee on Rules is as follows:

APPEARANCE BEFORE RULES COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 111, MAY 10, 1961

Mr. Chairman, first let me express my appreciation for the opportunity to be heard in support of House Resolution 111 to create a select committee to investigate the Federal aid highway program. There was a time when I thought this resolution was being bottled up. However, I am glad that this is not the case for I believe your own committee has a mandate for progress and the House should be allowed to work its will on this resolution.

I have been a member of the special subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works to investigate the highway program from its formation in September of 1959. From this vantage point I have become increasingly convinced that there is an enormous and important job to do if the public interest is to be served by our highway program which will spend over $40 billion in tax moneys before it is concluded in about 1975. However, I have become equally convinced that this job will not and cannot be done by our present subcommittee which contains 12 Democrat members and only 7 Republican members.

As I have pointed out several times in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there has never been a select or special committee of the House, charged with investigating a particular field such as here, where the minority members have had such little representation regardless of which party controls the House.

I include at this point, for the record, a copy of a speech which I made on the floor of the House on May 26, 1960, setting forth an analysis of all special or select committees, beginning with the 80th Congress.

Such a politically constituted committee cannot command the broad confidence of the House or the public that its motives are beyond suspect. We are all sophisticated enough to recognize that there will always be a minimum of politics in every subcommittee or committee and this is especially true where the majority party has a 2-to-1 majority on the committee.

At present, I understand the staff of our subcommittee has a number of investigations going in a number of States, one of which happens to be the State of Massachusetts. According to the press, this Massachusetts road scandal is very serious indeed.

At this point in the record I should like to insert an article in the March 1961 issue of the Atlantic entitled "Dirty Money in Boston," and "The Judge's Opinion."

I should also like to call the committee's attention to numerous other articles appearing in the Massachusetts papers which I have already inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my January 16, 1961, speech when I first introduced House Resolution 111.

This serious condition in Massachusetts, which reportedly is a conspiracy to defraud the Federal Government of hundreds of thousands of dollars, has been known to our subcommittee since January 1960, when this matter was first investigated by the Bureau of Public Roads and a firm of expert real estate appraisers.

Nonetheless, as of today, almost 1½ years later, we have not even been briefed on what our own investigators have uncovered and we do not even know if and when this matter will be the subject of a hearing.

Under the circumstances, I think it is understandable that the public and certain members of the subcommittee have no confidence that this and other investigations will be pressed to conclusion no matter where the chips may fall.

I have before me a number of newspaper stories which I should like to read into the RECORD at this point. One of them is taken from the Boston Traveler, dated August 19, 1960; the other is from the Cincinnati Enquirer on August 26, 1960; and the third is from the Boston Herald on January 27, 1961. This latter story is entitled, "Congressional Probers Mixing DPW Whitewash."

It is rather immaterial whether or not these newspaper stories accurately reflect the facts, although I believe there is a great deal of substance in them. The point is that newspapers are printing such stories and people are reading them. Therefore, the impression is conveyed that this subcommittee is politically motivated in selecting its targets.

There have been charges and countercharges of politics on both sides, especially prior to the recent presidential election, but now that the election is over, I think and hope that politics will be submerged and that both parties which contain men of good will can unite against the crooks, grafters, and incompetents who are bringing our vast Federal aid highway program into public disrepute.

Mr. Chairman, in drafting this resolution I have combined what I think are the best features of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and the House Select Committee on Small Business.

The Senate select committee, called the Labor Rackets Committee, investigated the extremely sensitive field of labor and management for 3 years and reflected credit upon the Senate and upon the Congress. Composed of four Democrats and four Republicans, even though the Republican strength in the Senate was considerably less than this ratio, this select committee, under the graceful chairmanship of Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, kept politics at an absolute minimum.

During these 3 years of investigation, all of the committee reports, over a 3-year period, were unanimous except for two. Of these two reports, I notice that the only dissent in one was filed by a Democratic Senator and in the other the four Republican members signed one and the four Democratic members issued two separate views on the same subject matter. This, I think, is a marvelous record and one which I am convinced can be duplicated in this equally sensitive area of Federal aid to highways. On the other hand, our own subcommittee has prepared only two reports which have divided along partisan lines.

You will notice that my resolution calls for a select committee composed of 12 Members of the House appointed by the Speaker, 6 from each party. The number, 12, is an arbitrary figure to be sure, but I have chosen it with the thought that such committees will be more effective with a relatively small membership. You will further notice that the 12 members selected by the Speaker will select a chairman from the majority and the vice chairman from the minority party. This, again, is a feature which I have taken from the resolution creating the Labor Rackets Committee and which, in my judgment and the judgment of many observers, operated to keep politics at a minimum.

Let me demonstrate how this can be so. The Democratic Party, in addition to controlling both Houses of the Congress, now controls the executive branch of the Government and is, therefore, responsible for administering the Highway Act of 1956. And, while it is true that prior to the last election our special subcommittee was, in a sense, investigating the shortcomings of a Republican administration, the shoe is now, or shortly will be, on the other foot. The possibility is not entirely remote, in my view, that the Republicans could capture control of the House and this committee in 1962. And, human nature being what it is, a Republican majority in control of the investigative machinery of the House theoretically could be more interested in tarring a Democrat administration than getting at the facts.

But, under my resolution and my hypothetical example, the Democratic Party would still retain an equal number of members on the select committee, and in addition, would have a vice chairman of its own all of whom could act as a break on any political excesses on the part of the Republicans. So, while in the short view the Democrat Party may be surrendering a few of its prerogatives, in the long-range view, I think both parties and the public interest can be served if what I have described should come about. Congresses may come and go, but such a watchdog committee will be needed until about 1975 and later.

There are other and equally cogent arguments to support my resolution which I hope will commend it to all Members of the House regardless of what party they belong to. These include the need for competent engineers on the staff to investigate some of the engineering aspects of this program which, in my opinion, would save millions and perhaps billions of dollars. Some of these areas in need of investigation were listed in my January 16, 1961, speech on the House floor and appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 815–824.

In conclusion, I would like to point out to this committee that House Resolution 111 was introduced on January 16, 1961, which was prior to the time that the House passed House Resolution 23, which reactivated the Special Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee to investigate the highway program.

Therefore, if House Resolution 111 should be passed by the House, it would supersede House Resolution 23. But this poses no problems for the functions and files of the present special subcommitee would merely be transferred to the new select committee, created by my resolution.

This procedure was, in fact, followed by the Senate which, upon the expiration of the Labor Rackets Committee, passed a resolution transferring the files and functions of the old committee to the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations which was also chaired by the Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas.

Under his gracious leadership, I notice that the new committee of the Senate is continuing the good work in this field which was carried on for 3 years by the old committee.

(The speeches and articles referred to are as follows:)

THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. Udall]. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, some time ago a letter was written to and published in Des Moines Register by the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman JOHN BLATNIK, member of the Public Works Committee and chairman of the Select Committee on Interstate Highways on the Problems of the Interstate System.

Since the letter he wrote on the subject was misleading and inaccurate in certain respects and dealt with problems that concerned Iowa, and because I, also, am a member of the Public Works Committee and a member of the Select Committee on the Interstate Highways and a Congressman from Iowa, I feel it my duty to answer, to set the record straight and to comment further on some of the real problems that need the attention of the select committee now; problems, if resolved, that could save much money I am sure—millions of dollars of money, and also, and maybe more importantly, make it possible to use large sections of this very much needed Interstate System at an earlier date, thereby adding to the prosperity and growth of all Iowa cities and the agriculture economy at a much earlier date.

In the letter that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] wrote, the charge was made that the budget was balanced and there was a surplus of $1.6 billion at the close of fiscal year 1957 because general fund obligations of the Federal-aid program of $1.98 billion were transferred to the Highway Trust Fund as of July 1, 1956. Also, that almost $3 billion in revenue in taxes from highway users went to pay general fund obligations. The exact quotes are:

"When the highway trust fund was created on July 1, 1956, none of this revenue was transferred to it, but general fund obligations totaling $1.98 billion were transferred to the highway trust fund. The only asset the highway trust fund acquired as of July 1, 1956, was the right to future revenue from these sources.

"Thus the highway trust fund was saddled with an almost $2 billion connection of unpaid bills, while the $2,944 million in taxes from highway users went to pay general fund obligations. The administration thus was able to proclaim a surplus of $1,626 billion."

This is far from the truth. Here are the facts, taken from the record and sustained by the Department of Commerce:

If all revenue and expenditures that were accounted for through the highway trust fund in the fiscal year 1957 had been accounted for in the general fund of the Treasury, there would have been a greater increase in the surplus on June 30, 1957. The increase would have been $516 million greater. In other words, if Congress had not set aside special revenues from the general fund for the highway trust fund and if payments for Federal aid work had been from the general fund, the surplus would have been $516 million greater. This is because revenues that went into the highway trust fund amounted to $1,482 million and expenditures from the fund amounted to $966 million, a difference of $516 million.

Time and time again we hear the fallacious charge that the troubles of the highway trust fund stem from the fund assuming the obligations of the general fund prior to creation of the highway trust fund. The other side of the picture is rarely presented. When the trust fund assumed these liabilities referred to on July 1, 1956, the general

fund also gave up revenue from a gasoline tax of 2 cents which had for years been going into the general fund and which would have gone into the general fund in 1957 if the highway trust fund had not been created. I cite the hearings before the Department of Commerce and related agencies' appropriation for 1961—table, page 480.

I was surprised to read in the same newspaper article "that the then Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, prevailed upon Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, to insert the so-called Byrd amendment which injected the pay-as-you-go principle that is now causing considerable difficulty."

This is the first time I have heard that Senator BYRD was not proud of the authorship of section 209(g). True, the administration supports the Byrd amendment, but so do the leaders of Congress and the Congress because this amendment was passed by the Congress and not by Senator BYRD. In fact, it was an amendment to the language of the Appropriations Act for 1960 for the Federal aid highway program that made it clear that Congress expected that all payments for Federal aid highway work must be available in and derived from the highway trust fund.

In spite of the administration's position, there was ample opportunity for the Congress to attempt to suspend the provisions of the Byrd amendment when additional revenue measures were being considered in the summer of 1959. In fact, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee stated in debate on the floor of the House on the 1959 act that they considered many alternatives, one of which was the suspension of the Byrd amendment. Congress did not choose the alternative when they passed the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1959 with its inadequate financing provisions.

The cutback in the Federal aid highway program is definitely the result of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1958. The President, when he signed the 1958 act, recognized that the highway trust fund would be inadequate to continue to finance the volume of the Federal aid highway program provided by the 1958 act. He said on April 16, 1958, more than 2 years ago:

"It will be necessary for the Congress in its next session to return to the subject of highway legislation in order to provide funds for the enlarged Federal assistance under this act. Its action at that time should be in accord with the sound principles that established the trust fund as a means for keeping Federal-aid highway expenditures on a self-sustaining basis."

As a consequence, the President recommended to Congress, in January 1959, a temporary increase in the gasoline tax of 1½ cents to keep the highway program on schedule.

If the Congress had followed the President's recommendation, apportionments could have been made as authorized by the Congress and there would not have been any cutback in the program. Without the required additional revenues the Bureau of Public Roads had no choice but to cut back the program. Under the law, it would have been irresponsible fiscal management to have done otherwise. However, it should be recognized that the principal reduction in the program resulted from the provisions of the 1959 act decreasing the interstate authorization for fiscal year 1961 from $2.5 billion to $2 billion, a 20-percent decrease. This year, against the administration recommendations, the fund was further reduced by $25 million with the forest roads announcement.

The newspaper article referred to states:

"Further complicating the financial picture is the plan adopted by the administration last October which is known as reimbursement planning. Regardless of what they call it, it is nothing more than contract control and it represents an operation whereby the administration is telling the States just when and to what extent they can obligate funds apportioned to them."

That is exactly what the administration is doing. To do otherwise, would create a chaotic situation among the States. Through reimbursement planning the Federal aid highway program has been permitted to go forward at a uniform rate with prompt reimbursement for work completed. The alternative to reimbursement planning under current revenue would have been to let the States proceed to obligate the full amount of their apportioned funds without any controls until maximum obligations would have been reached for which prompt reimbursement could have been assured. This procedure would have permitted the more active States to have quickly used up the maximum allowable obligations which could have been permitted and then there would have had to be declared a nationwide moratorium on all new contracts for a period of time until the trust fund could again support new obligations. Obviously, such a procedure was rejected and each State is being treated fairly under the reimbursement planning procedure.

A fact that is rarely mentioned is that, if a State does not desire prompt reimbursement, it may go ahead with the approval of projects within the total funds apportioned to it. The limitation of the Highway Trust Fund to make prompt reimbursement has required reimbursement planning. If Congress would see fit to provide sufficient funds, I am sure the Bureau of Public Roads would be glad to discontinue reimbursement planning.

The newspaper article also states that the delay in completing the program from 1972 to 1976 could mean the loss of 10,000 lives. That is what the President was attempting to avoid when he recommended an increase in the gasoline tax of 1½ cents in order to keep the program on schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment briefly on the work of the special subcommittee in the Federal aid highway program and to make some suggestion on how it can be made more effective and serve the public interest.

Let me point out that I believe it was I and the distinguished Congressman from Ohio, GORDON SCHERER, who first suggested that a watchdog committee be created to keep an eye on this program. We believe that everyone should know now that a program of this magnitude needs to be watched very closely to determine whether or not it is following the intent of Congress, to determine whether the policies adopted by Congress are wise and sound, to determine whether or not the Federal and State Governments, which have the major responsibility, are taking full advantage of the legislation and applying it in such a way that the public interest will be best served; and to determine whether or not additional legislation may be needed.

I believe this committee should have for its objectives:

First, keep the building of the program on schedule.

Second, guarantee that the taxpayers are getting a full dollar's worth of highway for each tax dollar spent on this project.

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the subject earlier this year, I pointed out that based upon experience so far, this committee should begin now with a qualified staff to hold hearings to determine whether or not it might not be to our national advantage to set up an efficient rating procedure whereby the emphasis on road construction would be placed on those roads where the study showed the greatest traffic to be generated or where they would be needed most.

I further pointed out the urgency for a decision on the desired height of bridges over navigable streams; that because of the controversy that exists between the U.S. Army Engineers and the Bureau of Public Roads, the public interest might be served if we used the prestige of our committee to get an early decision on this matter so that plans could be made now to build the bridges that will be necessary over these major streams.

I also stated that in certain States there is disagreement among the people over the location of the Interstate Highway System. In one instance, apparently because of political pressure, a road that is expected to carry 20,000 cars a day across the country is routed in such a manner that it is 18 miles longer than it needs to be, thus forcing cross-country traffic to travel that many extra miles. Hearings to determine the validity of these political charges raised by the States could be of great value and might in the future save millions of dollars of money.

The charges have been made that many of the interchanges are far too elaborate and in some instances more interchanges have been built than are necessary. The committee could hold hearings on this phase of the highway building program. It is apparent that this phase of the highway building program needs some public hearing. I can envision millions of dollars being saved by eliminating some of the frills, if any, on these interchanges.

Moreover, we might find it advisable to set up a priority system on these interchanges so that the trunk lines which appear to me to be more important could be built first and then we could give attention to building interchanges.

There have been further charges made that in certain areas too much emphasis is placed on the building of the extensions of the highway system rather than on the building of the trunk lines. It appears to me that much could come from hearings on this phase of the Interstate Highway program.

Some people have pointed out there might be some virue in adopting a policy of minimum standards for highway construction which, in the minds of some people, are too fixed. They point out that the soil bases are different across the United States and much money might be saved by adopting realistic minimum standards for these highways.

My own preliminary study of the building programs in the various States of the Union shows me that we are building four-lane highways in many areas where two lanes could be used for many years. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if this is necessary and I would like to know if, in areas where two lanes are enough, we might build two lanes now and then plan to build the four lanes at a later date when the main trunk system has been completed or when they are actually needed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment on the work of the special subcommittee to date. First, let me say I have a great respect for the chairman of our committee. However, because he has not consulted with all members of the committee to discuss policy matters, or the scope and kind of investigation that should be made, and because there is some evidence of too much politics in the committee, the chairman has been handicapped in doing the job that can be and, I believe, should be done by this committee.

Let me demonstrate, Mr. Speaker, why there is support for the criticism that this subcommittee was created in an election year for political purposes. The subcommittee was constituted so as to include 13 Democrats and only 6 Republicans.

I thought this was an unusual way to set up an investigating committee which is presumably committed to a minimum of partisanship and maximum objectivity in its investigations and hearings, and upon

making a personal study of such special or select committees of the House, I found that this political stacking is unprecedented. The records show that from the 80th Congress to date, no such committee has been so loaded against the minority, regardless of which party controlled the House. This study of select or investigating committees reveals that since the 80th Congress there have been 23 select committees which have been assigned a special investigating job and in 21 out of the 23 select committees there has only been a 1-vote majority. There were two instances when there was a three-vote majority.

In addition to this loading of my own committee, there is evidence that members of the majority party who logically should have served on this committee were kept off because they did not support certain proposals for the highway system presented by certain leaders of the Congress.

In addition, it should be noted that when the committee was set up it was understood, in accordance with the practice of the Congress, that the minority would be given representation on the staff. This was not recognized until 6 months later when the minority was authorized to hire one person for the general counsel.

It should also be pointed out that while the staff that was hired does have qualifications to investigate crime and corruption, none of them have had any real experience with highway law, highway construction, or in dealing with State highway officials and/or the Bureau of Roads. Since there are so many people who have had experience, have prestige, and are respected by those who are more vitally interested in adequate highways and who have ability and knowledge on the subject, it seems unfortunate that this talent has not yet been called upon by the committee.

"NAME OF COMMITTEE OR SUBCOMMITTEE

"1. Select Committee on Small Business: 80th Congress; 4 Democrats, 5 Republicans.

"2. Select Committee on News Print, Printing and Wrapping Paper, Paper Products, Pulp and Pulpwood; 80th Congress; 3 Democrats, 4 Republicans.

"3. Select Committee on Foreign Aid: 80th Congress; 8 Democrats, 11 Republicans.

"4. Select Committee on Transactions on Commodity Exchanges; 80th Congress; 3 Democrats, 4 Republicans.

"5. Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures: 80th Congress; 2 Democrats, 3 Republicans.

"6. Special Committee on Reconstruction of Roofs and Skylights and Remodeling of House Chamber: 80th Congress; 2 Democrats, 3 Republicans.

"7. Special Committee on Reconstruction of Roofs and Skylights and Remodeling of House Chamber: 81st Congress; 3 Democrats, 2 Republicans.

"8. Select Committee on Small Business: 81st Congress; 6 Democrats, 3 Republicans.

"9. Special Committee To Attend World Assembly for Moral Rearmament: 81st Congress; 3 Democrats, 2 Republicans.

"10. Special Committee on Lobbying Activities: 81st Congress; 4 Democrats, 3 Republicans.

"11. Special Committee on House Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of House Chamber; 82d Congress; 3 Democrats, 2 Republicans.

"12. Select Committee on Small Business: 82d Congress; 6 Democrats, 5 Republicans.

"13. Select Committee on Chemicals, Pesticides, and Insecticides in and With Respect to Food Products: 82d Congress; 4 Democrats, 3 Republicans.

"14. Select Committee on Education, Training, and Loan Guarantee Programs of World War II Veterans: 82d Congress; 5 Democrats, 4 Republicans.

"15. Special Committee on House Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of House Chamber: 82d Congress; 2 Democrats, 3 Republicans.

"16. Select Committee on Small Business: 83d Congress; 5 Democrats, 6 Republicans.

"17. Select Committee on Inclusion of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia Into the U.S.S.R.: 83d Congress; 3 Democrats, 4 Republicans.

"18. Special Committee on Tax Exempt Foundations: 83d Congress; 2 Democrats, 3 Republicans.

"19. Select Committee on Small Business: 84th Congress; 6 Democrats, 5 Republicans.

"20. Select Committee on Benefit for Survivors of Deceased Members and Former Members of Armed Forces: 84th Congress; 3 Democrats, 2 Republicans.

"21. Select Committee on Financial Position of the White County Bridge: 84th Congress; 2 Democrats, 1 Republican.

"22. Select Committee on Small Business: 85th Congress; 7 Democrats, 6 Republicans.

"23. Select Committee on Small Business: 86th Congress; 7 Democrats, 6 Republicans."

Here, I believe, is abundant evidence that a seven-vote majority for this type of committee is unprecedented in the Congress, It is therefore no surprise, Mr. Speaker, that the public does not have the respect for and the confidence in this committee that they should have.

This committee, Mr. Speaker, was appointed before the end of the session last year with an authorized budget of approximately $295,000 for a 10-month period. A large staff of counsel, investigators, and accountants has been investigating alleged highway scandals since last fall. We are now late in the 84th calendar day of this session, yet we have had only two hearings—one admittedly not completely investigated—both of which lasted less than 10 days.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I call on the chairman of the Roads Committee to carry out the responsibility that the watchdog committee to date has failed to. I do this because the watchdog committee is now working on finding alleged irregularities, collusion, and the effect of politics on the building of this highway system. This is needed and the staff that has been retained for this is qualified for this investigation which is no doubt needed and which I do not want to hamper in any way. The present staff is not qualified, however, to do the job in the areas that I have mentioned earlier. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the chairman of the Roads Committee of the Congress plan now to use our present staff on the Public Works Committee and acquire such additional expert talent as is needed and which is available to start hearings in the many areas which I have already referred to. In my opinion this would render a great public service by reinstilling confidence in those people who are responsible for building the highway system and reassuring us all that we are and will get our money's worth for the tax dollars spent for this most monumental public works program ever undertaken in the history of the world.

If our study would prove that more money is needed, then I suggest that we ask the Ways and Means Committee to give serious thought to the recommendation of Senator CASE of South Dakota, which provides a special license system whereby some assurance is given that those who use the interstate system most will pay a larger share for the cost of building the system.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. I should like to inquire of the gentleman just what he means when he says there has been politics in the special subcommittee; and precisely what he means when he says that the public does not have confidence in the activities of the special committee. I believe both statements are misleading.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. If the gentleman reads my remarks that I am placing in the RECORD tomorrow, this will be explained. In the meantime, I should like to point out to you that since the 80th Congress there have been 23 select investigating committees appointed and authorized by this House. In all of them, with one or two exceptions, the majority was a one-vote majority in favor of the majority party. In two instances, the difference was a three-vote majority on the committee. Our committee has a seven-vote majority.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is it a larger committee numerically?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. It is a larger committee numerically and there is some criticism by some on that score. Also, I should like to point out there are members of our committee who are outstanding members of our committee who, apparently, if they did not vote as some Members of the House thought they should vote on some of the questions before our committee are not now members of this select committee, and they would really be qualified members to serve on that select committee.

Mr. WRIGHT. Is the gentleman saying that someone has resigned from the select committee or has been dismissed from the select committee or has ceased to participate in its activity because of some vote?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am not suggesting that at all. I am suggesting there are some Members who were on the Roads Subcommittee and who sat with you and with me for 74 days on the discussion of the Interstate Highway System and demonstrated real interest and who have talent and they are not now on this select committee. The point I am making, and there is some feeling on the part of some of us, is that there was possibly some politics played.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is questioning the decision in the original selection of the membership of the special committee.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. What is that?

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman is questioning the wisdom of the decision in the selection of the membership of the special committee.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. That is true, yes.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been a member of the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal Aid Highway Program from its inception. From this vantage point I have been convinced that there is an enormous and important investigative job to be done and a thorough evaluation of policies adopted by the various State highway departments if the public interest is to be served by this multibillion dollar highway program. However, I have become equally convinced that this job will not and cannot be fully done by our present subcommittee which contains 13 Democrat members and only 6 Republicans.

As I have pointed out several times before in the RECORD, there has never been a select or special committee of the House, charged with investigating a particular field, where the minority members have so little representation regardless of which party controls the House. Such a politically constituted committee cannot command the broad confidence of the House and the public that its motives are beyond suspect. We are all sophisticated enough to recognize that there will be a minimum of political consideration in every committee and this is especially so where the majority party has more than a 2 to 1 majority on the committee.

Thus it is with this special subcommittee. There have been charges and countercharges of politics on both sides in the manner this committee has functioned to date; this was especially true in the period prior to the recent presidential election. But now that the election is over, I think and hope that politics will be submerged and that both parties, which contain men of good will, can unite against crooks, grafters, and incompetents who are bringing our vast Federal aid project into public disrepute. Accordingly, I have introduced a resolution to create a new, select bipartisan, committee of the House to complete the job which so far has not and could not be done during the short existence of the Special Subcommittee To Investigate the Federal Aid Highway Program. I include the resolution at this point in the RECORD:

"*Resolved*, That, effective January 3, 1961, there is hereby established and created a select committee which is authorized and directed to conduct investigations and studies of all aspects of and problems arising under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 and to determine whether any changes are required in the laws of the United States and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation: *Provided*, That the select committee shall not invade any subject matter under active investigation by any standing committee of the House.

"SEC. 2. (a) The select committee shall be composed of twelve members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, six from the majority party and six from the minority party, and shall, at its first meeting, to be called by the Speaker, select a chairman from the members of the majority party and a vice chairman from the minority members, and adopt rules of procedure not inconsistent with the rules of the House.

(b) Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointments.

"SEC. 3. The select committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

"SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution the select committee is authorized as it may deem necessary and appropriate to (1) make such expenditures from the contingent fund of the House; (2) hold such hearings; (3) sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House has recessed, or has adjourned; (4) require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; (5) administer such oaths; (6) take such testimony, either orally or by deposition; (7) employ on a temporary basis such attorneys, investigators, technical engineering, and other assistants and consultants who are qualified, experienced, and knowledgeable in roadbuilding and highway matters as it shall be deemed necessary and appropriate in the judgment of the chairman of the select committee.

"SEC. 5. For further purposes of this resolution (1) subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the select committee or any members designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member; (2) oaths to witnesses may be administered by the chairman of the select committee or any member thereof.

"SEC. 6. The majority of the members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except two or more shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking evidence including sworn testimony.

"SEC. 7. The expenditures authorized by this resolution shall not exceed —— and shall be paid upon vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of the select committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration."

Mr. Speaker, in drafting this resolution, I have combined what I think are the best features of the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field and the House Select Committee on Small Business.

The Senate select committee, called the "Labor Rackets Committee," investigated the extremely sensitive field of labor and management for 3 years and reflected credit upon the Senate and upon the Congress. Composed of four Democrats and four Republicans, even though the Republican strength in the Senate was considerably less than this ratio, this select committee, under the graceful chairmanship of Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, kept politics at an absolute minimum.

During these 3 years of investigation, all of the committee reports were unanimous except for two. Of these two reports, I notice that the only dissent in one was filled by a Democrat Senator and in the other the four Republican members signed one, and the four Democrat members issued two separate views on the same subject matter. This, I think, is a marvelous record and one which I am convinced can be duplicated in this equally sensitive area of Federal aid to highways.

You will notice that my resolution calls for a select committee composed of 12 Members of the House appointed by the Speaker, 6 from each party. The number 12 is an arbitarary figure, to be sure, but I have chosen it with the thought that such committees will be more effective with a relatively small membership. You will further notice that the 12 members selected by the Speaker will select a chairman from the majority party and the vice chairman from the minority party. This, again, is a feature which I have taken from the resolution creating the Labor Rackets Committee and which, in my judgment and the judgment of many observers, operated to keep politics at a minimum.

Let me demonstrate how this can be so. The Democratic Party, in addition to controlling both Houses of the Congress, now controls the executive branch of the Government and is, therefore, responsible for administering the Highway Act of 1956. And, while it is true that prior to the last election our special subcommittee was, in a sense, investigating the shortcomings of a Republican administration, the shoe is now, or shortly will be, on the other foot. The possibility is not entirely remote, in my view, that the Republicans could capture control of the House and this committee in 1962. And, human nature being what it is, a Republican majority in control of the investigative machinery of the House theoretically could be more interested in tarring a Democratic administration than getting at the facts.

But, under my resolution and my hypothetical example, the Democratic Party would still retain an equal number of members on the select committee and, in addition, would have a vice chairman of its own, all of whom could act as a brake on any political excesses on the part of the Republicans. So, while in the short view the Democratic Party may be surrendering a few of its prerogatives, in the long-range view I think both parties and the public interest can be served if what I have described should come about.

There are other and equally cogent arguments to support my resolution which I hope will commend it to all Members of the House regardless of what party they belong to. I welcome their support for this resolution and, for further considerations, I refer them to a speech which I made on the floor of the House on September 16, 1960, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 14, pages 18775 to 18782. I also include this speech at this point in the RECORD:

"FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM

"(Speech of Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, August 31, 1960)

"Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee of the Federal-Aid Highway Program, of which I am a member, has been in existence for almost 1 year now. During this time, the staff of a dozen or so counsel and investigators, under the direction of the chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota, has been combing the country for scandals in the multi-billion-dollar Interstate Highway System. While getting the crooks is important, and I am in favor of it, this is not the only thing this committee ought to be doing. Then, too, it should be noted that what our subcommittee has done to date would convince even a man from Mars that it has not borne out the charges yet, made in some of the press and some of the Democratic colleagues' press releases, that our exposés would make Teapot Dome seem like a child's game of marbles and would dwarf in comparison the sordid Dave Beck-Jimmy Hoffa episodes uncovered by the McClellan Labor Rackets Committee of the Senate.

"Thus far, we have held two hearings: one of them involving vertical bridge clearance and another dealing with fraud in Oklahoma, which case admittedly was not completely investigated. Also, it should be noted that just when it appeared that the subcommittee could get its teeth into a real meaty scandal involving alleged millions of dollars of right-of-way irregularities in the State of Massachusetts, the chairman has unilaterally decided that there will be no more hearings until after the November election in order to keep any political considerations out of the probe.

"Now this decision represented a complete reversal of the Chair's earlier position, for we Republican members of the subcommittee had been informed that there would be further hearings after the conventions of the two political parties but before the November elections.

"What occurred between early May and June 20 that would account for this press release indicating a complete change from earlier positive assurance to the committee? I suggest a clue can be found in the Boston Traveler, dated May 13, 1960, which first broke the news that the Bureau of Public Roads had 'uncovered evidence of hundreds of thousands of dollars in our appraisals in Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program.' Carried under the headline 'U.S. Probes Appraisals for Massachusetts Roads,' this story was front-page stuff in the Boston Traveler. I include at this point in the RECORD, the article referred to above:

"'[From the Boston Traveler, May 13, 1960]

"'U.S PROBES APPRAISALS FOR MASSACHUSETTS ROADS

"'(By Tom W. Gerber)

"'WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Bureau of Public Roads has uncovered evidence of hundreds of thousands of dollars in overappraisals in Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program.

"'And the Bureau has launched a two-pronged investigation of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works' land value estimates for rights-of-way for Federal-aid highways.

"'*Bureau cut off payments for land takings here*

"'Atop this, the Traveler learned today the Bureau in January cut off payments to the

State for right-of-way land takings based on DPW appraisals.

" 'This action was taken pending exhaustive audit of each suspected overappraised land parcel in highway rights-of-way.

" 'A top source said the Bureau has made no payments to the State for acquiring rights-of-way since Federal funds were shut off 4 months ago.

" 'And it was learned Massachusetts is the only State in the Nation currently under this restriction.

" 'Under normal practice, the Bureau makes progress payments for acquiring needed highway rights-of-way without audit.

" 'This helps speed construction of the Nation's $37 billion, 41,000-mile highway program. Audits normally are conducted later.

" 'Engineer-appraiser-accountant teams from the Bureau's project examination division have been investigating the Massachusetts DPW's right-of-way land appraisals for several months.

" 'More than 100 suspected swollen appraisals are under scrutiny.

" 'And only last week, the Bureau hired the Washington, D.C., valuation engineering firm of Beasley & Beasley, to doublecheck the Bureau's findings.

" 'This professional appraising firm often has worked under Government contract. It has been hired in the past by the Navy and the Army Corps of Engineers in addition to the Bureau of Public Roads.

" 'Three years ago, some of the evidence uncovered by this concern led to Federal indictments in the Indiana highway scandals.

" 'The Traveler learned three land parcels in eastern Massachusetts, valued by State-hired appraisers at about $100,000 each, only were worth between $30,000 and $40,000 in the opinion of Government appraisers.

" 'The Department of Justice here has been informed of these preliminary findings, the Traveler learned. It was reported "watching" the investigation.

" 'Overpayments in two categories

" 'Bureau agents discovered what they considered to be overappraisals both in the costly Interstate Highway System and in the so-called primary, secondary, and urban programs in Massachusetts.

" 'The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the costs under the interstate program and splits the costs 50–50 with the State for primary, secondary, and urban projects.

" 'The Traveler learned the Bureau's systematic analysis of the State's right-of-way land appraisals done on a sample basis.

" 'Bureau agents, including former FBI men, are examining more than 10 percent of roughly 1,000 right-of-way land appraisals accomplished by the State last year.

" 'However, one source said the sampling included the three in the $100,000 bracket. He said the State's questionable appraisals generally appear to be between 25 to 50 percent too high according to Federal standards.

" 'Two separate sources told the Traveler many of the State's appraisals were "unreasonable, unsupported and erroneous." Both sources used the same words.

" 'The investigation was touched off late last year when the State failed to provide satisfactory documentation for land appraisals required for highway rights-of-way.

" 'A Traveler source said it soon was "obvious" much of the data in the State appraisals was erroneous.

" 'However, this source refused to rule out the possibility the bloated appraisals represented merely errors of judgment.

" 'But he pointed to the fact some estimated land values in the DPW appraisals failed to coincide with appraisals of similar nearby land.

" 'Professional probers costly to Government

" 'He also pointed to the fact the Bureau had hired the firm of professional appraisers "at considerable cost to the Government."

" 'He said this wouldn't be done unless "substantial sums" were involved.

" 'It was reported the investigation had not yet reached the point where appraisers, property owners and DPW employees were being questioned, with a view toward more drastic action by the Government.

" 'The Massachusetts DPW usually hires private appraisers to make land value estimates. They are paid from $500 to $1,000, depending on the scope of the appraisal job.

" 'If the land is believed to be worth more than $25,000, two appraisers are hired. For the most part, these appraisers are local real estate operators.

" 'Probe reported planned in two stages

" 'The investigation was reported to be planned in two stages.

" 'Now under way is the first stage to determine the basis for the suspected high appraisals.

" 'The second stage would be to make certain that none of the appraisals was set before the right-of-way land was examined.

" 'While the Bureau has shut off payments to the State for acquiring right-of-way land, construction progress payments still are being made.

" 'It was reported this part of the highway program in Massachusetts was not under unusual examination.

" 'In previous years, all Federal payments under the cooperative highway construction program were cut off in Indiana and Arizona when scandals racked their State highway departments.

" 'Di Natale aware of Federal probe

" 'State Public Works Commissioner Anthony N. Di Natale issued a statement Sunday suggesting he was aware of the Bureau double-barreled inquiry.

" 'He announced he would "cull out and fire incompetents" hired by the DPW as property negotiators and appraisers on highway projects.' "

"This subcommittee, authorized by the House to investigate irregularities in the Interstate System has proved to be a 'most reluctant dragon' when Massachusetts is concerned. This alarming situation has been known by the subcommittee since January of 1960, when the Bureau of Public Roads first learned of it, cut off all payment on all Massachusetts Federal-aid projects, and began a vigorous investigation on its own initiative. And as noted above, it has been noted in the Boston press since May 13, 1960. Yet, even though the staff independently determined that there was substance to these allegations of a conspiracy to defraud the Government, this subcommittee had made no move to have the staff, assisted by the Bureau of Public Roads, prepare this case for hearing.

"This inaction should be contrasted with the alacrity with which this subcommittee pounced upon some newspaper clippings exposing alleged irregularities in Tulsa, Okla., and which resulted in a series of hearings during the first week of May of this year. So eagerly was the Oklahoma matter pushed, that the grand jury evidence was presented in open hearings shortly after several contractors were indicted and even before they could be given a fair trial in a court of law. It is also interesting to note that the present Governor of Oklahoma, whose presence as a witness was demanded by me to explain why he had rewarded unfaithful State highway officials with increased pay and job security, was not called as a witness.

"May came and went, and still there was little interest in Massachusetts. So did June and July. But in the words of a familiar song, 'The days grow short as we reach September.' On August 16, 1960, the Bureau of Public Roads, in a letter from Mr. Ellis L. Armstrong, Commissioner, referred the results of their investigations to the subcommittee and to the Department of Justice for its review and any action it may deem to be appropriate. This letter has been released to the press and reported in the Boston Traveler on August 17, 1960. I therefore include it in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

" '[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 17, 1960]

" 'LETTER TO HOUSE UNIT DETAILS ROAD PROBE

" '(Traveler Washington Bureau)

" 'WASHINGTON.—Following is the text of a letter transmitting reports on the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program from the Bureau of Public Roads to the House Subcommittee on the Federal-aid Highway Program:

" ' "Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK,

" ' "*Chairman, Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

" ' "DEAR MR. BLATNIK: Reference is made to the review by this Bureau of certain appraisal practices in the State of Massachusetts which has been continuing since the beginning of this year and with certain aspects of which members of your staff are familiar. As a result of information that fee appraisers retained by the State of Massachusetts, in connection with Federal aid projects, were submitting inadequate or misleading information in appraisal reports to justify appraisals far in excess of true market value, the Project Examination Division of this Bureau in cooperation with your field offices undertook a special review in January of this year. In addition, at that time the Bureau required that no payments be made to Massachusetts reimbursing it for the cost of the acquisition of right-of-way on Federal-aid projects, except after final audit of such property involved.

" ' "BUREAU CONTINUES SPECIAL REVIEW

" ' "After several months of review, the Bureau retained the firm of Beasley & Beasley of Washington, D.C., to make new appraisals of certain selected projects in Massachusetts, including a primary Federal-aid project in Wakefield and an interstate project in Attleboro. At the same time the Bureau continued its own special review. The firm of Beasley & Beasley has now submitted its first reports containing its appraisals in Wakefield and the southerly part of the interstate project at Attleboro. Copies of these reports are forwarded herewith.

" ' "An analytical and comparative review of these Beasley appraisals and those of independent fee appraisers retained by the State is now underway. This analysis to date reveals that certain fee appraisers retained by the State, by using misleading information and ignoring available data, placed values on selected properties far in excess of values that could be supported by available true market data. For example, sales of improved properties were reported as unimproved and were used to support prices in land far in excess of the true land value. At the same time, the appraisers ignored pertinent sales of unimproved property in the immediate vicinity of the subject properties which, if used, would have justified the assignment of much lower values.

" ' "CASES INVOLVE LARGE SUMS

" ' "For the most part these selected cases involved extensive properties and large sums of money. The Bureau has made no payments in reimbursement to Massachusetts on any of these properties.

" ' "A preliminary detailed analysis of these selected cases is now in our files and available to your committee. This analysis, together with other independent information which has come to the attention of this Bureau, support a conclusion that certain fee appraisers employed by the State have been subjected to pressures which comprised their independence. Such analysis and such other information have been and are being

submitted to the Department of Justice for its review and any action it may deem to be appropriate.

" ' "If there is any further information on this subject which you desire, please do not hesitate to call us.

" ' "Sincerely yours,

" ' "ELLIS L. ARMSTRONG,

" ' "*Commissioner of Public Roads.*" '

"On August 17, 1960, the Boston Traveler carried an article written by its correspondent Tom W. Gerber, under such headlines as 'Land Appraisals Boosted 300 P.C.,' 'Excesses Run Into Millions of Dollars,' and 'High State Official Is Under Suspicion,' I ask that this article dated August 17, 1960, also be printed at this point in the RECORD, as well as similar articles appearing in the Boston Herald, dated August 18, 1960, entitled 'U.S. Pledges Complete Probe of Massachusetts Highway Land Cost'; in the Boston Traveler on August 18, 1960, entitled, "Massachusetts Highway Scandals Worst Yet'; In the Boston Herald dated August 19, 1960, entitled 'FBI To Probe State Scandal in Land Taking'; and in the Boston Traveler, dated August 19, 1960, entitled 'GOP Demands Action in Massachusetts Roads Probe.'

" '[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 17, 1960]

" 'MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY SCANDAL

" '(By Tom W. Gerber)

" 'WASHINGTON.—Excessive land appraisals in the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program run into the millions of dollars, the Traveler learned today.

" 'A high State official is under suspicion in the racket, believed the largest yet in the Nation's $50 billion highway construction program.

" 'These facts come to light as the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads filed a preliminary report to Congress on a 3-month investigation of highway land takings in Massachusetts.

" 'The results of this inquiry and other data already have been turned over to the U.S. Justice Department for "any action * * * it may deem appropriate."

" 'The preliminary investigation report was prepared by Beasley & Beasley, an independent Washington valuation engineering firm retained by the Bureau of Public Roads to look into the Massachusetts situation. Its inquiry is continuing.

" 'Three years ago, evidence uncovered by this firm in another BPR investigation led to Federal indictments in the Indiana highway scandals.

" 'The current report does not name the Massachusetts official under suspicion in the land appraisal racket.

" 'However, the Traveler learned the official and certain accomplices subjected highway right-of-way land appraisers employed by the State to "pressures which compromised their independence."

" 'These appraisers were hired by the State, mostly last year, to set values on land the State would take for construction of Federal-aid highways.

" 'In some cases, their appraisals were up to 300 percent higher than detailed valuations determined by Beasley & Beasley. These cases involved extensive land tracts.

" '*Threats go with bloated appraisals*

" 'The Traveler learned the bloated appraisals were submitted in some cases under threat of losing the State's business if the fee appraisers failed to comply.

" 'However, the Federal Government will not have to pay for these excessive land-taking costs.

" 'The BPR in January cut off payments to Massachusetts for highway right-of-way taking based on State department of public works appraisals.

" 'The Federal Government usually reimburses the State for 90 percent of the costs of land-taking and construction of the vast Interstate Highway System within the State.

" 'It also pays the State half the cost of land-taking and construction under the so-called primary, secondary, and urban highway construction program.

" 'Most of these facts were contained in a Beasley & Beasley report forwarded by the BPR to the House Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program.

" 'Two thick volumes of investigation results and an accompanying letter were sent to the subcommittee that has been investigating reported abuses in the interstate highway program nationwide.

" 'The report dealt with alleged land appraisal excesses in Wakefield and part of an Interstate Highway 95 project in Attleboro and North Attleboro.

" 'Two additional volumes were expected to be sent to the subcommittee within a few days with additional details on the Attleboro-North Attleboro project.

" 'The valuation engineering firm, which previously has worked under contracts with the Army, the Navy, and the BPR, is expected to complete a study of the Gardner area next month.

" 'In addition to this study, the Bureau's project examination division has been investigating suspected land valuation excesses in Massachusetts since January, when Federal payments were halted.

" 'The Bureau's agents still are operating within the State.

" 'The letter transmitting the reports to Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, subcommittee chairman, told how some excess appraisals were devised.

" 'The letter said "certain fee appraisers retained by the State" used misleading information and ignored available data that would have supported lower valuations.

" 'Thus, the letter said, sales of improved properties were reported as unimproved and were used to support prices for unimproved nearby land far in excess of true value.

" 'The letter continued:

" ' "At the same time the appraisers ignored pertinent sales of unimproved property in the immediate vicinity of the subject properties which, if used, would have justified the assignment of much lower values."

" 'Thus, if there was a $30,000 house on a lot worth $10,000, the land alone would be appraised for $40,000 to justify an excessive valuation for a property to be taken in the vicinity.

" 'The Traveler learned the puffed valuations were on only a small percentage of the properties involved in land-takings in the Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro areas.

" 'The investigation showed land appraisals were reasonably accurate on smaller properties.

" 'Yet, the Traveler's sources said the excessive valuations would run into "millions of dollars"—considerably more than originally suspected when the investigation first was undertaken.

" 'And the State already has paid for some land takings based on these overvaluations, the Traveler learned.

" 'But no Federal money has reached the hands either of the State official or the appraisers involved. The appraisers are paid fees based on their work.

" 'Normally, the Federal Government would reimburse the State half of the highway improvement cost under the primary, secondary, and urban Federal highway program.

" 'The project in Wakefield, now in the construction stage, involved a widening of Route 128.

" 'It is a 3.3-mile stretch skirting Wakefield's northern boundary from North Avenue to the Saugus River, including the Lowell Street interchange.

" 'It originally was planned in 1956, designed in 1957 and authorized for acquisition in 1958 and 1959. The State filed its required declaration of land taking in August 1959.

" 'The Attleboro project on which the investigation still was incomplete, involved two stretches of interstate highway totaling 6.6 miles.

" 'The first part extended 4.5 miles from the Rhode Island line in South Attleboro through industrial-commercial property to a point north of Thacher Street.

" 'The second stretch was 2.1 miles from just north of the proposed Commonwealth Avenue interchange to a point north of Kelley Boulevard.

" 'Hundreds of land tracts are involved in the land-taking process that will clear the way for the new highways. The exact number still is undetermined as the investigation continues.

" 'The precise number of fee appraisers involved in the overvaluations also was undetermined. It was believed to be a comparatively small number.

" 'A Traveler source said some of the appraisers apparently worked actively with the States official while others were "coerced."

" 'Since Federal money didn't change hands, any official charges against these persons based on Justice Department investigation, probably would be something like conspiracy.

" 'Under State procedure, appraisals approved by the State department of public works are sent to a five-member real estate review board for review.

" 'However, this group meets only once weekly and lacks facilities for investigating the basis on which the submitted appraisals were determined.

" '[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 18, 1960]

" 'UNITED STATES PLEDGES COMPLETE PROBE OF MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY LAND COST

" '(By Tom W. Gerber)

" 'WASHINGTON.—The chairman of a Federal highway investigating subcommittee Wednesday pledged a complete rundown on excessive appraisals in Massachusetts' Federal-aid highway program.

" 'Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK (Democrat of Minnesota) told the Herald his group was going to find out about U.S. Bureau of Public Roads' evidence that overvaluations totaled "millions of dollars."

" '*GOP member wants faster action*

" 'BLATNIK, whose subcommittee was formed to watchdog the biggest construction undertaking in world history, said he hoped to send investigators to Massachusetts within a month.

" 'But the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican of Ohio), told the Herald the investigation should be started immediately.

" ' "There's no reason why the subcommittee staff should not conduct a complete investigation at this time," SCHERER said.

" 'SCHERER, reached Wednesday night soon after his return from Cincinnati said the Massachusetts highway scandals were far worse than in Oklahoma.

" 'SCHERER said he expected to have a further statement on the Massachusetts highway scandals after he had studied BPR reports sent to the subcommittee.

" 'The subcommittee in May held hearings on the Oklahoma highway scandal. Evidence was developed on falsified reports, payments for work not done, death threats and juggled claims.

" '*Meeting August 24*

" 'BLATNIK said the subcommittee would discuss the evidence of bloated appraisals for right-of-way land in the Massachusetts highway program at an executive session August 24.

" 'The Minnesota Congressman said subcommittee experts would evaluate data ob-

tained by the independent valuation engineering firm of Beasley and Beasley and other material in BPR files before investigators were sent to the Bay State.

" 'I want to make this perfectly clear," BLATNIK said. "The situation in Massachusetts will be given a complete rundown."

" 'However, he said hearings on highway right-of-way appraisals in Massachusetts certainly would not be held before Thanksgiving.

" 'BLATNIK said no hearings would be held until after the November elections.

" 'Politics charge feared

" 'We could be accused of playing politics," he said.

" 'But SCHERER disagreed. He noted the Beasley and Beasley reports and BPR-developed information already had been turned over to the U.S. Justice Department for "appropriate action."

" 'The committee would be more justified going into Massachusetts before any possible indictments are returned than afterward," he said.

" 'The BPR reports to the subcommittee and other information obtained by the Herald implicated a high Massachusetts official in the excessive appraisals racket.

" 'However, the official was not named in the reports.

" 'But it was learned he exerted "pressures" on State-hired fee appraisers to "compromise their independence," in making true market value appraisals.

" 'Up 300 percent

" 'Some of these appraisers actively cooperated in the puffed-appraisal racket while others were coerced by the threat of losing State business if they failed to cooperate, the Herald learned.

" 'Some appraisals for large land tracts were as much as 300 percent over subsequent appraisals by Beasley and Beasley, it was learned.

" 'The valuation engineering firm from Washington, D.C., was hired by the BPR in May to investigate and doublecheck information developed by the BPR's project examination division since January.

" 'That was when the Federal Government shut off land-taking reimbursements to the State under the Interstate Highway program and the so-called primary, secondary, and urban program pending a full audit.

" 'The Federal Government pays the State 90 percent of the land-taking and construction costs under the $50 billion Interstate program and half the land-taking and construction costs under the primary, secondary, and urban system in the State.

" 'Two areas covered

" 'However, despite this 8-month holdback of Federal funds, the Herald learned the State already has paid for some of the land that was excessively appraised.

" 'The BPR report to the subcommittee, prepared by Beasley and Beasley, covered Federal-aid highway projects in two Massachusetts areas—Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro.

" 'The Wakefield propect was a widening of Route 128 along a 3.3-mile stretch around the community's northern bulge. This is under the primary road program.

" 'The Attleboro-North Attleboro project was in two parts of proposed Interstate Route 95.

" 'No comparison

" 'The first stretched for 4.5 miles from the Rhode Island line in South Attleboro through costly industrial and commercial property to a point near Thacher Street.

" 'The second was a 2.1-mile segment from north of the proposed Commonwealth Avenue interchange to a point just north of Kelley Boulevard.

" 'However, the Beasley and Beasley reports of these projects contained only painstaking appraisal of each land parcel involved in the highway construction.

" 'There was no comparison with State appraisals.

" 'This was contained in other BPR data not sent to the subcommittee, but to which the subcommittee was given access.

" 'A Herald source said two additional volumes covering other land appraisals in the Attleboro area would be sent to the subcommittee of a later date.

" 'Many values upheld

" 'In addition, the Herald learned another Federal-highway project in the Gardner area also was under BPR and Beasley and Beasley review.

" 'Study and analysis of this area was expected to be ready next month.

" 'The Herald's source said hundreds of land tracts were involved in the two 4-inch thick reports sent to the subcommittee. However, he said only "a small percentage" of the appraisals received by Beasley and Beasley had been found to be valued excessively.

" 'Generally, he said, the larger tracts were overvalued while smaller plots taken under eminent domain were appraised with reasonable accuracy.

" 'Nevertheless, the Herald was told authoritatively the total overvaluation in Massachusetts would run into "millions of dollars."

" 'At the outset of the investigation this spring, it was believed the overvaluations would range only in the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

" 'How was it done

" 'In a letter transmitting the report to the subcommittee, Public Roads Commissioner Ellis L. Armstrong told how fee appraisers justified excessive valuations.

" 'The letter to BLATNIK said State-hired appraisers used "misleading information" and ignored "available data" that might support a true valuation.

" 'For example, sales of improved properties were reported as unimproved and were used to support prices in land far in excess of the true value," the letter said.

" 'And the Herald learned these appraisers sometimes ranged as far as several miles from the property they were supposed to be appraising to find more costly land they could cite to support an inflated appraisal.

" 'Up to lawyers

" 'The Herald source emphasized the suspected appraisers and the State official involved never collected Federal funds. This money was shut off in January.

" 'However, intentional overappraisals submitted in expectation the State would be reimbursed with Federal funds possibly could be considered conspiracy.

" 'But this was up to the Justice Department to determine.

" 'Meanwhile, both the BPR and the Beasley and Beasley investigations continued.

" '[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 18, 1960]

" 'MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY SCANDAL WORST YET

" '(By Tom Gerber)

" 'WASHINGTON.—Preliminary evidence indicates the Massachusetts highway scandal is bigger than all six under congressional investigation in other States put together, an informed source said today.

" 'The source, which is close to the investigating subcommittee, would not name the other six States currently under probe.

" 'However, he said the Massachusetts situation also involved more money than scandals previously uncovered in Arizona, Indiana, and Oklahoma.

" 'The executive council today rejected a proposal to halt State land-damage payments during the Federal investigation of the Massachusetts highway scandal.

" 'Councilor Augustus Means, sole Republican member, proposed the freeze and cast the only vote recorded in favor.

" 'He called attention to the Federal Bureau of Public Roads investigation of Massachusetts land appraisals in the Federal-aid highway program.

" 'Something is apparently brewing in the Department of Public Works and the U.S. Government," he said. "This body should not continue to approve any more land damages until the matter is cleared up."

" 'Councilor Joseph R. Crimins, one of seven Democrats voting against the motion, said a halt in payments would hurt small property owners whose homes had been taken for new highways.

" 'Democratic Councilor Patrick J. McDonough bitterly attacked Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, and the Herald and Traveler.

" 'He said the newspaper's stories about the Federal investigation were "phony and padded" for the benefit of SALTONSTALL.

" 'SALTONSTALL will have all kinds of Federal men here to produce phony headlines," he said.

" 'He told the council that similar Federal investigations are going on in every State of the Union. No single State is being singled out, he said.

" 'Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, chairman of the highway investigating subcommittee, said his group will make a complete rundown on evidence that excessive land appraisals in the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program totaled millions of dollars.

" 'BLATNIK said he hoped to send subcommittee investigators to Massachusetts within a month.

" 'Asks probe right now

" 'But the ranking subcommittee's minority member, Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, Ohio), suggested the investigation should begin immediately.

" 'In an exclusive story in yesterday's Traveler, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads reported it had evidence of bloated appraisals for right-of-way land in the Massachusetts highway program.

" 'The BPR report to the subcommittee covered Federal-aid highway projects in Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro. The report was prepared by Beasley & Beasley, a valuation firm from Washington, D.C.

" 'The report and other information obtained by the Traveler implicated a high Massachusetts official in the excessive appraisals racket. The official, however, was not identified by name.

" 'Pressures exerted

" 'But it was learned he exerted pressures on State-hired fee appraisers to compromise their independence in making true market value appraisals.

" 'Some of these appraisers actively cooperated in the puffed-up appraisals, while others, it was learned, were coerced with threats of losing State business if they didn't cooperate.

" 'Some appraisals for large land tracts were as much as 300 percent higher than appraisals subsequently made by Beasley & Beasley, it was learned.

" 'The firm was hired by the BPR in May to probe into information developed by the Bureau's project examination division since January.

" 'During January, the Federal Government suspended land-taking reimbursements to the State under the Interstate Highway program and the so-called primary, secondary, and urban program pending a complete audit.

" 'The Federal Government pays the State 90 percent of the land-taking and construction costs under the $50 billion interstate

program. It pays half the land-taking and construction costs under the primary, secondary, and urban system in the State.

" 'BLATNIK told the traveler his subcommittee will discuss the evidence of bloated appraisals in Massachusetts at an executive session August 24.

" 'Subcommittee experts will evaluate it before investigators are sent into the State; he added:

" ' "I want to make this perfectly clear," he said, "the situation in Massachusetts will be given a complete rundown."

" 'But he surmised that hearings on the evidence would not be held before the November elections. Otherwise, he added, "we could be accused of playing politics."

" 'SCHERER disagreed, noting that the Beasley and Beasley reports already have been turned over to the U.S. Department of Justice for appropriate action. He said:

" ' "The subcommittee would be more justified going into Massachusetts before any possible indictments are returned than afterward."

" 'In addition to the Wakefield and Attleboro-North Attleboro projects, the BPR also is reviewing another Federal-highway project in the Gardner area, it was learned.

" 'Study and analysis of this area is expected to be ready next month.

" 'Hundreds of land tracts were involved in the two 4-inch-thick reports sent to the subcommittee. But only a small percentage of the appraisals received by Beasley and Beasley had been found to be valued excessively, a source said.

" 'In general, he explained that the larger tracts were overvalued while smaller plots taken under eminent domain were appraised with reasonable accuracy.

" 'Nevertheless, the total overvaluation in Massachusetts would run into millions of dollars, it was reported.' "

" '[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 19, 1960]

" 'FBI TO PROBE STATE SCANDAL IN LAND TAKING

" '(By Paul Costello)

" 'The FBI will be called in within 1 week to investigate the alleged millions of dollars in excessive appraisals for rights-of-way in the Massachusetts Federal-aid highway program.

" 'The Herald learned Thursday night that the U.S. Justice Department has been kept informed of the preliminary investigation of large-scale land damage frauds by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads and it has decided to call the FBI into the case.

" 'Three investigations

" 'The FBI inquiry will be conducted separately from the Bureau of Public Roads investigation and from the investigation being conducted by the independent valuation engineering firm of Beasley & Beasley.

" 'All that remains to be completed before the FBI steps in is the filing of a formal request by the Justice Department and the completion by the Bureau of Public Roads of its final draft of the preliminary report based on its 7-month Massachusetts study.

" 'The BPR broke the scandal Wednesday in a letter to a special House subcommittee set up as a watchdog on the billion-dollar Federal-aid highway program throughout the Nation.

" 'The FBI entrance into the scandals comes on the heels of announcement Wednesday by subcommittee Chairman Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK that preliminary reports of BPR and Beasley & Beasley warranted a complete rundown on excessive appraisals in Massachusetts' Federal-aid highway program.

" 'BLATNIK said then that he hoped to send committee investigators into Massachusetts within a month.

" 'Turns over files

" 'However, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Representative GORDON H. SCHERER (Republican, Ohio), told the Herald that there was no reason why staff investigators shouldn't start on the case at once.

" 'The Bureau of Public Roads turned over its files in the case to the Justice Department Wednesday. The Justice Department, on the basis of BPR information, decided to call in the FBI.

" 'The evidence presented by the BPR showed that at least one high State official has been implicated in the right-of-way scandal.

" 'This official has not been identified pending submission of evidence to a Federal grand jury, but the Herald learned he exerted pressures on State-hired free appraisers to compromise their independence, in making true market value appraisals.

" 'Beasley & Beasley, which was hired by the BPR in May to doublecheck and develop evidence uncovered by BPR investigators since January, has reported some appraisals were inflated by as much as 300 percent.

" 'Started in January

" 'The BPR launched its review of the Massachusetts phase of the Federal highway program in January after shutting off land-taking reimbursements to the State as the result of reports of widespread abuses here.

" 'The Federal Government reimburses the States for 90 percent of the cost of land taking and construction under the $50 billion interstate program and pays 50 percent under the primary, secondary, and urban road construction program.

" 'The preliminary BPR report, which is the basis for the FBI being called in, covered Federal-aid projects in Wakefield along Route 128 and in the Attleboro-North Attleboro area on Interstate Route 95.

" 'The investigation by the FBI will be a brand new study. The BPR material will be used only to supply leads for FBI agents to follow.

" 'Under usual procedures the FBI would turn over the results of its investigation to the Justice Department, which then must decide whether to seek indictments before a Federal grand jury.

" 'Stormy session

" 'In a stormy session of the executive council on Beacon Hill yesterday as Democratic councilors defended the department of public works and the Furcolo administration in the right-of-way scandal.

" 'The storm broke when the lone Republican on the council, Augustus G. Means of Essex, introduced a mild motion requesting that the council refrain from acting on pending land-taking cases until the Federal investigation has been completed.

" 'The council defeated the motion 7 to 1 and then approved 39 land-taking damage awards.

" 'Means, who reminded the councilors that "it is this honorable body" that must in the last analysis pass on all land takings, said "something is brewing in the department of public works * * * and I urgently request that we suspend action until it is apparent these land takings are in order."

" 'Councilor Joseph Ray Crimmins, Democrat, of Somerville, seconded Means' motion "just to get this out in the open," and then challenged Means to produce evidence of wrongdoing in the DPW.

" 'The strongest comments came from Councilor Patrick J. McDonough, Democrat, of Boston, who charges the published stories out of Washington on the Massachusetts investigation are "phony, padded stories for the benefit of one LEVERETT SALTONSTALL."

" '[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 19, 1960]

" 'GOP DEMANDS ACTION IN MASSACHUSETTS ROADS PROBE

" '(By Tom W. Gerber)

" 'WASHINGTON.—Republican Members will seek a showdown Wednesday on their demand that a congressional subcommittee begin an immediate investigation of the Massachusetts highway scandal.

" 'They will press their demand in an executive session of the House Highway Investigating Subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota.

" 'Want to defer probe until after election

" 'BLATNIK and the other 12 Democratic members of the 19-man group want to put off any inquiry until after the November election. They don't want to embarrass the Massachusetts Democratic administration and thus indirectly Democratic presidential nominee Senator John F. Kennedy.

" 'Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, Republican, of Ohio, is expected to lead the minority fight for an immediate inquiry.

" 'Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican of Massachusetts, said the BPR's "shocking charges * * * must be investigated to the fullest."

" ' "This, I am confident responsible Federal authorities will do," he said.

" ' "Personally, I know nothing more of this matter than what I have read in the newspapers. But to pass this matter off merely as election-year politics demonstrates careless disregard for the taxpayers' interest and public trust."

" 'Although the subcommittee has not yet sent its investigators to Massachusetts, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads is pressing ahead with its inquiry. Moreover, the FBI is expected to launch an independent investigation next week.

" 'The BPR investigation already has turned up evidence that Massachusetts appraisers inflated right-of-way land appraisals for Federal-aid highways by millions of dollars.

" 'The BPR turned over its preliminary files in the case to the Justice Department on Wednesday for "appropriate action." The Justice Department, in turn, decided to call in the FBI.

" 'High State official under suspicion

" 'A high State official is under suspicion, it was learned, of pressuring State-hired appraisers to "compromise their independence" by inflating their estimates of land values.

" 'The independent appraisal firm of Beasley & Beasley, hired by the BPR to check the right-of-way properties, has indicated some values were ballooned by as much as 300 percent.

" 'The Federal Government reimburses States for 90 percent of the cost of land taking and construction under the $50 billion Interstate Highway program, and 50 percent under the primary, secondary, and urban road construction program.

" 'Since the BPR shut off reimbursements to Massachusetts last January, however, no Federal money has been paid out for the inflated appraisals.

" 'Federal courts nevertheless could prosecute participants in the inflated scheme for conspiracy to defraud.'

"And while the subcommittee is investigating these alleged right-of-way irregularities in the Bay State, I commend to its attention the possibility that there may be some liberties taken with the Federal purse in the awarding of contracts for consulting engineering work by the Massachusetts Public Works Department. I especially would like the subcommittee to investigate the possibility that these contracts may have been awarded on a political patronage basis to J. L. Hayden Associates and to Thomas Worcester, Inc., both Massachusetts firms. Of prime concern should be: Are any of these moneys and large funds being returned to the campaign coffers of the party faithful? The basis for my information and concern are some recent newspaper clippings from the crusading Boston Herald, which some good public-spirited citizen of the State of

Massachusetts recently sent to me. Because some Members of the House do not read the Boston papers and because I want to be helpful to the chairman of my subcommittee, I request that the newspaper articles just mentioned also be printed at this point in my remarks. They are articles entitled: 'Parkway Brochures Cost $46 Each,' in the Boston Herald dated August 23, 1960; 'No Comment, says Ricciardi,' in the Boston Herald on August 23, 1960; 'Thomas Worcester Charged With $180,784 Tax Evasion' in the Boston Herald on August 23, 1960; 'Company Made Payments on Bogus Bills, Trial Told' in the Boston Herald on August 25, 1960; '$23,000 Brochure Job Sublet for About $5,000,' in the Boston Herald on August 25, 1960.

" '[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 23, 1960]

" 'PARKWAY BROCHURES COST $46 EACH

" '(By David Farrell and Wayne Hanley)

" 'The Furcolo administration paid $46 per copy for 500 "Commemorative Brochures" on the proposed President Adams Parkway, the Herald learned last night.

" '*Study still going on*

" 'Some $23,000 of the taxpayers' money was shelled out to J. L. Hayden Associates, Inc., one of the administration's pet consulting engineering firms, for preparing the 44-page, 9-inch by 12-inch brochure.

" 'The money was spent by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works at the suggestion of Governor Furcolo despite the fact that the Federal Government is spending $25,000 for a study of the feasibility of establishing such a parkway.

" 'Furcolo and his newly appointed commissioner of public works, Jack Ricciardi, announced last week that a parkway from Faneuil Hall, Boston, to Plymouth was being considered. The existing portions of the southeast expressway from Boston to Quincy as well as the Plymouth bypass would be incorporated in the new roadway that calls for construction between Quincy and Kingston, according to the Governor.

" 'Just why the souvenir booklet, which is largely a collection of pictures and facts researched from various historical books and societies, was not put together by the DPW's regular staff of public relations consultants has not been explained.

" 'Ostensibly the brochure was prepared to help influence the Federal Government on the necessity of constructing another parkway through the south shore to Plymouth in addition to the expensive southeast expressway and Route 3A.

" 'More likely, according to one leading Democrat, the huge outlay was made to supply Governor Furcolo with some publicity aimed at garnering votes for him along the south shore in his bid to unseat Senator SALTONSTALL. The timing of the announcement during the current political campaign would seem to bear this out, especially since the brochure was prepared last winter.

" 'Most statehouse and Capital Hill observers see little or no chance of an additional highway—which by the DPW's own conservative estimate would cost a staggering $76 million—being built by the State or Federal Government along the south shore in the foreseeable future.

" ' "*If approved*" *clause*

" 'That the State has no intention of spending a dime of its own for construction of the parkway is manifest from the tenor of the statements by Furcolo and Ricciardi when they launched the trial balloon about the road last week. Both officials qualified their statements about the proposed parkway with a handy "if approved by the Federal Government" escape clause.

" 'The Federal officials who are studying the feasibility of establishing (not necessarily constructing) a President Adams Parkway were in Boston the last week of July conferring with representatives of the Boston office of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads and the State public works department.

" 'One official at the Bureau of Public Roads told the Herald he was sure the Federal Government would balk at constructing any great amount of new roadway for the parkway and would insist on using existing roads like Route 3A or the entire length of the Southeast Expressway when it is completed through Hingham, Norwell, Hanover, Pennbroke, and Kingston to the Plymouth bypass.

" 'He pointed out that a freeway to the western suburbs, as recommended in the 1948 master highway plan, would have to be built before the south shore gets another new highway, especially if the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority is unable to finance extension of the turnpike from Weston to Boston.

" '*Started in 1959*

" 'The firm which authored the expensive brochure is one of the up and coming professional engineering firms in Massachusetts. J. L. Hayden Associates, Inc., doing business at 1340 Soldier's Field Road, Brighton, was incorporated on April 9, 1959.

" 'The firm's incorporation papers, on file at Secretary of State Joseph Ward's office, show that John L. Hayden of 14 Richland Road, Wellesley, is president and treasurer. Clerk is Philip A. Brancucci, lawyer, of 10 Arlington Street, Cambridge. The corporation's three directors are listed as Hayden, Brancucci and Alice P. Kavanaugh of 54 Kenmore Road, Medford.

" 'J. L. Hayden Associates is only one of four related firms whose president is Hayden and whose offices are at 1340 Soldier's Field Road. Other corporate papers on file at the statehouse reveal that Hayden is also president of Hayden, Harding & Buchanan, Inc.; Hayden, Harding & Buchanan Engineers, Inc.; and Polytechnical Engineering, Research & Sales Co., Inc. This latter firm is known as Persco.

" 'All of these firms, with the exception of Persco, have been the recipients of several lucrative consulting engineering contracts from the Furcolo administration in recent years.

" '*Many contracts*

" 'There are many consulting engineering firms doing business with the department of public works which lets the vast majority of its engineering work out on contract to private firms on the grounds that the department does not have enough qualified engineers to handle the tremendous workload occasioned by the State's huge road program.

" 'A check of the DPW's contracts with these firms shows that the Hayden companies have been unusually successful in convincing State officials not only of the value of their work but also of the diversity of their capabilities.

" 'Following is a rundown of some of the Hayden firms' contracts with the DPW and its division of waterways:

" '1. A $921,000 lump-sum contract to Hayden, Harding & Buchanan, Inc., and Charles A. Maguire & Associates for consulting engineering work on the Inner Belt. The two firms presumably are splitting the work.

" '2. An $878,000 contract to Hayden, Harding & Buchanan Engineers, Inc., for consulting engineering on a portion of Interstate Route 195 which runs between the Rhode Island border at East Providence and New Bedford.

" '*Eighteen-million-dollar cost*

" 'The firm's slice of this roadway is a segment between Fall River and Westport. Estimated construction cost of this piece of roadway is $18 million and the engineering fee granted H., H. & B. Engineers, Inc., amounts to 4.88 percent of this or $878,000. Through last May the firm had received a half million dollars for the work it had done to date. Although consulting engineering fees for highway construction jobs generally run about 4½ percent, the 4.88-percent fee to the Hayden concern is not unusual.

" '3. A $225,000 consulting engineering fee for work on a $6 million construction segment of the same road, Interstate Route 195, between Seekonk and Swansea. This contract also involved H., H. & B. Engineers, Inc.

" '4. A $148,000 contract for J. L. Hayden Associates for an extensive study of the State's highway needs as well as recommendations for a detailed program of future construction in Massachusetts. This presumably was the study that resulted in the billion-dollar-highway program that Furcolo unsuccessfully recommended to the legislature this year.

" '5. An $84,000 contract for J. L. Hayden Associates to review and study for possible revision and rewriting the DPW's manuals, guides, and specifications.

" '*Waterways projects*

" '6. A contract between the division of waterways and J. L. Hayden Associates for consultant services on certain waterways projects. As of last January the Hayden firm was paid $8,811 for its work, principally survey work, on Quequechan River in the Fall River area where the river's channel was being relocated.

" 'Hayden, Harding & Buchanan, Inc., and Polytechnical Engineering, Research & Sales Co. were incorporated on April 7, 1955. Hayden, Harding & Buchanan Engineers, Inc., was incorporated April 30, 1957, while J. L. Hayden Associates was formed on April 9, 1959.

" '[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 23, 1960]

" 'NO COMMENT, SAYS RICCIARDI

" 'State Public Works Commissioner Jack Ricciardi of Wellesley late yesterday gave a "no comment" answer to State Auditor Thomas J. Buckley's 154-page report sharply criticizing the DPW.

" 'Ricciardi, a former deputy commissioner, said he had just received the bulky document and asked for time to study it.

" '*Contracts cited*

" 'Buckley's report made mention of a deputy commissioner who received an average of $14,000 annually as a consultant for more than 2 years.

" 'It also singled out for criticism the granting by the DPW of 44 separate under-$1,000 contracts to a single painting contractor as a "device to circumvent the laws."

" 'It was pointed out that under State law only contracts of $1,000 or more require competitive bidding. The 44 contracts referred to in the audit of the highway division of the DPW were "each for $125 less than the statutory limit of $1,000."

" 'Buckley reported they went to one painting contractor for work confined to a single section of the East Boston Expressway.

" 'The report also criticized payment of $775,812 for corrective construction at the Roy C. Smith Bridge on the Southeast Expressway near the Neponset Interchange in Dorchester. The payment was made, the report said, despite a ruling from the attorney general that the contractor was at fault.

" 'Buckley also questioned the award of a lump sum contract for $84,000 for professional engineering services which should have been performed on a cost-plus basis; "overruns" on construction projects due to consistent failure of preliminary plans to show either the terrain or the makeup of the area with any degree of accuracy; changes in a connecting roadway contract on a road in Philipston at a cost of $83,000 despite the attorney general's disapproval, and failure of leases for gas stations and restaurants to spell out responsibility for local real estate taxes.

"'*Payments held up*

"'The Buckley report did not identify the deputy commissioner involved as a consultant, but Ricciardi readily admitted the State auditor had him in mind.

"'The audit also charged the Federal Bureau of Public Roads has held up payments of $6,721,817 on land damage cases, pending the outcome of its probe into claims of overpayment for land taken for federally aided roads.

"'The same Federal agency, the report said, has withheld approval of a bridge at Fall River due to a question concerning the safety of steel girders. The report says welding problems have arisen and that as a result the Bureau has not been billed for $655,396 for this project.

"'Buckley's report contends that specifications for highway construction failed to properly identify the type of terrain. It said many examples were shown of ledge being found instead of earth and other variances.

"'Because of the varying charges for removal of peat, earth, or rock, Buckley said the overrun charges on one contract in Methuen amounted to $76,000.

"'The report also cited a Middleboro contract where overrun charges of $222,778 were made on one contract for gravel borrow alone. In the same contract, Buckley said the overrun for digging out peat came to $44,500.

"'Review Audit Cited

"'The State auditor also took issue with payment of $9,894.48 to a consultant for a review audit of one of Buckley's own audit reports on the department.

"'Buckley pointed out that his previous criticism of leasing of parking lots without bids resulted in the DPW's cancellation of contracts and the advertising for bids.

"'A comparison of the bids, he said, showed the high bids will amount to $70,578.60 annually, whereas the negotiated leases on the same lots amounted to $7,020 per year.

"'[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 23, 1960]

"'THOMAS WORCESTER CHARGED WITH $180,784 TAX EVASION

"'Thomas Worcester, 63, president of Thomas Worcester, Inc., Boston engineering and construction firm, went on trial before Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., and a jury in U.S. district court yesterday charged with evading income taxes totaling $180,784.

"'Worcester, of Putnam Street, Waltham, is charged with evading personal taxes totaling $74,582 for 1950, 1951, and 1952, also taxes of $106,202 allegedly owed by his firm for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951. The Government alleges he filed false returns understating his own and the corporation's income.

"'It is charged that his personal net income during the 3 years involved totaled $263,156 but that he reported only $112,162 in his returns.

"'Also, that the company's net income for the years 1950 and 1951 amounted to $209,114, but that only $48,457 was listed in the returns.

"'Assistant U.S. Attorney Norman A. Hubley, in his opening to the jury, said the Government would show that Worcester channeled large sums out of the firm and into his own hands. He said the funds were diverted to two other concerns through fictitious expense charges.

"'[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 25, 1960]

"'COMPANY MADE PAYMENTS ON BOGUS BILLS, TRIAL TOLD

"'Philip W. Murphy, former comptroller of Thomas Worcester, Inc., Boston engineering and construction firm, testified in U.S. district court yesterday that the company made large payments to another firm on the basis of fictitious bills and vouchers.

"'Asked by Lewald the purpose of the Ross Turner concern, Murphy said, "Mr. Worcester needed to have a considerable sum of money and the partnership was formed in order to bill the Worcester company for services, and the Worcester company in turn would make checks payable to Ross Turner & Co."

"'Murphy, a resident of East Bridgewater, was called as a Government witness at the trial of Thomas Worcester, head of the engineering and construction firm, on income tax evasion charges.

"'*Say $180,784 evaded*

"'Worcester, 63, is charged with evading taxes totaling $180,784 by filing false returns for himself and his firm. Included are personal taxes of $74,582 allegedly owed for 1950, 1951, and 1952, and $106,202 allegedly owed by Thomas Worcester, Inc., for 1950 and 1951. Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., is presiding at the jury trial.

"'Murphy, under questioning by Assistant U.S. Attorney George H. Lewald, testified that payments totaling $105,240 were made by the Worcester company in 1949 to a newly organized firm called Ross Turner & Co., which had been set up in an office on State Street.

"'The firm was a partnership whose members comprised Worcester, Murphy and two other employees of the Worcester firm. Murphy, who worked as comptroller directly under Worcester, said the payments were made purportedly for engineering services rendered to the Worcester company by Ross Turner & Co., but that actually no services were made. The checks covering the payments, said Murphy, were signed by Worcester and himself.

"'[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 25, 1960]

"'TWENTY-THREE THOUSAND DOLLAR BROCHURE JOB SUBLET FOR ABOUT $5,000

"'(By David Farrell and Wayne Hanley)

"'The consulting engineering firm which was handed a $23,000 contract for preparing 500 commemorative brochures on the proposed President Adams Parkway sublet the job to a Boston advertising agency, the Herald learned last night.

"'*Job turned over to ad agency*

"'J. L. Hayden Associates, which was paid $46 a copy for each of the brochures, turned the job over to Parsons, Friedmann & Central Advertising Agency, of 69 Newbury Street, almost immediately after signing the contract with former State Public Works Commissioner Anthony DiNatale.

"'DiNatale quit his post as head of the DPW recently but was commissioner on December 8, 1959, when the agreement between the State and the Hayden firm was set up.

"'Although mystery continued to shroud some aspects of the brochure, several developments were uncovered by the Herald.

"'Here are the known facts in the strange case:

"'Commissioner DiNatale and John L. Hayden, of Wellesley, who is president of J. L. Hayden Associates and two other firms which have been paid hundreds of thousands of dollars in the past year for consulting engineering work in a variety of DPW projects, including the updating of DPW manuals and publications, signed a contract December 8 providing for the parkway brochure.

"'Shortly thereafter Hayden or one of his representatives called Robert Friedmann, treasurer and account executive of the advertising agency, and requested the agency to go to work immediately on the project.

"'It is not clear whether Hayden made the call because his secretary reported that he had gone on vacation and she didn't know when he would be back when the Herald attempted to question him about the brochure.

"'At any rate, the agency contacted Winthrop Printing & Offset Co., of 141 West Second Street, South Boston, and asked the firm to quote a price on the job.

"'It was explained the job had be done as fast as possible even if it involved overtime.

"'The firm submitted a price somewhere in the vicinity of $2,000 and was given the job.

"'Roy E. Orrall, an executive of the printing firm, said his company printed the brochure but referred all questions about it to Friedmann.

"'Raymond E. Parsons, of South Weymouth, president of the advertising agency, said he was not familiar with all of the details of the brochure.

"'*About $5,000*

"'He did say the total value of the job was "about $5,000" and this included the printing of the brochures as well as the creative work the agency put into the preparation of the original copy.

"'Parsons indicated he thought his agency was given the job because the firm had considerable experience in producing historical material. The famous folder on Boston's Freedom Trail, was considered an outstanding guide on the city's historic sites, was prepared by his agency.

"'"I can say that we were entirely ethical," Parsons said. "We prepared the brochure at a price customary for such work. It was within the normal price range that any agency would have charged."

"'Parsons indicated that the total cost for the agency and printing company's efforts did not exceed $5,000.

"'*Several mysteries*

"'Several mysteries still remain in the strange case of the parkway brochure:

"'1. Why did the Furcola administration pay Hayden Associates $23,000 for a job that apparently was worth considerably less?

"'2. Why the tremendous Christmas rush to complete the job "as fast as possible," even if it meant overtime? The brochure was not released to the press until last Friday, August 19—some 8 months after it was completed.

"'3. Why do DPW records show that the work on the brochure was done between January 11, 1960, and February 3, 1960, when it now has been established that the work was jammed through in December 1959?

"'4. Why was a professional engineering firm that was busy with a multitude of other Department of Public Works contracts chosen to do a brochure that was primarily a historic and scenic guide that was more properly the work of an advertising agency?

"'[From the Washington News, Aug. 23, 1960]

"'HIGHWAY CHARGES FLY ON HILL

"'Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, Republican of Ohio, today charged a Democratic-controlled investigation committee is deliberately covering up a Massachusetts road-building scandal which is "the granddaddy of them all."

"'Representative SCHERER, ranking minority member of the House Highway Investigating Committee, said the roadbuilding skullduggery being investigated by the committee "looks like peanuts" compared with the Massachusetts situation.

"'He flatly accused Committee Chairman JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat of Minnesota, of arbitrarily deciding to stop "all further hearings because the Massachusetts scandals had to be kept under cover until after the election."

"'"He's a liar," Representative BLATNIK retorted. "We've been in touch with the Massachusetts situation all the time. There's no change in tune."'

"I do not know if the 'political consideration,' referred to by the Chair, means that to expose this Massachusetts matter prior to election would be embarrassing to some Democratic politicians in the Bay State who are offering their credentials to the voters this fall. Nor do I know if exposure would

prove to be a Teapot Dome or another Hoffa-Beck episode. But I find this forbearance is a remarkable thing under the circumstances and, I fear, it will serve no worthy cause other than to obscure the true facts which the public ought to know and to undermine public confidence in the objective of an important committee of Congress. Accordingly, I urge our subcommittee to move into Massachusetts forthwith and prepare this hearing as soon as possible, letting the chips fall where they may. This alleged scandal has been known since January and further delay cannot be justified on any ground other than narrow political expediency.

"OTHER UNFINISHED BUSINESS

"There are also other areas of our highway program which I have long urged in vain that our subcommittee investigate and inform the Congress. These areas raise the questions of whether congressional policies are sound and are being administered properly by both Federal and State officials. It may be that these matters are not as glamorous as exposing corruption and laying hold of some scandals whose perfidy is rightly aired before the bar of public scrutiny, but they are nonetheless important. Without being exhaustive, the following list of objectives ought to engage the attention of our forum:

"1. The reevaluation of the provisions for extending the Interstate System beyond 40,000 miles; and, if this policy is sound, establishment of a standard to determine when and where such extension shall be made.

"2. A reevaluation of the decision that the system shall serve both local needs and through traffic as well, together with some clarification of the policy vis-a-vis the location of interchanges.

"3. A review and clarification of the policy regarding design standards relating to the use of multiple-lane highways as opposed to two-lane highways and design standards of interchanges.

"4. Review and clarification of the policy regarding construction of the Interstate System between population centers, and connecting links into population centers.

"5. Review and clarification of the policies regarding route locations as such decisions are related to the economic impact of the highways on the affected community.

"6. Review and clarification of the policies relating to promotion of an integrated highway system and their implementation in the system's projects to date.

"7. Reevaluation of the present policies relating to highway bridges over navigable waters with the view to developing different but adequate standards for bridge construction under the Federal Bridge Act.

"8. Reevaluation of the policy providing for payment of the costs of relocation of utilities on highway right-of-way onto highway construction.

"9. Clarifications of reasons for the wide variation between the cost estimate of 1955, upon which the 1956 act was based, and the revised cost estimate submitted to Congress in 1958.

"10. Investigation of the extent to which defense needs become the determining factor in route location and mileage.

"Mr. Speaker, this entire highway program will be up for reappraisal by the Congress early in the next year. Unless some of these areas indicated above are explored, there simply will not be any record of facts and evidence which can form a solid foundation for the Congress to legislate upon or to base an informed examination of the present laws. If the new Congress is to raise some $13 billion in new revenue to help this Interstate System out of its financial dilemma, such inquiries as I have suggested must be answered. I would feel that I have failed to protect the best interests of all Americans, including my own constituents in the First District of Iowa, if I did not take this last opportunity in the waning days of this Congress to renew my demands, voiced on the floor of the House on May 26, 1960 (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 106, pt. 9, pp. 11322–11325) and often in committee hearings, that these areas be timely explored. I sincerely hope that this can and will be done and that when the new Congress returns in January, we can have the benefit of such investigations."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. The gentleman's complaint on the membership of the committee is not quite clear to me, although it may be very valid. I would point out to the gentleman that the ratio on many committees is 12 to 6. If I recall correctly there are quite a few committees in the House where the ratio is 2 to 1. The gentleman made reference to the political aspects of the Highway Committee but did not give any substantiation of it.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I mentioned it.

Mr. BLATNIK. What political situation does the gentleman make reference to? He does not name anybody.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. There are several instances of record, but I must confess I did not come prepared to argue this particular point. There are members on the gentleman's side and some on my side who I am sure agree with me on this point.

I should point out that the gentleman interrogating me is chairman of the committee of which I speak. I would remind him that the division of the committee membership is not 12 and 6, but is 13 and 6. This is completely out of proportion, and I cite to the gentleman the record that has been made by this Congress. I refer the gentleman to two important committees, the Labor Rackets Committee and the Committee on Small Business. They are pretty well balanced.

Mr. BLATNIK. I made myself clear. The gentleman may have a valid point and I do not dispute his position, when he says that there ought to be a closer division on this committee than 2 to 1. Certainly that is true of committees in some instances, and of subcommittees, but I again direct my question: what is political about the subcommittee? I must confess I feel a reference is being made to me as chairman of that committee last year, and I do not recall any charge being made that it was political. Will the gentleman state for the record something definite?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I will be glad to cite the record of our own committee where I think the chairman himself had some comments about certain people playing politics. He may have been right. His accusation, of course, was made about people across the aisle.

Mr. BLATNIK. The chairman can speak for himself, and I will at a later time, but I am addressing myself to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am referring to the record.

Mr. BLATNIK. What is the gentleman's basis for the complaint that the gentleman makes about the committee being political?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I mentioned one charge about politics that was made, or at least suggested by the chairman. We find that in the committee report. I have not the record before me so I cannot give the gentleman the exact date and page of the report. That statement was made in which the chairman at least inferred that there was politics on our side.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is the gentleman who says there was politics. I do not remember saying so. But let the record show what politics this committee was playing. Tell us of our own experience any instance that would lead the gentleman to believe that politics was being played? That is a rather serious charge.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. We have very few representatives or employees on the committee studying these irregularities in connection with construction in various States. I have a feeling that maybe for political reasons you have not completed the studies and reports and investigations that ought to be made in some of the areas into which we have gone. I feel that we have not made as much progress as we should have. I recall one instance in the State of Florida where the newspapers have exposed the activities of a member of the highway commission down there. If a half or a third of those charges are true there is more money involved and more corruption involved and more disregard of the public interest in the activities of this one man than has been characteristic or true of all the investigations we have made so far. It can be said that due to the fact this man is a political appointee maybe it is because of politics that we have not made any more progress.

Mr. BLATNIK. Why does the gentleman say a second time that maybe it is because of politics? It is or it is not. The gentleman stated the committee was political minded. I am asking in all fairness that the story be told. Now, will the gentleman indicate instances that can be substantiated? His is a serious charge and a serious reflection on the committee, and I want a statement rather than innuendoes. What has the committee done that the gentleman should tell me in the well of the House and in the official record of this body that the committee was politically motivated or politically bent? The gentleman complains only that the ratio of membership was not satisfactory.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes, I do, and it was motivated by politics.

Mr. BLATNIK. One illustration quoting what I said is not sufficient. Give me an example.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The Republicans had no chance to sit down with the majority Members and discuss any place the procedures and methods we were going to use in this investigation. We had no voice in selecting the employees of the committee. They were all selected by the majority.

Mr. BLATNIK. The majority always selects committee employees.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to remind the gentleman that this has not been true in the case of many other investigating committees of the Congress.

Mr. BLATNIK. It is true of our parent committee, the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I am speaking now of the special investigating committees that have been created by the Congress since the 80th Congress.

I placed in the RECORD a report of a study that I made on this question sometime last year.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will the gentleman give us one instance in which the committee played politics?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, I said that you certainly did not recognize the Republicans when you went to set up the procedures on how you were going to proceed. We were not counseled on what States we were going into or what areas we were going into.

Mr. BLATNIK. Let the RECORD show that the committee never moves until an executive session is held and a full review made of the case and only at that point is the decision made by the members in executive session whether or not they feel that the findings warrant a public hearing.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I recall in one instance I read in the newspapers we were going into a certain State before the executive committee had any hearings; at least, I was not

notified of any executive committee meeting to be held on Florida, for instance. I read about that in the newspapers. I was not counseled. I did not know until I received a letter from a staff member, or possibly it was from the chairman himself just when we were going to have it.

Mr. BLATNIK. I received no complaint from the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. Now, if you have complaints about not being consulted, bring them to him first and do not take the time and the expense of the House to air a complaint.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The minority leader is not here, but I think he can speak for himself. I have a feeling that he agrees substantially with what I have said and done and the statements I have made in regard to this. It is impossible for him because of weather conditions to be here today.

Mr. BLATNIK. Will you give us one example of where the committee played politics or give us an indication, even a slight one, of any time where there was any politics played by the subcommittee?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. We have not proceeded with any hearings in the States where we started.

Mr. BLATNIK. In what State?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, we have not, according to your own statement. We postponed the hearings in Oklahoma.

Mr. BLATNIK. We did not postpone Oklahoma. We completed the Oklahoma case.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. The RECORD does not show that, and I do not understand that to be the case. I understood we were going to come back, and the Governor of Oklahoma said he would come back.

Mr. BLATNIK. He stayed here all the time. He was never recalled. If it was necessary for him to appear, of course, he would have. Of course, all that occurred before he ever became Governor of Oklahoma, anyway. I am puzzled by the gentleman's observations.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, I am puzzled, too.

Mr. BLATNIK. And I am puzzled by these peripheral statements and arguments that are being made by the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. There is reason to believe that the public does not have and probably will not continue to have the type of confidence they ought to have in our committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. They will never have confidence in view of the irresponsible statements made here. No evidence has ever been brought or no illustrations have been brought to the attention of the House Members to justify those arguments.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I suppose the gentleman will take issue with any statement I make in that regard.

Mr. BLATNIK. I do not, but I just want the RECORD to show and I am pressing the gentleman to give me one example where politics was played. There may be other reasons, but you are saying politics were played.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think because we have not moved as fast as we should in certain directions.

Mr. BLATNIK. How many committees have moved as fast as they should? But is that political?

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Well, I interpret it as such in this case.

Mr. BLATNIK. And that is the only illustration the gentleman has to submit to substantiate his charges of political interference.

[From the Atlantic Magazine, March 1961]

DIRTY MONEY IN BOSTON

THE CASE

(By Charles L. Whipple)

(It has been said that the city of Boston is so corrupt that it is no longer aware of its own corruption. Deals have been made ever since the wings were added to the original brick statehouse under Governor McCall in 1916. The taxpayer himself has wearily shrugged his shoulders with the thought that nothing can be done about graft. But in August of 1960 an inquiry, which had been 3 years in starting, suddenly broke into the open when it came under the jurisdiction of Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., of the U.S. District Court of Massachusetts. Charles L. Whipple, who covered the case for the Boston Globe, has examined some 40 volumes of testimony resulting in the conviction and sentencing for income tax evasion of Thomas Worcester, a well-known Boston consulting engineer, whose firm had been involved in the building of Massachusetts highways. The pattern of corruption as revealed by this inquiry and confirmed by the opinion of the judge is too corroding to be accepted in silence. In how many other American cities has this pattern been duplicated?)

En route to pick up the payoff money one day in 1950, Frank Norton's car passed Faneuil Hall, where the Boston Tea Party had begun, and swung into Merchants Row. It stopped just short of State Street, the city's financial nerve center, and Norton waited. A man opened the door and climbed into the back seat with Norton, taking with him a brown paper package. It measured 8 by 11 inches, was 3 or 4 inches thick, and contained $5,000 in cash, in denominations of $20 and under; and the man was later able to swear under oath that he had never seen the money and that, indeed, it might have been Confederate currency.

In a minute or so, the man got out of the car without the package, and Frank Norton was driven around the corner and up State Street past the old statehouse. Norton's pickup of the payoff money was one of many such cash deliveries. Others may have been made to his suite at a hotel next to the statehouse. The bribes took various forms. In all, they totaled $275,000, or exactly 10 percent of the $2,750,000 in highway contracts that Norton obtained over 3 years for the engineering firm of Thomas Worcester, Inc., from the State department of public works and other public bodies.

To whom did the bagman's money go? Little of the cash, apparently, remained with Norton or his family. Rather, there is evidence, in a recent revealing case before Federal District Court Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., of a statewide network of corruption involving high public officials of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and members of the great and general court (as the State legislature is called), and for which the banks, insurance firms, the press, the bar, and members of the judiciary itself must bear a share of the blame.

For the first time, and after years of rumor, this pattern of corruption has been disclosed under sworn testimony in the case of *United States* v. *Thomas Worcester*. It shows not only bribery but politicians loafing on the payroll, not only crooked accounting but a deliberate sabotage of the two-party system: a bipartisan payoff of legislators with jobs and money, the latter coming, at least in part, from shared commissions on contractors' performance bonds. And it even shows that the judiciary itself is not immune to temptation. Some elements of the pattern may be age old, but its extent is new.

The hearings turned the spotlight of publicity and judicial inquiry on the State's most powerful official, who is not charged with any crime and who has denied, under oath, any wrongdoing. The official is William F. Callahan, former State public works commissioner and now chairman of the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority. For the department of public works, a decade ago, he supervised the construction of Route 128, the circumferential highway around Greater Boston which has attracted a billion-dollar electronics industry. For the authority he built the $239 million toll road from New York State to Newton, a suburb of the capital, and he now seeks $175 million more to extend the toll road into Boston.

Thomas Worcester was the engineering contractor who designed all of the first stage of Route 128—an 18-mile stretch of superhighway between Route 9 and Lynnfield. His work on it included designs for 44 bridges, one of which took first prize in a national competition for the most beautiful bridge in its class. During World War II, he had done more than $100 million worth of work for the Army and Navy. Now 64, Worcester, a graduate of Harvard, is well placed socially and the owner of a lovely home in Waltham. His firm, successor of one founded by his father, enjoyed a national reputation for quality.

How, then, did he become entangled in bribery? Frank Norton dangled before him the prospect of juicy State contracts. Norton was a smooth talker, with mysterious business in Canada and Mexico. Worcester swore that Norton, in 1948, said he was "certain he could get the jobs for me because he knew Callahan." Competitive bidding is not required on contracts with consulting engineers.

Once Norton moved into Worcester's firm, with cards printed that described him as assistant to the president, Worcester was hopelessly trapped. He was soon aware that besides paying Norton's salary and signing an agreement to pay him 10 percent of the amount of all public contracts that Norton obtained, he had to get cash in large amounts and small denominations to Norton. Worcester bothered little with financial matters, but he and his comptroller accomplished the transfer of money by cashing checks based on fraudulent vouchers, invoices, payroll entries, and even salary payments to themselves.

All these items were charged off to business expenses in Worcester's income tax returns, and this is what ultimately brought him into court, although in the case of two subsidiary firms set up to siphon off the cash, Worcester and his comptroller paid themselves extra salary in order to pay taxes on the part of their "salary" that had gone to Norton.

The close-mouthed Norton apparently never divulged to anyone in the firm where the cash went, saying only that it was for necessary expenses and "went in and out." He always promised an accounting. It never came, and according to one witness the entrapped contractor declared, "It's got to be stopped if we're going to keep business going * * *. It's almost impossible to do business today without somebody looking for something," and buried his face in his hands.

Primarily an engineer, Worcester was not required to file a performance bond on each State contract. General contractors, engaged in actual construction, must do so. Such bonds are purchased from insurance companies, which charge a normal fee of 1 percent of the contract amount. The agent or broker selling the bond to the contractor is paid a commission, determined by bargaining with the insurance company, which ranges between 20 and 35 percent of the premium. Not until late in the Worcester case did it become apparent to what use these commissions could be put.

Worcester was a small fish in a big aquarium. As part of a highway program that has remade the Nation's roadmaps, the Massachusetts Legislature alone has authorized $1,036 million since 1948 for highway construction, with $683 million of it financed by borrowing. In the last 5 years alone, the State has received more than $243.5 million in Federal highway aid. Other States have done similarly, until the weary taxpayer, grateful for being able to go places faster, has begun to wonder what he can do about

the mounting costs and whether, in fact, they are entirely legitimate.

Worcester was indicted March 13, 1957, for income tax evasion. Not until 3 years and 5 months later did his trial begin. His defense was that the payments to Norton were business expenses. He was convicted by a jury after a 13-day trial. Then Judge Wyzanski, on September 9, 1960, offered to place him on probation, suspending an 18-month prison sentence, if he testified with candor before various bodies on request, including the grand jury. Worcester appeared there September 28, and also permitted U.S. Attorney Elliot L. Richardson to examine him under oath on October 4.

Richardson then filed a motion that Worcester's probation be revoked because he had not been sufficiently candid. Worcester's counsel opposed the motion, and in an effort to ascertain the truth, Judge Wyzanski made Worcester's grand jury testimony public on October 27. The testimony named Callahan, and the fat was in the fire. The subsequent hearings, known as revocation proceedings, are unusual in jurisprudence but by no means without precedent.

Central to the Worcester hearings was whether this relatively small contractor, convicted of evading $180,000 in taxes, told the truth when he later testified that when Norton was hospitalized for a heart attack in the fall of 1949, Worcester delivered a package of cash to Norton's wife and she put it in the overcoat pocket of a man who was sitting in the next room, but whom she would not allow him to see. This man, Worcester swore she told him, was Callahan.

Both Callahan and Mrs. Norton made out-of-court denials to the press. It became necessary, then, to request their testimony. Judge Wyzanski telegraphed them invitations to appear, but both balked. Mrs. Norton telegraphed the judge: "Thank you for your kind consideration, but I feel I can add nothing to what I have already said." A message from Callahan's secretary stated: "Your telegram of November 14 read. Mr. Callahan does not care to accept the invitation."

Subpenas were then issued for both. Callahan was persuaded by his advisers to engage a lawyer best known locally for his unsuccessful defense of the Brink's bandits, who had perpetrated the Nation's largest cash holdup. Through him, Callahan fought a monumental battle both in and out of court, including two trips in vain to the U.S. Court of Appeals, to hamstring the proceedings. Then, after Mrs. Norton had sworn emphatically she could not remember any such episode involving Callahan's pocket, Callahan himself denied the charge with the emphatic word, "Never!"

Judge Wyzanski, in an opinion that has rocked Boston, found Worcester's testimony candid, credible, complete. He accused Mrs. Norton of direct falsehoods and inexplicable failures to remember. Worcester was, he said, "a most reluctant source of infamous information about others," and he has "completely persuaded me of his decency." Callahan's denial "is unconvincing * * *. No one who reads in full Callahan's testimony, first before the petit jury and then in these revocation proceedings, would care to stake much on Callahan's oath * * *. I unhesitatingly stamp Callahan as an untrustworthy witness. And I accept Worcester's story of the episode at Mrs. Norton's home."

Wyzanski agreed with another category of Worcester's accusations. Worcester had identified, the judge said, "former members of the State legislature, a former candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor, and a Member of Congress as recipients of what may, with some euphemism, be called the Worcester bounty."

* * * * *

Such matters—and they were but a small part of a mammoth out-of-court campaign in Callahan's behalf—bothered the judge not at all. He referred in his opinion to another element of the pattern of corruption: no man now alive was apparently allowed, nor indeed, did he at all desire, to see any more than one small link in the long and hidden chain. And certainly this applied to Worcester.

"The tendency of an otherwise decent man, like Worcester, when he gets into a sordid racket of extortion, bribery, and corruption is, as much as possible, to look the other way as his hand stretches forth to disburse a bounty," said Judge Wyzanski. "Except for the episode in Mrs. Norton's home, Worcester did not know in that kind of detail, with that kind of accuracy of observation required of a witness before he can effectively testify. He did not want that kind of knowledge. He never had it. He cannot legitimately invent it. And even if, with a battery of detectives and investigators, he had tried to discover the facts, he would have had as much difficulty as the district attorney has had in this case."

One man alone, in the case of the Worcester bounty, saw more than one link in the chain of corruption. He was Frank Norton, the bagman, who brought in the State contracts to Worcester and delivered the cash. On December 30, 1951, worried about a Federal tax probe of Worcester, he had called on Judge Charles E. Flynn, the lawyer whom he had had the Worcester firm hire for the case. He asked Flynn for a very good-sized drink.

"Before he quaffed it," Judge Flynn testified, "he asked me if I thought I could spare it and I thought it was a very good-sized one. And I said 'Yes,' and he said, 'Will you get me another and make me a decent-sized one.'" Flynn poured a stiff one in an old-fashioned glass; Norton downed it and said, "I feel better." Flynn had a party for his children in progress, and Norton, taking his leave after a few minutes, asked how the tax case was going. "I said, 'It's going very badly,'" Judge Flynn recalled. "He says, 'For who?' I says, 'You know for who. It's going badly for the Worcester Co., and for you.' He says, 'For me?' I said, 'Yes.' I said, 'They're breathing right down your neck.' He said, 'Is that so?' And he said, as he went out the door, 'Well, I'll take care of that.'"

Two days later, on New Year's Day, 1952, as he sat hunched over the dining room table, where he was working on his income tax return, Francis C. Norton died of a heart attack. As one witness put it to Norton's widow months later, when the tax sleuths were even hotter on the trail of the missing money, "Dead men can't testify."

Frank Norton had had a stroke in October 1949. There is evidence to suggest that it may have been brought on by worry over the possibility of the Federal tax probe. Worcester's first general counsel, unable to stomach the bribery plan, had resigned. The daughter of a police chief had been fired by Worcester's comptroller, Philip W. Murphy, on suspicion of "blabbing" to an auditor about the cash going to Norton. The girl told her father, and he has testified that he told Callahan's brother-in-law, John Murphy, that he would go to the Internal Revenue Service unless he got satisfaction. The police chief never did so, though he says he let Murphy see him talking to tax agents. He said that instead, from the chief's own home, John Murphy phoned Callahan in Greenfield and the matter was settled by giving the girl a letter of recommendation, plus full pay till her coming marriage. Callahan could not remember the call, though he said he was in Greenfield. John Murphy remembered it, but insisted that the chief's daughter and her job were never mentioned, and said that he merely inquired what kind of firm the Worcester Co. was.

In July of 1951, however, things got hot. A tax agent was investigating the tax evasions of Internal Revenue Collector Denis Delaney, who was later convicted, and Worcester had done some contracting work for the owner of a building which the Internal Revenue Service was to occupy. When the agent went to the Worcester plant and asked to see the books, Philip Murphy turned white and almost fainted. In almost no time, Philip Murphy testified, he and Norton were burning Murphy's little black book recording the cash payments to the bagman.

Yet it seems possible, and despite Judge Flynn's testimony about the agents' breathing down Norton's neck, that the tax probe did not become really serious until late fall of 1952. The near-fatal collapse of a heavy overpass section in Sullivan Square, Charlestown, had led to discovery by the First National Bank of Boston that Philip Murphy and Worcester had endorsed to contractor M. DeMatteo two checks totaling $60,000 from the State which had been previously assigned to pay off indebtedness to the bank. Worcester testified that DeMatteo, to get the money, had threatened to cause trouble for the Dever campaign. From here on, the tax agents really moved in. But Norton was no longer alive to tell his story.

From the 40-odd volumes of the Worcester case transcript, there is much that can be gleaned, though the task is complicated by Philip Murphy's recent admission of perjury and the fact that perjury charges against other witnesses are being weighed as this is written.

The pattern in the evidence on which Judge Wyzanski based his finding shows the familiar payment of political campaign contributions, of the sort Worcester meant in his testimony about his gifts to the late Gov. Paul A. Dever when he ran for reelection unsuccessfully against the then Representative Christian A. Herter in 1952: "Of course, the thing always has been to try to play both ends against the middle, if you could—contribute to both sides—but Mr. Dever, of course, had the strong argument that we had received all this work and there was more in the offing. He was dangling something quite attractive."

The pattern also shows both political parties loading up the payroll with politicians, some of whom did not even bother to pick up their paychecks but had them mailed. Ex-Mayor C. Gerald Lucey of Brockton, then a State representative, told how the then Republican chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee sent him to the Worcester firm, because he knew I was not representing any company there and he thought I should become associated * * *. He was a fine, honorable gentleman, even though he was a Republican. One lawyer, Henry M. Santosuosso, was paid $11,000 in 10 months for nonexistent legal consultations, and when the tax agents caught up with him, he hurriedly phoned the firm's counsel, whom he had never seen, and asked what jobs the company had worked on so he could have something to hang my hat on. Another, ex-State Senator Edward M. Rowe, at Norton's suggestion was paid $20,000, most of it in a year for which he filed no Federal tax return, because, as one witness said Norton put it, "The Democrats wanted Rowe to run (for Governor) in the Republican primary in order to create a division in the Republican Party."

According to his testimony, Vincent J. Shanley, then a Boston city councilor, seemed a most deserving case to Governor Dever, for he had eight children and needed money. Worcester paid him $50 a week for 77 weeks, for doing nothing. On the payroll of both Worcester and the Federal Bureau of Public Roads was Constantine J. D'Amato, now an engineering contractor in his own right. He was recently charged, during a

probe of the Metropolitan District Commission (one of the few sincere legislative probes of corruption in Massachusetts), with having been paid for swimming pool designs which he had traced from someone else's work.

Yet the phony jobs were but a small part of the story. They paid only a score or so of legislators and political hangers-on. But if—and there is now no legal evidence to prove it was done—the same practice was followed by enough other contractors and subcontractors, it would not have required too many of them to "employ" in this fashion a majority of the 280 members of the State senate and house of representatives.

Only the naive would consider this the sole approach to influencing legislation on, say, a State highway bond issue, and, sure enough, the testimony in the Worcester case dredged up what could be other ways and means. There was, for example, the matter of contractors' performance bonds. The commissions paid to insurance brokers handling them are lucrative. It has been estimated that in 2 years these brokers' commissions on bonds for contractors dealing with the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority totaled almost $300,000 in what indirectly was taxpayers' money.

Hence, ears pricked up when the subject entered the Worcester case testimony. A name running through much of it was that of Percy G. Cliff, a Boston insurance man and close friend of both Callahan's and Frank Norton's. Cliff has been ill with a heart condition, but with authorization from his doctor and lawyer, the court held an unusual, 45-minute session in his Winchester home. There the insurance broker testified that he had handled performance bonds for contractors doing business with the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority. Cliff admitted he had been associated since 1953 with John M. ("Mom") Shea, Callahan's personnel manager and job dispenser. But on the advice of Cliff's physician, Judge Wyzanski ended the session abruptly, without getting an answer to his question whether Shea had been Cliff's partner, or * * * your coventurer, or * * * was a friend who shared in certain of your financial transactions.

With Callahan on the stand a week later, the matter came up again. Callahan testified that his nephew, Francis R. Murphy, Jr., had been associated with Cliff in business. The witness replied, over his counsel's roaring objection, that Shea handled job requests from legislators, both Democrats and Republicans. Next, Callahan testified he had heard that Shea, after losing the State DPW job in a change of regime in 1953, worked together as an insurance broker with Cliff. Soon Callahan was admitting that Shea received a share of the commissions on turnpike performance bonds, but he didn't know what size share, nor did he know whether Shea transferred half or more of his commissions to cash.

"Has it come to your attention, Mr. Callahan," asked U.S. Attorney Richardson, "that members of the legislature did receive shares of the commissions on the turnpike performance bonds?"

"Well," said Callahan, "if a legislator has an insurance broker's license, he absolutely has the right to share in performance bonds." In a moment he was admitting, "Yes, it has come to my attention," and he also testified that legislators had received a share of the commissions paid to Cliff. The judge barred, because "it may have an interest but not relevance," a request for the names of the legislators. Richardson implied, in asking a question, that Cliff's share in all of the turnpike performance bond commissions had been 60 percent. If it was, Cliff would have received $175,000.

At any rate, another part of the pattern now seemed clear enough. There are 54 insurance brokers in the legislature, and I do not mean to imply that any of these shared commissions with Cliff, Shea, or Callahan's nephew. But the conclusion seems inescapable that some legislators who voted for the turnpike authority and its huge bond issue were involved with at least one of these men, and it was naturally to their advantage to support the legislative proposals of a person or persons who would see to it that they received their share of the commission.

Then there were other disclosures. Callahan denied it, but documentary and other evidence indicated that he discussed State contracts with Norton even in Florida. Callahan admitted that his son-in-law, John J. Kelly, Jr., is an officer of Highway Traffic Engineers, Inc. Other testimony showed that half the stock of this firm, headed by Callahan's long-time associate, former Metropolitan District Commissioner Edgar F. Copell, is owned by the same Kelly; that 90 percent of the firm's work is done for the turnpike authority; and that the company had not only hired Worcester's former comptroller, confessed perjurer Philip W. Murphy, but had given him a $50-a-week pay raise last October.

Callahan admitted more: that he purchased for $1 an option to buy the stock of the Bay State Dredging Co. (a firm which hired Norton's son, Larry, after the latter left Thomas Worcester, Inc.) and sold the option for $70,000 to contractor Lou Perini, owner of the Milwaukee Braves baseball team. Though Callahan had denied at Worcester's trial that he was ever interviewed by an Internal Revenue agent in connection with the case, he now testified that he has in fact been investigated by the tax men for 3 years or more, and complained, "If ever a man has been harassed in the last 18 months, I have been." Callahan was asked how much his net worth had increased since 1949. He said the increase was normal and not much. But no figure of any kind was ever forthcoming.

Also, throughout the hearings there ran a thread that involved lawyers and judges and officials dealing in land damage and other cases; a firm called Public Relations, Inc., which, recommended by Governor Dever, received $29,000 from Worcester for doing nothing except standing by and whose president, William A. Beale, was under hypertensive drugs that affect my memory very much; a section of the press ever ready to print the worst about Wyzanski and the best about Callahan; and a network of gossip and espionage that defies description.

There was, for example, Judge James M. Langan, special justice of the Middleboro district court, who showed up as counsel for Mary P. Norton, widow of the alleged bagman. Langan was barred as her counsel under a law preventing a judge from representing a witness in a criminal proceeding, and was later put on the stand himself. Langan had been counsel only last fall for a State senate committee probe of the DPW that resulted in a whitewash. Now, in short order, he was testifying that Cliff had recommended him to Mrs. Norton, that he handled two land-taking cases for the turnpike authority, and that he was paid $5,000 for two cases that Highway Traffic Engineers gave him.

There has always been some mystery as to why it took more than 3 years after Worcester was indicted, on March 13, 1957, for his case to be brought to trial. It had been assigned to Federal District Judge William T. McCarthy, but had not been tried when he retired last June. He had said that if there were bribery involved, it should be called to the attention of the State attorney general right off the bat.

Langan was asked, at the posttrial hearings, about his having been a trustee in the 1955 reorganization of the Gil Wyner Co., once the State's leading contracting firm. It then developed that as trustee he filed a $50,000 bond from Aetna, Cliff's insurance company, as did the other two trustees, and all three of them had been named by Judge McCarthy. The broker's commission for all three bonds was paid not to Cliff but to one Harry Toner, whose offices are at 10 Post Office Square. Toner, though not identified as such in court, is Judge McCarthy's son-in-law. The other two trustees were Joseph Gottlieb, assistant U.S. attorney when Judge McCarthy was U.S. attorney, and Timothy J. Driscoll, who is a close associate of Callahan and who attended most of the Worcester hearings. Judge Langan could not remember who had suggested Toner for the bonds.

Whatever conclusions may be drawn from all this, a pattern of corruption and payoffs does emerge. Has it been copied in other contracting firms and in other States? Federal grand juries which have been holding hearings on highway scandals may come up with findings that show additional graft and bribery. As for Massachusetts, the case of the Worcester bounty shows there has been dirty money in circulation. And there is reason to believe that President Kennedy, when he addressed the Bay State Legislature 4 days after Judge Wyzanski's bombshell, may have had this in mind. Quoting in part from the Massachusetts Bay Colony's founder, Gov. John Winthrop, he said: "Today the eyes of all people are truly upon us—and our governments in every branch, at every level, National, State, and local, must be as a "city upon a hill" constructed and inhabited by men aware of their grave trust and their great responsibilities."

Governor Winthrop's memorial, with its reference to a "city upon a hill," stands on Boston Common, its back toward the statehouse.

Save for Worcester himself, now free on probation, no individual involved in his bounty has been indicted as this is written. But as Judge Wyzanski's opinion tells so eloquently, Massachusetts has been indicted—and there she stands!

THE JUDGE'S OPINION

(By Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr.)

(A graduate of Harvard and the Harvard Law School who served as secretary to both Judge Augustus Hand and Judge Learned Hand, and from 1935 to 1937 as special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States, Judge Charles E. Wyzanski, Jr., was appointed to the U.S. District Court of Massachusetts in December 1941.)

This court has all the evidence necessary and proper to enable it to decide whether Worcester has violated the conditions of his probation. And this court is entirely clear, on grounds to be recited, that Worcester is not now in violation of his probation; and the complaint, filed by the district attorney, seeking revocation of probation should be, and hereby is, dismissed, without prejudice to the right of the district attorney at any future time upon new evidence, or upon failure of Worcester hereafter to cooperate with the authorities denominated in the probation order, to file a new complaint.

Worcester's testimony before the grand jury and later in the office of the United States district attorney falls in three main parts.

First, he identified former members of the State legislature, a former candidate for the Republican nomination as Governor, and a present Member of Congress as recipients of what may, with some euphemism, be called the Worcester bounty.

Second, he stated that he gave to Mrs. Norton at her home, while Callahan was there, cash, which Mrs. Norton put into Callahan's pocket in his coat hanging in the hallway.

Third, Worcester denied that he had any other knowledge of consequence as to who

were the ultimate recipients of the remaining parts of the roughly $275,000 paid to Norton, or any of the rest of the Worcester bounty.

The first of the foregoing three parts of Worcester's testimony was adequately confirmed by the testimony of the recipients of the Worcester bounty.

The second of the foregoing three parts was the crux of the not always pinpointed testimony, which covered many weeks. I found Worcester's testimony before me candid, credible, complete. To be sure, he was not quite clear where Callahan's coat was hanging. It may be that he did not observe Mrs. Norton actually slip a packet of bills into Callahan's pocket.

But in this hearing, which is, after all, not a criminal case against Callahan, that is, which is not a proceeding in which every essential element of a crime must be established beyond a reasonable doubt, I am fully satisfied with the correctness of Worcester's version. (Cf. *Holland* v. *United States*, 348 U.S. 121; *Becher* v. *United States*, 2d Cir., 5 F. (2d) 45 (per L. Hand, C.J.); *Commonwealth* v. *Webster*, 5 Cush. 295, 320 (per Shaw, C.J.); C. P. Curtis, *The Oppenheimer Case*, p. 228; Earl Jowitt, *The Strange Case of Alger Hiss*, p. 332.)

Nor is there any reason for me to prefer the version of Mrs. Norton. She is a witness whose testimony reveals constant instances of direct falsehoods and inexplicable failures to remember. It is beyond belief, for example, that she did not see, and indeed use, any cash in the safe deposit boxes she leased jointly, first with her husband and then with her daughter. Her plainly concocted story about visits to the box to look at insurance policies and wills would not persuade any intelligent person. Her account of why she procured a larger box defies credence.

Equally clearly, there is no reason for me to prefer Callahan's version to Worcester's. It is true, of course, that Worcester might conceivably seek to gain his own freedom by implicating an innocent man. But Worcester does not appear to me to be a Jonathan Wild, or a seeker after Naboth's vineyard. He is a most reluctant source of infamous information about others. Sitting, as he has, month after month in this courtroom, during first a jury trial and later a revocation of probation proceeding, he has completely persuaded me of his decency.

Callahan's flat denial of the claimed incident at Mrs. Norton's home is unconvincing. Callahan from the outset has shown a want of candor about his relations with the late Francis Norton and members of his family.

No one who reads in full Callahan's testimony, first before the petit jury and then in these revocation proceedings, would care to stake much on Callahan's oath.

The petit jury was hardly given the same impression that the revocation hearings give of Callahan's familiar relations with, and interest in, Norton, his wife, and his son. I unhesitatingly stamp Callahan as an untrustworthy witness. And I accept Worcester's story of the episode at Mrs. Norton's home.

As to the third part of Worcester's testimony before the grand jury and before U.S. District Attorney Richardson, I also believe Worcester. The tendency of an otherwise decent man, like Worcester, when he gets into a sordid racket of extortion, bribery, and corruption is, as much as possible, to look the other way as his hand stretches forth to disburse a bounty. Except for the episode in Mrs. Norton's home, Worcester did not know in that kind of detail, with that kind of observation required of a witness before he can effectively testify. He did not want that kind of knowledge. He never had it. He cannot legitimately invent it. And even if, with a battery of detectives and investigators, he had tried to discover the facts, he would have had as much difficulty as the district attorney has had in this case.

Worcester being entitled to continue on probation, is there anything more this court should say? In my view, the bench and the bar are entitled to a somewhat broader opinion, trying broadly to assess the value, if any, and the fruits, if any, of the revocation proceedings, now brought to an end.

It is legitimate and desirable to bring out in public such matters as do affect a court's determination whether to revoke probation. High policy and severe consequences are involved. Correct determination is more likely if the court is subject to contemporaneous observation. (*In re Oliver*, 333 U.S. 257, 270; *Crowley* v. *Pulsifer*, 137 Mass. 392, 394 (per Holmes, J.).)

The inquiry into Worcester yielded as by-products a deeper public interest in, and concern about, many topics which are worth listing.

Under the present system does the Bureau of Internal Revenue follow sound procedures to trace the payment and receipt, in cash, of large sums often falsely claimed as deductible items from gross taxable income, or falsely omitted from accountable gross taxable income?

Is it incumbent upon the legislative or executive branch of the Government, by statutory change, by administrative ruling, by adoption of practices in the Federal Reserve System, or otherwise, to require every bank to report to some central authority each large withdrawal of cash in bills, together with such explanation (for example payroll purposes) as the withdrawer gives?

Would this be an improper invasion of privacy, or is it in fact no more than often has been imposed on bankers and their clients in the interests of national security or of preserving the stability of the banking system against foreign or other withdrawals?

Is it more burdensome or intrusive to require such quasi-confidential disclosures by administrative means than by the regular statutory reporting characteristic of wage, dividend, and other payments relevant to income tax matters? Or than by the open court processes upheld by Judge Learned Hand in *McMann* v. *SEC*, 2d Cir., 87 F. (2d) 377? (See also *Bowles* v. *Shawano Nat. Bk.*, 7th Cir., 151 F. (2d) 749; *Wigmore, Evidence* (3d ed.), sec. 2286.)

Upon what basis was Worcester singled out for prosecution? Can it be true that of the successful bidders for contracts with the State, Worcester alone paid bribes and took them as deductions from Federal income tax?

May it be that the report on Worcester came from a bank which was properly dismayed to find that Worcester was reassigning to another an account theretofore assigned to it?

Could it be that the bank knew no other contractors equally guilty of income tax evasion? Doesn't the landlord almost always know when the tenant runs a gambling casino?

And once informed of Worcester's subjection to extortion, and Worcester's improper deductions of bribes, why did the Internal Revenue Service stop its scrutiny, if it did stop, before checking all reputable firms of engineers?

What sort of responsibility have the press and other media of communication displayed in reporting this case? Can it truly be said that with a high standard of detachment they have told the public all the court evidence that was discreditable, no matter whose ox was gored?

Did they report the testimony that in their own press contractors inserted advertisements which served no legitimate purpose of contractors but, so far as appears, could have had as their objects only the glorification of State officials of something less than perfect purity and the increase of advertising revenues of media which might thereafter be friendly to such officials?

Did they recite that Beal and his firm, Public Relations, Inc., both allegedly engaged in public relations, or in putting out fires if fires occurred (an eventuality which seems never to have occurred), apparently received money not only from Worcester but from a public utility?

Was the press aware that a news report of that extraordinary expenditure by a company having its own normal public relations staff and its own regular advertising agencies might force the department of public utilities to slough off its indifference and start an inquiry about some friends and patrons of the press?

On the whole, except for a commendable uncovering of the details of how many State legislators are currently serving as agents for fidelity, bonding, and other insurance companies, how much has the press thought of itself as the protector of civic integrity?

How has the press earned the high praise of Mr. Justice Robert H. Jackson, who said that even more than the courts they could be the guardians of liberty, the sentinels who watch for the capricious and the corrupt, the arbitrary and the autocratic? (See "Supreme Court in the American System of Government", pp. 81–82.)

How far has the bar initiated reform based upon its daily experience with the sufferings its clients have undergone at the hands of a network of corruption? Were sophisticated lawyers unaware, until this case began, that to secure certain types of public business a contractor had to get his performance bond, or his materialman's bond, or his bond for wages, or his trustees' bond from a relative of a judge, or of a public official, or of a legislator?

Has there been no way to expose this system, whereby the favored insurance agent receives cash for nothing more than a telephone call and a few details passed on to the fidelity or insurance company?

Is the only method by which this venal system will be supplanted a public insurance system modeled on other governmental insurance systems?

Have the private interests which professedly care about the capitalist system no awareness of what kind of free enterprise they have been fostering?

Do they not realize that the people will smite them when they see what this corruption costs in taxes, and, more important, in trustworthiness of judges, legislators, and executives?

But it will be said that the questions just put are no business of a judge. He is not to be a common scold. Nor is he to use his place to push before the public his name, his views, his personality.

If he does so, will it not be believed that, not content to be a robin in his own backyard, he aims to be a Washington eagle screaming for carrion—a vulture, without song or sweetness, seeking a national audience?

I am not unmindful that just such charges have been and will be made. And I am not unaware that no humble disclaimer of egotism and ambition will be acceptable in all quarters.

There will be those who say that in no way does pride more clearly manifest itself than in a pretended humility. Confession of error is one of the most conceited forms of self-aggrandizement.

But even if one is to be charged with vanity, with absence of taste, with lack of grace, with lust for higher office, is it not time to sound a clarion? Another will blow it better. But it is worth something to prove that the trumpet can be blown. And it is more important, far more important, to give to the grand jury, to the district attorney,

and to those vested with broad investigatory powers the sense of public support.

"To do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God" is a command which sometimes can be fulfilled only in a spirit of righteous indignation.

The hearings are terminated.

All witnesses are excused.

The probation of Worcester is continued.

[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 19, 1960]

GOP DEMANDS ACTION IN MASSACHUSETTS ROADS PROBE

(By Tom W. Gerber)

WASHINGTON.—Republican Members will seek a showdown Wednesday on their demand that a congressional subcommittee begin an immediate investigation of the Massachusetts highway scandal.

They will press their demand in an executive session of the House Highway Investigating Subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat of Minnesota.

WANT TO DEFER PROBE UNTIL AFTER ELECTION

BLATNIK and the other 12 Democratic members of the 19-man group want to put off any inquiry until after the November election. They don't want to embarrass the Massachusetts Democratic administration and thus indirectly Democratic presidential nominee Senator John F. Kennedy.

Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, Republican of Ohio, is expected to lead the minority fight for an immediate inquiry.

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, said the BPR's shocking charges * * * must be investigated to the fullest.

"This, I am confident responsible Federal authorities will do," he said.

"Personally, I know nothing more of this matter than what I've read in the newspapers. But to pass this matter off merely as election year politics demonstrates careless disregard for the taxpayers' interest and public trust."

Although the subcommittee has not yet sent its investigators to Massachusetts, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads is pressing ahead with its inquiry. Moreover, the FBI is expected to launch an independent investigation next week.

The Bureau of Public Roads investigation already has turned up evidence that Massachusetts appraisers inflated right-of-way land appraisals for Federal aid highways by millions of dollars.

The Bureau of Public Roads turned over its preliminary files in the case to the Justice Department on Wednesday for "appropriate action." The Justice Department, in turn, decided to call in the FBI.

HIGH STATE OFFICIAL UNDER SUSPICION

A high State official is under suspicion, it was learned, of pressuring State-hired appraisers to compromise their independence by inflating their estimates of land values.

The independent appraisal firm of Beasley & Beasley, hired by the Bureau of Public Roads to check the right-of-way properties, has indicated some values were ballooned by as much as 300 percent.

The Federal Government reimburses States for 90 percent of the cost of land taking and construction under the $50 billion interstate highway program, and 50 percent under the primary, secondary, and urban road construction program.

Since the Bureau of Public Roads shut off reimbursements to Massachusetts last January, however, no Federal money has been paid out for the inflated appraisals.

Federal courts nevertheless could prosecute participants in the inflated scheme for conspiracy to defraud.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Aug. 23, 1960]

DEMOCRATS ARE DUCKING PROBE OF ROAD SCANDAL, SCHERER SAYS

(By Phillip M. Swatek)

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Congressional investigation of a major highway scandal in Massachusetts is being ducked because of the election, Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, Cincinnati, charged today.

He said the House Highway Investigating Committee, controlled by the Democrats, was avoiding the Massachusetts case like the bubonic plague even though it will make other scandals look like peanuts.

SCHERER, ranking Republican on the investigating committee, would not, however, be any more specific concerning political ramifications.

Despite this, the inference of his charges is that airing of such a scandal—"granddaddy of them all"—would hurt Democratic Gov. Foster Furcolo in his campaign for the Senate seat of LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Republican incumbent. There was no suggestion that Senator John F. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, Democratic presidential nominee, would be affected.

The Cincinnatian said he will recommend to Republican minority members of the committee tomorrow that they ask that investigation of the Massachusetts case get underway.

Likelihood of this request being granted by Representative JOHN BLATNIK, Democrat, of Minnesota, chairman, are slim indeed. On June 20 BLATNIK announced there would be no further hearings on irregularities in the Federal highway program until after the November elections because he wanted to keep them free of "political considerations."

It is significant, SCHERER said, that a few days before BLATNIK's announcement of no more hearings, word came out about the Massachusetts scandal.

"It seems obvious that the sudden change of tune and the arbitrary decision of the chairman * * * was reached because the Massachusetts scandals had to be kept under cover until after the election," SCHERER declared.

SCHERER also released today a copy of a letter written by Ellis L. Armstrong, U.S. Commissioner of Public Roads, which revealed that the Bureau has been running its own investigation in Massachusetts since January. Results of the investigation, he said, have been turned over to the Department of Justice.

Armstrong said that certain State fee appraisers, by using misleading information and ignoring valuable data, placed values on property far above the true market value.

"For the most part these selected cases involve extensive properties and large sums of money," Armstrong wrote. The Commissioner also pointed out in his letter that the Federal Bureau has made no reimbursement payments on any of it.

SCHERER stated that until June 20, when BLATNIK made his announcement, the Democratic majority and its committee staff, made repeated charges that the Federal highway program was riddled with waste, inefficiency, and fraud. He said also they didn't hesitate in this election year to make the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Public Roads—both controlled by the Republican administration—their first targets.

The Cincinnatian said he was flabbergasted but pleased when BLATNIK reversed his position June 20 and conceded that overwhelming majority of the work being done was of the highest order. It was at the same time he called off any further hearings until after the election.

[From the Boston Herald, Jan. 27, 1961]

SCENE AND HEARD AT THE STATE HOUSE—CONGRESSIONAL PROBERS MIXING DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS WHITEWASH

(By David Farrell)

Another whitewash of the Massachusetts Department of Public Works is in the making. This transparent coat will be applied by the special House subcommittee investigating the Federal aid highway program which is now taking a cursory glance at land damage transactions in the department of public works.

The Democratic-controlled congressional committee reportedly has sent a couple of investigators to Boston to conduct a preliminary examination of the right-of-way takings. This, of course, some 12 months after the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads suspended paying the Federal share of land damage costs on federally aided highways.

GRAND JURY IS KEY

The subcommittee is playing a wait-and-see game with U.S. Attorney Elliot Richardson, who has convened a Federal grand jury to look into the property takings made by the department of public works during the critical summer-fall period of 1959.

If Richardson comes up with substantial evidence indicating wrongdoing and therefore misuse of Federal funds, then the subcommittee will be in a position to expand its own investigation. However if the Republican law enforcement officer shows his cards and doesn't produce a particularly strong hand, the Democratic Congressmen will use this in their endeavor to get out of Massachusetts and off the hook here.

Richardson's probe of certain department of public works activities has been limited to an on-and-off inquiry that has been interrupted and delayed by the Goldfine proceedings and the lengthy Thomas Worcester case, both of which he has been handling. Indictments from this probe are not expected for some time.

Meanwhile he is awaiting word from Washington on whether he be allowed to continue in his role of prosecutor until the land investigation is wrapped up. The Kennedy administration is expected to permit him to complete his presentation of the case before replacing him with Attorney Richard Maguire's law associate.

Republican Congressmen, who are outnumbered on the Highway Subcommittee by a 13 to 6 margin, are of the opinion that the Democratic leadership of the subcommittee is playing politics with the Massachusetts end of the group's probe. A move to reorganize the group into a 12-man committee composed of 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans was shelved in Congress a few days ago.

Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa, a minority member of the highway probers, pointed out that Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN's Labor Rackets was a bipartisan group of four Democrats and four Republicans which accounted for much of the committee's tremendous success during the past 3 years.

RELUCTANT DRAGON

SCHWENGEL said formation of the new committee would guarantee a thorough and fair disposition of the whiff of corruption that manages to pour forth from the Massachusetts road program.

He described the present subcommittee as a "most reluctant dragon" as far as the State's highway investigation is concerned. "This alarming situation has been known by the subcommittee since January of 1960," he said. "Yet even though the staff independently determined that there was substance to these allegations of a conspiracy to defraud the Government, this subcommittee

has made no move to have the staff, assisted by the Bureau of Public Roads, prepare this case for hearing."

SCHWENGEL also thinks the House investigators should take a long, hard look at consulting engineering contracts handed out by the department of public works in recent years.

"I commend for its (subcommittee's) attention the possibility that there may be some liberties taken with the Federal purse in the awarding of contracts for consulting engineering," he said.

"I especially would like the subcommittee to investigate the possibility that these contracts may have been awarded on a political patronage basis.

"Of prime concern should be: Are any of these moneys and large funds being returned to the campaign coffers of the party faithful?"

CHAIRMAN SILENT

SCHWENGEL said he didn't know whether a full probe of the road program here would prove to be a Teapot Dome or another Hoffa-Beck episode. But I find this forbearance is a remarkable thing under the circumstances and, I fear, it will serve no worthy cause other than to obscure the true facts which the public ought to know and to undermine public confidence in the objective of an important committee of Congress.

"Accordingly I urge our subcommittee to move into Massachusetts forthwith and prepare this hearing as soon as possible, letting the chips fall where they may. This alleged scandal has been known since January (1960) and further delay cannot be justified on any ground other than narrow political expediency."

Representative BLATNIK, chairman of the subcommittee, has been holding back on the Massachusetts investigation for reasons known to himself. He is cognizant of the existence of a powerful element in the congressional delegation who is not interested in any deep probe of the Massachusetts DPW.

He also is aware of the likelihood that some of the scandalous operations that were discovered in his subcommittee's pass at the Florida highway program might be prevalent in Massachusetts as well. A probe of equipment rental, survey work, and a couple of resident engineers might just prove to be an auspicious beginning to a long and fruitful cleanup in this State.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for the reasons which I have given, I sincerely hope that all Members of the House, regardless of political affiliations, will support my resolution.

As I have pointed out above, there are widespread stories appearing in our Nation's press that our special subcommittee is playing politics and refusing to hold public hearings involving the State of Massachusetts. More specifically, there are rumors and reports that the subcommittee has no intention of holding any hearings involving Massachusetts until Congress has adjourned and then only to cover those matters which have been developed by the Bureau of Public Roads and not to go into other areas which involve prominent political figures in that State. I hope and trust that these reports are untrue. However, on the basis of the record so far, it will be interesting to see whether or not our subcommittee does hear the Massachusetts matter prior to the time our present session of Congress ends.

NEED FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS AND AVAILABILITY OF EMPLOYMENT

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the debate on H.R. 2010 I stated that the daily newspaper in my hometown of Gilroy, Calif., weekly publishes an announcement by the farm labor office citing the need for agricultural workers and the availability of employment. The articles also cite the continuing and new claims for unemployment insurance during the week.

Here is the article which appeared on May 5 in the Gilroy Evening Dispatch:

BERRYPICKERS NEEDED IN AREA

There is still a need in the area for men and women to pick strawberries, according to Arnold Hamilton, local State department manager.

"During the past week 503 continued-week and 186 initial claims were filed at the local office. In the same period 67 agricultural and 6 other placements were made," Hamilton said.

Mr. Speaker, here again is an example of the truth that jobs are available and offered; unemployed capable of doing this work are available, yet they choose not to take employment in agriculture.

THE B–52 "H" BOMBER JOINS OUR TEAM

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today we live in a world filled with tension and we find ourselves facing one crisis after another. Whether in Laos, Cuba, the Congo, Formosa, Berlin, or other areas of our shrinking world, the threat to peace remains constant.

Without doubt, however, the primary deterrent to war is the existence of a strong U.S. counterstriking force. The principal arm to that counterforce is the B–52 manned bomber, the only operational, very long range jet bomber in the arsenal of the Strategic Air Command.

The B–52 now has progressed to the "H" model, and with its 8 mammoth turbofan engines, each of which provides 17,000 pounds of thrust, it possesses an unrefueled range of more than 10,000 miles. Through its ability to carry air-breathing Hound Dog missiles or ballistic Sky Bolt missiles, the B–52H bomber will be able to strike targets 500 to 1,000 miles beyond its normal penetration range.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues the delivery of the first B–52H on May 9, 1961, to the Strategic Air Command from the Wichita Division of the Boeing Co. Ceremonies are being held today at Wurtsmith Air Force Base in Michigan where the newest member of the B–52 family has joined the SAC striking force.

Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief of the Strategic Air Command, aptly emphasized the vital role which this global missile bomber assumes when he stated:

Addition of the B–52H bomber to the Strategic Air Command operational inventory will significantly increase the command's deterrent capability. The B–52H represents the most flexible deterrent found in this country today.

While the President's message on the defense budget on March 28, 1961, unfortunately failed to include a budgetary request for additional manned bombers, he acknowledged the vital necessity for such weapons in our defense system when he said:

Our existing bomber forces constitute our chief hope for deterring attack during this period prior to the completion of our missile expansion.

I want to remind my colleagues in the House that the B–52H jet bomber which was delivered to the Strategic Air Command this week is the first of only 102 which have been ordered by the Air Force. There will be no more produced after August 1962 unless the Congress takes the necessary action to insure continued production.

In this connection, I am pleased that the House Armed Services Committee and the Armed Services Committee of the other body have become concerned with the failure of defense budget requests to include bomber aircraft. It is reassuring to the American people and the security of our Nation that the distinguished members of these two committees are not ready to write off as obsolete the proven manned bombers which are the mainstay of our defense arsenal.

Our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, wisely summarized the authorization by his committee when he said:

While it may well be true that the intercontinental ballistic missile may at some time in the future provide our principal means of deterrence and our greatest offensive capability, that time has not come as yet. The committee was unanimous in its belief that this country needs the proper mix of missiles and bombers. After all, the missile can do only one of two things: It can go or it cannot go. A bomber, on the other hand, has an almost infinite variety of capabilities. It can carry all kinds of weapons, it can proceed and be recalled, it can go a certain distance and wait for a further command, it can perform reconnaissance, it can do just about anything.

We should regard the authorization of additional B–52 bombers for our defense system as an insurance policy well worth the money for the protection it provides. This insurance policy would help provide

us peace, not war, and time to carefully reappraise our defense posture.

There is economy in this insurance policy, too. I fully agree with the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee who pointed out:

> Everybody knows that if we stop the line (bomber assembly line) it will cost us a great deal of money to get it started again, and we don't get very much for the money spent in starting it up in the way of actual aircraft.

Another important consideration in continuing present production of the B–52 is the ready availability of a skilled working force with the technical know-how and the efficiency needed to turn out this missile-carrying bomber. I am referring to the more than 21,000 men and women of the Wichita Division of the Boeing Co. who already have produced the other powerful members of the B–52 family and who now have entered the last 15 months of production on present orders.

Obviously it would be more costly to phase out the program in 1962 and then retool and reorder planes a year hence.

The multiplying crises which we face around the globe require that we maintain a proven and flexible global deterrent such as the B–52H bomber as the keystone to America's security.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the implications of Federal aid to education have been clouded over by the great controversy that has developed over whether or not such aid should be extended to private schools. I feel that they go far beyond this question.

Federal control of education would follow Federal aid as an unavoidable consequence. President Kennedy's Commissioner of Education has said:

> Without a strong, centralized Government agency taking a firm hand in the educational direction of the Nation we are likely to drift.

I will not lend my support to any measure which will open the door to such probability. This has historically been the ladder to absolute power in a completely centralized government and it is how Hitler and Stalin eventually assured control of the minds of their youth.

In some letters I receive from my constituents, there is a kernel of misunderstanding in that they believe a program of Federal aid to education would mean a reduction in taxes. Such a program would not reduce taxes by 1 cent; in fact, the cost of education would be more than under the present, locally supported system. The Federal Government can give to the States nothing which it does not first take from the taxpayers of the States. It is a well known fact that out of every tax dollar that goes to Washington, some 30 percent is lost in the maze of bureaucracy before the money is returned to the State and local levels.

In addition, the residents of my State of New York suffer a further financial loss. For example, it is estimated that the President's program of Federal aid to public schools will cost New York about $350 million more to carry its share of the aid, over a 3-year period, than it would receive in benefits.

Although those within the Federal Government who support the plan of Federal aid to education base justification of it on financial inability of local school districts, I question their sincerity because they make no effort to grant relief through lowered Federal taxes. More Federal aid will raise Federal spending, but the administration has not indicated whether the bill will be paid for by increasing taxes or simply by running the Nation deeper into debt and adding to the almost incredible total of $750 billion for past commitments. Is this the proper legacy for the children whose future we now discuss?

The rate of classroom construction since 1945 indicates that 626,000 new classrooms will be built in the next 9 years. President Kennedy has said that a total of only 600,000 are needed in the next 10 years. This does not indicate any need for Federal interference.

There are, across the Nation, a few areas where the people have not been able to provide adequate school facilities and if it can be shown that they have demonstrated a sincere interest in education and have made every effort to provide for their children without discrimination, here the particular attention of the Federal Government would be justified, although only under a tightly drawn formula.

I call your attention to the legislation now pending which would return to the States, for educational purposes, a percentage of the money collected through Federal excise taxes. This would provide substantial sums free of extra tax burdens, free of deficit spending, and assure protection against Federal interference. Here is our answer to the problem of Federal financing of our schools, if this has to be.

FULL MINORITY REPORT OF THE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM HEARINGS ON BRIDGE CLEARANCE

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-aid Highway Program, of which I am the ranking Republican member, on May 8, 1961, filed its first interim report with the House and later received 1,500 copies from the Government Printing Office. However, for some unexplainable reason, this report omitted two pages from the minority report. This was a mistake of the committee and not the Government Printing Office, and I am advised that the Government Printing Office cannot correct this error. Meanwhile, many copies of this report have been circulated to the public as it is. Under unanimous consent I include the minority views, including the two omitted pages, at this point in the RECORD. I feel that this is necessary in order that the full views of both the majority and the minority may be available to the Members of the Congress, who will soon need them as we debate the highway legislation.

MINORITY VIEWS

We find that the basic evidentiary facts are not in dispute and are accurately set forth in the majority report. However, we cannot agree with many of the conclusions in that report which are couched in extreme, intemperate language and which are so contrary to the record evidence that their validity must not go unchallenged here. Accordingly, we set forth below in detail those parts of the majority report from which we dissent.

The insistence that there was a "long-standing need for a new clearance" (p. 5) reveals the presumptuous attitude of the majority that there was such a need in the face of expert testimony to the contrary by the Nation's best informed defense officials. All these experts testified that prior to the launching of the Russian sputnik on October 5, 1957, the 14-foot clearance was adequate for long-range needs of our national defense.

There is a similar insistence, equally unfounded, that there was a conflict in views between the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Public Roads. On the contrary, the record reveals the closest cooperation between these two agencies, which, unlike some of our more theoretical and hindsight-gifted colleagues, were confronted with the reality of solving a difficult question. The fact is that as soon as the Department of Defense reached a decision for a 17-foot clearance and later a 16-foot clearance, these decisions were accepted as authoritative by the Bureau which promptly took appropriate action to implement them. The majority's findings involve a 1-foot clearance difference—the 16 feet approved versus the 17 feet that the majority states is needed.

Thus, it is inaccurate to state, as does the majority report (p. 2):

"There was one question at issue throughout the 3½ years between the enactment of the Highway Act and the subcommittee's hearings: Should the 14-foot clearance, the commonly accepted standard for 30 years, be superseded by a higher clearance in response to the requirements posed by newer vehicles and weapons related to the national defense."

The vertical clearance standard was not an issue at the time of enactment of the Highway Act. Nor had any need for a clearance in excess of 14 feet been found by the Department of Defense or any agency thereof 15 months after passage of the 1956 act, when, on October 1, 1957, Defense formally advised BPR that the 14-foot clearance was "adequate for the movement of present and anticipated equipment and materials of the Department of Defense agencies" (hearings, pp. 28–29; exhibit 4). As noted above, the question of the vertical clearance standard became an object of special cooperation between the agencies only after Russia launched its sputnik. The only group which has made a big issue of the standard is this subcommittee and its activities are of 1½ years duration, not 3½ years.

In addition to the foregoing, we reject the following specific conclusions for the reasons stated:

Page 2, second paragraph, first sentence: "* * * the matter of raising overpass clearances from 14 to 17 feet * * *."

The change in clearance standard was to a new level of 16 feet, not 17 feet as indicated.

Page 2, third paragraph, last sentence: "The problem of transporting missile and rocket components compounded the urgency of raising highway clearance for more standard items of military equipment—notably armored force, engineering and artillery vehicles—which were already far too large for vertical clearances predominant for three decades."

The subcommittee has no basis for stating that there was any justification or urgency for raising highway clearances for standard items of military equipment. Testimony shows that such standard items as did require more than 14-foot clearance were items which the Department of Defense was quite satisfied to move by other means of transportation or to accept the limited highway mobility for such equipment as is afforded by use of available highway detours around highway structures constructed with 14-foot vertical clearances (pp. 73–75, 149, 315, 405 of hearings).

Page 3, fourth paragraph, third sentence: "Arguments were raised over the difficulties of increased expenditures for this purpose and the technical problems involved."

This is unsupported. There were no arguments. Questions were asked as to alternative courses of action, and as answers to these questions became available they were accepted promptly without argument (hearings, pp. 130–131, 137–138, 212–214).

Page 3: Even more basic, apparently, was the question of who would pay for the revisions—the Bureau of Public Roads or the Department of Defense.

There is absolutely no evidence to support this contention.

Page 3, paragraph 6, last sentence: "This was 3 years, 6 months, and 10 days after the 14-foot standard had been originally adopted."

There is nothing significant about this elapsed period of time. It has been established by the testimony that the 14-foot vertical clearance was recognized as adequate to meet defense needs as late as October 1, 1957.

Page 3, seventh paragraph: "During this long period of indecision by the executive branch of the Government, some 2,200 affected structures were built to the old specification. Although estimates vary, the cost of revising the clearances on these structures is expected to exceed $200 million."

This statement implies that indecision by the executive branch of the Government has cost in excess of $200 million, which is untrue. General Besson has made it clear that the Department of Defense has not requested that any of existing structures on the system be revised to the higher clearance and believes, in fact, that revision can be avoided in most instances (hearings, pp. 319–320). However, even if all structures were to be converted to the 16-foot clearance the cost of conversion would have been $123 million greater at the time of the decision in January 1960 to increase the standard as compared to conversion cost at the time first serious consideration was given the problem in the fall of 1957 (hearings, pp. 226–227, 317, 325). The testimony also makes it clear that the number of structures referred to was the number authorized, only some of which were built during the period cited.

Page 4, last sentence: "The comment of the subcommittee chairman, on conclusion of these hearings, that the 3½-year vacillation represented 'unconscionable, incredible, inexcusable, and indefensible delay' appears justified by the testimony."

The testimony does not justify such harsh and intemperate language. However, it is fair to point out that this hyperbole finds justification only in the preconceived notions of the chairman and the majority members of the subcommittee.

The phrase "this was unconscionable, incredible, inexcusable, and indefensible delay" is taken from a mimeographed statement which he read into the record and distributed to the press at the conclusion of the hearings (hearings, p. 408). The record also shows, and the Chair acknowledged, that this statement had been prepared by the majority the day before. Thus, he and his colleagues had arrived at this and other preconceived conclusions highly critical of the Department of Defense and BPR even before hearing the testimony of the two most important witnesses, the Federal Highway Administrator and the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics (hearings, pp. 407–412). We are in complete agreement with our colleague and subcommittee member, the gentleman from Florida, who observed (hearings, p. 411):

"Mr. CRAMER. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I thought the objective of these hearings was to decide whether (1) there was an unreasonable delay, and (2) what the cost to the taxpayers might be of that delay, and (3) the question is was the judgment exercised in deciding on 16 feet rather than 17 feet contrary to the best interests of the defense of this Nation.

"Two people, Mr. Tallamy and Mr. McGuire, are the ones who principally had the responsibility for making those decisions and they are the ones who were asked to come before this committee to state the justification and the reasons for their final determination and yet your statement was drafted before they were even heard. It was drafted yesterday.

"I think it is inexcusable that their testimony should be completely ignored in the chairman's statement of his conclusions of what the hearings have shown, because the basic question in the whole hearing was: Was the judgment of the Secretary logical, reasonable, and in the best interests of the defense of our country? The Secretary said his primary concern and the overriding consideration he had was the defense of our Nation and not crippling the missile program. He said it categorically. He showed the reason why he made the decision.

"He had all of the information before him that this committee brought out to light, at the time that decision was made; and he said, in my opinion the defense of this Nation is not being hampered in any way by making a 16-foot rather than a 17-foot clearance decision, and my overriding consideration was the defense of the Nation.'

"Mr. Tallamy said he did in his department what he had been doing on the 14-foot clearance until he was given the instructions to permit a 16-foot clearance by the Secretary of Commerce, who is the only person who could give him that authority to do so.

"It seems to me it is inexcusable that the conclusions you suggest before this committee will go out across this country and the people of this country will have the opinion that this is the conclusion of this committee—even though you stated that it is the statement of the chairman of this committee—that it is the conclusion of this committee at the termination of this hearing, after the Secretary has been heard, that the delay was inexcusable, unconscionable, and indefensible, and also carrying the implication that the defense of our country has thus been materially hampered, and apparently purposely so by this administration.

"I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I for one object to it. I do not think it is proper procedure, and I do not think we should play politics with our defense."

Page 5, second sentence: "* * * when delay and excessive caution * * *."

It is obvious that an answer to a complex problem involving the dimensions and quantities of missiles, that are to be moved over highways in a remote future year cannot be developed within a very short period of weeks, or months, from the date the Nation first becomes conscious of the fact that it is moving into a missle age (p. 315). It is a matter of opinion as to whether the actual time taken to reach a decision on increasing the interstate vertical clearance was excessive. As to whether the caution was excessive, it is noted that the chairman of the subcommittee seemed to advocate even a more cautious approach of holding up construction until decision could be made (p. 316). The economic loss to the Nation through having to wait to benefit from use of new highways thus delayed would far exceed any expenditure for converting structures to a higher clearance, even though such conversion should become necessary in the future. The Department of Defense has not requested such conversion and hopes to avoid it. General Besson thinks this matter should be left to the future and then considered on a case-by-case basis (hearings, pp. 307, 325–326).

Pages 9–10: "That was the factor of cost * * * must be prepared for the most severe scrutiny * * * would seem to justify the bureaucratic caution of the lower echelons * * *."

The report at this point seems to condemn consideration of cost by public servants, and seems to infer that action unsupported by sound justification should be taken. The subcommittee should not make a report seeming to encourage reckless action by public servants (pp. 350–351 of hearings).

Page 12, last paragraph: "* * * the most striking thing about 'Leonard's difficulties with the road system was the fact that the Defense Department appeared to have no interest in them' * * *." and quoted testimony by Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. Leonard.

General Schriever testified that 1 year before Mr. Leonard's firm was asked to commence a route study, as follows:

"I might say that in 1955 we made a number of studies concerning the transportation of the Atlas and we considered the possibility of going through the Panama Canal by boat. We looked at our C–133 in terms of transporting it by air, and we were also looking at the possibility of transporting it by road" (pp. 328–330 of hearings).

Pages 13–14: "* * * members of the subcommittee and the counsel attempted to discover why relatively little attention seemed to have been paid to the oversized items of equipment in the normal defense inventory—not missiles or rockets—and their transport. A definite answer did not emerge * * *."

In his testimony, General Besson was certainly specific when he said:

"I will say that in 1957 the three departments in looking at their problems, with respect to these clearances decided that 14 feet was still adequate, and that was based on the experience of people where there had been problems, but where no one, to my knowledge, had ever built a military boat in a military basement that could not be moved. So far as I know, the military requirements over the years have been met, and they have been met on time" (p. 315 of hearings).

Mr. Chacey also explained the necessity for moving items of equipment other than intercontinental ballistic missiles and space vehicles in oversea areas where clearances are often less than in the United States (pp. 109–110 of hearings).

Pages 20–21: If testimony of the type inserted on pages 20–21 is to be included in the report of the subcommittee leaving an inference that Mr. Tallamy should have been

aware of the problem prior to the spring of 1959, then there should also be included Mr. Tallamy's views on the matter which are not in agreement with the subcommittee's chief counsel's contention (hearings, p. 349).

Page 22, third paragraph: "This last factor mentioned is extremely significant. As the testimony showed, more and more the points at issue between the two Government agencies in the matter of the 17-foot clearance arose from the question: 'Who's going to pay for it?' "

The existence of an issue between the two agencies, and particularly a question "Who's going to pay for it" are contentions of the subcommittee's chief counsel, and are not in accord with fact or testimony.

Mr. Chacey testified otherwise (p. 136). Mr. Siegle testified otherwise (pp. 137–138 of hearings).

Page 23, second paragraph: "Behind this brief exchange of views lay strong differences * * *."

This is a doubtful conclusion on the record here. Questions raised by Mr. Siegle and Mr. Tallamy were logical questions relating to possible alternate courses of action. When answers were given to these questions, the answers were accepted without dispute. When later, the Department of Defense came to a decision and requested specific action, that action was taken promptly by the Bureau of Public Roads (pp. 378–380 of hearings). In May 1959 Mr. Tallamy had indicated a willingness to work with the Department of Defense—"on increased vertical clearances even greater than 17 feet, but stressed the neecssity for having strong justification which could be supported before congressional committees" (pp. 212, 323 of hearings).

Page 25: "According to Mr. Siegle, there were still differences of opinion between the two agencies on the matter of whether the proposed clearance should be extended from the Interstate System to certain roads on other highway systems."

The testimony quoted on page 25 in support of this unfounded contention actually contradicts it. How could there still be differences on a matter which was mentioned in discussion for the first time, as is evident from the second sentence of quoted testimony? Incidentally it should be noted that were there any difference on this matter, it could not have been a significant fact to the subcommittee because the reported discussion took place less than a week prior to formal decision by the Department of Defense. Actually, there was no serious intent expressed by Department of Defense representatives at the hearings to request extension of the increased vertical clearance to entire systems of highways other than the Interstate System, and it is apparently not the intention of the Department of Defense to do so. How then could interagency differences of opinion exist on this matter?

Page 26, first paragraph: "More conferences and concurrences followed. At last, on October 1, 1959 * * *."

Such language designed to create an impression of delay is inappropriate since only 1 week elapsed from the time of the September 25 memorandum quoted on page 25 and the letter of October 1. Such conferences and concurrences which may have taken place were within the Department of Defense, and not between the two agencies, as implied by the language of the subcommittee report.

Pages 26, 27, 28: An endeavor is made to show an excessively high cost for what is called a 6-month delay. The figures are derived from a course of questioning pursued by the chief counsel of the subcommittee which injects his own analysis and interpretation, and which was corrected in later testimony appearing on pages 226–227 and again on pages 317 and 325 of hearings.

Particularly, the statement made on page 28 of the subcommittee's report reflects accurately the expressed contention of the chief counsel, but it is not in accord with the facts.

The testimony clearly shows that the cost of conversion of all structures built over a 27-month period since October 1957 would be $123 million. No decision had been made to convert any of them, and such as might be converted would probably be decided upon sometime in the future on a case-by-case basis.

Pages 34, 35: "* * * the 'saving' is largely theoretical. * * * Yet the 'saving' finally made was not very great, when compared to the loss occasioned by the delay in reaching an ultimate decision. For example, as the counsel for the subcommittee brought out in the testimony, it would cost the Government $106 million more to raise the level—in this case to 17 feet—in October 1959 than it would have cost 6 months earlier."

Exactly the reverse is true. The saving in constructing future structures to 16 feet instead of 17 feet is real. On the other hand, any increment of cost such as the $106 million is purely speculative since no decision to convert any existing structures has been made. Again, the subcommittee uses in its speculation on this point a figure derived by a line of questioning pursued by the chief counsel of the subcommittee which was shown by later testimony to be incorrect (pp. 226–227, 317, 325 of hearings).

Page 37, last paragraph, fourth sentence: "By 1956, the inventory of conventional oversized items possessed by the military had swelled and had already raised serious questions about clearances for road transport."

This is a contention of chief counsel of the subcommittee, unsupported by expert testimony of the Nation's best authorities on the subject (pp. 73–75, 149, 315, 405 of hearings).

Page 37, last paragraph, fifth sentence: "Despite this, the Bureau of Public Roads ordained a vertical clearance standard of 14 feet on a system of interstate highways which was specifically intended to be built with an eye to military use."

Such a statement implies an arbitrary action taken without knowledge of Department of Defense needs as furnished in House Document 249, 81st Congress, 1st session, and in 1955 testimony of the Department of Defense in hearings relating to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, reinforced by frequent telephone conversation between Public Roads and Department of Defense representatives most concerned with highway needs of the national defense (pp. 13, 14, 348 of hearings).

Page 37, last paragraph, sixth sentence: "The Defense Department was not consulted about this clearance; but the Defense Department made no effort to point out its deficiencies. * * *"

As just stated above, the Department of Defense was regularly consulted on all of its highway needs.

Any fair statement of conclusions would include at this point the fact that the Department of Defense formally advised the Bureau of Public Roads, October 1, 1957, that the 14-foot clearance was adequate for the movement of present and anticipated equipment and materials of the Department of Defense agencies.

The Department of Defense found it had no deficiencies, so why say "made no effort to point out its deficiencies?"

Page 38, first paragraph, first sentence: "Shortly after the standard was adopted, the Defense Department began to entertain second thoughts."

This is not so. Shortly after the standard was adopted the Department of Defense made review of the 14-foot standard, and found it adequate.

The Department of Defense did not begin to entertain second thoughts until sometime after the launching of the Russian sputnik in October 1957 at which time the Congress and the whole Nation also began to take a look at our new defense posture resulting from entry into the missile age.

Page 38, first paragraph, second sentence: "But it took 3 years 6 months 10 days * * *."

There is nothing significant about a span of time between approval of interstate standards when the 14-foot vertical clearance was fully adequate to meet defense needs and the time when this standard was raised.

Page 38, first paragraph, third sentence: "During this time, over 2,200 affected structures were built to a standard that was already obsolete."

Nor is there anything significant about the number of bridges built during the period cited. Nor were more than 2,,200 affected structures built during the period. That is the number that were authorized. Again not all structures built during any period of the past will be converted to 16 feet. Finally, the standard was not already obsolete.

Page 38, second paragraph: This paragraph is too harsh in the light of the testimony.

Page 38, third paragraph, second sentence: "Here, too, there existed an apparent chasm between the officials on the working level and those in the higher echelons of responsibility."

This is false. The Assistant Commissioner for Operations, who is in the higher echelons of responsibility within the Bureau of Public Roads, was promptly informed of all developments (pp. 115, 137, 139, 140 of hearings). Furthermore, within 2 weeks after receipt by the Bureau of Public Roads of the rough draft of the proposed letter requesting 17-foot clearance, the Commissioner of Public Roads was informed of the problem.

Page 38, third paragraph: "Markedly significant was the fact that the Federal Highway Administrator was not apprised of the problem until March 1959, many months after his subordinates first began to grapple with the intricacies of the situation."

A fair statement in the subcommittee's report would identify this statement as the contention of the chief counsel of the subcommittee during his course of inquiry at the hearings. A fair statement would also include Mr. Tallamy's response which refuted any such notion just as any experienced administrator would do (pp. 349, 350 of hearings).

Page 38, fourth paragraph: "With communication between the various levels so prone to shortcircuiting, and with the Department of Defense so intent on avoiding any danger of being assessed for the expense necessary to revise the clearance standard, it was inevitable that the end result would be some glaringly mistaken assumptions all around."

This kind of a statement does not sound like a conclusion or finding but rather is an observation based on certain premises or contentions for which sound support is lacking in the testimony.

Page 38, sixth paragraph: "This report already has reviewed at considerable length the incredible record of vacillation. The testimony clearly supports a finding that this was a problem critical in nature, belatedly recognized, grossly mishandled, improvidently appraised and analyzed, and perversely solved, if indeed it has been solved."

The testimony does not do so.

Page 38, seventh paragraph: "As long as they are there, they threaten to strangle the mobility of military units that have oversized items in their inventory."

Such a statement betrays even to a layman a lack of understanding of basic transportation facts on the part of any group which would make such a statement. Inherently an item is not oversized unless it exceeds the capacity of normal facilities. By very definition of the term "oversized," there is meant restricted mobility. Furthermore, regardless of what vertical standard may be adopted, there will always be oversized items.

Pages 38, 56, eighth and ninth paragraphs:

"On the basis of the record before it, the subcommittee finds that the determination for a 16-foot clearance was controlled almost entirely by budgetary considerations rather than military requirements. The testimony is uneqivocal that the decision was based on current factors, that little consideration was given to future necessities, and that an insufficient margin of safety was left to meet unforeseen contingencies. It is abundantly clear, too, that the decision pointedly ignored the expressed mandate of the Congress that the Interstate System shall anticipate the needs of 1975.

"Although obviously dilatory in recognizing that higher clearances were vitally necessary to the national defense, the military services clung to a virtual unanimity of opinion that at least 17 feet was not only desirable but a seemingly imperative recommendation."

In these paragraphs the subcommittee draws different conclusions than were drawn by top Defense officials. In doing so the subcommittee demonstrates that it is less cost conscious than the Department of Defense. The simple facts are that the higher the standard, the greater the cost. In the wisdom of top Defense officials, a 16-foot vertical clearance can be afforded. It is inappropriate for the report of the subcommittee, even if the judgment of that subcommittee were different, to condemn the Department of Defense as they do in these paragraphs. Impartial reading of exhibit 50 on page 356 and of Mr. McGuire's testimony on pages 383–406 shows no justification for such comments. Certainly there is no basis for the statement that "the decision pointedly ignored the expressed mandate of the Congress." One is brought to wonder just what decision could have been made by the Department of Defense that would not have brought forth criticism by the subcommittee of the type presented in these two paragraphs. Suppose the Department of Defense had requested 18 feet or 20 feet, or more. What then?

Page 39, second paragraph: "* * * that the liaison between the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Public Roads left a great deal to be desired. * * * Reevaluation of the effectiveness of this liaison * * * would seem to be mandatory."

No deficiencies were found to exist in liaison in any of the testimony presented at the hearings. On the contrary there was frequent reference made to the close liaison maintained between Mr. Chacey's and Mr. Siegle's office. Many discussions took place on this one matter of vertical clearance. In addition see pages 113, 114, 308, and 348 of the record.

Page 7, first paragraph, last sentence: "The comment of the subcommittee chairman, on conclusion of these hearings, that the 3½ year vacillation represented 'unconscionable, incredible, inexcusable, and indefensible delay' appears justified by the testimony."

The testimony does not justify such harsh and intemperate language. However, it is fair to point out that this hyperbole does find justification in the preconceived notions of the chairman and the majority members of the subcommittee.

The phrase "this was unconscionable, incredible, inexcusable, and indefensible delay" is taken from a mimeographed statement which he read into the record and distributed to the press at the conclusion of the hearings (hearings, p. 408). The record also shows, and the chair acknowledged, that this statement had been prepared by the majority the day before. Thus, he and his colleagues had arrived at this and other preconceived conclusions highly critical of the Department of Defense and BPR even before hearing the testimony of the two most important witnesses, the Federal Highway Administrator and the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Supply and Logistics (hearings, pp. 407–412). We are in complete agreement with our colleague and subcommittee member, the gentleman from Florida, who observed (hearings, p. 411):

"Mr. CRAMER. May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that I thought the objective of these hearings was to decide whether, (1) there was an unreasonable delay, (2) what the cost to the taxpayers might be of that delay, and (3) the question is, Was the judgment exercised in deciding on 16 feet rather than 17 feel contrary to the best interests of the defense of this Nation?

"Two people, Mr. Tallamy and Mr. McGuire, are the ones who principally had the responsibility for making those decisions and they are the ones who were asked to come before this committee to state the justification and the reasons for their final determination and yet your statement was drafted before they were even heard. It was drafted yesterday.

"I think it is inexcusable that their testimony should be completely ignored in the chairman's statement of his conclusions of what the hearings have shown, because the basic question in the whole hearing was: Was the judgment of the Secretary logical, reasonable and in the best interests of the defense of our country? The Secretary said his primary concern and the overriding consideration he had was the defense of our Nation and not crippling the missile program. He said it categorically. He showed the reason why he made the decision.

"He had all of the information before him that this committee brought out to light, at the time that decision was made; and he said, 'in my opinion the defense of this Nation is not being hampered in any way by making a 16-foot rather than a 17-foot clearance decision, and my overriding consideration was the defense of the Nation.'

"Mr. Tallamy said he did in his department what he had been doing on the 14-foot clearance until he was given the instructions to permit a 16-foot clearance by the Secretary of Commerce, who is the only person who could give him that authority to do so.

"It seems to me it is inexcusable that the conclusions you suggest before this committee will go out across this country and the people of this country will have the opinion that this is the conclusion of this committee—even though you stated that it is the statement of the chairman of this committee—that it is the conclusion of this committee at the termination of this hearing, after the Secretary has been heard, that the delay was inexcusable, unconscionable, and indefensible, and also carrying the implication that the defense of our country has thus been materially hampered, and apparently purposely so by this administration.

"I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I, for one, object to it. I do not think it is proper procedure, and I do not think we should play politics with our defense."

WILLIAM C. CRAMER.
GORDON H. SCHERER.
JOHN F. BALDWIN.
FRED SCHWENGEL.
HOWARD W. ROBISON.

Mr. Bass of New Hampshire was not on the subcommittee at the time of the hearings involved and therefore took no part in the report.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WHITENER for the remainder of the week, on account of the death of Mrs. David H. Whitener, a relative.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Thursday, May 11, 1961, on account of official business.

Mr. LIBONATI (at the request of Mr. NIX), for Thursday, May 11, 1961, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCRANTON (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER), for 10 minutes on May 17.

Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER), for 1 hour on May 17.

Mr. HEMPHILL (at the request of Mr. HARDING), for 1 hour on Tuesday, May 16, 1961.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MERROW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, the remarks he made in Committee today, and to include a newspaper statement.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania, the remarks he made in Committee today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HALL.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. HARDING) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PUCINSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARDING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 15, 1961, at 12 oclock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

893. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of reciprocating engine spare parts procurement and repair requirements at the San Antonio Air Materiel Area (SAAMA), Air Materiel Command, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

894. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an initial report to the Congress on a review of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

895. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to validate payments of certain per diem allowances made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard while serving in special programs overseas"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

896. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide for payment of unused compensatory time earned by deceased postal employees, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

897. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to juvenile delinquency control and control of youth offenses or will provide training of personnel for work in these fields, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

898. A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend further the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

899. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend benefits of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 to widows and surviving children of former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the U.S. Secret Service division, who were retired or who died in the service of any such organization prior to the effective date of such amendments"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

900. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FASCELL: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 384. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization signed by the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 388. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 209. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to exercise his authority to operate a program, to be known as "University Free Cuba," to provide assistance to certain Cuban refugee students, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 226. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 7001. A bill to provide for the control of mosquitoes and mosquito vectors of human disease through research, technical assistance, and grants-in-aid for control projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 7002. A bill to provide an adequate basis for administration of Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ark. and Nev., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H.R. 7003. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to subject television networks to certain controls designed to assure that their operations are in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7004. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 7005. A bill to provide for the establishment of a farm electrification research laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 7006. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958, to provide for cancellation of student loans for service as a teacher in a private school as well as for such service in public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7007. A bill to amend titles I, II, and III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 7008. A bill to encourage the use of private benefit plans in lieu of social security by providing that individuals who are eligible for certain benefits under such plans shall not be entitled to social security benefits or subject to social security taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 7009. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to place a memorial tablet in Woodlawn Memorial Cemetery, Carbondale, Ill., in commemoration of the memorial ceremonies held there on April 29, 1866; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7010. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7011. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 7012. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7013. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extensions of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 7014. A bill to establish a comprehensive code governing elections in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H.R. 7015. A bill to prohibit strikes, work stoppages, and slowdowns at critical defense facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 7016. A bill to provide for an additional benefit factor for flood control projects located in labor surplus areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 7017. A bill to provide a program for an Operation Bootstrap for the American Indian in order to improve conditions among Indians on reservations and in other communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 7018. A bill to authorize a negotiated sale of land at the Agricultural Research Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 7019. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7020. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 7021. A bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 7022. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 7023. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that a voluntary employees' beneficiary association may retain its tax-exempt status even though it enters into certain nonprofitmaking arrangements with an organization which does not have such status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 7024. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, for purposes of determining the annual income of an individual eligible for pension, payments of State bonus for military service shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD:

H.R. 7025. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, for purposes of determining the annual income of an individual eligible for pension, payments of State bonus for mili-

tary service shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 7026. A bill to amend section 204 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide incentive pay for duty performed by members of the Armed Forces involving space flight; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 7027. A bill to amend section 204 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide incentive pay for duty performed by members of the Armed Forces involving space flight; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 7028. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, for purposes of determining the annual income of an individual eligible for pension, payments of State bonus for military service shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 7029. A bill to create an additional judicial district for the State of Florida, to be known as the middle district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H.R. 7030. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 7031. A bill to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce by communication facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.J. Res. 423. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Camp Matthews Marine Corps rifle range; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prevent the designation of any Federal lands in Nevada as primitive or wilderness areas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to deploring the unregulated importation and use in certain American television film productions of foreign-made musical recordings and requesting Congress to enact corrective legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 7032. A bill for the relief of Jose S. Canahuati and Mrs. Jelile Cronfel Canahuati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOELLER:

H.R. 7033. A bill for the relief of Harvey L. Hunt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 7034. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jacob Grygus and Miss Zofia Grygus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

144. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. Erwin F. Selmes, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, Washington, D.C., petitioning consideration of their resolutions that were adopted by the 70th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Back-Door Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my "Report From Washington," on the subject of "Back-Door Spending":

The following statement is taken from the U.S. Constitution:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law."

When one tries to find out what governmental policies have contributed to our 48-cent dollar, he finds that a reckless unconstitutional procedure called back-door spending must bare a major share of the blame.

Back-door spending is the method by which many Federal agencies are able to get their hands on funds without annual review by House or Senate appropriations committees, or by Congress as a whole. Basically, it is of two types:

1. The agency is permitted to borrow money directly from the Treasury instead of being required to justify expenditures and obtain funds from the Appropriations Committee or

2. The agency is permitted to incur contractual obligations prior to review by the Appropriations Committee, which in effect reduces the appropriating process to a mere rubberstamp approval of money already spent. In this manner, billions of our tax dollars are authorized for expenditure with no control being exercised by the Congress. Congress has no chance to tell the agency, "You may spend so much." The spending is not counted in the budget. There is no revenue raising, just borrowing.

If we played ball like this back home, the police chief, the fire chief, the public works director, and all the other city department heads would merely tell the finance director how much money he needed (or wanted) and the finance director would be obliged to comply with the request. The city council would have no say over how wisely the money was spent, or if there was enough revenue to pay the total bill.

This is one of the major reasons why the Federal debt and limit is now at $288 billion and headed higher. This is the way Congress has lost control of Government spending to the agency directors with their insatiable appetites.

The effort of conservatives to stop this back-door spending of taxpayer's money has been dealt a severe blow with the passage of the so-called depressed areas bill—and $300 million of the money to be spent on this dubious project will be obtained through the back door. No budget accounting and no strings attached.

The chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, CLARENCE CANNON of Missouri, called it "financial duplicity, fiscal insanity."

Several other bills have contained this same back-door provision, notably the Latin American $500 million foreign aid measure.

Shortly after the Rules Committee was packed, a resolution calling for a halt to the practice of back-door spending was submitted to the committee. It carried the signatures of 122 Members of the House, including mine, so here was an issue on which the House could work its will.

At this point it became clear that the purpose of the Rules Committee packing was not to allow legislation to reach the floor, but to prevent legislation from reaching the floor which the administration did not approve. The committee killed the resolution by an 8 to 7 vote.

The sooner we recognize that this has been a pure and simple power struggle, the sooner the Rules Committee fight will be placed in its proper perspective. The public should know that we did not experience a fight to abolish the power of the Rules Committee. It was a fight to place that power in different hands—those of the spenders.

A final last-ditch battle is underway to bypass the Rules Committee in an effort to stop back-door spending. A discharge petition is being prepared to take the issue out of the clutches of the Rules Committee and on to the floor of the House. It will require 219 signatures. I will sign the petition and am making every effort to influence others to do the same. I believe our future solvency is at stake.

Birthday Greetings to Former President Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to join with millions of my fellow citizens in paying tribute to former President Harry S. Truman on the event of his 77th birthday. It was a high privilege for me to have had the opportunity to serve as a Member of this body under this great American's strong and vigorous leadership.

As histories are written in later years, I am confident that they will place Mr. Truman among the greatest of our Presidents. He was a good President. It has been said that a truly great man is one who can walk with kings but never

lose the common touch. Of no man was this more true than of Harry Truman.

President Truman was called upon to guide our Nation through the period of rebuilding a free and stable world—a world which knew the threat and danger of totalitarian tyranny.

TRUE TO HIS CONVICTIONS

Crucial decisions were made by President Truman with frankness and courage. He stood firm in his convictions and for economic, social, and humanitarian justice to which he was sincerely dedicated. He bravely withstood the smears and insults which throughout all history have been hurled at those who champion human rights and social justice. It is these qualities that will give Harry Truman a rightful place in history as one of our great Presidents.

While the duty of President Franklin D. Roosevelt was to lead our Nation through the war, it was the duty of President Truman to lead us through the long, hard peace which was always threatened by the perils of communism. I am sure that future historians will bear out my firm belief that Mr. Truman carried out his duty with vigor and strength.

When communism threatened Western Europe, President Truman answered with the Marshall plan. When communism threatened our Asian neighbors, President Truman met their challenge with firm and resolute action. When communism threatened Berlin, President Truman met their challenge with all the resources of our free Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues and fellow Americans in extending to President Truman and his wonderful wife my best wishes for continued good health and many more happy birthdays.

The Role of the Federal Government in Our Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an address by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania, the Honorable JOSEPH S. CLARK, delivered at the 49th annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D.C.:

THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN OUR SOCIETY

The role of the Federal Government in our society should be whatever it needs to be to keep America prosperous and free. The first thing we have to do in deciding what is needed is to think. Too many people do not really think about the proper role of the Federal Government in the modern world; they just react. Their conclusions are arrived at emotionally, not as a result of careful thought.

I suggest these premises as a basis for rational thought:

First. The Federal Government is neither the "Great White Father" who will save us all, nor is it George Orwell's big brother.

Second. The Federal Government, in itself, is neither necessarily good nor necessarily bad. It is part of us. We created it.

Third. Federal officials are not necessarily inferior in ability to State and local officials, nor are they necessarily superior.

It follows that any particular role for the Federal Government should be considered on a case by case basis.

In short, if the Federal Government is the best means to accomplish a desirable end, let's use it. If it isn't, let's not.

For example, it may be the national judgment—as I think it is—that the choice of teachers, the kind of buildings and the curricula of our public schools should be determined by State and local elected officials, because these decisions cannot be made as wisely or as well by the National Government.

At the same time, it may be the national judgment—as I think it is—that part of the money for public education should be raised through national taxation. The national tax system, it is argued, is more equitable, and relatively less overburdened, then State and local tax systems.

Thus, our decision should be—and, I think, will be—for Federal aid to the public schools without Federal control. Nor should we be deterred by the irrational plea of those who argue that to put the Federal Government into any new field of "spending" is, in itself, undesirable and bad.

From these premises and this example, then, I conclude:

First, that insofar as our national resources must be mobilized to meet current problems, only the Federal Government can do it. If it be true that our human resources must be as fully educated, as fully trained, and as well utilized as possible—then the Federal Government must take an active role in planning for the development and utilization of our national manpower. Just as the personnel director of a company must be concerned with staffing his corporation, so must the U.S. Government concern itself with staffing freedom.

Second, only the Federal Government can effectively intervene in economic affairs where such intervention is necessary in the public interest. Our economy is now national in scope. Almost every transaction is inextricably intermingled with every other transaction. Such a national economy can be dealt with intelligently only through our National Government. We can argue among ourselves whether minimum wage laws, or labor relations laws, or unemployment compensation laws are necessary or wise. But if necessary and wise, they cannot be left to the 50 States for independent action. And, of course, nobody really thinks they should be; the States rights argument in the economic area is a facade for opposition to any laws at all.

Third, our national tax system falls on the whole across the country in some relation to the ability of everyone to pay. Our chaotic State and local tax systems do not. The time is at hand to utilize the national tax system to raise the money to solve certain of our national problems, which have up to now been left strictly to State and local governments.

Many of those who inveigh against the Federal Government are really not devotees of States rights as such; they are interested in the incidence of taxation, and they know that they fare better when needed services are financed through local property taxes and State sales taxes. It is not that local democracy is purer democracy; it is just cheaper—for them.

I do not love big government as such; far from it. But I am convinced that as the world becomes constantly both smaller and more complex the role of the Federal Government in our society is both inevitably and, on the whole, wisely bound to become a larger one.

Surplus Property Allocated to the States for Purposes of Education, Health, and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Public Law 61 which I introduced in the 84th Congress, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare allocates surplus personal and real property to the 50 States and territories for purposes of education, health, and civil defense.

The Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that property costing $82,795,415 was made available to the States during the period January 1 through March 31, 1961. It should be noted that many of the States received property which cost in excess of a million dollars during this period. California received in excess of $8 million.

I am advised that the property received by the States, especially for educational purposes, is one of the most beneficial contributions made by the Federal Government to what many of us consider to be our first line of defense in this space age.

I wish to congratulate Secretary Ribicoff and his staff and the other agencies, notably General Services Administration and Department of Defense, who cooperate in making this program so successful.

Secretary Ribicoff's report follows:

Surplus property for which the Federal Government paid $82,795,415 was made available to the States for educational, public health, and civil defense purposes during January, February, and March 1961 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Real property accounted for $5,559,507 and personal property for $77,235,908.

Secretary Abraham Ribicoff announced the totals in making his quarterly report to Congress on the Department's surplus property program.

Property no longer needed by the Federal Government is distributed, under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to educational and public health agencies and civil defense organizations of State and local governments, and to eligible nonprofit health and educational institutions exempt from Federal taxes. Regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and various State agencies channel the surplus property to the institutions.

Property transferred to the States includes such items as school and hospital building sites; buildings suitable for college dormitory or faculty housing; motor vehicles; hospital,

school, and office furniture; hand and machine tools; motion picture projectors; laboratory equipment; and school and office supplies.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Personal property received by State surplus property agencies for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, Jan. 1 through Mar. 31, 1961 (acquisition cost)

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$77,235,908	$5,559,507	$82,795,415
Alabama	2,950,773		2,950,773
Alaska	300,541		300,541
Arizona	741,290		741,290
Arkansas	508,189	15,750	523,939
California	8,230,901	110,914	8,341,815
Colorado	696,467		696,467
Connecticut	1,112,292		1,112,292
Delaware	240,897		240,897
Florida	3,764,356	320,821	4,085,177
Georgia	1,648,355		1,648,355
Hawaii	744,291		744,291
Idaho	351,172		351,172
Illinois	2,018,440		2,018,440
Indiana	1,848,064	41,195	1,889,259
Iowa	734,773		734,773
Kansas	1,291,494	117,343	1,408,837
Kentucky	1,288,514		1,288,514
Louisiana	2,226,105	230,656	2,456,761
Maine	651,719		651,719
Maryland	1,766,992	1,732	1,768,724
Massachusetts	2,214,688		2,214,688
Michigan	2,115,622	2,827,869	4,943,491
Minnesota	1,071,437		1,070,437
Mississippi	2,249,753		2,249,753
Missouri	921,229		921,229
Montana	217,811		217,811
Nebraska	903,126	935	904,061
Nevada	228,452		228,452
New Hampshire	326,218		326,218
New Jersey	992,534		992,534
New Mexico	982,335		982,335
New York	4,088,904		4,088,904
North Carolina	2,359,819	3,841	2,363,660
North Dakota	517,667		517,667
Ohio	4,280,456	80,000	4,360,456
Oklahoma	1,392,137	55,140	1,447,277
Oregon	1,215,003		1,215,003
Pennsylvania	2,512,502		2,512,502
Rhode Island	354,033		354,033
South Carolina	1,140,131		1,140,131
South Dakota	221,823	57,018	278,841
Tennessee	1,593,399		1,593,399
Texas	3,353,521	151,468	3,504,989
Utah	928,231	54,357	982,588
Vermont	219,668		219,668
Virginia	2,804,781	1,416,512	4,221,293
Washington	1,683,758	39,454	1,723,212
West Virginia	936,154		936,154
Wisconsin	1,425,286		1,425,286
Wyoming	227,913		227,913
District of Columbia	274,427	2	274,429
Puerto Rico	367,465	34,500	401,965
Virgin Islands			

House Concurrent Resolution 298

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, Premier Khrushchev and his associates in international communism, with the full cooperation of Dictator Fidel Castro, are making attempts to extend the system of communism to and within this hemisphere. This is most dangerous to our peace, to our safety, and to our security. Faced with the intolerable communistic Cuban situation, we must in the interest of our national security reaffirm the Monroe Doctrine by an immediate air and naval blockade of Cuba. This will make clear to the world that we do not intend to tolerate the Castro menace and that we are taking positive and effective action to prevent the extension of the system of communism in this hemisphere.

On May 9, 1961, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 298 expressing the sense of the Congress that an immediate air and naval blockade of Cuba should be imposed for the purpose of implementing the Monroe Doctrine.

The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the Monroe Doctrine expresses the historic policy of the United States with respect to the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the United States considers any attempt on the part of foreign powers to extend their system to any portion of the Western Hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety; and

Whereas the United States considers that any interposition by any foreign power in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere can only be considered as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States; and

Whereas it is impossible that any foreign power can extend its system to the Western Hemisphere without endangering our peace and happiness, and it is equally impossible that we should behold such extension in any form with indifference; and

Whereas recent events in Cuba and elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere have indicated that attempts are currently being made to provide a permanent foothold for international communism in this hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Monroe Doctrine should be reaffirmed by the immediate imposition of an air and naval blockade of Cuba by the United States for the purpose of preventing further intervention or exercise of control by foreign nations affecting the internal affairs and destinies of nations of the Western Hemisphere.

The adoption of the foregoing resolution will make clear to the world that we do not intend to tolerate the Castro menace and that we are taking positive and effective action to prevent the extension of the system of communism in this hemisphere.

Polk Brothers Honored as Brand Name Retailer of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on May 4, Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON was principal speaker at the annual brand names dinner in New York at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, during which one of my constituents, Mr. Sol Polk, president of Polk Bros., was honored as "Appliance Store Brand Name Retailer of the Year."

This is undoubtedly the highest award that American brand name manufacturers bestow upon a retailer in this country, and needless to say, I am extremely proud that a merchant in my congressional district received this coveted award this year.

The full significance of this annual award dinner in New York I believe can be focused by the fact that our Nation's Vice President did take time out from his very busy schedule and, by his presence as principal speaker, signify his own respect for the great contribution to the American economy that the name brand manufacturers and dealers of this country are making.

This is the first time since the founding of the Brand Names Foundation, which annually issues this highly respected tribute to American merchants, that the Brand Name Retailer of the Year Award has been presented to a retailer of the Midwest.

Mayor Richard J. Daley has eloquently expressed the pride experienced not only by the people of my district, but by all the people of Chicago, when he wrote Mr. Polk the following message upon learning of this great honor bestowed on Polk Bros.:

I extend to you my warmest congratulations. It is edifying when a native Chicagoan, or a Chicago enterprise, wins just acclaim for integrity and ability, as some of this glory is always shared by Chicago as a whole, adding, as it does, to our reputation for growth, enterprise, opportunity.

Recalling the humble beginning of the Polk Bros. organization some 25 years ago and observing your growth to a group of large marts covering Chicagoland, I am sure that you and your brothers and sister who make up your executive group well deserve the award which has been bestowed upon you.

Mr. Speaker, several hundred stores from all parts of the country compete for this Retailer of the Year Award. It is like TV's Emmy, or the motion picture industry's Oscar, something like winning the world's series, or bowling a 300 game, or running a 4-minute mile. It is one of the highest honors in the retailing business, and I am sure that in accepting this award, Sol Polk received it with a feeling of deep appreciation not only because he has brought a great distinction upon the retailing firm he heads, but also because his firm reflects so eloquently the high standards of merchandising throughout Chicagoland.

I am sure that all the merchants of Chicago were indeed honored to know that one of their associates was singled out for this great national honor. But the full significance of this award can be realized only if we fully understand what a great contribution American retailers are making toward the survival of free enterprise in this country.

At a time when many of us are deeply concerned over the problems which are being created throughout this country because American workers are being displaced by foreign imports competing for their jobs, it is encouraging to know that firms like Polk Bros. and thousands of other American retailers exert a profound effort to encourage the purchase of American-made name brand products in this country.

Recently I stated that the movement of durable consumer goods across the counters of America is the best way to sustain our Nation's economy. Sol Polk and his brothers and sister have made a tremendous contribution which can be felt not only within the immediate area

of their retail stores, but throughout our Nation, in promoting sales campaigns which help move the products of American workers from factory to consumer and which have brought them this outstanding award this year. By their outstanding techniques of merchandising name brand products, Polk Bros. helped produce a sufficient demand in the appliance manufacturing field so that thousands of Americans can continue at their productive jobs.

The American retailer is the backbone of economic survival for the United States. It is only when he devises methods to continue the flow of commerce across his counters that we can look with confidence to a high standard of employment in our Nation. When his business suffers, it is not long before the workers in American factories, manufacturing the goods and appliances which are sold at the retail level, begin to curtail their workweek and ultimately suffer long layoffs.

In the struggle for survival we frequently hear a great deal of discussion about arms and military weapons to protect the security of our country. Too often we overlook the fact that as important to our survival and security is a sustained economy because people who have an opportunity to earn a living and an opportunity to share the comforts of a bountiful nation will not easily fall prey to the prophets of false ideologies.

Polk Bros. clearly exemplifies the high standards of American merchandising. In their 26 years, this firm has risen from a small store located in the very heart of my congressional district to one of Chicago's leading merchandising establishments. It is particularly significant that they have accomplished this by their purchase and distribution of trademarked products and by publicizing the values of American engineering, ingenuity, research, and integrity of brand name manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, in paying tribute to Sol Polk as retailer of the year, I am sure that America's industry is also paying tribute to his brothers, Morris, Sam, and Harry, and his indefatigable sister, Mrs. Goldie Bachmann-Luftig, as well as the entire staff of this awe-inspiring firm.

We in Chicago are proud of them all because working as a closely knit family, the Polk's have inspired new vistas for all retailers in America's second largest city and throughout the Nation.

Keynes Economic Theories Exploded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 11, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion my able colleague from Missouri, Mr. TOM CURTIS, is one of the most able Members of the House and I have deep respect for his keen knowledge and understanding of economics and of our free enterprise system. One of the finest statements I have seen, exploding the questionable economic theories of Lord Keynes, who is now quoted so liberally by the President's economic advisers, is a recent letter Mr. CURTIS wrote to his constituents. I am including it here as a part of my remarks because I feel it is most important reading for every Member of Congress:

MAY 1961.

DEAR CONSTITUENTS: I have been conducting some correspondence with one of my good friends in the community who insists that in the name of bipartisanship I should support the Kennedy program before the Congress. He expresses a point of view that is quite common in what may be termed the intellectual circles of our community. I have had other expressions along this line. I think it is important that our people be included in the intellectual discussion that lies behind much of the debate that has been going on in the Congress for years.

It is not the good guys against the bad guys. It is essentially a debate between the followers of the economic and political philosophy of Lord Keynes and those who disagree with Lord Keynes and who essentially do not have a neat compact and doctrinaire economic-political philosophy to fall back upon for answers to each question that arises to face our society.

I would like to state my philosophy which I believe conforms to that of many of the economists and political philosophers who disagree with Keynes. I believe that we move forward best into the unknown by following the scientific method of testing observations and theories, the laboratory method. This is fine for the physical sciences such as chemistry, physics, botany, zoology, etc., but where is the laboratory for the social sciences * * * economics, political science and sociology? Unfortunately, it is the world itself. It cannot be placed behind academic walls in a science laboratory. The laws of the physical sciences pierce academic walls and can be studied anywhere. The laws of economics and political science do not.

The private enterprise system in economics relies upon the free marketplace as the laboratory where economic ideas can be tested. It places its emphasis upon the individual as opposed to any rigid social grouping of human beings. The democratic system of government relies upon the free legislative body as the laboratory where ideas in political science can be tested. It too places its emphasis upon the importance of the individual human being as opposed to any rigid social groupings of human beings.

Who knows what truths we will learn from the laboratories? Who knows when "breakthroughs" into new realms of knowledge will occur? Who can be but impatient at times with the laboratory system not coming up with answers to questions which we think it is important our society have? But because we have not found a cure for cancer does that mean we should abandon the laboratory technique, the scientific approach for seeking truth? So in the field of economic and political sciences should we abandon the private enterprise system or the democratic system of government because there remain important problems to be solved which we have not yet solved?

We can go back to witch doctoring, if that is the wish of the people. We can turn things over to those who state they have all the answers already. We can turn our society over to the intelligentsia who say they know what is best for the people and that it is no longer necessary to maintain the two laboratories—the free marketplace and the free legislative body to test the truth of things.

It may be merely a matter of faith on my part that makes me support the laboratory method as the correct way to pursue truth. Faith because I cannot prove it. If faith it is, there it is and there it will stand.

The following is the letter I recently wrote to my Keynesian constituent.

"DEAR WALTER: Thanks for your letter of April 14, 1961. I will keep on trying to get my viewpoint across to you, although I gain the impression that you don't really read or listen carefully to what I am trying to say.

"For example you say: 'Your opinion that we have our economy at its highest peak of production is reflected in their suggesting that a 3.4-percent increase in our economy would bring in the golden age of prosperity.'

"I have tried to make it quite clear in my rebutting the criticism directed against our economy that I do not feel that it is at its peak or for that matter ever will be. There will always be room for improvement.

"I have tried to point out that this 'numbers game' of trying to measure a dynamic economy by aggregates such as gross national product is ineffective. The gross national product series of economic statistics, though one of the most valuable, does not measure meaningful economic growth. For example, $1 million spent for a new steel plant will show up larger in the GNP series than will $1 million spent on education. GNP does not wash out economic mistakes, indeed it sometimes reflects an economic mistake in larger sums than a meaningful economic advancement. GNP will not measure a shift in an economy from manufacturing to services (which include education) and distribution. Yet an economy that is spreading its goodness to more of its people is bound to start emphasizing the service and distributive fields in relation to manufacturing. Such vital areas of advancement as increased leisure time and religion are not reflected in GNP increases.

"I have just written the minority report to the Joint Economic Committee's report on the President's economic report. I shall forward you a copy as soon as it is printed, possibly with this letter."

Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Meany, and the authors of the National Goals Report are all following the economic philosophy of Lord Keynes. I disagree with Lord Keynes' economic philosophy. There are many leading economists who disagree with the Keynes approach. Indeed, I would say that the preponderance of economic thought today is away from the Keynes philosophy.

This has nothing to do with Republicans and Democrats, although the two political parties could do worse than agree to disagree on the basis of fundamental economic philosophy. Mr. Kennedy selects Keynesian economists—Dr. Heller, Dr. Gordon, and Dr. Tobin—as his Council of Economic Advisers and chooses to follow their advice in economic matters in setting forth his legislative program. They are fine men. I have known and argued with them for years. I believe they respect my point of view, although they do not agree with it. I have none of the carping kind of criticism that you direct against me coming from them. I think we are moving the national debate forward to get at the points of difference. This is democracy at work and the way to come to proper solutions of our problems.

I have no objection to your supporting the Keynesian approach if you believe it is right, but I do believe you owe it to yourself and others who rely on your advice to at least listen with an open mind to those who are is disagreement. If we are right—and of course, I believe we are—the course that you suggest and that Mr. Kennedy is advocating will badly damage our society and will not solve our problems.

One of the themes of the Keynesian philosophy is that aggregate consumer purchasing power will automatically produce increased consumer demand. This increased consumer demand will stimulate the economy to produce to meet the demand. The economy in responding to meet the demand will employ more men, and so we get full employment.

I point out that this theory of economics is based upon the classical concept of the 19th and early 20th century when Lord Keynes was active. It is predicated upon an economy of scarcity, when indeed all that had to be done was to give more purchasing power to the consumers and automatically they spent the money for goods and services. I have suggested, and I believe I am right, that the U.S. economy of the 1960's is not one based upon scarcity, but rather one based upon plenty. Take the agricultural sector, for example. Even if we gave to our consumers twice the amount of purchasing power they have now they would not buy any more agriculture produce. Indeed, under doctor's advice Americans are actually eating less and more selectively. Therefore, increasing aggregate purchasing power will not help solve the farm problem. We actually are producing more than we need or our people can eat. I have to watch myself with you, so I hasten to state that I am talking, as the Keynesians are, in the aggregate. Of course, there are people in our society who could eat more, beneficially, if they had more money, but as important is their problem from a humane standpoint there are not enough of these people in America today to have any real impact on agricultural surpluses. In other words, taking care of the poor will not solve these aggregate economic problems. We must, therefore, direct our efforts at solving the distributive problem of getting ample good living to all our people on its own bottom. This is a special problem. It is not simple and it cannot be solved by dealing in Keynesian aggregates. It can be seriously damaged, however, along with our entire system by treating it in an aggregate fashion.

The next step in Keynesian philosophy is to have the Government enter the picture to bring about the increase in aggregate consumer purchasing power. This was the philosophy of the New Deal of the 1930's. Even in those days this did not work and it is doubtful how much it may have helped. In 1938, after 6 years of the Keynesian approach, we had 10,390,000 people unemployed (according to the old statistics * * * modern statistics would make this an even greater figure). This was 19 percent of the labor force of 54,950,000. Contrast this, if you will, with our present picture of 66,700,000 persons employed out of a work force of 70,600,000 people, giving an unemployment figure of 3,900,000 persons. This is 5.6 percent of the labor force.

World War II; America becoming the "arsenal for democracy" in 1939 solved the great depression not Keynesian dogma or was this following Keynesian dogma? I shudder at the thought.

The reason the Kennedy proposals include Federal aid to education, Federal aid to depressed areas, Federal aid for community facilities, federally financed housing programs, federally supported health care programs, etc., is primarily to have the Federal Government assume the job that the Keynesian philosophy rests upon * * * get more money into consumption. The problems of education, housing, community facilities, health care, etc., are almost incidental in their minds to getting the aggregate purchasing power up. That is why people like myself who are concerned about solving educational, health, and housing problems have such a difficult time debating these people. We concentrate on meeting the social need involved in education, health, and housing. We point out with effectiveness, I believe, that we do a much better job solving these problems without the Federal Government getting massively into the picture.

If your interest is primarily aggregate purchasing power being implemented by the Federal Government, of course, you aren't going to be too concerned about what Federal programs you advance in order to bring this about * * * if one doesn't work, another might. And so it is with the Keynesians * * * they are looking around for almost anything that would justify Federal expenditures. That is another reason I worry about them. War is the easiest thing with which to justify Federal expenditures. Now, I am not suggesting these philosophers would actually take us to war to implement their economic philosophy. But I think it is perfectly right to state that making an economy work based upon peace is not a passion with them as it is with me. The way in which the Keynesians ignore the impact of World War II and the Korean war in propounding their philosophy is calloused and dangerous.

But look at consumer purchasing power during the recent recession. Did it go down? It did not. Total personal income in 1959 was $383.3 billion; in 1960 it was $404.2 billion. Disposable personal income was $337.3 billion in 1959 and $254.2 billion in 1960. Did the people spend the additional money? No, for some reason or other they saved more. In 1959 they saved $23.4 billion; in 1960 they saved $26.4 billion. This reflects an economy which is based more on plenty than one based upon scarcity.

We have a lot of social problems to solve, but thank the Lord they are no longer the problems based upon the centuries of economics which was predicated upon the law of scarcity. For the first time in the history of man, I believe the problems that face us are the problems arising out of the laws of economics based upon plenty. New and tough problems are created all right and many of the problems revolve around individual problems of scarcity * * * but they are not the old problems of aggregate scarcity mankind has been fighting for centuries. Just as I have said in education, our society has gotten on top of the problem of mass education, quantity education, which no other society has achieved before. Now for the first time we can begin to attack meaningfully the problems of quality education, and the problems involved in quality education I submit are considerably more difficult than the problems of quantity education.

Yet what are the Kennedy proposals on education? Keynesian—getting the Federal Government to spend more money and directing the attention to the problems of quantity education which have largely been solved. In this process we damage the work that is going forward in quality education. The Federal Government can help in improving quality education so let's direct our attention there.

If there is disagreement on these two different fundamental approaches let's debate them honestly and see if we can resolve them. I say the Keynesian approach looks backward to the early days of the 20th century and that this approach will damage, not help to solve the problems that face us in the 1960's. President Kennedy and his advisers disagree. However, they, and you, try to put the debate on the basis that they are interested in the people and are forward looking, that their opponents, which includes me, are not interested in the people and are backward looking. That begs the question. Which is true? Let's start discussing the question itself. Let's put out in the open our conflicting facts and arguments and see which point of view justifies the epithet "mossback".

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS,
Your Congressman.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 15, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, whose service is perfect freedom, we praise Thee for the vision of liberty which, like a bow of promise, arches the dark skies and inspires mankind to overthrow all despotism and to break the fetters of oppression.

We praise Thee O Lord for the judgment and wisdom of all those, guided by Thee, who designed and founded the nations and institutions in which liberty is enshrined.

In this day of global conflict for the bodies and minds of man we pray that Thou wilt purge and cleanse our own hearts that we may be found worthy to march with the armies of emancipation which bring both liberty and release from the want and woe which beset so many millions of Thy children and grind them into the dust of poverty.

In this day of battle when there is sounding forth a trumpet which must never know retreat, we praise Thee for the courage, the labor, and the sacrifice of all those who are anywhere challenging and fighting the enemies of freedom.

In this day on ages telling, good Lord deliver us from discouragement, appeasement of evil, indifference, petty prejudice, and from all attitudes and actions and words which may hinder the achievement of a just and lasting worldwide peace of good will.

We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 11, 1961, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 11, 1961, Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to which was referred the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal

financial assistance for education, on May 12, 1961, reported it favorably, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 255) thereon, which was printed, together with minority and individual views.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2010. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6094. An act to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2010. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 6094. An act to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Retirement Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL FACILITIES AT THE AEROMEDICAL FIELD LABORATORY, HOLLOMAN AIR FORCE BASE, N. MEX.

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed construction of research and maintenance facilities for animals at the Aeromedical Field Laboratory, Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT AND FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1933

A letter from the Governor, Farm Credit Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend further the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries and the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUDIT REPORT OF NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

A letter from the executive vice president, National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the audit of the financial transactions of that council, for the year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COLLECTION OF FEES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES UNDER NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1955

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSION OF BENEFITS OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1957

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend benefits of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 to widows and surviving children of former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the U.S. Secret Service Division, who were retired or who died in the service of any such organization prior to the effective date of such amendments (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRANSPORTATION OF REMAINS OF VETERANS WHO DIE IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES TO PLACE OF BURIAL

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

BALANCE SHEET AND PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT OF NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, Springfield, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, a balance sheet and profit and loss statement of that club, for the fiscal year May 1, 1960, to April 30, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN CONNECTION WITH GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL PARKWAY, VA.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION BY THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

"Resolution requesting the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization to take action to halt the flood of surplus foreign military rifles into the United States and to protect the domestic rifle manufacturing industry

"Whereas an overwhelming rise in the importation of surplus foreign military rifles has occurred in the past 5 years, and the influx of said rifles has caused an alarming decline in the sale of domestic rifles, seriously affecting the rifle-making industry in this country and in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and has resulted in hundreds of skilled craftsmen being forced onto the ranks of the unemployed; and

"Whereas the importers of surplus foreign military rifles, pressing the advantage of the

low costs of foreign labor, can convert surplus military rifles to sport or hunting rifles at a very low cost thereby placing them in a position which enables them not only to undersell but also to imperil the domestic rifle manufacturing industry: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization to take such action, including the submission of legislation to the Congress of the United States, as may be necessary to protect the domestic rifle manufacturing industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to Mr. Frank Ellis, Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington, D.C., and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate May 1, 1961.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the State Road Commission of the State of Utah, favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the July 1, 1961, deadline specified in section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code for a period of time sufficient to permit the 1963 Legislature of the State of Utah to consider the subject of outdoor advertising along the Interstate System of Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

A statement and resolution adopted by the 66th annual session of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington, relating to the services of clergymen of the different religious groups at inaugural ceremonies; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The following report was submitted:

By Mr. PROXMIRE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 1619. A bill to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old series currency, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 256).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, dated May 5, 1961, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1858. A bill to amend section 105(b) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1859. A bill for the relief of Francisco Saverio Danna; and

S. 1860. A bill for the relief of Dr. Joseph S. Salama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1861. A bill for the relief of Emmett W. Gleeson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

S. 1862. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to permit the private carriage of letters and packets in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1863. A bill to provide for the establishment of a senior citizens service training program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. McNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (by request):

S. 1864. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Columbus Bend project, Texas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 1865. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1866. A bill for the relief of Dr. Berchmans Rioux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1867. A bill to authorize the disposal of the property known as Ellis Island for purposes consistent with the public interest; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. 1868. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands situated on Horn Island in the Gulf of Mexico to the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1869. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns and rural counties; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BLAKLEY, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "AGING AMERICANS"

Mr. McNAMARA submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 145), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging 10,000 additional copies of the committee print, "Aging Americans—Their Views and Living Conditions," a report by the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, issued by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the 86th Congress, 2d session.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF GEORGE W. NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA submitted a resolution (S. Res. 146) for the Senate to adjourn on July 11, 1961, as a mark of further respect to the memory of Hon. George W. Norris, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HRUSKA, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 105(b) OF HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend section 105(b) of the Housing Act of 1949.

The amendment would provide an additional exception to the requirement that the purchasers or lessees of land from an urban renewal agency commence improvements on the land within a reasonable period of time. This exception would apply to a purchaser or lessee which, first, is a public body or nonprofit corporation; and second, acquires the property for subsequent disposition by it in accordance with the urban renewal plan. The amendment is designed to permit public agencies or private nonprofit corporations, such as industrial development foundations, to purchase

urban renewal land and hold it undeveloped while attracting industry to the locality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1858) to amend section 105(b) of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENIOR CITIZENS SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. McNAMARA. Madam President, many critics of new programs and new legislation affecting the Nation's senior citizens have complained loudly that we are being too paternalistic and too welfare-statish.

In making these complaints, I gather that they mean that older Americans—especially those who are retired—should not just settle back and bask in the sun, sway in the rocking chair, stay cooped up in a home for the aged—and allow society to wait on them, hand and foot.

Madam President, there is a great deal of merit in urging older men and women—especially if they are able to get around—to remain active and useful in their retirement years. During the past 2 years of my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on the Aged and Aging, and now, as chairman of the Senate's Special Committee on Aging, I have been impressed by the large number of older citizens who could make important contributions. Contributions not only to their own morale and well-being, but to the community at large.

Once again, therefore, I wish to introduce, for proper reference, a bill that would enable the growing numbers of such aged Americans to participate in training and refresher programs, for developing the necessary skills in the fields of community service.

This proposal has recently been publicized as a Senior Citizens Peace Corps. I think this is to be welcomed, since it will show that either on a domestic or an overseas basis, the senior citizens of America are just as anxious to express their deep-felt desire to be of help to their fellow men as are the youth of our Nation.

Madam President, I hope that my fellow Senators on both sides of the aisle will see the importance and the positive nature of the purpose of my bill, and that we forge ahead in the field of aging—beyond the mere statements of policy issued at the recent White House Conference on Aging—to make real and concrete our public declarations about encouraging our increasing population of older persons to continue to lead useful lives—in this case, by offering their time and their talents to the solution of problems affecting the community at large.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and a brief description of its contents be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and description will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1863) to provide for the establishment of a senior citizens service training program, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Senior Citizens Service Training Program Act."

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that, within the large number of retired Americans, there are thousands of men and women who are able and willing to make significant contributions to the civic development of their communities and Nation, and who constitute a vast reservoir of manpower capable of being trained or retrained for currently unfilled roles in the broad area of occupations which obtain in the fields of health, education, and welfare, that, by assisting and encouraging retired Americans to perform on a part-time basis occupational roles (whether presently in existence or yet to be created) in such fields, the Federal Government, in cooperation with State and local governments and civic-minded organizations, cannot only greatly contribute to the general civic development of the Nation, but also to the restoration of dignity and of a meaningful life to our otherwise retired population.

(b) It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide for the training or retraining of retired Americans for part-time occupational roles in the broad area of health, education, and welfare so as to enable them to lead more active and meaningful lives and, at the same time, to alleviate the existing shortage of personnel in this area of community service occupations.

MANPOWER SURVEYS

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall conduct manpower surveys, on a regional basis, within the fields of health, education, and welfare with a view to determining the kind and extent of part-time employment opportunities within such fields which are available to retired individuals. In carrying out such surveys, the Secretary shall cooperate with the Secretary of Labor, and shall have authority to utilize, on a reimbursable basis, such of the personnel and facilities of the Department of Labor, or of any other department or agency of the Government, as he deems necessary or desirable.

(b) On the basis of data collected by or made available to him as a result of such surveys or otherwise, the Secretary shall publish and disseminate among retired individuals and appropriate officials, groups, agencies, and organizations, within each region of the United States, information relating to—

(1) the kinds of positions within the fields of health, education, and welfare which are available within such region to retired individuals;

(2) the number of each kind of such positions which are so available; and

(3) the training required to qualify for such positions.

TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary shall, from time to time and in cooperation with State and local governments and civic organizations, establish and conduct, within the various regions of the United States, occupational training programs which are designed to qualify retired individuals living within such regions for locally available positions in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

(b) In determining whether to establish and conduct one or more training programs within any particular region of the United States, the Secretary shall be guided by the following considerations:

(1) The number of positions within the fields of health, education, and welfare (within such region) which would be available to retired individuals, if properly qualified;

(2) The number of retired individuals desiring to participate in any such training program; and

(3) The type and extent of training required to qualify such individuals for such positions.

(c) The Secretary shall not conduct, within any region of the United States, any training program if, on the basis of all the data available to him, he finds that the positions for which training of senior citizens is provided can otherwise be filled by full-time job applicants.

GRANTS TO NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) In carrying out the training programs provided for in section 4, the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, utilize the services of public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies, which shall be reimbursed for their services through a system of direct grants to be created and administered by the Secretary for such purpose.

(b) The Secretary is further authorized to make direct grants to such organizations for demonstration projects designed to promote the interest of such organizations in undertaking the training and recruitment of retired individuals for employment within the fields of health, education, and welfare.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, for the fiscal year commencing July 1, 1961, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the sum of $5,000,000.

The description presented by Mr. MCNAMARA is as follows:

PROVISIONS OF SENIOR CITIZENS' SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM BILL

SECTIONS 1 AND 2

These sections present the findings of fact and the purpose of the bill, referring to the thousands of men and women who constitute a vast reservoir of currently unused manpower in health, education, and welfare, and the need to train or retrain these retired persons for part-time employment in such fields.

SECTION 3

The bill calls for manpower surveys by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with the Department of Labor, to determine the kind and extent of part-time employment opportunities in the fields of community services on a regional basis; publication and dissemination of the survey results on the kinds of positions suitable for senior citizens; the number of such positions available; and the training required for these positions.

SECTION 4

This part of the bill establishes the nature of the training programs required. The Secretary of HEW, in cooperation with State and local governments and civic organizations would conduct training programs for available positions—guided by the number of positions in a given region; the number of retired individuals desiring training, and

limited to training for positions which would remain otherwise unfilled by younger, full-time job applicants.

SECTION 5

The Secretary is authorized to use the services of both public and nonprofit organizations in pursuance of the purposes of the act; and to make direct grants to such organizations for pertinent demonstration projects.

SECTION 6

The bill authorizes appropriation of $5 million for each of 3 years, starting July 1, 1961, for the purpose of carrying out the above provisions.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, on behalf of myself and Senators McCLELLAN, COOPER, EASTLAND, KEFAUVER, and SYMINGTON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a slight measure of relief for cotton farmers whose cotton acreage has been flooded out by recent heavy rains. This is a companion measure to a bill introduced in the House of Representatives last Thursday by Representative GATHINGS.

The House Agriculture Committee was sufficiently impressed with the merits of this legislation and the need for urgent action on it to call a special session on Friday to approve the bill. I understand that the bill will probably be brought up for action in the House early this week. Department of Agriculture witnesses who appeared before the House committee testified in favor of the bill and stated that regulations to implement the legislation would be drawn up at once in order to get the program into operation without delay.

This is a simple piece of legislation and it is sorely needed to help farmers who have been unable to plant their allotted cotton acreage because of flood conditions or whose plantings have been washed out. Thousands of acres of cotton land in several States have been made unworkable by recent flood conditions. Passage of this legislation will enable cotton growers to transfer, under certain conditions, all or part of their acreage allotment from a flooded-out farm to another farm within the county or in an adjoining county. The Secretary of Agriculture will specify the counties to be covered by the transfer program and will prescribe regulations under which it will be carried out. I might mention that Congress voted this same type of relief for cotton farmers in 1958.

Madam President, cotton farmers in my State are caught in a severe cost-price squeeze and unless this transfer authority is approved, it may be bankruptcy for many of them. A great many farmers have already lost sizable sums in planting costs due to flood conditions.

Others have simply not had a chance to get any seeds in the ground because of standing water. If these farmers can move their flooded-out acreage to higher ground it will at least help to cut down on their losses. There is little planting time left and this bill must be acted upon at once if it is to be effective. I introduce this companion bill to Representative GATHINGS' bill in order to give the Senate Agriculture Committee a specific bill to consider pending completion of House action on H.R. 7030. I hope that the committee will act prompt on this humanitarian measure.

In closing, I wish to point out that much of the losses suffered by cotton farmers in my State and other States in the flood region could have been prevented if these farmers had available to them weather information tailored to fit their farming needs. This type of weather information will be provided to farmers in southern and eastern Arkansas, western Tennessee, and southeastern Missouri if we can obtain funds to implement the special agricultural weather service project which has been proposed by me and others from this area. The long-range forecasts under this proposed program would have undoubtedly influenced many farmers to postpone their cotton planting to a later date. This special service for the farmers would at least have provided the farmers with some warning of the future rainfall prospects and would have tempered the producer's traditional eagerness to get his new crop in the ground.

There are no funds in the 1962 budget to initiate this special weather service project, but I am hopeful that the Congress will look with favor on our request for the small sum which is needed to get this program under way. I plan to testify on this project before the Appropriations Subcommittee tomorrow. The recent floods in the cotton-growing areas will have served some useful purpose if they help in drawing attention to the need for better weather service for farmers in our area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1865) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ISSUANCE OF A GOLD MEDAL TO BOB HOPE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, on behalf of myself and Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BLAKLEY, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FONG, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McGEE, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, I introduced a Senate joint resolution authorizing the President to present a medal in the name of the American people to one of the great humanitarians of our time—Bob Hope.

Most Americans know Bob Hope primarily as a superb entertainer.

Over the years he has brought laughter and humor to many millions of men and women all over the world, from the stage, in the movies, and on radio and television, and no man has given more generously of his time and energy traveling around the world to entertain our Armed Forces.

In fact, he has given up some 18 Christmases at home so as to be with our military youth at far off bases, substituting to the best of his ability for the family that was in their minds and hearts.

There is another less known side of Hope's life. For many years also, quietly but consistently, this American has been engaged in a career of good works. He has appeared in nearly every State in the Union on behalf of charitable, civic, and philanthropic groups.

Around our land there are many Hope foundations for less fortunate people.

His organizing work is seemingly limitless; his travels almost constant; and his devotion inspiring.

Bob Hope, American patriot, has given of his time, his tremendous personality, and his physical resources to a selfless career of humanitarianism that now stands out in the annals of our country.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution to have the President of the United States present, in the name of the people of the United States of America, a gold medal of appropriate design to Bob Hope, in recognition of his services to the country and to the cause of world peace, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas moments enriched by humor are moments free from hate and conflict, and therefore valued by mankind; and

Whereas Bob Hope has given to us and to the world many such treasured moments; and

Whereas he has done so unstintingly and unselfishly, with heavy demands on his time, talent and energy; and

Whereas his contributions over a long period of years to the morale of millions of members of the United States Armed Services, in addition to those of our friends and allies, have been of immediate and enduring value; and

Whereas these contributions have been made during Christmas and at other times by personal contact in countless miles of travel around the globe, to the farthest outposts manned by American youth, during times of peace and war, often under dangerous conditions and at great personal risk; and

Whereas while at home he has given firm and imaginative support to humanitarian causes of every description; and

Whereas in all this Bob Hope has rendered an outstanding service to the cause of democracy, as America's most prized Ambassador of Good Will throughout the world. Therefore be it

Resolved, That the President is authorized to present in the name of the people of the United States of America a gold medal of appropriate design to Bob Hope in recognition of his aforesaid services to his country and to the cause of world peace.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such a medal to be struck and furnished to the President.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment which I expect to offer to the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance to education, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be received and printed and lie on the desk until it is made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the desk, as requested.

Mr. THURMOND submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1021, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TO ESTABLISH WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE THE OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL BOXING COMMISSIONER; ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, on March 29, 1961, I introduced in the Senate a bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill, S. 1474, and that at the next printing of the bill his name be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED ANTARCTIC COMMISSION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. WILEY. Madam President, on April 6 I introduced in the Senate S. 1516, a bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica.

Through an error, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] was not included among those listed as cosponsors.

I am very pleased to have Senator HOLLAND on the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1516, Senator HOLLAND's name be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF ANTITRUST LAWS WITH RESPECT TO THE MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRUGS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, on April 12, 1961, I introduced the bill (S. 1552) to amend and supplement the antitrust laws with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] may be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADMISSION OF CHINESE COMMUNIST REGIME INTO UNITED NATIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] be added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, which is designed to express the sense of the Congress concerning admission to the United Nations and diplomatic recognition of the Chinese Communist regime. In addition I ask that the name of Senator DOUGLAS appear as a cosponsor on the next printing of Senate Concurrent Resolution 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 8, 1961, the names of Senators HART, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Missouri, HUMPHREY, GRUENING, and NEUBERGER were added as additional cosponsors of the following bills, introduced by Mr. CLARK on May 8, 1961:

S. 1817. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; and

S. 1818. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 8, 1961, the names of Senators HART, DOUGLAS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Missouri, HUMPHREY, GRUENING, NEUBERGER, and PELL were added as additional cosponsors of the following bills, introduced by Mr. CLARK on May 8, 1961:

S. 1819. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; and

S. 1820. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes.

ORDERLY MARKETING ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of April 27 and May 8, 1961, the names of Senators TALMADGE, CHAVEZ, SMATHERS, BUSH, LONG of Louisiana, BARTLETT, WILEY, MCCARTHY, BIBLE, and MCGEE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1735) to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE on April 27, 1961.

ABOLISHMENT OF TAX AND PROPERTY QUALIFICATIONS FOR ELECTORS IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 8, 1961, the names of Senators HART, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Missouri, HUMPHREY, GRUENING, and SYMINGTON were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections, introduced by Mr. CLARK on May 8, 1961.

ABOLISHMENT OF LITERACY TEST QUALIFICATIONS FOR ELECTORS IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 8, 1961, the names of Senators HART, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, LONG of Missouri, and HUMPHREY were added as additional consponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 82) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy

test qualifications for electors in Federal elections, introduced by Mr. CLARK on May 8, 1961.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from radio address by him on progress at the present session of Congress.

Address by him proposing the establishment of a United Nations Commission To Establish Criteria for Disarmament.

By Mr. BEALL:

Address entitled "The Responsibility of Being a Republican," delivered by Representative CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland, before the Maryland Federation of Young Republicans, in Hagerstown, Md., on May 13, 1961.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech on "Israel—A Demonstration of Freedom With Responsibility," delivered at Clarksburg, W. Va., May 13, 1961, commemorating 13th anniversary of the State of Israel.

A PEACE INSTITUTE WITH NEW PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, the most important problem in the world today is that of how to preserve the peace. To that end, a new organization has been formed. It is headed by a great public servant, the Honorable James J. Wadsworth.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "A Peace Institute With New Program," which was published on yesterday in the Washington Star, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PEACE INSTITUTE WITH NEW PROGRAM

(By L. Edgar Prina)

Early last month, a new organization came into town and set up shop almost without notice in an old smooth-faced, red brick building on 18th Street NW.

The events of the last few weeks—in Cuba, in Laos, in Algeria—may provoke the thought that the timing of this one could not have been worse if it had been planned that way.

But the leaders of the new organization believe that their reason for existing has taken on a new urgency and importance.

Called the Peace Research Institute, it is a private, nonprofit group aimed at the support, advancement, and promotion of study of the problems of preventing war.

The institute is unlike the antiwar organizations of the past—outfits which confined their appeals largely (without success) to the moral and religious sensibilities of mankind. It is embarked on a different approach, one it hopes will have a greater chance.

THE NEW DANGERS

Physical scientists have produced new weapons which for the first time actually endanger civilization. One small hydrogen bomb, for example, could incinerate a great city and its millions of inhabitants and imperil, with radioactive fallout, many thousands more hundreds of miles away.

Perhaps the social scientists using the research method can discover the means to prevent the use of these new weapons and find out how international life can be regulated so that thermonuclear war may be averted.

The institute's first president is former Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, deputy U.S. representative to the United Nations during the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration.

He served also as American representative on disarmament, 1958–61, and acted as chief negotiator for this country in international disarmament talks.

Dr. Arthur Larson, Director of the U.S. Information Agency under Mr. Eisenhower and now director of the World Rule of Law Center at Duke University, is vice president and general counsel.

THE SOVIET AIMS

Mr. Wadsworth, as his experience makes plain, knows the Russians. The curious may wonder, therefore, how he could hope that the free world could persuade the Russians to sign an agreement on arms control and disarmament and live up to it, even with an inspection system.

But there is no doubt that he does.

In an interview he was asked whether research on peace problems would not be fruitless in the absence of any manifestation of a genuine Soviet desire to lessen world tensions.

"No, I don't think so," he replied. Of course, peace will never be certain unless all nations desire it. But there are such things as gradual disarmament, nuclear test bans, inspection systems, and the like where more facts and figures are needed before they could be implemented.

"For example, how many men and machines would it take to police a test ban adequately? What are the economic factors of disarmament? How can we strengthen international organizations? We need the answers to these kind of questions and I think the Peace Research Institute can help find them."

The former Ambassador believes that a fresh breeze of change is blowing across the intellectual community. Up until quite recently, there was very little concern among scholars with the problems involved in maintaining peace.

Today, Mr. Wadsworth says, there is a growing interest in applying the scientific method to the world's No. 1 problem.

His institute's primary objective is "to assure that the fullest use is made of research talents from all disciplines throughout the United States on problems of international relations in search of further knowledge of ways to prevent war."

In other words, it will function as a peace broker.

WORK WITH UNIVERSITIES

It will do this by maintaining a close working relationship with universities and other research centers in order to identify studies they might undertake if they had the financial resources and facilities.

Meanwhile, it will keep in close communication with Government agencies and international organizations to discover their research needs.

To carry on its work, the Institute will seek to negotiate contracts with Government agencies, civilian and military; obtain grants from foundations and other sources and establish a clearinghouse to keep all those concerned informed of current and completed research in the field.

A forerunner of PRI, the Institute of International Order, last year completed five pilot studies which identified more than 500 topics which need further exploration. The studies covered:

The technical problems of arms control; economic factors bearing upon the maintenance of peace; the international rule of law; national and international decision-making and communication in relation to war and peace.

THE PRESENT-DAY RADICALS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, on May 12 there was published in Life magazine an editorial entitled "The Unhelpful Fringes—The Present Day Radicals, Left or Right, Bring Us Neither Hope Nor Realism."

In the editorial there is profound thinking with respect to a problem that appears to be growing in this country today; and I hope that every Member of this body who has not already read the editorial will find the time to read it.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNHELPFUL FRINGES—THE PRESENT-DAY RADICALS, LEFT OR RIGHT, BRING US NEITHER HOPE NOR REALISM

Not since the 1930's, when technocracy, Father Coughlin and the American Communist Party were in full cry, has the fringe-group situation in the United States been so lively as it is now. Extremists are resuming their long-quiescent ideological warfare; there is a rash of new little magazines, both left and right. Most of the new yearners, says Irving Kristol in Encounter, are "trapped in a peculiarly American dilemma: How to be a radical without becoming a crank." Are any succeeding?

Let's start on the right with the John Birch Society. The most striking fact about it is its growth rate: it claims to have doubled its membership every 4 months since December 1958 and is now aiming at 100,000. How come? Founder Robert Welch is not all that charismatic, and anyway most members have never seen him. Nor are they seduced by the standard hate group appeals—Birchers are not anti-Semitic or anti-Negro. What brings new members in, apparently, is a line of argument, clearly and sincerely put forth in Welch's bluebook, the society's bible.

"The purpose of the John Birch Society," says the bluebook, is "to promote less government, more responsibility, and a better world." Obviously any good Jeffersonian could join that cause, and many such have. Welch is a fundamentalist Whig who believes that forms of government don't matter much, since all government is dangerous to liberty; the quantity is what matters, and the more the worse. "I had rather have for America * * * a government of 300,000 officials and agents, every single one of them a thief, than a government of 3 million agents with every single one of them an honest, honorable public servant.

"The increasing quantity of government, in all nations, has constituted the greatest tragedy of the 20th century" (Welch). The less you know of American history, and of 20th century tragedy, the easier it is to sneer at that statement.

The rapid spread of Birchism, then, is a part of the Whig (miscalled conservative) revival of this country, itself a natural reaction to the welfare state. BARRY GOLDWATER's personal success as a speaker and writer is the healthiest sign of this revival; but there are others. The Young Americans for Freedom represent the strong minority reaction on many college campuses against the dull orthodox liberalism of the academic scene. Yet both GOLDWATER and the Y.A.F.,

as well as Wm. F. Buckley's National Review, have taken some pains to dissociate themselves from the Birchers; and indeed the distinction is crucial. Unlike GOLDWATER et al., Welch scores not only democracy (a perennial fraud) and both major political parties (ubiquitous opportunism) but the U.S. political process itself. "We are at a stage where the only sure political victories are achieved by nonpolitical organization." The Birch Society is semisecret and members occasionally resort to dirty tricks (such as midnight telephone harassment). But what really sets it apart from healthier organizations are its political desperation and its romantic pessimism about our system's capacity for self-correction. The Birch Society is the I.W.W. of the right.

To this heady mixture the Birch formula adds a patriotic foam of uncompromising war on communism, at home and abroad. Here, where they should be most useful, the Birchers go most wrong. The basic dilemma of modern Whiggery is how to combat a monolithic Soviet enemy with an 18th century style minimum government and budget. The Birch escape from this dilemma is to internalize a menace which is in fact predominantly external; i.e., to find as many Communists at home as abroad. The Communist conspiracy at home is thus ballooned to the point where it includes Chief Justice Warren, the ADA., thousands of Protestant ministers, and even (in Welch's own demonography, if not that of his followers) Dwight Eisenhower. Welch even speaks of a tightly organized conspiracy of nearly 40 million Americans, supporters of the welfare state. The conspiratorial view of events can explain anything and lead to any lunacy. But lunacy is not a monopoly of the far right.

"I feel a desperate shame for my country. Were I physically able to do so, I would at this moment be fighting alongside Fidel Castro." So read a telegram to a fairplay for Cuba rally in San Francisco on April 22, signed by C. Wright Mills. He is a prominent professor of sociology at Columbia, author of "The Power Elite" and other tracts, a witch-hunter of the left.

"Left" is an imprecise word in America these days. Lacking a coherent set of goals, non-Communist but tired of the cold war, some would-be leftists have discovered a pseudosolution to the cold war. The name of this pseudosolution is unilateral nuclear disarmament.

Bertrand Russell, by brilliant deductions from false premises, has made "Better Red than dead" a meaningful slogan in Great Britain. He has recently been gaining a numerically small but rather influential American following. The pacifist marchers from Aldermaston, and the 1960 split in the British Labor Party over Britain's arms policy, have their counterparts in this country. One may ignore the anti-civil-defense demonstrations, and the amateur frogmen clamped to newly launched nuclear submarines. But one cannot ignore bright American intellectuals who present muffled or roundabout versions of the straightforward Russell case for surrender to the Communists.

The peace fronts in America often serve Communist strategy, but that does not mean they are of Communist origin. The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (SANE) recently found its New York chapter infiltrated by Communists and immediately suspended its charter. The role of communism in such movements, considered all important by Birchers, is troublesome but exaggerated. Plenty of bona fide peacemongers—some all-out pacifists, some not—are genuinely concerned with our Nation's, and the human race's survival. SANE, at least, has a stated objective not unlike Kennedy's: inspected and controlled disarmament.

Quite different, and more alarming, is the position of a newer organization, the Committees of Correspondence. Sparked by two distinguished Harvard professors, Sociologist David Riesman and Historian H. Stuart Hughes (a grandson of Charles Evans Hughes), the Committees of Correspondence is a discussion network that starts with a flat rejection of deterrence as a strategy. Riesman, for example, has described the United States-Soviet cold war as a sibling rivalry and employs other Freudian metaphors to malign any Westerner who is willing to use nuclear weapons in defense of his freedom. He says it takes more masculine courage to offer a Gandhian nonviolent resistance to armed communism than to fight it. Says his colleague, Hughes: "I can find no alternative to the renunciation of thermonuclear deterrence as an instrument of national strategy * * * we have set forth on uncharted ground * * * and may end in transcending more than one of the loyalties that most Americans take for granted."

In other words, the Kremlin blackmail strategy has already succeeded with Messrs. Riesman and Hughes. They would save not Western civilization, certainly, but Western lives by an act of faith in Communist intent. Their logic is based on a reading of the world situation at least as romantic and antipolitical as that of the Birch Society.

Thus both the leading new fringe positions, left and right, are shot through with escapism and desperation. Neither is helpful to the actual American situation. Extremists have often been utopian and inspiring; these are utopian and defeatist.

GARY COOPER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, over the weekend a great and beloved American has passed to his reward. I refer to a fellow Montanan, Gary Cooper.

He was born in Helena. He went to the schools of Montana, except for 4 years when he was in England. He also attended Grinnell College in Iowa. He left Montana in the early twenties to earn his livelihood as a newspaper cartoonist in Los Angeles, Calif. He did not meet with much success in that line of endeavor; and, becoming quite discouraged, was considering going back to Montana, when he met two colleagues from Helena, who told him that he could make easy money by falling off horses. On that basis, he stayed in Hollywood.

Gary Cooper's father was a distinguished member of the Montana Supreme Court, just as later my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], was also a member of that court.

It is with a deep sense of loss that we of Montana note the passing of this great actor, this great American, who was always just Gary Cooper, always just himself.

On behalf of the people of my State and, I am sure, on behalf of the people of the entire Nation, I wish at this time to extend to Mrs. Cooper, his wife; to his daughter; and to his mother, who is still alive, and is living in Los Angeles, our deepest sympathy; and I express the hope that the good Mr. Cooper did in his lifetime will live long after him.

He could well serve as an inspiration to the young America of today, because in his life he portrayed what he really was—a good American, a man who believed in his country, a man who did not put on airs, but who, I repeat, was always himself.

We will miss him because we loved him. We will miss him because he was a great man. Those of us who come from Montana will miss him because he was one of our own. May his soul rest in peace.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, I want to join the distinguished senior Senator from Montana in paying tribute to Gary Cooper, who left our State as a young man to become a great film star. His personal qualities fitted him well for the hero's role he so often played. In Montana we are proud that our State—part of the American West Gary Cooper came to personify—left its imprint on him.

Mr. Cooper was born May 7, 1901, in Helena, Mont., son of a British lawyer who had come west, married a Montana girl, and managed a ranch as well as practiced law.

As the distinguished majority leader has said, Gary Cooper's father was a judge of the Montana Supreme Court. In later years I was privileged to succeed Mr. Cooper as a justice of the supreme court in the same line of the judiciary that he occupied in Montana.

The family went to England when Gary was 9, but returned to Montana 4 years later. He worked on the family ranch during the manpower shortage of World War I, helping tend 450 head of cattle.

His Hollywood career began in 1924, after 2 years at Grinnell College in Iowa and brief stints in door-to-door solicitation for a photography studio, and in selling advertising space on a theater curtain. The Fox Western Studios took him on as a rider at $10 a day.

Although he played varied roles, including the memorable "Sergeant York," for which he won an Oscar, Gary Cooper was above all else a hero of the West. In "High Noon," perhaps the finest western ever filmed, Mr. Cooper's performance as the courageous sheriff of a town on the edge of panic will not be forgotten.

Besides Cooper the film star, there was Cooper the man. Modest in success, wholesome in his personal life, and courageous when afflicted by a fatal disease, Gary Cooper was indeed an American hero.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, I join the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished junior Senator from Montana in expressing my deep regret at the death of Gary Cooper. Gary and his wife have been our friends for many years. He was an outstanding American, a great sportsman, a fine gentleman, in addition to his extraordinary talents as an actor.

My wife and I extend deepest sympathy to Mrs. Cooper and all the family at the untimely loss of this outstanding citizen.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, for one who at one time in his life had great affection for the stage and for the performing arts, the death of Gary Cooper comes as a distinct shock, and for a very good reason. No one could have followed

the theater and the motion picture industry without recognizing that the fare that had been "dished up" was not too well regarded or too acceptable in many quarters of the country. If I had to use one term to describe what Gary Cooper personified in his presentations to the country, it would be the word "wholesome." He was always wholesome, and he was fit fare for men, women, and children ever since I remember his first presentation.

So through the performing arts he made a great contribution to the country. He made it in the form, not only of entertainment, but edification, as well. And when one has done that, he has indeed ingratiated himself in the affection of everyone; and that is why I think Gary Cooper's passing is so universally mourned.

I share with the majority leader and his colleague from Montana the sense of bereavement that they feel when a great performer, who has done so much for entertainment and instruction, has had to pass away at an untimely age.

ADDRESSES OF VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON IN HAWAII

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Madam President, it was my privilege last week to accompany Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON from here to Honolulu on the first leg of his historic trip to southeast Asia. The Vice President was most enthusiastically received by the citizens of the Aloha State. This was partly in recognition of the high office he holds and the constructive leadership he has given for many years in Congress, but more perhaps because the people there know that he, more than any other national leader, was responsible for two accomplishments of great importance to Hawaii, to the Nation, and to the whole Pacific area: the granting of statehood to Hawaii, and the establishment of the East-West Cultural and Technical Interchange Center.

During his brief stay in Honolulu, the Vice President addressed a joint session of the Hawaii Legislature and was guest of honor at groundbreaking ceremonies at the East-West Center. His stirring remarks recognize the importance of the Pacific area to the Nation and to the world.

He forcefully expressed the American determination, not only to win the cold war, but also to win the peace.

I ask unanimous consent that his two addresses be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON, JOINT SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII, MAY 9, 1961

Aloha.

I am never so much at home as in the halls of a legislative body among representatives of free men and women. I feel very much at home with the Hawaiian House and Senate this afternoon—even though your senate does leave something to be desired; namely, Democrats.

My earliest boyhood memories are of the legislature of my own State of Texas, where my father served as a pioneer frontier lawmaker. One footnote to history is that my father wanted to name me after the man who was speaker of the house of representatives when I was born. As things have turned out, I am just as glad my mother prevailed. Think of the confusion that would have existed in Washington in recent years had my name been "SAM RAYBURN JOHNSON."

All of you can understand, I am sure, my great pride last summer at Los Angeles when my name was placed in nomination before the Democratic Convention by that man who had been my father's colleague, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States—Mr. SAM RAYBURN.

That pride was approached—if not exceeded—by the fact that my nomination was seconded by an able, valiant, and courageous son of these islands, your Congressman—my great and good friend—DAN INOUYE.

Will Rogers once said he never met a man he did not like. I can say that in my years in Washington I never met a man or woman from these islands I did not like. Certainly I shall always cherish the friendship of one of the most dedicated and valuable public servants our Nation and your State have produced—my former colleague and continuing close friend, OREN LONG. I would also like to pay my sincere respects to one good Hawaiian and good American that the Democratic Party let get away, Senator HIRAM FONG. With these men and with my old personal friend Jack Burns, I expect to continue in the future—as in the past—working for the greatness of America and for the good of your State.

The mission that brings me here is a mission undertaken at the request of a man who wants peace—who is determined that our country and our cause will prevail—and who understands that the works of freemen can know no East and no West—the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

My purpose on this mission to some of the young, growing independent nations of Asia is that of a factfinder. I go seeking to determine what must be done now to safeguard the security of those who are free—and what must be done together in the future to fulfill the opportunities and responsibilities of freedom among the peoples of Asia.

The United States does not accept—will never accept—the fatalism of those who preach that freedom can be strong, steadfast, and sure only in one area of the world. Our freedom is a fortune, and we recognize it—but men can never be truly free saving unto themselves this fortune God meant all his children to share.

Our President has said—and it is the spirit of his administration—that "Our democracy must demonstrate that it is still prepared to contend patiently, as well as with insight and passion, for the cause of human freedom in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America, as well as in areas now held in satellite status by the Soviet Union."

For this contention, the United States must and will commit the full strength of its great capacity, the full moral force of our devotion to peace, the full energy and vitality of our people, to that cause of human freedom everywhere. Freedom cannot be secure in our world until the yoke of poverty, illiteracy, and disease is lifted off the shoulders of men everywhere.

Our end is freedom. Our means are the means of peaceful men.

To the peoples around the Pacific, Americans can and do point with the greatest of pride to these islands of Hawaii where the proudest heritages of East and West have met and brought into being a vital and living democracy.

Hawaii offers to the eye some of the world's greatest natural beauty. But far more important is the inspiration Hawaii offers to the hearts of men by the example here of the brotherhood and harmony that has been achieved among your peoples under freedom.

For Hawaii, statehood has been achieved. You are proud of it. All of us who participated in this fulfillment of your dream are proud to have had a part. But statehood is not the end—it is only the beginning—of Hawaii's greatest role.

Hawaii is for the free world the bridge between West and East, opening the way to the cooperation and understanding between these cultures that is the only sure road to universal peace.

I would say to you of the Legislature of Hawaii—and to all the Americans in these islands—that your leadership in Washington wants to work with you to make our 50th star shine as a star of the first magnitude.

Your economy in Hawaii prospers today.

We want to work with you not merely to maintain that prosperity but to increase it for all the people.

The foundation must be laid for broader industrialization.

The continuing strength of your agriculture must be assured and its diversification moved forward.

Education at all levels presents a challenge of rare opportunity here. It is my special hope that the East-West Center will help make Hawaii one of the world's greatest centers of learning, research, and scholarship.

Hawaii has never been lacking in enterprise in meeting the needs of its people. I want you to know that Hawaii will never be lacking in support, understanding, and interest from this administration.

There are problems to be met. The cost of living must not be allowed to increase artificially or unnecessarily. The foundation for strong industry and strong agriculture demands that attention be given to the basics of water supply and soil utilization as in the mainland States. Where there are gaps in essential Federal services between territorial status and statehood, those gaps must be closed.

Hawaii waited patiently and faithfully through many generations for attainment of statehood. It is my pledge to you that Hawaii will never again sit at the second table.

We in Washington, we on the mainland, we who are Americans from every State, salute you—welcome you proudly to the Union—and say to you from our hearts, aloha.

ADDRESS OF VICE PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AT THE DEDICATION OF EAST-WEST CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, MAY 9, 1961

This is one of the most personally gratifying moments of my public life. I am proud—and I shall always be proud—to have been the first sponsor of legislation providing fulfillment of your vision here of this great East-West Center.

Thomas Jefferson—before his death—looked back over his grand and noble life and asked that the stone on his grave commemorate the three achievements of which he was most proud:

First, that he was author of the Declaration of Independence;

Second, that he wrote the basic statement of religious freedom in the Virginia resolutions; and

Third, that he was founder of the University of Virginia.

I am not quite ready to contemplate my own epitaph—but of the works to which I have contributed I have the greatest confidence that this East-West Center will outlive them all.

Many individuals from Hawaii—and on the mainland—shared the vision embodied in this center. I cannot name them all. But I would like to express my gratitude

and ask your recognition of the one man whose energy, faith in America, and confidence in Hawaii contributed most—Jack Burns.

Since the earliest Americans landed on the far shore of the North American Continent, this hearty breed has moved westward, planting seeds as they moved, hoping others would share the ripened fruit in later harvests. We today follow in that tradition. We plant a seed from which we believe will grow a mighty tree spreading its branches over the lives of generations to come all around this great ocean of the Pacific.

The world will note what a different seed it is that freemen plant. The adversaries of freedom in the capitals of communism plant seeds of division, of strife, of suspicion, of hatred, of death and destruction. We are never more proud—we are never more nearly our true selves—than when we plant, as we do today, a seed of peace.

Aggressors may forget but freemen must always remember this:

The aggressor may destroy cities, lay waste to the farms, infiltrate the jungles, penetrate the deserts. He may ford the rivers and even seek to span the seas. But wherever there remains an enlightened and independent man, the aggressor will never securely hold the gains of his aggression.

The ultimate defense of freedom lies not in weapons systems nor in the implements of arms. These we must maintain as responsible men to deter the folly of those few leaders who acknowledge no responsibility to God or man or their own people. But freedom's surest defense and freedom's greatest force is the enlightenment of the minds of the people.

Arms can never make us invulnerable nor enemies invincible, but the support we give to education can make freedom irresistible.

This Center is a testament of our faith in this proposition. But this Center is more. It is an expression of a peculiarly important faith which American experience has bequeathed to us today. Out of many cultures—from many races and religions—we in America have enriched our free society with many prized contributions. The wealth of this diverse heritage we have fused together into the one great contribution which is indelibly American: that is the living proof America itself offers that the unity of mankind is not impossible.

The unity of people, cultures, heritages, races, religions, and regions in the United States represented as great a challenge in the beginning as the unity many dismiss as impossible in other regions of this world. America's success in unity—a success crowned gloriously in these islands—is a cornerstone on which the world can and must build.

A common language is only a convenience. A common heritage is only a comfort. A common currency is only a detail. Such things are the results of unity, not the cause. We must by our American example and leadership encourage independent nations to understand that unity always is possible and forever imperative.

The survival of freedom and independence must come through the free association and unity of those who aspire to peace among themselves and with their neighbors. The peaceful man is not always free; but the freeman is always a man of peace. To keep both their peace and their freedom, freemen on every continent can profitably turn to uniting themselves together in common purposes above and beyond their common defense. Unity affords the greatest strength against attack from without. But—far more important—unity affords the greatest strength for attack on the evils of poverty, illiteracy, and disease.

The world must be rid of poverty before it can be free of fears.

The world must be able to read before it will be able to build.

The world must be healthy before its people can be truly hopeful.

It is to accomplish such goals that we must and do encourage men who are independent to begin the work of uniting to prevent the compromise of their independence.

Back to the beginning of history, division has been—as it is today—the chief instrument of despots and tyrants. The oldest such division which tyrants have used against peace and freedom is the world's division between East and West. It is this division which we must end to clear the way to a world where peace is universal and freedom is universally secure.

The road to that goal is long. It will not be easy. In our lifetime—and even in the lifetime of our own children—the goal may not be realized. But we must reach toward it and work for it. We are reaching for that goal here today.

The purpose of this East-West Center is not for West to teach East or East to study the West. The purpose here is to bring together two proud and honorable cultures whose strengths are drawn from antiquity, and to fuse a new strength—a new strength for freedom that will last through eternity.

The concept of the East-West Center is as broad as the vast Pacific area it will serve. The center will flourish and grow within the heart of your own great university. The two institutions will do much to reinforce each other. But their missions and their service will not be the same. The University of Hawaii is here to serve Hawaii. The East-West Center is here to serve the world.

To this center we shall bring the wise men of the West and invite the wise men of the East. From them we shall hope that many generations of young scholars will learn the wisdom of the two worlds united here and to use that wisdom for the purposes and ends of mankind's highest aspirations for peace, justice, and freedom.

I am proud that three of the most distinguished educational leaders of the United States are advising on the development of this center: Clark Kerr, president of the University of California; John Gardner, president of the Carnegie Corp.; and Herman Wells, president, of Indiana University.

As we dedicate this center we are not unmindful that since its conception communism has crudely acknowledged it by entering into competition against it. Communism has instituted in Moscow a center dedicated to the same purpose. But in this, as in much else, we ask the watching nations of the world to observe the contrast between a free society and the society which holds the State supreme. While we here seek to bring the youth of many lands together with our own—confident that freedom will not only prevail but be enriched—the Communists rigidly exclude students at their center from contact with, or exposure to, their own young people.

The free society has nothing to fear from its own freedom. The closed society must—above all else—fear itself. We by maintaining devotion to the principles on which our society was founded, by working without ceasing for the perfection of the unity which is our greatest strength, by continuing faithfully to plant these seeds of peace, can face the future not with fear, but with anticipation of the ultimate success of our cause.

SENATOR GORE, OF TENNESSEE, CHOSEN AS CHAIRMAN OF U.S. DELEGATION TO INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, my esteemed colleague from Tennessee has established a distinguished record in foreign affairs.

He is, as we all know, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and chairman of its Subcommittee on Africa.

For some time, he was the Senate adviser to the U.S. delegation to the Geneva Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests.

In addition, he has been a member of the American delegation to the Interparliamentary Union. This organization is composed of parliamentarians from 60 countries and exerts important influence in the fields of disarmament, the expansion of parliamentary systems, and the discussion of world problems. As a member of our delegation in past years, I have come to know many of these parliamentarians and to achieve a better understanding of our mutual problems.

Now, in recognition of his wide background, his fellow members of the U.S. delegation have this year elected my colleague as their chairman. I am highly gratified by their choice.

In this post, in which he succeeds the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, of the House of Representatives, my colleague will lead this country's delegation to the next annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union at Brussels in September.

My colleague does not take this assignment lightly. Upon his election to the chairmanship, he called attention to the delicate nature of his new undertaking by forecasting the probable belligerency of the Soviet Union at this year's meeting as a result of the difficult situations which have arisen in the Congo and Cuba.

I believe I state the unanimous sentiment of the Senate when I express my full confidence in his leadership and wish him and the others in our delegation godspeed at the September meeting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee with regard to his colleague's assuming such an important post in the Interparliamentary Union. A better choice could not have been made, and I think the Senate will recognize that this is an appointment in which it has full confidence. We know that, under Senator ALBERT GORE, we shall be well and capably represented.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, I appreciate the words of the majority leader about my colleague [Mr. GORE]. I think the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union to be held this year at Brussels will be particularly important. I can think of no better or safer hands to hold the chairmanship of the delegation than those of my colleague [Mr. GORE], who has had wide experience and is very knowledgeable in foreign affairs. He has the esteem of parliamentarians not only in this country but also in all nations which will be represented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 189, H.J. Res. 143.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 143) authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May 1961 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, the reason for consideration of the resolution at this time is that the date involved is the coming Friday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, similar action was taken on virtually an identical resolution last year. The resolution has already passed the House of Representatives. If this week is to be designated as National Transportation Week, of course there must be action at once.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the resolution.

The resolution (H.J. Res. 143) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and that the consideration of nominations on the executive calendar begin with those designated to be U.S. marshals.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Ben S. Stephansky, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Bolivia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Paul H. Black, and sundry other candidates, for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Helath Service; and

Marvin S. Cashion, and sundry other candidates, for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive H, 87th Congress, 1st session, a treaty of extradition between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil, signed at Rio de Janeiro on January 13, 1961 (Executive Rept. No. 6).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with U.S. marshals.

U.S. MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Wesley H. Petrie, of Hawaii, to be a U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the nominations for U.S. marshals be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the nominations were considered and agreed to en bloc, as follows:

Wesley H. Petrie, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

Cato Ellis, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be a U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the nominations for U.S. attorneys be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the nominations considered and agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Joseph F. Radigan, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years.

John H. Reddy, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

B. Andrew Potter, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Oklahoma for a term of 4 years.

Joseph Peter Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

TREATY OF EXTRADITION WITH BRAZIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, for the information of Senators I think it should be mentioned at the present time that in addition to the two treaties which it has been announced were to be considered today, the Senate will consider the Treaty of Extradition with Brazil which was reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations today. The vote on this treaty will likewise be delayed until tomorrow. We shall have three votes on three treaties tomorrow, by the addition of the Treaty of Extradition with Brazil, to be considered also by the Senate today.

OPPOSITION TO DEPRESSED AREAS LEGISLATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, one of the most vigorous opponents of depressed areas legislation was Oldham Paisley, publisher of the Marion Daily Republican at Marion, Ill., which was alleged to be deep in the heart of a depressed area.

After the bill recently considered was passed and signed, editor Paisley produced a front page editorial for his publication under the title "We Said We Did Not Need Santa Claus—Here Is the Proof."

It is regrettable that the photographs included in this editorial cannot be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because they are most revealing. The text, however, can be inserted, and I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of the editorial be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE SAID WE DID NOT NEED SANTA CLAUS—HERE IS THE PROOF

For many months, the Daily Republican has said that Marion and Williamson County were not in a depressed area despite the allegations of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS.

We told Senator DOUGLAS, and all other politicians, seeking votes by offers of Santa Claus, that we were not depressed and had not been for a long time.

The Chinese have stated that one picture is worth a thousand words. With that statement in mind, we made these Polaroid photos this week and last week, and they are only a portion of the pictures that could be made, to show that Marion is progressive and not depressed.

Every one of these pictures is something that has happened in Marion since January 1, 1961, or are happening now. You can verify these pictures yourself and when you do, you will find many other views that show that Marion is on the move, without the aid of Santa Claus. None of these are Government-aided projects.

Five new homes now under construction on Julianna Street in the Castellano addition. There are three more homes being built on Laura Lane, the next street south.

Marshall Skelcher has almost sold all of the 64 5-acre tracts he offered for sale on April 15. The view above shows the old

Louie Sanders home. The Marion water tower and telephone tower are visible in the background of above photo, taken on the site.

Site for the new Marion Presbyterian Church, to be built at the end of South Carbon Street. Plans are now being completed and it is hoped to start construction this summer. Dr. W. W. Ritchey home and barn in the background.

Foundations for two new homes, in addition to a new home for John Goss, being built on Hadfield Street, in the Clarence Cagle addition, east of Parish Park Place. Cagle is now planning for another addition.

New home of William S. Giles on South Carbon Street, into which they moved a week ago.

Ninety-four-room Castellano motel, under construction on new Highway 13 in north part of city. Marion Castellano expects to have 51 rooms ready for occupancy in August.

The Bank of Egypt recently opened their expanded lobby with its modern banking facilities. The above photo shows how the lobby has been doubled in size, with a fine private office for the bank president. Growth of the bank made this expansion necessary.

Two new homes under construction on Red Bud Lane in the Charles Shoot addition to Marion. Another house is now under construction, across the street from these two homes, west of Longfellow School.

Four new homes on West Goodall Street, near North Russell Street being built by Williams Realty. The corner house is being built by Harry Dawson. Foundations have been laid for two more homes on opposite side of street by Charles Shoot.

Nearly complete $50,000 remodeling and refurnishing of Feurer Brothers IGA at 113 South Russell, opposite the high school.

Work is progressing rapidly now on the $500,000 Bracy warehouse, being built on the Illinois Central tracks, back of Motel Marion.

Facts are much better than fiction and the allegation that we are "depressed" is fiction. You can, if you wish, add to these concrete examples of our progress, some Federal projects, such as the post office improvements and the two housing projects nearing completion, but any way you figure it, Marion is progressing and we are proud to be a part of such a progressive community.

NIXON'S CRITICISM OF KENNEDY

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President, on the evening of May 6, former Vice President Nixon addressed a Republican statewide meeting in Des Moines, at which he made an address on public affairs, political and otherwise. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the story in the Des Moines Register of May 7, 1961, written by George Mills, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON CHARGES FARM DECEIT; CORN PRICES FORCED DOWN, HE CONTENDS; RAKES FREEMAN IN TALK AT DES MOINES

(By George Mills)

Richard M. Nixon charged in Des Moines Saturday night that the Kennedy administration broke the corn market in order to force farmers to comply with the new feed grain program.

Nixon, the 1960 Republican presidential nominee, addressed a $25-a-person GOP chicken dinner at KRNT theater. He is on a four-speech Republican tour.

FOUR THOUSAND TICKETS

The fund-raising affair produced more than $100,000 before deduction of expenses. Ticket sales exceeded 4,000.

The smiling Nixon was in friendly political territory in Iowa, and he seemed to realize that fact. He carried this State by more than 170,000 votes last fall.

He was hatless and his hair was windblown when he stepped off a plane at the airport Saturday afternoon.

The whole airport production was almost a rerun of a Nixon 1960 campaign appearance in Iowa. There was a welcoming crowd, smaller than last fall but warmly friendly, small girls carrying signs, all kinds of autograph seekers, lots of politicians, even some of the same newspapermen who barnstormed with Nixon during the campaign.

He denied in effect that he is running for President in 1964.

PRIVATE CITIZEN

"My political future is probably behind me," he said in an interview. "I am here as a private citizen." The tour, however, is being looked upon as a drive by Nixon to strengthen his bid for continued leadership of the Republican Party.

He indicated he may speak out on foreign policy questions under certain conditions.

"If it helps the country, I will say it," he declared. "If it is going to hurt the country, I will keep my mouth shut."

He declined to criticize the Kennedy record in Cuba and Laos. The situation in both places is in a state of flux, he said, and it would not be right to inject criticism into a situation when the prestige of the Nation is at stake. He said the Democrats should have followed the same policy with President Eisenhower.

"Democratic criticism of President Eisenhower over the U–2 incident was disgraceful," he said.

RAKES FREEMAN

Nixon delighted the crowd Saturday night as he aimed at Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman the kind of ammunition the Democrats used to fire at Ezra Taft Benson, who was Eisenhower's Secretary of Agriculture.

"None of us expected that farm prices would be broken to force compliance," Nixon said. He declared Freeman promised not to pistol whip the farmers by such dumping of Government-owned corn on the market. He called that policy economic blackmail.

"The higher farm prices pledged 6 months ago have not been fulfilled," Nixon said.

"Average prices received by farmers in April were under those of a year ago. Here in Iowa the farmer acutely knows of the sharp decline in the price of corn."

Nixon said the administration's sales policy "seems to me to be at least unfair to those who are now marketing corn produced last year." He declared that dumping of corn is going on "day after day." He said the Department "insists that it is selling only deteriorated corn."

LARGE AMOUNTS

"But the daily sales report of the Commodity Stabilization Service reveals to one and all that large amounts of storable No. 1 and No. 2 corn are being placed on the market," he said.

Cheap feed will mean cheap livestock next year, Nixon added.

"Especially there is concern that depressed corn prices will encourage overexpansion of numbers," he said. "With this only can come disastrous hog prices in the fall of 1962."

Nixon expressed approval of the basic Federal farm program now in force. The use of payments in grain to encourage farmers to retire land from production was endorsed in the 1960 Republican platform, he said.

"But this difference I must emphasize," he said. "We were committed to a voluntary program, not one that forces the farmer to comply by threatening to destroy his market."

Nixon called the administration's long-range farm program "a frontier without freedom."

CITES CONTROLS

"It could impose marketing quotas and controls upon every farmer in the Nation," he said. "Safeguards against actions by one commodity group which might adversely affect other segments of the agricultural economy are not provided. Safeguards for the farmer who wants to be free of Government regulation are not provided."

He said the proposed controls would increase unemployment both on and off the farm. Fewer farmers would be needed to produce the lessened output, he said, and fewer wage earners to handle the smaller flow of production from the farm. Small cities and towns would be damaged, he contended.

Nixon said that a farm program should not "blight the opportunities of our farm people and mire them utterly in controls and regimentation."

A report from Chicago Saturday night told of Nixon criticizing President Kennedy for asking newspapers to use self-restraint in the handling of news in these times. Nixon said in a taped TV show that the President's request was "well intentioned but unrealistic."

Nixon said that any press censorship in peacetime is dangerous, "voluntary or otherwise."

"If we make errors in this," Nixon said, "it should be on the side of printing the news rather than suppressing it."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Madam President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the article, an editorial from the Des Moines Register of May 9, 1961, in connection with the address.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON'S CRITICISM OF KENNEDY

Richard M. Nixon adopted a responsible and understanding line on foreign affairs in his speech in Des Moines. He did not try to make political capital out of the difficulties of the Kennedy administration in Laos and Cuba.

However, he did criticize President Kennedy for asking newspapers to go easy on covering news of such situations and national security affairs. He said any press censorship in peacetime, voluntary or otherwise, is dangerous—and we thoroughly agree. The strength of democratic government depends on keeping the people, who ultimately rule, informed about what their Government is doing. Nixon is right in saying that "if we make errors in this, it should be on the side of printing the news rather than suppressing it."

In discussing agricultural policy, Nixon was less cogent. He attacked the Kennedy administration for breaking the price of corn to force farmers to comply with the new feed-grain program. He said this policy was unfair to those now marketing corn produced last year.

But all farmers are eligible for the price support on corn and do not have to accept the market price if they have storable grain. Corn prices rose more than the usual seasonal amount from November to March and in March were somewhat above the price of a year earlier. Quality of corn this year has been below average, and now that the end of the loan period is near (last of May), more low-quality corn ineligible for loan is

coming to market. The market price of corn, however, is only 5 to 8 cents lower than it was a year ago.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has sold more corn this year, but with stocks at an all-time high, this is to be expected. Lots of old corn is going out of condition.

Nixon said the lower corn price was worrisome, because cheap feed will generate cheap livestock next year. But he endorsed the payment-in-kind feature of the new feed-grain program and recalled that this idea had been advocated by the Republicans last fall. This payment-in-kind proposal is the thing to worry about in connection with cheap feed generating more livestock and lower prices. The payment in kind would put back into the market a lot more grain from Government stocks.

Nixon called the administration's long-range farm program a frontier without freedom. He said this program might lead to marketing quotas and controls on every farmer. He did not seem to recognize that Secretary Freeman's proposals are not a program but a new method of developing farm programs. The proposed new law would not give the Secretary any authority to impose controls.

The former Vice President said he thought the new feed grain program was sound "in basic concept," and he affirmed that "no one believes more deeply than I that the Government has an obligation to help farmers solve their problems."

Nixon is undertaking the role of leader of the loyal opposition, which is commendable. From his experience in Government and his position as titular leader of the Republican Party, he can do much to help guide the administration and to acquaint the people with its failures and weaknesses. The enthusiasm of his audience of party faithful in Des Moines shows that he maintains a powerful hold on Republican opinion in this State.

STEWART UDALL, GREAT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, after 8 long years of frustration the Nation's conservationists find new hope in the administration's vast programs to protect and develop the Nation's resources.

Less than a month after taking office President Kennedy and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall began to reverse corrosive policies which had brought conservation and resource development to a virtual standstill. Secretary Udall's policy announcements indicate a return to the conservation philosophy of Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

In less than 4 months he has scrapped the partnership policy of hydroelectric development and initiated a Federal program of planning, constructing, and interconnecting generating plants to provide an adequate supply of low-cost power for homes, farms, and industry in areas whose economies would otherwise remain static. He has promised a stronger and more aggressive reclamation program.

Secretary Udall has also announced that no more applications for lands in the public domain will be accepted from private individuals until September 1962. This moratorium will give the Bureau of Land Management an opportunity to study the 60,000 applications now on file and stop the scandalous speculation in public lands.

He has taken over the administration of the Department of the Interior with vigor and imagination. If his first 4 months as Secretary are any indication, he will be one of the greatest Secretaries of the Interior we in the United States have had.

Madam President, recently Secretary Udall was unjustly accused of requesting an oil company executive to solicit $100 contributions to the forthcoming Jefferson-Jackson Day Democratic dinner.

After the facts became known, it developed that the Secretary's name was used without his knowledge or approval. Ironically enough, the only decision made to that date by the Secretary concerning the oil industry adversely affected this executive's company.

Mr. Udall is a veteran of World War II, a successful attorney, a son of a former chief justice of the Arizona Supreme Court, and was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. He possesses an almost aggressive reputation for integrity. His reputation is far above reproach.

Madam President, an excellent editorial captioned "Those $100-a-Plate Dinners," was published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, one of Ohio's great newspapers, on May 5, 1961. It points out clearly the unfairness of the attack on Secretary Udall and discusses frankly the real issue involved. I commend this editorial to my colleagues in the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOSE $100-A-PLATE DINNERS

We can't get too excited about Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall's suggestion to a friend that it would be well to bring a few more friends to a $100-a-plate Democratic dinner. Republicans have $100-a-plate dinners too, and it is a good bet that Republican leaders have indicated to friends that a fine turnout on such occasions would be a very fine thing.

We doubt very much that Mr. Udall, who possesses an almost aggressive reputation for honesty, would consider attendance by members of the oil industry at such a dinner any reason for future favors. Indeed, men like Udall are usually tougher on their friends than anyone else; they lean backwards, and their friends know it.

But we can get rather excited about $100-a-plate dinners. No dinner is worth $100. Why are they held? To pay off campaign deficits, and such deficits are quite bipartisan. Sometimes the Democrats are in the hole, sometimes the Republicans.

It is to help to pay off a Democratic campaign deficit of more than $2 million that the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner is to be held on May 27, and even a political party must pay its debts if it is to remain a respectable member of society. Costs of campaigning have gone up, and it is almost impossible to conduct a campaign in these days of television without going into the red.

Well then, how could the situation be improved? How could it be altered so that party debts could be paid without putting the bee on a few individuals who possess that much money? It could be done by broadening the base of giving to make up such deficits. This is not precisely a new thought. Attempts have been made to do it, and thousands have sent in a dollar, and even more. But there has never been enough response to pay the bill.

Perhaps it would be easier to get contributions for a known deficit of such-and-such an amount, than to ask for funds just-in-case. Perhaps the drive for funds should take place after the election, instead of before the election.

Some 34,082,289 Americans voted for President Kennedy. If every one of these contributed 6 cents it would wipe out the $2 million debt—and leave a margin. If every one of the 33,881,866 Americans who voted for Richard Nixon contributed 6 cents, it would put $2,032,911.96 in GOP coffers.

It would be a mighty easy way to pay campaign deficits if someone could figure out an inexpensive way to collect the money, and it would put an end to $100-a-plate dinners, in addition to giving everyone a far greater feeling of participation.

But to attempt to make Udall the goat for $100-a-plate dinners is ridiculous. They were well established when he was in knee pants.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, it is no secret that money is essential in political campaigns. The cost of political campaigns, especially presidential campaigns, has reached enormous levels. Tens of millions of dollars are spent.

Both political parties raise money as best they can. It is a sad commentary on our Republican form of government that such a vital instrument of freedom as a presidential campaign must depend for its financing on methods less equitable and rational than those used by charities.

Madam President, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana and majority leader of the Senate [Mr. MANSFIELD] has proposed legislation to help correct this situation. His bill, S. 227, will, among other things, shorten the length of presidential campaigns, thus saving political parties millions of dollars and saving political leaders and citizens generally from the wear, tear, and distractions of enduring prolonged political campaigns. It will also provide up to $1 million for each political party for the tremendous costs of television and radio broadcasting.

In introducing this legislation in the Senate on January 9, 1961, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] made a magnificent speech in which he said:

I do not think that it serves the interests of the entire Nation when elections can be influenced significantly or even decided by the question of which candidate can raise the most money. I do not think it serves the national interests when the expenses for those who campaign to serve all the people must be financed by a relative handful of people and organizations which make large contributions directly or indirectly. I do not think it adds to the dignity and vitality of the Nation's political life when another major source of political finance is the patently unsatisfactory practice of selling $2 steaks at $100-a-plate dinners.

Madam President, the majority leader has completely stated the case for reform of presidential campaign financing. Let us go ahead and do something about it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPETENT MEN IN IMPORTANT GOVERNMENT POSITIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in yesterday's issue of the New York Times magazine there appeared an article by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], having to do with much of the work which he and his committee have undertaken relative to the difficulties which confront the administration of the Government in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "To Do Our Best, We Need Our Best," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO DO OUR BEST, WE NEED OUR BEST

(The times require Government servants of the highest caliber. A Senator outlines these ways of removing the barriers that keep good men out of Washington.)

(By HENRY M. JACKSON)

Look at the front pages of the newspapers. Around the world the din of battle in the cold war is rising. Khrushchev and Mao believe that the free world is off balance, and that by pushing on the pressure points, from Cuba to Laos, from the Congo to Vietnam, from Geneva to space, they can force us to take several steps backward.

Our Government's ultimate resource in this struggle is the people who work for it. People make the decisions on which success or failure turns. People man the action posts—as diplomats in trouble areas, as technical-assistance workers in Africa, as scientists in aero-space laboratories, as negotiators with the Soviet Union, as strategic planners in the Pentagon and as soldiers guarding the boundaries of freedom in Korea.

For nearly two years, our Senate Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery has been making a nonpartisan study of how our Government could best organize to meet the mortal challenges of the cold war. A main question has been what the Government can do to make sure that the jobs of first importance to the survival and flourishing of our free way of life will be filled with first-rate people.

The posts of special concern are at the Cabinet and sub-Cabinet levels. They embrace the top positions in the Departments of State and Defense, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Treasury, the International Cooperation Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the like.

Many of these top posts are now occupied by officials coming from the career services—Foreign Service officers or Pentagon old-timers. In good part, however, these positions are held by private citizens temporarily in Government service. They come from and return to private life—the law and industry, labor organizations, and universities or research centers.

The level of excellence in our public service must keep pace with the mounting complexity of the national-security issues we face. We confront a twin problem:

1. The career services must be made a better training ground of candidates for these top spots.

2. We must lower the barriers which now discourage highly qualified people in private life from serving governmental tours of duty.

A President should draw freely upon the seasoned and able members of the career service in filling many of the key foreign-policy and defense jobs. The new Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Roger Jones, will profit from his background as a former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and a veteran of 20 years with the Bureau of the Budget.

Yet today, our career services are really not geared to produce enough officials with the large executive talents, width of perspective, and breadth of experience needed in top positions. For the most part, regular career officers have very few chances to see the problems of foreign and defense policy "in the round." An official normally spends almost his whole career in one agency. Even there, he may not be exposed to the problems of the department as a whole.

Further, our Government has been very niggardly in giving civilian officials opportunities for advanced training. They rarely have a chance to get away from day-to-day pressures to get fresh perspectives, and acquire new skills and knowledge.

In this respect, our civilian career services have much to learn from the personnel-development programs of the Armed Forces. Promising officers follow career patterns designed to expose them to the problems of their services as a whole. At regular intervals they profit from attendance at the admirable service schools. Today almost every military officer must attend the National War College or its equivalent and serve in a joint or international command, before he can receive his first star.

A program for developing more leaders from the career service should stress greater flexibility and latitude in job assignments, and movement between agencies. A pilot program has recently been started for the exchange of outstanding civilian and military personnel between the Departments of State and Defense. This program could profitably be expanded to include personnel from the Budget Bureau, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Central Intelligence Agency and related agencies.

In addition, we should give more civilian officials of outstanding ability opportunities for advanced training. How better to develop an international monetary expert than by a stint of service on Wall Street? And how better to equip a Pentagon official with an understanding of the political and economic forces at work in the world than by a year spent in travel and research at a center for advanced international studies?

There is a long leadtime in bringing an official to the point where he is ready for leadership. We ought to be worrying now, in 1961, about those who will fill the key foreign-policy and defense posts in 1981. The time is overdue for the Government to strengthen and broaden its programs for bringing the cream of our college students into its service.

Suppose, for example, that our junior-recruitment programs could bring to Washington each year 200 young men and women from the very top of their classes. If these people started working for the Government at an average age of 25 and if half of them remained in Federal service for 40 years, we would be able to develop a pool of 4,000 executives on the job and in training. At any given time, 1,500 of these would be at the peak of their powers, with 25 or more years of varied Government experience to draw on.

I am convinced that the returns from establishing such a career-leadership reserve are well worth whatever special cost or effort may be involved.

Programs to strengthen the career services must be matched by steps to make it easier for people in private life to accept key Government assignments.

The kind of people required is in very short supply. They must have not only executive ability but also a feeling for how business is done in the Government and an understanding of the problems of national-security affairs. Only a very few possess this sought-for combination of talents.

Men and women having these talents are found in both political parties. The yardstick for making appointments to top national-security posts should therefore be ability to do the job—regardless of party. This was true in the time of Stimson, Forrestal and Lovett. And it is as true today in the cold war.

We simply cannot afford the luxury of placing needless barriers in the path of gifted citizens willing to come to Washington. But today we do. Take the conflict-of-interest laws. The subcommittee's study soon made it clear that these laws, though aimed at desirable and necessary objectives, have adverse unintended side effects as now written. They place needless roadblocks in the path of able people willing to accept Government posts.

I therefore urged the administration to submit at this session of Congress comprehensive proposals for modernizing the body of statutes dealing with conflicts of interest. The administration's proposals have now been put before the Congress. They merit speedy congressional study and action.

We cannot legislate honesty. Yet statutes and regulations will always be required to keep officials from getting into compromising situations, and to deal with the very few persons who are tempted to use public office for private gain.

Seven conflict-of-interest laws are now on our statute books. They have been enacted over the course of a century. Four of them became law over 90 years ago.

The existing statutes are in good part archaic. They are more concerned with the problems of the Civil War period than of today's cold war. They have not been updated to reflect the social and economic revolution our country has undergone in the past century. They take inadequate account of the rise of the modern corporation, the growth of public ownership of stocks, the Government's contemporary need for the services of part-time consultants and advisers, the heavy traffic between public and private employment and the peculiar problems now posed by the scientist-adviser.

Further, the draftsmanship of these statutes is defective. Compliance with the letter of these laws can result in ridiculous consequences. They are therefore often simply ignored or winked at.

In their present form, these conflict laws often needlessly hamstring the Government in filling critical jobs. One example: The legal profession has been one of the prime recruiting grounds for top-level national security officials. Yet today's statutes make it peculiarly hard for members of the bar to serve the Government.

Five of these laws aim at keeping Government employees from acting on behalf of other persons in their business relations with the Government. Since it is mainly the legal profession that acts in this representative capacity, the impact of these statutes falls largely on lawyers.

The lawyer's problem is compounded by the fact that law firms must do business in the form of partnerships. A lawyer remaining in a partnership after taking on a Government assignment becomes subject to the conflict-of-interest laws on two counts—because of what he may do and also what his partners may do. The partners cannot take part in activities denied the lawyer without exposing him, and possibly even the partnership as a whole, to the consequences of illegal behavior.

A lawyer taking on a full-time Government job meets this problem by resigning from his firm. But what of the lawyer-adviser asked to serve the Government as a part-time consultant on, say, disarmament or foreign aid?

The services of such consultants may be required only 1 or 2 days a month. Yet as top advisers, task force members, or trouble-shooters on spot assignments, they can do much to shape our foreign and defense policies in wise directions.

A lawyer helping the Government in this capacity obviously cannot be expected to resign from his private practice. But from the standpoint of the conflict-of-interest laws, both he and his partners are now treated as if he worked for the Government full time. As a result, countless lawyers of superior qualifications are forced to turn down consultancies.

Let me cite two cases illustrating the absurdities that can result:

A practicing lawyer in New York who is also an amateur art authority regretfully declined an appointment as an unpaid adviser to the Federal Commission of Fine Arts. Acceptance might have required either his resignation from his law firm or withdrawal of the firm from antitrust cases, tax problems and all other legal work involving the Federal Government.

The other case comes from the files of our subcommittee itself. I invited a distinguished attorney in one of the Capital's leading law firms to serve as a temporary subcommittee consultant on the problem of modernizing the conflict-of-interest statutes. I had in mind a memorandum requiring about a week's work.

The lawyer apologetically declined our invitation. The reason? Unless he resigned from his law firm, he could not advise us on the conflict-of-interest laws without in the process entangling both his partners and himself with these very same laws.

Another example of how these laws now make it difficult for the Government to secure officials from private life: Today, most people have a heavy stake in the retirement or life-insurance plans of their employers. Few men can afford to withdraw from such plans, which are so important not only to their future but to their families. Yet a strict reading of existing conflict statutes leaves it open to doubt whether a private citizen in Government can continue to participate in the retirement and insurance programs of his regular employer.

The stock-investment problem is another deterrent to public service: In recent years the Senate, and particularly the Armed Services Committee, has required candidates for high national-security posts to sell stocks the committee believes the officials could not retain and still properly discharge their duties.

The stocks, for the most part, have been those of companies doing business with the Pentagon. Our new Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, had to sell very substantial holdings in the Ford Motor Co., while accepting a salary reduction of more than 90 percent in the process.

So far, the committee has found no good yardsticks for determining which stocks an official may keep, and which he must sell. Each portfolio tends to be considered by the Senators as an individual case.

There is real need to guard the public against favoritism in official decisions. The question is how to do this without imposing unreasonable sacrifices upon men accepting Government jobs. The Senate, through the Armed Services Committee, is now searching for better ways to handle the problem of stock divestment.

Making it easier for outstanding men to come to Washington is only half the task. The other half is to keep them there. Both the turndown and the turnover rates have been unsatisfactorily high. I can recall one 6-month period when the Defense Department alone lost its Deputy Secretary, three Assistant Secretaries, and its General Counsel.

It may take 2 or 3 years to master a job. A heavy price is paid when an official is lost just as he has reached the height of his usefulness. Little can be done to prevent a man from resigning if he so decides, but it is desirable to secure advance assurances from appointees that they will remain in office at the pleasure of the President and their department chiefs.

Finally, any program for raising the excellence of our public service must try to do something about Government salary scales. Particularly at the sub-Cabinet level, the pay of most officials lags far behind the salaries they could command in private life—not only in business but even in the academic world.

Some major adjustments upward are clearly needed. Roger Jones, the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, suggested to our subcommittee that even $20 million annually, wisely used to adjust the top salary grades, would make it dramatically easier to hold outstanding career officials and to enlist the help of more first-rate private citizens.

In his penetrating testimony, Mr. Robert Lovett told our subcommittee:

"While the challenges of the moment are most serious in a policy-making sense, I see no reason for black despair or for defeatist doubts as to what our system of government or this country can do. We can do whatever we have to do in order to survive and to meet any form of economic or political competition we are likely to face. All this we can do with one proviso: we must be willing to do our best."

And to do our best, we need our best.

In time of hot war we put our ablest people to work wherever they are. We sweep aside pointless barriers to public service. In this time of equally fateful cold war, we must do the same.

We need the finest leadership, the finest planners and the finest administrators our country can produce. The "help wanted" sign is up for keeps.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, at the conclusion of routine morning business, there be a call of the calendar for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARIES OF SENATORS BUSH, DODD, AND BOGGS

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I wish to take a moment today to extend birthday congratulations to my two distinguished colleagues in the Senate, Senators BUSH and DODD of Connecticut. It is quite a coincidence that both Senators from Connecticut have their birthdays on the same day. It is paralleled by the fact that Senator JAVITS and I have our birthdays on the same day. So far as I know, except for these two instances, there is no similar occurrence in the history of the Senate.

Both Senators from Connecticut have afforded us a good example of solidarity by entering the world on the same day. Although they bear different party labels, they have worked together in harmony, and both of them serve their State and their Nation well. It has been my privilege to work closely with Senator DODD on the Judiciary Committee, and with Senator BUSH in the development and support of legislation. I have learned to value their qualities of intellect, ability, and dedication, and it therefore gives me special pleasure to salute them on this anniversary day.

At the same time, I want to extend the same congratulations to our colleague from Delaware, Senator BOGGS, who also is celebrating his birthday today. Senator BOGGS is in good birthday company, which is precisely where he deserves to be, for, by his manifest ability he has given full proof of the judgment of the good people of Delaware in electing him to this body.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LUNCHEON TODAY FOR LORD ATTLEE

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, Earl Clement Attlee, formerly Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, will be in Washington this week. Lord Attlee is here in the cause of disarmament. This afternoon he will talk with President Kennedy. Later in the week he plans a conference with Mr. McCloy, who is in charge of our disarmament negotiations. Tomorrow at 12:30 in room G–219, an informal organization of Members of Congress for Peace Through the Rule of Law is giving a luncheon for Lord Attlee.

All Members of the Senate are welcome. Any of them who may hear this announcement or may read of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they will get in touch with my assistant, Mr. Benjamin Read, will be welcome guests.

We would like to have a large attendance in honor of this eminent and very great world statesman.

THE AMERICAN YOUTH CIVIC PROGRAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I would like to draw your attention to a youth program which though small

points the way toward achieving helpful recreation programs for our youth. It is especially noteworthy since the original initiative to organize this group was undertaken by the teenage youth themselves.

This organization, the American Youth Civic Organization, was organized in ward 23 in Cleveland. This is an area where there is need for wholesome recreation and the opportunity for delinquency preventative work.

This youthful civic organization established a program for young men, 14 years of age and over, for the avowed purpose of offering Cleveland youth an opportunity to serve their community. With such a service motif they secured the interest and cooperation of John F. Kovacic, Cleveland city councilman and of Milton Bowman, mayor's traffic safety coordinator.

Under the sponsorship of these teenagers, regular meetings are held, parliamentary procedures learned, discussions of traffic safety are discussed, educational films are exhibited and dances for the young people in the ward provide needed social fellowship.

I wish to commend young Joseph Sterned, Jr., and Tony Peikovsek, the present officers, and I am encouraged to know the ideals of the American Youth Civic Organization are spreading out into nearby wards of Cleveland.

Madam President, I believe our Cleveland young men are to be congratulated and encouraged in this very worthwhile effort.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 227, S. 1852.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, this bill would authorize appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in a total of $12,499,800,000. This is an enormous sum, even by today's standards, and an authorization of this magnitude is another reminder of the high cost of preparedness in the troublous and perilous times in which we live.

Earlier this year, President Kennedy sent to the Congress an eloquent special message on defense. In that message, the President outlined our basic defense policies. Many parts of the message deserve remembering, but one sentence in particular could hardly be quoted too often. That is the sentence beginning:

> The primary purpose of our arms is peace, not war—to make certain that they will never have to be used.

I mention that at this point in an attempt to avoid an impression that in our preoccupation with providing an adequate defense, we have overlooked the primary purpose of such a defense.

An annual authorization of appropriations for the procurement of the major weapons is a new departure for the Senate and for the Congress. Until this year, appropriations for these purposes have been sought on the basis of authorizations that were practically without limitation. The existence of such authorizations made it difficult for the Committees on Armed Services to discharge the responsibilities imposed on them by the rules of the House and the Senate. The requirement for more specific authorizations in these areas was imposed in 1959, to be effective this year, in the hope that this procedure would permit the Committee on Armed Services to contribute more to the formulation of our defense policies, and that this review by the Committees on Armed Services would assist the Committees on Appropriations in their deliberations.

The authorization bill that is before the Senate was formulated after hearings at which the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretaries of the military departments, and the military chiefs of the Armed Forces testified before the committee. The Secretary of Defense presented an unusually comprehensive and informative statement. In only one respect does the committee recommendation differ from the recommendations of the executive branch. When one considers that the bill involves many different weapons and a total of more than $12 billion, this is a complimentary indication of the committee's reaction to the programs of the President and the Secretary of Defense. This is an appropriate time to point to the statement by the Secretary of Defense that—

> Our predecessors did a very thorough job in preparing their fiscal year 1962 proposals.

While the recommendations of this administration differ somewhat in their emphasis, it is only fair to observe that in its major outline the current program for weapons procurement is a continuation of the major programs proposed in President Eisenhower's administration.

One area to which additional emphasis is devoted is our capability to prevent and to respond to limited wars. A major part of our defense expenditures has been applied recently to the attempted achievement of an invulnerable strategic missile force. Elements of this force include Polaris submarines and the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman ballistic missile systems. The need for such systems is fundamental in view of the threat that we face, but unfortunately these systems are limited in their versatility. They add nothing to our ability to defend ourselves in a conflict not involving the exchange of nuclear weapons at long range. Our prayer is that potential adversaries will share our realization of the cataclysmic effect on both sides of such a devastating exchange and that they will be constrained from precipitating it.

Although not all of these actions are directly related to the authorization bill before the Senate, the President has proposed several courses of action for strengthening our ability to deter or confine limited war. Among these are expanded research on nonnuclear weapons, additional transport aircraft and amphibious transports, procurement of additional quantities of conventional ammunition, modification of existing tactical fighters, and development of an advanced tactical fighter. I shall be surprised if these actions are not indicative of the trend in defense plans for the immediate future. I think it is clear that other steps to improve our conventional forces will be forthcoming.

Before discussing in general terms the weapons for which this authorization is intended, I should like to describe the one change recommended by the committee. This is in the form of an additional authorization of $525 million for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft for the Strategic Air Command. In explaining a recommendation representing a composite judgment of 17 members, it is virtually impossible to specify the factors that motivated each member in reaching a decision. In this instance, there were several grounds upon which a decision to procure additional bombers might reasonably be based. To some members, the most persuasive argument for taking this action is that manned bombers constitute a proved system, while intercontinental ballistic missiles are new, and have many complexities and uncertainties. Other members may have been motivated by the realization that a state of mutual deterrence, or an effective agreement banning atomic weapons, might leave us inadequately prepared in systems to respond to conventional warfare. Still other members were impressed by the more deliberate response that may be made with manned systems and by the greater utility and flexibility that these systems afford. Another justification for procuring more manned bombers is to assure adequate launching vehicles for the standoff missiles such as Hound Dog and Skybolt. Some of the B–52's in our current force are already several years old. By the time the Skybolt development is completed and this missile system is operational, a substantial part of the B–52 force may be approaching the end of the period of effective use.

In recommending additional authorization of appropriations for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft, the committee is mindful that it does not have the complete power of decision in this area. The Committees on Appropriations may not concur in this recommendation. Even if the Committees on Appropriations agree with this view, there is no assurance that the executive branch will obligate funds for this purpose. To use a legal term, Con-

gress is not empowered to mandamus the executive branch to require use of the authorizations and appropriations granted. But I remind the Senate that in other years we have provided amounts above those recommended by the executive branch at a time when the executive branch insisted that no more was required, and yet the additional amounts were eventually used, at least in part, to enhance our retaliatory strength.

Madam President, for my part, I am unwilling to rest the future security of this Nation altogether on long-range intercontinental missiles at this stage of their development.

I shall now turn to some of the items that this bill is intended to authorize for procurement. In doing so, I shall refrain from detailing the numbers of the missiles and the aircraft to be procured, and from indicating the part of the total authorization that is allocated to any one weapon. This information is available in the committee and will be made available to Members of the Senate who may desire to see it. It is the committee's hope, however, that both Congress and the executive branch will make a new start in their policies on publicizing the details of our defense program. This is a subject on which it is difficult to find a satisfactory middle ground. It probably would be unreasonable to come before the Senate with a bill authorizing appropriations totaling more than $12 billion and to say, in effect, that this authorization is for defense, but I can give you no further details. At the same time, I cannot believe that it is in the public interest to designate and publicize the purpose for which every dollar is spent by the Department of Defense. An unreasoning insistence on the publication of such information adds substantially to the cost of our defense, and, more seriously, it gives our potential enemies a tremendous advantage over us. It is not inconceivable that we could destroy ourselves by insisting upon a full exercise of the privilege of knowing the most intimate defense secrets.

For my part, I prefer to absorb the criticism that will come from some quarters over such a policy in the firm belief that the general public supports this view. Hardly a week passes in which I do not receive correspondence from my constituents protesting the extent to which our defense plans, bases, weapons, and programs are publicized.

I now turn to a discussion of the authorizations for the different services and the impact of the bill upon them.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Department of the Army authorization in this bill total $761,800,000. Of this sum, $211 million is authorization of appropriations for the procurement of five different types of Army aircraft; $550,800,000 is authorization for the procurement of eight different types of missiles. The aircraft and missile types are enumerated and briefly described in the committee report, and I shall not discuss each one at this time unless some Member of the Senate desires information about one of them.

In general, the Army aircraft types are intended to provide a gradual increase in the capability of the Army for air mobility within the combat zone. They do not provide strategic airlift and they do not provide close air support of ground forces since, under our current Defense operation, these functions are provided by other Armed Forces.

Army missiles for which appropriations would be authorized by this bill include the Hawk, which provides a field army with a defense against low altitude aircraft; improvements to the Nike-Hercules system, which is deployed around cities and critical installations for defense against aircraft; the Redeye, which will provide individual troops with close protection against low flying aircraft; the ENTAC, a new antitank guided missile of promising effectiveness; and additional quantities of Honest John and Little John missiles. In the longer ranges the bill would authorize appropriations for the Sergeant, a solid propellant successor to the Corporal, and for the Pershing, a solid propellant successor to the Redstone.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Navy part of the bill provides authorization of appropriations not only for aircraft and missiles, but for the construction and conversion of naval vessels.

The $2,915 million authorization is for naval vessels; $1,585,600,000 is authorization of appropriations for Navy and Marine Corps aircraft; and $606,400,000 is for Navy missiles, some of which will be used for Marine air wings. In addition, there is an authorization of $27 million for surface-to-air missiles to be used by Marine divisions.

The Navy vessel authorization is for funds to finance procurement of 36 new ships, including 10 Polaris-type submarines, a submarine tender, 7 guided missile frigates, 3 nuclear attack submarines, and 4 vessels to be used in the amphibious and vertical assault operations of the Marine Corps—22 older ships could be modernized with this authorization, which also includes an item to restore the unobligated balances that were borrowed to accelerate the procurement of 5 Polaris submarines, pursuant to the President's order earlier this year.

Missiles to be procured by the Navy include those for installation aboard ships such as Tartar, Terrier, and Talos; air-to-air types, such as Sparrow and Sidewinder; and the air-to-surface missile, Bullpup. The Sparrow, Sidewinder, and Bullpup missiles will be procured both for the Navy and the Marine Corps. As one might expect, the largest part of the Navy missile authorization is for missiles to arm the 29 Polaris submarines that will have been placed under contract through the fiscal year 1962.

The Navy and Marine Corps aircraft types include two types of fighters; two types of attack planes that can deliver nuclear bombs, and are also effective for close support of ground troops; helicopters for antisubmarine warfare, for transporting Marine Corps troops in vertical envelopment, for search and rescue; a new land based plane for antisubmarine work; and a carrier-based early warning and interceptor control aircraft.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The bill proposes authorization of appropriations for Air Force aircraft procurement in the amount of $3,812 million, and for Air Force missile procurement in the amount of $2,792 million.

Five hundred and twenty-five million dollars of the Air Force aircraft authorization is restricted to appropriations for procurement of long-range manned aircraft that I have discussed earlier. Other types to be procured are the KC–135, a jet tanker; the F–105, a high performance fighter that also has the characteristics for effective support of ground troops; the T–38, a jet trainer; the T–39, a training and mission support type; the T–40, also for mission support; and the C–130E, a turboprop transport. This authorization includes sums for projects not requiring authorization of appropriations under section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149, such as items for modifications to aircraft already in inventory, replenishment spares, and for aircraft still under development, such as the B–70 and the C–141. Indeed, the part of the Air Force aircraft authorization that requires authorization under a strict construction of section 412(b) is less than the part that does not require such authorization.

In Air Force missiles, the authorization is intended to support appropriations for continued procurement of the Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles; the Hound Dog air-to-surface missile; the Bullpup air-to-surface missile, that is also used by the Navy and the Marine Corps, and drones for training purposes.

As in the case of aircraft, the missile-procurement appropriation authorization includes several items that are related to and associated with missile systems, but are not strictly for the procurement of missiles themselves. Items of this type include modifications, component improvement, industrial facilities, and ballistic missile support costs. In the case of the missile authorization, these items constitute a relatively small part of the total missile procurement request.

Madam President, in his testimony before the committee, the Secretary of Defense indicated that the program proposed does not provide everything that everyone would like to have, and that there is room for differences among reasonable men as to what constitutes the optimum combination of programs for the Nation's defense. The Secretary stated that the executive branch had carefully examined all the principal alternatives, and had selected a combination of programs intended to give the Nation an adequate defense, at the least cost, in the light of the threat as it is viewed today.

The committee has also weighed the alternatives, and endorses this authorization request as another step toward providing the defense capability that we need. In this connection, I would be less than forthright if I failed to point out the difficulty of being finite about the specific number of any type of ship, aircraft, or missile that should be procured in a given fiscal year. To use

a hypothetical illustration: If the Department's authorization request proposes procurement of 25 units toward a total objective of 100 for an operational inventory, it is exceedingly difficult for a layman to reach an informed judgment on whether this is the correct rate, or whether one-half that amount or twice that amount should be authorized. The specific numbers of any type to be procured in a given year depend upon many related questions, including the existence of reasonably satisfactory substitutes, the total amount of money to be spent on national defense, the contractor's capability to produce and deliver, the existence of the necessary facilities and installations to accommodate the weapons, and the availability of trained personnel to operate them. Thus, I would underscore Secretary McNamara's statement that this bill does not provide all of everything that each of the Armed Forces would desire; but I believe it reflects a mature consideration of relative priorities, and that it will permit a substantial increment to our defense capabilities.

Madam President, that concludes my statement.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from California, who is a hard working and very valuable member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Madam President, I wish to say that I subscribe wholeheartedly to the statement made by the chairman of the committee in closing his presentation of this matter. In this bill we have not provided everything for everyone; neither have we done everything that everyone wants. But I agree that this bill constitutes a mature and careful evaluation of the defense needs of our country.

I call attention to the fact that the committee made a determination which I regard of major importance, as a policy matter, to the defense of the country; namely, the decision to authorize the appropriation of $525 million for the procurement of long-range manned bombers for the Strategic Air Command.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether it is true that it was impossible to provide in the bill authorization for the procurement of the B–70, because it is not subject to procurement.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California is correct in that statement. Section 412, as passed by the Senate, required authorization of appropriations for research and development; in conference it was necessary to yield on that part of section 412; and, as of today, the requirement for an authorization of appropriations applies only when the weapon is to be procured for operational use.

Mr. ENGLE. In other words, this bill does not bear directly upon whether at some subsequent time we shall procure the B–70, except insofar as the committee has stated very clearly and insofar as its action has very clearly indicated that the committee does believe in the need for manned bombers in the future. But at the present time the B–52 is the only one which is subject to immediate procurement, is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it is the only long-range manned aircraft that is capable of immediate procurement; and the Senator from California has correctly stated that in this bill the committee does not in any wise undertake to pass upon the merits of the B–70 or the speed with which that program should be carried forward. But the bill reflects the unanimous opinion of the committee that it is not wise at this time to abandon the procurement of manned long-range aircraft.

Mr. ENGLE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding to me.

I should like to make the additional statement that in my opinion the committee has made an intelligent and an important decision on a policy matter; namely, that it is the consensus of opinion of the committee that manned bombers will be necessary for a long time to come; and, that being true, that we shall purchase the ones which are immediately subject to procurement, without prejudice to the B–70, because the B–70 is the next bomber in the line of production and is the next generation of manned bombers for this country.

I should like to express the hope that from here on we shall proceed on the basis that we do intend to keep manned bombers in the arsenal of our Nation, and that we shall do what we can to expedite, speed up, and bring into the arsenal of our country at the earliest possible moment the B–70, as a complete weapons system subject to procurement sometime in the future, under a bill such as the one now under consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator relate the authorization just a little to the regular defense budget? Since I left the Appropriations Committee, I do not follow it quite as closely as I used to. I used to follow these matters very closely. The committee report indicates that on January 19, 1961, there was a proposal covering these general procurement items. According to the committee report, that was on January 19, 1961.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I presume that was a proposal which came from the previous administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. That was a proposal of President Eisenhower.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then there is a current proposal, carried in column 2 of the table which appears on page 15 of the committee report. Incidentally, I think these figures might well be inserted in the RECORD, as a part of the distinguished Senator's remarks, to indicate what these totals are.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to ask unanimous consent that the table which appears on page 15 of the committee report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather there is an increase in the new proposal of somewhere in the neighborhood of $1¼ billion for these various procurement items.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is approximately correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would probably be reflected by an increase in the budget for this administration over what was submitted by the prior administration.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is already reflected. Budget estimates covering these items have already been submitted by the present administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I notice that when the Secretary of Defense appeared he made mention, in his remarks, of these procurement items based on a preliminary reappraisal. He said that later there will be a complete reappraisal. I would gather, from that statement, that there might even be some additions to these procurement items when that resurvey is made.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is wholly likely, but from my knowledge of the purpose of the resurvey, the only items for which authorization might be required and might be involved would be for transport aircraft, because for the immediate future the resurvey is related more to the means of fighting what we call conventional wars. I do not think it would involve any more of the long-range type missiles, or aircraft, or naval vessels, that are required under section 412(b).

Mr. DIRKSEN. One could assume that if the international picture, either in one place or another, becomes more critical, there may be a reevaluation and new steps will be found necessary to meet the new conditions.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have been in this Chamber when we passed appropriation bills for $52 billion for the Air Force within 10 minutes. This country was at war, the administration said it was necessary, and the Congress forwarded the availability of the money as rapidly as possible.

In case the international situation were to deteriorate very badly, of course it would be necessary to have additional appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the distinguished Senator will yield further, and I trust this will not be construed as a narrow partisan or parochial remark, it does seem to me, as one surveys the situation around the world and what our needs may be, and the increasing cost of weaponry of all kinds, that, as we think of it in the context of both the military and the domestic programs, rapidly we are getting into an area that is best equated by the old phrase, "Guns versus butter," "Guns and butter," or "Guns or butter." The question is, then, Where shall the emphasis be?

I say, frankly, to the very distinguished Senator from Georgia, that the matter is of concern because on tomorrow we shall bring into the Chamber the Federal aid to education bill, that has been

increased by $250 million by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Now we are expected to spend $850 million across the board for each of the first 3 years in grant money, not to speak of loans and funds for scholarship purposes.

In proportion, there are programs for what I think of, for want of a better term, in the welfare field. It is incumbent upon the Congress to be rather cautious as to how it operates in this field, in our estimates of our military needs, which are likely to grow, when we think in terms of the parliamentary fall in Iran, the difficulties in Laos, the difficulties at Geneva, the difficulties in Latin America, the possibility always of a movement toward Berlin and the recognition of East Germany as a sovereign country, and every other situation that one can direct attention to, trouble and stress of one kind and another.

Obviously, it means that this country, in order to be safe and secure, must be in the forefront in the weaponry field; and that costs money.

So I become a little distressed about the way we are authorizing funds on the domestic front for a variety of purposes, when I have never been persuaded that the urgency is such that it must be done at this particular time, if at all.

I do not ask particularly for a comment, but I thought, in view of the fact that this procurement authorization is before us, that observation ought to be made, because the Congress must come to grips with the question, since it has exclusive authority over the public purse.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, I suppose that every Member of this body has his own method of arriving at what he regards as priorities in the requirements of our Federal Government. I would not question any Senator's views with respect to the priorities of any program or its cost. For my part, I have never had any great difficulty in arriving at my own priority. In today's troubled world I have always placed those measures that will assure the security of these United States above all others, and I have no difficulty in my own mind in drawing the line between the procurement of weapons to defend this country and programs of social reforms, however desirable they may be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may address one other observation to the distinguished Senator, I notice that there was a reduction of $138 million in the B–70 program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In considering and discussing the matter in various quarters, I gather that those who are subcontractors in the electronics field and those who had already been engaged would have to let their skilled workers go if the funds were not available. I thought there had to be a pretty urgent reason for taking that work out of the program, because if the companies who have these highly skilled technicians would have to let these people go because contracts were canceled, they would have to leave or find new work.

Mr. RUSSELL. That issue cannot be determined conclusively by this bill, because it does not deal with programs of research and development.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The B–70 program is in the process of development. Undoubtedly it will be dealt with when the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense is before the Senate.

In the committee over which I am privileged to preside there was a very extensive discussion of the desirability of expediting the B–70 program over and above what was provided even in the Eisenhower budget, in addition to the effect of the reduction, to which the Senator has referred, proposed in the budget of the Kennedy administration. The effect of that of course will be to slow down the development program. It will slow down the work on every aspect of the B–70, subcontractors and all.

My own view is that we ought to proceed to procure the B–70 at the earliest possible date or do away with the program altogether.

This was involved to a degree in the administration's program, because the procurement program as submitted by the administration did not contemplate the acquisition of any manned bombers after 1962. The Senate Committee on Armed Services was simply not willing to assume the responsibility of stopping the procurement of manned bombers in 1962. As I stated in my statement, I do not know what motivated all of the members of the committee, but the committee members were unanimous on that one point. All 17 members felt we should continue to procure manned bombers after 1962.

In my opinion, missilry has not yet achieved that stage of perfection and development which would warrant placing all the future security of this country on the operation of the missile system.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I have only one other question. Was there a unanimous report from the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. RUSSELL. It was a unanimous report by all 17 members.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some of the members of the Committee on Armed Services on the minority side are unavoidably detained. Therefore, I felt it necessary to ask some questions in this field. I am sure there will be no objection to consideration of the bill today, in view of the fact that the report was unanimous.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was no opposition to the report or to the bill in the committee. One of the able and distinguished members of the committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has just entered the Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that certain members of the Committee on Armed Services who will probably reach the city in a little while, if they desire to have remarks included in the RECORD, insofar as possible be permitted to include the remarks in the RECORD at this point in connection with the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be pleased to have that done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, who is one of the most vigilant and thorough members of our committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the kind remarks by the chairman of the committee. I rise to say that I think the report represents the opinion of the committee as a whole.

The members on the minority side appreciate the leadership which the distinguished Senator from Georgia provided, particularly on the issues with respect to which we had some problems. The authorization for bombers and decisions with respect to some of the classified projects were decisions which were unanimous, so far as I know.

I think there was some difference of opinion with respect to the Nike-Zeus, but the decision of the committee was by a substantial majority and did not run along party lines at all. It is a pleasure for me to share in the support of the bill and to say that there was no partisan division on the bill.

So far as I know, the members of the minority support the features of the bill as it is presented at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is my recollection, Madam President.

I have been exceedingly happy to observe how free from partisanship the committee has been in its approach to all of the problems that have come before us since I have been privileged to preside over the committee as chairman. I have presided during Republican administrations and Democratic administrations. I state on this floor that a person in the committee room who did not know whether we had a Democratic or Republican administration would have been hard put to know what administration was in power as we considered the measures that were referred to us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I think that is typical of the very distinguished chairman of the committee. He has rendered an astonishingly constructive service not only to the Senate but also to the country.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I join in the testimony and tribute voiced by my distinguished colleague from South Dakota.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to point out, along with the Senator from South Dakota, that this is the first time a bill of this nature has come before the Senate; that is, an authorization bill for what is ordinarily called military hardware for the forthcoming budget year, including missiles and aircraft and major military items which heretofore have not been authorized, in the sense that no authorization was required.

As no doubt has been stated by the Senator from Georgia, the Senator is the author of the amendment to last year's

military authorization bill which provides that authorizations shall be necessary for these major items. This is a very distinct step forward, with many advantages to the Senate and to its committees, in the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi, in getting a well understood and rounded out missile program which will give to the Congress a far better opportunity to exercise its judgment and its legislative will.

Under present law the military program has to come before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and of course the House Committee on Armed Services, as well as the Appropriations Committees. This is the first year of operation, and I think it has already proved its merit and its advantages.

There is one thing I wish to mention, which I am sure the Senator from Georgia has covered. The bill does authorize additional manned bombers as a striking force, at least in the long-range-type bomber. The Senator from Mississippi thinks this is not only sound but also needed.

The bill does not mention the B–70 program. I assume the Senator from Georgia perhaps touched on that in his statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have undertaken to do so, yes.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi did not have an opportunity to be present in the Chamber all the time the Senator from Georgia was speaking. The fact that the B–70 program is not included in the authorization bill would in no way preclude the Congress from making an additional appropriation should it see fit to do so; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that we did not deal with the B–70 program in the bill because that program is still under development, and that there is no requirement in section 412(b) for authorization of appropriations for research and development.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. We took a unanimous position, as I said, in favor of not discontinuing the procurement of manned bombers in 1962.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I felt sure the Senator had covered that, but I wished to cover it from my viewpoint and to say that in the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi the B–70 is a companion, in effect and as a practical matter, to the manned bomber program which is covered by the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California expressed the same view.

Mr. STENNIS. As the Senator from Mississippi understands the facts now, at the proper time he will certainly support a request for additional funds to step up and push forward at a more rapid rate the B–70 program, because the development of the manned bomber is in our frontline of defense. I think we will need such craft for many years to come, and I do not believe it will be rapidly replaced by any kind of missile.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is my understanding—and if I am incorrect in my understanding, I hope to be corrected—that all actions proposed to be taken under the bill are consistent with the further development of the B–70. But the bill is a procurement bill which deals with the actual cost of planes or parts in being. It is not a bill which deals with authorization for research funds for research. Funds for research and development on the B–70 can be provided by the appropriations bill for the Department of Defense, and if so, that action would be wholly consistent with the provisions of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I had already stated that when the appropriation bill is before the Senate, every Senator will have an opportunity to express himself with respect to the continuation of the B–70 program, but that under the language of section 412(b), the program does not require authorization of appropriations in a measure of this type.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is my understanding. I wanted to make the record clear so far as my own position is concerned, because personally I am one of those who believe that the manned bomber will be with us for some time.

Madam President, if the Senator will indulge me further——

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to say for the record that one feature of the bill which I believe should be commended is the way in which it supports the statement by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, that we should put the defense posture of this country in such form that we will not be forced to go into nuclear wars. The distinguished chairman of the committee knows that in committee he and I both have felt that once we started the use of nuclear weapons, it would be hard to have a small nuclear war. So we have felt that supports should be given to beefing up, if we will, the conventional forces of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps particularly, and to a certain extent the Air Force, so that we can deal with limited war situations in a limited way, and not be forced into a nuclear war because of inability to meet a situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. As the Senator knows, I have been interested for many years in large, all-cargo aircraft to provide an ever-ready airlift for mobility of our fighting ground forces. I should like to ask what the situation is regarding that type of craft. I believe it is now designed as the C–141, the giant cargo plane that will have a capability to fly over both oceans without refueling and stops. The plane is one of the most badly needed instruments in our arsenal, I believe.

Mr. RUSSELL. The subject is dealt with on page 13, next to the last paragraph, of the committee report.

I had stated that we included in the authorization funds for the continued development of the B–70 as well as the C–141, the new jet transport, though it was not necessary to do so. We did this because the Air Force, in making up its presentation to the committee, included the item. The law does not require that the authorization deal with weapons systems that are in the stage of research and development, but in this instance we did, because we approved all the aircraft that the Department of the Air Force recommended to us. So there are funds included in the totals for the development of the C–141.

No one has been more prophetic in his statements as to our defense needs than has the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who for several years was "the voice in the wilderness" insisting that we modernize our lift capability. Today we see the necessity for doing so. While we are starting a little late, we will try to expedite the program so far as we can.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished Senator, who is chairman of the committee, for those kind remarks. There will be sufficient funds, therefore, available to move the program along at the most rapid possible speed consistent with normal design, performance, and perfection of the type of aircraft it is to be.

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee is so advised.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for the inclusion of that item.

EXHIBIT 1

	Proposal of Jan. 19, 1961	Current proposal	Difference
Aircraft:			
Army	$193,700,000	$211,000,000	+$17,300,000
Navy and Marine Corps	1,527,000,000	1,585,000,000	+58,000,000
Air Force	3,197,000,000	3,287,000,000	+90,000,000
Missiles:			
Army	520,500,000	550,800,000	+30,300,000
Navy	473,000,000	606,400,000	+133,400,000
Marine Corps	24,981,000	27,000,000	+2,019,000
Air Force	2,811,000,000	2,792,000,000	−19,000,000
Naval vessels: Navy	1,825,000,000	2,915,000,000	+1,090,000,000

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, when the military procurement bill was under consideration in the Senate Armed Services Committee, I offered an amendment which would have had the effect of speeding up by 1 or 2 years the date when the Nike-Zeus anti-ICBM missile system, the free world's only antimissile system under development, would be operational. The amendment would have authorized allocation of $169 million for fiscal year 1962 to permit the Army to go into limited production of certain component parts of the Zeus system prior to completion of final tests on this vital defense weapons system,

as was done with the Atlas and Polaris missile systems. I urged the committee to make these funds available to the President so he would at least have congressional authority if he should change his mind on Zeus component part production because of further breakthroughs the Soviets may make in coming months in developing their anti-ICBM missile system. The committee, however, by a decisive vote concurred in the administration's position on declining to expedite the Zeus program.

This decision by the administration and the committee has concerned me so that I considered offering the same amendment on the Senate floor. I have decided, however, against doing this because of the decisive vote in committee and also because information surrounding the development of the Zeus system is of such a highly classified nature that I feel it should be discussed only in executive session of the committee.

I shall not labor the point on the Senate floor today except to again express my grave concern about this decision, especially in view of the recent setbacks the free world has suffered at the hands of the Communists and also in view of the intelligence information we have available as to the progress being made by the Soviet Union in developing a Soviet antimissile system. My statement before the Armed Services Committee is classified as "secret," but it is available to any Member of this body wishing to study the facts and figures contained therein. In addition to this, I have twice this year, on February 2 and 24, addressed the Senate on the importance of speeding up the operational date of the Zeus system, and on February 22 I wrote a letter to every Senator attaching my first speech and the January 30 issue of Missile and Rockets magazine, which contained a series of important articles on the Zeus system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1962 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For aircraft: For the Army, $211,000,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,585,600,000; for the Air Force, $3,812,000,000, of which amount $525,000,000 is authorized only for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft for the Strategic Air Command.

MISSILES

For missiles: For the Army, $550,800,000; for the Navy, $606,400,000; for the Marine Corps, $27,000,000; for the Air Force, $2,792,000,000.

NAVAL VESSELS

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,915,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 104. An act to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico; and

S. 712. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1372. An act to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments; and

H.R. 2195. An act to convey certain land of the Pala Band of Indians to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corp.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, to consider certain treaties on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF THE SEA BY OIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I call up Executive C (86th Cong. 2d sess.), the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil.

The Senate, as in committee of the whole, proceeded to consider the treaty, Executive C (86th Cong. 2d sess.), the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, which was read the second time, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF THE SEA BY OIL, 1954

The Governments represented at the International Conference on Pollution of the Sea by Oil held in London from 26th April, 1954, to 12th May, 1954,

Desiring to take action by common agreement to prevent pollution of the sea by oil discharged from ships, and considering that this end may best be achieved by the conclusion of a Convention,

Have accordingly appointed the undersigned plenipotentiaries, who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

(1) For the purposes of the present Convention, the following expressions shall (unless the context otherwise requires) have the meanings hereby respectively assigned to them, that is to say:—

"The Bureau" has the meaning assigned to it by Article XXI;

"Discharge" in relation to oil or to an oily mixture means any discharge or escape howsoever caused;

"Heavy diesel oil" means marine diesel oil, other than those distillates of which more than 50 percent, by volume distils at a temperature not exceeding 340° C. when tested by A.S.T.M. Standard Method D. 158/53;

"Mile" means a nautical mile of 6080 feet or 1852 metres;

"Oil" means crude oil, fuel oil, heavy diesel oil and lubricating oil, and "oily' shall be construed accordingly.

(2) For the purposes of the present Convention the territories of a Contracting Government mean the territory of the country of which it is the Government and any other territory for the international relations of which the Government is responsible and to which the Convention shall have been extended under Article XVIII.

ARTICLE II

The present Convention shall apply to sea-going ships registered in any of the territories of a Contracting Government, except

(i) ships for the time being used as naval auxiliaries;

(ii) ships of under 500 tons gross tonnage;

(iii) ships for the time being engaged in the whaling industry;

(iv) ships for the time being navigating the Great Lakes of North America and their connecting and tributary waters as far east as the lower exit of the Lachine Canal at Montreal in the Province of Quebec, Canada.

ARTICLE III

(1) Subject to the provisions of Articles IV and V, the discharge from any tanker, being a ship to which the Convention applies, within any of the prohibited zones referred to in Annex A to the Convention in relation to tankers of—

(a) oil;

(b) any oily mixture the oil in which fouls the surface of the sea, shall be prohibited.

For the purposes of this paragraph the oil in an oily mixture of less than 100 parts of oil in 1,000,000 parts of the mixture shall not be deemed to foul the surface of the sea.

(2) Subject to the provisions of Articles IV and V, any discharge into the sea from a ship, being a ship to which the Convention applies and not being a tanker, of oily ballast water or tank washings shall be made as far as practicable from land. As from a date three years after the date on which the Convention comes into force, paragraph (1) of this Article shall apply to ships other than tankers as it applies to tankers, except that—

(a) the prohibited zones in relation to ships other than tankers shall be those referred to as such in Annex A to the Convention; and

(b) the discharge of oil or of an oily mixture from such a ship shall not be prohibited when the ship is proceeding to a port not provided with such reception facilities as are referred to in Article VIII.

(3) Any contravention of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this Article shall be an offense punishable under the laws of the territory in which the ship is registered.

ARTICLE IV

(1) Article III shall not apply to—

(a) the discharge of oil or of an oily mixture from a ship for the purpose of securing the safety of the ship, preventing damage to the ship or cargo, or saving life at sea; or

(b) the escape of oil, or of an oily mixture, resulting from damage to the ship or unavoidable leakage, if all reasonable precautions have been taken after the occurrence of the damage or discovery of the

leakage for the purpose of preventing or minimising the escape;

(c) the discharge of sediment—

(i) which cannot be pumped from the cargo tanks of tankers by reason of its solidity; or

(ii) which is residue arising from the purification or clarification of oil fuel or lubricating oil,

provided that such discharge is made as far from land as is practicable.

(2) In the event of such discharge or escape as is referred to in this Article a statement shall be made in the oil record book required by Article IX of the circumstances of and reason for the discharge.

ARTICLE V

Article III shall not apply to the discharge from the bilges of a ship—

(a) of any oily mixture during the period of twelve months following the date on which the Convention comes into force in respect of the territory in which the ship is registered;

(b) after the expiration of such period, of an oily mixture containing no oil other than lubricating oil.

ARTICLE VI

The penalties which may be imposed in pursuance of Article III under the law of any of the territories of a Contracting Government in respect of the unlawful discharge from a ship of oil or of an oily mixture into waters outside the territorial waters of that territory shall not be less than the penalties which may be imposed under the law of that territory in respect of the unlawful discharge of oil or of an oily mixture from a ship into such territorial waters.

ARTICLE VII

As from a date twelve months after the present Convention comes into force in respect of any of the territories of a Contracting Government all ships registered in that territory shall be required to be so fitted as to prevent the escape of fuel oil or heavy diesel oil into bilges the contents of which are discharged into the sea without being passed through an oily-water separator.

ARTICLE VIII

As from a date three years after the present Convention comes into force in respect of any of the territories of a Contracting Government, that Government shall ensure the provisions in each main port in that territory of facilities adequate for the reception, without causing undue delay to ships, of such residues from oily ballast water and tank washings as would remain for disposal by ships, other than tankers, using the port, if the water had been separated by the use of an oily-water separator, a settling tank or otherwise. Each Contracting Government shall from time to time determine which ports are the main ports in its territories for the purposes of this Article, and shall notify the Bureau in writing accordingly indicating whether adequate reception facilities have been installed.

ARTICLE IX

(1) There shall be carried in every ship to which the Convention applies an oil record book (whether as part of the ship's official logbook or otherwise) in the form specified in Annex B to the present Convention. The appropriate entries shall be made in that book, and each page of the book, including any statement under paragraph (2) of Article IV, shall be signed by the officer or officers in charge of the operations concerned and by the master of the ship. The written entries in the oil record book shall be in an official language of the territory in which the ship is registered, or in English or French.

(2) The competent authorities of any of the territories of a Contracting Government may inspect on board any such ship while within a port in that territory the oil record book required to be carried in the ship in compliance with the provisions of the Convention, and may make a true copy of any entry in that book and may require the master of the ship to certify that the copy is a true copy of such entry. Any copy so made which purports to have been certified by the master of the ship as a true copy of an entry in the ship's oil record book shall be made admissible in any judicial proceedings as evidence of the facts stated in the entry. Any action by the competent authorities under this paragraph shall be taken as expeditiously as possible and the ship shall not be delayed.

ARTICLE X

(1) Any Contracting Government may furnish to the Contracting Government in the territory of which a ship is registered particulars in writing of evidence that any provision of the Convention has been contravened in respect of that ship, wheresoever the alleged contravention may have taken place. If it is practicable to do so, the competent authorities of the former Government shall notify the master of the ship of the alleged contravention.

(2) Upon receiving such particulars the latter Government shall investigate the matter, and may request the former Government to furnish further or better particulars of the alleged contravention. If the Government in the territory of which the ship is registered is satisfied that sufficient evidence is available in the form required by law to enable proceedings against the owner or master of the ship to be taken in respect of the alleged contravention, it shall cause such proceedings to be taken as soon as possible, and shall inform the other Contracting Government and the Bureau of the result of such proceedings.

ARTICLE XI

Nothing in the present Convention shall be construed as derogating from the powers of any Contracting Government to take measures within its jurisdiction in respect of any matter to which the Convention relates or as extending the jurisdiction of any Contracting Government.

ARTICLE XII

Each Contracting Government shall send to the Bureau and to the appropriate organ of the United Nations—

(a) the text of laws, decrees, orders and regulations in force in its territories which give effect to the present Convention;

(b) all official reports or summaries of official reports in so far as they show the results of the application of the provisions of the Convention, provided always that such reports or summaries are not, in the opinion of that Government, of a confidential nature.

ARTICLE XIII

Any dispute between Contracting Governments relating to the interpretation or application of the present Convention which cannot be settled by negotiation shall be referred at the request of either party to the International Court of Justice for decision unless the parties in dispute agree to submit it to arbitration.

ARTICLE XIV

(1) The present Convention shall remain open for signature for three months from this day's date and shall thereafter remain open for acceptance.

(2) Governments may become parties to the Convention by—

(i) signature without reservation as to acceptance;

(ii) signature subject to acceptance followed by acceptance; or

(iii) acceptance.

(3) Acceptance shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of acceptance with the Bureau, which shall inform all Governments that have already signed or accepted the Convention of each signature and deposit of an acceptance and of the date of such signature or deposit.

ARTICLE XV

(1) The present Convention shall come into force twelve months after the date on which not less than ten Governments have become parties to the Convention, including five Governments of countries each with not less than 500,000 gross tons of tanker tonnage.

(2)—(a) For each Government which signs the Convention without reservation as to acceptance or accepts the Convention before the date on which the Convention comes into force in accordance with paragraph (1) of this Article it shall come into force on that date. For each Government which accepts the Convention on or after that date, it shall come into force three months after the date of the deposit of that Government's acceptance.

(b) The Bureau shall, as soon as possible, inform all Governments which have signed or accepted the Convention of the date on which it will come into force.

ARTICLE XVI

(1) Upon the request of any Contracting Government a proposed amendment of the present Convention shall be communicated by the Bureau to all Contracting Governments for consideration.

(2) Any amendment communicated to Contracting Governments for consideration under paragraph (1) of this Article shall be deemed to have been accepted by all Contracting Governments and shall come into force on the expiration of a period of six months after it has been so communicated, unless any one of the Contracting Governments shall have made a declaration not less than two months before the expiration of that period that it does not accept the amendment.

(3)—(a) A conference of Contracting Governments to consider amendments of the Convention proposed by any Contracting Government shall be conveyed by the Bureau upon the request of one-third of the Contracting Governments.

(b) Every amendment adopted by such a conference by a two-thirds majority vote of the Contracting Governments represented shall be communicated by the Bureau to all Contracting Governments for their acceptance.

(4) Any amendment communicated to Contracting Governments for their acceptance under paragraph (3) of this Article shall come into force for all Contracting Governments, except those which before it comes into force make a declaration that they do not accept the amendment, twelve months after the date on which the amendment is accepted by two-thirds of the Contracting Governments.

(5) Any declaration under this Article shall be made by a notification in writing to the Bureau which shall notify all Contracting Governments of the receipt of the declaration.

(6) The Bureau shall inform all signatory and Contracting Governments of any amendments which come into force under this Article, together with the date on which such amendments shall come into force.

ARTICLE XVII

(1) The present Convention may be denounced by any Contracting Government at any time after the expiration of a period of five years from the date on which the Convention comes into force for that Government.

(2) Denunciation shall be effected by a notification in writing addressed to the Bureau, which shall notify all the Contracting Governments of any denunciation received and of the date of its receipt.

(3) A denunciation shall take effect twelve months, or such longer period as may be specified in the notification, after its receipt by the Bureau.

ARTICLE XVIII

(1)—(a) Any Government may, at the time of signature or acceptance of the present Convention, or at any time thereafter, declare by notification in writing given to the Bureau that the Convention shall extend to any of the territories for whose international relations it is responsible.

(b) The Convention shall, from the date of the receipt of the notification, or from such other date as may be specified in the notification, extend to the territories named therein.

(2)—(a) Any Contracting Government which has made a declaration under paragraph (1) of this Article may, at any time after the expiration of a period of five years from the date on which the Convention has been so extended to any territory, give notification in writing to the Bureau, declaring that the Convention shall cease to extend to any such territory named in the notification.

(b) The Convention shall cease to extend to any territory mentioned in such notification twelve months, or such longer period as may be specified therein, after the date of receipt of the notification by the Bureau.

(3) The Bureau shall inform all Contracting Governments of the extension of the Convention to any territories under paragraph (1) of this Article, and of the termination of any such extension under paragraph (2) of this Article, stating in each case the date from which the Convention has been, or will cease to be, so extended.

ARTICLE XIX

(1) In case of war or other hostilities, a Contracting Government which considers that it is affected, whether as a belligerent or as a neutral, may suspend the operation of the whole or any part of the present Convention in respect of all or any of its territories. The suspending Government shall immediately give notice of any such suspension to the Bureau.

(2) The suspending Government may at any time terminate such suspension and shall in any event terminate it as soon as it ceases to be justified under paragraph (1) of this Article. Notice of such termination shall be given immediately to the Bureau by the Government concerned.

(3) The Bureau shall notify all Contracting Governments of any suspension or termination of suspension under this Article.

ARTICLE XX

As soon as the present Convention comes into force it shall be registered by the Bureau with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE XXI

The duties of the Bureau shall be carried out by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland unless and until the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organisation comes into being and takes over the duties assigned to it under the Convention signed at Geneva on the 6th day of March, 1948, and thereafter the duties of the Bureau shall be carried out by the said Organisation.

In witness whereof the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done in London this twelfth day of May, 1954, in English and French, both texts being equally authoritative, in a single copy, which shall be deposited with the Bureau and of which the Bureau shall transmit certified copies to all signatory and Contracting Governments.

For the Government of Australia:
For the Government of Belgium:
Subject to acceptance.
M. A. VAN BOECKEL.
For the Government of Brazil:
For the Government of Canada:
Subject to ratification.
ALAN CUMYN.
For the Government of Ceylon:
Subject to acceptance.
T. D. PERERA.
For the Government of Chile:
For the Government of Denmark:
Subject to acceptance.
MOGENS BLACH.
For the Government of Finland:
Subject to acceptance.
S. SUNDMAN.
For the Government of France:
Sous réserve de ratification.
R. MASSIGLI.
For the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:
Subject to acceptance.
KARL SCHUBERT.
For the Government of Greece:
Subject to acceptance.
M. SAKARIS.
KOSTAS LYRAS.
For the Government of India:
For the Government of Ireland:
Subject to acceptance.
F. H. BOLAND.
For the Government of Israel:
For the Government of Italy:
Subject to acceptance.
GIULIO INGIANNI.
For the Government of Japan:
Subject to acceptance.
S. MATSUMOTO.
For the Government of Liberia:
Subject to acceptance or ratification by the President with the advice and consent of the Liberian Senate.
GEORGE B. STEVENSON.
S. EDWARD PEAL.
For the Government of Mexico:
Subject to acceptance.
G. LUDERS DE NEGRI.
For the Government of the Netherlands:
Subject to ratification.
A. H. HASSELMAN.
For the Government of New Zealand:
Subject to acceptance.
For the Government of Nicaragua:
F. H. CONER.
For the Government of Norway:
Subject to acceptance.
SIGURD STORHAUG.
For the Government of Panama:
For the Government of Poland:
For the Government of Portugal:
For the Government of Spain:
For the Government of Sweden:
Subject to acceptance.
G. BÖÖS.
For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
Subject to ratification by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.
Y. MALIK.
For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
Subject to acceptance.
GILMOUR JENKINS.
PERCY FAULKNER.
For the Government of the United States of America:
For the Government of Venezuela:
For the Government of Yugoslavia:
Subject to acceptance.
PREDRAG NIKOLIC.

ANNEX A

PROHIBITED ZONES

(1) Subject to paragraph (3) of this Annex, the prohibited zones in relation to tankers shall be all sea areas within 50 miles from land, with the following exceptions:

(a) *The Adriatic Zones*

Within the Adriatic Sea the prohibited zones off the coasts of Italy and Yugoslavia respectively shall each extend for a distance of 30 miles from land, excepting only the island of Vis. When the present Convention has been in force for a period of three years the said zones shall each be extended by a further 20 miles in width unless the two Governments agree to postpone such extension. In the event of such an agreement the said Governments shall notify the Bureau accordingly not less than three months before the expiration of such period of three years and the Bureau shall notify all Contracting Governments of such agreement.

(b) *The North Sea Zone*

The North Sea Zone shall extend for a distance of 100 miles from the coasts of the following countries:

Belgium,
Denmark,
the Federal Republic of Germany,
the Netherlands,
the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

but not beyond the point where the limit of a 100-mile zone off the west coast of Jutland intersects the limit of the 50-mile zone off the coast of Norway.

(c) *The Atlantic Zone*

The Atlantic Zone shall be within a line drawn from a point on the Greenwich meridian 100 miles in a north-north-easterly direction from the Shetland Islands; thence northwards along the Greenwich meridian to latitude 64° north; thence westwards along the 64th parallel to longitude 10° west; thence to latitude 60° north, longitude 14° west; thence to latitude 54°30′ north, longitude 30° west; thence to latitude 44°20′ north, longitude 30° west; thence to latitude 48° north, longitude 14° west; thence eastwards along the 48th parallel to a point of intersection with the 50-mile zone off the coast of France. Provided that in relation to voyages which do not extend seawards beyond the Atlantic Zone as defined above, and which are to ports not provided with adequate facilities for the reception of oily residue, the Atlantic Zone shall be deemed to terminate at a distance of 100 miles from land.

(d) *The Australian Zone*

The Australian Zone shall extend for a distance of 150 miles from the coasts of Australia, except off the north and west coasts of the Australian mainland between the point opposite Thursday Island and the point on the west coast at 20° south latitude.

(2) Subject to paragraph (3) of this Annex the prohibited zones in relation to ships other than tankers shall be all sea areas within 50 miles from land with the following exceptions:

(a) *The Adriatic Zones*

Within the Adriatic Sea the prohibited zones off the coasts of Italy and Yugoslavia respectively shall each extend for a distance of 20 miles from land, excepting only the island of Vis. After the expiration of a period of three years following the application of prohibited zones to ships other than tankers in accordance with paragraph (2) of Article III the said zones shall each be extended by a further 30 miles in width unless the two Governments agree to postpone such extension. In the event of such an agreement the said Governments shall notify the Bureau accordingly not less than three months before the expiration of such period of three years, and the Bureau shall notify all Contracting Governments of such agreement.

(b) *The North Sea and Atlantic Zones*

The North Sea and Atlantic Zones shall extend for a distance of 100 miles from the coasts of the following countries:

Belgium,
Denmark,
the Federal Republic of Germany,
Ireland,
the Netherlands,
the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,

but not beyond the point where the limit of a 100-mile zone off the west coast of Jutland intersects the limit of the 50-mile zone off the coast of Norway.

(3)—(a) Any Contracting Government may propose—

(i) the reduction of any zone off the coast of any of its territories;

(ii) the extension of any such zone to a maximum of 100 miles from any such coast, by making a declaration to that effect and the reduction or extension shall come into force after the expiration of a period of six months after the declaration has been made, unless any one of the Contracting Governments shall have made a declaration not less than two months before the expiration of that period that its interests are affected either by reason of the proximity of its coasts or by reason of its ships trading in the area, and that it does not accept the reduction or extension, as the case may be.

(b) Any declaration under this paragraph shall be made by a notification in writing to the Bureau which shall notify all Contracting Governments of the receipt of the declaration.

ANNEX B

Form of oil record book

I. FOR TANKERS

Date of entry					
(a) Ballasting of and discharge of ballast from cargo tanks					
1. Identify numbers of tank(s)					
2. Type of oil previously contained in tank(s)					
3. Date and place of ballasting					
4. Date and time of discharge of ballast water					
5. Place or position of ship					
6. Approximate amount of oil-contaminated water transferred to slop tank(s)					
7. Identity numbers of slop tank(s)					
(b) Cleaning of cargo tanks					
8. Identity numbers of tank(s) cleaned					
9. Type of oil previously contained in tank(s)					
10. Identity numbers of slop tank(s) to which washings transferred					
11. Dates and times of cleaning					
(c) Settling in slop tank(s) and discharge of water					
12. Identity numbers of slop tank(s)					
13. Period of settling (in hours)					
14. Date and time of discharge of water					
15. Place or position of ship					
16. Approximate quantities of residue					
(d) Disposal from ship of oily residues from slop tank(s) and other sources					
17. Date and method of disposal					
18. Place or position of ship					
19. Sources and approximate quantities					

(Signature of officer or officers in charge of the operations concerned)

(Signature of master)

II. FOR SHIPS OTHER THAN TANKERS

Date of entry					
(a) Ballasting, or cleaning during voyage, of bunker fuel tanks					
1. Identity number of tank(s)					
2. Type of oil previously contained in tank(s)					
3. Date and place of ballasting					
4. Date and time of discharge of ballast or washing water					
5. Place or position of ship					
6. Whether separator used: if so, give period of use					
7. Disposal of oily residue retained on board					
(b) Disposal from ship of oily residues from bunker fuel tanks and other sources					
8. Date and method of disposal					
9. Place or position of ship					
10. Sources and approximate quantities					

(Signature of officer or officers in charge of the operations concerned)

(Signature of master)

III. FOR ALL SHIPS

Date of entry					
Accidental and other exceptional discharges or escapes of oil					
1. Date and time of occurrence					
2. Place or position o ship					
3. Approximate quantity and type of oil					
4. Circumstances of discharge or escape and general remarks					

(Signature of officer or officers in charge of the operations concerned)

(Signature of master)

Certified a true copy of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, and of the annexes thereto:

[SEAL] E. J. PASSANT,
Librarian and Keeper of the Papers for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

LONDON, September 16, 1954.

Mr. SPARKMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, the convention is designed to prevent the pollution of the high seas by oil discharged from ships, especially tankers.

Oil pollution of the high seas constitutes an international problem in that oil dumped in the ocean can drift many miles and befoul beaches and harbors sometimes hundreds of miles from where it was discharged. Such pollution is not only harmful to coasts and coastal waters, but also to birds and other wildlife and marine resources.

Since World War I, this has been a problem that has engaged the efforts of maritime nations from time to time. All previous such efforts have failed, for various reasons. The present convention was negotiated at London in 1954 but not signed by the United States for lack of consensus among the interested Government agencies and industry groups. In fact a technical working group at that time recommended against acceptance of the convention for various reasons, the principal of which were: First, the prospect of strengthening the convention at another conference scheduled 3 years hence; and second, the fear that adherence then might result in a weakening of the U.S. industry's effective voluntary controls over pollution.

The prospective conference, however, never materialized. In 1958 the convention entered into force for most of the maritime nations of Europe and in 1959 the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization—IMCO—assumed responsibilities under the convention and also certain functions from the United Nations. In the light of these more recent developments, the executive branch undertook to review the convention. The result of this review is the present recommendation that the United States accept the convention, subject to certain conditions.

The 21 articles of the convention are summarized on pages 2–4 of the committee report. In brief terms, the convention seeks to alleviate the pollution problem by prohibiting the discharge of oil and oily wastes, as defined by the convention, in areas close to land. In general, the prohibited zone extends 50 miles from shore. In certain badly polluted areas it ranges as high as 100 miles for ships. For tankers, the prohibited zones are necessarily somewhat larger. To insure compliance with this prohibition, the convention requires ships to carry oil-record books which are open to inspection by all convention parties. On these books are to be entered all actions that might result in a discharge of oil or oily matters. Again, for tankers the requirements are more stringent. Violators of the convention will be tried in the courts of the country of the ship's registry.

Madam President, I believe of the matters discussed by the committee and set forth on pages 4–7 of the report, only two need to be mentioned here. The committee took great pains that the record be entirely clear on the supremacy of U.S. laws in U.S. territorial waters. The convention itself is quite specific on this point, but lest there be any doubt, the State Department's proposed understanding states that "article XI effectively reserves to the parties to the convention freedom of legislative action in territorial waters, including the application of existing laws, anything in the convention which may appear to be contrary notwithstanding. Specifically, it is understood that offenses in the U.S. territorial waters will continue to be punishable under U.S. laws regardless of the ship's registry." The Department

of State, moreover, gave verbal assurances to the committee that there can be absolutely no doubt on this point.

The second matter that I wish to call to the attention of the Senate concerns the reference of disputes to the World Court.

The article in question reads:

> Any dispute between contracting governments relating to the interpretation or application of the present convention which cannot be settled by negotiation shall be referred at the request of either party to the International Court of Justice for decision unless the parties in dispute agree to submit it to arbitration.

Under this provision, disputes referred to the Court would not be subject to the so-called Connally reservation by which the United States reserves to itself the right to decide what is within its domestic jurisdiction and therefore not subject to the Court's jurisdiction. Here it is important to keep two things in mind. In the first place, the United Nations Charter, of which the Court's statute is an integral part, contains a general prohibition against intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. In the second place, it is difficult to conceive of any issue arising under this treaty that might involve the question of domestic jurisdiction. The convention applies to vessels far out at sea. It does not pertain to vessels in U.S. territorial waters, nor to oil or oily wastes produced from fields or drilling operations, as was made clear at the committee's hearings. The committee accepted the Department of State's view that a reservation, such as the Connally reservation was entirely unnecessary in this case.

Madam President, the committee endorsed this convention as a necessary first step toward the prevention of oil pollution of the high seas. Neither the State Department, nor the industry, nor the committee pretends that this treaty is perfect. However, the understanding, reservations, and recommendations attached as a condition to our ratification will bring the treaty more in line with accepted U.S. standards and practices. Moreover, with the machinery of IMCO now functioning, and a review conference scheduled for 1962 to consider strengthening amendments to the treaty, it is in the national interest to accept the convention. As long as we remain outside of the convention, we have little or no opportunity to improve it. An industry spokesman has assured the committee that its acceptance will not result in the lowering of high "good housekeeping" standards now employed voluntarily by the industry.

Under these circumstances, I urge the Senate to advise and consent to ratification subject to the conditions set forth on page 4 of the committee's report.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, inasmuch as the United States has been one of the principal sufferers from the dumping of oil on the high seas, it seems to be very much in our interest to approve the convention. The Senator from Alabama has very ably presented the reasons why we should be concerned with the convention and why we should approve it. I simply wish to associate myself with his remarks and to urge that the convention be approved subject to understandings and reservations as set forth in the resolution of ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the convention will be considered as having passed through its parliamentary stages up to and including the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, in the English and French languages, which was signed at London on May 12, 1954, in behalf of certain states, but not the United States of America, subject to the following understanding and reservations and with the following recommendation:

The acceptance by the United States of America of the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, is subject to the following understanding:

In accepting the convention the United States declares that it does so subject to the understanding that article XI effectively reserves to the parties to the convention freedom of legislative action in territorial waters, including the application of existing laws, anything in the convention which may appear to be contrary notwithstanding. Specifically, it is understood that offenses in U.S. territorial waters will continue to be punishable under U.S laws regardless of the ship's registry;

The acceptance by the United States of America of the said convention is subject to the following reservations:

1. The United States accepts article VIII of the convention, subject to the reservation that, while it will urge port authorities, oil terminals, or private contractors to provide adequate disposal facilities, the United States shall not be obliged to construct, operate, or maintain shore facilities at places on U.S. coasts or waters where such facilities may be deemed inadequate, or to assume any financial obligation to assist in such activities;

2. The United States accepts the convention subject to the reservation that amendments communicated to contracting governments under the provisions of paragraph (2) of article XVI will become binding upon the United States of America only after notification of acceptance thereof has been given by the United States.

The United States of America, in accepting the convention subject to the aforesaid understanding and reservations, recommends that the parties give consideration to the formulation of amendments to the convention at the earliest practicable date to bring about—

(1) International uniformity in fines and penalties;

(2) International uniformity of enforcement;

(3) A more realistic definition of what shall constitute oil pollution;

(4) The right of access of each contracting government to the official reports of other contracting governments filed with the bureau which relate to its own vessels; and

(5) A more flexible arrangement for fixing the time within which contracting governments shall notify the bureau whether or not they accept an amendment.

Attest.

———— ————,
Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I believe it is the understanding that the vote on that question will be deferred until tomorrow. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask, then, that the further consideration of the convention be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive I.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the further consideration of Executive C will be temporarily laid aside.

MODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LOAD LINE CONVENTION

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the proposal (Ex. I, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on May 31, 1949, for modification of article 3(e) of the International Load Line Convention signed at London on July 5, 1930, which was read the second time, as follows:

> (e) A "new ship" is a ship, the keel of which is laid on or after the 1st July, 1932, all other ships being regarded as existing ships; except that where the Convention has been modified as provided in Article 20(1), the term "new ship" shall, so far as the modification is concerned, be taken to mean a ship the keel of which is laid on or after the date of the coming into force of the modification, all other ships being regarded, so far as the modification is concerned, as existing ships.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, since 1933 the United States has been a party to the International Load Line Convention. The basic purpose of this convention is to limit the extent to which ships engaged in international commerce may be loaded. Such vessels are marked with so-called load lines, which, taking into account the season and the area where the ship will be operated, indicate the point beyond which the vessel may not safely be submerged.

Some 64 countries are now parties to this convention.

The treaty now before the Senate makes a slight technical change in the provisions of article 3 of the convention. The convention itself distinguishes between ships existing at the time the convention came into effect and ships whose keels were laid thereafter. The amendment now under consideration clarifies the definition of the term "new ship." The effect of the amendment is that modifications in ship design agreed to under the convention are not to take effect retroactively but would apply only to new ships.

The committee has received no objections from the industry to the adoption of this amendment and on May 9, after a brief hearing, without objection ordered the convention favorably reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the proposal will be considered as having passed through its parliamentary stages up to and including the resolution of ratification, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to acceptance by the United States of America of a proposal made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on May 31, 1949, for modification of article 3(e) of the International Load Line Convention signed at London on July 5, 1930.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, as in the case of Executive C, it is agreed that the vote shall not be taken on this proposal today, but that it will be deferred until tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that Executive I be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Executive H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Executive I will be temporarily laid aside.

TREATY OF EXTRADITION WITH BRAZIL

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty of extradition between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil (Exec. H, 87th Cong., 1st sess.), signed at Rio de Janeiro on January 13, 1961, which was read the second time, as follows:

TREATY OF EXTRADITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED STATES OF BRAZIL

The United States of America and the United States of Brazil, desiring to make more effective the cooperation of their respective countries in the repression of crime, have resolved to conclude a treaty of extradition and for this purpose have appointed the following Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America: His Excellency John Moors Cabot, Ambassador of the United States of America to Brazil, and

The President of the United States of Brazil: His Excellency Horacio Lafer, Minister of State for External Relations,

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found to be in good and due form, agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Each Contracting State agrees, under the conditions established by the present Treaty and each in accordance with the legal formalities in force in its own country, to deliver up, reciprocally, persons found in its territory who have been charged with or convicted of any of the crimes or offenses specified in Article II of the present Treaty and committed within the territorial jurisdiction of the other, or outside thereof under the conditions specified in Article IV of the present Treaty; provided that such surrender shall take place only upon such evidence of criminality as, according to the laws of the place where the fugitive or person so charged shall be found, would justify his commitment for trial if the crime or offense had been there committed.

ARTICLE II

Persons shall be delivered up according to the provisions of the present Treaty for prosecution when they have been charged with, or to undergo sentence when they have been convicted of, any of the following crimes or offenses:

1. Murder (including crimes designated as parricide, poisoning, and infanticide, when provided for as separate crimes); manslaughter when voluntary.

2. Rape; abortion; carnal knowledge of (or violation of) a girl under the age specified by law in such cases in both the requesting and requested States.

3. Malicious wounding; willful assault resulting in grievous bodily harm.

4. Abduction, detention, deprivation of liberty, on enslavement of women or girls for immoral purposes.

5. Kidnapping or abduction of minors or adults for the purpose of extorting money from them or their families or any other person or persons, or for any other unlawful end.

6. Bigamy.

7. Arson.

8. The malicious and unlawful damaging of railways, trains, vessels, aircraft, bridges, vehicles and other means of travel or of public or private buildings, or other structures, when the act committed shall endanger human life.

9. Piracy, by the law of nations; mutiny on board a vessel or an aircraft for the purpose of rebelling against the authority of the Captain or Commander of such vessel or aircraft; or by fraud or violence taking possession of such vessel or aircraft.

10. Burglary, defined to be the breaking into or entering either in day or night time, a house, office, or other building of a Government, corporation, or private person, with intent to commit a felony therein; housebreaking.

11. Robbery.

12. Forgery or the utterance of forged papers.

13. The forgery, falsification, theft or destruction of the official acts or public records of the government or public authority, including Courts of Justice, or the uttering or fraudulent use of the same.

14. The fabrication or the uterance, circulation or fraudulent use of any of the following objects: counterfeit money, whether coin or paper; counterfeit titles or coupons of public debt, created by national, state, provincial, territorial, local, or municipal governments; counterfeit bank notes or other instruments of public credit; and counterfeit seals, stamps, dies, and marks of State or public administration.

15. The introduction of instruments for the fabrication of counterfeit coins or bank notes or other paper currency as money.

16. Embezzlement by any person or persons hired, salaried or employed, to the detriment of their employers or principals.

17. Larceny.

18. Obtaining money, valuable securities or other property by false pretenses, or by threats of injury.

19. Receiving any money, valuable securities or other property knowing the same to have been unlawfully obtained.

20. Fraud or breach of trust by a bailee, banker, factor, trustee, executor, administrator, guardian, director or officer of any company or corporation or by anyone in any fiduciary capacity.

21. Willful non-support or willful abandonment of a minor or other dependent person when death or serious bodily injury results therefrom.

22. Perjury (including willfully false expert testimony); subornation of perjury.

23. Soliciting, receiving, or offering bribes.

24. The following offenses when committed by public officials: extortion; embezzlement.

25. Crimes or offenses against the bankruptcy laws.

26. Crimes or offenses against the laws of both countries for the suppression of slavery and slave trading.

27. Crimes or offenses against the laws relating to the traffic in, use of, or production or manufacture of, narcotic drugs or cannabis.

28. Crimes or offenses against the laws relating to the illicit manufacture of or traffic in substances injurious to health, or poisonous chemicals.

29. Smuggling, defined to be the act of willfully and knowingly violating the customs laws with intent to defraud the revenue by international traffic in merchandise subject to duty.

30. Aiding the escape of a prisoner by force of arms.

31. Use of explosives so as to endanger human life or property.

32. Procuration, defined as the procuring or transporting of a woman or girl under age, even with her consent, for immoral purposes, or of a woman or girl over age, by fraud, threats, or compulsion, for such purposes with a view in either case to gratifying the passions of another person; profiting from the prostitution of another.

33. The attempt to commit any of the above crimes or offenses, when such attempt is made a separate offense by the laws of the Contracting States.

34. Participation in any of the above crimes or offenses.

ARTICLE III

Except as otherwise provided in the present Treaty, the requested State shall extradite a person accused or convicted of any crime or offense enumerated in Article II only when both of the following conditions exist:

1. The law of the requesting State, in force when the crime or offense was committed, provides a possible penalty of deprivation of liberty for a period of more than one year; and

2. The law in force in the requested State generally provides a possible penalty of deprivation of liberty for a period of more than one year which would be applicable if the crime or offense were committed in the territory of the requested State.

ARTICLE IV

When the crime or offense has been committed outside the territorial jurisdiction of the requesting State, the request for extradition need not be honored unless the laws of the requesting State and those of the requested State authorize punishment of such crime or offense in this circumstance.

The words "territorial jurisdiction" as used in this Article and in Article I of the present Treaty mean: territory, including territorial waters, and the airspace thereover, belonging to or under the control of one of the Contracting States; and vessels and aircraft belonging to one of the Contracting States or to a citizen or corporation thereof when such vessel is on the high seas or such aircraft is over the high seas.

ARTICLE V

Extradition shall not be granted in any of the following circumstances:

1. When the requested State is competent, according to its laws, to prosecute the person whose surrender is sought for the crime or offense for which that person's extradition is requested and the requested State intends to exercise its jurisdiction.

2. When the person whose surrender is sought has already been or is at the time of the request being prosecuted in the requested State for the crime or offense for which his extradition is requested.

3. When the legal proceedings or the enforcement of the penalty for the crime or offense committed has become barred by limitation according to the laws of either the requesting State or the requested State.

4. When the person sought would have to appear, in the requesting State, before an extraordinary tribunal or court.

5. When the crime or offense for which the person's extradition is requested is purely military.

6. When the crime or offense for which the person's extradition is requested is of a political character. Nevertheless

a. The allegation by the person sought of political purpose or motive for the request for his extradition will not preclude that person's surrender if the crime or offense for which his extradition is requested is primarily an infraction of the ordinary penal law. In such case the delivery of the person being extradited will be dependent on an undertaking on the part of the requesting State that the political purpose or motive will not contribute toward making the penalty more severe.

b. Criminal acts which constitute clear manifestations of anarchism or envisage the overthrow of the bases of all political organizations will not be classed as political crimes or offenses.

c. The determination of the character of the crime or offense will fall exclusively to the authorities of the requested State.

ARTICLE VI

When the commission of the crime or offense for which the extradition of the person is sought is punishable by death under the laws of the requesting State and the laws of the requested State do not permit this punishment, the requested State shall not be obligated to grant the extradition unless the requesting State provides assurances satisfactory to the requested State that the death penalty will not be imposed on such person.

ARTICLE VII

There is no obligation upon the requested State to grant the extradition of a person who is a national of the requested State, but the executive authority of the requested State shall, subject to the appropriate laws of that State, have the power to surrender a national of that State if, in its discretion, it be deemed proper to do so.

ARTICLE VIII

The Contracting States may request, one from the other, through the channel of their respective diplomatic or consular agents, the provisional arrest of a fugitive as well as the seizure of articles relating to the crime or offense.

The request for provisional arrest shall be granted provided that the crime or offense for which the extradition of the fugitive is sought is one for which extradition shall be granted under the present Treaty and provided that the request contains:

1. A statement of the crime or offense of which the fugitive is accused or convicted;

2. A description of the person sought for the purpose of identification;

3. A statement of the probable whereabouts of the fugitive, if known; and

4. A declaration that there exist and will be forthcoming the relevant documents required by Article IX of the present Treaty.

If, within a maximum period of 60 days from the date of the provisional arrest of the fugitive in accordance with this Article, the requesting State does not present the formal request for his extradition, duly supported, the person detained will be set at liberty and a new request for his extradition will be accepted only when accompanied by the relevant documents required by Article IX of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE IX

The request for extradition shall be made through diplomatic channels or, exceptionally, in the absence of diplomatic agents, it may be made by a consular officer, and shall be supported by the following documents:

1. In the case of a person who has been convicted of the crime or offense for which his extradition is sought: a duly certified or authenticated copy of the final sentence of the competent court.

2. In the case of a person who is merely charged with the crime or offense for which his extradition is sought: a duly certified or authenticated copy of the warrant of arrest or other order of detention issued by the competent authorities of the requesting State, together with the depositions upon which such warrant or order may have been issued and such other evidence or proof as may be deemed competent in the case.

The documents specified in this Article must contain a precise statement of the criminal act of which the person sought is charged or convicted, the place and date of the commission of the criminal act, and they must be accompanied by an authenticated copy of the texts of the applicable laws of the requesting State including the laws relating to the limitation of the legal proceedings or the enforcement of the penalty for the crime or offense for which the extradition of the person is sought and data or records which will prove the identity of the person sought.

The documents in support of the request for extradition shall be accompanied by a duly certified translation thereof into the language of the requested State.

ARTICLE X

When the extradition of a person has been requested by more than one State, action thereon will be taken as follows:

1. If the requests deal with the same criminal act, preference will be given to the request of the State in whose territory the act was performed.

2. If the requests deal with different criminal acts, preference will be given to the request of the State in whose territory the most serious crime or offense, in the opinion of the requested State, has been committed.

3. If the requests deal with different criminal acts, but which the requested State regards as of equal gravity, the preference will be determined by the priority of the requests.

ARTICLE XI

The determination that extradition based upon the request therefor should or should not be granted shall be made in accordance with the domestic law of the requested State, and the person whose extradition is desired shall have the right to use such remedies and recourses as are authorized by such law.

ARTICLE XII

If at the time the appropriate authorities of the requested State shall consider the documents submitted by the requesting State, as required in Article IX of the present Treaty, in support of its request for the extradition of the person sought, it shall appear that such documents do not constitute evidence sufficient to warrant extradition under the provisions of the present Treaty of the person sought, such person shall be set at liberty unless the requested State or the proper tribunal thereof shall, in conformity with its own laws, order an extension of time for the submission by the requesting State of additional evidence.

ARTICLE XIII

Extradition having been granted, the surrendering State shall communicate promptly to the requesting State that the person to be extradited is held at its disposition.

If, within 60 days counting from such communication—except when rendered impossible by force majeure or by some act of the person being extradited or the surrender of the person is deferred pursuant to Articles XIV or XV of the present Treaty—such person has been delivered up and conveyed out of the jurisdiction of the requested State, the person shall be set at liberty.

ARTICLE XIV

When the person whose extradition is requested is being prosecuted or is serving a sentence in the requested State, the surrender of that person under the provisions of the present Treaty shall be deferred until the person is entitled to be set at liberty, on account of the crime or offense for which he is being prosecuted or is serving a sentence, for any of the following reasons: dismissal of the prosecution, acquittal, expiration of the term of the sentence or the term to which such sentence may have been commuted, pardon, parole, or amnesty.

ARTICLE XV

When, in the opinion of competent medical authority, duly sworn to, the person whose extradition is requested cannot be transported from the requested State to the requesting State without serious danger to his life due to his grave illness, the surrender of the person under the provisions of the present Treaty shall be deferred until such time as the danger, in the opinion of the competent medical authority, has been sufficiently mitigated.

ARTICLE XVI

The requesting State may send to the requested State one or more duly authorized agents, either to aid in the identification of the person sought or to receive his surrender and to convey him out of the territory of the requested State.

Such agents, when in the territory of the requested State, shall be subject to the applicable laws of the requested State, but the expenses which they incur shall be for the account of the State which has sent them.

ARTICLE XVII

Expenses related to the transportation of the person extradited shall be paid by the requesting State. The appropriate legal officers of the country in which the extradition proceedings take place shall, by all legal means within their power, assist the officers of the requesting State before the respective judges and magistrates. No pecuniary claim, arising out of the arrest, detention, examination and surrender of fugitives under the terms of the present Treaty, shall be made by the requested State against the requesting State other than as specified in the second paragraph of this Article and other than for the lodging, maintenance, and board of the person being extradited prior to his surrender.

The legal officers, other officers of the requested State, and court stenographers in the requested State who shall, in the usual course of their duty, give assistance and who receive no salary or compensation other than specific fees for services performed, shall be entitled to receive from the requesting State the usual payment for such acts or services performed by them in the same manner and to the same amount as though such acts or services had been performed in ordinary criminal proceedings under the laws of the country of which they are officers.

ARTICLE XVIII

A person who, after surrender by either of the Contracting States to the other under the terms of the present Treaty, succeeds in escaping from the requesting State and takes refuge in the territory of the State which has surrendered him, or passes through it in transit will be detained, upon simple diplomatic request, and surrendered anew, without other formalities, to the State to which his extradition was granted.

ARTICLE XIX

Transit through the territory of one of the Contracting States of a person in the custody of an agent of the other Contracting State, and surrendered to the latter by a third State, and who is not of the nationality of the country of transit, shall, subject to the provisions of the second paragraph of this Article, be permitted, independently of any judicial formalities, when requested through diplomatic channels and accompanied by the presentation in original or in authenticated copy of the document by which the State of

refuge has granted the extradition. In the United States of America, the authority of the Secretary of State of the United States of America shall be first obtained.

The permission provided for in this Article may nevertheless be refused if the criminal act which has given rise to the extradition does not constitute a crime or offense enumerated in Article II of the present Treaty, or when grave reasons of public order are opposed to the transit.

ARTICLE XX

Subject to the rights of third parties, which shall be duly respected:

1. All articles, valuables, or documents which relate to the crime or offense and, at the time of arrest, have been found in the possession of the person sought or otherwise found in the requested State shall be surrendered, with him, to the requesting State.

2. The articles and valuables which may be found in the possession of third parties and which likewise are related to the crime or offense shall also be seized, but may be surrendered only after the rights with regard thereto asserted by such third parties have been determined.

ARTICLE XXI

A person extradited by virtue of the present Treaty may not be tried or punished by the requesting State for any crime or offense committed prior to the request for his extradition, other than that which gave rise to the request, nor may he be re-extradited by the requesting State to a third country which claims him, unless the surrendering State so agrees or unless the person extradited, having been set at liberty within the requesting State, remains voluntarily in the requesting State for more than 30 days from the date on which he was released. Upon such release, he shall be informed of the consequences to which his stay in the territory of the requesting State would subject him.

ARTICLE XXII

The present Treaty shall be ratified and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged at Washington, as soon as possible.

The present Treaty shall enter into force one month after the date of exchange of ratifications. It may be terminated at any time by either Contracting State giving notice of termination to the other Contracting State, and the termination shall be effective six months after the date of such notice.

In Witness Whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed hereunto their seals.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Portuguese languages, both equally authentic, at Rio de Janeiro, this thirteenth day of January, one thousand nine hundred sixty-one.

JOHN M. CABOT.
HORACIO LAFER.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, Executive H was reported only today. However, final action on the treaty will not be taken until tomorrow. I should like to make a statement concerning it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, although the formal report of the committee was filed only today, I hope in view of the routine nature of this extradition treaty that the Senate may be able to vote on it tomorrow. So that Senators who review the RECORD may have notice of the general nature of this convention, I will make a brief statement regarding it at this time.

As Senators may have noted, a number of United States citizens have in recent years fled to Brazil in order to escape prosecution for crimes in the United States. Although the United States has treaties of extradition with some 65 foreign countries, it does not have such a treaty with Brazil. The principal reason we have not been able to negotiate such a treaty has resulted from the fact that under Brazilian law, capital punishment has been absolutely prohibited. For that reason, Brazil has been reluctant to conclude a treaty with the United States, which in some jurisdictions permits capital punishment.

This difficulty in the negotiation of the convention has been overcome by the provision in article 6 that neither country is bound to extradite an individual charged with crime if the death penalty might be imposed.

Article 2 lists the crimes for which extradition may be sought, and this list of crimes is similar to those included in other extradition treaties.

It will be noted that political offenses are not subject to extradition proceedings. Article 5 describes specific circumstances when extradition is not to be granted.

Brazil is the only country in the hemisphere with which the United States does not have an extradition treaty. Since it is reasonable to believe that various crimes have been planned with the thought that Brazil might be a refuge, the committee, without objection, ordered the convention favorably reported to the Senate on May 9. No objections from any source have been received. I hope the Senate will be able to approve this treaty when it convenes tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does that conclude the discussion and debate on the three treaties?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It concludes my remarks on two of them. I have made a short statement concerning the third one, Executive H. It seems to me that perhaps the further consideration of the treaty may be left open, so that if any Senator desires to discuss it tomorrow, he may do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that all three treaties were reported unanimously.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request: That at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow, and after the unopposed items on the calendar have been disposed of, the Senate proceed to a vote on the three treaties which have been discussed in the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly have no objection to that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the intention of the acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations or some other member of the committee to request at that time the yeas and nays on each of the three treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection the proposed unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I serve notice that a request for the yeas and nays will be made on each of the three treaties tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the proposed unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO RESTORE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS OF THE STATES TO THE RESPECTIVE STATES AND TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. STENNIS. Madam President, on January 13 last, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] introduced a proposed constitutional amendment which would restore the public school systems of the States to the respective States and to the people. The proposed constitutional amendment reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, every State shall have exclusive control of its public schools, public educational institutions, and public educational systems, whether operated by the State or by political or other subdivisions of the State or by instrumentalities or agencies of the State. Nothing contained in this article shall be construed to authorize any State to deny to any pupil because of race, color, national origin, or religious belief the right to attend schools equal in respect to the quality and ability of the teachers, curriculum, and physical facilities to those attended by other pupils attending schools in the same school system."

Madam President, I am a cosponsor of this proposal, as I have been in the past. I shall speak in support of it now.

In urging the adoption of this amendment, I am making no attack on the Federal courts. Neither is it my major purpose today to make an effort to oppose Federal aid to education.

My plea today is for a public school system of a type that will best serve and effectively serve all of our citizens.

Senate Joint Resolution 30, the Talmadge proposed constitutional amendment, gives express constitutional language to what had always been, prior to 1954, constitutional principles and Supreme Court law.

I make no legalistic argument. My appeal is to the commonsense of this body and to the commonsense of the rank and file of the people of this Nation.

In large areas of the Nation, we cannot have an effective and efficient school system that serves all of the children unless relief is given from the present demands of the Federal courts that the schools be integrated by force. I propose that we meet this situation in a practical way, and through a method provided by the Constitution itself—an amendment to the Constitution.

I know this question of school integration has become an emotional issue. I

know it is steeped in national politics and also in international politics. It is difficult, indeed, to get the problem considered apart from these side issues.

There is now great agitation for Federal aid to our educational program. I do not attack the motives of those who propose it. Recently, Secretary Ribicoff, an able proponent of the Federal-aid-to-education bill, while defending the bill against a proposed rider calling for integrated schools, said:

> I think it is a tragedy to put on the back of education the problems of everything, including the problems of civil rights. We should not block education with side issues.

I do not suggest that Secretary Ribicoff was advocating segregated schools. I assume that he was not. However, his remarks cogently point out, in effect, that the Federal aid bill should not carry the load of the issue of integrated schools.

Madam President, I say with equal emphasis that in large areas of the Nation the public school system should not and cannot carry the burden of enforced school integration.

Let us look at the facts.

Madam President, a school is not a machine; it represents the spirit and the cooperation of a community. It must have the support of the people—of the parents and of the entire community effort.

Although the States are charged with responsibility for maintaining the public schools the local units of government have largely assumed this burden, from the early days of our Nation. The local people have repeatedly voted local taxes on themselves and their property, to build and maintain school buildings. A large part of the entire cost of operations was originally paid from funds which the people themselves paid, through self-imposed taxes. Madam President, in many cases, taxes of this type were, and still are, very, very burdensome. Often they were imposed on a very narrow tax base.

In fact, the story of the development and functions of the local public school is one of the classic sagas of American history.

The governing officials of the schools have been elected by the people at the local level.

As the financial load grew greater, the States have carried more and more of the money load, and also have prescribed requirements both for teacher qualifications and for the curriculums. But the school has remained the pride and the property of the local unit. From this fact has come much of the strength of the public schools.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the able Senator from Mississippi yield at this point?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia, who is the author of this amendment, and has done very fine work on it over the period of years since he has been a Member of this body.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, the able Senator from Mississippi is a cosponsor along with several other Members of this body of this proposed constitutional amendment.

I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the cogent point he is making—namely, that the States created our public school system; that the public schools are operated by local officials elected by the people; and that the public schools are financed by the local people. In the entire scheme of American history, there is nothing—unless it be a church—that is as local as is the public school system.

Madam President, will the able Senator from Mississippi yield further to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I desire to make a few remarks, and then to request that certain material be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, during the course of my remarks upon the introduction of my proposed constitutional amendment on this subject, I referred to the fact that Congress, in voting in 1958 to admit Alaska as the 49th State, gave that State exclusive and perpetual control over its public schools and colleges.

The fact that such a grant of authority was made occasioned expressions of great surprise on the part of many Americans—including the then President of the United States, who was quoted by the New York Times as stating at his news conference:

> It was a matter that I have not even heard about.

A subsequent check of the admission acts of all other States, made at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, disclosed that 10 other States likewise were granted "exclusive control" over their educational institutions, upon the granting of statehood to them.

Such grants of authority were made to the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, in 1889; to the States of Idaho and Wyoming, in 1890; to the State of Utah, in 1894; to the State of Oklahoma, in 1906; and to the States of New Mexico and Arizona, in 1912.

In each case, Madam President, the term "exclusive control" was used; and, with the one exception of Oklahoma, each such delegation of power was made "forever." In the case of Oklahoma, there was written into the law a further proviso assuring that the act would "not be construed to prevent the establishment and maintenance of separate schools for white and colored children."

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the able Senator from Mississippi, the remainder of my remarks, which are based primarily on research work done by the Library of Congress, and contain verbatim quotations from the acts of Congress admitting the respective States to the Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, I thank the able Senator from Mississippi for yielding to me. I commend him for the ever-diligent fight he has waged, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, to preserve the Constitution of the United States and its principles under which this Nation has become the greatest and freest on the face of the earth.

And if the people of America lose the right to maintain control of the public schools on the State and local level, it will be the greatest entering wedge for an eventual dictatorship that our Government has ever seen.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia very much for his fine contribution to the presentation of this highly important matter. As always, he is well prepared. I think the reference the Senator has given, including the pledges made to the States on their admission, is another conclusive fact relating to the legal situation that has existed in this Nation all these years, and which was, as I have said before, settled law, both under the Constitution and under Supreme Court interpretation, until the year 1954, when the opinion in the noted school integration case was rendered.

As I recall, the Senator pointed out that the State of Alaska was one of the States that had this provision in its Constitution.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct. Since that time we have admitted Hawaii with substantially the same provision.

Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. While the Senator is on that particular point, may I state that the two last States were admitted after this amendment to the Constitution by the Supreme Court in 1954.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield further.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator, being the able lawyer and scholar that he is, I am sure is aware of the fact that the very same Congress which submitted the 14th amendment for ratification by the respective States created a segregated school system here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STENNIS. I recall that fact.

Mr. TALMADGE. Furthermore, it was the intent of the Congress that the administration of the public schools is something that should be left to the States and local government.

Mr. STENNIS. There is no doubt about it. I thank the Senator again.

I recite further the hard, commonsense facts of life with reference to the public school system.

The local public school in the South has been, and still is, and I hope will continue to be for a long time to come, the major social activity of the community, village, town, or city of its location. That is true throughout most of the length and breadth of this great land. I relate that reference to the

South first because in that section are conditions of which I have absolute, positive, local knowledge.

The local church has its place and makes its contribution, but it is primarily the local public school that serves as principal focal point of activity for the social life of the community. This is true for the children and for many of the adults.

Almost every school has its local PTA organization with its meetings, its parties, its luncheons, its dinners, its dances for both young and old almost the year around. The various school athletic events include interschool rivalry in football, basketball, baseball, tennis, swimming, and other events as weekly affairs with large attendances. The school and many different classes of the school have parties, dances, recitals, class plays, class days, and other social functions during the entire scholastic period, as well as many during the vacation months.

Thus, almost the entire social life of the school area centers around the public school.

The foregoing facts being true, it is clear that it is impossible to separate the educational functions of the public school from the social life of the community or area that the school serves. They go together.

Almost 7 years have passed since the Supreme Court rendered its celebrated school decision that launched the Court's social-educational experiment.

There have been much further litigation and many court battles since that time. Racial bitterness and enmity and strained relations have been aroused where friendliness and cooperation existed before. Military troops and bayonets have been used, and threats and coercion have been applied in many ways. Federal power has been arrayed against State power. Federal courts have been arrayed against State legislatures.

Even with all this effort, confusion, and aroused bitterness, according to a reliable survey made in 11 Southern States in December 1960 by the New York Times, less than 2 percent of the Negro children are attending school classes with whites.

The city of New Orleans underwent weeks and months of racial strife and bitterness heretofore unknown in that fine city. Business there has been seriously hampered and curtailed. The public schools in the city of Atlanta are scheduled for desegregation this fall. According to responsible newspaper reports, business has fallen off in Atlanta due to the sit-in demonstrations, which could be a forerunner of a pattern of more extreme strife this fall. This strife and unrest and litigation and enmity have actually extended to relations between the sharecroppers and the landlords on farms in the South where zealous courts undertake to deny the landowner a choice in selecting the person to work his land.

Recently, the Attorney General of the United States, in my opinion without legal authority, filed a suit in Federal court against the State of Virginia seeking to enjoin the State of Virginia from spending any money raised by State taxes in any county for school purposes solely because one county has failed to meet Federal demands for integrated schools.

This continuing strife and confusion is dwarfing the lives of the young generations of both white and colored youth in vast areas of our Nation.

The great teaching profession, which is second only to the ministry, is in the high state of uncertainty and a low state of morale due to the future question as to continued strife, in which proper educational methods cannot function.

The opposition has been hard and unyielding. Most of the schools affected have been in a state of turmoil and confusion, and much of this continues. This will not change, because the experiment is an invasion of the social life of the people in these areas.

However, history shows that there is nothing new in this pattern of conduct. Whenever any governing authority has tried to establish patterns of social conduct over the people contrary to their strong desires, the effort has always failed. This is true in the spiritual as well as secular history. The Jews and Arabs, for instance, have lived side by side since prior to Biblical times until now. Chapter after chapter and book after book of the Bible relate the differences, the strife, and the bitterness that existed between these people, each of which has great virtues and has contributed much to civilization, past and present. Until now, though, they have never been successful in finding the formula for a social life together, as witness the refugee camps throughout much of the Middle East today.

I remember that in 1928 ex-President Herbert Hoover called the 18th amendment "a noble experiment." The people had actually voted the 18th amendment on themselves by the direct approval of 36 or more State legislatures. The experiment, though noble, was not practical and it did not work. It led to lawlessness, strife, bootleg wars, and crime wars. The people, including the "drys" using their commonsense, repealed the amendment.

With the same commonsense, we should submit this amendment to the people for ratification.

If adopted, it would pave the way for legislation at the State level in accordance with its powers, and each State could and would enact laws providing for a modern educational program in keeping with the needs and desires of the great majority of the people of that State.

In this way, the educational programs in the most affected areas would promptly take a new start and have renewed vigor and wholesome support.

The alternative is to have the education of our youth bogged down in civil strife and bitterness to the great detriment of all who are directly involved, and to the hurt of the Nation.

Perhaps with this solution to the school integration threat realized, other less serious racial issues could also be resolved.

This school question can well plague the political life of this Nation for generations unless some remedy is obtained.

What is offered by the proponents of this social-educational experiment except more strife, dissension, bitterness, and uncertainty?

The proponents of this amendment offer a sane, logical, and constitutional course to follow through the proposed constitutional amendment. This is the orderly way to proceed. This is the constitutional way to proceed.

In the Federal aid to education bill which will be considered by the Senate within the next few days, the administration has assured us on the one hand that there is to be no effort of the Federal Government to interfere in our schools. This assurance is contained in the bill itself in section 103, which reads as follows:

> SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Further, we are given assurances that the Powell amendment will not be offered to the bill, seeking to deny Federal funds to those schools which have not integrated their classrooms. On the other hand, the Department of Justice has recently filed a proceeding in a Federal Court against the State of Virginia, seeking to enjoin the State of Virginia from spending any money raised by State taxes in any county where the schools have not been integrated. Is this a case of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing?

Certainly, if the pattern is to enforce integration through the denial of State funds, it is certain there will be an attempt to enforce integration through the denial of Federal funds.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does it not strike the Senator as being somewhat ludicrous that the Government would tell us, on the one hand, it is not going to interfere in regard to expenditure of Federal funds, while at the same time the same Government goes into the Federal courts to insist that State funds and local funds be spent in accordance with its own peculiar notions?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. With all deference, it is a ridiculous position on its face. At a time when the bill is about to be considered, as the Senator from Mississippi understands, since the bill will be presented for debate in this Chamber tomorrow, the bill has a provision that there shall be no kind of direction, supervision, control, or determination of any kind with reference to any school in any State, yet another branch of the Government, the Department of Justice, is suing the State of Virginia not in regard to Federal money but in regard to money of the State of Virginia, raised from taxes imposed on the people of Virginia by the State legislature. The Federal Government seeks to enjoin the State from

spending money throughout the entire State for all public schools until compliance with enforced integration is had in one county.

Mr. TALMADGE. Would not a good analogy be that I could tell the Senator from Mississippi, "I am going to give you $1,000. You can spend the $1,000 in any way you see fit. There are absolutely no strings whatever attached to it. However, I shall insist on directing the expenditure of the funds that you now have."

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Georgia is correct. The last part of the statement, the reference to funds which belong to me and are in my own pocket, emphasizes expenditures in regard to which the Federal Government has no interest or concern.

Madam President, I think this is the most glaring case we have observed in a long time of traveling two ways at once, and of contradiction, in regard to policies on a serious subject.

Madam President, as a show of good faith and as a guarantee of their profession that no Federal control is intended, now or hereafter, these proponents should join us now in pushing for early adoption of this proposed amendment. Thus, with this constitutional amendment in effect—preserving local control—we can keep educational processes on a sound basis of administration.

If the Congress then should decide that education in the States should be given Federal aid, then such assistance could be supplied with assurance to all that local control would be preserved.

The future of liberty in the United States is in no small measure dependent upon the best fundamental education possible under this system of local control.

Now that the door to Federal control has been opened by the courts, other controls in other fields of school administration will surely follow. This is not a southern problem. It is a national problem. I hope that our friends in other sections of the country will recognize the problems we in the South now face as a symptom of a disease which might someday engulf their own schools also.

More and more, we shall be urged to accept offers of Federal aid and, in some measure, Federal control. Federal aid in this field inevitably will be followed by an increased degree of Federal control.

These schemes will be offered not only as the desirable, but, indeed as the only, solution to local school problems.

Through acceptance of these programs, extended under the guise of aid and "raising standards" and "achieving national goals" in education, the balance of power in the control of local school systems is certain to shift from the local school board to some Washington bureau.

The selection of textbooks, testing of students, determination of school curriculums and schedule, and even the licensing of local teachers will become vested in Washington.

Unless and until this amendment, or some other effective measure, is passed assuring non-Federal control I cannot support a Federal aid to education bill.

UNDERSTANDING

The proponents of Federal aid to education offer promises of money. It is not money that we most need. We need understanding. We need appreciation of our conditions and the problems growing out of these conditions.

Even though the people of my State are not among those with the highest, or even the medium level, per capita income of the Nation, we have been making tremendous progress in our school system for all of our children, both white and Negro. This is entirely at our own expense. During a recent year, no other State paid as high a percent of its total tax income for educational purposes as did Mississippi. We continue to be near the top in this respect. We have trained Negro schoolteachers, more than any other State in the Union. They are paid the same salaries, on a qualification basis, as are the white teachers. I can personally testify that most all of these teachers, the children and the parents favor their present system of segregated schools and do not want to give them up. The school facilities, the lunchroom programs, the transportation systems are supplied to the Negro and white children on an equal basis. In many places, the facilities and services for the colored children exceed those for the whites.

As I said in the beginning, I do not present a legalistic argument. I present my argument as a commonsense, factual statement of the problem as it extends down to the ground level—to the homes, communities, the small towns, and the cities throughout great areas of this country.

No one is a stronger proponent of public school education than is the Senator from Mississippi. The question is not one of money. It is not a theory, but is a very practical, commonsense problem that we are up against. We must consider our educational system on the one hand and the social customs and habits that are engrained in the people over many decades, if not centuries. Today we are flirting with ideas and attempting to destroy or at least impair a sound, vigorous, and effective educational system. We are doing more harm than we could possibly do good, and are leaving areas of the country without an effective way of carrying on an educational program.

The question is not one of financial responsibility. We can carry the load in that way, but we cannot carry the load as it is now presented in an enforced integration pattern. Those who are supporting the bill for Federal aid to education have very high purposes. My plea to them is to join in passing the amendment submitted in order to put at rest the great strife, enmity, and bitterness that is being engendered and is increasing. Let us put it out of the way of our educational system.

As Secretary Ribicoff said, let not the educational problem which is burdening the Nation be encumbered by a side issue that may be connected with civil rights. I hope that there will be an aroused interest on this subject at a proper time.

I observe also that joining as cosponsors of the amendment are the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG].

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator on the very able and effective speech he has just delivered. I join with him in the hope that Members of Congress will join hands with us now in proposing legislation to carry out the express wishes of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that our schools be recognized as essentially State and local in nature and are to be operated accordingly on the State and local levels.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator again. I wish also to thank him, as one who is affected by the problem, for the very fine work he has done over a period of years in trying to get favorable consideration for and a very practical solution to the present problem.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR TALMADGE

In the statute enacted to enable the admission of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, the following language appeared: "The schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said States, respectively, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university" (Public Law 52, 50th Cong., 2d sess., ch. 180, sec. 14; 25 Stat. 676, 680 (1889)).

Similar language appears in similar context in the enabling act or act of admission for each State admitted to the Union since that time. The specific provisions concerning each of these States are as follows:

Idaho: "SEC. 8. The schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university" (51st Cong., 1st sess., ch. 656, sec. 8, 26 Stat. 215, 216 (1890)).

Wyoming: "SEC. 8. The schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college or university" (51st Cong., 1st sess., ch. 664, sec. 8, 26 Stat. 222, 223 (1890)).

Utah: "SEC. 11. The schools, colleges, and university provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes, or of the income thereof, shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university" (53d Cong., 2d sess., ch. 138, sec. 17, 28 Stat. 107, 110 (1894)).

Oklahoma: "SEC. 8. Such educational institutions shall remain under the exclusive control of said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands herein granted for educational purposes, or the income or rentals thereof, shall be used for the support of any religious or sectarian school, college, or university" (59th Cong., 1st sess., ch. 3335, sec. 8, 34 Stat. 267, 273 (1906)).

In this connection, it also is most interesting to note that section 3 of the same act admitting Oklahoma contains the following language:

"Fifth. That provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control; and said schools shall always be conducted in English: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall preclude the teaching of other languages in said public schools: *And provided further*, That this shall not be construed to prevent the establishment and maintenance of separate schools for white and colored children."

New Mexico: "SEC. 8. That the schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted herein for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university" (61st Cong., 2d sess., ch. 310, sec. 8, 36 Stat. 557, 563).

Arizona: "SEC. 26. That the schools, colleges, and universities provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the said State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted herein for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university" (61st Cong., 2d sess., ch. 310, sec. 26, 36 Stat. 573, 714).

Alaska: "SEC. 6(j). The schools and colleges provided for in this Act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State, or its governmental subdivisions, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted herein for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college or university" (July 7, 1958 (H.R. 7999), Public Law 85-508, 85th Cong., 2d sess., sec. 6(j)).

Furthermore, the Hawaii Admission Act contains the following language with reference to the schools of that State in section 5(f): "The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands granted under the preceding subsections shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college or university."

The principle of State and local control of public education is well established by both law and precedent.

Our Founding Fathers recognized that education is a local responsibility by leaving it as one of the areas retained for State and local control under the terms of the 9th and 10th amendments.

It is a principle which is supported both by the local nature of school financing and by the findings of responsible Federal study groups.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, after each national election, there has generally been a resurgence of interest in electoral reforms. More often than not, it has been short lived. As other programs and events become prominent, proposals for electoral reform have been displaced.

This is unfortunate; for there are plenty of areas in which reform is badly needed. First and foremost, although it is no easy matter, I believe the electoral college system should be abolished. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has introduced a constitutional amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, that would accomplish this important purpose.

Further action will soon be needed to clarify the role of the mass media in election campaigns.

Many people also feel that the timing of campaigns for President and Vice President should be altered. I recently introduced a bill (S. 1749) to provide for the holding of presidential elections on 2 days, which was introduced not as a final answer to the problem but as something which should be discussed and studied.

Another resolution I introduced, Senate Resolution 141, calls for the scheduling of nominating conventions for national office after Labor Day, instead of in July or August as is the present practice. In this same area, former President Eisenhower last year recommended that the inauguration be moved back to permit a new President sufficient time to develop his budget and programs before Congress convenes in January.

The Privileges and Elections Subcommittee of the Senate Rules Committee has just completed 2 days of hearings on campaign financing, particularly on legislation to amend the Corrupt Practices Act as it affects the reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures. The subcommittee is also considering legislation introduced by Senators MANSFIELD and NEUBERGER to provide some measure of financial assistance for Federal election campaigns.

The Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee plans comprehensive hearings on electoral reforms in the near future. These hearings will include testimony from former Presidents and prominent political scientists.

Among other electoral reforms which recently have been put forth are: according 4-year nonvoting seats in the Senate to the candidates receiving the second highest number of votes for President and Vice President, setting up a system of national primaries, and establishing a Hoover-type Commission on Electoral Revisions.

Contrary to past experience, there seems to be a genuine enthusiasm for electoral reforms following the 1960 election. This enthusiasm is extremely encouraging. It gives every evidence of continuing and of being translated into meaningful action both at the Federal and State levels.

Today, I want to discuss an electoral problem which I believe is of special significance. I refer to the increasing disenfranchisement of intelligent, active citizens who move from one area to another shortly prior to an election and are therefore unable to vote. During the last campaign, I received a great many letters from people in this predicament. I know, for example, that the Nixon headquarters received many times this amount.

As an example:

Mr. Candidate, I would like to vote for you. I know your record and I respect your views, but because I have moved across the street (or across the country) I am not eligible. I can't understand this. A national election should be open to everyone. Mobility is no indication that I or anyone else lacks the necessary discernment or convictions to vote intelligently. What can I do to obtain and guarantee my right to vote?

On Washington's Birthday of this year, I addressed the Senate briefly on the plight of the politically disposed. I included in my remarks at that time excerpts from an excellent study by Mr. Walter Kravitz, of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I later sent copies of that statement to the 50 State Governors.

I have received replies from more than 30 States. Most were quite informative and sympathetic. I intend to summarize the Governors' comments later in my remarks, but first I want to pose and comment upon the general problem.

Mr. President, the kindest word we can use to describe the current situation is chaos.

Three States, for example, require 2 years' residence within their boundaries before they will permit an elector to cast his ballot. In 35 States the requirement is 1 year; in 12 others it is 6 months.

Three States demand 1 year's residence in the county. Eight others require 6 months; 17 specify anywhere from 2 to 4 months; and 6 others ask 30 to 40 days.

Finally, one State actually requires 1 full year's residence in a precinct, and three others expect 6 months residence in an equivalent locality. Nine States demand from 2 to 4 months, while 23 require from 10 to 40 days.

The situation is not only chaotic. It is unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory, and dangerous.

It is unjust because it penalizes the mobile elements of our population.

It is unreasonable because of the great variation in these requirements and because a citizen may be stripped of his vote for a month, or 2 months, or even a year, if by merely moving across the street he also crosses a district or precinct line.

It is discriminatory because the weight of disfranchisement leans most heavily on urban voters.

It is dangerous because it may distort the outcome of a close election, because it alienates responsible segments of our citizenry, and—most frightening of all—because it encourages the fearful cancer of electoral apathy.

How many persons are affected by archaic State residence requirements? According to the American Heritage Foundation, some 8 million potential voters were barred from voting in the

1960 elections because of inability to meet State, county, or locality qualifications.

In other words, some 7½ percent of the total civilian population of voting age were disfranchised by these residence laws. Mr. President, the percentage margin of victory in dozens of elections last year was less than 7½ percent. I refer not only to the popular vote for the Presidency but also to a great many congressional races.

Who are these victims of this anachronism? The tragedy of the whole affair is that they include some of our most intelligent and informed citizens.

The American Heritage Foundation again reports that the disfranchised include many of our better educated and more responsible citizens—people with the initiative and character needed to pull up stakes and seek advancement in a new community. Many are educators, lawyers, clergymen; others are business executives.

A General Electric Co. spokesman reports that 6 percent of its executive personnel were disfranchised in 1960 because of being shifted from State to State.

Oil companies, chainstores, and large corporations frequently transfer engineers, managers, salesmen, and their executives. Each change of residence within a year usually disfranchises two votes and in some cases more.

Mr. President, it is no exaggeration to compare apathy in a democracy to cancer. Like that dread disease, apathy may so consume the body politic as to bring about its death.

We have some expert testimony on the relationship between residence disqualifications and political apathy. Consider how the States ranked in percentage of civilians of voting age who voted in the 1960 election. The eight States with the largest percentage turnout all have laws that encourage voting. The eight States with the smallest percentage turnout all raise formidable legal barriers to voting.

I do not for a moment deny the basic merit of the principles underlying the requirement of residency qualifications of some sort for voters. Fraud is deterred by such requirements. Furthermore, residence provides some assurance that the citizen has acquired a reasonable familiarity with local candidates and issues.

It is the severity and harshness of some of these requirements that trouble me. Is anything really gained by depriving a citizen of his suffrage because he lacks 2 years' State residence? Does that citizen really lose his competence to vote for State officers because he has moved within a State from one county to another less than 6 months before election day? Is movement from one precinct to another sufficient cause for the total loss of voting rights, even though the move may have occurred within 30 days of the election?

I question both the justice and the wisdom of such severity. Nevertheless, as far as State and local issues and State and local elections are concerned, the Congress does not have a direct role to play and the qualifications for voters can and should be left up to the State.

When we turn to national elections, and especially to the election of the President and Vice President, I fail to see the relevance of residence restrictions. State and local residence requirements have absolutely no bearing on the competence of any American citizen to cast a vote in a national election.

How are we to correct this injustice? The situation is admittedly a delicate one. As matters now stand, the Constitution clearly gives the responsibility for setting voters' qualifications to the States. It is something of a paradox that the question of who votes in a presidential and vice presidential election is determined at the State and local level.

A Governor of one of our States and two distinguished political scientists have indicated to me that the solution is to be found in congressional action. I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a copy of a letter from Gov. William L. Guy of North Dakota in which he suggests that Federal action is needed to effectively aid the 8 million politically disposed Americans.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Bismarck, N. Dak., March 2, 1961.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Thank you for your letter of February 23, requesting my remarks regarding the residency requirements for voting.

It would seem to me that the only way to obtain uniformity on voting in Federal elections is to have a Federal election law that would permit everyone to vote regardless of his local residence requirements. We have taken steps in North Dakota to attempt to reduce the residency requirements for voting in the national elections. The State legislature is still in session and we do not know how this bill will fare.

We feel that North Dakota's residency requirements are not too stringent, requiring residents in the State for 1 year, in the county for 90 days, and in the precinct for 30 days. Our proposed legislation would pertain to those who come into the State and do not meet the State voting requirements.

With kindest regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM L. GUY,
Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to include at this point a very forceful and perceptive letter expressing the same viewpoint from Prof. Rhoten A. Smith, professor of politics at the New York University School of Law.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF LAW,
New York, N.Y., April 26, 1961.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I appreciate very much your letter of March 27 requesting some amplification of my views concerning residency requirements. I am happy to respond to this request.

My reasons for believing that the method of constitutional amendment, however cumbersome, is the only sure cure for the problem, stem largely from the clear language of section 2, article II, of the Constitution: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors."

This seems to me clearly to give plenary power to the State legislatures over the selection of electors, which would include, since they are all now popularly elected, the power to set the qualifications for voting for such electors. This, in turn, includes any residency requirement.

Now it might be argued with considerable logic (in my judgment at least) that the 14th amendment could be so construed as to grant to Congress the right to set voting qualifications insofar as they relate to elections for presidential electors and Members of Congress. But, as is well known, since the time of the civil rights cases (109 U.S. 3 (1883)), the Supreme Court has fairly consistently held to the view that the 14th amendment does not constitute a positive grant of new powers to Congress to legislate in this area so much as it prevents the States from taking certain positive steps which abuse the privileges and immunities of citizens, deprive persons of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, or deny persons equal protection of the laws.

A citizen prevented by the residency requirements of a State from voting for presidential electors might, of course, bring suit under the 14th amendment claiming a denial of the equal protection of the laws. However, so far as I know, no one has brought such a suit, and the decisions in this area of political questions seems to me to offer little hope that the Supreme Court would be likely to find for the plaintiff in such a case.

It is in this context, then, that I should think the most certain approach to the problem lies in constitutional amendment.

My own preference would be for an amendment which approached the problem not only of the voter who loses his right to vote for presidential electors through moving, but also those who lose in this way their right to vote for Members of Congress. To mention a personal note: I was once disfranchised altogether and prevented from voting in a senatorial election in which I had personally worked actively for one of the candidates, because within 10 days of the election I had to move a few miles away and out of the precinct in which I had formerly lived. This must be a fairly common occurrence today.

Since you have invited me to do so, I will be bold enough to suggest one form such an amendment might take:

"The Congress shall have the power to set all requirements and qualifications for voting for electors for President and Vice President of the United States and for Members of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States. Nothing in this section shall be construed, however, to deprive the respective States of the power to provide other and different requirements for voting for officers of the State and of other jurisdictions within and subject to the State: *Provided*, That such other qualifications do not contravene any other provision of this Constitution."

Such language might be considered too broad; politically, such an amendment might encounter opposition from some who fear, for a variety of reasons, such broad control of the National Government over voting requirements for national officers. On the other hand, the problem of disfranchisement through residency requirements, it seems to me, is only part of a larger problem: the need for a right to vote in national elections which is under the jurisdiction of and enforceable by the National Government. This suggested amendment—or some version thereof—would, I think, meet that larger problem.

Under authority of such an amendment, were it adopted, one may hope the Congress would pass legislation setting U.S. citizenship as the sole criterion for voting for presidential electors (or, at the most, requiring in addition thereto, residence within the boundaries of the United States for some minimum period just prior to any presidential election). Qualifications for voting in elections to choose U.S. Senators would perhaps be confined to those who had been a resident of the State concerned for some minimum period, regardless of the period of their residency within any lesser subdivision. The residency requirement for voting for Members of the U.S. House of Representatives might include, in addition to residency with the State, a reasonable minimum period of residency within the congressional district in which one votes.

Let me say again that I appreciate your interest in my views. I hope the foregoing may be of some value to you in your search for a solution to this problem of increasing seriousness.

Sincerely yours,

RHOTEN A. SMITH,
Professor of Politics.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, presumably, Federal action would entail the passage of a constitutional amendment. I am reluctant to advocate such a course for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the practical difficulty of persuading a sufficient number of the States to ratify.

There have been certain small but encouraging trends to liberalize residency requirements in recent years. Some States have lowered their overall requirements. Others have eased the restrictions on intrastate movement.

Even more heartening are the reforms seven States have adopted to safeguard the vote in presidential elections of those who have moved from one State to another.

Connecticut and Vermont permit ex-residents to vote for President by absentee ballot within certain specified time periods. This is referred to as the Connecticut approach.

The Wisconsin approach adopted by Wisconsin, California, Missouri, Ohio, and Oregon waives all or part of the normal residence requirements for new residents who wish to vote for presidential and vice presidential electors.

Gov. Wesley Powell, of New Hampshire, recently called my attention to another encouraging development, the issuance of a memorandum on this subject by the staff of the national Governor's conference. I ask unanimous consent to include his letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,
Concord, N.H., March 13, 1961.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR KEN: I very much appreciate the letter which you addressed to me on February 23 and the enclosure from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You are probably aware of the paper which was prepared by the staff of the national Governors' conference at the request of the executive committee, of which I am a member.

It appears doubtful that we shall be able to get action on this subject at the current session of the legislature, but I do believe we shall succeed in having this issue referred to the legislative counsel for study in preparation for recommendations to be submitted to the legislature in 1963.

I personally agree that sound procedures should be worked out in order that duly qualified citizens shall not be denied the right to vote for President and Vice President of the United States.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

WESLEY POWELL,
Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I had known about an earlier recommendation of the Council of State Governments, made in 1955, for the adoption of a model law patterned after the Connecticut plan. The more recent report, dated January 1961, explores what the States can do on their own initiative to remedy existing inequities and to avert Federal interference in a field traditionally reserved to the jurisdiction of the States.

The study considers both the Wisconsin and Connecticut approaches, the breadth and gaps in their respective coverage, and the encouraging statistics of increased voter participation in the States which have adopted either of these two plans. Both approaches, the report points out, deal solely with presidential elections, but each solves only half the problem. Connecticut's absentee ballot system makes no provision for new residents; the Wisconsin plan takes care of new residents but ignores the plight of former residents. Very sensibly, the report suggests that the States adopt both methods.

Along this line, Gov. John Dempsey of Connecticut, whose State was the first to permit ex-residents to vote for President by absentee ballot, informs me that his secretary of state this year sponsored the introduction of additional legislation. The new bill follows the Wisconsin approach and would reduce the 1-year residence requirement to 60 days for voting in presidential elections. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Dempsey's letter be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Hartford, Conn., March 20, 1961.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: Thank you so much for your letter of February 23 and its enclosure, relating to residence requirements for voting in the several States, and the problem of the U.S. citizen who moves from one State to another prior to a presidential election.

This involves a matter of particular interest and concern to us in Connecticut, since Connecticut was one of the first States to enact legislation to cope with this problem. Also, Mrs. Ella T. Grasso, our secretary of state, has been most active in sponsoring action to resolve this problem in Connecticut and, through the conference of secretaries of State, in encouraging action to resolve it in other States.

Connecticut now has a law which permits a former Connecticut elector who has moved to another State within the period of 24 months before a presidential election to vote by special absentee presidential elector ballot in his former Connecticut town provided he has not lived in his new State long enough to meet its State residence requirement for voting.

In the current session of our general assembly, the secretary of state sponsored the introduction of a bill which would permit new residents of the State to vote for presidential electors here provided they are otherwise qualified and provided they do not have this privilege in any other State.

Mrs. Grasso has also been in consultation with the attorney general with regard to the constitutional aspects of this type of legislation.

May I assure you that we are desirous of doing whatever can be done to alleviate this unfortunate situation. For this reason, we should be most appreciative of your sending to us any other materials which you may have with regard to this matter. Moreover, if there is anything which we in Connecticut can do, please do not hesitate to get in touch with me.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

JOHN DEMPSEY,
Governor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, apparently Connecticut can bring about such a reform by legislation. Unfortunately, as the national Governor's conference study notes, most States must amend their constitutions to achieve the same result.

This is the problem, for example, in Delaware, Governor Carvel's office informs me. Governors Rockefeller, of my own State of New York, Quinn, of Hawaii, Kerner of Illinois, Combs of Kentucky, Meyner of New Jersey, Sanford of North Carolina, Lawrence of Pennsylvania, Rossellini of Washington, and Gage of Wyoming have written to me that they face the same obstacle.

To circumvent this difficulty, the Governor's conference report suggests an ingenious legal alternative. I quote from page 5 of the report.

It has been indicated in the preceding discussion that virtually all State constitutions refer specifically to residence requirements for voting—thus proposals to shorten or eliminate the waiting period for voting in presidential elections would apparently have to be accomplished by State constitutional amendment. However, it has been suggested that the qualifications for those voting for presidential electors can be established by State legislative action alone. The line of reasoning used in support of this contention is the assumption that qualifications for voting in presidential elections may be governed by the provisions of the Federal Constitution which says: "Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors."

The report notes that during the early years of the Republic, State legislatures selected the presidential electors themselves:

It was apparently taken for granted that this was a matter left up to the State legislatures to decide. Only gradually was legislation adopted in the States to provide for popular election of presidential electors.

The report cautions the States not to proceed precipitously in this matter, since there is no thorough study of the constitutional questions involved. Such a study was recently initiated by the Council of State Governments.

Interestingly enough, Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, mentioned this very point last December. In returning a bill to his State's general assembly, the Governor wrote:

> At least one case has suggested that this provision (i.e., art. 2, sec. 1, cl. 2) empowers a State legislature to disregard the constitution of the State in determining the manner of appointment of presidential electors (*McPherson* v. *Blacker*, 146 U.S. 1 (1892)). In the absence of a definitive decision, however, we should not lightly assume that the legislature can override our constitution in this respect.

Governor Meyner also disagrees with another contention of the Governor's conference study. According to that study:

> Absentee voting provisions are usually statutory in nature and can be amended by simple enactment of the law. This is the Connecticut approach to preserve voting rights and can in most instances be adopted by the States promptly.

Governor Meyner, in the same message from which I quoted above, applauds the movement toward reducing residence requirements. But he points out, in his veto of Connecticut-type legislation, that his State's constitution specifically limits the vote to residents:

> Thus, our constitution gives the legislature no power to extend the vote to persons who are not domiciled in New Jersey and in the county for the requisite periods. It is plain that this bill cannot be sustained under the State constitution.

Presumably, other States may run into the same difficulty.

Another objection to the absentee ballot system raised by Governor Meyner was also cited to me by Governor Hatfield of Oregon:

> The State of previous residence has no obligation to the citizen who has moved to another State.

The absentee ballot system, he continues, ignores "both the administrative difficulties and possibility for fraud." The Oregon system, which permits new Oregon residents to vote for President and Vice President after only 30 days' residence, is, according to the Governor, far superior.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include the full text of Governor Hatfield's letter at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
> STATE CAPITOL,
> *Salem, Oreg., March 13, 1961.*
>
> The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING,
> *U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR KEN: Your invitation to comment on residency requirements for voting is most welcome. As Secretary of State and as Governor, I urged the constitutional amendment, adopted by Oregon voters last fall, that will permit new Oregon residents to vote for President and Vice President after only 30 days.
>
> Our 30-day requirement is tied to the closing date for voter registration and seems reasonable in minimizing potential fraud. The 30-day period is required for the preparation of poll lists, mailing of voters' pamphlets, and other necessary administrative arrangements.
>
> Two points seem worthy of special mention:
>
> 1. The residence requirement for participation in State and local elections (6 months) is necessary. In most instances, it will take about 6 months to gain working familiarity with local issues and candidates.
>
> 2. The State of previous residence has no obligation to the citizen who has moved to another State. The suggestion of the National Association of Secretaries of State that a citizen retain residence for voting purposes in his former State until he qualifies elsewhere seems to me to ignore both the administrative difficulties and possibility for fraud. The Oregon system is far superior.
>
> While I would hope that Federal action could be avoided, the States have the responsibility for bringing their residence requirements for presidential voting in line with the current facts of political life.
>
> If I can be of further service, please let me know.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> MARK O. HATFIELD,
> *Governor.*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, here, then, are the merits and defects of the solution advanced to permit newly moved citizens to retain their right to vote in presidential elections. The Connecticut absentee voter plan covers former residents, but ignores new residents, increases administrative difficulties, widens the possibility of fraud, and may be constitutionally infeasible in some States. The Wisconsin system of waiving the usual requirements for new residents who wish to vote for President and Vice President is simpler and more straightforward, but it omits newly removed residents and adoption usually requires use of the cumbersome, time-consuming, and difficult constitution-amending process.

Mr. President, I am not dismayed by the differences of opinion among the Governors and other officials and persons who deal with this subject. Let the arguments rage, the hotter the better and the louder the better. If nothing else, the noise of the controversy may awaken the people of this country to the serious extent of the basic injustices involved. And the people need rousing, by every kind of publicity, if we are to have effective reform.

I am reassured by the letters I have received from so many Governors. Most of them are fully aware of and concerned about the injustices I have described. Thirty-two Governors have written to me as of this date. All but six emphatically agree that this problem requires serious attention.

As expected, the overwhelming opinion of the chief executives from whom I have heard is that this is most definitely an area of State jurisdiction and responsibility. Only two Governors mentioned Federal action favorably. Governor Guy, of North Dakota, thought uniformity on voting in Federal elections could be achieved only by a Federal election law. Governor Egan, of Alaska, suggested that Congress investigate stringent absentee-voting requirements. I ask unanimous consent to include his letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> STATE OF ALASKA,
> OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
> *Juneau, Alaska, March 6, 1961.*
>
> Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
> *U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR KEATING: This will acknowledge your letter of February 23 in which you asked for my comments regarding residency requirements for voting for President and Vice President of the United States.
>
> The 1960 Alaska Legislature adopted a revised election law for our State and this law was given its first test in our primary and general elections of last year. While the law generally proved to be satisfactory, experience has demonstrated that it is wanting in some areas.
>
> I have submitted to the legislature now in session two proposed amendments which I believe will improve certain aspects of the basic election law. The amendment provides for preregistration and the second amendment liberalizes the method by which minority parties may place the names of their candidates for President and Vice President of the United States on the Alaska ballot.
>
> As you pointed out in your letter and the related material which you enclosed, there is need for further study regarding the question of abolishing the residency requirement for voting for President and Vice President of the United States.
>
> In our last election there was confusion among the large number of military personnel and their dependents stationed in Alaska as to their voting rights in our State. This is one aspect of the problem which I believe merits consideration by Congress in its deliberations regarding the residency requirement.
>
> In reviewing the Library of Congress study which you enclosed, Alaska's residency requirements appear to be most liberal as compared with those of other States. While this law allows most of our newer residents to vote absentee in the States in which they previously had established residence, our recent election did disclose that some residents who came to Alaska from States having stringent absentee voting requirements were disenfranchised. Here is another area which I believe Congress might investigate in its deliberations on residency requirements.
>
> I appreciate this opportunity to explain my views on this question. If there is anything further you or your committees wish to know concerning Alaska's voting laws or my personal opinions on the subject, I will be most happy to send this information to you.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> WILLIAM A. EGAN,
> *Governor.*

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Governors of three States in which the residence requirements for new residents have been lowered for presidential elections write that they are quite satisfied with the results. The Governors of 12 other States say they also favor the Wisconsin approach. In six of these States, legislation liberalizing residency requirements for new residents was introduced this year.

Only two Governors indicated they favored the Connecticut approach, and one of them favors it in coordination with the other method. Connecticut itself, as I have mentioned, is moving toward adoption of the Wisconsin model.

I was glad to have my belief confirmed that this is a nonpartisan issue. Of the

26 Governors who responded affirmatively, 16 are Democrats and 10 are Republicans. This is roughly the same ratio as there are Democratic and Republican Governors presently in office.

Mr. President, I am very pleased to report that the chief executive of my own State, Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, is intensely interested in the matter of residence requirements. In the closing days of the recent session of the New York State Legislature, he recommended a complete revision of the suffrage article in the State's constitution.

The Governor's suggestions are thorough and comprehensive. First, he would bring about a general reduction for the State's newcomers. Requirements for residence in the State would drop from 1 year to 6 months, and in the county from 4 months to 3. The 30-day election district requirements would be unchanged.

Once a citizen has qualified under these regulations, suggests the Governor, he should be permitted to retain his voting right no matter how close to election day he may move, so long as he remains in the State.

In addition, paragraph 3 of the proposed amendment would empower the legislature to provide special procedures that would permit newcomers with at least 30 days' residence in the State to vote for presidential and vice presidential electors.

Finally, the amendment would permit the legislature to make special provision for ex-residents who had moved to another State within 1 year of the election and had not yet met the requirements of their new State. The voting rights of these persons would be limited to a presidential election.

If these proposals are adopted, and I certainly hope they will be, New York will have the most advanced residence requirement law in the Nation. With Governor Rockefeller's support, there is every hope that the measure will be adopted.

I ask unanimous consent to include assembly print No. 5767 at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE AND ASSEMBLY PROPOSING A NEW ARTICLE 2 OF THE CONSTITUTION, IN RELATION TO SUFFRAGE, AND REPEAL OF THE ARTICLE 2 OF THE CONSTITUTION PRESENTLY IN FORCE

SECTION 1. *Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That article 2 of the constitution as presently in force is hereby repealed and replaced by a new article 2 of the constitution, to read as follows:

"ARTICLE 2

"Suffrage

"SECTION 1. Every citizen of the age of 21 years, who shall have been an inhabitant of this State for 6 months next preceding an election and for the last 3 months a resident of the county, city, or village and for the last 30 days thereof a resident of the election district in which he may offer his vote shall be entitled to vote at such election for all officers that now are or hereafter may be elective by the people and upon all questions which may be submitted to the vote of the people, except that the legislature may establish a reasonable test of literacy for voters and may exclude from the right of suffrage persons convicted of any felony and persons determined to be mentally incompetent.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the residence requirements imposed by section 1 of this article, no citizen who is registered and otherwise qualified to vote shall be deprived of his right to vote by reason of his removal from the election district in which he is registered to another election district in the State within the 3 months next preceding an election, and every such citizen shall be entitled to vote at such election in the election district in which he is so registered.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the residence requirements imposed by section 1 of this article, the legislature may provide special procedures whereby every citizen of the age of 21 years who shall have been an inhabitant of this State for 30 days next preceding an election in which electors are to be chosen for the Office of President and Vice President of the United States shall be entitled to vote for such electors in this State and special procedures whereby every citizen who is registered and would be qualified to vote at such election but for his removal from this State within 1 year next preceding such election shall be entitled to vote for such electors, provided in both cases that he is not able to qualify to vote for such electors in any other State and that he shall not be entitled to vote for any other officers or upon any question which may be submitted to the vote of the pepole.

"SEC. 4. The legislature shall define residence for voting purposes, insure secrecy in voting, and provide for the registration of voters and the administration of elections. The legislature shall also provide for absentee registration and absentee voting in cases which it deems appropriate.

"SEC. 5. Except as may be otherwise prescribed by the legislature for village and town elections, all boards or officers registering voters, distributing ballots or receiving, recording or counting votes shall have equal representation from the two political parties which at the gubernatorial election next preceding that for which such boards or officers are to serve cast the highest and next highest statewide vote."

SEC. 2. *Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That the foregoing amendment be referred to the first regular legislative session convening after the next general election of members of the assembly and, in conformity with section 1 of article 19 of the constitution, be published for 3 months previous to the time of such election.'

(NOTE.—Article 2 of the constitution proposed to be repealed by this concurrent resolution, refers, generally, to suffrage and contains provisions relating to the qualifications of voters, absentee voting, exclusions from the right of suffrage, residency for voting purposes, registration of voters, absentee registration, permanent registration, the manner of voting, identification of voters and bipartisan registration and election boards and officers. This concurrent resolution has been introduced for study purposes only.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in recent years the shibboleth of those who seek to refine our democratic institutions has been the appeal that we must consider the image we present to the world. In the conflict between the Soviet system and our own, so goes the argument, the uncommitted peoples of the world have us under constant scrutiny to see how well we live up to our professions of democracy. If we improve ourselves, we are told, then we shall rise in the estimation of these people; if we lag, we shall lose ground with them.

Naturally, I should like to see our prestige abroad increased. I doubt that the alleviation of injustices caused by stringent residence requirements would have much effect upon opinion abroad, but, frankly, even if it did, I would not want our decisions to depend upon that argument.

The example I would have us set is for ourselves more than for others. I am less concerned with our image abroad than I am with our duty to ourselves, to our political tradition, and to our posterity. The image we present to the world is worthless unless it springs from the depths of our own sincere convictions, unless it is derived from the essence of our beliefs.

Our own well-being and self-interest, the growth of our own liberties, the better and more equitable functioning of our own democracy—this is our first concern.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEORGE W. NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

At the age of 81, and after 40 years as a Representative and Senator from that State—an impressive fact in itself—George W. Norris retired from public life. As would be the case following so remarkable a political career, his colleagues and friends assembled in Washington on December 10, 1942, to give him a testimonial dinner.

Not certain on his plans, several of the speakers at the dinner suggested that upon his retirement Senator Norris might remain in Washington or, perhaps, make his home in the Tennessee Valley. On the face of it, either was a reasonable assumption. Washington was where he had spent so much of his later life, and, on the other hand, the famous Tennessee Valley project had absorbed much of his interest and energy.

But Senator Norris had other thoughts. McCook, in Red Willow County, Nebr., was his home; his duties concluded, this is where he would return.

His carrer in public life started in that county: First as its county attorney, later as a district judge, and then for 10 years as a Representative in Congress from the Fifth District. In 1912 he was elected to the Senate by the State legislature after having prevailed in the popular primary election held to designate the preferred candidate for that office.

He continued as a Member of the Senate until January 1943.

His proposals for political reform and his record of legislative achievements identify him as a very creative and active individual. We recall his famous resolution which broke the grip of Speaker

Cannon over the House; his anti-injunction legislation cosponsored by Mr. LaGuardia; his constitutional amendment abolishing the so-called lame duck sessions of Congress; and the measures he advocated to establish the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration.

Senator Norris spearheaded the movement for unicameral legislation in our State. The adoption of an amendment by the people of Nebraska in 1934 gave our State the only single-chamber legislature in the Union. Significantly, when it met for the first time on January 5, 1937, Senator Norris visited the assembly, which necessitated his missing on that day the first opening of the new Congress pursuant to the operation of the 20th amendment to the Constitution.

During his service in the Senate, Senator Norris became the chairman of two standing committees, the Committee on Agriculture and the Committee on the Judiciary. It is with a great measure of satisfaction that the senior Senator from Nebraska is now a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and works on legislative matters similar to those which concerned and challenged the mind and faith of Senator Norris.

Senator Arthur Capper, of Kansas, once described Senator Norris as "a living, perambulating declaration of independence in human form." This, I believe, has caught the truth and reflects the meaning of Senator Norris' life. He lived at a time when our Nation was experiencing a period of sweeping social and economic adjustments. He sensed the needs of the Nation and developed and supported programs which helped guide the course of our national progress. But he did so as the spokesman of no particular or provincial interest. His field of activity and concern was wide and varied. He was indifferent to political labels and scorned associations with special groups. It is for his general activity, interest, and achievement for which we pay him honor.

Senator Norris fought economic waste, social injustice, and tyranny as he found it. Usually the cause was unpopular, and mainly he fought alone. His actions, however, were characterized by patience, courage, and integrity; and through them he inspired others. Although individuality was his hallmark, he was acorded general honor and esteem by his colleagues and of the Nation.

July 11, 1961, will mark the 100th anniversary of the birth of Senator Norris. In honor of this great Senator, the State of Nebraska will hold a ceremony later this month in the State capitol at which time a bust sculptured by Mr. Jo Davidson will be presented to the State. Later in the year further celebrations commemorating the centenary of his birth will be held.

The U.S. Senate would be remiss, Mr. President, if it failed to note the occasion. Therefore I submit a resolution providing that when the Senate concludes its business on July 11, or on the first ensuing day when it is in session if it does not meet on July 11, it stand adjourned in further respect to the memory of George W. Norris, the late Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, in submitting the resolution, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered and approved at this time. I may say that this proposal has the concurrence of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 146) for the Senate to adjourn on July 11, 1961, as a mark of further respect to the memory of Hon. George W. Norris.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the late George W. Norris served for ten years as a Member of the House of Representatives and for thirty years as a Member of the United States Senate with dedication, distinction, and untiring concern for the public welfare; and

Whereas he served with distinction as chairman of two standing committees of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Committee on the Judiciary; and

Whereas he sponsored progressive reforms through such proposals as the 20th amendment to the Constitution, anti-injunction legislation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Acts, and the unicameral amendment to the Nebraska State constitution; and

Whereas, he was beloved by his own State of Nebraska and the Nation as a whole for his courage, integrity, and unselfish devotion to the cause of his fellow man; and

Whereas July 11, 1961, will mark the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of George W. Norris: Therefore be it

Resolved, That at the conclusion of that day's business, or if the Senate is not in session on that date, then on the next following day on which it will be in session, the Senate stand adjourned as a mark of further respect to the memory of the late Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris.

The preamble was agreed to.

OLD SERIES CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT (S. REPT. NO. 256)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1619, reported today by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1619) to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old-series currency, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, S. 1619, of which I am the author, is the old-series currency adjustment bill. It is designed to clean up some old historical statutory relics and, in the process of doing this, to save the Government about $10,000 a day in interest charges.

Before July 1, 1929, the old large-size bills were issued. There are still a good many of them outstanding on the books of the Treasury, although everyone knows that many have been destroyed by fire, flood, or accidents of one kind or another, or are in the hands of collectors who value them more for their historical interest than as money. In addition, between June 30, 1929, and January 30, 1934, the date of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, small-size gold certificates were issued to the public. About $12½ million of these small-size gold certificates are now outstanding.

When one of these old notes is received, it is immediately retired, though, of course, it is still legal tender and in every respect equal to any other bill.

This old-series money is still outstanding on the Treasury's books as currency. S. 1619 would transfer these obligations to the non-interest-bearing public debt, as was previously done with old Federal Reserve banknotes and national banknotes, both now being liquidated, and with U.S. notes. In the future, when any of these old-series notes might be presented to the Treasury, they would be redeemed in full in new issues. In addition, the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, to write off from the books of the Treasury so much of the old-series notes as, in his judgment, he believed had been destroyed or irretrievably lost.

S. 1619 would make available for current use the security now backing up this old-series currency. For instance, some $30 million in gold is lying in the Treasury vaults as security for $30 million of gold certificates. There is no reason in the world to tie up this $30 million of gold. If a gold certificate is presented, the gold cannot be paid out under the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, and, in any event, many of the gold certificates have certainly been irretrievably lost or destroyed. So also some $31 million standard silver dollars are being held as security for Treasury notes of 1890 and old-series silver certificates. During the 18 months ending December 31, 1960, only $26,134 of old-series silver certificates were turned in and only $6 of Treasury notes of 1890. And the Federal Reserve banknotes are required to hold security for some $36 million of old-series Federal Reserve notes. During the same 18 months only $469,730 in these old-series Federal Reserve notes were retired. To maintain $98 million of reserves in gold, silver, and Government bonds against this old-series currency is entirely unnecessary.

Accordingly, S. 1619 would make available $98.1 million of gold, silver, and other reserves for current use by the Government. This would reduce the Government's borrowing by $98.1 million. The interest on this borrowing would amount to some $3 to $4 million a year at current rates. This would mean a saving of $10,000 a day.

The bill contains several other supplementary provisions, such as the one authorizing the Treasury to keep an historical collection of notes.

This proposal has been carefully considered and has bipartisan support. Mr. Julian B. Baird, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, testified in favor of the same proposal on June 24, 1960; the Committee on Banking and Currency then reported S. 3714; and the Senate passed the bill on June 28, 1960,

on a calendar call. This year Mr. Robert V. Roosa, Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, submitted a favorable report to the committee in which he stated:

> Enactment of the bill would be a businesslike step that would result in significant savings, without impairing in the least the redeemability of the old currency.

The Committee on Banking and Currency has again reported the bill unanimously, and Mr. Roosa's letter and accompanying statements are set forth in full in the report. The Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller General have also approved the bill.

It seems to me there is no question of the desirability of taking a businesslike step that would result in saving about $10,000 a day.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Wisconsin for this eminently economical and businesslike proposal. This is an idle and unneeded reserve, which is costly to the Government and to the people to maintain.

During the preceding administration I thought I would have a little fun with the Treasury and the Federal Reserve, so I obtained bills of these various denominations and issues and asked that they be redeemed in gold. The reply was that they could not be redeemed in gold or silver. I was, however, offered bills of identical issue in return for the bills which I offered and for which I demanded redemption.

So I think it is very clear that this reserve is purely a token reserve. It is not needed, it is not necessary, it is costly to the Government. The Senator from Wisconsin, by this measure, has more than earned his keep for his entire period in the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who is, it seems to me, the outstanding economist in Congress. There is no one whose support I would rather have on this measure.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. To whom is the interest now paid which will be saved at the rate of $10,000 a day?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The interest is paid to those who loan the money to the United States by purchasing its securities.

Mr. HRUSKA. Those to whom the interest is paid hold the specific securities, do they?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Actually, this measure will release these funds, which in turn can be used to pay off the outstanding securities against the credit of the U.S. Government, and thereby reduce the debt by $98 million, and reduce the interest paid on obligations of the U.S. Government by between $3 million and $4 million a year.

Mr. HRUSKA. So, in reality, reserves must be set up by law; and the effect of the bill will be to release those reserves. In short, it is a bookkeeping transaction, is it not?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. And the bill will not necessarily result in the cessation of writing Government checks in the sum of $10,000 a day, will it? Is not that the actual picture?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. That was my understanding, and I wished to confirm it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But, in my judgment, there will be an actual saving of $3,500,000.

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes, indeed; and I think the Senator is to be congratulated upon pursuing this course, because it will give the transaction a businesslike status, which at the present time it does not have. So I wish to add my congratulations to those of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1619) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Old Series Currency Adjustment Act".

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) The term "United States notes" means currency notes issued pursuant to the first section of the Act of February 25, 1862 (12 Stat. 345), the Act of July 11, 1862 (12 Stat. 532), the resolution of January 17, 1863 (12 Stat. 822), section 2 of the Act of March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 709), or section 3571 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C., sec. 401).

(c) The term "Treasury notes of 1890" means currency notes issued pursuant to the Act of July 14, 1890 (26 Stat. 289).

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the general fund of the Treasury, to be credited as a public debt receipt, the following:

(1) Gold held as security for gold certificates issued prior to January 30, 1934.

(2) Standard silver dollars held as security for, or for the redemption of, silver certificates issued prior to July 1, 1929.

(3) Standard silver dollars held as security for, or for the redemption of, Treasury notes of 1890.

SEC. 4. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with the approval of the Secretary, may require any Federal Reserve bank to pay to the Secretary, to be credited as a public debt receipt, an amount equal to the amount of Federal Reserve notes of any series prior to the series of 1928 issued to such bank and outstanding at the time of such payment.

SEC. 5. Any currency the funds for the redemption or security of which have been transferred pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of this Act, and any Federal Reserve notes as to which payment has been made under section 4 of this Act, shall thereafter, upon presentation at the Treasury for redemption, be redeemed by the Secretary from the general fund of the Treasury and thereupon retired.

SEC. 6. (a) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, upon completion of the transfers and credits authorized and directed by section 3 of this Act there shall be carried on the books of the Treasury as public debt bearing no interest the following:

(1) Gold certificates issued prior to January 30, 1934.

(2) Treasury notes of 1890.

(3) United States notes issued prior to July 1, 1929.

(4) Silver certificates issued prior to July 1, 1929.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, there shall be carried on the books of the Treasury as public debt bearing no interest Federal Reserve notes as to which payment has been made to the Secretary under section 4 of this Act and the amount of the payment credited as a public debt receipt in accordance with such section.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to determine, from time to time, the amount of—

(1) outstanding currency of any type designated in subsections (a) and (b) of this section,

(2) circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks, issued prior to July 1, 1929, for which the United States has assumed liability, and

(3) circulating notes of national banking associations, issued prior to July 1, 1929, for which the United States has assumed liability.

which, in his judgment, have been destroyed or irretrievably lost and so will never be presented for redemption, and to reduce accordingly the amount or amounts thereof outstanding on the books of the Treasury and to credit such amounts to the appropriate receipt account.

SEC. 7. The first paragraph of the Act of May 31, 1878, entitled "An Act to forbid the further retirement of United States legal-tender notes" (31 U.S.C., sec. 404), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *And provided further,* That in the event of any determination by the Secretary of the Treasury under section 6 of the Old Series Currency Adjustment Act that an amount of said notes has been destroyed or irretrievably lost and so will never be presented for redemption, the amount of said notes required to be kept in circulation shall be reduced by the amount so determined".

SEC. 8. (a) The fifth paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C., sec. 415) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The liability of a Federal Reserve bank with respect to its outstanding Federal Reserve notes shall be reduced by any amount paid by such bank to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 4 of the Old Series Currency Adjustment Act."

(b) The seventh paragraph of section 16 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C., sec. 416) is amended by striking out the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Any Federal Reserve bank shall further be entitled to receive back the collateral deposited with the Federal Reserve agent for the security of any notes with respect to which such bank has made payment to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 4 of the Old Series Currency Adjustment Act. Federal Reserve banks shall not be required to maintain the reserve or the redemption fund theretofore provided for against Federal Reserve notes which have been retired, or to which payment has been made to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 4 of the Old Series Currency Adjustment Act."

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this Act shall impair the redeemability of any currency of the United States as now provided by law.

SEC. 10. In order to provide a historical collection of the paper currency issues of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, after redemption, to withhold from cancellation and destruction and to transfer to a special account one piece of

each design, issue, or series of each denomination of each kind of paper currency of the United States, including bank notes, heretofore or hereafter issued, and to make appropriate entries in the redemption accounts and other books of the Treasury to cover any such transfers.

NEEDED: GREATER UTILIZATION OF FREE ENTERPRISE TO SUPPORT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the United States and its allies today are locked in a life-or-death struggle against communism—militarily, ideologically, and economically. To win the battle, we need more effectively to marshal our resources and manpower.

International relations could, I believe, be greatly improved if we offered a greater chance to serve the country to employees and management of businesses operating overseas.

Businessmen of the country operating around the globe are ready and willing to assume a larger role in serving U.S. interests, if given the opportunity.

To marshal such cooperation, the President, in my judgment, could profitably schedule a conference of business leaders and industry engaged in operations overseas. The purpose would be to map strategy and enlist support for more effective participation of free enterprise, not only in the development of improved trade programs, but also in furthering foreign policy interests of the United States.

I have suggested to President Kennedy that such a conference could add greater strength to our foreign policy. At this time, I request unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my letter to the President and a number of additional messages from a cross section of business operating overseas: First, endorsing the idea of such a conference; and second, expressing a willingness to act, in effect, above and beyond the call of duty to further strengthen U.S. foreign policy.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to respectfully suggest a Government-business conference. The purpose would be to map strategy by which U.S. firms operating abroad could better cooperate in serving the objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

Currently there are hundreds of American enterprises operating in countries throughout the globe. In my judgment, these represent potential built-in "Voices of America." Recently I contacted firms with oversea operations, suggesting that a business-Government conference could result in finding new avenues for broader support by U.S. enterprises for our foreign policy.

The great majority of responses reflected a real willingness of leaders in the field to more effectively serve our national interests abroad. Overall, the responses reflected the following:

1. Firms now engaging in attempting to improve the global image of the United States almost unanimously felt that efforts could and should be greatly expanded.

2. Greater coordination between Government and business would be mutually beneficial in strengthening our policies and programs in foreign lands; and

3. That U.S. enterprises were willing to dedicate more effort and resources to supporting our foreign policy.

In my judgment, these represented "open offers" by private enterprise that should not be overlooked, and could be an invaluable asset to the United States.

* * * * *

Although I know you are extremely busy, I would appreciate getting your reaction to this suggestion.

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your letter of March 29, and the outline of your proposal that businessmen of America now operating around the globe be given the opportunity to assume a larger role in serving the interests of the United States in the countries in which they have enterprises.

We have read your recommendations carefully and find them in complete accord with the national chamber's stated policies. Rallying points for this effort have been American chambers of commerce abroad, now established and effectively operating in 22 countries around the world (with more than one branch functioning in Spain, Italy, Germany, and Brazil). The newest member of the Amcham fraternity is the one recently set up in Ireland. There are several others in the planning stage.

The role of the national chamber in connection with these organizations is that of an information clearing house, as most of the Amchams are members of the national chamber. They are not, of course, branches of our organization.

* * * * *

We are passing along your recommendations to the American chamber abroad, asking for their specific suggestions and reactions, which we will be pleased to convey to you when they are received.

We will be happy to cooperate with you in any suitable way possible to put forth your suggestions both here and abroad.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE R. MILES.

INTERNATIONAL TELEPHONE AND
TELEGRAPH CORP.,
New York, N.Y., April 7, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Mr. Harold S. Geneen, president of ITT, is away from the office for several days and your March 30 letter, together with your statement on the "Larger Role for Business in U.S. Foreign Policy" has come to me.

I will show it to Mr. Geneen upon his return but, meanwhile, on behalf of ITT, I can say that your proposal strikes us as being sound.

In the first place, responsible U.S. corporations operating overseas are already doing much to win friends for our country. Any company operating outside the U.S. borders quickly becomes aware of its responsibility to be an informal ambassador and a good citizen.

Certainly, any way that this can be harnessed constructively to further foreign policy is worthy of the support of our company, and others operating abroad.

In thinking about such a program it is important to keep in mind that many such companies (ours is a case in point) employ relatively few Americans overseas. Even our top management in our European companies are all citizens of their own countries. These people, are respected as business leaders in their own countries and as managers of U.S.-owned enterprises, but in many cases might find it awkward to speak for the United States.

We shall be most interested in the reception that your proposal receives and we commend you for it.

Cordially,

WARD B. STEVENSON.

BRANIFF INTERNATIONAL AIRWAYS,
Dallas, Tex., April 7, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In reply to your letter of March 29 addressed to the company and to which was attached your statement on the necessity for and ability of U.S. firms operating overseas furthering U.S. foreign policy aims around the world, it is an excellent statement and we hope that it inspires any such U.S. firms which are not actively participating in a program of this nature to do so.

In our own operations we are not only individually doing whatever we can but we also actively support and cooperate with organizations already set up to encourage doing and to do many of the things listed in your letter.

In our own operations, which are relatively minor in terms of total economy of that portion of Latin America which we serve, we have had in effect certain basic policies for many years all of which we think make their contribution to the objectives you outlined.

We hire locally and train within our organization a great preponderance of local nationals and residents. In fact, in every country we serve which has any governmental regulations concerning the percentage of foreigners who are allowed to hold managerial and technical jobs, the actual proportion of natives is in every instance substantially above the legal requirement. This training is conducted in both Latin America and by bringing Latin Americans to the United States for specific training programs.

Our managers, many of whom are now local citizens, work constructively and cooperatively with our Embassies, consulates, USIS and other governmental agencies toward the objectives you list. The few U.S. citizens we have based in these countries are required to maintain regular social, in addition to the ordinary commercial relationships with the nationals of the country in which they are based.

In at least one country our manager, an American, is chairman of a committee set up with governmental approval to work toward the objectives you list. This is a cooperative activity of the U.S. Inter-American Council, the Embassies, the USIS services, etc.

These are just a few examples because I know your time is limited and valuable.

In short, we quite agree with the objectives you enumerated and are doing everything we can to carry them out.

Cordially,

CHAS. E. BEARD,
President.

E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & CO.,
INC., INTERNATIONAL DEPARTMENT,
Wilmington, Del., April 7, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have in front of me your letter of March 31, addressed to

the Du Pont Co., enclosing a statement recommending that businessmen of America engaged in foreign operations be given the opportunity to assume a larger role in serving the interests of the United States in the countries in which they have enterprises.

This is certainly a worthwhile objective and one which we are encouraging our foreign manager to further.

We have recently reviewed the activities in the general areas that you mentioned with the general managers of our principal foreign subsidiary companies and find that in a number of ways all of them are taking an active part in local community relations of various types.

In the capacity of Chairman of the USIAC–USIA Liaison Committee of the U.S. Inter-American Council, I personally have been quite interested in setting up local USIAC–USIA Liaison Committees, consisting of leading local North American business leaders in a number of the Latin American countries. While some of these committee are more active than others, they generally are meeting with the local representatives of the U.S. Information Agency and in some cases with the American Ambassador, in an endeavor to work in the various areas outlined in your letter.

The idea of a general conference of the sort that you suggest undoubtedly has considerable merit, although I would think that it would be desirable to draw up a specific program covering the specific points to be discussed and developed in such a meeting before any final decision is made. Sometimes meetings of this sort are apt to turn into assemblies where businessmen are asked to endorse the pet projects of a wide variety of Government agencies without any real chance of participation in their formulation. Further, I would think that the main objective that you have in mind, being to reach American businessmen living abroad, some sort of program involving cooperation at the local level in the various foreign countries with U.S. Government representatives would be more useful than a meeting in Washington.

Wishing you every success in your endeavor,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN K. JENNY.

W. R. GRACE & CO.,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
New York, N.Y., April 4, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you very much for your letter of March 30. Your ideas are challenging as an indication as to how a united United States can work together to advance the causes of democracy in underdeveloped areas.

I sincerely hope that your ideas will be developed and implemented by the present administration.

We in W. R. Grace & Co. stand ready to do our share.

Sincerely,

PETER GRACE.

OTIS ELEVATOR CO.,
New York, N.Y., April 5, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 29 in connection with your recommendation that businessmen of America now operating around the world be given the opportunity to assume a larger role in serving the interests of the United States in the countries in which they have enterprises.

During World War II, Mr. Nelson A. Rockefeller, through the Office of Inter-American Affairs, organized in connection with the Embassies in each country a group of local businessmen, all American citizens, into what was known as coordinating committees. There was one such committee in each of the other American Republics. I believe their contribution to the furtherance of inter-American relations during the period of the war was great, and I believe a revival of this system would be equally effective now.

Whatever is done, in my opinion, must be done within the country and by Americans who know the local customs and problems—it cannot be done in Washington.

I am sure that all Americans abroad would be only too willing to cooperate if given an opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

PERCY L. DOUGLAS,
Executive Vice President.

PENNSALT CHEMICALS CORP.,
INTERNATIONAL DIVISION,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 5, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I heartily subscribe to the thoughts expressed in the statement attached to your letter of March 31, 1961. There is certainly much good to be accomplished in this area and you are to be congratulated for promoting such a plan. I feel sure you will receive willing support of the program from industry engaged in international trade.

Sincerely yours,

G. T. COLLINS,
General Manager.

UNITED FRUIT CO.,
Boston, Mass., April 18, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The U.S. Senate,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Permit me to offer you my warm endorsement of your recent proposal aimed at enlarging the role of business in U.S. foreign policy.

Insofar as United Fruit Co. is concerned, we have for more than 60 years endeavored to play a role of ever-increasing responsibility toward the host countries of Latin America where we have been privileged to conduct our agricultural operations.

Specifically, we have maintained a program of hospitals, dispensaries, traveling nurses, and sanitation calculated to maintain and improve the health of our employees, their families, and the communities adjacent to areas where we grow our products. The same applies to an extensive system of grade schools which the company has built, has financed and operated. Both the hospital and the school staffs are nationals, practicing their respective professions strictly within the framework of local laws and customs.

Our research programs are also conducted in terms of local national support. Tropical plants are procured from all over the world and wherever we find indications that certain plants have special significance to a specific Latin American country, this information is made known to the government and the extension workers in the area.

Throughout these six decades, we have always respected the dignity of the individual. Increasingly we have developed nationals through training courses to rise to positions of high responsibility. I might cite the instance of a humble Guatemalan who came to our company from the mountains 30 years ago. Our company provided him with a job opportunity. He married and raised his children in company communities where his family worshipped and his children attended our schools. This man saved his money and was able to send his oldest son to the United States for his higher education. That son has recently returned to the same banana community where he grew up, and we are proud to say that he has become medical director of our hospital there.

In general it is the policy of our company today to develop nationals to a point where they can become independent agriculturists. In instances where they take up banana agriculture we call them "associate producers." They grow the fruit on their land (in many cases acquired from our company) and we participate with them in the matter of technology, disease control, land and sea transportation, and the eventual sale of their product in world markets.

* * * * *

I trust that this statement of United Fruit Co.'s performance and attitude toward the role of business in furthering U.S. foreign policy may be helpful to you to underscore your powerful and forward-thinking resolution.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. SUNDERLAND.

INTERNATIONAL PACKERS, LTD.,
Chicago, Ill., April 10, 1961.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I have read your letter of March 29 and the attached article expressing your views on the larger role for business in U.S. foreign policy. We were glad to read the statement that was attached to your letter and to have your views on this subject, as it is something that has been of considerable interest to our company and to our employees in the foreign fields for some time.

The American citizens who live in foreign countries do make a substantial contribution to the betterment of international relations, both in their activities as private individuals and through their group efforts. The chamber of commerce in most of these areas is normally made up of American businessmen and local businessmen with interests closely allied to American business who are very active in fostering better relations and in working closely on a wide variety of community projects.

In addition to the chamber of commerce, in most of the larger cities there is an American society whose membership is limited to American citizens. These societies take an active part in political, social, and welfare activities, and during times of emergency, such as during the Second World War, they were a very active media for patriotic activities.

In many cases the relationship between the permanent-resident Americans and the governmental employees and diplomats is not as close as it might be, as the latter are rotated frequently and are in the country for such a short period of service that they seldom make permanent local contacts.

There is room for closer liaison between the Government employees and the permanent-resident Americans for the promotion of American interests in the fields outlined by you, and anything that can be done on the part of our Government to help coordinate the efforts to create the "good image of America" would meet with the frank and enthusiastic support of the business houses and of the permanent American residents in foreign countries.

Yours sincerely,

MARVEN GIBSON

AMERICAN MUTUAL
INSURANCE ALLIANCE,
Chicago, Ill., April 10, 1961.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Many thanks for your kind letter of March 31 enclosing a copy of your statement recommending that American business and industrial firms operating abroad play a more vital role in furthering U.S. foreign policy aims around the world.

We think that your recommendation is an extremely important one and thank you for calling it to our attention. At present, only a few of our member companies operate abroad, but in recent months we have been studying the possibility of setting up a foreign facility through which the insurance on the foreign operations of policyholders of mutual companies might be placed.

Your recommendation will be brought to the attention of the appropriate committee of our association to determine how our companies may best participate in the suggested program.

Sincerely,

NEWELL R. JOHNSON,
General Manager.

VISION, INC.,
EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
April 14, 1961.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I heartily agree with your proposal for more effective business-government cooperation in our foreign affairs. The only way we can meet the world war of subversion and propaganda we are now involved in (but fail to see) is by a cooperative effort of all segments of our society.

I am encouraged by the number of people today, both in government and business, who are thinking along the lines of your statement. The problem is how to convert this concern into positive action.

We have been working with a number of the major companies on a new program of this type for Latin America.

* * * * *

Congratulations on taking this new initiative. I hope it will bear fruit.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. BARLOW,
President.

SCHOOLS IN CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three outstandingly fine editorials published recently in the Washington Post.

First, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the editorial entitled "Schools in Crisis," which was published today in the Washington Post. I desire to say that the editorial could really be the opening statement of the remarks which I shall make tomorrow when the school bill is brought up for Senate consideration and debate. I do not know how anyone could improve on the case the Washington Post makes in this editorial in support of the administration's school bill. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOLS IN CRISIS

Apart from the constitutional controversy over public support of private schools, apart from scruples respecting support for schools which are segregated, apart from fears that Federal financial aid may lead to Federal encroachment on local control of educational policy—apart from all these subsidiary issues—the inescapable reality is that the American public school system is in a state of crisis.

The crisis in the public schools arises from three decades of failure to give them the kind of support at the local level which they must have if they are to fulfill their indispensable role in preparing Americans for self-government and survival in an embattled world. This local failure stems in large measure not from any indifference or neglect but from an inability to raise sufficient funds through local powers of taxation.

A crippling shortage of classrooms and of qualified teachers continues—and grows worse year after year. At the close of the Eisenhower administration last fall, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported a shortage of 142,100 classrooms, compared with 135,200 the previous year. There were about 1,868,000 pupils in excess of normal classroom capacity, an increase of 122,000 over the previous fall; 683,000 pupils in 36 States were attending school on curtailed or half-day sessions.

Looking into the immediate future, President Kennedy put it this way in his message to Congress on education:

"An average net gain of nearly 1 million pupils a year during the next 10 years will overburden a school system already strained by well over a half million pupils in curtailed or half-day sessions, a school system financed largely by a property tax incapable of bearing such an increased load in most communities. There are some 90,000 teachers who fall short of full certification standards. Tens of thousands of others must attempt to cope with classes of unwieldy size because there are insufficient teachers available."

It is to combat this crisis that the President has recommended, and the Senate Committee on Education and Labor has approved, a major Federal-aid measure which would help the States to construct new school buildings and employ additional teachers in their public schools. Senate debate on the important measure is scheduled to begin next week. Time and again such legislation has foundered in the past on the shoals of collateral questions.

It would be tragic to let these collateral questions again obscure the fundamental need of the Nation for a revitalized and efficient public school system. Federal aid to the public schools deserves to be debated on its own merits. The program recommended by the President and approved by the Senate Education Committee is sound, practical, and effective. It carefully safeguards the States against Federal control of the schools. Let it pass. Let the collateral questions be debated and decided in their turn. But let the public schools get on with their vital contribution to the national welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this very succinct and short editorial, relatively speaking, the Washington Post has made the case, in my judgment, for the administration's bill. Tomorrow, I shall present the administration's case, in a very brief speech, but along the same lines as those of the editorial published today in the Washington Post.

For quite some time my speech has been ready; and I am glad to find the editors of the Washington Post emphasizing exactly the same major points which I shall emphasize in my speech tomorrow.

WIRETAPPING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appears today in the Washington Post a significant editorial which I think also constitutes superlative journalism. The editorial is entitled "Eavesdropping for Everyone." It is in general opposition to all except a very restricted type of wiretapping legislation.

Again I wish to say that I agree wholeheartedly with what I consider to be the very sound position the Washington Post takes in this editorial. If I have any reservation, it is in respect to the last paragraph of the editorial. I am not prepared even to vote to give—as the Washington Post would give—to three Federal district court judges authority to issue approval of wiretapping.

The editorial states, in part:

This newspaper believes that for the sake of these freedoms wiretapping should be rigidly restricted to a Federal law enforcement agency in cases involving a grave threat to national security and with the authorization of a panel of three Federal district court judges.

I have not changed the view which I have held during all my years in the Senate. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that even in the first year I was a Member of the Senate I spoke out in defense of protecting the civil liberties of the American people; and basic to the protection of civil liberties is the protection of privacy.

I happen to be one who is convinced that we do not have to adopt Communist tactics to beat communism; that we do not have to adopt police state procedures to beat police state growth in the world.

So far as I am concerned, wiretapping is the device of totalitarians, and cannot be justified in a country that boasts about people being free.

I am satisfied that with sound law enforcement, efficient law enforcement, diligent law enforcement, wiretapping is never needed.

I am also satisfied that wiretapping is the tool of the lazy in law enforcement. It is the tool of the inefficient in law enforcement. It is the tool of those in law enforcement who, in my judgment, have never learned one of the great lessons of this whole free society of ours—that the Government is the servant, and not the master, of the people.

When we give to the Government the unchecked kind of wiretapping that is being proposed by the Department of Justice, we move in on the precious right of privacy and individual liberty in this country; and, in my judgment, that has no place in a free land such as the United States.

I am satisfied we can check up on the Communists, I am satisfied we can check up on the gangsters, I am satisfied we can take care of those who seek to terminate the structure of freedom, without ourselves resorting to the kind of wiretapping legislation that is being proposed by the Kennedy administration.

I hope the Kennedy administration, from the White House, will make it clear to the Department of Justice that it has no intention of supporting this kind of invasion of what I consider to be basic personal rights in this country.

It has been pointed out before, and it is pointed out now in the excellent editorial in the Washington Post, that there we are not dealing with search and seizure. We are not dealing with a warrant for search and seizure in which the court has to specifically point out in the warrant what the police officers are to go into the house to get. We are dealing here with a proposal that opens

up any conversation, during the process of wiretapping, to the ears of law enforcement officers which they have no right to hear.

The argument cannot be made, so far as I am concerned, on the analogy that if the courts can give a warrant for search and seizure, then the courts ought to be able to give a warrant to eavesdrop, as the Washington Post puts it in the editorial. They are not comparable, because, as has been pointed out by the court, when a wiretapper hears a telephone conversation, he hears all.

Furthermore, it opens the way to the wiretapping of conversations that have nothing whatsoever to do with the alleged purpose of granting the right of the wiretapping in the first place.

It is still pretty sound American jurisprudence that it is better to have the guilty go free than to have one innocent person wronged.

I repeat, this right of privacy is so basic to American freedom that I do not intend to sit here in the Senate of the United States and let this administration, or any other administration, put the pressure on, so to speak, in order to accomplish the passage of a wiretapping bill. I may not be able to stop it, but I will do my best; and I serve notice I will do my best to stop any wiretapping legislation from passing at this session of Congress, because when I make that fight, I am making a fight for the very precious guarantee of individual liberty and freedom in this country which has characterized throughout our history the very important principle of protecting the people from their own Government when their own Government proposes to follow a course of action that jeopardizes the individual liberty of any of its citizens.

I think the case against wiretapping legislation is so overwhelmingly in support of those of us who take the position that wiretapping legislation should not be passed that I shall renew my efforts this year, if this administration comes forward with a wiretapping bill, to see to it that it is fully discussed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Post editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAVESDROPPING FOR EVERYONE

The Department of Justice has become an advocate of virtually unlimited wiretapping. The statement made the other day to the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights by Assistant Attorney General Miller is full of pious obeisances to rights of privacy; it embraces every known cliché on civil liberties. But when all this lipservice has been paid to the Constitution and the free traditions of the American people, what the Department seeks is permission for every police force, Federal, State, and local, to listen in on telephone conversations at their own pleasure.

Mr. Miller wants Congress, in brief, to let the Attorney General authorize wiretapping in any case which he thinks involves national security—and, for good measure, in any case involving kidnaping, too. He wants Congress, in addition, to authorize Justice Department wiretapping in connection with any serious crime on the basis of a court order from any Federal judge. And on top of all this he wants Congress to allow wiretapping by State authorities for whatever crimes the States consider serious, provided only that some State judge can be persuaded to issue a court order.

One fallacy in this proposal is that a court order to wiretap is in some way analogous to a search warrant. But a valid search warrant specifies what is to be sought and narrowly restricts the range of the search; it forbids rummaging. A wiretap exposes to eavesdropping everything said over a tapped telephone, whether by a particular suspect or by someone wholly unrelated to the crime under investigation.

A great deal of experience in New York State with wiretapping under court order makes it perfectly plain, moreover, that this system affords no protection at all for privacy. Complaisant judges issue orders indiscriminately—authorizing the police to tap a telephone for months on end without any restraint whatever. The tapping, moreover, is commonly done in connection with minor racketeering, gambling, prostitution and such offenses, sometimes contributing more to shakedowns and blackmail.

"A right of privacy is essential to a free community," Mr. Miller intoned to the subcommittee just before urging curtailment of the right. "Upon privacy depends freedom of thought, freedom of association, and freedom of expression." How very true. And, as the authors of the Bill of Rights recognized when they forbade unreasonable searches, these freedoms are worth some restraints on police activity, even some sacrifice in police efficiency.

This newspaper believes that for the sake of these freedoms wiretapping should be rigidly restricted to a Federal law enforcement agency in cases involving a grave threat to national security and with the authorization of a panel of three Federal district court judges.

CUBA AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is another Washington Post editorial which I think is so good I would like to have it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and associate myself with the views expressed. I refer to the editorial in the Washington Post for Sunday, May 14, 1961, entitled "Old School Ties."

The editorial discusses in some detail the problems that have arisen between Cuba and the United States. I particularly point out the comment in the editorial which reads as follows:

Nevertheless, the credibility of the United States has suffered. All nations must be in a position to make diplomatic disavowals. But the various assertions by Secretary Rusk and Ambassador Stevenson, though perhaps true in a narrow technical sense, were substantially belied by the broader facts. Mr. Stevenson's eloquent statements in the United Nations are unlikely now to have quite the same ring of sincerity, for the bloom is off the azalea.

It is my hunch that Ambassador Stevenson never would have made these speeches in the United Nations referred to in the editorial in the Washington Post if he had been fully informed of the part the U.S. Government played in supporting the ill-fated attempted invasion by the Cuban exiles. If my hunch is accurate, then the administration made a grievous mistake by keeping Mr. Stevenson uninformed as to the true facts. After having served 3 months in the United Nations last fall, I know how important it is for members of the U.S. delegations to be kept in a position so that every word they speak within the United Nations, either in committee, or the Security Council, or the General Assembly, will conform strictly to the facts.

Next, I think the Washington Post was entirely too charitable in its references to both the CIA and the Pentagon, because, in my judgment, the military planning for the ill-fated invasion was inexcusably bad.

However, taking the editorial as a whole, I think it sets forth observations which call for very serious pondering by every Member of Congress, as well as every policymaker in the executive branch of the Government, including President Kennedy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD SCHOOL TIES

One of the worst effects of the Cuban disaster, now seen in more perspective, is the marring of confidence in American policy. This has both domestic and foreign ramifications. The extent of the reaction can be exaggerated, and no doubt in time it will blow over. But in the interim it unquestionably is a check upon the actions of the Kennedy administration.

Both here and abroad the forms of the criticism are substantially the same. Some believe that American assistance to the Cuban invaders was not justified in the circumstances and violated treaty commitments. Others believe that the effort to overthrow the Castro regime was warranted but that the bungle aggravated the problem.

It would be foolish to attempt now to assess the ultimate result. In some places in Latin America the defeat of the operation seems to have served as a tocsin about the degree of Communist domination of Cuba. The emphasis on collective measures and the avoidance of rash steps by the administration, despite several bristling statements, has restored a certain balance.

Nevertheless, the credibility of the United States has suffered. All nations must be in a position to make diplomatic disavowals. But the various assertions by Secretary Rusk and Ambassor Stevenson, though perhaps true in a narrow technical sense, were substantially belied by the broader facts. Mr. Stevenson's eloquent statements in the United Nations are unlikely now to have quite the same ring of sincerity, for the bloom is off the azalea.

Internationally there also has been some damage. Prevailing sentiment has been strongly to rally around the President and the flag; indeed, there was not a little jingoism. Mr. Kennedy has skillfully protected his political position. Moreover, he has taken full responsibility for the disaster, without attempting to pin the blame on individuals or groups. But there has been severe questioning of the proficiency and functions of the Central Intelligence Agency. And there has been a serious loss of faith in the realism of military planning under the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Possibly the various inquiries into intelligence will disclose some structural deficiencies; the objective ought to be to correct them without disrupting the entire system. Possibly some changes will be in order in the Pentagon; naive assumptions and faulty execution are certainly cause for concern. But neither the CIA nor the Pentagon made the final decision in respect of Cuba, and no

additional committees would have been a complete safeguard against miscalculation.

The sobering fact is that many high officials in the administration knew of the plans and gave their approval. President Kennedy himself had vetoed previous plans for direct participation of American Armed Forces. Some few persons, including Senator FULBRIGHT, protested what they thought an unwise course. But there was not enough counsel of skepticism to illuminate the dangers and halt the operation.

Why did this happen? Why did the checks and balances normally associated with the staff system fail to work? Why did most of the intellectuals, the bright young men assembled by Mr. Kennedy, get swept along?

It is possible to hazard several guesses. One is that among the staff people serving the President, many come from essentially the same background and have similar patterns of thinking. If this sort of old school tie operates among those most directly charged with planning, the President's own preference for competition in ideas can be frustrated. Advice can become inbred.

Another possible explanation concerns the difficulty that the intelligent generalist often faces when confronted by the specialist with a mass of details. Sound general judgment, including reservations, sometimes can be overwhelmed by an ultimatum from the expert that it is necessary to move now in a particular way or forever forfeit the chance.

Obviously there are many other explanations. If the chastening experience of Cuba serves to bring an examination in humility of the function of criticism in the formulation of policy, there may indeed be a gain. The whole purpose would be defeated, however, if the administration were to overcompensate to the extent of developing a hypercaution that would paralyze its ability to act.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 15, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1372) to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 15, 1961:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ben S. Stephansky, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15, 1961:

U.S. MARSHALS

Wesley H. Petrie, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for a term of 4 years.

Cato Ellis, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Edwin Langley, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Joseph F. Radigan, of Vermont, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Vermont for the term of 4 years.

John H. Reddy, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years.

B. Andrew Potter, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

Joseph Peter Kinneary, of Ohio, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 15, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Thomas C. Pexton, assistant minister, Shiloh Congregational Christian Church, Dayton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we call upon Thy name for guidance here, as have many of our forebears before us. Be Thou present in this Legislature, and bless each Member with Thy abiding love. Be Thou our guide, and inspire us to actions that will benefit this Nation and the world about us.

Keep us mindful of those principles of freedom and equality which have made our country great. May they be as mighty beacon lights protecting our Ship of State from the rocky shoals of godless ideologies that would lure it to destruction. Be Thou our helmsman through the rough waters of our day. We pray in the name of Him who was and is "the light of the world." Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 11, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2195. An act to convey certain land of the Pala Band of Indians to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 104. An act to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico.

S. 201. An act to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land.

S. 322. An act to make certain funds available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho.

S. 507. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinaielt Tribe.

S. 751. An act to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act.

S. 1208. An act to amend Public Law 86-506, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960.

S. 1215. An act to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951.

S. 1289. An act to amend sections 337 and 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifests.

S. 1719. An act to amend title 23 of the United States Code with respect to Indian reservation roads.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1372. An act to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LAIRD reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

House Resolution 289

Resolved, That during the 87th Congress, the Committee on Science and Astronautics shall be composed of 26 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 290

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Science and Astronautics: JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Massachusetts.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: CATHERINE D. NORRELL, Arkansas.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight

tonight to file a report on the bill H.R. 7030.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN STATUTORY AWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 861) to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in any case in which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determined before August 1, 1952, that the loss or the loss of use of a creative organ, or arrested tuberculosis, suffered by any veteran was service connected, and such loss or loss of use, or tuberculosis, would have been compensable under the amendments made by Public Law 427, Eighty-second Congress, if application therefor had been made on August 1, 1952, then the Administrator shall pay to such veteran in a lump sum the total amounts which would have been payable to him on account of such loss or loss of use, or tuberculosis, under (1) such amendments, (2) section 315 (k) or (q), as appropriate, of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957, and (3) section 314 (k) or (q), as appropriate, of title 38, United States Code, before the date of enactment of this Act, if such veteran had applied therefor on August 1, 1952, reduced by the amounts paid to him before such date of enactment under such amendments, such section 315 (k) or (q), and such section 314 (k) or (q).

SEC. 2. An application by the veteran concerned, filed within two years from the date of enactment of this Act, shall be required for benefits under this Act and no payment shall be made under the provisions of section 3021 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the death of any veteran occurring before the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFINING THE TERM "ORGANIZE" AS USED IN THE SMITH ACT

The clerk called the bill (H.R. 3247) to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term "organize" as used in that section.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RYAN. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does anyone else object? It takes three objections. There being no further objection, the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"As used in this section, the term 'organize', with respect to any society, group, or assembly of persons, includes the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the term "organize" and substitute the terms "organizes" and "organize".

Page 1, line 7, substitute "include" for "includes".

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Justice made the suggestion that we offer this amendment since the term 'organize" is used in the law both in the plural and in the singular.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Is this a clarifying amendment?

Mr. CELLER. It is purely a clarifying amendment. It does not change the substance. I shall insert the report from the Department of Justice:

MAY 8, 1961.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 3247, a bill "To amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term 'organize' as used in that section."

The Smith Act (18 U.S.C. 2385), among other things, provides that anyone who "organizes or helps or attempts to organize any society" which advocates the overthrow of the U.S. Government shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and shall be ineligible for employment by the U.S. Government for 5 years after such conviction.

In *Yates et al.* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 298), the Supreme Court held the Congress intended that the term "organize" should refer only to those acts entering into the creation of a new organization and not to acts thereafter performed in forming new units or regrouping existing ones. The Court found that within the framework of this legislative intent the Communist Party had been organized in 1945, and that the 3-year statute of limitations had run on the "organized" charge.

This bill would add a new paragraph to section 2385 which would define the term "organize" as used in the section. The term would include "the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons."

Enactment of this legislation will constitute a direct expression of legislative intent that the Smith Act provisions relating to the organizing of groups is to be applicable to the reorganizing of existing groups and the forming of new units.

The Congress may wish to consider the desirability of amending the text of this bill to read as follows:

"As used in this section, the terms 'organizes' and 'organize', with respect to any society, group, or assembly of persons, include the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons."

This suggestion is prompted by the fact that both terms appear in the statute.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

BYRON R. WHITE,
Deputy Attorney General.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 3247, to amend section 2385, title 18, United States Code, to define the term "organize" as used in that section, which section is part of the Smith Act of 1940, which outlaws conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States. Accordingly, my bill amends section 2385 by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph defining the term "organize."

Identical bills passed the House in the 85th and 86th Congresses; however, despite their passage without opposition, the Senate took no action, notwithstanding the fact that this legislation has the approval of the Department of Justice.

The Supreme Court has held previously that the term "organize," as used in the Smith Act, refers only to the original and official organization of the Communist Party in 1945 and does not refer to the party's continuing process of organizing groups for the purpose of overthrowing the Government.

Since its incepton, however, the Communist Party has been continually organizing groups and cells for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of the United States, and this continuing process of organization has not, according to the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Smith Act, been declared illegal in construing congressional intent.

If my bill is passed, the term "organize" will mean a continuous process of organizing groups and cells and of recruiting new members and not merely the original national organization of the Communist Party or some other party or society whose aims are inimical to the security of the United States.

In the 85th Congress the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives constituted a special subcommittee to study some of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court, on which I was ranking minority member. Among the decisions selected by the subcommittee for study was a decision rendered on June 17, 1957, in the case of *Yates* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 298).

Hearings were conducted on July 17, 1958, at which time a subcommittee heard from those Members of Congress who had introduced legislation designed to affect the decision of the Yates case together with other interested witnesses.

At the conclusion of those hearings the subcommittee concluded that legislation was necessary to clarify the meaning of the term "organize" as it is now used in the Smith Act. It was further concluded that the definition as set forth in my previous bills would accomplish that purpose.

In 1940 Congress enacted the so-called Smith Act which made it a crime for a person to commit any of three defined acts. The first was to knowingly or willfully advocate the overthrow by force or violence of any government in the United States; the second was to organize any society or group to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of any such government; the third was to be a member of or affiliated with any such society or group.

The Yates case involved the question of whether 14 known Communists had violated the first two parts of the act. The defendants had been convicted after jury trial on a single count of indictment charging them with conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence and with organizing groups for the same purpose. Their convictions had been affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The Supreme Court reversed the convictions and held that as to "advocacy" there must be actual incitement to action, and that the term "organize" referred only to the official organization of the Communist Party in 1945 and not to a continuing process of organization.

In the opinion of the Court, the organizing prohibited took place in 1945 when the Communist Political Association was disbanded and reconstituted the Communist Party of the United States. The indictment, returned in 1951, was therefore barred by the 3-year statute of limitations.

From a legislative history of the Smith Act, and as a matter of commonsense, it is my opinion that the term "organize" was intended to mean a continuous process of organizing groups and cells and of recruiting new members and not merely the original organization of the Communist Party or some other party or society whose aims are inimical to the security of the United States. The trial court in the Yates case had instructed the jury that the term "organize" included such things "as the recruiting of new members and the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes, and other units of any society, party, group, or other organization." The House Judiciary Committee concluded that this definition adequately expressed the original intention of Congress when it enacted the Smith Act, and my bill, approved by the committee, contains substantially that language.

The necessity for immediate action to counteract the effects of the Yates decision is born out by a report received by the subcommittee from the Department of Justice outlining the history of Smith Act conspiracy cases since the decision in Yates against United States. The following seven such cases have been reversed by courts of appeals, at least in part based upon the Yates decision's defining of "organize";

1. *Bary* case, Denver, 10th circuit (248 Fed. 2d 201): Seven defendants; August 23, 1957.

2. *Sentner*, St. Louis, eighth circuit: Five defendants; April 4, 1958.

3. *Brandt*, Cleveland, sixth circuit: Six defendants; May 23, 1958.

4. *Welman*, Detroit, sixth circuit: Six defendants; March 25, 1958.

5. *Kuzma*, Philadelphia, third circuit: Ordered the acquittal of four and authorized retrial of five; November 13, 1957.

6. *Fujimoto*, Hawaii, ninth circuit: All seven defendants ordered acquitted; January 16, 1958.

7. *Huff*, Seattle, ninth circuit: The convictions of all four defendants who had appealed were ordered reversed. One of the defendants in this case did not appeal but served her sentence, and therefore her conviction still stands; January 16, 1958.

The Government was authorized to retry the following 6 cases in which a total of 39 defendants were involved:

Yates	10
Bary	7
Sentner	5
Brandt	6
Welman	6
Kuzma	5

The Department of Justice reports that the Government dismissed the Kuzma and Yates cases, involving a total of 15 defendants, partly on the Yates definition of "organize." Still under consideration are the remaining 4 cases involving 24 defendants. In addition, the Government, since the Yates case, has also dismissed, in part due to the "organize" definition in Yates, two conspiracy cases involving 17 defendants, which had not been tried at the time of the Yates decision.

The House Judiciary Committee has supported me in my opinion that, in view of the definition placed by the Supreme Court upon the term "organize" as it is used in the Smith Act, and its resulting deleterious effect upon the Government's efforts to combat the Communist conspiracy in this country, action should be taken by Congress to assert its intention with respect to organizational activities, particularly of the Communist party.

My bill is a simple, unambiguous measure which affords the necessary solution to the problem and therefore I urge that H.R. 3247 do pass.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 3247, a bill introduced by my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CRAMER, to define the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act.

Identical bills passed the House without opposition in both the 85th and 86th Congresses. This bill had the endorsement of the Department of Justice during the Eisenhower administration. In my opinion, and in the opinion of many of those charged with protecting our country from communist infiltration by those agents intent on teaching the violent overthrow of our Government, this is an essential amendment to the Smith Act.

An amendment is necessary in order to overcome the decision of the Supreme Court in the Yates case, wherein the Court held that the term "organize" referred only to the official organization of the Communist Party and not to the continuing process of organization.

In my opinion there can be no clearer example of the Supreme Court misconstruing the original intention of Congress. Therefore, I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in voting for the measure in order to restore the original definition intended by Congress of the term "organize."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVE RESTRICTION OF THE NEW MEXICO ENABLING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2551) to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 104, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That those provisions of section 10 of the Act entitled "An Act to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the original States", approved June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557, 563), which provides that, in the case of the sale by the State of New Mexico of lands granted or confirmed to the State by such Act, legal title shall not be deemed to have passed until the consideration shall have been paid and any sale not made in substantial conformity with the provisions of such Act shall be null and void, are hereby waived with respect to the following sales by the State of New Mexico of lands which constituted, or constitute, a portion of a tract of land for the sale of which a contract had been previously entered into, but only insofar as such sales would (but for the enactment of this Act) violate the terms and conditions contained in section 10 of such Act because of the fact that the full consideration for the entire tract was not, or is not, paid prior to the time of the

sale of such portion and the issuance of the patent therefor:

(1) Any sale of any such portion, if the patent with respect thereto was issued on or before September 4, 1956;

(2) Any sale of any such portion, if the patent with respect thereto is issued after September 4, 1956, and if the right to purchase such portion is derived from an assignment, made on or before September 4, 1956, under the contract to purchase the entire tract; and

(3) Any sale of any such portion, if the patent with respect thereto is issued after September 4, 1956, and if the right to purchase such portion is derived from the contract to purchase the entire tract or from a contract entered into in substitution of such contract, and if the right or rights to purchase all other portions of such tract were, on or before September 4, 1956, assigned or relinquished by the person who entered into such contract.

Consent is hereby given to the State of New Mexico to adopt any amendment to the constitution of the State or to enact any laws necessary to carry out the purposes hereof.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2551) was laid on the table.

LANDS AT NELLIS AIR FORCE RANGE, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6494) to provide for withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of Defense of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nev., for defense purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subject to valid existing rights, the public lands, and the minerals therein, within the areas described in section 2 of this Act are hereby withdrawn from all appropriations and other forms of disposition under the public land laws, including the mining and mineral leasing laws and disposals of materials under the Act of July 31, 1947, as amended (61 Stat. 681; 30 U.S.C. 601–604), except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, and reserved (subject to an agreement which has been approved by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior for the joint use of the lands for military, grazing, and wildlife purposes), for the use of the Department of Defense for a period of ten years with an option to renew the withdrawal and reservation for a period of five years upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior, and subject to the condition that the reservation may be terminated at any time during either of such periods by the Secretary of Defense upon notice to the Secretary of the Interior. However, this Act does not affect Executive Order Numbered 7373 of May 20, 1936 (1 F.R. 427), establishing the Desert Game Range, except to the extent rendered necessary by the national defense.

(b) Lands and resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to such appropriation and other disposition as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine to be consistent both with the requirements of Executive Order Numbered 7373 of May 20, 1936 (1 F.R. 427), and, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, with the requirements of the national defense. The Secretary of the Interior may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, authorize use or disposition of any of the lands or resources withdrawn and reserved by subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to prohibit applications for further withdrawals and reservations at the time of termination or expiration of any withdrawal or reservation under subsection (a) of this section, under laws and regulations then existing.

SEC. 2. The lands withdrawn and reserved by this Act are those that are now or may hereafter become subject to the public land laws within the areas described as follows: Approximately 81,480 acres of land, more or less, located approximately 27 miles northwest from the eastern boundary of Nellis Air Force Base, adjoining the eastern boundary of Nellis Air Force Range, Clark County, Nevada, and more fully described as follows:

(1) Parcel 1, adjoining the eastern and southern boundaries of the Nellis Air Force Range, Clark County, Nevada, comprised of township 15 south, ranges 57 and 58 east; sections 1 to 6, the northeast quarter of section 7, sections 8 to 16, the northeast quarter of section 17, the northeast quarter of section 21, sections 22 to 26, the northeast quarter of section 27, the northeast quarter of section 35, section 36, all in township 16 south, range 57 east; sections 1 to 7, the south half and the northwest quarter of section 8, the west half of section 16, sections 17 to 21, the southwest quarter of section 22, the southwest quarter of section 26, sections 27 to 35, all in township 16 south, range 58 east; sections 1 to 4, the northeast quarter of section 5, the northeast quarter of section 9, the north half, the southeast quarter, the north half of the southwest quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 10, section 11, 12, the northwest quarter of section 13, the north half and the southeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 14, the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 15, all in township 17 south, range 58 east; section 6, the northwest quarter of section 7, all in township 17 south, range 59 east, Mount Diablo meridian, Clark County, Nevada, a total of 81,160 acres, more or less.

(2) Parcel 2, the south half of the southeast quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 20, the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 21, the northwest quarter of the northwest quarter of section 28, the north half of the northeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 29, all in township 16 south, range 57 east; for a total of 320 acres, more or less.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Nelis Air Force Range, Nevada, for defense purposes."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "Defense" and insert in lieu thereof "the Air Force".

Page 2, line 10, strike out the word "Defense" and insert in lieu thereof "the Air Force".

Page 2, line 22, strike out the word "Defense," and insert in lieu thereof "the Air Force,".

Page 2, line 24, strike out the word "Defense," and insert in lieu thereof "the Air Force,".

Page 3, line 3, strike out all of subsection (c) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) Upon request of the Secretary of the Interior at the time of final termination of the reservation effected by this Act, the Department of the Air Force shall make safe for nonmilitary uses the land withdrawn and reserved, or such portions thereof as may be specified by the Secretary of the Interior, by neutralizing unexploded ammunition, bombs, artillery projectiles, or other explosive objects and chemical agents. Thereafter the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to law shall provide for the appropriate use or disposition of all or any part of the land withdrawn and reserved under provisions of this Act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of the Air Force at that time from making application for further withdrawal and reservation of all or part of said lands under laws and regulations then existing."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nev., for defense purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPACT

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 225) to grant the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin Compact and to enter into such compact on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AMEND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5751) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to require the registration of certain additional persons disseminating political propaganda within the United States as agents of a foreign principal, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this bill H.R. 5751 would provide a method of controlling unsolicited foreign propaganda and it in no way isolates citizens of this country from information they desire to receive.

At the present time, we are in effect subsidizing the dissemination of pro-Communist political propaganda, which is not designated as such for general distribution to our citizens of this country, most of whom do not want it nor have ever requested it.

It is estimated that in the year 1959 over 10 million individual propaganda items entered the United States from Soviet-bloc countries. The Foreign Agents Registration Act does not at the present time provide that this material be properly labeled at the time of importation.

H.R. 5751 is designed to correct this weakness and plug up this loophole in the act. It is patently ridiculous for this Government to use the taxpayers' dollars for the purpose of disseminating information for the most part entirely false and directed at the overthrow of our form of government.

May I emphasize that this identical bill passed the House in the 86th Congress under suspension of the rules. Unfortunately, it was not considered in the Senate before adjournment.

Investigations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities disclose the fact that Communist-bloc countries are using the subterfuge of channeling their pro-Communist propaganda through free countries such as Canada, Mexico, and some of the South American countries, thus giving the information an authentic guise.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act requires the registration with the Attorney General of those agents of a foreign power who disseminate political propaganda in the United States. It also requires the labeling of political propaganda so that the American public can be on notice respecting it. The theory underlying H.R. 5751 rejects any concept of censorship. It is based on the same premise which undergirds the labeling provisions commonly found in food and drug laws, which require the producers of poisonous drugs to label them as such.

As a result of the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigations and hearings, I am compelled to conclude that the American public is not being given the protection which the law contemplated. Now that the executive branch of the Government has seen fit to discontinue the Government's practice of intercepting Communist propaganda mailed into this country from abroad, the poison will be poured into the veins of our society without restriction and without notice or warning of its nature.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I regret this measure was passed over, and urge early passage because it is desirable legislation.

TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS AND BAGGAGE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4321) to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects of certain retired members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we could have a brief explanation of this bill. I would like to ask particularly whether there is any retroactive provision in this bill.

Mr. KILDAY. If the gentleman will yield, his question is whether or not it is retroactive.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. KILDAY. No it is not retroactive.

The amount involved is very small. The situation is this. Under the present law a retired person or his dependents may ship their household effects only to the residence previously designated, even though shipping to a newly selected place would cost less money. This bill permits a redesignation of the destination and if it costs more to ship to the new destination, the individual must pay the increased cost.

Mr. GROSS. It will not require payment for the shipment of goods in excess, or personal effects in excess?

Mr. KILDAY. No; if the gentleman will notice in the report on the first page, the committee has included language which makes it clear, that any additional cost will not be borne by the Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 253(c)), is amended by adding the following at the end thereof: "Such baggage and household effects may be shipped to a location other than the home selected by him. In any case in which the costs are in excess of those which would have been incurred if shipment had been made to his selected home, the member shall pay that excess cost. If a member authorized to select a home under subsection (a) accrues that right or any entitlement under this subsection but dies before he exercises it, that right or entitlement accrues to and may be exercised by his surviving dependents, or his baggage and household effects may be shipped to the home of the person legally entitled thereto if there are no surviving dependents."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, delete the quotation mark after the period and add the following:

"However, in any case in which the costs are in excess of those which would have been incurred if shipment had been made to the member's selected home, the surviving dependents or the person legally entitled to the baggage and household effects, as the case may be, shall pay that excess cost."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF COSTS BEFORE FOREIGN TRIBUNALS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4322) to amend section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of costs for certain United States nationals before foreign tribunals.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending the first sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "Under regulations to be prescribed by him, the Secretary concerned may employ counsel, and pay counsel fees, court costs, bail, and other expenses incident to the representation, before the judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation, of—

"(1) personnel subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice;

"(2) nationals of the United States serving with, employed by, or accompanying the armed forces outside of the United States; and

"(3) the dependents of any person covered by clause (1) or (2).";" and

(2) by striking out the words "persons under its jurisdiction" in subsection (c) and inserting the word "personnel" in place thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL PAY FOR DIVING DUTY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4323) to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to special pay for diving duty, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 236), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. (a) Members of the uniformed services entitled to receive basic pay and assigned by competent orders to the duty of diving shall be entitled to receive, in addition to basic pay, special pay at a rate not to exceed $110 per month for periods during which diving duty is actually performed, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary concerned.

"(b) No member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive the special pay authorized pursuant to this section in addition to incentive pay authorized pursuant to section 204 of this Act.

"(c) The President may, in time of war, suspend the payment of diving-duty pay."

SEC. 2. Section 204(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 235(a)), is further amended—

(1) by striking out clauses (8), (9), and (12), and the word "and" at the end of clause (12);

(2) by redesignating clauses (10), (11), and (13) as "(8)", "(9)", and "(10)", respectively; and

(3) by adding the word "and" after the semicolon at the end of clause (9).

SEC. 3. Section 204(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 235(c)), is further amended by striking out "(13)" and inserting "(10)" in lieu thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAKE UNIFORM CERTAIN REENLISTMENT BONUS PROVISIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4324) to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 207(e) and 208 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 238(e), 239), are each amended by striking out the words "ninety days" wherever they appear therein and inserting the words "three months" in place thereof.

SEC. 2. Any individual who—

(1) reenlisted in the regular component of the uniformed service concerned after July 15, 1954;

(2) reenlisted within three months but more than ninety days after the date of his discharge or release from active duty; and

(3) received no reenlistment bonus, or received an enlistment allowance, or a reenlistment bonus computed under the provisions of section 207 of the Career Compensation Act,

may be paid a reenlistment bonus under section 208 of such Act if he received no bonus, or may be paid the difference between the amount of the enlistment allowance or reenlistment bonus that he actually received and the amount that he would have received if his reenlistment bonus had been computed under the provisions of section 208 of such Act. To be eligible for payment under this section, an individual must apply for the payment within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. Retroactive payments shall be made from appropriations applicable at the date of reenlistment or from appropriations currently available for military pay and allowances.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE PAY OF CERTAIN PROFESSORS AT U.S. ACADEMIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4325) to increase the pay of certain professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the table for "Commissioned Officers" in section 201(a) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 232(a)), is amended—

(1) by inserting a footnote 3 after the figure "985.00" in the column relating to commissioned officers with over thirty years of service; and

(2) by adding the following footnote after footnote 2;

"[3] While serving as a permanent professor at the United States Military Academy or the United States Air Force Academy, basic pay for this grade is $1,065.00, if the officer has over 31 cumulative years of service, and $1,145.00, if the officer has over 36 cumulative years of service."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACADEMIC DEAN, NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4326) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the compensation of the Academic Dean of the Naval Postgraduate School.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7043(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary shall prescribe the compensation of the Academic Dean. However, the compensation may not be more than the maximum rate prescribed for positions covered by section 1113 of title 5."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SETTLEMENT OF PAY ACCOUNTS OF DECEASED MEMBERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4327) to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of section 714(c) of title 32, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Payment under clause (6) of subsection (a) shall be made—

"(1) upon settlement by the General Accounting Office; or

"(2) as otherwise authorized by the Comptroller General."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REASSIGN SUPPLY-DUTY-ONLY OFFICERS OF THE U.S. MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4328) to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That officers on the active list of the Marine Corps designated for supply duty, except the officer serving as Quartermaster General on the date of enactment of this Act, are hereby reassigned as officers not restricted in the performance of duty. All provisions of law relating to officers on the active list of the Marine Corps not restricted in the performance of duty apply to officers reassigned by this Act, except as otherwise specifically provided herein.

SEC. 2. The numbers of officers authorized to serve in grades above captain in the Marine Corps as set forth in the table in subsection (a) of section 5443 of title 10, United States Code, are readjusted to the extent necessary to include the numbers of officers authorized for those grades by subsections (g) and (h) of that section as those subsections read before the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) Each officer serving in the grade of brigadier general or colonel who is reassigned as an officer not restricted in the performance of duty by this Act, and who is senior to the senior officer in the first promotion zone established for his grade after the enactment of this Act, shall be considered for all purposes to be in that promotion zone.

(b) Within the number of officers not restricted in the performance of duty that may be recommended for promotion to a grade below brigadier general, as determined under section 5756 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of the Navy shall allocate a portion thereof for officers on the active list of the Marine Corps who were formerly designated for supply duty and who were reassigned as officers not restricted in the performance of duty by this Act. The portion allocated shall afford at least the same opportunity for promotion to such officers as is afforded other officers not restricted in the performance of duty. These provisions apply only when there is an eligible officer in the promotion zone. For the purpose of the above provisions, "eligible officer" means an officer who is serving in a grade below colonel, who has been reassigned as an officer not restricted in the performance of duty by this Act, and who has not previously been in a promotion zone established for any grade after the enactment of this Act. Reassigned officers in a zone of consideration established for the grade of major shall also be allocated a portion of the number of officers who may be recommended for promotion from within that zone, so as to afford them at least the same promotion opportunity as is afforded other officers not restricted in the performance of duty.

SEC. 4. This Act does not terminate or reduce the four-year term of the officer who is serving as Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps on the date of enactment of this Act or deprive him of the rank, pay, allowances, or retirement privileges to which he became entitled under sections 5204 and 5205 of title 10, United States Code. However, he shall be counted as a major general for the purposes of sections 5443 and 5448 of that title, as amended by this Act. His date of rank as a major general is July 1, 1954. When he ceases to serve as Quartermaster General, he shall be reassigned as an officer not restricted in the performance of duty and he may be reappointed by the President alone to the permanent grade of major general to rank from July 1, 1954.

SEC. 5. Subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5001(a)(8) is amended by striking out the words "supply duty or".

(2) Section 5204 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5204. Quartermaster General: detail

"The Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps shall be detailed by the Commandant from officers of the Marine Corps on active duty."

(3) Section 5205 is repealed.

(4) The analysis of chapter 515 is amended by striking out the following items:

"5204. Quartermaster General: appointment; term, pay and allowances.

"5205. Heads of Staff Departments: retirement."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"5204. Quartermaster General: detail."

(5) Section 5409(c) is amended by striking out the words ", excluding officers designated for supply duty,"

(6) Section 5443 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words ", excluding officers carried as additional numbers in grade," wherever they occur in subsections (a), (b), (c), and (f); and

(B) by striking out subsections (g) and (h) and redesignating subsections (i) and (j) as subsections "(g)" and "(h)".

(7) Section 5448 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "excluding officers carried as additional numbers in grade," wherever they occur in subsections (a), (b), and (c); and

(B) by striking out subsections (f) and (g) and redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections "(f)" and "(g)".

(8) Section 5588 is repealed.

(9) The analysis of chapter 539 is amended by striking out the following item:

"5588. Regular Marine Corps: officers designated for supply duty."

(10) Section 5589(e)(3) is amended by striking out the words "be designated for supply duty or".

(11) Section 5703 is amended—

(A) by striking out clause (1) in subsection (a) and renumbering clauses (2), (3), (4), and (5) as clauses "(1)", "(2)", "(3)", and "(4)", and

(B) by striking out subsection (d) and redesignating subsections (e) and (f) as subsections "(d)" and "(e)".

(12) Section 5706 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words ", the number of officers of the Marine Corps designated for supply duty," in clause (3);

(B) by striking out clause (8) and renumbering clauses (9), (10), (11), and (12) as clauses "(8)", "(9)", "(10)", and "(11)"; and

(C) by striking out the words "or colonels in the Marine Corps" in clause (9) as so renumbered.

(13) Section 5707 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "supply duty or" in subsection (d); and

(B) by inserting the words "supply duty," before the words "or duty in any technical specialty" in subsection (f).

(14) Section 5709 is amended—

(A) by amending the catchline to read as follows; "§ 5709. Navy and Marine Corps: retention of rear admirals and major generals on the active list"; and

(B) by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection "(c)".

(15) The analysis of chapter 543 is amended by striking out the following item:

"5709. Navy and Marine Corps: retention of rear admirals, major generals, and brigadier generals on the active list."

and inserting the following item in place thereof.

"5709. Navy and Marine Corps: retention of rear admirals and major generals on the active list."

(16) Section 5751(a) is amended by striking out the words "not restricted in the performance of duty".

(17) Section 5759 is repealed.

(18) The analysis of chapter 545 is amended by striking out the following item:

"5759. Regular Marine Corps; male officers designated for supply duty: numbers that may be recommended."

(19) Section 5765 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "not restricted in the performance of duty" in subsection (a); and

(B) by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsection (d) as subsection "(c)".

(20) Section 5769(b) is amended—

(A) by striking out clauses (4) and (6) and renumbering clause (5) as clause "(4)"; and

(B) by striking out the following words in the last sentence: "; and an officer in the grade of captain in the Marine Corps designated for supply duty is not eligible for promotion to the grade of major until there is a vacancy for him among officers of his designation in the combined grades of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major".

(21) Section 5775 is amended—

(A) by striking out clauses (7) and (8) in subsection (a) and renumbering clauses (9), (10), and (11) as clauses "(7)", "(8)", and "(9)"; and

(B) by striking out the words "and each male officer of the Marine Corps designated for supply duty" in subsection (b).

(22) Section 5776(b) is amended—

(A) by striking out the words ", or a male officer of the Marine Corps restricted in the performance of duty serving in the grade of colonel," in the first sentence; and

(B) by striking out the words "or brigadier general" in the second sentence.

(23) Section 6020 is repealed.

(24) The analysis of chapter 555 is amended by striking out the following item:

"6020. Marine Corps officers: detail to duty in Supply Department."

(25) Section 6374 is amended by striking out the words "not restricted in performance of duty" in the catchline and the words "not restricted in the performance of duty" in the text.

(26) Section 6375 is repealed.

(27) Section 6376 is amended by striking out the words "not restricted in performance of duty" after the word "colonels" in the catchline and the words "not restricted in the performance of duty" in the first sentence of the text before the words "serving in the grade of colonel".

(28) Section 6377 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "; Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty" in the catchline;

(B) by striking out the words "and each officer designated for supply duty serving in the grade of colonel on the active list of the Marine Corps" in subsection (a); and

(C) by striking out, in subsection (e), the words "or colonel in the Marine Corps" in the first and second sentences and the words "or colonel" in the second sentence.

(29) Section 6378 is amended—

(A) by striking out the words "; Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty" in the catchline;

(B) by inserting the word "and" after the words "in any staff corps," in the first sentence of subsection (a) and by striking out the words ", and each officer designated for supply duty serving in the grade of colonel on the active list of the Marine Corps" in that sentence;

(C) by striking out the word ", colonel," in the last sentence of subsection (a); and

(D) by striking out clause (8) in subsection (b).

(30) The analysis of chapter 573 is amended by striking out the following items:

"6374. Regular Marine Corps; brigadier generals not restricted in performance of duty: retirement for failures of selection for promotion.

"6375. Regular Marine Corps; brigadier generals designated for supply duty: retention on active list; retirement.

"6376. Regular Navy, line captains not restricted in performance of duty; Regular Marine Corps, colonels not restricted in performance of duty: retirement for length of service.

"6377. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders; Regular Marine Corps, colonels designated for supply duty: retirement for length of service or for age.

"6378. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders; Regular Marine Corps colonels designated for supply duty: continuation on active list; retirement."

and inserting the following items in place thereof:

"6374. Regular Marine Corps; brigadier generals: retirement for failures of selection for promotion.

"6376. Regular Navy, line captains not restricted in performance of duty; Regular Marine Corps, colonels: retirement for length of service.

"6377. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders: retirement for length of service or for age.

"6378. Regular Navy, line captains restricted in performance of duty, staff corps captains, and Nurse Corps commanders: continuation on active list; retirement."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 5, strike out lines 1 through 7 inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"(7) Section 5448 is amended—

"(A) by striking out the words ', excluding officers carried as additional numbers in grade,' wherever they occur in subsection (a), (b), and (c); and

"(B) by substituting the number '36' for the number '32' in the last sentence of subsection (a); and

"(C) by striking out subsections (f) and (g) and redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections '(f)' and '(g).'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIRED PAY FOR ENLISTED MEMBERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4330) to provide uniform computation of retired pay for enlisted members retired prior to June 1, 1958, under section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That members retired prior to June 1, 1958, pursuant to section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the Act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995), are authorized to include active service performed to the date of retirement as creditable service in the computation of basic pay upon which retired pay is based.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINGENCY OPTION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6668) to amend title 10, United States Code,

with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, entitled "Annuities Based on Retired or Retainer Pay" may be cited as the "Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Act".

SEC. 2. Section 1431 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1431. Election of annuity: members of armed forces

"(a) This section applies to all members of the armed forces except—

"(1) members whose names are on a retired list other than a list maintained under section 1376(a) of this title;

"(2) cadets at the United States Military Academy, the United States Air Force Academy, or the Coast Guard Academy; and

"(3) midshipmen.

"(b) To provide an annuity under section 1434 of this title, a person covered by subsection (a) may elect to receive a reduced amount of the retired or retainer pay to which he may become entitled as a result of service in his armed force. Except as otherwise provided in this section, unless it is made before he completes 18 years of service for which he is entitled to credit in the computation of his basic pay, the election must be made at least three years before he is retired or granted retired or retainer pay. However, if, because of military operations, a member is assigned to an isolated station or is missing, interned in a neutral country, captured by a hostile force, or beleaguered or besieged, and for that reason is unable to make an election before completing 18 years of that service, he may make the election, to become effective immediately, within one year after he ceases to be assigned to that station or returns to the jurisdiction of his armed force, as the case may be. A member to whom retired pay or retainer pay is granted retroactively, and who is otherwise eligible to make an election, may make the election within 90 days after receiving notice that such pay has been granted to him.

"(c) An election may be changed or revoked by the elector before he retires or becomes entitled to retired or retainer pay. However, unless made on the basis of restored mental competency under section 1433 of this title, the change or revocation is not effective if the member is retired or becomes entitled to retired or retainer pay within three years after making the change or revocation.

"(d) If an election made under this section is found to be void for any reason except fraud or willful intent of the member making the election, he may make a corrected election at any time within 90 days after he is notified in writing that the election is void. A corrected election made under this subsection is effective as of the date of the voided election it replaces."

SEC. 3. Section 1434 of title 10, United States Code is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows: "(b) A person may elect to provide both the annuity provided in clause (1) of subsection (a) and that provided in clause (2) of subsection (a), but he may elect only 25 or 12½ percent of his reduced retired or retainer pay for each annuity. The reduction in his retired or retainer pay on account of each annuity, and the amount of each annuity, shall be determined in the same manner that it would be determined if the other annuity had not been elected."; and

(2) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) Under regulations prescribed under section 1444(a) of this title, a person may, before or after becoming entitled to retired or retainer pay, provide for allocating, during the period of the surviving spouse's eligibility, a part of the annuity under subsection (a)(3) for payment to those of his surviving children who are not children of that spouse."

SEC. 4. Section 1436 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following at the end of the catchline: "; withdrawal for severe financial hardship";

(2) by inserting the designation "(a)" before the words "The reduction" at the beginning; and

(3) by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(b) Under regulations prescribed under section 1444 (a) of this title, the Secretary concerned may, whenever he considers it necessary because of the member's severe financial hardship, allow him to withdraw from participation in an annuity program under this chapter, when requiring the member to continue to participate in the program would violate equity and good conscience. The absence of an eligible beneficiary shall not of itself be a basis for such action. However, no deductions from his retired or retainer pay may be refunded to him under this subsection."

SEC. 5. Section 1444(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new sentences at the end thereof: "In addition to a report on the administration of this chapter, the report shall also contain a detailed account, including an actuarial analysis, of those cases in which relief is granted under sections 1436(b) and 1552 of this title, or any other statutory or administrative procedure. This subsection does not apply to actions taken under section 1445 of this title."

SEC. 6. Chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"§ 1445. Correction of administrative deficiencies

"Whenever he considers it necessary, the Secretary concerned may, under regulations prescribed under section 1444(a) of this title, correct any election, or any change or revocation of an election, under this chapter when he considers it necessary to correct an administrative error. Except when procured by fraud, a correction under this section is final and conclusive on all officers of the United States.

"§ 1446. Restriction on participation

"(a) Notwithstanding section 1441 of this title, if a person—

"(1) has made an election under this chapter;

"(2) is retired for physical disability before he completes 18 years of service for which he is entitled to credit in the computation of his basic pay;

and thereafter dies, his beneficiaries are not entitled to the annuities provided under this chapter until they give proof to the department concerned that they are not eligible for benefits under chapter 11 or 13 of title 38. If the beneficiaries are not eligible for benefits under chapter 11 or 13 of title 38, the annuity shall begin on the first day of the month in which the death occurs.

"(b) Whenever the beneficiaries on whose behalf the election was made are restricted, under subsection (a), from participating in the annuities provided under this chapter, the amount withheld from the elector's retired or retainer pay as a result of an election under this chapter shall be refunded to the beneficiaries, less the value of any annuities to be paid under this chapter, and in either case without interest."; and

(2) by striking out the following item in the analysis:

"1436. Computation of reduction in retired pay."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"1436. Computation of reduction in retired pay; withdrawal for severe financial hardship."; and

(3) by adding the following new items at the end of the analysis:

"1445. Correction of administrative deficiencies.

"1446. Restriction on participation."

SEC. 7. Any person who, before the date of enactment of this Act, has filed a change or revocation, subject to section 1431(c) of title 10, United States Code, of an election made under section 1431(b) of that title, which change or revocation would be ineffective if he were to retire upon the date of enactment of this Act, shall have that change or revocation become effective on that date, or three years after the date upon which it was filed, whichever is later.

SEC. 8. Any person who—

(1) made an election before the date of this Act which would be effective if he retired on the day before such date; and

(2) hereafter retires for physical disability before completing 18 years of service for which he is entitled to credit in the computation of his basic pay—

shall be considered as having applicable to him all of the provisions of chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, existing on the date preceding the date of enactment of this Act, except that any revocation or change of an election is not effective until three years after the date of filing such revocation or change, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEALING SECTION REQUIRING BONDING OF OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2554) to repeal section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code requiring an annual report by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the bonding of officers and employees of the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code (which requires the submission to the Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury of an annual report with respect to the bonding of officers and employees of the Federal Government) is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SCOTTS BLUFF NATIONAL MONUMENT, NEBR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5760) to revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to preserve the scenic and historic integrity of Scotts Bluff and adjacent features, the Secretary of the Interior may revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument so as to exclude from it certain private and Federal lands and substitute other private lands more essential to the purposes of the monument: *Provided,* That the revised boundaries shall encompass an area which is about three hundred and fifty acres less than the acreage of the monument as of the date of this Act. Notice of the designation of the revised boundaries pursuant to this section shall be given by publication in the Federal Register.

SEC. 2. The Secretary, in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, may procure, in such manner as he may deem to be in the public interest, lands and interests in lands within the revised boundaries designated pursuant to section 1 of this Act. To avoid the undesirable severance of parcels in private ownership which extend beyond the revised boundaries, the Secretary may, in his discretion and with the consent of the owners, acquire lands or interests in lands that are in private ownership but which lie outside the revised boundary. Property so acquired outside the revised boundary and federally owned lands excluded from the monument pursuant to section 1 of this Act may be exchanged by the Secretary of the Interior for any land of approximately equal value within the revised boundaries. Nothing in this section shall be construed as repealing or limiting the existing jurisdiction, power, or authority of the Secretary prescribed by the public land laws.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 20, strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, but not more than $15,000, as may be necessary for the acquisition of lands newly included within the boundaries of the monument as revised pursuant to this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO INCLUDE TWO MONUMENTS IN THE NATCHEZ TRACE PARKWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6346) to include Ackia Battleground National Monument, Miss., and Meriwether Lewis National Monument, Tenn., in the Natchez Trace Parkway, and to provide appropriate designations for them, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, to facilitate the administration of two areas of the national park system, known as Ackia Battleground National Monument, Mississippi, and Meriwether Lewis National Monument, Tennessee, those areas are included in the Natchez Trace Parkway, which they adjoin; and they shall be administered as a part of the parkway. In order to provide continued recognition of the significance of these portions of the parkway, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide them with appropriate designations in accordance with the historical events which occurred on them.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CEDAR BREAKS NATIONAL MONUMENT, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6422) to add Federally owned lands to, and exclude Federally owned lands from, the Cedar Breaks National Monument, Utah, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to further the administration, enhance the setting, and promote the public appreciation and enjoyment of the Cedar Breaks National Monument, in the State of Utah, the lands in the State of Utah, particularly described as follows, to-wit: west half northwest quarter northeast quarter, west half southwest quarter, northeast quarter, west half northwest quarter southeast quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter southeast quarter, all situated in section 36, township 36 south, range 9 west, Salt Lake meridian, northeast quarter lot 8, section 36, township 36 south, range 9 west, Salt Lake meridian, west half northeast quarter northwest quarter, and northwest quarter southeast quarter northwest quarter, both situated in section 12, township 37 south, range 9 west, Salt Lake meridian, consisting of 111.4 acres, more or less, are excluded from Dixie National Forest and added to the monument.

SEC. 2. The lands in the State of Utah particularly described as follows, to-wit: south half southeast quarter, section 15, township 36 south, range 9 west, Salt Lake meridian, north half lot 2, and south half lot 4, both in section 22, township 36 south, range 9 west, Salt Lake meridian, consisting of 129 acres, more or less, are excluded from the monument and added to Dixie National Forest.

SEC. 3. Lands added to the Cedar Breaks National Monument pursuant to the provisions of this Act shall be administered in accordance with the Act of August 25, 1916, chapter 408 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1–4), as amended and supplemented, and shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the monument. The lands added to the Dixie National Forest shall be subject to all laws and regulations applicable to the national forest.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "quarter, northeast" and insert in lieu thereof "quarter northeast".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TUPELO NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD SITE, MISSISSIPPI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6519) to provide additional lands for the Tupelo National Battlefield site, Mississippi, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, to further the purposes of the Act of February 21, 1929 (45 Stat. 1254), the Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation or with donated funds not to exceed one-half acre of land and interests in land for addition to the adjoining Tupelo National Battlefield site.

SEC. 2. The Tupelo National Battlefield site is hereby redesignated the Tupelo National Battlefield which shall continue to be administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DUPLICATES OF ROBERT FROST MEDALS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 712) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet", approved September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 883), is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after the word "That", and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this subsection shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale."

The bill was ordered read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. THOMAS ANTHONY DOOLEY III, MEDAL

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 306) to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the gallant and unselfish public service rendered by Doctor Thomas Anthony Dooley III in serving the medical needs of the people of Laos living in the remote areas of the Laotian jungles, and of peoples in other newly developing countries, the President of the United States is authorized to award posthumously to Doctor Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in the name of Congress, an appropriate gold medal. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck a gold medal

with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500 for this purpose.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 306, to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in recognition of his gallant and unselfish public service in providing medical care for the underprivileged peoples of the world, particularly the people of Laos living in the remote areas of the Lao jungles.

I am sure all Members of the House are thoroughly familiar with the tremendous and unselfish accomplishments of Dr. Dooley before he passed away as a cancer victim on January 18, 1961, 1 day after his 34th birthday. In his short lifespan, Dr. Dooley worked tirelessly and with true Christian zeal to halt or cure preventable disease among peoples of southeast Asia who previously had scant hope of any medical care in their lifetime.

Dr. Dooley's initial interest in these peoples in relatively unknown and hitherto untouched areas of the world began when, as a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy Medical Corps, he administered to the refugees seeking freedom and asylum from the Communists of North Vietnam. In 1956 he obtained permission from the new Government of Laos to establish a small village hospital in Nam Tha, 5 miles from the border of Communist-held China, to assist the underprivileged of the area. In late 1957, Dr. Dooley and Dr. Peter D. Comanduras, a Washington specialist and medical professor, began their plans for the establishment of Medico—Medical International Cooperation Organization. This voluntary, nonpolitical, nonsectarian organization was at first under the auspices of the International Rescue Committee but in late 1959 became a separate entity, incorporated as Medical, Inc.

DR. DOOLEY'S LAOS HUMANITY CONTRASTED TO COMMUNIST INHUMANITY

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Dooley returned to Laos in 1959 and established another hospital in the remote village of Muong Sing and the first under Medico auspices. By the end of 1960, Medico had 17 projects in operation in 12 countries, including 7 hospitals in Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Malaya. Dr. Dooley played an important role in getting all of them started. The cancer condition that claimed Dr. Dooley's life earlier this year resulted from an injury he received while serving his medical mission in Laos. It is very sad to note that the very people Dr. Dooley worked and gave his life for in the cause of humanity are now being slaughtered and trampled over by the inhuman brutality and infiltrating tactics of Communist rebels.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this House passes this resolution overwhelmingly as a tribute to Dr. Dooley's humanity, and let the world know what the Dr. Dooleys have done and are doing for underprivileged peoples in contrast to what the Communists are doing today.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support House Joint Resolution 306, a bill which calls upon the Nation to award, posthumously, to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, a token of the affection, the esteem, and the admiration which his fellow citizens hold for him. Last session when I introduced H.R. 9404 and at the beginning of this session, when I introduced a joint resolution similar to that being considered, to make an award to Dr. Dooley, a number of people asked me just why I wanted to see this man singled out among the other brave and dedicated people who are serving humanity in faraway places. Frankly, I found it a little difficult to enunciate my precise sentiments. I have been trying, in the months since, to put into words just why I felt this gallant doctor should be an object of special consideration.

The reasons for my admiration for Dr. Dooley—for the Nation's admiration and respect for him—are manifold.

First, it is customary and proper for a grateful country to decorate those men who have, at the risk of their lives and safety, gone forth to do battle against our enemies. We most often give medals to men who do this in the uniform of their country. Dr. Dooley wore that uniform with distinction, when he served as medical officer during the evacuation of the thousands of freedom-loving Vietnamese who fled south after the partition of that unhappy country. I suspect most of the Members of this House have read with incredulous wonder of the harrowing experiencies which that young man underwent during that evacuation. This, in itself, would be ample excuse for some token of his country's esteem. In helping give to thousands of Vietnamese relief from pain and sickness—in helping men, women, and children to escape from the encroachments of the unfree world, Dr. Dooley adequately and more than adequately performed his duty to his country, and to mankind.

But for this young man it was not enough to put in his years in the Navy, do his work creditably and courageously, and retire to a civilian life in which, judging by the prophecies of his medical professors, he could have had a remunerative and not particularly wearing medical practice as a "society doctor." Tom Dooley was not content to count his years in the Navy as the payoff to his country and to the spark of love of humanity which illumined him so brilliantly. Like most other great men, Tom Dooley was a little unreasonable, a little impractical, somewhat unused to balancing credits against debts and closing the books as soon as possible. Tom Dooley had to go back, because he had looked upon the naked face of pain and disease and found it unbearable. He was not content with returning to the United States and telling people about what he had seen, hoping to inspire other young men to go forth and emulate what he had done. Instead he had to go himself. He had to throw his own not-very-sturdy body and his steel-tough soul into the fight against mankind's oldest and most implacable enemy—disease. Tom Dooley had to go back to the steaming and disease-ridden jungles of southeast Asia, to the border settlement of Nam Tha. Why? He had to do it, I think, for the same reason mountain climbers have to climb mountains—for the same reasons country doctors have to answer 2 a.m. calls at homes where they know they won't get paid—for the same reason saints have to march singing into the arenas and the concentration camps. Tom Dooley had to do what he did because he believed in the highest of religious dictates—"That Ye Love One Another." To Tom Dooley this was not a once-a-week text, to be trotted out on Sunday, admired, and put back in its case until next Sunday. It is a commandment—a requirement—a price we must pay, in a way, for being human beings. Tom Dooley, like a few other outstanding human beings in every country and every age, did not begrudge that price, or try to keep his bill low, or to pay it in easy installments.

So, for his devotion to his duty—to a higher and more difficult duty than simply serving his Nation in its uniform, Tom Dooley deserves our respect and our appreciation.

But mere devotion to duty is not enough, I suspect, to merit the medal which we are about to give to Dr. Dooley. What else was there in this man's life and work that merits such an accolade?

Tom Dooley was a dedicated fighter against disease and against pain. In his own books, he quoted the great Albert Schweitzer to the effect that there is a worldwide brotherhood of those who have known pain—that there is an empathy possible among those whose lives and health have been threatened. Tom Dooley belonged to this brotherhood—to this international conspiracy against death. In the course of his own selfless work, Tom Dooley incurred a dangerous cancer. He returned to the United States to have it removed, and then, without knowing whether he had five decades or 5 months to live, he returned to Laos, to give whatever time his Maker had allotted to him, to the continuing fight. At the risk of his life, in sublimed disregard for his own pain and his own welfare, Tom Dooley returned to the task which his own compulsions drove him to. We all know the story—and the ending. Here, indeed, was devotion to duty, above and beyond the call of duty, at the risk of life and limb.

But what, Mr. Speaker, does this all add up to? Does the fact that a human being may be dying of cancer earn for him anything beyond the sympathy of us all? Does the simple fact of physical

courage entitle a man to special recognition by the Congress? Perhaps not. But, Mr. Speaker, there is more meaning than this to Tom Dooley.

In going into Laos, this dedicated physician was not acting as a symbol of American foreign policy. He didn't go to Laos to convert the heathen, or to make good little pro-Americans out of them. Tom Dooley went back to Laos, up to the border village of Nam Tha, a few miles from Communist China, in country where few white men had ever gone, and fewer still were wanted, to heal the sick. He went there, not as one American spreading a newfangled kind of foreign aid, but as a man seeking to serve his brothers in God's family. Tom Dooley's medicine has been criticized as 19th century medicine. It has been defended, on that very basis, as a vast improvement over the 14th century medicine available, and as the kind of thing the people of the area could most effectively utilize and continue when Dooley was gone.

In doing this, Tom Dooley has done something for us all. He has, no doubt, made friends for America in Laos. That is very desirable, and very laudable. But he has done more—and for his fellow Americans. He has shown them a vision of the kind of faith that moves mountains and conquers worlds. He has shown us a better way to win men's hearts than by giving them bombs and bullets to shoot at our enemies. He has shown us a new glimpse into an old reality—into the kind of power that brotherhood can have.

But let me say it in Tom Dooley's own words:

Let us stop all this blather and bleat about the beatitudes of democracy. Let us get out and show, with simple spontaneity and love, our ability to work at the level of the people we aim to aid. Let us stop proclaiming ourselves as the world standard. Democracy, as championed by the United States, does not translate well into Lao. Not yet. We evolved it from 1776 to 1958. Let us be patient with the Asian. The Lao need only time, education, and stimulation.

I believe that we would gain more for our own country (and this is certainly part of the incentive behind our foreign aid) if we emphasized the connections that exist between peoples. Let us show that we believe these connections to be greater than the differences. The cables binding humanity around the world are stronger than national rivalries. Let us reaffirm, and then live, our belief in the family of man. Let us prove again that America understands that "God hath made of one blood all men for to dwell upon the earth."

For his personal courage, for his devotion to his duty, for the gift, not the loss of his life, for the lesson in the stimulation of humility and the power of love that he has given to all the world, but mostly to us, Tom Dooley deserves the gratitude of our Nation.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAL AVIATION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 398) authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Whereas the city of Pensacola proposes to celebrate with appropriate ceremonies the fiftieth anniversary of naval aviation during the period June 6 through June 11, 1961; and

Whereas, while there was limited naval aviation activity prior to the establishment of a school for training of naval aviators at Pensacola, the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, is regarded as the first home for naval aviators; and

Whereas the training programs of the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, have significantly contributed to the defense of the United States and through its training programs for friendly governments, has contributed to the defense of the free world; and

Whereas all naval aviators who have trained at Pensacola are being extended an invitation to attend their class reunion and participate in the gala and significant events associated with this outstanding occasion; and

Whereas naval dignitaries not only from the United States, but from the Governments of Canada and Great Britain, have been invited to send representatives; and

Whereas this fiftieth anniversary of naval aviation has great national and international significance in that military training of great historical importance has been carried on for fifty years; and

Whereas a celebration of the character planned will contribute greatly to the educational and cultural welfare and to the defense of the people of the United States by highlighting the great traditions of naval aviation which have been handed down through the years and which must be kept intact in today's troubled world; and

Whereas appropriate recognition is taken of the contributions, the interest, and the warm friendship shown by the people of Pensacola and Escambia County for naval personnel and/or naval aviation through these fifty years; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States recognizes the tremendous significance of fifty years of devoted labor and sacrifice that has gone into the compiling of this record which has been established by naval aviation and by the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to design and manufacture and to accept payment therefor from private sources, a galvano of appropriate design commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of naval aviation. The payment of such cost, if any, to the Government shall be reimbursed to the appropriation of the Bureau of the Mint, by the Fiesta of Five Flags and Naval Aviators Homecoming Celebration, 330 Brent Building, Pensacola, Florida.

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to present such galvano to the Secretary of the Navy in connection with this celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of naval aviation at Pensacola, Florida.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUITIES FROM CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT FUND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5432) to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide increases in certain annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes", approved June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 219; Public Law 85-465), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the annuities and increases in annuities provided by the preceding sections of this Act, shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof be permitted to sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN DUTY-FREE ALLOWANCE FOR RETURNING RESIDENTS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6611) to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C., sec. 1201, par. 1798(c)(2)), is amended—

(1) by striking out "$200, if such person" in subdivision (A) and inserting in lieu thereof "$100 if such person arrives before July 1, 1963 (or $200 if such person arrives on or after July 1, 1963), and he either", and

(2) by striking out "$300 in addition, if such person" in subdivision (B) and inserting in lieu thereof "$300 in addition, if such person arrives on or after July 1, 1963, and he".

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to persons arriving in the United States on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. In applying paragraph 1798(c)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to

articles acquired in the Virgin Islands of the United States by any person—

(1) who arrives in the United States (as defined in section 401(k) of such Act) during the period beginning on the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on June 30, 1963, and

(2) who has remained outside the United States (as so defined) for less than 48 hours, the 48-hour requirement in such paragraph 1798(c)(2)(A) shall be treated as satisfied.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 6611 provides a temporary reduction from $500 to $100 in the amount of purchases abroad that a returning resident of the United States may bring into this country free of duty. The bill was introduced by me following the recommendation of the President contained in a letter to the Speaker dated February 24, 1961, wherein the President asked that such action be taken as a part of his overall program to counter our present unfavorable balance-of-payments position.

The Members will recall that we passed earlier another proposal that was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means on this same subject matter, our balance-of-payments position.

Since 1799 it has been customary for the United States to permit free entry into the United States of what we refer to commonly as personal effects. In 1897, however, the Congress deemed it advisable to place some limit upon the amount of personal purchases that could be brought back to the United States by an American returning from some visit abroad. So a limit of $100 was placed on duty-free items a tourist could bring back. That remained the law until 1948. In 1948 the Congress raised this $100 exemption of goods that could be brought back by the returning tourist free of duty to $400. Following that the Congress, in 1949, took another look at the situation and raised the $400 exemption to $500.

Under existing law, a returning U.S. resident is allowed the following personal exemptions from duty on articles he has purchased abroad:

1. If the returning resident remains outside the territorial limits of the United States for at least 48 hours, he may claim an exemption from duty for $200 worth of articles acquired abroad. If, however, he returns through a port of entry on the Mexican border, he need only have been absent from the United States for such time (not to exceed 24 hours) as the Secretary of the Treasury has by regulation provided with respect to such port. At present, these regulations require an absence of at least 24 hours (the maximum requirement permitted under the law) in the case of residents returning through one of the southern California ports below Los Angeles. In the case of other ports along the United States-Mexican border, there is no period of absence provided for. This $200 exemption from duty may be claimed once every 30 days.

2. If the returning resident remains outside the territorial limits of the United States for 12 or more days, he may claim an additional exemption from duty for $300 worth of articles acquired abroad. This additional exemption, which may be claimed together with the basic exemption described above, can be utilized only once in every 6-month period.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us differs slightly from the President's recommendation in that it provides for a temporary 2-year reduction rather than a 4-year reduction, which he suggested initially. This provision would remain in effect until the close of June 30, 1963, when the Congress could have another look to see whether or not this lower duty-free exemption should be permitted to continue.

Mr. Speaker, there is a second provision in the bill which was not recommended in the President's message, but which was agreed to in committee. It deals with the waiver of the 48-hour requirement with respect to tourist purchases in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who have raised some question about this proposition on the ground that it is a step backward; that it should not be taken. Mr. Speaker, it should be borne in mind that the action by the Congress in 1948, and the second action in 1949, raising this ceiling to $500, was taken at a time when it was desirable for us to promote the expenditure abroad of dollars by tourists going to Europe.

Mr. Speaker, maybe this does not have as much effect on balance of payments as some other actions that could be suggested or recommended. It is thought that, perhaps, this will have an effect to the extent of maybe $150 million and, perhaps, produce some additional revenues of $5 million or $10 million in payment of duties. But, Mr. Speaker, the main purpose that the Congress had in mind, in my opinion, in increasing this limitation from $100 to $400, and then later to $500, has been attained, and it is not necessary any longer for us to permit this type of exemption from duty on the part of American citizens who travel abroad for that basic reason. I see no reason why we should deal more liberally in this area than any other country in the world deals today when we have a balance-of-payments problem of our own. No other tourist-conscious country permits its people to return home from a visit and bring with them as much as would be provided even under the program set forth in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, some have also raised a question as to whether or not some countries may retaliate should this proposal be adopted. I would like to include at this point a letter I received from Assistant Secretary of State Hays on this point:

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MILLS: It may be of value to you and your committee to know that the State Department has reviewed the situation and attitudes of the various countries likely to be most affected by the action proposed in H.R. 5191 to reduce the duty-free entry privilege for certain American tourists abroad from a maximum of $500 to a maximum of $100. In view of the fact that in nearly all cases the new U.S. regulations would be more favorable than those now applied by other countries to their own tourists visiting the United States, and taking account of the reactions which have been received thus far to the U.S. proposal, the Department of State does not anticipate any other government will institute retaliatory or punitive action which would further restrict the expenditures of their own nationals in the United States or their ability to bring items purchased in the United States back into their own country free of duty.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. You propose to limit what the average citizen can buy abroad. Are you doing anything about a corporation like the Ford Motor Co. sending $350 million abroad in one check to buy a company over there?

Mr. MILLS. That is an investment over there—yes; we have some recommendations before the committee at the moment that deal with matters in the area of tax treatment of these investments abroad on which hearings are now being conducted.

Mr. HAYS. Would the gentleman be willing to give us any assurance that there will be more than hearings on that question?

Mr. MILLS. I am not ever in a position, as my good friend knows, to predict what the committee may do, but certainly this is a matter that will be considered in executive session.

Mr. HAYS. Yes; and, on the past record, I think I can make a prediction.

Mr. MILLS. You think we will report it out then?

Mr. HAYS. No; I do not.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman whether the committee gave any consideration to exempt Canada from the provisions of this bill?

Mr. MILLS. We have never provided in areas of this sort for any distinction with respect to tariff duties and application of rates of duty except over the years we always had a preferential tariff rate of duty for Cuba and the Philippines and special treatment for products of Communist-dominated countries or areas. But, as a general rule, we have never differentiated or distinguished between countries in the application of our duties. We follow the most-favored-nation policy under which we treat all alike. It would be discriminatory and, I think, contrary to all of the basic policy that this country has pursued over the years, if we were to do so.

Mr. LAIRD. This exemption was really granted for the purpose of increasing trade and cutting down on aid; is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. We did it as a vehicle to try to increase the dollar balances of some of these European countries that were encouraging American tourism. I think it has done a great deal to accomplish that. We are at a point now

where we are disturbed by our own imbalance in these payments. I think we should begin to think in terms of restricting some of these things since the initial basic reason for liberalizing this provision has been fruitful.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. SCRANTON. I notice that you estimate the dollar curb will probably amount to $150 million approximately.

Mr. MILLS. That is a Treasury estimate. They cannot estimate with any degree of accuracy in this field.

Mr. SCRANTON. Exactly how do they arrive at their estimate?

Mr. MILL. We interrogated them in the committee. It is their best guess. That is about all we can say.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Would Members of Congress come under the provisions of this law?

Mr. MILLS. It is my understanding that we are subject to the same rules that are applicable to any other traveling American; yes.

Mr. GROSS. Do the customs officials actually inspect these MATS planes when Members of Congress travel?

Mr. MILLS. You will have to ask somebody who has been abroad under those conditions. I myself do not know from experience, as a matter of fact.

Mr. GROSS. So this is designed to cover Members of Congress as well as the ordinary citizen?

Mr. MILLS. Any returning American citizen is covered.

Mr. GROSS. What about the 48-hour provision?

Mr. MILLS. The 48-hour provision is with respect to how long a person must remain out of the United States in order to avail himself of this duty-free entry of the basic $200 under existing law or $100 under the bill we are now considering. There are certain exceptions, with respect to the Virgin Islands and to Mexico, for example.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. What about our neighbor to the north? Will there be any reciprocal action?

Mr. MILLS. No, we are assured by the Department of State that there will not. This applies only to American citizens. Canada does not extend to her citizens any such liberality as we extend to ours, even under the terms of this bill. Besides, this is an action of our own Government affecting our own citizens. Canada would have to legislate with respect to their own.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Iowa asked whether this applied to Members of Congress. Would the gentleman tell us whether this would apply to officials and employees of the United Nations?

Mr. MILLS. It applies to American tourists coming back from foreign countries.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But how about someone visiting the United Nations?

Mr. MILLS. We always permit them to bring their personal effects with them; we have always done that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But that would be when they came from outside the country.

Mr. MILLS. They bring with them their personal effects when they represent a foreign government.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How about when they come from Iowa to the United Nations?

Mr. MILLS. I thought the gentleman asked about someone coming in from abroad.

Mr. GROSS. For the information of the gentleman from Michigan, they are not giving anything away to Iowa at the United Nations, as I found out last Friday.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And Sunday, too.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. Very soon we will have before us a bill to encourage tourism. What are other nations doing for their nationals?

Mr. MILLS. Other nations do not treat their own nationals in this respect as liberally as we treat our citizens even under the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] to extend his remarks.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, no one is more concerned than I with the balance-of-payments position of the United States. I admire the vigor with which the present administration has approached this very serious matter and I am certain that their efforts will ultimately be rewarded. In fact, we are already noting a reverse in the previous gold flow pattern which I am sure everyone here is glad to see.

We are asked to approve H.R. 6611 in the interest of contributing toward a solution of our balance-of-payments problem. I think we should all recognize that the estimated saving in gold outflow of about $150 million will not carry us too far along this path. I have deep reservations that the pending proposal will save that much money. But that is another matter.

What concerns me most is that in taking this measure, which, as I have said, will do little to balance our payments position, we will unquestionably unbalance the deep friendly ties we have painstakingly built up over the years with our neighbors to the north and south—Canada and Mexico. This result is inevitable. And this action will be taken at a time when we need these ties of friendship more than ever before. We should be striving to solidify and strengthen these ties in the interest of the long-range challenge now presented to nations of the Western Hemisphere by the establishment of a Communist regime at our doorstep in Cuba. But, I submit, the pending proposal will serve to weaken these bonds and might prove to be much more disastrous than any imbalance in our payments position.

There is a further point which must not be overlooked in the case of our contiguous neighbors. Over the years, in the field of tourist trade, we have continuously enjoyed a favorable balance with our northern neighbor. In 1959, for instance, Canadian tourists spent some $100 million more in the United States than our citizens spent in Canada on tourism. The figures for 1960 are not as yet compiled but it is certain that much the same balance in our favor persisted. Should the Canadian Government retaliate, and who would blame her, this might very well serve to cut down on Canadian tourist purchases in the United States and negative this attempted move to assist our balance-of-payments position.

While tourist trade with Mexico shows, in 1959, a balance in favor of Mexico of some $190 million, we cannot overlook the effect this measure is certain to have on the sizable quantities of money which our tourists spend on lodgings and meals in the border States. As you know, the special absence requirements applicable to tourists who would claim present U.S. exemptions are waived, in large part, for travel to Mexico. The reason for this is that the greater number of U.S. border tourists visit Mexico by day and spend the evening and night in one of the border States. Many hotel and dining facilities have been constructed for this purpose. If we discourage this tourist trade, which we no doubt will if this proposal becomes law, then many of these border interests will be severely hurt.

Nor, Mr. Speaker, can we ignore the fact that on overall trade, we sell about twice as much to Mexico as we buy from her. In 1960, U.S. exports were $806.8 million while our imports from Mexico were some $443 million. Here again, any retaliation on the part of Mexico could serve to cut down the very large favorable balance of trade we now enjoy to the ultimate detriment of our balance-of-payments position.

Mr. Speaker, I come from an area of New York State which has fostered and built up a large part of the world-renowned friendship between the people of the United States and the people of Canada. We have played a major role in nurturing these ties of amicable and peaceful, side-by-side existence with the people of the great dominion to the north. The people in my district look upon our Canadian friends as their brothers in democracy. I urge this great body not to disturb these links which have been forged over the years by mutual trust, understanding, and respect.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, this legislative proposal would have the effect of temporarily reducing the present $500 to $100 duty-free exemption on goods

brought into the United States by returning U.S. residents. The bill would also amend present law with respect to the Virgin Islands so that the 48-hour period of absence from the United States required for certain exemptions would be waived.

Mr. Speaker, the President has recommended the reduction in the duty-free allowance as a measure to correct the balance-of-payments problems and the gold outflow problem confronting our country. Frankly, I am doubtful of the efficacy of this recommendation. I personally believe that we are going to have to look to some of the more basic things affecting our balance-of-payments posture such as foreign aid and off-shore procurement as well as to insist that foreign countries remove their discriminatory trade barriers against American-produced goods. However, if the President says this is what he needs to meet the problems of balance of payments and gold outflow, then I am willing that he should have the changes contained in this legislative proposal.

Therefore, I join in urging my colleagues to vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6611.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the remedial proposal of the President to assist in solving the balance-of-payments problem by lowering the customs exemption from $500 to $100, seems to me an overconcentration on trivia.

There are two distinct factors involved. One, the small amount of money as compared to the sums contributing to an unfavorable balance. Two, a factor which far outweighs this particular financial solution—the good human relations established abroad.

In the first sense, let me make some reasonable financial comparisons. Our imports last year amounted to about $15 billion. Duty and taxes on this amount were approximately $1,500 million. The estimated value of articles brought into the United States under $500 exemption and over $200 in value, was $140 million. The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that about $100 million will be gained from lowering the exemption. Compared to the revenue from imports, this amount seems like nickels and dimes.

But what is even more important than this purely monetary consideration, and a small amount at that, is the all-important fact of human relations.

Americans traveling abroad, by their immediate contacts with the citizenry wherever they happen to be, have been engaged in a vast person-to-person program of inestimable benefit. Americans, by talking to shopkeepers and vendors, large and small, buying their wares, have created a great amount of good will and rapport.

Everywhere our citizens go, large cities or villages, this effective type of public relations is established and spread. This is an immediate type of contact, more intimate in nature, and one which I believe in its effectiveness is far superior to the propaganda efforts on an official and planned basis. In fact, this type of relations supplements and assists our official efforts.

There is no substitute for personal contact in the great good it can do. Each American citizen who goes abroad is described as an "ambassador of good will." If this type of good will costs our Nation but $100 million a year, then I say it is worth it. To achieve the same results as do the American travelers, through official means, would cost maybe 10 times that amount.

This is why I believe that such a so-called saving or remedial measure to help solve the balance-of-payments problem, is neither practical nor of any great merit when compared to the intangible values which I have listed. It smacks of that old adage, that you cannot cut off your nose to spite your face.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about this bill, H.R. 6611, mainly because I fear the damage it might do can far outweigh any possible advantages to be gained. I note that we shall vote on the bill on Wednesday next. I am glad that we shall have this additional time to reflect more deeply on this subject. Like everyone else, I am deeply troubled by our balance-of-payments problems. It was in part for this reason that I have been working so hard on the international travel bill. Almost one-third of the current dollar gap is attributable to the tourist gap. I am sure all of us realize that the way to offset this is to encourage spending of hard currency in this country by nationals of other countries.

What troubles me about this bill—reducing the duty-free allowance—is that the dollar advantage to be gained is so little compared to the possible loss of good will with other countries. I am also concerned that we are acting on the basis of insufficient facts.

On March 9 I wrote the Acting Commissioner of Customs and asked specific questions. I wanted advice chiefly as to the percentage of Americans who use their full $500 allowance, the average amount brought in by tourists, the projections for differences in these figures that would be brought about by the reduction, and advice as to problems relating to enforcibility. The Commissioner was not able to answer the first three questions. Based, however, on a 1959 survey, it was stated that 4.5 percent of returning residents' declarations covered articles valued at more than $500. However, declarations may include more than one person entitled to an exemption. The Commissioner indicated that the maximum potential reduction in tourist purchases under proposed legislation would be about $175 million annually.

I wonder what the medium would be.

I also wrote the Secretary of State and asked to be advised about the impact of this proposed legislation on foreign policy. I specifically asked about press reports that the Canadian and Mexican Governments had protested the proposal. Beyond this I was concerned about the general impact in other areas as well.

The reply of the Assistant Secretary, the Honorable Brooks Hays, indicated that official representations against the proposed reduction were received from the Netherlands Embassy and from the Haitian Embassy. The Canadians expressed the hope that nothing would be done to further aggravate an unfavorable balance of trade that Canada has with the United States, but apparently there was no official protest or requested exemption. The Government of Mexico did not make an official representation either. There was, perhaps pointedly, no general comment about the impact of the bill.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the full text of my letters to the Secretary of State and the Acting Commissioner of Customs and their replies to me:

MARCH 23, 1961.

HON. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently the President in a message to the Congress requested legislation to reduce the duty-free allowance applicable to American tourists returning to the United States from $500 to $100.

For a long time I have been interested in ways and means to promote the flow of tourist travel in both directions, and I have introduced in the Congress legislation to establish an Office of Tourism in the Department of Commerce, plus basic amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to temporary travel of visitors to and in the United States.

It was reported in the press recently that the Canadian and Mexican Governments had protested the proposal to reduce the duty-free allowance for Americans reentering the United States. In view of the fact that the proposal undoubtedly has foreign policy implications, I should like to have your views as to any possible adverse effect that the proposed legislation might have should it pass the Congress. The President stated that the legislation is designed to correct in some part the present deficit in balance of payments. While the objective is undoubtedly commendable, I am concerned lest possible adverse effects abroad might outweigh the potential benefits to this country. I would be interested in knowing further whether the Department of State has made an analysis of the extent to which a change in the duty-free allowance would reduce the balance-of-payments deficit.

I am considering also a suggestion that rather than lose the negotiating power of our present $500 duty-free allowance, we might adopt a policy of reciprocity with respect to the duty-free allowances of other countries from which foregin students and tourists come to the United States, and also with respect to the monetary restrictions of those countries.

In view of the fact that the House Committee on Ways and Means is currently considering the proposed legislation, I would appreciate advice on the foregoing at the earliest possible date. The subject is of great importance and I should like to have all pertinent facts in front of me before arriving at conclusions on the legislation.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1961.

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LINDSAY: Thank you for your letter of March 23, 1961, concerning the proposed reduction in the customs exemption for returning U.S. residents. The Department is happy to provide you with the following information on the points you raised in your letter.

The Department has made no analysis of the extent to which a change in the duty-free allowance would reduce the balance-of-payments deficit. However, a Department of the Treasury study has indicated that the proposed reduction in the allowance would reduce the deficit by $140 to $175 million.

Official representations against the proposed reduction have been limited to notes from the Netherlands Embassy on behalf of the Netherlands Antilles and from the Haitian Embassy. The proposed reduction was touched upon at the Joint United States-Canadian Trade Committee meeting held in Washington, D.C., on March 13 and 14. At this meeting attended by Ministers of the Canadian Government and Cabinet members of our Government, the Canadian delegation pointed out that their country had an unfavorable balance of trade with the United States and that Canadian tourists spend $100 million more per year in this country than U.S. citizens spend in Canada. The Canadians did express the hope that nothing would be done further to aggravate the unfavorable balance, but at no time has the Canadian Government formally requested a specific exemption from the proposed reduction. No official representation has been received on this subject from the Government of Mexico.

The Department wishes to call to your attention two points which will be of interest to you in your consideration of a suggestion that the United States might adopt a policy of reciprocity with respect to the duty-free allowances of other countries. The first point is that the U.S. duty-free allowance is presently more generous than that of most other countries having a similar allowance. In December 1960 the Department requested American missions and consular posts to review local regulations on the quantity of goods which may be imported duty free by returning residents. The review showed that the level of the duty-free allowance is generally well below that of the United States. In reducing its duty-free allowance from $500 to $100 the United States would be moving closer to the levels maintained by other countries permitting a similar allowance.

A second point of still greater importance is that a policy of reciprocity would run contrary to our traditional policy of most-favored-nation treatment as embodied in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, bilateral trade agreements, and treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation. Under this policy we have since 1923, with few exceptions such as our treatment of Philippine products, unconditionally extended to all countries entitled to such treatment the benefits accorded to products of any country. Action on our part inconsistent with this policy, embodied in so many international commitments, could readily constitute the basis for similar action by other countries detrimental to our exports. It would appear in our own best interests not to encourage other countries by our own actions to disregard policies and commitments which protect and benefit our trade.

If the Department can be of further service to you, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely yours,
BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

MARCH 9, 1961.

Mr. DAVID B. STRUBINGER,
Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Customs, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STRUBINGER: As you know, we shall soon have in the House for legislative action the President's proposal to reduce the duty-free tourist allowance from $500 to $100.

I would appreciate having an analysis of the impact that this proposed reduction would have on the dollar gap. Here are some of the questions I have in mind:

What percentage of Americans use their full allowance? What is the average amount brought in by tourists?

What are the projections for differences in the above figures that would be brought about by a reduction?

What are your problems relating to enforcibility?

I should like to have any other thoughts you may have on this general subject which will be helpful to me as a legislator in making an intelligent decision on this proposal.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN V. LINDSAY,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 24, 1961.

Hon. JOHN V. LINDSAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LINDSAY: I am pleased to supply you with background information concerning the proposed amendment to paragraph 1798, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which would reduce returning resident exemptions to $100.

Returning residents entering the United States across our Canadian and Mexican borders may bring in articles acquired abroad valued up to $200 per person on an oral declaration. No record is maintained of the value of the merchandise brought in under such exemptions.

At our sea and air ports, while a written declaration is required of every overseas passenger, a listing of articles acquired and their value is required only when the value exceeds $200 per person. No information is available concerning the amount or value of purchases valued at less than $200 per person.

The basic exemption of $200 per person is available to a returning resident once every 30 days, provided he has been out of the country at least 48 hours. The additional exemption of $300 is available to a returning resident once every 6 months provided he has been out of the country 12 days or more.

Early in January 1960, we obtained information from a number of our principal field offices to determine what the impact of such legislation would be on the volume of tourist purchases abroad. This survey covered calendar year 1959. A similar survey was recently completed to secure 1960 information. As indicated above, the only information available covered purchases abroad valued at more than $200 per person.

Projecting these data, we have estimated that the total value of returning residents' purchases abroad in 1960 was approximately $415 million and that the maximum potential reduction in tourist purchases under the proposed legislation would be about $175 million annually. These are the only estimates which we have developed in connection with the proposed legislation.

We regret that specific answers to your first three questions of March 9, 1961, are not available. Our 1959 survey indicated that 4.5 percent of the returning residents' declarations covered articles valued at more than $500, but a declaration may include more than one person entitled to an exemption.

With respect to problems of enforcement, we foresee the need for intensifying our examination of passengers' baggage, because many more returning residents will have made purchases approaching or exceeding their allowable exemptions. There undoubtedly will also be an increased number of attempts to smuggle merchandise into the country, but we believe that entirely adequate countermeasures can be taken and are economically feasible.

Sincerely yours,
D. B. STRUBINGER,
Acting Commissioner of Customs.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6611.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DULSKI) there were—yeas 74, nays 6.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement of last Thursday, further proceedings will go over until next Wednesday.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CARIBBEAN ORGANIZATION

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House Joint Resolution 384 providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization signed by the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

The Clerk read House Joint Resolution 384 as follows:

Whereas representatives of the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America signed at Washington on June 21, 1960, the "Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization" to replace the agreement signed at Washington on October 30, 1946, establishing the Caribbean Commission in which the Government of the United States of America participates by authority of the joint resolution of March 4, 1948 (62 Stat. 65; 22 U.S.C. 280h); and

Whereas these four Governments have reviewed the work of the Caribbean Commission, have recognized that the Commission has rendered valuable services to the Caribbean area, and have considered statements from the local governments calling for a review of the Caribbean Commission Agreement in the light of new constitutional relationships; and

Whereas the purposes and functions of the Caribbean Organization are similar to those of the Caribbean Commission, that is, to consult and to advise with respect to social, cultural, and economic cooperation in the area; and

Whereas since the establishment of the Caribbean Commission significant constitutional and economic changes have taken place in the area, and the Governments of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands have indicated their willingness to accept increased responsibility in consulting and advising with respect to social, cultural, and economic problems in the area: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized to accept on behalf of the Government of the United States of America the "Agreement for the Establishment of the

Caribbean Organization" signed at Washington on June 21, 1960, by representatives of the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America; that the participation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands of the United States in the Caribbean Organization is hereby authorized; that the Caribbean Organization shall, upon promulgation by the President of an Executive order to this effect, be entitled to the privileges, exemptions, and immunities conferred by the International Organizations Immunities Act (59 Stat. 669; 22 U.S.C. 288); and that the Secretary of State is hereby authorized to appoint or designate a United States observer to the Caribbean Organization.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us authorizes the President to accept on behalf of the Government of the United States the Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization which was signed in Washington on June 21, 1960, by representatives of France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. It also authorizes the participation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands in the Organization, and further authorizes the United States to have an observer at the meetings.

Although the United States has always had an interest in the Caribbean, it had no possessions in that area until it acquired Puerto Rico as a result of the war with Spain and in 1917 purchased from Denmark the Virgin Islands.

The events of World War II brought home to us very forcibly the importance not only of our own dependencies but those of our allies in the Caribbean. Of course, we had common problems, the human problems, in all of these areas. To deal with all of these problems, there was established the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission in 1942. When the war was over, the French and the Netherlands, each of whom had territorial possessions in the Caribbean, joined the United States and Great Britain in the establishment of a new international body, the Caribbean Commission, to deal on a reasonable basis with the problems common to all the islands.

The Caribbean Commission has been in operation for about 12 years. It has accomplished many important tasks in agriculture, housing, public health, education, and tourism.

Now it is proposed that the Commission be terminated and there be established the Caribbean Organization. The principal point is that the major powers recognize that a great measure of self-government has been achieved by the territories in the area. We feel that these areas should have responsibility commensurate with their larger measure of self-government.

The United States now contributes about $140,000 a year to the Caribbean Commission. I am very happy to tell my distinguished friend from Iowa that upon the acceptance of this agreement and the establishment of the Carribean Organization, the United States will be relieved of this contribution. Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands will, on entry, contribute to its budget.

Our committee believes the creation of the Caribbean Organization with a membership made up of the nonindependent countries is a very important move—one that is very vital to the United States and to the area. It shows to the whole world how the United States feels about placing people on a self-reliant basis.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Florida who is now speaking for sponsoring this particular piece of legislation before the House. This, of course, is an area in which the committee, which I have the honor to chairman, is very much involved. I think the legislation is most timely. I support it most heartily, and I think it will go a long way in supporting a favorable position which we desire in the Caribbean.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I have for the past 12 years followed the activities of the Caribbean Commission and have been sympathetic to its program and appreciative of its accomplishments. It is my understanding that the purposes of the Commission will be continued in the new Caribbean Organization and for the most part its machinery will be retained.

It is my belief that a Caribbean Organization, through broad participation by the island areas of the Caribbean, can take some giant steps toward bringing about economic and social development throughout the island area. Of particular importance for the future, I believe, is the research council, whose members will concern themselves with advisory matters relating to agriculture, fishing, wildlife, forestry, economics, statistics, medicine, public health, sanitation, nutrition, social problems, education, and the fastest growing industry in the Caribbean—tourism.

I am especially pleased with the roles the Virgin Islanders and Puerto Ricans will play in the Caribbean Organization and the manner in which they have accepted increased responsibilities. This is one of the ways in which the citizens of our own insular areas can gain the political maturity which is a necessary first step toward greater autonomy.

It is my understanding that the U.S. Government will make no direct contribution to the Organization, but that the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico will contribute $25,200 and $140,000, respectively. I believe that these funds will be well spent and the benefits derived from our participation will be worthwhile.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for those remarks.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Now, let me see if I have it straight and clear that this legislation is going to save us some money; that the resolution is not going to cost us any money.

Mr. FASCELL. Let me say that it will not.

Mr. GROSS. Where are they going to have the headquarters of this outfit?

Mr. FASCELL. In Puerto Rico.

Mr. GROSS. When it comes to establishing and maintaining the headquarters, does the gentleman know of any international organization today that does not cost American taxpayers plenty of money?

Mr. FASCELL. The United States will not be a member, if we adopt this resolution and approve the agreement which has heretofore been entered into. By this joint resolution we authorize the participation of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. They will pay their share of the budget out of the funds available to them. You can interpret that any way you want, but it sounds pretty good to me.

Mr. GROSS. This is most amazing, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. I thought the gentleman would be interested and pleased.

Mr. GROSS. Only last Friday I saw Mr. Stevenson in the United Nations new mission building just completed. He was ankle deep in wall-to-wall carpeting, with figurative tears running down his checks. The U.N. is broke, he said, and must have millions of dollars. I never saw a man stand any deeper in wall-to-wall carpeting, pleading poverty, than did Adlai Stevenson last Friday afternoon. And, so it is utterly amazing that we have a resolution today that deals with an international organization that is going to save the people of this country some money. I hope the gentleman is right. I fervently hope he is right.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Is it anticipated that in this new Nation that has just been established, including Trinidad, will become a member of it? How is that designated: Barbadoes, Trinidad, and others.

Mr. FASCELL. In the report there is a list.

Mr. BOW. I could not find it, and that is what I was interested in.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman have page 13 of the staff memorandum before him?

There are 12.

Mr. BOW. I was looking at page 14 "Eligibility for Membership of the Organization."

Mr. JUDD. There are just four countries entering into this agreement: The French, the Dutch, the British, and our-

selves. Those nonindependent areas eligible to join the Caribbean Organization are 12. The Republic of France has three departments: French Guiana, Guadeloupe, and Martinique. The Netherlands has two: Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. The United Kingdom has five: The Bahamas, British Guiana, British Honduras, the British Virgin Islands, and the West Indies. The West Indies is a group of islands which the British have organized into a federation, and it comes in as one group.

Mr. BOW. As I understand, Trinidad and Barbados and some of the other islands are not a part of the British Virgin Islands.

Mr. JUDD. They are not; that is right.

Mr. BOW. Under article 3 on page 14, how do these new nations come in? The gentleman from Puerto Rico indicates that he might have the answer.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Jamaica, Trinidad, and the other islands that are in the chain; from Puerto Rico to Trinidad all come within the West Indies Federation.

Mr. BOW. What about the new federation?

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. That is the new federation.

Mr. BOW. Where on page 14 are they designated as eligible for membership in the organization?

Mr. JUDD. As the West Indies.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. The West Indies.

Mr. JUDD. The West Indies is the federation.

Mr. BOW. I am glad they are included. We all wish them well, I am sure; and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is one of the best steps the United States can take at this time, not only because of the impact in the Caribbean area which, as everybody knows, is very troubled just now, but because it demonstrates to the world that the United States is continuing its leadership in dealing in the right way with its possessions or former semicolonial areas. On the one hand some governments and groups are insisting that all colonial peoples be given their full independence right now even though their economy is not viable, even though their agriculture, their industry, their educational and health measures, their communications, and their governmental machinery are not sufficiently developed to enable them to handle their affairs successfully. On the other hand there are some countries that are not willing to take any steps whatsoever in the direction of giving greater autonomy and self-government, or preparation for it, to peoples under their control.

The procedure followed in this resolution is the sensible middle ground. We started out during the war and went further in 1948 to pull together these semicolonial areas which, in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, are possessions of the United States, and in the case of the other 10 areas possessions of 3 metropolitan powers, Britain, France, and the Netherlands. This joint effort has worked very well. But it has been the four controlling powers that are members of the Caribbean Commission and not the areas themselves. While they are not fully independent now, they manage successfully most of their affairs under local self-government. Under this resolution the four powers agree to establish a successor, the Caribbean Organization, which these areas will join on their own. It will be they, not we, who are members. It will give them greater stature. They will operate the Organization. Its headquarters will be in Puerto Rico. Each of the four metropolitan powers will have observers at the meetings of the Organization. And there is a safeguard, that if at any time any one of the four powers thinks something is going wrong it has the right under the agreement to withdraw after 1 year's notice.

So there is no possible danger in this arrangement. It is a real step forward for peoples and governments that are making a constructive effort to handle wisely their economic, social, and cultural problems and relationships. It will enable them to move ahead in developing a strength and unity in that part of the world which obviously needs such strength and unity among the peoples themselves.

So, Mr. Speaker, there should be no opposition to this measure.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this time to say that I believe this legislation before us today is good and I think it should be adopted. There is the possibility that we will be saving some money. But in addition to that it seems to me that this is a great tribute to a great people. These are the people of Puerto Rico who are fine Americans and who are fine citizens of our country. Throughout the years that I have been a Member of this body, and even before that time, I have been close to the people of Puerto Rico. I have seen them progress under able leadership. It seems to me that this is a great answer to the world as to our feeling in the United States toward areas such as Puerto Rico.

We now see them taking their place as full-fledged members of our society, and beginning to handle in this Caribbean area this very important work. The headquarters of this organization instead of being in Washington will be in Puerto Rico. To me this is a great tribute to the people of Puerto Rico and a great tribute to our colleague, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, who has so well and ably over the years represented the people of Puerto Rico in this body.

I just would like to take this opportunity to say how I admire him and how pleased I am that this step is being taken for those fine people of a very beautiful island.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Nothing, I think, could underline more sharply than our action here the difference between the way the United States and the three Western European countries are moving in this difficult problem, and in contrast, the way the Soviet Union moves. This joint resolution extends greater authority and autonomy to areas not yet fully independent by authorizing their direct participation in the Caribbean Organization, while in Cuba, another island in the same part of the world, the people are losing their freedom to the cruelest colonial power in history, the Soviet Union.

Mr. BOW. The Cuban people came into the United States at the same time and were given independence while Puerto Rico has become a Commonwealth, but communism has made slaves of the peoples of Cuba, whereas the people in Puerto Rico have freedom. I hope the U.S. Information Agency will tell the world of this situation so that the entire world will know that in one area of the Caribbean there is communism and slavery and the loss of freedom, while in another, under our flag, there is the great Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, where the people have freedom and advancement, and a situation of living such as has never been known before in that area, brought about not because of us particularly but because of the people of Puerto Rico desiring freedom and working with us and we with them.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank my colleagues for being so generous in their praise for the people of Puerto Rico. We have done nothing else than take advantage of freedom. When people have freedom they always find a way to progress.

I support this joint resolution wholeheartedly. I may say in the name of the people of Puerto Rico that we are very happy to undertake these responsibilities. It will cost us a certain amount of money, but we think it is worth it. We have developed in these years of existence of the Caribbean Commission an experience of good neighborliness, of togetherness. We have compared notes, we have compared programs. I am proud to say that Operation Bootstrap originated in Puerto Rico, has extended to Trinidad and Jamaica, with the same good results. We have seen some things in the other islands that we have tried in our own. This is the way we want to live, in peace with our neighbors, each one with his own responsibilities and sharing our experiences.

I may say that the Caribbean Organization as authorized by this joint resolution is only advisory and consultative. There is nothing executive about it. There are no commitments that can be made by one area or another for joint action of a political or such other nature.

I am happy to say that the offices of the Caribbean Commission, which heretofore had been in Trinidad, are now located in Puerto Rico. The Caribbean Organization, therefore, will have its offices in San Juan, P.R., where they are

very welcome. We in Puerto Rico feel very proud that we have been given that distinction. We do not feel that we are the head of the Caribbean Organization, but we think we with the rest of the members of the Organization are ahead in the Caribbean.

Mr. Speaker, the Caribbean Commission, which the Caribbean Organization will replace, has proved throughout the years the worth of the Caribbean governments' gathering at the counsel table for the exchange of ideas and for the promotion of cooperation between the areas. Considerable good has already emerged from these meetings, and the prospects are in the future for the Caribbean Organization to operate for the benefit of the people of the Caribbean islands.

Political changes have taken place in parts of the area, and the new Caribbean Organization will reflect political change, with the Caribbean governments taking over the functions within the Caribbean Organization which were previously undertaken by the metropolitan governments. The constitutional relationships of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico with the United States and of the Virgin Islands with the United States would in no way be altered by virtue of the authorization in the resolution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to participate in the Caribbean Organization.

As the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico and the only representative in the Congress from the area of the Caribbean, I fully endorse House Joint Resolution 384. I have participated in and witnessed the accomplishments of the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission and later of the Caribbean Commission, which the Caribbean Organization will replace. There is an enthusiastic response of the people represented and a spirit of helpfulness from one to the other. Here there is borrowing of ideas and not of money; there is exchange of understanding, not of misunderstanding; there is an established dignity. There is a sharing of information instead of a hiding of it behind a drop curtain of isolation.

Principally, from the interest of the United States in its position of limelight, there is provided within the Organization an opportunity for the United States to allow the Puerto Rican example of progress, dignity, and hope to be used to the advantage of the participating governments and their people and to the great advantage of the free world.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 384 which authorizes the President to accept for the United States the agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Organization. This Organization would replace the present Caribbean Commission and would include in its membership French Guiana, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Netherlands Antilles, Surinam, British Guiana, the West Indies, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The Caribbean Organization is the next logical step in the evolution of this region, placing more responsibility directly on the peoples of this area in an organization directly representing them and in which they themselves will make the decisions. The establishment of the Caribbean Organization in place of the existing Caribbean Commission will reflect the large measure of self-government that has been granted these countries since 1946. The principal function of this Organization will be to study, formulate, and recommend programs and courses of action in economic matters which will contribute to the well-being of the Caribbean area.

Because the participating members are not sovereign and independent states, they cannot belong to the Organization of American States. In view of the increasing problems in the Latin American area that are the result of accelerated activities by the international Communist movement, every effort should be made to grant more opportunities for the peoples of this area to participate actively in cooperative undertakings that will contribute to their economic and social advancement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to answer a question by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What, if any, additional obligation does this impose upon the United States?

Mr. JUDD. This imposes not one single additional obligation on the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, what is all this talk of the whereases here and all this money on page 2? What does that mean?

Mr. JUDD. To which provision is the gentleman referring?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, for instance, here on page 1, there are these whereases here—one, two, three, and then the fourth paragraph you begin and then on all of page 2—what is the significance of all of that?

Mr. JUDD. The significance of the joint resolution is that the Caribbean Commission was established in 1948 and the United States joined by joint resolution of the Congress. It has worked primarily to improve the economic, educational, social, and cultural development and relations of the peoples in these various areas. It has been very successful. They are all highly pleased with it. This resolution replaces the Caribbean Commission with the Caribbean Organization in which the areas will participate more actively on their own instead of through the parent governments. The United States will send observers. It could withdraw Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands from the Commission if we decided the Organization was acting improperly; for example, embarking upon military or political activities. The agreement does not authorize the Organization to get into those fields. Authority in them remains with the four metropolitan powers. So there is no additional obligation. The peoples affected consider it so valuable that they have offered to underwrite the budget. We will not have to pay $140,000 directly for its support hereafter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We have paid about how much?

Mr. JUDD. About $140,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A year?

Mr. JUDD. That is right—a year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that all?

Mr. JUDD. That is all.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the meaning of the provision referring to international organizations immunities? To whom do they give immunity and why?

Mr. JUDD. They are the same immunities that the International Organizations Immunities Act now confers on diplomatic officials of other governments and the representatives of international organizations. It gives them the right to own property in our country and to enter our country free from the usual restrictions and requirements for immigrants or visitors. This new Organization plans to have its headquarters in Puerto Rico, and representatives of the French, the British, and the Netherlands areas need to have the same immunities as they come into Puerto Rico that they would have if they came to Washington now. It does not extend any immunities that do not already exist under the present Caribbean Commission; it merely transfers them to the successor organization, and its personnel.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida that the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H.J. Res. 384).

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this measure, and that I may be permitted to revise and extend the remarks I made previously.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ROLE OF CUBA IN INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) expressing the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to re-evaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of March 28, 1954, declares that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties; and

Whereas Cuba today has become a base and staging area for Communist subversive activity throughout the hemisphere; and

Whereas the present Government of Cuba offers a clear and present danger to the spread of political liberty, economic development, and social progress through all the Republics of the hemisphere; and

Whereas the Declaration of Havana of September 2, 1960, was an open attack on the Organization of American States clearly showing that the present Government of Cuba stands in defiance of every proclaimed principle of the inter-American system; and

Whereas the present Government of Cuba has signified its unquestioning acceptance of the Soviet line on international affairs; and

Whereas representatives of the present Government of Cuba continue to participate in the councils of the Organization of American States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; and also to exclude representatives of the Government of Cuba from attendance at meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to urge immediate recognition by the Organization of American States of the dangers posed by the international Communist movement in the Western Hemisphere. It specifically indicates congressional support for the use of collective measures under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance against the present Government of Cuba, and it urges the exclusion of Cuba's representatives from attendance at all meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board.

Under the Rio Pact, the American Republics may resort jointly to the use of sanctions and/or armed force in eliminating a threat to the hemisphere. The Declaration of Caracas, agreed to in 1954 when communism had infiltrated the Guatemalan regime, specifically names communism as an extracontinental threat to the hemisphere.

The Communist-dominated Government of Cuba has indicated unquestioning acceptance of the Soviet line on international affairs, and it is intervening daily in the internal affairs of other Latin American countries. Increasing quantities of military assistance from the Sino-Soviet bloc are being received by the Castro government, including weapons more advanced than any held by its Latin American neighbors. This flow of arms has been accompanied by Sino-Soviet military advisers and technicians.

Cuba today is a base and staging area for Communist subversive activities throughout the Western Hemisphere. Cuban diplomats in almost every country in Latin America have encouraged local opposition groups, harangued political rallies, distributed inflammatory propaganda, and indulged in a multitude of political assignments beyond the usual call of diplomatic duty. Such activities require careful scrutiny by the Organization of American States.

The countries of Latin America have as great a stake as the United States in countering communism in the Western Hemisphere, and we should work together to meet this threat. The resolution now under consideration urges the use of collective measures against the Cuban regime.

This resolution deals also with another issue which is of grave concern and that is the continued attendance of representatives of the Cuban Government at meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board. Partial action concerning this situation was taken recently by the Board itself when it voted to deny the Cuban delegation access to classified material and classified sessions. As a temporary measure, while the present and evident military alliance exists between Cuba and the Soviet bloc, the Board's action fails to deal with the more important problem of a country's membership on the Board when its position has been altered due to political realignments or other reasons. The resolution would support action by the foreign ministers to change or clarify the terms of membership on the Board.

Failure to take collective action against a regime which has defied the principles of the Organization of American States would be a travesty of the collective security system. I am fully aware of the fears some Latin American leaders harbor regarding possible domestic reaction in their countries should they support sanctions against Castro. Nevertheless, I am deeply convinced that failure to deal effectively by means of the Organization of American States with a Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere weakens the inter-American system by undermining confidence in the principle of collective security and by permitting the source of infection to continue. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 226.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is very much I can add to the excellent explanation of this resolution that has been given by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, chairman of our subcommittee.

Unanimously, we felt that the time had come to express the sense of the Congress, and we believe the sense of the people of the United States, that our hemispheric defense measures and our collective security measures through the Organization of American States become meaningless if we permit participation by a government which is clearly bringing the Soviet Union within the Western Hemisphere.

I hope that we will have a rollcall on this measure so that it can be clearly demonstrated this is the will of the Congress who speaks for the American people.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I feel we should underline for the attention of the whole country what commitments the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of 1954 contained. It is being said in some quarters that the United States is trying to coerce the Latin American countries, that it is departing from the principle of nonintervention in dealing with Cuba.

The fact is that the principle of nonintervention was based on the understanding and the commitment that all the American countries in the OAS would act whenever there is a threat to our hemisphere because of the "domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power." The declaration specifically declares that such a situation would "constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."

That is plain language, and we should make it clear that the obligation is equally on all of the American states party to the Caracas agreement. The United States is living up to its commitments when it presses for prompt, decisive action by the OAS before this cancerous process in Cuba spreads still further to the other countries, as it certainly will otherwise do.

I hope the Kremlin will take notice of this action today, I hope Castro will take notice, I hope all of our friends and colleagues in the Western Hemisphere as well as our own people will take notice. The Caracas mechanism was devised to deal with this kind of threat, the threat is real and present. It is time for the mechanism to operate. We are ready to go ahead with our part, and we call on the others to do the same.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I would just like to underscore the fact that by this action we are showing congressional approval of collective action expected to be taken by the Organization of American States.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman feel that this resolution complies with sections 14, 15, and 17 of the articles of the Organization of American States?

Mr. MAILLIARD. It was the feeling of the subcommittee that it definitely did.

Mr. BOW. By this action are we endorsing and reaffirming our position in supporting articles 14, 15, and 17 of the Organization of American States?

Mr. MAILLIARD. It is my belief that we definitely are.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman feel that it is in the best interests of our country that we do that?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I believe that if we subscribe to the principles which we have done, certainly we ought to take this action to be consistent with our support of those principles.

Mr. BOW. Does the gentleman feel that these particular articles I refer to—I am sorry I do not have them with me so that I can read them, but I will put them in the RECORD—that those provisions of the Organization of American States are in the best interests of our Nation in view of what has happened in Cuba; that these provisions are in the best interests of our country?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MAILLIARD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I should like to comment on the questions raised by the gentleman from Ohio. If the member countries of the Organization of American States will all, including the United States, carry out in good faith the commitments that were made, then I do not see dangers in the articles to which the gentleman refers. The gentleman is concerned—and we discussed it here the other day—that we will consider ourselves bound under these particular articles not to take unilateral action, that others may not do what they have undertaken the obligation to do, and so we may be denied the opportunity to act in our own self-defense. It is my strong belief that if the other countries do not follow through with their obligations, we are released from our obligations under the articles the gentleman refers to.

Mr. BOW. It would seem to me that under the articles I have referred to none of the members of the Organization of American States can do anything so far as Communist Cuba is concerned. Does the gentleman agree with that? I am talking about the provisions that we are now endorsing. But, there is a prohibition against the Organization of American States or any of the individual countries from doing anything to try to stop the growth of communism in Cuba.

Mr. JUDD. Che Caracas Agreement, which this concurrent resolution deals with, calls upon all the countries in the Organization of American States to meet and to consider the adoption of appropriate action. We are now estopped from any unilateral action, unless and until the Organization of American States should fail to meet and act in accordance with the commitments contained therein. In the event of such a failure, the United States must be free to act. As the gentleman knows, in the resolving clause of this concurrent resolution, a meeting should be called or such steps should be taken as may be necessary to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. It is to get all the states to work out policies and plans on what the hemisphere should do with respect to Cuba that this resolution should be passed today.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I think we have arrived at a point today when we can ask ourselves this question: Is collective security in the Western Hemisphere gone forever? What must we do now that communism exists in Cuba and it is a threat to the whole Western Hemisphere? This resolution is not the only answer, but it is a predicate to it, whatever may be required. I certainly think that we should emphasize our belief in collective action first, and that is the way I read this resolution. The OAS is the oldest organization of its kind in the world. It has done some mighty good things. I do not think that we want to snap our fingers and eliminate it as an effective organization. The United States took a long time to recognize the value and the benefit of the Organization of American States. Not until 1933 with the establishment of the "good neighbor" policy and the enunciation of the general principle of nonintervention did we think the OAS was important to our security and to that of the Western Hemisphere. I say that for the United States and all American countries the time has now come to act quickly when this whole system is challenged, challenged clearly by the Communists. The United States should be clear and unmistakable in its efforts and in its desire to take collective action first. And this, as I see it, is the purpose of the resolution.

In Costa Rica in 1960 the American countries took collective action.

However, the resolution adopted did not condemn Castro and the Communist government in Cuba. The OAS has shown through the course of its history that it can act effectively if it wants. Now I think this is what Congress is saying: "It is time for Latin American countries to stand up and be counted; we have too long delayed affirmative action against communism in Cuba, and in this hemisphere."

I said so many months ago, as has the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], others in this House, some in the other body, and many voices throughout the whole Western Hemisphere. Yet we have not been able to obtain an affirmative plan of concerted action. I feel that we should make this final request by way of this congressional expression and within a reasonable time seek to get the commitment from the Latin American countries to meet affirmatively and with action the threat of communism in Cuba and the Western Hemisphere. Failing that, I think we ought to give careful attention to the words spoken by President Kennedy when he said recently:

> Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations which are to the security of our Nation.

I think this is the light by which today's action by this Congress should be cast on this resolution. I am cartain this House will support President Kennedy in whatever steps he deems essential to our security.

But first let the United States be on record by the voice of this Congress urging and requesting the joint action of the countries of the Western Hemisphere against communism in Cuba and its further infiltration in this hemisphere.

Mr. BOW Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding. I should like to ask this question. The gentleman has referred to the articles of the Organization of American States. My question is this: Does not the gentleman think that by entering into the articles of the Organization of American States we have in effect repealed the Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. FASCELL. No, sir.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. These South American countries understand perfectly this Caracas Agreement, this agreement of solidarity. Why does it take this sort of thing, our further going on record to convince them that they ought to do something, if that is what the purpose of this resolution is?

Mr. FASCELL. That is true; the gentleman raises a very pertinent point. But because of the leadership and the responsibility which is cast upon this Government I believe it is necessary and wise in our discretion at this point to make this one last, final appeal.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PILLION. I should like to point out that this resolution leaves out a most important element; and that is that Cuba was one of 80-some nations that met in Moscow last December, at the meeting of the 21st Communist International. It was a party to the resolutions passed by that group of associated nations aimed, of course, at the destruction, primarily, of the United States. I simply think that that should have been placed in the "whereas" clauses of this concurrent resolution so that we could identify the situation correctly in an overall, worldwide sense, rather than in the narrow, limited sense as contained in this resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. I would say to the gentleman that the resolution has that in it. It is unquestioned that the Government of Cuba has accepted the "Commie line"; the puppet leader has so stated; the resolution says so. So I think it is adequately clear.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address this question to the gentleman from Florida with reference to article 15 of the Organization of American States. I should like to read it for the benefit of the Members so that they may know exactly how our hands are tied:

No state—

That refers to the United States—

or group of states—

That would be this type of resolution—

has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic and cultural elements.

It would seem to me that under article 15, this very article of the Organization of American States, this resolution is a violation of that, because it says no state or group of states shall in any manner whatsoever intervene, in any manner interfere. I think our hands are tied. I think that article 15 has repealed the Monroe Doctrine. I think we are at the mercy now of this particular event.

Mr. FASCELL. I would not engage in any legalistic discussion on that point, but we can change, as we did with the Declaration of Caracas, in any other way to determine what course of action we shall take. As far as this is concerned, I do not believe it is breaking the Monroe Doctrine at all.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I would answer to the gentleman from Ohio that by our subscribing to the articles which the gentleman has been describing the Monroe Doctrine has not been repealed. The agreement in effect invites other countries to join us in a hemisphere Monroe Doctrine; but if they do not, we still have our own Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in 1951, during the height of the Korean conflict, a meeting of the Organization of American States was called in Washington to consider the undermining influence of international communism. This meeting resulted in the 21-member Organization of American States adopting a pledge of united resistance against any Communist encroachment in this hemisphere.

This pledge was reaffirmed in the Caracas Agreement of 1954.

Yet today Communist encroachment in this hemisphere is a fact. Unofficially, this has long been established. It was rumored when Castro and his small band of guerrillas were operating in the Oriente Province of Cuba in 1958. The whispers of Castro's Communist leanings grew louder when he marched triumphantly into Havana. However, the fears of the free people of this hemisphere were quelled when Castro's early television tirades denied Communist affiliations.

Suddenly bitter attacks on the United States were heard over the endless cracking of the firing squads. U.S. enterprises in Cuba were seized without a hint of payment, and U.S. citizens were harassed, even jailed.

The United States justifiably broke diplomatic relations with the Castro government, and the State Department's white paper entitled "Cuba" officially established the fact that Communist encroachment in this hemisphere presented a clear and present danger to the security of the Americas.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in support of this resolution. For a long time I have called for concerted action of this nature against Cuba.

In the 87th Congress I introduced a resolution calling for a meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Organization of American States, and I urged that it adopt a four-point plan of action which included:

First. A resolution indicting the Castro government for subverting the principles of freedom in this hemisphere and thereby constituting a threat to hemispheric security.

Second. A resolution against Cuba calling for the strongest sanctions possible under the OAS charter.

Third. A resolution calling for diplomatic isolation of Castro by the OAS.

Fourth. A reaffirmation of the Caracas Agreement of 1954 condemning Communist infiltration in this hemisphere.

In this Congress, I have supported measures ranging from the severance of diplomatic relations with Cuba by all American Nations, complete economic boycott, and the establishment of an OAS military force.

Yet we have so far met the Cuban-Communist threat only halfway. Though diplomatic relations are no more, we have not stopped Cuban imports into this country. For example, Castro's plantations sell over $2 million of tobacco a month in the United States. In addition to tobacco, fruit and vegetables are imported and sold in the United States. These imports total an annual volume of $60 million for Castro, who uses this money to expand and perfect his Communist domination of the Cuban people. This fact is particularly shameful when we reflect on recent events.

Each time I have urged the State Department to take action, I received the answer that the matter was "under consideration."

The introduction of a resolution in Congress has become necessary, and I am hopeful that its passage will correct this specific situation.

Mr. Speaker, our leadership in the free world is now being questioned. The free people in this hemisphere alone are waiting expectantly for our next step. I believe a resolution such as the one before us today is a necessary step of leadership, and for that reason I urge all Members to give an overwhelming voice to this call for action.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, but I would like to ask a couple of questions. The first is, Is one of the sanctions included that could be put into effect by the Organization of American States that of a military blockade to prevent the shipment to this hemisphere and to Cuba of such things as rocketry, for which I understand pads are in existence and bases are being constructed to make it an armed arsenal that could endanger this country, or at least the State of Florida?

Mr. SELDEN. The measures that can be decided upon by a meeting of consultation of ministers of foreign affairs convoked under the Rio Pact are those detailed in article 8 of the Rio Pact. They are: recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; partial or complete interruption of economic relations or of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, telephonic, and radiotelephonic or radiotelegraphic communications; and use of armed force.

Mr. CRAMER. In other words, it is your construction that the Organization of American States could impose a military blockade by sea and air?

Mr. SELDEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. CRAMER. Let me ask the gentleman one additional question. Has your subcommittee or the Committee on Foreign Affairs looked into, what I understand to be, the fact that in Guantanamo Bay the Cuban workers there are being paid in American dollars and the minute they get outside the gate, they go through a Cuban bank run by Castro and they are robbed of the American dollars which are replaced by one unit of Cuban currency for one American dollar, with the pre-Castro exchange rate 4 pesos to $1 and the result is that Castro gets at least 75 percent of the payroll on Guantanamo Bay and 100 percent of the American dollars by taking it from the workers there, and in that manner we are subsidizing Castro?

Mr. SELDEN. The Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs is keeping as closely informed of that situation as we can, and we do know that we have problems in Guantanamo Bay insofar as the Cuban workers are concerned.

Mr. CRAMER. Is that not a correct statement of fact, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. SELDEN. I do not know.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to suggest that is a matter the committee should certainly investigate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this resolution is considered to be of far-reaching importance, may vitally affect our national security, some think it should not have been brought up under suspension where debate is limited to 40 minutes and in this case unfortunately, the time wholly controlled by those who support the measure.

During the last 10 minutes on 3 occasions I have requested time, twice for just 30 seconds so that I might call attention to the situation now confronting the committee—less than 100 Members on the floor—and to my reasons for opposing the resolution. Will later get permission to revise and extend my remarks at this point and to ask for a quorum, for apparently only by such tactics will one be able to even register a silent protest.

The press and statements by those in the executive as well as in the legislative branches of government, tend to convince some that Russia is establishing a military base in Cuba, furnishing Castro with munitions of war, actions which, if continued, will ultimately force us to take some positive action.

If my understanding of the Monroe Doctrine is correct, in substance it was that we would not permit the establishment by any government of a military base in the Western Hemisphere which might endanger our existence as a nation. If present-day information is to be accepted at its face value, that is just what Russia, with Castro's acquiescence, is now doing in Cuba. If we condone this policy is there any reason to believe that ultimately a missile base will not be there established?

By the adoption of this resolution we refuse to meet our responsibility.

Over the years we have spent billions, taken unprecedented action to contain communism, to prevent its spread to our part of the world. Now the danger the enemy is on our doorstep, apparently establishing a beachhead from which we might ultimately be destroyed.

Unfortunately, because of the many one-world and international organizations which we have joined, we now find ourselves where we must either repudiate and disregard our solemn pledges to avoid any independent actions for our self-preservation or go along with whatever course of conduct these international organizations may advocate. This though it means our destruction.

None is so dumb that he does not realize that always when it comes to a question of self-preservation other considerations must yield.

Because the State Department, backed by the House and Senate Committees on Foreign Affairs, has committed us to submit to the direction of these one-world or international organizations, we now find ourselves in a situation where we must either ignore or repudiate our solemn promises or entrust our future to their decision.

Throughout my service here it has often been with deep regret that I found myself unable to agree with our Committee on Foreign Affairs, with our State Department, and vote to surrender at least a part of our sovereignty to some international organization or group.

So it is today that instead of doing whatever may be necessary to protect this country of ours, I find that this resolution is now asking that the Organization of American States take over the decision as to whether we shall or shall not adhere to the Monroe Doctrine, assert our own independence and right to act for the preservation of our Government, or whether we leave that issue to the Organization of American States.

We are no longer free to declare or avoid war. This resolution asks a group of nations or states as they are called to determine our foreign policy.

Will the proponents of this resolution kindly spread somewhere in the record their views as to what it may be necessary for us to pay or do for the other governments belonging to this Organization in order to secure their cooperation for any measure which may be necessary for our defense.

Just how long do the advocates of this measure think we should stand with our hands tied behind us while the other so-called American states determine what should be done?

Where is the independence for which the forefathers fought and which we always asserted until the coming of the internationalists?

Twenty-one nations signed the charter of the Organization of American States. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] said, what about article 15 of that charter, which he quoted and which I repeat:

> No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic, and cultural elements.

Are we not asking the 20 other nations which signed that charter to disregard article 15?

Are we or are we not, by the adoption of this resolution, advocating intervention in the internal and external affairs of Cuba, which signed the charter on April 30, 1948?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 56]

Addabbo	Boykin	Coad
Addonizio	Brewster	Colmer
Alger	Broomfield	Cook
Anfuso	Bruce	Corbett
Arends	Buckley	Curtis, Mass.
Auchincloss	Byrne, Pa.	Curtis, Mo.
Ayres	Cahill	Daddario
Barrett	Cannon	Dague
Bass, N.H.	Carey	Daniels
Bass, Tenn.	Celler	Davis, Tenn.
Bennett, Mich.	Clancy	Dawson
Blitch	Clark	Delaney
Dent	Holtzman	Philbin
Derwinski	Ichord, Mo.	Powell
Devine	Jennings	Rabaut
Diggs	Joelson	Rains
Dole	Karth	Randall
Donohue	Kearns	Riley
Dooley	Kee	Rivers, S.C.
Durno	Kelly	Roberts
Dwyer	Keogh	Rodino
Edmondson	Kilburn	Roosevelt
Elliott	King, Calif.	Rousselot
Ellsworth	King, N.Y.	St. George
Evins	Kirwan	St. Germain
Fallon	Kluczynski	Stantangelo
Farbstein	Landrum	Saylor
Fenton	Lesinski	Scherer
Findley	McDowell	Schweiker
Fino	Macdonald	Seely-Brown
Flood	Madden	Shelley
Flynt	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Iowa
Forrester	May	Smith, Miss.
Frelinghuysen	Merrow	Smith, Va.
Fulton	Miller, N.Y.	Spence
Garmatz	Milliken	Staggers
Gary	Minshall	Stephens
Gavin	Monagan	Stratton
Giaimo	Montoya	Teague, Tex.
Gilbert	Moorehead, Ohio	Thompson, La.
Glenn	Morgan	Thompson, N.J.
Granahan	Morris	Tuck
Grant	Morrison	Van Pelt
Gray	Mosher	Wallhauser
Green, Pa.	Moss	Walter
Hagan, Ga.	Moulder	Whalley
Hagen, Calif.	Multer	Wharton
Hall	Nix	Wickersham
Halleck	O'Brien, N.Y.	Willis
Harvey, Mich.	O'Neill	Wilson, Calif.
Healey	Osmers	Wilson, Ind.
Hébert	Patman	Winstead
Hoffman, Ill.	Peterson	Wright
Holland		Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 271 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ROLE OF CUBA IN INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] for 3 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is not much that I can say in 3 minutes. I had hoped that there might be several hours of debate on this very important step we are taking. Under the present legislative situation, debate is limited and there can be no amendments.

First, let me make it plain that I believe that anything we do should be done through the Organization of American States. That is the proper instrumentality for the attainment of hemisphere solidarity.

I do not think that we will have the support of all the American States unless the governments in those countries feel that they have the support of their respective electorates. The language in the preamble of the resolution under consideration will make it more difficult for some of these governments to get that support.

What we are doing here in the resolution itself, expressing the sentiment of the Congress that the Cuban situation should be handled by the Organization of American States to preserve hemisphere solidarity as a matter of common interest and security cannot be questioned.

But when we say, "Whereas the present Government of Cuba offers a clear and present danger to the spread of political liberty," and so forth, are we not

passing judgment on and interfering in the internal affairs of another nation?

I do not know. I would avoid the risk of that interpretation by removing language that is unnecessary. I know that among the Latin Americans there is a strong feeling that there should be no outside interference in the internal affairs of any of the American Republics. The recent statement by the Government of Brazil made that clear.

In the subcommittee I voted against this resolution, stating that my purpose in doing so was that I did not want the full committee to have it come out unanimously, and possibly not give it the same consideration. I stated that if the full committee approve the resolution and if the House seemed to approved it, and there was a rollcall, I thought it would be the patriotic duty of everybody to vote for the resolution, even though some might have mental reservations on the language in the preamble.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped we might have had a fuller discussion and the opportunity of offering amendments, but, the resolution having been brought up this way under suspension of the rules the presumption must be that it has been approved. So, while I have great reservations as to the wisdom and propriety of the action in its present framing I shall vote for the resolution, and I ask all my colleagues, certainly those on my side of the aisle, to remember that this is a matter of patriotism to show national unity. I have voted on similar occasions where I might have had reservations, but whether it was from a Republican or a Democratic administration when it came to a vote of the House I felt that we in the Congress must show to the world national unity. So I shall vote with reservations for the resolution and hope it will be passed on a rollcall unanimously.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN].

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, for it is headed in the right direction. There are, however, some questions that leave me with the feeling that we are again talking one way and acting another. For example, this resolution is directed at taking sanctions against Cuba with the aid of the Organization of American States. Yet in March of 1961 Paul Hoffman, in his capacity as managing director of the United Nations Special Fund—of which we contribute 40 percent of the annual budget—signed an agreement with Cuba to help Castro's government diversify his farm production and thus lessen the island's dependence on a sugar crop.

If we are to hold our head high in the field of foreign affairs I submit it is time to take a course and follow it to completion and not change every time the Russian bear makes a noise.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] such time as he may require.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and feel that it is long overdue. I congratulate the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] on their leadership in bringing this before us. I feel that this resolution expressing the sense of Congress to initiate steps within the Organization of American States to protect this hemisphere from Russian imperialism is a step in the right direction, in that it demonstrates determination against a Communist takeover. I personally feel that it would be a still more useful and realistic move to pass the resolution that I introduced on our first day of business in 1960; and more recently on the first day of business in the current session of Congress. It is House Concurrent Resolution 5 and reads as follows:

Whereas the intervention of international communism directly or indirectly in an American republic would constitute a fact or situation threatening the sovereignty and political independence of the states of the entire New World; and

Whereas the American continents, by the free and independent position which they have assumed and maintained, have long since ceased to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European power or powers; and

Whereas the intervention of international communism, directly or indirectly, or however disguised, in any American state, would be in effect such a colonization by a non-American power or powers, and would violate the sovereignty and political independence of an American state; and

Whereas such a fact or situation extended to any portions of this hemisphere would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States and the American continents; and

Whereas the American republics have condemned intervention or the threat of intervention, even when conditional, from any extrahemispheric power and have rejected the attempt of the Sino-Soviet conspiracy in its attempt to destroy hemispheric unity and security; and

Whereas in the rapidly developing contingencies of the atomic age there might not be time to assemble a meeting of the Inter-American Organ of Consultation to provide for joint action to repel the danger: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That if such a fact or situation should present a sudden emergency, then any one or more of the high contracting parties to the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance would be justified, in the exercise of individual or collective self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, in taking steps to forestall intervention, domination, control, and colonization by international communism in the New World.

In case of such defensive measures having been taken by the defending state or states, it or they should report to the Inter-American Organ of Consultation, to the end that an emergency committee, after the manner provided by the Convention of Havana of 1940, be set up for the provisional administration of the state thus defended, pending its restoration to a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, of course, I am very much in favor of a strong, vigorous, and decisive action against the Cuban Communists and their leader, Fidel Castro. From the very moment this man began to come to power, I felt the need for a strong policy against this Communist leader. In fact, I believe everywhere communism rears its ugly head, it should be fought. "Faint heart never won fair lady," they say, and certainly a faint heart is not going to win confidence, support, and the conquest of the minds of men—freemen—all over the world in our fight against communism.

It is true that Cuba was ruled by a dictator when Batista was in power. I did not like Batista then. Batista, however, was our friend, and certainly it is better to have a dictator opposed to communism than to have the present pro-Communist dictator.

It is obvious Fidel Castro has taken advantage of the interim since his rise to power to build up his armament. The fiasco resulting from the premature invasion of Cuba by exiled patriots shows only too well the fact that the Communists have furnished leadership, military organization, equipment of an advanced design and large amounts of materiel and supplies to Castro. All of these things under skilled direction made it relatively easy for the Cuban dictator to crush the last spark of opposition of the freedom-loving invading patriots.

With this invasion threat out of the way, the bearded Castro is working to make his island even more of a military bastion. He is now building more military roads, unpacking Russian MIG planes shipped to him from behind the Iron Curtain, unloading more tanks and stocking up his arsenals of arms and ammunition.

Our people sit aloof, 90 miles from the coast of Cuba, waiting for something favorable to develop. During all of this time, the "bearded one" goes about his business of extending the tentacles of communism into every nook of Cuban life. Our people may appear patient at present, but they are greatly disturbed. Should Castro's plans encompass the building of a launching pad for ballistic missiles, our people will not seem so patient. On the contrary, they will reach the point that they will not tolerate communism in this offshore island. The beginning of the actual construction of a missile base in Cuba will demand immediate action from us.

I do not believe anything we have done denies us the right today to apply and enforce the Monroe Doctrine. The time for colonization by the European powers in the New World has ceased. Our Nation first announced over 100 years ago the principle of the Monroe Doctrine and now we should step in and affirmatively show the world that communism is going to be stamped out in the Western Hemisphere as many years ago were the European efforts to colonize Central and South America.

Mr. Speaker, we need a blockade of the ports of Cuba. We need to give active support to the freedom-loving elements operating against Castro. We need to move forward on a line that will show the Cuban people clearly what a monster they have in Fidel Castro as dictator of their country, and we should give support, help, and inspiration to those patriotic Cuban people who want to see their land free, wanting to stamp out the last vestige of communism in the island which America freed from the Old World in 1898.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Alabama yield for a question?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Has the administration issued any kind of statement either favoring or opposing this resolution?

Mr. SELDEN. This resolution was originally introduced as House Concurrent Resolution 218 on the 13th of April. The executive branch made several recommendations to the committee, and the subcommittee rewrote the resolution in line with those recommendations. The resolution was then reintroduced, and that is the resolution before the House today.

Mr. YATES. Has there been a statement by the administration on the resolution before the House?

Mr. SELDEN. There is no objection on the part of the administration.

Mr. YATES. Has there been a statement by the administration? Ordinarily, the report on a bill would contain a statement by an executive branch agency. Has there been such a statement?

Mr. SELDEN. There has been no written statement as far as the present resolution is concerned. There was one on the first resolution, however.

Mr. YATES. But, as far as the House is concerned there is no information before the House as to whether the administration favors this program.

Mr. SELDEN. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that the general rule with respect to concurrent resolutions is that the administration is not asked for a report or to give its approval or disapproval? This is an advisory statement by the Congress of its estimate of what is the wise course for the administration to follow in this field, and of course is based also on its estimate of public opinion in the country.

Mr. YATES. In earlier Congresses I remember, for example, when the Middle East resolution was before us, a statement was definitely made that the administration favors the Middle East resolution. That was a sense resolution. There was also an earlier resolution pertaining to the Far Eastern situation, but the attitude of the administration at that time was made known to the House. There is no statement before the House at the present time as to what the attitude of this administration is on this resolution.

Mr. JUDD. It is true that on various occasions an administration has suggested to the Congress that it would be helpful to it for Congress to pass a concurrent resolution on a given subject, and we have done that.

Mr. YATES. Has such a statement been made by this administration?

Mr. JUDD. The executive branch did not initiate this resolution. It was initiated in the Congress. When the Congress initiates a sense resolution like this, it is its prerogative to go ahead on its own. Generally it consults informally with the administration to make sure that it will not interfere with or frustrate any of its policies. The present administration raised no objections to this resolution.

Mr. SELDEN. I can add that the committee had a verbal assurance from this administration that there is no objection to the resolution as far as the administration is concerned.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield to me, speaking for myself, I certainly think at this critical time and in the delicate situation we are in at present, I would want to have an affirmative statement from the administration rather than a verbal assurance that it has no objections.

Mr. JUDD. I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois call up the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs and get his reaction rather than ask for a public statement from the executive branch. In certain circumstances, we are sometimes better off if the administration does not have to commit itself to the position stated in a resolution of this sort. It has more freedom in negotiations.

Mr. YATES. It seems to me, if I may reply to the gentleman, that on a matter as great and as important as this, we should have a statement from the executive branch.

Mr. JUDD. But not necessarily a public statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 226?

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on this vote, I ask for the yeas and nays and request that further proceedings on the resolution go over until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement of last Thursday, further proceedings will go over until next Wednesday.

UNIVERSITY FREE CUBA PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO CUBAN REFUGEE STUDENTS

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 209) requesting the President to exercise his authority to operate a program, to be known as University Free Cuba, to provide assistance to certain Cuban refugee students, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Whereas there has long been a bond of friendship between the people of Cuba and the people of the United States dating from the years when the American people did battle for Cuba's freedom; and

Whereas these bonds of friendship, woven in the history of our two countries, and strengthened by our close association as neighbors of similar interest and aspirations, should and will continue as a shield against any alien assault to render these bonds asunder by the propaganda of suspicion and hate; and

Whereas the great goals of freedom set by the patriot Jose Marti, envisioning a happy and free people governing themselves by the decisions of the ballot box and enjoying unhampered the rights of free speech and press, are just as revered today by the Cuban and American people, for they are the eternal goals of democracy; and

Whereas many thousands of Cubans are now residing in the United States in order to enjoy the individual freedoms which do not exist in their homeland; and

Whereas among these guests in the United States are many students whose education has been interrupted, and many professors from the University of Havana who have fled the tyranny and suppression which have replaced once again the sovereign right of the university to teach and maintain the hard-won freedoms of Jose Marti; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States recognize and esteem education at all levels, particularly the university level where international educational exchange programs have been operated for many years with great success; and

Whereas the aforementioned students, even if able to locate employment in order to continue their studies, will still need additional financial assistance to accomplish this: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested to exercise his authority under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, and the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, to operate a program to be known as "University Free Cuba", under which assistance in the pursuit of education will be furnished to college students in the United States from Cuba in need of such assistance because of the authoritarian restrictions placed upon the activities of its citizens by the Cuban regime, or because they are refugees in the United States from the present Government of Cuba. It is the sense of the Congress that existing college and university facilities, public or private, be utilized for this purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the President is requested to encourage the Organization of American States to undertake a study of all possible inter-American educational programs at the university level which might contribute to improved knowledge of inter-American affairs including an examination of the feasibility and desirability of establishing on a permanent basis a "University of the Americas".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is before us expresses the sense of Congress that the President exercise his authority under acts which are named to expend funds for assistance to certain Cuban refugees, namely students who need this assistance because of the authoritarian restrictions placed on the activities of those citizens by the Cuban Government or because they are refugees in the United States from the present Government of Cuba.

In a discussion of the importance of this resolution I would like to go back just a moment in order to bring us up to date. When Castro took over the Government of Cuba we had a transition period there for a while in which some of us said: "Let's wait and see." Others were happy, and others were sad. I was one of those who said, "Let's wait and see what happens."

Being from Miami, a point close to Cuba, the wait and see attitude was not

too long in evolving into "Now you know what the answer is" because refugees started streaming into Miami and other areas of the country at a very high rate.

It was not too long after the Castro regime took over that we in Florida and other areas of the country had the Batista refugees and also the Castro refugees. They were both seeking haven in the United States, and we got a tremendous number of them in Miami; but other areas of the country also received Cuban refugees.

These people came in seeking shelter, seeking homes, seeking freedom, running from threats of destruction, personal and otherwise. The local citizens tried to do all that it was possible to assist the refugees. The local Cuban community, the Latin community, took them into their homes, and local welfare organizations tried to provide for the refugees. The church, both Catholic and Protestant, did everything they possibly could to take care of these people. We had various citizens committees assisting in this problem. It was not too long before it became very obvious to those people who worked very, very hard in trying to solve the problem, that it was beyond the capability of the citizens of the local area. Under the leadership of the great newspaper, the Miami Herald a citizens group was formed to alert the people of the United States to the fact that this was really a national problem and not a problem for Miami and Florida, for New Orleans, New York, or other cities where they had communities of these Cuban refugees. That was the situation under the leadership and under the efforts of the local people whose resources were exhausted, when President Eisenhower, in November of 1960 appointed Tracy Voorhees who had great experience in refugee problems, to study it and report. Mr. Voorhees took over the job as the President's personal representative, and in a very short time it became obvious to him that this, indeed, was not a local problem but a national one.

The President said in appointing Mr. Voorhees to this task:

> In appointing Mr. Voorhees for this task last November, and in giving him funds and added powers on December 2, I sought to express by effective action the interest which, as President of the United States, I felt in these troubled people, as well as my deep sympathy for them and desire to be of help to them.
>
> This latest exodus of persons fleeing from Communist oppression is the first time in many years in which our Nation has become the country of first asylum for any such number of refugees. To grant such asylum is in accordance with the long-standing traditions of the United States. Our people opened their homes and hearts to the Hungarian refugees 4 years ago. I am sure we will do no less for these distressed Cubans.

The Vorhees' report was mainly to the point that the Cuban problem was a national problem, not a local problem. It focused the attention of the country on this problem and focused the utilization of our resources more effectively on the problem. In addition to pointing out in his report that this was a national problem, Mr. Vorhees urged certain things that were necessary: Housing, food, clothing, and health facilities. Education was one of the areas that he dealt with specifically, and this is the main purpose of the present resolution.

At below college level in our area alone—I do not know what it was in other areas—there were 6,500 students who had to be taken into our schools. This created a difficult problem, but we were able to assimilate them and finally get some help for that purpose.

This resolution, however, deals specifically with education at the higher level. It has to do with those students who are already attending universities in the United States or those who are refugees and seek to continue their education in the United States. It was estimated that there were approximately 900 college students in the United States.

In January, after Mr. Voorhees made his final report, the suggestion was made to the administration that funds should be made available in the way of loans to assist these students to continue their education.

On January 20, President Kennedy appointed Mr. Abe Ribicoff the Secretary of HEW to continue as this Government's representative concerning the problems of the Cuban refugees. President Kennedy said at that time:

> I want you to make concrete my concern and sympathy for those who have been forced from their homes in Cuba, and to assure them that we shall seek to expedite their voluntary return as soon as conditions there facilitate that. I believe that the present program can best be strengthened by directly bringing to bear your personal leadership and the vast welfare, health, and other skills of your Department. I am anxious that you make use of private services available for the refugees to the greatest extent possible.
>
> Both here at home and abroad, I want to reemphasize most strongly the tradition of the United States as a humanitarian sanctuary, and the many times it has extended its hand and material help to those who are "exiles for conscience's sake." In the presently troubled world, we cannot be a peacemaker if we are not also the protector of those individuals as well as nations who cast with us their personal liberty and hopes for the future.

Subsequent to the appointment, Secretary Ribicoff went to Miami and made a personal investigation. He came back and reported to President Kennedy that urgent action was necessary. He acted very promptly. Part of his report to the President of the United States dealt with the areas of this resolution. The President then authorized the making of loans totaling $100,000 to 328 Cuban students attending 15 colleges and universities throughout the country: Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.; Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.; Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.; Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.; Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, Baton Rouge, La.; New York University, New York, N.Y.; North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, Raleigh, N.C.; Tulane University of Louisiana, New Orleans, La.; University of Alabama, University, Ala.; University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.; University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla.; University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, P.R.; University of Southwestern Louisiana, Lafayette, La.; and Villanova University, Villanova, Pa.

The interest-free loans made under this program make it possible for the students to continue their education.

We in the Committee on Foreign Affairs feel this is a very, very important thing that has to be done. The assistance program known as University Free Cuba makes it possible for the students who choose to come to the United States in the first instance to continue their education; it makes it possible for those who were driven away from Cuba to become educated in our universities.

To sum it up, Congress in expressing its approval of the President's program, is doing a thing of major importance. There are a lot of good people who come into the schools. They can be fine ambassadors when they return home to Cuba. If they decide to cast their lot with us, we are laying the foundation for their becoming good U.S. citizens.

In addition, the resolution recommends that action be taken to study education at university levels in the Western Hemisphere, to determine what improvements can be made, if any, in the inter-American effort at higher education. This overall study to include the feasibility and desirability of establishing a University of the Americas. This concept has been talked about for a long time, but we have never had the facts upon which to base a decision.

In full accord with that recommendation, the President offered, out of funds available to him, $25,000 to the Organization of American States, to help defray the cost of this inter-American higher education survey. The resolution before you expresses the sense of the Congress in support of the President's program in that regard.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. May I ask, Is there any direct suggestion here that the United States immediately undertake an educational program of its own, in other words, even in existing universities or otherwise, for Cuban refugees?

Mr. FASCELL. The resolution expresses the sense of Congress that the President out of funds already available to him for this purpose make loans to those students to attend universities in the United States which they are now attending.

Mr. LINDSAY. Is this an authorization bill?

Mr. FASCELL. No, it is not.

Mr. LINDSAY. Will an authorization bill be coming to the Congress?

Mr. FASCELL. That I do not know. It depends on the extent of the problem in the next fiscal year.

Mr. LINDSAY. Is there any discretionary power in the Executive at the present time to find funds to make loans immediately for this purpose?

Mr. FASCELL. Certainly.

Mr. LINDSAY. To what extent, financially, does our Government intend to obligate itself in this regard?

Mr. FASCELL. I am advised that loans have been made so far to the extent of $100,000.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. No further authorization is needed. The President has the authority under the Information and Educational Exchange Act. He might have to get more money to make the additional loans, but he has the authorization, if he desires to make them.

Mr. FASCELL. I thought I made that clear.

Mr. LINDSAY. I simply support this resolution and I am trying to clarify some aspects of it, because I am interested in the subject of these Cuban refugees and their welfare. Does the gentleman know the number of Cuban refugees in this country at the present time, and what are their age groups; that is to say, how many are of primary or secondary or college school level?

Mr. FASCELL. I do not have the exact figures, but the best estimates are available, and I will be glad to furnish them. It has been estimated that there are over 60,000 Cuban refugees in the United States. In the Miami area alone there are about 6,500 attending public school and private elementary and secondary schools, and there are approximately 900 Cuban refugee college students in the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. They are not all attending public schools.

Mr. FASCELL. Oh, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, 3,000 are attending public schools and between 2,500 and 3,000 are attending parochial schools.

Mr. FASCELL. That is true. The impact has been absorbed not only by the public schools but by the parochial schools.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, have there been a certain number of universities that have come forward dealing with this problem?

Mr. FASCELL. I just read the whole list of the universities, and I would not want to do it again, but I would point out to the gentleman that the list of universities participating in this program is in the RECORD. I believe the only one in New York is NYU.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, what is the purpose of this resolution? If we have already spent $100,000 on 328 students, what is the purpose of this resolution, to legalize something that has already been done?

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman knows perfectly well that you cannot legalize anything by a sense resolution. At the time the resolution was introduced by me there was no such program. I might say to the distinguished gentleman, we feel that it is important at this point and time to express the difference, that is, that Congress express a difference in our feelings and our treatment between the Cuban people as such and the Cuban Government as such; and that we emphasize to the world what happens under our way of life and what happens under the Communist way of life. That is one of the purposes of this resolution and why the resolution came up immediately after the preceding resolution which I cosponsored with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama and which asks for OAS sanctions against Cuba.

Mr. GROSS. Could this be considered an invitation for them to come over here in greater and greater numbers for free education in this country?

Mr. FASCELL. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa knows that refugees from the tyranny of communism in Cuba do not need any greater invitation than that to live, and they are coming over here by rowboats and other means, and I imagine they would swim if they could. So, I do not think this resolution is going to add unduly to the burden we already have as a free country, which is that we for one of the few times in history have become the primary sanctuary of a people who are fleeing Communist tyranny. In other words, to be specific and to answer the gentleman's question, I do not believe the resolution is an open-door invitation which would make Cubans flee their country. Their primary motive will be to escape tyranny and live in freedom.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Is there any control over the choice of universities if this program continues, or is that a choice to be freely made?

Mr. FASCELL. That is a choice to be freely made. As the gentleman can see from the list of those universities, they are scattered all over the country.

Mr. ADAIR. As long as the university qualifies and the student wishes to go there, he would be permitted under this program?

Mr. FASCELL. That is right. The loan is made to the institution or in conjunction with the institution.

Mr. ADAIR. Secondly, are we to understand that these loans are to be repaid?

Mr. FASCELL. That is right; they are non-interest-bearing loans which will require repayment starting the first year after graduation. I think that is the only way to do it.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to my colleague from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL]. As he knows, he and I have discussed this problem which is of great concern to my own alma mater, the University of Florida. I am particularly pleased to note that the resolution calls for a more detailed study of the future educational needs of our Latin American neighbors. The gentleman will recall that I introduced legislation that would be, I think, of particular interest in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], because I know he is going to give me a hearing on my bill, which I hope will be helpful in this matter.

Mr. FASCELL. I thank my colleague from Florida for those comments. I know he has long been a leader in this area and I am very appreciative of his support of this resolution.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FASCELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida for bringing this resolution to the House, and also to our colleague from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], the chairman of this subcommittee. I think this is one of the ways to proceed to show the people of these oppressed countries that the people of the United States are friendly and that the Congress of the United States has a real interest in their destiny. I think there has been probably too little of this done in the past and I am hoping there can be more done in the future. I say that as a result of a trip I made to the Soviet Union in 1957 and my observations there. I saw literally hundreds of delegations that were brought to Moscow and conducted through the university. I visited the University of Moscow one day to see what was going on and while I was there delegation after delegation from these foreign countries was being conducted through the university. I understand many of them are brought over there and are educated and go back to their respective countries and become subversive tools for the Communist doctrine.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a real step forward. It is, you might say, a formalizing of something I know we are doing. But I am particularly interested in the suggestion here that a University of the Americas be established. We know of the university that is being established in Hawaii and the one in Beirut, which has been in existence for many years and of the tremendous impact that these American-type universities have in making friends for America. I think for too long we have overlooked South America and I am glad to see this step being taken now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second, and I make that demand to keep the record straight. The gentleman did not qualify.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California demanded a second and it has been already ordered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman did not qualify. He did not say he was opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I demand

that the Chair ask if the gentleman is opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is the ruling on my demand?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's demand is too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say the Speaker does not need to ask one who demands a second to qualify; that is, whether he is opposed to the bill.

I had assumed that one who demanded a second would not do so unless he could qualify. I was not advised the gentleman who demanded a second favored the resolution until I just asked him.

It is true, under rule XXVII, that it is not the duty of the Chair on a motion to suspend to call for a second, but it is the custom of the Speaker to ask whether a second is demanded. The precedents show that, when a second is demanded, an opponent of the bill is entitled to recognition, and it is true that, when so opposed, a member of the committee reporting the bill is entitled to preference, but he is not entitled to preference unless he is opposed to the bill.

It has also been held that the right to demand a second is not necessarily precluded by preliminary debate. Anyone interested in precedents will find some in 5 Hinds, sections 6799 to 6808.

Even though it has been customary for the Committee on Foreign Affairs to monopolize the time given for debate, I had not anticipated that any member of that committee would hog the debate on a bill as important as House Concurrent Resolution 226 or on House Concurrent Resolution 209, which, while not as important or far reaching, is, nevertheless, a continuation of the administration's program to spend more and more money, though it is true that on 209 the idea seems to have originated with the Committee on Foreign Affairs rather than with the administration.

Mr. MAILLIARD. I do not think there is any need to add to what has been said here, except to say I am in support of the resolution. I was hoping to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Is there any limitation as to the amount of a loan given to any individual student?

Mr. MAILLIARD. There is nothing in this that would put on a limitation. It requests the President to exercise powers he already has. I do not know whether under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 or under the Mutual Security Act of 1954 there were any such restrictions. I cannot answer that.

Mr. HOEVEN. What guarantee do we have that the loan will be repaid?

Mr. MAILLIARD. The same guarantee that anyone makes when he agrees to repay a loan.

Mr. HOEVEN. That does not afford much of a guarantee for repayment when you consider that these students will likely return to Cuba once a stable government is reestablished.

Mr. SELDEN. I doubt that under stable circumstances the loans would not be repaid.

Mr. HOEVEN. If and when they go back to Cuba without paying off their loans, what guarantee do you have that the loans will ever be repaid?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the majority leader and several Members on this side, and for the convenience of the Members, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the answer is, At the present time loans are made to institutions, and the institutions in turn make the loans to the students. This is the type of control we are trying to maintain.

Mr. HOEVEN. I would like to pursue the inquiry a bit further. Assuming some of the students do not repay their loans before they return to Cuba, after a stable government is established on the island, what guarantee do we have that such loans will ever be repaid?

Mr. FASCELL. Personally, as I explained, promissory notes will be signed. I do not think we would deny them the right to an exit permit just because they have not paid, but I would say it is improbable.

Mr. JUDD. If the gentleman will yield; if the situation in Cuba becomes stabilized with a free government there, a free society, so that these students can go back and make available to their own people the skills and, I hope, the favorable attitudes they have received from their experiences in our American colleges, I would be glad to introduce a resolution to forgive those loans, if necessary, because we would save more every day from stabilization of the situation in Cuba than all the loans would amount to.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not want any time.

Mr. FASCELL. I yield the 3 minutes then to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. In reply to the gentleman from Minnesota, we should fully understand that the number of students getting loans can be increased. There is no limitation as to the number of student refugees coming into this country from Cuba. Who would not want to enter the United States as a refugee, or otherwise, to get a free education at American taxpayers' expense?

Furthermore, there is no guarantee that any of the loans will ever be repaid. The minute a stable government is reestablished in Cuba, it is only natural that the beneficiaries of our generous loan program will return to Cuba and if they have not repaid their loans before they depart our shores, the American taxpayer will be holding the proverbial sack. That is nothing new for Uncle Sam.

Mr. GROSS. I have listened to the gentleman from Minnesota making the same old tired statement that if we just educate some more people and send them back to their countries, everything will be perfection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. That was not my statement. I said that if the situation in Cuba were stabilized in such a way that these students could go back, we would save money by forgiving the loans.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, would you?

Mr. JUDD. Rather than spending the amounts of money we have to spend now for hemisphere defense because of Communist forces in Cuba.

Mr. GROSS. Tell me how you would save any money in that way.

Mr. JUDD. If the situation in Cuba were stable, the savings in the defense budget of the United States would be very great, indeed.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows we are not going to stabilize the situation in Cuba in that way.

Mr. JUDD. That is why the gentleman's question, I thought, was somewhat hypothetical.

Mr. GROSS. And the answer that the gentleman from Minnesota gives is a thousand percent hypothetical.

Mr. JUDD. I never suggested sending these students back to stabilize the situation. I said that if and when it is stabilized so that they can go back, that will be so much better a situation, that it will cost us less money.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, sure, and you know what happens if the dog stops while chasing the rabbit. We are now asked to put our stamp of approval on the establishment of another—what is it—still another university? Is that what you are out to do, I ask the gentleman from Florida? Is this University of the Americas another foot in the door?

Mr. FASCELL. The answer is "No." The Organization of American States is being asked to make a study to find out whether or not anybody is interested.

Mr. GROSS. Plenty of people are interested in foreign countries in getting a free education at the expense of American taxpayers. They are already coming over here by the hundreds in the student exchange program. They are being paid $6 and $7 a day plus tuition, plus transportation and everything else. How far in God's name do you want to go with this business? How much of this can the taxpayers of this country stand? Incidentally, I noticed a story in a newspaper last week, I believe it was the Washington Post, where a fellow, a resident of the District of Columbia went down to Richmond, Va., and recruited a 19-year-old girl for immoral purposes. This fellow was charged with violation of the Mann Act. His mother was operating a house of assignation in the District of Columbia—and she testified in court that she was catering to foreign exchange students.

Why another program when the foreign student exchange program is in operation? Let us not spread this all over the country so that no one will know what is taking place. I doubt if many Members of the House or of the other body know now what is being done in all facets of this business of educating foreigners. Let us keep this thing within bounds. I see no reason for this resolution. In my opinion, it is just another foot in the door looking to the establishment of still another program to be paid for by our people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, there are presently in the United States many Cuban citizens who have fled their homeland in the face of Castro's oppressions. Included among these refugees are a number of Cubans attending colleges and universities who need assistance in order to continue their studies. President Kennedy in March of this year announced the extension of loans to these students to enable them to pursue their education at the colleges or universities they are presently attending.

House Concurrent Resolution 209 simply endorses the action of the President and asks that the operation of this program be continued and that it be known as University Free Cuba.

The resolution further requests that the President encourage the Organization of American States to undertake a study of the possible inter-American educational programs at the university level which might contribute to improved knowledge of inter-American affairs. This the President has done with a $25,000 grant to the OAS to help finance the cost of the study. This resolution provides further that in the carrying out of the study by the OAS an examination be included of the feasibility and desirability of establishing on a permanent basis a University of the Americas.

There is a definite need for improved knowledge of inter-American affairs as a means of creating closer cultural ties among the peoples of the Americas. Therefore, I urge the support of this legislation which is designed to provide an effective exchange of inter-American knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to suspend the rules and pass the resolution, House Resolution 209.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that two-thirds appeared to have voted in favor of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement, the vote goes over until Wednesday.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on House Resolution 209.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CLARIFICATION OF THE TERM "ORGANIZE"

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the Consent Calendar today is H.R. 3247, a bill to clarify the meaning of the term "organize" as it is used in section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code. This section is part of the Smith Act of 1940 which outlaws conspiracy to overthrow the Government of the United States.

Because a number of groups and individuals interested in civil liberties have expressed concern over the legislative treatment which this bill has received, including its consideration on the Consent Calendar, I would like to take a moment to go into its background.

In 1940 Congress enacted the so-called Smith Act making it a crime for a person to commit any of three defined acts. The first was to knowingly or willfully advocate the overthrow, by force or violence, of the Government of the United States; the second was to organize any society or group to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of our Government; the third was to be a member of or be affiliated with any such society or group.

This statutory language was subjected to judicial interpretation in the case of *Yates* v. *United States* (354 U.S. 298) decided by the Supreme Court in 1957. In this case the defendants had been convicted after jury trial on a single count of indictment charging them with conspiring to overthrow the U.S. Government by force and violence and with organizing groups for the same purpose. The Supreme Court reversed the convictions, holding that as to "advocacy" there must be actual indictment to action, and that the term "organize" referred only to the official organization of the Communist Party, which took place in 1945, and not to a continuing process of organization.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that H.R. 3247 seeks to counteract the effect of the Yates decision by defining the term "organize" to mean a continuous process of organizing groups and cells and of recruiting new members, rather than merely the original organization of the Communist Party or some other party or society whose aims are inimical to the security of the United States. Many Members of this body, including my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], who has asked that he be associated with my remarks, are keenly aware of legislative efforts to rebuke the Supreme Court, especially after Court decisions in cases involving civil liberties. On many occasions I have voted against such legislation and I would do so today, by interposing my objection to the bill before us, if I regarded this measure as simply a slap at the Supreme Court of the United States.

I think, however, that a broader definition of the term "organize" is justified. Although the Department of Justice of the present administration does not appear to have been called on for its position, which is unfortunate, enactment of identical legislation was favored by the previous administration and presumably this same sentiment prevails. My personal view, which I know is shared by a number of my colleagues, is that legislation which limits individual activity, regardless of the extent or justification in terms of national security, should be the product of current hearings and should be accorded something other than the perfunctory consideration afforded by the Consent Calendar procedure.

A TRIBUTE TO GEORGE W. NORRIS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OLSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, those of us from the western reclamation States and my colleagues from the Tennessee Valley will always be deeply grateful to George W. Norris. For as we know, the late great Senator from Nebraska contributed mightily to the program of wise and proper development and conservation of our natural resources during his 40 years in Congress.

He is known as the father of TVA, and he coauthored, with our distinguished Speaker of the House, the Rural Electrification Act.

Senator Norris was also concerned with that other vital resource—people, our human resources. The Norris-La Guardia Anti-Injunction Act—considered by labor as its magna carta—stands as another of his major contributions, freeing workingmen from tyrannical injunctions and outlawing the evil "yellow dog" contract.

It was President Franklin D. Roosevelt who described Senator Norris as "the very perfect, gentle knight of American progressive ideals," whose life was an "able and heroic fight on behalf of the average citizen."

It is thus fitting indeed that in this year of the 100th anniversary of the birth of George W. Norris, there will be a centennial observance to pay tribute to his memory. And it is also fitting that a major event in this observance will be held here in the Nation's Capital, where Senator George Norris made so many lasting contributions to the benefit of the people of our Nation.

The event will be the George W. Norris National Centennial Conference, to be held May 16 and 17 at the Willard Hotel. The letterhead of the group

sponsoring the conference lists 10 prominent individuals as initial sponsors of the Norris centennial. They are Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt; Speaker Sam Rayburn; Senator John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky; Senator Lister Hill of Alabama; Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Murray Lincoln, president of Nationwide Insurance Companies; George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO; James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association; and Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers.

These initial sponsors have been joined by some 200 others, including Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Chief Justice Earl E. Warren, many Members of Congress from both parties, and other prominent individuals in government and across the Nation in various fields of endeavor.

The enthusiastic response to news of the Norris centennial observance is an indicator of the great esteem in which Norris is held by our Nation. So, too, is the splendid gathering of speakers who will join in the tribute to the memory of Senator Norris on May 16 and 17.

The list includes Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont, Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, Gov. Frank Morrison of Nebraska, and Theodore C. Sorensen, Special Counsel to the President, and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Special Assistant to the President.

They and other speakers will pay deserved tribute to the late Senator from Nebraska, will honor his name, and, at the same time, will focus needed attention on the principles for which George W. Norris fought throughout his long and magnificent public life.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an article by Roscoe Fleming entitled "George W. Norris—Great Man in Politics," from the November 21, 1960, issue of Union News, official publication of the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union; as well as excerpts of statements by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on Senator George W. Norris:

GEORGE W. NORRIS: GREAT MAN IN POLITICS

(By Roscoe Fleming)

America's greatest political man of the 20th century, saving only Presidents, was a plain-featured, stocky, old-shoe sort of fellow from the Nebraska prairies. Certainly he was the Nation's most useful U.S. Senator of the century.

He was George William Norris, and he spent 40 years in Congress working for the interest of the Nation's plain people. Though he never gave an inch for political approbation, a half dozen great achievements bear his name, any one of them enough to make a man's lasting reputation.

In the labor field he's best known as the principal sponsor of the Norris-La Guardia Act, sometimes known as labor's magna carta.

Norris also fought almost alone through a dozen heartbreaking years for what became the great Tennessee Valley Authority, America's most magnificent conservation achievement both as respects people and other natural resources; now a monument and a model throughout the world as a high point of democratic achievement. Finally, after saving the project again and again, he got the pen with which Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the TVA Act.

He also did more than any other Congressman in establishing the Rural Electrification Administration that brought light and lightened labor to 2 million farm households.

This man ended the absurdity of a possibly repudiated Congress and President holding on to office for a full 4 months after an election. Now the new Congress and President, bearing the mandate of the people, go into office in January.

Again, he created the first one-house State legislature in the United States, that of Nebraska; and it is largely due to him that Nebraska is, so far, the only State that is also a complete public-power province.

He did his best to strike the shackles of the poll tax off people who wish to register and vote for President and Vice President. This reform hasn't come yet.

Perhaps his achievement which accomplished least is his earliest—striking down the rules by which the Speaker of the House was the absolute czar of the House.

In the long half-century since, the "power elite" of the House have merely retreated to a previously prepared position in the Rules Committee, as we've been poignantly reminded the past few months. This one of Norris' battles—that of full democratization of the House rules—is yet to win.

Why all this at this time?

Because the new year will be Norris' centenary year, and unless the people and the peoples' organizations get busy, it will go almost unremarked. Certainly those he fought all his life, hope it will.

He was born July 11, 1861, in the clangorous beginning of the Civil War, of poor, hard-working farm parents in Sandusky County, Ohio. His father died of a farm accident when the little boy was not quite 4 years old.

He never knew anything but hard work, lightened only by a loving mother and sisters. He literally fought his way through school ending by working his way through a law course at Valparaiso University, Indiana, a "poor boy" school where room and board were $1.60 a week—but you got the $1.60 at a dime an hour or less, for the hardest kind of work.

He spent a year teaching in raw new Washington State, sleeping in a big box filled with straw, in an abandoned section hands' bunkhouse. Later he settled in Nebraska and slowly worked up to a 7 year's judgeship, then to 10 years in the House, the scene of his historic battle with "Czar" Cannon; then to the Senate.

In early years an ardent standpat Republican, he grew so far out of that mold that the national Republican power elite sought by crooked means to beat him; finally he went all-out independent and ran that way. He supported more of F.D.R.'s New Deal than many Democrats.

The way he got interested in labor's plight and became one of its stoutest champions is told in a fine new book of labor history, "The Lean Years," by Irving Bernstein.

The lean years were those of 1920–33, when the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover triumvirate reigned supreme for the "power elite," and working people took the short end of the stick.

Norris, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, went to Pennsylvania in 1926 to investigate the corrupt Republican primary in which "Boss" Vare, later unseated, had beaten Gifford Pinchot. Norris stumped the State for William B. Wilson, the Democratic candidate, who almost won.

In the course of the campaign he got a thorough education in woes of the coal miners: "16 tons and what do you get? One day older and deeper in debt."

One of his guides through the coal country was a man who'd been so thoroughly wrecked by a mine explosion that he'd become a cripple, dependent on charity and his relatives. The latter's son jalopied the two to a weed-grown graveyard where they saw an epitaph, self-written, so it was said, by the man beneath the stone:

"For 40 years beneath the sod with pick and spade I did my task. The coal king's slave, but now, thank God, I'm free at last."

The more Norris found out about the conditions in which working people existed, the more furious he got. Labor organization was fought by every means from blacklisting to starvation to beating.

The great weapon of the operator was the injunction, granted at every request by complacent judges, State and Federal.

Bernstein relates that there were injunctions forbidding persons to pray on the roadside or to sing in groups; that required pickets to be American citizens or to speak the English language; that denied the rights of free assembly.

Most significant perhaps were the injunctions granted to enforce yellow-dog contracts—contracts of employment which compelled the worker to swear, as a condition of employment, never to join a labor organization. This was known as the American plan.

Norris went back to Washington. The fight took him nearly 7 years, amid discouragements too long to detail here. But he got the act through the Senate, and Fiorello La Guardia, later New York's fighting mayor, got it through the House. Hoover signed it only because both Houses had passed it by more than enough to override a veto.

The fight for the Tennessee Valley Authority was even longer, overlapping that for the Norris-La Guardia Act at both ends. .It began when the Harding administration of fragrant memory tried to sell out the great works built at Muscle Shoals on the Tennessee River during World War I. (Actually Theodore Roosevelt saved the seed of TVA long before, when he vetoed an act to give that waterpower away.)

Norris time and again prevented the sale, and got through one TVA act that was pocket-vetoed by Calvin Coolidge and another that was just plain vetoed by Herbert Hoover.

Finally he saw his triumph under F. D. R., and TVA became a shining light for democratic emulation all over the world, a savior of a ruined region, an enormous source of national * * * safety, as in World War II and Korea. * * *

The REA of course has also provided an immense economic stimulus as well as modernizing the homes and barns of 2 million farm families to make them income to buy the products of factory workers. (Once, talking to Norris in his last year, I asked him which of his achievements he thought would live longer. He hesitated, then in a bashful sort of small-boy voice he said: "You forgot the REA.")

I did not know him so well as some, but in a lifetime of reporting he is about the only man who talked exactly the same whether with feet cocked up on the table in his Senate committee room, or in his living room in McCook, Nebr., or on a rostrum before many thousands.

He was defeated, to Nebraska's loss, in his last campaign at 80, and died 2 years later after completing an autobiography that is a plain man's testament.

We shall not see his like again. Nor shall we see a fitting memorial for this great man of the people, unless the people see to it.

He is commemorated by Norris Dam and powerhouse of the TVA, and his Nebraska friends intend to name a reclamation lake after him and to preserve his home as a

shrine. But for national honors, little has as yet been done.

Labor and the great farmers' and cooperative and conservation organizations to whose causes he devoted his life, might well see to it. A monument in the Nation's Capital, or a resumption of Norris' forward march, such as a giant power public grid spanning the West and maybe the Nation? The time is pretty short, too, until July 11, although the whole year is Norris' centenary. And for that matter his name will glow brighter down the American years whether we, his beneficiaries, do anything about it now or not.

ROOSEVELT ON NORRIS

1. The place: McCook, Nebr.

The time: September 29, 1932.

The occasion: Franklin D. Roosevelt, Democratic Party candidate for President of the United States, had this to say of Senator George W. Norris, Republican, of Nebraska:

"We should remember that the ultimate analysis of history asks the answer to questions which are not concerned so much with what you and I, in these modern days, call ballyhoo, or headlines, as they are with much simpler fundamentals.

"History asks: 'Did the man have integrity? Did the man have unselfishness? Did the man have courage? Did the man have consistency?'

"And if the individual under the scrutiny of the historic microscope measured up to an affirmative answer to these questions, then history has set him down as great indeed in the pages of all the years to come.

"There are few statesmen in America today who so definitely and clearly measure up to an affirmative answer to the four questions as does the senior Senator from Nebraska, George W. Norris. In his rare case, history has already written the verdict.

"Not you alone in Nebraska, but we in every part of the Nation, give full recognition to his integrity, to his unselfishness, to his courage, and to his consistency. He stands forth—whether we agree with him on all the little details or not—he stands forth as the very perfect, gentle knight of American progressive ideals.

"I am hoping that at this moment thousands of boys and girls—thousands of first voters—are listening to my words, for I should like them to give some thought and some study to the very remarkable public service of the man in whose hometown I now stand.

"I should like them to read of the able and heroic fight on behalf of the average citizen which he has made during his long and honorable career. I should like them to know that sometimes he has made this fight with his party, and sometimes—as now—against the leader of his party.

"I should like them to know that always he has been thinking of the rights and welfare of the average citizen, of the farmer, the laborer, the small businessman—yes, and of the rights and welfare of those who have been born to or have acquired greater wealth.

"But especially it has been an unselfish fight, and directed to the fact that it is the little fellow who has the fewest friends in high places, and that too often it is the little fellow who has been forgotten by his government."

2. The place: Omaha, Nebraska.

The time: October 10, 1936.

The occasion: President Roosevelt, campaigning for reelection, declared:

"First, a word to you as Nebraskans. I hope it will be heard by the citizens of the other 47 States because I know that what I am going to say represents the conviction of the great majority of those who are devoted to good government, clean government, representative government.

"On this platform sits a man whose reputation for many years has been known in every community—a man old in years but young in heart—a man who through all these years has had no boss but his own conscience—and the senior Senator from the State of Nebraska, given to the Nation by the people of Nebraska—George W. Norris.

"Outside of my own State of New York, I have consistently refrained from taking part in elections in any other State.

"But Senator Norris' name has been entered as a candidate for Senator from Nebraska. And to my rule of nonparticipation in State elections I have made—and so long as he lives I always will make—one magnificently justified exception.

"George Norris' candidacy transcends State and party lines. In our national history we have had few elder statesmen who, like him, have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years.

"He is one of the major prophets of America.

"Help this great American to continue a historic career of service.

"Nebraska will be doing a great service, not only to itself but to every other State in the Union and to the Nation as a whole if it places this great American above partisanship and keeps George Norris in the Senate of the United States."

3. The place: Washington, D.C.

The time: December 10, 1942.

The occasion: a testimonial dinner in honor of Senator George W. Norris heard this letter from President Franklin D. Roosevelt:

"DEAR GEORGE: You can understand, I am sure, why it isn't possible for me to attend dinners these days, nor do I need to tell you of the pleasure it would give me to be with the friends who are gathering in your honor tonight.

"It would ever be a privilege, as well as a pleasure to join with any group of fellow Americans whose purpose is to recognize your long and faithful service as guardian of the public interest. Of all that you have done for your country and for your fellow citizens as the tireless champion of liberalism, I have spoken many times, publicly and privately.

"Through twoscore years you have been a tower of strength in every storm. I can only reiterate what I have often said before—that in our national history we have had few elder statesmen who, like you, have preserved the aspirations of youth as they accumulated the wisdom of years.

"In these critical days we need your counsel as never before and the youth of the land particularly need the force of your example which has been as a beacon light of righteousness for more than a generation.

"Always affectionately,

"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT."

THE COMMUNIST CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRATIC PROCEDURES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the worldwide challenge of communism must be fought by the free nations with alertness, diligence, and intelligence if we are to win.

The temptation to adopt some of the more direct tactics of the Communists in this fight is almost overwhelming. The worth of the principles of a free society—when faced with subversive and conspiratorial tactics—is being tested daily. Throughout the world we face Communist military moves, usually by the use of native revolutionists as a front. Korea, Indochina, Laos, and Cuba present examples of Communist methods. Before any of these military moves were made, however, there was a time period of Communist subversion and infiltration—a softening up of the existing structures of government. During this softening up process, the Communist infiltrators used the liberties of a free society—such as free speech, free assembly, and the free press to lay the conspiratorial foundations for Communist governments, which, when once established, proceeded to abolish these selfsame freedoms. This method of operation presents to democracies their greatest dilemma and their severest test.

How can we preserve the freedoms of speech, assembly, and press when they are being used to undermine the very foundations of our free society? That is the difficult question we seek to answer.

The problem of procedure by a congressional committee dealing with the problems of Communist activity in the United States has concerned a great many Members of the House. Over the years, I have joined with other Members in criticizing some of the procedures of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I find that I am still critical of certain procedures under which the committee operates.

I have been critical of intemperate statements by staff members in the past, as well as some of the committee members. Notwithstanding these criticisms, I am aware of the need for investigation by a congressional committee of some type, into those movements of the extreme left or extreme right.

Perhaps a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee could be the answer to this problem. The term "un-American" is too vague to lend itself to clarity of meaning. Supreme Court decisions have certainly cast doubt on the definitions which develop in regard to what the specific meaning of the word "un-American" happens to be. Other Supreme Court decisions have overturned citations for contempt which have originated in this committee on the grounds of improper procedure or unconstitutionality. These decisions are controversial in some quarters, nevertheless they cannot be lightly dismissed.

I do not join with any group, whether they be from the extreme left or extreme right, in their vicious personal attacks on either the members of the Supreme Court or the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I believe that the members of the judicial and legislative groups are men of sincere dedication to the preservation of the basic liberties guaranteed by our great Constitution. I certainly do not always agree with the wisdom of their decisions or actions, but I refuse to attack them on the basis of their motives.

I have discussed these matters many times with my colleague from California, the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, who serves as one of the Democratic Members of the House Committee on Un-American Ac-

tivities. Mr. DOYLE is, in my opinion, one of the most dedicated Members of the House of Representatives. His loyalty to constitutional principles is unquestioned. He is a fine American. The gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] has been under vicious personal attack because of his membership on the Committee on Un-American Activities. He could have solved this problem at any time by resignation from the committee. He would have been, in such an event, no longer a target for abuse.

Along with many other Members of the House of Representatives, I urged the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] to stay on the committee. In view of the fact that the committee has been reestablished every Congress since it was made a permanent committee and there being little likelihood that it would be abolished, it has seemed to many Members important that Members of Congress who were fairminded and possessed of judicial qualifications retain their membership on the committee.

Certainly Congressman CLYDE DOYLE possesses the qualifications noted. In my opinion, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] has exercised a moderating influence on the procedures of this committee. He has studied the rules of the committee in regard to the rights of witnesses to appear in prepublic hearings, to have the advice of counsel in regard to their legal rights and to receive fair treatment during their appearance as a witness.

As a result of Congressman DOYLE's study of the rules of procedure, the Committee on Un-American Activities has accepted various revisions of its rules and, I understand, that new and improved rules are now under consideration and will soon be printed.

In a democracy we deal with facts and situations as they are and not as we would like them to be. We move forward slowly through time periods of education, persuasion, compromise, and finally, action. Each of these four steps are partial steps; they are never the full stride which contestants on either side of an issue would like to see made. The education may be inadequate, the persuasion may be weak because of disunity in public opinion or fears of real or fancied dangers. The compromise may be much less than the contestants on either side desire and the action taken may be partial in nature rather than complete. This is the procedure of the democratic process. It is slow. It is at times frustrating. In the face of this slowness and frustration, we are prone to compare the quick and decisive actions of the totalitarian governments. We are tempted sometimes to adopt their methods to obtain their efficiency. When we are tempted let us examine closely the other items which must be included in the totalitarian package; that is, loss of individual freedom, liberty, and dignity and the degradation of all our moral and spiritual values under the brutish impact of the police state.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I append to my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post under date of April 17, 1961.

GOLDEN RULE

Representative CLYDE DOYLE extended to House Members the other day an invitation which ought not to be ignored—to suggest rules for the conduct of the Committee on Un-American Activities. He did this in his capacity as chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Rules and in terms indicating a genuine desire to meet criticisms of the committee and improve its procedure. In the same spirit, and in spite of the fact that Mr. DOYLE specified that "this invitation is not extended to any private group but only to the Members of the House," we offer some observations with due deference.

Rules are not the real remedy for the problem presented by the Un-American Activities Committee. Its trouble lies more in what it tries to do than in how it does it. Often it aims to try men for opinions, associations and activities which are not forbidden by law and to subject them to punishment by publicity for conduct which the Constitution forbids Congress to declare criminal. Its power to subpena citizens and hold them up to obloquy operates, we think, to inhibit the freedom of expression which is basic to the democratic process.

It is hard to think of a procedural rule that could curb this tendency. Procedure that would ensure a fair trial would cripple the normal and proper investigating functions of the committee. What is needed is not formalization of proceedings as though the committee were a court but relaxed modes of inquiry so that the committee can do its legitimate work effectively without treading on the rights of individuals.

The only rule likely to bring this about is the Golden Rule—a rule of consideration for the liberties and sensibilities of others. If committee members will remember that they are neither censors nor inquisitors but simply agents of the House of Representatives empowered to obtain information relevant to the discharge of the House's legislative responsibilities, they will cure the conduct which has brought the committee into such widespread disrepute. An indispensable condition of the power they exercise is forbearance and respect for the right of freemen to hold diverse views.

NEEDED AMENDMENTS TO THE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a bill which is designed to encourage voluntary pension plans for self-employed individuals by affording them an equitable tax standing with wage earners.

This Chamber has considered this proposal before and a proposal of this type, the Keogh-Simpson bill, was approved by the House on March 16 in the 86th Congress. Among those submitted for the consideration of the House earlier was one proposed by my distinguished predecessor, the late Honorable Daniel A. Reed, in 1951 and 1952.

Mr. Speaker, present law provides that amounts set aside by an employer to an employee's credit in a retirement fund are not subject to Federal income tax until they are withdrawn or made available. Without this tax deferment, these amounts would be subject to current taxation. However, this advantage does not cover self-employed persons, such as proprietors of small businesses, doctors, lawyers, and farmers.

This proposal would permit self-employed persons to defer payment of Federal income tax on earnings set aside for their retirement up to 10 percent of annual income, provided such amounts do not exceed $2,500.

The Treasury Department raised objections to a similar proposal and in so doing suggested that an alternative be drafted "to secure the tax relief for their retirement saving only by establishing qualified pension plans providing comparable benefits for their own employees on a nondiscriminatory basis."

The present version of the bill takes advantage of the advice of the Treasury Department, as developed by Senate hearings last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which suggests an amendment to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to clarify the technical information required by section 7, and I would like to make explanations.

Subsection (b) of section 7 should be amended because industry-wide, multi-employer plans do not have records of employees—they only have records of beneficiaries.

Subsection (c) of section 7 should be recast. The way it is now worded is ambiguous. A plan might be funded, that is, pensions may be provided under a modified pay-as-you-go system through the establishing of a liability to be carried on the books of the company for this specific purpose. The costs are then met, as incurred, by the allocation of assets against this liability. The reserve assets so set up would still belong to the general assets of the company.

Subsections (f)(1), (f)(1)(D), and (f)(2) of section 7 need to be amended since their meaning is misleading. At present, they confuse the method of funding and medium of funding as being one and the same thing.

When subsection (b) of section 7 is recast, subsection (f)(3) will have to be changed to conform with it.

Under the section on definitions, section 3(a), it is necessary to add three of the terms used in the act. Without clarification, these terms are easily misconstrued.

I strongly urge the Committee on Education and Labor to give prompt consideration to these suggested changes.

LINCOLN—A CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as president of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, I had the distinct

privilege of hearing a scholarly address by Prof. William Wolf, professor of theology at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., during the last meeting for my tenure of office on May 10.

Professor Wolf spoke eloquently on Lincoln as a Christian statesman, and since I found so much in this address which should be considered as America gropes for a moral tone to characterize its position of leadership in the world today, I want to share it with those who could not be present at the meeting:

"The grandest figure on the crowded canvas of the nineteenth century"—this was Walt Whitman's description of Abraham Lincoln. His judgment has not only been sustained by history, it has been deepened by the perspective of the 150 years since his birth. Professor Randall, one of the greatest Lincoln scholars, concluded his study of the Presidential years with a chapter entitled "God's Man."

"Lincoln," he wrote, "was a man of more intense religiosity than any other President the United States ever had. * * * Surely, among successful American politicians, Lincoln is unique in the way he breathed the spirit of Christ while disregarding the letter of Christian doctrine." (J. Randall, "Lincoln the President," IV, pp. 375 ff.)

The focus of our present interest is Lincoln as a Christian statesman and Lincoln's religion as illuminating the spiritual center of American history. Let us allow Lincoln himself to sharpen our focus. On that long, circuitous train ride from Springfield to Washington in 1861 the President-elect spoke many times about the Nation as God's instrument and about himself as open to God's guidance and direction.

He spoke to the New Jersey legislators of his boyhood excitement in reading about the Revolutionary War and the promise in it for "all the people of the world for all time to come." Then he added: "I shall be most happy indeed if I shall be an humble instrument in the hands of the Almighty, and of this, his almost chosen people, for perpetuating the object of that great struggle." ("Collected Works of A. Lincoln," IV, p. 236. Rutgers Press.)

These two themes—"this Nation under God" and Lincoln as "God's instrument"—can be traced through the Presidential years as they increase in depth and in consecration and as they more and more penetrate each other.

After a period of doubting Lincoln had early manifested an intellectual interest in the Christian faith although he never became an actual member of a church. After the death of their son Eddie in 1850 the Lincolns began attending the Presbyterian Church in Springfield. They continued this regular church attendance in Washington. The chief inspiration religiously for Lincoln, however, came from the Bible. He had a minute and profound knowledge of its contents, greater by far than that of most present-day clergymen.

Lincoln enjoyed quoting a text as his immediate response to something said to him. He deflated the somewhat pompous Lord Lyons, the British Ambassador, who made an official call to announce formally to the President in the name of his gracious sovereign Queen Victoria the betrothal of the Prince of Wales to the Princess Alexander of Denmark. Said Lincoln to the bachelor Ambassador when he had finished his communication, "Go thou and do likewise."

Next to this type of repartee, he liked to quote Scripture in answer to Scripture. Hugh McCulloch, an official of the Treasury Department, once introduced a delegation of New York bankers with much deference. Speaking of their patriotism in holding the securities of the Nation, he clinched his commendation of them with the text: "Where the treasure is there will the heart be also." Lincoln, like a crack of the whip, rejoined, "There is another text, Mr. McCulloch, which might apply, 'Where the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together.'" (Hill, "A. Lincoln, Man of God," pp. 269–70.)

It would be possible to multiply illustrations of his sharpness in tracking down Biblical texts. More significant than these humorous items for his maturing faith is his view of the authority of the Bible as revelation for him. Lincoln told his lifetime friend Joshua Speed that he should take all of the Bible that he could on reason and the rest on faith and that he would live and die a better and a happier man. Lincoln spelled out this conviction with even greater clarity in his response on September 7, 1864, to the loyal colored people of Baltimore, who presented him with a magnificently bound Bible as a token of their appreciation of his work for the Negro. This is one of the great documents of Lincoln's religious confession.

"In regard to this Great Book, I have but to say, it is the best gift God has given to man. All the good the Savior gave to the world was communicated through this book. But for it we could not know right from wrong. All things most desirable for man's welfare, here and hereafter, are to be found portrayed in it." (CWAL, VII, p. 542.)

Lincoln's religion was founded upon the bedrock of Scripture. From the Bible in a quite independent way he quarried granite to support a religious interpretation of American history and of man's vast future.

Lincoln held the Nation under God's judgment. He was very far removed from a current type of piety that drags God in by the backdoor in the last paragraph. A southern newspaper gave wide publicity to one of Lincoln's encounters with a clergyman in a visiting delegation. The minister said he hoped "the Lord was on our side." When Lincoln rejoined, "I don't agree with you," the mouths of all were stopped. The President made it clearer. "I am not at all concerned about that, for I know the Lord is always on the side of the right. But it is my constant anxiety and prayer that I and this Nation should be on the Lord's side." (Carpenter, "Six Months at the White House," p. 282.)

Such perspective and detachment from self-justification is the fruit of the conviction that God is Lord of this universe. "Behold, the nations are like a drop from a bucket, and are accounted as the dust on the scales." (Isaiah 40:15) In his proclamation after the humiliating disaster of Bull Run in July 1861 he expressed his belief in God as ruler of the nations. "It is fit and becoming in all people, at all times, to acknowledge and revere the supreme government of God; to bow in humble submission to His chastisements; to confess and deplore their sins and transgressions in the full conviction that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom * * * it is peculiarly fit for us to recognize the hand of God in this terrible visitation, and in sorrowful remembrance of our own faults and crimes as a nation and as individuals, to humble ourselves before Him, and to pay for His mercy." (CWAL, IV, p. 482.)

After Lincoln's death there was discovered among his papers a meditation on the divine will. His secretaries, Nicolay and Hay, said he had not intended it "to be seen of men." The first sentence underlines again the basic belief that God is is control of this world. "The will of God prevails. In great contests each party claims to act in accordance with the will of God. Both may be, and one must be wrong. God cannot be for, and against the same thing at the same time. In the present civil war it is quite possible that God's purpose is something different from the purpose of either party—and yet the human instrumentalities, working just as they do, are of the best adaptation to effect His purpose. * * *" (CWAL, V, pp. 303–304.)

The Rutgers editors of Lincoln's collected works date this piece early in September 1862, following the second defeat at Bull Run. During this month he finally decided to issue the preliminary Proclamation of Emancipation. He had always believed slavery to be a moral wrong and had early risked his political future by calling it such in the Illinois Legislature, then predominantly southern in orientation. As President, however, he had felt that his sworn duty to uphold the Constitution obligated him to accept slavery where it already existed. Slowly he moved toward emancipation, convinced that he might legally free the slaves only as an act of military necessity.

Gideon Welles, Secretary of the Navy, has recorded in his diary the solemn way in which Lincoln announced his decision to his Cabinet on September 22, 1862.

"We have a special Cabinet meeting. The subject was the proclamation concerning emancipating slaves. * * * There were some differences in the Cabinet, but he had formed his own conclusions, and made his own decisions. He had, he said, made a vow, a covenant, that if God gave us the victory in the approaching battle (which had just been fought) he would consider it his duty to move forward in the cause of emancipation. We might think it strange, he said, but there were times when he felt uncertain how to act; that he had in this way submitted the disposal of matters when the way was not clear to his mind what he should do. God had decided this question in favor of the slave. He was satisfied it was right—was confirmed and strengthened by the vow and its results; his mind was fixed, his decision made; but he wished his paper announcing his course to be as correct in terms as it could be made without any attempt to change his determination. For that was fixed." (Atlantic Monthly, 1909, p. 369.)

The testimony is incontrovertible. Lincoln reached his decision about the timing of the proclamation in an immediate awareness of the presence of God. The solemn vow and covenant could become dangerous in the hands of a fanatic or even of a lesser man than Lincoln. The taking of a vow may have been more in conformance with Old Testament than with New Testament religion, but the practice was imbedded in Lincoln's biblical piety and came to him as part of the early religious heritage of the Nation.

Once in a talk with L. E. Chittenden, his Register of the Treasury, Lincoln spelled out further his sense of being directed by God's will. "That the Almighty does make use of human agencies, and directly intervenes in human affairs, is one of the plainest statements in the Bible. I have had so many evidences of His direction, so many instances when I have been controlled by some other power than my own will, that I cannot doubt that this power comes from above. * * * I am satisfied that, when the Almighty wants me to do or not to do a particular thing, he finds a way of letting me know it." (Chittenden "Recollections," pp. 448 ff.)

The decision to emancipate the slaves had not been an easy one. It was preceded by the blood, sweat, and tears of a struggle to know the will of God on the matter. The historian Randall comments perceptively on Lincoln's decision: "If these deliberations had given him humility, and a sense of association with divine purpose (which was more than once indicated), they had also given executive confidence. In reaching his important decision there is ample reason to

believe that Lincoln had not only endured anxious hours, but had undergone a significant inner experience from which he emerged with quiet serenity." (Randall, II, p. 161.)

Lincoln's strong prophetic sense of the injustice of slavery kindled in him an indignation at those clergymen who tried to defend the peculiar institution. There is a fragment from the time of the classic debates with Douglas with a reference to a Dr. Ross, a minister in Alabama who wrote a pamphlet "Slavery as Ordained of God" in 1857.

"The sum of proslavery theology seems to be this: 'Slavery is not universally right, nor yet universally wrong; it is better for some people to be slaves; and, in such cases, it is the will of God that they be such.'

"Certainly there is no contending against the will of God; but still there is some difficulty in ascertaining, and applying it, to particular cases. For instance we will suppose the Reverend Dr. Ross has a slave named Sambo, and the question is 'Is it the will of God that Sambo shall remain a slave, or be set free?' The Almighty gives no audible answer to the question. No one thinks of asking Sambo's opinion on it. So, at last, it comes to this, that Dr. Ross is to decide the question. And while he considers it, he sits in the shade, with gloves on his hands, and subsists on the bread that Sambo is earning in the burning sun. If he decides that God wills Sambo to continue a slave, he thereby retains his own comfortable position; but if he decides that God wills Sambo to be free, he thereby has to walk out of the shade, throw off his gloves, and delve for his own bread. Will Dr. Ross be actuated by that perfect impartiality which has ever been considered most favorable to correct decisions?

"But, slavery is good for some people. As a good thing, slavery is strikingly peculiar, in this, that it is the only good thing which no man ever seeks the good of, for himself.

"Nonsense. Wolves devouring lambs, not because it is good for their own greedy maws, but because it is good for the lambs." (CWAL, III, pp. 204–205.)

One of the greatnesses of Lincoln was the way he held to strong moral positions without the usual accompaniment of self-righteousness or smugness. He expressed this rare achievement provisionally in his humor and in an ultimate way in his religious evaluations. To the Pennsylvania delegation that congratulated him after the inauguration he said, urging forebearance and respect for differences of opinion between the States, "I would inculcate this idea, so that we may not, like Pharisees, set ourselves up to be better than other people." (CWAL, IV, p. 274.)

The second inaugural is the climax of Lincoln's religious development. In it he gave the theme of "this Nation under God" its most powerful expression. Earlier, in the proclamation after Bull Run, he had urged the Nation to see the hand of God in the terrible visitation of war. Increasingly he defined the theological issue in the conflict. His papers and letters show his belief that God willed "His almost chosen people" like Israel of old to be the bearer of new freedom to all men everywhere. The Puritan background of Lincoln's confidence in American destiny under God had become rationalized in the 18th and 19th centuries into the dream of world democracy with the original religious perspective rapidly disappearing into the distance.

With his incisive logic Lincoln gave definition to America's hope for democracy in terms compelling to his contemporaries, but he also sustained that vision in its original religious rootage and reference to God's will. The religious interpretation was organic and fundamental. It never savored of a pious but irrelevant afterthought as it does in so much contemporary political and pulpit oratory. The depth of Lincoln's religious interpretation of the Nation's history, however, was not merely an inheritance from the past but a living power of rekindled insight.

Lincoln interpreted the slavery issue in terms of the Old Testament prophets. His Puritan forebears would have called it a discerning of the signs of the times. As Lincoln analyzed God's intention to lead men into larger freedom and appropriated to his use the language of the Declaration of Independence and the sayings of the Founding Fathers he came in the context of events to regard slavery as a contradiction of God's will. This defiance of God's justice had been built into the life of the Nation and was therefore subject to God's judgment.

The long, unhappy debates over the slavery issue had weakened the Nation and made it seem hypocritical to aspiring men in other countries. For somewhat more than the last year of his life Lincoln understood the tragedy and suffering of the Civil War as God's judgment upon this evil and as punishment to bring about its removal. The judgment fell upon both sides, for slavery was a national and not merely a sectional evil. The North had also prospered from the cheap raw materials that slave labor fed into its factories. It was conceivable to Lincoln that a just God might allow the war to continue "until all the wealth piled by the bondmen's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk." In the severe language of Scripture Lincoln held the Nation under judgment: "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

But the judgments of God have as their purpose the reformation of His people. The renewal of an America newly dedicated to the increase of freedom had been his theme at Gettysburg and must be understood as the implied correlative here of the emphasis upon judgment.

The leaven of Christianity that is at work in this address and carries the analysis of judgment beyond that of an Amos or a Jeremiah is expressed in the Savior's warning about the peril of judging. It is also present in the scriptural paraphrase of the Savior's summary of the law and of St. Paul's famous chapter on love that Lincoln achieves in his phrases "With malice toward none: with charity for all." The disclaimer of human judgments does not lead, however, to irresolution in action. The very opposite is the case. Understanding the perspective of two antagonists before the judgment seat of God and thereby freed from the tyranny of self-righteousness fanaticism, there comes to Lincoln the resource of "firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right."

This document is one of the most astute pieces of theology ever written. It is also a charter of Christian ethics. It may seem strange to call Lincoln a theologian, for he was obviously not one in any technical sense. There are many profundities in the Christian religion which he never did illuminate, but in the area of his vision he saw more keenly than anyone since the inspired writers of the Bible. He knew he stood under the living God of history.

He understood, for example, the finiteness of man's religious perspective without thereby becoming either a relativist or a skeptic. He achieved a perspective above partisan strife that was not shared by most of the Christian theologians of his day or any day, who often express Christian insights in obsolete terms in a way that defies the position of man. Lincoln could detach himself from his own interested participation in events and submit all, including himself as judging, to higher judgment. The highly tentative nature of his own judgments do not argue uncertainty or irresolution but simply confess that God is God and man remains on every level man.

The Second Inaugural illuminates the finiteness of man when in sincerity men embrace opposite courses of action under the conviction that each is responsive to God's will. "Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes His aid against the other." It has often been pointed out that religion has exacerbated human strife by clothing diametrically opposite lines of activity with the sanctions of holiness.

There is a fanticism in men that blinds them to the truth of their position, increases their self-righteousness, and isolates them from their fellows. It is the fallacy of supposing that a sincere intention to do God's will guarantees that what I sincerely do is the will of God. Lincoln could detach himself from the element of pretense in the idealistic claims made by both sides. In his meditation of the Divine Will Lincoln opened up horizons beyond the simple but all too common analysis—that one side is right and the other wrong. Both could not be right. Each might be partly right and partly wrong and God might use both sides as His instruments to effect a result not foreseen by either side. Lincoln argued that this was the case with the Civil War. "Only God can claim it," he once said, thereby stating that the complexities of historical events are so involved that finite man cannot claim infallible insight for his own interpretations. Lincoln expressed this again in his own comments on the Second Inaugural in a letter to Thurlow Weed:

"I expect the latter to wear as well as—perhaps better than—anything I have produced; but I believe it is not immediately popular. Men are not flattered by being shown that there has been a difference between the Almighty and them. To deny it, however, in this case, is to deny that there is a God governing the world: It is a truth which I thought needed to be told; and as whatever of humiliation there is in it, falls most directly on myself, I thought others might afford for me to tell it." (CWAL, VIII, p. 356.)

The fact, however, that the divine will remains in ultimate mystery need not lead to a despairing or resigned agnosticism. Because Lincoln was aware that Providence would overrule the element of pretension in the highly idealistic claims made by each side he was not therefore led to the conclusion that responsible action undertaken by either side would necessarily be irrelevant to the moral issue. The mystery is illuminated by meaning like lightning in the night sky. Knowing that God and not Lincoln would have the final word in the dilemma of the two contestants at prayer, he could yet venture provisional judgments and act resolutely in their light. "It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces * * * let us strive on to finish the work we are in." Lincoln's sympathy for the dilemma of the Quakers, caught between p..cifism and emancipation as a act in war, is another illustration of the depth of his biblical spirituality on this point.

He could appreciate the sincerity of his foe although he believed him wrong, but because of his religious perspective he could deal magnanimously and forgivingly without the self-righteousness of the victor. This point of vantage beyond the strife of factions did not, however, kill the nerve of resolution. Since God was supreme a man might act without fanaticism and hatred on the one hand and without torturing doubt or irresolution on the other.

This is the charter of responsible action for the Christian citizen. St. Francis, the loving, gentle imitator of Christ, will always be dear to the hearts of men. The appeal, however, of the ascetic who leaves the responsibilities of society for the cultivation

of individual piety and ecstatic person-to-person relationships has an element of romanticism in it. Lincoln represents the responsible Christian citizen of this world struggling to be responsive to the guidance of God amid the challenges of the full historic setting of man's life. Both the Christian saint and the Christian statesman are needed, but there can be little doubt as to which one more fully represents the demands of a God revealed through the Bible as the "Great Disposer of Events."

Lincoln's religious analysis of the Nation's history is as relevant today as it was when he painfully developed it. One has only to substitute the phrase "segregation in public education" for Lincoln's word "slavery" and his theological analysis becomes luminous. America stands today among the nations of the world as the self-professed defender of democracy in areas that are being progressively inundated by totalitarianism. Our professed defense of the right of all men everywhere to be free sounds increasingly hollow to multitudes in Asia and Africa because of our racial discrimination at home. If the rising colored peoples of the world turn from democracy to communism partly because of our racialism the security of America will become a very frail thing. And yet "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

To a religious understanding of the Nation's destiny that is as meaningful today as for the crisis of the Civil War, Lincoln adds a dynamic for responsible action that is equally helpful. Courageous action prayerfully undertaken in openness and in unself-righteous concern for all men is the leaven that can alter the whole lump. It was such a perspective that enabled Lincoln not only to serve the Union without Pharisaic stances but also, therefore, to serve it more effectively. Those who wield great power are often snared in traps of their own making when they become blinded by considerations of prestige.

Lincoln could concentrate on practical actions needed to restore the Union because he was free of the determination to punish the South. A Christian statesmanship rooted in reconciliation and forgiveness marks the address he made on the evening of April 11, 1865, his last public utterance. He appealed to the people to support his principles and action for reconstruction. "Let us all join in doing the acts necessary to restoring the proper practical relations between these States and the Union: and each forever after, innocently indulge his own opinion whether, in doing the acts, he brought the States from without, into the Union, or only gave them proper assistance, they never having been out of it." (CWAL, VIII, p. 403.)

The problems of national reconciliation in a spirit of forgiveness were uppermost in his mind when the bullet struck him on Good Friday. He carried to his death another item of unfinished business mentioned 4 days before in this last speech. "Him from whom all blessings flow, must not be forgotten. A call for a national thanksgiving is being prepared, and will be duly promulgated." (CWAL, VIII, p. 399.)

Lincoln was a biblical Christian, or to be still more precise, a biblical prophet who saw his country as "God's almost chosen people" called to world responsibility and himself as "an instrument of God" responsible "to the American people, to the Christian world, to history, and on final account to God." (CWAL, VII, p. 302.)

The Second Inaugural reads like a supplement to the Bible. In it there are 14 references to God, 4 direct quotations from Genesis, Psalms, and Matthew, and other allusions to scriptural teaching. The London Spectator commented prophetically on this masterpiece:

"We cannot read it without a renewed conviction that it is the noblest political document known to history, and should have for the Nation and the statesmen he left behind him something of a sacred and almost prophetic character. Surely, none was ever written under a stronger sense of the reality of God's government. And certainly none written in a period of passionate conflict ever so completely excluded the partiality of victorious faction, and breathed so pure a strain of mingled justice and mercy." (Carpenter, p. 31.)

HON. ROY G. FITZGERALD

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article which appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of April 1961 which was written by a former Member of Congress from Ohio, the Honorable Roy G. Fitzgerald. It is particularly interesting and, refreshing I might add, to review the momentous work done by our predecessors in the Congress. Many valuable contributions have been made which have gone relatively unheralded.

Mr. Fitzgerald is still active though 86 years of age. He was a Member of Congress from 1921 to 1931. He has climbed Mt. Rainier and swam the Bosporus from Asia to Europe and his accomplishments are legend. I am also enclosing a letter from my good friend, Robert Klepinger, a Washington attorney, which sheds further light on this milestone:

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Hon. JOHN M. ASHBROOK,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The enclosed American Bar Association article is a jewel. Congressman Roy G. Fitzgerald, the dean of the Dayton, Ohio, bar and who represented our Third Ohio District in Congress, is the father of the United States Code and the system of cumulative codification of the Federal laws. The United States Code is, of course, the greatest accomplishment in the field of revision and codification ever enacted. The article fails to state that the chairman of the House Committee on Revision of the Laws was Colonel Fitzgerald. Under his chairmanship and for the first time in the history of our country, the laws of the District of Columbia were gathered in one volume which included the centuries old British and Maryland statutes applicable to the District. The District laws as of this date still have never been actually revised as distinguished from being codified.

In 1948 titles 18 and 28 of the Code were revised and enacted into positive law. Those titles contained the laws relating to crimes and criminal procedure, and to the judiciary and judicial procedure, and represented the most careful and accurate revision and simplification ever presented to the Congress. The monumental task required 4 years and was performed by the original compilers of the Code, the West Publishing Co. and the Edward Thompson Co.

I well recall "An Afternoon in Congress" as I was clerk to Mr. Fitzgerald's committee from 1925 until 1934. Incidentally, the Congressman who was certain there was no chance at all of passage of the bills to which the article refers was the late Representative B. Frank Murphy of Ohio.

ROBERT F. KLEPINGER.

AN AFTERNOON IN CONGRESS

The code of the United States laws has been enacted into law, clearing the chaos that had resulted from neglect to collect the permanent law since the Revised Statutes of 1878. No one knew what the law was, hidden in 40-odd volumes. Two Commissions of Congress had worked on the problem in vain. The House Committee on the Revision of the Laws was established and a special committee to cooperate was set up in the Senate. Col. Edward Little, chairman of the House Committee on the Revision of the Laws, wore his life out at the task. He prepared a code and had it adopted by the House, but as it was called The Little Code, the Senate committee chairman seemed hostile.

A committee of the American Bar Association was appointed to press the matter. Cases were being reversed upon the discovery of an obscure law. A bill was pending in the Senate to amend a law which had been repealed. "An attempt to hang a picture on a wall that had been torn down."

At Colonel Little's death, the new chairman received better cooperation from the Senate through George Wharton Pepper, Senator from Pennsylvania, and the help of the West Publishing Co. was secured. The code was prepared and passed by the House and Senate and the Senate committee dissolved.

Then Senator Robert La Follette, stirred by suspicions in the minds of some labor leaders that the code was a scheme to cheat the unions, in some mysterious way, had the Senate pass a bill to provide that the code would be but prima facie evidence and declared that he would resist any further code legislation unless the House concurred in his amendment.

The House convened at noon on May 29, 1929, the last day of the session. The chairman of the Committee on the Revision of the Laws was interested in three bills—the Senate bill of Senator La Follette, and bills to provide cumulative codification of the laws of the United States and those of the District of Columbia. By unanimous consent he secured their passage. The procedure was to have bills enrolled after adjournment and sent to the Senate the next day. The enrollment clerk was persuaded to enroll them at once and permit the chairman to take them to the Senate. He took them and handed them to George W. Norris, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and asked him to have a meeting of the committee, to approve the two cumulative codification bills. He said, "Impossible—the Congress will adjourn in a few hours and all the Senators are too busy. It's useless anyway, for we've entered into an agreement not to take up any bill that hasn't been on our calendar 24 hours." The House chairman persisted and asked him to have the committee polled on the two bills. He was opposed to the polling of a committee. The House chairman went to Thomas G. Walsh, ranking Democrat of the committee. The House chairman went to Walsh. He was opposed to the polling of the committee, but finally said, "If Senator Norris wanted it, all right." The chairman reported to Senator Norris that Senator Walsh would "go along." The House chairman then descended to the Judiciary Committee office, the only such office in the Capitol building, and there found a clerk, Allen R. Cozier, who took his dictation on the typewriter, reporting that the Senate committee has considered the bills and recommended their passage. Cozier accompanied him to the Senate floor and had the two reports signed by Senator Norris, and borrowing his pen, went through the

Senate and secured the signatures of all the other members of the Judiciary Committee. The House chairman handed them to Senator Norris and asked him to seek recognition by the Vice President. Again he said, "See Senator Walsh." They were handed to Senator Walsh who was told that the House had concurred in the La Follette amendment to the code. Senator Walsh arose. Vice President Curtis said, "For what purpose does the Senator from Montana rise?" He replied, "I move that the Rules of the Senate be suspended and that the House bills for the cumulative codification of the laws of the United States and of the District of Columbia pass." Senator La Follette demanded to know about his amendment to the code and was told that it had been passed by the House. Senator David Reed, of Pennsylvania, asked, "What number are these bills on our calendar?" turning through its pages. Senator Walsh said, "They are not on the calendar," and as Reed hesitated, the Vice President said, "I hear no objection, the bills are passed." The Senate had passed into law two bills which no Senator had read.

The chairman returned to the House and asked a Congressman of greater experience, "What chance is there to get the Senate to pass a bill that we passed here this afternoon?" He replied, "No chance in a million. No chance at all."

ROY G. FITZGERALD.

DAYTON, OHIO.

THIRTY-ONE YEARS ON THE JOB

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is so easy to criticize and call attention to mistakes and unfaithful service. It is far more important, I feel, Mr. Speaker, to give well deserved recognition when important tasks are done faithfully and well by dedicated Government employees. An unusual number of Federal employees go about their duties in a quiet, efficient manner day after day. Even though they, like everyone else do not always feel full of pep and vigor each day and even though they have accumulated sick leave which can be used, they report daily and work daily because they have a deep sense of responsibility. Such devotion to duties and personal responsibilities is found among many Federal employees in all branches of our Government and, unfortunately, is not given the recognition so richly deserved.

One such instance came to light only recently and was the subject of an editorial in the Dayton Daily News and was reported in the Miamisburg News. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial and news story, reprinted in full at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Dayton Daily News, May 2, 1961]

IN BODY AND SPIRIT

During all of his 31 years at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, William P. Bonner never missed a day's work. Starting in as an airplane mechanic's helper, he was a foreman in the flight and engineering test group at the time of his retirement. He has been dubbed by fellow employees "the healthiest man on the base."

Healthy in more than one sense of the word. Not just physically healthy. The man enjoying the soundest bodily health is bound to have his bad days. A rough cold, a splitting headache, a lame back, a smashed fingernail.

Only the ones who are mentally healthy and morally responsible go 31 years without missing a day.

[From the Miamisburg News, May 4, 1961]

MIAMISBURG MAN RETIRES AT WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB WITH UNIQUE RECORD

After more than 31 years of service in the Aeronautical Systems Division at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, William P. Bonner of 4034 Maue Road, retired last weekend leaving behind an outstanding on-the-job record.

In 1959, after completing 30 years of service without taking a day's sick leave, Bonner was given the "Healthiest Man at Wright Field" title by his fellow employees. He extended his record to his retirement date. When elected "healthiest man" and upon being interviewed, he said he guessed he was "just lucky" for he ate no special diets and took no special exercises.

Bonner has been an experimental electronic systems modification foreman in the Flight and Engineering Test Group at the Aeronautical Systems Division. He began his career in October 1929 as an airplane mechanic's helper and remained in the same department throughout his career, progressing to the foremanship during World War II.

Civilian employees of the division numbering 225 were honored last week at an awards ceremony, many receiving pins for lengthy service, others gaining recognition for inventions and money or laborsaving suggestions. In the latter category one of those receiving recognition was Thomas J. McGuire, 603 Buckeye Street, Miamisburg.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, we have had considerable debate here today about Cuba, and we have a resolution which will be voted on on Wednesday relating to the Organization of American States and the situation in Cuba. Previously—last June 25 to be correct—I had expressed some concern about the Organization of American States. Now we have had a discussion a few minutes ago about the establishment of a university. We have asked that the Organization of American States make a study to determine whether or not it is feasible to have a university. I would suggest it would be much better for the Organization of American States to make a study on how to get rid of communism in Cuba. That, after all, should be the prime objective of the Organization of American States and the prime objective of the United States of America. We have long since passed the time when we should continue to accept the insults and the indignities that we have received from Cuba. I made this same statement on the floor last June. I repeat it now.

Now, I am concerned about the Organization of American States, Mr. Speaker, and I want to read, so that there will be no misunderstanding on that point, the article of the Organization of American States which, in my opinion, repeals the Monroe Doctrine. And, if we repeal the Monroe Doctrine, then surely we are in trouble. Let me read it. It is article 15 of the Organization of American States, and this is what it says:

> No state or group of states has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other state. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the state or against its political, economic, and cultural elements.

Now, let us analyze it. "No State"—that would mean the United States—"or group of States," which would mean those that were today petitioning to do something, "has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly," and today by this resolution which we will vote on Wednesday, we are indirectly attempting to do this, "for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs"—now, this is the internal affairs we are talking about of Cuba, which is prohibited by this article of the Organization of American States—"of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force"—but listen to this, Mr. Speaker—"but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State"—and listen to this—"or against its political, economic, and cultural elements."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this poses a very serious question which this Congress should consider. I think it poses a very serious question that every Member of this House should consider before voting on these resolutions next Wednesday, because in a specific reply to a question of mine it was stated that this one resolution endorses this provision of the Organization of American States, and I do not believe that any of my colleagues in the Congress want to endorse a prohibition against our taking any action in any manner whatsoever, economic, cultural, or by force against communism, just 90 miles off the shores of the United States of America.

I believe that with any reading that we can give this, this particular provision negates the Monroe Doctrine that so many of us have talked about in the past. And, if we have done this, then it seems to me it is time that, instead of a resolution providing for the Organization of American States to study universities or a resolution asking them to make some statement, we ask the Organization of American States to take some action against communism in this hemisphere, and if they fail to do it, that we do it ourselves, because if we do not do it, we are soon going to find communism spreading throughout this entire hemisphere. I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, for my country. We seem to bellow loud and carry a toothpick, let us return to a policy of self-preservation

and carry a big stick and speak softly. I fear our countrymen are becoming a bit weary of resolutions, and appeal to others rather than our taking care of our own.

Let us stand firm and make it clear to all that we shall with courage protect and defend our heritage and our rights.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, the special Subcommittee on Labor, of the Committee on Education and Labor, begins hearings on bills to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, with the Secretary of Labor as the first witness. Views of the Department of Labor are incorporated in a letter of August 9, 1960, that follows. The Secretary outlines the need for revision of the act, citing that neither its reporting nor disclosure purposes are being effectively achieved. As chairman of the subcommittee that will begin hearings on this act, I feel the information is particularly pertinent, and under unanimous consent I include the letter in the RECORD for study by my colleagues:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., August 9, 1960.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: Two years ago the Congress enacted the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. At the time of its adoption some Members of Congress expressed misgivings as to the adequacy of the law and indicated a desire to reappraise the act at a later date on the basis of subsequent experience.

In view of these expressions of doubt and concern as to the effectiveness of the legislation, I am submitting to you a report covering the administration and operation of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act during the first 18 months of its existence.

As you know, this legislation became effective January 1, 1959. It was enacted by the 85th Congress after investigations and hearings by both Houses of Congress extending over several years. These investigations clearly demonstrated the desirability of full disclosure of the facts surrounding the provisions and operations of employee welfare and pension benefit plans.

The President in signing the bill into law (Public Law 85–836) on August 28, 1958, noted a number of shortcomings in the legislation and stated that he had approved the act "because it establishes a precedent of Federal responsibility in this area. It does little else." He declared that "if the bill is to be at all effective it will require extensive amendment at the next session of the Congress."

The President, both in 1959 and in 1960, has made specific recommendations to the Congress for strengthening amendments to the Welfare and Pensions Plans Disclosure Act. Although bills to carry out his recommendations were introduced in both Houses of Congress, no legislative action has been taken. Experience in administering the law shows a substantial amount of confusion and noncompliance on the part of those responsible for meeting its modest provisions. Meanwhile, over a half million dollars is being spent annually by the Department of Labor in an attempt to administer the law while the cost to those required to prepare reports undoubtedly runs into the millions.

As the law is now written, neither its reporting nor its disclosure purposes are being effectively achieved. Nor is it likely these important objectives can be accomplished unless the law is substantially strengthened. The inability of administrators of employee benefit plans to obtain authoritative interpretations of the Act's provisions has caused confusion and contributed to the substantial degree of noncompliance and inadequate reporting which has occurred. The lack of either investigatory or enforcement powers by the Secretary of Labor has seriously handicapped the Department and affords no persuasive deterrent to those who wish to ignore its provisions, or to manipulate or embezzle funds.

For example:

1. The number of plan descriptions (142,500) which have been filed with the Department of Labor to be made available for public disclosure is many thousands short of the number of plans believed to fall within the scope of the act.

2. Based upon information relating to the frequency of changes in employee benefit plans it is obvious that the number of plan amendments submitted to the Department of Labor under the requirements of the act is thousands short of the total number which should have been submitted and thus full and current details of these plans are not available for public disclosure.

3. The law requires that for each description of an employee welfare or pension benefit plan the plan administrator shall file an annual report covering the operations of that plan. By June 30, 1960, only 100,500 annual financial reports had been filed with the Department of Labor. Not only were some 15,000 to 20,000 reports delinquent and in violation of the law after June 30 but thousands of other submissions consolidated the financial data for several plans into a single report contrary to the explicit provisions of the act.

4. Moreover, obvious defects and omissions are clearly evident in thousands of reports which have been filed and thus patently not in compliance with the law. In many instances, after these deficiencies have been called to the attention of plan administrators, they remain uncorrected. Under the present state of the law, the Department can take no further action.

5. Finally, the overall adequacy or accuracy of seemingly complete reports filed with the Department of Labor cannot be effectively determined because of the absence of rulemaking, investigatory or enforcement authority thus leaving the Secretary of Labor for all practical purposes, powerless to uncover abuses.

These examples are clearly symptomatic of the unsatisfactory character of this act. The net effect, to date, raises grave doubt as to the wisdom of retaining so weak a law on the statute books. To continue the law in its present form in the belief that it assures adequate protective safeguards is a shameful illusion. To abandon it entirely, however, would be an act of betrayal to the millions of Americans who have a right to a sense of security that the billions of dollars annually received and disbursed by these plans are being honestly and prudently managed.

The only recourse, therefore, is the prompt amendment of the act to require, among other considerations, that reports should be complete and meaningful and timely filed; that plan administrators should be entitled to receive authoritative interpretations of the act's provisions; and that the Department of Labor should have the appropriate investigatory and enforcement powers customarily granted by the Congress for the proper enforcement of legislation it has adopted.

The attached report enlarges on these matters. It also describes the nature of the specific recommendations made by the President for strengthening amendments. These necessary improvements in the present act are reflected in bills introduced in 1959 by Senator SCOTT (S. 2550) and by Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN (H.R. 7489) which are still awaiting action by the Congress.

I again urge their speedy adoption.

Respectfully submitted.

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the civil rights legislation that I am introducing today is brought before this Congress not with the intention that it be acted upon immediately, but rather with the thought in mind that if our present law in respect to court appointed referees in matters of evaluation involving denial of voting rights to American citizens proves ineffective, an alternative solution will be constantly kept in mind. Should the present law prove ineffective and an alternative plan become imperative, this proposal is readily available for consideration by my colleagues.

PROPOSED KLM CONCESSION

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] made a most illuminating address before this body last Tuesday. Unfortunately, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee business prevented my being on the floor while this talk was delivered.

Since then, I have read the speech in the RECORD, together with the sensible, intelligent remarks of several of our colleagues who associated themselves with the Oklahoma gentleman's thesis. I am happy to join with them in asking that the Congress pay particularly close attention to negotiations now in progress between our State Department and Netherlands Government representatives.

Air rights are valuable commodities these days; they should not be disposed of free of charge or at bargain rates.

Mr. Speaker, the current edition of Babson's Washington Report covers the KLM situation particularly well. Under unanimous consent I include this brief analysis as a part of the RECORD:

President Kennedy is under strong pressure from the Netherlands Government to

make Los Angeles another American port of call for KLM the Royal Dutch Airline.

There are rumors that the Netherlanders are so serious in their demand that veiled threats of a Dutch withdrawal from NATO are involved.

American-flag international airlines are justifiably concerned. Such a concession to KLM could provide new wedges for airlines of other nations—most of them heavily subsidized by their governments—to demand similar expansion of operating facilities in the United States.

Already harassed by competition from subsidized foreign airlines, the U.S. carriers are in danger of being backed against the wall, by the impractical generosity of their own Government.

Strong U.S. oversea airlines are vital to our national security. Other nations recognize this fact of life. It's time we did, too.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin), for May 15 through May 18, on account of death in his family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PRICE, for 30 minutes on Thursday, May 18, 1961.

Mr. OLSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) for 1 hour on Wednesday, May 17, 1961.

Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) for 5 minutes today, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL, for 30 minutes tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois.

Mr. EDMONDSON and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BELL.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. JUDD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. NORRELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 201. An act to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 322. An act to make certain funds available to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 507. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinaielt Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 751. An act to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1208. An act to amend Public Law 86-506, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1215. An act to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1289. An act to amend sections 337 and 4200 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to eliminate the oath requirement with respect to certain export manifests; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1719. An act to amend title 23 of the United States Code with respect to Indian reservation roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2195. An act to convey certain land of the Pala Band of Indians to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corp.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1372. An act to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 16, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

901. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

902. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

903. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1961 in the amount of $48,024,000 for various agencies of the executive branch (H. Doc. No. 161); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

904. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving an increase in the amount of $100,000 for the Securities and Exchange Commission (H. Doc. No. 162); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

905. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries and the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

906. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

907. A letter from the clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the court's order relating to the case of *Wilma D. Marsh* v. *The United States* (No. Congressional 3-58), pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and House Resolution 513, 85th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

908. A letter from the executive vice president, National Safety Council, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the National Safety Council for the year 1960, pursuant to Public Law 259, 83d Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

909. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

910. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives, pursuant to section 1(f) of the Act of June 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 151); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

911. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 11, 1961, the following bill was reported on May 12, 1961:

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Science and Astronautics. H.R. 6874. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted May 15, 1961*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7035. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and

Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 7030. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7035. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska:

H.R. 7036. A bill to prohibit strikes at defense facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7037. A bill to amend section 3238 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7038. A bill to eliminate the right of appeal from the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico to the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7039. A bill to amend chapter 50 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the transmission of bets, wagers, and related information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7040. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to clarify the technical information required by section 7; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 7041. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending high school or college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 7042. A bill to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 7043. A bill to extend to employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 the benefits of salary increases in connection with the protection of basic compensation rates from the effects of downgrading actions, to provide salary protection for postal field service employees in certain cases of reduction in salary standing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 7044. A bill to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 7045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the amortization over a 60-month period of certain civil defense facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7046. A bill to provide reimbursement for New York City for the portion of the costs of its police department attributable to providing protection to the United Nations and delegates thereto; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7047. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act to clarify the technical information required by section 7; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 7048. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that, for purposes of determining the annual income of an individual eligible for pension, payments of State bonus for military service shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7049. A bill to amend section 204 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide incentive pay for duty performed by members of the Armed Forces involving space flight; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7050. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to permit the free flow of commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 7051. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS:

H.R. 7052. A bill to amend section 927 of the Act of March 3, 1901, relating to responsibility for criminal conduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7053. A bill to provide for the admission of certain evidence in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FENTON:

H.R. 7054. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources; to the Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 7055. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 7056. A bill to clarify the relationship with and the effect of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 with State and/or Federal apprenticeship laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 7057. A bill relating to the application of the terms "gross income from mining" and "ordinary treatment processes normally applied by mine owners or operators in order to obtain the commercially marketable mineral product or products" to certain clays and shale for taxable years beginning before December 14, 1959; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7058. A bill to allow in the computation of percentage depletion in the case of clay used in making brick, tile, sewer pipe, and other burnt clay products, the same cutoff point and the same depletion rate as are presently allowed in the case of calcium carbonates and limestone used in making cement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSWEEN:

H.R. 7059. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, without any prior determination by the President, to furnish emergency assistance in the form of feed grain and seeds to farmers, ranchers, and stockmen who suffer damage or hardship in certain localized disasters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 7060. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 7061. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide for payment for unused compensatory time owing to deceased postal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 7062. A bill to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 7063. A bill to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 7064. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7065. A bill to protect civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 7066. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer, spouse, or dependent who is a student at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7067. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as educational expenses to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as educational expenses to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SILER:

H.R. 7069. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 7070. A bill to authorize the retraining of persons displaced from their jobs by automation or other technological development, foreign competition, relocation of industry, shifts in market demands, or other change in the structure of the economy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 7071. A bill to advance certain officers on the retired list without affecting retirement pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Con. Res. 304. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Con. Res. 305. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Con. Res. 306. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during

the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 291. Resolution to provide for necessary expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to pollution of Klamath River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization to take action to halt the flood of surplus foreign military rifles into the United States, and to protect the domestic rifle manufacturing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 7072. A bill for the relief of Mason and Angeliki Bakhos and their minor child, Andre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7073. A bill for the relief of Sangwoo Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 7074. A bill for the relief of Politis Konstatin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7075. A bill for the relief of Cecylia Shemezis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 7076. A bill for the relief of Sangwoo Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H.R. 7077. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elba Haverstick Cash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 7078. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Sahagun de Lara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

145. By Mr. SHRIVER: Petition of Frank Vannerson and other students of the University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans., urging the necessary appropriations to the degree recommended by the President for the support and promotion of the Peace Corps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

146. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Merwin K. Hart, president, National Economic Council, Inc., New York, N.Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting a thorough investigation of the State Department; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

147. Also, petition of Harold Elsten, Cortland, N.Y., relative to a redress of grievance for compensation based on *Elsten* v. *U.S.* and *F.C.C. and Elsten* v. *ABC Network;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

148. Also, petition of Ray H. Meyer, Batesville, Ind., relative to petition by creditor for private bill for the relief of creditor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

149. Also, petition of George Washington Williams, Baltimore, Md., relative to a redress of grievance relating to integration and its effects; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

150. Also, petition of C. Taylor Burton, director, Utah State Department of Highways Salt Lake City, Utah, relative to requesting the extension of the deadline specified under section 131, title 23, United States Code, for Federal-State agreements to regulate advertising in areas adjacent to the Interstate Highway System; to the Committee on Public Works.

151. Also, petition of Clark Foreman, director, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, New York, N.Y., relative to requesting Congress to pass a resolution asking the Un-American Activities Committee to cancel its hearings on the Fund for Social Analysis; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

152. Also, petition of L. R. Hegland, executive secretary, Montana Medical Association Billings, Mont., relative to transmitting a copy of a resolution upon health care for the aged which was adopted by the Montana House of Delegates at its interim session in April 1961; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Late Gary Cooper: A Real American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALPHONZO E. BELL, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation has suffered a great loss in the passing of a distinguished citizen, Gary Cooper—actor, artist, business leader, husband, father, outdoor man; a real American.

He came to be a symbol of vigor, courage, and heroism in American life. He served as a source of inspiration to many of the youth of this Nation who admire such pioneer qualities of quiet strength of character, steadfastness, honesty, and fairplay.

He had a public career of the highest order of fidelity and service. He gave of both himself and of his resources, not only to many of the worthwhile charities, but to many of those who needed a helping hand in their strife for a better life.

His two Oscars—given for his performances in the title role in "Sergeant York," 1941, and as the courageous sheriff in "High Noon," 1953—doubtless rank among the most popular awards ever presented by the Motion Picture Academy.

Mr. Speaker, the manly qualities in American life that Gary Cooper so ably portrayed in such pictures as "The Virginian," "The Westerner," and "For Whom the Bell Tolls," future generations will not only continue to enjoy, but what is more important, will continue to emulate and thus will find a source for renewed courage.

I am honored by listing myself among those who have been Gary Cooper's friends. I will miss him. The people of this Nation and of this world will miss him.

But at this sad time our particular sympathy goes out to Mrs. Cooper, the devoted wife who shared the trials and satisfaction of our friend's varied and eminently useful career.

Local Support Strong for Area Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt about local interest in and support for area development, after a remarkable meeting held yesterday afternoon in Muskogee, Okla.

In response to a letter inviting their attendance to discuss the program, more than 100 mayors, city managers, and other county and local officials of Oklahoma's Second Congressional District met for more than 3 hours.

Federal officials attending the conference said last night they had never attended a more enthusiastic and constructive meeting of local officials.

Tomorrow, because of the widespread interest in this program, I will submit a more detailed report on the Oklahoma area development meeting.

Under aggressive and enlightened New Frontier leadership, the tremendous area development program just passed by the Congress is off to a flying start—and the people are ready and eager for action at the earliest possible date.

Needed: Neutralist United Nations Disarmament Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the arms race between the Communist world and the non-Communist world poses an ever greater threat to peace, either by premeditated war or by accidental war.

For almost 15 years, the world has talked of reduced—rather than increased—armaments.

Regrettably, however, the Communists adhere to a policy of aggression. Their aggression is ever toward ultimate triumph of communism, rather than the establishment of peace in a world of self-governing nations.

Consequently, progress has been literally impossible. The Communists have continued to block conference after conference. Militarily, they have reduced manpower only if such reductions were balanced—or perhaps stepped up—by increases of firepower by new weapons.

Because of the stalemate, I suggested yesterday, in a broadcast over radio station WGN, in Chicago, the establishment of a neutralist United Nations commission to attempt to set up universally recognized criteria for disarmament. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY, OF WISCONSIN

Today, the United States and the non-Communist world, face major challenges, including efforts to find:

Ways to stop Communist aggression without sparking a third world war; a formula for negotiating differences between the non-Communist and Communist worlds; and, establishment of a climate of peace and law by which nations can, by self-determination, seek and attain their national destinies.

These are great and formidable challenges. Around the globe—in Cuba, Laos, Berlin, the Congo, and elsewhere—Red troublemakers are threatening the freedom of peoples and nations.

What can be done about it?

Over the years, there has been a great deal of talk about disarmament. Unhappily, this has been difficult to achieve. Why? Because the Communists are committed to aggression rather than to disarmament and peace.

Time after time, Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev have restated their ultimate goals of world conquest. As recently as January of this year, Khrushchev, in a policy speech, reemphasized that if a takeover of the world, nation by nation, could not be accomplished peacefully, then force would be utilized to attempt to gain this objective. Despite an all-out addiction to aggression—military, political, ideological, however—the Reds continue to pay lip service to the cause of disarmament. Why? Because it serves as a smokescreen behind which to carry on their evil acts of aggression. Actually, too, they frustrate every effort to negotiate for realistic reduction of armaments. At the same time, they accuse—and all too often successfully—the United States and the Western allies of roadblocking progress in this field.

In the light of the Reds' sabotaging disarmament at the conference table—and indulging military-economic-political-ideological aggression elsewhere in the world—is there any hope for realistic negotiations?

Personally, I would like to be more optimistic. Unhappily, however, the picture is darkly clouded. Nevertheless, we must keep on trying: (1) to get agreement at the conference table; and (2) to mobilize world opinion on the side of realistic disarmament.

How can this best be accomplished? Perhaps by the following suggestion: The United Nations, I believe, could well establish a Commission on Disarmament comprised solely of neutralist nations. The commission would have the responsibility of hammering out a realistic plan of disarmament. The plan could be presented to the United Nations. Then, a vote of "Yes" or "No" would be required by the major powers. This would put all nations—including the Soviet Union—of the world on the spot—reflecting more clearly whether they were for or against disarmament. Regrettably, the smokescreen of charges and countercharges fired between East and West have made it difficult for nations of the world to clearly discern who is responsible for the obstruction of progress.

The traditional, major points of difference between East and West have focused upon inspection. Experience—both prior to, and following, World War II—should have taught the world, however, that treaties signed by tyrants are so much paper—unless self-enforcible. The Russians—like Hitler—have freely and recklessly torn up a great many treaties and agreements, after these have served their cause.

The establishment of such a neutralist U.N. Commission could not be expected to miraculously resolve the difference between East and West in negotiations. Nevertheless, such a body could, I believe, (1) develop criteria which would be universally recognized as fundamental to reduction of arms in the world; (2) present a clearer picture of who—namely, the Red bloc—has continually been obstructing progress.

Until a realistic system has been developed, we will need to continue (1) to maintain a strong deterrent power against massive attack; (2) develop more effective forces to cope with brushfire wars; (3) design techniques for stopping the infiltrative actions of the Reds in Southeast Asia, Latin America, Africa, and elsewhere in the world; and (4) gird ourselves for a long, difficult struggle—for the battle against the great and growing Red threat to freedom will not be easily won.

H.R. 7036: A Bill To Prohibit Strikes at Defense Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVE MARTIN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would outlaw any strikes, work stoppages, or slowdowns at any defense facility or any plant or enterprise in connection with the national defense or security of the United States.

The recent hearings in the Senate have disclosed the scandalous events which have taken place at our missile installations. Strikes, slowdowns, and work stoppages have greatly curtailed our program—a program which is costing the taxpayers billions of dollars.

The shocking disclosures have made every American citizen sick at heart, and has caused a sense of frustration for our well-being. I think it is high time that legislation be introduced and passed, which would make unlawful these tactics.

The work stoppages have resulted in the loss of over 162,000 man-days of work during the last 5 years at our missile sites. It has resulted in much overtime pay which has resulted in workers on the job receiving more pay than our top scientists. This is a ridiculous situation, as every American well knows. Without these labor abuses, the United States would probably have been first with a man in space. Labor unions are disregarding their responsibilities. There is involved here too much urgency—yes, even our own survival—to allow these irresponsible actions to continue.

The danger from communism is too real and too great to tolerate this condition to exist further. Action to correct these abuses is needed now. We are in a desperate fight to maintain our freedoms against the evil forces of communism. The hour is late; action is needed now.

Congratulations! This Is National Tax Freedom Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it takes the average taxpayer today just short of 4½ months to earn enough to pay his year's local, State, and Federal taxes. So assuming on January 1, 1961, he assigned the entire amount of his regular weekly paychecks to the tax collector until his annual tax debt was paid, today for the first time in 1961 his taxes would be paid up and he would commence receiving his own paychecks to expend for his own family needs.

Today, for the first time, the average American breadwinner is free, as such, and will be until December 31 to earn his and his family's needs for food, shelter, and recreation if there is any left for the latter.

A similar average taxpayer in 1920, in the days when Government was not so big and costly, would have worked to cover his share of taxes from January until February 28. After 2 months of work the average taxpayer 40 years ago could have celebrated Tax Freedom Day.

Twenty years later in 1940 taxes had increased so that March 27 could have been celebrated as national average taxpayers Tax Freedom Day. The anniversary was almost a month later.

If one figures the rate of increase each 20 years and projects it into the future a taxpayer in due course will be working 365 days a year for his Government and all his needs will be provided. But until then, Mr. Average Taxpayer, congratulations are in order—the rest of your paychecks this year you can keep.

Mr. Speaker, during the days of the "old frontier," a citizen if he desired could work a few days on the local roads and his obligation was over.

Today under the New Frontier the people are headed into full-time employment but under the modern affluent society of the near future there will be only one employer and the work will be steady.

The only freedom will not be tax freedom but, unfortunately, will be the free-

dom to work day in and day out, year in and year out—all needs cared for from the cradle to the grave—for Uncle Sam.

Until then, congratulations, Mr. Average Taxpayer. This is your National Tax Freedom Day.

Pennsylvania Is Meeting Its Responsibility in School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my privilege to address a group of students, teachers, parents, educators, and other citizens of one of the communities in my district of Pennsylvania. The occasion was the dedication of a new high school at York Springs, in the Bermudian Springs Joint School System.

Because I, as a former schoolteacher, and school director for many years, feel very strongly on the subject of school and education, I ask consent that my address be made a part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ADDRESS OF HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING AT DEDICATION OF HIGH SCHOOL, BERMUDIAN SPRINGS JOINT SCHOOL SYSTEM, YORK SPRINGS, PA., SUNDAY, MAY 14

I think it significant that you dedicate this building on the day we honor the mothers of America.

The mothers and schools of today will pretty largely determine the shape of the world tomorrow.

One hundred years ago, April 12, 1861, members of the Confederate Army shelled Fort Sumter. Recently I was privileged to visit Charleston, S.C., and this fort which became the first target in a tragic era of civil conflict and hatred—which, unfortunately, did not end with the surrender at Appomattox, on April 9, 1865. Adams County bears mute testimony to this strife since many regard the Battle of Gettysburg as the turning point of the war.

The years 1861 to 1865 were years of crisis. Since that time we have had similar critical times: 1914–18 and the First World War; 1941–45, the Second World War; 1950–53, the Korean conflict. Today we are living through a continuing, highly tense cold war with Russia, Communist China, and Socialist Cuba.

We have achieved a remarkably high level of scientific and technological knowledge—for peaceful as well as warlike purposes. How we use this knowledge will depend pretty largely on you and me. With every scientific advancement, life appears to become more complex and highly mechanized. We use our cars to drive a block. Our children are transported to schools. Electrical appliances tell us when to get up, furnish music in the process, perk the coffee while we shave with an electric razor, tell us when the evening roast is cooked to our specifications, stop the washer when the clothes are clean, show us what others are doing on our TV screen, heat our houses, cool our food and drinks; jet airplanes transport us at 600 miles per hour; and so it goes.

Six days ago I stood within 3 feet of the man whom we know definitely, and without any question of doubt whatsoever, was in outer space and returned safely. A prior claim by another country has never been fully substantiated to the satisfaction of some of us.

The splitting of the atom was the first step in the preparation of the atom bomb—a device which could either destroy all mankind or result in undreamed of technological advances. With each advance tensions rise and it will require all of our intelligence, conscientiousness, and strength to avoid war and with it the possibility of total annihilation.

How will we meet this challenge and what bearing do wars, spacemen, and atomic bombs have on dedicating a new school building? Each can have a tremendous impact—not only on Adams County and the United States but on the entire world. All are involved in these new discoveries and the accompanying threats to our lives and well-being. Those of us who are older are attempting to deal with the world's problems of today, but age ultimately takes its toll and others take our places. This school has been constructed for one purpose—to better prepare those who follow, to meet life's many challenges and obstacles, and I predict these challenges will multiply with each advance in knowledge. This high school and the adult community of the Bermudian Springs school system have the responsibility for training students to better meet these challenges.

This new structure is another expression of our American ideals and traditions. We believe that obtaining an education is the privilege of every American, regardless of race, creed, or color. John Adams, our second President, expressed the views of most of us when he said: "The education here intended is not merely that of the children of the rich and noble, but of every rank and class of people, down to the lowest and poorest. The revenues of the state would be applied infinitely better, more charitably, wisely, usefully, than even in maintaining the poor. This would be the best way of preventing the existence of the poor."

Theodore Roosevelt expressed a similar sentiment: "From the lowest grade of the public school education in this country is at the disposal of every man, every woman, who chooses to work for and obtain it. Each one of us, then, who has an education has obtained something from the community at large for which he or she has not paid. The man who accepts it (education) must be content to accept it merely as a charity unless he returns it to the State in full in the shape of good citizenship."

Public education has expanded from an isolated, poorly supported concept to a nationwide system controlled by each individual State and I might add, parenthetically. I trust the individual State concept will remain.

After spending half a lifetime in some phase of public education, I become intensely weary and my blood pressure rises on many occasions when calamity howlers, for political expediency or for some other personal or selfish reason that cannot be justified, continually condemn our system of education. Their remarks are an insult to every loyal, conscientious administrator, classroom teacher, and school director. I want to be the first to admit our system is not perfect, but what, I ask you, is?

I like a phrase coined in the last political campaign—"A record is not something on which to stand but on which to build." You people in education have compiled a good record but that is not enough. You must and will move forward.

In January I was driving from Washington to my home. It was the day on which an educational task force appointed by the President made its report. The chairman of the committee, Dr. Hovde, president of Purdue University, was being interviewed on radio. He remarked quite casually that a Federal outlay of $2½ billion per year would be required to give American education a significant uplift. What that significant lift should be he did not say. When asked how the committee proposed to raise this money he replied, even more casually, they had not gotten around to that.

Sometime later Governor Lawrence was quoted as having said, and I quote: "We must come face to face with the chaotic, frequently obsolete, educational system which surrounds us." Just when did the Governor become an authority on public education? He also quoted Dr. McMurrin, U.S. Commissioner of Education, as having "called many of our schools flabby and soft." I should like to ask the educators present, What is a soft and flabby school?

This week a publication, Decade of Experiment, came to my desk. It is a report of the Ford Foundation for the Advancement of Education. The following is the first sentence in the publication: "In the middle of the 20th century the American educational system—a distinctive feature of our democratic life and one of which we have been traditionally proud—finds itself in crisis."

On the opposite page is a statement made by Walter Lippmann in 1954: "Our educational effort today is still in approximately the same position as was the military effort of this country before Pearl Harbor."

To what period do these dispensers of gloom refer? A product can only be evaluated after it has been tested. The end product of every school system is its citizens. Ten, fifteen, or twenty years from now an honest value can be placed on your efforts here today and in the days to come. Didn't the school systems of a decade or two ago produce the Alan Shepards and thousands like him? Let's quit being calamity howlers and talk of accomplishments.

This building has been erected to meet the demands of an ever-increasing school population as well as to improve the standards of the education being offered. A phenomenal growth on high school population has recently occurred. In 1905 one-third of those enrolling in grade school entered high school and only about 9 percent of an age group graduated. By 1930 over 75 percent entered with 45 percent graduating. Today those figures are higher.

There are reasons for this change. The non-high-school graduate has a difficult time finding employment. Our expanded courses, such as vocational education, tend to keep students in school longer because they realize in this days of automation some knowledge of mechanization is essential.

The little red schoolhouse was a landmark and served a distinct and useful purpose in a pioneer society in thinly populated areas.

However, with the tremendous growth of urban areas, a complete revamping of our school system seemed desirable. Smaller districts were consolidated and were thus able to offer advantages not possible previously.

Larger units in themselves do not necessarily mean improved education. It does mean an expanded curriculum, easier administration, and better physical facilities. Stone and mortar do not make a school. You now have the physical facilities and it becomes the responsibility of teachers, administrators, students, parents, and that maligned group of men who have a thankless job and whose reward comes only in the knowledge of a job well done—and I mean school directors—to provide the best education possible for the children of this community. In building a better educational system here, you make your contribution to a better America—this, in turn, helps build a better world. The starting point for all of this is the individual citizen and that citizen dare not be a mediocre one if he is

to make his contribution to society. He must be equipped to take his place in an extremely diversified world and become a conscientious, contributing citizen. He must maintain a vital interest in all that occurs around him.

Someone has said, "The success of democracy rests on wise citizen participation in public affairs and on respect for the individual wherever his talents lie."

My experience in Washington sometimes makes me fearful there are those who would take away our individual freedoms and rights and in their place substitute rule from a central point. We do not want all roads leading to Washington. That day can come only if we fail to exercise our God-given rights and remain strong as individuals.

We are still a relatively new country and the opportunities for discoveries and advancement have never been greater. To meet the mounting challenges, we must produce citizens capable of maintaining the strength and integrity their country demands. This can only be accomplished if all take advantage of educational, social and political opportunities offered. This school, and every similar one throughout this great State, is another indication of our vast resources available to interested individuals, and may I remind you all this has been done at the State and local level and I trust will continue to be done in that manner.

Our hope and future strength lies in an educated populace which will form an intelligent, dedicated citizenry.

May I wish you, citizens of this community, parents, teachers, students, members of the school board, good fortune and success in all your endeavors.

The Responsibility of Being a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on May 13, 1961, Congressman CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., of Maryland's Sixth District, addressed the annual convention of the Maryland Federation of Young Republicans in Hagerstown, Md.

I ask unanimous consent that this speech may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF BEING A REPUBLICAN

(Delivered before the Maryland Federation of Young Republicans in Hagerstown, Md., Saturday, May 13, 1961, by Congressman CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR., Republican, of Maryland)

Just one century after the Republican Party saw its first President inaugurated on the steps of the east front of the Capitol, the party is faced with the necessity to assess its maturity. In spite of valid cause for optimism in many areas, the Republican Party in Maryland and throughout the Nation will face one of its most crucial tests in less than 18 months. Our optimism can only be justified and the tests can only be met if we realistically assess the validity of our cause, the soundness of our principles and the maturity of our party. If the results of this self-examination give us the confidence that our dedicated work is an essential ingredient of national existence and progress, we can go forward.

In the first place, let us be honest with history. In many respects, the Republican Party has been a minority party since 1932. We have attained a majority in the House of Representatives at only brief intervals since that date. Without the tremendous personal prestige of General Eisenhower it is questionable whether we would have held the White House at any time since that date.

Although this record is not encouraging, many Republican leaders, newspaper editors and political commentators now predict that we have an opportunity to gain a majority in the U.S. House of Representatives in 1962 and to increase Republican membership in the 50 State legislatures. With proper planning, sound policy, adherence to principle and hard work, these prophecies can become reality. Nowhere is the promise greater for a Republican victory than in the State of Maryland.

The Monday morning quarterback can serve a useful purpose. While it may not serve the needs of the moment to review in detail the presidential election of 1960, it is possible to draw some conclusions that may guide us in the future. These conclusions take into account both our gains and losses on November 8, 1960.

Without trying to alibi the fact that we lost; we lost the White House and we lost the House of Representatives; yet we did make the impressive gain of 22 seats in the House. Before examining some of the reasons for the loss, let us consider the factors which may have influenced the gain. Most of these 22 seats were won from Democrats who had earned the radical tag for extreme records far to the left of center of both political parties. At the same time, seven incumbent Republican Congressmen lost their seats and an analysis of these losses indicates that they suffered from either positions in the extreme right wing or from weaknesses engendered by factional fights within their district Republican organizations.

Comforting as the gain in House membership may be to the Republican Party, it is still necessary to realistically remember that in Congress the Republican Party ran behind Nixon and the Presidential ticket. John F. Kennedy won the White House by only two-tenths of 1 percent of over 68 million recorded votes. This is a plurality of less than a single ballot in each of the Nation's precincts. President Kennedy's plurality was 49.7 percent of the total recorded vote with Richard M. Nixon being credited with 49.5 percent. Cope, the political paper of the AFL–CIO, estimated that in 11 States a popular shift of a fraction of 1 percent would have resulted in a Nixon victory. The New York Herald Tribune has pointed out that excluding Dixie, Democrats outpolled Republicans in contested elections by a total of 26,950,000 to 26,295,000

These figures indicate that the Presidency of the United States hung as evenly in balance as it is historically possible to imagine. This balance, of course, turned upon the personalities of the candidates, the campaign that they conducted and the assets and the liabilities that each brought into the campaign with him. But, if personality can sway a presidential election, we may assume that the collective election of the Congress reflects more accurately the reaction of the electorate to parties and platforms. In this respect, the Republican Party in congressional campaigns throughout the country did not equal the performance of Vice President Nixon. This is the gap that we must recognize and seek to close next year.

The New York Times in an article which appeared on May 7, 1961, analyzed the problem as follows:

"This raises the question of what new factors are in play to affect the long-term trend, and here everything is arguable." (The very short-range factor, how time and change will treat President Kennedy, is not arguable except by the most reckless knights of the crystal ball.)

The most compelling phenomena, as always for politicians, are voting statistics. These suggest—though not to Senator GOLDWATER's satisfaction—that the electorate will take large doses of Republicanism of the liberal, internationalist persuasion, but has less and less taste for the party in traditional old-guard packaging.

In the 1960 elections, for example, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, running on a strongly liberal-Republican voting record, won by a majority of a third-of-a-million votes in New Jersey at the same time Kennedy was carrying the State for the Democrats. The two other Republican senatorial victories won with impressive ease also returned liberals—MARGARET CHASE SMITH in Maine and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER in Democratic Kentucky, by wide majorities.

Conservatives, by contrast, had difficulty everywhere except in New Hampshire and Kansas, and KARL MUNDT of South Dakota, that model of orthodox prairie Republicanism, barely squeaked through with a majority of only 15,000 out of over 300,000 votes cast.

The 1958 Senatorial elections were even more conclusive. Democrats won seats previously held by such stalwarts of conservatism as John W. Bricker of Ohio, George W. Malone of Nevada, Chapman Revercomb of West Virginia, William E. Jenner of Indiana, Charles E. Potter of Michigan, Edward J. Thye of Minnesota, Frederick G. Payne of Maine, and Frank A. Barrett of Wyoming.

Former Senator William F. Knowland, running for Governor of California on a platform endorsing the so-called "right-to-work" law, was humiliatingly defeated. The only new Republican Senators elected this year—KENNETH B. KEATING of New York, WINSTON L. PROUTY of Vermont and HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania—quickly identified themselves with the Senate's liberal Republican minority and have since been voting accordingly.

I do not know whether you will agree with Russell Baker, the author of this quotation, but I think that we have to recognize that he is expressing the opinion of many Americans both within and without the Republican Party.

I would personally take issue with Mr. Baker on one point. I would take issue with him to the extent that he attempts to draw a sharp line of division between elements within the Republican Party. To this concept I must address myself today.

I do not mean to contend that there will not always be variations of opinion within the Republican Party and I hope that the day will never come when this is not so. We shall always have Republicans who, by virtue of background, environment, and experience react differently to national issues. But such healthy variety of viewpoint should not inhibit Republican unity and a solid party front. Such party unity can, however, be only achieved when there is a firm adherence to the basic principles of the party and a willingness on the part of individual Republicans to slough off personal and sectional interests for the sake of advancing our ideas of government and policy. For those of us who feel deeply about public questions it is often a great sacrifice to realize that an abiding principle of the party would restrict the exercise of our own whim in such matters. As one who has felt it necessary to cast an independent vote on occasion in my brief career in the Congress, I feel peculiarly qualified to issue this call first to party responsibility and secondly to the resultant party discipline. I do not believe that my conduct in the past has been inconsistent with this challenge.

I speak of principles; you may well ask me to define what I mean. In other words, what is a Republican?

The answer is simple: individualism is the bedrock of our party. If we are a conservative party, it is that we are dedicated to conserving human freedom and human dignity above all else. As Republicans we recognize that human freedom does not originate in Annapolis or in Washington. Human dignity is not the product of legislation or bureaucracy. Liberty is a common goal of people and we as a party contend that it can only flourish in the soil of freedom, economic and human freedom. Nor can the seat of any government be the source of the wealth of nations. It is created in factories or farms, at desks and in the market places where thrifty, industrious Americans earn. Although some Democracts may choose to forget, it was Thomas Jefferson who said, "That government which governs least, governs best," and it was Woodrow Wilson who said "The history of liberty is a history of limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because a concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

Republicans are unshaken in the wisdom of individuals to determine their own personal and national destinies. We are Republicans because our party is more deeply endowed with a sense of integrity in public affairs. We are Republicans because we seek to speak as Americans not as members of special groups of economic or social interests which may be inconsistent with the larger interests of our Republic. We can become the voice of the Nation expressing the opinions and the aspirations of all the people; truly a collective voice rather than a mere babble of shrill, individual cries for preference.

Adherence to principle can cause hard decisions. I frankly mention the recent vote in the House of Representatives on the enlargement of the Rules Committee as an example of this. There we had a simple choice between an opportunity to embarrass a new administration, but to do so we had to deny the right of a representative assembly to control of its own legislative processes. For me the choice was compelling, but not easy. At no time in the protracted debate on this subject in the press and on the floor of the House did I ever hear anyone deny this simple proposition.

In Maryland we have a similar difficult but compelling choice. We have seen how a ruthless majority has ridden roughshod over the principles of representative government and ignored the demand for equitable congressional representation. The creation of the so-called Eighth Congressional District violates every concept of fair and reasonable congressional districting. I personally went to Annapolis and testified in favor of a complete and equitable redistricting of seats in the House of Representatives. When the general assembly ignored all the calls upon its sense of fairness and historical and constitutional policy on this question, I then announced my support of the petition for referendum on the Congressional Redistricting Act of 1961.

But at this point we have another decision to make. If we support fair representation in the Congress of the United States, it follows that we must support fair representation in the General Assembly of Maryland. This may be less popular among some Republicans but I say to you that the principle is the same and that we as a party will gain dignity, honor, and victory if we recognize the validity of the principle. From my personal experience in campaigning in one of the largest suburban communities of Maryland, I can assure you of the tremendous response that we will receive if we demonstrate that we are ready to act upon this principle.

What I have had to say amounts to a plea to all of you and to all of our fellow Republicans throughout the United States that by our actions and our words we make it clear to all our fellow countrymen that true Republican doctrine is as we know it.

This does not mean that we should compromise our principles and our convictions for the sake of a transitory success. It does not mean that we should become the feeble echoes of the cry of "tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect." It does mean that as the one political party which can genuinely represent a majority of the American people we must offer constructive opposition and reasonable alternatives to the proposals of the other party. It means that we must constantly evidence our concern for human problems and human rights. It means that we must persuade the American people that we do not regard power and responsibility as an end in itself but rather as an evidence of our conviction that human freedom rests on economic freedom.

In the light of recent events in Cuba, in Laos and around the world we must demonstrate that our respect for the individual is the most important political weapon in our struggle with the forces of communism. Our national purpose as stated in the Declaration of Independence is to proclaim "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." As this is the essence of the American spirit, it must be the essence of the Republican policy. As we recognize that there are human needs to be met, we can recognize that there are solutions to be found within the framework of our principles. We must know ourselves to be the party of responsible progress and we must be willing to organize ourselves to fulfill the responsibility of that role.

Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy Pays Tribute to Poland's Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, May 7, by proclamation of Mayor Richard J. Daley, Chicago officially observed the 170th anniversary of Poland's inspiring constitution.

More than 150,000 Chicagoans participated in a colorful parade and a program in Humboldt Park in tribute to this magnificent Polish document, which in 1791 brought to the people of Poland and to the European Continent for the first time the principles of dignity and self-rule, which only 2 years earlier had been incorporated into the Constitution of the United States.

I am sure I speak for all of those who participated in Sunday's inspiring program that we were indeed proud to welcome as the main speaker for this event in Chicago the Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General of the United States.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the inspiring remarks delivered by the Attorney General in tribute to Poland's Constitution of 1791. His remarks reflect to a great extent the sentiments expressed here in Congress by more than 100 of our colleagues last week, when on May 3 we honored the Polish Constitution here in the House of Representatives. I am sure it is a source of great pride to all Americans of Polish descent that the Attorney General of the United States would join in this tribute.

Mr. Speaker, Attorney General Kennedy's remarks, delivered in Chicago on Sunday, follow:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT F. KENNEDY, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY OBSERVANCE, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 7, 1961

I want to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to all of you for inviting me here today because I know I am among people who are dedicated forever to love of country and liberty. It is a great honor to join with you in celebrating the 170th anniversary of Poland's adoption of a constitution which gave meaning and noble expression to liberty and the fundamental rights of man.

The history of Poland goes back many years—many more than that of the United States, but almost since the day the Declaration of Independence was drafted in Philadelphia, the history of Poland and the United States have been entwined. These close ties have existed between the Poles and the Americans because of mutual respect for each other.

Casimir Pulaski was 29 years old when he came to America as a volunteer to serve in the Continental Army. He participated with distinction in the Battle of Brandywine and formed his own cavalry unit which was known as Pulaski's Legion. Pulaski was with the ragged American Army during the cruel winter at Valley Forge and lost his life leading an attack against the British defenses at Savannah, Ga. Though he died fighting for America's freedom, I cannot help but believe that he also was fighting for Poland's freedom.

Thaddeus Kosciusko, another Polish volunteer, was one of the most popular officers in the Continental Army—by all accounts. He was Washington's adjutant, built the fortifications at West Point and later served as a strategist and fighting officer in the recapture of Charleston, S.C.

After the United States had won its independence, Congress awarded him American citizenship, the rank of brigadier general and a large land grant. But Kosciusko returned to Poland and a few years later fought to defend the constitution which we honor today. In 1794, when Polish patriots again sought to win their freedom by fighting, Kosciusko returned from exile to lead them—and again distinguished himself—only to be overwhelmed by vastly superior forces.

Kosciusko still was pleading the cause of Polish independence in 1814—at the Congress of Vienna. He was then 68 years old, but the same democratic spirit which burned brightly in Jefferson and Lafayette—also was unquenchable in him.

And down through the years to the Second World War—Poles and Americans have stood steadfast for the cause of liberty. The Poles, under Lt. Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, had the distinction of capturing Cassino and its historic abby which blocked the Allied advance in Italy for so many months. I visited Monte Cassino several years ago and climbed up the steep, rocky hillside where the Polish soldiers fought their way forward. I will never forget the inscription on the memorial to the Polish soldiers who are buried there:

"We Polish soldiers, for our freedom and yours, have given ourselves to God, our bodies to the soil of Italy and our hearts to Poland."

These very same principles of freedom for which these gallant Polish soldiers died at Cassino should be an inspiration to free people everywhere in the world today.

I might add that on this same trip in 1955, I visited Poland, too, and after traveling through the Soviet Union, it was inspiring to see that the people of Poland still stand and yearn for the principles of freedom and meaningful democracy.

So, the ties between our countries, beginning with Pulaski and Kosciusko, go to the present time and it just wasn't a coincidence that the President, in his state of the Union message, mentioned one country—Poland—because he has the same admiration and affection for the Poles than I do.

We continue to be interested in and have concern for the welfare of the Polish people and we have attempted to maintain our close ties with them. In doing this, we have developed cultural relations and exchanges. We have developed economic programs which are of assistance to the Polish people.

What we need are:

1. More flexibility in giving assistance to Poland and other countries behind the Iron Curtain.

2. Strengthen the economic and cultural ties between Poland and the United States.

3. Increase the exchange of students, teachers, and technicians.

4. Explore with the Polish Government the possibility of using our frozen Polish funds on projects of peace that will demonstrate our abiding friendship for and interest in the people of Poland.

Recently, we have been disturbed by a number of hostile statements made by Polish leaders. However, we believe that the Poles favor, as we do, the continuing development of constructive relations between the two countries and we hope that they will avoid words and actions which would impede such development.

The Polish people will know that the American people and the American Government will continue to seek friendly relations. They also will know that we will work unceasingly to defend freedom and individual rights as heirs of a noble heritage—in the spirit of 1791 as well as in the spirit of 1776.

Israel: A Demonstration of Freedom With Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Saturday, May 13, 1961, to have been a participant in the ceremonies at Clarksburg, W. Va., commemorating the 13th anniversary of the State of Israel. This bar mitzvah anniversary observance, which afforded me a stimulating and enriching experience, was sponsored by Louis Hiller Lodge No. 727 of the B'nai B'rith, the Sisterhood of the Tree of Life Congregation of Clarksburg, and the Clarksburg Chapter of Hadassah.

Mr. S. J. Birshtein, a prominent civic and business leader of Clarksburg, conducted the gathering as master of ceremonies and reported that the subscription of $15,000 in bonds for Israel was the best in recent years.

Rabbi Elihu E. Elefant, spiritual leader of the Tree of Life Synagogue, offered an inspiring invocation, and warm welcoming addresses were delivered by Mr. Hyman Rosen in behalf of the B'nai B'rith and Mr. Donald Berman, chairman of the Clarksburg Israel Bond Committee.

Among the dramatic highlights of the evening was the lighting of 13 candles for each of Israel's years as an independent state, and one for growth. The participants in this ceremony were Mr. Jake Berman, Mr. H. A. Caplan, Mr. Abraham Chapnick, Mr. Leonard Gotlieb, Mr. Ray Kramer, Mr. Jack Marks, Mr. Albert Rosen, Mr. Jack Schwartz, Mrs. Jack Schwartz, Mrs. A. Robert Marks, Mrs. Sarah Markowitz, Mrs. George Rosen, and Mr. Maxwell Samuel.

Mr. Steve Gaynor, prominent vocalist and comedian from Pittsburgh, added the lighter touches to an evening of encouragement and inspiration.

It was my pleasure on this occasion to confer awards on the two winners of a community essay contest on Israel commemorating the bar mitzvah of Israel, Mr. Robert Lees, age 14, and a student at Central Junior High School, who received the junior award, and Miss Barbara Birshtein, age 16, a junior at Washington Irving High School, winner of the senior award.

Dr. Isadore Buff of Charleston, State chairman of bonds for Israel, and Mrs. Buff were among the honored guests at the celebration, as were also Mr. and Mrs. Julian Blackman, community and State civic leaders from Portsmouth, Va., and Mr. W. G. Stathers, a leading Clarksburg attorney.

As speaker of the evening, I was introduced by the Honorable Howard Caplan, a close personal friend and former U.S. attorney for the northern district of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my remarks delivered at the bar mitzvah celebration of the State of Israel in Clarksburg.

There being no objection, the remarks will be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAEL: A DEMONSTRATION OF FREEDOM WITH RESPONSIBILITY

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, commemorating the 13th anniversary of the State of Israel bonds for Israel rally, 8:30 p.m., e.s.t., Clarksburg, W. Va., Saturday, May 13, 1961)

Seldom has the ancient ceremony of the bar mitzvah been more symbolically appropriate than this year in its application to the State of Israel. The Jewish nation, the source of much of the greatest moral and religious philosophy of Western civilization, now observes the "coming of age"—the traditional acceptance of moral responsibility—of the State of Israel.

There has probably been no state, not excepting even our own United States, which has achieved statehood with a higher degree of moral consciousness and national self-awareness than has the State of Israel. And the Christian world is reminded today by the State of Israel—as it has been in times past by the Jewish people themselves—of how far we have often strayed from our own moral commandments. Thus, though it is a grim connection to make, there is an almost poetic justice in the Eichmann trial being held in Israel during the year of its bar mitzvah.

For this trial, which is being conducted with the most scrupulous regard for judicial process, is not animated by the desire for vengeance against the man Eichmann. There can be no mortal punishment or vengeance suitable to the ghastly crimes for which he stands accused. Nor is it a trial merely of the Nazi system and the German people who supported it during its days of power. Western civilization itself is, to some extent, on trial. For the Nazi system prospered in one of the most advanced nations of the Western World, and it had its apologists even in the United States and in England. Thus, each of us who, as an adult during the thirties and forties, did less than his utmost to combat the disease of nazism, shares a portion of the guilt for the crimes for which Eichmann is accused. In this sense, the State of Israel, in the year of its bar mitzvah, probes the moral responsibility of the Western World.

The American poet, Robert Frost, during his recent visit to Israel remarked half facetiously that he "looked upon Israel as an American colony." Though it would not do to overstate the point, as in most of Frost's remarks, there is the pungent taste of truth in this one. I refer not only to our official and early recognition of the State of Israel, nor to that country's substantial financial support from Americans of Jewish faith.

Equally important is the hold which Israel has upon the imagination of millions of Americans of every faith because so much of the Israel experience seems related to our own national experience. Like the United States, Israel has drawn its population from the exiles and refugees of many lands—the "ingathering" of the past 13 years, which has almost trebled the population of Israel, being one of the great and dramatic achievements of this century.

And as the United States, the first great democracy of the modern world, was viewed with dislike and anxiety by the monarchies of Europe, so Israel, the first experiment in democracy in the Middle East, is feared and disliked by the Arab autocracies.

Finally, Israel shares the American "frontier experience" in the form of the Negev desert, which comprises half of the entire country. This region, as forbidding as the most wild and barren regions of the American West, has already begun to yield to the genius of Israeli science and the courage and industry of Israeli pioneers.

Thus, as Americans and as participants in the great enterprise of Western civilization we are committed—within certain limitations—to the support of Israel for moral, political and practical reasons.

First, we have been politically involved in the support of an independent and peaceful development of Israel since our support of the United Nations partition out of which the State of Israel emerged. This was further sealed by President Truman's immediate recognition of Israel on May 14, 1948, only a few hours after the final withdrawal of the British forces.

But American political support of Israel is not solely a matter of our keeping trust with past resolutions to serve the rightful and legitimate interests of Israel. We have strong and compelling practical reasons of our own self-interest in our desire to see Israel prosper and flourish in peace. As a cultural enclave of the West, it offers our best hope for the development of democracy in a section of the earth torn by centuries of oriental despotism, intrigue and tribal rivalries. Israel thus offers the best hope for political stability and orderly progress in the Middle East, and hence, our strongest defense against the infiltration of Soviet power.

Though the Middle East has temporarily yielded the headlines to Cuba, Laos and Vietnam, we know that as long as that region is a battleground of the cold war, Russian interests are served by instability and by pitting Israel and the Arab nations against one another, while we must seek to maintain political stability and develop friendship

with the Arab nations without sacrificing the claims of Israel.

Another eminently practical reason for our support of Israel is the increasing importance of its role of technical assistance and guidance to the lesser developed countries of Asia and Africa. Commenting on the contributions of foreign specialists to the development of such countries as Ghana, Nigeria, Liberia, Ceylon, and the Philippines, one observer recently remarked:

"Perhaps the most sympathetic figure among these rivals experts is the Israeli, sunburnt, stripped for action; he too comes from a poor land which is making itself richer by sweat and ingenuity. Many in Asia and Africa would prefer to go into partnership with Israel, whose problems are more nearly related, and who, therefore, sees solution in more realistic terms."

In addition to such technical assistance, Israel has provided training in Israel for a significant number of students and civil servants from Asia and Africa. The variety of training and education ranges from a special "in residence" study of Israel cooperative villages by 30 Burmese officials and their families to Japanese scientists doing advanced research at the Weizmann Institute of Science and other Asian and African students engaged in postgraduate studies of mathematics, medicine, architecture, and economics.

A third form of cooperation between Israel and the new states has been the establishment of joint economic enterprises in which Israel provides managerial experts and technical training for the local personnel, participates in the work, and contributes a substantial share of the capital. Typical of such ventures are the Black Star Line, an Israel-Ghana shipping company, and the Ghana National Construction Co., in both of which companies ownership is vested 60 percent in the Government of Ghana and 40 percent in Israeli principals.

The contributions of Israel to the development of the new states and to the extention of democratic forms of government is perhaps best expressed in the words of an African official from Senegal upon the completion of his tour in Israel, when he declared:

"Naturally many of us are overawed by the Soviet experiment. It's a very tempting road to rapid modernization for an underdeveloped country. But we couldn't stomach the forced labor that goes with it. We don't think parliamentary democracy as it is practiced in certain Western countries can work in Africa, yet most of us are anxious to retain the basic principles of a democratic society. In Israel we see a whole nation working hard for the same goals under a democratic system of government."

Thus, the people of Israel, by virtue of their contest with a harsh and formerly barren land, and out of their heritage of democratic idealism which has withstood the centuries of privation and suffering, may assume a role of leadership among the underdeveloped countries which the larger and more prosperous Western democracies are denied.

But equally binding as our political and practical commitments to Israel is the debt we owe to Jewish culture and tradition for having first awakened the moral consciousness of Western man. In the history of the Western World perhaps the first truly civilized answer to the question of what each of us owes to his fellow man solely for the sake of man's humanity to man was that given by the writer of Leviticus: "The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Leviticus 19: 34).

The intellectual and spiritual contributions of Judaism were the source of the early nourishment of that which is most precious in Western civilization. The idea of the dignity and integrity of the individual expressed in Job's despairing cry that "I will not sacrifice my integrity"; the ideal of social justice, served in varied ways and by such diverse personalities as Moses and Spinoza, and the belief in the brotherhood of all men as the children of one Creator—these values have shaped the aspirations of Western man and were the source of much of Christianity and Mohammedanism.

Not only did the Jewish people animate Western moral and religious thought by giving the world their own Book in the Old Testament, but it was the Alexandrian Jews who translated the Book of Law, the Pentateuch, into Greek.

It was these Jews and succeeding generations who kept alive the knowledge of classical Greek during the early Middle Ages when the light of learning had been virtually extinguished in Europe. And it was in large part through Jewish philosophers in the service of Moslem courts that classical learning was reborn in Europe, thus laying the foundation for the Renaissance.

This Jewish devotion to the life of the mind—so strong as to have been thought by many Jews and non-Jews as a hereditary trait—has placed the civilized world in lasting debt. Negligible as a political power in the world at large, and representing less than 1 percent of the world population before World War II, the Jewish people have supplied a leadership far out of proportion to their numbers in every field of human arts and sciences.

Of the 257 Nobel Prizes awarded in the first 50 years of this century, 34 were awarded to Jews. Though the intellectual achievements of Jews have been the product of individuals rather than of a group, they have in large part resulted from mobilizing the individual's resources in response to the oppression of the group. This capacity, perhaps more than any other, has been responsible for keeping the Jew alive as a cultural and national identity through 2,000 years of the dispersion.

Nor is there any indication that the well springs of Jewish creativity have been dried by the creation of the State of Israel. To name only one instance: the desalination of sea water on a practical and economic basis—which may well prove to be the greatest scientific boon to mankind in this century—has been further advanced by the scientists of Israel than by those of any other nation.

But whatever the source of Jewish creativity, the modern world would be far poorer but for the artistic and scientific contributions of Jews. Indeed, it is not overstating the case to observe that of the four men who have framed the problems of our century, three were Jews. I refer to Charles Darwin—the only gentile—Karl Marx, Sigmund Freud, and Albert Einstein.

Whatever one may think of the conclusions they reached, the works of these four men opened new ways of thinking and gave an indelible and distinctive stamp to the modern world.

Thus, as legatees of Western civilization and as brothers of the human race we are morally obligated to the cause of a Jewish national homeland. We are thus compelled, not only as an acknowledgment of our debt to Jewish culture, but as insurance against the persecution and oppression which has marked the life of the Jew in Diaspora.

Spinoza, among the most gentle and noble of our great philosophers, once wrote that "A free man thinks of nothing less than of death; and his wisdom is a meditation not of death, but of life." Thus he set forth the text of Israel. For certainly no people has offered its martyrs more bravely or in greater numbers than the Jew. The Christian martyrs of the Roman Empire are numbered in the thousands. The Jews cannot name or number their martyred millions in the world of Christendom, culminating—to the eternal shame of all men—in the ghastly and bestial crematoria of the Nazis.

There has been a further difference between the lot of the Christian martyr and that of the Jew. The Christian died secure in his faith in the reward of immediate afterlife. The Jew received no halo and no promise of reward; and though the idea of an afterlife acquired some popularity after the Dispersion, it has never been the article of faith, the flaming conviction for the Jew that it is for the Christian.

Thus, if Jewish martyrdom had meaning, it was related to the continuity of Judaism and the hope of the ultimate rebirth of a Jewish national homeland. In the moving words of the ancient lament, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning—let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy." For this reason also, the free nations of the West—which call themselves Christian—must help justify the nameless martyred millions of Jews.

The two millennia of the Diaspora are drawn to a close. But the epic struggle of the Jewish nation is not at an end, but a new beginning. The State of Israel, as it observes its Bar Mitzvah, has a man's work to do. In the words of Mrs. Golda Meir, Foreign Minister of Israel, in her eloquent address to the United Nations in 1957, "The deserts of the Middle East are in need of water, not bombers. The tens of millions of its inhabitants are craving for the means to live and not for the implements of death."

Israel has shown the way. There, in a desolate and alien land the broken victims of the Nazi horror and destruction brought only their faith and the invincible spirit of free men and women. The desert has retreated under the steady advance of fields of cotton, corn and wheat; forest and vineyard are covering the once barren and eroded hills; and the new city of Eilat has become a thriving port and Israel's outlet to Africa and the Far East.

Under the inspiration of the example of Israel, and with the support of the free nations of the West, these acts may be duplicated in the other countries of the Middle East, and thus bring that region to a new level of civilization. In this way also Israel will serve the spirit of freedom and responsibility.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 13, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT—TOWARD DICTATORSHIP?

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas, May 13, 1961)

The Constitution, the basis of our limited Federal-State Government, outlines a republic within a democracy to safeguard personal liberty and dignity from Government regulation and control. Checks and balances are stipulated to assure limited government by prevention of the executive, legislative, and judiciary from encroachment on each other through balance of power. Any factor affecting this balance must be resisted. The world has witnessed a series of dictatorships, so it is not surprising that many people are aware of the need for containing the power of the Executive. It is in order, therefore, at any time and particularly now to

evaluate the performance of the executive branch since this administration took office 3½ months ago.

Here are a series of actions by the Executive, by officials within the administration following President Kennedy's demands, or by Congress as controlled by the Democrats and following his demands: (1) The President's first Executive order was to declare food surpluses and give them away as a welfare measure for nutritional reasons. This exceeds the Executive's jurisdiction under the law. (2) The Rules Committee membership was increased to expedite legislation programing and to control the ground rules of debate and the amendment of legislation; (3) military speeches must be censored, must go through the executive (Arleigh Burke); (4) newspapers asked to impose self-censorship; (5) television and radio executives told by FCC Chairman Minow, "There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license. I intend to see that you pay your debt to the public with service." (6) Regulatory agencies, arms of the Congress, not the administration, are the subject of President Kennedy's proposals to reorganize and delegate powers; (7) Congress forced to give up constitutional duty to scrutinize and approve appropriations annually in the depressed areas bill during the House-Senate conference (back-door spending); (8) Congress told to approve $500 million for foreign aid to Latin America, the Executive absolutely refusing to specify countries and projects to receive aid, although Congress was told last year such information would be forthcoming; (9) Peace Corps set up by Executive order not by legislation; (10) House minimum wage replaced by President Kennedy version in House-Senate conference; (11) judgeships, public works, and patronage used to force and keep Congressmen in line to vote as President Kennedy decides on all his many legislative proposals; (12) the agriculture bill proposed by Secretary Freeman would relieve Congress from any future need for action.

When you realize that already the House has given up constitutional control of trade and tariffs, that CIA intelligence information goes to the administration, not Congress, and that the Presidency has already been likened to a benevolent dictatorship through past transfer of power from Congress to the Executive, what does it add up to?

Now let's explore the foreign situation: (1) The Executive is Commander in Chief of our defense forces representing approximately one-half of all Government expenditures; (2) foreign aid is almost entirely under the control of the Executive and nations, friend or foe, may be subsidized at the will of the Executive. In summary, are we indeed becoming a dictatorship? Can we hope to maintain our individual freedom and free institutions, indeed, our very form of society, if we concentrate the balance of power in one branch of government, dominated by one man? On the contrary, are we not then trying to beat dictatorships (communism) by becoming a dictatorship, while preserving the outward form of constitutional government?

The international scene is no more encouraging at this time: (1) Cuba continues unhampered its warlike buildup; (2) Laos seems scheduled to be added to Communist victories; (3) pro-Castro sentiment runs rampant in many Latin American countries; (4) no apparent end is in sight for settling the dangerous issues in the Congo; (5) the Soviet Union continues to stall in negotiations for the control of nuclear weapons.

Optimistically, positively and constructively, I say there is a solution to our present troubles at home and abroad. At home, let us reassert constitutional checks and balances—let us keep Federal Government limited, cut welfare spending, reduce debt and taxes—in short, the reassertion of Jeffersonian Democracy now championed by conservatives. Internationally, let us show to the world once again the majesty and power exemplified by our national symbol, the American eagle. Let us demonstrate to all people, and especially the Communist leaders, that we are not the "paper tiger" the Chinese Reds have been able to convince too many uncommitted peoples that we are. The American people are far ahead of the leadership in demonstrating our willingness to show the world that the American eagle will remain a symbol of hope and strength and courage to all who desire to be free. The leadership must let the world know the will of the American people to support with action the magnificent words of President Kennedy in his inaugural address. There can be no further stalling. We must be done with continuous negotiations which are merely used by the Communists to cloak further aggression. We have the will and the means to show clearly that America is not a "paper tiger" but a mighty eagle, soaring into the heavens with strength and ready to defend freedom by backing up our words in Cuba, in southeastern Asia, and wherever the Communists threaten the freedom and liberty of mankind.

Mother's Day Service, Combined Church Schools, First Lutheran Church of Altoona, Sunday, May 14, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 14, 1961, it was my privilege to deliver the following Mother's Day address to the combined Sunday Schools of the First Lutheran Church of Altoona, Pa., as part of their annual Mother's Day service:

MOTHER'S DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT MOTHER'S DAY SERVICE, FIRST LUTHERAN CHURCH, ALTOONA, PA., MAY 14, 1961

Holy Scripture reminds us that "he that honoreth his mother is as one that layeth up treasure."

The converse of this text for my Mother's Day message is to be found in Proverbs, chapter 14, verse 20: "A foolish man despiseth his mother."

The scriptural lesson here taught agrees with common experience and general opinion.

A man's value can generally be pretty well determined—by his relations with his mother—by the way he looks at her—speaks to her—speaks about her.

The attitude of an honorable and manly man toward his mother is an attitude of love and respect.

An affectionate regard for the wishes of his mother does no harm to a man's dignity and independence, and a protective chivalry helps a man to develop a firm courage.

Mother's Day is an excellent institution if we take it as an occasion to emphasize an attitude that reveals our conduct and speech the year round.

Thus we can observe Mother's Day in an appropriate manner by giving some extra remembrance to one we never forget, and by displaying on Mothers' Day before the world a feeling that we show to our mothers and experience in ourselves, every day of the year.

Mother's Day can be worthwhile, too, if it marks a turning point in our relations with our mothers, by providing a time of good resolutions which are adhered to in a conscientious manner.

It can be worthwhile if we write a letter and continue the correspondence, if we give needed help, resume close association, apologize for past neglect and, above all, resolve to do better in the future.

On the other hand, Mother's Day is a mockery if it is only an occasion of momentary attention after 12 long months of utter disregard for our obligation of love and respect.

Wear a carnation if you wish, but unless it represents an emotional tie, a relationship of affection and honor between you and your mother, it might just as well be a lowly cabbage.

The beauty of the carnation must represent the beauty of the relationship it is intended to symbolize.

To wear it honestly as the token of Mother's Day you must mourn your mother if she is dead, or rejoice in her if she is living. Living or dead, she should be the object of your unfailing love and deepest respect.

Every mother has borne pain and undergone danger for her child. Mothers down through the ages have given years of effort to the physical care and sustenance, the intellectual development, and the moral training of their children. This display of deep maternal love is a free gift, expecting no sort of return or reward.

But though our mothers have freely given, with no thought of recompense, the gift itself demands at least the just recognition of gratitude and of whatever form of expressing that gratitude deemed appropriate to present circumstances.

For those who are grown up and have established their own families and independent way of life there is no one prescribed and proper form of relationship with their mothers.

In some families it has been found an ideal arrangement to have the mother live with them, helping with the household duties, thus being spared the expense of a separate establishment and benefiting by the consciousness of being needed.

In other families, where circumstances or personalities may differ, such an arrangement might be disastrous to family relationships. In such cases harmony and happiness might be best served by the mother's keeping a separate and independent living place, to whose upkeep her children might contribute if necessary. Some find the best answer in a flexible system of traveling and exchanging visits.

The basic necessity is affection at the core of the relationship, with the physical details to be adjusted by mutual agreement, and with regard to financial and other circumstances.

What is essential is the attitude of mutual respect and love that leads to cordial agreement and generous cooperation in establishing harmonious conditions of living.

This attitude is represented neither by the slogan, "Mother knows best," nor by the masterful declaration, "Now, mother, we know what is best for you, and you needn't trouble yourself—we'll arrange it all."

Respect should not be exaggerated into abject submission nor care and solicitude degraded into tyranny.

A mother is, first of all, a person entitled to recognition as an equal and independent personality, with her own opinions and preferences.

Her opinion on your affairs is to be sought with respect, listened to with courtesy and attention, and given its due weight in the formation of your decisions. Her opinion on her own affairs is paramount and deci-

sive, except insofar as she may choose to defer to your opinion or preference.

Courtesy is the outward expression of the warmth of affection that must permeate family relationships. But courtesy does more than express that warmth of affection—it preserves and stimulates it. Mother's Day affords the opportunity for an expression of formal courtesy from all of us toward our mothers.

The writing of letters, the wearing and giving of flowers, the special celebrations of the day such as dinners, parties, entertainments, all these are of value as acts of courtesy, as tangible, audible, visible assurances to our mothers of the warmth of our feelings for them.

This virtue of courtesy has been fittingly celebrated by the English Catholic poet, Belloc, in terms that associate it vividly both with religion and with motherhood:

"Of courtesy, it is much less
Than courage of heart or holiness,
Yet in my walks it seems to me
That the grace of God is in courtesy.

"On monks I did in Storrington fall,
They took me straight into their hall;
I saw three pictures on a wall,
And courtesy was in them all.

"The first the annunciation;
The second the visitation;
The third the consolation
Of God that was our Lady's Son.

"The first was of St. Gabriel;
On wings a-flame from Heaven he fell;
And as he went upon one knee
He shown with heavenly courtesy.

"Our Lady out of Nazareth rode—
It was her month of heavy load;
Yet was her face both great and kind,
For courtesy was in her mind.

"The third it was our little Lord,
Whom all the kings in arms adored;
He was so small you could not see
His large intent of courtesy.

"Our Lord, that was our Lady's Son,
Go bless you, people, one by one;
My rhyme is written, my work is done."

Courtesy is a form of politeness, but it is a stronger word than politeness, carrying with it the implication of real feeling, of gentleness and courage and kindness.

Courtesy goes with the "something more" of politeness, with the dramatic demonstration of affectionate respect.

Politeness, therefore, is suitable to our everyday relations with our mothers and courtesy is suitable to this special day.

Not a nod of greeting but a low bow, not a hasty kiss but a hearty embrace, not a friendly word but a gift, a flower, a speech of tribute.

This is a day for the plentiful and courteous bestowal of gifts and praises—upon our mothers. Let us be grateful and gracious in our observance of the occasion.

We ourselves know, and we can be assured our mothers know, how we feel about them. If our feelings are not such as are appropriate to the day let us labor to amend them.

If our feelings are, however, in tune with the spirit of the day, let us not shrink from giving full and enthusiastic expression to them in the confidence that a bold expression of devotion to the ideal of motherhood, and to one particular mother, will be beneficial not only to our personal relationships but to the community in general, and particularly to our young people.

Standing in this holy place, I am made strongly aware of the most fitting celebration of this occasion—the spiritual. The best and greatest gift we can give to our mothers is to pray, sincerely and fervently, both for their welfare and for our own fulfillment of their hopes for us.

Nearest to the heart of any mother is the hope that her son or her daughter will be a good man or woman. An endeavor to fulfill this hope in the development of our own characters should, therefore, be our resolve on this day for the coming year.

May God guide our consciences in the formation of this resolution and strengthen our wills in its performance.

The value of this day, in strengthening and renewing our relationship with our mothers, is great and lasting. From the natural human virtue of love between mother and child we rise easily and naturally to the love of God.

The value of such natural human emotions and virtues is eloquently celebrated in a familiar poem by Father Abram J. Ryan, which might well be taken as the keynote of our Mother's Day observance:

"Better than grandeur, better than gold,
Than rank and titles a thousandfold,
Is a healthy body and a mind at ease,
And simple pleasures that always please.

"A heart than can feel for another's woe,
And share his joys with a genial glow;
With sympathies large enough to enfold
All men as brothers, is better than gold.

"Better than gold is a conscience clear,
Though toiling for bread in an humble sphere.
Doubly blessed with content and health,
Untried by the lusts and cares of wealth,
Lowly living and lofty thought
Adorn and ennoble a poor man's cot;
For mind and morals in nature's plan
Are the genuine tests of an earnest man.

"Better than gold is a peaceful home
Where all the fireside characters come,
The shrine of love, the heaven of life,
Hallowed by mother, or sister, or wife.
However humble the home may be,
Or tried with sorrow by Heaven's decree,
The blessings that never were bought or sold,
And center there, are better than gold."

Progress at This Session of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Congress has now passed the midway mark in this session. In a weekend address over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to review some of the progress, as well as some of the jobs left to be done.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM RADIO ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

Today, we live in a pushbutton age. In Congress, however, the right buttons have not been pushed to create the kind of fast-paced progress anticipated in this era of the New Frontier.

Now, it is true that the problems are complex. And the instruments of accomplishment are sometimes unwieldy.

As of now, the major legislation—and some of it very controversial—passed, included:

Increase in minimum wage and extension of coverage to workers;

Area development program for communities suffering from economic depression;

Extension of unemployment compensation benefits;

Approval of additional Federal judgeships.

However, midway in the session, this is not a startling record.

What are some of the major fields in which action is still needed? These include:

Speeding up the space program;

Strengthening our defenses; this involves also reexamination and improvement of our global effort to combat communism, not only in the military, but also on the nonmilitary fronts;

Reexamination of the farm problem to try to find realistic solutions to production-consumption imbalance;

Needed improvement and expansion of our educational system;

Carrying forward the highway construction program, if possible, on a pay-as-you-go basis;

Equitable revision of our tax system to better serve, not stunt, economic growth and progress;

Liberalization of social security, including realistic efforts to meet the health needs of our aging folks.

These measures and a long list of others still await final consideration in Congress.

LEGISLATION OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO WISCONSIN

In addition, there are a number of pieces of legislation of special interest to Wisconsin. These include:

(1) Appropriations for improvement and expansion of our port and harbor facilities and flood control.

(2) Congress has failed, in my judgment, to provide realistic legislation to enable the Menominee Indian Tribe—now terminated from Federal control and constituting our 72d county in Wisconsin—to meet the great economic, health, sanitation, educational, and other problems confronting them. Early this session, I cosponsored legislation for extension of Federal control until a proper foundation could be laid for tribal control over their affairs. Unfortunately, the Congress too long delayed consideration of such legislation.

Now it appears that the best that may be achieved is legislation to (1) extend assistance in the field of education, health, and sanitation until the tribe itself can handle these matters; (2) provide loans to help meet the tremendous financial obligations; and (3) authorize Uncle Sam to keep a watchful eye on the financial affairs of the tribe to attempt to assume its economic stability.

Unless these minimum actions are taken, however, the tribute will find itself hard put to meet its obligations and fulfill the needs of the Menominee Indians in years ahead.

(3) Next, we find that there has been a failure to act expeditiously on my bill S. 1515 to provide $10 million supplemental funds for the school lunch program for the current fiscal year.

Unfortunately, the Department of Agriculture has too long delayed a report on the bill—holding up action in Congress. As a result, the program is now suffering serious curtailment. In the light of these facts, I contacted, not only the Appropriations Committee, but the Secretary of Agriculture to "prod" them for action.

(4) The appropriation of funds for expansion of research facilities at our Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, also, is of major interest to Wisconsin.

Regrettably, the House of Representatives cut out $300,000 for much-needed expansion of the research facilities. In the Senate, however, I urged reinstatement of these funds. In my judgment, this is essential, not only for our forest interests, but for the economy of Wisconsin and the Nation.

INVEST IN AMERICA

Now turning to another topic: A great many of you will recall that during the past week there have been nationwide observances held to encourage more folks to invest in America. This is indeed a sound, most worthy project. Today, there are more than 13 million shareholders in publicly owned corporations. In my judgment, however, this number can and should be greatly expanded to include more people. Why? Because by sound, confident investment in our job-creating free enterprise system we can—

More quickly lick such problems as unemployment and business and industrial slowdowns;

Successfully meet the Communist challenge to our free enterprise systems; and

More effectively fulfill the ever-growing needs of a fast-expanding population.

Investing in America, however, means more than just investing our money for a profit. Rather it means also dedicating the time, thought, energy, and resources to building a stronger, better America to meet the growing challenges of the future.

NEEDED: GREATER PUBLIC EDUCATION ON FREE ENTERPRISE

The economy, in my judgment, could be greatly strengthened by instilling in our people, particularly youth, a greater understanding of the working principles of our free enterprise system.

Today, unfortunately, there is an abysmal lack of such knowledge.

To a large degree, too large, I believe, people still believe—in a vague, distorted way—what, in effect, the Communists are saying about us, that is—

That big business attempts to bleed the public for profits;

That labor represents a class struggle against the capitalists; and

That our society is essentially one of conflicts, rather than of cooperation in efforts to fulfill our needs, individually and nationally.

Now, it's true that, in the past, there have been conflicts, and abuses of power.

Today, however, the enlightened interests are becoming more and more aware that the broad, long-range interests of management, labor, consumer, and the Nation can be best served, and are being best served, by cooperation, rather than by antagonism and conflicts of interests.

Management, traditionally interested, to a large degree, in profits, more and more looks after the human needs of their workers; for a happy, well-paid employee is a more productive worker; and also a market for more products of the economy.

Labor also has a vested interest in the success of the business upon which jobs are dependent.

The public, as consumers, as well as investors (exemplified by the 13 million shareholders of publicly owned corporations) has a real interest in the success of job-creating, commodity-producing enterprises, as well as the welfare of the American worker.

The American people, however, in school and by adult education, need to be better informed of ways in which we, as individuals, can contribute to further strengthening our free enterprise system.

Only if this is done, can we successfully meet the ever-growing needs of a fast-expanding population, as well as the challenge of the Communists.

NEEDED: SPEED UP U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

During this past week, also, we witnessed one of the great "breakthroughs" in our space program: that is, the successful suborbital flight of Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard into space. This was a historically significant step forward in freemen's efforts to explore the universe.

The American people, I believe, can be justly proud.

Now, however, we look forward to success, with, we pray, a minimum of setbacks, in our next step of launching a manned spacecraft into orbit around the earth.

In the world stadium, nations are carefully watching the contest between the major protagonists of freedom and communism in space exploration, the United States and the Soviet Union. Although we didn't plan it that way, this is, indeed, a real space race.

According to experts, the cumulative scientific-technological value of our accomplishments far exceeds that of the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore nor underestimate the psychological impact which Russian "firsts" in space have had upon the minds of the world.

Regrettably, the U.S. timetable has run only a short distance behind Communist launchings. After the first sputnik, for example, we shortly orbited not one, but many, satellites—now outnumbering the Soviets by about 40 to 15.

Recently, the Soviets reportedly orbited the first man in space. Now, we have successfully conducted a suborbital flight.

With such a relatively short lag in timing, it would appear that by only a slight speed-up of our program we could demonstrate to the world that we can accomplish space feats not only equal to and greater, but also faster, than the Soviet Union.

"The question is not: Will we do these things? Rather, the issue is: When will we do them?

"Will we do them before, or after, the Soviets? In my judgment, we should do it before.

"We recognize, of course, that space feats are basically scientific-technological-military accomplishments rather than weapons of propaganda warfare.

"Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the tremendous psychological impact which Soviet triumphs have had upon the world.

"The task now is to, first, predetermine the next major accomplishments in space; and second, as possible, set up the timetable so that the United States can get the maximum benefit not only from the accomplishments themselves, but also from the great psychological impact of firsts in the space race," Senator WILEY concluded.

Who Killed Atomic-Powered Plane?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which I wrote for the May issue of the national magazine, Aircraft and Missiles:

WHO KILLED ANP?—PSEUDOSCIENTIFIC ADVICE GIVEN TO PRESIDENT ON NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT; DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ESTABLISHED DESIGN CRITERIA THEN SHOT HOLES IN PROJECT; CONTINUOUS AIRBORNE ALERT NATURAL APPLICATION FOR ANP

(By Congressman MELVIN PRICE, Democrat of Illinois)

It is extremely unfortunate that the Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion (ANP) project has been canceled. Nuclear propelled aircraft are important to the Nation's future; I therefore believe we will someday develop such aircraft despite this latest Executive decision. The decision just injects an indefinite delay that will cost us a great deal in money, and prestige.

DECISION INPUTS

I admire the President for his ability to make forthright decisions, although I question his decision relative to the nuclear aircraft programs. The previous administration, while pretending to support the ANP program, held back any real progress by their indecision. The Kennedy decision was in error because of incorrect advice provided by his scientific and defense advisers. The same people who have been assembling the information for decisions on ANP provided the input again. Based on my long acquaintance with their behind-the-scenes operations, it is no great surprise to me that again we have an adverse decision. This situation was brought forcefully to the forefront during the Joint Committee's executive hearings on the ANP program early in March. At our hearings we asked the Defense Department and the Atomic Energy Commission to tell us about the technical data and other considerations which supported new criteria which was formulated for the ANP project. We also asked whether, in the development of the latest criteria, the officials in the Joint AEC–Air Force Office responsible for the technical direction of the project, and the contractors responsible for developing the nuclear designs had been consulted.

Unfortunately, we couldn't get adequate answers to our questions. We did find out, though, that certain criteria recently set down by the Defense Department was in direct conflict with the testimony of experts responsible for the technical program. We also found out that the Defense Department did not even consult the experts responsible for the direction of the program and for the development of the designs. It was quite apparent from the hearing that the members of the new administration in the Defense Department relied solely on the advice and recommendations of the same people in the Defense Department who have been against the project for years.

PSEUDO-SCIENTIFIC ADVISERS

What little testimony we could get from these people again confirmed the fact that they were not familiar with the technical developments in the program and had not even attempted to obtain first-hand information concerning the facts of our aircraft nuclear propulsion program. It was most discouraging to again come up against Government career personnel whose actions for years have been—and are—the shuffling and assembly of the same papers and representing the information they contain as the latest facts for the use of those responsible for the decisions. So this time, too, although the decision makers were different, they had the same old input of "facts" upon which to reach a decision.

The situation which resulted in the scuttling of the ANP program must be guarded against in the future. Serious errors could also be made in our other vital atomic energy programs unless we learn from what happened in the ANP program. We must take the time to get up-to-date facts. We must look behind the fancy "position" papers we are presented with and do whatever is necessary to get at the pertinent facts to guide our decisions.

STATUS OF ANP

I think one of the most unfortunate aspects of last month's decision to stop the ANP project is related to the status of the work at the time. A great deal of important progress was made in the last year. Major experiments were conducted to add a great deal of confidence to the designs. In fact, manufacture of a full-power nuclear aircraft propulsion plant unit for ground testing was ready to start. Many thousands of hours of tests were conducted under reactor operating conditions to prove out the mate-

rials and designs. Tests were conducted to the point of breakdown of the materials to obtain complete assurance on the adequacy of design margins. All of the information obtained confirmed the adequacy of the designs and in fact showed that significant growth margins were already in hand in the design. The status of the development, particularly for the direct cycle system which had a considerably greater amount of effort on it, clearly indicated that the next step should be a full-size integrated propulsion plant test. Going back to the laboratory bench, as called for by the new high temperature materials program being started to fill in for ANP, just doesn't contribute anything of significance toward getting on with nuclear flight.

GROWTH POTENTIAL CLICHE

As you know, the ANP program was given a set of design objectives known as the "York criteria" for guidance in developing the first engines. This Defense Department criteria specified a subsonic aircraft since a possible mission was foreseen for such an aircraft and technical data clearly indicated the feasibility of meeting the criteria with the first generation of engines developed. In accordance with this "York criteria," work was going ahead to meet requirements. At the same time, though, within the Defense Department, a talking campaign was being conducted to give the impression that what was really wanted, and what was absolutely necessary to obtain a military useful aircraft, is multimach flight characteristics.

Fortunately, the nuclear aircraft developers had the foresight to look into the multimach growth potential of the individual cycles although their instructions were clear that the goal was, at the time, subsonic operation. The technical data that was developed, which the Joint Committee closely reviewed during the March hearing, indicated multimach potential was clearly present in the concepts under development. Unfortunately the picture on growth potential was not clearly presented, or it may not have been presented at all, to the new administration.

INCONSISTENCIES APPARENT

Consistent with my belief that the facts were not made available to the decision makers are the apparent inconsistencies that now exist between the decision to drop the nuclear aircraft and the characteristics specified for our defense weapons. Take, for example, the Skybolt missile system recently earmarked for additional effort. It is planned to use conventional aircraft with their very limited range to provide a mobile launching platform for the intermediate range Skybolt missiles. A nuclear aircraft with, for practical purposes, unlimited range and endurance characteristics would increase the effectiveness of the Skybolt missile system tremendously.

The recently announced plan to keep one-eighth of our heavy bomber force on airborne alert points up another inconsistency relative to the decision to stop the nuclear aircraft. The unlimited endurance of nuclear energy sources gives a nuclear propelled aircraft enormous advantages in meeting such alert objectives. For the same airborne alert force a nuclear aircraft provides the potential for greatly reduced aircraft, personnel, and support facility requirements.

Obviously the unlimited range which comes from nuclear aircraft endurance characteristics will open up completely new mission capabilities which cannot at present be foreseen. An idea of the military effectiveness which of such a revolutionary system can be obtained from our experience with nuclear submarines. Wouldn't it have been unfortunate if the unimaginative arguments advanced relative to the nuclear submarine turned out to be the controlling ones in that decision as they were in the nuclear aircraft decision?

I have pointed out many times that we could have had nuclear aircraft in flight today if it had not been for the "on again, off again" system of mismanagement by the Defense Department and its scientific advisers.

I can see the same approach creeping into the management of other defense projects and the Rover nuclear rocket program.

Our Religious Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given at the annual meeting of the Religious Heritage of America, Inc., during the annual Washington pilgrimage which it sponsors:

OUR RELIGIOUS HERITAGE AND THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY

(Keynote address by the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota)

Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege to participate in the conferring of the Religious Heritage Awards to these distinguished men and women whose service to God and man has been so outstanding as to merit this recognition and tribute.

Your Washington pilgrimage comes this year at a time characterized by perhaps as great a confusion of emotions as at any period in American history. On one hand there is profound gratitude for the goodness of life that is possible for us in this land. On the other hand there is great uneasiness, uncertainty, perplexity, even anxiety and despair. Less than 15 years after winning a war with total, unconditional surrender of all our enemies, we are soberly asking, What can we do to survive?

We are profoundly grateful that no such thing has happened here as we saw happening in Hungary 3 years ago, in Tibet last year, and in Japan this week. But we are dismayed that such things can be happening to anybody anywhere on this globe in the middle of the supposedly enlightened 20th century.

Can Korea go on indefinitely half slave, half free? Or Germany? Or the whole wide world? Down deep inside, we know the answer is "No."

I

Much of the reason for our confusion is that we have not understood the nature of the conflict in which we are engaged.

We have seen that it is a conflict of arms; who will win the missile race? Whichever side wins could compel the other to surrender or perish. Because of our religious heritage, we would not use superior power for that purpose. Because of their Communist heritage, the other side would so use it—Mr. Khrushchev reavowed that last month.

We have seen that it is a conflict of economic systems. Which will crack up first under the strain?

We have seen that it is a conflict of educational systems. Which will produce not only the smartest but the toughest minds?

We're beginning to see that it is a conflict, not so much of wealth and weapons as of wills. Which side will work the harder?

But many have not seen that the basic conflict is far deeper and more fundamental. It is a conflict between two totally different philosophies of life and, therefore, of government.

It is a conflict between wholly different sets of values.

It is a conflict between two wholly different concepts as to the nature of man; which means two different concepts as to the nature of the universe; which means two different concepts as to the nature of God—or whether there is a God.

We have not fully understood that most of all it is a conflict of faiths.

On one hand are those who openly proclaim that there is no God, that there is no moral order in the universe, and that man is merely an animal with a larger brain than others—the smartest of the animals, but nothing more. The conduct of the Communists which we denounce flows naturally and inevitably from that philosophy and faith.

During the 8 months in 1930 which I spent in an area under the control of the Chinese Communists in south China, and during visits behind the Iron Curtain in Europe in 1947, I learned—as did you who have had similar experiences—that Communists have no more scruples about wiping out a hundred, or a thousand, or a million human beings who stand in their way than you and I have about spraying DDT on some mosquitoes that are troubling us. And why should they hesitate or have scruples, if man is just an animal? If there is no God, then to whom can we expect men to consider themselves accountable?

On the other hand, our country and our free society were founded on the belief that there is a God; that there is a moral order in the universe; that there are moral laws which men and nations can no more violate with impunity than they can the laws of gravity or electricity; and that, while man is indeed the smartest of the animals, he is also something more—he is a child of God, and therefore, a part of God. Because he is a part of God, he is capable of becoming more and more like God, if willing to respond to God's loving quest for him, as your child is capable of becoming more and more like you, of whom he is a part, if he is willing to do so.

It is this, the divine in man, which we believe is different in character and kind from anything the animals have. It is this which is the unique and precious thing about man. It is this which we, at our best, have always believed it is the first business of a good government and a good society to protect and nourish and develop. It is this religious faith which is responsible for the unique values our civilization has developed. It is because our heritage is a religious heritage that the individual human being is considered by us at our best as sacred and of infinite worth.

Many in our country have assumed that the conflict between the Communists and free peoples is like that between the two major political parties in America. Both want the same good ends, but differ as to the best means to gain those ends—and keep them. But the world conflict is not over different means to the same good ends, different ways to attain the same good objectives; it is a conflict over objectives. Ours is peace; theirs is conquest. We want to end this world conflict; they intend to win it.

A truce to them, or a conference at the summit, is not, as we assume, a move toward real peace, which means a resolution of difficulties; rather, it is a politico-military tactic designed to win another victory. If they offer a truce in Korea, when their military operations there are no longer paying them dividends, it is not because they desire to end the struggle; it is only to shift to some other place like Indochina where they believe they can carry on the war more successfully.

"Peaceful coexistence" means that as long as we are stronger than they, we should be nice enough to allow them to coexist peacefully until they can become enough stronger than we so they can then compel peaceful submission by us.

And when they break up a conference at the summit as soon as they know they cannot divide the free world and score there another triumph, it is only to shift to some other place like Japan or some other tactic than smiles or threats, some tactic like subversion, which offers better prospect of success in advancing toward the never-changing goal of world domination.

The reason why it has not proved possible to get any real agreement with the Communist world, whether at Yalta or the United Nations, at Panmunjom or Geneva or Paris, is because the Communists are not pursuing the same goals as we at our best are pursuing.

And why are they not pursuing the same goals as we? Because they do not believe the same things as we believe—about man, and about the universe, that is, about God.

One reason for our difficulties is that we have been exposed so long and continuously to the Judeao-Christian body of ethics that we take its moral standards for granted. We assume that they are normal human standards. We tend to equate Christian with human. And since the men in Moscow and Peiping are human beings, we assume they will react as Christians do. When they do not so react, we are surprised, angry, and call them inhuman. But their ruthless behavior is not because they are inhuman; it is because they are merely human. We have almost forgotten that human beings, unexposed to moral teachings based on belief in a moral universe under a moral God, or with their spiritual natures unsensitized by a morally and spiritually regenerating religion, are predatory, like other animals. If this is not so, why should any men—including you and me—need a Saviour?

We cannot rightly condemn atheistic Communists for betraying Christian values which they have never professed, and which, in fact, they denounce.

It is absurd to expect them to live as if this were a moral universe when they insist there is no such thing as a moral order in the universe, that there are no such things as right and wrong, good and evil, truth and falsehood.

It is absurd to expect them to believe that man has the capacity to make moral judgments, when their creed tells them that man is not a moral being, he is an economic animal.

In short, it is absurd to expect them to build up a heritage of freedom and to recognise and guard the unalienable rights with which we believe man is endowed by his Creator, if they do not believe there is a Creator.

II

All this means that we have not understood the world conflict because we have not understood the adversary. And a main reason why we have not understood the adversary is because we have not really understood ourselves and our own culture and heritage. We have almost forgotten that our heritage in this land is a religious heritage, predominantly a Christian heritage.

So, our first task is to reexamine our heritage, rediscover the essential elements and forces in it, rededicate ourselves to that heritage, fulfill it in our own land and time and generation, and share it with the world.

How did it begin? Our Pilgrim Fathers came to this land because they were determined to have religious liberty. They had discovered that it was not possible to have religious liberty without political liberty; and that political liberty could not be maintained without economic liberty, that is, opportunity for the individual to improve his lot, in accordance with his ability and his effort.

They had no precedent, no blueprint, but they had clear minds. They devised, for the first time on a major scale in all of human history, a system whereby people control government instead of government controlling people. It worked. It released the creative capacities previously unrecognized in all sorts of persons from all sorts of races, climes, and countries. It led to an unprecedented outburst of creative energy, imagination, effort, production, and progress.

As long as our people adhered to it they progressed, and prospered. Then, little by little, many came to forget the heritage in their preoccupation with the goodness of living which had become possible. They came to trust results more than causes; material fruits more than spiritual roots. They paid less and less attention to the textbook from which the heritage had come. They paid less attention to the counsel of the prophets of their heritage, ancient and modern. They paid less and less attention to its moral principles. Many began to believe that it is possible to get good by doing evil, to get justice by bowing down before injustice, to get right by might, to get trust by being untrustworthy, to get peace by sacrificing our principles and other peoples' rights and territory.

Many came to think it is possible to get a brotherhood of man without first of all believing in the fatherhood of God.

Thus has our society come to its present confusion, division, uncertainty, despair.

III

All this tells us what we have to do. We have to return to our religious heritage—not in order to go back, but in order to go forward.

First, we must recapture our faith: faith that God is, that He and His power are available to men, that with God it is possible for man to build His kingdom on earth.

What we need in America today is to recapture a faith in our heritage and our faith comparable to the faith the Communists have in theirs.

For our free society to survive, we must qualify in our generation as a worthy spiritual instrument, as the founders of our heritage did so qualify in their time and generation.

Second, we must rediscover the principles of our Christian heritage. They are recorded in a textbook, a sort of laboratory manual, which faithfully records the experience of those who have followed and those who have rejected the principles. It makes clear that it is not possible to get good by doing evil, but that it is possible to get good by doing good. The latter is just as dependable as the former. It teaches that we cannot get peace by direct pursuit of it. Men have been trying that for 50 centuries and there still is no peace. Rather, peace is a byproduct that follows, if we seek first His kingdom and His righteousness, His right relations in the world. There will be "peace on earth" only when there is "glory to God in the highest."

Third, we must rededicate ourselves to the principles, and put them into practice—in our work; in our homes; in our social and civil organizations; in our churches.

With all my heart, I believe that the religious heritage which our forefathers developed here, a heritage leading to voluntary federation under law, represents the best set of ideas and values ever put together in one place in the world's history. I think they are the hope of mankind. The achieving of a world of freedom and peace depends upon our understanding their true nature, making them work better here at home, and helping spread them throughout the world—with all our hearts and souls as well as our minds.

This world conflict is not an old-fashioned struggle for the control of land; it is for control of man—the mind of man, the soul of man, the whole of man.

Fourth, if we are to have the inner strength to fulfill our religious heritage here and to share it abroad, we must ally ourselves with the truly great leaders, the founders of our faiths. This means for us who are Christians that we must rediscover Christ our Master, must recommit ourselves to His Lordship and His direction, receiving from God the power to be and to do that He promised to His disciples.

IV

If these things in our heritage are not true, if God is not, then of all men we are the most foolish. Our whole effort in this land is futile, in fact makes no sense.

But if God is, then what ought to be can be. There are dark valleys to go through, but there is no reason for dismay or despair.

God regularly operates through men and women—men and women who allow themselves to be captured by Him, give themselves to preserving and strengthening the heritage others have developed thus far, and work and walk forward with God unafraid.

Never did we in America face such a fundamental challenge to the ultimate values of life. Never did we have to think so deeply or work so hard as we shall have to in the years just ahead if we are to live in dignity and usefulness—or even to live at all.

Our generation cannot escape the call to great dedication and heroic effort if we are to "secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity" which came out of our religious heritage. It is not necessary to remind you of this pilgrimage that on these blessings depend all others.

"Because of the Health Condition Described at the Time of Application, We Cannot Accept Your Wife as a Member"—A Sidelight of Hospitalization Insurance for the Retired

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 15, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, few issues scheduled to come before the Congress are as controversial as the proposal for hospitalization and nursing home cost insurance for persons retired under social security. We are told repeatedly that such a proposal has little if any merit, and should not be considered seriously. However, I have a letter in my possession which raises an interesting sidelight on this issue, and I would like to share it with the Members of the House of Representatives as a factor to be considered.

First of all, I should say that our Blue Cross-Blue Shield program in St. Louis was among the first such plans in the country to make it possible for retired persons over 65 to obtain coverage on an individual basis. It is my understanding that in many areas of the country, the worker who goes on retirement under social security can no longer obtain insurance coverage from Blue Cross-Blue Shield, whether he can afford it or not. So our situation in St. Louis is therefore much better than the arrangements pos-

sible for elderly people in many other parts of the country.

WIFE'S APPLICATION FOR HOSPITALIZATION INSURANCE REJECTED

Nevertheless, in the instance just called to my attention, while the retired worker was able to apply for and receive coverage for himself under Blue Cross-Blue Shield following his retirement and following the cancellation of his coverage under the group plan in effect where he had been employed, he and his wife now discover that the wife's application for nongroup coverage can not be approved "because of the health condition described at the time of application."

The wife writes me:

Am enclosing a letter from the Blue Cross, which tells me they cannot give me hospital insurance. My husband retired recently, and up until then we had a policy from where he was employed, but canceled at the time of retirement.

We are living on our social security and veterans bonus, and if I would become ill and had a large hospital and doctor bill we would have to mortgage our home. I know there are thousands of people in the same position we are in, and would appreciate your voting for passage of the medical bill when it comes to a vote. I would be happy to have my social security reduced by a few dollars and have it applied toward the insurance. Now this might be a suggestion when it comes up for discussion. I would thank you very much if you would give this a thought.

The letter from Blue Cross Service which the wife forwarded to me notified the husband of acceptance of his application for both Blue Cross and Blue Shield nongroup enrollment but added:

Because of the health condition described at the time of application, we cannot accept your wife * * * as a member. This notation has been made on your application.

WHAT IS THE SOLUTION FOR FAMILIES IN THIS SITUATION?

Mr. Speaker, one of the strongest arguments made against the proposed social security program of hospitalization insurance coverage is that retired individuals and couples—who are not medically indigent and thus not eligible for coverage under the Kerr-Mills Act of last year—can purchase adequate insurance by themselves and thus do not need such insurance under social security.

But what about cases of this kind? During his working lifetime, the husband could purchase both hospital and surgical coverage for himself and his wife under the group policy at his place of employment. Suddenly, however, he finds upon retirement that his wife is not eligible for either coverage under the nongroup enrollment open to such individuals following retirement.

Presumably, if the wife has a health condition which makes it uneconomic for the Blue Cross-Blue Shield program to accept her, her chances of requiring hospitalization would be such that the need for prepayment hospitalization insurance becomes even more urgent.

I would urge that those who have insisted there is no need for the coverage under social security proposed for retired persons by President Kennedy come forward now and advise how this kind of case should be handled. I am certainly anxious to learn how the couple involved in this particular case can solve what to them is a most important and worrisome retirement problem. Everyone interested in this issue would have to concede it is a problem which demands solution.

Federal Support of Medical Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 15, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address on Federal support of medical education, which I delivered at the John Archer Society dinner, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pa., on April 26, 1961:

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF MEDICAL EDUCATION

(Address of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, U.S. Representative, Second Congressional District of Rhode Island, at John Archer Society dinner, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Wednesday, Apr. 26, 1961, at 6 p.m.)

Of the many responsibilities shared by all Members of the Congress of the United States, none is more important than the one I shall attempt to fulfill today.

I refer to the duty to render public reports on matters of national significance. There are several ways to do this. One of the best is direct, face-to-face discussions.

Because of the particular congressional role I have held for many years, I believe I have a special obligation to conduct such discussions before groups of physicians.

When that group is within so distinguished an institution as the University of Pennsylvania Medical School, that obligation becomes, instead, a privilege.

In Philadelphia, a Member of Congress cannot help but feel the presence of those early patriots who established the political foundations of the Republic. I am sure that physicians visiting this old city must, in similar fashion, feel the presence of John Morgan and William Shippen, who pioneered our great national structure of medical schools. Close behind these two we—both the legislator and the physician of today—can discern the heroic figure of Benjamin Rush, pioneer in mental health, who in spite of his busy schedule of medical practice and teaching, found time to help formulate the Declaration of Independence.

On down through the years we are reminded of other great physicians associated with this city and this school: men like Archer, Long, Osler, De Leon, and Barnes. Then we reach the contemporary scene and encounter figures such as Drs. Isidor Ravdin, Howard Rusk, Charles Mayo, and E. Vincent Askey, who in the same tradition, combine the talents of teacher, researcher, or practitioner of medicine with invaluable contributions to the larger national scene.

And thus I must blend my gratitude and pride for being chosen to present the annual lecture of the John Archer Society with a large portion of humility in the presence of a gathering which represents so vital a segment of our national history and of present-day eminence in medical science.

As chairman of the subcommittee of the House which has responsibility, among other things, for the annual appropriations for the U.S. Public Health Service, my work obviously has a direct impact upon the scope and directions of Federal, State, and local public health programs and the very important research programs of the U.S. Public Health Service. Less well known among physicians is the fact that the actions of my subcommittee have had, cumulatively, a far-reaching impact on medical education.

When I first became a member of my subcommittee, the research program of the Public Health Service was small, and limited principally to its own epidemiological and laboratory study of the communicable diseases. Funds for research grants and training awards to non-Federal investigators and institutions were relatively insignificant. This was but a reflection of the emphasis then being given to consolidating the great advances made against communicable diseases in the first three decades of the present century. Even then, however, the shape of our population and its environment was undergoing important changes, creating new health problems and needs for a new research effort.

Oversimplified, the two most significant changes were these:

1. Emergence of the chronic disease problem: Because of reductions in morbidity and mortality from communicable diseases—particularly among infants, children, and mothers—more people were living longer, and therefore becoming more susceptible to the chronic diseases such as cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and emotional disorders.

2. Emergence of environmental health problems: The longer average life expectancy, together with improved economic conditions and other factors, had greatly expanded our population. The flowering of U.S. technology and industry concentrated more and more of these people in our cities. At the same time it introduced an entirely new set of health problems—air and water pollution, ionizing radiations, food additives, a deluge of new drugs and synthetics, an alarming increase in accidents on the streets, in the factory, and in the home.

Thus, almost from the beginning of my service on the subcommittee, we have had to devote more and more attention to national needs in these two areas of chronic diseases and environmental health.

Back around 1945 and 1946 we felt that the Nation should begin learning more about the cause, prevention, and treatment of chronic disease. This required some redirection and strengthening of the Public Health Service's own research. More important is the fact that expansion of research in universities and medical schools was considered imperative.

According to their own representatives, the size of the needed expansion was clearly beyond the resources of the universities, foundations, voluntary health agencies, and other private sources. In concurrence with the advice of experts in and out of the Government, we determined that a gradual, year-by-year buildup of a Federal grants-in-aid program, would be required. The mechanism to be used was the National Institutes of Health of the Public Health Service—an organization with experience in the granting field and a tradition of first-class medical and biological research.

So much for philosophy and background. Now let us look at what has happened. The simplest and quickest measurement is in terms of the dollars that have been spent to bring our Nation unquestioned world leadership in medical and biological science. Taking as our baseline the last prewar year, the total national investment in this work has risen from about $45 million in 1940 to around $715 million in 1960. In 1940 Federal support of such research was 7 percent, or $3 million. In 1960 the Federal share was 53 percent or about $380 million, most of

which was provided through the National Institute of Health.

Here I should like to point out that although the percentage of non-Federal funds has greatly decreased in relation to Federal funds, there has, nevertheless, been a remarkable increase in the actual amount of non-Federal assistance to medical research—from $42 million in 1940 to an estimated $335 million in 1960. It seems to me this affords clear proof that Federal funds have stimulated rather than suppressed private expenditures in medical research.

Most of these Federal funds have been appropriated for research and training related to specific diseases such as cancer, arthritis, neurological disorders, cardiovascular diseases, and the like. However, very sizable amounts have, of necessity, gone into study of basic medical and biological questions. Overall, the great bulk of the research up until now has been oriented toward laboratory rather than clinical phases.

As to results, a gathering such as this would know, far better than I, of the remarkable array of new concepts, drugs and procedures that have already come forth. You, better than I, know of the still greater advances which lie ahead simply because the greatest part of the work of the past decade has been of a fundamental nature and therefore provides the building material for tomorrow's new clinical developments and the substance of tomorrow's medical education. The research construction program has had the same effect on the physical plants of our schools.

Now I must look at the other side of the coin. The very scope and vigor of our national research effort, not only in biology and medicine, but in many other scientific fields, has either created, intensified, or at least revealed certain problems.

It is easy for us to forget the national proliferation in these other fields of science, paralleling the growth in biomedicine, but involving vastly greater Federal funds. These other research interests of the Federal Government also have had to be advanced primarily through project grants and contracts, largely with the same institutions who are the mainstay of our health-related research.

I am sure you are familiar with the administrative problems; with the rigidities; and with the tendency toward creation of imbalances between research and teaching functions that have been reported from many institutions, as resulting from the volume of project research.

I have heard it said that our national concentration on direct project research grants and contracts carries an inherent danger of causing the universities to lose control over such factors as the relative emphasis their faculties shall give to fundamental versus applied research. Some authorities feel the very independence of many universities is threatened.

These possibilities are a matter of grave concern to my committee, as I know they are also to other segments of the Congress having similar interests in preserving a healthy research and educational structure in our Nation.

As one approach to a redress of the present trend as it relates to medically oriented research, the Congress recently authorized NIH to explore methods for a new program of general research grants to universities and similar institutions. These general grants would augment rather than replace the project grant system. Our thought was that reasonably large sums made available for institutions to use as they saw fit, in meeting particular internal problems, would help them achieve their own institutional goals, objectives and standards of excellence.

The Congress has not yet approved the details of this new grants program. However, the principle is sound and the need seems to be well established. I am hopeful that something concrete will be forthcoming in the near future.

Another problem growing out of the emphasis on laboratory research during the past decade has been the need for more funds, facilities and projects for clinical research. To meet this need, a new clinical research facilities grants program was established last year by NIH as a result of recommendations by the Congress.

Totally, the program aims to provide support for a variety of basic and clinical research efforts on a broad variety of diseases and fundamental biomedical problems. The similar clinical facility programs of the NIH categorical Institutes are to be concerned primarily with a particular type or group of diseases, such as heart disease or cancer.

Behind the original congressional action were the considerations that (1) clinical research has been insufficient because of a lack of adequate means to provide the careful observation and control needed for research in the complexities of human biology; and (2) that valuable research in animals or chemical laboratories often has not been carried over into studies in human patients because of a lack of proper research facilities and conditions. One of the principal reasons for these deficiencies has been the high costs of clinical research.

A clinical research facility is defined as a resource within a medical institution, aimed at enhancing the quality and quantity of clinical investigations. It is a discrete physical unit or research ward of about 10 to 20 beds in a hospital, but apart from the general care wards, with a stable, well-trained nursing and dietetic staff to provide precise control and observation, and with directly supporting specialized laboratory facilities.

The grant funds pay for the renovation and equipment of the centers, the costs of the care of research patients (including specialized nursing, diet kitchens, and other services), supporting laboratories and certain staff salaries.

In those facilities, scientists can carry on coordinated investigations in a wide range of diseases and basic scientific problems. NIH cites as an example of such cooperative work, the problem of transplanting human tissues and organs. Advances in both the basic sciences, such as chemistry and immunology, and in the clinical sciences, such as surgery and internal medicine, are necessary before important advances can be made in transplantation techniques.

Good progress has been made in getting this clinical program under way. First-year grants averaging about a half-million dollars each have been awarded to 19 institutions in every part of the country. A number of other very promising applications is being studied by NIH and its advisory groups and action on these should be forthcoming soon.

AID TO MEDICAL EDUCATION

While not created by the large-scale investment in medical research, the third problem I wish to discuss was intensified by it. Furthermore, the continuation and future expansion of that research effort will be jeopardized if this third problem is not solved. And finally, full public benefit from the results of the medical research program will depend to a significant degree on how well that problem is solved.

I refer to impending deficits in both the quantity and quality of new physicians that our country must have if we are to maintain and improve our present high standards of medical practice.

Studies made by my committee and by other responsible groups over the past 2 or 3 years indicate that our medical schools are losing ground in the competition for superior college students.

During the current fiscal year approximately 10,000 predoctoral fellowships in the physical, life, and social sciences, psychology, engineering, the arts, humanities, and education will be awarded by four Federal agencies—the Department of State, the National Science Foundation, the Office of Education, and the National Institutes of Health.

These fellowships provide a stipend of from $1,800 to $2,500, plus $50 allowance for each dependent, and travel allowances. Full tuition is paid to the institution which the recipient chooses to attend, and in some instances an additional subsidy to the institution is provided.

We all know that college enrollments are rapidly increasing. However, the number of college students applying to medical schools has dropped at a time when the number of college graduates has been increasing. Furthermore, the quality of applicants is said to be decreasing. These trends offer a serious threat to the necessary increase in the number of physicians in the future. It is a threat also to the quality of future graduates.

Against this decline of medical school applications is the widely held belief that, today, this country has a relative shortage of medical manpower. We believe that shortage will become acute in the years ahead unless action is taken.

One of the several expert committees that have been studying this problem reported last year that it found four principal reasons for the impending physician shortage:

1. The tremendous increase in population in the past 20 years—from 132 million in 1940 to 180 million in 1960;

2. We have not expanded our production of physicians at a sufficient rate to meet the needs for medical care of the increasing population in an addition to the augmented needs for teaching and research;

3. The shift in the U.S. population distribution resulting in a greater percentage of the very young and very old who require the greatest amount of medical care;

4. The demand for health services resulting from our rising standard of living, wide expansion of hospital and medical insurance, and the increasing health-consciousness of our people.

In addition there are such factors as the great length and cost of medical training and the fact that many other satisfying and intellectually stimulating scientific careers with high prestige and adequate financial reward have developed during the past 20 years.

This same study found the average cost of 4 years of medical school to be approximately $11,600 for those graduating in 1959. Since scholarship support has been meager, many students hesitate to shoulder a large loan, and the curriculum is so demanding that few students can carry a part-time job without considerable sacrifice of time needed for their studies. Thus the choice of medicine as a career has been to a considerable extent influenced by financial factors, and many promising college graduates who would have liked to study medicine have been discouraged.

To help remedy this situation it has become apparent to me that (1) the Federal Government must provide direct assistance to the teaching functions of medical and related schools; (2) that the Federal Government should supplement private, industrial, and State sources in providing scholarship, fellowship, and loan assistance to medical and dental students as it now does to Ph. D. candidates in the basic sciences; and (3) it should relieve the serious financial and administrative imbalances between the research and teaching functions of the medical schools.

Several legislative proposals now being studied in the Congress are designed to meet these needs. I would like to describe very briefly my own bills which I believe would go a long way toward helping meet our national requirements in this area.

On January 25 of this year I introduced a bill which would provide for a 10-year program of grants for education in the fields of medicine and dentistry to be administered by the U.S. Public Health Service. Under this program each accredited degree-granting medical and dental school would receive a block grant of $100,000 each year, together with $500 for each student, plus $500 additional for each student enrolled in excess of average past enrollment.

For schools providing only 1, 2, or 3 years of professional training in medicine or dentistry, block grants of $25,000, $50,000, and $75,000, respectively, would be awarded. With these funds the schools could meet the costs of establishing, maintaining, or enlarging their teaching staffs and of maintaining, acquiring, and operating the necessary equipment.

I should like to emphasize that these funds are intended primarily to meet the costs of new or expanded instruction programs. Special training projects outside the regular curriculum which are financed with other public funds or private grants are excluded. The same exclusion applies to the costs of research and to the operations of any hospitals.

My bill applies a few conditions for institutional eligibility for Federal grants that I believe you will agree are entirely reasonable and desirable:

1. The school must be either a public or a nonprofit private institution located within the United States.

2. The school must provide reasonable opportunity for the admission of out-of-State students.

3. During the period it is receiving Federal payments, the school must make every reasonable effort to maintain its income for operating expenses from sources other than the Federal Government at a level equal to that which existed before receiving the Federal funds. In the case of a new school, similar efforts should be made to obtain such non-Federal operating income at the highest possible level.

4. The school will submit from time to time such reports as the Surgeon General may reasonably require to assure that these purposes are being carried out.

To advise the Surgeon General on the policies and regulations under which the program would operate, there would be established a National Council on Education for Health. The Surgeon General would be ex officio chairman and the Commissioner of Education an ex officio member. The council membership would include 10 leaders in the fields of health sciences, education, or public affairs. Four of the ten would be persons actively engaged in an appropriate field of professional education.

A companion bill was introduced by me on the day after the first bill was offered. This second legislative proposal is designed to provide Federal funds which would stimulate and supplement non-Federal scholarship funds for medical and dental students. Each State wishing to participate would establish a commission on medical and dental scholarships, or designate an existing agency to serve as the State commission. The commission would develop a plan covering certain broad eligibility requirements which are spelled out in my bill, and which stipulates that the annual stipend paid any individual would not exceed $1,250 of Federal funds or one-half the amount of the total awarded to the student. My plan also provides that, insofar as possible, 75 percent of Federal funds awarded the State commission must be used for medical and 25 percent for dental scholarships.

Another important requirement is that the State commission review annually the educational progress being made by each scholarship recipient.

To finance this program the bill calls for an appropriation of $5 million for the first fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961; $10 million for the next fiscal year, and an equal amount for the next 8 years.

The Surgeon General will be advised on policies, regulations and administration of this program by a National Advisory Committee on Medical and Dental scholarships. This group will include the Surgeon General, who shall also serve as Chairman, the Commissioner of Education, and 10 members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Three of these shall be recognized authorities in the field of professional education, three shall be teachers or practitioners in medicine or dentistry, and four shall represent the general public.

Since my bills were introduced, others having the same general objectives have been proposed in response to the request made by President Kennedy in his health message of February 9, that over the next decade the capacity of medical schools be increased by 50 percent and of dental schools by 100 percent.

I am particularly impressed with a provision of one of these which would help expand teaching facilities of our medical schools by means of matching grants of Federal money for construction purposes. This provision follows in principle the methods under which the research facilities of the schools and universities have been helped to expand by Federal grants in recent years. This particular bill would also extend and strengthen this latter program of research construction for another three years, an action I heartily approve.

I believe the needs for strengthening the medical schools in their teaching function are so clearly apparent that this Congress will take affirmative action of some kind. Whatever that action may be, I will do all in my power to make certain that it does not lead to Federal control.

Now I would like to discuss briefly the impact upon graduate and continuing medical education of these existing programs of Federal aid to medical and biological research, including the recently initiated clinical research facilities program.

NIH and the American Hospital Association have recently completed part of a study on how much research is being conducted in hospitals throughout the country. They found that in 1958, over $125 million was being spent on research in more than 850 hospitals—1 out of every 8 in the United States. Twenty-three averaged $2 million a piece; 58 averaged over $½ million; 62 averaged about $158,000 on research; and 145 were spending over $50,000 annually.

Now my committee has been told by experts that clinical research in a hospital setting is a very painstaking and precise matter. Care and study of the research patient demands much more of the physician-investigator, of the interne and residents, and of every hospital department than does the care of the usual nonresearch patient.

We also understand that the viewpoints and methods of scientific inquiry acquired by students and house officers participating in laboratory and clinical research enhances their ability to practice a superior kind of medicine throughout the rest of their professional lives.

The surprising amount of clinical research already in progress in hospitals and the large expansion now being undertaken should, in my opinion, not be overlooked in any consideration of the impact of research on medical education.

Of the same nature, but perhaps to a different degree, is the impact of the new knowledge resulting from these research programs on the continuing education of physicians having little direct exposure to the organized research process itself.

It seems to me their already difficult task of keeping up with the latest scientific developments in clinical medicine will become even more difficult. In this connection it would appear that more study should be given to improved and expanded methods of medical communications. I expect the professional societies and the medical centers will need to develop more and better kinds of short refresher courses and symposia; more extensive use of new educational media such as closed circuit TV programs may have to be explored.

All of these concerns would seem to be applicable in even greater measure to the schools in their need to keep their curriculums abreast of the rapidly expanding flood of new knowledge.

This brings me back to the need for direct Federal aid to the medical schools and to the greater numbers of superior students needed by medicine and the Nation.

I accept the proposition that medical research, medical practice and medical education are interdependent, and that anything affecting one in an important way will have discernible effects on the other two.

The medical research potential and performance of our country has been greatly enhanced, so much so that it bears little resemblance to what existed before.

With respect to medical practice, the new knowledge and tools coming out of that research already have added greatly to the physician's ability to help his patients. Still greater advances are in prospect.

Thus it follows that the third component—medical education—will have to be helped if we expect it to keep in balance with research and practice, and with the needs of our exploding population.

The Federal Government should not be expected to do the whole job. But it should do its share by reinforcing the efforts of the medical profession and the schools, the foundations and other important elements of our society having a direct interest in maintenance of medical education.

I am committed to the principle that teaching at every level and in every field of science must remain free of central domination. It must retain flexibility to meet rapidly changing scientific patterns and the particular needs of diverse geographical areas. Also, it must truly reflect the wishes of the scientific and academic community. All of these requisites are served best when governmental financial responsibility is shared by nongovernmental funds and interests, and is guided by nongovernmental advice. My bills stress this factor, and I believe, reflect the wishes of all who know the importance of maintaining the integrity of the teaching of medicine and science.

Fifteen years of experience with the NIH research grants, research training and research construction grants programs have demonstrated that Federal assistance need not bring Federal control. Instead, these programs have nourished freedom rather than restricted it. They have helped stimulate a volume, scope, and quality of medical research in this country that has no parallel in history.

By following the same principles I believe we can accomplish the same objectives in Federal aid to medical education.

I can conceive of no more appropriate setting than this city and this school of Rush and Morgan for a careful reexamination of our national methods and goals of furthering teaching and research in science and medicine. These men were physicians who not only helped form a new Nation and its first medical school, but were also participants, with men like Franklin and Jefferson, in laying the foundations for the age of reason and its superstructure, the age of free science pursued by free men in free institutions of learning.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. O. H. Bertram, pastor, Redeemer Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, Pa., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace in Christ, humbly we praise Thee for the countless blessings that are ours in this country, as in no other land on earth; and contritely we beseech Thy pardon for our repeated ingratitude and our thankless neglect of Thy mercy. For the sake of Thy Son, our only Saviour, who laid down His life in payment for our sins, and then rose from the grave, to seal our eternal salvation, forgive us these sins of selfishness, and fill us with a new fervor of faith. Make us a repentant people. Take away from us all pride, and bring us down on our knees in repentance and true supplication. Send Thy Holy Spirit into our lives and hearts, to break our pride, and hold our hands in humble petition to Thy grace.

Reject and restrain all who seek to overthrow Thy church and destroy the blessings of our free Government. In Thee do we place our trust, not in our own might or power. To this end, help us to walk more closely with Thee, in greater love to our fellow men, and in deeper devotion to Christ's Golden Rule. To this end, teach us to exercise godly fear above personal favor, policies and principles above politics. May Thy guiding hand rest upon this body of our Government, so that all that is done here may serve better Thy glory and the welfare of our Nation.

In Thine everlasting compassion, comfort all the sick, the sorrowing, the destitute and the dying, with the love and comfort which only Thou art able to give. May they rest upon all who are heavy laden. Graciously provide for the homeless and hungry throughout the world, and lead us to share our bounties with them in their need.

Above all, loving Father, draw us closer to Thee, to seek the counsel which was offered to us through Thy Son: "Ask and it shall be given unto you, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you." For these heavenly blessings we humbly implore Thee through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 15, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 861. An act to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected;

H.R. 2554. An act to repeal section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code requiring an annual report by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the bonding of officers and employees of the Federal Government;

H.R. 3247. An act to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term "organize" as used in that section;

H.R. 4321. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects of certain retired members;

H.R. 4322. An act to amend section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of costs for certain U.S. nationals before foreign tribunals;

H.R. 4323. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to special pay for diving duty, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4324. An act to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4325. An act to increase the pay of certain permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy;

H.R. 4326. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the compensation of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School;

H.R. 4327. An act to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office;

H.R. 4328. An act to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps;

H.R. 4330. An act to provide uniform computation of retired pay for enlisted members retired prior to June 1, 1958, under section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the Act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995);

H.R. 5760. An act to revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and for other purposes;

H.R. 6346. An act to include Ackia Battleground National Monument, Miss., and Meriwether Lewis National Monument, Tenn., in the Natchez Trace Parkway, and to provide appropriate designations for them, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6422. An act to add federally owned lands to, and exclude federally owned lands from, the Cedar Breaks National Monument, Utah, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6494. An act to provide for withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nev., for defense purposes;

H.R. 6519. An act to provide additional lands for the Tupelo National Battlefield Site, Miss., and for other purposes;

H.R. 6668. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; and

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 104. An act to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment to the constitution of the State of New Mexico;

S. 712. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States; and

H.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May 1961 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 861. An act to provide that no application shall be required for the payment of statutory awards for certain conditions which, prior to August 1, 1952, have been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2554. An act to repeal section 14(c) of title 6 of the United States Code requiring an annual report by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the bonding of officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 3247. An act to amend section 2385 of title 18 of the United States Code to define the term "organize" as used in that section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4321. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the transportation of dependents and baggage and household effects of certain retired members;

H.R. 4322. An act to amend section 1037 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of costs for certain U.S. nationals before foreign tribunals;

H.R. 4323. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to special pay for diving duty, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4324. An act to provide uniformity in certain conditions of entitlement to reenlistment bonuses under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4325. An act to increase the pay of certain permanent professors at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy;

H.R. 4326. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the compensation of the academic dean of the Naval Postgraduate School;

H.R. 4327. An act to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office;

H.R. 4328. An act to reassign officers designated for supply duty as officers not restricted in the performance of duty in the Marine Corps;

H.R. 4330. An act to provide uniform computation of retired pay for enlisted members retired prior to June 1, 1958, under section 4 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, as amended by section 6(a) of the act of August 10, 1946 (60 Stat. 995); and

H.R. 6668. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to annuities based on retired or retainer pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5760. An act to revise the boundaries of the Scotts Bluff National Monument, Nebr., and for other purposes;

H.R. 6346. An act to include Ackia Battleground National Monument, Miss., and Meriwether Lewis National Monument, Tenn., in the Natchez Trace Parkway, and to provide appropriate designations for them, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6422. An act to add federally owned lands to, and exclude federally owned lands from, the Cedar Breaks National Monument, Utah, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6494. An act to provide for withdrawal and reservation for the use of the Department of the Air Force of certain public lands of the United States at Nellis Air Force Range, Nev., for defense purposes; and

H.R. 6519. An act to provide additional lands for the Tupelo National Battlefield site, Miss., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; placed on the calendar.

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—THE CALENDAR AND TREATIES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it the understanding of the Chair that at the conclusion of the morning hour, measures on the calendar will be called, for the consideration of those to which there is no objection; and that following the consideration of calendar measures to which there is no objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the three treaties which were considered on yesterday?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS FOLLOWING TODAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the majority leader has received requests that three committees or subcommittees may meet today during the session of the Senate. I would have no objection, because I presume they have a calendar of witnesses, including, no doubt, some from out of the city.

But I ought to serve notice now that since most of today will be taken up by speeches on the aid-to-education bill, there is always a likelihood that action will be taken tomorrow. Hence, beginning tomorrow, I would have to object to requests that any committees be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate, until the Senate has completed its action on that bill. I say that only by way of intimation to the committees, so that if witnesses are scheduled to appear before them, they can dispose of them accordingly, for the convenience of both the committees and the witnesses.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished minority leader that I think he is being fair in stating the situation as it will exist beginning on tomorrow—namely, that the Senate and its committees should be on notice that, from tomorrow on, there will be no dispensations by the Senate to allow committees to meet during the sessions of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the basis of the statements just now made, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

On request of Mr. HART, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

REGULATION OF ELECTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT IN PETRIFIED FOREST NATIONAL MONUMENT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract under which Fred Harvey is authorized to operate the Painted Desert Inn and provide related facilities for the public in Petrified Forest National Monument (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 35

"Joint resolution relating to imports of ceramic tile

"Whereas the ceramic tile industry of the United States has in past years sought protection from excessive imports of ceramic tile from low-wage foreign countries; and

"Whereas the production and employment in the ceramic tile industry and related business in the producing communities have been seriously curtailed and are threatened with further curtailment; and

"Whereas the ceramic tile industry of California has particularly been hampered by foreign imports and is threatened with serious unemployment; and

"Whereas other industries in California, such as the talc mines, are dependent on the ceramic tile industry for the use of their talc and clay; and

"Whereas definite relief for the ceramic tile industry from the serious effect of excessive importation of ceramic tile for sale at prices below domestic costs of production, is generally necessary in order to halt the progressive decline in ceramic tile production in many areas; and

"Whereas the ceramic mosaic tile industry has recently appealed to the U.S. Tariff Commission for reasonable relief: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress to provide immediate relief to the ceramic tile industry of the United States from the vast and ever-increasing quantities of low-cost imported ceramic tile which is flooding our markets; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the U.S. Tariff Commission to provide immediate relief to the ceramic mosaic tile industry under the terms of the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act by granting the increased duty requested on imported ceramic mosaic tile in Escape Clause Investigation No. 100; and be it further

"Resolved, That after such time as the U.S. Tariff Commission has made its recommendation to the President of the United States, the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President, Vice President, and members of the President's Foreign Policy Trade Commission to grant any requested relief; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to immediately transmit a copy of the resolution to each member of the U.S. Tariff Commission; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit on or after May 10, 1961, a copy of the resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to each member of the Foreign Trade Policy Committee of the President."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 33

"Joint resolution relative to California Indian lands

"Whereas the Government of the United States is contemplating action to terminate all Federal trusteeships with regard to California Indian lands; and

"Whereas the domestic water supply and sewage disposal systems of some of the lands involved do not meet State and county health laws and standards; and

"Whereas the Indians involved will be required to meet these State and county health laws and standards upon accepting title to said lands; and

"Whereas most of the Indians involved are unaware of the impact the State and county sanitary laws will have upon their limited financial resources; and

"Whereas many of the Indians have small pensions or other inadequate incomes and might lose their homes and be forced to become county welfare recipients because of their inability to comply with these necessary laws; and

"Whereas the inadequate sewage disposal systems are or will be a menace to the health of a great many people through water contamination: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to improve the domestic water supply and sewage disposal systems on these Indian lands so as to meet the standards and laws of the State and of the counties where such lands are located; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Joint resolution relative to pollution of Klamath River

"Whereas Klamath River is an interstate stream over which the United States and the States of California and Oregon exercise jurisdiction in varying degrees; and

"Whereas the quality of Klamath River waters results in excessive algal growth, creating a condition of pollution and nuisance; and

"Whereas the California water plan envisions extensive future development of Klamath River waters; and

"Whereas a report on investigations of pollution in the Klamath River system dated June 1955, prepared by the U.S. Public Health Service, states that 'until the natural pollution in Klamath River is controlled, the use of these waters for drinking, culinary, or recreational purposes will be impaired'; and

"Whereas this water quality condition now constitutes a serious problem to the residents, water users, and the fish and wildlife resources in the State of California; and

"Whereas in order to achieve an equitable and comprehensive solution to the present problem and to assure adequate water quality for future development under the California water plan, it is essential that a cooperative study be conducted by the appropriate governmental agencies of the United States, the State of California, and the State of Oregon; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the United States, as declared in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, to encourage such cooperative studies with respect to water pollution, including pollution of interstate streams, and funds are available under said Federal law for grants for such purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests the United States and the State of Oregon to join with the State of California in conducting a cooperative study of the problem existing on the Klamath River; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States; to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Reclamation; to the Governor, the legislature, the State engineer, and the State Sanitary Authority of the State of Oregon; to the Klamath River Compact Commission; and to the Departments of Water Resources and Fish and Game and the State and Regional Water Pollution Control Boards of the State of California."

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 22

"Joint resolution relative to the President's message on natural resources

"Whereas the President of the United States has sent to the Congress a message outlining a vast program for the development of our country's natural resources; and

"Whereas the Presidential message proposed the planning and execution of many large resources projects affecting the State of California; and

"Whereas the President's message on natural resources offers great and long-lasting importance to the prosperity and well-being of every Californian; and

"Whereas the President's natural resources program urged the establishment of planning commissions to develop comprehensive river-basin plans by 1970 in cooperation with individual States, and the passage of legislation to enable the Government to reserve known future reservoir sites whenever such protection is necessary; and

"Whereas the President's natural resources message told Congress that all Federal agencies concerned are being asked to provide data on flood control hazards in specified areas in all 50 States, and to help the States in regulating or zoning the flood plains; and

"Whereas the President's natural resources message rejected the 'no new starts' on water storage projects attributed to the previous national administration, and directed Federal agencies to chart a progressive, orderly program for starting new flood control projects; and

"Whereas the President's natural resources message called for quick congressional action to preserve the Point Reyes area in Marin County as a shoreline national park; and

"Whereas the President's natural resources message called for greater governmental and industrial effort to meet the problems of water and air pollution; and

"Whereas the President's natural resources message notified Congress that the national administration is redoubling its efforts to desalt sea water for drinking and industrial use, saying, 'No water resources program is of greater long-range importance'; and

"Whereas the President, in his message on natural resources, noted that the pace of power facility expansion must be tripled by 1980 to meet the needs of the economy and national defense, adding, 'Sustained heavy expansion by all power suppliers—public, cooperative, and private—is clearly needed'; and

"Whereas the President urged continued emphasis on building hydroelectric facilities and on cooperating with industry to develop full-scale nuclear reactors to generate electricity; and

"Whereas the President, in his natural resources message, told the Congress he has asked the Secretary of the Interior to plan for further national cooperative pooling of electric power, both public and private; and

"Whereas the President has asked for 'concerted attention' to increase research and development of our ocean resources, including the gathering of data on reserves of oil and natural gas in the Continental Shelf, fish conservation, and the training of scientific specialists in oceanography; and

"Whereas the President informed Congress in his natural resources message he has ordered a long-range Federal-State wildlife conservation program; and

"Whereas the President urged Congress to enact a much-needed wilderness protection bill; and

"Whereas the President's message on natural resources asked Congress to 'accelerate' forest planting and developing on Federal lands, and to speed up Federal advice and assistance to independent timber owners and ways to increase yields; and

"Whereas the President told Congress he has instructed the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to hurry the building of access roads to public forests to make additional supplies of merchantable timber available to small businesses; and

"Whereas the President, in his natural resources message, after noting that the problems of resource development cannot be delayed or ignored much longer, said, 'We must face up to them now': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully endorses these proposals in the President's message to Congress outlining his program for development of our natural resources, and urges the California delegation in the Congress to take favorable and speedy action thereon; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 113

"Resolution relating to compensating the Philippine Scouts for their services rendered in World War II

"Whereas the Philippine Scouts units serving with the U.S. Army rendered heroic and invaluable services in behalf of the United States of America and the Free World during World War II, and suffered particular hardship and cruelties in the early days of that conflict when their homeland was over-

run by the hostile forces of the common enemy; and

"Whereas the Philippine Scouts served side by side with American troops and conducted themselves with great valor and distinction in the campaigns in the Philippine Islands, and particularly in the battles on the Bataan Peninsula and at the island of Corregidor; and

"Whereas during these campaigns and prior thereto the Philippine Scouts were compensated pursuant to pay scales fixed by the Government of the United States with levels of remuneration substantially lower than those prescribed for other soldiers serving with the U.S. Army, with the result that the compensation received by these brave men was not commensurate with the extraordinary service they rendered; and

"Whereas action taken by the Congress of the United States, through enactment of Public Law 607 of the 77th Congress on June 16, 1942, to raise pay scales applicable to the Philippine Scouts to levels of equality with those of other soldiers serving with the U.S. Army were never fully effectuated in respect to services rendered by those men in the early campaigns in the Philippine Islands; and

"Whereas many important and prominent personages, including the former commander in the Philippine area, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, have commented upon and urged that appropriate actions be undertaken to effect the long overdue adjustments in compensations earned by the men who served in the Philippine Scouts during those critical days; and

"Whereas there is presently a bill in Congress, H.R. 1133, to provide benefits for members and survivors of members of the Philippine Scouts on the same basis as such benefits are provided for other members of the Armed Forces of the United States and their survivors: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to enact into law H.R. 1133 to compensate those Philippine Scouts who served in World War II for the lesser wage and salary amounts paid them at that time; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California."

Four resolutions adopted by the Senior Reserve Commanders Association, Army of the United States at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., relating to the strength of the Active Army, and so forth; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the Montana Medical Association, relating to care for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

A petition signed by Harumasa Irei, mayor of Kadena Son, Hisao Uema, chairman, Kadena Son Assembly, and Kasei Kisewaga, head, Kadena Son Military-Used Land Owners' Association, of the Ryukyu Islands, relating to the payment of certain claims preceding the effective date of Japanese peace treaty, April 27, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KERR:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"ENROLLED HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 547

"Concurrent resolution relating to sugarbeets and sugarbeet allotments

"Whereas the economy of several southwestern counties has suffered from reductions in allotments on various agricultural commodities over the past few years; and

"Whereas the consumption of products grown in Oklahoma contributes to the strength of our economy; and

"Whereas the production of raw sugar in Cuba from 1944 through 1960 amounted to 100 million tons; and

"Whereas the United States is no longer accepting these imports and is increasing domestic acreage allotments of sugarbeets: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th session of the Oklahoma Legislature (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. The President of the State Board of Agriculture is hereby directed to cooperate with the various farm organizations and citizens in Greer, Kiowa, Harmon, Jackson, Tillman, and Beckham counties to assist them in securing acreage allotments of sugarbeets, and to assist them in securing a domestic market for sugarbeets.

"SEC. 2. The President of the State Board of Agriculture is further directed to compile data and information to be submitted to the committee hearings in our National Congress showing why we should have a greater domestic sugarbeet allotment."

ELIMINATION OF POLLUTION OF ST. LOUIS RIVER—RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Common Council of the City of Superior, Wis., recently adopted a resolution requesting the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to take action to eliminate pollution of the St. Louis River which runs along the northwestern border of Wisconsin, adjacent to Minnesota. As a result of this pollution the bathing beach in Superior has had to be closed for health reasons. The city of Superior has provided a sewage treatment plant of its own. The common council urges that pollution originating elsewhere and thus beyond the control of the local authorities be eliminated, and calls on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate the necessary action.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution, adopted May 2, 1961, and signed by Mayor Lawrence M. Hagen of Superior, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Whereas this portion of the St. Louis River described in the caption hereof is located between Wisconsin and Minnesota and borders the west side of Billings Park which is property owned by the city of Superior, Wis., as well as several residents in that area; and because of pollution, the bathing beach at Billings Park has been closed by order of the health authorities depriving many people of recreational facilities formerly enjoyed by them; and

Whereas the city of Superior was forced by the State of Wisconsin health authorities to provide a sewage disposal plant in the year 1956 at great cost to the city; and

Whereas this polluted condition of the river is unsanitary, detrimental to tourist trade and deprives many people of bathing facilities and other recreation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Superior, That the U.S. Senators from Wisconsin and the Congressman of the 10th District be requested to use the authority and prestige of their high office in bringing to the attention of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the immediate need of eliminating pollution in and near the waters adjacent to Billings Park in the city of Superior.

Passed and adopted this 2d day of May 1961.

Approved this 3d day of May 1961.

LAWRENCE M. HAGEN,
Mayor.

Attest:

R. E. MCKEAGUE,
City Clerk.

PHILIPPINE-AMERICAN DAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Queens County, N.Y., chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, relating to the designation of a Philippine-American Day. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Philippine people, who have seen fit to set November 15 as Philippine-American Day, a day on which 27 million Filipinos have recalled the special ties of long friendship that have linked our two peoples together; and

Whereas on this special day of commemoration, the Philippine people renewed their pledge "to meet and deter further encroachment of communism": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Queens County chapter of the Catholic War Veterans of the U.S.A., Inc., in annual convention assembled, advocate a foreign policy hereafter of giving preferential attention to the Philippines—a free nation committed to friendship with America; and be it further

Resolved, That our Government be petitioned to celebrate on November 15, on American initiative by Presidential proclamation, an American-Philippine Day.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 64. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III (Rept. No. 257).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1870. A bill for the relief of Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1871. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction for depreciation of property to be computed without regard to the salvage value of such property; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JORDAN:

S. 1872. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to $1,800 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from their social security benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1873. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to donate dairy products and other agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses," approved September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 899), in order to permit the use of donated foods under certain circumstances for training college students; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1874. A bill for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1875. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to eliminate the exclusion of structures having in excess of 5,000 acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1876. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Iva Lee Holloway of Tulsa, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1877. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code so as to authorize the appointment of citizens of Guam and the Virgin Islands to the U.S. Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1878. A bill to add certain lands to the Wasatch National Forest, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 1879. A bill to repeal the tax on general telephone service and the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1880. A bill for the relief of Johann Czernopplsky;

S. 1881. A bill for the relief of Maria La Bella; and

S. 1882. A bill for the relief of Assunta Bianchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1883. A bill to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HART (for himself, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. TALMADGE):

S. 1884. A bill to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1885. A bill to amend section 302(i) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to extend the period of time for which individuals may serve as members of advisory committees appointed by the Administrator; and

S. 1886. A bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1887. A bill to recodify, with certain amendments thereto, chapter 19 of title 5 of the United States Code, entitled "Administrative Procedure"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RESOLUTIONS

OPPOSITION TO REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1961

Mr. HRUSKA submitted a resolution (S. Res. 147) opposing Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HRUSKA, which appears under a separate heading.)

OPPOSITION TO REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1961

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 148) opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1961, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the deduction for depreciation of property to be computed without having to take into account what is known as salvage value of the property.

If our national policy is to encourage private business growth, I am confident that this bill will find a good reception. The subject of salvage value has generated a tremendous volume of tax controversies between the Internal Revenue Service and taxpayers engaged in business requiring the use of buildings and machinery. Questions arise over the trade-in value of property, which must be estimated sometimes years in advance of disposal of the property. Taxpayers are required to guess how much they can dispose property for years after it has been acquired. Moreover, in these days of advancing technology and development, buildings and machinery quickly become obsolete, further adding to the difficulty in computing salvage value.

In order to bring some order and equity out of this confusion, my bill provides that depreciation can be computed without regard to salvage value. However, in order to provide a safety valve against loss of revenue, the bill also contains a provision which will prevent overreaching by taxpayers who take advantage of the additional depreciation thus permitted and then dispose of the property within 5 years in order to seek to convert this advantage into long-term capital gain.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1871) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit the deduction for depreciation of property to be computed without regard to the salvage value of such property, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 167(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to use of certain methods and rates of depreciation) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In computing the allowance under subsection (a) in respect of any property under any method of computing depreciation, the salvage value of such property shall not be required to be taken into account: *Provided,* That, to the extent salvage value has not been taken into account, profit realized from the sale or exchange of such property within 5 years shall be recognized and treated as ordinary income."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO WASATCH NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it may be appropriately referred. I ask unanimous consent that it may remain on the desk through Friday, May 19, so that other Senators may wish to sponsor it if they desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 1878) to add certain lands to the Wasatch National Forest, Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

IMPLEMENTATION OF 23D AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, proposed legislation submitted to the Congress today as President Kennedy's recommendation to implement the 23d amendment to the Constitution of the United States and to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the table for 1 week to permit

other interested Senators to join as cosponsors. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join as sponsors of this bill and thereby demonstrate in another fuller measure our belief in democracy's greatest symbol—the right to vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

The bill (S. 1883) to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as chairman of your Committee on the District of Columbia, I hope to call hearings on this bill at the earliest propitious time. Because of its importance to this Nation's Capital City, and as a symbol for what it stands, I desire that hearings on this bill be conducted before the full District Committee, thereby giving the entire membership the fullest opportunity to examine every aspect and giving to the Senate a bill that we trust will come as close to a model measure as it is possible to devise.

At this time I can see no reason why the Congress should not approve a bill this year and thereby give to District election officials ample time to work out the details of registration and election day activities before the 1964 presidential election.

Principally, the bill provides that a District resident may vote in the presidential election if he has resided in the District for 90 days prior to the election; if he is 18 years of age at the time of the election; and if he registers in the year of the presidential election.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the President of the United States submitting this bill to the Congress and a letter from President Walter N. Tobriner, of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting this bill to the President, be included at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, there may be one or two controversial points in this legislation which will draw sufficient attention that many Members of the Senate will desire to express their views. Certainly, one concerns the recommendation that persons reaching 18 will be eligible if they meet other qualifications.

May I express my personal view, Mr. President, that I hope the Senate will concur in this recommendation. A survey I have made of the 50 States shows that 46 States have a voting age requirement of 21 years. Hawaii has a 20-year minimum, Alaska 19 years, and Georgia and Kentucky at 18 years.

There are pro and con arguments for an 18-year minimum. However, I believe strongly that the Sputnik-Atlas-Redstone era has properly ushered in new and greater responsibilities for our young men and women. Today, on this floor we are debating greater educational advantages for our youth to assure that they can get the tools to meet the challenges of this age of space. Both the pace and the degree of education all across the board are being stepped up to help America meet the challenges.

Therefore, our youth with such education not only is prepared to meet the responsibilities of maturity at 18 but should meet them fully. I am not moved by the belief that 18-year-olds cannot measure up.

In one sense we might say that if our youth can fight wars at 18, then they should cast votes at 18. More than that, if youth must prepare for maturity and its increased responsibilities, then I believe they can discharge at 18 those demands at the polls in a fair, effective, and enlightened manner. I am hopeful that the Congress may adopt an 18-year-old age requirement.

Mr. President, I again express the hope that Congress may act favorably on this legislation this year.

EXHIBIT 1

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am pleased to transmit to the Congress draft legislation implementing the 23d amendment to the Constitution, providing for voting by the residents of the District of Columbia in presidential elections.

The passage of the 23d amendment by the Congress and its remarkably prompt ratification by the required number of States reaffirms the belief of the people of the entire Nation in the basic principle that government must be responsible to those governed. I take special pride, therefore, in submitting this proposal to permit the greatest possible number of citizens of the District of Columbia to share with their fellow Americans the basic right to vote for President and Vice President of the United States.

I hope that prompt and favorable action will be taken by the Congress on the proposed legislation so that the longstanding aspirations of the citizens of the District of Columbia to participate in national elections finally will become a reality.

In addition to the draft bill, I am enclosing a letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia describing this legislation in detail. A similar letter has been sent to the Speaker.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

MAY 11, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a bill "To regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President, and for other purposes."

Now that the 23d amendment has been approved, it is necessary that the Congress enact legislation to implement it.

The bill submitted herewith amends the act of August 12, 1955, which provides for elections in the District of Columbia of delegates to the national political conventions and of certain political party officials.

Principally, the bill provides that a District resident may vote in the presidential election if he has resided in the District for 90 days prior to the election; if he is 18 years of age at the time of the election; and if he registers in the year of the presidential election. Registered voters who are absent from the District or unable because of physical condition to come personally to the polling place may vote by absentee ballot. To vote in the presidential election a voter is not required to disclose his party affiliation.

A person desiring to vote in the political party elections held in May may do so if he has resided in the District for 6 months instead of a year as required by present law.

Under the bill any political party may place its candidates for President and Vice President on the ballot if its candidates for such offices were on the ballot in five or more States in the last preceding presidential election or if the party nominates its candidates by a petition signed by at least 500 registered voters of the District.

The bill requires presidential electors nominated by a political party to vote for the candidates of the party they are nominated to represent. Additionally, electors must take an oath that they will vote for such candidates.

The bill has been subjected to much study by representatives of the political parties, citizens generally, and officials of the District government.

The bill submitted herewith is a revision of an earlier draft and represents the present views of the Commissioners after discussion of the subject matter with representatives of the executive branch of the Government. This revised draft, in the opinion of the Commissioners, is the most appropriate measure to implement the 23d amendment. The Commissioners strongly urge that it be submitted to the Congress with your approval.

Very sincerely yours,

WALTER N. TOBRINER,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

PROTECTION AGAINST UNAUTHORIZED COPYING OF ORIGINAL ORNAMENTAL DESIGNS OF USEFUL ARTICLES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the question of effective protection for original ornamental designs of useful articles against unauthorized copying is becoming of increasing importance in this country and throughout the world. I was privileged in the 86th Congress to join with the then chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, and with the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin, in the sponsorship of S. 2075, a bill providing such protection. This bill was the outgrowth of years of drafting, redrafting, study and discussion launched by the Coordinating Committee of the National Council of Patent Law Associations. Another bill, S. 2852, similar in most respects to S. 2075, but containing several important differences, was introduced in the 86th Congress by my distinguished colleague from Georgia, Senator TALMADGE.

On June 29, 1960, as acting chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, I held a 1-day hearing on both of these bills. This preliminary hearing developed not only the background of this problem and the interest generated by it within the Government, industry, and the bar, but also made clear the differences between S. 2075 and S. 2852. As a result of constructive efforts since June of 1960 by all parties concerned, these differences

have now been completely reconciled. Moreover, several other valuable comments have emanated from a continuing study of this area by the bar. The result is S. 1884 which I now introduce. I am gratified that the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin the ranking minority member of the Patents Subcommittee [Mr. WILEY], and the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], are joining with me in sponsoring this proposal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1884) to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 302(i) OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 302(i) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to extend the period of time for which individuals may serve as members of advisory committees appointed by the Administrator. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill we be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1885) to amend section 302(i) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to extend the period of time for which individuals may serve as members of advisory committees appointed by the Administrator, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the attached proposed bill be introduced in the Senate at your earliest convenience: "To amend section 302(i) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to extend the period of time for which individuals may serve as members of the advisory committees appointed by the Administrator."

The purpose of this bill is to provide the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency with greater flexibility in the use of experts and consultants. In particular, this bill, if enacted, would enable the employment of consultants at the rate of $100 per diem for a maximum 1-year period. Under existing law the Agency is handicapped by section 302(i) of the Federal Aviation Act (Public Law 85-726, sec. 302(i), 49 U.S.C. 1343(g)), which limits the Agency's use of experts and consultants to a period less than 100 days in any calendar year.

While this section (302(i) of the Federal Aviation Act) endeavors to confer the benefits of section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), which authorizes the employment of experts and consultants, and which permits compensation of such individuals at a statutory rate, it also limits their employment to 100 days in derogation of the same basic authority (5 U.S.C. 55a), which permits temporary or intermittent employment for a 1-year period.

The work program of the Agency, by its very nature, embraces projects requiring temporary and intermittent services for periods totaling more than 100 days and perhaps as long as 1 year. For this reason, we strongly urge enactment of this legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this draft bill to the Congress.

Sincerely,

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

FEES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES UNDER NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury requesting the proposed legislation, together with his memorandum relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1886) to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and memorandum presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation and vessel inspection laws.

The proposed legislation would repeal certain statutes prohibiting the charging or collection of fees for certain services rendered to vessel owners by the Bureau of Customs and the U.S. Coast Guard. It would further repeal fees presently fixed by statute for other services rendered by the Bureau of Customs to vessel interests and thus permit the Secretary of the Treasury, under general authority, to fix fees to be collected upon the rendering of any of these services.

The services for which a fee may or may not now be charged are more specifically set forth in a memorandum accompanying this letter.

It will be appreciated if you will lay the draft bill transmitted herewith before the Senate. A similar proposal has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

MEMORANDUM TO ACCOMPANY A BILL "TO REPEAL AND AMEND CERTAIN STATUTES FIXING OR PROHIBITING THE COLLECTION OF FEES FOR CERTAIN SERVICES UNDER THE NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS"

The proposed legislation would repeal the statutory provisions against the charging and collection of fees by collectors or other officers of customs or by the U.S. Coast Guard for any of the following services:

Measurement of tonnage and certifying same; issuance of a license or granting of a certificate of registry, record, or enrollment; endorsement of change of master; certifying and receiving manifest, including master's oath and permit; granting permit to vessels licensed for the fisheries to touch and trade; payment of entry and clearance fees for vessels engaged in the foreign and coasting trade on the northern, northeastern, and northwestern frontiers; payment of clearance fees for vessels making daily trips between any port in the United States and any port in the Dominion of Canada wholly upon interior waters; granting certificate of payment of tonnage dues; recording bill of sale, mortgage, hypothecation, or conveyance, or the discharge of mortgage or hypothecation; furnishing certificate of title; furnishing a crew list; certificate of protection to seamen; bill of health; shipping or discharging of seamen as provided by title 53, Revised Statutes, sections 563 and 646 of title 46; apprenticing boys to the merchant service; inspecting, examining, and licensing steam vessels including inspection certificate and copies thereof; and licensing of master, engineer pilot, or mate of a vessel.

In addition it would abolish certain fees which are prescribed by statute for entry and clearance of vessels, post entry, granting permits to proceed, receiving manifest, change of name of vessel, recording bills of sale, mortgages, hypothecations or other instruments, issuing certificates of ownership, and issuing abstracts of title.

The repeal or amendment of these statutes is necessary in order that the Secretary of the Treasury may in his discretion set fees under the provisions of section 501 of the act of August 31, 1951 (5 U.S.C. 140).

It is contemplated that, in those regulations, fees will be established for, but not necessarily limited to, admeasurement of vessels, registry of vessels, issuance of enrollments and licenses, or licenses, renewals of licenses, issuance of special certificates to vessels, authorization for changes of names of vessels, furnishing and recording abstracts of title of vessels, recording of evidence of title to, and encumbrances upon, vessels and the discharge of the latter, entry and clearance of vessels, furnishing certificates of ownership of vessels, furnishing copies of documents, records, or other papers filed in offices of collectors of customs or in the Bureau of Customs, and certifying such copies.

It is also contemplated that, in addition to any fees which may be established in those regulations, there will also be prescribed therein charges for services performed by customs officers at places other than their official stations, as, for example, admeasuring or readmeasuring vessels at such places, entering or clearing vessels at points which are not ports of entry, furnishing customs supervision over vessels at such points, and the like. It is anticipated that any such charge will reimburse the Government for the compensation of the customs officer concerned while absent from his official station as well as any other expense incurred by the Government in connection with the service rendered.

Certain obsolete portions of section 4382 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U.S.C., 1958 edition, title 46, sec. 330), section 4383 of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., 1958 edition, title 46, sec. 333) and the act of June 19, 1886 (U.S.C., 1958 edition, title 46, sec. 331), have been included in the comparative print although it is probable that they have been repealed by implication or at least superseded. They are the 16th, 18th, 24th, and 25th items of Revised Statute 4382; the reference to naval officer in Revised Statute 4383; and the last sentence of the act of June 19, 1886.

OPPOSITION TO REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1961

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I submit a resolution expressing the opinion of the Senate that it does not favor Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961, which was transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 9 of this year. The plan deals with the Federal Trade Commission.

The reorganization proposal would concentrate vast powers of the Commission in the hands of the Chairman, who is an appointee of the President. Mindful of the fact that the Commission is a quasi-judicial body, a plan that suggests and provides for such transfer of powers would be most unwise.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There will be four such resolutions before the Senate and the appropriate committees. They will be disavowals of the four reorganization plans submitted. On two, the action period, under the 60-day provision, will expire on June 26; on another, on July 2; and on the fourth, on July 8.

These resolutions are being submitted by different Senators, so that hearings can be held on the whole matter of reorganization and what is contemplated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and will be appropriately referred.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The resolution (S. Res. 147) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 4 of 1961 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 9, 1961.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, for myself and the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], a resolution not favoring Reorganization Plan No. 1, submitted to the Congress by the President in regard to reorganization of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. President, I am in accord with the general objectives of the President's reorganization plan, but it raises some serious questions that unless answered satisfactorily could deprive the investing public and securities industry of basic rights. The only way to get the answers to these questions is to introduce a resolution of disapproval and to get a hearing. Introduction of the resolution will make possible hearings by the Government Operations Committee, of which I am a member.

The questions raised by the reorganization plan are these:

Does the plan give the SEC authority to delegate to a subordinate employee not only its administrative functions, but also its quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions? If so, does this not raise a constitutional question concerning the redelegation of such powers? And would this not give quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial powers to lower officials who have not had nominations confirmed by the Senate?

Does the plan not fail to provide adequate machinery for SEC review of a decision? As it would take the vote of two Commissioners to secure full commission review of a staff decision, could the Commission avoid accepting particularly controversial matters? And would it not deprive a party of the right to present its case to the full Commission?

Who has the right to petition a full commission review in such matters as rulemaking and regulation issuance?

In providing for further judicial appeals from decisions of a lower level official, does the plan deprive the U.S. court of appeals of the high-level advice of the full Commission? While not affecting the right of appeal to the courts, the plan does not appear to make available to the court, in the case of a controverted case, the expert knowledge and evaluation of the full Commission, on which it has come to rely in the past. Thus, the court then might either accept the lower level decision or send the case back to the full commission for determination? Would this not add substantially to the length of the proceeding?

Since the plan provides that subordinate officials' decisions can become final without review, would not conflicting decisions by hearing examiners be passed onto the courts without the full Commission have the opportunity to reconcile those differences?

In a letter G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, has questioned some aspects of the SEC reorganization plan.

Mr. Funston said:

The exchange certainly does not want to create roadblocks to the commendable objectives of Reorganization Plan No. 1. But we do feel that it goes much further than seems necessary in permitting the delegation of Commission authority to the staff—especially where the right of review in matters of great importance is not clear.

Under the Reorganization Act, the SEC plan is presented to Congress on a take-it-or-leave-it basis; and thus cannot be amended. Reorganization plans become effective automatically within 60 days unless disapproved by either branch of Congress.

I believe it is desirable to improve the efficiency of the SEC. Certainly this ought to be done without depriving litigants of their rights or reducing the Commission's responsibilities to those appearing before it. A full hearing is necessary to answer all questions raised by this proposed new SEC procedure.

I shall certainly cooperate to secure early committee consideration of any legislative proposals which would attain the desirable objectives of the reorganization plan without jeopardizing the rights and obligations of those who deal with the agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 148) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1961 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 27, 1961.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand that hearings will be promptly held and that we shall have an opportunity to consider the question.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 1021, the aid-to-education bill, which I ask to have printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The amendment would change the method of allocation of Federal funds from a grant system to a system of sharing Federal income taxes with the States. The amendment in no way would disturb the distribution which has been arrived at, very painfully, by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The amendment would provide a very real and definite philosophical basis for State control over education.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the pending measure, Senate bill 1021, and I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit the amendment, under the rule, for myself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. This is the so-called Cooper-Javits amendment, to change the allocation formula in the bill. Senator COOPER, who is unavoidably absent from the Senate, has telephoned me to insist that I submit the amendment today so that Members of the Senate may read it. In view of his unavoidable absence, he has asked me to put my name on the amendment as its sponsor, with his name added to it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1021, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1021, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. MILLER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1021, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROUTY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1021, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STABILIZATION OF MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] be added as a cosponsor to S. 1747, a bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States and for other purposes, and that at the next printing of the bill his name be listed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that yesterday the Senate received the nomination of Ben S. Stephansky, of Illinois, to be U.S. Ambassador to Bolivia, and that today it also received the nominations of Thomas S. Estes, of Maine, to be our Ambassador to the Republic of Upper Volta, Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, to be U.S. Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and the Kingdom of Yeman, and John S. Badeau, of New York, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Republic.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1961—SEC

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that open hearings will be held, by that subcommittee, beginning May 22, 1961, at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1961, which would effect a reorganization of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], to whose committee the reorganization plan was referred under the Reorganization Act, has requested the comments of the Banking and Currency Committee on the plan. The hearing of which I am giving notice will be a preliminary hearing, designed to elicit information on the basis of which the Banking and Currency Committee can respond to the request of the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations.

These hearings have been scheduled after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. The members of the Committee on Government Operations are being invited to attend, and also all the members of the full Committee on Banking and Currency.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearings are requested to notify Mr. Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5304, New Senate Office Building, telephone Capitol 4-3121, extension 3921, not later than Friday, May 19, 1961.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Remarks made by him on the California wine industry.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Address entitled "Zeal for Freedom," delivered by him in Tulsa, Okla., at an American Day rally of northeastern Oklahoma junior and senior high school students.

By Mr. BUSH:

House bill 6705 and editorial entitled "Unsolved Problem," published in the Westport (Conn.) Town Crier of May 11, 1961, relating to improvement of commuter and other passenger service on the New Haven Railroad.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Editorial entitled "A Major Service," publishing in the San Francisco Examiner of May 3, 1961, dealing with the service rendered by Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY, of California, in connection with the relocation of the right-of-way for the Canyon power project tunnel aqueduct, California.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Community Development Key to Economic Progress," written by himself and published in the County Officer of recent date.

THE PRESIDENT'S LETTER ABOUT SACRIFICES FOR THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, some time prior to May 15, Mrs. Alicia Patterson, editor and publisher of the newspaper Newsday, in New York, addressed to the President of the United States a letter in which she asked him to specify the sacrifices he was asking Americans to make.

On May 15, the President addressed a letter to Mrs. Patterson; and it is reproduced in the New York Times of today, May 16. I think the letter is of sufficient importance to merit wider currency; and, for that reason, I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S LETTER ABOUT SACRIFICING FOR UNITED STATES

GARDEN CITY, LONG ISLAND, May 15.—Many thanks for your wire of May 4. I appreciate your interest in our Nation's needs and the spirit that motivates your telegram.

Apparently the demands of the cold war are not as dramatic, and thus not as well identified, as the demands of the traditional shooting war—such as rationing (which we do not need), a doubling of draft quotas (which would not help), or an increase in personal income taxes (which would only impede the recovery of our economic strength).

But that does not mean that nothing is being asked of our citizens. The facts of the matter are that all the programs I am seeking to strengthen our economy, our defenses, our image abroad, our balance-of-payments position and our foreign policy tools—all make demands upon one or more groups of Americans, and most often upon all Americans jointly. All of them involve some effort, some inconvenience, or some sacrifice—and, indeed, they are being opposed in some quarters on that basis.

SEEKS CUTS FOR DEFENSE

For example: I have asked that we provide a leaner, more efficient defense establishment by terminating certain projects and closing a good many bases, although there are many protests from those who want economy practiced in someone else's community. I have asked that a major effort in foreign aid to other nations be maintained for many years to come, as burdensome as some regard it. I have asked young Americans to serve without pay or comfort in a Peace Corps for underdeveloped countries; I have asked many talented individuals to give up a higher income to serve their country in public office (and not all have been willing to do so); and I have asked all Government officials to give up any incompatible financial interest.

I have asked that our excise and corporation tax rate not be permitted to fall as scheduled by law—that trucking companies and jet airline companies pay a higher tax for the highways and airways they use—that our business corporations pay a higher payroll tax for improved Social Security, unemployment compensation and health insurance—and that certain taxpayers give up their privileges of expense account living in yachts, hunting lodges, nightclubs, and all the rest. I have asked all Americans to help meet our deficit through higher postal rates.

These requests for sacrifice are being strongly resisted by some unwilling to pay the price of national greatness.

ECONOMIC APPEALS NOTED

I have asked other Americans to contribute to the strengthening of our economy by paying a decent minimum wage—or to give up their rights to purchase as many duty-free goods when they are traveling abroad—or, if they are farmers, to accept the limitations of our feed grain program. I have asked our businessmen and labor leaders, through my advisory committee, to adopt price and wage levels consistent with our economic goals and need to compete; and, more directly, I have asked them to take steps that will avoid harmful work stoppages in our missile and space effort.

I have asked the newspaper industry, without much success, to exercise more self-restraint in publishing intelligence data helpful to any enemy. My messages on education, urban affairs and natural resources have all stressed the role the local community must assume if we are to make the most of our schools, our cities and our water and other resources. We have made clear our very strong request to employers, labor unions, and indeed all citizens for an end to racial discrimination.

EXCELLENCE THE THEME

I have tried to make the whole tone and thrust of this office and this administration one that will demand a higher standard of excellence from every individual in his private life—in his education, his physical fitness, his attitudes toward foreign visitors, his obligations as a citizen, and all the rest.

And finally, each time we make any move or commitment in foreign affairs, I am in

need of the support of the American people, their understanding, their patience, their willingness to endure setbacks, and risks and hardships in order that this country can regain leadership and initiative.

So I have asked quite a lot of the American people—and I have been gratified at their response. There is much more to be done. But I do not wish to be misinterpreted. I think we have the will as well as the resources to prevail. And I think we will.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with those in the Public Health Service.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations in the Public Health Service will be stated.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUBLICATION OF MILITARY INFORMATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the papers this morning an Associated Press article gives detailed information about the location of Russian missile-launching pads, including one less than 500 miles from Alaska.

Information is also presented about the number of long-range rockets now available to the Soviet Communists.

The article goes on to say:

> At least 10 of the reported missile pads have been identified as launch sites for the Soviet Union's 8,000-mile-range T–3 missile, which carries a thermonuclear warhead.

It then states:

> The United States has determined the location of 14 Russian missile and rocket factories.

The article then says that this information appeared in the May issue of Military Review, a magazine published by the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

The article goes on to present various Russian capabilities in this field, including Soviet missile production capacity. The article closes by giving further rather precise information as to missile launching locations, including one in Poland.

If the information in this article is correct, then information given the Senate by the Central Intelligence Agency is incorrect.

But that is not the point I wish to make in these brief comments. Secretary of Defense McNamara and members of the Senate Armed Services Committee joined recently in criticizing the dissemination of too much military information. But today we have an article, whether right or wrong, emanating from the Department of Defense itself; an article presenting information about missile production and launching pad locations which is the most detailed that I have ever seen.

I am particularly interested this morning, because recently testimony was deleted by the Department of Defense from the galley proof of Senate hearings after the transcript of these hearings had been edited for security; and I have protested the deletion.

Based on the contents on the lengthy passage deleted, it was obvious this was done for public relations reasons only.

We keep from the American people information about broad important policy problems they have the right to know about, at the same time the Department of Defense itself releases detailed information about Russian missilery contrary to that presented the Senate by the CIA in classified hearings.

I suggest to Secretary McNamara, for whom I have the greatest respect, that before there is further criticism from his Department in this field, he examine his own shop.

Again, let me present a simple fact, further illustrated by this recent unfortunate article out of Leavenworth. Regardless of the amount of money spent by the American taxpayer on our security, we will never handle our defenses either efficiently or effectively unless we reorganize the Pentagon building in recognition of progress, instead of continuing to let it drift in tradition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article in question by Mr. Bem Price of the Associated Press be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTY-SEVEN PADS FOR SOVIET MISSILES

(By Bem Price)

WASHINGTON, May 15.—U.S. military leaders believe they know the locations of 37 Soviet missile-launching pads, including one less than 500 miles from Alaska.

And they figure the Russians have 35 to 50 long-range war rockets ready to shoot.

At least 10 of the reported missile pads have been identified as launch sites for the Soviet Union's 8,000-mile-range T–3 missile, which carries a thermonuclear warhead.

Further, the United States has determined the location of 14 Russian missile and rocket factories.

All of this information appears in the May issue of Military Review, a magazine published by the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

The magazine noted that the data have been compiled from unclassified sources and added, "Because of a tight Soviet control over military information, this data is derived from sources which are not necessarily accurate or complete."

In addition to estimating that the Russians have between 35 and 50 long-range missiles ready to shoot, the Military Review figures the Soviet Union is capable of producing up to 200 strategic missiles by the winter of 1961–62.

At latest count, the United States had an estimated 59 ready-to-shoot missiles, including 32 of the submarine-launched Polaris rockets.

Further, said the magazine, "there is some evidence that the U.S.S.R. is prepared to fire strategic missiles from mobile launchers mounted on rail cars."

The rail-mounted missile is believed to be a boost-glide weapon, known as the T–4A. This missile is boosted upward by a rocket engine, then glides to its target like an aircraft. It carries a 3,100-pound payload. The range is not known, but since it is regarded as a strategic weapon it presumably can travel 1,500 miles or more.

In spotting the launching pads, the magazine noted that all are located within the Soviet Union with the exception of one at Seroc, 20 miles north of Warsaw, Poland.

Most of the Russian launch pads appear to be located west of the Ural Mountains, though there is a launch site at Anadyr in Siberia across the Bering Sea from Alaska.

There is, additionally, a concentration on the Siberian mainland just to the northwest of Japan, and on the Sakhalin Islands, due north of Japan.

The sites near Japan are identified by the magazine as Komsomolsk and Nikolaev, in Siberia, and Okha, Terpeniye and Korsakov in the Sakhalins.

There is a heavy concentration of missile launch sites in northern Russia at Kures-saarem Sovetck, Luga, Minsk, Kalinin, Brobruisk, Roslavi, Kiev, and Kola.

In general, however, the launch sites appear to be widely dispersed, including three intercontinental-range launch sites along the extreme southern borders—at Murghab, Alma-Ata and Irkutsk.

VIOLENCE IN ALABAMA

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think the whole country must be deeply shocked, appalled, and indeed ashamed by the evidence of violence which we see again with respect to the so-called freedom riders in the buses in the South.

Mr. President, it seems to me that, whatever one may think about the

undertaking of the mission, these are American citizens, and we have a great tradition of law and order in our country. I know government can only do what it can do consistent with realities, but this principle does not extend to a failure to prosecute those who are guilty of crimes. I hope very much, even if the State of Alabama does not feel it can or should give police protection to these people who are riding in buses in accordance with the laws and the Constitution of the United States, who are entitled to every protection—if the State of Alabama feels the mob is overwhelming its authority and the State cannot exercise it—that the United States will enforce the laws of the United States. We have express criminal laws in this regard.

I think the Attorney General of the United States is showing a commendable initiative in stepping into the situation and I, for one, wish to express my support of him.

Mr. President, I have sent the following telegram to the Attorney General of the United States:

I am deeply shocked and concerned by reports of violence, injury to persons and destruction of property in Alabama involving burning of an interstate bus and attacks on persons in the Birmingham bus terminal. These reported actions constitute clear violation of the civil rights of American citizens and violation of Federal law, including 18 U.S.C. 33 dealing with destruction of interstate motor vehicles, and 18 U.S.C. 241 involving conspiracies against the rights of citizens. There may well be other specific Federal statutes, as well as possible need for further legislation, involved in these situations. I trust no effort will be spared to bring to justice those who took part in these incidents. I would deeply appreciate your advising me as to the plans of the Department of Justice for taking action in these cases.

Mr. President, I hope very much that those who are guilty of violations of the law will be prosecuted. I hope very much the country will take note of what these struggles mean and how they are attended by violence, by personal injury, and by disgrace to the good name of the United States throughout the world. I hope very much these ideas may also have their effect upon the decent citizens of the States in which these terrible acts are taking place.

STATE DEPARTMENT BLUNDER IN CUBAN CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there was published in the May 14, 1961, issue of the Herald Tribune an article written by a highly respected journalist, Rowland Evans, Jr., entitled, "State Department Blundered in Cuban Crisis."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE DEPARTMENT BLUNDERED IN CUBAN CRISIS—FAILURE TO BRIEF CONGRESS COULD HAVE HAD SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES

(By Rowland Evans, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy did his part to consolidate the Nation, and a good deal more, in the gloomy aftermath of the Cuba fiasco. He consulted more high-level Republicans than you could shake a stick at, and he stamped out the wildfire of partisan attack before it could be started in earnest.

But the State Department was mesmerized, or something close to it, and couldn't seem to pick itself off the floor on the morning after. It failed utterly and dangerously to do its own job of consulting with Congress.

As a result, the Secretary, Dean Rusk, was required to go before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, headed by the aggressive WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, a man who knows a Senator's right when he sees it. And Allen W. Dulles of the CIA, who would rather not attend meetings of that kind, was likewise compelled to spend several hours with the full Foreign Relations Committee the following day.

As it happened, both Mr. Rusk, the amateur, and Mr. Dulles, the pro, acquitted themselves well, but either might easily have slipped during his long question-and-answer session with the most powerful committee of Congress. And if they had, the administration might then have come face to face with a full-scale investigation of the kind that the Democrats forced on former President Eisenhower last year when the U–2 fiasco torpedoed the summit conference.

LEADS TO TROUBLE

Consultation, or sharing part of the secret, with the proud and prerogative-conscious Senate is a vital aspect of the political game. Failure to know this and act upon it is to open a Pandora's box of unwanted and unnecessary troubles, and to exacerbate the very difficulties that need curing.

The Cuban invasion was launched on Sunday night, April 16. The State Department did not make an effort to get in touch with Senator MORSE, the chairman of the subcommittee that is directly responsible for Latin-American affairs, until April 26, more than a week later—and then only in response to Senator MORSE's second urgent telegram asking for information.

The first MORSE message, a telegram to Secretary Rusk asking for a briefing "in keeping with the spirit of the advice and consent clause" of the Constitution, was not even acknowledged, so far as can be determined. And yet it never should have had to be sent. Mr. Rusk and his lieutenants should have reacted automatically to the automatic need to tell the top men of Congress what was going on. The reaction should have been reflex, not forced by a telegram asking for news of what happened.

Senator MORSE dispatched his first appeal for information on April 24. When no reply came, he sent his second on April 26, this one asking Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles to come up and talk to the subcommittee on April 28. But Mr. Bowles replied that he couldn't make it.

Until that moment, Senator MORSE was punctilious in refraining from anything resembling pressure tactics. He knew that Messrs. Rusk and Bowles had a major crisis on their hands. He did not want to obstruct or confuse or get in the way.

ALMOST BLEW TOP

But when he got Mr. Bowles' refusal, he almost blew his top—and for a very interesting reason. He knew that high officials in the administration, including Mr. Bowles and Chip Bohlen and MacGeorge Bundy and others, had been briefing large numbers of editors in the State Department auditorium on the inside story of Cuba. He also knew that some of his Senate colleagues were seriously embarrassed when they were asked by these same editors to give their assessment of the scene behind the scene—and had to beg off because they had never been shown a glimpse of it.

This was not touching Senate pride, but trampling on it. With a couple of exceptions, the Foreign Relations Committee was angry. The exceptions were the chairman, Senator FULBRIGHT, who was the only Member of Congress let in on the secret of the invasion before it happened; and the Democratic leaders, Senator MANSFIELD, and Senator HUMPHREY, who had gotten the word at their regular legislative breakfast with President Kennedy on April 18.

Under these circumstances, it is scarcely surprising that Senator MORSE made his speech in the Senate condemning the whole enterprise (the first Member to raise the issue on the floor of either House): Nor is it surprising that he then demanded the presence of Mr. Dulles.

MOST IMPORTANT

The Cuban affair was the most important event ever to happen within the jurisdiction of the Morse subcommittee. Except for what they picked up in the newspapers, neither the Morse subcommittee nor the full committee had heard a word about it.

A good argument can be made, and often has been, against consulting Members of Congress before an undertaking as risky and as clandestine as the Cuban invasion.

What is not accepted, and should not be acceptable in a government that divides its powers among separate branches, is failure to consult after the event, and particularly at a time when every visiting editor, and every enterprising reporter, were getting selected versions of the inside story from the top.

Relationships between the competing power blocs in Washington are sometimes decided irrevocably by errors of no larger dimension than this one, and the result can be mean for the offending party. This time, no damage was done. But, next time, it may be different.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that every responsible official of this Government, starting with the President of the United States, and including his White House advisers; the Secretary of State and the advisers in the State Department; Mr. Dulles, the head of the CIA, and all the advisers of the CIA; the Secretary of Defense, and all his advisers in the Pentagon Building, will read and take careful note of the very wise observations Mr. Evans has made in the article which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD.

THE FINANCIAL PROBLEM CONFRONTING THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] has earned a reputation as a man of a commandingly sound judgment in the field of finance. Grounded in the twin principles of fiscal responsibility and a balanced economy, my esteemed colleague has untiringly supported the free competitive-enterprise system responsible for the preeminence of this Nation.

Last Thursday, before the Delaware Bankers Association in Wilmington, the Senator discussed, "The Financial Problem Confronting Us." As he forthrightly declared:

It is the task of our generation to see that Western civilization is preserved in the clash that was foreseen so clearly by De Tocqueville. Sound monetary policy and fiscal responsibility are all-important for the preservation of the heritage we cherish and would pass on to our sons and daughters.

Mr. President, I recommend the analysis by the Senator from Maryland of our financial status to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. They will find it, as with all statements of the Senator from Maryland, based on fact, statistics, and commonsense. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the speech entitled, "The Financial Problem Confronting Us," by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objections, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FINANCIAL PROBLEM CONFRONTING US

As a Senator from a neighboring State, I take great pleasure in accepting your invitation to participate in the convention of the Delaware Bankers Association.

I have a particularly warm feeling for Delaware inasmuch as it was the first State to ratify the Constitution on December 7, 1787. My own State of Maryland was not far behind. It was the seventh, and ratified the Constitution on April 28, 1788.

I know that you expect me to discuss issues of finance and economics inasmuch as I have been honored by my colleagues by being appointed a member of the Finance Committee and the Joint Economic Committee. Discussion is certainly needed these days when so many of our young people in our schools receive only one point of view.

Furthermore, there are far too many individuals today who are attempting to make economics an exact science. Their efforts are doomed to failure because economics by its very nature must respond to the wishes of the people. All economic decisions involving taxes, money, and banking are the ultimate result of the legislative process. If that endeavor is sound, then our economy will move forward; otherwise we will retrogress and, in due course, might lose our position of world leadership.

One of the most influential private organizations upon which legislators like myself depend is the American Economic Association, which was founded by Francis A. Walker, who was president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1881.

Unlike those who presently claim to be economists, President Walker realized that economics and politics in the best sense of that word were inextricably entwined. Hence, until very recent times students in many institutions took courses in political economy rather than in economics.

I would like to touch briefly on the mode of teaching economics at MIT because so many of those who are the financial and industrial leaders of your State receive their education at that institution.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology is now celebrating its centennial. An article in the Boston Sunday Herald, rotogravure section, in its issue of October 30, 1960, stated, and I quote:

"The social sciences made their first appearance as a byproduct of the appointment in 1881 of a distinguished economist, Francis A. Walker, as president of the institute. Despite his administrative duties and many outside activities, President Walker found time to give a popular lecture course in political economy and to write a textbook that became the most widely used one in the country."

Although MIT was a new school with many problems, President Walker found time to organize the American Economic Association and was its president from 1886 to 1892. I have emphasized this quotation because you will note that the original course which President Walker gave was known as one in political economy and not economics.

Many of the principles that have been espoused by the Democratic Party, which has been charged by the people of the United States with their economic destiny for the next 4 years, were supposedly formulated by Thomas Jefferson. There may be those who believe that he was opposed to those ideas and ideals which you and I hold so dear. Nothing could be further from the truth.

On the contrary, one of Jefferson's closest friends was E. I. du Pont, who founded the industry that has made your State known throughout the world. Although he was born in France and lived under a series of tyrannies, both he and his father, Pierre Samuel du Pont, finally came to the United States to establish our first military installations at the direct invitation of Thomas Jefferson.

Prior to his emigration to America, E. I. du Pont played an important role in facilitating our negotiations with the French for the purchase of Louisiana. Prof. Louis M. Hacker, of Columbia University, one of America's leading historians, in his book "The Shaping of the American Tradition," stated that:

"In the spring of 1802, the retrocession of Louisiana became generally known in America, though it had been the subject of anxious reports in the dispatches Secretary of State Madison was receiving from Rufus King in London and Robert R. Livingston at Paris. Jefferson's letter to Livingston shows how he regarded the situation. The United States could not stand alone in this crisis. Beneath his plans for shifts of diplomacy, one may read Jefferson's fears for the safety of democracy in America. Through his friend du Pont de Nemours, Jefferson attempted to convince the First Consul of the danger in which the occupation of Louisiana would put France."

We can perceive therefore the important role that one of your leading earlier citizens played in expanding our boundaries and establishing America as a continental power.

But even before the Du Pont family came to Delaware to establish their powder works, there was a constant clash in the United States with regard to monetary and fiscal policy. In fact, during the Revolution itself there were those who believed that the Original Colonies could issue all of the paper currency they wished without any regard for its value abroad or its ultimate redemption.

George Washington, although he was willing to sacrifice his entire estate in a common cause, would not consent to be ruined by accepting worthless currency issued by colonies with no fiscal responsibility. He said: "Speculation, peculation, and an insatiable thirst for riches seem to have got the better of every other consideration, and almost of every order of men."

Actually, throughout our history there have been two theories as to how to become a prosperous and wealthy nation. One of them which has been practiced so well here in your great State is that of producing new goods and services that add to the well-being of our people. The other which has been repeated at frequent intervals throughout our history is to perform a feat of "money magic" and issue more currency, thereby making ourselves "wealthy" though there is no production to match the added money.

I wish to make it abundantly clear that I am not challenging the vital role which the banking fraternity plays through the wise extension of credit. I am only concerned with its abuse. I am also concerned with excessive taxation which has reached the punitive stage and is siphoning off funds for projects of dubious value, thus making it more difficult for those with enterprise to accumulate real capital and provide a solid base upon which the banking fraternity is able to extend sound and abundant credit.

The members of this distinguished group who manage Delaware's leading banks have successfully provided their customers with adequate credit to meet their needs. This has been difficult since you have endeavored to restrain those inflationary forces which could destroy our way of life and still enable your customers to grow and prosper.

Money and banking are complex subjects to many people. It is therefore not surprising that throughout our history political conflicts have raged over these basic economic issues. These conflicts arose immediately after our Government was established. Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, proposed an act to establish the credit of our new Nation. Throughout the Revolutionary War, the Continental Congress—which mobilized the military and economic efforts of the Thirteen Original Colonies—had issued an almost unlimited quantity of paper money. It became worthless, and its low esteem as a medium of exchange led to the familiar phrase "not worth a continental."

Among other immediate fiscal reforms, Alexander Hamilton also urged the establishment of the first Bank of the United States. It was chartered in February 1791. However, its life was brief, and those who believed that easy credit was a basis for their salvation made sure that its charter was not renewed when it expired in 1811.

Shortly thereafter, our Nation was involved in the War of 1812, accompanied by new inflationary pressures. Following the conclusion of that conflict, a second Bank of the United States was established on April 10, 1816. It provided a mechanism to maintain a uniform currency. The legislation which made this step possible required that all money payments to the Government should be either in gold or silver, or in bank notes which were redeemable in these precious metals.

Again, those who sought easy prosperity through inflation of the currency were not idle. They described that bank as, and I quote, "the monster." Its existence became a political football. When its charter expired in 1836, during the administration of Andrew Jackson, it was not renewed.

For many years thereafter, our country was confused by a variety of conflicting opinions with respect to monetary and banking matters. A momentous battle arose after the Civil War when the Federal Government attempted to redeem the "greenbacks" which had been issued without any gold or silver reserves behind them.

Your predecessors knew that foreign lenders would not undertake the task of providing funds to develop our growing economy until financial stability was restored. However, once again financial sanity did not prevail for very long and, on February 4, 1868, the Congress suspended further retirement of the greenbacks.

In spite of the lack of the communication media we now enjoy, our generation is fortunate that thoughtful citizens continued to press for currency reform. Their efforts were rewarded on February 12, 1873, when the Congress adopted a Coinage Act, which limited the free coinage of silver. Shortly thereafter, a depression ensued which the advocates of easy money quickly attributed to this act as well as the financial interests which had supported it. This legislation soon became known as, and I quote, "the crime of 1873."

For the next 6 years debates on monetary policy dominated all political discussions. They culminated with the passage of the Bland-Allison Act, which authorized the purchase of up to $4 million worth of silver each month for coinage into dollars at a fixed ratio related to gold of 16 to 1. It was vetoed by President Hayes, a Republican, but in less than 24 hours, it was enacted into law over his veto as there was a

Democratic House of Representatives and a Senate that was closely divided.

Once again, however, there were citizens with understanding and persistence who supported the efforts of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Sherman. On January 1, 1879, he undertook the difficult task of resuming specie payment and redeeming the greenbacks. Sound monetary and financial views prevailed for many years, but any student of American history knows that the financial and business leaders during the latter part of the last century played a vital role in attaining this objective.

I am sure that everyone here is familiar with the oratory which marked the Democratic National Convention held in Chicago in July of 1896. William Jennings Bryan of Nebraska, a "dark horse" for the Presidency, was nominated after his famous "Cross of Gold" speech on behalf of the free coinage of silver. In spite of his persuasiveness, our country continued the sound financial policies which had been established, and thereby developed a strong, free-enterprise economy.

To be sure, our banking system continued to face great problems. They culminated in the panic of 1907. By that time, however, we had become sufficiently mature that our political leaders did not lose their heads. Instead they established a monetary commission under the Aldrich-Vreeland Act to make a comprehensive study of the changes needed in the Nation's money and banking mechanism. In 1913 the work of this commission bore fruit with the establishment of the Federal Reserve System under the leadership of Carter Glass and President Woodrow Wilson.

Recently, the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, concluded an extended series of hearings and filed its report with the Congress. I am distressed that the majority members, in their views with regard to the expected Federal budget deficit, stated that:

"While we recognize that all of the proposed programs have been carefully chosen and proposed spending of a strategic kind, we cannot help noting that in view of the serious gap in our economy and the evident inability of monetary policies to play a counterrecessionary role, the magnitude of the expected deficits does not fully accord with expectations for vigorous use of countercyclical fiscal policies."

In other words, we now have some very fancy economic theories to justify the same kind of loose thinking that was the basis for the issue of unlimited money by the original Colonies of the greenbacks as well as Bryan's campaign for free silver.

I feel that the arguments advanced by the majority in the Joint Economic Report necessitate a return to the use of the term "political economy" in lieu of economics. There can be little question but that what is being proposed in their statements are political measures which have slight bearing on the economics of production of goods and services upon which the welfare of our people depends.

All of you are concerned with our present problems involving the balance of payments. I do not profess to be a prophet, but it is a fact that on March 21, 1959, some 2 years ago, in an address in Pittsburgh, I stated that: "American citizens are not permitted to convert paper dollars into gold; however, foreigners have this opportunity. In recent years we have been providing them with dollar resources to enable them to draw on our gold balances. Unless we maintain competitive prices in world markets and bring about a balance in terms of our international payments our economy is headed for serious trouble.

"In 1948 U.S. gold stocks reached a postwar high of $24.6 billion. At the end of last year they stood at $20.6 billion, a decline of $4 billion. The reduction in 1958 alone totaled $2.3 billion. In fact, the monthly figures show a falling gold stock for every month since January 1958. While a $20 billion gold stock provides an adequate base for our currency, it must be self-evident that a decline of about 10 percent a year can no longer continue without completely destroying our own economic system. This, perhaps, is the best way for us to fully appreciate the impact of unsound economic policies, since an excess of demands for dollar payments abroad over purchases from us will sooner or later be reflected in our monetary reserves."

If we are to maintain our government of individual liberty, it is necessary that a large portion of the efforts of each of us continues to be dedicated to our personal satisfactions and to the formation of capital. This is not a function that can be met through Government loans or largess. In my supplemental views to the Joint Economic Report, I stated that:

"The total cost of Government is approximately $157.5 billion. If this is compared with the national income estimates for 1960 of $418.4 billion, it appears that Government is absorbing 37.6 percent of the earnings of the American people. On the other hand, this only leaves 62.4 percent of our national income for investment in private enterprise as well as for all of our personal needs. A serious question is raised as to whether it is possible to operate a private enterprise economy under such conditions."

I also said:

"Although complete and detailed data of Federal tax receipts by income classes are not available beyond 1957, an examination of the basic allocation of tax receipts towards certain Federal programs is most revealing.

"On the expenditure side are listed the items in terms of priority. Interest payments must be met if the Government is to remain solvent. General Government expenditures are shown next; major national security is our next order of priority; international affairs and finance come next; followed by veterans' services and benefits. Then other domestic programs are considered in their order of interest to the Congress, such as agriculture and agricultural resources, labor and welfare, commerce and housing, and natural resources.

"On the receipt side are listed the income by source in the following order: First, there is income from corporation income taxes, then excise taxes; followed by estate, gift, customs, and miscellaneous taxes; and then the receipts from the personal income taxes, which are shown in terms of income tax brackets. This [analysis] reveals some startling facts. If the first four expenditure items are taken; namely, interest payments, general Government expenses, major national security programs, and international affairs and finance expenditures in the year 1957—we find that they preempted all of the receipts from the corporate income tax, all the excise, estate, and gift taxes, customs and miscellaneous receipts, as well as the receipts from personal individual income taxes down to the $7,000 to $8,000 brackets. By adding the next two priorities of budget expenditures—veterans' services and benefits and agriculture and agricultural resources—we then find the Congress has authorized the use of the receipts from all corporate income taxes, excise, estate, and gift taxes, customs, and miscellaneous receipts, as well as the payments to the Federal Government through personal income taxes down to the $5,000 bracket. Expenditures for labor and welfare, commerce and housing, and natural resources were paid for by taxes received from those citizens with taxable incomes of less than $5,000."

I hope that I have not been too partisan in my statement before this audience. In fact, although I am a Republican, I regard the book entitled "Constitutional Government in the United States," by Woodrow Wilson, as one of the finest texts on the functions of our Federal Government that has ever been written. I have no doubt but that Woodrow Wilson and Thomas Jefferson would be the first to repudiate some of the ideas that have been advanced in their names.

At the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles last July, a platform was written entitled "The Rights of Man," which was presumably taken from Thomas Jefferson's first inaugural address. Once again, it is enlightening to look at the record. Jefferson's address is quite different from what our friends who take such delight in quoting from America's early statesmen tell us. In this address, Thomas Jefferson said:

"A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, which shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities."

I heartily commend the statements of those who founded the Democratic Party to the officials who today are attempting to direct our economic destiny. At no time in our history has it been so important for us to maintain a position of strength and leadership, not only for ourselves but for the Western World.

Communism has made no attempt to delude us as to its ultimate objective. It is simple—world conquest.

In closing, I would like to read one final quotation from one of the greatest students of our form of government who has ever lived, Alexis de Tocqueville. He said:

"There are at the present time two great nations in the world, which started from different points, but seem to tend toward the same end. I allude to the Russians and the Americans. Both of them have grown up unnoticed; and while the attention of mankind was directed elsewhere, they have suddenly placed themselves in the front rank among the nations, and the world learned their existence and their greatness at almost the same time.

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All the others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. The American struggles against the obstacles that nature opposes to him; the adversaries of the Russian are men. The former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its arms. The conquests of the American are therefore gained by the plowshare; those of the Russian by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unguided strength and commonsense of the people; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of Heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

It might interest you to know that this statement was made more than 100 years ago. It is the task of our generation to see that Western civilization is preserved in the clash that was foreseen so clearly by Alexis de Tocqueville. Sound monetary policy and fiscal responsibility are all-important for the preservation of the heritage we cherish, and would pass on to our sons and daughters.

IRRESPONSIBLE PROCUREMENT POLICIES AND LACK OF CONTROL OVER INVENTORIES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Comptroller General recently sent two reports to the Congress calling our attention again to the irresponsible procurement policies and almost complete lack of control over inventories in the Defense Department.

In his more recent report of May 10, he tells us how the Air Force spent $465,000 for spare parts it did not need while at about the same time the Navy had from 25 to 50 percent of first-line fighter aircraft grounded in Japan because of a lack of parts. In addition, he said, through loose procurement practices, the Navy was buying more parts for planes it did not have, and had "lost" about $1.3 million worth of material in its supply system.

In this latter case, it was reported that the San Antonio Air Materiel Area overstated its requirements for procurement and repair of certain engine parts by more than $2 million. The Comptroller General said:

As a result about $456,000 worth of spare parts were bought unnecessarily by SAAMA in fiscal year 1959.

This is just another example of the laxity in procurement and inventory accounting on the part of the military services.

While these may be isolated instances, they form over the years a clear pattern of a lack of good inventory accounting procedures by the services, as well as an apparent lack of any interest in doing anything about it.

Several weeks ago, the Comptroller General described another careless situation which resulted in a serious lack of spare parts at the Marine Corps air facility, Iwakuni, Japan. This was under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department.

The Comptroller General said that his review of the loose inventory practices at this base in Japan showed that—

A relatively high percentage of the aircraft of the 1st Marine Aircraft Wing were out of commission because parts needed to keep them in operating condition were not available in the Navy supply system in Japan.

The Comptroller General also said:

For example, from 25 to 50 percent of firstline fighter aircraft were grounded for lack of parts. We found this condition existing even though the air facility at Iwakuni had an inventory of aviation material and spare parts amounting to over $6.2 million and over $1.2 million worth of material that was not needed was being ordered from the United States.

The Comptroller General stated:

We found, for example, that essential aircraft parts such as valve assemblies had not been stocked in Japan for periods ranging from 9 to 22 months, while, on the other hand, orders had been placed for items such as transmission assemblies costing over $32 thousand for support of aircraft no longer assigned to the air facility in Japan.

He went on:

As a further indication of the deficiencies in the supply system, we found that a physical inventory taken by the air facility disclosed that the value of aviation material on hand totaled over $6.2 million as compared to the recorded inventory of over $4.9 million. The difference of about $1.3 million between the physical inventory and the recorded inventory represents material which, in effect, was lost in the supply system.

Such loose control over inventories by the Defense Department result not only in an indefensible waste of taxpayers' dollars but also it is a serious threat to our military preparedness.

These two reports, one under date of May 10, and the other March 17, are but continued examples of such loose practices, and the time is long past due when we can accept from the Defense Department the simple explanation that they will try to do better.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD the letters summarizing both of these reports as sent to the Congress under dates of March 17, 1961, and May 10, 1961, and I strongly recommend that every Member of Congress read these reports in their entirety.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed is our report on review of supply management activities of the Marine Corps Air Facility, Iwakuni, Japan, Department of the Navy.

Our review disclosed that a relatively high percentage of the aircraft of the 1st Marine Aircraft Wing were out of commission because parts needed to keep them in operating condition were not available in the Navy supply system in Japan. For example, from 25 to 50 percent of firstline fighter aircraft were grounded for lack of parts. We found this condition existing even though the air facility at Iwakuni had an inventory of aviation material and spare parts amounting to over $6.2 million and over $1.2 million worth of material that was not needed was being ordered from the United States. We found, for example, that essential aircraft parts such as valve assemblies had not been stocked in Japan for periods ranging from 9 to 22 months; while, on the other hand, orders had been placed for items such as transmission assemblies costing over $32,000 for support of aircraft no longer assigned to the air facility in Japan.

As a further indication of the deficiencies in the supply system, we found that a physical inventory taken by the air facility disclosed that the value of aviation material on hand totaled over $6.2 million as compared to the recorded inventory of over $4.9 million. The difference of about $1.3 million between the physical inventory and the recorded inventory represents material which, in effect, was "lost" in the supply system.

As a result of our findings, action has been taken to cancel the requisitions for $1.2 million worth of unneeded material. We have been informed also that corrective action has been initiated on a number of measures we proposed to remedy the deficiencies we noted in supply control. If properly implemented, this action should improve the supply conditions in Japan. We were further advised that appropriate steps were being taken which should improve supply support to aircraft units in the Far East and in the future should keep to a minimum the number of aircraft out of commission for lack of parts.

This report is also being sent today to the President of the Senate. Copies are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Navy.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1961.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed is our report on review of reciprocating engine spare parts procurement and repair requirements at the San Antonio Air Materiel Area (SAAMA), Air Materiel Command, Department of the Air Force.

Our review disclosed that SAAMA's fiscal year 1959 and 1960 requirements for the procurement and the repair of reciprocating engine spare parts were overstated by almost $2 million. This was due to SAAMA's failure, when computing these requirements, either (1) to take into consideration more than $1.4 million worth of Government-owned spare parts in the hands of engine overhaul contractors; or (2) to revise spare parts repair schedules in accordance with latest program changes. As a result, about $456,000 worth of spare parts were bought unnecessarily by SAAMA in fiscal year 1959. SAAMA officials became aware of the condition early in 1959, when they learned that the overprocurement was caused by their reliance, in computing requirements, on the deficient report by a contractor of Air Force assets it had on hand. By that time, however, it was too late to permit economical termination of the 1959 procurement contract.

Notwithstanding the knowledge gained from this experience, SAAMA officials relied on incomplete contractors' reports in computing their fiscal year 1960 requirements. As a result of this reliance, together with a contractor's failure to ship reclaimed parts promptly to the depot, SAAMA planned to buy more spare parts than it needed. When we brought this to the attention of SAAMA officials, they were able to reduce computed requirements for that year by $441,000 before procurement action had been initiated. Our disclosures also caused SAAMA officials to adjust their spare parts repair schedules so as to prevent an unnecessary expenditure of over $1 million for the repair of parts in excess of Air Force needs.

In commenting on our findings, which we brought to the attention of agency officials, the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Materiel) stated that his office believes that the deficiencies disclosed in our examination will be remedied for the most part by the requirements adjustments made by Air Force officials at SAAMA and by procedural changes made by these officials to provide greater control over requirements computations. Although the Air Force has taken corrective actions to remedy the deficiencies we found at SAAMA, we are recommending that the Secretary of the Air Force bring this report to the attention of all Air Force officials responsible for making requirements computations at other AMA's so that all available assets will be considered when computing future requirements, thereby avoiding overstated requirements and unnecessary buying.

This report is also being sent to the President of the Senate. Copies are being sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Air Force.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, World War II and the years since its termination have been tragic for some 17 million Rumanians in their historic homeland. They were among the first to be involved in the world conflagration, and they were also among the first to be caught in the claws of the Soviet Union's aggressive totalitarianism. In this respect, their history during the last two decades has not been a happy one.

Most of Rumania's modern history has been tragic, but it has also had its heroic intervals. Centuries ago the country was overrun and subjected to the rule of the Ottoman Turks.

But Rumanians refused to be reconciled to the oppressive yoke of the alien regime and fought back with all the means at their disposal. And they always looked forward to the day when they could cast off that yoke.

More than 100 years ago the Crimean War offered them this chance. At the end of that war—in 1856—they first attained autonomous status. Then in 1877 they seized upon another chance, and proclaimed their independence on May 10 of that year.

This year they celebrated the 84th anniversary of that independence day, which they rightly regard as their true national holiday.

CURTAILMENT OF NONESSENTIAL DOMESTIC PROGRAMS IN FAVOR OF NEEDED NATIONAL DEFENSE-TYPE EXPENDITURES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, several weeks ago, I pointed out my concern over the fact that, as a result of proposals by the administration, we were facing a budget deficit of at least $2 billion for fiscal years 1961 and 1962—without any regard for increases in our national defense effort. It seems to me to be very shortsighted to take further action to aggravate our national budget situation before acting on all appropriations for national defense and space activities. In the May 10 issue of the Wall Street Journal there is an excellent editorial pointing out the need to curtail our national spending policies with respect to nonessential domestic programs in favor of needed national defense-type expenditures, and that such restraint on the part of both the administration and the Congress will be required if the American people are to be persuaded that sacrifices on their part are necessary. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEED TO CHOOSE

No one, we suppose, is under any lingering illusion about the costs of exploration and national defense in the years ahead; those costs promise to skyrocket.

President Kennedy has just spoken of a bigger space effort. Annual outlays for civilian space work alone will probably more than triple, to $3 billion, within a very few years, this newspaper has reported. Military spending, already consuming more than half the national budget, will also continue to rise; for one reason, the engines of war grow more costly as they grow more complex.

Whether all the prospective increases in defense and space spending are absolutely necessary is something few of us are in a position to judge, though all would agree that whatever is necessary must be spent. But the prospect does raise what former Vice President Nixon calls a fundamental issue, an issue all but overlooked by most commentators and most people in Washington.

The issue, as Mr. Nixon puts it, is "how our national effort is being mobilized to meet the threat to our existence. For example, the new administration has made proposals which would impose upon the Nation, over a 2-year period, an additional $10 billion in new obligational authority, with the result that we shall have a new deficit of at least $5 billion even if revenues are estimated on the optimistic side.

"Of this new total of $15 billion in spending and obligations, less than one-third is to be spent for defense and national security over and above the Eisenhower estimates. Fully $11 billion is budgeted for spending and obligational authority in nonmilitary areas such as health, welfare, education, housing and public works."

Opinions naturally differ about the merits of these new domestic spending proposals; our own opinion is that most of those presented or enacted so far are remarkably ill conceived even in terms of their ostensible aims. There is no doubt at all, however, that they are extremely expensive and that they will grow still more expensive in the later years when defense and space costs will also be much higher.

And when the Government is already heading into deeper deficits, it takes no great economic foresight to see the inflation that is being built up for the future. Among its many other evils, such inflation would of course boost still more the costs of all the things, including defense and space work, which the Government is trying to do.

Even if the various new or enlarged domestic programs were desirable in themselves, the necessity for choice is inescapable. President Kennedy and most Americans believe international communism's threat is grave and getting worse; then the priority belongs on meeting the threat. The Nation cannot undertake all these things as well and still maintain a strong economy which is the foundation of military strength.

The President recently referred to what he regards as a kind of collective American unwillingness to do the things that must be done in the face of the Communist threat. We do not believe such unwillingness exists; on the contrary, we think the people are perfectly prepared for greater sacrifices if needed to preserve their freedom and their Nation.

What many people are perhaps unwilling to countenance, in a time of international peril and domestic inflationary danger, is business as usual in Washington—this splurge of new billions for political handouts. That is not a particularly noble cause for which to pay still higher taxes or suffer more inflation or both.

The United States has never been, and we think is not now, a nation of children incapable of understanding the need for choice. The choice today is as simple as it is fundamental. In Mr. Nixon's words, "before we embark on any new spending programs at home, we should put first things first * * * so that we can meet the increased threat of Communist aggression."

If the Kennedy administration and the compatible Congress would restrain their extravagance for the nonessentials, they would be able to see clearly America's willingness to sacrifice for the essentials.

STEVENSON'S 100 DAYS AT THE U.N.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently an article entitled "Stevenson's First 100 Days at U.N.: Diplomacy Endures Despite Strife," by Mr. William R. Frye, United Nations correspondent for the Christian Science Monitor was published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune issue of April 30, 1961.

The article by Mr. Frye gives a fine accounting of the statesmanship of Mr. Stevenson at the United Nations. It tells us the great work that Mr. Stevenson has undertaken to cooperate with the new countries that are now represented at the United Nations. I quote one or two paragraphs. Speaking of Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Frye said:

He survived—and survived well. Looking back on the past 100 days, three major threads can be detected:

Stevenson sought to identify the United States with anticolonial Africa and Asia, at the same time minimizing, where he could, the damage to traditional American alliances with Europe and Latin America.

He sought to establish a line of communication, if not yet of meaningful negotiation, with the Soviet delegation.

He opened up for reconsideration traditional United States policies, tactics and viewpoints, giving other delegates a welcome impression of flexibility and openmindedness.

The article concludes with this evaluation, to which I fully subscribe:

The consensus here is that the United States is represented in the U.N. by a man of exceptional stature.

Adlai Stevenson is a tower of strength for American diplomacy at the United Nations. He works in close cooperation and harmony with our friends, associates, and allies at the U.N. He does credit not only to himself but to the President of the United States and to our Nation by his exemplary service.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I have referred, which was published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, issue of April 30, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEVENSON'S FIRST 100 DAYS AT U.N.: DIPLOMACY ENDURES DESPITE STRIFE

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The first 100 days of Adlai E. Stevenson at the United Nations have been tumultuous, frustrating, and inconclusive in all respects but one. That one: Stevenson is a master of the diplomatic trade.

The new U.S. delegate to the U.N. scarcely had time to dust off his desk last January before a major Congo crisis blew up in his face as a result of the murder of Patrice Lumumba. Much of the next 3 months found him in the midst of one challenge after another.

He survived—and survived well. Looking back on the past 100 days, three major threads can be detected:

Stevenson sought to identify the United States with anticolonial Africa and Asia, at the same time minimizing, where he could, the damage to traditional American alliances with Europe and Latin America.

He sought to establish a line of communication, if not yet of meaningful negotiation, with the Soviet delegation.

He opened up for reconsideration traditional U.S. policies, tactics, and viewpoints, giving other delegates a welcome impression of flexibility and openmindedness. Also he introduced a new dimension of subtlety and literary style into American public utterances here.

Stevenson had the advantage of an extraordinary reputation preceding him. In a sense, this reputation was also a handicap, in that his every utterance was expected to be in iambic pentameter, and no man could live up to such a standard. But in general, it was an asset to have U.N. delegates viewing him through rose-tinted spectacles.

Soon after he arrived, the usually blase Secretariat News, house organ of Dag Hammarskjold's international civil service, passed along to its readers a highly complimentary bit of Stevensoniana. The new U.S. delegate, it said, had been asked how he managed to avoid the deleterious effects of so much popular adulation.

"Oh," he was quoted as replying, "it's all right so long as you don't inhale." The attitude behind publication of this story was as significant as the story itself.

Stevenson began his tenure with important personal and policy approaches to the Africans. He paid them elaborate courtesies, sought them out socially, asked their advice. More important, he followed that advice, at least in certain respects.

The U.S. Congo policy underwent subtle but significant changes in directions desired by the moderate Africans. A U.S. aid plan for Africa, first presented by the Eisenhower administration, was followed up.

Stevenson sided with the Africans and Asians against Portugal on freedom for Angola. He denounced South African racial segregation.

Meanwhile the United States and India began cooperating more closely, to mutual advantage.

It was not all gravy, however. Latin Americans, envious of the attention given to Africa and fearful that help to that continent would cut into their aid, began to sulk.

They staged a revolt against paying their share of the Congo peace operation, and had to be bought off with 80 percent rebates, largely financed by the United States.

Whether out of deference to Latin fears or for other reasons, Stevenson pulled back slightly on the Africa aid plan—and a disappointed Africa began to complain. Jaja Wachuku of Nigeria delivered two bitter anti-American tirades, rubbing much of the gloss off the earlier honeymoon.

Meanwhile, Stevenson took a new look at issues involving the Russians. He tried to reach a broad understanding with them early in March for a moratorium on the cold war in the U.N.

The negotiations were not entirely successful but he and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko did eliminate certain embarrassments for the United States and produced circumstances which led to a dropping of Hungary and Tibet, at least until September.

Critics called this softness to the Communists. Others felt it was flexibility in conditions where the United States had much to gain from a temporary cease-fire on some propaganda fronts.

The Cuban crisis presented Stevenson with his most serious problem. He had a mountainous task, defending the U.S. position in an action of which virtually everyone else in the U.N. disapproved—some including Latin Americans.

Nevertheless, by eloquence and patient lobbying, he succeeded in shunting the General Assembly into an empty exhortation for peace. Stronger criticism was shelved, though not until after the United States had taken a bad tongue lashing and a 44 to 7 rebuke in committee for giving bases to the anti-Castro rebels.

This, plus an Arab explosion against American support of Israel, represented Stevenson's principal setbacks. He scored on the Congo, on relations with India, and—despite Wachuku—on friendship with the new Africans.

The consensus here is that the United States is represented in the U.N. by a man of exceptional stature.

THE ALTERNATIVE TO COMMUNISM IS A LIBERAL AND PROGRESSIVE SOCIETY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe that one of the most penetrating and thought-provoking articles I have ever read was printed in the Washington Post on May 9, under the byline of Mr. Walter Lippmann. Mr. Lippmann is one of our great economists and a noted political scientist. The article is entitled "To Ourselves Be True."

I suggest that this is a credo for American diplomacy. What Mr. Lippmann tells us is that "we cannot compete with communism in Asia, Africa, or Latin America if we go on doing what we have done so often and so widely—which is to place the weak countries in a dilemma where they must stand still with us and our client rulers, or start moving with the Communists. This dilemma cannot be dissolved unless it is our central and persistent and unswerving policy to offer these unhappy countries a third option, which is economic development and social improvement without the totalitarian discipline of communism. For the only real alternative to communism is a liberal and progressive society."

I believe what Mr. Lippmann is saying to us is that we all too often seem to be fighting the wrong war. We are fighting communism in areas where communism does not even exist, when, in fact, the real war of today is the war against poverty, illiteracy, and misery. It is that war which, if we put our minds to it, we can win and we ought to win.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO OURSELVES BE TRUE

(By Walter Lippmann)

We have been forced to ask ourselves recently how a free and open society can compete with a totalitarian state. This is a crucial question. Can our Western society survive and flourish if it remains true to its own faith and principles? Or must it abandon them in order to fight fire with fire?

There are those who believe that in Cuba the attempt to fight fire with fire would have succeeded if only the President had been more ruthless and had had no scruples about using American forces. I think they are wrong. I think that success for the Cuban adventure was impossible. In a free society like ours a policy is bound to fail which deliberately violates our pledges and our principles, our treaties and our laws. It is not possible for a free and open society to organize successfully a spectacular conspiracy.

The United States, like every other government, must employ secret agents. But the United States cannot successfully conduct large secret conspiracies. It is impossible to keep them secret. It is impossible for everybody concerned, beginning with the President himself, to be sufficiently ruthless and unscrupulous. The American conscience is a reality. It will make hesitant and ineffectual, even if it does not prevent, an un-American policy. The ultimate reason why the Cuban affair was incompetent is that it was out of character, like a cow that tried to fly or a fish that tried to walk.

It follows that, in the great struggle with communism, we must find our strength by developing and applying our own principles, not in abandoning them. Before anyone tells me that this is sissy, I should like to say why I believe it, especially after listening carefully and at some length to Mr. Khrushchev. I am very certain that we shall have the answer to Mr. Khrushchev if, but only if, we stop being fascinated by the cloak and dagger business and, being true to ourselves, take our own principles seriously.

Mr. K. is a true believer that communism is destined to supplant capitalism as capitalism supplanted fuedalism. For him this is an absolute dogma, and he will tell you that while he intends to do what he can to assist the inevitable, knowing that we will do what we can to oppose the inevitable, what he does and what we do will not be decisive. Destiny will be realized no matter what men do.

The dogma of inevitability not only gives him the self-assurance of a man who has no doubts but is a most powerful ingredient of the Communist propaganda. What do we say to him, we who believe in a certain freedom of the human will and in the capacity of men to affect the course of history by their discoveries, their wisdom, and their courage?

We can say that in Mr. K.'s dogma there is an unexamined premise. It is that the capitalist society is static, that it is and always will be what it was when Marx described it a hundred years ago that—to use Mr. K.'s own lingo—there is no difference between Governor Rockefeller and his grandfather because a capitalist society cannot change, in its dealings with the underdeveloped countries it can only dominate and exploit. It cannot emancipate and help. If it could emancipate and help, the inevitability of communism would evaporate.

I venture to argue from this analysis that the reason we are on the defensive in so many places is that for some 10 years we have been doing exactly what Mr. K. expects us to do. We have used money and arms in a long losing attempt to stabilize native governments which, in the name of anti-communism, are opposed to all important social change. This has been exactly what Mr. K.'s dogma calls for—that communism should be the only alternative to the status quo with its immemorial poverty and privilege.

We cannot compete with communism in Asia, Africa or Latin America if we go on doing what we have done so often and so widely—which is to place the weak countries in a dilemma where they must stand still with us and our client rulers, or start moving with the Communists. This dilemma cannot be dissolved unless it is our central and persistent and unswerving policy to offer these unhappy countries a third option, which is economic development and social improvement without the totalitarian discipline of communism.

For the only real alternative to communism is a liberal and progressive society.

PROFESSIONAL SPORTS BILL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, S. 1856, introduced May 11, 1961, is a forward step in preserving the competitive vigor

of this country's professional sports. Some 37 bills relating to this subject have been proposed in the past 10 years, but this is the first bill that leaves intact the system of player selection, control, and team organization that has made professional baseball, football, basketball, and hockey the successes they are today.

S. 1856 recognizes that our antitrust laws apply to these professional sports but exempts from those laws the contracts and practices developed over the years best suited to them. The exemptions are:

First. The right of professional teams to operate within a specific geographic area.

Second. Agreements entered into between the teams providing for equalization of competitive playing strength.

Third. Rules adopted by the teams pertaining to the employment of players and the terms of their employment.

Fourth. Agreements entered into between the teams to assist in the preservation of public confidence in the honesty in sports contests.

In addition to the forestated exemptions the bill permits the clubs in such professional sports to enter into agreements relating to television rights of their contests but makes unlawful the telecasting of a contest within 75 miles of a home club of a different league when the home club is playing a regular scheduled home game unless consent in writing is given by such club.

The bill contains similar provision applicable to the telecasting of football games, requiring permission from a college team playing within a 75-mile radius of a professional contest. However, this provision would be applicable only if such telecasting is injurious to or may tend to destroy the team or sport at said college.

Some bills previously introduced provided for a limitation on the number of players a major league baseball team could own and an unrestricted draft of all players a team owned in excess of a certain specified number. Ford Frick, commissioner of baseball, testified at a hearing before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation that these provisions would so seriously cut down player personnel that only a fraction of the 22 minor leagues could be served with sufficient playing talent. With these severe restrictions they would not get the best talent because there would not be afforded an opportunity for many young men interested in this field of endeavor to develop their talents. Shortening the base paths or handing out baskets to outfielders is not desirable. America wants the best talent available and this bill would create the proper climate to insure that the very best is what we get.

S. 1856 keeps the Government out of sports. Some other proposals have advocated Washington regulation of the operating procedures employed by professional sports. It is conceivable this could lead to regulations in baseball such as allowing six strikes before an out for the team that is behind; time and a half for play over nine innings and double time on Sundays; or appeal of an umpire's decision to the Federal courts.

If S. 1856 is enacted, the status of professional sports will be stabilized. The traditional, well-seasoned methods of management and operation will be preserved in this important area. Then we will be truly able to say: The future is bright for the Mudville nines of today and tomorrow—as well as the top nines of the majors whose recruits come from America's Mudvilles.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I noted with some dismay that I was not in the Chamber on Thursday when my colleague and good friend from Michigan introduced S. 1856, relating to professional team sports and the antitrust laws. If I had been, I would have promptly announced my desire to cosponsor the measure.

During the discussion about the bill, the Senator from Minnesota expressed the hope that, by joining the Senators from New York and Michigan in sponsoring it, the Detroit Tigers and the New York Yankees might lend some assistance in vaulting his State's newly acquired Minnesota Twins into the league leadership from its third-place spot. The Senator from New York advised that no such assistance would be forthcoming. The Senator from Michigan then pointed out that the fourth cosponsor of the bill, the distinguished minority leader, must have had other reasons for cosponsoring, since the two Chicago teams are limping along at the bottom of the pile.

In these discussions my colleagues neglected, to my regret, to take into consideration the part that my home team, the Baltimore Orioles, would play in any such realinement policy. As a matter of fact, the flock itself reacted to this ruffling of its feathers by knocking the Twins out of third place on Thursday afternoon shortly after the discussion on the Senate floor and claimed that perch for itself. Unfortunately, however, they experienced some misfortune Sunday and temporarily slipped off. But I want my colleagues from New York and Michigan and Minnesota and Illinois and elsewhere to know that the Birds will regain, and then never relinquish, that perch until they decide to fly to a plusher nesting place in a more rarefied atmosphere.

Mr. President, on behalf of the next American League champions, the Baltimore Orioles, I would like to have my name added as cosponsor of S. 1856.

OBSERVANCE OF NATIONAL RADIO MONTH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation, May is observed as National Radio Month.

Over the years, radio has made its indelible mark on American progress and history.

By creative programing, these "voices of the airways" provide news, analysis of significant events, public service announcements, emergency messages, drama, and other forms of enlightenment and entertainment.

Today, there are more tha 4,300 radio stations serving the American people. Ninety-seven percent of the homes are radio equipped; and 40 million automobiles have radios installed. In addition, there are an estimated 8 million portables meeting the needs of the mobile people. Overall, there are 158 million radios in use in the United States.

For accomplishments in the past we salute the station managers, directors, editors, broadcasters, writers, and others in radioland for a job well done.

For the future, however, the industry faces a more far-reaching challenge.

Domestically this includes a responsibility for creating ever-better ways to serve the informational, intellectual, cultural, and spiritual needs of the people.

As a voice of our foreign policy, also, radio will constitute one of our major weapons in the battle for men's minds against the global Communist propaganda machine. As well, it will serve importantly to tell the story of the United States, its ideas and ideals of freedom to the world.

This then is the challenge: First, to live up to the highest standards of programing of the past; and second, to create the new ideas and techniques needed to meet the ever greater needs of the future.

TRIBUTE TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, few, if any, Government officials in the history of our country have been able to match the outstanding public service record of the Chief of our Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

May 10 was the 37th anniversary of Mr. Hoover's appointment as head of our most respected law enforcement agency.

Mr. Hoover has now started on his 38th year in this position with the same vigor, industry, and enthusiasm that marked the first year of his administration.

The exploits and high standards of the FBI under Mr. Hoover's direction are legendary.

We all remember, I believe, the succession of top-name hoodlums—the Dillingers and the Machinegun Kellys—brought to account by the FBI in the twenties and the thirties.

Equally important, the FBI always has helped to alert us to the dangers of communism, while at the same time riding herd on subversive elements in the United States.

I could fill scores of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by inserting articles, news stories, and editorials lauding Mr. Hoover on his 37th anniversary as FBI Director.

However, I believe it will suffice to cite just two of the most outstanding pieces—an editorial from the Washington Daily News, a Scripps-Howard paper, of May 10, and an article by syndicated columnist, Lyle C. Wilson, also from the Washington Daily News of May 10.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert these items in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FBI'S 38TH YEAR

Two days after his election last November, President Kennedy announced his decision to keep J. Edgar Hoover as Director of the FBI.

This didn't surprise anybody, but it tells a good deal about the standing of the FBI under Mr. Hoover's management.

The head G-man this week begins his 38th year on the job. The late Harlan F. Stone, who had just been appointed Attorney General, told Mr. Hoover on May 10, 1924, to take over the FBI and make something of it.

President Kennedy is the sixth President to retain Mr. Hoover. Mr. Kennedy's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, is the 13th head of the Justice Department in the FBI Chief's career.

To all good effects, the anniversary of Mr. Hoover's original appointment is the anniversary of the FBI. When he took charge, the Bureau was in deserved disrepute—it was rife with politics and incompetence. Now it operates in such a manner that no incoming President or Attorney General, whatever his politics, has any doubt about what he is going to do about it—he's going to keep Mr. Hoover in charge.

This Bureau and its Chief has survived 37 years "in a city of politics where the casualty rate runs high among bureau heads," as Don Whitehead observed in his best-selling book, "The FBI Story." It has survived because it has been operated with the strictest discipline, a severe sense of impartiality and an absence of politics.

And it has survived because it has earned an exceptional degree of public confidence—a public confidence which keeps the FBI strong and discourages those who would meddle with it.

A TOAST TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Now is the time for all good men to drink an anniversary toast in wine or water to J. Edgar Hoover of the FBI.

Today is the 37th anniversary of his appointment as FBI Director. That choice was made by the late Harlan Fiske Stone, Attorney General in the Coolidge Cabinet before he was boosted to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Justice Department and its investigative arm had been in ill repute before Justice Stone and Mr. Hoover began in 1924 to figure in the headlines.

William J. Burns was head G-man during the Harding administration and Harry M. Daugherty was Mr. Harding's Attorney General. Mr. Daugherty was head of the so-called Ohio gang, a principal figure in the scandals which degraded the Harding administration. President Coolidge forced Mr. Daugherty out of the Cabinet in 1924, named Justice Stone to succeed him.

One of Justice Stone's first acts was to name 29-year-old J. Edgar Hoover Director of the newly created FBI. Messrs. Stone and Hoover began accomplishing the almost impossible. Their task was to restore public confidence in the Department of Justice. Mr. Daugherty left the Department under charges of corruption growing out of an investigation which, according to the Encyclopedia of American History, "revealed that the Attorney General, acting in concert with members of the Ohio gang, had received payments from violators of the prohibition laws [and] also disclosed that Mr. Daugherty had failed to prosecute for graft in the Veterans Bureau." He was acquitted in 1927 on a conspiracy charge.

Mr. Hoover established high standards for the FBI. He compelled his men and his organization to conform precisely to those standards. Soon, Mr. Hoover became and has remained a legend in his own time. It became standard operating procedure for the Congress and Presidents of the United States to turn to Mr. Hoover and his men when the Nation was troubled with a law enforcement problem of great magnitude and the citizens were uneasy in their beds at night.

That is the way it was when Charles A. Lindbergh, Jr., was kidnaped and murdered. Congress enacted the Lindbergh kidnap law and stipulated that Mr. Hoover and the FBI should enforce it. Not a moment too soon, either. When prohibition finally came to an end, the hoodlums who had been enriched by bootleg booze turned to kidnaping as a new bonanza. Others began knocking over national banks. They, also, were in FBI jurisdiction. One by one, the Dillingers and the Machinegun Kellys were disposed of.

Meantime, the Communists were crawling out of the internal woodwork in the United States. Mr. Hoover and the FBI drew the assignment to ride herd on them. Then began the ceaseless effort of the American Commies, their friends and their dupes to get Mr. Hoover.

Mr. Hoover and the FBI comprise the most effective roadblock in this country to the objective of all Communists here and abroad which is to bury the American way of life.

Harry S. Truman probably was under the greatest pressure of any President to fire Mr. Hoover and to cripple the FBI. HST wouldn't have dared even if he had wanted to do that. To Edgar Hoover: Skoal.

COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the progress that our country is making toward space exploration, the harnessing of atomic energy for peacetime pursuits, and other miracle developments has been possible only because of the contributions and support of American industry.

The American business community has furnished our Government with highly skilled specialists in management, research and development, science and technology, and other fields where we require top personnel in order to win the cold war fight against world communism.

Now, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has set another fine example by offering to spend between $15 and $25 million to launch a commercial communications satellite.

This offer has been pending before the National Aeronautical and Space Administration since last December 14 when, according to an Associated Press dispatch of May 10, A.T. & T. asked the agency to assign it a rocket booster to launch an experimental communications satellite.

A.T. & T. has said it would welcome participation by other companies but that even if it proceeded alone it would make all experimental information available to others.

The Associated Press dispatch, as carried in the Baltimore Sun of May 11, reports that the General Electric Corp. and the General Telephone & Electronics Corp. are among other American companies that have advanced proposals for a communications satellite system.

I urge, and I hope my colleagues in the Senate will join with me in urging, that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration give careful study and consideration to these proposals, and to the magnanimous offer of A.T. & T.

For us to achieve the accelerated progress necessary to deter the Communists from worldwide aggression will require the closest cooperation between Government and private industry.

With this thought in mind, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks the Baltimore Sun story of May 11, referred to earlier.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUNDS OFFERED FOR SPACE SHOT

WASHINGTON, May 10.—The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. told Congressmen today it is willing to spend $15 million to $25 million to launch a commercial communications satellite.

The A.T. & T. plan, described before the House Science and Astronautics Committee, is one of several that private companies are circulating before Government agencies.

All plans would lead to a system of communicating anywhere on earth through satellites. Telephone calls, telegraph messages, and television could be beamed to a satellite and then relayed to a remote area.

James E. Dingman, vice president and chief engineer of A.T. & T., testified that his company had asked the National Aeronautics and Space Administration last December 14 to assign it a rocket booster to launch an experimental communications satellite.

READY TO PAY ALL COSTS

Dingman, said A.T. & T. was ready to pay the cost of the launching booster, the launch pad, and the satellite. He estimated the total cost at $15 million, but added that A.T. & T. would be willing to spend as much as $25 million on the project.

Dingman said A.T. & T. would welcome participation by other communications companies. Even if it proceeded alone, he said, the company would make all experimental information available to others.

Eventually, he continued A.T. & T. envisions a worldwide system with agreements similar to those nations have on international cable communications.

General Electric Corp. and the General Telephone & Electronics Corp. are among other American companies that have made proposals for a communication satellite system.

MAJ. GEN. EDWIN A. WALKER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate an editorial which appeared in the May 11 issue of the Manchester Union Leader and a news story from the April 23 issue of the Arkansas Democrat.

Both articles are concerned with the circumstances surrounding Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker being relieved of his command of the 24th Infantry Division.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Democrat, Apr. 23, 1961]

SERVICEMAN'S WIFE RAPS WALKER ATTACK AS "FALSE, MALICIOUS"

The wife of a serviceman serving under Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker in Europe charged in a letter to the Democrat yesterday that the controversial Overseas Weekly

publication was presenting a "false and malicious picture of General Walker and the patriotic pro-blue and citizenship in services programs."

The letter, signed by Ann Flynn, care of M. Sgt. R. T. Flynn of the Headquarters Company, 24th Division, also said:

"Many of us here are deeply concerned lest General Walker become the latest victim of an organized smear and that any patriotic educational programs within our armed services will be abandoned for fear of censure from obscure, if powerful, forces."

General Walker, former commander of the Arkansas Military District, was relieved of his command in Germany pending an investigation of charges in the April 16, issue of Overseas Weekly, a private publication, that he subjected men under him to a "barrage of propaganda" based on John Birch Society publications and that in January 1960 he had termed former President Truman, former Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—among others—as "definitely pink."

In an accompanying document, Ann Flynn linked the publication's charges to a post ban against a reporter for the publication and implied that the John Birch Society—currently under charges from certain quarters in this country—gave the publication an excuse for what she termed "smear charges."

Mrs. Flynn wrote:

"In recent months one reporter from the Overseas Weekly had been banned from all military kasernes in the 24th Division for attempts to purchase inside information or smear material from military personnel. Since this reporter was banned and his successor permitted on military kasernes only under military escort, the Overseas Weekly has waged a vendetta against General Walker and his division."

She added:

"The Overseas Weekly, a sensational type of magazine which features the crimes, scandals, and gripes of American servicemen in Europe * * * is irreverently tagged the 'Oversexed Weekly' by GI readers here."

Mrs. Flynn sent with her letter and her estimate of the current situation and its background, copies of the Taro Leaf, "authorized Army newspaper published by and for the men of the 24th Infantry Division" in Augsburg, Germany. The materials were mailed through the Army Air Force Postal Service and bore eight airmail stamps.

"As a dependent," Mrs. Flynn wrote, "I have the right to correct the false and malicious picture of General Walker and the patriotic pro-blue and citizenship in service programs without fear of official censure.

"It might interest your readers to know that the men of the 24th Division are not so 'confused' by General Walker's programs as has been alleged. As a matter of fact, the 24th Division has the highest reenlistment rate in Europe, the lowest number of incidents, the championship marksmanship and boxing teams, and the Taro Leaf won the latest Army award for editorship of its paper.

"Enclosed, you will find some general background material on General Walker written by me which you may feel free to use as you see fit."

General Walker became commander of the 24th Division in November 1959. On April 25, 1960, according to Mrs. Flynn, a 30-man team of officers and enlisted men introduced Citizenship in Service, a 6-hour series of lectures supported by skits, charts, and tape recordings. Intent of the program, she wrote, is "to inculcate moral and legal responsibility, to teach fundamental principles of citizenship and patriotism, and to motivate members of this command so as to reduce sociological stress in service and generate a desire for the awards of self-discipline and public service."

At the same time, she added, the general began a troop physical training program for conditioning the men to maximum combat readiness.

"Despite gripes about the PT program, it is probable that the 24th today could stand up to physical stress far better than troops who can't adjust to climate and weather conditions," wrote Mrs. Flynn. "Much unnecessary loss of life in the Korean war was due to this one factor. Last year the 24th Division chalked up the lowest incident rate for respiratory ailments during rugged training exercises among competing units."

"Walker introduced parallel informative programs for dependents of the servicemen and 'these interested dependents' asked the USAREUR libraries to provide special reading shelves on communism for both military and civilians.

"Library books, publications of the U.S. Government investigating committees and various periodicals are usually discussed and analyzed at weekly or semimonthly meetings of study groups," Mrs. Flynn continued. "The paperbound edition of J. Edgar Hoover's 'Masters of Deceit' and the Government publication 'Handbook for Americans' are key source books for such groups. There was also much interest in Alan Drury's 'Advise and Consent' and Victor J. Fox's 'The Pentagon Case.'"

In autumn of 1960 a series of books was introduced to all company and battery sized units throughout the division including such titles as the Hoover book, "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," by Anthony Buscaren; "In Every War But One," by Eugene Kinkead; "The Techniques of Communism," by Louis Budenz, "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda," by U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee; "The Life of John Birch," by Robert Welch, Jr.; "Fox's Pentagon Case," and "The Story of Mary Liu," by Edward Hunter.

The blue program derived its name from maps which showed the free world in blue and the Communist world in red with General Walker saying:

"It is in all aspects a profreedom cause. This program is a positive approach toward the defeat of open Communist subversion of the American way of life based on the Constitution, belief in God, and freedom of man."

The Taro Leaf featured writings by Hoover, Cardinal Spellman, George Washington, and Theodore Roosevelt. Mrs. Flynn added that one issue of the Taro Leaf carried a digest reprint of an article by Robert Welch, the Birch Society's head.

The division sponsored showings of the film, "Operation Abolition," the film "Man on a String," which, Mrs. Flynn wrote, "is a dramatization of Soviet espionage methods exposed by American counterespionage." There was also publicity on the radio series, "If Freedom Fails," described by Mrs. Flynn as dramatizing what happens to a free and democratic country when the Communists seize power.

Mrs. Flynn said this was the general background leading up to now with "General Walker * * * under fire, both from political and newspaper channels."

In speaking of the Overseas Weekly and its vendetta against General Walker and his division she wrote:

"In their issue of April 16 this vendetta reached new heights of retaliation. They accused General Walker of pushing a propaganda barrage on the philosophy of the controversial John Birch Society within the 24th Division. The paper attempted to link the general's problue program with the Birch Society's book of principles called, they allege, The Blue Book."

"The availability of the 'Life of John Birch' on company bookshelves is interpreted as evidence of a link between the problue program and the John Birch Society. (They read no comparable meaning into the availability of other books, such as J. Edgar Hoover's 'Master of Deceit,' Kinkead's 'In Every War but One' etc.)

"The newspaper equated problue concern with Communist infiltration and propaganda techniques, the appearance of Edgar C. Bundy (a critic of Communist infiltration in our churches) as a speaker within the division, and the showing of 'Operation Abolition' with parallel interests of the John Birch Society."

Mrs. Flynn added:

"The Overseas Weekly erroneously reported the sale of 'American Opinion' (a magazine edited by Robert Welch) on division newsstands, falsely quoted from a speech that General Walker made in early 1960, inferred opposition to the problue program from a general officer on his staff and alluded that the special warfare office bears a resemblance to a 'cell' taking secret orders 'to promote front organizations that do not use the John Birch name'."

Mrs. Flynn said that the current investigation of charges was ordered before his relief from his command was ordered and expressed the fear:

"Much of what happens as a result of this investigation will determine whether or not the armed services will be permitted to continue with educational programs that build dedication to American political, religious, and moral values and understanding of the aims and activities of organized communism against our dedicated leaders and our way of life."

She declared that Walker is "carrying the ball for a lot of others, both in Europe and in the United States (yet) there are those who would silence such a man as this and damn all such problue programs to oblivion."

According to material submitted to the Democrat by Mrs. Flynn, General Walker's program extended to the men, their wives and to children in high school. It emphasized value of American citizenship, how to recognize "overt and covert Communist methodology in the Communist attempt to subvert military morals, esprit, prestige and leadership," a working knowledge of the "reciprocal legal obligations and areas of responsibility" of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and to identify NATO "as a disciplined force for freedom * * * and the accomplishment of NATO members in halting Communist aggression."

The program enlisted and urged the support of chaplains in "helping the officers, noncommissioned officers, the men, their wives and children to 'put on the whole armor of God' (Ephesians 6: 11)."

It included classes in discipline, law and order, traffic safety, morale, physical fitness, and community relations with the German nationals.

[From the Manchester Union-Leader, May 11, 1961]

THE GENERAL WALKER CONTROVERSY

The ouster of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker from his command in Germany pending an investigation of charges made against him in the controversial Overseas Weekly publication may well mark the first time that a U.S. Army general was ousted on hearsay evidence.

The April 16 issue of the publication had charged General Walker with subjecting men under him to a barrage of propaganda based on John Birch Society publications and said that in January 1960, he had described former President Truman, former Secretary of State Dean Acheson and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt—among others—as "definitely pink."

On the other side of the coin, those friendly to General Walker maintain that there is an element of spite in the Overseas Weekly editorial. They claim that General Walker had banned an Overseas Weekly reporter from all military kasernes in the

24th Division for attempting to purchase inside information from military personnel. The reporter's successor, it is alleged, was permitted on military kasernes only under escort. They claim that the Birch Society controversy simply provided the private publication with an opportunity to renew its vendetta against General Walker.

General Walker, who became commander of the 24th Division in November 1959, has introduced patriotic problue and citizenship in service programs to instill in his men a sense of moral and legal responsibility and to teach them the fundamental principles of patriotism and good citizenship. The Taro Leaf, authorized Army newspaper published by men of the 24th Infantry Division, features the writings of J. Edgar Hoover, Cardinal Spellman, and other patriotic Americans. The Taro Leaf won the latest Army award for editorialship of its paper and the division itself has the highest reenlistment rate in Europe. General Walker places particular emphasis on physical training to condition his men to combat efficiency.

Information programs also are open to dependents of the servicemen. Libraries provide special reading material on communism.

Those supporting General Walker deny the charge that a magazine edited by Robert Welch is sold on division newsstands. And they charge Overseas Weekly with falsely quoting from General Walker's early 1960 speech.

During the McCarthy era, Maj. Irving Peress was charged with being a Communist. He was promoted in rank. General Walker, on the other hand, is charged by a single magazine with having some connection with the John Birch Society, and despite the fact that he has flatly denied the charge, he is dismissed.

Congress should give this controversy a complete and thorough examination.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have read copies of the Overseas Weekly which were sent to me by personnel of the 24th Division, and I also received a copy of Mrs. Flynn's letter which formed the basis for the article in the Arkansas Democrat.

In addition, I have studied copies of the Taro Leaf, the official newspaper of the 24th Division, and I have examined the training circular which activated the problue program. I found nothing to criticize in either of these publications.

With the possible exception of the two newspaper articles in the Manchester Union-Leader and the Arkansas Democrat, it seems that the majority of stories which appeared in many American newspapers have, if only by omission and implication, condemned General Walker without sufficient facts and on the basis of hearsay and rumor.

General Walker has been an outstanding American officer and military leader. He has served courageously and well in all his commands and was a combat officer at Anzio, Cassino, and Heartbreak Ridge. His ability to command and inspire his troops has served his country well and he should receive the consideration and courtesy of an objective hearing on the charges leveled against him without being prejudged or condemned out-of-hand by the American press. The large volume of letters which I have received have been overwhelmingly in favor of General Walker retaining his command, and no evidence has been brought to my attention to lead me to any other conclusion at the present time.

In justice to General Walker, it might be well for both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees to make a thorough investigation of the action taken against the general and the reasons for it. I urge my colleagues on both committees to consider this course of action.

AMERICAN INDIAN DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I heartily endorse the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on May 9, 1961, to set aside the fourth Friday of every September as American Indian Day.

The development of the American personal characteristics of bravery, independence, and an interest in woodlore all owe a debt of gratitude to our original Indians.

Also, the American Indians' contributions in the fields of agriculture and the arts are well known. Many of the early settlers in colonial America would most likely not have survived were it not for the skills in cultivation which they learned from the Indians. In addition, Indian architecture has had a profound influence on present-day homes in many of our Southern regions. The music, dances, and lore of the American Indian represent some of the purest examples of American culture.

I, myself, am particularly sensitive to the accomplishments of the American Indians for among my ancestors can be found Siwanoy Indians who made their home in New England and New York—where many mountains, towns, and streets still bear Indian names.

Mr. President, it is more than fitting that we honor the American Indian, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 84. I commend the distinguished Senior Senator from New York for introducing this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order entered on May 15, the clerk will call the first measure on the calendar.

SIMPSON CONSTRUCTION CO.

The resolution (S. Res. 129) relating to the bill (S. 101) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Simpson Construction Co.," was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MILLER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be put over, and that it may retain its place on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURES PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1185) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the expenditure from certain capital reserve funds of certain amounts for research, development, and design expenses was announced as next in order.

Mr. MILLER. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

The bill (S. 1183) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

The bill (S. 870) to amend the Menominee Termination Act to make an orderly transition to its status after supervision ends was announced as next in order.

Mr. HART. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

PAINTING AND MARKING OF RADIO TOWERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 684) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the painting and illumination of radio towers which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "dismantled", to insert a comma and "or the Commission may require the owner to dismantle and remove the tower when there is a reasonable possibility that it may constitute a menace to air navigation.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 303(q) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 303(q)) is amended by inserting after the period at the end thereof the following: "The permittee or licensee shall maintain the painting and/or illumination of the tower as prescribed by the Commission pursuant to this section. In the event that the tower ceases to be licensed by the Commission for the transmission of radio energy, the owner of the tower shall maintain the prescribed painting and/or illumination of such tower until it is dismantled, *or the Commission may require the owner to dismantle and remove the tower when there is a reasonable possibility that it may constitute a menace to air navigation.*"

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 4130) to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HART. Over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

KAY ADDIS

The bill (S. 68) for the relief of Kay Addis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kay Addis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

IOANNIS F. KOSTAKIS

The bill (S. 130) for the relief of Ioannis F. Kostakis was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of the Act of September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86-363), Ioannis F. Kostakis shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 4 of that Act.

DR. NOBUTAKA AZUMA

The bill (S. 219) for the relief of Dr. Nobutaka Azuma was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Nobutaka Azuma shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 18, 1951.

HOK YUEN WOO

The bill (S. 268) for the relief of Hok Yuen Woo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hok Yuen Woo shall be held and considered to be the minor natural-born alien child of Chew Yat Woo, a United States citizen.

AIKO SHINZATO

The bill (S. 294) for the relief of Aiko Shinzato was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Aiko Shinzato shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

RODOPI STATHEROU

The bill (S. 441) for the relief of Rodopi Statherou (Statheron) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rodopi Statherou (Statheron) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ASPASIA A. KOUMBOURIS (KUMPURIS)

The bill (S. 442) for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child, of Mr. and Mrs. John Kumpuris, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

CHARLES EDWARD PIFER

The bill (S. 485) for the relief of Charles Edward Pifer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Charles Edward Pifer, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Joy J. Pifer and Griffin Watson Pifer, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Charles Edward Pifer shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

WONG GAR WAH

The bill (S. 967) for the relief of Wong Gar Wah was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wong Gar Wah shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SZE-FOO CHIEN

The bill (S. 1093) for the relief of Sze-Foo Chien was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sze-Foo Chien shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent resident to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduce one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

EDWARD C. TONSMEIRE, JR.

The bill (S. 1168) for the relief of Edward C. Tonsmeire, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Edward C. Tonsmeire, Junior, of Biloxi, Mississippi, is hereby relieved of liability to the United States in the sum of $1,382.64, which he accepted in good faith, the said amount representing basic allowance for quarters paid to him as an officer in the United States Coast Guard at $67.50 per month from June 13, 1951, to April 30, 1952, and at $77.10 per month from May 1, 1952 to August 12, 1952, in violation of section 302(b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 813), and station per diem allowance at $9 from June 14, 1951, to July 28, 1951, in violation of paragraph 4300 of the joint travel regulations, issued under authority of section 303 (b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 814); the said Edward C. Tonsmeire, Junior, having occupied during the entire period from June 13, 1951, to August 12, 1952, Government quarters at Fort DeRussy, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii.

SEC. 2. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SIRIJO TANFARA

The bill (S. 1204) for the relief of Sirijo Tanfara was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sirijo Tanfara shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MARGARET JEAN DAUEL

The bill (S. 415) for the relief of Margaret Jean Dauel was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, line 11, after the word "this", to strike out "Act." and insert "Act: *And provided further,* That if the said Margaret Jean Dauel is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Margaret Jean Dauel may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided,* That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act: *And provided further,* That if the said Margaret Jean Dauel is not entitled to medical care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GIUSEPPA ALONZI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 570) for the relief of Giuseppa Alonzi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of section 4 of the Act of September 22, 1959, Giuseppa Alonzi shall be deemed to have been registered on a consular waiting list pursuant to section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act under a priority date earlier than December 31, 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HENRY EUGENE GODDERIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1073) for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "on", to strike out "February 1, 1956" and insert "September 1, 1955", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry Eugene Godderis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on September 1, 1955.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JENNO BECSEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 32) for the relief of Jenno Becsey, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jeno Becsey shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of January 3, 1957: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jeno Becsey."

MR. AND MRS. FRANKLIN LEONG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 264) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Leong, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, in line 4, after the word "of", to insert "the proviso to", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "sections" and insert "section"; in line 5, after "201 (a)", to strike out "and 202 (b)", and in line 6, after the name "Franklin", to strike out "Leong." and insert "Leong, natives of Burma."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of the proviso to section 201(a) shall not be applicable in the cases of Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Leong, natives of Burma.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD P. WALL

The bill (H.R. 1320) for the relief of Edward P. Wall was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

KIM HYOUNG GEUN

The bill (H.R. 1329) for the relief of Kim Hyoung Geun was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DANICA DOPUDJA

The bill (H.R. 1351) for the relief of Danica Dopudja was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HANS E. T. HANSEN

The bill (H.R. 1366) for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MAURICE DEVLIN

The bill (H.R. 1368) for the relief of Maurice Devlin was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BENJAMIN E. CAMPBELL

The bill (H.R.1424) for the relief of Benjamin E. Campbell was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WLADYSLAW FIGURA

The bill (H.R. 1447) for the relief of Wladyslaw Figura was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MARIO MENNA

The bill (H.R. 1453) for the relief of Mario Menna was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ERWIN P. MILSPAUGH

The bill (H.R. 1535) for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MARITIME MUSEUM ASSOCIATION OF SAN DIEGO

The bill (H.R. 1896) for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RAYMOND G. GREENHALGH

The bill (H.R. 2138) for the relief of Raymond G. Greenhalgh was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LT. MATTHEW A. WOJDAK, U.S. NAVY (RETIRED)

The bill (H.R. 2188) for the relief of Lt. Matthew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired) was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PEGGY LOENE MORRISON

The bill (H.R. 2331) for the relief of Peggy Loene Morrison was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TERATA KIYOSHI JOHNSTON

The bill (H.R. 2681) for the relief of Terata Kiyoshi Johnston was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM JOSEPH VINCENT

The bill (H.R. 3498) for the relief of William Joseph Vincent was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

JAMES DELBERT HODGES

The bill (H.R. 3842) for the relief of James Delbert Hodges was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DR. TUNG HUI LIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1343) for the relief of Dr. Tung Hui Lin, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Tung Hui Lin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of November 27, 1952, upon payment of the required head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

REYNOLDS FEAL CORP. AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5178) for the relief of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, after the word "claims", to insert a colon and *"Provided, however,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOHN NAPOLI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 1346) for the relief of John Napoli, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "claims", to insert a comma and "of any nature whatsoever,", and in line 8, after the word "States", to strike out "for personal injuries, loss of and damage to his personal property, and other loss and damage", and insert "arising from or".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ARTHUR B. TINDELL

The bill (H.R. 1397) for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education was announced as next in order.

Mr. MILLER. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

That completes the call of the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, in accordance with the agreement reached yesterday, the Senate is now to vote on the three treaties. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the three treaties be voted on en bloc, but that the vote be shown separately in the RECORD for each treaty. As I understand, there is no opposition to voting on the treaties en bloc. They were all reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and this proposal has been cleared with the minority leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

TREATY OF EXTRADITION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE UNITED STATES OF BRAZIL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification of Executive H will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of a treaty of extradition between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil, signed at Rio de Janeiro on January 13, 1961. (Executive H, 87th Cong., 1st sess.)

The yeas and nays were thereupon taken on the three treaties en bloc, and the vote on each treaty is herewith stated, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF THE SEA BY OIL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification of Executive C, 86th Congress, 2d session, the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil?

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Ex. No. 1]

YEAS—92

Aiken	Bridges	Carlson
Allott	Burdick	Carroll
Anderson	Bush	Case, N.J.
Beall	Butler	Case, S.Dak.
Bennett	Byrd, Va.	Church
Bible	Byrd, W.Va.	Clark
Blakley	Cannon	Cotton
Boggs	Capehart	Curtis

Dirksen	Jordan	Prouty
Dodd	Keating	Proxmire
Douglas	Kefauver	Randolph
Dworshak	Kerr	Robertson
Eastland	Kuchel	Russell
Ellender	Lausche	Saltonstall
Engle	Long, Hawaii	Schoeppel
Ervin	Long, La.	Scott
Fulbright	Mansfield	Smathers
Goldwater	McCarthy	Smith, Mass.
Gore	McClellan	Smith, Maine
Hart	McGee	Sparkman
Hartke	McNamara	Stennis
Hayden	Metcalf	Symington
Hickenlooper	Miller	Talmadge
Hickey	Monroney	Thurmond
Hill	Morse	Wiley
Holland	Moss	Williams, N.J.
Hruska	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Humphrey	Muskie	Yarborough
Jackson	Neuberger	Young, N.Dak.
Javits	Pastore	Young, Ohio
Johnston	Pell	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—8

Bartlett	Fong	Magnuson
Chavez	Gruening	Morton
Cooper	Long, Mo.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Madam President, we, in Massachusetts, have an especial interest in the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil. In Massachusetts, our citizens have been brought up to believe that our natural resources, our areas of great scenic beauty, should be kept as nature intended them. We have sought to preserve the beauty of our beaches. We need this convention to prevent ships from pumping oil into the waters off our shores. This oil drifts ashore, defiles our beaches, and makes them unpleasant for bathers and hikers.

Massachusetts is in the flight lane of many migratory birds. Her shores are visited by many species on their way north at this time of year and again in the fall on their way south. Many of these birds stay with us throughout the year and a great many more spend their summers along our shores, and we have set aside many refuges for them.

This dumped oil slick destroys the food sources of these birds and destroys their ability to fly by coating their feathers. Our Audubon Society and bird lovers everywhere are pleased this has been ratified by the United States. We look forward to clear waters and clean beaches in the future.

MODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LOAD LINE CONVENTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive I, 87th Congress, 1st session, the proposal made by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on May 31, 1949, for modification of article 3(e) of the International Load Line Convention, signed at London on July 5, 1930?

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Ex. No. 2]

YEAS—92

Aiken	Ervin	Monroney
Allott	Fulbright	Morse
Anderson	Goldwater	Moss
Beall	Gore	Mundt
Bennett	Hart	Muskie
Bible	Hartke	Neuberger
Blakley	Hayden	Pastore
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Pell
Bridges	Hickey	Prouty
Burdick	Hill	Proxmire
Bush	Holland	Randolph
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Saltonstall
Cannon	Javits	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnston	Scott
Carlson	Jordan	Smathers
Carroll	Keating	Smith, Mass.
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Sparkman
Church	Kuchel	Stennis
Clark	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	Long, Hawaii	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, La.	Thurmond
Dirksen	Mansfield	Wiley
Dodd	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McGee	Yarborough
Eastland	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Engle	Miller	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—8

Bartlett	Fong	Magnuson
Chavez	Gruening	Morton
Cooper	Long, Mo.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

TREATY OF EXTRADITION WITH BRAZIL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification of Executive H, 87th Congress, 1st session, the Treaty of Extradition between the United States of America and the United States of Brazil, signed at Rio de Janerio on January 13, 1961?

The yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[Ex. No. 3]

YEAS—92

Aiken	Ervin	Monroney
Allott	Fulbright	Morse
Anderson	Goldwater	Moss
Beall	Gore	Mundt
Bennett	Hart	Muskie
Bible	Hartke	Neuberger
Blakley	Hayden	Pastore
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Pell
Bridges	Hickey	Prouty
Burdick	Hill	Proxmire
Bush	Holland	Randolph
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Saltonstall
Cannon	Javits	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnston	Scott
Carlson	Jordan	Smathers
Carroll	Keating	Smith, Mass.
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Sparkman
Church	Kuchel	Stennis
Clark	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	Long, Hawaii	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, La.	Thurmond
Dirksen	Mansfield	Wiley
Dodd	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McGee	Yarborough
Eastland	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Engle	Miller	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—8

Bartlett	Fong	Magnuson
Chavez	Gruening	Morton
Cooper	Long, Mo.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified as to the action of the Senate on the treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President of the United States will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that request has been granted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Permission has been granted to the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am pretty sure the request was granted previously. The group included three or four.

Madam President, in connection with the request, since a question has been raised, I have served notice that on tomorrow, on the theory that the Senators will be voting on amendments, I shall have to object to any request for a committee to meet when the Senate is in session. This will give the committees ample time to notify witnesses, to avoid any inconvenience.

The question has been raised. If I did not object, some other Senator would object, and therefore I feel I should accept the responsibility. This does not apply to today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This means there will be no use in making a request tomorrow, for it will be objected to? Is that the understanding?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. The majority leader concurred in that, as being entirely fair.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make inquiry as to what time the Senate intends to convene tomorrow. Hearings have been scheduled by the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in regard to the field of Government efficiency and economy. Witnesses are coming from the east coast.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I have no information other than that the Senate will convene at the usual hour.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Twelve o'clock noon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I relent in regard to one request, by all logic I cannot interpose objection to other requests.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was simply hoping that the Senate would not convene at 11 o'clock in the morning. If so, I might as well notify everyone to stay home.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, it is the intention of the leadership, according to the majority leader, that the Senate will convene at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then we can probably get in a couple of hours of work.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is the intention to convene at noon.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. The Senate will convene at noon Wednesday?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED PATENT MONOPOLIES

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, the patent policy of the Department of Defense, in giving away private patents on $7 billion a year worth of publicly sponsored research, is to me so completely indefensible and contrary to the public interest that I am constrained to ask why either the President or the Congress permits the policy to continue for a minute.

A patent is a legalized monopoly. A patent gives to the person who holds it the right to prevent anyone from manufacturing something in competition with the man who owns the patent. More often than not, patents do not belong to the man who did the inventing. They often belong to the corporation which hired the man who did the inventing. When corporations do business with other corporations, to reduce the expense of inventing new articles or improving their way of doing business, the usual rule is that the corporation which pays for the research will own all patent rights.

The cost of a patent monopoly can be extremely high. General Electric Corp., for example, has been known to charge the public more than 50 times the cost of production on at least 1 item on which it held patents for many years.

Since the first year of the George Washington administration, the United States has pursued a policy of granting patents to people who invented something at their own expense. This was to encourage people to invent at their own expense, in order to advance the useful arts. Dating back to Washington's administration, this Nation has also been seeking to develop better weapons and improved methods of national defense.

Starting in 1789, under the Washington administration, the Government gave a contract to Eli Whitney, the famous inventor of the cotton gin. Under this contract, Eli Whitney was to develop a method of manufacturing interchangeable parts for muskets, cannons, and other firearms. This contract went into effect in 1789, the first year when Congress met. It preceded the first patent law. Eli Whitney had no patents on anything he manufactured for the U.S. Government when the research was paid for by the taxpayers of the country.

For the following 150 years, two systems of research existed side by side. Private enterprise had monopolies to those things which it invented at its own expense. Whenever private enterprise contracted to invent or to develop something for the Government, the results of that research belonged to all the people of the country. There was no monopoly. The result was that the effect of competition would guarantee the public low prices and better commodities than a patent monopolist would accord the public.

That is fundamental to our system of free competitive enterprise, dating back to the whole theory of Adam Smith, which even preceded this Government.

If Senators have any doubt about what I am saying, take a look at what we have to pay to buy a color television set today, and notice how slowly the cost comes down. That is because Radio Corp. of America holds a patent monopoly. Compare the cost of penicillin at the beginning and now. Penicillin was developed under a Government contract, with the Government retaining all patent rights. In the early years of manufacture, the cost of manufacture was $20 for 100,000 units. The fact that everybody could compete for the business brought the cost down to 60 cents for 100,000 units in about 10 years. Penicillin is something one must have if one has pneumonia or any one of a great number of other diseases. It is cheap at any price. If a private company held a patent to this commodity it would have the right to charge several times what one now has to pay for it.

Almost every department in the U.S. Government, with the exception of the Department of Defense, is required by Federal law to reserve patent rights for all the research, which is paid for by 180 million American taxpayers. It is the Department of Defense, however, which spends 90 percent of all the research money. This Department takes advantage of the fact that the law is silent, insofar as it is concerned, to grant private monopoly rights for all commercial applications of all things developed at public expense under the $7-billion-a-year expenditure entrusted to that Department for this program.

In this Department, certain contractors in wartime took advantage of the Government to obtain contracts which permitted them to keep private monopoly rights on everything developed at Government expense.

The result is that we are now spending $7 billion a year—more than half of the money that is being spent for all research and development—through contracts under which large corporations are permitted to have private patent monopolies for at least 17 years on anything they discover in spending the taxpayers' money on contracts that guarantee a profit in addition to all expenses.

If any executive who is cashing in on this bonanza at our expense should discover that one of his vice presidents had signed a contract with a scientist or other corporation to have research done for his company to improve on its products, and if he discovered that the employee or the subcontractor had reserved exclusive patent rights on everything developed with the company's money, he would probably fire that vice president by wire. He would not even bother to have a personal consultation to offer the man an opportunity to explain.

A considerable number of the largest companies which are heading up the fight to maintain private patents at public expense are among those which went into court and threw themselves on the mercy of the judge to criminal charges that they had been systematically cheating and defrauding the U.S. Govern-

ment on things sold to the Government for a period of more than 10 years, involving billions of dollars. That is what those operators will do to the taxpayers when they are required to bid for the business. Yet that is not the kind of business they most desire. What they demand and desire most is business for which they do not even have to bid, and when they can prevent anyone else from manufacturing the commodity under such a system we must pay them anything they want, or do without the product.

Since I started making this fight 2 years ago, two Government departments that were giving away patent rights have changed their policies. Those I have in mind are the Post Office Department and the Federal Aviation Agency. Only the giant which spends most of the money, the Department of Defense, remains as the last leaf on the tree. Private businessmen on loan to Government from large corporations, high-ranking military officers, who expect, after they retire, to work for some of the same corporations with whom they are now signing contracts, are holding out to continue this patent giveaway, which would cost us hundreds of billions of dollars to maintain the cost of private monopolies at public expense.

The record is full of testimony—some of it from big operators who would have a great financial advantage in maintaining the status quo. There was testimony to the effect that it probably would not cost 5 cents extra to get these contractors to do the work under the old system, under which the Government retained the patent rights for the benefit of all the people.

The cost of these monopolies to be paid by housewives and other consumers is somewhat like a hidden tax concealed in the price of the product. This cost, over a period of 30 years, will exceed the cost of the national debt, so far as the average citizen is concerned. This outrage should be stopped immediately. My guess is that President Kennedy probably will stop it. If he does not, I believe Congress should undertake to do so.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 228, S. 1021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, may we have action on the motion to consider the bill, so that the bill will be before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments, on page 3, line 1, after "1961", to strike out "$666,000,000, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, $766,000,000, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, $866,000,000" and insert "and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, $850,000,000,"; in line 7, after the word "Allotment", to strike out "And Payments"; in line 10, after the word "per", to strike out "public school pupil, the number of such pupils" and insert "child of school age, the number of children of school age,"; in line 13, after the word "States", to insert "A State allotment under this section for any fiscal year shall be available for obligation by the State, in accordance with the provisions of this title, during such year and the next fiscal year (and for those two years only)."; in line 17, after "106",", to strike out "and by subsection (b) of this section,"; in line 23, after the word "of", to strike out "public school pupils" and insert "children of school age"; on page 4, line 2, after the word "subsection", to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; after line 3, to strike out:

(b) Subject to the provisions of section 106, a State's minimum allotment for any fiscal year shall be the product of $15 multiplied by the number of public school pupils in such State in the preceding fiscal year. If, for any fiscal year, the amount allotted to any State under subsection (a) is less than such State's minimum allotment, the Commissioner shall deduct from the sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 for such fiscal year, such amount as may be necessary to allot to each such State its minimum allotment for such fiscal year, and shall thereafter reallot among the remaining States and in accordance with subsection (a), the balance remaining after such deduction, and shall repeat such deductions and reallotments until, for each fiscal year, the amount allotted to each State is not less than such State's minimum allotment.

At the beginning of line 19, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; in line 22, after the word "per", to strike out "public school pupil for the State by the income per such pupil" and insert "child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age"; in line 25, after the name "Guam," to insert "American Samoa,"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "that," to insert "(i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75 and (ii)"; in line 4, after ".75", to insert "and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of education in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate."; in line 22, after the word "per", to strike out "public school pupil" and insert "child of school age"; in line 24, after the word "Guam", to insert "American Samoa,"; on page 6, line 7, after the word "per", to strike out "public school pupil" and insert "child of school age"; in line 11, after the word "Guam", to insert "American Samoa,"; in line 12, after the word "of", to strike out "public school pupils in the State or in all the States" and insert "children of school age in the State or in all such States,"; after line 15, to insert:

(4) the term "child of school age" means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

On page 8, line 11, after the word "Guam", to insert "American Samoa"; in line 12, after the word "have", to strike out "neither been increased to achieve their minimum allotments under section 105(b) nor" and insert "not"; in line 22, after the word "Guam", to insert "American Samoa,"; on page 9, after line 2, to insert:

(C) The "income per public school pupil" for a State or for all the States for any fiscal year means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of public school pupils in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

In line 13, after the word "Guam,", to insert "American Samoa,"; on page 10, line 12, after the word "Guam,", to insert "American Samoa,"; on page 12, after the word "local", to strike out "educational" and insert "education"; in line 5, after the word "agencies", to insert "and other public agencies or institutions operating a public school, which, in the determination of the State agency, are"; on page 13, after line 8, to insert:

(9) programs for the improvement of instruction through the acquisition and utilization of audiovisual and other instructional materials and equipment.

On page 14, line 11, after the word "for", to strike out "school"; in line 20, after the word "approved", to insert "by the State education agency"; on page 15, line 6, after the word "State", to insert "from its allotment for any fiscal year"; in line 9, after the word "that", to strike out "in which such sums were received" and insert "for which such allotment was made"; in line 24, after "(b)", to strike out "In" and insert "With respect to any public school operated by a public agency or institution other than a State or local education agency, and in"; on page 16, line 4, after the word "salaries", to insert "within the entire State, within a given geographical area within the State, or with respect to particular categories of public schools,"; on page 18, line 22, after the word "be", to strike out the semicolon and "but the State education agency may waive the application of this section in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the cost of construction and the State education agency determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the education agency undertaking the construction"; after line 17, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 113. The State education agency may waive the application of section 112 in cases

or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the State education agency determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the education agency undertaking the construction.

On page 20, at the beginning of line 5, to change the section number from "113" to "114"; in line 14, after the word "Guam,", to insert "American Samoa,"; on page 21, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "education for local communities." and insert "education—"; after line 3, to insert:

(a) by a State or local education agency, or

(b) if the State application approved under this title so provides, by another State or local public agency or institution.

In line 17, after the word "constructed.", to strike out "Such terms do not include athletic stadiums, or structures, or facilities intended primarily for events, such as athletic exhibitions, contests, or games, for which admission is to be charged to the general public." and insert "Such terms shall include gymnasiums and similar facilities, except those intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public."; on page 22, line 11, after the word "Public", to strike out "Law" and insert "Laws 815 and"; after line 12, to strike out:

FEDERAL ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY

SEC. 201. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 237), is amended by striking out "ending prior to July 1, 1961".

After line 17, to strike out:

EMPLOYMENT ON FEDERAL PROPERTY

SEC. 202. (a) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out "ending prior to July 1, 1961".

(b) Clause (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of such section, relating to computation of the amount of entitlement, is amended to read: "(B) the sum of the number of children determined under subsection (a) and one-fourth of the number of children determined under subsection (b)".

On page 23, after line 4, to strike out:

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 203. (a) Clause (B) of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "(B) amounts to 3 per centum or more in the case of subsection (a), or 6 per centum or more in the case of subsection (b), of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance during such year and for whom such agency provided free public education, except that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, in the case of subsection (b), the percentage requirement shall be 4 per centum and 5 per centum, respectively, instead of 6 per centum".

(b) Paragraph (2) of such subsection (c) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and substituting therefor "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions the Commissioner may waive the conditions of entitlement contained in clause (A) or (B) of this paragraph whenever, in his judgment, exceptional circumstances exist which would make the application of such conditions inequitable and would defeat the purposes of this Act".

On page 24, after line 2, to strike out:

COMPUTATION OF LOCAL CONTRIBUTION RATE

SEC. 204. Subsection (d) of section 3 of such Act, relating to the computation of the local contribution rate, is amended in the following respects:

(a) The first sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "and the local educational agency".

(b) Clauses (1) and (2) of the first sentence of such subsection are amended to read—

"(1) he shall place each school district within the State into a group of generally comparable school districts; and

"(2) he shall then divide (A) the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which he is making the computation, which all of the local educational agencies within any such group of such comparable school districts made from revenues derived from local sources, by (B) the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such second preceding fiscal year."

(c) The third sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "If, in the judgment of the Commissioner, the current expenditure in those school districts which he has selected under clause (1)" and substituting in lieu thereof "If, in the judgment of the Commissioner, the current expenditures in the school districts within the generally comparable group as determined under clause (1)".

(d) The fourth sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "(i)" and "or (ii) 50 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States (which for purposes of this sentence and the next sentence means the fifty States and the District of Columbia), but not to exceed the average per pupil expenditure in the State: *Provided*, That if, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the application of clause (ii) of this sentence results in a lower local contribution rate than resulted from the application of such clause during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, as such clause was then in effect, then such clause, as in effect during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, shall be in effect during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959".

(e) The fifth sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out ", or in the United States," and ", or in the United States, as the case may be".

On page 25, after line 20, to strike out:

ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN DECREASES IN FEDERAL ACTIVITIES

SEC. 205. Subsection (f) of section 3 of such Act, relating to adjustment for certain decreases in Federal activities, is repealed.

At the top of page 26, to strike out:

SUDDEN AND SUBSTANTIAL INCREASES IN ATTENDANCE

SEC. 206. (a) Section 4 of such Act, relating to sudden and substantial increases in school attendance as a result of activities of the United States, is repealed.

(b) Section 1 of such Act is amended by striking out "; or (4) there has been a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as the result of Federal activities".

(c) Clause (A) of section 3(c)(4) of such Act is amended by striking out "(including funds available under section 4 of this Act)".

(d) Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act, relating to the method of making payments, is amended by striking out "section 2, 3, or 4" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2 or 3".

(e) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "sections 2, 3, and 4(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 2 and 3".

After line 17, to strike out:

DEFINITION OF FEDERAL PROPERTY

SEC. 207. The third sentence of paragraph (1) of section 9 of such Act, relating to the definition of "Federal property," is amended by inserting "and" before "(B)" and by striking out ", and (C) any school which is providing flight training to members of the Air Force under contractual arrangements with the Department of the Air Force at an airport which is owned by a State or a political subdivision of a State".

On page 27, after line 3, to strike out:

DEFINITION OF AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE OF FEDERALLY CONNECTED CHILDREN

SEC. 208. Paragraph (10) of section 9 of such Act is amended by adding the following additional sentence thereto: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, average daily attendance under subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner on the basis of the average daily attendance determined in accordance with State law (excluding children for whom the local educational agency received tuition) multiplied by the membership ratio between children qualifying under subsections (a) or (b) of section 3 and all children for whom free public education is provided; such membership ratio shall be derived from membership counts for two days during the fiscal year covered by the application, in accordance with such regulations."

After line 19, to strike out:

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAW 815

Employment or residence on Federal property

SEC. 301. (a) Paragraph (2) of section 5(a) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 635), relating to the determination of the number of children residing on Federal property or residing with a parent employed on Federal property for purposes of the limitation on the total of the payments to any local educational agency, is amended by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "25 per centum".

(b) Section 5(b) of such Act is amended by striking out "two or more" and inserting in lieu thereof "both".

Sudden and substantial increases in attendance

SEC. 302. (a) Section 5(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "; and " at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a period and by striking out paragraph (3) thereof.

(b) The first sentence of section 3 of such Act, relating to the dates of filing applications, is amended by striking out ", except that the last such date with respect to applications for payments on account of children referred to in paragraphs (2) or (3) of section 5(a) shall be not later than June 30, 1961".

(c) The last sentence of section 5(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "paragraph (1), (2), or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1) or (2)".

(d) Section 5(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)", by striking out "or 10 per centum in the case of paragraph (3),", and by striking out ", and unless, in the case of paragraph (3), the construction of additional minimum school facilities for the number of children in such increase will, in the judgment of the Commissioner, impose an undue financial burden on the taxing and borrowing authority of such agency".

(e) Section 5(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "paragraph (1), (2), or (3)" and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraph (1) or (2)".

(f) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act, relating to the definition of "base year", is amended by striking out "paragraph (1), (2), or (3)" and inserting in lieu children referred to in paragraphs (2) or (3) of section 5(a), the base year shall in no event be later than the regular school year 1958–59".

Additional Federal payments

SEC. 303. Section 8 of such Act, relating to additional Federal payments in unusual cases, is repealed.

Definition of Federal Property

SEC. 303. The third sentence of paragraph (1) of section 15 of such Act, relating to the definition of "Federal property," is amended by striking out "(A)" and by striking out ", and (B) any school which is providing flight training to members of the Air Force under contractual arrangements with the Department of the Air Force at an airport which is owned by a State or a political subdivision of a State".

Average per pupil cost of construction

SEC. 305. The first sentence of paragraph (6) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "increased by a percentage estimated by the Commissioner to represent additional costs for site improvements, equipment, and architectural, engineering, and legal fees, and multiplied by a factor estimated by the Commissioner to represent the area needed per pupil in minimum school facilities" and inserting in lieu thereof "multiplied by 95".

Indian lands

SEC. 306. (a) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 14(a) of such Act are amended by striking out "Federal property" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian lands".

(b) Section 14(b) of such Act is amended by substituting in the first sentence thereof "July 1, 1966" for "July 1, 1961" and "$60,000,000" for "$40,000,000" and by substituting in the last sentence thereof "June 30, 1966" for "June 30, 1961".

Children for whom local educational agencies are unable to provide education

SEC. 307. Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting the following sentence after the first sentence thereof: In any case in which the Commissioner makes arrangements under this section for constructing or otherwise providing minimum school facilities situated on Federal property in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, he may also include minimum school facilities necessary for the education of children residing with a parent employed by the United States though not residing on Federal property, but only if the Commissioner determines, after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency, (1) that the construction or provision of such facilities is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, and (2) that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children."

Technical amendment on judicial review

SEC. 308. Section 11(b) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentences: "The local educational agency affected may file with the court a petition to review such action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. Upon the filing of the petition the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the action of the Commissioner in whole or in part." Section 32 of the Act of August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85–791), is repealed.

Effective date

SEC. 309. The amendments made by this title and title II of this Act, other than section 308, shall be effective for the period beginning July 1, 1961.

On page 32, after line 4, to insert:

Extension of temporary provisions of Public Law 815

SEC. 201. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 633), is amended by striking out "1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "1964".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "1961" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1964", and (2) by striking out "$40,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$60,000,000".

(c) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "1958–1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "1961–1962".

After line 17, to insert:

Extension of temporary provisions of Public Law 874

SEC. 202. The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by striking out "1961" each time it appears in sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) and inserting "1964" in lieu thereof.

At the top of page 33, to insert:

Extension of laws to American Samoa

SEC. 203. (a) The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each time it appears in sections 3(d), 6(c), and 9(8).

(b) The Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," in section 15(13).

And, after line 8, to insert:

Report of operations under these laws

SEC. 204. The Commissioner shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1963, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended by this Act, including an analysis of the relation between Federal payments under these laws and Federal payments under title I of this Act, and his recommendations as to what the future relation between these laws and that title should be if they are further extended.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "School Assistance Act of 1961".

Declaration of purpose

SEC. 102. It is the purpose of this title to authorize a three-year program of Federal grants to States to assist their local education agencies to construct urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, to employ needed additional public school teachers and pay them adequate salaries, and to undertake special projects directed to special or unique educational problems or opportunities. It is the intent of Congress that with this assistance the quality of public elementary and secondary education will be substantially improved in all States and that inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced.

Assurance against Federal interference in schools

SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 104. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without any limitation of such appropriation or condition inconsistent with or contrary to the terms or purposes of this title, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, $850,000,000, for the purpose of making payments to State education agencies as provided in this title.

Allotment to States

SEC. 105. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per child of school age, the number of children of school age, and the effort for public school purposes of the respective States. A State allotment under this section for any fiscal year shall be available for obligation by the State, in accordance with the provisions of this title, during such year and the next fiscal year (and for those two years only). Except as provided by section 106, such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year, an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 for such year as the product of—

(1) the number of children of school age in the State in the preceding fiscal year, and

(2) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (b))

bears to the sum of corresponding products for all the States.

(b) for purposes of this title—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75 and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75 and (iii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of education in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and August 31 of such fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this title. Allotment ratios for each fiscal year shall be computed on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for the purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise such allotment ratios, and, as so revised and promulgated, such promulgation shall be equally conclusive.

(3) The term "income per child of school age" for any fiscal year for a State or for all the States means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(4) the term "child of school age" means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

Maintenance and improvement of State and local support for public school financing

SEC. 106. (a) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall be reduced if such State's effort for such fiscal year is not at least equal to such State's base effort for such year. The amount of such reduction shall be the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the public school expenditures it would have made in such year had it exerted the State's base effort for such year.

(b) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall also be reduced if such State's effort for such year is not at least equal to the State's base effort for such year plus the average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five-fiscal-year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961. The amount of the reduction under this subsection (which shall be in addition to the reduction, if any, under subsection (a)) shall bear the same relation to the sum otherwise allocable to the State under section 105, (1) as the difference between the State's effort and the national effort for such year bears to the national effort for such year, or (2), if it would result in a smaller reduction, as the difference between the State's expenditure per public school pupil and 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year, bears to 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year. This subsection shall not apply to any State for any year for which the State's effort equaled or exceeded the national effort for such year or the State's expenditure per public school pupil equaled or exceeded 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year.

(c) The total reductions which may be made under subsections (a) and (b) from the sum otherwise allocable to a State for any fiscal year, shall not exceed one-third of such sum.

(d) The sum of the reductions under this section for each fiscal year shall be reallotted by proportionately increasing the allotments under section 105 for such year of those remaining States (other than the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) whose allotments for such year have not been reduced under this section.

(e) For purposes of this section—

(1) (A) A "State's effort" for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the State's expenditure per public school pupil by (ii) the income per such pupil for the State; except that the State's effort shall be deemed to be equal to the State's base effort and to the national effort in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

(B) A State's "base effort" for a fiscal year means the average State effort over the three immediately preceding fiscal years.

(C) The "income per public school pupil" for a State or for all the States for any fiscal year means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of public school pupils in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(2) (A) The "national effort" for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the expenditure per public school pupil for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the income per such pupil for all such States.

(B) The average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, shall be determined by dividing the difference between the national effort for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, by four.

(3) (A) The "public school expenditures" of any State in any fiscal year means the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof in such year for public elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State (including payments in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes from any sources).

(B) The "expenditure per public school pupil" for any State for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing the State's public school expenditures in such year by the number of its public school pupils for such year.

(C) The "national expenditure per public school pupil" for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the public school expenditures of all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the number of public school pupils in all such States for such year.

(4) The Commissioner's determinations of the State effort, base effort, income, public school expenditures, and expenditure per public school pupil, for any State, and his determinations of the national effort, average rate of increase, and expenditure per public school pupil, shall be conclusive for purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise any such determination, and as so revised, such determination shall be equally conclusive.

Payment of allotments to States

SEC. 107. Payments to States which have submitted and had approved their applications under this title of Federal funds allotted to them pursuant to section 105 (as adjusted by the application of the provisions of section 106 and as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditure by the States of the funds so allotted.

State agency administrative costs

SEC. 108. From the sums allotted to it under section 105, as adjusted by section 106, for each fiscal year, a State education agency may use such amount as it deems necessary for any supervision, services, and other costs of administering its activities under this title in that year, except that such amount shall not be more than whichever is the lesser of (1) ten cents multiplied by the number of public school pupils in the State during the prior fiscal year, and (2) $150,000, except that if, for any State, such lesser amount is less than $25,000, such amount shall be increased to $25,000.

Special educational projects

SEC. 109. Each State education agency shall set aside, from the sums allotted to it under section 105, as adjusted by section 106 for any fiscal year, an amount equal to 10 per centum of the sums so allotted to it for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, for paying part of the costs of pilot, demonstration, or experimental projects of local education agencies, and other public agencies or institutions operating a public school, which, in the determination of the State agency, are designed to meet public school problems or to develop or evaluate public school programs of a special or unique nature, including but not limited to—

(1) remedial or special instructional programs or services for pupils having special language or adjustment problems;

(2) programs or services for adapting curriculums to the needs of deprived or disadvantaged pupils;

(3) programs or services for pupils from in-migrant or unusually mobile families;

(4) programs for coordinating the school system planning and programs in the area served by the local education agency, with the planning and programs of other public or private nonprofit agencies dealing with problems related to the alleviation of the same deteriorated or depressed areas and of the families and children residing therein;

(5) programs for developing new types of elementary or secondary instruction or programing;

(6) programs for developing multipurpose uses of elementary and secondary school facilities;

(7) programs to stimulate improvements in construction, design or location of elementary and secondary school facilities;

(8) programs to encourage and stimulate educational excellence, including programs for exceptionally gifted children;

(9) programs for the improvement of instruction through the acquisition and utilization of audiovisual and other instructional materials and equipment.

State applications

SEC. 110. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments under this title shall submit through its State education agency an application to the Commissioner which—

(1) provides assurance that the State education agency shall be the sole agency for administering the funds received under this title;

(2) provides for specifying at the beginning of each fiscal year the proportion of its allotment for such year that will be expended for (A) public school teachers' salaries, and (B) the construction of public school facilities; and provides that such allotment, except for sums used in accordance with sections 108 and 109, shall be used exclusively for either of such purposes;

(3) sets forth criteria and procedures to insure that in allocating funds received under this title (exclusive of amounts to be used for projects under section 109 and amounts to be used under section 108) to local education agencies (A) the amounts to be used for school facilities construction will be allocated within the State so that priority is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which are least able to finance the cost of needed school facilities, and (B) the amounts to be used for teachers' salaries will be allocated so that preference is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional teachers or increases in their teachers' salaries and which are least able to finance such costs.

(4) sets forth the criteria and procedures, consistent with the purposes of section 109, on the basis of which local education agency

projects under such section will be approved by the State education agency;

(5) provides assurance that every local education agency whose application for funds under this title is denied, will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency;

(6) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, funds paid to the State and by the State to the local education agencies under this title, which procedures shall include provision for repayment to the United States of any sums received by the State from its allotment for any fiscal year under this title which are not obligated by it in accordance with the provisions of this title by the end of the fiscal year following that for which such allotment was made, or which are not expended in accordance therewith by the end of the second fiscal year following that in which they were obligated (unless such sums have been deducted from subsequent payments pursuant to section 107);

(7) provides assurance that the requirements of section 112 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this title; and

(8) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require and for access by the Commissioner, upon request, to the records upon which such information is based.

(b) With respect to any public school operated by a public agency or institution other than a State or local education agency, and in the case of any State in which a State education agency has exclusive responsibility for financing the construction of school facilities or for the payment of teachers' salaries within the entire State, within a given geographical area within the State, or with respect to particular categories of public schools, the Commissioner may modify or make inapplicable any of the provisions of subsection (a) with respect to funds specified for school construction or teachers' salaries, as the case may be, to the extent he deems such action appropriate in the light of the special governmental or school organization of such State.

Review of State applications

SEC. 111. (a) (1) The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the conditions specified in section 110 (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency.

(2) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency, finds that such agency is not complying substantially with the provisions required to be included in its application under section 110(a), or that any funds have been diverted from the purposes for which they have been paid, the Commissioner shall forthwith notify the State education agency, and he shall thereafter withhold further payments to the State under this title until there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, there is a repayment, or an arrangement for repayment, of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended.

(b)(1) A State education agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State or agency is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(3) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

Labor standards

SEC. 112. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed in whole or in part under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality to be determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276c–5) for construction projects under this title, and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The State education agency of each State shall take such steps as shall be necessary to assure that the wage standards required above shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and in each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project. The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

SEC. 113. The State education agency may waive the application of section 112 in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the State education agency determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the education agency undertaking the construction.

Definitions

SEC. 114. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

(2) The term "local education agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision.

(3) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(4) The term "State education agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public schools.

(5) The term "public school pupils" means pupils in average daily attendance at public schools within a State, or within all of the States, as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with criteria developed by him to assure uniform determinations for all the States.

(6) The term "public schools" means schools providing free education at public expense, under public supervision and direction and without tuition charge to resident pupils, and which is provided as elementary or secondary school education—

(a) by a State or local education agency, or

(b) if the State application approved under this title so provides, by another State or local public agency or institution.

(7) The term "elementary and secondary education" shall not include any education provided below the kindergarten level or beyond grade 12.

(8) The terms "school facilities" and "public school facilities" mean classrooms and related facilities (including furniture, instructional materials other than textbooks, equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes) for public schools, and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such terms shall include gymnasiums and similar facilities, except those intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(9) The terms "construct", "constructing", and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

(10) The term "teacher" means any member of the instructional staff of a public school as defined by the State education agency of each State.

(11) The term "teachers' salaries" means the monetary compensation paid to teachers for services rendered in connection with their employment.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874

Extension of temporary provisions of Public Law 815

SEC. 201. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 633), is amended by striking out "1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "1964".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "1961", each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1964", and (2) by striking out "$40,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$60,000,000".

(c) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "1958–1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "1961–1962".

Extension of temporary provisions of Public Law 874

SEC. 202. The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by striking out "1961" each time it appears in sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) and inserting "1964" in lieu thereof.

Extension of laws to American Samoa

SEC. 203. (a) The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each time it appears in sections 3(d), 6(c), and 9(8).

(b) The Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," in section 15(13).

Report of operations under these laws

SEC. 204. The Commissioner shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1963, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended by this Act, including an analysis

of the relation between Federal payments under these laws and Federal payments under title I of this Act, and his recommendations as to what the future relation between these laws and that title should be if they are further extended.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, will the Senator yield so that I may submit some amendments to the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, I send to the desk three amendments to S. 1021 and ask that they be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed.

THE VOICE OF LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "School Boards Assume Voice of Education," written by John Rosson, published in the Washington Star, issue of May 7, 1961, in which there is a recitation of action taken by the National School Boards Association in Philadelphia on May 6. At that meeting the association took a stand against Federal aid to education by holding that the local school boards could handle school problems.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL BOARDS ASSUME VOICE OF EDUCATION

(By John Rosson)

PHILADELPHIA, May 6.—The leadership of the Nation's thousands of school boards voted here today to drop its cloak of provincialism and become a major spokesman on national educational issues.

The National School Boards Association, composed of school board members from 50 States, the District, and 2 territories, has never before attempted to express its feelings on nationwide educational matters.

The NSBA members, holding their 21st annual convention in Convention Hall, decided their effectiveness would not be felt if they continued to stand for local isolationism and did not speak out on educational issues affecting the Nation.

MIGHT CHALLENGE NEA

The decision immediately was interpreted as placing the NSBA in a good position to challenge the National Education Association's ranking as the foremost spokesman for American public school education.

"It is a foregone conclusion," one association officer said, "that we will be disagreeing with the NEA often."

The statement was based on NEA's strong stand in favor of Federal aid to education.

After deciding to jump into the national scene, the school board group voted overwhelmingly to:

1. Oppose Federal aid to education because "it would be naive to think that it will not mean Government control."

2. Oppose any broadening of the National Defense Education Act, which, among other things, provides Government scholarships.

3. Oppose Senate and House bills giving aid to States for educational television.

CHOICE OF TEXTBOOKS

4. Oppose further Federal aid of any kind "until the association could determine the position of each of the State school board associations."

5. Insure that choice of textbooks in the Nation's schools remain a local and State matter.

In defeat of Federal aid resolutions, a few delegations—including the one from the District—took a beating.

District School Board President Wesley S. Williams, supported by School Board Member Louise S. Steele, argued strongly for Federal aid legislation "because we need the money." They also argued that impacted area funds, paid to many school boards for years, have not meant Federal control.

Among those voting against Federal aid were the Maryland and Virginia delegations. They also based their arguments on the threat of Government intervention in local school matters.

The delegates were Dr. Barnard Joy of Arlington, and William Gravatt, of Blackstone, Va., and Dr. Richard D. Wiegle, of Annapolis, and Mrs. Frances Dodson, Charles County, Md.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I have one request and one announcement to make before I make my first speech on the education bill.

First, I ask unanimous consent that both majority and minority members of the professional staff of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted access to the floor of the Senate during the days that the education bill will be under discussion. I speak in behalf of the full membership of the committee because both the majority and the minority will need the professional assistance of the staff members of the committee, and I ask unanimous consent that they be authorized to come to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, reserving the right to object, since I did not hear the opening remarks of the Senator from Oregon, may I inquire whether he included the staff members of the minority?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I included the minority professional staff members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, as Senators know, I am usually delighted to have interruptions when I participate in debate, but I stand here today in a dual capacity, speaking not only for myself, but for the leadership of the Senate, and the administration, in presenting, in this first speech, the administration's case in support of S. 1021. Therefore, I think it would be in the interest of orderly procedure in the Senate for me to ask my colleagues to forbear with me so that my first speech on the bill may be presented without interruption. There will be plenty of time to cross-examine me in the interesting debate which I am sure we are starting now, and which will last for several days in the Senate. So I will finish the first speech, which is for the most part a speech of description in explanation of the bill. When we really get into the argumentative phases of the debate, I shall always be glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I inquire how long the Senator from Oregon expects to address himself to the first phase of his presentation?

Mr. MORSE. I have 14¼ pages. I imagine I can present it in 30 or 35 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That address will be what might be termed the first phase?

Mr. MORSE. My case in chief.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That presentation will be the first phase of the argument of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. My case in chief. I am so glad that my good friend from Illinois did not ask me how many hours I think I may have to discuss this subject in the next few days, but I want him to know that he will be pleasantly surprised at the determination of the Senator from Oregon to be exceedingly brief in the presentation of the arguments from time to time in support of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe it is one of the interesting phenomena of the 1st session of the 87th Congress that speeches have generally been on the brief side. I pleasantly and jocularly derided the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] the other day, before a meeting downtown, by saying that I would call him "Silent," for his first name, since the rule does not permit me to use his name, because since January 3, I had not heard him make a speech in the Senate in excess of 20 minutes in length. The Senator from Oregon has certainly delighted me, and I am sure he has delighted other Senators, by his interesting brevity.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate that compliment. I have been so delighted to be able to yield the honors for a considerable amount of discussion on the floor of the Senate to my good friend from Illinois. I suspect that an analysis of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show that about 10-fold the amount of space has been consumed by my good friend from Illinois—and that is as it should be, because of our difference in position on the floor of the Senate. However, I am delighted that in this session of Congress the Senator from Illinois has talked more than has the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Actually the Senator from Illinois is the quiet type, as the Senator from Oregon knows.

Mr. MORSE. I did not know that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes, indeed. But I thought I would get a comment from the Senator from Oregon with respect to the rather interesting attribute that has suddenly developed in this session of Congress, particularly in the Senate. I wondered if he had some logical way to account for it, drawing on recollection, having in mind some of the rather long speeches to which the Senate has been treated, and by which it has been edified.

Mr. MORSE. I have an explanation: Change of administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is that it? I wondered whether that was one of the qualities of the New Frontier.

Mr. MORSE. We do not have as many criticisms to make now.

Madam President, in opening this historic debate on Federal aid to education in the 87th Congress, I shall touch on many old familiar themes. In April and in May of 1949, 12 years ago, many of us participated in this Chamber in another debate upon this subject of Federal aid to education.

We spoke then of differing formulas for aid, of flat grants and of equalization of segregation riders, and of aid to church-related schools. Here we heard pleas that the State and local governments, could or could not afford the educational costs. Schools whose needs were then apparent, in the interim have quietly been educating a generation of schoolchildren from the first grade through high school. It is a generation which has been educationally shortchanged. It has been a generation which in too large a part has lost a priceless asset—the opportunity to obtain an education which would fit it under optimum conditions for the great tasks which will confront our Nation in the decade or two ahead. We have wasted, in many instances, the precious natural resource, and an irreplaceable one, the brainpower potential of many, many children. These are the boys and girls who had to attend part-time classes. These are the boys and girls who tried to learn from harried and overworked teachers in classes which contained too many children. These are the youngsters who were taught by teachers, willing enough to be sure, but teachers nevertheless, who could not meet the qualifying tests under State law of teacher accreditation. These are the children who were taught by teachers, who tried but who were worried by personal problems resulting from low salaries and the bitter necessity of supplementing insufficient incomes by second jobs.

Twelve years ago, we heard a great Republican Senator from Ohio, Senator Taft, explode the fallacy, then advanced, as in all likelihood it will be again in this debate, that a State has a vested right in the income taxes collected by the Federal Government. He pointed out then with relentless logic that to accept this theory was to destroy the necessary powers of the Federal Government. He reminded us that we are citizens of the United States as well as citizens of our respective States. I commend to the Senate that discussion of 12 years ago. It will be helpful in the days ahead as we work on the current bill. All this we heard then, and more.

In the debate this week, many of the same arguments will be made. Again charts will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD purporting to show that some States will receive aid from other States, and that others will receive less than is paid out in taxes. When these events occur, if they do, I suggest that we reflect upon the wisdom of Senator Taft.

But, Madam President, as I have indicated, there has been one change in the interim. A generation has grown up which knows World War II as history only. It is a generation graduating from high school with but dim and childish memories of the Korean conflict. It is a numerically large generation. We have had a tremendous population growth since the two wars, and, although the rate of increase may be at last slowing down, in absolute numbers it is continuing to grow.

Time is running ever more short to meet the increasing demands being placed upon our educational plant. The load in absolute numbers each year upon our overburdened classrooms and our dedicated teachers continues to grow. Unless we find ways and means to meet the financial needs of our schoolchildren, as expressed in terms of classrooms, pupil-teacher ratios, and salaries of teaching personnel, we run the risk of finding ourselves in ever increasing difficulty and of being faced by a more and more dilapidated educational system.

What is our situation today? What is the factual basis for the need S. 1021 is designed to meet in part? Facing page 298 of the hearing record is a large chart entitled: "Fall 1960 Statistics on Enrollment, Teachers, and School Housing in Full Time Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, by State."

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this chart be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, since it contains the basic documentation for the case the proponents of the bill present.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fall 1960 statistics on enrollment, teachers, and school housing in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools, by State

Region and State	Number of pupils enrolled			Number of classroom teachers			Number of teachers teaching under substandard credentials [1]			Degree or number of semester hours required for lowest regular teaching certificate [2]		Number of pupils in excess of normal capacity of the accessible publicly owned school plants in use		
	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
United States (50 States and District of Columbia) [4]	36,305,104	24,457,321	11,847,783	1,409,995	861,035	548,960	91,552	67,249	24,303			1,868,000	1,181,000	687,000
North Atlantic	8,434,285	5,255,535	3,178,750	348,604	194,141	154,463	25,375	16,490	8,885			523,538	297,591	225,947
Connecticut	480,473	343,611	136,862	20,005	12,232	7,773	[5] 1,700	[5] 1,200	[5] 500	B	B	21,841	10,741	11,100
Delaware	82,206	47,572	34,634	3,088	1,977	1,711	529	435	94	B	B	1,846	1,138	708
Maine	204,783	[6] 155,898	[6] 48,885	8,175	5,609	2,566	379	298	81	96	B	14,145	[6] 9,261	[6] 4,884
Maryland	607,363	358,022	249,341	[7] 23,520	[6] 12,305	[7] 11,215	[6] 6,200	[6] 4,457	[6] 1,743	B	B	57,836	30,092	27,744
Massachusetts	837,643	560,365	277,278	35,553	20,983	14,570	[5] 1,150	[5] 580	[5] 570	B	B	39,961	22,158	17,803
New Hampshire	105,909	72,468	33,501	4,504	2,768	1,736	450	360	90	B	B	4,323	3,073	1,250
New Jersey	1,054,405	739,862	314,543	46,266	30,225	16,041	6,180	4,733	1,447	B	B	79,886	48,519	31,367
New York	2,786,600	[10] 1,630,000	[10] 1,150,000	119,500	62,300	57,200	5,850	2,630	3,220	B	B+30	224,800	[10] 135,600	[10] 89,200
Pennsylvania	1,950,501	1,133,576	817,015	74,653	38,355	36,298	965	501	464	B	B	52,081	18,175	33,906
Rhode Island	134,513	[10] 79,963	[10] 54,550	5,255	2,694	2,561	346	187	159	B	B	6,509	[10] 3,546	[10] 2,963
Vermont	74,891	53,393	21,498	3,110	2,100	1,010	326	238	88	B	B	4,652	3,173	1,479
District of Columbia	121,448	80,806	40,643	4,375	2,593	1,782	1,300	871	429	B	[11] B	15,658	12,115	3,543
Great Lakes and Plains	10,211,806	7,046,836	3,164,970	409,884	259,941	149,943	24,964	20,278	4,686					
Illinois	1,741,709	1,287,537	454,172	72,114	49,108	23,006	5,735	5,144	591	[12] 60	B	122,998	104,925	18,073
Indiana	[6] 983,531	[6] 709,496	[6] 274,035	[6] 35,000	[6] 25,248	[6] 9,752	3,000	2,250	750	B	B	15,000	11,250	3,750
Iowa	577,735	381,276	196,459	26,264	14,903	11,361	320	220	100	B	B	13,775	6,900	6,875
Kansas [13]	465,000	332,000	113,000	21,610	12,980	8,630				B	B	(14)	(14)	(14)
Michigan	1,680,749	1,045,537	635,203	63,942	36,691	27,251	8,353	6,893	1,460	120	120	54,675	32,445	21,630
Minnesota	692,336	413,758	278,578	29,092	15,152	13,940	517	401	116	B	B	28,995	15,263	13,792
Missouri	824,305	[6] 628,045	[6] 196,350	30,084	20,727	9,357	149	68	81	64	B	35,300	[6] 26,300	[6] 9,000
Nebraska	282,997	193,319	89,678	13,804	8,811	5,083	566	476	90	40	B	6,835	5,141	1,694
North Dakota	138,163	[6] 100,807	[6] 37,266	7,528	5,202	2,326	34	24	10	64	B	4,687	[6] 3,096	[6] 1,591
Ohio	1,950,852	1,306,759	644,093	73,729	45,524	28,205	4,951	3,779	1,172	B	B	60,604	43,147	17,457
South Dakota	149,348	[6] 111,212	[6] 38,136	7,677	5,698	1,982	339	273	66	[13] 30	B	13,871	[6] 8,764	[6] 5,107
Wisconsin [13]	725,000	517,000	208,000	28,950	19,900	9,050	1,000	750	250	64	B	21,200	10,700	10,500

See footnotes at end of table.

Fall 1960 statistics on enrollment, teachers, and school housing in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools, by State—Continued

Region and State	Number of pupils enrolled			Number of classroom teachers			Number of teachers teaching under substandard credentials [1]			Degree or number of semester hours required for lowest regular teaching certificate [2]		Number of pupils in excess of normal capacity of the accessible publicly owned school plants in use		
	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Southeast	8,791,792	5,964,358	2,827,434	317,330	197,778	119,552	16,376	12,687	3,689	----	----	626,278	385,379	240,899
Alabama	789,134	[10] 444,200	[10] 344,934	26,461	14,690	11,771	2,227	1,305	922	B	B	143,598	[10] 87,542	[10] 56,056
Arkansas	422,160	[10] 240,021	[10] 182,139	15,022	7,820	7,202	2,214	1,739	475	B	B	29,692	[10] 17,836	[10] 11,856
Florida	979,165	575,533	403,632	37,265	20,807	16,458	493	461	32	B	B	73,086	38,155	34,931
Georgia	931,539	[10] 646,280	[10] 285,259	32,820	21,290	11,530	196	190	6	B	B	76,163	[10] 49,935	[10] 26,228
Kentucky	618,204	443,452	174,752	23,499	15,730	7,769	2,965	2,545	420	96	B	58,380	41,847	16,533
Louisiana	714,000	559,000	155,000	26,598	15,956	10,642	1,650	1,106	544	B	B	16,726	12,004	4,722
Mississippi	575,000	387,000	188,000	18,691	10,915	7,776	588	373	215	B	B	39,902	27,867	12,035
North Carolina	1,102,026	[6] 839,916	[6] 262,110	37,458	26,911	10,547	1,690	1,469	221	B	B	53,544	[6] 36,450	[6] 17,094
South Carolina	580,920	375,152	205,768	20,856	12,330	8,526	[17] 33	[17] 18	[17] 15	B	B	23,345	11,370	11,975
Tennessee	794,760	604,017	190,743	29,641	21,934	7,707	1,075	850	225	B	B	31,746	14,815	16,931
Virginia	847,228	582,872	264,356	32,663	19,737	12,926	2,116	1,803	313	B	B	61,041	38,406	22,635
West Virginia	437,656	266,915	170,741	16,356	9,658	6,698	1,129	828	301	B	B	19,055	9,152	9,903
West and Southwest	8,679,223	6,071,604	2,607,619	327,404	204,919	122,485	24,716	17,708	7,008	----	----	293,204	195,652	97,552
Arizona	306,866	236,491	70,375	11,184	8,369	2,815	51	46	5	B	B+30	17,477	10,269	7,208
California	3,353,600	2,282,000	1,071,600	119,250	74,500	44,750	11,000	8,000	3,000	B	B+30	61,000	55,000	6,000
Colorado	392,217	243,295	148,922	16,683	9,323	7,360	184	142	42	90	B	19,235	11,602	7,633
Idaho	158,918	[10] 88,879	[10] 70,039	6,348	3,409	2,939	1,449	1,118	331	B	B	10,352	[10] 5,489	[10] 4,863
Montana	146,315	[6] 99,696	[6] 46,619	6,879	4,479	2,400	270	242	28	64	B	6,530	[6] 5,146	[6] 1,384
Nevada	64,378	42,424	21,954	2,729	1,848	881	----	----	----	62	B	4,560	3,129	1,431
New Mexico	222,953	[10] 133,138	[10] 89,815	9,191	5,116	4,075	173	136	37	B	B	16,478	[10] 8,736	[10] 7,742
Oklahoma	[10] 539,000	[10] 328,500	[10] 210,500	20,290	11,600	8,690	----	----	----	B	B	20,000	16,000	4,000
Oregon	388,500	[6] 270,433	[6] 118,157	17,085	10,856	6,229	1,959	1,919	40	B	B	7,896	[6] 6,089	[6] 1,807
Texas	2,151,236	1,678,809	472,427	80,684	54,330	26,354	6,500	3,574	2,926	B	B	76,904	50,263	26,641
Utah	237,785	142,986	94,799	8,526	4,629	3,897	404	277	127	B	B	16,851	8,625	8,226
Washington	638,433	476,338	162,095	24,594	14,241	10,353	2,100	1,700	400	B	B	33,254	13,662	19,592
Wyoming	78,932	48,615	30,317	3,961	2,219	1,742	626	554	72	B	B	2,667	1,642	1,025
Alaska	43,306	33,579	9,727	1,816	1,328	488	71	63	8	90	B	5,056	4,450	606
Hawaii	144,692	85,409	59,283	4,957	2,928	2,029	50	23	27	B	B	7,751	5,626	2,125
Outlying parts:														
American Samoa	5,378	3,423	1,955	301	236	65	8	----	8	[19]	[19] B	455	----	455
Canal Zone	11,443	6,541	4,902	356	190	166	2	2	----	[20] B	[21] B	232	232	----
Guam	13,690	9,059	4,631	509	310	199	66	60	6	60	B	----	----	----
Puerto Rico	570,461	386,705	183,756	13,672	8,730	5,542	2,981	875	2,106	68	B	169,440	136,647	32,793
Virgin Islands	6,879	4,741	2,138	232	130	102	----	----	----	60	60	1,516	1,153	363

Region and State	Number of pupils attending school for less than a full or normal schoolday			Inventory of instruction rooms				Additional instruction rooms needed (as of fall 1960)			Instruction rooms scheduled for completion during 1960–61 school year
	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Available, beginning 1959–60 school year	Completed during 1959–60 school year	Abandoned for instructional purposes during the 1959–60 school year	Available, beginning 1960–61 school year	Total	To accommodate excess enrollment reported in col. 13	To replace unsatisfactory facilities (exclusive of those in col. 24)	
(1)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)
United States (50 States and District of Columbia) [4]	[22] 685,496	[22] 505,861	[22] 179,635	1,286,960	69,400	17,800	1,338,560	142,160	66,141	76,019	69,553
North Atlantic	283,288	153,025	130,263	298,226	13,501	3,772	307,955	36,076	19,073	17,003	13,567
Connecticut	18,987	6,682	12,305	17,086	1,258	355	17,989	1,060	805	255	672
Delaware	98	98	----	3,150	226	7	3,369	155	62	93	130
Maine	4,613	[6] 1,295	[6] 3,318	7,393	369	118	7,644	893	543	350	414
Maryland	36,244	19,652	16,592	18,959	1,100	168	19,891	2,912	2,057	855	1,192
Massachusetts	4,195	3,082	1,113	33,104	689	159	33,634	2,342	1,332	1,010	800
New Hampshire	2,133	----	2,133	4,028	241	82	4,187	294	152	142	185
New Jersey	59,163	41,744	17,419	36,535	1,964	255	38,244	3,839	2,806	1,033	1,328
New York	[23] 137,770	[10 23] 70,669	[10 23] 67,101	96,900	3,960	910	99,950	16,000	8,200	7,800	5,800
Pennsylvania	13,465	7,168	6,297	69,633	2,941	1,516	71,058	6,548	2,146	4,402	2,722
Rhode Island	4,226	[10] 241	[10] 3,985	4,583	257	54	4,786	407	230	177	100
Vermont	----	----	----	3,113	224	107	3,230	849	194	655	92
District of Columbia	2,394	2,394	----	3,742	272	41	3,973	777	546	231	132
Great Lakes and Plains	[22] 109,120	[22] 94,119	[22] 15,001	378,924	----	----	----	39,213	14,884	24,329	19,822
Illinois	50,407	49,775	632	67,659	1,872	676	68,855	8,699	4,691	4,008	4,403
Indiana	[14]	[14]	[14]	33,930	1,933	178	35,685	1,321	500	821	2,152
Iowa	----	----	----	19,915	546	313	20,148	705	505	200	500
Kansas	[14]	[14]	[14]	23,378	[14]	[14]	[14]	[24] 2,007	[24] 1,139	[24] 868	[24] 375
Michigan	13,614	11,833	1,781	51,242	3,500	200	54,542	10,762	1,931	8,831	3,810
Minnesota	12,286	8,599	3,687	26,798	1,292	351	27,739	3,816	1,016	2,800	1,190
Missouri	----	----	----	29,119	1,388	286	30,221	4,354	1,524	2,830	1,391
Nebraska	703	703	----	14,797	462	307	14,952	358	189	169	332
North Dakota	----	----	----	7,378	350	512	7,216	902	156	746	399
Ohio	31,022	22,179	8,843	66,669	3,273	663	69,279	3,919	2,020	1,899	3,551
South Dakota	1,088	[6] 1,030	[6] 58	7,249	257	193	7,313	820	463	357	219
Wisconsin	----	----	----	30,790	1,520	510	31,800	1,550	750	800	1,500

See footnotes at end of table.

Fall 1960 statistics on enrollment, teachers, and school housing in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools, by State—Continued

Region and State	Number of pupils attending school for less than a full or normal schoolday			Inventory of instruction rooms				Additional instruction rooms needed (as of fall 1960)			Instruction rooms scheduled for completion during 1960–61 school year
	Total	Elementary [3]	Secondary [3]	Available, beginning 1959–60 school year	Completed during 1959–60 school year	Abandoned for instructional purposes during the 1959–60 school year	Available, beginning 1960–61 school year	Total	To accommodate excess enrollment reported in col. 13	To replace unsatisfactory facilities (exclusive of those in col. 24)	
(1)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)
Southeast	[22] 118,329	[22] 106,294	[22] 12,035	297,384	16,102	5,435	308,051	45,968	21,363	24,605	16,113
Alabama	27,041	[10] 20,223	[10] 6,818	23,687	2,324	271	25,740	7,335	4,926	2,409	2,645
Arkansas	2,432	[10] 2,432	([10])	13,867	675	366	14,176	2,410	1,130	1,280	721
Florida	44,863	39,766	5,097	30,866	2,384	186	33,064	4,744	2,505	2,239	1,851
Georgia	17,534	17,534	([10])	33,903	867	346	34,324	3,714	2,460	1,254	532
Kentucky	2,789	2,789	----------	22,204	1,010	552	22,662	8,906	1,946	6,960	1,331
Louisiana	3,224	3,224	----------	25,077	1,426	239	26,264	1,457	689	768	1,099
Mississippi	----------	----------	----------	16,983	1,801	1,056	17,728	2,597	1,163	1,434	1,571
North Carolina	2,076	[6] 2,076	([6])	38,166	1,608	457	39,317	3,714	1,620	2,094	1,510
South Carolina	([14])	([14])	([14])	20,104	787	405	20,486	1,859	858	1,001	721
Tennessee	355	355	----------	27,830	1,144	392	28,582	2,984	1,054	1,930	1,726
Virginia	16,717	16,597	120	28,405	1,794	911	29,288	4,326	2,332	1,994	1,967
West Virginia	1,298	1,298	----------	16,392	282	254	16,420	1,922	680	1,242	439
West and Southwest	172,707	150,371	22,336	306,353	22,385	4,036	324,702	20,162	10,375	9,787	19,602
Arizona	14,200	7,734	6,466	10,335	1,265	150	11,450	1,085	697	388	487
California	122,000	110,000	12,000	108,000	10,000	1,000	117,000	4,000	2,000	2,000	10,000
Colorado	9,739	8,757	982	14,347	1,459	470	15,336	1,371	762	609	584
Idaho	----------	----------	----------	6,045	224	123	6,146	812	400	412	282
Montana	3,904	[6] 2,513	[6] 1,391	6,805	253	108	6,950	443	250	193	353
Nevada	4,543	4,543	----------	2,327	271	76	2,522	302	167	135	137
New Mexico	----------	----------	----------	7,941	420	121	8,240	1,104	562	542	458
Oklahoma	----------	----------	----------	25,997	975	825	26,147	2,300	800	1,500	1,000
Oregon	3,531	[6] 2,250	[6] 1,281	14,987	760	168	15,579	699	348	351	588
Texas	4,987	4,987	----------	75,251	4,365	307	79,309	4,438	2,488	1,950	3,629
Utah	9,187	9,187	----------	7,598	728	185	8,141	962	576	386	401
Washington	616	400	216	23,333	1,490	447	24,376	2,383	1,218	1,165	1,422
Wyoming	----------	----------	----------	3,387	175	56	3,506	263	107	156	241
Alaska	----------	----------	----------	1,079	90	26	1,143	295	200	95	119
Hawaii	2,052	2,052	----------	4,994	281	174	5,101	446	246	200	330
Outlying parts:											
American Samoa	----------	----------	----------	251	12	12	251	35	15	20	1
Canal Zone	----------	----------	----------	406	26	20	412	7	7	----------	22
Guam	----------	----------	----------	561	14	50	525	243	----------	243	53
Puerto Rico	320,325	268,711	51,614	11,577	738	108	12,207	4,860	4,216	644	500
Virgin Islands	----------	----------	----------	190	8	1	197	97	52	45	39

[1] Some of the teachers included in cols. 8 through 10 may have met the minimum general education requirements given in cols. 11 and 12 but lack either the required semester hours of professional education or directed teaching.
[2] "B" means the bachelor's degree, the equivalent of 120–128 semester hours; "M" means the master's degree.
[3] Unless otherwise noted, data for elementary and secondary schools are classified by type of organization of the school, rather than by grade group.
[4] Totals for cols. 2 to 10, 16 to 19, and 23 to 26, while shown to the last digit, are not in fact precise to that degree but merely represent the sum of unrounded and rounded figures furnished by the various States; totals in cols. 13 to 15 and 20 to 22 include estimates for nonreporting States.
[5] State advises that "these teachers are working toward standard certificates; their certificates are emergency but not substandard."
[6] Data for elementary and secondary schools are reported by grade group (kindergarten through grade 8 for elementary, and grades 9 to 12 for secondary).
[7] Includes librarians and guidance personnel.
[8] Data estimated by local school superintendents.
[9] As of June 1960.
[10] Data for elementary and secondary schools are reported by grade group (kindergarten through grade 6 for elementary, and grades 7 to 12 for secondary).
[11] Represents requirement for teaching in junior high and vocational high schools; master's degree required for teaching in senior high schools.
[12] Data relate to requirement for teachers who pass the teachers' examination; requirement without examination is a bachelor's degree.
[13] Excludes vocational schools.
[14] Data not available.
[15] Represents requirement for teaching in rural schools; requirement for teaching in town schools is 60 semester hours.
[16] Data for elementary and secondary schools are reported by grade group (kindergarten through grade 7 for elementary, and grades 8 to 12 for secondary).
[17] Data for 1959–60 school year.
[18] Estimated data for 1960–61 school year.
[19] No regular certification requirements for teaching grades 1 to 9; bachelor's degree required for teaching grades 10 to 12.
[20] Represents requirement for teaching in schools for U.S. citizens; in schools for Latin Americans the requirement is a Republic of Panama normal school certificate or its equivalent.
[21] Represents requirement for teaching grades 7 and 8 in schools for U.S. citizens and in secondary schools for Latin Americans; master's degree required for teaching grades 9 to 12 in schools for U.S. citizens.
[22] Incomplete; total for States reporting.
[23] Includes New York City data for 1959.
[24] Incomplete.

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, advance data from forthcoming Office of Education Circular No. 634, Jan. 13, 1961.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, before discussing further these statistics, I should like to indicate the points I shall cover in this opening statement on the bill.

I propose to discuss first the need for an improvement in our schools throughout the country. Second, I shall touch upon the precedents for the National Government assuming a portion of the burden of meeting the need. Third, I shall advert very briefly to the constitutional issues involved. Lastly, I shall describe the contents of the bill, S. 1021, which is before us for debate today. The pending bill was reported to the Senate favorably by a committee vote of 12 to 2.

THE NEED FOR AID TO EDUCATION

As of the fall of 1960 there were 36,305,104 pupils enrolled in our public elementary and secondary schools. To teach these boys and girls, the chart shows we have a combined teaching staff of elementary and secondary public schools which totals 1,409,995 teachers.

But of the more than 36 million children in the public schools there were 1,868,000 of them being taught in overcrowded classrooms.

Almost 2 million of our children are being housed in schools and classrooms in excess of the normal capacity of the school plants. Almost 700,000 boys and girls, last year, attended school for less than a full or normal schoolday because the classrooms in the schools of the community simply could not accommodate them. We needed last fall 142,160 more classrooms in the public schools than we had.

Arguments will be advanced. I feel sure, that a need of this magnitude can be met by sources other than the Federal Government. The statistical data will be attacked perhaps, on the basis that it is not completely accurate to the last pupil or classroom. Senators may be told that the States and local governments have means of again rising to the continuing emergencies of school construction and operating costs of existing plants, and they may be reminded again and again that 80 percent of the bonds for school purposes last year were floated.

For the sake of argument only, let us assume that there may be some minor variations in the statistics on classroom shortages. Perhaps we do not need 142,160 classrooms; perhaps we need

only 140,000. Still with all the fine record of achievement of our local communities in floating bond issues, the brutal fact remains that there are 140,000 schoolrooms not there.

The children who should be in these missing 140,000 plus rooms are among the 1,868,000 children who are being cheated out of an education to which we believe they are entitled. Whose loss is this? It is a loss, not only to the child who is not receiving an education under optimum learning conditions; it is a loss to the teacher who cannot use his or her skills to maximum advantage because of crowded conditions. It is a major loss, in the final analysis, to all of us as citizens of the United States in the years to come. Why? Because skills, techniques and information needed by all of our citizens in the complex society created by our technology have not been taught effectively in many cases.

There is another shocking statistic in that chart, and I refer now to the number of teachers who are working with our children who do not possess the proper credentials to teach. By definition, they are substandard teachers. There were 91,552 such teachers last fall who could be found in almost every State of the Union and in each of the possessions of the United States. There were 25,375 of them in the North Atlantic States, 24,964 of them in the areas of the Great Lakes and Plains; 16,376 of them in the great States of the South, and the West and Southwest had 24,716 of them.

Many of these are very able teachers, I feel sure, but the fact remains for one reason or another, they could not meet the accreditation requirements of the State laws of the 50 States.

I spoke of the pupils who are in excess of the normal capacity of the classrooms in the school plant throughout the country. On the chart we find the figure of 1,868,000. More than one-half million are in the North Atlantic States; 293,204 of them are in the West and Southwest; 626,278 are in the States of the Southeast and, with the exception of 171,000 or so, the balance come from the Great Lakes and Plains States.

Here, then, we have the parameters of the problem. Too many children, in too few schoolrooms, and teaching them, too many teachers who cannot meet the minimum requirements for teacher accreditation under State law.

How can this complex of need be best met?

It is proposed in S. 1021 that the Federal Government exercise its authority under the general welfare clause of the Constitution to provide money to the States for these three purposes: School construction; teachers salaries; and for special projects in an amount which will not exceed 10 percent of the first year's appropriation for all purposes.

Madam President, I have spoken up till now of the needs of the past. What of the needs of the future? Testimony presented on page 94 of our hearings by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Ribicoff, indicates that the enrollment in our elementary and secondary schools will increase from our present 36-million-plus students to more than 44 million in the years 1968–69; that increases in enrollment will require, according to his best judgment, an additional 437,000 instructional personnel and 600,000 new classrooms before the decade ends. The greatest need will be upon us, he feels—and I join with him in the feeling—in the next 5 years.

I should like to take just a moment to express heartfelt appreciation to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff. I know that I speak the unanimous point of view of every member of the subcommittee, on both sides of the table, and of every member of the full committee, on both sides of the table. I bespeak their appreciation and thanks to Secretary Ribicoff for the magnificent way in which he has cooperated with the committee during the past many weeks as we worked together trying to hammer out on the anvil of conscionable compromise, in accordance with the facts as we found them, the bill which we today bring to the Senate for action.

In my many years in the Senate, I have had the pleasure of associating with many dedicated public servants, but Secretary Ribicoff is outstanding among them. Here is a man who is always interested in asking the question: What are the facts? And then in following to where those facts lead. Here is a man who feels very deeply the need of bringing to an end a cruel waste of human resources in this country, resources which are now being wasted because we are not developing to the maximum intellectual potential so many tens of thousands of American boys and girls.

So, for the record, I say to Secretary Ribicoff, "Thanks, and thanks again, for the wonderful assistance you have been to me as chairman of the subcommittee and to the members of both the subcommittee and the full committee."

Madam President, at this point I bring to the attention of the Senate the statement of the President of the United States in his message to Congress dated February 20, 1961. In this message President Kennedy said:

> Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself, in an era such as this, all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity.
>
> The human mind is our fundamental resource. A balanced Federal program must go well beyond incentives for investment in plant and equipment. It must include equally determined measures to invest in human beings—both in their basic education and training and in their more advanced preparation for professional work. Without such measures, the Federal Government will not be carrying out its responsibilities for expanding the base of our economic and military strength.

With this, Madam President, I shall turn to my second major point. However, before doing so, I wish to make a comment concerning one of the statesmanlike statements made by the President in his message of February 20, 1961. Another great President in our history also once spoke on the subject of enlightening our people. I think that President Kennedy's message to Congress dated February 20 is but an extension of the great tenet which Thomas Jefferson uttered when he said that "a democracy can be no stronger than the enlightenment of its people."

When President Kennedy, in 1961, said:

> Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education—

he, to all intents and purposes, in my judgment, underlined that tenet of Jefferson's.

PRECEDENTS FOR FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Madam President, the American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, in 1960 prepared a brochure which may be found on pages 865 through 879 of the printed hearings. I ask unanimous consent that the printed material starting with the headline "State Grants at Admission to Union" on page 868 and continuing through the conclusions and recommendations on page 879 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE GRANTS AT ADMISSION TO UNION

ALABAMA

Act of admission, March 2, 1819 (3 Stat. 491, sec. 6).

Grant to Alabama: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; all salt springs in the State; 36 sections for a seminary; 1,620 acres for the seat of government; and 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be reserved for construction of public roads and canals and improving the navigation of rivers by the State.

ARIZONA

Act of admission, June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 572–573).

Grant to Arizona: Sections 16, 36, 2, and 32 or their equivalent in each township for schools; in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, September 28, 1850, and July 2, 1862, above: 200,000 acres for the university, 100,000 acres for public buildings, etc., 100,000 acres for insane asylums, 100,000 acres for penitentiaries, 100,000 acres for schools and asylums for the deaf, dumb, and blind, 50,000 acres for hospitals for disabled miners, 200,000 acres for normal schools, 100,000 acres for charitable institutions, etc., 150,000 acres for agricultural and mechanical colleges, 150,000 acres for school of mines, 100,000 acres for military institutions, and 1,000,000 acres for payment of certain railroad bonds; 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

ARKANSAS

The act of admission of June 15, 1836 (5 Stat. 50–52, ch. 100) made no grant, but a supplementary act of June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 58–59, ch. 120) made the following grant:

Grant to Arkansas: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; up to 12 salt springs, etc.; 5 sections for public buildings, in addition to 10 sections granted to the territory under act of March 2, 1831 (4 Stat. 473, ch. 67); 72 sections (two entire townships) for a seminary (which had been granted to the territory under an earlier act); and 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be reserved for making roads and canals by the State.

CALIFORNIA

The act of admission, of September 9, 1850 (9 Stat. 452–453, ch. 50) made no grant.

COLORADO

Act of admission, March 21, 1864 (13 Stat. 34, secs. 7–9).

Grant to Colorado: Sections 16 and 36 in every township or its equivalent, for schools; 20 sections for public buildings; 20 sections for a penitentiary or State prison; and 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for roads, ditches, or canals, to effect a general system of irrigation of the agricultural land. (Superseded by an act of Mar. 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 475–476).)

FLORIDA

The act of admission, March 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 742–743, ch. 48), made no grant, but a supplemental act of the same date (5 Stat. 788, ch. 75) made the following grant:

Grant to Florida: 8 sections for the seat of government; section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; 2 townships, in addition to 2 already reserved, for two seminaries; 5 percent of the net proceeds of the sale of lands within the State thereafter sold by Congress, for educational purposes.

IDAHO

Act of admission, July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215–217).

Grant to Idaho: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 50 sections for public buildings, 72 sections for a university, a penitentiary, 90,000 acres for an agricultural college, and in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850, above, and any grant of saline lands; 100,000 acres for a scientific school, 100,000 acres for normal schools, 50,000 acres for an insane asylum, 50,000 acres for a university at Moscow, 50,000 acres for a penitentiary, and 150,000 acres for other charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

ILLINOIS

Act of admission, April 18, 1818 (3 Stat. 430, sec. 6).

Grant to Illinois: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; all salt springs in the State; 36 sections for a seminary; 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be reserved for appropriation by the State for encouragement of learning, of which one-sixth is to be used for a college or university.

INDIANA

Act of admission, April 19, 1816 (3 Stat. 290, sec. 6).

Grant to Indiana: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; certain salt springs, etc.; one township for a seminary; 4 sections for the seat of government; 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be applied to construction of roads and canals by the State.

IOWA

The act of admission, March 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 742–743, ch. 48), made no grant, but a supplemental act of the same date (5 Stat. 789–790, ch. 76) made the following grant:

Grant to Iowa: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university (reserved by an act of July 20, 1840); 5 sections for public buildings; up to 16 salt springs, etc.; 5 percent of the net proceeds of the sale of public lands within the State sold by Congress after its admission, for roads and canals.

KANSAS

Act of admission, January 29, 1861 (12 Stat. 127, sec. 3).

Grant to Kansas: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; 10 sections for public buildings; up to 12 salt springs; 5 percent of receipts from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for roads and internal improvements.

KENTUCKY

The act of admission, February 4, 1791 (1 Stat. 189, ch. 4) made no grant.

LOUISIANA

The act of admission, February 20, 1811 (2 Stat. 641–643), provided in section 5 that 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands after January 1, 1811, were to be applied to construction of roads and levees by the State.

MAINE

The act of admission, March 3, 1820 (3 Stat. 544, ch. 19), made no grant.

MICHIGAN

The act of admission, June 15, 1836 (5 Stat. 49, ch. 99), made no grant but a supplementary act of June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 59–60, ch. 121), made the following grant:

Grant to Michigan: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university (reserved under an act of May 20, 1826 (4 Stat. 180, ch. 90)); 5 sections for public buildings; up to 12 salt springs; 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State is to be appropriated for making roads and canals by the State.

MINNESOTA

Act of admission, February 26, 1857 (11 Stat. 167, sec. 5).

Grant to Minnesota: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; 10 sections for public buildings; up to 12 salt springs; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for roads and internal improvements.

MISSISSIPPI

Act of March 1, 1817 (3 Stat. 349, ch. 23, sec. 5).

Three percent of receipts from sale of public lands in Mississippi is to be applied to construction of roads and canals by the State. No lands were granted.

MISSOURI

Act of admission, March 6, 1820 (3 Stat. 547, sec. 6).

Grant to Missouri: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; up to 12 salt springs, etc.; 4 sections for the seat of government; 36 sections and lands previously reserved for a seminary (an act of Feb. 17, 1818, 3 Stat. 407, sec. 3, had reserved 2 townships for a seminary); 3 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in Missouri is to be reserved for making roads and canals by the State.

MONTANA

Act of admission, February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 679–681).

Grant to Montana: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; lands for a penitentiary and 90,000 acres for agricultural colleges; 100,000 acres for a normal school, 50,000 additional acres for agricultural colleges, 50,000 acres for a reform school, 50,000 acres for a deaf and dumb asylum; and 150,000 acres additional for public buildings; in lieu of grants under the acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850; and 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

NEBRASKA

Act of admission, April 19, 1864 (13 Stat. 49, secs. 7–11).

Grant to Nebraska: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; 20 sections for public buildings; 50 sections for a penitentiary; up to 12 salt springs; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State are to be paid to the State for schools.

NEVADA

Act of admission, March 21, 1864 (13 Stat. 32, secs. 7–9).

Grant to Nevada: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 20 sections for public buildings; 20 sections for a penitentiary; and 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State are to be paid to the State for roads, ditches, and canals to effect a general system of irrigation of agricultural land.

NEW MEXICO

Act of admission, June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 561–563).

Grant to New Mexico: Sections 16, 36, 2 and 32 or their equivalent in each township for schools; in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, September 28, 1850, and July 2, 1862, above; 200,000 acres for the university, 100,000 acres for public buildings, etc., 100,000 acres for insane asylums, 100,000 acres for penitentiaries, 100,000 acres for schools and asylums for the deaf, dumb and blind, 50,000 acres for hospitals for disabled miners, 200,000 acres for normal schools, 100,000 acres for charitable institutions, etc., 150,000 acres for agricultural and mechanical colleges, 150,000 acres for school of mines, 100,000 acres for military institutes and 1,000,000 acres for payment of certain railroad bonds; 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

NORTH DAKOTA

Act of admission, February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 679–681).

Grant to North Dakota: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university, lands for a penitentiary and 90,000 acres for agricultural colleges; 40,000 acres for a school of mines, 40,000 acres for a reform school, 40,000 acres for a deaf and dumb asylum, 40,000 acres for the agricultural college, 40,000 acres for the university, 80,000 acres for normal schools, 50,000 acres for public buildings and 170,000 acres for other educational and charitable purposes; in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

OHIO

Act of admission, April 30, 1802 (2 Stat. 175, sec. 7).

Grant to Ohio: Section 16, or its equivalent in each township, for schools; certain salt springs.

OKLAHOMA

Act of admission, June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 272–275).

Grant to Oklahoma: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; $5,000,000 in lieu of sections 16 and 36 in Indian territory; section 13 in all lands opened to settlement and lands selected in lieu thereof, one-third for the university and university preparatory school, one-third for normal schools and one-third for the agricultural and mechanical college and the colored agricultural normal university; section 33 and lands selected in lieu thereof previously reserved for charitable and penal institutions and public buildings; and in lieu of grants under the acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850, above; 250,000 acres for Oklahoma University, 150,000 acres for the university preparatory school, 250,000 acres for the agricultural and mechanical colleges, 100,000 acres for the Colored Agricultural and Normal University and 300,000 acres for normal schools; 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

OREGON

Act of admission, February 14, 1859 (11 Stat. 383–384).

Grant to Oregon: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; 10 sections for public buildings; up to 12 salt springs; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for roads and internal improvements.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Act of admission, February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 679–681).

Grants to South Dakota: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 72 sections for a university; lands for a penitentiary and 120,000 acres for agricultural colleges; 40,000 acres for a deaf and dumb asylum, 40,000 acres for a school of mines, 40,000 acres for a reform school, 40,000 acres for the agricultural college, 40,000 acres for the university, 80,000 acres for normal schools, 50,000 acres for public buildings and 170,000 acres for other educational and charitable purposes; and, in addition, land for an insane asylum; in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850; and 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

TENNESSEE

The act of admission, June 1, 1796 (1 Stat. 491, ch. 47), made no grant.

TEXAS

The act of admission, March 1, 1845 (5 Stat. 797–798), and December 29, 1845 (9 Stat. 108), made no grant.

UTAH

Act of admission, July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 109–110).

Grant to Utah: Sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 100 sections for public buildings, two townships and 110,000 acres for a university, 200,000 acres for an agricultural college, and in lieu of grants under the acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850, above; 500,000 acres for water reservoirs for irrigation, 100,000 acres for an insane asylum, 100,000 acres for a school of mines, 100,000 acres for a deaf and dumb asylum, 100,000 acres for a reform school, 100,000 acres for normal schools, 100,000 acres for an institution for the blind; 50,000 acres for a hospital for miners and a penitentiary; 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

VERMONT

The act of admission, February 18, 1791 (1 Stat. 191), made no grant.

WASHINGTON

Act of admission, February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 679–681).

Grant to Washington: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 72 sections for a university, lands for a penitentiary and 90,000 acres for agricultural college; 100,000 acres for a scientific school, 100,000 acres for normal schools, 100,000 acres additional for public buildings, 200,000 acres for charitable, educational, penal and reformatory institutions; in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

WEST VIRGINIA

The act of admission, December 31, 1862 (12 Stat. 633–634, ch. 6), made no grant.

WISCONSIN

Act of admission, August 6, 1846 (9 Stat. 58).

Grant to Wisconsin: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university (reserved under an act of June 12, 1838) (5 Stat. 244, ch. 110); 10 sections for public buildings; up to 12 salt springs; and 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for roads and canals.

WYOMING

Act of admission, July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222–224).

Grant to Wyoming: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 50 sections for public buildings, 72 sections for a university, lands for a fish hatchery, a penitentiary, 90,000 acres for an agricultural college and in lieu of grants authorized by the acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850, above, and any grant of saline lands; 80,000 acres for an insane asylum, 30,000 acres for a penal, etc., institution in Carbon County, 30,000 acres for a penitentiary, 5,000 acres for a fish hatchery, 30,000 acres for a deaf, dumb, and blind asylum, 10,000 acres for a poor farm, 30,000 acres for a hospital for miners, 75,000 acres additional for public buildings, and 260,000 acres for charitable institutions; and 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

STATE GRANTS SUBSEQUENT TO ADMISSION AND PRIOR TO 1900

General provisions of law making grants to all States or to States subsequently admitted into the Union:

May 20, 1826 (4 Stat. 179, ch. 83). The Secretary of the Treasury was to select school lands to be reserved in lieu of section 16 in each township where no such lands had been appropriated as authorized by laws granting section 16 to certain States.

June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 55, secs. 13, 14). Money in the Treasury on January 1, 1837, in excess of $5,000,000 was to be deposited with the State treasurers, who were to give certificates of deposit for safekeeping and repayment when required by the Secretary of the Treasury; payments were to be made in four installments. (An act of Oct. 2, 1837, 5 Stat. 201, c. 1, postponed payment of the fourth installment of these funds until January 1, 1839, but according to Edward G. Bourne's History of the Surplus Revenue of 1837, p. 41, there was no surplus on January 1, 1839, and so the fourth installment was not paid.)

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453, secs. 2, 8–9). After deducting 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in certain States for certain expenses and 5 percent for new States, etc., the proceeds from the sale of public lands is to be divided among the 26 States, the District of Columbia, and 3 Territories on the basis of population (secs. 1–2).

Five hundred thousand acres is to be granted to each new State for internal improvements (less any lands granted for internal improvements while a territory), including roads, canals, bridges, etc. (secs. 8–9).

September 28, 1950 (9 Stat. 519–520). Swamp and overflowed lands unfit for cultivation in each State where such lands are situated are granted to the States; proceeds from such lands are to be for reclamation of same.

March 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634–635). States are to be indemnified for swamplands erroneously sold.

March 3, 1855 (10 Stat. 719, ch. 21, sec. 14). Money collected from vessels on account of the death of passengers was to be paid by the collector of customs to State boards for care of sick or destitute immigrants. (Repealed by act of Aug. 2, 1882, 22 Stat. 191, sec. 4.)

The Morrill Act of July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503–505). Grant to each State, of 30,000 acres of nonmineral lands for each Senator or Representative in Congress under the 1860 apportionment; the Secretary of the Interior was to issue land scrip for and deficiency in lands; the proceeds from the sale of such lands and scrip were to be invested in Government bonds, etc., and are to constitute a perpetual fund the interest from which is to be used for endorsement, support, and maintenance of at least one college for agriculture and the mechanic arts.

January 30, 1865 (13 Stat. 567, No. 10). Acts passed in 1864 granting lands to States, etc., to aid in the construction of roads, etc., are not construed as embracing mineral lands, which in all cases shall be reserved to the United States unless otherwise specifically provided in the act making the grant.

July 23, 1866 (14 Stat. 208, ch. 209). The grant under the Morrill Act of 1862, above, is extended to any new State which may be admitted to the Union.

March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 467–469). A trust fund of $250,000 was established to aid in education of the blind. The interest from this fund was to be paid to the American Printing House for the Blind, for manufacture, etc., of books to be distributed among all the public institutions for the education of the blind in the States, etc., upon requisition by the superintendents of such institutions, who are ex-officio trustees of the fund. (An act of June 25, 1906, 34 Stat. 460, ch. 3526, appropriated $10,000 annually for this purpose, instead of the interest from the fund. The amount has been increased many times since then.)

March 3, 1881 (21 Stat. 521, No. 26). The Secretary of the Treasury was to cause a complete set of weights and measures to be delivered to the Governor of each State for the use of land-grant colleges, the cost of each set not to exceed $200. (This function was later transferred to the Secretary of Commerce.)

Hatch Act of March 2, 1887 (24 Stat. 440–442). Agricultural experiment stations are established in land-grant colleges and $15,000 a year is authorized to be appropriated to each State for expenses of the stations. (This authorization has been increased and supplemented many times since then.)

August 27, 1888 (25 Stat. 450). The Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers was to pay the States $100 a year for each disabled veteran in State homes. (These functions have been transferred to the Veterans' Administration and the amount of payments has been increased several times since then.)

March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 975). The States are required to pay half the cost of maintenance of each disabled veteran for which payments are made under the act of 1888, above.

The Second Morrill Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat 417–419). Annual appropriations, increasing from $15,000 to $25,000 for each State, are authorized for payments to States for further endowment of agricultural and mechanical colleges established under the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, above. (These authorizations have been increased several times since then.)

The Carey Act of August 18, 1894 (28 Stat. 422, sec. 4). Grant of 1,000,000 acres of desert lands to each of the public-land States, to aid in the reclamation of such lands, provided the States have them irrigated, etc.

Acts of February 24, 1897 (29 Stat. 594, ch. 313, sec. 3), and May 5, 1900 (31 Stat. 169–170). Fines collected from persons setting fires to timber on public lands, etc., are to be paid into the public-school fund of the county in which the lands where the offense is committed are situated. (Now incorporated in 18 U.S.C. 3613.)

ALABAMA

May 3, 1822 (3 Stat. 675, ch. 46). The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to pay 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in Alabama to the State for roads, canals, and improving the navigation of rivers, as provided in the act of admission of March 2, 1819.

May 23, 1828 (4 Stat. 290, ch. 75). Grant of 400,000 acres for purpose of improving the navigation of certain rivers.

July 4, 1836 (5 Stat. 116, sec. 3). Five percent of the proceeds from sale of certain lands ceded by the Chickasaws is to be reserved for construction of public roads and canals and improving the navigation of rivers by the State.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458 secs. 1, 8–9, 17). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State of Alabama and certain other States was to be paid to Alabama and the other States (sec. 1). (An act of Aug. 30, 1842 (5 Stat. 567, sec. 30) suspended the 10-percent payments, etc.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose (secs. 8–9)).

Two percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State which had been reserved for construction by the United States of roads leading to the State under the act of March 2, 1819, above, was to be paid to the State for certain roads, etc. (sec. 17).

August 11, 1848 (9 Stat. 281, c. 152). Receipts from sale of public lands may be used for schools.

September 20, 1850 (9 Stat. 466–567), May 17, 1856 (11 Stat. 15–16), March 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 195–197). Grants of lands for construction of railroads.

April 23, 1884 (23 Stat. 12, ch. 27). Grant of 46,080 acres additional for the university.

ARIZONA

Act of admission was subsequent to 1900 (June 20, 1910).

ARKANSAS

See act of June 23, 1836, in part I, above.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Arkansas and certain other States was to be paid to Arkansas and the other States (sec. 1). (An act of Aug. 30, 1842 (5 Stat. 567, sec. 30) suspended to 10-percent payments.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

July 29, 1846 (9 Stat. 42, ch. 68). The use of the 72 sections granted under the act of June 23, 1836, in part I above, for the benefit of common schools is authorized, instead of for a seminary.

September 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519–520). Grant of swamp and overflowed lands unfit for cultivation in Arkansas to the State; proceeds from the same are to be for reclamation of same.

February 9, 1853 (10 Stat. 155, ch. 59). Grant of rights-of-way and lands for a railroad.

CALIFORNIA

March 3, 1853 (10 Stat. 246–248). Grant of sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; 10 sections for public buildings.

July 23, 1866 (14 Stat. 219, sec. 4). The Commissioner of the General Land Office is to certify over to California as swamp or overflowed lands all such lands upon approved township surveys and plats.

COLORADO

March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 475–476). Supersedes the act of admission of March 21, 1864, above. Grant of 50 sections for public buildings (instead of 20), 50 sections for a penitentiary (instead of 20), an additional 72 sections for a State university and up to 12 salt springs, etc.; the 5 percent of proceeds from sales of public lands within the State are to be used for internal improvements.

April 2, 1884 (23 Stat. 10, ch. 20). Colorado is permitted to select for school purposes other lands in lieu of lands in sections 16 and 32.

FLORIDA

Act of March 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 788, ch. 75), See part I, above.

May 17, 1856 (11 Stat. 15–16). Grant of lands for railroads.

ILLINOIS

March 3, 1819 (3 Stat. 525, ch. 95). Grant of 4 sections for the seat of government.

December 12, 1820 (3 Stat. 610, ch. 2). The Secretary of the Treasury is to pay the 3 percent provided in the act of admission, above, to the State.

March 2, 1827 (4 Stat. 234, ch. 51). Grant of lands for a canal.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Illinois and certain other States was to be paid to Illinois and the other States (sec. 1). (The 10-percent payments were suspended by act of Aug. 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

September 20, 1850 (9 Stat. 466–467). Grant of lands for a railroad.

INDIANA

April 11, 1818 (3 Stat. 424, ch. 49). The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to pay to Indiana the 3 percent of proceeds from the sale of public lands provided in the act of admission of April 19, 1816, above.

March 2, 1827 (4 Stat. 236, ch. 56). Grant of lands for a canal.

March 2, 1833 (4 Stat. 622, ch. 87). The State was authorized to use the lands granted under the act of 1827, above, to aid in construction of a railroad, instead of a canal.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Indiana and certain other States was to be paid to Indiana and the other States (sec. 1). (The 10-percent payments were suspended by act of Aug. 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

May 9, 1848 (9 Stat. 219, ch. 36). Grant of additional lands for the canal.

IOWA

Act of March 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 789–790). See part I, above.

March 2, 1849 (9 Stat. 349, ch. 78). Iowa was authorized to use the receipts from sale of its 500,000 acres granted under the act of September 4, 1841, above, for schools (instead of internal improvements).

May 15, 1856 (11 Stat. 9, ch. 28). Grant for railroads.

LOUISIANA

March 3, 1827 (4 Stat. 244, ch. 97). The Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to locate two townships which had been reserved by acts of 1806 and 1811 for seminaries in Louisiana Territory and title to such lands are vested in the State for use of a seminary or seminaries.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Louisiana and certain other States was to be paid to Louisiana and the other States (sec. 1). (An act of Aug. 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30, suspended the 10-percent payments.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

March 2, 1849 (9 Stat. 352, ch. 87). Grant of certain swamplands.

June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 18–19). Grant of land for railroads.

MICHIGAN

Act of June 23, 1836 (Stat. 59–60). See part 1, above.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Michigan and certain other States was to be paid to Michigan and the other States (sec. 1). (An act of Aug. 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30, suspended the 10-percent payments.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

August 26, 1852 (10 Stat. 35, ch. 92). Grant of land for rights-of-way and for a ship canal.

June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 21–22). Grant of land for railroads.

March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 797). Grant of land for a military wagon road.

June 20, 1864 (13 Stat. 140, ch. 137). Grant of land for wagon roads for military or postal purposes.

MINNESOTA

March 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 195–197). Grant of land for railroads.

March 12, 1860 (12 Stat. 3, ch. 5). The benefits of the act of September 28, 1850, above, are extended to Minnesota.

March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 208, ch. 79). Grant of lands for the university.

MISSISSIPPI

February 20, 1819 (3 Stat. 485, ch. 31). Grant of two sections of land for a seat of government and one township for a seminary.

May 3, 1822 (3 Stat. 674, ch. 46). The Secretary of the Treasury is to pay 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in Mississippi to the State for roads and canals.

March 14, 1826 (4 Stat. 149, ch. 15). Receipts from sales of public lands received under act of admission in 1817 may be used for improvement of navigable rivers and bays.

July 4, 1836 (5 Stat. 116, sec. 1). Five percent of the receipts from certain lands ceded by the Chickasaws are to be reserved for construction of roads, canals, etc.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Mississippi and certain other States was to be paid to Mississippi and those States (sec. 1). The 10 percent payments were suspended by an act of Aug. 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

September 20, 1850 (9 Stat. 466–467). Grant of land for r. railroad.

August 11, 1856 (11 Stat. 30–32). Grant of land for railroads.

June 20, 1894 (28 Stat. 94, ch. 110). Grant of 23,040 acres for the university.

February 20, 1895 (28 Stat. 673, ch. 106). Grant of 46,080 acres for agricultural and mechanical colleges.

MISSOURI

May 3, 1822 (3 Stat. 674, ch. 46). The Secretary of the Treasury is to pay 3 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in Missouri to the State for roads and canals.

January 24, 1827 (4 Stat. 200, ch. 5). Provision for selection of lands for a seminary or seminaries and that title be vested in the State.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458 secs. 1, 8–9, 16). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in Missouri and certain other States was to be paid to Missouri and those States (sec. 1). (The 10-percent payments were suspended by an act of Aug. 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30.)

Grants of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted

for this purpose) (secs. 8–9). Two percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State which had been reserved for construction by the United States of roads leading to the State was to be paid to the State for certain roads, etc.

June 10, 1852 (10 Stat. 8–10). Grant of land for rights-of-way and railroads.

February 9, 1853 (10 Stat. 155, ch. 59). Grant of land for rights-of-way and a railroad.

March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 395, ch. 116). Confirmation of grant of certain lands to Missouri.

NEBRASKA

March 30, 1867 (15 Stat. 13, ch. 23). The benefits under the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, above, are extended to Nebraska.

NEVADA

July 4, 1866 (14 Stat. 85, ch. 166, sec. 2). Grant of 72 sections for a university.

June 16, 1880 (21 Stat. 288, ch. 245). Grant of 2,000,000 acres for schools in lieu of sections 16 and 36 in each township.

OHIO

March 3, 1803 (2 Stat. 225–226). Grant of additional school lands and one township or 36 sections for an academy; 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for roads.

March 3, 1827 (4 Stat. 242, ch. 93). Grant of certain lands to aid in making a road.

May 24, 1828 (4 Stat. 305, ch. 108). Grant of land for extending the Miami Canal.

June 19, 1834 (4 Stat. 679, ch. 56). Grant of additional lands for support of schools in the Connecticut Western Reserve.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in Ohio and certain other States was to be paid to Ohio and those States (sec. 1). (The 10-percent payments were suspended by an act of Aug. 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30.).

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

OREGON

March 12, 1860 (12 Stat. 3, ch. 5). The benefits of the act of September 28, 1850, above, were extended to Oregon.

March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 208, ch. 79). Grant of lands for the university. (An act of Sept. 27, 1850, 9 Stat. 499, sec. 10, amended by an act of July 17, 1854, 10 Stat. 305, sec. 4, had granted two townships to the Territory of Oregon for a university.)

July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. 355, ch. 213), July 4, 1866 (14 Stat. 86), July 5, 1866 (14 Stat. 89), December 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 374), February 25, 1867 (14 Stat. 409), and March 3, 1869 (15 Stat. 340). Lands were granted to Oregon for military wagon roads.

February 9, 1871 (16 Stat. 595, No. 24). Oregon was authorized to use receipts from lands granted by act of September 4, 1841, above, for schools (instead of for internal improvements).

TENNESSEE

February 28, 1867 (14 Stat. 569, No. 31). The benefits of the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, above, are extended to Tennessee.

WEST VIRGINIA

April 14, 1864 (13 Stat. 47, ch. 58, sec. 2). The benefits of the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, above, are extended to West Virginia.

WISCONSIN

August 8, 1846 (9 Stat. 83). Grant of lands for the purpose of improving the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers, etc.

March 3, 1847 (9 Stat. 179, sec. 3). The State is authorized to dispose of its 5 percent found for roads and canals, granted in the act of admission of August 6, 1846, for purposes recommended by a certain State convention.

June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 20–21), and April 25, 1862 (12 Stat. 618, No. 30). Grants of land for railroads.

March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 797) and June 25, 1864 (13 Stat. 183, ch. 153). Grants of land for military wagon roads.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Federal aid to education has ample historical justification.

2. That Federal aid to education is currently a reality.

3. That Federal aid to education is free from the danger of Federal control, because of past history and the content of current provisions in congressional bills.

4. That Federal aid to education is needed in much larger quantities to insure first class education for all American youth.

5. That Federal aid to education is supported by all informed citizens.

6. That Federal aid to education can be increased greatly without affecting our economy.

7. That Federal aid to education can be greatly increased and have the approval of the majority of Congress and the American people.

8. That Federal aid to education should be increased in 1961, because of the platform statements and candidates' comments, and should provide for both school construction and teachers' salaries.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, even before the congressional actions were taken which were listed in the brochure, before even the Constitution of the United States itself was adopted, Congress, in the Survey Ordinance of 1785, provided that—

> There shall be reserved, the lot No. 16, of every township for the maintenance of public schools in each township.

I submit, Madam President, that there is ample precedent in these cited statutes for broad-scale general Federal aid to education.

In more recent times there has been widespread Federal participation in the State educational processes through grants of money to school districts in each of the States. I speak now of the record made by the Federal Government in the administration of Public Laws 815 and 874, which were enacted in 1950.

Last year, public school teachers in the 3,821 school districts which participated in Public Law 874 payments had portions of their salaries paid by the Federal Government. These 3,821 school districts contain about 10.2 million schoolchildren; that is to say, they include approximately one-third of all of public-school children in the United States.

Yet as we listen to some of the arguments about how terrible it is supposed to be for the Federal Government to make a contribution to the salaries of teachers, those arguments apparently are made by persons who are unaware of the fact that the Federal Government has been doing that very thing in principle for the benefit of 3,821 school districts which participate under Public Law 874. Those 3,821 school districts contain approximately one-third of all public-school children in the United States.

I shall repeat that. Throughout our hearings—yes, until we presented all the facts to our colleagues, even in the executive session of our committee—we heard—and I speak respectfully—the old bromide argument that the Federal Government must not in any way participate in the paying of the salaries of teachers by making any Federal grants-in-aid to the States.

Let the record show again that the Federal Government has been making such grants under Public Law 874 for the benefit of teachers who are instructing about one-third of the public-school children in the United States today. This is not a new principle.

Apparently, for many persons, it becomes a question of the kind of cloak in which the Federal aid program is to be clothed. If Federal aid is clothed under a descriptive term which involves federally impacted areas, it is perfectly all right, then, to make large contributions to pay the salaries of the teachers of schoolchildren.

I think this is the place to emphasize to the Senate what my position will be, as floor leader for the administration, on this particular bill. My position will be that I shall ask Senators, time and time again, never to take their eyes from the schoolchildren of America. That is the essence of my case.

During the debate in the next few hours I shall not be diverted into following a course of action which, in my judgment, would sell short the educational needs and rights of the boys and girls who go to school. Certainly their children have rights, including the right to expect the elected representatives of the people of the United States to take necessary action, by means of passage of educational legislation, so as to see to it that they have, at the least, a chance to develop their maximum intellectual potential. That is what I am pleading for. But my argument is that the job will never be done if it is left entirely to the States.

The States have not done it thus far, and there is little hope that they can do it in the future. Congress has already recognized the Federal responsibility, by means of laws similar to Public Law 874, by which, last year, the Federal Government paid portions of the salaries of the teachers in 3,821 public-school districts, which contain approximately 10,200,000 schoolchildren, or approximately one-third of all our public-school children.

Under Public Law 815, since 1950, the Federal Government has contributed almost $1 billion—$962½ million, to be exact—to local school districts for school construction. I submit, Madam President, that there has been a need, which was met in part by Public Laws 815 and 874, both of which were based upon the rationale of Federal impact in the areas encompassed under those two statutes. I am very much pleased that the committee, in reporting S. 1021 to the Senate, recognized, through the extension of these acts, the continuing need for these programs. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the first column of the tables on pages 757 and 758, showing the amounts to be received by each of the States under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 for the fiscal year 1962.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the tables was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 75.—*Assistance for payments to school districts, federally affected areas, Public Law 784, as amended, fiscal year 1962*

State or territory:	Extension without amendment
Alabama	$5,392,600
Alaska	8,090,300
Arizona	5,436,700
Arkansas	1,134,000
California	42,955,850
Colorado	6,638,100
Connecticut	2,179,000
Delaware	956,400
Florida	7,718,700
Georgia	7,841,500
Hawaii	5,269,500
Idaho	1,790,700
Illinois	3,879,600
Indiana	1,090,800
Iowa	852,200
Kansas	5,687,500
Kentucky	4,575,900
Louisiana	1,077,400
Maine	1,953,600
Maryland	9,733,600
Massachusetts	7,093,900
Michigan	1,538,000
Minnesota	609,750
Mississippi	1,751,600
Missouri	2,783,100
Montana	1,836,500
Nebraska	2,227,500
Nevada	1,645,000
New Hampshire	1,411,800
New Jersey	4,433,300
New Mexico	5,434,000
New York	6,148,100
North Carolina	5,500,700
North Dakota	442,300
Ohio	5,794,000
Oklahoma	8,622,900
Oregon	1,093,000
Pennsylvania	5,814,700
Rhode Island	2,086,000
South Carolina	4,029,400
South Dakota	2,265,900
Tennessee	2,516,100
Texas	14,457,000
Utah	2,150,700
Vermont	121,400
Virginia	19,697,600
Washington	9,588,000
West Virginia	148,300
Wisconsin	706,600
Wyoming	861,600
Guam	888,600
Puerto Rico	1,930,000
Virgin Islands	60,700
Wake Island	105,000
Total	250,046,000

TABLE 76.—*Assistance for school construction, federally affected areas, Public Law 815, as amended, fiscal year 1962*

State or territory:	Extension without amendment
Alabama	$1,646,400
Alaska	2,447,300
Arizona	1,552,900
Arkansas	626,300
California	9,039,800
Colorado	551,900
Connecticut	796,200
Delaware	----------
Florida	499,600
Georgia	941,300
Hawaii	1,748,300
Idaho	604,100
Illinois	97,800
Indiana	887,300
Iowa	315,900
Kansas	1,845,900
Kentucky	907,700
Louisiana	----------
Maine	1,147,800

TABLE 76.—*Assistance for school construction, federally affected areas, Public Law 815, as amended, fiscal year 1962*—Con.

State or territory:	Extension without amendment
Maryland	$2,197,200
Massachusetts	1,166,900
Michigan	2,971,400
Minnesota	14,800
Mississippi	920,900
Missouri	1,522,800
Montana	1,022,400
Nebraska	684,900
Nevada	298,500
New Hampshire	330,700
New Jersey	978,900
New Mexico	4,048,200
New York	2,300,000
North Carolina	1,143,600
North Dakota	781,700
Ohio	714,700
Oklahoma	2,267,400
Oregon	660,000
Pennsylvania	----------
Rhode Island	197,500
South Carolina	814,800
South Dakota	653,400
Tennessee	238,800
Texas	3,329,900
Utah	522,400
Vermont	----------
Virginia	2,272,700
Washington	1,618,600
West Virginia	----------
Wisconsin	23,500
Wyoming	195,600
Guam	1,297,400
Puerto Rico	195,000
Virgin Islands	----------
Wake Island	----------
Technical services	1,000,000
Total	62,042,000

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the $850 million authorized under the bill for title I purposes is in addition to the moneys to be advanced for Public Laws 815 and 874 purposes.

The title I grant program is truly general in its application. It contains an allocation formula which provides that the poorest States in personal income will receive approximately three times as much money per school-age child as will the richest States, measured by the same standard. States falling between the extremes of income will receive allotments scaled in proportion to their incomes.

Madam President, Federal aid for our public schools on the elementary and secondary levels is not a new thing. We have granted it also under the National Defense Education Act, under whose terms money is made available for public school facilities involved in the teaching of mathematics, science, and the modern languages. Senators will recall that under section 301 of the National Defense Education Act, we authorized an appropriation of $70 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, for the purposes of making payments to State educational agencies for the acquisition of equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.

I shall not weary the Senate by further recital of other acts of Congress providing for grants, under other authority, to institutions of higher learning. I simply make the point that this Federal aid is not a new or an untried program. This is no innovation, but is the continuation and broadening of a pattern which has appeared time after time in our history.

What is new is that we now stand on the threshold of passing a law which will, for this day and age, begin to make significant contributions to the education of all public-school children in each of the States, and that we recognize an obligation to do so under the general welfare clause of the Constitution.

I move now to my third main point in this discussion.

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

Madam President, I have no doubt, as a constitutional lawyer and as a Senator, that it is perfectly proper, from the constitutional standpoint, for the Congress to enact Senate bill 1021. However, in order to meet any argument which might be raised against the constitutional propriety of this action, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the very able memorandum signed by the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Alanson W. Willcox. His brief may be found on pages 111 and 112 of the printed hearings.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY OF THE CONGRESS TO ENACT S. 1021

The power of the Congress to enact S. 1021 rests on its constitutional authority to appropriate funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. The scope of that congressional power has been so broadly defined by decision of the Supreme Court, and the expenditures contemplated by S. 1021 fall so clearly within the power, that there is no need to review the controversy which for a century and a half surrounded the Federal power of expenditure, or to refer to the innumerable Federal expenditures that have been made throughout our history for purposes of the general welfare. It is not amiss to point out, however, that the first Federal grants to the States for the purpose of education antedated the Constitution, and that grants for this purpose have been made from time to time ever since.

The existence of the power of expenditure as a separate power independent of the other enumerated powers of Congress, which had so long been in dispute, was finally affirmed by the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U.S. 1 (1936)); the contrary view, that expenditures could be made only in support of the other congressional powers, was expressly rejected. The Court did not find it necessary in that case to indicate further the scope of the general welfare clause, but clarification was not long delayed. Challenge to the unemployment compensation and old-age insurance provisions of the Social Security Act brought further decisions affirming in the broadest terms the discretion of Congress in determining what expenditures are for the general welfare of the United States.

In *Steward Machine Company* v. *Davis* (301 U.S. 548 (1937)), the Court said of expenditures for the relief of the unemployed (pp. 586–587):

"The problem had become national in area and dimensions. There was need of help from the Nation if the people were not to starve. It is too late today for the argument to be heard with tolerance that in a crisis so extreme the use of the moneys of the Nation to relieve the unemployed and their

dependents is a use for any purpose narrower than the promotion of the general welfare."

In *Helvering* v. *Davis* (301 U.S. 619 (1937)), the validity of the old-age insurance system was upheld. The Court expounded more fully the meaning of the general welfare clause (pp. 640–641):

"Congress may spend money in aid of the 'general welfare.' Constitution, article I, section 8; *United States* v. *Butler* (297 U.S. 1, 65); *Steward Machine Co.* v. *Davis*, supra. There have been great statesmen in our history who have stood for other views. We will not resurrect the contest. It is now settled by decision. *United States* v. *Butler*, supra. The conception of the spending power advocated by Hamilton and strongly reinforced by Story has prevailed over that of Madison, which has not been lacking in adherents. Yet difficulties are left when the power is conceded. The line must still be drawn between one welfare and another, between particular and general. Where this shall be placed cannot be known through a formula in advance of the event. There is a middle ground or certainly a penumbra in which discretion is at large. The discretion, however, is not confided to the courts. The discretion belongs to Congress, unless the choice is clearly wrong, a display of arbitrary power, not an exercise of judgment. This is now familiar law. 'When such a contention comes here we naturally require a showing that by no reasonable possibility can the challenged legislation fall within the wide range of discretion permitted to the Congress' (*United States* v. *Butler*, supra, p. 67; cf. *Cincinnati Soap Co.* v. *United States*, ante, p. 308; *United States* v. *Realty Co.*, 163 U.S. 427, 440; *Head Money* cases, 112 U.S. 580, 595). Nor is the concept of the general welfare static. Needs that were narrow or parochial a century ago may be interwoven in our day with the well-being of the Nation. What is critical or urgent changes with the times."

The Supreme Court has subsequently sustained, as valid exercises of the power to spend for the general welfare, Federal construction of public housing and Federal projects for reclamation and irrigation (*Cleveland* v. *United States*, 323 U.S. 329 (1945); *United States* v. *Gerlach Live Stock Company*, 339 U.S. 725 (1950)). In both of these decisions the Court, on the authority of the social security cases, treated the congressional determination as decisive of the propriety of the expenditures.

The President in his message to Congress on this subject, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in his testimony on S. 1021, have presented to Congress convincing reasons for exercise of the national power of expenditure, in the manner provided in the bill, in support of public primary and secondary school education throughout the Nation. There is no need to repeat or summarize those reasons here. If the Congress concurs in the judgment which the President and the Secretary have expressed, it cannot be doubted that the Supreme Court would accept that judgment as conclusive.

Since Congress would be exercising a power expressly conferred upon it by the Constitution, no question under the 10th amendment would arise. "The 10th amendment states but a truism that all is retained which has not been surrendered (*United States* v. *Darby*, 312 U.S. 100, 124 (1941)).

The Supreme Court held many years ago that Federal grants-in-aid to the States, though conditioned upon various actions by the States, raise no justiciable issue at suit of a State or of a taxpayer (*Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447 (1923)). The Court observed (p. 480):

"Probably, it would be sufficient to point out that the powers of the State are not invaded, since the statute imposes no obligation but simply extends an option which the State is free to accept or reject."

To the same effect is *Oklahoma* v. *Civil Service Commission* (330 U.S. 127 (1947)).

United States v. *Butler*, supra, has occasionally been cited as though it construed the 10th amendment as a limitation upon powers otherwise granted to Congress. It did not do so. The Court held that the regulatory effect of the expenditures there under consideration, in matters not falling within the powers of Congress, rendered the statute invalid as exceeding the scope of congressional authority. The 10th amendment, said the Court, serves to "forestall any suggestion" that Congress may exercise powers not granted, expressly or by reasonable implication.

Any argument that the *Butler* case construed the 10th amendment as restricting the granted powers was put to rest in the following year, by *Helvering* v. *Davis*, supra. The lower court had held the old-age insurance system unconstitutional, on the ground that assistance to the aged was a matter reserved to the States at the time the Constitution was adopted, and thus reserved to them by the 10th amendment (*Davis* v. *Edison Electric Illuminating Co.*, 89 F. 2d 393 (C.C.A., 1st Cir., 1937)). The court likened care of the aged, in this respect, to education.[1]

In reversing the judgment the Supreme Court said (301 U.S., at pp. 644–645):

"Counsel for respondent has recalled to us the virtues of self-reliance and frugality. There is a possibility, he says, that aid from a paternal government may sap those sturdy virtues and breed a race of weaklings. If Massachusetts so believes and shapes her laws in that conviction, must her breed of sons be changed, he asks, because some other philosophy of government finds favor in the Halls of Congress? But the answer is not doubtful. One might ask with equal reason whether the system of protective tariffs is to be set aside at will in one State or another whenever local policy prefers the rule of laissez faire. The issue is a closed one. It was fought out long ago. When money is spent to promote the general welfare, the concept of welfare or the opposite is shaped by Congress, not the States. So the concept be not arbitrary, the locality must yield" (Constitution, art. VI, par. 2).[2]

That the 10th amendment does not limit the granted powers has been consistently held by the Court in subsequent cases (*United States* v. *Darby*, supra; *Oklahoma* v. *Civil Service Commission*, supra).

It is thus beyond dispute that S. 1021, if enacted by Congress, will be a valid exercise of congressional authority, and that no issue will arise by reason of the 10th amendment.

ALANSON W. WILCOX,
General Counsel, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, it would be a work of supererogation to dwell further upon this point. I concur wholeheartedly in the conclusion of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare General Counsel that it is "beyond dispute that S. 1021, if enacted by Congress, will be a valid exercise of congressional authority, and that no issue will arise by reason of the 10th amendment."

CONTENTS OF THE BILL

Madam President, I turn now to a brief description of the bill, S. 1021, as reported. I commend to your attention pages 8 to 13 of the committee report, which contains a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

In my coverage of this point, I propose to mention merely the highlights, and to defer until later any detailed discussion on these points, if they are raised in debate.

In saying this, however, I am constrained to point out to the Senate the importance of section 102 of the bill, which is the declaration of purpose. With your indulgence, I shall read the short 12 lines which embody the philosophy and intent of the Congress with respect to this important matter:

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 102. It is the purpose of this title to authorize a three-year program of Federal grants to States to assist their local education agencies to construct urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, to employ needed additional public school teachers and pay them adequate salaries, and to undertake special projects directed to special or unique educational problems or opportunities. It is the intent of Congress that with this assistance the quality of public elementary and secondary education will be substantially improved in all States and that inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced.

Section 103 of the bill is an assurance against any Federal interference in the curriculum and operation of the local school systems. It is strong language, and designedly so, because education is primarily a community responsibility.

In this connection, I should like to take you back with me to Wednesday, April 9, 1947, when the late Senator Taft presented testimony to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. His statement may be found on page 40 of the committee hearings on Federal aid to education of that date. Senator Taft said:

The administration of education and control of the school system must be completely in the hands of the State and local administrators. I believe that every Federal aid proposal which has been made accepts this principle in theory. It is admitted that local self-government in education is essential to the preservation of liberty in a country the size of the United States. * * * I believe that the standards should be clearly established in the law, and that the Federal Government should interest itself in only one question, whether the statutory standard is complied with and the money used only for the purposes of the act.

The bill to which Senator Taft addressed himself contained this provision:

SEC. 2. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to any school * * *.

Section 103 of Senate bill 1021 reads as follows:

In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Madam President, I submit that section 103 contains precisely the type of as-

[1] It may be noted that, if practice in 1789 were controlling, it would confirm the propriety of Federal grants for educational purposes.

[2] It may be noted that of the six Justices who concurred in the *Butler* opinion, four (Hughes, C. J., and Roberts, Sutherland, and Van Devanter, J. J.) concurred with Cardozo, Stone, and Brandeis, J.J., in *Helvering* v. *Davis*.

surance against Federal interference in local schools which were called for by the late and great Senator from Ohio.

Section 104 of S. 1021 authorizes the appropriation of $850 million each year for 3 years starting with the fiscal year beginning July 1 next. Section 105 provides that the funds appropriated in any year shall be allocated among the States on the basis of relative school-age population as weighted by relative income per school-age child.

Allotments for the second and third fiscal years could be subject to an adjustment under section 106 to take into account the lack of effort maintenance by public school systems exerted by the States in those years.

We all know that frequently the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House find it difficult to appropriate the full amount authorized by the legislative committees for a specific purpose. S. 1021 recognizes this and provides for a proportionate reduction in that event.

The statistical formula of the bill, which is, I might add parenthetically, discussed on pages 204 through 207 of the hearing record, is designed to distribute more money to the poorer States than to the richer States by a factor of 3 to 1. The committee, in reporting the bill, removed a flat per child floor amount and instead reverted to the formula of S. 8 of the 86th Congress, the McNamara bill, which provided that no State shall have an allotment ratio greater than seventy-five one-hundredths nor less than twenty-five one-hundredths, thus constricting the extremes at both the ends, to achieve a 3-to-1 relationship between the richest and the poorest State.

During the course of our committee deliberation on this point, careful consideration was given to an alternative proposal advanced by Senators COOPER and JAVITS, the effect of which would have been to increase the amount of money to the richest States and to the poorest States at the expense of the States in the middle. The committee in rejecting this approach did so, in my judgment, on the basis that there is a need for improved school facilities and teacher salaries in each and every State and that equalization between the richest and poorest States must also take into consideration the concept of equalization in the States in between.

In my own State I know that there are school districts whose services can be improved if additional funds can be made available. The same is true, I feel, in each of the States. We are looking in this bill for an equalization of educational opportunity for each child. This method of allotting the funds, in the judgment of the committee, is the fairest way in which we can, to the best of our ability, provide each of the States with an opportunity to improve its own educational system.

FORMULA DISCUSSION

Madam President, the distribution of funds among States in any Federal grant program calls for the exercise of judgment. A particular proposed distribution must be designed to serve the purposes sought to be accomplished under the program in question.

In this bill we have a program whose purpose is broadly to provide Federal financial assistance to all the States so that they may, with the funds provided, augment and speed their own efforts to remedy deficiencies in public elementary and secondary education—deficiencies which stem from shortages of classroom facilities, inadequate numbers of teachers, and a teaching profession whose level of compensation is too low to attract and retain the share it needs of our most able young men and women.

In designing any Federal grant program, it is the responsibility of the Congress to provide that it shall be responsive to national needs and purposes. In enacting any Federal program, the Congress is acting for all the people of the United States—not just for one or more States or the citizens of some selected group of the States.

This does not mean that the program is to be designed to have exactly the same effect on each State nor with respect to each citizen of the United States. Rather, the program must take appropriate account of the differences among the States and among our citizens which are relevant to the purposes of the program in question.

Members of Congress can disagree with complete sincerity as to how the distribution of funds among the States for the benefit of all our citizens should be made. The difference in the positions they take will depend in part on the relative significance which they attach to various aspects of the purposes which they regard the program as designed to achieve. Inevitably, their positions will also be affected by their views of their responsibilities as representatives of particular States and congressional districts and their citizens.

The bill before the Senate provides for a distribution of Federal funds among the States which is designed to achieve three major purposes:

First, to give every State a significant amount of assistance. This purpose stems from the recognition that the public elementary and secondary schools of every State in the Union are in need of improvement with respect to classroom facilities and teaching staff.

Granted it is a matter of degree of comparison as between the States. In our hearings it was brought out time and time again that, no matter which State was named, there are geographic pockets and school districts in that State in which there is inadequate educational opportunity provided for girls and boys.

Second, to give States amounts of assistance calculated to provide relatively more help to States with low economic ability and relatively less help to States with high economic ability. This purpose stems from the recognition that the primary responsibility for our public school rests with the States and that they vary in their ability to carry out this responsibility.

Third, to give every State assistance calculated to reflect the size of its school age population. This purpose stems from the recognition that the size of the task of public elementary and secondary education varies widely among the States depending on the number of children to be educated.

There are many possible ways of designing formulas to take combined account in the distribution of Federal funds of the economic ability of the States and the sizes of their school age population. There is no one "best" way to do this; the decision is a matter of judgment.

There is no one "best" way to do this, in my opinion. The decision, I want to emphasize, is, after all, a matter of judgment.

Let me take the Senate step by step through the formula of S. 1021. When I discuss this formula, I am sure every Senator knows I am discussing a matter which is highly technical, a matter which involves, really, in some respects, some of the recesses of mathematical techniques. Yet I want to give the Senate my assurance, as chairman of the subcommittee, that I speak for my colleagues on the subcommittee when I say that our formula was thoroughly worked out by the technicians who were assigned the task by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am sure we have a formula here which will stand the tests of fairness and equity.

In essence—and I think this is the time to say it in the presentation—we offer the Senate the same formula that we offered the Senate last year in S. 8, the McNamara bill, which the Senate voted for. The present President of the United States was then a Senator from Massachusetts, and the President of the United States voted for the formula in S. 8 last year.

I think I should take another moment, by way of digression, to point out that S. 1021 as we bring it to the floor of the Senate is not the same as the S. 1021 which the administration had proposed.

It is not the same S. 1021 in amount. It is not the same S. 1021 in formula. It is not the same S. 1021 in connection with the federally impacted legislation I have already discussed.

We had the benefit of the advice, testimony, and consultation of the administration, principally through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am certain that I violate no confidence when I say that the Representative from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] who occupies the same position of legislative responsibility in connection with this bill over on the House side that it is my honor to have here on the Senate side, in the course of the consideration of the matter, had a lengthy conference with the President in regard to the original S. 1021 bill. As the Representative from New Jersey will tell Senators, we made it very clear to the President that we welcomed the assistance we were getting from the White House and from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; we also made it very clear, however, that the final legislative responsibility rests with the Congress——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I said at the beginning I would prefer to complete my statement. I am almost through it. I am sorry.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is quite all right.

Mr. MORSE. We made it very clear that the final legislative responsibility rests with the Congress; that after giving consideration to all the points of view, we would then weigh the evidence and we would come forward with a bill which we as Senators and Representatives have the obligation to the people of this country to recommend. After we finish with the legislation, then the executive has the responsibility at the executive level, to decide what it might want to do with any legislation Congress passes. But I am free to say this—in fact, I owe it to the President to say it this afternoon—I am satisfied that, in principle, the bill we have brought to the Senate of the United States does not substantially vary from the principle of the bill which the President advocated in his message to Congress on education as was manifested in the original S. 1021.

What are some of the differences? I shall mention them quickly.

PUBLIC LAWS 816 AND 874

There is a difference in respect to the federally impacted area legislation, in that the administration recommended a substantial cut in that legislation.

I can say, with some sense of pride, because I am not responsible for it, though the committee and all who testified before it are responsible for it, that I am proud to submit to the Senate, in behalf of the committee, this reference work on education. When these two volumes are read from cover to cover it will be found that they are probably about as good and authoritative and expert a reference work on existing educational problems in this country as can be obtained in any library in the country. This really is the source of very valuable information.

As the committee went through the hearings and listened to the large number of Senators who came before us and testified, we were impressed. Some Senators who testified I see facing me on the floor of the Senate today. We heard testimony as to the ill effects the administration's first title II and title III proposals would have had in many of the federally impacted areas of the States. As we weighed the testimony and the facts and figures which were presented to us we felt, as I think the Senate will agree, that the committee was correct in its recommendation that the federally impacted areas legislation should be extended unchanged for another 3 years.

The bill does provide, however, that at the end of 18 months the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should submit to the Congress, based upon a study which it is directed to conduct during the 18-month period, its recommendations as to any modifications desired in the federally impacted area legislation now on the books. We felt we needed many more facts than we had before us, before there was a tapering off of the impact legislation. We felt also we ought to see the benefits from a 3-year period of title I of the Federal-aid bill, before we tapered off on existing legislation in regard to federally impacted areas.

We should keep in mind throughout the debate that we are talking about a 3-year program, we are not talking about permanent legislation. We are talking about a child program. All the proposals, including that with regard to the federally impacted areas, will come to an end at the conclusion of 3 years, Madam President, unless the Congress at that time proceeds to take further legislative action.

FORMULA CHANGES

We also changed the formula in the bill. The Senate will hear debate on that later. We changed the formula in several respects. In the first place, we changed it in regard to the basis for calculating the aid, from average daily attendance per public school pupil to school-age population between the ages of 5 and 17 in the State, which includes both public and private school students.

I am ready to face up to the problem, and I think notice ought to be served now to the Senate about this change, because I think Senators are entitled to receive all the facts from me. If the Senate does not receive every fact from me it will be only because I have overlooked a fact, and I shall be glad to have my attention called to any fact I should happen to overlook. I think this fact should be brought to the attention of the Senate, because there will be debate in regard to it.

The school-age population factor which is written into the formula of the revised bill, S. 1021, as we present it to the Senate, is exactly the same provision as that found in S. 8, the bill which the Senate passed last year under the leadership of Senator MCNAMARA. Again, I say, it is the same formula which the now President of the United States voted for last year when he was a Senator from Massachusetts. It is a formula which is based on all school-age children in a State who are between the ages of 5 and 17, both those going to public schools and those going to private schools.

The original S. 1021, as first introduced this year, limited that part of the formula to public school students in average daily attendance.

One might say, "Why make a change?" We shall go into that in greater detail later, but Senators are entitled to know the major reasons for it now.

First, Madam President, it was because every child in a State is potentially a public school student. Every child in a State is an educational burden to the State, in the sense that the State has responsibilities toward every child in the State, whether the child goes to a public school or to a private school.

Next, the States already give considerable assistance to children who go to private schools. Some are provided with fire protection. Some are provided with utility services. Some are provided with lunch programs. Some are provided with health services. The program varies State by State. In some States transportation services are provided. In some States the children are provided with textbooks. There is a sort of mixed problem now, but each State makes a substantial contribution to support children in the State, irrespective of whether they go to public schools or to private schools.

I am very frank about this, Madam President, when I say that we would use both the public and private school students in connection with the formula we are now offering in S. 1021, which, as I say, was the formula used last year. This works out more equitably we feel and will provide a greater degree of equalization among all the States, as compared to using the public school daily attendance factor. Only because it happens to be a fact, and we ought to face up to facts, I point out that there are some States in the country in which the private school population is very, very small. Many of those States—not all of them, but many of them—are in the South. In many Southern States the percentage of Catholic students, of Presbyterian students, of Baptist students, and of other students going to private schools is a very, very small fraction of the total school population. However, in some other States, such as New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut—yes, even New York, I say to my good friend from New York [Mr. KEATING]—there is a much larger ratio or percentage of private school students compared to public school students.

The committee, as was done last year, went into the problem and asked for table after table, for calculation after calculation, from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to carry out the responsibility which I mentioned earlier in my speech; namely, the responsibility to render a final judgment which in our opinion will work most equitably and fairly throughout the country, from coast to coast.

When we did that, Madam President, we came to the conclusion that the private school children as well as the public school children should be included in the count, as was done last year.

Furthermore, we did it because it works out to a much better equalization program than if we had left out the private school children. I best describe that in this way: Under the original bill, the equalization would have been 2 to 1, with the private school children left out, but under S. 1021 as we now offer it to the Senate, it will be 3 to 1. From an equalization standpoint, the including, as we did last year, of both the private and public school children, we respectfully submit, brings to the Senate a bill which is more fair from the standpoint of the equalization factor. I am sure all of my colleagues will recognize this, but for the benefit of the public, so that it will be in the RECORD and there can be no doubt about the fact that the Senator from Oregon emphasized it in his descriptive speech on the bill, I ask Senators to keep in mind that the most important principle, in the view of the committee, is the principle of equalization. That should be our number one objective.

We have an objective of being of assistance to each and every State, but the great need is the need for seeing to it that we raise the level of educational opportunity from one which is now sub-

marginal in many school districts in the country to a level at which we can say, with some rightness, that every boy and girl in the country at least has a reasonably equal opportunity—and I stress the words "reasonably equal"—a reasonably equal opportunity to develop his or her potential to the maximum extent that his or her inherent qualities permit.

If we were to take that action, the fair and equitable thing would be to include both the private and public schools in the formula.

I shall take the Senate step by step through a description of the formula, technical as it is. I have tried my level best to reduce it to language that is readily understandable. I have probably failed. I see the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] smiling at me, because he knows exactly what I am talking about. We sat there and scratched our heads. In fact, I am not so sure that I am not a bit more bald now than when our hearings started, as I scratched my head to see if I could not rub into my head an understanding of the formula.

I think I know it pretty well now, technical as it is. I have tried to reduce it to simple language. I hope it will be helpful to Senators and the general public, members of which may from time to time refer to the speech. So in computing and applying the formula, I would state these steps:

First step: First, determine the number of children of school age in the State, 5 to 17; second, divide the State personal income by the number of children of school-age population; third, this resulting fraction is called "income per child of school age."

Second step: First, determine the number of children of school age in the Nation; second, divide national personal income by number of Nation's school-age children; third, this fraction is called "income per child of school age for all the States."

Third step: First, divide income per child of school age in X State by income per child of school age for all States; second, multiply this ratio by 0.50; third, subtract the resulting decimal from the number "1.00."

The reason for this statistical treatment is to rank the States from high to low in order of State income per child in such a way that the poorer States have a larger index number than the richer States. This index number is termed the "allotment ratio." A State with average income per child will have an allotment ratio of 0.50. A richer State will have an allotment ratio of less than 0.50. A poorer average State will have a higher allotment ratio than 0.50.

Fourth step: Adjustment of allotment ratio. If a State has an allotment ratio of more than 0.75, the ratio is reduced to 0.75.

In other words, under the bill a State can never get a ratio higher than 0.75 nor a lower ratio than 0.25. The main reason for that determination is the consideration of what would be equitable in dividing up the money, so to speak. We think the formula is somewhat arbitrary—true—but seasoned with reason, fairness, and equity. It mathematically insures a 3-to-1 ratio which is the equalization ratio which was decided upon by the committee as an equitable one.

I shall later talk a bit about Alaska and the territories, where certain exceptional economic conditions, because of historic pattern, really justify making a certain exception for those areas.

To return, however, to the matter in hand, the computation of the formula—

Fifth step: Determine the number of children of school age in State X for the preceding fiscal year.

Sixth step: Multiply this number of children in State X for the preceding year by the adjusted allotment ratio for State X. This resulting number is called the State product.

Seventh step: Add all State products to get sum of State products.

Eighth step: Allot to State X an amount of money which bears the same ratio to the total money appropriated as the State product for State X bears to the sum of the State products.

I shall read the algebraic formula, but it is important only to get it printed in the RECORD:

ALGEBRAIC FORMULA

$$\text{Allotment to State X} = \text{Total appropriation} \times \frac{\text{State product of State X}}{\text{Sum of State Products}}$$

$$\text{where State product of State X} = \text{Children in State X} \left[1.00 - .50 \frac{\frac{\text{Income in State X}}{\text{Children in State X}}}{\frac{\text{Income in Nation}}{\text{Children in Nation}}} \right]$$

The formula will make more sense when Senators read it in the RECORD tomorrow than it does from listening to me state it now, but I have described it orally only because I wanted Senators to know that we have gone to a higher mathematical course in the committee. I do not know how many Senators could pass an examination on this subject.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I said I wanted to finish my statement first, and then I shall yield. I think I must maintain continuity in the RECORD. I do not know how many of us could pass an examination, but I think because of the excellent briefing we have had time and time again from the experts we have called before us, we can give Senators our word that it is our judgment that we submit a formula, as we did last year, which I believe is fair and equitable, and which I think will do justice not only to all States concerned but, importantly, it will do justice as a fair formula of equalization to all the boys and girls of the country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very pertinent question at that point? It has a bearing on the formula.

Mr. MORSE. I have declined to yield to so many of my colleagues that I do not feel I can do so now. I am almost through. I will yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I do not want the point to escape my mind.

Mr. MORSE. Nothing ever escapes the Senator's mind.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Oregon could have the colloquy placed at the end of his discourse.

Mr. MORSE. I find it extremely difficult to refuse to yield to the Senator, yet at the same time I owe an obligation to other Senators. But, go ahead.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am deeply grateful.

I have been listening to the formula, and I am wondering whether a State agency or the Commissioner of Education or the members of a school board can factor that formula without a course in quadratics, least squares, the fourth dimension, a book of logarithms, and probably an engineer's slide rule?

Mr. MORSE. After the formula is presented to them, I assure the Senator they can use it by applying plain, simple arithmetic.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in passing, I might mention two further amendments which were adopted by the committee. The first extends title I grants to American Samoa. In this connection I should like to pay tribute to Senator LONG of Hawaii who made a most convincing plea for the need of this treatment being given American Samoa by the committee. He was seconded in his efforts by the U.S. Department of the Interior, the agency which has jurisdiction over this possession. American Samoa, in the reported bill, is given the same treatment as is accorded to Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

I wish to thank the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] for the contribution he made to the work of my committee. I also wish to thank him for the great honor he has paid me by sitting through the description of the bill. I appreciate his support and help from the very beginning.

Second, both Senators GRUENING and BARTLETT were most diligent and pursuasive in bringing to the attention of the committee the problems faced by a State where construction costs are abnormally high. Language therefore was provided to meet such a contingency now and in the future.

Section 106 of the bill assures that no State will relax the effort currently being made by that State to meet its public school needs. If it should so do, its allotment would also be reduced in proportion to its failure to maintain the average State effort. This reduction, however, would not apply if the State's expenditure per public school pupil equaled or exceeded 110 percent of the national average expenditure per pupil.

In fact, I digress now to stress this point. We have been very careful, in connection with the bill, to make certain that no State could use a Federal-aid-to-education grant as an excuse for lying down on its own State effort. If it does it is subject to the danger of losing a portion of its funds to other States. Each State is encouraged, so to speak, to continue to the best of its ability to make a sincere effort to provide its students with the best education it can give and to finance this from its own funds.

Sections 107 and 108 deal with the payment of allotments to States and with State agency administration costs. It is provided in section 108 that State agency administration costs may not exceed the lesser of $0.10 per public school pupil in the preceding year or $150,000. Section 109 concerns special educational projects. This section provides that each year of the 3-year program the State agency shall set aside 10 percent of the funds received in the first year for paying part of the costs of pilot demonstration or experimental projects of the local education agencies and other public agencies or institutions operating a public school, which, in the determination of the State agency, are designed to meet public school problems or to develop or evaluate public school programs of a special or unique nature, including but not limited to the nine illustrative examples set forth on pages 12 and 13 of the bill.

I wish to mention this special problem in a few brief words. Witness after witness and educational authority after educational authority pointed out that one of the great needs in the educational process in this country is some experimentation in educating children; some experimentation for research work in connection with the learning process; some special projects necessary to be conducted to help defective children or backward children and, yes, some research project in respect to superior children. Therefore we thought it was only fair and equitable that we provide a section in the bill which would permit the setting aside of 10 percent of the Federal aid money for these special research and experimental projects.

The committee in reporting this bill added the ninth category, a program for the improvement of instruction through the acquisition and utilization of audiovisual and other instructional materials and equipment.

That is a very important addition. If Senators will read the hearings, and if they will do further investigating, they will agree with me that we have not even scratched the surface yet in regard to audiovisual instruction and the use of other instruction media that modern science is developing. By all means I believe that this section of the bill, the ninth category, should be written into the bill. It was one of the great strengths of the bill, because it really helps provide the funds to meet the question that is so often asked of educators: What can we do to improve our whole educational process? This would provide funds to help them experiment along those lines.

Section 110 of the bill concerns the procedures and processing of the State applications. In this connection, I refer to page 13 to the middle of page 16 of the bill and to page 11 of the committee report. The committee amendment adopted in the reported version of the bill, provided that public agencies and institutions which operate public schools may receive funds under section 109 for special types of educational projects. Such projects would include, for example, schools operated for the benefit of handicapped children and for delinquent and dependent children. Funds would also be available for public schools operated by State institutions of higher learning in connection with teacher training.

Section 111 of the bill concerns the conditions under which an application of a State shall be approved and the rights of the State education agency if it is dissatisfied with an action of the Commissioner as well as the remedies available to it.

Section 112 of the bill is the traditional Davis-Bacon language which requires that laborers and mechanics must be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

Section 113 of the bill permits wholly and voluntarily donated labor to be used in the construction of schools but provides that the State education agency must credit any amount so saved to the education agency undertaking the construction.

Section 114 of the act consists of definitions of terms used in the bill. The section speaks for itself.

Title II of the bill is now simply an extension of the existing provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, which I have already discussed in some detail. The only changes which were made by the committee were to insert American Samoa for coverage; increase the authorization of the appropriation for Indian school children from $40 million to $60 million, without which the extension would have been meaningless for them; and, to require that the Commissioner of Education submit a report through the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Congress within 18 months, commenting upon the operations of Public Laws 815 and 874 as extended by this act together with his recommendations for change and an analysis of the relationship between Federal payments under title I of the act.

Mr. President, this has been a somewhat lengthy presentation, and there are many matters which I am convinced will be further explored before the final vote upon the bill. But I assure the Senate that the work which has been done by the committee represents a feasible, needed, and desirable implementation of the general welfare clause of the Constitution through the provision by the Federal Government of funds necessary to permit us, as a Nation, to start upon the job of bringing full educational opportunity within the reach of every American boy and girl who can profit from it.

Mr. President, the committee has worked long and hard on the bill. We have brought to the Senate a bill which has received as thorough consideration and painstaking study by members of the committee as has been true of any bill to which I have been a party in my more than 16 years as a Member of the Senate. We have brought to the Senate a bill which, in my judgment, meets a great national need. I recognize that many sincere men and women can have many differences over various parts of the bill. However, I am perfectly willing to hammer out on the floor of the Senate whatever may prove to be, by facts presented in arguments, any justifiable adjustments of the bill. However, this bill, just as was S. 8 the McNamara bill of last year, is a good bill; it is a sound bill. It is a bill which I believe should be passed before the week is out.

I thank the Senate for so patiently hearing me this afternoon in this speech, which sets forth a description and an explanation, as best I could make them, of the various sections of the bill.

I am now most willing to make myself available for such questions as Senators may wish to ask me for the purpose of explanation. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] sought to interrupt me a few minutes ago. However, I observe that he has been called from the floor, so I invite questions from other Senators.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I feel that more than mere pleasantries are involved in having the RECORD note at this point the painstaking manner in which the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has delineated the very important features and, yes, the philosophy behind the drafting and presentation of S. 1021.

It has been my responsibility to serve on the subcommittee, to listen to the witnesses, and to confer with individual Senators on many of the more controversial aspects of this bill. I say again, however, that never have I had the opportunity to serve with a chairman of a subcommittee who, I believe, has been more objective, not only in the questions which he asked of witnesses who testified, but also in the manner in which he conducted the entire course of the rather complicated hearings, and the prolonged hours which necessarily were given in the drafting of legislation of this type.

This is not a gratuitous compliment. Ofttimes I think we fail to express our sincere thanks when we know the effort which a Senator—as in this instance, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]—has expended during periods of several weeks, especially in connection with S. 1021. I was gratified to serve at his side.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia will permit me to interrupt him long enough to say that he is always most gracious and kind to the Senator from Oregon. I appreciate deeply his statement. However, I want the RECORD to show that there really was no chairman of the subcom-

mittee; we were partners together. We were associates in conducting the hearings, in interrogating witnesses, and in working out our adjustments within the committee. I could not have worked with a more cooperative or finer group of Senators than my associates, including the chairman of the full committee. We all recognized that we had an equal responsibility.

The present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], on an occasion or two honored us with his presence at some of our meetings. He saw for himself how correct I am when I say there was really no chairman of the subcommittee; there were simply associates on the subcommittee on both sides of the table.

I observe that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has just entered the Chamber. Even though the Senator from Illinois and I did not agree on every detail of the bill—in fact, at times we definitely disagreed—I wish to thank the minority leaders of my committee, under the leadership of the minority leader of the Senate, for their complete cooperation at all times in advancing the bill through the committee, then to the calendar, and now today to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I embrace the sentiment which the Senator from Oregon has expressed in reference to the Members of the minority. There was, I think, a very sincere approach to the problem on the part of individual Senators, regardless of party affiliation, to study the question, to appraise it, so far as possible, and to report to the Senate a bill which would have had careful consideration within the committee.

I have been mindful, during the prolonged hearings on this measure and in correspondence with my constituents, of two aspects of the problem which loom large in the public mind and on which we can never give too great assurance.

Of primary importance, Mr. President, in achieving an effective solution to our national educational problems is the principle that the individual States retain the discretionary right to disburse Federal assistance funds where they are most needed, in supplementing teachers' salaries or in the construction of new facilities.

The State of West Virginia is a case in point. We have 16 counties paying a maximum annual salary of $3,492 for a teacher with an A.B. degree. In the other counties the range extends to a maximum of $5,821. There is an equally wide spread in the pupil-teacher ratio, the median class size for grade 1 ranging from slightly more than 16 students in Morgan County to almost 32 students in Hancock County, and in grades 2 through 6—for the present academic year—the median class size varies from slightly more than 22 pupils in Hampshire County to 33 in Kanawha. It should be obvious from these considerations that the State and local authorities are best qualified to determine the allocation among their school districts, and to decide whether a given district or administrative unit is most in need of additional facilities or higher teachers' salaries.

An even more fundamental point to many Senators and to their constituencies, is that neither the pending bill nor any other Federal assistance measure will be used as an entering wedge to gain Federal domination or supervision of our public school system. Though I realize that there have been some exaggerated fears expressed on this point, I believe it is incumbent upon those of us who support strongly the concept of Federal responsibility in this field to be most vigilant in guarding against the slightest degree of Federal encroachment.

Though our public educational system is not as tidy an affair as some of its critics would desire, there can be no effective denial of the fact that much of the richness, diversity, and strength of American life is directly attributable to the principle of local control of our school system. The loss of this principle would be too great a price to pay for Federal assistance, no matter how plentiful.

Therefore, I ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not true that we have preserved in the bill the very important factor of determination at the State or local level.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about it. Let us get that point behind us right now. Anyone who examines the bill will agree that there is no question that we have written that safeguard into the bill in this language, which appears on page 2, section 103:

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN SCHOOLS

SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy, determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

I do not know how the doctrine could be stated more clearly than that.

I was a cosponsor of the Taft bills of 1947 and 1949. I spoke about the 1949 bill today. I could have said the same things about the Taft bill of 1947.

How well I remember the late Senator from Ohio, time and time again, as the record of the debates in those 2 years will show, standing on the floor of the Senate, when some opponent made the argument that the bill would lead to Federal domination of education. The Senator from Ohio would say, sometimes shaking his finger at the Senate, "If anyone has any stronger language, that he believes will guarantee better State control of education than is provided in my bill, give it to me, and I will write it into the bill." But then he would say, "You cannot do it because you cannot make the bill stronger than it is, so far as the guaranteeing of State control of education is concerned." Then he would read to the Senate language identical in meaning, although differing somewhat, perhaps, in phraseology, with the language of section 103, which I read to the Senate a moment ago.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I feel certain that not only are Senators reassured by the statement just made by the Senator from Oregon, but our separate constituencies, being in correspondence with Members of this body on this very item, also will be reassured. I think it is important, as has been indicated, that we make it perfectly clear at the outset of the debate that there will be no Federal domination; that the determination of the use of the funds will be at the State or local level, whether they are to be used for school construction or for aid in the payment of the salaries of teachers.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from West Virginia mentioned that point, although it will take us into the substantive argument; and I prefer not to do that now, until I propound a unanimous-consent request. However, I wish the Senator from West Virginia to know that in the committee some of us were rather adamant in taking the position that this bill should be a broad one, so as to cover both school construction and the salaries of teachers. I take the view that if we pass a bill limited to school construction, by imposing that very condition we shall, in a sense, be interfering with the educational process of the States. Instead, I believe the States should determine what they wish to use the money for. So long as we make clear the educational purposes under the standards of the act, I believe the States should determine whether they wish to use any or all of the money for the purpose of school construction, or whether they wish to use any or all of the money for the purpose of paying the salaries of the teachers, or whether they wish to make a division of the money between those two purposes. So we propose to leave that to the States; and I believe that is some of the best evidence I can present in regard to our determination not to interfere with the State control of education.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First, Mr. President, I should compliment the distinguished Senator from Oregon on the diligence with which he has pursued the matter at hand. It is a little regrettable that he is so diligent in persisting in error, but I shall not discuss that further now. [Laughter.]

At any rate, I wish to state that the Senator from Oregon was very generous to me, for, although I am not a member of the committee, and was a self-invited guest there, he permitted me to participate in the examination of the witnesses. For that, I am most grateful.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is always entitled to all ex-officio rights in the committee; and in any event he is always welcome there, both as a friend and colleague and as minority leader of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before yielding, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the request I shall now make has been cleared with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. Before I began to make my speech, I assured him that I would not make this request without taking up the matter with him. However, I understand that while I have been speaking, other Senators have taken up this matter with him; and I understand that he has no objection.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments now be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be treated as original text, for the purpose of further amendment. That is the customary request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry, as follows: If the request is agreed to, will it change in any way the degrees of amendments or substitutes which can be offered to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at all; the bill will be open to amendment in three degrees.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York for making the matter perfectly clear. I meant to make it clear when I asked that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc that the bill as thus amended be treated as original text for the purpose of further amendment. I agree that will leave the Senator from New York free to submit any amendments he may wish to submit, even amendments to sections of the bill to which committee amendments have been offered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, let me congratulate the Senator from Oregon on the very able work he did in the committee, in reconciling so many differences and in bringing the bill to the floor by the overwhelming vote of 12 to 2. I also wish to congratulate him on his very cogent and carefully reasoned statement.

I should like to ask him a few questions in connection with his presentation, if he will permit me to do so.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Illinois do so. First, however, I wish to say that the Senator from Illinois and I have been partners in connection with the Senate consideration of this matter. In my opinion, the Senator from Illinois is an outstanding educational expert, both in the Congress and in the entire Nation. He knows the problems which confront the country, as regards the plight of the school children and the inadequate support being given to education in many parts of the country. I have stood with the Senator from Illinois before, here on the floor of the Senate; and I am honored to stand with him again, today.

I hope I shall be able to answer the questions he has in mind. If I cannot answer them, certainly I can obtain the answers by conferring with some of the experts who are around me, here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon made some very cogent arguments in regard to why education in general needs additional funds. He pointed out that 140,000 additional classrooms will be needed, probably at the rate of 30,000 or more each year; and that additional teachers are needed, in order to reduce the present size of classes and to replace the approximately 90,000 teachers whose present terms are about to expire.

Is it not also true that funds are needed in order to increase the present salaries of the teachers?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I pointed out that one of the reasons why a larger percentage of the teachers is not accredited is that in some instances the salaries are so low that better qualified teachers cannot be obtained. I should like to state that I can supply for the RECORD some material which bears upon this point.

For instance, 1,700,000 teachers will be needed by 1968–69, 400,000 more than in 1958–59 are needed in order to care for just the new enrollments. To replace those leaving in the next 10 years we need to recruit 1.6 million teachers.

However, at the present time, only 129,000 new teachers become available each year, although approximately 95,000 of them, or 73 percent, actually enter the teaching profession.

When we begin to compare the salaries of teachers with the salaries paid in the manufacturing or industrial field, we find a startling situation. The goal is to raise the salaries of teachers until they are at least in the same class with the salaries of other professionals who have comparable training.

In 1958, the average of the salaries of engineers who had graduated from college was $9,647, whereas the average salary of teachers was $4,827. After 10 years, an engineer is paid 67 percent more than his starting pay; after 10 years, salespeople are paid 86 percent more than their starting pay; but after 10 years, teachers are paid only 49 percent more than their starting pay. Even if the salaries received by teachers were doubled in the next decade, they would be only three-fourths of those received by other professions. True, there has been some improvement; but the improvement has been inadequate.

The Senator from West Virginia pointed out that three-fifths of all teachers in West Virginia need to be replaced every 6 years. That creates a very serious problem for West Virginia; and I believe it is another reason why the bill we are urging is very sound.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in 14 States, one-third of the teachers earn $3,500 or less?

Mr. MORSE. I believe that statistic appears in the record which has already been made. I do not recall that particular fact, but I know the problem was thoroughly discussed, and the statistics are to be found in the record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the average for the country as a whole is approximately $5,200—as I believe it is—does not that mean that approximately half of the teachers are paid less than $5,200?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

That brings us to consider the number of school districts in which the salaries of the teachers are inadequate, in comparison with their training.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the annual pay received by teachers is approximately one-fourth of the annual income of doctors, approximately one-third the annual income of lawyers, and approximately one-half the average annual income of druggists and veterinarians?

Mr. MORSE. I must honestly say to the Senator that I cannot recall from my own recollection those specific statistics, but I can say the record of the committee hearings will show that kind of disparity, whether it is in those percentages or not. If the Senator from Illinois says those are the figures, that is good enough for me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think those figures are approximately correct.

Mr. MORSE. May I interrupt the Senator to point out that because that is true, because there is that great disparity, we have been having great difficulty getting men into the teaching profession. I happen to be one who believes it is very important to our boys and girls at every level of education to have as teachers both men and women. I think that is very important. I know that professional educators agree with that statement. There is a great deal of literature on the subject. But we cannot get the appropriate percentage of men in the teaching profession because of the great salary discrepancy.

I think it is interesting to bring up the point now that as the Senator knows, for many years in the Senate I have been fighting for legislation to provide equal pay for men and women doing identical work. Here is an example that shows when there is not equal pay for men and women doing identical work, we withhold the educational process, and therefore deny the children of our country the opportunity to have the benefit of having both men and women as teachers, which I think is very important to the educational process.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Assuming the average salary of the teachers is $5,200, which would be around $85 a week, is it not true that the average truckdriver will make appreciably more than this sum?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes. The Senator will find in the record statistic after statistic that shows many of the workers in the so-called skilled trades receive substantially more income a year than do teachers. Let me make perfectly clear that I do not in any way disparage the skilled workers. I do not think they are overpaid, but I think teachers are grossly underpaid as a class.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in many cases unskilled workers earn as much as teachers?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, yes. In recent months a term has been used throughout the country that was new to me at least up until the time it was used. It is "moonlighting." There was quite a discussion of it in New York City last fall, when I was serving in the United Nations. There was quite a conflict going on between the mayor, the head of the police department, and others over the fact that many policemen had extra jobs in order to eke out what they considered to be an amount necessary to enable them to maintain their families in health and decency. There are thousands and thousands and thousands of teachers in the country today who are "moonlighters," to use that word. They have to have extra jobs in order to keep body and soul together.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now may I ask the Senator from Oregon some questions dealing with the ability of States and localities to provide added amounts necessary to finance adequate educational systems.

As I understand it, approximately 56 percent of the funds now devoted to education comes from the localities, approximately 40 percent from the States, and only 4 percent from the National Government. Is it not true that the localities get their money almost exclusively from the general property tax?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct, and the Senator could not raise a more vital question in the debate. I want to take a moment to speak on it. The question raised by the Senator from Illinois, in my judgment, is one of the so-called key questions that every Senator will have to face up to as we face this issue in the days immediately ahead. The record on the desk of each Senator will show, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that in school district after school district, in State after State in this country, an unfair burden is being placed on real property for the support of the schools of this country.

I know we ran into the argument on the part of some witnesses—yes, for a time, on the part of some of our colleagues—"Well, we do not think there is a great need for this bill, because look at the school bond issues that have been passed." I want to say, to the everlasting credit of the parents of the country, they have passed school bond issue after school bond issue. But that does not make it right; that is no justification for it.

Where are the parents—and most of us in this body are parents—who would hesitate doing that which would impose on them an additional sacrifice, even though they know it is an unreasonable sacrifice, to give those boys and girls of whom we are proud to be parents an opportunity for a better education by means of an additional property tax? But that does not make the tax fair and right. I think it is time we got away from the use of a regressive tax as the base for supporting the schools of this country. I do not yield to anyone in consistently urging that we increase homeownership. That is why I am a strong advocate of homeownership. That is why next week, or before this week is over, I shall speak in support of the housing program and the enlargement of it. Why? Because I am convinced that if private homeownership is increased, the opportunity is decreased for a leftist movement in this country.

At the risk of boredom I shall now make a statement, because we have to come back to it again and again in our legislative process. As I have said so many times, if there is family farm ownership, and private homeownership in the cities, of this country, we will have a society about which we do not have to worry so far as any leftist movement is concerned—Communist, or Fascist, or state Socialist.

Therefore, I am glad the Senator from Illinois has raised this question. I am going to give him a statistic in a moment or two. However, I want to stress this point. I urge one not to argue with me, so far as trying to convince me is concerned—not that my mind is closed, but because I know the facts do not support the argument—that we do not need a Federal aid to education bill, because in a small town, or in a country crossroads, or at a railroad station Y, or in one or another small community of America last year they passed another school bond issue. My question is, Should they have been asked to do it? Was it fair? Is this an equitable distribution of educational responsibility in this country? I think the facts show that the answer to those questions is "No."

I do not intend to let that argument, which I consider to be an argument of division, take me from the course which I think is clearly outlined here if we are going to serve the goal of getting the children of the country the help they need.

If the Senator from Illinois would be so kind as to permit me, I should like to call attention for the record the fact that Federal tax revenues increased 85 percent since 1945, but State and local revenues from taxes rose 221 percent.

From 1946 to 1959 Federal debt rose 6 percent, while State and local debt rose 300 percent.

That is what is happening in the local school districts of America.

I am not going to keep my eyes off the fact that there is a Federal interest in minimum standards of education, about which I have been talking most of the afternoon. The Senator from Illinois is very helpful when he makes the argument in support of my position which he has just made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that land and buildings, which furnish the bases for the general property tax, are already taxed approximately as heavily as they can stand?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And is it not also true that in the assessment of land and buildings the homes of the wealthy are assessed at a smaller percentage of their market value than are the homes of the poor and of the middle classes?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. Of course, there are some areas in which there is needed improvement in the property tax. I speak now as an alderman. My good friend from Illinois was once a city councilman from Chicago. I am a city councilman in Washington, D.C., for I am a member of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and that makes me an alderman. In the District of Columbia we need to take a long, hard look at our property assessments.

Of course, in regard to assessments, we must not forget that we need to look to see what percentage the assessment is compared to the true value of the property.

On the other hand, I do not think we, as Members of Congress, can justify taking the position that we can slap a great increase on the real property tax of the District of Columbia and walk out constantly on the appropriations we ought to make to pay for the Federal cost in the District of Columbia in lieu of taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am trying to establish two points. First, that the average assessment upon real estate is higher than the owner of real estate can properly bear.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Second, that in the assessment of real estate, the well-to-do are favored because their property is assessed at a smaller fraction of its market value than is the property of the lower and middle income groups. Therefore, the general property tax is regressive.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The percentage of tax is greater for those in the lower income brackets and in the middle income brackets than it is for those in the upper income brackets.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This regressive nature of the general property tax is also shown by the higher percentage of real value taxed for the homes of working men and middle income groups than for industrial property. That is, the assessed valuation of the former generally represents a greater percentage of actual market value than does the assessed valuation of the latter, and, therefore, lower and middle income homeowners bear, proportionately, a greater tax burden than do industrial property owners.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, would the Senator agree, therefore, that the 56 percent of school revenues now derived from local taxation comes from a source which cannot bear much more of a burden and, moreover, is raised under a system of regressive taxation? Is that not true?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. I thank the Senator for his help.

I should like to supplement something I said a few moments ago concerning bond issues, because there is another point about which I am sure the Senator from Illinois agrees with me. I spoke about the many bond issues of last year. Many communities at the same time refused school bond issues and school tax increase proposals at the polls.

Bond elections in 1960 approved $1,757 million in new issues, 30 to 36 percent above the 1957–59 level. However, as I said, many communities refused school

bonds and school tax increase proposals in 1960 at the polls, for $401,500,000 worth were rejected.

Again I stress that the comparison of those figures does not justify the conclusion that there is no need for Federal aid to education; to the contrary, it justifies the conclusion that we ought to stop the unfairness and inequity we are imposing upon the homeowners of America by asking them to bear an undue burden.

An interesting corollary is involved. The committee record will show that there was not the same hesitancy as to rejecting road bonds. Do Senators know why? It is because when the communities pass road bonds they receive Federal contributions. The State will put up $1 and the Federal Government will put up many times $1 for roads, but that is not true in connection with schools. In connection with school bonds, the States and local communities pay the whole bill.

This is an interesting commentary, because it is what the record shows. I digest it for Senators. I admit we need improvements in roads, but is it not a sad commentary that in this country, badly as we need roads, the American people give preference to roads over schools? That is what the argument really adds up to. Although people vote for the issuance of road bonds because they can get help from the Federal Government, they reject school bonds because they do not get help from the Federal Government.

I repeat, in those instances in which the school bonds were voted it was because those parents were willing to make the additional sacrifice, not because it was right to ask them to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that, in regard to the 40 percent of school revenue coming from State sources, the major portion of State funds is raised by sales taxes?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. I should like to state some facts in regard to that. The Senator from Illinois knows them perfectly, but we should state them for the record.

The existing State tax structures are regressive compared to Federal taxes. One-third of the States have no income taxes. Two-thirds of the States rely heavily on sales taxes, as the Senator has pointed out, and almost all of them rely on consumer excise taxes. That is simply another example of regressive taxation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under the sales taxes, services are generally exempted; are they not?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And, customarily, investments are exempted?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The percentage of income spent for services and investments increases as income increases, so that the taxable portion of one's income diminishes as income increases?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So a proportional sales tax of 3 or 4 percent is actually a regressive tax insofar as income is concerned; namely, the percentage of tax decreases as the income increases.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So if a State is supporting education locally with funds raised by a highly regressive tax system, it is actually financing education by compelling the poor man and the man of middle income to pay in taxes a larger fraction of his income than those with greater income pay. Is that not true?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. I completely agree. These facts were brought out over and over again in our hearings. Senators can find them in the hearings, though not as succinctly and well stated as the Senator from Illinois has pointed out. Such facts as the Senator has brought out served as the basis for the committee's reaching the conclusion it reached as to the absolute necessity for Federal aid to education.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that approximately 52 percent of Federal budget receipts is derived from Federal income taxes, which are progressive in nature, and about 25 percent from the corporate profits tax, which is also somewhat progressive in nature?

Mr. MORSE. The record shows that to be true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not using the words "progressive" or "regressive" in any ethical sense, but merely in the arithmetical sense.

Mr. MORSE. As words of art in the tax language.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Therefore, part of the significance of Federal aid to education is that it will help to shift the burden of paying the costs of schools and of educating our children from those who are less able to bear the burden to those who are better able to bear the burden.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is completely correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that not one of the basic reasons why so many people are opposing Federal aid to education, because so long as they can keep the system financed locally they can throw the burdens upon the shoulders of those who are less able to bear the cost?

Mr. MORSE. They do not publicly confess it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; but is that not really one of the reasons?

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, it is.

Mr. President, I have just received a note that calls for my attendance at the majority leader's office immediately. I know there are many Senators who can carry on the discussion while I respond to the note. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 20, change the period to a comma, and add the following language: "and no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall withhold funds appropriated under authorization of this title from any State or school otherwise eligible because of any law, policy, or practice of the State or school with regard to segregation or desegregation of the races in the schools."

On page 3, line 6, change the period to a semicolon, and add the following language:

Provided, however, That no funds are authorized by this title to be appropriated which are conditioned on the compliance by a State or school with any policy or law with regard to segregation or desegregation of the races in the schools.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the pending amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senate, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I wish to state that there will be no yea-and-nay votes this afternoon, and after talking with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, I announce that the vote on the pending amendment will come early tomorrow.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is regrettable that one cannot readily perceive the entire range of true purposes of legislation being considered in the Congress by a resort to the testimony before the committees, the committee reports, and the bill itself; for experience has proven beyond any shadow of a doubt that many times legislation enacted by the Congress is not at all what it appears to be on the surface. In no area is the uncertainty of purpose more certain than in the area of Federal aid to education.

When the so-called civil rights bills were before Congress in the last several years, we were confronted with legislative proposals to authorize the payment of Federal funds to school districts which would attempt to implement a policy of desegregation. That was nothing more than a legislative proposal for bribery of local school districts and school officials, in order to achieve the very dubious social aim of integration of the races in the schools. The proposals were an insult to the people and school districts with segregated schools, and constituted an affront to their sincerity.

Whenever the question of Federal aid to education has been considered in recent years, there has been an effort to write into the bill a provision that funds should be withheld from States which have laws or policies which result in the separation of the races in the schools. Such an amendment was adopted by the House of Representatives to the education bill passed by that body last year. Fortunately, that bill was never agreed to in conference.

This year there have been indications that such an amendment will not be adopted, or even offered by its usual proponents, on the assumption that the ex-

ecutive branch will take administrative action to withhold the funds proposed to be authorized by the bill which we are now considering from States which maintain segregated schools. Recent acts of the administration lend credence to the belief that it is the policy of the administration to use every tool at its command to force integration of the schools.

The President, in the very early days of his administration, issued an Executive order—and appointed a committee to enforce it—which would require the Government to practice a policy of so-called nondiscrimination in employment and to withhold Government contracts from private employers who do not hire applicants of minority races. This Executive order has already caused infringement on the rights of employers, and has had an impact on the industrial communities of my State and others.

Another example of the policy of the administration is the President's intrusion into the centennial observance, which recently took place in Charleston, S.C., of the War Between the States. The President based his interference on the ground that funds were contributed by the National Government to the Civil War Centennial Commission, in Washington, and that the Commission was cooperating in the observance at Charleston, although the observance was being financed without the assistance of any Federal funds. This is illustrative of the length to which the executive branch will go in tracing Federal funds to their most remote and even unconnected application, in order to exercise control by the National Government, to the end that the racial segregation policies and practices of State and local governments, and even private organizations and citizens, shall be nullified and replaced by those dictated by the National Government.

Another instance lies in the action taken by the Department of Agriculture to obtain integration of the State and county committees of the agricultural stabilization program.

The intent and singlemindedness of purpose of the administration to enforce integration of the races by any means at its command is further illustrated by the ill-advised efforts of the Department of Justice to force the reopening and maintenance on an integrated basis of the public schools of Prince Edward County, Va.

It would be naive, therefore, to assume that the executive branch of government would overlook the potential of any general Federal aid to education program enacted by the Congress for furthering the administration's purpose of advancing racial integration in all areas, including the schools. The legal rationalization by which the administration could seek to justify a withholding of funds appropriated under an aid-to-education bill was prepared by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, in March 1961. This memorandum is entitled "The Power of the President To Withhold Federal Funds From Educational Institutions Which Discriminate Among Students on Grounds of Race." The memorandum concludes as follows:

> There can be little disagreement about the validity of the proposition that, when the Supreme Court has held that Federal payments in aid of segregated education are unconstitutional, any statutes authorizing such payments are unconstitutional and the President need not wait for congressional action repealing or amending the statutes before ordering that the payments be withheld.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of the memorandum be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POWER OF THE PRESIDENT TO WITHHOLD FEDERAL FUNDS FROM EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS WHICH DISCRIMINATE AMONG STUDENTS ON GROUNDS OF RACE

In the school segregation cases, and in subsequent opinions, the Supreme Court has enumerated several principles which must be taken into account in measuring the power of the President, without further legislation, to withhold Federal funds from educational institutions which discriminate among students on grounds of race. Among these principles are:

1. State support of segregated schools through any arrangement, management funds, or property cannot be squared with the 14th amendment's command that no State shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws (*Cooper* v. *Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958)).

2. The right of a student not to be segregated on racial grounds in schools is said to be so fundamental and pervasive that it is embraced in the concept of due process of law with the result that any act in support of segregated schools which is prohibited the States under the 14th amendment is prohibited the United States under the 5th amendment (*Rollins* v. *Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954); *Cooper* v. *Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1 (1958)).

3. All provisions of Federal, State, or local law requiring or permitting racial discrimination in public education must yield to the fundamental principle that such discrimination is unconstitutional (*Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 349 U.S. 294 (1955)).

A President who chooses to continue distributing Federal funds in aid of education without imposing upon the recipient a condition that the funds not be used to support segregated schools might justify his decision on the ground that the particular statutes under which the funds are being distributed have not been the subject of Supreme Court decisions and any statements in the school segregation cases that such statutes are unconstitutional are dicta. The President who would prefer to act contrariwise, however, may conclude that he has not only the power, but under some circumstances even the duty to withhold payment of any funds to be used by the recipient for a purpose which the Supreme Court has indicated would be unconstitutionally discriminatory. It should be noted that even the President who finds in these recent decisions of the Supreme Court a mandate for withholding funds might be justified in making the same sort of distinction the courts have made between public and private schools and between elementary-secondary schools and schools of higher learning.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

It was in the *Civil Rights* cases, 109 U.S. 3 (1883), that the Supreme Court indicated that the prohibitions of the 14th amendment extended only to State action, not to acts of individuals, and that Congress in the exercise of its powers under the 14th amendment could not prohibit purely private acts of racial discrimination. It remains a valid principle that a private school may refuse to admit Negroes without violating the 14th amendment. In re *Girard College Trusteeship*, 391 Pa. 434, 138 A. 2d 844; 357 U.S. 570 (1958). Although the school segregation cases made it clear that neither the States nor the Federal Government may refuse admission to a particular school on grounds of race or color, and although in *Cooper* v. *Aaron* (supra) the Court indicated that State or Federal support of segregated schools through any arrangement, management, funds, or property cannot be squared with the obligations of the 5th and 14th amendments, the Court has provided no certain basis for determining when either a State, or the Federal Government, by providing financial benefits to private schools generally, would be charged with the legal responsibilities for acts of racial discrimination practiced by the schools. There is at least one case worth noting in this connection. It involved a private hospital in North Carolina which admitted only white patients. A U.S. court of appeals held that county payments of $16 per day for the care of each indigent white patient from the area which in the aggregate constituted less than 4½ percent of the hospital's total income were insufficient to transform the private discriminatory acts of the hospital into State acts which would be prohibited by the 14th amendment. (*Eaton* v. *Board of Managers*, 261 F. 2d 521 (4th Cir. 1958).) Although the Supreme Court denied certiorari (359 U.S. 984 (1959)), the Court has repeatedly indicated that no inference as to the correctness of the decision below should be drawn from this fact.

Even if it be conceded, however, that not every contribution by a State or the United States to a private school which engages in acts of racial discrimination converts the acts of the school into State or Federal acts thereby making the contribution itself unconstitutional, it must also be conceded that some circumstances are conceivable under which contributions are so substantial and their purpose so clearly an attempt to evade the constitutional obligation that a court would hold that they violated the provisions of the 5th or 14th amendment. In the light of the existing case law, perhaps the most definite statement which can be made is that in determining whether the act of giving aid is distinct from the act of a particular recipient, the courts would pay particular attention to the purpose, scope, and nature of the aid program.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND SCHOOLS OF HIGHER LEARNING

In public elementary and secondary schools the process of eliminating segregation is to be undertaken "with all deliberate speed." However, the Supreme Court indicated that in measuring compliance with its mandate the courts may consider problems relating to administration, the school plant, transportation, personnel, revision of school districts and amendment of local laws. It was anticipated by the Court that during this transition period, circumstances in some school districts would permit the use of racial criteria in making school assignment which would not be permitted after the transition period. Decisions on questions of this sort were to be made by the courts on equitable grounds.

After its decision in the first *Brown* case (347 U.S. 483) the Supreme Court remanded a case, involving the admission of a Negro student to the University of Florida, with instructions that the principles enunciated in the Brown case be followed. A year later, after the second *Brown* opinion (349 U.S. 294) enunicated the principles to be followed by the courts in implementing desegregation, the Supreme Court recalled and

vacated its decree, indicating that in the admission of Negro students to graduate professional schools there is no reason for delay. Negroes are entitled to prompt admission under the rules and regulations applicable to other qualified candidates. *Hawkins* v. *Board in Control*, 350 U.S. 413 (1956). At least one appellate court has indicated that there would seem to be as little reason for delay in eliminating racial barriers to admission into any public educational institution of collegiate or higher level. (See *Booker* v. *State of Tennessee Board of Education*, 240 F. 2d 689 (6th Cir. 1957).)

There can be little disagreement about the validity of the proposition that, when the Supreme Court has held that Federal payments in aid of segregated education are unconstitutional, any statutes authorizing such payments are unconstitutional and the President need not wait for congressional action repealing or amending the statutes before ordering that the payments be withheld. There may, however, be a great deal of disagreement about the effect of these recent Supreme Court decisions on the validity of existing statutes authorizing Federal aid to education. The power to withhold payments to States for the support of public segregated colleges and institutions of higher learning is perhaps least subject to question. Withholding payments to States for the support of public elementary and secondary schools is a power less clear because of the transition time authorized for some areas under the principles of the second Brown opinion. The propriety of withholding payments for the support of private schools of any educational level would seem to depend not only upon the particular statute but upon the relation the particular payment bears to the total income of the school. Yet even where constitutional concerns might not require that payments be withheld, the provisions of particular statutes might either expressly or impliedly authorize the President to withhold them. For this reason it would be worthwhile to consider the provisions of some of the statutes authorizing Federal aid to education.

SOME STATUTES AUTHORIZING FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID TO EDUCATION

Many of the programs of Federal financial assistance for education authorize payments only to States or to local public educational agencies. Some of these are the programs authorizing grants to States for agriculture and mechanic arts colleges (26 Stat. 417 (1890), 7 U.S.C. 321–26, 328–29); vocational education, in agricultural, trade, industrial, and home economics subjects (39 Stat. 929 (1917), 20 U.S.C. 11; 49 Stat. 1489 (1936), 20 U.S.C. 15j); public library services for rural areas (70 Stat. 295 (1956), 20 U.S.C. 355); and school lunch programs (60 Stat. 230.32 (1946), 42 U.S.C. 1751–60). Payments to local educational agencies are authorized under the act of September 30, 1950 (c. 1124, 64 Stat. 1100, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 236–44), for financial assistance for areas affected by Federal activities, and under the act of August 12, 1958 (Public Law 85, 620, 72 Stat. 548, 20 U.S.C. 631–45), for school construction in areas affected by Federal activities.

Some of these programs have provisions dealing specifically with racial discrimination. In the program for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, for instance, title 7, United States Code, section 323, provides that no money shall be paid out for the support of maintenance of a college where a distinction of race or color is made in the admission of students; but if a State establishes and maintains separate colleges for white and colored students, payments are authorized if they are equitably divided according to a statutory formula. At the time this act was passed, in 1890, it was thought that the maintenance of separate colleges for white and colored students would satisfy the requirements of the 14th amendment. The recent decisions of the Supreme Court make it clear that States may not maintain such segregated colleges. From these circumstances, it may be argued that the congressional intent was to permit payments only to those States which did not violate the provisions of the 14th amendment, and that the President may give effect to this intent by refusing payments to States which are maintaining segregated colleges in violation of the 14th amendment. It is most interesting to note that title 7, United States Code, section 326, provides that when the administrator of the program withholds funds from a State he shall notify the President and the amount involved shall be left separate in the Treasury until the close of the next Congress. The State may appeal to Congress from the decision of the Administrator; and if the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid to the State, it shall be covered into the Treasury.

With regard to the various vocational training aid programs, 20 U.S.C. 17 provides that the Commissioner of Education may make such recommendations to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, relative to the administration of 20 U.S.C. sections 11–15 and 16–28 as he may from time to time deem advisable and that it shall be the duty of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out the rules, regulations, and decisions which it may adopt. 20 U.S.C. 26 permits the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to withhold allotments to any States whenever it shall be determined that such money is not being expended for the purposes and under the conditions set forth in sections 11–15 and 16–28. There is also a provision like the one contained in 7 U.S.C. 326 (supra), for the States to appeal any withholding to Congress. Although racial discrimination is nowhere mentioned in these sections, the regulations issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare include the following provision:

"FEDERALLY AIDED PROGRAMS TO BE ADMINISTERED WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION

"In the expenditure of Federal funds and in the administration of federally aided programs of vocational education there shall be no discrimination because of race, creed, or color" (45 C.F.R. 102.18).

No cases have been found which deal with any attempts to enforce this regulation.

Chapter 16 of title 20 which provides financial aid for public library services in rural areas mentions nothing in specific terms about racial discrimination and in section 351 provides that the administration of public libraries, the selection of personnel and library books and materials shall be reserved to the States and their local subdivisions. Yet section 358 defines the term "public library" to mean "a library that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds. * * * " This lends support to the determination of any administrator who decides to withhold funds from any library which serves only white people or which serves only colored people. Since neither serves all residents of a community and both would fall short of the statutory definition of "public library."

These examples should be sufficient to illustrate the fact that in almost any statute the Administrator can find implied authority to withhold funds from recipients who refuse to eliminate racial discrimination in their use of the funds.

THE FEASIBILITY OF ATTEMPTING TO DISCOURAGE SEGREGATION IN EDUCATION BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

One matter which is still uncertain is whether the school segregation cases impose a negative or a positive duty upon public officials with regard to racial equality in education. Although the first *Brown* case (supra) contains some language indicating that State school authorities have a duty to bring about integration, there is other evidence to indicate that their only duty is to eliminate race as a basis for classifying students for purposes of public education. For instance one court has said that the Supreme Court decisions do not compel the mixing of the different races in the public schools, but simply require that no child shall be denied admission on the basis of race or color. (*Thompson* v. *County School Board of Arlington, Va.*, 144 F. Supp. 239 (E.D. Va., 1956), aff'd., 240 F. 2d 59 (4th Cir. 1956), Cert. denied, 353 U.S. 910 (1957).) Other opinions have said that the Supreme Court decisions do not require racial integration but merely forbid racial discrimination. (*Briggs* v. *Elliott*, 132 F. Supp. 776 (E.D.S.C. 1955); *Avery* v. *Wichita Falls Independent School District*, 241 F. 2d 231, 234, (5th Cir. 1957).) Some support for this position may be found in the decision upholding a State pupil placement law that makes no reference to race or color but sets forth various other factors to be considered in the admission of students to particular schools. *Shuttlesworth* v. *Birmingham*, 162 F. Supp. 372 (N.D. Ala. 1958), aff'd., 358 U.S. 101 (1958).

If the President were to proceed by Executive order to direct the Departments concerned to withhold payments of Federal aid to education from recipients who used the funds in a racially discriminatory manner the degrees of difficulty in enforcing such order would correspond, roughly, to the degrees of clarity with which his power to issue such order is illuminated.

If the order were to require, as a condition for receiving a Federal grant that the grantee refrain from using race as a factor to be considered in the admission of students to particular schools, the order would be relatively easy to enforce with respect to public institutions of higher learning. In elementary and secondary schools, especially in localities with a pupil placement system of the type considered in *Shuttlesworth* v. *Birmingham*, *supra*, it would be relatively difficult to enforce. It might be appropriate to note here, that even if the President does have the power to withhold funds from school systems which practice racial discrimination he would not, by reason of that fact, have the authority to require integration.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have read that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has stated that any program of Federal aid to education enacted should not be encumbered by efforts to use it as wedge for integration.

I have also heard assurances from Members of Congress that funds authorized under the bill before us, S. 1021, would not be withheld by the administration from States which maintain segregated school systems. Such assurances, well intentioned though they may be, are signally unconvincing when viewed in the light of this administration's previous actions and the repeated efforts in the Congress to enact extreme and punitive legislation to accomplish integration of the races in all phases of life, including the schools.

If there is no intention to withhold funds authorized under this Federal-aid-

to-education bill from States which maintain segregated schools, then there should be written into the bill meaningful language to assure that no such occurrences will take place. The amendment I have offered is designed to accomplish that purpose. It is quite simple. To section 103, the so-called assurance against Federal intervention in schools provision, the amendment would add the following language: "and no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall withhold funds appropriated under authorization of this title from any State or school otherwise eligible because of any law, policy or practice of the State or school with regard to segregation or desegregation of the races in the schools."

Since there is also a possibility that Congress would see fit to tie a rider on appropriations made pursuant to this act, my amendment would add to section 104, which authorizes appropriations, the following language:

Provided, however, That no funds are authorized by this title to be appropriated which are conditioned on the compliance by a State or school with any policy or law with regard to segregation or desegregation of the races in the schools.

If, indeed, there is no intent or purpose to use Federal aid to education as a wedge and a bribe to accomplish the goal of racial integration, adoption of this amendment should be automatic and noncontroversial. If, as I suspect, this Federal-aid-to-education proposal has as its real purpose the provision of another stick with which to beat the South over the head, then this amendment will be rejected. The vote on this amendment will show the true purpose of the bill, for all to see; and at least the people will have an opportunity to judge the true merits of the legislation which we are considering, without having to rely on the conflicting opinions and expressions of legislators and administration officials.

Of course, Mr. President, this is as far as any Member of Congress can go in trying to provide protection in that situation. I realize that the situation is still a hazardous one, and that this amendment will not prevent the exercise of much control if the bill is enacted into law, even though this amendment is adopted, nor would it provide an absolute guarantee against the issuance of such an executive order, if the President saw fit to do so.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will my friend yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to propound a question to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. Perhaps it will come as no surprise to him when I say that I am opposed to his amendment. However, does not the Senator from South Carolina recognize that if his amendment is rejected, that will be tantamount to having the Senate state that "A department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States may withhold funds appropriated under authorization of this title from any State or school otherwise eligible because of any law, policy, or practice of the State or school with regard to segregation or desegregation of the races in the schools"? I should like to sharpen the issue.

Mr. THURMOND. In reply to the Senator's question, I will say that it is my understanding that the proponents of the bill assert that section 103, on page 2 of the bill, will prevent the withholding of funds for such a purpose. They claim that this verbiage is sufficient. The verbiage speaks for itself. It provides that—

In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

They claim that under this provision there is a prohibition against any control. In view of the previous action of the administration, I would make the verbiage more specific.

As I stated a few moments ago, however, this is about all that I think might be done through the Congress to accomplish the goal I have in mind. However, I realize it would still not protect the situation from the standpoint of the Federal Government's exercising control. It would still not prevent the President from issuing an executive order, if he saw fit to do so, although in my opinion, he would have no legal right to do so, regardless of the Senate's action on my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, it is the view of the Senator from South Carolina that, if his amendment is defeated, it will lie within the province of the Chief Executive to issue an executive order denying funds to a State or school because of the law, policy, or practice with regard to segregation or desegregation in a school?

Mr. THURMOND. So far as the Senator from South Carolina is concerned, that is not his opinion. I do not think the President has that right under the Constitution, but I fear that under his construction of the Constitution he may interpret that he does have such a right.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, do I correctly understand that the Senator feels his amendment is unnecessary, but he desires it for double protection, one might say? Is that the purpose of offering the amendment?

Mr. THURMOND. I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator feel that even without his amendment the Chief Executive would have no authority under the Constitution to issue such an order as I have referred to? If so, I must emphatically disagree with his interpretation of the provisions of the bill and the significance of this legislative history.

Mr. THURMOND. I think I have explained my position here, that, so far as the Congress is concerned, this is about the only avenue of approach I know of to try to accomplish the goal of minimizing the chance that the President will take such a step. Repeatedly the Congress has rejected the opposite of my amendment, so a rejection of my amendment, as much as I would regret it, would indicate no legislative intent to adopt the contrary and approve withholding of such funds. Such an intent could be expressed only by the adoption of the contrary language, as the Senator from New York just read it.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, is the Senator through? I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MOSS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from South Carolina if he will yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum, in order to afford Senators an opportunity to hear the statement of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the question before the Senate today is simply this:

Is America offering all of its children the kind of education which will sustain our national ideals and meet the challenge of the space age world?

I believe any honest answer must be—America is not.

It would be naive to say that we can solve our educational dilemma entirely with money. The kind of education we want for our children calls for initiative, dedication, inspiration, and dogged hard work. But it would also be naive to say that resourcefulness and elbow grease are enough—that we can solve our problems without money.

I do not think anyone will challenge me when I declare that this big, rich, abundant country that is America can afford to give its children a quality education. The problem is that certain States and specific localities cannot. Money in substantial enough amounts will not be forthcoming to properly educate all of our children if the task is left entirely to State legislatures and local bonding capacities.

The bill before us today—S. 1021—of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, represents a prudent attempt to supplement State and local education funds with a comparatively small Federal contribution which can be used as the States and localities see fit—to increase teachers' salaries or to build more classrooms.

In my opinion, there are six main reasons why we must use the Federal Government to improve the education of our children. They are briefly:

First. The unequal division of money and children among the States.

Second. The right of each child to a quality education.

Third. The mobility of our population.

Fourth. The limited taxing capacities of our States.

Fifth. The extent to which Federal land ownership takes property tax revenues from the States.

Sixth. The fact that Federal taxes based primarily on ability to pay are collected more efficiently than State taxes.

Let me develop each of these premises in some detail.

First, money and children are unequally divided among the States.

The income per public school pupil in the richest State, New York, is almost four times the income per pupil in the poorest State, Mississippi. New York, with only 17 percent of its total civilian population enrolled in its public schools, has an average income for each school child of $18,485, while Mississippi, with 26 percent of its civilian population enrolled in its public schools, has an average income of only $5,202 available for the education of its children.

This means, therefore, that New York, with its much smaller educational burden and its much higher income, has more than three times as much ability to discharge its responsibility as Mississippi has.

Now, of course, these are the two States at the opposite ends of the economic and educational spectrum. But there are many other examples which emphasize the disparity. My own State of Utah is one of them. The students enrolled in our public schools represent 27 percent of our civilian population—the highest public school enrollment under this criterion in the country. To meet this high educational responsibility, Utah leads the Nation in the percent of personal income devoted to education. We devote 5½ percent as compared to a national average of 3.7 percent. Yet even with this Herculean effort, we are currently spending $24 less per pupil in Utah than is spent on the average American boy and girl.

It is obvious that the equalization formula in the bill before us today offers great hope to States like Utah. If the full amount authorized is appropriated, and the flat grant figure of $15 per school child is adhered to, Utah would receive $23.67 for each school child in the fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964, or a total of $6,321,000 each year. In a State where the zeal for education is as great, as in Utah, and the birthrate as high, these additional dollars would be thoroughly appreciated and well spent, I assure the Senate.

Many of our neighboring States in the West are in much the same position as Utah. They are comparatively low income States with high public school burdens. Among the 11 States making the greatest effort to support their schools are 7 Western States—Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Wyoming, Washington, Oregon, and Colorado.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a brief comment?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Senator from Utah know the reason I have not been present in the Chamber while he has been speaking and the reason I shall have to leave the Chamber immediately after these comments. I have to return to the majority leader's office for a further conference in regard to handling the education bill. However, I should like to have the Senator from Utah know that, as chairman of the subcommittee, I deeply appreciate his support of the principle of Federal aid to education, and I shall rely heavily upon him in the course of the debate in the next few days for passage of the very best possible bill we can pass in the Senate. I hope the Senator understands the reason for my absence from the Chamber.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the senior Senator from Oregon, and I appreciate his generous remarks. I certainly commend the Senator for the leadership he has given as chairman of the subcommittee and as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate. I assure the Senator I shall serve under his banner in this cause, in an endeavor to secure passage of a meaningful aid to education bill at this session.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, second, it is a well-established principle in the States, that all boys and girls are entitled to equal school opportunities, regardless of race, color, religion, or place of residence.

I believe most profoundly that this principle should be equally applied on a national basis. Education is too important to us as a nation to allow the quality or quantity of the schooling received by our citizens to be determined by the chance location of wealth among the States. The money is where the children are not and the schools are generally poorest where the children are. Only through the Federal Government can we tax the wealth where it is and distribute it where the children are.

Third, we are a people on the move, so ignorance cannot be quarantined behind State boundaries.

We can no longer slough off the lack of educational opportunities in one section of the country by patting ourselves on the back and saying "our schools are good." The boys and girls who are being educated in one of our poorer States today may be a neighbor or an employee tomorrow.

Nevada is a good example of the mobility of our population. Two of three citizens now living in Nevada were born in some other State. Six out of every 10 residents in Wyoming and Arizona first saw the light of day somewhere else. In Utah, where there is a relatively stable population, one out of five of our current residents comes from another State.

It seems to me that we cannot escape the fact that it is to the concern of all of us to raise the standards of education in every State in the union. With America on wheels, how can the level of our education in any part of it be anything but a national concern?

Fourth, certain wealth cannot be taxed by the States, but only by the Federal government.

As we all know, much of the wealth produced in many States is not taxable because it is made by non-resident corporations whose profits are distributed to stockholders who pay taxes in other States. In many States, this is not too serious a problem. But in my State of Utah, one single industry accounts for approximately twenty percent of the total assessed valuation of the state, and that industry is almost entirely Eastern-owned. There are not more than a handful of stockholders in Utah. This represents a great loss of revenue to the State from its most valuable single resource.

Losses of revenue of this type reduce the capacity of a State to finance its education. This, in turn, impairs economic stability and growth, because it places an unequal burden on the businesses which are owned or incorporated in the State. It is common to hear large industries threaten to move to States where the tax situation is more favorable. Naturally, threats like this have the effect of holding down State and local taxes—often making a State or community choose between educating its children and assuring its economic growth.

Fifth, the main source of revenue for education is the property tax, yet in many States—particularly Western states—the Federal Government owns more than half the land.

Large blocks of land in Federal ownership greatly reduce school tax revenues. In Utah, for example, 7 out of every 10 acres belong to Uncle Sam. Real property taxes are actually paid on less than 25 percent of the land in the State, yet such taxes account for more than half the bill for educating our children. Other States have similar—and in some cases even more acute—problems.

Also, some of the best land which was once on State and county tax rolls has been removed for the use of Federal installations. At the present time there is a great deal of Federal activity in Utah. It has brought many additional children into our State to be educated. Often the parents are located in sparsely settled areas, so that the children must be transported many miles to school before their education can begin. All this is costly.

The Federal Government has recognized its responsibility in part for the problems created by Federal activity through enactment of Public Laws 874 and 815, commonly called the "impacted areas" laws. I am indeed glad that these programs would be extended for 3 years by the bill.

But I point out that the approximately $10 million received by Utah school districts during the past decade do not begin to pay for the increased educational costs stimulated by the Federal activities.

My sixth and final point is that Federal taxes are collected and distributed more efficiently than local and State taxes.

Federal taxes are collected at an average cost of 44 cents per $100 collected. State taxes are collected at an average cost of $1 per $100 collected. Local tax administration and collection costs run as high as from $5 to $10 per $100 collected.

A 1958 study reported by the National Education Association disclosed that direct administrative costs of 10 grant programs averaged 1.2 percent of the amounts distributed. In its 1955 report, the Hoover Commission indicated that Federal administrative costs for the school lunch amounted to less than 2 cents out of every dollar, and that the cost of administering Federal vocational education programs was about the same, while the cost of administering instructional programs at land-grant colleges supported by Federal funds amounted to less than one-fifth of a cent for each dollar of Federal money distributed for this purpose.

Those who decry the high cost of sending a dollar to Washington and having it returned to the States either have not taken the time to check Federal collection and administration costs, or they practice sheer deception.

Those, then, are my six premises for concluding that education is a problem of national dimensions which must be dealt with on a national basis. I believe they are forthright and firm. Why, then, is there such vocal opposition to Federal aid to education?

In my opinion, this opposition is based on six principal fallacies, and I would like to consider each of them quickly.

The first is that Federal aid will bring Federal control. The second is that Federal aid is unconstitutional. The third, fourth, and fifth are based on figure juggling on enrollment forecasts and classroom needs, and on the level of teachers' salaries, and the last is the oft-heard and thoroughly mistaken assertion that the American people do not want Federal aid to education, that each State and school district can and would prefer to completely finance its own educational system.

Let me consider these fallacies, one by one.

First, the fallacy that Federal aid will inevitably bring Federal control.

Neither logic nor experience supports the contention that giving Federal grants to the States to pay extra dollars to schoolteachers or to provide brick and mortar for school buildings will mean Federal control of what is taught in the schools, and how and by whom. The control of education is reserved to the States and counties, and no one involved in the present discussion has any intention to tamper with it. The local school board will remain in full charge.

The fact the bill specifically states that in its administration—

> No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school system.

What could be more explicit? More unequivocal? More scrupulous?

Let me assure Senators that I would be the first to object if the Federal Government, in granting funds under any of these programs, should attempt to interfere with local school boards, local control, or to dictate the curriculum.

Second, the fallacy that Federal aid is unconstitutional.

The practice of Federal aid is older than the Constitution. As early as the Land Ordinance of 1785, the Confederation of States provided that the 16th section of each township or one thirty-sixth of the acreage in the public land States should be granted to the States by the national government for the benefit of the common schools.

Since that time we have given Federal aid to education in a variety of ways, and to say that it has been unconstitutional—or that government control has resulted—is plain, unvarnished misrepresentation. Lincoln signed into law the Morrell Act, which set up aid to our land-grant colleges. Then there is the GI bill, under which many of our veterans have gone to school, and the impacted areas bill. Are these programs contrary to American principle?

Many people who challenge the constitutionality of Federal aid have evidently forgotten that President George Washington, in his message to the Second Congress in 1790, recommended the enactment of legislation providing Federal aid to education. Surely the man who was President of the Constitutional Convention should be in a better position to judge the constitutionality of an issue than some of today's self-styled constitutional experts.

Third, the fallacy that since the postwar school population peak has passed, enrollment increases in elementary and secondary schools will soon begin to decline.

It is true that this fall and next fall there will not be as large an increase proportionately as when the war babies first hit our schools. But an analysis of the enrollment data now available shows that the impact of increasing school population on school needs will be as significant during the 1960's as it was during the 1950's. Enrollments are expected to increase by over 8 million in the next 10 years—with the proportionate increase in the secondary schools larger than it has been in this last 10 years. Furthermore, the Nation has not completely solved all of the school problems which piled up during the past 10 years.

Fourth, the fallacy that the classroom shortage problem has been solved.

The Office of Education reports an average of 69,000 classrooms built each year for the last 5 years. Federal aid opponents triumphantly point out that if this rate of construction is maintained the classroom shortage will be licked by 1970.

Howeved, the figure of 69,000 classrooms added annually included many temporary and makeshift classrooms as well as those which are satisfactory. Also classrooms which are empty in areas from which the children have moved. A longer look shows that the shortages really have not changed much in 6 years. We must run just to stand still; 69,000 simply keeps pace with school population increase; it does not take up the gaps.

Last fall, for example, it was estimated that approximately 8 million children in 36 States were going to school in overcrowded, improvised or makeshift facilities, or were on half day sessions because there was not room to keep them all day. Two million others were in obsolete or inadequate buildings.

A good, conservative estimate indicates that we need to build at least 80,000 new classrooms a year for the next 5 years.

Fifth, the fallacy that since teachers' salaries are higher than they were a decade ago, Federal assistance is no longer needed.

Ten years ago the level of teachers' pay was a national scandal. To use the year 1950 as a yardstick is both unfair and unrealistic. The question is: How do teachers' salaries stack up in today's market? The average annual salary for all classroom teachers for 1959–60 was $5,068. This was below the median for even the lowest responsibility levels of many other groups with comparable training. Here are some examples: accountants $5,713; engineers, $6,408; mathematicians, $5,713; chemists, $5,471; job analysts, $5,523; and employment managers, $6,513.

The key question, however, is, Are teachers' salaries high enough to keep a solid core of career teachers in the service? Evidently they are not. Our schools are engaged in a desperate and losing struggle to attract and hold the kind of people who are suited to teaching and who possess the proper professional training.

Again, may I turn to my State of Utah for a report on what is happening. In the last 6 years, only 4 out of each 10 graduates we have prepared in our colleges to teach have actually accepted teaching positions in the State of Utah. The other six have accepted positions in other occupations, or taken teaching positions in other States. Those who declined teaching positions in Utah did so for a variety of reasons.

The Utah Education Association makes periodic surveys to determine why teachers leave the Utah school system. Salary is one of the chief reasons. In its last survey the Utah Education Association found that teachers who left teaching to enter business and industry increased their annual earnings in the first year by an average of $1,494. Those who left to teach in other States increased their earnings by just under $1,300.

I submit that the quality of schooling received by our boys and girls depends more than anything upon the quality of the teacher in the classroom. The teacher makes the school. America's schools are filled with dedicated, devoted men and women who are sticking to their teaching jobs despite higher income scales in industry and business, and despite cramped quarters and scanty equipment and other harassments. We need to properly pay them and to attract into the school system more people like them—more young people who will pick up the torch as the older ones retire.

And now, finally, the last fallacy—the communities and States want to finance their own schools—the people don't want Federal aid for education.

Of course, each community, each school district, each State wants to finance its own schools—if it can. But too many cannot. Some school districts have exceeded their legal limitation to borrow. Others are unable to do so because of limited resources to finance additional borrowing or because of other financial demands upon them. From 1946 to 1959 Federal debt increased by 6 percent, but local debt soared more than 300 percent.

While Federal taxes have increased 85 percent in war and postwar years, States and local communities have had to increase their tax revenues by 221 percent. Thus the capacity of many States and communities to raise more taxes for their schools has about been exhausted—the bottom of the barrel has been scraped—there is grumbling resistance among the people to further taxation.

One of the problems is that the Federal Government, because of the demands of national defense, has all but usurped the most fair and progressive of all taxes—the income tax—and this has tended to confine the States and communities to their traditional property taxes, sales taxes, and other forms of taxes. The most important revenue producer, the property tax, has doubled since 1950. That is about all property can stand. Also, the prevailing opinion among tax experts is that this burden is regressive, its incidence is uncertain, and its administration is fraught with serious injustices.

As the capacity of communities to help their schools has become exhausted, more people have recognized that Federal aid to education is the only answer.

A recent public opinion poll, conducted by a private research agency experienced in public affairs surveys, showed that out across the Nation two-thirds of the people feel the Federal Government should increase its support for public schools. Over 65 percent of those interviewed favored increased Federal aid, 23 percent felt there shculd be no increase, 6 percent would decrease or abolish Federal support, and 6 percent did not know. The replies were consistent, regardless of area, level of education, or economic status.

In my own State of Utah, 81 percent of those interviewed in a private research agency poll conducted last year favored Federal aid for school construction, and 56 percent favored Federal aid for general school operation.

Mr. President, we have been considering Federal aid to education bills in Congress now for 75 years. The time has come when we can no longer put the matter off. We must do whatever is necessary to keep abreast in the education marathon.

As H. G. Wells once said:

> Civilization is a race between education and catastrophe.

How prophetic his words.

What larger task confronts us than giving our children the finest training of which we are intellectually, spiritually, and financially capable so they will be equipped with the knowledge they need in a space age world, and a system of values which will assure wise direction of that knowledge. Our children must learn the intricacies of space exploration and learn also about civilization and democracy. Greater resources must be committed to this task. Our sheer survival as a people and as a democracy are at stake.

THE NEED FOR TELEVISION IMPROVEMENT

During the delivery of Mr. Moss' remarks,

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Wyoming, with the understanding that his remarks will be printed in the RECORD after the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. McGEE. I heard the blessed word "Wyoming" in the Senator's remarks, and I could not resist asking the Senator to yield. I appreciate the generosity of the junior Senator from Utah for permitting me to interrupt at this moment. I have another commitment.

Mr. President, I should like to include in the RECORD a series of articles, in respect to the broadcasting industry in this country, following the remarks of the junior Senator from Utah, so that it will not affect the continuity of his remarks.

The Senator from Utah has been instrumental, throughout his career in the Senate, in supporting legislation to untangle some of the confusion in the communications industry and to put it on a positive and constructive basis.

Mr. President, the series of articles to which I have reference, has to do, for the most part, with a recent address by the new Chairman of the FCC. The remarks, made to the recent National Association of Broadcasters convention, evoked a series of commentaries, critical and applauding comments on the statement, so I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 11, 1961, written by Lawrence Laurent, entitled, "Broadcasting Industry Shaken by Blunt Talk"; an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of the same day entitled, "Mainstream for TV?"; an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of the same day entitled, "Whither TV?"; an article from the Evening Star of the same day written by Doris Fleeson and entitled, "A Call for Improved Television"; and a syndicated article written by Ward Cannel and published in the Casper, Wyo., Morning Star of April 28, 1961, entitled, "TV Seeks Out Writers True to Mediocrity."

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1961]

BROADCASTING INDUSTRY SHAKEN BY BLUNT TALK

(By Lawrence Laurent)

Nearly 3,000 broadcasters and radio engineers started back to their homes last night after the 39th annual convention of the National Association of Broadcasters. And as they headed for home, many must have had the same thought:

"Was this trip really necessary?"

In the past, the broadcasters gathered to look at new technical wonders, to discuss their problems, and to hear high praise for their industry. It has been a customary ritual for members of the Federal Communications Commission to pay homage to and sing praises for "the American system of broadcasting."

This year's convention, at the Shoreham and Sheraton Park Hotels, was different. It may have marked an important turning point in the history of broadcasting regulation.

Since the first Radio Act of 1912, followed by the Radio Act of 1927 and the Communications Act of 1934, the guiding principle has been this: Once a station license is given, it cannot be removed except for demonstrable, legally provable evidence of social harm.

This meant no broadcaster would lose his license. It meant that he was free to profit as much as he could. It came to mean that any program that could interest the public was considered "in the public interest."

How things have changed.

The philosophical heart of FCC Chairman Newton N. Minow's stern lecture on Tuesday was this: If a broadcaster expects to keep his license, he will have to give us good evidence that he has used his station for positive, responsible social good.

If the broadcasters reeled, it was understandable. For nearly 30 years, broadcasting's status quo has been maintained by playing the president of the NAB against the Chairman of the FCC. Now, however, the strongest advocate of improved broadcasting is NAB President LeRoy Collins.

The gist of Governor Collins' convention keynote speech was that no trade association could help broadcasting unless the profession is willing to help itself. He demanded the industry stop worshiping audience ratings; that the perilous times don't permit a broadcaster to ignore the great social and economic questions of our time.

The broadcasters applauded Collins' speech on 15 separate occasions. For FCC Chairman Minow, the reception was less enthusiastic.

Minow was a teenage staff sergeant in the Army Signal Corps during World War II. He came home from the wars to win honors as a college scholar and as a distinguished attorney, one of the partners of Adlai E. Stevenson. He has mellowed with age and honors.

But there is still a lot of the tough sergeant in 35-year-old Newt Minow.

Thus, his stern lecture to this broadcasters' convention will probably be remembered as the "shape up or ship out" speech.

In clean, uncluttered language, Minow set forth his plans:

"I did not come to Washington to idly observe the squandering of the public's airwaves. The squandering of our airwaves is no less important than the lavish waste of any precious natural resource. I intend to take the job of Chairman of the FCC very seriously.

How did broadcasters react? Well, the most often heard comment in the lobby of the Sheraton Park was a half joking: "I guess a lot of TV stations will be put up for sale."

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1961]

MAINSTREAM FOR TV?

Stern and candid talk to the broadcasting industry seems to be the order of the day. Television in particular is a source of widespread disillusionment. People who not so many years ago were ecstatic over the marvels that television would bring into their living rooms are today moaning over the trivialities and violence that characterize too

much of the fare. The industry is far from realizing its potential.

The first pointed lecture to the broadcasters at their annual convention here came from their own president, LeRoy Collins, former Governor of Florida. "The ironic truth is that, within broadcasting and without," Mr. Collins said, "it still does not command the recognition and prestige it should deserve." Though he praised the substantial achievements of radio and television in entertainment and informational reporting, he insisted that "these are not enough." Broadcasters have also a great responsibility to help the people understand the complex and rapidly changing world in which they live and to provide more "quality and diversity" in their programming.

Chairman Newton N. Minow of the Federal Communications Commission was still more blunt in reviewing the "vast wasteland" of television. In both the Minow and Collins speeches there were rather pointed warnings. Mr. Minow's reminder that "there is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license" was an obvious hint that the FCC will not renew licenses of stations that fail to serve an adult concept of the public interest. Mr. Collins pointed to the continuing demand for pay-TV and said that the surest defense of broadcasters against it would be to provide "more and more of the higher quality programming which pay-TV holds out that it will supply."

There is little or nothing that is new in this appeal to the broadcasting industry "to get out in the mainstream of American life," but the pressure is now coming from very influential sources. Just enough has been seen and heard of television and radio at their best to know that the broadcast media can do a great deal better if they try.

[From the Washington Evening Star, May 11, 1961]

WHITHER TV?

There is much in Mr. Minow's speech to the National Association of Broadcasters which will evoke a hearty amen from many members of the television-viewing public. There are also statements, or intimations, in the speech which call for some rethinking.

The remarks of the new FCC Chairman, while encompassing radio, were addressed primarily to the television industry. His central theme was that much of the fare offered the viewing public is no better than a "vast wasteland" of junk, some of the commercials included. He thinks that the industry can and should do better—an opinion which we share and which we believe is shared by most broadcasters.

Basically, however, Mr. Minow was saying that the TV industry should make available more of what the public ought to watch, not necessarily what industry thinks the viewers want to watch. By way of illustration, he said he would not argue against the proposition that more people, given a choice, would prefer a Western to a symphony. "But your obligations," he told the broadcasters, "are not satisfied if you look only to popularity as a test of what to broadcast."

From this, it seems to us, two inferences flow. One is that the people are to be given less choice—that, again illustratively, if they watch TV at all they will watch fewer Westerns and more symphonies. The second is whether those people who prefer Westerns will not simply turn off their sets rather than watch a higher type program. No one knows, of course, whether this would be the case or not. But it certainly poses a problem for the industry—one of those "tough problems" which Mr. Minow concedes are not "susceptible to easy answers."

There is also the element of threatened coercion which, as we read it, runs through Mr. Minow's talk. He said he is "unalterably opposed" to governmental censorship, and that there will be no "suppression of programing which does not meet with bureaucratic tastes." Two paragraphs later he added: "I say to you now: renewal [of broadcasting licenses] will not be pro forma in the future. There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license." The import of this, we think, will be clear enough to the industry.

There are, perhaps, two main roads out of this "vast wasteland." One is for the industry to make greater efforts to improve the quality of its programing. The other is for the FCC to assist and encourage these efforts, without, at the same time, setting itself up as an arbitrary judge of what the public ought to watch and what the industry can afford to show.

[From the Evening Star, May 11, 1961]

A CALL FOR IMPROVED TELEVISION—MINOW CALLED NEW FRONTIER'S BOLD SCOUT FOR EFFORT TO END INDUSTRY STAGNATION

(By Doris Fleeson)

A bold scout for the New Frontier has broken with a thunderclap through the barriers of do-nothingness which time and official timidity have erected around the independent agencies of the Government.

No Gunsmoke hero ever stunned his quary more completely than Newton N. Minow, new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, did the TV industry at its convention here.

Mr. Minow fired squarely into the teeth of 2,000 broadcasters that their TV program output was a "vast wasteland." Before they could even swallow hard, he followed with a warning that the FCC would no longer automatically renew station licenses.

Then he issued an invitation to the station operators to watch their stations' programs for one whole day from sign-on to sign-off. What they would see, he assured them, was violence and mediocrity, and—worst of all from their point of view—they would end up being bored.

Today official Washington, not to mention the TV industry, is only slightly less interested in Mr. Minow than in the astronauts, with honors for nerve being distributed almost evenly. Yet what Mr. Minow has done is only to assert that the public interest which justifies the granting of licenses for the enormously valuable airwaves cannot be served without taking into account what the public gets, which is the programs.

It was the industry's second blow this week. Its own broadcasters association president, former Gov. LeRoy Collins of Florida, told it that it was not master in its own house but was permitting the rating services to dictate its product.

TV viewers will remember Mr. Collins as the handsome, soft-spoken chairman of the Democratic National Convention last summer. His manner of speaking is gentler than the Midwest twang of Mr. Minow and his phrases were less barbed, but he also challenged them by saying: "I want your active support, not just your acquiescence. If you want someone to paddle your boat into stagnant pockets of still water then you do not want me."

Altogether, it has not been a good week for the broadcasters. They have really only one place left to go now besides up and that is the White House woodshed, into which the newspaper publishers and editors preceded them. The President however supports Mr. Minow strongly.

Darkening suspicions about the forces which drove Mr. Minow and Mr. Collins into action can be set at rest. "Villians" are the young Minow and Collins children who love to watch TV. Their fathers have been watching it harder than ever under the impact of new responsibilities.

The Minow-Collins statements also are the only truly logical followthrough on the TV scandals exposed by the Harris subcommittee of the House. On Mr. Minow for the Federal Government and Mr. Collins in his industry monitor job lie responsibility for a change for the better. If there is no Federal responsibility for insuring that, then its right to grant licenses and look into the programing is a sham.

Today the possibly dreamy idealists who really want the regulatory agencies to perform the functions assigned to them are toasting Chairman Minow and wondering what life would be like if his fellow chairmen followed his example and reread the law creating them.

[From the Casper (Wyo.) Morning Star, Apr. 28, 1961]

TV SEEKS OUT WRITERS TRUE TO MEDIOCRITY

(By Ward Cannel)

NEW YORK.—Quiet, everybody. It is that hushed, holy moment again when the TV networks reveal the shows we'll be allowed to see next season. It promises, as usual, to be pretty sad stuff.

But if you'll just follow the grim glass wall that shuts videoland away from living up to its promise and responsibility, you'll see at once how it all gets this way and why it is that it has to be this way.

According to a survey by this reporter of the TV terrain in both Hollywood and New York, the big, unsolved problem plaguing TV is the lack of creative writers—the talent wellspring of all entertainment.

The need is so desperate that the minimum fees of the Writers Guild of America surpass the pay for any other talent.

An hour-long, sponsored TV film script commands $2,200.

An actor with a speaking part, working 3 days, must be paid a minimum of only $225. The director of the show, working 12 days, must be paid a minimum of only $1,560. His first assistant only $410.

"But," says a Writers Guild representative, "a TV writer today can command usually 2 or 2½ times the minimum—upwards of $5,000 for that hour-long script."

Even with the high fees available, producers say, it's tough to find good creative writers. Cy Howard, executive producer of Desilu, says:

"I've got a couple of $2,000-a-week creative writer-producer jobs here that I haven't been able to fill for nearly a year."

Tom McDermott, chief of the "Four Star Playhouse," says it took him nearly that long to locate a writing team he could use.

Leland Hayward, spectacular producer in both Broadway and Hollywood, wonders openly where all the writing talent is nowadays.

And so forth. And why? Well, it's like this:

There are only about 3,500 writers in the guild (membership is based on your ability to sell scripts to TV). But only about a dozen writers in the guild can command the really big money.

Nonguild writers obviously aren't worth considering or they would have sold enough scripts to become guild members.

Besides, no producer worth his salt in litigation will read a script unless it comes via a reputable agent. The penalty can be a lawsuit by the author charging plagiarism.

But reputable agents in the literary marketplace of 1961 are mostly big agencies, representing as many big name writers, actors, directors, etc., as they can corner.

"They won't read a script by a new writer," says a nationally known TV critic, "unless they're pressured into it."

Adds one big Hollywood TV producer: "Used to be an agent would read and know what he was reading. Those days are gone. Today nobody wants to develop new writing talent."

The network programing offices tell you to see an agent or a producer if you're a writer.

And, with rising production costs at every turn, few producers will take a chance on a promising—but only promising—new writer.

What is the way out?

"If I were a new writer trying to get into TV today," says Leland Hayward, "I wouldn't know where to begin. Even if I knew what I know."

Spectacular-founder Max Liebman's advice isn't much more helpful:

"If I were a new writer, the first thing I'd do is write something. Something good. Too good to be produced on today's TV. But not good enough to be great.

"Just good enough to show them I could be mediocre."

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask about the time of meeting tomorrow. I hope it will not be earlier than 12 o'clock.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will be 12 o'clock.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that committees will not be permitted to meet in the afternoon, and we need the time each morning to consider important committee business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished minority leader has stated—and I agree with him—that there will be no meetings of Senate committees during the session of the Senate beginning tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns this afternoon it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LT. COMDR. VICTOR A. PRATHER, MEDICAL CORPS, U.S. NAVY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, during the past few days we have all watched the splendid accomplishments of the young men who are spearheading the U.S. exploration and conquest of space. With boldness, courage, and a sense of dedication that identifies them with the long line of extraordinary men who have led our Nation to greatness, they risk their lives to raise the celestial blinds and enrich mankind with knowledge of what is beyond. Mr. President, I would like to direct your attention to the accomplishments of one of these space pioneers, Lt. Comdr. Victor A. Prather, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, who, on Friday, May 5, 1960, in company with Comdr. Malcolm D. Ross, U.S. Naval Reserve, set a new world's altitude record of 113,500 feet for manned balloon flight. After descending safely, Dr. Prather became the fatal victim of a tragic accident, falling from the cable of a rescue helicopter and drowning in his restrictive space suit.

Born in Detroit, Victor Prather spent most of his adult life in the service of his country. Entering the Navy as a young man 17 years of age, he served during World War II as an enlisted man. After the war he attended Tufts College and Tufts Medical School in Medford, Mass. There he expressed an interest in space medicine while still an undergraduate. There he met his wife, Virginia Merritt, of Fall River, Mass., a student at Jackson, the girls' college associated with Tufts. In medical school he studied while Mrs. Prather worked as a medical technician at the nearby Massachusetts General Hospital. He then returned to naval service as a medical officer and soon became qualified as a flight surgeon.

Dr. Prather's fine record in Africa and analytical, probing mind caused his assignment to specialized work investigating human survival in the upper atmosphere and in space. Working in the area of physiological telemetry, Dr. Prather made valuable contributions in the development of miniaturized and subminiatured equipment used for gathering and radioing back physiological and psychological data from men and animals in the upper atmosphere and in space. He prepared a number of scientific papers on work accomplished in this area that contributed significantly to existing knowledge.

When the opportunity come for Victor Prather to add to man's knowledge of the effects of prolonged exposure in the upper atmosphere on the human body, he eagerly sought it, without regard for the personal hazards involved. In the open gondola of a balloon, protected against the hazards of cosmic radiation and 79° below zero temperatures only by their space suits, Commander Ross and Dr. Prather spent nearly 12 hours far above the earth under conditions of continuous stress as they conducted experiments and operated the balloon. The data they gathered will materially add to our understanding of the problems incurred in man's invasion of the upper atmosphere.

Even by his tragic and untimely death Dr. Prather contributed to man's conquest of space. As a result of this unfortunate accident, new procedures are being instituted and equipment modified to insure against reoccurrence. Mr. President, I am confident that the Members of this Body join me in expressing our sympathy to the mother, widow, and children of this patriotic young American who gave his life while striving to advance the scientific frontiers of our country and add to mankind's fund of knowledge.

CANCER OF CRIME

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York Mirror recently published a series of articles by Harry Singer and Gerald Duncan entitled the "Cancer of Crime." This series highlights in a powerful way the techniques by which modern crime is outwitting obsolete law enforcement. It contains a strong plea for advancing the tools for fighting crime out of the horse and buggy age.

Too many of us are unaware of the menace of organized crime. We fail to recognize the full threat to our liberty and security posed by the barons of the underworld. I believe that the continued growth and expansion of criminal activities is a danger to our Nation and our freedom just as is Communist subversion.

We have followed for too long the counsel of extremists whose attitudes are shaped either by wishful thinking or an abysmal ignorance of the dangers confronting us. In no other field has the Federal Government been so reluctant to perform its proper role in assisting the States as in the field of law enforcement. I have never been able to understand how the same pressure groups that plead for Federal involvement in almost every local and individual problem can be so strongly opposed to the most modest efforts to mobilize a joint Federal-State counteroffensive against nationwide crime.

Mr. President, this outstanding series in the New York Mirror deserves the attention of everyone interested in the facts about crime, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the series of articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Mirror, Mar. 26, 1961]

CANCER OF CRIME—MURDER MADE EASY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said it: "Since 1950, crime has increased 69 percent—four times as fast as our expanding population. Today, we find ourselves confronted with the worst era of lawlessness in the Nation's history." In a series of articles beginning today, the New York Mirror explores the rampancy of gangsterism.)

(By Harry Singer and Gerald Duncan)

A man can pick up a phone in New York, order a murder in California—and get away with it.

Police might be listening in on a tapped wire. They might hear the caller's identity, and where he'd be having a drink an hour later. They might even arrest him. But he could never be prosecuted.

That's because of conflict among State and national statutes on wiretapping.

It's one of the ways of the law, which frequently makes it a friend of criminals who drain $22 billion a year from our pocketbooks—a sum equal to all the U.S. income and profits taxes of all the corporations in all the Nation in 1960—almost twice the money spent in all the country's department stores in 1959—$128 for every man, woman, and child.

Crime is a crippling cancer on the economy, the morality, and the democracy of the United States. It is organized, it is regimented, and it operates, in the opinion of many law enforcement officers, with more efficiency than government.

Greed is its motive; power is its goal; murder its ultimate weapon.

From coast to coast, judges, district attorneys, police officials, and lawyers say something must be done. They say there must be a national clearinghouse of criminal information. They say there must be an ever-present spotlight of publicity on master criminals. They say crime must be exterminated lest America be forced to go on bended knee to organized crime and beg for constitutional rights and privileges.

Only the bold say these things out loud. Most say them in private, and add, "Don't quote me."

Few publicly advocate disturbing the status quo, which is the system of agency jealousies and perennial budget battles. It's much like the long rivalry among Army, Navy, and Air Force for who gets the credit.

Crime is a cancer, and few crime doctors are willing to pool their knowledge, their information, their skills, and their money to prevent its spread.

We found one man willing to say for publication what hundreds say anonymously. At New Orleans, U.S. Attorney M. Hepburn Many said:

"We are helpless. Unless there is a spiritual rejuvenation of the people, we are lost."

We found one man who put it in writing—Gerald L. Goettel, former deputy chief of the U.S. Attorney General's special group on organized crime (1958–59). He wrote:

"Something must be done on the national level, for the States will never be able to contain syndicated crime. The solution lies within the U.S. Government.

"Surely we must not permit the road from Apalachin (the New York gathering of gangsters in 1957) to lead to still greater power for the 'invisible government,' which, day by day, is eroding our national wealth, politics, and character."

In the highest places, men change their minds on public policy.

Last year, after serving as chief counsel for the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, Robert F. Kennedy said:

"* * * our first and most urgent need is for a national crime commission. This commission would serve as a central intelligence agency, a clearinghouse to which each of the 70-odd Federal agencies and the more than 10,000 local law enforcement agencies throughout the country would constantly feed information on the leading gangsters."

Last week, as U.S. Attorney General, Kennedy said:

"I think we are now able to accomplish within the Department of Justice a good number of those things that I thought should be done through a national crime commission."

There are 15 crime commissions in metropolitan areas scattered across the country. They cannot subpena, they cannot prosecute. They can only spotlight.

In Los Angeles, weary of waiting for national action, police have established liaison with 56 departments in 15 States to, as they say, "in a small way promote a better exchange of information" on criminals.

And crime marches on.

Statistics are mountainous. The import of them is that tribute to crime is paid, directly or indirectly—

On every container of milk lifted from a grocer's showcase.

On every loaf of bread.

On every brassiere or blouse or man's suit or child's jumper.

On every package of cigarettes or chocolate bar from a coin machine.

On everything, the U.S. Senate Select Committee found last year, that moves to consumers on wheels.

That's the cancer of crime in labor racketeering alone.

Crime has many cancers, multiplying—like the disease itself—on the sinews, the very vitals of the Nation.

Gangsters soared to the seats of the mighty on the millions—and the machine-gun murders—of prohibition. Many of them didn't live beyond 32, which was a ripe old age for a hoodlum in those days. But those who survived—and there were some—invested their fortunes after repeal to make more fortunes in—

Illegal gambling—the greatest underworld revenue in the land today, reaping profits calculated by Milton R. Wessel, former special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General, at $9,175 million through play with racetrack bookmakers, policy banks, baseball, football and basketball pools, and slot and pinball machines. Dice game profits are in addition.

Narcotics, a worldwide alliance with sources on both sides of the Mediterranean, in Red China, in Mexico.

Prostitution—less organized than gambling or narcotics or labor racketeering, but so operated that a girl in Dallas in March might be in Kansas City in May.

Bootlegging (who wants 1 million pounds of sugar that disappear annually from New York docks except outlaws who operate illicit stills?)

Money lending—an unconscionable collection of usurers who lend $5 a week for $6, and number 150,000 in New York City alone.

Who's to blame?

Ten years ago, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, said:

"We produced this society. It is up to us to trace back the ills within that have culminated in this cancerous growth of crime."

We haven't.

[From the New York Mirror, Mar. 27, 1961]

CANCER OF CRIME—HOW LAWS AID THE LAWLESS

(By Harry Singer and Gerald Duncan)

The district attorney's investigator warned: "You can't do that," meaning roam in the jungle of gangsterism looking for the cancer of crime on the body of the Nation.

"You can get hurt," he said. "You can get killed. Take a town like Calumet City outside of Chicago. You won't last a half hour on the street."

Crime is so brazen that Walter Buchbinder, chief investigator for the District Attorney's Rackets Bureau in Brooklyn, felt constrained to urge caution.

Today's gansters are ruthless. But they are also cautious. They are cautious because they shun bad publicity. They don't want it any more than a Hollywood star.

Top criminals—known in underworld and overworld alike as the wise guys—learned the hard way the perils; financial perils, that is, of spotlights of their evils.

The U.S. Senate Crime Committee, headed by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, made them squirm more than 10 years ago at televised hearings in Washington. Other witnesses fidgeted and sweated under prodding by the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor and Management Field, chairmaned by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas.

And the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics—with relentless publicity, with grueling undercover work, with generous rewards for information—is making dope less and less lucrative for organized crime.

Many law enforcement officers believe crime—big crime—can be smothered by publicity. But powerful forces oppose it. Organized law is against publicity without prosecution leading to conviction. Only this month the New York State court of appeals outlawed grand jury presentments—a traditional weapon against crime.

That action favored the criminals, and they encourage it, and more and more seek the cloak of respectability—and secrecy.

In the upper echelons of crime, the machinegun—popular in Chicago, New York, and elsewhere during the prohibition heyday of Al Capone and his kind—is today considered a crude instrument of murder, when murder is necessary.

"The killing of any big name has to be approved by a syndicate," Buchbinder said.

But it's done with a .38 or a .45 behind the ear—swift and sure—and, in today's underworld, the concrete overcoat is again in favor for disposal of a body. There are few deep-sea divers among detectives.

Gangsters, like other men, have discovered many ways to cover their tracks.

Item: The phone.

Lines of communication are the most important avenues of criminal operation. But criminals, because of wiretapping statutes, can use the phone under protection of law. A man in New York who orders a murder in California can't be prosecuted because of Federal law that prohibits listening in, and if somebody should listen in, the evidence would be barred in court. Moreover, the eavesdropper might face trial as a law violator.

Item: Meeting places.

The wise guys don't have to bother with rooms wired with recording devices by law enforcement agents, thus risking prosecution under State laws. They can—and do—buy a motel and talk without fear.

Item: Hideaway for money.

Swiss banks are an absolute haven. Swiss banks are like other banks—except in one important respect: They conduct their business in secrecy. Transactions are done in code—such as T. W. 1130, with deposits of $200,000, and 470,970 D.S. and 67,252 N.T., totaling $500,000 (of which more later).

Secrecy is one of the weapons of crime that frustrates the crime doctors.

George H. Gaffney, district supervisor of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics in New York City, said it this way:

"We are using horse and buggy methods against jet age criminals. They've got guns and we are fighting with bows and arrows."

Many authorities have said, in these words or others, that organized crime knows where it is going—and organized law doesn't.

Leroy Wike, executive secretary of the International Association of Chiefs of Police in Washington, used strong language:

"Our judicial system is on the side of the criminal. There is little consideration given to the victims of crime. With every court decision, there is an ever-narrowing field in which the police can work."

But there is an ever-widening field in which criminals can work. Many investigators believe that one of the reasons is the lack of coordination of information on the lawless.

A striking example is Meyer Lansky, notorious gambler, who suns in Florida while bus drivers and clerks and stenographers and carpenters battle snow and sleet in New York.

Lansky applied in 1950 to the U.S. Department of the Interior for permission to obtain oil and gas leases. In the application he said he was native-born. He isn't, and at that time the Immigration and Naturalization Service was pressing denaturalization and deportation proceedings against him.

The record shows Lansky might have been deported—or at least jailed—if one agency had known what another agency knew at the same time. The statute of limitations expired and Lansky enjoys the full protection of the law.

Most law-enforcement people cry: Give us a clearinghouse of information.

But other law-enforcement people say many criminal files contain only rumor and hearsay—that such information can't be made available willy-nilly to other law-enforcement people.

"We can't turn over our raw files," said Robert Wick, Deputy Director of the FBI.

[From the New York Mirror, Mar. 28, 1961]

CANCER OF CRIME—WHY A KILLER CAN ROAM SCOT FREE

(By Harry Singer and Gerald Duncan)

A raw file is a jigsaw puzzle of crime. It is a collection of scraps of paper with scribbled notes, of rumors, hearsay, of photographs, of facts.

"Sonny" is a raw file in the FBI record room, in the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics, in the Secret Service's dossiers, in the Treasury's Alcohol Tax Unit, in the rackets bureaus of the district attorneys of New York and Brooklyn, and in nobody knows how many local police headquarters.

Put them all together—all the information gathered by all these agencies—and enough evidence would emerge, in the belief of

many law-enforcement officers to put Sonny in prison—

For dope peddling.

Or counterfeiting.

Or hijacking.

Or receiving stolen goods.

Or police payoffs.

Or murder.

The data is not put together. Sonny has all the rights and privileges of a law-abiding citizen. He goes every day to his legitimate business front—a long-haul trucking operation.

On this subject, William Hundley, special assistant to the U.S. Attorney General, said:

"Too long have investigative agencies decided what they will turn over to other law enforcers. When they get anything good they first look to see if there is a possibility of a violation within their jurisdiction.

"It takes time, effort, and money to get the big shots, and then the statistics of your accomplishments drop."

In a year's report on crime, Sonny is an infinitesimal percentage. At least one raw file indicates—but can't say with enough conviction—that he—

On July 18, 1958, ordered or executed the assassination of his partner in a $50 million nationwide dope ring. The victim was standing on a street corner in Brooklyn. The killer shot him in the head as he talked with his brother-in-law, then creased a bullet across the brother-in-law's mouth to button his lips. The brother-in-law got the message, and hasn't talked since.

On August 27, 1958, ordered or executed the assassination of a Brooklyn bar owner as he was about to step into the lobby of his apartment building. Eleven bullets were pumped into the man's head.

On September 7, 1958, ordered or executed the assassination of a man with a front as a mortician who was trying to spread his underworld wings in Greenwich Village narcotics distribution.

That's what a raw file on Sonny shows.

A raw file is put together by investigators talking to people—talking with money. An investigator takes all the stories he hears—and pays for them, not even knowing if they are true.

A raw file is put together by soliciting the confidence of B-girls, prostitutes, women of lazy morals but sharp memories. Investigators know them as one of the most valuable sources of criminal information.

A raw file is put together by tips from anonymous informers—just plain good citizens (or maybe some of them have a grudge). Some lawmen say they have had more information from Mr. Anonymous than anywhere else.

Sum it up: You take a guy and put him to bed (figuratively) and you wake up with him in the morning; you know every move he makes, and if you have patience, you've got him sooner or later.

This, then, is a raw file (some specifics omitted while, perhaps, the U.S. Department of Justice makes an effort to correlate information against one man)—

Sonny is 42, white, weighs 175 pounds, has black wavy hair and brown eyes. He lives with his wife and three children, two daughters and a son, in Brooklyn. His girl friend, Tina, an office worker, is pregnant.

His hangouts include nightclubs in the Brooklyn-Queens area, many of which he is rumored to have a piece of in secret—also certain union headquarters under investigation as paper locals. He has been questioned in labor extortions.

By trade, Sonny is a baker. He owns his own house in Brooklyn, and other properties jointly with his brother.

He has been questioned in gang killings—two in 1954, one in 1956, and three in 1958.

Brooklyn detectives have been questioning a Garfield, N.J., man whose phone records show calls back and forth between him and Sonny—and also to clubs in which Sonny has an interest.

Sonny and one other were arrested in Providence, R.I., on suspicion of concealing John (Chappie) Mazziotta, prime suspect in the 1952 Arnold Schuster murder.

In regard to the murder of Albert Anastasia in New York's Park Sheraton hotel on October 25, 1957, it is indicated he was concerned in supplying the killers from Providence, R.I.

His name crops up repeatedly in all references to organized crime—from Brooklyn across the country.

Information is that he is a contact man for the mob in relation to numbers rackets, policy and bookmaking, loan sharking, and that he is also the enforcer or strong-arm threat behind the jukebox industry.

His initial earnings are in gambling, and with the proceeds he has been able to widen his sphere of influence.

He owns a piece of a decorating business, a general contracting business, a stevedoring business, a bar and grill.

He was arrested at 18 for stabbing a man. The man refused to sign a complaint. At 21 he was arrested for cutting himself in at 25 cents a pass at a dice game.

And that's the way it goes—for what, with full details, would be a page in a newspaper.

In perhaps a dozen places, there is information on Sonny of incriminating character. All together, it might put him behind bars. It hasn't been put together.

[From the New York Mirror, Mar. 29, 1961]

CANCER OF CRIME—SMASHING A GLOBAL DOPE RING

(A U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary said it: "Heroin smugglers and peddlers are selling murder, robbery, and rape. Their offense is human destruction. In truth and in fact, it is murder on the installment plan." In this fourth of a series on organized crime, the New York Mirror tells how a notorious bigtimer was trapped.)

(By Harry Singer and Gerald Duncan)

A janitor cleaning out a basement locker in a Montreal apartment building discovered $75,000 in stolen bonds, three revolvers, two kilograms of heroin—and a slip of paper bearing a phone number in Kew Gardens, Queens.

That was 3 years ago and 3,000 headaches ago.

The threads of organized crime are as multitudinous as a Persian rug, and they take as long to weave into a pattern for the forces of justice. But the discovery in Montreal ultimately led to the end of the trail for one of the biggest narcotics smugglers ever convicted in New York.

The ingredients were international intrigue.

Diplomatic pressures from Washington to Berne that pried the lid of secrecy off Swiss bank accounts.

Jail confidences between cellmates.

A Kew Garden landlady's scaring away unwanted carpenters.

Twenty-four grains of heroin (scarcely enough to hold between thumb and forefinger, but 300 to 400 "fixes" by the time of sale to addicts).

This cancerous house of crime began tumbling after the theft of $2 million in negotiable bonds from a Montreal bank on January 25, 1958.

On April 3, 1958, Swiss police arrested Gabriel Lucien Graziani, 36, a French Corsican, for trying to sell some of the bonds in Geneva. Five days later, the janitor in Montreal made his find.

International cables hummed.

Montreal detectives flew to Geneva. U.S. narcotics agents visited apartment 3F at 118-09 83d Avenue, Kew Gardens.

Mrs. Rebecca Spolan, the landlady, remembered Graziani as an occupant from mid-1957 to early 1958 with his wife and small daughter. Graziani had installed a cedar closet, saying the others were too damp for his clothes.

Back in Geneva, Graziani was released for lack of evidence linking him to the theft of the bonds. He returned to France, where he would be safe from extradition on narcotics charges because of French law.

In Kew Gardens, U.S. narcotic agents were suspicious but could not come up with anything tangible.

They searched the closet, found nothing.

Then a new personality entered the case—Antranik Paroutian, 35, a Frenchman with a record as a bordello operator in Toulon. He occupied the apartment with the Grazianis and after they left, moving in with Yolande Ecabert, a Swiss citizen introduced to him in New York. They skied together and nightclubbed together and made trips to Canada.

Paroutian and his mistress left but had not been long gone—this was shortly before the first search by narcotics agents—when Mrs. Spolan saw two men place a ladder against the Paroutian window.

"What are you doing?" she called.

"Installing an air conditioner," she was told.

"You are not," she exclaimed. She screamed so loudly the men ran, leaving the ladder behind.

Police came. Narcotics agents returned. They searched the place again. Nothing.

On June 8, 1958, George H. Gaffney, district director of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics, received a tip. (Tips are heavily relied on to arrest the spread of the dope cancer.)

A third search of the cedar closet uncovered a concealed door leading to a compartment capable of holding 100 pounds of heroin. There was heroin there, but only 24 grains of it.

It eventually proved enough.

Gaffney's men learned that Graziani had opened a Swiss bank account in 1956, giving Paroutian power of attorney, and that subsequently it was changed to three code accounts known only by numbers: T.W. 1130, 570, 970 D.S., and 67,252 N.T.

In less than a year, $517,900 was deposited in the accounts from New York.

Manhattan Federal authorities acted. An indictment was handed up charging conspiracy between Graziani and Paroutian. But it alleged only conspiracy to transfer money.

In April 1960, Paroutian was arrested in Beirut, Lebanon, for trying to buy $10,000 worth of morphine. President Eisenhower signed a warrant, and Paroutian was brought to New York.

The legal wheels turned fast. In Brooklyn, Assistant U.S. Attorney Robert S. Kreindler obtained an indictment on the basis of the 24 grains of heroin.

Then the big break came.

Louis de Almeida, a Brazilian lawyer, was arrested here on a charge of trying to sell half a kilogram of cocaine to an undercover agent. He was jailed in the same cell with Paroutian in the Federal House of Detention.

De Almeida, speaking French as well as Portuguese, confided his distress to Paroutian. Paroutian, sensing sympathy, blurted out his story, wanted to know where he might buy cocaine, suggested he soon would be free.

Luck played on the side of the law. De Almeida, questioned later about his own predicament, revealed what Paroutian told him:

That he bought morphine in Lebanon and Turkey for $400 a kilo, smuggled it to Marseilles, converted it to heroin in a hideaway laboratory, packed it in 27-kilo lots in secret parts of French cars destined for ship-

ment to the United States, Canada, or Mexico, and sold it for $4,000 a kilo.

The net tightened. Through intervention of the State Department, Swiss bankers were persuaded—for the first and only time—to open a coded record. The Manhattan and Brooklyn indictments were combined.

Paroutian was positive he would beat the case. He had even arranged to post bail of $50,000 and flee New York on a French ship. He reconsidered because he was certain he would be freed.

In Brooklyn Federal Court, de Almeida told his story, the Swiss bank accounts were divulged, and last November 4 Paroutian was fined $20,000 and sentenced to 20 years for conspiracy, a 5-year sentence for possession to run concurrently.

"A disaster has occurred," he wrote his brother in France.

[From the New York Mirror, Mar. 30, 1961]

CANCER OF CRIME—HEART OF THE RACKETS: GAMBLING

(Maybe you don't gamble. But you pay the bill—in wages taken out of circulation by the gambler; in food, clothes, and cars not bought by the losers; in dividends not earned because an insurance company paid a bond for a bank teller who stole and gambled. The cancer of gambling is discussed in this fifth of a series of articles on organized crime.)

(By Harry Singer and Gerald Duncan)

Everybody who makes a $2 bet with a bookie or slips 50 cents to a policy runner feeds the gambling cancer of crime.

The money bet illegally every year is reckoned at a staggering $46.5 billion—more than all expenditures for the national defense in fiscal 1960.

Gambling supports 50,000 master bookies and 400,000 little fellows—and ruins families, like the $7,000 wage earner in Syracuse, N.Y., who couldn't buy enough food for his wife and children—and builds hotels, like the fabulous Flamingo in Las Vegas.

Gambling finances every conceivable kind of racket. A Brooklyn grand jury in 1958 summed up its pollution this way:

"Gambling is the very heartbeat of organized crime both on a local and national scale.

"The public may think of the bookmaker in the corner candy store as an innocent betting commissioner operating a legitimate business. We know otherwise.

"Actually, if you scratch the professional operator of gambling ventures, you find the narcotics peddler, the loan shark, the dice-game operator, the white slaver, the murderer."

Nothing has changed—except more of it.

Milton R. Wessel, who in 1958–59 headed the U.S. Attorney General's Special Group on Organized Crime (until it died of financial starvation imposed by Congress) last week estimated the money churned annually in illegal gambling vats as follows:

Baseball: $13.5 billion.
Football: $12 billion.
Racing: $9 billion.
Basketball: $7 billion.
Policy: $4 billion.
Fights and hockey: $1 billion.

The gross profit is calculated at more than $9 billion. That makes illegal gambling one of the Nation's great industries—for in an average year the entire automobile output of all Detroit's factories has a wholesale value of no more; in 1959, the entire retail sales of furniture and furnishings in the United States were less than $7 billion.

Investigators believe half the $9 billion gross profit is invested by gangsters in bribery for protection, in the purchase of political influence, and in making clean sports crooked.

That leaves $4.5 billion for crime syndicates to spread in other fields—loan sharking, buying into legitimate enterprise, labor racketeering, prostitution, and bootlegging.

Gambling isn't a cancer only on the big cities. It also affects the small, such as Falconer, N.Y., a community of less than 5,000 on the fringe of Buffalo, near the Pennsylvania border.

The New York State Commission of Investigation discovered Falconer supported a bookmaking operation with links to Minneapolis, Detroit, Washington, and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Investigations come and investigations go—and gambling continues at the same old stand.

In Syracuse, where the $7,000 wage earner lost $8,000 in 18 months, the boss gambler had been in the same spot for 25 years. In Massachusetts, the State crime commission found some gambling establishments hadn't changed addresses for 30 years.

On that phase, the Massachusetts commission said bluntly as long ago as 1957:

"It seems to have been a universal finding by crime survey commissions that organized illegal gambling could not exist within a community without the knowledge and protection of the local police.

"The place to which customers come, such as a horse room, the location of a card or dice game or of pinball machines, is more than apparent; it is obvious.

"The idea that games float to hide from police is more fiction than fact. Gaming operators have told the commission that they move to avoid complaint, not arrest."

The lifeline of organized gambling is quick communication. That means telephone or telegraph.

It is vital in horseracing, and in baseball, football, and basketball play.

A bookmaker must learn results fast in racing—for the $2 bettor wants to know whether he won or lost before playing the next race.

There's a nationwide agency that provides the information—the Delaware Sports Service in Wilmington. Through code names it supplies 4,000 to 8,000 clients all over the United States, and some in Canada and Europe. It's all perfectly legal.

Just as important to the baseball, football, and basketball bookie is the need to know "the line"—that is, the point spread, for example, between Harvard and Yale—and, to all bookies, where to "lay off" heavy bets.

Athletic Publications, Inc., in Minneapolis, supplies "the line" to 8,000 to 10,000 customers a week during peak periods. Lists are mailed out Monday; latest odds are given by phone—again to clients identified by code.

The "layoff" is simple insurance. It starts with the $2 wager. If there are too many on one selection for the little fellow, he goes to a bigger fellow—and so on until a top gambler does business with a national clearinghouse—one at Biloxi, Miss., another near Covington, Ky.

That's the way organized gambling operates—and there's no Federal weapon against it, except a law requiring revenue stamps on gambling devices, and a law taxing gross receipts 10 percent.

Not long ago, U.S. agents raided a "layoff" headquarters in Terre Haute, Ind., where in 3 months $3,363,152 had been bet. Eight men were indicted and convicted—two from Chicago, one from Detroit, two from Las Vegas, and three from Indiana.

But there are 50,000 top bookies in the Nation. And one man can carry $400,000 in cash, as Buggsy Siegel did before he was shot to death in 1947 in his Beverly Hills, Calif., love nest—or $200,000 in cash, as Jake Lansky did from Havana's casinos in 1958.

There's more where that came from—more than all the millions prohibition made for mobsters. Some of it today is pressuring to legalize parimutuel betting in the Nation's newest States, Alaska and Hawaii; legalized gambling, as Nevada has demonstrated, is the gangster's friend.

[From the New York Mirror, Mar. 31, 1961]

CANCER OF CRIME—NEW ORLEANS: WIDE OPEN TOWN

(The definition is that of Aaron M. Kohn, managing director of the Metropolitan Crime Commission of New Orleans: "Protected, unpunished crime, otherwise known as organized crime, has been permitted in our Nation to become the greatest single dollar business, exerting destructive influence on every aspect of our way of life." This is the sixth of a series of articles on that influence.)

(By Harry Singer and Gerald Duncan)

"There's no organized crime in New Orleans," the man said.

The man was Alfred A. Theriot, deputy chief of the New Orleans Police Department.

We talked about gambling and New York's notorious Frank Costello, whose skull was creased by a bullet in 1957 to serve notice he was getting too ambitious in his old age, and "Dandy Phil" Kastel, long-time kingpin in Louisiana crime.

We talked about slot machines, which were spotlighted out of underworld popularity by Senator KEFAUVER's Senate Crime Committee in 1951, and pinball machines, which are everywhere in New Orleans and neighboring parishes. We talked about vice.

"No; there's no organized crime here." Theriot said, "Do you want some girls?"

U.S. Attorney M. Hepburn Many, whose jurisdiction embraces New Orleans, observed with weary cynicism:

"The businessman does business with the racketeer, and the racketeer with the businessman, and both are interwoven, and can't be pried apart."

Aaron M. Kohn, who for 10 years has been a voice crying in the wilderness of crime as managing director of the Metropolitan Crime Commission of New Orleans, specified:

"We have the handbook, the lottery, the pinballs, and the slot machines—what's left of them. And we have cops whose entire conversation is about graft and women."

Periodically Kohn transmits to law-enforcement officers information gathered by his investigators on all types of crime—bookmaking, pinball machines, roulette, dice games, prostitution, B-girls.

Last August he reported 109 offenses in 72 places, naming each, to Sheriff John G. Fitzgerald, of Jefferson Parish, where the Kefauver committee found widespread crime 10 years ago. Kohn noted:

"Of the 11 places reported to you on June 3, 9 were illegally operating thereafter."

Kohn wrote to Col. Provosty A. Dayries, superintendent of the New Orleans Police Department, that 118 violations were observed in 90 locations, and that of 22 places cited for B-drinking, 21 were named in a letter a month before.

"We again stress the fact that B-drinking is organized crime," Kohn said. "Women are employed by the management of these establishments to use various forms of sexual seduction, many of them indescribable in public print, to induce unwary or foolish males into situations which frequently make them victims of fraud, theft, forgery, or robbery."

Revenue laws make a delicate distinction in the operation of mechanical devices. The city of New Orleans requires a permit showing payment of $10.25; the State of Louisiana, $25; the United States, $10 for amusement and $250 for gambling (which isn't against U.S. law).

Nowhere does a sign proclaim that a pinball machine has a payoff. But claw-type machines are labeled "For amusement only," and customers can grab for hours—and do—and when a prize drops, it's behind a padlocked chute.

Pinball machines are less frustrating. Say a chap's playing in a barroom. He inserts a nickel, then he can risk maybe $5 or $10

more in coins to increase the odds—and if he hits, lights flash, bells ring, and there's enough commotion so the bartender knows something's happened. He winks, the player wanders off, returns for a drink, and the bartender passes him a 10-spot, or a 20, or a 50, and says:

"Here's that dough I owe you."

Who's to say it's a gambling payoff?

Peter Hand, a bookmaker who served 8 years in the Louisiana Legislature and acknowledged his gambling ties with Costello and Kastel, made a startlingly frank disclosure about payoff to legislators during a TV interview on July 14, 1959.

"They give it the name of 'expense money,'" he said, "but I think 98 percent of them will take this so-called expense money or whatever you want to call it.

"If you're not an attorney, it's a bribe. If you are an attorney, it's expense money or something of that sort."

Hand talked as if he were describing doughnut sales.

Question. Were you paid or given expense money to be for or against some legislation?

Answer. Absolutely, lots of times.

Question. Did you account for it?

Answer. Yes sir.

Question. Then that is the thing to do, that is correct—it is not wrong to take it, it's wrong not to—

Answer. Pay Federal income tax on it.

Question. Mr. Hand, if I as a citizen want to have certain legislation passed, how do I go about approaching a member of the legislature in a way which would best assure passage of a bill?

Answer. Well, get yourself one that—well, get someone who knows the legislators, and, if he's a good man and got pretty good connections up there (Baton Rouge), he's going to tell you right off the bat, "Now this is going to cost you something, because you know those boys up there has got to live"—and from then on you and him get together.

Question. How much would you say as a minimum it would cost to get a bill through?

Answer. Well, it depends upon how large the bill is, and for what big concern and things like that. It may cost you from $500 up.

Question. You make it sound as though—you said 98 percent of them take this, as you put it, "expense money." Don't you feel that we have any honest legislators at all up there, Mr. Hand?

Answer. As far as I'm concerned, it's very few. I didn't come across—against any of them, and I served for 8 years up there.

Hand is a gambler, and he knows gambling, and this is how the interview went:

Question. Is it possible to operate a handbook or an illegal gambling game without the consent of the authorities?

Answer. Absolutely not.

Question. How long could you stay in business?

Answer. About 20 minutes. You see, today the jukebox operators sent word down the line to all the saloonkeepers to "buy a Federal stamp and you will not be molested by the police." So that shows collusion between the city hall and the gamblers.

Question. Do you think—is all gambling big business or can the small businessman operate a little, operate just a little game or something?

Answer. Oh, yes, sir. It all depends on what he operates. You can take $300 and get in a handbook and become a millionaire in 4 or 5 years, make a big large living in the first year.

Yes; make a big large living on the miseries of such men as the Brooklyn taxidriver who owed $11,000 to bookies, and was told to sell his cab and pay or get a bullet in the back, and chose life to death—and went on relief.

[From the New York Mirror, Apr. 1, 1961]

CANCER OF CRIME—HOW THE LABOR RACKETS WORK

(The judgment is that of Kings County Judge Samuel S. Leibowitz: "Racketeers have adopted a cloak of respectability that is hard to pierce. They are using unions as a blackjack. When they have trouble, they can send for a killer as you would send for a carpenter or a plumber." In this seventh of a series on organized crime, the New York Mirror canvasses labor racketeering.)

(By Harry Singer and Gerald Duncan)

How does a labor racket start?

Like this, in simplest terms:

Two sales organizations compete for business, whether it's doughnuts, tulips, tenpenny nails, or terra cotta.

The rivalry is keen. People fight. Noses are bloodied. Both sides suffer, and so do their sales.

Along comes what the underworld knows as a wise guy, a brain. He steps in as mediator, a peacemaker with a plan.

"Form an association," he says. "You take this side of the street, and you take that side. Everybody will be happy, and you each pay me a pittance as membership fee and I'll see that nobody treads on anybody else's toes."

Fine. There's peace among the employers. Then the wise guy turns to the employees.

"Form an association," he says, "so the employers don't push you around. Pay me dues, and I'll see that you get your rights."

So the wise guy becomes arbiter among the employers, and among employees, and between employers and employees. He is a power for peace, a system is established, nobody wants trouble—and the cost is passed on to the customer at the breakfast counter, or the patron at the florist's, or the man building a house.

At a workshop on organized crime conducted last fall by the International Association of Chiefs of Police in Washington, Capt. James E. Hamilton, commander of the intelligence unit of the Los Angeles Police Department, told about a labor racketeer who took a pick-and-shovel job to organize ditchdiggers on a years-long sewer project.

This wise guy coaxed 11,000 laborers into a union, each of them paying $4 a month as dues, and influenced the appointment of a business agent.

"A nice little income," Hamilton said, adding:

"How you can expect honest administration of a union like that is pretty hard to understand, because everyone having anything to do with funds must come from the ranks of the union, and the laborer today is just not capable of handling funds of that magnitude.

"We found all kinds of derelictions—from kickbacks to personal loans out of union funds. The setup is such that they have no proper administrator to administer those funds.

"So the kickback. Nothing illegal. After all, if I arrange for 10 of these fellows to get a job, why can't I get $1.50 a day?"

The U.S. Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, headed by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat of Arkansas, spotlighted racketeering at public hearings for 3 years 1958–60).

U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, then chief counsel to the committee, made this observation:

"I think the gangsters have gotten much smoother in their operations. From prohibition they learned about operating in interstate commerce. They set up a transportation system to operate with other groups throughout the country, obtaining sugar and other ingredients.

"The second thing, they obtained a great deal of money during and immediately after the war. They have a great deal of cash available, so when they move into an area, the legitimate businessman can't compete.

"They can pay a greater bonus for placing their jukebox, or their pinball machine, for instance, than the ordinary businessman."

Prohibition was still in its heyday when Al Capone, with prohibition millions, moved into the labor scene in Chicago. That was nearly 40 years ago, long before Capone, who had wriggled out of arrests for everything from misdemeanor to murder, was jailed at Alcatraz, in San Francisco Bay, for income tax fraud.

Virgil W. Peterson, operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission since 1942, recently told how mobsters gained control of unions in the building trades and threatened contractors with ruin unless big money was paid.

"Sluggings and bombings were commonplace," he said. "During 1922 alone there were at least 14 buildings bombed and 2 policemen killed."

In the 1930's, gangsters put 125,000 members of the International Alliance of Theatrical State Employees in thrall to the underworld by electing a hoodlum as president. Millions of dollars were extorted out of the movie industry from Hollywood to New York.

The cancer infected bartenders' unions and spread to restaurants. A lawyer told the McClellan committee he couldn't hold his job as counsel to the Chicago Restaurant Association because he didn't know any gangsters. The proprietor of one of the city's finest dining rooms testified that every restaurant owner in Chicago lives in fear of underworld terror—such as the gasoline spraying and igniting of one place, with $1,400,000 damage.

Nothing has stopped the poison. The McClellan committee found it among unions of teamsters, bakers, textile workers, butchers—and in garbage collection.

The committee put a searchlight on carting evils in Los Angeles. On the other side of the country, it found:

"The New York garbage collecting industry has been infiltrated and dominated by the basest criminal elements in the country, men whose other profitable enterprises include the docks and numbers rackets and worldwide traffic in dope, and whose copious criminal records include arrests for everything from murder to mayhem, interspersed with felonious assault, extortion, coercion, grand larceny, burglary, and vagrancy."

The Teamsters Union, headed by James R. Hoffa, whose word could stop every truck in the Nation, was a particular target:

"Well-nigh incalculable power over our economy is wielded by this union. The Teamsters assert jurisdiction over every product and commodity in this country which moves on wheels, including milk and other foods, clothing, furniture, appliances, coal, oil, automobiles, steel, lumber, construction materials, and daily newspapers. The Teamsters can, in short, stop the Nation's economic pulse.

"If Hoffa is successful in combating the combined weight of the U.S. Government and public opinion, the cause of decent unionism is lost, and labor-management relations will return to the jungle era."

Gangsters want out of the jungle. The gathering of 58 hoodlums from all over the country at Apalachin, N.Y., on November 14, 1957, demonstrated how.

Of the lot, 16 were engaged in garment manufacturing or trucking, 10 owned grocery stores, 17 operated taverns or restaurants, 9 were in the construction business. Others were interested in coal companies, auto agencies, laundries, and race horses. Some were involved in funeral homes. One was the leader of a band.

All legitimate.

[From the New York Mirror, Apr. 2, 1961]

CANCER OF CRIME—WITHOUT WIRETAPPING—WHAT?

(Wiretapping has been called dirty business. But the question has been raised whether narcotics traffic, labor racketeering, extortion and murder aren't dirtier business. In this eighth of a series of articles on organized crime, the New York Mirror explores wiretapping as a weapon against gangsterism.)

(By Harry Singer and Gerald Duncan)

The judicial wraps put on wiretapping inspired Brooklyn District Attorney Edward S. Silver to compose an imaginary phone conversation to demonstrate how criminals can thumb their noses at police and prosecutors.

It goes like this:

Peanuts: "Lo, Boss, thisez Peanuts."

The Boss: "Yeah, hello, did the shipment come in OK?"

Peanuts: "Sure thing, Boss, 50 horse."

The Boss: "What do you mean—50 horse? I was expecting 50 kilos of heroin. Give it to me straight."

Peanuts: "Gee, Boss, dats no way to talk on the phone. You warned me y'self. I——"

The Boss: "Listen, dope, that's old stuff. My mouthpiece told me the bulls aren't allowed to stick their snoots in our private business. It's against the law, y'hear? It's dirty business to do such a thing."

Peanuts: "You all right, Boss? You ain't cockeyed or something? Are you hittin' the stuff y'self?"

The Boss: "Look, dope, I'm tellin' ya. Let 'em listen. The Lip tells me and he gets paid to know. The more they listen the better. It's better'n you think. There's some stuff known like the fruit of the poisoned bush, or something. If they grab the stuff after listen'n it's out. They ain't allowed to do such naughty things no more."

Peanuts: "Look. Boss, should I come over? I think you need me."

The Boss: "Forget it, Peanuts.

"I'm fine, great—the boys is all with me—forget it—and say, you get another grand for the job you did yesterday. The D.A. will know his canaries can't eat lead—it's bad for their diet. That's pretty good, what?"

Peanuts: "OK, if ya say so—ya had me worried there for a bit."

The phrase "dirty business" in connection with wiretapping was born in a historic dissent by four Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court to a majority decision in 1928 upholding conviction of a bootlegger. The man was found guilty in Federal court on the basis of eavesdropped evidence obtained in violation of the laws of the State of Washington.

In subsequent rulings the Supreme Court prohibited use of wiretapped evidence in any Federal court, including when it led to a third person, branding such evidence as "the fruit of the poisoned tree."

New York—and other States—permit wiretapping when law enforcement officers obtain an order from a State supreme court justice after swearing to certain suspicions of crime.

But the U.S. Supreme Court in 1957 hobbled the New York law by holding that Congress, in putting radio, telegraph, and telephone under the Federal Communications Commission in 1934, "did not mean to allow State legislation" to say otherwise.

Time has only confused the situation—with the criminal the beneficiary. In 1960 the U.S. court of appeals in New York, refusing to bar introduction of wiretap evidence in State courts, ruled that Federal law makes it a criminal offense to present it.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, was appalled.

"This decision," he said, "emphasizes the incredible legal situation which now prevails. New York has the most well-balanced carefully safeguarded, up-to-date laws on the subject of wiretapping and other forms of eavesdropping of any State in the Nation.

"Nevertheless, a New York district attorney who acts in full compliance with the requirements of the New York law now must face the risk of Federal prosecution. I cannot conceive of anything more illogical and indefensible."

District Attorney Silver was flabbergasted. He said:

"Unless a legislative change is made, certainly in New York State, and I think it will be true all over the country, we will be witnessing the greatest legal jailbreak that has ever happened.

"I know in my county there are at least 200 defendants that will have to be dismissed in various cases if some change isn't made."

Manhattan District Attorney Frank S. Hogan assessed the decision as a blow.

"Our files are full of cases," he said, "where, but for wiretaps, some of the worst racketeering offenders might well have gone unpunished."

A report last month by the New York State Commission of Investigation summed up testimony by police, prosecutors, and lawyers:

"Law enforcement officials must have the right to intercept telephone messages, with proper restraints * * * to safeguard personal liberties, if they are to cope with dangerous criminal conditions" because "protection of our citizens is being irreparably curtailed."

Time and again law-enforcement people say that communication is the core of the cancer of crime.

George H. Gaffney, district supervisor of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics in New York, put it this way:

"You must destroy their lines of communications. Either the criminal is going to be denied the use of the phone, or the Government is going to be given use of wiretapping to fight him with his own weapon."

What wiretapping can do was told to the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights by Harold Lipset, an investigator in San Francisco:

Case No. 4023: Parents of a teenage boy found evidence which led them to believe their son was using narcotics. Monitoring and recording phone conversations at this home produced evidence that the parents' fears were justified. The police department was notified. Investigation led to arrest of a narcotics ring.

Case No. 3349: Wiretapping led to exposure of a high school prostitution racket.

The arrest of notorious gambler Harry Gross in Brooklyn in 1950 followed conversation heard on tapped wires, disclosing a bookmaking ring with payoffs topping $20 million a year.

Ten years ago, the late Robert P. Patterson former Federal judge and former Secretary of War, said:

"The underworld of today would rate Jesse James as a small-fry amateur. Crime has become big business. Law-enforcement systems operating along lines good enough for 1851 or 1901 are too slow for the swifter pace of the times we are living in. * * *

"If we are in dead earnest in insisting that organized crime be defeated, we should lose no time in putting this powerful weapon—that is, wiretapping, into the hands of the officers we depend on to do the necessary work."

That was 10 years ago.

[From the New York Mirror, Apr. 3, 1961]

CANCER OF CRIME—TIME FOR A SHOWDOWN WITH THE MOBS

(Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, said it: "There have been enough studies and exposes. The time for counterattack is long overdue. Crime is at war with America. It is high time we declare war on crime." The New York Mirror discusses how it might be done in this final article of a series on organized crime.)

(By Harry Singer and Gerald Duncan)

What will kill organized crime?

Not sporadic drives. Not hit-and-run tactics. Not the imprisonment of an Al Capone. Not a raid on top level gang meetings, such as that at Apalachin, N.Y., in 1957.

Myles J. Ambrose, as assistant for law enforcement to the Secretary of the Treasury, told the 66th annual conference of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

"Enforcement efforts often have been directed at cutting the weeds rather than destroying the roots.

"Almost every syndicated criminal in the United States has at one time or another been prosecuted and convicted for a criminal act. On only rare occasions has the organization he headed been destroyed.

"Invariably, able lieutenants have sprung up to assume the reins. * * * Time after time these groups have survived massive onslaughts of public exposure, investigation and prosecution, but they nevertheless had the capacity to 'pick up the chips' and start again."

Powerful voices have been raised to make the Federal Government a mighty force against the underworld. Among them was President Kennedy's when he was a member of the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field:

"The hearings demonstrated beyond a doubt that local law enforcement officers for various reasons were incapable of dealing with this enemy.

"It seems to me that because of the nationwide aspects of this problem, a separate Federal agency should be established or an appropriate existing agency be expanded or modified to act as an intelligence gathering agency on organized criminal activities."

The cry has reverberated across the land for a national crime commission or a clearinghouse of criminal information, or both, as scalpels to excise the cancer of crime.

Capt. James E. Hamilton, commander of the intelligence unit of the Los Angeles Police Department, told a crime workshop organized by the International Association of Chiefs of Police:

"As far as I am concerned, I am for a national crime commission, for a special section on organized crime. * * * I am for a bucket brigade if it will do the job. * * *

"Regardless of all we say about the exchange of information and cooperation, the definite lack has been on a Federal level in furnishing local departments information as to the movement of national figures."

Milton R. Wessel, who in 1958–59 headed the short-lived U.S. Attorney General's Special Group on Organized Crime, told the police panel:

"I submit that statistics showing steady increase in major crimes are incontestable proof that the situation is beyond the control of local police."

In Washington, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, composed a rebuttal:

"America's compact network of State and local law enforcement agencies traditionally has been the Nation's first line of defense against crime."

Hoover viewed change warily:

"No profession in our country has been so beset by outside theorists and pressure groups as law enforcement. This is true to such an extent today that we members of the law enforcement profession are well advised to be extremely skeptical of many alleged 'friends.'

"I refer particularly to those persons—some in an earnest desire for a remedy to the crime problem, and others blinded by the urge of 'empire building'—who have advanced such potentially dangerous so-called

solutions as Federal crime commissions, national clearinghouses and special prosecuting teams to cover the United States."

Hoover calculates the cost of crime at $22 billion a year. He has reckoned its increase since 1950 at 69 percent—a rate four times as fast as the population expansion.

To meet the challenge, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, a crime fighter since the 1940's, introduced a bill in the Senate last February 2 cosponsored by 27 other Senators, both Democrats and Republicans. Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, filed an identical measure in the House.

The legislation, as described by KEFAUVER, would create a national commission on interstate crime to "keep abreast of the activities of organized crime, coordinate the efforts of the 70-odd Federal agencies, lend assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies by serving as a criminal intelligence clearinghouse, and report to Congress on its findings."

There was no rush to enact the proposal into law.

On February 27 Senator KEFAUVER said:

"We are still trying to work out something that will satisfy Mr. Hoover."

Last week, Richard B. Ogilvie, who was in charge of Wessel's midwestern office, said in Chicago:

"Hoover was very cool to the whole idea of the Attorney Generals' special group. He ordered that the FBI files, containing the very information we needed on organized crime, were to be closed to us.

"Criticizing Hoover is a dangerous thing for anyone to do.

"But honesty compels me to say that some of Hoover's ideas are sadly behind the times. The FBI is still organized to fight a crime pattern of the twenties and thirties. It is not set up to do battle with the criminal syndicate—the organized conspiracy that drains $22 billion a year from the United States."

As far back as 1930, the late Representative Loring M. Black, Jr., Democrat, of New York, proposed "a national clearinghouse where those entrusted with law enforcement may swap information on individual criminals of all kinds."

In 1951 Senator KEFAUVER urged a national commission to act as "a nationwide clearinghouse for all the crime committees, volunteer, State and local" to supply continuous information on gangsters.

A high police source in Los Angeles said the other day: "We would like to have the U.S. Government work with and not independently of local law enforcement. The problem is catching the criminal, not who catches him."

Not everybody sees it that way—which keeps the criminal happy, fat and a fester on the face of the Nation.

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLD VOTE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I note with pleasure that the President has just recommended that 18-year-olds be permitted to vote in the District of Columbia. I have always supported the 18-year-old vote and am the author of a pending resolution in the Senate to amend the Constitution to give this privilege to 18-year-olds throughout the Nation. With the growth of the mass media and the expansion of America's educational system, 18-year-olds, more than ever before, are in a position to think about and reach intelligent decisions on public issues.

The District of Columbia should have a model election law, on which other States can draw for needed improvements in their own election codes. Four States now permit persons under 21 to vote. I am hopeful that the District of Columbia will follow this precedent and that in doing so, the Congress will stimulate the adoption of similar measures on the part of other States.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I urge that the President give serious consideration to supporting a constitutional amendment on the 18-year-old vote as did President Eisenhower. This is one of the best and most direct ways in which we can make better citizens out of our Nation's youth.

The Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee soon plans comprehensive hearings on constitutional amendments relating to electoral reforms. My amendment on the 18-year-old vote is pending before this subcommittee. As a member of the subcommittee, I intend to do everything I can to have this subject fully aired and fully discussed at our hearings.

Mr. President, the strength and vigor of American democracy has always been dependent upon the participation of citizens in the processes of government. America's 18-year-olds can and do think for themselves. We must permit them to play an active role in democracy. Nothing makes a man mature like trust and responsibility. We must give our young people the right to grow up.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL SEASHORE RECREATION AREAS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 7, the New York Times published an editorial declaring that the time has arrived for the establishment of Federal seashore recreation areas at Cape Cod; Point Reyes, in California; and Padre Island, just off the shore of Texas.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Three Needed National Parks," be printed at this point in my remarks, because the editor of the Times has very briefly and effectively stated the arguments for early action.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 7, 1961]

THREE NEEDED NATIONAL PARKS

Now that hearings have been held by committees of both House and Senate, there is no reason for further delay by Congress in passing the bills to establish new national seashore parks at Cape Cod; Padre Island, in Texas; and Point Reyes, in California.

In his conservation message to Congress February 23, President Kennedy specifically named these three areas. Secretary of the Interior Udall has given them vigorous backing. The recent hearings in Washington disclosed overwhelming and nationwide public support. The opposition has dwindled to local minorities made up mostly of landowners still angling for a better price when they sell to the Park Service and would-be developers who are trying to shrink the size of the proposed parks so they can have additional, adjacent acreages to exploit.

Each of these areas has its own natural splendor; Cape Cod, with its great Nauset Beach windswept and surfswept by the North Atlantic; Padre Island, in its setting of shallow, subtropical seas; Point Reyes, with its backdrop of white cliffs and scenic California hills. Each is uniquely worth saving unspoiled for future Americans.

To delay can only increase the cost of the lands that have to be bought by the Park Service at the risk of losing some of them permanently. At this very moment the bulldozers are scraping out a subdivision in the heart of the Point Reyes peninsula. Texas developers who envisage a new Miami Beach on Padre Island are trying to force a compromise that would leave to their devices an additional 20 miles, and the widest and best parts, of the long, wild barrier beach. Commercial and residential developments continue to whittle away at Cape Cod. The speculation that is always touched off by plans for public acquisition is driving land values skyward.

In working out this kind of legislation, politicians often try to placate or accommodate every last segment of local interest. There comes a time when the few remaining dissenters who will never quit grabbing for the extra concession, simply must be overridden in the public interest. At Cape Cod, Padre Island, and Point Reyes that time has arrived.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, real estate developers are moving into the areas. Costs will inevitably skyrocket if there is delay. There is increasing pressure and need for reservation of shoreline areas for our citizens. Each of the three sites named—Cape Cod, Point Reyes, and Padre Island—is an outstanding area of unique natural beauty which makes it a proper site for Federal acquisition.

It is the intention to have bills establishing all three of these areas before the Senate this year. Hearings have been concluded by the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] is the chairman. They will be taken up in executive session very soon and, I believe, reported favorably. The subcommittee has done excellent work in reducing areas of difference and opposition to a minimum so that the bills may be passed.

The creation of these three seashore areas will, I hope, be only the beginning of a program to assure the Nation adequate outdoor recreational facilities.

In addition to these bills, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is considering a general bill on shoreline preservation. The bill will seek to initiate careful studies of additional Federal seashore areas, to have the Forest Service survey shorelines on ocean fronts, lakes, and rivers in the national forests, and to encourage the State governments to undertake shoreline preservation programs.

It is our hope that when the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission reports next January on our outdoor recreation needs in the years ahead, we shall have made at least a modest start toward the goals they will set.

OUTBREAK OF CRIME IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, Washington, D.C., has been struck in the last 10 days with an outbreak of crime which has focused attention on law enforce-

ment generally in this Nation's Capital City.

The upward crime trend has been a constant one in recent years, although this city has not been alone in this regard compared with other major cities of the country.

One major deterrent to the criminal element would be to have more policemen on the streets day and night each and every day. Congress can discharge its responsibility as the legislative body of this city by appropriating funds to permit a 3,000-man force—a goal sought for some years by the police department here.

I join the call made by the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who advocates more funds. Although the financial picture in the city of Washington has much to be hoped for, I reiterate a pledge I made several years ago—that the city of Washington deserves and should have a 3,000-man police force.

District officials this year are seeking funds for 118 more men, so as to bring the force to 2,832 men. I join with the Senator from West Virginia in urging Congress to face up to its responsibility in this important field. I hope Congress will appropriate sufficient funds to insure a 3,000-man Department, so as to cope with the rising crime rate.

I can report that today the Metropolitan Police Force reached its full authorized strength of 2,714 men. This means that a recruiting drive, which has been under the leadership of Chief Robert Murray for almost a year, has been successful. Now we must take the next step to the 3,000-man goal.

More policemen patrolling the streets in our residential and business areas will certainly go a long way toward putting the criminal element on notice that violence will not be tolerated.

As chairman of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia, I believe the Senate is entitled to know what the facts are and what steps are being taken to cope with this alarming problem.

Mr. President, I inform the Members of the Senate that I have today extended an invitation to the 15-member Law Enforcement Council of the District of Columbia to meet jointly with the members of the Committee on the District of Columbia on the coming Friday morning, May 19, at 10 o'clock, in the committee rooms, to discuss means and methods to cope not only with the latest crime surge but also with the increasing crime rate over the past year.

I do not believe there is an overnight answer; neither is it my desire or intent to dramatize a situation which is bad enough in its own right. However, I believe the Law Enforcement Council, comprised of the President of the Board of Commissioners, Chiefs of the Metropolitan and U.S. Park Police, and other law enforcement officers and representatives of the District courts, can make a real contribution. This Council was established under an act of Congress in 1953 to make a continuing study and appraisal of crime and law enforcement here. The Law Enforcement Council, comprised of men who cope day in and day out with crime, should provide a broader base through their knowledge and experience in arriving at an overall approach to this problem. I hope the Council may implement its recommendations made to Congress earlier this year and provide a priority basis for action.

Crime cannot be curtailed on a piecemeal basis any more in this city than in any other major metropolitan center. However, if Congress can assist local officials, then we must do our part to make this a city where men, women, and children can once again walk the streets of their Nation's Capital City without fear. No stone should be left unturned to control criminal elements here, and notice must be served on the offenders that their actions will not be tolerated on any level of law enforcement.

Washington, D.C., as a symbol of the advantages of American freedom and ideals, must lead, rather than follow, as a model for effective yet proprietous law enforcement.

DESIGNATION OF INAUGURATION DAY AS A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a representative group of letters, among the many which have been forwarded to me following introduction of the proposal (S. 863) calling for Inauguration Day to be designated a national holiday. Some of these letters were in response to an inquiry made by Mr. William Pardridge, of the District of Columbia, who is doing background on an article for a national magazine on this subject. He asked a selected group of school superintendents their reaction to releasing schoolchildren in observance of such a holiday. As Senators read these letters, they will find thoughtful reaction. All agree with the importance of the holiday. Most feel, and I think properly, that the present and future resources of television make it possible for the schools to develop suitable programs for observance of this important event, similar to the programs now developed for Lincoln's Birthday, without releasing the children from school. Designation of Inauguration Day as a national holiday would provide the formal setting within which our schools could plan such programs.

I hope my colleagues will read these letters and will be persuaded to support the bill S. 863.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROSSE POINTE PARK, MICH.,
February 10, 1961.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: My wife and I wish to applaud your efforts represented by your bill introduced to make Inauguration Day a national legal holiday. Of all the present holidays stemming from recognition of national events, historical or otherwise, this could be the most significant due to the educational implications for our future citizens.

Schools in Detroit were in session during the inauguration of President Kennedy, and it was necessary for my wife to pick up the children (four in number) and rush them home for lunch so they could see history in the making. They were late returning to school, but I believe this was justified. I believe we have an obligation to our children to afford them every opportunity to receive an education in the functions of our Government, to instill in them the desire to become good and active citizens.

L. W. TOBIN, Jr.

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
Salt Lake City, Utah, February 21, 1961.

Mr. WILLIAM D. PARDRIDGE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PARDRIDGE: In connection with the last inaugural day, a goodly number of our students saw and heard the inaugural program by viewing the proceedings on television sets established in the schools. It is my belief that this is a better way to bring students in contact with the historic events of Inauguration Day than by declaring a school holiday.

I am confident that within 4 years we will have much finer television viewing in our schools and more children can view the events of the day via television. I believe that if this is done in the school under the supervision of teachers, more children will participate and will have a more effective experience than if schools are closed and children are left on their own or dependent upon the initiative of parents to participate in the inauguration activities. In other words, I would be in favor of a holiday celebrated in the schools in the same way that we celebrate, for example, Lincoln's Birthday.

Very truly yours,

M. LYNN BENNION,
Superintendent of Schools.

ELLINWOOD PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Ellinwood, Kans., February 20, 1961.

Mr. WILLIAM B. PARDRIDGE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PARDRIDGE: The resolution you mentioned, submitted by Senator HART, of Michigan, concerning designating Inauguration Day as a national legal holiday, makes a lot of sense to me. I considered dismissing school this year for this very reason except I thought of it too late to do it in an orderly fashion. I agree with the resolution and I am sure any clear thinking educational leader will feel the same.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my view.

Sincerely yours,

SAM C. STITT,
Superintendent.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
CITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., March 2, 1961.

Mr. WILLIAM D. PARDRIDGE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PARDRIDGE: Thank you for your letter of February 15 wherein you attach a copy of an article which appeared in the January 17 issue of the Washington Evening Star concerning an inauguration holiday for U.S. Government employees and other persons.

The Chicago public schools were not closed for Inauguration Day but this significant event in our country's history was commemorated in each of the schools. Television sets were available and students heard and saw the events surrounding the inauguration of our new President.

In classwork and through discussions, teachers and students were cognizant of the significance of this event and we feel this was a most helpful educational experience for the girls and boys in our schools.

Thank you for presenting your thinking on this subject.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN C. WILLIS,
General Superintendent of Schools.

BALTIMORE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Baltimore, Md., February 23, 1961.
Mr. WILLIAM D. PARDRIDGE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PARDRIDGE: I thank you for sending me a copy of the article published in the Washington Evening Star on January 17, 1961, concerning the proposed holiday for Federal employees on Inauguration Day. You inquire concerning my attitude toward the dismissal of public schools on that day to enable children to hear a live telecast of the ceremonies and activities occasioned by the inauguration of a President.

I have reviewed the matter with certain members of my staff here in Baltimore city and it is the general feeling that closing schools on that day would do little to increase the possibility of pupil observations of live telecasts of the inauguration ceremony and attendant activities. Even though Baltimore city is in close proximity to Washington, D.C., it has not been the policy to close the schools on Inauguration Day. Units of instruction are planned by most of the teachers which would permit children to view various aspects of the inauguration ceremony while in the classroom and under the guidance of their teachers. The educational values and the significance of the occasion is heightened, in our opinion, through the skillful planning of our teachers in acquainting their pupils with the basic democratic values that are symbolized in the inauguration of a President.

We agree that the day has a great historical significance. We question whether making it a holiday for school children would heighten their respect for the dignity of the occasion.

Sincerely,

GEORGE B. BRAIN,
Superintendent.

OMAHA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Omaha, Nebr., February 20, 1961.
Mr. WILLIAM D. PARDRIDGE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PARDRIDGE: Your letter concerning the possibility of making Inauguration Day a legal holiday is an intriguing one.

It would seem to me, as superintendent of schools of some 52,000 young people, that it would be folly to give them a legal holiday to view the inauguration ceremonies. You may not know that we do not dismiss school in Nebraska on either Washington's or Lincoln's Birthday. We discovered some time ago that in order to instill patriotism we can do a better job with school in session than with youngsters roaming the streets, hot rodding it over the landscape, or engaging in undirected activities during a holiday.

Most of the students in the Nebraska area who cared to do so viewed the inauguration ceremonies during the noon hour. I believe that if you conduct an investigation you will find that practically all the schools in the Nation which had access to television receivers probably saw President Kennedy take the inaugural oath.

Frankly, I am opposed to the idea of compulsory closing of school on Inauguration Day. Likewise, I am opposed to the granting of a holiday for civil workers in any guise whatsoever. I believe you will find that most of them had the opportunity, because of the nature of the work that they do, to observe the inauguration ceremonies last month.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY A. BURKE,
Superintendent of Schools.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
OFFICE OF THE
SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS,
Newark, N.J., March 7, 1961.
Mr. WILLIAM D. PARDRIDGE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PARDRIDGE: This is to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of February 15 and the accompanying reprint from the Washington Evening Star.

I am in general agreement that it is significant and of timely educational value in the viewing of the inaugural ceremony of a President of the United States and that the opportunity should be afforded to pupils to benefit therefrom through the medium of television. The value of such an educational experience applies particularly, I believe, to pupils on the junior and senior high school levels.

While the official and widespread excusing of pupils from classes or school attendance on such an occasion might very well present a variety of problems, nevertheless the idea has sufficient merit to warrant its being explored and studied thoroughly well in advance.

You may be interested to know that pupils in the Newark public schools had the opportunity to view the recent inaugural ceremonies due to the fact that schools were closed because of snowstorm conditions. However, if schools had been open, many if not most of our junior and senior high school pupils would have had the opportunity to watch the ceremonies on television due to special assembly and program arrangements made in advance.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD F. KENNELLY,
Superintendent of Schools.

ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., February 23, 1961.
Mr. WILLIAM D. PARDRIDGE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PARDRIDGE: In general, our schools utilize television as a means of participation in Inauguration Day activities. I agree that this is an important day in our country although I am not now in a position to say that this should necessarily be a school holiday.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. SPAIN,
Superintendent.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Cleveland, Ohio, February 20, 1961.
Mr. WILLIAM D. PARDRIDGE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PARDRIDGE: To achieve the purposes which seem apparent in your proposal to have the school closed on Inauguration Day, it seems more effective to me, to have the schools in session that day, with special attention in school to the importance of the day.

In such a case, attention to the social, economic, and political implications of the event would not be left to chance, but become a part of the teaching and learning process. Further, the attention to the event which is given by the mass media, particularly by the very effective medium of television, could be capitalized in school by having the pupils view the event, actually more advantageously than they would if they were on the scene.

Mr. Kennedy, in his address that day, expressed the idea that one should not be asking what his country can do for him, but rather, what he can do for his country. I've always subscribed to that thesis. In line with that, I think my country will be better off if we spend a day working than if we spend it loafing. And that goes for youngsters in school, too.

Finally, I think that our 135,000 youngsters absorbed more of substance and understanding of that Inauguration Day by being in school than they would have, had they been out of school.

Sincerely yours,

MARK C. SCHINNERER,
Superintendent of Schools.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 118. An act for the relief of Helen Irma Imhoof;

S. 126. An act for the relief of Edward W. Scott III;

S. 138. An act for the relief of Mico Delic;

S. 177. An act for the relief of Hadji Benlevi;

S. 217. An act for the relief of Alessandro Gellhorn;

S. 285. An act for the relief of Alpo Fransila Crane;

S. 292. An act for the relief of Mah Jew Ngee (also known as Peter Jew Nah);

S. 330. An act for the relief of Harry N. Kouniakis;

S. 417. An act for the relief of Haruo T. Hendricks;

S. 532. An act for the relief of Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz);

S. 545. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Clifford;

S. 555. An act for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou;

S. 663. An act for the relief of Andreas Rakintozis (also known as Andreas Rakintzis or Rakajes);

S. 894. An act for the relief of Captain Ernest Mountain; and

S. 1097. An act for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt.

TENTATIVE PLAN FOR MEETING BETWEEN PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND CHAIRMAN KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there have been statements in the newspapers and on the radio and television to the effect that a meeting may take place between President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev. There have been semantic acrobatics as to whether this will be a summit meeting.

I take this occasion to remind Congress and the country that President Kennedy had some very definite and precise prescriptions for a summit meeting, and he placed them before the country in one of his debates with former Vice President Nixon.

I believe it is necessary, in view of the enormous gravity of a meeting between these two heads of state, that the country be aware of the position which the President has taken before and, as a matter of fact, of the position taken by the former Vice President of the United States.

In the televised debate on the night of October 7, 1960, Vice President Nixon was asked by a reporter the following question:

Mr. Vice President, according to news dispatches, Soviet Premier Khrushchev said today that Prime Minister Macmillan had assured him that there would be a summit conference next year after the presidential elections. Have you given any cause for such assurance, and do you consider it desirable or even possible that there would be a summit conference next year if Mr. Khrushchev persists in the conditions he has laid down?

Mr. Nixon answered the question, and it is necessary to say a word about his reply, because Mr. Kennedy then agreed with what Mr. Nixon had said and added a condition of his own.

Mr. Nixon said he would be willing as President to meet with Mr. Khrushchev if such a meeting would be, first, an aid to world peace; second, before such a meeting preparations should be made for a conference so as to provide reasonable certainty of success; third, there should be negotiations at the ambassadorial level to delineate the issues and to prepare the way for negotiations; fourth, it would be necessary for Mr. Khrushchev to give assurance that he really desired to accomplish something useful, and not merely to make propaganda.

When Mr. Kennedy's turn came to rebut the answer of Mr. Nixon, Mr. Kennedy said there was "no disagreement." He stated that "his view was the same." Then he added something. Mr. Kennedy said:

Before we go into the summit, before we ever meet again, I think it is important that the United States build its strength, build its military strength as well as its economic strength. If we negotiate from a position where the power balance is moving away from us, it is extremely difficult to meet a situation, to meet a situation on Berlin as well as on other things.

Mr. President, undoubtedly there is no position on the face of the earth which is more complex, more difficult, and often more painful than that of President of the United States, especially in these perilous times. Certainly I have no desire to add to that burden. However, as a Senator, I believe it is desirable that I call the attention of the President to something which may possibly have been overlooked, something concerning which I feel very deeply. That is, before the President goes to the summit—and I understand a decision has not been finally made—he should consider whether these specific conditions have been met, particularly the last condition; namely, that the United States shall have built its strength, and the power balance does not seem to be moving away from us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the debate between Vice President Nixon and Mr. Kennedy and the question by Mr. Spivak which provoked this section of the debate be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. SPIVAK. Mr. Vice President, according to news dispatches, Soviet Premier Khrushchev said today that Prime Minister Macmillan had assured him that there would be a summit conference next year after the presidential elections. Have you given any cause for such assurance and do you consider it desirable or even possible that there would be a summit conference next year if Mr. Khrushchev persists in the conditions he has laid down?

Mr. NIXON. No; of course, I haven't talked to Prime Minister Macmillan. It would not be appropriate for me to do so. The President is still going to be President for the next 4 months, and he of course is the only one who can commit this country in this period.

As far as the summit conference is concerned, I want to make my position absolutely clear. I would be willing as President to meet with Mr. Khrushchev or any other world leader if it would aid the cause of world peace. I would not be willing to meet with him, however, unless there were preparations for that conference, which would give us some reasonable certainty, some reasonable certainty that you would be going to have some success.

WARNS OF DASHING HOPES

We must not build up the hopes of the world and then dash them, as was the case in Paris. There Mr. Khrushchev came to that conference determined to break it up. He was going to break it up because he knew that he wasn't going to get his way on Berlin and on the other key matters with which he was concerned at the Paris conference.

Now, if we are going to have another summit conference, there must be negotiations at the diplomatic level, the Ambassadors, the Secretaries of State, and others at that level, prior to that time, which will delineate the issues and which will prepare the way for the heads of state to meet and make some progress.

Otherwise, if we find the heads of state meeting and not making progress, we will find that the cause of peace will have been hurt rather than helped. So under these circumstances, I, therefore, strongly urge and I will strongly hold, if I have the opportunity to urge or to hold, to this position that any summit conference would be gone into only after the most careful preparation and only after Mr. Khrushchev, after his disgraceful conduct at the United Nations, gave some assurance that he really wanted to sit down and talk and to accomplish something, and not just to make propaganda.

Mr. MCGEE. Senator Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have no disagreement with the Vice President's position on that. My view is the same as his. Let me say there is only one point I would add—that before we go into the summit, before we ever meet again, I think it is important that the United States build its strength, build its military strength as well as its economic strength. If we negotiate from a position where the power balance is moving away from us, it is extremely difficult to meet a situation—to meet a situation on Berlin, as well as other things.

SEES BERLIN PERIL

Now, the next President in the first year is going to be faced with a very serious situation with our defense of Berlin, our commitment on Berlin; it is going to be a test of our nerve and will; it is going to be a test of our strength; and because we are going to move in 1961 and 1962 partly because we have not maintained our strength with sufficient vigor in the last years, I believe that before we meet that crisis that the next President of the United States should send a message to Congress asking for revitalization of our military strength, because come spring or late in the winter we are going to be face to face with the most serious Berlin crisis since 1949 or 1950.

On the question of the summit, I agree with the position of Mr. Nixon. I will not meet Mr. Khrushchev unless there were some agreement at the secondary level, Foreign Ministers or Ambassadors, that would indicate that the meeting will have some hope of success or useful exchange of ideas.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for more than a century the pride of America has been its fine system of public school education. It was founded on the premise that education is the heart of a democratic society and is the birthright of every American citizen.

Through the years, we Americans have willingly supported our public schools in the belief that it is in them that we develop our most precious natural resource, our children.

Although our system of public education has worked well, I maintain we could do better—much better. Indeed, it must be the very best if our society is to meet the grim challenges of the years ahead. As President Kennedy has stated, our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education.

I may add that our progress in education can be no swifter than our willingness to provide facilities for it. That willingness will be tested in our consideration of Senate bill 1021 to provide Federal aid to education.

Mr. President, the fact is that our actions may well determine the future course of our public school system. Today, we are confronted with an appalling shortage of the two basic facilities which a good educational system demands: adequate classroom space and sufficient trained teachers.

These are facts which a Republican Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare admitted were depriving more than 10 million American children of a first-rate education. His successor in the present Democratic administration also has stated these crucial shortages endanger our entire public school system. Surely we must act now to avert a crisis in our schools.

State and municipal taxes already are committed to the hilt. Dropping the solution of this massive problem in their laps will mean that we are willing to sentence our school system permanently to the near-starvation diet which now stunts its growth and development.

Mr. President, we owe our children the best possible education. The form and content of this education, we all agree, must remain with educators and local and State school boards themselves to determine. There is, and will be, no attempt by the Federal Government to interfere with this traditional concept of education in our Republic. I flatly reject the charges of opponents of Federal aid that Government assistance will bring Government control.

The Government's sole responsibility—in the absence of State and local ability to meet fully the pressing need—is to help to construct adequate classroom space and to train and attract enough qualified teachers.

Mr. President, at present more than 37 million young Americans attend elementary and secondary schools. School administrators estimate that approximately 2 million of these children are crowded in excess of normal school capacity. This means there are not enough classrooms or enough qualified teachers to meet the requirements of our school population. The U.S. Office of Education estimates the classroom shortage to exceed 142,000. There is a classroom shortage of nearly 4,000 in Ohio.

Unless classroom construction is drastically stepped up, the situation will become worse. An average annual net

gain of 1 million elementary and secondary school students is expected during the next 10 years. This will place a further strain on our already overcrowded, understaffed schools.

Mr. President, the figure of 2 million is deceptively small. Because of this seriously overcrowded condition, not only so-called excess students are affected, but all students are affected. Educators generally agree that the effectiveness of classroom instruction is seriously reduced under such conditions.

It is not only the serious shortage of classroom space that threatens the growth and improvement of American education. Equally serious is the drastic lack of qualified teachers.

This year, 94,000 unqualified classroom teachers—nearly 7 percent of the total throughout our public education system—are instructing American schoolchildren. These are teachers with substandard training, who have been issued temporary, or emergency, credentials. There are 5,600 of them in Ohio.

The 94,000 figure, Mr. President, is only part of the picture. The real teacher shortage is far greater than that. There are thousands of unfilled positions throughout the Nation. Still more teachers are needed in order to reduce the unwieldy size of classes and to eliminate the need for half-day sessions which rob schoolchildren of an adequate education.

Mr. President, the truth is that there will always be a teacher shortage until such time as the teaching profession is made more financially attractive to more people.

In fact, Mr. President, the average salary of elementary and secondary school teachers last year was under $5,100. Persons starting out in this profession are paid much less than that. Of 18 major professions, teaching—which certainly is one of the most important—ranks 14th in average income. In fact, the estimated average income in the other professions is 63 percent higher than that for teachers.

In the face of these facts, it is little wonder that the demand for new teachers always exceeds the supply. According to the National Education Association, 227,000 new teachers were needed in the fall of 1959. The potential teachers who were graduated the previous June numbered 125,000, little more than half the need. Of these, only 92,000 entered the teaching profession.

There can be no doubting the reason for the serious shortage of teachers. It is money—or, rather, the lack of adequate salaries. Industry and Government pay far better salaries and attract thousands who otherwise would devote their lives to teaching our youth. Of course, Mr. President, the future of our country is dependent upon our youth.

A third deeply serious problem has developed in our public education system. The quality of education a child receives can often be measured in terms of the dollars and cents devoted to his schooling. I am startled by the disparity between the expenditures per pupil by the States.

For example, in New York State the total per pupil is $726 annually. In Ohio, the total is $437. The national average is $390 a year. In Alabama, where the per capita income is low, only $217 is spent annually on each schoolchild; in South Carolina, only $223; in Mississippi, only $225.

That means that fine young scholars in States such as Alabama, South Carolina, and Mississippi—to mention only three—are discriminated against, through no fault of their own.

A student who possibly could become a great nuclear physicist who would serve our Nation magnificently may thereby be deprived of that opportunity, due to inadequate training.

Mr. President, I assert that those who mournfully predict that Federal aid means Federal control are completely wrong. The evidence is against them. Federal assistance programs, from the land-grant colleges to the GI bill of education, have brought no hint or suggestion of Government domination of schools.

Furthermore, Senate bill 1021 specifically reserves to States and municipalities their full authority to hire teachers and to determine the subjects taught. It leaves the States completely free to determine whether to use Federal aid for classroom construction or for teachers' salaries.

No charge of interference by the Federal Government with complete State and local control of education can legitimately be made.

Mr. President, one need not be a statistician to be able to recognize the urgent need for a Federal-aid-to-education program.

We only have to use our eyes. A visit to the school buildings of almost any city will reveal the crowded conditions under which millions of children receive their basic education. In Cleveland, Ohio, and in other communities throughout the Nation those in charge of the schools have to resort to the use of half-day sessions, instead of permitting the pupils to attend the full-day sessions they need for an adequate education.

One does not have to be a building inspector in order to note that millions of children are daily attending classes in dilapidated, dangerous firetraps.

Mr. President, we, as Senators, represent the people of our respective States. We truly represent the people of the United States. The welfare of the people throughout the Nation must be our first concern; and I am sure it is.

The people of the United States have consistently indicated their support for a program of Federal aid to education.

In a 1957 Gallup poll, this question was asked: "Do you favor or oppose Federal aid to help build new public schools?" Seventy-six percent of those questioned answered in the affirmative. Only 19 percent were opposed.

Mr. President, I am aware that President Kennedy's school program would cost Ohioans slightly more than the amount which would be returned to Ohio in the form of aid to education. Yet, I am confident Ohioans recognize the pressing need for this legislation and agree that education is a matter of national concern and not just a local problem.

We have an obligation to provide the finest possible education for all the schoolchildren of this country. They cannot be given the finest possible education in antiquated, overcrowded school buildings, with classes conducted by teachers who have received inadequate training, and who are there on an emergency or temporary basis.

We must begin now to correct the sorry deficiencies in our public school system. These problems will not disappear if we ignore them. They will only grow more acute.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to act favorably on this aid-to-education bill, so that we may better fulfill the basic right of every American child to the best education an affluent nation can provide.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to take a moment, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, and as the one who has the task of seeking to carry this bill through the Senate, to express, from the very bottom of my heart, my very deep appreciation to the Senator from Ohio for the very able speech which he has just delivered. I feel it could have been the so-called keynote speech in this debate. I would have been proud to make the speech the Senator from Ohio has just made.

It was necessary for me in my position to make a speech earlier this afternoon explaining and describing the bill, rather than going into the substantive matters which the Senator from Ohio has so ably gone into. However, I wish to say, without fear of successful contradiction—and the debate in the next few days will prove how right I am—that the speech of the Senator from Ohio cannot be successfully rebutted. I will tell the Senate why it cannot be successfully rebutted. There is no debater in the Senate who can succeed in debating against the interests of the little boys and girls of America. That is what the Senator from Ohio is talking about. I do not care what forensic legerdemain is dredged up on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the bill—there is no Senator, in my judgment, who can deny, on any logical ground, to the little boys and girls of America what they are clearly entitled to from a moral and economic standpoint, and that is an equal break in educational opportunity in the United States.

There are thousands and thousands of boys and girls who are being denied that equal break, as I pointed out this afternoon. I wish to thank the Senator from Ohio for making that point in his speech very clear.

May I say for the RECORD, and for the benefit of other Senators, that the Senator from Ohio, coming from one of the so-called richer States, evaluated on the basis of Federal income payments, recognizes the people of his State will have to pay somewhat more—not a great deal

more—than theoretically they are going to get returned to Ohio by way of Federal aid to education in Ohio. By doing that, however, they are not in any way cheating Ohio; they are enriching Ohio, because, as we build up the minimum standards of education for all the boys and girls of this country, under the equalization formula of S. 1021, we benefit every person everywhere in America. On this point we are dealing with a national need, as the Senator from Ohio recognizes, and as I hope every other Senator will recognize. With the mobility of our population, we would perform a disservice to the people of Ohio, to the people of my State, and to the people of any other State, if we permitted areas of submarginal educational standards to continue to exist, because it would strike a serious blow, not only at the culture and economy of America, but the security of America.

I close my commendation of the Senator's speech by saying that, in urging the adoption of S. 1021, we are urging the strengthening of the greatest defense weapon America has. We are urging the strengthening of the greatest security protection America has. And what is it? The education of the people of this country, starting at the age of 5, on through the elementary and secondary schools, to the colleges of America.

Let me stress again, and I will be heard to say it over and over again in the next few days, because, in my judgment, it is an unanswerable argument, we cannot justify a continuation of the wasting of the mental resources of America. We are wasting them. Let me also point out to the American people that Russia is not making that mistake. Russia and the Communist world recognize the importance of developing the intellectual potential of their country.

We are not going to get ahead of Russia in manpower, as I have said before, but we must in brainpower.

When I make this plea for establishing in our law for the first time the principal of Federal aid to education, I am offering the Congress the opportunity to strengthen the greatest defense weapon we have; namely, the intellectual potential of the boys and girls of America.

I thank the Senator from Ohio for what I consider to be not only a wonderful speech, but an unanswerable contribution to this debate.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I express my sincere gratitude to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who is a great leader in this body.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and at the conclusion of any other business I shall move for an adjournment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon some questions, because I think it will be extremely important to our colleagues who will have to vote on the issue to understand clearly the rationale of this bill in terms of allocation. I know the Senator from Oregon will answer the question in his customary candor, in a desire to bring enlightenment to those who will have to consider the matter.

In view of the fact that we have liberalized in the bill the uses to which the funds can be put, making them applicable to both construction and teachers' salaries. This places a greater premium than heretofore on the question of allocation. In other words, the impact of this bill will really be based, to a material extent, upon what every State gets out of it in actual money because of its flexibility in use.

Mr. MORSE. I agree to that statement.

Mr. JAVITS. I think it would be useful if we started with S. 1021, which was the fundamental bill which was before the committee, in order to see just how it proposed to allocate these funds, and to ask the Senator the following question. Under S. 1021, was it not our purpose to allocate a given sum which was authorized for appropriation by fixing a base amount which every State was to have per pupil of public school age, and then have an allocation formula based upon need? Was it not built upon those two foundations?

Mr. MORSE. The first plan, as the Senator from New York knows, as a very able and helpful member of the subcommittee, was to fix the figure at $15 per child, and then based on average daily attendance, as the fixed amount that each State would receive for each child. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Then the changes that were made in that formula by the full committee, after the subcommittee brought it to the full committee, were to increase the amount by having a set figure, which for the 3 years is set at $850 million, and to drop out the $15 which was the base figure, but, nevertheless, to continue the application of the same allocation formula to a larger amount that we dropped out of the base figure. Is that a fair characterization of what we did?

Mr. MORSE. That is a fair characterization.

Mr. JAVITS. Also, we changed the formula by including all children of school age, whether or not they were attending public school.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That is why we arrived at the higher figure, with different ratios for the schools.

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. The allotment ratio, as it is called in the bill, interests me greatly, and I think it will interest our colleagues. I should like to ask the Senator a question on that point.

Is there any rationale whatever for utilizing an approach which provides that only one-half the amount which is allocated to the States, rather than the total allocation, is based upon the relationship of the income per child per State to the national income per child for the Nation as a whole?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be frank and honest with the Senator on that question. After we looked at all the alternatives, as I said earlier this afternoon, the final formula involved the exercise of what we thought was an act of judgment to give us the fairest result. We looked at all the alternatives, and the majority of us decided that would give us the formula which we thought would be of fair and equitable assistance to each State and would at the same time give us a maximum amount of equalization within the framework of the total money we would have available for authorization and, we hoped, for appropriation.

As the Senator knows, he and I completely agree there ought to be Federal aid to education. We vary in regard to the formula which ought to be adopted for administering the funds. All I can say is that we adopted the division of funds arrived at, as the Senator outlined, because we thought that, looking at the picture as a whole, it would give us the fairest distribution of the funds, all States considered.

Mr. JAVITS. In view of the fact that the so-called Cooper-Javits formula, which I have already had printed as an amendment, is premised upon the concept of a minimum foundation education in each State and conditions the allocations upon that basis, will the Senator tell us how he calculates the formula used by the committee, which is before the Senate in the pending bill, will in any way contribute toward a minimum educational floor in terms of the education of the individual student in the individual State? In other words, what in the Senator's plan—and I use that term only illustratively and not advisedly—is a substitute for what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I have tried to do in our foundation plan, by setting a minimum objective toward which the Federal Government would contribute?

Mr. MORSE. We do not think that in order to provide a fair distribution of the funds, so as to guarantee what we think is the maximum amount of equalization among the several States, there is any particular virtue in providing a fixed-sum amount, such as $15 per student. We do not think there is anything about that particular principle which would cause us to advocate the Senator's formula over our formula. We are satisfied that the formula we have proposed, which is the formula the Senate adopted last year, would assure, in the application of the formula to each State, what would amount to a guarantee of a fixed total sum and, in addition, would make it possible for us to equalize a little more equitably than would be the case if we followed the formula of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky.

When the formula is applied, in effect, New York will get a rather definite fixed sum of money, as will Oregon and every other State, but that does not mean we can sit down with a lead pencil and say, "We are going to multiply the number of students by $15 per student, and we have assurance that that will be the amount of money we will get."

Mr. JAVITS. I do not think that was quite the thrust of my question, but perhaps I did not explain it properly. I was really thinking about the foundation idea contained in our formula, toward which the Federal Government is contributing; the idea of a minimum education per child as defined by an optimum sum of money, which is $400 per pupil per year,

which happens to be the national average expenditure.

Is there something in the Senator's formula—and again I use the word illustratively—which is a substitute for this idea of setting an objective which the Federal Government is to ask States, as well as itself, to realize as an aspiration?

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's question. I should like to have the RECORD show that we do not accept the concept of the Cooper-Javits formula of a fixed-sum guarantee to each State based upon a fixed amount of $15 per student.

I shall be very frank with the Senator. That is out, so far as the formula in the bill is concerned, and we think that fact strengthens the bill. We think it is more fair to have it out, because we think we are able to equalize a little better and thus to guarantee to a greater extent the minimum standard of education, for which the Senator argues, under our formula than would be true under his formula.

Mr. JAVITS. So far as we are concerned, the $15 really is not related to that part of our formula which sets a minimum foundation basis for the education of the individual child.

I do not wish to put words in the Senator's mouth. We are both too good lawyers for that.

I understand the Senator to be expressing the view that there is nothing in the formula of the bill which seeks to meet that foundation concept.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Because the majority simply does not feel that concept is either desirable or necessary.

Mr. MORSE. We say it is not necessary.

Mr. JAVITS. I think that is a fair statement. I wanted to have that statement for the information of Senators, so that we may understand our differences.

Mr. MORSE. We do not think it is necessary.

Mr. JAVITS. I thoroughly believe that we need a Federal-aid-to-education bill. Our disagreement in this regard is only upon the method of making it the best possible bill and, at the same time, being the most hardheaded about money.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I are concerned about the fact that we believe the same objectives could be served and that the monetary amount expended could be reduced by $250 million, which is certainly nothing to be lightly laid aside, if the formula were more like our own instead of what is in the bill. We have the feeling that the committee, in the desire to proceed as it did and to be of somewhat more help to the so-called middle States—that is, those between the highest income and the lowest income—strained itself more than the purposes of the bill required. I think this is a fair statement of our point of view, and it is in no way a reflection upon the committee. This difference merely represents a disagreement between us.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is a fair statement of our difference in point of view.

In the same spirit, I reply to the Senator by saying that I draw no invidious comparison when I present the point of view of the majority briefly. We think that when we are dealing with a difference of $250 million, in round numbers, we are dealing with a proposed expenditure which could not possibly involve the waste of a single cent.

Last year the Senate passed a bill which provided for $916 million. We are offering a bill this year to provide for $850 million. The amount for which the Senator so ably argued in the committee, and again today, is $666 million.

In my judgment, $850 million is still a very modest sum. When I think of the need of the schools of this country, I do not think there ought to be very much disagreement among those of us who are supporting the principle of Federal aid to education by reason of too strenuous a difference over a formula merely because one formula would provide $250 million more of expenditures than the other formula.

I consider the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] on our team. Our only difference is over the distribution of available funds, which would involve a formula, and therefore would involve the total amount of funds. I do not wish to see us get into such a position that our opponents would be successful through the use of the divide-and-rule technique.

I respect the Senator's difference with me on this question. I do not prefer his formula. I believe ours is the better formula. But he feels just as sincerely the other way.

On behalf of my committee I wish to say a word about our point of view with regard to the group of States in the middle to which the Senator has referred. There is a group of States in the middle. I do not believe they are treated under the Cooper-Javits formula as equitably as they would be under the formula which the majority of the committee has approved. I believe that the so-called poorer States and the richer States would be given treatment to the disadvantage of the so-called middle group of States.

Furthermore, as I said in committee—and I know the Senator did not share my point of view—10 of the 20 poor States are not making an effort in comparison with their ability to pay that the block of States in the middle are making. The Senator from New York reversed that argument on me in committee by saying he thought it was pretty good that 10 were making the effort.

That result is not good enough for me. I think before we "discriminate"—and I use the term advisedly—against the interests of the middle group of States, the entire group of 20 States in the lower bracket ought at least to make the same effort in accordance with their ability to pay as do the middle States.

The Senator from New York knows my argument on my last point. He does not agree with it. He answered it in committee from his standpoint. But I still hold to my point of view. I think from the standpoint of the problem of getting legislation passed in the Senate, our formula is preferable for the reason that if the Cooper-Javits formula were selected, we would have to draw a line somewhere. That line would be between the 15th and 16th States, between the 14th and 15th States, between the 16th and 17th States, depending upon where the line is drawn. But the line must be drawn, and it would be an arbitrary line. The moment such a line were drawn, both Senators and Representatives in those States would say, "Why did you draw the line at that point? Why did you not draw it between the 18th and 19th States or the 19th and 20th States?"

So when all is said and done, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] had also reached the problem that the majority of us had also reached, of exercising a judgment.

Subjective factors enter into judgments such as those. I know, and am perfectly willing to admit, that we must exercise judgment as to where the line is to be drawn in order to get what we feel is a fair result. But a line must be drawn. We do not think the result is particularly unfair. That is our honest difference. While the formula is referred to as my formula, it is not mine except in the sense that it bears my name since I am the author of the bill. But I think that we have offered a bill that is less arbitrary and would have fewer arbitrary results than the formula presented by the Senators from New York and Kentucky.

Mr. JAVITS. In reply to that argument, I say that as we examine the record of the middle income States, we observe that they have far less need and they certainly do not on the whole, considering them on the average, do any more to their educational system than do the lowest income States. The formula chosen by the committee constricts both the top and bottom for the benefit of people in the middle income States, who really do not need it. So we would not be serving the objective we seek to serve, and we would be penalizing to some extent States which need the help most urgently, and also States which pay the most, as these comparisons show. The figures for my own State and other industrial States are reduced even over and above what the original committee bill (S. 1021) proposed for them.

I tried to develop in this colloquy with the Senator from Oregon what might be helpful, because Senators will read the RECORD, and sometimes the written word is a little more understandable than is the spoken word.

Mr. MORSE. May I add at that point——

Mr. JAVITS. I was about to ask to have printed in the RECORD some charts.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest that the Senator go ahead.

Mr. JAVITS. I will yield at this point.

Mr. MORSE. I believe that we have explained with complete clarity the difference between the two formulas so far as the principles are concerned. Our formula provides, in contrast with the Cooper-Javits formula, that the difference in financial amounts will be distributed among a certain group of States. It would take away from the richer States and the poorer States. But our answer to that argument is that we believe it would be fair in order to give an overall balanced program for 50 States. We think, most respectfully, that the Cooper-Javits formula would result in too much for both the richer States and the poorer States. We feel that there must be a challenge to the poorer States to increase their effort a bit, so that they would spend a larger percentage of their income based upon their ability to pay for educational purposes. We believe the richer States would not in any way be injured or harmed by being asked to make the contribution which we request under our formula.

But I want the RECORD to show that we would not penalize the richer States except in terms of comparison with the Cooper-Javits formula.

The question is whether or not the committee formula—and I prefer that name for it—is fair to the richer States.

I see the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] on his feet. I believe it would be agreed that he comes from one of the richer States. I think he will say that he believes at least a majority of the committee has made a case in equity for the formula, and that it is not unfair to the richer States.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I will yield in a minute. Since the Senator from Oregon has made a comment on the State of Pennsylvania, I point out that the State of Pennsylvania would receive more money under the committee formula than it would either under the administration bill or our formula. So I do not think that case is particularly illustrative.

I hope that Senators from the so-called large taxpaying States will vote for a Federal-aid-to-education bill. I think on the whole most of us are committed to the principle of bringing up the level of education in this country by Federal aid. We are not committed, however, to the principle of making a contribution to States that do not need it. I think this is one of the real arguable points with respect to the formula.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I have the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I thought the Senator from Oregon had the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I will yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I think I will wait until I can obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in proper juxtaposition——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Linked with what the Senator from New York said about the State of Pennsylvania, I should like to say that although my State does not suffer a great deal, I want the RECORD to show that the State of Oregon would receive less per child under the committee formula than it would under the Cooper-Javits formula. But I think the committee bill would be fair to the State of Oregon. When the Senator finishes I would like to ask to have printed in the RECORD a table showing what the distribution of the funds under the so-called Morse formula would be.

Mr. JAVITS. I know the Senators very well, and I am not in the remotest way indicating that their judgment was influenced on this account. I am confident that they did their utmost to arrive at a formula in the best way they thought would get the bill passed, and would accomplish the job that they felt needed to be done. We felt the same way.

I was referring to that point only because the Senator was giving the example of the State of Pennsylvania as a State in that category, which it is not, by virtue of the way the figures fell, with no implication whatever of that kind. I would be the first to renounce any such implication.

Mr. MORSE. I did not mean to imply it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD a chart which shows the distribution by States in the 3 years of its effectiveness of the application of the formula which is contained in the Cooper-Javits amendments.

I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a chart showing the original allocation of the bill, S. 1021, as it came from the subcommittee to the full committee.

I suggest that Members of the Senate read the charts to make their comparisons with the chart contained at page 4 of the committee report, which represents an estimate of the allocation under the pending bill by way of the implementation of the arguments which have been made by the Senator from Oregon and myself.

There being no objection, the charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Javits' revision of Cooper formula moved in subcommittee—Estimated State allotments

3 years; $20 per child guaranteed every State; equalization up to about 2:1 (1st year) and 3:1 (4th year) in neediest States (reaching 15 States below 75 percent of national average income in 3d year)

	1st year	2d year	3d year		1st year	2d year	3d year
New York	$48,905,680	$48,905,680	$48,905,680	Wisconsin	$12,932,920	$12,932,920	$12,932,920
Delaware	1,457,840	1,457,840	1,457,840	California	63,279,320	63,279,320	63,279,320
Illinois	29,449,960	29,449,960	29,449,960	New Hampshire	1,889,720	1,889,720	1,889,720
New Jersey	18,423,860	18,423,860	18,423,860	Michigan	29,679,420	29,679,420	29,679,420
Connecticut	8,380,860	8,380,860	8,380,860	Indiana	16,719,420	16,719,420	16,719,420
Rhode Island	2,292,200	2,292,200	2,292,200	Oregon	6,608,020	6,608,020	6,608,020
Massachusetts	15,569,280	15,469,280	15,569,280	Washington	11,278,460	11,278,460	11,278,460
Alaska	721,140	721,140	721,140	Minnesota	12,118,660	12,118,660	12,118,660
Pennsylvania	34,964,360	34,964,360	34,964,360	Nebraska	5,171,740	5,171,740	5,171,740
Missouri	13,614,620	13,614,620	13,614,620	Wyoming	1,285,200	1,285,200	1,285,200
Iowa	10,598,740	10,598,740	10,598,740	Colorado	6,757,240	6,757,240	6,757,240
Montana	2,656,000	2,656,000	2,656,000	Vermont	1,295,220	1,295,220	1,295,220
Florida	17,217,740	17,217,740	17,217,740	New Mexico	4,041,580	4,659,874	6,343,866
Arizona	4,584,880	4,584,880	4,584,880	West Virginia	8,328,400	11,625,834	15,096,000
Kansas	8,558,780	8,558,780	8,558,780	Georgia	15,786,060	22,289,542	28,867,066
Texas	36,736,260	36,736,260	36,736,260	Utah	4,533,984	6,318,792	8,103,600
Maine	3,574,420	3,574,420	3,574,420	Tennessee	16,126,150	22,130,874	28,115,600
Virginia	14,945,960	14,945,960	14,945,960	Alabama	21,733,450	27,473,458	33,213,466
Hawaii	2,646,880	2,646,880	2,646,880	North Carolina	31,696,266	40,012,666	48,329,066
Oklahoma	9,270,180	9,270,180	9,270,180	Arkansas	13,272,366	16,309,916	19,347,466
North Dakota	2,421,860	2,421,860	2,932,400	South Carolina	22,629,300	27,067,584	31,505,866
Louisiana	12,618,160	12,618,160	17,521,066	Mississippi	22,177,734	25,965,666	29,753,600
South Dakota	2,731,940	2,731,940	3,799,600				
Kentucky	11,088,280	11,141,750	15,761,866	$20 per child, United States	640,354,520	640,354,520	640,354,520
Idaho	2,943,800	3,345,416	4,572,000	Equalization	52,729,930	96,803,932	153,863,152
Maryland	10,493,760	10,493,760	10,493,760				
Ohio	33,719,520	33,719,520	33,719,520	Total	693,084,450	737,158,452	794,217,672
Nevada	1,122,660	1,122,660	1,122,660				

States ranked by income per public school child. States below the line receive equalization grants (more than $20 per pupil). District of Columbia included in totals, at $2,034,220 each year.

Allotments computed as ¼ the amount by which minimum foundation exceeds 4 percent of State income, or $20 per public school child, whichever is larger. Minimum foundation is product of number of pupils in ADA in public elementary and secondary schools times $350 1st year, $375 2d year, $400 3d year. Pupils for 1959–60 school year. State personal income, 3-year average 1957–59. Increase in school enrollment not projected.

Estimated allotments to States under the proposed administration School Assistance Act of 1961: Fiscal year 1962, fiscal year 1963, fiscal year 1964

States	Fiscal year 1962		Fiscal year 1963		Fiscal year 1964	
	Amount per State	Amount per pupil in average daily attendance in public schools	Amount per State	Amount per pupil in average daily attendance in public schools	Amount per State	Amount per pupil in average daily attendance in public schools
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Total [1]	$666,000,000	$19.75	$766,000,000	$22.04	$866,000,000	$24.22
Alabama	19,691,692	27.27	22,583,245	31.06	25,327,454	34.65
Alaska	555,000	15.00	645,000	15.00	750,000	15.00
Arizona	6,260,276	22.60	7,619,234	25.74	9,043,884	28.71
Arkansas	10,538,844	28.18	11,874,871	32.09	13,101,790	35.80
California	52,733,321	16.82	64,313,909	19.16	76,414,133	21.37
Colorado	7,157,176	19.83	8,630,311	22.58	10,074,516	25.19
Connecticut	6,600,000	15.00	6,960,000	15.00	7,305,000	15.00
Delaware	1,155,000	15.00	1,215,000	15.00	1,290,000	15.00
Florida	19,120,968	20.65	23,494,752	23.52	28,120,464	26.23
Georgia	22,014,247	26.05	25,488,608	29.67	28,859,731	33.10
Hawaii	3,121,256	22.95	3,711,812	26.14	4,285,832	29.16
Idaho	3,760,723	24.91	4,339,997	28.37	4,872,393	31.64
Illinois	23,310,000	15.00	24,060,000	15.00	24,780,000	15.00
Indiana	16,956,529	18.51	19,671,096	21.08	22,317,020	23.52
Iowa	11,280,457	21.20	13,016,980	24.15	14,680,475	26.94
Kansas	9,445,918	21.97	11,033,685	25.02	12,613,723	27.91
Kentucky	14,583,887	24.97	16,638,833	28.44	18,558,615	31.72
Louisiana	15,034,329	23.56	17,525,995	26.84	19,997,176	29.94
Maine	4,125,926	22.30	4,750,050	25.40	5,326,446	28.33
Maryland	8,976,670	16.09	10,773,691	18.32	12,629,855	20.44
Massachusetts	11,700,000	15.00	12,090,000	15.00	13,273,515	16.09
Michigan	27,070,253	17.67	32,079,528	20.13	37,150,155	22.45
Minnesota	13,062,937	20.28	15,270,830	23.10	17,445,053	25.77
Mississippi	14,687,654	29.67	16,255,415	33.80	17,565,544	37.69
Missouri	12,246,808	17.03	14,064,931	19.40	15,795,929	21.64
Montana	2,919,012	20.85	3,419,626	23.75	3,920,101	26.49
Nebraska	5,321,259	20.00	6,129,038	22.78	6,912,416	25.41
Nevada	$952,274	$15.87	$1,174,979	$18.08	$1,411,359	$20.16
New Hampshire	1,734,218	17.70	2,035,633	20.15	2,337,963	22.48
New Jersey	14,400,000	15.00	14,985,000	15.00	15,555,000	15.00
New Mexico	5,275,194	24.88	6,263,277	28.34	7,302,037	31.61
New York	37,650,000	15.00	38,715,000	15.00	39,735,000	15.00
North Carolina	27,905,485	27.25	32,093,440	31.04	36,142,562	34.62
North Dakota	3,100,067	24.60	3,558,869	28.02	3,969,490	31.26
Ohio	28,735,988	16.30	33,879,936	18.56	39,031,368	20.71
Oklahoma	11,951,838	24.39	13,723,715	27.78	15,400,110	30.99
Oregon	7,095,843	20.10	8,356,592	22.89	9,601,681	25.54
Pennsylvania	26,880,000	15.00	30,986,280	17.06	34,942,097	19.03
Rhode Island	1,800,000	15.00	1,845,000	15.00	1,974,787	15.67
South Carolina	15,228,456	28.25	17,537,616	32.18	19,776,441	35.89
South Dakota	3,262,057	23.81	3,796,681	27.12	4,295,246	30.25
Tennessee	19,542,885	26.13	22,526,242	29.76	25,390,845	33.19
Texas	40,262,707	21.40	47,368,850	24.38	54,438,623	27.19
Utah	5,778,627	25.34	6,725,922	28.87	7,662,943	32.20
Vermont	1,459,990	21.16	1,638,770	24.10	1,827,851	26.88
Virginia	17,846,093	22.88	20,821,009	26.06	23,746,498	29.07
Washington	11,408,373	19.67	13,486,454	22.40	15,567,293	24.99
West Virginia	10,658,865	25.56	12,110,817	29.11	13,443,253	32.47
Wisconsin	11,615,012	17.63	13,630,443	20.07	15,650,932	22.39
Wyoming	1,541,357	21.11	1,803,631	24.05	2,065,380	26.82
District of Columbia	1,620,000	15.00	1,620,000	15.00	1,635,000	15.00
Guam	363,080	27.93	445,341	31.81	567,685	35.48
Puerto Rico	14,243,895	27.93	17,050,201	31.81	19,904,454	35.48
Virgin Islands	167,575	27.93	190,800	31.81	212,882	35.48

[1] 50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands.

School Assistance Act of 1961—Estimated allotments to States under S. 1021, title I, as reported by the committee, fiscal year 1962

State	Amount	Amount per school-age (5 to 17 inclusive) child
(1)	(2)	(3)
50 States, District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	$850,000,000	$18.54
Alabama	24,005,156	26.70
Alaska	1,111,660	18.53
Arizona	7,405,140	21.84
Arkansas	12,867,468	27.79
California	46,230,357	12.45
Colorado	8,896,358	19.09
Connecticut	5,215,540	9.26
Delaware	1,239,501	10.59
Florida	21,923,016	19.30
Georgia	28,045,856	25.61
Hawaii	3,739,329	21.74
Idaho	4,408,622	23.83
Illinois	31,516,867	13.11
Indiana	22,781,255	18.75
Iowa	14,386,515	20.41
Kansas	11,111,415	20.20
Kentucky	21,409,762	25.86
Louisiana	22,202,969	24.35
Maine	5,175,297	21.84
Maryland	13,681,203	17.23
Massachusetts	14,789,751	13.38
Michigan	37,928,701	17.65
Minnesota	18,395,829	20.67
Mississippi	17,480,858	27.79
Missouri	18,520,779	18.09
Montana	3,888,736	20.80
Nebraska	7,357,227	20.05
Nevada	1,040,292	13.69
New Hampshire	2,726,162	19.47
New Jersey	16,592,271	11.98
New Mexico	6,370,666	24.22
New York	40,652,380	10.90
North Carolina	33,751,156	26.41
North Dakota	4,535,574	25.20
Ohio	$39,517,893	$16.16
Oklahoma	12,602,078	22.50
Oregon	9,042,171	19.49
Pennsylvania	44,026,417	16.56
Rhode Island	3,433,585	17.08
South Carolina	20,398,967	27.79
South Dakota	4,459,796	23.60
Tennessee	23,526,845	25.30
Texas	58,063,833	21.84
Utah	6,321,123	23.67
Vermont	2,083,288	22.16
Virginia	23,803,278	22.65
Washington	12,976,374	17.73
West Virginia	12,913,602	24.60
Wisconsin	20,021,484	19.61
Wyoming	1,793,553	19.93
District of Columbia	1,565,588	9.26
American Samoa	194,541	27.79
Guam	500,247	27.79
Puerto Rico	21,093,754	27.79
Virgin Islands	277,915	27.79

School Assistance Act of 1961—Estimated allotments to States under S. 1021, title I, as reported by the committee, fiscal year 1962—Continued

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the colloquy between my good friends from New York and Oregon. As a member of the subcommittee who labored arduously in an effort to get as much unanimity both in the subcommittee and within the full committee as was possible, in view of the radically different views as to what the formula should be, I should like to make a brief statement of my own point of view.

In the first place, I believe we must handle the distribution of the funds, in the last analysis, on an empirical basis. There is no "pat" formula which meets all cases and all equities. In the end we must attempt to deal as justly as we can with the needs of all of the 50 States.

We found, when we went from the subcommittee to the full committee, that the formula which we had adopted appeared grossly unfair to the States of Rhode Island, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and New York. At least so it seemed to a majority of us on the Democratic side of the full committee. We, therefore, adjusted the formula in order to provide what some of us felt was a fair distribution to those States.

We found also that we had to make special provision for Alaska, because no formula would fairly fit that State. I am of the view that we did an injustice to the District of Columbia. By a floor amendment later this week I shall endeavor to get the consent of the Senate to remedy that situation.

I believe in the end we arrived at the fairest formula that men of good will, earnestly seeking to arrive at a just solution, were able to evolve. In saying that, I do not wish in any way to criticize, expressly or impliedly, the strongly-held view of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky, that the foundation, as advocated by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and later picked up by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] with his customary vigilance and ability, is not a workable formula, and does not have much to be

said for it. Clearly it does. They have one way of handling the problem. We have another.

I wish to make the RECORD clear that the Senator from Oregon and the other members of the committee on our side of the aisle on the full committee paid very careful attention to the formula of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky. We concluded that ours was better. Our colleagues in the Senate may disagree. I am sure the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky do. I honor their sincerity and their belief. However, this is an honest effort to solve a difficult problem in the best way we can do it.

Let me say also that there was a great "to do" as to whether all school-age children should be included in the formula, as was done last year in the McNamara bill, and as had been done previously on a number of occasions, although I have not made any historical research on the subject, or whether the formula should include only the children in average daily attendance in public schools.

A very plausible case can be made for including private schoolchildren. I believe that an equally good argument can be made for excluding them. But, in the end, whether we include them or exclude them, I submit the test of the formula is whether on the whole, empirically, it meets the test of fair-minded men as being a pretty good way of handling a very difficult problem, to which there is no ideal solution.

I believe we have arrived at that pretty good way, because we have met two tests: First, is our solution a national solution? Does it recognize the fact that education is a national problem? The child growing up in Mississippi may mature and live in Pennsylvania during his or her working life. Therefore, the citizens of Pennsylvania have a real national interest in seeing to it that the child from Mississippi is as well educated as is possible to arrange through the help of as much Federal aid to education as it is possible to get Congress to pass and the President to sign.

Whether we arrive at the figures on the basis of all children of school age or only of children in average daily attendance in public schools, the end result is a substantial amount of equalization, and the children from the poorer States, on a per capita income basis, get substantially more. I ask my friend from Oregon if my recollection is not correct that in one instance, at least, they would get 3½ times as much as the children of the richest State, which I believe to be Connecticut.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. They would not get as much more as my friend from Kentucky or my friend from New York would like to see them get. However, I believe they would get enough more. I think the formula which we adopted is fair to the so-called middle income States, where there is also a substantial differential. The differential is not as great. The formula could have been changed around to make it work some other way. However, I would like to say for the record, for the benefit of Senators who may wish to read it, that those of us on the subcommittee and on the full committee who are responsible for the bill reported to the Senate felt that we had earnestly and conscientiously achieved a fair result, which we now present to our colleagues in the Senate with some pride of authorship.

We regret that our friends from Kentucky and New York do not agree with us. We honor their position. However, this is a standard which we are content to place before the Senate for its determination.

If it is possible for a Member of the Senate to resent a little what some members of the press have been saying about the action of the committee, I should like to make very clear that we did not, as has been charged in some newspapers, doctor the bill to get votes from the South. Whatever doctoring was done was to make it fairer to States in the North—New Jersey, Rhode Island, Massachusetts. We thought the earlier formula was unjust.

Pennsylvania fares well under this formula. As the Senator from New York has stated, it fares better under this formula than it would fare under any other formula. Nevertheless, I think the formula is fair and just to Pennsylvania. I have no apologies to make for the extra millions of dollars which would come to my State because of the adoption of this particular formula.

I think I know something about the educational needs of my State, having just spent a year serving on the Pennsylvania Governor's Commission for Education. I assure Senators that there is not a boy or girl in Pennsylvania who does not need every nickel of this relatively minor amount of Federal aid which the bill, if passed, would give him. That is equally true of the boys and girls of every one of the other 49 States. I have no apologies to make for what the bill means to Pennsylvania. I am happy about the money our State would get.

I wish we could get more. I feel that in the years to come the program will have to be expanded, not curtailed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Pennsylvania is not in a position to say, because his modesty prevents him from saying it. I can testify that the Senator from Pennsylvania in no way advocated this formula merely because his State would fare better under the formula than it would fare under either the average daily attendance formula of the original S. 1021 or under the Cooper-Javits formula.

The Senator from Pennsylvania worked diligently during our executive sessions—and we worked long and hard on this question. For more than 2 hours, late one afternoon, we talked with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and experts from his department in an informal conference.

In fact, as the RECORD will show, we recessed a committee meeting, and we gave full notice to the Senators on the Republican side of the table that we were taking the recess so that we could have a conference with the spokesmen for the administration. Throughout that conference and throughout all my conversations with the Senator from Pennsylvania within the subcommittee, he continued to say, over and over again, that what he wanted was what would prove to be a most fair, a most equitable, and a most just formula. Whatever that turned out to be, that was what he would favor. It was in that spirit that he approached his work on the committee.

After we consulted with the experts, we concluded that this formula, which was the same as the formula contained in the McNamara bill last year, in principle, was the one which would do the greatest amount of justice to the States as a whole.

I am glad the Senator from Pennsylvania said what he did about the effect of the formula on the Southern States. I join with him in his comment in regard to some of the newspaper articles which have been published. We did not make a political approach to the problem. We did not cut this cloth in order to fit a political pattern. We cut the cloth to fit what we thought were the needs of all of the States. We cut the cloth in an endeavor to make certain that we did not skimp in any way on any part of the garment as it affected any particular State, or against the interest of that State.

I think that when we consider the so-called 3-to-1 ratio in respect to some of the Southern States, it will be seen that we are still giving them a full measure of support. I speak respectfully about some of the same Southern States. A few minutes ago I pointed out that in terms of economic wealth, some 10 of the 20 lowest States really have not made a contribution on the basis of their limited ability to pay in proportion to the contributions and educational needs that have been made to the group of States in the middle. We must be fair to the group of States in the middle. It was our opinion that the other formula did not do that; that the formula which we have adopted is the one which is the most just and equitable. That is why it was adopted.

I thought the RECORD should show the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania. As I have told him personally, I wish to tell him now on the record, I shall always appreciate the hard work, the long hours, and the devotion he gave to the work of our committee, which has reported what I believe is a fair and equitable formula.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his kind and gracious comments, undeserved though I believe them to be. In the interest of the

accuracy of the RECORD, I wish to make a slight addition or refinement to what I said earlier, when I referred to the ratio of 3½ to 1 between Connecticut and Mississippi. I was converting into children in average daily attendance from the formula which we finally adopted, which was based on all school-age children. If we take all school-age children, no State will receive more than 3 times as much per child as any other State; but if we eliminate private school children—and we had before us formulas and statistics which enabled us to do that—then we find actually, in terms of children in average daily attendance, a 3½-to-1 ratio.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have always felt there was a national responsibility for education, and I have voted for distribution formulas which gave a larger Federal grant to States having low per capita incomes, instead of standing out for equal per capita grants among the States. I have done this despite the fact that my own State, Illinois, is one of seven or eight States having the highest per capita income. So I think this policy is correct for the reasons which have been stated this afternoon; namely, that education is a national responsibility; and that because the population is mobile, and moves from low-income States to high-income States, in order to protect our future citizens, it is necessary, to raise the educational levels in the low-income States from whence labor comes.

I am not certain, however, that I can accept a 3-to-1 ratio. In times past, the ratio has been 2 to 1. I have accepted that ratio, but a 3-to-1 ratio is pretty rough.

Am I correct in my understanding that the original proposal of the administration was for a 2-to-1 ratio?

Mr. CLARK. Yes, it was. It was tentative; and it excluded private school children. That argument can be made up and down several hills and vales.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But regardless of whether we count children in public schools or count all school children, the ratio was roughly 2 to 1; that is, we ranged from 33 to 66 on the scale.

Mr. CLARK. I think it was 2½ to 1, according to what Mr. Lee, our staff assistant, tells me.

Mr. MORSE. 2½ to 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then it has been raised to 3 to 1?

Mr. CLARK. It has been raised to 3 to 1 on the basis of including all school children.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand that the effect of raising the ratio from 2 or 2½ to 1 to 3 to 1 has been to cause a dilution through taking, as the basis of computation, all children of school age rather than all public school children?

Mr. CLARK. It depends on what the Senator means by dilution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. States having higher income per capita tend to be also, do they not, the States having a high percentage of students in private and parochial schools?

Mr. CLARK. The generality is correct. There are certain specific exceptions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know; but is it not true that Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Illinois have a very high percentage of students in private schools?

Mr. CLARK. Although it seems curious, I think the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] will bear out the statement that New York and Pennsylvania fare quite differently. I am not quite certain why, because both States have large numbers of private school children. However, New York makes out worse than Pennsylvania despite that fact, because, I suppose, the over-all per capita income is higher in New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Apparently it is the question of the relationship between income and children of school age which produces this mathematical difference between Pennsylvania and New York, strange as that seemed to me when I read the figures.

Mr. CLARK. It is odd, because actually the State which gets the worst deal under the formula adopted by the committee is Connecticut, which has an enormous number of private school children.

I must inform my friend that the complications of these mathematics are somewhat beyond my comprehension. Therefore, as I said earlier, I believe we have to regard this matter empirically; and when we regard it empirically, I believe that on the whole it is rather fair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask a question. The Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Oregon objected to my use of the verb "dilute". Let me say, then, that the effect of increasing the ratio between the poorer States and the wealthier States has been mitigated by giving the public schools an allowance for the children who are not attending public schools.

Mr. CLARK. To some extent that is correct. There is also the problem of the middle-income States.

I am happy to yield now to the Senator from Oregon, so that he can discuss that aspect of the matter, on which no doubt he is better qualified to speak than am I.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I shall submit the figures later on, and perhaps I shall supplement them tomorrow.

But in making a comparison as between the administration's bill and the new bill, we find that under the original Senate bill 1021, which was based upon daily average attendance in public schools, the total amount of proposed funds was $666 million, and Illinois would have received $23,210,000, or $15 per student.

Under Senate bill 1021 as reported by the committee, the amount of money is $850 million, instead of $666 million; and with the formula calculated on the basis of the total school population between ages 5 and 17, and including both private school children and public school children, Illinois would receive $31,516,867, which would be only $13.11 per student, in contrast to the $15 under the administration's bill.

Mr. CLARK. However, that includes many children who are not in the public schools, I believe.

Mr. MORSE. But let me point out that it takes into account—and this is greatly to the advantage of Illinois—parochial school children, who constitute 22.5 percent of all school children. So I point out that I do not believe this provides any unfair discrimination against Illinois.

The next figure—I do not now have it at hand, but I shall get it for the Senator—will show how much Illinois would receive under both bills. I shall have that information for the Senator very soon, and I believe he will be pleased with the result, because it shows that the bill will not work to a very serious disadvantage for Illinois. But first I wish to check the figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A large part of increase from $23 million to $31 million is accounted for by the increase in the total authorization from $666 million to $850 million a year, because that is an increase of more than one-fourth, and that in itself would raise the share of Illinois by about $6 million a year.

Very frankly, I am somewhat dissatisfied with this proposal to devote to the public schools, funds based on the number of children who attend private schools, not public schools.

Mr. CLARK. I must say that I share some of the Senator's concern in that regard. But we have done that before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Last year I voted for the Lausche amendment, which undertook to change the method of computation.

Mr. CLARK. I agree that this is somewhat of a change. But before the Senator makes up his mind on that basis, I ask him—and I know he will—to test this matter pragmatically, and to remember that the Cooper-Javits amendment, for which a rather strong case can be made, although the amendment was rejected by the committee, would have made a differential of 6 to 1 as between the poorer States and the richer States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, let me say to the Senator from New York that he certainly demonstrates a great degree of national concern when he proposes to alter the formula still more to the disadvantage of the wealthier States. I wish to say that his capacity for absorbing punishment from the electorate is even greater than I thought it would be.

But I must say I think there is a limit, somewhere, to the degree to which one

can compel the wealthier States to raise the educational level of the poorer States. I think there is a responsibility for us to ask the wealthier States to help education in the poorer ones; there is no doubt about that. But whether it should be at a ratio of 3 to 1, I am uncertain; and I am astounded at the suggestion of a ratio of 6 to 1.

When I came on the floor, I was under the belief that the Javits formula would diminish the differential. But now I find, if I correctly understand the proposal, that the differential will be increased.

I hoped that I might support the Javits amendment. But if the facts in regard to it are as they have been stated, I shall have to oppose the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sorry I interrupted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall yield after I say that if the Senator from Illinois will examine the figures the Senator from Oregon will give to him, the Senator from Illinois will find that insofar as Illinois is concerned, the ratio is a little less than 3 to 1.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now have some figures which I wish to give to the Senator from Illinois. They are based on the $850 million total and on calculations based on average daily attendance. Let us now assume that we had taken the original administration bill, and that instead of having a total of $666 million, the total was $850 million, based upon average daily attendance. With the total $850 million, based upon the average daily attendance, in accordance with the original bill, Illinois would have received $21,574,236, figured on the basis of public school students in Illinois alone.

But if the total were $850 million, with both public school students and private school students considered in making the calculation, although with the money going only to the public schools, Illinois would receive $31,516,867, or, in round numbers, $10 million more. So it does not follow, as I analyze these statistics, that the difference is due entirely to the difference or the increase in the appropriation recommended. By including in the calculation the private school students—who, as I have already stated, constituted approximately 22.5 percent of the total school population in Illinois—the change in the formula is to the advantage of Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Personally, I am very dubious whether any State should take advantage of such a formula, because it is using the high proportion of students in private and parochial schools to further build up the public schools.

But on the question of having a ratio of 2 to 1 or a ratio of 3 to 1, it seems to me that in times past the furthest we have gone has been a ratio of 2 to 1.

Mr. MORSE. The staff advise me that the ratio was 3 to 1 in Senate bill 8, the McNamara bill of last year, when that bill was passed by the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the ratio in the Hill-Burton Act?

Mr. MORSE. It is 5 to 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not think the spread was so great.

Well, Mr. President, let me say here and now, as one who has supported larger amounts for poorer States, that there is a limit beyond which we cannot go.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am surprised to learn that under the Hill-Burton Act the ratio is 5 to 1. I think we should consider changing that formula when the matter again comes before us.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield, let me say that the Senator from Pennsylvania, who comes up for reelection next year, is well aware of the fact that there is a limit beyond which we cannot go.

Mr. MORSE. I supported the revision because it reduces the ratio in respect to the so-called poorer States over what the Cooper-Javits amendment would provide.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All I can say, then, is that it is less bad than the Cooper-Javits proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Second, the fact that we passed this formula last year in S. 8 augured well for its acceptance this year, because we thrashed it out then. It was fair then. I think it is fair now. I think the change from the average daily attendance is more equitable for the other States, including Illinois, when we adopt a formula here which is not to the disadvantage of Illinois, if we start with the assumption that the 3-to-1 ratio is equitable; and it is that assumption that the Senator challenges.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think we had better get the figures straight, because there is some misconception about them. The relative ratio between the Javits-Cooper formula and this formula comes out to about the same.

The reason is that we started from a higher base in our formula, whereas the committee formula started from a lower base. In the committee formula, the lowest figure is $9.26 per student in Connecticut, and the highest is $27.74 per student in Mississippi. This is a ratio of 3 to 1. In the Cooper-Javits formula, the lowest is $20 and the highest, for Mississippi, is $65.40. The next figure is $59.19.

I think it is important to understand the difference. I do not expect to absorb all that punishment, because the facts do not justify it. The difference is a philosophic difference. Whatever the Senate decides, we will hold the banner aloft in getting the bill passed.

Under our concept, it is the States in the middle level which do not do as well, whereas in the committee's concept it is the States in the middle level which do better.

Under our concept, we have the flat sum of $20 per student. The higher income States do somewhat better and the lower income States do somewhat better in total, rather than in ratio, whereas in the committee bill less money goes to the higher income States and the lower income States.

I agree with the Senator that there must be some reason for the proposition of higher income States helping the lower income States, and there must be a greater incentive. I am not satisfied we are doing all we should do in terms of incentive. That is way I was interested in the incentive idea. It is only fair to say for the record that the difference comes out of somebody. Somebody is always paying, no matter what formula is fixed. The difference is in balance as between the two formulas, the committee concept giving more to the middle income States than would the Cooper-Javits formula.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A very interesting arithmetical anomaly has appeared. The committee formula results in a difference of between $9 and $27. The formula of the Senator from New York creates a difference of between $20 and $65. It would seem as though the Senator from New York must be providing a much greater amount of money in order to give more to the low-income States and more to the high-income States. That is a piece of mathematical legerdemain which would do credit to Houdini.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from New York is providing less money by some $250,000 over the 3 years, because under our proposal, it is only the public schools which would be covered, and under our proposal there are more States by far that get the flat sum of $20 than under the committee proposal. So the mathematics develop in that way.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I simply want to add this probably to the further confusion of the Senator from Illinois, until he has an opportunity to study the tables. I say to the Senator from Illinois, as he studies the tables overnight—and he is a Senator who does his bookwork—that it is not only the first year we should be talking about. We should also be taking a look at the second and third years. In my judgment, the so-called Morse formula is preferable to the Cooper-Javits formula because in the second and third years, in many instances, it will be found, under the Cooper-Javits formula, that some of the poorer States get an increase in the ratio beyond 3 to 1.

The Morse formula has a tendency to maintain more nearly a level, so it remains more constant in the second and third years than under the Cooper-Javits proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD tables from the committee report bearing on this point, in addition to the tables I suggested a few minutes ago be inserted in the RECORD, showing the comparison of the two formulas.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Estimated allotments to States under S. 1021, title I, as amended by committee, May 11, 1961: Fiscal year 1962 [1]

State	Amount	Amount per school-age (5 to 17, inclusive) child	Percent of total authorization
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
50 States, District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	$850,000,000	$18.54	100.00
Alabama	24,005,156	26.70	2.82
Alaska	1,111,660	18.53	.13
Arizona	7,405,140	21.84	.87
Arkansas	12,867,468	27.79	1.51
California	46,230,357	12.45	5.44
Colorado	8,896,358	19.09	1.05
Connecticut	5,215,540	9.26	.61
Delaware	1,239,501	10.59	.15
Florida	21,923,016	19.30	2.58
Georgia	28,045,856	25.61	3.30
Hawaii	3,739,329	21.74	.44
Idaho	4,408,622	23.83	.51
Illinois	31,516,867	13.11	3.71
Indiana	22,781,255	18.75	2.68
Iowa	14,386,516	20.41	1.69
Kansas	11,111,415	20.20	1.31
Kentucky	21,409,762	25.86	2.52
Louisiana	22,202,960	24.35	2.61
Maine	5,175,297	21.84	.61
Maryland	13,681,203	17.23	1.61
Massachusetts	14,789,751	13.38	1.74
Michigan	37,928,701	17.65	4.47
Minnesota	18,395,829	20.67	2.16
Mississippi	17,480,858	27.79	2.06
Missouri	18,520,779	18.09	2.18
Montana	3,888,736	20.80	.46
Nebraska	$7,357,227	$20.05	0.87
Nevada	1,040,292	13.69	.12
New Hampshire	2,726,162	19.47	.32
New Jersey	16,592,271	11.98	1.95
New Mexico	6,370,666	24.22	.75
New York	40,652,380	10.90	4.79
North Carolina	33,751,156	26.41	3.97
North Dakota	4,535,574	25.20	.53
Ohio	39,517,893	16.16	4.65
Oklahoma	12,602,078	22.50	1.48
Oregon	9,042,171	19.49	1.06
Pennsylvania	44,026,417	16.56	5.18
Rhode Island	3,433,585	17.08	.40
South Carolina	20,398,967	27.79	2.40
South Dakota	4,459,796	23.60	.52
Tennessee	23,526,845	25.30	2.77
Texas	58,063,333	21.84	6.84
Utah	6,321,123	23.67	.74
Vermont	2,083,288	22.16	.25
Virginia	23,803,278	22.65	2.80
Washington	12,976,374	17.73	1.53
West Virginia	12,913,602	24.60	1.52
Wisconsin	20,021,484	19.61	2.36
Wyoming	1,793,553	19.93	.21
District of Columbia	1,565,588	9.26	.18
American Samoa	194,541	27.79	.02
Guam	500,247	27.79	.06
Puerto Rico	21,093,754	27.79	2.48
Virgin Islands	277,915	27.79	.03

[1] Allotments are based upon school-age (5 to 17 inclusive) population with no minimum allotment per pupil; allotment ratios with limits of 0.25 and 0.75; allotment ratios of 0.75 for American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; and an allotment ratio of 0.50 for Alaska.

Estimated allotments to States under S. 1021—Title I, based upon average daily attendance in public schools: Fiscal year 1962 [1]

State	State product	State allotment	Percent of total authorization
Total	$17,026,881	$850,000,000	100.00
Alabama	$528,793	$26,397,909	3.11
Alaska	18,500	923,540	.11
Arizona	168,111	8,392,280	.99
Arkansas	280,500	14,002,858	1.65
California	1,416,080	70,692,218	8.32
Colorado	192,196	9,594,629	1.13
Connecticut	124,212	6,200,795	.73
Delaware	19,250	960,980	.11
Florida	513,467	25,632,818	3.02
Georgia	591,162	29,511,435	3.47
Hawaii	83,817	4,184,234	.49
Idaho	100,989	5,041,478	.59
Illinois	432,167	21,574,236	2.54
Indiana	455,344	22,731,257	2.67
Iowa	302,921	15,122,138	1.78
Kansas	253,657	12,662,827	1.49
Kentucky	391,630	19,550,586	2.30
Louisiana	403,726	20,154,431	2.37
Maine	110,796	5,531,054	.65
Maryland	241,056	12,033,772	1.42
Massachusetts	267,319	13,344,849	1.57
Michigan	726,934	36,289,318	4.27
Minnesota	350,767	17,511,660	2.06
Mississippi	371,250	18,533,195	2.18
Missouri	328,871	16,417,590	1.93
Montana	78,386	3,913,112	.46
Nebraska	142,895	7,133,470	.84
Nevada	$25,572	$1,276,581	0.15
New Hampshire	46,570	2,324,824	.27
New Jersey	269,472	13,452,329	1.58
New Mexico	141,658	7,071,718	.83
New York	627,500	31,325,467	3.69
North Carolina	749,363	37,408,998	4.41
North Dakota	83,248	4,155,829	.49
Ohio	771,665	38,522,337	4.54
Oklahoma	320,950	16,022,165	1.88
Oregon	190,549	9,512,409	1.12
Pennsylvania	720,922	35,989,193	4.23
Rhode Island	39,756	1,984,662	.23
South Carolina	404,250	20,180,590	2.37
South Dakota	87,598	4,372,985	.51
Tennessee	524,797	26,198,424	3.08
Texas	1,081,199	53,974,603	6.35
Utah	155,177	7,746,601	.91
Vermont	39,206	1,957,205	.23
Virginia	479,232	23,923,771	2.81
Washington	306,356	15,293,617	1.80
West Virginia	286,229	14,288,856	1.68
Wisconsin	311,905	15,570,629	1.83
Wyoming	41,391	2,066,283	.24
District of Columbia	27,000	1,347,869	.16
Guam	9,750	486,730	.06
Puerto Rico	382,500	19,094,807	2.25
Virgin Islands	4,500	224,645	.03
American Samoa	3,750	187,204	.02

[1] Allotments are based upon average daily attendance in public schools with no minimum allotment per pupil; allotment ratios with limits of 0.25 and 0.75; allotment ratios of 0.75 for American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; and an allotment ratio of 0.50 for Alaska.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I conclude my statement by pointing out that the two figures I have given are the very maximum relationship in the third year, and that there is no greater relationship as between the States in the amendment which the Senator from Kentucky and I propose.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 16, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 104. An act to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico; and

S. 712. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 17, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 16, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Brockway McMillan, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas S. Estes, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Upper Volta.

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, to serve concurrently and without additional compen-

sation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

John S. Badeau, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Republic.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16, 1961:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

For appointment as indicated:

To be senior surgeons

Marvin S. Cashion
Louis S. Gerber
Dominick J. Lacovara
Louis J. Oropallo
Bernard F. Rosenblum

To be surgeons

Baruch S. Blumberg
Carleton R. Dean
Walter H. Freygang, Jr.
James P. Shortal
Chen Tung Sun
Hugh F. Williamson
Harold C. Woodworth

To be senior assistant surgeons

Ray A. Brinker
Vincent A. DiScala

To be senior dental surgeons

Charles J. Donnelly
Isadore J. Jarin
Harry J. Kunstadter
Louis L. Murzin

To be dental surgeon

Stanley Raynor

To be senior sanitary engineers

Clarence J. Feldhake
Jens A. Jensen
Daniel J. Weiner

To be sanitary engineer

Paul F. Woolrich

To be pharmacists

Cornelius B. Kelly, Jr.
Dwight D. Wendel

To be senior scientists

Elwin E. Bennington
William F. Buren
Leon O. Emik
Robert H. McCauley, Jr.
Herbert F. Schoof

To be scientist

Albert S. Perry

To be sanitarians

George J. Burton
James A. King
Wilbert R. McLean
Stephen Megregian

To be senior veterinary officer

Earl J. Catcott

To be nurse officers

Hilda H. Falls
Elsie K. Y. Ho
Ovelia Winstead

To be dietitians

Rebecca T. Crockett
Margaret L. Smith

To be therapists

Martha D. Collins
Edith W. Palmer

To be health services officers

Louisa E. Haas
Stanley I. Hirsch
Max T. McKee
Elsa J. Nelson
Albert E. Rhudy

For permanent promotions as indicated:

To be senior assistant surgeons

William J. Atkinson
John R. Baugh
George T. Harding, Jr.
Otto L. Loehden
Robert J. Warren
Frederick V. C. Feather-stone

To be senior assistant dental surgeon

James W. Knowles

To be senior sanitary engineer

Joseph L. Minkin

For appointment as indicated:

To be senior assistant surgeons

Paul H. Black
Sherman M. Weissman
Fred Gorstein
Jack Zusman

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

James E. Hamner III
Sherman L. Cox
Milton E. Schaefer
Loren F. Mills

To be assistant dental surgeons

Robert J. McCune
Philip M. Lightbody
Irwin Blumenthal
David R. Madsen
Steve D. Hunsaker
Richard E. Adams
Bryant G. Speed
James D. Ashman
Darrel D. Lee
James N. Franklin
Lloyd K. Croft
Kenton E. Nesbit
Merwyn C. Crump
Maurice A. Correy
Wayne E. Stroud
David Stevenson
Gerald C. Stanley
Kenneth J. Richter
Robert A. Cialone
Norman L. Clark

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

William C. Galegar

To be assistant sanitary engineers

James R. Coleman
John N. English
John A. Frierson

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers

G. Lee Christensen
Fred M. Reiff
Max E. Burchett
John K. Carswell
Samuel B. McKee
James H. Eagen
Howard J. Edde
John E. Hagan III
John M. Leach
Russel H. Wyer
William A. Felsing, Jr.
John D. Clem
Louis J. Breimhurst
Robert L. Bolin, Jr.
Robert H. Reeves
James V. Waskiewicz
Stuart F. Somers
Carl H. Johnson

To be senior assistant veterinary officers

Robert P. Botts
Allan C. Pier
Kirby I. Campbell
William A. Priester, Jr.
Philip H. Coleman

To be assistant veterinary officers

John O. Iversen
Billy E. Hooper
Robert G. Scholtens
William B. Henry, Jr.
Wendell E. Johnson

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The words of the Master, Matthew 28: 20: *Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*

Most merciful and gracious God, Thou art here with us in the fellowship of prayer and in the faith which calls upon Thee for guidance in pursuing the ways of reason and righteousness.

May our minds and hearts be animated and aglow with the comradeship and counsel of our blessed Lord for we humbly acknowledge that our finite wisdom is so fallible and our insight so limited.

Grant that we may feel the urgency of Thy divine appeal to give ourselves as partners and fellow workers in the great struggle against aggression, injustice, and inhumanity.

Show us how we may create an atmosphere of good will among the members of the human family and may the visions and hopes which we cherish of a world of peace and brotherhood soon be attained and fulfilled.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May 1961 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1619. An act to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old-series currency, and for other purposes.

S. 1852. An act to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 7030) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HOEVEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the provisions of this bill?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes. This legislation is exactly the same legislation as the House and Senate approved in 1958, when we had a similar flood condition. This permits farmers in flooded-out areas to move their allotment of acreage to higher ground. It will not increase the acreage by 1 acre, but it will permit them to have an income in 1961, continue their operations and liquidate their indebtedness. A large area is flooded with water. This winter and spring has been exceptionally cold and wet. Our farmers have experienced difficulty and disaster in 3 of the last 4 crop years.

Mr. HOEVEN. This applies just to 1961, and there is no cost whatever involved?

Mr. GATHINGS. It applies to 1961 only and there is no cost involved. This is emergency legislation that is needed immediately. If cotton is not planted before May 20 the chances are little yield will result.

Mr. HOEVEN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out of section 344(n) the figures "1958" and inserting the figures "1961".

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 344(n) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the figures '1958' where they first appear therein and inserting the figures '1961' and (2) by striking out the last two sentences thereof and inserting: 'Any farm allotment transferred under this paragraph shall be deemed to be released acreage for purposes of acreage history credits under sections 344(f)(8), 344(m)(2), and 377 of this Act.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORE "FREEDOM RIDERS"—MERCHANTS OF RACIAL HATRED

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the so-called "freedom riders" have obtained their goal. Their sole purpose in trespassing upon the South and its well established and understood customs was to create a deplorable and disturbing situation. This they have done. It is difficult for any southerner who understands the problems confronting our people to sympathize with this radical extremist group which has invaded our State. They got just what they asked for.

Every decent southerner deplores violence in this case; all of us understand the tremendous aggravation brought about by these self-annointed merchants of racial hatred.

When the group left Washington last week, the fanfare and publicity marking their departure made it clear that their motives were not those of good will and racial understanding. They deliberately set about to violate the laws of Alabama.

ELECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

WORTHINGTON OIL REFINERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1414) for the relief of the Worthington Oil Refiners, Inc.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

EMMETT P. DYER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1623) for the relief of Emmett P. Dyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the application for old-age insurance benefits filed with the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance in February 1956 by Emmett P. Dyer (social security account numbered 578–28–5162) shall be deemed to have been filed on December 31, 1956; and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is hereby authorized and directed, without requiring a further application, to recompute his primary insurance amount (effective with respect to monthly insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act) on the basis of such filing date and in accordance with section 102(e)(6) of the Social Security Amendments of 1954. Such recomputation shall not be deemed to be a recomputation for the purposes of section 215(f) of the Social Security Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS J. ROSENSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2686) for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MRS. MAURICIA REYES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3843) for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JAMES H. McMURRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4872) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

HELEN TILFORD LOWERY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1887) for the relief of Helen Tilford Lowery.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Helen Tilford Lowery, Cincinnati, Ohio, and her claim for compensation benefits arising out of radio necrosis of both feet allegedly contracted as a result of the course of X-ray treatments while a student nurse at Freedmen's Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia, from 1934 through 1938, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such Act if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within the six-month period which commences on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided,* That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the date of its enactment except in the case of such medical or hospital expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIG SANDY RANCHERIA, CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1593) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in the Big Sandy Rancheria, California, and to accept other land in exchange therefor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, and subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to convey by quitclaim deed to the American Baptist Home Mission Society, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land described as the north half of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the south half of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 10 south, range 23 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, comprising 7.50 acres, more or less, of the Big Sandy Rancheria, California, and to accept in exchange therefor a conveyance in fee simple to the United States by the American Baptist Home Mission Society of a tract of land described as the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter and the north half of the north half of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 4, township 10

south, range 23 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, comprising 12.50 acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The land conveyed to the United States under section 1 of this Act shall become a part of the Big Sandy Rancheria.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELEN IRMA IMHOOF

The Clerk called the bill (S. 118) for the relief of Helen Irma Imhoof.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act the periods of time Helen Irma Imhoof resided abroad in the employ of the United States Ambassador to Italy shall be held and considered to be residence and physical presence in the United States within the meaning of section 316 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD W. SCOTT III

The Clerk called the bill (S. 126) for the relief of Edward W. Scott III.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edward W. Scott III, who was born in the Republic of Panama on May 25, 1938, of an American citizen mother, shall be deemed to have been born in the Canal Zone.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICO DELIC

The Clerk called the bill (S. 138) for the relief of Mico Delic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child Mico Delic shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Eli Delich, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HADJI BENLEVI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 177) for the relief of Hadji Benlevi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hadji Benlevi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided,* That the said Hadji Benlevi executes and files with the Attorney General, in such form as he shall require, a written waiver of all rights, privileges, exemptions, and immunities under any law or any Executive order which would otherwise accrue to him if he retains this occupational status as a treaty trader.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALESSANDRO GELLHORN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 217) for the relief of Alessandro Gellhorn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alessandro Gellhorn shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 323 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERICA BARTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 277) for the relief of Erica Barth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

ALPO FRANSSILA CRANE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 285) for the relief of Alpo Franssila Crane.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alpo Franssila Crane shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Radford Raymond Crane, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That no natural parent of the beneficiary, by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAH JEW NGEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 292) for the relief of Mah Jew Ngee (also known as Peter Jew Mah).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mah Jew Ngee (also known as Peter Jew Mah) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY N. KOUNIAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 330) for the relief of Harry N. Kouniakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harry N. Kouniakis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARUO T. HENDRICKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 417) for the relief of Haruo T. Hendricks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Haruo T. Hendricks, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant and Mrs. Joel C. Hendricks, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANLEY BULSKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 532) for the relief of Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz) shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilige, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH CLIFFORD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 545) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Clifford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elizabeth Clifford shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on September 30, 1956: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICOLAOS A. PAPADIMITRIOU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 555) for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicholaos A. Papadimitriou shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Mr. and Mrs. James N. Demmette, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the said Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREAS RAKINTOZIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 663) for the relief of Andreas Rakintozis (also known as Andreas Rakintzis or Rakajes).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the entry of certain relatives of United States citizens and lawfully resident aliens", approved September 22, 1959 (73 Stat. 644), Andreas Rakintozis (also known as Andreas Rakintzis or Rakajes) shall be held and considered to be eligible for a quota immigrant status under the provisions of section 203(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act on the basis of a petition approved by the Attorney General prior to January 1, 1959.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. ERNEST MOUNTAIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 894) for the relief of Capt. Ernest Mountain.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Captain Ernest Mountain shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of June 30, 1929, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE DOCK ON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1458) for the relief of Lee Dock On.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 101(a)(27)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lee Dock On shall be deemed to be a returning resident alien.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act Lee Dock On may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LASZLO HAMORI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1394) for the relief of Laszlo Hamori.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, upon his admission for permanent residence in the United States, Laszlo Hamori shall be held and considered to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNELIESE FRANZISKA GUAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1575) for the relief of Mrs. Anneliese Franziska Guay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Anneliese Franziska Guay may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissable under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care under the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. E. WATERSTRADT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1097) for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any period of limitations or lapse of time, claim for credit or refund of overpayment of income taxes for the taxable years 1942 to 1945, inclusive, made by A. E. Waterstradt, of Takoma Park, Maryland, may be filed at any time within one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. The provisions of sections 322(b), 3774, and 3775 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 shall not apply to the refund or credit of any overpayment of tax for which credit or refund is filed under the authority of this Act within such one-year period.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALLACE R. PRICE AND NORA J. PRICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1531) for the relief of Wallace R. Price and Nora J. Price.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wallace R. Price and Nora J. Price, his wife, of Grand Ledge, Michigan, the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all the claims of Mr. and Mrs. Price against the United States arising out of a collision which occurred on September 11, 1953, between a United States Post Office truck and a vehicle which Mrs. Price was driving. This claim is not cognizable under the tort claims procedure as provided in title 28, United States Code: *Provided,* That no

part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike "against the United States" and insert: "and their subrogee, the State Farm Mutual Auto Insurance Company, Marshall, Michigan, against the United States and Mr. George F. Brooks."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD GAMES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1687) for relief of World Games, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

RALPH B. CLEVELAND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4636) for the relief of Ralph B. Cleveland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ralph B. Cleveland, Florence, Oregon, the sum of $670.07, plus any interest on such amount required to be paid by him under the terms of the judgment rendered against him in the district court of Lane County, Oregon, as a result of a motor vehicle collision on May 4, 1959, near Deadwood, Oregon, between a privately owned vehicle and a Government vehicle being operated by him within the scope of his employment with the Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Ralph B. Cleveland against the United States for reimbursement of amounts required to be paid by him under the terms of such judgment. Such sum shall be paid only on receipt by the Secretary of the Treasury of assurances satisfactory to him that Ralph B. Cleveland will use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment in full: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, strike "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD A. HARTMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4796) for the relief of Richard A. Hartman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Richard A. Hartman, Hanover, Pennsylvania, an employee in the postal field service, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $381.79. Such sum represents the amount of certain overpayments of compensation made to the said Richard A. Hartman through administrative error in the determination of his longevity benefits as a postal field service employee. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard A. Hartman, Hanover, Pennsylvania, the sum certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Postmaster General as the sum of amounts paid to the United States by the said Richard A. Hartman, or withheld from amounts otherwise due him from the United States, by reason of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSTON BELT & TERMINAL RAILWAY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6013) for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Houston Belt and Terminal Railway Company the sum of $28,614.16. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Houston Belt and Terminal Railway Company against the United States for reimbursement for actual expenses borne by such company for alteration of its bridge 3.62 over Brays Bayou in Houston, Harris County, Texas, which alteration was made in connection with the improvement of Brays Bayou for flood-control purposes and for which amount such company has not otherwise been reimbursed, and if Houston Belt and Terminal Railway Company had not made such bridge alteration, such alteration would have been made subsequently at the expense of the United States as a part of its flood-control project which included the improvement of Brays Bayou; and such bridge alteration inured to the benefit of the United States in subsequently carrying out such flood-control project which it approved and authorized: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I did not object to the consideration or passage of H.R. 6013 by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY]. I would like to point out, however, that I consider the committee report to be somewhat evasive in supporting the justification for the passage of this bill.

It is noted in the committee report that the Harris County Flood Control District was the local sponsor for a channel improvement project that was authorized by Congress on September 3, 1954, under the River and Harbor Act as amended. It is further stated that the local flood control district "was not aware that the cost of such alterations was authorized as a Federal expense." Despite their apparent lack of knowledge, they were aware that the plans for such bridge alteration had to be approved by the district engineer for the Corps of Engineers at Galveston. The plans for the alteration were approved by the above-mentioned engineer, but obviously he could not obligate the Federal Government to the expense of the bridge alteration, since this particular project had not as yet received construction money.

It is inconceivable to me that the local flood control district would have been aware that the plans had to be approved by the district engineer, and yet could have proceeded "not aware that the cost of such alteration was an authorized Federal expense."

I recognize this as a legitimate Federal cost of the project, but I do object to the manner in which it was presented to the Judiciary Committee and to the House.

MISS ELSIE ROBEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6224) for the relief of Miss Elsie Robey.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MAX BLEIER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1353) for the relief of Max Bleier.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

MRS. JOSEFA PIDLAOAN AND DAUGHTER, ANNABELLE PIDLAOAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1399) for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Pidlaoan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaoan.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

MANSUREH RINEHART

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1477) for the relief of Mansureh Rinehart.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

IDO ENRICO CASSANDRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1602) for the relief of Ido Enrico Cassandro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ido Enrico Cassandro, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph H. Livaudais, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Ido Enrico Cassandro shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LILYAN ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1642) for the relief of Mrs. Lilyan Robinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Lilyan Robinson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Lilyan Robinson. From and after the date of the enactment of this act, the said Mrs. Lilyan Robinson shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIE HARA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1677) for the relief of Elie Hara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elie Hara shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOMISLAV LAZAREVICH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1888) for the relief of Tomislav Lazarevich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tomislav Lazarevich shall be held and considered to be the natural born minor alien child of Steve Lazarevich, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of section 4 of the Act of September 22, 1959, Tomislav Lazarevich shall be deemed to have been registered on a consular waiting list pursuant to section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act under a priority date earlier than December 31, 1953."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. FRANCISCA HARTMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2152) for the relief of Mrs. Francisca Hartman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Francisca Hartman shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, strike out all of lines 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REOKO KAWAGUCHI MOORE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2155) for the relief of Reoko Kawaguchi Moore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Reoko Kawaguchi Moore, if otherwise admissible to the United States except for the one conviction in Japan on June 3, 1953, of violation of the Narcotics Control Act and the Criminal Code of Japan, shall be considered to be admissible under the Act and not subject to the ineligibility and exclusion provisions of section 212(a) of the Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(23) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Reoko Kawaguchi Moore may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. TUI HING TOW WOO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2156) for the relief of Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tui Hing Woo, also known as Tow Shee, if otherwise qualified, shall be exempt from the provisions of section 312(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as provided in the first proviso of paragraph (1) of section 312 of said Act, even though she has only resided in the United States continuously since 1937.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo shall be held and considered to have compiled with the provisions of section 312(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSE LAUCHENGCO, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2835) for the relief of Jose Lauchengco, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of section 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Lauchengco, Junior, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born minor alien child of Mrs. Angeles Y. Sapota, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural father of Jose Lauchengco, Junior, shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the words "United States" change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 284, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4614) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Abbitt	Fulton	Philbin
Addabbo	Gavin	Powell
Anfuso	Gilbert	Rabaut
Ashley	Goodling	Rains
Auchincloss	Granahan	Randall
Barrett	Grant	Rhodes, Pa.
Battin	Gray	Riley
Belcher	Green, Pa.	Rivers, S.C.
Blitch	Griffin	Roberts
Breeding	Gubser	Rodino
Brewster	Hagen, Calif.	Rooney
Buckley	Healey	Rousselot
Byrne, Pa.	Hébert	Santangelo
Cahill	Holifield	Saylor
Cannon	Holland	Schweiker
Carey	Holtzman	Scranton
Celler	Horan	Selden
Clancy	Ichord, Mo.	Shelley
Clark	Kearns	Slack
Coad	Kee	Staggers
Cook	Keogh	Steed
Corbett	Kilburn	Stephens
Curtis, Mass.	Macdonald	Teague, Tex.
Dague	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, La.
Delaney	Merrow	Thompson, Tex.
Dent	Miller, N.Y.	Toll
Devine	Milliken	Tuck
Dole	Minshall	Van Pelt
Donohue	Moorhead, Pa.	Wallhauser
Dooley	Morgan	Walter
Evins	Morrison	Wilson, Calif.
Farbstein	Moulder	Wilson, Ind.
Fenton	Nix	Winstead
Fino	O'Neill	
Flood	Osmers	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 284 provides for the consideration of H.R. 4614, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 4614 is to promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States. To accomplish this, the bill imposes upon the Secretary of Commerce certain duties and functions described in the report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and provides for the establishment of an Office of International Travel and Tourism in the Department of Commerce to assist the Secretary in the performance of these duties and functions.

The encouragement of travel within the United States for the purpose of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States long has been recognized as desirable.

Shortly before World War II the Congress passed an act to encourage travel in the United States, which created a Travel Bureau in the Department of the Interior with the authority to cooperate with and coordinate existing travel encouragement agencies of the United States, and cooperate with similar agencies of other countries, in the development of good will, understanding, and commerce by increasing travel to the United States.

In 1948 a bill which would strengthen the functions of the Travel Bureau passed the House but did not become law. At that time the Congress and the Nation were interested in taking steps to assist European nations in their economic recovery. It appeared that the making of positive efforts to promote travel to the United States at that particular time by the nationals of countries already short of dollars would be undesirable. Indeed, only a few countries then were in an economic position to afford expenditures for travel and most countries were so short of dollar exchange that they had been forced to restrict exchange for travel and other purposes. In keeping with the realities of the time the Congress not only cut off appropriations to the Travel Bureau, but included a provision in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 for the purpose of adding to dollar receipts of foreign nationals.

More recently it has appeared that as the foreign nations have achieved economic recovery and have been enabled to relax restrictions on exchange they have made available for their nationals to travel, it is only proper again to emphasize the benefits which might be received in a better understanding of the peoples of the United States if greater encouragement were given to the

promotion of travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries.

It is believed that H.R. 4614 is a desirable and feasible legislative proposal.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 284.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from California, my colleague on the Rules Committee, has explained, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 4614 under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

When this matter came before the Rules Committee I was one of those who opposed the granting of a rule on this bill. A rule was granted for the resolution providing the rule was adopted by a single vote.

I am opposed to the adoption of this rule, and the consideration of the bill, for some very simple reasons.

H.R. 4614 would establish in the Department of Commerce a new agency of Government, a so-called Tourist Agency, with some 60 employees to start with, at cost of some $3 million a year—that is for the first year—$4,700,000 the second year, and only the good Lord knows how much each year thereafter, for the purpose of getting citizens of foreign countries to visit the United States.

Mr. Speaker, every penny of the money involved in the creation and financing of this new agency of Government would have to be borrowed by our Federal Treasury to be paid off by our children, our grandchildren, and future generations yet unborn, because we are already operating in the red—we already have a deficit. Our present tax revenues will not now meet the cost of Government. Every time we create a new activity or new agency of Government we do so on borrowed money.

I wonder how far we want to go in having the Federal Government, this great Central Government of ours, enter into competition with every free enterprise activity in the world we can possibly think of. We are being told by the sponsors of this legislation that we have to have a Federal agency to encourage the citizens of foreign countries to visit the United States and to tour this country. Yet we have a great many American as well as foreign airlines, and ship lines, also of other countries, busily engaged now in promoting such travel, not only to the United States by tourists from other countries, but also travel by tourists from this country to other countries. They are very busy, and have their representatives working all over the world. It is being proposed now that Uncle Sam do the same thing, all on borrowed money.

I just wonder how far we can continue to go with proposals such as this, when we stop and realize—I think it is very interesting to take the hearings on this legislation and read them—that in foreign country after foreign country, foreign nation after foreign nation, the governments have restrictions on the amount of money their citizens can take out of their own country for use in foreign travel.

I think perhaps the largest amount allowed under the restrictions placed on such travel is $700 for a person from England who wants to visit the United States or tour this country. Other countries have as low as $200 as their restriction. I see some of you in front of me who just returned not long ago from visiting our Nation's greatest city, New York. I am sure you will agree with me if you have had the experience most Americans have when they visit that great metropolis, that probably the amount of money that each foreign citizen is permitted to take out of their own country for the purpose of visiting the United States would not take care of the cost of spending one weekend in New York, especially if they visit a nightclub or so. So, I am wondering if the next step will not be that we will be asked to furnish the funds for these foreign citizens to come and see what a brave and glorious and wonderful land we have, and how well we handle things in this country. We are told by some agencies of our Government that should know, that from some foreign countries practically all of the tourists and all of the diplomats and special groups who visit here, mostly at their own government expense, are actually engaged in various types of intelligence, and are usually working for the benefit of those countries behind the Iron Curtain. So, I suppose in this way we can encourage that sort of tourism as well as other kinds. But, in my own mind, here is an opportunity for some of those great champions of economy—and I have seen a number of them running around here rather lively lately and orating on the floor of the House—to say the time has come when we stop creating new agencies and new departments of Government, operating on borrowed money; that we begin to live within our own Federal income, our tax income; and that we try to balance the budget instead of unbalancing it by adding new Federal activities continuously as we have been doing. Now, you and I have watched—at least some of us who have been here throughout the years—how bureaucracy grows and thrives and spreads. You have seen these little so-called activities, little agencies of Government, begin, of course, with a high-sounding purpose, or for a good purpose, something nice to do if we could afford it. But, they grow and expand and spread, and instead of costing just a few million dollars a year, in a short time the costs are running into tens of millions, and even higher. By the defeat of this rule we not only have the opportunity to save a great deal of tax money, by casting an honest vote for economy, but also to save a great deal of the time of the House in considering this type of spending legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this rule will be defeated.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not consideration has been given to the employment of the U.S. Information Agency, which has offices scattered all over the world as propaganda specialists and in a promotional type of work, to also attract tourism to the United States. What is wrong with using an existing agency already staffed rather than to create a duplicating and parallel agency.

Mr. BROWN. As far as I am concerned, I found no evidence before the Committee on Rules that there is any plan to use an existing agency. Of course, if we used an existing agency, then there would be no excuse for creating a new bureau or bureaucracy in the Federal Government.

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman know any reason why the U.S. Information Agency and its oversea staff could not perform this function along with its normal functions?

Mr. BROWN. Of course, I know no reason why they could not, or why other agencies of the Federal Government could not do just that. Of course, I am very well aware of the fact that the private enterprise transportation services of this country do have representatives abroad attempting to sell their services, their travel, to citizens of foreign countries who may wish to visit the United States and who are able to get the necessary funds with which to do it.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. I am very much interested in my colleague's explanation of the bill. I note that the bill provides for a $3 million appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, for the purposes outlined in the bill; and thereafter not to exceed $4,700,000. I am wondering if the gentleman will pursue his comments still further. It would seem to me that the spending of money in this Nation by travelers from abroad would create additional business and additional income in this country on which taxes would be paid. I wonder if the gentleman would comment further on that.

Mr. BROWN. I would be glad to comment on that. First of all I am sure the gentleman from Ohio, my colleague, who is a very learned individual, knows full well that we have never started any activity of the Government and then held the cost down to the original estimate. It has always gone up. Secondly, there is not going to be much taxable income generated by travelers from foreign countries who cannot get sufficient money to spend in the United States under the laws of their own country, unless we furnish that money to them. And, of course, that would be the next step, that we should furnish money to them so that they might see our great and illustrious land, these people who are unable to come with their own funds, or bring out of their country sufficient money to meet their expenses while they are in the United States.

How far does the gentleman think that a visitor from Denmark, let us say, with a $200 limit, could travel in the United States, and how much wealth could he create in this country by spending his $200 here? He would be lucky if he was able to get out of New York City.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the gentleman's viewpoint and I appreciate the answers he has given to my questions.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understood the gentleman, he was needling some of us who talk economy but sometimes skid a little bit when it comes to a vote.

Mr. BROWN. I have noticed that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. About this $2 million that we gave to the Economic Council the other day. Was that not a little excessive?

Mr. BROWN. That $2 million, as the gentleman has evidently not learned yet, was for the purpose of saving money, because more than that amount is being spent, through the employment of consultants, out of other funds. And this $2 million was to be a limit. I regret to inform the gentleman, now that he has raised the question, that yesterday the other body took the limit off entirely, so now he can have his way, and still let them spend as much money as they wish.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman and commend him for his statement and desire to associate myself with him in his disapproval of this proposal. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether there were not any minority views expressed by members of the committee or anyone who appeared before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BROWN. There were no minority views expressed at the time although, I understand, there were members of the committee who were not in support of the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. ALGER. I wanted to take this opportunity to say that I disapprove the failure of the committee to give us minority opinions within the committee because we on the House floor thereby are denied that information.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. There were no minority views. The minority did not ask to present any views. I do not think the gentleman should, by implication, try to leave the impression with the House that the minority was deprived of the opportunity to present any views that they might have. There was the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BROWN. I am sure the gentleman did not mean to imply that.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further, so that I may reply to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, let me assure the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee that in no sense am I inferring that anyone was denied his rights. I think the gentleman knows me well enough to know that I would not infer that. I have been on that committee and I regard it too highly. I know how fair the gentleman was to this member of the committee when he was a member of it.

I wanted also to express my disappointment that those who for whatever reason disagreed with the purpose of the bill, if they did disagree, did not express themselves so that we on the floor of the House would have their views.

Mr. SISK. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I think it must be thoroughly explained that this legislation got through the Committee on Rules only by an eyelash. There were certain circumstances that helped it along to get that eyelash.

It seems to me this legislation is typical of something that is going on not only here but all over the world and that is in direct contravention of what we used to believe was the way this Government functioned. It was well said that Government should do for the people what they could not better do for themselves. Certainly this question of tourism is a thing that private enterprise can do infinitely better than Government.

When Government gets into tourism, as it does to the *n*th degree in Russia, where everyone is furnished with an intourist guide not only to guide them but also to watch them and go through their luggage and briefcases in the meantime, it has certain merit, but we, I presume, do not expect to do that in this country.

Another thing, I think we are putting the cart before the horse. We are asking a lot of these people to come over here on very modest amounts. It has been pointed out, I believe, that the maximum amount that can be taken out of a foreign country for travel is $700. We are inviting them to come over here. We are telling them they are going to find everything: a land of milk and honey. As a matter of fact, they are going to find transportation in this country very poor indeed compared to their own country. That I can guarantee you.

I sat at the feet of Dean Landis the other day. I do not think anybody is going to accuse the gentleman of being a violent reactionary of any kind. He informed us categorically that all our modes of transportation were, as he expressed it, very sick indeed. So it seems rather a poor time to force more work on them.

Reference has been made to the great city of New York. I will guarantee it is going to be very difficult for the great city of New York to accommodate more people than it is accommodating already.

Maybe it would be better, if the Government is going to do for the people what they cannot better do for themselves, that the Government assist the transportation agencies of this country, that we help the airlines, that we help the railroads, that we help all means and modes of travel, and that we give a slight lift to private enterprise so that they can take care of all of this rush that we wish to encourage into this country.

I am quite sure that the amount of money derived therefrom will not compensate us for the expense Government will eventually have to go to. Certainly it is true that in this bill the amount is very modest, but as the ranking member has well said, and we are thoroughly accustomed to that, this amount will have to grow, and it will grow and grow, and the bureaucrats who will have to administer it will also proliferate all over the country.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that it is the style today to present to the Congress, as they have brought out in the past on the floor of the Congress, all sorts of legislation which lead us into the New Frontier but have no solid basis behind the approach that they make. If we set up another agency in the Department of Commerce we will never get rid of the agency. We will never get rid of the agency. It starts off with $3 million and it only runs to $4,700,000 in future years. How long do you suppose it could stay at that point? Frankly, I cannot see and I do not believe that it would be at all possible for anybody in the budget office or in the White House to destroy and break down the silly setup we have presented to us here to vote for today. Is there no sense of responsibility left in the minds and hearts of the membership of the House of Representatives? Is it not time that we woke up? Is it not time that we began to feel a sense of responsibility and to realize that we should keep out of such performances as the creation of new agencies in the Department of Commerce?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if there is any rock or stone unturned by which Congress can spend money on international deals, I do not know where it would be found. I would like to know who dreams up all of these international boondoggles. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, Mr. HARRIS, who brought this bill to the floor of the House, a question. I call his attention to page 308 of the hearings and ask him what this item of $50,000 is to be spent for? It is under the title of "Visitor Satisfaction Materials." What in the world could visitor satisfaction materials be?

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I would be glad to have the gentleman, whose name appears on the bill, explain that.

Mr. MACK. This is the budget which has been submitted by the Department of Commerce who is going to be responsible for carrying out the provisions of the bill. As I understand this portion of it, it would have to do with certain publications concerning this country to give information to the tourists when they are travelling within this country.

Mr. GROSS. Just publications? This would not have anything to do with anything in the nature of scotch or bourbon or gin?

Mr. MACK. Unfortunately, that is not envisioned by the Secretary of Commerce. On page 423 of the hearings, we have the budget as proposed by the Department of Commerce. I presume the gentleman has seen that—"Visitor Satisfaction—a modest budget should be available to provide training material which would be valuable to hotels, resorts, restaurants, etc., in developing in their employees an understanding and appreciation of the problems of foreign visitors."

Mr. GROSS. Let me point out to the gentleman there is already earmarked $2,500,000 for advertising and $205,000 for editorial promotion.

There is also $814,750 for sales promotion; so this "visitor satisfaction materials" must go to something more than reading material. I hope that before the debate is over, if this rule is adopted, and I certainly hope the rule is defeated—if the rule is not defeated I hope somebody will explain to the satisfaction of the Members of the House what is meant by "visitor satisfaction materials."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman notice in the press the other day that the State Department was becoming worried over the fact that some of these new members of the United Nations have three or four or five wives? Now, if they are worrying about that, undoubtedly we would have to supply quarters for those extra wives if they came over here.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has suggested another interpretation of what it means; on the one hand, it is reading material, and on the other it is the satisfaction of extra-marital relations or something that corresponds to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is quite clear they will be entertained here, but the gentleman would not advocate that a man should leave one of his wives at home, would he?

Mr. GROSS. Oh, of course not; no.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I guess not.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether the Members of the House realize it or not, but I think it was in the third deficiency appropriation bill that the House appropriated a substantial increase in the appropriation for the bankruptcy referees and courts of this country to take care of not only the bankruptcies that are already pending, but the predicted increase in bankruptcies that will take place in this country. Why not vote down this rule and save the taxpayers of this country some money that can be used to prevent the increase in bankruptcies in this country instead of spending it for a lousy boondoggle of this kind?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is evident by the questions that have been raised that the fair thing to do would be to adopt this rule and let the committee explain the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWN) there were—ayes 60, noes 37.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken and there were—yeas 241, nays 70, not voting 121, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—241

Albert	Frazier	Mills
Alexander	Friedel	Monagan
Andersen, Minn.	Gallagher	Montoya
	Garland	Morris
Andrews	Gary	Morse
Ashley	Gathings	Mosher
Ashmore	Glenn	Moss
Aspinall	Goodell	Multer
Ayres	Griffin	Murphy
Baker	Griffiths	Murray
Baldwin	Hagan, Ga.	Natcher
Barry	Halpern	Nelsen
Bass, N.H.	Harding	Norblad
Bass, Tenn.	Hardy	Norrell
Bates	Harris	O'Brien, Ill.
Becker	Harvey, Mich.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Beckworth	Hays	O'Hara, Ill.
Bell	Hechler	O'Hara, Mich.
Bennett, Fla.	Hemphill	Olsen
Bennett, Mich.	Henderson	Ostertag
Blatnik	Hosmer	Passman
Boland	Huddleston	Patman
Bolling	Hull	Perkins
Bolton	Inouye	Peterson
Bonner	Jarman	Pfost
Boykin	Jennings	Pike
Brademas	Joelson	Pirnie
Bray	Johnson, Calif.	Poage
Breeding	Johnson, Md.	Poff
Bromwell	Johnson, Wis.	Price
Brooks, La.	Jonas	Pucinski
Brooks, Tex.	Jones, Ala.	Quie
Broomfield	Jones, Mo.	Reuss
Broyhill	Judd	Rhodes, Ariz.
Burke, Mass.	Karsten	Riehlman
Burleson	Karth	Rivers, Alaska
Casey	Kastenmeier	Robison
Cederberg	Kearns	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Keith	Rogers, Fla.
Chamberlain	Kelly	Rogers, Tex.
Chelf	Kilday	Roosevelt
Chenoweth	Kilgore	Rostenkowski
Chiperfield	King, N.Y.	Rutherford
Cohelan	King, Utah	Ryan
Collier	Kirwan	Saund
Conte	Kitchin	Schneebeli
Cooley	Kluczynski	Scott
Corman	Knox	Seely-Brown
Cramer	Kornegay	Selden
Curtin	Kowalski	Sheppard
Curtis, Mass.	Landrum	Shipley
Curtis, Mo.	Lane	Shriver
Daniels	Lankford	Sibal
Davis, Tenn.	Lennon	Sikes
Denton	Lesinski	Sisk
Derounian	Libonati	Smith, Iowa
Derwinski	Lindsay	Smith, Miss
Diggs	Loser	Spence
Dingell	McCormack	Springer
Dominick	McDonough	Stafford
Dowdy	McDowell	Steed
Doyle	McFall	Stratton
Dulski	McIntire	Stubblefield
Edmondson	McSween	Sullivan
Elliott	McVey	Taylor
Ellsworth	MacGregor	Teague, Calif.
Everett	Machrowicz	Thomas
Fallon	Mack	Thompson, N.J.
Fascell	Magnuson	Thornberry
Findley	Mahon	Tollefson
Finnegan	Mailliard	Trimble
Fisher	Mathias	Tupper
Flynt	Matthews	Ullman
Fogarty	May	Vanik
Ford	Miller, Clem	Van Zandt
Forrester	Miller, George P.	Vinson
Fountain		Watts
Weis	Widnall	Young
Westland	Willis	Younger
Whitener	Wright	Zablocki
Whitten	Yates	Zelenko

NAYS—70

Abernethy	Durno	Moore
Adair	Goodling	Nygaard
Alford	Gross	O'Konski
Alger	Haley	Pelly
Anderson, Ill.	Hall	Pilcher
Arends	Halleck	Pillion
Ashbrook	Harrison, Wyo.	Ray
Avery	Hiestand	Roudebush
Bailey	Hoeven	St. George
Baring	Hoffman, Ill.	Schadeberg
Beermann	Hoffman, Mich.	Schenck
Belcher	Jensen	Scherer
Berry	Johansen	Schwengel
Betts	Kyl	Short
Bow	Laird	Siler
Brown	Langen	Smith, Calif.
Bruce	Latta	Smith, Va.
Byrnes, Wis.	Lipscomb	Taber
Church	McCulloch	Thomson, Wis.
Cunningham	Marshall	Utt
Davis, James C.	Martin, Nebr.	Weaver
	Mason	Wharton
Davis, John W.	Meader	Williams
Dorn	Moeller	

NOT VOTING—121

Abbitt	Garmatz	Morrison
Addabbo	Gavin	Moulder
Addonizio	Giaimo	Nix
Anfuso	Gilbert	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Granahan	Osmers
Barrett	Grant	Philbin
Battin	Gray	Powell
Blitch	Green, Oreg	Rabaut
Boggs	Green, Pa.	Rains
Brewster	Gubser	Randall
Buckley	Hagen, Calif.	Reifel
Burke, Ky.	Hansen	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	Harrison, Va.	Riley
Cahill	Hasha	Rivers, S.C.
Cannon	Harvey, Ind.	Roberts
Carey	Healey	Rodino
Clancy	Hébert	Rooney
Clark	Herlong	Rousselot
Coad	Holifield	St. Germain
Colmer	Holland	Santangelo
Cook	Holtzman	Saylor
Corbett	Horan	Schweiker
Daddario	Ichord, Mo.	Scranton
Dague	Ikard, Tex.	Shelley
Dawson	Kee	Slack
Delaney	Keogh	Staggers
Dent	Kilburn	Stephens
Devine	King, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Dole	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Donohue	Macdonald	Thompson, Tex.
Dooley	Madden	Toll
Downing	Martin, Mass.	Tuck
Dwyer	Merrow	Van Pelt
Evins	Michel	Wallhauser
Farbstein	Miller, N.Y.	Walter
Feighan	Millikin	Whalley
Fenton	Minshall	Wickersham
Fino	Moorehead, Ohio	Wilson, Calif.
Flood		Wilson, Ind.
Frelinghuysen	Moorhead, Pa.	Winstead
Fulton	Morgan	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Mr. Wilson of California for, with Mr. Clancy against.

Mr. Giaimo for, with Mr. Van Pelt against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Dague against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Miller of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Battin.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Nix with Mr. Cahill.

Mrs. Granahan with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Wallhauser.

My Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Scranton.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Moorehead of Ohio.

Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Dole.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hruska.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Dent of Pennsylvania with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Brewster with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Ikard of Texas with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Schweiker.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Horan.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Milliken.

Mr. McDONOUGH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4614) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4614, with Mr. YATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the Members of the House for just a few minutes, I think I can dispel some of the fears and illusions that have been expressed on the floor of the House regarding the proposed legislation. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported this bill, H.R. 4614, and urges its passage.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill; it is needed legislation. The committee has worked it out very carefully and have incorporated safeguards which, in my judgment, are desirable and, in my opinion, strengthen our recommendations to the House for your acceptance today.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan bill. It is true that it is an administration bill, not only of this administration but also of the previous administration.

This bill is recommended by many people and organizations interested in the future welfare of our country. Many such organizations testified before the committee, travel organizations, hotel associations, airline associations, and so forth, as well as many Members of Congress. As a matter of fact, there were no witnesses who appeared during the course of the hearings and opposed the legislation. The Secretary of Commerce appeared twice and testified on behalf of the administration, giving the background of the consideration of this proposal, the need for it, and the good it would accomplish for this country.

The purpose of the bill is to promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States. To accomplish this the bill imposes upon the Secretary of Commerce certain duties and functions, and provides for the establishment in the Department of Commerce of an Office of International Travel and Tourism to assist the Secretary in the performance of these duties and functions.

This is no Johnny-come-lately bill; this legislation was proposed years ago. During the last Congress the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, through its subcommittee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK], conducted extensive hearings. The other body had passed a bill and sent it over here. It was incontrovertibly established that insofar as international travel and tourism is concerned, the United States has an imbalance of $1 billion; in other words, the people of this country who traveled abroad spent a billion dollars more in travel than did people from other countries of the world spend coming to this country; and the purpose of this legislation is to try to do something about reducing the imbalance.

During the last Congress, hearings were conducted before the committee, the committee was not satisfied with it as it was presented at that time and decided that if we had more time to go into it we could make a better record and perhaps bring to you a better bill. At least, there could be a better understanding and a greater accomplishment with it. This had resulted exactly as the committee thought it would when after hearings and executive sessions of the subcommittee in the last Congress the committee decided to postpone action until this Congress to give it further consideration and thus have an opportunity for us to go into it further.

During the interim several members of the committee have made an extensive study of the facts, what the situation is; they have made reports to the committee, they have testified before the committee, thus resulting in the bill we have before us today. I want to commend the members of our committee who have given so much of their time and study to it. I want to commend the subcommittee and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] and all members of the committee, for the extensive study they have given to this legislation and in preparing it for your consideration.

Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said here today about the cost. I think my record shows I am a fairly conservative individual. As a Member of this Congress I do not advocate spending all the money that we can authorize and appropriate. That is well known. I think you will find the members of our committee give very close scrutiny and attention to any proposal that authorizes an appropriation of funds by this Congress. This is no exception.

The hearings disclose it is contemplated to bring many people to this country who will spend their money here. The Government in turn will get in return manyfold the amount that will be spent in carrying on this important travel agency under the leadership and direction of the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, who is well known.

Today I remind you the private travel agencies and private industries spend some $15 million a year in carrying on this kind of work abroad. This does not in any way interfere with that operation, and it does not take anything away from their efforts. It complements what they are doing on behalf of our country in operating abroad.

Foreign governments spend in this country $20 million a year in promoting foreign travel by our own people. In other words, there is more money spent in this country by foreign governments advertising and promoting travel abroad by people of this country. It would seem to me that it is time that we should try to undertake to get some of this back into our country instead of seeing everything go the other way all of the time. Consequently, I feel that the committee has done a good job in bringing this bill to you.

We are justified, Mr. Chairman, in asking the support of this House for this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Reading from page 7 of your report, it states:

> In his report on the pending legislation the Secretary of Commerce suggested that it be amended to include an authorization for the use of counterpart funds.

It goes on to state that this was opposed by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Treasury on the ground that a specific provision was not necessary, because that authority existed. Later the Secretary of Commerce suggested that that authority be not included. It seems to me that we should not only authorize the use of counterpart funds, but I would like to see it written into this bill, at least, a portion of it, and I would suggest even as much as 50 percent of any money that was spent for this purpose be in counterpart funds. Now, we have counterpart funds in many of these countries from which we are trying to attract visitors. I know one of the arguments will be that where we are giving away money, that they do not have money to spend to come over here. But, I am not sold on that. However, I think that where we have these counterpart funds, they should be utilized. I know there is a tendency on the part of many of our agencies of Government that they would rather spend U.S. tax dollars than to use counterpart funds that are available. I would like to have your comment on that, if you please.

Mr. HARRIS. The committee gave a great deal of consideration to the question. Not only was it discussed during

the course of the hearings and in the report that the gentleman referred to, but in executive session it was discussed. And, there is a lot of merit in it. However, we found in the principal countries where most of the travel would be expected they do not have counterpart funds available, and for that reason we thought it would be most inadvisable to try to require the use of counterpart funds.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Let me ask this question: In those countries where there are counterpart funds available, what would be the objection to requiring this agency to utilize those funds?

Mr. HARRIS. I might say to the gentleman, if he will permit, that we are going to have some further discussion of this matter when the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] takes the floor. It will be thoroughly discussed at that time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I understand that, but I wondered what your attitude would be toward it. You have a lot of influence concerning the passage of this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. In any country where it would be permitted, where it could be used, it would be perfectly all right, but the proposal we had before us was to use counterpart funds, and that being true, we might as well have no bill. That is the reason the committee reported it as it is.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 4614, directs the Secretary of Commerce to first, develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries; second, encourage the development of tourist facilities, low-cost unit tours, and other plans within the United States for meeting the requirements for foreign visitors; third, foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States consistent with sound economic principles; fourth, encourage the facilitation of international travel; and fifth, collect and exchange certain statistics and information concerning travel and tourism.

In performing these duties the Secretary, among other things, is to utilize to the fullest extent possible existing Government agencies; may consult and cooperate with those in or concerned with the field of international travel; and may establish branches in foreign countries as he deems necessary and desirable. He is specifically prohibited, in exercising the authority granted by this act, from engaging in competition with businesses engaged in providing or arranging for transportation or accommodations.

In order to assist him in carrying out this program and duties, an Office of International Travel and Tourism is established within the Department under a Director to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

The encouragement of travel within the United States for the purpose of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States long has been recognized as desirable.

Shortly before World War II the Congress passed an act to encourage travel in the United States (54 Stat. 773) which created a Travel Bureau in the Department of the Interior with the authority to cooperate with and coordinate existing travel encouragement agencies of the United States, and cooperate with similar agencies of other countries, in the development of good will, understanding, and commerce by increasing travel to the United States.

Again in 1948 this committee considered a bill which would strengthen the functions of the Travel Bureau with respect to encouragement of travel to and within the United States. This bill, H.R. 6136, passed the House but did not become law.

At that time the Congress and the Nation were interested in taking steps to assist European nations in their economic recovery. It appeared that the making of positive efforts to promote travel to the United States at that particular time by the nationals of countries already short of dollars would be undesirable. Indeed, only a few countries then were in an economic position to afford expenditures for travel and most countries were so short of dollar exchange that they had been forced to restrict exchange for travel and other purposes. In keeping with the realities of the time the Congress not only cut off appropriations to the Travel Bureau but included a provision in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 for the purpose of adding to dollar receipts of foreign nationals under which—

> The Administrator, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall facilitate and encourage, through private and public travel, transport, and other agencies, the promotion and development of travel by citizens of the United States to and within participating countries.

Under this authorization the Secretary of Commerce created a Travel Division within his Bureau of Foreign Commerce. Whether or not as a result of the efforts of this Division, it is clear that the growth in the number of U.S. citizens traveling abroad has been tremendous.

For the past several years there have been various measures before the Congress culminating in bills which were the subject of hearings by this committee during the last Congress. During the course of our committee's consideration of the bills last year, a number of questions arose as to the proper format in which legislation should be drafted to carry out the purposes of the legislation. These could not adequately be resolved before the close of the session. Following adjournment our committee has given intensive study to the subject and indeed members of the committee were authorized and directed to make an extended examination of the travel situation in a number of foreign countries and have provided us with an informative and comprehensive report and recommendations.

On the basis of the committee's examination of the subject, of the hearings on the bills which are before the committee, and of the committee's familiarity over these past many years with the problem, the committee believes that this is an appropriate time for practical efforts to be undertaken by our Government, jointly with industry, to promote more travel to the United States.

It appears to the committee that there does exist a potential market of foreign nationals which can be attracted to visit the United States. It appears that for sundry reasons, whether from misunderstanding about the cost of travel and tourism within the United States, inconvenience and annoyance over visa requirements, competition from foreign tourist areas, lack of incentive to come here, different rates of commissions received by travel agents on foreign and domestic business, or otherwise, this market has not developed as it might.

It appears to the committee that there is a role which an official Government agency may undertake in supplementing the activities of others toward encouraging foreign nationals to come to this country. Our own travel industry is estimated to have spent in 1960 in 75 foreign countries about $15 million, $10 million by our international airlines alone. At the same time foreign travel interests are estimated to have spent in this country to attract our citizens abroad some $20 million, over $4 million being by foreign government tourist offices in this country.

The committee believes that the "selling" of this country as a place to visit for study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities, is but a portion of the job which needs to be done. The proper treatment of these visitors once they have reached this country is most important. At this time there is an acknowledged lack of low-cost unit tours, such as are widely available in other countries, under which foreign visitors can tour this country at reasonable cost. The committee believes that in the encouragement of such tours, an official agency properly has a role, though here the domestic travel industry, of course, has major responsibilities.

The committee is of belief that H.R. 4614 is a desirable and feasible legislative proposal.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GLENN].

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee held hearings last year on similar bills to this, one of which had been passed in the Senate having to do with the creation of an Office of International Travel in the Department of Commerce, the same purport as this bill, H.R. 4614.

The Senate bill came to us late in the session, and our hearings were consequently both limited and late. The subcommittee was in accord with the overall purpose of the legislation; to increase the flow of foreign tourist traffic to the United States, and to thus stimulate the domestic economy; to reverse or retard the flow of travel dollars involved in our foreign payment deficit; and to expose as many citizens of the world as possible

to America as a travel destination. The Eisenhower administration approved the legislation. However, the then Secretary of Commerce did not give us the benefit of any detailed study or plan of organization and program, which was sufficiently convincing to the subcommittee to enable us to report a bill, particularly as to the estimate of a cost of $5 million.

We, therefore, took no action last year on reporting any bill. Our capable chairman, PETER MACK, after consultation with the subcommittee members instructed the staff to work on the problem following adjournment, and several members of this committee, at the request of the chairman, undertook the making of a survey of the international travel picture in various foreign countries. Their endeavor has been of great help in the present hearings this year. The report which they filed is specific, detailed, and factual, and their observations and conclusions manifest what can be accomplished with this legislation. MR. O'BRIEN, Mr. HEMPHILL, and Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI are to be complimented on the very fine performance of their assignment.

On the convening of the Congress this year, bills were again introduced to establish the Office of International Travel and Tourism, and a bill in the Senate was passed in short order. I introduced a counterpart to the Senate bill for which I am sorry. A cursory reading of the Senate bill made it appear satisfactory, but after the benefit of our hearings and our executive sessions, I am convinced that this bill, H.R. 4614, is the one that should be enacted, and I endorse it without reservation.

It is important to keep in mind that the worldwide development of tourism has become one of the most competitive business enterprises in world commerce. In many foreign countries it is sponsored and controlled by the national government. It is an instrument of their national policy.

The budgets of foreign countries for their official travel offices bears out their importance. Great Britain spends over $3½ million annually, France $2½ million, Canada $2½ million, Ireland $1½ million, while our budget for 1961 is only $165,000, a little more than Finland, East Africa, and San Marino.

The practical results of these spending programs has poured billions of American dollars into the economy of other nations around the world. The emergence of many nations from the difficult postwar period into prosperity has raised the standard of living and enabled the citizens of foreign countries to travel.

This will be a new field for our Government to develop—its benefits can be only measured by the objectives, but they are sufficiently attractive and basically sound to warrant a reasonable investment.

Let me mention three objectives:

First. The program will seek to increase the flow of foreign tourist traffic to the United States at a rate sufficient to check the flow of dollar balances from this country arising out of our failure to bring travelers to our shores in sufficient numbers. It is estimated that a billion dollars of our national payment deficit lies in the field of tourism.

Second. It will stimulate the domestic economy in direct proportion to the number of additional travelers, which can be sold on visiting our country. It is estimated that a European traveler spends a little over $500 in the United States. An increase of only 100 percent in 4 years over the current level of visitors would pour $250 million annually into the domestic economy in the fourth year of the program.

Third. In the competitive effort by the nations of the world to lure travelers within their borders, we can make an effective contribution to world peace and understanding. Unless the tourist, who is being sought by scores of foreign countries is attracted to our shores, he will be drawn to other destinations. During our hearings, it was reported by an American travel representative in England that Russia is putting on a massive tourist drive throughout the world, and can be one of our main competitors.

It must be continuously remembered that the function of the U.S. Office of International Travel will be to sell the United States as a travel destination. It is not charged with promoting transportation, hotels, facilities, or other specific features. It will, however, furnish necessary information to the potential traveler concerning those services or facilities essential to his plans. And keep in mind, that almost every State in the Union and scores of our cities have travel attractions, which will be featured in the program. There will be European and other offices for dissemination of this tourist information.

Some may ask—how can an average citizen of a foreign country meet some of the comparative high travel and lodging rates in this country? Our travel industry has considered this—in fact they have been working on plans to meet all obstacles, and one solution is the so-called package deal for tourists, either individually or in small or large groups—an all-cost trip meeting the requirements of all pocketbooks. I have found that Europeans like to travel in groups, and the one-piece bus tour method is one of the most popular in Europe. It permits the tourist with limited funds to budget his trip. We can duplicate it here.

All segments of the travel industry throughout the United States gave enthusiastic support to this program during our hearings. The steamship industry and the airlines gave assurance of cooperation in making fares attractive, and the most convincing factor to me was the complete study, analysis, and plans made by the Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Hodges appeared before our subcommittee on two occasions, and I was greatly impressed and pleased with his presentation of the problem and his program.

The record will disclose how minutely he went into the subject, and how well he has planned. He suggests a first year budget of $3 million, and an annual expenditure of slightly under $4.7 million thereafter. Now, these are not just round figures; he submitted a breakdown of costs and allocations in detail. I am convinced that these requests are reasonable, and to do the job envisioned, they are necessary. Also considering all aspects, I am of the opinion that this can be one of the best and most far-reaching endeavors in the foreign field that we will have legislated on this year.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, in the closing days of the last Congress, the Senate passed a bill similar to the one that we are considering today. My subcommittee held hearings on this bill but it was not reported because we were not completely satisfied with the provisions of this bill. While we favored the general objectives, we felt that several changes were needed to be made if this program were to be a success. Following this, three members of our committee made an extensive study and submitted a very valuable report. While the Congress was in recess last fall, I asked the staff of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to do further research and when I returned to Washington, I drew up H.R. 4614 which we are considering today. This bill directs the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries. It also establishes an Office of International Travel and Tourism within the Department of Commerce.

International travel has today become a big business and I am thoroughly convinced that a program of travel promotion is in our national interest both as a matter of economics and as an opportunity to promote international understanding. We are all aware of the fact that we have a substantial deficit in our balance of payments which has caused an alarmingly large drain on our gold supplies. Few of us, however, realize that one-third of this deficit is because of the great number of American citizens traveling in foreign countries. The travel deficit is approximately $1 billion on an annual basis. This bill is designed to attract foreign tourists to the United States in order to reduce this deficit. The President in his message to Congress on February 6 made reference to the imbalance of payments and gold outflow. He strongly endorsed a travel bill to expand efforts to encourage foreign travel to the United States.

Other countries are spending millions of dollars annually in the United States and elsewhere to attract foreign tourists. Now that the people of other countries are able to afford a trip to the United States, it is logical that we should enter this field. Increased travel from abroad will have many economic benefits and approximately 10 percent of the money that is spent here will end up in the Public Treasury. However, the most important consideration of this bill is that it will promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States. It will give more people in foreign lands

firsthand impressions of this great country and an impression which is generally inaccurately reflected through our tourists traveling in foreign lands. It would improve our international relations by giving these people the true story about America—our Government, and our desire for peace. For these reasons, I think we are justified in using Government funds to sell this country as an attractive travel destination. Today, in excess of $20 million is being spent annually within the United States by foreign advertisers to lure our American citizens to foreign lands. We are today the only nation which does not have a substantial government program to stimulate the growth of tourism.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that we should pass H.R. 4614 to compete with other countries in this important area. Mr. Chairman, my committee conducted hearings on this and 15 similar bills in March and April of this year. We have carefully considered all the testimony received and we have accepted certain amendments which we feel strengthen the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat surprised at some of the opposition that developed over this bill, which is designed to encourage foreign tourists coming to this country. During the last 3 years we have had a deficit in our balance of payments of approximately $10 billion. We have lost $5 billion of our gold supply. It would seem to me that the people who call themselves conservatives ought to be interested in doing something about it. This bill, as I see it, will do something about the deficit in our balance of payments and something about the loss of gold in this country.

I was amazed at some of the people who today are evidently concerned. Some of them, I notice, having opposed foreign aid in the past. I might say that I for the first time last year opposed foreign aid because of my concern over this very important problem. Therefore I am convinced that this Government does have a reason to get into this area, that the Government should conduct itself as these other governments are doing today in appropriating substantial sums of money to encourage people to come into our country to see what we have to offer here.

I might mention that in the proceedings of the subcommittee, and I believe we had hearings for some 2 weeks and have 500 pages of testimony, there was not a single Member of Congress who came before the subcommittee to oppose this bill. For that matter, there was not a single person who came before our subcommittee to oppose this legislation.

This bill was approved unanimously by my subcommittee. Every person on my subcommittee was in favor of this bill at the time it was reported, Republicans as well as Democrats. The first objection that was raised, I think, was raised in the full committee during the executive session. I could understand their concern because when this problem first came to me over a year ago I was not at all enthusiastic about it, and I raised several questions that were raised in our executive session at the time it first came before our committee.

But in the course of the hearings all of these questions have been resolved. I hope that the people who have raised an objection to the bill today will take the time to read part of the testimony and, needless to say, we will be very happy to answer any questions you may have concerning the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in the closing days of the last Congress, the other body passed a bill designed to establish an international office of tourism. That bill came to the House. In the House, our colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], had introduced a bill and my subcommittee gave it consideration at that time. It is interesting that one of the questions I raised at the time this bill was before the committee had to do with the problem of foreign currency.

This year the other body did include the provision concerning foreign currencies in their bill. But, in the course of our hearings this year, it became quite obvious to us this provision was not necessary. The Department of Commerce already has the authority to use foreign currencies and it is not necessary to put any additional amendment in to provide for these foreign currencies.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman because I was trying to explain it for the benefit of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It seems I have been unable to make myself clear. There is plenty of authority for using all these funds, but in the past we have been unable to impress a lot of these agencies as to the desirability of using them, and I think you are going to have to write it into law and say that wherever these funds are available, they shall be used. That is what I am insisting on. I want to support this bill. I am in favor of this. I would like to see more people come to the United States. I would even vote to appropriate money to bring more people to America where they could learn about our way of life, and carry this message back home, and I think it would do far more good than much of the money that we are spending in foreign countries. At the same time I cannot vote for a bill where you are not requiring these agencies to use the counterpart funds which, in my opinion, will never be used unless we write it into law demanding that they be used.

Mr. MACK. I first would like to say that they do have this authority, that the Secretary of Commerce has told the committee he is going to utilize all the counterpart funds available.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. I understood the previous speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], to say that if a mandatory provision to use counterpart funds had been included in the bill, we would not have a bill. Can the gentleman shed some light on that, if that is a correct interpretation of the gentleman's statement?

Mr. MACK. I think the problem there, as it has been explained to me, is the fact that if you have a mandatory requirement in the bill, then they will not be able to get the funds necessary to operate the agency of Government if counterpart funds are not available at the time they are needed. I might say this matter is up to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and if they decide to authorize the counterpart funds, the counterpart funds would have to be used by the agency or they would not have funds available.

Mr. BARRY. It would be possible for us to vote for this bill, if we believed the counterpart funds had to be used, first if the Committee on Appropriations so authorized in an appropriation bill covering the expenses for this agency of Government; is that not true?

Mr. MACK. Yes, this is a matter which must be determined by the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

Mr. BARRY. I think you referred earlier, or perhaps one of the previous speakers, referred earlier to hasty hearings on this. Was not that caused by our imbalance of exchange and imbalance of payments?

Mr. MACK. We had hearings last year.

Mr. BARRY. Does the gentleman think those who were opposed to the bill were heard as well as those who were particularly interested in it?

Mr. MACK. I think the gentleman will agree that 500 pages of testimony indicates substantial coverage.

Mr. BARRY. Inasmuch as the gentleman was chairman of the subcommittee I just wanted to make certain in my mind that he felt the opposition had been heard, too.

Mr. MACK. I only know that the hearings were well publicized, and that considerable time was devoted to this subject matter. We held hearings on March 28, 29, and 30, and April 11 and 12 of this year.

Mr. BARRY. And no one appeared against it?

Mr. MACK. As I say, we issued notices at the time the hearings were announced. The Secretary of Commerce appeared personally on two occasions before my committee, and I have news articles I received from California to New York. The hearings were extensively reported. I think most people who read the newspapers were aware of the fact that hearings were being conducted.

Mr. BARRY. As far as the gentleman was concerned, then, there was really no objection to the bill from the public.

Mr. MACK. No person testified in opposition to the bill when the subcommittee was holding hearings. No person to the best of my knowledge appeared before the Rules Committee in opposition to the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. On that particular point I may say to the gentleman from

New York that the budget that was submitted by his administration in January of this year included about 12 pages on the question of counterpart funds that was referred to by the gentleman.

Mr. MACK. I might also say that the last administration approved the proposal. That was during the last session of Congress. I may also say that President Eisenhower designated 1960 as the official Visit America Year, but they recognized too late that they had failed to follow through with any type of program to make it a success.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. KING of Utah. During debate on the rule on this bill two rather provocative questions were raised, and I would like to have the gentleman address himself to those questions if he will. The first was: Why cannot the U.S. Information Agency which now has a rather elaborate network spread over most of the world, why can they not be used for this service since they have the machinery already set up?

And the second question, as I understand it, was: What can the Government expect to do which private industry has not already done? It has been testified that private agencies are already spending $15 million a year in selling America. What would another $2 million or $3 million do that the $15 million are not doing? If the gentleman would discuss those two questions I would appreciate it.

Mr. MACK. I would be very happy to, and I had intended to cover those subjects at a little later point, but will be glad to do so now.

First of all the airlines, the steamship lines, the travel agencies, and others are interested selfishly in promoting their own interests. The purpose of this bill would not be to duplicate or subsidize any corporation or any private business, but to do what is being done by other countries, such as Great Britain, to encourage people to come to this country as a destination, to give them information, and develop low-cost tours.

It is a separate function. You need a Government agency and you need a private agency to carry that out.

Mr. KING of Utah. Is it not the purpose of the private tourist agencies also to bring people to America, or conversely?

Mr. MACK. Yes. We made reference to this in the report. You have Pan American Airways that would like to bring people to America on Pan American airplanes. You have several steamship lines that are operating overseas. You have some travel agencies, a limited number, that are operating overseas trying to encourage people to come here. This is an official function that is necessary as far as the overall program is concerned, if you want to do it successfully. The State of Florida has an agency similar to this. I have requested certain information from one of the Congressmen from Florida, and I understand the State of Florida spends some $4,600,000 a year to encourage the tourism and business into the State of Florida. Incidentally, they have done it with a great deal of success.

If you are going to really be serious about the visit U.S.A. program, you have to do that. There is promotional work and advertising, and it will take money to perform that service. I hope that answers the first question satisfactorily.

The second question concerns the U.S. Information Service. As I stated last year when this bill was before the committee, several of us were concerned that this job could be done in another fashion. If the gentleman will look at the hearings of last year, I suggested that the U.S. Information Service could perform this function. But, after doing considerable research on the matter, it was quite obvious that is not a function of the U.S. Information Service. On the other hand, the U.S. Information Service will perform a function that will assist our representatives, and we will utilize their facilities, as well as the facilities of the Department of State, wherever practicable. So they do have a part in it, but they cannot perform the service and they are not designed to perform the same functions that would be performed under the provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. First, the gentleman mentioned, in response to a previous question, that Pan American is advertising to bring people to America by Pan American Airlines. He said that this legislation had a much broader purpose than that. It is a fact, however, that one of the great losses to the United States is the travel on foreign lines that have been subsidized by foreign governments.

Is there going to be any attempt in this advertising to get them to use American lines, both air and surface?

Mr. MACK. I know that the Department of Commerce would be very happy to have them use American lines, and I am certain they would not discriminate against the American companies.

Mr. BRAY. I would hope they would not.

Mr. MACK. I do not think the purpose is to begin a program to discriminate against the transportation of other governments.

Mr. BRAY. The purpose is to get them to come to America instead of going from America. A very substantial part of the loss has been due to Americans using foreign lines. If we are going to make no attempt to sell American lines, it certainly would not save us so much gold as if we would do that. I wanted to mention that because that has been one of the great causes for the loss of gold to America. The subsidized foreign lines are taking the business of Americans traveling abroad. If we do not make some attempt to protect our lines, like the foreign countries do, we are not going to accomplish very much, at least as far as our gold reserves are concerned.

Mr. MACK. I share the gentleman's concern about the amount of money spent on foreign lines.

However, I do not believe that it would be the objective to exclude the foreign lines from the benefit of this legislation. I understand that the Americans are spending approximately $450 million—and these figures are not too accurate; they are estimates—on foreign carriers, and the foreigners are only spending about $104 million on the American lines. So, the gentleman is correct. You would have a deficit of approximately $346 million, which is part of the overall deficit. I think that something can be done to improve that situation, but in fairness I must say that I do not believe that is the objective to be accomplished by this legislation.

I might say to the gentleman, since he raised this question—and I notice that the gentlewoman from New York also mentioned the problem of our transportation system—that that is one of the things that can be accomplished here. This bill can strengthen our transportation system. There is a good possibility that the rates can be reduced if we can improve our flow of traffic and put it more in balance.

Today we have great peakloads going to Europe on the airlines especially in the spring of the year, about this time of the year, on in through the middle of July, and we have the peakloads coming back in the fall of the year. Since the Europeans take their vacations about the same time as the Americans, and if the program is successful, then you will even the flow of traffic, getting a heavier load, and therefore it would have the effect of reducing the cost of the transportation system.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple bill. It is designed to strengthen the foreign commerce of the United States and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally. Under this bill the Secretary is required to develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States.

The people on the Continent traditionally have traveled in groups. They have had group tours, and many expect the same kind of tour when they come into this country. The other problem is that some of the expenses are staggering when you get off the plane or ship in New York City and walk into the hotel. By group rates that can be reduced substantially.

I notice some of the congressional people went to New York on a special excursion that cost $30 per person. I heard this morning of another trip that leaves on Friday and comes back on Sunday that costs $50 a person for the week end. A travel agency does have a program for touring the entire eastern

seashore from Florida to New York for $150 for a 14-day period. That is the type of thing that we hope to encourage so that we can attract more tourists into this country. The bill will foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States consistent with sound economic principles.

That is carrying out the idea of the Bermuda Agreement of 1946 between the United States and Great Britain.

The bill provides that the Secretary shall "encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of international travel generally."

Also he is required to "collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics, information, and schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to international travel and tourism.

Also we have required that the Secretary of Commerce—"shall utilize the facilities and services of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible; and, to the fullest extent consistent with the performance of their own duties and functions, such agencies shall permit such utilization of facilities and services."

We are permitting him to "consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, and organizations engaged in or concerned with international travel, including local, State, Federal, and foreign governments, and international agencies."

And also he "may obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified professional organizations and personnel."

And he "may establish such branches in foreign countries, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, as he deems to be necessary and desirable."

We establish in this bill the Office of International Travel and Tourism. In the bill which I introduced we provided for a Director rather than an Assistant Secretary of State. And we establish that the salary shall be $18,000 per year.

The only other change made in the bill was that we authorize $3 million for the first year and $4.7 million in succeeding years. I might say, if some Members have any concern about the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that my chairman has been most diligent in this area and required that we authorize a specific amount for future years rather than leave it as an open-end proposition. I concur in that. I believe if it is necessary, as some of the gentlemen here have indicated, to expand this facility, that they shall come back to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for authorization before they can go to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my statement, and I should be glad to answer any questions anyone might have, if I can.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How many consultants presently in the Department of Commerce have been promoting this idea?

Mr. MACK. As a matter of fact, the Department of Commerce was at first opposed to this proposal and only late last year agreed to go along with it.

Mr. GROSS. How many consultants in the Department of Commerce have been promoting this? The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. MACK. To be perfectly fair about it, I do not know of any professional in the Department of Commerce who has been promoting it.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say professional, I said consultant.

Mr. MACK. I do not know of any consultant today who is promoting this bill who is associated with the Department of Commerce.

Mr. GROSS. The chairman of the subcommittee held hearings on this bill and I am sure he knows that the hearings show that at least one consultant has been hired at the rate of $50 a day plus expenses to promote this thing. He must know that; and I do not know how many more. But at least one shows up in these hearings.

Mr. MACK. I did not know; I was not aware of the fact that anyone had been hired to lobby the Congress on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I did not say to lobby the Congress, I said to promote it. I would rather the gentleman would not put words in my mouth.

Mr. MACK. I must say I was not aware of the fact that anyone had been hired for that purpose.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to say that I objected to the bill as it first came to the full committee on the ground that paragraph (b) in section 3 could be construed to develop a governmental agency that would be in competition with our own travel agencies.

I proposed an amendment to make sure that the Secretary, under the authority of this act, shall not provide or arrange for transportation for, or accommodations to, persons traveling between foreign countries and the United States in competition with business engaged in providing or arranging for such transportation or accommodations.

I do hope that in the conference our conferees will insist that that amendment stay in, because it was not in the Senate bill, it was not clear, and I think we should make it very definite that we are not trying to set up a governmental organization in competition with our own taxpaying organizations.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN].

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Chairman, I am on the subcommittee that handled this bill. I must say that when the hearings on similar bills started last year, I was extremely dubious as to the necessity for this legislation. However, as the hearings developed last year and as they were continued this year—and incidentally, I attended all the hearings because of my feeling originally about the bill—I became convinced of the need for this legislation.

These hearings, which were conducted under the able leadership of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK], developed certain things which convinced this member of the subcommittee that this is legislation which is going to be extremely beneficial to this country.

The United States is one of the very few countries which does not appropriate money for this specific program. Tourism is a big business. It just so happens that we are not benefiting from this business the way the other countries of the world are doing.

Questions were asked of the various witnesses that appeared before the subcommittee as to whether or not this bill was being pushed for the purpose of having the Government take over the expenditure of money private industry of this country is now spending. It was proved, to my satisfaction, at least, that this was not the idea, that these funds were to supplement the funds presently being spent by private enterprise.

As a matter of fact, the National Association of Travel Organizations, which is probably one of the biggest organizations in this field, indicated that the members of that organization were spending approximately $101 million a year now for this type of work, and, of that sum, approximately $10 million was for promotional work in foreign countries. The witness for this group testified that the members intend to continue to spend that sum and, in fact, increase the amount they spend annually.

We may ask: Why is it necessary to have Government funds spent when so much is being spent by private enterprise? That question has already been answered, I think, but I should like to add that I feel sure that when a private industry spends money for such promotional work, it is spending it for its own particular interest. The airlines, for instance, are undoubtedly slanting such promotional funds to appeal to the sections of the United States which they serve. That is the reason why it is necessary to have these Federal funds to supplement that type of expenditure to promote travel to this country in general.

We were asked, Can you use counterpart funds for these purposes? Frankly, I think we can and should use counterpart funds wherever possible. Secretary Hodges was asked his personal feeling about the matter, and I believe that he said he was in favor of the use of counterpart funds, and if this bill became law he would explore that possibility to the fullest. He pointed out one thing we should consider here, however; I believe he said that counterpart funds are available usually only in the underdeveloped countries, that there are normally not counterpart funds available in the developed countries of Europe from which most of this traffic is expected to develop. Therefore, that would seem to restrict the use of counterpart funds.

It seems to me this is a relatively small expenditure that is being asked

for here and I think there are strong possibilities of a large return. Therefore, I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any estimate of the return that he so fluently talks about?

Mr. CURTIN. Secretary Hodges was asked that particular question. He was not able to put it down in dollars and cents. The question was also asked of the Secretary as to the currency restrictions of foreign governments and whether that would not restrict the amount of money that people could spend when they came to this country.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania cannot tell us and neither can the Secretary of Commerce tell us whether this is going to increase tourism to this country or not; is that correct?

Mr. CURTIN. That is quite correct.

Mr. GROSS. So this is another one of these blank check operations—where we hope for the best and fear the worst—but the money is going to be spent anyway.

Mr. CURTIN. It is a promotional program and practically all the other countries in the world find it is a profitable expenditure, and I certainly think we ought to try it.

Mr. GROSS. Why did this go from $910,000 to $3 million.

Mr. CURTIN. I believe that the original expenditure asked for in one of the bills last year was this lesser sum. However, this year as the hearings developed, the witnesses itemized the amount of money that would be necessary until the next fiscal year. It is my recollection that the $900,000 in that bill last year was for the fiscal year ending July 1961, and the $3 million in this bill is for the fiscal year ending July 1962.

Mr. GROSS. I understand this bill has the support of the Kennedy administration; is that correct?

Mr. CURTIN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And this is the Kennedy bill—or is it?

Mr. CURTIN. This bill also had the support of the Eisenhower administration last year. This present bill, I believe, had some reductions in the amount and some of the personnel originally asked for in President Kennedy's recommendations.

Mr. GROSS. President Kennedy wanted a Secretary, did he not, in the Department of Commerce to direct this operation?

Mr. CURTIN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And he also wanted a $20,000-a-year salary for this Pooh-Bah; is that correct?

Mr. CURTIN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And I think originally he wanted to start this thing at $5 million; did he not?

Mr. CURTIN. I am not sure as to the figure, but it was more than is set forth in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. So this is not exactly the Kennedy bill?

Mr. CURTIN. The idea in back of this legislation is favored by the Kennedy administration and was favored by the Eisenhower administration; that is right.

Mr. GROSS. And it was thrown out by the Committee on Appropriations, and every time it has been tried in the past several years it has been thrown out. They tried to run it through the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriations for the purpose has been thrown out; has it not?

Mr. CURTIN. My colleague is more familiar with whether that is correct than I am.

Mr. GROSS. So we had to wait until this year to get a bill out of the Committe on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for this kind of boondoggle.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. I did not find anywhere in these hearings a statement as to the number of tourists, the actual number of tourists coming into the United States from foreign countries and those leaving the United States to go to foreign countries as tourists. Is such a figure available?

Mr. CURTIN. I believe it is in the hearings. I believe it was submitted in a letter—which later became a statement—addressed to the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK], from Secretary Hodges. I believe it is part of the exhibits attached to that statement.

Mr. KYL. I did find some figures of the nonimmigrant visa status people and, of course, a lot of those would be students rather than tourists; would they not?

Mr. CURTIN. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me on this question in order to make it clear, the record of the hearings show that there were 455,000 people who came into this country from overseas and 1,500,000 approximately who went from this country to foreign lands.

Mr. KYL. Could the gentleman give me the number of the page that that information is to be found?

Mr. HARRIS. I would be glad to look it up and advise the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIN. I yield.

Mr. KYL. Is it not true that one-third of this so-called travel gap cost is involved in travel itself rather than in the stay within the United States or the foreign country?

Mr. CURTIN. I am not quite sure I understand the gentleman's question. Does the gentleman mean is it in transportation or is it in money left in this country after they arrive where we have this travel gap?

Mr. KYL. The gentleman interprets it correctly.

Mr. CURTIN. That is a question I would like to refer to the distinguished chairman of the committee who undoubtedly would be able to answer it.

Mr. HARRIS. I refer the gentleman to page 3 of the report in which there is a disclosure of the payments and receipts arising from foreign travel in the decade from 1950 to 1960, from which he can obtain the information.

Mr. KYL. The purpose of asking the question was to ascertain if there was anything in this bill which would promote the use of U.S. travel facilities rather than foreign carriers.

Mr. HARRIS. No; the bill is not designed for that purpose at all. As the gentleman will remember, the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER] a moment ago explained his interest in subsection (b) on page 3 of the bill in which he wanted it made abundantly clear that this was not to interfere whatsoever with what private carriers or transportation people are doing in this regard; in other words, this will not in any way arrange for transportation or for accommodations, or try to describe what type of travel should be used. The intent of the bill is to supplement the work of private industry and in this way encourage through advertising and so forth abroad this program which would inure to the benefit of the private agencies who are trying to develop travel for the transportation facilities of this country. We hope by this method we will recoup some of the losses we have sustained in our international balance of payments.

Mr. KYL. The point I wanted to make is that if we continue to use foreign carriers in the same proportion in the future as we have in the past the relative disparity between income and outgo so far as tourism is concerned would still exist, would it not?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think you can view it that way. I think our own people should utilize our own travel facilities extensively. What we need to do is to change the situation where foreign travelers use other lines instead of ours. We hope to do so by this method. We hope it will encourage the use of our own carriers. And then there is the matter of the kind of accommodations they will have when they get here. The mechanics of this program have been worked out more or less consistently we think.

Mr. KYL. It would seem reasonable to assume that with a larger number of Americans going abroad than vice versa, our people must be using these foreign carriers to create this disparity which shows up, and I was hoping we might be able to do something realistic about it.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, that should be the concern of all of us, but I do not think that is where the great bulk of the imbalance comes; that comes from money that is spent in foreign countries. That is what brings about the imbalance of payments.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I believe the RECORD up to this point is abundantly clear in one respect; that is, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did not bring this bill to the floor as a starry-eyed, ill-conceived, hastily constructed bill.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned a moment ago that he was

dubious at the start. Many other members of the committee felt the same way. That is one reason why we did not bring a travel bill to the floor of the House last year. I will admit I was one of those who wanted a long, close look at this legislation.

I had the opportunity of traveling abroad last fall to study this problem, as it were, in the field. One of the things in this debate which has puzzled me a little bit has been the reference, particularly during the discussion on the rule, to this bill being in competition with free enterprise. I suggest it is entirely the opposite. I suggest that it is a partnership with free enterprise; and I suggest, further, that the travel industry is big business indeed, and that every segment of it which was represented at the hearings and by the representatives to whom we talked abroad, favored this legislation. When I mentioned the travel industry, I am not thinking only of the airlines, the steamship lines, and the railroads, but I am thinking all the way down to the distribution of that dollar, to the little storekeeper who sells a pennant to a visitor for a dime. I conceive this agency as being the hub of a wheel.

The suggestion has been made here that the U.S. Information Service could handle this matter, that the embassies could handle the matter, that the airline travel agencies could handle the matter. What we need is a hub represented by this travel agency which can coordinate all of those activities.

We found during our investigations abroad that none of them separately can do that job. I admit very frankly at this point unless that hub, that core, is manned by capable, experienced travel people, the program will not succeed. I believe it will be so manned. I believe that the first $50 million of additional revenue we get through these additional visitors to our shores will pay, more than pay off in direct taxation the amount appropriated in this bill, leaving everything additional to the general economy of our country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman will agree with me, this being an off year so far as elections are concerned, with the junketing number of Members that is going to take place all over the world, if the Members of Congress could not save the taxpayers some money by drumming up this business while they are junketing around the world. Could it be done somewhat in that way?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I think the gentleman has his own ideas on that. Let me say that I have before me a 40-page document. I am not ashamed of the document and the words which went into it. I think we are better prepared to deal with this problem on the floor of the House today because three Members of this House did junket abroad and did study this problem abroad.

I would like to say finally, Mr. Chairman, that an experience I had in London one day erased the final doubt from my mind. I took a long walk in the fog there one morning and I counted the number of countries which have official Government travel agencies. Some of them were very elaborate, indeed. There were 40. There was Great Britain, of course, but we went all the way down the line to little Malta, and I have an idea that those 40 countries are not just throwing money away. I think they feel that they are producing for their respective countries, and I think that the United States will benefit from the passage of this legislation.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words in support of the pending bill, H.R. 4614, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, which I feel is of extreme importance. The most dramatic part of this bill, and I might add, my bill H.R. 4145 which is similar to the bill before us, deals with the outflow of gold from the United States. Of equal importance is the part that deals with the fact that if we can attract people here to the United States who have been neglected for quite some time, that the long-range point of view of this bill will be almost as effective, and that is giving proper perspective to the United States, and our much vaunted way of life to the people who ordinarily feel that it would be beyond their means to be able to come to the United States.

I think that the imbalance of the difference between American tourists spending abroad and foreign tourists spending here in the United States has become four times as large as it was less than 15 years ago.

During the past year it reached a staggering sum and made up almost one-third of our total payments imbalance.

I think that even more significant is the fact that the increase in this travel deficit in 1960 alone amounts to $145 million. Unquestionably, the greatest single factor contributing to this deficit increase has been the explosive expansion of the numbers of U.S. citizens traveling and spending abroad.

This expansion, in turn, is largely due to concentrated effort on the part of foreign governments and international transportation interests to corner American tourist dollars through intensive advertising campaigns and promotional programs conducted in this country. Since World War II the United States heart of its foreign aid program has taken steps at home to facilitate travel of U.S. citizens abroad, and has provided both financial and technical assistance to foreign countries to aid in the rehabilitation and expansion of tourist facilities overseas. But little or nothing has been done to promote travel to this country from abroad or to prepare the tourists and transportation industries of this country to accommodate a substantial number of foreign travelers. For various reasons, the so-called Visit U.S.A. in 1960 campaign announced by President Eisenhower never got off the ground, and the small amounts presently budgeted by the Department of Commerce for the initial work of an Office of International Travel, in my opinion, are completely inadequate to support an effective promotional program. The new Office of International Travel and Tourism would be created within the Department of Commerce with a budget of $3 million for the first year and attempts to set up a realistic travel promotion program on the Federal level.

The bill I introduced contains an additional provision for the establishment of a Travel Advisory Board, to aid in the task of formulating overall policy with special emphasis on the development of the American tourists and travel facilities to fit the special requirements of foreign visitors. This Advisory Board would be composed of 20 members, appointed by the Secretary and would include representatives of all segments of the tourist industry. They would be individuals who, by reason of interest, training, or experience are qualified to advise and consult with the Director and make recommendations for programs and policies to be adopted. While I believe such an Advisory Board would be of real importance in stimulating interest and making the program more effective, I heartily support the provisions of H.R. 4614 which was authored by my good friend and colleague, PETER F. MACK. I know that this legislation will give impetus to a program which was endorsed by both the previous administration and by the present administration.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. MCDOWELL].

Mr. MCDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4614, which is similar to a measure I introduced as H.R. 5536, to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of an Office of International Travel within the Department of Commerce.

In my testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I stated that I would support and vote for the committee bill if it adequately carried out the purposes I had in mind in introducing my own H.R. 5536.

Among the steps advanced by President Kennedy to ease the balance-of-payments problem was one to attract foreign investment and travelers to this country.

The bill we are considering today will make it possible to launch a major drive to attract foreign visitors to the United States.

It is significant that this legislation had the support of the Eisenhower administration last year, and that it has the broadest kind of support in the travel industry, and among leaders in banking, business, farming, and labor.

The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hodges, has endorsed it heartily, and many people have appeared to testify in favor of it.

The United States is the only major nation in the world today which does

not have a travel bureau to encourage people from other nations to visit our 50 States.

Because of the lack of such a Federal tourist agency, other nations are getting the tourist trade, and our travel deficit is growing at the rate of $150 million a year.

In 1960 the travel deficit reached the alarming sum of $1,200 million or the equivalent of about one-third of our entire balance-of-payments deficit.

If we brought home to our shores all of the dependents of our Armed Forces, as former President Eisenhower proposed, the saving would still be less than what is being drained off by means of foreign travel by Americans.

Americans last year spent $2.2 billion abroad, while foreign tourists spent only about $1,100 million in our own country.

It was shown in the committee hearings that American travel abroad has doubled since 1953, and this increase is largely due to the fact that under the active leadership and direction of national governmental agencies abroad foreign tourist and transportation companies have been engaged in a massive program of travel promotion.

The travel bill under consideration here today—like the bill I sponsored—will make it possible for the United States to expand travel in this country by people of other nations, and to encourage these foreign tourists to visit us for purposes of study, and activities in such diverse fields as culture, recreation, and business.

The Soviet Union has moved aggressively to lure tourists behind the Iron Curtain.

We must not lose sight of the fact that we are in a cold war, and it behooves us to get as many tourists to come to this country as possible where they can observe us at work, at play, in our homes, in our business, and governing ourselves.

In this way we will be able to build enduring friendships, and our visitors will leave our shores knowing us as we really are. They will go back home to become the best kind of ambassadors of good will.

Many of these tourists will come in the future, as they have come in the past, to the great State of Delaware.

Let me say that Delawareans will continue to display their matchless hospitality.

Our restaurants, our seashore, our famous museums and historic buildings and towns will continue to rest, relax, delight, and educate all of our visitors.

Rehoboth Beach has few equals anywhere in the world, and the French and Italians with their own superb beaches will find new delights at Rehoboth Beach.

Culturally minded European families will enjoy especially the new and stimulating way in which they can enjoy the arts in our State.

Europeans who have lived all their lives with some of the world's greatest art museums and galleries will especially enjoy such museums as Winterthur, with its matchless collections of American furniture, the Hagley Museum, the Delaware State Museum at Dover, and the Zwaanendael Museum at Lewes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS.]

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of this bill, I would like to join my colleagues in support of this legislation. I feel strongly that this bill is in the national interest, and of course we in the resort State of Florida have an interest in it as well.

As you know, this bill would seek to increase foreign tourism in this country by establishing American travel offices overseas, conducting promotional campaigns for travel within the United States, greater facilitating the processing of visitors as they enter and leave the United States, and easing travel restrictions. In short, we would greatly improve our image overseas by extending a warmer hand of welcome.

Previously, travel within the United States was considered a very expensive proposition, available only to a small segment of the world. But now, as more countries are showing the effects of prosperity, travel within the United States could become a reality for millions of the world's citizens if the desire to do so were created. A campaign to create such desire is inherent in this bill. I further believe that this bill meets with the action requested by the President. In a recent message to Congress, the President outlined the balance of payments problem and the gold outflow. In this message, the President stated that Americans spend some $2 billion abroad on foreign tourism, but that only $1 billion is spent by foreign travelers in the United States. Thus, Mr. Chairman, if a bill of this nature were passed, the United States could realize an additional income of $1 billion.

It is my belief that such an energetic program outlined in this legislation would not only be a boon to the national economy, but the economy of every community and tourist facility in the Nation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I have long been interested in this subject and have had legislation in for some time. Although I would have made changes in the bill that the committee reported out, I think it is an excellent composite of a collection of ideas and brings us to the hard, basic fact that we have to face, which is that it is high time that our National Government provided some national leadership in this all-important area. The fact is that the current balance of payments problem can be attributed in large part to the tourist gap. Almost one-third of the dollar gap for the year 1960 is traceable to the tourist gap. So, here we have got a hard, practical reason for the enactment of this bill.

It is extremely important also to stress the nonmonetary benefits that might accrue—the political, cultural, and educational significance of foreign tourism and the promotion of it. But, we have a tough-minded Congress here, and they are entitled to know what the facts are insofar as the benefit materially to be gained by the United States in this area, so I will concentrate on that.

The tourist gap is well over a billion dollars. It is accelerating at the rate of $100 million a year. It has been proven that there is a direct relationship between the amount of hard currencies that a country gains and the amount of effort that that government puts into the operation of the tourist business. Figures have been stated by the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee, Mr. GLENN, indicating the amount of effort that other countries put in. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN], has done the same: Great Britain, $2.8 million; France, $2.6 million; and India, $1.5 million per year.

The several States of the United States collectively spend over $17 million a year in order to attract tourists into their areas. It is estimated that $1 out of every $10 spent in this country by foreigners finds its way into the National Treasury.

It seems to me that what has to be done in this country if we are to take a leadership position is to shift the whole point of view about travel to the United States. For decades we have as a country been obsessed with a kind of xenophobia. We have done just the opposite of trying to attract people to come to the United States. Our whole system of immigration laws is designed, in fact, to keep people out of the United States. Every tourist who comes to the United States must qualify under the immigration laws insofar as they apply to nonpermanent residents of the United States and go through all the necessary redtape. We are so afraid that one of them might wish to settle down in the United States and become a permanent resident that we handcuff the business of encouraging people to come to this country. I suggest that what we have to do is to change the direction of the railroad train that we are on. For years we have been going in the direction of exclusion. Now it is high time that we reverse the direction of the train and start competing with other countries; that we ask people to come to the United States and encourage them to visit us.

This bill will bring together and provide leadership to the entire industry. This is a private industry, run by conservative people. But it is an industry which recognizes the need for national leadership. The industry is willing to spend money—to make substantial investments. They have faith that this program will work. They are willing to develop programs in order to attract the nationals of other countries to this country; but they do look for leadership. No one segment of the industry, be it hotels or airplanes, or railroads, or travel agents, is going to go out on a single limb by itself in the absence of a nationwide effort with a national leadership behind it.

I quite agree with the statement made a moment ago by my colleague from New York, Mr. O'BRIEN, that other countries which are making a national effort to attract tourists to their countries, are not doing it with any sense of altruism toward the rest of the world.

They are trying to attract capital to their own countries.

I agree also with the statement that this is going to require the assistance of professionals if we are going to do a proper job. The U.S. Government has got to take experts aboard if it is going to promote tourism to the United States.

Now, can the job be done? I do not think the travel industry would be as enthusiastic about this measure if it did not think it could be done. It can be done. Why do we stand in this Chamber and even for a moment make the suggestion that we cannot compete with other countries in this kind of thing? We are experts in package programs. We know how to do this, so let us begin.

Mr. Chairman, let me make one other reference. When I testified before the subcommittee which has written this bill, I emphasized the importance of the Congress taking steps to reexamine our immigration laws insofar as they apply to tourists. I mentioned that we give the impression of being obsessed with a sense of xenophobia, and we do. And one reason we do is because of the ridiculous complexities of our immigration system for tourist visitors, the so-called nonpermanent immigrants to the United States. When you think that a foreigner coming to this country has got to deal with the State Department to get a visa, with Health, Education, and Welfare for his health check, with the Treasury Department for his customs check, with the Justice Department for his immigration check, and now with the Commerce Department which is going to be involved in the travel business, you can see how utterly absurd it is that there is no reformation of this entire subject.

In addition to this, remember that there are in our immigration laws built-in restrictions against travel. For example, why are we bogged down with visas where tourists are involved? The Secretary of State should be given the power to waive the visa requirement for nonpermanent residents—tourists to the United States—on the basis of reciprocity with other countries.

Some say, How are you going to have a check if you get rid of visas? The Justice Department, which is responsible for immigration and our internal security, has made it eminently clear that this is desirable, and it ought to be done. What you would establish in lieu thereof is a less expensive and less cumbersome system of preinspection. A bill I have introduced would make these changes.

Another example: the burden of proof is on a tourist to prove that he is not coming to the United States in order to settle down permanently. He has to prove this before he can get a visa to visit the United States. Why should not this be changed? I believe it should, and a bill I have introduced would do so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Fifty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Abbitt	Evins	Norrell
Addabbo	Fallon	O'Neill
Addonizio	Fenton	Osmers
Albert	Fino	Ostertag
Anfuso	Flood	Philbin
Ashley	Fogarty	Powell
Auchincloss	Fulton	Rabaut
Barrett	Garmatz	Rains
Bass, N.H.	Gavin	Randall
Becker	Gilbert	Rhodes, Pa.
Blitch	Granahan	Riehlman
Brewster	Grant	Riley
Broomfield	Gray	Rivers, S.C.
Buckley	Green, Pa.	Roberts
Burke, Ky.	Harsha	Rodino
Byrne, Pa.	Harvey, Ind.	Rousselot
Cahill	Hébert	Saylor
Cannon	Holifield	Schweiker
Carey	Holland	Scranton
Casey	Holtzman	Shelley
Celler	Horan	Smith, Va.
Chiperfield	Ichord, Mo.	Spence
Clark	Kearns	Staggers
Coad	Kee	Steed
Collier	Keogh	Stephens
Colmer	Kilburn	Stubblefield
Conte	Kitchin	Teague, Tex.
Cook	Kluczynski	Thompson, La.
Corbett	Macdonald	Thompson, Tex.
Daddario	Madden	Toll
Dague	Martin, Mass.	Tuck
Davis, John W.	Meader	Wallhauser
	Merrow	Walter
Davis, Tenn.	Miller, N.Y.	Watts
Dawson	Milliken	Whalley
Delaney	Minshall	Williams
Dent	Moorhead, Pa.	Wilson, Calif.
Devine	Morgan	Wilson, Ind.
Diggs	Morrison	Winstead
Dole	Mosher	
Donohue	Moulder	
Dooley	Nix	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 4614, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 311 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY], is recognized.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, when the point of order was made I had about completed my statement.

In conclusion, let me say that for the reasons that I have mentioned—economic, political, cultural, and educational—a new effort is required in this area. The promotion and facilitation of foreign tourist travel in this country is on all possible counts both good policy and good sense. The most immediate pressing reason is the necessity for positive action to help mitigate the alarming deficit in our balance of payments. More important in the long run is the need to open new and vitally needed channels of communication between the American people and our friends all over the world.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the distinguished gentleman from Illinois to yield me this time so that I might advise the Committee that I am going to offer an amendment to this bill on page 4, line 24. This amendment will provide as follows:

> Of which not less than $2 million annually shall be used for the purchase of foreign currency credits owned by the United States Treasury.

This will require the use of foreign currencies in the administration of this program up to not less than $2 million a year.

In some of the debate here today it was indicated that there were no foreign currencies except in backward Nations. I will say to the membership that I hold in my hand a record of the foreign currencies owned by the Treasury. If anyone is interested, when I have used my time I shall be glad to refer to any country you want to and show their foreign currencies owned by the United States Treasury. I am talking about France, the United Kingdom, Germany, and almost all of the South American countries; in fact, practically any place you can think of where this program might be put into effect there are foreign currency holdings. So I think we should utilize these foreign currencies inasmuch as we are setting up this agency abroad and going to use these moneys abroad. We might just as well be using the currencies we have in our possession.

I take this time, if anyone is interested in finding out about any particular country, to say that I have the record here. I will at the proper time offer this amendment to permit the use of foreign currencies for this purpose.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, in March and April the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee conducted hearings on H.R. 4614, and 15 other similar proposals. We are today considering the reported measure, and I should like to take this opportunity to go on record as a proponent of the bill.

The legislation before us, if favorably considered, would establish an Office of International Trade and Tourism and would also impose upon the Secretary of Commerce certain functions and duties in carrying out the provisions of the measure. The primary purpose of the bill is, of course, to encourage foreign tourists to visit the United States thereby promoting friendly understanding and appreciation among this and other Nations. However, Mr. Chairman, it is to another equally important, and perhaps even more imminent, purpose that I should like to address myself for the next few moments.

At the present, most Americans are deeply, and I think properly, concerned about the outflow of gold from this country and the deficit in our international balance of payments. Intensive studies have revealed that an important aspect of the trade deficit accounts for nearly one-third of our total balance of payments deficiency. This has been referred

to as the tourist gap or the travel dollar gap. Defined simply, this gap is the difference between the amount spent abroad by American tourists as compared with the amount spent in the United States by foreign travelers.

Mr. Chairman, it goes without saying that this tourist gap is highly detrimental to the Nation's economy. It represents over a billion dollars lost each year to foreign businessmen and it means that in order to travel abroad over 1,500,000 Americans disregard the natural and scenic vacation wonders of places like Oklahoma and the Southwest in general. I would suggest this afternoon that the adoption of H.R. 4614 and the implementation of its provisions would develop an aggressive and effectual program which might result in a reversal of this trend. Foreign tourists would be encouraged to visit the United States and the dollars they spend would, I think, go a long way toward arresting the evergrowing tourist gap and correcting the balance of payments deficit.

Mr. Chairman, some Members of Congress may understandably hesitate to authorize a new program costing several millions of dollars, especially in these years of unbalanced budgets and a national debt approaching $300 billion. However, I would point out that funds for a Federal travel bureau, in a very real sense, would be an investment realizing dollar returns as more and more foreign tourists visit America. Foreign trade and tourist dollars are an intricate part of our gross national product. With an increase of foreign visitors, which would surely come as a result of the enactment of this bill, we can expect an expansion of the foreign trade component of the GNP, resulting in an increase of the entire national income. Economically then, Mr. Chairman, there is justification for enactment of the measure before us.

In conclusion, I am convinced that fruits of action in this vast field of international travel are exceeding abundant. I have touched on only one major phase. There are, of course, many others that could be brought to your attention. However, that aspect already mentioned in my remarks is sufficient enough, I think, for me to urge the committee to report H.R. 4614 back favorably to the House, and to then join with me in voting final approval.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the subcommittee which has been considering this legislation now for 2 years. When we first received the legislation last summer it was known as S. 3102, a Senate bill, which had an authorization of $5 million. At that time, for the benefit of those on my left, not only had the Republican Budget Bureau approved the $5 million authorization and the Secretary of the Treasury of the last administration under budget authority had sent a letter to the chairman of our committee approving the authorization.

When we examined the witness concerning the legislation we were not satisfied that the legislation had been prepared with the proper background, even though it was proposed by the administration, so we did not report out the bill last year, because we felt they were not prepared. We made an exhaustive examination to determine whether or not this would be profitable to the United States.

In that connection, we found that for the Department of Commerce in previous years the budget had carried an item of $75,000 for encouraging travel. When we were overseas on a trip of investigation we found that the United States of America was the only country of any consequence we could find that had not realized that traffic was a profitable business. Even though travel today is the fourth largest industry in the United States, even though the United Kingdom today is spending over £2 million, or approximately $6 million, and even though such little countries as Denmark have a budget for this purpose of over $2 million, today we question the economy of spending over 3 years approximately $12 million in an effort to offset $1,200 million of imbalance in our balance of payments. So this measure says we will offset 1 percent against the deficit to see what we get back. We will get back our investment tenfold if this program works.

If you are interested in what other countries have spent, look at page 386 of the hearings.

If you are interested in the facts of the record, look at it and the facts will tell you that other countries realize that this is profitable. When we were on this particular trip that some call a junket, we went to the State of Hawaii and examined carefully what the State of Hawaii was able to do. The State of Hawaii had a budget of $2 million and they estimated that the tourist business had brought them as much money or even more money than any other industry they have in that great State of Hawaii. When we went to London and were trying to examine the reason for the vacuum which existed in our U.S. effort, we found that other countries questioned the fact that this great country of America had never seen the profit that other countries had realized. When I speak of profit, I not only speak of, perhaps, the $50 million or up to the $500 million which it has been estimated we will get from the tourist trade, but I am talking about the tax dollar that will be realized from the money that is spent in this country. If you are interested in the tax dollar, and if you want to read the record and see what the truth of the matter is, look at page 379 of the record and you will find the tax potential that will bring revenue to this country far in excess of this meager item that we are spending amounting to $3 million the first year and $4.7 million in the years after that.

It just does not make any sense to say that this is not an economy measure for the country. It does not make any sense to do what some of my friends call nit picking on this proposition where we can make some money for a change, and then turn around and try to excuse their vote on some other proposition where we are giving away money with no possibility of a return.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I wonder if the committee made any investigation of the capacity of these foreign countries to spend money for this purpose. That is, I can see how some of the foreign countries might spend money to get Americans to go to their countries, but do they have the capacity to spend money to come here and spend money in the United States?

Mr. HEMPHILL. They not only have the capacity, but on pages 67, 68 and 69 of the record we have listed not only how much they can spend or take out of their country, but they allow them to buy dollars to come to this country to spend in this country. Not only have we done this—but just to give one illustration of what can be done, about 2 or 3 years ago under the auspices of one of the travel agents, 80 Swedish industrialists came to this country for the purpose of visiting in a group. When they went back to Sweden, after a period of 3 or 4 months had elapsed, they were asked what impact it had on their purchases of goods from the United States. This is what they said: They said, We went as a group, but if we had come as individuals and then come back to try to tell the group what the advantages are of trading with America, no one would have listened. But as a group, everybody has been able to see just what the situation is. That particular industrial organization is sending this year, and has sent every year since their first trip, 80 Swedish industrialists to this country to see if they can buy our goods to take back to Sweden to sell. That is the sort of thing that has not been examined, apparently, by the people who are opposed to this bill. They have not only not read the record, but they have not examined into the question of the impact of this legislation. This is the first legislation I have seen, providing for so small an expenditure, which has so great a potential of bringing you back the dollars that America is spending overseas in the currencies of other countries and bringing back good relations and bringing about an opportunity even down to the smallest villages for foreign visitors to come and visit with us and see how we live and learn to love us. The opportunity is unlimited at a price of 1 percent of what you are investing against—even if you want to call it gambling and I say it is investing, not gambling.

This is good legislation. It is sound legislation. Every other country in the world knows it is good legislation. They spend money on this sort of thing and they wonder why we have not spent money on it. Someone has questioned the budget on advertising. I questioned the advertising at first, but I realize in order to sell America you have to give them a picture of America overseas. We found out that you cannot even get a map of the United States so that people in other countries can make out a travel

itinerary for themselves. We found out that you could not get information about the United States.

In one place we ran into a situation triggered because Pan American had published a book. It was illegal for the government authorities to put out that book because Pan American had its name on it. We found that a private individual was buying copies at 75 cents apiece and distributing them so that people would know something about America. The people of this country wanted to go to America but did not have the information, did not know how to go about it.

We do not have offices similar to even the small countries of Europe, Cyprus, Malta; even the little country of Ghana has offices to lure travel organizations and travel generally to their country. I think we should be willing to spend a little money on the development of this the fourth biggest industry in the United States. I think it deserves at least the consideration this bill allows and the potential which this bill will promote.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill and urge upon my colleagues favorable consideration and an affirmative vote on its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to stress one particular point of this bill which has not been discussed with the attention I feel it deserves. We have talked about the potential that is present in this bill to make money for the United States. We have talked about the potential for tax revenue that is inherent in the bill. I do not want to belittle these things, but there is an even greater potential to the United States and to the people than the money that might be attracted by the very modest expenditure provided in this bill; that is, the possibility of bringing to our shores a large number of visitors; and this bill offers to us a vehicle which extends an opportunity for Europeans, Asiatics, Africans, nationals of countries everywhere around this world to visit the United States.

It offers a potential vehicle for them to visit us in unit tours, low-cost tours, which would probably be the way most of them can travel. As has been pointed out to us previously, most of these people do not travel as Americans travel, individually, but cooperatively. They travel as parts of business groups, parts of labor unions, parts of religious groups, parts of professional societies, groups from the same or a similar college, or groups with kindred interest. I would ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which handled this particular bill, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK] a question which I would ask him to discuss. Page 3 of the bill, subsection (2), reads as follows:

> (2) May consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, and organizations engaged in or concerned with international travel, including local, State, Federal, and foreign governments, and international agencies;

I am sure my colleague recalls that we discussed the proposition of whether this could not be utilized by the Secretary to stimulate and encourage low-cost tours and to encourage American organizations and American travel associations, various trade unions, which are engaged in cooperative programs of travel abroad. I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether or not my understanding is correct that this section will encourage the Secretary to cooperate and assist these organizations that are engaged already in these programs, to assist them in bringing their alter egos in other lands to this country under cooperative programs?

Mr. MACK. I may say to the gentleman in two of the bills we have instructed the Secretary to refer to the development of tourist facilities, low-cost unit tours, and other arrangements with the United States in meeting the requirements. I would think he would be interested in developing various groups within this country, the ones the gentleman has mentioned, in order to have some assistance in developing tours in this country. One of the big problems in connection with the program and to make the business attractive is as the gentleman has outlined, and I am sure the Director or the Secretary would want to consult those groups.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to point out that we are spending in this country right now billions of dollars to encourage friendship abroad through the various exchange programs and through programs which we have in the State Department and other Government agencies to bring foreign nationals within our boundaries to see our country.

In subsection (1) of section 2, it is stated:

> The "Secretary" shall—(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States.

Under these two sections a program of great benefit could be conferred upon our people in the encouragement of international travel. Dollars can be earned. More important we can earn friends in a battle for men's minds with atheistic godless communism—visitors to our shores will have an opportunity to learn of our way—its virtues and of our concern for the dignity of man.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I promised to yield back part of my time.

Mr. GROSS. Do not be in a hurry. We have the rest of the afternoon. This is the shank of the afternoon.

I wonder if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] would like to see these tourists equipped with Mercedes, Volkswagens, or Fords made in England, or whether they will bring their own cars when they come to this country, and perhaps sell them here to compete with the auto industry in Michigan. I do not know of any exclusions in this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not like to ask any embarrassing questions.

Mr. GROSS. I would not want the gentleman to ask such questions.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have the highest admiration for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. Since cars have been coming in from abroad, I do not know how he regards some activities.

Mr. GROSS. The tourists will have to have a car; will they not? The tourists will have to have an automobile to travel in when they come to this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have no idea of what they will want. Has the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. No; but I assume we will be providing them in one way or another with automobiles before we get through with this, if we follow the usual procedure in dealing with foreigners in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it a good idea we have here in this bill to encourage these people to come here from abroad on the theory they may spend some of their money here? They might be induced to do that, provided we continue this foreign aid program and give them the money so that they can come over. Some folks do not think that will be very helpful overall.

Someday, sometime, someone will have to say something about our own national security, but realizing how the House talks, acts, and votes until adversity comes—until we have no more dollars to spend—can borrow no more—the spending seems certain to continue. But just a word about our present situation.

SELF-PRESERVATION

Mr. Chairman, now or later, if we are to survive as a nation, the administration will be forced to adopt a positive, aggressive policy—determine what we must do for our own protection and then aggressively follow through.

Yesterday, for 40 minutes, the House debated House Concurrent Resolution 226, which states:

> It is the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; and also to exclude representatives of the Government of Cuba from attendance at meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board.

Tomorrow, there may be a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of this resolution.

We are asking the 20 nations of the Organization of American States to take action to protect our future existence. This because, by joining this and other international organizations, we have surrendered our right to act independently, even though our national existence may be at stake.

We are now confronted by the fact that we must either make good our promises to others or, violating those

agreements, do whatever we think is necessary to retain our independence, make secure our future existence as a nation.

My vote will again, as always in the past, be cast against a surrender of the power to determine our own course in world affairs, instead of placing our future in the hands of a one world or some international organization.

That we must before too long make a vital decision is evident from the editorial in the May 20 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which I read:

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CAN'T AFFORD ANOTHER FIASCO IN CUBA

It ought to be plain to everybody by this time that no insurrection against Castro's Soviet satellite in Cuba is going to succeed without U.S. assistance, and a lot more of it than was available for the abortive and scandalously overadvertised putsch of last month. With Soviet military equipment on the ground, as detailed in the Kennedy-Schlesinger memorandum, a successful revolt on a far larger scale than this fiasco is not in the wood.

The mystery of why it was encouraged remains. Statements by President Kennedy and State Department officials that this country was not involved certainly did little to boost morale among the Cuban rebels. A failure by the Central Intelligence Agency to evaluate the strength of the movement is obvious. Apparently underrated was the ability of Castro's police state apparatus to deal with such outbreaks unless seriously supported by us. In any event, this country has again invited the gibe "Too little and too late" from friend and foe alike.

Certainly all Americans will respond with gratitude to President Kennedy's courageous assurance that we do not intend to permit Cuba to be abandoned to the Communists and that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our Nation. It is unfortunate, of course, that this plain truth could not have been laid on the line earlier, most appropriately during the previous administration when Castro's Communist connection had been established beyond doubt—and before the Soviet Union had committed so much materiel and prestige to the adventure.

Now, instead of dispelling a threatening situation, we must deal with an accomplished fact. However, we shall have to make do with what we have, trusting that from now on officialdom will be guided, if not by wisdom from on high, at least by better intelligence work than appears to have been provided by CIA.

For whatever action is decided on, Khrushchev has provided more than ample justification. By stating that Soviet forces will "render the Cuban people all necessary assistance in beating back any armed attack on Cuba," the Soviet dictator underscores the Soviet involvement in this grassroots revolution. Surely world opinion, if anybody is worried about that, cannot fairly condemn the United States for any course deemed necessary to deal with this invasion of the West.

If intervention is the only way out, such a course should be as acceptable to Americans as a possible involvement in Laos, which the public seems to contemplate calmly. For a country which has been involved in two world wars and one costly police action in areas far from our shores, prevention of a Soviet satellite a few miles off Florida ought to be routine. Unless survival has become a dirty word, we have nothing to apologize for in Cuba except failure.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill under consideration to create within the Commerce Department an Office of International Travel and Tourism. I was pleased to cosponsor this legislation and am gratified that the committee has given us this early opportunity to vote on it.

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, I enjoy the privilege of examining closely and discussing at length all of the elements of our international policies and programs. The basic underlying purpose of these is to assist other people in promoting their material welfare and in preserving their God-given right to govern themselves in a free and democratic society. Frequently the implementation of these policies and the administration of these programs comes in for some fortified criticism and de-evaluation. Much of this criticism is engendered by a basic lack of understanding of and appreciation for the different backgrounds, training, culture, customs, and ambitions of people of the Old World and the New. Our continuing challenge, therefore, is to find effective ways and means of developing the kind of understanding and appreciation so badly needed.

I consider the objectives of this legislation are a step in the right direction toward meeting that challenge. The success of our educational, cultural, and scientific exchange program has shown there is no more effective way for people to get to know and understand one another than by giving them the opportunity to travel and live abroad, to observe one another in their individual home surroundings and to see for one's self the day-to-day activities, modes and mores that go to make up the whole personality of a man and his reflection of and impression on his national government.

The effects of previous legislative measures to encourage our people to travel abroad and tour foreign cities of the world have meant a great deal to our citizens and have accounted for a large measure of continuing interest in and accelerated concern for the problems and aspirations of people in foreign lands. Evidence of this interest is the growing number of citizens, business leaders, labor organizations, civic clubs, who have joined and actively participate in the people-to-people groups which have sprung up all over our country.

I consider this measure a type of people-to-people activity, in that it is designed to encourage foreign visitors to our country. The Office of International Travel through branch offices to be established throughout the world, will help in encouraging low-cost travel programs, will assist in facilitating necessary travel documents, and will make itself available to answer questions and generally assist in promoting travel to our shores, and throughout our country.

I would suggest that in setting up these offices abroad particular attention be paid to including the words "U.S. Government" Office of International Travel and Tourism. This will make it clear that it is an official office of our Government and will avoid any doubt or confusion which might arise as to its identity. There are numerous varieties of travel offices and agencies all over the world with similar names and the words "U.S. Government" should be used to distinguish this Office from any commercial enterprise.

I join the other Members of the House who commend Committee Chairman HARRIS and Subcommittee Chairman MACK for getting this bill to the House. I hope for its speedy enactment and implementation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4614, which is designed to create an Office of International Travel and Tourism. The function of this Office will be, as I understand, to promote more travel in America on the part of our foreign neighbors and friends.

As a representative from Utah, a typically Western State, I see unlimited possibilities in this Office. The West is a land of fantastic scenery, of vast plains, of rugged mountains, of incomprehensible geological formations, of colorful and stirring history. It is typically American. I hope that this new Office, once it becomes operational, will give adequate publicity to the West, to the end that the latter might receive its fair share of the tourist dollar.

During the debate, one of the gentlemen in opposition to the bill suggested that New York might have difficulty in accommodating all of the tourists who will come to our shores. May I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that the West has no such problem. I am told that one could drop every man, woman, and child on the face of the earth into the recesses of the Grand Canyon, and thereafter would have difficulty in finding them. Space is no problem in the West. We will take every tourist that the world can send us, and will see that he has the finest tourist experience of his life.

I am not suggesting for a moment that the other sections of our great land be slighted. Each one has its unique contribution, and each one should receive full consideration. We must recognize, however, that the West is geographically removed from the place where the vast majority of these tourists will first set foot on American soil. I am suggesting, therefore, that the Director of the new Office of International Travel and Tourism make a particular effort to encourage tourists to extend their proposed itinerary to all parts of the Nation, and particularly to the West. Bryce Canyon, Zion Canyon, Rainbow Natural Bridge, Salt Lake City, Yellowstone, Grand Canyon—these are but a few of the fantastic experiences that await the newcomer to America. It is my hope that these experiences may become realities, and that through them, many millions of Europeans, Africans, Asians, Australians, and South and Central

Americans may come to know us better, and that through this greater enlightenment, the cause of peace and international understanding may be served.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this bill offers a splendid and positive approach to two problems, the need to have more tourist travel from abroad in our country and the need to improve the balance of money exchange between our country and other nations. There are safeguards in the legislation to protect the security of our country. The bill is in a modest amount when the possibilities of return are considered.

I sincerely hope that the House will pass the measure promptly.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall—

(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States;

(2) encourage the development of tourist facilities, low cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of foreign visitors;

(3) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

(4) encourage the facilitation of international travel through simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel;

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open for amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, I do not think the Members of the House ought to be deprived of this sugar-coated language that we have in this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will continue reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

(5) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics, information, and schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to international travel and tourism.

SEC. 3. (a) In performing the duties set forth in section 2, the Secretary—

(1) shall utilize the facilities and services of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible; and, to the fullest extent consistent with the performance of their own duties and functions, such agencies shall permit such utilization of facilities and services;

(2) may consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, and organizations engaged in or concerned with international travel, including local, State, Federal, and foreign governments, and international agencies;

(3) may obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified professional organizations and personnel;

(4) may establish such branches in foreign countries, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, as he deems to be necessary and desirable.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall authorize the Secretary to provide or arrange for transportation for, or accommodations to, persons traveling between foreign countries and the United States in competition with business engaged in providing or arranging for such transportation or accommodations.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, strike out lines 18 through 20 and insert the following:

(4) encourage the simplification, reduction or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of international travel generally;

Page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out "Nothing in this Act shall authorize the Secretary to" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary, under the authority of this Act, shall not".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 3, line 7, after the word "possible" insert "including the maximum utilization of counterpart funds."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be very brief. I think most people recognize that where we do have counterpart funds which can be used they should be used. The report points out that there is authority. We have authority in many fields that is never exercised. This amendment says that in performing the duties set forth the Secretary shall utilize the facilities and services of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible; and then I would add that he shall do this, including the maximum utilization of counterpart funds. For the benefit of those who will say that there are no counterpart funds available in some countries, I can only say that if there are none, they cannot be used. But where those funds are available they should be used. So I am asking that this amendment be adopted on that premise.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated to the committee earlier in the afternoon, the committee gave considerable attention to the utilization of counterpart funds. The question was discussed during the course of the hearings. We considered it in executive session of the committee. As proposed at that time, it would have authorized the use of counterpart funds for this program in lieu of appropriations, as I understood it. I also stated to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] that I believe where counterpart funds were available and could be utilized, we should utilize them. So, as far as I am concerned—and I have talked with some of the Members—I am willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 4:

"SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce an Office of International Travel and Tourism.

"(b) The Office of International Travel and Tourism shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of $17,500 per annum. All duties and responsibilities of the Secretary set forth in sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall be exercised through the Director."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 10, strike out "$17,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,000".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee how he arrived at this good, round figure of $18,000 for this new director. Who is he? What are his qualifications?

Mr. HARRIS. In the first place, the bill as it came to us from the other body provided for an Assistant Secretary in the Department of Commerce. It is well known that a position of that kind carries with it an authorization of $20,000 a year. We did not feel, neither did the Secretary of Commerce feel, that we should have an Assistant Secretary to perform this function even though it was rather important. He suggested that we have a director under the Secretary of Commerce to carry out this function. Then the question of salary arose and the figure of $17,500 was included in the bill. In the discussion of the matter it appeared to the committee that $18,000 for comparable work would be more appropriate and that is the way we arrived at this figure.

Mr. GROSS. Would this individual be a classified employee or a schedule C employee, or what would he or she be?

Mr. HARRIS. He would be designated as the Director for this program at the designated salary. I cannot commit the Secretary of Commerce as to who the person would be. That would be his responsibility.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not know whether this individual is going to be a civil service employee or a schedule C or what?

Mr. HARRIS. My attention has just been called to the fact that this would be a Presidential appointment.

Mr. GROSS. How many more employees will they have in this office; can the gentleman tell me?

Mr. HARRIS. I believe the budget that was submitted to us carried an estimate of what would be required, which the gentleman will find in the

hearings. I am surprised he has not already seen it, in view of the thorough work the gentleman always does. The Washington office, it is estimated, would have 23.

Overseas branch field managers, as recommended, six. Travel promotion advisers, six. An average of 4 foreign employees in each office would be a total of 24. So there would be an estimated total of 59.

Mr. GROSS. An estimated total of 59 of all categories and descriptions?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Are the salaries for these employees listed?

Mr. HARRIS. No; they are not.

Mr. GROSS. How many would be of supergrade status? Is this one at $18,000 a year the only one?

Mr. HARRIS. That would be the only one.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 11, strike out "all duties and responsibilities of the Secretary set forth in sections 2 and 3 of this Act shall be exercised through the Director." and insert "The Director shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer to page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. We have already passed that page.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we return to page 3 so the gentleman from Massachusetts may offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, would that unduly delay us tonight?

Mr. HARRIS. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

There was no objection.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK, of Massachusetts: On page 3, line 19, before the word "may" and after the numeral "(4)" add "After consultation with the Secretary of State", and strike out in line 20 after the comma the words "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State,".

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to provide in the establishment of branch offices abroad that the Secretary of Commerce shall consult with the Secretary of State. Under the language in the bill it is provided "with the concurrence of the Secretary of State." That would give the Secretary of State a veto. I do not believe that in delegating a duty to an agency or department we should give another department a veto power.

I have conferred with the chairman of the committee, with the chairman of the subcommittee, and with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], and they are all in agreement on the amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to compliment the gentleman. This is the first amendment I have heard of for a long time that would take some power away from the Secretaries of State, who past and present seek to run all the affairs of this Government. I am for the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, permit me to say to my colleagues on this side, you notice the difference in the procedure. Yesterday when I demanded a second the Speaker said I was too late, and enforced what was said to be the rule. I had to be right up and on time or I could not get recognition, even though I had gone along on the assumption that no one would demand a second unless he was opposed to the bill as rule 27 states. But when the gentleman, the majority leader from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] comes in today, with an amendment to a section which we have passed, too late, notice how we treat him. Certainly, distinguished leader that he is, we yield and let him offer an amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. You are not opposed to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, personally I love you.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman of the committee perhaps a kindergarten question, but I have traveled quite a good deal and I am just wondering what is the imperative necessity for a government organization of this kind?

Mr. HARRIS. The debate, I believe, rather clearly explained the reasons for this.

Mrs. BOLTON. It has not explained it to me at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. I doubt very seriously that I will be able to explain it to the gentlewoman satisfactorily, but I will do the best I can.

Mrs. BOLTON. I know it will be very difficult—I am merely a woman who has traveled a very great deal.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, the committee could benefit, I am sure, from the information which the gentlewoman could give us on it. The need for this, as was explained during the course of the hearings and during the course of the debate this afternoon, is to try to do something about catching up on the lag or the imbalance that now exists of about $1 billion, as a result of travel by our people overseas as compared with the amount of expenditures from people abroad coming into this country. The reasons for developing this program are that it will contribute greatly to the future welfare of our country and to good relationship of this country with other countries.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I say very simply then, I think it will contribute a great deal toward putting more and more power into Washington—if that is what you are trying to do, you are taking a very real course in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall submit to the President to the Congress an annual report on his activities under this Act.

SEC. 6. For the purpose carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $910,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and such sums as may be necessary for each fiscal year thereafter.

Committee amendment:

On page 4, line 21, strike out lines 21 and 22 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and not to exceed $4,700,000 for each fiscal year thereafter."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow to the committee amendment: On page 4, line 24, before the period insert "of which not less than $2,000,000 annually shall be used for the purchase of foreign currency credits owned by the United States Treasury".

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment in no way affects the previous amendment which was adopted which provided for the maximum utilization of counterpart funds. In some instances, there is a difference between counterpart funds and foreign currency owned by the Treasury. But the amendment I have offered, although it does not in any manner affect the other amendment which provides that the Secretary would be required wherever available to use to the maximum amount of the funds that are available. But, under this amendment, he must use at least $2 million each year in foreign currencies. As I said before in debate today, there are foreign currencies in every country where they may be able to use this program. I might point out that some question was raised about backward countries. In France we have $29,722,000 in these funds. In Germany we have $14,800,000. In Israel, where we may do some of this work, we have $47,613,000. I could go on down the list. We have millions of dollars in practically every country where this could be done. I see no reason at all when we are going to use a program of this kind, to generate tourism in these foreign countries, why we should not use the currencies which we have in the Treasury of the United States to carry on these programs. So, I submit, Mr. Chairman, there is no conflict between the amendments that have been adopted and my amendment. This amendment requires that there must be at least $2 million of foreign currencies used each year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this eliminate the $4,700,000 or is it a provision that $2 million of that must be in counterpart funds?

At least $2 million of any amount appropriated must be in counterpart funds.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand that what he refers to as counterpart funds is credit owned by the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. BOW. I am referring to foreign currencies. The gentleman's previous amendment was "counterpart funds" and I said in my opening statement there is some difference between counterpart funds and foreign currencies.

Mr. HARRIS. I understood the gentleman was referring to counterpart funds.

Mr. BOW. I am referring to foreign currencies in this amendment; it specifically says "foreign currencies."

Mr. HARRIS. That is quite different from counterpart funds.

Mr. BOW. This amendment specifically refers to foreign currencies owned by the Treasury of the United States. They are now in the Treasury owned by the United States.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple proposition. The gentleman from Ohio voted against the rule, and now his objective is to reduce the appropriation by $2 million. Members who are opposed to the bill ought to vote for the amendment and those who are in favor of the bill ought to vote against the amendment. As a matter of fact, the committee amendment increases the appropriation from $1 million to $3 million for the first year, and the effect of the Bow amendment would be to keep it at $1 million for the first year. The reason for that is because there are no funds available in the countries where we would like to promote travel to the United States.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I will yield but first I want to be sure I get my point across, because the gentleman from Ohio is an authority on appropriation bills and I do not have that background. However, I do understand this problem and I want to explain it before I yield.

This problem is very simple. I have in my hand a copy of the budget for 1962. On page 1011 is a table showing funds available in all countries: They are Burma, India, Israel, Pakistan, Poland, U.A.R., and Yugoslavia; and that is all. The chart from which the gentleman from Ohio was reading shows countries that have no funds available. Therefore, if you vote for the Bow amendment you would be voting to reduce the appropriation by $2 million.

I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman means funds available in excess of present requirements. You have funds but they are not in excess of present requirements to meet commitments. Is that correct?

Mr. MACK. That is exactly my point. There are some funds in the other countries, but they are not in excess of our present requirements. It is that simple; and as I said, if you are opposed to the bill then vote for the Bow amendment which has the effect of reducing the appropriation by $2 million. However, if you believe we ought to reduce our deficit in the international balance of payments then vote against the Bow amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I regret that the gentleman from Illinois did not yield for a question on this matter of foreign currency. To say there are foreign currencies in these few countries is not the fact. Here is a Treasury report for the period July 1, 1960, through December 31, 1960. There are foreign currencies in France, in Germany, in the United Kingdom, in Japan, in Greece. I can go down through the list of any country you will go to to get people to travel with you. I am surprised that the gentleman from Louisiana has added to this debate by saying these are necessary for our present commitments. I did not think he had committed us that much around the world. There were some additional commitments of $600 million. Maybe that has something to do with it. But these funds are available. We do this, and the gentleman knows it, in the State, Justice appropriation bill, and so far as the U.S. Information Agency is concerned we do it, we do it in the foreign building projects, in the FBO. In one appropriation bill after another there is language providing that a certain amount of the currencies of the countries in the Treasury will be used. This does not reduce and will not reduce the amount one iota. You will only be using foreign currencies instead of foreign dollars in these countries where you purchase currency from the Treasury Department.

It seems to me when we have these currencies in the Treasury, this is one of the areas where it is proper to use them, as we do in the foreign building operation, as we do with the U.S. Information Agency, as we do in many other ways. We are going to come in here shortly with another bill that is going to create more foreign currencies. We had better find some way to use them and use them properly. This is one place this can be done.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is not my purpose to get into this debate. However, if the gentleman will refer to page 1011 of the budget for fiscal 1962, he will find listed there the countries in which we have local currencies in excess of our requirements, followed by countries where currencies held are not in excess. Some of the countries that the gentleman named have currencies stronger than our own. It could conceivably be that we would wind up with local currencies concentrated in five or six countries of the world. Maybe we would not have any need for the excess currencies, where we might have possibly 80 or 90 percent of the total in five or six or seven countries. In what position then would the legislation be?

Mr. BOW. I have confidence in the gentleman. The gentleman is chairman of the great subcommittee on the foreign giveaway program, but I am sure he is not going to let 90 percent get into any one nation.

The gentleman will have to admit a $2-million-a-year purchase on this program will never take 90 percent of the currency of any country, when we have $370 million in India alone. You would not have it all over the world and you are not by this $2 million amendment going to get 90 percent of the currency in any one country.

Mr. PASSMAN. That is not what the gentleman from Louisiana said. The gentleman from Louisiana said that maybe we would reach a point where 80 or 90 percent of all the currencies that we owned would be in six or seven foreign countries, and not equally distributed throughout the world. There would be a plus in certain cases, and there would be a minus in countries where we might need the currencies. If the gentleman should read the language on page 1011 of the budget he might find the facts. I am trying to be helpful toward fixing the legislation so that it will work, not so that it will not work.

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Illinois a question. I would like to have a definition of the duties and authority of the Director that will be created if this is enacted into law. How much power does he have? What is he to do?

Mr. MACK. Well, the Director, I will say to the gentleman, would serve under the Secretary of Commerce and would be responsible to the Secretary, and would set up the entire program both here and overseas.

Mr. ALFORD. In particular are we to understand that the Director then is empowered to operate a travel agency for the United States?

Mr. MACK. The committee amended the bill on page 4.

Mr. ALFORD. Yes; I have that.

Mr. MACK. Which makes it very clear that the Director shall perform such duties in the execution of this act as the Secretary may assign.

Mr. ALFORD. That is the purpose of my question. What are his duties that the Secretary may assign to him under this bill?

Mr. MACK. Previous to that the Director would have more authority. Now, under the bill the Director would be in charge of the program, of organizing the program, of promoting and carrying out the provisions of this act in promoting travel generally to the United States. He would participate in the selection and

establishment of foreign offices and direct the activities as suggested.

Mr. ALFORD. On page 2, line 21, we have this language:

> Encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of international travel generally.

Is this Director to be empowered to liberalize the issuance of visas for travel into the United States?

Mr. MACK. No. The hearings made that very clear, that the Director or the Secretary would not have that power. The legislation does give the Secretary the authority or the responsibility for encouraging simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of international travel generally. There was an objection raised concerning the language in the Senate bill, and I believe that this bill relieves any question that might be raised concerning this provision. It does not amend any immigration laws. It only empowers the Secretary or places the responsibility on the Secretary to coordinate, to encourage simplification, to do whatever he can to encourage people to come to this country.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not think we had extensive discussion during the course of the debate, and I wanted to emphasize what the chairman of the subcommittee has just said. It is true that the bill passed by the other body used the words "coordinate all travel facilities," and so forth. The Subcommittee on Immigration under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], raised some question about the language. We analyzed it and went into it and found out that the words "coordinate all travel facilities" might very well cause the Secretary of Commerce, in his administration of the bill, to supersede some of the administration of our immigration laws. Consequently, the record is very clear in the hearings and also in the consideration of the bill that the language was changed to make it very certain that the immigration laws will not in any way be affected by it.

Mr. ALFORD. I thank the gentleman. I might say to the distinguished chairman that that was a particular matter of doubt in my mind with reference to the immigration laws.

I should like to ask one more question. Do we have any statistics available to show this? May I say that we are of the opinion that anyone with an income of less than $10,000 a year certainly could not ordinarily travel abroad. Have we any statistics available to show, in comparison with what we are calling the small amount that we are going to expend, the number of people who will be able to travel from these countries to the United States? We have heard it discussed today that they will be able to travel in units or groups and stay at hostels at moderate expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALFORD] has expired.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this to reply to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALFORD]. In the course of the debate today several people raised questions about the amount of money available and the amount allowed to be taken out of other countries. I think almost all of the countries where we plan to establish an International Travel Office for all practical purposes have no restrictions. Where there are restrictions they can secure additional funds on request.

Now, to answer the gentleman's question, I think he will find these figures on potential tourists interesting. In England they consider a person a potential tourist when he earns 1,200 to 1,500 pounds a year. To give you some idea of the number of potential tourists, there were 2,150,000 British residents who traveled to the Continent last year. There were 3,500,000 Germans who traveled to foreign countries from Germany last year.

In Britain there are 1,340,000 who are earning more than 1,500 pounds per year. In Germany there are 1,110,000 who are earning over $4,500 per year. So there are quite a few within these countries who are financially able to come to this country.

Mr. ALFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset, if you ask the State Department whether there are any foreign currencies available that might be used for any purpose the answer will always be categorically no. They will always tell you that the funds are committed. Let me give you an illustration. For the last several years the Air Force has been trying to make and has made contracts with foreign scientists for research and development, tests and evaluation. They have been paying these foreign scientists for this work out of the U.S. Treasury with U.S. dollars.

In our Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations we asked the question, "Why can you not pay these foreign scientists with foreign currencies, which have been generated through various programs of the United States over the last 10 or 15 years?" The State Department always says that these foreign currencies are committed. I just do not believe it. The facts have been proved that these foreign currencies were not committed.

All you have to do is to put the pressure on the State Department. They do not want to give them up to the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or to this organization. It is about time we compelled the State Department to make these currencies available. I think this amendment is good, and the more we do of it the better off we will be.

This is a good point to get started on the program in a bigger way. They will always give you a million alibis why this cannot be done. I think we ought to take the bull by the horns and tell them how we want it done.

Let me give you an illustration of how these foreign currencies have been used. Over the years we have built up these foreign currency accounts in various countries. I noticed the other day that by a stroke of his pen the President decided we will use foreign currencies to help save these pyramids and other historical monuments in Egypt. We are going to help pay for the removal of these pyramids from the Valley of the Nile so they will be preserved for posterity. Maybe it is a good idea, but Congress was never asked whether that could be done, whether these foreign currencies could be made available for that purpose. I ask the chairman of my Subcommittee on Mutual Security, was he ever consulted about the giving away of some $11 million in foreign currencies for that purpose? I do not think he was.

I just noticed the other day that the President signed an agreement to give to the Government of Austria all of the foreign currencies that have been generated over the past 10 or 15 years in that country. Congress was never consulted, yet I will venture to say that 6 months ago if the State Department had been asked they would have said, "There is no foreign currency available in Austria, there is no foreign currency available in Egypt." They want to decide for themselves how these moneys shall be used. I just do not think we should tolerate it. Where we have a bona fide and legitimate opportunity to utilize these foreign currencies in such a program as this one we should decide, not the State Department.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am trying to be helpful. As a usual thing, members of the Committee on Appropriations are pretty much in accord when we endeavor to save actual dollars. This information is not from the State Department, but from the Budget Bureau.

I made a statement earlier that we may find ourselves in a condition where 80 or 90 percent of all the local currencies that we own may possibly be concentrated in seven or eight countries. Reference to page 1011 of the budget will indicate that we now have excess currencies in only eight countries. We have no excess currencies in the other countries. So, I am wondering what position we would be in if we adopted the amendment, and then found later that about 75 percent of the need for local currencies would be in countries where we would not have such currencies available in excess of needs.

This is a statement from page 1011 of the budget presentation for fiscal 1962:

> In 68 of the 92 countries listed in table 3 the approximate supply of currencies available in 1962 is less than our anticipated needs for regular operations with the result that the United States will have to purchase the currencies of these 68 countries.

I am afraid that if we adopt an amendment which requires this agency to use local currencies, it is not going to accomplish the job intended.

Therefore, I repeat, I think the budget that came down in January would do a better job explaining why this amendment should be defeated than I can do.

I hope, too, that you will read pages 10 and 11 of the hearings on this subject matter.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not claim to be an authority on foreign affairs. I must admit very frankly that I do not know the full import of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I respect his views and, of course, understand that he has the best of intentions. But I do have some grave concern about the proposed amendment. It is anticipated that the greatest good from this proposal will come from those countries where we do not have foreign credit. The gentleman from Louisiana has just read the account of the budget for fiscal 1962 which was submitted to this Congress under the administration of President Eisenhower. That budget did not show any foreign credits of the United States Treasury for any of the Western European countries, where it is expected that, perhaps, the greatest good will come. Let me read a paragraph from a letter from the Treasury Department, addressed to me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations Appropriations on March 27, 1961, with reference to this particular item:

> There is, however, one provision of the bill which this Department believes to be unnecessary. Section 6 of the bill would amend section 104 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress (7 U.S.C. 1704), to make foreign currencies generated by title I sales available for financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the bill, in amounts to be specified from time to time in appropriation acts. This provision is unnecessary since authority now exists under which the proposed U.S. Travel Service could purchase from the Treasury foreign currencies to pay expenses incurred abroad in connection with its operations. Under this authority, currencies in Treasury accounts from all sources, including those accruing under Public Law 480, as amended, could be made available to the U.S. Travel Service to the extent such currencies can be utilized freely for payment of U.S. expenses in the country of origin.

Mr. Chairman, I prefer to take the advice and suggestion on this matter of those who are handling it, and who had it before them and who know what the situation is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bow) there were—ayes 46, noes 52.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. Bow and Mr. HARRIS.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 51, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, strike all of lines 23 and 24, and insert the following: "$910,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa strikes out an amendment which has just been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. YATES). The Chair sustains the point of order. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa would strike out an amendment which has just been adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 4, line 23, strike the matter following "1962", insert a period, and strike the remainder of line 23 and all of line 24.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order, for the same reason as was stated in connection with the previous amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard?

Mr. GROSS. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we heard the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and other members of the committee say no one appeared before the committee in opposition to this bill. I did not appear because I could not believe a bill of this kind, in view of the huge debt and deficit situation of the Federal Treasury of this country, could be or would be offered to the House of Representatives. That is one of the reasons I did not appear before the committee.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] says that we must enact this legislation in order that there will be a better appreciation by foreigners of the United States. My friend from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] said the legislation must be enacted so that foreigners will learn to love us.

Now, after 13 years and $100 billion given away to the foreigners, if they have not learned to love us, if they have not learned to appreciate us, I do not think $5 million a year is going to help the situation very much.

One of the quarrels I have with this legislation is the fact that we have cultural attachés and cultural officers all over the world. I was looking recently at a list of the cultural officers now on the Government payrolls. Go dig one out and take a look. We have a $19,000-a-year cultural officer in London. Why should not that fellow be handling this tourist business in London instead of sending some more high-priced people over there? Why should not the cultural officers in the USIA be handling this business instead of setting up a new bureaucracy in the Department of Commerce? Why do you not get rid of some of those people? Then you could come in here with some slight justification.

I still do not know who the new $18,000-a-year Director is going to be. I do not believe there is a Kennedy or a Kennedy brother-in-law available. Apparently they all have Government jobs now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just who can the President trust? Maybe he has to take one of the family.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know. I would not want to pass on that.

Speaking of cultural officers, I learned a couple of years ago we had an eight or nine thousand dollar a year cultural officer in Iceland. What did they do? They put a woman cultural officer in Iceland at $13,000. So we apparently had two cultural officers in Iceland.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. If they cannot find a Kennedy, maybe they can find a broken-down politician from Iowa like Gillilland that Eisenhower put on the CAB.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Iowa never got an advance from any committee in the House for traveling expenses anyway.

Mr. GROSS. I am not so sure that the State of Ohio has not had a few broken-down politicians.

Mr. HAYS. Two or three of them were elected to the Presidency.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding most, if not all, of the Presidents elected from Ohio were Republicans.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of them stayed here and attended to business and did not travel all over the world all the time, riding planes and so forth.

Mr. HAYS. And they never sent their secretary for a trip around the world to get her out of town.

Mr. GROSS. I suggest to Members of the House, before we approve a new bureaucracy such as this, a new addition to a bureaucracy, that we get rid of some of the superfluous personnel we have all over the world. Let us save the taxpayers a little money and vote this bill down.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Permit me to do as did the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and assume that a statement made by a Member referred to him, even though his name was not mentioned. He seemed to think some-

thing said fitted him, so he puts on the coat, as is sometimes said, takes the floor, squawks about it, and makes as he did once before the false charge that I sent a secretary on a trip around the world to get her out of Washington, and, because, on the other occasion, he did refer to me, I now assume he is again doing so. It may be he will leave his remarks out of the RECORD.

He is just absolutely wrong if he was referring to me when he talked about sending a secretary around the world at Government expense. I never sent a secretary around the world on any mission, I never sent any employee out of this country or anywhere in this country at public expense. The gentleman from Ohio may put that in his pipe and smoke it. On a prior occasion he was told of his error. The gentleman will not tell the truth, that is what causes trouble. I nailed that lie in the RECORD once before.

Mr. HAYS. You can nail it all you want to, but the fact remains that I know about it, and so do you.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I say to you and to the Committee, the Members on the floor, you are not telling the truth, and I say again that I never sent any secretary or employee of my office out of town nor anywhere else at public or, for that matter, at my or private expense. What the gentleman probably is talking about is something he does not understand about somebody on the Committee on Government Operations. Though he was once advised of the trip. There were three women on that trip by a subcommittee around the world. A woman member of the committee and of Congress; Mrs. Davis, a most talented and faithful clerk of the committee; and another committee employee, were on the trip. I did ask the chairman of the committee to permit a woman member to accompany the committee, even though I knew some members did strenuously object to women members going on investigations. There seemed to be a thought that the pleasures or activities of the male members were in some way circumscribed if the women were along. I did not go on that trip or any other outside of the U.S.A., except once to Alaska.

Mr. HAYS. Oh, I understand it all too well.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. I did not yield to the gentleman. I repeat that he did not tell the truth if referring to me he made that charge.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, during the debate in the Committee of the Whole, a reference was made to a distinguished Iowan as a broken down politician. This is indeed unfortunate because it is evident that the gentleman who made the statement obviously did not have the facts or he would not have made such an unfounded charge or accusation. In order to set the record straight I ask unanimous consent to set the record straight and to have my remarks inserted in the RECORD following the statement on this matter by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WAYNE HAYS.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4614) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 281, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the agreement of last Thursday, further proceedings will go over until tomorrow.

PROGRESS IN MIGRATORY FARMWORKER PROBLEMS

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's most socially and economically deprived groups is our migratory agricultural workers. For the past three decades, the migratory farmworker problem has increased in scope and severity until it can no longer be tolerated by this Nation. Within the last 20 months, the American public has become increasingly aware of the plight of our migratory workers. The attention now being given our migratory farmworkers is largely attributable to the efforts of the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, the chairman of which, I am proud to say, is the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey, HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR. It was, therefore, with no little interest that I noted an excellent editorial in the Jersey Journal, Jersey City, N.J., on April 22 entitled, "Hope for Migrants."

The editorial gives well deserved recognition to the leadership provided by my colleague from New Jersey in the field of migratory farmworker problems by noting that "one of the Nation's principal voices in their behalf is that of Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey. He has done much to make their plight known."

The editorial also points out that Secretary of Labor Goldberg has promised "united Federal effort to aid the most economically underprivileged group in the Nation, the migrant farmworker."

Senator WILLIAMS has formulated an 11-point legislative program designed to improve the living and working conditions of our migratory farmworkers which is now pending before the Congress. With the passage of this program, we will be proving to ourselves and to the world that we are no longer ignoring the needs of our fellow Americans no matter how small or politically insignificant they may be.

Because the editorial is indicative of the growing national interest and concern for our migratory farmworkers and because it recognizes the positive leadership of Senator WILLIAMS in this field, under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

HOPE FOR MIGRANTS

Secretary of Labor Goldberg has promised a "united Federal effort" to aid the most economically underprivileged group in the Nation, the migrant farmworkers. Americans who place human values above economic advantage applaud this announcement, and will be anxious to see the pledge carried out as quickly as possible.

The 400,000 migrant farmworkers and their families are a weight on the conscience of America. They have been conspicuously deprived of a just share in the Nation's prosperity. In an era when such things as automobiles, numerous appliances including television, and varied and abundant food are commonplace for the average American family, the migrant's average yearly income is less than $1,000.

These workers and their families suffer more than economic deprivation. Another aspect of their problem was summed up thus by Secretary Goldberg: "Because they are constantly on the move, their children are denied the opportunity to receive a decent education, and restrictive residence requirements deny them public health and welfare services."

The plight of the migrants has not gone unnoticed. One of the Nation's principal voices in their behalf is that of Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey. He has done much to make their plight known. During the Eisenhower administration, the then Labor Secretary, James Mitchell, also a New Jerseyite, urged vigorous Federal action to improve working conditions for migrant labor.

It is right that our State, important as it is in agriculture and advanced as it is in outlook, should provide leadership in this cause. The chance for prompt action now rests on the fact that this administration, including Agriculture Secretary Freeman, is fully behind Goldberg's pledge of united effort and Senator WILLIAMS' legislation. Whatever is done, it cannot be done too soon.

AMENDING HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, which was transmitted by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

In my judgment this bill represents a very important and very desirable item of legislation. It is intended to strengthen the position of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures, up to a statutory limitation of $10,000, the investments of the public in withdrawable accounts of savings and loan associations. It will do this by a method which, in the main, will not add any significant financial burden to the insured institutions.

The opportunity to strengthen the Insurance Corporation without adding to the burden of insured institutions arises from legislation passed by the Congress in 1950 as part of the program for the retirement of the Government stock in the Federal home loan banks and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

During that year we approximately doubled the amount of the stock in these banks that member institutions were required to hold, with a provision that each bank should retire Government stock equal to the excess stockholdings of members immediately prior to the enactment of the legislation and that annually thereafter each bank should retire Government stock equal to 50 percent of the net increase in its stock held by its members.

Through the operation of this legislation, and through voluntary additional retirements by the banks, the retirement of the Government stock was promptly completed, and as of July 1, 1951, the capital stock of the Federal home loan banks was owned entirely by their members, as it has been ever since. The doubled requirement for members' stockholdings is still in effect, although its primary purpose has long since been accomplished.

Under the same 1950 legislation, we also required the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to retire its Government stock of $100 million, by application each year of one-half of its net income. It was estimated that this would require a period of 10 to 15 years, but the retirement was actually completed in approximately 8 years. The final payment was made in July 1958.

Of course, the application of one-half of its net income to the Government stock retirement meant that the resources of the Corporation did not increase as rapidly as they otherwise would have done. It is the object of the bill to accelerate the building up of those resources.

The bill would require each institution insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation to make with respect to its future regular premiums an annual prepayment equal to 2 percent of the net increase in the accounts of its insured members, less any requirement for the purchase of Federal home loan bank stock. At the same time, the bill would reduce the stock-purchase requirement from the existing figure of 2 percent of the aggregate unpaid principal of the members home mortgage loans, home-purchase contracts, and similar obligations to 1 percent of that base.

The general result would be that an institution having both Federal home loan bank membership and insurance of its accounts by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation would make approximately the same total payments as if the bill had not been enacted, but that a part of the total would go to the Insurance Corporation to strengthen its resources, instead of going to the purchase of Federal home loan bank stock. The correspondence between the total payments under existing law and those under the bill would not be exact, but in the typical case it would be approximate.

Under the terms of the bill, the Corporation would establish a primary reserve, which would be its general reserve, and a secondary reserve. The premium prepayments would be credited to the secondary reserve.

As of the close of each year the Corporation would also credit to the secondary reserve a return on the outstanding balances of that reserve, at a rate equal to the average annual rate of return on the Corporation's investments in Government and Government-guaranteed obligations. When the aggregate of the two reserves reached 2 percent of a base consisting of the total of the accounts of insured members and creditor obligations of all insured institutions the premium prepayments would cease, and each insured institution's pro rata share of the secondary reserve would be used, so far as available, to discharge the institution's obligations for its annual premiums, which are one-twelfth of 1 percent of the accounts of its insured members and its creditor obligations. If the aggregate of the two reserves later fell below 1¾ percent of the base, the prepayments would resume and such use of the secondary reserve would cease.

However, if the primary reserve, by itself, should at the close of any year equal or exceed 2 percent of the base, the Corporation would pay in cash to each insured institution its pro rata share of the secondary reserve and would not thereafter accept or receive any further prepayments.

There are a number of other provisions in the bill. Some of them are perhaps too complicated to mention in detail at this point, but I would like to call attention to one of the most important protective features. This is the provision that no Federal home loan bank member which is such a member on the date of enactment of the measure shall be permitted to reduce its stock to an amount which is less than the amount held by it as of the close of that date, with two exceptions.

The first exception is that, subject to the minimum of $500 to which all members are subject, any such member may at any time reduce its stock to an amount which is not less than 2 percent of its unpaid loan principal as of the close of the date of enactment and not less than 2 percent of such principal as of the beginning of the year in which the reduction is made. This exception is intended to take care of members which, on the date of enactment of the bill, hold bank stock in excess of the 2 percent requirement.

The second exception allows the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, in its discretion, to permit such a member to reduce its stock to an amount below that held on the date of enactment, but not less than 2 percent of the member's unpaid loan principal at the beginning of the year of the reduction and not less than the $500 minimum. This exception is designed to allow the Board to permit a reasonable degree of flexibility in proper cases.

In my opinion it is desirable that this measure be given prompt consideration.

A FARM CREDIT EMERGENCY

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include correspondence with the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the Members and the administration to a grave emergency in farm financing and farmer's credit which is likely to ruin thousands of farmers unless decisive steps are taken immediately.

I refer to a complete lack of either public or private financing for essential soil and water conservation on farms. This is a life and death matter for thousands of farmers in drought areas, for in many instances, without the means of developing new water sources, they face not only the loss of a year's crop, but actual loss of the trees, vines, and plantings which may have taken many years to bring to production. In other instances, floods, winds, and natural disasters make soil conservation and rebuilding projects essential before land can be restored to production.

I became urgently concerned with this problem last fall when farmers in the district I represent were unable to get loans to deepen wells and install pumps to restore water supplies cut off by 2 successive years of drought. To my astonishment, I found that all funds appropriated to the Farmers Home Administration for soil and water loans were exhausted within a month after the start of the fiscal year last July. The money had been used to cover loan applications already pending at the start of the year. No more loan funds would be available until next July. Now, the Members certainly know that our farms needing this financing will literally dry

up and blow away without water for a year while an application is pending.

It is true that the Farmers Home Administration has programs for both insured private loans and for bank participation loans, but these programs currently provide no relief because banks generally will not loan at the interest rates specified and because of the comparative long term of the loans.

We had been looking forward to financing relief for the coming fiscal year starting July 1, but I now find that under budget recommendations of the administration now before the Committee on Appropriations, no relief is in sight. Here are the cold facts: Appropriation of $3 million has been recommended. The Farmers Home Administration already has on hand 526 applications from individuals for soil and water conservation loans, together with 107 applications for similar loans from associations. To fund these approved applications will require $13 million. Thus, we would be $10 million short of enough money to make the loans already requested 2 months before the fiscal year starts, without regard to the credit requirements sure to develop hereafter and before July 1, 1962.

Furthermore, to my knowledge, the applications on hand represent only a small fraction of the actual demand and need for these loans. Farmers naturally have been discouraged from filing applications with no possibility of getting the money.

Obviously, to carry on this urgent program, immediate steps must be taken to make loan financing available. It appears to me this requires either or both the appropriation of substantial additional funds, or revision of the insured and participation loan programs to make such loans attractive to private financing.

To get at the facts and make them available to the Members, I have directed a letter to the Department of Agriculture people and I now have a response from the Secretary of Agriculture. I think these letters point up the urgency of the problem and the hopelessness of a solution unless we enlarge and fund this program. I am including my inquiry and Secretary Freeman's response, with accompanying data. I most urgently commend them to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations, the Members generally, and those in the administration responsible for our budget recommendations. I ask for immediate help.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1961.

Mr. JOHN A. BAKER,
Director, Agricultural Credit Services, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BAKER: It is my understanding that funds available to the Farmers Home Administration this fiscal year for soil and water conservation loans are exhausted and that it will be impossible to serve many applicants seeking assistance.

In view of the increasing national emphasis on the conservation and development of our water resources, it is most important that farmers be afforded every opportunity to install safe dependable water supplies for domestic use, irrigation, and related purposes. In many instances a lack of adequate water, even for a temporary period, results in substantial financial losses and frequently prevents a farmer from continuing his operations.

In other instances the establishment of urgently needed soil conservation practices may make the difference between success and failure. It will be unfortunate if the planning or construction of essential soil and water conservation facilities is delayed because loan funds are not adequate to meet the needs of eligible applicants.

Will you, therefore, give me as soon as possible the number of applications now on hand for soil and water conservation loans, the estimated amount required to process such applications and the amount included in the 1962 budget request for these loans. Please indicate in your reply the number of families represented by these applications and the outlook for additional applications in the future.

Since authority also exists for insuring loans made with funds advanced by private lenders for these purposes, I shall appreciate information on the extent to which funds from that source have supplemented funds appropriated for these loans and the outlook for insured loan funds in the future.

Sincerely yours,

B. F. SISK,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1961.

Hon. B. F. SISK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SISK: It is true as indicated in your letter of April 18, 1961, that there are no appropriated funds available with which to make additional soil and water conservation loans the rest of the fiscal year.

As of March 31, there were on hand 526 applications for soil and water conservation loans to individuals and 107 applications for similar loans to associations. These applications represent about 6,000 families. Based on recent loan averages of about $4,000 each for individual loans and $100,000 each for associations, it would require approximately $13 million to process the applications on hand. A table showing by States the number of applications received this year and the number on hand is enclosed.

The budget for fiscal year 1962 submitted by the previous administration recommended a total of only $183 million for farm ownership, farm operating, and soil and water conservation loan programs. When the present administration took office, a thorough review was made of the need for funds for Farmers Home Administration programs, as well as for other high priority programs of the Government. As evidence of his strong support for Farmers Home Administration loan programs, the President on March 20, 1961, submitted a budget amendment to the Congress recommending an additional $11,900,000 for farm ownership loans and an additional $72,100,000 for operating loans. In view of the urgent needs of other high priority programs, and the competition for scarce budgetary resources, the President did not find it possible to request other additional funds proposed by the Farmers Home Administration. However, budgetary needs and resources are under frequent review by this administration and if the President finds it possible to request additional funds in the future, I am confident that he will submit such a request to the Congress.

More specifically, the President's budget as submitted for fiscal year 1962 contains $3 million for soil and water conservation loans. Adequate insured loan authority exists to supplement such appropriated funds but the amounts available from private lenders to make insured loans have been very limited in recent years. We hope that more insured loans can be made next year, but unless there is a significant change in the money market, it appears that the amount available from private lenders will probably be somewhere in the neighborhood of $1 million, which has been the average for the last 2 years. For your further information, we are enclosing a second table showing amounts which have been available for loans since the Water Facilities Act was amended in 1954.

We have found that potential applicants hesitate to apply for loans when it is known that adequate funds have not been available in previous years for all those who did apply. However, in view of the increased interest in the development of water resources and the installation of soil conservation practices, we expect a substantial increase in the number of applications to be received next year as compared with this year. An even greater increase will probably result if existing authorities are broadened as proposed in S. 1643 and H.R. 6400 which were introduced recently.

A copy of our reply to your letter is being sent to each of the Senators and Congressmen to whom a copy of your letter was sent. If you wish any further information, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary.

Applications for soil and water conservation loans, 1961 fiscal year through Mar. 31, 1961

State	Applications from individuals	Applications on hand Mar. 31, 1961	Applications from associations	Applications on hand Mar. 31, 1961
Alabama	6	0	0	0
Arizona	18	13	1	1
Arkansas	49	17	0	0
California	57	11	1	2
Colorado	27	19	23	22
Florida	7	5	0	0
Georgia	6	3	0	0
Hawaii	1	1	0	0
Idaho	75	53	2	3
Illinois	2	1	0	0
Indiana	10	6	0	0
Iowa	16	4	0	0
Kansas	20	8	7	21
Kentucky	15	1	13	15
Louisiana	10	3	0	0
Maryland	2	2	0	0
Michigan	21	10	0	0
Minnesota	8	4	0	0
Mississippi	38	23	0	0
Missouri	23	10	0	0
Montana	66	39	4	3
Nebraska	37	25	0	0
Nevada	10	2	0	0
New Jersey	1	0	1	0
New Mexico	38	20	0	1
New York	3	1	0	0
North Carolina	20	6	0	0
North Dakota	12	9	1	1
Ohio	11	6	0	2
Oklahoma	23	15	0	0
Oregon	31	17	7	7
Pennsylvania	1	2	0	0
South Carolina	25	4	0	0
South Dakota	18	9	0	0
Tennessee	15	4	2	3
Texas	69	36	8	8
Utah	43	32	2	3
Virginia	11	4	0	0
Washington	85	36	6	5
West Virginia	0	1	6	6
Wisconsin	43	23	0	0
Wyoming	17	8	2	4
Puerto Rico	88	33	0	0
Total	1,078	526	86	107

Amounts authorized and used for SW loans since act was amended to extend program to humid areas

Fiscal year	Appropriated	Committed	Insured authority	Committed	Total	
					Appropriated and insured	Committed
1955	$11,500,000	$4,022,000	$25,000,000	$15,500,000	$36,500,000	$19,522,000
1956	11,500,000	1,300,000	25,000,000	10,600,000	36,500,000	11,900,000
1957	5,500,000	5,500,000	25,000,000	4,000,000	30,500,000	9,500,000
1958	5,500,000	4,600,000	25,000,000	1,200,000	30,500,000	5,800,000
1959	5,500,000	5,000,000	25,000,000	2,500,000	30,500,000	7,500,000
1960	2,000,000	2,000,000	25,000,000	924,000	27,000,000	2,924,000
1961 [1]	3,000,000	3,000,000	25,000,000	1,021,390	28,000,000	4,021,390

[1] As of Mar. 31, 1961.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY IS NOT WELL YET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to comment again on the situation which exists and the situation which may exist in a very precious industry of this Nation. I am speaking of the textile industry. If I were to choose any topic for this particular address or these remarks that I am about to make, I believe it would be, "The Textile Industry is Not Yet Well."

As we all know, on May 2 of this year all of us were most happy in the fact that the President of the United States had seen fit, after examination by a special council which he had set up to propose a program aimed at the aid of the textile firms in their effort to meet foreign competition to detail his efforts in behalf of the textile industry.

In the well of this House before it has been my privilege and also my duty to express my opinion and my concern, along with some of my colleagues, at the threats which the textile industry found at its doorstep and has continued to find during the 5 years I have been a Member of this Congress.

From time to time we have outlined here the statistics on foreign imports which have given us concern and which today give increasing impetus to the realization that something must be done.

I say we were happy with the President's program. We were happy because it was the first time in many years that the administration, or at least the executive branch of the Government, or any of the departments of the executive branch of the Government, had given the concern which we thought was necessary and proper to the problems of the textile people.

I have here, and I quote from it, the President's special message, because it was significant to us in the textile area. It gives us hope.

I believe this program will assist our textile industry to meet its basic problems, while at the same time recognizing the national interest in expansion of world trade and the successful development of less developed nations. It takes into account the dispersion of the industry, the range of products, and its highly competitive character. It is my hope that these measures will strengthen the industry and expand consumption of its products without disrupting international trade and without disruption of the markets of any country.

I was glad that the President expressed that hope, and when questioned by some of the reporters on the message of the President I said it gave me great hope and along with other people in the textile industry I hastened to express that hope.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an article from the Wall Street Journal of May 3, 1961, which says something about the program, which I insert at this point of my remarks.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

KENNEDY PROPOSES PROGRAM AIMED TO AID TEXTILE FIRMS MEET FOREIGN COMPETITION

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy ordered a series of administration actions and studies aimed at helping domestic textile manufacturers meet stepped-up foreign competition.

The administration steps range from a proposed international conference to seek limitations on textile shipments to this country to a study of additional depreciation deductions on textile machinery. Some of the Administration proposals were vague and indefinite.

Coming on the eve of today's vote in the House on raising the minimum wage and broadening coverage, the President's message prompted hope among some House Democratic leaders that the administration's expressed willingness to help domestic textile manufacturers might encourage some Southerners to vote with them on the minimum wage bill. Particularly in the House, every vote on the bill will be important.

The seven-point program, developed by a special Cabinet committee headed by Commerce Secretary Hodges, was presented personally by the President at a meeting of leading textile industry officials at the White House. These are the seven points:

The State Department was directed to call an early conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries, "to seek an international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries." This obviously is aimed at persuading foreign textile-producing countries voluntarily to agree to reduce shipments to the United States.

An application by the textile industry for higher tariffs or quota protection under the present reciprocal trade law "will be carefully considered on its merits."

The Agriculture Department was directed to make recommendations for subsidies either to cotton producers or to U.S. mills to eliminate or offset the higher raw cotton prices U.S. textile mills must pay compared with those paid by foreign producers.

The administration will send Congress shortly a proposal to provide Federal aid, unspecified but presumably some sort of loans and grants for retraining and readjustment, for industries seriously injured or threatened with serious injury from increased imports. Presumably this would apply to all industries and not just the textile industry.

The Treasury Department was directed to review existing depreciation deductions on textile machinery. Revision of these allowances, along with the tax investment credit proposed in his recent tax program, should assist in the modernization of the textile industry facilities, the President declared.

The Small Business Administration was directed to help the textile industry obtain the necessary financing to modernize its equipment. No details were given.

Finally, the Commerce Department was directed to cooperate with management and union groups in a broad research program covering new products, practices, and markets.

Mr. Kennedy said he hoped the program would "assist our textile industry to meet its basic problems, while at the same time recognizing the national interest in expansion of world trade and the successful development of less developed nations."

The administration has been under increasing pressure from the domestic textile industry and Congress Members from textile-manufacturing areas. This agitation was considered a threat to continuation of the reciprocal trade program next year when it comes up for renewal by Congress, and the administration program just announced was obviously designed to help keep in line the votes of lawmakers from textile-manufacturing districts on other issues.

White House officials conceded the program is a middle course between the desires of textile manufacturing groups for drastic import curbs and of free-trade forces for minimum curbs on imports. "It will probably please neither group completely," one high-ranking official declared.

However, spokesmen for textile and apparel trade associations said they are "highly encouraged" by the administration program. They conceded some of the steps are not particularly new, but said they feel the "atmosphere" at the White House indicates a new awareness of textile industry problems.

They indicate there probably would be an early industry petition for quota or other relief by the Government under the Reciprocal Trade Program. Asked if he feels the administration program would produce mandatory Government import quotas, J. M. Cheatham, president of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, replied, "We certainly will be dissatisfied if this doesn't produce the necessary measures to give us relief."

The free-trade versus protectionist battle focused most recently on textile imports from Japan, and the Government worked out an agreement whereby Japan voluntarily reduced its exports to the United States. Since then, however, exports to the United States have been stepped up from Hong Kong and elsewhere.

Most of the administration proposals were deemed to hold out real promise of eventual help—even though they were in general terms. For example, while Mr. Kennedy said only that the Treasury Department is going to review tax depreciation allowances, it would be politically difficult for the administration to decide that no changes should be made. Similarly, it would be politically dangerous for the Agriculture Department to fail to come up with recommendations for some sort of cotton price aid for the U.S. mills.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I also have an article from one of my local papers located in Rock Hill, S.C., known as the Rock Hill Evening Herald, dated May 7, 1961, in which they share the concern and they say, "So Far, So Good; Let's Wait and See."

I enclose that article at this point:

SO FAR, SO GOOD; LET'S WAIT AND SEE

President Kennedy's program to relieve the ailing textile industry is as good as anything proposed in recent years. It remains to be seen whether it gets beyond the study stage into corrective action.

There are two key points—the volume of textile imports and the price at which U.S. cotton is sold abroad.

On imports, the President proposed a conference of all countries that import and export textiles. The idea would be for these countries to work out a fair and practical system of quotas on textile imports. The idea is good, but practical results may be a long time in coming. Perhaps speedier action will come from the President, himself, after he receives a report from the Official of Civilian Defense Mobilization on the harmful effects of imports upon U.S. textiles.

On cotton prices, the President told the Department of Agriculture to study the matter of equalizing the price of U.S. cotton at home and abroad. American mills now must pay 6 cents a pound more for U.S. cotton than this country charges for U.S. cotton sold abroad. The issue has been studied so many times it is threadbare. Another study is not apt to shed new light. The idea of selling U.S. cotton at a lower price to foreign competitors of U.S. mills does not make sense.

The President's suggestion that the United States give thought to a better depreciation allowance on textile equipment holds some promise. A faster writeoff of machinery would encourage mills to replace machinery faster—which would make them more efficient and more competitive.

Another suggestion—that the Department of Commerce step up its research for new products, processes and markets in textiles—offers no hope of immediate results. It is sound and may bring long-range benefit, although it must be noted that alert industries should do their own hunting for new products, processes and markets.

The President's program looks good on paper and may turn out to be helpful. Only time will tell whether the plan produces real help for American textiles.

Mr. HEMPHILL. That particular paper serves an area which is entirely or almost entirely dependent upon the textile industry, the textile industry which provides not only production but provides jobs; and, of course, when you provide jobs you provide consumers; and when you provide consumers you provide trade in the local area.

Then, as matters progressed, on May 10, 1961, I was distressed—and I say distressed—to read in a paper in which I do not have any great confidence, but at least it has expressed the ideas of those who think may be radical or left wing, or whatever you may call them, so far as the textile industry is concerned; and I am speaking of the Washington Post, commonly termed among those of us who read it with suspicion, the Washington Daily Worker. In any event, they had an article on the editorial page, which I read frequently and read on that morning of Wednesday, May 10, 1961, called "A Terminal Case."

We all know in the treatment of diseases when you speak of a terminal case what you are talking about is somebody that is going to die. This particular editorial was about the textile industry. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this editorial be included at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

A TERMINAL CASE

With its oversea outlets vanishing and the competition at home increasingly savage, the textile industry was lobbying with desperate energy this spring for Federal quotas to hold back the rising flood of foreign imports. Last week President Kennedy told the textile manufacturers he would extend every legitimate kind of aid they were requesting, but he declined to impose quotas. The President put himself on the side of commonsense and international fairplay.

Although only 7 percent of the cloth sold here is now imported, the manufacturers can see the future clearly. From 1958 to 1960, imports of cotton, wool, and synthetic fibers more than doubled.

The State Department will renew its labors to persuade the exporting nations into voluntarily limiting their shipments to us. Apparently these self-imposed limits are to be expanded with time. Meanwhile the textile makers here will have a grace period to get out of the lines of production in which they find they cannot compete. This temporary protection is altogether proper.

President Kennedy evidently has convinced the textile industry of his genuine concern for its troubles. He will propose loans like those offered in distressed areas. The Commerce Department will undertake the research that the industry no longer can afford. The Agriculture Department will seek a solution to the really outrageous inequity of cotton pricing; the mills here must buy raw cotton on the supported domestic market, while their competitors abroad can buy American cotton 20 percent cheaper on the unsupported world market.

All of these remedies will be money well spent if they relieve the political pressure for the imposition of fixed quotas, with the discrimination that would mean. But the point to remember is that no amount of protectionism can restore the industry even to the fragile health it enjoyed 15 years ago.

Our cotton exports have sunk to one-third of the 1947 level, and quotas will not raise them. At home, consumers have spent a diminishing share of their income on clothing; plastics and paper have replaced many industrial uses of cloth. Although textile production has diminished only slightly since World War II, productivity in the mills has risen more than 70 percent; it has meant the loss of 400,000 textile jobs, and quotas will not bring them back.

Fixed textile import quotas would invite retaliation against our own products, and betray our whole foreign economic policy. Textile manufacturing is largely a low-wage, low-investment industry suitable for the early stages of a nation's development. With its high-wage, mature economy, the United States has outgrown much of textile manufacturing as an appropriate livelihood. Sustained protection of uneconomic mills would close our markets to struggling nations in whose advancement we have invested millions of dollars of foreign aid.

The decline of uncompetitive industries is always a cruel affair, both for the people who work in it and those who invested in it. The President has rightly perceived that the Government's proper role is to soften temporarily a blow that cannot be shielded except at prohibitive cost in both dollars and international good faith.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whose idea it is that this is a terminal case. I am here to say that anybody who says the textile industry's illness is a terminal case is doing a great disservice to the people working in that industry, the people investing in that industry, and the merchants depending on the industry as a source of merchandise and trade. I resent that article. I felt it was designed to please those who have sought to undermine the textile industry, and some, I fear, are still on the scene, not having changed with the administration.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. I assume one of the organizations to which he refers is the so-called Committee on National Trade Policy, when he says there are those who would like to do away with the textile industry.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that my district is next to his district. He and I have been friends for many years. I have been one of his admirers for many years. I want to say this for public consumption down in his part of the world, that I do not know anyone who has been more zealous in championing the cause of the textile people, sharing the concern others have had over the illness of the textile industry, and trying to do something about it, lifting his voice.

I am mindful of a recent and very productive trip which my distinguished friend went on in which he went into some of the textile plants over in the East and made a very wonderful and significant report. I congratulate him on it publicly. I want to say to him that his statesmanship in this field is a matter of great admiration throughout my entire State, and I am happy to have his comment during these remarks.

Mr. WHITENER. I certainly appreciate the generous remarks of my old friend and schoolmate, who has been one of our outstanding fighters for the jobs of the people in our area. As he has well stated, our districts are very similar, and depend so much on the good health of the textile industry that I feel we must of necessity speak out whenever the opportunity presents itself. I commend my friend for what he is doing, what he has done, and what I know he will do in the interest not only of the people of his district but my district and throughout this Nation who are so concerned about the state of the textile industry.

If the gentleman will permit me to do so, I should like to call to the attention of our colleagues some figures which I received yesterday from the Department of Commerce. One of my outstanding constituents is A. G. Myers, Sr., of Gastonia, who is chairman of the board of a rather large textile concern operating some 14 or 15 plants in my home county. I am happy that I happened to have this

information in my pocket today when the gentleman from South Carolina commenced his remarks.

I think very few people realize that in this country a great proportion of the textile industry is of the type we have in our part of the country, not the so-called integrated system of textile manufacturing, but where we have yarn mills. We sell to the knitting trade and to the finished goods trade. These yarn mills must be in a position to compete not only with the large textile organizations that we have in our own country which have an integrated system from the cotton or the manmade fiber to the finished product, but they must compete in prices with the products coming in from abroad.

In recent years for the first time we have seen the importation of cotton yarns and manmade fiber yarns. I think it is significant that we find in January of 1959 there were only 57,000 pounds of imports of cotton yarns for domestic consumption. In January of 1960, this figure had risen to 746,000 pounds of yarn which were brought into this country. In 1961 in January, 1,133,000 pounds of cotton yarn were shipped into this country from foreign manufacturing plants. At the same time we see from these statistics that great quantities of manmade fiber yarns are coming into our country from foreign nations. In 1950 the total amount of cotton yarn shipped into our country from abroad was 1,381,000 pounds whereas in 1960 there were 15,140,000 pounds of cotton yarn shipped into the United States from foreign countries. During that time we saw the advent of Spain, Portugal and other countries in the field of yarn manufacturing and exporting to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this table from the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The table referred to is as follows:

Cotton and manmade fiber yarns, U.S. imports for consumption, 1959–61

[Thousands of pounds]

	Cotton yarn			Manmade fiber yarn		
	1959	1960	1961	1959	1960	1961
January	57	746	1,133	429	232	185
February	102	1,363	881	258	293	354
March	124	1,709	1,123	64	571	399
April	100	1,663	----------	403	567	----------
May	82	955	----------	415	314	----------
June	71	1,472	----------	604	372	----------
July	36	1,354	----------	336	255	----------
August	62	1,328	----------	468	359	----------
September	94	1,024	----------	410	176	----------
October	162	1,649	----------	269	233	----------
November	141	955	----------	126	184	----------
December	378	922	----------	53	122	----------
Total	1,381	15,140	----------	3,855	3,678	----------

Source: Bureau of the Census, "Report FT-110."

Prepared by Textiles and Clothing Division, Business and Defense Services Administration, Department of Commerce, May 12, 1961.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman has mentioned newspaper comment on this critical subject. Twenty miles from my hometown and just 6 or 8 miles from the line of my congressional district, there is published a newspaper known as the Charlotte News which is owned by the Knight newspaper people. For some time, they apparently were very unsympathetic with the problem of our people who earn their living in the textile plants with reference to this problem of textile imports. Just a few minutes ago, I read the Charlotte News of Monday, May 15, 1961, which is yesterday's issue and I was pleased to find an editorial entitled "Textiles: Time for Relief Is Short." They conclude with this statement:

> But, clearly, the time has come for concrete action and negotiations that produce substantial results.
>
> Otherwise, SAM ERVIN'S talk (that is in reference, of course, to our distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina) of a liquidated industry may assume an appearance of prophecy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this very splendid editorial in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

TEXTILES: TIME FOR RELIEF IS SHORT

Despite Senator SAM ERVIN'S gloomy forecasts of an ongoing liquidation of the textile industry, two major factors give concreteness to President Kennedy's recent promises of relief.

One is a new high of tough protectionist sentiment in the Congress. Unless accommodated by determined efforts to guard U.S. industries against unregulated foreign goods imports, this sentiment could result in grievous damage to the international trade structure.

The administration, according to a New York Times report, sees a necessity of avoiding that risk by concrete concessions. While hope remains of avoiding mandatory tariffs or quotas on imports, these have not been ruled out. In any event, the pressure on the administration is strong and growing.

The other major factor is statistics that remove all doubts of merit in industry cries for help. There must, to be sure, be new initiatives by industry in research, merchandising, and plant modernization—and the Government can assist here without question. But in view of the following figures, industry initiative clearly cannot do the job alone:

Textile imports in 1960 were running at the rate of 140 percent of exports which hit their lowest point since World War II.

Textile employment was at an alltime low—at 807,300 in January, it was about half the total employment in 1947.

Five years ago, when industry complaints led to a voluntary quota system in Japan, imports in cotton broadwoven goods, the largest category, were running 3 percent of total U.S. production.

The figure in 1960 was 8 percent and rising.

The domestic textile industry labored through this period and still labors under the discriminatory two-price cotton system which gives increasing advantage to foreign factories.

The administration ought to take every possible step to avoid tariff and quota walls by making voluntary import-limit arrangements with a dozen countries comparatively new in the textile field, or by arranging with other countries to take greater shares of the imports.

Once the mandatory tariff-quota door is opened, there can be no visible end to appeals by other industries for protection. Moreover, the encouragement of economic development in friendly countries is basic to the U.S. role in the world.

But, clearly, the time has come for concrete action and negotiations that produce substantial results.

Otherwise, SAM ERVIN'S talk of a liquidated industry may assume an appearance of prophecy.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the Charlotte Observer, also published by the Knight newspapers, a year or two ago were implying in their editorials and articles, written by their representative here in Washington, that the people in the textile industry and people like the gentlemen from South Carolina who have been concerned about the future of the industry were crying wolf when no wolf was at the door.

I was very pleased to note on Friday, May 12, 1961, a United Press International article appearing in the Charlotte Observer entitled "U.S. Textile Industry Is Sick." The publication of this article in the Observer would indicate, I hope, that they have now seen the light and realized that we are confronted with a disastrous problem. I do not, of course, agree with everything else in the article, but I think the burden of the article is that the textile industry is in such shape that immediate assistance must be had if we are to preserve the jobs of the people in it.

Significantly, this article points out that one out of every three workers who worked in textile plants in 1947 either has another job today or is jobless. We are told in this article that more than one-half of these 229,000 people were turned out when 838 mills stopped their looms and closed their doors. The man who wrote this apparently is not too familiar with textiles, because it was not stopping looms that put that many out of work, it was stopping frames, looms, openers, pickers, winders, spoolers, and cards, and all types of other machinery. But in this article there is further pointed out something which I think very few people in the nontextile areas realize. They say that American manufacturers cannot compete with goods from places like Hong Kong, Japan, India, and Pakistan where the cost of labor is so much lower than it is here; but

at another point in this article we are told that today the big problem is Hong Kong, since they are now exceeding the Japanese in the amount of textiles that are being sent into this country.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this article I have mentioned may be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

U.S. TEXTILE INDUSTRY IS SICK—MILLS INSIST FOREIGN IMPORT CURBS ARE ONLY SURE CURE

(By Steven Gerstel)

WASHINGTON.—The textile industry in the United States is sick.

A lingering malady, first diagnosed shortly after World War II, has steadily eaten away at its size and strength.

One out of every three workers who toiled in a mill in 1947 has another job today; or he is jobless.

More than one-half of these workers—229,000—were turned out when 838 mills stopped their looms and closed their doors.

Many of these mills were small. But many of them were either the only or the biggest industry in a New England village or a town in Dixie.

To the textile industry there is only one cure for the illness: stop the flood of imports. We can't compete with the cheap labor overseas, they cry. Save us, because in time of war the United States will need us.

To President Kennedy, to Senate committees, to the Commerce Department, to the State Department, to the press, and to anyone else who will listen, the textile industry says it is faced with extinction unless the Government imposes country-by-country, category-by-category quotas on foreign imports.

The chant has been adopted and repeated by Senators and Representatives from the textile States. They have repeated it in speeches on the floors of Congress and they have repeated it to President Kennedy.

The President has reacted. He has announced a seven-point program to help the industry. But he has not specifically recommended quotas.

The President, like virtually everyone else including the importers and the committee for a national trade policy, knows the textile industry is unhealthy.

But he has said that "protectionism is not a solution" to American trade problems.

Commerce Secretary Luther Hodges, speaking to the 12th annual convention of the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, said "I need not tell you that until and unless you have more unselfishness and more long-range planning and thinking, nobody can help you stay in business and make a profit.

"Many of us," he added, "are asking the country to take care of us before we have done all we can."

Buried beneath the statistics showing the decline of the textile industry and the well-publicized drive for quotas are at least several weaknesses within the industry itself.

One, pointed out by the Senate subcommittee which recommended quotas, is the industry's unwillingness to spend enough on research to find new uses for textiles.

Another, revealed by Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, last week is that domestic textile manufacturers have heavy investments in foreign mills which compete with the American companies.

Foreign textiles have undoubtedly hurt the domestic industry and hurt it badly.

Imports are one facet of this pain.

American manufacturers cannot compete with goods from places like Hong Kong, Japan, India, and Pakistan where the cost of labor is much lower.

A vivid example of the difference is that a man can buy identical white shirts in this country at two prices. The $2.95 model has a "made in Hong Kong" label. The more expensive shirt was made in the United States.

In addition, the imports, which account for only about 8 percent of the domestic consumption, tend to drive American prices down and cut profits.

But exports from the United States have also been hurt by the increase abroad. The export market has remained relatively stable while foreign manufacturers have muscled in, both in this country and elsewhere.

Kennedy's seven-point program has given the industry a good deal of encouragement. The feeling stems mainly from the fact that the Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization will consider any request for quotas if the industry can prove it is vital to the national defense.

The industry feels it can prove this, if not on a blanket basis then certainly in some categories. It plans to file for quotas.

But it may run into trouble. Southern manufacturers are refusing to bid on Army Quartermaster Corps contracts. They are shying away because the President's Committee on Equal Job Opportunities won't approve defense outlays to plants that are segregated.

South Carolina, for example, has a specific law which prohibits Negroes and whites working together in mills.

The textile industry has a friend in Kennedy. His home State of Massachusetts has suffered the full effects of the industry's decline. He also received the backing of the Southern textile people because of his campaign promises of relief. And he needs the votes of many textile Congressmen to push his program through Congress.

But Kennedy is no longer a Massachusetts Senator and he has to weigh the plight of the textile industry against the effect of quotas on such allies as Japan and such neutrals as India.

IMPORT RATE DOUBLES 1958

BOSTON.—Textile imports poured into the United States markets in 1960 at twice the rate of 1958 and 10 times the rate of 1948, the Northern Textile Association (NTA) reported Thursday.

A study of Federal import statistics, just completed, shows imports of textile manufacturers last year reached a record 1.3 billion square yards in contrast to only 131 million square yards 12 years ago, the NTA said.

Surprisingly, in 1960, Hong Kong moved out ahead of Japan as the principal source of cotton textile imports, although Japan remained in second place. The combined totals from Spain, Egypt, France, and Portugal multiplied 33 times in 2 years.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, and may I say again to the gentleman from South Carolina that the 806,000 remaining textile workers that we are told we now have—and I do not include the apparel industry in that number—today feel a sense of appreciation for the splendid work that the gentleman from South Carolina is doing in trying to preserve the jobs of those people in the industry. I feel that unless others join with us in this battle the textile worker will become a vanishing breed in this country, and that throughout the great textile area in which we live and the great cotton-producing area in which we live we will see appearing on the horizon ghost towns as these textile plants are passing from the American economic scene by reason of the dereliction of many in protecting a basic textile industry, a basic value of our economy, and an industry which provided a livelihood for many thousands and millions of people in the past, an industry which has given to me and thousands of others summer jobs in vacation periods. We were able to get work in those plants, an industry which is home-owned, for the most part, where the largest chain in the textile industry, unlike many other great industries, produces only approximately 5 percent of the total of American textiles. It is an industry of small business.

We hear so much about small business here in the Halls of Congress. I certainly hope my friends over on the left and on the right will join with us as we carry on this battle for survival of an industry which is so important to all of us.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for the inclusion of those fine statistics and for his comments.

I have here the May 11, 1961, edition of the American Textile Reporter, and I should like to refer to an article beginning on page 19 and continuing on page 44 of that publication, with which I do not altogether agree. It goes on to say this proposal is a gift package but there is precious little in it, I share the gentleman's concern, but I must say I do not see it that way. I feel that we have an opportunity. Since the textile industry was lulled to sleep once before—and before we passed the Reciprocal Act of 1958 it was lulled to sleep—it should wake up to the fact that it was lulled into this false security position and the textile industry should not be lulled into any sense of false security. Words alone are not sufficient in this day and time. We must give voice to our feelings here, but we also want those who are charged with responsibilities uptown to know that we expect some action from the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Commerce in accord with the President's proclamation.

I believe the President was sincere. We were sincere in appealing to him in the campaign last fall, and also during the spring when various Members of Congress went to him representing the textile industry. I was not privileged to be selected for the smaller group, but I was in the larger group. He gave us hope.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article from the American Textile Reporter at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

The textile industry has received a beautiful gift package tied with fancy ribbon from President Kennedy but there's precious little in it.

In effect, the President has said he may favor more import restrictions on textiles if foreign exporting nations do not agree to an international control program which would guarantee them an ever-increasing share of

the U.S. market. In other words, the administration isn't opposed to foreign manufacturers taking a larger and larger share of domestic business; it only opposes abrupt increases in textile imports which disrupt market conditions here. What the Government is seeking is a system which would—and this a direct quote—"stabilize the increase." This is what industry leaders are applauding.

The fact of the matter is that the industry got absolutely nothing from the President's seven point program which it did not already have—except, perhaps, a little more reason to hope for faster tax write-offs on textile machinery and the "privilege" of paying the same price as foreign competitors for U.S. cotton. Most industry spokesmen disagree with this interpretation; some go so far as to say that the seventh item in the President's program—his pledge that an application by the industry for import relief under the escape clause or national security provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be "carefully considered on its merits"—means that any request for restrictions by way of these routes will be automatically approved. However, the President's promise represents no more than what is required by law.

Actually, the industry's plea for mandatory quotas was rejected by President Kennedy—for the present—at a crucial April 18 meeting at the White House with his Cabinet Committee on the Textile Industry. In all the debate over what President Kennedy's seven point program means to the industry, the question of just what the Committee recommended has been forgotten. However, this is an extremely important point.

The recommendations of the Cabinet group, headed by Commerce Secretary Luther H. Hodges, were neatly fuzzed up in the various briefings, off-the-record explanations of the new program, and the President's announcement itself. When the excitement died down, there was no one to explain the Committee's role in the final decision. Chairman Hodges took off for Europe 24 hours before the White House announced the program and other Cabinet members long since had gone back to the affairs of their various departments. The White House merely said the seven-point program was "developed" by the Hodges group.

There was a reason for shunting the Cabinet Committee to one side in the excitement of getting the program out. The reason was that the Hodges Committee had in fact recommended import quotas along the lines urged by textile industry leaders for years. The President, however, was unwilling to accept the quota system for international political reasons and he ordered an alternative solution developed. This is when the seven-point program, featuring the international conference idea, was cooked up as a substitute.

It cannot be established whether the Cabinet Committee's recommendations were ever put on paper. The White House denies there was any record of the April 18 meeting, the decisive session on the textile problem. They say the group's presentation was oral and did not contain any recommendations, a version of the meeting that is hard to credit. It is difficult to believe that the group, after studying the situation with the object in mind of making recommendations, merely took the President on a "tour of the horizon" to acquaint him with problems with which he is well acquainted from his days in Congress. It is also difficult to believe that the Committee failed to make recommendations, as the President requested when he organized the study group, explicitly or implicitly, on paper or otherwise.

On the basis of information supplied by a first-rate authority within the Government, here's what transpired at the April 18 meeting. After detailing various possible solutions to the import question, Secretary Hodges said the Committee was recommending import quotas on a country-by-country, category-by-category basis. This was the only workable solution to the import issue, he told the President. Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon, who also attended the meeting, seconded the recommendations. This was obviously a difficult task for a man of his liberal trade views, but he backed Secretary Hodges completely. George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, opposed the plan. President Kennedy also found the plan unpalatable and directed that a substitute be prepared. The result was the seven-point program.

To a striking degree, the President's proposals parallel recommendations made to the President by the National Committee for a National Trade Policy, a liberal trade group. This placed some members of the industry in the position of praising recommendations which only a short time before they had criticized. Representatives of foreign countries, exporter and importer groups were generally gleeful over developments. They felt it meant the President plans to help the industry become more competitive by modernization while doing little about imports.

Another authoritative source said the White House had ordered industry representatives to show enthusiasm over the program if they expected any help at all. This source said that some of the statements issued after the White House meeting with industry leaders were written by members of the President's staff. Although spokesmen for the industry deny these reports, it is hard to understand what the industry could find in the program on imports to generate so much enthusiasm. Privately, a number of textile people did express dismay and puzzlement.

By weekend, a group of fiber, textile, and apparel trade associations had announced plans to petition the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for import restrictions under the national security provision of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. The speed with which they acted reflects their desire to get something done before the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act comes up for extension next year. This is the sole remaining lever available to the industry to help get favorable consideration of its bid for protection.

The national security procedure has been viewed by the textile industry as the most promising vehicle to control imports since it was changed in 1958 by an amendment sponsored by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. At the time, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon was Under Secretary of State and in charge of guiding the bill through Congress. In order to get it through the conservative Finance Committee, he had to agree to accept the Byrd amendment. In effect, this extended the meaning of the national security provision—which specified that import controls could be imposed if imports threatened national security—to include economic welfare. Thus, if imports threaten to undermine the economic welfare, the Byrd amendment says they also threaten the national security.

Commenting on the petition which would be filed, ACMI President J. M. Cheatham said: "Our group is confident it can substantiate the position that imports are increasing at such a rate as to threaten not only the American fiber-textile-apparel industry's ability to contribute to the growth of the Nation's economy (that is, its economic welfare), but also its capacity to supply the Nation's primary military textile item requirements in the event of either a limited or general emergency."

However, at a high level background briefing, one U.S. official said that the administration is against trade restrictions. While he reluctantly acknowledged that textile imports are a growing problem, he stated flatly that the United States has no present intentions of rolling back imports. Instead, he said, the problem is to increase imports over the years on a systematic basis. He said a primary objective in forthcoming trade talks would be to convince Canada and Western Europe that they also must accept a larger share of textile imports from developing nations.

It is difficult to see how such comments can be construed to show a change of atmosphere in Washington.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. While it is not in any way going to solve the problem of the textiles, I was very much interested in a matter called to my attention back several years ago where the Government sold cotton abroad at several cents a pound less than it was being sold to American industry. I introduced a bill that provided that at least for a period of time the American industry would be enabled to purchase cotton at the same price that it was sold abroad. I think there was an 8-cent differential, or something like that. Is that correct?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Six cents to eight and one-half cents.

Mr. McCORMACK. I introduced a bill again a few days ago. On one occasion we had a bill up here relating to agriculture. The chairman of the committee and the ranking Republican member of that committee were agreeable to accepting my bill as an amendment, but it was not germane to the bill before the House. A Member made a point of order. I never could understand why legislation along such lines, whether introduced by me or by someone else, should not be reported out of the committee. From information I have received, I know that the bill would be helpful, not a solution, but it is one of the steps. As I remember, it was one of those matters mentioned by the President in his statement of a few weeks ago, and I understand that the President's Committee on Textiles is considering the matter.

Would the gentleman care to express his views as to the value of legislation along such lines to the textile industry?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I certainly would, and I thank the gentleman for his remarks and his interest, and for his introduction of that legislation.

In the fourth item of the several items mentioned by the President in his message, he mentioned specifically that he had directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers.

I found when I was overseas looking into the textile problem that this was one of the situations of a problematical nature. The differential in cotton is very significant, and this year when it was first announced that there would continue to be a differential there was great concern in the industry which was

expressed to me about the fact there was still this differential in cotton. I think and I hope this will go a way toward solving the problem.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a matter that has been considered for several years. I introduced my first bill back 5 or 6 years ago, and a distinguished Member of the other body, who was a Member of this House, the present Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] introduced a bill. I was so impressed with the justice and the fairness of it that my conscience prompted me to introduce the bill for whatever value it might be worth. Now, when I read the President's statement and the several points called to the attention of one of the President's Cabinet Committee, I again introduced a bill about 10 days ago. Now, this matter is nothing new. It has been considered previously. The thought in my mind is, Why cannot the Secretary of Agriculture—and I say this in no critical sense—get an immediate report relative to this situation? At least, the prompt passage of that bill would be an affirmative act of deep interest to the textile industry; action showing interest; taking it out of the academic stage into the active stage. That is something that should be done very quickly. It seems to me that the Department of Agriculture—and I say it in no critical sense—should make a prompt report, and certainly the Committee on Agriculture should see that prompt action is taken on such legislation.

I do not care whether my bill is reported out. I am not seeking authorship. I am seeking results, because that particular aspect—and I am not confining my remarks to the textile industry alone—appeals to my sense of fairness, something that the American industry is entitled to.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman for his timely and very pertinent remarks, and I am heartily in agreement with him. It is a very fair thing, and I shall do all in my power to help him further the consideration and passage of this legislation.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WHITENER. I want to say to the gentleman and my colleagues that I appreciate the statement just made by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and for the effort he has put forth in this one problem concerning the textile industry. I have talked to many people who know and understand the problem, and they feel that if we can get one-price cotton, as suggested by the distinguished majority leader, that our ability to compete with foreign textiles would be greatly improved. I know of no American in the textile industry, whether as employee or as owner, who feels that we can bring the type of operation of our plants, the wage scale, and the other operations, down to the low standard which the gentleman from South Carolina and I have observed in foreign textile plants. But, if we can get for our industry a bit of help, such as the gentleman from Massachusetts is suggesting, we can give them a good run for their money, because even though we talk about the excellence of these mills abroad, my observation has been that they are not yet the type of people who have the ingenuity of the American people. So, if we can break through with this one-price cotton and two or three other things, I am sure that we can compete and rebuild our textile industry which is staggering now. I think it is characteristic of our friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] that he is not seeking personal recognition and does not say that he has any great pride of authorship.

Rather, he is trying to eliminate an inequity which any fairminded person upon study and reflection would recognize. I certainly join with the gentleman from South Carolina in pledging to the gentleman from Massachusetts my fullest efforts in trying to accomplish the very worthwhile purpose which he is promoting through his legislation.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield again to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fairness of the proposition has so effectively appealed to me since I first had called to my attention this differential against American industry that after introducing the bill I sent a letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture a few days ago enclosing a copy of the bill, urging early action by his committee. It seems to me to be so self-evident that we ought to give our American industry the same opportunity to buy at the same price at which we are selling abroad.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with the gentleman's sentiments and I might say it is my feeling that the actions of the gentleman show the good faith of the Kennedy administration in promoting some relief along this line and other lines.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me in order that I might ask the distinguished majority leader a question?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITENER. I hear it said by many that we must protect our foreign cotton market for the farmers of our country. It seems to me that the basic market of the American cotton farmer is still the American textile industry and when we overlook the fact that the basic requirement for cotton in this country will probably always be the American industry, I am wondering if the gentleman would agree with me that in trying to protect a so-called foreign market we are probably overlooking the more important market which our farmers have for their cotton.

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer is that the American textile industry is one of the great industries of our country and that certainly every consideration should be given to enable this great industry—and I am not confining my remarks to this—to meet foreign competition; and certainly in the field that I have addressed myself to in connection with the bill that I have introduced, to give to the American textile industry the same price level that is given to textile companies abroad.

Now, that is not the whole solution, but certainly it would constitute an important step forward in meeting the problems that confront the American textile industry.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I want to thank the gentleman. Unless he objects, under permission previously granted, to keep the continuity of these remarks, I shall insert at this point in the RECORD the bill known as H.R. 6783 introduced by the distinguished majority leader and for which we of the textile area are most grateful:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to assist the United States cotton textile industry to reestablish and maintain its fair historical share of the world market in cotton textiles so as to (1) insure the continued existence of such industry, (2) prevent unemployment in such industry, and (3) allow employees in such industry to participate in the high national level of earnings.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to make available to textile mills in the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years not less than seven hundred and fifty thousand bales of surplus cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation at such prices as the Secretary determines will allow the United States cotton textile industry to regain the level of exports of cotton products maintained by it during the period 1947 and through 1952. Cotton shall be made available to a textile mill under this Act only upon agreement by such mill that such cotton will be used only for the manufacture of cotton products for exports.

(b) The Secretary shall announce, not later than September 1 of each year for which surplus cotton is made available under this Act, the price at which such cotton is to be made available and thereafter for a period of thirty days shall accept applications from textile mills for the purchase of such surplus cotton. In the event the quantity of cotton for which application is made exceeds the quantity of such cotton made available for distribution under this Act, the cotton made available for distribution shall be distributed pro rata among the mills making application therefor on the basis of the quantities of cotton processed by such mills during the three calendar years preceding the year for which such distribution is made.

SEC. 3. The Secretary shall promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 4. Any person who knowingly sells or offers for sale in the United States any product processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any cotton made available under this Act shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I also have here an article which was sent to me through the mails, put out apparently by Prentice-Hall, Inc., whom I know as lawbook publishers, dated May

15, 1961, in which there is a treatment of trade under the title "Trade Restraint—For Awhile." I do not believe this article expresses the truth of the situation but I think it important in any discussion of this kind that we document for the RECORD what others are saying, because we want the whole picture.

We in the textile industry want, and I know the President wants, and so do others, the comments on the situation. So I include that in the RECORD at this point:

TRADE RESTRAINT—FOR AWHILE

Against his long-range wishes, President Kennedy is following a trade policy with decidedly protectionist overtones. If current calculations are right, however, it will be discarded after about a year. In the meantime, administration officials realize, it will be difficult to curtail imports while simultaneously trying to promote American trade abroad.

So far, willingness to restrain imports has shown up best in the White House's response to the textile industry's plea for protection. This gave Mr. Kennedy a chance to begin erecting a shelter over textiles, while also heralding a broader aim of Government: aid to any industry hurt by imports.

The object of both efforts is to show domestic protectionists and foreign industrialists alike that the administration is sympathetic toward U.S. economic woes traceable to foreign competition. This is intended to quiet the protectionists and keep them from seeking drastic solutions while also persuading foreigners to use self-restraint in shipipng to the United States to avoid officially-imposed barriers.

Administration aids are all but certain that they can begin working toward an unqualified free trade policy after about a year. They feel confident that industry problems here can be smoothed over if not solved.

And, privately, they concede that free trade will become politically realistic next year, after Congress renews Presidential authority to bargain with other countries to reach agreements on mutual reduction of tariffs.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, recently I received from an old friend who had just visited in Kioto, Japan, a letter in which he wrote to me about my interest in textiles and he said:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: My son, Walter Jr., sent me copies of your report to Congress on your investigation of the Chinese and Japanese textile situation and I want to express my appreciation of your efforts in behalf of our industry. I visited four mills in Manila, four in Hong Kong, and four in Taiwan before coming to Japan.

I have been through some of the mills you visited and I know you share my grave concern over the future of our industry in the States. The mills of Manila and Hong Kong are running 7 days a week and with their wages and ability to buy cotton 6 cents and 8½ cents cheaper in August it is no wonder. I was especially impressed with the high caliber of our State Department representatives in Hong Kong.

When you consider there was scarcely any textile industry in Manila, Hong Kong, and Taiwan prior to 1948 and there are now 400,000, 500,000, and 382,000 spindles, respectively, in those countries, and Japan has come up from 3,500,000 spindles at the end of the war to more than 12 million—all while the industry in the United States is being liquidated.

Do hope the President's seven-point program will furnish some relief. It is urgently needed.

I call that to your attention because that ties in with the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina who was over there and was on the scene.

I have here some clippings which I should like to include at this time from Japanese papers. One of them is the Mainichi Daily News. These clippings are dated May 5, 1961, and they are from Japan. I ask unanimous consent to include them at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The articles referred to are as follows:

JAPAN TO PARTICIPATE IN INTERNATIONAL COTTON CLOTH MEET CALLED BY JFK

Keiichi Matsumura, director of the Textile Bureau of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, told the press Thursday that Japan will take part in an international conference proposed by President Kennedy on textile trade problems.

At the same time present cotton fabric export quota negotiations between the United States and Japan will be continued, he said. The cotton export quota is outside the scope of the international textile conference, he said.

The United States has proposed that Japanese delegates suspend negotiations temporarily until the Kennedy administration has worked out a reconstruction plan for the U.S. textile industry.

Now that President Kennedy has announced America's 7-point textile program, negotiations for cotton fabrics export quotas should be resumed, the Japanese Government considers. The Foreign Ministry is instructing the Japanese Embassy in Washington to make the proposal to the American Government.

Matsumura said that at the proposed international conference the United States will request European countries to purchase more textiles in order to lessen pressure on the American textile industry. At the same time, the United States may urge textile exporting countries to adopt a voluntary export quota system, he said.

The Government and Japanese businessmen will sound out the opinions of cotton exporting countries on the proposed international textile conference at the International Cotton Conference to be held in Osaka starting May 8.

Regarding the international conference proposed by President Kennedy, Kichihei Hara, chairman of the All-Japan Cotton Spinners Association, commented that the Japanese industry was willing to make concessions to the extent that other countries concerned are willing to respect a rightful share for each other.

[From the Mainichi (Japan) Daily News May 5, 1961]

UNITED STATES PLANS INTERNATIONAL MEETING TO FIX TEXTILE QUOTAS

WASHINGTON, May 4.—The State Department said Wednesday it is getting in touch with the main textile exporting and importing nations to arrange a conference on President Kennedy's plan for controls of the textile trade.

Later, however, a State Department official said this did not mean that formal invitations had been sent out or that the full list of countries to be invited had been determined.

At the conference, one official said, the United States probably will propose a formula for assuring slow and orderly expansion of textile exports. The result would be a system of semivoluntary export quotas somewhat like Japan's quota controls.

About 20 countries and colonies, including Hong Kong, were to be asked to attend. The State Department was expected to announce the list later Wednesday.

At the same time, the United States and Japan will resume direct talks on Japan's 1961 quota controls on textile shipments to the U.S. market. Japan wants to increase the quotas by an average of 30 percent, contending that Hong Kong and other countries are taking advantage of Japan's rigid self-limitation to seize big shares of the U.S. market.

A State Department official said it would be impossible to complete the complex multilateral negotiations on the proposed worldwide textile trade restrictions in time to deal with Japan's proposal for the current calendar year.

However, it was expected that the international arrangement would replace the United States-Japan arrangement in future years.

A State Department official denied a published (New York Times) report that the Kennedy administration's plan for meeting the complaints of the U.S. textile industry points strongly toward imposing U.S. import quota barriers.

He said this could not be completely ruled out if the proposed conference and other measures fail to solve the problem on a multilateral, cooperative basis. But the administration hopes to avoid a sweeping protectionist move which would undermine the basic U.S. liberal trade policy and invite retaliation against U.S. exports.

[From the Yoniuri, May 5, 1961]

J.F.K.'s SEVEN-POINT PLAN SPIRITS JAPAN TEXTILE INTERESTS

WASHINGTON, May 2.—Japanese textile interests were greatly encouraged Tuesday that President Kennedy had avoided all reference to mandatory quotas in laying down a seven-point program of assistance to the U.S. textile industry.

The main attention of foreign producers, who have been sending an increasing flow of cotton textiles into the U.S. market, was centered on Kennedy's proposal for an early conference of the principal textile exporting and importing countries.

The State Department is now arranging to call the meeting which presumably will be held in Washington.

Kennedy defined the purpose of the conference as an effort to seek an international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries.

To many textile experts here, this sounded like a U.S. effort to obtain voluntary instead of mandatory quotas on imports to this country.

How far such a conference can go in reaching a broad understanding remained to be seen.

The U.S. domestic industry was gratified by the seven-point Kennedy program particularly on point 7 which invited the industry to make use of the existing escape clause provisions under the tariff commission or the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act.

The United States-Japan Trade Council headed by Nelson Stitt said in a letter to President Kennedy "We are confident that you will approve no measure on textiles which would be inconsistent with our paramount foreign policy objectives." He said the textile industry together with other segments of the American economy "has a vital stake in maintaining its export markets. This goal can scarcely be achieved by adopting restrictive quota barriers against imports or similar devices which would invite retaliation."

REACTION

The Japan textile industry Wednesday expresed deep concern over Kennedy's proposal and decided to watch closely its future developments.

As to the proposed international conference, the industry is expected to decide on its firm attitude after sounding opinions of delegates from textile producing countries who are to attend a general meeting of the International Cotton Federation to be opened in Osaka Monday.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, the thing that is bothering us so much is the fact that textile imports not only from Japan, where we have the voluntary quota, but now from Hong Kong, where we have no quota, are rising. I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this time a newspaper clipping on this subject, from the Columbia, (S.C.) State, of May 13, 1961.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The newspaper clipping is as follows:

JUMP IN TEXTILE IMPORTS REFLECTED IN NEW REPORT

BOSTON.—Textile imports poured into the U.S. markets in 1960 at twice the rate of 1958 and 10 times the rate of 1948, the Northern Textile Association reported Thursday.

A study of Federal import statistics, just completed, shows imports of textile manufactures last year reached a record 1.3 billion square yards in contrast to only 131 million square yards 12 years ago, The NTA said.

Surprisingly, in 1960, Hong Kong moved out ahead of Japan as the principal source of cotton textile imports, although Japan remained in second place. The combined totals from Spain, Egypt, France, and Portugal multipled 33 times in 2 years.

Cotton manufactures imported from Formosa, Korea, Pakistan and India jumped 1,200 percent in the same 2-year period, the NTA said, while in wool textiles Italy and Japan supplied nearly two-thirds of U.S. imports.

Seabury Stanton, president of Berkshire Hathaway Inc., New Bedford, Mass., and chairman of the association, said the report is being distributed to more than 100 Members of Congress who took part in recent import discussions. It also will go to Government and trade officials studying the problem.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, just today in the Wall Street Journal, on page 10, appears an article of importance in this connection. I ask unanimous consent to include that article in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TEXTILE INDUSTRY ASKS AGENCY TO RULE IMPORTS THREATEN U.S. SECURITY—SUCH A FINDING WOULD EMPOWER PRESIDENT TO ORDER REMEDIES SUCH AS QUOTAS, TARIFFS, FEES

WASHINGTON.—The textile industry began the series of steps it hopes will result in the imposition by President Kennedy of Government quotas on textile imports.

Industry organizations petitioned the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for a finding that textile imports are threatening the national security. If such a finding is made, the President is empowered under the reciprocal trade law to order remedies such as import quotas, higher tariffs, or import fees.

Though the filing with the agency made no mention of specific remedies, there's no doubt the textile industry seeks import quotas. In past testimony before congressional committees, industry representatives have contended that the only way to solve the industry's ills is for the Government to slap country-by-country and category-by-category quotas on textile imports.

The industry action comes less than 2 weeks after President Kennedy, in outlining a seven-point program of Government assistance for the domestic industry, gave assurance that an application under the reciprocal trade law would be carefully considered on its merits.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM

The seven-point administration program ranged from a proposed international conference, not yet called, to seek voluntary agreement among foreign textile-producing countries to reduce shipments to the United States to a study of additional depreciation deductions that might be allowed for tax purposes on textile machinery.

The industry petition requested the OCDM "to institute an investigation, to require expedited submission of views, and at the earliest practical time to determine and advise the President that textiles and textile manufacturers are being imported under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security."

Under the reciprocal trade law, the OCDM, in order to render a finding that imports threaten the national security, must conclude that the affected domestic industry is essential either to the Nation's military establishment, to the national economy, or to both.

The textile industry argued that it qualified for Federal help on both counts. Because of excessive imports, the industry said it "is threatened with absolute incapacity to meet projected national defense requirements." The petition noted that during times of emergency, the military demands for textiles climb sharply. For example, it said, military consumption of textiles at World War II's peak exceeded normal consumption by 50 times; during the first full year of the Korean emergency, military consumption jumped tenfold.

AN IMMEDIATE INCREASE

"It may be concluded that there will be an immediate increase in the military requirements for textile manufactures in the event of an emergency, ranging from 10 times to as much as 50 times the rate at present," the petition asserted. In addition, it added, during emergency times "the requirements for textile materials to fill civil defense and essential civilian needs would be very high."

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, the reason I have included all these various articles is that I think they reflect the concern of the people of this Nation over what is going to happen to the textile industry. For my part, it is very vital that this industry survive. For my part, it is very vital that this particular industry not only survive but that conditions improve, because if conditions do not improve then people will be out of work. Not only will people be out of work, but a great industry will lose its impact on the American economy. I do not believe it is the will of the people of this country, I am certain now it is not the will of this administration, and I do not believe it is the will of this Congress that this industry shall disappear or be so decimated that it no longer has its impact as one of the great industries on the American scene.

I think we should not be lulled into any sense of security. We not only have our problems incidental to the industry and peculiar to the industry, we have the problem of meeting the competition. That is a problem that we cannot afford to overlook. In spite of all the assurances we have, we of the textile area must be ever on guard that not only is our industry efficient but that we overlook no opportunity to improve and compete in every way.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point some tables showing the trend in the textile industry and in the imports of certain textile manufactures. These tables appear on page 1 through page 7 of the booklet I have here. They show these most unfortunate effects on the textile industry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Trends in U.S. imports of certain textile manufactures

[U.S. imports of textile manufactures increased 10 times since 1948 and more than doubled since 1958]

	Millions of square yards			Percent increase	
	1948	1958	1960	1958–60	1948–60
Cotton manufactures	64	456	1,008	121	1,475
Wool manufactures	26	55	111	102	327
Wilton and velvet carpets	1	5	8	60	700
Manmade fiber manufactures	8	49	100	104	1,150
Silk manufactures	32	65	83	28	159
Total	131	630	1,310	108	900

Nineteen hundred and sixty imports were sizable both absolutely and as a percentage of domestic production of cloth and yarn.

	Square yards		Imports as percent of domestic production
	Imports	Domestic production	
Cotton broadwoven manufactures	*Millions* 841	*Millions* 10,914	7.7
Wool broadwoven manufactures	74	483	15.3
Wilton and velvet carpets	8	33	24.2
Man-made and silk broadwoven manufactures	163	3,278	5.0
Yarn and yarn products, except broadwoven	224	3,714	6.0
Total	1,310	18,422	7.1

In 1948, imports were less than 1 percent of domestic production; in 1958 the ratio was 3.5 percent, and in 1960, 7.1 percent.

For certain types of textiles this ratio is much higher. In 1960, wool broadwoven textile imports were 15 percent of domestic production, carpet imports 24 percent, and silk textile imports over 200 percent.

Imports enter in many forms such as yarn, fabric, and a great variety of textile products, including apparel.

Imports in each of these forms have risen sharply; 1960 fabric imports were 2½ times greater than in 1958. In the same period, imports of textile products rose by two-thirds. Yarn imports jumped 800 percent.

There has also been a marked increase in the sources of imports.

	Millions of square yards			Percent change	
	1948	1958	1960	1958–60	1948–60
Cotton manufactures	64	456	1,008	+121	+1,475
Hong Kong	(1)	66	278	+321	(2)
Japan	14	278	264	−5	+1,786
Spain, Egypt, France, and Portugal	3	5	216	+3,320	+7,100
Formosa, Korea, Pakistan, and India	(1)	8	105	+1,213	(2)
All other	47	99	145	+46	+209
Wool manufactures	20	55	111	+102	+327
Italy	2	7	34	+386	+1,600
Japan	(1)	19	27	+42	(2)
United Kingdom	11	18	21	+17	+91
All other	13	11	29	+164	+123

[1] None or negligible.
[2] Not applicable.

Hong Kong is the principal source of U.S. cotton textile imports. In 1960, her share of U.S. cotton textile imports was 28 percent.

Japan is the second largest source of cotton textile imports with her share of the U.S. market almost as large as that of Hong Kong. Portugal is the third largest source, followed by Spain and Egypt in that order.

Italy is the chief source of U.S. wool textile imports. In 1960, her share of U.S. wool textile imports was 31 percent.

Japan is the second largest source of wool textile imports followed by the United Kingdom. Hong Kong is now a significant source.

Japan is by far the chief source of manmade fiber and silk textile imports. In 1960, Japan's share of U.S. manmade fiber textile imports was 75 percent, and her share of silk textile imports was 88 percent.

Lower-wage countries have been taking an increasing share of U.S. textile imports. In 1960, over three-fourths of these imports came from countries whose textile workers on the average are paid less than 18 cents per hour.

Following are detailed tables:

COMPOSITE TABLES

TABLE I.—*U.S. imports of certain textile manufactures, 1958–60*

[Millions of square yards]

	1958	1959	1960
Cotton manufactures	456	690	1,008
Hong Kong	66	200	278
Japan	278	288	264
Portugal	1	4	62
Spain	1	10	61
Egypt	1	2	55
India	3	28	53
France	2	13	38
Formosa, Pakistan, and Korea	5	27	52
All other	99	118	145
Wool manufactures, except carpets	55	91	111
Italy	7	20	34
Japan	19	26	27
United Kingdom	18	23	21
All other	11	22	29
Wilton and velvet carpets	5	7	8
Belgium	4	5	4
Japan	----	1	3
Manmade fiber manufactures	49	95	100
Japan	25	75	75
Silk manufactures	65	92	83
Japan	57	82	73
Total	630	975	1,310

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; American Carpet Institute; and Textile Organon.

In addition to the general table shown above, these composite tables consist of one table for each kind of textile manufacture showing import data by major category for the years 1958–60.

There is also a table for each kind of textile manufacture showing import data by major category and principal country of origin for 1960 alone.

A table showing a comparison of textile industry average hourly earnings between selected foreign countries and the United States is also included:

COTTON

TABLE II.—*U.S. general imports of cotton manufactures, by major category, 1958–60*

[Millions of square yards]

	1958	1959	1960
Broadwoven fabric [1]	148	250	471
Made-up manufactures [2]	55	53	58
Woven apparel	186	304	312
Total	389	607	841
Yarn	4	6	71
Knit manufactures [3]	19	25	33
Other manufactures [4]	44	52	63
Total	67	83	167
Grand total	456	690	1,008

[1] Includes countable cotton cloth, pile, tapestry, upholstery, drapery, table damask, blanket, towel, and bedspread fabrics.
[2] Includes sheets, pillowcases, handkerchiefs, and other made-up manufactures of broadwoven fabric.
[3] Includes underwear, gloves, hose, apparel, and other knit or crocheted manufactures.
[4] Includes floor coverings, coated, filled, or waterproofed fabrics, and miscellaneous cotton manufactures.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Rept. No. FT-130.

TABLE III.—*U.S. general imports of cotton manufactures by major category and principal country of origin, 1960*

[Millions of square yards]

Country	Total	Broadwoven [1] fabric	Made-up manufactures [2] and woven apparel	Yarn and [3] knit manufactures	Other [4]
Hong Kong	278	83	181	12	2
Japan	264	95	130	13	26
Portugal	62	31	----	31	----
Spain	61	44	2	15	----
Egypt	55	45	----	10	----
India	53	51	2	----	----
France	38	33	----	3	2
Formosa, Pakistan, and Korea	52	47	4	1	----
All other	145	42	51	19	33
Total	1,008	471	370	104	63

[1] Includes countable cotton cloth, pile, tapestry, upholstery, drapery, table damask, blanket, towel, and bedspread fabrics.
[2] Includes sheets, pillowcases, handkerchiefs, and other made-up manufactures of broadwoven fabric.
[3] Includes underwear, gloves, hose, apparel, and other knit or crocheted manufactures.
[4] Includes floor coverings, coated, filled, or waterproofed fabrics, and miscellaneous cotton manufactures.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Rept. No. FT-130.

WOOL

TABLE IV.—*U.S. imports for consumption of wool manufactures except carpets, by major category, 1958–60*

[Millions of square yards]

	1958	1959	1960
Broadwoven fabric [1]	34	47	62
Apparel, not knit, and blankets, robes, and steamer rugs	4	11	12
Total	38	58	74

[1] Includes billiard cloth, and pile, tapestry, and upholstery fabric.

WOOL—continued

TABLE IV.—*U.S. imports for consumption of wool manufactures except carpets, by major category, 1958–60*—Continued

[Millions of square yards]

	1958	1959	1960
Top and yarn	7	19	19
Knit and other manufactures [2]	10	14	18
Total	17	33	37
Grand total	55	91	111

[2] Includes knit fabric, knit apparel, knit gloves and hood coverings, woven and nonwoven felts.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Rept. FT-110.

TABLE V.—*U.S. imports for consumption of wool manufactures except carpets, by major category and principal country of origin, 1960*

[Millions of square yards]

Country	Total	Broadwoven fabric [1]	Apparel, not knit, blankets, robes, and steamer rugs	Yarn, top and knit, manufactures [2]
Italy	34	28	1	5
Japan	27	15	3	9
United Kingdom	21	14	1	6
All other	29	5	7	17
Total	111	62	12	37

[1] Includes billiard cloth, and pile, tapestry and upholstery fabric.
[2] Includes knit fabric, knit apparel, knit gloves and head coverings, woven and nonwoven felts.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Rept. FT-110.

MANMADE FIBER AND SILK

TABLE VI.—*U.S. imports for consumption of manmade fiber manufactures, by major category, 1958–60*

[Millions of square yards]

	1958	1959	1960
Broadwoven fabric [1]	20	44	42
Apparel, not knit [2]	12	32	38
Total	32	76	80
Knit manufactures [3]	2	3	3
Other [4]	15	16	17
Total	17	19	20
Grand total	49	95	100

[1] Includes pile fabric.
[2] Includes handkerchiefs and woven mufflers.
[3] Includes gloves, hose, and underwear.
[4] Includes spun yarns, lace, braids, ribbons, fringes, and miscellaneous items.

Source: Textile Organon, and U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Rept. FT-110.

TABLE VII.—*U.S. imports for consumption of manmade fiber manufactures, by major category and principal country of origin, 1960*

[Millions of square yards]

Country	Total	Broadwoven fabric [1]	Apparel, not knit [2]	Other, [3] and including knit manufactures [4]
Japan	75	34	29	12
Total	100	42	38	20

[1] Includes pile fabric.
[2] Includes handkerchiefs and woven mufflers.
[3] Includes gloves, hose, and underwear.
[4] Includes spun yarns, lace, braids, ribbons, fringes, and miscellaneous items.

Source: Textile Organon, and U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Rept. FT-110.

TABLE VIII.—*U.S. imports for consumption of silk manufactures by major category, 1958–60*

[Millions of square yards]

	1958	1959	1960
Woven fabric	55	81	72
Other [1]	10	11	11
Total	65	92	83

[1] Includes wearing apparel, laces, scarves, and handkerchiefs.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Rept. FT-110; and Bureau of Foreign Commerce World Trade Information Service Statistical Repts., pt. 3, Nos. 60-26 and 61-2.

TABLE IX.—*U.S. imports for consumption of silk manufacturers, by major category and principal country of origin, 1960*

[Millions of square yards]

	Total	Fabric	Other [1]
Japan	73	67	6
Total	83	72	11

[1] Includes wearing apparel, laces, scarves, and handkerchiefs.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Rept. FT-110; and Bureau of Foreign Commerce World Trade Information Service Statistical Repts., pt. 3, Nos. 60-26 and 61-2.

Textile industry average hourly earnings in selected foreign countries and the United States, 1958–60

[In U.S. dollars]

Country	Date of earnings	Average hourly earnings	Comparative U.S. average hourly earnings	Ratio of foreign to United States
				Percent
Belgium	Oct. 1959	$0.51	$1.56	33
France	Apr. 1959	.39	1.57	25
Formosa	1959	.05	1.57	3
Hong Kong	Apr. 1959	.10	1.52	7
India	Apr. 1959	.12	1.52	8
Italy	Sept. 1959	.28	1.59	18
Japan	1959	.17	1.57	11
Korea	1959	.06	1.57	4
Pakistan	Dec. 1958	.18	1.52	12
Portugal	1958	.10	1.45	7
Spain	1958	.18	1.51	12
United Kingdom	Apr. 1959	.55	1.57	35
West Germany	May 1960	.54	1.61	34

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Labor Developments Abroad;" and French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies, Paris, France.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say, we of the textile area are glad that the President took the action he did, happy in the hope he has given and determined that we on our part shall leave no stone unturned, not only to make friends and influence people to our way of thinking, but to do things to preserve our industry; to do what we should do in keeping faith with the people in those industries; the people who have sent us here to represent the textile-industry areas; the people who have made sacrifices through the years by sending their sons to war as well as making other sacrifices; the people who have paid the taxes through the years, in the faith that a country as great as this is would always consider the textile industry and its people valuable and necessary assets of this great country. I could not leave the well of this House, Mr. Speaker, without saluting these people—many of whom are my close personal friends whom I admire and love as honest, hardworking, self-sacrificing Americans who hope for their just share in the great future that faces America.

THE IOWA PLAN FOR GROWTH AND PROGRESS IN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of discussion these days about Federal aid to education. As one who has been the personal beneficiary of an excellent public school system, as one who has been a part of that system in the capacity of a teacher, and as one who led forces for improved educational opportunities in my State as a member of the Iowa Legislature, I am fully aware of the fact that proper and adequate education is important to the preservation of our freedom opportunities. I know education best fulfills its high purpose when responsibility for education is kept close to the people it serves, when it is rooted in the home, nurtured in the community and sustained by a rich variety of public, private and individual resources and encouraged by government. The bond linking home and school and community—the responsiveness of each to the needs of the others—is a precious asset of American education.

This bond must be strengthened, not weakened, as American education faces new responsibilities in the cause of freedom. For the increased support our educational system now requires, we must look primarily to citizens and parents acting in their own communities, school boards and city councils, teachers, principals, school superintendents, State boards of education and State legislatures, trustees and facilities of private institutions.

Someone has reminded us that:

Education is the parent of progress, the creator of culture, molder of destiny. Art is the work of her hands as is philosophy and science. It banishes ignorance, discourages vice and disarms anarchy. It has become and is freedom's citadel, the great arm of the Republic, the pride of adolescence while promoting humility. It is the joy of old age. Fortunate the nation and happy the homes that welcome it. Those interested in education, and all reasonable men should be, need forever to remember that the school is its workshop. The school, in its workshop, if it has an adequate course of study and good teachers, stirs ambition, stimulates ideals and forges the keys that open the door of opportunity. True education promotes and expands freedom. The school, through its teachers and libraries, is a source of inspiration and the aid of aspiration. It is irresistible power.

Mr. Speaker, bills for pouring massive sums of Federal funds into the country's educational coffers will soon be before us. All of us realize, I am sure, that regardless of the way, we must give an added stimulus to higher education and bring forth more and better trained college graduates.

To that end, I am today introducing three bills which will have a salutary effect upon solving the problems of higher education. They are the result, Mr. Speaker, of long and thorough research and study on this great problem. Most of the research and study which I will reveal today was done by my research team of college students in the law school at the University of Iowa. The work of this team has been ably supervised and directed by Dr. Deil Wright, of the department of political science at the university. The present members of this fine research team, of which I am very proud, are Robert Downer, of Newton, Iowa; Tom Scheuerman, formerly of Rock Island, Ill., now residing in Iowa City, Iowa; and Ivan Ackerman, of Allison, Iowa.

This research team has always had in mind developing a system that would expand opportunities and promote freedom by developing a greater sense of responsibility for it at the grassroots level. These bills, we believe, are consistent with this objective. They would offer a tax deduction or a tax credit for college expenses. One bill would increase the personal exemption for college students and/or parents who meet the bills. The other two would offer tax credits for these expenses. Because at least some of the ideas in these bills and others to be introduced originated in Iowa I have chosen to call this "The Iowa Plan For Growth and Progress for Higher Education."

These bills will, I feel, go a long way toward helping meet the crisis in higher education, should it be the will of Congress to enact any one of them into law.

These are modest approaches, and are the first phase of a total program to meet this challenge more adequately than has been suggested by any plan presented so far. They are sound ones because they recognize that the costs of a college education are legitimate tax deductions or credits. Instead of adding to the burden of the taxpayer, they offer him some real encouragement in a way which would serve as an inducement to send more of our young people to college. Figures show that a college education is not only a good investment for the individual, it is equally good for the growth and productive capacity of the country.

It is my sincere hope that these bills can be considered by the Ways and Means Committee during its hearings on general tax revision and that recommendations will be forthcoming to see this principle of tax credit or deduction for college educational expenses enacted into law.

It is my intention to take the floor on other occasions in the future in support of this legislation. I seek to emphasize the need for such legislation and explain how my bills meet this need. Today, I will dwell on the bill which will increase the personal income tax exemption for those who pay college expenses.

In the past decade we have seen a greater emphasis placed upon the values of higher education than ever before. As a result, college enrollment figures have shown a greater increase than the growth in our population. During this period, the population of the United States grew only 18.5 percent, or only

about one-third of the rate of growth of our colleges and universities in America. Between the falls of 1958 and 1959 there was an increase of 143,741, or 4.5 percent, in the enrollment of universities, liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges, technological schools, religious schools, and junior colleges in the United States. During that period a total enrollment of 3,402,297 full- or part-time students compared with 3,258,556 the previous year. Between 1957 and 1958 the enrollment increase was an additional 5.5 percent. A more alarming figure, perhaps, is the increasing number of freshmen entering our colleges and universities each year. The number of freshmen enrolling in the fall of 1959 was 826,969 or 5.6 percent above the total—freshman enrollment—of 781,075 only 1 year before. The freshman enrollment, in turn, was 6.6 percent above the 1957 figure in 1958.

Recent studies point out that, in all probability, this trend will continue or even accelerate during this decade. In 1940 only 15 percent of all Americans between the ages of 18 and 24 were enrolled in institutions of higher learning. By 1950 this portion had reached 30 percent, or double the percentage in only 10 years. However, this phenomenal increase can, in some measure, be attributed to the large numbers of exservicemen receiving financial aid through the GI bill. By 1960 this figure had reached 40 percent, and it is expected that fully one-half of the persons in this age group will be attending college by 1970, if the present trends continue.

As could be expected from these figures, more students from lower income families are attending colleges and universities now than in the past, and an increasing number from these families are expected in future years. However, there are still a great many potentially excellent students who are unable to obtain educations above the high school level. A recent study has revealed that approximately 50 percent of the students graduating in the upper one-fourth of their high school classes do not go on to college. Of that 50 percent, lack of the necessary funds prevents the majority from attending. A survey in the April 1960 issue of Scholastic Teacher pointed out that 63 percent of the high school students taking part in the survey said that they planned to go on to college. The survey also shows that only 22 percent, or only about one-third of those interested in attending college, have the funds necessary to finance a college education. Elmo Roper, in a recent survey for the Ford Foundation, found that 69 percent of the parents interviewed say that they expect to send their children to college, but only three-fifths of these families feel that they can afford to do so. The U.S. Office of Education estimates that by 1970 the cost of obtaining a college education will be double that of today if the present economic spiral continues.

The latest averages of college costs show that tuitions generally range from $300 to $1,200 per year; board and room averages from $400 to $600 for State-supported institutions, and $300 to $900 for private colleges and universities; books and supplies range from $25 to $200, and fees from $15 to $75 per year.

Today, I am going to speak to you about the first of a series of three bills that I have introduced as an attempt to partially alleviate the financial burden on families with members in college. At a later time, I will speak to you concerning the two other bills I have introduced on this subject.

The bill I am going to discuss with you now is one which, I believe, would materially aid this situation but, in my opinion, is not the best solution to this problem. This bill would increase Federal income tax exemption for dependents by $400 for each person in the family attending college. Thus, a family of five with one person in college would receive a total of $3,400 in exemptions rather than the present $3,000, and if this family had two college students this amount would be increased to $3,800.

If this proposal were adopted it would be very easy to administer. Only a slight change in present tax forms would be necessary, requiring the addition of one space where a person or family would be allowed to add $400 in exemptions for each of the members of the family enrolled in college. Auditing of returns would be no more complicated if the plan were adopted, because only a statement from the college or university would be necessary to show that the person was in college for a given year, and thus was entitled to the exemption.

This plan would provide some relief to the students or the parents of students who were hard-pressed financially. However, I feel that this proposal has several disadvantages which are not present in the other two bills that I have introduced. The other two bills use a tax credit rather than a tax deduction. Under a tax credit the amount of tax relief granted is equal for everyone, that is, each person qualifying for the credit has his tax bill reduced by the same amount. Since it is my primary aim in these proposals to aid lower income families who need help most. I feel that a tax credit is better suited to this situation. With a tax deduction, the amount by which the tax bill is reduced increases as the income, and the percentage at which it is taxed, rises. Thus a $400 tax deduction might mean a tax saving of $80 for one man, and $200 for another.

Because of this feature, the loss of revenue to the Treasury would be proportionately greater for the same amount of tax relief granted to taxpayers in lower income groups. I am sure that we all agree that the persons who should be benefited primarily by this tax relief are those in lower income brackets; consequently the tax credit proposals which I will be discussing with you soon are more advantageous.

However, I do feel strongly that if this tax deduction proposal were adopted it would be a big stride forward in the solution to this vital problem. In times such as these, when America badly needs college-educated men and women, it is our duty to see that as many of them as possible have the opportunity to attend college, and thus become more useful citizens of our Nation.

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 1, 1961, on page A2947, there appears a letter from a Mr. A. L. Thomas, of Gonzales, Tex.

The purport of the letter is to set forth alleged facts concerning a resident of Gonzales who was severely burned and who did not receive adequate medical care because of her inability to pay for medical care. The letter goes on to state that the woman "will die quickly and be out of her misery."

The letter was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a short introductory comment to the effect that the letter was "self-explanatory". It was also contended in that introduction that the letter demonstrated "the need of our elderly for medical aid with eloquent force." The suggested implication of the introductory comment is that here is the conclusive evidence on which to decide the great and urgent need for the Federal Government to provide medical care for our aged. Apparently we needed no other facts on which to proceed to the enactment of a vast Government medical program than the facts in the letter.

Mr. Speaker, two questions arise from the inclusion of this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first question is—was the letter really self-explanatory as claimed? The second question is—did the letter really demonstrate "the need of our elderly for medical care with eloquent force" as claimed? The answer to both of these questions is a very emphatic "No." A third possible question could be answered with equal emphasis, "No; the woman not only did not die but she is recovering very satisfactorily."

The letter from Mr. Thomas was not self-explanatory. Its contents were at complete variance with the facts. I have in my possession affidavits by relatives of the injured woman and another person having firsthand knowledge of the incident. These affidavits prove conclusively that not only was there no medical neglect of the woman, but that she did more to prevent medical care than did any person or any other thing. There is also evidence that the physician care was provided without cost.

Also, the letter failed to demonstrate need for a Federal program to provide medical care for social security recipients. The truth of the matter is that even if the facts had been as they were alleged to be in Mr. Thomas' letter, the woman concerned would not have benefited from a program of social security health care coverage for our elderly. The lady involved would not have been able to qualify for benefits under the President's program because she is not presently eligible for social security. Thus, a case selected to demonstrate a need for health care under social security concerned an individual who could not have qualified for help even if we had had such a program. It would have been necessary for such a program to

cover persons not qualified for social security benefits to help this individual—a program of compulsory national health insurance from the cradle to the grave.

Mr. Speaker, as can be noted in the accompanying RECORD insert with a Washington dateline, it has been contended that my Republicanism would preclude my having an interest in obtaining and disclosing the true facts in this case. In response to such a fallacious and specious contention, I categorically assert that neither Republicanism nor Democratism that may be tinged with a leftwing bias should preclude a common interest in obtaining the true facts in this case and its applicability to the question of whether or not America should embark on a program of compulsory Government health care for the aged under social security.

When it is proposed to spend literally billions of dollars in added taxes on our people for a new and untried Federal program, I think it is imperative that we insist on the facts. When an individual undertakes to reflect on the integrity of members of an honorable professional group, the only responsible course demands that the attacker know his facts. Unfortunately, ignorance of the facts in this case has led to rash and intemperate allegations that investigation have proved false. Those persons responsible for disseminating this misinformation owe apologies to the American people and to the persons who were the subject of this unwarranted criticism.

It is to be regretted that so much time has been devoted to an attempt to mislead the people on this subject. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means which has legislative jurisdiction over proposals to amend the Social Security Act to provide a program of health care. As a member of that committee I have endeavored to learn of a single case in which an individual who has sought medical care has been refused such care because of financial inability to pay. Thus far no valid case of such a denial of care has come to my attention. It is the fact of committee responsibility and my search for information that prompted my inquiry into the alleged case in Gonzales, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, I will include as part of my remarks the following documents: First, chronology of events; second, statement by Dr. Harvey Renger, president, Texas Medical Association; third, letter, May 9, 1961, from BRUCE ALGER; fourth, letter, May 9, 1961, received by BRUCE ALGER; fifth, letter, May 11, 1961, from BRUCE ALGER; sixth, affidavit of husband of patient; seventh, affidavit of employer of husband; eighth, affidavit of son-in-law; ninth, reprint of letter from Dallas Morning News of May 14, 1961; tenth, article with Washington dateline, Dallas Morning News, May 14, 1961; eleventh, reprint of notarized statements from Dallas Morning News, May 14, 1961; and twelfth, news article from Dallas Morning News, May 14, 1961:

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

March 20, 1961: Mrs. Muenich burned herself but she refused to let her husband seek medical care for her.

March 28: Son-in-law of Mrs. Muenich for the first time called a doctor and within 30 minutes the physician was at the house. The patient declined to submit to hospitalization, but did receive treatment.

March 30: Patient admitted to hospital.

April 4: Patient left hospital at her own insistence contrary to advice of physician.

April 5 to May 1: Patient received treatment by physician at home and through office calls.

May 2: Patient readmitted to hospital.

STATEMENT OF HARVEY RENGER, M.D., PRESIDENT, TEXAS MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, IN REGARD TO THE LETTER INSERTED INTO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD PERTAINING TO THE BURN CASE IN GONZALES

A letter by Mr. A. L. Thomas citing the case of a Gonzales woman who suffered burns a month ago was recently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In a news article which appeared in several Texas newspapers, it was reported that the woman still has not been hospitalized, and that this incident reflects the need for a Government medical care program for the aged. As president of the Texas Medical Association, I investigated this case personally, and here are the true facts:

The patient, Mrs. L.M., 62, who resides in a small community outside of Gonzales, relates a history of warming herself over a heater on the night of March 20, 1961. Her clothes caught on fire and she sustained burns of both buttocks and right hip. She was brought to her son-in-law, Mr. A.W., on March 28, who lives in Gonzales, Tex. He contacted Dr. D.M.S. by telephone and the doctor suggested that she be brought to the office. The son-in-law maintained that she did not want to come to the office. Therefore, Dr. D.M.S. went to Mr. A.W.'s home to see the burned woman within 30 minutes time of the first phone call. The delay of 8 days was caused by the patient's declination to heed the advice of her husband, who wanted to call a doctor earlier. These were second degree burns with some small areas of third degree burns. The patient then was treated with an antiseptic spray, a pressure bandage was applied over the bleeding burned area, and she was advised to be hospitalized.

She received injections of tetanus and antibiotics in the home. On the next day, March 29, no action was taken and on March 30, she was brought to the office of Dr. D.M.S. The doctor requested again that the patient be admitted for hospitalization. The family then went to see the husband's employer, Mr. D.W. Mr. D.W. agreed to take care of the hospital bill and let the patient's husband remit monthly installments out of his salary back to him. The patient was admitted at 5 p.m. on March 30 and stayed in the hospital until April 4 at 3:45 p.m. She left the hospital at her own insistence, and contrary to the advice of the doctor. She went back to her son-in-law's home, who cared for her approximately 2 weeks. She was seen at the doctor's office on April 10 and 19, at which time she received treatment and further advice. She left the home of her son-in-law and went back to the community in which she lived.

Dr. D.M.S. was out of town attending a medical meeting between April 23 and 26 and had asked Dr. W.A.S. to cover for his calls. On Sunday evening, April 23, Dr. W.A.S. was called by phone to attend this patient in her home. The doctor was told over the phone that the neighbors had collected some money to pay for his call. The doctor informed the individual calling that he would not accept the money collected, it should be used for other purposes, and that he would gladly donate his services as requested by phone that Sunday afternoon. Dr. W.A.S. was directed to the place by some neighbors and went into the house and found the patient lying on her abdomen under an improvised treatment tent. The patient declined to talk.

Her temperature was taken by the doctor and found to be 99.2°. The wounds looked well, considering the burn, and were dry. An eschar on both buttocks no larger than a man's hand was found. Dr. W.A.S. remarked that the lesions were healing well and that they were not as severe as had been related to him over the phone. It was suggested to the patient that she get up and move around and that the wound should be soaked in a warm solution each day. The husband made the remark that he did not have time to look after her because of his chicken business. Dr. W.A.S. finished the examination and then suggested that they bring in a urine specimen for an examination the next morning. He also left a supply of antibiotics and rest medicine, because the patient was restless at night. He suggested that she be given a bath. Inasmuch as the family and the neighbors indicated that they could not bathe her, Dr. W.A.S. secured a nurse (Mrs. E.H.) the next morning. The nurse was instructed to give the patient a bath and to remake her bed. For the call, Dr. W.A.S. accepted no fee, providing his professional services as his donation to the cause. Dr. W.A.S. then reported back to Dr. D.M.S., who returned on Wednesday, April 26. On April 28, Dr. D.M.S. was contacted and was asked to come back and see her—which he did. She looked well, and the woman was doing fine. She had a slight cold with a cough, and he advised her to continue the same medicine as prescribed by Dr. W.A.S. On Sunday, April 30, Dr. D.M.S. went back to the home to see her. The friends of the patient had reported that she had fever, and on that Sunday her temperature was 100.6°.

Dr. D.M.S. gave her another injection of antibiotic. The patient was readmitted on May 2 at 7 p.m. to a hospital in Gonzales. She is still under medical supervision at this time. In regard to the question of admission to John Sealy Hospital in Galveston, an application was made for a future admission in case the patient would require skin grafting. The woman at this time is not acceptable for grafting, and it is possible that the wound may well heal without grafting. These are the facts in the case, and I have been assured that this lady was not, in any way, neglected because of the lack of medical or hospital care.

I sincerely hope that all these facts will be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As it now stands, the citation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contains errors and represents a definite reflection on the integrity and self-respect of the people in the fine community of Gonzales, Tex. It also is a reflection on the medical profession and the hospital in Gonzales which have served the health needs of this area for so many years.

Sincerely,

HARVEY RENGER, M.D.

MAY 3, 1961.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1961.

———— ————,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ————: Please refer to your insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, May 1, page A2947, "Aged People in Desperate Need of Medical Aid."

I am now in possession of an entirely different version of this case, and I regret exceedingly that the original fallacious and apparently completely unfounded statement was inserted in the RECORD without complete investigation of the facts.

I assume that you now have the statement of Dr. Harvey Renger based upon the

investigation of the case of the lady in Gonsales who was burned. I assume that you will want to present the facts based upon the investigation in view of your earlier insertion. Out of courtesy, I will wait until today's RECORD is printed, and if you have not chosen to correct the RECORD in this case, I will feel that it is my duty to do so.

With kind regard.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE
AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1961.

Hon. BRUCE ALGER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ALGER: My statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, May 1, 1961, including the letter from Mr. A. L. Thomas, of Gonzales, reporting the case of an elderly woman who had received severe burns and needed treatment, reflected the woman's plight. It was made and placed in the RECORD after telephonic inquiries to Gonzales had been made.

Since Mr. Thomas' letter brought this case to public view, I have received a letter in which Dr. Harvey Renger contends that the lady had good medical care. His contention on this is at complete variance with the beliefs of the people in this community who took care of her.

The first I knew about any disagreement over the facts in the Gonzales matter was from an attack made on me by Dr. Renger, as president of the Texas Medical Association, in Texas newspapers. His press release was dated May 3, 1961, and was printed in Texas newspapers now in my possession, on May 4, 1961.

Dr. Renger's letter to me is dated May 6, 1961, 3 days after his public attack on me in the newspapers, was mailed in Austin, May 6, and was received here May 7, days after his public attack. Under the circumstance, I do not feel that his letter calls for any answer.

We have made additional telephonic inquiries to Gonzales since this attack and have received a number of additional letters and statements from Gonzales which do not agree with Dr. Renger's statements. I do not believe his attack on me justified, and if you want to make a public attack on me, please print this letter with it. I did have my staff investigate this matter by telephone, both before and after my statement in the RECORD. I feel that if you knew the facts we have, not even your Republicanism could induce you to print Dr. Renger's statements about this case.

The claim that Mr. Thomas' letter reflected on "the integrity and self-respect of the people * * * in Gonzales" is spurious. On the contrary, the Thomas letter recites the concern the neighbors had for the burned lady, and their diligent and continuing efforts to obtain proper care for her.

With your great interest in this lady's welfare, you will be interested to know that the concerned, kind-hearted, public spirited people of Gonzales have contributed $150 to a fund for her health care. With this donated money she was hospitalized after my statement was printed.

With kind regard.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1961.

Senator ——— ———,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ———: Thank you for your prompt acknowledgment of my letter of May 9, 1961, in regard to your insertion of the statement by Mr. A. L. Thomas concerning the woman who was burned in Gonzales.

Please be assured, Senator, that my Republicanism has nothing to do with my interest in this case, nor do I have any desire to attack anyone including you. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee the issue involved in your insertion, Federal aid for medical care, is one of direct concern to the committee on which I serve. In view of the wide variance of the statements by Mr. Thomas and Dr. Harvey Renger, I am making an effort to secure additional information and if, upon receipt of that information, any further action on my part is warranted I assure you I will do whatever I feel is necessary to present a true statement of all the facts in this case.

Sincerely yours,

BRUCE ALGER.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Gonzales:

I, Louis Muenich, wish to state in simple uncomplicated language the facts concerning medical care rendered my wife, Mrs. Louis (Martha) Muenich, while under treatment for burns accidentally sustained by her at 3 a.m. the 20th of March 1961 according to the calendar to which I refer at our home in the Clark community.

I know she has not lacked medical attention at any time. Any request, before hospitalization, during hospitalization and since hospitalization, has been readily met.

I am satisfied no medical services other than those received could have been desired, nor do I expect any differently patterned services to be necessary in the future.

I can truthfully say there has been no neglect on the part of the medical profession of Gonzales or the Holmes Memorial Hospital. Any statement to the contrary is not true.

LOUIS MUENICH.

Sworn to and subscribed before me by the said Louis Muenich this May 6, 1961.

LILY WILSON,
Notary Public,
Gonzales County, Tex.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Gonzales:

I, Douglas Walshak, the employer of Louis Muenich, have been called upon to assist in the case of the burn afflicted to Mr. Muenich's wife. I am definitely of the opinion that there has been absolutely no neglect from the medical profession in the care of this patient. I think they have gone beyond the normal call of duty in respect to Mrs. Muenich's medical care.

Dated, May 3, 1961.

DOUGLAS WALSHAK.

THE STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Gonzales:

I, Adolph Wachtendorf, of Gonzales, Gonzales County, Tex., the son-in-law of Mrs. Louis Muenich, would like to make the following statement for clarification of the recent article that Senator ——— ——— had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to my mother-in-law's plight.

I can truthfully say that she has had no neglect from the medical profession of the city of Gonzales, Gonzales County, or the Holmes Memorial Hospital, of Gonzales, Tex. The doctors involved have cooperated to the fullest extent, and have never refused when called upon to give her aid or professional services. Anything published to the contrary is not true.

ADOLPH WACHTENDORF.

Sworn to and subscribed before me by the said Adolph Wachtendorf, this May 3, 1961.

HELEN PIWETE KEETON,
Notary Public,
Gonzales County, Tex.

[From the Dallas Morning News May 14, 1961]

LETTER SENATOR ——— HAD INSERTED IN RECORD

GUS THOMAS INSURANCE AGENCY,
Gonzales, Tex., April 26, 1961.

Re medical aid for the aged.

U.S. SENATOR ——— ———,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ———: An elderly couple have been living near Gonzales in utter poverty. A neighbor lady noted the other day that she had not seen them lately, so she went over to check them.

She found the lady had been burned terribly several days earlier, and was just laying there suffering. She and her husband got her to town to the county doctor. He treated her and quickly used up the old man's $69, and sent her home to the shack with no food, no medicine, not even an aspirin, and said she was all right.

The neighbor persuaded another doctor to look at the old lady; he threw up his hands, said she way dying and needed to be in a first-class hospital, such as at Galveston. He treated her, and is having her bandages changed daily, per the report.

The neighbors have gone to the county authorities, the Red Cross, the welfare, without getting any aid for the burned woman. Now, the neighbors are poor people too; they are feeding the couple, but they can't help the old woman in her misery. It is anticipated that she will die quickly and be out of her misery.

I make a few points for medical aid for the aged through social security. Charity will not get the job done: 51 percent of our citizens over 50 years of age are doing without medical care; the medical doctors' union (AMA) is not about to treat poor folks for free; we are spending untold millions of dollars treating previous members of the services for non-service-connected ailments; we are pouring untold millions into foreign aid, without buying one friend; we are running second in more than just space development. Time is running out.

Sincerely,

GUS THOMAS INSURANCE AGENCY.

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 14, 1961]

REPRESENTATIVE ALGER DETERMINED TO GIVE A FULL REPORT

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON.—Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Dallas, Saturday advised Senator ——— that he was determined to get a full report for presentation to Congress on allegations that a badly burned Gonzales woman had been denied medical treatment.

ALGER said that there was a wide variance in accounts given by A. L. (Gus) Thomas, a Gonzales insurance agent, and Dr. Harvey Renger, president of the Texas Medical Association.

He said he would base his future actions on additional information he was seeking.

ALGER'S letter was the second he has written ——— in a week following publication by ——— of a letter from Thomas in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

———, in replying to ALGER'S first letter, contended he had checked Thomas' account by telephone before inserting the Thomas letter in the RECORD.

"Since Mr. Thomas' letter brought this case to public view," ——— wrote, "I have received a letter in which Dr. Harvey Renger contends that the lady had good medical care.

"His contention on this is at complete variance with the beliefs of the people in this community who took care of her."

——— said he had not known of any disagreement over the facts of the case until he heard an attack made upon him by Dr. Renger.

Three days after the attack, ——— advised ALGER, he received a letter from Renger. (In it Dr. Renger reported that the unidentified woman had received extensive medical care and was recovering, not dying, as Thomas' letter had alleged.)

"Under the circumstances," ——— wrote, "I do not feel that his letter calls for any answer."

——— said he had obtained a number of additional letters and statements from Gonzales which do not agree with Dr. Renger's statements.

"I do not believe his attack on me was justified," he said.

"I feel that if you knew the facts we have, not even your Republicanism could induce you to print Dr. Renger's statements about this case."

ALGER wrote back that "my Republicanism has nothing to do with my interest in this case, nor do I have any desire to attack anyone, including you."

He pointed out that as a member of the House Ways and Means Committee he was directly concerned with proposed legislation for Federal aid for medical care of the elderly.

"In view of the wide variance of the statements by Mr. Thomas and Dr. Harvey Renger, I am making an effort to secure additional information and if, upon receipt of that information, any further action on my part is warranted I assure you I will do whatever I feel is necessary to present a true statement of all the facts in this case," ALGER advised ———.

——— contended that the woman was not hospitalized until after publication of Thomas' letter and only then through the donation of $150 by citizens of Gonzales.

The ——— published the Thomas letter as an argument for enactment of Federal medical aid to the elderly.

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 14, 1961]

STATEMENTS BY FIGURES IN CASE REFUTE CHARGE

GONZALES, TEX.—Following are notarized statements concerning the case of Mrs. Louis Muenich which refute the claim she was denied proper medical care.

"I, Louis Muenich, wish to state in simple uncomplicated language the facts concerning medical care rendered my wife, Mrs. Louis (Martha) Muenich, while under treatment for burns accidentally sustained by her at 3 a.m., the 20th of March 1961, according to the calendar to which I refer at our home in Clark community.

"I know she has not lacked medical attention at any time. Any request, before hospitalization, during hospitalization and since hospitalization, has been readily met.

"I am satisfied no medical services other than those received could have been desired, nor do I expect any differently patterned services to be necessary in the future.

"I can truthfully say there has been no neglect on the part of the medical profession of Gonzales or the Holmes Memorial Hospital. Any statement to the contrary is not true.

"LOUIS MUENICH.

"Sworn to and subscribed before me by said Louis Muenich this May 6, 1961.

"LILY WILSON,
"Notary Public, Gonzales County, Tex."

"I, Adolph Wachtendorf, of Gonzales, Gonzales County, Tex., the son-in-law of Mrs. Louis Muenich, would like to make the following statement for clarification of the recent article that Senator ——— had placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in regard to my mother-in-law's plight.

"I can truthfully say that she had had no neglect from the medical profession of the city of Gonzales, Gonzales County, or the Holmes Memorial Hospital, of Gonzales, Tex. The doctors involved have cooperated to the fullest extent, and have never refused when called upon to give her aid or professional services. Anything published to the contrary is not true.

"ADOLPH WACHTENDORF.

"Sworn to and subscribed before me by the said Adolph Wachtendorf, this May 3, 1961.

"HELENE PIWETZ KEETON,
"Notary Public, Gonzales County, Tex."

"I, Douglas Walshak, the employer of Louis Muenich, have been called upon to assist in the case of the burn afflicted to Mr. Muenich's wife. I am definitely of the opinion that there has been absolutely no neglect from the medical profession in the care of this patient. I think they have gone beyond the normal call of duty in respect to Mrs. Muenich's medical care.

"Dated, May 3, 1961.

"DOUGLAS WALSHAK."

"The following members of the Gonzales County Medical Society met in an emergency meeting, called on the night of May 2.

"After a complete review of the circumstances of the case and a thorough discussion of the treatment that was administered to the patient, we are all in accord and are convinced that there has been no denial of medical care or neglect of this patient medically.

"Dated, this May 3, 1961.

"LOUIS J. STAHL, M.D.
"SAM NIXON, M.D.
"WALTER A. SIEVERS, M.D.
"J. C. PRICE, M.D.
"DAVIS M. SHELBY, M.D.
"ODON VONWERSSOWETZ,
"S. M. PONDER, M.D."

[From the Dallas Morning News, May 14, 1961]

GONZALES FOLK DISPUTE LETTER CLAIMING WOMAN DENIED PROPER MEDICAL CARE

(By Jimmy Banks)

GONZALES, TEX.—It's a ramshackle, four-room house on a chicken ranch near historic Gonzales—a rather strange place for a political football, now being kicked around in Congress, to be hatched.

On the night of March 19, Louis Muenich, 56, and his 62-year-old wife went to church. They returned to the house about 9:30 p.m. After they ate a light snack, Mrs. Muenich insisted that her husband, who had spent most of the day as he spends all his days—gathering eggs and feeding chickens—go to bed.

It was almost 3 a.m. when she woke up complaining of cramps in her legs. Muenich got up to light a gas heater.

"The flame was inch and half high," recalls the small, weatherbeaten German worker, indicating the size with thumb and forefinger.

"She got up and back up to stove. She had on cotton nightgown. You know how cotton burn. Whoosh! She's on fire. I run and try to beat it out with my hands. I get blisters right here but can't get fire out. Then I pick up bucked of water and throw on her.

"I want to call taxi and go to town to see doctor. But no, she don't want to go," he said, shaking his head. "I tell her I can find some doctor at 3 o'clock in morning. But no. Next morning, same thing—she don't want to go. Next day, she still don't want to go."

Her refusal to seek medical attention led to a bizarre chain of circumstances. Well-meaning but misinformed neighbors spread an alarm that reached U.S. Senator ——— in the form of a letter written by A. I. (Gus) Thomas, complaining that the woman was being left to die by hardhearted doctors because she had no money for medical care.

——— had the letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 1, 1961, as an example of the need for a program of medical aid to the aged under the social security program. However, she is not covered by social security and would not be eligible for aid under the bill now pending.

The entire letter has been refuted by notarized statements from Muenich, his son-in-law, hospital authorities, and the two doctors who treated Mrs. Muenich—plus personal interviews by a reporter of the News.

Thomas refuses now to say anything about the matter.

"Utterly no comment—and don't even use that," he told the Dallas News, without even waiting for the first question to be asked.

The furor he created as a result of Mrs. Muenich's burns continues to flame, however, with Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Dallas, and ——— clashing over the case.

Mrs. Muenich, who was never in critical conditions, is recovering in John Sealy Hospital at Galveston. Her husband, unable to understand that the accident has suddenly become a Federal case, continues his work which he describes as trot, trot, trot all day from six to six, picking up eggs and feeding chickens.

When his wife rejected his repeated demands that she see a doctor, he treated the burns as best he could.

Neighbors, meanwhile, reached a state of near panic over the situation. Their insistence that Muenich take her to a doctor led him to get her as close to one as he could. He finally telephoned a taxi, 8 days after the accident, and took her to the small, plain but neat, Gonzales home of his daughter and her husband, Adolph Wachtendorf.

"I had to get taxi driver to help me carry her to car," said Muenich, "She much taller, much bigger than me."

Wachtendorf immediately called Dr. David M. Shelby, who came within 30 minutes and treated Mrs. Muenich. Dr. Shelby advised hospitalization but she steadfastly refused, contending she was "not bad off."

Her son-in-law, an Army medical corpsman for nearly 2 years, listened carefully to the doctor's instructions and agreed to take care of her in his home.

Two days later, on March 30, Mrs. Muenich was brought to Dr. Shelby's office. This time, he managed to persuade her to enter the hospital—after her husband's employer, Douglas Walshak, was contacted and consented to pay the hospital bill, permitting Muenich to pay back the money in monthly installments out of his salary.

That is the way the Muenichs wanted it, despite their modest circumstances. He receives $25 a week plus housing, utilities ("we don't have a water faucet in house yet," says Muenich) and eggs for working on Walshak's chicken ranch.

Mrs. Muenich left the hospital against Dr. Shelby's advice on April 4 and returned to her son-in-law's home. Walshak paid the $69 bill.

She stayed at the Wachtendorfs' for 2 weeks, going back to the doctor's office on April 10 and 19. The burns were healing as rapidly as could be expected.

Mrs. Muenich left the Wachtendorfs' and went back to her home a few days before Dr. Shelby left to attend a medical meeting in Galveston. He asked Dr. Walter A. Sievers to care for his patients during his absence.

The day he left, one of Mrs. Muenich's neighbors contacted Dr. Sievers, said the woman was in terrible condition and needed treatment.

Dr. Sievers drove out to the little Clark community immediately and was greeted at the turnoff from a farm-to-market road by neighbors who offered to pay him for his services. He refused, explaining that if the patient's family was unable to pay, he would donate his services.

Neither doctor has been paid a cent for services.

"In view of what I had been told, I was surprised at how well she was getting along," Dr. Sievers recalls. "The main thing she needed was to be cleaned up. The wounds were healing nicely. Her temperature was 99.2 I gave her some antibiotics out of my bag and also left a prescription.

"Mr. and Mrs. Muenich seemed a little belligerent over the neighbors trying to do something for them," said Dr. Sievers, "and the son-in-law also objected to the neighbors coming in."

Muenich told the News he finally asked neighbors to stop bringing food to the house.

"The next day, I sent one of my hospital nurses out to give Mrs. Muenich a bath," said Dr. Sievers.

When Dr. Shelby returned, he responded to another urgent call from neighbors who reported she had high fever. Her temperature was 100.6 degrees, primarily as a result of an apparent lung ailment accompanied by a persistent cough, but the burns were continuing to heal, Dr. Shelby gave her another injection of antibiotics.

Muenich continued his efforts to take care of both his wife and the chickens.

"I put epsom salts and little pinch of salt in water to bathe burns," he said.

When Mr. and Mrs. Muenich realized he could not care for her properly, she went back to the hospital voluntarily. Dr. Shelby, who has been accused of refusing to treat her because she had no money, then X-rayed her to check on the lung condition and continued antibiotics for that.

An opening at John Sealy Hospital in Galveston enabled him to send her there last Tuesday. Although he did not feel the trip was really necessary, he wanted her to go partly because of the furor over the case—for verification of his diagnosis and judgment—and partly because of the lung ailment.

Doctors at John Sealy told the Dallas News that Dr. Shelby apparently did everything possible for the patient, that her burns are not severe and the lung condition is responding well to treatment. They agreed with Dr. Shelby's conclusion that no skin grafting is likely to be necessary.

Thomas' letter said neighbors finally called in another doctor, who threw up his hands, said she was dying and needed to be in a first-class hospital, such as at Galveston.

He obviously referred to Dr. Sievers, the only doctor to treat Mrs. Muenich other than Dr. Shelby before she went to John Sealy. Dr. Sievers happens to own the Holmes Memorial Hospital in Gonzales and considers it "first-class."

"If he was referring to me," Dr. Sievers said bluntly, "he is a damned liar."

Investigations by both the Gonzales County Medical Society and the Texas Medical Association found that there was no denial of medical care and no neglect of the patient.

County Judge John A. Romberg, who handled the disbursement last year of $5,178 in county welfare funds (much of it for medical care of the poverty stricken), also found that medical care was not denied. He added that he knew of no case in which anyone in Gonzales County ever had been denied medical care or hospitalization because they couldn't pay.

Judge Romberg has worked for YARBOROUGH in all of his campaigns but admits ruefully: "I wish he hadn't gone quite so far without checking with someone down here."

The judge cannot agree that the case offers an example of the need for a medical aid program—although he admits the county would be glad to get any financial help we could from anyone and I'm not as scared of the Federal Government as a lot of people are.

Undoubtedly, the strongest refutation of the letter which instigated the storm is contained in the affidavits of Muenich, Wachtendorf, and Walshak.

They declare flatly that Mrs. Muenich was never neglected by the doctors or the hospital, that the doctors have cooperated to the fullest extent and that "anything published to the contrary is not true."

Ironically, backyard gossip and political motives apparently twisted the old couple's strong-willed determination to be self-reliant into an alleged argument for a Federal medical care program.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I asked the gentleman to yield because I know that he has many times, in public hearings, requested of witnesses who were insinuating or suggesting that there were people in our society who were not receiving adequate health care, that they call these cases to his attention and the committee's attention so that we could learn from them, to find out whether or not it would help, also to get the picture. I have joined in this kind of approach and I myself have many times asked that question. I have done so in my public speeches in discussing this subject of health care for the aged.

Mr. ALGER. I believe the gentleman is referring to the statements, also made before the committee during our rather complete hearings sometime back, that no instance has been reported where anyone was denied medical care in this country because of inability to pay; that the services were there.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is exactly right, because statements were continually being made that there were situations in the form of a challenge, although the real purpose was to find these cases, because I do believe this, there are instances in our society in St. Louis or St. Louis County or anywhere in this country where somebody, unbeknown to neighbors, or something that has gone wrong in the administration of a program, where the help that was available in the program might not have gotten to them. But, the point is that there was a program ready and available to them.

Mr. ALGER. Then the gentleman agrees that the statement stands that nobody is denied medical care to the knowledge of the gentleman from Missouri, because of inability to pay.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is correct. There are programs in the community. I have said that about St. Louis County and St. Louis city, particularly when last year the gentleman and I were trying to find out what programs there were in the various counties and States.

Now, I would like to take the opportunity at this time to call the attention of the House to some remarks I made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 19, on page 6336. I headed it "A New Lobbying Technique." I think I called it to the gentleman's attention, I received a very unusual postcard from a constituent, and I put the form in the RECORD, because this is what it says:

SAMPLE, FRONT OF POSTCARD (ADDRESS)

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, House Office Building, Washington 26, D.C.

SUGGESTED LETTER NO. 1

Date_____

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I feel that it is most important that H.R. 4222 be passed. I personally know some elderly persons who are not getting proper medical care at this time because they cannot afford it.

Sincerely yours,

_____
(Write in your name)

_____
(Write in your address)

SUGGESTED LETTER NO. 2

Date_____

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I feel that it is most important that H.R. 4222 be passed. I personally know some other elderly persons besides myself who are not getting proper medical care at this time because we cannot afford it.

Sincerely yours,

_____
(Write in your name)

_____
(Write in your address)

These are being distributed, apparently, by the Committee on Political Education, AFL–CIO.

Mr. ALGER. Do I understand the gentleman to say that these are examples that are being distributed asking people to write their Congressmen, giving examples?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is right. And I want to say that I am very pleased they are, and I want to commend them because, as these people write to me—and I regret this is the only one I have received, in spite of the fact that apparently this program was started some time ago—I hope the people will write in because I want to write back to them and say, "Will you supply to me the name of this person confidentially so that we can look into it and find out what has happened?" Because we do feel that there are programs set up to take care of them.

On the other hand, if it shows that our knowledge is incomplete on this subject and there are not programs that will take care of them we want to know that, too. But I think it is about time that we got some of this information because every case to date that has been brought to my attention, just as the case the gentleman is citing of someone down in Gonzales, Tex., whenever you run the case down you find out it is not true, or there has been something in error; that is understandable, an administrative error that can easily be corrected.

This is a serious matter and goes far beyond the State of Texas or in the case of this unfortunate person, in Gonzales. It is this kind of, I must call it, propaganda that is being used to urge this Congress to change this basic health care program in our society, which is the greatest of any society, to change it radically in a way that in my judgment would badly destroy its quality and hurt all of us, because it would put an end to the continued increase in quality care.

That is why I think that what the gentleman is doing is particularly significant in tracing through this case and I hope he will trace through any other case that is called to our attention, without prejudging it. If it is an actual case and something needs to be done, it reveals the fact that our systems are not as we think they are. But I would appeal to the press who do not apparently report what is being said right here, if the press of this country thinks that there are people around this country in any number who are not receiving adequate medical care, they could help us and bring these matters to our attention. But here is this case the gentleman has cited—and I hope people will read the RECORD for the details of it, because I have read the record of this case that the gentleman has cited today, and far from its being what it was billed as being, quite the reverse is true.

Here is a person who had suffered an accident. The doctor's care was given freely, adequate, and rather extensive medical care was given freely; not necessarily altogether free, but much of it was free. But certainly it was available to this person and was utilized and the people themselves—and I will ask the gentleman if this is not true—the people themselves have said that they thought that they were doing pretty well; is that about right?

Mr. ALGER. I have not gone into the details. I think my colleagues will find it sufficiently interesting to read all the details, but I must corroborate what the gentleman has just said, what he has intimated in his question. The doctors visited this lady several times, against her wishes. She did not want to be attended. She said she was not badly off, although she was burned; not seriously as burns go we know now, but at the instance of the occurrence it was serious. Her husband insisted and her husband finally forced her to go to the doctor; or rather, I should say, the doctor came to her. She would not go. The doctor came within 30 minutes of being called. Two doctors paid innumerable visits. Then she was taken to the hospital and given all of the medicine and all of the care that one could expect. The doctors refused to take a penny. Even when the neighbors tried to raise money and give it to the doctors they said no, that they were donating their services.

There are some who in their zeal to get a program passed who are not only going too far but are downgrading a profession that is not only willing but is bound by its code of conduct to donate its services.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As I recall it, there was also a son-in-law who felt a little bit badly about this.

Mr. ALGER. He asked people to stop helping them. People brought food. As the additional services were offered, this gentleman finally said, 'We don't want more attention."

Does not the gentleman share my concern on the other end of the spectrum of the cases that may be given us; would it not be a shame if we found some of these cases are politically motivated and that in our investigation we found they are being trumped up? Just to get a program passed they are downgrading and hurting the finest medical care that has been given in the world.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I trust we will not find too much of that. I want to say one thing, though. Frequently when I have made speeches pointing out what I believe is true, that this is the greatest health care program that any society has ever had, some people have said, "You are satisfied with it." I have said, "No. I want to continue to improve it, because there are many areas in which we can improve it, and should." But I do feel that the ingredients are within the system for this future improvement. It has been the very success of the health care program in our society that has created the major problem. Our people live 10 years longer because of the success of the health care program, not because of its failure. I believe that in this system lies the greatest opportunity for continued improvement to keep it always the highest and give care to as many of our people as possible, if not most of them.

Mr. ALGER. I want to join the gentleman by saying he has stated what I was about to comment. Those who are critics of the health care system in our country should notice that our people live longer and have better health, and we have the freest medical attention in the world.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Thirty years ago many of our medical students, those who could afford it and who wanted a top medical education, used to go to the universities of Western Europe, because that was where the top medical care was. Today the only society that has free medicine is the United States. What is the situation as far as medical students are concerned? They come from Western Europe and all around the world to the United States, which is now the mecca for those who want to learn the highest skills in the field of medicine. I think it behooves us to think very carefully over this subject of whether we want to continue the high quality care that we have in our society and continue to improve it as we go on into the future.

Mr. ALGER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and in closing want to commend him for the work he has done in this field. I think he is the most able man in the Congress in this field. I hope that through his efforts and those of our colleagues we will preserve the finest medical care in the world rather than be led astray by this philosophy that has infiltrated the thinking of many people in this matter. We can present to our colleagues the things we have heard in our hearings, not slanted, but that we have heard before the Committee on Ways and Means. This case I have cited was not only in my State of Texas but it was also within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

ASSISTANCE TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, today the House Committee on Education and Labor reported a bill to authorize assistance to higher education institutions for the construction and improvement of needed facilities and to authorize scholarships for undergraduate study. The reason I take the floor, as will my colleague on the subcommittee, the gentle- from New York [Mr. GOODELL], is that the subcommittee and now the full committee has accepted amendments and substitutes offered by the gentleman and myself.

Going to the two titles of the bill—one to provide aid for academic facilities and the other to provide scholarships, let us consider first title I, the academic facilities title.

As the President recommended and as Congresswoman GREEN introduced the bill, it provided only loans for academic facilities. In the past we have been providing loans for income producing buildings, mostly college dormitories. But, it has been felt the colleges are lagging behind in providing the needed academic facilities and due to the great increase in enrollment in the next decade, additional academic facilities must be provided. In fact, in the next 5 years, it is estimated college enrollments will increase by about one-third, and in 10 years they will just about double. From our hearings, we determined that strictly loans for academic facilities just as we provided loans for income-producing buildings would not be adequate and would not build the classrooms that are needed. It is estimated in our hearings that about 30 percent of the needed increase in academic facilities would be constructed by the loan provision.

Dr. Flemming, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, appeared before us and in his testimony, I believe, in a most conclusive manner showed us why strictly loans would not be adequate. One of the reasons quoted from the American Association of Land Grant Colleges and State Universities and State universities associations recommendations was that since both legal restrictions and major considerations of education philosophy bar many institutions from using loans as a means of constructing academic facilities, we believe it is essential that the grant and loan program be linked together in legislation.

Another reason why this would not be as beneficial as some people might have expected it to be is that tax supported institutions can secure loans at just about as favorable a rate of interest as they can receive from the Federal Govnernment. So the subsidized rate of interest would be mostly to private institutions of higher learning. If the institutions accepted the loans, intending to pay them off in later years, and began to look for the money, it was pointed out by Dr. Flemming and others, they would have difficulty in encouraging contributions because there is a great willingness on peoples' part to contribute money for a building that is to be constructed, but

after it is constructed, they are not quite as willing to contribute money.

Also, if they were to secure the moneys, undoubtedly, it would have to come from increased tuitions. This would be harmful to private institutions and it would not be desirable judging from the past experience of tax supported institutions. Also, there might be an effort for the administration and the colleges and universities not to increase professors' salaries as they should, wanting to use the available money rather than pay off the loans. This would be undesirable because we need the greatest brains in this country as professors to teach our young people who are enrolled in higher education. Therefore, the recommendation which was quote by Dr. Flemming, which was made by the American Council on Education, was that the moneys be divided—70 percent for grants and 30 percent for loans and that the grant money be made available on a 50–50 matching basis.

In our subcommittee we accepted a compromise, however, of 60 percent grants and 40 percent loans, the grants to be allocated on a matching basis one-third Federal, two-thirds by the State or local institution. This was accepted by the full committee, and we hope that the House agrees with this Republican proposal which I assure you will do the greatest amount of work in providing the academic facilities that are so greatly needed if we are going to be able to educate the increased number who will enroll in our colleges and universities.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. Having the pleasure of serving on this subcommittee with the gentleman from Minnesota I can particularly appreciate his taking time today to discuss this very important issue. He has done a very incisive job of analyzing the provisions of title 1, the academic facilities construction section of the bill.

I think it should be emphasized that the Republicans on the subcommittee first moved to have a 70-percent-grant, 30-percent-loan provision adopted in this academic facilities section in accordance with the almost unanimous testimony from the academic leaders of this country as to their needs. That was rejected by the subcommittee on a strictly party-line vote. Subsequently, however, this compromise was adopted providing 60 percent for grants and 40 percent of the funds for loans, the matching part to be one-third by the Federal Government and two-thirds by the institution rather than 50–50 as the Republicans originally proposed. Is that not correct?

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is correct, and I thank the gentleman. To substantiate that, I would like to quote from page 127 of the committee hearings on aid to higher education, at the bottom of the page where Dr. Fleming quoted from the American Council on Education.

I ask unanimous consent that this be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A new program of federally administered assistance to institutions of higher learning, for construction of academic facilities of the kinds they require to meet their needs in improvement of quality as well as expansion of enrollment should be established, offering each institution the following options on each separate project: (a) A grant to defray up to 50 percent of the cost of construction, or (b) a low interest 40-year loan to finance such construction, the interest rate to be determined under the same formula approved for the college housing loan program.

A long-range program is recommended, with initial authorization for 4 years and with funds supplied at the average rate of $1 billion a year. A survey of member institutions by the American Council on Education indicates that of this annual amount approximately 70 percent should be appropriated for matching grants and 30 percent authorized for loans.

Mr. QUIE. Another point that was raised many times was the need of financial assistance to students. But I might point out in the offset that unless academic facilities are provided for the students there will not be any place to educate the many students who have the academic ability to continue their education in our colleges and universities.

When Dr. Henry L. Ashmore, the president of Pensacola Junior College at Pensacola, Fla., representing the American Association of Junior Colleges, appeared before our committee I asked him about comparative costs of higher education in Florida and also about assisting those who were financially unable to go to a State university or to a private college. I asked Dr. Ashmore the cost of education in a junior college, in a State university, and in a private college. He stated the difference in Florida was as follows: In a junior college it would be $450; in the State university $1,200; and in a private college in the State of Florida about $2,000 or $2,200. All of these figures are quite comparable to national averages.

I asked him if that amount was the actual cost of the education or the total amount and he said it was the total cost, that board and room would be the greatest cost, and this is included in the above amounts. Tuition would run to about $225 in the State university of Florida. In the university a student pays very little of the total cost of higher education; he pays less than 20 percent and the State pays the other 80 percent, but after a student is discreet he could go to the University of Florida for $1,200, but if he went to Pensacola Junior College the cost would be $450.

We feel under title 1 of this bill we have provided ample assistance for the construction of the junior and community colleges which will enable the children of ability to go in their first 2 years right in their own community thereby saving them a great deal of money and in those 2 years choosing whether they want to follow a technical course which would give them the skills to be employed in an occupation in high skill or to go on 2 more years or longer in other institutions of higher learning to follow some profession.

I believe the direction we have chosen in this legislation is sound.

In title II some of us were quite alarmed and dismayed at the direction we were taking by setting up State commissions to administer a Federal scholarship program, the amounts of money to be given regardless of the institution the child chose to enroll in. After we worked on this for long hours in the subcommittee, we found we could reach no agreement. So the subcommittee reported the bill without making any final recommendations to the full committee. We spent long hours in the full committee deliberating how best we could provide assistance to students who wanted to go to college, who had the ability to go to college but were unable to find the financial means to go.

Many changes were made in the administration's proposal. When the bill came up to us from the administration it was an amendment to the National Defense Education Act which, I believe, recognizes that any assistance to needy students ought to be coordinated under one title, under one program. This was changed to where we would have a separate scholarship program and a separate loan program. Also, there were other changes to divide the scholarships according to the number of people in each congressional district, one scholarship for each 50,000 population of a congressional district.

Another part of it was to grant 1,000 Presidential awards to the most able students in the country with a $1,000 stipend to each one.

As we progressed there was a feeling by Members that we were providing scholarships or grants in an undesirable way. So an amendment was offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH], that the student who received a scholarship would pay it back after he had finished his college education at the rate of 5 percent of his annual salary per year or 20 percent of the scholarship he received per year, whichever he chose.

When the committee went back into session it reversed its position and struck this from the bill. Many of us felt that the wisest thing the committee could do was to remove title 2 or the scholarship section from the bill and consider it at the same time that title 2 of the National Defense Education Act was considered in order that we might have a coordinated aid—financial assistance to students program rather than to have a patchwork of legislation which we have seen in other areas of Federal legislation and which I surely hope we will not do under any assistance by the Federal Government for students who want a higher education.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Is it not true that while the full committee was considering the scholarship title of this aid to higher education bill, the President sent to the Congress his recommendation for changes and extension of the National Defense Education Act so that we had before the full committee at that time the recommendations of the administra-

tion which could have been considered and coordinated, both the NDEA program and the scholarship program in this bill, making them cohesive, so that there would be a better balance?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. The message was sent to us and it could have been and it should have been considered at the same time, judging from the experience that was related to us in our hearings and the way the colleges presently administer their scholarship program and blend them with National Defense Education Act loans.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. We are now proceeding with a scholarship program without the benefit of hearings as to the manner in which the NDEA program has been working and just exactly the best way of coordinating loans and scholarships, under that program or under a separate program; is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. When we found that the full committee would not accept our proposal to strike title II, the scholarship section of the bill, and consider it with the loan section of the National Defense Education Act, the only alternative was to propose a substitute which would grant financial assistance in such a way that we could blend this sort of assistance with the National Defense Education Act loan. Such an amendment was offered, and we are happy to say that it was accepted today by a vote of 22 to 6.

There are many reasons why this substitute is preferable, and I am going to call on my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] who offered this amendment, to explain it further.

But, I would like to make two points first. When Dr. Flemming was before us, he stated that from all the information he could derive and from the recommendations of the American Council on Education—and he quoted from their recommendations—he said the scholarships should be awarded by the institutions themselves using funds allocated in approximately the same manner as the Federal student loan fund.

Then he went further and quoted from Dr. J. Douglass Brown, dean of Princeton University, a statement filed with the Office of Education, in which he strongly supported placing the responsibility of the scholarship program in the hands of the colleges and universities. A quote from his statement is this:

> Because of the urgent need to encourage all accredited institutions in American higher education to participate vigorously in the search for outstanding young people in their area of coverage by having scholarships of distinction to attract such talent and to take an active rather than a passive role in motivating young people of talent to go on to college. Also, it is believed that this method of administration would increasingly assure a stimulating stream of private students in all accredited institutions which would encourage excellence in instruction and in student response throughout higher education.

Now, a comparable program which we looked at at great length was our national merit scholarship program and tried to determine whether there was any congregating of scholarships in some institutions. Dr. Flemming made a study of this and he said that it is interesting to note that of the Federal scholarships 50 percent of them go to only 36 of the colleges. That means that 50 percent of the students who receive national merit scholarships go to 3 percent of the total number of accredited colleges and universities in our country or, looking at it in another way, of the colleges and universities who have enrolled in their student body one or more scholarship holders—and that number is 391—50 percent of the scholarship holders have chosen to go to colleges which are 9 percent of the total who have national merit scholarship holders enrolled, indicating quite conclusively that under a national scholarship program administered by State commissions they would undoubtedly congregate in a few institutions. But, the administration bill had a proposal which would make it even worse than that. Every student who received a stipend would choose his own college or university. Then the college or the university would receive $350 in addition for each student who received a stipend, supposedly to compensate the college for accepting that student. This would mean that the colleges and universities would be out seeking these students over and against the students who receive their financing from other sources, which would be the same thing as if a parent said, "I will give you $350 under the table if you will accept my child."

Here the Federal Government is saying, "We will give you $350 if you will accept one of our scholars."

The prestige institutions, the institutions which have chosen not to increase their enrollment would not in any way be compensated for the increased cost of educating these scholars. They would get the $350 and be placing a Federal scholar in their enrollment in place of a person who would have paid his own expenses. This is completely unreasonable.

An amendment was adopted in the committee under which the stipend to the institution would be one-half of the stipend to the student, with a top of $350. This is even more unreasonable, since if a student who chose to go to college received only a $100 stipend, the institution would only get $50 for educating him. But if another student received a $700 stipend the institution would receive $350 for educating him. Also, a stipend to the student would be granted regardless of the cost of education at the institution. So one student might choose to go to a junior college and receive a $1,000 stipend from his State commission, and it would only cost him $450 to go to that junior college, so you could say that he would be making money. The junior college would receive $350 for educating that student. Then if another person were to go to a State university or a private college and received only $100, it would cost him a great amount above that, and the institution would receive only $50 for educating him.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. It would seem that would be an absurd result of the bill as it was written, but as a practical matter I think the gentleman from Minnesota is absolutely right. It would work out that way, because is it not true that the whole basis of this scholarship system proposed by the administration is that the State commission would grant a scholarship without reference to the school that the recipient was going to attend? It would grant a scholarship and a stipend to him before anybody knew what college that student was going to be enrolled in, so they would have no idea what the cost of his education would be. Let us say in the senior year in high school a student was awarded a Federal scholarship under the administration bill of $700 based on need—the amount that his family could provide, the amount that they felt he could earn part time. Then the student enrolled in his local community college and paid $250 or $300 for his education that year. The $700 scholarship stipend would already have been allocated to him; is that not correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct; whether the cost of education in one of the institutions quoted in the East was $2,600 or in the case of California, where there is no tuition cost to the student of going to the college or the junior college, would only be his living expenses, regardless which institution he chose, he would receive the same stipend under the administration bill.

Mr. GOODELL. Pursuing that point further, if a very brilliant student applied to one of the top universities in this country, after receiving a scholarship and a stipend, the stipend and the scholarship would already have been granted to him and might easily have been $300 or $400, based upon his family need and the fact that they felt that he might go to a community college if he were assisted with $300 or $400 from the Federal Government. That brilliant student might be barred from actually going to a school where the cost was $2,200 or $2,400 a year. That expensive school might very well be the exact school that fitted his needs and his talents. Thus a brilliant student that this country needs to develop would be lost.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

While he is speaking, I would suggest that he explain the difference between the administration's bill and his substitute, because the gentleman has worked long hours on studying these proposals and has come up with an amendment which makes it a sound bill. I think it would be interesting to this body to see the difference between these two proposals.

Mr. GOODELL. May I say at the outset that I was extremely pleased at the vote this morning, 22 to 6 in the full committee, to adopt the substitute which I proposed, because I think it does establish a bipartisan position in favor of some sort of Federal assistance to students on a grant basis in connection with higher education. I think it greatly

improves the chances of our having a good higher education bill of this kind.

Running down the differences quickly, the substitute which I proposed would have provided for college administration of the program. This is in contrast with the administration bill, which provided for administration by a State commission. In connection with the State commissions there were a great many criticisms made during our committee deliberations. No. 1, the cost of setting up these State commissions throughout the country was originally to be assumed by the Federal Government. The State Commissions were going to give examinations all over the country. Then they were going to try to evaluate the need of everybody who took that examination and graded high on it. Thus the responsibility on these State commissions was to evaluate the merit of these students within the State and the need of each student relative to the others.

The administrative costs of doing this were about 15 percent of the total amount of student money in this scholarship title of the bill. That in our opinion is an excessive cost.

In addition, we felt the State commissions were a very clumsy vehicle to accomplish the purposes of this bill. So college administration of the program would strike out entirely the State commissions and would save all the administrative expense that was to be funneled into those State commissions. The colleges themselves for the most part have the framework set up today to administer this type of program for scholarship aid and loan aid in their own schools under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. There has been a great improvement in college administration of such programs since NDEA was enacted in 1958. The colleges would take over the administration and carry the cost of it, which would be minimal under the circumstances because it would feed right into their presently established programs.

Mr. QUIE. This would be the same as the present program under the National Defense Education Act, in which the college bears the cost of administration.

Mr. GOODELL. That is right, by having the college administer the grants to students as well as the loans under the National Defense Education Act, we have the same agency administering both of these funds. Thus the student who applies will have the same individual deciding how much he needs in a grant to him and how much he needs in a loan in order for him to attend that particular institution. The colleges, of course, will take into consideration the cost of the education at the institution to which he applies.

Mr. QUIE. Many people are going to make the point that some institutions have no experience in determining student needs. This might have been true prior to the National Defense Education Act, but did not our hearings show that about 600 institutions prior to that time had had no experience, but now the Office of Education has helped them develop a program so that they are already equipped to determine student needs and are equipped to administer this new title II?

Mr. GOODELL. I think the gentleman from Minnesota is correct. One of the great advantages of having the colleges administer the program would be a further stimulation to the colleges to set up new scholarship grant and loan programs financed from private sources, so that such funds would be made available to needy students from their areas.

I might point out also that the program that was sent up here by the administration, title II on scholarships, would have cost a total of $925 million over a period of 5 years. The program that was substituted this morning on my motion will cost $280 million instead of $925 million. There are a number of reasons why the program substituted this morning would be more economical. We will actually grant more scholarships and more aid the first year than the administration program. The substitute program is going to provide 40,000 estimated grants of assistance to students in the first year as compared to the administration bill's 25,000. Another reason our program will be cheaper is that we, originally at least, are granting aid for 2 years rather than for 4 years.

It was my concept that the great need was to get the students out of high school and over the hump into college, and that, perhaps, grants as well as loans were necessary to do this. Testimony indicated that as a rule, once a student gets out of high school into the college atmosphere, he finds ways of staying in college through various assistance programs that are now operating. This was the consistent testimony, I believe, of the college administrators themselves. The great problem is getting them to start—and not to keep them there after they are once stimulated by college courses.

In addition, the 2-year proposal was amended in the committee as a compromise to provide if a given student was granted aid in high school to go to college for 2 years, and in his sophomore year in college it developed that he could not continue in the opinion of college officials without further grant assistance from the Federal Government that the college would have the option of reviewing that student's grant and renewing it for another 2 years at whatever level they felt was necessary to keep him in college. This was to avoid the situation that some of the members of the committee feared would develop in which we would send virtually all these students to attend junior college and community colleges or abandon them when they actually could find no way of staying on in college without some sort of grant assistance.

I might point out the substitute conforms to the administration request that the maximum amount of grant aid would be $1,000 per student. There can be no further aid per student beyond $1,000. Presumably, the national defense education loan program can thereafter come into play to assist a student who needs more money than the college is able to grant to him.

I think, perhaps, one of the most important aspects of having the colleges administer the grants to students is that we would avoid what the gentleman from Minnesota talked about in the national merit scholarship program where 36 colleges now have enrolled on their campuses 50 percent of the national merit scholars in this country. This would be avoided by granting aid directly through the colleges to the students instead of through State commissions. We are granting funds to the college to make assistance available to the students who come to that institution needing aid. The money would be allocated on the basis of 5 percent of the entering class of that college multiplied by $700. For example, if an entering class in a given college was 100 students, 5 percent of that would be 5. Multiplying 5 by $700, that school would receive $3,500 to dispense as it felt was most economical and most effective among as many scholarship recipients as they chose.

I think that this would avoid completely the collecting of students in the prestige institutions which without question would have developed in the program as it was sent up here by the administration.

Another aspect that is important to me is that the colleges themselves under my substitute can grant these assistance grants based upon factors other than simple objective tests.

The danger of having State commissions administer this program was that they would inevitably have so many applicants that they would have to give an objective test such as the Princeton tests, put the results through an IBM machine or other automated process, and automatically award scholarships accordingly. When the colleges administer it, they may take into consideration not only the score the student makes in college board examinations, but also the marks he made in high school, the amount of extracurricular activity in high school, and all the other factors normally considered by a college admissions board.

I think that all of these factors make it extremely important that we have adopted a bipartisan proposal in the full committee which eliminates the bad features of the administration's proposal and which gives us a bipartisan framework under which we can proceed to help our higher institutions of learning.

Mr. QUIE. Now, going further in the comparison of these two bills, I think it should be pointed out that the number of scholarships in the administration's bill for the first year was 25,000, while under the new proposal 40,000 students would receive financial assistance. By the time 5 years were over under the administration proposal, 212,500 would have received financial assistance, while under our proposal 200,000 would have received financial assistance, but at less than half the cost.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. GOODELL. In connection with this problem of who will administer the scholarship or grant-in-aid program I think it would be well to place in the

RECORD at this time the opinion of the college administrators themselves. When they were polled on this question they were asked whether they felt that scholarships should be awarded by a national competition without reference to geographical areas; 11 percent said they thought they should be allocated on that basis; 11 percent said they thought they ought to be allocated on the basis of State commissions giving State examinations as proposed in the administration bill; 11 percent of the State educators favored that kind of approach.

Seventy-seven percent of the college educators favored a program which was administered by the colleges themselves within the framework of the NDEA loan structure; 77 percent favored the type of approach that was proposed this morning by me in the committee, and that was adopted in full committee, and which will come to the floor.

Mr. QUIE. I will quote an eminent authority whom many people quote on the scholarship program, President Everett Case, of Colgate University, chairman of the American Council on Education's Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government, page 147 of the hearings:

> The scholarships should be awarded by the institutions themselves and those funds allocated in approximately the same manner as Federal student loan funds.

Mr. GOODELL. I think we had as close to a unanimous opinion in the testimony of the educators before our subcommittee as you could get on this question. If we are going to have a grant-in-aid or scholarship program it should be administered by the colleges themselves.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Morse, vice president of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute appeared before us reporting on the advisory committee of national student financial programs. He stated that the needy student who is extremely able is now receiving financial assistance.

A Federal scholarship program which merely duplicates current programs is certainly not needed. At present, the extremely able but needy student is receiving ample financial assistance and attending college. The moderately able, moderately needy student is also obtaining a higher education. The moderately able and very needy student has been overlooked. In this last group are hidden thousands of talented young people for whom a program is vitally needed which will stimulate and encourage them to seek a higher education.

Dr. Morse comes to a different conclusion than we did. A large number of people in higher education believe that the proposal we have adopted will actually assist those moderately able but very needy students to get an education.

Mr. GOODELL. I am very proud, and we in New York State are very proud of the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Dr. Morse is a distinguished representative of that institution. I would like to point out that Dr. Morse was very helpful to us on the entire subcommittee in presenting material and information and giving us the benefit of his experience. He did not agree with all of our final conclusions on this side of the aisle and particularly that the program should be administered by the colleges. Dr. Morse thought the State commission plan had a great deal of merit. But in his testimony and in his observations to the gentleman from Minnesota and myself he did indicate that in his opinion the very topnotch students in this country are going to college and are able to enroll and find financial assistance if needed. He refined the definition later on by saying he would concede that the top 1½ to 3 or 4 percent of students are going to college with no problem as to financing because they are getting some kind of assistance. But assuming this is true, the administration proposal for scholarships would, in my opinion, have taken care of the same group that presently finds ways to go to college. It would have given them Federal scholarships, thereby supplanting the private sources that are providing the topnotch students with education today. Is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is right. Dr. Morse also made a statement on that as follows:

> 3. A Federal scholarship program should be designed to complement various student support programs already in existence—The Nation's colleges, many organizations, the Federal and State Governments, all support excellent and much needed student aid programs. Any new Federal program should take into consideration the purposes and achievements of these programs, and it should seek, in the words of President Kennedy, "to supplement but not supplant those programs of financial assistance to students which are now in operation."

I believe that the presidential awards which the administration did not recommend, but which were in the bill when the full committee considered it, would supplant many of the national merit scholarships. This might lessen the interest in the national merit scholarship program by its sponsors.

Mr. GOODELL. I think that is true. I want to say, in all fairness, I do not think Dr. Morse came to the conclusion that it would supplant these particular scholarships. However, in the testimony before the subcommittee we did find that the great problem is not the topnotch students. It is the moderately able students, just below the top level, who are to a degree going to waste in the country. These students are not receiving much assistance to go on to college. This to me is the great merit of the program we proposed this morning. Colleges all over the country will have funds available to go out and seek these students. The institution is required to go out and find ways to induce the students to come to college that would not otherwise consider doing so.

Mr. QUIE. He also stated further on in his testimony that money, even in small amounts, should not be given to students who do not have serious need for it. Undoubtedly, if 1,000 presidential awards were given of $1,000 each, regardless of the need of the students, some of that would be going to students that had no need.

Mr. GOODELL. Yes. As you are well aware, that proposal for 1,000 presidential scholarships was eliminated by the adoption of the substitute this morning.

Mr. QUIE. Then, in regard to paying a stipend, regardless of the need, I think this is a significant statement by Dr. Morse "that the payment of excessive moneys to students contributes to increase in college fees and unduly promotes the attendance of students in high cost institutions." This does not permit your substitute.

Mr. GOODELL. May I say in conclusion that the bill which was reported this morning is not what we would have written, I am sure, had we been in the majority. It does not conform in every way to the specifications that we feel are so important in this momentous age as far as higher education is concerned. But, it is a greatly improved bill over what was sent down here to us by the President, in my opinion. In that light it is my intention, provided that this is not watered down and diluted too much on the floor, to support this bill as it is reported out of the full committee wholeheartedly and enthusiastically on the floor. I will fight in every way I can to see that it is not destroyed by amendments or by conference recessions when we get to working this over with the Senate later on.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the gentleman from New York joins me today in going over the various aspects of the bill as it now is reported from the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a comparison of the two bills be incorporated with our remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The comparison is as follows:

TITLE II COMPARISON

ADMINISTRATION BILL	REPUBLICAN SUBSTITUTE BILL
Administration of program	
Separate State scholarship commissions.	Each institution of higher education.
Federal cost of program	
Nine hundred and twenty-five million nine hundred and fifty thousand dollars.	Two hundred and eighty million dollars.
Number of students assisted	
Twenty-five thousand the first year, two hundred and twelve thousand five hundred at end of 5 years.	Forty thousand the first year, two hundred thousand at end of 5 years.
Duration of scholarships	
Four years.	Two years.
Maximum annual stipend	
One thousand dollars.	One thousand dollars.

Eligibility requirements	
Must attain sufficiently high rank on State examination to qualify, be in need of financial assistance to continue education and be admitted to institution.	Must be an individual capable of doing superior academic work, who is in need of financial assistance to pursue a full-time course of study and is without reasonable expectation of obtaining aid from any other source, and who is of good character with earnest desire to obtain an education at an institution of higher education.
Identification of recipients	
State commission examination of applicants.	Each participating institution is required to develop its existing procedures or initiate new programs for identifying and motivating prospective recipients who would be eligible but who otherwise would not go on to higher education.
Payments to institutions	
Three-hundred-and-fifty-dollar grants to colleges for each Federal scholar in attendance, with a total Federal cost over 5 years of $300 million.	This provision completely eliminated.
Administrative costs	
Cost amounting to 12 to 15 percent of the total scholarship funds for the first 2 years, and thereafter the costs borne by the States.	Administered by the colleges with no cost to the Federal Government.
Allocation of funds	
Each State would be allocated funds based upon the number of students graduating from high school and the number of students already in college.	Funds allocated directly to the colleges based upon 5 percent of the entering freshmen class multiplied by $700.
Coordination of loans and grants	
Awarded by State commissions and unrelated to NDEA loans awarded by colleges. These would supplant many private scholarships.	Grants administered by the colleges, over and above private scholarship funds, and blended with NDEA loans.
Colleges benefiting	
Students would be awarded scholarships based upon statewide examinations and need. Students would then enroll in the college of their choice and tend to congregate in a few institutions.	All of the estimated 2,000 colleges, junior colleges, and community colleges would have Federal funds available to allocate assistance grants to students.
Stipend relation to the cost of education	
Stipends granted regardless of cost of education (could be greater than cost of education at the institution).	Institutions administer, so stipend would not be greater than the cost of the education.

Mr. QUIE. In conclusion, I, too, would say that I am happy with the outcome of the deliberations of our full committee. It is not exactly the bill as I would have liked to have seen it written; in fact, I still have some question whether it was wise for us to consider scholarships separate from loans and I still wish we could have taken the time to study thoroughly the National Defense Education Act loan program, how it has functioned in its 4 years of operation and then make certain that we blended and developed under one title a program of assistance to needy students. But, being unable to do this, I feel that we have brought together here legislation which, when we work on the National Defense Education Act, we will be able to blend the two programs together to make certain that they will not go in separate directions and make difficult of administration by the institutions of higher learning themselves and actually be of greatest assistance to needy students with ability to go to college and to give them the financial assistance which they need.

Mr. GOODELL. As a final note, and a more harmonious note than some of the other things we talked about today, may I take the time to commend the Democratic members of the Committee on Education and Labor who supported my move this morning to substitute an entirely different program for higher education than the President sent to the Congress. I believe that in discussing this for the past 2½ or 3 weeks in the full committee many of these Democrats saw the great failings and disabilities in the proposal that was sent up to us, and they voted conscientiously with most of the Republicans to report out a bill on a bipartisan basis which can command a great deal of bipartisan support in the House.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman.

A NEW INVITATION TO OKLAHOMA'S VACATIONLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, less than 2 years ago I called the attention of the Congress and of the American public to the rapid development of Oklahoma as the recreational heartland of the United States. At that time, I pointed to the phenomenal and almost unbelievable growth of Oklahoma in the field of outdoor recreation. In concluding those remarks, I expressed my firm faith in the tremendous and continuing economic growth that lies ahead for our State and extended to all Americans an invitation to come to Oklahoma and discover for themselves the new vacation mecca of America.

In recent weeks one of Oklahoma's great newspapers has published an inventory of our State's recreational resources which eloquently and factually confirms everything that I said 2 years ago on this subject. On April 16, 1961, the Daily Oklahoman of Oklahoma City included in its Sunday edition an "Outdoor Guide to Oklahoma." This publication is not only an outstanding contribution to the wide ranging literature on recreation in Oklahoma, but is also a highly useful guide to sportsmen and vacation-minded citizens all over our land.

The fund of information in the Oklahoman's "Outdoor Guide" is dramatic proof that Oklahoma is in a position today to serve all the people of the United States, whatever their recreational interests. Whether one be inclined toward fishing, camping, scuba diving, skiing, hunting, exploring, water sports or sightseeing, Oklahoma has become a wonderland of easily accessible and beautiful lakes, modern facilities, and varied entertainment for millions.

As is borne out by the "Outdoor Guide," Oklahoma's claim to being the Nation's recreational heartland is not idle boasting. It is based on the solid facts of an unparalleled record of planned achievement in the development of water resources and of constant growth in the number of our citizens from all parts of the country who visit the State each year. These facts in turn rest on the foresight of those public servants who many years ago saw in Oklahoma's rich natural endowment, principally its lakes and rivers, a grand opportunity for progress in water conservation and development for the benefit of the entire Nation.

Thanks to decades of dedicated effort by the State government, by the Corps of Army Engineers, and by the Bureau of Reclamation, Oklahoma now has more than 1,000 square miles of surface water and more than 10,000 miles of lake shoreline. About half of this comes from huge manmade multipurpose reservoirs that last year attracted some 20 million visitors. According to the Daily Oklahoman, in the next 10 years alone we can expect this surface area to double and the shoreline to triple.

What is more, all this says nothing of Oklahoma's 15 State parks which in 1958 attracted 8 million visitors and which today are visited by up to 12 million vacationeers annually.

My main purpose today is to invite the attention of the House and of America's sportsmen to the Outdoor Guide's specific inventory of this great recreational development and growth. In particular, I would like to point to those lakes and reservoirs in northeastern Oklahoma lying within the confines of the Second Congressional District.

It is not by accident that these recreational areas are emphasized, for by far the major part of Oklahoma's water resources are found in this portion of the State. Of equal importance is the fact that the two of the largest new reservoirs now under construction in Oklahoma—Eufaula Reservoir and Oologah Reservoir—also are located in the Second District. If all of Oklahoma may be said

to be developing into the recreational heartland of America, then the center of this development is taking place in northeastern Oklahoma.

In my remaining remarks I will refer briefly to some of the most outstanding recreational areas in the Second District and will call freely upon the eloquence of the Daily Oklahoman's presentation to summarize our State's achievements in this field.

The Grand Lake o' the Cherokees, located in the extreme northeast corner of the Second District, provides an example in miniature of the tremendous growth which Oklahoma's recreational areas have enjoyed. After 3 years of drought prior to 1955, a "new era" has come to this 66-mile long lake that covers almost 60,000 acres and is surrounded by 1,300 miles of scenic shoreline. Today, the "Outdoor Guide" reports that this "beautiful $40 million hydroelectric reservoir has more recreational facilities, more visitors, and more prosperity than at any time since it was opened to the public in 1941." The following passages from the "Outdoor Guide" describe vividly the many recreational opportunities which it now provides:

Giant black bass and barn-door crappie abound again in their old haunts while believe-it-or-not runs of white bass and a boom of trotline fishing for catfish have restored the lake to high favor among fishermen.

With the water level pretty well pegged inside the 15-foot confines of the power pool, boating has hit a new peak with the great influx of the powerful ski rigs adding greatly to the activity and excitement.

The lake's many deepwater bays protected from wind by the steep, tree-covered hills offer ski opportunity unlimited and afford safe and pleasant anchorages for cruising boatmen in even the largest cabin cruisers.

At least 10 parks with modern facilities are available free to visitors. There are four convenient airstrips and even a year-round hunting area where you can shoot quail and pheasants to your heart's content.

More than 200 resorts now dot the lake's deep-etched shoreline and there are more than 70 heated fishing docks in operation on the lake at which 150,000 anglers while away the winter months. It is estimated that 2 million crappie were taken from the lakes last year and that a majority of them were creeled in fishing docks.

Just below Grand Lake in the vicinity of Spavinaw lie the somewhat smaller but no less important Spavinaw Lakes, the Lower Spavinaw having been opened for recreational purposes since 1922. The Lower Spavinaw was created initially to solve Tulsa's chronic water shortage problem. Since the 1920's it has also become a haven for an ever-growing number of bass fishermen from the tristate area of Arkansas, Missouri, and Kansas. A brief but illuminating sketch of the history of this area, leading to the development of the Upper Spavinaw in 1953, has been included in the Daily Oklahoman's report:

Many believed that the sparkling lake soon would be fished out, but year after year there were more fish. Now experts think than the great number of fishermen was responsible for the fact that the lake has continued to be a top fishing spot for almost 40 years.

With the approach of World War II, there was another industrial boom in the Oil City and before the war had ended Tulsans knew that even more water was needed. When the shooting was over engineers marched 9 miles upstream on Spavinaw Creek from the initial dam and built another one.

Thus, Upper Spavinaw was created. It stretches 9 miles up the creek almost to the city limits of Jay and covers 3,192 acres.

If the opening of the original lake had been exciting 31 years earlier, the opening of the new one was doubly so. Every effort had been made to remove rough fish from Spavinaw Creek before the dam was closed and precautions were taken to see that no white bass got into the water. * * * There isn't better bass fishing any place than on Upper Spavinaw.

Another of Oklahoma's notable recreational achievements is the Hulah Reservoir whose development was begun by the Corps of Army Engineers as a flood control project to control the Caney River. Situated to the west of Grand Lake and the Spavinaws and nudged up against the Oklahoma-Kansas border, this lake has now turned into a two-State recreational area for fishermen, skiers, and duck hunters alike. The "Outdoor Guide" gives us this thumbnail description of the area and its attractions for the sportsman:

Hulah Reservoir is not a large lake. It has long, twisting arms with the 97-foot earthen dam that stretches a mile across the Caney located 96 miles upstream from the confluence of the river it holds in check and the Verdigris upon which a big lake is now in the finishing process. * * * The reservoir was completed in 1951 at a total cost of little more than $11 million.

Fishing is excellent at all seasons but of late the water ski addicts have taken over during spring and summer months.

"The skiers burn more gallons of gasoline in their motors here every summer than we have gallons of water in the lake," an official (with tongue in cheek) reported recently.

At that he might not have been too far off base. One holiday weekend last summer the engineers counted more than 15,000 persons at the lake.

With good fishing and excellent skiing facilities, Hulah has good duck hunting to make it a recreational spot with 12 months appeal to the sportsmen.

It is perhaps the only lake in the United States that passes out duck blinds on a first-come, first-served basis.

In addition to their attractions for the energetic sportsmen, Oklahoma's lakes also provide matchless beauty and every modern convenience for the sightseer, camper, and picnicker. One of the best examples of these features of Oklahoma's resource development is at Greenleaf Lake, near Muskogee, which is also a fisherman's paradise:

Sheer straight-up-and-down bluffs and the steep, heavily timbered Cookson Hills give the crystal-clear spidery little lake a charm that can be found no place else in Oklahoma.

Now operated by the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board * * * there are several rustic cabins for rent, a large youth camp, lodge that can be opened for large groups, boat ramps, campsites and picnic areas on the west side of the lake just north of the dam.

There are camp supplies, tackle, and groceries at the small restaurant that serves as headquarters. Boats, motors, fuel and some storage space is also available.

Whopper black bass, barn-door crappie, and arm-long channel catfish are the top prizes for anglers, but for sheer fun and enjoyment fishermen can take a creelful of pan fish, a sport that is especially relished by youngsters just taking on the art of mastering rod and reel.

Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir, north of Gore, provides still another of Oklahoma's great flood control projects which has become known throughout the Southwest for its spectacular beauty, fine fishing, and boating. Deep, crystal-clear water is a special feature of the Tenkiller Lake area. The Daily Oklahoman's report includes these facts:

A hydroelectric, flood control project of the Corps of Army Engineers that cost more than $25 million, Tenkiller Ferry stretches its crystal-clear water from its damsite more than 30 miles to a point well past Standing Rock where Cherokee braves once stood and shot fish with bow and arrow.

The power pool level is 630 feet but the engineers point out there are 37 feet above this level reserved for flood control. They also report that 35 feet may be taken below the top of the power pool in a gradual drawdown for the production of electricity.

About 2 years ago, during a great flood, Tenkiller Ferry was filled to capacity and water avalanched over its native stone spillway in an awesome display that rivaled Niagara Falls. Actually, the tumbling water fell 1 foot farther than at Niagara.

The force of the water cut deeply into the native stone and now underway is a vast project for refacing the spillway with concrete and steel to prevent additional damage should capacity be reached again.

North of beautiful Tenkiller is spacious Fort Gibson Reservoir, located in the heart of the Second District. This reservoir is one of Oklahoma's most fully developed recreational centers with good roads available to reach even secluded areas and a stable water level to enhance both fishing and boating. A nostalgic historical background and a setting of famed natural beauty increase its appeal to the many thousands who visit this area each year. Space will permit only a few of the more tantalizing excerpts from the Daily Oklahoman's account of this richly endowed playground:

The reservoir is not unlike the figure of a wry Chinese dragon in appearance on a map as its more than 225 miles of shoreline takes frequent excursions into the hills to form the many legs.

Dotting this picturesque shoreline are more than 20 unrivaled resorts that offer comfort, pleasure, and relaxation to their many patrons.

Perhaps the heart of the lake region is Sequoyah State Park, a superb installation situated on a well-groomed 2,800-acre tract that will have available a fine new nine-hole golf course this spring.

The park is located on a rugged parcel of land that juts out into the lake between Grand River and scenic Fourteenmile Creek. It boasts a swank lodge, deluxe cottages and cabins, campgrounds, a trailer park complete with electricity and water, vast picnic area, huge swimming beaches, fishing docks, boats, a big marina with docks berthing some of the largest cruisers in the State, a grocery store, a riding academy, and about everything else you can bring to mind that makes leisure time worth every cent it costs.

For all their importance, not all of Oklahoma's best fishing is found in its

great lakes and reservoirs, as is indicated by these comments of the "Outdoor Guide" on Big Sallisaw Creek, also located in the Second District:

Ounce for ounce the fiercest fish fight an angler can match is with a brownie, and the finest brownie fishing in Oklahoma is to be found on beautiful Big Sallisaw Creek, a clear, cold stream flowing across Sequoyah County in the scenic Cookson Hills.

The water is rarely dingy since the springs flow across clean sandbars, gravel beds and white flint rocks.

The stream can be fished from the banks or it can be waded. Best fishing spots are usually the downstream edges of shoals where the water swirls into good holes of cold water.

Similarly, the Illinois River, which flows into Tenkiller Reservoir, offers the sportsman unique opportunities not always available on the State's reservoirs lakes:

Oklahoma sportsmen are rediscovering the intriguing adventure and excitement of float fishing and most of them are doing it on scenic Illinois River, a sparkling spring-fed masterpiece of nature that heads in the rocky crags southeast of Siloam Springs, Ark., and enters Oklahoma near Watts through Lake Frances.

More than 1,500 boatloads of fishermen made successful excursions down the swift moving stream last year and the growing interest in outdoor living and pleasure indicates that even more boats will hurry over the sparkling, fish-infested water this year.

In addition to the innumerable fishing areas which one may find around any of Oklahoma's great lakes and in its major rivers, our State has taken significant strides in the field of wildlife conservation. This review of recreational opportunities in the State would not be complete without some mention of the big game, especially deer refuges which have been established in nearly all of Oklahoma's 77 counties. Some of the best deer refuges are to be found in Ouachita National Forest, the Cookson Hills, and the Spavinaw Hills.

Finally, mention should be made of Oklahoma's State park system which is one of the best of its kind in the Nation. The major problem of the parks has been to keep pace with a constantly increasing number of visitors. Something of the scope of this system is suggested by the Daily Oklahoman, in the following quote:

During the past year more than $654,000 in capital improvements—additions, renovations and furnishings—in the parks was spent by the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board which supervise the parks.

Besides the biggest lake and the biggest lodge, 93,000-acre Lake Texoma and 106-room Texoma Lodge in Texoma State Park, large lakes with parks include Fort Gibson Reservoir, 19,000 acres; Tenkiller, 12,500; Great Salt Plains, 10,700; Murry, 6,000; and Wister, 4,000. State recreation areas are on 46,300-acre Grand Lake o' the Cherokees; Canton Reservoir, a 6,700-acre lake, has Corps of Engineers recreation areas.

In closing, let me reiterate that these brief and selective remarks are intended to give only a sampling of the great sweep and variety of the outdoor recreational development which has taken place in Oklahoma in recent years.

To appreciate fully Oklahoma's tremendous contribution in this field, especially those of the northeastern part of the State, you must turn to the record as it is set out in the Daily Oklahoman's "Outdoor Guide to Oklahoma." Once again, I want to commend this outstanding presentation to all of America's sportsmen.

At the same time, I wish to repeat the invitation I extended 2 years ago on behalf of all Oklahomans to all of America's citizens to come to our State. No written report or speech, no matter how eloquent, can fully convey the beauty and wealth of the resources and facilities which Oklahoma now offers to the Nation.

Only when you come to see for yourself will you discover why each year additional thousands of Americans are visiting Oklahoma to take advantage of its recreational possibilities.

Only then will you find why Oklahomans take an ever-increasing pride in their State and believe with all their hearts that it has a key role to play in the continued development of our natural resources.

PROPOSED SUMMIT MEETING

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, recent reports indicate that the President is making plans to meet with Mr. Khrushchev in June. Like everyone else in the country I too would like to see tensions between Russia and the free world lessened, but I do not believe this is the way to do it. At the very least, this is another reversal of his attitude expressed during the campaign when he blasted so-called summit meetings. What possible good can such a meeting produce at this time?

We are presently engaged in finding methods to outlaw Communist takeover of governments in this hemisphere and recently failed in this attempt in Cuba. Are we now running to Khrushchev, asking for mercy from further spreads of Communist influence in the Americas?

We are presently trying to work out some method of saving face over our retreat in Laos. Are we running to Khrushchev to ask him to help us in this affair when we all know that Russia and Red China masterminded the Laotian invasion?

We are still talking about orbiting a human in 1963, and Russia has already done this. Are we asking Khrushchev to let us know how he did it?

Khrushchev has stated that he will in the near future sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany while we have been committed to the preservation of our position in Berlin and a unified Germany by peaceful election. Are we backing down on this commitment?

For years Russia has refused to permit any inspections of its atomic blasts, and has broken up all conferences on nuclear test bans. This has been repeated in the last month. Can it be truthfully said that there is any sign that Russia, or its bloc of suckling pigs nursing on the same snake milk, have given even the remotest idea that there is a better climate for working our disagreements? Is there any hope that signs of American weakness in foreign affairs constitutes any basis on which to work out an agreement at the summit which will tone down the cold war?

This proposed meeting is in violation of the President's public statements before and after the campaign; creates a further impression of free world weakness in the neutral and satellite countries; offers opportunity to Khrushchev to heap further indignities on the President of the United States, and will stimulate further demands for retreat from present free world positions in support of freedom.

I would strongly suggest that this meeting, if carried through at this time, will do nothing but give further opportunities to Khrushchev to seek retreats by this Government from its pledges to the free world, to mouth further insults and to give impetus to his propaganda that communism is stronger and must inevitably win world domination. As has been said on many occasions, a summit meeting of this kind will be completely unproductive and may do real harm unless the basic goals are first carefully outlined and the means for discussing those goals have first been worked out in depth by normal diplomatic channels.

CULTURAL RESPONSIBILITY OF RADIO AND TELEVISION INDUSTRY

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the fantastic growth of the commercial radio and television industry in the United States is a tribute to the business energy and technical skill of our Nation. But equally noteworthy is the failure of that industry to match its physical growth with a sense of cultural responsibility.

When one considers that there are almost as many radio sets in this country as there are families and that almost 90 percent of all the homes in this country are equipped with television sets, the awesome power of this industry to influence the taste of our people—indeed, to mold the national culture—is brutally apparent.

I say "brutally" because in all too large a part of the programing that is poured out of our 60 million radio sets and our 56 million television sets is scarcely a compliment to the national intelligence. It does not reflect much credit on our culture that carbon-copy cowboys mouth carbon-copy words in carbon-copy saloons through endless hours of carbon-copy westerns. It is not a major national achievement that iden-

tical private eyes chase identical crooks through endless hours of identical crime and violence shows. Even in the third vast area of dramatic programing, the so-called situation comedy, we are not subjected to an overdose of wit, insight, and originality.

This is not a critical essay, and I by no means wish to demean the fascinating achievements of radio and television's best talents, most particularly in news and nonfiction presentations. But we cannot avoid the fact that in recent years there has been a steady deterioration in the majority of the prime time network offerings; there has been a slavish timidity and a degrading lackluster in their format and content; and there has been a shameless and disturbing death rate among programs designed for the even slightly more discriminating tastes of millions of our citizens.

This great industry has reached a critical period in its development. Because the airwaves belong to the people, there is no question of the propriety of governmental inquiry into the causes and the possible cures of the industry's problems. Because of the incredible impact of its product on the mind and taste and spirit of the whole Nation, and therefore upon its very soul, it assumes an importance and sensitivity quite outside the normal profit and loss standards of most businesses. Indeed, it seems to me that the television executive who measures his success purely in profit figures is plainly irresponsible.

Yet, the admission that it is the right and the duty of the general public, and therefore the Government, to make such an examination raises yet another complicated and unpretty question—namely, censorship. I do not propose that any direct system of censorship be imposed on the selection of broadcast material. In fact, I am opposed to it both as a matter of principle and as a matter of practical workability.

The bill that I am proposing is motivated by a desire to avoid direct governmental censorship and yet provide the responsible leaders of the broadcasting industries, and the allied advertising agencies, sponsors, and production units, with intelligent and sympathetic guides to action.

I am proposing the creation of a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television to be composed of 11 outstanding private citizens prominent in the fields of education and communications, or in the civic, cultural, or religious life of the country. These citizens, appointed by the President with Senate approval, will make a continuing study of programing trends and make annual recommendations, including suggested legislation, to both the Congress and the Federal Communications Commission. The Board also is authorized to investigate the extent to which broadcasting stations carry programs designed to broaden the civic, education, and cultural interests of the American people and to study the nature and composition of groups which exercise effective control over programing.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that these proposals will receive the consideration and support of this body.

AMERICAN EXPORT CREDITS GUARANTY CORPORATION

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] joined me today in introducing a bill to establish an adequate export credit guarantee system for U.S. exporters.

The following is a statement, which we jointly issued in connection therewith:

The United States faces a serious problem in regard to the imbalance of international payments and the outflow of gold to other countries. Our national income from the goods or services we provide to the rest of the world is presently far exceeded by what we spend outside of the United States. One way to correct the imbalance in payments is for the United States to sell more goods and services to other nations—to export more.

During World War II, and for some years immediately thereafter, the United States was virtually the only market in which foreign buyers could shop for needed goods and services, and there was such a ready market for our exports that credit terms were not so vital as they now are. Today other industrial nations are stronger economically than they ever were, and they now compete aggressively with the United States in all world markets. This competition will intensify, and we must prepare to meet its challenge.

More and more, American exporters now find that foreign buyers are as interested in the terms of payments as they are in price and quality. American exporters now face the need to offer payment terms to prospective buyers equal to those granted by foreign suppliers. More and more, American exporters find they are often not as well equipped to meet the credit terms offered by competing nations.

A great part of our export sales, like our domestic sales, is not paid for immediately in cash. Purchasers abroad, like those at home, customarily ask for credit terms. If the U.S. exporter cannot finance the deal himself, or obtain financing elsewhere, very often he loses the sale to a competitor who is able to meet the buyer's need for credit terms.

Recognizing the vital role of adequate credit facilities in the expansion of national income from exports, other countries for many years have offered their exporters and their financing institutions incentives designed to make available adequate funds to permit credit extensions to oversea customers. One major incentive takes the form of a guarantee against export credit loss—a form of insurance which provides that the exporter, or his banker, will be protected against nonpayment of trade bills.

As in other forms of insurance, the exporter pays a small premium for such protection. The insuring organization depends upon the income from many premiums to offset the losses sustained by the relative few.

We are still the wealthiest nation in the world and have adequate resources to finance oversea business. However, our commercial banks and other lending institutions must avoid risks and there is presently no adequate export credit guarantee system in the United States to make it possible for our financing institutions to make as much of their funds available to exporters as they would if they were effectively protected against unforeseeable losses. The United States does have a system of partial guarantees to cover some of the risks involved in exporting certain categories of goods, but, as President Kennedy pointed out, in his balance-of-payments message to Congress of February 6, 1961, American export credit facilities "are not yet adequate, nor are they comparable to those offered by other countries."

The question is what kind of an export credit guarantee system will be of most value and utility to our country, in the intensifying struggle for world markets? What has been our experience to date with credit guarantees? What can we learn from other countries? How can we best equip ourselves to increase our trade and improve our economic health as a Nation?

As long as 6 or 7 years ago, a number of manufacturers, bankers and others involved in international trade sensed that adequate export credit could well become a critical problem for their individual businesses and for our Nation. They began to examine the export credit systems of other countries and the advantages which their exporters gained from their use.

They established the National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees (NCC) sponsored by the International Section of the New York Board of Trade, Inc. The NCC promptly gained the support of more than 100 companies in many States. Both in size and diversity of its membership, the NCC has since grown to represent a cross section of all American interests concerned with foreign trade. Today its roster of members includes well over 200 companies with headquarters in 26 States, with combined invested capital of more than $25 billion and annual sales of nearly $50 billion, covering the spectrum of American industrial output that goes to the export market—from drugs, chemicals and hospital supplies, to mining, transportation, agricultural and construction equipment, to farm products, steel, containers, glass, metals, textiles, office equipment, electronic equipment, and a variety of other products and services which can be sold overseas.

The NCC has maintained contact with the existing export credit insuring systems of all nations and has over a period of years kept informed of their operations. It finds that what these other countries are doing for their exporters goes well beyond anything presently available to the U.S. trade. Through correspondence and meetings in the principal centers of American export industry, the NCC has held discussions, interchanged ideas and experiences with business leaders, and has gradually evolved a specific proposal designed to meet the practical and reasonable needs of the trade.

Studies of export credit guarantee operations in other countries show that other nations offer guarantees which go beyond those now available to U.S. exporters especially as to:

1. The breadth of loss protection afforded;
2. The extent of goods and services covered;
3. The speed and flexibility with which guarantees are made available in keeping with exporters' needs;
4. The terms on which the guarantees are made available, e.g., minimum documentation requirements, flexibility, and ready adaptation to specific trade and market practice, etc.

Generally speaking it was observed that all other nations recognize the clear distinction between banking and insurance. Bankers and other lenders of money must emphasize avoidance of risk; insurers, on the other hand, are in the business of assessing and spreading risks. Hence, other nations keep their export credit insurance systems separate from their lending agencies. Because of their accumulated long and wide experience in export credit underwriting, all

the world's principal trading nations, except the United States, now insure their exporters against credit loss to an extent that enables them to effectively compete in offering attractive credit terms to purchasers. These credit guarantors generally show a profit from their operations. Since they impose no burdens on their taxpayers, they are not subsidies.

On the basis of its findings, the NCC began to implement its proposal and to formulate a program to put the U.S. trade on an equal footing. In devising its plan for the United States of America, the NCC sought to find a solution that would best meet U.S. needs and that would accord with the American tradition of allowing private enterprise to function to the fullest extent possible. Under the NCC plan, a privately owned and administered guarantee corporation would assume responsibility for the insurance of commercial credit risks, with Government participation limited to whatever part of the noncommercial risk underwriting was found to be beyond the capacity of the political-risk reserves.

We have carefully studied the findings of the NCC. It is our opinion that most useful to the American exporter would be a system which would have the advantage of both the broad coverage offered to our competitors and the flexibility and skill inherent in the American tradition of free enterprise. Private capital and management can provide commercial export credit guarantees as comprehensive as those available in other countries. It can also administer the provision of guarantees against noncommercial credit risks, if given a degree of Government support in that area. Thus, it would be possible to have the advantage of the flexibility and skills inherent in a commercial insurance type organization. The Government's role can then be centered on the overall control of those aspects of the operation which cannot be undertaken wholly by private enterprise, i.e., the guaranteeing of political or catastrophe risks which might prove to be beyond the financial capacity and scope of any one or any combination of private organizations.

We have carefully considered whether this entire operation could best be accomplished by the establishment or entry into a field of a number of insurance organizations whose combined resources and facilities might be equal to the task, or whether it would be best to create a single, specialized organization which would serve as a central agency or instrument in whose ownership and business all interested companies and individuals could participate.

After much deliberation, it is our considered opinion that the single instrument or agency approach is preferable for these reasons:

Amassing information on the credit worthiness of individual buyers and countries all over the world and creating an organization with the facilities needed to insure a nation's export credit sales is an enormous task—one that can be efficiently performed only by a strong, centralized insurance carrier specializing in and confining itself to this type of underwriting.

Even if a number of commercial underwriters in the casualty, marine, and other branches of insurance were to enter the field, as competitors they would not pool the information separately accumulated from their credit underwriting experience. If each had only a part of the business, the premium income from their respective shares would not be enough for any of them to build an organization of adequate strength and capacity to provide the kind of service needed to satisfy the exporters of their nation.

As the experience of other countries shows, this task can be efficiently performed only by one specialized organization concentrating its entire resources in the foreign credit guarantee field. Consequently, in the case of the United States of America, a comparable centralized underwriter is needed for our exports to reach their maximum potential.

We have decided to introduce a bill which calls for the establishment of a federally chartered, privately owned and managed American Export Credits Guaranty Corporation.

In this bill authorizing the creation of a single Guaranty Corporation any possible monopoly stigma is avoided by requiring that the equity ownership of the Corporation be available to any and all interested American insurance companies. In addition, the Corporation would be required to spread its underwriting portfolio and premium income by offering to commercial insurance companies direct participating shares or reinsurance up to 90 percent of its volume of business. There would be no prohibition against setting up other enterprises which would underwrite guarantees.

The Corporation would serve as a central clearinghouse, or vehicle, for all interested commercial insurers. The Corporation would offer the U.S. exporter and/or his financing institutions a contract of guarantee to protect his receivables up to an agreed percentage, against all types of unpreventable commercial and/or political credit risks. Its premium rates and contract conditions would be competitive with those charged in other nations, yet sufficient to provide income to cover losses and expenses, plus a fair return on invested capital.

Losses from both commercial and political risks would be met from premium income. Since no private insurer, or group of insurers, can assume the political and other noncommercial risks involved in export credits, the bill provides for a measure of U.S. Treasury support for these particular risks. In the event that loss reserves accumulated from political risk premiums were not equal to meeting political risk loss claims (for example, due to a general freeze of receivables in a given country because of exchange transfer restrictions), the Corporation would be authorized to borrow within prescribed limits from the U.S. Treasury. Against such emergency borrowing, the Corporation would pledge its "frozen" receivables as collateral. Loans from the Treasury would be used only to cover political risk losses, and the corporation would keep all political risk funds separate and apart from its commercial risk and private capital funds.

To protect the public interest and to provide direction of the Corporation's exposure limits and other factors relating to political risks for which Government funds might be needed to meet emergency excess claims situations, and to police the use of such Treasury funds, a Government Director would serve on the Board of the Corporation. This Government Director would have veto power over the Corporation's political risk operations, globally, by country and by length of credit terms, and over political risk premium rates and political risk claim reserves. Since there would be no intermingling of public with private funds, the Government Director need not, and would not, be involved in the Corporation's detailed underwriting activities, though he would have a vote in these matters equal to other members of the Board.

Goods and services of all types exported from the United States, Puerto Rico, or its possessions, when more than 50 percent of their export value is produced or manufactured in the United States of America, Puerto Rico, or its possessions, would be eligible for coverage provided the payment terms were consistent with the type of product or service, the custom of the industry and market, and other pertinent factors, including the general credit worthiness of the customer and country at time of acceptance of the risk.

Short-term consumer-goods credits (normally to 6 months, exceptionally to 1 year) would generally be covered under global policies, based mainly upon the exporter's (or banker's) own credit determination. Such global policies would require that the Corporation be offered all short-term credit business, or a cross section of it sufficient to give the Corporation a reasonable spread of risk and to minimize average premium cost.

Credit for durable consumer goods (normally to 3 years) would be subject to these same general principles.

Medium-term, capital goods credits (to 5 years from delivery but jet aircraft and other special cases to 7 years) would be covered under specific policies.

Credit guarantees for services would be made available to cover nonpayment of export earnings arising from engineering, architectural, contracting, and other technical services; leasing rentals or fees from the use of property rights such as patents, trademarks, copyrights, licensing of technical know-how, etc.

In all respects, the Corporation's underwriting policies would be flexible, and based primarily on individual risk criteria, with a view to providing the U.S. exporter with maximum protection at the lowest cost consistent with a self-sustaining operation.

We believe the advantages of the export credit guarantee system embodied in the bill can be summarized as follows:

It is generally held unwise for the Federal Government to undertake any activity that can be performed satisfactorily by private enterprise.

The underwriting of export credit demands a high degree of specialized knowledge and competence. Qualified personnel can be more readily attracted and held by a private corporation than by a governmental agency. And a private corporation is not subject to political pressures in its personnel, its underwriting, or other policies.

A private corporation can render prompt and efficient service, because it is not subject to the encumbrances of Federal administrative, management, and personnel procedures. Also, any dissatisfaction with service can be quickly brought into the open without the reservations that are sometimes evident in dealing with a Government agency.

Exporters and their bankers should be able to obtain a single comprehensive policy covering both political and commercial risks.

Private management can adjust its policies and procedures to changing commercial conditions more rapidly than can governments.

Private corporations can make decisions on commercial credit risks based on business judgments without the political pressures and considerations that can bear on the decisions of a Government agency.

Considerable reservoirs of financial and credit information can readily become available to a private corporation from business sources in this country and abroad. But commercial organizations, in the United States and other countries, are generally reluctant to disclose such information to any Government agency.

The U.S. Government should be relieved of any possibility of political repercussions which might arise from one of its agencies having to: (1) Determine the insurability or credit worthiness of individual buyers; and (2) serve as a debt collector when guaranteed accounts develop into actual or pending loss claims requiring the guarantor to take steps against citizens of other countries to protect these receivables.

The Government should be spared the necessity of adding to its budgetary burden to set up a fully adequate Government export credit guarantee system, necessitating the adding of some thousand persons to the Federal payroll, and the establishment of offices throughout the Nation.

The question may be asked: What about the export credit guarantee operations of the Export-Import Bank?

Examination of the expanded guaranty facilities which Eximbank announced on March 24 shows that these will not in all respects put our export business on an equality with its foreign competition. Even were this proposed new Export-Import Bank program to be fully implemented, there would still remain certain deficiencies.

The Guaranty Corporation as proposed by this bill would overcome the most basic objection of the Eximbank operation, namely, the fusion of banking and insurance functions in one and the same institution. Banking must inherently avoid taking risks. Insurance, on the other hand, is the business of recognizing and accepting those risks which reasonable and prudent safeguards cannot prevent. The insurer's function is to spread, or average, those risks over the widest possible area so that the impact of sustained loss is kept within bearable limits.

The experience of other countries shows that an export credit guaranty operation is successful when it is administered through a centralized organization specializing in that particular field.

This principle is not followed in Eximbank's currently revised credit guaranty program. Instead, that program divides itself into two parts: one relating to short-term credits (applicable to consumer goods sold on terms usually not extending beyond 6 months); and the other to medium-term credits (applicable principally to machinery and other capital goods usually sold on payment terms for 6 months to 5 years). Export-Import Bank now proposes to make short-term credit guarantees available through companies engaged in casualty, marine and other branches of insurance, or through syndicates or pools of such companies. As to medium-term credits, Eximbank proposes to continue intermingling guarantees with direct financing, and to administer this part of the program directly from Washington as in the past.

It is easy to see that, if several insurance companies, or insurance pools or syndicates, operating separately, are to provide the short-term credit guarantees to the trade, then the available volume of guarantee business is likely to be so fragmented that none of these individual companies, or groups can afford the qualified underwriting staff or organization essential to an efficient operation in this new and highly specialized branch. Each individual participant will naturally endeavor to attract as clients those exporters having the largest dollar volume of business to offer, consequently the tendency will be to give prime attention to serving the large exporting firms, with consequent lesser attention to those with a smaller business volume.

Our proposed Guarantee Corporation, on the other hand, will have every incentive to service all exporters desiring guarantees. As the central vehicle for this type of underwriting it will provide the personnel and facilities requisite to efficient operation and will spread the business among all other companies wishing to participate, without the necessity for those companies to set up their own credit underwriting mechanisms.

Since Eximbank proposes to continue issuing its medium-term credit guarantees directly from Washington, this could mean continued procedural difficulties and delays which would endanger the ability of American suppliers to obtain business for which they were competing with the exporters of other nations.

There is, and will continue to be, a need for the Export-Import Bank, especially to provide medium and long-term financing for foreign development projects and other types of export financing which our private lending institutions cannot undertake. The bill we are introducing provides that Export-Import Bank be given an overall control of the political risk underwriting of the proposed Guaranty Corporation. It would, however, relieve the Bank of the detail workload and the responsibilities involved in granting its direct credit risk guarantees to the export trade and permit these to be assumed by private business operating with private funds under Government supervision and a degree of control adequate to protect the national interest.

We believe that this legislation provides for a system of export credit guarantees which will become as important to the expansion of American export trade as the Federal Reserve System is to the soundness, stability and orderly progress of our banking structure.

The availability of comprehensive guarantees against losses would encourage insurance companies, banks and other sources of financing for exports to make available a very considerable increase in funds for this purpose.

In turn, this would permit the exporter whose capital does not permit him to finance all of his sales with his own funds to enlarge his exports to a degree which would result in added income to the United States of possibly hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

The American Export Credits Guaranty Corporation is the instrument which is needed by both the Federal Government and private business to undertake their respective roles and act together in expanding our exports to their utmost.

NEW POSTAGE BILL IN CONGRESS

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. PETERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has not concluded hearings or reported a bill on the proposed postal rate increases, so it is premature at this time to take issue.

However, the May 11 editorial of the Uintah Basin Standard, of Roosevelt, Utah, so aptly portrays the apprehensions of many nonmetropolitan editors and publishers that I believe it deserves your most serious consideration and submit it herewith for insertion in the RECORD:

NEW POSTAGE BILL IN CONGRESS: A HARDSHIP

A drastic postage rate increase bill which, passed in its proposed form, will cost publishers of small nonmetropolitan newspapers through the country about $6 million per year has been introduced in the Congress. Hearings are now in progress before the House Post Office Committee, having started April 25.

The bill, which was drafted by the Office of the Postmaster General, known as H.R. 6418, was introduced by Representative THOMAS MURRAY, Democrat, of Tennessee, and would raise $78 million annually from second-class mail, for a 79-percent increase overall. However, hundreds of small weekly newspapers will find their increase will run several times more than the overall 79 percent.

Needless to say, the National Editorial Association, national organization of the small newspaper publishers, is very actively fighting this bill. There are many reasons why this is so and why NEA is so vigorous in their opposition.

Major changes asked in second-class rates are abandonment of free-in-county mailing rights, the addition of 1¼ cents per piece rate and 1½ cents per pound within county, plus a surtax of 1½ cents per piece on some rated publications sent beyond the county. Some rates will not be changed. The biggest chunk of added revenue, nearly $69 million out of the $79 million sought from second class, would come from the surtax.

All these figures perhaps won't mean much to the average person who might read his hometown newspaper each week, until its editor makes the same kind of an observation the editor of the Standard is about to make. He'll use some plain, cold, hard dollar-and-cents facts to illustrate what it would do to his operation. Like any other inflationary proposition, it would be the consumer who'll have to pay the bill.

For an example, if the Standard publisher is forced to abide by the proposed bill, his average cost of mailing the Standard for 1 month will jump from approximately $12.58 to $65.20. (These figures are actual for the month of February 1961, based on the number of pounds of newspapers mailed through the local post office). When we do some more calculating with these dollar-and-cents figures, we find the cost of mailing the Standard for a full year would jump from $52.92 to $2,751.84. Carrying on the formula a bit further this means a 530-percent increase in cost of mailing the Standard for 1 year's time. If we print more pages, the cost will increase in proportion.

Since the paid circulation of the Standard averages about 1,700 to 1,800, this would mean the price of the Uintah Basin Standard would have to be raised to $5.50 per year to break even.

If the average small town publisher had to absorb this 530-percent increase on his own, he'd soon have one of the following signs on his front door: "New Postal Law Put Us Out of Business"; or "Plant for Sale—Make a Reasonable Offer"; or "Bankrupt", etc.

This is very serious with people like your local editor. It's like was stated earlier, someone will have to pay the higher cost of living—the little retailer or businessman can't do it, so the increase is passed on to the little fellow—the consumer.

Also in this proposed bill are 5-cent letters, 4-cent postcards, plus many other postage costs, that are conceived by the Postmaster General to balance the postal budget that has not been balanced since you first started receiving letters, way back when.

The idea of a hike in postal rates was advocated by the former administration, and has been taken up by the new administration. So it's not a partisan deal, but rather a bad deal for publishers and readers of smalltown newspapers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCHADEBERG, for May 22 through May 24, on account of official business of House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. SCHERER, for May 22 through May 26, on account of official business of House Committee on Un-American Activities.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. ALGER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. VANIK, for 15 minutes, tomorrow, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. QUIE (at the request of Mrs. WEIS), for 1 hour, today.

Mr. CURTIN (at the request of Mrs. WEIS), for 15 minutes, on May 17.

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. KING of Utah, for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE.

Mr. GATHINGS, to revise and extend the remarks he made in the House today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DULSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. ANFUSO.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1619. An act to authorize adjustments in accounts of outstanding old-series currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 143. A joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May 1961 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 104. An act to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment at the constitution of the State of New Mexico; and

S. 712. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 15, 1961, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2195. An act to convey certain land of the Pala Band of Indians to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corp.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 17, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

912. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

913. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to a proposed bill now pending before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee entitled "A bill to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

914. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed contract extension agreement to extend through December 31, 1961, or until such prior time as a new long-term contract may be executed, concession contract No. 14–10–333–103 under which Fred Harvey is authorized to operate the Painted Desert Inn and provide related facilities for the public in Petrified Forest National Monument, pursuant to the act of July 14, 1956 (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

915. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting determinations relating to partial deferment of the February 1, 1962, and 1963, construction payments due the United States from the Fort Sumner Irrigation District, Fort Sumner project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2924. A bill to repeal an act entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the district of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459); with amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6352. A bill to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the unlimited deduction for charitable contributions for certain individuals); without amendment (Rept. No. 395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 7079. A bill to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7080. A bill to authorize gratuitous benefits for a remarried widow of a veteran upon termination of her remarriage; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7081. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 7082. A bill to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 7083. A bill to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7084. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Citizens Council on Migratory Labor"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7085. A bill to provide for the registration of contractors of migrant agricultural workers and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7086. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7087. A bill to amend section 13(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with respect to the exemption of agricultural employees from the child labor provisions of such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7088. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants for improving domestic agricultural migratory workers' health services and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7089. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7090. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7091. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7092. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 7093. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that social security benefits and other annuities shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility of individuals for pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7094. A bill to amend section 503 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that up to $10,000 in payments under policies of life insurance shall not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility of individuals for pension; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7095. A bill to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY (by request):

H.R. 7096. A bill to provide for the restoration to Indian tribes of unclaimed per capita

and other individual payments of tribal trust funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H.R. 7097. A bill to prohibit strikes, work stoppages, and slowdowns at critical defense facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7098. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase from $1,200 to $1,800 the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 7099. A bill to validate payments of certain per diem allowances made to members and former members of U.S. Coast Guard while serving in special programs overseas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 7100. A bill to provide leave to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7101. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7102. A bill to create the American Export Credits Guaranty Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 7103. A bill to create the American Export Credits Guaranty Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 7104. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the driving of the golden spike at Promontory, Utah, completing the first transcontinental railroad route; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 7105. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance grants for undergraduate study in such institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 7106. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize financial assistance grants for undergraduate study in such institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 7107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income termination payments received by an employee whose position has been eliminated by automation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H.R. 7108. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and title IV of the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7109. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to simplify and improve the election and appointment of directors of the Federal home loan banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 7110. A bill to eliminate the requirement that Federal Reserve banks maintain certain reserves in gold certificates against deposits and note liabilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 7111. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7112. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7113. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 7114. A bill to approve the amendatory repayment contract negotiated with the Huntley Project Irrigation District, Montana, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 7115. A bill to amend the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 7116. A bill to amend further the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 7117. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase to 2½ percent the multiplication factor for determining annuities for certain Federal employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7118. A bill to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instruction materials for the blind, and to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and to otherwise improve such act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7119. A bill vesting in the American Battle Monuments Commission the care and maintenance of the original Iwo Jima Memorial on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, Volcano Islands, Pacific Ocean area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.R. 7120. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 7121. A bill to extend wartime rates of compensation to veterans and their dependents for service-connected disabilities incurred during periods when individuals may be inducted for service in the military or naval service outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 7122. A bill to authorize the procurement of liability insurance for Government employees using motor vehicles in the course of their official duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.J. Res. 424. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy test qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 425. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.J. Res. 426. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy test qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 307. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of a publication entitled "Soviet Total War—Historic Mission of Violence and Deceit," 85th Congress, 1st session; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 308. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of parts 1, 2, and 3 of hearings entitled "Communist Training Operations—Communist Activities and Propaganda Among Youth Groups"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 309. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of hearings entitled "The Northern California District of the Communist Party—Structure—Objectives—Leadership"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 310. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of a study entitled "Legislative Recommendations by House Committee on Un-American Activities—Subsequent Action Taken by Congress or Executive Agencies—A Research Study by Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Con. Res. 311. Concurrent resolution providing for additional copies of House Document 336, 86th Congress, 2d session, entitled "Facts on Communism—Volume I, the Communist Ideology"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H. Con. Res. 312. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress that no further reductions in tariffs be made during the life of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 292. Resolution providing for additional copies of a consultation entitled "Language as a Communist Weapon"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 293. Resolution providing for additional copies of testimony of Petr S. Deriabin, former officer of the USSR's Committee of State Security (KGB) entitled "The Kremlin's Espionage and Terror Organizations"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 294. Resolution providing for additional copies of staff consultations entitled "The Ideological Fallacies of Communism"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 295. Resolution providing for additional copies of hearings entitled "Communism in the New York Area—Entertainment," 85th Congress, 2d session; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 296. Resolution providing for additional copies of a consultation with Edward Hunter, author and foreign correspondent, entitled "Communist Psychological Warfare—Brainwashing," 85th Congress 2d session; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 297. Resolution providing for additional copies of House Document No. 119, 86th Congress, 1st session, entitled "Patterns of Communist Espionage"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. ELLSWORTH presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the expenditures and the income of the Government of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 7123. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takako Coughlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 7124. A bill for the relief of Martin Kamnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 7125. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gerardo L. Yubero, his wife, Luz Fortuny de Lopez, and their two minor children, Gerard Lopez Fortuny, and Fernando Lopez Fortuny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7126. A bill for the relief of Ying-Kwei Pan (Bingham Y. K. Pan), Ti-Wei Liu Pan, Kai-Tien Pan and Kai-Yu Pan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 7127. A bill for the relief of Hajime Sumitani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 7128. A bill for the relief of Constantine D. Diles and his wife, Vasiliki Diles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 7129. A bill for the relief of Piero Della Bordella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 7130. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Cornish Fei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7131. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katarina Pezelj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7132. A bill for the relief of Cary (Chow-Yuen) Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

153. By Mr. GIAIMO: Petition of 41 constituents of the Third Congressional District of Connecticut in support of H.R. 3745, the so-called World War I pension bill; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

154. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Maj. Gen. Stuart D. Menist, The Senior Reserve Commanders Association, Army of the United States, San Francisco, Calif., relating to urging certain strengths for the Active Army, Army Reserve paid drill, and Army National Guard paid drill; to the Committee on Armed Services.

155. Also, petition of Nathan Wolfman, city council, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to requesting support and approval of the proposed Delaware River Basin project; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Addition of Electric Generating Facilities to the New Plutonium Production Reactor at Hanford, Wash., at a Cost of $95 Million Not in Best Interest of All the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago Congress gave its final approval to the depressed areas bill authorizing almost $400 million for loans and grants to revitalize depressed areas. I supported that legislation because it was for the national good as well as for the good of my constituents. But, now I want to call attention to a proposal that will come before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy May 17 which, if approved, would result in spending $95 million of Federal funds—taxpayers' funds—that would further aggravate the conditions we are trying to correct. I refer to the proposed addition of electric generating facilities to the new plutonium production reactor being constructed at Hanford, Wash.

The needless expenditure of this $95 million would, in my opinion, be contrary to the best interests of the citizens. It would result only in producing heavily subsidized electricity by nuclear fuel which would be used to lure industries away from other areas where there is a serious need for additional employment opportunities.

Present challenges facing this Nation from international tensions have already placed considerable stress on available Federal finances. As the trend seems to continue toward the Government doing more and more for everybody and because greater use of the back-door spending mechanism makes it easier to spend tremendous amounts of money, it has become a matter of the utmost urgency for every thoughtful Member of Congress to evaluate each new spending proposal very carefully. There seems to be a serious relaxation of what used to be considered as fiscal guidelines so we should determine whether such spending is absolutely necessary and is the best possible utilization of available funds.

With this in mind, let us look at the $95 million proposal to add electric generating facilities to the new Hanford plutonium production reactor.

Many of us remember the House debate in July 1958 on authorizing construction of the plutonium production reactor at Hanford. It was to cost $145 million, including $25 million to allow for subsequent addition of electric generating facilities if and when Congress should authorize it.

There were clear assurances in 1958, however, that incorporating convertibility features in the project to the tune of $25 million would not commit Congress to the actual addition of electric generating equipment at some later date. In fact, during debate on the project, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy said:

> I want to say and reiterate that by passage of the authorization legislation today we shall not in any way commit ourselves ever to convert the plant.

Let us not forget this important point—there is absolutely no commitment for Congress to proceed with adding generating facilities to Hanford now or even in the future simply because it has equipment which would permit such an addition. The proposed Hanford steamplant can and should be considered solely on its merits or demerits.

I will not attempt at this time to elaborate on all the demerits of adding electric generating facilities to Hanford, because I, along with several of my colleagues, will have much to say about this project in the next few days. But, today, I will limit my remarks to its effect on other areas and resources of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I supported construction of the new production reactor in 1958 to produce weapons grade plutonium and asked other Members to support it also. During debate on that bill, I pointed out that nothing in the bill at that time—and I repeat at that time—should cause the coal industry concern because we were making no commitments to add electric generating facilities to the reactor. Now, however, this administration has requested authorization to proceed with the addition of these facilities, and this should cause serious concern to the coal industry. I do not say this merely because I am privileged to represent a coal mining area; but, rather, because this major industry represents a vital natural resource of America which is presently in a seriously depressed condition.

The proposal is to add about 700,000 kilowatts of generating capacity to Hanford. This is roughly equivalent to 2,319,000 tons of coal per year, based on an 85-percent load factor. The load factor may seem somewhat high to many, but let me quote from page 16 of the "Supplemental Report on New Production Reactor Power Plant Economic Feasibility Study" prepared by the Federal Power Commission and dated February 1961. The report states:

> An NPR maximum annual power plant factor of 85 percent has been adopted for comparison of NPR plant dependable capacity to that of conventional fuel-electric plants.

Since it takes less than one pound of coal to generate a kilowatt-hour of electricity in most modern steamplants, the total kilowatt-hours from the Hanford steamplant can be translated into 2,319,000 tons of coal.

This figure can also be expressed in terms of man-days of employment for miners in this depressed industry. An average of 12.12 tons of coal can be mined per man per day. This would mean that approximately 191,360 man-days of gainful employment could result from generating 700,000 kilowatts of electric power using a modern fossil fuel steamplant.

I recognize there is no proposal to construct an alternative steam facility of this size presently being considered. But I can assure you that if the future power needs of the area require such an additional block of power—and I might point out that the Bonneville Power Administration reported in its 1960 annual report there is a surplus of power in BPA—there are other resources that can be developed to meet the need, including conventional steamplants. In fact, some of the power companies in the Pacific Northwest are already planning for the time when steam generating units will be required on their own systems. For this reason, it might be said that adding these electric generating facilities to Hanford would further postpone the use of coal-fired stations to firm up much of the Pacific Northwest's nonfirm hydropower.

Mr. Speaker, another criticism I have of this proposal is even more important than the first. This is that $95 million of sorely needed Federal funds would be used in such a way as to further aggravate conditions which we have attempted to alleviate by enacting the depressed areas bill. A serious concern of the Congress at that time was to devise means to forestall shifting industrial enterprises from one area to another. But, the availability of such a large block of heavily subsidized power would be used to lure industrial enterprises away from other sections of the country that are in desperate need of additional employment opportunities.

In urging that these generating facilities be added to the Hanford reactor, the Bonneville Power Administration said to do so would make possible the early sale of an additional 400,000 kilowatts of firm industrial power. Such an appeal from the BPA is by no means new. For years they have been saying:

> Low-cost hydroelectric power is the great drawing card for the Pacific Northwest. Ample supplies provide immediate opportunities for power-using industries.

Now they want to use $95 million of Federal funds—taken primarily from taxpayers in the industrialized East—to produce approximately 700,000 kilowatts of steam electric power. Which, by the way, would be the first Federal steam electric plant outside the TVA area.

There was be no question but what this power will be heavily subsidized, because the various studies of economic feasibility for this project indicate significant items of economic cost have been excluded from consideration. The studies have not been based upon the cost of producing power at the Hanford site, but rather have been based upon the economics of merely adding power to the heat source which will be finished late in 1962. As an example of the cost factors which have been excluded, I might point out that none of the capital costs of the plutonium reactor itself are charged to power production, in spite of the fact it would be impossible to produce power without the heat generated by the reactor. This to me, is just as illogical as attempting to evaluate power costs in a conventional plant based solely on generating costs and excluding the price which had to be paid for the boilers and other standard equipment required to produce steam to turn the generators.

Furthermore, no portion of the $25 million now being spent for the convertibility features of the reactor has been allocated to the cost of power. This, in spite of the fact, that it is admitted electricity could not be produced without such features and they serve no useful purpose other than making the addition of power generating facilities possible.

These are but two of the significant items of economic cost which have been excluded from the economic feasibility study of this project, and there are others. But I think they are sufficient to indicate that if power facilities are added, the resultant electricity would be heavily subsidized, and could be used by the Bonneville Power Administration to entice new industries into the Pacific Northwest.

It is interesting to note that on the basis of the percentage of Federal taxes borne by individuals in the various States, the people of Pennsylvania are being asked to pay almost $7 million toward the cost of adding electric power at Hanford.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question of my devotion to the orderly development of atomic power as rapidly as improved technology will allow. But, I cannot—and I will not—lend my support to a project such as the one being proposed at Hanford that will only very slightly, if at all, mean substantial advancement in reactor technology. There are many more advantageous ways for the Federal Government to use $95 million for the national good than to waste them on unnecessary and uneconomical undertakings such as this.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely feel that the addition of electric generating facilities to the new production reactor at a cost of $95 million will be contrary to the best interests of all the American people and will have the effect of dissipating many of the benefits which we hope will accrue from the enactment of the depressed area law.

I urge every Member of Congress to search deep within his conscience and answer truthfully whether he or she feels that this expenditure is absolutely necessary and is the best use of available Federal funds.

H.R. 6611

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week the House considered H.R. 6611, providing for a temporary reduction in the duty free allowance for returning American tourists. I support the basic principle of this legislation, but I believe sincerely that it should not apply to imports from our neighbors, Canada and Mexico.

Under the legislative procedures, it was not possible to amend the bill to except these imports from contiguous countries. Therefore, I had no choice but to oppose this legislation. On Wednesday, May 17, the House will vote on this bill.

Believing as I do in the basic principle of this legislation I am today introducing a substitute bill which carries out the fundamental intent but excepts imports from the two contiguous nations, Canada and Mexico.

Relocation of Right of Way of Canyon Power Project Tunnel Aqueduct, California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the Department of the Interior's approval of an application by the city and county of San Francisco to relocate a right-of-way for the canyon power project tunnel aqueduct to be constructed between O'Shaughnessy Dam at Hetch Hetchy Reservoir in Yosemite National Park and the Early Intake in Stanislaus National Forest.

This approval, pending for 2 years under the previous administration, was accomplished in little more than 3 months after the present administration took office, with Secretary Stewart Udall directing the operation of the Department of the Interior.

The relocation of the right-of-way will save the city of San Francisco approximately $1 million in construction costs. At the same time, the approval bound the city to engineering and esthetic considerations which will guarantee the preservation of fish and wildlife under optimum conditions and maintain the natural beauty of the site.

San Francisco Representative JOHN F. SHELLEY maintained close contact with the Interior Department in settlement of what at first appeared to be conflicting interests. Representative SHELLEY is widely and fondly known for his ability to negotiate happy conclusions to troubled situations.

It is proper that the Congressman's efforts are fully appreciated in his native city of San Francisco.

It gives me pleasure to call attention to the excellent editorial which appeared in the San Francisco Examiner, May 3, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAJOR SERVICE

For months it has been touch and go as to whether San Francisco would get the required Federal permit to relocate the aqueduct for its $21 million canyon power project

on the north side of Tuolumne Canyon in the Sierra. The relocation involves a saving of $1 million to the city.

This week, thanks largely to the quiet efforts of Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY, the permit was granted. Wisely, the permit requires the city to maintain a streamflow and preserve recreational values in the canyon.

We congratulate Congressman SHELLEY for performing a major service to this city.

New Superior California Product Breaks a European Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, California is justly proud of her great and historic vineyards and of her preeminent wine industry. We produce 92 percent of all the grapes and 85 percent of all the wines produced and consumed in our country. And now the College of Agriculture of the University of California has been able, through science, to improve the quality of the production of our vintners, and to produce a gourmet treasure.

A few weeks ago, at the World Trade Center in San Francisco, I made some comments on the new Premier Semillon, a new California wine, created by the joint efforts of the university and one of our great California wineries. I ask consent that those comments appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL, OF CALIFORNIA, MARCH 6, 1961, SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. Feldman, Dr. Amerine, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Nightingale, ladies and gentlemen, today California produces 92 percent of all the grapes and 85 percent of all the wine produced and consumed in the United States. As for jobs—a category of which all of us are particularly conscious—our vineyards and wineries employ, if seasonal workers are included, approximately 111,000 persons.

Those figures are not new to many of you. I iterate them to remind you that the accomplishment we honor today is part of something vital and important to our vital and important State. California and its wine industry have prospered together for almost 20 decades. It behooves all of us to do all in our power to strengthen that mutual prosperity in the decade of the sixties—and the decades to come.

The mutuality of California and its wine industry is due primarily to three causes.

The first is appreciation and utilization and, perhaps, I might add, improvement, of European winemaking know-how. Rather than trying to start from scratch, California's early vintners transplanted to the New World not only the cuttings but also the practices of the great Old World winemakers. And, incidentally, they included Armenians and Hungarians and Germans as well as Spaniards and Italians and Frenchmen. Charles Wetmore, who founded the Cresta Blanca Winery, which helped develop and bottle the great new wine we have just tasted, was a prominent enologist of his day who was commissioned by his fellow vintners in the early 1880's to sail to Europe and buy for them the finest European cuttings. Dr. Nelson and Mr. Nightingale used modern temperature and humidity controls to induce the noble mold to grow, but the Semillon grapes on which they induced it were handpicked from vines born 80 years ago in France.

The second major reason for the growth of our great wine industry is appreciation and utilization of intelligently controlled research. California vintners have not merely followed their ancestors. Led by the progressive college of agriculture of our great State university, they have tried constantly to improve the quality and yield of their grapes, and the purity as well as the taste of their wines. When the vineyards of Europe were threatened by the dread pest of phylloxora near the end of the 19th century, American roots were exported to France and Germany. Today, in one of the most interesting examples of cultural exchange the world has ever seen, the great vineyards of both Europe and California are stocked identically with American roots on to which European cuttings have been grafted. All three of the wines just tasted—the traditional California Semillon—the world-famous standard of excellence, Chateau d'Yquem—and our precedent-breaking new Premier Semillon—were pressed from grapes grown from European cuttings grafted to American rootstock.

Finally, California's wine industry was driven forward by the vigor and daring of our free-enterprise system. It took courage and confidence 80 years ago to nurture helpless vine seedlings when banking, shipping, and railroading were the accepted, safe-and-sane occupations for growth investment. And it took courage and confidence 5 years ago for Cresta Blanca to underwrite an experiment in applied science from which no immediate returns could possibly be foreseen.

There is, then, a heritage behind Premier Semillon—not only the obvious, European-rooted heritage of fine winemaking, but also the specific heritage of California's wine history. And that heritage and that history, I believe, are more important for what they portend than for what they have accomplished. This is nearly always true of a vigorous civilization such as ours, and it should be true: The future magnetizes the present, and overshadows the past. Only by growing can we remain a healthy social order, and only by looking ahead can we grow.

This is particularly true of an accomplishment like that represented by Cresta Blanca Premier Semillon. Its importance today lies in its promise for tomorrow. Certainly, no one is going to get rich on the 1,300 bottles a year that Mr. Nightingale is now producing and Mr. Feldman is now rationing like tickets to the Giants' opener next month.

It is a magnificent fact that production of California wine as represented by shipments last year set an alltime record of—I may as well be precise about this: 129,355,394.06 gallons. That's the official Wine Institute figure, and I plan to ask Roy Taylor who bought that six-hundredths of a gallon. That total is 3.92 percent higher than the 1959 figure, which was itself a record.

Two subsidiary facts directly related to the product being introduced today are, if anything, even more impressive.

Shipments of California table wine have burgeoned much more than shipments of all wine. Since 1952, total shipments of California wine have increased a little more than 11 percent, while shipments of table wine have risen a whopping 55 percent. In every year since 1952, table-wine shipments have been higher than the previous year.

Even more encouraging, California's premium table wines are doing best of all. Nobody publishes premium-wine as distinct from popular-priced-wine figures, but I have been able to learn that sales of premium wines from 1953 through 1959 increased more than 46 percent. The corresponding figure for all California table wines is around 25 percent, so premium wines are surging ahead at nearly double the rate of all table wines.

We can enjoy this pleasant picture, then: That segment of the California wine business which is doing best is the most culturally important, the most promising and the most profitable segment—the segment encompassing premium table wines.

And that is the segment to which the new wine honored here today belongs, and which, I am convinced, it will materially bolster.

I wouldn't dare try to improve on the descriptions of Premier Semillon presented so eloquently by Dr. Amerine, Dr. Nelson, Mr. Nightingale and Mr. Feldman, but I would like to point out that this superior new California product in effect has broken a European monopoly of one of the gourmet treasures of the world. With one or two minor exceptions, Premier Semillon represents the development in and by California of the only European wine type not previously produced successfully outside of Europe. It demolishes one of the few remaining bastions of European winemaking superiority.

From our viewpoint, the elimination of European exclusiveness in the production of botrytised wine is simultaneously an elimination of just about the only unfilled setting in the bracelet of great California premium wines.

Until the university and the Cresta Blanca winemasters applied their genius to the problem, the comfortably dry California days and pleasantly cool nights in which we glory, prevented us from also enjoying a wine of our own enriched by the noble mold. To unburden ourselves from the patronage of the lovers of Chateau d'Yquem and the other famous botrytised wines of France and Germany, we had to offset the perfection of our climate. That is quite an assignment. I salute the responsible gentlemen for accomplishing it, and I trust it will be accomplished for this purpose only.

I have waited throughout this program for one of my predecessors to tell the beautifully ironic story of an earlier conquest. I don't know whether they saved it for me or didn't do their homework, but here it is.

Among the cuttings Charles Wetmore brought back from Europe on the trip to which I have alluded were some from the world famous Chateau d'Yquem vineyard which Wetmore planted in his new acres in the Livermore Valley. The cuttings grew to vines, and in 1889 Wetmore entered a California white table wine made from grapes grown on those vines in the wine judging of the great Paris Exposition. As I was told the story, the upstart entry from an unknown winery in the unknown wine country of California was a laughing matter throughout Paris. On the day of the announcement of the winner, a single shrouded bottle stood on a long table. The shroud was removed, revealing—as the Grand Prix Gold Medal winner—Cresta Blanca's Livermore Valley entry.

To the chagrined audience of Parisiennes, the Marquis de Lur-Saluces, the owner of Chateau d'Yquem, gallantly made one of the great statements of wine history.

"The daughter has excelled the mother," the Marquis said of Wetmore's wine.

I have no intention of competing with a deceased Marquis who cannot fight back, but I cannot help suggesting—after tasting a vintage Chateau d'Yquem and our new Premier Semillon—that this great California winery has done it again.

In closing, thank you very much for allowing me to take part in this delightful ceremony.

Commuter and Other Passenger Services on the New Haven Railroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the major problems facing the people of Connecticut, and especially residents of Fairfield County, is the deterioration of service by the New Haven Railroad. This problem is an urgent one to some 30,000 people who must use the railroad to commute to their jobs each day.

The Honorable ABNER W. SIBAL, of the Fourth Connecticut District, which embraces all of Fairfield County, has introduced in the House of Representatives a bill proposing an interstate compact in which Connecticut, New York, and other affected States would unite to bring about an improvement in commuter and other passenger services by the New Haven Railroad. I hope that Representative SIBAL's excellent suggestion will be given serious consideration by the States concerned and by the Congress, which must give its consent to the proposed compact.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. SIBAL's bill, H.R. 6705, may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with an editorial from the Westport Town Crier entitled "Unsolved Problem," which comments favorably upon it, following these remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (H.R. 6705) to grant the consent of Congress to the States of Connecticut and New York, and other affected States, to enter into a compact relating to the taking of action to bring about improvement in commuter and other passenger services of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Connecticut and New York, and any other State affected by the commuter and other passenger services of the New York, New Haven, and Hartford Railroad, to enter into a compact designed to aid in the maintenance and improvement of such services of such railroad in the States which are parties to such compact, and such compact, among other things—

(1) shall provide machinery necessary for the determination of the need of such railroad for public funds and the uses to which such funds should be put;

(2) shall contain provisions to insure that any public funds made available would be used to improve commuter and other passenger services;

(3) shall provide for financial participation by each State which is a party to the compact; and

(4) shall provide for giving the public a voice in the policies of such railroad insofar as they relate to commuter and other passenger services.

SEC. 2. No such compact shall be binding or obligatory on any party thereto unless it shall have been ratified by the legislature of each State which is a party thereto and shall have been approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved.

UNSOLVED PROBLEM

Congressman SIBAL's proposal for an interstate authority as a further step toward solution of the commuter problem in States served by the New Haven Railroad comes as a timely reminder that the matter of the New Haven is by no means finished business.

It is true that the legislatures of three out of four States have approved multi-million-dollar tax concessions designed to aid the railroad. The commuters have coughed up with still another 10-percent fare increase. Not only, however, do a number of the other points in the agreed-upon program await implementation, but the overall economic climate assures that the emergency program itself will not be enough.

It will be recalled that the four-State emergency project involved State aid, which is partially arranged for; commuter contribution, which was first to come; Federal aid in the form of repeal of the tax on passenger transportation, for which the Kennedy administration has shown no enthusiasm; and a program of improvement of service on the part of the railroad, which is hardly visible as yet.

Even these, however, do not strike at the heart of the problem. Thanks largely to the system of superhighways that has been developed—and is still being developed—the New Haven's freight revenues are not likely to rise to the former level. Even with the tax concessions, it is not at all certain that carrying commuters is not, per se, a losing proposition. This combination can only mean continued financial distress for the railroad and continued pressure on commuter service.

It was all to the good that our lawmakers, finally and belatedly, stepped in and performed an emergency bailout for the New Haven. The fact is, however, that they did so without adequate background information and with no real plan for the future. They failed entirely to answer the really basic questions: Will it be possible to continue commuter operations under private management, or should the public take a hand? Is the present operating management adequate? How feasible are plans for complete operating reorganization, such as the Baldwin-Towers proposal?

These are just a few of the questions that must be answered. The time to look for those answers is now, not when the next severe crisis raises its ugly head. Connecticut has suffered from Ex-Governor Ribicoff's 6-year neglect of this problem. It is encouraging to see freshman Congressman SIBAL urging a look ahead. He deserves the legislature's support.

Zeal for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the address I delivered on May 1 in Tulsa, Okla., at an extraordinary Americanism Day rally of northeastern Oklahoma junior and senior high school students in Skelly Stadium. It was sponsored by the Intercounty Council of Civitan International, which includes four clubs in Tulsa, and one each in Sand Springs, and Broken Arrow, Okla.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZEAL FOR FREEDOM

(By Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma)

What a great honor it is to be here today, to be chosen to address this huge Civitan Americanism Day program welcoming 36 new citizens, to be a part of the answer of the freedom-loving citizens of Oklahoma, of America, and of the world to the challenge of the Soviet conspiracy on this May Day. I want to thank the six Civitan clubs who launched this Americanism Day observance, in a new dimension, with thousands of students participating.

Years ago Americans stood idly by as the wobblies, the psychopaths, the unbalanced and the hard core Communists observed May Day as a day dedicated to the propagation of communism, and its fellow-travelers marched in regimented style attempting to show worldwide adherence to their slave-state system.

Today the answer of the free world to this challenge of captives of communism gives ringing proof of the vitality and dedication of free men around the world. Students participating today from 23 public high schools and 4 parochial schools give a new and strong emphasis to America's answer.

I am thankful that Civitan International here in northeastern Oklahoma has planned full participation of our young Americans in this day. The American Bar Association, the American Heritage Foundation, the National Governors Conference, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Educational Association, the International Association of Police Chiefs, the Association of American Law Schools, the National Conference of Bar Presidents, the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions International, and dozens of other national and local organizations join with Civitan International to today dedicate themselves to an American offensive against this seizure of May Day as a day dedicated to communism.

It is fitting indeed that instead of permitting this seizure through abdication of Democratic zeal in our system, that we make it our day of observance of the power, dignity, and moral strength, a day dedicated to our belief in the eternal and undying principle of law and order.

Two Presidents have marked May 1 previously as Americanism Day, by proclamation. Last month, President Kennedy did likewise.

DEMOCRACY CHALLENGES FALSE DOCTRINES

More than 40,000 celebrations were held as the United States last year observed this law day of dedication to the eternal verities of individual freedoms guaranteed by law. Each year the national impact of a resurgent democracy challenging the false doctrines of communism grows as America's answer to the slavery of the mind, the body and the spirit that holds captive one-third of the world's population.

Today here in Tulsa, as elsewhere throughout the entire Nation, we observe this day as a militant answer of America's youth, of its adults, and of its new American citizens receiving their rights of citizenship—there were 364 new citizens in Oklahoma last year—and as a day of militant free men unwilling to sacrifice our birthright for the chains of dictatorial rule over every facet of our daily life.

These priceless freedoms to walk erect in dignity as individuals instead of pawns of an all-powerful state did not come to our forefathers on a silver platter. They did not come in ease or complacency as a casual gift nor as the answer to a frivolous wish. They came because men and women chose to risk

death rather than to submit to the imprisonment of their minds and spirits by alien control that could bend them to their will or force their compliance to the goals of the chosen few in the privy council or the Kremlin.

Today in Red Square in Moscow and in the dozens of captive satellite countries overrun by communism the youth of those nations march in regimentation to the pageantry of their system. Massive propaganda efforts, worldwide in their scope, attempt to portray this pageantry of flags, of armed might, of massed marching as the wave of the future in the world contest in which freedom everywhere is challenged.

With the power to command compliance, with a state-owned press, with the suppression of all avenues of open and free criticism or thought, this ominous wave of massed millions seeks to convince the underprivileged billion people of the new nations that communism is so militant, so vigorous, so overwhelming in its zeal and missionary spirit that the old-fashioned freedom of democracy will fall before the loud blasts of its shrill and screaming trumpets.

But all the pomp and ceremony of the Soviet system that masks the ugly treachery of conspiracy and contempt fails to realize the span of nearly 3 centuries that gave deep root and substance to the democracy and freedoms that are our priceless heritage.

FRONTIER NO PICNIC

It was not an easy task that the Pilgrims took to carve out a place for religious freedom on our continent. It was no accident that we transplanted the Magna Carta into the soil of the colonies of Virginia and Pennsylvania. It was no picnic to transform a hostile frontier into a homeland for patriots who loved their God, revered the law and were willing to die rather than submit to any government that was not of their own choosing. Their right to freedom under laws of their own making took precedence over the accumulation of wealth, of power or of prestige. Next only to the love of family, for whom they sought this freedom in perpetuity, was their love of America and the hope it held for liberty for all mankind.

It was this torch of freedom that was passed on to much of the world as it existed then. It was this spark of democratic zeal that swept away the long-established dynasties that had long ruled the Western World by divine right of kings. Thus it was American ideals of liberty that set the course for dozens of other nations to achieve their freedom.

Eight wars, from the Revolutionary War of 1776 to the Korean war of 1950, have been waged to preserve the freedoms of man. In America and around the world, the blood and resources of this Nation have been spent that all manner of men could hope for a way of life of brotherhood in equality instead of slave and master.

Yet growing out of the rubble and ruin of two World Wars has come a new virus of totalitarian dictatorship that is threatening to quench the light of liberty and hope that was lighted over the years at such cost in life and property.

Today by subversion, conquest, and revolution this mighty force seeks to expand its system to the very shores of our continent. Nearly one-third of the world's people today are under its ironclad rule as it reaches now westward for still more power.

It wears many faces and speaks with many voices. Its methods are ever-changing but its motives never change. Purporting to end colonial power, it actually (but secretly) seeks to build up the most ruthless colonial empire ever known. Falsely speaking for freedom, it woos the newly independent nations into a new and viciously captive state. Propagandizing for peace and disarmament, it seeks under this false cover to subvert new millions to iron curtain power.

WAR IS INVISIBLE

It is a war of new dimensions that we face, not a war wherein the brave and the bold can face on the battlefield the enemy of freedom. From 5,000 miles away through outer space is the ever-present threat of total war of annihilation by ICBM. One hundred divisions, mobilized on two continents, add more threats to their so-called "peaceful expansion" of the Communist philosophy. Blackmail, espionage, agents provocateur, volunteers, and military training missions add to the underground methods by which expansion of the system is forced on the unwary or the weak nations that fall in the path of their desires. It is an invisible war in which the outstretched hand is in reality the mailed fist. May Day in the Communist world is the pageant of its method of exploitation and expansion of its system.

Never underestimate the dedication and zeal of the Communists for their cause.

That is why this huge rally of Tulsa's youth today is important. We must show ourselves and the world that the missionary zeal and dedication that we have for our system of democracy and freedom is greater than their zest for and belief in their slave-state system. That is why we must on this day have a greater sense of responsibility for the preservation of our heritage than can be lathered into the pageantry in Red Square, Moscow—or in Peiping or Budapest or Prague or Warsaw. We must have it because we know and understand the great difference between our two systems.

In the kind of war that we face, hot or cold, we must understand that our enthusiasm for our system must be more sustained, more enduring, more vigorous and more intelligently directed than the Communists can muster from their regimented captive peoples. If we do not have this sustained sense of enthusiasm against all obstacles, we may lose the conflict in the years to come.

There are times, as we face them now, when the tide of battle in the invisible war seems to run against us and the course of freedom everywhere. These are merely individual battles, only a small part of the enduring and lasting conflict that may go on for decades before this threat of Communist domination of the world will be ended.

RUSSIANS NOT 10 FEET TALL

We would make great errors if we suddenly decided that the Russian Communists have grown 10 feet tall, or that their achievement of a man in space marked the final decision in the conflict. They have their failures, too, although a controlled press can hide their failures while we tell the world of all our actions, good or bad.

In such conflict, whether in actual brush war as in Laos today, or in Cuba, the fortunes may go temporarily against us. These reversals must not be a time for despair or a signal to weaken us in our purpose. They signal instead a time for reexamination of the broad scope of the conflict and of its ever-changing course. They should inspire Americans everywhere to new vigor and new determination to build our strength and our determination to carry on to a final victory.

Russians and their captives are of the oriental mind. Time means little to them as they calculate the impatience of the Western World. If a score of years finds them ahead of where they are today—they mark it as a victory of great importance. They hope that because of the impatience of America and our Western allies, they can wear us out as we weary of the continuous tensions and conflict. Sustained, determined, steadfast we must be in order not to fall victims of the fatigue of the ebb and flow of the cold war fortunes.

Perhaps we are facing a new and a different call to duty in the battalions of freedom than our forefathers answered. Theirs was a call to die for freedom if it were necessary. Ours may be to risk dying, but also to be ever conscious that we must be willing to think for our country, to understand the cold, calculating movements of the Communist conspiracy in every part of the world, and to react with a clear, unimpassioned mind in the way that will best serve America and uphold the shield of liberty we carry for most of the free world as well.

The long, tedious task of constant readiness to fight if need be with conventional weapons or with missiles may be the duty of this generation. But on top of this military readiness must be even other offensive weapons in the field of winning the hearts and minds of a billion of the world's people in the new and uncommitted nations. This billion of the world's population will look either to the United States or to communism for leadership in the decades to come.

THINK FOR COUNTRY

Today some of them lean toward communism in the new nations of Africa, southeast Asia, the Middle East, and in Latin America. They are not lost to the free world, yet, but the siren song of quick industrialization, a better standard of living, and world trade with the Iron Curtain bloc is false, but attractive bait to undeveloped nations emerging from centuries of colonial rule. What a shame it would be in modern history if these people won their freedom from one form of colonial rule to exchange it for a more ruthless, vicious colonial system under the Communist hammer and sickle.

Thus, we must not only be prepared to die for America and freedom in today's threat, but to think and serve in ways that will make it possible to prevent this world's domination by communism, of which Mr. Khrushchev so often boasts.

This one-third of the world's people must be permitted to see the good and the bad in our system of democracy by our acts and deeds, not just our words. And it must be made possible for them to see clearly, without the rose-colored glasses of Communist propaganda, the acts and deeds, not just words, of the Kremlin conspiracy.

To do this will take great efforts, not on the battlefield, but in the schoolroom, in the laboratories, in the hospitals, in the mines and on the farms of the farflung areas of the continents were these billion people live. We, with our science and our feeling of the brotherhood of man, must find ways to show the true and kindly face, the humanitarian face, of Uncle Sam. We must show that, while our fist is a strong shield of freedom, the hand is open in friendship and in cooperation for their chance to develop a prosperous, progressive freedom-loving democracy where man is the master of his own destiny, the author of his own scheme of business, the owner of his own enterprise, and the one who can make his own decisions instead of carrying out the orders of a foreign master.

SHOW BY DEEDS OUR LOYALTY

We must show them by deeds, not words, that we on the freedom side of the world seek friends and partners, not slaves or automatons carrying out the orders of distant masters.

By unlocking the secrets of nature through atomic research in health, engineering, and peaceful power, by transforming the salty waters of the seas surrounding desert lands into vast sources of usable irrigation water, by engineering and by education, we can with the perseverance, patience and endurance that the conflict requires, in God's good time roll back the Iron Curtain so that democracy and freedom will again take the offensive.

And in so doing, by our concern for the freedom and development of all manner of men, we earn anew for centuries to come

the right to be known as the defender of man's precious freedoms and the friend who helped a billion of the world's underprivileged people to find their way into the 20th century.

Massachusetts Lauds National Commander John E. Erickson, Veteran of World War I, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include part of my remarks delivered at a dinner in honor of John E. Erickson, national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., held under the auspices of the Department of Massachusetts in the town hall in Stoneham, Mass., on Sunday evening, May 14, 1961. Department Commander Edwin Hayden Lombard was toastmaster of the evening:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Greetings, in my travels—from barracks to barracks—I have noticed a special spirit that distinguishes the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., from other veterans' groups.

Like them, we are united by shared memories.

And we have our own legislative program.

But more important than these—in some respects—are the strong social ties that transform comradeship into friendship.

This closer relationship is evidenced by the warm welcome that we give to our national commander, John E. Erickson, here in the hometown of Department Commander Edwin H. Lombard.

Stoneham sent many volunteers to serve with the famous 26th Yankee Division. That was one of the first to fight in 1917, and earned one of the best combat records in the American Expeditionary Force.

Stoneham has a long tradition of service for freedom, beginning with the farmers and tradesmen who fought a short distance from here, at Bunker Hill, and Concord and Lexington.

This area is rich in patriotic traditions.

That spirit was exemplified on May 5 of this year. Our neighbor from Derry, N.H., less than 40 miles north of Stoneham, became the world's first true astronaut as he operated the manual controls of the space capsule named "Freedom 7" 115 miles above the earth.

What inspired Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., with pioneering courage?

It was the example of his parents and his community.

His father served in World War I and World War II.

In the years between and since, he made it a daily custom to fly the American flag outside his home, and outside his downtown business office.

His son grew up as a participant in this moving ritual. Patriotic reverence for the flag, and the ideals that it symbolizes, developed the courage and the faith in freedom that we admire in Commander Shepard.

As veterans of World War I, we feel that we are related in spirit to this brave young officer of the U.S. Navy.

Our active service ended long ago but from that experience we learned a continuing devotion to what is best for our country.

There are some people with no faith in anything but themselves who seize upon the slightest pretext to discredit the veterans and the organizations that represent them.

It was our turn to be the target a short time ago when some newspapers carried the report that the veterans of World War I had spent over $200,000 in lobbying for a separate monthly pension for all veterans of the First World War. This made us out to be "Mr. Big" among all the lobbies.

Our guest of honor, National Commander Erickson, promptly exposed the false charge that our organization had spent more money on lobbying efforts in 1960, than any other of the 283 groups who must report on these activities to the Congress.

As a matter of fact, we had only spent $31,000, including items that did not have to be reported, such as the purchase of office equipment and miscellaneous outlays.

We knew that our organization was growing rapidly, but we also knew that it was not so prosperous that it could spend more money on influencing legislation than the National Association of Manufacturers, for example, or any of the other powerful lobbies.

Although the truth is that we spent $31,000 instead of $200,000 for this purpose, the charge that was subsequently disproved shows that some people on the outside are jumping the gun and are apprehensive about the actual progress we are making.

For this growth we give credit to the energetic leadership of Commander John E. Erickson.

Last year we had a membership of 170,000. It is expected that the total will pass the 200,000 mark, by the time of the national convention in September.

In the name of the 67 barracks in Massachusetts with returns still coming in we thank our national commander for his hard work and his success in building up the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

I think that some of his ancestors must have come from Massachusetts, because Commander Erickson typifies the patriotism, the courage, and the determination of the Massachusetts officer of World War I who gave us this battle cry: "The command is 'Forward'."

Community Development Key to Economic Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a strong economy provides a foundation upon which to build a dynamic social, political, and military structure to serve and protect the Nation.

This involves:

Strengthening of our free enterprise system;

Smoothing out lines of cooperation between local-State-Federal governments and free enterprise, in creating jobs and producing commodities for progress;

Putting more "muscle" into our national defense;

Fulfilling the human needs of our people.

In creating such machinery to meet challenges to our security and progress, we must not overlook the potentials of effective leadership and support at the community level.

Recently, I was privileged to publish an article in the County Officer entitled "Community Development—Key to Economic Progress." The article reflects upon the ways in which community action can strengthen our overall economy. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT—KEY TO ECONOMIC PROGRESS

(By the Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY, U.S. Senator from Wisconsin)

(Whether you are a prosperous county, merely interested in increasing the economic potential you already have, a growing county seeking new industry, or a depressed area looking for a push to get you off economic dead center, this article, written by a famous and respected Member of the U.S. Senate, may prove to be the most profitable piece of reading you will do this year. Senator WILEY, in this exclusive article for County Officer, has outlined a finely detailed, clearly marked blueprint for your county's economic future.)

The progress and security of our Nation and its people depend upon a strong, dynamic, forward-moving economy. A good rate of economic progress, however, can be attained only by full utilization of our human and natural resources.

Today, the challenges to our economic system are manifold, including the need for:

Maximum employment;

A good rate of business, industrial and other commercial activity;

Fulfilling the growing needs of a fast-expanding population;

Competing successfully against the Communist system;

Proving to the world that our free economic system, operated by a free people, can best serve a nation and its citizens.

To attain these objectives requires cooperation among citizens, local government and free enterprise, to creatively tailor plans to the needs of each locality.

By experience, programs have been evolved to provide a framework of action within which communities can move ahead to resolve economic problems and to promote progress. Among the major ones are included:

Encouraging greater industrial development in both urban and rural areas;

Creating a better climate of opportunity for job-creating businesses—large and small;

Expanding rural development programs, particularly in areas of chronically low income;

Exploring for new economic opportunities, such as promoting tourism, to bolster local economies.

Other efforts for maximum utilization of natural and human resources to serve our people are also needed.

Local-State interests—working with, and utilizing services provided by, Federal agencies—also can serve to promote progress in these areas of economic activity.

SPURRING INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS

Now, what can be done, for example, to spur industrial progress? This can be accomplished in two ways:

(1) By attracting new industries:

A community development committee can be formed to:

Determine quantity and skills of available workers;

Study economic trends in area;

Determine likely industrial prospects;

Survey local market needs and opportunities;

Enlist assistance of State engineering schools, bureaus of business research, etc., to assist in specific technical problems;

Discover why in the past, industry may have failed, or moved away;

Survey locally available natural resources and industrial potential;

Set up clearinghouse of information on sources of venture capital;

Examine and utilize applicable methods of successful industrial expansion programs of other communities;

Determine needed civic improvements, i.e., traffic arteries, store fronts, garbage disposal, street paving, etc.

Enlist assistance of Office of Area Development of the Department of Commerce and the Business and Defense Administration;

Review and, as possible, favorably adjust tax system and/or other local government services.

Having made these determinations, projects to remedy weaknesses should be commenced and publication and promotion of area's advantages should be undertaken. Additional steps may include: developing and reserving for industry suitable industrial sites; modernizing old industrial facilities, and building new ones. Financing for such efforts can be raised by contributions or floating bonds.

(2) To expand existing industry:

Steps include efforts to:

Find sources of business expansion loans (banks, individuals, insurance companies, the Small Business Administration);

Initiate local business and industry improvement clinics with assistance of local trade associations, government field officers, university engineering and business schools;

Render where possible, or suggest specialists to render, market and product development assistance.

The Office of Area Development of the Department of Commerce provides technical services to States and local communities; issues publications on area development problems, and assists States and local groups to:

Create new industrial diversification;

Acquire and prepare land for industrial use;

Organize industrial districts;

Develop new products;

Locate new markets;

Locate industrial prospects;

Help manufacturers who are seeking sites for new branch plants on plant location data.

IMPROVING THE OUTLOOK FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Now, how is it possible to brighten the outlook for small business? Nationwide, there are over 4.6 million enterprises, of which about 95 percent are in this category.

To help meet some of the different problems, the Small Business Administration provides a number of services to small businesses and local companies seeking to raise employment or economic development in a community.

The programs include:

(1) Local development company loans:

Companies having a broad base of ownership may borrow funds to buy land and either build a new factory or expand and convert an existing plant, provided the project will aid a small business concern.

(2) Production assistance:

Small businesses are invited to register their facilities at the SBA regional office. The SBA acts as a clearinghouse for services which small firms may offer other small firms or larger firms.

(3) Research and development assistance:

Technical assistance is provided by SBA on—

Product research;

New product potential;

Processing methods;

Product and marketing developments;

New industrial uses for materials; and

Industrial uses for agricultural products.

Assistance is also rendered through—

Advice on problems of plant location and plant space and undertaking the locating of tools or materials needed.

Awarding of a certificate of competency, to the small business is a device to encourage it to bid in competition with larger firms for Government contracts.

Management courses, in conjunction with local educational institutions.

Management counseling with SBA regional office.

Management seminars and 1-day conferences.

Publishing information on available materials, patents, and "how-to" articles.

(4) Financial assistance:

Business loans for financing on reasonable terms when it is not otherwise available through private lending sources;

Disaster loans granted to aid firms stricken by either physical damage or economic injury.

In general, the assistance rendered small business emphasizes efforts to aid areas adversely affected by: Unemployment, economic dislocation, chronic depression, and "natural" economic shifts.

DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS "POOLS"

The development of small business "pools," also, is helping to meet some problems that could not otherwise be resolved, such as programs to:

Collect market and research information related to a particular industry for dissemination to participating members;

Contract, acquire or establish laboratories and other facilities for the conduct of research;

Prosecute applications for patents and render patent services for participating members; as well as

Negotiate and grant licenses under patents held under joint programs.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Today, urban-rural communities are becoming more closely integrated and interdependent. Consequently, greater cooperation is essential to progress. Local business, industry, and services, for example, may depend upon the buying power of the farmers in the surrounding community. The rural development program aims at resolving economic problems in chronically depressed areas in agriculture.

The general objective of the rural development program is to assist in remedying low income on farms and disadvantaged rural families.

The major targets of the program include:

Providing farm families with information and ability to gain tools, land and skills for successful farming;

Education and job training;

Health services and community sanitation;

Expansion of markets for products of small farms, i.e., new processing plants, additional co-ops;

Changes in crops and increased crop production;

Forestry and conservation assistance for small woodlots and timber processing enterprises;

Water resource development;

Industrial development, etc.

About 200 counties in 30 States have been designated for the rural development program.

The accomplishments achieved have been:

New businesses and services activities have added nearly 18,000 full- or part-time jobs;

Market improvement projects started;

Soil mapping completed on farms in rural development areas;

Projects in health services reported;

Rural clubs organized in communities, to exchange ideas on promoting better living;

And other steps that have improved income and farm life.

How can a local county with chronic low-income initiate a rural development program? A county may apply to the State rural development committee. The committee decides which counties and/or areas will be designated, and how extensive the program will be in those areas. Even though the county may not be designated a rural county under the program, it can ask the State extension service for technical assistance. It can, under its own aegis, follow closely the form of the rural development counties. And, if the State rural development committee assents, it can have the help of rural development agents on specific problems.

CUTTING A BIGGER "SLICE" OF THE "TOURIST PIE"

In exploring for new economic opportunities, let's take a look at the development of tourist trade. Tourism is one of the fastest-developing businesses in the United States. Annually, tourists in this country spend between $15 and $20 billion.

By developing tourist attractions, a great many communities can cut for themselves a larger slice of this "economic pie."

Overall, tourism benefits not just a few, but many segments of the community's economy, including services, transportation, accommodations, entertainment, cleaning services, products such as sporting equipment, souvenirs, fashions, etc., utilities (power, water, light). The result: greater economic growth and easing of the local tax burden. A secondary benefit from tourism is that it attracts new industry through increase in population, pleasant locale for plant location, etc.

A great many communities, either by exploiting an existing potential or even by importing one, can probably turn themselves into meccas which will appeal to tourists. Examples of attractions:

A good inn, an historical landmark (battlesite, churches, mill, etc.);

A body of water, an animal preserve;

Hills, mountains, valleys, forests or woods;

Geological formations and other natural or man-made features.

Programs that will develop tourist trade include:

A facelifting program for unsightly areas, refuse, junk; paint and spruce up; encourage clean, comfortable lodging places with well-cooked, well-served meals;

Developing or improving specific tourist attractions; obtain expert advice in restoring historic structures, draining lakes, etc.

Determine from what areas to attract tourists, and then advertise; enlist cooperation of area newspapers, magazines, TV and radio stations to help sell community.

What are basic tourist habits? According to a report by the Department of Commerce:

Eighty percent travel by car;

Sixty-nine percent stay in motels;

Twenty-six percent stay in hotels and resorts; 27 percent with friends and relatives. (These add up to more than 100 percent because many tourists use more than one type of accommodation on a trip);

Most tourists take two vacation trips a year, totaling 20 or more days;

Seventeen percent go in the winter; 18 percent in spring; 40 percent in summer; 25 percent in fall;

Average annual expenditure per family is $400;

Roughly 1 out of 12 goes abroad each year. The rest stay in the United States, the largest single tourists market in the world.

Tourist development programs can be supported by private or business financing; by group (chamber of commerce, community associations, etc.) contributions; or other ways. Overall expanding tourism promises ever-greater economic opportunity for the

years ahead. Why? Because of paid and increasingly longer vacations, good roads, more leisure time and money, early retirement, more education—all these portend a fast-growing opportunity for the American to travel.

SUMMARY

This, then, is a brief look at some opportunities to better utilize our human and natural resources for economic progress. Our success is dependent upon forward-looking, hard-working creative leadership, including private citizens, county officials, civic leaders, and others. In facing the future, however, I am confident that—as in the past—such high-quality leaders will continue to emerge to do a successful job of building a stronger economy.

Shortage of Physicians and How To Solve It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting into the RECORD the text of an address by Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo, entitled "A National Emergency—Ways of Meeting the Physician Shortage," as well as a copy of a letter I am this day addressing to the Honorable OREN HARRIS, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, calling his attention to the address.

Dr. Maurillo is a member of the board of regents of the University of the State of New York. He has headed several committees of the board of regents in studying medical education in Europe and has made several notable recommendations which have since been adopted. In this address, delivered on May 16, 1961, before the International Congress of Surgeons in Chicago, he makes some very interesting observations on medical education in the United States and suggests ways to solve the problem of physician shortage.

His address is as follows:

A NATIONAL EMERGENCY—WAYS OF MEETING THE PHYSICIAN SHORTAGE

(An address by Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo)

For the past 13 years I have been trying my best to prove to medical educators that there really is a shortage of doctors in the United States and something must be done about it.

The Board of Regents of New York State has accepted one important suggestion that was made: they have approved medical education given in Italy, Switzerland, France, Holland, Belgium, and Ireland. Now 400 to 500 American doctors are being graduated every year from the institutions in those countries. I was the chairman of each of the committees which made the study of European medical education and which made the recommendations to the board of regents.

On May 8, 1956, I gave an address before the 150th annual meeting of the New York State Medical Society in which I emphasized the critical need for more doctors. The New York Times, in an excellent editorial on the following day, quoted important parts of my speech and my conclusions.

Congressman Francis E. Dorn, of Brooklyn, N.Y., presented to his fellow Congressmen the entire New York Times editorial and a résumé of my speech. This was repeated in the U.S. Senate and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On May 29, 1956, Congressman Dorn introduced a bill (H.R. 11518) which incorporated all of my conclusions with particular emphasis on the part which suggested that an impartial, disinterested congressional committee be appointed to study the reasons for the shortage of doctors in the United States. This bill has been pigeonholed every year since its introduction as a result of the action of lobbyists.

On March 28, 1957, I delivered a major address on the same subject before the New York State Board of Regents. Copies were sent to all the medical college deans of New York, to all college and university presidents, to all assemblymen and senators, and to the Congressmen and two U.S. Senators from New York State. In that speech, I also stated that specialization in medicine was getting out of control and that 80 percent or more of the graduates of medical colleges wanted to specialize. I then suggested that all specialty education should be controlled by the medical colleges and that a Ph. D. degree should be awarded to each specialist.

In July 1959, I was summoned to Washington to testify in connection with a bill concerning the grant of $50 million a year for international health research. The Congressmen were alerted by my talk to the peril to national health caused by the shortage of doctors and they were urged to amend the bill by adding $50 million a year for medical education. This bill was kept in committee with no chance of passing.

The need for more physicians is common knowledge today. Even the AMA and the deans of the medical colleges admit that our country needs more medical faculty doctors, more research doctors, more full-time doctors for our independent hospital centers, more doctors for public health and mental hospitals and for industrial clinics, more interns and residents, and—most important—more general practitioners for our 180 million people. A very conservative estimate of the shortage of doctors would be 35,000 and this could easily be stretched to 50,000.

Now let us look at the reason behind this critical shortage. Many experts concede that the United States had enough doctors in 1935 for its 125 million people. You must bear in mind that 75 percent of the total number of doctors were doing general practice in that year. Today the percentage of doctors doing general practice is less than 30 percent.

In 1935, 77 medical colleges graduated 5,183 doctors.

In 1950, 79 medical colleges graduated 6,135 doctors.

In 1955, 82 medical colleges graduated 6,845 doctors.

In 1960, 85 medical colleges graduated 7,081 doctors.

I mention these figures to show that in a period of 25 years—and even with the addition of eight new medical colleges—there was an increase of only 27 percent or fewer than 1,900 doctors. This small, inadequate increase does not compensate for the more than 3,500 doctors who die each year.

In 1935, the medical colleges and other agencies doing medical research spent about $1 million of Federal, State, and private money; in 1940, about $5 million; in 1948, approximately $90 million; and in 1960, approximately $730 million. The last sum, $730 million, is more than the total amount of money spent for medical research in the rest of the world.

The Federal Government gave the following amounts to medical colleges in 1960: Harvard, $7,130,919; Columbia, $4,427,285; New York University, $4,772,755; University of Michigan, $4,025,157; the two New York State medical colleges, $2,069,087. Each medical college in the United States received upward of $500,000 in 1960.

The figures are not available, but I doubt that the entire cost of undergraduate medical education in the 85 medical colleges can be more than $125 million a year.

Should there exist such a great discrepancy—$730 million for medical research versus $125 million for medical education? I am not against research work for I am convinced that it is absolutely necessary in our very competitive world. Let us be reasonable. We should not spend such a large amount of money for research without first producing more doctors. Let us not put the cart before the horse. If we want to get full value for the money spent, we should have research doctors who are really dedicated individuals.

Recently we have been reading in the daily newspapers that there are not enough college graduates available for medical education. Here is the record on this score:

Last year, the 85 medical colleges selected about 8,100 students from a list of more than 15,000 students who had been recommended by the premedical faculty committee in each of the colleges and universities in the United States. All these students had been screened during each year of college work and only those with the highest averages were recommended. If the medical colleges want more students, why don't they take more female students? Why this discrimination? Why do females constitute only 5 percent of the total number of medical students? It isn't that way in other countries, 50 percent or more of the doctors in Russia are females. Why are more than 2,300 Americans studying medicine in foreign countries? It seems to me that the medical colleges should be grateful for the fact that they have a fine selection of students to choose from. I am absolutely sure that more students would want to become doctors if some of the existing barriers were removed.

Russia, with 68 medical colleges, graduates more than 14,000 doctors a year. In 1960, 1,000 doctors were graduated from the University of Paris Medical College. This is about one-seventh of the total number of doctors who were graduated from the 85 medical colleges in the United States in the same year. Let me emphasize this point: these graduates from the University of Paris are well-trained doctors. They are ready to practice immediately after graduation without internship training and I would trust any one of them to do good general practice of medicine in any country in the world.

The Japanese tried our system of medical education. They built 80 medical colleges with an average capacity similar to ours. They have learned their lesson. Today they have centralized and have only 44 colleges. They expect to have only 40 by 1965. Their doctors are better trained today in the larger medical centers. Why? Because the cost of operating small medical centers is tremendous and uneconomical.

What is the best treatment to combat this very critical shortage of doctors in the United States? I suggest two practical solutions.

My first plan:

Congress should pass a bill at this 1961 session and incorporate the following:

(a) Allocate to the 85 private medical colleges $50 million with no strings attached other than the guarantee mentioned below. Beginning with the freshman class of 1962 and at a rate of $4,000 per student for each of 4 years, this money is to be paid to the colleges for the undergraduate medical education of each additional student admitted beyond the total of the 1961 freshman enrollment. The colleges must guarantee the acceptance of 3,125 students above their 1961 enrollment, otherwise the Federal Government will not grant any research money.

In this manner, the colleges will produce 3,000 doctors by 1966.

(b) Allocate another $25 million to the 41 State medical colleges on a matching-plan basis; $2,000 of Federal money for $2,000 of State money for each additional student admitted beyond the total of the 1961 freshman enrollment. Likewise, this is to begin with the 1962 freshman class. As for the private colleges, no research money will be given unless additional students are accepted.

(c) Allocate $10 million for medical scholarships on the basis of need and at a minimum of $300 and a maximum of $1,500. This will increase the number of scholarships each year by 2,500.

(d) Set up a fund of $5 million for medical student aid. This fund will guarantee the payment of loans made to students by the banks of the United States and will pay the interest of 6 percent on the loans for 6 years.

This bill will not cost more than $90 million a year after 1966. In 4 years time, it will have produced 6,000 more doctors a year. By means of the scholarship and student-aid plans, it will stimulate college students to enter the profession of medicine. This bill can be financed from the money saved by the Federal Government since it will not add, until 1966, $1 to the present allowance for medical research.

My second plan:

Congress should pass a bill at this 1961 session and incorporate the following:

(a) Allocate $50 million a year to the 86 medical colleges for trisemester undergraduate medical education in 1962. The formula for the best method in which to divide the money among the colleges can be worked out either on the basis of student population, or on the size of the medical college or on the number of doctors to be graduated. This plan was used during World War II and, to the best of my knowledge, it was successful.

(b) Allocate $10 million for scholarship money as in plan I.

(c) Allocate $5 million for student aid as in plan I.

The number of doctors graduating under this plan will depend on whether a new class is admitted each semester or only every other semester. I can assure you that the increase in the number of doctors will be greater than 50 percent.

Now, what would be the cost of adding 30 medical college centers with the capacity to graduate 150 doctors yearly in each college—a total of 4,500 doctors. The money required would be $1½ billion for capital costs and between $150 million to $300 million per year for operating expenses. Isn't this a tremendous and fantastic amount of money to pay for the education of an additional 4,500 doctors a year? It would take 8 years before the first doctor is graduated. Thirty thousand doctors will be needed to operate the 30 medical centers. By 1970, the population of the United States will be 210 million. Where are the doctors to come from who are needed to take care of that population?

My conclusion is that there is no need to study this problem further. We have reached the emergency point. Congress must act now and not next year. I firmly believe that the deans of the medical colleges will accept the first plan. At any rate, either plan is much better than building 30 more medical college centers. It is especially better for the taxpayers who must pay the bill.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the pleasure of transmitting to you a copy of an address by Dr. Dominick F. Maurillo, which he delivered today at the International Congress of Surgeons now being held in Chicago. The title of his address is "A National Emergency—Ways of Meeting the Physician Shortage."

Dr. Maurillo is a member of the board of regents of the University of the State of New York. He has been for many years interested in the field of medical education and the problem of the shortage of physicians in the United States.

His address contains some very interesting information on the problem, as well as statistics explaining the critical shortage. In particular, however, I want to call your attention to his proposals to Congress, beginning at the bottom of page 5 of his address and continuing until the end.

I shall appreciate having your comments regarding his proposals. Do you think that legislation along the lines he suggests should be introduced? Is there such legislation before your committee now? Do you have any other suggestions or ideas in connection with Dr. Maurillo's letter and the proposals he makes? I feel that this is a serious problem which should not be ignored or neglected. Your views in the matter will be of prime importance to me.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

H.R. 591 Prohibits Unjust Discrimination in Employment Because of Age and Should Be Enacted Into Law

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 16, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years legislation was introduced in Congress in an effort to assist older persons in securing employment. The subject of providing employment opportunities to persons over 40 years of age has become a problem of national importance and concern.

During the 85th Congress I introduced a bill to prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of age. The bill was reintroduced in the 86th and 87th Congresses and is now known as H.R. 591. It is pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Because of the widespread reluctance to employ persons over 40 years of age, 4 years ago the Fraternal Order of Eagles, of which I am a member launched a spirited and determined campaign to awaken this Nation to the imperative need for promoting a more rational attitude toward our aging population.

The Eagles' campaign known as "Jobs after 40" is directed by the Grand Aerie of the Fraternal Order of Eagles and is participated in by all lodges in the United States commonly referred to as local aeries. My membership is maintained in Aerie No. 286 in my hometown of Altoona, Pa.

The long and proud history of the Fraternal Order of Eagles is replete with the organization's dedicated efforts to improve the health and welfare of all Americans and in particular the Nation's wage earners and their families.

Such legislative milestones as America's first workmen's compensation law in 1908 and the first mother's pension law in 1911 were due in a large measure to the efforts of the Fraternal Order of Eagles. The organization also played a leading role in advocating enactment in 1923 of the old-age pension law and the Social Security Act in 1935 with its subsequent amendments extending coverage and increasing benefits.

It was due to the widespread effect of the "Jobs after 40" campaign of the Fraternal Order of Eagles that public attention was focused on the compelling need for legislation prohibiting unjust discrimination in employment because of age. Four years ago, as a result of studying the facts and figures presented on the subject I was convinced of the need of legislation and sponsored my first bill in the 85th Congress.

The Fraternal Order of Eagles through the Eagle magazine has continued to keep the spotlight of publicity on the urgent need for legislation to end the existing unjust discrimination in the employment of persons over 40 years of age.

We are all familiar with the term "old age," but we would do well to familiarize ourselves with the term "economic old age." It is not a new term, merely one that has received very little attention. By "economic old age," I mean the problem a worker faces when he passes his 40th birthday, and for some reason has to seek employment. Unfortunately we have reached a point where many employers judge a man's ability not by his previous work experience, or his capability, or his desire to work, but by his chronological age.

Some progress has been made in showing the shortsightedness of this type of thinking. Various groups and individuals have concerned themselves with the problem of economic old age. The Congress has held hearings on the problems of the aged, and the effects of continued unemployment upon the older worker. Recently several States have enacted legislation to prevent job discrimination caused by age. We cannot, however, expect the State governments and private businesses to act if the Federal Government merely talks piously about the problem and fails to act. I feel that it is imperative that the Congress demonstrate in an affirmative manner their interest in this problem.

For that reason I am appealing for action on H.R. 591. My bill H.R. 591 entitled the "National Act Against Age Discrimination in Employment" would eliminate age discrimination for all of the Nation's employees within the limits prescribed by the Federal Constitution. It is fully realized that H.R. 591 will not be a panacea for all situations where unjust discrimination because of age exists. We can, however, by enacting H.R. 591, make great strides toward combating this wasteful practice.

It is my belief that my bill should be of particular interest to the Congress, because I would safely venture to guess that the great majority of us would be considered to be economically old. Yet

I am sure that none of us feel that because we have celebrated a 40th birthday we are incapable of serving our constituents and our Nation. If political old age and economic old age were synonymous this great body would be sadly depleted.

We are all familiar with the story of the middle-aged worker with children still in school—who, suddenly, because of technological unemployment, factory relocation, or structural unemployment, finds himself without a job. What recourse does he have? Only one: he must seek new employment if he intends to continue to meet his financial obligations. However, compared with the younger worker the odds are greatly against his getting new employment either as quickly or at a salary that will compare with his last job, and the major reason—age. To reiterate what was said earlier—it does not seem to matter what the individual's previous experience was, or what ability he has, or that he desires to work—these are seldom taken into consideration—what really counts is the arbitrary yardstick—chronological age.

We can see what a serious economic problem this has become and will pose in the future by the fact that today out of a labor force of 73 million the age group 40 to 65 is the fastest growing segment of our population.

The question most frequently raised is, Why cannot these individuals obtain new employment as easily as the younger worker? The answer is because of prejudice and ignorance—ignorance of the true facts, and a reliance on medieval concepts and beliefs about older workers. Many firms and individuals are still convinced that older workers are more accident prone, that their absenteeism is higher, that because of age they are less productive, and also that they are more apt to leave their jobs to seek new employment. The cost and restrictions of industrial health and pension plans are often given as further justification for a hiring age limit.

Let us examine these archaic concepts in the light of modern fact. The Special Senate Committee on Unemployment Problems of the 86th Congress, reported in their findings, by both the majority and minority, that older workers have fewer accidents, that absenteeism decreases proportionately with age, and that these workers seek new jobs less frequently than younger workers. Perhaps they may not be as strong physically as the younger worker, yet their experience and training make them a more valuable asset. As to the allegation that the cost of health and pension plans greatly increases for the older workers, the same special Senate committee reported that the overall difference may be minor as a part of the total employment cost. Thus in the overall picture these so-called arguments appear to carry very little weight.

Frankly, it is time for action by Congress in approving legislation that will dispel once and for all the fallacious concepts that encompass the older worker. My bill H.R. 591 does not give the older worker an unfair advantage over his younger fellow employee; it merely attempts to make him an equal.

We all remember the Biblical quotation "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." Now is the time to render unto the older worker the things that are rightfully his—an equal opportunity for employment.

Many years ago a great English statesman, Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, said "Let us hope that the heritage of old age is not despair." I am sure if alive today he would join all of us in saying "Let us hope that the heritage of economic old age is not despair." We can avert the continued despair of persons over 40 years of age by enacting H.R. 591, thus curbing an employment policy based on age that is highly discriminatory, economically wasteful, socially harmful, and morally wrong.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. HOWARD W. CANNON, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, before whose face the generations rise and pass away, in whose sight 1,000 years are but as yesterday when it is past. In Thy presence may we see ourselves as we really are, but weak and erring men who are greatly in need of Thy mercy.

Sanctify our imaginations to take in the far horizons of human need. In all the material acquisitions of things to live with, keep us from forgetting the things worth living for. Save us from falling on the sword of our own prosperity. Grant us we beseech Thee, as we face this seething world with all its ferment of unrest, a new baptism of passionate concern and care to help heal all the open sores of this sadly severed world.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HOWARD W. CANNON, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. CANNON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 16, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1394. An act for the relief of Laszlo Hamori;

H.R. 1458. An act for the relief of Lee Dock On;

H.R. 1531. An act for the relief of Wallace R. Price and Nora J. Price;

H.R. 1575. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anneliese Franziska Guay;

H.R. 1593. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in the Big Sandy Rancheria, California, and to accept other land in exchange therefor;

H.R. 1623. An act for the relief of Emmett P. Dyer;

H.R. 1642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lilyan Robinson;

H.R. 1677. An act for the relief of Elie Hara;

H.R. 1887. An act for the relief of Helen Tilford Lowery;

H.R. 1888. An act for the relief of Tomislav Lazarevich;

H.R. 2152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Francisca Hartman;

H.R. 2155. An act for the relief of Reoko Kawaguchi Moore;

H.R. 2156. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo;

H.R. 2835. An act for the relief of Jose Lauchengco, Jr.

H.R. 4636. An act for the relief of Ralph B. Cleveland;

H.R. 4796. An act for the relief of Richard A. Hartman;

H.R. 5432. An act to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund;

H.R. 6013. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.;

H.R. 7030. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 384. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization signed by the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 1320. An act for the relief of Edward P. Wall;

H.R. 1329. An act for the relief of Kim Hyoung Geun;

H.R. 1351. An act for the relief of Danica Dopudja;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen;

H.R. 1368. An act for the relief of Maurice Devlin;

H.R. 1397. An act for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell;
H.R. 1424. An act for the relief of Benjamin E. Campbell;
H.R. 1447. An act for the relief of Wladyslaw Figura;
H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Mario Menna;
H.R. 1535. An act for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh;
H.R. 1896. An act for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego;
H.R. 2138. An act for the relief of Raymond G. Greenhalgh;
H.R. 2188. An act for the relief of Lt. Matthew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired);
H.R. 2331. An act for the relief of Peggy Loene Morrison;
H.R. 2681. An act for the relief of Terata Kiyoshi Johnston;
H.R. 3498. An act for the relief of William Joseph Vincent; and
H.R. 3842. An act for the relief of James Delbert Hodges.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1394. An act for the relief of Laszlo Hamori;
H.R. 1458. An act for the relief of Lee Dock On;
H.R. 1531. An act for the relief of Wallace R. Price and Nora J. Price;
H.R. 1575. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anneliese Franziska Guay;
H.R. 1642. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lilyan Robinson;
H.R. 1677. An act for the relief of Elie Hara;
H.R. 1887. An act for the relief of Helen Tilford Lowery;
H.R. 1888. An act for the relief of Tomislav Lazarevich;
H.R. 2152. An act for the relief of Mrs. Francisca Hartman;
H.R. 2155. An act for the relief of Reoko Kawaguchi Moore;
H.R. 2156. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tui Hing Tow Woo;
H.R. 2835. An act for the relief of Jose Lauchengco, Jr.;
H.R. 4636. An act for the relief of Ralph B. Cleveland;
H.R. 4796. An act for the relief of Richard A. Hartman; and
H.R. 6013. An act for the relief of the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1593. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land in the Big Sandy Rancheria, California, and to accept other land in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1623. An act for the relief of Emmett P. Dyer; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5432. An act to make permanent certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.J. Res. 384. Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Agreement for the Establishment of the Caribbean Organization signed by the Governments of the Republic of France, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any reports of committees?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I call up Executive Calendar No. 227, and request its consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William L. Batt, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

RESOLUTION BY CHAUTAUQUA COUNTY (N.Y.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have received a copy of the resolution adopted by the Chautauqua County Board of Supervisors on May 12, 1961, to revive the plans of the Army Engineers for a spillway from Chautauqua Lake into Lake Erie, to take care of flood waters during flood conditions.

I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 99–61

Resolution requesting congressional action for construction of Chautauqua Lake to Lake Erie spillway project

Whereas recent flooding of lands bordering Chautauqua Lake and the Chadakoin River, both above and below the Warner Dam, has caused great damage and reemphasized the need for another outlet to Lake Chautauqua, due to the inadequacy of the Chadakoin River to carry off excess waters after heavy rains; and

Whereas the Army Engineers have completed plans for another outlet and spillway to be located at Hartfield, through which waters in times of emergency would be diverted from Chautauqua Lake to Lake Erie: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this board of supervisors hereby urgently requests its representatives in Congress to cause such action to be taken by the Congress of the United States as will bring about the construction of the Chautauqua Lake to Lake Erie spillway project at the earliest possible date; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS and Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, U.S. Senators, and CHARLES E. GOODELL, Representative in Congress.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the City Council of Elizabeth, N.J., has given voice to the admiration that Americans feel to Naval Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, the first man from the free world to travel into outer space. The resolution adopted by the council on May 9 is a stirring expression of the pride felt by our Nation and other nations when we watched the "Freedom 7" perform perfectly while the eyes of the world were upon it. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Naval Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, on May 5, 1961, became the first astronaut of the free world to explore the outreaches of our earth's atmosphere by virtue of a rocket propulsion and eventual recovery at sea; and

Whereas such event is deemed to go down in history as one of the most momentous occasions in man's natural impulse to investigate the mysteries of outer space: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That city council hereby goes on record as congratulating Commander Shepard on this great triumph and feat for the United States, knowing full well the ramifications that his success has in the struggle for space between the free world and that which is enslaved; our further congratulations to the scientists who have made this accomplishment possible, and to the administration of our President, John F. Kennedy, under whose leadership this became possible; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DOUGLAS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

H.R. 6094. An act to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946 (Rept. No. 258).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 880. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy (Rept. No. 259).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell 10 Liberty-type merchant vessels to citizens of the United States for conversion into barges (Rept. No. 260).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration (Rept. No. 261).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of March 1961. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, MARCH 1961

INTRODUCTION

This is the 16th in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories under the Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is for the month of March 1961.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost value of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the agencies involved.

The four agencies reported that as of March 1, 1961, the cost value of materials in their stockpile inventories totaled $15,777,805,000 and as of March 31, 1961, they totaled $15,521,799,000, a net decrease of $256,006,000 reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc., during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 but the cost value figures are summarized by agency and program as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories

[In thousands]

Agency and program	Beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1961	End of month, Mar. 31, 1961	Net change, reflecting acquisitions, disposals, adjustments, etc.
Department of Agriculture:			
Price support program:			
Agricultural commodities	$7,003,235	$6,719,956	−$283,279
Exchange commodities—strategic and critical materials	48,979	64,833	+15,854
Total, Department of Agriculture	7,052,214	6,784,789	−267,425
General Services Administration:			
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile	6,123,077	6,119,120	−3,957
Federal Facilities Corporation: Tin inventory	9,519	9,519	
Defense Production Act program	1,463,805	1,470,798	+6,993
Supplemental stockpile	883,821	883,821	
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	60,201	67,416	+7,215
Total, General Services Administration	8,540,423	8,550,674	+10,251
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:			
Civil defense stockpile	18,993	19,383	+390
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:			
Civil defense medical stockpile	166,175	166,953	+778
Grand total	15,777,805	15,521,799	−256,006

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

Detailed tables in this report show opening inventories at the beginning of the month in quantity and cost, transactions during the month, and the closing inventories at the end of the month. Each inventory is shown by commodity except the national stockpile, for which commodity detail is classified.

Pertinent information and explanation are set forth in notes accompanying the respective tables. Statutory authority and program descriptions are shown in the appendix to the report.

The inventories covered by the report are tabulated in detail, as follows:

Table 1: Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, March 1961: Including agricultural commodities and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter.

Table 2: Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, March 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

Table 3: Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, March 1961.

Table 4: Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1961.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, March 1961: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Agriculture defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Lists each commodity in the form in which it exists when extended support, and in some instances in a form to which the supported commodity is processed or converted to increase marketability. The commodities are grouped under the appropriate statutory subclassifications as "Basic," "Designated nonbasic," "Other nonbasic," and "Exchange."

Unit of measure: The applicable unit used in the accounting records and reports of the Corporation.

Inventory, beginning of month: Quantity: In number of units. Cost value: All inventories are recorded in the accounts at cost. "Cost value" is comprised of the initial cost of the commodity plus storage, handling, transportation, and accessorial expenses paid or accrued up to the date of reporting. The initial cost of inventories acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans is the unpaid balance of the notes plus storage and other charges advanced, any equities due or paid to producers on warehouse-stored collateral (by Public Law 85-835, and beginning with 1959 crop production, the Corporation will not make equity payments to borrowers on unredeemed price support loan collateral, title to which it acquires on or after maturity of the loans), and the net value of any quantity or quality differences determined upon delivery of farm-stored collateral. Amounts paid to lending agencies participating in the loan program for crop years prior to 1958 were recorded as a part of inventory cost.

Adjustments: Warehouse settlements, exchanges and transfers (net): Warehouse settlements include the net differences in quantity and/or value represented by the net of overdeliveries, premiums, underdeliveries, and discounts arising from movement of commodities. Exchanges represent the net change in quantity and/or value for inventories exchanged or in process of exchange. On completed exchanges, the change in value represents differentials due to location, quality, and quantity. Unprocessed commodities removed from inventory for conversion or processing (on a contractual or fee basis and excluding conditional sales) are included as a reduction of inventory. Processed commodities acquired as a result of this conversion or processing are included as an addition to inventory.

Acquisitions: As reflected in accounting records and reports; and includes commodities acquired by delivery of collateral securing loans, commodities purchased under terms of purchase agreements, commodities purchased directly from producers or processors as a part of the support operation but not under purchase agreements; and processed commodities acquired by purchases which offset conditional sales of unprocessed commodities from inventory. The cost value of acquisitions is described under the explanation of the cost value of inventory.

Carrying charges added to investment after acquisition: Total costs of storage, handling, transportation, and other accessorial expenses incurred during the month.

Disposals: As reflected in accounting records and reports. Inventory transactions generally are recorded on the basis of transfer of title. Disposition commitments are not reflected in the accounts. Cost value: Represents acquisition value plus applicable amount of carrying charges. The amount of cost allocated to commodities removed from inventory is determined with the view of retaining in the inventory accounts the cost of commodities remaining on hand. The cost allocated to commodities removed from price support inventory is generally computed on the basis of average unit cost of the commodity reflected in the inventory accounts for the applicable crop year and general storage location. In the case of commodities generally stored commingled (e.g., bulk grains and bulk oils) the crop year is determined on the first-in-first-out basis. In the case of commodities stored in identified lots, the crop year is determined by lot identification.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural price support program inventories under Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, March 1961: Including agricultural commodities, and strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month								Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Carrying charges added to investment after acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Storage and handling	Transportation and other	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Agricultural commodities:													
Basic commodities:													
Corn	Bushel	1,452,505	$2,421,302	−561	−$545	403	$623	$12,130	$2,409	23,312	$52,329	1,429,035	$2,383,500
Cornmeal	Pound					69,306	2,568		(1)	69,306	2,568		
Cotton, extra long staple	Bale	58	16,633					25	1	2	616	56	16,043
Cotton, upland	do	3,763	645,716			13	1,196	2,451	28	1,228	202,248	2,548	447,143
Peanut butter	Pound			+73	+20					73	20		
Peanuts, farmers' stock	do	67,287	6,564	−35,031	−5,182	39,796	3,811	171	480	31,633	1,939	40,419	3,905
Peanuts, shelled	do	59,230	9,864	+34,958	+5,162	7,829	1,075	103	72	16,517	2,381	85,500	13,895
Rice, milled	Hundredweight	1,317	11,766			93	778	26	143	809	7,374	601	5,339
Rice, rough	do	382	2,114	−1	−10			18	(1)	48	275	333	1,847
Tobacco	Pound					12,468	6,590			12,468	6,590		
Wheat	Bushel	1,096,713	2,857,220	−147	−565	5,814	10,993	13,601	5,965	24,265	78,345	1,078,115	2,808,809
Wheat flour	Pound					252,419	13,546	(1)	3	252,419	13,549		
Total, basic commodities			5,971,179		−1,120		41,180	28,525	9,101		368,234		5,680,631
Designated nonbasic commodities:													
Barley	Bushel	51,183	63,396	−44	−36	708	583	680	797	1,105	1,877	50,742	63,543
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	310,568	867,529	−25	−438	5	9	6,448	891	2,854	9,659	307,694	864,780
Milk and butterfat:													
Butter	Pound	69,354	41,884			24,517	14,827	195	362	21,641	13,375	72,230	43,893
Cheese	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Milk, dried	do	279,583	39,708			100,120	15,394	191	774	115,138	18,347	264,565	37,720
Milk, fluid	do					51,419	2,108			51,419	2,108		
Oats	Bushel	10,883	9,055	−21	−8	107	58	104	59	124	126	10,845	9,142
Rye	do	4,012	5,912	−10	−9	1	(1)	48	107	291	508	3,712	5,550
Tung oil	Pound	14,873	3,161					5	11	4,392	938	10,481	2,239
Total, designated nonbasic commodities			1,030,645		−491		32,979	7,671	3,001		46,938		1,026,867
Other nonbasic commodities:													
Beans, dry, edible	Hundredweight	(1)	2		(1)	1,838	11,876	161			(1)	1,838	12,039
Flaxseed	Bushel								(1)		(1)		
Soybeans	do	587	1,409	−3	−18	(1)	2	−17	1	409	958	175	419
Total, other nonbasic commodities			1,411		−18		11,878	144	1		958		12,458
Total, agricultural commodities			7,003,235		−1,629		86,037	36,340	12,103		416,130		6,719,956
Exchange commodities: [2]													
Strategic and critical materials:													
Aluminum oxide, abrasive, crude	Pound	7,089	510			2,854	158	1	73		173	9,943	569
Antimony, metal	do	1,193	318			1,095	262	4	−2	132	49	2,156	533
Asbestos, amosite	do	4,131	487					52	22		40	4,131	521
Asbestos, chrysotile	do	500	143			(1)	(1)					500	143
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	1,550	355			1,299	210	13	−104		26	2,849	448
Bauxite	do	1,919,228	12,444			157,799	685	104	195	90,371	943	1,986,656	12,485
Beryl ore	do	1,895	403			6		1	(1)			1,901	404
Beryllium copper master alloy	do	449	902			94	184	2	2		4	543	1,086
Bismuth	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Boart	Carat					500	1,379					500	1,379
Cadmium	Pound							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Chrome ore, chemical grade	do	53,270	635					13	−157		−2	53,270	493
Chrome ore, refractory grade	do							2	2		4		
Chrome ore, Turkish, metallurgical	do							1	(1)		−1		
Chromium metal	do	91	90					(1)	(1)	91	90		
Colemanite, Turkish boron minerals	do							4	−57		−53		
Columbite	do	195	152			156	122	2	(1)		−1	351	277
Diamonds	Carat	140	2,236			354	4,490					494	6,726
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Pound	20,619	3,305			8,196	1,274	22	45	2,830	551	25,985	4,095
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	2,507	544			1,119	240	4	6		5	3,626	789
Ferromanganese	do	16,017	1,772			45,818	4,174	47	229		456	61,835	5,766
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	36,133	661			41,425	739	15	41		27	77,558	1,429
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do							−2	36		34		
Iodine	do	40	42			−40	−42						
Lead	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Manganese ore, chemical grade	do	39,161	1,315			23,894	791	3	−48		21	63,055	2,040
Manganese ore, metallurgical grade	do	440,334	10,448			144,620	2,830	156	1,252		2,394	584,954	12,292
Manganese ore, natural, battery grade	do	66,147	3,457			6,161	299	1	39		15	72,308	3,781
Mica	do	478	1,179			97	340	13	2		(1)	575	1,534
Quartz crystals	do	144	2,050			5	46	9	1			149	2,106
Rutile	do	14,079	1,453			−19		14	−25		50	14,060	1,392
Silicon carbide	do	14,756	1,469			8,967	846	21	91		109	23,723	2,318
Thorium nitrate	do	50	115					(1)	(1)	50	115		
Tin	do							(1)	−3		−3		
Titanium sponge	do	3,000	3,879			130	408	8	2	1,500	2,070	1,630	2,227
Zinc	do							(1)	(1)		(1)		
Adjustment of prior period custodian expenses [3]			−1,385						−1,453		−2,838		
Total, strategic and critical materials			48,979				19,435	508	189		4,278		64,833
Total, Department of Agriculture			7,052,214		−1,629		105,472	36,848	12,292		420,408		6,784,789

[1] Less than 500.

[2] See appendix, p. 16, for notes relating to reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

[3] Allocation of custodian expenses by type of material.

NOTE: Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, March 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The General Services Administration defines the content of the columns as follows:

Program and commodity: Identifies the program and the minerals, metals, fibers and oils acquired under the program.

Unit of measure: The standard weight or measure of minerals, metals, fibers, and oils determined to be the stockpile unit of measure.

Inventory, beginning of month: Opening inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the beginning of the accounting period.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in inventory other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Decreases occur from theft, loss incurred while in transit to stockpile location, repacking from one type of container to another, beneficiation of a low-grade material to a higher grade, and the removal of material for sampling and testing purposes. Increases occur from return of material previously removed for sampling and testing purposes and from quantities received at storage locations in excess of quantities billed by the contractor. A new chemical analysis of the materials may cause an increase or decrease where the weights are based on chemical and moisture content. Increases or decreases are also made from findings of audits of inventory and accounting records.

Acquisitions: For the National Stockpile and Defense Production Act acquisitions include open market purchases at contract prices; intradepartmental transfers at market or appraised value at time of transfer; transportation to first permanent storage location; and, beneficiating and processing cost in upgrading materials. For the supplemental stockpile acquisitions include the market value or CCC's acquisition cost, whichever is the lower at time of transfer from CCC.

Disposals: Cost of disposals are calculated at the average unit price of inventory at time of removal from inventory. For the national stockpile inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that by their nature would deteriorate if held in storage for lengths of time; and, sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government. For the Defense Production Act inventory disposals consist of sale of materials that have been determined to be obsolete or excess to the needs of Government.

Inventory, end of month: Closing inventory represents quantity and cost of material in storage at the end of the accounting period.

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
National stockpile: Total (classified detail omitted)			$6,123,077		−$8		$2,465		$6,413		$6,119,120
Federal Facilities Corporation: Total, tin	Long ton	4	9,519							4	9,519
Defense Production Act:											
Aluminum	Short ton	763	386,575			8	4,070			770	390,645
Asbestos, chrysotile	Short dry ton	2	2,103							2	2,103
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	1,370	18,168							1,370	18,168
Beryl	Short ton	2	1,124			(1)	32			2	1,155
Bismuth	Pound	23	52							23	52
Chromite, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	908	32,970			13	502			921	33,472
Cobalt	Pound	25,187	52,063							25,187	52,063
Columbite	do	10,618	51,736							10,618	51,736
Copper	Short ton	133	73,866					1	329	133	73,537
Cryolite	do	38	10,475							38	10,475
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	20	1,394							20	1,394
Graphite, lubricating	Short ton	(1)	73							(1)	73
Lead	do	8	3,036							8	3,036
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide	Short dry ton	4	2,524							4	2,524
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	3,041	176,332							3,041	176,332
Mica, muscovite block and film	Pound	6,175	35,265			45	678			6,219	35,944
Nickel	do	123,670	106,590			1,898	1,124	4,752	4,440	120,815	103,275
Palladium	Troy ounce	8	177							8	177
Rare earth residue	Pound	6,086	658							6,086	658
Rutile	Short dry ton	9	1,725							9	1,725
Tantalite	Pound	1,529	9,734							1,529	9,734
Thorium	do	849	42							849	42
Titanium	Short ton	22	167,648			(1)	5,354			22	173,002
Tungsten	Pound	79,809	325,458			1	2			79,810	325,460
Subtotal, DPA commodities			1,459,787				11,762		4,769		1,466,780
Machine tools inventory:											
In storage	Tool	(1)	23							(1)	$23
On lease	do	(1)	3,966							(1)	3,966
On loan	do	(1)	29							(1)	29
Subtotal, DPA machine tools			4,018								4,018
Total, Defense Production Act			1,463,805				$11,762		$4,769		1,470,798
Supplemental stockpile: [2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	143	18,485							143	18,485
Antimony, metal	do	9	5,108							9	5,108
Asbestos, amosite	do	5	1,154							5	1,154
Asbestos, chrysolite	Short dry ton	5	3,499		(1)					5	3,499
Asbestos, crocidolite	Short ton	3	978							3	978
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type	Long dry ton	2,340	35,966							2,340	35,966
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type	do	1,033	16,592							1,033	16,592
Beryl	Short ton	9	19,365		+$5					9	19,370
Bismuth	Pound	1,497	3,316							1,497	3,316
Cadmium	do	6,609	10,938							6,609	10,938
Chromite, chemical grade	Short dry ton	137	11,735	(1)						137	11,735
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	1,312	206,983		−1					1,312	206,982
Chromite, refractory grade	do	169	4,750							169	4,750
Cobalt	Pound	1,077	2,169							1,077	2,169
Colemanite	Long dry ton	63	2,799							63	2,799
Columbite	Pound	213	501							213	501
Copper	Short ton	10	6,832		−5					10	6,828
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	561	1,505							561	1,505
Diamond, industrial, stones	do	10,524	134,632							10,524	134,632
Fluorspar, acid grade	Short dry ton	503	26,941							503	26,941
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade	do	43	1,357		(1)					43	1,358
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump	do	1	341							1	341
Iodine	Pound	242	231							242	231
Lead	Short ton	222	58,681							222	58,681
Manganese, battery grade, natural	Short dry ton	35	3,334							35	3,334
Manganese, chemical grade, type A	do	12	1,016							12	1,016
Manganese, chemical grade, type B	Short ton	28	2,387							28	2,387
Manganese, metallurgical grade	Short dry ton	1,264	114,407							1,264	114,407
Mercury	Flask	16	3,446							16	3,446
Mica, muscovite block, strained and better	Pound	263	698							263	698
Mica, muscovite film	do	27	212							27	212

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 2.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories under General Services Administration, March 1961: Including materials in the national stockpile, Federal Facilities Corporation tin inventory, Defense Production Act purchase program, the supplemental stockpile of materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities, etc., and inventory in transit from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile*—Continued

[In thousands]

Program and commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Supplemental stockpile—Continued	Pound										
Mica, muscovite splittings	do	4,826	$6,226							4,826	$6,226
Mica, phlogopite splittings	do	252	234							252	234
Palladium	Troy ounce	548	9,872							548	9,872
Quartz crystals	Pound	82	1,099							82	1,099
Rare earths	Short dry ton	2	2,427							2	2,427
Ruthenium	Troy ounce	15	560							15	560
Selenium	Pound	157	1,071							157	1,071
Silicon carbide, crude	Short ton	87	17,090							87	17,090
Tantalite	Pound	8	21							8	21
Thorium	do	4,030	9,839							4,030	9,839
Tin	Long ton	8	16,401							8	16,401
Titanium	Short ton	6	23,401							6	23,401
Tungsten	Pound	4,485	15,627	+8						4,493	15,627
Zinc	Short ton	324	79,599		(1)					324	79,599
Total, supplemental stockpile			883,821		(1)						883,821
Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit:[2]											
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude	Short ton	30	3,197				$172			30	3,369
Antimony, metal	do	2	890			(1)	52			2	942
Asbestos, amosite	do	1	310				40			1	350
Asbestos, crocidolite	do	3	811				39			3	849
Bauxite	Long ton	855	11,575			40	941			895	12,516
Beryllium copper master alloy	Pound	690	1,403				4			690	1,407
Chromite, chemical grade	Short ton	81	1,444				82			81	1,526
Chromite, metallurgical grade	do	(1)	30				2			(1)	31
Chromite, refractory grade	do	3	66				4			3	70
Colemanite	Long ton	4	247				5			4	251
Diamond, industrial, bort	Carat	2,449	6,464							2,449	6,464
Ferrochrome, high carbon	Short ton	7	2,288			1	551			8	2,838
Ferrochrome, low carbon	do	1	515				5			1	519
Ferromanganese	do	42	7,755				453			42	8,208
Fluorspar, acid grade	do	18	660				27			18	687
Manganese, battery grade, natural	do	10	999				15			10	1,014
Manganese, chemical grade	do	16	1,009				65			16	1,074
Manganese, metallurgical grade	do	433	17,671				2,416			433	20,086
Rutile	do	5	868				51			5	918
Silicon carbide, crude	do	11	2,004				108			11	2,112
Thorium nitrate	Pound					50	115			50	115
Titanium sponge	Short ton					1	2,070			1	2,070
Total, supplemental stockpile inventory in transit			60,201				7,215				67,416
Total, General Services Administration			8,540,423		−$8		21,442		$11,182		8,550,674

[1] Less than 500.
[2] See appendix, p. 16, for notes relating to the reporting of strategic and critical materials acquired by exchange or barter of agricultural commodities.

NOTE: Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense stockpile inventory under the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, March 1961*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization defines the content of the columns as follows:

Commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for engineering supply units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory-quantity: Shown only for one item, namely, engineering supply units. It is not feasible to furnish quantity figures on the other commodity groups because they are composite groups of many different items. To report quantities, it would be necessary to list numerous different items.

Inventory-cost value: Dollar value figures on commodities in the stockpile inventory essentially reflect their actual cost. The stockpile inventory is generally augmented by acquisition of Government excess property without reimbursement to the several holding agencies. The value assigned to these materials is (1) original acquisition cost if known, (2) estimated current market value of items in similar condition, or (3) average unit cost of identical or similar items purchased in the open market for stockpiling. Government excess property acquired by reimbursement is assigned a value equal to the amount of the fair-value reimbursement required.

Adjustments: Represent inventory pricing adjustments resulting from recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during the month, including return to inventory of items previously released from inventory for reworking, etc. Value stated in terms of actual costs of the commodities.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month, including items released from inventory for reworking, etc. Values shown are based on average unit costs.

Inventory at end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Engineering stockpile (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe and fittings).	10-mile units	(1)	$9,847		[2]+$4		$45		[3]$4	(1)	$9,893
Chemical and biological equipment			858		[2]−1		85		(1)		942
Radiological equipment			8,288		[2]+6		272		[4]17		8,548
Total, civil defense stockpile, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.			18,993		+10		402		22		19,383

[1] Less than 500.
[2] Accounting adjustments.
[3] Issued as administrative property.
[4] Consists of grants to other Federal agencies and to States of $17,200, and inventory writeoff of $117.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

TABLE 4.—*Civil defense medical stockpile inventory under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1961*

EXPLANATORY NOTES

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare defines the content of the columns as follows:

Commodity: Composite groups of many different items.

Unit of measure: Shown only for hospital functional units; not feasible for other composite groups.

Inventory cost value: The dollar value figures in the civil defense medical stockpile inventory reflect essentially the average acquisition costs per unit of the commodities. No transportation, delivery, or storage costs are included.

Adjustments: Represents increases (+) or decreases (−) of materials in commodity groups other than increases from acquisitions or decreases from disposals. Normally these transactions result from inventory pricing adjustments due to recalculation of fixed average unit prices, transfers of commodities from one composite group to another, removal of material for sampling during testing or reworking, etc., during the month.

Acquisitions: Materials placed in inventory during month, including new procurement and acquisition of Government excess property.

Disposals: Materials removed from inventory during the month. Costs of disposals are calculated on a basis of the average unit price of items in inventory at the time of removal. Disposals consist principally of items no longer suitable for stockpiling due to deterioration and of samples consumed through testing.

Inventory at end of month: Closing inventory after transactions for the month have been applied to the inventory at the beginning of the month.

[In thousands]

Commodity	Unit of measure	Inventory, beginning of month, Mar. 1, 1961		Transactions during the month						Inventory, end of month, Mar. 31, 1961	
				Adjustments		Acquisitions		Disposals			
		Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value	Quantity	Cost value
Medical bulk stocks and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses.	----------	----------	$107,432	----------	+$16	----------	[1] $923	----------	[2] $145	----------	$108,225
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	----------	----------	4,117	----------	−131	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	3,985
Civil defense emergency hospitals	Each	2	37,662	----------	−33	----------	----------	----------	[2] 1	2	37,628
Replenishment units (functional assemblies other hospitals.	----------	----------	16,965	----------	+149	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	17,114
Total, civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.	----------	----------	166,175	----------	+1	----------	923	----------	146	----------	166,953

[1] Includes $912,870 serum albumin returned from manufacturers resulting from reworking blood plasma.

[2] Inventory writeoff (certificate of destruction).

NOTE: Figures are rounded and may not add to totals.

APPENDIX

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Commodity Credit Corporation

The Price-Support Program

Price-support operations are carried out under the Corporation's charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714), in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958 and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1962. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations, and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producer's commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation, particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Strategic and critical materials stockpiling and related programs

1. National stockpile: The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. GSA is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OCDM. In addition, GSA is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OCDM determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

2. Tin received from Federal Facilities Corporation: Public Law 608, 84th Congress (50 U.S.C. 98 note), provided, among other things, for the continuation of operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., from June 30, 1956, until January 31, 1957. It provided also that all tin acquired by the Federal Facilities Corporation by reason of such extension should be transferred to GSA.

3. Defense Production Act: Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, GSA is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

4. Supplemental stockpile: As a result of a delegation of authority from OCDM (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) GSA is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Civil defense stockpile program

This stockpiling program conducted pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended, is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Civil defense medical stockpile program

As authorized under Public Law 920, 81st Congress, and following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, 1958, the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has delegated responsibility to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to plan and direct operation of the medical supply portion of the OCDM stockpile. The warehousing of the medical stockpile is principally within the OCDM warehouse system; in addition, the medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position emergency hospitals and other treatment units in communities throughout the Nation.

EXPLANATORY NOTES RELATING TO THE REPORTING OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS ACQUIRED BY EXCHANGE OR BARTER OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Surplus agricultural commodities in the Commodity Credit Corporation's price-support inventory may be exchanged or bartered for strategic and critical materials under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480), and other basic legislation including the CCC Charter Act, as amended, the Agricultural Act of 1954, and the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Except for small amounts which may go to the national stockpile, the strategic and critical materials acquired by Commodity Credit Corporation under the barter program are transferred to the supplemental stockpile.

Direct appropriations reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for materials so transferred from the price-support inventory.

The General Services Administration is charged with the custody and management of strategic and critical materials, and becomes the responsible reporting agency when title to these bartered materials is placed in the supplemental stockpile.

For purposes of this report, strategic and critical materials acquired by barter may appear in three inventories, reflecting the stages of the transfer of title.

1. The Department of Agriculture reports those to which the Commodity Credit Corporation still has title, prior to transfer to the supplemental stockpile.

2. The General Services Administration reports those which have been transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation exchange inventory in two parts:

A. Materials for which title is "in transit" from Commodity Credit Corporation to the supplemental stockpile.

B. Materials for which title has passed to the supplemental stockpile.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of materials in nine Federal stockpile inventories as reported by the Agriculture Department, General Services Administration, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on March 31, 1961, totaled $15,521,799,000. March activity in these stockpiles resulted in a net decrease of $256,006,000.

Net change in these stockpile inventories reflects acquisitions, disposals, and adjustments. March activity and end-of-month totals are summarized:

[In thousands of dollars]

Inventories by agency and program	Cost value, Mar. 1961	
	Net change during month	Total, end of month
Department of Agriculture: Price support program:		
1. Agricultural commodities	−283,279	6,719,956
2. Exchange—strategic and critical materials	+15,854	64,833
Total, Department of Agriculture	−267,425	6,784,789
General Services Administration: Strategic and critical materials:		
3. National stockpile	−3,957	6,119,120
4. Federal Facilities Corporation, tin inventory		9,519
5. Defense Production Act program	+6,993	1,470,798
6. Supplemental stockpile		883,821
7. Supplemental stockpile inventory in transit	+7,215	67,416
Total, General Services Administration	+10,251	8,550,674
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:		
8. Civil defense stockpile	+390	19,383
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:		
9. Civil defense medical stockpile	+778	166,953
Grand total	+256,006	15,521,799

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies involved as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

STORAGE AND HANDLING

The report shows storage and handling costs for Commodity Credit's price support inventory totaled $36,848,000 for the month of March. It should be noted these storage costs are for only 2 of the 9 stockpiles covered by the report.

INCREASES AND DECREASES

The major net decreases in cost value during March were $199 million in cotton, $48 million in wheat, and $38 million in corn. This was partially offset by net increases including $12 million in dry edible beans, $10 million in manganese and ores, and $5 million in aluminum and ores.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Of 17 agricultural commodities in Commodity Credit's $6.8 billion price support inventory on March 31, 1961, those leading in cost value include:

Wheat, with 1.1 billion bushels at a cost of $2.8 billion;

Corn, with 1.4 billion bushels at a cost of $2.4 billion; and

Grain sorghum with 308 million hundredweight at a cost of $865 million.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Strategic and critical materials are shown in six inventories totaling $8.6 billion, including the $6.1 billion national stockpile for which itemized detail is classified. Combined figures from the other 5 inventories show materials (in all grades and forms) leading in cost value as follows:

Aluminum, bauxite, etc., with 7.6 million tons at a cost of $509 million;

Manganese (and ores), with 5.3 million tons at a cost of $354 million; and

Tungsten, with 84 million pounds at a cost of $341 million,

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Supplies and equipment in 2 civil defense stockpile inventories total $186 million. Nearly 90 percent is in the medical stockpile valued at $167 million.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1888. A bill for the relief of Laura Celani; and

S. 1889. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Geohar Ogassian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1890. A bill for the relief of Sangwoo Ahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1891. A bill to provide for the appointment of a U.S. permanent representative to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 1892. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1893. A bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1894. A bill to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements;

S. 1895. A bill to repeal 18 U.S.C. 791 so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship;

S. 1896. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ferenc Domjan and others;

S. 1897. A bill to amend section 373 of title 28, United States Code, so as to authorize retired judges of certain territorial courts to perform judicial service when designated and assigned;

S. 1898. A bill to withdraw from the district courts jurisdiction of suits brought by fiduciaries who have been appointed for the purpose of creating diversity of citizenship between the parties;

S. 1899. A bill to increase the fees of jury commissioners in the U.S. district courts;

S. 1900. A bill to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service; and

S. 1901. A bill to validate payments of certain per diem allowances made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard while serving in special programs overseas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (by request):

S. 1902. A bill to supplement and revise the laws prescribing restrictions against conflicts of interest applicable to employees of the executive branch of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1903. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction as trade or business expenses of certain amounts paid in escrow or to insurance companies including interinsurers, reciprocal underwriters and mutual insurance companies to provide protection against losses from floods; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1904. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as not to exclude from the benefits provided by such act areas which include structures of 10,000 or less acre-feet of floodwater detention capacity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1905. A bill to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Chickamauga and Chattanooga National Military Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1906. A bill for the relief of Fares Salem Salman Hamarneh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the appointment of a U.S. permanent representative to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and for other purposes, generally in support of that organization.

Mr. President, the OECD is one of the most important initiatives ever undertaken by the United States in respect of its foreign economic policy and in respect, I may say, of world peace.

At the present time our Ambassador to OECD functions under our Ambassador to NATO. OECD is so important, as was demonstrated during the debate when the OECD Treaty was under discussion on the floor of the Senate, that we should have an ambassador representing us in that organization, in his own right, as the representative of the President. I hope very much that the bill will be considered at an early date by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1891) to provide for the appointment of a U.S. permanent representative to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STUDIES OF ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF DEACTIVATING CERTAIN PERMANENT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which directs the Secretary of Commerce to study the economic effects of deactivating permanent military installations in areas of substantial unemployment. Under the bill, the Secretary of Commerce would report his findings to the Secretary of Defense and to Congress.

I am joined in sponsoring this bill in the Senate by my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and in the House by Representatives DWYER and FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

As members of the Senate are aware, the Department of Defense recently announced the closing of 72 military installations in the United States, including a number of arsenals. One multimission ammunition depot scheduled to be inactivated is Raritan Arsenal in Edison Township, N.J. It is the only one of four multimission ordnance depots in this region planned for deactivation.

Clearly, Mr. President, it would not be in our national interest to continue a military installation where facilities are inadequate or obsolete, or the mission of the base itself is outmoded in these days of swift technological change. It would be inexcusable to waste millions of the taxpayers' dollars to keep alive an activity which has outlived its usefulness.

It is quite another thing, however, to fail to take into any account whatsoever the effect on the economy of the communities involved when a major military installation is closed, particularly in an area of substantial unemployment. The people of Middlesex County, N.J., understand this all too clearly. Camp Kilmer, now in caretaker status, is in the same county as Raritan Arsenal. Unemployment, according to the latest figures, stands at 8.8 percent in Middlesex.

In the statements of Army officials and, more recently, at a meeting with Assistant Defense Secretary Thomas Morris, it was made clear that the Secretary of Defense has no authority to take this factor into account in arriving at a decision.

The bill I am introducing today would, in effect, require the Federal Government to look at all sides of any decision to deactivate a military facility.

It requires the Secretary of Commerce, upon application from any Governor representing an area where the unemployment rate is 6 percent or more, to measure the economic effect of the proposed closing of any permanent installation by taking into account, among other considerations: The approximate losses which would be incurred by other agencies of Government—for example, the Federal Housing Administration which insures home mortgages—as a result of such action; the approximate cost to the Federal Government of relocating such an installation; the approximate cost to the Federal Government of reactivating an installation in any national emergency.

Under this bill, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to conduct the investigation as expeditiously as practicable. While his recommendations would not be binding, the Secretary would transmit his findings to the Secretary of Defense and to Congress.

This procedure would permit a careful review of factors other than those presently considered by the Secretary of Defense in arriving at his determination.

Since the very existence of some communities is involved in decisions of this magnitude, I believe that elemental justice dictates, at the very least, a review of all the economic effects before irrevocable decisions are made.

During consideration of the area redevelopment bill, the House of Representatives approved an amendment similar to the one we propose today. This provision was, however, dropped from the final version of the Area Redevelopment Act, which is now law. We believe this proposal warrants consideration on its own merits.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1892) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment, introduced by Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

THE RIGHT OF THE BLIND TO ORGANIZE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind.

The 1st and 14th amendments to the Constitution already guarantee to all American citizens the right to assemble freely and to join with like-minded citizens to promote their mutual interests.

Blind citizens have these same rights, but unfortunately there is evidence accumulated over a number of years that too often these rights have been denied to blind people by some individuals and organizations which are concerned with the welfare of the blind.

I want to make it completely clear that there is no criticism here of the many fine organizations for the blind which have done such an excellent job of helping blind people. Most public and private welfare agencies for the blind are doing a wonderful job, and they should be congratulated and encouraged.

However, I believe we should forestall and prevent any threats or fear of reprisals simply because blind people join together to achieve common goals. My bill would protect these blind citizens in their constitutional right to join together to express their views about programs which affect their welfare.

My bill to protect the right of the blind to organize would do two things:

First, it directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to consult to the fullest extent practicable with representatives of organizations of the blind in formulating and administering programs for the blind, and to encourage State agencies to do likewise in formulating and administering programs for the blind which receive the support of Federal funds.

Second, my bill states that no official concerned with a program for the blind

to which Federal funds are contributed shall exert the influence of his office against the right of blind individuals to join organizations of the blind.

The subject matter of this proposal has been brought to the attention of the U.S. Senate in previous years by our President, then Senator, John F. Kennedy. In the 85th Congress he introduced proposed legislation identical to the bill I am introducing today, and he sponsored the same proposal again in the 86th Congress with more than 30 cosponsors.

Mr. President, I believe this proposed legislation deserves the attention and support of my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie at the desk for 5 days for those who may wish to join as cosponsors.

I also ask unanimous consent that the text of this proposal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 1893) to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in the formulation, administration, and execution of programs for the aid and rehabilitation of the blind, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, to the fullest extent practicable, consult and advise with authorized representatives of organizations of the blind; and shall, in developing and recommending policies and procedures to State agencies, take such steps as may be appropriate to encourage such agencies to consult with authorized representatives of organizations of the blind in the formulation, administration, and execution of any State program for the aid and rehabilitation of the blind to which Federal funds are contributed.

SEC. 2. No officer or employee of any Federal, State, or other agency concerned with the administration of any program for the aid or rehabilitation of the blind to which Federal funds have been contributed shall exert the influence of his office or position against the right of the blind to join organizations of the blind. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall adopt such regulations and shall condition Federal grants to State or other programs for the blind on such terms as will prevent the exertion of any such influence against self-expression of the blind through organizations of the blind.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the bill S. 1021, a bill to provide financial assistance for education. This amendment would strike all of the bill after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the provisions of my bill, S. 1119, which I introduced on February 28, 1961.

I am opposed to Federal aid to education for very fundamental reasons, chief among which is that in order to meet the immediate financial needs of the moment we would be sacrificing our principles of constitutional Government and would be wiping out another vestige of State sovereignty.

My bill, S. 1119, which I shall offer as an amendment in the nature of a substitute, would provide a means of aiding education without sacrificing constitutional values. It would appropriate to each State for educational purposes only 5 percent of the funds paid in each year through income taxes collected in such State. This money would not leave the State. There would be no department or bureau in Washington administering the program. Full and complete jurisdiction and control over the expenditure of the funds and the programs pursuant thereto would be in the hands of the States. In this manner, we would not embark on a program of waiving our constitutional values and principles. At the same time, we would retain in each State adequate funds to provide financial assistance for public education.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the desk.

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1021, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROUTY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1021, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF BENEFITS UNDER THE OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6027) to improve benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program by increasing the minimum benefits and aged widow's benefits and by making additional persons eligible for benefits under the program, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the next printing of Senate Resolution 135, relating to the economic impact of national defense, submitted by me on May 3, 1961, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] may be added as an additional cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF CHANGE OF HEARING DATES ON SENATE RESOLUTION 105

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I announce, for the information of the Senate, a further change in the hearing dates for Senate Resolution 105, to create a Special Committee on National Fuels Study.

The hearings are now scheduled for June 12 and 13, at 10 a.m. in the Interior Committee hearing room, 3110 New Senate Office Building.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

Letter to the President of the United States, signed by 52 Members of the Senate and 12 Members of the House of Representatives, recommending a Presidential citation for Oskar J. W. Hansen for accomplishments in the field of sculpture and art.

NEEDED: STRONGER ANTI-COMMUNIST PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the United States and its allies must more effectively mobilize their people and resources, if we are to defeat Communist attempts to conquer the world.

Personally, I strongly feel that first, there is not a sufficiently broad sense of urgency; second, that we are not creating good enough ideas and techniques for effectively battling the Reds; and third, that we are failing to adequately mobilize potential resources to serve U.S. interests in the cause of peace.

Recently, I suggested to President Kennedy that greater utilization, as "voices of America," of U.S. firms operating abroad could further strengthen our foreign policy. This recommendation was based on an enthusiastic response by U.S. enterprises operating around the globe to such an idea.

Today, I received from the White House a letter stating that the idea would receive "most careful attention from the President, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of State."

In my judgment, however, the time for careful attention is past. Rather, now is the time for strong, creative realistic action to more effectively cope with the Red menace to freedom in the world.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the White House letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The President has asked me to reply to your letter of May 12, suggesting a conference of Government officials and representatives of American business firms operating in foreign countries for the purpose of exploring ways in which American companies can cooperate in carrying out the aims of U.S. foreign policy.

The President is, of course, aware of the significant part that U.S. business concerns have played in the economic development of other countries. He has stated that their most important future role will be to assist in the development of healthy and responsible private enterprise within the underdeveloped nations. Their willingness

to cooperate in every way with the Government in furthering our foreign policy, as emphasized in the letters you received in response to your recent inquiries, will receive most careful attention from the President, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of State.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Special Assistant to the President.

VIEWS OF PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE ON S. 1643

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, currently the Senate Agriculture Committee is holding hearings on the administration's farm proposals, as outlined in S. 1643.

All of us recognize that in agriculture we need a new program designed to resolve the special problems of the present, of the future, and those inherited from the past.

Among other objectives, the program must, first, create a positive—not a negative—image of the American farmers' contribution to our economic life and progress; second, attempt to establish a relatively good supply-demand balance for the production and the consumption of farm commodities; third, find better ways to utilize farm surpluses, plus a reduction of costs of storage—using these invaluable resources as assets, not as economic millstones around the neck of the economy; and fourth, assure the farmer a fair share of the national income.

Personally, I have long felt that, first, the farmers should have a stronger voice in programs affecting their future; second, solution of the supply-demand imbalance of farm products can best be obtained on a commodity-by-commodity basis; and, third, self-help as a principle should be encouraged, insofar as possible, thus reducing the load on Uncle Sam.

We recognize, of course, that in connection with the administration's far-reaching recommendations, as outlined in S. 1643, serious questions must be resolved. Congress, therefore, will need to weigh carefully the impact of such a program—if adopted—on the farmers, the taxpayers, and the consumers.

Recently, I was privileged to review a statement on Senate bill 1643 by Bill Eckles, general manager, and Paul Affeldt, president, of the Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Wisconsin.

In order to give my colleagues the benefit of the evaluation made by this fine organization, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, IN SUPPORT OF THE AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1961, S. 1643

(By W. C. Eckles, general manager, and Paul Affeldt, president)

Honorable Chairman ELLENDER and Senate Agriculture Committee members, we first would like to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before your committee. We would especially like to compliment the chairman for the early hearings and opportunity for offering various interests a chance to express their views on the Ellender-Cooley farm bill, or technically The Agricultural Act of 1961, S. 1643 and H.R. 6400.

On behalf of more than 15,000 Wisconsin dairy farmers who belong to Pure Milk Products Cooperative with offices at Fond du Lac, Wis., we would like to state that this Ellender bill (S. 1643) conforms very closely to many policy resolutions enacted over the past several years by the members of Pure Milk Products Cooperative at their annual meetings. Copies of several of these resolutions have been added as an appendix to this presentation to indicate the agricultural policy and programs desired by the organization membership.

These were not developed by employees and officers. But they came up from the grass roots of PMPC's membership. Each local (77 in number) considers drafts and recommends resolutions at their 77 local meetings. These in turn are considered by an overall committee from all locals. They are debated, changed, and finally enacted by members at the annual meeting or organizationwide convention each fall.

The organization, Pure Milk Products Cooperative, has long recommended that the farm problem be attacked and solved by action—

1. On a commodity-by commodity basis, with all programs finally correlated into an overall program.

2. On which the advice and consideration of real farmers be heard, even though in advisory capacities, when such programs are being drafted and developed.

3. In which farmers are finally given an opportunity through referendum to approve or reject programs if quotas or marketing limitations are considered.

4. In which domestic consumption and use of our agricultural abundance is in maximum use to better feed, clothe and house our own citizens.

5. That permits our other production in agriculture beyond a reasonable reserve for domestic safety, to be used to promote better relations between the other nations who are our allies and who also need more food and fiber.

6. That permits farm organizations and cooperatives to do as much of the management, processing, distribution and development of new outlets as is reasonable and consistent with American business methods.

7. That programs contributing to improved general health and well-being be charged at least partially to departments other than Agriculture. That food programs contributing to better allies and improving international relation be "tabbed" or charged to the appropriate category and not the farm program.

We strongly support the Ellender-Cooley bill as enabling legislation through which agricultural programs could be developed that would begin moving farmers' incomes toward a parity of income level.

TITLE I

Set up machinery through which advisory committees could be designated for assisting in developing programs. Of these, a substantial majority (66 percent) would have been nominated by farm vote. Consumers and farm organization specialists would also be given consideration.

It is our opinion that programs as are developed should, if they are to be effective, provide for supply adjustments if such are needed to maintain a reasonable balance between production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

We strongly support these provisions that provided quotas, marketing limitations, etc., if they are applied across the board to all producers following a referendum or vote where a two-thirds majority of farmers have approved such.

The extension of marketing order authorization to all commodities as proposed we believe to be sound. Many years of experience with Federal milk orders by our and other organizations have proven successful. Classes based on grade and use for establishing minimum prices to be shared in and pooled to various producers has proven sound when used. On several agricultural products, marketing order and regulatory programs for other commodities than those presently eligible for protection should be given the chance to come under such minimum pricing programs. Orders have operated successfully on several commodities. Other branches of agriculture should be given a chance for similar protection.

We have found order programs most useful in stabilizing and marketing milk. Other commodities might have similar success if authority were granted through new or amended legislation.

We presume some groups who now have such orders will be reluctant to support amendment of the laws under which they operate fearing some lessening of the effectiveness of their program. We believe the umbrella of protection provided by the Agricultural Agreements Act of 1937 as amended should be extended to other commodities. If this is too strongly opposed, similar market order legislation might be enacted to extend the protection and voice in marketing to more of agriculture than that which in the past has been enjoyed by fluid milk markets and some fruits and vegetables, etc.

Quotas or marketing allotments are not new to agriculture or businesses. They should be on effective unit basis if used. Their application under orders should be effective and reasonably efficient to administer. We repeat, that in our judgment their introductions and uses should follow a referendum process by affected producers.

The provisions that would permit only congressional review and veto prior to introduction of a farm program under these bills seem to be the cause of major disagreements. We would hope that appropriate amendments satisfactory to the legislative and executive branch of our Government might be developed so that this type of legislation might be made available to American agriculture.

TITLE II

We strongly support title II of the Ellender-Cooley bill that would substantially increase funds for and lengthen the period of operation of Public Law 480.

This program has successfully moved agricultural products into international channels where needed. Assurance of longer range programs could materially improve the program in our opinion.

TITLE III

Title III providing for consolidating and improving the lending authorities to agriculture is quite important in our opinion. Much of agriculture needs expanded credit to move it out of a position of inefficiency due to limited sized units.

As the American population explosion continues, more efficient agricultural units must be developed. This demands reasonable priced and available credit for farmers.

There is urgent need for reasonable loans to farmers to improve facilities, production units and living standards. Farm people use moneys for purchasing commercial products. Increased credit would stimulate and improve business and the national output.

TITLE IV

Title IV providing for expanding the school milk program and improvements in the bargaining position of cooperatives is strongly urged by Pure Milk Products Cooperative.

Farmers with larger cooperatives properly financed could in time, we believe, reduce the need of agriculture for so much dependence on Government. The legislation providing for merging and consolidating cooperatives into more effective units could, in our opinion, result in a more efficient movement of food and fiber to consumers after a period of time.

We believe the Ellender-Cooley bill would be excellent because:

(a) It can cut the cost of farm programs to Government and still assure consumers adquate food at the cheapest relative price.

(b) It would let farm selected groups have a major voice in developing and suggesting farm programs to the Department of Agriculture and Congress.

(c) The program would be most democratic by having farmers, consumers, the executive and legislative branches of Government all involved in its promulgation and activation or use.

(d) The wide powers presently delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture would be reduced. Less bureaucracy and governmental red tape would be involved.

(e) It would mean less government in agriculture by giving farmers an opportunity to expand cooperatives and do a more effective job in producing for market needs. Farmers would make major decisions on programs, quota enactments, etc.

(f) It is enabling legislation through which a variety of approaches to improving farm income could be developed and effectuated.

In conclusion, Honorable Chairman and committee members, we believe this enabling legislation of S. 1643 through which farm income could be materially improved, our agricultural abundance could be efficiently utilized and American farmers given more of a voice to help develop programs they desire, is most sound and very good legislation.

We, of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, would again urge the reconciling of differences between branches of Government and political parties to make such adjustments as will make the legislation acceptable to Congress for early enactment.

We believe you will have done a great service to America's farmers and the economy.

We believe it to be basically the soundest and finest agricultural legislation to ever come before Congress. We think farmers will heartily approve its use and reduce governmental costs and materially improve farmers' income and living standards.

We are honored at Pure Milk Products Cooperative to have had you kindly and, as usual, objectively listen to our views and suggestions on this very important matter. We hope this presentation has been of value in transmitting the views of a large segment of America's organized agricultural producers and dairymen to Congress.

Our policy resolutions attached are indicative that what we have presented has been the views of those we represent and work for.

Again, thanks for granting us time to present our views to you.

NEED FOR SUBSTANTIAL INCREASE IN DOMESTIC SUGAR PRODUCTION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, one of the most important items of domestic legislation that should be undertaken by the Congress is a long-range extension of the Sugar Act, to provide for a very substantial increase in domestic sugar production. Those who are anxious to see our sugar purchases made in foreign countries have erroneously represented the facts concerning our sugar program. The production of sugar in the United States, whether it be cane sugar or beet sugar, is not subsidized by the general treasury of the United States. The consumer of sugar pays the entire cost. The program has worked well. The important consideration now is the extension of the program over a period of many years and provision for a greater production of sugar within the United States. There are many reasons why we should produce more of our own sugar, but I should like to mention seven:

First. It is just plain commonsense that when the United States is plagued with a costly agricultural program and billions of dollars of surpluses, we should no longer import from foreign countries 45 percent of the sugar we need. To continue to do so will lessen the respect for the United States, both among our own people and among the people of other countries. We would not respect another nation if it did not make every effort to cut down its surpluses, by producing other crops that it needed.

Second. Increased domestic production of sugar will be beneficial to thousands of individual farmers. I am more familiar with the sugarbeet situation than I am with the sugar-cane situation. In Nebraska and in dozens of other States there are wide areas where the farmers' land is suitable to the production of sugar beets on an efficient basis. This is especially true in irrigated areas. These farmers are anxious to obtain sugarbeet quotas which they are presently denied.

Third. Increased domestic production of sugar will be beneficial to hundreds of communities, because it will increase the farmers' income which is spent locally. It will be beneficial to labor, to our transportation systems, and to our economy in general.

Fourth. A substantial increase in the production of our own sugar will be most beneficial to the U.S. Government, because it will be an important step toward the solution of our farm problem. It will put land into the production of a crop that is needed by our economy, and will take the same land out of the production of crops of which there is a surplus.

Fifth. Our Government will be further helped by an increase in domestic sugar production, particularly by means of sugarbeets. A sugarbeet industry makes for stability and prosperity in an irrigated area. In fact, without the right to raise sugarbeets, irrigation district repayment contracts to the Government of the United States may be in serious jeopardy.

Sixth. Cuba will not be providing sugar for the United States in the foreseeable future. After Communism has ended in Cuba, land reform, the need for protein food, and other factors will make it impractical for Cuba ever again to provide the United States with as much sugar as she has in the past.

Seventh. Our domestic production of sugar should be increased now, and at a progressive rate extending over several years in the future, before commitments, implied or otherwise, are made to Nations which have not been regularly supplying us with sugar. To fail to increase our domestic production at this time would be to irresponsibly encourage foreign countries as new suppliers.

Mr. President, the leadership of this Congress and in the administration have a responsibility not only to pass a sugar act, but to do it now, as soon as ample and exhaustive hearings are held. The effort to increase our domestic sugar production involves various problems, including transportation costs, modernization of methods and procedures in processing and marketing the building or enlarging of new processing plants, and the orderly transition to a sugar economy by the farmers involved. None of these problems is impossible of solution. They cannot be solved, however, without Government leadership, both in the Congress and in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, I appeal to the Secretary of Agriculture to take the lead, in behalf of the American farmer, to formulate a program and to fight for it. The Secretary should champion a program that will give to the American farmer the right to produce a much greater share of the sugar that is needed in the United States. The Secretary of Agriculture owes such an obligation, not only to the farmers, but also to the taxpaying public, because of the contribution which such a program will make toward the solution of our overall agricultural problems.

Mr. President, the State Department should have a voice in the allocation of the part of the sugar we need that is to come from other countries. The State Department, however, has no right to take a position to the detriment of, and hostile to, the American farmer, in an effort to hold down or lower the portion of the sugar we need which ought to be produced domestically. The Department of Agriculture, as well as the leadership in the Congress, does have a responsibility to provide aggressive leadership in working for the adoption of an orderly program of increased domestic sugar production, because it will be beneficial to all.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday I served notice that it would be necessary, as of today, to object to all requests for committee meetings. If I make an exception in one case, then I should make an exception in all cases; but, since important legislation is before us, I think Senators ought to be

available for floor duty, and I am constrained to object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is objection.

THE UNITED STATES, CUBA, AND LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the most outstanding scholars in all Latin America is the president and head of the University of Puerto Rico, Jaime Benitez. He made a speech recently at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara, entitled "The United States, Cuba, and Latin America."

It is one of the most penetrating analyses of the Cuban problem that I have had an opportunity to read for some time. I take only a moment to read a short paragraph or two:

Surely this situation is one that the United States will have to view in a much larger context than that of Castro or of Cuba alone.

The Castro image and the kind of action, the purposes and methods, the aims and ideals associated with it, right or wrong, provide a collective vision, a version of the world in which many of the dispossessed, the oppressed, and the disenfranchised peoples of the Caribbean, Latin America, and, possibly, the whole world, see a role for themselves, a means to achieve their goals of participation in the life of their nations, a way of exercising the power that resides in masses and numbers. Such an image cannot be undone in a moment. The end of Castro would not be the end of the image, and there are times when a live demagog is infinitely preferable to a dead martyr, particularly when that potential martyr has proven himself (with the help of all concerned) one of the most salable saints in recent history.

Can the United States avoid being maneuvered into becoming the antagonist of such mass movements and such mass aspirations, which exist whether or not the Cuban revolution truly represents them?

The president of the University of Puerto Rico goes on in his analysis to make what I think are some very constructive suggestions in regard to needed changes in American foreign policy in Latin America. I think not only are they worthy of the careful consideration of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of Members of the Senate, and of the entire Congress, but I recommend the speech of the president of the University of Puerto Rico to this administration, to the end that it weigh the suggestions and, on the basis of their merit, take those suggestions which might be helpful in a reexamination and reappraisal of American foreign policy in all Latin America.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the speech be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES, CUBA, AND LATIN AMERICA

(By Jaime Benitez)

Mutual trust and understanding between the Americas would be greatly helped if the United States found it possible to distinguish between its genuine long-term interest in Latin America and its present irritable obsession with Fidel Castro. More attention to the realities of the situation in the hemisphere and less attention to the more extreme antics of the Cuban Premier would help achieve the same goal.

For, if left to his own devices, Castro will succeed in undoing or, at least, isolating himself and his "revolution" sooner and more completely than if the United States undertakes to direct the process. That Castro can do this for himself is evidenced by his unnecessary aggressiveness against friends and potential friends both in Cuba and throughout Latin America and his consequential alienation of what was once widespread support at home and abroad. That U.S. initiative can harm rather than help democratic developments in Cuba is evidenced by the ineffectiveness of its efforts to line up a Latin American front against Castro.

The priority accorded the present situation in Cuba, at least, in the public mind, has been a hindrance to the development of the "new deal" for Latin America promised by the new administration in the United States. In many ways, it may have seriously delayed the eventual substitution of the present dictatorship by a free and democratic government in Cuba.

Regrettably, the chances of the United States separating these two distinct problems one from the other seem unlikely in the present state of tension and the present scramble for a "solution" to the Cuban "problem." Too much is against it, and it is worthwhile to reflect on why this should be so.

Friends of the United States in Latin America and friends of Latin America in the United States have jointly suffered through a long period, painful and unnecessary, of being systematically ignored: ignored by academic, journalistic, political, intellectual and other opinion-molding centers of authority. It is thus felt—with what degree of validity no one can say—that the present sympathetic receptivity to matters Latin American is due to the awakening caused in these circles by the Castro revolution, in much the same way as scientific research and intelligence in general, and even primary and secondary schooling, have received a big boost from the success of the Soviet Union's first sputnik. Certainly this dramatic reversal from apathy to fascination ensuing on Castro's irrupting into print has both its origin and its nourishment in the Cuban drama. This is reflected in a thousand ways, ranging from the random identification of similar revolutionary movements throughout the world with the Castro trademark to last year's Latin American joke that Mr. Eisenhower's offer of $500 million in aid should be called the Fondo Fidel.

This natural pleasure at being suddenly recognized, the objects of a jealous affection, akin to any convert's zeal, is aided and abetted by the particular way in which United States foreign policy is subject to the pressures and influence of the mass media: newspapers and their headlines, commentators and their alarmist reports, the weekly magazines with their red-ringed covers, the newsreels, films and television, all the mighty who shape and fashion American public opinion, and through that public opinion, American policy, are committed to the maintenance of what is newsworthy. Castro, who has managed to thrill, shock and infuriate public opinion, is considered, and given the nature of the situation has become, more "newsworthy" than all the rest of Latin America put together.

This factor has collateral effects that are just as dangerous as the monopolizing of the Latin American image by the Cuban situation. Certain elements of the revolution in Cuba, for instance, have been exaggerated out of all proportion, so that public understanding of this phenomenon so close to the U.S. borders has been seriously misled. What is going on in Cuba is not confined to beards and fatigues, public assemblies, military scores, 10-year-old traffic policemen and so on. The whole social fabric of Cuba is being affected, disrupted, reoriented. To what extent and in what varying proportions of chaos, demagogery, and progress this is so, we are now unfortunately in no position to assess impartially. Construction, agricultural reform, new economic policies, new international alinements, reeducation, governmental austerity, the decimation of élites, and many other developments typical of traditional revolutionary situations deserve closer attention than they are getting; certainly, they cannot be ignored out of hand because the political manifestations that accompany them are distasteful.

If Castro continues to be, for the average American, what Latin America is all about; if he dominates North American understanding of the peasant movement in northeast Brazil, the survival of Peronism in Argentina, the rise of substantial opposition parties in Chile, the Peace Congress recently held in Mexico, there is serious error: error compounded by the fact that the playback of this image that the mass media are creating is, in Latin America, that picture of the little giant from the south locked in mortal combat with the colossus of the north that has so long bedevilled traditional and reciprocal misconceptions about the roles of both parts of the hemisphere.

Second, the clear and present danger that many aspects of the present situation in Cuba represent for the United States and its policy of inter-American cooperation, may well be a danger that the United States is going to have to put up with. There can be little room for argument that Castro has set back the development of democratic institutions in Cuba for some time; but we have to be aware of the fact that before Castro they never existed fully and they might not have blossomed forth even had he not taken power. Furthermore, it may well be that many elements of Castro's revolution—good and bad—are by now thoroughly irreversible. It is hard to imagine, for instance, how the great majority of the expropriated property could be returned to its former owners, and the longer the present regime stays in power, the harder such restitution would become. The most that could be hoped for from a successor government would be some form of compensation; and how would that compensation be paid for in an economy that will already have been altered in its basic structure?

Surely this situation is one that the United States will have to view in a much larger context than that of Castro or of Cuba alone.

The Castro image and the kind of action, the purposes and methods, the aims and ideals associated with it, right or wrong, provide a collective vision, a version of the world in which many of the dispossessed, the oppressed and the disenfranchised peoples of the Caribbean, Latin America, and possibly, the whole world, see a role for themselves, a means to achieve their goals of participation in the life of their nations, a way of exercising the power that resides in masses and numbers. Such an image cannot be undone in a moment. The end of Castro would not be the end of the image, and there are times when a live demagog is infinitely preferable to a dead martyr, particularly when that potential martyr has proven himself (with the help of all concerned) one of the most salable saints in recent history.

Can the United States avoid being maneuvered into becoming the antagonist of such mass movements and such mass aspirations, which exist whether or not the Cuban revolution truly represents them?

The answer to this question is highly difficult and fraught with dangers. To see the situation clearly requires that the United States accept the facts of the problem. Stated briefly, these are that any rich and powerful nation faced with a skilled demagog who identifies himself with a popular cause and becomes its symbol, is subject to a basic internal ambivalence. If it is a generous and politically unselfish nation as the United States is, this ambivalence is even more painful. For, on the one hand, the nation will want to support the legitimate aspirations that gave rise to the demagog, and on the other, will feel a profound irritation at seeing such valid ideals, debased by mobbery, hatred and mass manipulation. Further, the nation facing this problem is made painfully aware that the very strength of that demagog is fed by grievances with a genuine basis. What then if that nation feels an additional burden of guilt for having allowed those grievances to grow to the point of no return? As if this weren't bad enough, there is the painful truth that demagoguery flourishes by flaunting authority: the principle of psychological redress, of seeing the righteous and the mighty disturbed in their majesty, is one that has worked in favor of every law-breaking challenger since earliest human history. With Castro it has the additional advantage of involving the very small with the very large, thus adding a comic or tragic touch to the spectacle, depending upon on which side of the arena one happens to sit.

If these elements of the problem were not difficult enough, there are still two more of prime importance, both of which make it hard for the United States to see the question posed by the coming revolutionary changes in Latin America clearly and that are, instead, forcing the Castro image ever more powerfully to the fore.

The more important of these, clearly, is the way in which the present great power squeeze, with its faculty for making international mountains out of local molehills, for neglecting deeper issues in favor of combating local irritants, for taking the short view rather than the long, for adopting a defensive stand rather than the more solid posture becoming a great power sure of itself, has made of Castro a smokescreen through which the United States seems unable to see the true issues involved. Because of the power politics that form the constant background to the struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union, all reform movements, tinged with Castroism or not, directly influenced by him or not, are lumped together under the generic name of Fidelista. This pernicious error crops up again and again in the mass media in much the way that during the worst years of the McCarthy insanity in the United States, the single word "Communist" was used as the bogyman with which to conjure everything from appropriations, to the exile of some of America's outstanding intellectuals to Princeton's Institute for Advanced Studies. Such is the form of propaganda that not only does the United States fall into this error, but by a process of natural compensation, in which many errors tend to cancel each other out, some legitimate and perfectly democratic reform movements in Latin America and elsewhere find themselves, willy-nilly adopted into the Castro movement. In short, the prevalent looseness of thought simply makes it easy for Castro and others like him to take advantage of such genuine movements and pervert them for their own ends, ultimately turning them against the United States. Blind opposition to or identification of diverse reform movements with Fidel merely breeds Castro's advantage.

All this confusion of Castro and Latin America, this lumping together of dissimilar problems, distinct interests, varying backgrounds, is, I have suggested, the United States worst enemy in seeing its hemispheric relations in a true and clear light.

There is a parallel simplification in reverse which is equally harmful and which affects adversely the rhetoric of all Latin American political movements, be they of the right, the left or the center. This is the attribution to the United States of all the responsibilities and blames for all failings and mishaps south of the Rio Grande. Latin American elites have consistently neglected to examine their own shortcomings and limittaions and have, instead, made the United States the scapegoat for their own missed opportunities, aggrandizing the hostile role of the great power, the United States, and thus freeing themselves of the responsibility for their own unstable governments, their dictatorships, their land tenure systems, their armies and their economic, social, and political underdevelopment. Justice to the strong requires a special kind of courage and sophistication that is uncommon among those who are both weak and proud. Yet without such courage, and without the wisdom that derives from it, understanding will remain obscured and accord impossible. Explanations which exempt any of the parties from the compulsion to better themselves serve nothing, and this is why, if additional reasons were needed, personal, intellectual confrontations of the highest caliber between North and Latin Americans are so urgently necessary.

Well? We have seen some of the difficulties that face the United States, and some of the reasons why these difficulties, far from conveniently disappearing, are in the process of growing into fixed and inflexible attitudes. What then does the United States do?

Experience shows us certain things it does not do. It does not, for instance, try to dragoon the other countries of the hemisphere, all of which have internal problems susceptible to the same sort of solution as Castro's into overt, coordinated action against the point of irritation. This is akin to asking men who are showing signs of a highly infectious disease to go to the source of the infection and take on all the risks involved. But negative approaches to the question are not fundamental. Positive approaches are urgent. The world situation does not give any country time to reflect truthfully on its mistakes. The greater the stress, the more urgent it is that a closer vision of policy for the future be motivated.

To get at this new policy, I wish to use as a point of departure the report entitled "The Voice of Latin America and Its Significance in Today's World," submitted by William Benton and Adlai Stevenson on November 1, 1960, on their return from a 2-month visit to Latin America.

It is a very good report, well-documented and thought-provoking, and written with the skill and insight one might expect of its authors. Would that a similar document, as well meaning and generous were to be written about the United States by Latin Americans of corresponding authority and worth. The report is, at the same time, revealing in several ways that its authors did not intend. For example, the opening sentence declares: "Until the spring of 1960—the year both of us reached 60—neither Gov. Adlai Stevenson nor I had ever been in the great cities of South America." This statement carries its own tone of pathos. For Messrs. Stevenson and Benton, outstanding intellectual, cultural, and political leaders in their own rights, are representative figures of the highest quality in the United States or anywhere in the world. Their lack of direct contact has been typical of the elites of the United States. Until very recently, leading figures have had neither first-hand knowledge, nor even (and this has been galling to Latin Americans) much serious interest in South America. The same could not be said in reverse. Almost every leader in Central or South America has been to the United States; many have studied there; most are fluently conversant in English.

How to account for this basic disparity in reciprocal knowledge of each other's countries, institutions, languages and cultures? Mr. Benton, in his report, suggests that it is due to a profound conviction prevailing in the United States that there is nothing really worthwhile south of Rio Grande; that traffic with Latin America would be one-way traffic, with help, knowledge, protection and development flowing southward and little more than local color and appreciation infiltrating back. I believe that many difficulties in inter-American relations result from this conviction. I further believe that this conviction is erroneous in point of fact and that the unfortunate difficulties ensuing therefrom are compounded both by the U.S. ignorance vis-a-vis Latin America and Latin American insecurity vis-a-vis the United States. Such basic failure in communication need not be everlasting, and the fact that pedagogy, language instruction and Latin American studies have been the most neglected areas in American education over the past 50 years need not prevail forever. Yet the present unhappy state of affairs, which Messrs. Benton and Stevenson were honest and chagrined enough to admit, demonstrates that the sins of the fathers are indeed visited upon their children, and that the ills that educators do, live on after them.

Several other observations could be made on the basis of this report. Its accent on the amount of travel, organization and work represented by the trip, the speed and urgency of it all, the breathlessness of its appeal, is in itself revealing. Is it possible that all the work, work, work and help, help, help the United States intends for Latin America is due to fear? To fear that it is too late, that some international battle is being lost? Surely Latin America has some thoughts of its own on the subject; surely it has its own contributions to make; surely any help extended must be help out of a profound belief in the value of the things that the two cultures share, out of belief in a deeper and fuller life for both. Yet the report reveals too much the puritanical sense of guilt, the urgency of doing; it lacks its own breathing space, its sense, if one may use such a word today, of poetry, of enjoyment of life rather than activity.

This same urgency even, in some parts, conveys a sense of panic, which is unfortunate. The United States is a great power; the one thing that great powers cannot permit themselves is a sense of frenzy. Why, for instance, should the seat of the OAS be changed from Washington to Panama? Because its present location points to the fact that the United States is the outstanding Nation of the hemisphere? The United States does not need to apologize for its strength or weaken it. What it must do is to turn it to the best advantage of all. If the OAS is to become an important influence in the orientation of U.S. policies it had better remain in Washington.

Finally, there are in parts of the report, due to these very same factors I have mentioned, aspects of that same condescension that has always deeply disturbed Latin America, particularly when it becomes a question of what must be done. This pressure to get things done—and "done" here means, fundamentally, done for or to Latin

America—ends up by giving an unfortunate impression that if only the United States could wake up and do its job in Latin America right, then the subcontinent might indeed turn out as the United States has, rich, educated, developed, democratic, and self-fulfilled.

The fact is that the United States position, which for all the valuable suggestions of the report, its quick sympathy, its honesty, and its compressed command and understanding of enormously diverse situations, should be anything but that of writing a blueprint for the development of Latin America. Rather, it should be an invitation to these countries to write their own blueprints, or perhaps not even to go that far, but to think, in terms of their own aspirations, just what kind of societies it is that they want and aim to achieve.

It is terribly important that the impetus for change come from the republics themselves; changing societies against their will can only be done through violence, and then for how long? And is it not possible—I pose this as a hypothetical question on which we might well reflect hard and long—that some people may prefer to remain what they are? Is it not possible that it is not in the interests of the United States to broaden its vision and seek to be for all what it would be for itself? The great cultural hegemonies of the past were not based—and this is an understatement—on any deep understanding of the problems, the cultures, the aspirations of the countries included in such groupings. The Roman Empire did not wax strong on an understanding of Carthage and Asia Minor; nor did the British import their institutions of parliamentary procedure, of equality under the law and respect for individual rights by sympathy toward the Indian border states or Tanganyika. True enough, these cultural hegemonies were created under an imperial system of master-and-slave relationships; but do we know the answers to the 20th-century version of these relationships? I am merely suggesting, with this very pertinent question, what I think is a major problem; that it may be that what we should all do is tend our own gardens, and provide one's services upon request, not merely when needed. Our neighbors may like to grow unsightly plants and we blooming roses, but until they express a desire for roses, who would take care of the roses once they were planted?

Within the framework of the autodeveloped plan for Latin America, the United States would be perfectly correct in establishing its own limits, its own requirements, and even in stating, quite candidly, its own aims. In fact, it is necessary that the United States make these limits plain in advance; the nature of the aid it is prepared to grant on request, the extent and kind of services and personnel it is prepared to lend, and the things it would expect to get in return, just as any two partners in a development enterprise would have clear understanding before any project was begun. There are, beyond Latin America itself, many projects on which the partnership could embark together; there are areas in the world where the partnership could make a definite contribution, and some in which the process of learning could be shared.

It has been said by some, quite recently by Mr. Douglass Cater in the Reporter, that Puerto Rico is an answer to Castro, and indirectly, to Latin America's own development. Having been one of the persons responsible in part for this development, I am deeply appreciative of the compliment intended. Nevertheless, I think that the abstraction Puerto Rico-Latin American development contains some serious errors. To begin with, the situations are not entirely comparable. The links that bind us to the United States are many and mutually beneficial to an extent that is not true of any of the other Latin American republics. Then there is the fact that our development in Puerto Rico may not be the kind of development that a country in Latin America would choose to follow; I am not, as I suppose I have made amply plain, a believer in the interchangeability of solutions. Further, there is a widespread belief in Latin America that what has been achieved in Puerto Rico has been achieved more by the United States than by Puerto Rico itself. In this they are wrong, as we in the United States and in Puerto Rico are both wrong—one wonders if for the same reason—in not giving due credit to Rexford Guy Tugwell for his brilliant participation in the pacific revolution led by Luis Muñoz Marín in Puerto Rico.

It may be well to recall briefly a bit of recent, yet forgotten, Puerto Rican history. Until quite late in his period of office, Franklin D. Roosevelt made his appointments to the governorship of Puerto Rico in cavalier fashion: first an amiable newspaperman from Florida, whose only qualification for that office was a substantial contribution to the Democratic campaign; then, after the dismal failure of this first appointment, a retired Army general from Georgia whose noted tightlippedness was supposed to contrast with the bumbling loquacity of his predecessor, but who was obviously out of his depth. By the time he was withdrawn in 1938, and Admiral Leahy became his successor, the articulate groups in the opposition—all except the most conservative in the professional groups and the well-heeled landed and commercial elites—had adopted a fundamentally independentist position. We saw no other viable solution for the development of Puerto Rico, no other way out of a futile colonial tutelage.

It was also in 1938 that first under the designation of Acción Social Independentista and a little later under its present name of Partido Popular Democrático, Luis Muñoz Marín created the social, economic, political movement destined to direct the Government of Puerto Rico from 1941 to the present. This movement was at first firmly committed to the twin aims of social justice and independence for Puerto Rico. It was not until Muñoz Marín encountered unyielding opposition from his potential clientele—namely, in the startling lack of support of the jibaro or peasant section as well as the laboring masses for the proposed independence of Puerto Rico—that he and his followers were forced to reexamine the assumptions of his program. It is to Muñoz Marín's everlasting credit that he had the courage and the wisdom to align himself with the needs and the exigencies of the democratic process and rated social justice first. Thus, after a bitter internal struggle which has taken different turns throughout the years, the way to human progress and social dignity seems to be finally cleared in the complex political formulae of our present Commonwealth organization. It must be added that the success achieved has been in no small part due to the practical qualities, experience, and flexibility that the last non-Puerto Rican governor, Tugwell, brought to his post. But the formula of Commonwealth and social justice which has succeeded so well in Puerto Rico is not in the cards for the countries of Latin America. These are sovereign nations and must remain such; they must have both independence and social justice and this creates a totally different situation.

I am not suggesting, of course, that there are not elements in the Puerto Rican situation that would not be extremely beneficial, as examples, to many of the countries in Latin America. What I am saying, what I am insisting on, is that the United States only needs to make it possible for the Latin American republics to be able, if they so care, to undertake similar operations, or adaptations of the Puerto Rican experience. I am suggesting that Puerto Rico as a panacea is as dangerous a simplification as any of the others that I have been discussing.

This brings me to my conclusion. I have insisted throughout on three main points: (1) that the United States should divert its present extravagant interest in Fidel Castro towards an awareness of the realities facing it in dealing with Latin America; (2) that it should provide solid support for the creation of independently motivated social and economic changes in Latin America, and (3) that it should do so not as the all-powerful progenitor of such changes but as a financial and technical partner who participates in such programs on request, making clear beforehand his terms and anticipations and, at the same time, his own secondary role concerning the means taken, the timetable, the form, the personnel and so on, involved.

This may sound as though the United States should be merely a passive agent towards Latin America, a source of an abstract bounty, ideologically uncommitted.

Let me dispel that impression immediately, with what I consider must be the most important step the United States should take.

This involves a recognition of the fact that in the next decade a great upheaval, economic, social, and cultural will be taking place throughout Latin America, as it will in much of the world. It is my opinion that the United States must identify itself positively with these movements, that it must, in the French sense of the word "d'avancer," go ahead, of the great reform of the balance of the century. It must provide moral and intellectual endorsement and if need be assistance for these reforms. Instead of letting situations occur, as they have in Cuba, in distasteful forms, about which it can then do nothing, it should exercise all its moral suasion to seeing that these reforms occur within frameworks favorable to peace, progress, justice, and liberty. The United States should issue now, before once again it is too late, a declaration of principles as far-reaching as Wilson's 14 points or Roosevelt's Atlantic Charter, and incorporate into this statement those elements which form part of the natural and just aspirations of the great masses in Latin America and throughout the world that yearn for social justice and reform.

What should such a document contain? What would be its fundamental points?

I think they are three.

First, a statement of the principles of democratic life. These are expressed better and earlier, in the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America than in any other document. The principles on which that declaration is based, of the fundamental equality of men, of equality before the law, and of the right of every man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness over and above any and all consideration of property and the priority of these rights over any and all other rights, need to be reiterated and reaffirmed as valid for the entire hemisphere, and all limitations of these rights, even those represented by the vested interests of the United States, to be firmly condemned and repudiated.

This means that the United States must declare its acceptance of the right of all governments in the hemisphere to amend their laws in the pursuit of these aims, to do over their systems of land tenure, to overcome injustice, and give a fair chance to the destitute. It also means that the United States must realize that in the modern world, the role of the state in the task of equalization is fundamental and more important than any other single factor.

Second, a declaration along the lines laid down by Kenneth Galbraith in his recent article in Foreign Affairs, "A Positive Approach to Economic Assistance," in which he develops the idea (the same idea that Muñoz Marín and Tugwell and several other able and devoted people working together put into practice in Puerto Rico) that capital by itself is not enough to do the job; that machines by themselves are not enough: that these two elements alone cannot transform a society and that people are the indispensable factor in such transformations.

Efficient and progressive governments, without which peaceful social change is impossible, require a reservoir of trained and effective personnel, and such reservoirs cannot be created without education, without resourceful government intervention, without a sense of the obligations of public administration: in short, without planning, without a sense of the difference between objectives and ways, by which I mean methods and structures. This dimension of implementation is a higher form of what is so often called know-how. It does not involve merely the tricks of the trade, but also a sensitivity to carrying dreams out, to making them work in practice, to add the missing dimensions of reality to the hopes of man.

I am persuaded that the great chasm that is involved in all this, the one that so facilitates the growth of demagoguery and Peronism, the chasm between objectives and achievements, the difference between the dream world of what ought to be and the reality of what it takes to make dreams come true, is one of the greatest obstacles to hemispheric development. In 1940 a group of us had the dreams, the goals, the enthusiasms, the general support, but all these, important and indispensable as they were, were not enough. We needed also the courage to make the hard choices, the wisdom to discard inoperative formulae, the techniques, the resources, the kind of managerial leadership essential to bring objectives into fruition. This special talent required for operational action has often been deprecated in the Latin American world and has unjustly been equated to the organization men and the operators without faiths and spiritual strength to live by, of which the United States seems to produce so very many. Such operators or robots are a distorted representation of the pragmatic or hard-headed idealist of whom I am speaking. If such people do not exist in Latin America in sufficient quantity, it is of the highest urgency to facilitate their recruitment and training. For otherwise, Latin Americans may find themselves at a loss to effect successfully their own impending revolutions. It is part of the task all of us face, Latin Americans, the United States, leaders of education in the Western World, to provide the leadership and assistance necessary for these cadres to come into existence, so that these in turn may create structures on which governments may rest in stability and justice. Next to this task, capital and machinery is of minor importance.

Third, and last, the United States must be willing to state just how much it is willing to put up with. It must recognize that it cannot do the job for Latin America. Even if it wanted to, it could not do it by itself, for people are not saved, they save themselves. The United States must, therefore, be willing to tolerate many and different paths toward the goals to which the whole hemisphere can subscribe, and it must make plain beforehand that it is willing and even eager to see such diversity, that its interests lie in furthering these goals and not in imposing a single matrix on all forms of social, economic and political progress. Latin American elites must have the intellectual courage necessary to search out the difficult ways that lead to service and responsibility; they must find the will and magnanimity to tread these paths as the leaders of their own millions of ill-housed, ill-trained and ill-fed; ultimately, they will find this to be to the benefit of all. This may be too much to expect of either the United States or Latin America, but certainly not too much to ask, at least for those of us committed to the uses of intelligence and of good will.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, turning to another matter, very quickly, and I should like to have the attention of the minority leader on this, so he can advise his side of the aisle, I want to make an announcement, with the complete approval of the majority leader. I cleared this matter earlier this morning with the majority leader at the time the Subcommittee on Education met. My Subcommittee on Education is going to proceed next Tuesday morning at 9:30 a.m. with our subcommittee markup of the national defense education bill. We will continue day by day in those markup sessions until we report the bill to the full committee.

It is my hope, and I risk the prediction, that we shall be able to report the bill to the full committee by Thursday noon of next week.

I wish to make this announcement because I do not want any Senator to feel that I or any member of the committee have in any way let him down or given him the run-around, because, as the minority leader well knows, it was our hope and expectation that we could finish the mark-up of the NDEA bill this week.

But we got into session this morning, and I listened to the representatives of members of the subcommittee on both sides of the table, Democrat and Republican alike. The physical facts are just these with regard to time: I am confronted with a situation in which many members of the subcommittee are already committed to other committee meetings for the rest of this week. The committees considering migratory labor, unemployment, and some other subjects have commitments from members of the Education Subcommittee, so that if I did my very best to continue the hearings tomorrow and Friday, I would have difficulty getting a quorum. Therefore, I knew the time had come to reach an agreement with my colleagues on the committee. They had every reason to ask for a postponement of the markup hearings. Therefore, I cleared with the majority leader the plan to start the markup sessions next Tuesday. We would have started them Monday, but some members of the subcommittee could not be present Monday, but told me, as chairman of the subcommittee, they would agree, starting Tuesday at 9:30 a.m., to stay with the deliberations of the committee until work on the bill is completed.

I want the record to show that the majority leader has given me assurances that, as soon as the Labor and Public Welfare Committee reports the NDEA bill and it is put on the calendar, Senate action on that bill will be given priority, save and except for the housing bill if it is ready. If it is, we will proceed to the consideration of that bill, subject, of course, to any other calendar emergency which may arise on the floor of the Senate.

I want Senators to know that, as we promised, we are going to complete consideration of the NDEA bill as soon as possible by completing marking up the bill, and get it to the Senate calendar. I also want them to know that the majority leader has given us assurance that the bill will receive high priority on the calendar as soon as it is ready.

I wanted to make this statement because I do not want to be in a position where anyone can have any basis even for a suspicion that we are not keeping our promise. It is true we told certain Senators we would do our very best to get the bill marked up this week. I wish the RECORD to show that I cannot deliver on that promise. It does not mean we are walking out on the promise. It means it is a continuing promise and we will get the bill out of the committee next week as soon as we can.

Mr. SYMINGTON obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may yield for 1 minute.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the Members of the Senate appreciate the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I know how diligently the Senator has pursued the problem. What he says gives point to the difficulties which confront the Senate at the present time.

Insofar as I know, there must be 120 or more subcommittees and committees, and there is no coordination about their meetings. I am confronted, as other Senators are confronted, by days when four subcommittees or committees of which I am a member announce meetings at one and the same time. It becomes a physical impossibility to carry that kind of a workload and to do full justice to it.

The Senator is to be commended for having in mind the real physical problems confronting other Senators with regard to their committee commitments, and I am sure everyone will agree he has been extraordinarily diligent in seeking to complete action on the National Defense Education Act amendments.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is very kind. Quickly I add that of course we have another group entitled to consideration, and that is our professional staff members, both majority and minority. They are working for both sides in the preparation, every hour, of memorandums we can use in the debate the rest of this week on S. 1021. We cannot expect our professional staff to be working on two

bills at the same time, so in fairness to them also we decided this morning we should postpone markup hearings on S. 1726 until next Tuesday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is especially true of an overworked minority staff, I assure the Senator.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, first I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] for his courtesy in waiting.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri be allowed 3 minutes, regardless of the interruption by other Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MISINFORMATION ABOUT OUR DEFENSES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the RECORD inaccurate information about our defenses, published by one of the services.

Millions of Americans probably read the Associated Press article I have in my hand referring to this Defense Department release. I personally read it on the front page of one of the Nation's leading newspapers.

Today I read in the press that—

Pentagon spokesmen said Military Review reprints articles from other military journals over the world, and that the one in question—while not labeled as such—actually largely was a compilation of press and magazine reports.

Now I ask two questions.

If this information, critically important to the security of the United States and the free world, is correct, why is it not put out at high level by the Government?

If it is incorrect, why does the Government spend the taxpayers' money to mislead the people by putting it out at all?

PRICE REDUCTION CAMPAIGN URGED BY WARRENSBURG NEWS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the editors of the Warrensburg News have over the past several months been strongly urging a national effort on the part of the administration to bring about price reductions. They argue that such a campaign would strengthen our economy and thereby help to alleviate present unemployment difficulties.

I am very much impressed with this idea and have discussed it on the floor of the Senate on two occasions. There is always a little bit of extra leeway where, by cutting corners, increasing production, or just squeezing a little harder, prices can be lowered. If there were widespread sentiment behind a campaign to accomplish this purpose, the logical result would be for consumers to increase their purchases in order to take advantage of the efforts of manufacturers and retailers to encourage sales by reducing prices.

William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has urged action along these lines, and Joseph Slevin of the New York Herald Tribune has also written several articles supporting this kind of a campaign. I want to suggest today that, while action by the Federal Government in this area may not be imminent, there are a number of national organizations which, I believe, could successfully undertake a campaign to lower prices. I should like to urge that serious consideration be given to this undertaking by volunteer groups as well as by the relevant Federal officials.

This is a simple and straightforward proposal. It has merit. It is imaginative and constructive. I commend the Warrensburg News for the strong stand which it has taken in support of this idea.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the end of my remarks an editorial from the May 4 issue of the Warrensburg News entitled "Senator KEATING Is in Our Corner." All I can say Mr. President, is "Yes, Senator KEATING is in your corner."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR KEATING IS IN OUR CORNER

The editorial campaign of the Warrensburg News for a national program of price reductions got recognition on the floor of the U.S. Senate on April 19 when Senator KENNETH B. KEATING cited it in his remarks before that body.

An editorial from this paper and an article on the same subject by Joseph Slevin, national economics editor of the New York Herald Tribune, were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator KEATING.

Commenting on the editorials, Senator KEATING said:

"Such a campaign to lower prices would not be to the detriment or disadvantage of any group or individuals in our economy. Quite the contrary, such a campaign, spearheaded by the White House or by vigorous civic groups, would help step up our economy. It would assist our economy and our Nation as a whole."

In support of this position the Senator called attention to a public appeal for price reductions by William McChesney Martin, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

"Throughout our country," Mr. Martin said, "we must not only increase our productivity but also pass some of the gains on to the consumer in the form of lower prices, rather than have all of it go exclusively to labor in higher wages or to management in higher profits."

Senator KEATING observed that the voices raised for a campaign of price reductions have received surprisingly little notice in Congress or in the press.

This is indeed surprising when one considers the logic of the points made by Senator KEATING and Mr. Martin. We hope that the Senator's efforts to bring this crucial issue to the fore will at last get results.

GERMANS PROSPER BY REJECTING U.S. ADVICE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in yesterday's edition of the Washington Daily News there was published an article written by Roger Stuart on the economic resurgence of Germany.

Mr. Stuart points out that although the Economic Advisers for the United States advised Germany on their economic problems following World War II, their advice was not followed by the Germans. In fact, the Germans took a diametrically opposite view in regard to a sound economy. Instead of following the advice of the American advisers at that time not to pay too much attention to balanced budgets and a sound economy, the Germans went the other way and insisted on a balanced budget, insisted on a sound economy, and insisted on interest rates which would not encourage speculation and inflation. The German economy, under that program, which was exactly opposite to that of the theorists the United States sent to Germany, has had a greater degree of resurgence and recovery, probably, than the economy of any other nation in the world.

Mr. Stuart also points out that one of the advisers to the German Government, whose advice was not taken by the Germans at that time, fortunately, was Prof. Walter Wolfgang Heller, now serving as Chairman of President Kennedy's three member Council of Economic Advisers.

I am not too sure about the facts reported in the article, but I assume they are correct. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANS PROSPERED WHEN THEY REJECTED U.S. ADVICE

(By Roger Stuart)

A 10-year-old report and analysis of the West German economy is the "button" in a childish game of concealment now being played by the State Department.

The 446-page document was prepared by a Marshall plan team of U.S. economists in 1951 and was submitted to the German Minister of Finance with recommendations for action.

When the State Department was first asked about the report officials said they could not find their copy. Later they admitted it was in the files, but said it couldn't be released because its classification was uncertain. (It was recently declassified from "secret.") However, information about the advice was readily available from other sources.

Why do State Department officials, trying despite the report's declassification, oppose disclosure of its contents? The answer apparently is twofold:

First, because it would reveal how poorly advised were the Germans by the team of American economists, since the extraordinary prosperity that has been achieved under practices which were precisely the reverse of what the report advised.

Second, because those who prepared the report include economists now helping to shape the Kennedy administration's multibillion-dollar program of Federal action and controls.

The Marshall plan team of 1951, whose prophecies were to prove so wrong in the case of West Germany, included Prof. Walter Wolfgang Heller, now serving as chairman of President Kennedy's three-member Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. Kennedy made it clear before his inauguration last January that the Council would become "a key element within the Presidential Office."

The President-elect said the CEA would "deal not only with the state of the economy but with our goals for economic progress." And he was leaving it to the Chairman, he said, to find ways and means "of providing us with the best possible staff assistance and advice in the major fields of economic and social policy with which the administration will be concerned."

Among other things, Dr. Heller and his 1951 teammates told Dr. Ludwig Erhard and and his Finance Ministry that West Germany couldn't achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it kept worrying about inflation.

A certain amount of inflation wouldn't hurt, it was suggested and the Germans shouldn't "confuse wartime inflation with the normal operations of peacetime credit."

Moreover, the newly organized Ministry was told that it had an "excessive concern for price stability" and was "overly timid" in allowing the creation of new credit.

But Dr. Erhard knew from bitter experience in the catastrophic days following the First World War what terrible things might occur as a result of runaway inflation.

"We shall continue to resist inflation," he declared. And West Germany, to its great good fortune, did.

The report, calling for easy money, said that "a rate of interect high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment."

Nevertheless, West Germany maintained its high rate of interest—and watched both personal savings and investments grow.

Rather than grant industry liberal depreciation allowances, a "compulsory investment program" should be put in force, said the American fiscal advisers, adding that "the nostalgic hopes * * * looking toward a revival of the 19th century role of the capital market plays no such role in any modern country and there is no prospect that it will."

Dr. Erhard, who had studied his economics under a professor whose slogan was "free enterprise is the essence," saw to it that West Germany kept its liberal depreciation policy. Industry expanded rapidly, and the country prospered.

By the end of 1951, John J. McCloy, U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, was able to report that already a "transformation" had occurred which "might almost be called a miracle," and he added:

"West Germany has largely reestablished itself as a solid, productive country. Its production has increased from 1947 threefold, until it has become the second largest industrial producing country in Western Europe."

The steady growth and development since then provide one of the brightest pages in the history of free enterprise—anywhere and in any age.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am glad to know that the Senator from Iowa has had printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Germans Prospered When They Rejected U.S. Advice," by Roger Stuart, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on May 16. The article refers to a 10-year-old report and analysis of the West German economy. The State Department apparently refused to give it to the reporter who sought to obtain it. Evidently Mr. Stuart got it through another source.

The point is that the Germans were advised by a Marshall plan team of American economists in 1951 that, among other things, West Germany could not achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it kept worrying about inflation. The article states—

A certain amount of inflation wouldn't hurt, it was suggested and the Germans shouldn't "confuse wartime inflation with the normal operations of peacetime credit."

Moreover, the newly organized ministry was told that it had an "excessive concern for price stability" and was "overly timid" in allowing the creation of new credit.

But, as we all know, Dr. Ludwig Erhard had learned from bitter experience something about these matters, and he said that they would continue to resist inflation, which they did. We have seen the results of his ministry in the last 10 years, during which Germany has become the strongest industrial nation in Europe and has made the most remarkable recovery that the annals of history record.

It is a little disturbing to read this article because one of the principal members of the Marshall plan team was Dr. Walter Heller, who is now chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Mr. Kennedy, at his inauguration last January, made it clear that this Council would become a key element within the Presidential office.

I have been disturbed by some of Dr. Heller's testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, and I therefore thought that this story was especially interesting and worthy of the attention of Members of Congress.

PROGRESS OF NEGROES IN AMERICA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, those who agitate for racial integration in this country often times vie with one another in a popular sport to determine which one can paint the worst possible picture to our country and the world of the "inhuman treatment, oppression, and lack of opportunities" accorded the American Negroes by members of the white race, particularly in the South. In their zeal to force racial integration in areas where integration is not desired by the overwhelming majority of the people of both races, these integration zealots have been doing a great disservice to our country in painting such a distorted picture of race relations to the rest of the world and in attempting to divide our people at home at a time when we should be united as never before. They give this distorted view to the world and then try to tell those opposed to forced integration that we must submit to the supposed world opinion that they have been able to conjure up against our position.

If the integrationists are truly concerned about world opinion and are not just trying to use what adverse world opinion they are able to generate to force attainment of their end of racial integration, then I would think that they would be trying to present to the world the true picture of the great progress the American Negroes have made in this country in such a short period of time.

Fortunately, there are Americans outside the South and there are some few publications outside the South that have the courage to run against the liberal pressures in this country which eschew presenting our best side for consideration in molding world opinion about our great country. In the May 22, 1961, issue of U.S. News & World Report, which is ably edited and published by Mr. David Lawrence, there is an excellent article which presents the true picture of the progress which the Negro race has been able to make in this country in a brief time. The article is entitled appropriately "Truth About the Negro's Progress in America." It points out among other things how much more freedom, material prosperity, and opportunities the American Negroes have than do any other Negroes in the world—and in fact than most other peoples in the world, whether they be in Soviet Russia, Red China, or on the Continent of Europe.

This is what we should be telling the world insead of trying to run our country down with distorted images painted for the purpose of forcing an unwanted social revolution in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUTH ABOUT THE NEGRO'S PROGRESS IN AMERICA

(Kennedy campaign to raise the status of American Negroes is turning new attention to their condition. What's found, in the records, is a story of amazing progress through the years. Negroes in the United States now fare better than many Europeans, better than any other members of their own race anywhere: better paid, housed, better educated—just name it. And new gains are coming constantly.)

Is the American Negro today downtrodden, denied a fair chance, living at a substandard level, lacking opportunity for higher education?

The official attitude in Washington is that the answer to this question is "Yes."

The administration is making a point of placing Negroes in key posts up to the Cabinet level. Scouts are being sent by the Federal Government to search for qualified Negroes to fill higher-paid civil service positions. There is to be increased pressure on employers who have received Government contracts to give greater attention to Negro applicants whenever job opportunities occur.

A separate division in the Department of Justice is engaged in looking out for the rights of Negroes. The Supreme Court, in recent decisions, has broadened these rights. And Congress is asked to strengthen laws designed to bring about racial equality.

The idea, at home and abroad, is that the American Negro is relegated to a life of hardship and persecution.

SWIFT PROGRESS

Yet what do the facts really show? An answer can be obtained from the Census Bureau, from employment and housing figures, from Negro organizations, from reports on education and income.

What emerges is this conclusion: There is probably no group in history that has made the progress that American Negroes have made in so short a time.

One hundred years ago almost all the Negroes in the United States were slaves, wholly uneducated. Less than 25 years ago, the bulk of Negroes was engaged in farm labor in the South. Most of them lived in primitive shacks with no running water, no laborsaving devices, no refrigeration. Young, mature, and aged Negroes alike were bound to long hours of labor. They lacked time for a full grade school education. They died young.

Most of the world's 308 million Negroes with the exception of those in the United States, are found by U.N. agencies to be living like that today—and dying before the age of 40.

In America what do you find among Negroes today?

The 19 million Negroes in the United States are unofficially estimated to have had income in 1960 of more than $20 billion. That works out to more than $1,000 a year for every Negro man, woman and child in the country. The people of Western Europe, on the average, do not have so large an income per person. Negroes who live outside the United States do not even approach that income or the standard of living which is made possible by it.

In France, the individual Frenchman's share of the national income is about $850 a year. In West Germany, per capita income is about the same. In Britain, it is roughly $1,000, or about the same as that of the American Negro. Taking Western Europe as a whole, income per person comes to about $650.

In the newly formed "black republics" of Africa, reports to the United Nations indicate that cash incomes of Negro citizens range from $182 a year in Senegal to $40 a year in the Somali Republic. Best guesses by western experts on Communist countries is that per capita income in the Soviet Union is $200 to $300 a year, and in Red China about $50 to $100 a year.

The U.S. Negro who worked the full year in 1958 is estimated by the Department of Labor to have earned a median income of $3,368, meaning that half the Negro workers got more than this, and half got less. That's more than the $2,234 estimated for the average worker in Great Britain and more than four times the estimate of $800 for the average worker in the Soviet Union.

This median wage also is a measure of the advance that Negroes have made in the United States. Twenty years ago the median income for Negroes was estimated at $639—less than a fifth of the 1958 figure.

IN THE NORTH, JOBS

The gain in income stems primarily from the fact that since 1940, jobs have opened for Negroes in cities of the North and West as well as the South. In 1940, the census counted more than 1.5 million Negroes working on farms in the South. By 1950 this number had been cut to 1 million, and by 1960 Negroes working on southern farms had dwindled to 770,000, or a little more than half the 1940 count. In the same 20-year span, the number of male Negroes employed as household workers had plummeted from 90,000 to 9,000.

Today there are more than 5.5 million Negroes employed in American industry. Approximately half of these are listed as skilled or semiskilled workers, groups whose wages have been rising in recent years. Reports from Negro organizations show that the greatest gains in employment occurred in the aircraft, automobile, chemical, communications, electronics, steel, and meatpacking industries.

The 1940 census showed that Negroes made up less than 10 percent of the number of men workers in industry. Now about one in every six men in industry is a Negro. Negro women also have found an increasing number of job openings in industry.

Along with their gains in industry, Negroes have been making inroads in getting white-collar jobs. The 1960 census showed about 600,000 Negroes in clerical and sales jobs—more than six times the number counted in 1940.

FREE SPENDERS

Don W. Connell, a marketing analyst, reports that three Negroes out of four now live in cities with populations of 50,000 or more, and that half of them live in cities with more than 250,000. He reports that the Negro market is primarily an urban market, and one that is becoming increasingly urban in composition.

With more money to spend then ever before, urban Negroes are spending it freely on items that would be luxuries for most European workers and impossibilities for most natives on other continents. Mr. Connell finds that Negro families spend even more freely than white families on such things as clothing, toiletries, house appliances, TV sets, record players and home furnishings.

A report by a Negro research organization notes that, when it comes to buying automobiles, the Negro prefers a car in the middle or upper price range.

A marketing survey reports that Negroes in the United States own 4.5 million automobiles—one for every five Negroes in the country. In Soviet Russia, there is only one car for each 350 people, and most of those are either state-owned or belong to high-ranking party officials.

WAR-BORN PROGRESS

Spokesmen for Negro groups, while still pressing for better conditions for members of their race, agree generally that Negroes in the United States are doing better than they ever did before, better than they are doing anywhere else in the world. Guichard Parris, to top official of the National Urban League, the oldest nationwide organization devoted to improvement of race relations, says:

"Nineteen forty and the early war years were the time of the big breakthrough for Negroes. In the past 20 years, the Negro has come farther than he did in the entire previous three quarters of a century since the end of the Civil War."

This breakthrough resulted from the increasing demand for workers in the expanding war industries in the North and West. Prosperity through most of the postwar years has enabled Negroes to continue their progress. The Labor Department finds that young Negroes make up a highly mobile part of the labor force, with workers willing to move from place to place to get better jobs.

That is cited as a contrast to most other countries. West Indians, flocking to England, complain that they can get nothing but unskilled jobs as day laborers. Arabs in France are said to be faring no better.

Although U.S. Negroes on the whole still have lower living standards and lower pay than the white population, improvement for Negroes is recognized as being widespread. A Negro historian, Dr. John Reuben Sheeler of Texas Southern University, in a Government pamphlet, gives this picture:

"Today, economic well-being is far from being limited to a fortunate few within the Negro community; it has spread like a wave to touch most of the Negro population. Every major city in the country is dotted with comfortable Negro homes—including ranch-type dwellings with late-model cars parked in the driveways. Often the family owns a second car."

A housing survey made along with the 1960 census found that almost 2 million Negroes owned and occupied their own homes. Two out of three of these homes were judged by Government standards to be in good condition. The Public Housing Agency states that almost half of all public-housing units in the United States are rented to Negroes. This housing is generally new, built to accepted standards. Occupancy is limited to prevent crowding and the development of slums.

In large Northern and Western cities, Negro tenancy in low-cost public housing runs as high as 90 percent in some projects. Local housing authorities point out that there are still slums in most cities, and that Negroes live in them, accounting for a high proportion of juvenile delinquency and crime. But federally aided slum clearance and urban-renewal projects are attacking slums, and Negroes are benefiting.

MORE AND BETTER SCHOOLING

Education for Negroes also is improving rapidly, even though controversy over segregated schools may give a different impression.

More than 120,000 young Negroes are attending colleges and universities in the United States, compared with some 23,000 back in 1940. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reports that applications for college enrollment by Negroes are increasing. In all of Great Britain, with 50 million people. British officials report only about 100,000 college and university students.

The Southern Education Reporting Service notes that, at the grade and high school level, American Negro youngsters are getting increasing attention and opportunity. Almost every Negro child between the ages of 7 and 13 now is enrolled in a grade school. More than 8 out of 10 between the ages of 14 and 17—the high school age—also are enrolled in classes.

The kind of education being given to Negro children is reported by Dr. Ambrose Caliver, a Negro and chief of the adult-education section of HEW, to be steadily improving. With a background of 40 years' experience, Dr. Caliver says: "The quality of education for Negroes is increasing phenomenally as equipment, facilities and the number of trained teachers increases."

It is in the Southern States, where the segregation fight is centered and where most schools are still segregated, that the greatest efforts have been made to improve Negro education. Run-down, 1-room schoolhouses for Negroes still exist in some rural areas, as they also do for white pupils. But school budgets show that these backward facilities are rapidly giving way to up-to-date consolidated schools in much of the South. The most modern teaching equipment is supplementing blackboards and chalk.

Teaching load—the number of pupils per teacher—is a yardstick used by many educators to gage teaching quality. The lower the load the better the teaching. In Negro schools in the South the average load is 27 pupils to a teacher. In Western Europe, a United Nations report puts the average load at 80 or more.

Reports from State school authorities show that salaries of Negro teachers generally are equal to those of white teachers in the South. In Alabama, Tennessee, and North Carolina, Negro teachers generally are paid more than white teachers. Mississippi reports that spending for Negro schools doubled between 1952 and 1957, while outlay for white schools rose 30 percent. Other Southern States spend at nearly equal rates for white and Negro schools.

CAP AND GOWN, AND THEN

Officials of Negro colleges report an increasing number of applications from Negroes for graduate courses in the sciences. They think this results in part from the fact

that most American scientific and professional societies now accept Negroes as members. They expect an even heavier rush to graduate schools if President Kennedy's drive to recruit Negroes for top Federal jobs gains momentum.

There is at present no accurate count of the number of Negroes holding Federal jobs. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, notes that application forms for Government positions have not called for a statement of race since 1941.

However, an April 1960, estimate by the Labor Department reported that 855,000 Negroes were employed by Federal, State and local governments in jobs at all levels. In addition, about 200,000 Negroes were in the Armed Forces—around 5,000 as commissioned or warrant officers. A tabulation by the Civil Service Commission suggests that more than half the Negroes holding Federal jobs work in Washington. These number between 50,000 and 55,000. One in six has a supervisory job, and more than 300 have policy-shaping posts.

HIGHER ECHELONS

The Kennedy administration is moving swiftly to place additional Negroes in positions of top importance. Robert C. Weaver, head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency holds the highest post in Government ever attained by a Negro. He may step even higher. He is being mentioned as a possibility for Secretary of the Department of Urban Affairs—a new Cabinet position requested by the President.

In the White House, President Kennedy has installed Frank D. Reeves as a special assistant, coordinating all Government activities in the field of civil rights. He has chosen Andrew Hatcher as associate press secretary.

Samuel Z. Westerfield, of Atlanta University, is assistant director of debt analysis, the first Negro to hold a professional staff job in the Treasury Department. Mrs. Dollie Lowther Robinson has been named as a top assistant in the Labor Department. Christopher C. Scott is Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, Carl Rowan is a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State. Cecil Poole of San Francisco is the first Negro to be appointed a Federal district attorney.

These newcomers are meeting other Negroes already holding high Government posts. Dr. James C. Evans is a manpower expert in the Defense Department. Clifton R. Wharton, a career diplomat, is Ambassador to Norway. Dr. Ambrose Caliver is chief of the adult-education section of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Maj. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., is the highest ranking Negro officer in the Air Force.

"In no other country in the world," said a widely traveled foreign diplomat recently in Washington, "has a minority group achieved such status and broad employment in their nation's government."

NEW HORIZONS

For the next break-through, Negro leaders are suggesting as targets banking, insurance and some policymaking positions in business and industry.

A number of Negroes already have been successful in these fields with companies dealing with members of their own races. There are at least 33 Negro savings and loan associations in the United States with assets ranging from $1 million to more than $10 million. There are 53 Negro-owned life insurance companies with assets totaling $230 million and 14 Negro banks with combined resources of more than $40 million.

Negro athletes and entertainers, who got their training and start in the United States have long been recognized both at home and abroad as great performers. Most Negro advances in these fields were made before World War II but there have been some important gains since. Negroes did not play in big league baseball until 1947, but today there are Negro players on every major-league club. Altogether they number 80, including some of the highest paid stars in the game. Negro basketball and football stars are drawing big pay as professionals. And Althea Gibson cracked the color barrier in lawn tennis to win the American, British and French championships, going on from there to turn professional.

Negro entertainers now are being sent on world tours as good will ambassadors by the State Department.

AT THE POLLS

By moving in large numbers into big cities, where they are displacing many white residents, Negroes now are acquiring political power. In metropolitan areas, old-line white politicians are dealing with Negro political leaders as equals. To some observers, both white and Negro, these incursions into politics represent one of the biggest breakthroughs of all.

In New York City, for example, Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, a Democrat, can successfully defy Tammany Hall, the regular Democratic organization. In Washington he has become a recognized power as chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

There are Negro members in 23 State legislatures. In Michigan, a Negro, Otis M. Smith, easily won the key office of auditor general at the last election. There are Negro judges in New York, Illinois, Michigan, and California. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has not been able to keep count of all of the Negroes who hold lesser elective offices throughout U.S. communities.

With political power in his grasp, with more money in his pockets than any worker outside the North American Continent, and a chance for a good education at hand, the American Negro today is the central figure in an amazing success story for a minority group. The title of that story might be one which already has been used by the famous Negro educator, Booker T. Washington—"Up From Slavery."

FLOOD CONDITION ON ELK AND VERDIGRIS RIVERS, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, last week I called the Senate's attention to the disastrous flood which was occurring in southeastern Kansas, and particularly on the Elk and Verdigris Rivers, based on information that I received from Emmett E. Wilson, president of the Verdigris Valley Flood Control and Water Conservation Association of Independence, Kans.

Estimates of flood losses are now available and I have reports from Fred L. Hedges, mayor of Coffeyville, Kans., and C. O. Dobbins, commissioner of finance and revenue of that same city, stating that had it not been for the more than 500 citizens who volunteered for a continuous watch and sandbagging of dykes for several days, the flood damage to that city would have been disastrous. As it was, considerable damage resulted in the city and surrounding territory.

I also have a letter from Earl W. Unruh, president of the Sinclair Pipe Line Co. at Independence, Kans., which gives additional information regarding the flood in Montgomery County and on the Elk and Verdigris Rivers.

These letters are typical of many letters which I have received from the flood area and all stress the need for the construction of the Elk City Reservoir on the Elk River, which is the principal tributary of the Verdigris River.

Had the Elk City Reservoir been constructed, we would have avoided this unfortunate and disastrous flood situation.

Preconstruction planning on this reservoir has already been completed and the Corps of Army Engineers advise me that with an appropriation of $1 million, we could begin acquiring real estate and start construction of this badly needed reservoir. It is currently estimated that the cost of this project would be $22,200,000. It is my sincere hope that we can secure early construction money for this project.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters I mentioned previously together with an editorial from the Coffeyville Daily Journal of May 12, 1961 be printed in the RECORD as part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the letters and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COFFEYVILLE, KANS., *May 15, 1961.*

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: While time has not permitted an accurate computation of the damages suffered in dollars by the flood-waters in the Verdigris River Valley the past week, it is believed to be in the millions. Reports are that this flood is the worst on record.

It is very evident that the flooding Elk River was responsible for most of the water causing the Verdigris River to leave its banks and spread destruction for miles throughout the valley. According to the available information it is believed that had the Elk City Dam and Reservoir been a reality very little damage would have happened.

Here in Coffeyville a good many homes and several industries were damaged to a considerable extent; estimates run into several hundred thousands of dollars. This damage is very slight in comparison to what would have been had the levee north and east of our city failed to hold. More than 500 citizens responded to the call for volunteer workers to sandbag the levee and to constantly watch and repair the dike for several days while it was at its highest on record.

The people of Coffeyville and throughout the valley feel that the construction of the Elk City Dam and Reservoir is needed and will appreciate your efforts in securing an appropriation to get it started. This Elk City Dam and Reservoir will be a great benefit to this entire area, not only for flood protection but for water storage which is needed.

We respectfully urge your assistance in this matter.

Yours very truly,

FRED L. HEDGES,
Mayor.

COFFEYVILLE, KANS., *May 5, 1961.*

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The recent damaging flood in the Verdigris River Valley is evidence of the tremendous need for the construction of the Elk City Dam and Reser-

voir in the northwest part of Montgomery County.

Here in Coffeyville huge losses were avoided by inches when the floodwaters reached the sandbags on top of sections of the levee northeast of our city. While considerable damage was suffered here in town, it was only a fraction of what would have occurred had the levee failed to hold.

It is reported that the damage caused by the floodwaters to farms, buildings, crops, railroads, roads, etc., in the Verdigris River Valley will reach into millions of dollars. As the Elk River furnished most of the water which sent the Verdigris on this destructive rampage it is a general opinion that if the Elk City Dam and Reservoir was built and in operation the damage to this area would have been comparatively slight.

Speaking not only for myself but my many friends and neighbors, I respectfully request your earnest effort in securing an appropriation which will make a start on the construction of the Elk City Dam and Reservoir possible.

Respectfully,

C. O. DOBBINS,
Commissioner of Finance and Revenue.

SINCLAIR PIPELINE CO.,
Independence, Kans., May 12, 1961.

HON. FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: We are definitely not crying "wolf" when we call for help from the Congress to avert any recurrence of what the southeast Kansas area has just gone through. The flood we have just experienced came within an inch of being an all-time high record, and I am certain it far surpassed an all-time high in damage to crops, homes, industries, county, and State roads, bridges, etc.

We know you, ANDY, and WALTER are intimately aware of our serious plight and the assistance that the Elk Reservoir will be in averting recurrence. But we would like to arm you with a number of facts, statistics and ideas that you may use in whatever way necessary to convince the Congress that we should begin construction of the Elk City Reservoir as quickly as possible. The following are some of the figures that have been hastily collected to help you get action while the news of the disaster is still fresh:

Over 13 percent of the land in Montgomery County alone was covered by damaging, crop-killing waters. This does not count the areas where the water stood but drained within 72 hours. This is in excess of 55,000 acres of crop damage. It is estimated that farmers put into their land in out-of-pocket costs for seed, fertilizer, labor, tilling, etc., approximately $20 per acre, out of which they hoped to gain a gross revenue of $50 per acre. In this instance they are out the $20 and also the $50 per acre, totaling nearly $3,800,000. Adding to this figure the damage to homes of over 60 families in Coffeyville, 65 in Elk City and Independence, more in Neodesha, Claremore and other smaller points along the path of the Verdigris, the industrial damage to refineries and many other industries in Neodesha, Independence, and Coffeyville, and a tremendous amount of road damage, bridge damage, and silt destruction of borrow ditches, the figures reach a staggering total.

If the Elk City Reservoir had been completed and operative, the tremendous flood in the Elk River drainage basin could have been held up while the runoff from the Verdigris south of Fall River and Toronto Reservoirs went by, thus eliminating the severe and extensive damage and distress which has just been experienced.

We know you and ANDY and WALTER MCVEY are doing everything in your power to help at this time, but we also want to help. Please let us know what we can do or what other information you might need to get this project under way.

Sincerely yours,

EARL W. UNRUH.

[From the Coffeyville (Kans.) Journal, May 12, 1961]

OOLOGAH MAKES ELK CITY DAM EVEN MORE NECESSARY

One of the important reasons why construction on the Elk City Dam and Reservoir should start immediately, is the fact that the Oologah Dam on the Verdigris is nearing completion.

Once the Oologah Dam is completed, and that will be in the near future, the Verdigris will back up within only a few miles of Coffeyville. This means that in periods of heavy rains when the Verdigris is running high, the runoff will be slowed down considerably, creating a much more serious threat of floods for Coffeyville, Independence, and other cities in the Verdigris Valley.

In periods of extreme high water, the gates on the Oologah Dam would be closed to prevent flooding below the dam. The same situation prevailed during the recent crisis at the Fall River and Toronto Dams. As you will recall, the levels of those lakes shot up nearly 30 feet from heavy rains last weekend.

Keeping the gates closed at Fall River and Toronto undoubtedly kept the Verdigris from additional flooding. As it was, most of the flooding was caused by the Elk River which flows into the Verdigris north of Independence.

As it turned out, the levee at Coffeyville held (with the aid of hundreds of volunteers and thousands of sandbags), but it is almost certain that the dike wouldn't have had a chance if the Oologah Dam had been closed.

The Elk City Dam is a necessity, and it will be even more so when the Verdigris is dammed at Oologah within the next few months.

PEOPLE HAVE THE WILL IF KENNEDY HAS THE WAY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk in recent months about sacrifices which our people must make in these perilous times if our country is to survive and function as the bastion of freedom throughout the world. The people have been told to ask what they can do for their country in ringing tones which warned against expecting the country to do for them. They also have been told that "our greatest adversary is not Russia, but our own unwillingness to do what must be done." The words, of course, are the President's and they seem to imply that there is a lack of willingness on the part of our people to meet the challenges of the cold war both on the home front and in the area of international relations.

From my own experience, in talking with people throughout the country and in the mail that I receive, I suggest this is the worst kind of absurdity. Our people have been shocked out of any complacency they might have felt at one time. In fact, I believe the majority of them view the need for sacrifice on the home front and action on the foreign front with greater clarity than does the White House or the State Department. On the question of sacrifices and "not asking what the Nation can do for you" the people are as far ahead of the President as they are puzzled by his actions. I am sure that to them, the idea of "sacrifice" does not square with the administration's action in pushing through new and bigger welfare programs that have not been demanded. Nor does their idea of "unwillingness" square with the administration's complete lack of advice as to what it wants done in relation to Cuba and other areas where the people's freedom is being challenged.

This whole question was expounded very clearly on May 5 in an editorial which appeared in the Detroit Free Press entitled "People Have the Will If Kenneday Has the Way." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEOPLE HAVE THE WILL IF KENNEDY HAS THE WAY

The President, a much abused man in recent weeks, struck back at his critics in Chicago a few days ago.

He was feeling the stings of Cuba, of Laos, of the success of the Russian space flight, and the accompanying cries of alarm from all sides.

The people had discovered that their idol, the man elected on a campaign of strength and leadership, was only human. They were disillusioned.

Yet Kennedy threw the blame straight back at them. "Our greatest adversary," he said, "is not the Russians. It is in our own unwillingness to do what must be done."

If true, this is a shocking indictment. Never in their history have the people been reluctant to do what was necessary. And we, for one, do not believe they are unwilling now.

The trouble, we believe, is twofold, and most of the blame belongs to the President.

First, while he has talked of sacrifice, he has offered no programs calling for sacrifice. He has done nothing to persuade the people of the need to tighten their belts and their wills.

Secondly, those programs which the President has put before Congress have tended in precisely the opposite direction. While asking us not to ask what the country can do for us, he has told Congress what his administration intends to do for us.

He has pushed through a bill to increase the minimum hourly wage to $1.25.

He has endorsed and gotten out of committee a bill to spend more than $3.3 billion for Federal aid to education.

He has signed into law a measure granting $400 million in aid to depressed areas.

He has called for expanded Federal housing programs.

He has seen enacted a law increasing aid to the unemployed.

He has proposed a measure increasing price supports on crops, and telling farmers to write their own support laws.

He has sought to increase benefits and lower the age limit under social security.

He has called for an expanded medical care plan.

These are hardly measures that sound like sacrifice. These are proposals not of defense but of welfare. These are programs of a fat and comfortable nation, doing more out of its bountiful riches.

These are, in short, programs the people expect of a Democratic administration when times are good and the urge to give them something for nothing is great.

President Kennedy will, we think, have a hard time persuading the people of war and sacrifice when his actions speak of peace and prosperity.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Mr. David S. Broder of the Washington Star has written a very clear and analytical report on what the school bill is really aimed at, which was published in the Washington Evening Star on May 15, 1961. The article sums up the entire question of juggling the bill back and forth to satisfy different segments of Congress and the people in such a clear way that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORK-BARREL ISSUE SEEN IN SCHOOL BILL JUGGLING

(By David Broder)

Why did the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee decide last week to boost North Dakota's share of the aid-to-education benefits 13 percent and cut Oklahoma's share 17 percent?

The two States are almost identical in resources for education; each has about $8,000 income per public school pupil. Yet the committee decided Oklahoma would receive $25.70 per pupil and North Dakota, $35.97. How come?

The answers to these questions are part of the controversy over the merits of rival "distribution formulas" and "equalization plans" that will occupy a large part of the debate starting tomorrow in the Senate on Federal aid to education.

It sounds like dull stuff—and it is certainly technical—but the example of Oklahoma and North Dakota shows what these decisions can mean in terms of the benefits to individual States and the ultimate costs to all taxpayers.

THE BASIC QUESTION

The basic question is this: If the Government starts handing out money for education, will it be distributed on a "pork-barrel" basis or with some relation to need?

Neither North Dakota nor Oklahoma appears to have serious current problems in education. The official statistics of the U.S. Office of Education show that 91,552 teachers across the country were working last fall with substandard credentials. Oklahoma had none and North Dakota only 34. Neither State had any pupils in part-time classes. The "classroom shortage" in the two States combined was one-fiftieth of the national total and both States planned this year to build enough classrooms to meet the immediate problem of "excess enrollment."

Opponents of Federal aid might argue that these States need no outside help. But the backers of Federal assistance are committed to the belief that every State has or will have problems in education, and therefore every State should receive money.

PLANS VARY

How much? There they begin to differ among themselves. Republican advocates of a "foundation plan" distribution system would give North Dakota 35 cents of every $100 in Federal grants; Oklahoma, $1.33.

The Kennedy administration proposed giving North Dakota 47 cents of each $100 and Oklahoma, $1.79.

But the Democratic majority of the Senate committee handling the bill last week rejected both these plans and substituted an "equalization formula" of its own that, surprisingly, raised North Dakota's share to 53 cents of every $100 and cut Oklahoma's to $1.48.

Such changes were not uncommon. As a result of the committee's work, some States' shares of the available funds gained up to 62 percent while others lost up to 38 percent of their shares. More States lost than gained.

What the committee Democrats did was this:

1. Both the administration and the Republican formulas included "floor" amounts per pupil to protect the interests of the wealthy States that contribute heavily to the Federal Treasury and "bonus payments" to provide special assistance to low-income States. Under the Republican plan, sponsored by Senators CLIFFORD CASE, of New Jersey, COOPER, of Kentucky, and JAVITS, of New York, North Dakota and Oklahoma, with nearly identical resources, each would have received $20 per public school pupil. The administration plan, for similar reasons, would have given North Dakota $24.60 per pupil and Oklahoma $24.39. But the committee Democrats knocked out the "floor" and thereby increased the spread in benefits between the very rich and the very poor States.

TWO OTHER FORMULAS

2. Both the administration and the Republican formulas distributed funds on the basis of average daily attendance in public schools. As President Kennedy said, "nonpublic school children are rightfully not counted in determining the funds each State will receive for its public schools." But the committee Democrats decided to count all children of school age, thereby increasing the subsidy for States with large numbers of private and parochial school pupils or with large numbers of truants.

3. As these changes worked out, 22 States, including North Dakota, gained money, 2 were unaffected, and 26, including Oklahoma, lost money. To deal with this political problem, the committee Democrats decided to increase the size of the first-year authorization to $880 million from the $666 million Mr. Kennedy proposed and the $693 million the Republicans recommended. By increasing the cost in this way, they were able to provide dollar increases for all but two States over the amounts the President and his Budget Bureau advisers had urged.

This, however, did not alter the fact that 26 States would receive a smaller slice of the total Federal pie than they would have under the administration formula.

RESULT OF FORMULA CHANGE

As a result of the rejiggering of the formula by the committee Democrats, 8 of the 10 lowest-income States received a smaller share of the Federal funds than they would have under the administration plan.

Of the 10 States with Democrats on the committee, five gained increases in their share of the Federal funds and five suffered decreases. The net result was that slightly more than one-third of the increase over the amount recommended by Mr. Kennedy for the first year—$62.2 million of $184 million—went to the 10 States with Democrats on the committee.

These are the 22 States whose share of the Federal funds would be increased by the change from the administration formula to the committee Democrats' formula:

Alaska, up 62 percent; Rhode Island, 48; Wisconsin, 36; Pennsylvania, 28; New Hampshire, 23; Maryland, 19; Missouri, 18, Louisiana and Kentucky, 15; Vermont, 14; Texas and North Dakota, 13; Michigan and Minnesota, 10; Nebraska, 9; Ohio, 8; Illinois and South Dakota, 6; Indiana, Montana, and South Carolina, 5; and Virginia, 4.

Two States—Iowa and Georgia—would be unaffected by the change.

The shares of the Federal funds to 26 States and the District of Columbia would be decreased by the following percentages: Oregon, 1 percent; Massachusetts, Colorado, and Maine, 2; Arkansas, 4; New Mexico, West Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina, and Alabama, 5; Hawaii, 6; Arizona and Mississippi, 7; Kansas and Utah, 8; Wyoming and Idaho, 9; New Jersey and Florida, 10; Washington, 11; Delaware and Nevada, 12; New York, 15; Oklahoma, 17; the District of Columbia, 25; California, 31, and Connecticut, 38.

NAACP WEEK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today is the seventh anniversary of the historic U.S. Supreme Court decision on public school desegregation, and it is being fittingly celebrated in New York City by a citywide rally designated in honor of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, "NAACP Week." It is so designated in honor of the great week and the role of the NAACP in it.

The effect of the leadership of the NAACP in civil rights litigation for several decades has strengthened law enforcement and fortified the right of protest and petition. This organization has acted with courage and in the best American tradition in seeking the application of law in a very difficult field. The historic words of the Supreme Court in its unanimous decision—and I emphasize the word "unanimous" in view of all the controversy about it—will go down in history.

On May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court held that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place.

Nonetheless, 7 years later we are reminded by an article published in the New York Herald Tribune of today that public school desegregation, which is now the fundamental right of every American child and of the American people, proceeds at a very slow pace.

We need Federal laws to help speed public school desegregation, with power in the Attorney General to sue, and in the Federal Government, by what laws we pass in Congress, to give financial aid to cities still seeking to desegregate their schools, as well as to prevent civil disorder and the assaulting of people who peacefully make their way into the South for the purpose of expressing their views on this subject, in support of the Constitution and the law. They are subject to assault and disgraces, not only with respect to the community which inflicts them but also to the United States as a whole.

I hope very much that as time goes on, with the power of enforcement in the Attorney General, and through laws that we in Congress pass, the decent conscience of these communities, which is always the finest sanction of liberty on the American scene, will assert itself as against those who would desecrate these communities by seeking to take the law into their own hands.

Federal laws are needed for this purpose; it cannot be accomplished by Exec-

utive order alone. The Federal Government's role must be one of backing up enforcement where the local situation is such that it is unlikely otherwise to be accomplished within that measureable and reasonable time called by the Supreme Court in the use of the words "with all deliberate speed."

The slow pace of public school desegregation is a real factor in our national prestige at home and abroad. The authority of the U.S. Government must be employed to fortify and reinforce the moderate forces in the South which are themselves seeking to make progress in complying with the law.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Herald Tribune article printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 17, 1961]

THE PICTURE AFTER 7 YEARS OF SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

(By H. D. Quigg)

They have been 7 lean years.

The picture is a mottled one, the voices diffuse—the problem not all in the South. But if the weight of cold totality is going to be the measure, they have been far from years of plenty for the cause of desegregation. Its gain in terms of Negro pupils in desegregated classes in the area hit by the Supreme Court decision stands at a lean 6.3 percent.

There is the fact, however, that more than one-fourth of all the biracial school districts in the area now are desegregated to some degree.

But figures are cold, even when the arguments behind them run hot.

The broad picture is this:

The 17 States and the District of Columbia which were segregated racially at the time of the 1954 decision now have 195,625 Negro pupils—or only 6.3 percent of their Negro pupil total—attending desegregated classes.

And of these, 81,392 are in Washington, D.C., where 84 percent of the classes are desegregated; 35,000 are in Missouri, 28,000 in Maryland, mostly in Baltimore.

South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi have no public-school children desegregated. Louisiana has four. The others show the following numbers of Negroes in schools with whites: Florida, 27; North Carolina, 82; Arkansas, 113; Virginia, 208; Tennessee, 342; Texas, 3,500; Delaware, 6,734; Oklahoma, 9,822; Kentucky, 16,329, mostly in Louisville; West Virginia, 14,000.

While many of the Deep South States are defiant—and may face new demands this fall—there has been voluntary desegregation in border States at a fairly speedy rate. And 777 of the 2,839 biracial school districts in the 17-State-plus-District of Columbia, are now desegregated to some degree.

As a matter of technicality, there are now only two states that never have admitted a Negro to a white State-supported educational institution. They are South Carolina and Mississippi.

The University of Georgia was desegregated in January. Alabama was technically put on the road to desegregation briefly in 1956, when Autherine Lucy stayed in the University of Alabama 3 days.

(Officials excluded Miss Lucy from classes because of student riots and expelled her when she accused the university of conspiring to instigate the riots. The courts upheld the university. Miss Lucy went to Texas, got married, and faded into pioneering history.)

For Georgia, there will be a break with the past this fall when Atlanta—a key city of the Deep South—is under Federal court order to put into effect its plan for desegregation of its school system.

For Mississippi, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People says a school desegregation effort probably will get under way this fall.

IN NEW YORK

The North is not without its problems, too.

In New Rochelle, N.Y., which George M. Cohan celebrated in song as being "Forty-Five Minutes From Broadway," and which became known during the Civil War as a stop on the route for escaped slaves to Canada, the school board has announced it would appeal a Federal judge's ruling that it had intentionally created an elementary school as segregated and had not acted in good faith to effect desegregation.

In New York City, a school board report indicated that the increase in Negro and Puerto Rican students—they now make up more than one-third of the city's public school enrollment of 986,679—was making school integration more difficult. A special school census showed four schools were composed entirely of Negro and Puerto Rican children and that about one-fifth of New York City schools had enrollments of 85 percent or more Negroes and Puerto Ricans.

The New York State Negro population rose 56.1 percent during the last decade to 1,495,233—both State and city have more Negro residents than any other similar subdivision in the country.

IN CLINTON, TENN.

Mob action in Clinton, Tenn., in 1956 made Clinton High School the first instance of interracial school attendance in a southern community under military control.

Today, there is no trouble with, no interference with, not even any talk of, the fact of desegregation at Clinton High. The community (population 4,895; Negroes 220–250) more or less accepts and has forgotten about it—just as they never gave thought, prior to 1956, to the fact that white and Negro kids played sandlot football and basketball together.

Almost everyone you talk with now blames outsiders for the riots of the first year of court-ordered desegregation, 1956. It was the outsiders, they say, who stirred up the local prosegregationist element and other outsiders who formed the hoodlum core of the mobs.

SOMEBODY CAME IN HERE

"I've always felt," said editor Horace W. Wells of the Clinton Courier-News, "that there's somebody who came in here as part of a whole southwide effort to stop integration wherever they could—and they weren't willing for even one community to give in.

"The local atitude toward school desegregation was that we didn't want it—but we supported the law."

The town is quiet now. The white citizens council and its youth auxiliary are no more. No crosses burn, no dynamite explodes in yards. But in August 1956, John Kasper got into town shortly after 12 Negroes had registered among the 805 total student body. He began visiting homes, making speeches and soon mob violence set neighbor against neighbor.

The National Guard came in and restored quiet. In December the local Baptist minister was beaten up after he escorted fearful Negro children to school. There were arrests and convictions and Kasper went to jail. In 1958, when things seemed quieting down inside school the building was destroyed by dynamite on a foggy Sabbath morning by three predawn blasts, three seconds apart, expertly placed. The FBI is still seeking the guilty.

In the first year of school back in Clinton, in an $800,000 new building (they went to an abandoned school building in Oak Ridge, Tenn., for 2 years), the high school graduating class will include no Negroes. There is a chance that four may be graduated next year.

SURVIVOR IN COLLEGE

There have been 40 Negro students who enrolled 61 times (during the 5 spring registrations), 23 of them withdrawing from school, only 2 being graduated. Bobby Lynn Cain, who survived threats, insults and mental torture the first year to become the first Negro graduate, will finish college this spring and hopes to teach.

And now they're speaking to each other in Clinton High for the first time since the mob violence of 1956.

Lawyer Sidney Davis, who in 1956 helped the preacher escort the Negroes through the name-calling pickets to the high school, said he had noticed white and Negro boys talking on the walks this year. Why is tension eased? "I think because parents have stopped talking about it."

Leo Grant, the Clinton attorney who led a group of local volunteers and threw teargas grenades to clear the mob away in 1956, said he believed things were quiet "because many good people around here now have one of these"—and he pulled a revolver from a drawer. "Kasper, the catalyzer, is gone, but the same prejudiced people are here. But now they know that our police down there next to the school have shotguns."

IN VIRGINIA

In Prince Edward County, Va., in a cultured, civilized, 163-year-old community, there has been no violence, no disorder, no vulgar demonstrations—and, for 2 years, no public schools. They were closed following a court order to admit Negroes to them. It is the only county in the country which has no free public school system.

The county's 1,500 white children attend a private school system supported largely by public funds. The 1,700 Negro children have no formal schools, their parents having rejected a white offer to set up private schools for them also. UPI correspondent Louis Cassels, an old hand at this sort of situation, reports from the town of Farmdale (population 5,800):

"To a reporter who saw paratroopers fighting a mob in Little Rock and heard 'cheerleaders' shrieking racial hatred in New Orleans, it is almost incredible to observe how well mannered a town can be, even when it is divided right down the middle in which both sides sincerely feel they are defending issues of principle which admit of no compromise."

Prince Edward was one of the five Supreme Court cases that comprised the 1954 Supreme Court ruling that public school segregation is unlawful. Last month, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy moved. He asked a Federal court to force the county to reopen free public schools, and—for the first time—the Government seeks to intervene as a plaintiff.

WITH BROTHERHOOD

Negro adults have opened 15 so-called training centers which keep the Prince Edward Negro children busy with supervised play activities, but one-third to one-half of the teenagers don't attend. During weekday mornings teenage Negroes drift around idly.

A UPI reporter went into one of the centers where 90 children were registered but only 37 were present. Thirty-seven piping little voices from dusky heads were bearing down on their morning hymn, "America, the

Beautiful," at the part which goes: "* * * and crown thy good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea."

The centers are in makeshift quarters, from church basements to shacks. Approaching one at the opening hour, the reporter saw two Negro girls, ages 7 or 8, in clean pinafores with hair in pigtails, each proudly clutching a plaid bookcase, walking to school. He talked to Mary Delos Baker, 7, who had never been to a regular school.

MARY WANTS TO LEARN

"Can you read, Mary?"

"No sir," she replied.

"Are you learning to read a little bit?"

Long doubtful pause, then an uncertain nod of her head.

"Do you want to learn to read?"

Vigorous nod of assent, and an emphatic, "yes, sir."

The white leaders regret that the Negroes will not accept the offer to set up a Negro system of private schools (also public-fund supported). J. Barrye Wall, a white leader, says that any public school now operated by the county would be, by definition, "integrated"—even if only Negroes attended.

Mrs. Helen Baker, a Negro Quaker, who went to the county as a field agent for the American Friends Service Committee to try to arrange to send Negroes to school elsewhere, said: "No matter how this legal struggle goes, I have no fear that any child will ever be hurt. Prince Edward County will behave admirably. These people are gentlemen."

IN WASHINGTON

Washington, the Nation's Capital, and Louisville, Ky., are two big cities which accomplished school desegregation with relatively no trouble. The District of Columbia, which now has 120,000 students in 96 elementary schools, was segregated at the time of the Supreme Court ruling but integrated that fall. Louisville, whose 400,000 population is 16 percent Negro, waited until 1956 and meanwhile prepared.

In Washington, 76 percent of the school children are Negroes (no southern city has a comparable racial ratio) and the city has been traditionally southern in its mores. The 7 years of nontroubled segregation are called a miracle of social adjustment by school superintendent Carl F. Hansen.

ANOTHER MIRACLE

A rather specific "miracle" can be cited in the case of Louisville, where the schools were desegregated with little incident. In this southern city some white parents are now sending their children to schools with all-Negro faculties. The rather startling figures from the hometown of the "Old Kentucky Home" show that nearly 100 white children this year attended 10 different schools in which all the teachers are Negroes.

Prior to desegregation, academic standards in the Washington Negro schools were low. There was fear they would pull down the standards for the white students too. Tests show the opposite. At the start, tests showed citywide medians for all students to be far below national norms—reflecting the low scores of ill-prepared Negroes. There has been a yearly improvement. Today the citywide medians are just below national.

The superintendent of schools said that "the desegregation process has brought a renewal of vigor, energy, enthusiasm, and imagination" to the whole school system.

IN LOUISVILLE

In Louisville, which has just elected a Negro as chairman of the board of education, more than 80 percent of 47,297 pupils are in mixed student bodies. Of its 78 schools, only 3 now are all-Negro, 10 all-white.

The Louisville plan, worked out by the late Superintendent of Schools Omer Carmichael, was to redistrict all schools without gerrymandering or regard to racial pockets—and then allow parents the choice to move their children to another district. Negro leaders say this safety-valve transfer system, allowing whites to move out, has outlived its usefulness. Another objection has been to the slow desegregation of Negro teachers—40 of the city's 417 Negro teachers now are in desegregated faculties.

But in general, Louisville has done very well and is improving. And a study showed a significant academic strengthening of the Negroes and evidence of some slight gains for white students.

IN LITTLE ROCK

A city with which violence has been associated—Little Rock—is quiet. In this Arkansas community, to which President Eisenhower sent Federal troops in 1957 to enforce the court order for integration, seven Negroes attend Central High, four attend Hall High. They make average grades, are tolerated by white students, who talk with them about school matters, but don't participate in club activities. They mix in gym classes without trouble.

"There are very few incidents any more; when something occurs, we get right on it," Central High Principal Jess Matthews told UPI Correspondent Al Kuettner. "I guess this was the most famous school in the world for a while, but it was the wrong kind of fame. The thing people don't realize is that even at the worst time, when the troops were all over the place, we were still teaching classes."

IN NEW ORLEANS

In New Orleans, another city of violent opposition to integration, the first case of school desegregation below the college level in the Deep South brought demonstrations last November and scores of arrests. But Federal marshals have escorted four Negro girls to and from classes in two previously all-white elementary schools since November 14. There are no longer any crowds or disturbances.

At New Orleans' McDonogh 19 School, three Negro girls have had a year of schooling that might be compared with private tutoring—they're the only students. No whites have attended, except for 1 week earlier in the year when two white boys, sons of John Thompson, went there for 4 days; then the family left town.

The white boycott never was perfected at William Frantz School, where as of May the 1 little Negro girl is among 15 white pupils. She is in the first grade with three white boys and three white girls.

A substitute school established across the parish (county) line for refugees from the two schools probably will not be available next year because of the finances of the other parish. The organizers of the makeshift school have regrouped into a cooperative and are trying to raise money to build a school for refugees.

IN ATLANTA

On May 6, Attorney General Kennedy said in an address to University of Georgia law school students and alumni: "When parents send their children to school this fall in Atlanta, peaceably and in accordance with the rule of law, barefoot Burmese and Congolese will see before their eyes Americans living by the rule of law."

The Atlanta plan for desegregation of schools is a pupil-placement program that sets up a list of items other than race to govern transfers and admissions. They include psychological factors and whether the action would tend to upset the peace and well-being of the community.

Al Kuettner reports from Atlanta: "There is no present indication whether a Negro child actually will go to an integrated school this fall. More than 20 have formally applied for transfer to white schools since applications opened May 1. It seems reasonable to assume that at least some of these might pass all the placement qualifications. The school board says some appear to have applied in good faith and some not."

The barefoot Burmese may have to take a second look.

THE VARIED VOICES

Attorney General Kennedy: "In this case (Prince Edward County)—in all cases—I say to you that if the orders of the Court are circumvented, the Department of Justice will act. We will not stand by or be aloof. We will move * * * for on this generation of Americans falls the full burden of proving to the world that we really mean it when we say all men are created free and are equal before the law."

Acting Gov. Paul Johnson of Mississippi (last November) said neither Mississippi nor its subdivisions will ever help enforce an invalid decision of a Federal court to integrate schools—that the compact under which Mississippi entered the Union reserved for the State the right to regulate public health, morals, education, and safety.

White boy in Louisville schools: "I was in the second grade when the schools were integrated (5 years ago). I feel all right about it. It never bothers me except when we have to undress in the showers after gym. I'm sorry I feel that way."

NO SEPARATE AND EQUAL

Woodford R. Porter, Negro member of Louisville school board (in interview a few days before he was elected chairman of the board): "Now desegregation is accepted here—nobody's objecting. For the Negroes, the big thing in desegregated schools is—they don't necessarily want to go to school with whites, but there's no such thing as 'separate and equal'; those two animals just don't live together."

James Baldwin, Negro author: "This 'new day' has been coming for nearly 100 years. Viewed solely in the light of this country's moral professions, the lapse is inexcusable. * * * The time is forever behind us when Negroes could be expected to 'wait'."

John Kasper, the racial agitator who stirred mobs at Clinton, Tenn., at desegregation of 1956, commenting on the 1958 bombing which destroyed Clinton High School: "A great victory for the white people of Tennessee."

Mrs. Margaret Anderson, guidance director at Clinton High School: "A young Negro girl came screaming to my office. 'I can't take it any more,' she said. 'I've had all I can take.' She cried as if her heart would break. I felt her tears on my arm and I knew they were the same as those of white children."

THE FIRST 100 DAYS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the May 15 issue of Newsweek magazine appears an excellent editorial written by Mr. Henry Hazlitt, entitled "The First 100 Days." Mr. Hazlitt points up in more eloquent fashion what I have been repeating before the Senate and in my speeches before the public—that the deficit spending policy of the administration will inevitably lead to more inflation; that the sacrifices our people will be compelled to make as a result of this inflation will be attributable not to increased spending for national defense

but to increased spending for nondefense programs; and that such spending will not provide the sustained economic growth which the United States must have to defeat the Communist world in the economic competition to which Premier Khrushchev has challenged us. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hazlitt's editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST 100 DAYS

(By Henry Hazlitt)

At noon on April 29, President Kennedy completed his first 100 days in the White House. During the election campaign, he announced that these would be "the crucial days" of a new administration, and drew a parallel with the famous first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt's Presidency.

In view of the hairline margin of his victory, Mr. Kennedy has so far been astonishingly successful in getting his domestic program through. Of the 16 measures called for in his "must" list of February, 7 have already been enacted, and some action is underway on all but 2. The President can surely not be accused of inactivity. During the period he sent no fewer than 19 messages to Congress—an unparalleled record.

But is this a record of success? That depends on what the practical effect of these measures will be (or will be judged to be) at the election 3½ years from now.

The President's Cuban venture was a disastrous failure. It was seen to be such a failure by practically everybody within 72 hours after it was launched. The consequences of economic policies are more difficult to judge. Their longrun effects are often quite different from their immediate effects. The innumerable factors always at work in the economic realm lead to wide differences of interpretation. Bad consequences of bad policies are often blamed on something else—especially by those who originally recommended the policies. But the longer a bad policy is continued the worse its consequences tend to become, and the more obvious becomes the connection between the consequences and the policy.

SPENDING PROGRAM

Let us now look at some of the major Kennedy measures, both enacted and proposed. They include a higher minimum wage with broader coverage; aid to depressed areas; higher and longer unemployment benefits; aid to dependent children of the unemployed; increased social security benefits, with a lowering of the eligibility age; medical care for the aged; large Federal school aid; expanded foreign aid; an omnibus farm bill, with higher price supports; lower interest rates through Government intervention; withholding of taxes on dividends and interest (though with some limited incentives for business investment), and a cyclical rather than an annual balance—beginning with a planned deficit.

Space does not permit an analysis here of any one of these proposals. But they add up, individually and collectively, to a huge spending program. And all this is on top of the tremendous annual spending program in excess of $100 billion (including social security) that had already been planned by President Eisenhower. This spending, and the deficits it would entail, are being taken very lightly. "Such a deficit ($2 billion)," now says Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, "is not a cause for alarm in times like these. Another deficit is in prospect for fiscal 1962, one of about $3 billion. This, too, will be entirely appropriate."

INFLATION AHEAD

What this spending and these deficits mount up to, however, is inflation. This inflation may seem at the beginning to be beneficent. The upturn in business that has already started may continue. In spite of the measures that discourage employment by forcing up labor costs, there may even be further improvement in employment.

But what will happen when all this inflationary tinder catches fire, as it eventually will? What will happen if world confidence in the dollar is shaken again? What will happen if the run on gold is suddenly resumed? What will happen, in brief, if the inflation, now so devoutly prayed for in the administration in the belief that it will restore employment, not only arrives but starts to get out of hand? For as other governments have learned to their bitter cost, this is the way of "planned" inflations.

The Kennedy program, as unfolded in the first 100 days, is a program of inflation and welfare-statism. During the past two decades, the wrecks of such programs have been scattered over Europe and Latin America for all to see. The true friends of Mr. Kennedy will warn him of these consequences now, while there is still time to reconsider his course.

THE TREND OF THE ECONOMY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am well aware of the fact that the matter of economic growth has become something of a partisan political issue, which, of course, it definitely should not. So it is reassuring to find an economist—indeed the dean of American economists, who has no partisan political axes to grind, express views which sustain my position that there is no chronic slack in our economy and that increased Federal Government spending is not the proper way to stimulate economic growth. I refer to Dr. Arthur F. Burns, whose views are set forth in an excellent article by Mr. Nate White, business and financial editor of the Christian Science Monitor, appearing in the May 13 issue of the Monitor.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BURNS MEGATON BOMB

(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—Dr. Arthur F. Burns, the dean of American economists, has taken issue with the theories of stagnation which the present official economists of the Kennedy administration have been advancing.

The words of Dr. Burns ring with a background of factual clarity. Here is a man who has devoted his professional life to finding out what are the ingredients of business cycles, recessions, booms. He has no political ax to grind, and he has no commitments to the Republican Party or any other party to develop a theory of political economics.

Dr. Burns is not a political economist. He is a man dedicated to scientific factfinding and analysis. He is president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, which is a private, nongovernmental, objective organization for factual analysis of economic movements.

Dr. Burns worked with the bureau's founder, the late Wesley Mitchell, in developing the early series on business cycles. He is the Einstein of the economics profession. He carried this valuable research work much further along, and his writings on the subject are the textbooks used throughout the world as source material on business cycles. His associates, Dr. Solomon Fabricant and Dr. Geoffrey Moore, together with Dr. Burns, constitute a triumvirate of fact and analysis which is grounded on bedrock facts.

Dr. Burns has dropped a megaton bomb. When he calls the economic theories of the Kennedy economic team "neostagnationist," it is time to listen.

He agrees with the thoughts advanced by Dr. Paul A. Samuelson, professor of economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who did the early spadework for Mr. Kennedy's economic analysis, Dr. Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the other CEA members, and Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg that unemployment is disturbing, that the lag in the economy is disturbing, but he thoroughly disagrees on the interpretations, either of the causes or the trend.

Furthermore, Dr. Burns finds that the Kennedy group deliberately chose a point of departure for their growth rate which gives, as he see it, an incorrect view of the economy—one of slow growth. If they had chosen a different departure point, the growth rate would be greater.

Washington journalists have accepted the Kennedy economic analysis and as a result a theory has been effectively spread through America and the world that the United States is in a posture of economic stagnation.

To an economic scientist such as Dr. Burns, especially the economic scientist who knows more about business cycles than any other, this use of facts and their resulting interpretation is a disservice to the economics profession. Even more serious, when such an analysis is used as the foundation of national policies it becomes dangerous.

Dr. Burns does not spare the Eisenhower administration, in which he served, the responsibility for its part in the recession now ending. He puts the blame on the sudden change in Federal finances from an annual deficit rate in 1958 of $17 billion to an annual surplus rate of $7 billion—a swing of $24 billion in little more than a year; the Government's restraints on expansion, including Federal Reserve action to raise interest rates; and the steel strike.

These factors stopped an expansion from the 1958 recession, Dr. Burns reasons, but he also argues that they were artificial factors, superimposed by decisions, and were not basic problems with the growth process.

Dr. Burns thinks the neostagnationists have wrongly reasoned and have based their conclusions on a too narrow period of time.

In answer to the CEA's conclusion that "we face a stubborn problem of chronic slack, and the road to recovery is a long one," Dr. Burns says, "there is no chronic slack of our economy. * * * Full employment is not a remote possibility. * * * The underlying forces of economic expansion are strong. * * * We would be courting inflation and a gold crisis if we now arranged new governmental spending programs so that they would mature when the economy is already advancing without them."

The issue between the economic schools of thought is thus joined. The Samuelson-Heller-Goldberg school will be heard from without question. They have been challenged by the dean of their profession, and they cannot remain quiet.

What will be even more interesting, however, will be the trend of events. Time is rushing on. The pace of the American economy is proceeding much more rapidly than seemed possible from the January forecasts.

Facts will soon catch up with theory, in other words, and the sooner the better.

STATEMENT BY THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN AT DES MOINES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, last Saturday night in Des Moines, a Democratic rally was held at which the main speaker was John M. Bailey, national Democratic chairman. We are always happy to have visitors come into Iowa, but we are a little resentful when visitors abuse the hospitality of our State by not leveling with the people. A good example of Mr. Bailey's abuse of our hospitality, and his poor taste and superficial evaluation of the intelligence of the people of Iowa is one of the statements contained in his speech. I quote:

> With people hunting work in Cedar Rapids and Des Moines, HICKENLOOPER and MILLER both voted against the depressed areas bill and so did all of the Iowa Republicans in the House.

Of course, this statement was calculated to cause his listeners to believe that the depressed areas legislation would help people hunting for work in Cedar Rapids and Des Moines. The truth of the matter is, however, that under the depressed areas bill, according to the Assistant Chief of the State and Community Development Division of the Area Redevelopment Agency, none of the 20 major areas and 90 smaller areas which will shortly be declared depressed and eligible for relief are situated in Iowa. Unemployment in Cedar Rapids was 4.3 percent and in Des Moines 4.7 percent in March—well below the required 6 percent under the depressed areas bill.

I hope that if Mr. Bailey comes into my State again, he will not try to mislead the people of Iowa again. Fortunately most of them are intelligent enough to recognize false propaganda when they see it. However, Mr. Bailey would probably be well advised to extend a public apology to the people of Iowa for trying to mislead them.

THE STRENGTH OF AMERICA—ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR KNOWLAND

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, former Senator William F. Knowland, who served in this body with distinction as minority leader, recently delivered a stirring address before the Traffic Club of Greater Los Angeles.

With his usual candid approach, our former colleague made a number of specific recommendations which I believe are worthy of consideration of every Member of this body.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the text of Senator Knowland's address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY FORMER U.S. SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, AT THE TRAFFIC CLUB OF GREATER LOS ANGELES DINNER MEETING, TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1961, STATLER HOTEL, LOS ANGELES

The strength of America is not its military power, its industrial might nor its geographic greatness. It is the moral foundation of our Nation and the faith of those who founded and preserved our Republic.

I submit that history records that where civilizations have flourished and died in the past, their decline has been due in a great degree to either the absence of a moral foundation for their form of government, or the failure of its citizens to pay proper allegiance to the form of government which had been established.

Benjamin Franklin so wisely announced when leaving Independence Hall when he was asked what kind of government had been given to the American people: "We have given you a Republic if you can keep it."

Our challenge is to "keep it" for ourselves, our children and grandchildren.

It has long been my conviction that the men who sat at Philadelphia were motivated by divine guidance in submitting to the country and the world at large a representative system of law, order, and liberty.

It was 2 years before Lincoln's election to the Presidency and the subsequent outbreak of the Civil War. In his "House Divided" speech he said: "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

We need to face some fundamental decisions if our form of government and our economic system are to be preserved. How can we best preserve our priceless heritage? This is our challenge as a nation and as individuals. You here will play a part in the great decisions that will win or lose this historic battle. The hour is very late. We face our challenge in the atomic and space age. It is not the time for faint hearts or timid men. The survival of our Republic as well as a free world of freemen is at stake.

What are my beliefs in this regard? I give them to you, as the reflections of one who for 30 years has been active in public affairs and for more than 13 years as a Member of the U.S. Senate, during 6 of which I served as both majority and minority leader:

1. The growth of the Federal Government has been astronomical in character. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches have all at one time or another expanded Federal power and whittled away at the rights of the States. This trend needs to be reversed now before we pass the point of no return.

2. I believe we should forthrightly fight for the American private enterprise system. No citadel can be protected by defenders who are defeatists and so naive as to lower the drawbridge over the moat as a gesture of friendship to the barbarian. International communism seeks to nibble the free world away bit by bit. Domestic socialism (under whatever guise) is an opiate that can start in small doses and ultimately destroy our free enterprise system. The cure is not more of the same regardless of any quack advice to the contrary.

3. No responsible official can ignore the fact that the interest on the national debt amounts to over $8 billion a year. This interest charge is greater than all income into the Treasury as late as 1941, and all expenditures as late as 1938.

4. A government that cannot protect the legal and constitutional rights of its citizens is not worthy of being supported. We must stand for the protection of the individual citizen against the encroachment of the criminal underworld, labor "goonsters," or business racketeers and this is, and should remain, primarily the responsibility of local and State authorities.

5. Freedom is indivisible. Lincoln said our Nation cannot be "half slave and half free." Nor in our time can the world. It has never made sense to me for American funds to be used in support of Communist Yugoslavia or Poland. Between them they have received over $2 billion of American aid. This same sum of money very likely could have given us an earth satellite ahead of the Soviet sputnik.

6. Today the Federal Government is a major partner in most of the medium and larger companies of the Nation, taking 52 percent in corporate income taxes. The personal income taxes, Federal and State, are at the point where they put a wet blanket on the incentive which helped to build our Nation. The drying up of savings for investment could slow down the continued modernization of American industry which is so essential if our productivity is to keep ahead of the Soviet Union.

7. At Washington and throughout the Nation there are doctrinaire forces that believe in a regimented economy. In 1961 under the slightest pretext they will move openly to reestablish OPA type controls over prices. Inevitably this will lead to wage and commodity allocation controls and to the same chaotic conditions existing in 1946 and 1947, which brought the end to OPA.

8. There has been, in some quarters, a steady encroachment of labor upon the responsibilities of management that is becoming a detriment to small business and tends to cause small operators to sell out to larger competitors. Two years ago I said, and I repeat now: "Unions should be responsible to their own membership and to the American public. Collective bargaining must not become collective bludgeoning." I believed then and I believe now that no man or group of men should have the power to strangle the economic life of our community, our State and our Nation.

The trend to stifling free enterprise, whether resulting from inequitable labor demands or a growing multiplicity of tax burdens is most harmful to our economic structure. It can price American products out of the market. The loss of either our domestic or foreign markets means the loss of jobs for our people.

9. If there is any function in which the local people should keep control it is in the field of education. Where Federal funds go, ultimately Federal control will follow. There is no such thing as free Federal money. It comes from the people residing in the 50 States. However, a dollar flowing from the States to Washington suffers substantial attrition before it comes back as a grant-in-aid.

10. The American Constitution was founded on the principle that the individual had certain rights that neither the Government nor even tyrannical temporary majorities could take from him.

For example, not even a unanimous vote of Congress, the approval of the President or the action of the Supreme Court can take away his freedom of religion, press or right to peaceably assemble and petition the Government for a redress of grievances (first amendment).

In guarding the rights of one group we must not abuse the rights of other groups. The great asset of our way of life is that we uphold the dignity and independence of the individual citizen and our Constitution makes certain that the state is his servant and not his master. We believe in a Divine Being and communism is a godless tyranny.

We are dealing with an international arsonist. With a penny box of matches and a cloak of darkness and stealth he and his associates can burn down vast areas of the free world while we are put to it to maintain expensive firefighting equipment, electronic alarms and our ever vigilant force of watchmen and firefighters.

These are the great contrasts with totalitarian communism or fascism. On these

basic differences there is not and there cannot be any weakening of our faith or our beliefs.

Today the world is challenged by the Communist international conspiracy—an atheistic, expansionist, aggressive, imperialistic philosophy whose danger alert men and women recognized many years ago.

Khrushchev has threatened that he would "bury" us. This was no alcoholic belligerency of a dictator in his cups. This is, has been, and will probably remain the basic doctrine of international communism.

We must keep in mind that the pressures will continue from the Elbe to the China Sea. Communism hopes we will lose our fortitude and yield to its game of international extortion. The world should have learned at Munich that the road of appeasement is not the road to peace: it is only surrender on the installment plan.

We are near an international high noon which will determine the free world's survival against international communism. In fact it can be said it is now past 11:45.

Laos apparently is about to be lost to the free world.

Unless steps are taken forthwith to bolster freedom in Asia, Viet Nam, Cambodia, and Thailand are in imminent danger.

Whatever effective action we take entails risks of war with Communist China and the Soviet Union.

If we permit the free world to be nibbled away there are even greater risks to our survival. If we are not prepared to take risks to preserve freedom then our own security is endangered.

Our survival in the history books will not be based on our popularity or in the billions of international grants, loans, or gifts, but on our strength and our capacity and will to use it.

Have we developed a guilt complex that because we are economically successful we must be internationally impotent?

If so, we had better shake off the schizophrenic foreign policy that will trade our survival for a degree of popularity at the United Nations among neutralist Asian and African States.

It is time we stop, look, and listen before we destroy our heritage for an organization that will neither fight to preserve freedom, apply sanctions to maintain respect for its own charter nor carry an equitable financial burden for activities undertaken by its own governing body.

I refer specifically to less than 17 nations participating in the Korean defense, the passage of a series of ineffective resolutions while freedom was strangled to death in Hungary and the lack of member financial backing for the current situation in the Congo.

Can the United Nations survive if, for lack of support of its members, we have to furnish 90 percent of the manpower as in Korea or 90 percent of the financial support as in the Congo?

Nations which neither put up nor pay up are sitting with equal voice and vote and are paralyzing our capacity to act. If this is allowed to continue we will lose what little popularity we have left in the world but, what is more important, we will lose our own self-respect, which is even more important.

What steps might be taken to help retrieve the situation at this late date?

1. Place a tight naval blockade around Cuba and stop the import of any military supplies to the Castro regime. Communist planes, tanks, guns and ammunition are a threat to our security and to the other nations in the Western Hemisphere. To be legal a blockade must be effective. Serve notice that if our naval vessels are fired upon we will return the fire and take such other action as our national interests require. Let's keep Castro and his Communist supporters guessing rather than assuring them in advance we will be weak, vascillating or ineffective.

2. Organize an international freedom fighters corps. Openly and proudly help equip, train and morally support such an organization. They would be available to fight for freedom in the Western Hemisphere or elsewhere where communism seeks to destroy freedom. Like the volunteer Flying Tigers, this corps could be effective and have a sting.

The Chinese Communist regime sent volunteers against the United Nations in Korea. Because of this fiction that organization refused to proceed against the bases north of the Yalu River.

Communism will understand us better if they know that we can use semantics and power as effectively as they and for a better purpose. The purpose of human freedom. We do not intend that freedom will be destroyed while trying to untie the gordian knot of complex Communist techniques.

3. Bring the Republic of China and the Republic of Korea into the Southeast Asian Defense Organization. The 500,000 Chinese Nationalists and the 500,000 ROK forces will change a debating society into an organization of substance.

If this is not acceptable to some of the SEATO members then let us disband the paper tiger and put arms in the hands of those who will have the fortitude to use them in defense of freedom.

Are there risks in all this? Of course there are. But there are greater risks in allowing the impression to get abroad among the cynical and ruthless men in Moscow, Peiping, or Havana that we are too proud to fight or are unwilling to take risks to preserve our freedom.

In this age when a conspiracy, active or passive, has for years sought to debunk our national heroes, apologized for our greatness as a nation and sought to weaken if not destroy our independent existence and our American capacity to act decisively and effectively, I would recall to your minds the ringing words spoken in the Virginia Assembly by Patrick Henry: "I know not what course others may take but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

ADMINISTRATION TINKERING WITH THE FARM PROBLEM

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the administration's tinkering with the farm problem is causing increasing concern not only here in Congress but also among the majority of conservative farmers. They have good reason to distrust Washington-initiated quackeries in their own specialized field of experience, know-how, and investment. Speaking in Chicago last week, Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Nation's largest farm organization, warned against Government intervention in agriculture.

Mr. Shuman said:

A completely controlled agriculture, such as would result from the administration's proposed Cochrane-Freeman farm plan, not only would stifle the opportunity of our farm families but the resulting inefficiencies of production and marketing would result in higher costs to the consumers.

Mr. Shuman then pointed out that the amazing increase of 9 percent per year in agricultural productivity since 1952, as compared to 21½ percent increase in industrial man-hour output, proved that the family farm continues to remain the most efficient pattern of economic organization in agriculture. This agricultural efficiency gave the consumer much more food for an hour's take-home pay than a generation ago. He then warned, however, that this efficiency cannot be maintained if agriculture is saddled with a vast network of controls and price fixing by Government bureaucrats.

Because of its importance I ask unanimous consent that the article from which I have quoted be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Farm Bureau Federation's official newsletter, May 8, 1961]

FEDERAL CONTROL THREATENS FAMILY FARM, SHUMAN SAYS

Government intervention in agriculture may destroy the ability of the family farm to change with the times, thereby causing it to lose its markets.

That is the grave danger facing modern agriculture, Charles B. Shuman, American Farm Bureau Federation president, said in Chicago last week.

"A completely controlled agriculture, such as would result from the administration's proposed Cochrane-Freeman farm plan, not only would stifle the opportunity of our farm families but the resulting inefficiencies of production and marketing would result in higher costs to consumers," Mr. Shuman said.

The technological revolution in American agriculture and the ability of the family farm to adjust to changing needs has brought about an unparalleled farm production capacity, Mr. Shuman said.

He pointed out that in 1952 the average farmworkers produced food and fiber to support 17 persons. Now 1 farmworker is able to produce enough for about 25 persons.

Increases in productivity per man-hour in agriculture have nearly tripled that of nonagricultural industry, the farm leader pointed out. Productivity of the farmworker in the 1950's increased by 9 percent a year, compared to a 2½ percent annual increase in man-hour output in industry.

"This remarkable increase in agricultural productivity is the reason that food is the consumer's best buy. It is significant that Americans today purchase much more food for an hour's take-home pay than they could a generation ago.

"The family farm continues to remain the most efficient pattern of economic organization in agriculture. If allowed to make full use of its potential in a market price system, the family farm can more than hold its own in continuing to assure this Nation of an ample and economic supply of food and fiber for its expanding population.

"The family farm will be unable to do this, however, if it is subject to a vast network of controls and pricefixing which would transfer the farmer's business decisions to Government bureaucrats. That is what would happen under the Cochrane-Freeman farm plan."

Mr. Shuman said the Cochrane-Freeman scheme is misleading. It gives the appearance of authorizing farmers to devise their own programs, but in fact gives absolute power to the Secretary of Agriculture to impose price-fixing and control programs for all farm commodities through handpicked advisory committees.

"The Cochrane-Freeman farm scheme would in effect set up Government directed cartels for each farm commodity," Mr. Shuman said.

"It is paradoxical that the Federal Government on the one hand prosecutes price fixers in the electrical industry and on the other hand the administration gives its blessing to a scheme which would establish almost unlimited price fixing in agriculture. Farm Bureau is opposed to monopoly—in industry, labor, agriculture, or the Government itself.

"If the administration really wants to promote a New Frontier for agriculture, it should turn its emphasis toward a program that would enable the sectors of agriculture now under Government controls to return to a competitive market system," he said.

In the final analysis, millions of consumers exercising their right of free choice in the marketplace know better what is good for them than any bureaucrat. The farmer wants and needs a system by which his production can be guided by consumer needs, not directed by unrealistic Government programs.

"Agriculture has a bright future if farmers' organized bargaining power is used to make the market price system function better," Mr. Shuman said.

He cited the organization of the American Agricultural Marketing Association under sponsorship of Farm Bureau. The association was organized to help coordinate the activities of State and regional farm marketing-bargaining associations and improve farmers' bargaining power.

"With the concentration of the marketing and distribution of agricultural products in the hands of fewer buyers, and the resulting dangers of monopolistic practices from such concentration, it has become apparent that it is not only in the best interest of farmers but also in the best interest of our entire national economy that the marketing power of farmers and ranchers be strengthened.

"The wider use of contract marketing also has created a greater need for strengthening the bargaining position of farmers. Many farmers and agricultural leaders are of the opinion that in the future most agricultural commodities will be produced under contract.

"Marketing contracts are now being used for many commodities. This development may be used to the advantage of farmers if they can negotiate effectively for price and other considerations before the crop is under production.

"It is obvious that the market power of farmers will be organized by someone. Farm Bureau believes it can best be done by farmers operating their own voluntary marketing associations, rather than by labor, Government, or some other group."

Mr. Shuman said Farm Bureau's marketing-bargaining activities will always be based on the idea that a better income to farmers must be earned through providing the desired quantity and quality of farm products where and when the market exists—not by forcing prices to uneconomic levels.

IRRESPONSIBLE FOREIGN AID SPENDING

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a recent edition of the Saturday Evening Post contained two sterling editorials which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

The first of these is entitled "Congress Should Slam the Back Door on the Spenders." It presents a brief but cogent analysis of the trend in recent years to finance popular giveaway programs by sneaking up to the back door of the Treasury for payment of the bill. The editorial calls for reform and I wish to add my voice to this plea.

The second commentary, entitled "The United States of America Was Once Underdeveloped—But It Got No Aid," illustrates the drawbacks of wholesale foreign aid giveaways by tracing the history and growth of our own Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these fine editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD SLAM THE BACK DOOR ON THE SPENDERS

One of the first acts of the liberalized House Committee on Rules was to bottle up a resolution calling for an end to back-door spending, by which is meant the bypassing of Congress by Government agencies. Through this device billions of dollars never appropriated by Congress flow into spending agencies. This is how it is done:

Under normal procedure two separate steps must be taken by Congress to establish a program or set up a project. First, Congress must authorize the program or project. Then Congress must appropriate funds from the U.S. Treasury to pay for it. Unfortunately it is not required that the two steps be taken together.

Why would Congress authorize a project, but fail to provide money to carry it out? The answer is that it is easier to favor some grandiose plan as a good idea than to knuckle down to the task of finding the money. Besides, it is more popular. Many a fancy spending program has sailed through both Houses of Congress, only to be stopped dead in its tracks by one of the Appropriations Committees.

Now where does the back door come in? This way: To bypass the Appropriations Committees the sponsors of some spending programs hit on the device of writing into each authorization bill a provision by which money for the program could be borrowed from a specified fund in the U.S. Treasury. This fund consists of money paid back to the Treasury by those who had previously borrowed from it—other countries, for example. This money is earmarked to be applied on the public debt. Before it can be so applied, it is up for grabs by the various agencies named in the authorization bills.

Back-door spending has become a popular instrument for initiating programs involving large-scale spending unlikely to be approved by Appropriations Committees.

Well, what's wrong with this? Authorization to drop around at the Treasury's back door comes from the same Congress that appropriates money in the ordinary way.

First, this method is a loophole in the control of Federal spending and budgeting. It encourages special-interest groups and spenders to avoid budgetary controls.

Second, back-door spending has enabled some Federal programs to continue year after year without scrutiny by the Appropriations Committees.

Finally, it's probably unconstitutional. The Constitution provides that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law. * * *"

This situation calls for reform, but the House Rules Committee, apparently reluctant to throw up any barriers to Federal spending, refused to let the House vote on a bill which would have outlawed the practice.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA WAS ONCE UNDERDEVELOPED—BUT IT GOT NO AID

Once upon a time there was an underdeveloped country. We mean underdeveloped. The 4 million inhabitants were scattered for the most part along 1,200 miles of seacoast. Only primitive and mostly hostile tribes occupied a vast interior wilderness, which few of the new Nation's citizens had explored.

The country had no railways, no roads except streaks of dirt, and little transportation of any kind. Communications were slow, uncertain and difficult. Telegraph and telephone lines had not been built. Markets were few. Almost no industry existed. Hospitals were luxuries provided only in a few towns.

The Nation was deeply in debt. Such currency as circulated was of uncertain value. The people had been impoverished by years of war. Sectional jealousies were rife. Local leaders in every area spouted different ideas as to what should be done.

Not only was no foreign aid obtainable, but the powerful nations of Europe were unfriendly, if not actually hostile. Many doubted that the little Nation could survive, much less ever amount to much.

Such was the state of this underdeveloped country in the two decades following the long war by which it had won independence and freedom.

While the Nation was admittedly underdeveloped, the people were not underprivileged. They had gained the unique advantage of individual liberty. By a written Constitution they had guaranteed to themselves the right to choose their ways of making a living. They could think, write, speak, worship and assemble as they pleased and spend their money, when they had any, as they wished.

Also, unlike people in many underdeveloped countries of the mid-20th century, they were never underfed. Generally speaking, they were energetic, industrious, ambitious and possessed of considerable integrity. They worked hard, paid their just debts as they were able and felt their responsibilities as free citizens.

By enterprise and thrift they increased their capital and accumulated money to invest in industrial endeavors. Their rising prosperity attracted foreign capital with which they hastened their business expansion. Despite the costly setback of a horrible sectional war, they vigorously developed their natural resources and produced foods, fibers, raw materials and manufactures for export, and in turn became a great market for the rest of the formerly skeptical world.

From their underdeveloped beginnings these people became so rich, powerful and generous that they could send billions of dollars' worth of aid to other underdeveloped countries. Perhaps if these latter-day countries will adhere to the principles of individual liberty, responsibility and personal integrity and will find out how their people may become well nourished and energetic, they in turn will enable historians in another century to write proudly of their accomplishments.

TELEVISION DOCUMENTARIES

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I noted with a great deal of interest an article entitled, "How To Get Involved," which appeared in the May 8 issue of Newsweek. The article is the result of an interview with CBS producer, Frederick W. Friendly, who produced "Harvest of Shame" for the television series, "CBS Reports."

The article points out that Mr. Friendly and his staff have produced 23 documentaries with subject matters ranging all the way from our rapidly increasing population to the explosion of the H-bomb.

That documentaries are now accepted as a TV form and are judged on their individual merits can be attributed to the creativity of producers like Fred

Friendly, who has just won his 10th Peabody Award for "Harvest of Shame."

Because the article concerns a producer whose work is indicative of the many excellent and informative documentaries which are now produced on television, I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO GET INVOLVED

Less than 2 years ago when CBS producer Fred W. Friendly embarked on his first solo venture in TV documentaries, he looked hard at the realities of TV programing and gulped gamely: "I don't like to use the word 'scared' but I do have great apprehension about the whole thing." But by the time "CBS Reports" hit the air last week with "Why Man in Space?" Friendly and his staff had behind them 23 documentaries that were among the best shows of any kind ever to appear on TV. CBS glowed with paternal pride, and Friendly himself had just pocketed his 10th Peabody Award [1] (six more than Ed Murrow, seven more than anyone else).

Flushed and exhilarated Friendly hurled himself all over an armchair in his office one afternoon last week and beamed: "Let me tell you about my current agonies." A big-boned, dark-haired hyperthyroid, Friendly carries his agonies around with him the way other men carry their lunch pails—and for much the same reason. Recently, for example, he has been feeding on the problem of the John Birch Society. "This show we've been thinking of doing in May on Birchism fascinates me, but is it really important enough? Television has tremendous impact. You don't want to bring out a cannon to kill a fly."

FRUSTRATING

Friendly pounded his chest, hunting for cigarettes. "This is a frustrating time for America," he continued. "The world is going to hell in a hurry. It doesn't mean everything is lost, but it's going to be rough. People try to say the reason for this is the Communists. So Ike, Warren, your preacher are all Communists. It's very easy for Birchism to get people looking under the bed. So we're going to do the show."

Friendly's agonies are outgrowths of a more general and pervasive itch that he defines as "being involved," a condition that has led him and his staff to everything from the population explosion to the implosion of the H-bomb. "We have a minimum of going out and saying to someone: 'Would you like to say something for our camera?'" Friendly remarked. "We get them when they're involved, and we're involved, too."

The telephone rang, and Friendly leaned farther forward to pick it up, almost bending himself double. "What's new in space?" he asked by way of greeting. After replacing the phone, he heaved himself to a sitting position, and began to reminisce. "Those old 'See It Nows'—they're nostalgic and amateurish," he said firmly of the shows he did with Ed Murrow for 8 years. "We made some of them in 4 or 5 days. 'CBS Reports' has 10 full-time producers, and they do about 2 shows each a year. When we did 'Harvest of Shame,' David Lowe lived with the migrant workers for 1 full year."

Friendly regards it as notable that documentaries are now accepted as a TV form and are judged on their individual merits. "We've established a beachhead," he said. "In the beginning, we couldn't afford one failure. It was sudden death. Now we're getting judged on the averages. We've done some not-so-good shows. Look, I'm proud of those 10 Peabodys, but if I've been up to bat more than 300 times, and no one else has been up more than 15, how could I help getting more base hits? I wish there were a way to assume a posture of not winning without looking like a has-been."

[1] For "Harvest of Shame," the explosive documentary on migrant farmworkers.

FEDERALLY FINANCED SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, with the issue of Federal legislation in the field of education presently occupying both Houses of Congress, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent article by George W. Oakes in the Washington Sunday Star. This lucid and highly informative account of the scholarships aspect of education legislation is most helpful in evaluating the great contribution which the Federal Government has made to higher education and to the Nation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, May 7, 1961]

BROADENING EDUCATION AID: A RENEWED PUSH FOR FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS

(By George W. Oakes)

The Kennedy administration hopes that 212,500 promising but needy high school graduates will acquire a college education through federally financed scholarships in the next 5 years.

The Federal scholarship bill which has been reported by the House Education Subcommittee provides 25,000 stipends of up to $1,000 annually for the first year of the legislation, rising to $50,000 for each of the last 3 years. The total cost would be approximately $925 million. The scholarships, allocated to the States according to high school enrollment, would be awarded competitively by State commissions. For example, it is estimated that the total number available for students in Washington, assuming the average grant to be $700, would amount to almost 700 for the entire program or about 80 for the first year.

The full House committee in considering the subcommittee report on Friday adopted an amendment that would alter the entire character of the scholarship proposal. This amendment would require Federal scholars to repay the total cost of their scholarship from earnings over a period of years. As the full committee adopted this amendment by the close vote of 16 to 14, and as several Democrats who opposed the amendment were absent from the meeting, present prospects are that the full committee will restore the original grant proposal by killing the substitute loan version in its meeting next Thursday.

WIDELY DEBATED ISSUE

Congress has vigorously debated the issue of federally financed scholarships in recent years. The present bill was introduced by Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of the subcommittee now handling the bill. In 1958 the Hill-Elliott bill, most of which became law as the National Defense Education Act, included a plan for Federal scholarships but this section was eliminated during debate in the House.

Although half of all high school graduates in this country now go on from high school to some form of higher learning, educational authorities agree that the Nation is still incurring too large a loss of valuable talent. Despite the fact that the college population is booming—1 million more students will be enrolled in 1964 than in 1959—too many students with college potential are economically unable to pursue their studies beyond high school. In fact, it is generally accepted in Government and private educational circles that every year approximately 150,000 students of marked ability fail to enter college. Of this number it is believed that 60,000 to 100,000 are prevented annually from continuing their education for lack of financial means.

However, various studies conducted by the universities and others concerned with higher education have shown that many other factors besides money contribute to this loss of trained talent. Too frequently the family background and parental attitudes toward educational attainments discourage the potentially capable student from going to college. In fact, Dr. Elmer West in his 1956 study on higher education states that this consideration is of greater importance than economic means in determining college attendance.

One of the chief reasons given for additional financial aid through a Federal scholarship is the extraordinary rise in college tuition fees. During the past decade they have mounted 86 percent. The average current expenditure of attending college away from home rose from approximately $1,200 per student in 1953 to $1,650 in 1960. As Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff put it, "when this cost is considered in relation to the fact that in 1959 the median income of heads of families 35 to 54 years of age was $6,140, it is easy to understand why many families with modest incomes find it difficult to send their sons and daughters to college."

THE PRESENT SCHOLARSHIPS

Office of Education officials estimate that 1,800 colleges and universities in this country granted $90 million in scholarships during the academic year 1959–60. State scholarship programs provided another $10.5 million and other scholarship awards amounted to an additional $20 million during this same period.

In general these scholarship programs benefit needy students in the upper 10 percent of the average high school graduating class. The proposed Federal program would probably help those ranking roughly between the top 10 percent and 15 percent or the moderately able, very needy students.

The increasing use of college student loans, especially those offered under the Defense Education Act, has ameliorated but not solved the problem of students requiring financial aid. In 1959–60 loans arranged under this Federal program amounted to $50.1 million while another $45 million was loaned by other plans which the colleges themselves operate.

In general student loan programs are of particular value to those from the middle and lower middle income groups whose families can help pay off, if necessary, a small debt. Defense Education Act loans averaged $438 in 1959–60. But students from the lowest income groups are discouraged by their hard-up families from incurring a financial obligation, and particularly a large one.

Although university organizations like the American Council on Education and individual leaders in higher education support a Federal college scholarship program, some, like President Frederick L. Hovde of Purdue University who was chairman of President Kennedy's education task force (which did not recommend college scholarships), claim that there are no adequate State-by-State studies of the distribution of qualified and needy students and that those who fail to go to college for financial reasons may be fairly heavily concentrated in a few States

or regions—a view shared by some Government authorities.

Other educators in and out of Government would admit that there is considerable merit to this criticism of the proposed Federal plan which would allocate scholarships by States. For example, California, which would receive the second largest number of scholarships (approximately 15,000), has an extensive system of public colleges and junior colleges which charge only a nominal fee to State residents. Thus, there appears to be less need for Federal scholarships for Californians to attend their own State colleges. However, the Federal plan would help California students who wanted to go to college out of the State but couldn't afford to do so.

TRAINING SCIENTISTS

Although the Soviet man-in-space achievement is being used in Congress as an argument for Federal scholarships in order to train more and better scientists, Government officials involved in scientific education disagree. In their opinion, we should devote more Government funds toward doing a better job of teaching science to students in college rather than urging more to apply even if some of them would make excellent college material. This can be accomplished by greater efforts to improve the training of college science teachers and to encourage young scientists.

In order to locate the most talented students the university community believes that the Federal scholarships should be distributed among the colleges who are best qualified for a talent recruitment job rather than be awarded by State commissions. They question whether the sought-after student can be counted on to apply to State commissions. They also point out the plan of selection by State committees would permit Federal scholars to apply to any institution. As a result the already intense pressure on the more prominent universities will be increased. On the other hand, if the scholarships were widely distributed among colleges throughout the country so they could pick the winners, the smaller and less prominent institutions would be improved by acquiring more good students. This would be beneficial in raising the level of many colleges which must be expanded and improved in order to meet the demands of our rising student population which will almost double in this decade.

However, administration officials contend there is no equitable method to distribute scholarships to the colleges and there seems no way to do so in the South without supporting segregation with Federal funds.

An important attraction for the colleges to which Federal scholars would go (which would particularly aid smaller colleges) is the provision in the proposed legislation to pay each institution $350 per student per year as compensation for the extra operating expenses incurred.

A POSSIBLE FRUSTRATION

If the Federal scholarships are awarded by State committees, a winner might also be given another scholarship by a college that wanted him since the bill does not prohibit holders of Federal scholarships from acquiring others. If this occurred, the purpose of Federal scholarships seeking out new talent not now receiving other financial aid would be, in part, frustrated.

Under the administration plan, Federal awards would be granted by State commissions on a competitive basis. Those winners who do not require financial aid would receive merit certificates but monetary grants would only go to those who need them.

In addition to the scholarships the House bill, in order to encourage scholastic excellence, provides for $1,000 special presidential awards to the top thousand Federal scholars regardless of need who, by competitive examination, have proved themselves outstanding on the basis of academic achievement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the education of American youth has been a major concern of this Nation's statesmen since the formation of our Union. Thomas Jefferson in writing his own epitaph, requested that he be remembered as the author of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, the author of the Declaration of Independence, and the founder of the University of Virginia. To have founded the University of Virginia was considered by this great American as a more significant accomplishment than to have been President of the United States.

In expressing the intimate relationship of education and democracy, Jefferson said:

I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it away from them, but to inform their discretion by education.

Herein lies the philosophy behind our State and local public school systems.

Democracy is based upon a belief in the dignity and rights of the individual. This belief necessarily leads to the belief that each individual should have a full opportunity to develop his abilities. Free public education is the only way to give to all this opportunity.

From what sources does public education in America draw its strength? There are two primary sources. First, there is the interest in and responsibility for public education at the State and local levels. The value of locating authority at these governmental levels was lucidly expressed by Dr. William Henry Ruffner, Virginia's first superintendent of public instruction. In drafting legislation in 1870 to establish a public school system in Virginia, Dr. Ruffner said he was guided by what he called "the established doctrine of liberal government, that power should be distributed, and should always be kept as near to the people as is consistent with the end to be subserved."

Of equal importance to local supervision is constant, unswerving emphasis upon quality. Indeed, these elements are closely related, for who is more eager to improve a county's education standards than that county's school board and the local PTA?

Nor can quality in education be measured in dollars and cents. Is a public school system worth more because its authorities have spent more? It is not the amount which is spent but rather the value which is received. In simple language, the proper test of the quality of public education is whether the program creates wisdom and understanding. Our Government is based upon the teachings of the Bible, and in that Good Book it is written:

Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom; and with all the getting, get understanding;

For—

Happy is the man that findeth wisdom. Her ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I have studied the Federal-aid-to-education proposals.

If I could convince this distinguished body of my personal belief that S. 1021, S. 1241, and S. 1482 would have been considered unconstitutional by our Founding Fathers and that these bills would sooner or later lead to Federal control of our Nation's entire education system—both public and private—I am confident that they would never win congressional approval.

Although these bills are objectionable for other reasons as well, I will limit my discussion to the two aspects of this proposed legislation which I consider especially repugnant. I refer to the dubious constitutionality of these bills and to the dangers of federally controlled education which they invite.

GENERAL WELFARE CLAUSE

I cannot emphasize too strongly that the general welfare clause was not intended to constitute in itself a grant of power to the Federal Government. Otherwise, the Constitution would never have been ratified. In voting to ratify the Constitution, New York first and then Virginia and two other States adopted qualifying resolutions to the effect that the State was voting to join a Union of strictly delegated powers and should the new Federal Government ever exceed those delegated powers, to the detriment of the ratifying State, it reserved the right to secede. In fact, all thirteen States felt the same way and believed that they had made secure, for all time, the doctrine of limited Federal powers, through the prompt and unanimous ratification of the 10th amendment.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution reads as follows:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

History clearly indicates the meaning which our Founding Fathers intended this section to convey.

In the Articles of Confederation the term "general welfare" is used in both article III and article VIII:

Article III: The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare.

Article VIII: All charges of war and all other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defense or general welfare and allowed by the United States in Congress assembled shall be defrayed out of a common treasury.

An examination of these articles and the way in which they were interpreted indicates that no broad independent power to provide for the general welfare was ever intended.

Students of American history agree that the weakness of the Articles of Confederation imperiled the Revolutionary movement. If the Continental Congress had possessed authority to legislate for the general welfare, there is no question but that in such an emergency they would have laid the taxes required to finance a successful fight for freedom.

Madison in the 41st issue of the Federalist had the following to say:

But what would have been thought of that assembly (Congress of the Confederation) if, attaching themselves to those general expressions and disregarding the specifications which ascertain and limit their import, they had exercised an unlimited power of providing for the common defense and general welfare? I appeal to the objectors themselves, whether they would in that case have employed the same reasoning in justification of Congress as they now make use of against the convention. How difficult it is for error to escape its own condemnation.

Obviously article VIII of the Articles of Confederation gave the Continental Congress no authority to legislate for the general welfare. Events of history bear this out. The Continental Congress could and did exercise only those powers which had been expressly granted, that is, the powers to declare war, make treaties, establish post offices, and so forth.

Was this limited interpretation of the power to provide for the general welfare given a broader meaning by the Constitutional Convention of 1787? Certainly not.

On August 6, 1787, the Rutledge committee, which had been appointed for the purpose of reporting the Constitution, submitted the following article for the Convention's consideration:

ARTICLE VII

SECTION 1. The Legislature of the United States shall have—

1. The power to lay and collect the taxes, duties, imposts, and excises;

2. To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States;

3. To establish a uniform rule of naturalization throughout the United States;

4. To coin money.

And so forth.

This article, as reported, was taken verbatim from Mr. Charles Pinckney's original draft, the purpose of which was to give the new Federal Government limited powers. It is to be noted especially that in submitting its report, the committee rejected the so-called Bedford amendment, which, borrowing the philosophy of Hamilton as expressed at the Convention, would have given Congress the power to legislate in all cases for the general welfare of the Union.

On the 18th of August, 20 other proposals giving additional powers to Congress were referred to the Rutledge committee. Some of these were afterward adopted and became parts of the Constitution. However, it is interesting to note three which were rejected as they all dealt with education. Their rejection indicates, of course, that no substantive power to legislate for the general welfare was ever intended:

To establish a university.

To establish seminaries for the promotion of literature and the arts and sciences.

To establish public institutions, rewards, and immunities for the promotion of agriculture, commerce, trades, and manufacturers.

The proponents of a more centralized form of government, however, were not yet ready to yield, even though the Convention at this point had adopted the philosophy of Pinkney's original draft. On the 25th of August, an attempt was made to undo what had already been agreed upon. The first clause of article VII, section 1, then read:

The Legislature of the United States shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

The advocates of centralization urged adding to this clause the following words:

for the payment of said debts and for the defraying of expenses that shall be incurred for the common defense and general welfare.

This proposed amendment was rejected, Connecticut alone voting for it and 10 States against it.

On the 12th of September the Rutledge committee reported the Constitution as revised and arranged. Article I, section 8 of this draft reads in part:

The Congress may by joint ballot appoint a treasurer. They shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises;

To pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States;

To borrow money—

And so forth, through the 18 powers.

If this wording of article I, section 8, had prevailed, there would indeed be a general welfare clause. But it was rejected, thanks primarily to the efforts of Gouverneur Morris and James Madison. Article I, section 8, finally emerged from the Convention on September 15, as follows:

The Congress shall have power—

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate commerce—

And so forth.

The words "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States," constituting the third clause as reported in the Constitution by the Rutledge committee on September 12, were moved up into the second clause. Moreover, after the words "United States" the phrase "but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States" was added. Article I, section 8, as finally revised robbed the words "to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States" of any independent grant of power and made them merely descriptive of the powers subsequently enumerated.

Furthermore, there is a presumption against the grant of a general power where particular powers follow which would be included in the preceding general power.

Madison states the proposition as follows:

For what purpose could the enumeration of particular powers be inserted if these and all others were meant to be included in the preceding general power? Nothing is more natural and common than first to use a general phrase and then to explain and qualify it by a recital of particulars. But the idea of an enumeration of particulars which neither explain nor qualify the general meaning and can have no other effect than to confound and mislead is an absurdity which, [if] we are reduced to the dilemma of charging either on the authors of the objection or on the authors of the Constitution, we must take the liberty of supposing had not its origin with the latter.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution should have removed any doubt as to whether the Federal Government was one of limited or general powers. Under the 10th amendment if a specific power to do a particular thing is not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, then it is reserved to the States.

The intention of our Founding Fathers is crystal clear. Unfortunately that intention has been distorted in the recent past by a Supreme Court whose decisions on occasion go beyond interpreting our Constitution in the light of those age-old guideposts: Intention of the authors, literal meaning, and precedent.

In *U.S.* v. *Butler*, 297 U.S. 1 (1936), the Court rejected the facts of history and held that the Federal Government had the right to tax and spend in the exercise not only of its specified powers but also of its so-called power to provide for the general welfare.

Commenting on this fabricated authority in *Helvering* v. *Davis*, 301 U.S. 619 (1937), the Court had the following to say:

Congress may spend money in aid of the "general welfare." Constitution, art. I, section 8 * * * There have been great statesmen in our history who have stood for other views. We will not resurrect the contest. It is now settled by decision (that is *United States* v. *Butler*). The conception of the spending power advocated by Hamilton and strongly reinforced by Story has prevailed over that of Madison, which has not been lacking in adherents.

Without speculating on what the decision of the present Court would be were

it faced with a case arising under the proposed Federal aid to education, I believe that Congress should exercise particular care in passing legislation where litigation thereunder would have difficulty in reaching the courts. This viewpoint was endorsed by a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare document of March 28, 1961, entitled "Memorandum on the Impact of the First Amendment to the Constitution Upon Federal Aid to Education."

I quote it in part as follows:

> Despite the existence of a number of Federal educational programs in recent years, judicial review in Federal courts at the instance of a taxpayer of the lawfulness of Federal expenditures has not been available since *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U.S. 447) decided in 1923. It should therefore be emphasized that the questions discussed in this memorandum are probably not open for judicial determination, unless adequate special statutory provisions are enacted to authorize judicial review.
>
> The difficulties of obtaining a court test of legislation in this area impose a solemn responsibility upon both Congress and the Executive to be especially conscientious in studying the Constitution and relevant Supreme Court decisions so that any enactment will scrupulously observe constitutional limitations.

Apparently neglecting the words of caution which it has espoused, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare goes on to recommend Federal aid not only to public education but also to higher secular education. I, myself, however, am not prepared to support measures of doubtful constitutionality—particularly when affected parties stand a good chance of being denied judicial review.

FEDERAL CONTROL

Nor is the doubtful constitutionality of Federal aid to education proposals my sole objection to them.

The day on which the Federal Government can appropriate money for mass education precedes by but a brief span the day when it may seek to control citizens through tyranny over men's minds.

But it is argued that these measures stipulate that the Federal Government is not to exercise any supervision over policy determination, personnel, or curriculum. History shows us that Federal control inevitably follows Federal money, and anything to the contrary we write into the pending bill a subsequent Congress can repeal.

The very disclaimer of an intention to regulate educational policy indicates that advocates of this aid program believe the Federal Government does possess such dictatorial authority.

Furthermore, after attempting to tranquilize the Congress with its assurance of no control, this proposed legislation proceeds to enumerate some very substantial controls which would be engrafted on our system of education.

I shall briefly discuss three of the more obnoxious ones to be imposed on recipients of Federal aid.

In S. 1021, S. 1241, and S. 1482, all construction projects are placed under the restrictive measures of the Davis-Bacon Act. This, of course, means that the Secretary of Labor will determine the prevailing wage on similar construction in the locality and consequently the wage which each worker on federally aided school construction will receive. The recipient of aid is, therefore, prevented by law from completing construction with the minimum cost to itself, to the Federal Government, and, therefore, to the taxpayer. The waste resulting from such procedure is objectionable enough, but far worse is the clear implication that if the Federal Government can set the wages of workers who build educational structures it can also—and would eventually—regulate the salaries of instructors who teach in these buildings.

Another sample of the Federal control of education inherent in these bills is to be found in S. 1241, section 102(a)(3) of which specifies "that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials." Although this provision may seem harmless enough to some, it gives the Federal Government a far from insignificant control over policy determination in our schools. For example, are small classrooms in which the pupil receives more individual attention an extravagance? Would rooms be elaborate if they were constructed specially for vocational training or perhaps for instruction in foreign languages which might include soundproofing and individual booths equipped with tape recorders? Features of classroom construction considered an elaborate design by one educator might be deemed a near necessary requirement by another. These are matters about which reasonable men may differ. Under this bill, however, the final arbiter of what is elaborate or extravagant would be the Federal Government. This is Federal control of all school buildings.

Section 109 of S. 1021 illustrates another form of Federal control that would be exercised over aid recipients. This provision would require each State receiving Federal aid to set aside 10 percent of these receipts for experimental projects. Although I certainly favor a State's making every effort to improve its system of education, I do not consider it appropriate for the Federal Government to require a State to use a percentage of its Federal funds for pilot projects when the State itself might consider that it needs all available funds for other purposes.

Even though this legislation disclaims any intention to control education, these bills are replete with examples of Federal dictation.

Individual and States rights—already wavering under Federal onslaught—will be further imperiled when educational policy itself becomes the tool of a central authority.

Nazi Germany followed the familiar pattern of, first, centralization of power; second, thought control; and finally, destruction. Cuba, now in the second phase, rapidly approaches the third. Must America, too, invite this cycle?

Those who feel that complete Federal control of educational policy is not forthcoming need look no further for a different conclusion than the Federal Government's present highway program. Federal funds are available only to those States whose roadbuilding programs meet certain specifications. Consequently, if a State accepts any Federal money for road construction, it must, in effect, also accept Federal design. Furthermore, if the Federal Government contends that any of its funds have been misspent, it investigates the matter at the expense of State sovereignty and dignity. Several such investigations are proceeding at present. As a final consequence, States which accept large amounts of Federal money for road construction become increasingly dependent on such funds.

States cannot now give up Federal aid to roads, nor will they be able to give up Federal aid to schools, regardless of Federal control, once that program becomes established.

In the meantime, as our public school system becomes federalized, corresponding developments will be taking place in our private school community. Under S. 1241, institutions of higher learning, be they public or private, sectarian or nonsectarian, would receive various forms of Federal aid. If S. 1241 and S. 1021 become law, there will be petitions from private schools, sectarian and nonsectarian, charging that the Congress has acted unfairly in excluding such schools from its aid-to-education program. Indeed, as S. 1482 and its advocates clearly demonstrate, the campaign has already begun.

The State of Virginia faced an issue of this type many years ago, before the Constitution had been ratified.

In the late 1770's and early 1780's there was substantial support in the Commonwealth for offering State financial aid to teachers of the Christian religion.

Just as today we hear it argued that education needs Federal support, so then the argument was that religion—specifically, the Christian religion—needed State support.

Fortunately for every American who seriously practices his religion, James Madison was not misled by the apparent harmless nature of this proposal. In his "Memorial and Remonstrance" of 1784, Madison clearly outlined the dangers which State subsidization of religion would create.

Objecting to this type of subsidy, Madison said:

> Because it is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. * * * Who does not see that the same authority which can establish Christianity in exclusions of all other religions may establish, with the same ease, any particular sect of Christians in exclusion of all other sects? That the same authority which can force a citizen to contribute threepence only of his property for the support of any one establishment may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever?

And further:

> Because, finally, "the equal right of every citizen to the free exercise of his religion, according to the dictates of conscience," is held by the same tenure with all our other rights. If we recur to its origin, it is equally the gift of nature; if we weigh its importance, it cannot be less dear to us; if we consult the declaration of those rights "which

pertain to the good people of Virginia as the basis and foundation of government" it is enumerated with equal solemnity, or rather with studied emphasis.

The acclaim which Madison's "Memorial and Remonstrance" was received, in addition to its effect on other States and on the first amendment to the Constitution, led our Commonwealth to pass in 1785 Jefferson's famous bill establishing religious freedom. Virginia thereby became the first State in the modern world with both complete religious freedom and complete separation of church and state.

Again I emphasize that the eagerness of some church schools to receive Federal funds—already apparent—will be compounded if S. 1021 and S. 1241 become law. Unmindful of the constitutional issues, parochial school officials will argue that justice demand they be included under the Federal aid program. Indeed, S. 1482 would extend such coverage to them now. And when the aid comes, the control will not be tardy in following.

With respect to Federal aid for parochial schools, some Members of the Congress are still willing to recognize the constitutional objection to such a program, first voiced by James Madison. Yet they are perfectly willing to override Madison's construction of the general welfare clause, in order to support a program of Federal aid for nonsectarian public schools.

It requires no prophet nor the son of a prophet to predict that even though aid to parochial schools may not be provided at this session of the Congress, it will certainly be provided by some subsequent Congress if the pending proposal to authorize the appropriation of $2,550 million for public schools be written into law. And, by the same token, the current proposal of $2,550 million will be just a starting point for that type of Federal aid.

Few Members of this Congress recall the spirited debates in the House of Representatives in 1924 over a Federal aid to education bill quite similar to the one we have before us. At that time, the proponents of the program were requesting appropriations of only $100 million. About 15 years have passed since the late Senator Robert Taft, of Ohio, voted by the Senate as one of its all-time great Members, predicted that if the Government started a program of Federal aid, the cost would soon pyramid to $3 billion per year. And today we are already at $2,550 million.

Some may answer that the Congress will never vote for aid on such a lavish scale because tax revenue for the purpose will not be available. But the lavish spenders will not be handicapped by any lack of tax revenues. They will have no difficulty in financing Federal aid to education or aid for any other purpose because they will lean instead upon deficit spending and back-door Treasury financing. That, of course, is what Germany did following the end of World War I.

There are many people who say "it can't happen here." We know that we have the greatest measure of personal freedom of any people in the world, which is often referred to as American constitutional liberty. Yet in these aid-to-education bills, in the recently passed wage-and-hour bill, and in numerous other bills we are deliberately eroding the Constitution, upon which our personal freedom rests. Ever since the end of World War II, subject to several minor recessions, we have had a program of inflation, due in no small part to deficit financing, which has eroded more than two-fifths of the former value of our currency. We see no end of the present cold war or of the backbreaking burden of a defense program, presently costing more than one-half of the entire revenue of our Government. In fact, this Congress will no doubt increase expenditures for defense by a billion to a billion and a half dollars, to be financed by borrowed money.

The Secretary of the Treasury has predicted a deficit, in the next fiscal year, of nearly $3 billion. Last week, the Budget Director expressed before a House committee the view that the deficit might be larger than officially predicted. Personally, I share the viewpoint of those who believe that even without the additional expenditures contemplated in the pending school bills, the deficit will be $2 or $3 billion larger than the current Treasury Department estimate.

Yet we are calmly and blandly asked to embark upon a new type of Federal spending, to assume a jurisdiction that the Federal Constitution does not authorize, and which the Founding Fathers never contemplated, in order to relieve the financial burden of supporting a system of public education which the States and their political subdivisions have heretofore carried, and for the most part in a commendable manner. How does this Congress propose to pay the bill for this new aid program? Echo answers: In borrowed dollars, because no Member of Congress can deny the deficit that is facing us, both in the current fiscal year, and likewise for the year that will commence next July.

Mr. President, because the pending proposals are without constitutional sanction, because the expenditure of Federal funds always will be followed by Federal control, and because under existing conditions the Federal Government cannot safely assume new financial obligations for domestic spending, I am opposed to the pending bills, and I hope they will be defeated.

THE RETURN OF PERSONAL DIPLOMACY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the quest for the preservation of our free society is the primary objective of our foreign policy. The President's first official trip to a foreign country, his journey to Canada, is the opening move in a series of oversea trips, the purpose of which is to assure not only the preservation but also the strengthening of the forces of freedom throughout the world. It is eminently fitting that Canada, our close and historic neighbor nation, should be the first to be honored by a visit by the President. It is no less a source of gratification that our Chief Executive will soon travel to France, where he will be received by one of the great men of our time, Gen. Charles de Gaulle. France's intimate and unforgettable links with our national past and the key role she plays in the structure of the free world make this visit a timely and appropriate symbol of our solidarity with this old and esteemed ally.

At this time, in a more distant part of the world, Vice President JOHNSON is contributing his high gifts of mind and personality to the immediate and pressing challenges that freedom faces in lands threatened by Communist encroachment.

At the same time, Secretary of State Rusk is in Geneva, wrestling with representatives of several foreign powers, many hostile, over the problems of Laos and the Far East.

These efforts by the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State are to be applauded and supported. We have also been apprised of the diplomatic exchanges that may result in a face-to-face meeting in Europe, in early June, between our President and Premier Khrushchev.

In the light of the extent to which the President appears to be embracing the concept and practice of personal diplomacy, the temptation is strong to cite the historical irony that this policy represents. It will be remembered that in the course of the 1960 presidential campaign President Eisenhower was frequently criticized for his use of personal diplomacy. Indeed, the phrase itself, born in respect, would have died in degradation if the political voices which were attacking it were given full credence. Happily, the American public was so well aware of the tremendous force for good represented by the missions of friendship of President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Secretary Dulles, and Secretary Herter, that our people are convinced that personal diplomacy has its place and its function in the conduct of international affairs.

I have always felt that history has a keen sense of humor, a bit sardonic at times perhaps, but good for the soul, and a healthy rectifier of distorted perspectives. The fact that personal diplomacy, crushed to earth, rises again, thanks to a vigorous lift by its detractors, is vivid proof of the point.

It is the sincere hope of the American people that the President will be successful in his efforts to strengthen the hand of freedom in the world. His personal meetings with our traditional allies, and with the representatives of those other nations who share, too, our concept of the dignity of man, will surely be welcomed by us all as steps toward the solidarity of the free world.

With respect to the prospective meeting with Mr. Khrushchev, I think it not inappropriate to cite a statement made by our President during the 1960 campaign, on an October 4 telecast in Indianapolis. In the course of this interview program, the Democratic candidate was asked to comment on President Eisenhower's rejection of a proposal by

five neutralist nations that he meet with Khrushchev. In the course of his response, which upheld the President's decision, the then Democratic candidate stated:

> There is no sense having a meeting unless there is an atmosphere before the meeting which leads you to hope that there will be some success.
>
> On the issues on which we are divided with the Soviet Union, disarmament and Berlin, which are the two chief ones at the present time, there is no indication that there is a common meeting ground. Therefore, just to meet, just to sit down, just to spend an hour, unless there is some basis for hope, particularly as Khrushchev is being extremely belligerent now, I thought the President showed good judgment.

In commenting on this statement, it is reasonable to ask whether the conditions then considered as essential exist today in the present context of our relations with Russia. It may validly be argued, I believe, that far from our having an atmosphere of detente in those relations, they are strained to a serious degree.

It is fervently to be hoped that the President's eventual decision in this matter will be most deliberately weighed.

His responsibility is grave, and we cannot but sympathize with him in the solemn hour of choice that he faces.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BICENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF BUCKINGHAM COUNTY, VA.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the people of Buckingham County, Va., on Friday May 12, 1961, observed the bicentennial anniversary of the county's formation. I was honored by an invitation to participate in the observance.

Buckingham County is an adjacent neighbor of Prince Edward County. The citizens of the two counties are of a kindred spirit. The people of Buckingham have great sympathy with their friends in Prince Edward, who have been under attack by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, through Federal courts and otherwise, for 10 years.

I share the concern of the people of Buckingham, and all of Virginia—and I hope of the Nation—over the problems which the NAACP has produced in Prince Edward County; and I take pride in the fortitude demonstrated by the citizens of Prince Edward in defense of principles in which they believe and rights they hold dear and especially I commend the efforts of the white citizens of Prince Edward County to give educational facilities to the Negro school children.

I stated my views on this matter at Buckingham last Friday, and I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from my statement published in the body of the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DEFENSE OF PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY

Action by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People resulted in withdrawal of Prince Edward County support of public schools. Under NAACP influence colored leaders in the county will neither provide for education of their children nor accept assistance from the white people of the county.

In short, the NAACP is more interested in the integration of public school children than it is in the education of colored children; and the NAACP, alone, is responsible for the fact that 1,700 colored children in Prince Edward County are not now attending good schools with qualified teachers.

White people of the county deplore the fact that colored children of the community are being kept out of school; but everyone should be aware that so long as this condition can be maintained, the NAACP and others can make propaganda use of it to discredit the county's efforts to restore full and complete educational facilities. This has been done and it is being done now.

White citizens of Prince Edward have successfully established a system of accredited schools for their children, and they have offered to do the same thing for colored children. This offer has been open and standing since December 1959, but parents of only one colored child have dared to submit an application for enrollment.

When Negro leaders did nothing to provide education for colored children in the county, white citizens formed a corporation in the name of "Southside Schools, Inc.," to provide educational opportunities for Negro students. Officers of the corporation communicated with parents of every potential colored student in the county.

In a letter to every Negro parent in Prince Edward, dated December 19, 1959, R. B. Hargrove, president of the corporation said:

"Southside Schools, Inc., has been formed to provide schools for those Negro children who have not been able to get an education since the public schools were closed this fall.

"It is our intention to set up good schools, get qualified teachers, and, so that the Negro children of this county will not lose time from school, to run these schools at least 180 days, which is a full school year. The actual location of the schools and the securing of the teachers will be determined after all applications have been received.

"There are funds available from the State of Virginia to pay tuition for children when public schools are closed. The board of this corporation has set a tuition charge of $240 per child. Therefore, each parent can apply for this money after enrolling, which will pay for educating your child. How to do this will be explained to you and help given by this corporation after your child is enrolled in school.

"Enclosed is an application for registration. Please fill it out and return it to Southside Schools, Inc., Post Office Box 164, Farmville, Va., as soon as possible but not later than January 15, 1960. No application received after January 15 will be accepted.

"We urge you to mail your application immediately as we must know as soon as possible how many pupils to prepare for."

The letter enclosed a form for use in applying for admission to the school. The form consisted simply of blanks for the name; date and place of birth; grade completed, and last school attended; and the name and address of parent or guardian; signature and date.

At the end of the letter, there was a postscript which said:

"If you are in doubt about the meaning of anything in this letter we urge you to see the member of the board of directors living nearest you. He will be glad to explain exactly what is meant."

To this date there has been only one application for school enrollment in response to this letter.

Members of the board of Southside Schools, Inc., are well known, outstanding citizens of the community. The Negroes of Prince Edward County have every reason to trust them, and confide in them. Many of them are known personally to people in Buckingham. Besides Roy B. Hargrove, the president, the board includes:

J. V. Lewis, vice president; J. B. Wall, Jr., secretary; R. M. Bradshaw, treasurer; W. J. Sydnor, Graham Raiford, J. Nat Wilkerson, C. W. Glenn, Mrs. Bessie W. Taylor, A. N. Fore, T. W. Brooks, Jr., R. E. Taylor, P. T. Atkinson, Fielder Hubbard, Ralph Carlton, Richard G. Nelson, and John Gates.

When this letter, offering schools to colored children in Prince Edward, went out, Oliver W. Hill, the Negro lawyer representing NAACP in Richmond, and Roy Wilkins, NAACP executive director from New York, made a hurried return to the county. They showed up at a Christmas party for the county's colored children on December 23, 1959.

Hill used such an occasion as the Christmas party for colored children to tell their parents that:

"Some benighted individuals are trying to entice you away from your rights by promising you a private school.

"All you are losing is 1 or 2 years of Jim Crow education, but at the same time in your leisure you can gather more basic education than you would in 5 years of Jim Crow schools."

Accepting this kind of outside guidance for their "advancement," instead of the offers of assistance from their white neighbors who want to work with them for the establishment of schools, the colored people of Prince Edward County have ignored educational opportunities provided for them.

Noting the clear indications of intimidation by the NAACP—when only one application for enrollment was received—officials of Southside Schools, Inc., promised that the identity of applicants for enrollment would not be disclosed until the schools were open. But even this did not result in any more applications.

Later, members of the board of Southside Schools, Inc., personally visited their Negro friends in each magisterial district in the county, urging them to take advantage of the opportunities to get the schools open for their children.

After these visits they called an interracial meeting on June 30, 1960, for the same purpose. The proceedings of the meeting were not published, but the fact remains that all efforts to persuade Negroes in Prince Edward County to accept the educational opportunities offered to them have been totally unsuccessful.

Prince Edward supervisors have adopted ordinances to provide educational opportunities for all children, white and Negro. From the beginning the Prince Edward people have done all they could to encourage Negroes in the county to take advantage of the school facilities that were offered.

Great publicity has been given the Prince Edward case. Much of the publicity consists of more propaganda than fact. A brief review of developments leading to present conditions might help to get the situation into factual perspective. Let me outline the facts.

For 10 years, since 1951, in and out of Federal courts, Prince Edward County has been under continual attack by the NAACP in its efforts to force integration of public

school children, not only in Virginia but everywhere.

The NAACP attack started with a strike by colored high school students in the county on April 23, 1951. A strike of any kind in Prince Edward County is news. It is an agricultural county. There had never been a strike there before.

On the day of the strike the students said they wanted a new school. But when Oliver Hill showed up the facts came out. The effect of the strike was that of a publicity stunt opening the NAACP drive to force integration in the county's public schools.

This was followed in short order by NAACP moves to institute suits in Federal courts to integrate schools in Prince Edward County, and in communities in three other States and in the District of Columbia. By remarkable coincidence, all of these cases got to the Warren Court in time to be considered together.

Then came May 17, 1954, when the Warren Court handed down its original decision in these cases. The decision is now an infamous blot on our history. It disregarded judicial precedent; it usurped authority of sovereign States; and, in effect, it amended the Constitution by judicial fiat.

The illegality of the decision was emphasized by the fact that it reversed the traditional position of the U.S. Supreme Court, including the decision by Chief Justice Taft. There has never been a Federal law requiring integration of public schools. The only law on the subject ever passed by Congress provided for segregation in public schools of the Nation's Capital at Washington, D.C.

A year later on May 31, 1955, the Warren Court implemented its decision. Seven hours after this 1955 decision, the Prince Edward Board of Supervisors put county public school funds on a month-to-month basis, and 7 days later citizens of the county in a mass meeting endorsed the board's action and moved for a system of private schools.

As the situation went through legal maneuvers in late 1955 and early 1956, the people of Prince Edward for nearly a year reflected on the position they were taking. On May 3, 1956, they presented their supervisors with a petition signed by more than 4,000 citizens affirming their determination to educate their children "in some other way if that be necessary to preserve separation of the races in the schools of this county."

The NAACP pushed the Prince Edward case into a Federal district court again, and then on through the Warren Court again, and finally Judge Sterline Hutcheson was forced to rule, in August 1958, setting a tentative date for integration of Prince Edward schools in 1965.

The NAACP appealed this decision, and again in May 1959 a higher Federal court ordered Judge Hutcheson to integrate Prince Edward schools in September 1959. At this point Prince Edward supervisors refused to levy county taxes for integrated public schools.

Thus the NAACP forced Prince Edward County to abandon its support of public schools. The Prince Edward Educational Corp., formed in 1955 to conduct an independent school system if and when that were necessary put into effect the plans it had ready for use under these conditions.

White people almost simultaneously began to urge the colored people of the county to take the lead in providing schools for their own children, and offered to help; but Oliver Hill told the Negroes to "get busy at the polls; throw out these stupid local government leaders."

When it became apparent that the Negroes would not take the lead in behalf of their own children, the white people of the county chartered Southside Schools, Inc., with a certificate of incorporation from the State corporation commission dated December 15, 1959.

The white people of the county are still ready and eager to help, but the fact remains that the NAACP, which precipitated the problem in the first place, is still keeping 1,700 Negro children in Prince Edward County out of school.

THE UNFINISHED WORK OF GEORGE NORRIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] made a remarkably fine speech at the Norris Centennial Conference held in Washington, D.C., at the Willard Hotel. The subject of the speech was "The Unfinished Work of George Norris."

I think it was particularly fitting that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] should make the speech, because for years in the Senate he has carried out the philosophy of constitutional liberalism which characterized the many years of dedicated public service of George Norris in the Senate of the United States. I consider it a privilege and an honor to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point the speech by the Senator from Vermont yesterday at the Norris Centennial Conference.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNFINISHED WORK OF GEORGE NORRIS

(By Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Norris Centennial Conference, Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961)

Had George Norris lived to be a thousand years old, his work would not have been completed. His aim was to make a better life for people—to insure justice for rich and poor alike—to secure the fruits of their labors for those who create the wealth of the Nation.

George Norris did not start this work. It began in the dim past ages beyond which history does not record. It existed in the Holy Land 2,000 years ago.

It came to America with the Virginia colonists and the Pilgrims—it was at Lexington and Concord and Antietam and Gettysburg. It surged across the continent to the Pacific Ocean—and in its course it encountered discouragement—hardship and bloodshed—and in its wake it left with each new era at least some small measure of progress.

Although George Norris championed the cause of people generally, he was particularly concerned with the welfare of rural people. There is little doubt that his concern for the farm folks was deeply imbedded in his character during the formative years of his life.

Being left fatherless at the age of 4 and having lost his only brother, who could have become the family mainstay, during Sherman's march to the sea, one can easily understand why young George bitterly resented the fact that his mother was required to work incessantly, indoors and out, to raise the part of her large family that lived to adulthood.

Impressions fixed in one's character between the ages of 4 and 14 can never be erased, and the hardship years which Norris spent on his mother's Ohio farm undoubtedly molded into his character determination and courage as well as some cynicism and bitterness.

When we think of the conveniences and luxuries which we enjoy today, we all wish that our fathers and mothers had been permitted to enjoy them too. But we know that even those who endured hardship that you and I might live better, would give thanks with us that the differences between the levels of our society are being narrowed from decade to decade.

It was the depression of the early 1930's that triggered the greatest works of George Norris in behalf of the American people.

Agriculture was on the rocks, the utility companies were riding high politically and bank deposits, representing the life savings of many people were evaporating before the depositors' eyes.

When farm price legislation was before the Senate, Senator Norris admitted being stumped as other men have been since that time.

At one point in the debate on farm legislation, he stated:

"If we are fair in our hearts we must realize no man knows what to do.

"We are like drowning men grasping at a straw. The farmers of this Nation are not going to be peasants, they are not going to be bound down as slaves."

Soon thereafter, he was involved in two movements which have done more to raise the standard of living of rural people and to give hope to millions of farm families than anything else that has happened during our memory.

With the backing of Franklin D. Roosevelt and in collaboration with Dr. Arthur Morgan he plunged vigorously into the program for the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The opposition here encountered would have seemed insurmountable for one of lesser determination.

He was even accused of robbing the taxpayers, widows and orphans of this country.

Eventually, his efforts prevailed and the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority is now one of the economic and social wonders of the world.

Although the name of George Norris will always be associated with the Tennessee Valley Authority and in the American mind this may be his monument, it should not be forgotten that the REA is also a living memorial to the great Nebraska statesman.

In the battle for the establishment of the REA, Norris threw himself into the fight without restraint.

Had he not done so, this great agency would have been delayed and possibly have been established on a basis less favorable to the rural areas of the United States.

As a matter of fact, Senator Norris did not win every point in the rural electrification battle and had to accept modifications in the initial program in order to get this great work underway.

The battle for an effective REA was won in the conference meetings with the House, at which Senator Norris was usually the sole representative of the Senate.

As a result of his persistency in this epic struggle, over 98 percent of all the farms in the United States are now using central station electric service.

Largely as a result of the REA victory, American agriculture has become the envy of the world and our most potent weapon in defense of democratic government.

George Norris also championed the cause of the workingman and the efficient functioning of the legislative branch of Government.

Were it not for the fact that the TVA and the REA tower above his other accomplishments as a legislator, he would still command an impressive position in U.S. history by reason of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and the lame duck amendment to the Constitution.

It must be noted that all the economic and political monuments erected to his name were built through his service to people.

To this day, vested economic interests and unscrupulous political powers detest the name of George Norris and this fact in itself creates another monument to his name.

When we celebrate the anniversary of a great man, it is not enough just to sing our praises of his accomplishments and to honor his name.

To be content with commemorative exercises of this sort would scarcely constitute a tribute worthy of the name.

George Norris carried on a work which he did not begin and which he did not finish.

It never will be finished.

The degree to which we honor his name will be determined by the manner in which we carry on the work he left unfinished.

The Tennessee Valley Authority today represents a great regional development.

Its area has seen the development of navigation, of low-cost power, of more prosperous farms and of a multi-million-dollar industrial region.

It has converted a large area of extreme poverty into one of relative prosperity.

Had this agency not been established, the farm people of America might still be handicapped by having to use inferior fertilizers.

American industry might not be benefiting from the availability of low-cost industrial power which had its inception in the TVA and the United States might not have yet realized the full value of harnessing the atom for purposes of war or peace.

The TVA, however, operates only over a small section of our country.

Other areas are still waiting for the benefits which have already accrued to the people of the Tennessee drainage area.

The population of the United States is increasing at the rate of nearly 3 million persons a year.

The development of our natural resources must keep ahead of the increase in population.

I do not mean that the development of other areas must emulate the TVA to the letter. That would be impossible.

Not all areas have the hydroelectric potential.

Not all have water transportation waiting to be developed.

Not all have the mountains and forests and recreational potential as are found in the Tennessee Valley.

There is no part of our Nation, however, but what holds the possibility of greater development for the benefit of mankind.

On January 20, 1943, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association held its first general convention in St. Louis.

World War II was being fought at that time with the outcome in doubt.

In the course of the address I made at that convention I said:

"Concentration of political power, concentration of natural resources and concentration of commerce in the hands of a few has paved the way for disaster and downfall in many a nation. Concentration of population is probably the most fatal concentration of all. When the history of this tragic era in which we live is written, these facts will be found to be doubly true. The overpopulated and underfed nations under dictatorial control lend themselves to the starting of conflagrations, which in this day soon become worldwide.

"With the example of other countries before us, we Americans are challenged with the task of beating back the same evil-fraught conditions which have brought disaster and misery to people of all races and colors since the world began.

"Decade after decade has seen the population of America concentrating in great cities. The percentage of our rural population has declined until today it comprises only about 22 percent of the whole. We have seen industries expand until their employees in a single locality are numbered by the hundred thousand. We have seen titles to the great natural resources of our Nation so manipulated by corporate organizations and cartels that today the transportation, the power, the products of our mines, the commerce of our seas and the financial policies of our Nation are ultimately controlled by less than 1 percent of the people.

"We see this right before us. Even those who are themselves in control see it. Many of them recognize such a condition as leading only to ultimate disaster and would themselves correct it if they could. We are challenged with the problem of working out a better system and putting it into operation. To meet this challenge will require all of our resourcefulness and courage."

Since the time I made this statement, our rural population has still further declined and I am even more concerned over the trend of population and industry today than I was in 1943.

There is no question but what this continuing trend toward the concentration of people, industry, and political power in a relatively few great industrial and urban areas must be stemmed if we are to maintain maximum economic, social, and security levels in this country.

I believe in the rural areas of America.

They are the source of our food and fiber—our raw materials used in industry and to a large extent of our technical ingenuity and managerial ability so necessary to our great commercial and industrial enterprises.

These rural areas must not only be kept virile and productive but must become satisfactorily available for a diffusion of our industries and our population.

George Norris knew this to be a fact, otherwise he would not have exerted such prodigious efforts to inaugurate the TVA and the REA.

If he were living today, I know he would be working heroically to keep the rural areas of our Nation strong.

It now falls to our lot to continue the work which he so valiantly carried on.

Great areas of the country are still awaiting the full development of their land and water resources.

Great areas will be available for increased productivity of the land, and for industrial and home development when this is done.

But it is not alone the addition of minerals to the soil or the impounding of waters which they need.

It is better roads—better schools—better health facilities and equal opportunity under national programs that they must have.

There is a fascination about the word "frontier."

I want my frontier to have a background of mountains and forests, lakes and rivers, of farms and villages—of churches and modern schoolhouses, of electrically equipped and lighted homes, of men and women employed in a healthy environment.

And I would hold to its proper perspective the frontier which has for its horizon the jagged outline of city skyscrapers beneath which millions of people worry about rent and water and unemployment and A bombs.

I said the background of my frontier would include electrically equipped and lighted homes.

The work of men like George Norris and SAM RAYBURN and others has made this part of the background possible.

The work they started, however, is not and possibly never will be fully completed.

As to the work of the rural electrification program, we have practically achieved our objective so far as area coverage is concerned.

Nearly every community in the country now has central station service available.

We will continue to work until complete area coverage is obtained. We cannot rest on past accomplishments.

The goal of low-cost electric power should now be sought vigorously.

We also have the responsibility of providing an adequate supply of energy to the new homes and the new industries which are being established in the areas where development has been encouraged by the extension of rural electric lines.

The electric industry and particularly the rural electric segment of the industry is on the threshold of a period of rapidly increasing demands.

During the 25 years of rural electrification the demand for power on the farms has been doubling about every 5 years.

Meeting the need of the rapidly increasing demand on the farms and the supply needs for rural industry and rural residences presents a most formidable challenge.

Where will this power come from?

It is estimated that during the next 10 years the demand for all power will increase 1 trillion kilowatt-hours, necessitating an increase in installed generating capacity from 180 million kilowatts to 337 million kilowatts.

To meet this staggering increase in demand will require all the resources of public, cooperative, and corporate power interests combined.

It will necessitate the construction of generating plants of a size still on the drawing boards, plants of from 300,000 to a million kilowatts capacity.

I have no doubt that this demand will be met.

More efficient plants using fossil fuels will be constructed, energy developed from nuclear plants will become practicable and competitive, and remaining sources of hydropower will be harnessed.

Power pooling, already well underway will be extended toward its ultimate goal of a national system.

The trend toward a nationwide power grid is here.

It cannot be stopped and probably should not be stopped.

The question confronting you and me and all Americans is whether this trend shall be permitted to be developed into a gigantic power monopoly or whether it shall be so guided as to constitute a great benefit to all our people in all areas.

Gifford Pinchot, the great Governor of Pennsylvania, in his message to the State legislature on this same subject of power monopoly 36 years ago stated:

"If uncontrolled, it will be a plague without previous example. If effectively controlled in the public interest it can be made uncomparably the greatest material blessing in human history."

The necessity for adequately controlling and directing the great power systems of the United States is even more imperative today than it was in the days of Governor Pinchot.

Since 20 percent of the new energy which we must develop during the next decade will be used on farms and rural areas, it is our job in carrying on the unfinished work of George Norris to see that our rural people are not only furnished with adequate energy supplies at reasonable prices but that they have full access to power sources, old and new, on terms equal to those given the most favored corporate interests.

It would be entirely feasible to set up regional wholesale power supply organizations with the cooperation of Federal, State, local, public, and cooperative, as well as corporate private power systems.

These organizations should be made responsible for meeting the expanding requirements of all systems selling electricity to ultimate consumers.

Congress should carefully study this whole situation and take whatever action is necessary to facilitate development along these lines.

There is a job to do today equal in importance to that which confronted George Norris in those days when he was battling to make the Muscle Shoals power project the basis for a TVA which would afford more than a hundred municipal and cooperative systems access to modern power supply.

The greatest honor which we can pay to him and the one which I know he would appreciate most, will be to resolve that we will carry on his unfinished work so that there will be no diminution in the strength and character of rural America.

GEORGE W. NORRIS NATIONAL CENTENNIAL CONFERENCE DINNER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, during the past 2 days, May 16 and 17, there has been a very important meeting in Washington, D.C., of the George W. Norris National Centennial Conference, attended by followers and believers in the principles of the late Senator George Norris and people interested in conservation from all over the United States.

Madam President, on the evening of May 16 Theodore C. Sorensen, special counsel to the President, a native of Nebraska, delivered a very splendid address at the banquet meeting in connection with the life, the achievements and the courage of Senator Norris. I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I have a copy of the address in front of me, and I was going to ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. I am happy to join with the Senator from Tennessee in requesting unanimous consent that the address by Mr. Sorensen on May 16 at the George W. Norris National Centennial Conference dinner be printed in the RECORD.

The Sorensen speech last night was one of the most moving and inspirational speeches I have heard in a long, long time in this city. I wish to congratulate Mr. Sorensen this afternoon on the floor of the Senate for the brilliance of his speech. I hope every Member of Congress will read it, because it is a very fitting tribute to one of the great statesmen in the entire history of this Republic—George Norris.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank my colleague from Oregon, who in many respects reminds me of the great Senator from Nebraska, the late Senator Norris. I hope the RECORD will show that we have jointly asked that this address by Mr. Sorensen be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THEODORE C. SORENSEN, SPECIAL COUNSEL TO THE PRESIDENT, AT THE GEORGE W. NORRIS NATIONAL CENTENNIAL CONFERENCE DINNER, TUESDAY EVENING, MAY 16, 1961, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I speak tonight in the hope that my words might help to do honor to three extraordinary men—

George Norris, of Nebraska, a man of peace who ironically shares this centennial year with the war that taught him to hate war;

My father, C. A. Sorensen, a Norris disciple and servant, who instilled in his children the Norris discipline of service; and

Our President, John Kennedy, in whose stead I speak tonight in the deep-seated belief that he above all embodies in American public life today the courage of Nebraska's Norris.

Yet it is Norris alone for whom we gather; it is Norris of whom I must speak. But in what fashion? I cannot speak on the good fights he fought and the issues he raised—for others can do that better than I. I cannot speak of George Norris in terms of party politics—for he cared little for parties and less for politics. Nor can I speak of him from personal experience—for in his days of glory I was too young to talk with him, and in his later years he was too old to talk with me. My knowledge and admiration of the Norris tradition are those which a father bequeaths to a son. I have no worthier legacy; and I share it with you gladly.

Yet the contrasts of the Norris life do not fit the neat patterns of a testimonial address. He was the Senator from Nebraska—but he belonged to the Nation. He was, through most of his life, a Republican—but his statesmanship knew no party. He was a gentle, kindly soul—but he showed his enemies no mercy. He was devoted to serving the people—but his will, not theirs, cast his every vote. He became famous for the battles he lost—but he lived to see almost his every cause prevail.

He was a politician without guile or ambition—an elder statesman with the aspirations of youth—a widely hailed hero who most often walked alone. He was both praised and condemned, both sought after and shunned. He was capable of soft words and of righteous wrath—of sincere humility and of stubborn conviction. His dress and speech were of the old frontier—but his ideals are found on the new.

Tonight we look back for a century or a generation. But George Norris always looked ahead to another generation, or even another century. His toughest battles, he once wrote to a wise Nebraska editor, were fought so that "sometime in the future honest, patriotic citizens would be able to see the light." His greatest efforts, he later remarked, were pledged to causes which did not succeed until decades had passed. And his favorite phrase, recurring throughout his talks, was his reference—and his dedication—to "generations yet unborn."

Is this not the greatest lesson which George Norris has handed down to those of us who gather here tonight? Are we not most in need of his patience, his endurance, his foresight, his steadfast determination, if we are to serve and save generations yet unborn? George Norris was never discouraged by setbacks. He was never diverted by side issues. He was never deterred by the hasty judgments or the popular whims of his colleagues or his constituents. "I stand on the doctrine," he told a Wayne, Nebr., audience on the night of October 28, 1930, with my father campaigning at his side, "I stand on the doctrine that in every official act a Senator performs, in every vote that he casts, he should be guided solely and exclusively by his conscientious convictions as to what is right."

Can more be asked of any man? Can we ask less today? We are caught up in a ceaseless struggle with a relentless opponent. It is not simply a contest with one man or one nation or one system, but a contest for the survival of liberty itself. The outcome may never be clear to us—but it will be very clear to generations yet unborn.

Are we up to such a test? Can we be "a nation of Norrises"? We dare not be swayed, just as George Norris was never swayed, by those with either faint hearts or trigger fingers—by private interests or public polls—by fringe groups or frills, by daydreams or nightmares. We cannot rest on a single gain—or retreat from a single setback. And if we seek a course of decision and action, then we must bear in mind that such a course is not possible without risk, and cost, and hardship.

Some say: what can I do? Others ask: where is the sacrifice? And I am reminded that there were in ancient times those to whom the Scriptures had cause to explain that the commands of the Kingdom of Heaven were not far off in the future, or across the sea, but "very near unto thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayst do it." Today, the challenges and sacrifices of the New Frontier are not far off in the future, neither are they across the sea in Luang Prabang or Matadi or the Escambray Mountains. They are here, in the demands newly made of us all, in the programs offered every day, many, diverse, controversial, but all pointing to one central objective, the creation of an America so fit, so lean, so powerful and so respected that it can fulfill its founders' dream to bring peace through "illumination and emancipation to mankind all over the earth."

Who can say he knows not how to help? The taxpayer asked to support aid to those poorer nations on whose progress we depend? The housewife asked to pay higher postage rates to help close the deficit? The college student asked to serve, without pay or comfort, in a Peace Corps for less-developed nations? The motorist asked to pay higher taxes for the highways he enjoys? The scientist or executive who is asked to accept government service, with its lower pay and fewer privileges? The farmer who is asked to help cut the surpluses we waste? The union which is asked to cooperate in preventing work stoppages at a missile base? The businessman who is asked to pay a higher payroll tax for broadened social insurance, or a decent wage to his employees? The editor who is asked to exercise more self-restraint in publishing secret intelligence? The tourist or service wife who is asked to cut down on purchases abroad? The school board which is asked to end its discriminatory practices? I ask you—can any of these say in truth that no sacrifice is too much but no sacrifice has been asked?

Some sacrifices—such as the cost of better schools and better teachers—affect us all. Others—such as the closing of surplus military bases—affect individual communities. Still others—such as cutting down expense-account cruises and night-clubbing—affect only a few citizens but the loudest lobbies.

George Norris loved to take on the lobbies and the trusts and the special interests; and he would love to be in Washington now to hear the wounded cries of the billboard lobby and the defense contractors and the truckers and the yacht brokers and the AMA, the NAM and even the ADA. But I do not wish to sound partisan. For in foreign affairs, the sacrifices are the greatest of all. The very risks we take—the losses which come with the victories—the abuse that accompanies the praise—all this the citizen is asked to accept and support, not for his party but for his country. And he will soon be asked for more.

There are those who say that much of this has little to do with survival—that it advances the welfare state but does not help the state to fare well. But in the long run only a growing America can be a strong America. Only healthy, well-educated Americans can be strong Americans. If we do not use our talents and our plant to capacity—if we do not show the world that our way, freedom's way, knows no match and

no master, then no amount of armies and no amount of atoms can save the slow erosion of our security.

All this, I know, takes time. Excellence in education, equality in race relations, superiority in space, invulnerability in arms—all take time to achieve and more time to take effect. But the Norris-La Guardia Act took 8 years, the Lame Duck Amendment took 10 years, and the TVA took 12.

For George Norris never wearied. If saints are moved by a voice or a vision, then George Norris was a saint, moved by the voice of conscience and the vision of his Nation's future. "I do not claim," he once said, "that I am doing the right thing. I only claim I am doing what to me seems to be right." And so he always saw the longer view and the larger picture; and so must we. He would remind us tonight that the tributaries are often more tempting than the main channel—that the quick result is often more dramatic than the long haul—and that there is not a step to be taken that will not arouse doubts or fears in the hearts of some.

But if we can only move ahead—not slowly but deliberately, not alone but with allies, not from fear but with hope—then can we fulfill the Norris dream and complete the Norris legacy. And we shall do it, not for him alone, not for ourselves, but for "generations yet unborn."

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the role.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

I address my views to those who, generally speaking, favor Federal aid to education, whatever may be their differences with respect to the internal context of the bill in terms of allocations and other features.

I oppose the amendment, Mr. President, for one very fundamental reason, which is that under the terms of the amendment it is conceivable that a State or a school district—more likely a school district—which is in contempt of court or in the prospect of being in contempt of a court which has made a desegregation decree in regard to the public schools, would nonetheless be entitled to Federal aid.

This elementary question, it seems to me, should settle whatever one may think about the merits or the demerits of desegregation of the public schools. It is the elementary point that conceivably, if we agreed to the amendment, we would be lending ourselves to aiding and abetting a contempt of a court order. After we adopted, in the Civil Rights Act of 1960, most stringent provisions with respect to obedience to all court orders, it would seem an exercise of the most overt kind in self-frustration and in turning our backs upon our own considered action, should we now adopt the amendment allowing such a situation.

It seems to me that that point alone would be enough to end any serious consideration by those who generally support the amendment. I do not address myself to those who are in opposition to the bill, though knowing Senators as I do, I feel that even they, notwithstanding their opposition, would not wish to do anything to the bill. The fact is, as everyone knows, that the adoption of an amendment such as the one before the Senate would very likely mean the end of the bill. I do not believe that even those who oppose the bill would wish to extend their opposition to the point of trying to kill it by the adoption, or by lending themselves to the adoption of this kind of amendment. That is my first point, which is minimal, and that is all that is needed to defeat an amendment that is based upon this fundamental question of law in terms of the policy as we have declared it ourselves.

The second point is this: It has been pretty much implied and accepted by all who support the bill, that, if possible, an effort would be made to exclude from consideration the whole question of the implementation of the Supreme Court's decree on the desegregation of public schools. This idea, to which I have myself been a party, is just as broad as it is long. If it is our purpose—because we have had previous experience which indicates that it is desirable in terms of the passage of some Federal aid to education bill—to exclude from the bill itself measures which will deal with this fundamental question of desegregation of public schools, then it is equally valid and clearly proper that we exclude the affirmative, which seeks to compel money to go to school districts, whatever may be their practices and however they may be in defiance, of a court order in a school desegregation case. So I think that reason is an added one as to why the amendment should be rejected, because it would violate what is almost—and I see the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] who is handling the bill in the Chamber—the accepted desire of the proponents of the bill to exclude from its consideration the question of public school desegregation, leaving that question to separate law, executive action, and the other means which are open to all of us in our Government and in the Senate.

Finally, if we should agree to the amendment, such action would certainly be most discouraging to all who wish to see the wise and historic decision of the Supreme Court obeyed. Such action would only be a license or permission for the forces which are slowing down any compliance with the Supreme Court decree to slow down compliance even further by indicating the attitude of the Senate is that it does not feel very strongly about compliance with the law. On the contrary, the bill would enable us to support school systems whatever may be their position on the school desegregation issue.

We should be enlightened by a very interesting news story which appeared in today's issue of the New York Herald Tribune entitled "The Picture After 7 Years of School Desegregation." I am well acquainted with the facts and figures, as are many other Senators. I refer to the facts and figures only because they happen to be so current and right up to date today. The reporter states that the whole effort to bring about desegregation of public schools is indeed a very lean one. The saying is, "Seven lean years." Of course, that statement is borne out by the fact that only 6.3 percent of the Negro pupil total in the whole 17-State area which was biracial and segregrated before the Supreme Court decision are now attending desegregated classes, and that in the States of South Carolina, from which the proponent of the amendment comes, Georgia, Mississippi and Alabama, there are no public school children desegregated at all.

Indeed, it may interest Senators to know that the only two States in the Union that have not admitted a Negro to a white State-supported higher educational institution are South Carolina and Mississippi. Even most Southern States have admitted Negroes to formerly all-white colleges, though by requirement of the courts in some instances, where the institution is State supported.

It seems to me with that kind of discouraging picture—discouraging enough in and of itself in terms of our domestic policy—and with the danger of aiding and abetting contempts against our courts in terms of their court orders, we should consider another point. There are the overriding considerations of where we stand in the world on the whole issue.

There is the lag and the slowdown, the dreadful and disgraceful disorders, the long roster of unhappiness—and I use the word "unhappiness" advisedly—for our country and for the South, whether it is in Jacksonville, Atlanta, Clinton, Tennessee, Little Rock, or Allison, Alabama, as it was the other day, or in Birmingham. It would affect not only that one State and the people of that State, but also the entire Nation in the eyes of the world, particularly in the eyes of the hundreds of millions of people whose skins are yellow, black, or brown. Most Senators travel a great deal. I hazard the guess that our Nation would be affected in the eyes of Europeans, who even to this day do not understand how we can endure any such disgrace in terms of our national standing and our national determination as expressed in the Constitution.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Would the Senator consider the adoption of the amendment as a step backward in the whole procession of civil rights legislation?

Mr. JAVITS. Very definitely. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for introducing such a phrase. It would certainly be a step backward. It would be a march backward. It would encourage those who want to march backward faster.

Mr. BUSH. It seems to me the effect of the amendment would be positively

to validate the practice of segregation within the public schools. Would the Senator agree that the amendment could be so interpreted?

Mr. JAVITS. That is my interpretation of the amendment, in the sense that it would be giving, as it were, a bonus to those who, notwithstanding the national policy, the national constitution, and the decision of the Supreme Court, have nonetheless held out against public school desegregation and especially, as I point out to my colleague, in terms of the orders of the courts. It would tolerate under the amendment, as I read it, a grant of money flowing to school districts which are in open defiance of the order of court. We ourselves have set the utmost penalties in the most considered way when we passed a bill in 1960 making the defying of orders of the court a crime, whether such order is a desegregation order or any other order.

It seems to me that the Senator from Connecticut stated the point very well when he said it would be a backward step. It certainly would.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator will permit an observation, it seems to me that the amendment would be a Powell amendment in reverse.

Mr. JAVITS. Again the Senator is very helpful, because I think what the Senator has just said, goes to the second point, that I tried to make. That is, it was pretty much accepted that we would not bring this issue into this particular piece of legislation, in the fervent hope that it would get finally, at long last, beyond this issue.

I do not consider the issue extraneous, I wish to emphasize. I think it is most pertinent. But I think the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is handling the bill, and other Senators who have asked us to exercise self-discipline as conducive to the best way to get Federal aid to education—and I have linked myself to that effort advisedly—I believe it is the right thing to do. I do not want to see the effort shattered by the other side any more than I wish to see it shattered from the side of those who favor the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. We all know the legal ability of the Senator from New York. Is it the Senator's opinion that if the bill is passed in its present form without amendment, it would be impossible for the Federal Government to withhold aid from States regardless of the situation in such States regarding segregation?

Mr. JAVITS. It is not my belief that it would be impossible to withhold. I do not believe that the bill carries that kind of mandate. The bill carries authority. I believe that authority may therefore be exercised by the Executive, consonant with the laws of the United States.

For myself, I have crossed the bridge, let us say, of the willingness to depend in this particular case, in respect of Federal aid to schools, upon that Executive authority—using the word "authority" in its advised sense—which the Executive may or may not exercise.

Congress is giving the Executive a clear mandate. I believe that to be entirely proper. It is a mandate which the Executive, under our form of government, will not defy and will not violate, except if there were a supervening reason.

I do not introduce the school desegregation question into this argument, even by my present assertion of legislative history. I merely wish to say that in my judgment, as a lawyer, the bill does not make the President of the United States distribute the money to every school district without regard to any law or fundamental Executive authority of the President. It does not strip him of the basic concept of the use of the word "authorization." I do not wish to specialize it by applying it to a situation or court decree or school district. I wish to make it clear in the legislative history—and the Senator who is in charge of the bill is on the floor—that there is nothing in the bill which is in derogation of the fundamental authority of the President of the United States to enforce all the laws of the United States. I stand on that.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I hope that the distinguished Senator from New York fully appreciates the significance of what he has just said. I did not raise this point for the purpose of aiding the pending amendment. As a matter of fact, even though I do not favor the bill, I cannot vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina. However, what the distinguished Senator from New York, who knows this legislation from A to Z, has said is that there is in the pending measure an element of Federal control as well as Federal aid. In spite of the section in the bill which disclaims Federal control, he has put every Member of the Senate on notice that if we vote for the bill in its present form we are voting for Federal control; that the Federal Government can set up standards and exercise a certain amount of coercion against the States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I cannot allow that statement to stand as an interpretation of my views, because it is not correct. Where I differ with the statement of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, my astute friend, is that the control to which he refers is control over education. I do not see any implication in anything that I have said with respect to control over education. I specifically state—and again I call attention to the fact that the Senator handling the bill is on the floor—that control over education is specifically renounced by the terms of the bill.

I am not talking about the fundamental authority of the President to enforce all the laws. The Senator from New Hampshire is talking about the President running counter to a specific provision in the bill. The bill says that the President shall not exercise any control over education. What the Senator from New Hampshire is arguing would be a proper argument if the Thurmond amendment were adopted. What he says would be right if the amendment were adopted. If the amendment is rejected, I am right in what I have said. The President retains supervening responsibility to enforce all the laws. The words in the bill specifically deprive him of control over education.

Mr. COTTON. I do not wish to belabor the point. However, in spite of the rather complicated statement the Senator from New York has made, and the fine distinction he has drawn, if there are circumstances in the operation and conduct of public education by a State under the terms of the bill which justifies the President in withholding or causing to be withheld aid under the bill, then, there is in the bill an element of Federal control, and not just control but Federal control over education. I do not see how my friend from New York, able and adroit though he is, can possibly escape that inference.

Mr. JAVITS. If I may reply to the Senator from New Hampshire, I believe my view is borne out by the fact that the author of the amendment himself, facing the very problem to which the Senator from New Hampshire refers, has attached his amendment on page 2, line 20, to section 103 of the bill, the precise section which strips the President of any such discretion. The author of the amendment realized the problems he was up against. Here is a specific direction to the President which tells the President:

> SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

That is the direction which is given the President. Now we are talking about the authority of the President to enforce all the laws of the United States.

It is possible, for example—and I now state a ridiculous example—that a school may be used as a blind for moonshine operations. I am sure no one would say that the President of the United States, under the bill, must give aid to that school, notwithstanding that it is overtly violating the most basic law of the United States. Would anyone say that aid must be given under those circumstances? Of course not.

Nonetheless, the mandate is clear when it comes to the specifics of education. In that respect the President must not exercise any control or direction. The proponent of the amendment, recognizing that this is the section which he must qualify if he would carry his point, attached his amendment to that section. That clearly shows the purport of the section, the effect of the amendment, and why I oppose it, and why I cannot go along with the Senator from New Hampshire in his view.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I concur in the basic views expressed by the distinguished

Senator from New Hampshire. Unlike my distinguished friend from New York, I am opposed to the bill. At the same time I am also opposed to the pending amendment. Actually this is an interdiction on an administrative or ministerial act. The amendment provides that "no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall withhold funds appropriated under authorization of this title." That is an interdiction upon the distribution of funds, which would, of course, be an administrative act.

I can conceive of a situation if, for instance, the Department of Justice had a hand in the distribution of the funds. We could try to reconcile that with the Department's views as expressed in the speech the Attorney General made in Atlanta, Ga., when he said that he was going to give vigorous enforcement to the Supreme Court decision. Incidentally, the distinguished Senator from New York has called attention to the fact that today is the 7th anniversary of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Brown school case.

So the amendment is at least timely in the sense that this is an anniversary occasion. But imagine the fix the Attorney General would be in if he announced to all the world that he intended to enforce that decision, and then had to participate in the distribution of these funds, directly or indirectly. Under this kind of provision, he would find himself both going and coming. He would not know what to do.

So while I am against the bill, I am also opposed to the amendment as such. If we consider the view expressed by the incumbent administration and the view expressed by the incumbent Attorney General, the bills which have been introduced, while not formally under the imprimatur of the administration, but nonetheless introduced by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the distinguished Representative from New York and chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, [Mr. CELLER], would certainly add up to a very fine kettle of fish if the amendment were written into the bill.

I do not wish the amendment to be a vehicle for my objection to the bill. I object to the bill and shall oppose it on what I think are far more fundamental grounds. However, I do not wish to see the bill confused with this kind of ministerial interdiction.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senators who have opposed the amendment. As Senators know, I seldom tell stories; however, a famous judge before whom I occasionally appeared in Delaware used a humorous expression which may be pertinent at the moment. He would say to eloquent counsel, "Counsel, if you quit now, I am with you."

I thank the Senators for their opposition to the amendment. Perhaps on the other amendments we shall have another opportunity to discuss this subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a wise lawyer who knows when his case is won.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I desire to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. Before doing so, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for a moment, to assure him that I associate myself completely with the able argument he has just made not only in opposition to the Thurmond amendment, but also in his able reply to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

The Senator from New York has pointed out that in the committee I urged Senators to join with me in some self-restraint, as the Senator from New York put it, in the offering of amendments involving steps which many of us favor with respect to independent legislation. I urged that such proposals not be added to S. 1021 in the form of riders, because, in my opinion, that is exactly what such amendments would constitute—legislation by way of riders. I think we should not encumber a Federal aid to education bill which is limited to public schools with any riders which might arouse much controversy and debate on the floor of the Senate. To do so might possibly jeopardize the passage of any bill whatsoever.

I express appreciation to every member of the full committee and of the subcommittee. I thank particularly the Republican members of the committee, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] for the complete cooperation I received from them at all times in taking the bill through committee in respect to this particular subject matter.

Those Senators who cooperated in this respect—for instance, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]—are men of very deep and dedicated conviction on the whole question of civil rights. The RECORD shows that I have shared their point of view for many years in the Senate.

Of course, it was tempting, from our standpoint, to offer to the bill an amendment which would involve the question of civil rights on just the opposite side of the issue from the position taken by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. But we decided that we owed it to the Senate and to the country to report a public school bill unencumbered, not crippled, by any amendments either on civil rights or on private school issues—and the latter issue is the second point I wish to mention.

I also asked Senators on the committee to cooperate with me, if they would—and they did; I deeply appreciated the fact that they did—to limit the bill to one which would not raise the civil rights issue and would not raise the private school issue. Here, again, members of the committee have differing points of view on, for example, loans carrying an interest rate which would cover the charge of the use of the money, so that interest would in no way be a hidden subsidy to private schools, but would meet constitutional tests. We feel that that question cannot be settled until the Supreme Court finally passes on the issue. Nevertheless, we felt that this bill was not the vehicle for raising that issue; so self-restraint was exercised by all of us. Thus, we have reported to the Senate, by a vote of 12 to 2—but unanimously, so far as this particular point is concerned—a bill which represents the unanimous point of view of our committee that the bill should not in any way be encumbered by a civil rights amendment.

One member of our committee reserved the right to offer a so-called private-school amendment on the floor of the Senate. It will be offered; and when it is offered, I shall speak against it. I hope that many other Senators will urge that it be defeated.

I have only this comment to make in addition to what the Senator from New York said, because in my opinion, he has proved the case in opposition to the Thurmond amendment.

It is my judgment that the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is a civil rights rider of the kind which friends of public school aid have agreed should not be added to the bill. Civil rights amendments of any size, shape, or color are bound to defeat the bill. Perhaps that is why it was offered.

Certainly it is evident that the absence of a general Federal aid to education program has not stayed the hand of the Department of Justice in expressing its interest in segregation matters within the States. If no school bill is passed, the Department of Justice will still continue to intervene where it believes the Constitution calls for intervention.

The enactment of the bill without the Thurmond amendment or the Powell amendment will not change the obligation of the Department of Justice or of the Federal courts to continue their present policy with respect to school segregation. The attempt to add either amendment can be viewed under present circumstances as an effort to kill the bill.

I fully respect the opinion of the opponents of Federal aid to education, and I respect their right to use parliamentary means to prevent its enactment. But I favor S. 1021, and am, therefore, against the Thurmond amendment.

I simply ask the Senate today to guard against such parliamentary maneuvers, because, I think we must never lose sight of our primary function as Senators, which is to pass legislation which will give to the boys and girls of the country a better chance to develop their intellectual potential.

In my judgment, one facet of the Thurmond amendment really is an attempt to direct the President of the United States or the executive branch of the Government in the execution of their constitutional duties. That cannot be done by legislation. That constitutional duty rests upon the executive branch of the Government. Whether we pass school legislation or do not pass school legislation, that constitutional obligation will not be changed one iota.

Therefore, for the reasons I have set forth, and for the further reason that it would seek to give at least the impression that Congress is not in favor of the enforcement of the Constitution of the United States, I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 70, as follows:

[No. 39]

YEAS—25

Bennett	Goldwater	Smathers
Blakley	Hill	Sparkman
Butler	Holland	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Talmadge
Dworshak	Jordan	Thurmond
Eastland	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Ellender	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Robertson	
Fulbright	Russell	

NAYS—70

Aiken	Fong	Miller
Allott	Gore	Monroney
Anderson	Hart	Morse
Bartlett	Hartke	Morton
Beall	Hayden	Moss
Bible	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Boggs	Hickey	Muskie
Burdick	Hruska	Neuberger
Bush	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pell
Cannon	Javits	Prouty
Capehart	Keating	Proxmire
Carlson	Kefauver	Randolph
Carroll	Kerr	Saltonstall
Case, N.J.	Kuchel	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Smith, Mass.
Church	Long, Mo.	Smith, Maine
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Cotton	Magnuson	Wiley
Curtis	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	McCarthy	Yarborough
Dodd	McGee	Young, Ohio
Douglas	McNamara	
Engle	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—5

Bridges	Cooper	Schoeppel
Chavez	Gruening	

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE EARL CLEMENT R. ATTLEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we have in the Chamber a distinguished guest, and I should like, if I may, to propound a unanimous-consent request that the Senate stand in recess for 5 minutes in order that Senators may receive the visitor from across the sea; but before asking for a ruling on that request, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for a statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, we have the honor today to welcome, both in the Foreign Relations Committee and here on the floor, a former Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Earl Attlee, for many years a leading figure in the House of Commons, and now a Member of the House of Lords. I know all of us are acquainted with his great contribution to the leadership of our ally Great Britain. He is now engaged in a very important work, traveling about this country and other countries.

I think it is a great privilege for us to have the opportunity to greet him. I hope all Members of the Senate will take this opportunity to shake hands with Lord Attlee. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess.

Thereupon, at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess.

During the recess, the Earl Attlee was greeted by Members of the Senate.

On the expiration of the recess, at 2:23 p.m., the Senate reassembled and was called to order by Mr. MANSFIELD.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment to S. 1021.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, beginning with line 2, it is proposed to strike out all through line 18 on page 33 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 102. Five per centum of all Federal income taxes collected are hereby authorized to be appropriated and deemed to be revenue for the State within which it is collected, for use for educational purposes only.

SEC. 103. District directors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State within which their respective internal revenue districts are situated, at the end of each fiscal year an amount equal to 5 per centum of the Federal income taxes collected within such State during said fiscal year.

SEC. 104. The use and expenditure of the moneys hereby authorized to be appropriated by this Act shall be solely at the discretion of the State, and shall not be subject to control, review, or audit by any court of the United States.

SEC. 105. (a) For purposes of this Act, the amount of Federal income taxes collected within each State during any fiscal year is an amount equal to—

(1) the total amount of Federal income taxes collected in the internal revenue district or districts in such State during such fiscal year reduced by

(2) the total amount of credits allowed and refunds paid in such internal revenue district or districts during such fiscal year with respect to overpayments of Federal income taxes during such fiscal year or any preceding fiscal year.

(b) For purposes of this Act, the term "Federal income taxes" means—

(1) the income taxes imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (including payments of estimated tax under sections 6153 and 6154 of such Code);

(2) the withholding taxes imposed by chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on the income of nonresident alien individuals and foreign corporations and on tax-free covenant bonds; and

(3) the withholding tax on wages of individuals imposed by chapter 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(c) Each district director of internal revenue shall, as soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, report to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of Federal income taxes collected in his internal revenue district during such fiscal year, and the amount remitted to the respective States.

SEC. 106. For purposes of this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia. The determination of the amount of Federal income taxes collected in the District of Columbia during any fiscal year shall be made under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, education is a vital part of democracy. There is no force more important to us today in the maintenance of our traditions of free speech, free thought, and free enterprise, than the proper education of our younger generations. Freedom of choice in this educational process is as vital to the process as harmony is to music.

Whenever we impose a regulatory hand over the educational process, the dark shadow of dictatorial procedures begins to rise into view and there comes with it the disturbing possibility that the shadow may envelop us and turn off the light of education itself.

Thomas Jefferson wrote these immortal words:

> I have sworn upon the Altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

To me this is as important to us today as it was to the Nation in Mr. Jefferson's time. I am glad that these words are inscribed around the interior wall of the Jefferson Memorial in our Nation's Capital. They have real meaning for all of us as individuals and for our Nation as well as for all nations of the world.

The great enemies of Western civilization, Soviet Russia, and the Communist movement, as any totalitarian government, represent the very antithesis or opposite application of these great words of Jefferson. They believe in tyranny over the mind of man, and indeed over the world itself. They begin with their educational system within

their own boundaries by assigning mandatory education of a particular nature to those individuals who they deem best fitted for it. They teach what they please to teach and train as they please to train.

The bill before us today in the Senate, S. 1021, is not directly analogous to the totalitarian system, and I do not wish to condemn it with such a comparison. It is, however, a beginning of something that is a dangerous departure from our system of sovereign States and from our traditions of public education.

If this bill is enacted, the Federal Government will begin to move into one of the last sanctuaries of State and local operation—the field of public education.

Today is an eventful day. We are debating constitutional values that I do not believe are realized by the American people.

If some of the schoolteachers who speak in favor of Federal aid to education, because they believe that they will get higher salaries through it, would stop and think about the controls and regulations they are inviting in order to get the aid, I believe there would be but few who would sacrifice the principle to satisfy immediate monetary needs.

The danger of the bill is more than its immediate provisions, which are bad enough in themselves. The real danger is that, once the floodgates are opened, the tide rushes in. There is no turning back without great difficulty once we start such a program as this. It is too late a few years hence to say that we wish we had not set aside and abandoned our constitutional principles but had left the control and the responsibility of public education where it belonged in the sovereign States and in the local communities.

I say to one and all at this time that we should think of these things right now and not start in motion forces that can, and probably will, change the structure and nature of our entire system of public education throughout the United States.

I view the Constitution as a living responsive document. I think it has served us well these many years. I believe that it should continue to live and endure from one generation to the other without reference to the mark of time. Its rules, its principles should be changed only by the methods as provided in the document itself. I do not believe it should be liberally construed or misconstrued, or abandoned or set aside to accommodate an immediate or temporary viewpoint, thus to lose its sustaining strength and abiding values.

If the bill were passed, we would drop the abiding values of local and State responsibility and control over free public education.

I am against S. 1021, because it accepts the fallacious theory that there is something called Federal aid which does not really cost the people anything.

I am against the bill because, regardless of its careful language, it unquestionably would establish a Federal bureaucracy that will parcel out funds to the States and communities for school purposes—and who can doubt that this Federal bureaucracy will be reaching and continually reaching for control of our local school systems?

Throughout the history of our Nation, primary and secondary education has been a subject of State and local concern.

The U.S. Constitution, the principles of which have served us so well, provides that all powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States or to the people.

There is no authority in the Federal Constitution authorizing or enabling the Federal Government to take charge of our local school systems in the 50 States.

Of course not. Such a concept would have been abhorrent to the authors of the Constitution, and to the generations who have followed until a few years ago when the notion has been developed that all power and responsibility should and must be vested in the Central Government, and it should support the people rather than the people supporting the Government, thus setting in motion the inevitable course that the Government would regiment and control the people instead of being controlled by them.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I commend the Senator from Texas for his approach to the problem in two particulars. First, he proposes that the money that would be authorized to be appropriated should be made available solely at the discretion of the States, and should then not be subject to control, review, or audit by any court of the United States. Such proposal, though not in exactly the same language, is very similar to a provision in an amendment which I have had printed and may offer later.

The other point of the Senator for which I commend him is that he directs attention to the tax approach. There is one basic difference, however, with respect to measuring the tax for the revenue that would be available. I understand the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Texas, he would make 5 percent of the Federal income tax collected within a given State available for distribution back to that particular State. Is that correct?

Mr. BLAKLEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And the 5 percent would apply to the corporation tax as well as to the personal income tax.

At that point there is considerable difference between the amendment which I have suggested and the amendment which the Senator from Texas has submitted.

In my State and in many other States very few corporations are chartered for major business activities. Most of the corporations that operate in my State and in many other States have their home offices in some other State. For example, the users of tobacco in my State contribute to the income of corporations which pay their taxes in North Carolina. The purchasers of automobiles in my State make their contribution to the profits of the automobile manufacturers who pay their taxes in the State of Michigan. The purchasers of insurance in my State contribute to the profits of corporations that pay their insurance corporation taxes in Connecticut, New Jersey, or New York. The purchasers of groceries in my State contribute to the profits of corporations that pay their taxes at the home office of those corporations in Minnesota, or some other State.

As a further illustration, the principal railroads in my State are the Chicago and Northwestern; the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific; and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy. All those railroads pay their corporation taxes to the State of Illinois.

The major difference in that respect between the amendment which I would suggest and the one the Senator from Texas has proposed is that those who contribute to the corporate income, and thereby to the tax of the corporation—those who live in the States which are served by the corporation organized in another State—would not get any of the credit for the income tax paid which their business makes possible.

The State of Delaware, for example, where many corporations are organized, would be collecting and getting the benefits of the tax withheld in Delaware but earned in States all over the Union, because of the fact that Delaware is the home State of so many corporations.

Therefore I hope that as the debate progresses the Senator will give some consideration to the point I raise, to see if he might not modify his amendment so that of the total collected in taxes—corporate and personal—some percentage might be made available for appropriation to the States, for use by the States for educational purposes, without any control whatever by the Federal Government.

The approach of the Senator in cutting off any Federal control between Washington and the States is commendable. The approach of using income taxes as a means of measuring the national interest in education is commendable. I would like to have the Senate consider the problem of the States which have very few home offices of corporations for crediting the corporation income tax which their business makes possible.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his suggestions, which I believe are meritorious and to which some consideration should be given, particularly with respect to the income tax of corporations which are centered elsewhere by virtue of some attractive situation.

The fundamental point is to avoid Federal participation or control in the educational system. I am trying to get at some of the taxes paid by the corporations, in order to sustain the educational system, because of the fact that the Federal Government has so preempted the field of taxation that some measure of this kind is necessary.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate very much the Senator's comment, because I believe he sees the problem. I thought it would be possible to accomplish the desired purpose if we set aside or in effect made available by appropriation a certain percentage of the income tax, to be redistributed to the States on the basis of the number of schoolchildren within a State. Then the measure of need would be the number of children of school age, and that would be the only basis upon which the redistribution would be made.

That would make it possible to have a certain percentage of the total revenue from the corporation income tax made available for distribution to the States. The money would go to the States purely upon a per capita basis, considering the number of children of school age. It would apply to all children, regardless of whether they were attending public schools or private schools. The money would go, as it would under the Senator's amendment, to the State itself for the State to expend as it saw fit for education.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I thank the Senator.

The bill before the Senate—S. 1021—insures that, along with the funds provided, there will go out into the States a Federal interest in the schools. With the Federal interest there could be, and almost surely would be, Federal court action. There is nothing in the bill to prevent the Attorney General from following up the Federal interest with court action and injunctions. I have examined it closely, but find no such provision.

There is no use saying that this will not happen or that it cannot happen.

Mr. President, I cannot accept the contention that Federal control of our schools is in no way involved in proposals for Federal aid to our schools.

Following the enactment of legislation appropriating Federal funds to our local school systems, we would be foolish not to expect Federal controls of every description.

We would have to expect teachers' salaries to be set by a Federal agency.

We would have to expect that a Federal agency would look into questions such as textbooks to be used and courses of study.

There are those who say that these things would not happen. I believe—and the evidence is with me—that they would be bound to happen.

Bureaucracy expands whenever and wherever it is encouraged, or even permitted, to do so.

Already, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has quadrupled its staff. Officials of the Department have not been hesitant to admit that their goal is to create national standards of education and a national curriculum.

In this admission, surely, there is evidence enough to convince any open-minded observer that Federal aid—so-called—is the first step, and a long one, toward creation of a Federal school system.

In such a system, control of teachers and subjects would eventually be removed from community control—that is, from control by parents of students—and placed under the jurisdiction of a Federal bureau in Washington.

I am against this.

I know—because I have discussed it with them—that an overwhelming majority of the people of my State of Texas are against it.

I am convinced that most of the people of all the States are against it if they understand the real issues involved.

Federal aid—which, in the interest of accuracy, should be called taxpayers' aid, since all the money the Federal Government has comes from the taxpayers—would bring with it all the wastefulness that attends sprawling bureaucracy.

Those who advocate the appropriation of Federal funds for our local schools proceed on the assumption that all who do not agree with them are simply anti-education.

Mr. President, this is not the case.

Speaking for myself, I realize clearly that no element of American society is more vitally important to the present and future of our Nation than the young people of the United States. They must be adequately educated and properly prepared for citizenship.

I have offered my bill as a substitute because it maintains funds and control in the States without any question. I believe in proper education. Our population is increasing at such a fast rate that we are told to expect a population of 200 million by the year 1970. The combined population of the United States and Canada in 1960 of 197 million is expected to reach 312 million by the year 2000. A world in which it took thousands of years to reach the number of 1 billion living people, which occurred in about the year 1830, reached the second billion in 100 years—1930—and now by the year 1965, in only 35 years, will reach the third billion. At this rate, more than 6 billion people may be living on our planet at the end of this century.

Population increase offers no suggestion that our constitutional freedom should not endure; and indeed it must.

Therefore, we must equip our young people to meet this challenge. They face competition that was unknown to our forefathers and to most of us. This responsibility is a local and State one, as it always has been, and we should not establish a bureaucratic system that will destroy local initiative and responsibility.

My amendment calls for 5 percent of all Federal income tax collected to be retained in the States. I dare say that if we open the gates to Federal aid to education as called for in S. 1021, the demands on a Federal agency or bureau and to the Congress would, within a short while, be higher than 5 percent of our Federal income.

Federal aid to education in the manner that is inherent in S. 1021 proceeds on the territorial theory instead of on the correct theory that our Government is composed of 50 States with sovereign powers and responsibilities. In dealing with territories the Federal Government may justly provide educational regulations and control. It may be expected to provide financial support for education. When a territory becomes a State, however, it puts on the mantle of responsibility in education in like manner to all other sovereign States. The system proposed in S. 1021 could lead to a quasi-territorial relationship with the States, and this was never intended in our form of government.

We need to foster something that will encourage individual effort. If the Federal Government controls education and doles out money through a bureaucracy, then an individual State will become dependent or reliant on the Federal Government. Counties and cities will depend on the State, and individuals will depend on counties and cities.

What are we doing to encourage the individual? I think we might consider reversing the process and help the individual. He, in turn, will strengthen the whole process, because he is the foundation of the process. He is at the roots.

I have introduced a bill, S. 1162, which is designed to help and encourage the individual. It would provide an additional $1,200 income-tax exemption each year for dependents, spouses, or the taxpayer himself who is attending college as a full-time student. These same benefits are applied to high school full-time attendance in the sum of $400 a person.

My bill, S. 1161, would encourage taxpayers and dependents to go to college and high schools. There is no substitute for knowledge. We cannot, however, force higher education on individuals with any degree of measured success. It is largely a voluntary process. We should encourage that private volition—the desire to learn.

I expect to pursue S. 1162 more fully in future months.

Devoid of any element of Federal control and of any agency or bureau administering the program, my amendment does not raise the constitutional or traditional arguments raised by S. 1021 that cannot but carry with it the dangers of control or a Federal interest. The mere threat of the cessation of funds could be a control.

Traditionally, throughout the history of this Nation, primary and secondary education has been a matter of State and local concern. Our forefathers intended it this way and our people have traditionally approved and handled it this way.

The local school is a memory that is not only cherished by those now living, but it has been cherished and steeped in the early daily lives of our forebears for generations. Local and State taxation to support public schools is an established American way of life.

There have been Federal payments in lieu of taxes under Public Laws 815 and 874 to compensate for children of Federal employees using schools in impacted

areas, thus letting the Federal Government share the burdens placed on the area by Federal activities. These payments do not offer precedents for the proposal facing us at the present time.

I urge consideration of my amendment as the way to aid public education without controls.

The amendment would direct the District Director of the Internal Revenue to turn over to each State 5 percent of the income taxes collected. The fund would be for educational purposes only. There would be no administrative difficulties. Each State would receive according to its own contribution. The States would have absolute and sole discretion as to expenditure of the funds.

The bill clearly precludes any Federal control, review, or audit.

I believe that strong State and local governments are essential to the effective functioning of the American system of Federal Government and that they should not be sacrificed needlessly to leveling, and sometimes deadening, uniformity.

I am not among those who hold that we can no longer afford local management of our school systems.

On the contrary, I solemnly declare that we cannot afford any other kind of management.

I do not consider that there is any reason in logic to consider another kind of management.

If we need more money for educational purposes, let it be provided by keeping in the States—or returning to them—some portion of the enormous sums now taken from their citizens by the Federal income tax. And let the States and the communities continue to administer the schools that serve their people.

This is precisely what my amendment to the pending bill would authorize.

Mr. President, I submit it for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I congratulate the Senator from Texas on a very fine presentation and on offering an amendment which I believe is a vast improvement over the bill now before the Senate.

Would the Senator be willing to consider modifying section 102 of his amendment by changing "5 per centum" to "2 per centum"? It occurs to me that 5 per centum would be more than would be needed to provide for the current demands under the bill. I believe 2 per centum would amount to $1.5 billion, or an amount in that vicinity. Five per centum would amount to about $3.1 billion. My impression is that 5 per centum is more than is being proposed at this time. I hope the Senator will consider modifying his amendment so as to start, at least, with 2 per centum rather than the 5 per centum proposed in his amendment.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Louisiana will agree that the figures contained in S. 1021 are preliminary. In my judgment, they merely establish a formula, and Congress will be called upon to provide a larger amount when a Federal system of education is started. When the Federal Government takes over the control and operation of schools, which will certainly be the case, the amount of money now provided will not be enough. I think the 5 percent provided in my amendment is not really an excessive amount to be retained by the States.

This is the people's money. It is money which is in the States, but which the Federal Government is now collecting from the people in their localities. I think the people should keep the money for the support of their educational system and its expansion and development.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Texas is perhaps guilty of the same mistake which he is attributing to the authors of the bill. By whichever approach is followed, that of the Senator from Texas or that of the sponsors of the bill, if the program is at all successful and is popular, an effort will be made to increase the amount. Nevertheless, it seems to me that it would be better to start small and grow big, rather than to start big and, in the event the program proves not to be good, after it has been put into effect, not be in a position to retreat from it.

It seems to me that it would be better, if the program is to be started on a different basis, it would not be desirable to increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated annually at this time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. Before I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, I wish to make one observation in response to the Senator from Louisiana. I think that, really, the percentage is a secondary consideration in connection with this bill; and a judgment better than mine, for instance, could prevail, in determining whether the percentage would be 5, 4, or 3.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. BLAKLEY. If it be the sense of this great body or of the Congress that the level of the allowance should be below what would be determined by the 5-percent formula, that might very well be the proper thing to do.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

In the second place, I am sure the Senator from Texas would like to see these funds used for education. But I am sure he would not wish to have any effort made, in connection with his amendment, to tie the amount of the funds which would be received by the States to the level of the State expenditures for education, and I do not believe he would wish his amendment to be used as a measure of future Federal control in connection with such aid for education.

Mr. BLAKLEY. The bill itself specifically provides that the Federal Government will have no authority whatever in this area.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But that provision is also subject to amendment. As the Senator from Texas knows, the last enactment is the one which prevails; and the one which prevailed might be such a provision included in a future appropriation bill.

So I believe the last part of this section of the amendment should be stricken out, so there would be less basis for someone in the future to argue that the Federal Government could specify how these funds were to be used for education. In other words, if the amendment does not specify that the funds shall be used for educational purposes, in the future there would be less possibility that someone could use this provision as a basis or lever for having the Federal Government exercise control over the States' use of the funds for education.

In any event, the amendment of the Senator from Texas would not guarantee any higher level of State expenditures for education; the matter would still be discretionary with the States. But it seems to me the amendment would be more desirable if the author of the amendment would agree to strike out the words "for use for educational purposes only," so as to permit the States which feel that they already are making a sufficient effort in connection with education to spend the money for purposes which they might regard as even more pressing at the moment.

Mr. BLAKLEY. It seems to me that here we are dealing with a measure which suggests a need for greater expenditures of funds for education. I understand that, generally, the proponents of Senate bill 1021 are proceeding on the theory that financial aid to education is necessary, and that the Federal Government is the only one which can provide it, and that they are indeed pleased to have the Federal Government do so.

When there is a remission to the States of part of the funds collected by means of the income tax, I do not believe we shall then have any assurance that the funds remitted to the States will be used in the field of education, although I believe they should be used in that field. This amendment does not at all limit the States to using for education only the 5 percent which comes from the income taxes. They will be able to add to that amount—as they do now; they will be able to continue to expend for education whatever amounts they wish to raise by other means.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But I suggest that there will be some who will disagree with the Senator from Texas, and who would like to see the Federal Government attach strings—for various purposes—to the use of any Federal appropriations for Federal aid to the States, if such aid has to do with education.

There are some States, such as Louisiana, in which the effort now being made by the people in the field of education vastly exceeds the national average. In fact, I am proud to say that Louisiana is near the top of the list, if not at the top of the list, in the effort to provide education for its people. Even though one State might already be doing enough in that field, if the bill is amended by means of the pending amendment, it would imply that all the States should do more, even though the fact may be that the State at the top

of the entire list is doing enough, and is doing much more than any of the other 49 States are doing.

I am suggesting that the Senator's proposal that the States do not have enough money for this purpose is equally applicable to expenditures by the States for other purposes. It may be that certain States are now spending too large a part of their incomes for education, and should spend more for other purposes.

So I suggest that the inclusion in the amendment of the words "for use for educational purposes only" constitutes a standing invitation to a Senator at some future date to offer to a future appropriation bill an amendment which would cause a Federal string to be attached to the use of this money, so as to permit the Federal Government to have the control over the use of the money.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I suggest that if this measure is enacted into law, it will continue in effect for so long as the Federal Government collects income taxes, and it will continue to affect the use of the 5 percent for so long as this law remains on the statute books.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But does not the Senator from Texas realize that this bill will be effective only by means of future appropriation bills, and that in any future appropriation bill there could be included a provision which would supersede this provision of the Senator's amendment, and that such a future provision could provide that the States must accede to the wishes of the Federal Government if the States wish to receive the funds?

Therefore, I think the inclusion of the words "for use for educational purposes only" is a mistake, because it seems to me that such a provision constitutes an invitation to someone to do just what I am sure the Senator from Texas would like to avoid—namely, attach such Federal strings to the return of these funds to the States and to the use of funds by the States, even though the funds originally were paid by the taxpayers.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to join my colleagues in congratulating the Senator from Texas on his amendment, although I will reluctantly oppose it. I think there is merit in his proposal. I disagree very strenuously with the distribution proposed; but I think the Senator from Texas is correct when he states that Congress should write into the bill the most explicit possible provision to guard against Federal domination.

Does not the Senator from Texas agree that the bill already specifies that there shall be no Federal interference? In that connection, I now read from the bill the following:

ASSURANCE AGAINST FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN SCHOOLS

SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

It seems to me that is an effort by the authors of Senate bill 1021 to prevent any Federal interference, and I believe that is a very emphatic assertion.

I should like to ask the Senator from Texas this question: Is it not true that by providing that the money used for this purpose shall have originated in each of the respective States, the provision I read is substantially reinforced? Is not that the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BLAKLEY. The purpose of the amendment is to permit each State to have remitted to it part of the tax that is collected in that State.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is fine. On that very point, I should like to point out to the Senator from Texas that, unfortunately, his proposal will, first, require much more money than the bill. I am sure the Senator is aware of that. Is not the estimate $3 billion a year?

Mr. BLAKLEY. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is approximately four times as much as the bill now calls for. Furthermore, the amendment would provide the money in a unique way, because the States would receive a return of part of the income taxes paid by their citizens. So the wealthier States would receive more, and the poorer States would receive less. The wealthier a State was, the more it would receive; the poorer a State was, the less it would receive.

I call attention to the fact that, as compared with the amounts to be received under the bill as it now stands, New York would receive a 1,200 percent increase in its share, by means of this amendment; Mississippi would receive only a 20-percent increase; North Carolina would receive approximately twice as much; and Wisconsin, my State, would receive, on the average, about four times as much.

My point is that because this is one country and because we have to be very much aware of the great need for improved education in States which have limited financial resources, it is very important that we place as much emphasis as possible on returning to the States that especially need such funds a greater share than a flat return on the basis of a percentage which would be precisely similar for each State.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Does the Senator from Wisconsin suggest that the formula should be one which would take from those who have and would give to those who do not have? Is that the formula the Senator from Wisconsin would suggest?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that is what has been done for many years in our country. Regardless of whether that formula is sound, it certainly has ample precedents historically.

I should like to point out what we do if we do not do that. Under the Senator's proposal, which I have had analyzed, the State of Delaware would receive $183 per school age child. New York would receive $136 per school age child. Texas would receive only $65 per school age child. Arkansas would receive only $37 and Mississippi would receive only $31 per school age child.

I think every study, whether the Rockefeller study or the studies of various committees, has indicated that States like Mississippi and Arkansas, particularly, and other States that have limited resources and relatively small incomes, especially need assistance.

I submit that the kind of formula proposed, while it has merit—and I am persuaded very much by the Senator's argument that we should restrain and restrict the Federal Government—does have the impact of providing money where it is least needed and not providing sufficient funds where they are needed the most.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. Let me make an observation in reply to the Senator from Wisconsin. I have the concept that we have long felt that our country was made up of sovereign States, and that when each State reached its position of sovereignty it agreed to undertake the responsibilities of sovereignty. As I meant to point out in my speech, when there is a territory under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and responsible to it, the Federal Government is responsible for all affairs within that area. But, under our system of education, and I believe under our constitutional law, it has been its duty and responsibility to handle the educational system within the sovereign States. When a State maintains its sovereignty and says, "We are a sovereign State. We undertake our obligations under our constitution," then I say it ought also to undertake the responsibility of maintaining its educational system. It ought not to say that it will undertake responsibilities under its sovereignty in every area except that of supporting its educational system. I think it ought to take all the responsibility of sovereignty and maintain its educational system also.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the Senator on a very eloquent and moving statement. I subscribe to a great deal of the statement. I think we can meet the objective of the Senator by returning a varying percentage of the income tax to each State, a percentage which would vary in accordance with the needs, so that one State might receive one-half of 1 percent, another State 4 percent, or perhaps even 5 percent. In that way, we can see to it that each State receives the amount it needs to enable it to provide education, but the fundamental concept of the Senator from Texas, which is absolutely sound, would be served, because the funds would be those which originated in the State, which had been paid by the people and the corporations of Texas. Therefore, it would preserve the sovereignty of which the Senator so eloquently speaks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to call the distinguished Senator's attention to figures I have here. They are not mine; they are figures of the President of the United States. There is an anticipated deficit

this year of $2.3 billion. There is an anticipated deficit for next year of $2.8 billion. On the basis of collections of internal revenue, the proposal of the Senator from Texas would call for the withholding, actually, by the States of $3.1 billion a year.

Of course, that would be plowing a nuclear hole into the revenues. So when we add those expenditures, the deficit goes from $2.3 billion to $5.4 billion in one year, and to $5.9 billion in the following year. How are we going to find the taxes with which to run the other functions of government, unless we want to cut them off?

Mr. BLAKLEY. If I may be quite frank, I think the obligation to support the educational system rests with the States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So do I.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I come here with my amendment because we have before this body and before the other body of Congress a bill to have the Federal Government take the responsibility to support the educational system. It is suggested that the only reason for the Federal Government's doing it is that the school systems need money and we have plenty of it, and we are assured that the Federal Government does not want another thing to do with it. A little clause is written in the bill saying the Federal Government shall not have anything to do with it, but then there are 14 pages explaining how the money cannot be obtained unless certain things are done.

Fundamentally, I say the States should support their educational systems. My only suggestion is that money is being taken out of the States, anyway, so let the States keep a little of their own money which is being collected by reason of the usurpation by the Federal Government of the taxing power.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to the Senator from Texas, first, that I am against the bill that is presently before the Senate. I shall not vote for it.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Neither shall I.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think there is a splendid way to simplify this approach. Let us have a five percent income tax deduction across the board for everybody. Let us then take the bill brought into the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Oregon and put it in limbo and keep our hands out of State affairs. Then we will not have a bill and we will not have to worry about controls. There will be nothing to worry about. Everybody will be happy with an income tax deduction, and the States and the people back home can do as they please about raising money.

Mr. BLAKLEY. If the distinguished Senator from Illinois will do that and put S. 1021 in limbo, my amendment will not be here.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Texas knows that I have walked over to his side of the aisle, where there are 65 New Frontiersmen. I have only 34 troops on the other side. It has to be a pretty redoubtable commander who will start for a hilltop when he is outnumbered two to one. So I am here in a position of entreaty and supplication.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. Will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Let me make a very brief statement. I am going to hold up, but I am almost brought to tears——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAKLEY. By the situation in which the minority leader finds himself, but, with his great ability to find his position, I am sure he will prevail. I think the "frontier" he carries may not be new, but it is an everlasting one, and it is very, very forceful.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My difficulty is that the only ammunition I have is words. So often my feeble eloquence falls on sterile ground here on the New Frontier. It takes votes to get something done. If the Senator will get enough votes on his side of the aisle to join us, we will send the bill back to committee, or put it in limbo, where it belongs. Then the people in Texas will be happy, and we will be happy too. [Laughter.]

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if it is the intent of the amendment that it would operate automatically. Would the revenue receipts paid into the district director's office be transferred from the Internal Revenue Service office in the State to the State authority, or would an annual appropriation be required?

Mr. BLAKLEY. The amendment calls for a transfer direct. It is authorized and directed by the Congress that the district directors make an annual accounting and transfer the money.

Mr. CURTIS. What the Senator proposes is that this be automatically carried out by the District Director of Internal Revenue in a State. He would take 5 percent of the receipts from income taxes and turn that sum over to the State authority; is that correct?

Mr. BLAKLEY. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator regard possession of Federal revenues by the Internal Revenue Service the same as money in the hands of the U.S. Treasury?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I think so.

Mr. CURTIS. How would the Senator meet the constitutional problem which arises over these words:

> No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

If the District Director of Internal Revenue receives money in taxes, and the money is a part of the Treasury receipts and is in the Treasury under the provisions of the Constitution, the only way it can be given out is as the result of an appropriation by the Congress. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I think that would be covered by the constitutional process.

Mr. CURTIS. There would have to be annual appropriation?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I think the process suggested is sufficient. The "annual" is covered by the authorization, and it would go along with the operation of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. CURTIS. That may be the case. I think it is a problem which merits a great deal of study.

If the amendment is agreed to and the Federal income tax revenues should be reduced by 5 percent, does the Senator propose to impose other Federal taxes? Does the Senator anticipate that Government expenditures will be reduced? Or does the Senator propose an increase in the Federal deficit in order to effectuate the transfer of 5 percent of the income tax revenues to the States?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I recognize that there is some small disparity in respect to the money which would be left in the States under the 5 percent limitation provided in the amendment. However, I think that disparity would not have a very long life, once we move into the field.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope the Senator will not misunderstand me. I am not in favor of the committee bill. I wish to preserve for the parents and for other local people in the country the right to run their own schools.

Mr. BLAKLEY. The amendment will do so.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the committee bill is the beginning of the end of local control over schools. The words in the bill to the effect that there is to be no Federal control are merely pious, self-serving words, and are not binding on a subsequent Congress, nor do they take precedence over the provisions in the bill which set up controls, limitations, approvals of applications and other strings.

Mr. BLAKLEY. The Senator is now speaking of S. 1021, the bill before the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. I refer to the committee bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have already indicated my position that the States of the Nation and the local governments have been doing an excellent job in providing for the education of the children of our country. Moreover, it is my opinion that with very few exceptions the States and local governments are in a far better fiscal position to finance the schools than we are on the central level. Our national debt is $290 billion. We are threatened with international complications which, if they arise, will require tremendous expenditures. The value of the dollar has dropped from 100 cents in 1941 to 46 cents in 1961, based on purchasing power.

I do not subscribe to the proposed method of financing the schools, for the term "Federal aid" is not a truly reflective description of what is sought to be done. I say we are now discussing the method of financing the operation and construction of schools.

The Senator from Texas desires that control over education remain at home, without Federal domination. I subscribe to that, because I think the people at home know best what ought to be done. They see the public officials spend money. They know how the money is spent. They know what the tax burden is. Therefore they, far better as a result of seeing actually what is done, can determine what is right. If the spending is removed thousands of miles—perhaps 3,000 miles—the people do not know what is going on.

The Senator's amendment, however, provides for a distribution of 5 percent of the receipts from income taxes. The income taxes collected are some $61 billion annually. Five percent of that amount would be $3,050 million. The committee bill provides $850 million a year, I think. May I suggest to the Senator from Texas that he reduce the amount from 5 percent of receipts from income taxes to perhaps 1¼ percent, which would be $750 million a year, to be distributed in accordance with the formula now contained in the amendment? That would bring the figure in close proximity to what is provided by the committee bill and what was provided by the President's recommendation. If the income tax receipts were high, the amount would be increased, and if income tax receipts dropped, the amount would be decreased. However, I think the 1¼ percent, or perhaps 1⅜ percent, would be more proper.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that I would not have any objection to a substitution, for the 5 percent figure, of a percentage which is thought to be the appropriate amount or the adequate amount to meet the situation at this time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I suggest that 1⅜ percent would about equal the recommendation in the committee bill and the recommendation of the President for the second and third year. I ask, would the Senator accept that?

Mr. BLAKLEY. Perhaps it should be 2 percent. We have to make some allowance for the possibility of receipts from income taxes going up and down.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Two percent would provide $1.2 billion, or 33 percent more than recommended either by the committee or by the President.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I am not adamant on the question of percentage.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would 1⅜ percent be acceptable?

Mr. BLAKLEY. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would the Senator accept such an amendment to his amendment?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I am willing to accept whatever percentage seems appropriate to meet the problem.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I repeat that 1⅜ percent would make the amount available under the Senator's amendment practically identical with what would be available under the committee amendment, the recommendation of the President, and the original bill. Is that not true?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I point out that there is merit in a percentage of 5 percent, although it would represent a great deal of money. I believe the merit is that under the proposal of the Senator from Texas no State would suffer, as compared with what would happen under the committee bill. Even Mississippi would enjoy an increase. Under the proposal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], a very large number of States would have to take a substantial cut, and while perhaps we would dissociate ourselves from that possibility, the fact is in the case of Mississippi the contribution would be sharply reduced. North Carolina would be cut almost in half with respect to what it would receive. Then we would get into a situation in which Senators would be divided to some extent. We must consider the realities of life. Senators would be divided on the basis of what the States would receive. So there is merit in the proposal of the Senator from Texas in that every State would improve its position.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My understanding is that the Senator from Texas is primarily interested in keeping control of education at home and not placing it under the central Government.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Yes. I am not at all responsive to the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin and the notion that 5 percent is the absolute and there should be no change. My view and my interest is to have in the bill a provision which would leave the money in the State where it is collected and under the absolute control of the State and the Congress, and the Federal Government would not have any part in its administration or expenditure. I think the question of percentage is subject to some flexibility.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Before we proceed to discuss the particular thought which the Senator from Ohio has advanced, I should like to try to reconcile two points. I cannot support the amendment of the Senator from Texas, even with the proposal of the Senator from Ohio, unless we could do something that would take care of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for the very reason, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has pointed out, that there would be a maldistribution of income due to the situs of various corporations in the United States.

Perhaps we could achieve the purpose of maintaining control within the States if we would forego the corporation income tax and confine this provision of the bill to the individual income tax.

I should like to ask the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] if he would consider an adjustment, or an amendment to his amendment, which would confine that provision to the individual income tax collected within each State, and with a percentage which would come out approximately to the figure contained in the administration or committee bill. Otherwise, I cannot support the amendment, because the result would be a gross inequity, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] pointed out. I think we can achieve the desired result by confining the formula to the individual income tax collected within each State.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Does the Senator from Iowa have in mind, say, 5 percent of the individual income taxes collected?

Mr. MILLER. My thought is that 2 percent, or perhaps 2½ percent, of the individual income tax would bring us about $700 million a year. We can secure that information very rapidly if the Senator from Texas will consider that amendment acceptable.

I wonder if the Senator from Ohio would also go along with that idea.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the Senator from Iowa proposed a percentage of 2½ percent of the individual income tax or the corporation income tax? I did not follow his statement in that respect.

Mr. MILLER. My point is that the amendment would provide nothing with respect to corporation income taxes, because of the maldistribution of income due to the situs of the home offices of corporations. We should confine the formula to a percentage of individual income taxes collected within each State. All we would have to determine would be how much 1 percent of the individual income tax collected would bring, and we could then very easily compute a percentage which would yield approximately $700 million a year. In that way we would preserve local control within the State, which is the point that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] has been talking about. There would result no greater impact on the Federal budget than the present committee bill envisages, which is the problem of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. We would also eliminate the problem of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], which concerned the corporation income taxes and the maldistribution of corporation income.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How would the Senator from Iowa reach that goal?

Mr. MILLER. As I said, I do not know exactly what 1 percent of the individual income tax would bring in. Let us assume it would bring in $350 million. Then we could easily adapt the amendment to 2 percent of the individual income tax, which would produce $700 million. Such action would preserve control within the State, which the Senator from Texas wants.

If the Senator from Texas would accept some such provision, and if it ties in with the idea of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I would be happy to spend a little time on the subject, and I think we could arrive at a suitable amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield so that I may answer the question?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. Despite the disparity of income from corporations, we still

would not get away from the difficulty of administration that would come about as a result of withholding taxes from widespread corporations. The home offices of widespread corporations often withhold taxes from people in several different States. The individual pays the income tax. How would the Senator take care of that situation?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. As soon as we get by the point we are discussing, I have a proposal for a slight amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] which would take care of that very problem. If the Senator will be patient for a moment, I will present it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one additional question to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator is correct in that a number of difficulties would be cleared up by his suggestion. One fundamental difficulty would still remain. There would be a great discrepancy between what the States would receive and what they need in terms of the number of school-age children. The fact is that a wealthy State—wealthy in terms of personal income—would still receive, under the modification of the Senator from Iowa, a great deal more per school-age child than the poor State would receive.

When Senator Taft worked on this subject as hard as he did in 1948 and 1949—Senator Taft pointed out over and over again the reason why this problem is a national one is that the citizens of Mississippi are every bit as much citizens of America as are citizens of New York and Ohio; and the schoolchildren of Mississippi need proper education. Good education for children in Mississippi strengthens our society and strengthens America.

If we can find any justification whatever for Federal aid to education, it must come about through the fact that the States do not have the kind of wealth within their borders to provide the kind of education that the children of their community need and deserve.

As Senator Taft said, the fact is that we do not have the American dream. We do not have equality of educational opportunity, because the child in Mississippi, Arkansas, or any of the poorer States does not have the same kind of educational opportunity. Therefore, if the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] would consider one further adjustment—incidentally, he would then have covered the provisions of my amendment, which I would be delighted to donate—that adjustment would provide a varying percentage of income tax distributed to each State so that one, New York, for example, might receive 0.4 of one percent Mississippi might receive 4.5 percent of its income taxes.

In this way we would provide for the same kind of distribution formula as is contained in the bill, but we would retain the fundamental principle for which the Senator from Texas has fought so well today, because we would confine the bill to the people within a State who have made the payments, and therefore they would have a real basis for resistance to any encroachment by the Federal Government on education.

Mr. MILLER. I agree with much that the Senator has said. However, I believe there may be two answers. The first answer is that once we get the additional revenue into the hands of the States where it originated, and once the States have had a chance to utilize it, I believe we will be in a much better position to find out how much more is needed in the way of Federal assistance or revenue returned to the States in order to achieve the minimal standard.

Another answer is that if we would have a Federal aid for construction facilities on the need basis, for which I have long argued, we would give relief to the poorer States with respect to their construction requirements, and would relieve them sufficiently to enable them to pay better teachers' salaries.

I am not seeking perfection. We will not get perfection under any bill or under any amendment. However, we would be in a much better position if we were able to get some of the additional revenue back into the hands of the States, and then to evaluate the situation, than we are in now.

I have the feeling that we may be moving a little bit too fast, and that we ought to try to let the States handle the matter by returning to them revenue which has been raised within their borders.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield further, I would say to the Senator from Iowa the fact is that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has labored very hard and diligently on this subject and has held many hearings over a period of many weeks, and the members of the committee, after great debate and long consideration, have painstakingly arrived at a formula for the distribution of the funds which they believe is as fair as any formula can be. They considered the various arguments that were made in favor of distributing the money in one way or another. They have gone into great detail on how the distribution should be made.

As I would agree with the Senator from Iowa that we should not disturb the amount at which the committee has arrived, so I would assume we should not disturb the distribution formula presented by the committee, because this has been arrived at after painstaking study of the whole subject. A proportion of the taxes collected within a State should be returned to the people of that State. That is why I keep emphasizing over and over again that the way to do it is to return a varying percentage to each State. Then we do not have to argue about the formula that has been set up in committee.

Mr. MILLER. Could we go into this matter of the difference in the amounts after we get this one amendment taken care of?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The difficulty is that once we get the amendment taken care of, the whole distribution formula is changed very greatly. It must be changed, because, just as soon as we fix the return on the basis of the income tax paid within a State, the amount New York receives or the amount Nevada receives, or the amount Mississippi receives or the amount Wisconsin receives per school age child, is entirely different and is inversely related to State need, and the whole fight begins all over again. Then, instead of Senators being in a position where they can simply accept the expert advice of the committee, they have on their hands the fight as to whether Iowa gets a little more or New York gets a little more or Wisconsin gets a little more or Nevada gets a little more. If we can leave the distribution problem to the committee, then we can take care of the fundamental point that has been raised by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Under my amendment, we do not have that formula. It is very simple. We say to the State that the people should get the taxes that are collected in their State. The amendment does not contain an equation. It does not contain a formula. It does not contain any principle for the Federal Government or anyone else determining what will happen in any State. It provides only that the money collected from the people in a State will be retained by the State, and that it will be used for educational purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will yield further, I merely wish to add that 3 years ago I made my maiden speech in the Senate on exactly this kind of proposal. I believe I proposed 5 percent. However, after consultation with other Senators and educational experts and other persons familiar with the subject, I came to the conclusion that this would work the gravest inequity. The fact is that the Senator has changed the distribution formula. There is no way he could avoid it. Under the proposal of the Senator from Texas, New York would receive 12 times as much as the bill proposes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. KEATING. My inquiry is, Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. KEATING. In due course I will ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield so that I may submit an amendment for printing?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the bill pending before the Senate. It would change the method of counting the pupils in the individual States. The bill recommended by the President contained the provision that the counting shall be on the basis of the students attending public schools alone. The committee changed the President's recommendation and added a provision that the count shall be made on the basis of

students attending public schools and parochial schools.

In my opinion, that method of making the count is erroneous and unjust. Parochial school students are not at all participating in the aid that will be given. Not participating, they should not be counted. My amendment provides for a return to the language recommended by the President, that only those pupils, between the ages of 5 and 17, attending public schools be counted in determining the allocation that shall be made to the separate States.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator a question about his amendment, because I would like to assist the Senator in clarifying the matter. Does his amendment contain the same formula that was contained in the original 1021? If it does, I would like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the original amendment was on the basis of public school students figured on an average daily attendance. I would like to know whether he refers to average daily attendance, or whether he is offering the amendment which counts the enrollment in public schools. It makes some difference in the final outcome of the formula.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment which I have submitted will eliminate the changes made by the committee, and will accept the identical recommendations made by the President. A year ago I made the argument on the same basis, that it was unjust to count the students in the parochial schools—Lutheran, Episcopalian, and Catholic—in determining the number of students supposedly attending public schools.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator's amendment also propose to reduce the authorization to $666 million?

Mr. LAUSCHE. My amendment conforms completely to the recommendation of the President.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The colloquy of the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators seems to indicate, or at least it is the view of the Senator from Wisconsin, that the formula which was worked out by the committee cannot be changed. In due course there will be before the Senate an amendment which will seek to change that formula and make it more equitable. I would say to the Senator from Texas that so far as the formula is concerned, even though I cannot support his amendment, it is a much more equitable formula than the one proposed by the committee in regard to the distribution of the funds. The proposal of the committee places a premium on those States which do not tax their own citizens enough for public school education.

It prejudices a State like New York and many other States which tax their citizens for public school education in the way they should. So it does not distress me to hear the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] say that to alter this formula would result in the State of New York getting a larger percentage of the take. There is some merit in the proposal that if there is to be Federal assistance, funds which are taken from a State, should go back to the State from which they came.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Would the distinguished Senator from New York agree, perhaps, that under the Constitution, the obligation is with the States to support the public school system?

Mr. KEATING. Within certain limits. Do not press me too far. I might say something which would be injurious to the Senator's case. However, within certain limits I agree.

Mr. BLAKLEY. The principle of the amendment is that it leaves in the State of New York, in the State of Wisconsin, in the State of Illinois, or in the State of Texas only a small part of the taxes which are being collected from the citizens of those States for the use of their educational system and for disposition according to the laws of the respective jurisdictions.

Mr. KEATING. My impression is that the 5 percent provided in the Senator's original amendment is rather high.

Mr. BLAKLEY. It might be.

Mr. KEATING. I am not certain whether I understood that the Senator would agree to modify his amendment by reducing the amount.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I have said that I would be willing to accept an amendment to provide a percentage which would be adequate for the present needs. I am not certain what that percentage should be. I feel there is an area for consideration in that respect. Perhaps the amount should be 2 percent or some lesser percentage than 5 percent.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to study the Senator's amendment further. I shall not take a final position now, but I did not wish to let the record stand as it was with reference to the sanctity of the formula worked out. I do not consider that the original formula reported by the committee is sacrosanct and not subject to further consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield the floor?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall reply to the Senator from Texas, and then I shall be ready to vote. I hope the amendment can be disposed of within the next few minutes, because we must get on with the work of considering the bill step by step. Considerable time has been spent on this amendment.

I may say to the Senator from Texas that the minority leader had a little fun with me a few moments ago when he said to me, "You are a piker compared with the Senator from Texas, when you consider what the Senator from Texas would raise for education by his amendment in comparison with the paltry $850 million provided in the bill." The Senator from Texas is really proposing something which is typical of the well-known reputation of the great Lone Star State. When a Texan starts to deal with something, he deals with it in big figures. The proposal of the Senator from Texas would raise many times $850 million if it were adopted.

I speak for a very modest bill, a very moderate bill, providing for $850 million which would be appropriated on the basis of a formula which, I hope to show in the course of the debate, is fair and equitable to all the States concerned.

The proposal of the Senator from Texas emasculates the bill. It is a proposal by way of a substitute, so far as most of the major features of the bill are concerned. In effect, it eliminates the continuation of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. It does away entirely with the so-called federally impacted areas legislation.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 are the subjects of separate legislation. They are not before the Senate at this moment but are in committees for consideration, are they not?

Mr. MORSE. No; they are in the bill now under consideration. Several bills relating to continuation of the program were before the committee and its continuation is now being recommended by the committee as a part of this measure. The Senator would eliminate them by his substitute. A great many school districts in Texas would suffer if the Senator's amendment were adopted.

If the Senator will turn to table 75, on page 757 of the hearings, he will see that Texas, in fiscal 1962, will receive $14,457,000 under Public Law 874. Table 76, on page 758, shows that Texas, in fiscal 1962, will receive $3,329,900 under Public Law 815.

There has been much talk this afternoon by Senators who have deplored the principle of Federal aid to education. Yet many Senators appeared before our committee, as the hearings will show, and expressed objection to the reduction in Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 funds as was proposed in the original administration bill. The committee unanimously voted to continue Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 for another 3 years, but required that at the end of 18 months the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare report to Congress any inequities or injustices in the application of those two laws, and make recommendations for amendments thereto.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD tables from the Tenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education of the U.S. Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare, which show what the various school districts in Texas now receive both under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, including what has been received under Public Law 815 for the last 10 years.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 12.—*Federal funds reserved, by local educational agency, by section of Public Law 815, as amended*

Project No.	Local educational agency	County	Sec. 202, Public Law 815	Sec. 305				Sec. 5, Public Law 85-620	Secs. 401 and 14	Total funds reserved
				Public Law 246	Public Law 731	Public Law 949	Public Law 85-267			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	TEXAS									
1	Crosby I.S.D.	Harris	$152,948							$152,948
2	Ysleta I.S.D.	El Paso	1,333,391	[1] $816,585	[1] $989,446	[1] $920,000	[1] $806,680	[1] $907,040		[1] 5,773,142
3	New Boston I.S.D.	Bowie	168,982							168,982
4	Orange I.S.D.	Orange	683,018							683,018
5	Galena Park I.S.D.	Harris	319,672							319,672
6	De Kalb I.S.D.	Bowie	160,162	100,000						260,162
7	Belton I.S.D.	Bell	107,990		49,500		110,000	78,120		345,610
8	Ind. S.D. of El Paso	El Paso	1,814,466	32,928	1,163,310	870,351	934,000	2,046,798		6,861,853
9	Vidor I.S.D.	Orange	355,643							355,643
10	Hooks I.S.D.	Bowie	412,216							412,216
11	Grand Prairie I.S.D.	Dallas	1,090,352	406,500	[1] 362,250	123,499	122,000			2,104,601
12	Brazoria I.S.D.	Brazoria	109,688	35,100						144,788
13	Bastrop I.S.D.	Bastrop	53,047							53,047
14	Temple I.S.D.	Bell	229,286							229,286
15	La Porte I.S.D.	Harris								
16	Rosen Heights I.S.D., Fort Worth	Tarrant	348,903		36,488					385,391
17	Beaumont I.S.D.	Jefferson								
18	Weatherford I.S.D.	Parker	152,608							152,608
19	Texarkana I.S.D.	Bowie	1,037,190							1,037,190
20	Castleberry I.S.D., Fort Worth	Tarrant	649,492		165,000	115,500				929,992
21	Kingsville I.S.D.	Kleberg	510,541	164,350	109,500					784,391
22	Birdville I.S.D., Fort Worth	Tarrant	387,329	157,250	113,500	242,500				900,579
23	Kennedale I.S.D.	do	39,676							39,676
24	Keller I.S.D.	do	69,944							69,944
25	Grapevine I.S.D.	do	21,470							21,470
26	Eagle Mountain S.D. No. 17, Fort Worth	do	13,701							13,701
27	Frenship Rural H.S., Wolfforth	Lubbock	151,206	196,650						347,856
28	Village Creek C.S.D., Fort Worth	Tarrant	10,157							10,157
29	Edgewood I.S.D., San Antonio	Bexar	1,193,871	281,885	192,000	440,500	208,499	201,880		2,518,635
30	Benbrook C.S.D. No. 58	Tarrant	36,651			51,000				87,651
31	Chapin C.S.D., Fort Worth	do	24,160							24,160
32	Lampasas I.S.D.	Lampasas	72,898							72,898
33	South San Antonio I.S.D.	Bexar	651,782		104,000		147,000	57,750		960,532
34	Dumas I.S.D.	Moore	64,296							64,296
35	White Settlement Com. Cons. S.D. No. 37, Fort Worth.	Tarrant	1,308,756		264,500					1,573,256
36	Cooley C.S.D. W-20, El Paso	El Paso								
37	Azle I.S.D.	Tarrant	201,326			95,500				296,826
38	Harlandale I.S.D., San Antonio	Bexar	1,548,045		351,000	308,000		336,500		2,543,545
39	Wainwright C.S.D. No. W-21, El Paso [2]	El Paso								
40	Killeen I.S.D.	Bell	862,507		759,517			132,355		1,754,379
41	Nash I.S.D.	Bowie	40,718							40,718
42	Granbury I.S.D.	Hood	47,236			34,500				81,736
43	Roma I.S.D.	Starr	53,029							53,029
44	Nederland I.S.D.	Jefferson	119,152							119,152
45	Pasadena I.S.D.	Harris								
46	Fort Worth I.S.D.	Tarrant	687,573							687,573
47	Liberty C.S.D. No. 12, Texarkana	Bowie	33,980							33,980
48	Macedonia C.S.D. No. 39, Texarkana	do	47,161							47,161
49	Flour Bluff I.S.D., Corpus Christi	Nueces	218,114	126,350	146,500		122,000			612,964
50	Pewitt I.S.D., Naples	Morris	141,612							141,612
51	Channelview I.S.D.	Harris	253,737	53,550						307,287
52	Southside Rural H.S.D. No. 17, San Antonio.	Bexar	39,974							39,974
53	Lakeview I.S.D., Waco	McLennan	[3] 44,254							[3] 44,254
54	Cove I.S.D., Orange	Orange	106,874							106,874
55	Seagoville I.S.D.	Dallas	47,702							47,702
56	La Marque I.S.D.	Galveston								
57	Borger I.S.D.	Hutchinson	378,373							378,373
58	La Coste Rural H.S.D. No. 3	Medina	15,373							15,373
59	Mount Creek C.S.D. No. 93, Grand Prairie. [4]	Dallas								
60	Mineral Wells I.S.D.	Palo Pinto	212,041	489,760						701,801
61	Colorado C.S.D. No. 36, Del Valle	Travis	84,962	177,598	127,650	59,667		133,591		583,468
62	Sundeen I.S.D., Corpus Christi	Nueces	211,330	126,300	90,500					428,130
63	Corpus Christi I.S.D.	do	886,934							886,934
64	Northside I.S.D., San Antonio	Bandera, Bexar, and Medina.	70,177		77,000		285,000			432,177
65	Florence Hill I.S.D., Grand Prairie	Dallas	38,106	12,000	15,000	16,493				81,599
66	San Angelo I.S.D.	Tom Green	223,289			221,030				444,319
67	Arlington I.S.D.	Tarrant	42,100					418,695		460,795
68	Port Neches I.S.D.	Jefferson								
69	East and Mt. Houston I.S.D., Houston	Harris	151,470	135,000						286,470
70	Irving I.S.D.	Dallas	473,715	234,950	148,500	152,500				1,009,665
71	McGregor I.S.D.	McLennan	62,349		179,000					241,349
72	Bridge City I.S.D.	Orange	33,802							33,802
73	Socorro C.S.D. W-5, El Paso	El Paso	28,353							28,353
74	Euless I.S.D. [5]	Tarrant								
75	Schertz-Cibolo C.S.D. No. 29, Schertz	Guadalupe	218,680		38,500			159,499		416,679
76	Gatesville I.S.D.	Coryell	102,877		87,500					190,377
77	Angleton I.S.D.	Brazoria	387,270	81,000						468,270
78	Godley I.S.D.	Johnson								
79	Queen City I.S.D.	Cass	143,704							143,704
80	Burleson Cons. I.S.D.	Johnson								
81	Joshua I.S.D.	do								
201	La Vega I.S.D., Waco	McLennan	80,648							80,648
202	Little Cypress I.S.D., Orange	Orange	136,083							136,083
203	Bancroft C.S.D., Orange	do	61,000							61,000
204	Alvarado I.S.D.	Johnson	58,715							58,715
205	Boerne Co. Line I.S.D., Boerne	Kendall	60,927							60,927
206	Mansfield I.S.D.	Tarrant	90,244							90,244
207	Atlanta I.S.D.	Cass	130,112							130,112

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 12.—*Federal funds reserved, by local educational agency, by section of Public Law 815, as amended*—Continued

Project No.	Local educational agency	County	Sec. 202, Public Law 815	Sec. 305				Sec. 5, Public Law 85-620	Secs. 401 and 14	Total funds reserved
				Public Law 246	Public Law 731	Public Law 949	Public Law 85-267			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	TEXAS—continued									
208	Connally Cons. I.S.D., Waco	McLennan	$75,998	$186,200	$5,700	$36,000	$239,310			$543,208
209	San Vicente C.S.D. No. 2, Big Bend National Park.	Brewster	20,900						$18,000	38,900
210	Lackland AFB I.S.D., San Antonio [6]	Bexar								
211	Seguin I.S.D.	Guadalupe	51,211							51,211
212	Hondo I.S.D.	Medina								
213	Burkburnett I.S.D.	Wichita	14,174		40,000	70,000		$685,294		809,468
214	San Antonio I.S.D.	Bexar								
215	Garland I.S.D.	Dallas		222,300						222,300
216	San Marcos I.S.D.	Hays	203,280	84,000	114,903					402,183
217	Cleburne I.S.D.	Johnson	63,179							63,179
218	Big Spring I.S.D.	Howard	198,439		144,500		377,350	146,632		866,921
219	New Braunfels I.S.D.	Comal	18,838					104,475		123,313
220	Port Lavaca I.S.D.	Calhoun								
221	Panhandle I.S.D.	Carson	50,883							50,883
222	Natalia I.S.D.	Medina	41,329			[1] 45,000	[1] 35,000			[1] 121,329
223	Wimberly Rural H.S.D.	Hays								
224	Devine I.S.D.	Medina	100,000							100,000
225	Brazosport I.S.D., Freeport	Brazoria								
226	Clarksville I.S.D.	Red River	86,080							86,080
227	West Oso I.S.D., Corpus Christi	Nueces	152,845							152,845
228	Duncanville I.S.D.	Dallas	44,535	54,500	14,500					113,535
229	Thorndale I.S.D.	Milam								
230	Sheldon I.S.D.	Harris	45,045							45,045
231	Southwest Rural H.S.D. No. 29, Atascosa.	Bexar	71,263			22,000	17,000	28,350		138,613
232	Daingerfield I.S.D.	Morris	59,290							59,290
233	Monahans-Wickett I.S.D.	Ward								
234	East Central Rural H.S.D. No. 20, San Antonio.	Bexar	112,420							112,420
235	Rio Grande City I.S.D.	Starr	90,000							90,000
401	A. & M. Cons. I.S.D., College Station	Brazos		29,500						29,500
402	Garner C.S.D. No. 83	Parker		42,374						42,374
403	Victoria I.S.D.	Victoria		128,509	130,196					258,705
404	San Felipe I.S.D., Del Rio	Val Verde		34,270						34,270
405	Bryan I.S.D.	Brazos		125,500		131,500				257,000
406	Wheatland C.S.D. No. 38, Dallas	Dallas								
407	De Soto I.S.D.	do			16,000					16,000
408	Sowers C.S.D. No. 51, Irving	do				[3]				
409	Gainesville I.S.D.	Cook								
410	Del Rio I.S.D.	Val Verde		227,500	65,000	98,55.	618,200			1,009,253
411	Shady Grove C.S.D. No. 3, Grand Prairie.	Dallas		9,500						9,500
412	Cedar Hill I.S.D.	do								
413	Copperas Cove I.S.D.	Coryell			170,500		45,000	[1] 289,386		[1] 504,886
414	Denison I.S.D.	Grayson								
502	Beeville I.S.D.	Bee			229,000		201,600			430,600
503	Everman I.S.D.	Tarrant			17,000	[1] 41,250				[1] 58,250
504	North East I.S.D., San Antonio	Bexar			410,500	263,552	300,500	592,725		1,567,277
505	Aldine I.S.D., Houston	Harris								
506	Hurst-Euless I.S.D., Hurst	Tarrant	22,536		93,950					116,776
507	Abilene I.S.D.	Taylor			394,000	611,000	290,500			1,295,500
508	Tye I.S.D., Abilene	do			18,000		10,000			28,000
509	Pottsboro C.S.D. No. 813	Grayson			13,500					13,500
510	McAllen I.S.D.	Hidalgo			140,500					140,500
511	Skidmore-Tynan Rural H.S. No. 36	Bee			19,000					19,000
512	Mission I.S.D.	Hidalgo			76,500					76,500
513	Converse C.S.D. No. 12, San Antonio	Bexar								
515	Layne C.S.D. No. 93, Denison	Grayson			14,500	23,000				37,500
601	Smithfield I.S.D.	Tarrant				16,000				16,000
602	Newark C.S.D. No. 53	Wise								
603	Robstown I.S.D.	Nueces								
604	Laredo I.S.D.	Webb								
605	Harlingen Cons. I.S.D.	Cameron								
606	Stanton I.S.D.	Martin								
607	Springtown I.S.D.	Parker								
701	Lake View Ind. Schs., San Angelo	Tom Green								
702	Potter Co. Cons. C.S.D. No. 3, Amarillo.	Potter					253,971	181,582		435,553
703	Anthony I.S.D.	El Paso					19,500			19,500
704	Nolanville C.S.D. No. 50	Bell						15,450		15,450
801	Lower Southampton Twp. S.D.	Comal						29,355		29,355
802	Shallowater I.S.D.	Lubbock						41,715		41,715
803	Iowa Park I.S.D.	Wichita						34,505		34,505
804	Judson R.H.S.D. No. 8, Converse	Bexar						29,355		29,355
805	Coohoma I.S.D.	Howard								
806	City View C.S.D. No. 8, Wichita Falls	Wichita						44,400		44,400
	Total		[2] 24,133,655	[3] 4,771,909	[3] 7,697,910	[3] 5,008,895	[3] 5,143,110	[3] 6,695,452	18,000	[1] [3] 53,468,931

[1] Includes the following grants under sec. 8:

	Public Law 246	Public Law 731	Public Law 949	Public Law 85-267	Public Law 85-620
Ysleta I.S.D.	$210,585	$494,446	$460,000	$334,180	$378,650
Grand Prairie I.S.D.		77,750			
Natalia I.S.D.			22,500	17,500	
Copperas Cove I.S.D.					103,536
Everman I.S.D.			3,750		
Total	210,585	572,196	486,250	351,680	482,186.

[2] Consolidated with Applicant No. 8.
[3] Includes $2,016 grant under sec. 209(c).
[4] Consolidated with Applicant No. 11.
[5] Consolidated with Applicant No. 506.
[6] Changed to sec. 204 case.

TABLE 1.—*Public Law 874: Net entitlement and current expenditures of applicants, fiscal year 1960*

Project number and local education agency	Net entitlement under Public Law 874 [1]	Total current expenditures
(1)	(2)	(3)
TEXAS		
2. Clarksville I.S.D.	$9,304	$363,673
3. Orange I.S.D.	33,952	1,573,467
4. Panhandle I.S.D.	18,200	371,443
5. Dumas I.S.D.	55,717	1,121,602
6. New Boston I.S.D.	46,765	290,970
8. Atlanta I.S.D.	6,774	437,538
11. Nash I.S.D.	9,793	87,973
12. Malta C.S.D. No. 8, New Boston	3,862	25,000
14. Maud I.S.D.	8,406	93,666
15. Red Lick C.S.D. No. 10, Texarkana	2,383	20,000
16. Simms C.S.D. No. 6	13,548	125,000
18. Fort Worth I.S.D.	770,408	18,957,178
19. Grand Prairie I.S.D.	107,315	1,894,251
21. Belton I.S.D.	50,601	470,050
22. Ysleta I.S.D.	346,456	3,245,917
24. Jones Crossing C.S.D. No. 25, DeKalb	1,632	12,000
26. Macedonia C.S.D. No. 39, Texarkana	9,222	132,000
29. Spring Hill C.S.D. No. 52, DeKalb	986	30,121
30. Hubbard C.S.D. No. 55, DeKalb	1,150	18,000
31. Leary C.S.D. No. 67	4,978	31,000
32. Hooks I.S.D.	63,741	311,210
33. Texarkana I.S.D.	65,250	983,502
34. Temple I.S.D.	84,047	1,458,658
35. Redwater I.S.D.	6,529	78,795
36. Pleasant Grove C.S.D. No. 42, Texarkana	1,305	50,000
38. Lake Worth I.S.D., Fort Worth	21,872	390,000
39. Weatherford I.S.D.	40,072	620,169
40. Marietta C.S.D. No. 42	2,040	34,449
41. Castleberry I.S.D., Fort Worth	117,852	930,000
45. El Paso I.S.D.	1,182,905	12,940,801
47. DeKalb I.S.D.	28,483	333,082
48. Birdville I.S.D., Fort Worth	113,363	1,915,332
49. Kennedale I.S.D.	4,407	210,883
50. Keller I.S.D.	7,835	150,000
51. Annona I.S.D.	3,754	87,000
52. Dimple Rural H.S.D., Clarksville	1,469	65,520
54. LaCoste I.S.D.	2,530	79,864
55. Harlandale I.S.D., San Antonio	296,387	2,634,848
56. Devine I.S.D.	17,628	259,457
57. Azle I.S.D.	38,277	401,082
58. McGregor I.S.D.	23,423	276,240
59. Karnack, I.S.D.	18,689	206,134
60. Frenship Rural H.S.D., Wolfforth	44,316	309,367
61. Killeen I.S.D.	474,101	1,279,167
62. Benbrook C.S.D. No. 58, Fort Worth	22,852	82,511
63. Lytle I.S.D.	7,263	78,080
64. Mineral Wells I.S.D.	106,752	746,843
65. Chapin C.S.D. No. 39, Fort Worth	10,528	56,726
66. Lampasas I.S.D.	31,585	435,684
68. White Settlement S.D. No. 37, Fort Worth	127,564	781,299
72. Detroit I.S.D.	1,958	131,900
73. S. San Antonio I.S.D., San Antonio	97,121	812,499
74. Mansfield I.S.D.	9,548	246,775
75. Pewitt Cons. I.S.D., Naples	10,283	312,035
81. Granbury I.S.D.	13,629	185,026
82. Avery I.S.D.	6,774	99,300
83. Everman I.S.D.	10,446	145,000
84. Roma I.S.D.	6,692	338,961
85. Pasadena I.S.D.	16,609	7,008,501
87. Stephenville I.S.D.	3,917	395,641
88. Seagoville I.S.D.	9,304	407,277
89. Flour Bluff I.S.D., Corpus Christi	81,451	513,767
93. Burkburnett I.S.D.	128,380	599,065
94. Southside Rural H.S.D. No. 17, San Antonio	12,160	228,767
96. Iowa Park I.S.D.	11,090	445,211
98. Colorado C.S.D. No. 36, Del Valle	79,493	342,533
100. San Angelo I.S.D.	73,290	2,889,332
105. Aledo I.S.D.	5,794	105,000
106. Middle Well C.S.D. No. 3, Dumas	5,260	78,681
107. Socorro C.S.D. No. W-5, El Paso	6,855	133,355
109. Springtown I.S.D.	8,161	155,000
110. Brock Rural H.S.D. No. 52, Weatherford	1,877	54,284
112. Bluff Dale C.S.D.	[2]	
113. Edgewood I.S.D., San Antonio	261,229	2,074,746
114. Queen City I.S.D.	6,529	179,850
115. Irving I.S.D.	74,200	2,464,532
116. Southwest Rural H.S.D. No. 29, Atascosa	21,383	241,317
117. East Central Rural H.S.D. No. 20, San Antonio	16,404	308,161
118. Schertz-Cibolo C.S.D. No. 29, Schertz	68,965	275,800
119. Lake View I.S.D., San Angelo	5,795	558,000
120. Gatesville I.S.D.	43,579	316,931
121. Joshua I.S.D.	5,549	126,715
124. Poolville I.S.D.	2,203	64,500
125. Peaster I.S.D.	2,285	60,250
126. San Antonio I.S.D.	1,101,884	15,839,878
127. Alvarado I.S.D.	9,385	188,500
128. Godley I.S.D.	2,530	73,025
129. Burleson I.S.D.	12,324	185,277
130. Grandview I.S.D.	2,530	120,400
131. Rio Vista I.S.D.	[2]	
132. New Braunfels I.S.D.	37,542	627,595
133. Boerne Co. Line I.S.D.	11,181	245,789
134. Northeast I.S.D., San Antonio	228,767	2,917,362
202. Randolph Field I.S.D., Randolph AFB	280,650	371,053
203. Lackland I.S.D., Lackland AFB	159,000	212,957
206. Garner C.S.D. No. 83	1,232	21,096
207. Wampler S.D., Weatherford	816	17,083
209. Grapevine I.S.D.	4,978	315,932
212. San Vicente C.S.D. No. 2, Big Bend National Park	4,226	9,269
213. Cleburne I.S.D.	11,507	728,245
TEXAS—continued		
216. Kyle I.S.D.	$1,551	$121,376
217. Tolar I.S.D.	1,877	64,376
219. Pyote I.S.D.	7,670	122,870
220. Copperas Cove I.S.D.	62,190	220,380
221. Kingsville I.S.D.	77,363	1,421,862
222. Millsap I.S.D.	5,060	110,000
223. Seguin I.S.D.	30,279	913,219
224. Flat I.S.D. No. 911	3,020	46,003
226. Reno C.S.D. No. 78, Azle	1,479	14,408
227. Connelly Cons. I.S.D., Waco	80,472	332,430
230. Rendon C.S.D. No. 68, Fort Worth	3,019	39,071
231. Carroll C.S.D. No. 99, Fort Worth	1,550	41,431
233. Carleyville C.S.D. No. 28, Fort Worth	4,325	39,275
238. San Marcos I.S.D.	18,281	802,245
239. Glen Rose I.S.D.	8,672	135,204
240. Bonham I.S.D.	11,589	460,734
241. LaVega I.S.D., Waco	40,154	854,779
243. Natalia I.S.D.	13,629	149,474
247. Celina I.S.D. No. 903	1,224	130,016
248. Duncanville I.S.D.	14,445	324,703
253. Lockhart I.S.D.	6,203	489,629
254. Somerset I.S.D.	10,038	105,000
255. Northwest I.S.D., Justin	5,223	246,935
256. Big Spring I.S.D.	143,071	1,872,699
258. West Oso I.S.D., Corpus Christi	3,835	483,712
259. Del Rio I.S.D.	138,092	890,641
401. Fort Sam Houston I.S.D.	308,700	413,633
402. Daingerfield I.S.D.	7,908	539,125
403. Floresville I.S.D.	9,304	322,482
404. Stockdale I.S.D.	2,285	141,000
405. Whitt I.S.D.	1,224	11,386
409. Laredo I.S.D.	120,463	2,195,037
410. Tioga I.S.D.	1,350	57,251
419. Crowley I.S.D. No. 62, Fort Worth	1,958	48,898
422. Potter County Cons. S.D. No. 4, Amarillo	64,965	103,997
423. Harlingen Cons. I.S.D.	86,920	2,111,863
424. Evant I.S.D.	1,958	90,523
426. Waco I.S.D.	129,523	4,899,116
427. Boyd I.S.D.	5,142	146,973
428. Alvord I.S.D.	1,142	109,489
429. Decatur I.S.D.	4,407	260,627
431. Salado I.S.D. No. 908	3,019	75,341
432. Moody I.S.D.	2,693	184,254
434. Shady Grove C.S.D. No. 3, Grand Prairie	1,224	49,430
435. Wilmer-Hutchins I.S.D., Hutchins	5,876	547,786
436. Princeton I.S.D.	2,304	131,153
437. Paradise I.S.D.	2,121	82,528
440. Newark C.S.D. No. 53	2,285	40,887
441. San Felipe I.S.D., Del Rio	15,017	312,707
442. Lubbock I.S.D.	60,313	7,844,611
443. Lancaster I.S.D.	7,671	419,181
444. Bishop I.S.D.	4,815	391,587
447. Victoria I.S.D.	2,407	2,164,776
448. Poteet I.S.D.	8,488	235,604
450. Amarillo I.S.D.	240,682	7,156,193
452. Bridgeport I.S.D.	2,611	282,517
453. Hondo I.S.D.	4,243	274,000
454. McKinney I.S.D.	32,238	903,603
501. Cedar Hill I.S.D.	6,284	139,742
502. Castroville I.S.D.	2,203	90,477
504. Sherman I.S.D. No. 906	73,698	1,433,440
509. De Soto I.S.D.	3,346	137,061
511. La Vernia I.S.D.	1,795	80,000
516. Tye I.S.D., Abilene	6,447	35,984
601. Melissa Rural H.S.D. No. 708	1,632	48,906
602. River Road I.S.D., Amarillo	3,182	88,818
605. Denison I.S.D.	43,014	1,240,000
607. Beeville I.S.D.	63,170	888,611
610. Oglesby I.S.D.	1,306	60,190
612. Hurst-Euless I.S.D., Hurst	45,704	912,506
701. Midway I.S.D., Waco	3,672	151,089
702. Liberty-Eylau Rural H.S.D. No. 36, Texarkana	13,568	306,000
704. Skidmore-Tynan Rural H.S.D. No. 36, Skidmore	2,204	162,000
705. McAllen I.S.D.	26,116	1,891,755
706. Kempner C.S.D. No. 4	2,121	10,172
707. Petrolia I.S.D.	3,591	98,363
708. Byers I.S.D.	2,366	80,729
709. Hughes Springs I.S.D.	4,162	209,138
710. Northside I.S.D., San Antonio	92,061	770,448
711. Prosper I.S.D. No. 912	1,061	97,791
713. Pilot Point I.S.D.	1,713	149,200
714. Kerrville I.S.D.	21,219	617,643
715. Abilene I.S.D.	283,856	4,139,835
716. Golden Rule I.S.D., Denison	4,570	88,000
718. Red Oak I.S.D.	1,306	41,998
719. Robstown I.S.D.	5,060	742,993
721. Rio Hondo I.S.D.	5,618	295,849
801. Mission I.S.D.	15,507	828,710
802. Wylie C.S.D. No. 11, Abilene	979	121,233
803. Florence I.S.D.	6,610	85,000
805. Robinson I.S.D., Waco	2,774	51,845
809. Edinburg Cons. I.S.D.	23,831	1,778,748
810. Merkel I.S.D.	3,672	245,543
812. Ponder I.S.D.	[2]	
814. Savoy I.S.D.	1,796	67,313
815. Coahoma I.S.D.	4,407	263,472
816. Clyde I.S.D.	[2]	
817. Hubbard I.S.D.	2,530	155,108
818. Adamsville C.S.D., Lampasas	1,142	14,665
819. Bartlett I.S.D.	2,448	170,000

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Public Law 874: Net entitlement and current expenditures of applicants, fiscal year 1960*—Continued

Project number and local education agency	Net entitlement under Public Law 874,[1]	Total current expenditures
(1)	(2)	(3)
TEXAS—continued		
820. Los Fresnos I.S.D.	$5,549	$280,095
821. Stanton I.S.D.	3,999	282,359
822. Anthony I.S.D. No. 906	9,386	162,899
824. Tuloso-Midway I.S.D., Corpus Christi	[2]	
825. Anna I.S.D. No. 902	1,143	69,081
827. Blum I.S.D.	897	68,465
828. Santo I.S.D.	1,632	69,834
829. Whitney I.S.D.	2,448	129,632
830. Pottsboro C.S.D.	7,916	49,485
831. Lewisville I.S.D.	3,019	270,521
832. Valley Mills I.S.D.	2,285	109,000
833. Progress C.S.D. No. 11, Palo Pinto	1,143	15,343
902. Comfort County Line I.S.D., Comfort	2,366	150,859
903. Mesquite I.S.D.	3,591	1,162,935
905. Lipan I.S.D.	[2]	
906. Brackett I.S.D., Brackettville	2,530	142,033
907. Claude I.S.D.	3,182	156,555
908. Academy I.S.D., Temple	2,285	126,308
909. San Benito Cons. I.S.D.	14,609	1,056,496
910. Denton I.S.D.	20,893	1,301,120
911. Nolanville C.S.D. No. 50	4,570	30,781
912. Axtell Rural H.S.D.	1,632	77,367
913. Van Alstyne I.S.D.	2,612	118,443
1001. Comal County Rural H.S.D., New Braunfels	5,713	325,502
1002. Buffalo Gap C.S.D. No. 9	[2]	
1003. Shallowater I.S.D.	3,264	163,478
1004. Arlington I.S.D.	208,363	2,608,870
1005. Alamo Hts. I.S.D., San Antonio	56,559	1,457,549
1006. Marfa I.S.D.	2,775	294,889
1007. Troy I.S.D.	$1,796	$115,563
1008. Holland I.S.D.	1,142	102,292
1009. Gregory-Portland Cons. I.S.D., Gregory	1,550	554,870
1010. Bandera I.S.D.	1,061	148,814
1011. Marion Rural H.S.D.	5,468	80,268
1012. Douglasville Rural H.S.D.	4,815	77,646
1013. Corpus Christi Cons. I.S.D.	147,559	9,887,285
1014. Rogers Cons. I.S.D.	2,367	173,184
1015. Eagle Mountain-Saginaw I.S.D.	12,895	198,276
1016. Linden-Kildare Cons. I.S.D.	6,366	535,511
1017. Judson Rural H.S.D. No. 8, Converse	9,059	111,234
1019. Elbow Cons. C.S.D. No. 10, Big Spring	4,162	60,062
1020. Canutillo I.S.D.	2,285	133,300
1021. Groom Cons. I.S.D.	1,224	103,836
1022. Marshall I.S.D. No. 102-902	39,828	1,237,039
1024. China Spring Rural H.S.D.	2,774	96,371
1101. Canyon I.S.D.	3,591	470,934
1102. Webb C.S.D. No. 79, Fort Worth	[2]	
1103. City View C.S.D. No. 8, Wichita Falls	2,774	40,206
1104. Aransas County I.S.D., Rockport	[2]	
1105. Center Point C.S.D. No. 7, Big Spring	1,068	24,617
1106. Briggs I.S.D.	1,877	35,000
1107. McQueeney C.S.D. No. 25	1,714	76,635
1108. San Elizardo I.S.D.	3,591	55,114
1109. Mount Calm I.S.D.	[2]	
1110. Zapata County I.S.D.	[2]	
Total	10,754,929	188,459,007

[1] May be changed on basis of additional information.

[2] No net entitlement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the second point I wish to stress is that under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, Federal aid is being given to one-third of the schoolchildren of the Nation. Yet, we have heard some Senators support these two public laws—and this is a paradox—who profess to be against Federal aid to education. But simply mention touching Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, and watch Senators parade before the committee—and I welcomed them with open arms—crying, "Do not touch Public Laws 815 and 874." Why? Because the school districts in their States are the direct beneficiaries of the Federal aid money which goes into those districts, without the slightest control of a single one of the schoolrooms in those buildings.

I hope I may be pardoned if I say that I am not deeply moved by some of the arguments made this afternoon about the great specter of Uncle Sam about to move in on the little schoolchildren of America and proceed to dictate their educational destiny. There is simply no basis in fact for that. The Federal Government has been pouring millions upon millions of dollars into the school system of the country for many years. Yet there has not been a particle of evidence offered on the floor of the Senate, in a single one of our debates on Federal aid to education from year to year, to give any substance at all to the argument of fear, to the appeal to emotion, that if Federal aid to education is provided, aid which will benefit the Nation's children, it will subject them, according to what was said by implication this afternoon, to some form of totalitarianism in the United States.

I say good naturedly and respectfully, with some humor in my voice, that that is a lot of hogwash. It is simply not borne out anywhere in the evidence.

I repeat again, and I shall then be through with my answer to the Senator from Texas, I do not want any Senator, during the days of this debate, to forget about the rights and the future of the boys and girls for whom I am pleading. My plea is for them.

We have brought to the Senate from the committee, by a vote of 12 to 2, a bill which we believe to be fair, equitable, and just; we believe it will meet the need in our country to strengthen the greatest defense weapon that is available to us, one which is more important than jet bombers or missile pads or all our other preparations for the destruction of humanity—namely, the great defense weapon which, after all, is the potential intellectual power of the young people of the Nation, because we must rely upon the maximum possible development of their intellectual power; in my opinion, that constitutes the only hope for the survival of our Republic.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, let me thank the Senator from Oregon for, and compliment him on, his reply to the Senator from Texas.

I was very much interested in what the Senator from Oregon had to say about Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. During the presentation the Senator from Oregon made, I said privately to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], that I remember that when I was privileged to serve on that committee, in the 81st Congress, we held hearings on what now are known as Public Laws 815 and 874. One of those laws calls for assistance by the Federal Government in connection with the maintenance and operation of schools in areas in which there are Federal activities; and the other law calls for Federal aid for school construction. It was my privilege to handle the school construction bill; and the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. HILL]—who at that time served under the chairmanship of our late and beloved friend, Senator James Murray, of Montana—was the author and the chief proponent of the maintenance and operation law. Both of those laws have now been on the statute books for 10 years.

I have in my office—and it is one of my proudest possessions in the course of my public life—the pen which was used by President Truman to sign what is now Public Law 874.

I have not heard a single complaint from anyone, anywhere, to the effect that the powerful, strong arm of the Federal Government was interfering in local school matters, even though approximately $2 billion of Federal revenues have been utilized in connection with Public Laws 815 and 874—a total of approximately $2 billion.

Mr. MORSE. Let me state for the record the exact amounts. But, first, I wish to express my appreciation of the Senator's support and also my appreciation of the very important argument he has made just now in support of the bill. I also wish to compliment him and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for their great leadership 10 years ago, when Public Laws 815 and 874 were passed. The Senator knows that I

joined them then, as one of the cosponsors of those measures.

Let me point out that at that time, in the course of the debate on those measures, we heard many of the same arguments that we hear now. In fact, at the present time, when one enters the Chamber and hears some of the current debate, he can almost say, "This is where I came in, 10 years ago." In other words, Mr. President, although today few would question the wisdom of either Public Law 815 or Public Law 874 now, 10 years ago, when those measures were under consideration here, prior to their enactment into law, there were Members who argued that they should not be enacted; they argued that their enactment would result in interference by the Federal Government with the programs of the States.

Mr. President, I do not propose to let the opponents of Federal aid to education "get off the hook," so far as that situation is concerned. Certainly, many of those who now oppose Senate bill 1021 were definitely opposed, 10 years ago, to the enactment of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. Yet today no one would be able to persuade them to vote against those public laws; they are too good politicians to do that.

But today we find that we are unable to persuade them to favor the enactment into law, in connection with the pending measure, of the same protections which the Senate voted in connection with those measures. Thus it is that they attempt to scare us when we attempt to provide this aid for the benefit of the education of the boys and girls of the country.

Well, Mr. President, I do not scare very easily.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that is a masterpiece of understatement. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a moment ago I said that I wished to state for the record the exact amounts of the Federal funds provided to the States in connection with Public Law 815 and Public Law 874.

In connection with Public Law 874, the Federal Government has provided to the States, in 10 years, $962,212,788—practically $1 billion. Mr. President, can anyone show me a list of Senators who wish to have that law repealed?

In connection with Public Law 815, the Federal Government has provided to the States, and they have spent, $962,585,000, in Federal aid to education. Can anyone show me a list of Senators who wish to have repealed the measure which provides that amount of aid for the education of the young people of the country? If there is such a list, I shall immedately pass it on to the people of the country.

Today, we are proposing this Federal aid; it is proposed on the basis of the vital statistics I presented to the Senate yesterday. I have yet to hear one word of rebuttal of that statement, or one word of argument to the effect that such a need does not exist, or one word of argument to the effect that the Congress and the taxpayers of the country should stop wasting money by having it used for the development of the maximum intellectual potential of the young people of the country, or one word of argument that these expenditures constitute a shameful waste.

Mr. President, in the course of this debate, I do not intend to be diverted from the mainstream; I will not permit myself to be taken up the tributaries; I will not permit my canoe to be taken into the rapids, and capsized. I intend to remain in the mainstream, because when we stay in the mainstream, I know we shall finally do justice to the young people of the Nation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When the Senator from Oregon stays in the mainstream with his canoe—which makes one yearn for the great outdoors—will he place along the banks of that stream signs which will show clearly how many hundreds of thousands of dollars this State, that State, and the other State—States A, B, C, D, and E—have received under Public Laws 815 and 874? In addition, we might suggest that any Senators who are afraid of the possibility of Federal control can introduce a bill which will provide that their States shall be excluded from receiving such aid, because of their fear that the strong arm of the Federal Government will interfere with the education of their young people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with that request, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the tables which are included in the Tenth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. They show the contributions which have been made by way of Federal aid to education, to each State of the Nation, during the last 10 years, under Public Laws 815 and 874.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 9.—*State summary of net entitlements of local educational agencies, Public Law 874 (81st Cong.), as amended, fiscal years 1951 through 1960*

State	Net entitlement by fiscal year—										Total
	1951 [1]	1952	1953	1954	1955 [2]	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960 [3]	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
Alabama	$379,930	$695,560	$792,433	$959,849	$856,785	$1,003,506	$2,812,647	$3,087,346	$3,591,004	$4,099,094	$18,368,154
Alaska	104,689	338,416	420,653	1,839,563	2,201,546	2,977,131	3,422,818	3,919,086	4,857,235	5,900,890	25,982,027
Arizona	318,343	496,521	563,760	574,245	703,612	984,783	1,511,829	1,777,662	3,528,115	4,210,008	14,668,878
Arkansas	825,683	813,614	736,814	641,110	514,490	622,594	886,850	795,248	894,517	902,229	7,633,149
California	6,729,195	9,772,554	10,462,976	12,966,820	13,580,814	14,738,952	18,221,657	20,270,141	26,611,663	31,255,873	164,610,645
Colorado	638,563	1,246,900	1,469,400	1,629,170	1,716,239	2,153,768	2,701,452	3,142,123	4,209,629	4,984,047	23,891,291
Connecticut	433,497	612,781	917,350	1,317,256	1,278,326	1,197,993	1,353,270	1,090,231	1,485,200	1,632,548	11,318,452
Delaware	155			18,644	19,416	48,175	132,806	168,882	181,826	209,952	779,856
Florida	471,089	791,406	1,156,636	1,509,102	1,368,370	1,821,277	2,990,146	3,500,099	4,169,476	4,794,256	22,571,857
Georgia	2,361,228	2,532,196	2,358,738	2,086,145	1,555,165	1,770,026	3,615,124	3,699,104	3,989,099	4,701,881	28,668,706
Hawaii	425,018	761,059	956,703	1,072,150	1,080,090	1,272,274	1,658,274	1,927,944	2,900,993	3,996,866	16,051,371
Idaho	189,533	228,300	334,964	411,891	364,115	434,561	604,106	742,138	1,165,642	1,319,398	5,794,648
Illinois	872,532	1,124,532	1,399,181	1,608,070	1,705,459	1,948,610	2,285,810	2,275,616	2,512,990	3,021,474	18,754,274
Indiana	340,827	545,811	712,705	853,103	858,751	725,726	767,460	675,039	726,948	872,296	7,078,666
Iowa	79,496	166,225	177,325	278,469	304,157	216,796	338,709	312,214	403,276	651,965	2,928,632
Kansas	967,454	1,953,639	2,474,243	2,804,405	3,038,190	3,242,430	3,170,594	3,423,524	3,979,442	4,389,280	29,443,201
Kentucky	382,929	869,435	1,032,579	753,909	851,721	607,223	873,686	892,691	1,013,008	1,151,529	8,428,710
Louisiana		177,309	252,539	495,416	431,599	405,771	799,203	824,043	903,544	772,760	5,062,184
Maine	130,262	231,319	293,271	433,632	577,673	656,382	777,173	918,627	1,254,913	1,560,356	6,833,608
Maryland	528,243	782,228	1,167,216	1,642,037	2,811,488	3,463,413	4,700,726	5,069,869	6,011,590	7,425,176	33,601,986
Massachusetts	290,858	439,129	564,776	755,881	938,899	1,083,559	2,028,915	2,897,066	4,063,008	5,254,577	18,316,668
Michigan	1,223,879	1,029,882	970,797	1,302,873	915,686	427,313	386,643	482,065	738,405	958,506	8,436,049
Minnesota	23,207	43,311	69,866	122,177	122,382	100,370	95,798	98,184	370,696	400,310	1,446,296
Mississippi	259,198	410,003	468,133	517,184	419,288	432,221	658,878	868,614	1,168,061	1,279,587	6,481,167
Missouri	292,266	391,597	733,617	1,072,699	905,024	984,705	1,097,221	1,433,309	1,867,475	2,202,794	10,980,707
Montana	153,972	195,205	204,886	279,683	251,267	244,097	422,186	490,658	1,054,891	1,420,977	4,717,832
Nebraska	243,444	528,818	694,584	817,440	883,155	951,462	970,055	1,001,070	1,424,689	1,764,507	9,289,215
Nevada	169,034	366,693	500,704	545,071	526,394	615,176	623,605	677,412	1,033,546	1,150,988	6,208,623
New Hampshire	172,313	73,612	324,059	355,187	370,549	411,955	467,683	542,294	811,069	1,044,148	4,573,010
New Jersey	172,420	564,398	824,503	1,074,468	1,157,109	1,429,868	1,596,136	1,830,745	2,412,335	3,423,040	14,485,022

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 9.—*State summary of net entitlements of local educational agencies, Public Law 874 (81st Cong.), as amended, fiscal years 1951 through 1960*—Continued

State	Net entitlement by fiscal year—										Total
	1951 [1]	1952	1953	1954	1955 [2]	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960 [3]	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
New Mexico	$257,458	$316,789	$714,823	$1,118,379	$1,132,601	$1,429,583	$1,991,537	$2,352,196	$3,681,283	$4,137,725	$17,132,374
New York	150,935	472,120	1,235,329	1,738,007	1,626,295	1,934,785	2,329,486	2,596,009	3,631,846	4,789,979	20,504,791
North Carolina	116,214	183,496	273,271	467,444	494,052	510,129	1,204,914	1,318,183	1,656,448	2,134,373	8,358,524
North Dakota	1,797	129,725	144,513	184,365	170,309	200,902	172,175	175,850	263,706	376,659	1,820,001
Ohio	989,006	1,453,698	1,919,414	2,690,231	2,814,152	3,122,014	3,249,764	3,208,959	3,807,799	4,353,400	27,608,437
Oklahoma	1,196,198	1,571,275	2,181,434	2,793,250	2,802,876	3,322,825	4,285,764	4,575,770	5,637,845	6,498,647	34,865,884
Oregon	213,827	344,887	268,012	286,588	432,571	624,172	790,463	734,262	790,517	834,831	5,320,130
Pennsylvania	391,863	612,271	866,526	1,155,758	1,098,528	1,304,179	1,557,828	1,620,098	3,822,384	4,525,090	16,954,525
Rhode Island	256,919	381,104	475,510	559,027	630,908	802,769	1,127,263	1,194,812	1,366,700	1,581,836	8,376,848
South Carolina	232,321	495,205	928,913	920,621	893,804	852,713	1,963,319	2,166,854	2,437,919	2,989,847	13,881,666
South Dakota	114,669	388,606	434,589	488,973	641,684	824,446	998,012	1,128,198	1,592,556	1,744,166	8,355,899
Tennessee	195,862	204,170	289,133	652,406	847,372	972,964	1,372,696	1,402,887	1,673,974	1,962,767	9,574,231
Texas	2,112,238	4,293,995	4,277,723	4,952,728	4,606,046	5,306,915	7,531,865	8,337,379	9,565,999	10,754,929	61,739,817
Utah	462,054	547,482	652,542	697,177	719,953	780,574	1,131,263	1,189,348	1,390,797	1,651,421	9,222,611
Vermont	16,443	32,390	43,091	51,150	43,087	44,815	57,701	56,308	71,920	73,868	490,773
Virginia	1,895,311	2,936,658	4,210,832	5,434,267	6,372,227	7,064,353	8,715,251	9,462,484	10,699,580	12,867,425	69,658,368
Washington	1,638,104	2,232,746	2,439,589	3,553,832	3,282,358	4,067,307	4,487,115	5,008,943	6,509,262	7,458,871	40,678,127
West Virginia	18,547	28,500	27,841	36,719	67,256	83,976	144,153	142,348	114,556	104,396	768,292
Wisconsin	63,506	100,686	180,357	372,189	405,595	318,265	314,272	239,000	512,228	570,359	3,076,457
Wyoming	108,489	117,692	2,049	180,372	217,037	237,671	326,491	387,874	450,100	657,911	2,685,686
Guam							333,758	450,458	600,980	659,348	2,044,544
Virgin Islands									43,221	77,430	120,651
Federal agencies [4]	75,000	2,788,134	3,095,690	2,788,955	3,670,283	4,797,499	5,268,394	5,682,664	7,249,346	9,191,907	44,607,872
Total	29,686,018	47,814,282	57,696,592	71,860,087	75,276,843	85,664,973	111,324,889	122,263,928	156,915,213	186,748,487	945,251,312

[1] Payments prorated at 96 percent for fiscal year 1951.
[2] Payments prorated at 99.5 percent for fiscal year 1955.
[3] May be changed on basis of additional information.
[4] Payments to other Federal agencies for sec. 6 and subsec. 8(a) at 100 percent.

TABLE 13.—*State summary of Federal funds reserved, for local educational agencies, by section of Public Law 815, as amended*

[Funds reserved for construction of school facilities, fiscal years 1951 through 1960, as of Sept. 30, 1960]

State	Sec. 202, Public Law 815	Sec. 305				Sec. 5, Public Law 85-620	Secs. 401 and 14	Total funds reserved
		Public Law 246	Public Law 731	Public Law 949	Public Law 85-267			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alabama	$9,036,675	$3,071,099	[1] $1,583,650	[1] $2,002,023	[1] $1,662,270	[1] $1,721,450		[1] $19,077,167
Alaska	2,934,392	1,141,500	1,093,750	2,443,201	522,396	2,242,417	$233,525	10,611,181
Arizona	11,104,181	932,881	688,400	1,519,263	[2] 1,230,431	[1] [2] 1,116,603	7,296,450	[1] [2] 23,888,209
Arkansas	8,101,981	637,200	[2] 1,944,974	1,439,274		[2] 1,930,811		[1] 14,054,240
California	[3] [4] 59,281,237	13,523,607	16,659,894	[2] 21,419,276	10,567,358	20,949,056	627,155	[1] [3] [4] 143,027,583
Colorado	6,658,074	989,389	3,132,415	[1] 2,832,132	[2] 2,955,179	[1] 1,137,720	226,400	[1] 17,931,309
Connecticut	3,566,699	2,008,686	754,043	1,492,642	282,590	1,327,884		9,432,544
Delaware		205,220	100,100					305,320
Florida	7,620,698	2,500,116	3,023,775	4,571,378	3,877,177	1,593,438		23,186,582
Georgia	[3] 17,821,610	4,809,053	[1] 3,230,625	2,335,949	546,750	[1] 2,615,406		[1] [3] 31,359,393
Hawaii	4,459,537	1,503,936	2,496,796	1,475,460	3,902,078	5,230,409		19,077,216
Idaho	[3] 2,937,929	[3] 177,664	341,705	[3] 722,150	[3] 401,148	639,701	1,026,763	[3] [5] 6,247,060
Illinois	7,878,304	926,263	1,510,134	954,135	2,331,652	134,528		13,735,016
Indiana	3,544,037	1,729,294	144,420	[1] 1,369,887	[1] 558,320	[1] 1,688,052		[1] 9,034,010
Iowa	1,616,278	66,939	69,183			508,484		2,260,884
Kansas	5,564,078	1,746,944	2,149,645	1,908,330	856,759	2,033,877		14,259,633
Kentucky	[3] [4] 4,854,838	506,044	293,000	227,850		216,910		[3] [4] 6,098,642
Louisiana	3,942,433	405,107		[1] 2,119,946		405,383		[1] 6,932,869
Maine	1,112,408	698,546	111,830	93,420	185,872	837,088		3,039,164
Maryland	15,647,924	9,237,824	6,815,544	4,915,620	3,986,855	7,888,810		48,492,577
Massachusetts	255,383	495,000	856,657	546,402	369,800	956,705		3,479,947
Michigan	14,254,079	7,568,951	[1] 7,978,702	[1] 6,141,151	719,798	[1] 4,584,832		[1] 41,247,513
Minnesota	730,938	115,290		[1] 242,235	212,040	37,620	2,448,833	[1] 3,786,956
Mississippi	3,739,683	462,945	64,349	1,054,972	479,419	1,346,601		7,147,969
Missouri	5,488,232	2,621,998	[2] 2,090,227	[1] 1,609,256	[1] 1,596,735	1,024,715		[1] [2] 14,431,163
Montana	1,629,318	237,342	[3] 33,780	279,905	67,408	1,842,374	3,401,834	[3] 7,491,961
Nebraska	1,433,134	326,203	766,257	529,738	724,893	1,733,559	187,660	5,701,444
Nevada	[2] 2,927,152	[2] 1,031,864	148,679	827,987		435,551	692,036	[2] [5] 6,063,269
New Hampshire	153,507	117,130	93,810	145,260		315,380		825,087
New Jersey	2,716,955	1,176,564	1,764,100	777,313	1,167,075	1,765,408		9,367,415
New Mexico	7,559,168	1,977,566	[1] 2,660,522	[1] 3,957,007	2,980,705	[1] 3,827,392	12,077,829	[1] 35,040,189
New York	6,062,116	4,436,740	1,435,735	213,009	494,802	2,654,988		15,297,390
North Carolina	5,188,272	582,300	590,400	2,083,073	270,765	1,569,374		10,284,184
North Dakota	226,970			197,749	1,079,985	1,301,391	278,483	3,084,578
Ohio	9,124,253	[1] [3] 7,856,253	1,708,645	1,435,808	933,759	1,025,741	338,203	[1] [2] 23,022,662
Oklahoma	7,995,738	[1] 4,296,893	[1] 2,429,266	[1] 1,412,647	1,603,868	[1] 4,475,192	4,261,030	[1] 26,474,634
Oregon	1,883,858	[3] 271,389	528,650	420,925		[2] 730,331	212,000	[2] 4,047,153
Pennsylvania	3,518,211	573,899	255,577	142,200		16,100		4,505,987
Rhode Island	719,321	1,032,673	765,043	483,912		444,456		3,445,405
South Carolina	[3] [4] 9,996,243	702,466	830,333	1,247,902	1,829,483	1,124,993		[3] [4] 15,731,420
South Dakota	560,628	407,101	[1] 770,483	[1] 496,051	871,245	[1] 1,342,261	291,891	[1] 4,739,660
Tennessee	5,350,865	921,206	1,783,035	396,515	186,280	258,680		8,896,581
Texas	[4] 24,133,655	[1] 4,771,909	[1] 7,697,910	[1] 5,008,895	[1] 5,143,110	[1] 6,695,452	18,000	[1] [4] 53,468,931
Utah	4,886,898	780,753	894,192	1,091,671	185,586	1,144,624	180,000	9,163,724
Vermont	185,110							185,110
Virginia	25,290,033	9,545,408	9,191,989	6,569,754	3,380,818	7,202,562		61,189,564
Washington	25,930,675	[3] 3,878,543	[2] 1,780,655	3,293,350	1,464,502	1,589,413	955,432	[3] 38,898,570
West Virginia			145,008			23,140		168,148

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 13.—*State summary of Federal funds reserved, for local educational agencies, by section of Public Law 815, as amended*—Continued

[Funds reserved for construction of school facilities, fiscal years 1951 through 1960, as of Sept. 30, 1960]

State	Sec. 202, Public Law 815	Sec. 305				Sec. 5, Public Law 85-620	Secs. 401 and 14	Total funds reserved
		Public Law 246	Public Law 731	Public Law 949	Public Law 85-267			
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Wisconsin	$239,352	$100,200				$32,250	$1,008,275	$1,380,077
Wyoming	45,352	43,450	$95,607	$180,351	$55,650	266,478	1,177,350	1,864,238
Guam					680,466	1,068,496	1,069,411	2,818,373
Puerto Rico		89,674						89,674
Virgin Islands								
Total	[3 4] 349,914,412	[1 5] 103,299,022	[1 3] 93,503,494	[1 3] 94,626,974	[1 3] 60,374,027	[1 3] 105,663,086	38,008,560	[5] 845,389,575

[1] Includes the following amounts approved under sec. 8: Alabama, $101,800 under Public Law 731, $5,000 under Public Law 949, $74,625 under Public Law 85-267, and $112,497 under Public Law 85-620; Arizona, $56,445; Arkansas, $708,824 under Public Law 731 and $382,372 under Public Law 85-620; California, $443,171; Colorado, $192,000 under Public Law 949, $145,939 under Public Law 85-267 and $134,540 under Public Law 85-620; Georgia, $531,147 under Public Law 731 and $260,100 under Public Law 85-620; Indiana, $152,812 under Public Law 949, $169,327 under Public Law 85-267 and $341,850 under Public Law 85-620; Louisiana, $84,599; Michigan, $369,110 under Public Law 731, $80,524 under Public Law 949 and $188,496 under Public Law 85-620; Minnesota, $25,097; Missouri, $50,060 under Public Law 949 and $133,870 under Public Law 85-267; New Mexico, $124,710 under Public Law 731, $744,478 under Public Law 949 and $268,300 under Public Law 85-620; Ohio, $466,115; Oklahoma, $586,079 under Public Law 246, $490,400 under Public Law 731, $474,500 under Public Law 949 and $765,061 under Public Law 85-620; South Dakota, $94,894 under Public Law 731, $61,723 under Public Law 949 and $5,661 under Public Law 85-620; Texas, $210,585 under Public Law 246, $572,196 under Public Law 731, $486,250 under Public Law 949, $351,680 under Public Law 85-267 and $482,186 under Public Law 85-620; total col. (3), $1,262,779; total col. (4), $2,993,081; total col. (5), $2,800,214; total col. (6), $875,441; total col. (7), $2,997,508.

[2] Includes the following amounts approved under sec 9: Arizona, $170,930 under Public Law 85-267 and $350,025 under Public Law 85-620; Idaho, $65,164 under Public Law 246, $261,550 under Public Law 949 and $94,520 under Public Law 85-267; Missouri, $202,990; Montana, $20,000; Nevada, $13,910; Ohio, $797,919; Oregon, $157,192 under Public Law 246 and $156,600 under Public Law 85-620; Washington, $298,311 under Public Law 246 and $125,080 under Public Law 731; total col. (3), $1,332,496; total col. (4), $348,070; total col. (5), $261,550; total col. (6), $265,450; total col. (7), $506,625.

[3] Includes the following amounts approved under sec. 203: California, $175,570; Georgia, $292,540; Idaho, $132,376; Kentucky, $828,311; Nevada, $41,010; South Carolina, $2,872,929; total, $4,342,736.

[4] Includes the following amounts approved under sec. 209(c): California, $121,120; Kentucky, $576,602; South Carolina, $15,651; Texas, $2,016; total; $715,389.

[5] Includes $4,342,736 approved under sec. 203; $715,389 under sec. 209(c); $10,929,023 under sec 8; $2,714,191 under sec. 9.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield once more to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. On Monday of this week, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] and I and two Members of the House of Representatives—Representative ELLSWORTH and Representative KARTH—visited the submarine base at New London, Conn. We wished to examine one of the nuclear submarines and one of the Polaris missile submarines. We saw them, and we went aboard them. We went to sea on one of the nuclear reactor, atomic submarines; and in it we went below the surface of the sea. We had an amazing experience.

My point is that when we talked with the officers of that submarine, we learned that the crews of these tremendously complicated and extremely expensive submarines are not only handpicked and very carefully selected; we also learned that as more and more equipment of that sort is produced, there will definitely be needed—according to the commanders of those submarines—a higher standard of education and a broader base of education in all the communities of the Nation.

One may put education on any level he wants to put it. I do not think we ought to justify a good educational program only on the basis of national defense; but if there ever was a case for education, it is in this age of the electronic computors, of jet aircraft and rockets, of the most technical and complicated economy this country has ever known, when we need highly educated people. Technicians and scientists are not made only at the upper level of education; the process starts at the elementary level. It starts in kindergarten and the first grade. It starts in the elementary and secondary schools. This is the weakness in our educational system. Our universities are well staffed, although many of them need to be expanded. We have a program for it. But the great need in education in America, as the Senator from Oregon has so rightly pointed out, as the champion of this cause, is in primary and secondary education.

I submit that any restrictions upon a bill which would impede the progress of education would not only stand in the way of the security of our country, but, as the Senator from Oregon has said, would deny the young people of America the opportunity which they justly deserve.

Yes, I do stand with the Senator from Oregon. I am happy to be a cosponsor of the bill. This is probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that will come before the Congress.

I ask any Senator to point out in what respect the GI bill was a failure. We poured money into the GI education bill. That bill has brought back to the American people billions of dollars in increased productivity, better homes, families that are better off, and a better America.

Mr. MORSE. It has more than paid for its cost.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Even in terms of revenues to the Federal Government. Look at the George-Barden Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, the Dean Act, the Morrill Act, the Land Grant College Act. There are 4 or 5. Every one of them involved Federal aid, and I have not heard a word said urging that such aid to vocational education should be done away with because it had been ground down by the heavy hand of the Federal Government. That argument is bunkum, and I think every American ought to know it.

I commend the Senator from Oregon. He does not scare easily. There may be some limitations the Senator from Oregon may have, but one of them is not that he becomes frightened. There is not one Senator who knows he is going to run away from an argument. In fact, it is nice to be on his side.

Mr. MORSE. I not only want to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution, but I want to supplement his reference to the GI bill. I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] in connection with the point raised by the Senator from Minnesota in regard to the GI bill. The Senator heard me say the evidence is that the GI bill has more than paid for its cost already. The Senator from Texas will bear me out, because he is the author of a bill which seeks to extend the GI rights to veterans presently coming out of the Service. I happen to be a cosponsor of that bill. I am a strong supporter of it. It is of deep regret to me that my administration has sent an adverse report on the bill. I make a plea now to the President of the United States that he take a personal look at it.

Once again he has been ill advised by some of his advisers who do not know what the facts are or what the true situation is. I can remember that when the President of the United States was a Senator from Massachusetts he was not an opponent of doing justice to the veterans of this country.

Let me say to the Senator from Texas about that GI bill, in my judgment, this is about the most democratic scholarship bill that can be offered. I am for scholarships, but here is really a democratic scholarship bill, because here is a bill that would make available to the young men, and in some instances the young women, coming out of the military service, the opportunity to go to college and complete their education. What do the figures of the Veterans' Administration show in regard to our experience under the GI bill? The administration prepared, as the Senator from Texas knows, and we had it as evidence in our hearings, an analysis of the income of the graduates who have been beneficiaries under the GI bill. The administration projected that income in relation to what the income in

all probability would have been if the veterans had not had a college education. We know there are statistical formulas that make a scientific conclusion.

It was found that the increase in income of these people as a result of their having gone to college and obtained college degrees had already returned to the Treasury of the United States increased tax dollars that more than paid for the cost of their education.

So let us put this question on a good business basis. If Senators believe in a strong economy in America, then they should provide for the expenditures of money to carry on the education of boys and girls beyond the point it would reach if the Federal aid funds were not provided, which would eventually pay back into the Treasury of the United States more than the cost of the Federal aid.

This is a matter of arithmetic with me, so make my plea for Federal aid not only on the basis of the security and defense of our country, but on the basis of a clear moral obligation we owe to the young people. I make it on the basis of sound economy, because I believe this bill is economically sound.

I apologize to the Senator for holding him so long. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield for a moment, in order that I may propound an inquiry to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to express my appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for the kind remarks he has made about me, but more for what he has said about the pending GI bill. As a coauthor of the bill now pending, and a strong believer in education of all types, at all levels, local, State, and National, and having worked with the distinguished Senator from Oregon in 1959, when the Senate passed the cold war GI bill by a vote of 57 to 31, I ask the Senator whether, as a result of his experience as chairman of the Education Subcommittee, he does not believe that all these bills will pay for themselves in the long run.

Mr. MORSE. That is the burden of my argument.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is it not a fact that the passage of the pending bill, the passage of the National Defense Education bill, and the passage of the other education bills, will in no substantial way lessen the need for the enactment of the cold war GI bill?

Mr. MORSE. The need will continue. I certainly hope we can change the recommendation of the administration. I have such confidence in my President that I am sure that if we could ever get his personal attention to the matter, just as if he were sitting with us once again as a Senator from Massachusetts, he would support what we are espousing.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Oregon for what he did last year in standing shoulder to shoulder with me in support of the cold war GI bill. Recommendation or no recommendation, we plan to continue the hearings and fight with all the resources at our command to write into law what I consider the most important legislative proposal pending before the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be with the Senator.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in regard to the economic value of legislation in the education field, table 19 on page 272 of the hearings, entitled: "Lifetime Income (Earnings) Based on Arithmetic Means for Males in Selected Age Groups, by Years of School Completed, for the United States, 1939, 1946, 1949, 1956, and 1958." It is interesting evidence in support of my argument made a few moments ago with respect to the sound economics of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 19.—*Lifetime income (earnings) based on arithmetic means for males in selected age groups, by years of school completed, for the United States, 1939, 1946, 1949, 1956, and 1958*

Years of school completed and age	1939 [1]	1946 [2]	1949 [3]	1956 [4]	1958 [5]
1	2	3	4	5	6
Income from age 18 to death:					
Elementary:					
Total	(5)	(5)	$113,330	$154,593	$154,114
Less than 8 years [4]	(5)	(5)	98,222	132,736	129,764
8 years	(5)	(5)	132,683	180,857	181,695
High school:					
1 to 3 years	(5)	(5)	152,008	205,277	211,103
4 years	(5)	(5)	185,279	253,631	257,557
College:					
1 to 3 years	(5)	(5)	209,282	291,581	315,504
4 years or more	(5)	(5)	296,377	405,606	435,242
Income from age 25 to death:					
Elementary:					
Total	(5)	$87,004	104,998	143,712	143,808
Less than 8 years [4]	(5)	74,369	91,095	123,205	120,965
8 years	(5)	98,702	122,787	168,004	169,976
High school:					
1 to 3 years	(5)	107,940	141,870	192,254	198,881
4 years	(5)	135,852	174,740	237,776	241,844
College:					
1 to 3 years	(5)	161,699	201,938	281,553	305,395
4 years or more	(5)	201,731	286,853	391,992	419,871
Income from age 18 to 64:					
Elementary:					
Total	$40,005	(5)	100,413	138,127	137,786
Less than 8 years [4]	(5)	(5)	86,912	117,930	115,418
8 years	(5)	(5)	116,968	161,124	161,643
High school:					
1 to 3 years	56,653	(5)	132,371	182,795	188,362
4 years	71,453	(5)	159,487	224,529	231,509
College:					
1 to 3 years	77,775	(5)	180,841	254,092	279,640
4 years or more	109,961	(5)	251,493	354,457	382,982
Income from age 25 to 64:					
Elementary:					
Total	37,172	74,071	91,932	127,047	127,286
Less than 8 years [4]	(5)	62,334	79,654	108,310	106,449
8 years	(5)	84,687	106,889	148,033	149,687
High school:					
1 to 3 years	53,011	92,044	121,943	169,501	175,779
4 years	67,383	114,023	148,649	208,322	215,487
College:					
1 to 3 years	73,655	138,871	173,166	243,611	269,105
4 years or more	104,608	168,983	241,427	340,131	366,990

[1] Restricted to persons reporting $1 or more of wage or salary income and less than $50 of other income for native whites and Negroes.
[2] Total money earnings.
[3] Total money income.
[4] Includes persons reporting no years of school completed, not shown separately.
[5] Not available.

Source: Miller, Herman P., "Annual and Lifetime Income in Relation to Education," American Economic Review 50, pp. 962-986, December 1960. Table 11, p. 981.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I now yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I enthusiastically agree on the need for the proposed legislation. I think the Senator from Oregon knows I favor it strongly.

I agree with what the Senator from Minnesota said, that there is no more important domestic legislation, in my opinion, to come before Congress than this bill. It is imperative that the bill before the Senate be passed. Whether my amendment is agreed to or not, I shall vote for the bill and shall vote for it happily. There is no question about the need involved. I reinforce what the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Minnesota have said about the need.

I recall to the memory of the Senator from Oregon what I said in the committee hearings; namely, that impressive statements in regard to national defense that I have heard made were made by Admiral Rickover when he appeared before the Committee on Appropriations to ask for funds for nuclear-powered submarines. He said, "Gentlemen, I cannot overemphasize the overwhelming importance of education. We must have better educated people to operate, as well as to produce, the new weapons we have, the submarines and the missiles and the rest. We are developing

a new technological society in which education is enormously important, not only for our national strength but also for our national defense and military strength."

One of the members of the committee asked the admiral:

Where would you get the money for this?

Admiral Rickover thought for a few seconds and then he said:

If I had to make a choice as to whether you should appropriate money for these weapons, to which I have devoted my life, or whether you should appropriate the money for education, I would say, "Give it to education."

Weapons become obsolete, but a trained, skilled, educated people is never obsolete.

I feel very strongly that the bill must be passed, but I invite the attention of the Senator from Oregon to something which he well knows, that there is a fear in the country that there will be Federal interference in regard to education. I invite attention to the fact that this is a new program. It is true that there has been Federal aid for education legislation passed back through the years as far as the Northwest Ordinance, before the Constitution was adopted. This pattern has run all the way through American history. One conservative President after another has asked for Federal aid to education, including President Grant, President Hayes, and President Garfield.

There is no question about the fact that this is a program in the American tradition, but it is something new. The bill will provide massive Federal aid to education at the primry and secondary level, including aid for teachers' salaries.

Therefore, I think it was wise for the committee to include what I am sure the Senator from Oregon supports, section 103, which specifies that there shall not be any Federal interference by any Federal official, department or agency with the school administration at the local level.

I wish to recall to the Senator's memory something he will no doubt remember. Long before I was a Senator, when I was sitting in the gallery listening to one of the eloquent speeches of the Senator from Oregon, I heard him say he agreed with the late Senator from Ohio, that if anybody could show him any way in which the proposed legislation could be made more restrictive, in the sense of preventing Federal interference he would accept it.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, with which I think the Senator from Oregon well knows I disagree, because of inequitable distribution impact, nevertheless does have an element of wisdom and strength, because it would provide that the funds to be returned to the States would be returned from tax moneys gathered in the States. Therefore, there would be a financial basis to provide a philosophical basis for resisting Federal encroachment.

I hope that when the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin comes before the Senate the Senator from Oregon will give consideration to taking it to conference, inasmuch as it would not disturb the substantive distribution and would not change the amounts. The amendment would provide a philosophical basis for resistance to Federal encroachment, and would comply with what the Senator from Oregon and the former Senator from Ohio said would assist the local authorities to resist Federal encroachment in the future.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin very much for the statement he has made. It is a distinct contribution to the debate.

I always feel sad when I cannot agree with my friend from Wisconsin. As the Senator knows, he appeared before our committee and made a very able presentation in support of his amendment. I studied it. I reached the conclusion I could not support the amendment. I shall oppose the amendment when the Senator offers it.

This only represents, however, an honest and sincere difference of opinion with the Senator from Wisconsin and in no way at all represents any feeling on my part that the Senator from Wisconsin is not as anxious as I am to do whatever is necessary to give protection to the boys and girls of the country, whose need I think represents the major premise of this whole debate.

Madam President, I am about to close my argument in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Texas. I shall close by speaking the words of a man of great memory in the Senate of the United States, because I feel that on May 4, 1949, the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Robert Taft, completely answered the argument of the Senator from Texas this afternoon and the argument of other Senators, who seem to feel that we can best handle the problem by a form of remission to the States of part of the moneys collected by the Federal Government from Federal income taxes.

The Senator from Wisconsin is quite correct in referring in the debate this afternoon to the position which I always took on this subject when Bob Taft was in the Senate. I was always one of the cosponsors of the Taft aid-to-education bills, in 1947 and 1949.

I now close my argument against the amendment of the Senator from Texas by letting Bob Taft speak on the subject once more in the Senate, this time through my lips.

On May 4, 1949, there was an amendment offered to a Federal aid-to-education bill by a Senator from Connecticut, which had the identical principle of Federal income tax remission as is contained in the amendment of the Senator from Texas, and which will be contained in amendments of other Senators to be subsequently offered. Mr. Taft said:

Mr. President, I have every sympathy with the purposes stated by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, but I think the method proposed by his amendment is no better than the method proposed by the bill.

His amendment certainly violates every principle of Federal finance. It is based on the supposition that in some way a State has some property right to the taxes collected from sources within its boundaries. If, for one moment, we admit such a principle, the entire Federal financial system will crash, because a State has no such interest. The place where tax moneys are collected has no relationship even to whether people living in that State pay the taxes. For instance, hundreds or thousands of people live in Connecticut and pay income taxes to the collector of taxes in Connecticut, but earn all their income in the State of New York. None of that money comes from Connecticut. There is no reason why Connecticut should be credited with that particular tax money, for it is not earned in Connecticut. Likewise, many corporations of tremendous size have their principal offices located in Connecticut, and other corporations have their principal offices located in New York. Certain other tremendously large corporations have their principal offices located in other States. Each of those corporations pays its income taxes at the place where its principal office is located, although in many cases the money on which those taxes are paid is earned in all the States of the Union. The fact that the money is collected in the State where the principal office of the corporation is located has no relationship whatever to the right of that particular State to those particular funds. Certainly we cannot for a moment recognize the right of a State to the tax funds collected in it, simply because that is the place where the taxes happen to be paid.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a small table showing the distinction in this case, for the States of North Carolina and Missouri.

Madam President, although the figures as of today would differ from those in the table, the principle that Senator Taft was talking about remains the same; and I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1948

	Missouri	North Carolina
Individual income taxes	$525,000,000	$228,000,000
Corporate income taxes	320,000,000	187,000,000
Total	845,000,000	415,000,000
Payroll taxes	78,000,000	34,000,000
Miscellaneous	190,000,000	788,000,000
Total	1,113,000,000	1,137,000,000

Mr. MORSE. The statement of Senator Taft continued:

Mr. President, the other day I referred to the State of North Carolina. In this connection, I might point out that North Carolina pays $228 million in individual income taxes, $187 million in corporation income taxes, $34 million in payroll taxes, and $788 million in excise taxes, but that money has no relationship at all to the State of North Carolina. Those taxes are paid entirely by people throughout the United States who buy the cigarettes on which the taxes are imposed. But it happens that the excise taxes of $788 million for North Carolina, more than all the other internal revenue taxes collected in the State of North Carolina—in fact, nearly twice as much as all the other taxes collected in the State of North Carolina—are from sources within the State.

The amendment recognizes some proprietary interest of the State in the money collected within the State. That simply is contrary to fact. The internal revenue taxes collected by the United States are collected, not from citizens of the States; they are collected from citizens of the United States.

They are collected from them because they are citizens of the United States. Where they earn the money, or whether the taxes are collected within the State, makes not the slightest difference. So the whole theory of the amendment, it seems to me, is based on an absolutely unsound fiscal principle.

The effect of the amendment may or may not be desirable. Personally, I do not think we should allocate the money in the way the amendment proposes. It is Federal money, as I have indicated; it is not State money. It is not the money of the citizens of the States. It has no relation whatever to the State, except that it happens to be collected by the Federal internal revenue collector stationed within the State. The suggestion is that, because of the assumption that the State has some proprietary interest in the money collected, it shall go to the State without any strings whatever, and therefore without any possible control. I say the assumption is wrong. If the Senator wishes to remove Federal control, then the bill should be amended simply to provide that, once the money is paid to the State, there shall be no check, no audit, or any other control imposed upon the State.

So far as I am concerned, Bob Taft made my argument against the amendment that later may be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and other Senators, bearing upon the proposal for income tax remission. He made the argument on May 4, 1949. In my judgment, it has stood ever since, unsuccessfully sought to be rebutted in every debate we have had on the subject of Federal aid to education. I am ready to vote on the amendment.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the Blakley amendment as follows:

On page 1, line 3, change the word "Five" to "Two" and insert the word "individual" before the word "Federal".

On page 1, line 10, change the figure "5" to "2" and insert the word "individual" before the word "Federal".

On page 1, line 16, add the word "individual" at the end thereof.

On page 1, line 19, insert the word "individual" before the word "Federal".

On page 2, delete subsection (b)(2); renumber the following subsection.

On page 2, line 16, insert the word "resident" before the word "individuals".

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, the purpose of the amendment is to reconcile some problems that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and I had with respect to the amendment as originally offered.

The Senator from South Dakota pointed out very well that the use of the corporation income tax would involve a great disparity of equity because of the locale of the home offices of business corporations. By changing that provision to cover only individual income taxes, we would remove the disparity.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] was concerned about a percentage of 5 percent, or a $3 billion appropriation, under the amendment originally submitted. By changing that provision to 2 percent of the individual income tax, we would arrive at approximately $812 million a year.

On page 3 of the Commissioner's annual report for fiscal year 1960, we find that $44,945,000 was collected by reason of the individual income tax and withholding tax. On page 6 we find that approximately $4,300 million was returned by way of refunds, leaving a net of some $40,606 million from the individual income tax.

Two percent of that amount is a figure of approximately $812 million, which is pretty close to the original proposal of the bill and the administration, so that would satisfy the Senator from Ohio.

The last part of the amendment provides that in the case of the withholding tax on wages, we make clear that the provision relates to withholding taxes on wages of resident individuals within the State. I am hopeful that that will satisfy the problem that the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and I both have with respect to this provision of the amendment.

I shall be happy to yield for any questions.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Madam President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the right to modify his own amendment. Does the Senator from Texas so modify his own amendment?

Mr. BLAKLEY. I so modify my amendment and accept the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that the Senator from Texas is about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I understand that he wishes a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment. If the Senator from Texas will ask for a yea-and-nay vote now, I shall be glad to join with him and help him to obtain one. I think there is a sufficient number of Senators in the Chamber to order a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

Mr. BLAKLEY. I have accepted the modification to my amendment suggested by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Texas has perfected his amendment. He does not require the consent of the Senate to perfect his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Did the distinguished Senator from Texas accept the modification of his amendment suggested by the distinguished Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BLAKLEY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The modified amendment now before the Senate provides substantially a 2-percent tax only on individual income taxes, and excludes corporate taxes.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I gather by hasty arithmetic that instead of $3.1 billion, the amendment would account for roughly $1.2 billion a year.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would be glad to yield, though I do not have the floor. I merely made a parliamentary inquiry. I am trying to understand the arithmetic involved.

Mr. BLAKLEY. The amount would be approximately $800 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor. To whom does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. BLAKLEY. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the modified amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BLAKLEY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 40]

YEAS—30

Allott	Ervin	Miller
Blakley	Goldwater	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Russell
Butler	Holland	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hruska	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston	Stennis
Cotton	Jordan	Talmadge
Curtis	Lausche	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—64

Aiken	Fulbright	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Bartlett	Hart	Morton
Beall	Hartke	Moss
Bennett	Hayden	Muskie
Bible	Hickey	Neuberger
Burdick	Hill	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Prouty
Cannon	Javits	Proxmire
Carlson	Keating	Randolph
Carroll	Kefauver	Scott
Case, N.J.	Kerr	Smith, Mass.
Church	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Clark	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Wiley
Dodd	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ellender	McGee	Young, Ohio
Engle	McNamara	
Fong	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—6

Boggs	Chavez	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Saltonstall

So Mr. BLAKLEY's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. GORE obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to permit me to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected?

Mr. GORE. Madam President, I yield for that purpose, if I may do so without losing the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McNAMARA. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield, without losing his right to the floor? The Senator from Arkansas wishes to call up a bill which will take only a minute to dispose of.

Mr. GORE. I shall speak for only 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for an inquiry, while a large number of Senators are in the Chamber?

Mr. GORE. I yield, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask the majority leader what the situation will be for the remainder of the day. I understand the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has a speech which will require 20 minutes. Other amendments may be offered. I am trying to ascertain, while Senators are present in considerable number, if there is likely to be another yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, once I yield for this colloquy——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, if the Senator from Tennessee wishes to be arbitrary when Senators are interested in the program for the rest of the day, he may do so. I will withdraw the inquiry.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Illinois can arbitrarily withdraw his inquiry.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And he will, Madam President, I withdraw the inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. With the permission of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and the distinguished minority leader——

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished majority leader does not need my permission.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce to the Senate, on the basis of the information just enunciated, that there will be no more yea-and-nay votes tonight, because evidently speeches are in the offing.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, that information and the entering of that order was accomplished in less than 1 minute, without the aid of all the priverbosity of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I ask that those words of the Senator from Tennessee be taken down. They constitute a personal reflection. So I rise to a point of personal privilege. I ask that the words be taken down; and I ask that the Senator from Tennessee be required to take his seat, in accordance with the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the Senator from Tennessee will be seated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I move that the Senator from Tennessee be permitted to proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Tennessee be permitted to proceed in order.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, I do not agree that the application of the word "verbosity" to the utterances of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is an indictment. It seems to me that it constitutes a rather accurate description of the performance he was undertaking. However, I accede to the motion made by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. Madam President, I intend to speak but briefly. If I may proceed, I shall soon relinquish the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee declines to yield.

THE PROPOSED SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. GORE. Madam President, I am well aware that the decision for the holding of a meeting between the President of the United States and the Soviet Premier is one which the President alone must make for our country. I am perfectly willing to have the President make that decision. If he decides to go to a summit conference with the Russian Premier, the President will go with the unstinted support of the junior Senator from Tennessee and, I am sure, with the united support of the United States.

Nevertheless, Madam President, inasmuch as I am not now advised that such a decision has finally been made, in the exercise of the responsibility of a Member of the U.S. Senate, I wish to state briefly my view that a conference between the heads of state of contending powers involves the gravest of risks. Invariably and unavoidably, such a meeting stirs hopes for an easing of international tensions.

Therefore, an unsuccessful meeting between such heads of state brings about a worsening—rather than an improvement—of tensions.

Moreover, coming in the wake of the Cuban and the Laotian affairs, and before the President's program of strengthening the Armed Forces of the United States and before his own positive international policies and programs have had time to take deep root, the United States of America at this time cannot appear to her best advantage.

Neither the climate for negotiation nor the condition of issues is now advantageous for the United States.

Therefore, I consider a meeting such as the one proposed at this time as premature, ill-conceived, and ill-advised.

Madam President, in dealing with the Russian Premier, we should be warned that he is bound by no scruples whatsoever. I was angered and saddened at the humiliation which President Eisenhower suffered from him at the last summit conference in Paris. Of course, I know that this conference followed in the wake of the U–2 incident. But the conference now proposed would occur in the wake of the Cuban and the Laotian affairs. I raise these questions because I think it timely that they be raised.

It is my earnest hope that before reaching a decision on this very important matter, the President of the United States will have occasion to consider these points of view. I know that many persons hold hopes for the results of such a conference. Perhaps there are some grounds for such hopes. If so, the possible advantages of the holding of such a conference must be weighed against the risks which are inherent.

Madam President, I would much prefer to see President Kennedy go to such a conference only after very careful planning, after the reaching of agreement on the agenda for discussion, after the strength of the United States had been shored and after an improvement of our economic programs and power.

I know that some persons say that under present circumstances we should not build up our hopes for the success of such a conference. That is exactly what was said by former Secretary Herter before the abortive summit conference of Paris a year ago.

I close by saying that if my doubts, if my apprehensions, are ill founded, then I shall be the happier therefor, and by saying again, that, if the President makes an affirmative decision on this question, he will have my support, and I am sure the united support of all of us; but that the question should be approached as one of grave importance.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to commend the Senator from Tennessee for what he has just said. He has, in effect, raised a flag of caution. I do not have the skepticism which he has, but I honor him for making the statement which he has just made, because I believe that if a meeting of this sort is consummated, we ought to go into it with our eyes wide open and be aware of all the potentials involved, and recognize that, in reality, this is not a summit meeting, but, in effect, a meeting between two chiefs of state, with the hope of getting down to bedrock and sizing up what the problems are, as well as sizing up each other.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished and very able majority leader, my friend.

In connection with his remarks about the potentials involved, let me recall to the Senate that the potential of President Eisenhower for world leadership was seriously impaired at Paris. As I have said, I resented it. All Americans did. I think this is a risk which must be considered; and if that be one of the potentials in the coming conference, at least I would direct the attention of the Senate to one difference. President Kennedy is in the beginning of his term, and we look hopefully to his leadership, not only of America but of the free world, for 4 years, and perhaps longer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to join in a part of the remarks which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has made. I mentioned earlier today a quotation from President Kennedy which I think bears repetition.

Let me say at the outset I entirely share the Senator's views that, whatever decision the President makes will be loyally supported by, I believe, every Member of this body. We know how great his responsibility is and what a serious decision it is. But I share the hope of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that the decision will be most deliberately weighed.

What I quoted this morning was the statement of candidate Kennedy in which he was asked a question about President Eisenhower's rejection of a proposal that he meet with Mr. Khrushchev, and in the course of that response, where he upheld the President's decision and said he agreed with President Eisenhower, he said, among other things:

> There is no sense having a meeting unless there is an atmosphere before the meeting which leads you to hope that there will be some success.
>
> On the issues on which we are divided with the Soviet Union, disarmament and Berlin—

Parenthetically, those are much the same issues now—

> which are the two chief ones at the present time, there is no indication that there is a common meeting ground. Therefore, just to meet, just to sit down, just to spend an hour, unless there is some basis for hope, particularly as Khrushchev is being extremely belligerent now, I thought the President showed good judgment.

That was his comment at the time. The President of the United States always has access to information or facts which are not generally accessible to all Members of Congress. Far be it from me, as a Member of Congress, to try to take issue with his decision, but I have an instinctive feeling that, frankly, this is not an appropriate time for a summit conference.

I think the Senator from Tennessee has performed a service in bringing this matter up, although I conclude by saying again that, whatever the President's decision is, and if his decision is to go to a summit, it will be loyally supported here and every one of us will wish him unbounded success in his negotiations.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from New York. I am sure he joins me in the sentiment that the President must decide this question in the light of the information he has and the situation as it prevails today; and I shall be pleased, as I know the Senator from New York will be happy, for him to consider it in that light, without reference to some statement which may or may not have been made in the campaign. I am sure the President will make it in that light.

It was only in the discharge of my own responsibility as a Member of the U.S. Senate that I felt I should speak. After all, under the Constitution, the Senate has a limited partnership with the President in such matters.

Before closing, Madam President, I should like to advert to an unpleasant occurrence at the very beginning of this statement. I intended only to make this very brief statement, and, frankly, I desired to make it to as many of my colleagues as would lend me their attention. When an announcement is made that the business of the day is finished, we see what happens in the U.S. Senate—only a few remain. I think the Senate could well give consideration to means of encouraging more earnest debate by a larger portion of its membership on the vexatious and grave problems of our times.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia obtained the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me so that I may offer an amendment, to have it before the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for the purpose outlined, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, for myself and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], I call up amendment "5-16-61—G."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD without being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

TITLE I—SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "School Assistance Act of 1961".

Statement of finding

SEC. 102. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that responsibility for and control over education is one of the powers not delegated to the United States but reserved to the States or to the people under the tenth amendment to the Constitution.

(b) The Congress hereby reaffirms and reenacts a portion of article III of the Ordinance of 1787, adopted by the Confederation Congress, July 13, 1787, as follows: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

(c) The Congress further finds that continued encouragement of the means of education requires the strengthening of State governments.

Authorization

SEC. 103. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and for each fiscal year thereafter, to each State, to be used by such State for educational purposes only, an amount equal to 25 per centum of the Federal tax on cigarettes (computed as provided in this Act) collected on cigarettes sold within such State during the preceding fiscal year.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, on or before October 1, 1961, and on or before October 1 of each succeeding year, pay to each State the amount authorized to be appropriated to such State pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. For the purpose of determining the amount of payments under the provisions of this section, the Secretary of the Treasury shall estimate the number of cigarettes sold in each State in each fiscal year on the basis of such statistics as may be available.

(c) For the purposes of this section the term "State" includes the District of Columbia.

THE URGENT NEED FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Madam President, I rise to support the School Assistance Act of 1961. The Greek philosopher, Diogenes, said to the world some 300 years before Christ:

> The foundation of every state is the education of its youth.

Not only has this concept been the foundation of our Republic; it also has been the sinew of our great strength as a Nation and the very strength of our democratic processes. It has made our country a cathedral of pride and hope for freemen everywhere—and for many of the enslaved of the world as well.

But now this educational foundation must be strengthened for the new heights of national effort which urgently challenge us—the battle against killing and crippling diseases, the pressing need to equitably adjust our economy to the spectacular advances of technology and automation, the halting of dilapidation and obsolescence in our cities, the conversion of our abundant natural resources to new and better uses. Then, too, there is a universe to reach and explore, a galaxy of stars from which to seek new treasures.

In the face of these positive national challenges, there is an ever-present external one which threatens our very existence. It is the challenge of Soviet aggression—aggression not only against our Nation, but also against freedom and liberty wherever they exist.

These are challenges which do not afford us the leisure of unhurried action; rather, action is imperative and time is of the essence, and we must recognize the need for a prompt marshaling of our financial resources for the strengthening of our educational system if these challenges are to be realistically met. Any hesitation over what it may cost us in terms of dollars and cents is unthinkable. The cost of a sound and purposeful educational system for our children and our youth—and for the security and continued freedom of our Nation—is a bargain at any price.

Today, the awesome advance of the Russian juggernaut is a most compelling external challenge—a challenge made more formidable by the stern emphasis which the Soviets have placed on the education of their youth. We know that this emphasis is not only for the construction of stronger foundations for their state; it is also for the eventual sovietizing of all nations.

It is impossible to determine with any accuracy just how much the Soviet Government annually spends on education. It is sufficient, however, to note that approximately 13.7 percent of its national budget is earmarked for this purpose. It also is significant that this concentrated Soviet educational effort is producing each year more engineers, technicians, and scientists than we are producing for ourselves in this country. And if this gap in the hard core need of brainpower is permitted to spread, we will be guilty of a cynical default on behalf of the American destiny.

Why does this educational gap exist between ourselves and the Soviets? Because much of our educational system, from kindergarten through the college, has been underfinanced by too much for too long. As a result, we are offering almost 1 million of our students something less substantial than a good standard elementary education.

Today, more than 600,000 students are attending one-teacher schools. Some 100,000 students are attending public high schools which offer no advanced mathematics such as geometry or trigonometry. Nearly 62,000 students are attending high schools which offer neither chemistry nor physics. On top of this, nearly 100,000 of our full-time teachers are not qualified teachers.

Right now, the sheer cost of catching up with the Nation's classroom shortage, in bricks and mortar alone, is estimated at close to $1 billion. This is only for elementary and secondary schools. For our colleges, we will have to spend close to $20 billion in the next 10 years just to meet the classroom needs of ever-growing enrollments.

But bricks and mortar are only a part of the cost. Once these buildings are erected, they have to be equipped and maintained and staffed—and the cost of all this is also staggering.

In education, as in everything else, we get what we pay for. But the dollar cost of meeting the increased educational needs of the American people is immense—far greater than many communities can afford, no matter how they reappraise their tax sources at every level. Historically, public education has been supported in great part by the general property tax. Today, this tax has almost reached confiscatory proportions in some communities. As a result, new tax sources are being sought. But the sources of taxable wealth vary from State to State, from community to community, depending on whether they encompass fully employed large-scale industrial activity, or agriculture areas, or whether the State as a whole has been free from economic depression.

My own State of West Virginia is an example in point. Because of long-term unemployment and underemployment, the State lacks the means of assisting its especially hard-hit depressed school districts. As a result, the educational process in my State is in a crisis and needs a helping hand—the helping hand of Federal aid.

As of February 1961 there were approximately 152,000 unemployed persons in my State, or about 22.5 percent of a labor force of 675,000 persons. In several of my State's counties, unemployment is as high as 26 percent. In the face of such economic hardship, the support which West Virginia can furnish its school system is meager at best.

Today, West Virginia ranks 44th in the United States in per pupil expenditure for education. It only spends $240 per pupil per year, or about one-third less than the national average of $369 per pupil per year. Indeed, with 100 percent assessments on property, and maximum rates of levy, the amount available per pupil in my State still falls far short of the national average.

This adverse condition is further aggravated in several serious respects. For one, in my State there are 1,242 schoolrooms that need replacing because of obsolescence and dilapidation—conditions which presently require excessive upkeep and unnecessary remodeling, but conditions with which many of our school districts must live because of the lack of funds for new construction.

Moreover, West Virginia is short 680 classrooms needed to take care of excess student population. For some years now, many of our students have had to attend one-half-day sessions, and currently 1,131 students are forced to follow this discriminatory schedule. Children on half-day schedules attend school less than the 5 or 6 hours most States require as a minimum. If they are on a 4-hour session, they are deprived of an hour a day of instruction. By the end of the school year, this lost hour per day adds up to 2 months of schooling lost.

Parenthetically, I might add that although the State's population has been decreasing, the number of children entering school and already attending school remains constant.

Another aggravating condition with regard to education in my State, a condition which militates against the full development of our national brainpower needs, is the fact that approximately 75.5 percent of West Virginia's secondary schools are too small to offer many of the requirements for maximum development of every student's educational capacity. In some instances, vital subjects are left untaught. Students find they cannot obtain instruction in some of the science and mathematics courses and in foreign languages. As a result, when some students from these small West Virginia schools try to enter college, they are rejected—cast aside because they fail to meet requirements for college entrance.

Today, of the West Virginia students entering the ninth grade, only 25 percent go to college. As a comparison, the national average is 52 percent. Thus, it can be said that the small secondary schools in my State, handicapped by lack of funds for needed expansion, and for lack of ability to offer instruction in many vital subjects, are part of the reason for the educational gap between this Nation and Russia.

The critical situation with regard to education in West Virginia can also be highlighted by the fact that a high percentage of our rural schoolteachers are unqualified to teach, according to our West Virginia State Department of Education. Our school districts, however, have no alternative but to hire such untrained teachers, because they cannot afford to pay the kinds of salaries licensed teachers require. In addition, at present there are 155 classes in my State that are being taught by teachers with critical area permits—that is, by teachers who have only high school diplomas to their credit.

The estimated average annual pay for West Virginia classroom teachers is $3,980, as against a national average of $5,389. Only six States have lower average annual salaries. This low salary situation in my State is said to be largely responsible for an appalling turnover of more than 10,000 teachers

during the past 7 years—over 50 percent of the total number of teachers employed in West Virginia. But our teacher picture is further darkened by the fact that those teachers who have remained steadfast in their jobs have an average age of 48 years, and can be expected to retire within a few years. At present salary levels, it may not be possible to replace them.

Paradoxically, West Virginia trains approximately 1,000 teachers each year, at a cost of more than $1 million a year, but less than one-third of the teachers my State annually trains remain in the State to teach school. In effect, because of the low pay for teachers in West Virginia, my State is in the abnormal position of educating teachers for work in other States while she direly needs them herself. The State of Ohio, for example, reported that it had hired 526 West Virginia teachers last year. Any West Virginia teacher, with proper certification, can add from $1,500 to $2,000 to his or her annual income as a teacher by merely moving to another State.

Madam President, in 1958, the Congress enacted the National Defense Education Act as a means of catching up with Soviet Russia's surprising superiority in education. As an action, this was a splendid forward step, but only a step—only one step in several which we must take if we sincerely believe that education is our master defensive weapon for survival.

Our next step must be the enactment of the bill before us—to provide Federal aid to education—if the first step we already have taken is not to prove a hobbled one. It is not enough to emphasize the need for enriched instruction in the sciences, the mathematics, foreign languages, or to attract college students to these career opportunities, or to the teaching profession via a Federal student loan program. We must strengthen the basic beginnings of education in the elementary and secondary schools by ending the classroom shortages throughout the Nation, and by making the profession of teaching more attractive through higher pay.

Recently, a teacher in one of Maryland's more populous counties, close to Washington, D.C., left his job to run a milk route in order to better provide for his family. He made more money delivering milk every morning than he did teaching school. In the Soviet Union, I might point out, the teacher is treated as one of the elite and, comparatively speaking, enjoys greater benefits and higher financial rewards than does his American counterpart.

The Federal Government must face up to its obligation insofar as the national need for brainpower is concerned. Opponents of this legislation declare that it would mean Federal control of education—a fact which is not borne out by the history of Federal participation in education.

Since the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, the Federal Government has financially participated in school support without one single instance of interference in any State's or community's educational curriculum. For more than 100 years the Federal Government has supported land-grant colleges in many States without a single instance of interference. This is also true regarding Federal aid to schools in areas impacted by Federal employees or military personnel.

Rather than spending profitless time fearing Federal interference in the school curriculum, we should do some positive thinking about how our States and the Federal Government should apply bigger percentages of their tax take for education.

Alexander Pope once wrote:

> Just as the twig is bent the tree's inclined.

By the same token, what we do about our educational system today will shape the security and growth of America tomorrow. For these reasons, enactment of the bill before us—to provide Federal aid to education—is a requirement which we cannot afford to deny to ourselves or to our children.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to take only a minute to express my high commendation of the Senator from West Virginia for the speech he has just made. I point out that in this one short speech he has made the case for this bill, and in this one short speech he has very succinctly applied to one State, his own State of West Virginia, the basic principles and purposes of the pending bill. So far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to say to the court—using that analogy here in the Senate—to the Senate as a court—we rest our case.

I would be perfectly willing to go to a vote on the bill based upon the speech the Senator from West Virginia has made. He and I know, however, that we will not be afforded that privilege. There will be amendment after amendment offered. However, I am glad that we can point over and over again in the RECORD to his great supporting speech which magnificently backs up the committee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am very humbly grateful for the very kind remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. I appreciate so much what he has said. I congratulate him on the fine work he has done in making it possible for this exemplary piece of legislation to be brought to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

I am informed that the Senator from Idaho wishes to make a speech. He has temporarily stepped off the floor. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CENTENNIAL OF BIRTH OF GEORGE W. NORRIS—ADDRESS BY HON. LISTER HILL, OF ALABAMA

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent speech delivered on May 16 by the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] at the George Norris Memorial Centennial. The speech was a particularly fitting one, because Senator HILL served with George Norris in the Senate of the United States. The RECORD will show that on some of the great human welfare legislation which will always bear the name of Norris, the Senator from Alabama, who would say he was a private in the ranks, was really an able senatorial assistant to Senator Norris.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS I REMEMBER GEORGE W. NORRIS

(Speech by Senator HILL at ceremonies in Washington honoring memory of George W. Norris, May 16, 1961)

It is a solemn occasion when men and women meet to honor a friend whose life is ended. It is a time of remembrance, of recognition, of rededication. For some of us this a lonely time. We meet in this, the centennial year of his birth, to commemorate the long and fruitful life of a great American. But to those of us who knew George Norris, this day revives the first sharp sense of loss we suffered when he died. Our sense of loss is undiminished by the years. We loved him, drew strength from his courage, gained wisdom from his patience, learned tolerance from his compassion.

The story of his life is known to all of us. In this assembly his contributions to the public welfare will be surveyed. Their range is broad, for his interests spread as wide as the far horizons of the prairies he called home. From those plains he brought to Washington, and he never lost, his deep awareness that there is no place for men to hide. For him responsibility was limitless and it was complete. His commitment to his fellow men was total, with no reservation. George Norris wanted a better life for all people. That was his single goal. Throughout his life he worked to achieve it.

All the talents with which he was endowed, all the skills he acquired, these were every day invested in the never-ending task to which he was committed. This is the durable inheritance he has bequeathed to us who are gathered here to do honor to his memory. He did not leave us a project to promote, or a program to foster in his name. He left us a yardstick, a standard of service by which each one of us can test our own objectives, appraise our methods, and measure our accomplishments.

High on the list of George Norris' achievements stands the creation of TVA, and my memories of George Norris are deeply rooted in his sponsorship of this great enterprise. When I first came to Washington to take my seat in Congress he had already accepted as his own the long and arduous fight to save for public use the war surplus properties at Muscle Shoals in my home State of Alabama. This was the beginning of TVA. A dam half built across the river and a chemical facility constructed to produce munitions, these were the assets regarded as surplus to the Nation's need when World War I was ended.

TVA exists today because some auspicious fate decreed that George Norris should be

chairman of the committee of the Senate to which bills for the disposal of these properties were referred. There is no better illustration of the simple way this noble man accepted the consequences of his complete dedication to public service. Evasion of responsibility would have been easy for a politician with a normal instinct for self-preservation. The issue was bound to be controversial and the properties were not located in his own State. But for George Norris there could be no hiding place, for him no peace in noninvolvement. He was obliged to act in behalf of the people—the people of my State, the people of adjacent States—far from the State he represented.

I like to think that TVA will forever bear the mark of his rare and selfless spirit. I believe, in some mysterious fashion, it makes a difference that the enterprise was not born of parochial concern, or in response to local political pressure, and that no man's ambition was advanced by its creation. Its lineage is pure. TVA was established because each day George Norris asked himself the timeless question, lately cheered but rarely answered: "What can I do for my country?" This was his response: He could undertake to save for public use the properties constructed by the Government at Muscle Shoals in Alabama.

It was a titanic job he undertook. To those who would continue on the trail he blazed, this is a truth to remember. George Norris never asked what was feasible. He asked what was right. He never asked how long and hard the road ahead would be. He saw a distant goal and knew he had to start without delay.

For more than 10 long years he labored. I remember how tirelessly he worked. He read reports, consulted experts, conducted long and exhausting hearings. Alone he journeyed in search of facts, north to Ontario, west to the Pacific, south to Muscle Shoals. Again and again he spoke on the floor of the Senate. Every parliamentary skill he possessed was at the people's service. The Senate's tradition of unlimited debate was employed in their behalf. Like a patient schoolmaster to reluctant pupils, he made his points over and over again, sharing with his colleagues all that he had so deeply learned. He mastered engineering data, probed the mysteries of power accounting and finance, studied chemical operations. But he talked about the back-breaking toil of the people to whose increased well-being he was determined the properties at Muscle Shoals should be dedicated.

He affirmed a high moral principle, the principle that all the people, not just a few, have a right to share the fruits of scientific progress. But he talked about the ill-lit country schoolroom, the dim lamp in the parlor, the pump in the yard, the bucket and the wood-burning stove in the kitchen. Into the record he introduced maternal and infant mortality statistics, the poignant story of the brief lifespan in rural areas, where life was more harsh, labor more pitiless than it needed to be because the people were denied the boon of electric energy.

George Norris fought that the farmer and the housewife might participate in the modern world. He spoke for the poor, the lonely, and the overburdened. He saw the power from Wilson Dam as a tool to use to make life easier for the farmer and the housewife, to release their energies for greater productivity, to expand their opportunities. This was his dream. Muscle Shoals was a place to start. Public ownership and operation was a means to the end. It was as simple as that to George Norris.

Little by little, man by man, the circle of support for his proposals began to widen. Plans to sell the properties were defeated and abandoned in the face of his relentless exposure. Twice his measures providing for public utilization were adopted by the Congress only to fail of Executive approval.

George Norris was no stranger to discouragement in those years. He walked with sorrow often, but his determination never faltered. I remember this. And I remember something else of great significance. I wonder at it now, and I am humble in the recognition of a triumph. Successive bills were not diluted to make approval easy. Each bill was better than the last, broader in its vision, wiser in its provisions. More men contributed their talents. As George Norris taught, he learned, until in 1933 when we met together in the committee of conference to determine the final provisions of the statute a Government corporation was established with responsibilities much broader than a mandate to devote to public use the properties owned by the Government at Muscle Shoals. These facilities were basic to the program. They formed the strong foundation. But the act went further.

TVA was finally created to demonstrate what could be accomplished when the job of developing a region's resources is seen as a whole, when administration is decentralized, when management and politics are sternly separated, when a conscious effort is made to enlist the assets and the energies of local governments in promotion of a total program. A brilliant administrative innovation was achieved. A pilot plant for progress throughout the world was created.

Many men had worked together over the years, but let us here remember that it was the patience and the dedication of George Norris that welded all of us together. He was our leader. It was his decision to thwart disposal of the properties at Muscle Shoals that held a beachhead where the rest of us could find a place to fight. Through the years he was the one who kept the purpose of all our efforts clear. Like a watermark on every page of the statute the stamp of George Norris stands out.

It stands out in the sections where TVA is directed to make energy available for rural and domestic use at the lowest possible rates but at the same time to achieve revenues to cover the costs of power production. George Norris wrote these objectives in the law. There is no uncertainty about their meaning, no qualification on the responsibility of those entrusted with administration. Their job is to endeavor ceaselessly to decrease power costs, to increase its use by consumers.

When TVA austerely resists pressure to construct uneconomic projects, no matter how attractive they may appear to local sponsors, when it refuses to locate plants at sites which would increase production costs, no matter how appealing the solicitations, these are the provisions of the statute it is honoring. This was the injunction of George Norris. When TVA engineers determine that larger and more efficient units will lower power costs, larger and more efficient units must be designed and must be fabricated. When it is clear that the costs of electrical equipment are not restrained by the check of honest competition, TVA is obliged to act. The statute requires it. Foreign bids must be solicited. Collusive bidding must be exposed. This is the way power rates are held down. This is the yardstick of George Norris.

Today, when the highest domestic use of electricity and the lowest rates in the United States are reported from the region served by TVA, I read the list of appliances the people use with a reminiscent satisfaction—electric feed grinders, hay driers, milking machines, and freezers on the farm; refrigerators, ranges, water heaters, washing machines, and driers, air-conditioning units in the home. These appliances are in use today because the cost of electricity to the domestic consumer has been reduced from 6 cents to less than a penny a kilowatt-hour as average use has risen from 600 to more than 9,000 kilowatt-hours a year. These appliances are in use on farms and in homes today because George Norris devoted his life to his fellow men.

Because of him, over 98 percent of the farms in the region have electric service and 75 percent have pressure running water systems. All-electric schools flourish in the valley; electric house heating is spreading. When I see these changes, this surging progress, I remember his deep conviction that it could be done. This is what he meant.

I remember how he used to smile, his whole face would be alight, as he described what an abundant supply of electricity could do to change the lives of people. I think he would not be astonished to discover that this power system his faith created is now the largest in the United States, that the demands of the people for electric energy have outstripped the capacity of the river to supply it, and that coal, another gift of nature, is releasing its long-hoarded energy to promote their well-being. I know he would not be surprised to see that the rates of private power companies adjoining TVA have been reduced, that use on their systems has increased while their profits have risen. He knew the yardstick would work. His faith was boundless.

Today, from Burma and Brazil, Tunisia and Iran, from Norway and from the British Isles, from every continent of the earth men come to visit TVA. They come as pilgrims visit shrines, seeking nourishment for their hopes and their aspirations. They visit a modern laboratory where new types of fertilizers are being developed, a plant where they are produced and farms where products are tested. They watch huge barges move in long tows on the tranquil river. They visit nurseries where seedlings are made ready for planting in a great program of reforestation. They see how electricity is used in the homes, on the region's small farms, and in its new industries where the people find employment. These things they see bear testimony to a great man's vision and to his work.

But above all I think these visitors sense the spirit of total public service. On massive dams and on giant steamplants they read the bare inscription—"Built for the People of the United States," each one a silent tribute to the living spirit of George Norris. Over and over the simple affirmation is repeated. This program, these projects, are committed to the cause of all the people, as George Norris was committed. There is no other beneficiary, no other purpose served.

The truth about George Norris was never obscured. Some years ago I attended a dinner here in Washington where George Norris was an honored guest. Fine words and moving phrases described his public service. But I remember best a tribute paid by a veteran member of the Senate press gallery. He said something like this: "If I were ever elected to the Senate I would be grateful that the alphabet would cause my name to come after the name of Norris. For if I entered the Chamber when a rollcall was in progress, and my name was next, I would simply ask how Norris voted. If I voted as he did, then I could be sure that I had served my country well."

In the scrambled alphabet of time all our names come after that of George Norris. When our commitment to the people is as complete as his, when in our several ways we work as hard and as courageously as he worked, when we are as generous in victory as he was and as steadfast in defeat, then of each of us it can be truly said that we have "served our country well." Then we shall have entered fully into possession of the heritage he bequeathed us. Then shall the ageless spirit of George W. Norris be fulfilled.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed immediately to the consideration of H.R. 7030, which was messaged over from the House today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a bill (H.R. 7030) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I have cleared this bill with the majority and minority leaders and with the chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. I know of no objection to it from any source. The House passed the bill yesterday to unanimous consent.

This is an emergency measure and unless it becomes law in the next few days it will do no good. I introduced an identical bill on Monday and a full explanation of its provisions appeared in Monday's RECORD. However, I shall explain the bill briefly for those who may not have read my statement.

This bill would bring a small measure of relief to cotton farmers whose land has been unplantable because of recent floods, or whose plantings have been washed out. Thousands of acres of cotton land are under water or are so wet that farmers cannot plant them. This bill would permit farmers whose cotton acreage has been flooded to transfer their acreage allotment to another farm within the county or in an adjoining county where they can plant on higher ground. It would not increase cotton acreage one bit, but it will keep many farmers from going broke. Cotton farmers have had disastrous weather strike them in 3 out of the last 4 years, and approval of this transfer authority is one small way that we can help to lessen their losses this year.

The Congress voted this same relief for cotton farmers in 1958, so there is a precedent for this bill. The Department of Agriculture has approved this bill and is taking action to see that it is implemented without delay as soon as it is signed by the President.

I hope that there will be no objection to this very important measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 7030) was read the third time and passed.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, we have been up and down the hill so often on the Federal aid to education bill that there is very little new to be said on the issue. However, I believe this proposal to be of such importance to the survival of our form of government that I hope I will be forgiven for repeating some of the basic points involved.

It sometimes seems that we, as a people, have lost the capacity to take the long view and are content to react only in the event of a current emergency. We passed the National Defense Education Act in 1958 only after the Russians shocked us into action by the launching of sputnik. There is no doubt that drastic action was needed to improve the science and language programs in our high schools, but this need existed long before sputnik was put into orbit.

Again, there are overtones of reaction to recent events in the consideration of the present bill. At the time our newspapers were filled with reports of the Russian victory in the man-in-space race, there were various predictions that this event would make it easier to get a Federal aid to education bill through the Congress. If the Russian accomplishment has resulted in increased support for the bill, well and good; but let us not be diverted from the basic fact that this type of program would be needed if the Soviet Union did not even exist. We should pass this bill because it is the wise and right thing to do so—not because external forces prod us into action.

The future of democratic governments will—in the long run—be determined by the ability of their citizens to make wise decisions. The Nation's Founding Fathers were acutely aware of this fact. George Washington wrote:

> Knowledge is in every country the surest basis of human happiness. In one in which the measures of government receive their impressions so immediately from the sense of the community as in ours, it is proportionately essential.

Thomas Jefferson also had a unique understanding of the necessity for an educated and informed citizenry in a free society. Jefferson correctly said:

> If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be.

He was as proud of his role in founding the University of Virginia as of his authorship of the Declaration of Independence.

God has not ordained that our form of government will succeed; nor is there any evidence from history to support the thesis that democracy is a natural form of society. Our form of government is the product of great human effort. It was created by our forefathers with the realization that man is potentially good, but also potentially a beast. Wise actions by our people will always be needed to keep the beast from seizing control. Through education we strive to bring out the good in our young people and to cultivate in them a desire to preserve and protect the values of our society. A good education is basic to good citizenship.

The exercise of the right to vote by one who is incapable of weighing the issues and making a rational decision does not contribute to the ultimate survival of this Nation. I can think of nothing better calculated to hasten our downfall than the casting of a ballot by a person who does not have the intellectual capacity to vote wisely. James Madison once said:

> Popular government without popular education is a prolog to a farce or tragedy.

The problem of education for citizenship was well stated in a comment by a noted scholar which appeared in a magazine some months ago. He said, in effect, that if he exercised his right to vote as carefully and thoughtfully as a citizen in a democracy should, he would spend all his time studying the candidates and the issues. This is a fair commentary on the awesome responsibilities of a citizen in a democracy in this complex and ever-changing world.

The frustrations of the cold war and the general complexity of life today prompt our people to look for easy solutions to complex problems. It is difficult for the shallow thinker to resist the impulse to believe those who have a knack for making complex problems seem simple. The apparent widespread interest in organizations such as the John Birch Society is symptomatic of a natural desire to find an easy answer to the difficult problems facing our Nation and the world. To blame all our difficulties on the Communists is simple enough to do.

It is much harder to face reality and accept the world we live in, and then do something constructive to make it more to our liking. We can blame the Communists for our troubles from now until doomsday, but this will not contribute to the solution of our problems. A genuinely educated citizenry will not be deluded by crackpots and demagogs from within, or by alien doctrines from without. In the long run, the quality of our educational system and the intellectual capacity of our citizens will determine how well our heritage is enriched and preserved.

The frustrations of decision making in a democracy are also evident from the results of the last election. The two candidates were poles part in their analysis of the Nation's domestic and international problems and what should be done about them. I have my own personal opinion of which analysis was correct. But, the public was so confused and undecided as to who was right that the vote was almost equally divided. There is something drastically wrong with our educational system when the voters—confronted with such diverse views and with the wealth of information available through the mass media—are unable to make a more clear-cut decision on which candidate offered the best program for the Nation. In less perilous times, the Nation could afford an indecisive, timid electorate—but not in these days of crisis.

We have been deluged with reports in recent years pointing out the emphasis which Russians place on education as a means of achieving their goal of world domination. There is no doubt that the Russian leaders have a deep understanding of the interrelationship between education and economic development. Their approach to education is focused on the training of technical skills. The success of their concentration on this narrow aspect of education is unquestioned. In less than 50 years, Russia has moved from a relatively undeveloped state into the space age. Sputnik, lunik, and the cosmonaut are only a few of the more glamorous results of their intense devotion to education.

We have a much more difficult task in education in America. Our people must not only be trained in ever increasingly difficult technical skills, but also in the development of those human traits which make up the political, economic, and social man. It is not enough if our scientists are experts in their technical field but know nothing outside and beyond their specialty. The degree of development in technical skills will not be the factor that determines our future. Our society's future will be molded by our success in creating self-discipline in our young people and imbuing them with an understanding of American traditions and institutions. According to Herbert Spencer, the overall object of education is the development of character. The quality of the character developed by our educational system in turn determines our national character.

The need for an educated citizenry is more crucial today than ever before. The world has entered an era of great instability filled with both dangers and promises. Great changes are taking place daily which are shaping the future world which our children will inherit. Remarkable advancements are being made in all fields of science—from the development of the power to split the atom, to a cure for polio. Scientists have opened new vistas of knowledge which can be applied either to destroy civilization or to cure many of the problems of mankind. At the same time, our capacity for understanding and getting along peacefully in the world has not kept pace and—if anything—has deteriorated. Whether we use this fund of knowledge for mankind's benefit or his doom will, in large measure, be determined by what kind of educational system we have.

If our youth are to be equipped to cope with this complex world, we must improve our educational system at all levels. It is not enough to educate them for adjustment to present conditions. They must be armed with knowledge which will enable them to shape and master the future.

Charles E. Silberman has summed up the requirements of a modern education system, as follows:

> To be practical, an education now must prepare a man for work that doesn't yet exist and whose nature can't even be imagined. This can be done only by teaching people how to learn, by giving them the kind of intellectual discipline and the depth of understanding that will enable them to apply man's accumulated wisdom to new conditions as they arise.

The demands on our educational system were never greater and, if they are to be met, we must have a drastic revision in our sense of values.

In our society we must make sure that every individual has the means to develop his full intellectual potential. A quality education should be available to every boy and girl, whether he or she is from Arkansas or California. Waste in human resources is too costly in a democracy. The uneducated or undereducated man is not only incapable of being an effecive participant in the democratic process, but also does not make his fair contribution to economic progress.

Education and economic progress go hand in hand. Each is essential to the other. Education more than any other factor raises the productivity of a nation—and of the individual. Industry today is more dependent on education than ever before. Automation—and technological progress in general—dramatized the vulnerability of the uneducated man to machine competition. In order to meet the challenge of this new industrial era, our educational system must be revised and updated.

The makeup of our labor force is changing rapidly, reflecting new technological developments. Occupations requiring a high educational level are expanding rapidly, while those requiring little education are contracting. The reasons for this trend were well stated by Dean Francis Chase of the University of Chicago when he said:

> The qualities essential to employability and productivity are coming closer and closer to the characteristics that have long been attributed to the educated person.

In 1910, considerable education was required of only a third of the labor force. This has now risen to one-half the labor force. The day is approaching rapidly when the man with only his energy to sell will have nothing to sell. Obviously, it would be a waste of time and money to give every young person a college education. But, we can insure that every person has a chance, and is encouraged, to develop his full intellectual capacity. If we do less, we shall be wasting the Nation's most valuable asset—the brainpower of its youth.

Careful examination of the current unemployment situation reveals the relationship between education and economic dislocations. A recent Wall Street Journal article pointed out that the chances of unemployment are in inverse proportion to a worker's educational level. In March, the unemployment rate among professional and technical personnel was 1.6 percent; clerical personnel, 4.9 percent; skilled workers, 9.1 percent; semiskilled workers, 12.1 percent; and unskilled workers, 19.1 percent.

In spite of this clear-cut handwriting on the wall for uneducated workers, the Department of Labor has estimated that 7.5 million, or 30 percent, of those entering the labor force in the 1960's will not have completed high school. There is a bleak future for these unskilled workers. No doubt many of this number have the capacity to go on to further training in both citizenship and specific technical skills. Without further education most of them will be a drag on the economy and will be on and off the unemployment rolls. In the long run, the country—and the individual worker—would be far better off if a portion of the funds spent on unemployment compensation were devoted to educating the less skilled worker to fill a more responsible role in industry.

While there is extensive unemployment in the ranks of the unskilled and semiskilled workers, there is a critical shortage of technicians and skilled personnel in many industries. Education has not kept pace with technology. John Kenneth Galbraith went to the heart of this dilemma when he said:

> * * * the machine has become desperately dependent on the improvement of man, and our economy is better suited to supply machines than to improve men.

Statistics prove that there is a high correlation between social dislocations—crime, poverty, and so forth—and lack of education. It has been estimated that we pay about twice as much for the cost of social dereliction as we pay for all elementary and secondary education. We cannot afford this waste of human resources and perpetuation of the poverty-ignorance breeding cycle. Unless we place education in proper perspective, national strength will never be adequately developed.

The status of education in America leaves much to be desired. I do not agree with Robert Hutchins' statement that "we do not know what education could do for us because we have never tried it." We have tried, but we have not tried hard enough. The problems of meeting the demands on our educational system will get worse before they get better. The school age group since 1950 has grown twice as fast as the total population. It was 45 million last year, and is expected to increase to nearly 49 million by July, 1963. An estimated $5 billion was spent for public elementary and secondary education in 1948–49. This has risen to an estimated $16.7 billion this school year. Although expenditures have tripled in a little over 10 years, it is expected that $30 billion will be required in 1968–69 just to maintain existing standards. In spite of the fact that educational expenditures are rising rapidly, the percentage of gross national product devoted to education has remained relatively constant at about 3.5 percent since 1930, according to the Rockefeller Report on Education. Although the relationship of educational expenditures and GNP has remained fairly constant, the rapid rise in enrollments has resulted in a proportionately smaller expenditure of the GNP per pupil. We still spend as much on tobacco and alcohol and over twice as much on purchase and operation of automobiles as we do on public elementary and secondary education. I often wonder what history will say of a nation which spends three times as much on its military establishment as on its public schools.

The status of teachers in our public schools is a national disgrace. Henry Adams summarized the importance of teachers when he said:

> A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops.

Our teachers have the responsibility for shaping the hearts and minds of our children and yet they are regarded by many as little more than full-time baby-sitters. They are woefully underpaid and overworked.

We constantly hear of the difficulties of attracting and retaining qualified teachers. The Office of Education reported that in the current school year, 91,500 or 6.5 percent of the teachers in public elementary and secondary schools did not meet full certification standards. It is surprising that this number is not higher in view of the Nation's complacent attitude toward the status of the teaching profession. It is estimated that by the end of the 1963–64 school year 279,000 additional teachers will be needed to staff our schools. There was a gain of only 55,000 teachers this year over last year's total. It is obvious that the profession must be made more attractive if a sufficient number of qualified teachers are to be obtained.

The teacher makes the school. Until we give teachers true professional status and salaries commensurate with their responsibilities, we cannot hope to attract the best talent available. An article came to my attention recently which vividly illustrates what is happening to the teaching profession and, of equal importance, why it is happening. The article reported the results of a study made of a group of some 500 men who had taken a battery of World War II tests for Air Cadet training and, after the war was over, went into teaching or school administration. An analysis of the Air Corps test scores clearly showed that those who left the teaching profession were more intelligent than those who remained in teaching. The income of those who quit teaching surpassed the income of those remaining in teaching by more than 25 percent. The same was true in salary comparisons of ex-college teachers and those who remained as instructors or professors. The questionnaires completed by the group revealed that financial considerations were clearly ahead of all other factors in influencing those who had left teaching to take up some other occupation. And, money was also listed as a source of major dissatisfaction with their profession by those remaining in teaching. The results of this study prove that the teacher-salary situation tends to drive out the best qualified people, leaving the lesser qualified teachers behind. I wish that this report had been given broad publicity since it furnishes much food for thought on what is wrong with education today.

The only practical way to help meet the problems facing our educational system is the implementation of a realistic program of Federal aid to education. Education is a national problem and must be faced with that in mind. The mobility of our people and the interdependency of all facets of our economy make the problems of one State the problems of all. If Arkansas' schools are not as good as they should be, Maine and California suffer the consequences along with the people of my State. The effect may be indirect, but it is there nevertheless. There is a tremendous difference between the States in income, wealth, and tax-paying ability. There are wide variations in educational standards in districts within a State. The poorest districts cannot provide a good school system even with confiscatory tax rates. Local governments, try as they will, are simply not in a position to obtain the additional revenue needed to support an adequate school system in all too many areas.

The Federal Government is uniquely qualified to raise the money needed to finance improvements in local school systems, particularly in the poorer States which do not have a broad tax base. Perpetuation of the existing disparity between the States in educational opportunities is not in the best interests of the rich or the poor States.

Many of my constituents, as well as others throughout the country, are concerned about the possibility of Federal control of our schools. I appreciate these fears, although I am convinced that there is little basis for them. We have had Federal aid in various forms, starting with the Land Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 which gave millions of acres of land to the States for education. The Morrill Act of 1862 helped establish land-grant colleges like the University of Arkansas. Other laws, such as the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 and the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, provided substantial assistance to education. The GI bills of World War II and Korea helped millions of veterans to obtain an education. The Public Law 815 and 874 programs provide aid to federally impacted areas. And, the latest program authorized by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 provides many forms of aid to schools and individual students. So, Federal aid has existed without Federal control for many years. This bill contains unambiguous language prohibiting Federal control, and we must accept the proposition that the officials who will administer the program will obey the law. Education must remain under the complete direction and control of local school officials. I would be the first to object if the Federal Government attempted to interfere with local control of the schools.

I wish to discuss for a moment the situation in my own State and why Federal aid is essential in building a better educational system in Arkansas.

According to the latest NEA rankings of the States, Arkansas ranked 49th in teachers' salaries with an average of $3,500. Within the State, average salaries in the districts ranged from $2,133 to $5,111. Is there any doubt about whether the children in the district where the teachers were paid an average of $2,133 received as good an education as they should?

Recently I received a letter from a superintendent of a small school system in Arkansas which pointed out one of the most difficult problems of the low-income States in retaining qualified teachers. He said:

> The most disappointing factor that I am confronted with each year is to employ teachers whom I know to be substandard while those top teachers who have been trained at Arkansas' expense go to other States where they can get twice as much money. We can never have an educational program good enough for the children of Arkansas as long as this exists.

A Federal aid program would certainly help in raising Arkansas teachers' salaries and would help us to retain many good teachers who otherwise would seek opportunities outside the State. Per pupil expenditures in Arkansas were estimated at $242.48 compared with a national average of $390. In spite of this low expenditure, I might point out that Arkansas has increased its per pupil expenditure by 107 percent in the last decade and ranks No. 2 nationally in this respect.

The State is making a strenuous effort to improve its schools—a far greater effort than the national average. Although Arkansas ranked 49th in per capita income in 1959, it ranked 20th in public school revenue as a percent of personal income. The State ranks sixth in increase in teachers' salaries within the last 10 years. Arkansas is making a much greater effort to improve its schools than many of the richer States. Last year the State spent 3.6 percent of personal income on schools while the wealthy State of Connecticut spent only 2.8 percent. Progress is being made, but the simple facts are that Arkansas and all of the poorer States do not have a tax base which will support an adequate educational system.

Madam President, there has been entirely too much talk and too little action on Federal aid to education legislation. We cannot afford to continue to pay only lipservice to educational problems. If we want to provide our youth in every section of the country with truly a quality education, this bill is a good start. A Federal-aid program is certainly not the entire answer to the problem. There must be a general revival of respect for education and intelligence. We must make the term "egghead" a compliment rather than a mark of derision. Unless education is placed at the top of our national priority list, I fear that history will not be kind to us. Passage of this bill could be the turning point for education in America. I hope that the Senate chooses the proper path and passes the bill by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, as a member of the Education Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee who has had the privilege of giving detailed study to the need for strengthening our national education effort, I strongly support the basic aid to education program as outlined by President Kennedy and reported to the Senate in S. 1021.

President Kennedy has said, "The human mind is our fundamental resource." We might correctly add that the brainpower of Americans that is not developed

to full potential constitutes a tragic waste of our Nation's and each individual's most valuable natural resource.

In patterning the public school assistance program after S. 8, the bill which passed the Senate last year, we have followed a sound approach which will be fair to schoolchildren in all of the 50 States.

It is noteworthy that the proposal retains the stipulation that State or local school boards have an option on whether the national funds will be utilized for classroom construction or teacher pay increases, or both. It absolutely safeguards local control of schools.

A key point of the legislation, which the Legislature of my own State of Texas, and all other legislatures, should heed is the provision that:

> Each State will be expected to maintain its own effort or contribution; and every State whose effort is below the national average will be expected to increase that proportion of its income which is devoted to public elementary and secondary education.

There is no denying that we need to strengthen our public schools for Texas boys and girls. In Texas nearly 5,000 students are attending less than full day sessions, and 6,500 teachers are teaching with substandard credentials.

Improving our public schools demands action at the local, State and national levels of government.

The need is so great that none of these levels of government acting alone is likely to be able to meet the requirements, and all acting together are not likely to do too much.

I believe that meeting the educational needs of the Nation calls for a cooperative effort at all governmental levels—that means local aid to education, State aid to education and Federal aid to education. We need greater effort and stronger support at all governmental levels capable of helping.

Let me respectfully add this—that those features of so-called Federal aid to schools which might be objectionable are clear to me. I personally believe in keeping control of our schools in State and local hands, and I am convinced we can pass laws which do not decimate our ability to run our own schools.

With the Land Grant College Act of 1862, under which Texas A. & M., the first tax supported university in Texas, was founded, with the World War II and Korean GI bills, with the impacted area school aid bills and the home economics and vocational agriculture aid bill and other Federal aid bills, we have proved that national assistance to education need not abridge local control of education.

Most of us agree that we must strengthen our schools, but some fear that Federal aid to schools would mean that local school boards would no longer run the schools. I have considered this matter carefully as a member of the Senate Education Subcommittee.

Since 1950 we have had two Federal programs of direct financial aid to public schools in operation in this country. These are Public Laws 815 and 874, providing Federal funds for construction, operation, and maintenance of schools in areas affected by Federal activities—such as military bases and others—the federally impacted areas bills. Under these laws, more than $115 million of Federal funds have gone to Texas school boards to finance construction of over 3,000 new classrooms at 300 different schools to house 85,000 students, and to help maintain and operate classes.

This year, 245 school districts scattered in every part of Texas are receiving a total of $10,677,000 of money voted by Congress which is being used for the operation and maintenance of these schools. These include in Abilene, Corpus Christi, Fort Worth, San Antonio, El Paso, Amarillo, Waco, Sherman, and Irving schools and many others. In addition, Texas public school boards are receiving, this year, $2,994,000 from Federal money voted by Congress for construction of classrooms in 22 public schools.

I believe I know our Texas school boards pretty well. Most of them are comprised of sound, reasonable men and women who have their feet on the ground. They are the men and women who give long hours of unpaid dedicated service to building the strongest public schools they can. No one can convince me that these Texas school boards would have taken this Federal money, let alone continue to take it, if there were strings attached that would take away their own local control of the schools.

One-third of all schoolchildren who go to public schools in America today, go to schools in federally affected areas where part of the money comes from our American Government. It is our own American way. What is being done for one-third of our schoolchildren without Federal control of local school activities can be done in all of our schools without Federal control of local school activities.

These local districts have known of the financial problems of their districts; they have known how very rapidly State and local taxes and indebtedness have risen as compared to federal taxes and debt. These districts have demonstrated that with this great amount of federal help under Public Laws 815 and 874, these public schools serving one-third of the pupils in all public schools in America, have been able to provide a great portion of the extra facilities and teachers needed in the past ten years. However, so many are now at the ceiling of their indebtedness that it is clear that an additional Federal program is needed to help finish the job.

Madam President, I congratulate the able Senators who have led in this effort to achieve workable bills and have presented them to the Senate this year and last.

Madam President, I particularly congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. As chairman of the Education Subcommittee he patiently presided and listened to all the witnesses. He started hearings early in the morning and continued them late in the day, when the Senate was not in session. He permitted witnesses to be heard every time possible, including Saturdays. He conducted hearings beginning early Saturday mornings and continuing until after 1 o'clock Saturday afternoons, in a diligent effort to see that meaningful legislation was passed.

I have served on a number of Senate subcommittees in the brief four years of my service in the Senate, but I have never seen another chairman of a subcommittee who has been more diligent in conducting hearings more consecutive hours on more consecutive days than the senior Senator from Oregon, considering the total length of the hearings. I think the Senator from Oregon deserves the thanks of all of us, and he and those who worked with him deserve the thanks not only of this generation of Americans but also of the coming generation of Americans.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, as the time approached for the Senate to take up the pending measure to authorize a program of Federal assistance to the States in aid of education, I reviewed the correspondence I have received on this subject through the past several years. Most of it, I am happy to say, has favored Federal aid legislation, and the proportion which takes this position has increased quite sharply within the past year. I think no subject affecting domestic policies of our country has been more closely studied by the people of Idaho than has this one. I am glad that this is so. Certainly no decision should be reached on so significant a question without the most painstaking examination of all the factors involved. I have given much thought and study to it, and my mail confirms that great numbers of my constituents have pondered the basic issues presented with the utmost care.

I support the principle of Federal aid to education, and I intend to vote for the bill which is now before the Senate, unless unacceptable amendments are attached to it. I am aware, however, that many thoughtful people have serious reservations about taking this step. I wish to discuss briefly those aspects of the problem which seem to me to have occasioned the most concern.

The question which first arises is whether there is really a present need to make any change in the methods by which our public school systems are financed. Some statistics are needed in arriving at a meaningful answer. For example, the Idaho Office of Education reported to the U.S. Office of Education, in the fall of 1960, that Idaho had a shortage of 812 classrooms. Scheduled for construction during the 1960–61 year were 282 classrooms, leaving my State still 530 classrooms short. Much of this limited new construction, it should be noted, is being financed with Federal funds under Public Law 815, in districts which have qualified as Federally impacted areas.

Madam President, in order to demonstrate the extent to which Federal aid is already a reality in my State, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two tables showing grants and entitlements to Idaho school districts, under the impacted areas programs, for fiscal 1960.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public Law 874 entitlements in State of Idaho for fiscal year 1960 for administration and teachers' salaries

Project No.	Applicant	Entitlement
1	Arco Joint Class A School District No. 11	$44,315
2	Pocatello Class A School District No. 25	48,689
5	Snake River Class A School District, Moreland	18,706
6	Blackfoot Class A School District No. 55	101,610
7	Mackay Joint Class B School District No. 182	6,726
9	Idaho Falls Class A School District No. 91	165,142
10	Swan Valley Class C School District No. 92, Irwin	8,934
11	Firth Class A School District No. 59	6,086
12	Shelley Joint Class A School District No. 60	15,016
201	Mountain Home Class A Independent School District No. 6	306,899
202	Bonner County Class A School District No. 82, Sandpoint	14,154
203	Salmon Class A School District No. 291, Salmon	7,976
204	Boise City Independent School District	79,166
501	Rigby Joint Class A School District No. 251	26,540
502	Idaho Falls Joint Class A School District No. 93	52,300
503	Minidoka County Schools, Joint Class A School District No. 331, Rupert	112,822
601	Glenns Ferry Joint Class A School District No. 192	6,021
701	St. Maries Joint Class A School District No. 41	6,365
703	Lake Lowell County School District No. 5, Caldwell	3,710
801	Lapwai Class A School District No. 341	43,474
901	Grandview Joint Class B School District No. 365	20,591
902	Kamiah Joint Class B School District No. 304	21,713
903	Dubois Class B School District No. 161	16,590
1001	Challis Joint Class B School District No. 181	8,401
1002	Cottonwood Joint Class A School District No. 242	9,890
1003	McCall Class B School District No. 421	11,964
1004	Worley Class B School District No. 275	3,828
1005	Grangeville Joint Class A School District No. 241	39,714
1006	American Falls Joint Class A School District No. 381	12,836
1008	Plummer Class B School District No. 42	12,588
1010	Meadows Valley Class B School District No. 11, New Meadows	12,559
1011	Bonners Ferry Class A School District No. 101	19,559
1012	Hailey Class A School District No. 61	4,944
1101	Council Class B School District No. 13	14,187
1102	Basin Class C School District No. 72, Placerville	2,483
	Total	1,286,498

Public Law 815 cash payments in the State of Idaho in fiscal year 1960 for school construction

Class A School District No. 55, Blackfoot	$60,134
Joint Class A School District No. 93, Idaho Falls	73,855
Joint Class A School District No. 241, Grangeville	5,847
Joint Class A School District No. 52, Moreland	3,102
Class A School District No. 6, Mountain Home	292,279
Joint Class A School District No. 91, Idaho Falls	47,000
Joint Class A School District No. 251, Rigby	15,940
Joint Class A School District No. 341, Lapwai	63,500
Class B School District No. 365, Bruneau	2,977
Joint Class A School District No. 331, Rupert	37,808
Total	602,442

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, the classroom shortage does not tell the whole story. My mail has contained many fact-filled letters detailing the inadequacy of teachers' salaries in Idaho. There is an acute shortage of teachers who meet minimum certification standards. Moreover, case after case has been reported to me of young people who have grown up in Idaho, received their education in our public schools, and entered the teaching profession after being trained for it in Idaho institutions of higher learning, only to leave the State within a year or two to pursue their careers in neighboring States which are in a position to offer higher salary schedules.

In the last analysis, however, I think we have to measure the adequacy of our public school systems not alone by counting the classrooms or by counting the number of applicants for teaching positions, but on the basis of a value judgment formed upon personal observation and the appraisal of informed professional and lay opinion. On this basis, I think that the American people generally have arrived at a consensus that public education must be made better. There is a need to improve our school systems.

Many question, however, whether the addition of Federal funds to those which are now being raised by the States and localities will in fact contribute to the solution of this problem. I have received many letters which pose this question:

> What good does it do to ship Idaho money to Washington and back? It still has to come from Idaho taxpayers.

Part of the answer lies in the fact that the bill before the Senate contains an equalization formula under which Idaho schools, to take one example, will receive $4,409,000 in aid from the Federal Government during the first year the program is in operation, while Idaho contributes only $1,377,000 to it in tax money—a ratio of more than 3 to 1 in Idaho's favor. Our States differ widely in their levels of economic development and per capita income.

If the discrepancies in the educational opportunities which they are able to afford to our youngsters is a problem of national concern, as I believe it to be, then it must follow that a national tax base must be used to minimize them. This is precisely what the pending bill proposes to do.

I am aware that some States which have a highly developed industrial and financial structure will seem to suffer from the application of this equalization formula. It is important to remember, however, that the national tax base is not the same as the one upon which the States and local school districts must rely. For example, much of the Federal revenue is derived from corporate income taxes. When an Idaho citizen buys a new car, the profit to the manufacturing corporation may be taxed in Delaware, but it is derived from Idaho. That profit cannot be taxed for the benefit of Idaho schools except by use of the national taxing power. Similarly, the higher per capita incomes in the industrial States, which yield most of the Federal revenue traceable to the personal income tax, are made possible, in part, by industrial activities which depend upon Idaho timber, Idaho minerals, and Idaho markets.

It seems to me, therefore, to be both necessary and fair that the Nation's wealth should be used to supplement that of the individual States, in order to insure an adequate education to every American child, wherever he may live. It is reassuring that Federal aid proposals have had very broad support from Senators and Congressmen representing the wealthier States. This reflects, of course, an increasing awareness that the Nation can ill afford inadequate education in any State.

Finally, there is much genuine concern that Federal aid to education will necessarily be accompanied by, or will eventually lead to, a federalization of our school systems—that is, to Federal control.

On this issue it should be noted that there is a long history of Federal assistance programs, ranging from school-lunch legislation to the basic authorizing legislation for the land-grant colleges, which have not in fact resulted in Federal control over school administration. Nevertheless, I believe that constant vigilance must be exercised, in order to make sure that no such interference takes place; and I would not support any Federal aid bill which did not contain a specific prohibition against interference at any level by Federal officials. The bill now before us includes this language:

> In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

To those who say that Federal interference, although now prohibited, may creep in at a later date, I would reply that this can happen only if the people, through their Congress, decide to relax this prohibition. If they were ever to make a decision to federalize public education, and I hope they never do, they could make it, regardless of whether the pending measure is enacted.

These considerations have led me to conclude that a carefully drawn Federal aid program represents, on balance, a necessary and desirable supplement to the efforts the States are making to improve the quality of public education. Therefore, I support the pending bill, and urge its passage.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, I wish to thank the Senator from Idaho for the support he has just now given us, by means of his very able speech. As he knows, I completely agree with the premises he has laid down.

I wish to thank him also, not only for the help he has been this year, but likewise for the help he has always been to those of us who each year have had the responsibility of bringing to the floor of the Senate a Federal-aid-to-education bill.

It is a matter of great pleasure to me and, I am pleased to state, also to the entire Senate, I am sure, that we are able to have his support, which we welcome most gladly.

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, I appreciate the kind words of the Senator from Oregon. All who have followed the course of his long and determined efforts to have such aid to education provided, know how indebted all of us are to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon for the excellent and outstanding work he has done in this connection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate now adjourn, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 18, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 17, 1961:

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR

William L. Batt, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Area Redevelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 41: 1: *Blessed is he that considereth the poor; the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble.*

Almighty God, as we daily think of humanity's many needs, may we develop new capacities of sympathy and understanding for men and nations everywhere.

Grant that we may enable them to become the masters over those handicaps and obstacles which still impede their progress toward the achievement and enjoyment of a nobler civilization.

Emancipate us from all cold and apathetic tempers of mind lest we become too cynical to hope for better days and too willful to believe that there are resources and reserves of divine help and strength upon which we have not yet drawn.

May the new social order for which we are praying and laboring embody and express the moral and spiritual truths and teachings of the lowly Man of Galilee, who incarnated and proclaimed His faith in God, our Father; His love of man, our brother; and His vision of the kingdom of heaven, our destiny.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1320. An act for the relief of Edward P. Wall;

H.R. 1329. An act for the relief of Kim Hyoung Geun;

H.R. 1351. An act for the relief of Danica Dopudja;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen;

H.R. 1368. An act for the relief of Maurice Devlin;

H.R. 1397. An act for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell;

H.R. 1424. An act for the relief of Benjamin E. Campbell;

H.R. 1447. An act for the relief of Wladyslaw Figura;

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Mario Menna;

H.R. 1535. An act for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh;

H.R. 1896. An act for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego;

H.R. 2138. An act for the relief of Raymond G. Greenhalgh;

H.R. 2188. An act for the relief of Lt. Matthew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired);

H.R. 2331. An act for the relief of Peggy Loene Morrison;

H.R. 2681. An act for the relief of Terata Kiyoshi Johnston;

H.R. 3498. An act for the relief of William Joseph Vincent; and

H.R. 3842. An act for the relief of James Delbert Hodges.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1346. An act for the relief of John Napoli;

H.R. 5178. An act for the relief of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 32. An act for the relief of Jeno Becsey;

S. 68. An act for the relief of Kay Addis;

S. 130. An act for the relief of Ioannis F. Kostakis;

S. 219. An act for the relief of Dr. Nobutaka Azuma;

S. 264. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Leong;

S. 268. An act for the relief of Hok Yuen Woo;

S. 294. An act for the relief of Aiko Shinzato;

S. 415. An act for the relief of Margaret Jean Dauel;

S. 441. An act for the relief of Rodopi Statherou (Statheron);

S. 442. An act for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris);

S. 485. An act for the relief of Charles Edward Pifer;

S. 570. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Alonzi;

S. 684. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers;

S. 967. An act for the relief of Wong Gar Wah;

S. 1073. An act for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis;

S. 1093. An act for the relief of Sze-Foo Chien;

S. 1168. An act for the relief of Edward C. Tonsmeire, Jr.;

S. 1204. An act for the relief of Sirijo Tanfara; and

S. 1343. An act for the relief of Dr. Tung Hui Lin.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 60]

Ashley	Inouye	Riley
Auchincloss	Kearns	Rivers, S.C.
Blitch	Keogh	Roberts
Brooks, La.	Kilburn	Sisk
Buckley	Macdonald	Stephens
Colmer	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, La.
Evins	Moeller	Walter
Granahan	Morrison	Winstead
Grant	Powell	
Hébert	Rains	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 405 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN DUTY-FREE ALLOWANCE FOR RETURNING RESIDENTS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6611) to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROLE OF CUBA IN INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is, Will the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) expressing

the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and for other purposes?

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 404, nays 2, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—404

Abbitt	Curtin	Harvey, Mich.
Abernethy	Curtis, Mass.	Hays
Adair	Curtis, Mo.	Healey
Addabbo	Daddario	Hechler
Addonizio	Dague	Hemphill
Albert	Daniels	Henderson
Alexander	Davis, James C.	Herlong
Alford	Davis, John W.	Hiestand
Alger	Davis, Tenn.	Hoeven
Andersen, Minn.	Dawson	Hoffman, Ill.
Anderson, Ill.	Delaney	Holifield
Andrews	Dent	Holland
Anfuso	Denton	Holtzman
Arends	Derounian	Horan
Ashbrook	Derwinski	Hosmer
Ashley	Devine	Huddleston
Ashmore	Diggs	Hull
Aspinall	Dingell	Ichord, Mo.
Avery	Dole	Ikard, Tex.
Ayres	Dominick	Inouye
Bailey	Donohue	Jarman
Baker	Dooley	Jennings
Baldwin	Dorn	Jensen
Baring	Dowdy	Joelson
Barrett	Downing	Johansen
Barry	Doyle	Johnson, Calif.
Bass, N.H.	Dulski	Johnson, Md.
Bass, Tenn.	Durno	Johnson, Wis.
Bates	Dwyer	Jonas
Battin	Edmondson	Jones, Ala.
Becker	Elliott	Jones, Mo.
Beckworth	Ellsworth	Judd
Beermann	Everett	Karsten
Belcher	Fallon	Karth
Bell	Farbstein	Kastenmeier
Bennett, Fla.	Fascell	Kee
Bennett, Mich.	Feighan	Keith
Berry	Fenton	Kelly
Betts	Findley	Kilday
Blatnik	Finnegan	Kilgore
Boland	Fino	King, Calif.
Bolling	Fisher	King, N.Y.
Bolton	Flood	King, Utah
Bonner	Flynt	Kirwan
Bow	Fogarty	Kitchin
Boykin	Ford	Kluczynski
Brademas	Forrester	Knox
Bray	Fountain	Kornegay
Breeding	Frazier	Kyl
Brewster	Frelinghuysen	Laird
Bromwell	Friedel	Landrum
Brooks, Tex.	Fulton	Lane
Broomfield	Gallagher	Langen
Brown	Garland	Lankford
Broyhill	Garmatz	Latta
Bruce	Gary	Lennon
Burke, Ky.	Gathings	Lesinski
Burke, Mass.	Gavin	Libonati
Burleson	Giaimo	Lindsay
Byrne, Pa.	Gilbert	Lipscomb
Byrnes, Wis.	Glenn	Loser
Cahill	Goodell	McCormack
Carey	Goodling	McCulloch
Casey	Gray	McDonough
Cederberg	Green, Pa.	McDowell
Celler	Griffin	McFall
Chamberlain	Griffiths	McIntire
Chelf	Gross	McMillan
Chenoweth	Gubser	McSween
Chiperfield	Hagan, Ga.	McVey
Church	Hagen, Calif.	Macdonald
Clancy	Haley	MacGregor
Clark	Hall	Machrowicz
Coad	Halleck	Mack
Cohelan	Halpern	Madden
Collier	Hansen	Magnuson
Conte	Harding	Mahon
Cook	Hardy	Mailliard
Cooley	Harris	Marshall
Corbett	Harrison, Va.	Martin, Nebr.
Corman	Harrison, Wyo.	Mason
Cramer	Harsha	Mathias
Cunningham	Harvey, Ind.	Matthews
		May
Meader	Poff	Smith, Iowa
Merrow	Powell	Smith, Miss.
Michel	Price	Smith, Va.
Miller, Clem	Pucinski	Spence
Miller, George P.	Quie	Springer
Miller, N.Y.	Rabaut	Stafford
Milliken	Randall	Staggers
Mills	Ray	Steed
Minshall	Reifel	Stratton
Monagan	Reuss	Stubblefield
Montoya	Rhodes, Ariz.	Sullivan
Moore	Rhodes, Pa.	Taber
Moorehead, Ohio	Riehlman	Taylor
Moorhead, Pa.	Rivers, Alaska	Teague, Calif.
Morgan	Robison	Thomas
Morris	Rodino	Thompson, La.
Morrison	Rogers, Colo.	Thompson, N.J.
Morse	Rogers, Fla.	Thompson, Tex.
Mosher	Rogers, Tex.	Thomson, Wis.
Moss	Rooney	Thornberry
Moulder	Roosevelt	Toll
Multer	Rostenkowski	Tollefson
Murphy	Roudebush	Trimble
Murray	Rousselot	Tuck
Natcher	Rutherford	Tupper
Nelsen	Ryan	Ullman
Nix	St. George	Utt
Norblad	St. Germain	Vanik
Norrell	Santangelo	Van Pelt
Nygaard	Saund	Van Zandt
O'Brien, Ill.	Saylor	Vinson
O'Brien, N.Y.	Schadeberg	Wallhauser
O'Hara, Ill.	Schenck	Watts
O'Hara, Mich.	Scherer	Weaver
O'Konski	Schneebeli	Weis
Olsen	Schweiker	Westland
O'Neill	Schwengel	Whalley
Osmers	Scott	Wharton
Passman	Scranton	Whitener
Patman	Seely-Brown	Whitten
Pelly	Selden	Wickersham
Perkins	Shelley	Widnall
Peterson	Sheppard	Williams
Pfost	Shipley	Willis
Philbin	Short	Wilson, Calif.
Pike	Shriver	Wilson, Ind.
Pilcher	Sibal	Wright
Pillion	Sikes	Yates
Pirnie	Siler	Young
Poage	Sisk	Younger
	Slack	Zablocki
	Smith, Calif.	Zelenko

NAYS—2

Hoffman, Mich. Kowalski

NOT VOTING—27

Auchincloss	Grant	Rains
Blitch	Green, Oreg.	Riley
Boggs	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Brooks, La.	Kearns	Roberts
Buckley	Keogh	Stephens
Cannon	Kilburn	Teague, Tex.
Colmer	Martin, Mass.	Udall
Evins	Moeller	Walter
Granahan	Ostertag	Winstead

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Ostertag.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today two bills affecting Cuba. In addition we have House Joint Resolution 384 which authorizes the President to accept for the United States the agreement for the establishment of the Caribbean Organization. I believe that all three bills are constructive and should be approved.

House Joint Resolution 384 establishes a strong organization for the development of Caribbean areas which are not eligible for membership in the Organization of American States since the OAS is limited to sovereign, independent countries. However, the new Organization will allow representation directly by the people concerned in a body designed to improve their well-being through the promotion of economic and technological development. As such it will continue progress now underway and is designed to remove a taint of paternalism which is out of date in the Caribbean area.

House Concurrent Resolution 209 will assist through loans for college expenses, those brave Cubans who have demonstrated their devotion to freedom. It will help those who left their native land rather than live under a Communist-controlled police state. By creating a University Free Cuba the United States will continue the program already in effect to educate freedom-loving youth of Cuba. In the expectation that they someday will return to liberate their people, there could not be a more rewarding investment than this. The program would not only give encouragement and practical assistance where needed, but it should help crystallize a group to resist Communist dictatorship only 90 miles from our borders.

Finally, we have House Concurrent Resolution 226 which is designed to help eliminate Communist membership on the Inter-American Defense Board. This is highly essential. The resolution also suggests that Latin American countries comprising the OAS break diplomatic relations with the present Cuban Government and cease trade with or otherwise communicate with that island. However, as we approve this proposal we must be very careful not to play into Castro's hands by helping create hatred among the Cuban people for the democratic countries of the Americas.

I fully approve of trying to persuade other American states to join in a solid front with the United States against Castro's Communist dictatorship. In carrying out the intent of this resolution, I would warn the administration to exercise caution and good judgment, lest they alienate those very people on whose eventual revolt against Communist tyranny we must depend.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my position in regard to this resolution a matter of record, because I think it is important that this Government make no move which would preclude unilateral action on the part of the United States regarding Cuba if, in

our defense, such action becomes necessary. I am deeply concerned that we do not put all of our reliance in fighting the Communist conspiracy in the Western Hemisphere in the Organization of American States, because I am not sure we can depend upon them to be on our side in a showdown with communism.

At this very moment some of the most prominent members of OAS will not take a stand against Castro. It would be foolhardy for us to put the safety of the United States at the mercy of those who in the final showdown may not be on our side. I would like to point out further, Mr. Speaker, while this resolution gives the ministers of the Organization of American States the power to decide upon certain nations, it does not bind them to do so. I am already on record and I believe that we should now institute an economic blockade of Cuba until further plans can be worked out. I am not in favor of letting such a vital decision be the subject of prolonged debate in another international sewing circle.

UNIVERSITY FREE CUBA PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO CUBAN REFUGEE STUDENTS

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is, Will the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 209) requesting the President to exercise his authority to operate a program, to be known as University Free Cuba, to provide assistance to certain Cuban refugee students, and for other purposes?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I must make clear my position regarding this resolution. It is another instance where Congress is waiving its authority to safeguard the people's money. No matter how laudable its objectives—and I certainly have every sympathy for the refugees of the Castro tyranny—we have no right to abrogate our authority and responsibility as the representatives of the American people under the blanket authority this resolution gives to the President. We are not told how much will be spent, what schools will be given aid, what students will be helped, nor what subject matter will be taught. The most compelling objection is that these untold millions will be spent without the approval of Congress nor investigation by the proper committees of Congress.

One other point I think should be made: I have consistently opposed the role of the Federal Government in supporting education. In my opinion, it is unconstitutional in any form. For that reason I opposed the National Defense Education Act and I see no difference here. If it is wrong for the Federal Government to support education for our own people, there is no justification for supporting education for foreigners.

ESTABLISHING AN OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question on passage of the bill (H.R. 4614) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 305, nays 104, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—305

Addabbo	Davis, Tenn.	Healey
Addonizio	Dawson	Hechler
Albert	Delaney	Hemphill
Alexander	Dent	Henderson
Andrews	Denton	Herlong
Anfuso	Derounian	Holifield
Ashley	Diggs	Holland
Ashmore	Dingell	Holtzman
Aspinall	Dominick	Horan
Avery	Donohue	Hosmer
Ayres	Dooley	Huddleston
Bailey	Downing	Hull
Baker	Doyle	Ichord, Mo.
Baldwin	Dulski	Ikard, Tex.
Barrett	Dwyer	Inouye
Barry	Edmondson	Jarman
Bass, N.H.	Elliott	Jennings
Bass, Tenn.	Ellsworth	Joelson
Bates	Everett	Johnson, Calif.
Beckworth	Fallon	Johnson, Md.
Bell	Farbstein	Johnson, Wis.
Bennett, Fla.	Fascell	Jonas
Bennett, Mich.	Feighan	Jones, Ala.
Blatnik	Fenton	Jones, Mo.
Boland	Finnegan	Judd
Bolling	Fino	Karsten
Bonner	Fisher	Karth
Brademas	Flood	Kastenmeier
Bray	Fogarty	Kearns
Breeding	Ford	Kee
Brewster	Fountain	Keith
Brooks, La.	Frazier	Kelly
Brooks, Tex.	Frelinghuysen	Kilday
Broomfield	Friedel	Kilgore
Broyhill	Fulton	King, Calif.
Burke, Ky.	Gallagher	King, N.Y.
Burke, Mass.	Garland	King, Utah
Burleson	Garmatz	Kirwan
Byrne, Pa.	Gary	Kitchin
Cahill	Gathings	Kluczynski
Cannon	Gavin	Knox
Carey	Giaimo	Kornegay
Casey	Gilbert	Kowalski
Celler	Glenn	Landrum
Chamberlain	Goodell	Lane
Chelf	Gray	Lankford
Chenoweth	Green, Oreg.	Lennon
Chiperfield	Green, Pa.	Lesinski
Clark	Griffin	Libonati
Coad	Griffiths	Lindsay
Cohelan	Hagan, Ga.	Loser
Conte	Hagen, Calif.	McCormack
Cook	Haley	McDowell
Cooley	Hall	McFall
Corbett	Halpern	McIntire
Corman	Hansen	McMillan
Cramer	Harding	McSween
Curtin	Hardy	McVey
Daddario	Harris	Macdonald
Daniels	Harrison, Va.	MacGregor
Davis, John W.	Hays	Machrowicz
Mack	Peterson	Smith, Iowa
Madden	Pfost	Smith, Miss.
Magnuson	Philbin	Spence
Mahon	Pike	Springer
Mailliard	Poage	Stafford
Mathias	Poff	Staggers
Matthews	Powell	Stratton
May	Price	Stubblefield
Meader	Pucinski	Sullivan
Merrow	Quie	Taylor
Miller, Clem	Rabaut	Teague, Tex.
Milliken	Randall	Thomas
Mills	Reuss	Thompson, La.
Monagan	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, N.J.
Montoya	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Moorhead, Pa.	Rivers, Alaska	Thomson, Wis.
Morgan	Rodino	Thornberry
Morris	Rogers, Colo.	Toll
Morrison	Rogers, Fla.	Tollefson
Morse	Rogers, Tex.	Trimble
Moss	Rooney	Tupper
Moulder	Roosevelt	Ullman
Multer	Rostenkowski	Vanik
Murphy	Rutherford	Van Zandt
Murray	Ryan	Vinson
Natcher	St. Germain	Wallhauser
Nelsen	Santangelo	Watts
Nix	Saund	Weis
Norblad	Saylor	Whalley
Nygaard	Schneebeli	Whitener
O'Brien, Ill.	Schwengel	Wickersham
O'Brien, N.Y.	Scott	Widnall
O'Hara, Ill.	Seely-Brown	Willis
O'Hara, Mich.	Selden	Wilson, Calif.
Olsen	Shelley	Wright
O'Neill	Sheppard	Yates
Osmers	Shipley	Young
Ostertag	Shriver	Younger
Passman	Sibal	Zablocki
Patman	Sikes	Zelenko
Perkins	Sisk	

NAYS—104

Abbitt	Dowdy	Mosher
Abernethy	Durno	Norrell
Adair	Findley	O'Konski
Alford	Flynt	Pelly
Alger	Forrester	Pilcher
Andersen, Minn.	Goodling	Pillion
	Gross	Pirnie
Anderson, Ill.	Gubser	Ray
Arends	Halleck	Riehlman
Ashbrook	Harrison, Wyo.	Robison
Battin	Harsha	Roudebush
Becker	Harvey, Ind.	Rousselot
Beermann	Harvey, Mich.	St. George
Belcher	Hiestand	Schadeberg
Berry	Hoeven	Schenck
Betts	Hoffman, Ill.	Scherer
Bolton	Hoffman, Mich.	Schweiker
Bow	Jensen	Scranton
Bromwell	Johansen	Short
Brown	Kyl	Siler
Bruce	Laird	Slack
Byrnes, Wis.	Langen	Smith, Calif.
Cederberg	Latta	Smith, Va.
Church	Lipscomb	Steed
Clancy	McCulloch	Taber
Collier	McDonough	Teague, Calif.
Cunningham	Marshall	Tuck
Curtis, Mass.	Martin, Mass.	Utt
Curtis, Mo.	Martin, Nebr.	Van Pelt
Dague	Mason	Weaver
Davis, James C.	Michel	Westland
	Miller, N.Y.	Wharton
Derwinski	Minshall	Whitten
Devine	Moore	Williams
Dole	Moorehead, Ohio	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn		

NOT VOTING—24

Auchincloss	Grant	Riley
Baring	Hébert	Rivers, S.C.
Blitch	Keogh	Roberts
Boggs	Kilburn	Stephens
Boykin	Miller, George P.	Udall
Buckley		Walter
Colmer	Moeller	Winstead
Evins	Rains	
Granahan	Reifel	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Moeller against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Winstead with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. LAIRD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the unanimous consent request, is the gentleman saying that there is so little interest in the House of Represenatives in the spending of nearly $4.5 billion of the taxpayers' money that general debate can be disposed of in 2 hours?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, we did it last year without any trouble, and we thought all questions were answered last year and 2 years ago. I am sure the gentleman knows that about half of the total of the bill is grants to States for public assistance, and there is nothing that you or I can do about it in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I regret to observe that this abbreviated procedure is apparently becoming par for the course in the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7035, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I do this for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The program for the balance of the week is the pending bill, and after the disposition of this bill there is H.R. 3279, increasing travel allowance for Federal employees.

Mr. HALLECK. And that will conclude the work for this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all I have now.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know of nothing else at the present time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be able to bring to you today another unanimous report, from our Committee on Appropriations, for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. This is the 15th year that I have had the opportunity of working on this bill and the 11th year as chairman. For 11 years now we have had a unanimous report coming out of our committee. I started on this subcommittee back in the days that many of you will remember, with Frank Keefe of Wisconsin, who did such a splendid job in the fields of labor, health, and education in 1947 and 1948. We have tried to continue this progress.

First, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the members of our committee; on this side, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], for the long hours they put in on the hearings, meeting all day and many nights until 6 o'clock in the evening. I want to thank them for the help that they have given me, and also thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], the ranking Republican member, who has been of such great help, and who knows as much about this bill as I do. The new member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], has done a remarkable job and has given us much assistance during this, his first year. Of course, I could not stop there without saying a word for our clerk, Mr. Moyer. We think we have the best clerk of any Committee on Appropriations in the House.

This is a unanimous report from the committee. That means compromise. There are some areas in which I think we ought to be doing more and there are members of the committee who think that we ought to be doing less. This bill is the result of 7 or 8 weeks of hearings and compromise on both sides. So we come to you with a unanimous report.

There are three or four items in the bill this year that I think are unusually important. One has to do with training programs.

For the last several years the committee has encouraged, especially the Department of Labor, to institute a really effective program for the training of men and women for skilled industrial jobs. This is especially important in areas where automation, migration of industry, and other economic factors have raised unemployment to high levels.

While such a program is needed to relieve unemployment, the relief of unemployment is far from being the only factor involved. We have the situation today where large numbers are unemployed and at the same time there is a large unfilled demand for people skilled in certain industrial activities. Anyone who doubts that situation exists has only to look at the many columns of help-wanted ads in the Sunday edition of any metropolitan newspaper. Thus we have a perhaps equally important problem of meeting an existing demand for much needed skilled people.

This year the committee has decided to quit just talking about this problem and has included funds in the bill to start really doing something about it. Funds are included in the Secretary of Labor's Office to supervise and coordinate the program in the Department of Labor. Funds are included in the Bureau of Labor Statistics to make a study of the problems resulting from automation. The committee has approved the small increase requested for the promotion of industrial training programs in the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training and, in addition, has recommended an increase of $500,000 over the budget to enable this Bureau to staff up to the level necessary to do a really effective job. The committee has increased by $1 million the appropriation request for area vocational educational programs under the Defense Education Act and will expect that these programs be encouraged to follow the lines that will result in maximum contribution toward the solution of this problem. Finally the committee has recommended an increase, over the budget request, for the cooperative research program in the Office of Education, and will expect that a part of this increase be used to establish at least one demonstration project in the field of training and of retraining persons displaced from their jobs in industry.

In the hearings with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, considerable time was spent on the question of hospital costs. We were told that hospital costs have gone up 300 percent in the last 20 years; and all through the hearings, if you have time to read them, you will find that we have been insisting that more attention be spent on training physical therapists and others that can help in expanding the home-care programs and permit people to get out of the hospital sooner than they otherwise would be able. We have also added a special appropriation for a new program of research in hospital facilities. There is $10 million in the bill for this new program.

We had evidence given to us by doctors from the Mayo Clinic and the Methodist Hospital in Rochester who have been working on a project now for 6 years, studying the value of a new design for hospitals. In the last 40 or 50 years there has been little change in the design of hospitals. As a result of their study, they came to our committee and told us, after this 6-year study of the problem, that they were able to bring down the cost of nursing care in the intensive ward area from $54 a day to $14 a day. This is one of the most significant findings that was presented to our committee this year. That is why we included the $10 million as a new item.

I shall try to go down the table in the report; and if Members have the committee report in front of them, they will be able to follow the explanation

of the changes made by the committee from the suggestions of the Budget.

In the Department of Labor we cut the appropriation for the Secretary by $184,000; $150,000 of the cut was to cover the cost of the Labor-Management Committee set up by the President. We thought this should be financed all in one place, rather than split between the Departments of Commerce and Labor. We cut out $27,000 for two positions in Civil Defense and another $7,000 item for a new position in the personnel office.

In the Bureau of Labor-Management Reports we made a reduction of $500,000 from the request because the workload did not come up to what they expected.

In the Bureau of International Labor Affairs they asked for an increase of some $130,000, and we gave them half the increase asked for.

In the Office of the Solicitor we approved the budget estimate.

For the Bureau of Labor Standards we approved the budget estimate.

In the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights we gave them the amount they asked for.

For the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, because of automation and other factors we have included $647,000 more than they have this year. The recommended increase includes approval of the requested increase of $147,000 aimed primarily at strengthening the Bureau's support of the Department's manpower program by providing staff and promotional materials to expand and improve training in industry. The committee has added another $500,000 to initiate a really effective program of training. The committee will expect that special emphasis be given to those areas of high unemployment due to increased automation, migration of industry, and other factors; and to those areas where serious shortages of properly trained personnel exist.

In the Bureau of Employment Security we made a small cut of $158,000 from the amount requested for salaries and expenses.

We cut the Employees' Compensation Fund $1,500,000, because they gave us a new estimate that indicated this amount will not be needed.

We gave the Bureau of Labor Statistics just what was asked for. We also gave the Women's Bureau the budget estimate, $668,000, and we gave the Wage and Hour Division what was asked for.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Now as to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we gave the Food and Drug Administration what they asked for. I think we should have given them more, but it was a compromise and I am supporting this amount.

Mr. Chairman, few agencies of the Federal Government fulfill a more responsible and necessary role than the Food and Drug Administration. And few areas subject to Federal action are experiencing more dynamic changes than those over which the Food and Drug Administration has responsibility. In a very literal sense, this agency has the direct and personal welfare of every man, woman, and child in the United States under its protection. Every American relies upon the Food and Drug Administration each day for a supply of safe and pure foods, drugs, and cosmetics. And in times such as these when technology provides us with a myriad of new food preparations, complex drugs undreamed of even 5 or 10 years ago, and almost unimaginable varieties of cosmetic products, these responsibilities of the Food and Drug Administration become all the more vital to the everyday health and well-being of the American people. It might be worth while to pause very briefly and mention a few FDA responsibilities which have become more difficult to fulfill as a result of changing times.

PESTICIDES

One such responsibility is to protect all consumers of foods—especially consumers of fresh produce—from excessive residues of toxic pesticides and other agricultural chemicals which might still be on these foods after they enter the interstate market. It is interesting to note that, whereas prior to 1940 there were fewer than half a dozen chemicals available as pesticides, there are today over 200 such chemicals used in over 45,000 chemical preparations. These in turn are used to the tune of 600 million pounds by 2 million farmers on every crop grown in this country. Some of these pesticides, I might add, are so toxic that a drop undiluted falling on the skin of a human being can cause death. The way these chemical agents are used, therefore, becomes extremely important. Unless they are applied to crops in accordance with prescribed directions for use, residues of these poisonous chemicals can remain on the crops and find their way to the consumer's dinner table.

Since it is impossible to survey how every farmer uses each of these pesticides during the crop cycle, it becomes imperative that, at the very least, we sample these crops once they are in interstate commerce to make sure that they do not contain residues which would be harmful to consumers. This sampling job, Mr. Chairman, is a responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration.

It is of great concern to me—and I am sure to all American consumers—that with the resources now available, FDA can sample only one-fifth of 1 percent of the estimated 2,500,000 interstate shipments of food crops which have been treated with these agricultural chemicals. In terms of numbers, this amounts to the collection of approximately 5,000 samples a year, out of the estimated 2,500,000 shipments. During the hearings before my subcommittee, testimony was provided to show that in order to determine the extent of the problem, let alone to provide minimum protection, FDA should sample at least 1 percent or 25,000 samples of the annual shipments of food crops treated with agricultural chemicals. This certainly seems reasonable. The appropriations which we would provide the Food and Drug Administration for fiscal year 1962 would permit that agency, by 1963, to collect 13,000 samples, equivalent to a sampling of one-half of 1 percent of the annual interstate shipments of such food crops. This is progress in the right direction.

DRUGS

Another responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration which has been given an entirely new look as a result of technological changes, as well as a result of new techniques of distribution and marketing, is the responsibility to protect all Americans from unsafe, impotent, and mislabeled drugs. It is interesting to note that in fiscal year 1960 the Food and Drug Administration received 480 new drug applications. In effect, therefore, we can say that a new drug is developed in this Nation on the average of more than one every day. In addition to this, the Food and Drug Administration in fiscal year 1960 received 2,059 so-called supplements of new drugs. These supplements are changes in new drugs which had been previously approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

Not only are new drugs being developed and changed in greater numbers, but they are for the most part more complex than before. Some have timing agents which permit them to dissolve and to react over a period of time. Some are so potent that they must be administered only by specialists with extreme caution. Some are very prone to habit forming. Others can develop serious reactions with certain individuals. Yet it is the responsibility of FDA to clear for safety each of these drugs and their supplements before they can be marketed. Then FDA must make sure that they are being marketed under the approved labeling, that they contain the approved ingredients, and that they are sold under the approved means of distribution. This is a tremendous task.

It is also the responsibility of the Food and Drug Administration to make certain that promotional literature for new drugs and their supplements submitted to physicians by the drug industry contain accurate and honest descriptions of the drugs, how they are to be used, and what they can affect. When one considers that the general practitioner in this Nation receives an average of 4,700 such pieces of literature annually and that the Food and Drug Administration seriously reviews only 2 percent—100—of these, we can begin to visualize clearly the scope of the FDA responsibility.

Likewise, when we realize that there are over 56,000 retail drugstores which must be inspected to guard against illegal sale of prescription drugs and of counterfeit drugs—a problem of growing dimensions—we can again better understand what the Food and Drug Administration faces. When we realize that there are over 12,000 manufacturers of drugs which have to be surveyed to ascertain whether or not FDA-approved drugs are being manufactured in accordance with proper safety controls, we get an even better picture of the responsibilities which are the Food and Drug Administration's in this area.

Recent findings of the Kefauver committee, as well as a recent study of FDA drug operations made by a special committee headed by Dr. Detlev W. Bronk,

President of the National Academy of Sciences, have indicated, in the former case, the phenomenal changes which have occurred in the development, manufacture and distribution of drugs, and, in the latter case, the inadequate resources available to the Food and Drug Administration to cope adequately with these changes and to provide the type of consumer protection which this Nation deserves. The appropriation for fiscal year 1962 would contribute substantially to the strengthening of FDA drug activities across the board.

OTHER PROBLEMS

These two problems are but two of a host of problems confronting the Food and Drug Administration as a result of relatively recent changes in the technology of foods, drugs, and cosmetics. As significant as these two problems are, others are no less significant. If time permitted, I would like to discuss a few of these at length. It suffice, however, merely to list some of them.

First. Food additives: There are over 3,000 chemicals used today in the manufacture, processing and packaging of foods. FDA must evaluate and prescribe tolerances for the safe use of each of these in every food product. It must then enforce such tolerances.

Second. Color additives: There are an estimated 465 manufacturers, packers and mixers of color additives and an estimated 18,000 firms using such additives. Each color additive must be tested for safety and used under specific tolerances established by the Food and Drug Administration. FDA must also certify many of them on a batch-by-batch basis.

Third. Hazardous substances: Under an act passed by the Congress last year, FDA must evaluate household products which contain hazardous substances and must prescribe proper cautionary labeling for each such product. There are an estimated 300,000 trade items used in and around the household containing dangerous substances.

Fourth. Frozen foods: This means of processing and distributing foods has grown phenomenally. Prior to World War II frozen foods output in this country was about 268 million pounds a year. Today the output is well over 5 billion pounds annually. Since these products do not receive a final heating during manufacture, and since they are consumed in the home often without sufficient heat to destroy micro-organisms, it becomes imperative that they be produced in the plant under the most sanitary conditions and that they are not subject to any mishandling in commerce. FDA inspections must assure that this is the case.

Fourth. Cosmetics: This is an industry which has made great strides in the past decade or so. Retail sales of cosmetics approach an annual figure of $2 billion. There are approximately 2,000 manufacturers and distributors in the United States. The big problem here, is that cosmetics now on the market and being developed be subjected to adequate tests to determine their safety for individual users. Each year the Food and Drug Administration encounters products which have not received that type of testing and which are causing harm to users. The job of sampling the thousands of cosmetic products on the market and those which are constantly being added is a task of huge dimensions for the Food and Drug Administration.

Thus, citing only a handful of problems, we get some concept of the importance of the Food and Drug Administration's activities to the health and welfare of each and every American and of the complexity of these problems in changing times such as these.

The fiscal year 1962 appropriations would be another in a series of steps taken by the Congress within recent years to bolster the Food and Drug Administration and provide it with the resources which experience and private studies, such as the Citizens Advisory Committee of 1955, have shown to be needed in order that this agency might fulfill adequate its responsibilities to the American people.

Over a period of years, my Subcommittee has heard testimony which overwhelmingly shows that FDA is not equipped with the manpower and other resources to do its job with the thoroughness necessary to provide maximum protection. FDA can inspect each of the estimated 100,000 establishments under its jurisdiction on the average of about once every 4 years. Problems such as those I have mentioned are not receiving the attention they must get. Only within the past 5 years has FDA been able to start replacing its obsolete scientific equipment. Half of its inventory is still obsolete. Only since fiscal year 1958—over half a century since passage of the food and drug law—have funds been provided for renovation of the district office laboratories. Although the Congress has permitted FDA to make considerable strides in these recent years, the job is far from done. We must continue this progress until the American consumer has the protection to which he is entitled in these changing times. Should this fiscal year 1962 appropriation be provided FDA, it would represent an investment of about 13 cents for each American citizen. I can think of no investment bearing greater returns.

Next in order of consideration are the programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education. These programs are essential to our national progress and, indeed, to our very survival. The Congress has repeatedly affirmed its deep concern for education beginning with the first Morrill Act of 1862 to establish the great land-grant college institutions and more recently by the provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

One of the most successful of these programs is in vocational education. It helps to fill our needs for skilled manpower. It provides a weapon against unemployment. It cuts down school dropouts. It increases the efficiency of the Nation and provides wider occupational choices for the individual. Under this program, special training is provided for high school students and adults who need retraining or additional training for new jobs.

The sum of $33,672,000 included in the bill for 1962 provides for continuation of the program at the 1961 level of operation and includes $4 million to continue the practical nurse training program extended by the Congress earlier this year.

LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

The 68 land-grant colleges and universities participate in a permanent appropriation of $2,550,000 a year and also share in an annual appropriation through the Bankhead-Jones Act—1935 and 1952. Last year the Congress increased the annual authorization from $2,501,500 to $11,950,000.

The bill provides $8,194,000, which is an increase of $5,692,500 over the 1961 appropriation and represents the first of two steps to reach the new maximum authorized by the Congress last year. Uniform grants to each State will increase from $20,000 to $90,000, and Puerto Rico will be included. Variable grants to each State based on population will increase from $1,501,500 to $3,604,000.

For many years the land-grant colleges have underwritten the Nation's progress in agriculture and the mechanic arts. About one-fifth of the total enrollment in higher education in the United States is accommodated by the land-grant colleges and universities.

GRANTS TO LIBRARY SERVICES

Last year the Library Services Act was extended through 1966—Public Law 86–279—thus continuing a program that has brought new or improved public library services to over 35 million rural residents. Federal funds are limited to not more than 66 percent nor less than 33 percent of the total costs. The act opens the world to every isolated community. Over 250 new bookmobiles are on the roads as a result of this program. Over 1½ million rural children and adults who were formerly without any library services at all are participating. It liberates the homebound and help to provide education to thousands of rural communities.

The act continues to authorize $7,500,000 a year to promote further development. This amount is requested for fiscal year 1962 to provide for the continuation of grants at the maximum authorized level.

No Federal program supplementing the education of our rural population has gained wider acceptance nor has been received with greater enthusiasm.

AID TO FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

The appropriation bill before the House today carries funds for the permanent provisions of the acts aiding schools in federally impacted areas. The sum of $85,700,000 appears in the bill as "Payments to school districts" and another item of $24,850,000 appears as "Assistance for school construction." The $85 million item is the amount necessary to pay entitlements to federally impacted school districts authorized by Public Law 874 and the $24 million item is the amount necessary for construction of school facilities as authorized by Public Law 815. I want to comment on the appropriation for these two programs

because some members may have wondered at the amount for the 1962 fiscal year compared to the much larger amounts appropriated for these programs for the current fiscal year, totaling $280 million for both programs.

In 1958 this Congress amended these two Federal impact laws by making permanent the provisions insofar as they apply to children who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property. Congress extended the provisions authorizing payments to all other categories of Federal impact until June 30, 1961. Thus the appropriation of $85 million for Public Law 874 and $24 million for Public Law 815 includes only funds for payments for the children living on Federal bases. There is nothing in this appropriation for those districts educating children who live in a taxable home with a parent employed on Federal property.

The administration has recommended permanent legislation to the current session of Congress for payments to school districts for children who live in a taxable home with a parent employed on Federal property. At the same time, the proposed legislation provides that the rate of payment be cut in half from the present 50 percent of the local contribution rate to 25 percent of that rate.

I call this matter to your attention to explain why the appropriations we are voting on today for these two programs total only $110,550,000, as compared with the $280 million appropriated for the current fiscal year. Also, I want to alert you to the fact that a supplemental appropriation will be required for these two programs whether Congress supports the administration's recommended cuts in payments or extends these two laws without the recommended reductions.

If Public Law 874 was extended in its present form, the estimated requirements for 1962 would be $250 million. Under the extension recommended by the administration, the requirements would be $158 million. If Public Law 815 was extended in its present form, the requirements would be about $62 million. Under the amendments proposed by the administration, the estimated cost would be about $45 million.

I am pleased to note that the Committee on Education and Labor has shown its good judgment in recommending against the proposed severe cuts and for continuation of the present program. I personally do not believe that this program should be curtailed in view of the continuing burdens placed upon communities by the tax-exempt status of Federal property.

In my home State of Rhode Island, 21 federally impacted school districts received approximately $1,117,000 for 7,851 children whose parents were living in taxable homes in the 1960 fiscal year. Had the proposed amendments been in effect in 1960, these 21 federally impacted school districts would have received only $558,000 for these same children. This is a very substantial cut for these districts to absorb at a time when the number of children brought into these communities by activities of the Federal Government is increasing each year.

DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The National Defense Education Act provides greatly needed assistance in States and their subdivisions, to communities, to school districts, and to individuals. Every State and practically every community, large or small, benefits from this act.

The bill includes $210,857,000 which represents an increase of $23,377,000 over the amount provided for fiscal year 1961.

STUDENT LOANS (TITLE II) ($58,430,000 AMENDED TO $75,145,000)

The student loan program allows needy students to borrow money for a college education. This year 145,000 students in 1,407 colleges will be aided in continuing their education. This program has met with universal acceptance and is one of the finest actions taken by this Government to encourage our people to invest in themselves through education.

SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION (TITLE III) ($57,750,000)

Title III of the NDEA is aimed at improving instruction in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages. It aids the schools in the acquisition of equipment and minor remodeling of laboratories and supports advances in foreign language instruction. Loans to nonprofit private schools are also available under terms of the act.

The schools have been deplorably weak in these important fields of instruction which are so definitely allied with the national defense. Under the impetus of NDEA there has been a fivefold increase in approved projects to strengthen instruction. Student enrollment has increased significantly. Teacher competency has been reinforced and State supervisory services are increasingly effective. I will insert in the RECORD at this point a statement of comments submitted by various local superintendents throughout the country showing the value of equipment acquired with the aid of NDEA funds.

Title III of the NDEA has brought about a dynamic change in thousands of schools. Instruction in science and mathematics has been upgraded and updated. Rural schools have been put on a par with their urban counterparts. New curriculum materials have been developed, new equipment has been purchased, laboratories have been modernized, new resource centers have been established and higher standards have been set. In thousands of schools, yesterday's obsolete scientific equipment has been replaced by the modern equipment used in industry and commerce; in hundreds of school laboratories, the age of electronics can now be taught and understood.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS (TITLE IV) ($21,762,000)

The budget estimate for fiscal year 1962 represents an increase of $1,012,000 over the amount provided in 1961.

The graduate fellowship program has expanded and strengthened graduate facilities in our colleges and universities. Over 680 graduate programs have been established or expanded in 149 graduate schools. Three-year fellowships have been awarded to 4,000 students for graduate study through 1961. The committee has reduced the budget request for this item by $1 million which will curtail the program expansion in 1962 but will not reduce any existing programs.

GUIDANCE, COUNSELING, AND TESTING (TITLE V): (A) GRANTS TO STATES ($15 MILLION), (B) INSTITUTES FOR COUNSELING PERSONNEL ($6,900,000)

In the kind of world we are facing, our youth must meet challenges which impose new requirements of personal initiative, effort, and ability. In order to accomplish this, we must maintain imaginative programs of guidance and counseling in our schools. This is the objective of title V of the NDEA. A dramatic example of how this program is aiding our schools reduce "drop-outs" and thereby to cut down on delinquency and unemployment is provided by the higher horizons project in New York City. This project has enabled the successful education transition of children coming from families of minority groups in New York City, such as Puerto Ricans, by providing special guidance and education programs which are supported by title V funds. Otherwise, a substantial number of these children would find it impossible to get alone in school with the result that many would drop out and add to the delinquency problem. This is the sort of activity that needs to be spread across this country if we are to combat the evils of delinquency and the problems of unemployment due to lack of education.

ADVANCED TRAINING FOREIGN AREAS AND LANGUAGES (TITLE VI) ($15,250,000)

The teaching of foreign languages so that the learner can converse fluently and comprehend quickly is an imperative skill in a world which, almost overnight, has shrunk to a neighborhood. Within the past few years the aims of such teaching have altered. The methods have changed. The materials of instruction have expanded. To meet this change, the NDEA is supporting more institutes for retraining teachers and more research to discover the most effective teaching methods and develop specialized materials.

Under the NDEA, 48 language centers are now in operation and more than 4,000 teachers will attend summer institutes in 1962.

Great progress is being made in the development of teaching materials such as guides, grammars, readers, and manuals; and projects have been undertaken for research in the improvement of the technique of teaching languages.

NEW EDUCATIONAL MEDIA: RESEARCH AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION (TITLE VII) ($4,700,000)

Educators and laymen alike are convinced that the solution of many of our educational problems may be found in the wider and more effective use of motion pictures, TV, radio, and the other media of communication. Current developments in teaching machines, educational TV, language laboratories, and similar devices are opening up possibilities that hold much promise for improve-

ment of educational communication. This program will undoubtedly introduce changes in practice, but more importantly, it is creating a solid basis for changes built on sound research.

AREA VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS (TITLE VIII) ($12,800,000)

This allocation provides for the training of technicians in occupations requiring scientific know-how in fields necessary for the national defense such as automation, chemical and metallurgical engineering, civil construction, and electronics.

Prior to the advent of the NDEA a relatively small number of schools and institutions in a comparatively small number of States offered technical programs for training technicians. Now new buildings and facilities are being provided by the States and communities. High standards have been developed and students of top-level ability are being attracted.

The committee believes the acceleration of this program can be accomplished by adding $1 million to the budget request as provided by the Committee bill.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR IMPROVEMENT OF STATISTICAL SERVICES (TITLE X) ($1,550,0000)

These grants provide a sorely needed stimulus toward implementation of adequate data systems and standard definitions essential in order to have meaningful and comparable data in the schools. The work essential to achieving an adequate modern record and data system for the States and their 40,000 constituent local school units is underway.

Before the NDEA 13 States were using machine data processing to some extent, now 38 States either have installed or have definite plans to install machine systems.

This completes the presentation of the NDEA items.

MENTALLY RETARDED

The appropriation bill contains $1 million for grants to aid in the training of teachers of mentally retarded children. The American promise of equality and human worth must extend to every child within the borders of our country, no matter what are his capacities or his lacks.

There is no community in the United States that does not contain youngsters handicapped by mental retardation. We know that mental retardation can be caused by a variety of conditions and diseases, and yet we are just beginning to realize that much can be done to prevent these causes and to cure the disease. The future holds a great deal of hope and promise for the mentally retarded. Thousands of them can be returned to health and well-being. Presently there are approximately a million and a quarter mentally retarded children in the Nation and only about one-fourth are receiving suitable education. Throughout the years, the greatest single barrier to the expansion of educational services for these children has been the lack of qualified teaching and supervisory personnel. The program developed under Public Law 85–926 will help greatly in alleviating this serious problem.

Public Law 85–926 is designed to encourage expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies. It is carrying on that objective in a constructive and heart warming way.

It is estimated that in 1962 the budget request of $1 million would provide 68 fellowships to approximately 20 institutions of higher learning, plus 2 fellowships for each State; it is expected that this stimulation will reach the grassroots in every community. We shall know more about mental retardation and be able to go forward with a program of rehabilitation and hope for the national welfare, the community progress and the individual well-being.

As our committee report indicates it is time for consideration of broadening this program to other areas of handicapped children, particularly those afflicted with speech and hearing defects. I plan to introduce legislation which I hope the legislative committee will urgently consider.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

There is no agency of Government which surpasses the U.S. Office of Education in the dedication and accomplishments of its small staff. The Office has grown in numbers in recent years because of the tremendous workload assumed under the NDEA and other actions of the Congress. But we must be aware of the great importance of its contributions to the cause of education through the services it provides to all our citizens.

This is one of the areas where we had to compromise differences within the Committee. The bill provides for an increase over 1961 but is a reduction of $500,000 from the request.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

The committee received expert testimony from a distinguished group of educators and private citizens who recommended a strengthening of the program of cooperative research in education conducted by the Office of Education. This research which is done in the colleges and school systems throughout the country has shown remarkable potentiality for improving educational practices. In recognition of the administration's concern for this program, the President sent a special message and amendment to the budget of the Office of Education which asked for increased research funds for the areas of English instruction and the identification of talent.

It is a national disgrace that the total investment in education research in this country is such a small fraction of the tens of billions of dollars spent by our people on education. We felt that the testimony received by the committee from this eminent group of educators gave the committee sufficient evidence to support an increase in the budget for this activity. Accordingly, the bill contains $5.5 million for this purpose, an increase of $360,000 over the revised amount recommended by the President. Further, in view of the increasing importance of this activity the committee recommends in the bill its establishment as a separate appropriation account rather than its continued inclusion in the salaries and expenses budget of the Office of Education. In this way the Congress can have a much clearer concept of the amount of money available for this purpose.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The bill recommends approval of all funds requested for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, plus certain increases. This Federal-State program, which is devoted to rehabilitating disabled people and placing them in useful jobs, is doing one of the better jobs among public agencies today. It has had the interest and support of both political parties, both in the Congress and in the executive branch, and our confidence in it has not been misplaced. The number of disabled people being rehabilitated is increasing steadily each year, although I must say that I would be much happier if the rate of increase could be stepped up.

The request for grants to States for support of the basic program of rehabilitation services was for $90 million. The request made no provision for an allotment base, which has been used in this appropriation for several years to make available maximum Federal funds for State matching, without appropriating large sums which we know will revert to the Treasury. The committee has, therefore, reinstated in this bill the provision for an allotment base, in the amount of $90 million, thereby making it unnecessary to appropriate some $27 million which would not have been used.

The committee has recommended increases for the research and training programs of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. In my opinion, the funds for this important work are still far short of what we should be investing, and I am disappointed that the administration's request was so far short of the need.

The request for training funds is a good example of what I mean. We cannot expect to see major increases in rehabilitation services for disabled people unless we do something about the serious shortages of professional personnel who work with the disabled. Despite repeated testimony before the committee, from experts within the Government and outside, describing the serious and widespread effects of these shortages, we still are getting requests for inadequate funds to reduce these shortages and to permit public and voluntary agencies in rehabilitation to recruit trained personnel when they need them. The committee, accordingly, has increased the amount for training by $1 million.

In the rehabilitation research program, I have been equally disappointed that the request for 1962 made so little provision for the expansion needed. We must be willing to invest much more in the pursuit if new knowledge of our rehabiiitation programs of the future are to measure up to their responsibilities. The committee has noted a number of research projects now underway which give promise of helping to do a better job among the severely disabled, particularly among disabled persons who are

social security beneficiaries, as well as others in their later years. In mental retardation, I have noted with satisfaction that a number of research projects are underway, as well as demonstration projects to apply earlier research findings.

These and other evidences of progress are encouraging, but this research program is still operating on an extremely limited scale and I hope that the request for next year will indicate a more realistic approach to research needs in this important field.

As one step in this direction, the committee has included in this bill an additional $1 million for the establishment of two or three pilot regional rehabilitation institutes, in which a comprehensive effort can be made in programs of teaching and research in rehabilitation. The committee received testimony which convinces us that such institutes can play an extremely important role in advancing this whole field, and particularly in undergraduate and graduate teaching in physical medicine and rehabilitation, along with the other specialized fields in rehabilitation. Each of these centers would also have formal working arrangements with a large voluntary rehabilitation center which provides services to disabled people, so that the teaching and research phases could be related to the practical needs of service programs.

The committee is in complete agreement on the amounts in this bill for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and I urge your support of this appropriation.

For the Public Health Service, with respect to buildings and facilities, we gave them what they asked for.

Under community health activities, many appropriation items were lumped together. We broke them down into individual items, like chronic diseases and health of the aged, communicable disease activities, control of venereal diseases, control of tuberculosis, community health practice and research, and so forth. Starting on page 14 you can see the comparison between the amounts for last year and the amounts in the bill.

AIR POLLUTION

In one area, air pollution, we have allowed $500,000 more than the budget requested because of the terrific problem we are having now in that field.

No other environmental hazard, it seems to me, is growing faster in importance than air pollution. This is true whether you judge it by the growing public awareness of the problem—as reflected in the newspapers and magazines—or by the growing evidence that filth in the air, like filth in the water, can seriously endanger our health.

The projected budget increase for the Public Health Service's part in the national effort to keep air pollution within bounds can be justified, in my opinion, by a single fact: all four of the principal sources of air pollution are expected to grow even faster in the near future than they have in the past. These are population, urbanization, industrialization, transportation.

That means more people, crowding more than ever into our biggest metropolitan areas. It means more industries—to supply our wants and to keep our living standards climbing, but also to dump more and more waste products into the urban atmosphere. It means more and more cars and trucks belching their exhaust gases on our streets and highways.

But there are also other new facts which give urgency to our need for more vigorous Federal leadership in this field.

For example, the early evidence—primarily statistical evidence—which indicated an association between air pollution and lung cancer is being increasingly confirmed by followup studies, in the laboratory as well as in the field. One of the latest and most meaningful of these is the production, for the first time, of a human type of lung cancer in mice by inhalation of air pollutants.

In addition to new knowledge about cancer, with which we are all so deeply concerned, the Public Health Service program is also providing convincing evidence of the relationship between air pollution and other types of lung ailments.

Research in these important areas must be accelerated. Furthermore, we must make more effort to apply—much more generally than is now being done—what we already know about controlling air pollution.

While air pollution's economic damage is less alarming than its potential health hazards, it certainly seems worth mentioning when you consider that the latest estimates put the national annual economic toll as high as $7.5 billion. This includes injury to vegetation and livestock, corrosion and soiling of materials and structures, interference with visibility, and depression of property values.

The efforts of the Public Health Service, of course, are calculated to help reduce both kinds of damage. The increase in the budget for Federal activity in this field is in line with the objective suggested in President Kennedy's message on natural resources, to provide "new leadership, research, and financial aid and technical assistance for the control of air pollution."

In this connection, I also want to make a few comments on two of America's biggest industries, the automobile industry and the oil industry, and their contributions—to air pollution and to air pollution control.

Motor vehicles constitute one of the major sources of air pollution and, unlike many other important pollutant sources, this one is universal throughout the United States. Our cars and trucks go everywhere.

I cannot escape the conclusion that the automobile industry has been dragging its feet in the matter of factory installation of blow-by devices. These, as you probably know, are relatively inexpensive devices for controlling emissions from automotive crankcases. While they will not solve the larger problem of exhaust emissions from the tailpipe, they do eliminate from one-fourth to one-third of the motorcar's total contribution to our air pollution problem.

Such devices were factory-installed on new cars sold this year in the one State of California and are available—at a higher price, of course—as optional dealer-installed equipment on new American cars in other localities. In view of the mounting evidence that air pollution not only is costly but may also be highly hazardous to human health—and since this new device eliminates a part of it at a low cost—it would have seemed both good business and good public relations for the auto industry to install such a device at the factory on all new cars sold in this country. This, in fact, is what Secretary Ribicoff recently recommended.

Unlike automobiles, oil refineries are not an important part of the air pollution problem in every city, but they certainly are in many cities. In the Los Angeles area refineries have placed into effect control measures which drastically reduce their potential contribution to Los Angeles smog. What this means, then, is that Los Angeles suffers a minimum of refinery emissions and, in addition, receives new cars with blow-by control devices factory installed.

In other parts of the country, however, neither the automobile industry nor the oil industry is cooperating half so well. New Jersey, for example, is one of the many States that receive almost none of the advantages insisted upon in Los Angeles. New Jersey comes to mind because it has just recently come to my attention that New Jersey's Rutgers University is attempting to develop smog-resistant plants in order to help truck farmers to survive. A single ride at almost any hour of the day on the upper stretches of the New Jersey Turnpike makes it patently clear why Rutgers is interested in plants that can survive smog, and you don't have to be an expert loaded down with instruments to see that both refineries and automobiles play an important role in New Jersey's smog problem.

I should think that these two rich industries—simply in enlightened self-interest, if for no other reason—would do everything they reasonably could do to abate their own contribution to this growing environmental hazard, if only to avert the risk of drastic legislation which might seem to them much less reasonable in its demands. Many of the controls imposed on the refineries in Los Angeles also make economic good sense, too, in that they cut down losses from evaporation of a marketable product. And factory-installed blow-by devices for automobiles cost less than $5 and also improve the car's function.

What could be more reasonable than for both the oil and automobile industries to follow throughout the country the splendid example set in Los Angeles?

NURSING SERVICES

In nursing services and resources, we gave them $300,000 more than they asked for to try to develop a home care program that will reduce hospital costs.

The supply and quality of available nursing services continues to be a matter of foremost importance since these are fundamental to the success of all medical and health programs related to

patient care. Already faced with shortages of nursing services, health administrators face new pressures in connection with the rising demand for nursing care for people sick in their homes. It is for this reason that the committee recommended an additional $300,000 for the Division of Nursing, with the suggestion that it be used for traineeship grants. It is understood, however, that such grants are a long-term approach to this problem since they are primarily intended for the support of teaching, supervisory, and administrative personnel. It is recognized that there is also an immediate and urgent need for special training for those who give direct care to the patient. This includes learning to care for patients with complicated appliances, or needing special treatments, learning how to teach patients to care for themselves, and learning new methods of helping them back to as complete activity as possible. The intention of the committee is to provide some immediate help in developing the nursing resources needed for home care and aged health services in any appropriate manner.

In grants for hospital construction, we gave them the budget estimate which is what they had a year ago.

WATER POLLUTION AND SHELLFISH SANITATION

On the item of milk, food, interstate, and community sanitation, we have added $1,800,000 for construction of two sanitary laboratories—one to be located on the east coast and the other on the gulf coast; and for water supply and water pollution control we allowed the full request which is an increase of $3 million over the appropriation for 1961.

History seems to be repeating itself. In the early days of this century typhoid fever was the No. 1 public health problem of the Nation. People got it from the drinking water; they got it from shellfish that fed on polluted water. By the early 1920's the whole shellfish industry was threatened with extinction.

Then, at long last, something was done. The people of this Nation demanded and got drinking water that was free from harmful bacteria. The shellfish industry, working with the Public Health Service, regained its reputation for providing safe and nutritious food. In most parts of the country, there has not been a case of typhoid fever in years. But a lot of lives were lost, a lot of people suffered, before we got busy and did the things we knew ought to be done.

Well, you would think after 30 or 40 years, we would be a little more progressive when faced with a similar problem, hepatitis. That is a serious disease. It can be fatal. It can be chronic. It almost always results in a long and debilitating illness. Although it occurs in cycles, the cycles have been coming faster and faster in recent years and, in each cycle, the number of cases have been higher. So far this year, over 30,000 cases have been reported—a record high—and there are undoubtedly thousands of others that have not been reported. Moreover, the evidence is mounting that hepatitis is a water borne disease. We know that hundreds of people in Mississippi and New Jersey got hepatitis from eating raw shellfish harvested from contaminated waters. That problem was pinpointed and remedial action was taken. But what about the inland States where people seldom eat raw shellfish but where there has been an even higher incidence of hepatitis? Must we wait until there is absolute and final proof that polluted water is causing this illness and perhaps a lot of other virus diseases?

A better way, I say, is to take heed of the warnings we have had this year and step up our water pollution control and shellfish sanitation programs.

Sewage, chemicals, and radioactive pollutants are a fast-growing threat to the safety of our water supplies. They endanger all industries—and the shellfish industry is only one of many—that depend on clean, safe water in order to operate.

We need to strengthen our water pollution control program all along the line—better enforcement, more research, more personnel, more money for sewage treatment works.

We also need to step up shellfish sanitation research. It is a national disgrace that we now have only one small laboratory—out in Purdy, Wash.—making any study of how all this new and growing pollution, chemical and radiological as well as biological, may be affecting a basic food supply. We need shellfish research laboratories on the northeast and gulf coasts as well as in the Northwest. If we already had them, the tragedies of the oyster eaters in Pascagoula and the clam eaters in New Jersey might have been prevented.

It is no longer enough to curb the gross pollution that we know makes people sick. What we should be concerned about now is the water people use with confidence because they think it is safe. Probably most of it is safe, now, but you cannot wall off pollution with chemical treatment indefinitely. More and more people are going to find, as the shellfish harvesters in Raritan Bay found, that the water they thought was safe, was not safe. Just let that happen to the water supply of a big city—as it could happen—and imagine the consequences.

We have a clear duty to do everything within our power to see that the known methods of controlling pollution are fully applied and that research on ways to screen out viruses, chemical poisons, radioactivity, and other pollutants is speeded up. This bill represents our minimum responsibility to protect the water and water products used by American industry and by the American people.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

The NIH stands today at the center of our national medical research effort. Over the years the Congress has responded vigorously to the public demand for an all-out attack on the dread diseases and the fearful disabilities which constantly threaten each of us. It has consistently acted on its firm conviction that the steady and orderly expansion of medical research is a sound investment in our future welfare and that the defense of the health of our people is no less vital or less urgent a national need that the defense of our shores and the air above us.

There is abundant evidence that this investment is paying off—first, and most importantly, in better health and better medical care for the American people but also in dollars and cents by steadily reducing the economic losses due to illness and premature deaths. The potential for even greater dividends is there if we will but maintain the momentum which has been so painstakingly built up.

This House can be justly proud of the aggressive part it has played in turning what was once a mere handful of laboratories, sheltering a few Public Health Service scientists anxious to do research, into the leading medical research institutions not only in this country but in the world. In field after field, a high proportion of the leading investigators are found among the clinicians and scientists whom NIH has developed either in its laboratories and Clinical Center at Bethesda or by supporting their work at other institutions through research grants or fellowships.

For my own part, I am especially proud to have had the privilege of serving as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which must review the NIH budget during the 11 years in which most of the growth of the Institutes has taken place. I do not say this boastfully nor do I seek credit for any part I may have had in fostering this growth. I say it because I want you to know—and I want my constituents at home in Rhode Island to know—that no task in my 20 years of public service in the Congress has given me greater satisfaction than this opportunity to press forward a program whose success will so directly effect the well-being of every man, woman, and child. Each Member of this House has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. The preamble of the Constitution says that one of its purposes is to "promote the general welfare." I believe that nothing will promote the general welfare more meaningfully than a program designed to promote sound health and a long and active life for each individual American.

It is therefore all the more astonishing to me that the executive branch, which, under our system of government, has the primary responsibility for developing national policy, has so consistently left it to the Congress to take the lead in stimulating the vital programs of the National Institutes of Health. Only once during the past 9 years—and that was 5 years ago—has the administration come forward with a budget which requested any substantial increase for the NIH programs, and even then the proposed amount was inadequate for the needs. In the past 3 years, the appropriation requests submitted to the Congress have simply tried to hold the budget line and have represented a retrenchment and a flat refusal to grasp the opportunities for progress which were so clearly at hand.

The budget sent to the Congress in January by the previous administration was in this same short-sighted pattern. Members of the House will recall that

the budget message spoke of "a substantial program increase for medical research and training." But what did the budget actually provide? It provided for an appropriation which was $20 million less than the Congress appropriated for 1961. The budget cutters created the illusion of an increase by putting their sharp pencils to work on the 1961 appropriation. To get a favorable comparison they cut out of the 1961 figure a lot of so-called nonrecurring items and so came up with an apparent increase.

They even deleted one program—grants for construction of cancer research facilities—started last year on a trial basis, that has now proved its worth and must be continued.

In order to have a fair basis for judging the adequacy of the budget, the committee asked the NIH to submit for the record a full and frank statement of the history of its budget requests for 1962. I wish every Member of this House would study the facts submitted—as every member of the committee has studied them. The original estimates which the various Institutes submitted to the Director of NIH and which reflect the sound professional judgment of the program administrators on the actual needs of their programs were, in the aggregate, slashed 28 percent before they were acceptable to the past administration for submission to Congress.

I want to emphasize that the original figures prepared by the Institutes were not wild estimates but realistic assessments of what would be required to push forward with successful programs, to make available support for all first-class research projects that pass muster under NIH's rigid review system, and to meet training and construction needs. Each Institute Director when pressed during his testimony admitted—and some of them were very reluctant to tell the committee this—that his actual need, the money he could profitably invest in health research, was greater than his original request to NIH. This was confirmed by the expert witnesses in whose professional competence and personal integrity the committee has the highest confidence. They too, testified that the NIH budget, even as revised by the present administration, fell far short of our national requirements.

It is to the credit of the present administration that it recognized that the budget figures submitted to Congress before it took office were unrealistic. In response to a Presidential directive, the NIH submitted a revised estimate in February. It was virtually the same as the one it had originally submitted. This time the Public Health Service and the Department approved it without change but the Bureau of the Budget arbitrarily cut the figure by $58 million. The revised estimate is therefore 9 percent short of NIH's conservative request and 23 percent short of what the Institutes originally asked for. I cannot tell you exactly how much more it falls short of what is actually needed if we are as serious as we ought to be about pushing these vital programs as hard as they can go.

Frankly, I am disappointed. I had hoped—not for partisan reasons but because I feel so strongly that we have no obligation more demanding of us than promoting the health and welfare of our people—that the new administration would develop a vigorous, forward-looking program to meet the needs of medical research.

I had hoped that we would see the new administration take real initiative in regard to the NIH programs. As it has not yet seen fit to do so, it remains the responsibility of the Congress to champion progress toward human health.

In doing so we are on solid ground. The programs which have been developed by the NIH, at the urging of the Congress, have demonstrated beyond question that they meet urgent and vital needs. They have demonstrated that they have earned the highest respect of the medical and other health professions and of the entire scientific community. They have demonstrated that they enjoy widespread public support—that the taxpayers of this country feel that this is one Government activity which should not be stinted. They have demonstrated that they are productive—that the country is getting tangible returns on its investment of faith and funds in medical research. And they have demonstrated that the problems are as varied and complex as the need is urgent and vital—that we cannot stand pat but must expand our efforts as fast as our capabilities and opportunities develop.

A hold-the-line budget, or one with so small an increase as the Bureau of the Budget proposed, simply will not hold the line on the health frontier. It will leave serious gaps and may deny support to the very projects which might have resulted in the most dramatic new advance. In medical research, as in so many areas of science, the new breakthrough often comes in the most unexpected quarter.

A substantial expansion of the NIH support programs is also necessary if we are to provide research opportunities for the physicians and scientists who have been so painstakingly trained under the fellowship and training-grant programs of the National Institutes of Health. The Congress has appropriated a lot of money during the past 10 years to enable the NIH to support a wide range of research training programs. We took long-range measures to remedy significant manpower shortages or to broaden the capabilities of clinicians and medical scientists. It would indeed be false economy and seriously delay the attainment of our long-term objectives if these highly qualified investigators were now to be denied the opportunity for carrying out the research for which they were trained.

The clinical research center program must go forward. This program, for the support of general therapeutic and metabolic research centers, was launched to meet part of the need for facilities and is now in its second year. It is designed to serve investigators in a wide range of medical specialties and scientific fields by making available to them the specialized services and resources for complex studies of human patients. Awards have been made to 19 of these centers and a number of other very promising proposals are under review. The program has been enthusiastically received by the research community. We may confidently expect that it will result in significant advances toward the solution of a wide variety of disease problems.

The parallel program, launched this year, for the support of categorical clinical research centers—that is, centers devoted to a single category of diseases—is also responding to a widely felt and urgent need. This is evident from the many well-thought-out plans which have been received since this program was announced less than a year ago. The Cancer Institute has applications which clearly deserved support worth five times the amount available for this program. The Heart Institute had 40 requests for center grants under its $5 million appropriation. The Institute of Mental Health had 11 totaling over $4 million and only had half a million to disperse. The Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness, which also had only half a million dollars, had 14 applications totaling nearly $3 million. These are programs that must obviously be continued.

The committee received evidence that there is a need to develop the center concept for anesthesiology. This is a field that is deeply concerned with the public health even though its importance has not been sufficiently understood. Competent surgery is impossible without competent anesthesia. If it is true that a Center will develop knowledge and save lives in heart disease and cancer, it would seem that the concept of a Center for anesthesiology will be most fruitful in the development of life saving skills.

The proper environment for intellectual growth, imaginative stimulation, and the development of scientific and clinical skills, requires the collection of the best available minds. These people must become available in such numbers that their daily duties in a department of anesthesiology can be performed satisfactorily and yet time be provided for study, reading, discussion, and the gathering of new knowledge. Laboratories, technical assistance, equipment and office space must be made available for proper functioning. This well balanced environment of education, training of scientists, research work of the highest caliber and the best possible patient care constitutes an Anesthesiology Center.

The committee was informed that the shortage of facilities was one of the reasons which led the NIH to request no substantial increase in funds for the support of research training. The training programs were greatly expanded in each of the past 3 years and their rapid growth has not only strained facilities but has created some administrative and planning problems which the schools must have time to resolve.

The only increases contemplated for 1962 are an additional $2 million for the expansion of the graduate research training program and an increase of $400,000 for the training of chairside assistants for dentists. We face a severe

shortage of dentists and the use of chairside assistants will enable the dentist to work more efficiently and to handle more patients, by relieving him of a lot of routine, time-consuming tasks.

The total appropriation for training included in the bill is nearly $14 million less than the amount appropriated last year but I want to assure the House that not cutback of the research-training programs was intended by the committee or suggested by NIH. The decrease is more than offset by the nonrecurring expenditure in 1961 of over $16 million to get all these training programs on a forward-financing basis. The payment dates of these grants have now been adjusted so that all schools will know well before the beginning of the academic year exactly how much training money they will have available.

I do not want to leave the impression that all the needs for new research-training programs have been met. On the contrary, the committee is convinced that further opportunities for building up our supply of competent research manpower exist and should be vigorously pursued. However, we have accepted the judgement of the Director of NIH that a year for assimilating the recent increases is desirable and that the direction of effort in the training area needs reexamination. The committee has therefore directed the NIH to prepare, for next year's hearings, a balance sheet showing the estimated needs for research manpower 5 and 10 years from now so that the Congress will be able to assess what further expansion of the training programs, if any, is necessary.

I do not want to take the time of the House to dwell at length on the many successes of the past or to describe the many promising investigations that are underway. The highlights are laid out in the transcript of the hearings which every Member of this House should take time to review.

The record is impressive. There has been progress all along the line. We are moving rapidly ahead in getting a better understanding of the functioning of the human body. Knowledge of the specific causes of diseases—always the first step toward a cure—is increasing every day. There has been a substantial advance in ability to diagnose diseases, in the development of cures or more effective treatments, and, for some diseases, in the development of preventive methods. The clinicians and scientists supported by the NIH programs have created, tested, and perfected new drugs, new surgical procedures, and new diagnostic and therapeutic techniques.

It is impossible for a layman to describe in detail all that has been done during the past year but I would like to give you some examples of the sort of things that were reported to the committee during our hearings.

Scientists in the Cancer Institute have for the first time achieved a 5-year survival for a number of patients with a rare but deadly cancer by treating them wholly with drugs. There has been marked improvement in the survival rate of women with breast cancer through the use of a combination of surgery and drug treatment. Research into the relationship between viruses and cancer—a very hopeful area of research—has been greatly accelerated both in the Institute itself and through research grants.

We were told of an important discovery concerning the cause of the type of hardening of the arteries that usually leads to heart attacks and is one of our greatest killers. We were told of remarkable achievements in heart surgery, including the invention of an electronic device which, in certain types of heart failure can keep the heart beating until it is able to resume its own regular rhythm, and of the development of a method for massaging the heart to restore the flow of blood without the necessity of opening the chest.

Progress is being made in the study of cystic fibrosis and virus infections, in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis and diabetes, and strokes, in the diagnosis and treatment of mental disorders, and in dozens of other disease areas and basic biological problems which I will not attempt to describe.

These advances are due as much to the high competence of NIH scientists in Bethesda as to the excellent work done by NIH grantees throughout the country. It is, therefore, particularly disturbing to me to learn that the Institute now faces a critical personnel problem.

The NIH, through its grant programs, has progressively strengthened the universities and medical schools and enabled them to embark on stimulating research programs. This was the aim of the Congress in appropriating funds for these grant programs and the House will, I am sure, take much satisfaction in their success. But one result of having strong research institutions throughout the country has been to heighten the competition for first-class men.

In this competition, the NIH, with only a few positions above the GS–15 level and a salary ceiling of $19,000, is at a serious disadvantage.

During the past year NIH has lost a number of outstanding men with the result that there has been an unfortunate disruption of some of its research programs. In his testimony, the Director cited, as an example, one Institute in which an important program has been built around four really topflight scientists. All four were offered distinguished positions in some of our best universities at salaries the lowest of which was $25,000 and these positions offered opportunities for part-time practice or consultation, which the government does not permit. Three of these men accepted. It is a fair guess that their annual income will be $30,000 or better.

I might add that it speaks well for the spirit which prevails at NIH that the fourth man passed up the opportunity to increase his income by more than 50 percent and chose to stay in Bethesda.

Salary is not the only factor which governs the scientist job preference but it often determines the choice of men with families to support and children to send to college. It is clear to me that NIH must be given some flexibility in its salary structure so that it will retain its ability to attract and to hold men of superior talent.

The committee has therefore urged the Surgeon General and the Secretary to give prompt consideration to this problem and to make suitable recommendations to the appropriate congressional committees.

The impressive catalog of the achievements of NIH scientists, and of the several thousand outside investigators whose work NIH supports, has focused the committee's attention on a highly important aspect of research to which too little attention is given. This is the communication of research results to medical practitioners.

The ultimate purpose of medical research is to make it possible for the medical and related health professions to give the American people more effective medical care. It is for this reason that the public supports research programs so enthusiastically and it is for this purpose that the Congress has made such sizable appropriations available for them.

Let no one forget that a research project does not end until the applicable results have been made readily available to medical practitioners throughout the country.

I do not pretend that this is a simple task. The mechanisms available at present—medical journals and other publications, symposia, medical conventions, and the other traditional means of professional communication—are slow and time consuming. They do not reach many practitioners who are either too busy to avail themselves of these means or are in remote areas not easily served by some of them.

But NIH has taken too little initiative in tackling the communication problem and in applying the great progress which has been made in communication techniques to the areas of its special interests and responsibilities. The committee feels that the possibilities of radically new approaches to the communication problem need to be thoroughly and systematically explored.

No funds have been specifically earmarked for this purpose in the 1962 appropriation but the committee has made it clear to NIH that it expects it to present, at next year's hearings, a well-considered plan which will set out the responsibilities of the various components of the Public Health Service and outline a vigorous developmental program in medical communication.

Another area which might profitably receive more attention—as NIH itself has recognized—is the application of physical science and engineering techniques to medical research problems. The possibilities range from the development of simple prosthetic devices to new surgical tools and elaborate automated laboratory instruments. We had some interesting testimony on this during the hearings from a couple of witnesses who showed the committee an ingenious mechanism for stapling together tiny blood vessels which cannot be sewn by hand and told us about a

small electronic device which a heart patient might wear to warn him of overexertion.

During the course of the testimony by outstanding leaders in the fields of research, health services, and medicine, several witnesses emphasized the problem presented by the rapidly rising cost of present-day hospital care. Research has made possible rapid and far-reaching changes in the nature and character of hospital and medical practice but a major barrier to the widespread application of new techniques and research findings is the economic factor. It has therefore become urgently necessary to determine the most effective and economical means of providing these new approaches to the diagnosis and treatment of disease in the hospital setting.

Witnesses emphasized that these approaches could best be developed by carrying out research in the design and construction of hospitals and treatment facilities to determine how patients, especially those requiring intensive treatment and 24-hour nursing services could best be handled to make the most use of research findings, and at the same time, reduce to a minimum the costs involved in treatment. The committee was much impressed by this testimony.

The committee has therefore included in the bill a new appropriation of $10 million for grants for hospital research facilities. These funds would be used for making grants, as authorized by section 433(a) of the Public Health Service Act. These grants would be made on a matching basis which would permit the use of Federal funds for not more than two-thirds of the cost of these facilities.

I have not attempted to discuss each of the many NIH activities for which funds are appropriated in this bill.

I have, for example, said nothing about the new institutional grants which were authorized by the Congress at the end of the last session. Five percent of the research project funds in this year's appropriation will be used to make these formula grants to medical, dental, osteopathic, and public health schools, and certain other institutions, for the general support of their research and research-training activities.

I have said nothing about the new program, which the Congress also approved last year, for making research career awards to selected investigators who want to devote their professional life to medical research.

Both of these programs are important steps in the development of even closer cooperative relations between the NIH and the institutions in which the bulk of non-Federal medical research is conducted. Both are described in the report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill.

The major items which the Bureau of the Budget so recklessly cut from the budget request and which the committee has restored are $17,300,000 for the support of new research projects; $9,500,000 for the institutional research grant program; $14 million for the increased support of general therapeutic and metabolic research centers; $7,500,000 for the enlargement of the categorical clinical research center program; and $5 million for a new program for special research resources centers.

I am sure that the House will agree that these are important and necessary elements in the further growth of medical research which should not be impeded by the lack of essential funds.

These appropriations for the National Institutes of Health total $686 million, including $30 million for the sixth and final year of the program under the present Health Research Facilities Construction Act. This is a small sum in relation to the many vital needs which it serves. It is, my colleagues, the minimum investment we dare make to promote so fundamental an aspect of the general welfare as the people's health.

For grants for waste treatment works construction, we allowed the full $50 million which is authorized by law.

For foreign quarantine activities, because of the increased foreign travel into this country, especially at airports, we allowed an increase of $200,000.

In our hospital and medical care program, in order to make them first-class hospitals, we have raised that figure by $500,000.

Four years ago the Surgeon General had special surveys made of the Public Health Service hospitals to determine their staffing needs. Even in view of the considerable needs that were demonstrated by these surveys, only modest increases were provided in fiscal years 1959, 1960, and 1961 as the first three steps in a 4-year program to get the hospitals to an adequate staffing level. The 1962 budget provided for an increase of only 27 additional man-years of employment. In recognition of the inadequacy of the budget request the justifications stated the estimate provides for additional staff in the hospitals to the level approaching that previously identified as needed. Everyone who has made any serious study of the Public Health Service hospitals has concluded that there are two definite needs that are not yet filled. One is for additional operating staff and the other is for a good research program which will help in attracting and retaining good personnel as well as contributing to our conquest of disease. The committee will expect that the increase of $1 million be allocated to these two purposes, giving first priority to operating personnel, thus assuring better care for patients.

In the National Institutes of Health, and this is where the largest increases are, we have raised the President's budget by $58 million. This is a compromise figure. There were several figures the committee had to consider. The original estimates of the Institute directors, the original budget submitted in January, the revised President's budget, the public witnesses requests, and so forth. The amount of $641 million included in the bill is the U.S. Public Health Service's final official request which was cut $58 million by the Bureau of the Budget.

We have $5 million for grant for construction of cancer research facilities on a nonmatching basis because we find time and time again one of the greatest needs in cancer research is lack of facilities.

Then we have $10 million for research in the construction of hospital facilities. We are convinced it will cut the cost of care in hospitals, which is going up and up and up. About 65 percent of our bills in a hospital represent personnel costs, and hospital costs have gone up 300 percent in the last 20 years.

A 6-year study was carried on in Rochester, Minn. It was a controlled study of the circular hospital unit. It was developed that with this kind of new design, they could reduce the cost from $54 per day to $14. They claim 60 percent of all hospital patients in any given area in the country require general hospital care. About 20 percent do not require as much hospital care, and there is 20 percent of the population in the hospital that demands that kind of intensive care which is the most expensive, that is, where you have a nurse around the clock—3 nurses which cost $50 per day. In some of our Eastern States it will go as high as $60 and $70 a day. They found by building this circular hospital and having the nurses in the center where the nurse can see every patient and the patient can see the nurse, that they can bring about this economy and also that in one 8-hour shift a nurse will walk more than a mile less than she would in the old rectangular designed hospitals that have been built heretofore. They gave us other facts and figures which are in the hearings, but the main thing is that through a controlled study like this, they have been able to reduce the cost of nursing care for those people who need this most intensive care from $54 to $14 per day, or $40 a day.

Grants for construction of health research facilities was allowed $30 million. That is the authorization. That runs out this year, but legislation has been introduced to increase this to $50 million. We gave them just what they asked for.

Scientific activities overseas: We reduced the request by $2,084,000, but allowed $4,293,000 more than they have this year.

National health statistics: We gave what they asked for.

The National Library of Medicine is the best library of its kind in the world. We gave just what they asked for.

For St. Elizabeths Hospital, we have increased this appropriation by $166,000 to fully man the new buildings that have been built out there and provided 150 more positions for St. Elizabeths than called for in the budget.

Now we come to the Social Security Administration. We increased the limitation on "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," by $320,000 to buy some land adjacent to their site in Baltimore. It undoubtedly will be needed in the near future to enable them to build larger quarters. We were told that if we did not buy the land now it would surely cost much more later on.

For grants to States for public assistance, we gave them the request of $2,285 million. This is the largest single item in the bill, and there is absolutely nothing we can do about it, for the

law provides that if the States put up their money, under the law, the Federal Government is bound to match it. In the present bill it is $2,285 million. There is nothing we can do about it unless we change the law.

We reduced the request for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance $79,000.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

For salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau, we approved the request.

It has been suggested to every Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and every administrator of the Federal Security Agency that it is wrong to relegate the Children's Bureau to a third level position. The committee strongly feels that the responsibilities and the activities of the Children's Bureau are of sufficient importance to warrant placing it on a level directly below the Secretary rather than being just another office in the Social Security Administration. The Secretary has always had the authority to make such an organizational change and give the Children's Bureau the recognition that it deserves.

The committee also feels that the Children's Bureau should be given more responsibilities for research than it has in the past. The research programs of the National Institutes of Health have been primarily in the disease areas and the committee is of the opinion that this is as it should be. There has been some tendency, however, during the past few years to do more work in the behavioral research area especially in connection with children. This, it seems to the committee, should more properly be the role of the Children's Bureau. When this was discussed during the hearings, considerable doubt was expressed as to the authority of the Children's Bureau to make research grants in this area. While much important research could be done directly, a well rounded research program should include extramural activities. The committee is especially anxious that the Children's Bureau be given a more important role in connection with the problem of juvenile delinquency. It may well be that the committee itself is as much at fault as anyone for the current situation, for the committee encouraged the Mental Health Institute in this field rather than attempting to lay a foundation, and encouraged the Department to take the steps necessary, for such a program in the Children's Bureau. However, it will be expected that the Department give serious consideration to this matter during the next year and if necessary seek legislation to make a well-rounded program possible; and be prepared to present such a well-rounded program to the committee next year.

We increased grants to States for maternal and child welfare by $2,350,000.

The net increase over the amount requested represents an increase of $1 million each for the three original categories and a reduction of $650,000 in the amount requested for the new activity "Research or demonstration projects in child welfare." There was $1 million requested for the later program of which $350,000 was estimated to be necessary for expenses in fiscal year 1962, and $650,000 was for obligations to be incurred in 1963 and succeeding years. The committee does not feel that it is wise to deviate from the standard procedure of providing funds for such activities on an annual basis, thus assuring a review at least once each year.

The authorization for each of the three original categories is $25 million. For "Maternal and child health services" the bill provides $23 million compared with $18,167,000 available for 1961. The bill includes $25 million for "Crippled children's services" compared with $20 million available for fiscal year 1961. The bill includes $18,750,000 for "Child welfare services" compared with $13,666,000 available for 1961. Over the last several years these appropriations have not even kept up with the increase in child population and the increase in costs, let alone provide for any improvement in these services. In one category the figures show that in the decade from 1950 to 1960 these appropriations actually decreased $6 per year per 1,000 children. In view of these facts the committee feels that this increase is rather modest.

In the past far too little attention has been paid to the plight of unwed mothers in the teenage group and their children. Despite the efforts of welfare agencies and law enforcement officials, there continues to be a thriving black market in babies. This is made possible to a large extent by the lack of decent programs for young unwed mothers and their children. The committee will expect that the Children's Bureau use a portion of the increased funds in fiscal year 1962 to get effective programs started to better deal with the problem, and to rehabilitate these mothers so that they may become a part of decent society rather than going on to further degradation as now so often happens.

For cooperative research in social security we have given them $350,000 more than they had in 1961, but $800,000 less than the request. The reduction made by the committee represents funds that were requested for obligation beyond fiscal year 1962. As I have already mentioned the committee does not feel that it is wise to deviate from the standard procedure of appropriating funds for such programs on an annual basis.

Then there are several items for which we allowed the budget request without change: Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner; American Printing House for the Blind; Gallaudet College, the only college in the world for deaf people; and Howard University.

PROGRAM IN AGING

We have included the full amount of the budget request for the Office of the Secretary.

During the hearings I expressed deep concern, disappointment, and dissatisfaction with the Department's activities in aging. There is no clearly defined program and little evidence of leadership directed toward positive action following the White House Conference on Aging.

The report of the Conference, "The Nation and Its Older People," transmitted to the President, April 10, 1961, is not the blueprint for action the country was promised during the years preceding the Conference and in the hundreds of meetings that were held throughout the Nation in preparation for it.

The report at best is little more than a directory of participants, a collection of general policy statements, and a wide assortment of recommendations that have little significance without some indication of the plans that will convert them into action.

Unless a more useful document is prepared for the American public with a determination on the part of HEW to follow through, the White House Conference on Aging will have been not only one of the most expensive, but the least productive of the national conferences, and could become one of the cruelest hoaxes ever perpetrated against the Nation's senior citizens. Immediate action must be taken to develop a program that will achieve the aims and purposes set forth in the bill which established the conference.

The Office of Field Administration asked for 18 new positions, for an analyst and a secretary in each regional office. We denied that request. The total reduction was $138,000.

In related agencies, the National Labor Relations Board shows a cut of $667,000. We explain this in the report.

That is, I think, the main changes we made in this bill.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. On page 9 of the report, at the bottom of the page, you indicate a decrease of a million dollars from the amount requested for national defense fellowships.

Did the gentleman explain why there was that reduction in the amount requested?

Mr. FOGARTY. This has been one of the more controversial sections of the Office of Education. It has received some bad publicity with reference to certain of the fellowships that were granted in connection with the teaching of folklore and other things like that. As a result, this million dollars was cut. I may say to the gentleman there were some who wanted to cut a lot more.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. On the same page 9 of the committee report, the committee has reported on funds for Public Law 874. The funds appropriated are simply for the permanent section of the law which applies 100 percent to the children who live on Federal property and their parents live on Federal property. The Committee on Education is working on a bill which will extend the section B authorization for children who live on private property although their parents work on Federal installations. If that bill is passed, does the gentleman expect to

take the initiative to bring a supplemental appropriation bill in during this session to provide the funds required?

Mr. FOGARTY. We would expect the administration to send up a request for a supplemental bill, and I hope we will give them every dime they are entitled to under the law. That has been my position since 1950.

Mr. BALDWIN. I appreciate that. The gentleman from Rhode Island has been a leader in this field for Public Law 874. The reason I raised the point is due to the fact that some school districts are having great difficulty and will have more difficulty unless those funds are appropriated in the current session.

Mr. FOGARTY. I can assure the gentleman from California that when this legislation is extended we will try to do everything we can to get the appropriation to meet the law as extended.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say he gave the Office of the Secretary of Labor a special assistant as requested by the Department and as described in the hearings?

Mr. FOGARTY. A special assistant, yes.

Mr. GROSS. A special assistant to the Assistant Secretary?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. You gave them an assistant?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That was for the purpose of maintaining proper relations with other Departments?

Mr. FOGARTY. No.

Mr. GROSS. You did not give them this assistant?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, not for liaison work with other Departments.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that. I do not know of any other department that has to have a special assistant to maintain proper relations with other departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that you increased the number of labor attachés in foreign countries?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. All this does is to provide more funds for the people here in Washington. These people in the Department of Labor I might say have been doing a good job. They asked for a $132,000 increase. We allowed them an increase of $66,000, half of what they requested. The labor attachés are appointed through the Secretary of State. These people in the Department of Labor also back up the delegates to the International Labor Organization. That meeting is going to be held next month in Geneva.

Mr. GROSS. So they did get some more money for the reason stated in the hearings, because the Labor Department has acquired heavy new responsibilities in respect to the development of U.S. foreign policy.

Since when did the Department of Labor start becoming a vital factor in foreign policy?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know how vital it is.

Mr. GROSS. Well, having heavy new responsibilities.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought the witness gave a very good account of the International Labor Organization. I thought what he said made sense; that in some foreign countries many of the leaders in government came up from the ranks of labor, and it is good to have people who know the problems of labor in these countries, like Africa, for example.

Mr. GROSS. Did we have labor attachés in Cuba, and if we did, what happened to that situation?

Mr. FOGARTY. We do not have a labor attaché in every country in the world.

Mr. GROSS. Now, I understand from the hearings that these labor attachés are trained some place; they are given training some place. Can the gentleman tell me where that school may be and who operates the training school?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Department of State, I assume.

Mr. GROSS. The Department of State?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. The labor attachés are appointed by the Department of State. They are not appointed by the Department of Labor, and there is nothing in here for labor attachés; not in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. No money in this bill for labor attachés?

Mr. FOGARTY. No.

Mr. GROSS. Even through the Department of Labor?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. This section in the Department of Labor has been headed by Mr. Lodge for the past 2 or 3 years.

Mr. GROSS. Is Lodge the man who has had such wonderful training through his father in operating the giveaway program?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes; he still is.

Mr. GROSS. He still is what?

Mr. FOGARTY. He is still head of this program for the Department of Labor.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I have no doubt of that. If you can dig up any more internationalists to run this show, they will be dug up.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think he has done a very good job. He is a very energetic young man, and I think he is putting some sense into this program. He is doing a good job.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I think it ought to be said that in many countries which have strong labor movements and sometimes labor governments, most of the important and effective work that has been done in combating communism has been done by men coming out of our own labor movement. They understand the kind of fight that has to be made because they went through the battle of resisting Communist infiltration of some unions in this country. They have exerted a constructive and helpful influence in keeping several other countries in the free world instead of having their will as free nations gradually eroded with inevitable movement toward or into the other camp. These labor leaders ought to be commended for the beneficial work they have done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder if the Committee on Foreign Affairs called Mr. Goldberg up to tell them how to handle these foreign aid bills and so on and so forth.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether they did no not, but it might have been a good idea, because he is a very able man.

Mr. GROSS. From what he said it would be a good idea?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Goldberg is going to be one of our great Secretaries of Labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Speaking about Mr. Goldberg, he just testified here last week that all the jobs even in the defense plants should belong to union men. And, when the gentleman from Minnesota talks about the State Department and the Foreign Service, knowing what we do know, I wonder if the gentleman has forgotten about Walter Reuther's training in Russia, together with his brother, when they were working in the factories.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know where he got his training but wherever he got it, it has stood him in good stead. I do not think there is one any more willing or who has done more to fight communism in this country than Walter Reuther.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the second paragraph on page 41 of the report:

> The bill includes $95,000, the amount of the request, as the final amount necessary to liquidate contract authority previously granted for the construction of the auditorium-fine arts building.

I wonder if the gentleman could tell me the progress of the program for the auditorium-fine arts building, for Howard University—and just what the liquidation of the contract authority portends for the future. The gentleman knows of my long interest in Howard University.

Mr. FOGARTY. We chided them a little bit on their presentation because in all of their building programs they have been a year or two behind. But we have given them enough to complete the building.

Mrs. CHURCH. Then there is nothing portentous about the term liquidation of contract; nothing to indicate that completion of the building will be interfered with?

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, no. We are just finishing the financing.

Mrs. CHURCH. There is no intent to phase out any part of the programs?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. We gave them everything they asked for.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think they deserve it. I think they are doing a good job at Howard University. That is becoming a really great school, and this Congress and past Congresses have helped tremendously in this regard.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. In the report on page 22 I notice the committee recommended that 5 percent of the total appropriation for research grants be allowed in fiscal year 1962 for institutional grants to public and other nonprofit institutions. Is it the intention of the committee to increase this gradually up to the 15 percent that was originally authorized?

Mr. FOGARTY. That would be based on the testimony next year. When the act passed Congress a year ago the plan of administration called for 5 percent for the first year, 10 percent the second year, and then it will go up to 15 percent.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It will be the intention of the chairman of the committee to recommend that the authorization be raised to the 15 percent figure?

Mr. FOGARTY. Unless something happens to indicate this program is not an efficient way to carry out the research program.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I thank the gentleman and I commend him for his outstanding work in this field of medical research.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to congratulate and commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the members of his committee for their work not only this year but down through the years, which I think has been very thorough. The bills that have been brought to this floor have reflected painstaking inquiry and a thoroughgoing dedication to constructive accomplishments in the field in which they are working. I think they have done a magnificent job.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my friend from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] in expressing personal appreciation to the gentleman from Rhode Island and his subcommittee of the fine bill which they have reported and of their very informative report.

I hope when we go back into the House some of the sections of this report, particularly those dealing with cancer and with infant mortality may be made a part of the record of these proceedings because I think the gentleman is bringing to the attention of the House some very significant and basic information. The information on the subject of air pollution control, indicating the probability that many deaths are occurring across the country because of polluted air, is vital information. There is vital information in the report on the subject of infant mortality. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us how the Public Health Service accounted to the committee for the fact that we are witnessing an increase in infant mortality in the United States.

Mr. FOGARTY. They did not give us a very good explanation. In the report we encourage the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau to make a complete study on the rise in infant mortality. It was brought out in the hearings, however, that the States have some responsibility in this, also. There is a great range in the figures. The low is 20 per 1,000 and it goes up to 43 per 1,000 live births in the highest State. Some States are not doing a very good job in this particular area.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I know that many of us will be awaiting with a great deal of interest the report of the Public Health Service on this analysis that I am glad to see the committee is having made; and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, first may I compliment the gentleman on what I think is a very fine report and a very fine bill.

Regarding the Department of Labor appropriations as set out in Report No. 392, page 5, of the Appropriations Committee, I note that the committee has provided for a substantial increase in the suggested appropriation for the Bureau or Labor Standards. As the Members know, the Special Subcommittee on Labor will begin hearings Wednesday, May 24, on amendments to the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act which is administered by the Bureau of Labor Standards.

I think the Members, therefore, would be interested in comments contained on page 5 of the report with respect to the need for amendments to the act. The report states:

> Activities required of this Bureau by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act cost approximately $500,000 per year. Secretary Mitchell stated that this act provides only "a shameful illusion" and "no persuasive deterrent to those who wish to ignore its provisions, or to manipulate or embezzle funds." When asked his opinion of this statement, Secretary Goldberg said "I join in that statement 100 percent." The committee does not like to see funds wasted and hopes that legislative action will be taken to correct this matter.

I would like to emphasize the last statement wherein the committee hopes that legislative action will be taken to correct the deficiencies in the present law. This becomes very meaningful in view of our hearings to begin next week on proposed amendments, and I hope all interested Members will contact the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was testified by Secretary Mitchell a year or two ago that this law did not really accomplish anything. We asked the present Secretary of Labor this year if he agreed with Mr. Mitchell and he said he did. That is why we put it in the report that way.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, one thing that has bothered me over a considerable period of time has been the method of processing the total and permanent disability claims under the social security law. It has caused a great many complaints to be made to my office and many other Congressmen tell me that they have had similar difficulty. A great deal of time is spent by the congressional staffs in working on social security cases. I think this has been brought about partly because of the system by which the claims are processed.

The claimant makes out his claim with the district office of the Social Security Administration. Under the law, of course, he is expected to make out his case, but unless a man was given assistance it would be impossible for many of them to make out their claims. The district office does assist the claimant. However, he does not have the same assistance that a veteran receives where there is generally a county service officer, a veterans contact man in the Veterans' Administration office, and a service officer in the various veterans' organizations, locally, to assist the claimant.

After the claim has been processed in the district office, it goes to the State vocational rehabilitation office, which decides whether the claim should be paid. From there, it goes to the Social Security office at Baltimore, which again reviews the case and claim. While they have no authority to set aside a denial of the claim which they consider erroneous, they send back all claims which they think are wrong to the State office. They have only authority to set aside the allowance of a claim they think is erroneous. The evidence shows that the State office had to reinvestigate or call for a reinvestigation in some 55 percent of the claims, and the Baltimore office sent back to the States approximately 15 percent of their claims.

This process of going through the State office causes a delay of from 60 to 90 days, costing $19 million, and makes one think that what is everybody's business is nobody's business.

Thus it must be obvious that the system is cumbersome, inefficient, and wasteful administratively. We have the unique situation where State vocational rehabilitation agencies, with no monetary interest, determine the eligibility of claimants applying for benefits under a Federal program. Since the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the expenses of the State agencies, and since the State agencies have no monetary stake in the program, there is obviously no incentive on the part of the State agencies to economize, or even operate efficiently, except the personal pride of the individuals.

Some have sought to defend this administrative monstrosity with the argument that it requires the applicants to come in contact with the facilities for rehabilitation and so be rehabilitated. The facts are that through this program 1,317,000 persons were referred to State vocational rehabilitation agencies through June 30, 1960, and only 6,600—one-half of 1 percent—were successfully rehabilitated. It is worse than a failure from the standpoint of vocational rehabilitation, and thus attempts to make claims examiners out of people trained in rehabilitation. This diverts trained persons from this field that already has a shortage of such manpower.

Many formal and informal studies have been made of this matter and practically all have found serious shortcomings. On March 4, 1959, when the Committee on Appropriations was holding hearings on the budget for fiscal year 1960, Mr. Mitchell, the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, was asked:

What is your personal opinion of bringing the States into this?

Mr. Mitchell replied:

My personal opinion is that if this were asked at the beginning of the program, I would have recommended against it, and quite strongly, because I think it violated some of the fundamental principles of Federal-State relations in that, for one thing, it gave the States an opportunity to write blank checks against Federal funds.

When asked, in connection with the hearings this year, Mr. Mitchell indicated that his opinion in the matter had not changed.

On October 23, 1959, the Comptroller General of the United States transmitted to the Speaker of the House a copy of the report on the General Accounting Office's study of this program. The summary of principal findings and recommendations included the following:

Our review indicated that the handling of applications for disability benefits by the State agencies is cumbersome and results in unnecessary costs and excessive processing time. An evaluation of the present requirements of law, that disability determination must be made by State agencies, is needed.

Last summer and fall, the survey and investigations staff of the Committee on Appropriations made a detailed study of this program and came up with similar conclusions and recommendations, with considerable detail to document the fact that this is a most unsatisfactory program from many points of view.

This report brought out the fact that budget controls were weak and applied differently in different States, that in many States records were insufficient to allow for a definite separation of funds which were spent for State programs and funds which were spent on Federal programs of determining disability, and that there was absolutely no uniformity in fee schedules for medical examinations.

Just to take the medical fee schedules as one example, it was pointed out that of 54 contracting State agencies, 39 are free to revise the schedules used in their program without even relating them to other programs in the States. Among the various State agencies, some use the workmen's compensation program fee schedule, others use Veterans' Administration fee schedules, and one uses Blue Shield, but most set their own, which are revised from time to time, with no uniformity in the base schedule or the revisions as compared to what other States are doing. One thing is common—the fees and other costs are continuing to go up. While the cost per case for fiscal year 1960 was budgeted at $32.50, it actually amounted to $36 by the time the year was over. The estimates for fiscal year 1961 were based on a presumption that the cost would average $36 per case during that fiscal year; however, at the time of the staff's inquiry the unit cost had already risen to $41 per case. In 1957, the cost per case averaged $17.64. In just 4 years the cost has gone up over 130 percent.

While just the unnecessary expense of this program is certainly sufficient cause for change, the same basic administrative requirements which lead to waste of funds also lead to undue delays in claims processing, inconsistent determinations as to eligibility, and in general lead to unsatisfactory and inequitable treatment of claimants.

Coupled with these difficulties is an appeals system which leaves much to be desired. The Appeals Council is technically a part of the Office of the Secretary; however, the Council and all employees are paid from Social Security Administration funds and are actually more under the supervisory control of the Social Security Administration than under the Secretary. This cannot help but influence appeals decisions.

If any further proof of the weakness of this whole system were needed, one has only to look at the sorry court record to find it. According to recent statistics, of the cases that were taken to court, 173 had been affirmed and 103 were reversed. This is not to say the court found that in 173 cases the appeals were correctly decided, but only that the court found there was sufficient evidence in the case to sustain a finding. Thus in over a third of the cases the court found that there was not even sufficient evidence to sustain a finding. This is practically the same as the court's setting aside the verdict of a jury. It certainly is not only an indication, it is proof that there is something really wrong with this program.

On the whole, I think the social security district offices and the review office in Baltimore are doing a good job under the circumstances. I think that the problem is the system under which they work. The following facts will show that something must be wrong with the system besides the expense and unnecessary delay.

There are approximately 30,000 applicants each month under the disability provisions of the act. Of this number, approximately 19,000 will be allowed and 11,000 will be disallowed. Out of the group whose claims are disallowed, about 3,000 will want their cases reconsidered. Of that number, about 40 percent, or 1,300, will have their claims allowed on reconsideration. Out of the 60 percent, or 1,700 disallowed, about 700 will go on to a requested hearing before a referee. Of that number, about 200, or 30 percent of those whose claims were disallowed, will have them allowed before the referee of Appeals Council.

Then, a small percentage go to court, and of that number over one-third have their claims allowed. This leaves one to wonder about the 8,000-plus whose claims are denied and never ask for reconsideration or appeal. Undoubtedly, many claims for disability are filed which are unfounded and should not be allowed; but when 40 or so percent of those who ask for a rehearing after their claims have been denied are then allowed the claims on reconsideration, and the claims of 30 percent of those who have had them denied on reconsideration are allowed by the referee or the Appeals Council—and then over one-third of those disallowed by the Appeals Council are allowed by the court—one wonders, if these 8,000 who did not ask for reconsideration had the ability or the assistance to exercise their rights, just how large a percentage of these disallowed claims would eventually have been allowed.

I want my Government to be a fair government, but in this case I am certain in my own mind that justice is being denied a great many people. Certainly if there is any group of people in our Nation that deserves just treatment it is this group of disabled who in so many cases are unable to help themselves. In the interests of efficient government, in the interests of saving the taxpayers millions of dollars now being wasted, and for just plain humanitarian reasons, I hope that we will not put off much longer straightening out the administrative mess that we have helped create in connection with this program.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I wish to say to the gentleman that no Member of the Congress performs a more useful and valuable work than the gentleman now in the well of the House. It was a stimulus to national morale, and an example of dedication to the public service over and beyond personal ambition and aims when the gentleman offered almost on a silver platter a seat in the other body, elected to remain here in this body to continue the great and dedicated work he is doing, for which the American people always will be indebted to him.

I have received a number of telegrams from my constituents interested in the continuance on an enlarged scale of apprenticeship training. I commend the gentleman and his able colleagues on the subcommittee for acting favorably in that area.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. We increased that amount by $500,000 over the budget.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I have here a telegram from the chancellor of the University of Chicago, reading:

Strongly urge restoration of funds for support of NDEA, title IV fellowships which are

of great importance to programs being financed jointly by the Government and the universities.

Is that covered in the present bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, not to his liking.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Does my colleague disagree with the eminent chancellor of the University of Chicago?

Mr. FOGARTY. This is a unanimous report. There was some give and take on this, and what we came out with is the best compromise we could agree on.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I appreciate that in the grinding of the legislative mills compromises sometimes become necessary, but I do hope that in the other body the funds will be restored as recommended by the chancellor of the University of Chicago who is an outstanding scientist as well as educator, and the House conferees will agree to accept such restoration, if in the judgment of the other body, it is made. I know that my colleagues on the subcommittee always will welcome the counsel of the Nation's educators and scientists, among whom the chancellor of the University of Chicago is preeminent.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island. He knows that I am interested in what procedure the Government follows in connection with hiring older people. I note on page 41 of the report this short paragraph that I would like to read:

> During the hearings the chairman of the subcommittee expressed deep concern, disappointment and dissatisfaction with the Department's activities in aging. There is no clearly defined program and little evidence of leadership directed toward positive action following the White House Conference on Aging.

There has been a lot of talk about helping the aged to obtain work. I personally have undertaken from time to time to ascertain from the various departments of the Government the number of people actually hired 45 years of age or older and 60 years of age or older. It is very clear that when one seeks those actual figures it is quite difficult to get any figures. The heads of the departments will always tell you, "We have a policy of not discriminating against older people," but when you ask for figures they do not seem to have them and are not interested in obtaining them. The gentleman has undertaken to help me get thcse figures, and I want to thank him again for that, but I hope too, that a new effort will be made to find out whether or not the various departments are in truth and in fact following their own policies about hiring older people.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. I also would like to commend the gentleman on the work he has done with his committee in bringing the pending bill before us. On page 17 of the report, you speak of the need for shellfish laboratories on the east coast and the gulf coast. I believe this is in the amount of $1,820,000. I believe this came about as the result of the hepatitis outbreak in the shellfish and oyster industry.

Mr. FOGARTY. That has been traced to oysters in the Mississippi area, and clams in the New York, New Jersey area.

Mr. GIAIMO. On the east coast near Milford, Conn., the Fish and Wildlife Service specializes in shellfish and oyster culture where we have a great industry in shellfish and oysters. At the present time there is pending before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries a bill which will enlarge the functions of this fish and wildlife agency in Milford, which will initiate a research project into the whole area of the oyster industry and the commercial production of shellfish and oysters.

Mr. FOGARTY. This bill would have no effect on that at all.

Mr. GIAIMO. Would this have any effect on that?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman raised the question with me a couple of days ago, and I went to the trouble to get the details on this subject. We have complete cooperation between the Public Health Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service. There is no duplication of effort there at all. But they work together and the people of the Public Health Service are backing this bill that you speak of.

Mr. GIAIMO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I commend the gentleman and the committee for giving cognizance to the extremely serious problems of automation and recommending additional funds for the Department of Labor in the retraining of industrial workers. I note on page 57 of the hearings the gentleman states and I quote:

> We have talked a lot about retraining workers during the last 4 or 5 years, but I do not think anything very worthwhile has materialized.

I wonder if the gentleman does not feel this is in an area where we could make a larger investment?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am sure we could. We have been asking the Secretary of Labor every year to spend more time and effort in this area. Everyone agrees more should be done, but nothing much has been accomplished.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The records of the Congress will show that the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island has been closely associated with me in our effort to do something about the education program of the United States. I am just a little bit surprised to see reductions made in the appropriation.

Mr. FOGARTY. As I said a while ago, this is a unanimous report and, therefore, a compromise report.

Mr. BAILEY. I would just like to say to the gentleman from Rhode Island that my Committee on General Education will begin hearings on amendments to the Defense Education Act on Tuesday of next week, and we will probably be talking to you a little bit later.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. I also want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island for the work he has done in this field and for the report he has given us today on the floor. In line with what previous gentlemen have said, I thank him for remaining on this side of the Congress and for the help he has given me and for the stature he gives to the State of Rhode Island by virtue of his position here in the Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank my colleague.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island and the subcommittee and the staff for the excellent report on this bill.

MEETING THE NEEDS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. Chairman, once again, as I have done so often in the past when this annual appropriation bill has come before us, I want to express my personal gratitude to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for the magnificent work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation which is so vital to every American. As a result of the work of the Fogarty subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the American people have been living longer, living better, enjoying better health, better educational opportunities, improved health and welfare programs generally, and are enjoying greater protections against nearly all of the hazards of our fast-paced environment.

And, as usual, the report accompanying this annual appropriation bill constitutes once again one of the most interesting and useful documents to come before us from any committee of the House.

There is an important difference about this appropriation bill this year, however, which deserves comment, I believe. For the first time since I came to Congress 8 years ago, I am delighted to find that the executive department, from the President on down, has recognized without apology of any kind the vital importance of the funds requested for all of the social welfare programs and consumer protection services covered in this bill, and this is truly a new atmosphere. I remember in 1953, when the appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration, for instance, was slashed to somewhere in the neighborhood of $5 million; in this bill we are appropriating the record level of $23,580,000 for FDA.

NEED FOR FAR-REACHING CHANGES IN BASIC FOOD, DRUG AND COSMETIC ACT OF 1938

A good part of the credit for the revitalization of the Food and Drug Administration in recent years must be ascribed to the effective report filed by the Citizens Advisory Committee in 1955 which spotlighted so dramatically the starvation appropriations this agency had been receiving. Before that, some of us had been vigorously, but unsuccessfully, trying to call these facts to the attention of the White House and the Budget Bureau during the first few years of the Eisenhower administration, but no one seemed to be listening.

I note that the committee report on this bill now suggests the establishment of a new Citizens Advisory Committee study to take up where the 1955 report left off, and to evaluate the work of the agency and its minimum needs on the basis of so many developments since 1955 in food, drug, and cosmetic technology.

To my mind, however, far more urgent than such a study—which I am sure would be worthwhile—is the need for a comprehensive rewriting of the basic Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. In 23 years since that important act became law, we have had a series of patchwork improvements added on to it, but fundamentally the act suffers from many forms of obsolescence. That is why I prepared and introduced on the first day of this session H.R. 1235 which is an omnibus bill attempting to close the more glaring loopholes in the basic act.

GAPS IN PRESENT LAW WHICH WOULD BE CLOSED BY H.R. 1235

I am pleased to see that Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff has recognized the importance of many of the changes proposed in my bill. In the hearings of the Fogarty subcommittee, furthermore, Commissioner Larrick of the FDA has gone through a list of shortcomings in the powers and authority of his agency, and these coincide to a great extent with the loopholes which H.R. 1235 would close. Briefly, some of them include:

First. The lack of authority to require pretesting for safety of all ingredients used in cosmetics, along the lines of the Food Additives Act of 1958 provisions for ingredients used in or on foodstuffs.

Second. The lack of an anticancer provision on cosmetics ingredients equivalent to the Delaney clause in the Food Additives Act and in the Color Additives Act of 1960.

Third. The lack of clear-cut authority for requiring easily readable labeling of foods, drugs and cosmetics, particularly as to weights and sizes.

Fourth. The lack of airtight factory inspection authority such as would be necessary to encourage more physicians to prescribe medicines by generic terms rather than by trade names.

Fifth. The lack of effective regulatory powers over the sale and distribution of barbiturates and amphetamines, the so-called pep pills.

Sixth. The lack of required certification of all antibiotics rather than just the few covered in the basic act.

Seventh. The lack of authority to require proof of efficiency as well as of safety of new drugs.

Eighth. The lack of authority to require pretesting for safety and for efficacy of therapeutic devices.

TOO MANY LOOPHOLES FOR LEISURELY PIECEMEAL REPAIRS

Both Secretary Ribicoff and Commissioner Larrick have testified to the importance of such changes in the law. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been asked by Chairman OREN HARRIS of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to report on H.R. 1235 as a prelude to scheduling hearings on this legislation, and I hope that the report when filed will constitute the overall endorsement of H.R. 1235 which I anticipate on the basis of the statements responsible officials of the Department have been making.

I have been told that it is not good legislative tactics to put so many controversial provisions into an omnibus bill which would touch so many unrelated industries, and thus might organize disparate pressure groups into a single, organized opposition to the whole bill. Yet I feel that in 23 years we have gone much too slowly in closing loopholes in the basic act as they have developed or have become glaring. The process of taking one subject at a time every 2 years or so, and closing the loopholes in just one area at a time, may serve to divide the opposition into manageable proportions, but the progress is much too slow. And, in the meantime, as technology changes, gaps in the law enable new dangers to the consumer to develop without control until enough damage has been done to the health or safety of enough people to warrant drastic action.

Therefore, I hope we can tackle the overall problem now with open minds and a determination to make the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act into the consumer protection statute it is supposed to be and which most Americans trustingly believe it to be.

OTHER IMPORTANT PROGRAMS IN APPROPRIATION BILL

In the meantime, I applaud the Fogarty subcommittee for its action in this bill not only on the Food and Drug Administration's record budget but on the tremendous amounts recommended for the National Institutes of Health and for other vital programs of the Public Health Service, including research into the major diseases which plague mankind and into the environmental factors which present such dangers to the public. These are among the most useful dollars spent each year by the Federal Government. There are so many other items of importance to the general public in this appropriation bill, including programs of the Department of Labor, that it is impractical for me to try to mention them all in these few minutes.

But I do want to comment on the proposal in the committee report that the $1 million-a-year program now in operation for assisting teachers to obtain training in the skills of teaching the mentally retarded be expanded to increase the limitation and also to include teachers of children with speech and hearing defects.

I was happy to join with the gentleman from Rhode Island, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and other sponsors in the passage of the retarded children education assistance bill several years ago, but I feel that instead of continuing this limited approach we should go into the kind of broad overall program as called for in H.R. 15, which would establish a 7-year program of fellowships and scholarships for encouraging teachers in all fields of exceptional children, including the extraordinarily gifted.

When I introduced the original bill in the 85th Congress, it was my hope we could arrange for early hearings in that Congress on this whole subject of teachers of exceptional children, but no hearings were scheduled then or in the 86th Congress. I am pleased that the chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], is now planning to arrange such hearings for later in the current session, and I look forward to a comprehensive review of the needs in this field. An extensive research program was authorized in this area in the last Congress and I hope that we now have sufficient background information to justify going ahead with an effective action program to meet the needs of exceptional children.

ALL AREAS OF EXCEPTIONALITY SHOULD BE INCLUDED

Much as I recognize the need for more trained teachers for the mentally retarded, and for children with speech and hearing defects, as suggested by the Appropriations Subcommittee in its report, I think we must also open our eyes to the similar needs of children with other types of handicaps, including emotional disturbances, heart disease, the crippled, and so on. And with the increasing emphasis in our educational system in trying to locate and identify the extraordinarily gifted, we certainly need more teachers especially trained to give these outstanding youngsters the best possible guidance and help in achieving to their full learning potential. That holds true also for all of the exceptional children.

Mr. Chairman, again I congratulate the Fogarty subcommittee for an outstanding legislative accomplishment in this bill. While not every Member will be in agreement with every decision made in the legislation—obviously some compromises are required in connection with an appropriation bill aggregating, as this one does, more than four and a quarter billions of dollars—the net result is a magnificent recognition of the social welfare needs of our country.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman will recall Dr. Ralph A. Sawyer, vice president of the Department of Research at the University of Michigan who appeared

following me and Senator Hart before the gentleman's subcommittee, to urge the removal of the 15-percent limitation on overhead expenses.

His testimony appears at page 692 of the hearings with regard to section 204, page 45 of the bill. I gather that no action was taken by the subcommittee with respect to either the removal of that limitation of 15 percent or an increase in the percentage. Was this considered by the committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, it was considered. I think the gentleman from Michigan made a very excellent statement, and the doctor he brought with him from the University of Michigan made a fine statement. We did not, however, have the votes in the committee to raise the 15 percent. Some members wanted to cut it below 15 percent. The result is that we have a compromise agreement to hold what we have.

Mr. MEADER. I take it the gentleman himself is receptive to the suggestion and that he himself favors some relaxation of this limitation.

Mr. FOGARTY. There are many who feel that direct aid to medical schools is the answer. I think the quicker we get that the better off we are going to be. I think we should have some legislation along that line.

Mr. DURNO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DURNO. I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Rhode Island. As he may know, I have been a practicing physician for 35 years. I realize the difficulty the gentleman has in getting this appropriation. I am interested in knowing how you go about justifying the $58 million in excess of the request. What is the authority for the increase?

Mr. FOGARTY. First, we asked the various institute directors what they thought they needed. We got their estimates. Then we asked the Surgeon General what his recommendation was for those institutes. He generally cuts the requests by a few million dollars. Then it goes to the Department and to the Bureau of the Budget and they cut it further. Sometimes in the Bureau of the Budget it is just an arbitrary cut to come within a ceiling.

After listening to all these Government people we have some of the outstanding people in these various categories come in, at their own expense, and they tell us what they think ought to be done in these various areas.

This amount of $641 million is the exact amount the Surgeon General said was required. This was the compromise we reached.

I wanted to include $200 million over the budget. I think we could spend $200 million more very effectively.

Mr. DURNO. This is an emotional matter. I agree that very much more could be spent, but I would like to ask one final question: Did organized medicine ask for any of this?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. They had an opportunity. We never refuse anyone from appearing before our committee and testifying. We have talked to them from time to time, and in the research field, we find ourselves in agreement with the organized professional associations.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. First, I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, and the subcommittee for its work. I have read a great deal of the hearings and I find them most enlightening. But there are three major cuts which are distressing to me. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, it is my intention to follow the lead of the gentleman from Rhode Island.

I am concerned, however, about the reduction of a million dollars in fellowships under the National Defense Education Act. This act is barely underway. If, indeed, its original purpose was meritorious at all, they should be given more now.

The second cut is a reduction of $350,000 in the request for institutes for the guidance of personnel, something very badly needed throughout the whole system and in the National Defense Education Act. Many of us felt that the original amount provided and requested was too little.

The third one is the $500,000 cut in the salaries and expenses section. This would retard the work of the educational statistics group, as well as the college information center, which is vitally needed.

I think that these three cuts do great violence to the program of education under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I observe in the report that the committee has included a provision of $1,800,000 for the establishment and operation of shellfish laboratories.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BATES. I wish to commend the committee for that. We have a very serious problem up there. I am well acquainted with the situation on the east coast. I thank the gentleman for including this in the report.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to express approval of the report of the House Committee on Appropriations, presented by my colleague from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes. Many of the provisions of this bill, in addition to benefiting all the people of this Nation, are of special interest to the people of Rhode Island. An example of this is the inclusion of funds in the Office of the Secretary of Labor to institute an effective program for the training of men and women for skilled industrial positions. As the committee's report points out, this is of particular importance in areas where migration of industry and other economic factors have raised unemployment to high levels. The value of such a program cannot be too highly estimated, because the benefits which will accrue to those areas where chronic unemployment exists are innumerable.

With respect to the all-important field of education, grants for library services, assistance for school construction, expansion of teaching and education for the mentally retarded, and those with speech and hearing defects, and provision for a program in cooperative research are of the greatest necessity.

Also, funds for accident prevention, chronic diseases and health of the aged, community health research, control of tuberculosis, nursing services and resources, hospital construction activities, and other health services are important to the well-being of Rhode Island as well as that of the entire country. The expansion of programs for cancer research, mental health activities, research in heart disease, arthritis, and other illnesses are essential phases of integrated, realistic health planning.

I am very happy to note that funds have been recommended for the establishment of a Public Health Service shellfish laboratory in the East. This will greatly benefit Rhode Island due to the importance of the shellfish industry to my State and the danger to health which results from the contamination of water in which many shellfish are to be found. Progress toward providing solutions for this problem is very desirable and of great concern to Rhode Island.

The expansion of services under the Social Security Administration through increased grants to States for public assistance, maternal and child welfare, and provision for cooperative research in social security, continues and increases the benefits our citizens enjoy under our social security system.

The committee is to be commended for its realistic appraisal of human needs and its determination to meet these needs. Such farsighted judgments deserve careful consideration and approval by the Congress.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee submitting the report on the bill covering appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, I should like to express my strong support of the committee's actions and recommendations and urge that the House approve them. I have served on this committee in the 83d, 85th, 86th as well as now in the 87th Congresses, and I am acutely aware of how the programs of these agencies directly affect the lives and welfare of every man, woman, and child in this country. The Members of this Congress are also well aware of what these programs mean to each of our citizens, ranging as they do from unemployment compensation to such things that shall have a profound effect on our future as education and medical research.

NATION'S HEALTH IMPORTANT

There are many areas represented in these appropriations that I could comment on, but I would like now to discuss

some of the National Institutes of Health activities not covered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in his remarks. We give special emphasis to the appropriations of NIH for a number of reasons. First, because these appropriations support a series of programs which are of fundamental importance to the health and well-being of this Nation. This is an area of the national interest with which I have had a constant concern since my election to the Congress. The research programs carried out by the National Insitutes of Health have made possible a substantial expansion of knowledge concerning disease and health problems. The continued support of the programs will substantially increase the probability of major discoveries which will have as powerful effect upon the health status of the Nation in the future as the discovery of the antibiotics and immunizing vaccines have had in the past. Second, I am convinced that the people of this country are fully in support of the continued effort to enlarge the Nation's medical research program. Those of us on the committee who work closely with the research and related programs served by these appropriations can attest—simply from the amount and nature of our mail from the general public—to the desire for a greater effort in medical research. One thing that is generally acknowledged in this outpouring of sentiment for planned and productive medical research is that the United States is second to none in this field. Of this we can be proud because a healthy people, is a strong people, and a healthy nation is a strong nation. If we are to remain free from today's health hazards and from those that may involve from today's environment and if we are to remain free from those who seek to dominate us, then the answer is quite clear:

We must continue to make this investment commensurate with our intellectual and financial capacity to seek, find, and apply new knowledge for the benefit of man.

A third reason for my interest in the programs of the National Institutes of Health that the Members of this Congress should be aware of is this: For a number of years, our committee and those who administer the programs of the National Institutes of Health have been agreed that there is one key factor in developing a logical, orderly, fruitful national medical research program, namely, balance. Support of current research must be balanced by efforts to enlarge the medical research manpower of the future through training. These programs in turn must be completed by efforts to provide additional research facilities through construction—particularly for the highly specialized and complex facilities which research in major disease programs such as cancer require.

BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

During the past 2 years it has become more and more evident that development of up-to-date research facilities—some of which could be identified as large, regional, or national resources—was lagging behind. To get some measure of just where we stand, we need to look back more than 10 years when the so-called Public Health Service omnibus bill was enacted. That legislation through a key action (433a) provided the statutory authority for the Public Health Service to make grants for the construction of medical research facilities essential for the carrying out of research in the several categorical disease areas. Under this authority a small number of grants were made for the construction of cancer and heart research facilities, but the Korean war, among other factors, brought this program to a halt. From that time until 1956, a hiatus—in retrospect, a very serious hiatus—occurred.

In 1956, the Congress added title VII to the Public Health Service Act, authorizing up to $30 million each year for 3 years to assist in the construction and equipping of research facilities to enlarge the general capacity of medical schools, universities, and other institutions for research in the sciences related to health. These general needs have been so urgent that in 1958 the Congress extended the authority for an additional 3 years—through fiscal year 1962.

MATCHING PROGRAMS SUCCESSFUL BUT LIMITED

Let me sketch briefly some of the accomplishments that have been achieved through this modest effort alone. Since this program was announced in the fall of 1956, over $321 million in Federal funds have been requested by eligible applicants. These requests have been thoroughly documented in more than 1,100 applications from institutions doing health-related research—by public and private nonprofit schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, and public health; and by hospitals, universities, and other research institutions. From the $150 million appropriated for the first 5 program years, 755 grants have been awarded to 320 institutions in 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. According to the latest report we have received, 265 of these projects have been completed and over 180 projects are under contract—many of which are nearing completion.

With the kind of progress we have experienced in the construction of research facilities in the past 3 years, one might ask: "Is this enough? Does not this not satisfy the need?" The answer, our committee has found, is positively "No" on three counts. First, the funds authorized for this program are inadequate to meet any but a small portion of the need that exists. Secondly, the limitations of our matching program simply are too restrictive to allow many institutions to help fill national research needs perceived by our committee because of the inability of those institutions to finance construction to carry out research for which they are otherwise well qualified. Thirdly, since the program was directed to the general research needs of institutions it has failed to provide support for construction of facilities directly aimed at the highly complex and specialized needs of research in two specific major disease problems.

Now on the first point—that is, the inadequacy of the appropriation authorization, we noted in the statement in support of this year's appropriation request that there are projects awaiting action, despite the fact that the full appropriation has been used every year for the past 5 years. Let me give you the picture: As of March 10, 1961, there was a backlog of $22 million worth of projects that had been approved by the National Health Research Facilities Advisory Council but were awaiting payment. An additional 126 applications of over $48 million were pending, which represented new or deferred applications that were awaiting action of the Council. And an additional 93 notices of intent to file applications valued at over $33 million were on file. After persistent inquiry, our committee persuaded the expert witness on this subject to give us his best realistic estimate of the amount that could be used each year. That estimate was $65 million a year—over twice our present limitation and $15 million a year more than authorization provided in the amendment of this legislation submitted to the Congress by the administration.

NONMATCHING PROGRAM FILLS SPECIFIC NEED

Now I would like to turn to the other points having to do with the availability of support for the construction of categorical research facilities on a nonmatching basis. In the course of the committee's hearings last year, we requested and were provided with data obtained from NIH, its advisers, and others that clearly demonstrated the need for cancer research facilities. We were told that those needs were not otherwise typical of organizations doing research, since their programs focused on the cancer problem exclusively in contrast to most university research programs, which usually encompass a variety of research fields. The data, accumulated from 10 cancer research institutes, indicated an immediate need for over $28 million in research laboratory space. In addition, I made a special effort to bring out some of the facts about the statutory authority of such grants. It was generally acknowledged that purely categorical cancer research facilities represented a true national need. As a result, our committee recommended, and the Congress provided, a special earmark appropriation of $5 million to the National Cancer Institute for the support of construction of cancer research facilities. This was not offered as a 1-year effort; it was a start upon which could be mounted a national program for cancer construction needs and one which might be extended to other categorical areas as needs were demonstrated and as programs were described and presented. Yet considerable misinformation about this program has persisted, and, in fact, the administration itself early in this session offered—as part of its recommended legislation—a proposal to repeal the authority for making nonmatching construction grants.

The Kennedy administration in recommending the repeal of the authority by which cancer research facilities are being built on a nonmatching basis completely disregards the most pressing need in the area of cancer research which exists in our Nation this year. This need was emphasized time and again during

the many days of hearings held before our subcommittee. Dr. Kenneth Endicott, Director of the National Cancer Institute, testified before our committee as follows in testimony taken from part 2 of our hearings, page 871:

APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS FOR CANCER RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. LAIRD. In the area of cancer research facilities, limited to this categorical area, you have before you at the present time, I understand, a group of applications for medical research facilities. One of the requirements of these applications was the certification that all avenues had been investigated and that the facility which was proposed could not possibly be constructed if they were required to meet the standards of the Medical Research Facility Act. What do these applications total in dollars and cents?

Dr. ENDICOTT. We have before us for consideration at the next meeting of the council some 30 applications for $25,819,165.

Mr. LAIRD. And there is a certification with these applications that the research facilities could not be constructed under any other program?

Dr. ENDICOTT. We have asked them to demonstrate that they have exhausted every reasonable possibility of raising matching funds. Now, of course, all of these applicants will be visited before their grants are acted upon. The visiting teams are now in the field. The council meeting will be at the end of April, the 29th and 30th of April and 1st of May.

I had an opportunity to talk to the site visitors, who have visited perhaps half by now, and the report was made at the Council meeting a week or so ago, 2 weeks ago I guess it was, that none of the applicants visited at that time could be excluded from eligibility on this basis. In other words, so far as the visitors could tell, they had, in fact, exhausted every reasonable possibility of raising matching funds.

Mr. LAIRD. You have $5 worth of applications for every $1 that you have available to you for this program.

Dr. ENDICOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you know of any other program in the National Cancer Institute where there is such a great demand for funds, in any ratio like that?

Dr. ENDICOTT. Not this year, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. Against this historical backdrop, let us examine the most recent developments. First, and most importantly, what has happened as a result of the conservative start afforded by the $5 million cancer construction program authorized for the current year? Although there has been relatively little positive publicity on the program, universities, medical schools, hospitals, and other research institutions have responded with well thought out programs in the cancer research field. In fact, I understand that the National Advisory Cancer Council, which met just last month, considered over 30 applications from nearly as many institutions for grants totaling over $25 million. This set of facts alone indicate that our earlier judgments not only were correct for the current year but will probably hold, at least in principle, for the foreseeable future.

For the second most recent development in this effort to examine all the pertinent facts on health research construction, we need only turn to the record of the committee's hearings, released earlier this month. During the questioning of the administration witnesses, I asked for an estimate of what the greatest needs would be in medical research in the next 3 years. Three factors were cited, and the first of the three was research facilities. To make sure that there would be no misunderstanding, I asked which one of the three factors mentioned should have the highest priority; and the unhesitating answer was, and I quote, "Most acutely, research facilities." Later, in response to a specific question as to what might happen if the research construction were limited to a 50–50 matching program only, the committee was told, if the present bill—to repeal—is enacted as such, I think there is going to be a serious deficiency because I think that many schools cannot develop the research plans they desire on a 50–50 basis.

FACILITIES ESSENTIAL TO PROGRESS

These are the facts, then, that make our course clear; if medical research is to continue to flower, we must take the necessary steps to see that the construction of facilities—not only general purpose facilities—but the specialized facilities for research in categorical diseases, keeps pace with the other component factors of sound medical research—growth for the Nation. I am thinking specifically of the urgent need to provide research space for the numbers of bright young people emerging from our training programs—young people with creative minds and full measures of research ideas of high potential. I am thinking of the rapidly evolving research techniques and instrumentation for cancer research and cardiovascular research that are crying for up-to-date facilities in which to be put to work for the benefit of mankind. The steps we must take, as the facts I have just related indicate, are:

First, we must not only continue the health research facilities construction program, we must substantially increase its annual limitation in the years ahead, and

Second, we must not only continue the present nonmatching program for construction of research facilities to meet national and regional needs in the categorical area of cancer, but we must also expand this program to other categorical areas as opportunities and meaningful programs are developed and presented.

INCREASES FOR ALL RESEARCH APPROPRIATIONS SUPPORTED

Now I would like to turn to the general considerations surrounding my support for the appropriations for the Public Health Service's medical research activities. I am sure that there is general agreement on the consistent bipartisan nature of the support in Congress for these programs which seek to acquire new knowledge in order that people may have better health. I cannot recall that there has ever been a time when the action of a committee members or of the committee itself has been governed by considerations related to the party in power. There have been years, however, when the executive branch has been unduly restrictive in setting the level of its appropriation requests for medical research activities; and this, I am sorry to say, is one of those years.

We have heard much about the New Frontier but apparently it does not yet include the frontier of the medical sciences. The administration is organizing a bold new program to help our fellow man in underdeveloped countries but it is apparently not yet ready to expand a health research program which will benefit men everywhere. It apparently finds nothing odd in planning to spend three times as much to put man into space as it proposed to spend for the research needed to keep men on earth a little longer.

The Members of this Congress should know that the level of $641 million for the NIH appropriations represents the original estimate for fiscal year 1962 prepared by the Director of NIH, working in conjunction with the directors of the several institutes. This is the same budget that was supported by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In fact, the new Surgeon General in testifying before our subcommittee supported the $641 million appropriation with a most positive statement. His testimony makes it very clear that his request of $101 million above the original $540 million budget for the National Institutes of Health would be the absolute limit which he could support. No guidelines or limitations were imposed upon him in arriving at this figure. His testimony on page 56 of volume II of our hearings is as follows:

NIH BUDGET FOR 1962

Mr. LAIRD. You are a new Surgeon General and you made a very careful study of the budget of the National Institutes of Health. You had long experience in the National Institutes of Health, and served as the Acting Director of the Heart Institute. You prepared a budget which you submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare?

Dr. TERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. That provided for an increase in the NIH budget of $101 million.

Dr. TERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. That was your best judgment?

Dr. TERRY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. As to what the National Institutes of Health could use to carry on an effective program for 1962?

Dr. TERRY. That is correct, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. Do you think that we would be getting to the point where you would have better control over this program if we followed your recommendation this year?

Dr. TERRY. I do not know, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. You did not have any guidelines given to you by President Kennedy, or the Bureau of the Budget, or anyone else, in determining that particular figure?

Dr. TERRY. We had guidelines, but not limitations, sir.

Mr. LAIRD. But there was no limitation imposed upon you, that you could not go above $101 million?

Dr. TERRY. There was no suggestion that I could, should, or could not.

Mr. LAIRD. And you had complete freedom in the area of funding when you came up with that recommendation?

Dr. TERRY. I had complete freedom in terms of making what I felt was the best recommendation that could be made for the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. LAIRD. It is interesting to note that the Bureau of the Budget arbitrarily cut back the $641 million figure to $583 million for the National Institutes of

Health. This cutback in the requests of the Surgeon General and the Public Health Service represents the New Frontier's position on these vital health research programs.

In past years, the Congress—responding to the wishes of the people it represents—has appropriated those additional funds which medical research could wisely and profitably use. The record gives substantial evidence that these additional funds were, in fact, wisely and profitably used, and that the forward thrust of these programs will not be sustained unless additional funds are provided now. I am therefore wholeheartedly in support of the committee's bill, which is now before you for action, calling for a level of $641 million for the eight appropriations of the National Institutes of Health. It is impossible to measure these $641 million against vital statistics that report on the deaths from cancer, heart disease, diabetes, infections, and a host of other health hazards. We cannot talk of them in terms of death rates or millions of deaths per year. What we are concerned with is people and with supporting a long-range and tireless effort to produce health facts—facts that mean children may be strong instead of crippled; families held together in strength instead of separated by death; and for even the most severely crippled, a productive life instead of long-term disability.

The appropriation figure of $641 million for NIH for 1962 is a sound one, and I urge each Member to join with me and the members of our committee in supporting this funding level for the coming year.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us contains an amount of $64,450,000 for grants to States for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. Grants to States will be made on the basis of a $90 million allotment. This is, without doubt, one of the best investments we make, for this is the program which helps restore disabled people to activity and usefulness and jobs. In addition we have approved an appropriation of $19,250,000 for research and training. This is an increase of $2 million above the Kennedy budget.

I have great enthusiasm for the work being done in this program. It has been developing soundly for the past 40 years and I believe it has reached the place where we should support a substantial expansion in this humane and sensible approach to the problems of our disabled men and women.

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION LEADERSHIP

For much of the improvement in the vocational rehabilitation program, we are indebted to the previous administration, which proposed the law which was enacted in 1954, and which is now the basis for this entire rehabilitation effort on the part of the Federal Government and the States. I take pride in the fact that, since 1954, the Federal-State program has nearly doubled the number of disabled people rehabilitated each year. In addition, there is an excellent research program, to secure new knowledge and new methods, and a training program to produce the skilled staffs to work with larger numbers of the disabled.

The previous administration consistently requested increased funds for the rehabilitation program and our committee has never failed to report a bill in support of these increases. We have, in fact, recommended additional increases on several occasions, for I am convinced—as the committee has been—that we still are not fully capitalizing on the great potentials of the vocational rehabilitation program.

The previous administration provided a foundation for expanding this program and I should like this to be clear. In fact, during the committee's hearings this spring, the eminent Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Miss Mary E. Switzer, expressed her gratitude for the great progress made possible by the last administration. She pointed out that the clear commitment made by the last administration, back in 1954, has actually made today's program possible. On this point, I would like to quote Miss Switzer from the record:

> I think we cannot say often enough that the commitment of the previous administration to this program in a very special way has made it possible for us to tell the story we are now able to tell. I think it has not only been in the shift in the law and the funds that were provided by the Federal Government to permit the States to move ahead, but in the development of the research and training program and, finally, in the development of the international program. I would certainly like the record to be clear as to my views on that.

I should like also, at this point, to pay my respects to the able and distinguished chairman of our committee [Mr. FOGARTY]. The gentleman from Rhode Island has served on the HEW appropriations subcommittee longer than any member of the Senate or the House. He has been a consistent and effective champion of the vocational rehabilitation program. Under his chairmanship, the program receives the same careful scrutiny as all requests coming before the committee, yet he has shown his belief in the basic soundness of the rehabilitation program by his support of the funds required to expand it.

WISCONSIN REHABILITATION PROGRAM

In Wisconsin we have a rehabilitation program which is doing an excellent job and which was for many years a leader among the States in this work. I am hopeful that Wisconsin will soon be able to develop its program to the place where every disabled person in our State will be able to get the rehabilitation services he needs to become self-sustaining again—and I would offer that same hope for the disabled residents of every State, for this is one of the things we mean when we say that the United States is the land of opportunity.

IN 1962 OVER 107,000 TO BE REHABILITATED

Last year the Federal-State rehabilitation program restored 88,000 disabled people to employment. This year they expect to rehabilitate 96,000. The bill before us now will provide enough funds to enable the State agencies to rehabilitate about 107,000 disabled individuals. To me, this is a wonderful thing to do—to provide the means whereby these thousands of handicapped Americans will become able to look after themselves, learn a job, and have the satisfaction of being self-supporting citizens.

I find a special pleasure in the fact that this appropriation will make it possible for the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation to reach another milestone in its history—for if the committee's bill is approved, 1962 will be the first year in which this program has rehabilitated more than 100,000 disabled people in a single year.

Aside from the numbers being rehabilitated, the State rehabilitation agencies today are helping us in many ways in the economic and social problems which confront both the States and the Federal Government. While the appropriations for this work represent an outlay of Federal funds and of State funds, the rehabilitation programs have shown time and again that the cost of this work is returned to the Federal and State Treasury many times in the form of taxes which the disabled people pay when they return to work.

While our Government is considering many proposals having to do with our older citizens, the rehabilitation program is already doing something constructive about it. As we all know, the proportion of disability increases with age. However, with proper rehabilitation services, many of our older citizens cannot only become active again, but many of them can work at their old jobs or at new ones. The rehabilitation programs in the States have been proving this for several years. Back in 1945 less than 7,500 disabled persons over 45 years old were rehabilitated and restored to employment. That represented about 17 percent of the total for that year. This number has been growing steadily since then, and next year an estimated 33,000 disabled people in this age group, or 31 percent of the total, will be rehabilitated.

The success and the growth of this program—and many other rehabilitation programs outside the Government—are due in part to the excellent programs in training and research conducted by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

TRAINING REHAB WORKERS

We cannot expect to see larger numbers of disabled people restored unless something is done to cope with the shortages of professional personnel who work with the disabled. This need is so serious that it affects both the public program and the many fine voluntary agencies now engaged in this bill for expanding the training grant program aimed at meeting at least a part of this need, so that in the coming years there will be more physicians trained in the special procedures of rehabilitation—more physical therapists and occupational therapists—more rehabilitation counselors to work with the State agencies and others—and an increase in several other types of professional workers who are essential in providing rehabilitation services.

At the same time, the training program will support short, intensive courses of instruction for personnel already working in rehabilitation, to give them spe-

cialized training for working with people who have severe and especially difficult handicaps. One of these is mental illness, in which the possibilities for expanding our rehabilitation work are so tremendous. Another is mental retardation, in which the rehabilitation programs are trying to make a major effort. These disabilities require special knowledge which is now being provided to the staffs of the State agencies and other organizations through the training program of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.

REHABILITATION RESEARCH PROGRAM

The research program holds the real key to the future of rehabilitation work. We must have new knowledge, new procedures, new information if our investments in coming years are to pay the greatest dividends. Already the benefits of such research are beginning to flow into the work of rehabilitation agencies. Advanced types of artificial limbs are being developed, some of them offering simplified mechanical apparatus which reduces pressures on the user and aids his walking. Experimental work now is being done to see if the power impulses generated by certain muscles in the body can be used as control signals to manage artificial limbs. Other research is developing various kinds of external power, such as the hydraulic principle, to see if this type of power can be brought under control to the delicate degree required to safely actuate an artificial arm and hand.

A great variety of other research is being done in several hundred hospitals, universities, rehabilitation centers, and other research institutions of the country. In certain places, projects are underway to develop and increase the research capacities of schools and institutions which already have the nucleus of talent and facilities they need. One of these is in my own State of Wisconsin where the Curative Workshop of Milwaukee and the Marquette University School of Medicine are cooperating to develop a well-rounded plan and program of research in rehabilitation.

REHABILITATION CENTERS

The committee has also heard testimony on a further proposal in research which I believe has great merit. We still have not provided, in the field of rehabilitation, comprehensive research and training institutions where the several kinds of scientists and professional people can jointly work on the complicated problems of severe disability. This concept of the major and complete research and teaching center has been adopted in many other fields—in medicine, in space problems, and other areas—and it can be a powerful step forward in solving many of the problems of disability which remain unanswered today.

I believe we should support the establishment of several such centers and this bill provides the funds to begin with two in 1962. These centers would make available, as part of a total rehabilitation research effort, the skills of physicians, therapists, prosthetics experts, rehabilitation counselors, engineers, physicists, and other scientific personnel who play key roles in developing new knowledge in the total problem of disability and rehabilitation. They also would provide a complete training program for professional students. This sort of center probably will require that the work be carried out in a university, where the personnel and facilities can be provided in one organized effort. We have a number of outstanding universities in this country which already are engaged in teaching, research, and service in rehabilitation, and which would be prepared to undertake this sort of responsibility within a very short time.

In summary, then, I believe this bill provides essential funds for the further development of one of our most important public programs—vocational rehabilitation. I believe these funds for the rehabilitation of our disabled citizens represent one of the finest investments we make. I urge your support of this appropriation.

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that hospital rates have gone up over 300 percent over the last two decades. This increase will continue unless, through research, hospital design and operations can be improved.

This bill which we bring before the House of Representatives today provides for a new program to study hospital costs through the construction of two hospital research facilities. This program is undertaken under the authority of section 433A of the Public Health Service Act. Our committee feels that there will be sufficient benefit to any community in which such a research facility is located; that there should be a minimum of one-third non-Federal matching funds contributed by the community involved.

Our committee is very proud of starting this new program and wishes to give proper credit to outstanding doctors from the Mayo Clinic and Rochester Methodist Hospital who appeared before our committee suggesting that we embark on a hospital research facility program. I particularly wish to pay tribute to my friend and colleague, from Minnesota's First Congressional District, Mr. QUIE, who has worked very closely with our committee in the development of this new program.

The bill before us today includes $10 million to carry on this research program in hospital facilities and costs.

Since 1955, personnel of the Rochester Methodist Hospital, members of its board of directors, and members of the staff of Mayo Clinic have studied intensively several aspects of hospital function and design, in preparation for new hospital facilities. These studies have had as their objective new approaches to hospital construction and operation, to more efficient utilization of personnel, to improved care of the patient and to reduction of hospitalization costs. The studies to date include construction of, and controlled experiments with, a circular 12-bed nursing unit for the care of the critically ill.

Further studies are needed to reach the goals of improved care and reduced costs. The Rochester Methodist Hospital is seeking financial assistance for construction of an experimental and demonstrative hospital for research in patient care, hospital function, and design.

Surprisingly little controlled research is recorded in medical literature on the effect of physical facilities on care of the patient or on how design can reduce hospitalization costs. The lack of research in this field contrasts sharply with the tremendous amounts of money and energy expended for research in medicine and industry. And this dearth of critical studies is particularly surprising when one realizes that the operation of hospitals is said to be the third largest industry in the United States. Billions of dollars have been spent for hospital construction in this country alone in recent years.

A further indication of the need for careful reappraisal of hospital design and operation is the continuous increase in the cost of hospital care since 1940. Statistics from the U.S. Department of Labor demonstrate increases of almost 300 percent in the rates charged by hospitals in this period. This is much greater than the increase in consumer prices and the increase in physicians' fees over the same period.

A survey was made in Rochester in 1955 to determine variations in care required by patients in St. Marys Hospital and Rochester Methodist Hospital. This survey included classification by Mayo Clinic physicians of 1,100 patients for 7,513 patient-days according to the type of care required by each patient. Each day for a week each patient was placed in one of three categories based on the amount of nursing care required:

Stage 1: Constant observation because of serious illness.

Stage 2: Average care.

Stage 3: Minimal care because of satisfactory progress or a nonserious type of illness.

Analysis of this data revealed that on any given day approximately 20 percent of patients required stage-1 care, 60 percent stage-2 care, and 20 percent stage-3 care. While these percentages will vary somewhat from one hospital to another, the study did quantitate what has been recognized as a fact: Not every patient in a given hospital requires the same amount of care. Patients in stage 1 need more hours of nursing care daily and the care of more skilled personnel than patients in stage 2 or stage 3. Conversely, patients in stage 3 need fewer hours of nursing care daily and care of less skilled personnel than patients in stage 1 or stage 2. In addition, patients in the convalescent or stage-3 category appeared not to require the extensive equipment and facilities that are necessary for care of seriously ill patients.

The initial studies were directed toward the seriously ill patient who requires constant observation and more than average care, since it is this patient that incurs the greatest hospital expense. After consideration of many different possible architectural designs, it was the consensus that this category of patients could be cared for best in a small nursing unit of circular design with the nurses'

station centrally located and the patients' rooms placed peripherally. The inner wall of each room was to be made of double doors containing clear glass panels. This design would make each of the 12 patients visible to the nurse from her centrally located work station and the patients could at all times see the nurse. It would also reduce the distance between the patient and the nurse at her desk.

Funds were collected to build such an experimental unit from private foundations and from the Methodist Hospital. A research committee of Mayo Clinic physicians was appointed to supervise controlled research in an effort to determine the effect of hospital design and function on patient care.

Time does not permit review of the considerable mass of information accumulated from these studies of patient care in the circular unit and in the rectangular unit. Detailed data was accumulated and has been published.[1]

Among the many factors studied, several stand out. It was shown that the patient was better satisfied with his care in the circular unit, as were the patient's relatives because of the reassurance provided by constant visual contact between the patients and the nurses. Corridor travel by nurses was significantly less. Most surprising was the cost. A patient in a conventional unit requiring three special duty nurses around the clock pays $54 a day plus a room charge on an average of $20 or a total of $74. In the circular unit, equal or superior care was given for a total of $36 per day—a savings of $38 per day.

The experimental team has completed controlled studies of the care required by the patient who is acutely ill and evaluated how this is affected by architectural design. It has, however, only scratched the surface. What will be the effect of design and different methods of operation on the other 80 percent of the population in the hospital? Some hospitals have considered various phases of progressive patient care, but to date there has been no critical evaluation of the quality of care or its cost. This should be done before the method is more widely copied. Under ideal and controlled conditions is progressive patient care of a higher quality and lower in cost?

PROPOSED FUTURE HOSPITAL RESEARCH

Those responsible for studies to date have begun development of a program of study for the future when the experimental hospital is available. The research to be carried out in such a hospital would include:

First. Comparison of the circular nursing units with rectangular units in care of stage 2 and stage 3 patients to determine whether the circular design is superior for these groups. Both the quality of such care and the cost per patient-day would be evaluated.

Second. Positive determination of the feasibility of progressive patient care of patients in a general hospital. Again both the quality of the care received by the patients and the cost of that care would be ascertained.

Third. Study of other proposed schemes for segregation of patients by clinical service or probable length of stay. Possibly patients admitted for 1 to 3 days for a special diagnostic or therapeutic procedure could be accommodated at lower cost in a special hospital unit.

Fourth. Consideration of all possible mechanical, electric, and pneumatic devices to reduce hospital labor costs and installation of such devices for actual trial if determined to be of practical value.

SUMMARY

Considerable effort has been devoted to the Rochester Methodist Hospital study project by those bearing the local responsibility, and only after such effort had been made was it felt proper to seek help elsewhere. A great deal of data has been collected, study methods have been developed, and appraisal techniques have been refined, but much work remains to be done before the full significance and potential of the concepts under study can be precisely delineated.

In order to evaluate completely the patient care, costs, and patient-relative acceptance of stage care, an experimental hospital with its design based on function is necessary. This will be a tool for future studies. If approached with boldness and imagination, one can visualize that critical research might produce contributions in hospital design and patient care that could be prototypes throughout the country for many decades to come.

With the increasing and aging population, with the obvious immediate need for more hospital beds, with inadequate numbers of trained nurses available, and with the ever-increasing costs of hospitalization, it seems reasonable that any effort to solve these problems is a worthwhile contribution to the Nation's health and welfare.

The gentleman from Rhode Island has served on this committee longer than any Member of either the House or the Senate, and has gone through this bill on an item-by-item basis during the last 45 minutes.

This bill is not an easy one for the members of the House Committee on Appropriations to labor with each year. There is more testimony taken on the record than before any other subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with the exception of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been growing. In each of the last 9 years there have been substantial increases in the bill. This is particularly true when we look at the National Institutes of Health and the budget submission of the National Institutes of Health over the last 9 or 10 years. We have found ourselves in a position here in the House of Representatives where we have had additions made in the National Institutes of Health budget well beyond the appropriation level which has been established by our House committee during each of the last 7 years.

It was my hope that this year we would find ourselves in a position where the executive branch of our Government would take over the leadership of this particular program, and where the new Surgeon General would be in a position of giving strong leadership to the medical research program conducted by the National Institutes of Health.

I was indeed disappointed that this did not take place. We find that the recommendation made by the Surgeon General, after a considerable amount of study, meant very little to the New Frontier. These recommendations were made by a man who had served as acting head of the Heart Institute, who had long experience with the National Institutes of Health and the Public Health Service, but were not given much consideration by the New Frontier. It seems to me that it is most important that the executive branch under the leadership of the Surgeon General take control and give leadership to the whole area of medical research.

For that reason our subcommittee has included in this bill for the first time the recommendation of the Surgeon General as far as the National Institutes of Health are concerned. In the past the figures which have been recommended by the Surgeon General have been increased from $100 million to as high as $200 million by the other body. This year we are basing our committee recommendations on sound testimony, study, and research which has been done by the new Surgeon General as well as our committee. It may be necessary for us to bring this bill back to the House of Representatives at some future time in order to substantiate the $64 million figure, anticipating that the Senate might take action to increase this bill. The House of Representatives I am sure will stand firm on the recommendations of this subcommittee, and I believe that such a vote at a future time is probably inevitable.

In this particular bill we are placing special emphasis upon several programs. First, we are placing greater emphasis in the area of training the unskilled worker and the semiskilled worker and in also training people who are taken off the labor market by various handicaps. It seems to me that when we considered the depressed areas legislation passed early in this session of the Congress, a bill with over 95 percent of authorized funds in direct subsidies to industry, with less than 5 percent of the authorization going to this area of training individuals. It is sad but true that we enacted a piece of legislation which did not clearly meet the problems as we face the challenge of the 1960's.

During our committee hearings the new Secretary of Labor, and last year Secretary of Labor Mitchell, pointed out to us that the need in the labor market, as we face the next 5- and 10-year period, is in the area of the semiskilled and the skilled worker. It seems that the emphasis which we give in this bill to training individual Americans is a much greater step forward than the legislation which passed the House giving 95 percent of the aid in the form of direct subsidies to industry. I believe that the

[1] Sturdevant, Madelyne: Comparisons of Intensive Nursing Service in a Circular and a Rectangular Unit: American Hospital Association, 1960.

increased emphasis which we give to vocational training and vocational rehabilitation, the emphasis which we are giving to the apprenticeship training program, will go a long way in facing up to the problems of employment in the sixties.

One has to but pick up the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times or any of the other large metropolitan papers in the United States today and find on each Sunday new records being made in the want-ad sections of those papers, showing job opportunities for semiskilled and skilled workers. This type of training approach will go much farther than the depressed-area type of approach which places the emphasis on subsidies to industry instead of helping individuals secure job opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that was arrived at through hard work on the part of our subcommittee, and by the full committee and it was in a spirit of compromise that several of the sections are brought before us today. I do believe that the emphasis which we are giving to the program in this next year, the increased emphasis we have given to training individuals, to educational cooperative research, as compared with the budget presented to us, represents sound progress.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman would care to comment on the reduction of $1 million in the amount for national defense fellowships; if he could explain why that was done.

Mr. LAIRD. The budget estimate was for $22,762,000. We reduced this to $21,762,000. I think it is important to realize that this represents an increase over last year's program of a little over $1 million.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. That is right.

Mr. LAIRD. We feel that the fellowships which have been approved by the Office of Education should be very carefully scrutinized. I direct the attention of the gentleman to the record of the hearings of our committee, in which all of these fellowships as they were approved by the Office of Education are set forth. We feel that some of the fellowships approved are not in keeping with the intent of the National Defense Education Act as it was explained, as it was presented, and as it was passed by the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. We feel that this needs review. Certainly an increase of $1 million over last year's budget allows sufficient latitude for the Office of Education to carry on a very fine program, but we want to give them a warning, we want these programs and grants reviewed very carefully.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The gentleman feels that there is sufficient money in the bill to carry forward the proper program which was properly laid out in the law? You feel some abuses may have come into it, and that is why you have cut it back? Is that correct?

Mr. LAIRD. That is basically correct.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. We are almost up to the full authorization for this. The full authorization happens to be $22,762,000. We are only $1 million below the authorization. I believe this is healthy for the program.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER. I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin on what he said about retraining. I think his analysis was excellent. Does the gentleman feel the amount in the bill is adequate for these purposes?

Mr. LAIRD. I feel that the amount contained in this bill is a great improvement over what the administration asked for as far as these activities are concerned. Whether the administration will expend the funds at the rate that we have established I cannot say. I am hopeful these funds will be released by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HECHLER. I share the gentleman's enthusiasm for retraining as a means of picking up the economy in those areas affected by automation. I think it is a direct method. I think it gives full attention to the human problem. I hope that additional steps forward will be made in this very vital area of retraining.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that this business of international research grants has grown so big they have had to set up a staff officer to take care of it?

Mr. LAIRD. The international research grants as far as the National Institutes of Health are concerned?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. LAIRD. Yes. The total amount of funds made available, using soft currencies wherever we can in this particular area, has grown in the last few years.

An Office of International Research has been established at the National Institutes of Health to coordinate and exercise control over the development of these programs. Dr. Martin Cummings, who is now chairman of the department of microbiology at the University of Oklahoma Medical School, has been appointed Chief of this Office. It is my understanding that Dr. Cummings is an outstanding investigator with a broad background in medical research and its international ramifications.

Mr. GROSS. This is a brandnew Office, is that correct, or comparatively new?

Mr. LAIRD. It is a unit within the Office of the Director of the National Institutes of Health. It will have the function and responsibility for administering these oversea research activities.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee go into some of these research grants? I called attention to one or two of them last year. Did they go into it this year?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, we did. I think the gentleman referred last year, when this bill was on the floor, to some of these grants. We made a rather thorough study of them this year.

I will be very glad to furnish the gentleman a list of those grants.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I commend the gentleman and the chairman of the subcommittee and all its other members for this bill as a whole and especially for two particular items which I think are of great significance. One is the provision of funds to establish two regional institutes of vocational rehabilitation. At one time I had prepared a bill to establish in the National Institutes of Health an additional institute on vocational rehabilitation. This is a field that has been too long neglected, and it is a field that pays special dividends in that it returns disabled people to useful work. Thousands of persons who are in some way or other disabled are converted from tax consumers to self-supporting, self-respecting taxpayers.

But as I considered it further, it seemed wiser to follow the course this bill adopts of aiding and developing existing institutes, because research in rehabilitation is not so much a matter of laboratory research or test tube studies as it is a matter of working directly with patients. This research and training can best be done where the patients are in various places throughout the country rather than in Bethesda. So your committee, in its wisdom, very properly has recommended on a sort of trial basis, appropriation of $500,000 to each of two established institutions, each already cooperating with a high-grade university that is doing work in the same field. I am sure this is a pattern of Federal assistance which, at least in this special field, can be very productive, and I commend the subcommittee for its leadership and foresight.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

I have talked with my colleague on several occasions about the need for this type of center approach. We feel that the two centers which are provided for in this bill will be a real help. They will not only help to take care of individuals who happen to have an opportunity to use these centers, but I think even more important functions will be served by them in that they will provide a complete training program for professional students in vocational rehabilitation and will demonstrate procedures that others may follow in improving vocational rehabilitation programs throughout the Nation.

I would like to say we are making good and great progress in the field of vocational rehabilitation and this bill not only provides for the starting of these two additional centers, but it will make it possible to rehabilitate 107,000 individuals next year. This is real progress.

I would like, too, to point to the fact that it was President Eisenhower who sent a special message to the Congress on vocational rehabilitation, and since that message came to the Congress, I think there has been an entirely different emphasis on this program. We have gone from rehabilitating about 60,000 people each year, to over 100,000 people. This is a very fine program and it is done on a cooperative basis with the States. It is a matching program, with the States and the local communities really being responsible for its operation, under some guidance and these matching funds from the Federal Government.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman for yielding further. The other pioneering step I would like to commend is the provision of $10 million for hospital construction following out the pattern that very careful research and study at the Mayo Clinic have demonstrated can be so effective in giving better medical care to acutely ill patients who need 24-hour nursing care. Furthermore, it provides the better care at greatly reduced costs and with enormous benefit to the state of mind of the patients. A seriously ill and anxious patient who is down at the end of a long hall and may be afraid that when he wants help, the nurse may not be able to come, often pushes the button unnecessarily just to see the nurse and be reassured. In contrast, in this circular arrangement which was worked out at Rochester, and which I have had an opportunity to examine, there is a large picture window from the room to the center where the nurses are. The patient can see the nurses at all times and the nurses can see the patient. A curtain can be drawn when relatives are visiting or when treatments are being given, so that the patient is given the necessary privacy when needed. It makes the patients feel better, more secure, if they can look out and see the nurse and know she is available. This new pattern offers great possibilities, both from the standpoint of the well-being of patients and from the standpoint of the costs of hospital care to all who have to pay them. Again, I comment the gentleman and his committee for this important breakthrough.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. The gentleman from Wisconsin answered some questions concerning a portion of the committee report on the extension of teaching and education of the mentally retarded. As I understand the appropriation made in this bill is $1 million, the amount of the budget request, and is the same as it was for fiscal year 1961. The committee in its report, however, had recommended the broadening of the authorizing legislation to cover the area of increased responsibility, especially for teachers of the mentally retarded and for teaching children with speech and hearing defects. Will the gentleman tell us what the committee had in mind when it made this recommendation?

Mr. LAIRD. It would be necessary for the authorization to be amended, and legislation is now pending which raises this particular authorization.

Mrs. MAY. I think this is highly to be desired. I have a very particular interest in this field. One more question, if the gentleman will permit. On that same page of the report the committee states that it feels that the activity of the service for mental retardation under the Office of Education is of such importance that they have made another recommendation that consideration should be given to designating an assistant to the Commissioner to be in charge of that phase of the activity, other exceptional children, and children with speech and hearing defects. Would the gentleman enlarge on that specifically and tell us what action may be taken in this important field?

Mr. LAIRD. This action can be taken by the Commissioner to designate an individual who would be in charge of this program. We feel that by concentrating responsibility in one person who would devote his entire time to this program and acquiring a thorough understanding of what is taking place throughout each of the 50 States, that it would be of great help in furthering the programs of help to this group of children.

Mrs. MAY. I commend the gentleman for his attention to this subject. The State of Washington has done some rather outstanding work but we need additional assistance in this field. I feel this is deserving of the support of all.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentlewoman from Washington for her helpful suggestions.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. GARLAND. Can the gentleman from Wisconsin tell me where these two vocational rehabilitation institutes will be located?

Mr. LAIRD. The location of those institutions is not established by our committee. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Maine to the wording of our report, page 12, where is set forth the basis under which the assignment will be made.

Mr. GARLAND. That will be left to the Department to determine where they will go?

Mr. LAIRD. That will be left to the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and their advisory committee.

Mr. GARLAND. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Would the gentleman explain to me, on page 5, in the "Grants for construction of cancer research facilities," that $5 million is not, am I correct in my understanding, subject to the 50-percent matching fund?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct. That is made available under section 433(a) of the Public Health Service Act, which does not require matching. There is no matching requirement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I wonder if the gentleman will explain why he favors the expenditure of $58 million more for NIH than the Budget Bureau requested.

Mr. LAIRD. In my statement I tried to explain the reason I supported the work done by the National Institutes of Health, why I felt this is a reasonable budget. It is not as much as some members of our committee advocated, as the gentleman from Rhode Island pointed out, but I believe that we in the Congress are operating on a sound basis by accepting these figures which were justified in the budget submission of the Surgeon General as the best figure, the best funding level for fiscal year 1962 that he could arrive at after long and deliberate study on his part.

We had public witnesses who came before us. If you take the budgets of the individual Directors, you will find those budgets will total about $100 million more, and the public witnesses $200 or $300 million more. I believe we are on a sound footing by accepting the Surgeon General's figure.

I want to direct the attention of the gentleman from Iowa to the hearing record in which Dr. Terry testified at some length as to the proper funding level.

If you will turn to page 56, part II, you will find a discussion there between Dr. Terry and me in which this figure is substantiated very well, I believe.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The Government Operations Committee had a study made, and they found considerable inefficiency in the administration of some of these research projects.

Mr. LAIRD. From the press release I read, I felt there would be a lot of criticism in the report of the Government Operations Committee. I went over the report and I did not find the report very critical. There were statements made in the report that referred to the review of grants, and that they felt there should be better review, and a few other rather mild criticisms.

This program has grown at a rapid rate. That is why I support this funding level. I am not going to support the funding level requested by the public witnesses or the estimates by the Institute Directors of what could be spent. I think this is a reasonable funding level, one under which this program can make proper growth and proper progress in 1962.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. These findings were taken into consideration in setting this figure; is that right?

Mr. LAIRD. Before this bill was marked up I took that report home and spent a considerable amount of time on it, during the weekend before this bill was marked up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] but I would compliment him for his consistent record. I think he has been very, very liberal with the taxpayers' money in this bill, as he has been in the past.

I was impressed by his answer to a question by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH]. He said, "Yes, we gave them everything they asked for," and I think that runs the full course of this bill, with only a few items, perhaps, shaved a little. Throughout the hearings—I have done my best to read them, and they are voluminous, I will say to the gentleman—I find the gentleman asking many of those who appeared before the committee if they could not use a little more money. "Have you got enough money? Can you not use just a little bit more" or "quite a little bit more?" So, I want to compliment the gentleman for being real liberal.

Now, I obtained recently a copy of the report of the Committee on Government Operations, the Intergovernmental Subcommittee, chairmaned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN]. It is a report on a study of the National Institutes of Health in which it was found, among other things, that funds were being mishandled. There is a good deal of criticism to be found in this report. I wonder if the gentleman from Rhode Island has seen it?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, I have seen it and I have read it.

Mr. GROSS. And the 13 recommendations were made by the subcommittee?

Mr. FOGARTY. Some of the recommendations have already been carried out, and others are being worked on. I will say to the gentleman that the Committee on Appropriations had a similar investigation made 2 years ago, and there are some discrepancies between the two reports. We plan to have both reports examined this coming year to see where the discrepancies are, because the Committee on Appropriations investigators did not agree with some of the findings of this committee you speak of. But, we think it is a good idea for the other committee to make these investigations, and if they come up with some good suggestions, they will be followed.

Mr. GROSS. I am pleased to hear that the gentleman is going into the report. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any kind of a guess as to the number of new employees that will be put on the payroll as the result of this appropriation bill we have before us today. It seems to me, in going through the hearings, that a lot of new employees will be put on the payroll.

Mr. FOGARTY. There will be about 400 in the Department of Labor.

Mr. GROSS. 400?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. And approximately 3,000 in HEW.

Mr. GROSS. 3,000. That would be 3,400 additional employees to be put on the payroll.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is in round figures.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Well, that is a lot of people.

Mr. FOGARTY. Most of these are in the Public Health Service.

Mr. GROSS. That leads me to a little discussion of some of the things we had up last year. Is the Public Health Service still making grants for the training of dogs?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether they are or not; but, if they are, there is some good reason behind it.

Mr. GROSS. And a study of bird sounds at Cornell University?

Mr. FOGARTY. And the love life of a goat, which turned out to be pretty good research.

Mr. GROSS. Now, in what way could that be good research?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, I would have to refer to the hearings. That was a project that was ridiculed 10 or 11 years ago. But, when we got the facts about it, it turned out to have been a good project and resulted in new information of value. I remember that even one of the writers who ridiculed it admitted afterward that it was a worthwhile project. Some of these things that were criticized severely years ago have turned out to be good projects, although, from their titles, they might sound very foolish to some of us.

Mr. GROSS. For the edification of the new Members, I want to describe the research grant to the Israel Institute of Applied Social Research in Jerusalem, Israel. The grant is for $33,100. It is described as "A test of the husband-wife relationship."

It is further described as follows:

The aim is to develop a diagnostic pictorial test of both intrapersonal and interpersonal aspects of the role relationship of husband and wife. The test should be sensitive to the perceptions of actual behavior and norms and to the consonance perceived between these.

I want to ask, as I did last year, whether this grant has expired. Has there been any report made, if the gentleman knows; and if so, what was the result of this study of the intrapersonal and interpersonal relationship of the husband and wife?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know whether the report has been completed or not.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAIRD. We will see that the gentleman gets a copy of this report as soon as it is filed.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman; I should like to have it. For the edification of the new Members on both sides of the aisle, there has been some $89,000 spent by the Public Health Service, and part of it has gone for a study of behavior at cocktail parties. For their edification, I shall read briefly from a preliminary report. It says—

That the room in which the bar is situated tends to become crowded; that there is a variety of guests who will cringe in corners, while others sing, dance, slop martinis into the piano, and pursue members of the opposite sex to the pantry or beyond.

Then it goes on to say:

As the party began, the living room filled with friends; they conversed quietly in small groups of the same sex. Soon the unmarried guests began to scan the knots of people of the opposite sex and then to maneuver. Cross-sex conversations developed.

Things seemed to be off to a fair enough start, and around the bar in the dining room they stayed lively enough, but in the living room there was an ominous lag: "There was a long period of desultory conversation." Just as a social crisis appeared imminent, the gaiety of the dining room set began to engulf the others. Things were jumping so much that in the living room dyads of friends came together simply to rest.

Gradually the guests went home; or went to sleep. One hostess at 5 a.m. was unable to find a vacant bed.

I should like to know if we are continuing to spend money for this sort of thing.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman, if he can shed some light on this.

Mr. LAIRD. The Saturday Evening Post had an editorial on this, and I directed an inquiry to the Director of the National Institutes of Health about it.

Mr. GROSS. This is in the Public Health Service, not the National Institutes of Health. Is the gentleman telling me that the National Institutes of Health is engaged in something similar to this?

Mr. LAIRD. I believe this was funded by the National Institutes of Health. This particular project had to do with work of the National Mental Health Institute. Although this project was approved by the study group, and approved by the advisory council and went all the way through the usual procedures for proper approval; I, frankly, do not believe it should have been approved. On the other hand, I do not think we should be too critical if there are three or four bad decisions made out of the thousands of applications that are considered each year.

Mr. GROSS. I have made a request for the complete report by the Public Health Service on "Behavior at Cocktail Parties." I have not been very successful in getting it; in fact, I have not gotten anything except these excerpts from a preliminary report. As the gentleman from Wisconsin is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, would he be good enough to help me try to get a copy of the full report?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I will be very happy to see that the gentleman gets a copy of the report on this particular study. Support for the subject the gentleman is discussing now has been discontinued. It is not being funded at the present time. But I will be glad to see that a report on the information gathered up until the time it was stopped is made available to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I do not like to deal in excerpts from material, I like to have the full report.

Mr. LAIRD. I am not sure how complete the report will be, because that project was discontinued, as I understand it.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say, in conclusion, that I think an awful lot of money could be saved if the expenditure of these funds was properly screened. I cannot vote for this appropriation bill, dealing as it does in more than $4.3 billion, until the waste and extravagance is eliminated. I am convinced that many millions of dollars could be saved without hampering in the least essential research and health services.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, included in the report from the Appropriations Committee is a recommendation for the expenditure of $10 million for the construction of research hospital facilities. I rise in support of this recommendation, not merely because the experimental work on this proposal was conducted in my congressional district at the Rochester Minnesota Methodist Hospital. But, more importantly, because the results of their work which started 6 years ago could have a dramatic and profoundly important consequence for all Americans.

First, I will discuss the specific problems which the Rochester Methodist Hospital confronted. Then, I will explain the scope of the problem as it concerns our country as a whole. Finally, I will discuss the results of the experimental work already completed, discuss what remains to be done and why this program should receive the support of Federal financing.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is a Member here in this House who has not personally been a patient in a hospital or has not had a member of his family as a patient in a hospital. This experience is also generally true of our citizens as a whole. Therefore, all of us have some general knowledge of the tremendous rise in the costs of hospitalization.

To be more specific, the costs of hospitalization have risen—according to the Department of Labor statistics—more than 300 percent in the past 20 years. In a study conducted by doctors at the Mayo Clinic, in Rochester, Minn., it was found that of the total hospital charges to a patient, about 65 percent of these charges were the result of personnel costs and of this 65 percent about one-half was the cost of nursing personnel.

As a first consideration, the doctors at the Mayo Clinic and at the Rochester Methodist Hosiptal thought it best—back in 1955—to find out just what kind of patients the average hospital in this country took care of. Through a scientific sampling method, they sampled two hospitals in Rochester, Minn. One was the Rochester Methodist Hospital, which has 500 beds, and the other was St. Mary's Hospital, which has 900 beds and is the largest private hospital in our country.

Mayo Clinic doctors and administrators found that on any given day, about 20 percent of the total hospital population was made up of those people who needed intensive nursing care; about 60 percent was made up of those who needed average nursing care and the other 20 percent needed less than average nursing care.

Therefore, it became obvious to these doctors and administrators that the patients they should concentrate on were the patients costing the most, that is, the 20 percent needing the intensive nursing care.

Their problem then was to attempt to cut the costs of intensive-care patients, and they decided to do this by constructing a radically new type of hospital which they hoped would enable a highly efficient level of nursing care to be maintained at a drastic reduction in costs.

You can easily visualize the type of design they decided on when I tell you it was a circular design something like if you cut an orange in the center. At the core would be the nursing station, and in the various compartments would be the rooms. This enabled the patients to have direct eye contact with the nurses at all times, and also cut down the walking distances of the nurses—giving them more time with the patients themselves.

After this 3-year study, they also found that the drastic reduction in the cost of nursing care which they were hoping to accomplish was actually realized. To bring these results into concrete figures, an intensive-care patient in Rochester—and these costs are similar in most parts of our country—would pay $54 a day for 24 hours of nursing care. In this experimental unit, the same nursing care was obtained at a cost of $13.88 a day.

Mr. Chairman, I think these results are of vital importance to our whole country. If the 20 percent of intensive-care patients in our hospitals today could all be taken care of with such efficiency and with such savings, untold millions of dollars could be saved.

In addition, I need but mention the salvaging of many families' savings which all too often are completely wiped up by prolonged hospitalization at the present high costs.

Now, I have discussed the problems which the doctors and administrators of the Rochester Methodist Hospital tried to solve, and the results of their experiment with the 20 percent of intensive-care patients.

I believe the results speak for themselves, but there is much more work to be done. As the doctors and administrators themselves point out, they have satisfactorily proven out only the beneficial effects of this new design on intensive-care patients. Now, they want to expand their study, and precisely determine if new hospital designs would prove as beneficial and efficient as their first experimental unit for patients requiring only average or minimum nursing care.

To do this, they wish to build a 450-room hospital at a cost of about $11,500,000. Just as they did not expect the costs of their experimental hospital to be borne completely by outside sources, they equally do not expect the total cost of this new experimental hospital to be borne by the Federal Government.

The Rochester Methodist Hospital representatives have reported to the Appropriations Committee that they could raise—on a local level—about one-third of the construction costs if the Federal Government would provide two-thirds of the costs. This would come under section 433(a) of the Public Health Service Act.

In view of the dramatic results already obtained in this first experiment, and considering the ever-increasing burden which the hospitals of our country will have to face in the future because of increasing population and a greater percentage of older citizens, I strongly urge the Members of this body to support this endeavor. It is a program that will ultimately benefit our entire population.

In addition to urging your support, I will conclude with an expression of keenest admiration for the humane work of the Mayo Clinic and Rochester Methodist Hospital doctors and administrators for this great contribution they have made the common property of all our citizens—continuing in their great medical tradition.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point in my remarks a letter directed to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, from the executive director of the Louis W. and Maud Hill Family Foundation of St. Paul, Minn., in connection with this subject of research in hospital design and function:

LOUIS W. AND MAUD HILL
FAMILY FOUNDATION,
St. Paul, Minn., May 8, 1961.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
The House of Representatives, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: This letter is being sent to you at the request of Representative ANCHER NELSON. It is our understanding that your committee wishes to have our evaluation of the contributions to date to hospital care and management which have resulted from the research in hospital design and function being conducted in Rochester, Minn., under the direction of the Rochester Methodist Hospital and the Mayo Clinic. We indeed are happy to comply with this request.

As a preface to our evaluation, may I say that we in the Hill Family Foundation have been concerned for some years over the rapidly increasing costs of hospital care. Our studies of the problem lead us to these conclusions, namely that: (1) solutions to this cost problem must not in any way impair the quality of care rendered patients; (2) since the salaries and wages of professional and nonprofessional personnel account for nearly 70 percent of total hospital costs, this is an area needing thorough study to determine whether such personnel is being enabled to work at maximum efficiency; (3) there is a logical relationship between efficient use of personnel and physical design and equipment of hospitals.

Our study of the literature revealed that there had been no major changes in hospital design for many years and that there had been little objective research or study of the relationships between design, function, efficiency of operations, quality of care and costs.

We were pleased, therefore, to have the opportunity to participate financially in the research undertaken by Rochester Methodist Hospital and the Mayo Clinic. Our support

for the first phase of this research undertaking, directed to the care of patients needing constant nursing care, totaled $100,000.

We believe that the findings of this research clearly demonstrate that there is a direct relationship between design and cost of care of patients needing constant nursing care. We also believe that the results show that these reductions in costs can be made without impairing the quality of care provided. In fact, there is significant evidence that the quality of care is improved and that patients and their relatives prefer the circular design over the traditional design.

It may seem logical to conclude from this research that the circular design will produce the same savings, improvement in quality of care, and patient satisfaction if applied to patients needing normal nursing and even minimal nursing care. This would be our guess. However, we believe that these stages of care should be studied in the same careful, objective manner before large sums of money are invested in new physical plants.

It is our belief that the results of the research at Rochester provide substantial support for the concept of phase care. However, further research is needed to confirm beyond doubt the validity of this concept. We also believe that the research done to date indicates that it is highly desirable to give further study to other phases of hospital functioning such as new designs of equipment and adaptations of new developments in the fields of electronics and engineering to hospital services and patient care. Certainly the results to date of the research conducted at Rochester Methodist Hospital indicate that these are promising areas for more intensive study.

The fact that a number of new hospitals and major additions to existing hospitals are incorporating the circular design is evidence that the research at Rochester has had an impact upon the hospital management fields. It also is a reason why it is urgent that this research be extended as quickly as possible.

Perhaps the best way to summarize our thinking about the contributions to the hospital field which are coming out of the research at Rochester Methodist Hospital is to say that recently Hill Family Foundation made a grant to the hospital to aid it start research on design and function as related to the care of patients needing minimal nursing care. We sincerely believe that the Rochester Methodist Hospital, Mayo Clinic, and their consultants have opened up a fertile field needing further scientific research and that they are especially well qualified to conduct this research.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. HECKMAN,
Executive Director.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make it clear to the gentlemen who so ably serve on the Appropriations Committee, and to my other colleagues in this House, that I have no quarrel with the money request carried in the bill before us today. I shall vote for passage. While there are areas where I, personally, might wish to expand—or reduce—specific items of expenditure, I do not dispute the overall good judgment of the committee which has spent so many long hours studying every facet of the appropriation.

I wish to emphasize my support of grants to our research programs in the vital search for the causes and cures of the many-headed nemesis that stalks mankind—heart disease, cancer, mental illness, crippling diseases. I support the continuation of our Federal share of the hospital construction program, the extension of funds for the National Defense Education Act and of grants to those federally impacted school areas where an unfair share of the tax burden would otherwise be borne by a community; and assistance to our libraries.

The bill before us today is the fourth fiscal year 1962 appropriation to come before the House. It calls for an expenditure of $4.327 billion, which is some $199 million more than was originally requested by President Eisenhower.

Now it is a fact that the Congress and the American taxpayers have been advised by the Kennedy administration that its revised budget requests will plunge the Nation into deficit spending of anywhere from $2 to $4 billion for fiscal year 1962. This would make it appear that annual increases in the national debt are becoming as inevitable as death and taxes.

I do not approach the worthwhile measure before us today in the spirit of parsimony. I do, however, have a New England Yankee's regard for the taxpayers' dollar, and I wish to call the attention of the House to a glaring omission.

The bill—which calls for an increase of $199 million over the original Eisenhower request—takes no cognizance of the fact that the Congress in the past has appropriated some $166 million which, according to the Bureau of the Budget, the Department has been unable to spend to date and which will be carried over into the following fiscal year. These funds are not obligated.

Many of you who served in the 85th Congress will recall the overwhelming public demand for enactment of H.R. 8002, the Hoover Commission Budget Reform Act. Its purpose was to bring up for annual congressional review these same unexpended, unobligated carryover funds—amounting to as much as $20 billion in the Department of Defense alone—and to adjust subsequent annual appropriations accordingly.

I am disappointed that the new administration has failed to accompany its budget requests to the Congress with the additional request that Public Law 85–759 be implemented.

You are all familiar with this law. President Eisenhower twice tried to put it into effect. I had hoped that President Kennedy, who sponsored the legislation in the Senate and spoke vigorously for its enactment, would promptly make the same efforts upon taking office.

He has not done so.

Thousands of taxpayers across the country—men and women in every walk of life—who wrote to their Senators and Representatives in the 85th Congress urging enactment of this legislation, are today under the impression that it is actually being implemented, that the promised billions are being saved.

Unfortunately, Public Law 85–759 has been buried alive.

It is due to expire on April 1, 1962. It has never been tried. Time is running out. Without actual operating experience, we will never be able to ascertain whether we in the Congress can take a firmed grip on the Federal pursestrings and thereby give the taxpayers full value for the dollars they entrust to us.

I have taken the taxpayers' case to the White House, determined that they shall have a voice in the National Legislature which will speak out on this issue. I ask leave to insert correspondence with the office of the President which speaks for itself. I have received no responsive answer to my last letter, dated April 13, 1961. I wish also to include a table from page 623 of the budget which shows the carryover balance in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There is no carryover in the Department of Labor.

MARCH, 24, 1961.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In reading your budget message today, I am disappointed to find that you have made no recommendation that the Congress implement Public Law 85–759.

That this may be an oversight I have no doubt, for I recall the splendid service you performed as a Member of the 85th Congress when you introduced this legislation in the Senate and worked so vigorously to secure its passage. I remember, too, the outstanding efforts put forth by Ambassador Kennedy, as a member of the Second Hoover Commission, in behalf of this budget reform measure.

In view of the fact that the budget you have sent us today is precariously balanced on a tightrope of "ifs"—and in view of the fact that the Defense budget you will send us next week is reported to call for a deficit of as much as $1.5 billion—it seems to me vital that Public Law 85–759 be implemented at once. As you point out in your message, should present revenue estimates prove overly optimistic, this deficit undoubtedly will be greater still.

Implementation of Public Law 85–759 might well help overcome such a deficit.

The Bureau of the Budget advises me that as of the end of fiscal year 1960, unobligated carry-over balances in various Federal departments had reached the staggering figure of $37.565 billion—nearly one-half the total of the proposed budget. At the end of the calendar year 1960, $20 billion in Defense funds and more than $7 billion in foreign aid funds existed in unobligated carryover balance.

Implementation of Public Law 85–759 would return to the Treasury a substantial amount of this tremendous, unspent, unobligated sum of money. It would, to quote your own excellent speech on the floor of the Senate on June 5, 1957:

"Prevent a great carryover of funds, both with respect to foreign aid, and defense, which makes it almost impossible for us (the Congress) to know exactly what we are doing, and the effect our actions will have on the amount of money available to the executive branch. * * * This bill, in combination with the cost-basis bill which was passed last year, will give us far greater control over the amount of money the Government will spend in each year. * * * The reason why the Hoover Commission stated that it would save hundreds of millions of dollars is that placing this system in operation in business has brought about savings of 1, 2, and as much as 3 percent."

Estimates at the time, by experts, ran as high as $4 billion in annual savings if the legislation were enacted. It seems to me this would be an important savings today when our national debt has hit the $285 billion mark, and you warn us that it must go higher still before June 30.

Twice, since enactment of Public Law 85–759 in 1958, President Eisenhower submitted appropriation requests subject to limitation on annual accrued expenditures. In his fiscal 1960 budget, six such limitations were proposed. Exercising its prerogative under the law, the House Committee on Appropriations eliminated the accrued expenditures proposals. President Eisenhower submitted 12 limitations in his fiscal 1961 budget. Again the House Committee on Appropriations refused to adopt them. Apparently despairing of receiving any cooperation from the committee, President Eisenhower omitted all such recommendations from his fiscal 1962 money requests.

Public Law 85–759 will expire on April 1, 1962. The budget reform the Congress promised the American taxpayers has never, in fact, taken place. I am sure you vividly remember the flood of mail from thousands of concerned citizens, in all walks of life, urging passage of the Kennedy bill, S. 434, and its House companion, H.R. 8002. I have no doubt that these citizens are under the impression that now that the law is on the books the promised billions are being saved.

In truth, Public Law 85–759 has been buried alive.

Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that as Chief Executive, with the economic stability of our Nation as one of your foremost responsibilities, you resubmit your budget requests with the addition of accrued expenditure limitations for those agencies which have established a system of accrual accounting. I respectfully suggest, also, that as leader of the party which controls the Congress, and the committees of the Congress, your recommendation that Public Law 85–759 be implemented will meet with a warmer reception than was accorded President Eisenhower.

I feel that this is a matter of the utmost urgency if the Congress is to recapture its constitutional control over the power of the Federal purse, and if the American taxpayer is to be given some hope of fiscal responsibility in the management of his hard-earned tax dollar. I am certain that you share my deep concern.

Respectfully,

F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
April 8, 1961.

Hon. F. BRADFORD MORSE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BRAD: The President has asked me to acknowledge your recent letter on accrued expenditure limitations.

When the President was a Member of Congress, he supported the Hoover Commission recommendation to change the method of appropriating to the accrued expenditure basis. Legislation introduced for this purpose was modified before enactment to provide for accrued expenditure limitations within appropriations on an obligation basis. In accordance with this legislation, accrued expenditure limitations were proposed in the budgets for 1960 and 1961 for certain appropriations. These limitations were rejected by the Congress.

The principal operating advantages and economies to be obtained from the Hoover Commission proposals on budgeting and accounting are those associated with the adoption of accrual accounting and cost-based budgeting. As you know, both of these have been widely adopted in the civilian agencies of the Government, so that by the end of the fiscal year over 75 percent of the budgeting and accounting for civilian agencies will be on these bases. The President has asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to press toward rapid completion of the conversion of the remaining civilian agencies and the Defense Department to accrual accounting and cost-based budgeting methods.

Sincerely yours,

MYER FELDMAN,
Deputy Special Counsel to the President.

APRIL 13, 1961.

Mr. MYER FELDMAN,
Deputy Special Counsel to the President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MIKE: Thank you, sir, for your acknowledgment of April 8 of my March 24 letter to the President.

President Kennedy deserves only the highest praise for his splendid efforts, as a Member of Congress, in behalf of Hoover Commission recommendations—particularly in his fight to place appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis. It is precisely because I know his keen interest in this important area that I felt no hesitation in calling to his attention the failure to implement Public Law 85–759. It seems to me an ideal opportunity for the President to put his Kennedy Budget Reform Act into effect—or at least attempt to persuade those of his party who control the Appropriations Committee to do so.

In your second paragraph, Mike, you point out that accrual accounting and cost-based budgeting procedures have been widely adopted by civilian agencies of the Government, so that by the end of this fiscal year more than 75 percent of them will be operating on these bases. This is a fine achievement, accomplished over the last 5 years under Public Law 84–863. However, Public Law 84–863 does only half the job. To obtain the full operating advantages and economies possible, Public Law 85–759 must also be implemented. The President himself pointed this out in a speech he made, as junior Senator from Massachusetts, on the Senate floor on June 5, 1957. In urging passage of his bill, S. 434, he stated that it "* * * in combination with the cost-basis bill which was passed last year, will give us far greater control over the amount of money the Government will spend in each year."

In a word, implementation of Public Law 84–863, as outlined in the second paragraph of your letter is progressing satisfactorily. But, to be truly meaningful, implementation of Public Law 85–759 must also be made. And Public Law 85–759 has been buried alive.

In 1959, a year after Public Law 85–759 was enacted, President Eisenhower proposed limitations on six relatively small appropriations as starting points for putting the law into effect. The House Appropriations Committee struck the limitations from all six appropriations.

Among these appropriations was that of the Panama Canal Zone Government. Representatives of the Canal Zone Government thereupon went before the Senate Appropriations Committee with a strong plea for reinstatement of the limitations. They pointed out that their appropriation had been on a cost basis for 6 years and emphasized their conviction that to gain maximum benefits from Public Law 84–863, implementation of Public Law 85–759 was a necessary and logical step.

On being asked by Senator HOLLAND, of the Appropriations Committee, whether he saw any benefits to be gained by adoption of the limitations, the Comptroller of the Canal Zone testified:

"I believe there are benefits that do accrue through control of accrual expenditures. I think it places Congress in a position to review through its budgetary techniques, current expenditure requirements, which is really the best measure of accrual accomplishments, and by extension, it is the best point of performance control. It insures the opportunity of review and approval of an expenditure program annually, and any interim deviations from a planned program would automatically be brought to the attention of the Congress."

The Senate subcommittee reinstated the limitations on the Canal Zone appropriation and, after its passage by the Senate, Senator HOLLAND, as one of the conferees, indicated he would fight for retention of the limitations. Nevertheless, the conferees struck the last remaining limitation.

As I pointed out in my earlier letter, President Eisenhower proposed 12 appropriation limitations the following year. The Appropriations Committee again rejected them.

At a time when the Nation is plunging more and more into deficit spending, at a time when we will be asked to once more raise the temporary ceiling on the national debt, it seems to me absolutely vital that as responsible guardians of the public treasure, we must search for every means of conserving unnecessary expenditures. Public Law 85–759 offers that opportunity—offers it without stripping worthwhile spending projects of needed funds and without slowing down acceleration of programs which must be stepped up in the national interest.

I respectfully reiterate my suggestion that as Chief Executive, with the economic stability of our Nation as one of his most important responsibilities, the President resubmit his budget requests with the addition of accrued expenditure limitations for those agencies which have established a system of accrual accounting.

I respectfully reiterate my suggestion that as leader of the party which controls the Congress, and the committees of the Congress, his recommendation that Public Law 85–759 be implemented could meet with a warmer reception than was accorded President Eisenhower.

Time is running short. Public Law 85–759 expires on April 1, 1962. Without actual operating experience, we will never be able to ascertain whether it is possible for Congress to take a firmer grip on the Federal purse strings and thereby give the taxpayers full value for the dollars they entrust to us.

Sincerely,

F. BRADFORD MORSE,
Member of Congress.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Balance, start of 1962

[In thousands of dollars]

Appropriations:	*Unobligated*
Salaries and expenses, certification, inspection, and other services, Food and Drug Administration	646
Pharmacological-animal laboratory, Food and Drug Administration	-------
Grants for library services, Office of Education	916
Payments to school districts, Office of Education	-------
Assistance for school construction, Office of Education	-------
Defense educational activities, Office of Education	19,331
Research and training (special foreign currency program), Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	120
Buildings and facilities, Public Health Service	1,699
Hospital construction activities, Public Health Service	124,500
Grants for waste treatment works construction, Public Health Service	5,000
Medical care and foreign quarantine, Public Health Service	-------
Construction of Indian health facilities, Public Health Service	806

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Balance, start of 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Appropriations—Continued	Unobligated
General research and services, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service	-------
National Cancer Institute, Public Health Service	-------
Mental health activities, Public Health Service	-------
National Heart Institute, Public Health Service	-------
Grants for construction of health research facilities, Public Health Service	-------
Communicable disease activities, Public Health Service	-------
Construction of mental health-neurology research facility, Public Health Service	12,048
Construction, mental health facilities, Alaska, Public Health Service	-------
Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	57
Construction and equipment, treatment and cafeteria buildings, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	525
Extension and modernization of administration building, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	84
Construction, continued treatment building, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	-------
Construction and equipment of treatment building, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	-------
Construction and equipment, maximum security building, Saint Elizabeths Hospital	-------
Grants to States for public assistance, Social Security Administration	-------
Construction, Gallaudet College	197
Plans and specifications, Howard University	34
Construction of buildings, Howard University	247
Construction of men's dormitory (liquidation of contract authorization) Howard University	-------
White House Conference on Aging, Office of the Secretary	-------
Other	-------
Subtotal	166,211
Balance of anticipated pay increase supplementals included above	-------
Total appropriations	166,211
Contract authorizations:	
Auditorium, Howard University	440
Other	-------
Total, contract authorizations	440
Revolving and management funds:	
Advances and reimbursements, Office of Education	-------
Operation of commissaries, narcotic hospitals, Public Health Service	29
Bureau of State Services management fund, Public Health Service	-------
National Institutes of Health management funds, Public Health Service	-------
Service and supply fund, Public Health Service	2
Working capital fund, narcotic hospitals, Public Health Service	76
Advances and reimbursements, Public Health Service	-------

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Balance, start of 1962—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Unobligated
Revolving and management funds—Continued	
Operating fund, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, Social Security Administration	794
Advances and reimbursements, Social Security Administration	-------
Working capital fund, Office of the Secretary	81
Other	-------
Total, revolving and management funds	982
Proposed for later transmission:	
Appropriation other than pay increase supplementals	-------
Anticipated pay increase supplemental appropriations	-------
Total, proposed for later transmission	-------
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	167,633

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman a question. I note in the hearings that $1,118 was expended in Iowa to take care of the fishing industry. I did not know we had a commercial fishing industry in Iowa that required Federal funds. In the hearings I also read that the money was spent for care and maintenance of marine engines and fish nets. How much money for this purpose is being spent around the country?

Mr. MARSHALL. I think what the gentleman is referring to is the money that is used in the vocational educational end of the program, and it is being used to display salesmanship and so on in relation to fish. The testimony before the committee was that this was a very worthwhile part of distributive education in that it was familiarizing people just how to handle a product which is extremely valuable to the dietary requirements of the people.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to pay tribute to the gentleman from Rhode Island and to the members of his subcommittee for their outstanding work on this bill. Particularly, Mr. Chairman, it is encouraging to see the emphasis being placed on expanding the medical research programs. Certainly, nothing is more important to this Nation than the health of our citizens.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I also wish to compliment the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee for the work they have done, and I concur with the gentleman from Oklahoma in his remarks in regard to research in the problem of medical care in our country.

There is no doubt in my mind, and I believe this to be true with the majority of American citizens, that we must be concerned about health.

During the past 15 years this country has made great progress in the attack on disease, in the construction of hospitals, and development of other medical facilities.

But a great deal more is to be done. Expansion of present fields of research, establishment of new fields, training of medical personnel, and the availability of medical services to the people, need our serious study and support.

To save a life, to lessen pain, to cure the maimed—these are worthwhile goals for which our dollars are spent wisely. And more dollars are needed.

I join with my colleagues in support of legislation that will provide the plans and means to support a program for medical research, medical training, and medical service, not only to benefit this generation, but those to come.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, it is a rewarding experience to serve on the appropriations subcommittee for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. In one way or another, the work of these agencies touches on the life of every American family.

Our chairman, JOHN FOGARTY, well deserves the nationwide reputation he has earned for his great service to humanity. Many witnesses before the committee know first hand of his dedicated work as a Member of Congress. Many organizations have learned to appreciate and support his judgment. The consideration and fairness he shows as chairman makes it a pleasure to work with him.

My goodhearted friend from Indiana, WINFIELD DENTON, brings to the subcommittee legal training and experience together with genuine sympathy and understanding of the human problems with which we deal. The people of his State can be rightly proud of his effective contribution to this important work.

During the years I have served with Congressman LAIRD, I have learned to appreciate more and more his working knowledge of the intricacies of many of these programs. He is a tireless worker who makes a real effort to understand every phase of an agency's work.

We were joined this year by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. Since it was my privilege to serve with him on the agricultural appropriations subcommittee, his efforts are not new to me. A man of ability and commonsense, he is making a genuine contribution to the subcommittee.

Throughout our long and sometimes arduous hearings, all of us appreciated the services of Robert Moyer, our well-informed and able clerk whose work is uniformly excellent.

In addition to the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we consider appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, and the U.S. Soldiers' Home. For the most part, these agencies render good and necessary service. Their activities are covered in some detail in our report.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT CREDITS

I do, however, want to call special attention to an untidy situation that continues in regard to the railroad retirement trust fund. We have consistently urged that payments be approved to cover the military service credits authorized by law. It seems to me that the provisions of this law should be carried out; every day of delay only postpones the reckoning that must come.

Continued delay is bad budgeting and is unfair to members of the system as well as the taxpayers of the country. It is my understanding that a proposal will be made to the Bureau of the Budget to bring contributions to the fund up to date in five of six installments. I urge the Bureau to recognize this obligation to implement the law passed by Congress and to restore confidence in proper budgeting procedure.

U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

In studying the testimony concerning the U.S. Soldiers' Home, I am impressed by the efficiency with which it is administered by Gen. Wade H. Haislip and his staff. As Governor of the Home, he is to be congratulated on this fine record.

BOGGED IN PAPERWORK

The work of the Department of Labor has always interested me, but I am constantly amazed at the great mass of paperwork required of this agency. I am disappointed that the legislative committee and the Congress have not given more attention to eliminating useless paperwork and the resulting unnecessary expense.

An obvious example is the collection of reports of little or no real value or legal purpose. Thousands and thousands of these reports are accumulating under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act. Both former Secretary Mitchell and the present Secretary Goldberg have called attention to the situation without avail.

NO ENFORCEMENT POWERS

Not only do we bear the needless cost of employees and facilities but we contribute to the public illusion that the Secretary of Labor has enforcement powers. Commenting on this shameful deception, Secretary Mitchell said last year that the act provides "no persuasive deterrent to those who wish to ignore its provisions, or to manipulate or embezzle funds."

It is almost unbelievable that assets and insurance reserves of over $40 billion, which are intended to provide over 400,000 different benefits to 80 million workers, are so little protected. Yet administration of a law which does not provide this protection will cost about $580,000 next year.

LANDRUM-GRIFFIN COSTS

We encountered a similar situation in examining operations under the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act (Landrum-Griffin Act). The bill before you includes $5,775,000 for purposes of the act. In 3 years, Department of Labor expenses under the bill will cost the taxpayers about $13,467,000.

If a law is measured by the number of jobs it creates, this one has been a success since the budget requested funds for 596 positions. The Bureau of Labor Management reports originally requested 986 positions and $7,500,000 for administration of the law.

STATE LAWS APPLY

Our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], inquired into criminal actions to date. We were informed that there are 10 cases for embezzlement of funds. Convictions have been obtained in six. The Department admitted that State laws would usually cover these cases. It was stated that 1,469 alleged violations are under investigation but this figure is meaningless, in my opinion, since a great many will be dropped upon completion of the investigations.

When the Landrum-Griffin bill was before the Congress, people all over the country were barraged with propaganda originating mostly from antilabor sources. Some of this was misleading; and some, downright false. Because of their legitimate concern over conditions disclosed by committees of the Congress, many people accepted the propaganda without further investigation.

EFFECT OF HASTY ACTION

The very people often interested in a balanced budget and economy in Government, wrote, wired, telephoned, and visited Members of Congress to demand immediate adoption of the bill. Congress responded to the pressure generated by these activities. What has happened is a good example of what can happen when we legislate in this kind of climate.

In the face of these preposterous expenditures, I suggest that the Congress reappraise its action. Even the Department of Labor budget does not tell the whole story since the Department of Justice and the National Labor Relations Board are also involved in this flurry of fruitless activity.

REDUCTIONS IN LABOR BUDGET

The overall appropriation for the Department of Labor included in this bill is $283,113,000, a reduction of $2,179,000 below the budget request, and $791,447,800 less than appropriated for 1961. The large reduction is accounted for by action which made appropriations of $500 million for the Federal extended compensation account and $248 million for the unemployment trust fund unnecessary in the present bill. A reduction of $30 million was made in unemployment compensation funds for Federal employees and ex-servicemen and $18,924,000 in grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.

I hope the Congress accepts our recommendation for an increase of $500,000 for the promotion of industrial training programs by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training. We have consistently urged an effective program for the training of skilled industrial workers. At a time when both unemployment and the demand for skilled workers are high, the lesson is clear.

RESTUDY BUILDING COSTS

In our report, we call attention on page 6 to some disturbing testimony on the proposed construction of a building at 6th and Pennsylvania Avenues to house the employment service and unemployment compensation activities of the District of Columbia. Present operation and maintenance cost to the Government is $2.21 per square foot per year, while the estimated cost in this building would be $4.45 per square foot—more than double present costs. This is a considerable increase; we have recommended, therefore, that construction be delayed pending further study or until more information is presented to justify construction.

The overall appropriations for the many and varied activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are slightly more than $4 billion. Some of the programs involved are being discussed in greater detail by other Members, but I want to direct attention to a few of special concern both because of existing programs and because of new legislation pending in this Congress.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The Office of Education was created by an act of March 2, 1867, to collect such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education, to diffuse such information as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school systems, and otherwise to promote the cause of education.

While both the authority and operations of the Office have been greatly expanded by subsequent acts and executive orders, one of its major functions continues to be the collection and dissemination of information concerning education. This is certainly a proper and important purpose. The new Commissioner of Education, Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin, acknowledged this in his opening statement before our subcommittee:

> We are cognizant of the need for strengthening the Office as an agency for the acquisition and dissemination of accurate up-to-date information on all phases of education.

NEED UP-TO-DATE STATISTICS

As the Federal Government moves into more and more areas of education, we need more current facts and accurate figures on which to base public policy decisions. Unfortunately, we often find that the faster and farther the Office of Education moves into new programs, the less up-to-date information we can get.

When the Congress is being asked to consider a whole series of new programs

in the field of education, we must have factual information upon which to base the practical decisions we are asked to make.

AGREEMENT ON EDUCATIONAL GOALS

Let me make it clear from the outset that there is no quarrel with the intention of any of these programs. I know of no Member of Congress who is not interested in promoting the best educational opportunities our resources can provide. No conscientious citizen can be indifferent to the welfare of all of the schools of this country, whether devoted to public or private elementary, secondary, or higher education.

All of us want to make all of our schools as truly effective agencies of education as the resources of this Nation permit. This concern and determination is too real and too immediate to need elaborate embellishment.

FACED WITH PRACTICAL QUESTIONS

The test, however, is in applying our intentions to concrete action. Although we can agree on purposes, we must legislate in the area of ways and means. We are faced with practical questions of how it should be done, when it should be done, and in what measure it should be done. There are differences in practical judgments which can be resolved only on the basis of objective facts that will enable us to fairly evaluate the alternatives available to us.

Yet today we often find that there is no single fact or set of facts upon which proponents and opponents of any program can agree, whether it be the teacher shortage, the classroom lag, the scale of local effort, the extent of local initiative, or whatever. Instead of facts based on consistent and valid standards, we seem to be getting a wide variety of conflicting opinions.

BUREAU OF BUDGET CRITICISM

The Bureau of the Budget has criticized the Office of Education's figures on the classroom shortage and has commented on their inaccuracy for purposes of policy discussion.

In 1950, Congress ordered a survey of facilities at a cost of over $5 million and the Office of Education reported a shortage of 312,000 classrooms. In 1954, the Commissioner testified that the shortage had grown to 370,000 classrooms and other experts predicted it would rise to 600,000 in 3 years.

ESTIMATES ARE REVISED

Yet, when the White House Conference on Education polled the States, it reported a shortage of 198,625 classrooms. The Office of Education revised its estimate, and by 1959 the estimated shortage was 132,000 classrooms.

On his final day in office, January 9, 1961, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare released a report showing a shortage of 142,000 classrooms. This is the same figure given to us at our hearing on April 12.

NO OBJECTIVE STANDARDS

In response to a question I asked, concerning objective standards in determining classroom shortages so that valid comparisons could be made between States, we were told:

> There is a variation among States in regard to the standards. There is no uniform standard that is accepted or adopted by the 50 States. In some States they have standards written out in much greater detail than in others. In some States they have standards just for the construction of new buildings that they are going to build. * * * The answer specifically to your question: "There is a difference among the States in the standards."

CLASSROOM CONSTRUCTION HOLDS

Based on this wide variety of standards, the report of January 19, 1961, estimated a need for 607,600 classrooms in the next 10 years. This suggests construction of 60,760 classrooms a year. The same report says that we have been building classrooms at the rate of about 70,000 a year for the past 5 years.

Even if local efforts should decrease by 13 percent, it appears that the need would be met without any Federal activity. Persistent predictions that construction activity would decline have not materialized—despite some lag which can certainly be attributed to perennial promises of Federal assistance.

In any event, what assurance have we that today's predictions are more accurate than those of 10 years ago, 5 years ago, or last year?

OUTDATED FIGURES ANOTHER PROBLEM

These are examples of the questions that must inevitably occur when Congress is given contradictory figures on which it is expected to base practical judgments. Still another problem occurs when the figures are out of date. For example, the most recent issue of the bulletin on Federal funds for education listing expenditures by all departments is bulletin No. 2, published in 1959 and covering the years 1956–57 and 1957–58. Incidentally, this bulletin shows that Federal assistance for educational programs for the 1956–57 school year totaled $1,997,825,000 of which $656,632,000 was spent on elementary and secondary education and $1,032,374,000 on higher education. Surely, when expenditures of this magnitude are already being made for educational purposes, it would be useful to have more current information at a time when additional expenditures are being asked.

We need to know not only how much is being spent, but what effect these expenditures are having in meeting the problems they are intended to alleviate. We are asked to inaugurate programs based on projections into the future without knowing what the present situation is. The Commissioner and other witnesses indicated that efforts will be made to update the statistical gathering apparatus so that reports and bulletins will have more than historical interest.

I hope these efforts will be carried on with the same urgency so often displayed when some new expansion of authority of operations is requested.

NDEA FACTS UNAVAILABLE

The problem of obtaining current factual information is also illustrated in our discussion of the administration of the National Defense Education Act. Some school administrators have privately expressed misgivings about acting as collection agencies for the student loan program. Since collections do not begin until 1 year after graduation, there is no way to anticipate the experiences that lie ahead.

After 2 full years of operation, we still have no factual reports on the number of student borrowers who have dropped out of school or the collection problems created by dropouts. We do know that over 25 percent of the institutions of high learning are not taking part in this program. Again, however, we do not know why such a sizable number has chosen not to take part in the Federal loan program. Nor do we know what proportion of the funds are being used by State universities as compared to private institutions. Nor do we know the average loan made in either case.

HOPE FOR EARLY REPORT

Although the program is scheduled to expire on July 1, 1962, efforts are already underway to extend it and we have been told that if the Congress does so, additional funds will have to be appropriated in a supplemental bill either in this session or the next.

The Office of Education informs us that an extensive study of the loan program is in progress and that information will be forthcoming. I hope that the Congress will have the report sufficiently early to enable Members to study the actual operations and effects of the program during the past 2 years before we are asked to decide on extending or expanding it.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

We do have a little more information on the fellowship program under title IV of the act. This is frequently referred to in testimony as the national defense fellowship program and it is part of the National Defense Education Act. Of the 1,000 students participating in the first year's program, about 90 dropped out, according to the testimony we received. No figures were available for the second year.

The professed purpose of the program is to upgrade college teachers and there continues to be confusion about its relationship to national defense, the professed purpose of the act itself. Last year we had some discussion about the contribution of fellowships in American folklore to the Nation's defense. This year English folklore has been added to the list.

RELATION TO NATIONAL DEFENSE?

Other questions have occurred concerning fellowships in contemporary literature—also modern literature—dramatic art, theater and speech, musicology, sociology of marriage and family living, and a series of similarly unrelated subjects. These may be necessary and worthwhile studies and college teachers in these areas may need upgrading, but do they fulfill the intent of Congress in passing the National Defense Education Act?

In response to a question on the subject, Dr. McMurrin said:

I would like to say that I believe that sooner or later we are going to have to recognize that the real problem of American defense is tied up with the whole strength of our culture. Although it is possible for us to jest a good deal about a thing like American folklore, and this kind of jesting is very common in the American universities, it is still true that a genuine grasp and appreciation of and capacity for critical analysis of American culture is very considerably strengthened by studies in American folklore.

QUESTIONS OF STATE PRESSURE?

Questions are arising concerning another phase of the NDEA program which provides grants to States and loans to private schools for purposes of elementary and secondary instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Since grant funds are funneled through the States, there is always danger of State pressure on local systems to participate beyond their own desires.

Although it is true that such pressures are often indirect and therefore impossible to control from Washington under the act as written, we ought to have some idea of what local school boards and administrators think of the program at that level.

In response to a direct question on the subject, the Office of Education said that no attempt has been made to determine local sentiment. Since the ultimate test of effectiveness is at the local level, reviews and consultations with State departments do not necessarily accurately reflect opinion at the working level.

IMPRESSIVE WORK FOR RETARDED

During consideration of the Office of Education budget, we received impressive testimony on the work being done with the $1 million appropriation for training teachers of mentally retarded children. We have continued the funds within the statutory limitation but have suggested that the legislative committee give consideration to expanding the program to include teachers of children with speech and hearing defects.

It is estimated that only one-fourth of the more than a million retarded children are receiving suitable education. Throughout the years, a major problem has been the shortage of trained teachers. Grants made to colleges and universities under this program enable them to conduct teacher training programs. State agencies are assisted in preparing persons to supervise the special educational programs required in State and local school systems.

Thus, this modest appropriation is already showing results that warrant further consideration to determine what action can be usefully taken to strengthen this important endeavor.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION NEED

The bill before you continues the vocational education program at its present level. We discussed the problems arising from unemployment due to automation or migration of industries since special programs are being inaugurated in these areas. There is no evidence, however, that the traditional courses in the distributive occupations, agriculture, and practical nursing are less needed. With our continued population growth, training in these fields continues to enhance employment opportunities by upgrading individuals in their vocational specialties.

Because the program is national in scope and application, its purposes are not limited to specific area problems which can best be met by restricted programs. This does not discount the local impact of vocational education programs on improved employment opportunities and better trained workers. The local support given the program is the best testimony we have to its usefulness and its effectiveness at the community level.

FEDERAL IMPACT ASSISTANCE

Another subject of particular interest to your committee in studying the budget requests for educational purposes is Federal assistance to so-called impacted areas. Many of us, regardless of our position on across-the-board subsidies for school construction and teachers' salaries, have supported this program.

Despite some recent press insinuations to the contrary, there is no inconsistency in this position. When local school districts are clearly and presently faced with an added burden as a direct result of Federal activity which increases school population while reducing local tax income, the Federal Government has a clear and present responsibility to assist in meeting it. The problem is created by the Federal Government and justice demands that the Federal Government accept responsibility for assisting parents and the local communities in providing for the education of their children. Congress recognized this obligation in making permanent the provisions of Public Law 874 which relates to children who reside on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property.

DESERVES SEPARATE CONSIDERATION

The House will be asked to consider extensions and revisions of these programs, presumably in connection with the general Federal aid bill. This creates problems for members who believe that these are two entirely different programs that deserve to stand on their own merits. Legislation to extend assistance to impacted areas includes questions enough for one good debate.

This can be illustrated by taking a look at the allotments made in the District of Columbia area under Public Laws 874 and 815:

Actual and estimated entitlements under Public Law 874 of school districts in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area for fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962 (as of Apr. 14, 1961)

School district	Fiscal year 1960 (actual)	Fiscal year 1961 (estimated)	Fiscal year 1962 (estimated)[1]
Montgomery County, Md	$2,272,000	$2,489,000	$15,119
Prince Georges County, Md	1,967,082	2,310,000	84,744
Alexandria City, Va	626,726	649,000	----------
Arlington County, Va	1,523,030	1,541,000	66,355
Fairfax County, Va	3,192,564	3,597,000	110,298
Falls Church City, Va	121,937	117,000	----------

[1] Based on Public Law 874 without extension or amendment.

Summary of construction aid under Public Law 815 of school districts in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area for fiscal years 1960, 1961, and 1962 (as of Apr. 14, 1961)

School district	Fiscal year 1960 (actual)	Fiscal year 1961 (estimated)	Fiscal year 1962 (estimated)[1]
Montgomery County, Md	$2,233,437	$131,376	----------
Prince Georges County, Md	1,066,062	742,468	----------
Alexandria City, Va	----------	----------	----------
Arlington County, Va	54,640	----------	----------
Fairfax County, Va	2,069,136	1,726,474	----------
Falls Church City, Va	19,200	----------	----------

[1] Based on Public Law 815 without extension or amendment.

HELP OR HINDRANCE?

These programs have frequently been justified as providing payments in lieu of taxes, and rightly so in cases where Federal installations and landholdings have seriously reduced possible sources of tax revenue while increasing the school population through Federal activity. Do the counties and cities listed really qualify under this test?

This is a question frequently discussed in the Congress but never really resolved. Has the employment offered by the Federal Government been detrimental or beneficial to these communities? Has it decreased or increased the tax base? I can assure you that there are many communities in this country that would welcome the employment opportunities at the salary levels available in this area.

The legislative decisions involved cannot be made by our appropriations subcommittee. I think, however, that our experience with the program and the testimony we receive indicate that revision of this program properly merits separate consideration so that its worthwhile achievements are not lost because of unrelated controversies.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS RISE

One other item in the Office of Education budget illustrates the growth of this agency over a relatively short period of time. In 1952, we appropriated $3,447,713 for the salaries and expenses of 438 permanent employees. Last year, we appropriated $13,400,000 for the salaries and expenses of 1,047 employees, 104 of whom are assigned to regional offices.

The bill before you includes $11,364,000 for salaries and expenses, $2,511,000 less than was appropriated last year. However, funds for the cooperative research program are considered as a separate appropriation so this amount is actually $846,000 more than was available for similar purposes last year. The committee did make a reduction of $500,000 from the budget request with the declared intention that it be applied primarily to the additional positions requested.

EXPANSION BEARS WATCHING

With most of the regional representatives meeting in Washington twice a year and the additional communications expenses, the operations of the field offices deserve watching or we will find the familiar pattern of empire build-

ing at work. This is not a direct criticism of the Office of Education, but anyone experienced in the executive and legislative branches knows too well how fast these little sovereignties grow into big kingdoms.

Let me emphasize that these comments bear no ill will. All of us are anxious to make the Office of Education as efficient and effective an agency of Government as we possibly can. We wish the new Commissioner and his staff every success in strengthening and improving the services provided by law.

This is a time of new beginnings, and we want to be helpful in preventing the kinds of abuses and inadequacies that can only lead to disillusionment and bitter criticism later.

SENSITIVITY TO SUGGESTIONS

I have always regarded it as an important responsibility of the legislator to help administrators anticipate troubles and correct mistakes when programs are in the formative stage. Some officials are needlessly sensitive to suggestions, however constructive and well intentioned, and refuse to engage in candid discussions of shortcomings while there is still time to correct them.

In working with the details of these programs more intimately than most committees, we come to recognize patterns that often indicate the success or failure of programs. My own policy has been to bring the questions that occur to the attention of the administrators concerned in our hearings, rather than in press releases casting discredit on an entire agency or program. Neither false geniality nor bitter rancor serve the cooperative effort necessary to achieve our common goals.

REAL PROGRESS IN REHABILITATION

In our hearings on Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, I never fail to be impressed by the encouraging results of our vocational rehabilitation programs. While we can never be satisfied with the progress in this important work, we are heartened by evidence that real progress is being made.

Few programs receive such widespread and deserving support in our committee and in the Congress. Last year, 88,275 disabled men and women were returned to a useful working life through this program. In 1961, an estimated 96,000 will go on to gainful work, and we hope that this number will grow to 107,000 in 1962. Numbers alone, however, do not measure the full meaning of this program in human terms.

PROBLEM CONSTANTLY GROWING

Cheered as we are by this progress, the problem is so immense that we need to go forward more rapidly only to keep from falling farther behind. Those who are devoting their lives to this work tell us that between 2.5 and 3 million of our 20 million disabled citizens can be returned to satisfying and gainful employment. Each year, another 250,000 persons are disabled by injury or disease to the extent of requiring assistance and training in order to continue useful occupations.

We have included $19,250,000 for research and training in this vital field, an increase of $2 million over the budget request and $3,820,000 over last year's appropriation. This $2 million increase includes an additional $1 million to accelerate the training program, and $1 million to establish two regional institutes of rehabilitation.

SEVERE SHORTAGE OF SPECIALISTS

One of the major obstacles in providing rehabilitation services is the severe shortage of specialists in physical medicine and rehabilitation—psychiatrists.

Of the more than 250,000 physicians licensed to practice medicine in this country, only 369 are certified psychiatrists.

At this time, only 143 graduate medical students are trained in this field.

In 1959, only 57 percent of the residencies in physical medicine and rehabilitation were filled.

Only half of the Nation's medical schools have men on their staffs who are qualified to teach physical medicine and rehabilitation.

MANY SKILLS NEEDED

Due to the comprehensive and intensive nature of the treatment necessary for rehabilitation of the chronically ill and disabled, the coordinated efforts of many skilled specialists, in addition to the psychiatrist, are required. Specially trained nurses, physical therapists, occupational therapists, psychologists, speech therapists, vocational counselors, and others are essential to a successful rehabilitation program.

Also, there is a constantly widening gap between modern procedures in rehabilitation and the techniques generally in use in hospitals, nursing homes, and rehabilitation centers. The availability of well-trained personnel and greater emphasis on physical medicine and rehabilitation at the graduate and undergraduate levels of our medical schools would greatly reduce the timelag between the development of new procedures and their use in general practice.

NEED NIH-TYPE SUPPORT

Research programs being supported by the National Institutes of Health have limited application to physical medicine and rehabilitation, but the analysis of the causes of disabling diseases does not directly benefit such programs. Yet rehabilitation and physical medicine receive far less research support, Government or voluntary, than any major health field.

Research funds alone will not assure profitable investigations; they need to be evaluated and determined by specialists who know the areas which need study and can direct the research toward rewarding results.

RECOMMEND PILOT PROGRAM

For this reason, your committee recommends the establishment of this pilot program for two regional institutes to study the means of developing adequate facilities for graduate medical education and research. They should be as comprehensive in support of rehabilitation as the National Institutes of Health are in their support of categorical medical research programs.

The program should be comprehensive enough to afford the medical student the broadest possible view of the field. It should be conducted at high level to familiarize the student with the most advanced learning in the field and give him an understanding of the potential it offers in both treatment and research. It should provide an opportunity for students to come in contact with leaders in the field, since this is recognized as one of the most influential factors in the selection of a specialty.

UTILIZE EXISTING KNOW-HOW

Certainly consideration should be given to medical schools and research institutions that are now acknowledged leaders in this effort. The institutes should be established in connection with medical schools which have developed the comprehensive program we have outlined.

The pilot plans should establish formal arrangements for cooperation with a voluntary rehabilitation center providing rehabilitation services on a regional basis in order to test and demonstrate how university, State, and voluntary agencies can cooperate to provide rehabilitation services.

MANY FACETS OF PUBLIC HEALTH

Another section of the bill which has great interest for all of us is that dealing with the activities of the Public Health Service. It is impossible to discuss any or all of these items in the detail they deserve; I can only urge Members to read the hearings.

Problems unheard of as recently as 10 or 15 years ago give evidence of the growing complexities of the society in which we live. Programs dealing with air pollution control, radiological health, water pollution control, foreign quarantine activities, and hospital design rank with older efforts to control tuberculosis, venereal diseases, and improve food sanitation.

REVOLUTIONARY HOSPITAL DESIGN

Particular attention is properly being paid to hospital design and the construction of auxiliary facilities for the care of the chronically ill and aged to relieve the expense and congestion of hospital care. I am especially interested in the work of the Public Health Service to improve nursing home care for the aged since there is evidence that many people could receive better care in such homes in an environment that would be much happier than that of our crowded medical institutions.

The committee is greatly interested in these developments and we were impressed by the work being done in hospital design at the Rochester Methodist Hospital in Rochester, Minn. Revolutionary new designs promise the kind of economical construction and efficient operation that are necessary if we are to provide hospital care at reasonable costs for our growing population.

GENEROUS SUPPORT OF NIH

Since our chairman has given you a summary of the efforts and accomplishments of the National Institutes of Health, I merely want to make a few observations on some of the practical considerations that should interest all of us. The Congress has generously supported this unprecedented effort to

conquer disease and we can be proud of some of the results. Again, we are always impatient with the progress made in programs so directly concerned with human life and human suffering.

Dollars and cents are not an accurate standard by which such work can be measured and every breakthrough has special meaning for each of us. Two diseases alone, heart ailment and cancer, touch the lives of almost every family in the United States. Every new advance in eliminating or treating them is of immeasurable worth.

CAN IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION

But, because this work is so important and of such personal consequence, we are rightfully concerned that the best possible use be made of the resources committed to it. Appropriations have increased from $53,386,000 in 1952 to $560 million this year. The committee is recommending $641 million for 1962, which is $58 million more than requested in the budget and $81 million more than appropriated for 1961.

The generosity of the American people in support of these programs imposes a grave obligation to use every dollar as wisely as possible. I confess to misgivings about some of the fiscal operations involved in the rapid expansion of so many research programs. Not because I want less done, but because I want more done with the resources we have assigned to this great humanitarian endeavor.

A report of the Committee on Government Operations offers 13 recommendations on improving administrative practices. Although our committee has made no recommendations in this regard, I think it would be wise for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Institutes of Health to give earnest study and careful consideration to these recommendations.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have urged for some time that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare establish a Public Health Service shellfish laboratory in the North Shore area of Massachusetts, and I strongly recommend approval of this project for the east coast in order to deal more effectively with the problems facing the industry and the serious depletion and pollution which has taken place in past years.

The North Shore area of my district is famous for its clams all over the Nation and beyond, and officials of such municipalities as Newburyport, Ipswich, and Essex strongly advised me that such a laboratory would serve a tremendously useful purpose in increasing clam populations to their former abundance and ridding shellfish of undesirable bacteria resulting from polluted waters. The North Shore area would be ideal from every standpoint as a site for experimental work on a laboratory scale.

The city of Gloucester, Mass., famous as a fish center, has also expressed a special interest in this project. The Fish and Wildlife Service already maintains a biological office there and important research work is being carried on.

The Public Health Service is well aware of the seriousness and the urgency associated with problems of the shellfish industry in Massachusetts and other States along the New England coast and it is considering the New England area as a possible locale for such a laboratory. It believes that such a laboratory, if properly equipped, will assist in increasing the level of public-health protection afforded by the State shellfish sanitation programs. Your approval of this project is strongly urged.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I very cordially concur with the other Members of this distinguished body who have already complimented the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and every member of his so very important subcommittee—both majority and minority members—who have submitted this down-to-earth authorization bill for our consideration today. I use the term "down-to-earth bill" because almost every one of the items for which this splendid subcommittee has made study and recommended approval concerns millions of human beings who but for the furtherance of the programs in this bill might well be daily sufferers of death-dealing diseases and incurable maladies.

Each one of the past 14 years when the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island on the one hand, and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], and their respective subcommittee members, have brought forth their recommendations I have noted with pleasure that wherever they recommended reductions, they clearly had good arguments to sustain same.

And, Mr. Chairman, wherever the bill recommended increases or new departures and adventures in human welfare, the bill sponsors always had what appeared to me as crystal clear, valid reasons for same. Not least of all in today's bill I note again the repeated emphasis on research in cancer and research in the illnesses affecting the aged citizens of our beloved Nation, especially together with the repeated emphasis upon child welfare and education of our youth.

I pass to the full subcommittee my sincere compliments on making such honorable compromises and adjustments between themselves sufficient in sum and purpose so that they have brought this bill to the floor to our attention with their unanimous report and approval. Possibly my observation, which I now make on this point: to-wit, that the objectives of this bill are so high in purpose and necessity that this fact, together with other like basic factors, made it more than usually consistent and pleasant for all of the subcommittee members to join in unison in support of the bill as they have submitted it to us for approval. I thank them each and everyone for doing so.

UNANIMOUS REQUEST MADE IN DEBATE ON HEW APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, this is my first year serving on this particular subcommittee of the full House Appropriations Committee, and I must say that it has been a real revelation to me. I want to heartily concur with the thoughts expressed by our chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] and the ranking member on our side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] on the need for training, retraining, and vocational rehabilitation. I feel, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] said, that in the chronically depressed areas around the country much more emphasis should have been placed on training rather than outright grants for the subsidizing of industry. I do not happen to regard automation as a curse, but rather regard it as another in a series of steps improving our way of life. It does call for more technical training on the part of our working force, and we are supplying additional funds in this bill to provide for a cooperative research program in the Office of Education to establish at least one demonstration project in the field of training, and of retraining persons displaced in their jobs in industry.

Now when we leave the discussion of the Department of Labor and move over into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we are in an area which directly and indirectly affects the lives of practically every living American from the cradle to the grave. In the Office of Education there has been a tremendous increase in personnel from 300 in 1952 to about 1,100 today, most of whom now seem engaged in activities far removed from what was intended in the original act setting up the Office. Many are engaged in promoting methods of education, recommending school curriculums, selling teaching machines, and sending agents throughout the Nation trying to sell school authorities on the idea that they need and should apply for Federal aid. Therefore, I am pleased that the committee has seen fit to reduce the budget request for salaries and expenses, and this reduction applies to the additional positions and related expenses requested.

I must say, however, that I am alarmed over the special report released from the Office of Education on April 25 from its Committee on Mission and Organization. This report proposes the complete reorganization of the Office of Education into a "Federal Education Agency for the future." Coincidentally, S. 1726, introduced on April 27, empowers the Commissioner of Education to make drastic changes in the structure and personnel of the Office which would implement the recommendation of his special committee for an entirely new structure of bureaus to be established under the new name of the "U.S. Education Agency." We would do well to watch this reshuffling of the Office of Education closely.

Turning to the field of health and welfare, may I say that it is not easy to sit across the table from eminent doctors and medical people who are making a plea for more and more funds in the field of cancer research, heart disease, mental health, blindness, cystic fibrosis, aid to crippled children's programs, and not react sympathetically. None of us are against doing what we can to wipe out these killers and disablements; and members of the subcommittee find themselves on many occasions in a real tug of

conscience, trying to strike a happy balance between what ought to be done and what we can afford to do with what resources are available.

There has been some concern expressed here this afternoon that the total amount of funds requested in the bill are some $48 million over and above the budget request, but I would point out to the membership of this House that there are those on the committee who felt increases to the extent of $200 million were in order. I point this out only to illustrate that on our subcommittee there have been some serious differences of opinion, and we spent portions of 3 days marking up the bill, which gives indication that considerable attention was given to each specific item in the bill. And while I would like to live within the budget request, I support this bill, knowing that there was a good measure of give and take by both sides.

The largest item in the bill is the $2,285,800,000 in grants to the States for public assistance, and the unfortunate part about this whole business is that we can do nothing about cutting this amount unless we amend the present law; for the States are entitled to whatever they are willing to match in this regard. We can talk all we want to about local responsibility and States rights, but here is a program exceeding $2¼ billion which should, in my judgment, be carried on by our States and local communities, and I shudder to think what the bill will be 10 years from now if it continues to increase as it has over the past 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and our ranking committee member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], have in the course of their remarks itemized all the facets of this appropriation bill, and it is not my intention to delay reading of the bill or rehashing points already made so well by those preceding me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, at a time of national peril involving our defense of the free world we are spending too much on health, education, welfare, and various social programs embraced in this appropriation bill for the two Departments for 1962.

Indeed, we are increasing our welfare expenditures in recent years two to one over our defense expenditures.

Such expenditures are all the more suspect when we realize this is a period of deficit financing, accompanied by all the dangers of inflation which weakens purchasing power and threatens the very stability of our currency. Our economy rests on the soundness of our money. The free world rests on the military strength of the United States. The U.S. military strength rests on our economy and the soundness of the dollar. Finally, our freedom to enjoy life in a free society rests on the outcome of our challenge of communism with the degradation and enslavement that accompanies it.

For my part, I am tired of the congressional business as usual which shows an increase in most items of expense over last year, although a reduction from what we might have spent. We get too interested in the double entry justification of our action and forget that what we really should be doing is cutting expenses below last year. Our national existence is in peril, yet we not only spend as usual but increase the welfare as though the cost were not so important.

We should get our priorities straight. First, and always, a balanced budget—even reduce debt and taxes—then military expense appropriation. After this there should be an apportionment of what remains to the necessary expenditures of Government.

To do less than to be fiscally responsible in this way is not my definition of a Congressman's role. This appropriation bill should and could be considerably less. Therefore, I oppose this bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1962 appropriation bill for the Office of Education contemplates several serious reductions below the budget request—reductions which will hamper the new Commissioner of Education in his effort to assist American education achieve the level of excellence which the Nation deserves and needs.

The first reduction involves a cut of $1 million in the program of graduate fellowships—the program of the National Defense Education Act which was designed to improve the quality and quantity of our college and university teachers.

The second cut involves a reduction of $350,000 in the request for institutes for guidance and counseling personnel. This program of the National Defense Education Act was enacted in order to improve the quality of guidance given to our high school students so that we would have fewer dropouts and more capable students would go on to higher education.

The third serious reduction is in the appropriation for salaries and expenses. The reduction of $500,000 would mean the elimination of about 40 positions—a serious handicap to a new Commissioner of Education. The positions eliminated would retard the improvement of educational statistics; would eliminate the College Information Center, a service program for high school students and their parents to assist in the selection of a proper course of higher education; and would seriously hamper meeting the workload increases under the National Defense Education Act, particularly in the area of audit of loan, grant, and contract programs with universities and colleges.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I too wish to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], chairman of the subcommittee; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD], ranking minority member; and the other members of the Appropriations Committee for the hard work that went into the molding of such a well-rounded bill as H.R. 7035, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the year ending June 30, 1962.

Their interest, devotion, and dedication to the health field has been outstanding, and has made a great contribution to the welfare of our people.

I would like to express particular pleasure at the recognition accorded by the committee to the value of retraining workers. It is a matter of record that I offered a substitute depressed-areas bill that included more than double the amount for retraining workers that was included in the administration bill enacted into law. At the time, I was keenly disappointed by the House action, as this was an assistance feature of major import; one of direct benefit to those persons who are jobless as a result of progress—automation, technological advances, improved methods, streamlined production. As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] so well stated—

> When we considered the depressed-areas legislation early in this session of the Congress, a bill with over 95 percent of authorized funds in direct subsidies to industry, with less than 5 percent of the authorization going to this area of training individuals, it is sad but true that we enacted a piece of legislation which did not clearly meet the problems as we face the challenge of the 1960's.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, though not a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, I should like to take this opportunity to cite some of my reasons for supporting this bill. Under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], my colleagues on the subcommittee dealing with the appropriations for these two Departments have examined each request in great detail. While there might have been some areas in which I would have liked to see the appropriations further increased or reduced, in general, I wish to go on record in support of the recommendations as reported.

This is particularly true of the increased appropriations provided in this bill for cancer and heart research activities.

I am, as I am sure every thinking American is, deeply concerned with the progress being made toward conquering these two dread diseases. Today, heart disease and cancer together are responsible for two out of every three deaths in this country. Every single minute of the day, at least two persons die from heart disease and cancer in the United States. It has been estimated by our health authorities that last year over 1,150,000 people died from heart disease and cancer alone.

And these diseases strike heavily at all ages, not merely older people. Half of all cancer deaths, and one-third of all deaths from heart disease occur in persons under 65. They are by far the leading cause of death in babies and children under age 15.

The literally millions of people who are now suffering with heart disease and cancer in addition to the tens of millions who may be doomed in the future, together with the misery, heartbreaks, and medical expense that falls on these people and their families cannot, Mr. Chairman, be disregarded.

Yet the death toll from these diseases grows steadily every year. If present ratios continue, two-thirds of all Americans now living will eventually have

cancer or heart disease. And the incalculable economic loss to this Nation will continue to rise, unless we make a much greater effort in prevention and control.

All of these are compelling reasons why we should make an all-out effort to conquer these diseases through medical research.

My colleagues who are on the Appropriations Committee are to be congratulated for recognizing the urgency and necessity for continuing to press the attack against these diseases, and for providing the funds for the accelerated action in this bill. Mr. Chairman, I am always in favor of economy and sound management in Government, and I certainly do not favor waste or wild spending, but I firmly believe that medical research is not the place to either stand still or cut back. I am completely in agreement with the committee's action in increasing the funds allocated to research activities for these diseases within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The appropriations bill contains an increase of $8,550,000 for cancer research and $8,650,000 for research in heart diseases as supported through the National Institutes of Health, Medical Research Branch of the Public Health Service. This brings the total appropriation for the National Cancer Institute to $127,672,000, approximately $14 million above the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1961, and the amount for the National Heart Institute to $105,723,000, an increase of about $18 million.

In connection with these recommendations the committee has reported, what to me at least, are tremendously encouraging advances in the battle against these two dread diseases. Among the significant breakthroughs reported in cancer research was the apparently successful treatment of one type of cancer through chemotherapy; an improvement in survival rate for women with breast cancer; and new methods of prolonging the lives of leukemia victims. In the area of heart disease, much promising work is being done against atherosclerosis, a type of hardening of the arteries that often leads to heart attacks. In this same area of endeavor we have recently witnessed new methods of treating hypertension through newly discovered drugs and improved surgical techniques for treating congenital and other heart disorders.

In the light of these dramatic advances, I am convinced we are pursuing the correct course in increasing these appropriations. I am confident that every man, woman, and child will ultimately benefit from the advanced research that will be made possible in the coming year through this bill.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am proud to go on record in its support.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For grants, loans, and payments under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 1580–1605), $210,857,000, of which $75,145,000 shall be for capital contributions to student loan funds and loans for non-Federal capital contributions to student loan funds, of which not to exceed $1,300,000 shall be for such loans for non-Federal capital contributions; $54,000,000 shall be for grants to States and loans to nonprofit private schools for science, mathematics, or modern foreign language equipment and minor remodeling of facilities; $3,750,000 shall be for grants to States for supervisory and other services; $12,800,000 shall be for grants to States for area vocational education programs; and $15,000,000 shall be for grants to States for testing, guidance, and counseling: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of science, mathematics, and modern language teaching equipment, or equipment suitable for use for teaching in such fields of education, which can be identified as originating in or having been exported from a Communist country, unless such equipment is unavailable from any other source.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 18, line 10, strike out the period and insert: "*Provided further*, That no part of the appropriations contained in this paragraph shall be available for fellowships in the humanities and social sciences field."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in order to try to get the National Defense Education Act back to where I am sure the Congress intended it should be; that is, to provide fellowships for the study of mathematics, physics, engineering, chemistry, and other similar sciences as an aid to the national defense effort of this country. This thing has gone far astray. We now provide fellowships for social studies, studies in humanities, and so forth. My amendment simply brings it back to where I think it should be. I know of no reason why under the National Defense Education Act there should be studies of the ecology and economics of flowing water, English folklore, and American folklore. What is the difference between English and American folklore? I will be pleased to have any member of the committee tell me the difference and why we should be providing fellowships under the National Defense Act to study folklore, jazz, the theater, and so forth.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman on folklore and jazz, but we can do a great deal of good in the economics of flowing water field, if I understood the term which the gentleman used correctly. The water supply of our country and of the allied countries of the world is a vital asset in the cold war, and a good water supply is necessary.

Mr. GROSS. If this is so imperative why did you not write something into the water pollution bill to provide for education on this subject?

Mr. EDMONDSON. In this instance you have to begin in the schools. You have to prepare your men and women.

Mr. GROSS. These are fellowships. This does not deal with kindergarten or elementary schools.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I am certainly in sympathy with what the gentleman intends to do. But at our service academies, whether it be the Army, Navy, or Air Force, in the curriculum are also studies in the humanities and social sciences. Would the gentleman wipe out those courses of study at our defense academies?

Mr. GROSS. Those are special and particular schools. Cadets do not major, as the gentleman well knows, in such subjects as folklore, the theater, anthropology, and ballet dancing.

Mr. MICHEL. That is true. By the wording of the gentleman's amendment it covers a rather wide scope.

Mr. GROSS. It just brings it back to mathematics, physics, engineering, and chemistry where I think it ought to be and where I think most Members of Congress thought it ought to be when they voted for the National Defense Education Act. If the Members of the House will turn to page 467 of the hearings, they will find page after page of grants to various universities and colleges for studies in humanities and social subjects; but when you get to mathematics, physics, and so forth, the number drops very materially.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman would not object seriously to a study of political science that was concentrated upon some of the political problems that are vital to our defense; would he? He would not contend that would be entirely unrelated to our defense effort; would he?

Mr. GROSS. Not entirely unrelated, but political science is being taught in every university without the necessity for fellowships that are financed with millions of dollars in Federal funds.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is very obvious that the demand for these fellowships indicates there is a great deal of interest in the field. It is a field that our educational leaders think relates to defense.

Mr. GROSS. There will always be a demand for something that is free.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I seem to recall, Mr. Chairman, that when the National Defense Education Act was up the statement was made there was not one word in it that had to do with defense. That is why I voted against it. I agree with the gentleman. I do not think this is any part of defense, and I shall support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Washington for his pertinent observation, and urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to close the debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has offered an amendment to an appropriation bill which, in effect, is an amendment to existing law. He is offering such an amendment today in the form of a limitation on funds for this part of the National Defense Education Act. When the Congress is considering extension of the National Defense Education Act is the time this should be straightened out, if it needs straightening out. But the act did not confine itself strictly to mathematics, foreign languages and science. It went far beyond that. I do not see why we should today take over the responsibilities of the proper legislative committee to amend the National Defense Education Act by approving the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 11: Loans and payments under the National Defense Education Act, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, loans and payments under title II of the National Defense Education Act, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation for the same purpose for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid for the same purposes during the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to comment on some information that has been supplied to me by Members of the House with regard to the allocation of the funds for salaries and expenses of the Office of Education. The information which has been supplied to me on how the Office plans to allocate the cut in their request is not in accordance with the committee report. We would certainly request that the new Commissioner of Education follow this report, and give consideration to the desires of the committee as expressed in the hearings.

It is my understanding that the Office of Education plans to reduce, by just a little over one-third, the number of new positions requested. The committee's report expressly states that the reduction is over 50 percent. During the hearings on this portion of the Office's budget, the weaknesses in the area of statistics was commented on at length and emphasized not only by committee members but by the witnesses. I have been told that the Office of Education plans to apply a major part of the cut to their budgeted program to improve statistics in the field of education. I hope that the information I have received is not correct but, if it is, I certainly think some reprograming is in order.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7035) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks and include extraneous matter, and that I may have the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MAY 17—147TH ANNIVERSARY OF NORWEGIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, on this subject of health, education, and welfare, the Norwegians have been the leaders of the world. Their programs in social legislation have in a large measure strengthened the faith of the people in their democracy. Freedom from disease and ignorance and want are equally important to the other freedoms. In this respect, Norway over the years has led the world in freedom.

Today marks the 147th anniversary of Norway's independence. Today is the "Fourth of July" in Norway; and for Norwegians in the State of Montana, and in my hometown, Butte, Mont. This morning in Norway, as in the many cities throughout the United States, Norwegians and their children are up at the crack of dawn—hoping for beautiful weather—to begin the celebration of "Syttende Mai," in commemoration of the signing of the constitution of Northe signing of the Constitution of Norway, the annual parade for children is considered the largest parade in the world in celebrating this anniversary. The children march for more than 3 hours and finish their trek under the Royal Palace. Students, from elementary grades to those about to enter the universities, march together, boys wave red, white, and blue tasseled caps and the red, white, and blue flag of Norway and girls wave the same flag, and wear red, white, and blue bows on their dresses; invalid children dressed in historical fashion emphasizing the same red, white, and blue colors of Norway, sit in wheelchairs opposite the palace and join in the celebration. Oslo today is a gay and festive city; however, the Norwegians are a religious and pious people and from about 7 a.m. the people flock first to the churches, listen to sermons and also to the beautiful choirs composed of the young and old. Yes, today is a big day in Norway—everyone joins in the festivities—going to church, playing games, making speeches, and the waving of the Norwegian red, white, and blue flags.

Freedom, independence, and self-government have long been traditions in Norway. Denmark had dominated Norway until the conclusion of the Napoleonic Wars. Then Britain forced the Danes to cede Norway to Sweden. But the Norwegians were not willing to be Swedish subjects, and refused to accept the Treaty of Kiel. They proclaimed Norway an independent nation, adopted a constitution, and elected as their king Prince Christian Frederick, who had been the Danish Governor. The Swedes opened warfare against Norway but after 2 weeks a compromise settlement was made.

The Danish prince gave up the throne and the King of Sweden was elected King of Norway as well. He promised to respect the new Norwegian Constitution. Finally, without loss of life, in 1905 Norway succeeded in becoming absolutely independent with its own king.

Thus it was with faith and vision that a small group of men met at Eidvold on May 17, 1814, to promulgate a constitution which would guide the destinies of Norway for generations to come. Representatives had been elected by the people for the purpose of drafting and adopting a constitution. Historians report that it is doubtful if there has been an assembly of men more sincerely devoted to the general welfare of their country. Within 6 weeks of their first meeting, a new constitution was adopted and a new king elected.

The Constitution of Norway is in many ways similar to our own. In it there is provision for personal and individual liberty and it contains clauses advocating justice and equality. This Constitution of Norway is still in force, only slightly modified and modernized. By a curious coincidence, it consists of just 112 articles, one for each constituent. Unlike the typical constitutions promulgated between 1776 and 1812, it does not contain any solemn declaration of the rights of man, written in lofty and ostentatious style. Its language is strictly legal, partly akin to that of the old Frostathing law. In its formulation it is, also, the work of three excellent

lawyers: Christian Magnus Falsen, Wilhelm Frimann Koren Christie, and Christian Adolph Diriks.

Comparisons will show that the Norwegian fundamental law of May 17, 1814, is more liberalistic and democratic than its predecessors in the United States of 1787, revolutionary France of 1790's, and Spain of 1812. Thus it happened that Norway, during her 4 months of new independent life, advanced from a politically completely backward country, governed by an absolute monarch residing in a foreign capital, into the frontline of free and democratic nations. And this grand progressive revolution was accomplished without any internal conflict.

Norway is a constitutional monarchy. Its Constitution of 1814 was for many years the most liberal Constitution in Europe. All men and women over 21 years of age may vote and run for office. The King is the head of the Government, but his administration is carrried on through a Prime Minister and Cabinet who represent the majority in Parliament.

Norway was one of the first countries in the world to develop a program of social legislation. A large part of the funds of the National Government and of the local governments is spent for social services. Most wage earners belong to the National Insurance Bureau, which covers costs of medical treatment and hospital care, as well as sickness insurance. Persons who lose their jobs receive unemployment insurance. Old-age pensions are paid to all persons over 70 years of age, and all mothers of more than one child receive an allowance for each.

This small nation represents a moral force far beyond the relatively small number of its people. Norway's democratic government continues to serve as an inspiration to lovers of freedom throughout the whole world. Norway is a significant example to millions of people of the world today, both those of the free world and those who are dominated by the heel of totalitarianism.

Since the signing of the constitution in 1812, this little country has not had such an easy time of it. Less than 25 years ago, the Norwegians were assaulted by the Germans, and all looked dim and dark for Norway. There are but few countries that could match the bravery shown by these Norwegian people during the darkest hours of World War II, and the occupation period. The United States will long remember the courageous and determined stand, in the underground and in actual combat, that was the plight of this freedom-loving people. Also, today Norway on the borders of the Soviet consistently defy the Communist threat. Since the conclusion of World War II, Norway has been busying herself with reconstruction, social reform, educational advancements and economic recovery. By dogged determination all of these reforms and advancements have been continued to this date.

Since the foundation of the United Nations, Norway has contributed much to its success, and everyone recognizes the deep desire of the Norwegian people to preserve peace in the world. These Norwegians who conquered the sea, tilled the soil, and became friends to all of the people of the world have passed on this heritage of courage, adventure and integrity to succeeding generations.

Since the first immigrant of Norway to set foot on American soil, many have answered the roll for private and public service to help firm the foundation of our great Nation. To list the numbers and names would fill volumes, but to cite a few examples: Supreme Commander of the NATO forces in Europe, General Lauris Norstad, Ole Singstad, the builder of Holland, Lincoln and Queens Midtown tunnels; Olaf Hoff constructed tunnels under the Detroit and Harlem Rivers; and right here in Washington I make note that it was Gunvald Aus and Kort Merle who together built the magnificent Supreme Court building.

As an American, I am very proud of my heritage—both my mother and father migrated to this country at the turn of the century. My mother, whose maiden name was Anna Yennes, was born in Venneshaven north of Trondheim. My father, the late Albert Olsen, was born at Romsdalen. They were the typical immigrants, which we have read about in our U.S. history books. They came to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the "new country," and left their "old country" forever. I take deep pride in the contributions which Norwegian immigrants have made to our country, and particularly to my home town and all of the State of Montana. They were sturdy, hard workers, lovers of peace and had a keen desire to provide an education and the necessities of life to their children. From the time when the first of my parents' people arrived in this country and New York, the sons and daughters of Norway have contributed much to their new homeland. They did not take this new land for granted for they have worked hard to clear the forests, make the farms, build the homes, build the railroads, construct great cities; establish schools and educate their children; erect churches for their spiritual well being.

So, on this day of May 17, 1961, we extend our hand across the Atlantic to the people of Norway and wish them well, with greetings, good will, and congratulations. May her spirit reign forever and the friendship, we have come to know between us, continue in the same old personal way.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine tribute to Norway and its people. As a Representative of what is said to be the second largest Norwegian city in the world, I am proud to be able to concur in the gentleman's statement. Not being of Norwegian extraction myself, and having come to Minneapolis without close contact with persons of Norwegian stock previously, I have come to have the greatest admiration and respect for the strong, fine, sturdy, and self-reliant qualities they have—a God-fearing, industrious, friendly, and dependable people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

HEARINGS ON PROPOSED REORGANIZATION PLANS 1, 2, 3, AND 4

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, President Kennedy proposed reorganizations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Trade Commission. The plans are numbered, respectively, 1, 2, 3, and 4.

Hearings on the plans are scheduled for Thursday, May 18, 1961, in room 1501–B, New House Office Building.

All parties interested should immediately contact the chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, if they wish to express their views for or against the reorganization plans.

Unless the Senate or the House votes its disapproval within a 60-day period following submission of the plans by the President, they will become the law of the land.

Plans 1 and 2, on the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Communications Commission respectively, were submitted April 27. The 60-day period will expire, unless there is an adjournment, on June 26.

Plan No. 3, affecting the Civil Aeronautics Board, was submitted on May 3. The 60-day period will expire, unless there is an adjournment, on July 2.

Plan No. 4, affecting the Federal Trade Commission, was submitted on May 9. The 60-day period will expire, unless there is an adjournment, on July 8.

I have always opposed a delegation of legislative power to the President as being unconstitutional. We have given the President our power to make the laws unless we interpose a veto.

On May 10, I introduced resolutions of disapproval for each of the four plans in order to provide an opportunity for opponents of the plans to express their views and for the House of Representatives to express its will.

These resolutions were referred to the Committee on Government Operations. The committee may be discharged from further consideration of the resolutions if they have not been reported prior to May 20.

A motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of any of

these resolutions may be made by any Member favoring the resolution of disapproval.

When the committee has reported or has been discharged, it shall at any time thereafter be in order to proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Members opposed to a reorganization plan should vote "yes" on the resolution disapproving the plan.

While having introduced these resolutions of disapproval—House Resolutions 285, 286, 287, 288—without regard to the merits of the individual plans, permit me to point out that each of the plans involves the delegation of important functions of the Commissioners to employees far removed from the control of the electorate.

It might also be noted that, despite the fact that the Committee on Government Operations, in reporting out the last extension of the basic enabling legislation—the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended—deplored a tendency in recent years for the Executive to submit plans without the full justification in reducing expenditures and promoting economy that the bill requires, the President in each of the four plans submitted thus far, has simply stated:

> It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

NUCLEAR TEST NEGOTIATIONS

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the time has arrived when we should serve notice on the Russian nuclear test negotiators that we reach an honorable agreement within 30 days or we will cease negotiating and begin testing. It is obvious to me that no real results can be achieved and that the Kennedy administration, with its high hopes for results, is finding that the barriers to an honorable agreement are the same as those encountered by the Eisenhower administration. We have no concrete assurance that while these negotiations continue that the Russians are not using this time to their advantage by underground testing in violation of our agreement. I recognize the seriousness of this proposal, but we must realize that we may be literally negotiated to death. We are a patient people, but we can reach a point where our patience becomes foolhardy and we become lulled to sleep in the hope of reaching an understanding only to find that time is running against us.

CERAMIC MOSAIC TILE IMPORTS

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOOREHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Tariff Commission's recommendation that the duty on imported ceramic mosaic tile should be raised was the first hopeful sign the people of southeastern Ohio have seen in their economic struggle against the increasing flow of pottery and ceramic products into the United States from abroad. Communities in Ohio's 15th Congressional District, long known as centers of pottery production, have seen the decimation of production and the abolition of job opportunities they once offered. The inability to meet competition of foreign wage rates as it is translated into cost of end products has been crippling. The American ceramic tile industry has suffered from the same processes. It, too, is represented importantly in my district. It is looked to directly for jobs by a great many families and by thousands of service institutions which are indirectly dependent upon the incomes of others for their own prosperity. Government at all levels has a large stake in the well-being of this and other industries, since they provide tax revenues required for the functioning of public services. The conclusions by the Tariff Commission provide a good view of what is happening and what the prospects are for this domestic industry.

The Commission's investigation discloses that from 1955 to 1960 the quantity of tile produced in the United States has declined at the same time imports increased 455 percent from 5.1 to 28.3 million square feet. Between 1959 and 1960, imports rose in their total domestic sales from 35 to 42 percent of our domestic market. Inventories at the end of 1960 equalled 31 percent of the year's sales by American producers, while the total man-hours of production in U.S. tile plants were lower in 1960 than in the preceding 5 years. This was occurring despite the fact that tile consumption in America in 1960 reached a record high of 59.8 million square feet.

In the last half decade, aggregate net operating profits before income taxes of tile companies in the United States declined 58 percent. Since importers have accumulated sizable stocks of tile, the Commission recognized the immediate likelihood of a further loss of sales and profits for domestic producers.

With such an accumulation of evidence, there is little wonder that the Commission found unanimously that serious injury to our ceramic tile industry is resulting and that, with certain exceptions, tariffs should be increased.

On two past occasions, representatives of the U.S. Government have negotiated tariff reductions on tile imported into this country under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The present rate of duty on tile valued at not more than 40 cents per square foot is 4½ cents per square foot but not less than 21 percent or more than 30 percent ad valorem. Since 1954, more than 95 percent of the imported tiles have been classified within this category of value. Therefore, the Commission's recommended increase in duty on this grade of tiles to 12½ cents per square foot but not less than 60 percent nor more than 90 percent ad valorem should take a long step toward providing a needed remedy.

It is my earnest hope that President Kennedy will concur in the findings of the Tariff Commission so that our domestic tile industry can compete more favorably with the low-cost production from abroad that has been so injurious to American production.

THE FREE WORLD WILL NOT CONTINUE FREE UNLESS IT HOLDS THE SEAS

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a Russian author in a recent publication made the statement that "the free world will not continue free unless it holds the seas." The statement must have been startling to many people, but not to those who know something about history and understand the importance of controlling the seas. Our own history should prove convincingly the absolute necessity for maintaining seapower to keep a nation strong.

The U.S.S.R. now recognizes this fundamental truth. She has built a fleet of at least 500 submarines to harass the sealanes in the event of a war. When one remembers that Germany had only about 60 submarines at the outbreak of World War II, and remembers, too, the terrible damage she inflicted on allied shipping, then one must realize the terrific destructive ability now in the hands of the Soviet.

Not only is Russia building a navy but she is also engaged in a 7-year program of building a commercial fleet. During the year 1960, the Soviet and satellite shipyards were responsible for 72.7 percent of all new shipping tonnage constructed in the world. The free world countries constructed the remainder. The United States was about eighth in new ship construction. We are not replacing quickly enough our merchant fleet which is fast approaching block obsolescence, having been built hurriedly during World War II.

At the end of the second year of their 7-year shipbuilding plan, the Soviets now have 5 million deadweight tons of shipping. What they will have at the end of their 7-year plan is anyone's guess. On the basis of a 2-year performance, Russia could well become the greatest maritime nation in the world. If it does, it will control the seas, and then the United States will indeed become the last island of freedom in the world.

Our military men know the value of a strong merchant marine. The experiences of World Wars I and II demonstrated conclusively the absolute need

of cargo and passenger vessels to transport men and material to war fronts. Vice Adm. Ralph Wilson said after World War II that the American merchant marine was our fourth arm of defense and that without it the Navy could not have accomplished its missions.

Adm. Arleigh Burke stated that transportation is the key to the power of the United States for economic development or war.

Gen. Nathan Twining while Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that the American merchant marine might very well be the one source of strength of the free world to pluck victory from the chaos of nuclear war.

Rear Adm. Ralph James, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, stated the other day:

> There is no substitute for seapower—now or in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the growing lack of awareness on the part of our Government, outside the military, of the importance of maintaining our American merchant marine. During the 15 years I have been privileged to serve as a Member of Congress, I have seen at first hand the anti-American-merchant-marine attitude of the Departments of State, Justice, and Agriculture, although I must confess that there have been and are individuals in those departments who understand the problem and are sympathetic. What the attitude of the present Department of Commerce will be remains to be seen.

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that we may well be reverting to the attitude which existed in our country prior to World Wars I and II when we were caught short of the ships needed to carry out our war efforts. We paid a high price in money, delay and lives for our neglect. We cannot afford any such similar neglect again. Therefore I urge the appropriate people in our departments of government to open their eyes to the apathy which is growing amongst them, and more particularly, Mr. Speaker, to open their eyes to Soviet efforts to control the seas.

AUTHORIZATION OF EXPORT LICENSES FOR THE SHIPMENT OF PRECISION MACHINE TOOLS TO THE U.S.S.R.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, it may be recalled that in previous statements in the RECORD, on February 17, 1961 and March 1 and 13, 1961, I discussed the matter of export licenses authorizing shipment of precision machine tools to Soviet Russia.

There has been a recent development in this area which is of considerable concern to me and which I feel should be brought to the attention of the Membership of the House.

To recap briefly the problem involved, on February 6, 1961, I wrote to the Department of Defense requesting information concerning the Soviet automobile and truck industry and requesting the views of the Department in regard to a proposed export to the U.S.S.R. of transfer-type machine tools and machines used for the manufacture of gears.

A license for the shipment to the U.S.S.R. of transfer-type machine tools had been granted by the Department of Commerce in 1960. One of these authorizations was for the export of a multistation machine for machining V–8 cylinder blocks, of a value of $3,400,000, and for a multistation machine for machining V–8 cylinder heads, of a value of $1,900,000.

Briefly these machines can mill, drill, bore, ream, tap, and so forth, aluminum castings for V–8 cylinder blocks and heads. Machines of this type can be used in the mass production of all metal manufactures, such as refrigerators, tractors, electrical motors, and so forth.

Transfer machines are thus designed to complete a series of machining operations at successive stations, and to transfer the work automatically from one station to the next. My understanding is that the Soviets are placing heavy emphasis on the production of transfer machines at the current time because they are vital in solving production problems of complex and highly specialized equipment.

The other authorization was for the export to the U.S.S.R. of six 8-spindle gear hobbing machines, with a total value of $810,000. These machines can be used in plants which manufacture gears for automobiles, trucks, tractors, and farm implements. They are a mass-production machine for gears of wide application. Both spiral and straight-tooth gears can be cut on these machines.

The purchaser in the U.S.S.R. for the gear hobbing and the multistation machines was to be the Soviet organization Stankoimport, which is the central Soviet organization for importing metal-working machinery. The exact location of where these machines were to be used was not known to the Department of Commerce.

On February 21, 1961, I wrote to the President and the Secretary of Commerce requesting that because of the significance of such exports to the security of the United States, these licenses be suspended and the entire matter reevaluated.

In response to my request for the views of the Department of Defense, the Department on February 23, 1961, advised me that this equipment is the most advanced in the world and that, in the view of the Department, receipt of this equipment by the U.S.S.R. could contribute to Soviet military and economic warfare potential.

Here is what the Department of Defense stated:

> (a) The products of these transfer type machine tools are clearly of military value. V–8 cylinder blocks, the product of these machines, are a necessary part of engines for medium size supply trucks and personnel carriers which are vital to logistical support of the Soviet armed forces.
>
> (b) The technology contained in these transfer machines produced in the United States is the most advanced in the world.
>
> (c) So far as this Department knows, the U.S.S.R. has not installed this type of machinery for manufacturing cylinder blocks and heads.
>
> (d) The receipt of this equipment by the U.S.S.R. would contribute to the Soviet military and economic warfare potential.

On the basis of this information, by telegram to both the President and the Secretary of Commerce, I requested that the license for the shipment of these machine tools be revoked.

Subsequently, in a letter received from the Under Secretary of Commerce, dated March 9, 1961, the Department of Commerce advised that these licenses had been permanently revoked. The Department stated, in pertinent part as follows:

> The Department has also been engaged in reexamining and evaluating the determination made about a year ago to permit the export of the machine tools referred to in your letter for the production of automotive cylinder heads and blocks, and automotive, truck, tractor and farm implement gears in Soviet Russia. I am happy to be able to inform you that the Department is prepared not only to suspend the licenses in question as you requested but has, in fact, notified the exporters concerned that the licenses have been permanently revoked.

Today, May 17, I received a letter, dated April 24, 1961, signed by Mr. Roswell L. Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense, advising that the Department of Defense has withdrawn its objection to the issuance of licenses to export these machines to the U.S.S.R.

Because I know many Members of the House are interested in this matter, I am including here the complete text of the letter, which reads:

> Your letter of February 6, 1961, requested information possessed by the Department of Defense pertaining to the automotive and truck industry in the U.S.S.R. Our reply of February 23, 1961, set forth the facts available in the Department at that time.
>
> Because of your continuing interest in the subject, I should inform you that the Department has withdrawn its objection to the licensing for export of certain machines for the manufacture of automobile parts. It is our judgment that the impact of denying U.S. licenses would be largely frustrated by other free world countries which permit exports to the Soviet bloc of this type of equipment.
>
> Present information and the best obtainable judgment now support the conclusion that U.S. technology in this area is not significantly superior to that of European countries.

In my mind many questions are raised by this Department communication, and the decision announced therein, not the least of which is why I received a letter on May 17, 1961, which was dated April 24, 1961. It is my impression that on matters relating to requests for funds, for example, messages dispatched to Capitol Hill from the Pentagon can arrive here in about 15 minutes flat. It is difficult, therefore, to see why delivery of this letter should require about a month, or if delivery did not consume

that much time, why the letter should be antedated by about a month.

Turning to the substance of the letter, and the statement that "present information and the best obtainable judgment now support the conclusion that U.S. technology in this area is not significantly superior to that of European countries" various questions occur to me.

What, for instance, should cause the Department of Defense to change its conclusion contained in the letter to me of February 23, that the technology contained in the U.S.-produced transfer machines is the most advanced in the world, to the conclusion that U.S. technology in this area is not significantly superior to that of European countries?

If the intelligence information of the Department of Defense was not accurate or complete on February 23, can we assume that it is accurate and reliable on April 24, just 2 months later?

Specifically what new information does the Department of Defense possess concerning European machine tool technology in this particular area? None was presented to me.

What consideration was given to the fact that the Soviets can benefit from the ability of U.S. manufacturers to produce with dispatch, often, I understand, enabling much earlier delivery dates than from companies from abroad?

What consideration was given to the fact that American designed and produced machine tools are especially well suited for mass production, so important to the Soviets, when many others are not well suited for mass production?

Until such time as specific information is forthcoming to justify the conclusion that European technology is equal to U.S. technology in this area, I am forced to conclude that no such information exists, and that the Department of Defense decision is based largely on policy considerations rather than on cold, hard facts.

And if the decision is based on policy, the question is, "Why?" Will the Soviets be willing to try to solve the world's differences, if we sell them strategic precision machine tools? The answer is all too obvious. And if these American machine tools are so important to the Soviets as to cause them to complain over cancellation of such license, it only goes to show how significant these machines are to the U.S.S.R. economic and military effort.

Another question arises at this time, relating again to the date of the Department of Defense letter. Since the letter is dated April 24, 1961, and was delivered to me on May 17, 1961, does this mean that export licenses for machines of this type have been issued in the interim?

To find out, I have today addressed a special delivery letter to the Secretary of Commerce, requesting to be fully informed as to whether any licenses have been issued, and will advise the House when a reply is received.

Developments in the export control field point in my opinion with increasing urgency to the need for a complete congressional reevaluation of our export control policies as would be provided for by House Resolution 170, a measure I introduced earlier this session which is pending before the House. In my opinion, it is vitally important for Congress to look into this problem without delay.

AID TO DISPLACED CAPITOL HILL MERCHANTS

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to amend the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 to authorize the reimbursement of Capitol Hill merchants whose places of business are being taken pursuant to Public Law 86-651, for the purpose of extending the Capitol grounds.

I wish to include, as part of my remarks, the following excerpts from a letter which was addressed to me, calling to my attention the need for such reimbursement authorization, and referring to the precedents of law which has been established for such a procedure.

Without this relief legislation, most of the 24 or more merchants in the condemned area will experience a severe economic hardship in relocating their stores and businesses. We are now in the process of documenting the extent of these losses, which at this stage indicate upwards of $500,000. There is no question that some of these merchants will go out of business. Others, because of condemnation clauses in their leases, look to this relief legislation for their only help in covering the costs of moving and getting their establishments started in new areas. For these merchants, the value of their leasehold interests, goodwill and prime locations is lost completely under principles of the law of eminent domain. These losses will not be compensated for by our proposal. Only direct, proven expenses incurred, within the limitations set out in the bill, for moving and setting up our shops at a new location would be covered.

Precedent has been established by the Defense Department and Redevelopment Land Agency in the Southwest redevelopment area for compensating displaced merchants for their moving and relocating expense. A bill giving such treatment to displaced merchants in the Chantilly area was passed by the House of Representatives during the last session of Congress—H.R. 2467. Thus, the Capitol Hill merchants are not asking for a handout. They are simply asking to be put on a par and to be accorded a treatment similar to that which Congress has given to other displaced merchants.

Legislation authorizing the condemnation of the merchants' area was enacted with scarcely any warning or opportunity for these small businessmen to make a fair showing of the extreme economic and financial hardship that would be caused by this law. To partially rectify the unjust consequences resulting from this law, the merchants feel certain that this request for help with their moving expenses is reasonable, fair, and justified.

The Congress has adopted legislation which directs urban renewal authorities to compensate displaced merchants for necessary moving expenses, and it would seem to me that in this instance where the Congress itself is, in effect, acting as an urban renewal agency in its own behalf, it would be no more than equitable to see that similar reimbursement be made to businesses adversely affected.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 15, 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 7055, which proposed a tax revision allowing self-employed persons limited income tax deductions for contributions to their own retirement plans.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, wage earners are not taxed for amounts which are paid into pension and retirement plans. My bill would afford equal tax treatment to self-employed persons, including businessmen, professional men, and farmers.

As with wage earners, benefits from such retirement plans would be subject to tax when the income is received.

The self-employed persons carry a substantial economic load in community life. It is entirely equitable, therefore, that they be afforded the same treatment under our tax laws as the persons earning wages.

This bill, I believe, will encourage the principle of self-reliance and protect self-employed persons in their efforts to save for their years of retirement.

The bill, in addition, would place additional restrictions on pension plans of owner-managed corporations to prevent those plans from being used to obtain special tax advantages for a few individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the House this measure which I consider to be of vital importance.

PLIGHT OF THE SILK INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SISK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCRANTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, the textile industry has commanded the attention of this administration, resulting in the seven-point program recently publicized. The emphasis, however, appears to be on cotton, and the domestic silk industry, which has suffered almost incredibly in the last few years, is ignored.

The facts are astounding and point up the critical condition of the domestic silk industry. Therefore, I hasten to bring them to the attention of the House and this administration. The following facts are garnered from testimony of leading manufacturers:

In 1955 domestic producers accounted for 75 percent of the home market in silk fabrics; in 1959, 4 years later, they accounted for only 30 percent. During the

last 5 years production has declined 36 percent, while total imports have increased 350 percent, and Japanese imports have increased 407 percent. In 1955, Japanese imports were 27 percent of domestic production; in 1959, they were 217 percent of domestic production.

While Japanese imports constituted only 21 percent of a small domestic market in 1959, such imports represented 66 percent of a greatly expanded market.

Today Japanese producers dominate and control our market; the domestic manufacturer has become a marginal and in effect nonprofit producer of any fabric or fabric line with which the Japanese wish to compete. There is no silk fabric made in this country, or in Europe, which Japanese weavers cannot reproduce in comparable quality and market here at prices far below those of American or European producers.

Comparison of American and Japanese thrown silk prices

	American	Japanese
Raw silk	$5.10	$5.10
Throwing	1.80	.75
Per pound for thrown silk	6.90	5.85
10-percent duty charge		.59
Per pound for thrown silk		6.44
American		$6.90
Japanese		6.44
Japanese thrown silk cheaper per pound than American thrown silk (2 thread, 2/22 denier, organzine)		.46

Imports of Japanese thrown silk

	1959	1960	1961
January	50	110	300
February	30	71	215
March	31	104	145
April	50	140	125
May	60	120	
June	20	155	
July	40	160	
August	40	91	
September	50	181	
October	80	95	
November	120	190	
December	145	170	
Total bales	716	1,587	785

Source: American Silk Council, Inc.

In northeastern Pennsylvania, the plight of the silk throwing industry has meant a tremendous decrease in jobs. This being an area of chronic unemployment, these jobs are sorely needed, and it is incumbent upon the present administration to face up to this problem and meet it. The following testimony from Mr. Joseph W. Smith, president of the Lackawanna Textile Co., Taylor, Pa., and president of the Pennsylvania Throwsters Association, is straight and to the point:

A few years back our own Lackawanna County had 45 throwing plants employing an average of 80 people, or total of 3,600 jobs. Today we have only 11 working mills employing an average of 70 people, or a total of 770 jobs. The majority of these 11 remaining mills are only working part time because we cannot meet the competition from Japan.

This condition exists not because of more efficient manufacturing practices in foreign countries but because of cheap labor rates there and a low tariff.

The number of employees in my own company has dropped from approximately 90, 5 years ago, to an average of 40 at the present time.

Further conclusive evidence that the silk throwing industry is unable to compete with foreign imports is reflected in these figures obtained from the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, of imports of silk fabrics from Japan to the United States from 1955 to 1959. In 1955, we imported 14 million square yards of pure silk fabric and in 1959 we imported 67 million square yards of silk fabric, an increase of 379 percent. Total imports of silk fabrics from all countries, including Japan, for 1955 was 17 million square yards and in 1959, 72 million square yards, an increase of 324 percent. Imports of fabrics with silk mixtures from all countries in 1955 was 1 million square yards, and in 1959 we imported 9 million square yards, an increase of 800 percent.

The importation of these finished piece goods from other countries affects not only the throwing industry, but the dyeing plants and weaving plants as well.

As a manufacturer facing impossible competition, I am not opposed to imports from Japan or any other country, but this competition poses a real problem. I fully realize the economic necessity of foreign trade to our national economy, but we are faced with what appears to be an almost impossible situation.

It is my profound opinion that the only way this situation can be solved is to raise the tariff and reduce the quota of silk imports from foreign countries, thereby giving the American silk industry a chance for survival.

If this tariff is raised and the quotas cut on silk and piece goods, the Japanese will not suffer. We have to get the raw silk from Japan.

Silk piece goods and silk mixed piece goods, U.S. imports for consumption from principal countries, preliminary 1960

	Square yards	Pounds	Dollar value
United Kingdom:			
Silk	157,318	34,508	431,384
Silk mixed		205	
Total	157,318	34,713	431,384
West Germany:			
Silk	208,930	64,860	567,920
Silk mixed		225	
Total	208,930	65,085	567,920
France:			
Silk	447,699	74,839	1,337,041
Silk mixed	6,656	10,218	33,480
Total	454,355	85,057	1,370,521
Switzerland:			
Silk	700,238	146,268	1,987,521
Silk mixed		3,136	
Total	700,238	149,404	1,987,521
Additional: Silk bolting cloth	3,510	8,809	282,846
Italy:			
Silk	2,226,503	577,161	5,876,202
Silk mixed	86,557	37,248	233,621
Total	2,313,060	614,409	6,109,823
Additional: Silk bolting cloth		190	
Japan:			
Silk	60,025,101	4,535,355	33,634,047
Silk mixed	6,610,655	724,416	2,774,265
Total	66,635,756	5,259,771	36,408,312
Additional: Silk bolting cloth	96,972	10,475	59,044
Grand total (including all other countries):			
Silk	64,922,018	5,624,710	45,837,388
Silk mixed	6,889,041	802,654	3,444,000
Total	71,811,059	6,427,364	49,281,388
Additional: Silk bolting cloth	169,593	20,503	456,959
		5,334	64,293

Compiled by International Silk Association (USA), Inc., from FT-110 monthly U.S. Department of Commerce reports.

What action should be taken? Clearly, action by the Federal Trade Commission is the answer. The tariff rate on thrown silk should be increased from the present 10 percent to the original 20 percent as it existed in 1951 before it was reduced during the Truman administration. Both the Scanton Times and the Scrantonian, two of America's outstanding newspapers have editorialized effectively on this subject. The gist of their argument follows:

Area representatives of the silk industry have tried—futilely so far—to convince the U.S. Tariff Commission of the urgent need for restoration of a 20 percent duty on imported silk. This area, once the Nation's second largest silk center, has suffered serious economic setbacks because of competition from Japan and it is about time American mills and workers should be given some consideration.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRANTON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for getting into this picture. I realize from what he says here today that he is not being misled by the overtures of the administration to the textile producers of the Nation. It has been my privilege to be one of the leaders of this battle for the last 14 years. Whenever a situation develops, like it has developed in the textile industry, and 70 Members of the House of Representatives got together here, like we had some months ago here on the floor, then they

get scared and they offer concessions, and that is what they are trying to do now. They have been able to beat the group that wants to improve our international trade policies by knocking us off one at a time. They started off by doing that to the dairy industry, and then they offered concessions to the independent oil industry, and then made some concessions to the lead and zinc industry. In other words, that is a scheme of the State Department to continue to run our trade policies, when the Constitution says in article 8 that that is the business of the Congress. I want to commend the gentleman and I hope he keeps up his fight on this proposition, so that when we do get ready to write a new reciprocal trade agreement, we can write one with some sense in it, one in which we are not selling the jobs of American men and women down the river. You cannot buy friendship with dollars, and you cannot do it with American jobs.

Mr. SCRANTON. I am sure I will be in the forefront when the facts are as they are in this particular instance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and charts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] to this bill you just passed, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department appropriation bill. We have been building up labor attachés all around the world. You will find on page 430 a reference to these labor attachés, and part of the justification for them is carrying out "Department responsibilities under the reciprocal trade agreement program." Apparently we have not been getting much help from the labor attachés.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am sorry the gentleman did not call attention to that in the debate on the bill.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa cannot carry the entire load by calling attention to all these things when these bills come before the House. I had it staked out, I will say to the gentleman, to call it to his attention.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Iowa when the distressed areas bill was before the House Committee on Banking and Currency they had some language in the draft of that bill that said that grants and payments under the distressed areas bill were being made to distressed areas to compensate them for loss and injury they had suffered under the operation of certain Federal laws, including the reciprocal trade agreements. I demanded and at my request, they took that language out, because I said I did not want anybody to be able to say to me on the floor of the House that I was not trying to defend West Virginia's economy and the damage that was being done to our economy by the reciprocal trade agreements. I did not want somebody to say to me that that took care of me in the distressed areas bill.

THE GROWING NEED FOR AN ACADEMY OF FOREIGN SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session of the Congress I introduced a bill, H.R. 4729, to create a U.S. Academy of Foreign Service. Recent events on the international scene and the growing concern of all Americans appalled by the mounting arrogance of communism make it more imperative than ever that we take immediate constructive steps to insure proper training for the men and women on whom we must depend to combat communism all over the world.

There have been a number of such bills introduced by my colleagues in both the House and the Senate. This is evidence of a widely shared conviction that there exists a great need for the United States to shore up what for many years has been, to my mind, an obvious weakness—our lack of trained, knowledgeable people who understand completely the full implications of the Communist conspiracy and how to deal with it. All of us have read about the Communist system of indoctrinating cadres of youth in the art of Bolshevik leadership. We are only too painfully aware that in just about every country of the world, there are trained organizers—all of them graduates of rigid Communist political education centers—who are carefully and cleverly schooled in the devious ways of sabotage, propaganda, blackmail, and the undermining of free government. While we countenance none of these things, we cannot evade the fact that it requires an intimate knowledge of the ways of communism and Communist strategy in order for our own representatives to devise effective countermeans.

My bill proposes:

> That in order to promote peace, greater understanding and good will throughout the world and to provide for a trained force for the Foreign Service of the United States, and in order to provide more adequate and effective orientation and training for technical and other personnel serving with the Foreign Operations Administration, there is hereby established an academy to be known as the United States Academy of Foreign Service.

These are lofty goals that are right and decent in their statement of purpose, yet are to be realized only when we get down to the bedrock of reality. We should be candid and open about admitting that we have a great deal of lost time to make up, and very little time in which to close the gap. It must be realized that the Communists have been training for this sort of thing since Lenin organized the first fanatical cells of professional revolutionaries three generations ago.

It should be noted that my bill would entrust the management of the Foreign Service Academy to a Board of Trustees, consisting of the Secretary of State, the Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, two Members of the U.S. Senate appointed by the Vice President and two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker, and not more than one of the Senate and House Members shall be of the same political party. The Academy would be located outside the District of Columbia but not more than 300 miles therefrom. Admission to the Academy would be limited to men and women who have reached their 19th birthday and have not passed their 25th birthday, and who have had at least 2 years college or university education. All students would receive subsistence and compensation at such rates as may be determined by the trustees. The Academy would operate on the undergraduate and graduate levels, awarding bachelors, masters, and doctors degrees. The bill specifies that the scope of activities shall not be limited to academic studies only, but shall also include fieldwork abroad. This aspect of Academy training, in the view of many, is most essential.

Each student graduated from the Academy would agree to accept an appointment as an employee of the United States for the 5 years following the awarding of a degree, with the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare having priorities in that order, followed by other departments and agencies of the United States.

The United States cannot afford to allow the vital work of combatting the insidious work of professional Communists to Americans who are handicapped by improper training. As has been pointed out by the Saturday Evening Post in an editorial captioned "The Freedom Academy Bill Should Pass," we do not have amateur military officers. Nor do amateurs manage our huge industries.

Unfortunately, there have been objections raised in high places to the creation of an Academy of Foreign Service, objections that, in my judgment and the judgment of others, are based on the familiar reluctance of established agencies of our Government to acknowledge the existence of a weakness. For example, I have a copy of a letter written by an official of the Department of State to Dr. Charles S. Muschell, regional superintendent, the Pennsbury Schools, Fallsington, Pa., under date of March 26, 1961. Dr. Muschell, and the Pennsbury Board of Education, all are resident in Bucks County, Pa., part of the Eighth Congressional District comprising more than 500,000 people whom it is my privilege to represent.

The Pennsbury Board of Education had adopted a resolution calling for the establishment of an Academy of Foreign Service, and under date of February 22, 1961, forwarded to the President a copy of the resolution. The official from the Department of State, replying to Dr. Muschell's letter, takes a negative view of the whole idea. The letter, in part, states as follows:

> The proposal for an undergraduate Foreign Service Academy, similar to the academies for training officers in the armed services is a matter to which the Department of State has given a considerable amount of

attention for several years. The Department made a review of the whole question again last year at the request of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and reached the conclusion that the establishment of such an academy would not be in the best interest of the country or the Foreign Service. I think you may be interested in our report to the committee, Report on Recruitment and Training in the Foreign Service, a copy of which is enclosed.

There are a number of reasons for the Department's position regarding the establishment of an academy for the training of Foreign Service officers. Basically, the Department is concerned that such an academy would not provide the breadth of background which is necessary if the Service is to be truly representative of the American people. For example, the background and outlook of a group of new Foreign Service officers who had completed their academic work entirely with other young men and women interested in foreign affairs, might not be as broad as that of a group who had studied at a number of educational institutions in the various States of the Union. In the view of the Department, the latter group would have a much wider range of experience and training and would be more representative of our country.

I submit that what the Department of State is here attempting to prove is that there is nothing wrong with our present system of training for American oversea representatives. To accept this contention is to admit that we have no problem. Can any American, seeing what has taken place on the world scene in recent months, feel smug or complacent about our lack of effective counteroperations against the Communists' steady string of propaganda successes? We are being outmaneuvered, outwitted, outrun in dozens of trouble spots and yet our State Department would blandly deny that there is anything wrong, that there is no urgent need. I respectfully submit that the hour is late and that we had better put aside such illusions. The State Department's fallacious line of reasoning can perhaps most forcefully be pointed out by recalling that military training is practiced in many U.S. colleges and universities where there are Reserve officers training units. The ROTC and the NOTC are accomplishing an important job in our schools of higher learning, but does this eliminate the need for West Point or for Annapolis? The answer is obvious. Of course not. The parallel is exactly the same as the circumstances that would prevail in an altogether complementary and logical manner with our Academy of Foreign Service and the State Department cooperating.

Gentlemen, this is no time for the Congress to permit this important matter to be detoured or shunted off to the side by the unreasoning objections of the agency that ought to be most concerned about the problem. There is a real, pressing, immediate need for the United States of America to establish an Academy of Foreign Service. Let us proceed to that task by enacting the legislation that will translate hope into action.

FAIRPLAY FOR THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May Day, Fidel Castro proclaimed Cuba as the first Socialist-Communist state in our hemisphere. In this action, he pledged his support to a godless, tyrannical international bloc which is bent on destroying western civilization and at the same time he wiped out what little hope there might have been for any democratic institutions in Cuba. He haughtily said that free elections would no longer be needed in Cuba while at the same time launching a gigantic battle against the Catholic Church.

It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, how many Americans still hold to the belief that we can work things out with Castro. Decades of Communist treachery and perfidy do not seem to disillusion those who believe that the Communists can be dealt with and by making certain noble concessions, renouncements, accommodations, retreats, changes of policy, abandonment of policy, and/or softening of policy, we can achieve peace and unity. In fact, it makes one wonder what concessions are considered too great for the United States to make in the eyes of those who hold to the doctrine of accommodation and concession.

In almost every instance, the self-professed liberals criticize any affirmation of U.S. determination to use its tremendous power for curbing Communist aggression. In almost every instance, they urge that we take collective action even if that means compromising our position to the most timid and the weakest of our allies or even to the vast neutral bloc. The thoughts of the United States acting independently to defend our own best interests—even if circumstances would dictate—is labeled as isolationism or reaction.

Not too long ago, a group called the Fair Play for Cuba Committee was running ads in the papers venting their wrath concerning the terrible accusations being made against Castro. To them, it was a dirty smear to allege that Cuba was going Communist. All Castro wants, they said, is to return Cuba to the Cubans—sort of an agrarian reformer with beard. Firing squads, expropriations of property, embracing Khrushchev in New York—well now, these are of little note and do not tell us about the true Castro. We now find a new committee calling for another dose of American fairplay for Cuba despite events of the past year.

Mr. Speaker, I specifically refer to a meeting, labeled the Cuba protest meeting, which was held at Harvard University on April 26, 1961, and which resulted in what I consider to be a very soft and appeasing document which purports to be the consensus of opinion of a large number of Harvard, MIT, and Boston area college professors. This document, under the heading "An Open Letter to President Kennedy," was printed as an advertisement in an undetermined number of newspapers. I say undetermined because I have no way of knowing to what extent it was publicized, having seen but several of them myself.

This 860-word statement calls for "a cooling-off period and an announcement of our willingness to test the sincerity of the Cuban offer to negotiate differences" as well as a ringing condemnation of American policy and economic power which, they allege, in the early days of Castro could have "been wielded to further Cuban democracy" but instead was "wasted in a fruitless effort to weaken and undermine the new regime." Few of us have doubts about the sincerity of Castro. These professors are shocked that the major premise of United States-Cuban policy for at least a year has been that we must crush Castro although they give only passing attention to the ruthless Castro policies which have meant the firing squad and totalitarian manifestations in every direction.

In fact, a key to the tenor of the open letter is that only 20 words, 1 sentence, of the 860-word letter suggests any disenchantment of Castro and his policies. They are watered down words which really amount to only a slight rap on the knuckles for being a bad boy. Their concern for our policy and the temerity of President Kennedy and the American people to press for military intervention is voluminous. Their concern for Castro's tyranny is expressed in these words:

None of us approves the Castro regime's repression of civil liberties within Cuba, nor its dependence on the Communist bloc.

Note that carefully. They are not saying they disapprove but merely use the weaker language "We do not approve." Mr. Speaker, this is a shocking expression of weakness on the part of the participants in the Cuba protest meeting.

They are not even sure that Castro is a threat to America. They couch their suspicions in this carefully worded statement "Today, Castro may well, in fact, represent a threat to the security of the Americas." I know of very few straight thinking Americans who would not put their feelings in stronger terms when the security of America and the Americas is at stake. Their thoughts are summarized in a four-point statement:

Resolved, That the United States Government should—

1. Reverse the present drift toward American military intervention in Cuba;
2. Give no further support for the invasion of Cuba by exile groups;
3. Seek instead to detach the Castro regime from the Communist bloc by working for a diplomatic detente and a resumption of trade relations; and
4. Concentrate its constructive efforts on eliminating in other parts of Latin America the social conditions on which totalitarian nationalism feeds.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the body of this open letter be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT KENNEDY

The struggle against communism in the Western Hemisphere will not be won by brandishing the Big Stick. None of us approves the Castro regime's repression of civil liberties within Cuba, nor its dependence on the Communist bloc. But we believe the U.S. attempt to destroy Castro fails to come

to grips with the meaning of the recent Cuban experience, and seriously endangers the pursuit of our most vital interests in world affairs.

It is now a matter of record that the attempt at counterrevolution was planned, organized, and directed by an agency of the U.S. Government. This agency, acting in secret and deceiving both the American people and the Cuban rebels—particularly the most democratic among those rebels—has blundered in an inexcusable and almost inconceivable manner. But this was more than a failure of technique; it was a failure of policy itself.

The major premise of United States-Cuban policy for at least a year has been that we must crush Castro. Indeed, when certain of today's rebel leaders were still members of the Castro government, the United States had already demonstrated its disenchantment with the Cuban revolution. Our enormous economic power, which might have been wielded to further Cuban democracy, was wasted in a fruitless effort to weaken and undermine the new regime. Whether from aversion to evolution, or from fear of expropriation of American property, our Government acted so as to encourage those tendencies toward dictatorship and anti-Americanism latent in any Latin American social upheaval. The U.S. determination to isolate Cuba made the Soviet bloc Castro's only support of military and economic support. This resulted, as has happened so often before, in a sharp increase in the power of the local Communist Party.

Today, Castro may well, in fact, represent a threat to the security of the Americas. But this is not primarily a military threat. The danger Castro poses is clear: that by subversion or example his particular brand of social revolution will spread through Latin America. The burden, then, is on us. It requires a vastly greater effort than we have yet made to demonstrate that genuine social reform is compatible with democratic institutions.

Meanwhile, any further effort to destroy Castro would serve only to intensify terror within Cuba. A more formidable American-inspired rebel invasion, or the sending of American troops would, we believe, have still more disastrous consequences. "Victory" by American intervention would require bloody war and prolonged occupation. Can anyone believe that a free Cuban government would emerge from these circumstances? More important, even if we did succeed, by such means, in replacing Castro, we would still have done far greater damage to ourselves than to international communism. We would have established anti-Americanism as the central theme of Latin American politics for decades to come.

Already, Mr. President, in the view of such cautious and responsible journals as the Manchester Guardian and the Observer, the CIA fiasco has undone much of the good your administration has achieved in the world arena, and substantially weakened Ambassador Adlai Stevenson's effectiveness in the United Nations. Your threat to impose our will in the Caribbean, whatever the wishes of the other American states, and in violation of inter-American agreements, has created widespread suspicion that the United States will reorient its foreign policy in the direction of Soviet-style power politics. Further intervention in Cuba will give the lie to our professions of respect for treaty obligations, and will make it much more difficult for us to persuade the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America that we will act toward them with understanding.

We, therefore, endorse the resolution adopted by the Cuba protest meeting held at Harvard University on April 26, 1961:

"Resolved: that the United States Government should—

"1. Reverse the present drift toward American military intervention in Cuba;

"2. Give no further support for the invasion of Cuba by exile groups;

"3. Seek instead to detach the Castro regime from the Communist bloc by working for a diplomatic detente and a resumption of trade relations; and

"4. Concentrate its constructive efforts on eliminating in other parts of Latin America the social conditions on which totalitarian nationalism feeds."

We are distressed that there has been so little public discussion of the alternatives to present U.S. Cuban policy. With a few notable exceptions, debate has centered on the varieties of intervention rather than on the decision to intervene. In the press, consideration has been circumscribed by an uncritical acceptance of the early decision to overthrow Castro, and more recently, by an equally uncritical acquiescence in the call for national unity. We believe that there are alternatives, that debate is necessary—though it would be foolish to suggest that the alternatives can be seized without courage and patience. The first imperative is a cooling-off period, and an announcement of our willingness to test the sincerity of the Cuban offer to negotiate differences.

We regard this issue as a crucial and revealing measure of our desire to assume responsibility for new directions in foreign affairs. Surely we have confidence enough in the ways of freedom to accept this challenge.

SIGNERS [1]

James Luther Adams, Lamont professor of divinity, Harvard; Gordon Allport, professor of psychology, Harvard; Eric Bentley, Charles Eliot Norton, professor of poetry, Harvard; Reuben A. Brower, professor of English, Harvard; Allan Knight Chalmers, professor of applied Christianity, Boston University; Serge Chermayeff, professor of architecture, Harvard; Noam Chomsky, associate professor of modern languages, M.I.T.; Wendell Clausen, professor of Greek and Latin, Harvard; Albert Sprague Coolidge, lecturer on chemistry, Harvard; John P. Dawson, professor of law, Harvard; Giorgio deSantillana, professor of humanities, M.I.T.; L. Harold de Wolf, president of the faculty, B.U. School of Theology; John T. Edsall, professor of biological chemistry, Harvard; Rupert Emerson, professor of government, Harvard; Monroe Engel, lecturer on English, Harvard; Jacob Fine, professor of surgery, Harvard Medical School; Roderick Firth, professor of philosophy, Harvard; Donald Fleming, professor of history, Harvard; Caleb Foote, Walter Meyer visiting research professor of law, Harvard; John N. Gaus, professor of government, Harvard; Edward Geary, associate professor of romance languages, Harvard; Stephen Gilman, professor of romance languages, Harvard; Albert Guerard, professor of English, Harvard.

Eric Havelock, professor of Greek and Latin, Harvard; Lillian Hellman, visiting lecturer on English, Harvard; Hans Hofmann, associate professor of theology, Harvard; H. Stuart Hughes, professor of history, Harvard; Reginald Isaacs, Charles Dyer Norton professor of regional planning, Harvard; William Jencks, associate professor of biochemistry, Brandeis; Paul E. Johnson, professor of psychology, Boston University; Martin Kamen, professor of biochemistry, Brandeis; Nathan Kaplan, professor of biochemistry, Brandeis; Timothy Leary, lecturer on clinical psychology, Harvard; Paul T. Lehmann, Lamont professor of divinity, Harvard; Harry T. Levin, Irving Babbitt professor of comparative literature, Harvard; Laurence Levine, associate professor of biochemistry, Brandeis; Erich Lindemann, professor of psychiatry, Harvard Medical School; Salvador Luria, professor of biology, M.I.T.; Kevin Lynch, associate professor of city planning, M.I.T.; Kenneth S. Lynn, associate professor of English, Harvard; Boris Magasanik, professor of biology, M.I.T.; Frank E. Manual, professor of history, Brandeis; Herbert Marcuse, professor of politics and philosophy, Brandeis; Barrington Moore, Jr., senior fellow, Russian Research Center, Harvard; Walter Muelder, dean of the School of Theology, Boston University; Lewis Mumford; David Owen, Gurney professor of history and political science, Harvard.

E. S. Pattullo, assistant dean of the faculty of arts and sciences, Harvard; Robert O. Preyer, associate professor of English, Brandeis; John Rawls, professor of philosophy, M.I.T.; I. A. Richards, university professor, Harvard; David Riesman, Henry Ford II professor of social science, Harvard; Lloyd Rodwin, professor of land economics, M.I.T.; Sylvan Schweber, professor of physics, Brandeis; Jose Luis Sert, dean graduate school of design, Harvard; Harlow Shapley, Paine professor of astronomy, emeritus, Harvard; Irving Singer, associate professor of philosophy, M.I.T.; Huston Smith, professor of philosophy, M.I.T.; Maurice R. Stein, associate professor of sociology, Brandeis; Walter Toman, associate professor of psychology, Brandeis; John Van Doren, associate professor of English, Brandeis; E. V. Walter, associate professor of politics, Brandeis; Robert W. White, professor of clinical psychology, Harverd; John W. M. Whiting, Bigelow professor of education and director, Laboratory of Human Development, Harvard; Cedric Whitman, professor of Greek and Latin, Harvard; Norbert Wiener, institute professor of mathematics, M.I.T.; Amos Wilder, Hollis professor of divinity, Harvard; Edmund Wilson; Kurt H. Wolf, professor of sociology, Brandeis; Laurence Wylie, C. Douglas Dillon professor of the civilization of France, Harvard.

[1] Partial list.

Mr. Speaker, note once more the siren call that we "lure away" a satellite from the Communist bloc. They have not yet urged massive foreign aid but I would guess that it would be the next step if the past is prolog.

On Monday, one of our colleagues succinctly stated his dilemma by noting—

When Castro took over the Government of Cuba we had a transition period there for a while in which some of us said: "Let's wait and see."

I was one of those who said, "Let's wait and see what happens."

He concluded:

Being from Miami, a point close to Cuba, the wait and see attitude was not too long in evolving into "now you know what the answer is" because refugees started streaming into Miami and other areas of the country at a very high rate.

Mr. Speaker, it is significant to note that the "Now you know what the answer is" conclusion has been lost on this learned group of educators. The fact that these pronouncements are presented by what is termed as an intellectual group is of particular note. It is of particular note because we all take a second look at their views and mentally acknowledge an extra degree of credibility to the statements of our learned fellow citizens. I certainly do not criticize these views merely because they are so-called intellectual—I merely find it more alarming because of their conciliatory tone.

James Reston wrote in the New York Times of April 28, 1961:

The saddest men in Washington these days are the intellectuals on the White House staff who helped deal with the Cuban issue: McGeorge Bundy, former dean of the faculty at Harvard; Walt Whitman Rostow of Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., the Harvard historian.

Reston goes on to write:

A moratorium on sniping at the professors might not be a bad idea for if this brilliant young crowd fails, we might have to tolerate not only defeat but a spasm of anti-intellectualism as well.

National Review sums it up well by tartly observing in its May 13, 1961, issue:

Just how lack of knowledge, judgment, and sense on Cuba squares with brilliance, and just why criticism of lack of knowledge, judgment, and sense is "anti-intellectualism," are mysteries that we hope the New Frontier dialecticians will explain more fully in the next hundred days.

They also note appropriately, I believe, that—

When the liberals are responsible for a fiasco, there must be no criticism.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRUCE. I certainly concur in the gentleman's concern over the gentlemen who have been deceived into signing such a ridiculous ad as appeared in many of our national newspapers. I also have a certain amount of sympathy for them from the standpoint that obviously they are confused, and I believe many of them are sincerely confused.

As you analyze some of these statements that have been issued from official levels of government, perhaps we can begin to more clearly understand why they are sincerely confused. For instance, in April of this year, the State Department issued its much publicized white paper on Cuba. I have read it with great fascination because, apparently, the key people in leadership positions in the State Department are still convinced that the revolution in Cuba at its origin was not a Communist revolution. Item No. 1 in their white paper is headed with the title, "The Betrayal of the Cuban Revolution." The other evening I had the opportunity to discuss this in an informal way with a top State Department official who shall be nameless because of the pledge of obscurity in that conversation, and I asked him, "Why do you continue to insist that Castro betrayed the revolution?" I was trying to make the point that Fidel Castro's record clear back in 1948 in Bogotá, where he was part of a Communist assassination movement down there, was clearly known; that President Somosa had warned all of the Western Hemisphere of the nature of Fidel Castro.

I said to this State Department official, "How can you still cling to this idea that Communist Fidel Castro betrayed the Communist revolution that was successful in imposing a Communist dictatorship on the Cuban people?" His answer was, "Well, he betrayed the revolution." "Well, then," I said, "are you not and were you not familiar with the background of Raúl Castro, the brother of Fidel Castro, and Ché Guevara," and this distinguished gentleman of letters replied, "Well, historians are still arguing about Raúl Castro." Well, maybe historians still are, but I do find in the white paper issued by the Department, of which this man happens to be one of the top leaders, on page 12 of their own white paper it says:

Dr. Castro's brother, Maj. Raúl Castro, had himself been active in the international Communist student movement and had made his pilgrimage to the Communist world. Moreover, Maj. Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, a dominating influence on Dr. Castro, was a professional revolutionary from Argentina who had worked with Communists in Guatemala and Mexico. Through Raúl Castro and Guevara, the Communists, though unable to gain control either of the 26th of July Movement or of the rebel army, won ready access to Dr. Castro himself.

There are many wonderful people in our State Department. I have had conferences with several of them and as to many of them, I have the highest confidence in their integrity and their knowledge, but for the State Department at this stage to still be excusing itself, regardless of political administration when this took place, on the ground that Castro betrayed the revolution is pure fantasy. By their own admission on page 12, their intelligence sources, and I am sure their files give them full information on Ernesto (Ché) Guevara and Raúl Castro and Fidel Castro himself, these were the leaders of the revolution and, yet, their comment is that Castro betrayed the revolution.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Can the gentleman conceive how such a learned group as distinguished professors can still have any delusion that Castro is now not a Communist to mean that we are at fault and maybe we are the ones who should make changes?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; I think there is a possibility of understanding this, if the gentleman from Ohio will permit me to discuss this for just a moment.

There seems to be a theory at certain levels of the State Department and elsewhere in what is loosely called the intellectual world—and I do not mean to be critical of intellectualism because I take pride in our honest intellectualism, but there seems to be a theory that we have reached the stage where we dare not take a clear-cut position. We have adopted a position of negotiating in the international struggle globally primarily in areas outside of Communist control. We have constantly been willing to negotiate about Laos, about Vietnam, about Indochina, always in areas outside of the control of the Soviet Union.

With the advent of the atomic bomb in World War II and the dropping of it on Japan the Communist international apparatus opened up an all-out psychological warfare campaign, and we sincerely many of us, joined in pointing out what a wonderful thing atomic energy would be if harnessed for peace, but what a horrible and catastrophic thing it would be if used in warfare. Then came the H-bomb and potentially the C-bomb. The Communist psychological warfare experts went to work on an intensive campaign among the western peoples. They did not tell their own people about the horrible effects of the A-bomb, of nuclear explosions, but it was aimed primarily at the non-Communist world, to create this terrible fear. So we did not take a firm position opposed to them because, it was said, there would be the risk of war. There was a definite feeling apparently that if we just waited long enough there would be some sort of compromise between the capitalist system and the Communist system, that the Communist system was going to evolve into a form of capitalism. What would really happen, however, is that the free-enterprise system would be replaced, replaced by a form of super-international Social government.

When you get to this state of thinking that we do not really believe strongly enough in the American system that we want to defend it, but that we are willing to give up completely sovereignty here, there, and elsewhere in the name of compromise, then you are lost, and have moved into the realm of wishful thinking and cannot be realistic about what things actually are like.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It certainly seems to me that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana has added quite a bit of light to this discussion. It is amazing to me, and I cannot hide my amazement here, the degree to which people are willing to compromise the interests of the United States in return for what they consider to be a better world or more peaceful one.

Mr. BRUCE. If the gentleman will yield, I would say that from my observation during the few months I have been in Congress, but having spoken extensively across the country to various organizations, it is heartening to see the attitude of the people. At the grassroots, people are willing to stand up and be counted; they are rejecting this compromise attitude.

If the gentleman will permit, I would like to expand this just a little to show how this pattern of alarm and of double dealing is extending all over the world. I noticed in the Washington Post, a publication that I do not quote too often, the Washington Post of Tuesday, May 2, 1961, there was an article by Chalmers M. Roberts, an article that I think should be read by every Member of this House because it will give an insight into what has been developing over many years. You can spot events before they actually take place by noting certain lines that begin to evolve, certain suggestions that are dropped; and I notice in Chalmers Roberts' article in the Washington Post of May 2 the headline is "U.S. Takes New View, Ponders Recognition of Outer Mongolia." He states:

In the current issue of Foreign Affairs, one of President Kennedy's preinaugural foreign policy advisers, Zbigniew Brezezinski of Columbia University's Russian Institute suggests that American diplomatic recognition of Outer Mongolia could contribute to the further growth of the diversity which has developed within the Communist camp.

Recognition, he contends, would encourage the growth of a sense of independent statehood which almost certainly would lead to more assertive nationalism. In addition, it would give the United States a listening post in the heart of central Asia.

This would be humorous if it were not so tragic, because here is the so-called common line. We are going to give them another advantage by recognizing Outer Mongolia as a legitimate government, and somehow or other it is going to bring peace closer to you. It

is the same type of propaganda we heard about China, that we have watched consistently year in and year out as we have seen the edge of the Iron-Bamboo Curtain move ever closer to us. This is practicing the art of self-deception through lack of understanding, our willingness to substitute a Communist philosophy which they have clearly defined as their program in the ultimate conquest of the world.

I would direct the attention of every Member of the House to this particular article, because we have seen it in a couple of different places now. I raise the question just how long is it going to be before we begin receiving official hints that maybe a compromise of the tensions would be for us to recognize Outer Mongolia as a separate independent sovereign state. More of the art of self-deception.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Coming a little bit closer to our own continent, does the gentleman understand that possibly the people who participated in the Cuba protest meeting might not have understood the nature of international communism?

Mr. BRUCE. I am reluctant to question the motives of people. It is impossible for me, not knowing these gentlemen personally, and even if I did to honestly analyze what their motives are. I have to give them the benefit of the doubt. I would say, on the basis of the obvious fact, they are confused, they are in error, and certainly in their error and using their position of prestige to promote this soft attitude toward an understanding of the Communist dictatorship in Cuba, they are doing great damage to the cause of freedom in the United States. I give them the benefit of the doubt, by and large, that they are sincerely confused.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, contrasted to the "Open Letter to President Kennedy" type of approach to the Communist take-over in Cuba is that of Carlos Todd, editor of the Cuban Information Service. In an address of May 4, 1961, made to the 16th Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference in New Orleans, La., Mr. Todd summarized our decline in prestige in the Americas. His address follows these remarks. A Cuban exile, he succinctly stated the situation in these words:

> It is impossible to deal with the Soviets and the Chinese by conventional methods of modern diplomacy. They operate in exactly the same manner as do your gangsters, who work completely outside human laws and ignore them altogether when it suits their purposes. It is inconceivable that you have not realized, as a Nation, that the exact, same methods of Hitler's Germany nearly brought a German victory in Europe for precisely the same reasons. People simply refused to believe that nations could act thus.

Those who follow the belief that independent governments of the left are a proper vehicle to bring about social reform were wrong in China. I believe they are equally wrong in their appraisal of Cuba. It is high time that we started a more serious appraisal of our world position and place American security and leadership at the forefront of our considerations. There is no hope for the free world without a strong America, an America that leads. Mr. Speaker, if that means we must use our power to grasp the reins once more than I believe we must dedicate ourselves to that challenge.

Last Sunday, many Americans witnessed on television the Castro propaganda film on the abortive invasion attempt. Anyone could well understand the anger of Cuban totalitarian leaders at the United States for our part in that fiasco. The film showed much more than anger or even, to be charitable, righteous indignation. It demonstrated the old Communist tactics of deceit and propaganda. It will serve as a vehicle to sell throughout the Western Hemisphere the "hate America" theme of the Communists. It is unconscionable that Americans who profess their loyalty should be furthering this Communistic government in any way—whether it be by trade, aid or a policy of accommodation and civility.

As much as I am discouraged by the repeated colorblindness peculiar to many of our so-called liberals, whom I am sure are patriotic, I am equally encouraged by the dedication to fight communism, not pacify it, by many of our patriotic leaders, organizations, and publications. It is time that we start expressing an interest in fair play for the United States.

Tension in the Caribbean

(Address made to the 16th Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference, by Carlos Todd, editor, Cuban Information Service, New Orleans, May 4, 1961)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege and pleasure for me to be able to revisit your gracious city after my stay here in 1954. When I look back to those days—it has rained a lot since then—it becomes nearly impossible for me to believe that life in my country was a civilized affair, and terror did not rule the land.

Today, I have been asked to address this distinguished audience on the subject of "Tension in the Caribbean," an awesome task to cover in a few minutes, with its wide ramifications and the many implications that the title implies.

I am a Cuban citizen, born in Cuba, who has lived most of his adult life in that lovely and unfortunate island. As political editor for the newspaper Times of Havana, I lived through nearly 2 years of the frightful fiasco that is the so-called Castro revolution—in reality the Communist conquest of Cuba.

I have been witness to the total eradication of all freedoms in Cuba; to the destruction of its wealth and industry by the Red invaders; to the studied dismemberment of the Cuban family; and to the poisoning of the minds of young and old, to the degree where mountainous hatreds have been deliberately instilled into the hearts of a people who were once gay and happy and carefree.

I have seen all this happen before my very eyes; and I cannot dismiss it with the word "tension."

It is totally inadequate to say that I speak to you about "Tension in the Caribbean," when that so-called tension has become open warfare to the death.

There may be some among you that still believe that the word "war" implies only much shooting and desolation and nothing else. Only very recently, we have had occasion to witness this type of warfare in the ill-fated, abortive invasion attempt by a handful of young Cubans who willingly sacrificed their lives for the cause of freedom.

Nevertheless, that skirmish—for it was no more than that—was only a small armed engagement which served to accentuate the other kind of war, a war that is being waged relentlessly in the Caribbean and in every corner of this earth, the war for public opinion.

That tyrant and superb politician Adolf Hitler wrote in Mein Kampf that public opinion "was the mightiest factor of our time." He used it well and used it to the hilt. He has been surpassed and left far behind by Soviet Russia, which adopted some of his methods and added embellishments of her own.

This war—the war of advertising, for that is what propaganda really is—is being fought with tenacity, intelligence, and diligence by international communism.

The immediate and direct result of this type of warfare is what you call "tension," under the accepted semantics of the Western World. But it remains war to the death, no matter what you choose to call it. Mao Tse-tung recognized the principle years ago and wrote, "Politics is war without bloodshed. War is politics with bloodshed."

This tension, this war without bloodshed in the Caribbean, dates from the time that Fidel Castro, together with his Communist master, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, landed in Cuba in December 1956. From that moment, and throughout the succeeding months, tension increased fearfully within the island of Cuba; but it had not, as yet, reached any appreciable degree outside the country.

Tension in the Caribbean began from that date as it inevitably begins in every single place in the world where the Communists initiate their well-tried and successful program of infiltration, subversion, propagandizing, and bribery to secure total power in any given area. The Congo, Laos, Vietnam, Berlin, Cuba—every single focus of tension can be directly attributed to Communist action.

Open bloodless warfare—tension, if you insist in calling it that—intensified and finally burst forth from Cuba with explosive force, immediately after Castro and his Communists came to power on January 1, 1959.

It became open warfare in the armed sense when the Cuban Communist government attemped an abortive invasion of Panama in April of 1959. It is worthy to note that the invaders were politely returned to Cuba by the Panamanian Government. Castro tried again, in August of that year, to invade the Dominican Republic, in an attempt that also died at birth. The seas around the island were containing armed Cuban Communist aggression.

They did not and have not contained the open bloodness warfare, the tension that has spread throughout the countries of South and Central America. It has become impossible to limit that warfare to the Caribbean, to quarantine it, as you would a deadly disease, from the rest of Latin America. It is increasing daily and it is achieving new victories and faithful adherents in this hemisphere.

It has invaded this country today; and for the last 3 weeks it has become the subject of urgent discussion from the top of the White House down to the home of the humblest citizen who reads newspapers or watches television.

For the origins of this tension, one may begin with the relationship that existed between the United States and the nations of the Caribbean, Central and South America, in the era of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Those relations were at an all-time high; and the political, commercial, and industrial prestige of this country remained unchallenged in the hemisphere. The cordiality between your neighbors to the south and your Government was a strong bond for hemispheric unity.

Curiously enough, the policy of the good neighbor became, unconsciously to Latin American nations, the policy of the good father. An umbrella of protection—real or imaginary, as you wish—did not permit the intrusion of world power politics on the Latin American scene. The peoples of our countries felt, at that time, that the United States was concerned with their welfare, and reacted accordingly.

It was only after World War II, when militant communism began to march inexorably in every single continent in the world, that the Latin American mind began to have serious doubts of American intentions. Aid in enormous quantities went to reconstruct the ruin of Europe; the Asians received their share of largess; African countries began to acquire new importance in world politics; and in their comfortable acceptance of a sure thing, the United States did not turn an eye on Latin America. We became poor relations of no consequence.

Further, and more grievous still, the United States, whilst leaving the Latin American Republics to fend for themselves, resigned its position as the pater familias of the hemisphere; and, in doing so, effectively relinquished its position of leadership. You were no longer captain of the vessel. You became a mere member of the crew, defaulting all the privileges of the master of the ship.

You refused to assume the responsibility and the risk that had made you the undisputed leader of this hemisphere; and, instead of a former father, you became a rather questionable uncle.

Nothing had been basically changed in the everyday world of diplomacy, business, and industry; but there was a subtle difference in the overall picture that we Latin Americans were quick to notice. In the world of human relationships, there is nothing so appalling and insulting as to be considered safe by another person. It is an unspoken insult; and the dividing line between tolerance and contempt becomes very blurred under the circumstances.

That was the position in which you found yourself when the specter of communism began to haunt the hemisphere; and you frantically tried to buy and hold tin-pot dictators in different Latin American countries to protect your holdings against the advance of the Red hordes. In doing so you played right into Communist hands by actions which brought the inevitable reaction to dictatorships; revolutions, and the installment of the so-called independent governments of the left. The leadership that you had once assumed and kept for so many years continued to slip from your grasp—and in your paralysis of action and with your political blunders, you continued to make matters worse.

For the liberty of action which you once possessed as the hemispheric leader, had now passed out of your hands. You were the leaders no longer; and our peoples began to look upon you with ever-increasing doubts. In 1958, following the innocent theory that making a better humpty-dumpty would clear up matters for all concerned, your aid and your confused torpor unleashed the one force in this hemisphere that you had been so earnestly trying to repel, international communism.

Following the insane belief that the creation of an independent government of the left in Cuba would show the rest of Latin America the pristine purity of your intentions, you were—to use one of your expressions—conned into believing in and vitally aiding and abetting the rise of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Not that you were not warned. Your own special government departments informed your higher authorities of the nature of the hoodlums that run Cuba today before their accession to power. The information and the advice were ignored; and on January 1, 1959, Fidel Castro took over Cuba; and then, Ernesto (Ché) Guevara, of the Argentine and international communism, took over Fidel Castro. Your independent government of the left became the first firm foothold of the Soviets and the Red Chinese in this hemisphere—and you helped them to do it.

Imagine, then, the feeling that has been rising in Latin America since then. Every day that passed brought new insult and calumny from the Cuban Communists; and the United States, the greatest power on this earth sat back and remained wrapped in silent dignity. "El que calla, otorga," says the Spanish proverb—"He who remains silent, relinquishes"—which is exactly the manner in which your actions were interpreted by the people of Latin America. The great nation of the north was great no more. A small speck on the Caribbean could insult it, confiscate its goods, jail its citizens, arrest its diplomats, snub its Ambassador, and get away with it.

Oh, you had your troubles. If you intervened, you would be called bullies and aggressors. If you didn't, then you became the goat of the hemisphere and the world.

The picture of a declining United States, enervated, paralyzed, vacillating, robbed of the ability to act, was a delicious one to be enjoyed. You worried about popularity—about what the other fellow would say—in a world that couldn't care less.

For some Latin Americans, the time had come to take sides. Castro said early in 1959, "You are with the revolution or against it." This has become the cry in all Latin America: "You are with communism or against it." And never forget that people always wish to be on the winning side. So far, you are losing.

The recent fiasco in Cuba has only served to confirm that conviction to Caribbean and other Latin American nations. The harm that has been done by the failure of a small expedition is incalculable; and you now stand on the threshold of a "Götterdämmerung" in this hemisphere.

For the tension, the open warfare that emanated from little Cuba has grown to monstrous proportions in Latin America, and your own security is being threatened, according to the recent words of President Kennedy.

They have served, if only momentarily, to give pause to the Communist offensive; and they have brought some measure of hope to those people of the Caribbean and the hemisphere, which have always looked to the United States as the paladin of freedom and the shield against Communist aggression and intervention.

For the moment only; for that aggression and intervention has been made perfectly evident in the Caribbean today, with a Cuba invaded and conquered by the evil forces that guide the moves of the men of the Kremlin and Peiping.

The Presidential words did not allay the fact that the defeat of an invasion of Communist Cuba has been a major defeat for this country in the eyes of all Latin America and the world. Condemnation for the American-backed invasion in the United Nations and in many Latin American quarters is not a condemnation for U.S. "intervention" in Cuba—and I say intervention between quotation marks. The condemnation comes because, in the eyes of the world, this country lost.

Will Rogers said it in well chosen words, viewing the American political scene years ago, when he stated, "On the day after election, they do not ask you whether you held a nice, clean campaign. The only question they ask you is: Did you win?"

And that is the only question that was asked silently by the nations of Latin America after the failure of the U.S.-backed, Cuban-manned invasion. Did you win? Nothing else. For nothing else matters.

Consider, ladies and gentlemen, that these nations who regarded you as a protector—although they paradoxically screamed intervention just recently—have only to glance at the map of the world to judge you a bad security risk.

Within the short space of 16 years, the Communists have won control over more than 800 million people in 13 countries; and they have advanced from their initial base in Russia to win sensational successes in 4 continents—including North America. It is incontestable to say at this moment that they are winning that war to the death, the war of tension. And it is perfectly evident that, with the exception of the Cuban skirmish, they have done it without resorting to an all-out shooting war.

Indeed, they have won an armed clash at your very doorstep, which has left the people of this country stunned and aghast at their impotence before the Communist invader.

The world knows that the Communist onslaught on Cuba was not an attack on our little island. It was, as it is, a direct attack by Soviet Russia and Communist China on the United States of America. That you have permitted this attack and acknowledged a small armed victory with impunity—no matter what other considerations must be taken into account by you—has not been lost on Latin Americans.

Weak countries, like people, will forever look to the strong for guidance and help. If the United States is not ready to repel the Communist invader, if it does not lead us Latin Americans in the fight against these forces of evil, why should we act? In fact, how can we act against the armed might of Soviet Russia and its Chinese ally, already firmly entrenched across the Straits of Florida?

Be certain that no matter how you act, you will find worldwide criticism hurled at you. You are called imperialists and aggressors without sending a single armed man into Cuba. You will be called much worse if you do. The Communists will hold a worldwide propaganda feast, and the United States will be served up with an apple in its mouth.

Yet, if you are to survive as a nation, if you are to keep what little prestige American power still maintains, you must act, and you must act quickly. Otherwise, Khrushchev's words will become tragically prophetic within a very short time: "Your grandchildren will live under communism." The man means what he says. He intends to see to it that it becomes a reality.

We Latin Americans are accused of being dramatic, passionate, and mercurial in our ways. Underneath that exterior, we are all hard realists. And it is difficult for us, as realists, to understand exactly how you have permitted such open and arrogant Communist intrusion in your own bailiwick, with total impunity for the intruders on our hemispheric and your national security.

It is impossible to deal with the Soviets and the Chinese by conventional methods of modern diplomacy. They operate in exactly the same manner as do your gangsters, who work completely outside human laws and ignore them altogether when it suits their purposes. It is inconceivable that you have not realized, as a nation, that the exact, same methods of Hitler's Germany nearly brought a German victory in Europe for precisely the same reasons. People simply refused to believe that nations could act thus.

It is happening again. But this time the enemy is organized on a worldwide basis and is busily subverting, infiltrating, and corrupting the very system that you are called upon to defend—and doing it from within your own borders. And you are tacitly permitting him to do so with ghastly unconcern.

Do not believe for one moment that the rest of Latin American is not going to follow in the footsteps of Cuba. The southern continent will go entirely Communist; and it will do so very soon, unless you act rapidly to prevent it.

To those of you who still do not believe that a well organized, aggressive minority can take over a country with frightening ease, let me point to the case of Cuba. And, gentlemen, do not forget that right here, in the United States, a well organized, aggressive minority succeeded in changing your Constitution. Recall the 18th amendment. Recall, please, that a majority of your people bowed to the wishes of a well organized, aggressive minority, which condemned you to years of prohibition.

Meanwhile, the Communists are busy with plans for their Latin American takeover. Czech machineguns are being shipped to Colombian Red elements; and frenzied efforts are being made to unite them into a cohesive and effective force. In Cuba, Castro's guerrilla tutor is training Cubans for the invasion of Venezuela and Panama. The main attack is being directed against Venezuela, where Betancourt's hold becomes more tenuous with every day that passes. Brazil is another danger zone. Only in Peru—where documents of the most incriminating nature were abducted from the Cuban Embassy by Cubans, proving a huge conspiracy against the Peruvian Government—has communism been contained, not defeated.

At the moment, you stand tied hand and foot by the very entangling alliances that George Washington warned against. Whilst Soviet Russia conveniently ignores the United Nations and international treaties when it suits her—and gets away with it—you are ensnared in a web which will eventually smother you to death; and which is now being used with diabolical cleverness to stay your hand in your own defense.

The weapons that you have at hand in the international arena lie forgotten by your former Latin American allies. The Rio Treaty and the Caracas Declaration, which provided the means and the force to cast our communism from this hemisphere, are crumbling into dust.

You are being slowly and inexorably surrounded. Most of Europe is gone. Asia is practically gone. The entire west coast of Africa, facing the Atlantic, is going. Latin America is about to go.

It does not take much imagination to see the realization of Lenin's dream when he said, "We shall surround the United States. Without having to fire a shot, it will drop into our hands like a ripe fruit."

If this country is to survive, it must accept not only the responsibilities, but also the risks, of power. And it must come to understand one of the basic laws of power: it must be demonstrated or it must be used. Otherwise, power is nonexistent.

As Americans, you are faced with the greatest challenge that history has ever hurled at you. As Americans, you have always been mortal enemies of tyranny and despotism; of mass executions and mass imprisonment; of the concentration camp and the torture chamber; of viciousness and cruelty and oppression. Time and again you have fought against these things; and now you must fight against them once more.

Yesterday, you called these things Nazism and you fought and won. Today these same things are called communism; and again you must fight and win. For if you do not face the issue squarely, you will go down to inevitable defeat, and the entire world will become prey to the forces of evil.

Your forefathers never wavered, never hesitated, never counted the risks, never considered the odds—and they won. You, their descendants, cannot allow this precious heritage to be destroyed.

The fate of the entire world is at stake. You hold too much of the future of mankind to allow it to slip so heartrendingly from your hands.

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1961]

UNITED STATES TAKES NEW VIEW, PONDERS RECOGNITION OF OUTER MONGOLIA

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The United States has let out the word that it is considering diplomatic recognition of Outer Mongolia, an Asian Communist state that has claimed to be independent since 1924, and which is best known here as the former place of exile for long-time Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov.

A formal approach to Ulan Bator, capital of the country, which is supposed to have about one million inhabitants, will be made through Moscow.

If diplomatic relations are agreed upon, the United States is expected to follow this up later on by approving Outer Mongolian membership in the United Nations.

There is more to this whole business than meets the naked eye, however. It is an interesting tale of changing attitudes in Washington.

To go back in history, Outer Mongolia, a land of Buddhist Lamaism that is primarily agricultural, includes the bulk of the Gobi Desert and has served as a buffer between China and Soviet Siberia.

At the end of World War II, Chiang Kai-shek, then the boss of China, agreed to its independence. But China has always felt that Mongolia was as much a part of its realm to the north as is Tibet to the south.

This feeling applies to Red China as well as to Chiang's China. Nonetheless, the People's Republic of Mongolia, which is its official designation, began as a Soviet puppet and today remains in the Soviet sphere, not the Red Chinese. But Peiping has begun to give it economic aid, and there is considerable belief here that Outer Mongolia represents one of the friction points between Moscow and Peiping.

In the current issue of Foreign Affairs, one of President Kennedy's preinaugural foreign policy advisers, Zbigniew Brezezinski of Columbia University's Russian Institute, suggests that American diplomatic recognition of Outer Mongolia could contribute to the further growth of the diversity which has developed within the Communist camp.

Recognition, he contends, would encourage "the growth of a sense of independent statehood which almost certainly would lead to more assertive nationalism." In addition, it would give the United States a listening post in the heart of central Asia.

In fact, the Administration has such thoughts in mind today. Although there were Soviet feelers during the Eisenhower Administration about recognition, the United States in the past rejected the idea and refused to approve U.N. membership. In addition, Nationalist China vetoed Outer Mongolian membership when the Soviets tried to get into the U.N. in one of the package deals.

The occasion for the new move was a recent Soviet proposal in the Security Council to link membership for Outer Mongolia with that of Mauretania, a newly independent African nation. The Soviet Union last year vetoed Mauretanian membership on the plea of neighboring Morocco, which claims its territory, but the veto offended other African nations. Moscow quite obviously would like to get off the hook.

What the United States is now proposing is this: If Outer Mongolia will agree to exchange diplomatic missions, and to let an American mission operate under reasonable conditions in Ulan Bator, then the United States will approve U.N. membership.

Nationalist China could, of course, again veto Outer Mongolian membership. But since the Nationalists now have their backs to the wall as far as holding their own U.N. seat is concerned, there is some feeling they might let this one pass in hopes of holding some votes they themselves will need next fall.

The Outer Mongolian membership issue will be up again soon in the Security Council. But the United States will not approve until after diplomatic recognition is worked out—and tried out. That could take some months.

This U.S. initiative is indicative that Washington thinking about the Sino-Soviet bloc and about Communist Asia is going through some changes. There was some worry lest the move be interpreted as a forerunner of a changed attitude toward Red China itself, but officials here say flatly that is not the case.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article referred to by Mr. BRUCE in his remarks and an address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE SPACE AGE CHALLENGE TO RADIO AND TELEVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, a clarion call to arms was sounded last week before the 39th annual convention of the National Association of Broadcasters.

Newton F. Minow, the new chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, sounded that call in a courageous address to the convention here of the National Association of Broadcasters.

I arise now to compliment Chairman Minow, and to pledge to him my vigorous support of his courageous desire to help radio and television better serve the public interest.

These great media, particularly television, today face a grave challenge. Embodied in that challenge is a responsibility which very well may bear upon the survival of this Nation and its sister democracies in the titanic struggle against Communist oppression. Chairman Minow has laid that challenge and that responsibility before the broadcasters in very clear terms.

In the absence of a tragic nuclear war which I am sure all mankind hopes will never occur, television might well be the weapon with which the free world eventually wins the cold war.

I am convinced that television has the potential to be that weapon. Whether we capitalize effectively upon that potential will depend primarily upon how much spiritual force we put into the American television which the world will see in the age of space communications.

As a member of the space committee, I know that space technology soon will revolutionize communications; it will make worldwide television and radio a dramatic reality.

The day will be coming soon when our culture will parade competitively, and quite literally, before the entire world. The most remote and backward villages

of the most underdeveloped lands will be able, through the advances of space communications, to look in upon American life—and upon Soviet life, too—simply by flicking dials of their television sets.

Bedouin tribes in Arabia already have transistor radios, and can tune in programs from either side of the Iron Curtain. Some of the underdeveloped nations of Africa are planning extensive and elaborate use of television as an educational tool, to greatly accelerate their leap into the 20th century.

Will that leap veer in the direction of the free world, or in the direction of communistic despotism?

Our broadcasters very well could provide the answer. And that answer represents the great challenge which confronts them.

Foresight should tell us that through global broadcasting, nations will forge cultural bonds which will be far stronger, and far more conducive to peace, than any ties we have forged in the past, or are now forging, through trade, through treaties, and through cultural exchanges.

Judging from the current quality and content of our radio and television, I am not satisfied that the broadcasters are ready for this challenge—or are, as yet, recognizing the challenge and facing it.

Chairman Minow is not satisfied, either. He told the broadcasters' convention, and I quote:

With chaos in Laos and the Congo aflame, with Communist tyranny on our Caribbean doorstep and relentless pressure on our Atlantic alliance, with social and economic problems at home of the gravest nature, yes, and with technological knowledge that makes it possible, as our President has said, not only to destroy our world but to destroy poverty around the world—in a time of peril and opportunity, the old complacent, unbalanced fare of action-adventure and situation comedies is simply not good enough.

Your industry possesses the most powerful voice in America. It has an inescapable duty to make that voice ring with intelligence and with leadership. In a few years, this exciting industry has grown from a novelty to an instrument of overwhelming impact on the American people. It should be making ready for the kind of leadership that newspapers and magazines assumed years ago, to make our people aware of their world.

Ours has been called the jet age, the atomic age, the space age. It is also, I submit, the television age. And just as history will decide whether the leaders of today's world employed the atom to destroy the world or rebuild it for mankind's benefit, so will history decide whether today's broadcasters employed their powerful voice to enrich the people or debase them.

I have watched very little television in recent years. I have seen enough of it, and do see enough of it, though, to convince me that it has not improved very much, if it has improved at all, in satisfying the national need and the national appetite for programs cultural and educational.

What a tragedy it is that these twin marvels of modern technology, radio and television, have fallen so miserably short of their potential for good.

They could have been powerful civilizing agencies, instrumentalities of culture, of education, of inspiration, resounding with the spirit and the philosophy and the institutions of liberty.

They could have been winged messengers of enlightenment, carrying into the American home the best in music, in literature, in art, in philosophy, in languages, in history, in the social sciences, in the physical sciences.

They could have been stimulators of culture, purveyors of refinement, ambassadors of good will among our global neighbors.

They could have been powerful forces for good in every home and in every community, educators of our youth, turning the minds and feet of our children from the paths of delinquency rather than possibly into them.

My dissatisfaction is intensified by the realization that these media have not been these things, and yet might become these things.

In the spirit of fairness, I willingly recognize that there are good programs. It is possible by careful selection to get symphonic music, informative lectures, and educational films. In the coverage and interpretation of the news, television and radio have made commendable progress.

But making due allowances for these occasional islands of culture, the bulk of our broadcast activity is a dismal bill of fare.

Chairman Minow shares these feelings, for his message observes, and I quote:

Like everybody, I wear more than one hat. I am the Chairman of the FCC. I am also a television viewer and the husband and father of other television viewers. I have seen a great many television programs that seemed to me eminently worthwhile, and I am not talking about the much bemoaned good old days of Playhouse 90 and Studio One.

I am talking about this past season. Some were wonderfully entertaining, such as the Fabulous Fifties, the Fred Astaire Show, and the Bing Crosby Special; some were dramatic and moving, such as Conrad's Victory and Twilight Zone; some were marvelously informative, such as the Nation's Future, CBS Reports, and the Valiant Years. I could list many more—programs that I am sure everyone here felt enriched his own life and that of his family. When television is good, nothing—not the theater, not the magazines or newspapers—nothing is better.

But when television is bad, nothing is worse. I invite you to sit down in front of your television set when your station goes on the air and stay there without a book, magazine, newspaper, profit and loss sheet, or rating book to district you—and keep your eyes glued to that set until the station signs off. I can assure you that you will observe a vast wasteland.

You will see a procession of game shows, violence, audience participation shows, formula comedies about totally unbelievable families, blood and thunder, mayhem, violence, sadism, murder, western badmen, western goodmen, private eyes, gangsters, more violence, and cartoons. And, endlessly, commercials—many screaming, cajoling, and offending. And most of all, boredom. True, you will see a few things you will enjoy. But they will be very, very few. And if you think I exaggerate, try it.

Is there one person in this room who claims that broadcasting can't do better?

Well, a glance at next season's proposed programing can give us little heart. Of 73½ hours of prime evening time, the networks have tentatively scheduled 59 hours to categories of "action-adventure," situation comedy, variety, quiz, and movies.

Is there one network president in this room who claims he can't do better?

Well, is there at least one network president who believes that the other networks can't do better?

The challenge of the space age and the great conflict of ideologies which presently engages us makes it increasingly clear that radio and television are affected with the public interest. They bear a grave responsibility.

I strongly believe that they can, and must, make to national strength and security the great contribution they are capable of making.

If democracy is to survive, every enterprise, every interest, which has a great investiture of power must successfully bear the great responsibility which attends that power. This is abundantly true of radio and television. They have great power and, therefore, bear a great trust.

The magnitude of this power was graphically illustrated by Mr. Minow when he pointed out that our children spend as much time now watching television as they spend in school. He started out by saying, and I quote:

Your license lets you use the public's airwaves as trustees for 180 million Americans. The public is your beneficiary. If you want to stay on as trustees, you must deliver a decent return to the public—not only to your stockholders.

I am in Washington to help broadcasting, not to harm it; to strengthen it, not weaken it; to reward it, not punish it; to encourage it, not threaten it; to stimulate it, not censor it.

Above all, I am here to uphold and protect the public interest.

What do we mean by "the public interest"? Some say the public interest is merely what interests the public.

I disagree.

So does your distinguished president, Governor Collins. In a recent speech he said, "Broadcasting to serve the public interest, must have a soul and a conscience, a burning desire to excel, as well as to sell; the urge to build the character, citizenship and intellectual stature of people, as well as to expand the gross national product. * * * By no means do I imply that broadcasters disregard the public interest. * * * But a much better job can be done, and should be done."

And he later observed:

The best estimates indicate that during the hours of 5 to 6 p.m. 60 percent of your audience is composed of children under 12. And most young children today, believe it or not, spend as much time watching television as they do in the schoolroom. I repeat—let that sink in—most young children today spend as much time watching television as they do in the schoolroom. It used to be said that there were three great influences on a child: home, school, and church. Today, there is a fourth great influence, and you ladies and gentlemen control it.

If parents, teachers, and ministers conducted their responsibilities by following the ratings, children would have a steady diet of ice cream, school holidays, and no Sunday school. What about your responsibilities?

Is there no room on television to teach, to inform, to uplift, to stretch, to enlarge the capacities of our children? Is there no room for programs deepening their understanding of children in other lands? Is there no room for a children's news show explaining some-

thing about the world to them at their level of understanding? Is there no room for reading the great literature of the past, teaching them the great traditions of freedom? There are some fine children's shows, but they are drowned out in the massive doses of cartoons, violence, and more violence. Must these be your trademarks? Search your consciences and see if you cannot offer more to your young beneficiaries whose future you guide so many hours each and every day.

Because I am convinced that these media, weak or strong, will forge one of the links of our survival, I have today called upon the Space Committee to schedule hearings for the purpose of more fully evaluating our progress in the technology of space communications.

I realize, of course, that this technology is not directly related to my concern over the nature and quality of the programs which one day soon will be carried to other nations through space instruments.

The content of the programs is one problem; the science of transmitting them is another.

On the first, I want to conclude by saying that I share Chairman Minow's desires and objectives. I have stated my concern forcefully in the interest of being constructive, in the hope of stimulating broader and greater awareness of the problem, of the challenge, and of the trust and responsibility involved.

On the second, I want to make certain that we profit from our bitter and embarrassing experience of the space gap.

This country cannot afford a communications gap.

I am satisfied that this country presently leads the world in television and radio technology. I do not want to see us lose that lead through indifference, or through the inadequacy of our research program.

Worldwide broadcasting in radio and television will give our people a golden opportunity to show all the world that our culture and our way of life is, in fact, superior to that of the Communists.

I have called the broadcasters to measure up to this opportunity. I also want to make certain our technology measures up to it.

In my judgment, the consequences of a possible communications gap could be devastating, and certainly more lasting in their impact on global audiences, than have been the consequences of the present space gap.

Mr BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRUCE. Personally, I congratulate the gentleman on his concern, and I believe it is the same honest and sincere concern that I have, with the question of how radio and television should be used within the free enterprise system. Will the gentleman give me a definition of what is good programing?

Mr. KING of Utah. I have tried in my brief discussion to sketch out some areas which I think would certainly be included in the definition of good programing. I would think that programs should be calculated to edify, to enrich, and to enlighten.

Mr. BRUCE. How do you determine these things?

Mr. KING of Utah. If the gentleman is asking for a formula having mathematical preciseness, of course I am not in a position to give it. I think that people generally are agreed, however, that certain basic standards of excellence are generally necessary to constitute good programing.

Mr. BRUCE. Is it not true, if the gentleman will yield, that he quoted Mr. Minow as saying that which interests the public is not necessarily the yardstick, and have you not just in your statement said that which interests the public is the yardstick? I ask you these things, sir, because I spent 19 years prior to coming here in the broadcasting industry. We have tried, and I think generally in the broadcasting industry, many of us, to do an outstanding public service job. I think there is great concern. I attended that National Association of Broadcasters meeting and in contrast to your sincere belief in support of Mr. Minow, I would have to say—never in my observation with 10 years in radio news and 19 years in the broadcasting industry have I ever heard such an arrogant, overbearing violation of the concept of the American system as was epitomized by Mr. Minow's presentation. I know men in that audience who were willing supporters of this administration that is in power who were literally shocked beyond expression at the tone of the address by Mr. Minow because it carried with it the implication that the FCC at this point for the first time is going to evaluate on a new basis of what they think is good for the American people. I say, sir, if we are correctly reading what he says, in spite of his protestations against censorship, there was a clear threat here. Either you get in line with what I think is good or you are going to be in trouble in the reexamination for a license before the FCC. I say that a free broadcasting system and television system even though at times it does not meet its responsibility is far preferable to a Government-controlled broadcasting and radio system that says this is good and this is bad as far as content is concerned. As to discussion programs, you can have terrific discussion programs and you can have terrible discussion programs. When the FCC moves into this area, they are getting into an area of what in its net effect will be censorship and one of the most dangerous areas that it can move into. I would challenge Mr. Minow for a greater clarification of what he said before the National Association of Broadcasters.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. I want to say on that very point that I have heard several statements by some of the editorializing radio and television broadcasters, one in the Washington area, in which he made a similar charge in which he indicated that Mr. Minow was suggesting something like Government supervision or censorship of the spectrum. I do not think that that was suggested by Mr. Minow's remarks. I think what Mr. Minow suggested was that the industry had better tidy itself up and put its programing on a higher scale in order to meet the needs of the American people. He never suggested anything like these gentlemen implied or suggested in their repeated radio and television editorials. I think insofar as they misconstrue and misinterpret to the public the words that were uttered by Mr. Minow that they are doing their observers and their listeners a very, very serious disservice.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I would like to reply myself since the time is mine and is running out.

May I say I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana, and the response of the gentleman from Ohio. My own reactions to the gentleman from Indiana are as follows: I found nothing arrogant in the remarks of Mr. Minow. On the contrary, I found a spirit of freshness—a cleansing influence that I think the fetid atmosphere in which we have been traveling in this field has long needed.

I feel the speech was a landmark of courage. I did not see in it any threat of censorship, and Mr. Minow very specifically on two occasions in his speech made it clear that he was not coming, or speaking, in a spirit of censorship. Mr. Minow made it abundantly clear, as I read the entire text of his speech, that by any standard, not just his standard, nor the Government's standard, but by all reasonable standards—the standards of all reasonable viewers of television, programing had fallen quite short of its great potential for good; that where programs could generally have been elevating they had in general not been elevating. The most that can be said of many of them is that they are entertaining, but appeal to the very lowest level of intellectuality. Other programs are positively injurious, especially to immature minds. No reasonable person could question this statement. Mr. Minow was not saying anything that we do not all know, although few of us have the courage to put our ideas into words as he did.

Let me speak, for a moment, for myself. My children—I have several, one 7, one 5, one 4, one 2—and other children go to the television between the hours of 5 and 6; and I can state categorically that there is nothing on any of the channels available to them that in my opinion is even worth looking at.

Television could be of great service to my children, and to all children. It could inspire them, it could instruct them, it could open up their minds to the great mysteries of creation that lie before us, and initiate them into the resplendent world of science, but instead my children are forced to drag their way through tedious dreary shows which contribute nothing to their improvement. They are absolutely without content.

So I concur with the conclusions of Mr. Minow. I agree that we are not looking for censorship. I agree that what we are looking for is leadership

which will serve to encourage. No doubt the public also must share some of the blame.

The purpose of my speech is not necessarily to point the finger of blame at any one group; its purpose is to point out that everyone: producers, viewers, the public, and everybody who has any connection with television, has been getting along during the last 10 years on much less than the best. Perhaps this is the time for us—all of us—to raise our sights and accept the great challenge that is before us. Space communication is practically upon us. In the next 6 to 8 years it will be a commonplace. We will have communication systems extending to the entire world, which will make it possible for receivers all over the world and particularly in the underdeveloped nations to tune in on our programs. I am suggesting that in light of that great challenge I do not feel that the American producers and viewers have realized the magnitude of this challenge. I believe all of them should raise their sights. One of the difficulties is that the people themselves, the public, may have demanded inferior material. I will not quibble with the gentleman on the fact that the public itself has been asleep. The point is that all of us must accept the challenge; and I, myself, will do everything in my power to join other interested people in making an improvement possible.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I would congratulate the gentleman, for the last statement in particular, that if the public demanded what you would consider and I consider to be inferior programs, they must carry their share of the blame. There is not any actual censorship. We have it in our home. My children do not watch everything on television. I can control that myself. I am afraid that is an individual responsibility.

I would like to get off this point of censorship however, for we are dealing with the renewal of licenses, and if you reread Mr. Minow's speech there is a definite threat that if we do not meet a cultural standard which is rather indefinable, because what is good to one is not good to another, so if you reread Mr. Minow's testimony you must recognize that there is a threat, and you cannot escape the feeling that it was biased.

How do you get this measure of good and bad? That is the area of difficulty, and I am saying, having had experience in the broadcasting field, that license renewal coming up is a threat of censorship when put into the text of Mr. Minow's speech. I talked to these men after that convention. There was complete confusion. There was no guidance. I have been through this, with some of the edicts issued in the past by the FCC. You can get one set of attorneys and ask them, What do they mean? They will tell you one thing. You get another set of attorneys and ask them, What do they mean? They will tell you something else. There are no guidelines that have been established.

Mr. Minow's speech was clearly an idealistic speech, carrying with it the clear threat, If you do not meet the cultural standards something may happen, and his statement that that which interests the public is not good. How do you interpret that into public policy? That is in the realm of censorship.

Mr. KING of Utah. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not question the gentleman's sincerity.

Mr. KING of Utah. I appreciate that, nor do I question the sincerity of the gentleman in his remarks. In passing, I say that each one is entitled to his own opinion. I do not read into the remarks of Mr. Minow the implications that the gentleman has suggested. I read into them, on the contrary, a clarion call to the people, to all interested parties, to raise their standards and to accept this great challenge.

The gentleman from Indiana and I would agree, I suppose, up to this point: It would behoove the public to increase their standards and improve their cultural standards. Perhaps we part company at this point. I would go one step further and say I feel that the broadcasters have a positive duty to show some measure of leadership in this improvement. I do not conceive it to be their responsibility only to mirror public opinion. They have a force and a power in their control that is comparable to that of the atom bomb in the world of physical science, their power being in the world of human thoughts. I feel they are derelict in their duty if all they do is to reflect public opinion. I do not favor censorship, but I do favor the quickening of a strong, lively awareness of their responsibility to show forth some measure of leadership; to show the public that better things are possible with which to satisfy their appetite. If they will assume their responsibility in that spirit, we can move forward without censorship, which none of us want. In the spirit of cooperative effort we can solve the problem, and come up with television programs which are a credit to our culture, and an inspiration to the world.

THE SUCCESS STORY OF AN AMERICAN ENTERPRISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, with things going badly around the world—with confounding, insoluble problems in Laos, Vietnam, Korea, and Cuba—among other places, I want to take this time to say some cheerful things about the free enterprise system. I want to direct your attention to one of the greatest alltime success stories in American business. I want to discuss the ways and means by which an American corporation parlayed a $440,000 investment into a $50 million profit—much of it tax free—at practically no risk.

My story involves the Hanna Mining Corp., the Hanna Smelting Corp.—the M. A. Hanna Co. empire—and its dealings with the American Government.

This story begins in 1943 when the Hanna interests acquired mineral rights on Nickel Mountain, Douglas County, Riddle, Oreg. For almost 10 years this investment lay dormant, undeveloped, and unutilized. The low quality of the ore was deemed commercially unfeasible.

In 1952, at a time of national emergency with the unfortunate trend of the war in Korea, at a time when our prestige in the world was in peril, the Government entered into negotiations with the M. A. Hanna Co. for the production of nickel in the United States.

On January 16, 1953, negotiations were completed and contracts totaling $111 million were entered into between the Defense Materials Procurement Agency of the Federal Government and the Hanna Mining Co., the Hanna Nickel Smelting Co., and the M. A. Hanna Co. of Cleveland. The biggest contract was entered into with the Hanna Mining Co., a Delaware corporation, which was 1 day old, having been incorporated the day before.

Now for a look at the Hanna contracts with the Government—the most ingenius moneymaking device created since the invention of the printing press.

Under the terms of the contract, the Hanna Co. offered up its $440,000 investment in an Oregon mountain to the Federal Government and in exchange got the Government to, first, guarantee the financing of the development of its mineral properties at a cost of $3,800,000, second, build a $22,875,000 smelter to produce ferronickel from the ore, third, advance working capital to operate the smelter in the sum of $3,750,000, and fourth, obtained an option to buy the plant at salvage value at the completion of the contract. The contract further provided that the Government would pay $6 a ton for recovered ore until 125 million pounds of nickel were recovered. Unlike any other contract of this type, the superspecial Hanna contract for the production of nickel was divided into two contracts, the first with the Hanna Mining Co. for the mining of the ore, the other with the Hanna Nickel Smelting Co. for the operation of the smelting process. This was designed to allocate all profits to the mining company and take advantage of the income tax depletion bonanza. The other Hanna gimmick was a provision in the contract which expressly denied Government access to the records of the Hanna Mining Co.

Under these provisions, the private profits of the Hanna Mining Co. in the production of nickel ore under a Federal contract were expressly made to remain as private information. The Government was not even allowed to look into the books to see how much it was taken for. This was not a business contract—it was a backroom concoction in which the Government's representatives were either drugged or blindfolded. At least,

they were not thinking of us taxpayers that day.

The documentary on this act of cruelty to American taxpayers is completely set forth in the April 26, 1961, report of the Comptroller General of the United States. This publication should be required reading for every Member of Congress.

Here are some better quotes of the Comptroller General on the Hanna contract with the Government:

The contracts eliminated practically any risk of loss to the Hanna companies. Under the contract, the Government guaranteed virtually all the contractor's capital investment and provided a market for all the contractor's production at prices which virtually precluded operating losses.

The mining contract was based on estimates submitted by Hanna, prior to actual operation, which indicated a rate of profit of about 90 percent of costs before taxes.

The smelting contract permits Hanna to acquire smelting facilities for $1,700,000 which cost the Government over $22 million.

Changed conditions now indicate that the smelting facilities may have a commercial value for a number of years after the contract expires.

On page 10 of his report, the Comptroller General says:

Under the contract with the Hanna Mining Co., the Government agreed to buy a specified quantity of nickel-bearing ore at a fixed price including profit. Under the contract with the Hanna Nickel Smelting Co., the Government agreed (1) to sell to the smelting company all the ore purchased from the mining company at the same price the Government paid for the ore and (2) to purchase specified quantities of ferronickel produced from the ore at a price which included the cost of smelting and the cost of the ore but which did not include any profit to the smelting company. Therefore, all the profits anticipated under these contractual arrangements were included in the sales prices of the ore paid to the Hanna Mining Co. The GSA negotiation file indicates that this arrangement was made at Hanna's insistence, apparently for income tax purposes. Under this arrangement, a greater depletion allowance is available to the Hanna companies than might be the case if the mining company sold the ore directly to the smelting company. GSA's records indicate that the Government negotiators sought to negotiate one contract to cover both the mining and the smelting operations but that Hanna refused to contract on that basis.

The Hanna Mining Co.—the totally private affair of Hanna under the contract—did a flourishing business. The Hanna Nickel Smelting Co., in which the Government and Hanna were partners, suffered losses in 1956 at which time the company insisted on an increased selling price—a renegotiated contract at even higher taxpayer expense. The selling price of ferronickel to the Government was increased on November 8, 1957, and the smelting company recovered all losses, and began profitable operations.

According to the Comptroller General, there are indications today that the Hanna Nickel Smelter may have a useful economic life for perhaps 15 or 20 more years. The plant is commercially producing nickel at a cost of 60 cents per pound—formerly sold to the Government at double that price. The capital advanced for the smelter has been completely amortized. The ore reserves are estimated to last another 20 years.

From here on, Hanna has a free smelter, a mine fully developed at taxpayer expense, a publicly subsidized opportunity to compete and utilize mineral rights which were otherwise practically worthless. Private enterprise is wonderful when the Government puts you into business, guarantees a fat profit, and then provides clear title to property it has built. It could be said that Hanna provided the know-how. It sure did—the know-how to "milk" the taxpayer.

After the injustice of this contract became impossible to suppress, the General Services Administration pleaded with the Hanna corporations to make a payment above its obligation in the contract to cover the economic value of the smelter at the time of takeover. The Hanna reply on October 31, 1960, indicated that it considered the additional value of the smelter as compensation for its operation—as though it had not already been compensated enough.

In view of his substantial holding in the Hanna companies during the negotiation and execution of this contract, it is indeed surprising that Mr. George M. Humphrey, former Secretary of the Treasury, should have permitted this type of contractual dealings with the Government even though he allegedly surrendered his management of company affairs. Prior to his appointment as Secretary of the Treasury, he served as chairman of the board of the M. A. Hanna Co. During his tenure of office, he continued his substantial investment interests and presumably participated in the excessive profits of the Hanna Mining Co. After he resigned from public office on May 28, 1957, he promptly returned to his command post in the Hanna enterprises. It is incredible to believe that he was unaware of the extraordinary features of the Hanna contract with the Government.

The shame of this contract between the Hanna companies and the Government is that it exposes the lust for profits and a complete absence of patriotism. This contract—conceived in greed—is in every respect an un-American document—a treacherous abuse of the free enterprise system which suffers it and gives it life and shelter.

A LANDMARK IN HUMAN RELATIONS: THE MAY 17 SUPREME COURT DECISION ON PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in these often turbulent times of a divided world, when men everywhere are being called upon to choose between freedom or oppression—progress or retrogression—I consider it appropriate to take time out from the business of congressional legislation to praise the May 17, 1954, decision of the U.S. Supreme Court as an important landmark in human relations in America. This notable decision, well known to us all, overruled the separate but equal doctrine and held that "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal," thereby calling for desegregation in the Nation's public schools.

Many might question my designation of this historic Court decision as a landmark in human relations. They might point to the current reports about lack of progress in public school desegregation and maintain that indeed the landmark is barely visible through a thick and rolling fog. I am aware of statistical reports which indicate a slow pace in public school desegregation in some areas of the country. And I would agree that the fact that in the 7 years since the 1954 decision only 777 of a total of 2,839 biracial school districts in some 18 Southern and border States have desegregated is by no means impressive. Moreover, to note that there are still three States—Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina—which have no desegregated school districts is both disheartening and distressing. One might well wonder when the fog will lift and just what hurricanian winds must blow upon this Nation—already faced with pressing educational needs—before free public education, a fundamental to our society, will be fully desegregated in compliance with the Court decision.

And well we know, these affairs are not restricted to our Southern States, though the major problem is there. Those of us who represent the northern areas of this great Nation are all too often aware of similar needs in our own States.

The 1954 Court decision shall not be offset, however, because of little progress in some areas in the implementation of the decision. The fundamental principles of freedom, equality, and justice for all people which the decision underscored a hundredfold cannot be dimmed by regional hesitancy; no more so than the principles of freedom upon which this Nation is founded can be dimmed by any temporary setback we may experience in the present world situation.

There is a need, however, for American people to reaffirm their belief and their efforts on behalf of the goals of our free society. There will be a need, as trying times and situations arise, for a clear declaration of principle and a firmness in purpose and action. Attorney General Robert Kennedy eloquently expounded this thought earlier this month when speaking, at the Law Day exercises of the University of Georgia Law School, he stated:

The time has long since arrived when loyal Americans must measure the impact of their actions beyond the limits of their own towns or States. * * * Fifty percent of the countries in the United Nations are not white; * * * around the world, in Africa, South America, and Asia, people whose skins are a different color than ours are on the move to gain their measure of freedom and liberty.

From the Congo to Cuba, from South Vietnam to Algiers, in India, Brazil, and Iran,

men and women and children are straightening their backs and listening—to evil promises of Communist tyranny and the honorable promises of Anglo-American liberty. And those people will decide not only their future but how the cause of freedom fares in the world.

For on this generation of Americans falls the full burden of proving to the world that we really mean it when we say all men are created free and are equal before the laws. All of us might wish at times that we lived in a more tranquil world, but we don't. And if our times are difficult and perplexing, so are they challenging and filled with opportunity.

The Attorney General showed awareness of the difficulties of change which relate to law and local customs. He pointed out that, "The hardest problems of all in law enforcement are those involving a conflict of law and local customs." Certainly attention must be given to the fact that desegregation of public education has serious impact upon communities which have traditionally maintained separate schools. Yet, awareness of these difficulties of adjustment, which are perhaps commensurate with all social change, should not prevent recognizing when positive steps are being taken by local people and a State to comply with the law; or when no action has been taken; or when there is no indication of movement within the new framework. Whereas we cannot legislate the hearts and minds of men, we can and must remove laws which afford a shield for those who would deny to any man his rights as a citizen.

Ours is a glorious Nation, with a united strength and culture rich with the contributions of a diverse people. There are many goals of our society which are yet to be fully accomplished. But our strivings toward these goals are ceaseless. The goal of free public education in this Nation represents a challenge to society which has never before been undertaken. If we have shortcomings and temporary failures in the accomplishment of this goal, they are perhaps due, in no small manner, to the broadness of the total aim. Segregated schools because of conditions of race present a most serious threat to our American educational goal. Moreover, they promote conditions which are inconsistent with our basic belief in the individual dignity of man.

That the highest Court in the land should consider and proclaim that a segregated system of education is wrong is a landmark in human relations for the Nation. But when the men, women, and young students of the Nation in all communities, towns, metropolitan areas, and States recognize this principle and proclaim it daily through their activities and attitudes—this will not be a landmark, but a shining tower to which all in the world who cherish freedom may look for example and inspiration.

INCOME GAINED AS THE RESULT OF STOCK OPTIONS

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 to prevent the treating of income gained as a result of stock options as capital gains for tax purposes.

Under the provisions of the bill, stock and stock options issued to an individual for services rendered or to be rendered to a corporation or to a parent corporation or to a subsidiary would be treated as earnings and thus subject to taxation as ordinary income. Similarly this bill would provide that stock which is acquired through the exercise of such a stock option would also be taxable as income.

Mr. Speaker, it is grossly unfair that this special privilege has been allowed to exist as long as it has. This system has been used and abused to the point where there is absolutely no justification for its continuation.

The stock option method is quite simple. Under the provisions of section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 the officers of a corporation can grant a restricted stock option to those employees whom the corporation wishes to reward—this at the expense of the shareholders and the taxpaying public.

In 1945 the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the difference between the option price and the market value of the stock at the time when the option was exercised was income and taxable as income.

In 1950 those interested in using the restricted stock-option system succeeded in having legislation passed which overruled the Supreme Court in this matter. That legislation forms the basis of the pertinent part of section 421 referred to earlier.

The executives who benefit from the restricted option generally seek the benefits of increased compensation but without the payment of taxes resulting therefrom. When the option is granted, the option price must usually be within 95 percent of the market value of the stock at the time. Only after the market price goes up, is the option exercised. If the price does not go up, the option does not have to be exercised and invariably it is not exercised or it is revamped. The executive then holds the stock for 6 months so that the profit realized will receive the long-term capital gains tax treatment. The final sale of the stock must be at least 2 years after the option has been granted, but it may be held for many years without being exercised. When finally exercised, of course, it is then that the profit is realized, but no tax is due until the stock is actually sold. If held 6 months the profit is then taxed at capital gains rates.

Thus we have two advantages to the option holder under present law: the exercising of the option itself accrues no taxes and when the gain realized as a result is finally obtained it is taxable as capital gains and not as income. This, even though it is obvious that the privilege was an incident of the compensation arrangement.

The justification given by the corporations for these stock options is that this is the only way they have of keeping their top people. This bill, however, would eliminate the necessity for such bait since all corporations would be subject to the same law and none of them could use the stock option enticement to lure a competitor's employees.

I note that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has introduced a similar measure in the other body—S. 1625. While the two bills seek the same objective, mine goes somewhat further. It will be noted, for example, that in section 2 of my bill the amendment made by section 1 applies in the case of stock issued, and stock options granted, before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the bill with respect to transactions occurring on or after the enactment date.

Under this effective date where the stock option was granted and exercised in the past, but where the stock acquired through such exercise is sold on or after the date of enactment, any gain will be treated as ordinary income and not as capital gains.

Thus my bill contains a completely justified retroactive proviso that is not contained in S. 1625.

It seems fairly clear to me that the restricted stock option is merely a means of increasing the compensation of a favored few employees by a corporation at a low tax rate. I hope that the Congress will act favorably to eliminate this loophole.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. SULLIVAN, for May 18 and 19, on account of official business.

Mrs. HANSEN, for 3 days, May 16, 17, and 22, on account of official business in congressional district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY for 1 hour on Tuesday, May 23, 1961.

Mr. FORD (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) for 20 minutes on Thursday, May 18, 1961.

Mr. RYAN for 10 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Moss and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARSHALL and to include extraneous matter in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole House this afternoon.

Mr. QUIE and to include extraneous materials in the remarks he made on the bill H.R. 7035.

Mr. DOYLE.

Mr. LAIRD (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) to include extraneous matter in his remarks in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HENDERSON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MONAGAN.

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD.

Mr. LANE.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 32. An act for the relief of Jeno Becsey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 68. An act for the relief of Kay Addis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 130. An act for the relief of Ioannis F. Kostakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 219. An act for the relief of Doctor Nobutaka Azuma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 264. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Leong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 268. An act for the relief of Hok Yuen Woo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 294. An act for the relief of Aiko Shinzato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 415. An act for the relief of Margaret Jean Dauel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 441. An act for the relief of Rodopi Statherou (Statheron); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 442. An act for the relief of Aspasia A. Koumbouris (Kumpuris); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 485. An act for the relief of Charles Edward Pifer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 570. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Alonzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 684. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the painting, illumination, and dismantlement of radio towers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 967. An act for the relief of Wong Gar Wah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1073. An act for the relief of Henry Eugene Godderis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1093. An act for the relief of Sze-Foo Chien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1168. An act for the relief of Edward C. Tonsmeire, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1204. An act for the relief of Sirijo Tanfara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1343. An act for the relief of Dr. Tung Hui Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1320. An act for the relief of Edward P. Wall;

H.R. 1329. An act for the relief of Kim Hyoung Geun;

H.R. 1351. An act for the relief of Danica Dopudja;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen;

H.R. 1368. An act for the relief of Maurice Devlin;

H.R. 1397. An act for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell;

H.R. 1424. An act for the relief of Benjamin E. Campbell;

H.R. 1447. An act for the relief of Wladyslaw Figura;

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Mario Menna;

H.R. 1535. An act for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh;

H.R. 1896. An act for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego;

H.R. 2138. An act for the relief of Raymond G. Greenhalgh;

H.R. 2188. An act for the relief of Lt. Matthew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired);

H.R. 2331. An act for the relief of Peggy Loene Morrison;

H.R. 2681. An act for the relief of Terata Kiyoshi Johnston;

H.R. 3498. An act for the relief of William Joseph Vincent; and

H.R. 3842. An act for the relief of James Delbert Hodges.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 18, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

916. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for fiscal year 1962 involving an increase in the amount of $14,278,000 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 163); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

917. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Bureau of the Census to reimburse between its own appropriations"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

918. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

919. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of property management and accounting at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, August 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

920. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Kai Suen Lee, AA-28009, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

921. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case of Gilbert Ochoa, A2302786, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 6845. A bill to amend title 14 of the United States Code to provide for an expansion of the functions of the Coast Guard; without amendment (Rept. No. 403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 546. An act for the relief of In Fil Chung, In Ae Chung, In Sook Chung, and In Ja Chung; without amendment (Rept. No. 396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1064. An act for the relief of Samuel Pisar; without amendment (Rept. No. 397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1620. A bill for the relief of Kejen Pi Corsa; with amendment (Rept. No. 398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1626. A bill for the relief of Wladislaw Konko (Jack Konko); with amendment (Rept. No. 399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1911. A bill for the relief of Ricaredo Bernabe Dela Cena; without amendment (Rept. No. 400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sode Hatta; with amendment (Rept. No. 401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tome Takamoto; without amendment (Rept. No. 402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H.R. 7133. A bill to amend further the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit

Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7134. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 7135. A bill to amend section 6 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide for the deferment of police officers from training and service in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 7136. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for scheduled personal and corporate income tax reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 7137. A bill to assist in expanding and improving community facilities and services for the health care of aged and other persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 7138. A bill to revise the laws relating to depository libraries; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 7139. A bill to supplement and revise the criminal laws prescribing restrictions against conflicts of interest applicable to the executive branch of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 7140. A bill to revise the effective dates of certain increases in compensation granted to employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7141. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that, in the case of stock or stock options issued or granted in whole or in part for services rendered, the gain therefrom shall be treated as ordinary income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H.R. 7142. A bill relating to the application of the terms "gross income from mining" and "ordinary treatment processes normally applied by mine owners or operators in order to obtain the commercially marketable mineral product or products" to certain clays and shale for taxable years beginning before December 14, 1959; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7143. A bill to provide equal rights for all citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 7144. A bill to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MEADER:

H.R. 7145. A bill to permit the construction of certain public works on the Great Lakes for flood control, and for protection from high water levels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7146. A bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effects of acts of Congress on State laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7147. A bill to amend the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 to authorize the reimbursement of owners and tenants of certain real property acquired as additions to the U.S. Capitol Grounds for their moving expenses; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 7148. A bill to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 7149. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BETTS:

H.R. 7150. A bill relating to the application of the terms "gross income from mining" and "ordinary treatment processes normally applied by mine owners or operators in order to obtain the commercially marketable mineral product or products" to certain clays and shale for taxable years beginning before December 14, 1959; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 7151. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the disposal of surplus property to certain welfare agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7152. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State" to provide that the Secretary of State shall manage Ellis Island as a public national memorial to the immigrants to the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 7153. A bill to provide for the acceleration of the land acquisition program for the migratory bird refuges and waterfowl production areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7154. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to regulate the keeping and running at large of dogs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7155. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the Johnstown flood; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TUPPER:

H.R. 7156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for refund to States of certain taxes on distilled spirits and wine destroyed by fire, casualty, or act of God; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 7157. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 7158. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 7159. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act so as to eliminate the exclusion of structures having an excess of 5,000 acre-feet of flood water capacity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 313. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that annual reports should be made by the United Nations with respect to international economic assistance furnished to less developed nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 314. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to instruct the U.S. Mission to the United Nations to seek adoption of proposals penalizing members of the United Nations which are in default in meeting their financial obligations under the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Res. 298. Resolution expressing the continued opposition of the House of Representatives to the admission of the Communist China regime to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H.R. 7160. A bill for the relief of Sarantos Moundroukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 7161. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Katsube; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 7162. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances Elizabeth Sarcone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 7163. A bill for the relief of Ja Han Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H.R. 7164. A bill for the relief of Louis John Rakaczky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 7165. A bill for the relief of Esther Chin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 7166. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stefania Kuderewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 7167. A bill for the relief of Eugenia Wirszubaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 7168. A bill for the relief of Monti Marine Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7169. A bill for the relief of North American Manufacturers Export Associates, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.J. Res. 427. Joint resolution to provide for the payment of a special monetary award to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.J. Res. 428. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to confer a medal on Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Massachusetts Lauds National Commander John E. Erickson, Veterans of World War I, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include part of my remarks delivered at a dinner in honor of John E. Erickson, national commander of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., held under the auspices of the Department of Massachusetts in the town hall in Stoneham, Mass., on Sunday evening, May 14, 1961. Department Commander Edwin Hayden Lombard was toastmaster of the evening:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS J. LANE, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Greetings, in my travels—from barracks to barracks—I have noticed a special spirit that distinguishes the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., from other veterans' groups.

Like them, we are united by shared memories.

And we have our own legislative program.

But more important than these—in some respects—are the strong social ties that transform comradeship into friendship.

This closer relationship is evidenced by the warm welcome that we give to our national commander, John E. Erickson, here in the hometown of Department Commander Edwin H. Lombard.

Stoneham sent many volunteers to serve with the famous 26th Yankee Division. That was one of the first to fight in 1917, and earned one of the best combat records in the American Expeditionary Force.

Stoneham has a long tradition of service for freedom, beginning with the farmers and tradesmen who fought a short distance from here, at Bunker Hill, and Concord and Lexington.

This area is rich in patriotic traditions.

That spirit was exemplified on May 5 of this year. Our neighbor from Derry, N.H., less than 40 miles north of Stoneham, became the world's first true astronaut as he operated the manual controls of the space capsule named "Freedom 7" 115 miles above the earth.

What inspired Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., with pioneering courage?

It was the example of his parents and his community.

His father served in World War I, and World War II.

In the years between and since, he made it a daily custom to fly the American flag outside his home, and outside his downtown business office.

His son grew up as a participant in this moving ritual. Patriotic reverence for the flag, and the ideals that it symbolizes, developed the courage and the faith in freedom that we admire in Commander Shepard.

As veterans of World War I, we feel that we are related in spirit to this brave young officer of the U.S. Navy.

Our active service ended long ago but from that experience we learned a continuing devotion to what is best for our country.

There are some people with no faith in anything but themselves who seize upon the slightest pretext to discredit the veterans and the organizations that represent them.

It was our turn to be the target a short time ago when some newspapers carried the report that the veterans of World War I had spent over $200,000 in lobbying for a separate monthly pension for all veterans of the First World War. This made us out to be "Mr. Big" among all the lobbies.

Our guest of honor, National Commander Erickson, promptly exposed the false charge that our organization had spent more money on lobbying efforts in 1960 than any other of the 283 groups who must report on these activities to the Congress.

As a matter of fact, we had only spent $31,000, including items that did not have to be reported, such as the purchase of office equipment and miscellaneous outlays.

We knew that our organization was growing rapidly, but we also knew that it was not so prosperous that it could spend more money on influencing legislation than the National Association of Manufacturers, for example, or any of the other powerful lobbies.

Although the truth is that we spent $31,000 instead of $200,000 for this purpose, the charge that was subsequently disproved shows that some people on the outside are "jumping the gun" and are apprehensive about the actual progress we are making.

For this growth we give credit to the energetic leadership of Comdr. John E. Erickson.

Last year we had a membership of 170,000.

It is expected that the total will pass the 200,000 mark, by the time of the national convention in September.

In the name of the 67 barracks in Massachusetts with returns still coming in we thank our national commander for his hard work and his success in building up the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

I think that some of his ancestors must have come from Massachusetts, because Commander Erickson typifies the patriotism, the courage, and the determination of the Massachusetts officer of World War I who gave us this battle cry: "The command is forward."

The Late John Cashmore, Borough President of Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the people of Brooklyn have recently suffered a most grievous loss in the death of their beloved borough president and my very dear friend John Cashmore. He died unexpectedly after suffering a heart attack while being driven home from a dinner in Manhattan Sunday evening, May 7. I was present at the dinner and spoke with him there. A few hours later I heard the news of his death over the radio and was tremendously shocked.

His passing is a terrible loss for Brooklyn. John Cashmore was a great borough president, whose heart was with the people and with the borough he served so well. He was president of the borough of Brooklyn for 21 years. He was often referred to as "Mr. Brooklyn" because of his long years of service in the interests of the borough where he was born, raised, and lived all his life.

John Cashmore was born in Brooklyn on June 7, 1895. He attended elementary school, but was forced to go to work at an early age because of the untimely death of his father. He continued his schooling at night, including law courses at New York University. He enlisted in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War I and served in France. He was primarily a businessman and a public official who gave a lifetime of service to his community and to the people, regardless of race, color or creed.

Cashmore's political career began in 1922 when he was elected to the State assembly on the Democratic ticket. Two years later he was elected to the New York City Board of Aldermen, and then was reelected to five successive terms. From 1937 until 1940 he served in the city council, where he became majority leader and vice chairman. When Brooklyn Borough President Raymond V. Ingersoll died in 1940, Cashmore was elected as his successor and he has served in that office since then. He was reelected in 1941, 1945, 1949, 1953, and 1957. He had become so popular and beloved by all segments of Brooklyn's 3 million population that in the last two campaigns the Republicans supported him, too.

Cashmore's only defeat for public office took place in 1952 when he was nominated for the U.S. Senate against the Republican incumbent Senator Irving M. Ives. He often ran far ahead of the party and on one occasion received 33,000 more votes in Brooklyn than the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

His funeral on Thursday, May 11, was attended by many hundreds of people from all walks of life, including a group of more than 200 honorary pallbearers led by Mayor Wagner of New York. The group also included all Members of Congress from Brooklyn, 22 State assemblymen, 9 State senators, members of the city's board of estimate, and many other city and borough officials. He is survived by his widow Edythe, to whom he was happily married since 1926, and a son James and his family.

John Cashmore's death will be deeply felt in Brooklyn. He was dedicated to our borough and to its betterment. He was a distinguished citizen, an able leader, and a devoted public servant. He was a man who inspired great loyalty in all those who came in contact with him, and he returned the same loyalty. It is often said that Brooklyn is more than just a place—it is a state of mind. John Cashmore had a leading role in creating that state of mind in the 21

years that he served as its borough president. The people of Brooklyn will long remember him.

I extend my condolences to his widow and to his son. May the good name that he leaves behind serve as a consolation to them in this hour of their great bereavement.

The Ill-Considered Treatment of Farmer Byler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and appalled at the recent arbitrary and confiscatory act of the Internal Revenue Service in seizing three horses of an Amish farmer in Pennsylvania just at spring planting time.

I am referring to the case of Valentine Y. Byler, of New Wilmington, Pa., who was about to start his plowing when the Government took his horses and sold them at an auction to satisfy his delinquent social security payments.

Taking this man's horses at plowing time is tantamount to removing his means of livelihood. The cruelty of the act is further compounded by the fact that Farmer Byler's net annual income is reported at only $1,864 and he supports his wife, four children, and 83-year-old mother.

We still have freedom of religion in this country, and the Amish sect does not believe in insurance of any kind. By merely following his religious beliefs that social security is a form of insurance, this frugal, peace-loving farmer has been deprived of his ability to provide for himself and his family.

Only through the generosity of his neighbors and friends, who have donated from their meager savings to buy him new horses, has Byler been able to continue his farming pursuits.

I am not alone in my indignation over this harsh treatment. Letters from my friends in the Sixth District of Indiana indicate a strong public repugnance for the Internal Revenue Service's act.

One letter stated, in part—

Why can't they let these (Amish) people alone? They are the only ones in the world who don't have their hands held out for a handout from our Government. They want to get along on their own and we should certainly help them.

The letter continues—

This is the most picayune, despicable thing our Government has ever done. Can't you find someone who will crack down on the Internal Revenue Service and make them use a little commonsense?

One of the most respected jurists in Indiana protested the IRS action. He wrote, in part—

I demand the conscience of Congress and the President awaken. Pass a law exempting men and women from social security if they please. Likewise, get busy and amend the law so that Federal hatchetmen will have to go into court and get an order before confiscating 100 percent of a person's property or salary.

I join with these and other outraged Hoosiers in protesting this ill-considered, oppressive, and stringent treatment of Farmer Byler.

Farmers Home Administration Operating Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I share with all of my fellow Members of both parties, those representing urban districts as well as those of us representing predominantly rural areas, a deep feeling of concern about the cost-price squeeze in which our farm families are caught. As a result of rising costs on the one hand and declining prices of farm products on the other, many farm families have exhausted their capital and credit.

The Farmers Home Administration operating loan program has provided the credit to stave off bankruptcy for many thousands of farm families but the unprecedented demand for this type of credit, which is available only when other normal credit resources are exhausted, has depleted the funds available to the Farmers Home Administration for making these loans.

Recently, I addressed a letter to Mr. John Baker, Director, Agricultural Credit Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, to inquire as to the status of the funds available for this purpose. In order that my colleagues may have the benefit of the reply to this inquiry, I would like to include as part of these remarks my letter to Mr. Baker and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's reply thereto:

MR. JOHN BAKER,
Director, Agricultural Credit Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BAKER: I am concerned about the possibility that the very heavy demand by farmers for operating credit from the Farmers Home Administration may exceed the funds available.

Since FHA operating loans are available only to growers who are unable to obtain needed credit elsewhere it would be most unfortunate if farmers were forced into bankruptcy because of unavailability of this kind of credit. This would be even more distressing in view of the hope that the income from farming is on the uptrend.

In this connection I noted Secretary Freeman's recent statement that to the extent that farm loan policies and available funds can prevent it, no qualified farmer will be required to give up farming because of his inability to finance his 1961 operations.

I am concerned, however, about the phrase "to the extent that farm loan policies and available funds can prevent." I would appreciate it, therefore, if you will advise me as to the amount of operating loan funds now available for loans to new applicants, and also your best estimate as to when these funds will be exhausted. If your estimate is that the funds will be inadequate, I would also appreciate being advised the amount of additional funds that you estimate will be required to meet the needs for this kind of credit during the remainder of this fiscal year.

In addition, I would appreciate being advised as to the amount of funds which you estimate will be needed to meet this type of credit need for fiscal 1962, and how that amount compares with the amount requested in the administration's budget.

Relative to the phrase "farm loan policies" in Secretary Freeman's statement, I would appreciate your comment on any anticipated changes in the lending policies which have a bearing on the operating loan funds which will be needed for 1962.

Sincerely yours,
FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 11, 1961.

Hon. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STUBBLEFIELD: This will acknowledge your letter of April 11 concerning the Farmers Home Administration operating loan program.

In the fourth paragraph of your letter you requested us to advise you as to the present status of operating loan funds and the amount of additional funds that would be needed for the remainder of the fiscal year. As you know, the Department made available in February an additional $35 million for operating loans from the contingency fund authorized by the Congress. This was the full amount remaining in that fund for the 1961 fiscal year. As a result of this increase, the amount available for operating loans for the 1961 fiscal year totaled $232,100,000. During the 1960 fiscal year $197,100,000 was used for operating loans.

Even though additional funds have been made available for operating loans this year, the funds for initial loans are now nearly exhausted. Thirty-four States have already discontinued processing initial operating loans due to the lack of funds. The remaining States also will find it necessary to discontinue processing initial loans in the near future. A limited amount of operating loan funds has been reserved to meet the subsequent loan needs of indebted borrowers for the remainder of this fiscal year. This is necessary in order to protect the interests of both the borrower and the Government by enabling the borrower to continue with his farming operations.

There has been a substantial increase in the applications for initial operating loans during the 1961 fiscal year. Such applications were up approximately 21 percent for the fiscal year by the end of March as compared to last year. Applications received during the month of March in 1961 were 70 percent greater than during March of 1960. Many other agricultural lenders also have experienced a similar increase in demand for credit from farmers this year. Many factors are involved in this increased demand. The major ones seem to be the high cost of farm inputs, the narrow margin between income and expenses, the increased mechanization required on farms, and the need for making major adjustments and improvements in farm operations in order to assure a profitable return.

With respect to your question concerning expanded credit policies, we wish to advise you that one of the factors in the increased demand for Farmers Home Administration operating loans was the expansion of the agency's credit policies in March of 1961. This was done to make credit available to more small farmers who needed such assistance to continue their farming operations in 1961. This policy should be continued

next year and will further increase the demand for operating loans during the 1962 fiscal year.

The substantial increase in applications for operating loans and the recent estimates received from field offices indicate that it might require up to $20 million in additional funds to meet the demand for these loans during the remainder of the 1961 fiscal year.

You raised a question in your letter with respect to the amount of operating loan funds which will be needed for the 1962 fiscal year. The estimates referred to above, along with the accelerated trend in applications, indicate that it may require $300 million or more to meet the need for operating loans during the 1962 fiscal year The budget of the previous administration had recommended a total of only $160 million for operating loans for 1962. When the present administration took office, a thorough review was made of the need for loan funds for Farmers Home Administration programs as well as the need for funds for other programs of the Government. The President submitted a budget amendment on March 20, 1961, in House Document No. 112, recommending an additional $72,100,000 for operating loans for 1962, or a total of $232,100,000. In view of the needs of other high priority programs, and the competition for limited budgetary resources, the President did not consider it possible to request all the funds proposed by the Farmers Home Administration. However, budgetary needs and resources are under frequent review, and I am sure that if the President finds it possible to recommend additional funds for loans he will do so.

We appreciate your interest in the activities of the Farmers Home Administration. Please be assured that we are interested in meeting the credit needs of qualified applicants to the maximum extent possible under the authorities and resources available through the Department.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN.
Secretary.

Foreign-Made Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress a statement written by Mr. Thurman M. Nelson, president of Local No. 5, United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America, from Shreveport, La. This statement refers to the flood of foreign glass which is being imported into this country.

On March 14, I appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission, urging that this Commission take immediate action in further curbing the imports of foregn glass made by the low-paid workers in foreign countries at this time. I thought the reception given to me and others by the U.S. Tariff Commission was excellent and I was buoyed up with the thought that the Commission would give the glass people throughout the country a quick decision. Months have gone by since then and no decision has come from the Tariff Commission. In the meantime, conditions in this country in the glass industry have become more acute. Foreign-made glass continues to pour into this country in competition with glass made by American workmen.

Within my own home city of Shreveport, La., there is a large glass factory, owned by Libbey-Owens-Ford. Hundreds of workers are employed in this industry. They are outstanding citizens with reputations for paying their bills, supporting local civic projects, and rearing their families in this community as American citizens should do. I want to join with others who are working toward the reducing of foreign-made glass, in support of these people. They are fine citizens and they should have our active and aggressive support.

Before the glass industry reaches such a point that it may have to close the doors of many of its plants, I make another appeal to the Tariff Commission to make an early decision on the request submitted to it for the reduction of foreign-made glass in competition with our own products.

This statement is as follows:

On March 14, 15, and 16, 1961, the U.S. Tariff Commission held escape clause hearings concerning the imports of window glass from abroad.

Since the imports of window glass ran 425 million square feet in 1959 and approximately 354 million square feet in 1960, the domestic industry finds itself reeling under the impact.

Other than the Libby-Owens-Ford Window Glass Plant in Shreveport, La., a city of some 175,000, there is very little industry as this is an oil and gas center. The glass industry is known as a "family" industry and we have second and third generations of numerous families employed in the Shreveport plant.

This fact in itself illustrates that a glass worker would be very much out of place in any other industrial plant even if Shreveport were an industry city.

We have made a plea to the U.S. Tariff Commission through our international office for relief through the establishment of quotas as outlined in section 7 of the trade agreements legislation. We are therefore very prayerful that this relief will be granted so that this old American industry can continue to be enjoyed by the present workers and the glassworkers of the future.

If the U.S. Tariff Commission recommends relief for our glass industry, we hope and pray that you will give it your most serious consideration.

Respectfully yours,

THURMAN M. NELSON,
President, Local No. 5, United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America, AFL–CIO.

Results of a Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a questionnaire on nine important legislative matters which I have recently completed and tabulated.

The questionnaire was sent to approximately 7,350 residents of the Fifth Congressional District and drew a response of more than 1,373 replies. This response of more than 18.5 percent was highly gratifying to me and indicates a responsible interest in Federal legislation on the part of Conecticut Fifth District residents. In many instances, those who completed the questionnaire supplemented the form with lengthy letters and commentaries.

The questionnaire was not printed at Government expense and those who returned it affixed their own postage. One resident of Winsted, Conn., who remained anonymous sent me $2 with his questionnaire making the offering as "my mite toward sharing the expense" and asking for more opinion surveys.

A New Milford resident sent me a check to help share the cost of the survey which I returned with a note of thanks.

The nine questions included in the questionnaire were concerned with issues that touch on the lives of all of us and it was because of this that I sought a representative cross section of opinion from the people of the Fifth Congressional District.

After the initial mailing, there were many requests received for the questionnaire and actually returns are still coming into my office. The survey included questions concerning Federal aid to education, health protection for people over 65 years of age, import tariffs, regulation of drug prices, Federal aid to depressed areas, nuclear weapon testing, foreign aid appropriation, recognition of Red China, and the length and cost of presidential election campaigns.

While overwhelming support was shown in favor of Federal aid to education, and for school construction, there was a division of opinion on the question of aid for increasing teachers' salaries; and the score was almost 3 to 1 in opposition to aid for private schools.

A heavy vote was registered in favor of legislation to provide health protection for people over 65 years old, under social security. Protection from low-cost imports was advocated, either by quota or by higher tariffs, in preference to the present system. Government control or regulation of drug prices drew a 2 to 1 affirmative vote, and there was an even stronger expression of opinion in favor of Federal aid to depressed areas, which has recently been enacted into law.

By a score of more than 2 to 1, Fifth District residents would support the resumption of nuclear weapons testing, with or without agreement on effective inspection and control. And while they would favor reductions in foreign aid appropriations, they placed higher emphasis on the curtailment of military aid and split about even on the question of economic aid.

I have introduced legislation to curtail the cost and time of presidential campaigns. Fifth District residents agreed by a vote of 1,096 to 232, with 45 uncommitted, that presidential campaigns "are too long and too costly in time, money, and human energy."

In many instances comments on other pending legislation were written in the margins of the questionnaire. Among these were: "I favor withholdings on savings, and so forth. There is too much money being spent." One who identified himself as "just an old vet" urged $150 pension a month for all veterans at 65 and no less than 50-percent disability allowance for all World War I service-connected compensation claimants. There was a request for more Government curbs on unions. One wrote, "May God give you strength to do the right."

Other quotes from letters returned with questionnaires:

Goshen:

I do not think that Government can increasingly relieve the individual of his responsibilities and his self-reliance without also relieving him of his self-respect and his worth to himself and to others.

Waterbury:

I think the less we depend on Federal help the better we will be. I disagree with levying taxes to send things over to foreign countries. It is my experience that if you start helping or supporting someone and then you cease doing so, all you have done becomes a waster.

Watertown:

So far the Government seems to be hamstrung in its struggle to cope with Mr. Hoffa; I hope it will find some way to reverse the trend effectively.

Naugatuck:

I hope Congress will support the President on the proposals he has made to date.

Thomaston:

I am sure these questionnaires will remind more people as to their duty as Americans.

New Milford:

Perhaps if we applied some commonsense approaches to our problems, this country of ours would not be in the dire straits it is. We have spent billions all over the world and all over the world people are taking our dollars and stabbing us at the same time.

Derby:

If "low-cost imports" means materials may be bought inexpensively from foreign nations and in turn sold inexpensively to our own public we must have much to gain by low-cost imports.

Bridgewater:

Your questionnaire is a good idea. I'd been intending to write to you anyway, so I'll enclose it in this letter.

Canaan:

Federal control of drug prices as such seems to me hardly proper. But proceedings could be taken against collusive pricing under antitrust laws. Some drug prices seem to me much too high.

Waterbury:

I hope you will consider the results of this questionnaire merely as a guide to your thinking and continue to exercise your own good judgment on what is good for the district.

Warren:

In addition to my answers on the enclosed card I am opposed to all forms of paternalism in government, and the age 65 rather young to become a charge on the Government for aid of any kind.

Derby:

I, for one, as a citizen of this country, would like to see a more forceful attitude taken toward any would-be aggressor. Also to stop apologizing to the world for every move we make. We need a positive attitude. For myself, this is my country, right or wrong.

Seymour:

The strength of this Nation lies in the ability of its people to care for themselves. Don't penalize those who would and do care for themselves by taxing them to support others who will not meet their own responsibilities.

Ansonia:

Foreign labor costs are presently undermining our economy in many lines of industry. I work for a heavy machinery manufacturer who has suffered from loss of orders to West German manufacturers. The present system is inadequate and I feel a higher tariff would not be the solution.

Warren:

The big change needed on the New Frontier is the change in social security first. Amend our present social security law or scrap it and start with an up-to-date pension system. Enact a pension law which would cover every American citizen of retirement age, regardless of the amount of money they have paid into the fund.

Watertown:

We both favor continued economic aid to the underdeveloped countries. I do think we should be more careful to see the aid reaches those we want to help rather than line the pockets of the few. I wish we might give in a more generous spirit. We seem to haggle so over things.

Thomaston:

I would be presumptuous, indeed, to express an opinion on the resumption of testing of nuclear weapons. There is no question facing humanity today that transcends control of nuclear power. I believe that this is a decision that will have to be made by more knowledgeable and wiser heads than mine.

Bridgewater:

Your questionnaire impresses this writer as an extremely worthwhile method for making democracy work. It is, I think the first such communication I have ever received from one of my Representatives.

Wolcott:

Since the need for schools is so great, nothing should impede the construction and expansion of same. Private and parochial school assistance should not be considered presently since the subject is too controversial. However, we should consider the latters' needs later.

Torringford:

Since we are virtually supporting the free world, might we propose a world tax on these nations and then disperse payments for their support. Those that don't pay—no support, i.e., Yugoslavia, etc.

The survey report has been given wide coverage by the newspapers and the radio stations in my district and I call it to the attention of my colleagues with my own comment that it will be of great assistance to me in the consideration of major legislative measures pending in the Congress. I was genuinely impressed with the interest and knowledge in legislative matters displayed by so many residents of my district. Their reaction to the questionnaire and to my report on its results has been so favorable and receptive that I am making preparations for a future endeavor to organize similar public opinion surveys on an even larger scale.

The following is a breakdown of the results of the questionnaire:

Results of questionnaire

	Yes	No	Uncommitted
1. Do you favor Federal aid to elementary education?	900	405	68
For school construction?	954	315	104
For increasing teachers' salaries?	581	573	219
For private schools?	277	966	30
2. Do you favor legislation which would provide health protection for people over 65 years of age?	1,160	178	35
If so, should it be under social security system?	859	260	254
3. Do you favor protection from low-cost imports?	1,069	173	131
By higher tariff?	381	272	------
By quota?	505	233	------
By present system?	137	392	------
4. Do you favor Government control or regulation of drug prices?	919	436	18
5. Do you favor temporary Federal aid to depressed areas?	1,001	298	74
With adequate "antipirating" provisions?	958	124	291
6. Do you favor resuming the testing of nuclear weapons?	968	373	32
Before agreement is reached on effective inspection and control?	856	331	206
7. Do you favor reductions in foreign aid appropriations?	732	335	306
Military?	654	449	260
Economic?	598	504	361
8. Should the United States recognize Red China?	318	948	107
9. Do you feel that presidential campaigns are too long and too costly in time, money, and human energy?	1,096	232	45

Address by Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, at the testimonial luncheon given in his honor by the mayor and city of New York on Monday, May 15, 1961, Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg presented a most interesting and thought-provoking address in which he touched on several important problems of national interest. His views and thoughts deserve wider attention, and I am therefore pleased to insert his address into the RECORD.

Secretary Goldberg deserves to be commended for demonstrating that his approach to problems is not one-sided. He gave sound advice to both labor and industry, and I hope and trust they will take his advice in a spirit of cooperation for the Nation's interest. He asked both of them to observe "a simple rule of mortality" by eliminating discrimination in housing and employment. Laws alone will not end such discrimination,

but it can be accomplished through fair practices and unprejudiced policies.

Significantly, Secretary Goldberg spoke about the work stoppage at our missile bases in which we are all so deeply concerned. In speaking of the remedies to this situation, he said:

It has been suggested that the quickest way to attain the goal we seek is to adopt a law to compel a solution.

But I have learned from long experience that the adoption of laws does not necessarily solve the problem. Whether a law could or could not is beside the point. Labor and management, without a law to compel them, can on their own volition agree on these principles:

That the program is one of urgent priority;

That the work should be performed economically, at decent wage levels, under fair conditions;

That, as during the war, free labor and free management can outproduce the regimented and compelled work force of the totalitarian countries;

That, therefore, no interruption of work should take place.

I consider these proposals by the Secretary of Labor as very sage advice and I sincerely hope that both sides will agree to it. As a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I was extremely perturbed when I learned about these work stoppages and how much it is hurting our progress in scientific research and development, especially in space research.

The text of Secretary Goldberg's address is as follows:

I am greatly honored by this affair tendered to me by the mayor and the city of New York. It is, I hink, characteristic of this city that you have so honored two members of President Kennedy's Cabinet, and that those members are the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor.

I am sure my distinguished colleague, Luther Hodges, was as gratified at the luncheon given for him as I am today.

These affairs show an awareness—by your great mayor and the citizens of New York—of the interrelationship of industry and commerce and labor in the life of this city, and indeed in the life of the country.

Gestures of this sort are indications of the truly progressive character of your city. It is that progressive tradition, dating back many years, that has helped New York attain the eminence it enjoys in this Nation and throughout the world.

I would like this afternoon to address myself to a provocative concept advanced by our President, one that has been the subject of much discussion and soul searching, both in our press and in our own individual minds.

In his inaugural address, the President said: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country."

The question has been raised as to why the country was not furnished with a bill of particulars. This desire of people to be told specifically how to make their contribution to the national effort is quite understandable. Yet, I would like to raise the counterquestion with you as to whether this uncertainty does not in itself reflect a lack of awareness on the part of the people of their responsibilities to our society.

We pride ourselves for our dependence upon free enterprise, a free economy and personal decision to provide us with the goods and services for a good life. We are justifiably proud of our free institutions and the contributions they make. The managers of our vast industries, the leaders of our great labor unions, the important citizens who direct community affairs—all are among the prime movers of our national life.

At the same time, while Government has important responsibilities which it must exercise responsibility in our society, we ought not let Government dominate our lives. I am sure that most of us agree with that concept.

Given that general frame of mind, then, I would like to pose this question: Why is there any lack of awareness of what these tremendous groups, and the individuals in these groups, can do to advance the national interest?

I would like to suggest some answers, by way of specific examples in fields closely related to my own responsibilities as Secretary of Labor. I am, for example, the Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. The problem of discrimination exists in our national life.

That problem is not geographic in character. It is not, as those of us who live in the large, northern industrial cities would sometimes like to believe, strictly a southern problem. It exists here in New York, for example, in housing and employment practices.

Of course, the National Government is very much concerned with this problem, and is taking what are hoped to be effective steps to discharge its own obligations in this area. I believe that the beginning that has been made is extremely promising. President Kennedy's forceful leadership in this field has been reinvigorating. Under it, this administration has been able to create what I believe is a new and better climate for opportunity to flourish.

And here in New York, under your Governor and your distinguished mayor, much has been done. In this enlightened State and city, statutory protections exist to insure fair employment practices, for example.

Thus far government; but what of our private groups?

In reply to the question—what can I do for my country?—I say to the members of the business and management and labor communities of America: stop discriminating.

No individual or group needs a law or an Executive order to coax or command them to observe a simple rule of morality.

That would be a genuine contribution to the national welfare. Businessmen can follow fair employment and promotional practices and policies on their own volition, in their own businesses. Labor unions can end discriminatory habits using their own means and powers.

I might add a corollary thought here, as a visitor to this greatest of all western metropolises. As hosts to the world, and especially to the United Nations, the citizens of New York can make a real contribution to our welfare by pursuing the open and unprejudiced policy of the civilized host—as I am sure you try to do.

This should be true not only for first rank Ambassadors and diplomats but for the entire world community that lives and works here within your city limits.

My hometown, the Nation's Capital, faces the same responsibility.

What can you do for your country?

Let me give another example. I am, of course, very much concerned with labor-management relations. We have lately been engaged in an effort to insure regularity and stability in the work going on at our missile bases. This, in fact, is one of the things that brings me to New York today.

It has been suggested that the quickest way to attain the goal we seek is to adopt a law, to compel a solution.

But I have learned from long experience that the adoption of laws does not necessarily solve the problem. Whether a law could or could not is beside the point. Labor and management, without a law to compel them, can on their own volition agree on these principles:

That the program is one of urgent priority;

That the work should be performed economically, at decent wage levels, under fair conditions;

That, as during the war, free labor and free management can outproduce the regimented and compelled work force of the totalitarian countries;

That, therefore, no interruption of work should take place.

Now this attitude, and this remark, are not necessarily limited to the organizations working at missile bases.

My experience has convinced me that if labor and management are awaiting a bill of particulars on what they can do for their country, they don't have to look far.

There is no Government policy that prevents labor and management from developing, by mutual effort, better machinery for the settlement of disputes in vital matters—and in other matters as well. I would and do encourage such an effort. When labor and management ask: What can we do for our country?—an obvious answer is: Keep the peace. Keep the industrial peace not because a law compels you to but because of the welfare of the country and because it is to your own enlightened self-interest to do so.

I mentioned civil rights and labor-management relations as examples where voluntary effort in the public interest is self-suggesting.

Let me give you a third, based upon an interest inherent in the Secretary of Labor's job. Last week, the President issued an Executive order creating a Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. I have the honor to serve with Attorney General Kennedy and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff on that Committee.

The President's Committee will, of course, enlist the aid and seek the cooperation of governments and private organizations in this fight against the waste of delinquency.

In this important area, with $10 million authorized for Federal grants, it is obvious that if the President's Committee is to succeed it must depend upon the cooperation and aid of States and private organizations.

In commenting on this Executive order, the Washington Post remarked: "Juvenile delinquency is essentially a local problem which must be dealt with through local agencies—schools, churches, settlement houses, community welfare agencies—operating together to bring hostile and rebellious youth into participation in the community's life. The real need is to put what is now known into use and to prod responsible private and public agencies at the local level into more effective operation."

I agree with that sentiment. The Federal Government can perform good and needed service in this field. It is also true that long before the Executive order was issued, manifesting Presidential concern and intention to appropriate action, the question of what you could do for your country provided its own answer to men and women already at work on delinquency.

I have given you three instances of areas where individual and group response to the President's concept should be clear. There are many others, both inside and outside my own responsibility.

In the singular world of today, a world of troubled neighborhoods rather than separate nations, our Government undertakes aid programs that are of vital and paramount importance for the peace and security of the world.

These programs do not exclude voluntary efforts by groups and individuals.

A religious group near Washington, D.C., for example, has been sending cows to areas in the world where a cow is a treasure, and where fresh milk is a luxury.

Large programs like CARE are effective expressions of private American concern. They are examples of what persons in private capacities can do for their country and the world—for in leading the world toward greater well-being they also strengthen the United States.

This is a great metropolitan area, a huge complex of people and activity.

You know that as social problems arise, as the daily business of living becomes more and more demanding and challenging, the powers that can be brought to bear upon solutions need to be more effective. Responsible government must be an instrument for progress when the means at hand to private groups are not adequate to the problem they face. At the same time, government cannot be responsible unless our people make it so, unless they view their own actions in the light of the interest of all.

I would paraphrase the words of the President this way: All of us know what our country has done for us, and all of us know, in our heart and conscience, what we should do for our country. The resolution to act, to move forward, to seek the path of good conscience, is the only decision that remains.

Address by Hon. Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, at the Tennessee River Tributaries Association and Elk River Development Association, Fayetteville, Tenn., May 12, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I bring to your attention, and the attention of my other distinguished colleagues, the very timely, pertinent, and interesting address made by our former colleague, Hon. Stewart L. Udall, who is now the distinguished Secretary of the Interior:

ADDRESS BY HON. STEWART L. UDALL, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE TENNESSEE RIVER TRIBUTARIES ASSOCIATION AND ELK RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, FAYETTEVILLE, TENN., MAY 12, 1961

You do me a unique honor in asking me to talk with you about development of water resources. You were in the front lines of the long battle for water development in this region when I was a schoolboy in a little Arizona ranch town. You were among the first New Frontiersmen because you were pioneers in a coordinated comprehensive river development plan. To all of you residents of the Tennessee Valley, the subject of water and its planned control and use is far from novel.

I understand your valleywide association is only slightly more than a year old. You can accomplish much through joint and coordinated action, and you hold it within your power to be of considerable assistance to the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. You are holding fast to the original brilliant concept of TVA. You well realize that we can no longer afford to be piecemeal in our development of water resources. We must devise plans which will transcend the interests of individual localities or agencies, and which will conform to a broad plan of integrated development of all the resources of a great watershed. This is no time for standpatters, it is no time for the overly cautious approach to resource development—it is a time for broad gaged planning and bold action. President Kennedy has told us, "Failures to act now may be opportunities lost forever."

Years ago you and other farsighted men set the pattern. You saw the opportunities available in harnessing the mighty Tennessee and making it work for mankind. In so doing, you made the three letters TVA synonymous with the idea of overall basin development.

It wasn't a simple matter. I'm sure many of you vividly remember the slow and often disappointing struggle which you underwent before TVA became a reality. Perhaps by now, though, that stirring story is "old hat" to some of your neighbors in this valley. I know that you here tonight, representing various area development associations, have not forgotten and will not forget.

The world outside this beautiful valley of yours continues to hold up TVA as a shining example of the best that man can accomplish in utilizing nature. Just 6 days ago, the Christian Science Monitor carried a long story about the Cauca Valley Corp., a new river development effort in the South American nation of Colombia. It quoted the English-speaking general manager of the CVC as saying, "We think we are admirably suited for a TVA-type development." It isn't the admittedly great water development works of Russia that these South Americans look to as a guide—it is your own, our own, TVA. And so it goes, everywhere in the free world. Do not, yourselves, become immune to the great accomplishments around you.

Not all of the development of the Tennessee River region is to be spoken of in the past tense. Part of the job still remains to be done. I'm sure you recall the words of the late George Norris who said in his autobiography that:

"This program of controlling the surplus floodwaters of the great Mississippi Valley by storage in natural reservoirs situated on the main stream and along the tributaries is an immense one. It may never be fulfilled. That depends entirely upon the vision of the American people. It will require a vast amount of money to complete it; it will take years of planning and of labor to meet fully all of its factors; and yet it offers the only promise discovered by men for the effective control of floods and efficient conservation of natural resources."

Yes, you have begun to make real use of your river system—but you've only begun, as George Norris foresaw. Now you face the challenge of continuing with his great vision—yes, and that of many others as well. You who continue to hold to the vision, you who still have the evangelist's fervor and the salesman's persistence, must work together with the officials of the TVA to complete this project that is of great importance to all America. One of the dreams that you in the Southeast have long held is that of joining the Tennessee and the Tombigbee to cut off 600 miles of the long water journey from your ports to the gulf. The TVA itself was once such a pipedream—who knows, perhaps your later efforts will be crowned with success. Certainly, this administration favors a stepped-up program of long-range planning now in the resources field.

You leaders realize, too, that river development doesn't necessarily mean great power dams or navigation channels on every watercourse. You realize that some areas of this vast river basin are best suited for recreation development, others are promising for intensive agricultural undertakings, such as your growing poultry industry, or timber production, and some spots are best retained for the benefit of wildlife. There's room on the big Tennessee and its tributaries for all kinds of development. Not every mile of the system can be developed as a new Pittsburgh—just as not every mile can be drained farmland, a river park or a wildlife refuge. But every mile can be developed in some manner, with due consideration for economics and always with a progressive and farsighted standard of feasibility that holds great faith in the future.

Listen again to George Norris' words: "Every drop of water that falls from the heavens to the earth beneath should perform its proper share of preserving the blessings God intends to bestow upon his people." Every drop of water in this watershed can be made to work, over and over again, and it must be done. The important thing, it seems to me, is to develop this homeland of yours that the natural resources so abundant here are utilized and conserved in the highest and best manner appropriate to the overall concept of basin development.

All of us in the Kennedy administration were enthused and challenged by the precedent-setting special message of the President concerning natural resources. Here was given all of us a blueprint for the construction of an integrated program for the wise conservation and use of our natural resources. If that stirring message could be summarized in only two words, I believe those words would be, "Think big."

We must all think big and act in accord with that thought. Here we can see that even George Norris, who thought some of the biggest thoughts ever to burst forth in the U.S. Senate, didn't think big enough. George Norris almost overlooked one of the primary items in the Tennessee River development—the recreation potential of water. Recreation is a latecomer on the list of benefits of comprehensive river development, and certainly we cannot blame the founding fathers of TVA for initially paying it little heed. But now, in a Nation of rising wages and increasing leisure time, recreational use of the TVA facilities is growing at an astonishing rate. Americans have discovered that yours is one of the most diverse and enjoyable outdoor recreation areas in our Nation. I'm told that an average of $8½ million worth of new recreation facilities is added each year at the reservoirs of the TVA. In addition to a total governmental recreation investment here of $120 million, there has been nearly an equal amount in private recreation investments such as cottages and resorts. You have close to 50,000 boats on your river system. Think what all this already means to the economy of your valley. Think what more it will mean in the years immediately ahead.

Everywhere in the United States recreation is becoming big business. We're going to have to think and act mighty big if we meet the pent-up recreation demand.

We in the Department of the Interior have taken this recreation boom, and the President's message, to heart. We are embarking on some big planning for recreation development throughout the United States. We feel that this is the moment of decision. What we do, or don't do, in the next 10 years will set the character of this Nation for generations to come. America's open space is disappearing rapidly at a time when all signs point to mounting demands for parks, parkways, recreation areas, and wildlife refuges. We need open space in which to find outdoor enjoyment and refreshment of mind, body, and spirit.

To meet this need we are laying plans for a program without parallel in our history. Because much of this recreational development is of national impact, we want the Fed-

eral Government to take the lead in a program we're calling "Parks for America." And we want to encourage local areas and States to do more through a cooperative effort. Only a few areas and a few States, notably New York and California, are keeping up or vigorously attempting to keep up with the mounting demand.

This generation, as we see it, has a last-chance opportunity to save perhaps 15 or 20 million acres for national parks, another 2½ million acres for national recreation areas, more than a million acres for national parkways and scenic roads such as your Natchez Trace, 4½ million acres for wildlife refuge areas. The program will be costly, but every year we delay the costs will rise. Fortunately, much land we propose to retain as open space already is in public ownership. But for 4.6 million acres of privately held land that we foresee as national park lands, the estimated cost has doubled in the past 10 years, and is expected to nearly double again in the next 10. Make no mistake about it, if we do not act now the opportunity will vanish. What we save in the next 10 years may well be all we will ever have the chance to save.

These aren't the only ways in which we are undertaking to implement the natural resources program outlined by President Kennedy. We hold uppermost his warning that "Our Nation has been blessed with a bountiful supply of water; but it is not a blessing we can regard with complacency." In all those areas wherein we have primary responsibility for multiple-purpose water development we are hard at work drawing up plans for a resumption of the effort that shriveled into near nothingness during the past 8 years. In this we have as a shining example the transformation wrought in hydroelectric power production and consumption by your TVA. That transformation brought you from an area of relatively little electric use to one in which electric power consumption is nearly twice the per capita average for the rest of the Nation.

Too, we accept the goal of developing comprehensive river basin plans during the decade of the sixties, so that all parts of our country can follow the steps to progress that you have made.

And we share with others in the Government a concern that a major breakthrough be made, and made soon, on the growing problem of cleaning up our streams. Conserved water will be of little use if it is polluted water. No longer can we rely on the adage that "dilution is the solution to pollution." Something more, something positive, must be done. We face the imminent peril of having our major rivers become thousand-mile sewers.

No longer is water pollution a problem of a few metropolitan areas; it is a problem nationwide in scope. To meet it we must spend twice as much on municipal waste treatment plants as we now do. The administration's program for a grant-in-aid system to help communities meet this problem is the start. With its adoption perhaps I won't have to inhale the stench of the Potomac when I drive home on a hot day. Perhaps we will close out the business I read about recently in a magazine—the business some private enterpriser started on the Missouri River. He skims and sells the grease from the surface of the broad Missouri.

Already the Secretary of Agriculture and I are working together in another area to which the President directed his attention. Together we are formulating a comprehensive Federal recreational lands program and working to eliminate conflicts in fish and wildlife programs so that an increased and improved wildlife conservation effort may be made. If this takes some knocking together of a few bureaucratic heads, then Secretary Freeman and I are ready to do it.

I hope it goes without saying that in all these various fields of natural resource planning and development the Federal Government does not desire to move ahead alone. Nor does it expect to. We are heeding President Kennedy's view that only through the fullest participation and cooperation of State and local government and private industry can this task be done wisely and effectively. It's up to you folks just as much as it is to us. Resource development is a must—a natural, if you'll permit the pun. With our soaring population we are facing what I call the quiet crisis. For all its quietness, this crisis in the field of resource development is just as real as the one we face in world affairs. America has the ability to meet this crisis—we aren't a poor nation. Just a small part of the money we now spend on pointed-toed shoes and overpublicized gimmicks can have a beneficial effect for many generations if we direct the money into public investment. As progressive conservationists concerned with the efficient development of our Nation our job is cut out for us.

I'm sure I could do no better than to end with the closing words of the President's natural resources message: "The task is large but it will be done."

Proposed Presidential Citation for Oskar J. W. Hansen for Accomplishments in the Field of Sculpture and Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, on January 23, 1961, Representative BEN F. JENSEN wrote a letter to the President of the United States, praising Mr. Oskar J. W. Hansen now of Charlottesville, Va., as the sculptor of Liberty, and requesting that he be given a Presidential citation and the Medal of Merit for his accomplishments in the field of sculpture and art.

Fifty-two Members of the U.S. Senate, and 12 Members of the House of Representatives joined with Mr. JENSEN in this communication, and I ask unanimous consent that the body of this letter, with the signatures and my remarks, be printed in the Congressional RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 23, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In 1910 Oskar J. W. Hansen was 18. He wanted to become an American. In a rough sea and the dark of night he dived over the side from a foreign ship and lived to make the beach on the Carolina Banks "By the Dawn's Early Light."

The United States has come into being through attrition of folks who preceded Oskar onto those self-same beaches. These in time collected their forces at Yorktown. When the news of October 19, 1781, reached Philadelphia, our First Congress authorized a monument in commemoration of the alliance and victory which had given to our country both hope and a future. It is this very monument which Oskar restored and completed with his magnificent sculpture of Liberty in order that the will and obligation of the First Congress could be dedicated at long last on behalf of the President, by the Secretary of the Army, on October 19, 1957.

I have known Oskar many years. His renown as a sculptor and person both at home and abroad has advanced with the growth and prestige of our country. Secretary Harold Ickes wrote about his sculptures at Hoover Dam that he had "completed the most difficult task ever assigned to an artist." There Oskar built a monument which is competent, imaginative, and unique. He won this Government commission in a national competition with all his peers. The astrophysical data and star diagram preserve a basic thesis for projecting our national skill into space. Kindly note the abstracts in the pictorial record which may be had on request from the sculptor.

The Constitution covers all Americans like a seamless robe. It heals our inadequacies and adds luster to our defense of right. It was available to Oskar when he regained consciousness on that beach. At Yorktown we have written into the granite after his name a noble phrase: "Sculptor of Liberty." This is what he did: This, above all, is the sum of his life.

I now wish for myself and my fellow Americans a pause to consider the strong bond that binds us together as we face the future. For that reason, and because it is proper, I urge that you, Mr. President, give a Presidential citation and the Medal of Merit to the sculptor of Liberty.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

I concur in what BEN JENSEN has written.

CARL HAYDEN, U.S. Senator; SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, U.S. Senator; ALAN BIBLE, U.S. Senator; HARRY F. BYRD, U.S. Senator; J. W. FULBRIGHT, U.S. Senator; EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, U.S. Senator; KARL E. MUNDT, U.S. Senator; PAUL H. DOUGLAS, U.S. Senator; A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, U.S. Senator; HENRY M. JACKSON, U.S. Senator; HOWARD W. CANNON, U.S. Senator; LISTER HILL, U.S. Senator; GEORGE A. SMATHERS, U.S. Senator; FRANK E. MOSS, U.S. Senator; JOHN A. CARROLL, U.S. Senator; WARREN G. MAGNUSON, U.S. Senator; FRANK CHURCH, U.S. Senator; STEPHEN M. YOUNG, U.S. Senator; ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senator; LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President, U.S. Senate; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, U.S. Senator; MAURINE NEUBERGER, U.S. Senator; NORRIS COTTON, U.S. Senator; B. EVERETT JORDAN, U.S. Senator; H. E. TALMADGE, U.S. Senator; STUART SYMINGTON, U.S. Senator; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator; CLAIR ENGLE, U.S. Senator; GALE W. MCGEE, U.S. Senator; JACK R. MILLER, U.S. Senator; JENNINGS RANDOLPH, U.S. Senator; HOMER E. CAPEHART, U.S. Senator; LEE METCALF, U.S. Senator; OREN E. LONG, U.S. Senator; STYLES BRIDGES, U.S. Senator; FRANK CARLSON, U.S. Senator; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, U.S. Senator; HIRAM L. FONG, U.S. Senator; E. L. BARTLETT, U.S. Senator; RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senator; ESTES KEFAUVER, U.S. Senator; ALEXANDER WILEY, U.S. Senator; WAYNE MORSE, U.S. Senator; PAT MCNAMARA, U.S. Senator; ALLEN J. ELLENDER, U.S. Senator; HUGH SCOTT, U.S. Senator; JOSEPH S. CLARK, U.S. Senator; SAM J. ERVIN, JR., U.S. Senator; JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, U.S. Senator; JAMES O. EASTLAND, U.S. Senator; ROBERT S. KERR, U.S. Senator; JOHN SPARKMAN, U.S. Senator; SAM RAYBURN, Representative in Congress; JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Representative

in Congress; CHARLES A. HALLECK, Representative in Congress; HOWARD W. SMITH, Representative in Congress; HAROLD D. COOLEY, Representative in Congress; EMANUEL CELLER, Representative in Congress; THOMAS E. MORGAN, Representative in Congress; BRENT SPENCE, Representative in Congress; CLARENCE CANNON, Representative in Congress; W. D. MILLS, Representative in Congress; OVERTON BROOKS, Representative in Congress; EDWARD P. BOLAND, Representative in Congress.

President's Statement on Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, for 6 years the Special Government Information Subcommittee has studied the restrictions on the availability of Government information. Many of its reports and findings, after review and adoption by the Committee on Government Operations, have been filed with this House. The subcommittee has attempted to bring to the attention of the Members the critical nature of the problem of suppression of information.

In a recent address before the National Association of Broadcasters, the President made a most eloquent expression of the importance of freedom of information in our democracy. It was a dramatic indication of his personal concern that the people in our democracy should know the facts, and should be well-informed as they face the dangerous decisions that lie ahead. Discussing the strength of freedom, the President declared:

The great inner resource of freedom, the resource which has kept the world's oldest democracy continuously young and vital, the resource which has always brought us our greatest exploits in time of our greatest need, is the very fact of the open society.

Thus if we are once again to preserve our civilization, it will be because of our freedom, and not in spite of it. That is why I am here with you today. For the flow of ideas, the capacity to make informed choices, the ability to criticize, all the assumptions upon which political democracy rests, depend largely upon communication. And you are the guardians of the most powerful and effective means of communication ever designed.

For the history of this Nation is a tribute to the ability of an informed citizenry to make the right choices in response to danger, and if you play your part, if the immense powers of broadcasting are used to illuminate the new and subtle problems which our Nation faces—if your strength is used to reinforce the great strengths which freedom brings, then I am confident that our people and our Nation, and all other people and all other nations will again rise to the great challenge of the sixties.

The President spoke in the context of the successful Mercury astronaut flight. He noted, however, that the flight could have failed:

Because this is a free society, and because we therefore take our chances out in the open, of success or failure, all those who were part of the program, who were involved in the decisions which made the program possible, were also in hazard. And while their task did not in any manner approach that of the commander, nevertheless, it is a very real one, and it is the kind of risk which members of a free society must take.

There had been before the flight, as you know, a good many members of the community who felt that we should not take that chance. But I see no way out of it. I don't see how it is possible for us to keep these matters private, unless we decide on the highest national level that all matters which are risky, which carry with them the hazard of defeat, which could be detrimental to our society, that none of them will be printed in the paper or carried on radio or television.

The essence of free communication must be that our failures as well as our successes will be broadcast around the world. And therefore we take double pride in our successes.

I feel as a believer in freedom, as well as President of the United States, that we want a world in which the good and the bad, successes or failures, the aspirations of people, their desires, their disagreements, their dissent, their agreements, whether they serve the interest of the State or not, should be made public, should be part of the general understanding of all people.

The President spoke at a time when the city of Washington was welcoming the Mercury astronaut. The President spoke without a prepared text, and in order that Members may inform themselves of this important statement of principle, under unanimous consent I include the transcript of the President's remarks on May 8, 1961, to the convention of the National Association of Broadcasters in the RECORD:

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE OPENING SESSION OF THE 39TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Governor Collins, Bishop Hannah, ladies and gentlemen, we have with us today the Nation's No. 1 television performer, who I think on last Friday morning secured the largest rating of any morning show in recent history. [Laughter.]

I must say, I think all of us as citizens of the free world are extremely proud not only of Commander Shepard, but also of Mrs. Shepard—and perhaps with the Vice President they would come forward. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

Commander SHEPARD. How do you get them to stop? We only have time for a few words here, because I understand we have a rather busy day ahead of us. I just want to say, thank you very much for such a warm welcome. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT. I must say I think the presence of Commander Shepard and also Mrs. Shepard who I think is—I must say, when I saw her on television, I had great satisfaction as a fellow citizen. I must say we are delighted to have them all. It is a great source of satisfaction and pride to us.

I said this morning, when I read off the names of some of the other people who have been involved in this flight—Mr. Webb, who is head of NASA, and Dr. Dryden and all the rest—I said that they were names which were rather unknown. If this flight had not been successful, however, they would have been among the best known names in the United States. So that even I, who had nothing to do with the flight, would have become very much identified with it.

So that I do express my commendation to Commander Shepard and also his fellow astronauts who all involved themselves in the hazards and the discipline of the work, but also those who were involved with the program. Because this is a free society, and because we therefore take our chances out in the open, of success or failure, all those who were part of the program, who were involved in the decisions which made the program possible, who were involved in the very public decision which made the very public flight possible on Friday morning, were also in hazard. And while their task did not in any manner approach that of the commander, nevertheless it is a very real one, and it is the kind of risk which members of a free society must take.

There had been before the flight, as you know, a good many members of the community who felt that we should not take that chance. But I see no way out of it. I don't see how it is possible for us to keep these matters private, unless we decide on the highest national level that all matters which are risky, which carry with them the hazard of defeat, which could be detrimental to our society, that none of them will be printed in the paper or carried on radio or television.

The essence of free communication must be that our failures as well as our successes will be broadcast around the world. And therefore we take double pride in our successes.

I am delighted that there are members here of your profession who are not citizens of this country but who come from our hemisphere. I hope that they understand that we share a fraternal feeling with them, that we are engaged in a common effort to maintain freedom here in this hemisphere, and to assist freedom throughout the world.

And it has been our fortune to be placed in positions of responsibility—all of us—at a time when freedom is under its greatest attack.

I know that to those who live in some parts of this country and some parts of the world, that the discipline of the totalitarian system has some attraction. I called attention at my press conference more than a week ago to a comment made by a student in Paris, an African student, after the extraordinary flight of Major Gagarin, in which the student said, "The Russians don't talk about things, they do them, and then we hear about them."

It is difficult for me to believe that any young man or woman, or any citizen who understands the real meaning of freedom, who recognizes that freedom is at issue around the globe, could possibly hold that view.

I feel, as a believer in freedom, as well as President of the United States, that we want a world in which the good and the bad, successes or failures, the aspirations of people, their desires, their disagreements, their dissent, their agreements, whether they serve the interest of the state or not, should be made public, should be part of the general understanding of all people.

And that is why I was particularly anxious to come here today. There is no means of communication as significant as that in which you are involved: to hear, and to see, and to listen.

And you have the opportunity to play a significant role in the defense of freedom all around the globe.

Our adversaries in this struggle against freedom—and they are not national adversaries, we have no national disagreements, what is involved is the great struggle for freedom, and our adversaries in that struggle possess many advantages. Their

forces press down upon us, on the borders of the Middle East, southeast Asia, and Western Europe. They use the secrecy of the totalitarian state and the discipline to mask the effective use of guerrilla forces secretly undermining independent states, and to hide a wide international network of agents and activities which threaten the fabric of democratic government everywhere in the world. And their single-minded effort to destroy freedom is strengthened by the discipline, the secrecy, and the swiftness with which an efficient despotism can move. In addition, the ability of a totalitarian state to mobilize all of its resources for the service of the state, whatever the human cost, has great attraction for those who live on the marginal edge of existence, fired with a strong feeling of ancient wrongs and grievances, a feeling which is tirelessly exploited by our adversaries—the people who live on an income of $60 or $70 or $80 a year—the example of the Soviet Union which in the short space of 40 years has transformed itself from being among the most backward countries of Europe to being a leader in space, has powerful attraction.

Once a state succumbs, however, to this attraction, to the lure of communism, to the lure of totalitarianism—even for a moment—resistance is then crushed, opposition is destroyed, and despotic power is maintained even when finally the people may realize they have been cruelly misled—and the steady stream of refugees out of Vietnam in the north, out of Eastern Germany, out of Cuba, all indicate the real nature of their society once it has assumed control.

On this path thus far there has been no turning back. There can be no doubt, therefore, that this determined and powerful system will subject us to many tests of nerve and will in the coming years—in Berlin, in Asia, in the Middle East, in this hemisphere. We will face challenge after challenge, as the Communists armed with all the resources and advantages of the police state attempt to seize the balance of power in their direction.

But despite this, I do not believe that the tide of history is on the side of despotism. I do not believe that the tide of history necessarily is on either side. It is only what we decide ourselves we will do—which direction we will turn the tide of history—that we can be successful.

For we bring to the battle our own resources, the better advantages of a free society—advantages which our adversaries cannot match, advantages which if vigorously used offer hope for the ultimate triumph of freedom.

On our side is the simple and all-important fact that men want to be free, and nations want to be their own masters. It is this fact that helps to explain why no nation in the past decade—with the possible exception of Cuba, where a social revolution was betrayed, and where the story is not yet finally ended—has fallen under Communist rule without being subdued by armed force.

It is this fact that explains the courageous revolution against hopeless odds in Poland, and East Germany, and Hungary and Tibet—revolutions that would have succeeded if alien armies had not been present to put them down.

It is this fact that explains why the poverty-stricken nations of this hemisphere and Africa, filled with discontent in some cases, and social tensions, bearing the memory of past wrongs, have still not succumbed to the lure of communism.

And it is this fact that is man's best hope. For our Nation is on the side of man's desire to be free, and the desire of nations to be independent. And thus we are allied, if we are true to ourselves and true to our destiny, with the strongest force in the world today.

The great inner resource of freedom, the resource which has kept the world's oldest democracy continuously young and vital, the resource which has always brought us our greatest exploits in time of our greatest need, is the very fact of the open society.

Thus, if we are once again to preserve our civilization, it will be because of our freedom, and not in spite of it. That is why I am here with you today. For the flow of ideas, the capacity to make informed choices, the ability to criticize, all the assumptions upon which political democracy rests, depend largely upon communication. And you are the guardians of the most powerful and effective means of communication ever designed.

In the rest of the world this power can be used to describe the true nature of the struggle, and to give a true and responsible picture of a free society. And in addition, broadcasting has new and untried possibilities for education, for help to end illiteracy, which holds back so much of the world and which denies access to the information so vital to a free and informed choice. The full development of broadcasting as an instrument of education is one of the most significant challenges which confronts your industry. And here in our own country this power can be used, as it is being used, to tell our people of the perils and the challenges and the opportunities that we face—of the effort and the painful choices which the coming years will demand. For the history of this nation is a tribute to the ability of an informed citizenry to make the right choices in response to danger, and if you play your part, if the immense powers of broadcasting are used to illuminate the new and subtle problems which our Nation faces—if your strength is used to reinforce the great strengths which freedom brings, then I am confident that our people and our Nation, and all other people and all other nations will again rise to the great challenge of the sixties.

No man can hope to prophesy with precision the outcome of the great struggle in which our generation is now engaged. Yet we do know that the cause of human freedom has been threatened on many occasions since the system of free choice and democracy was developed in sunlit Greece more than 2,400 years ago. And yet from each threat and indeed from each defeat, as well as from each success, it has ultimately emerged unconquered.

That is why in the face of an ominous future we can share that faith which Winston Churchill expressed more than a half-century ago, "Humanity will not be cast down."

We are going along, along the same high road, and already behind the distant mountains the sun can be seen—and will be seen again.

That is your opportunity—and that is a responsibility which all of us who are citizens of the free world must once again meet.

Another War?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 17, 1961

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will we again be called upon to say goodby to loved ones, some of whom may return permanently disabled—others who will never come home?

There is every reason to be apprehensive, fearful, to gird ourselves for determined effort, be willing to sacrifice to preserve this a free, independent nation, where we and those we bring into the world can continue to enjoy the freedom and opportunity which have always been ours.

Another war confronts us because we have pledged help to others throughout the world who are less fortunate. We have forgotten that self-preservation always has been, and ever will be, uppermost in the minds of individuals and nations. When the chips are down every individual, every nation, always has and will continue to look first to its own welfare and existence.

As a member of so many international organizations, we have surrendered our right to act independently, even though our own existence be at stake. On our doorstep, in Cuba, because of our international agreements, the Communists have been able to establish a base—in violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Were it not for our international agreements, we could, and long ago, had we the spirit of the forefathers, have kicked the Russians, the Communists, from Cuba—blockaded the island itself if necessary.

Carried away by the natural and laudable desire to be helpful to others, listening to the preachment of intellectuals and internationalists whose objectives are laudable but impossible of attainment, we have fought and sacrificed not only to bring peace throughout the world, but to make the intellectual and spiritual standards of all others conform to our own.

Nowhere in America is there a reading or listening intelligent individual who does not know that, because of our commitments to international organizations, disputes in the Middle East, in southeast Africa, in Germany, in South America, as well as in Cuba, war is on our doorstep. We have spread our power too thin, in too many places. Over-extension, over-commitments threaten our ruin.

The President—an earnest, able, patriotic and courageous young man—is rightly apprehensive of what may befall. Some have criticized him because he relies to such a great extent upon members of his own family. For my part, I can understand his need for confidence in his advisers. Today, he does not know which way to turn for sound, patriotic advice.

A few years ago, the State Department, upon which he should be able to rely, was shot through and through with homosexuals, moral perverts and Communists. Today, there is no certainty that in it Communists do not know and betray to our enemies our most secret plans and accomplishments. Recent developments in Cuba may indicate that such is the fact.

The President has wisely called upon many of his political opponents, experienced individuals, to advise and help him, and, without exception, all have

given him of their best. However, the ultimate plotting of our course rests with the President, a burdensome responsibility which he has generously assumed. I doubt not that he has asked for Divine guidance.

We have been told that "God helps them that help themselves." As individuals, we cannot shirk our responsibility. Likewise, we cannot shirk our own responsibilities, either as individuals or as a Nation, to see that we remain strong, do not lose our freedom, our ability to defend our independence as a Nation.

Our efforts to help others will be futile if they continue to refuse to do their part toward the attainment of their own freedom and independence.

We cannot turn back the pages of history, rechart our course. New scientific and productive methods and achievements have created tremendously destructive and costly weapons. Another war may turn back for centuries present-day civilization. Our individual and national responsibility to our own and future generations cannot be shirked. Other nations, powerful because we have built up their strength, now challenge our ability to successfully meet a destructive war. The President has called for and we are preparing to defend the continued existence of our Government, of our way of life.

Throughout the country individuals and corporations granted billions of your tax dollars are engaged in the production of things and weapons needed if we are to preserve our own existence. This program we must all support. We can no longer tolerate the existence of groups or organizations which render production for defense more costly or inadequate.

When the Congress appropriated billions for the production of missiles, other implements of defense, at plants in Florida, in California, and other places throughout the United States, a few greedy, selfish groups took advantage of the opportunity and the need to secure for themselves benefits to which they were not entitled, the granting of which threatens our very existence. Some of these strikers received as much as $700 a week, in just one case added $692,000 to the cost.

While the average member of a union is just as patriotic, willing to pay his or her share of the tax burden, make as great a contribution to the general welfare, engage in combat fighting, as are the members of any other civic or religious group, because of the special privileges and benefits which have been granted, some few leaders and individuals have been able to and have taken advantage of the present situation.

For more than 20 years, when war or unemployment threatened or were with us, they have interfered and sabotaged our efforts to be ready, insisted that they alone should have the available jobs, and at a price named by them.

I need but cite strikes in Detroit more than 20 years ago where the Navy, in need of equipment necessary for national defense, was held up for 24 and again for 41 days by strikes, the issue being additional benefits for those engaged in such work.

Some have forgotten that, on May 25 of 1946, when strikes by railroad employees threatened to tie up the transportation system of the Nation, President Truman came before Congress and demanded, and the House passed by a vote of 306 to 13, legislation which gave him, as President, authority to seize some industries and imposed upon the railroad strikers the necessity of either permitting the railroads to be operated or themselves being drafted into the armed services where they would receive the pay of a serviceman. The strike ended very quickly.

Is there any reason why some should enlist or be drafted into the armed services while jobs in factories producing munitions of war should be available only to members of unions; nonunion men, veterans, and taxpayers, discriminated against?

In Michigan, employees in several plants, in order to keep production going, voluntarily took a lessened, a decreased wage, willingly offered to work additional hours. What a contrast between the action of these patriotic employees and those to whom I have just referred and who were in a situation to prevent us from adequately preparing for war.

The remedy?

Recently, Senator MCCLELLAN suggested that, in such situations, some of the special privileges and benefits granted to unions and their members should be suspended.

Twenty years ago, legislation designed to prevent the abuse and misuse of special privileges by any organization which interfered with our national welfare, public health, or our ability to defend ourselves, was introduced by me, but it never, because of the political power of a few union leaders, received consideration.

Another bill has just been introduced which would take from employees and unions, when they sabotage our national defense, the special privileges and benefits granted them by Federal legislation.

Our Constitution defines treason: I quote:

> Treason against the United States, shall consist only in levying War against them, or, in adhering to their Enemies, giving them Aid and Comfort.

Get that? Giving them "aid and comfort."

Neither a lawyer nor a judge is needed to determine that, if you are drafted or enlist in the defense of our country, I, working in the plant which produces a gun or the shoes you must wear while at the front line, by refusing to produce those things you need, am giving "aid and comfort" to the enemy—otherwise defined by that short and ugly word "treason."

No one is asking that those who are sabotaging our national defense, our ability to preserve ourselves and protect our position in the world, be punished by hanging, the punishment prescribed by the Constitution for treason, or even by imprisonment or fine. All anyone is suggesting is that those who strike, who refuse to work, while being permitted to refuse to contribute to our national defense, shall not be permitted to hinder others from carrying on; that the organizations to which they belong be deprived of the special privileges which they are abusing.

Just as the father takes from the son who drives the family automobile in a reckless, dangerous manner, so, too, should organizations and individuals who misuse and abuse to the detriment of the public the special legislation, privileges and exemptions which they enjoy, be deprived of those special privileges when misused or abused.

Those who pay, the parents, the wives, the sisters, the children of those who are called to the armed services, should insist that our legislators—whether in State or National office—give first consideration to the national good, the welfare of all, rather than granting some special benefit to members of particular groups and organizations expecting in return support, come election day.

Back of this whole present-day effort to involve us in war throughout the world, then to sabotage our production, are the Communists, and we, because of the foolish agreements we have made, seem to be powerless to act independently, act effectively.

The least we can do is to make an effort to prevent those here at home from interfering with our efforts to preserve our national welfare and sovereignty.

Let us once more make our own independence, our own welfare, our own security, our first consideration.

